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—2 Cor. 4:7

[PAGE VII] PREFACE

It is with mingled feelings of gratitude and regret that I let this book go to the public. I am grateful for God’s sustaining grace through so many years of intense work and am fully conscious of the inevitable imperfections that still remain. For a dozen years this Grammar has been the chief task of my life. I have given to it sedulously what time was mine outside of my teaching. But it was twenty-six years ago that my great predecessor in the chair of New Testament Interpretation proposed to his young assistant that they together get out a revised edition of Winer. The manifest demand for a new grammar of the New Testament is voiced by Thayer, the translator of the American edition of Winer’s Grammar, in his article on “Language of the New Testament” in Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible.

Winer

WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).

Thayer

THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).
———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).
I actually began the work and prepared the sheets for the first hundred pages, but I
soon became convinced that it was not possible to revise Winer’s Grammar as it ought
to be done without making a new grammar on a new plan. So much progress had been
made in comparative philology and historical grammar since Winer wrote his great
book that it seemed useless to go on with it. Then Dr. Broadus said to me that he was
out of it by reason of his age, and that it was my task. He reluctantly gave it up and
pressed me to go on. From that day it was in my thoughts and plans and I was
gathering material for the great undertaking. If Schmiedel had pushed through his
work, I might have stopped. By the time that Dr. James Hope Moulton announced his
new grammar, I was too deep into the enterprise to draw back. And so I have held to
the titanic task somehow till the end has come. There were many discouragements and
I was often tempted to give it up at all costs. No one who has not done similar work
can understand the amount of research, the mass of detail and the reflection required
in a book of this nature. The mere physical effort of writing was a joy of expression in
comparison with the rest. The title of Cauer’s brilliant book, Grammatica Militans
(now in the third edition), aptly describes the spirit of the grammarian who to-day
attacks the problems of the language of the New Testament in the light of
historical research.

From one point of view a grammar of the Greek New Testament is an impossible
task, if one has to be a specialist in the whole Greek language, in Latin, in Sanskrit, in
Hebrew and the other Semitic tongues, in Church History, in the Talmud, in English,
in psychology, in exegesis.1 I certainly lay no claim to omniscience. I am a linguist by
profession and by love also, but I am not a specialist in the Semitic tongues, though I

Broadus BROADUS, JOHN A., Comm. on Matt. (1886).
Moulton

(1908).

———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).

———, Grammatical Notes from the Papyri (The Expositor, 1901, pp. 271–282;


———, N. T. Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery (Cambr. Bibl. Essays, 1909,
pp. 461–505).

———, The Science of Language (1903).

Cauer CAUER, Grammatica Militans. 3d ed. (1912).
1 Cf. Dr. James Moffatt’s remarks in The Expositor, Oct., 1910, p. 383 f.
have a working knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic, but not of Syriac and Arabic. The Coptic and the Sanskrit I can use. The Latin and the Greek, the French and German and Anglo-Saxon complete my modest linguistic equipment. I have, besides, a smattering of Assyrian, Dutch, Gothic and Italian.

I have explained how I inherited the task of this Grammar from Broadus. He was a disciple of Gessner Harrison, of the University of Virginia, who was the first scholar in America to make use of Bopp’s *Vergleichende Grammatik*. Broadus’ views of grammar were thus for long considered queer by the students who came to him trained in the traditional grammars and unused to the historical method; but he held to his position to the end.

This Grammar aims to keep in touch at salient points with the results of comparative philology and historical grammar as the true linguistic science. In theory one should be allowed to assume all this in a grammar of the Greek N. T., but in fact that cannot be done unless the book is confined in use to a few technical scholars. I have tried not to inject too much of general grammar into the work, but one hardly knows what is best when the demands are so varied. So many men now get no Greek except in the theological seminary that one has to interpret for them the language of modern philology. I have simply sought in a modest way to keep the Greek of the N. T. out in the middle of the linguistic stream as far as it is proper to do so. In actual class use some teachers will skip certain chapters.

Alfred Gudemann,² of Munich, says of American classical scholars: “Not a single contribution marking genuine progress, no work on an extensive scale, opening up a new perspective or breaking entirely new ground, nothing, in fact, of the slightest scientific value can be placed to their credit.” That is a serious charge, to be sure, but then originality is a relative matter. The [Page ix] true scholar is only too glad to stand upon the shoulders of his predecessors and give full credit at every turn. Who could make any progress in human knowledge but for the ceaseless toil of those¹ who have gone before? Prof. Paul Shorey,² of the University of Chicago, has a sharp answer to Prof. Gudemann. He speaks of “the need of rescuing scholarship itself from the German yoke.” He does not mean “German pedantry and superfluous accuracy in insignificant research—but … in all seriousness from German inaccuracy.” He continues about “the disease of German scholarship” that “insists on ‘sweat-boxing’ the evidence and straining after ‘vigororous and rigorous’ demonstration of things that

---

Harrison HARRISON, GESSNER, A Treatise on the Philology of Greek Prepositions (1858).
Bopp BOPP, Vergleichende Grammatik (1857).
¹ F. H. Colson, in an article entitled “The Grammatical Chapters in Quintilian,” I, 4–8 (The Cl. Quarterly, Jan., 1914, p. 33), says: “The five chapters which Quintilian devotes to ‘Grammatica’ are in many ways the most valuable discussion of the subject which we possess,” though he divides “grammatica” into “grammar” and “literature,” and (p. 37) “the whole of this chapter is largely directed to meet the objection that grammar is ‘tenuis et jejuna.’”
² The Cl. Weekly, May 27, 1911, p. 229.
do not admit of proof.” There probably are German scholars guilty of this grammatical vice (are American and British scholars wholly free?). But I wish to record my conviction that my own work, such as it is, would have been impossible but for the painstaking and scientific investigation of the Germans at every turn. The republic of letters is cosmopolitan. In common with all modern linguists I have leaned upon Brugmann and Delbrück as masters in linguistic learning.

I cannot here recite my indebtedness to all the scholars whose books and writings have helped me. But, besides Broadus, I must mention Gildersleeve as the American Hellenist whose wit and wisdom have helped me over many a hard place. Gildersleeve has spent much of his life in puncturing grammatical bubbles blown by other grammarians. He exercises a sort of grammatical censorship. “At least whole grammars have been constructed about one emptiness.” It is possible to be “grammar

________________________

Brugmann

BRUGMANN, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).

———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).

Delbrück

DELBRÜCK, B., Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis (1867).


———, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871–1888).

Gildersleeve

GILDERSLEEVE, B. L., Editions of Pindar and Justin Martyr.

———, Latin Grammar. Many editions since 1867.

———, Notes on Stahl’s Syntax of the Greek Verb (1910).

———, Numerous articles in the American Journal of Philology.
mad,” to use The Independent’s phrase. It is easy to scout all grammar and say: “Grammar to the Wolves.” Browning sings in A Grammarian’s Funeral:

“He settled Hoti’s business—let it be!—

Properly based Oun—

Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic De,

Dead from the waist down.”

[Page x] Perhaps those who pity the grammarian do not know that he finds joy in his task and is sustained by the conviction that his work is necessary. Prof. C. F. Smith (The Classical Weekly, 1912, p. 150) tells of the joy of the professor of Greek at Bonn when he received a copy of the first volume of Gildersleeve’s Syntax of Classical Greek. The professor brought it to the Seminar and “clasped and hugged it as though it were a most precious darling (Liebling).” Dr. A. M. Fairbairn once said: “No man can be a theologian who is not a philologian. He who is no grammarian is no divine.” Let Alexander McLaren serve as a good illustration of that dictum. His matchless discourses are the fruit of the most exact scholarship and spiritual enthusiasm. I venture to quote another defence of the study of Greek which will, I trust, yet come back to its true place in modern education. Prof. G. A. Williams, of Kalamazoo College, says: “Greek yet remains the very best means we have for plowing up and wrinkling the human brain and developing its gray matter, and wrinkles and gray matter are still the most valuable assets a student can set down on the credit side of his ledger.”

Dr. J. H. Moulton has shown that it is possible to make grammar interesting, as Gildersleeve had done before him. Moulton protests against the notion that grammar

---

4 1911, p. 717.
5 Article by F. A. W. Henderson, Blackwood for May, 1906.
1 Address before the Baptist Theological College at Glasgow, reported in The British Weekly, April 26, 1906.
2 The Cl. Weekly, April 16, 1910.
Moulton

———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).
———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).
is dull: “And yet there is no subject which can be made more interesting than grammar, a science which deals not with dead rocks or mindless vegetables, but with the ever changing expression of human thought.” I wish to acknowledge here my very great indebtedness to Dr. Moulton for his brilliant use of the Egyptian papyri in proof of the fact that the New Testament was written in the vernacular κοινή. Deissmann is


———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

3 London Quarterly Review, 1908, p. 214. Moulton and Deissmann also disprove the pessimism of Hatch (Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 1): “The language of the New Testament, on the other hand, has not yet attracted the special attention of any considerable scholar. There is no good lexicon. There is no good philological commentary. There is no adequate grammar.”

Deissmann

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.

the pioneer in this field and is still the leader in it. It is hard to overestimate the debt of modern New Testament scholarship to his work. Dr. D. S. Margoliouth, it is true, is rather pessimistic as to the value of the papyri: “Not one per cent. of those which are deciphered and edited with so much care tell us anything worth knowing.”

Certainly that is too [Page xi] gloomy a statement. Apart from the linguistic value of the papyri and the ostraca which has been demonstrated, these letters and receipts have interest as human documents. They give us real glimpses of the actual life of the common people in the first Christian centuries, their joys and their sorrows, the little things that go so far to make life what it is for us all. But the student of the Greek New Testament finds a joy all his own in seeing so many words in common use that were hitherto found almost or quite alone in the New Testament or LXX. But the grammar of the N. T. has also had a flood of light thrown on it from the papyri, ostraca and inscriptions as a result of the work of Deissmann, Mayser, Milligan, Moulton, Radermacher, Thumb, Völker, Wilcken and others. I have gratefully availed myself of the work of

———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).


4 The Expositor, Jan., 1912, p. 73.


Milligan

MILLIGAN, G., The Greek Papyri with Special Reference to their Value for N. T. Study (1912).

———, The N. T. Documents (1913).


Thumb


———, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


Völker
these scholars and have worked in this rich field for other pertinent illustrations of the New Testament idiom. The material is almost exhaustless and the temptation was constant to use too much of it. I have not thought it best to use so much of it in proportion as Radermacher has done, for the case is now proven and what Moulton and Radermacher did does not have to be repeated. As large as my book is, the space is precious for the New Testament itself. But I have used the new material freely. The book has grown so that in terror I often hold back. It is a long step from Winer, three generations ago, to the present time. We shall never go back again to that standpoint. Winer was himself a great emancipator in the grammatical field. But the battles that he fought are now ancient history.

It is proper to state that the purpose of this Grammar is not that of the author’s Short Grammar which is now in use in various modern languages of America and Europe. That book has its own place. The present volume is designed for advanced students in theological schools, for the use of teachers, for scholarly pastors who wish a comprehensive grammar of the Greek New Testament on the desk for constant use, for all who make a thorough study of the New Testament or who are interested in the study of language, and for libraries. If new editions come, as I hope, I shall endeavour to make improvements and corrections. Errata are sure to exist in a book of this nature. Occasionally (cf. Accusative with Infinitive) the same subject is treated more than once for the purpose of fulness at special points. Some repetition is necessary in teaching. Some needless repetition can be eliminated later. I may explain also that the works used by me in the Bodleian Library and the British Museum had the citations copied twice with double opportunity for errors of reference, but I have guarded that point to the best of my ability. I have been careful to give credit in detail to the many works consulted.

But, after all is said, I am reluctant to let my book slip away from my hands. There is so much yet to learn. I had hoped that Mayser’s Syntax der griechischen Papyri could have appeared so that I could have used it, but he sorrowfully writes me that illness has held him back. Neither Helbing nor Thackeray has finished his Syntax of

Völker, F., Papyrorum graecorum syntaxis specimen (1900).
———, Syntax d. griech. Papyri. I, Der Artikel (1903).


Helbing

Helbing, R., Die Präpos. bei Herodot und andern Historikern (1904).
———, Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre (1907).

Thackeray
the LXX. The N. T. Vocabulary of Moulton and Milligan, though announced, has not yet appeared. Deissmann's Lexicon is still in the future. Thumb's revision of Brugmann's Griechische Grammatik appeared after my book had gone to the press.¹ I could use it only here and there. The same thing is true of Debrunner's revision of Blass' Grammatik des neuest. Griechisch. New light will continue to be turned on the Greek of the N. T. Prof. J. Rendel Harris (The Expository Times, Nov., 1913, p. 54 f.) points out, what had not been recently noticed, that Prof. Masson, in his first edition of Winer in 1859, p. vii, had said: “The diction of the New Testament is the plain and unaffected Hellenic of the Apostolic Age, as employed by Greek-speaking Christians when discoursing on religious subjects ... Apart from the Hebraisms—the number of which has, for the most part, been grossly exaggerated—the New Testament may be considered as exhibiting the only genuine fac-simile of the colloquial diction employed by unsophisticated Grecian gentlemen of the first century, who spoke without pedantry—as ἰδιώται and not as σοφισταί.” The papyri have simply confirmed the insight of Masson in 1859 and of Lightfoot in 1863 (Moulton, Prol., p. 242). One's mind lingers with fascination over the words of the New Testament as they meet him in unexpected contexts in the papyri, as when ἡ ἁρετή (cf. 1 Pet. 2:9) occurs in the sense of ‘Thy Excellency,’ ἔχω παρασχεῖν τῇ ἁρετῇ, O. P. 1131, 11 f. (v/A.D.), or when ὑπερῷον (Ac. 1:13) is used of a pigeon-house, τὸν ὑπερῷον τόπον τῆς ὑπερῴουσις αὐτῷ ἐν Μουχινῷ οἶκιας, O. P. 1127, 5–7 (A.D. 183). But the


———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).

Moulton and Milligan

Moulton and Milligan, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

¹ Prof. E. H. Sturtevant (Cl. Weekly, Jan. 24, 1914, p. 103) criticises Thumb because he retains in his revision of Brugmann’s book the distinction between accidence and syntax, and so is “not abreast of the best scholarship of the day.” But for the N. T. the distinction is certainly useful.

Blass


———, Hermeneutik und Kritik (1892).

———, Philology of the Gospels (1898).

———, Pronunciation of Ancient Greek (translation by Purton in 1890 of 3. Aufl. of Über die Aussprache des Griech. 1888).

Harris Harris, J. Rendel, Side-Lights on N. T. Research (1908).
book must now go forth to do its part in the elucidation of the New Testament, the treasure of the ages.\footnote{1 Brilliant use of the new knowledge is made by Dr. James Moffatt’s New Testament (A New Translation, 1913).

Angus}

I indulge the hope that the toil has not been all in vain. Marcus Dods (Later Letters, p. 248) says: “I admire the grammarians who are content to add one solid stone to the permanent temple of knowledge instead of twittering round it like so many swallows and only attracting attention to themselves.”

I make no complaint of the labour of the long years, for I have had my reward in a more intimate knowledge of the words of Jesus and of his reporters and interpreters. Τὰ ρήματα ὃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμα ἔστιν καὶ ζωὴ ἔστιν (Jo. 6:63).

I must record my grateful appreciation of the sympathy and help received from many friends all over the world as I have plodded on through the years. My colleagues in the Seminary Faculty have placed me under many obligations in making it possible for me to devote myself to my task and in rendering substantial help. In particular Pres. E. Y. Mullins and Prof. J. R. Sampey have been active in the endowment of the plates. Prof. Sampey also kindly read the proof of the Aramaic and Hebrew words. Prof. W. O. Carver graciously read the proof of the entire book and made many valuable suggestions. Dr. S. Angus, of Edinburgh, read the manuscript in the first rough draft and was exceedingly helpful in his comments and sympathy. Prof. W. H. P. Hatch, of the General Episcopalian Theological Seminary, New York, read the manuscript for the publishers and part of the proof and exhibited sympathetic insight that is greatly appreciated. Prof. J. S. Riggs, of the Auburn Theological Seminary, read the proof till his health gave way, and was gracious in his enthusiasm for the enterprise. Prof. Walter Petersen, Ph.D., of Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas, read all the proof and freely gave his linguistic attainments to the improvement of the book. Last, but not least in this list, Mr. H. Scott, of Birkenhead, England, read the book in galley proof, and in the Accidence verified all the references with minute care and loving interest, and all through the book contributed freely from his wealth of knowledge of detail concerning the Greek N. T. The references in Syntax were verified by a dozen of my students whose labour of love is greatly appreciated. Pres. J. W. Shepherd, of Rio Janeiro, Brazil, and Prof. G. W. Taylor, of Pineville, La., had verified the Scripture references in the MS., which were again verified in proof. The Index of Quotations has been prepared by [Page xiv] Rev. W. H. Davis, of Richmond College, Va.; the Index of Greek Words by Rev. S. L. Watson, Tutor of N. T. Greek for this session in the Seminary. All this work has been done for me freely and gladly. The mere recital of it humbles me very much. Without this expert aid in so many directions the book could not have been produced at all. I must add, however, that all errors should be attributed to me. I have done the best that I could with my almost

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{1 Brilliant use of the new knowledge is made by Dr. James Moffatt’s New Testament (A New Translation, 1913).

Angus}
\end{footnotesize}
impossible task. I have had to put on an old man’s glasses during the reading of the proof.

I must add also my sincere appreciation of the kind words of Prof. Edwin Mayser of Stuttgart, Oberlehrer H. Stocks of Cottbus, Pres. D. G. Whittinghill of Rome, Prof. Caspar René Gregory of Leipzig, the late Prof. E. Nestle of Maulbronn, Prof. James Stalker of Aberdeen, Prof. Giovanni Luzzi of Florence, Prof. J. G. Machen of Princeton, Profs. G. A. Johnston Ross and Jas. E. Frame of Union Seminary, and many others who have cheered me in my years of toil. For sheer joy in the thing Prof. C. M. Cobern of Allegheny College, Penn., and Mr. Dan Crawford, the author of Thinking Black, have read a large part of the proof.

I gladly record my gratitude to Mr. G. W. Norton, Misses Lucie and Mattie Norton, Mr. R. A. Peter (who gave in memory of his father and mother, Dr. and Mrs. Arthur Peter), Rev. R. N. Lynch, Rev. R. J. Burdette, Mr. F. H. Goodridge, and others who have generously contributed to the endowment of the plates so that the book can be sold at a reasonable price. I am indebted to Mr. K. B. Grahn for kindly cooperation. I am deeply grateful also to the Board of Trustees of the Seminary for making provision for completing the payment for the plates.

It is a pleasure to add that Mr. Doran has shown genuine enthusiasm in the enterprise, and that Mr. Linsenbarth of the University Press, Cambridge, has taken the utmost pains in the final proofreading.

Petersen PETERSEN, W., Greek Diminutives in –ιον (1910).
Stocks STOCKS, H., Das neutestamentliche Griechisch im Lichte der modernen Sprachforschung (Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, XXIV. Jahrgang, 633–700).
Gregory


Nestle


———, Novum Testamentum Graece. 8th ed. (1910).
———, Septuagint (Hastings’ D. B., 1902).
I should say that the text of Westcott and Hort is followed in all essentials. Use is made also of the Greek Testaments of Nestle, Souter, and Von Soden whose untimely death is so recent an event. In the chapter on Orthography and Phonetics more constant use is made, for obvious reasons, of variations in the manuscripts than in the rest of the book. It is now four hundred years since Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros had printed the Greek New Testament under the auspices of the University of Alcalá or Complutum, near Madrid, though it [Page xv] was not circulated till 1522. Erasmus got his edition into circulation in 1516. “The Complutensian edition of 1514 was the first of more than a thousand editions of the New Testament in Greek” (E. J. Goodspeed, *The Biblical World*, March, 1914, p. 166). It thus comes to pass that the appearance of my Grammar marks the four hundredth anniversary of the first printed Greek New Testament, and the book takes its place in the long line of aids to the study of the “Book of Humanity.” The Freer Gospels and the Koridethi Gospels show how much we have to expect in the way of discovery of manuscripts of the New Testament.

I think with pleasure of the preacher or teacher who under the inspiration of this Grammar may turn afresh to his Greek New Testament and there find things new and old, the vital message all electric with power for the new age. That will be my joy so long as the book shall find use and service at the hands of the ministers of Jesus Christ.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

LOUISVILLE, KY., 1914.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

The second edition has been called for so soon that I did not have the opportunity for rest that I desired before preparing for it. But I have gone steadily through the book with eager eyes. The result is that some five hundred changes have been made in the text here and there, all for the improvement of the book in one way or another, besides the *Addenda* at the end of the book. Most of the changes are small details, but they are all worth making. The *Addenda* are as few as possible because of the great size of the volume. I have been more than gratified at the kindly reception accorded the book all over the world in spite of the distraction of the dreadful war. Many

Souter


Soden


———, Griechisches N. T. Text mit kurzem Apparat (1913).

Goodspeed

scholars have offered helpful criticisms for which I am deeply grateful. In particular I wish to mention Prof. C. M. Cobern, Allegheny College, Meadville, Penn.; Prof. D. F. Estes, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.; Prof. Basil L. Gildersleeve, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; Prof. E. J. Goodspeed, the University of Chicago; Prof. D. A. Hayes, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; Prof. James Moffatt, Mansfield College, Oxford, England; Prof. [Page xvi] C. W. Peppler, Trinity College, Durham, N. C.; Prof. W. Petersen, Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas; Mr. William Pitfield, Manchester, England; Rev. Dr. Alfred Plummer, Bideford, England; Mr. H. Scott, Birkenhead, England; Prof. James Stalker, United Free Church College, Aberdeen, Scotland; Dr. Gross Alexander, Nashville, Tenn. I hope that future editions may make it possible to improve the book still further. Various minor repetitions have been removed, though more still remain than is necessary. But the book is at least made more intelligible thereby. The numerous cross-references help also.

In the Neutestamentliche Studien (1914) in honour of the seventieth birthday of Dr. Georg Heinrici of the University of Leipzig there is a paper by Heinrich Schlosser “Zur Geschichte der biblischen Philologie.” He tells the story of “the first grammar of the New Testament Greek” (1655). It is by Georg Pasor and is entitled Grammatica Graeca Sacra Novi Testamenti Domini nostri Jesu Christi. His son, Matthias Pasor, Professor of Theology at Gröningen, found his father’s manuscript and let it lie for eighteen years because many held grammatical study to be puerile or pedantic and the book would have few readers. Finally he published it in 1655, since he held grammar to be “clavis scientiarum omnisque solidae eruditionis basis ac fundamentum.” He was cheered by Melanchthon’s “fine word”: “Theologia vera est grammatica quaedam divinae vocis.” It is only 260 years since 1655.

New books continue to come out that throw light on the language of the New Testament. Part I (through α) of Moulton and Milligan’s Vocabulary of the Greek

Hamilton HAMILTON, The Negative Compounds in Greek (1899).

Gildersleeve

GILDERSLEEVE, B. L., Editions of Pindar and Justin Martyr.

———, Latin Grammar. Many editions since 1867.

———, Notes on Stahl’s Syntax of the Greek Verb (1910).

———, Numerous articles in the American Journal of Philology.


Petersen PETERSEN, W., Greek Diminutives in –ιον (1910).

Moulton and Milligan

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.
Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources (1914) is now a rich treasure in the hands of students. Sharp’s Epictetus and the New Testament (1914) is a very helpful monograph full of suggestions. A note from Dr. Albert Thumb announces that he is at work on a revision of his Hellenismus. So the good work goes on.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

AUGUST, 1915.

[PAGE XVII] PREFACE TO THIRD EDITION

My grammar has had to live and do its work in spite of the Great War, but the time for the Third Edition has come. In a letter Dr. Alfred Plummer says: “That so technical and expensive a volume should be already in a third edition in the fifth year of the war is indeed triumphant evidence of the value of the book. Scientific grammar is appreciated more widely than one would antecedently have ventured to expect.” These few years have allowed time for a thorough verification of the multitudinous references. This enormous task has been done as a labor of love by Mr. H. Scott, of Birkenhead, England, whose patient skill has placed all users of the book under a debt of gratitude that can never be paid. He had already put his invaluable services at my disposal, but now his leisure permitted him to employ his really wonderful statistical knowledge of the Greek New Testament for the benefit of students. These extremely useful tables are found in the Addenda to this Edition. I am sure that all New Testament students will appreciate and profit greatly from these tables.

A brilliant student of mine, Rev. W. H. Davis, has found some striking illustrations in the papyri that appear in the Addenda, besides a number from my own readings. Dr. Davis is at work on the lexical aspects of the papyri and the inscriptions.

--------
Thumb


———, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


If his studies lead him on to prepare a New Testament lexicon, the world will be the better for such an outcome.

Mr. J. F. Springer, of New York City, has also made some valuable contributions which appear in the Addenda. I am indebted also to Prof. Robert Law, of Knox College, Toronto, for errata.

I have watched with eagerness for criticisms of the book and have done my best to turn them to the improvement of the grammar. It is gratifying to know that ministers are using it in their studies as one of the regular tools in the shop. In the classroom only selected portions can be covered, but the preacher can use it every day (as many do) in his reading and study of the Greek New Testament. There are many ministers who read the Greek New Testament through once a year, some of it every day, besides the solid, critical study of a Gospel or Epistle with commentary, lexicon and grammar. This is the work that pays one a hundredfold in his preaching. My own reward for the long years of devotion to this grammar is found in the satisfaction that [Page xviii] scholarly ministers are using the book for their own enrichment. I have been gratified to learn of laymen who use the book regularly.

Besides the correction of infelicities and errata that could be found here and there and the Addenda at the end of the volume I have inserted a detailed Table of Contents which will greatly aid one in finding topics in the various chapters. The minute subdivisions with page references will supplement the various Indices to great advantage. The Index of Greek words, large as it is, was still incomplete. It has been doubled in this edition by Mr. Scott’s assistance. The Additional Bibliography records the most important recent contributions.

Death has been busy with New Testament linguists. Dr. Gross Alexander, of Nashville, has been claimed by death. Dr. George Heinrici, of Leipzig, is dead. Dr. Albert Thumb, of Marburg, has likewise passed on. Dr. H. B. Swete, of Cambridge, and Principal James Denney, of Glasgow, have also joined the great majority. These are irreparable losses, but there are others and even greater ones. Dr. Caspar René Gregory, of Leipzig, though seventy years old, volunteered for the army and was

____________________________

Swete


———, The Apocalypse of St. John (1906).

———, The O. T. in Greek according to the Septuagint (1887). 3 vols.

Gregory


killed in battle in France. With his death perished the hope of a new and revised edition of Tischendorf’s Novum Testamentum Graece for many years to come. A younger man must now take hold of this problem and make available for students the new textual knowledge.

Dr. James Hope Moulton fell a victim in April, 1917, in the Mediterranean Sea, to the German submarine. He was placed in a boat, but after several days succumbed to the exposure and cold. It was he who first applied in detail Deissmann’s discovery


Moulton


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

Deissmann

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


that the New Testament was written in the current κοινή as seen in the Egyptian papyri. He had planned three volumes on the New Testament grammar. Volume I (the Prolegomena) appeared in 1906 (Third Ed., 1908). He had nearly finished Volume II (Accidence), but had done nothing on Syntax, the most important of all. His death is an unspeakable calamity, but his work will live, for his Prolegomena preserves his interpretation of the New Testament language. The Accidence will appear in due time (is already in press). Prof. George Milligan, of Glasgow, has completed the publication of the Vocabulary of the New Testament.

The workers die, but the work goes on. It is pleasant to think that Greek is renewing its grip upon the world. Professors Stuart and Tewksbury are preparing a grammar and lexicon for Chinese students of the New Testament. Japan will do likewise. Prof. [Page xix] H. P. Houghton, of Waynesburg College, Pennsylvania, is confident that Greek can be saved for the college and the university, for “it is the basis of true culture” (The Classical Weekly, Dec. 11, 1916, p. 67). There is nothing like the Greek New Testament to rejuvenate the world, which came out of the Dark Ages with the Greek Testament in its hand. Erasmus wrote in the Preface to his Greek Testament about his own thrill of delight: “These holy pages will summon up the living image of His mind. They will give you Christ Himself, talking, healing, dying, rising, the whole Christ in a word; they will give Him to you in an intimacy so close that He would be less visible to you if He stood before your eyes.” The Greek New Testament is the New Testament. All else is translation. Jesus speaks to us out of every page of the Greek. Many of his ipsissima verba are here preserved for us, for our Lord often spoke in Greek. To get these words of Jesus it is worth while to plow through any grammar and to keep on to the end.

At the age of sixteen John Brown, of Haddington, startled a bookseller by asking for a copy of the Greek Testament. He was barefooted and clad in ragged homespun clothes. He was a shepherd boy from the hills of Scotland. “What would you do with that book?” a professor scornfully asked. “I’ll try to read it,” the lad replied, and

———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).
———, Licht vom Osten (1908).
———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.
———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

Milligan

———, The Greek Papyri with Special Reference to their Value for N. T. Study (1912).
———, The N. T. Documents (1913).
proceeded to read off a passage in the Gospel of John. He went off in triumph with the coveted prize, but the story spread that he was a wizard and had learned Greek by the black art. He was actually arraigned for witchcraft, but in 1746 the elders and deacons at Abernethy gave him a vote of acquittal, though the minister would not sign it. His letter of defence, Sir W. Robertson Nicoll says (The British Weekly, Oct. 3, 1918), “deserves to be reckoned among the memorable letters of the world.” John Brown became a divinity student and finally professor of divinity. In the chapel at Mansfield College, Oxford, Brown’s figure ranks with those of Doddridge, Fry, Chalmers, Vinet, Schleiermacher. He had taught himself Greek while herding his sheep, and he did it without a grammar. Surely young John Brown of Haddington should forever put to shame those theological students and busy pastors who neglect the Greek Testament, though teacher, grammar, lexicon are at their disposal.

In Current Opinion for January, 1919, page 18, in an article called “Europe’s Ideas of Wilson the Man,” one notes a pertinent sentence: “President Wilson once told a member of the diplomatic corps in Washington, who repeated it later in Paris, that if he were going to college all over again he would pay more attention to the Greek language and literature, which American universities, on the whole, neglect.” So the scholar-statesman feels. So the preacher ought to feel.

A. T. ROBERTSON.
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4. Verbs of Emotion
5. Verbs of Sharing, Partaking and Filling
6. Verbs of Ruling
7. Verbs of Buying, Selling, Being Worthy of
8. Verbs of Accusing and Condemning
9. Genitive Due to Prepositions in Composition
10. Attraction of the Relative

(j) The Genitive of the Infinitive
(k) The Genitive Absolute

IX. The Ablative Case

(a) The Name
(b) The Meaning
(c) Rare with Substantives
(d) The Ablative with Adjectives
(e) The Ablative with Prepositions
(f) The Ablative with Verbs

1. Verbs of Departure and Removal
2. Verbs of Ceasing, Abstaining
3. Verbs of Missing, Lacking, Despairing
4. Verbs of Differing, Excelling
5. Verbs of Asking and Hearing
6. Verbs with the Partitive Idea
7. Attraction of the Relative

X. The Locative Case
(a) The Name Locative
(b) The Significance of the Locative
(c) Place
(d) Time
(e) Locative with Adjectives
(f) Locative with Verbs
(g) The Locative with Substantives
(h) The Locative with Prepositions
(i) The Pregnant Construction of the Locative

XI. The Instrumental Case
(a) The Term Instrumental
(b) Syncretistic?
(c) Place
(d) Time
(e) The Associative Idea
(f) With Words of Likeness and Identity
(g) Manner
(h) [Page xxxvii] Degree of Difference
(i) Cause
(j) Means
(k) With Prepositions

XII. The Dative (True) Case
(a) Syncretism
(b) The Decay of the Dative
(c) The Idea of the Dative
The Dative with Substantives

With Adjectives

With Adverbs and Prepositions

With Verbs

1. Indirect Object
2. Dativus Commodi vel Incommodi (Ethical)
3. Direct Object
4. The Dative with Intransitive Verbs
5. Possession
6. Infinitive as Final Dative
7. The Dative of the Agent
8. The Dative because of the Preposition

Ambiguous Examples

CHAPTER XII. Adverbs

I. Special Difficulties

(a) Nature of the Adverb
(b) The Narrower Sense of Adverb

II. Adverbs with Verbs

(a) Commonest Use
(b) N. T. Usage
(c) Predicative Uses with γίνομαι and εἰμί
(d) With ἔχω
(e) With Participles
(f) Loose Relation to the Verb

III. Adverbs Used with Other Adverbs
IV. Adverbs with Adjectives

V. Adverbs with Substantives

VI. Adverbs Treated as Substantives

VII. The Pregnant Use of Adverbs

VIII. Adverbs as Marks of Style

IX. The Adverb Distinguished from the Adjective
   (a) Different Meaning
   (b) Difference in Greek and English Idiom

X. [Page xxxviii] Adverbial Phrases
   (a) Incipient Adverbs
   (b) Prepositional Phrases
   (c) Participles
   (d) The Verb Used Adverbially

CHAPTER XIII. Prepositions

I. The Name
   (a) Some Postpositive
   (b) Not Originally Used with Verbs
   (c) Explanation

II. The Origin of Prepositions
   (a) Originally Adverbs
   (b) Reason for Use of Prepositions
   (c) Varying History

III. Growth in the Use of Prepositions
   (a) Once No Prepositions
   (b) The Prepositions Still Used as Adverbs in Homer
(c) Decreasing Use as Adverbs after Homer
(d) Semitic Influence in N. T.
(e) In Modern Greek

IV. Prepositions in Composition with Verbs
(a) Not the Main Function
(b) Preposition Alone
(c) Increasing Use
(d) Repetition after Verb
(e) Different Preposition after Verb
(f) Second Preposition Not Necessary
(g) Effect of Preposition on Meaning of the Verb
(h) Dropping the Preposition with Second Verb
(i) Intensive or Perfective
(j) Double Compounds

V. Repetition and Variation of Prepositions
(a) Same Preposition with Different Cases
(b) Repetition with Several Nouns
(c) Repetition with the Relative
(d) Condensation by Variation

VI. The Functions of Prepositions with Cases
(a) The Case before Prepositions
(b) Notion of Dimension
(c) Original Force of the Case
(d) [Page xxxix] The Ground-Meaning of the Preposition
(e) The Oblique Cases Alone with Prepositions
(f) Original Freedom

(g) No Adequate Division by Cases

(h) Situation in the N. T.
   1. Those with One Case
   2. Those with Two Cases
   3. Those with Three Cases
   4. Possibly Four with ἐπί

(i) Each Preposition in a Case

VII. Proper Prepositions in the N. T.

(a) Ἀνά

(b) Ἀντί

(c) Ἀπό
   1. Original Significance
   2. Meaning ‘Back’
   4. Comparison with ἐκ
   5. Comparison with παρά
   6. Compared with ὑπό

(d) Διά
   1. The Root-Idea
   2. ‘By Twos’ or ‘Between’
   3. ‘Passing Between’ or ‘Through’
   4. ‘Because of’

(e) Ἐν
   1. Old Use of Ἐν with Accusative or Locative
2. Ἐν Older than εἰς
3. Place
4. Expressions of Time
5. ‘Among’
6. ‘In the Case of,’ ‘in the Person of’ or simply ‘in’
7. As a Dative?
8. Accompanying Circumstance
9. ‘Amounting to,’ ‘Occasion,’ ‘Sphere’
10. Instrumental Use of Ἐν

(f) Εἰς
1. Original Static Use
2. With Verbs of Motion
3. With Expressions of Time
4. Like a Dative
5. Aim or Purpose
6. Predicative Use
7. Compared with ἐπί, παρά and πρὸς

(g) Ἐκ (ἐξ)
1. Meaning
2. In Composition
3. [Page xl] Place
4. Time
5. Separation
6. Origin or Source
7. Cause or Occasion
8. The Partitive Use of ἐκ
9. ἐκ and ἐν
(h) ἐπί
1. Ground-Meaning
2. In Composition in the N. T.
3. Frequency in N. T.
4. With the Accusative
5. With the Genitive
6. With the Locative
7. The True Dative
(i) Κατά
1. Root-Meaning
2. Distributive Sense
3. Κατά in Composition
4. With the Ablative
5. With the Genitive
6. With the Accusative
(j) Μετά
1. The Root-Meaning
2. In Composition
3. Compared with σύν
4. Loss of the Locative Use
5. With the Genitive
6. With the Accusative
(k) Παρά
1. Significance
2. Compared with πρός
3. In Composition
4. With the Locative
5. With the Ablative
6. With the Accusative

(l) Περί
1. The Root-Meaning
2. In Composition
3. Originally Four Cases Used
4. With the Ablative
5. With the Genitive
6. With the Accusative

(m) Πρό
1. The Original Meaning
2. In Composition
3. The Cases Used with πρό
4. Place
5. [Page xli] Time
6. Superiority

(n) Πρός
1. The Meaning
2. In Composition
3. Originally with Five Cases
4. The Ablative
VIII. The “Adverbial” Prepositions

1. Ἀμα
2. Ἀνευ
3. Ἀντικρυς
4. Ἀντίπερα
5. Ἀπέναντι
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ἄτερ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ἀχρι(ς)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ἐγγύς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ἐκτός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ἐμπροσθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Ἐναντι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ἐναντίον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Ἐνεκά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Ἐντός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Ἐνώπιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ἐξω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Ἐξωθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Ἐπ-άνω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ἐπέκεινα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Ἐσω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Ἐως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Κατέναντι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>[Page xlii] Κατενώπιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Κυκλόθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Κύκλῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Μέσον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Μεταξύ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Μέχρι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Ὀπίσθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Ὀπίσω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. Compound Prepositions

X. Prepositional Circumlocutions

  (a) Μέσον
  (b) Ὄνομα
  (c) Πρόσωπον
  (d) Στόμα
  (e) Χείρ

CHAPTER XIV. Adjectives

I. Origin of Adjectives

II. The Adjectival or Appositional Use of the Substantive

III. The Adjective as Substantive

  (a) Any Gender
  (b) With Masculine Adjectives
(c) With Feminine Adjectives
(d) With the Neuter

IV. Agreement of Adjectives with Substantives
(a) In Number
(b) In Gender
(c) In Case
(d) Two or More Adjectives

V. The Attributive Adjective

VI. The Predicate Adjective

VII. Adjective Rather than Adverb

VIII. [Page xliii] The Personal Construction

IX. Adjectives Used with Cases

X. Adjectives with the Infinitive and Clauses

XI. The Adjective as Adverb

XII. The Positive Adjective
   (a) Relative Contrast
   (b) Used as Comparative or Superlative
   (c) With Prepositions
   (d) Comparison Implied by ἦ
   (e) In Absolute Sense

XIII. The Comparative Adjective
   (a) Contrast or Duality
   (b) Degree
   (c) Without Suffixes
   (d) Double Comparison
(e) Without Object of Comparison
(f) Followed by ἦ
(g) Followed by the Ablative
(h) Followed by Prepositions
(i) The Comparative Displacing the Superlative

XIV. The Superlative Adjective

(a) The Superlative Vanishing
(b) A Few True Superlatives in the N. T.
(c) The Elative Superlative
(d) No Double Superlatives
(e) Followed by Ablative
(f) No “Hebraistic” Superlative

XV. Numerals

(a) Εἷς and Πρῶτος
(b) The Simplification of the “Teens”
(c) The Inclusive Ordinal
(d) The Distributives
(e) The Cardinal Ἑπτά
(f) Substantive Not Expressed
(g) Adverbs with Numerals
(h) Εἷς as Indefinite Article
(i) Εἷς=Τις
(j) The Distributive Use of Εἷς

CHAPTER XV. Pronouns

I. Personal Pronouns
(a) The Nominative
   1. The First Person
   2. The Second Person
   3. The Third Person

(b) [Page xliv] The Oblique Cases of the Personal Pronouns
   1. Originally Reflexive
   2. ἀὑτοῦ
   3. Genitive for Possession
   4. Enclitic Forms

(c) The Frequency of the Personal Pronouns

(d) Redundant

(e) According to Sense

(f) Repetition of the Substantive

II. The Possessive Pronouns
(a) Just the Article
(b) Only for First and Second Persons
(c) Emphasis, When Used
(d) With the Article
(e) Possessive and Genitive Together
(f) Objective Use
(g) Instead of Reflexive

III. The Intensive and Identical Pronoun
(a) The Nominative Use of ἀὑτὸς
(b) Varying Degrees of Emphasis
(c) ἀὑτὸς with ὁὐτὸς
IV. The Reflexive Pronoun

(a) Distinctive Use
(b) The Absence of the Reflexive from the Nominative
(c) The Indirect Reflexive
(d) In the Singular
(e) In the Plural
(f) Article with
(g) Reflexive in the Reciprocal Sense
(h) Reflexive with Middle Voice
(i) The Use of Ἱδίος

V. The Reciprocal Pronoun

VI. Demonstrative Pronouns

(a) Nature
(b) Different Shades of Meaning
(c) Ὁ, ἥ, τό
(d) Ὁς
(e) Ὅδε

(f) [Page xlv] Ὅτος

1. The Purely Deictic
2. The Contemptuous Use of Ὅτος
3. The Anaphoric Use
4. In Apposition
5. Use of the Article
6. Article Absent
7. Οὗτος in Contrast with ἐκεῖνος
8. As Antecedent of the Relative Pronoun
9. Gender and Number of Οὗτος
10. The Adverbial Uses of τοῦτο and ταῦτα
11. The Phrase τοῦτο ἐστιν
12. In Combination with Other Pronouns
13. Ellipsis of Οὗτος
14. Shift in Reference

(g) Ἐκεῖνος
1. The Purely Deictic
2. The Contemptuous Use
3. The Anaphoric
4. The Remote Object (Contrast)
5. Emphasis
6. With Apposition
7. Article with Nouns except when Predicate
8. As Antecedent to Relative
9. Gender and Number
10. Independent Use

(h) Αὐτός

(i) The Correlative Demonstratives

VII. Relative Pronouns
(a) List in the N. T.
(b) The Name “Relative”
(c) A Bond between Clauses
(d) Ὄς
   1. In Homer
   2. Comparison with Other Relatives
   3. With Any Person
   4. Gender
   5. Number
   6. Case
      (α) Absence of attraction normal
      (β) Cognate accusative
      (γ) Attraction to the case of the antecedent
      (δ) Inverse attraction
      (ε) Incorporation
   7. Absence of Antecedent
   8. Prepositions with the Antecedent and the Relative
   9. Relative Phrases
  10. Pleonastic Antecedent
  11. [Page xlvi] The Repetition of Ὄς
  12. A Consecutive Idea
  13. Causal
  14. In Direct Questions
  15. In Indirect Questions
  16. The Idiom οὐδείς ἐστίν Ὄς
(e) Ὅστις

1. Varied Uses
2. The Distinction between ὃς and Ὅστις
3. The Indefinite Use
4. The Definite Examples
5. Value of ὃς?
6. Case
7. Number
8. Gender
9. Direct Questions
10. Indirect Questions

(f) Ὁἷος

1. Relation to ὃς
2. Incorporation
3. Indirect Question
4. Number
5. Ὁἷόν τὲ ἐστίν

(g) Ὅποιος

1. Qualitative
2. Double Office
3. Correlative

(h) Ὅσος

1. Quantitative
2. Antecedent
3. Attraction
4. Incorporation
5. Repetition
6. With ἄν
7. Indirect Questions
8. In Comparison
9. Adverbial

(i) Ἡλίκος

(j) Ὅ as Relative

VIII. Interrogative Pronouns

(a) Τίς
1. Substantival or Adjectival
2. The Absence of Gender
3. Τίς=ποιος
4. Indeclinable τί
5. Predicate Use of τί with τοῦτο
6. In Alternative Questions
7. The Double Interrogative
8. [Page xlvii] As Relative
9. Adverbial Use
10. With Prepositions
11. With Particles
12. As Exclamation
13. Indirect Questions
14. Τίς or τίς

(b) Ποῖος
1. Qualitative
2. Non-qualitative
3. In Indirect Questions

(c) Πόσος
1. Less Frequent than ποῖος
2. Meaning
3. In Indirect Questions
4. The Exclamatory Use

(d) Πηλίκος
1. Rare
2. Indirect Questions

(e) Ποταπός

(f) Πότερος

IX. Indefinite Pronouns

(a) Τίς
1. The Accent
2. Relation to Τίς
3. Τίς as Substantive
4. With Numerals=‘About’
5. With Substantives
6. With Adjectives
7. As Predicate
8. The Position of τίς
9. As Antecedent
10. Alternative
11. The Negative Forms

12. Indeclinable τι

(b) Εἴς = Τίς

(c) Πᾶς = ‘any one’

(d) Ὅ Δεῖνα

X. Alternative or Distributive Pronouns

(a) Ἀμφότεροι

(b) Ἐκαστος

1. Without Substantive

2. With Substantive

3. With εἶς

4. With Genitive

5. Partitive Apposition

6. Rare in Plural

7. Repetition

(c) [Page xlviii] Ἀλλος

1. Used absolutely = ‘An-other,’ ‘One Other’

2. For Two

3. As Adjective

4. With the Article

5. The Use of Ἀλλος ἄλλο

6. In Contrast for ‘Some—Others’

7. Ellipsis of Ἀλλος

8. The Use of Ἀλλος and Ἐτερος Together

9. = ‘Different’
10. Ἀλλότριος

(d) Ἐτερος

1. Absolutely
2. With Article
3. Second of Pair
4. =‘Different’
5. =‘Another’ of Three or More
6. In Contrast

(e) Other Antithetic Pronouns

XI. Negative Pronouns

(a) Οὐδείς

1. History
2. Οὐθείς
3. Gender
4. Οὐδὲ εἶς
5. Εἶς—οὐ

(b) Μηδείς

(c) Οὐτις and Μῆτις

(d) With Πᾶς

1. Οὐ πᾶς
2. Οὐ—πᾶς
3. Μή—πᾶς
4. Οὐ μή—πᾶν
5. Πᾶς—οὐ
6. Πᾶς—μή
CHAPTER XVI. The Article

I. Other Uses of ὁ, ἡ, τὸ

II. Origin and Development of the Article

(a) A Greek Contribution

(b) Derived from the Demonstrative

III. Significance of the Article

IV. The Method Employed by the Article

(a) Individuals from Individuals

(b) Classes from Other Classes

(c) Qualities from Other Qualities

V. Varied Usages of the Article

(a) With Substantives

1. Context

2. Gender of the Article

3. With Proper Names

4. Second Mention (Anaphoric)

(b) With Adjectives

1. The Resumptive Article

2. With the Adjective Alone

3. The Article not Necessary with the Adjective

4. With Numerals

(c) With Participles
(d) With the Infinitive
(e) With Adverbs
(f) With Prepositional Phrases
(g) With Single Words or Whole Sentences
(h) With Genitive Alone
(i) Nouns in the Predicate
(j) Distributive
(k) Nominative with the Article=Vocative
(l) As the Equivalent of a Possessive Pronoun
(m) With Possessive Pronouns
(n) With Αὐτός
(o) With Demonstratives
(p) With Ὄλος, Πᾶς (Ἅπας)
(q) With Πολύς
(r) Ἀκρος, Ἡμισυς, Ἑσσατος, Μέσος
(s) With Ἀλλος and Ἐτερος
(t) Μόνος

VI. Position with Attributives

(a) With Adjectives
   1. Normal Position of the Adjective
   2. The Other Construction (Repetition of the Article)
   3. Article Repeated Several Times
   4. One Article with Several Adjectives
   5. With Anarthrous Substantives
   6. With Participles
(b) With Genitives

1. The Position between the Article and the Substantive
2. Genitive after the Substantive without Repetition of the Article
3. Repetition of Article with Genitive
4. [Page I] The Article Only with Genitive
5. Article Absent with Both
6. The Correlation of the Article

(c) With Adjuncts or Adverbs

1. Between the Article and the Noun
2. Article Repeated
3. Only with Adjunct
4. Only with the Noun
5. When Several Adjuncts Occur
6. Phrases of Verbal Origin
7. Exegetical Questions
8. Anarthrous Attributives

(d) Several Attributives with Καί

1. Several Epithets Applied to the Same Person or Thing
2. When to be Distinguished
3. Groups Treated as One
4. Point of View
5. Difference in Number
6. Difference in Gender
7. With Disjunctive Particle

VII. Position with Predicates
VIII. The Absence of the Article

(a) With Proper Names
(b) With Genitives
(c) Prepositional Phrases
(d) With Both Preposition and Genitive
(e) Titles of Books or Sections
(f) Words in Pairs
(g) Ordinal Numerals
(h) In the Predicate
(i) Abstract Words
(j) Qualitative Force
(k) Only Object of Kind

IX. The Indefinite Article

CHAPTER XVII. Voice

I. Point of View

(a) Distinction between Voice and Transitiveness
(b) Meaning of Voice
(c) Names of the Voices
(d) History of the Voices
(e) Help from the Sanskrit
(f) Defective Verbs

II. The Active Voice

(a) Meaning of the Active Voice
(b) [Page li] Either Transitive or Intransitive
(c) Effect of Prepositions in Composition
Different Tenses Vary

The Active as Causative

Active with Reflexives

Impersonal Active

Infinitives

Active Verbs as Passives of Other Verbs

III.  The Middle Voice

Origin of the Middle

Meaning of the Middle

Often Difference from Active Acute

The Use of the Middle not Obligatory

Either Transitive or Intransitive

Direct Middle

Causative or Permissive Middle

Indirect Middle

Reciprocal Middle

Redundant Middle

Dynamic (Deponent) Middle

Middle Future, though Active Present

The Middle Retreating in the N. T.

IV. The Passive Voice

Origin of the Passive

Significance of the Passive

With Intransitive or Transitive Verbs

The Passive Usually Intransitive
(e) Aorist Passive
(f) Future Passive
(g) The Agent with the Passive Voice
(h) Impersonal Construction

CHAPTER XVIII. Tense

I. Complexity of the Subject
   1. The Difficulty of Comparing Greek Tenses with Germanic Tenses
   2. Bad Influence of the Latin on Greek Grammarians
   3. Absence of Hebrew Influence
   4. Gradual Growth of the Greek Tenses
   5. “Aktionsart” of the Verb-Stem
   6. The Three Kinds of Action Expressed in Terms of Tense
   7. Time Element in Tense
   8. Faulty Nomenclature of the Tenses
   10. The Effect of Prepositions on the Verb
   11. “Aktionsart” with Each Tense
   12. Interchange of Tenses

II. Punctiliar Action
   1. The Aorist
      (a) Aktionsart in the Aorist
         (α) Constative Aorist
         (β) Ingressive Aorist
         (γ) Effective Aorist
      (b) Aorist Indicative
(α) The Narrative or Historical Tense
(β) The Gnomic Aorist
(γ) Relation to the Imperfect
(δ) Relation to the Past Perfect
(ε) Relation to the Present
(ζ) Relation to Present Perfect
(η) Epistolary Aorist
(θ) Relation to the Future
(ι) Aorist in Wishes
(κ) Variations in the Use of Tenses
(λ) Translation of the Aorist into English

(c) The Aorist Subjunctive and Optative
   (α) No Time Element in Subjunctive and Optative
   (β) Frequency of Aorist Subjunctive
   (γ) Aktionsart
   (δ) Aorist Subjunctive in Prohibitions
   (ε) Aorist Subjunctive with οὖ μή
   (ζ) Aorist Optative

(d) The Aorist Imperative
(e) The Aorist Infinitive
(f) The Aorist Participle
   (α) Aktionsart
   (β) Ὀ and the Aorist Participle
   (γ) Antecedent Action
   (δ) But Simultaneous Action is Common also
(ε) Subsequent Action not Expressed by the Aorist Participle

(ζ) Aorist Participle in Indirect Discourse (Complementary Participle)

2. Punctiliar (Aoristic) Present
   (a) The Specific Present
   (b) The Gnomic Present
   (c) The Historical Present
   (d) The Futuristic Present

3. The Punctiliar (Aoristic) Future
   (a) Punctiliar or Durative
   (b) [Page liii] The Modal Aspect of the Future
      (α) Merely Futuristic
      (β) The Volitive Future
      (γ) Deliberative Future
   (c) The Future in the Moods
      (α) The Indicative
      (β) The Subjunctive and Optative
      (γ) The Infinitive
      (δ) The Participle
   (d) The Periphrastic Substitutes for the Future

III. Durative (Linear) Action

1. Indicative
   (a) The Present (ὁ ἔνοπτος) for Present Time
      (α) The Descriptive Present
      (β) The Progressive Present
      (γ) The Iterative or Customary Present
(δ) The Inchoative or Conative Present

(ε) The Historical Present

(ζ) The Deliberative Present

(η) The Periphrastic Present

(θ) Presents as Perfects

(ι) Perfects as Presents

(κ) Futuristic Presents

(b) The Imperfect for Past Time

(α) Doubtful Imperfects

(β) The Descriptive Tense in Narrative

(γ) The Iterative (Customary) Imperfect

(δ) The Progressive Imperfect

(ε) The Inchoative or Conative Imperfect

(ζ) The “Negative” Imperfect

(η) The “Potential” Imperfect

(θ) In Indirect Discourse

(ι) The Periphrastic Imperfect

(κ) Past Perfects as Imperfects

(c) The Future for Future Time

(α) The Three Kinds of Action in the Future (futuristic, volitive, deliberative)

(β) The Periphrastic Future

2. Subjunctive and Optative

3. Imperative

4. Infinitive

5. Participle
(a) The Time of the Present Participle Relative
(b) Futuristic
(c) Descriptive
(d) Conative
(e) Antecedent Time
(f) Indirect Discourse
(g) [Page liv] With the Article
(h) Past Action Still in Progress
(i) “Subsequent” Action
(j) No Durative Future Participles

IV. Perfected State of the Action

1. The Idea of the Perfect
   (a) The Present Perfect
   (b) The Intensive Perfect
   (c) The Extensive Perfect
   (d) Idea of Time in the Tense

2. The Indicative
   (a) The Present Perfect
      (α) The Intensive Present Perfect
      (β) The Extensive Present Perfect=a completed state
      (γ) The Present Perfect of Broken Continuity
      (δ) The Dramatic Historical Present Perfect
      (ε) The Gnomic Present Perfect
      (ζ) The Perfect in Indirect Discourse
      (η) Futuristic Present Perfect
(θ) The “Aoristic” Present Perfect

(i) The Periphrastic Perfect

(κ) Present as Perfect

(b) The Past Perfect

(α) The Double Idea

(β) A Luxury in Greek

(γ) The Intensive Past Perfect

(δ) The Extensive Past Perfect

(ε) The Past Perfect of Broken Continuity

(ζ) Past Perfect in Conditional Sentences

(η) The Periphrastic Past Perfect

(θ) Special Use of ἔχειμην

(c) The Future Perfect

3. The Subjunctive and Optative

4. The Imperative

5. The Infinitive

(a) Indirect Discourse

(b) Perfect Infinitive not in Indirect Discourse

(α) Subject or Object Infinitive

(β) With Prepositions

6. The Participle

(a) The Meaning

(b) The Time of the Tense

(c) The Perfect Tense Occurs with Various Uses of the Participle

(d) The Periphrastic Participle
CHAPTER XIX. Mode

Introductory

A. Independent or Paratactic Sentences

I. The Indicative Mode

1. Meaning of the Indicative Mode

2. Kinds of Sentences Using the Indicative

(a) Either Declarative or Interrogative

(b) Positive and Negative

3. Special Uses of the Indicative

(a) Past Tenses

(α) For Courtesy

(β) Present Necessity, Obligation, Possibility, Propriety in Tenses of the Past

(γ) The Apodosis of Conditions of the Second Class

(δ) Impossible Wishes

(b) The Present

(c) The Future

II. The Subjunctive Mode

1. Relations to Other Modes

(a) The Aorist Subjunctive and the Future Indicative

(b) The Subjunctive and the Imperative

(c) The Subjunctive and the Optative

2. Original Significance of the Subjunctive

3. Threefold Usage

(a) Futuristic

(b) Volitive
III. The Optative Mode

1. History of the Optative

2. Significance

3. The Three Uses
   (a) Futuristic or Potential
   (b) Volitive
   (c) Deliberative

IV. The Imperative

1. Origin of the Imperative

2. Meaning of the Imperative

3. Disappearance of the Imperative Forms

4. Alternatives for the Imperative
   (a) The Future Indicative
   (b) The Subjunctive
   (c) The Optative
   (d) The Infinitive
   (e) The Participle

5. Uses of the Imperative
   (a) Command or Exhortation
   (b) Prohibiton
   (c) Entreaty
   (d) Permission
   (e) Concession or Condition
   (f) In Asyndeton
B. Dependent or Hypotactic Sentences

Introductory

(a) Use of Modes in Subordinate Sentences
(b) The Use of Conjunctions in Subordinate Clauses
(c) Logical Varieties of Subordinate Clauses

1. Relative Sentences
   (a) Relative Sentences Originally Paratactic
   (b) Most Subordinate Clauses Relative in Origin
   (c) Relative Clauses Usually Adjectival
   (d) Modes in Relative Sentences
   (e) Definite and Indefinite Relative Sentences
   (f) The Use of ὅν in Relative Clauses
   (g) Special Uses of Relative Clauses
   (h) Negatives in Relative Clauses

2. Causal Sentences
   (a) Paratactic Causal Sentences
   (b) With Subordinating Conjunctions
   (c) Relative Clauses
   (d) Λῦτα τό and the Infinitive
   (e) The Participle

3. Comparative Clauses
   (a) The Relative ὅσος
(b) Relative ὅς with κατά
(c) Καθότι in a Comparative Sense
(d) ὡς and its Compounds

4. Local Clauses

5. Temporal Clauses

(a) Kin to Relative Clauses in Origin and Idiom
(b) Conjunctions Meaning ‘When’
(c) The Group Meaning ‘Until’ (‘While’)  
(d) Some Nominal and Prepositional Phrases
(e) The Temporal Use of the Infinitive
(f) Temporal Use of the Participle

6. Final and Consecutive Clauses

(a) Kinship
(b) Origin in Parataxis
(c) Pure Final Clauses
   (α) Ἴνα
   (β) Ὄπως
   (γ) ὡς
   (δ) μή, μή ποτε, μή πως
   (ε) Relative Clauses
   (ζ) The Infinitive
   (η) The Participle

(d) [Page lvii] Sub-Final Clauses
   (α) Ἴνα
   (β) Ὄπως
(γ) Μή, μή πως, μή ποτε
(δ) The Relative Clause
(ε) The Infinitive
(ζ) * and ὅτι

(e) Consecutive Clauses

(a) Ἰνα
(b) ὅτε
(c) ὅτι
(d) ὅτι
(e) The Relative
(ζ) The Infinitive

7. Wishes

8. Conditional Sentences

(a) Two Types
(b) Four Classes

(α) Determined as Fulfilled
(β) Determined as Unfulfilled
(γ) Undetermined, but with Prospect of Determination
(δ) Remote Prospect of Determination
(c) Special Points

(α) Mixed Conditions
(β) Implied Conditions
(γ) Elliptical Conditions
(δ) Concessive Clauses
(ε) Other Particles with ἐι and ἔν
9. Indirect Discourse

(a) Recitative Ὄρτ in Oratio Recta

(b) Change of Person in Indirect Discourse

(c) Change of Tense in Indirect Discourse

(d) Change of Mode in Indirect Discourse

(e) The Limits of Indirect Discourse

(f) Declarative Clauses

   (α) Ὄρτ and the Indicative

   (β) The Infinitive

   (γ) The Participle

   (δ) Καὶ ἐγένετο

(g) Indirect Questions

   (α) Tense

   (β) Mode

   (γ) Interrogative Pronouns and Conjunctions Used

(h) Indirect Command

   (α) Deliberative Question

   (β) The Conjunctions ἢνα and ὀπως

   (γ) The Infinitive

(i) [Page Ivii] Mixture

(j) The Subordinate Clause

10. Series of Subordinate Clauses

CHAPTER XX. Verbal Nouns

I. Kinship

II. The Infinitive
1. Origin

2. Development
   (a) The Prehistoric Period
   (b) The Earliest Historic Period
   (c) The Classic Period from Pindar on
   (d) The Κοινή Period
   (e) The Later Period

3. Significance

4. Substantival Aspects of the Infinitive
   (a) Case (Subject or Object Infinitive)
   (b) The Articular Infinitive
   (c) Prepositions
   (d) The Infinitive with Substantives
   (e) The Infinitive with Adjectives
   (f) The Infinitive with Verbs
   (g) The Appositional Infinitive

5. Verbal Aspects of the Infinitive
   (a) Voice
   (b) Tense
   (c) Cases with the Infinitive
   (d) The Infinitive in Indirect Discourse
   (e) Personal Construction with the Infinitive
   (f) Epexegetical Infinitive
   (g) Purpose
   (h) Result
(i) Cause
(j) Time
(k) The Absolute Infinitive
(l) Negatives
(m) Ἄν with the Infinitive

III. The Participle

1. The Verbals in -τος and -τέος

2. History of the Participle
   (a) The Sanskrit Participle
   (b) Homer’s Time
   (c) The Attic Period
   (d) The Κοινή
   (e) Modern Greek

3. Significance of the Participle
   (a) Originally an Adjective
   (b) The Addition of the Verbal Functions
   (c) [Page lx] The Double Aspect of the Participle
   (d) Relation between Participle and Infinitive
   (e) Method of Treating the Participle

4. Adjectival Aspects of the Participle
   (a) Declension
   (b) Attributive Participle
      (a) Anarthrous
      (b) Articular
   (c) Predicate Participle
5. Verbal Aspects of the Participle

(a) Voice

(b) Tense

(α) Timelessness of the Participle
(β) The Aorist
(γ) The Present
(δ) The Perfect
(ε) The Future

(c) Cases

(d) The Supplementary Participle

(α) The Periphrastic Construction
(β) A Diminution of the Complementary Participle
(γ) Verbs of Emotion
(δ) Indirect Discourse

(e) The Circumstantial Participle

(α) The General Theory
(β) Varieties of the Circumstantial Participle
(γ) The Absolute Participle in Subordinate Clauses

(f) The Independent Participle in a Sentence

(g) Co-ordination between Participles

(h) OŰ and µή with the Participle

(i) Other Particles with the Participle

CHAPTER XXI. Particles
I. Scope

II. Intensive or Emphatic Particles

1. Limitations

2. The N. T. Illustrations
   (a) Γέ
   (b) Δή
   (c) Εἶ μὴν, νὴ and ναί
   (d) Μέν
   (e) Πέρ
   (f) Τοί

III. Negative Particles

1. The Objective ΟŬ and its Compounds
   (a) Origin
   (b) [Page lx] History
   (c) Meaning
   (d) Uses
      (i) The Indicative
         (α) Independent Sentences
         (β) Subordinate Clauses
      (ii) The Subjunctive
      (iii) The Optative
      (iv) The Imperative
      (v) The Infinitive
      (vi) The Participle
      (vii) With Nouns
(e) Kai Où
(f) Redundant or Pleonastic Où
(g) Repetition of Où
(h) The Intensifying Compound Negative
(i) The Disjunctive Negative

2. The Subjective Negative Mή and Its Compounds
   (a) The History of Mή
   (b) Significance of Mή
   (c) Uses of Mή
      (i) The Indicative
      (ii) The Subjunctive
      (iii) The Optative
      (iv) The Imperative
      (v) The Infinitive
      (vi) The Participle
      (vii) Nouns
   (d) The Intensifying Compounds with Mή
   (e) Kai μή
   (f) Disjunctive Use of Mή

3. Combination of the Two Negatives
   (a) Mή oÙ
   (b) OÙ μή

IV. Interrogative Particles
   1. Single Questions
      (a) Direct Questions
(i) No Particle at All

(ii) The Use of Negative Particles

(iii) Other Particles

(iv) Interrogative Pronouns

(v) Interrogative Conjunctions

(b) Indirect Questions

(i) Pronouns

(ii) Conjunctions

2. Double Questions

(i) Direct

(ii) Indirect

V. Conjunctions

1. Paratactic Conjunctions

(a) Copulative

(i) Τέ

(ii) Καί

(iii) Δέ

(iv) Ἀλλά

(b) Adversative

(i) Δέ

(ii) Ἀλλά

(iii) Πλήν

(iv) Μέντοι

(v) Ομως

(vi) Εἰ μὴ
(c) Disjunctives

(i) Ἡ

(ii) Εἴτε—εἴτε (Ἐάντε—ἴάντε)

(iii) Οὔτε—οὔτε (μήτε—μήτε)

d) Inferential Conjunctions

(i) ἄρα

(ii) Γάρ

(iii) Οὖν

2. Hypotactic Conjunctions

VI. Interjections

CHAPTER XXII. Figures of Speech

I. Rhetorical, not Grammatical

II. Style in the N. T.

III. Figures of Idea or Thought

IV. Figures of Expression

(a) Parallels and Contrasts

(b) Contrasts in Words

(c) Contraction and Expansion

(d) Metaphors and Similar Tropes

ADDITIONAL NOTES

1. Καθαρίζω or καθερίζω

2. Prothetic Vowels in the N. T.

3. Elision

4. Παρρησία

5. Assimilation of ἐν μέσῳ
6. Rules for Assimilation of Consonants

7. Metathesis

8. Enclitics and Proclitics

9. Βουστροφηδόν

10. Perfect of ὀράω

11. Augment in the Past Perfect

12. List of Important Verbs

13. Ablaut
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ADDENDA TO THE SECOND EDITION

ADDENDA TO THE THIRD EDITION

INDEX TO ADDENDA TO SECOND AND THIRD EDITIONS

[PAGE LXIII] LIST OF WORKS MOST OFTEN REFERRED TO

I had prepared an exhaustive analytic bibliography of the pertinent literature, but it was so long that, on the advice of several friends, I have substituted an alphabetical
list of the main works mentioned in the book. The editions of Greek authors, the papyri and the inscriptions will be found in the Index of Quotations. Look there for them. For full histories of grammatical discussion one may turn to Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, vols. I–III (1906–1908); Gudemann, *Grundriß der Geschichte der klassischen Philologie* (2. Aufl., 1909); and Hübner, *Grundriß zu Vorlesungen über die griechische Syntax* (1883). By no means all the works consulted and referred to in the Grammar are given below. Only the most important can be mentioned. Hundreds that were consulted are not alluded to in the Grammar. But the following list represents fairly well the works that have contributed most to the making of my book. The chief journals quoted are also mentioned here.


———, *Johannine Grammar* (1906).

———, *Johannine Vocabulary* (1905).


**ALLEN, H. F.**, *The Infinitive in Polybius compared with the Infinitive in Biblical Greek* (1907).


———, *Du grec alexandrin et des rapports avec le grec ancien et le grec moderne* (1892).

*Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* (Leipzig).

**ARNAUD**, *Essai sur le caractère de la langue grec du N. T.* (1899).
ARNOLD and CONWAY, The Restored Pronunciation of Greek and Latin (1885).

AUDOIN, E., De la déclinaison dans les langues indo-européennes (1898).


BACON, ROGER, Oxford Greek Grammar. Edited by Nolan and Hirsch (1902).

BAMBERG, Hauptregeln der griechischen Syntax (1890).

BARON, Le Pronom Relatif et la Conjonctive en Grec (1892).

BARRY, W., The Holy Latin Tongue (Dublin Rev., April, 1906); Our Latin Bible (ib., July).

BÄUMLEIN, Untersuchungen über die griech. Modi und die Partikeln κέν und ĕnv (1846).

———, Untersuch. über griech. Partikeln (1861).

BEKKER, Anecdota Graeca. 3 Bde. (1814–1821).

BÉNARD, Formes verbales en grec d’après le texte d’Hérodote (1890).

BERDOLT, Der Konsekutivsatz in der ältern griech. Lit. (1896).

BERNHARDY, G., Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache (1829).


Bibl. Gr. V., Bibliothèque grecque vulgaire (Paris).


BIRKE, De Particularum μη et οù Usu Polybiano Dionysiaeo Diodoreo Straboniano (1897).

BIRKLEIN, F., Entwicklungsgeschichte des substantivierten Infinitivs (1882).


———, Die griech. Beredsamkeit von Alex. bis auf August. (1865).

———, Die Rhythmen der asianischen und römischen Kunstprosa (1905).

———, Hermeneutik und Kritik (1892).
———, Philology of the Gospels (1898).
———, Pronunciation of Ancient Greek (translation by Purton in 1890 of 3. Aufl. of Über die Aussprache des Griech. 1888).


Bloomfield, Study of Greek Accent (A. J. Ph., 1883).

Bohm, J., Das biblische “im Namen” (1898).

Boisacq, Les dialectes doriens (1891).
———, Dictionnaire étymol. de la langue grecque (1907 ff.).


Bonhoeffer, A., Epiktet und das N. T. (1911).

Bopp, Vergleichende Grammatik (1857).


Brockelmann, C., Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen (1907).

Brugmann, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).
———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).
———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).


Bultmann, R., Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (1910).

BURKITT, F. C., Syriac Forms of N. T. Proper Names (1912).

BURROWS, R. M., Discoveries in Crete (1907).


———, Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects (1904).

BUTTMANN, A., Grammatik d. neut. Sprachgebrauchs (1859).

BUTTMANN-THAYER, A Grammar of the N. T. Greek (1880).[Page lxvi]


Byz. Z., Byzantinische Zeitschrift (Leipzig).


CAUER, Grammatica Militans. 3d ed. (1912).

CHANDLER, H., A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation. 2d ed. (1881).


CHURTON, The Influence of the Septuagint upon the Progress of Christianity (1861).

CLAFLIN, EDITH, Syntax of Bœotian Dialect Inscriptions (1905).

CLASSEN, J., De Grammaticae Graecae Primordiis (1829).

Cl. Ph., Classical Philology (Chicago).

Cl. Q., Classical Quarterly (London).


Cl. W., Classical Weekly (New York).
CLYDE, J., Greek Syntax (1876).

COMPERNASS, De Sermone Gr. Volg. Pisidiae Phrygiaeque meridionalis (1895).

CONYBEARE and STOCK, Selections from the LXX. A Grammatical Introduction (1905).


CRÖNERT, W., Memoria Graeca Herculanensis (1903).

———, Questiones Herculanenses (1898).

CRUM, W. E., Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others (1902).

Curtius, G., Greek Etymology. 2 vols. (1886).

———, Studien zur griech. und lat. Grammatik (1868–1878).

DALMAN, G., Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch (1894).

———, Worte Jesu (1902).

———, The Words of Jesus (1902). Translation by D. M. Kay.

DAWES, E. S., Pronunciation of the Gk. Aspirates (1894).


DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

DELBRÜCK, B., Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis (1867).


———, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871–1888).

DICK, Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus (1900).


DIEL, De enuntiatis finalibus apud graecarum rerum scriptores posterioris aetatis (1894).


DÜRR, Sprachliche Untersuchungen (1899).

DYROFF, A., Geschichte des Pronomen Reflexivum (1892, 1893).

EARLE, M. L., Classical Papers (1912).

ECKINGER, Die Orthographie lateinischer Wörter in griech. Inschriften (1893).

E. G. T., Expositor’s Greek Testament.


ENGEL, E., Die Aussprache des Griechischen (1887).

ERNAUlt, Du Parfait en Grec et en Latin (1886).

EVANS, A. J., Cretan Pictographs and Pre-Phœnician Script (1895).

———, Further Researches (1898).

Exp., The Expositor (London).

Expos. T., The Expository Times (Edinburgh).

FARNELL, L. R., Greek Conditional and Relative Sentences (1892).

FARRAR, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).

FICK-BECHTEL, Die griechischen Personennamen. 2. Aufl. (1894).

FIELD, F., Otium Norvicense. Pars Tertia (1881).

FLENSBERG, Über Ursprung und Bildung des Pron. αὐτός (1893).


FOY, K., Lautsystem der griech. Vulgarsprache (1879).

FRÄNKEL, Griechische Denominativa (1906).

FRENZEL, Die Entwick. des relativen Satzbaues im Griech. (1889).

———, Die Entwick. der Sätze mit πρὶν (1896).

FUCHS, A., Die Temporalsätze mit den Konjunktionen “bis” und “so lang als” (1902).

FÜHRER, De Particulae ὁς cum Participiis et Praepos. punctae Usu Thucydideo (1889).

GALLOWAY, W. F., On the Use of Μή with the Participle in Classical Greek (1897).

GEDDES, A Compendious Greek Grammar (1888).

GELDART, The Modern Greek Language in Its Relation to Ancient Greek (1870).
GERSDORF, C. G., Beiträge zur Sprachcharakteristik der Schriftsteller des N. T. (1816).

GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH, Hebrew Grammar.

GEYER, M., Observationes epigraphicae de praepositionum graec. forma et usu (1880).

GILDERSLEEVE, B. L., Editions of Pindar and Justin Martyr.
—, Latin Grammar. Many editions since 1867.
—, Notes on Stahl’s Syntax of the Greek Verb (1910).
—, Numerous articles in the American Journal of Philology.

GILDERSLEEVE and MILLER, Syntax of Classical Greek. Part I (1900), Part II (1911).

*Gildersleeve Studies*. Volume in honour of Prof. Gildersleeve of Johns Hopkins (1902).

GILES, P., A Short Manual of Comparative Philology. 2d ed. (1901).


GOETZELER, L., De Polybii elocutione (1887).


GOODWIN, W. W., Greek Grammar. Various editions.


GREEN, Μή for οÙ before Lucian (Studies in Honour of B. Gildersleeve, 1902).

GREEN, B., Notes on Greek and Latin Syntax (1897).


GRIMM-THAYER, A Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).


GUILLEMARD, W. H., Hebraisms in the Greek Testament (1879).


HADLEY and ALLEN, Greek Grammar (1895).

HADLEY, JAMES, Essays Philological and Critical (1873).

———, Language of the N. T. (vol. II, Hackett and Abbott’s ed. of Smith’s B. D., 1898).


———, The Cun Constructions (Studies in Class. Phil., 1887).


HAMILTON, The Negative Compounds in Greek (1899).

HAMMER, De τέ Particulae Usu Herodoteo Thucydideo Xenophonteo (1904).

HAMMERSCHMIDT, Über die Grundb. von Konjunktiv und Optativ. [Page lxx]


HARRIS, J. RENDEL, Side-Lights on N. T. Research (1908).

HARRISON, GESSNER, A Treatise on the Philology of Greek Prepositions (1858).

HARRISON, MISS JANE, Prol. to the Study of Greek Religion (1903).


HATCH, E., Essays in Bibl. Greek (1892).


HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).

HAVERS, W., Untersuch. zur Kasussyntax der indog. Sprachen (1911).


HEINE, G., Synonymik des neustest. Griechisch (1898).

HEINRICI, K. F., Der literarische Charakter der neustest. Schriften (1908).

HEITMÜLLER, W., Im Namen Jesu (1902).

HELBIGING, R., Die Präpos. bei Herodot und andern Historikern (1904).

———, Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre (1907).


HENRY, Précis de grammaire du grec et du latin. 5th ed. (1894). Elliott’s tr. of 1st ed. (1890).

Hermes, Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie.

HESSELING, D. C., De Koine en de oude dialecten van Griekenland (1906).

HICKS, E. L., St. Paul and Hellenism (Studia Biblica et Eccl., 1896).

———, Traces of Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the N. T. (1896).

———, Use of Political Terms in the N. T. (Class. Rev., March and April, 1887).


HOFMANN, F., Neutestamentliche Bibelstudien. 5 Bde. (1903).

———, Über die Entwick. des Begriffs der Grammatik bei den Alten (1891).

HOFMANN, O., Das Präsens der indog. Grundsprache (1889).
———, Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum (1906).
———, Geschichte der griech. Sprache (1911).

HOGARTH, D. G., Philip and Alexander (1897).

HOLL, K., Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in nachchristlicher Zeit (Hermes, 1908, 43, pp. 243 ff.).


HOWES, The Use of Μή with the Participle (Harv. St. in Cl. Ph., 1901).

HATCH and REDPATH, Concordance to the LXX (1897).

HÜBNER, E., Grundriß zu Vorlesungen über die griech. Syntax (1883).

HÜBSCHMANN, Zur Kasuslehre (1875).

HUMPHREYS, M. W., The Problems of Greek (Congress of Arts and Sciences, 1904, vol. III, pp. 171 ff.).

Indog. Forsch., Indogermanische Forschungen (Straßburg).

IMMER, J., Hermeneutics of the N. T. Tr. by A. H. Newman (1877).

Intern. Woch., Internationale Wochenschrift.

JACOBSTHAL, H. K., Der Gebrauch der Tempora und Modi in den kretischen Dialektinschriften (1906).

JACQUIER, E., Histoire des Livres du N. T. Tomes I–IV. Ch. ii, Tome I, Langue du N. T.


JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).

———, On the True Meaning of the Κοινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

JEBB, R. C., Attic Orators. 2d ed. (1893).

———, Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey (1892).
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The Ideal Grammar? Perhaps the ideal grammar of the New Testament Greek may never be written. It is a supremely difficult task to interpret accurately the forms of human speech, for they have life and change with the years. But few themes have possessed greater charm for the best furnished scholars of the world than the study of language.

1 See J. Classen, De Gr. Graecae Primordiis, 1829, p. 1, who says: “Inter humani ingenii inventa, quae diuturna consuetudine quasi naturae iura adepta sunt, nullum fere magis invaluit et pervulgatum est, quam grammaticae ratio et usus.”
The language of the N. T. has a special interest by reason of the message that it bears. Every word and phrase calls for minute investigation where so much is at stake. It is the task and the duty of the N. T. student to apply the results of linguistic research to the Greek of the N. T. But, strange to say, this has not been adequately done.2

New Testament study has made remarkable progress in the sphere of criticism, history and interpretation, but has lagged behind in this department. A brief survey of the literary history of the subject shows it.

I. The Pre-Winer Period. It was Winer who in 1822 made a new epoch in N. T. grammatical study by his Neutestamentliches Sprachidiom. It is hardly possible for the student of the present day to enter into sympathy with the inanities and sinuosities that characterized the previous treatises on the N. T. idiom. Not alone in the controversy between the Purists and Hebraists was this true, but writers like Storr, by a secret system of quid pro quo, cut the Gordian knot of grammatical difficulty by explaining one term as used for another, one preposition for another, one case for another, etc. As a university tutor Winer [Page 4] combated “this absurd system of interpretation,” and not without success in spite of receiving some sneers. He had the temerity to insist on this order of interpretation: grammatical, historical, theological. He adhered to his task and lived to see “an enlightened philology, as deduced and taught by Herrmann and his school,” triumph over the previous “unbridled license.”1

II. The Service of Winer.

(a) Winer’s Inconsistencies. It must be said, however, that great as was the service of Winer to this science, he did not at all points carry out consistently his own principles, for he often explained one tense as used for another. He was not able to rise entirely above the point of view of his time nor to make persistent application of the philosophical grammar. It is to be borne in mind also that the great science of comparative philology had not revolutionized linguistic study when Winer first wrote. In a true sense he was a pathfinder.

(b) Winer Epoch-Making.—Winer in English. But none the less his work has been the epoch-making one for N. T. study. After his death Dr. Gottlieb Lünemann revised and improved the Neutestamentliches Sprachidiom. Translations of Winer’s Grammatik into English were first made by Prof. Masson of Edinburgh, then by Prof.

2 “And despite the enormous advance since the days of Winer toward a rational and unitary conception of the N. T. language, we still labour to-day under the remains of the old conceptions.” Samuel Dickey, Prince. Theol. Rev., Oct., 1903, “New Points of View.”

Winer, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).


1 See Pref. to the sixth and last ed. by Winer himself as translated by Dr. J. H. Thayer in the seventh and enlarged ed. of 1869.
Thayer of Harvard (revision of Masson), and finally by Prof. W. F. Moulton of Cambridge, who added excellent footnotes, especially concerning points in modern Greek. The various editions of Winer-Thayer and Winer-Moulton have served nearly two generations of English and American scholars.

(c) SCHMIEDEL. But now at last Prof. Schmiedel of Zürich is thoroughly revising Winer’s Grammatik, but it is proceeding slowly and does not radically change Winer’s method, though use is made of much of the modern knowledge.\(^2\) Deissmann,\(^3\)

Thayer

THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).

———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

Moulton MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).


2 Winer’s Gr. des neutest. Sprachid. 8. Aufl. neu bearbeitet von Dr. Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel, 1894—.

Deissmann

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


indeed, expresses disappointment in this regard concerning Schmiedel’s work as being far “too much Winer and too little Schmiedel.” But Deissmann concedes that Schmiedel’s work “marks a characteristic and decisive turning-point in N. T. philology.”

[Page 5] (d) BUTTMANN. Buttmann’s Grammatik des neuestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs had appeared in 1859 and was translated by Thayer as Buttmann’s Grammar of N. T. Greek (1873), an able work.

(e) Blass. It is not till the Grammatik des neuestamentlichen Griechisch by Prof. Blass in 1896 that any other adequate grammar appears in this field. And Blass departs a little from traditional methods and points of view. He represents a transition towards a new era. The translation by H. St. John Thackeray has been of good service in the English-speaking world.¹

III. The Modern Period. It is just in the last decade that it has become possible to make a real advance in New Testament grammatical study. The discovery and investigation that have characterized every department of knowledge have borne rich fruit here also.

———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).


Buttmann BUTTMANN, A., Grammatik d. neut. Sprachgebrauchs (1859).

Blass

———, Hermeneutik und Kritik (1892).

———, Philology of the Gospels (1898).

———, Pronunciation of Ancient Greek (translation by Purton in 1890 of 3. Aufl. of Über die Aussprache des Griech. 1888).

Thackeray


———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).

¹ First ed. 1898, second ed. 1905, as Blass’ Gr. of N. T. Gk. A revision of the work of Blass (the 4th German edition) by Dr. A. Debrunner has appeared as these pages are going through the press.
(a) DEISSMANN. Deissmann\(^2\) sees rightly the immensity of the task imposed upon the N. T. grammarian by the very richness of the new discoveries. He likewise properly condemns the too frequent isolation of the N. T. Greek from the so-called "profane Greek."\(^3\) Deissmann has justly pointed out that the terms "profane" and "biblical" do not stand in linguistic contrast, but rather "classical" and "biblical." Even here he insists on the practical identity of biblical with the contemporary later Greek of the popular style.\(^4\)

It was in 1895 that Deissmann published his *Bibelstudien*, and his *Neue Bibelstudien* followed in 1897. The new era has now fairly begun. In 1901 the English translation of both volumes by Grieve appeared as *Bible Studies*. In 1907 came the *Philology of the Bible*. His *Licht vom Osten* (1908) was his next most important work (*Light from the Ancient East*, 1910, translated by Strachan). See Bibliography for full list of his books. The contribution of Deissmann is largely in the field of lexicography.

(b) THUMB. It was in 1901 that A. Thumb published his great book on the κοινή, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, which has done so much to give the true picture of the κοινή. He had already in 1895 produced his *Handbuch der sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel*, which has done so much to give the true picture of the κοινή. He had already in 1895 produced his *Handbuch der sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel*. He aptly says: "Nicht die Profangräcität ist der sprachgeschichtliche Gegensatz zur 'biblischen,' sondern das classische Griechisch. Die neueren Funde zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache zeigen, daß die Eigentümlichkeiten des 'biblischen' Formen- und Wortschatzes (bei den original-griechischen Schriften auch der Syntax) im großen und ganzen Eigentümlichkeiten des späteren und zwar zumeist des unliterarischen Griechisch überhaupt sind."

---

\(^2\) Die sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel, 1898, p. 5: "Durch neue Erkenntnisse befruchtet steht die griechische Philologie gegenwärtig im Zeichen einer vielverheißenden Renaissance, die fordert von der sprachlichen Erforschung der griechischen Bibel, daß sie in engste Fühlung trete mit der historischen Erforschung der griechischen Sprache."

\(^3\) Ib., p. 7. Like, for instance, Zezschwitz, Profangräc. und bibl. Sprachg., 1859.


Thumb

---


———, *Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (1901).


neugriechischen Volkssprache. In 1912 the second enlarged edition was issued in English by S. Angus, as *Handbook of Modern Greek Vernacular*. This book at once took front place for the study of the modern Greek by English students. It is the only book in English that confines itself to the vernacular.

(c) MOULTON. In 1895, J. H. Moulton, son of W. F. Moulton, the translator of Winer, produced his *Introduction to N. T. Greek*, in a noble linguistic succession. In 1901 he began to publish in *The Classical Review* and in *The Expositor*, “Grammatical Notes from the Papyri,” which attracted instant attention by their freshness and pertinency. In 1906 appeared his now famous *Prolegomena*, vol. I, of *A Grammar of N. T. Greek*, which reached the third edition by 1908. With great ability Moulton took the cue from Deissmann and used the papyri for grammatical purposes.

Angus


Moulton


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

Moulton


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).
He demonstrated that the Greek of the N. T. is in the main just the vernacular κοινή of the papyri. In 1911 the Prolegomena appeared in German as Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuen Testaments.

(d) OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS. It is not possible to mention here all the names of the workers in the field of N. T. grammar (see Bibliography). The old standpoint is still found in the books of Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (1889); Hoole, The Classical Element in the N. T. (1888); Simcox, The Language of the N. T. (1890); Schaff, A Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version (1889); Viteau, Étude sur le grec du N. T.—Le Verbe (1893); Le Sujet (1896). The same thing is true of Abbott’s

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

Hatch HATCH, E., Essays in Bibl. Greek (1892).


———, The Writers of the N. T.


Viteau VITEAU, J., Essai sur la syntaxe des voix dans le grec du N. T. (Rev. de Phil., 1894).

———, Étude sur le grec du N. T. I, Le Verbe (1893); II, Le Sujet (1896).

Abbott
Johannine Vocabulary (1905) and Johannine Grammar (1906); Burton’s Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the N. T. Greek (1888, third ed. 1909) is yet a genuine contribution. In Kennedy’s Sources of N. T. Greek (1895) we see a distinct transition toward the new era of N. T. grammar. In 1911 Radermacher’s Neutestamentliche Grammatik is in fact more a grammar of the κοινή than of the N. T., as it is designed to be an Einleitung. The author’s Short Grammar of the Greek N. T. (1908) gives the new knowledge in a succinct form. The Italian translation (1910) by Bonaccorsi has additional notes by the translator. Stocks (1911) made numerous additions to the Laut- und Formenlehre of the German edition. Grosheide in the Dutch translation (1912) has made a revision of the whole book. The French edition (1911) by Montet is mainly just a translation. The fourth enlarged edition in English appeared in 1916. Many special treatises of great value have appeared (see Bibliography), by men like Angus, Buttmann, Heinrici, Thieme, Vogel, Votaw, J. Weiss, Wellhausen.

(c) Richness of Material. Now indeed it is the extent of the material demanding examination that causes embarrassment. And only thirty years ago K. Krumbacher\footnote{ABBOTT, E. A., Clue. A Guide through Greek to Hebrew (1904).}

———, Johannine Grammar (1906).

———, Johannine Vocabulary (1905).


Kennedy

KENNEDY, H. A. A., Recent Research in the Language of the N. T. (The Expos. T., xii, 1901).

———, Sources of N. T. Greek (1895).

———, St Paul and the Mystery Religions (1913).


Stocks STOCKS, H., Das neutestamentliche Griechisch im Lichte der modernen Sprachforschung (Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, XXIV. Jahrgang, 633–700).


Thieme THIEME, G., Die Inschr. von Magnesia am Mäander und das N. T. (1906).

Vogel Vogel, H., Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil (1899).


Weiss WEISS, J., Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik (1897).


Krumbacher
lamented that it was not possible to give “a comprehensive presentation of the Greek language” because of the many points on which work must be done beforehand. But we have come far in the meantime. The task is now possible, though gigantic and well-nigh insurmountable. But it is not for us moderns to boast because of the material that has come to our hand. We need first to use it. Dieterich\textsuperscript{2} has well said that the general truth that progress is from error to truth “finds its confirmation also in the history of the development that the Greek language has received in the last two thousand years.” By the induction of a wider range of facts we can eliminate errors arising from false generalizations. But this is a slow process that calls for patience. Dionysius Thrax,\textsuperscript{3} one of the Alexandrian fathers of the old Greek grammar (circa 100 B.C.), said: Γραμματική ἐστιν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῖσιν ὡς ἔπει δολὴ λεγομένων. Andrew Lang\textsuperscript{4} indeed is a disciple of Dionysius Thrax in one respect, for he contends that students are taught too much grammar and too little language. They know the grammars and not the tongue. A bare outline can be given of the sources of the new material for such grammatical study.

\textbf{IV. The New Grammatical Equipment for N. T. Study.}

(a) \textit{Comparative Philology.} We must consider the great advance in comparative philology. The next chapter will deal somewhat at length with various phases of the historical method of linguistic study.

1. \textit{The Linguistic Revolution.} A revolution has been wrought in the study of language. It must be confessed that grammatical investigation has not always been


———, Das Problem d. neugriech. Schriftsprache (1902).


Lang \textbf{LANG, A.,} Homer and His Age (1906).

4 Morning Post, Lond., May 5, 1905.
conducted on the inductive principle nor according to the historical method. Too often
the rule has been drawn from a limited range of facts. What is afterwards found to
conflict with a rule is called an “exception.” Soon the exceptions equal or surpass the
rule. Unfortunately the ancients did not have the benefit of our distinctions of
“regular” and “irregular.” Metaphysical speculation with lofty superiority to the facts
is sometimes charged upon grammarians.1 “Grammar and logic do not coincide.”2
Comparative grammar is merely the historical method applied to several languages
together instead of only one.3

2. A Sketch of Greek Grammatical History. The Greek has had its own history, but
it is related to the history of kindred tongues. “From the days of Plato’s Kratylus
downward … the Greek disputed as to whether language originated by convention
(νόµω) or by nature (φύσει).”4 Indeed formal Greek grammar was the comparison
with the Latin and began “with Dionysius Thrax, who utilized the philological
lucubrations of Aristotle and the Alexandrian critics for the sake of teaching Greek to
the sons of the aristocratic contemporaries of Pompey at Rome.”5 His Greek grammar
is still in existence in Bekker’s Anecdota,6 and is the cause of much grotesque
etymology since.7

This period of grammatical activity came after the great creative period of Greek
literature was over, and in Alexandria, not [Page 9] in Athens.1 Rhetoric was
scientifically developed by Aristotle long before there was a scientific syntax.
Aristotle perfected logical analysis of style before there was historical grammar.2
With Aristotle ὁ γραµµατικός was one that busied himself with the letters
(γράµµατα). He was not ἄγραµµατος; ἡ γραµµατική then had to do with the letters
and was exegetical.3 Plato does not treat grammar, though the substantive and the
adjective are distinguished, but only dialectics, metaphysics, logic.4 The Stoic
grammarians, who succeeded Plato and Aristotle, treated language from the logical

1 So Dr. John H. Kerr, sometime Prof. of N. T. in the Pac. Theol. Sem., in
conversation with me.
grammar in Schleicher’s sense is in its essence nothing but historical grammar by the
comparative method.”
4 Sayce, Prin. of Comp. Philol., 1875, p. 259 f.
5 Ib., p. 261.
6 Bekker BEKKER, Anecdota Graeca. 3 Bde. (1814–1821).
γραµµατικῆ was developed into a system by Apollonius Dyscolus (ii/A.D.) and his son
Herodian. Dionysius Thrax was born b.C. 166. Dyscolus wrote a systematic Gk.
Syntax of accentuation in 20 books (known to us only in epitome) about 200 A.D.
1 See Jebb in Whibley’s Comp. to Gk. Stud., 1905, p. 147 f.
3 F. Hoffmann, Über die Entwicklung des Begriffs der Gr. bei den Alten, 1891, p. 1.
4 Ib., p. 144. The early Gk. grammarians were “ohne richtiges historisches
Bewußtsein” (Steinthal, Gesch. der Sprachw. etc., 1. Tl., 1863, p. 39). Even in Plato’s
Kratylus we do not see “das Ganze in seiner Ganzheit” (p. 40).
standpoint and accented its psychological side. So the Alexandrian grammarians made γραµµατική more like κριτική. They got hold of the right idea, though they did not attain the true historical method.

Comparative grammar was not wholly unknown indeed to the ancients, for the Roman grammarians since Varro made a comparison between Greek and Latin words. The Roman writers on grammar defined it as the “scientia recte loquendi et scribendi,” and hence came nearer to the truth than did the Alexandrian writers with their Stoic philosophy and exegesis. It has indeed been a hard struggle to reach the light in grammar. But Roger Bacon in this “blooming time” saw that it was necessary for the knowledge of both Greek and Latin to compare them. And Bernhardt in 1829 saw that there was needed a grammatico-historical discussion of syntax because of the “distrust of the union of philosophy with grammar.” We needed “the viewpoint [Page 10] of the historical Syntax.” Humboldt is quoted by Oertel as saying: “Linguistic science, as I understand it, must be based upon facts alone, and this collection must be neither one-sided nor incomplete.” So Bopp conceived also: “A grammar in the higher scientific sense of the word must be both history and natural science.” This is not an unreasonable demand, for it is made of every other department of science.

3. The Discovery of Sanskrit. It is a transcendent fact which has revolutionized grammatical research. The discovery of Sanskrit by Sir William Jones is what did it. In 1786 he wrote thus: “The Sanskrit language, whatever may be its antiquity, is of wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either; yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and the forms of grammar, than could have been produced by accident; so strong that no philologer could examine all the three without believing them to have sprung from some common source which no longer exists. There is a

5 Ib., p. 277 f. For a good discussion of Dion. Thr. see Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 34 f.
7 See Kretschmer, op. cit., p. 4.
8 F. Blass, Hermen. und Krit., 1892, p. 157 f.
9 Steinthal, Gesch. etc., 2. Tl., 1891, p. 1, calls this time of struggle “ihre Blütezeit.”
10 Roger Bacon, Oxford Gk. Gr., edited by Nolan and Hirsch, 1902, p. 27: “Et in hac comparatione Grammaticae Graecae ad Latinam non solum est necessitas propter intelligendam Grammaticam Graecam, sed omnino necessarium est ad intelligentiam Latinae Grammaticae.”
Bernhardt BERNHARDY, G., Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache (1829).
Oertel OERTEL, H., Lectures on the Study of Language (1902).
1 Lect. on the Study of Lang., 1901, p. 47.
Bopp BOPP, Vergleichende Grammatik (1857).
2 See C. Herrmann, Philos. Gr., 1858, p. 422: “Die Natur der philosophischen Grammatik war von Anfang an bestimmt worden als die eine Grenzwissenschaft zwischen Philosophie und Philologie.” But it is a more objective task now.
similar reason, though not so forcible, for supposing that both the Gothic and the Celtic, though blended with a different idiom, had the same origin with the Sanskrit.” He saw then the significance of his own discovery, though not all of it, for the Teutonic tongues, the Lithuanian and Slav group of languages, the Iranian, Italic, Armenian and Albanian belong to the same Aryan, Indo-Germanic or Indo-European family as it is variously called.

4. From Bopp to Brugmann. But Bopp is the real founder of comparative philology. Before Bopp’s day “in all grammars the mass of ‘irregular’ words was at least as great as that of the ‘regular’ ones, and a rule without exception actually excited suspicion.” Pott’s great work laid the foundation of scientific phonetics. Other great names in this new science are W. von Humboldt, Jacob Grimm, Schlegel, Schleicher, Max Müller, Curtius, Verner, Whitney, L. Meyer.

4 See his Vergl. Gr., 1857. He began publication on the subject in 1816.
5 Delbrück, Intr. to the Study of Lang., 1882, p. 25.
1 Always mentioned by Bopp with reverence.
2 Deutsche Gr., 1822. Author of Grimm’s law of the interchange of letters. Next to Bopp in influence.
3 Indische Bibl.
4 Vergl. Gr. der indoger. Spr., 1876, marks the next great advance.
5 Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1866. He did much to popularize this study.
Curtius

CURTIUS, G., Greek Etymology. 2 vols. (1886).
———, Studien zur griech. und lat. Grammatik (1868–1878).

7 The discovery of Verner’s law, a variation from Grimm’s law, according to which p, t and k, pass into b, d and g, instead of f, th and h when not immediately followed by the word-accent.
Whitney

———, Language and the Study of Language (1867).
———, Life and Growth of Language (1875).

8 Life and Growth of Lang., 1875; Sans. Gr., 1892, etc.
Meyer

MEYER, L., Griech. Aoriste (1879).
But in recent years two men, K. Brugmann and B. Delbrück, have organized the previous knowledge into a great monumental work, *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. This achievement is as yet the high-watermark in comparative grammar. Brugmann has issued a briefer and cheaper edition giving the main results. Delbrück has also a brief treatise on Greek syntax in the light of comparative grammar, while Brugmann has applied comparative philology to the *Laut- und Formenlehre* of Greek grammar. In the *Grundriß* Brugmann has Bde. I, II, while Delbrück treats syntax in Bde. III–V. In the new edition Brugmann has also that part of the syntax which is treated in Vol. III and IV of the first edition. The best discussion of comparative grammar for beginners is the second edition of P. Giles’s *Manual*. Hatzidakis successfully undertakes to apply


9 Vergl. Gr., 1865.

Brugmann

———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).

Delbrück

———, Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis (1867).


———, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871–1888).


Giles

———, A Short Manual of Comparative Philology. 2d ed. (1901).

comparative grammar to the modern Greek.\textsuperscript{15} Riemann and Goelzer have made an exhaustive comparison of the Greek and Latin languages.\textsuperscript{16} There are, indeed, many interesting discussions of the history and principles growing out of all this linguistic development, such as the works [Page 12] of Jolly,\textsuperscript{1} Delbrück,\textsuperscript{2} Sweet,\textsuperscript{3} Paul,\textsuperscript{4} Oertel,\textsuperscript{5} Moulton,\textsuperscript{6} Whitney,\textsuperscript{7} Max Müller,\textsuperscript{8} Sayce.\textsuperscript{9} It is impossible to write a grammar of the

\begin{itemize}
  \item Riemann and Goelzer Riemann and Goelzer, Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin. I (1897), II (1901).
  \item Gr. comparée du Grec et du Lat.: Syntaxe, 1897; Phonétique et Étude de Formes, 1901. Cf. also King and Cookson’s Prin. of Sound and Inflexion as illustrated in the Gk. and Lat. Lang., 1888.
  \item Jolly
  \end{itemize}


\begin{itemize}
  \item JOLLY, Ein Kapitel d. vergl. Syntax. Der Konjunktiv und Optativ.
  \item Geschichte des Infinitivs im Indog. (1873).
  \item Schulgr. und Sprachw., 1874.
  \item Sweet SWEET, History of Language (1900).
  \item The Hist. of Lang., 1899.
  \item PAUL, H., Principles of the History of Language (1888). Tr.
  \item Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., 1888; 4th Germ. ed. 1909.
  \item Lect. on the Study of Lang., 1901.
  \item Moulton
  \end{itemize}

Moulton

\begin{itemize}
  \item Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).
  \item Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).
  \item Introduction to N. T. Greek (1895). 2d ed. (1904).
  \item Language of Christ (Hastings’ One-vol. D. B., 1909).
  \item The Science of Language (1903).
\end{itemize}
Greek N. T. without taking into consideration this new conception of language. No language lives to itself, and least of all the Greek of the N. T. in the heart of the world-empire. It is not necessary to say that until recently use of this science had not been made by N. T. grammars.

(b) ADVANCE IN GENERAL GREEK GRAMMAR. There has been great advance in the study of general Greek grammar. The foundations laid by Crosby and Kühner, Krüger, Curtius, Buttmann, Madvig, Jelf and others have been well built upon by Hadley, Goodwin, Gildersleeve, Gerth, Blass, Brugmann, G. Meyer, Schanz, Hirt, Moulton, W. F., and Gedean, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

Moulton and Milligan, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

6 The Sci. of Lang., 1903.
7 Lang. and the Study of Lang., 1867.
8 Three Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1891.

Sayce


———, Principles of Comparative Philology (1875).

9 Prin. of Comp. Philol., 1875.
10 By “die historische Sprachforschung” the Gk. tongue is shown to be a member of the Indo-Germanic family; thus is gained “der sprachgeschichtliche Gesichtspunkt,” and then is gained “ein wesentlich richtiges Verständnis … für den Entwicklungsgang der Sprache.” Brugmann, Griech. Gr., 1885, p. 4. Cf. p. 3 in third ed., 1901.

Buttmann Buttmann, A., Grammatik d. neut. Sprachgebrauchs (1859).

Madvig

Madvig, Bemerk. über einige Punkte des Griech. (1848).

———, Syntax of the Greek Language (1880).


Goodwin

Goodwin, W. W., Greek Grammar. Various editions.


Gildersleeve
Jannaris, etc. To the classical student this catalogue of names is full of significance. The work of Kühner has been thoroughly revised and improved in four massive volumes by Blass and Gerth, furnishing a magnificent apparatus for the advanced student. Hirt’s handbook gives the modern knowledge in briefer form, a compendium of comparative grammar, while G. Meyer and Brugmann are professedly on the [Page 13] basis of comparative philology. Jannaris is the first fairly successful attempt to present in one volume the survey of the progress of the language as a whole. Schanz makes a much more ambitious undertaking and endeavours in a large number of monographs to furnish material for a future historical grammar. Gildersleeve has issued only two volumes of his work, while the grammars of Hadley-Allen and Goodwin are too well known to call for remark. New grammars,

**Gildersleeve, B. L., Editions of Pindar and Justin Martyr.**

———, Latin Grammar. Many editions since 1867.

———, Notes on Stahl’s Syntax of the Greek Verb (1910).

———, Numerous articles in the American Journal of Philology.


**Schanz, M., Beiträge zur histor. Syntax d. griech. Sprache** (1882—).


Jannaris

**Jannaris, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar** (1897).

———, On the True Meaning of the Κοινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

12 The late G. N. Hatzidakis contemplated a thesaurus of the Gk. language, but his death cut it short.


3 Synt. of Class. Gk., 1900, 1911.

Allen, H. F., The Infinitive in Polybius compared with the Infinitive in Biblical Greek (1907).
like F. E. Thompson’s (1907, new ed.) and Simonson’s (2 vols., 1903, 1908),
continue to appear.

(c) CRITICAL EDITIONS OF GREEK AUTHORS. The Greek authors in general have
received minute and exhaustive investigation. The modern editions of Greek writers
are well-nigh ideal. Careful and critical historical notes give the student all needed,
sometimes too much, aid for the illumination of the text. The thing most lacking is the
reading of the authors and, one may add, the study of the modern Greek. Butcher⁴
well says “Greek literature is the one entirely original literature of Europe.” Homer,
Aristotle, Plato, not to say Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides are still the modern
masters of the intellect. Translations are better than nothing, but can never equal the
original. The Greek language remains the most perfect organ of human speech and
largely because “they were talkers, whereas we are readers.”⁵ They studied diligently
how to talk.⁶

(d) WORKS ON INDIVIDUAL WRITERS. In nothing has the tendency to specialize
been carried further than in Greek grammatical research. The language of Homer,
Thucydides, Herodotus, the tragic poets, the comic writers, have all called for minute
investigation,[Page 14]¹ and those of interest to N. T. students are the monographs on
Polybius, Josephus, Plutarch, etc. The concordances of Plato, Aristotle, etc., are
valuable. The Apostolic Fathers, Greek Christian Apologists and the Apocryphal
Apost. (1898). The universities of America and Europe which give the Ph.D. degree
have produced a great number of monographs on minute points like the use of the

Butcher


———, Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects (1904).

4 Harv. Lect. on Gk. Subj., 1904, p. 129. See also Butcher, Some Aspects of the Gk.
Genius, 1893, p. 2: “Greece, first smitten with the passion for truth, had the courage to
put faith in reason, and, in following its guidance, to take no account of
consequences.” So p. 1: “To see things as they really are, to discern their meanings
and adjust their relations was with them an instinct and a passion.”
Sophocles SOPHOCLES, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period
(1888).
5 Ib., p. 203.
6 See Bernhardy, Griech. Lit., Tl. I, II, 1856; Christ, Gesch. der griech. Lit. bis auf die
Zeit Justinians, 4. revid. Aufl., 1905; 5. Aufl., 1908 ff. Farnell, Gk. Lyric Poetry,
1891, etc. A. Croiset and M. Croiset, An Abr. Hist. of Gk. Lit., transl. by
Heffelbower, 1904.
1 Cf., for instance, Die Spr. des Plut. etc., Tl. I, II, 1895, 1896; Krebs, Die
Präpositionen bei Polybius, 1881; Goetzeler, Einfl. des Dion. Hal. auf die
Sprachgesch. etc., 1891; Schmidt, De Flavii Josephi eloc. observ. crit., 1894; Kaelker,
Quest. de Eloc. Polyb. etc.
Reinhold REINHOLD, H., De graecitate Patrum (1898).
preposition in Herodotus, etc. These all supply data of value and many of them have been used in this grammar. Dr. Mahaffy,\(^2\) indeed, is impatient of too much specialism, and sometimes in linguistic study the specialist has missed the larger and true conception of the whole.

(e) **THE GREEK INSCRIPTIONS.** The Greek inscriptions speak with the voice of authority concerning various epochs of the language. Once we had to depend entirely on books for our knowledge of the Greek tongue. There is still much obscurity, but it is no longer possible to think of Homer as the father of Greek nor to consider 1000 B.C. as the beginning of Greek culture. The two chief names in epigraphical studies are those of August Boeckh (*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*) and Theodor Mommsen (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*). For a careful review of “the Nature of the New Texts” now at our service in the inscriptions see Deissmann, *Light*, etc., pp.

Mahaffy

**MAHAFFY, J. P.,** A Survey of Greek Civilization (1897).

———, Greek Life and Thought (1896).

———, Progress of Hellenism in Alexander’s Empire (1905).

———, The Greek World under Roman Sway (1890).

———, What Have the Greeks Done for Civilization? (1909).

\(^2\) “A herd of specialists is rising up, each master of his own subject, but absolutely ignorant and careless of all that is going on around him in kindred studies.” Survey of Gk. Civilization, 1897, p. 3.

Mommsen

**MOMMSEN, T.,** Beiträge zur Lehre der griech. Präpositionen (1886–1895).

———, Die Präp. σύν und μετά bei den nachhom. Epikern (1879).

Deissmann

**DEISSMANN, A.,** Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).

10–20. See W. H. P. Hatch’s article (Jour. of Bibl. Lit., 1908, pp. 134–146, Part 2) on “Some Illustrations of N. T. Usage from Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor.” Cf. also Thieme, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Määnder und das Neue Test. (1906), and Rouffiac, Recherches sur les Caractères du Grec dans le N. T. d’après les Inscriptions de Priène (1911). Deissmann, op. cit., p. 18, thinks that ὅγα[πη]ν is rightly restored in a pagan inscription in Pisidia of the imperial period. For the Christian inscriptions see Deissmann, op. cit., p. 19. Schliemann3 has not only restored the story of Troy to the reader of the historic past, but he has revealed a great civilization [Page 15] at Mycenæ.1 Homer stands at the close of a long antecedent history of linguistic progress, and once again scholars are admitting the date 850 or even 1000 B.C. for his poems as well as their essential unity, thus abandoning Wolff’s hypothesis.2 They have been driven to this by the abundant linguistic testimony from the inscriptions from many parts of Greece. So vast is this material that numerous grammatical discussions have been made concerning the inscriptions, as those by Roehl,3 Kretschmer,4 Lautensach,5 Meisterhans,6 Schweizer,8 Viteau,9 Wagner,10 Nachmanson,11 etc.


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).


Thieme THIEME, G., Die Inschr. von Magnesia am Määnder und das N. T. (1906).

Rouffiac ROUFFIAC, J., Recherches sur les caractères du grec dans le N. T. d’après les inscriptions de Priène (1911).

1 Mycenæ and Tiryns, 1878.

2 See also Tsountas and Manatt, The Mycenæan Age, 1897.

3 Inscr. Graecae Antiq., 1882.

4 Kretschmer

These inscriptions are not sporadic nor local, but are found in Egypt, in Crete, in Asia Minor, the various isles of the sea, in Italy, in Greece, in Macedonia, etc.


———, Die griech. Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht (1894).

4 Die griech. Vaseninschr. und ihre Spr., 1894.
Lautensach LAUTENSACH, Verbalflexion der attischen Inschriften (1887).
5 Verbalfl. der att. Inschr., 1887.
6 Antiquités hellén., 1842.
7 Gr. der att. Inschr., 3. Aufl. von E. Schwyzer, 1900.
Schweizer


———, Grammatik der pergamen. Inschriften (1898).


8 Gr. der perg. Inschr., 1898.
Viteau

VITEAU, J., Essai sur la syntaxe des voix dans le grec du N. T. (Rev. de Phil., 1894).

———, Étude sur le grec du N. T. I, Le Verbe (1893); II, Le Sujet (1896).

9 La decl. dans les inscr. att. de l’Empire, 1895.
Wagner WAGNER, R., Questiones de epigrammatis graecis ex lapidibus collectis grammaticae (1883).
10 Quest. de epigram. Graecis, 1883.
Nachmanson

NACHMANSOHN, E., Beiträge zur Kenntnis der altgriech. Volkssprache (1910).

———, Epigraphisch-grammatische Bemerkungen (Eranos 11, 1912).

———, Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften (1903).


12 As, for example, Paton and Hicks, The Inscr. of Cos, 1891; Kern, Die Inschr. von Magn., 1900; Gärtingen, Inschr. von Priene, 1906; Gärtingen and Paton, Inscr. Maris
Indeed Apostolides\textsuperscript{13} seems to show that the Greeks were in Egypt long before Alexander the Great founded Alexandria. The discoveries of Dr. A. J. [Page 16] Evans in Crete have pushed back the known examples of Greek a thousand years or more. The linear script of Knossos, Crete, may be some primitive form of Greek 500 years before the first dated example of Phœnician writing. The civilization of the Hellenic race was very old when Homer wrote,—how old no one dares say.\textsuperscript{1} For specimens of the use of the inscriptions see Buck’s \textit{Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects} (Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary), 1910.

\textit{(f) FULLER KNOWLEDGE OF THE DIALECTS.} The new knowledge of the other dialects makes it possible to form a juster judgment of the relative position of the Attic. There has been much confusion on this subject and concerning the relation of the various Greek races. It now seems clear that the Pelasgians, Achaæans, Dorians were successively dominant in Greece.\textsuperscript{2} Pelasgian appears to be the name for the various pre-Achæan tribes, and it was the Pelasgian tribe that made Mycenæ glorious.\textsuperscript{3} Homer sings the glories of the Achaæans who displaced the Pelasgians, while “the people who play a great part in later times—Dorians, Æolians, Ionians—are to Homer little more than names.”\textsuperscript{4} The Pelasgian belonged to the bronze age, the Achaæan to the iron age.\textsuperscript{5} The Pelasgians may have been Slavs and kin to the

\textsuperscript{13} Essai sur l’Héllénisme Égyptien, 1908, p. vi. He says: “Les découvertes récentes des archéologues ont dissipé ces illusions. Des ruines de Naucratis, de Daphné, de Gurob, et de l’Illahoun (pour ne citer que les localités dans lesquelles les recherches ont donné le plus de résultats) est sortie toute une nouvelle Grèce; une Grèce antérieure aux Ramsès …; et, si les recherches se continuent, on ne tardera pas, nous en sommes convaincus, à acquérir la certitude que les Grecs sont aussi anciens en Égypte qu’en Grèce même.”

\textsuperscript{2} See Ridgeway, The Early Age of Greece, vol. I, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{3} Ib., p. 293. For the contribution of the dialects to the κοινή see ch. III.
\textsuperscript{4} Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., 1901, p. 526.
\textsuperscript{5} Ib., p. 406.
Etruscans of Italy. The Achæans were possibly Celts from northern Europe. The old Ionic was the base of the old Attic. This old Ionic-Attic was the archaic Greek tongue, and the choruses in the Attic poets partly represent artificial literary Doric. There was not a sharp division between the early dialects owing to the successive waves of population sweeping over the country. There were numerous minor subdivisions in the dialects (as the Arcadian, Bœotian, Northwest, Thessalian, etc.) due to the mountain ranges, the peninsulas, the islands, etc., and other causes into which we cannot enter. For a skilful attempt at grouping and relating the dialects to each other see Thumb’s *Handbuch*, p. 54 f. The matter cannot be elaborated here (see ch. III). But the point needs to be emphasized that [Page 17] the literary dialects by no means represent the linguistic history of Greece itself and still less that of the islands and other colonies (cf. Buck’s *Greek Dialects*, p. 1). The blending of these dialects into the κοινὴ was not complete as we shall see. “Of dialects the purest Hellenic is Dorian, preserved in religious odes,—pure because they kept aloof from their subjects. The next is the Æolic, preserved in lyric odes of the Lesbian school. The earliest to be embodied in literature was Ionic, preserved in epic poems. The most perfect is Attic, the language of drama, philosophy and oratory. This arose out of the Ionic by introducing some of the strength of Doric-Æolic forms without sacrificing the sweet smoothness of Ionic.”

In general concerning the Greek dialects one may consult the works of Meister, Ridgeway, Hoffmann, Thumb, Buck, Boisacq, Pezzi, etc.

7 Ib., pp. 666–670.
8 Hoffmann, Die griech. Dial., Bd. I, p. 7. A more recent treatment of the dialects is Thumb’s *Handb. der griech. Dial.* (1909), which makes use of all the recent discoveries from the inscriptions. On the mixing of the dialects see Thumb, p. 61 f. Thumb


———, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


2 MS. Notes on Gk. Gr. by H. H. Harris, late Prof. of Gk. at Richmond College.

Meister
(g) The Papyri and Ostraca. Thiersch in 1841 had pointed out the value of the papyri for the study of the LXX in his De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina, but nobody thought it worth while to study the masses of papyri in London, Paris and Berlin for the N. T. language. Farrar (Messages of the Books, 1884, p. 151) noted the similarity of phrase between Paul’s correspondence and the papyri in the Brit. Mus. “N. T. philology is at present undergoing thorough reconstruction; and probably all the workers concerned, both on the continent and in English-speaking countries, are by this time agreed that the starting-point for the philological investigations must be the language of the non-literary papyri, ostraca, and inscriptions” (Deissmann, Light, etc., p. 55). The κοινή is now rich in material for the study of the vernacular or popular speech as opposed to the book language. This distinction belongs to all languages which have a literature and to all periods of the language. It is particularly true of the modern Greek to-day as it was true in the early period. The

Meister, R., Beiträge zur Lautlehre d. LXX (1909).


———, Prol. zu einer Gramm. d. LXX (1907).

Hoffmann

Hoffmann, O., Das Präsens der indog. Grundsprache (1889).


———, Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum (1906).

———, Geschichte d. griech. Sprache (1911).


Gk. Dialects.

Boisacq

Boisacq, Les dialectes doriens (1891).

———, Dictionnaire étymol. de la langue grecque (1907 ff.).


Farrar Farrar, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).
Athenian newspapers as a rule affect the καθαρεύουσα. Occasionally a writer like Aristophanes would on purpose write in the language of the street. It is not therefore a peculiarity of the κοινή that the vernacular Greek prevailed then. It always prevails. But the καθαρεύουσα has secured a more disastrous supremacy over the δημοτική than in any other language. And we are now able to estimate the vernacular κοινή, since the great papyri discoveries of Flinders-Petrie, Grenfell and Hunt and others. We had already the excellent discussions of Mullach,1 Niebuhr,2 Blass,3 Foy4 and Lottich.5 But in the last fifteen years or so a decided impetus has been given to this phase of Greek grammatical research. It is in truth a new study, the attention now paid to the vernacular, as Moulton points out in his Prolegomena (p. 22). “I will go further and say that if we could only recover letters that ordinary people wrote to each other without being literary, we should have the greatest possible help for the understanding of the language of the N. T. generally” (Bishop Lightfoot, 1863, as quoted in Moulton’s Prol., 2d and 3d ed., p. 242). If Lightfoot only lived now! Cf. Masson’s Preface to Winer (1859).

The most abundant source of new light for the vernacular κοινή is found in the papyri collections, many volumes of which have already been published (see Index of Quots. for fuller list), while more are yet to be issued. Indeed, Prof. W. N. Stearns6 complains: “There would seem to be a plethora of such material already as evidenced by such collections as the Berlinische Urkunde and the Rainier Papyri.” But the earnest student of the Greek tongue can only rejoice at the “extraordinary and in part unexpected wealth of material from the contemporary and the later languages.”7

Mullach MULLACH, F., Grammatik d. griech. Vulgarsprache (1856).
1 Gr. der griech. Vulgarspr., 1856.
Blass


———, Die griech. Beredsamkeit von Alex. bis auf August. (1865).

———, Die Rhythmen der asianischen und römischen Kunstprosa (1905).


———, Evangelium sec. Lukam (1897).

3 Die griech. Beredsamkeit von Alex. bis auf Aug., 1865.
Foy Foy, K., Lautsystem der griech. Vulgarsprache (1879).
4 Lauts. der griech. Vulgarspr., 1879.
Lottich LOTTICH, B., De sermone vulgari Atticorum (1881).
5 De Serm. vulg. Att., 1881.
the publications of Drs. Grenfell and Hunt,8 [Page 19] Mahaffy,1 Goodspeed,2 the Berlinische Urkunde,3 Papyri in the British Museum,4 the Turin Papyri,5 the Leyden Papyri,6 the Geneva Papyri,7 Lord Amherst’s collection (Paris, 1865), etc. For general discussions of the papyri see the writings of Wilcken,8 Kenyon,9 Hartel,10 Häberlin,11 Viereck,12 Deissmann,13 de Ricci,14 Wessely.15 A great and increasing literature is


2 Gk. Pap. from the Cairo Mus., 1902, 1903.

3 Griech. Urk., 1895, 1898, 1903, 1907, etc.


5 Peyron, 1826, 1827.

6 Zauber Pap., 1885; Leeman’s Pap. Graeci, 1843.

7 J. Nicole, 1896, 1900; cf. Wessely’s Corpus Pap., 1895.

8 Griech. Papyrusurk., 1897; Archiv für Papyrusforsch. und verw. Gebiete, 1900—.

Kenyon

KENYON, F. G., Evidence of the Papyri for Textual Criticism of the N. T. (1905).

———, Handbook to the Textual Crit. of the N. T. 2d ed. (1912).

———, Palæography of the Greek Papyri (1899).

———, Papyri (Hastings’ D. B., extra vol., 1904).


10 Über die griech. Pap.


Viereck


———, Sermo Graecus quo senatus populusque Romanus (1888).

12 Ber. über die ältere Pap.-Lit., Jahresb. über d. Fortschr. etc., 1898, 1899.


14 Bul. papyrologique in Rev. des Ét. grecques since 1901.
thus coming into existence on this subject. Excellent handbooks of convenient size are those by H. Lietzmann, *Greek Papyri* (1905), and by G. Milligan, *Greek Papyri* (1910). For a good discussion of the papyri and the literature on the subject see Deissmann, *Light*, etc., pp. 20–41. The grammatical material in the papyri has not been exhausted. There are a number of excellent workers in the field such as Mayser,\(^{16}\) St. Witkowski,\(^{17}\) Deissmann,\(^ {18}\) Moulton,\(^ {19}\) H. A. A. Kennedy,\(^ {20}\) Jannaris,\(^ {21}\)


Lietzmann


Milligan

MILLIGAN, G., *The Greek Papyri with Special Reference to their Value for N. T. Study* (1912).

———, *The N. T. Documents* (1913).

Mayser


Witkowski


———, *Prodromus grammaticae papyrorum graecarum aetatis Lagidarum* (1897).


18 *B. S., 1901; Light, etc.; art. Hell. Griech. in Hauck’s Realencyc.; art. Papyrus in Encyc. Bibl., etc.

Kennedy


———, *Sources of N. T. Greek* (1895).

———, *St Paul and the Mystery Religions* (1913).

20 *Sources of N. T. Gk., 1895; Recent Res. in the Lang. of the N. T., Exp. Times, May, July, Sept., 1901.*
These are all helpful, but Crönert\textsuperscript{1} is right in urging that we need a comprehensive discussion of the syntax of the Ptolemaic papyri in order to set forth properly the relation of the papyri both to the N. T. Greek and to the older Attic. This will require time, for the mass of material is very great and is constantly growing.\textsuperscript{2} But enough already is clear for us to see the general bearing of the whole on the problem of the N. T. It is just here that the papyri have special interest and value. They give the language of business and life. The N. T. writers were partly \textit{ἀγράμματοι}, but what they wrote has become the chief Book of Mankind.\textsuperscript{3} Hear Deissmann\textsuperscript{4} again, for he it is who has done most to blaze the way here: “The papyrus-leaf is alive; one sees autographs, individual peculiarities of penmanship—in a word, men; manifold glimpses are given into inmost nooks and crannies of personal life in which history has no eyes and historians no glasses … It may seem a paradox, but it can safely be affirmed that the unliterary papyri are more important in these respects than the literary.” Some of the papyri contain literary works, fragments of Greek classics, portions of the LXX or of the N. T., though the great mass of them are non-literary documents, letters and business papers. Cf. also Deissmann, \textit{Light}, etc., p. 29. Unusual interest attaches to the fragments containing the Logia of Jesus, some of which are new, dating from the second or third centuries A.D. and showing a Gnostic tinge.\textsuperscript{5} It is no longer possible to say, what even Friedrich Blass\textsuperscript{6} did in 1894, that the N. T. Greek “is to be regarded something by itself and following laws of its own.” That view is doomed in the presence of the papyri. Hatch\textsuperscript{7} in particular laboured

---

1 Archiv für Pap.-Forsch., 1900, p. 215.
3 See Deissmann, Die sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel, 1898, p. 27.
5 See \textit{Αόγια Ἰησοῦ}, Sayings of Jesus, by Grenfell and Hunt, 1897. New Sayings of Jesus, by Grenfell and Hunt, 1904. See also two books by Dr. C. Taylor, The Oxyrhyn. Logia, 1899; The Oxyrhyn. Sayings of Jesus, 1905; Lock and Sanday, Two Lect. on the Sayings of Jesus, 1897.
7 Hatch HATCH, E., Essays in Bibl. Greek (1892).
under this error. The N. T. Greek [Page 21] will no longer be despised as inferior or unclassical. It will be seen to be a vital part of the great current of the Greek language. For the formal discussion of the bearing of the papyri on the N. T. Greek see chapter IV. A word should be said concerning the reason why the papyri are nearly all found in Egypt.¹ It is due to the dryness of the climate there. Elsewhere the brittle material soon perished, though it has on the whole a natural toughness. The earliest known use of the papyri in Egypt is about 3400 B.C. More exactly, the reign of Assa in the fifth dynasty is put at 3360 B.C. This piece of writing is an account-sheet belonging to this reign (Deissmann, *Light from A. E.*, p. 22). The oldest specimen of the Greek papyri goes back to “the regnal year of Alexander Ægus, the son of Alexander the Great. That would make it the oldest Greek papyrus document yet discovered” (Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 29). The discoveries go on as far as the seventh century A.D., well into the Byzantine period. The plant still grows in Egypt and it was once the well-nigh universal writing material. As waste paper it was used to wrap the mummies. Thus it has come to be preserved. The rubbish-heaps at Fayûm and Oxyrhynchus are full of these papyri scraps.

Mention should be made also of the ostraca, or pieces of pottery, which contain numerous examples of the vernacular κοινή. For a very interesting sketch of the ostraca see Deissmann, *Light*, etc. (pp. 41–53). Crum and Wilcken have done the chief work on the ostraca. They are all non-literary and occur in old Egyptian, Arabic, Aramaic, Coptic, Greek and Latin. “Prof. Wilcken, in his *Griechische Ostraka*,² has printed the texts of over sixteen hundred of the inscribed potsherds on which the commonest receipts and orders of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt were written.”³ It was the material used by the poorer classes.

(h) THE BYZANTINE AND THE MODERN GREEK. The Byzantine and modern Greek has at last received adequate recognition. [Page 22] The student of the N. T. idiom has much to learn from the new books on this subject. The scorn bestowed on the κοινή by the intense classicists was intensified by the modern Greek, which was long regarded as a nondescript jumble of Greek, Albanian, Turkish, Italian, etc. Indeed the modern Greeks themselves have not always shown proper appreciation of the dignity of the modern vernacular, as is shown, for instance, in the recent up-heaval at Athens by the University students over the translation of the Gospels into the Greek vernacular (δημοτική) of to-day, though the N. T. was manifestly written in the

---

7 Essays in Bibl. Gk., 1892, p. 11 f. The earliest dated papyrus is now P. Eleph. 1 (311 B.C.), not P. Hibeh, as Thackeray has it in his Gr. of the O. T. in Gk., p. 56. This was true in 1907; cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., March, 1910, p. 53.
Crum CRUM, W. E., Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others (1902).
vernacular of its day. “While the later Greeks, however, could no longer write classically, they retained a keen sense for the beauties of the classical language.”1 Just as the “popular Latin finally suppressed the Latin of elegant literature,”2 so the vernacular κοινή lived on through the Roman and Byzantine periods and survives today as the modern Greek. There is unity in the present-day Greek and historical continuity with the past. Dr. Rose is possibly extreme in saying: “There is more difference between the Greek of Herodotus and the Greek of Xenophon than there is between the Greek of the latter and the Greek of to-day.”3 And certainly Prof. Dickey4 is right in affirming “that the Greek of N. T. stands in the centre of the development of which classical and modern Greek may be called extremes, and that of the two it is nearer to the second in character than the first. The interpretation of the N. T. has almost entirely been in the sole light of the ancient, i. e. the Attic Greek, and, therefore, to that extent has been unscientific and often inaccurate.” Hatzidakis5 indeed complained that the whole subject had been treated with unworthy “dilettanteism” and not without ground for the complaint. He himself did much by his great work to put the study of modern Greek on a scientific basis,1 but he has not worked alone in this important field. Another native Greek, Prof. Sophocles, has produced a Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods in which there is an excellent discussion for that time of the κοινή, the Byzantine and the modern Greek. Other scholars have developed special phases of the problem, as Krumbacher,3 who

1 Dr. Achilles Rose, Chris. Greece and Living Gk., 1898, p. 7.
2 R. C. Jebb, On the Rela. of Mod. to Class. Gk., in V. and D.’s Handb. to Mod. Gk., 1887, p. 287. “In other words, the Bible was cast into spoken Latin, familiar to every rank of society though not countenanced in the schoolroom; and thus it foreshadowed the revolution of ages whereby the Roman tongue expanded into what we may label as Romance.” W. Barry, “Our Latin Bible,” in Dublin Rev., July, 1906, p. 4; cf. also art. on The Holy Latin Tongue, in April number.
3 Rose ROSE, A., Christian Greece and Living Greek (1898).
4 Chris. Greece and Living Greek, p. 253.
6 See also S. Angus, Mod. Methods in N. T. Philol. (Harv. Theol. Rev., Oct., 1911, p. 499): “That the progress of philology has thus broken down the wall of partition of the N. T. and removed its erstwhile isolation is a great service to the right understanding of the book’s contents.”
7 Einl. in die neugr. Gr., 1892, p. ix; cf. also H. C. Müller, Hist. Gr. der hell. Spr., 1891.
8 1870. One of the pressing needs is a lexicon of the papyri also. See Contopoulos, Lex. of Mod. Gk., 1868, and others.
9 Krumbacher
has enriched our knowledge of the Byzantine\textsuperscript{4} or Middle Ages Greek. Dieterich\textsuperscript{5} also has done fine work in this period of Greek, as has Thumb.\textsuperscript{6} Worthy of mention also is the work of G. Meyer,\textsuperscript{7} Geldart\textsuperscript{8} and Prestel,\textsuperscript{9} though the latter have not produced books of great value. See also Meyer-Lübke’s grammar,\textsuperscript{10} Jannaris’ \textit{Historical Greek Grammar} and the writings of Psichari.\textsuperscript{11} In general great progress has been made and it is now possible to view the development of the N. T. idiom in the light of the modern Greek. The apparent drift in the vernacular \textit{κοινή} of the N. T., like Ἰνα in the non-final clause, is too common for remark in the modern Greek. Indeed the N. T. had a predominant influence on the later Greek as the chief literature of the period, and especially as Christianity won the victory over heathenism. The Byzantine


———, Das Problem d. neugriech. Schriftsprache (1902).


3 Das Problem der neugr. Schriftspr., 1903. “Heute bedarf das Studiengebiet der byzantinischen und neugriechischen Philologie keine Apologie,” p. 3. In his hands the middle Gk. (Byzantine) is shown to be a rich field for the student both of philology and literature; cf. also Gesch. der byzant. Lit., p. 20.


5 Unters. zur Gesch. d. griech. Spr. etc., 1898; Gesch. der byz. und neugr. Lit., 1902.


7 Neugr. Stud., 1894.

Geldart GELDART, The Modern Greek Language in Its Relation to Ancient Greek (1870).


9 Zur Entwickelungsgesch. der griech. Spr.


10 Gr. der romanischen Spr.

Psichari

PSICHERI, J., Essai sur le grec de la Septante (Rev. des études juives, April, 1908).

———, Essais de grammaire historique néo-grecque (1886–1889).

Greek is in subject-matter largely ecclesiastical. The sermons and treatises of the Greek Christian Fathers constitute a large and valuable literature and amply illustrate the language of the time. The modern Greek is in all essential points the same as the Byzantine Greek of 1000 A.D. In forty years we have seen a revolution in the study of the modern Greek. But as late as 1887 Vincent and Dickson could say: “By many it is believed that a corrupt *patois* of Turkish and Italian is now spoken in Greece; and few even among professed scholars are aware how small the difference is between the Greek of the N. T. and the Greek of a contemporary Athenian newspaper.” The new Greek speech was developed not out of the Byzantine literary language, but out of the Hellenistic popular speech.

(i) THE HEBREW AND ARAMAIC. Less that is new has come from the Hebrew and Aramaic field of research. Still real advance has been made here also. The most startling result is the decrease of emphasis upon Hebraisms in the N. T. style. In chapter IV, III the Semitic influence on the N. T. language is discussed. Here the literary history is sketched.

1. *The Old View*. It was only in 1879 that Guillemard issued his *Hebraisms in the Greek Testament*, in which he said in the Preface: “I earnestly disavow any claim to an exhaustive exhibition of all the Hebraisms, or all the deviations from classical phraseology contained in the Greek Testament; of which I have gathered together and put forward only a few specimens, in the hope of stimulating others to fuller and more exact research.” Even in 1889, Dr. Edwin Hatch says: “Biblical Greek is thus a [Page 25] language by itself. What we have to find out in studying it is what meaning certain Greek words conveyed to a Semitic mind.” Again he says: “The great majority of N. T. words are words which, though for the most part common to biblical and to contemporary secular Greek, express in their biblical use the conceptions of a Semitic race, and which must consequently be examined by the light of the cognate documents which form the LXX.” And W. H. Simcox says: “Thus it is that there

1 See the Migne Lib. and the new Ber. Royal Lib. ed.
2 Dieterich, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
3 Vincent and Dickson, A Handook to Modern Greek (1887).
6 Essays in Bibl. Gk., p. 11.
1 Ib., p. 34. See also p. 9: “Biblical Gk. belongs not only to a later period of the history of the language than classical Gk., but also to a different country.” On page 14 we read: “It is a true paradox that while, historically as well as philologically, the Gk. (LXX) is a translation of the Hebrew, philologically, though not historically, the Hebrew may be regarded as a translation of the Gk.”

Simcox
came to exist a Hellenistic dialect, having real though variable differences from the
Common or Hellenic."

while the writer began with a complete, though provisional, acceptance of Hatch’s
conclusions, the farther the inquiry was pushed, the more decidedly was he compelled
to doubt those conclusions, and finally to seek to establish the connection between the
language of the LXX and that of the N. T. on a totally different basis.” He finds that
common bond in “the colloquial Greek of the time.”⁴

3. Deissmann’s Revolt. The full revolt against the theory of a Semitic or biblical
Greek is seen in the writings of Deissmann,⁵ who says⁶: “The theory indicated is a
great power in exegesis, and that it possesses a certain plausibility is not to be denied.
It is edifying, and what is more, is convenient. But it is absurd. It mechanizes the
marvellous variety of the linguistic elements of the Greek Bible and cannot be
established either by the psychology of language or by history.” There is here some of
the zeal of new discovery, but it is true. The old view of Hatch is dead and gone. The
“clamant need of a lexicon to the LXX” is emphasized by Deissmann⁷ himself. Prof.
H. B. Swete of Cambridge has laid all biblical students under lasting obligation [Page
26] to him by his contribution to the study of the Septuagint, consisting of an edition
of the LXX¹ with brief critical apparatus and a general discussion² of the Septuagint.
Brooke and McLean are publishing an edition of the Septuagint with exhaustive
critical apparatus.³ Students of the LXX now rejoice in Helbing’s Gr. der

---


———, The Writers of the N. T.

2 The Lang. of the N. T., 1890, p. 15. Note the date, as late as 1890.
3 Sources of N. T. Gk., 1895, p. v.
4 Ib., p. 146.
5 Die sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel, 1898; B. S., 1901; Hell. Griech., Hauck’s
Realencyc., New Light (1907), etc.
6 B. S., p. 65.
7 Ib., p. 73. Schleusner, 1821, is hopelessly inadequate and out of date. Hatch and
Redpath have issued in six parts (two volumes) a splendid concordance to the LXX
and other Gk. versions of the O. T., 1892–1896, 1900.
Swete


———, The Apocalypse of St. John (1906).

———, The O. T. in Greek according to the Septuagint (1887). 3 vols.

1 The O. T. in Gk. according to the LXX, vols. I–III, 1887–1894. He does not give an
edited text, but follows one MS. at a time with critical apparatus in footnotes.
2 An Intr. to the O. T. in Gk., 1900; 2d ed., 1914.
3 The Larger Camb. LXX, 1906—.
Septuaginta: Laut- u. Formenlehre (1907) and Thackeray’s Gr. of the O. T. in Greek, vol. I (1909). Conybeare and Stock’s Selections from the Septuagint (1905) has the old standpoint. Other modern workers in this department are Nestle, Lagarde, Hartung, Ralfs, Susemihl, Apostolides.
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Susemihl SUSEMIHL, Gesch. der griech. Lit. in der Alexandrinerzeit. I (1891), II (1892).
8 Gesch. der griech. Lit. in der Alexandrinzeit, Bd. I, II, 1891, 1892.
9 Du grec Alexandrin et de ses rapports avec le grec ancien et le grec moderne, 1892. Cf. among the older discussions, Sturz, De dial. Maced. et Alexan., 1808; Lipsius, Gr. Unters. über die bibl. Gräc., 1853; Churton, The Infl. of the LXX upon the Prog. of
4. The Language of Jesus. Another point of special interest in this connection, which may be discussed as well now as later, is the new light concerning the Aramaic as the language habitually spoken by Jesus. This matter has been in much confusion and the scholars are not at one even now. Roberts maint. that Greek, not Hebrew, was “the language of the common public intercourse in Palestine in the days of Christ and His apostles.” By Hebrew he means Aramaic. In *The Expositor* (1st series, vols. VI, VII) Roberts argued also that Christ usually spoke Greek. He was replied to (vol. VII) by Sanday. Lightfoot (on Gal. 4:6) holds that Jesus said Ἅββα ὁ πατήρ thus, Mark not having translated it. Thomson, “The Language of Palestine” (*Temple Bible Dict.*), argues strongly that Christ spoke Greek, not Aramaic. Neubauer contends that there was spoken besides at Jerusalem and in Judea a modernized Hebrew, and comments on “how little the Jews knew Greek.” A. Meyer urges that the vernacular of Jesus was Aramaic and shows what bearing this fact has on the interpretation of the Gospels. A. Jülicher indeed says: “To suppose, however (as, e.g. G. B. Winer supposes, because of Mk. 7:34; Jo. 7:25; 12:20) that Jesus used the Greek language is quite out of the question.” But Young, vol. II, *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (Hastings), article “Language of Christ,” admits that Christ used both, though usually he spoke Aramaic. So Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 8. But Dalman has
done more than any one in showing the great importance of the Aramaic for the interpretation of the words of Jesus. He denies the use of a modernized Hebrew in Jerusalem and urges that proper names like Βηθεσδά, חֶזְדָּא, בֵּית, are Aramaic (but see J. Rendel Harris, *Side Lights on the N. T.*, p. 71 f.). Dalman further urges that “Aramaic was the mother tongue of the Galileans.”4 J. T. Marshall5 makes out a plausible case for the idea of a primitive Aramaic Gospel before our Mark, and this would make it more probable that Jesus spoke Aramaic. E. A. Abbott6 also attempts to reproduce the original Aramaic of the words of Jesus from the Greek. But Prof. Mahaffy7 can still say: “And so from the very beginning, 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 [Page 28] with Pontius Pilate, were certainly carried on mainly in the Greek.” Zahn (*Intr. to the N. T.*) labours needlessly to show that Hebrew was no longer the language of Palestine, but he does
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3 The Words of Jesus considered in the Light of the post-Bibl. Jewish Writings and the Aram. Lang., 1902. Cf. also Pfannkuhe (Clark’s Bibl. Cab.).


4 Ib., p. 10.


5 Exp., ser. IV, VI, VIII. See also Brockelmann, Syrische Gr., 1904; Schwally, Idioticon des chrstl.-palästinischen Aramäisch, 1893; Riggs, Man. of the Chaldean Lang., 1866; Wilson, *Intr. Syriac Meth. and Man*., 1891; Strack, Gr. des bibl. Aramäischen.


———, *Johannine Grammar* (1906).

———, *Johannine Vocabulary* (1905).


7 The Prog. of Hellen. in Alexan. Emp., 1905, p. 130 f. Hadley (Ess. Phil. and Crit., p. 413) reaches the conclusion that Jesus spoke both Gk. and Aram.

Zahn


not prove that Aramaic was everywhere spoken, nor that Jesus always spoke Aramaic. Wellhausen (Einl. in die drei erst. Evang.) is prejudiced in favour of the Aramaic theory. It may be admitted at once that Aramaic was known to the majority of the Jews in Palestine, particularly in Judea. Cf. Ac. 1:19: τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν Ἀκελλαδομάχες; 22:2, ἀκούσαντες δὲ τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ προσεφώνει αὐτοῖς μᾶλλον παρέσχον ἡμῖν. There is no doubt which language is the vernacular in Jerusalem. Cf. also 26:14. Josephus confirms Luke on this point (War, V, 6. 3), for the people of Jerusalem cried out τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ, and Josephus also acted intermediary for Titus, τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ (War, VI, 2. 1). See also 2 Macc. 7:8, 21. Josephus wrote his War first in Aramaic and then in Greek. The testimony of Papias that Matthew wrote his λόγια in Aramaic bears on the question because of the tradition that Mark was the interpreter of Peter. The brogue that Peter revealed (Mt. 26:73) was probably due to his Galilean accent of Aramaic. Aramaic was one of the languages for the inscription on the cross (Jo. 19:20). It is clear therefore that the Hellenizing work of Jason and Menelaus and Antiochus Epiphanes received a set-back in Palestine. The reaction kept Greek from becoming the one language of the country. Even in Lycaonia the people kept their vernacular though they understood Greek (Ac. 14:11). On the other hand Peter clearly spoke in Greek on the Day of Pentecost, and no mention is made of Greek as one of the peculiar “tongues,” on that occasion. It is clear that Paul was understood in Jerusalem when he spoke Greek (Ac. 22:2). Jesus Himself laboured chiefly in Galilee where were many gentiles and much commerce and travel. He taught in Decapolis, a Greek region. He preached also in the regions of Tyre and Sidon (Phœnicia), where Greek was necessary, and he held converse with a Greek (Syro-Phœnician) woman. Near Cæsarea-Philippi (a Greek region), after the Transfiguration, Jesus spoke to the people at the foot of the mountain. At the time of the Sermon on the Mount Jesus addressed people from Decapolis and Perea (largely Hellenized), besides the mixed multitudes from Galilee, Jerusalem and Judea (Mt. 4:25). Luke (6:17) adds that crowds came also from Tyre and Sidon, and Mark (3:8) gives “from Idumæa.” It is hardly possible that these crowds understood Aramaic. The fact that Mark [Page 29] twice (5:41; 7:34) uses Aramaic quotations from the words of Jesus does not prove that He always spoke in that tongue nor that He did so only on these occasions. In Mk. 14:36, Ἀββά ὁ πατήρ, it is possible that Jesus may have used both words as Paul did (Ro. 8:15). In the quotation from Ps. 22:1, spoken on the cross, Mt. 27:46 gives the Hebrew, while Mk. 15:34 has an Aramaic adaptation. There is no reason to doubt that Jesus knew Hebrew also. But Thomson (Temple Bible, Lang. of Palestine) proves that Matthew gives the quotations made by Christ in the words of the LXX, while his own quotations are usually from the Hebrew. It is clear, therefore, that Jesus spoke both Aramaic and Greek according to the demands of the occasion and read the Hebrew as well as the Septuagint, if we may argue from the O. T. quotations in the Gospels which are partly like the Hebrew text and partly like the LXX.¹ In Lu. 4:17 it is not clear whether it was the Hebrew text or the LXX that was read in the synagogue at Nazareth.² One surely needs no argument


¹ See C. Taylor, The Gospel in the Law, 1869; Boehl, Alttestamentl. Cit. im N. T., 1878; Toy, Quota. in the N. T., 1884; Huhn, Die alttestamentl. Cit. etc., 1900; Gregory, Canon and Text of the N. T., 1907, p. 394.

to see the possibility that a people may be bilingual when he remembers the Welsh, Scotch, Irish, Bretons of the present day. The people in Jerusalem understood either Greek or Aramaic (Ac. 22:2).

(j) Grammatical Commentaries. A word must be said concerning the new type of commentaries which accent the grammatical side of exegesis. This is, to be sure, the result of the emphasis upon scientific grammar. The commentary must have other elements besides the grammatical. Even the historical element when added does not exhaust what is required. There still remains the apprehension of the soul of the author to which historical grammar is only an introduction. But distinct credit is to be given to those commentators who have lifted this kind of exegesis out of the merely homiletic vein. Among the older writers are to be mentioned Meyer, Ellicott, Godet, Broadus, Hackett, Lightfoot and Westcott, while among the more recent commentators stand out most of the writers in the International Critical Commentary, Holtzmann’s Hand Comm., The Expositor’s Greek Test., Swete, Mayor, G. Milligan, Lietzmann’s Handbuch, Zahn’s Kommentar, The Camb. Gk. Test., etc. In works like these, grammatical remarks of great value are found. There has been great advance in the N. T. commentaries since Winer’s day, when these comments “were rendered useless by that uncrirical empiricism which controlled Greek philology.”

V. The New Point of View. It will hardly be denied, in view of the preceding necessarily condensed presentation of the new material now at hand that new light has been turned upon the problems of the N. T. Greek. The first effect upon many minds is to dazzle and to cause confusion. Some will not know how to assimilate the new facts and to co-ordinate them with old theories nor be willing to form or adopt new theories as a result of the fresh phenomena. But it is the inevitable duty of the student in this department to welcome the new discoveries and to attack the problems arising therefrom. The new horizon and wider outlook make possible real progress. It will not be possible to avoid some mistakes at first. A truer conception of the language is now offered to us and one that will be found to be richer and more inspiring. Every line of biblical study must respond to the new discovery in language. “A new Cremer, a new

Broadus BROADUS, JOHN A., Comm. on Matt. (1886).
Westcott WESTCOTT, B. F., Language of the N. T. (Smith’s B. D.).
1 Winer, Gr. of the N. T. Idiom, Thayer’s transl., p. 7.
Cremer
Thayer-Grimm, a new Winer will give the twentieth century plenty of editing to keep its scholars busy. New Meyers and Alford will have fresh matter from which to interpret the text, and new Spurgeons and Moodys will, we may hope, be ready to pass the new teaching on to the people.” The N. T. Greek is now seen to be not an abnormal excrescence, but a natural development in the Greek language; to be, in fact, a not unworthy part of the great stream of the mighty tongue. It was not outside of the world-language, but in the very heart of it and influenced considerably the future of the Greek tongue.

[PAGE 31] CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL METHOD

I. Language as History. The scientific grammar is at bottom a grammatical history, and not a linguistic law-book. The seat of authority in language is therefore not the books about language, but the people who use the language. The majority of well-educated people determine correct usage (the mos loquendi as Horace says). Even modern dictionaries merely record from time to time the changing phenomena of language. Wolff was right when he conceived of philology as the “biography of a nation.” The life of a people is expressed in the speech which they use.1 We can well agree with Benfey2 that “speech is the truest picture of the soul of a people, the content of all that which has brought a people to self-consciousness.” However, we must not think that we can necessarily argue race from language.3 The historical conception of grammar has had to win its way against the purely theoretical and speculative notion. Etymology was the work of the philosophers. The study of the forms, the syntax, the dialects came later. The work of the Alexandrians was originally philology, not scientific grammar.4

(a) COMBINING THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS. It is not indeed easy to combine properly the various elements in the study of language. Sayce considers Steinthal too
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———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

1 See Oertel, Lect. on the Study of Lang., 1902, p. 9 f.
3 See Sayce, Prin. of Comp. Philol., 1875, p. 175 f.
4 See Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, pp. 2, 3.

Steinthal

psychological and Schleicher too physical. The historical element must be added to both. Paul objects to the phrase “philosophy of language” as suggesting “metaphysical speculations of which the historical investigation [Page 32] of language needs to take no count.” He prefers the term “science of principles.” The study of language is a true science, a real philosophy, with a psychical as well as a physical basis. It is properly related to the historical natural sciences which have been subject “to the misdirected attempt at excluding them from the circle of the sciences of culture.” Language is capable of almost perfect scientific treatment. Kretschmer outlines as modern advances over ancient grammar the psychological treatment of language, the physiology of sound, the use of the comparative method, the historical development of the language, the recognition of speech as a product of human culture, and not to be separated from the history of culture, world-history and life of the peoples. He thinks that no language has yet received such treatment as this, for present-day handbooks are only “speech-pictures,” not “speech-histories.”

(b) Practical Grammar a Compromise. Historical practical grammars have to make a compromise. They can give the whole view only in outline and show development and interrelation in part. It is not possible then to write the final grammar of Greek either ancient or modern. The modern is constantly changing and we are ever learning more of the old. What was true of Mistriotès and Jannaris will be true of the attempts of all. But none the less the way to study Greek is to look at it as a history of the speech-development of one of the greatest of peoples. But it is at least possible now to have the right attitude, thanks to the books already mentioned and others by Bernhardy, [Page 33] Christ, Wundt, Johannsen, Krumbacher,

5 Prin. of Comp. Philol., p. xvi.
6 Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., 1888, p. xxi. “The truth is that the science of which we are thinking is philosophy in the same way as physics or physiology is philosophy, neither more, nor less.”
2 Einl. in die Gesch. der grijch. Spr., pp. 3–5. He himself here merely outlines the historical background of the Gk. language.
3 “Κατὰ ταύτα λοιπὸν ἡ γραμματολογία δὲν ἐναι οὔτε ἀμυγής ἰστορική, οὔτε ἀμυγής ἀδυνήτητι ἐπιστήμη ἀλλὰ μετέχει ἁμφοτέρων.” Ἑλληνικὴ Γραμματολογία, 1894, p. 6.
4 “As a matter of course, I do not presume to have said the last word on all or most of these points, seeing that, even in the case of modern Gk., I cannot be expected to master, in all its details, the entire vocabulary and grammar of every single Neohellenic dialect.” Hist. Gk. Gr., 1897, p. x.
II. Language as a Living Organism.

(a) The Origin of Language. Speech is indeed a characteristic of man and may be considered a divine gift, however slowly the gift was won and developed by him. Sayce is undoubtedly correct in saying that language is a social creation and the effort to communicate is the only true solution of the riddle of speech, whether there was ever a speechless man or not. “Grammar has grown out of gesture and gesticulation.” But speech has not created the capacities which mark the civilized man as higher than the savage. Max Müller remarks that “language forms an impassable barrier between man and beast.” Growls and signs do not constitute “intellectual symbolism.” Paul indeed, in opposition to Lazarus and Steinhall, urges that “every linguistic creation is always the work of a single individual only.” The psychological organisms are in fact the true media of linguistic development. Self-observation and analogy help one to strike a general average and so make grammar practical as well as scientific.

(b) Evolution in Language. Growth, then, is to be expected in a living tongue. Change is inseparable from life. No language is dead so long as it is undergoing change, and this must be true in spoken and written usage. It is not the function of the

1 Gesch. der griech. Lit., 1893.
2 Wundt WUNDT, Völkerpsychologie. 2. Aufl. (1904). 3. Aufl. (1911 f.).
3 Völkerpsychol., 1900, 3. Aufl., 1911 f.
4 Beitr. zur griech. Sprachk., 1890.
5 Beitr. zu einer Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1885.
7 Mühl MÜLLER, I., Handbuch d. klass. Altertumswissenschaft (1885—).
8 Handb. der Altertumswiss. He edits the series (1890—).
10 Die griech. Spr. im Zeitalter des Hellen., 1901.
11 Untersuch. zur Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1898.
14 In Bd. III of Landgraf’s Gr., Golling says (p. 2) that Latin Grammar as a study is due to the Stoics who did it “in der engsten Verbindung mit der Logik.” Cf. origin of Gk. Gr.
18 Three Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1891, p. 9. See also The Silesian Horse-herd: “Language and thought go hand in hand; where there is as yet no word, there is as yet no idea.” Many of the writers on animals do not accept this doctrine.
19 Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. xliii.
grammarian to stop change in language, a thing impossible in itself. Such change is not usually cataclysmic, but gradual and varied. “A written language, to serve any practical purpose, must change with the times, just like a living dialect.”

In general, change in usage may be compared to change in organic structure in “greater or lesser fitness.” The changes by analogy in the speech of children are very suggestive on this point. The vocabulary of the Greek tongue must therefore continually develop, for new ideas demand new words and new meanings come to old words. Likewise inflections vary in response to new movements. This change brings great wealth and variety. The idea of progress has seized the modern mind and has been applied to the study of language as to everything else.

(c) CHANGE CHIEFLY IN THE VERNACULAR. Linguistic change occurs chiefly in the vernacular. From the spoken language new words and new inflections work their way gradually into the written style, which is essentially conservative, sometimes even anachronistic and purposely archaic. Much slang is finally accepted in the literary style. The study of grammar was originally confined to the artificial book-style. Dionysius Thrax expressly defined grammar as ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. It was with him a concern for the poets and writers, not “die Sprache des Lebens.” Grammar (γραμματική, γράφω), then, was first to write and to understand what was written; then the scientific interpretation of this literature; later the study of literary linguistic usage. It is only the moderns who have learned to investigate the living speech for its own historical value. Before the discovery of the Greek inscriptions the distinction between the vernacular and the literary style could not be so sharply drawn for the Greek of the classical period, though Aristophanes should have taught us much. We have moved away from the position of Mure who said: “The distinction between the language of letters and the vulgar tongue, so characteristic of modern civilization, is imperceptible or but little defined in the flourishing age of Greece. Numerous peculiarities in her social condition tended to constitute classical expression in speaking or writing, not, as with us, the privilege of a few, but a public property in which every Hellene had an equal interest.” The people as a whole were wonderfully well educated, but the educated classes themselves then, as now with us, used a spoken as well as a literary style. Jannaris is clear on this point: “But, speaking of Attic Greek, we must not infer that all Athenians and Atticized Greeks wrote and spoke the classical composition: a merely historical abstraction; that is, an artistic language which nobody spoke but still everybody understood.” We must note therefore both the vernacular and the literary style and expect constant change in each, though not in the same degree. Zarncke indeed still sounds a note of warning against too much attention

1 Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 481.
3 Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, pp. 3–5.
Zarncke ZARNCKE, E., Die Entstehung der griech. Literatursprachen (1890).
to the vernacular, though a needless one.\textsuperscript{3} In the first century A.D. the vernacular Greek was in common use all over the world, the character of which we can now accurately set forth. But this non-literary language was not necessarily the speech of the illiterate. Mahaffy\textsuperscript{4} is very positive on this point. “I said just now that the Hellenistic world was more cultivated in argument than we are nowadays. And if you think this is a strange assertion, examine, I pray you, the intellectual aspects of the Epistles of St. Paul, the first Christian writer whom we know to have been thoroughly educated in this training. Remember that he was a practical teacher, not likely to commit the fault of speaking over the heads of his audience, as the phrase is.” Hatzidakis\textsuperscript{5} laments that the monuments of the Greek since the Alexandrian period are no longer in the pure actual living speech of the time, but in the artificial [Page 36] Attic of a bygone age. The modern Greek vernacular is a living tongue, but the modern literary language so proudly called καθαρεύουσα is artificial and unreal.\textsuperscript{1} This new conception of language as life makes it no longer possible to set up the Greek of any one period as the standard for all time. The English writer to-day who would use Hooker’s style would be affected and anachronistic. Good English to-day is not what it was two hundred years ago, even with the help of printing and (part of the time) dictionaries. What we wish to know is not what was good Greek at Athens in the days of Pericles, but what was good Greek in Syria and Palestine in the first century A.D. The direct evidence for this must be sought among contemporaries, not from ancestors in a distant land. It is the living Greek that we desire, not the dead.

III. Greek not an Isolated Language.

\textit{(a) The Importance of Comparative Grammar.} Julius Cæsar, who wrote a work on grammar, had in mind Latin and Greek, for both were in constant use in the Roman world.\textsuperscript{2} Formal Sanskrit grammar itself may have resulted from the comparison of Sanskrit with the native dialects of India.\textsuperscript{3} Hence comparative grammar seems to lie at the very heart of the science. It cannot be said, however, that Pāṇini, the great Sanskrit scholar and grammarian of the fourth century B.C., received any impulse from the Greek civilization of Alexander the Great.\textsuperscript{4} The work of Pāṇini is one of the most remarkable in history for subtle originality, “une histoire naturelle de la langue sanscrite.” The Roman and Greek grammarians attended to the use of words in sentences, while the Sanskrit writers analyzed words into syllables\textsuperscript{5} and studied the relation of sounds to each other. It is not possible to state the period when linguistic comparison was first made. Max Müller in \textit{The Science of Language} even says:

4 Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., 1905, p. 137.
5 Einleitung, p. 3.
2 King, Intr. to Comp. Gr., p. 2.
3 Sayce, Prin. of Comp. Philol., p. 261.
4 Goblet d’Alviella, Ce que l’Inde doit à la Grèce, 1897, p. 129.
“From an historical point of view it is not too much to say that the first Day of Pentecost marks the real beginning of the Science of language.” One must not think that the comparative method is “more characteristic of the study of language than of other [Page 37] branches of modern inquiry.”¹ The root idea of the new grammar is the kinship of languages. Chinese grammar is said to be one of the curiosities of the world, and some other grammatical works can be regarded in that light. But our fundamental obligation is to the Hindu and Greek grammarians.²

(b) The Common Bond in Language. Prof. Alfredo Trombetti, of Rome, has sought the connecting link in all human speech.³ It is a gigantic task, but it is doubtless true that all speech is of ultimate common origin. The remote relationships are very difficult to trace. As a working hypothesis the comparative grammarians speak of isolating, agglutinative and inflectional languages. In the isolating tongues like the Chinese, Burmese, etc., the words have no inflection and the position in the sentence and the tone in pronunciation are relied on for clearness of meaning. Giles⁴ points out that modern English and Persian have nearly returned to the position of Chinese as isolating languages. Hence it is inferred that the Chinese has already gone through a history similar to the English and is starting again on an inflectional career. Agglutinative tongues like the Turkish express the various grammatical relations by numerous separable prefixes, infixes and suffixes. Inflectional languages have made still further development, for while a distinction is made between the stem and the inflectional endings, the stems and the endings do not exist apart from each other. There are two great families in the inflectional group, the Semitic (the Assyrian, the Hebrew, the Syriac, the Arabic, etc.) and the Indo-Germanic or Indo-European (the Indo-Iranian or Aryan, the Armenian, the Greek, the Albanian, the Italic, the Celtic, the Germanic and the Balto-Slavic).⁵ Indo-European also are Illyrian, Macedonian, Phrygian, Thracian and the newly-discovered Tocharian. Some of these groups, like the Italic, the Germanic, the Balto-Slavic, the Indo-Iranian, embrace a number of separate tongues which show an inner affinity, but all the groups have a general family likeness.⁶

(c) The Original Indo-Germanic Speech. It is not claimed that the original Indo-Germanic speech has been discovered, though Kretschmer does speak of “die indogermanische Ursprache,” but he considers it only a necessary hypothesis and a useful definition for the early speech-unity before the Indo-Germanic stock

---

¹ Whitney, Life and Growth of Lang., 1875—, p. 315.
⁴ Man. of Comp. Philol., 1901, p. 36.
Brugmann speaks also of the original and ground-speech (Ur- und Grundsprache) in the prehistoric background of every member of the Indo-Germanic family. The science of language has as a historic discipline the task of investigating the collective speech-development of the Indo-Germanic peoples. Since Bopp’s day this task is no longer impossible. The existence of an original Indo-Germanic speech is the working hypothesis of all modern linguistic study. This demands indeed a study of the Indo-Germanic people. Horatio Hale insists that language is the only proper basis for the classification of mankind. But this test breaks down when Jews and Egyptians speak Greek after Alexander’s conquests or when the Irish and the American Negro use English. The probable home and wanderings of the original Indo-Germanic peoples are well discussed by Kretschmer. It is undeniable that many of the same roots exist in slightly different forms in all or most of the Indo-Germanic tongues. They are usually words that refer to the common domestic relations, elementary agriculture, the ordinary articles of food, the elemental forces, the pronouns and the numerals. Inflexional languages have two kinds of roots, predicative (nouns and verbs) and pronominal. Pāṇini found 1706 such roots in Sanskrit, but Edgren has reduced the number of necessary Sanskrit roots to 587. But one must not suppose that these hypothetical roots ever constituted a real language, though there was an original Indo-Germanic tongue.

GREEK AS A “DIALECT” OF THE INDO-GERMANIC SPEECH. Greek then can be regarded as one of the branches of this original Indo-Germanic speech, just as French is one of the descendants of the Latin, like Spanish, Portuguese, Italian. Compare also the relation of English to the other Teutonic tongues. To go further, the separation of this original Indo-Germanic speech into various tongues was much like the breaking-up of the original Greek into dialects and was due to natural causes. Dialectic variety itself implies previous speech-unity. Greek has vital relations with all the branches of the Indo-Germanic tongues, though in varying degrees. The Greek shows decided affinity with the Sanskrit, the Latin and the Celtic languages. Part of the early Greek stock was probably Celtic. The Greek and the Latin flourished side by side for centuries and had much common history. All the comparative grammars and the Greek grammars from this point of view constantly compare the Greek with the Latin. See especially the great work of Riemann and Goelzer, Grammaire comparée.

---

1 Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, pp. 7–9.
2 Kurze vergl. Gr., 1. Lief., 1902, p. 3.
3 Ib., p. 27.
5 Einl. in die Gesch. etc., pp. 7–92.
6 See Max Müller, Three Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1891, p. 29.
7 Sayce, Prin. of Comp. Philol., 1875, p. vi.
1 See Meyer-Lübke, Gr. der röm. Spr., 3 Bde., 1890, 1894, 1899.
4 See Holder, Altcelt. Sprachsch., 1891 ff.
du Grec et du Latin. On the whole subject of the relation of the Greek with the various Indo-Germanic languages see the excellent brief discussion of Kretschmer. But the hypothesis of an original Graeco-Italic tongue cannot be considered as proved, though there are many points of contact between Greek and Latin. But Greek, as the next oldest branch known to us, shows more kinship with the Sanskrit. Constant use of the Sanskrit must be made by one who wishes to understand the historical development of the Greek tongue. Such a work as Whitney’s Sanskrit Grammar is very useful for this purpose. See also J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik. I, Lautlehre (1896). II, 1, Einleitung zur Wortlehre (1905). So Thumb’s Handbuch des Sanskrit. I, Grammatik (1905). Max Müller playfully remarks: “It has often been said that no one can know anything of the science of language who does not know Sanskrit, and that is enough to frighten anybody away from its study.” It is not quite so bad, however. Sanskrit is not the parent stock of the Greek, but the oldest member of the group. The age of the Sanskrit makes it invaluable for the study of the later speech-developments.

The Greek therefore is not an isolated tongue, but sustains vital relations with a great family of languages. So important does Kretschmer consider this aspect of the subject that he devotes his notable Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache to the setting forth of “the prehistoric beginnings of the Greek speech-development.” This effort is, of necessity, fragmentary and partly inferential, but most valuable for a scientific treatment of the Greek language. He has a luminous discussion of the effect of the Thracian and Phrygian stocks upon the Greek when the language spread over Asia Minor.

IV. Looking at the Greek Language as a Whole. We cannot indeed make an exhaustive study of the entire Greek language in a book that is professedly concerned

---

7 Prof. B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins Univ., has always taught Greek, but his Latin Grammar shows his fondness for Latin. See also Henry, A Short Comp. Gr. of Gk. and Lat., 1890, and A Short Comp. Gr. of Eng. and Ger., 1893.
Wackernagel

WACKERNAGEL, J., Das Dehnungsgesetz der griech. Komposita (1889).
———, Die Sprache des Plut. etc. Teile I, II (1895–1896).

1 Three Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1891, p. 72.
2 P. 5. Prof. Burrows (Disc. in Crete, 1907, pp. 145 ff.) raises the question whether the Greek race (a blend of northern and southern elements) made the Gk. language out of a pre-existing Indo-European tongue. Or did the northerners bring the Gk. with them? Or did they find it already in the Ægean? It is easier to ask than to answer these questions.
only with one epoch of that history. As a matter of fact no such work exists. Jannaris\textsuperscript{4} indeed said that “an ‘historical’ grammar, tracing in a connected manner the life of the Greek language from classical antiquity to the present time, has not been written nor even seriously attempted as yet.” Jannaris himself felt his limitations when he faced so gigantic a task and found it necessary to rest his work upon the classical Attic as the only practical basis.\textsuperscript{5} But so far [Page 41] he departed from the pure Attic method. But such a grammar will come some day.

\textbf{(a) Descriptive Historical Grammar.} Meanwhile descriptive historical grammar is possible and necessary. “Descriptive grammar has to register the grammatical forms and grammatical conditions in use at a given date within a certain community speaking a common language.”\textsuperscript{1} There is this justification for taking Attic as the standard for classical study; only the true historical perspective should be given and Attic should not be taught as the only real Greek. It is possible and essential then to correlate the N. T. Greek with all other Greek and to use all Greek to throw light on the stage of the language under review. If the Greek itself is not an isolated tongue, no one stage of the language can be so regarded. “Wolff\textsuperscript{2} deprecates the restriction of grammar to a set of rules abstracted from the writings of a ‘golden’ period, while in reality it should comprise the whole history of a language and trace its development.” H. C. Müller\textsuperscript{3} indeed thought that the time had not arrived for a grammar of Greek on the historical plan, because it must rest on a greater amount of material than is now at hand. But since then a vast amount of new material has come to light in the form of papyri, inscriptions and research in the modern Greek. Müller’s own book has added no little to our knowledge of the subject. Meanwhile we can use the historical material for the study of N. T. Greek.

\textbf{(b) Unity of the Greek Language.} At the risk of slight repetition it is worth while to emphasize this point. Müller\textsuperscript{4} is apologetic and eager to show that “the Greek language and literature is one organic, coherent whole.” The dialectical variations, while confusing to a certain extent, do not show that the Greek did not possess

\textsuperscript{4} Hist. Gk. Gr., 1897, p. v.

But it is more possible now than in 1884.
\textsuperscript{1} Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., 1888, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{2} Oertel, Lect. on the Study of Lang., 1902, p. 27. Thumb (Theol. Literaturzeit., 1903, p. 424) expresses the hope that in a future edition of his Gr. des N. T., Blass may do this for his book: “Die Sprache des N. T. auf dem großen Hintergrund der hellenistischen Sprachentwicklung beschreiben zu können.”
\textsuperscript{4} Ib., p. 16. On “die griechische Sprache als Einheit” see Thumb’s able discussion in Handb. d. grie. Dial. (pp. 1–12). With all the diversity of dialects there was essential unity in comparison with other tongues.
original and continuous unity. As early as 1000 B.C. these dialectical distinctions probably existed and the speech of Homer is a literary dialect, not the folk-speech.\(^5\)

The original sources of [Page 42] the Greek speech go back to a far distant time when as one single language an Asiatic idiom had taken Europe in its circle of influence.\(^1\)

The translator of Buttman’s *Greek Grammar* speaks of Homer “almost as the work of another language.” This was once a common opinion for all Greek that was not classic Attic. But Thiersch entitled his great work *Griechische Grammatik vorzüglich des homerischen Dialekts*, not simply because of the worth of Homer, “but because, on the contrary, a thorough knowledge of the Homeric dialect is indispensably necessary for those who desire to comprehend, in their whole depth and compass, the Grecian tongue and literature.”\(^2\) But Homer is not the gauge by which to test Greek; his poems are invaluable testimony to the early history of one stage of the language. It is a pity that we know so little of the pre-Homeric history of Greek. “Homer presents not a starting-point, but a culmination, a complete achievement, an almost mechanical accomplishment, with scarcely a hint of origins.”\(^3\) But whenever Greek began it has persisted as a linguistic unit till now. It is one language whether we read the Epic Homer, the Doric Pindar, the Ionic Herodotus, the Attic Xenophon, the Æolic Sappho, the Atticistic Plutarch, Paul the exponent of Christ, an inscription in Pergamus, a papyrus letter in Egypt, Tricoupis or Vlachos in the modern time. None of these representatives can be regarded as excrescences or impertinences. There have always been uneducated persons, but the Greek tongue has had a continuous, though checkered, history all the way. The modern educated Greek has a keen appreciation of “die Schönheiten der klassischen Sprache.”\(^4\) Müller\(^5\) complained that “almost no grammarians have treated the Greek language as a whole,” but the works of Krumbacher, Thumb, Dieterich, Hatzidakis, Psichari, Jannaris, etc., have made it possible to obtain a general survey of the Greek language up to the present time. Like English,\(^6\) Greek has emerged into a new sphere of unity and consistent growth.

**[Page 43]** (c) PERIODS OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE. It will be of service to present a brief outline of the history of the Greek tongue. And yet it is not easy to give. See the discussion by Sophocles in his *Greek Lexicon* (p. 11 f.), inadequate in view of recent discoveries by Schliemann and Evans. The following is a tentative outline: The Mycenaean Age, 1500 B.C. to 1000 B.C.; the Age of the Dialects, 1000 B.C. to 300 B.C.; the Age of the Κοινή, 300 B.C. to 330 A.D.; the Byzantine Greek, 330 A.D. to 1453 A.D.; the modern Greek, 1453 A.D. to the present time. The early stage of the Byzantine Greek (up to 600 A.D.) is really Κοινή and the rest is modern Greek. See a

---

5 Brugmann, Vergl. Gr., 1902, p. 8.
2 Sandford, Pref. to Thiersch’s Gk. Gr., 1830, p. viii.
3 Miss Harrison, Prol. to the Study of Gk. Rel., 1903, p. viii.
4 Hatzidakis, Einl. in die neugr. Gr., 1892, p. 4.
different outline by Jannaris and Hadley and Allen. As a matter of fact any division is arbitrary, for the language has had an unbroken history, though there are these general epochs in that history. We can no longer call the pre-Homeric time mythical as Sophocles does. In naming this the Mycenaean age we do not wish to state positively that the Mycenaens were Greeks and spoke Greek. “Of their speech we have yet to read the first syllable.” Tsountas and Manatt, however, venture to believe that they were either Greeks or of the same stock. They use the term “to designate all Greek peoples who shared in the Mycenaen civilization, irrespective of their habitat.” Ohnefalsch-Richter (Cont. Rev., Dec., 1912, p. 862) claims Cyprus as the purveyor of culture to the Creto-Mycenaean age. He claims that Hellenes lived in Cyprus 1200 to 1000 B.C. The Mycenaen influence was wide-spread and comes “down to the very dawn of historical Greece.” That Greek was known and used widely during the Mycenaean age the researches of Evans at Knossos, in Crete, make clear. The early linear writing of the Cretans came from a still earlier pictograph. The Greek dialects emerge into light from about 1000 B.C. onward and culminate in the Attic which flourished till the work of Alexander is done. The Homeric poems prove that Greek was an old language by 1000 to 800 B.C. The dialects certainly have their roots deep in the Mycenaean age. Roughly, 300 B.C. is the time when the Greek has become the universal language of the world, a WeltSprache. 330 A.D. is the date when the seat of government was removed from Rome to Constantinople, while A.D. 1453 is the date when Constantinople was captured by the Turks. With all the changes in this long history the standards of classicity have not varied greatly from Homer till now in the written style, while the Greek vernacular today is remarkably like the earliest known inscriptions of the folk-speech in Greece.

We know something of this history for about 3000 years, and it is at least a thousand years longer. Mahaffy has too poor an idea of modern Greek, but even he can say:

---


Hadley and Allen Hadley and Allen, Greek Grammar (1895).

2 Gk. Gr., 1885, p. 1 f. Deissmann indeed would have only three divisions, the Dialects up to 300 B.C., Middle Period up to 600 A.D., and Mod. Gk. up to the present time. Hauck’s Realencyc., 1889, p. 630. Cf. Müller, Hist. Gr. der hell. Spr., 1891, pp. 42–62, for another outline.

3 Gk. Lex., etc., p. 11.

4 Tsountas and Manatt, The Mycenaean Age, 1897, p. 316.

5 Ib., p. 335 ff.

6 Ib., p. 235.

7 Ib., p. 325. See also Beloch, Griech. Gesch., I., 85: “Auch sonst kann kein Zweifel sein, daß die mykenäische Kultur in Griechenland bis in das VIII. Jahrhundert geherrscht.” Flinders-Petrie (Jour. of Hell. Stud., xii, 204) speaks of 1100 to 800 B.C. as the “age of Mycenaean decadence.”

8 Cretan Pictographs and Pre-Phoenician Script, 1895, p. 362; cf. also Jour. of Hell. Stud., xiv, 270–372. See Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 22, for further proofs of the antiquity of Gk. as a written tongue. Mosso (Palaces of Crete, 1907, p. 73 f.) argues that the Mycenaean linear script was used 1900 B.C. Cf. Evans, Further Researches, 1898.

1 Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 13. See also Hatzidakis, Einl. in die neugr. Gr., 1892, p. 3.
“Even in our miserable modern pigeon-Greek, which represents no real pronunciation, either ancient or modern, the lyrics of Sophocles or Aristophanes are unmistakably lovely.”

(d) MODERN GREEK IN PARTICULAR. It is important to single out the modern Greek vernacular from the rest of the language for the obvious reason that it is the abiding witness to the perpetuity of the vernacular Greek as a living organism. It is a witness also that is at our service always. The modern Greek popular speech does not differ materially from the vernacular Byzantine, and thus connects directly with the vernacular κοινή. Alexandria was “the great culture-reservoir of the Greek-Oriental world … the repository of the ancient literary treasures.” With this [Page 45] general position Thumb heartily agrees. Hatzidakis even says: “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.” Since this is true it at first seems odd that the students at the University of Athens should object so much to the translation of the N. T. into the modern vernacular. They forget that the N. T. is itself written in the vernacular κοινή. But that was so long ago that it is now classic to them. Certainly in the Gospels, as Wellhausen insists, the spoken Greek became literature.

Knowledge of the modern Greek helps the student to escape from “the Procrustean bed of the old Greek” which he learned as a fixed and dead thing. It is probable that Roger Bacon had some Byzantine manual besides the old Greek grammars. “In England, no less than in the rest of Western Europe, the knowledge of Greek had died away, and here also, it was only after the conquest of Constantinople that a change was possible.” Western Christians had been afraid of the corruptions of paganism if they knew Greek, and of Mohammedanism if they knew Hebrew (being kin to Arabic!). But at last a change has come in favour of the modern Greek. Boltz indeed has advocated modern Greek as the common language for the scholars of the world since Latin is so little spoken. There is indeed need of a new world-speech, as Greek

3 The modern literary language (καθαρεύουσα) is really more identical with the ancient classical Gk. But it is identity secured by mummifying the dead. It is identity of imitation, not identity of life. Cf. Thumb-Angus, Handb. of Mod. Gk. Vern., Foreword (p. xi f).
4 Dieterich, Gesch. der byz. und neugr. Lit., 1902, p. 2.
3 Einl. in die drei ersten Evang., 1905, p. 9.
5 Thumb, Handb. der neugr. Volkspr., 1895, p. x.
7 Ib., p. xlii.
was in the N. T. times, but there is no language that can now justly make such a claim. English comes nearer to it than any other. This need has given rise to the artificial tongues like Volapük and Esperanto,[Page 46] the latter having some promise in it. But the modern Greek vernacular has more merit than was once conceded to it. The idioms and pronunciation of the present-day vernacular are often seen in the manuscripts of the N. T. and other Greek documents and much earlier in inscriptions representing one or another of the early dialects. The persistence of early English forms is easily observed in the vernacular in parts of America or England. In the same way the late Latin vernacular is to be compared with the early Latin vernacular, not with the Latin of elegant literature. “Speaking generally, we may say that the Greek of a well-written newspaper [the literary language] is now, as a rule, far more classical than the Hellenistic of the N. T., but decidedly less classical than the Greek of Plutarch.” The relation between the N. T. Greek and the modern Greek is will be shown in the next chapter. It should be noted here that the N. T. Greek had a strong moulding influence on the Byzantine, and so on the modern Greek because of the use of the Greek New Testament all over the world, due to the spread of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire. The great Christian preachers did not indeed use a peculiar ecclesiastical Greek, but the N. T. did tend to emphasize the type of κοινή in which it was written. “The diction of the N. T. had a direct influence in moulding the Greek ordinarily used by Christians in the succeeding centuries.” Compare the effect of the King James Version on the English language and of Luther’s translation of the Bible on German.

V. The Greek Point of View. It sounds like a truism to insist that the Greek idiom must be explained from the Greek point of view. But none the less the caution is not superfluous. Trained linguists may forget it and so commit a grammatical vice. Even Winer will be found saying, for instance: “Appellatives which, as expressing definite objects, should naturally have the article, are in certain cases used without it.” That “should” has the wrong attitude toward Greek. The appellative in Greek does not need to have the article in order to be definite. So when Winer often admits that one tense is used “for” another, he is really thinking of German and how it would be expressed in German. Each tongue has its own history and genius. Parallel idioms may or may not exist in a group of languages. Sanskrit and Latin, for instance, have no article. It is not possible to parallel the Hebrew tenses, for example, with the Greek, nor, indeed, can it be done as between Greek and English. The English translation of a Greek aorist may have to be in the past perfect or the present perfect

2 Jebb, On the Rela. of Mod. to Class. Gk., in Vincent and Dickson’s Handb. to Mod. Gk., 1887, p. 294. Blass actually says: “Der Sprachgebrauch des Neuen Testaments, der vielfältig vom Neugriechischen her eine viel bessere Beleuchtung empfängt als aus der alten klassischen Literatur.” Kühner’s Ausf. Gr. etc., 1890, p. 25. Blass also says (ib., p. 26) that “eine wissenschaftliche neugriechische Grammatik fehlt.” But Hatzidakis and others have written since.
3 See Reinhold, De Graecitate Patrum, 1898.
4 Jebb, ib., p. 290.
5 Gr. of the N. T. Gk., Moulton’s transl., 1877, p. 147.
to suit the English usage, but that proves nothing as to how a Greek regarded the aorist tense. We must assume in a language that a good writer knew how to use his own tongue and said what he meant to say. Good Greek may be very poor English, as when Luke uses ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγόν τούς γονέων τῷ παιδίῳ Ἰησοῦ (Lu. 2:27). A literal translation of this neat Greek idiom makes barbarous English. The Greeks simply did not look at this clause as we do. “One of the commonest and gravest errors in studying the grammar of foreign languages is to make a half-conjectural translation, and then reason back from our own language to the meaning of the original; or to explain some idiom of the original by the formally different idiom which is our substantial equivalent.”¹ Broadus was the greatest teacher of language that I have known and he has said nothing truer than this. After all, an educated Greek knew what he meant better than we do. It is indeed a great and difficult task that is demanded of the Greek grammarian who to-day undertakes to present a living picture of the orderly development of the Greek tongue “zu einem schönen und großen Ganzen” and also show “in the most beautiful light the flower of the Greek spirit and life.”² Deissmann³ feels strongly on the subject of the neglect of the literary development of Primitive Christianity, “a [Page 48] subject which has not yet been recognized by many persons in its full importance. Huge as is the library of books that have been written on the origin of the N. T. and of its separate parts, the N. T. has not often been studied by historians of literature; that is to say, as a branch of the history of ancient literature.”

[PAGE 49] CHAPTER III

THE KOINH

The Greek of the N. T. has many streams that flow into it. But this fact is not a peculiarity of this phase of the language. The κοινή itself has this characteristic in a marked degree. If one needs further examples, he can recall how composite English is, not only combining various branches of the Teutonic group, but also incorporating much of the old Celtic of Britain and receiving a tremendous impress from the Norman-French (and so Latin), not to mention the indirect literary influence of Latin and Greek. The early Greek itself was subject to non-Greek influence as other Indo-Germanic tongues were, and in particular from the side of the Thracians and Phrygians in the East,¹ and in the West and North the Italic, Celtic and Germanic pressure was strong.²

² Kühner, Ausf. Gr. der griech. Spr., 1834, p. iv. How much more so now!
¹ Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, pp. 171–243. But the true Phrygians were kin to the Greeks. See Percy Gardner, New Ch. of Gk. Hist., p. 84.
I. The Term Κοινή. The word κοινή, sc. διάλεκτος, means simply common language or dialect common to all, a world-speech (Weltsprache). Unfortunately there is not yet uniformity in the use of a term to describe the Greek that prevailed over Alexander’s empire and became the world-tongue. Kühner-Blass speak of “ἡ κοινή oder Ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος.” So also Schmiedel follows Winer exactly. But Hellenic language is properly only Greek language, as Hellenic culture is Greek culture. Jannaris suggests Panhellenic or new Attic for the universal Greek, [Page 50] the Greek par excellence as to common usage. Hellenistic Greek would answer in so far as it is Greek spoken also by Hellenists differing from Hellenes or pure Greeks. Krumbacher applies Hellenistic to the vernacular and κοινή to the “conventional literary language” of the time, but this is wholly arbitrary. Krumbacher terms the Hellenistic “ein verschwommenenes Idiom.” Hatzidakis and Schwyzer include in the κοινή both the literary and the spoken language of the Hellenistic time. This is the view adopted in this grammar. Deissmann dislikes the term Hellenistic Greek because it was so long used for the supposedly peculiar biblical Greek, though the term itself has a wide significance. He also strongly disapproves the terms “vulgar Greek,” “bad Greek,” “graecitas fatiscens,” in contrast with the “classic Greek.” Deissmann moreover objects to the word κοινή because it is used either for the vernacular, the literary style or for all the Greek of the time including the Atticistic revival. So he proposes “Hellenistic world-speech.” But this is too cumbersome. It is indeed the world-speech of the Alexandrian and Roman period that is meant by the term κοινή. There is on the other hand the literary speech of the orators, historians, philosophers, poets, the public documents preserved in the inscriptions (some even Atticistic); on the other hand we have the popular writings in the LXX, the N. T., the Apostolic Fathers, the papyri (as a rule) and the ostraca. The term is thus sufficient by itself to express the Greek in common use over the world, both oral and literary, as Schweizer uses it following Hatzidakis. Thumb identifies κοινή and Hellenistic Greek and applies it to both vernacular and written style, though he would not regard the Atticists as proper producers of the κοινή. Moulton uses the term κοινή for both

4 W.-Sch., N. T. Gr., p. 17.
5 Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., p. 3. Mahaffy does use Hellenism like Droysen in his Hist. of Hellenism, as corresponding to Hellenistic, but he does so under protest (p. 3 f.). He wishes indeed that he had coined the word “Hellenicism.” But Hogarth (Philip and Alexander, p. 277) had already used “Hellenisticism,” saying: “Hellenisticism grew out of Hellenism.”
1 Münchener Sitzungsber., 1886, p. 435.
Schwyzer SCHWYZER (SCHWEIZER), E., Die Weltsprachen des Altertums (1902).
3 Ib., p. 630.
4 Gr. der perg. Inschr., p. 19 f.
5 Die griech. Spr. etc., p. 9.
6 Prol., p. 23. It is not necessary to discuss here the use of “Hellenistic” Gk. as “Jewish-Gk.” (see “Semitic Influence” in ch. IV), for it is absurd. The notion that the κοινή is Macedonian Gk. is quite beside the mark, for Mac. Gk. is too barbarous. The theory of an Alexandrian dialect is obsolete. Du Canges, in his Glossarium called
spoken and literary κοινή. The doctors thus disagree very widely. On the whole it seems best to use the term κοινή (or Hellenistic Greek) both for the vernacular and literary κοινή, excluding the Atticism revival, which was a conscious effort to write not κοινή [Page 51] but old Attic. At last then the Greek world has speech-unity, whatever was true of the beginning of the Greek language.  

II. The Origin of the Κοινή.

(a) TRIUMPH OF THE ATTIC. This is what happened. Even in Asiatic Ionia the Attic influence was felt. The Attic vernacular, sister to the Ionic vernacular, was greatly influenced by the speech of soldiers and merchants from all the Greek world. Attic became the standard language of the Greek world in the fifth and the fourth centuries B.C. “The dialect of Athens, the so-called Attic—one of the Ionic group—prevailed over all other sister dialects, and eventually absorbed them. It was the Attic, because Athens, particularly after the Persian wars, rose to absolute dominion over all the other Greek communities, and finally became the metropolis of all Greek races.”

This is rather an overstatement, but there is much truth in it. This classic literary Attic did more and more lose touch with the vernacular. “It is one of our misfortunes, whatever be its practical convenience, that we are taught Attic as the standard Greek, and all other forms and dialects as deviations from it … when many grammarians come to characterize the later Greek of the Middle Ages or of to-day, or even that of the Alexandrian or N. T. periods, no adjective is strong enough to condemn this ‘verdorbenes, veruneinigte Attisch’” (S. Dickey, Princeton Rev., Oct., 1903). The literary Attic was allied to the literary Ionic; but even in this crowning development of Greek speech no hard and fast lines are drawn, for the artificial Doric choruses are used in tragedy and the vernacular in comedy.

There was loss as well as gain as the Attic was more extensively used, just as is true [Page 52] of modern English. “The orators Demosthenes and Æschines may be counted in the new Attic, where other leading representatives in literature are Menander, Philemon and the other writers of the New Comedy.” As the literary Attic lived on in the literary κοινή, so the vernacular Attic survived with many changes in the vernacular κοινή. We are at last in possession of enough of the old Attic inscriptions and the κοινή inscriptions and the


1 Blass indeed contrasts the literature of the Alex. and Rom. periods on this principle, but wrongly, for it is type, not time, that marks the difference. “If then the literature of the Alexandrian period must be called Hellenistic, that of the Roman period must be termed Atticism. But the popular language had gone its own way.” Gr. of the N. T. Gk., 1898 and 1905, p. 2. On the Gk. of Alexandria and its spread over the world see Wackernagel, Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 304 f.


1 Simonson, Gk. Gr., Accidence, 1903, p. 6. He has a good discussion of the dialects, pp. 221–265.
papyri to make this clear. The march of the Greek language has been steadily forward on this Attic vernacular base even to this present day. In a sense, therefore, the κοινή became another dialect (Æolic, Doric, Ionic, Attic, κοινή). Cf. Kretschmer, Die Entstehung der Koinή, pp. 1–37. But the κοινή was far more than a dialect. Kretschmer holds, it is fair to say, that the κοινή is “eine merkwürdige Mischung verschiedenster Dialekte” (op. cit., p. 6). He puts all the dialects into the melting-pot in almost equal proportions. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff considers the Ionic as the chief influence in the κοινή, while W. Schmidt denies all Doric and Ionic elements. Schweyzer rightly sees that the dialectical influences varied in different places, though the vernacular Attic was the common base.

(b) Fate of the Other Dialects. The triumph of the Attic was not complete, though in Ionia, at the end of the third century B.C., inscriptions in Attic are found, showing that in Asia Minor pure Ionic had about vanished. In the first century B.C. the Attic appears in inscriptions in Æolia, but as late as the second century A.D. Ionic inscriptions are found in Asia Minor. Ionic first went down, followed by the Æolic. The Doric made a very stubborn resistance. It was only natural that the agricultural communities should hold out longest. See Thumb, *Hellen.*, p. 28 f. Even to-day the Zaconian patois of modern Greek vernacular has preserved the old Laconic Doric “whose broad a 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.” It is not surprising that the Northwest Greek, because of the city leagues, became a kind of Achæan-Dorian κοινή and held on till almost the beginning of the Christian era before it was merged into the κοινή of the whole Græco-Roman world.

2 Riemann and Goelzer well say: “Quant au dialecte attique, grâce aux grands écrivains qui l’illustrent, grâce à la prépondérance politique et commerciale d’Athènes, grâce aussi à son caractère de dialecte intermédiaire entre l’ionien et les dialectes en a, il se répandit de bonne heure, hors de son domaine primitif, continua à s’étendre même après la chute de l’empire politique d’Athènes et finit par embrasser tout le monde sur le nom de langue commune (κοινή διάλεκτος)” (Phonétique, p. 16).


Wilamowitz-Möllendorff


———, Über die Entstehung der griech. Schriftsprachen (Verf. deutscher Phil. und Schulm., 1879, pp. 36–41).

Schmidt Schmidt, W., De Flavii Josephi elocutione (1894).
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 32.
2 Ib., p. 37.
There are undoubtedly instances of the remains of the Northwest Greek and of the other dialects in the κοινή and so in the N. T. The Ionic, so near to the Attic and having flourished over the coast of Asia Minor, would naturally have considerable influence on the Greek world-speech. The proof of this will appear in the discussion of the κοινή where remains of all the main dialects are naturally found, especially in the vernacular.4

(c) PARTIAL KOINES. The standardizing of the Attic is the real basis. The κοινή was not a sudden creation. There were quasi-koinēs before Alexander’s day. These were Strabo’s alliance of Ionic-Attic, Doric-Æolic (Thumb, Handb., p. 49). It is therefore to be remembered that there were “various forms of κοινή” before the κοινή which commenced with the conquests of Alexander (Buck, Gk. Dialects, pp. 154–161), as Doric κοινή, Ionic κοινή, Attic κοινή, Northwest κοινή. Hybrid forms are not uncommon, such as the Doric future with Attic οὐ as in ποιησοῦντι (cf. Buck, p. 160). There was besides a revival here and there of local dialects during the Roman times.

(d) EFFECTS OF ALEXANDER’S CAMPAIGNS. But for the conquests of Alexander there might have been no κοινή in the sense of a world-speech. The other Greek koïnes were partial, this alone was a world-speech because Alexander united Greek and Persian, east and west, into one common world-empire. He respected the [Page 54] customs and language of all the conquered nations, but it was inevitable that the Greek should become the lingua franca of the world of Alexander and his successors. In a true sense Alexander made possible this new epoch in the history of the Greek tongue. The time of Alexander divides the Greek language into two periods. “The first period is that of the separate life of the dialects and the second that of the speech-unity, the common speech or κοινή” (Kretschmer, Die Entst. d. Κοινή, p. 1).

(e) THE MARCH TOWARD UNIVERSALISM. The successors of Alexander could not stop the march toward universalism that had begun. The success of the Roman Empire was but another proof of this trend of history. The days of ancient nationalism were over and the κοινή was but one expression of the glacial movement. The time for the world-speech had come and it was ready for use.

III. The Spread of the Κοινή.

(a) A WORLD-SPEECH. What is called ἡ κοινή was a world-speech, not merely a general Greek tongue among the Greek tribes as was true of the Achæan-Dorian and the Attic. It is not speculation to speak of the κοινή as a world-speech, for the inscriptions in the κοινή testify to its spread over Asia, Egypt, Greece, Italy, Sicily and the isles of the sea, not to mention the papyri. Marseilles was a great centre of Greek civilization, and even Cyrene, though not Carthage, was Grecized.1 The κοινή

was in such general use that the Roman Senate and imperial governors had the
decrees translated into the world-language and scattered over the empire. It is
significant that the Greek speech becomes one instead of many dialects at the very
time that the Roman rule sweeps over the world. The language spread by
Alexander’s army over the Eastern world persisted after the division of the kingdom
and penetrated all parts of the Roman world, even Rome itself. Paul wrote to the
church at Rome in Greek, and Marcus Aurelius, the Roman Emperor, wrote his
Meditations (τῶν ἐς Ἐυρώπην) in Greek. It was the language not only of letters, but of
commerce and every-day life. A common language for all [Page 55] men may indeed
be only an ideal norm, but “the whole character of a common language may be
strengthened by the fact of its transference to an unquestionably foreign linguistic
area, as we may observe in the case of the Greek κοινή.” The late Latin became a
κοινή for the West as the old Babylonian had been for the East, this latter the first
world-tongue known to us. Xenophon with the retreat of the Ten Thousand was a
forerunner of the κοινή. Both Xenophon and Aristotle show the wider outlook of the
literary Attic which uses Ionic words very extensively. There is now the “Groß-
Attisch.” It already has γίνοµαι, ἔννεκεν, —τοσαν, ἐπά and ἣνεγκα, ἑοὐκακαν and
ἐδοκαν, βασιλίσσα, δεκυνό, σς, νάς. Already Thucydides and others had borrowed
ς from the Ionic. It is an easy transition from the vernacular Attic to the vernacular
κοινή after Alexander’s time. (Cf. Thumb’s Handbuch, pp. 373–380, “Entstehung der
Κοινή.”) On the development of the κοινή see further Wackernagel, Die Kultur der
Gegenwart, Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 301 ff.; Moulton, Prol., ch. I, II; Mayser, Gr. d. grieich.
Pap., Kap. I. But it was Alexander who made the later Attic the common language of
the world, though certainly he had no such purpose in view. Fortunately he had been
taught by Aristotle, who himself studied in Athens and knew the Attic of the time.
“He rapidly established Greek as the lingua franca of the empire, and this it was
which gave the chief bond of union to the many countries of old civilizations, which
had hitherto been isolated. This unity of culture is the remarkable thing in the history
of the world.” It was really an epoch in the world’s history when the babel of tongues
was hushed in the wonderful language of Greece. The vernaculars of the eastern

---

2 Viereck, Sermo Graecus quo Senatus Popul. Rom. etc., 1888, p. xi.
3 See Wilamowitz-Möllendorff: “In demselben Momente, wo die cäsarische
Weltmonarchie alle Ströme hellenischer und italischer Kultur in einem Bette leitet,
kommt die griechische Kunst auf allen Gebieten zu der Erkenntnis, daß ihre Kreise
erfüllt sind, das einzige das ihr bleibt, Nachahmung ist.” Über die Entst. der griech.
1 Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 496. See also Kaeper, Gesch. d. hellenist. Zeitalt.,
1901, p. 420: “Die Weiterentwicklung der Geschichte des Altertums, so weit sie für
unsere eigene Kultur entscheidende Bedeutung erlangt hat, beruht auf einer
fortschreitenden Occidentalisierung; auch das im Oriente emporgekommene
Christentum entfaltet sich nach dem Westen zu und gelangt hier zu seiner eigentlich
weltgeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit.”
2 Schwyzzer, Die Weltspr. etc., p. 7.
3 See Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., p. 7; cf. also Rutherford New
31) points out that the vase-inscriptions prove the statement of the Const. of Athens,
11.3, that the Athenians spoke a language compounded of all Greek and barbarian
tongues besides.
4 Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen., etc., p. 40.
Roman provinces remained, though the Greek was universal; so, when Paul came to Lystra, the people still spoke the Lycaonian speech [Page 56] of their fathers.¹ The papyri and the inscriptions prove beyond controversy that the Greek tongue was practically the same whether in Egypt, Herculaneum, Pergamum or Magnesia. The Greeks were the school-teachers of the empire. Greek was taught in the grammar schools in the West, but Latin was not taught in the East.

(b) VERNACULAR AND LITERARY.

1. Vernacular. The spoken language is never identical with the literary style, though in the social intercourse of the best educated people there is less difference than with the uncultured.² We now know that the old Attic of Athens had a vernacular and a literary style that differed considerably from each other.³ This distinction exists from the very start with the κοινή, as is apparent in Pergamum and elsewhere.⁴ This vernacular κοινή grows right out of the vernacular Attic normally and naturally.⁵ The colonists, merchants and soldiers who mingled all over Alexander’s world did not carry literary Attic, but the language of social and business intercourse.⁶ This vernacular κοινή at first differed little from the vernacular Attic of 300 B.C. and always retained the bulk of the oral Attic idioms. “Vulgar dialects both of the ancient and modern times should be expected to contain far more archaisms than innovations.”⁷ The vernacular is not a variation from the literary style, but the literary language is a development from the vernacular κοινή. Hence if the vernacular is the normal speech of the people, we must look to the inscriptions and the papyri for the living idiom of the common Greek or κοινή. The pure Attic as it was spoken in Athens is preserved only in the inscriptions.¹ In the Roman Empire the vernacular κοινή would be understood almost everywhere from Spain to Pontus. See IV for further remarks on the vernacular κοινή.

¹ Schwyzer, Weltspr., p. 29.
² Schweizer, Gr. der perg. etc., p. 22.
⁴ Schweizer, Gr., p. 27.
⁵ Thumb, Griech. Spr. im Zeitalter etc., p. 208 f. Lottich in his De Serm. vulg. Attic. shows from the writings of Aristophanes how the Attic vernacular varied in a number of points from the literary style, as in the frequent use of diminutives, desiderative verbs, metaphors, etc.
⁶ Schweizer, Gr., p. 23.
⁷ Geldart, Mod. Gk. Lang. in its Rela. to Anc. Gk., 1870, p. 73. See also Thumb, Griech. Spr. etc., p. 10, who calls “die κοινή weniger ein Abschluß als d er Anfang einer neuen Entwicklung.” On the older Gk. κοινή see Wackernagel, Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 300 f.
⁹ Atticismus, Bd. IV, pp. 577–734. A very important treatment of the whole question is here given.
¹ Hirt, Handb. der griech. Laut- und Formenl., 1902, p. 41.
2. Literary. If the vernacular κοινή was the natural development of the vernacular Attic, the literary κοινή was the normal evolution of the literary Attic. Thumb well says, “Where there is no development, there is no life.”² “In style and syntax the literary Common Greek diverges more widely from the colloquial.”³ This is natural and in harmony with the previous removal of the literary Attic from the language of the people.⁴ The growth of the literary κοινή was parallel with that of the popular κοινή and was, of course, influenced by it. The first prose monument of literary Attic known to us, according to Schweizer, is the Constitution of Athens⁵ (before 413), falsely ascribed to Xenophon. The forms of the literary κοινή are much like the Attic, as in Polybius, for instance, but the chief difference is in the vocabulary and meaning of the same words.⁶ Polybius followed the general literary spirit of his time, and hence was rich in new words, abstract nouns, denominative verbs, new adverbs.⁷ He and Josephus therefore used Ionic words found in Herodotus and Hippocrates, like ἐνδεις, παραφυλακή, not because they consciously imitated these writers, but because the κοινή, as shown by papyri and inscriptions, employed them.⁸ For the same reason Luke and Josephus⁹ have similar words, not because of use of one by the other, but because of common knowledge of literary terms, Luke also using many common medical terms natural to a physician of culture. Writers like Polybius aimed to write without pedantry and without vulgarism. In a true sense then the literary κοινή was a “compromise between the vernacular κοινή and the literary Attic,” between “life and school.”¹⁰ There is indeed no Chinese [Page 58] wall between the literary and the vernacular κοινή, but a constant inflow from the vernacular to the written style as between prose and poetry, though Zarncke¹ insists on a thorough-going distinction between them. The literary κοινή would not, of course, use such dialectical forms as τὸ ὑς πάντες, τὸ ἵς πραγμάτως, etc., common in the vernacular κοινή.² But, as Krumbacher³ well shows, no literary speech worthy of the name can have an independent development apart from the vernacular. Besides Polybius and Josephus, other writers in the literary κοινή were Diodorus, Philo, Plutarch, though Plutarch indeed is almost an “Anhänger des Atticismus”⁴ and Josephus was rather
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2 Griech. Spr., p. 251.
4 Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 5. Deissmann (New Light on the N. T., 1907, p. 3 f.) shows that part of Norden’s criticism of Paul’s Gk. is nothing but the contrast between literary κοινή and vernacular κοινή; cf. Die ant. Kunstpr.
5 Schweizer, Die Weltspr. der Alt., p. 15. See also Christ, Gesch. der griech. Lit., p. 305. See Die pseudoxenophonische Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, von E. Kalinka, 1913.
6 Schweizer, Gr., p. 21.
7 Christ, op. cit., p. 588.
8 Thumb, Griech. Spr. etc., p. 213. See also Goetzeler, De Polyb. Eloc., 1887, p. 15.
9 Thumb, ib., p. 225 f. See also Krenkel, Josephus und Lukas, 1894, pp. 283 ff.
10 Thumb, ib., p. 8.
2 Hatzidakis, Einl. in die neugr. Spr., p. 6.
3 Das Prob. der neugr. Schriftspr., 1903, p. 6. A valuable treatment of this point.
self-conscious in his use of the literary style. The literary κοινή was still affected by the fact that many of the writers were of “un-Greek or half-Greek descent,” Greek being an acquired tongue. But the point must not be overdone, for the literary κοινή “was written by cosmopolitan scholars for readers of the same sort,” and it did not make much difference “whether a book was written at Alexandria or Pergamum.” Radermacher notes that, while in the oldest Greek there was no artificiality even in the written prose, yet in the period of the κοινή all the literary prose shows “eine Kunstsprache.” He applies this rule to Polybius, to Philo, to the N. T., to Epictetus. But certainly it does not hold in the same manner for each of these.

(c) THE ATTICISTIC REACTION. Athens was no longer the centre of Greek civilization. That glory passed to Alexandria, to Pergamum, to Antioch, to Ephesus, to Tarsus. But the great creative epoch of Greek culture was past. Alexandria, the chief seat of Greek learning, was the home, not of poets, but of critics of style who found fault with Xenophon and Aristotle, but could not produce an Anabasis or a Rhetoric. The Atticists wrote, to be sure, in the κοινή period, but their gaze was always backward to the pre-κοινή period. The grammarians (Dionysius, Phrynichus, Πολεμών) set up Thucydides and Plato as the standards for pure Greek style, while Aratus and Callimachus sought to revive the style of Homer, and Lucian and Arrian even imitated Herodotus. When they wished to imitate the past, the problem still remained which master to follow. The Ionic revival had no great vogue, but the Attic revival had. Lucian himself took to Attic. Others of the Atticists were Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Dio Chrysostom, Aristides, Herodes Atticus, Ælian, etc. “They assumed that the limits of the Greek language had been forever fixed during the Attic period.” Some of the pedantic declaimers of the time, like Polemon, were thought to put Demosthenes to the blush. These purists were opposed to change in language and sought to check the departure from the Attic idiom. “The purists of to-day are like the old Atticists to a hair.” The Atticists were then archaic and anachronistic. The movement was rhetorical therefore and not confined either to Alexandria or Pergamum. The conflict between the κοινή (vernacular and literary) and this Atticistic reaction affected both to some extent. This struggle between “archaism and life” is old and survives to-day. The Atticists were in fact out of harmony with their time.

5 Jos., Ant., XIV, i, 1.
8 N. T. Gr., p. 2.
1 A sharp distinction as a rule must be made between the language of Arrian and Epict. The Gk. of Epict. as reported by Arrian, his pupil, is a good representative of the vern. κοινή of an educated man. Arrian’s introduction is quite Atticism, but he aims to reproduce Epictetus’ own words as far as possible.
2 Sophocles, Lex., p. 6. Athenæus 15. 2 said: Εί μὴ ἰατροὶ Ησαυ, οὐδὲν ἄν ἦν τῶν γράμματέων μωρότερον.
5 Thumb, ib., p. 8.
6 Ib., p. 252 f.
and not like Dante, who chose the language of his people for his immortal poems. They made the mistake of thinking that by imitation they could restore the old Attic style. “The effort and example of these purists, too, though criticized at first, gradually became a sort of moral dictatorship, and so has been tacitly if not zealously obeyed by all subsequent scribes down to the present time.”7 As a result when one compares N. T. Greek,8 one must be careful to note whether it is with the book Greek (καθαρεύουσα) or the vernacular (ἡμερήσια). This artificial reactionary movement, however, had little effect upon the vernacular κοινή as is witnessed by the spoken Greek of to-day. Consequently it is a negligible quantity in direct influence upon the writers of the N. T.1 But the Atticists did have a real influence upon the literary κοινή both as to word-formation2 and syntax.3 With Dionysius of Halicarnassus beauty was the chief element of style, and he hoped that the Attic revival would drive out the Asiatic influence.4 The whole movement was a strong reaction against what was termed “Asianism” in the language.5 It is not surprising therefore that the later ecclesiastical literary Greek was largely under the influence of the Atticists. “Now there was but one grammar: Attic. It was Attic grammar that every freeman, whether highly or poorly educated, had learned.”6 “This purist conspiracy” Jannaris calls it. The main thing with the Atticists was to have something as old as Athens. Strabo said the style of Diodorus was properly “antique.”7

IV. The Characteristics of the Vernacular Κοινή.

(a) Vernacular Attic the Base. One must not feel that the vernacular Greek is unworthy of study. “The fact is that, during the best days of Greece, the great teacher of Greek was the common people.”8 There was no violent break between the vernacular Attic and the vernacular κοινή, but the one flowed into the other as a living stream.9 If the reign of the separated dialects was over, the power of the one general

8 Moulton, Prol., p. 26. The diction of Aristophanes is interesting as a specimen of varieties of speech of the time. Cf. Hope, The Lang. of Parody; a Study in the Diction of Aristophanes (1906). Radermacher (N. T. Gk., p. 3) holds that we must even note the “barbarisches Griechisch” of writers like John Philoponos and Proclus.
1 Schmid, Der Atticismus etc., Bd. IV, p. 578.
2 Ib., p. 606 f.
3 Tröger, Der Sprachgeb. in der pseudolong. Schr., 1899, Tl. I, p. 61.
4 Schmid, ib., Bd. I, pp. 17, 25. See Bd. IV, pp. 577–734, for very valuable summary of this whole subject.
7 Strabo, 13. 4. 9.
8 Sophocles, Lex. of Rom. and Byz. Period, p. 11.
9 Deissmann, Die sprachl. Erforsch. etc., p. 11. Rutherford (New Phryn., p. 2) says that “the debased forms and mixed vocabulary of the common dialect would have struck the contemporaries of Aristophanes and Plato as little better than jargon of the Scythian policemen.” On the form of the κοινή see Wackernagel, Kult. etc., Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 305.
Greek speech had just begun on the heels of Alexander’s victories. The battle of Chæronea broke the spirit of the old Attic culture indeed, but the Athenians [Page 61] gathered up the treasures of the past, while Alexander opened the flood-gates for the change in the language and for its spread over the world.¹ “What, however, was loss to standard Attic was gain to the ecumenical tongue. The language in which Hellenism expressed itself was eminently practical, better fitted for life than for the schools. Only a cosmopolitan speech could comport with Hellenistic cosmopolitanism. Grammar was simplified, exceptions decreased or generalized, flexions dropped or harmonized, construction of sentences made easier” (Angus, *Prince. Rev.*, Jan., 1910, p. 53). The beginning of the development of the vernacular κοινή is not perfectly clear, for we see rather the completed product.² But it is in the later Attic that lies behind the κοινή. The optative was never common in the vernacular Attic and is a vanishing quantity in the κοινή. The disappearance of the dual was already coming on and so was the limited use of the superlative, –τοσαν instead of –ντον, and –θωσαν instead of –σθον, γίνομαι, σι, ἔπα, τίς instead of πότερος, ἐκτιστος and not ἐκάτερος.³ But while the Attic forms the ground-form⁴ of the κοινή it must not be forgotten that the κοινή was resultant of the various forces and must be judged by its own standards.⁵ There is not complete unanimity of opinion concerning the character of the vernacular κοινή. Steinthal⁶ indeed called it merely a levelled and debased Attic, while Wilamowitz⁷ described it as more properly an Ionic popular idiom. Kretschmer⁸ now (wrongly, I think) contends that the Northwest Greek, Ionic and Beotian had more influence on the κοινή than the Attic. The truth seems to be the position of Thumb,⁹ that the vernacular κοινή is the result of the mingling with all dialects upon the late Attic vernacular as the base. As between the Doric ᾗ and the Ionic η the vernacular κοινή follows the Attic [Page 62] usage, and this fact alone is decisive.¹ Dieterich² indeed sums up several points as belonging to
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¹ Christ, Gesch. der griech. Lit., 1905, p. 509 f. For “the Attic ground-character of the κοινή” see Mayser, Gr. der griech. Pap. (1906, p. 1).

Angus


² Kaibel, Stil und Text der Ἀθηναίων Πολιτείᾳ, p. 37.

³ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 3. Even in the literary κοινή the dual is nearly gone, as in Polybius and Diodorus Siculus; cf. Schmidt, De Duali Graec. et Emor. et Reviv., 1893, pp. 22, 25.


⁶ Gesch. der Sprachw., II, p. 37 f.

⁷ Verhandl. der 32. phil. Versamml., p. 40.

⁸ Wochenschr. für klass. Philol., 1899, p. 3; Die Entst. der Κοινή, 1900.


¹ Moulton, Prol., p. 33 f.

Besides the orthography is Attic (cf. ἱλεως, not ἱλαος) and the bulk of the inflections and conjugations likewise, as can be seen by comparison with the Attic inscriptions. Schlageter sums the matter up: “The Attic foundation of the κοινή is to-day generally admitted.”

(b) THE OTHER DIALECTS IN THE Κοινή. But Kretschmer is clearly wrong in saying that the κοινή is neither Attic nor decayed Attic, but a mixture of the dialects. He compares the mixture of dialects in the κοινή to that of the high, middle and low German. The Attic itself is a κοινή out of Ionic, Αεolic and Doric. The mixed character of the vernacular κοινή is made plain by Schweizer and Dieterich. The Ionic shows its influence in the presence of forms like ἵδης, σπείρης, ἐἰδυδία, ἤτης, καθ ἔτος (cf. vetus), ὄστεα, κελέων, βλαβέων, χρυσέων, ἤτος, ἤδος; absence of the rough breathing (psilosis or de-aspiration, Αεolic also); dropping of μι in verbs like διδω; καθών (χιτών), τέσσερα, πράσσω for πράττω (Attic also), etc. Ionic words like μον-φθαλμος (Herod.) instead of ἡτρ-φθαλμος occur. Conybeare and Stock (Sel. from LXX, p. 48) suggest that Homer was used as a text-book in Alexandria and so caused Ionisms like σπείρης in the κοινή. The spread of the Ionic over the East was to be expected. In Alexander’s army many of the Greek dialects were represented. In the Egyptian army of the Ptolemies nearly all the dialects were spoken. The Ionians were, besides, part of the Greeks who settled in Alexandria. The Ionic influence appears in Pergamum also. The mixing of

2 Unters. zur Gesch. d. griech. Spr., 1898, p. 258 f.
3 Meisterhans, Gr. der Att. Inschr.
Schlageter

SCHLAGETER, J., Der Wortschatz d. außerhalb Attikas gefundenen Inschriften (1912).


4 Der Wortsch. der außerhalb Attikas gefundenen att. Inschr., 1912.
5 Wochenschr. für klass. Phil., 1899, p. xvii.
6 Gr. der perg. Inschr., p. 201 f.
7 Unters. zur Gesch. etc., p. 259 f.
8 Arrian, II, 20. 5.
9 Myer, Das Heerwesen der Ptolemäer und Römer in Ägypten, 1900.
1 H. Anz, Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graec. Serm. vulg. etc., 1894, p. 386. Maysr, Gr., pp. 9–24, finds numerous Ionic peculiarities in the Ptolemaic pap. far more than Αεolic and Doric. He cites –ωσαν, μαραθίης, ἔσω, ἔνεκεν, ὄρεων, γογγύζω, παραθήκη, τέσσερες, ἔκπτωμα, etc. On the Ionic and other non-Attic elements in the κοινή see Wackernagel, Kult., p. 306 f.
the Attic with foreign, before all with Ionic, elements, has laid the foundation for the κοινή. The Æolic makes a poor showing, but can be traced especially in Pergamum, where Schweizer considers it one of the elements of the language with a large injection of the Ionic. Æolic has the α for η in proper names and forms in ας. Bœotian-Æolic uses the ending –οσαν, as εἶχοσαν, so common in the LXX. Moulton points out that this ending is very rare in the papyri and is found chiefly in the LXX. He calls Bœotian-Æolic also “the monophthongizing of the diphthongs.” In the Attic and the Ionic the open sound of η prevailed, while in the Bœotian the closed. In the κοινή the two pronunciations existed together till the closed triumphed. Psilosis is also Ionic. The Doric appears in forms like λαός (λεώς), ναός (νεώς), πιάζω (πιέζω), ἐσποόδαξα, ἦ λιμός, τό πλούτος, ἄλεκτωρ, κλίβανος (κρίβανος); and in the pronunciation perhaps β, γ, δ had the Doric softer sound as in the modern Greek vernacular. But, as Moulton argues, the vernacular κοινή comes to us now only in the written form, and that was undoubtedly chiefly Attic. The Arcadian dialect possibly contributes φεώναι, since it has ἄφεσθαι, but this form occurs in Doric and Ionic also. Cf. also the change of gender ἦ λιμός (Luke) and τό πλούτος (Paul). The Northwest Greek contributed forms like ἀρχόντοις, τοὐς λέγοντες, ἦται (ημιν cf. Messenian and Lesbian also), ἱρῴτου (like Ionic), εἴχοσαν (cf. Bœotian), λέλυκαν. The accusative plural in –ες is very common in the papyri, and some N. T. MSS. give τέσσαρες for τέσσαρας. The Achæan-Dorian κοινή had resisted in Northwest Greece the inroads of the common Greek for a century or so. The Macedonian Greek, spoken by many of Alexander’s soldiers, naturally had very slight influence on the κοινή. We know nothing of the old Macedonian Greek. Polybius says that the Illyrians needed an interpreter for Macedonian. Sturz indeed gives a list of Macedonian words found in the κοινή, as ἄσπιλος, κοράσιον, παρεμβολή, ῥύμη. But he also includes ἄγγέλλω! The Macedonians apparently used β instead of φ as βίλππος, δ as δάνατος, σ as σέρεθρον. Plutarch speaks of Alexander and his soldiers speaking to each other Μακεδονιστί. For full discussion of the Macedonian dialect see O. Hoffmann, Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und Volkstum, 1906, pp. 232–255.
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2 Kaibel, Stil und Text etc., p. 37.
4 Prol., p. 33. The caution of Psichari (Essais de Gr. Hist. Néo-grq., 2ème ed., 1889, p. cxlix) is to be noted, that the vernacular is not necessarily dialectical, but “destinée au peuple et venait du peuple.” Cf. on Æolic elements, Mayser, Gr., p. 9. He cites ἦ λιμός in the pap.; Λαός is also Æolic.
5 Prol., p. 34.
6 Moulton, ib., p. 38, n. 3. For Doric elements in the pap. see Mayser, Gr., p. 5 f.
7 W. H., Intr. to the Gk. N. T., App., p. 150.
1 Polybius, 28, 8, 9.
3 I, 592 B, 694 C. Kennedy (Sources of N. T. Gk., p. 17) says: “In any case, the Macedonian type of Greek, whether or not it is admissible to call it a special dialect, was so far removed from ordinary Attic as to make it certain that the latter on Macedonian lips must soon and inevitably suffer thorough-going modification.”
(c) Non-Dialectical Changes. It is not always possible to separate the various peculiarities of the koine into dialectical influences. “Where Macedonian, Spartan, Boeotian, Athenian and Thessalian were messmates a koine was inevitable. Pronounced dialecticisms which would render unintelligible or ludicrous to others were dropped” (see Angus, Prince. Theol. Rev., Jan., 1910, p. 67). The common blood itself went on changing. It was a living whole and not a mere artificial mingling of various elements. There is less difference in the syntax of the koine and that of the earlier Greek than in the forms, though the gradual disappearance of the optative, use of ἢν and finite verb in the non-final sense rather than the infinitive or even ὅτι, the gradual disuse of the future part. may be mentioned. It was in the finer shades of thought that a common vernacular would fail to hold its own. “Any language which aspires to be a WeltSprache (world-language), as the Germans say, must sacrifice much of its delicacy, its shades of meaning, expressed by many synonyms and particles and tenses, which the foreigner in his hurry and without contact with natives cannot be expected to master.”

Page 65 (d) New Words, New Forms or New Meanings to Old Words.
Naturally most change is found either in new words or in new meanings in old words, just as our English dictionaries must have new and enlarged editions every ten years or so. This growth in the vocabulary is inevitable unless the life of a people stops. A third-century inscription in Thera, for instance, shows συναγωγή used of a religious meeting, πάροικος (not the Attic μέτοικος) for stranger, ἄποστολος and κατήχησις in their old senses like those Americanisms which preserve Elizabethan English (“fall” for “autumn,” for instance). Here are some further examples. It is hard to be sure that all of these are words that arose in the koine, for we cannot mark off a definite line of cleavage. We mention ἁγάπη, ἁγιότης, ἁγνότης, ἁθεσμός, ἁθέτησις, ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, ἀκατάλυτος, ἀκροατήριον, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, ἀντίλυτρον, ἀνακαινόω (and many verbs in –ον, –ους, –ης), ἀναγεννάω, βαπτιστής, βαπτισμός, βαπτιστής, γρηγορέω (cf. also στήκω), δεισιδαιμονία, δηνάριον, δικαιοκρίσια, έλεγμοσύνη, έκκακενός, έκμυκτηρίζω, θειότης, θεοπνευστός, λογία, κατάχεω, κράβαττος, μαθητεύω, οἰκοδεσπότης, ὄρθριζω, ὄναρ, ὄψις, πρόσκαιρος, βούλιον, συμβούλων, τελόνων, ύποπτον, φιλαδελφία, ωτίον, etc. Let these serve merely as examples. For others see the lists in Deissmann’s

4 Mahaffy, Survey of Gk. Civilization, p. 220. Cf. Geldart, Mod. Gk. Lang. in its Rela. to Anc. Gk., p. 73, for discussion of “the levelling tendency common to all languages.”
1 Hicks, St. Paul and Hellen., in Stud. Bibl. et Eccl., 1896, p. 5. Mayser (Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 24–35) gives an interesting list of words that were chiefly “poetical” in the classic literature, but are common in the papyri. The poets often use the vernacular. Some of these words are ἄλεκτρον, βιβρόσκω, δέσιμος, δήμα, ἐκτίνασσο, ἐντρέσομαι, ἐπαιτεῖον, ἐπισεῖον, θάλάσσο, καταστέλλω, κοιμάσθω, κόπος, λαοί=people, μέριμνα, νήπιος, οἰκητήριον, περίκειμαι, προσφωνέω, σκύλλω, στέγη, συναντάω, ύστός. New forms are given to old words as λιμπάνομαι from λέπισω, etc. Ramsay (see The Independent, 1913, p. 376) finds ἐμπατείω (cf. Col. 2:18) used in the technical sense of entering in on the part of initiates in the sanctuary of Apollos at Claros in an inscription there.
Deissmann, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräciät etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

Moulton and Milligan

Moultin and Milligan, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

Winer-Schmiedel

Winer-Schmiedel, Winer’s Grammatik des neutest. Sprachidioms. 8. Aufl. (1894—).

Thayer

Thayer, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).

———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

Rutherford

pressing needs is a lexicon of the papyri and then of the κοινή as a whole. Many of these words were already in the literary κοινή, though they probably came from the vernacular. Some old words received slightly new forms, like ἀνάθεµα ‘curse’ (ἀνάθηµα ‘offering’), ἀπάντησις (ἀπάντησις), ἀποστασία (ἀπόστασις), ἀφορίσµος (ἀφορίσµος), βασιλεία (βασιλεία), γενέθλια (γενέθλια), δεκατεύω (δεκατεύω), λυχνία (λυχνία), μισθοδοσία (μισθοδοσία), νοµοθεσία (νοµοθεσία), οἰκοδοµή (οἰκοδοµή) κοίνης, ὀνοµασία (ὀνοµασία), πανδοχεύς (πανδοχεύς), παραφροσύνη (παραφροσύνη), ῥαντίζω (ῥαντίζω), στήκω (στήκω), ταµεῖον (ταµεῖον), τεκνίον (τεκνίον) etc.

Words (old and new) receive new meanings, as ἀνακλίνω (‘recline at table’). Cf. also ἀναπίπτω, ἀνακείµαι, ἀντιλέγω (‘speak against’), ἀποκριθῆναι (passive not middle, ‘to answer’), διαµόνιον (‘evil spirit,’ ‘demon’), δῶµα (‘house-top’), ἐρωτάω (‘beg’), εὐχαριστέω (‘thank’), ἐπιστέλλω (‘write a letter’), ὑψάριον (‘fish’), ὑψώνων (‘wages’), παρακαλέω (‘entreat’), παρασκέυασµα (‘distract’), παιδεύω (‘chastise’), πτῶµα (‘corpse’), συγκρίνω (‘compare’), σχολή (‘school’), φθάνω (‘come’), χορτάζω (‘nourish’), χρηµατίζω (‘be called’).1 This is all perfectly natural. Only we are to remember that the difference between the κοινή vocabulary and the Attic literature is not the true standard. The vernacular κοινή must be compared with the Attic vernacular as seen in the inscriptions and to a large extent in a writer like Aristophanes and the comic poets. Many words common in Aristophanes, taboo to the great Attic writers, reappear in the κοινή. They were in the vernacular all the time.2 Moulton3 remarks that the vernacular changed very little.

———, The New Phrynichus (1881).

2 See W.-Sch., p. 19, n. 8.
1 Schlageter (Wortsch. etc., pp. 59–62) gives a good list of words with another meaning in the κοινή.
2 Cf. Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., pp. 70 f., 147.

Moulton


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


from the first century A.D. to the third. “The papyri show throughout the marks of a real language of daily life, unspoilt by the blundering bookishness which makes the later documents so irritating.” It is just in the first century A.D. that the κοινή comes to its full glory as a world-language. “The fact remains that in the period which gave birth to Christianity there was an international language” (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, p. 59). It is not claimed that all the points as to the origin of the κοινή are now clear. See Hesseling, De koine en de oude dialekten van Griekenland (1906). But enough is known to give an intelligible idea of this language that has played so great a part in the history of man.

(e) PROVINCIAL INFLUENCES. For all practical purposes the Greek dialects were fused into one common tongue largely as a result of Alexander’s conquests. The Germanic dialects have gone farther and farther apart (German, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, English), for no great conqueror has arisen to bind them into one. The language follows the history of the people. But the unification of the Greek was finally so radical that “the old dialects to-day are merged into the general mass, the modern folk-language is only a continuation of the united, Hellenistic, common speech.” So completely did Alexander do his work that the balance of culture definitely shifted from Athens to the East, to Pergamum, to Tarsus, to Antioch, to Alexandria. This “union of oriental and occidental was attempted in every city of Western Asia. That is the most remarkable and interesting feature of Hellenistic history in the Graeco-Asiatic kingdoms and cities.” Prof. Ramsay adds: “In Tarsus the Greek qualities and powers were used and guided by a society which was, on the whole, more Asiatic in character.” There were thus non-Greek influences which also entered into the common Greek life and language in various parts of the


———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

3 Cl. Quar., April, 1908, p. 137.

Hesseling HESSELING, D. C., De Koine en de oude dialekten van Griekenland (1906).

1 Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. etc., p. 417.


Ramsay

RAMSAY, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).
empire. Cf. K. Holl, “Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in nachchristlicher Zeit” (Hermes, 1908, 43, p. 240). These non-Greek influences were especially noticeable in Pergamum, Tarsus and Alexandria, though perceptible at other points also. But in the case of Phrygia long before Alexander’s conquest there had been direct contact with the Arcadian and the Æolic dialects through immigration. The Greek inscriptions in the Hellenistic time were first in the old dialect of Phrygia, then gliding into the κοινή, then finally the pure κοινή. Hence the κοινή won an easy victory in Pergamum, but the door for Phrygian influence was also wide open. Thus, though the κοινή rests on the foundation of the Greek dialects, some non-Greek elements were intermingled.

Dieterich indeed gives a special list of peculiarities that belong to the κοινή of Asia Minor, as, for instance, –αν instead of –α in the accus. sing. of 3d decl., proper names in ἀς, τίς for ὁστις, ὁστις for Ὀς, εἶμαι for εμί, use of θέλω rather than future tense. In the case of Tarsus “a few traces of the Doric dialect may perhaps have lingered” in the κοινή, as Ramsay suggests (Expositor, 1906, p. 31), who also thinks that ναοκόρος for νεωκόρος in Ac. 19:35 in D may thus be explained.

But no hard and fast distinction can be drawn, as –αν for –ν as accusative appears in Egypt also, e.g. in θυγατέραν. Is it proper to speak of an Alexandrian dialect? Blass says so, agreeing with Winer-Schmiedel (ἡ Ἀλεξανδρεών διάλεκτος). This is the old view, but we can hardly give the name dialect to the Egyptian Greek. Kennedy says: “In all probability the language of the Egyptian capital had no more

Holl HOLL, K., Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in nachchristlicher Zeit (Hermes, 1908, 43, pp. 243 ff.).
Hermes, Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie.
4 Schweizer, Gr. der perg. Inschr., pp. 15 ff.
5 Ib., p. 25.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., 1905, p. 3 note.
2 Gr. des neut. Sprachid., § 3. 1, n. 4.
Kennedy

KENNEDY, H. A. A., Recent Research in the Language of the N. T. (The Expos. T., xii, 1901).
———, Sources of N. T. Greek (1895).
———, St Paul and the Mystery Religions (1913).

3 Sour. of N. T. Gk., 1895, p. 23. Irenæus (Minucius Pacatus) and Demetrius Ixion wrote treatises on “the dialect of Alexandria” (Swete, Intr. to the O. T. in Gk., p. 289). But they probably did not understand that the vernacular κοινή, which differed from
right to be called a dialect than the vernacular of any other great centre of population.” Schweizer⁴ likewise refuses to consider the Alexandrian κοινή as a dialect. Dieterich⁵ again gives a list of Egyptian peculiarities such as οἱ instead of αἱ, –α instead of –ας in nominatives of third declension, adjectives in –η instead of –α, ἐσοῦ for σοῦ, καθείς for ἐκοστος, imperfect and aorist in –α, ἤμην for ἤμν, disuse of augment in simple verbs, indicative instead of the subjunctive. Mayser (Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 35–40) gives a list of “Egyptian words” found in the Ptolemaic papyri. They are words of the soil, like πάμφορος itself. But Thumb⁶ shows that the majority of the so-called

---

the literary κοινή, was international (Thackeray, Gr. of the O. T. in Gk., vol. I, p. 19). “It is certain that many forms of this later language were specially characteristic of Alexandria” (ib.).

Schweizer


———, Grammatik der pergamen. Inschriften (1898).


4 Gr. der perg. Inschr., p. 27.
5 Unters. zur Gesch. etc., pp. 258 ff.

Thumb


———, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


6 Die griech. Spr. etc., p. 168 ff. See also Anz, Subs. ad cognos. Graec. Serm. vulg. etc., 1891, p. 262. “Nec quae Apostolides homo doctus Alexandrinus nuperrime protulit omnes caligines propulsaverunt. Certe nemo jam existet qui cum Sturzio Macedonicam dialectum ibi quaerat, sed altera e parte neminem puto judicare illam
Alexandrian peculiarities were general in the κοινή like ἥλθοσαν, εἶχαν, γέγοναν, ἔδρακες, etc. "There was indeed a certain unwieldiness and capriciousness about their language, which displays itself especially in harsh and fantastic word-composition.” As examples of their words may be mentioned κατανωτιζόµενος, παρασυγγράφειν, φιλανθρωπεῖ, etc. It is to be observed also that the κοινή was not the vernacular of all the peoples when it was spoken as a secondary language. In Palestine, for instance, Aramaic was [Page 69] the usual language of the people who could also, most of them, speak Greek. Moulton’s parallel of the variations in modern English is not therefore true, unless you include also peoples like the Welsh, Scotch, Irish, etc.

But as a whole the vernacular κοινή was a single language with only natural variations like that in the English of various parts of the United States or England.¹ Thumb perhaps makes too much of a point out of the use of ἐµός rather than µου in Asia Minor in its bearing on the authorship of the Gospel of John where it occurs 41 times, once only in 3 Jo. and Rev. (34 times elsewhere in the N. T.), though it is interesting to note, as he does, that the infinitive is still used in Pontus. But there were non-Greek influences here and there over the empire as Thumb² well shows. Thumb³ indeed holds that “the Alexandrian popular speech is only one member of a great speech-development.”

(f) The Personal Equation. In the vernacular κοινή, as in the literary language, many variations are due to differences in education and personal idiosyncrasies. “The colloquial language in its turn went off into various shades of distinction according to the refinement of the speaker” (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, p. 59). The inscriptions on the whole give us a more formal speech, sometimes official decrees, while the papyri furnish a much wider variety. “The papyri show us the dialect of Greek Egypt in many forms,—the language of the Government official, of the educated private person, of the dwellers in the temples, of the peasantry in the villages.”⁴ We have numerous examples of the papyri through both the Ptolemaic and the Roman rule in Egypt. All sorts of men from the farm to the palace are here found writing all sorts of documents, a will or a receipt, a love-letter [Page 70] or a dun, a memorandum or a census report, a private letter or a public epistle. “Private letters are

quae vulgo appellantur dialectum Alexandrinam solis vindicandam esse Alexandrinis.”

Cf. Susemihl, Lit. der Alexandrinerzeit.

1 Sir Jonathan Williams, an Eng. savant, is quoted in the Louisville Courier-Journal (May 9, 1906) as saying: “I have found in the city of Louisville a pronunciation and a use of terms which is nearer, to my mind, to Addison and the English classicists than anything which the counties of England, the provinces of Australia, or the moors of Scotland can offer.” He added that the purest English known to him is spoken in Edinburgh and Louisville. These two cities, for geographical reasons, are not provincial.

2 Griech. Spr. etc., pp. 102–161; Theol. Literaturzeit., 1903, p. 421; cf. also Moulton, Prol. p. 40. Moulton sets over against ἐµός the fact that John’s Gospel uses ἰνα rather than the infinitive so often. Much of the force of such an argument vanishes also under the personal equation.

3 Griech. Spr. etc., p. 171. Cf. also Zahn, Einleitung in das N. T., I, 38.

our most valuable sources; and they are all the better for the immense differences that betray themselves in the education of the writers. The well-worn epistolary formulae 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 N. T. letter-writers were content to use.¹ Deissmann² has insisted on a sharp distinction between letters and epistles, the letter being private and instinct with life, the epistles being written for the public eye, an open letter, a literary letter. This is a just distinction. A real letter that has become literature is different from an epistle written as literature. In the papyri therefore we find all grades of culture and of illiteracy, as one would to-day if one rummaged in the rubbish-heaps of our great cities. One need not be surprised at seeing τὸν µήτρως, τὸν θέσιν, and even worse blunders. As a sample Jannaris³ gives ἀξιωθεὶς ὑπαρατῶς γράμματα μεί εἰδότων, ἀξιωθεὶς ὑπ αὕτων γράμματα μὴ εἰδότων. Part of these are crass errors, part are due to identity of sounds in pronunciation, as ο and ω, ει and η, ει and ι. Witkowski⁴ properly insists that we take note of the man and the character of work in each case.

It is obvious that by the papyri and the inscriptions we gain a truer picture of the situation. As a specimen of the vernacular κοινή of Egypt this letter of the school-boy Theon to his father has keen interest (see O. P. 119). It belongs to the second century A.D. and has a boy’s mistakes as well as a boy’s spirit. The writing is uncial.

Θέων Θέωνι τῷ µατρὶ χαίρειν.

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 27 f.
Jannaris

JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).

———, On the True Meaning of the Koinê (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

3 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 7. Quoted from Griech. Urk., Berlin, 13², belonging to year 289 A.D.
Witkowski

WITKOWSKI, ST., Epistulae privatae graecae (1906).

———, Prodromus grammaticae papyrorum graecarum aetatis Lagidarum (1897).

4 The papyri contain “exempla ex vita deprompta, cum sermo scriptorum ut solutae ita poeticae orationis nullo modo veram nobis imaginem sermonis illius aetatis praebet. Etenim sermo, quem apud auctores hellinisticos comprehendimus, arti, non vitae, debetur.” Witkowski Prodr. gr. pap. Graec., etc., 1898, p. 197. He urges that in case of variations in forms or syntax one must inquire “utrum ab alia qua dialecto petita sit an in Aegypto nata, utrum ab homine Graeco an barbaro formata.” Ib., p. 198. He thinks it is necessary that we have “librum de sermone papyrorum, librum de sermone titulorum, librum de sermone auctorum poeticae et pedestris orationis illius aetatis, librum de dialecto Macedonica tractantem.” Ib.
καλῶς ἐποίησες. οὐκ ἀπένηχές με μετ’ ἐς αἰών. ἥ οὐ θέλις ἀπενέκκειν μετ’
τ’ ἐς αἰών ἀλεξανδρίαν οὐ μὴ γράψο τε ἐς πιστολὴν οὔτε λαλῶ σε, οὔτε υἱόν τε σε, ἐς καὶ ὁ ἐλθης ἀλεξανδρίαν, οὐ
μὴ λάβω παρὰ [σ]ου οὔτε πάλι χαίρω σε λυπόν. ἃμι μὴ θέλης ἀπενέκκει 
ταῦτα γε[ἰ]νετε. καὶ ἢ μήτηρ μου ἐπὶ Ἀργελάω ὅτι ἀναστάτοι με ἀφρον αὐτὸν.

καλῶς δὲ ἐποίησες. ὅφρα μοι ἐπημψε[ς]

μεγάλα ἀράκια. πεπλάνηκαν ἡμῶς ἐκε[ῖ],

τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑβ ὅτι ἐπέλευσες. λυπόν πέμψον εἰ[ς]

με, παρακαλῶ σε. ἃμι μὴ πέμψῃς οὐ μὴ φάγω, οὐ μὴ πείνω· ταῦτα.

ἔρωσθε σε εὐχ(ομαι).

Τῦβι η ...
Résumé. To all intents and purposes the vernacular κοινή is the later vernacular Attic with normal development under historical environment created by Alexander’s conquests. On this base then were deposited varied influences from the other dialects, but not enough to change the essential Attic character of the language. There is one κοινή everywhere (cf. Thumb, Griech. Spr., p. 200). The literary κοινή was homogeneous, while the vernacular κοινή was practically so in spite of local variations (cf. Angus, Κοινὴ “The Language of the N. T.,” Prince. Theol. Rev., Jan., 1910, p. 78 f.). In remote districts the language would be Doric-coloured or Ionic-coloured.

Phonetics and Orthography. It is in pronunciation that the most serious differences appear in the κοινή (Moulton, Prol., p. 5). We do not know certainly how the ancient Attic was pronounced, though we can approximate it. The modern Greek vernacular pronunciation is known. The κοινή stands along the path of progress, precisely where it is hard to tell. But we know enough not to insist too strongly on “hair-splitting differences hinging on forms which for the scribe of our uncial had identical value phonetically, e.g. οι, η, ι, υ, τ=θ in feet, or α=ε” (Angus, op. cit., p. 79). Besides itacisms the ι-monophthongizing is to be noticed and the equalizing of ο and ω. The Attic ττ is σσ except in a few instances (like ἐλάττων, κρεῖττων). The tendency is toward deaspiration except in a few cases where the reverse is true as a result of analogy (or a lost digamma). Cf. ἐφ = ἐλπίδα. Elision is not so common as in the Attic, but assimilation is carried still further (cf. ἐμέσῳ). There is less care for rhythm in general, and the variable final consonants ν and ζ appear constantly before consonants. The use of –ιν– for –ιει– in forms like πεῖν and ταμεῖν probably comes by analogy. Οὐθεὶς and µηθείς are the common forms till 100 B.C. when οὐδεὶς and μηδείς begin to regain their ascendency.

Vocabulary. The words from the town-life (the stage, the market-place) come to the front. The vocabulary of Aristophanes is in point. There was an increase in the number of diminutive forms. The κοινή was not averse to foreign elements if they were useful. Xenophon is a good illustration of the preparation for the κοινή. Cf. Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 8.

Word-Formation. There is the natural dropping of some old suffixes and the coining of new suffixes, some of which appear in the modern Greek vernacular. The number of compound words by juxtaposition is greatly increased, like πληρο-φορέω,
In particular two prepositions in compounds are frequent, like συν-αντι-λαμβάνομαι. New meanings are given to old words.

**Accidence.** In substantives the Ionic –ρης, not –ρας, is common, bringing nouns in –ρα into harmony with other nouns of the first declension (Thackeray, *Gr. of the O. T. in Gk.*, p. 22). The Attic second declension disappears. Some feminine nouns in –ος become masculine. The third declension is occasionally assimilated to the first in forms like νόκταν, θυγατέραν. Contraction is absent sometimes in forms like ὄρεων. Both χάριν and χάριτα occur. Adjectives have forms like ἀσφάλης, πλήρης indeclinable, πᾶν for πάντα (cf. μέγαν), δοσί for δοῦν. The dual, in fact, has disappeared in all inflections and conjugations. Pronouns show the disappearance of the dual forms like ἐκάτερος and πότερος. Τίς is used sometimes like δοσίς, and ὃς ἐὰν is more frequent than ὃς ἐὰν about A.D. 1. Analogy plays a big part in the language, and this is proof of life. In the verb there is a general tendency toward simplification, the two conjugations blending into one (μι verbs going). [Page 73] New presents like ἀποκτέννω, ὀπτάνω, are formed. There is confusion in the use of –άω and –έω verbs. We find γίνομαι, γινώσκω. The increase of the use of first aorist forms like ἔσχα (cf. εἶπον and εἶπα in the older Greek). This first aorist termination appears even in the imperfect as in ἔχα. The use of –οσαν (ἐξοσαν, ἔξοσαν) for –ον in the third plural is occasionally noticeable. The form –αν (δέδωκαν) for –ᾱσι may be due to analogy of this same first aorist. There is frequent absence of the syllabic augment in the past perfect, while in compound verbs it is sometimes doubled like ἄπεκατέστησαν. The temporal augment is often absent, especially with diphthongs. We have –τοσαν rather than –ντων, –σθωσαν rather than –σθων.

**Syntax.** There is in general an absence of many Attic refinements. Simplicity is much more in evidence. This is seen in the shorter sentences and the paratactic constructions rather than the more complex hypotactic idioms. The sparing use of particles is noticeable. There is no effort at rhetorical embellishment. What is called “Asianism” is the bombastic rhetoric of the artificial orators. Atticism aims to reproduce the classic idiom. The vernacular κοινή is utterly free from this vice of Asianism and Atticism. Thackeray (op. cit., p. 23) notes that “in the breach of the rules of concord is seen the widest deviation from classical orthodoxy.” This varies a great deal in different writers as the papyri amply testify. The nominativus pendens is much in evidence. The variations in case, gender and number of substantives, adjectives and verbs are frequent κατὰ σύνεσιν. The neuter plural is used with either a singular or plural verb. The comparative does duty often for the superlative adjective. The superlative form usually has the elative sense. Πρῶτος is common (as sometimes in older Greek) when only two are compared. Ἐαυτῶν occurs for all three persons. The accusative is regaining its old ascendancy. There is an increase in the use of the accusatives with verbs and much freedom in the use of the transitive and intransitive

Thackeray
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verbs. The growth in the use of prepositions is very marked both with nouns and in composition, though some of the old prepositions are disappearing. Few prepositions occur with more than two cases. Phrases like βλέπω ἀπό show a departure from the old idiom. New adverbial and prepositional phrases are coming into use. The cases with prepositions are changing. The instrumental use of ἐν is common. The optative is disappearing. The future participle is less frequent. The infinitive (outside of τοῦ, ἐν τῷ, εἰς τό and the inf.) is receding before ἠνα, which is extending its use very greatly. There is a wider use of ὅτι. Everywhere it is the language of life and not of the books. The N. T. use of expressions like εἰς τὸ ὑμῖν, ὅπως δοκεῖ, once cited as Hebraisms, is finding illustration in the papyri (cf. Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 123 f.). Μὴ begins to encroach on οὐ, especially with infinitives and participles. The periphrastic conjugation is frequently employed. The non-final use of ἠνα is quite marked. Direct discourse is more frequent than indirect. Clearness is more desired than elegance. It is the language of nature, not of the schools.

V. The Adaptability of the Κοινὴ to the Roman World. It is worth while to make this point for the benefit of those who may wonder why the literary Attic could not have retained its supremacy in the Græco-Roman world. That was impossible. The very victory of the Greek spirit made necessary a modern common dialect. Colonial and foreign influences were inevitable and the old classical culture could not be assimilated by the Jews and Persians, Syrians, Romans, Ethiopians. “In this way a Panhellenic Greek sprang up, which, while always preserving all its main features of Attic grammar and vocabulary, adopted many colonial and foreign elements and moreover began to proceed in a more analytical spirit and on a simplified grammar.”¹ The old literary Attic could not have held its own against the Latin, for the Romans lamented that they were Hellenized by the Greeks after conquering them.² Spenserian English would be an affectation to-day. The tremendous vitality of the Greek is seen precisely in its power to adjust itself to new conditions even to the present time. The failure of the Latin to do this not only made it give way before the Greek, but, after Latin became the speech of the Western world during the Byzantine period, the vernacular Latin broke up into various separate tongues, the modern Romance languages. The conclusion is irresistuble therefore that the Κοινὴ possessed wonderful adaptability to the manifold needs of the Roman world.³ It was the international language. Nor must one think that it was an ignorant age. What we call the “Dark Ages” came long afterwards. “Let me further insist that this civilization was so perfect that, as far as it reached, men were [Page 75] more cultivated in the strict sense than they ever have been since. We have discovered new forces in nature; we have made new inventions; but we have changed in no way the methods of thinking laid down by the Greeks…The Hellenistic world was more cultivated in argument than we are nowadays.”¹ Moulton² cannot refrain from calling attention to the remarkable fact that

---

² Cf. Sharp, Epictetus and the N. T. (1914), for useful comparison of language and thought of Epictetus and the N. T.
¹ Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., 1905, p. 137. He adds (p. 111): “The work of Alexandria was a permanent education to the whole Greek-speaking world; and we know that in due time Pergamum began to do similar work.”
the new religion that was to master the world began its career at the very time when the Mediterranean world had one ruler and one language. On the whole it was the best language possible for the Graeco-Roman world of the first century A.D.

THE PLACE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE KOINH

I. The New Testament Chiefly in the Vernacular κοινὴ. Observe “chiefly,” for not quite all the N. T. is wholly in the vernacular κοινὴ as will be shown. But the new point, now obvious to every one, is just this, that the N. T. is in the normal κοινὴ of the period. That is what one would have looked for, when you come to think of it. And yet that is a recent discovery, for the Purists held that the N. T. was in pure Attic, while the Hebraists explained every peculiarity as a Hebraism. The Purists felt that revelation could only come in the “best” Greek, and hence it had to be in the Attic. This, as we now know, could only have been true if the N. T. writers had been Atticistic and artificial stylists. So the Hebraists got the better of the argument and then overdid it. The most popular language in the N. T. is found in the Synoptic Gospels. Even Luke preserves the words of Jesus in colloquial form. The Epistle of James and the Johannine writings reflect the vernacular style very distinctly. We see this also in the Epistles of Peter (Second Peter is very colloquial) and Jude. The colloquial tone is less manifest in Acts, some of Paul’s Epistles and Hebrews. Cf. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 63 f. Wellhausen (*Einl.*, p. 9) stresses the fact that in the Gospels the Greek spoken by the people makes its entry into literature.

(a) Not a Biblical Greek. As late as 1893 Viteau says: “Le grec du N. T. est une variété du grec hébraïsant.” Again: “C’est par le grec des LXX qu’il faudrait expliquer, le plus souvent, le grec du N. T.” Viteau is aware of the inscriptions and the papyri and even says: “The Greek of the N. T. must be compared continually with the post-classical Greek in its various branches: with the Greek of the profane writers, with the Greek of the inscriptions and the papyri, and with the Greek of the Jewish LXX.”
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———, Étude sur le grec du N. T. I, Le Verbe (1893); II, Le Sujet (1896).


4 Ib., p. lv.
the Greek of the inscriptions [Page 77] of the Alexandrian and Græco-Roman periods, the Hebraizing Greek, finally the Christian Greek.”¹ But he labours under Hatch’s false idea of a distinct biblical Greek of which the N. T. is a variety; both of these ideas are erroneous. There is no distinct biblical Greek, and the N. T. is not a variety of the LXX Greek. Jowett² over forty years ago said: “There seem to be reasons for doubting whether any considerable light can be thrown on the N. T. from inquiry into language.” That prophecy is now almost amusing in the light of modern research. Simcox³ admitted that “the half-Hebraized Greek of the N. T. is neither a very elegant nor a very expressive language,” but he found consolation in the idea that “it is a many-sided language, an eminently translatable language.” Dr. Hatch⁴ felt a reaction against the modern Atticistic attitude toward the N. T. language: “In almost every lexicon, grammar and commentary the words and idioms of the N. T. are explained, not indeed exclusively, but chiefly, by a reference to the words and idioms of Attic historians and philosophers.” In this protest he was partly right, but he went too far when he insisted that⁵ “biblical Greek is thus a language which stands by itself. What we have to find in studying it is what meaning certain Greek words conveyed to a Semitic mind.”

Dr. Hatch’s error arose from his failure to apply the Greek influence in Palestine to the language of Christianity as he had done to Christian study. Judea was not an oasis in the desert, but was merged into the Græco-Roman world. Rothe⁶ had spoken “of a language of the Holy Ghost. For in the Bible it is evident that the Holy Spirit has been at work, moulding for itself a distinctively religious mode of expression out of the language of the country.” Cremer,⁷ in quoting the above, says: “We have a very clear and striking proof of this in N. T. Greek.” Winer⁸ had indeed seen that “the

¹ Ib., p. liii.
² Ess. and Rev., p. 477.
³ Simcox


———, The Writers of the N. T.

³ Lang. of the N. T., 1890, p. 20.
Hatch HATCH, E., Essays in Bibl. Greek (1892).
⁴ Ess. in Bibl. Gk., 1889, p. 2.
⁵ Ib., p. 11.
⁶ Dogmatik, 1863, p. 238.
Cremer


Winer
grammatical character of the N. T. language has a very slight Hebrew colouring,” but exactly how slight he could not tell. Winer felt that N. T. Greek was “a species of a species,” “a variety of later Greek,” in a word, a sort of dialect. In this he was wrong, but his notion (op. cit., p. 3) that a grammar of the N. T. should thus presuppose a grammar of the later Greek or κοινή is quite right, only we have no such grammar even yet. Winer made little use of the papyri and inscriptions (p. 21 ft. n.). We still sigh for a grammar of the κοινή, though Thumb has related the κοινή to the Greek language as a whole. Kennedy contended that there was “some general characteristic” about the LXX and N. T. books, which distinctly marked them off from the other Greek books; but “they are both children of the same parent, namely, the colloquial Greek of the time. This is the secret of their striking resemblance.”

Even in the Hastings’ Dictionary Thayer contends for the name “Hellenistic Greek” as the proper term for N. T. Greek. That is better than “biblical” or “Jewish” Greek, etc. But in simple truth we had better just call it N. T. Greek, or the Greek of the N. T., and let it go at that. It is the Greek of a group of books on a common theme, as we would speak of the Greek of the Attic orators, the Platonic Greek, etc. It is not a peculiar type of Greek except so far as that is due to the historical conditions, the message of Christianity, and the peculiarities of the writers. Deissmann, however, is the man who has proven from the papyri and inscriptions that the N. T. Greek is not a separate variety of the Greek language. He denies that the N. T. is like the LXX Greek, which was “a written Semitic-Greek which no one ever spoke, far less used for literary purposes, either before or after.” Blass at first stood out against this view and held that “the N. T. books form a special group—one to be primarily explained by study,” but in his Grammar of N. T. Greek he changed his mind and admitted that “a grammar of the popular language of that period written on the basis of all these various authorities and remains” was better than limiting oneself “to the language of the N. T.” So Moulton concludes: “The disappearance of that word ‘Hebraic’ from its prominent place in our delineation of N. T. language marks a change in our conceptions of the subject nothing less than revolutionary.” The new knowledge of the κοινή has buried forever the old controversy between Purists and Hebraists. The men who wrote the N. T. [Page 79] were not aloof from the life of their time. “It embodied the lofty conceptions of the Hebrew and Christian faith in a language which
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8 Thumb, Griech. Spr. etc., p. 120. It lasted “solange die biblische Gräcität als etwas isoliertes betrachtet wurde.” Thumb attacks the idea of a N. T. dialect or a peculiar biblical variety of the κοινή, pp. 162–201. For history of the Purist controversy see W.-Th. § 1, W.-Sch. § 2.
brought them home to men’s business and bosoms.”  Wackernagel understates the matter: “As little as the LXX does the N. T. need to be isolated linguistically.”

(b) Proof that N. T. Greek is in the Vernon’s Koivj. The proof is now at hand. We have it in the numerous contemporary Greek inscriptions already published and in the ever-increasing volumes of papyri, many of which are also contemporary. As early as 1887 a start had already been made in using the inscriptions to explain the N. T. by E. L. Hicks. He was followed by W. M. Ramsay, but it is Deissmann who has given us most of the proof that we now possess, and he has been ably seconded by J. Hope Moulton. Deissmann indeed insists: “If we are ever in this matter to reach

2 Wackernagel, J., Das Dehnungsgesetz der griech. Komposita (1889).
4 Wackernagel, J., Die Sprache des Plut. etc. Teile I, II (1895–1896).
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certainty at all, then it is the inscriptions and the papyri which will give us the nearest approximation to the truth." Hear Deissmann more at length: "Until the papyri were discovered there were practically no other contemporary documents to illustrate that phase of the Greek language which comes before us in the LXX and N. T. In those writings, broadly, what we have, both as regards vocabulary and morphology, and not seldom as regards syntax as well, is the Greek of ordinary intercourse as spoken in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, not the artificial Greek of the rhetoricians and litterateurs, strictly bound as it was by technical rules. This language of ordinary life, this cosmopolitan Greek, shows unmistakable traces of a process of development that was still going on, and in many respects differs from the older dialects as from the classical [Page 80] Attic." As Moulton puts it, "the Holy Ghost spoke absolutely in the language of the people."

The evidence that the N. T. Greek is in the vernacular κοινή is partly lexical and partly grammatical, though in the nature of the case chiefly lexical. The evidence is constantly growing. See Deissmann, Bible Studies, Light from the Ancient East; Moulton and Milligan’s “Lexical Notes on the Papyri” (The Expositor, 1908—). We give first some examples of words, previously supposed to be purely "biblical," now shown to be merely popular Greek because of their presence in the papyri or inscriptions: ἁγάπη, ἁκατέγνωστος, ὄνωσίω, ἀναστατόω, ἀντιλήμπτωρ, ἄλλογενής, ἀφιλάργυρος, σὺθεντέω, βροχή, ἕναντι, ἑνδιόσκο, ἑνώπιον, ἐπικατάρατος, ἐπισυναγογή, εὐάρεστος, εὐπροσωπέω, ἱερατεύω, ἱµατίζω, καταπέτασµα, καταγγελέως, κατήγωρ, καθαρίζω, κόκκινος, κυριακός, λειτουργικός, λογεία, νεφώτος, ὑφαντή, παραβολεύοµαι, περισσεία, πληροφορέω, προσκαρτέρησις, προσκυνητής, προσευχή, πρωτότοκος, σιτοµέτριον, συναντιλαβάνοµαι, φιλοπρωτεύω, φρεναπάτης, etc. For a lively discussion of these words see Deissmann (Bible Studies, pp. 198–247; Light, etc., pp. 69–107). The recovery of the inscription on the marble slab that warned the gentiles from the ἱερόν is very impressive. Μηθένα ἄλλογον ἐξακολουθεσθαι ἔντις τοῦ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τριφάκτου καὶ περιβόλου. δός δὲ ἄν ληφθῇ, ἑαυτῷ ἀέτος ἔσται διὰ τὸ ἐξακολούθειν θάνατον. The words above are no longer biblical ἅπαξ λεγόµενα. But this is not all. Many words which were thought to
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5 B. S., p. 81. Deissmann calls attention also to a booklet by Walch, Observ. in Matthæum ex graecis inscr., 1779. So in 1850, Robinson in the Pref. to his N. T. Lex. says: “It was, therefore, the spoken language of common life, and not that of books, with which they became acquainted”; cf. also the works of Schweizer, Nachmanson, Dittenberger, etc.

6 Encyc. Bibl., art. Papyri. “At the time when the ancient Greek culture was in conflict with Christianity, the assailants pointed sarcastically at the boatman’s idiom of the N. T., while the defenders, glorying in the taunt, made this very homeliness their boast. Latin apologists were the first to make the hopeless attempt to prove that the literary form of the Bible as a whole, and of the N. T. in particular, was artistically perfect.” Deissmann, Exp. Times, Nov., 1906, p. 59; cf. also Norden, Kunstpr., II, pp. 512 f., 526 f.

1 Prol., p. 5.
have a peculiar meaning in the LXX or the N. T. have been found in that very sense in the inscriptions or papyri, such as ἀδελφός in the sense of ‘common brotherhood,’ ἀθέτησις, ἀμετανόητος, ἀμφισβήτεσθαι, ἀναφέρω, ἀντίλυμψις, ἀπέχω, ἀπόκρυμα, ἀποτάσσομαι, ὄρετή, ὄρκετός, Ἀσιάρχης, ἄσιμος, ἄσπαζομαι, ἄποποιος, βεβαιώσεις, βιάζομαι, βούλομαι, γέννημα, γυγματεύω, γράφω, δειπνεῖο, δέον ἐπίτη, διαβάλλω, διασεῖο, δίκαιος, διότι—ὅτι, διγοτομέω, δόκιμος, δόκιμος, δώμα, δύναμις, ἐὰν—Ἀν, εἰ μὴν, εἰδὸς, εἰς, ἐκτένεια, ἐκτός, ἐκτινάσσω, ἐν, ἐνεδρεύω, ἐνοχος, ἐνυγγάτω, ἐπιβαλῶν, ἐπίσκοπος, ἐρωτάω, εὐσχήμων, ἐπιούσιος, εὐχαριστεῖο, ἑος, ἠγούμαι, ἡλικία, ἠσχαίνθη, θεωρέω, ἰδίος, ἱλαστήριον, ἱλέω, ἰστορέω, καθαρίζο, καθαρός, καινός, κακοπάθεια, κατά, κατάκριμα, καταντάω, κλίνη, κολάζομαι, κολλάω, κολαφίζω, κόπος, κοράσιον, κτάομαι, κύριος, λίκαω, λίγν, λούομαι, μενοῦνγα, μαρτυροῦμαι, μειώτερος, μικρός, μονή, ναῦς, νεκροί, νή, νομός, οἰκία, ὄμολογε, ὄνομα, ὄνωνιν, παρὰ, παράδεισος, παραθετικ, παρακάτω, παρεισφέρω, πάρεις, πάροικος, παροξύνομαι, πατροπαράδοτος, περιστάμω, περιτέκτονα, πλῆθος, πληθυσμός, πληροφόρεω, πράγμα, [Page 81] πράκτωρ, προβήτερος, πρόθεσις, προσέχω, πρόσκαρτερέω, προφήτης, σαπρός, σκῦλο, σκόλον, σαμαράγδιος, σωσάριν, σπευδολάτωρ, στάτις, στρατευόμαι, σφραγίζω, σφυρι, συγγενής, συμβούλιον, συνειδήσις, συνέχεια, συνευδοκέω, συνευδοχέσσαμαι, συνύστημι, αἴμα, σωτήρ, τήρησις, τόπος, υἱός, υἱὸς θεοῦ, υἱὸθεία, ὑποζύγιον, ὑποτίγων, ὑπόστασις, φάσις, φέρω, φθάνω, φίλος, φιλοστοργία, φιλοτιμεύμα, χάραγμα, χάρις τῷ Θεῷ, χρεια, χρόνος, ψωμίν, ψυχήν σώσαι. This seems like a very long list, but it will do more than pages of argument to convince the reader that the vocabulary of the N. T. is practically the same as that of the vernacular κοινή in the Roman Empire in the first century A.D. 1 This is not a complete list, for new words will be added from time to time, and all that are known are not here included. Besides neither Deissmann nor Moulton has put together such a single list of words, and Kenyon’s in Hastings’ D. B. (Papyri) is very incomplete. After compiling this list of words I turned to the list in the Hastings’ Dictionary of the vernacular in the LXX or the N. T. Far from it. Of the 4829 words in the N. T. (not including proper names) 3933 belong to older classic language (literary and vernac.) while 996 are late or foreign words. See Jacquier, Hist. des Livres du N. T., tome 1er, 1906, p. 25. Thayer’s Lex. claimed 767 N. T. words, but Thayer considered 89 as doubtful and 76 as late. Kennedy (Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 62) found about 550 “biblical” words. But now Deissmann admits only about 50, or one per cent. of the 5000 words in the N. T. (Light, etc., p. 72 f.). Findlay (Exp. Gk. T., 1 Cor., p. 748) gives 5594 Greek words in the N. T. (whole number), while Viteau (Syntaxe des Prop., p. xxx) gives 5420.
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The Bible by Thayer (art. “Language of the N. T.”) where are found some thirty new words common to the N. T. and the vernacular κοινή, words not common in the classic Greek. Thayer’s list is entirely different save a half-dozen. In his list are comprised such interesting words as ἀλληγορέω, ἀντοφθαλμέω, ἰποκαραδοκία, δεισιδαιμονία, ἐχθρίο, ἐγγίζω, ἐπιχορηγέω, εὐδοκέω, εὐκαιρέω, θριαμβέω, etc. This list can be largely increased also by the comparison between words that are common to the N. T. and the comic poets (Aristophanes, Menander, etc.) who used the language of the people. See Kennedy’s lists in Sources of N. T. Greek (ch. VI). Many of these, as Kennedy shows, are theological terms, like ἀποθητήριον, ἀρραβών, βαστίζω, εὐχαριστία, κυρία, μοστήριον, φιλάδελφία. The Christians found in common use in the Roman Empire terms like ἄδελφος, ἐπιφάνεια, ἐπιφανής, κύριος, λειτουργία, παρουσία, πρεσβυτερος, προγράφω, σωτήρ, σωτηρία, υἱὸς Θεοῦ. They took these words with the new popular connotation and gave them “the deeper and more spiritual” sense with which the N. T. writings have made us familiar” (Milligan, Greek Papyri, p. xxx). They could even find toῦ µεγάλου Θεοῦ εὐχρηστόν καὶ σωτήρος (GH 15, ii/B.C.). Cf. Tit. 2:13; 2 Pet. 1:1. ¹ The papyri often show us how we have misunderstood a word. So ἀπογραφή (Lu. 2:2) is not “taxing,” but “enrolling” for the census (very common in the papyri). But this is not all, for the modern Greek vernacular will also augment the list of N. T. words known to belong to the oral speech. When this much is done, we are ready to admit the vernacular character of all the words not known to be otherwise. The N. T. Greek is like the κοινή also in using many compounded ("sesquipedalian") words like ἄνδρευμητος, ἀνεξαρτήτως, ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, ὑπερεντυγχάνω, etc. There is also the same frequency of diminutives, some of which have lost that significance, as πλοιάριον, ὑπάρχων, ὅτιον, etc. The new meanings to old words are well illustrated in the list from the papyri, to which may be added ἀναλώ, ἐντροπή, ξωποιέω, σχολή, χορτάζω, etc.

As to the forms we need say less, but the evidence is to the same effect. The papyri show examples of Ἀκύλα (and –ου) for genitive, ὅων and ὅσι, ἐγενάμην, Ἕλαβα, Ἕσεσα, Ἡπίω, ἴνογενή, ἴπταν, ἴό, ἴδωκες, ἴδες, ἴγραψε, τίθε, σπεῖρης; the imperative has only the long forms –τοσαν, –ςθοσαν, etc. The various dialects are represented in the forms retained in the N. T., as the Attic in βούλει, διδόας, ἤμελλε, etc.; the Ionic in μναχηρίς, γίνομαι, γινόμαι, etc.; the Doric in ἁφέωνται, ἢτω, etc.; the Ἀλοικ in ἁποκτέννοι, 3d plural in –σαν, etc.; the Northwest Greek in accusative plural in –ες, perfect in –αν (3d plural), confusion of –αιω and –εω verbs, etc.; the Arcadian-Cyprian group in accusative singular in –αν, ἀφέωνται (also). It is curious that Thayer in Hastings’ D. B., follows Winer’s error in giving ἐδόσαν as an example of a form like εἴσασαν, for the present stem is διδο-, and σαν is merely the usual µ ending. See Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 4–20.

Among the syntactical peculiarities of N. T. Greek which are less numerous, as in the κοινή, the following are worthy of note and are found in the κοινή: the non-final use of ἵνα; the frequent use of the personal pronoun; the decreased use of the possessive pronouns; disuse of the optative; increased use of ὅτι; disuse of the future participle; use of participle with εἰμί; article with the infinitive (especially with ἐν and εἰς); ὑφες and βλέπω with subjunctive without conjunction; the absence of the dual;

¹ Moulton, Prol., p. 84; Wendland, Hell.-röm. Kult., p. 100.
use of ὅφελον as conjunction; frequency of ἐάν, ὃταν, etc., with indicative; interchange of ἐάν and ἃν; μὴ increasing upon οὐ; decreased use of indirect discourse; ἐξ=τις; disuse of some interrogative particles; use of ἰδιός as possessive pronoun; παρὰ and ὑπέρ with comparatives; disappearance of the superlative; frequency of prepositions; vivid use of present tense (and perfect); laxer use of particles; growth of the passive over the middle, etc.

Various phrases are common both to the N. T. and to the papyri, like δεξιὰν δίδω, µιλιστεῖ, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, κατὰ διναρ, κατὰ τὸ ἔρωτόν, παρέχομαι ἐμαυτόν, τὸ αὐτὸ φορεῖν. “There is placed before us in the N. T. neither a specific speech-form nor a barbaric Jewish-Greek, but a natural phase of the Hellenistic speech-development.”1 Deissmann (Exp. Times, 1906, p. 63) properly holds the N. T. to be the Book of Humanity because it “came from the unexhausted forces below, and not from the feeble, resigned culture of a worn-out upper class.” Swete (O. T. in Gk., pp. 295 ff.) shows how the LXX is influenced by the vernacular κοινή. As early as 1843 B. Hase (Wellhausen, Einl., p. 14) explained the LXX as “Volkssprache.” Thackeray (Grammar, pp. 22 ff.) gives a good summary of “the κοινή basis of LXX Greek.”

II. Literary Elements in the New Testament Greek. It is true then, as Blass2 sums it up, that “the language employed in the N. T. is, on the whole, such as was spoken in the lower circles of society, not such as was written in works of literature.” The N. T. writers were not Atticists with the artificial straining after the antique Attic idiom. But one must not imagine that they were mere purveyors of slang and
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———, The Apocalypse of St. John (1906).

———, The O. T. in Greek according to the Septuagint (1887). 3 vols.

Blass


———, Hermeneutik und Kritik (1892).

———, Philology of the Gospels (1898).

———, Pronunciation of Ancient Greek (translation by Purton in 1890 of 3. Aufl. of Über die Aussprache des Griech. 1888).

2 Gr. of the N. T. Gk., p. 1.
vulgarisms. Freudenthal speaks of the Hellenistic Jews as “one of those societies without a mother-tongue which have never attained to any true excellence in literature.” And even Mahaffy speaks of the Greek learned by the Jews as “the new and artificial idiom of the trading classes” which had neither “traditions nor literature nor those precious associations which give depth and poetry to words.” That is a curious mistake, for it was the Atticistic revival that was artificial. The koine had all the memories of a people’s life. Instance Robert Burns in Scotland. It is to be said for Mahaffy, however, that he changed his mind, for he later wrote: “They write a dialect simple and rude in comparison with Attic Greek; they use forms which shock the purists who examine for Cambridge scholarships. But did any men ever tell a great story with more simplicity, with more directness, with more power?...Believe me against all the pedants of the world, the dialect that tells such a story is no poor language, but the outcome of a great and a fruitful education.” The N. T. uses the language of the people, but with a dignity, restraint and pathos far beyond the trivial nonentities in much of the papyri remains. All the N. T. Greek is not so vernacular as parts of the LXX. The papyri often show the literary koine and all grades of variation, while the lengthy and official inscriptions “often approximate in style to the literary language.” Long before many words are used in literature they belong to the diction of polite speech. In a word, the N. T. Greek “occupies apparently an intermediate position between the vulgarisms of the populace and the studied style of the litterateurs of the period. It affords a striking illustration of the divine policy of

3 Hell. Stud., 1875.
Mahaffy


———, Greek Life and Thought (1896).

———, Progress of Hellenism in Alexander’s Empire (1905).

———, The Greek World under Roman Sway (1890).

———, What Have the Greeks Done for Civilization? (1909).

4 Gk. Life and Thought, 1896, p. 530.

4 Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 77.
It would indeed have been strange if men like Paul, Luke and the author of Hebrews had shown no literary affinities at all. Prof. J. C. Robertson (The Classical Weekly, March 9, 1912, p. 139) in an article entitled “Reasons for Teaching the Greek N. T. in Colleges” says: “Take the parable of the Prodigal Son, for instance. In literary excellence this piece of narrative is unsurpassed. Nothing more simple, more direct, more forceful can be adduced from among the famous passages of classical Greek literature. It is a moving tragedy of [Page 85] reconciliation. Yet its literary excellence is not accidental. The elements of that excellence can be analyzed.” In an age of unusual culture one would look for some touch with that culture. “I contend, therefore, that the peculiar modernness, the high intellectual standard of Christianity as we find it in the N. T., is caused by its contact with Greek culture.”

In his helpful article on N. T. Times Buhl underrates, as Schürer does, the amount of Greek known in Palestine. It is to be remembered also that great diversity of culture existed among the writers of the N. T. Besides, the educated men used much the same vernacular all over the Roman world and a grade of speech that approached the literary standard as in English to-day. One is not to stress Paul’s language in 1 Cor. 2:1–4 into a denial that he could use the literary style. It is rather a rejection of the bombastic rhetoric that the Corinthians liked and the rhetorical art that was so common from Thucydides to Chrysostom. It is with this comparison in mind that Origen (c. Celsus, vii, 59 f.) speaks of Paul’s literary inferiority. It is largely a matter of standpoint. Deissmann has done a good service in accenting the difference between letters and epistles. Personal letters not for the public eye are, of course, in the vernacular. Cicero’s Letters are epistles written with an eye on posterity. “In letters one does not look for treatises, still less for treatises in rigid uniformity and proportion of parts.” There may be several kinds of letters (private, family, pastoral or congregational, etc.). But when a letter is published

---

6 Robertson


1 Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen., p. 139.
2 Ext. vol. of Hast. D. B.
5 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 15.
6 B. S., pp. 16 ff. However, one must not think that the N. T. Epistles always fall wholly in one or the other category. Ramsay calls attention to the “new category” in the new conditions, viz., a general letter to a congregation (Let. to the Seven Chur., p. 24).
7 Ib., p. 11. See also Walter Lock, The Epistles, pp. 114 ff., in The Bible and Chr. Life, 1905.
consciously as literature, like Horace’s *Ars Poetica*, for instance, it becomes a literary letter or epistle. Epistles may be either genuine or unauthentic. The unauthentic may be either merely pseudonymous or real forgeries. If we examine the N. T. Letters or Epistles in the light of this distinction, we shall see that Philemon is a personal letter. The same is true of the Pastoral Epistles; but Ephesians is more like an epistle from its general nature. The Thessalonian, Corinthian, Galatian, Colossian, Philippian writings are all congregational and doctrinal letters. Romans partakes of the nature of a letter and an epistle. Jacquier, however (*Histoire des Livres du N. T.*, 1906, tome 1st, p. 66), remarks that “The Pauline Epistles are often more discourse than letter.” It will thus be seen that I do not agree with Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 3 f.) in calling all the Pauline writings “letters” as opposed to “epistles.” Milligan (*Greek Papyri*, p. xxxi) likewise protests against the sweeping statement of Deissmann. Deissmann gives a great variety of interesting letters from the papyri in his *Light from the Ancient East*, and argues here (pp. 224–234) with passion that even Romans is just “a long letter.” “I have no hesitation in maintaining the thesis that all the letters of Paul are real, non-literary letters.” Hebrews is more like an epistle, as are James, 1 John, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, Jude, while 2 and 3 John are again letters. The Letters to the Seven Churches again are epistles. This is a useful distinction and shows that the N. T. writers knew how to use one of the favourite literary methods of the Alexandrian period. Dr. Lock concludes: “*Letters* have more of historic and literary interest, *epistles* more of central teaching and practical guidance.” That Paul could use the more literary style is apparent from the address on Mars Hill, the speech before Agrippa, and Ephesians and Romans. Paul quotes Aratus, Menander and Epimenides and may have been acquainted with other Greek authors. He seems also to have understood Stoic philosophy. We cannot tell how extensive his literary training was. But he had a real Hellenic feeling and outlook. The introduction to Luke’s Gospel and the Acts show real literary skill. The Epistle to the Hebrews has oratorical flow and power with traces of Alexandrian culture. Viteau reminds us that about 3000 of the 5420 words in the Greek N. T. are found in ancient Attic writers, while the syntax in general “obeys the ordinary laws of Greek grammar.” These and other N. T. writers, as James, occasionally use classic forms like ἵψε, ἵσασι, ἐξῆσαν, etc. König in his discussion of the Style of Scripture finds ample illustration in the N. T. of the various literary linguistic devices, though in varying degree. See “Figures of Speech” (ch. XXII). But the literary element in the N. T. is subordinate to the practical and is never artificial nor strained. We have the
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1 Bible and Chr. Life, p. 117. For the history and literature of ancient letters and epistles see Deissmann, B. S.; Susmmihl, Gesch. der griech. Lit.; Overbeck, Über die Anf. der patrist. Lit. The oldest known Gk. letter was written on a lead tablet and belongs to the iv/B.C. and comes from near Athens. It was discovered by Prof. Wünsch of Giessen. See art. by Dr. Wilhelm of Athens in Jahresh. des österreich. archäol. Inst. (1904, vii, pp. 94 ff.).

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 5.

3 Le Verbe: Synt. des Prop., p. xxx.

1 W.-M., p. 37. Kennedy indeed (Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 134) says that 80 per cent. of the N. T. words date from before 322 B.C.

language of spirit and life. The difference between the old point of view and the new is well illustrated by Hort’s remark (Notes on Orthography, p. 152 f.) when he speaks of “the popular Greek in which the N. T. is to a certain extent written.” He conceives of it as literary κοινὴ with some popular elements. The new and the true view is that the N. T. is written in the popular κοινὴ with some literary elements, especially in Luke, Paul, Hebrews and James.

Josephus is interesting as a background to the N. T. He wrote his War in Aramaic and secured the help of Greek writers to translate it, but the Antiquities was composed in Greek, probably with the aid of similar collaborateurs, for parts of Books XVII–XIX copy the style of Thucydidæ and are really Atticistic. It is interesting to take a portion of 1 Maccabees as we have it translated from the Hebrew original and compare it with the corresponding portion of Josephus. The Greek of 1 Macc. is, like the LXX, translation Greek and intensely Hebraistic, while Josephus smooths out all the Hebraistic wrinkles and shifts it into the rolling periods of Thucydidæ. The N. T. has slight affinities in vocabulary, besides Josephus, with Philo, Plutarch, Polybius, Strabo, Diodorus and a few other writers in the literary κοινὴ.

Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, p. 64) holds that Paul’s “Greek never becomes literary.” “It is never disciplined, say, by the canon of the Atticists, never tuned to the Asian rhythm: [Page 88] it remains non-literary.” But has not Deissmann given a too special sense to “literary”? If 1 Cor. 13 and 15, Ro. 8 and Eph. 3 do not rise to literary flavour and nobility of thought and expression, I confess my ignorance of what literature is. Harnack (Das hohe Lied des Apostels Paulus von der Liebe und seine religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung, 1911) speaks of the rhythm, the poetic form, the real oratory, the literary grace of 1 Cor. 13. The best literature is not artificial nor pedantic like the work of the Atticists and Asian stylists. That is a caricature of literature. We must not forget that Paul was a man of culture as well as a man of the people. Deissmann (Light, p. 64 f.) does admit the literary quality of Hebrews. This epistle is more ornate as Origen saw (Eus., Eccl. Hist., VI, XX, 11).

III. The Semitic Influence. This is still the subject of keen controversy, though not in the same way that the Purists and the Hebraists debated it. Now the point is whether the N. T. Greek is wholly in the κοινὴ or whether there is an appreciable

4 Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., pp. 50 ff. Hoole, The Class. Elem. in the N. T., 1888, gives an interesting list of Gk. and Rom. proper names that occur in the N. T.

Semitic colouring in addition. There is something to be said on both sides of the question.

(a) The Tradition. See I, (a), for proof of the error of this position. It is certain that the idea of a special Hebraic Greek for the N. T. is gone. Schaff\(^1\) said that the Greek spoken by the Grecian Jews “assumed a strongly Hebraizing character,” and the N. T. Greek shared in this “sacred and Hebraizing character.” According to Hatch\(^2\) “the great majority of N. T. words…express in their biblical use the conceptions of a Semitic race.” Viteau\(^3\) calls it “Hebraizing Greek,” while Simcox\(^4\) speaks of “the half-Hebraized Greek of the N. T.” Reuss\(^5\) calls it “the Jewish-Greek idiom.” Hadley\(^6\) considered the “Hellenistic dialect, largely intermixed with Semitic idioms.” Westcott\(^7\) spoke of “the Hebraic style more or less pervading the whole N. T.” But Westcott\(^8\) admitted that “a philosophical view of the N. T. language as a whole is yet to be desired,” as Hatch\(^9\) lamented that the N. T. Greek “has not yet attracted the attention of any considerable scholar.” That cannot now be said after the work of Blass, Deissmann, Moulton, Radermacher and others, and was an overstatement then.

And yet the old view of “biblical Greek”\(^{[Page 89]}\) for both N. T. and LXX is still championed by Conybeare and Stock in their grammar of the Septuagint (Selections from the Sept., 1905, p. 22 f.). They insist, against Deissmann, on the “linguistic unity” of the LXX and of the N. T. as opposed to the vernacular κοινή. They admit, of course, that the LXX is far more Hebraic than the N. T. This sturdy contention for the old view is interesting, to say the least. Wellhausen (Einl. in die drei ersten Evangelien) is rather disposed to accent the “Semiticisms” (Aramaisms) in the Synoptic Gospels in contrast with the Attic Greek. Nobody now claims the N. T. Greek to be Attic in purity. “No one denies the existence of Semiticisms; opinions are only divided with reference to the relative proportion of these Semiticisms” (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, p. 65). The old view is dead beyond recall.

(b) The View of Deissmann and Moulton. Over against the old conception stands out in sharp outline the view of Deissmann\(^1\) who says: “The linguistic unity of the Greek Bible appears only against the background of classical, not of contemporary ‘profane’ Greek.” Note the word “only.” Once more\(^2\): “The few Hebraizing expressions in those parts of the N. T. which were in Greek from the first are but an accidens which does not essentially alter the fundamental character of its language.”
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1 Comp. to the Gk. Test., 1885, pp. 22, 25.
2 Ess. in Bibl. Gk., p. 34.
3 Synt. des Prop., p. xxxvi.
4 Lang. of the N. T., p. 20.
5 Hist. of the N. T., 1885, p. 36.
6 Lang. of the N. T., Smith’s B.D.
Westcott WESTCOTT, B. F., Language of the N. T. (Smith’s B. D.).
7 Art. N. T., Smith’s B. D.
8 Ib.
9 Ess. in Bibl. Gk., p. 1.
Conybeare and Stock CONYBEARE and STOCK, Selections from the LXX. A Grammatical Introduction (1905).
1 B. S., 1901, p. 66.
2 Ib., p. 177.
The portions of the Synoptic Gospels which were either in Aramaic or made use of Aramaic originals he considers on a par with the LXX. They use *translation* Greek. No one “ever really spoke as he may have translated the Logia-collection, blessed—and cramped—as he was by the timid consciousness of being permitted to convey the sacred words of the Son of God to the Greeks.”\(^3\) Thumb\(^4\) accepts the view of Deissmann and admits “Hebraisms in a few cases” only and then principally the meaning of words. In 1879 Guillemard\(^5\) disclaimed any idea of being able to give “an exhaustive exhibition of all the Hebraisms,” but he “put forward only a few specimens”! Moulton\(^6\) admits practically no Hebraisms nor Aramaisms outside of “translation Greek.” “Between these two extremes the N. T. writers lie; and of them all [Page 90] 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.” Once more\(^1\): “What we can assert with assurance is that the papyri have finally destroyed the figment of a N. T. Greek which in any material respect differed from that spoken by ordinary people in daily life.” Moulton\(^2\) realizes “the danger of going too far” in summing up thus the issue of the long strife over N. T. Hebraisms. According to Moulton (p. 18) the matter is complicated only in Luke, who, though a gentile, used Aramaic sources in the opening chapters of the Gospel and Acts. This new and revolutionary view as to Semitisms is still challenged by Dalman\(^3\) who finds many more Aramaisms in the Synoptic Gospels than Moulton is willing to admit. Deissmann indeed is not disposed in his later writings to be dogmatic on the subject. “The last word has not yet been said about the proportion of Semiticisms” (*Expositor*, Jan., 1908, p. 67). He is

\(^3\) Ib., p. 76. “What would we give if we could recover but one papyrus book with a few leaves containing genuine Aramaic sayings of Jesus! For those few leaves we would, I think, part willingly with the theological output of a whole century” (Deissmann, Light, p. 57).

\(^4\) Griech. Spr. etc., p. 121.

Guillemard GUILLEMARD, W. H., Hebraisms in the Greek Testament (1879).

\(^5\) Hebraisms in the Gk. Test., Pref.

\(^6\) Prol., p. 10.

\(^1\) Ib., p. 18. He quotes approvingly Deissmann’s remark that “Semitisms which are in common use belong mostly to the technical language of religion” and they do not alter the scientific description of the language. Moulton (Interp., July, 1906, p. 380) says: “Suffice it to say that, except so far as the N. T. writers are quoting baldly literal translations from the LXX, or making equally literal translations from the Aramaic in which the Lord and His disciples usually spoke, we have no reason whatever to say that the N. T. was composed in a Greek distinguishable from that spoken all over the Roman Empire.”

Dalman

DALMAN, G., Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch (1894).

———, Worte Jesu (1902).

———, The Words of Jesus (1902). Translation by D. M. Kay.

\(^3\) Wds. of Jes., 1902.
undoubtedly right in the idea that many so-called Semiticisms are really “international vulgarisms.” Schürer, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1908, p. 555, criticizes Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten*, 1908, p. 35) for running the parallel too close between the N. T. and the unliterary papyri. It is truer of the LXX than of the N. T.

The old view cannot stand in the light of the papyri and inscriptions. Both the Purists and the Hebraists were wrong. Many words and idioms heretofore claimed as Hebraisms are shown to be current in the vernacular κοινή. As specimens one can mention ἐνώπιον (gressor) according to Winer-Lünemann, p. 201, and “biblical” according to Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 90) as found in the papyri; πρεσβύτερος in the official sense occurs in the papyri of Egypt in combinations like πρεσβύτεροι ἱερεῖς; ἐρωτάω=‘to beg’ is in the papyri; ἐς in sense of πρῶτος also; [Page 91] προσευχή can no longer be regarded as a word of Jewish formation for a Jewish place of prayer, since it appears in that sense in a Ptolemaic inscription in Lower Egypt in the III cent. B.C.; ὄνομα occurs also in the sense of “person”; expressions like ἐς θανάτου are found in the papyri; βλέπειν ἁπά occurs in a papyrus letter; ἐς ὄνομα is in inscriptions, ostraca, papyri; οὖν οὖν is matched in the papyri by τρία τρία (this idiom has been traced in Greek for 2500 years); the instrumental use of ἐν as ἐν μαχαίρῃ is common; the use of ἐν τῷ and the infinitive so common in Luke appears in the papyri; and even ἐς ᾿Απάντησίν meets us in the papyri (Tebt. Pap. 43, II cent. B.C.). Certainly a full list of the words and phrases that can no longer be called Hebraisms would be very formidable. Besides, the list grows continually under the researches of Deissmann, Moulton, Maysger, Thumb, Kälker, Witkowski, Milligan and other scholars. The presumption is now clearly against a Hebraism. The balance of evidence has gone over to the other side. But after all one has the conviction that the joy of new discovery has to some extent blurred the vision of Deissmann and Moulton to the remaining Hebraisms which do not indeed make Hebraic Greek or a peculiar dialect. But enough remain to be noticeable and appreciable. Some of these may vanish, like the rest, before the new knowledge. The LXX, though “translation Greek,” was translated into the vernacular of Alexandria, and one can but wonder if the LXX did not have some slight resultant influence upon the Alexandrian κοινή itself. The Jews were very numerous in Alexandria.

“Moreover, it remains to be considered how far the quasi-Semitic colloquialisms of the papyri are themselves due to the influence of the large Greek-speaking Jewish population of the Delta” (Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 1906, p. cxx). Thackeray (*Gr. of the O. T. in Gk.*, vol. I, p. 20) uses the small number of Coptic words in the Greek papyri against the notion of Hebrew influence on the κοινή in Egypt. However, Thackeray (p. 27) notes that the papyri so far discovered tell us little of the private life of the Jews of Egypt and of the Greek used by them specifically. The marshes of the Delta were not favourable for the preservation of the papyri. The κοινή received other foreign influences we know. The Jews of the Dispersion spoke the vernacular κοινή everywhere, but they read the LXX, “a written Semitic Greek which no one ever spoke, far less used for literary purposes, either before or after.” And yet [Page 92]
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4 See Deissmann (B. S. and Light) and Moulton (Prol.).
Kälker KÄLKER, F., *Questiones de elocutione Polybiana* (1880).
1 Deissmann, B. S., p. 67. See also Angus, N. T. Philol., Harv. Theol. Rev., July, 1909, p. 453. The LXX, though translation Greek (see above), is in the vern. κοινή,
the Hellenistic Jews all over the world could not read continually the LXX and not to some extent feel the influence of its peculiar style. No one to-day speaks the English of the King James Version, or ever did for that matter, for, though like Shakespeare, it is the pure Anglo-Saxon, yet, unlike Shakespeare, it reproduces to a remarkable extent the spirit and language of the Bible. As Luther’s German Bible largely made the German language, so the King James Version has greatly affected modern English (both vernacular and literary). The situation is not the same, but there is enough of truth to justify the comparison. There are fewer details that preserve the Semitic character, but what does not disappear is the Hebrew cast of thought in a writer like John, for instance. No papyrus is as much a parallel to John’s Gospel as the Book of Job, for instance. Westcott¹ has true insight when he says of N. T. Greek: “It combines the simple directness of Hebrew thought with the precision of Greek expression. In this way the subtle delicacy of Greek expression in some sense interprets Hebrew thought.” What is true of John’s Gospel is true also of James. The numerous quotations both from the LXX and the Hebrew in the N. T. put beyond controversy the constant use of the O. T. in Greek on the part of the N. T. writers. Besides, with the possible exception of Luke and the author of Hebrews, they all knew and used Aramaic as well as Greek. The point is that the N. T. writers were open to Semitic influence. How great that was must be settled by the facts in the case, not by presumptions for or against. Dr. George Milligan (Greek Papyri, p. xxix f.) says: “In the matter of language, we have now abundant proof that the so-called ‘peculiarities’ of biblical Greek are due simply to the fact that the writers of the N. T. for the most part made use of the ordinary colloquial Greek, the koine of their day. This is not to say that we are to disregard altogether the influence of ‘translation Greek,’ and the consequent presence of undoubted Hebraisms, both in language and grammar. An over tendency to minimize these last is probably the most pertinent criticism that can be directed against Dr. J. H. Moulton’s Prolegomena to his Grammar of N. T. Greek.” So Dr. Swete “deprecates the induction which, as it seems to him, is being somewhat hastily based upon them (the papyri), that the Greek of the N. T. has been but slightly influenced by the familiarity of the writers with Hebrew and Aramaic” (Apocalypse of St. John, p. cxx).

Von Soden¹ sums up the whole matter as follows: “It was unavoidable but that the primitive Christian writers often used compulsion with the Greek tongue and offended against its genius. They wished to bring to expression things which, up to that time, and thus the N. T. writers had a double point of contact with the koine. Cf. Wackernagel, Theol. Lit., 1908, p. 38; Milligan, Epis. to the Th., p. lv. 1 Exp., 1887, p. 241. Thumb (Griech. Spr. etc., p. 132) denies any influence on the development of the Gk. But Thayer (Hast. D. B., Lang. of the N. T., III, 40b) is not surprised to find “idioms having a distinctly Hebraistic flavour even in native Greek circles.” Cf. also Reuss, Hist. of the N. T., 1884, vol. I, p. 33.

Soden


———, Griechisches N. T. Text mit kurzem Apparat (1913).

1 Early Chr. Lit., 1906, p. 11 f.
were foreign to the Greek spirit and only found expression in Semitic languages. And besides, it is only natural that the phraseology of the Greek translation of the O. T., to which they were habituated from their youth, should unconsciously flow from their pens, and still more, that when their subject-matter brought them into close contact with the O. T. or when they translated from the Aramaic dialect of Palestine, their Greek should receive a foreign tinge.” This by no means makes a special N. T. dialect or even Jewish-Greek, but it admits a real, though slight, Semitic influence even where it is not “translation Greek.” This position is more nearly in accord with all the facts as we now know them. It is pleasing to find Deissmann (Expositor, Oct., 1907, “Philology of the Greek Bible,” p. 292) rather reacting a bit from the first extreme position. He accents here strongly the influence of the LXX on the N. T. “It is one of the most painful deficiencies of biblical study at the present day that the reading of the LXX has been pushed into the background, while its exegesis has been scarcely even begun.” (Ib., p. 293): “A single hour lovingly devoted to the text of the Septuagint will further our exegetical knowledge of the Pauline Epistles more than a whole day spent over a commentary.” (Ib., p. 294): “This restoration of the Greek Bible to its own epoch is really the distinctive feature of the work of modern scholarship.” That hits the point. We cordially agree with his remark (Expositor, Nov., 1907, p. 435) that the Semiticisms of the Greek Bible do not place the N. T. outside of the scope of Greek philology, but are merely its birth-marks. In the Dec. (1907) Expositor (p. 520) Deissmann comments feelingly on the fact that the LXX “has served the Christian Church of Anatolia in unbroken continuity down to the present day.”

[Page 94] (c) LITTLE DIRECT HEBREW INFLUENCE. The Hebrew was not a living language any longer. Less than half of the O. T. quotations1 in the N. T. are from the Hebrew text. It was still read in most of the synagogues of Palestine and it is possible that a modernized Hebrew was in use to some extent for literary purposes.2 Perhaps the Hebrew text was consulted by the N. T. writers who used it much as a modern minister refers to his Greek Testament. The reading of the Hebrew O. T. would give one dignity of style and simplicity of expression. The co-ordination of clauses so common in the Hebrew is not confined to the Hebrew, but is certainly in marked contrast with the highly developed system of subordinate sentences of the Greek. But this paratactic construction is partly Hebraic and partly colloquial. The total absence of extended indirect discourse is a case in point also. Compare the historical books of the N. T. with Xenophon and Thucydides. Likewise the frequent use of καί and the sparing use of particles may be mentioned. The pleonastic use of pronouns like ηῆν οὖσας δόναται κλάσαι αὐτήν (Rev. 3:8) finds an occasional parallel (Moulton) in the papyri, but none the less its frequency in the N. T. is due to the Hebrew. The same remark applies to the effort to express in Greek the Hebrew infinitive absolute by the participle, as βλέποντες βλέπετε (Mt. 13:14), or the instrumental, as χαρᾷ χαίρεται (Jo. 3:29). Both of these constructions are found in the Greek, but with far less frequency. The use of προστίθημι with an infinitive for repetition, as προσέθη εἰς τρίτον πέμψατα (Lu. 20:12) is in evident imitation of the Hebrew ηῇ. Εἰ列为 does not mean οὐ as in εἰ δοθήσεται σμήνων (Mk. 8:12), but is aposiopesis, the apodosis not being expressed.

1 Swete, Intr. to the O. T. in Gk., 1900, pp. 381–405.
2 Schürer, Jew. Peo. in Times of Ch., div. II, vol. I, p. 10. “Hebrew also continued to be the language of the learned, in which even the legal discussions of the scribes were carried on.”
This use is in the papyri. Ὠ-πάς in the sense of ὀὐδεὶς is due to the LXX translation of מְלָכַת, though Moulton (p. 246) has found in the papyri ἐκνευ and χωρίς so used with πάς.

The use of ῥῆμα, in the sense of ἑνὶ ὀνήματι ‘thing’ is a Hebraism after the LXX. The classic Greek already has λόγος in this sense. Πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν κύριος is a clear Hebraism. Προσωπολημπτέω first appears in the N. T. So also is ὅρθοσκειν ἐνόημον τινος rather than ὅρθοσκειν τινι a Hebraism. Cf. the circumlocutions πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὕτου (Acts 13:24) rather than the simple πρὸ αὕτου. The frequent use of the article in address, though occasional in Greek, [Page 95] is like the Hebrew and Aramaic vocative. The common use of ἦν or ἐστι and the participle suits both the Hebrew and the analytic tendency of the κοινή. Cf. the more frequent use of the instrumental ἐν. So the frequent construction ἐναι εἰς is due to ἐν in Hebrew, though in itself not out of harmony with the Greek genius. It occurs in the papyri. Ἀπὸ προσώπου=ἀπὸ μέριμνα and πρὸ προσώπου=πλὴν are both Hebraisms. The use of διδόναι in the sense of τιθέναι is due to τίνα having both senses (Thackeray, Gr. of the O. T. in Gk., p. 39); cf. Deut. 28:1, δόσω σε ὑπεράνω. So ἠμέραι takes the flavour of the Hebrew εἰμι, and εἰρήνη is used in salutation like πράσιν. The superfluous pronoun calls for notice also. The frequency of ἐν τῷ with the infinitive is due to ἐν. So also οὗς occurs in some Hebraistic senses like ἔν σε, but the papyri have some examples of οὗς for ‘quality,’ ‘characteristic.’ Thackeray (p. 42) notes the Hebrew fondness for “physiognomical expressions” like δοθαλμός, πρόσωπον, στόμα, χέρι, πούς, etc. The increased use of ὄνηρ and ὄνθρωπος like ὑψίζω rather than τίς, πάς, ἔκατος must be observed. The very extensive use of prepositions is accentuated by the Hebrew. Καὶ ἐγένετο translates γένετο. The use of a question to express wish is like the Hebrew idiom (cf. 2 Kgs. 18:33). But these constructions are doubtless due to the LXX rather than to Hebrew itself. It is not possible to give in clear outline the influence of the Hebrew Bible on the N. T. apart from the LXX and the Aramaic, though there was a little of just that kind. Kennedy 1 gives thirteen words common to the LXX and the N. T. (Thackeray, Gr., pp. 31 ff., gives a list of “Hebraisms in Vocabulary”) and counts “twenty Hebrew and Aramaic words which do not occur in the LXX, e.g. γιάζων, μαμωνᾶς, σκακά, ὡσαννά.” The words in the N. T. known to be Hebrew and not Aramaic are as follows: ἀβαδδών=ἀβαδδῶν; ἀλληλουία=αλληλουία; ἀμήν=ἀμήν; ἀρμαγεδδών=ἀρμαγεδδῶν; ἀρραβών=ἀραβῶν; βῆστα=βηστά; βεσσαλιβουβόβ=βουβόβ; βοανηρός=βοανηρός (cf. Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 49); βύσσος=βυσσός (cf. also βύσσον); ἐβραίστη from ἐβραίστη ἢ λείη=λείπει (MSS. Mt. 27:46); κάμμυλος=καμμύλος; ιουδαίως, ιουδαίσκως, ιουδαίος=יודֵּהַה; κορβάν=כְּרַבָּנ; κύμινον=κู่מִנ; λίβανος=לָבֵנָה, μάνα=מָנָה; μορφ=מּוּף; πάσχα=פֶּסַח (LXX, but same for Aramaic פסח); ραββί(εί)=רבי; σαβαῶθ=תָּאוֹ; σάββατον=שָּׁבָּת; σאתανᾶς=שַׂטָּן.

1 Sour. of the N. T. Gk., p. 110 f. Cf. Gregory, Prol., etc., p. 102 f., for foreign words in the N. T.
σάπθειρος = סַפִּיר; Σιλωάµ = מְלָכִּי־צֶדֶק; συκάµινος = שִׁקְמָה;
χηρουבί = כְּרוּבִים; ωσανάν = נָא הֹשַׁע (Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 222). Some of
these were already in classical Greek (βυσσός, λίβανος, σάφρειρος). Of
doubtful origin are νάρδος, νίτρον (Jer. 2:22), συκάµινος. This is a fairly complete list
of the Hebrew words in the N. T. The Aramaic words will be given later. There are to
be added, however, the very numerous Hebrew proper names, only a few samples of
which can be given, as ماریام = מִרְיָם; ملکیسیدک = מִלְכִּי־צֶדֶק; 
Σαούλ = שָׁאוּל; κτλ. Deissmann is correct in saying (“Papyri,” Encyc. Bibl.) that
lexical Hebraisms “must be subjected to careful revision,” but these remain.

Certain it is that the bulk of the examples of Hebraisms given by Guillemard
vanish in the light of the papyri and inscriptions. He feared indeed that his book was
“a return to old exploded methods.” It is indeed “exploded” now, for the N. T. is not
“unlike any other Greek, with one single exception, and absolutely unique in its
peculiarities.”1 There are three ways of giving these Semitic words: mere
transliteration and indeclinable, transliteration and declinable, Greek endings to
Aramaic words.

(d) A DEEPER IMPRESS BY THE LXX. It is true that the N. T. at many points has
affinities with the LXX, the “single exception” of Guillemard, but the LXX is not “the
basis of the Christian Greek.”2 In his second volume Viteau began to see that he had
been too extreme in his notion that the N. T. was Hebraized Greek: “The language of
the N. T. is not derived from that of the LXX; it is its sister. It is the same familiar
Greek language which one finds employed in the one or the other. But the Greek of
the LXX has exercised a considerable influence upon that of the N. T.”3 But even in
this volume Viteau overestimates the influence of the LXX on the N. T. Westcott4 had
the old idea that the N. T. language, “both as to its lexicography and as to its
grammar, is based on the language of the LXX.” It is undoubtedly true5 that a very
large proportion of the N. T. [Page 97] words are found in the LXX, but there are
very few words that are found in the N. T. and the LXX and nowhere else.6 Both the

1 Hebr. in the N. T., 1879, p. ix f.
2 Schaff, Comp. to the Gk. Test., p. 23.
3 Sujet, Compl. et Attr., 1896, p. ii.
4 Art. N. T., Smith’s B. D. Helbing in his Gr. der LXX (1907) promises to investigate
the Hebraisms in the second volume (p. iv). But he already sees that προστιθέναι
occurs in the papyri as well as constructions like ἐξ θν… ἐξ αὐτῶν. In general (p.
vii) the LXX shows the same tendency as the rest of the κοινή towards uniformity (the
disappearance of the opt., the superl., the 2d aorist, the middle, etc.). Cf. also Sel.
from the LXX by C. S. (1905) with a brief Gr. of the LXX; Deissmann, Die Anf. der
5 Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 142 f. Cf. Brockelmann, Grundr. der vergl. Gr. der
semit. Spr. (1907).
6 The 150 words out of over (4800) not counting proper names) in the N. T. which
Kennedy (Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 88) gives as “strictly peculiar to the LXX and N. T.”
cut a much smaller figure now. New pap. may remove many from the list that are still
left.
LXX and the N. T. use the current vocabulary. There are indeed numerous theological
terms that have a new meaning in the LXX, and so in the N. T., like ἐθνικότερα, ἀφεσις,
γέννα, ἐκκλησία, κύριος, λόγος, λυτρόν, μονογενής, πενήμα, σωτηρία, χριστός, κτλ.
(See longer list in Swete, Introduction to O. T. in Greek, p. 454.) So also many N. T.
phrases are found in the LXX, like εἰκόν ἡ θεοῦ, ὤσιμοι ἐξωσίας, πρόσωπος πρὸς
πρόσωπον, λαμμάνθει πρόσωπον, ἢ διασπορά, κτλ. (ib.). The O. T. apocryphal books
also are of interest on this point. We have a splendid treatment of the LXX Greek by
Thackeray. He shows “the κοινή basis of LXX Greek,” as to vocabulary, orthography,
accuracy and syntax (pp. 16–25). He notes σσ, τεσσεράκοντα, finds ν movable
before consonants, ναός, νόταιν, πλήρης indeclinable, ὁσεβή, disappearance of μυ-
verbs, ἠλθοσαν, ἠλθα, ἁνεβαιναν, ἑώρακαν, ὅς ἦν, οὐθείς, nominativus pendens,
even in apposition with genitive (cf. Apocalypse), constructio ad sensum, λέγον καὶ
λέγοντες with construction like ἀπιγγέλη λέγοντες, recitative ὁ, neuter plurals with
plural verb, partial disappearance of the superlative and usually in elative sense,
πρῶτος instead of πρότερος, ἐπιτούς, –ον, –ος for all three persons, disappearance
of the optative, great increase of τοῦ and the infinitive, co-ordination of sentences
with κατ, genitive absolute when noun in another case is present, blending of cases,
increase of adverbial phrases and prepositions, ἐμι ἐς, interchange between ἐν and ἐς
(increase of ἐς), etc. See also Psichari (Revue des études juives, 1908, pp. 173–208)
for a discussion of the Semitic influence on the N. T. Greek. The use of ἐμι ἐς occurs
occasionally in the papyri, the inscriptions and κοινη writers, but it is extremely
common in the LXX because of the Hebrew in the realm of syntax the LXX is far
more Hebraistic than the N. T., for it is a translation by Jews who at many points
slavishly follow the Hebrew either from ignorance of the Hebrew or the Greek,
perhaps sometimes a little of both. B in Judges, Ruth, 2–4 Kings, has ἐγὼ ἐμι with
indicative, as ἐγὼ ἐμι καθίσομαι (Judges 6:18). BA in Tobit 5:15 have ἔσομαι
finds this misunderstanding of ἀναιετησιν common in A in Ecclesiastes and six times in 3
Kings. It is the characteristic of Aquila. No such barbarisms as these occur in the N.
T., though the “wearisome iteration of the oblique cases of personal pronouns
answering to the Hebrew suffixes” finds illustration to some extent in the N. T. books,
and the pleonastic use of the pronoun after the Greek relative is due to the fact that
the Hebrew relative is indeclinable. The N. T. does not have such a construction as
ἤρξατο τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν (2 Chron. 3:1), though τοῦ ἐσελθεν έπὶ ἔληκεν (Ac. 10:25)
is as awkward an imitation of the Hebrew infinitive construct. The LXX translators
had great difficulty in rendering the Hebrew tenses into Greek and were often

Psichari

Psichari, J., Essai sur le grec de la Septante (Rev. des études juives, April, 1908).

———, Essais de grammaire historique néo-grecque (1886–1889).

2 Cf. Swete, Intr. to O. T. in Gk., p. 308.
1 Intr. to O. T. in Gk., p. 308.
2 Use should be made of the transl. of Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus, though
they are of much less importance. Cf. Swete, p. 457 f.
3 Swete, ib., p. 307.
whimsical about it. It was indeed a difficult matter to put the two simple Hebrew
timeless tenses into the complicated and highly developed Greek system, and “Vav
conservative” added to the complexity of the problem. Conybeare and Stock, Selections from the LXX, p. 23, doubt if the LXX Greek always had a meaning to the translators, as in Num. 9:10; Deut. 33:10. The LXX Greek is indeed “abnormal Greek,” but it can be understood. Schürer is wrong when he calls it “quite a new language, swarming with such strong Hebraisms that a Greek could not understand it.” It is indeed in places “barbarous Greek,” but the people who spoke the vernacular κοινή could and did make it out. Many of the Hellenistic Jews knew no Hebrew or Aramaic but only the κοινή. The Greek proselyte, like the Ethiopian eunuch, could read it, if he did need a spiritual interpreter. Schürer, who credits the Palestinian Jews with very little knowledge of the current Greek, considers “the ancient anonymous Greek translation of the Scriptures” to be “the foundation of all Judeo-Hellenistic culture.” He is indeed right in contrasting the hardness of Palestinian Pharisaism with the pliable Hellenistic Judaism on the soil of Hellenism. But the Jews felt the Greek spirit (even if they could not handle easily oratio obliqua) not only in the Diaspora, but to a large extent in the cities of Palestine, especially along the coast, in Galilee and in the Decapolis. On the spread of Greek in Palestine see Milligan, N. T. Documents, pp. 39 ff. The prohibition, about the time of the siege of Jerusalem, against a Jew teaching his son Greek, shows that it had previously been done. The quotations in the N. T. from the O. T. show the use of the LXX more frequently than the Hebrew, sometimes the text quoted in the Synoptics is more like that of A than B, sometimes more like Theodotion than the LXX. In the Synoptic Gospels the quotations, with the exception of five in Matthew which are more like the Hebrew, closely follow the LXX. In John the LXX is either quoted or a free rendering of the Hebrew is made. The Acts quotes from the LXX exclusively. The Catholic Epistles use the LXX. The Epistle to the Hebrews “is in great part a catena of quotations from the LXX.” In Paul’s Epistles more than half of the direct quotations follow the LXX. Here also the text of A is followed more often than the text of B. Swete even thinks that the literary form of the N. T. would have been very different but for the LXX. The Apocalypse indeed does not formally quote the O. T., but it is a mass of allusions to the LXX text. It is not certain that the LXX was used in the synagogues of Galilee and Judea, but it is clear that Peter, James, Matthew and Mark, Jewish writers, quote it, and that they represent Jesus as using it. In the Hellenistic synagogues of Jerusalem it would certainly be read. It would greatly facilitate a just conclusion on the general

4 Moulton, Prol., p. 13.
7 Ib., p. 157.
2 Swete, Intr. to O. T. in Gk., p. 395. Cf. Deissmann in Exp. Times, Mar., 1906, p. 254, who points out that Pap. Heid. (cf. Deissmann, Die Sept. Pap., 1905) “assimilates such passages as are cited in the N. T., or are capable of a Christian meaning, as far as possible, to their form in the N. T. text, or to the sphere of Christian thought.” Heinrici shows the same thing to be true of Die Leip. Pap. frag. der Psalmen, 1903.
3 Swete, Intr., etc., p. 402. All these facts about LXX quotations come from Swete.
5 Ib., pp. 29 ff.
relation of the N. T. Greek to the LXX Greek if we had a complete grammar and a
dictionary of the LXX, though we are grateful for the luminous chapter of Swete on
the Greek of the Septuagint in his Introduction to the O. T. in Greek; to Kennedy for
his Sources of N. T. Greek; to Hatch for his Essays in Biblical Greek; to Deissmann
for his Bible Studies and his Philology of the Greek Bible (1908); to Helbing for his
very useful Grammatik, and especially to Thackeray[Page 100] for vol. I of his
Grammar. It is now possible to make intelligent and, to a degree, adequate use of the
LXX in the study of N. T. Greek. The completion of Helbing’s Syntax and of
Thackeray’s Syntax will further enrich N. T. students. The Oxford Concordance of
Hatch and Redpath and the larger Cambridge Septuagint are of great value. Swete
laments that the N. T. grammars have only “incidental references to the linguistic
characteristics of the Alexandrian version.”

The translation was not done all at once, and not by men of Jerusalem, but by
Jews of Alexandria who knew “the patois of the Alexandrian streets and markets.”
One doubts, however, if these translators spoke this mixture of Egyptian κοινή and
Hebrew. On this point Swete differs from most scholars and insists that “the
translators write Greek largely as they doubtless spoke it.” They could not shake off
the Hebrew spell in translation. In free Greek like most of the N. T. the Semitic
influence is far less. Mahaffy was quick to see the likeness between the papyri and the
LXX. But one must not assume that a N. T. word necessarily has the same sense that
it has either in the LXX or the κοινή. The N. T. has ideas of its own, a point to be
considered later. We agree with Swete that the LXX is “indispensable to the study of
the N. T.” Nestle justly remarks that the Greek of the LXX enjoys now a much more

Helbing

HELBING, R., Die Präpos. bei Herodot und andern Historikern (1904).
———, Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre (1907).

Hatch and Redpath HATCH and REDPATH, Concordance to the LXX (1897).
1 Intr., p. 289.
2 lb., p. 9.
3 lb., p. 299.
4 Exp. Times, iii, p. 291.
5 Intr. to O. T. in Gk., p. 450 f. Hitzig, of Heidelberg, used to open his lectures on O.
T. by asking: “Gentlemen, have you a LXX? If not, sell whatever you have and buy a
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Crit. of the N. T. (Tr. 1901).

———, Novum Testamentum Graece. 8th ed. (1910).
———, Septuagint (Hastings’ D. B., 1902).
favourable judgment from philologists than some twenty years ago. Conybeare and Stock (Sel. from the LXX, p. 22) observe that, while the vocabulary of the LXX is that of the market-place of Alexandria, the syntax is much more under the influence of the Hebrew original. The LXX does, of course, contain a few books like 4 Maccabees, written in Greek originally and in the Greek spirit, like Philo’s works. Philo represents the Atticistic revival in Alexandria that was a real factor with a few. But the “genitivus hebraicus,” like ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ὁδίκιας, is paralleled in the papyri and the inscriptions, though not so often as in the LXX. Cf. Radermacher, N. T. Greek, p. 19. So also (p. 21) τοῖς ἔρθειας (Ro. 2:8) is like ἕκ πλήρους in the papyri and already in the tragic poets. Thumb properly takes the side of Deissmann against Viteau’s exaggerated idea of LXX influence (following Hatch). It is not always easy to decide what is due to the use of the LXX and what to the development of the κοινή vernacular. One must have an open mind to light from either direction. Deissmann is clearly right in calling for a scientific investigation of the Hebraisms of the LXX. Even the LXX and N. T. use of ἄρετή (Is. 42:8, 12; 1 Pet. 2:9; 2 Pet. 1:3) is paralleled by an inscription in Caria. We are not then to think of the Jews or the Christians as ever using in speech or literature the peculiar Greek used in the translation of the Hebrew O. T., which in itself varied much in this respect in different parts. The same intense Hebraistic cast appears in the O. T. apocryphal books which were originally in Hebrew and then translated, as Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, 1 Maccabees, etc. Contrast with these the Greek of the Wisdom of Solomon, 2 Maccabees and the Prologue to the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus, and the difference is at once manifest. The Wisdom of Solomon is of special interest, for the author, who wrote in Greek and revealed knowledge of Greek culture, art, science and philosophy, was yet familiar with the LXX and imitated some of its Hebraisms, being a Jew himself. Cf. Siegfried, “Book of Wisdom,” Hastings’ D. B. It must never be forgotten that “by far the greatest contribution of Alexandrian prose to the great literature of the world is this very translation of the O. T.” The name Christ (Χριστός) is found in the LXX “and so the very terms Christian and Christianity arose out of the language employed by the Alexandrian interpreters.” The only Bible known to most of the Jews in the first Christian century was the LXX. The first complete Bible was the Greek Bible. The LXX was the “first Apostle to the Gentiles” and was freely used for


7 Griech. Spr. etc., pp. 128–132.
1 Hell.-Griech., Hauck’s Realencyc., p. 638.
3 Deissmann, B. S., p. 76 ff. He rightly calls attention to the fact that many of the Ptolemaic pap. are contemporary with the LXX and bristle with proof that the LXX on the whole is in the vernac. κοινή of Egypt The Hebraisms came from the Hebrew itself in the act of translating.
4 Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., p. 80.
many centuries by the Christians. Conybeare and Stock (Sel. from the LXX, p. 24) go so far as to say that the N. T. itself would not have been but for the LXX. Certainly it would not [Page 102] have been what it is. “The Bible whose God is Yahweh is the Bible of one people, the Bible whose God is Κύριος is the Bible of the world” (Deissmann, Die Hellen. des Semit. Mon., p. 174).

Thackeray (Grammar of the O. T. in Greek, pp. 25–55) gives a careful survey of the “Semitic Element in the LXX Greek.” He admits that the papyri have greatly reduced the number of the Hebraisms heretofore noted in the LXX. He denies, however (p. 27), that the Greek of the LXX gives “a true picture of the language of ordinary intercourse between Jewish residents in the country.” He denies also any influence of the Hebrew on the vernacular Greek of the Jews in Alexandria outside of the vocabulary of special Jewish words like άκροβοστία. He thinks (p. 28) the Book of Tobit the best representative of the vernacular Greek of the Jews. There are more transliterations like γειώρας for Aramaic נֵוְרָא (Heb. נֵוְרָא) in the later books where the early books had πάροικος or προσήλυτος. The fact of a translation argues for a fading of the Hebrew from the thought of the people. In the early books the translation is better done and “the Hebraic character of these books consists in the accumulation of a number of just tolerable Greek phrases, which nearly correspond to what is normal and idiomatic in Hebrew” (p. 29). But in the later books the Hebraisms are more numerous and more marked, due to “a growing reverence for the letter of the Hebrew” (p. 30). We cannot follow in detail Thackeray’s helpful sketch of the transliterations from the Hebrew, the Hellenized Semitic words, the use of words of like sound, Hebrew senses in Greek words like δίδωµι=τίθηµι after נָתַן, υἱὸς ἀδίκιας, ὀφθαλµός, πρόσωπον, στόµα, χείρ, the pleonastic pronoun, extensive use of prepositions, καὶ ἔγένετο, ἐν for accompaniment or instrument, etc.

(e) ARAMAISMS. N. T. grammars have usually blended the Aramaic with the Hebrew influence. Schmiedel1 complains that the Aramaisms have received too little attention. But Dalman2 retorts that Schmiedel himself did not do the matter justice, and still less did Blass. Moulton3 recognizes the distinction as just and shows that Aramaisms are found chiefly in Mark and Matthew, but does not point out the exact character of the Aramaisms in question. We take it as proved that Jesus and the Apostles, like most of their Jewish contemporaries in Palestine who moved in public life, spoke both Aramaic and Greek and read Hebrew [Page 103] (cf. Lu. 4:17). Even Schürer4 admits that the educated classes used Greek without difficulty. There is no doubt about the Aramaic. Jerome says that all the Jews of his time knew the Hebrew O. T. The LXX disproves that, but Hebrew was used in the schools and synagogues of Palestine and was clearly read by many. The discourses of Jesus do not give the impression that he grew up in absolute seclusion, though he undoubtedly used the Aramaic in conversation and public address on many occasions if not as a rule.2 The

1 W.-Sch., Gr., § 2, 1 c. And Dalman (Words of Jesus, p. 18 f.) criticizes Schmiedel for not distinguishing Aramaisms from Hebraisms.
2 Words of Jesus, p. 18.
3 Prol., p. 8.
2 Dalman, Words of Jesus, pp. 9, 11; Ch. I, § IV, (i) 4, for full discussion.
Aramaic tongue is very old and its use as a diplomatic tongue (Is. 36:11) implies perhaps a previous Aramaic leadership. There was a literary as well as a vernacular Aramaic. The Aramaic portions of Daniel, Ezra, the Targum of Onkelos are in the literary Aramaic. Dalman suggests that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in the Judean literary Aramaic rather than the Galilean vernacular, but the reason is not very apparent. Zahn doubts the validity of Dalman’s distinction between a Judean and a Galilean Aramaic, but Peter was recognized in Jerusalem by the Galilean pronunciation (Mt. 26:73). The Galileans had difficulty with the gutturals and ψ.

This Aramaic is not to be confounded with the later Christian Aramaic or Syriac into which the N. T. was translated. The Aramaic spoken in Palestine was the West Aramaic, not the East Aramaic (Babylonia). So keenly does Dalman feel the difference between Hebraisms and Aramaisms that he avers that “the Jewish Aramaic current among the people was considerably freer from Hebrew influence than the Greek which the Synoptists write.” Not many can go with him in that statement. But he is right in insisting on a real difference, though, as a matter of fact, no great point was made about it at the time. With Josephus ἡ πάτριος γλῶσσα was the Aramaic (B. J. pr. § 1; v. 6, § 3; [Page 104] v. 9, § 2). He wrote his War originally in the native tongue for τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις. John (5:2; 19:13, 17, 20; Rev. 9:11; 16:16) uses Ἑβραϊκός in the sense of the Aramaic. So Luke has Ἡ Ἑβραῖς διάλεκτος (Ac. 21:40; 22:2; 26:14). The people understood Paul’s Greek, but they gave the more heed when he dropped into Aramaic. 4 Macc. (12:7; 16:15) likewise employs Ἑβραῖς φωνή. The two kinds of Jewish Christians are even called (Ac. 6:1) Ἑλληνισταί and Ἑβραῖοι, though Ἑλληνισταί and Συρισταί would have been a more exact distinction. It is beyond controversy that the gospel message was told largely in Aramaic, which to some extent withstood the influx of Greek as the vernacular did in Lycaonia. One cannot at this point discuss the Synoptic problem. It is not certain that Luke, probably a gentile, knew either Aramaic or Hebrew, though there is a real

3 D. S. Margoliouth, Lang. of the O. T., Hast. D. B.
4 Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 80.
5 Ib., p. 81.
Zahn

ZAHN, TH., Einl. in das N. T. Bd. I (1906), II (1907).


6 Einl. in das N. T., I, 1897, p. 19.
8 Meyer, Jesu Mutterspr., 1896, p. 58 f. Some of the Lat. monks actually thought that Jesus spoke Lat. and that the N. T. was written in that tongue! But Meyer (ib., p. 63 f.) will not allow that Jesus knew Gk. Chase, on the other hand, shows that Peter necessarily spoke Gk. on the Day of Pentecost (Credibility of the Acts, 1902, p. 114).
9 Words of Jesus, p. 42.
1 Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 7.
2 Schwyzzer, Weltspr. etc., p. 27.
Semitic influence on part of the Gospel and Acts, due, Dalman holds, to the LXX example and a possible Aramaic or Hebrew original for the opening chapters of the Gospel, already put into Greek. Hence the Aramaic original of Mark, Bousset argues, cannot be considered as proved. He rightly insists, as against Wellhausen, that the question is not between the classic Greek and Aramaic, but between the vernacular κοινή and Aramaic. But whatever is or is not true as to the original language of Mark and of Matthew, the gospel story was first told largely in Aramaic. The translation of the Aramaic expressions in Mark proves this beyond all doubt, as ταλειθά, κούµ by τô κοράσιον, ἔγειρε (Mk. 5:41). Dalman indeed claims that every Semitism in the N. T. should first be looked upon as an Aramaism unless it is clear that the Aramaic cannot explain it. The Mishna (Neo-Hebraic) was not itself unaffected by the Greek, for the Mishna has numerous Greek words and phrases that were current in the Aramaic. The Aramaisms of vocabulary that one can certainly admit in the N. T. are the following words: ἀββά = אַבָּא; ἀκελδαμάχ = נַקְרָבָא; ἀκελδαμάχ = דְּמָא חֲקֵל; all words beginning with βαρ = בַּר like Βαρνάβας; ἄκελδαμ = דְּמָא חֲקֵל; Βαβαθά = חֶסְדָּא בֵּית; Βεελζαθά, Βηθζαθά = זַיְתָא בֵּית; Γαββαθά = גַּבְּתָא; γέεννα = הִגּם נֵּיא; Γολγοθά = לְגָּלְתָּאגָּ; ἐλωΐ, ἐλωΐ, λαµα = σαβαχθανεί (or probably Heb. אֵלִי = ηλα, and the rest Aramaic, Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 53 f.) = שְׁבַקְחַּנִי λְמָא אֶלָהִי אֶלָהִי; ἐφφαθά = אֶתְפָּתַח; κορβανᾶς = קוּרְבָּנָא; κορβανᾶς = מָאמוֹנָא; κορβανᾶς = מָרָנָא; Μεσσίας = מְשִׁיחָא; πάσχα = פַּסְחָא; φαρίσαῖος = פְּרִישַׁיָא; ῥαββί = רַיקָא; ῥαββί = רַיקָא; ῥαββί, εἰς = רִבּוֹנִי; ῥαββί, εἰς = רִבּוֹנִי; ῥαββί, εἰς = רִבּוֹנִי; ῥαββί, εἰς = רִבּוֹנִי; ῥαββί, εἰς = רִבּוֹנִי; οὖν = εί; ῥαββί, εἰς = רִבּוֹנִי; οὖν = εί; ῥαββί, εἰς = רִבּוֹנִי; οὖν = εί; ῥαββί, εἰς = רִבּוֹנִי; οὖν = εί; ῥαββί, εἰς = רִבּוֹنִי; παῦλος = פַּוּלָא; ἐκορυφασμός = ποιείν καρπόν; ἀποκαθίστασις = συμβούλων.

Aramaisms of syntax are seen in the following. The expression γεύεσθαι θανάτου seems to be in imitation of the Aramaic. Wellhausen (Einl. in die drei Evang., pp. 31 ff.) suggests that εἷς καθεὶς εἷς (Mk. 14:19) is a hybrid between the Aramaic εַחְזֵי but this is an old Greek idiom) and the vernacular (κοινή) καθεὶς εἷς. He suggests also that Aramaic meanings are found in such words as σώζειν, ποιείν καρπόν, συμβούλων.

5 Einl. in die drei Evang., §§ 2–4.
6 Words of Jesus, p. 19; cf. also Schaff, Comp. to the Gk. N. T., p. 28. In 1877 Dr. John A. Broadus said in lecture (Sum. of the Leading Peculiarities of N. T. Gk. Gr., Immer’s Hermen., p. 378) that the N. T. Gk. had a “Hebrew and Aramaic tinge which arises partly from reading Hebrew and chiefly (so his own correction) from speaking Aramaic.” If instead of Hebrew he had said LXX, or had added LXX to Hebrew, he would not have missed it far.
ποιεῖν (διδόναι), εἱρήνη, εἱρήνην διδόναι, ὁδὸς θεοῦ, πλήρωμα, etc. As already explained, apart from the question of a possible original Aramaic Mark and an original Aramaic Matthew and Aramaic sources for the early chapters of Luke and the first twelve chapters of Acts, many of the discourses of Christ were undoubtedly in Aramaic. There was translation then from this Aramaic spoken (or written) gospel story into the vernacular κοινή as we now have it in large portions of the Synoptic Gospels and possibly part of Acts. The conjectural efforts to restore this Aramaic original of the words of Jesus are suggestive, but not always convincing. On the whole subject of Semitic words in the Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser, Grammatik, pp. 40–42. The list includes ἥρ(ψ)αβών, βόσσος, κύμινος, λίβανος, συκάμινος, χιτών. It is not a very long list indeed, but shows that the Orient did have some little influence on the Greek vocabulary. These words occur in older Greek writers.

[Page 106] (f) VARYING RESULTS. It is natural that different writers in the N. T. should diverge in the amount of Semitic influence manifest in their writings. They all used the vernacular κοινή which in itself may have had a very faint trace of Semitic influence. But of the nine authors of the N. T. six were probably Palestinian Jews. Now these six writers (Mark, Matthew, James, Peter, Jude, John) are just the very ones who reveal the Semitic mould of thought. It is often merely the Hebrew and Aramaic spirit and background. In Mark the Aramaic influence appears; in Matthew the LXX is quoted along with the Hebrew, and Aramaisms occur also; in James there is the stately dignity of an O. T. prophet with Aramaic touches (cf. his address and letter in Ac. 15) but with many neat turns of Greek phrase and idiom; Peter’s two letters present quite a problem and suggest at least an amanuensis in one case or a different one for each letter (cf. Biggs, Int. and Crit. Comm.); Jude is very brief, but is not distinctly Hebraic or Grecian; John in his Gospel is free from minor Semitisms beyond the frequent use of καί like ἃ, but the tone of the book is distinctly that of a noble Jew and the sum total of the impression from the book is Semitic, while the Apocalypse has minor Hebraisms and many grammatical idiosyncrasies to be discussed later, many of which remind one of the LXX. If the absence of the optative be taken as a test, even when compared with the vernacular κοινή, Matthew, James and John do not use it at all, while Mark has it only once and Jude twice. Peter indeed has it four times and Hebrews only once, but Luke uses the optative 28 times and Paul 31. The remaining three writers (Paul, Luke, author of Hebrews) were not Palestinian Jews. Paul was a Hellenistic Jew who knew his vernacular κοινή well and spoke Aramaic and read Hebrew. His Epistles are addressed chiefly to gentile Christians and naturally show little Semitic flavour, for he did not have to translate his ideas from Aramaic into Greek. In some of his speeches, especially the one delivered in Aramaic, as reported by Luke in Ac. 22, a trace of the Semitic point of view is retained. In contrast with Ac. 22 note Paul’s address on the Areopagus in 17. The author of Hebrews makes abundant use of the LXX but exhibits possible Alexandrian origin or training, and it is not clear that he knew either Hebrew or Aramaic. Luke presents something of a problem, for he seems to have had Aramaic sources in Lu. 1

1 Swete, Intr. to the O. T. in Gk., p. 381.
2 Dalman (Wds. of Jes., p. 42) thinks that the Heb. of Mt. are due to the LXX.
1 Biesenthal (Das Trostschreiben des Ap. Paulus an d. Heb., 1878) even thinks that the Ep. was written in Aram. or Heb.
and 2 (possibly also Ac. 1–12), while it is uncertain whether he was familiar with the Aramaic. There seems little evidence that he knew Hebrew. Blass\(^2\) thinks that he may have read his Aramaic sources or had them translated for him. Curiously enough, though a gentile and capable of writing almost classic Attic (Lu. 1:1–4), yet Luke uses Semitisms not common elsewhere in the N. T. Dalman\(^3\) shows that the genuine Hebraisms in Luke like λόγους in sense of things (9:28 but classical authority for this exists), διὰ στόµατος (1:70) are due to the LXX, not the Hebrew. The use of ἐν τῷ with the infinitive occurs 34 times in Luke, 8 in Acts, twice in Mark, thrice in Matthew, 4 in Paul, 4 in Heb.\(^4\) See ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τῶν Ἰησοῦν (Lu. 8:40). Blass calls this an Aramaism.\(^5\) But it is not a peculiarity of the discourses of Jesus, as it is found there only in ἐν τῷ σπείρειν (common to all the Synoptics, Mk. 4:4; Mt. 13:4; Lu. 8:5), and in Lu. 10:35; 19:15. Hence the idiom is common\(^6\) in Luke from some other cause. The construction occurs in “classical historians, in Polybius and in papyri,”\(^7\) but is most common in the LXX, and the parallel is wanting in the spoken Aramaic. Luke also freely uses καὶ ἐγένετο (almost peculiar to him in the N. T.), which at once suggests וַיְהִי. He doubtless got this from the LXX.\(^8\) He has three constructions, viz. καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ ἠλθέ, καὶ ἐγένετο ἠλθέ and καὶ ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν. The first two\(^9\) are common in the LXX, while ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν is due to the Greek vernacular\(^10\) as the papyri testify. The superfluous ἠφείς, ἠρξατο, etc., are Aramaisms, while ἐλθεῖν and the participle is Aramaic, like the Hebrew, and also in harmony with

2 Philol. of the Gosp., p. 205.
4 Dalman, Wds. of Jes., p. 33.
Blass


———, Die griech. Beredsamkeit von Alex. bis auf August. (1865).

———, Die Rhythmen der asianischen und römischen Kunstprosa (1905).


———, Evangelium sec. Lukam (1897).

5 Evang. sec. Lucam, p. xxii. But ἐν τῷ with the inf. occurs with great frequency in the LXX, 555 times in the O. T., Apoc. and N. T. (Votaw, Inf. in Bib. Gk., p. 20), chiefly in the LXX (455 times, only 55 in the N. T.). It occurs nearly as often in the LXX as all other prepositions with the infinitive together.
6 Dalman, Wds. of Jes., p. 34.
7 Moulton, Prol., p. 14 (1st ed.).
8 W.-M., p. 760 note.
9 Cf. Thackeray, Gr., pp. 50 ff. We have the type ἐγένετο ἠλθεῖ 145 times, and ἐγένετο καὶ ἠλθεῖ 269 times in the LXX, but ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν only once (1 Kgs. 11:43 B).
10 Moulton, Prol., p. 17.
the analytic vernacular κοινή. Nestle\textsuperscript{11} agrees with Blass (p. 131) in taking ὁμολογεῖν ἐν in Mt. 10:32=Lu. 12:8 as a Syrism. ב with ἡθήσεται is not in the Hebrew, nor ὁμόλογ. ἐν in the LXX, but דְבָה is used with ב in the Jewish-Aramaic and Christian-Syriac. Nestle refers to ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι (Heb. 13:15) as a Hebraism, for in such a case the Hebrew used ד. The LXX and the Aramaic explain all the Semitisms in Luke. Dalman\textsuperscript{1} ventures to call the LXX Hebraisms in Luke “Septuagint-Græcisms” and thinks that the same thing is true of the other Synoptists. Certainly it is proper to investigate\textsuperscript{2} the words of Jesus from the point of view of the peculiarities of style in each reporter of them. But, after all is said, the Semitisms in the N. T. Greek, while real and fairly numerous in bulk, cut a very small figure in comparison with the entire text. One can read whole pages in places with little suggestion of Semitic influence beyond the general impress of the Jewish genius and point of view.

\textsuperscript{11} Zeitschr. für neutest. Wiss., 1906, p. 279 f.
\textsuperscript{1} Wds. of Jes., p. 41.
\textsuperscript{2} Ib., p. 72.
IV. Latinisms and Other Foreign Words. Moulton\textsuperscript{3} considers it “hardly worth while” to discuss Latin influence on the \textit{κοινή} of the N. T. Blass\textsuperscript{4} describes the Latin element as “clearly traceable.” Swete\textsuperscript{5} indeed alleges that the vulgar Greek of the Empire “freely adopted Latin words and some Latin phraseology.” Thumb\textsuperscript{6} thinks that

Moulton


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

3 Prol., p. 20.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 4.
Swete


———, The Apocalypse of St. John (1906).

———, The O. T. in Greek according to the Septuagint (1887). 3 vols.

5 Comm. on Mk., 1898, p. xliv.
Thumb

they are “not noteworthy.” In spite of the conservative character of the Greek language, it yet incorporated Latin civil and military terms with freedom. Inasmuch as Judea was a Roman province, some allusion to Roman customs and some use of Latin military and official terms was to be expected,7 though certainly not to the extent of Romanizing or Latinizing the language. Cicero8 himself described Latin as provincial in comparison with the Greek. Latin words are fairly common in the Mishna.9 Latin names were early naturalized into the Greek vernacular and in the N. T. we find such Roman names as Aquila, Cornelius, Claudia, Clemens, Crescens, Crispus, Fortunatus, Julia, Junia, Justus, Linus, Lucius, Luke, Mark, Niger, Paul, Priscilla, Publius, Pudens, Rufus, Sergius, Silvanus (Silas), Tertius, Titus among the Christians themselves (Jewish and gentile), while Agrippa, Augustus (translated Σεβαστός), Cæsar, Claudius, Gallio, Felix, Festus, Julius, Nero (Text. Rec.), Pilate, Tertullus are typical Roman names. Note the Roman cities mentioned in Ac. 28, Cæsarea and Tiberias in Palestine. More than forty Latin names of persons and places occur in the N. T. The other Latin words, thirty (or thirty-one), are military, judicial, monetary or domestic terms. They come into the N. T. through the vernacular κοινή, none of them appearing in the LXX and but two in Polybius. “Plutarch uses Latin words more frequently than Polybius, none of them appearing in the LXX and but two in Polybius. ‘Plutarch uses Latin words more frequently than Polybius, but for the most part not those employed in the N. T.’”1

Jannaris2 observes that “the Roman administration, notwithstanding its surrendering to Greek culture and education, did not fail to influence the Greek language.” But in the N. T. only these Latin words are found: ἀσσάριον (as), δηνάριον (denarius), ——, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


6 Griech. Spr. etc., p. 152.
7 Hoole, Class. Element in the N. T., p. 4.

1 Burton, Notes on N. T. Gr., 1904, p. 15.

Jannaris

JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).

———, On the True Meaning of the Κοινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

ἔχω = aestimo (ἔχε με παρητημένον, Lu. 14:18), εὐρακύλων, θριαμβεύειν, κεντορίων (centurio), κῆνσος (census), κοδράντες (quadrans), κολωνία (colonia), κουστοδία (custodia), λεγίων (legio), λέγιον (lignum), λιβερτίνος (libertinus), λίτρα (libra), μάκελλον (macellum), μεμβράνα (membrana), μίλιον (mille), μόδιος (modius), ξέστης (sextarius), πραιτώριον (praetorium), σκάριος (sicarius), σικάριος (sicarius), σιμμίκθινος (semicinctium), σουδάριον (sudarium), σπεκουλάτωρ (speculator), αἱ ταβέρναι (taberna), τίτλος (titulus), φελόνης (paenula), φόρον (forum), φραγέλλιον (flagellum), φραγελλόω (flagello), χάρτης (? charta), χῶρος (corus). This is at most (31) not a formidable list. A few Latin phrases occur like ἐργασίαν δοῦναι (operam dare), τὸ ἱκανὸν λαμβάνειν (satis accipere), τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιεῖν (satis facere), συναίρειν (consilium capere). But Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, p. 117 f.) notes the use of ἐργασίαν δίδωσι (cf. Lu. 12:57). So συναίρει λόγον (Mt. 18:23 f.) occurs in two papyri letters of 2d cent. A lead tablet at Amorgus shows κρίνω τὸ δίκαιον (cf. Lu. 12:57). So συναίρει λόγον (Mt. 18:23 f.) occurs in two papyri letters of 2d cent. A.D. (Moulton, The Expositor, April, 1901, p. 274 f.). Thayer calls attention also to σὺ δψη (Mt. 27:4) as [Page 110] being Deissmann

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

Thayer

THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).
like *videris*. So also ὁψεσθε αὐτοί (Ac. 18:15). Grimm\(^1\) considers λαμβάνειν in Jo. 5:34, 41 equal to *capto* ("to catch at"). The majority of these instances occur in Mark and Matthew, Mark using more Latinisms than any other N. T. writer. Too much, however, cannot be argued from this point.\(^2\) There are besides such adjectives as Ἡρωδιανοι, Χριστιανοι, Φιλιππήσιοι, which are made after the Latin model.

Blass\(^3\) thinks that the syntax shows a greater Latin influence, but admits that it is difficult to tell the difference between native development in the Greek and a possible Latin bent. It is indeed difficult to speak with decision on this point. Ultimately Greek and Latin had great influence on each other, but at this stage the matter is at least too doubtful to appeal to with confidence.\(^4\) Paul indeed may have spoken in Latin at Lystra, according to Prof. Ramsay.\(^5\) Thayer\(^6\) indeed gives a longer list of Latin syntactical influences on N. T. Greek, but not all of them are certain. The anticipatory position of ἀπό and πρό in expressions of time and place, as πρὸ ἐξ ἡμέρας (Jo. 12:1), is a possible Latinism, though only of the secondary sort, since the Doric and the Ionic use this construction occasionally and the κοινή frequently (cf. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 101). Cf. also μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας (Ac. 1:5).\(^7\) The increased use of the subjunctive rather than the optative after a past tense of the indicative is a necessary result of the disappearance of the optative rather than a Latinism. The alleged blending of present perfect and aorist might [Page 111] be a Latinism, but it is

\(^1\) Gk.-Eng. Lex. of the N. T.
\(^3\) Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 4.

Ramsay

———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

3 Lang. of the N. T., Hast. D. B. Cf. also C. Wessely, Die lat. Elem. in der Gräc. der ägypt. Papyrusurk., Wien. Stud., 24 (1902). On the whole subject see L. Lafoscade, Infl. du Lat. sur le Grec, pp. 83–158. Ὄικανὸν ποιεῖν is as old as Polybius (Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 101). Cf. also μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας (Ac. 1:5).\(^7\) The increased use of the subjunctive rather than the optative after a past tense of the indicative is a necessary result of the disappearance of the optative rather than a Latinism. The alleged blending of present perfect and aorist might [Page 111] be a Latinism, but it is

Ramsay, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).

5 Exp., Sept., 1905, and March, 1906. “As his father, and possibly also his grandfather, had possessed the Roman citizenship, the use of Latin speech and names was an inheritance in the family” (Ramsay, Exp., Aug., 1906, p. 160). Cf. also Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies (1906, p. 65), where he says it is “certain” that he spoke the Latin language. So holds Alex. Souter (Did Paul Speak Latin?, Exp., April, 1911). At Iconium "a certain affectation of speaking Latin was fashionable." Moulton also thinks that Paul preached in Lat. at Lystra, since the earliest inscriptions there are Lat. (Prol., p. 233).

6 Lang. of the N. T., Hast. D. B.

7 On this matter of time see Schulze, Graeca Lat., pp. 13 ff.
at least doubtful if that is found in the N. T. The use of ὃτι and ἵνα rather than the infinitive follows naturally as the infinitive vanishes, but it is parallel to the growing use of ut with rogo, etc. Ἀπό and the ablative after φυλάσσειν may be due to cavere ab or to the general analytic tendency to express the preposition with the case (cf. the Hebrew also). Other smaller details are the absence of ὦ with the vocative, σὺν as equal to καί, δεῖ καὶ οὕτως (qui=et hic), γαμέω with dative=nubere alicui, infinitive alone with κελεύω. There is no evidence that the absence of the article in Latin had any influence on the vernacular κοινή, though Schmid1 thinks he sees it in the irregular use of the article in Ἀειλιαν. It is interesting in this connection to note the development in the vernacular Latin as represented in the Old Latin and the Vulgate versions. Unusual cases are used with many verbs; prepositions are much more frequent; the indicative with final ut and in indirect questions; common use of quia and quoniam like quod with verb rather than the accusative and infinitive; ille, ipse, hic is, more like the article, as the later Italian il, Spanish el, French le.2

Other foreign words had, of course, entered the κοινή or the earlier Greek, like βουνός (Cyrenaic and Sicilian); ἑδονή (Gallic or Celtic); ἄγγαρεύω (even Ἀσκῆλυς), γάζα, παράδεισος, σανδάλιον (Persian); χιτών (Oriental); κράβαττος (cf. Latin grabatus), παρεβολή, βύθις (Macedonian); ὠραβόν, κυνάμωμον, κυμίμον, μνᾶ (Phœnician); βαΐον, βίβλος, βύσσος, σίναπι, σινδών (Egyptian or Semitic?); ζιζάνιον (Arabic?). On the Egyptian words in the Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser, Grammatik, pp. 35–40; on the Persian words, ib., p. 42 ff., including γάζα and παράδεισος. Σίναπι is of uncertain origin. But Greek was known in all parts of the Roman Empire except parts of North Africa and the extreme west of Europe. There were great libraries in Alexandria, Pergamum and elsewhere. Schools were numerous and excellent. But none the less the mass of the people were βάρβαροι to the real Greeks and inevitably brought laxities into the vernacular. Cf. Radermacher, N. T. Gr., pp. 9 ff., who gives a good discussion of the Latinisms in κοινή writers.

Page 112 V. The Christian Addition. But was there a Christian addition if there was no separate biblical Greek, not to say a special Christian Greek? Winer1

Schmid SCHMID, W., Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern. 4 Bde. (1887–1897). 1 Atticismus etc., p. 64. Cf. Georgi, De Latinismis N. T., iii, Vita, 1733.
Winer

WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).
admitted “religious technical terms” in the Christian sense, but thought that “the subject scarcely lies within the limits of philological inquiry.” Blass has nothing to say on the subject. But even Deissmann insisted that “the language of the early Christians contained a series of religious terms peculiar to itself, some of which it formed for the first time,” but he added that this enrichment did not extend to the “syntax.” Once more hear Deissmann: “Christianity, like any other new movement affecting civilization, must have produced an effect upon language by the formation of new ideas and the modification of old ones.” Moulton sounds a note of warning when he says that “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…The N. T. must still be studied largely by light drawn from itself.” Westcott indeed thinks the subject calls for “the most careful handling” in order to avoid Jewish usage on the one hand and the later ecclesiastical ideas on the other. This is obviously true. Connect the discussion of the Semitic influence on the N. T. with this point and recall the revolutionary effect that Christianity had upon the Greek language in the ecclesiastical Greek of the Byzantine period, and the difficulty will be appreciated. Mahaffy does not hesitate to say that the main cause of the persistence of Greek studies to-day is due to the fact that the Gospels are written in Greek. “Greek conquered Jew and Jew conquered Greek and the world inherited the legacy of their struggle through Roman hands.” Under the influence of Christianity some of the old heathen vocabulary vanished and the remaining stock “was now considerably reduced and modified in a Christian and modern spirit.” The N. T. became the standard for ecclesiastical Greek as the Attic had been for the ancient world.

1 W.-M., p. 36.
2 B. S., p. 65 (note).
5 Westcott WESTCOTT, B. F., Language of the N. T. (Smith’s B. D.).
6 Smith’s D. B., art. N. T.
7 Mahaffy

———, Greek Life and Thought (1896).
———, Progress of Hellenism in Alexander’s Empire (1905).
———, The Greek World under Roman Sway (1890).
———, What Have the Greeks Done for Civilization? (1909).

6 The Gk. World under Rom. Sway, 1890, p. 389 f. Butcher, Harv. Lect. on Gk. Subj., 1894, p. 2 f., calls the power of Jew and Gk. on modern life one of “the mysterious forces of the spirit.” “Each entered on a career of world-wide empire, till at length the principles of Hellenism became those of civilization itself, and the religion of Judea that of civilized humanity.”

7 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 10 f.
Winer\(^1\) indeed curtly says: “To attempt to explain such expressions of the apostolical terminology by quotations from Greek authors is highly absurd.” Rutherford\(^2\) almost despairs of understanding N. T. Greek as well as “classical Greek,” since it contains so many alien elements, “but it has at least begun to be studied from the proper point of view,” though he overestimates the difficulty and the difference when he speaks of “the singular speech in which the oracles of God are enshrined.” On the other hand\(^3\) we must not let the papyri make us swing so far away from the old “biblical” Greek idea as to imagine that we can find in the vernacular κοινή all that Christianity has to offer. The Christian spirit put a new flavour into this vernacular κοινή and lifted it to a new elevation of thought and dignity of style that unify and glorify the language. This new and victorious spirit, which seized the best in Jew and Greek, knew how to use the Greek language with freedom and power.\(^4\) If the beauty of the N. T. writings is different from the ancient standard, there is none the less undoubted charm. Matthew Arnold put the Gospels at the acme of simplicity and winsomeness, and Renan spoke of Luke’s Gospel as the most beautiful book in the world. Norden\(^5\) admits that the N. T. style is less exclusive and more universal. There was indeed a compromise between the old and the new. The victory of the new brought rhythm (not the technical sort) and unity as the chief characteristics.\(^6\) In Christianity Hellenism becomes really cosmopolitan.\(^7\) If Christianity had merely used the Greek language and had been entirely alien to Hellenism, the [Page 114] N. T. would not have belonged to Greek literature, but this sympathy with the best in the world must not be overworked.\(^1\) The N. T. language is real Greek, though with the Christian spirit supreme in it because Christianity seized the Hellenic spirit and

---

\(^1\) W.-M., p. 36, n. 3.  
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RUTHERFORD, W. G., A Chapter in the History of Annotation (1905). 

———, The New Phrynicus (1881). 

\(^2\) Epis. to the Rom., p. x f.  
\(^3\) Cf. Zezschwitz, Profangräc. und bibl. Sprachg., 1859, p. 4, where he speaks of “dieses neue geistige Princip an der Sprache.” Deissmann (Die sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel, p. 8) accents the difference between the Christian ideas and the Greco-Rom. heathen words that express them. 

\(^4\) Ib., p. 12. Norden (Die griech. Kunstpr., Bd. II, pp. 453 ff.) indeed thinks that the N. T. wants the “freedom” (Freiheit) and “serenity” (Heiterkeit) of the ancient literature. This is true in part of Paul’s writing, where passion rages fiercely, and in Rev. and other apocalyptic passages. But what can excel Lu. and Jo. in lucidity and beauty? “Heiterkeit—blitheness or repose, and Allgemeinheit—generality or breadth, are the supreme characteristics of the Hellenic ideal.” Walter Pater, The Renaissance, 1904, p. 225. 


\(^6\) Ib., Bd. I, p. 290.  
\(^7\) Ib., Bd. II, p. 463.  

1 Cf. Hatch, Infl. of Hellen. on Christ.
transformed it. W. Christ\(^2\) rightly calls attention to the fact that Christianity brought “a renewal of the human race,” “the moral worth of man and a purer view of God.” So “this ethical new birth of mankind” found expression in the N. T. The touch of life is what distinguishes the N. T. writings from the philosophical, historical, religious and ethical writings of the time.\(^3\) In the Synoptic Gospels this quality reaches its height. “Far above these details is the spirit, the literary conception of a life to be written without ornament, without reflection, without the writer’s personality.”\(^4\) This fact constitutes a literary phenomenon amounting almost to a miracle. This vital spirit discloses itself on every page and baffles analysis. It is the essence of the N. T. language, but “is as pervasive as the atmosphere,” “as intangible as a perfume.”\(^5\) If some concentration and strength are lost, there is great adaptability.\(^6\) Thayer\(^7\) does not hesitate to speak of the fitness of N. T. Greek for its providential office. It is the language of men’s business and bosoms. It is the language of life, not of the study nor the cloister. It is not the language of a bygone age, but the speech of the men of the time. “The Book of the people has become, in the course of centuries, the Book of all mankind” (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 142). Christianity “began without any written book at all” except the Old Testament. “There was only the living word—the gospel, but no Gospels. Instead of the letter was the spirit. The beginning, in fact, was Jesus Himself” (*ib.*, p. 245). The N. T. is in close sympathy with both Jew and Greek, in a sense has both languages to draw on, can reach both the Semitic and the gentile mind, becomes a bond of union, in a word (as Broadus used to say) it is better suited to be the vehicle of truth conveyed by Jewish minds than classical Greek would have been. And a grammarian must admit that, however necessary and fundamental grammatical \[Page 115\] exegesis is, it forms only the basis for the spiritual exposition which should follow.

When one comes to details, he notes that the influence of Christianity is chiefly lexical, not grammatical.\(^1\) But a few points in syntax are to be observed, as in expressions like ἐν Χριστῷ; ἐν Κυρίῳ; πιστεύω; ἐπὶ with locative, ἐξ with accusative, ἐν with the locative or the accusative, πιστεύω with the dative, with the accusative or absolutely. As to the lexical element the lists of ἄπαξ ἑφημένα require severe sifting.\(^4\) It is too soon to pass a final verdict, but in the nature of the case the number would be small. Such words as ἀντίχριστος, ἐπεροδιδασκαλέω, εὐαγγελιστής,
The vocabulary of the N. T. Greek is not very extensive, somewhere near 5600 words, including proper names. But the main point to note is the distinctive ideas given to words already in use, like ἄγαπη, ἀγία, ἀγίος, ἀδέλφιος, ἀντίτυπος, ἀντιμισθία, ἀπολύτρωσις, ἀπόλεια, ἀπόστολος, ἀποστολή, ἀρτος, βασιλεία, βαπτίζω, βάπτισμα (—μός), γλώσσα, διάκονος, δικαιο, εἰρήνη, ἐκκλησία, ἐκλεκτός, ἐλπίς, ἐπισκόπος, ἐπιστρέφομαι, ἔργα, εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελιζόμεθα, ἑξοδία, ζωή, θάνατος, ἱερεύς, καλέω, καταλαγή, καταλλάσσω, κηρύσσω, κλητός, κόσμος, κοινωνία, λύτρον, λυτρώ, μετάνοια, δός, παράκλητος, πίς, πιστός, πιστέω, πνεύμα, πνευματικός, προσβήτερος, πρόσκομμα, σάρξ, σταυρός, συνείδησις, σώζω, σωτήρ, σωτηρία, ταπεινός, ταπεινοφροσύνη, ὁ υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἄνθρωπου, υἱόθεσία, χάρις, Χριστός, ψυχή, ψυχικός. When one considers the new connotations that these words bear in the N. T., it is not too much “to say that in the history of these and such like words lies the history of Christianity.” The fact that these and other terms were used [Page 116] in the popular language of the day gives a sharper point to the new turn in the gospel message. The deification of the emperor made Christians sensitive about the words θεός, υἱός θεοῦ, θείος, κύριος, κυριακός, σωτήρ, χάρις, βασιλεία, βασιλεία. See the luminous discussion of Deissmann (“Light,” pp. 343–384). The papyri and the inscriptions throw almost a lurid light on these words. Cf. Kύριος Κασταρ and Κύριος Ἴσσαοῦς (“Martyrium Polycarpi,” viii, 2) with 1 Cor. 12:1–3. The Christians did not shrink from using these words in spite of the debased ideas due to the emperorcult, Mithraism, or other popular superstitions. Indeed, Paul (cf. Col. 2:1 f.) often took the very words of Gnostic or Mithra cult and filled them with the riches of Christ. Cf. The Expositor for April, 1912, “Paul and the Mystery Religions,” by H. A. A. Kennedy. For the stimuli that Christianity derived from popular notions of law, religion and morality see Deissmann, “Light,” pp. 283–290. The mass of the N. T. vocabulary has been transfigured. The worshippers of a Cæsar would indeed call him σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου or υἱός θεοῦ, but the words were empty flattery. Deissmann well shows that a LXX word, for instance, in the mouth of a citizen of Ephesus, did not

5 Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 88. The Eng. of the King James Vers. (O. T. and N. T.) contains only about 6000 words (Adey, The Eng. of the King James Vers.). Max Müller (Sci. of Lang., p. 16) says that we use only about 4000 words in ordinary Eng. 6 Westcott, Smith’s B. D., N. T. Cf. also Hatch, Ess. in Bibl. Gk., p. 11. “Though Greek words were used they were the symbols of quite other than Greek ideas.” That is, when the distinctively Christian ideas are given. On the influence of Gk. on other languages see Wack., Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8, pp. 311 ff.
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mean what it did in the LXX, as ἀρχιερεύς, διαθήκη, θεός, προφήτης, σωτηρία. Much more is this true of the N. T. The new message glorified the current κοινή, took the words from the street and made them bear a new content, linked heaven with earth in a new sense. In particular the N. T. writers took and greatly enriched the religious vocabulary of the LXX.

VI. Individual Peculiarities. The language of Christianity was not stereotyped at first and there was more play for individualism. If the style is not all of the man, certainly each writer has his own style. But style varies with the same man also at different stages of his own development, with varying moods and when discussing different themes. Style is thus a function of the subject. All these points of view must be kept in mind with several of the N. T. writers, as Paul, Luke, Peter and John, whose writings show marked variations. Simcox notes that in the Thessalonian and Corinthian letters Paul uses ἐν παντὶ twelve [Page 117] times, in the Pastoral Epistles ἐν πᾶσι five (or six) times, while in Ph. 4:12 he has both. In thus accenting the individuality of the N. T. writers one must not forget that each writer had access to the common religious terminology of early Christianity. There was a common substratum of ideas and expressions that reappear in them all, though in certain cases there may have been actual use of documents. But one can never be sure whether Peter had James, or the author of Hebrews Luke’s writings. Peter probably had some of Paul’s letters when he wrote 1 Peter, and 2 Peter 3:15 f. expressly refers to them. The grammarian cannot be expected to settle questions of authorship and genuineness, but he has a right to call attention to the common facts of linguistic usage. Immer indeed complains that the linguistic peculiarities of the N. T. writers have been worked more in the interest of criticism than of exegesis. The modern method of biblical theology is designed to correct this fault, but there is a work here for the grammarian also. Winer declines to discuss this question and is horrified at the idea of grammars of each writer of the N. T. Language is rightly viewed from the point of view of the speaker or writer. The rapid and continued changes in the individual mind during the mental process of expressing thought find a parallel in the syntactical relations in the sentence. One cannot protest too strongly against the levelling process of an
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2 Writers of the N. T., p. 37. A. Souter (The Exp., 1904, Some Thoughts on the Study of the Gk. N. T., p. 145) says: “We must take each writer’s grammar by itself.” Immer IMMER, J., Hermeneutics of the N. T. Tr. by A. H. Newman (1877). 1 Hermen. of the N. T., 1877, p. 132. Thayer (Lex. of N. T. Gk., p. 689) speaks of “the monumental misjudgments committed by some who have made questions of authorship turn on vocabulary alone.”

unsympathetic and unimaginative linguistic method that puts all the books of the N. T. through the same syntactical mill and tags this tense as “regular” and that one as “irregular.” It is not too much to say that the characteristic of the Greek literature of this time was precisely that of individuality (cf. Plutarch’s Lives). Viteau has a brief discussion of “The Psychological Character of the Syntax of the N. T.,” for, added to all other things, there is “the influence of the moment.” Differences in culture, in environment, in gifts, in temperament inevitably affect style, but this fact is not to be stressed so as to make a new dialect for each writer. In the following discussions some lexical comments are given besides the grammatical to give a better idea of the writer’s style as a whole.

(a) MARK. Certainly Blass’ theory of an original Aramaic Mark is not proven, but Peter often spoke in Aramaic, and Mark was bilingual like Peter. For the Aramaisms and Hebraisms of Mark see previous discussion (Semitic Influence). The idea that Mark first wrote in Latin need not be seriously discussed. Matthew and Luke have also nearly as many Latinisms as Mark. It is not in his vocabulary that Mark is most distinctive, for of the 1270 words in Mark (besides 60 proper names) only 80 are peculiar to him among the N. T. writers. He has 150 in common with Matthew and Luke alone, while only 15 belong to Mark and John and nowhere else in the N. T.
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6 Le Verbe; Synt. des Prop., pp. xli ff.
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About 40 words belong only to Mark and the LXX in the Greek Bible, while Mark has 38 (besides proper names) occurring nowhere else in the N. T. or the LXX; but these are not all real ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, for there are the papyri! Mark seems fond of diminutives like the vernacular κοινή in general (θυγάτριον, κοράσιον, κυνάριον, etc.); εἰμί and ἔρχομαι with the participle are common, as in Luke (cf. 1:6, ἦν ... ἐκδεδυκένος; 1:39, ἦλθεν κηρύσσον); in fact he multiplies pictorial participles (cf. 14:67, ίδουσα ... ἐμβλέψασα λέγει); ὅν occurs with past tenses of the indicative (3:11, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρον); he loves the double negative (1:44, μηδὲν μηδὲν εἴπης); the article is common (as in N. T. generally) with the infinitive and sentences (9:23, τὸ ἐἰδύνῃ); broken and parenthetic clauses are frequent (cf. 7:19, καθαρίζων); at times he is pleonastic (2:20, τότε ἐν ἔκεινῃ τῇ ἡμερᾷ); he uses εὖθὺς (W. H. text) 41 times; he is emotional and vivid, as shown by descriptive adjectives, questions and exclamations (cf. 1:24; 2:7); the intermingling of tenses (9:33 ff., ἐπηρώτα ... λέγει ... εἶπεν) is not due to ignorance of Greek or to artificiality, as Swete well says, but to “a keen sense [Page 119] of the reality and living interest of the facts; there are 151 historic presents in the W. H. text against 78 in Matthew and 4 in Luke; there is frequent and discriminating use of prepositions (2:1, 2, 10, 13); the connective is usually καί rather than δέ, seldom οὖν; there is little artistic effect, but much simplicity and great vividness of detail; the vernacular κοινή is dominant with little literary influence, though εἶπεν, παιδιόθεν and ὑπία are held so by Norden.1

Πεπλήρωται (Mk. 1:15) is paralleled by ἐπληρώθη in a Fayûm papyrus and συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιαί πρασιαί by τάγματα τάγματα in the “Shepherd of Hermas” (Goodspeed, Bibl. World, 1906, p. 311 f.). In general Mark is not to be considered illiterate, though more Semitic in his culture than Greek. Wellhausen has noted that D has more Aramaisms in Mark’s text than B. But Mark’s Semitisms are not really barbarous Greek, “though Mark’s extremely vernacular language often makes us think so, until we read the less educated papyri” (Moulton, Camb. Bibl. Essays, p. 492). Even his fondness for compound (even double compound) verbs is like the vernacular κοινή. If the influence of Peter is seen in the Gospel of Mark, it was thoroughly congenial as to language and temperament.3 He gives an objective picture of Jesus and a realistic one.

(b) MATTHEW. The writer quotes both the Hebrew and the LXX and represents Jesus as doing the same. He has 65 allusions to the O. T., 43 of them being verbal quotations. And yet the book is not intensely Hebraistic. He has the instinct for Hebrew parallelism and the Hebrew elaboration, and his thought and general outlook

2 Mk. 6:39 f.
are Hebraistic, though his language is “colourless Hellenistic of the average type” (Moulton, Camb. Bibl. Essays, p. 484). We need not enter into the linguistic peculiarities of Q as distinct from our Greek Matthew if that hypothesis be correct. In Mt. 9:6 we see κλίνη rather than the vulgar κράβαττος of Mark. In 12:14 Matthew has συμβούλιον ἐξαβον for σ. ἐξίδουν of Mark (Moulton, op. cit., p. 485). He can use paronomasia as in κακοῖς κακῶς ἀπολέσσει αὐτοῦς (21:41). He uses τότε 91 times against 6 in Mark and 14 in Luke; he has ἥ basileía τῶν οὐρανῶν 32 times, while he

[Page 120] has ἥ basileía τοῦ θεοῦ 4 times (Mk. 14; Lu. 32); he uses ο πατήρ ο οὐράνιος 7 times and ο πατήρ ο ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς 13 times; he 12 times quotes the O. T. with the formula ἵνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ το ῥηθὲν or τότε ἐπληρώθη το ῥηθὲν, whereas Luke does not have it at all, Mark only once and John 7 times; κατ᾽ ὄναρ occurs 6 times and nowhere else in N. T.; like Luke he uses καὶ ἰδοὺ often (27 times) and ἰδοὺ after the genitive absolute 11 times; he alone speaks of ἡ ἁγία πόλις and πόλις τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως; like Mark he uses Ἱεροσόλυμα always save once (23:37), whereas Luke usually has Ἱερουσαλήμ; ὄμνυόν ἐν or εἰς, common in Matthew, does not occur in the other Gospels; τάφος, not in the other Gospels, is found 6 times; συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος occurs 5 times, and only once more in the N. T. (Heb.); note the pleonastic use of διθρόως as διθρόως βασιλέως; he twice uses εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, but the other Gospels ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι or ἐπὶ; the oriental particularity is seen in using προσέρχομαι 51 times while Mark has it only 5 and Luke 10 times; συνάγειν is used by Matthew 24 times; the vernacular κοινή is manifest in many ways as in the use of μονόρθωσος (like Mark), κολλυβισταί. Thayer in his list (Lexicon, p. 698 f.) gives 137 words occurring in Matthew alone in the N. T., but 21 are doubtful readings. Matthew has fewer compound verbs than Mark. Matthew does not use adverbial πολλά, while Mark has it 9 times. He has δὲ where Mark has καί about 60 times. Matthew has ὅτι after verbs of saying 38 times, while Mark has it 50 times. Of the 151 historic presents in Mark only 21 appear in Matthew, though Matthew has 93 historic presents in all. See Hawkins, Horae Synopt., p. 144 f. Matthew frequently has aorist when Mark has imperfect (see Allen, Matthew, p. xx f.). The periphrastic tenses are less common in Matthew than in Mark and Luke (op. cit., p. xxii). Matthew is less fond than Mark of redundant phrases (op. cit., p. xxvi). The Gospel is largely in the form of discourses with less narrative element than Mark. The style is more uniform and less graphic than either Mark or Luke and so less individual.1

(c) LUKE. Whether Luke knew Hebrew or Aramaic or both, cannot be stated with certainty. He did make use of Aramaic documents or sayings in Lu. 1 and 2, and in the early part of the Acts. He was also quite familiar with the LXX, as his quotations [Page 121] from it show. The Semitic influence in his writings has already been discussed. “He consciously imitates the Greek Bible, and in the parts of his narrative which have their scene in Palestine he feels it congruous to retain the rough diction of his sources” (Moulton, Camb. Bibl. Essays, p. 479). One thing is certain about him.


He had a good command of the vernacular κοινὴ and even attains the literary κοινὴ in Lu. 1:1–4 and Ac. 1:1–5; 17:16–34. The preface to his Gospel has often been compared to those of Thucydides and Herodotus, and it does not suffer by the comparison, for his modesty is an offset to their vainglory. Selwyn thinks that Luke was a Roman citizen, and he was a fit companion for Paul. He exhibits the spirit of Paul in his comprehensive sympathy and in his general doctrinal position. Renan calls Luke’s Gospel the most literary of the Gospels. He writes more like an historian and makes skillful use of his materials and with minute accuracy. His pictures in the Gospel have given him the title of “the painter.” Norden indeed thinks that Luke alone among the N. T. writers received Atticistic influence (Kunstprosa, II, pp. 485 ff. Cf. Blass, Die Rhythmen der asianischen und römischen Kunstprosa, p. 42). But we need not go so far. His versatility is apparent in many ways, but withal he makes a faithful use of his materials. His vocabulary illustrates his breadth of culture, for he uses 750 (851 counting doubtful readings) words not occurring elsewhere in the N. T. Some of them are still ἄπαξ λεγόμενα. One special item in his vocabulary is the large number of medical terms in his writings, as is natural, since he was a physician. His command of nautical phraseology is abundantly shown in Ac. 27 and 28.

The question of a double edition of the Gospel and Acts does not belong here. His

2 St. Luke the Prophet, 1901, p. 81.
3 Davidson, Intr. to N. T., ii, p. 17.
6 Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 1895; Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?; Chase, Credibility of Acts, 1902.
7 Vogel (Zur Charak. des Lukas, 1899, p. 19) calls attention to differences in the speeches of Stephen, Peter and Paul in the Acts.
9 Hobart, Medical Lang. of St. Luke, 1882. Many of these occur in the LXX also, but plenty remain to show his knowledge of the medical phraseology of the time.
language is that of a man of culture with a cosmopolite tone, who yet knows how to be popular also (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 241 ff.). He not only has a rich vocabulary, but also fine command of the κοινή diction. In particular his style is more like that of Paul and the writer to the Hebrews. Among matters of detail in Luke one will note his use of the infinitives with ἔν τῷ (34 times) and of τοῦ with the infinitive (24 instances); σῦν (23 times) is frequent, though seldom in the other Gospels; καὶ αὐτός (αὐτή) he has 28 times, and often constructions like αὐτός ὁ χρόνος; καὶ ἔγένετο or ἔγένετο δὲ he uses 43 times; he has δὲ καὶ 29 times; he loves πορεύομαι (88 examples); he uses εἴ like an interrogative 19 times; τὸ occurs often before a clause, especially an indirect question; he makes frequent use of καὶ ἵνα; ἔστω is common with him; ἐν with present participle occurs 55 times; the descriptive genitive is common; πρὸς with the accusative occurs 296 times with him and very often in the rest of the N. T.; he is fond of ἐνόπιον; τε (and τε καὶ) is almost confined to him in the N. T.; the optative is alone used by Luke in indirect questions and more often otherwise than by any other N. T. writer save Paul. This is a literary touch but not Atticistic. He alone makes any special use of the future participle; he is fond of πᾶς καὶ ὁ δὲ καὶ ἔστω; ἔστω in temporal sense is common in Luke, once in Mark, not in Matthew; a good many anacolutha occur in Acts, and the change from direct to indirect discourse is frequent; the relative is often attracted to the case of the antecedent and often begins a sentence (Ac. 2:24); ἐπιστάτα is used 7 times (peculiar to Luke) rather than κύριε or ῥαββί; the syntax is throughout in general that of the κοινή of the time. 3 [Page 123] Luke is also fond of ὁ μὲν οὖν (Acts). The historic present is rare in Luke (4 or 6 times). Luke uses the conjunctions and subordinate clauses with more literary skill than the other N. T. writers. He makes choice use of words and idioms. Cf. his report of Paul’s speech on Mars Hill. He accumulates participles, especially in the Acts, but not without stylistic refinement. In the Acts he is fond of ἐκείνων when ἔν would ordinarily be used.

(d) James. It is at first surprising that one recognized as such a thorough Jew as James, the brother of our Lord, and who used Aramaic, should have written in such idiomatic Greek. “In the skilful use of the Greek language its [Epistle of James] author is inferior to no N. T. writer.”1 There are very few Hebraisms in the Epistle, though the tone is distinctly Jewish, perhaps the earliest Christian document in the N.


1 Thayer, Lang. of N. T., Hast. D. B.
T. But one cannot think that James wrote the book in Aramaic, for the indications of translation are not present, as Bishop John Wordsworth once argued. There is not, however, in James studied rhetoric or keen dialectics. The author of Hebrews, Luke and Paul far surpass him in formal rhetoric. “The Epistle of James is from the beginning a little work of literature,” “a product of popular literature” (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 235). The writer uses asyndeton very often and many crisp aphorisms. Just as the Synoptic Gospels preserve the local colour of the countryside, so the Epistle of James is best understood in the open air of the harvest-field (*ib.*, p. 241). The incongruity of such a smooth piece of Greek as this Epistle being written by a Palestinian Jew like James vanishes when we consider the bilingual character of the people of Palestine (cf. Moulton, *Camb. Biblical Essays*, p. 487). Nevertheless, the author has a Hebrew mould of thought reminiscent of O. T. phrases. The atmosphere is Jewish and “international vulgarisms” do not explain it all. The pleonasms are just those seen in the LXX, and the book has the fondness for assonance so common in the O. T. Cf. Oesterley, *Exp. Gk. Test.*, p. 394. He uses many examples that remind one vividly of the parables of Jesus and many of the ideas and phrases of the Sermon on the Mount are here. There is also a marked similarity between this Epistle and the speech of James in Ac. 15 and the letter there given, which was probably written by him. He is fond of repeating the same word or root, as θρησκός, θρησκεία (1:26 f.) ; his sentences, though short, are rhythmical ; he is crisp, vivid, energetic; there is little in the forms or the syntax to mark it off from the current κοινή or the N. T. representatives of it, though his idiomatic use of the pronouns is worth mentioning, as is also that of ἕγε as an interjection, the gnomic aorist, the possible nominative μεστή in apposition with γλῶσσαν (3:8). But it is in the vocabulary that James shows his individuality, for in this short epistle there are 73 (9 doubtful) words not appearing elsewhere in the N. T., some of which are found in the LXX, like παραλλαγή. The use of συναγωγή (2:2) of a Christian assembly is noteworthy (cf. ἐκκλησία in 5:14 and ἐπισυναγωγή in Heb. 10:25). He has many compound words like ἀδιάκριτος, bookish words like ἐµφυτος, philosophical terms like ἔοικε, χρή.

(c) JUDE. It is here assumed against Spitta and Bigg that Jude is prior to 2 Peter, the second chapter of which is so much like Jude. There is not in Jude the epigram of James, but he has a rugged rotundity of style that is impressive and vigorous, if a bit harsh. His style is marked by metaphor and the use of triplets. He cannot be said to be “steeped in the language of the LXX” with Chase, but there is a more Hebraistic

---

1 See this point well worked out by Mayor, James (Epis. of), Hast. D. B. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 279.
3 Ib., p. cci f. Mayor, ch. viii, has also a luminous discussion of the “Grammar of St. James,” which shows conclusively that he has little that is distinctive in his grammar. Cf. Thayer (Lex., p. 708) for list of words peculiar to James.
5 Der Zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas, 1885.
6 Comm. on St. Peter and St. Jude, 1901.
7 Jude (Epis. of), Hast. D. B.
flavour than is observed in James, his brother. He has literary affinities with some of the apocryphal books and with some of Paul’s writings. If he shows a better command of Greek than 2 Peter, yet his \[Page 125\] “Greek is a strong and weighty weapon over which, however, he has not a ready command.”1 Per contra, there is little that is peculiar in his grammar, for he shows a normal use of the Greek idiom. The optative occurs twice (πληθυνθείη, verse 2, and ἔπτυμήσαι in 9) and the article is used skilfully with the participle. Cases, pronouns, tenses, free use of participles, indicate a real mastery of current Greek. The true superlative occurs in τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ πίστει. The idiomatic use of ἔβδομος without article is seen in Jude 14. The adverbial accusative is seen in τὸ δεύτερον \[Page 126\] and τὸν ὁμοίων τρόπον 7. For further details see Mayor on “Grammar of Jude and of Peter” (Comm., pp. xxvi–1v). He has 20 words (one doubtful) not found elsewhere in the N. T.2 A few of them like πλανήτης occur in the LXX. Some of them have a stately ring like κύματα ῥημα, and a number occur which are found in writers of the literary κοινή. He uses ἡ κοινὴ σωτηρία (“the safety of the state”) in a Christian sense, and so ὁ προεγγραμμένοι (“the proscribed”). But he has also command of technical Christian terms like ᾠδοι, κλητοί, πίστες, πνεῦμα, ψυχικός as Paul used them. The vividness of his style hardly justifies the term “poetic.”3 Deissmann (Light, p. 235) considers Jude a literary epistle in popular style and “cosmopolite” in tone (p. 242), with a certain degree of artistic expression. The correctness of the Greek is quite consonant with the authorship of the brother of Jesus, since Palestine was a bilingual country (Moulton, Camb. Bibl. Essays, p. 488). Besides, the Epistle has only 25 verses.

\[f\] PETER. As Peter was full of impulses and emotions and apparent inconsistencies, the same heritage falls to his Epistles. The most outstanding difference between 1 Peter and 2 Peter is in the vocabulary. 1 Peter has 361 words not found in 2 Peter, while 2 Peter has 231 not in 1 Peter.4 Many in each case are common words like ἀγιάζω, ἐλπίζω, εὐαγγελίζω, etc., in 1 Peter, and βασιλεία, ἐπιγινώσκω, etc., in 2 Peter. 1 Peter has 63 words not in the rest of the N. T., while 2 Peter has 57 (5 doubtful); but of these 120 words only one (ἁπόθεσις) occurs in both.5 This is surely a remarkable situation. But both of them have a number of words in common that occur elsewhere also in the N. T., like ἀναστροφή, ὕπερή, etc.1 Both use the plural of abstract nouns; both have the habit, like James, of repeating words,2 while Jude avoids repetitions; both make idiomatic use of the article; both make scant use of particles, and there are very few Hebraisms; both use words only known from the vernacular κοινή; both use a number of classical words like

---

1 Chase, Jude (Epis. of), Hast. D. B.
2 See Thayer’s list (Lex., p. 709). For fresh discussion of the gram. aspects of Jude and 2 Pet. see Mayor’s Comm. (1908). He accepts the genuineness of Jude, but rejects 2 Peter.
3 Maier, Der Judasbrief, 1906, p. 169.
4 Bigg, Comm. on St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 225.
ἀναγκαστῶς (1 Peter, Plato), πλαστός (Her., Eur., Xen., 2 Peter); both use picture-words; both seem to know the Apocrypha; both refer to events in the life of Christ; both show acquaintance with Paul’s Epistles, and use many technical Christian terms. But, on the other hand, 1 Peter is deeply influenced by the LXX, while 2 Peter shows little use of it; 1 Peter is more stately and elevated without affectation, while 2 Peter has grandeur, though it is, perhaps, somewhat “grandiose” (Bigg) and uses a number of rare words like ταρταρόω; 1 Peter makes clear distinctions between the tenses, prepositions, and uses smooth Greek generally, while 2 Peter has a certain roughness of style and even apparent solecisms like βλέμμα (2:8), though it is not “baboo Greek” (Abbott) nor like modern “pigeon English”; 1 Peter shows little originality and rhetorical power, while 2 Peter, though not so original as Jude, yet has more individuality than 1 Peter. Deissmann (Light, p. 235) says: “The Epistles of Peter and Jude have also quite unreal addresses; the letter-like touches are purely decorative. Here we have the beginnings of a Christian literature; the Epistles of Jude and Peter, though still possessing as a whole many popular features, already endeavours here and there after a certain degree of artistic expression.” It is not for a grammarian to settle, if anybody can, the controversy about those two Epistles, but Simcox is not far wrong when he says of 2 Peter that “a superficial student is likelier than a thorough student to be certain that it is spurious.” Spitta, Bigg and Zahn among recent writers suggest that in 2 Peter we have Peter’s own composition, while in 1 Peter we have the Greek of an amanuensis who either wrote out Peter’s ideas, revised them or translated Peter’s Aramaic into Greek. We know that Peter had interpreters (Mark, for instance), and Josephus used such literary help and Paul had amanuenses.

3 Cf. excellent lists by Chase, Hast. D. B., 1 Peter and 2 Peter. Many of these words are cleared up by the pap., like δοκίμων and ἄρετη.
Abbott


———, Johannine Grammar (1906).

———, Johannine Vocabulary (1905).

6 Writers of the N. T., p. 64.
7 Der Zweite Brief des Petrus.
8 Comm. on St. Peter and Jude.
Zahn

ZAHN, Th., Einl. in das N. T. Bd. I (1906), II (1907).


1 Einl. in d. N. T. Mayor in his Comm. on Jude and 2 Peter (1907) rejects 2 Peter partly on linguistic grounds.
On the other hand Chase (Hastings’ *D. B.*) and others reject 2 Peter entirely. It is worth mentioning that 2 Peter and the Apocalypse, which are the two books that furnish most of the linguistic anomalies in the N. T., both have abundant parallels among the less well-educated papyri writers, and it is of Peter and John that the terms ἀγρόματοι and ἱδώται are used (Ac. 4:13). As we have a problem concerning 1 Peter and 2 Peter on the linguistic side, so we have one concerning John’s Gospel and Epistles on the one hand and Revelation on the other. The use of the article in 1 Peter is quite Thucydidean in 3:3 (Bigg), and eight times he uses the idiom like τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον (1:17) and once that seen in τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἑδυνόν (4:3), the rule in the N. T. The article is generally absent with the attributive genitive and with prepositions as εἰς ὁμισομόν ἀμαρτός (1:2). There is a refined accuracy in 1 Peter’s use of ὃς (Bigg), cf. 1:19; 2:16, etc. A distinction is drawn between μή and οὗ with the participle in 1:8. Once ἵνα occurs with the future indicative (3:1). The absence of ὧν and the particles ἐφεξής, ἐπεί, ἐπειδῆ, τε, δὴ, πως is noticeable. 1 Peter makes idiomatic use of μὲν, while 2 Peter does not have it. 2 Peter uses the “compact” structure of article, attributive and noun, like 1 Peter (cf. 2 Pet. 2:1, 10, 16, 21), but the “uncompact” occurs also (cf. 2 Pet. 1:3, 9, 11, 14). In Jude and 2 Peter the commonest order is the uncompact (Mayor, *Jude and Second Peter*, p. xxii). The single article in 2 Pet. 1:1, 11 is used of two names for the same object. Cf. also Jude 4. The article with the infinitive does not occur in 2 Peter (nor Jude). 2 Peter has some unusual uses of the infinitive after ἔχω (2 Pet. 1:15) and as result (2 Pet. 3:1 f.). 1 Peter has the article and future participle once (3:13) ὁ κακόσαβον. Both 1 Pet. (1:2) and 2 Pet. (1:2) have the optative πληθυνθείη (like Jude). 1 Peter twice (3:14, 17) has εἰ and the optative. See further Mayor on “Grammar of Jude and 2 Peter” (*Comm.*, pp. xxvi–lx).

 па́улю. There was a Christian terminology apart from Paul, but many of the terms most familiar to us received their interpretation from him. He was a pathfinder, but had inexhaustible resources for such a task. Resch¹ has done good service in putting together the words of Paul and the words of Jesus. Paul’s rabbinical training and Jewish cast of mind led Farrar² to call him a Haggadist. Simcox³ says that “there is hardly a line in his writings that a non-Jewish author of his day would have written.” Harnack⁴ points out that Paul was wholly unintelligible to such a Hellenist as Porphyry, but Ramsay⁵ replies that Porphyry resented Paul’s use of Hellenism in

---

1 Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu, 1904.
Farrar FARRAR, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).
3 Writers of the N. T., p. 27.
Harnack


5 Exp., 1906, p. 263.
favour of Christianity. But Hicks is certainly right in seeing a Hellenistic side to Paul, though Pfleiderer goes too far in finding in Paul merely “a Christianized Pharisaism” and a “Christianized Hellenism.” Paul and Seneca have often been compared as to style and ideas, but a more pertinent linguistic parallel is Arrian’s report of the lectures of Epictetus. Here we have the vernacular κοινή of an educated man in the second century A.D. The style of Paul, like his theology, has challenged the attention of the greatest minds. Farrar calls his language “the style of genius, if not the genius of style.” There is no doubt about its individuality. While in the four groups of his letters each group has a style and to some extent a vocabulary of its own, yet, as in Shakespeare’s plays, there is the stamp of the same tremendous mind. These differences of language lead some to doubt the genuineness of certain of the Pauline Epistles, especially the Pastoral Group, but criticism is coming more to the acceptance of all of them as genuine. Longinus ranks Paul as master of the dogmatic style (Παῦλος ὁ Ταρσεῖος ὁντινα καὶ πρῶτον φημι προιστάμενον δόγματος ἀνοποδείκτου). Baur says that he has “the true ring of Thucydides.” Erasmus (ad Col. 4:16) says: “Tonat, fulgurat, merasflammam loquitur Paulus.” Hausrath correctly says that “it is hard to characterize this individuality in whom Christian fulness of love, rabbinic keeness of perception and ancient willpower so wonderfully mingle.” It is indeed the most personal and the most powerful writing of antiquity. He disclaims classic elegance and calls himself ἴδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ (2 Cor. 11:6), yet this was in contrast with the false taste of the Corinthians. But Deissmann (St. Paul, p. 6) goes too far in making Paul a mere tentmaker, devoid of culture. He is abrupt, paradoxical, bold, antithetical, now like a torrent, now like a summer brook. But it is

Hicks

HICKS, E. L., St. Paul and Hellenism (Studia Biblica et Eccl., 1896).

———, Traces of Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the N. T. (1896).

———, Use of Political Terms in the N. T. (Class. Rev., March and April, 1887).

7 Urchristentum, pp. 174–178.
8 See Excursus I to vol. I of Farrar’s Life of Paul.
9 Ib., p. 623. On Paul’s style cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 1, 5, 251, 276, 279, 281 f., 284 f., 289, 300–305. As to the Pastoral Epistles it has been pointed out that there is nothing in Paul’s vocabulary inconsistent with the time (James, Genuin. and Author. of the Past. Epis., 1906). It is natural for one’s style to be enriched with age. The Church Quart. Rev. (Jan., 1907) shows that all the new words in the Past. Epis. come from the LXX, Aristotle, κοινή writers before or during Paul’s time. Cf. Exp. Times, 1907, p. 245 f.
passion, not ignorance nor carelessness. He was indeed no Atticist. He used the vernacular κοινή of the time with some touch of the literary flavour, though his quotation of three heathen poets does not show an extended acquaintance with Greek literature. The difference between the vernacular and the literary κοινή is often a vanishing point. Paul’s style is unhellenic in arrangement, but in Ro. 8 and 1 Cor. 13 he reaches the elevation and dignity of Plato. Certainly his ethical teaching has quite a Hellenic ring, being both philosophical and logical. Hatch considers Paul to be the foremost representative of the Hellenic influence on early Christianity. He shows some knowledge of Roman legal terms and uses arguments calling for educated minds of a high order. The grammar shows little Semitic influence. He uses many rhetorical figures such as paronomasia, paradox, etc., which will be discussed in the chapter on that subject, some thirty kinds occurring in his writings. Farrar suggests that Paul had a teacher of rhetoric in Tarsus. He is noted for his varied use of the particles and writes with freedom and accuracy, though his anacolutha are numerous, as in Gal. 2:6–9. He uses prepositions with great frequency and discrimination. The genitive is employed by Paul with every variety of application. The participle appears with great luxuriance and in all sorts of ways, as imperative or indicative or genitive absolute, articular, anarthrous, etc. He is Ἐβραῖος ἐξ Ἐβραίων, but he handles his Greek with all the freedom of a Hellenist. He thinks in Greek and it is the vernacular κοινή of a brilliant and well-educated man in touch with the Greek culture of his time, though remaining thoroughly Jewish in his mental fibre. The peculiar turns in Paul’s language are not due to Hebraisms, but to the passion of his nature which occasionally (cf. 2 Cor.) bursts all bounds and piles parenthesis and anacoluthon on each other in a heap. But even in a riot of language his thought is clear, and Paul often draws a fine point on the turn of a word or a tense or a case. To go into detail with Paul’s writings would be largely to give the grammar of the N. T. In Phil. 2:1 we have a solecism in ἐι τις σπλάγχνα. His vocabulary is very rich and expressive. Thayer (Lexicon, pp. 704 ff.) gives 895 (44 doubtful) words that are found nowhere else in the N. T., 168 of them being in the Pastoral Epistles. Nägeli has published the first part of a Pauline lexicon (from α to ε) which is very helpful and makes use of the papyri and inscriptions. The most striking thing in this study is the cosmopolitan character of Paul’s vocabulary. There are very few words which are found only in the Attic writers, like αἰσχρότης, and no cases of Atticism, though even in the letters α to ε he finds some 85 that belong to the literary κοινή as shown by books, papyri and inscriptions, words like ἀθανασία, ἀθέτεω, etc. In some 50 more the meaning corresponds to that of the literary κοινή, as in ἀναλύω (Ph. 1:23). To these he adds words which appear in the literary κοινή, papyri and inscriptions after

6 Hicks, St. Paul and Hellen., 1896, p. 9.
7 Hibbert Lect. (Infl. of Hellen. on Chris., p. 12).
2 Der Wortsch. des Apost. Paulus, 1905. He says (p. 86): “Es überrascht uns nicht mehr, daß jeder paulinische Brief eine Reihe von Wörtern enthält, die den übrigen unbekannt sind.” This is well said. Each letter ought to have words not in the others.
Paul’s time, words like ἁρπαγμός, ἕναζήν, etc. Then there are words that, so far as known, occur first in the N. T. in the Christian sense, like ἐκκλησία. But the vernacular κοινή as set forth in the papyri and inscriptions furnishes the ground-work of his vocabulary, when to this is added the use of the LXX (including the Apocrypha) as in ἄντιλαμβάνομαι, ἀγιάζω. Especially noteworthy are some nice Greek points that are wanting in Paul (as well as in the rest of the N. T.) and in the papyri and inscriptions, as οἶχς τέ εἰμι, αἰσθάνομαι, πάνυ, μᾶλα, Ἐκτιμοῦ (seldom in the inscriptions), etc. Nägeli sums up by saying that no one would think that Paul made direct use of Plato or Demosthenes and that his diligent use of the LXX explains all his Hebraisms besides a few Hebrew words like ἡμίν or when he translated Hebrew. His Aramaisms (like ἀββά) are few, as are his Latinisms (like πραιτώριον). “The Apostle writes in the style natural to a Greek of Asia Minor adopting the current Greek of the time, borrowing more or less consciously from the ethical writers of the time, framing new words or giving a new meaning to old words…His choice of vocabulary is therefore much like that of Epictetus save that his intimate knowledge of the LXX has modified it.”¹ Paul’s Greek, in a word, “has to do with no school, with no model, but streams unhindered with overflowing bubbling right out of the heart, but it is real Greek” (Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Die griechische Literatur des Altertums, 2. Aufl., p. 159. Cf. Die Kultur der Gegenwart, Tl. I, Abt. 8, 1905).

Deissmann (Light, p. 234) sees Paul wholly as “a non-literary man of the non-literary class in the Imperial Age, but prophet-like rising above his class and surveying the contemporary educated world with the consciousness of superior strength.”

**[Page 132]** (h) **WRITER OF HEBREWS.** Bruce¹ is certain that the author was not a disciple of Paul, while Simcox² is willing to admit that he may have belonged once to

---

1 Walter Lock, Jour. of Theol. Stud., 1906, p. 298. Athletic figures are almost confined to Paul (and Heb.), and Ramsay (Exp., 1906, pp. 283 ff.) thinks Tarsus left this impress on him. A further discussion of Paul’s rhetoric will be found in the chapter on Figures of Speech. Cf. J. Weiss, Beitr. zur paulin. Rhetorik, 1897; Blass, Die Rhythm. der asian. und röm. Kunstpr., 1905. Deiss. (Theol. Literaturzeit., 1906, pp. 231 ff.) strongly controverts Blass’ idea that Paul used conscious rhythm. Cf. Howson, Metaph. of St. Paul. On Paul’s Hellen. see Hicks, St. Paul and Hellen. (Stud. Bibl. et Eccl., 1896); Curtius, Paulus in Athens (Gesamm. Abhandl., 1894, pp. 527 ff.); Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul (pp. 9, 30–41); Heinrici, Zum Hellen. des Paulus (2 Cor. in Meyer); Wilamowitz-Möll., Die griech. Lit. des Altert. (p. 157); G. Milligan, Epis. to the Th. (1908, p. lv). Paul had a full and free Gk. vocab., thought in Gk., wrote in Gk. as easily as in Aramaic. But his chief indebtedness seems to be to the LXX, the vernacular κοινή and the ethical Stoical writers. Milligan (see above, pp. liii–lv) has a very discriminating discussion of Paul’s vocab. and style. Garvie (Stud. of Paul and His Gospel, p. 6 f.) opposes the notion that Paul had a decided Gk. influence. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff

---


———, Über die Entstehung der griech. Schriftsprachen (Verf. deutscher Phil. und Schulm., 1879, pp. 36–41).

---

1 Hast. D. B., Hebrews.
the school of Philo, as Paul did to that of Gamaliel. Harnack suggests Priscilla as the author. If Paul had “imperial disregard for niceties of construction,” Hebrews shows “a studied rhetorical periodicity.” Von Soden\(^4\) considers that in the N. T. Hebrews is “the best Greek, scarcely different in any point from that of contemporary writers.” This is the more surprising when one observes the constant quotation of the LXX. The grammatical peculiarities are few, like the frequent use of \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) in comparison, \(\varepsilon\pi\varepsilon\iota\) with apodosis (protasis suppressed), the perfect tense to emphasize the permanence of the Scripture record which sometimes verges close to the aorist (4:3), the frequent participles, the varied use of particles, periphrases, the absence of the harsher kinds of hiatus, the presence of rhythm more than in any of the N. T. books, and in general the quality of literary style more than in any other N. T. writing. Westcott notes “the parenthetical involutions.” “The calculated force of the periods is sharply distinguished from the impetuous eloquence of St. Paul.” The writer does not use Paul’s rhetorical expressions \(\tau\iota\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\); \(\tau\iota\gamma\alpha\rho\); Moulton (\textit{Camb. Bibl. Essays}, p. 483) notes the paradox that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by one who apparently knew no Hebrew and read only the LXX. The use of subordinate sentences is common and the position of words is carefully chosen. There is frequent use of \(\mu\epsilon\nu\) and \(\tau\epsilon\) as well as \(\Omega\theta\epsilon\nu\) and \(\delta\iota\). The optative occurs only once and illustrates the true \(\kappa\omega\nu\iota\). The studied style appears particularly in ch. 11 in the use of \(\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\). The style is hortatory, noble and eloquent, and has points of contact with Paul, Luke and Peter. The vocabulary, like the style, is less like the vernacular \(\kappa\omega\nu\iota\) than any book in the N. T. Of 87 words which are found in the LXX and in this book alone in the N. T., 74 belong to the ancient literary works and only 13 to the vernacular. 18 other words peculiar to this Epistle are found in the literary \(\kappa\omega\nu\iota\). There are 168 (10 doubtful) words in Hebrews that appear nowhere else in the N. T. (cf. Thayer, \textit{Lexicon}, p. 708). These 168 words are quite characteristic also, like \(\sigma\phi\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\), \(\alpha\iota\theta\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\), \(\pi\alpha\nu\iota\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\), \(\pi\rho\omega\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\). Westcott\(^1\) considers the absence of words like \(\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\ell\omicron\omicron\), \(\mu\omega\sigma\theta\iota\omicron\omicron\), \(\pi\lambda\rho\omicron\omicron\) remarkable. The chief bond of contact in the vocabulary of Hebrews with the \(\kappa\omega\nu\iota\) is in the use of “sonorous” words like \(\alpha\nu\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\theta\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\mu\), \(\epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\), but the author is by no means an Atticist, though he does approach the literary \(\kappa\omega\nu\iota\). Deissmann\(^2\) indeed considers Hebrews as alone belonging “to another sphere: as in subject-matter it is more of a learned theological work, so in form it is more artistic than the other books of the N. T.” He even feels that it “seems to hang in the background like an intruder among the N. T. company of popular books” (\textit{Light}, p. 243).

---

2 Writers of the N. T., p. 42.
3 Thayer, Lang. of the N. T., Hast. D. B.
Soden


———, Griechisches N. T. Text mit kurzem Apparat (1913).

1 Comm. on Heb., p. xlvi.
John. The Johannine question at once confronts the modern grammarian who approaches the books in the N. T. that are accredited to John. It is indeed a difficult problem. There is a triple difficulty; the Gospel presents a problem of its own (with the Epistles), the Apocalypse also has its burden, and there is the serious matter of the relation of the Gospel and Apocalypse on the linguistic side. Assuming that John the Apostle wrote the Gospel, Epistles and Apocalypse, we have the following situation. The Gospel of John has a well-defined character. There are few Hebraisms in detail beyond the use of φωτός (12:36), καί in the sense of “and yet” or “but” (cf. Hebrew י and καί in LXX) as in 20:14, the absence of the particles save οὐν, and the constant co-ordination of the sentences with rhythmical parallelism. In the formal grammar the Greek is much like the vernacular (and literary) κοινή, but the cast of thought is wholly Hebrew. Ewald rightly calls its spirit “genuinely Hebrew,” while Renan even says that the Gospel “has nothing Hebrew” in its style. Godet calls the Gospel a Hebrew body with a Greek dress and quotes Luthardt as saying that it “has a Hebrew soul in the Greek language.” Schaff compares Paul to an Alpine torrent and John to an Alpine lake. There is indeed in this Gospel great simplicity and profundity. John’s vocabulary is somewhat limited, some 114 words (12 doubtful, Thayer, Lexicon, p. 704) belonging to the Gospel alone in the N. T. But the characteristic words are repeated many times, such as ἀλήθεια, ὑμετέρα, κρίσις, λόγος, φωνεῖν, μαρτυρέω, πιστεύω, σκότος, φῶς, etc. “He rings the changes on a small number of elementary words and their synonyms.” But words like ἐκκλησία, εὐαγγέλιον, μετάνοια, παραβολή, πίστις, αὐθεντέω do not occur at all. However, too much must not be inferred from this fact, for πιστεύω and εὐαγγελίζω do appear very often. Other characteristics of the Gospel are the common use of ἵνα in the non-final sense, the distinctive force of the pronouns (especially ἡμοί, ὑμοί, ἵνα), the vivid use of the tenses (like Mark), the unusual use of οὖν, ζωὴ ἀιώνιος is frequent (21 times, and more than all the rest of the N. T.), frequent repetition, favourite synonyms. The Johannine use of καί, δέ, ἀλλά, γὰρ, εἰ, ὅτι, οὐ, etc., is all interesting (see Abbott). The prepositions, the cases, the voices, the modes all yield good results in Abbott’s hands. The Epistles of John possess the same general traits as

3 Cf. Drummond, Charac. and Author. of the Fourth Gosp., 1904; Sanday, Crit. of the Fourth Gosp., 1905; Bacon, The Fourth Gosp. in Res. and Debate, 1910.
4 Quoted in Schaff, Comp. to Gk. N. T., p. 67.
5 Ib. On p. 73 Schaff puts Jo. 1:18 side by side in Gk. and Heb. The Heb. tone of the Gk. is clear.
7 Schaff, Comp. to Gk. N. T., p. 66.
9 Ib., p. 158. Abbott has luminous remarks on such words as πιστεύω, ἔξωσία, and all phases of John’s vocabulary.
3 Occurs 195 times in the Gospel and only 8 of the instances in the discourses of Jesus. Nearly all of these are in the transitional sense. Cf. Abb., Joh. Gr., 1906, p. 165. 4 On Joh. Synon. (like θεορέω, ὴρω) see ch. III of Abbott’s Joh. Vocab., 1905. In John ὴρω is not used in present (though often ἔφρακα), but βλέπω and θεωρέω. Luke uses it also in present only 3 times, Heb. 2, Jas. 2, Ac. 8, Apoc. 18. On the whole subject of Joh. gr. see the same author’s able work on Joh. Gr. (1906), which has a careful and exhaustive discussion of the most interesting points in the Gospel.
the Gospel save that ὁὐν does not occur at all save in 3 Jo. 8 while ἄτι is very common. Καί is the usual connective. Only eight words are common alone to the Gospel and the Epistles in the N. T., while eleven are found in the Epistles and not in the Gospel. Westcott, however, gives parallel sentences which show how common phrases and idioms recur in the Gospel and the First Epistle. The Apocalypse has much in common with the Gospel, as, for instance, no optative is found in either; ὅτι is very common in Gospel, 1 John and Apocalypse, more so than in any other book of the N. T. save Mark, and ἣν μή is very common in Gospel and Apocalypse; ὁὐν is almost absent from the Apocalypse [Page 135] as in Epistles and the discourses of Jesus, being common as transitional particle in narrative portion of Gospel; ἄρα, common in other Evangelists and Paul, is not found in Gospel, Epistles or Apocalypse; μέν, so common in Matthew, Luke (Gospel and Acts), Paul and Hebrews, is not found at all in Apocalypse and John’s Epistles and only eight times in his Gospel; ὅστη, which appears 95 times elsewhere in the N. T., is not found in Gospel, Epistles or Apocalypse save once in Jo. 3:16; μή ποτε, fairly common in Matthew, Luke and Hebrews, does not occur in John’s writings save in Jo. 7:26 (Paul uses it also only once, 2 Tim. 2:25, preferring μή πως, which he alone uses, 13 exx.). μαρτυρέω is more frequent in Gospel than in 1 John and Apocalypse, but μαρτυρία is as common in Apocalypse as Gospel; δνομα is frequent in Gospel and Apocalypse as applied to God; οὐδα is found less often in Apocalypse than in Gospel; ὅληθνος is common in Gospel, Epistle and Apocalypse, though ὅληθς and ὅληθα do not appear in the Apocalypse; νικάω occurs only once in Gospel (16:33), but is common in 1 John and Apocalypse; δοάμι is more frequent in Gospel and Apocalypse than in any other N. T. book (even Matt.); δείκνυμι appears about the same number of times in Gospel and Apocalypse; λόγος is applied to Christ in Jo. 1:1 and Rev. 19:13; the peculiar expression καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν which occurs in John 5:25 is similar to the καὶ ἐσμεν of 1 Jo. 3:1, and the καὶ οὐκ ἔλει of Rev. 2:2, 3:9; all are fond of antithesis and parenthesis and repeat the article often. Over against these is to be placed the fact that the Apocalypse has 156 (33 doubtful) words not in the Gospel or Epistles, and only nine common alone to them. Certainly the subject-matter and spirit are different, for the Son of Thunder speaks in the Apocalypse. Dionysius of Alexandria called the language of the Apocalypse barbaric and ungrammatical because of the numerous departures from usual Greek assonance. The solecisms in the Apocalypse are not in the realm of accidence, for forms like ὑφηκες, πέπτωκαν, διδῶ, etc., are common in the vernacular κοινή. The syntactical peculiarities are due partly to constructio ad sensum and variatio structurae. Some (“idiots” according to Dionysius) are designed, as the expression of the unchangeableness of God by ἄπο ὤν (1:4). As to ὢ ἵν the relative use of ὢ in Homer may be recalled. See also ἦ οὐταί in 11:14, ἡμουν ὢν in 14:14, οὕτω τοῖς κ. in 8:13. Benson [Page 136] (Apocalypse) speaks of “a grammar of Ungrammar,” which is a bold way of putting it. But the “solecisms” in the Apocalypse are chiefly cases of anacolutha. Concord is treated


1 Similarly τε, which occurs 160 times in the Acts, is found only 8 times in Luke’s Gospel. Cf. Lee, Speaker’s Comm., p. 457.

2 Apud Eus. H. E., VII, xxv.
lightly in the free use of the nominative (1:5; 2:20; 3:12), in particular the participles λέγων and ἔχων (4:1; 14:14); in the addition of a pronoun as in 3:8; in gender and number as in 7:9; in the use of parenthesis as in 1:5 f. Cf. Swete, Apocalypse, p. cxviii f.

The accusative, as in the vernacular κοινή (cf. modern Greek) has encroached upon other cases as with κατηγορεῖν (12:10). The participle is used freely and often absolutely in the nominative as ὁ νικῶν (2:26). Most of the variations in case are with the participle or in apposition, as ὁ μάρτυς after Χριστοῦ (1:5). Moulton¹ has called attention to the numerous examples of nominative apposition in the papyri, especially of the less educated kind. The old explanation of these grammatical variations was that they were Hebraisms, but Winer² long ago showed the absurdity of that idea. It is the frequency of these phenomena that calls for remark, not any isolated solecism in the Apocalypse. Moulton³ denies that the Apocalypse has any Hebraisms. That is possibly going too far the other way, for the book is saturated with the apocalyptic images and phrases of Ezekiel and Daniel and is very much like the other Jewish apocalypses. It is not so much particular Hebraisms that meet us in the Apocalypse as the flavour of the LXX whose words are interwoven in the text at every turn. It is possible that in the Apocalypse we have the early style of John before he had lived in Ephesus, if the Apocalypse was written early. On the other hand the Apocalypse, as Bigg holds true [Page 137] of 2 Peter, may represent John’s real style, while the Gospel and Epistles may have been revised as to Greek idioms by a friend or friends of John in Ephesus (cf. Jo. 21:24). With this theory compare Josephus’ War and Antiquities. One is slow (despite Moffatt’s positiveness in the Exp. Gk. Test.), in the light of Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, to say that John could not have written the Apocalypse, though it be the last of his books. Besides what has been said one must recall that the Apocalypse was composed on the Isle of Patmos, in some excitement, and possibly without careful revision, while the Gospel and First Epistle probably had care and the assistance of cultured friends. At any rate the vernacular κοινή is far more in evidence in the Apocalypse than in the Gospel and Epistles. “As Dante had the choice between the accepted language of education, Latin, and the vulgar tongue, so St. John had to choose between a more artificial kind of Greek, as perpetuated from

² W.-M., p. 671.
³ Prol., p. 9. Cf. also Jülicher, Intr. to N. T.; Bousset, Die Offenb. Joh., 1896; Lee, Speaker’s Comm. on Rev. Swete (Apoc. of St. John, 1906, p. cxx) thinks that John’s “eccentricities of syntax belong to more than one cause: some to the habit which he may have retained from early years of thinking in a Semitic language; some to the desire of giving movement and vivid reality to his visions, which leads him to report them after the manner of shorthand notes, jotted down at the time; some to the circumstances in which the book was written.” The Apoc. “stands alone among Gk. literary writings in its disregard of the ordinary rules of syntax, and the success with which syntax is set aside without loss of perspicuity or even of literary power.” Swete welcomes gladly the researches of Deissmann, Thumb and Moulton, but considers it preciious to compare a literary document like the Apoc. with slips in business letters, etc.

past teaching, and the common vulgar speech, often emancipated from strict grammatical rules, but nervous and vigorous, a true living speech.”

VII. N. T. Greek Illustrated by the Modern Greek Vernacular. Constant use will be made of the modern Greek in the course of the Grammar. Here a brief survey is given merely to show how the colloquial κοινή survives in present-day Greek vernacular. Caution is necessary in such a comparison. The literary modern Greek has its affinities with the literary κοινή or even with the Atticists, while the vernacular of to-day often shows affinities with the less educated writers of papyri of the N. T. time. The N. T. did indeed have a great effect upon the later κοινή when theological questions were uppermost at Alexandria and Constantinople. The cleavage between the literary and the vernacular became wider also. But apart from ecclesiastical terms there is a striking likeness at many points between the vernacular κοινή and modern Greek vernacular, though modern Greek has, of course, Germanic and other elements not in the κοινή. The diminutive is more common in the modern Greek than in [Page 138] the κοινή and usually in τ, as το ὄρνι. The optative is rare in the N. T.; in the modern Greek it has disappeared. The infinitive is vanishing before ἵνα in the N. T.; in the modern Greek νά has displaced it completely save with auxiliary verbs. The accusative in modern Greek has made still further headway and is used even with ὑπό and all prepositions. The μι verb has entirely vanished in modern Greek vernacular except ἠν. The forms in –οσαν, –οσαν are very common, as are the α forms in aorist and imperfect. The forms in –εζ (–αζ) for perfect and first aorist are also frequent. The middle voice has almost vanished as a separate voice (cf. Latin). Prepositions in the vernacular (chiefly εἰς) have displaced the dative. The superlative is usually expressed by the article and the comparative. Kennedy gives an interesting list of words that appear either for the first time or with a new sense in the LXX or the N. T. (or the papyri) that preserve that meaning in the modern Greek, as δῶμα (‘roof’), θυσιαστήριον (‘altar’), καθηγητής (‘professor,’ in N. T. ‘master’),

---

3 Thumb, Indoger. Forsch., 1903, p. 359 f. Boltz (Die hell. Spr., 1881, p. 10) quotes Rangabé as saying that the mod. Gk. is as far removed from that of the LXX as from that of Xenophon.
1 It still persists in Pontic-Cappadocian Gk. according to Thumb, Theol. Literaturzeit., 1903, p. 421.
2 There is a riot of indifference as to case in the vernacular Byz. Gk., as σύν τῆς γυναικός. Cf. Mullach, Gr. der griech. Vulgarspr., p. 27. Jean Psichari, Ρόδια καὶ Μῆλα (1906), has written a defence of the mod. Gk. vernac. and has shown its connection with the ancient vernac. The mod. Gk. has like freedom in the use of the genitive case (cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 32 ff.). Prepositions have displaced the partitive gen., the genitive of material and of comparison (abl.), in mod. Gk. The mod. Gk. shows the acc. displacing the gen. and dat. of the older Gk. (op. cit., p. 35 f.) after ἀκολουθω, ἀκούω, ἀπειρτω, etc. The double acc. goes beyond anc. Gk. usages (op. cit., p. 36) as δῶλα ρόδινα τῷ βλέπω, ‘I see everything rosy.’
3 Sour. of N. T. Gk., pp. 153 ff.
ξενοδοχεῖον (‘hotel,’ in N. T. ξενοδοχέω = ‘entertain strangers’), παιδεύω (‘chastise,’ from παῖς), φθάνω (‘arrive’), χορτάζω (‘feed’), etc. The list could be greatly extended, but let these suffice.4 A specimen of modern Greek vernacular is given from Pallis’ translation of Jo. 1:6–8: Βγήκε ἕνας ὄνομα σταλμένος ὑπὸ τὸ Θεόν ἀνθρώπος τοῦ Ἰωάννης. Αὐτός ἠράγε γιὰ κήρυγμα, γιὰ νὰ κηρύξει τὸ φῶς, ποῦ νὰ κάνει κι ὅλοι νὰ πιστέψουν. Λέν εἶπαν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, παρὰ γιὰ νὰ κηρύξει τὸ φῶς. The literary modern Greek in these verses differs very little from the original N. T. text, only in the use of ὑπῆρξεν, ὄνομαζόμενος, διὰ νὰ, δὲν, ἦτο. Moulton5 in an interesting note gives some early illustrations of modern Greek vernacular. In the second century A.D. ἔστα is [Page 139] found in OP 528. He quotes Thumb (BZ ix, 234) who cites from an inscription of the first century A.D. ἔχουσης as nominative and accusative plural. And Ramsay (Cities and Bish., II, p. 537) gives ἔπιτηδεύσουν as third plural form on a Phrygian inscription of the third century A.D. As one illustration note Paul’s use of κατέχω (Ro. 1:18). In modern Greek dialects κατέχω = ἠξεύρω, ‘I know.’

[PAGE 141] PART II

ACCIDENCE

[PAGE 143] CHAPTER V

WORD-FORMATION

I. Etymology. Grammar was at first a branch of philosophy among the Greeks, and with the foundation of the Alexandrian library a new era began with the study of the text of Homer.1 After Photius etymology “rules the whole later grammatical literature.”2 The Stoic grammarians were far better in etymology than in anything else and we owe them a real debt in this respect, though their extended struggle as to whether analogy or anomaly ruled in language has left its legacy in the long lists of “exceptions” in the grammars.3 In some grammars the term etymology is still applied to the whole discussion of Forms or Accidence, Formenlehre. But to-day it is

4 Cf. Thumb’s Handb. der neug. Volksspr. (1895); V. and D., Handb. to Mod. Gk. (1887); Thumb-Angus, Handb. of Mod. Gk. Vernac. (1912).

PALLIS, A., A Few Notes on the Gospel (1903).

———, Ἡ Νέα Διαθήκη (1902). The N. T. (Gospels) in modern Greek vernacular.

5 Prol., p. 234.

1 Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét. et Ét. des Formes Grq. et Lat., 1901, p. 245.

2 Reitzenstein, Gesch. der griech. Etym., 1897, p. vi.

3 Steinthal, Gesch. der Sprachw. etc., 2. Tl., pp. 347 ff.
generally applied to the study of the original form and meaning of words.\(^4\) The word ἐτυμολογία is, of course, from ἐτυμός and λόγος, and ἔτυ-μός, meaning ‘real’ or ‘true,’ is itself from the same root ετ– from which ἔτυ-μός, ‘true,’ comes. So also ἔτυ-άζω, ‘to test.’ Compare also Sanskrit sat-yaś, ‘true,’ and sāt-yaṁ, ‘truth,’ as well as the Anglo-Saxon sóð, ‘sooth.’ Tō ἔτυμον is the true literal sense of a word, the root. No more helpful remark can be made at this point than to insist on the importance of the student’s seeing the original form and import of each word and suffix or prefix. This is not all that is needed by any means, but it is a beginning, and the right beginning.\(^5\) “It was the comparative study of languages that first [Page 144] gave etymology a surer hold.”\(^6\) Curtius means etymology in the modern sense, to be sure.

II. Roots.\(^2\) It is not to be supposed that what are called roots necessarily existed in this form. They represent the original stock from which other words as a rule come. What the original words actually were we have no means of telling. They were not necessarily interjections, as some have supposed. Mere articulate sounds, unintelligible roots, did not constitute speech. Some interjections are not roots, but express ideas and can often be analyzed, as “jemine”=Jesu Domine.\(^3\) Others, like most nursery words, are onomatopoetic. There is, besides, no evidence that primitive man

---


Curtius

CURTIIUS, G., Greek Etymology. 2 vols. (1886).

———, Studien zur griech. und lat. Grammatik (1868–1878).

2 The whole subject of N. T. lexicography calls for reworking. Deissmann is known to be at work on a N. T. Lex. in the light of the pap. and the inscr. Meanwhile reference can be made to his Bible Studies, Light, and his New Light on the N. T.; to J. H. Moulton’s articles in the Exp. (1901, 1903, 1904, 1908); to Kennedy’s Sour. of N. T. Gk. (for LXX and N. T.); to Thayer’s N. T. Gk. Lex. and his art. on Lang., of N. T. in Hast. D. B.; to Cremer’s Theol. Lex. of N. T.; to Mayser’s Gr. d. griech. Pap. For the LXX phenomena see careful discussion of Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 112–136. Nothing like an exhaustive discussion of N. T. word-formation can yet be attempted. But what is here given aims to follow the lines of historical and comparative grammar. We must wait in patience for Deissmann’s Lex. George Milligan is at work with Moulton on his Vocabulary of the New Testament. Cf. also Nägeeli, Der Wortsch. des Apost. Paulus, a portion of which has appeared. Especially valuable is Abb. Joh. Vocab. (1905). For the LXX cf. also Swete, Intr. to O. T. in Gk., pp. 302–304. The indices to the lists of inscr. and pap. can also be consulted with profit.

could produce speech at will. But a few root-words appear like the Latin *ī* (‘go’) and probably the Greek *ἠ* (though *ἠέ* is found in Epic Greek). The number of Greek roots is comparatively few, not more than 400, probably less. Harris observes that of the 90,000 words in a Greek lexicon only 40,000 are what are termed classic words. The new words, which are constantly made from slang or necessity, are usually made from one of the old roots by various combinations, or at any rate after the analogy of the old words. Words are “the small coin of language,” though some of them are sesquipedalian enough. There seem to be two ultimate kinds of words or roots, verbs and pronouns, and they were at last united into a single word as ἡ-μι, ‘say I.’

It does not seem possible to distinguish between verbal and nominal roots, as in English to-day the same word is indifferently verb or noun, “walk,” for instance. The modern view is that verbs are nominal in origin (Hirt, *Handb.*, p. 201). The pronominal roots may furnish most of the suffixes for both verbs (ῥήματα) and nouns (ὄνόματα). Verbs, substantives and pronouns (Ἄντωνομιατα), therefore, constitute the earliest parts of speech, and all the others are developed from these three. Adjectives (ὄνόματα Ἐπιθετα) are merely variations from substantives or pronouns. Adverbs (Ἐπιρηματα) are fixed case-forms of substantives or adjectives or pronouns. Prepositions (προθέσεως) are adverbs used with nouns or with verbs (in composition). Conjunctions (σύνδεσμοι) are adverbs used to connect words and sentences in various ways. Intensive (Ἐπιτασεως) particles are adverbs from nominal or pronominal stems of a special kind. Speech has made a very small beginning with isolated words; in fact the sentence is probably as old as human speech, though we first discuss words. The number of root-words with the mere ending is not very great, but some few survive even in the N. T., where the case-ending is added directly to the root, as ἡλ-ς (Ἑλα, Mk. 9:50), with which compare Latin *sal*, English *salt*. So ναῦς (Ac. 27:41), Latin *nauis*. Instead of ἡλς the N. T. elsewhere follows the κοινή in using τὸ ἡλας, and τὸ πλοῖον instead of ναῦς. In ποὺς (πόδ-ς) the root is only slightly changed after the loss of δ (analogy of οὖς or ὄδοις). The pronoun εἶς (Ε-ς) is similarly explained. Pronouns and numerals use the root directly. In verbs we have many more such roots used directly with the personal endings without the thematic vowel ο/ε and sometimes without any tense-suffix for the present, like ἡ-μι (ἡ-μι). The whole subject of verbs is much more complicated, but in general the non-thematic forms are rapidly disappearing in the N. T., while in the vernacular modern Greek the non-thematic or μι verbs are no longer used (save in the case of εἶ-μι), as διόδω for δίδω-μι, for instance. A number of these roots go back to the common Indo-Germanic stock. Take δικ, the root of δείκνυ-μι. The Sanskrit has δίς-ā-ṁ; the Latin *dic-o, in-dic-o, ju-dex*; the German *zeigen*. Take the thematic verb σκέπ-το-μι. The

---

5 Harris HARRIS, J. RENDEL, Side-Lights on N. T. Research (1908).
7 Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 235.
9 “Über das relative Alter der einen oder der anderen Wortklasse läßt sich nichts Sicheres ausmachen” (Vogrinz, Gr. des hom. Dial., 1889, p. 164).
Sanskrit root is śṛṣṭi (‘look’), śṛṣṭi=spy. The Zend has ṣṛṣṭi, the Latin spec-iō, speculum, speceto, etc. In the Greek root metathesis has taken place and σπας has become [Page 146] σκεπ in σκέπ-το-ματ (‘to spy out’), σκοπ-ή (‘a watching’), σκοπ-ία (‘a watch-tower’), σκοπ-ός (‘a spy,’ ‘a goal’), σκόψ (‘owl’). Cf. Ph. 3:14 κατά σκοπόν. The old Greek writers made μυστήριον=μῦς τηρέω!

III. Words with Formative Suffixes. The Indo-Germanic languages have a highly developed system of affixes, prefixes, infixes, suffixes. The suffixes are used for various purposes, as case-endings of nouns, as personal endings of verbs, as aids in the creation of words (formative suffixes). The Greek is rich in these formative suffixes, which are more or less popular at various periods of the language. The suffixes in the Greek are quite similar to those in the older Sanskrit. When the formative suffixes are used directly with the root, the words are called primitives; when the stem of the word is not a root, it is called a derivative. Hence there are primitive and derivative verbs, primitive and derivative substantives, primitive and derivative adjectives. There are, of course, in the N. T. Greek no “special” formative suffixes, though the κοινή does vary naturally in the relative use of these terminations from the earlier language. In the modern Greek a number of new suffixes appear like the diminutives πολώνος (πώλος, ‘foal’), κτλ. “In all essentials the old patterns are adhered to” in the N. T. word-formation. See also Hadley-Allen (pp. 188 ff.) for the meaning of the Greek formative suffixes.

(a) VERBS. On the stem-building of the verb one can consult Hirt or Brugmann for the new point of view. Without attempting a complete list of the new words in the κοινή, I give what is, I trust, a just interpretation of the facts concerning the new words appearing from the time of Aristotle on that we find in the N. T. Hence some classes of words are not treated.
1. Primary or Primitive Verbs. No new roots are used to make verbs with old or new terminations in the κοινή. The tendency is all towards the dropping of the non-thematic or μι forms both with the simple root and with the suffix. The remnants of the μι forms, which are not quite obsolete in the N. T., will be given in the chapter on the Conjugation of the Verb. Here may be mentioned ὁπόλλωμι, which uses the suffix –νο. Thematic verbs made from the root by the addition of ο/ε are very common, like λέγ-ω, λείπ-ω (λιπ). The N. T., as the κοινή, has new presents like κρύβω, νίπτω, χύνω, etc. These kept increasing and are vouched for by modern Greek. Cf. Thumb, Handbook, pp. 129 ff.

2. Secondary or Derivative Verbs. Not all of these verbs are formed from nouns; many come also from verbs. Denominatives are made from nouns, like τιμά-ω from τιμή, while verbal roots (post-verbs, Jannaris) are made from verbs. The simple denominatives, ending in –άω, –έω, –δέω, –άζω, –ίζω, are not always distinguished from the intensive verbs or the causative denominatives, though ––δόω, ––ίνω, ––ύνω more commonly represent the latter. Ὀπτάω (from ὀπτω) besides Ac. 1:3 appears in the LXX, Hermes, Tebt. Papyri. Cf. also the rare λιμάνω. The κοινή is rich in new verbs in –νω. Verbs in –άω are common in the N. T., as in the κοινή, like κρύβω, νίπτω, χύνω, etc.

The majority of the new verbs in –έω are compound, as ἀγχημονέω, πληροφορέω (πληρο–φόρος, LXX, pap.), but δυνατέω (only in N. T.) is to be noticed on the other side. Ἀκοιρέω (from ἀκοιρός) is found in Diodorus; εὐπρόσωπέω (εὐπρόσωπος) is found in Gal. 6:12 (in papyri, 114 B.C.; ἐπως εὐπροσώπωμεν, Tebt. P. No. 19,12 f.). Cf. Moulton, Expositor, 1903, p. 114. These verbs have always been very numerous, though –εω gradually retreats before –ω. Γρηγόρεω (Arist., LXX, Jos.) is formed from the perfect ἐγρήγορα, which is not in the N. T., but Winer long...
Verbs in –έω are also very common and are formed from a great variety of stems. Αἴχω (from αἰχάλωτος) is in 2 Tim. 3:6 only by D” EKL al. pl. Or., the form in –ιώ being genuine. It is, however, common in the LXX, as is ἐγκρατεύω (1 Cor. 9:25), from ἐγκρατής (in Aristotle). Γυμνιεῖσθαι (not γυμνισθεῖσθαι, Dio Chrys., Plut., Dio Cass., etc.) is found in 1 Cor. 4:11 and is from γυμνητής.

The causative ending –ῶ is usually formed on noun-stems and is very common, sometimes supplanting verbs in –έω or –ιώ, as ἄνα-καινόω (Isocrates, ἄνακαινίζω), ἄναστατόω (from ἄναστατος, LXX, papyri. Cf. ἄναστατος με, ‘he upsets me,’ Deissmann, Light, p. 81); ἄρα-πυνώ (Anthol., classical ἄρα-πυνιζώ); δεκατεύω (classical δεκατεύω); δολιόω (LXX, from δόλος); δυναμόω (LXX, eccl. and Byz., from δύναμις); ἔξουσινώ (often in LXX, but W. H. read ἔξουσινω in Mk. 9:12, Plutarch even ἔξουσινιζω); θεμελιώω (LXX) is from θεμελίων; καυσόω (from καύσος, Disc., Galen); κεφαλίζω (Lob., ad Phryn., p. 95, κεφαλίζω, though not in any known Greek author) W. H. read in Mk. 12:4 with NBL as against κεφαλίζω and it means ‘beat on the head’ (cf. κολαφίζω). So κολοβόω (from κόλοβος, Arist., Polyb.,

1 W.-M., p. 115.
4 Cf. Sütterlin, Zur Gesch. der Verba Denom., p. 95.
Verbs in –ιζω do not necessarily represent repetition or intensity. They sometimes have a causative idea and then again lose even that distinctive note and supplant the older form of the word. Forms in –ιζω are very frequent in the N. T., as the γογγύζω (from γογγύς, ‘the nose’) is in the LXX and in literary (EKL), though neither word is known elsewhere, perhaps coined by Paul; φυλακίζω (from φυλακή) is in LXX and Byzantine writers. Of verbs in –ιζω, γογγύζω (onomatopoetic, like τονθρύζω of the cooing of doves) is in the LXX and the papyri.

Verbs in –όω are fairly common, like παροξύνω. Only one word calls for mention, σκληρύνω (from σκληρός, Plut., Epict., M. Aur., inscriptions); κραταίω (LXX, eccl.), from κρατίων; σαφώ (Artem., Apoll., Dus.) from σαφείρο (sφρός); σημειώω (from σημείων, Theophr., Polyb., LXX, Philo, Dion. Hal., etc.); σθενώ (Rhett. Gr.), from σθενεό (σθένος); χαριτώ (LXX, Jos., eccl.), from χάρις. Verbs in –όω do not always have the full causative idea. 

Verbs in –ιζω do not necessarily represent repetition or intensity. They sometimes have a causative idea and then again lose even that distinctive note and supplant the older form of the word. Forms in –ιζω are very common in modern Greek. Ρατικοί (LXX, Athen.), for instance, in the N. T. has displaced ῥαίνω, and βαπτίζω (since Plato) has nearly supplanted βάπτισο. These verbs come from many sorts of roots and are very frequent in the N. T., as the κοινή is lavish with them. The new formations in the κοινή appearing in the N. T. are as follows: αἰρετίζω (from αἰρετός, LXX, inscriptions); αἴμαλωτίζω (literary κοινή and LXX), from αἷμαλωτός; ἁνθεματίζω (LXX and inscriptions), from ἄνθέμιος; ἄνεμιζω (Jas. 1:6) is found in schol. on Hom. Od. 12, 336, the old form being ἄνεμω; ἄνεντιζω (from ἄνεντης, Arist., Polyb., Jos.); δειγματίζω (from δείγμα) appears in apocryphal Acts of Peter and Paul; δογματίζω (from δόγμα) is in Diodorus and the LXX; ἡγγίζω (from ἡγγύς, from Polyb. and Diod. on); ἦξ-υπνίζω (from ἦπνος, LXX, Plut.); θεατρίζω (from θεάτρον) in ecclesiastical and Byzantine writers, ἐκθεατρίζω being in Polybius; ἱματίζω (from ἱμάτιον) is [Page 150] found in Serapeum papyrus 163 B.C.; ιουδαίζω (from Ἰουδαῖος) is found in the LXX and Josephus and is formed like ἔλληνιζω and similar ethnic terms; καθάριζω (classic καθαίρω, from καθάρος, LXX, Jos., inscriptions); κρυσταλλίζω (from κρύσταλλος, Rev. 21:11) is still “not found elsewhere” (Thayer); μυκτηρίζω (from μυκτήρ, ‘the nose’) is in the LXX; ὄρθριζω (from ὄρθος) is in the LXX; πελεκίζω (from πέλεκος) is common in literary κοινή; σκορπίζω (akin to σκορπίος, root skerp) is in LXX and in literary κοινή, Attic form being σκεδάνω μι, old Ionic according to Phrynichus; σπλάγχνιζομαι (from σπλάγχνα, Heb. דָּלְפֵי) occurs in LXX, Attic had an active σπλαγχνεύω; συμμορφίζω (from σύμμορφος) is the correct text in Ph. 3:10 against συμμορφώ (EKL), though neither word is known elsewhere, perhaps coined by Paul; φυλακίζω (from φυλακή) is in LXX and Byzantine writers. Of verbs in –ιζω, γογγύζω (onomatopoetic, like τονθρύζω of the cooing of doves) is in the LXX and the papyri.

Verbs in –όω are fairly common, like παροξύνω. Only one word calls for mention, σκληρύνω (from σκληρός), which takes the place of the rare σκληρύνω and is found in LXX and Hippocrates. No new verbs in –αίνω (like εὐφραίνω) appear in the N. T. Verbs in –σκω are, like the Latin verbs in -scio, generally either inchoative or causative. It is not a very common termination in the N. T., though εὐρίσκω, γινώσκω and διδάσκω occur very often, but these are not derivative verbs. In the N. T. the inchoative sense is greatly weakened. The suffix belongs to the present and the imperfect only. In modern Greek it has nearly disappeared save in the dialects. Γαμίζω (accepted by W. H. in Lu. 20:34) rather than γαμίζω is causative (Arist. pol.); γηράσκω and μεθύσκω both come from the earlier Greek. Ἐν-διδό-σκω occurs

2 Λβ.
1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 302; Thumb, Handb., p. 133.
in the LXX, Jos., inscriptions. The new present στήκω (Mt. 11:25) is made from the perfect stem ἐστήκα (στέκω in modern Greek). As in N. T., so in modern Greek desideratives in –σίω, –σιάω drop out. The verbs in –τάω still retained (ὑγαλλίαω, ἄροτρ-τάω, θυμ-τάω, κοπ-τάω) have no desiderative meaning. Of these ὑγαλλίαω, for the old ὑγάλλομι, is late κοπ-τάω; ἄροτράω is from Theophr. On, κοπ-τάω is late in the sense of ‘toil.’ No new reduplicated verbs appear in the N. T.

(b) Substantives.

1. Primary or Primitive Substantives. Here the formative (stem-suffix) suffix is added to the root. It is important to seek the [Page 151] meaning not only of the root, but of this formative suffix also when possible. The root has in most cases the strong form, as in λόγ(λεγ)-ο-ς. These substantives are thus from the same root as the verb. With –μό-ς, –μή, expressing action, are formed in the old Greek words like θο-μός, τιμ-μή. With –μα, denoting result, we find ἄντ-σισ-μα (LXX, old Greek ἄντ-σισ-σις, from ἄντ-σισ-σις); διά-στη-μα (from διά-στη-μα, Arist., Polyb., Philo); ἔν-δυ-μα (from ἐν-δύμα, LXX, Strabo, Jos., Plut.); θέλη-μα (from θέλω, Arist. and LXX); κατά-κρι-μα (from κατά-κρι-μα, Dion. Hal., Pap.); κατά-λο-μα (from κατά-λο-μα, literary κομ-μα for old κατ-σογεαθόν, and with idea of place); κατα-στη-μα (καθ-στη-μα, Plut. and the LXX); κτίσ-μα (from κτίσ-μα, Strabo, Dion. Hal.); πρόσ-κο-μα (from προς-κό-μα, in LXX and Plut.). The suffix –σις, meaning action (abstract), appears in ἄνα-βλεγ-ις (Arist., LXX); ἄνα-δειχ-ις (from ἄνα-δειχ-ιν-μή, Plut., Diod., Strabo, Sirach); θέλη-σις in Heb. 2:4 (from θέλω, a “vulgarism,” according to Pollux); κατά-νυ-ις (from κατά-νυ-ις, LXX); κατά-κρι-σις (from κατά-κρι-σις, Vettius Valens, eccl.); πεποίθη-σις (from πε-ποίθ-α, πείθο, Josephus and Philo, condemned by the Atticists); πρόσ-κλι-σις (from προσ-κλί-ω, Polyb. and Diod.); πρόσ-χι-σις (from προσ-χι-ω, Justin Martyr and later). The suffix –μονή is used with πεπο-μονή (from πείθο, Ignatius and later) and ἐπι-ληπ-μονή (ἐπι-λανθ-άνω, ἐπι-λήψ-μων, Sirach). Σαγ-ήνη (LXX, Plut., Lucian) has suffix –ήνη (cf. –ον, –ον, etc.). Δια-σπορ-ά (δια-σπορ-ά, LXX, Plut.) and προσ-ευχ-ή (προσ-ευχ-όμαι, LXX, inscriptions) use the suffix –α (–Η). Cf. ὑπό-γραφ-ή (N. T., papyri), ὑπό-δοχ-ή (inscriptions), ὕψιθ (papyri), ἐμπλοκή (ἐμπλέκω, inscriptions), διά-ταχ-ή (δια-τάσ, papyri, inscriptions, later writings). The agent is usually –της (Blass, Gr., p. 62), not –τωρ or –την as in διώκτης (from διώκω, earliest example) and δό-της (from δό-ω, classic δοτήρ. But cf. σο-τήρ). See γνώστης (γνώσκω, LXX, Plut.), κτίσ-της (κτίσ-μα, Arist., Plut., LXX), ἐπι-στά-της (only in Luke, ἐρίστημι). See further under compound words for more examples. In modern Greek –της is preserved, but –τωρ and την become –τορ, –τηρας. Jannaris, op. cit., p. 288; Thumb, Handbook, p. 49. I pass by words in –ευς, –εν, –τρον, etc.

2. Secondary or Derivative Substantives. Only important words not in common use in the older Greek can be mentioned.

(a) Those from verbs. Words in –μός expressing action. From verbs in –ἀζω come ἀγασ-μός (ancient Greek ἀγίζω, but later form common in LXX and N. T.); ἀγνίς-μός (from ἀγνίζω, Dion. Hal., LXX, Plut.); ἀπαρτις-μός (Dion. Hal., Apoll. Dyse., papyri); ἀρπαγ-μός (ἀρπάζω is from root ἀρπαγ, ἀρπαγ-μός once
Abstract nouns in –σις are βίω-σις (in Sirach, from βίω); ἀνα-καινό-σις (Ἀνακαινο-ω, Etym. M. Herm.); ἀπάντη-σις (Ἀπαντά-ω, LXX, Polyb., Diod., papyri); ἀποκάλυψις (LXX, Plut.); ἀπο-κατά-στα-σις (Polyb., Diod., papyri, etc.); ἀπο-στα-σία (LXX); ἐκζήτη-σις (Ἐκζήτηω, true text in 1 Tim. 1:4, Basil Caes., Didym.); ἐν-δόμη-σις (from ἐνδόμεω, Jos., also ἐνδόμημες); ἐπιπόθη-σις (LXX, from ἐπιπόθεω); ὑπά-ἄντη-σις (LXX, Jos., App.). Words in –σις, common in Hebrews, make few new formations in the later Greek. Ἀγάπη begins to displace ἄγαπης (LXX, inscription in Pisidia, and papyrus in Herculaneum). Abstract nouns in –ἐτα (W. H. –ία) are chiefly from verbs in –έω as ἄφρεσκεία (from ἄφρεσκεω, Polyb., Diod., papyri, and usually in bad sense); ἐπι-πόθεια (so W. H., not ἐπιπόθια, in Ro. 15:23, from ἐπιπόθεω, probably by analogy like ἐπιθυμία. Not found elsewhere). Ἐρήθεια (from ἔρθεω, Arist. pol. The verb from ἔρθως, ‘working for hire’); ἱερατεία (from ἱερατεύω, Arist. pol., Dion. Hal., LXX, inscriptions); λογεία (–ία) is from λογεύω (‘collect’) and is found in inscriptions, ostraca, papyri (see Deissmann, Light, p. 105); μεθοδεία (from μεθοδέω, which occurs in the Koine, from μέθοδος, but not the abstract noun).

From ὀφειλῶ we have ὀφειλή (common in the papyri), ὀφεῖλμα (Plato, Arist., LXX). Words in –μα (result) are more common in the later Greek and gradually take an abstract idea of –σις in modern Greek. The new formations appearing in the N. T. are ἀ-γνώ-μα (O. T. Apoc., from ἄγνωστο; αίτιο-μα (correct text in Ac. 25:7, and not αἰτίαμα, from αἰτίαμαι). Cf. αἰτίοις in Eustathius, p. 1422, 21. This form as yet not found elsewhere); ἄντλημα (from ἄντλέω, Plut., what is drawn, and then strangely a thing to draw with, like ἄντλητρ or ἄντλητριον); ἀπ-ἀγγάσ-μα (from ἀπαγγέλω, and this from ἀπό and αὐγή, in Wisdom and Philo); ἄπο-σκιά-μα (from ἄποσκιαζό, and this from ἀπό and σκιά. Only in Jas. 1:17); ἄσθενή-μα (from ἄσθενεω, in physical

---


For long list of derivative substantives in the Ptol. pap. see Mayser, Gr., pp. 416–447.

sense in Arist. hist., papyri); βάπτισ-μα (from βαπτίζω, “peculiar to N. T. and ecclesiastical writers,” Thayer). In βάπτισ-μα, as distinct from βάπτισ-μός, the result of the act is included (cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 62); ἐξέρα-μα (from ἐξεράω, in Dioscor., example of the verb, cf. Lob., ad Phryn., p. 64); ἢττη-μα (from ἢτταύ-μαι, LXX, in ecclesiastical writers); ἱεράτευ-μα (from ἱερατεύω, LXX); κατ-όρθω-μα (from κατ-όρθω, literary κοινή, as Polyb., Diod., Strabo, Jos., Plut., Lucian and 3 Macz.); βάπτισ-μα (from βαπτίζω, Antiph., Anthol., Lucian); στέρεω-μα (from στερέω, Arist., LXX). Blass calls attention to the fact that in the later Greek words in –μα, like those in –σις, –της, –τος, often prefer stems with a short vowel, as δόμα (δόσις), θέμα (θέσις), though this form is already in the older Doric, κλ-μα, κρ-μα, πόμα (Attic πόμα). Hence ἄνάθε-μα in N. T., though ἄνάθημα in Lu. 21:5 (W. H. acc. to BLQΓ, etc.), and in the papyri “nouns in –μα are constantly showing short penult.”3 But ἄνάθεμα, like θέμα and δόμα, belongs to the list of primary substantives.

Words in –της (agent) are fairly numerous, like βαπτισ-της (from βαπτίζω, Jos.); βιασ-της (from βιάζω. Pind., Pyth. and others use βιατάς); γογγυσ-της (from γογγύζω, Theodotion and Symm. translation of the LXX); ἐλληνισ-της (from ἐλληνίζο, not in Greek authors, though ἐλληνίζο is, as in Xen., Anab., and Strabo, etc.); ἐξ-ορκισ-τής (from ἔξ-ορκίζο, Jos., Lucian, eccl. writers); εὐαγγελισ-της [Page 154] (from εὐαγγελίζο, eccl. writers); κερματισ-της (from κερματιζω, Nicet., Max. Tyr.); κολλοβισ-της (found in Men. and Lys.) has no verb κολλοβίζω, but only κολλοβος, a small coin; λυτρό-της (from λυτρό, LXX and Philo); μερίς-της (from μερίζω, Pollux); προσ-κυνή-της (from προσκυνεῖον, inscriptions, eccl. and Byz.); στασισ-της (from στασιάω, Diod., Dion. Hal., Jos., Ptol.); τελειω-της (from τελειῶ, only in Heb. 12:2). A few late words in –τηρ-ιον (from –τηρ and –ιον) occur as ἄκροατήριον (from ἄκροαόμαι, Plut. and other κοινή writers) where –τηριον means ‘place’; ἰλασ-τήριον (from ἰλάσκομαι, LXX, inscriptions, papyri, Dio Chrys.) is a substantive in the N. T., made probably from the adjective ἰλαστήριος (cf. σωτήριος) and means ‘propitiatory gift’ or ‘means of propitiation’ and does not allude to the mercy seat or covering. However, in Heb. 9:5 ἰλαστήριον does have the meaning of ‘place of propitiation’ or ‘mercy seat’ (cf. θυμία-τήριον). Deissmann passed this passage by, though he is correct in Ro. 3:25. Cf. φυλακτήριον.

(β) Those from substantives. Several words expressing place are formed after the fashion of the older Greek as ἄκροαόμαι, Plut. and other κοινή writers) where –τηριον means ‘place’; ἰλασ-τήριον (from ἰλάσκομαι, LXX, inscriptions, papyri, Dio Chrys.) is a substantive in the N. T., made probably from the adjective ἰλαστήριος (cf. σωτήριος) and means ‘propitiatory gift’ or ‘means of propitiation’ and does not allude to the mercy seat or covering. However, in Heb. 9:5 ἰλαστήριον does have the meaning of ‘place of propitiation’ or ‘mercy seat’ (cf. θυμία-τήριον). Deissmann passed this passage by, though he is correct in Ro. 3:25. Cf. φυλακτήριον.

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 62 f. For same thing in LXX (ἄναθεμα, πρόσθεμα, δόμα, etc.) see C. and S., Sel. from LXX, p. 28.
3 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 108. He instances besides ἄναθεμα in the sense of ‘curse,’ θέμα, ἐπίθεμα, πρόσθεμα, πρόδομα. On ἄναθεμα, for exx. in iii/B.C. inscr., see Glaser, De Rat., quae interc. inter serm. Polyb. etc., 1894, p. 82.
1 See Deiss., B. S., p. 131 f., where a lucid and conclusive discussion of the controversy over this word is given. See also Zeitschr. für neutest. Wiss., 4 (1903), p. 193.
ἀμπελ-ών from ἀμπελός, in the LXX, Jos., inscriptions and papyri,2 with which compare μῦλών (–ῶν) in Mt. 24:41 according to DHM and most cursives instead of μῦλος. Moulton (The Expositor, 1903, p. 111) has found φοινίκον (–ῶν), ‘palm-grove,’ in A. P. 31 (112 B.C.). Εἰδωλεύον (–ων W. H.), found first in 1 Macc. and 1 Esd., is formed after the analogy of μοσου-ἴο-ν. Τελώνιον (from τελώνις) is found in Strabo. Τετράδιον (Philo) is from τετράς, the usual guard in the prisons. Several new words in –της (quality) appear, as ἄδελφο-της (from ἄδελφος, 1 Macc., 4 Macc., Dio Chrys., eccl. writers); θεό-της (from θεός, Lucian, Plut.); κυριό-της [Page 155] (from κύριος, originally adj., eccl. and Byz. writers). Συροφοινίκισσα is the text of אAKL, etc., in Mk. 7:26 as against ΣύραΦοινίκισσα in BEFG, etc. In either case φοινίκισσα, not φοίνισσα (Text. Rec.) which is the usual feminine of φοίνιξ, as Κίλισσα is of Κίλιξ. Lucian has a masculine Συροφοίνιξ and Justin Martyr a feminine Συροφοινίκη. From this last φοινίκισσα probably comes. Cf. the use of βασίλισσα, the Atticists preferring βασιλίς or βασίλεια.

Ἡρώδιανός (from Ἡρώδης) and Χριστ-ιανός (from Χριστός) first appear in the N. T., and are modelled after Latin patronymics like Caesarianus (Καισαρ-ιανός, Arrian-Epictetus). Blass’ goes unnecessarily far in saying that the N. T. form was Χρηστ-ιανός (from Χρηστός), though, of course, ι and η at this time had little, if any, distinction in pronunciation. Μεγιστάν is from μεγίστος (as νεαν from νέος). Cf. Latin megistanes. Μεγιστάν is found in LXX, Jos., Maneth. Πληµµύρα (LXX, Dion. Hal., Jos., Philo) is from πλήµµυρα. There was, of course, no “Christian” or “biblical” way of forming words.

Diminutives are not so common in the N. T. as in the Byzantine and modern Greek2 where diminutives are very numerous, losing often their original force. Βιβλαρίδιον (a new form, but compare λιθαρίδιον) is read in Rev. 10:2 by ΝΑCP against βιβλιδάριον (fragment of Aristoph.) according to C* and most of the cursives and βιβλίον (by B). Variations occur also in the text of verses 8, 9, 10. Γυναικάριον (from γυνή), κλινίδιον and κλινάριον (from κλίνη) occur from Aristoph. on. Κοράσιον (from κόρη, called Maced. by Blass) is used disparagingly in Diog. Laert. and Lucian, but in LXX and Epict. as in the N. T. that is not true, though it hardly has the endearing sense (sometimes found in the diminutive) in κυνάριον (κύνες=’street-

2 Blass is unduly sceptical (Gr., p. 64). Deiss. (B. S., p. 208 f.) finds nine examples of ἐλαιών=’place of olives’ or ‘olive orchard’ in vol. I of the Ber. Pap., and Moulton (Exp., 1903, p. 111; Prol., p. 49) has discovered over thirty in the first three centuries A.D. In Ac. 1:12 it is read by all MSS. and is correct in Lu. 19:29 (ag. W. H.) and 21:37 (ag. W. H.). Ἐλαιών is right in Lu. 19:37, etc. In Lu. 19:29; 21:37, question of accent. Cf. also ἄμπελών (from ἄμπελος, LXX, Diod., Plut.) which is now found in the pap.

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 63. Cf. Lipsius, Urspr. des Christennamens, 1873. W.-Sch. (p. 135) suggests that these two words are not after the Lat. model, but after the type of Ἀσιανός, which was foreign to the European Greeks. But Ἀσιανός (from Ἀσία) is in Thucyd. and besides is not parallel to Χριστός, Χριστ-ιανός. Cf. Eckinger, Die Orthog. lat. Wörter in griech. Inschr., 1893, p. 27.

dogs’), but that sense appears often in παιδίον as in Jo. 21:5. Ὄναριον (from ὄνος) is found in Machon and Epictetus. Ὄψάριον (from ὄψις) is found in Alexis and Lucian, and ὅψωνον (likewise from ὄψις) is used by Dion., Polyb., Jos., Apocrypha and papyri. Ἐπερύγιον [Page 156] (from πτέρυξ) comes from Arist. down, but ψίχιον (from ψίξ) does not appear elsewhere. Both ὄστεριον (Anthol., Anax.) and ὦτιόν (LXX) are from ωτός, but have lost the diminutive idea, just as μύτι in modern Greek means merely ‘eye’ (ὀμμάτιον). Blass’ indeed accuses Luke of atticising when he uses ωτός in Lu. 22:50.

(7) Those from adjectives. The new substantives derived from adjectives in the later Greek found in the N. T. all have suffixes expressing quality. With –ia we find ἀπο-του-ία (from ἀπό-τομος, Diod., Dion., pap.); ἔλαφρια (from ἔλαφρος, cf. Lob., ad Phryn., p. 343. Cf. ἀσχρ-ία from ἄσχρος, Eust.); παράφρον-ία (from παράφρον). Greek writers use παράφρο-σύνη, but cf. εὐθομιαί-ία from εὐθομιαίων). So περισσεία (from περισσός, LXX, inscriptions, Byz.). W. H. use the ending –ia with κακοπάθ-εια (from κακοπαθής). With –όνη several new words occur from adjectives in –oς with the lengthening of the preceding vowel, as ἄγνω-σύνη (from ἄγνως, eccl.); ἄγιο- σύνη (from ἄγιος, not in earlier Greek writers); μεγαλο-σύνη (from stem μεγάλο of μέγας, LXX and eccl.). These forms are like ἵερο-σύνη from ἵερος (also in N. T.) which is as old as Herod. and Plato. Still μεγαλο-σύνη and ἵερο-σύνη are both found in inscriptions or in Glycas. Most of the words in –όνη belong to the later language. Ἐλεγμο-σύνη (from ἐλεγμός, Callim. in Del., Diog. Laert., LXX), like other words in –όνη, loses the ρ. So ταπεινο-φρο-σύνη (Jos., Epict.). Rather more numerous are the new words in –τής, as ἄγιο-τής (from ἄγιος, 2 Macc.); ἄγινα-τής (from ἄγινος, inscriptions); ἄδηλό-τής (from ἄδηλος, Polyb., Dion. Hal., Philo); ἄφελο-τής (from ἄφελος, eccl. writers, ancient Greek ἄφελεια); γιμνό- τής (from γυμνός, Deut., Antonin.); μάταια-τής (from μάταιος, LXX and eccl. writers); μεγαλειό-τής (from μεγαλείος, Athen., Jer.); πιό-τής (from πῖον, Arist., Theophr., LXX). Ἀκαθήρ-τής (Rev. 17:4) is not supported by any Greek MSS.

The neuter (and often the masculine and feminine) of any adjective can be used as a substantive with or without the article, as τό δοκίμω, Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 259 f., Dion. Hal., Long., LXX, papyri. Like μεθόδιον (the Syrian reading for θραία in Mk. 7:24) is προσφάγιον (προσ-φάγιος, –ον from προσ-φαγεῖν, [Page 157] inscriptions), σφάγιον (σφάγας, –ον, from σφαγή, Am., Ezek.), ὕπολην (ὑποληνίος, –ον, from ὕπολην, Demiopr. in Poll., Geop., LXX. Cf. ὕπο-ζύγιον). As already seen, ἴλασ-τήριον is probably the neuter of the adjective ἴλασ- τήριος, –α, –ον (from ἴλάσκομαι). So φυλακτήριον is the neuter of the adjective
φυλακ-τήριος, –α, –ον (from φυλακτήρ, φυλάσσω, Dem., Diosc., Plut., LXX).  
Σωτήριον and σωτηρία (from σωτήριος) are both common in the old Greek as is the case with ύπερ-φόν (from ὑπερῴος, –ωιος). Ζευκ-τηρία (from ζευκ-τήριος, only in Ac. 27:40) reverts to the abstract form in –ία.

(c) ADJECTIVES.

1. Primary or Primitive Adjectives. These, of course, come from verbal roots. Άμαρτ-ολός (from root άμαρτ-άνω, Arist., Plut., LXX, inscriptions) is like φείδ-ολος (4 Macc. 2:9), from φείδ-ομαι. Πειθ-ός (W. H. πιθ-ός from πείθω, as φειδ-ός from φείδομαι) is not yet found elsewhere than in 1 Cor. 2:4, but Blass regards it as “a patent corruption,” πειθοίς for πειθοίς. The evidence is in favour of πειθοίς (all the uncials, most cursive variants). Φάγος (from root φαγ–) is a substantive in the N. T. with paroxytone accent as in the grammarians, the adjective being φαγ-ός. The other new adjectives from roots in the N. T. are verbals in –τος. There is only one verbal (gerundive) in –τός (Lu. 5:38, elsewhere only in Basil), and that is neuter (βλητέος), “a survival of the literary language in Luke.” The sense of capability or possibility is only presented by the verbal παθη-τός (from root παθ–, πάσχω, eccl. writers). But the weakened sense of the verbal in –τος, more like an ordinary adjective, is very common in the later Greek. But they are rare in the modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 151). These verbals correspond to the Latin participle in -tus, like γνωστός, or to adjectives in -bilis, like δραμτός. They are common in the N. T., though not many new formations appear. They are usually passive like γραπ-τός (from γράφω, Georg. apol., LXX), though προσ-ήλυ-τος (προσ-έρχ-ομαι, root –ήλυθ-, LXX, Philo) is active in sense. The ancient form was ἔπηλυς. A number of new verbals were formed on compound words which will be discussed later. For the syntactical aspects of the verbal adjectives see discussion of the participle (cf. Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 221).

2. Secondary or Derivative Adjectives.

(a) Those from verbs. Σιτισ-τός (from σιτίζω, Jos., Athen.) is to be mentioned. It is equivalent to the Latin saginatus and is passive in meaning.

(b) Those from substantives. Some new words in –ιος occur as άμαράντινος (from άμαράντος, Philost., inscriptions); καθημερ-ινός (from καθ’ ἡμέραν, Athen., Plut., Jos.) is for ancient καθημερίος; κόκκ-ινος is from κόκκος (LXX, Plut., Epict., papyri); όρθρ-ινός (from όρθρος, LXX, older form όρθριος), with which compare ἐσπερ-ινός (from ἐσπέρα, from Xen. on) in the minusc. 1, 118, 209 (Lu. 12:38);
πρωινός (so W. H., from πρωί, for the older πρώιος, LXX, Plut., Athen., etc.); πύρινος (from πῦρ, Arist., LXX, Polyb., Plut.); ταχινός (from τάχα) from Theocritus on (LXX also).

There are several words in –ικός, like ἐθνικός (from ἐθνος, Polyb., Diod.); κερακίκος (from κέρακος, Hipp., Plat. pol., LXX) which supplanted the earlier κεράκιος, κερακεούς; κυριακός (from κύριος, –ακός instead of –ικός after ο, eccl. writers) is found in papyri of Fayûm and in inscriptions of Phrygia and Lydia. So λειτουργικός (from λειτουργία, LXX, papyri) and σαρκικός (from σῶς, in a contract in the Fayûm Papyri dated Feb. 8, A.D. 33).

Of special interest are several words in –ινός and –ικός. Ὀστράκινος (from ὀστρακόν, Hipp., Anthol., LXX), ‘made of clay,’ ‘earthen’; σάρκινος (from σάρξ, Arist., LXX, Polyb., Plut.) is thus not a new word, but is used in Heb. 7:16 and by Paul in 1 Cor. 3:1; Ro. 7:14 (correct text in each instance), where many MSS. have σαρκικός. Indeed σάρκινος in these two passages must mean more than made of flesh or consisting in flesh, perhaps “rooted in the flesh” (Thayer). Cf. relation of ἄληθ-ινός to ἄληθες. Still a real distinction seems to be observed between σάρκινος and σαρκικός in 1 Cor. 3:1 and 3:3. Σαρκ-ικός (from σάρξ, Arist., Plut., LXX) is a man who lives according to the flesh and is here opposed to those who are πνευματικοί (from πνεύμα, from Arist. down, but not in LXX, pertaining to the wind). But ὁ ψυχ-ικός (from ψυχή, Arist., Polyb., down) is the man possessed [Page 159] of mere natural life (1 Cor. 2:14) as opposed to regenerate (πνευματικός) life (1 Cor. 2:15). Σαρκικός can be applied to either of these two distinct classes. But in 1 Cor. 3:3 ἔτι γὰρ σαρκικοὶ ἔστε Paul reproaches the Corinthians. Proper names also have -ικός, as Ἐβραϊκός. Note accent in Τυχικός. Ῥωμαϊκός (from Ῥωμή) is read in Lu. 23:38 by the Western and Syrian MSS., common in the literary κοινή (Polyb., Diod., etc.).

Αἰώνιος, though found in Plato and Diod., is not a common adjective. But cf. LXX, O. T. Apoc., Philo, inscriptions, papyri. Cf. Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, 1908, p. 174. Δοκίμιος is from δοκιμή (Dion. Hal., Long., LXX, papyri). Μίσθιος is from μίσθος (LXX, Plut.), while Ρωμαίος is common in the literary κοινή. Μελίσσιος (from μελίσσα, like θαλάσσιος from θάλασσα) is read by the Syrian class of documents in Lu. 24:42. The word occurs nowhere else, though Nic. has μελισσαῖος and Eustath. μελίσσειος.

2 See comm. in loco. W.-M. (p. 123) held that σάρκινος was “hardly to be tolerated” in Heb. 7:16, but Schmiedel (p. 139) has modified that statement. Cf. on –ινός, Donaldson, New Crat., p. 458.
1 See Trench, N. T. Synon., 1890, pp. 268 ff.
Moulton and Milligan

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.
(γ) Those from adjectives. There are only a few new adjectives of this character, but they present special difficulties. About ἔπιούσιος (found only in Mt. 6:11 and Lu. 11:3 and used with ἄρτος) there has raged a long controversy. It has been derived successively from ἐπί and σύσια, ‘bread for sustenance,’ though σύσια only has the sense of ὑπάρξις in philosophical language (another theory, ‘bread of substance’ in the spiritual sense); from ἐπί and ὄν (ἐπόντιος, ἔπονσιος, like ἕκων, ἕκοψιος, etc.), ‘bread for the present,’ though the ὄ in ἐπί is not allowed to remain with a vowel save when a digamma existed as in ἐπεικής; from ἐπ-ιών (ἐπ-έμι, ‘approach’), like Ἦ ἐπιούσια (ἡμέρα), ‘the next day’ (Ac. 16:11), this last a common idiom. Lightfoot2 has settled the matter in favour of the last position. See also Ἧρεμος (from ἥρεμης, adv. ἥρεμα, Lucian, Eustath., Hesych); νεωτερικός (from νεώτερος, 3 Macc., Polyb., Jos.). In περιόπεισιος (from περί-όν, περίειμι, LXX) no serious problem in etymology arises, for περί retains the i in composition with vowels. It is used with λαός, to express the idea that Israel belongs to God as his very own.3 Πιστ-ικός (from πιστός, [Page 160] Plato, Diog., Dion. Hal., in sense of persuading, but Artem., Cedrenus and other late writers in sense of ‘genuine’) is hardly to be derived from πιπίσκω or πίω and hence=‘drinkable.’ ‘Genuine nard’ is a much more probable meaning. For curious details see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 138, n. 24. Πισταπός is from the older ποδαπός and occurs in Dion. Hal., Philo, Jos., papyri.

(δ) Those from adverbs. From ἰνόνοις ἰνώτερος (Polyb., LXX, Arist.) and ἰνωτερικός (Hippoc., Galen); ἐξώτερος (LXX, Strabo, etc.) no serious problem in etymology arises, for ἐξωτερικός (from the participle ἐξωτερικός) is common in the literary writers; from Aristotle and Plutarch. Τυπικός (from ἡπικός, papyri also). Πισταπός (from πιστός, [Page 160] Plato, Diog., Dion. Hal., in sense of persuading, but Artem., Cedrenus and other late writers in sense of ‘genuine’) is hardly to be derived from πιπίσκω or πίω and hence=‘drinkable.’ ‘Genuine nard’ is a much more probable meaning. For curious details see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 138, n. 24. Πισταπός is from the older ποδαπός and occurs in Dion. Hal., Philo, Jos., papyri.

(d) The Adverb. The adverb φειδομένως (from the participle φειδόμενος, Plut., Mosch., Alex.) is a new word of this nature. Cf. ὅμολογομένως in the older Greek. So τυχόν, ὄντος and ὑπερβαλλόντως. The neuter accusative singular and plural of adjectives continue to be used adverbially. Βαθέως occurs also in Theoc. and Αelian. Ἀκμήν (Theoc., Polyb., Strabo) is in the inscriptions also as well as ἐν ἄκμη (cf. Ditt., Syll. 326, 12). Ἐβραίεσθαι (Sirach) is properly formed (cf. Ἐλληνιστι) from Ἐβραῖς. Τουδάκικῶς is in Jos. See also Ἕνικος (Apoll. Dysc., Diog. Laert.). Ἐτευ (correct text Mk. 4:28) is a rare Ionic form for εἶτα (papyri also). Κενῶς is used from Arist. on. Ὀλίγος occurs out of the N. T. only in Anthol. and Aquila. Πρῶτος (correct text Ac. 11:26) occurs here for the first time. Ἑητῶς is found in Polyb., Strabo, Plut. Ρομαστί is common in the literary koine (Plut., App., etc.) and in Epictetus. Σωματικός is in the ecclesiastical writers. Φυσικός is in Aristotle, Philo, etc. Mayser (Gr., pp. 455–459) has a good list of derivative adverbs. See ch. VII for full discussion of the formation of the adverb.


3 Cf. Lightfoot, Rev. of the N. T., pp. 234–242, for full discussion of περιούσιος.

Winer-Schmiedel WINER-SCHMIEDEL, Winer’s Grammatik des neutest. Sprachidioms. 8. Aufl. (1894—).
IV. Words Formed by Composition (Composita). The Greek in the Ptolemaic papyri is not equal to modern German in the facility with which agglutinative compound words (δυστά Aristotele termed them) are formed, but it is a good second. The N. T. writers make use of many of the new compounds (some new kinds also), but not more than the literary κοινή, though more than the Atticists or Purists. The following lists will show how fond the N. T. is of double prepositional compounds like ἀν-ἀνά-πληρόω, ἀπο-κατ-ἀλλάσσω, ἐπι-συν-ἀγω, συν-ἀντί-λαμβάνομαι, etc. So also compound prepositional adverbs like ἐνώπιον, κατενώπιον, κατέναντι, etc. On the whole subject of compound words in the Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser, Gr., pp. 466–506. Compound words played an increasing rôle in the κοινή. Cf. Jannaris, op. cit., p. 310. See in particular F. Schubert, Zur mehrfachen präfixalen Zusammensetzung im Griechischen, Xenia Austriaca, 1893, pp. 191 ff.

(a) KINDS OF COMPOUND WORDS IN GREEK: proper composition (σύνθεσις), copulative composition (παράθεσις), derivative composition (παρασύνθεσις). In the first class the principal idea is expressed by the second part of the word, while the first and qualifying part is not inflected, but coalesces with the second, using merely the stem with connective vowel. As an example take οἶκο-νόμος, ‘manager of the house.’ The second kind of composition, paratactic or copulative, is the mere union of two indepedent words like παρά-κλήτως. It is not common in the old Greek save in the case of prepositions with verbs, and even this usage is far more frequent in the later Greek. It is seen in many late compound adverbs as in ὑπερ-άνω. The third or derivative composition is a new word made on a compound, whether proper or copulative, as ἔλδωλο-λατρία (or –εία) from ἔλδωλο-λατρεία. The above classification is a true grammatical distinction, but it will be more serviceable to follow a more practical division of the compound words into two classes. Modern linguists do not like the term “proper composition.” In principle it is the same as copulative.

(b) INSEPARABLE PREFIXES. These make a cross-line in the study of compound words. They enter into the formation of verbs, substantives, adjectives and adverbs. By prefixes here is not meant the adverbs and prepositions so commonly used in composition, but the inseparable particles ἀ– (ἀν–) privative, ἀ– collective or intensive, ἄρχ–, δυσ– ἡμι–, νη–. As examples of such new formations in the N. T. may be taken the following substantives and adjectives (chiefly verbal) with ἀ– privative: ἀ-βαρῆς (from Arist. down, papyri, in metaphysical sense); ἀ-γενεα-λόγητος (LXX); ἀ-γνωφός (Thom. Mag.); ἀ-γνώμα (O. T. Apoc., papyri); ἀγρι-έλαιος (Arist., papyri); ἀ-γνοεῶ (Apolc., papyri); ἀ-δηλότης (Polyb., Dion. Hal., Philo); ἀ-δία-κρίτος (from Hippocrates down); ἀ-διά-λειπτος (Tim. Locr., Attic inscriptions, i.e., etc.); ἀ-δια-φθορία (not in ancient Greek); ἀ-δυνατέω (LXX, ancient Greek means ‘to be weak’); ἀ-θέμιτος (for earlier ἀ-θέμιτος); ἀ-θεσμός (LXX, Diod., Philo, Jos., Plut.); ἀ-θετεῶ (LXX, Polyb.); ἀ-καιρέω (Diod.); ἀ-κρήτης (Diog. Laert., eccl. writers, papyri); ἀ-κατά-γνωστός (2 Macc., eccl. writers, inscriptions, papyri); ἀ-κατα-κάλωπος (Polyb., LXX, Philo); ἀ-κατά-κρίτος (earliest example); ἀ-κατά-λυτος (4 Macc., Dion. Hal.); ἀ-κατά-παστός (found only here. [Page 162] This is the reading of AB in 2 Pet. 2:14 rather than ἀ-κατά-παστός, verbal of καταπαύω, found in Polyb., Diod., Jos., Plut., cf. W. H., App., p. 170; Moulton, Prol., p. 47); ἀ-κατά-στασία (Polyb., Dion. Hal., papyri); ἀ-κατά-στατος (Hippoc., Polyb., LXX); ἀ-
With ἄρχι from ἄρχω we have ἄρχη-άγγελος (eccl.); ἄρχη-ιερατικός (inscr., Jos.); ἄρχη-ερεύς (LXX, inscr.); ἄρχη-πομήν (Test. of 12 Patr., wooden tablet from Egypt, Express., 1906, p. 61); ἄρχη-συν-ἀγγελος (inscr., eccl.); ἄρχη-τελος (only in Lu. 19:2); ἄρχη-τρι-κλινος (Heliod., cf. συμποσι-άρχης in Sirach). Cf. ἄρχη-φυλακίτης, P.Tb. 40 (B.C. 117), ἄρχη-δεσμο-φύλαξ (LXX).

With ἄ- connective or intensive are formed ἄ-νευσις (for ἄ-νεπτις, LXX, cf. Lat. con-nepot-ius), ἄ-τενίζω (Polby., Dion., Jos., Lucian).

With δυς- we have δυς-βάστακτος (LXX, Philo, Plut.); δυς-εντερίαν (late form, correct text in Ac. 28:8, older form δυς-εντερία); [Page 163] δυς-ερεύς (Diod., Philo, Artem.); δυς-νόητος (Arist. Diog. Laert.); δυς-φημία (LXX, Dion. Hal., Plut.).

With ἕμι- (cf. Lat. semi) are found only ἕμι-θανής (Dion. Hal., Dion., LXX, Strabo), ἕμι-ωρον (so W. H., Strabo, Geop., ΝΠ have -ώριον). Cf. ἕμισις.

For νη- note νηπιάζω (Hippoc., eccl.).

(c) Agglutinative Compounds (Juxtaposition or Parathesis). This sort of composition includes the prepositions and the copulative composition (dvandva). This last is much more common in the koine than in the older Greek. Cf. Jannaris, op. cit., p. 310, and Mayser, Gr., p. 469.


2 Cf. on ἄ– connective or intensive, Don., New Crat., p. 397. Also Döderlein, De ἄλφα intenso, 1830.
1. Verbs. The new compound verbs are made either from compound substantives or adjectives or by combining adverbs with a verb-stem or noun-stem or by adding a preposition to the older verb. This last method is very frequent in the later Greek due to “a love for what is vivid and expressive.” This embellishment of the speech by compounds is not absent from the simplest speech, as Blass\(^2\) shows in the case of Titus, where over thirty striking compound words are found, omitting verball and other common ones. Moulton (\textit{Cl. Quarterly}, April, 1908, p. 140) shows from the papyri that the compound verb is no mark of the literary style, but is common in the vernacular also. The preposition fills out the picture as in ἄντι-μετρέω (Lucian), and so ἄντι-λαμβάνω (Diod., Dio Cass., LXX). So also observe the realistic form of the preposition in ἐξ-αστράπτω (LXX, Tryphiod.) in Lu. 9:29; κατα-λθάζω (eccl. writings) in Lu. 20:6. The modern Greek even combines two verbs to make a compound, as παίζω-γελῶ. As examples of new compound verbs may be given ἄγαθοργέω, ἄγαθοφρέχω, in 1 Tim. 6:18 (eccl.); ἄγαθο-ποιέω (LXX, later writers); ἀλλ-γνορείω (Philo, Jos., Plut., grammatical writers); ἄνα-ζάω (inscriptions, later writers); ἄνα-θεωρ-έω (Diod., Plut., Lucian); ἄνα-στατ-όω (LXX, papyri); ἄνε-ετάζω (LXX, papyri); ἄνετι-διά-τίθημι [Page 164] (Philo, eccl. writers); ἄνετι-παρ-έρχο-μαι (\textit{Anthol.}, \textit{Sap.}, eccl. writers, Byz.); ἄντι-οφθαλμέω (Sap., Polyb., eccl. writers); ἄπε-ελπίζω (LXX, Polyb., Dion., Dioc., inscriptions); ἄπο-γράφο-μαι (papyri); ἄπο-ηθσαυρῐζω (Sir., Dion., Jos., Epipt.); ἄπο-κεφαλίζω (LXX, Epipt., etc.); αὐθ-εντέω (Polyb., papyri); γονο-πείτεω (Polyb., Heliod., eccl. writers); δια-γνορίζω (Philo, schol. in \textit{Bekk.}); δια-γογγύζω (LXX, Heliod., Byz.); δια-γρηγορεύω (Herod., Niceph.); δια-ἀνσάζω (Polyb., Plut.); δια-φημίζω (Aratus, Dion. Hal.); δι-ερμηνεύω (2 Macc., Polyb., Philo); δι-οδέω (LXX, Polyb., Plut.); δουλ-αγωγέω (Diod. Sic. and on); εἰρηνο-ποιέω (LXX, Hermes); ἐκ-διαπανάω (Polyb.); ἐκ-δικέω (LXX, Apoll., Dion.); ἐμ-βατεύω (inscr.); ἐκ-καινίζω (LXX); ἐκ-κακέω (Polyb., Symm. translation of LXX, Philo, Clem. Rom.); ἐκ-χρίω (Tob., Strabo, \textit{Anthol.}, Epipt.); ἐκ-ἀρτίζω (Jos., Hipp.); ἐκ-ιαχύω (Sir., Strabo, Plut.); ἐπι-καταλάσω (Polyb.); ἐπι-φαινόω (LXX, Acta Thom.); ἐπι-χορηγέω (Dion. Hal., Phal., Diog. Laert., Alex. Aphr.); ἐπερο-διδασκαλέω (eccl. writers); ἐπερο-ζεύγω (LXX, Philo, Dion.); ἐπι-δοκέω (probably simply from ἐμ and δόκεω, as there is no such form as δόκος or εὐδόκος, and cf. καρα-δοκέω in Polyb., Dion., Dion. Hal.); ἐυθυ-δρομέω (Philo); ἐυκ-καιρέω (from Polybius on, papyri); ἐυ-προσ-οπέω (P. Tb., Chrys.); θηριο-μαχέω (Diod., Artem., Igr.); ζωο-γονέω (Theophr., Dion., Lucian, Plut.); ζωο-ποιέω (Arist., Theophr., LXX); κακ-οὐχέω (from obsolete κακ-οὐχος, i.e. κακόν, ἔξω, LXX, Dio Cass., Plut.); καλ-ποιέω (Etym. Magn., LXX, Philo); κατα-βαρέω (Polyb., Dion., App., Lucian papyri); κατ-αγωνίζομαι (Polyb., Jos., Lucian, Plut., \textit{Ælian}); κατ-αντάω (Polyb., Dion., eccl. writers, papyri); κατα-κλήρο-δοτέω (LXX); κατα-ποιέω (2 and 3 Macc., Hipp., Polyb., Dion., Jos., \textit{Æl}, etc.); κατ-εξ-ουσιάζω (only N. T.); κατ-

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 70. Mostly adj., but πειθ-αρχέει occurs in the list. Blass, ib., p. 65, even thinks that it is not the province of grammar to discuss the numerous compounds with prepositions. It belongs to the lexicon. The lists that I give are not complete for prepositional compounds because of lack of space. See Helbing (Gr. d. Sept., pp. 128–136) for good list of compound verbs in the LXX. Mayser (Gr., pp. 486–506) gives list of compound verbs in the Ptol. pap. The κοινή is fond of compound verbs made of noun and verb. Cf. \textit{εἰ ἔτεκνοτρόφησεν, εἰ ἔξενοδόχησεν} (1 Tim. 5:10). So ὑψηλοφρονεῖν (text of W. H. in 6:17).
often two prepositions are used in composition with the same verb, where the
proper meaning must be given to each. The use of double prepositional compounds
grew rapidly in the koine; cf. Schmid, Att. IV, pp. 708 ff. Mayser gives a long list in
the Ptol. papyri (Gr., pp. 497–504), some of which are old and some new. Of 162
examples 96 are new. The N. T. is in perfect accord with the koine here. So it is with
ντι-παρ-έρχομαι (Anthol., Wisdom, eccl. and Byz. writers) in Lu. 10:31; ντι-ανα-
πληρόω in Col. 1:24 (Dem., Dio Cass., Apoll. Dusc.); ντι-δια-τίθημι (Philoi, Diod.);
αιο-κατ-αλλάσσω (not in old Greek), ἐπι-δια-τάσσομαι (only in N. T.); ἐπι-συν-ἀρω
(LXX, Ἑσοπ, Polyb.); κατ-εξ-συσώσσω (only in N. T.); παρ-εισ-έρχομαι (Polby.,
Philoi, Plut.); προ-εν-άρχομαι (only in N. T.); συν-ανα-μίγνυμι (LXX, Plut.); συν-ανα-
πάομαι (LXX, Dion. Hal., Plut.); συν-αντι-λαμβάνομαι (LXX, Dion., Jos.,
inscriptions, papyri); ὑπερ-εκ-χύνω (LXX); ὑπερ-εν-τυγχάνω (eccl.). There is in the
papyri (P. Tb. I, 66) a triple prepositional compound, προ-αντ-αν-αιρέω.

2. Substantatives. Here again the new compound substantive draws on verbs,
substantives, adjectives, adverbs and prepositions for part or all of the word. There
are also double compound substantives from compound substantives, adjectives, adverbs
and prepositions like προσωπολημψία, ἀλλοτριπετόκοπος, διαπαρατριβή. The great
majority have substantive or adjective for the second half of the word. These nouns
are more often abstract than concrete. Ἀγαθο-ποιία (from adjective and verb-stem,
eccl. writers); Ἀγαθοποιίος [Page 166] (adjective and verb-stem, Sirach, Plut. and later
papyri); Ἄγρι-ελαίος (from Ἄγριος and Ἐλαίος, Arist.); Ἀματ-εκ-χυσία (from
substantive, preposition and verb χύνε, eccl. writers); Ἀκρο-βυσσία (LXX); Ἀλεκτορο-
φωνία (Ἀσοπ, Strabo, eccl. writers); Ἀλλοτρι-επί-σκοπος (from Ἀλλότριος and Ἐπί-
σκοπος, Dion. Areop., eccl. writers. Deissmann finds a synonym for the word in ἄλλοτρων ἐπιθυμητῆς, Fayûm Papyri. See Bible Studies, p. 224); ὃς-οδὸν (LXX, Aristoph., Hyper., papyri); ἄνα-δεξίς (Sir., Polyb., Plut.); ἄνα-στροφή in the ethical sense (LXX, Polybius on, inscriptions in Pergamum and Magnesia); ἄνα-χοισις (Strabo, Philo, Plut.); ὄνθ-όπατος (Polyb., Dion. Hal., Lucian, Plut., inscriptions); ἄντ-λυτρον (one translation of Ps. 48:9, Orph.); ἄντι-χριστός (probably formed by John, eccl.); ἄγγιο-κόπος (Plut., LXX, papyri); ἄρσενο-κοίτης (Anthol., eccl.); ἄπο-καρα-δοκία (verb –ω in LXX, Jos., Plut.); ἄσι-ἀρχής (inscriptions, Polyc.); γαζο-φυλάκιον (LXX, Jos., Strabo); γλωσσο-κομον (earlier γλωσσοκομοῦν, LXX, Jos., Plut., Longin., inscriptions, papyri); δαι-δαιμονία (Polyb., Diod., Jos., Plut.); δεσμο-φύλαξ (Jos., Lucian, Artem., ἄργ-ἀβισμο-φύλαξ, LXX); δι-ερμή-νία (only in AD 1 Cor. 12:10); δι-ερμηνευτής probably correct 1 Cor. 14:28, κατά-λεγμα (only found elsewhere is the correct text for 1 Tim. 6:5, not παρά-δια-τριβή, which may be compared with παρά-καιτ-θη-κη in 2 Tim. 1:12, but παρά-θη-κη (Herod., LXX, inscriptions, papyri) is the true reading; δωδεκά-φυλόν (Clem. of Rome, N. T. Apoc.); δικαίο-κρίσια (Test. xii Pat., eccl., papyri); δωρο-φορία is read by MSS. BDFG against διακονία in Ro. 15:31; ἔθελο-θησια (from verb ἔθελο and θησια, eccl., cf. ἔθελο-δουλεία; εἰδωλο-λατρεία (W. H. –ia, two substantives, eccl.) and εἴδωλο-λάτρεια (eccl.); εἰλ-κρίνεια (LXX, Theophr. Sext., Stob.); ἐκ-πάληρωσις (2 Macc., Dion. Hal., Philo, Strabo); ἐκ-τένεια (2 Macc., Judith, inscriptions); ἐν-ἐδρον (late form of ἐνέδρα, LXX); ἔξ-ανά-στα-σις (double compound, Polyb.); ἐπι-σω-ἀγωγή (double compound, 2 Macc., inscriptions, Artem., Ptol.); ἐπι-συ-στασις (double compound, LXX, Philo, Sext.); ἐπι-χωρ-νηγία (eccl.); εὐ-δοκία (LXX, inscriptions); εὐ-ακόλουθον (a hybrid from εὐρός and Lat. aquilo, like auto-mobile; so W. H. for Text. Rec. εὐρό-κλῦδων in Ac. 27:14, which is Etym. Magn. alone); ἡδύ-οσμος (Strabo, Theophr.); ἱερ-σολωμείτης (Jos.); καλλι-έλαιος (Arist.); καλο-διδάσκαλος (only in Tit. 2:3); καρδιο-γνώστης (eccl. writers); κατ-αγγελέως (inscriptions); κατά-θεμα (only in Rev. 22:3); κατά-κρυμα (Sir., Dion. Hal., papyri); κατά-λεμμα (κατά-λεμμα in Ro. 9:27 for ὑπό-λ, LXX, Gal.); κατ-ήμωρ (papyri; cf. Deissmann, Light, p. 90; Radermacher, Gr., p. 15); κατά-τύμπα (LXX, Jos., Aristeas, Philo, inscriptions); κενο-δοξία (4 Macc., Polyb., Philo, Plut., Lucian); κοσμο-κράτωρ (Orph., eccl. writers, inscriptions); κομπο-πολες (Strabo, Ag. and Theod., eccl.); λογο-μοχία (only in 1 Tim. 6:4); μιταμ-λογία (Plut., Porph.); μεσο-νόκ-τον (Arist., LXX, κοινή writers); μεσο-τοῦχον (Erat.); μεσο-ουράνημα (Manetho, Plut.); μετ-ουασία (LXX, Anthol.); μεθ-απο-δοσία κατ-δότης (eccl.); μηρο-λογία (Arist., Plut.); νομο-διδάσκαλος (eccl.); νυχθ-ήμερον (Alex., App., Geop.); οἰκο-δεσπότης (Alexis, Jos., Plut., Ign., etc.); οἰκο-δομή (possibly Arist., Theophr., certainly LXX, Diod., Philo, Plut., condemned by Phrynichus); οἰνο-πότης (Polyb., LXX, Anthol., Anacr.); ὀλγο-πιστία (eccl. and Byz.); ὀλο-κληρία (LXX, Diog. Laert., Plut.); ὄρκ-ομοσία (LXX, Jos., τὸ ὄρκ-ομωσία in Attic); ὄρκ-θεσια (eccl.); δριθωμο-δουλία (only instance is in N. T.); παλιν-γενεσία (Philo, Longin., Lucian, Plut.); παντο-κράτωρ (LXX, eccl., Anthol.); παρά-κλήτος (Aq. Theod., Diog. Laert., Dio Cass., papyri, inscriptions); παρα-χειμασία (Polyb., Diod.); παπρι-ἀρχής (LXX); περι-θεσις (Arr., Gal., Sext.); περι-κάθ-αρμα (LXX, Epict., Curt.); περι-οχή (Theophr., Diod., Plut., etc.); περι-τομή (LXX, Jos., papyri); περι-ήμη (Tob., Ign.); πραι-παθία (Philo, Ign.); προ-ἀγώλον (Pollux); προ-σάββατον (LXX, eccl.); προς-αιτής (lit. κοινή); πρόσ-κομμα (LXX, Plut.); προσ-καρτέρησις (inscriptions, 81 A.D.); προσ-κυνητής (inscriptions, eccl., Byz.); προσ-
3. Adjectives. It will not be necessary to repeat the adjectives formed with inseparable prefixes ἀ–, etc. The method of many grammars in dividing the compounds according to the element in the first or second part has not been followed here. It is believed that the plan adopted is a simpler and more rational exposition of the facts. These adjectives are compounded of two adjectives like ὀλγῷ-ψυχος, an adjective and substantive like ἄγαθο-γενναῖος or vice versa ἄνθρωπο-άρεσκος; a substantive and a verbal like χειρο-πόιητος; a preposition and a verb like συ-πάθης, with two prepositions and verbal like παρ-εἰσ-ακτός; an adverb and a preposition and a verbal like εὖ-πρός-δέκτος, etc. The adjective compounds used in the N. T. characteristic of the κοινή are somewhat numerous. ἄγαθο-ποῖς (Sirach, Plut.); ἁγρι-έλαιῳ (Anthol.); ἄγκρο-γωνιῶδος (eccl.); ἄλλο-γενής (LXX and Temple inscriptions meant for gentiles to read); ἄν-εξί-κακος (from ἄνα, ἔξωμαι κακός, Lucian, Justin M., Poll., papyri); ἄνθρωπο-άρεσκος (LXX, eccl.); ἄπο-δέκτος (Sext. Emp., Plut., inscriptions); ὑπο-συν-ἀγγείος (2 Esdr.); ὑπερ-γέννητος (Lucian, Long.); ἀυτο-κατα-κρίτος (eccl. writers); βαρύ-τιμος (Strabo); γρα-ωδής (from γραφεῖν, εἴδος, Strabo, Galen); δοξο-λάβος (true reading in Ac. 23:23, late eccl. writers); δευτερο-πρῶτος (cf. δευτερ-ἐσχάτος, only MSS. in Lu. 6:1); δι-διάλογος (Strabo, Dio Chrys., eccl.); δί-ψυχος (eccl.); ἐξ-θαμβός (Polyb., eccl.); ἐκ-τενής (Polyb., Philo); ἐκ-τρόμος (only in ND Heb. 12:21, other MSS., ἔν-τρωμος, LXX, Plut.); ἐκ-φοβός (Arist., Plut.); ἐπι-θανάτιος (Dion. Hal.); ἐπι-πόθητος (eccl.); ἐπερ-γλωσσίς (LXX, Strabo, Philo); εὐ-ἀρέστος (Wisd., eccl., inscr., but Xen. has εὐφράστος); εὐ-κοπός (Polyb., LXX); εὐ-λογητός (LXX, Philo); εὐ-μετα-δότος (Anton.); εὐ-πάρ-εδρος (for Text. Rec. εὐ-πρόσεδρος, Hesych.); εὐ-περι-στατός (only in Heb. 12:1); εὐ-πρός-δέκτος (Plut.,
These adverbs are generally formed by parathetic composition and are used as
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\[\text{Philio, eccl.}\]; \[\text{Iσό-τυμος}\] (cf. \[\text{Iσό-ψυχος}\], Philo, Jos., Plut., Lucian, \textit{Eliia}, etc.); καθημερινός (from καθο \ ήμεραν, Judith, Theophr., Athen., Plut., Aleiph., Jos.); κατ-είδολος (only in Ac. 17:16); κενο-δοξός (Polyb., Diod., Philo, Anton., eccl. writers); λα-ξευτός (LXX, leit-ουργικός (LXX, eccl. writers)); μακρο-χρόνιος (LXX, Hipp., Agath.); ματαιo-λόγος (Teles.); μωγι-λάλος (LXX, schol. to Lucian); νεό-φωτος (LXX, papyri, Aristophanes?): δκτα-ήμερος (eccl. writers); Όλιγό-πιστος (only in N. T.); Όλιγό-ψυχος (LXX, Artem.); Όλο-τελής (Plut., Hexapla, eccl. writers); παν-ούργος (Arist., κοινή, LXX); παρα-λυτικός (eccl. writers); παρ-εισ-ακτος (Strabo); παρ-επι-δήμος (Polyb., Athen., LXX); πατρο-παρά-δοτος (Diod., Dion. Hal., eccl. writers); πεντε-και-δέκατος (Diod., Plut., etc.); πολλα-πλασίων (Polyb., Plut., etc.); πολύ-σπλαγχνός (LXX, Theod. Stud.); πολύ-τυμος (Plut., Herodian, \textit{Anthol.}); ποταμο-φόρητος (only in Rev. 12:15 and Hesych.); προ-βατικός (from πρό-βατον, LXX, Jo. 5:2); πρός-καιρος (4 Macc., Jos., Dio Cass., Dion. Hal., Strabo, Plut., Herodian); προ-φητικός (Philo, Lucian, eccl.); προτό-τοκος (LXX, Philo, \textit{Anthol.}, inscriptions, eccl.); σητό-βρωτος (LXX, Sibyll. Or.); σκληρο-τράχυλος (LXX); σκωληκό-βρωτος (Theophr.); σύμ-μορφος (Lucian, Nicand.); συμ-παθής (LXX); σύν-ψυχος (eccl. writers); συν-εκ-λεκτός (only in 1 Pet. 5:13); σύν-σωμος (eccl. writers); συ-στατικός (Diog. Laert.); ταπεινό-φρον (from ταπεινός, φρήν, LXX, Plut.); τρι-στεγός (Dion. Hal., Jos., Symm.); φθιν-σπωρινός (Arist., Polyb., Strabo, Plut.); φιλ-αγαθός (Arist., Polyb., Wisd., Plut., Philo); φιλ-αστός (Arist., Philo, Plut., Jos., Sext.); φιλ-ήμονος (Polyb., Plut., Lucian, etc.); φιλό-θεος (Arist., Philo, Lucian, etc.); φρεν-σατίτς (eccl. writers); χειρ-αγωγός (Artem., Plut., etc.); χειρο-ποιήτης (LXX, Polyb., Dion. Hal., papyri); χρυσο-δακτύλιος (Jas. 2:2, elsewhere only in Hesych.). It will be apparent from this list how many words used in the N. T. appear first in Aristotle or the literary κοινή. Aristotle was no Atticist and broke away from the narrow vocabulary of his contemporaries. Many of these late words are found in the papyri and inscriptions also, as is pointed out. But we must remember that we have not learned all that the papyri and inscriptions have to teach us. Cf. also the numeral adjective δεκα-τέσσαρες (LXX, Polyb., papyri). See further chapter VII, Declensions.

4. Adverbs. The late Greek uses many new adverbs and new kinds of adverbs (especially compounds and prepositional adverbs). For list of the new prepositional adverbs see chapter on prepositions. [Page 170] These are usually formed either from adjectives like ἐν-ώπιον (neuter of ἐν-ώπιος) or by composition of preposition and adverb as in ὑπερ-άνοι, or preposition and adjective as in ἐξ-περισ-σοῦ, or two or more prepositions (prepositional adverbs as in ἄπ-ἐν-αντι, or a preposition and a noun-root as in ἀπο-τόμος, or a substantive and a verb as in νοῦν-εχός, or an adjective and a substantive as in παν-πληθή, or an adjective and an adverb as in πάντοτε, or a preposition and a pronoun as in ἐξ-αντιγ. In a word, the compound adverb is made from compound adjectives, substantives, adverbs, verbs with all sorts of combinations. The κοινή illustrates a distinct turn for new adverbial combinations and the N. T. illustrates it very clearly. Paul, especially, doubles his adverbs as in ὑπερεκ-περισσοῦ. These adverbs are generally formed by parathetic composition and are used as

1 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 70.
prepositions in the later Greek, incorrectly so according to Blass.  

But it must be remembered that the κοινή developed according to its own genius and that even the Atticists could not check it. In Luke παν-πληθεί (Lu. 23:18) and παν-ουκεί (Ac. 16:34) are not derived from adjectives or previous adverbs, but from substantives (perhaps assoc. instr.). As to the use of adverbs as prepositions, all prepositions were originally adverbs (cf. ἐν-αντίον). In the later language we simply can see the process of development in a better state of preservation. No magical change has come over an adverb used with a case. It is merely a helper of the case-idea and is part of the analytic linguistic development.

The chief compound adverbs used in the N. T. characteristic of the κοινή are here given. As the list of adverbs is much smaller than those of verbs, substantives and adjectives, compounds with ἀ- privative are included here. ἀ-διά-λειπτος (Polyb., Diod., Strabo, 1 Macc., papyri); ἀνά-μεσον and ἀνά-μερος is the Text. Rec. in Rev. 7:17 and 1 Cor. 14:27, but this is not the modern editing, rather ἀνά μέσον, etc.; ἀν-αντι-ῥήτως (Polyb., etc.); ἀντι-πέρα (Xen. ἀντι-πέραν, Polyb., etc.); ἀπ-έναντι (Polyb., LXX, papyri and inscriptions); ἀ-περι-σπάστως (Polyb., Plut.); ἀπο-τόμος (Polyb., Diod., Wisd., Longin.); δηλ-αυγῶς (so ΣCLΔ in Mk. 8:25 for τηλ-αυγῶς); δια-παντός is the way Griesbach and Tisch. print διὰ παντός; ἕκ-παλαι (Philo and on, inscriptions); ἐκ-τενῶς (Polyb., LXX, inscriptions); ἐν-αντι (LXX, inscriptions); ἐν-όπιον (Theoc., LXX, papyri); ἐξ-ἀπαντα (LXX, Jamb., Byz.); ἐξ-αντίθης (Theogn., Arat., Polyb., Jos., etc.); ἕρ-ἀπαξ (Lucian, Dio Cass., [Page 171] etc.); καθ-εξής (Aelian, Plut.); κατ-ἐν-αντι (LXX, Hermas); κατ-ἐν-όπιον (LXX); vouν-ἐχῶς (Arist., Polyb.); παν-πανθεί (Dio Cass.); παν-ουκεί (rejected by the Atticists for πανοικί [LXX], Plato Eryx., Philo, Jos.); πάν-τοτε (Sap., Menand., Dion. Hal., condemned by the Atticists for ἐκάστοτε); παρ-ἐκτός (LXX); προσ-φάτως (LXX, Polyb., Alciph.); ὑπερ-άνοι (Arist., LXX, Polyb., Jos., Plut., etc.); ὑπερ-ἐκείνα (Byz. and eccl.); ὑπερ-εκ-περισσοῦ (Dan. 2:22, Ald., Compl.); ὑπερ-εκ-περισσῶς (T, W. H. marg. 1 Th. 5:13, Clem. Rom.); ὑπερ-λίαν (Eust.); ὑπερ-περισσῶς (only Mk. 7:37). There are two ways of writing some of these compound adverbs, either as single words or as two or more words. The editors differ as to διὰ παντός, ἔρ- ἀπαξ, ἐκ-πάλαι, καθ ἡμέραν, καθ ὅλον, ὑπερ ἐκείνα, etc. The editors do as they wish about it. These compound adverbs were still more numerous in the Byzantine writers. 1 For further list of verbs compounded with prepositions see “Language of the N. T.” by Thayer, in Hastings’ D. B. The κοινή was fond of compound words, some of which deserve the term sesquipedalian, like καταδύναστεώς, συναντλαμβάνωμαι, etc. We must not forget that after all these modern words from Aristotle onwards are only a small portion of

---

1 W.-M., p. 127.
Thayer

THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).

———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

the whole. Kennedy (Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 62) claims that only about 20 per cent. of the words in the N. T. are post-Aristotelian. Many of this 20 per cent. reach back into the past, though we have no record as yet to observe. The bulk of the words in the N. T. are the old words of the ancients, some of which have a distinct classic flavour, literary and even poetic, like αἰσθητήριον, πολυποίκιλος. See list in Thayer’s article in Hastings’ D. B., III, p. 37.

These lists seem long, but will repay study. They are reasonably complete save in the case of verbs compounded with prepositions and substantives so compounded. As a rule only words used by Aristotle and later writers are given, while Demosthenes is not usually considered, since he was more purely Attic.

V. Personal Names Abbreviated or Hypocoristic. The chapter on Orthography will discuss the peculiarities of N. T. proper names in general. Here we are concerned only with the short names formed either from longer names that are preserved or from names not preserved. This custom of giving short pet-names is not a peculiarity of Greek alone. It belonged, moreover, to the early stages of the language and survives still.2 It was used not merely with Greek names, but also with foreign names brought into the Greek. It is proof of the vernacular κοινή in the N. T. [Page 172] Cf. English “Tom” and “Will.” These abbreviated names are regularly from compounds, as Ζηνό-δωρος for Ζηνόδωρος (Tit. 3:13). Of the various forms used in these abbreviated names only three occur in the N. T., –ας, –ῆς, –ῶς. The great majority belong to –ας or –ᾶς.1 Αμπλίας (or –ᾶς) is the reading of the Western and Syrian classes in Ro. 16:8 for Αμπλάιάς (Latin Ampliatus); Ανδρέας is, according to Blass,2 “a genuine old Greek form,” while Sehmiedel3 thinks it can come from Ανδρομέδιας; Αντίπας is an abbreviation of Αντίπατρος (Rev. 2:13) (found in inscription iii/A.D. at Pergamum4); Απόλλωνας, possibly5 an abbreviation for Απόλλωνιος, is the reading of D in Ac. 18:24, though Ν 15, 180 read Απελλῆς here, while Απελλῆς is read by all MSS. in Ro. 16:10

________________________________________________________

Kennedy

KENNEDY, H. A. A., Recent Research in the Language of the N. T. (The Expos. T., xii, 1901).

———, Sources of N. T. Greek (1895).

———, St Paul and the Mystery Religions (1913).

2 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 293.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 71.
3 W.-Sch., p. 143.
4 Deiss., B. S., p. 187.
(cf. Doric Ἀπελλάς in inscriptions, PAS, ii, 397); Ἀρτέµις (Tit. 3:12) is an abbreviation of Ἀρτεμίδωρος; Δημᾶς (Col. 4:14; Phil. 24; 2 Tim. 4:10) is probably an abbreviation of Δημήτριος, though Δήμαρχος is possible (Δημέας also=Δημιᾶς), not to mention Δημάρτιος, Δημόδωκος; Ἐπαφρᾶς (Col. 1:7; 4:12; Phil. 23) is (Ramsay so takes it, Expositor, Aug., 1906, p. 153. Cf. genitive Ἐπαφράδος, PAS, iii, 375; Fick-Bechtel, p. 16) an abbreviation of Ἐπαφράδιτος (Ph. 2:25; 4:18), but it does not follow that, if true, the same man is indicated in Ph. and Col.; Ἐρμᾶς (Ro. 16:14) is from the old Doric form abbreviated from Ἐρμόδωρος; Ἐρμῆς (Ro. 16:14) may be merely the name of the god given to a man, though Blass doubts it. Likewise we may note that Θευδᾶς (Ac. 5:36) is possibly an abbreviation of Θεόδωρος; Ἰουνίας (sometimes taken as feminine Ἰουνία, Ro. 16:7) may be Ἰουνᾶς as abbreviation of Ἰουνιανός; Κλεόπας (Lu. 24:18) is apparently an abbreviation of Κλεόπατρος; Λουκᾶς (Col. 4:14; Phil. 24; 2 Tim. 4:11) is an abbreviation of Λουκανός and of Λούκιος; Νυμφᾶς (Col. 4:15) is probably derived from Νυμφόδωρος; Ὀλυμπᾶς [Page 173] (Ro. 16:15) is apparently abbreviated from Ὀλυμπιόδωρος, though Ὀλυμπιανός is possible; Παρενᾶς (Ac. 6:5) is probably an abbreviation of Παρενίδης, though Blass suggests Παρενένων; Πιταράς (Ro. 16:14) is derived from Πιταρόβιος; Σίλας (Ac. 15:22, etc.) is the same man as Σιλβανός (MSS. often Σιλβανός), as Paul always calls him (1 Th. 1:1, etc. So Peter in 1 Pet. 5:12); Στέφανας (1 Cor. 1:16; 16:15, 17) may be either a modification of Στέφανος or an abbreviation of Στέφανιφφόρος; Σώπατρος (Ac. 20:4) is read Σωσίπατρος by a dozen of the cursives and the Sah. Cop. Arm. versions, while Σωσίπατρος is the correct text in Ro. 16:21, but it is not certain that they represent the same man, for Σώπατρος is from Berœa and Σωσίπατρος from Corinth, though it is possible. Ἀρχέλαος, Νικόλαος appear in the N. T. in the unabbreviated forms, though in the Doric the abbreviated forms in –ας were used. On the subject of the N. T. proper names one can consult also Thieme, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander und das N. T., 1906, p. 39 f. He finds twenty of the N. T. names in the Magnesia inscriptions, such as Ἀφιέ, Ἀρτέµις (Ἀρτεμίδωρος), etc. Κυρία is a common proper name (cf. Hatch, Journal of Bibl. Lit., 1908, p. 145). For the papyri illustrations see Mayser, Gr. der griech. Papyri (Laut- und Wortlehre, Ramsay

RAMSAY, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).

6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 71. Cf. also Fick-Bechtel, p. 304. Fick (xxxviii) takes it from Ἐρμοκράτης, as also Ἐρμᾶς.
7 Ramsay (Exp., Dec., 1912, pp. 504 ff.) quotes inscription of Pisd. Antioch where Λουκᾶς and Λούκιος are used for the same person.
Thieme THIEME, G., Die Inschr. von Magnesia am Mäander und das N. T. (1906).
1906), p. 253 f. Cf. also Traube, *Nomina Sacra* (1907), who shows that in both B and Ἐ as well as D the abbreviation ḤC XP C is found as well as the more usual Ἐ C Ę C. Cf. Nestle, *Exp. Times*, Jan., 1908, p. 189. Moulton (*Cl. Quarterly*, April, 1908, p. 140) finds Ἀκοουέλαος in the body of a letter in a papyrus and Ἀκοὐτη, the abbreviated

Nestle


———, *Septuagint* (Hastings’ D. B., 1902).


Moulton


———, *Characteristics of N. T. Greek* (The Expositor, 1904).

———, *Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T.* (1911).


———, *The Science of Language* (1903).


MOULTON and MILLIGAN, *Lexical Notes from the Papyri* (The Expos., 1908—).

———, *The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I* (1914), II, III.
address, on the back. See also Burkitt, *Syriac Forms of N. T. Proper Names* (1912), and Lambertz, *Die griech. Sklavenbenamen* (1907).

VI. The History of Words. This subject concerns not merely the new words appearing in the N. T. but all words there used. This is the best place for a few remarks on it. It is not enough to know the etymology, the proper formation and the usage in a given writer. Before one has really learned a word, he must know its history up to the present time, certainly up to the period which he is studying. The resultant meaning of a word in any given instance will be determined by the etymology, the history and the immediate context. The etymology and the history belong to the lexicon, but the insistence on these principles is within the purview of grammar. The N. T. Greek on this point only calls for the same treatment granted all literature in all languages and ages.

Take σκάνδαλον, for instance. It is a shorter form of the old Greek word σκανδάληθρον, ‘trap-stick.’ The root σκανδ is seen in the Sanskrit skándâmi, ‘to dart,’ ‘to leap.’ The Latin has it in scando, de-scendo. The termination –άληθρον is possibly the suffix –τρον (–θρον) for instrument and σκανδ-άλα (η). The form σκανδάλη occurs in Alciphro, of which σκάνδ-άλο-ν is simply the neuter variation. Σκάνδ-άλο-ν occurs first in the LXX as a translation for מִכְשׁוֹל, ‘a noose,’ ‘a snare,’ as in Ps. 69(68):23. It was the trap-stick, the trap, the impediment; then a stumbling-block or any person who was an occasion of stumbling, as in Josh. 23:13. So Peter became a stumbling-block to Jesus, σκάνδαλον ἐξ ἐμοῦ (Mt. 16:23). Christ crucified became a σκάνδαλον to the Jews (1 Cor. 1:23). Take again ἐκκλησία (from ἐκκλητος, ἐκκαλέω). The root καλ appears in the Latin calendae, con-cil-ium, nomen-clā-tor; in the Old High German hal-ōn, ‘to call.’ Originally ἐκκλησία was a calling-out of the people from their homes, but that usage soon passed away. It became the constitutional assembly of Athens and “we must banish from our minds all remembrance of its etymology.” In the LXX the word is used as the equivalent of בַּשְׁלֵא, †the assembly of the Israelites as a whole. In the N. T. the word takes a further advance. It still appears in the sense of ‘assembly’ at times, as in 1 Cor. 11:18, but usually, as Thayer shows (*Lexicon*), the idea of the word is that of body or company of believers whether assembled or not, the body of Christ. This is true at times where the idea of assembly is impossible, as in Ac. 8:3. The word in this sense of body of Christians is used either in the local (Ac. 8:3) or the general sense (Mt. 16:18). In the general sense the word does not differ greatly from one aspect of the word βασιλεία. These examples must suffice.

VII. The Kinship of Greek Words. The study of the family tree of a word is very suggestive. Δείκ-νυ-μι is a good illustration in point. It has the root ὁδικ which appears in the Sanskrit diç-ārṇi, ‘to show,’ Latin dic-o, Gothic teiho, German zeigen, etc. On the root ὁδικ a number of Greek words are built, as ὅδικ-ην, ‘the way pointed out,’ ‘right’
or ‘justice’; δίκην, ‘after the way’ or ‘like’; δείξ-ις, ‘a showing’; δεή-μα, ‘something shown’; δικ-αίων, ‘a man who seeks to go the right way,’ ‘righteous’; δικ-αίω-σις, ‘to make or declare one to be righteous’; δικ-αίω-σις, ‘the act of declaring one righteous’; δικ-αίω-μα, ‘the thing declared to be right’; δικ-αίω-σύνη, ‘the quality of being right, ‘righteousness’; δικ-αίως, ‘righteously’ or ‘justly’; δικ-αίω-τής or δικ-αίω-της, ‘one who decides righteously’; δικ-αίω-τήριον, ‘the place for judging righteously.’ Each of these words occurs in the N. T. save three, δίκην, δικ-αιωτής, δικαστήριον. With these twelve words the difference in meaning is not so much due to historical development (like ἔκκλησια) as to the idea of the various suffixes. It is, of course, true that the N. T. has a special doctrine of righteousness as the gift of God which colours most of these words. The point is that all these various points of view must be observed with each word. Another illustration that will not be followed up is λό-τρον (Mt. 20:28), ἄπο-λό-τρω-σις (Ro. 3:24). The ideas of action, agent, result, instrument, quality, plan, person, etc., as shown by the suffixes, differentiate words from each other.


The development of this line of study will amply repay the N. T. student.

VIII. Contrasts in Greek Words or Synonyms. The Greek is rich in synonyms. In English one often has a choice between the Anglo-Saxon word or its Norman-French equivalent, as “to ask” or “to inquire.” The Greeks made careful distinctions in words. Socrates tripped the Sophists on the exact meaning of words as often as anywhere. We are fortunate in N. T. study in the possession of two excellent treatises on this subject. Trench, Synonyms of the N. T., 1890, is valuable, though not exhaustive. But he gives enough to teach one how to use this method of investigation. Heine, Synon. des neutest. Griech., 1898, is more comprehensive and equally able. The matter can only be mentioned here and illustrated. With δίκαιος, for instance, one should compare ἄγαθός, ἄγας, καθαρός, καλός, δεισίος, before he can obtain a complete idea of N. T. goodness or righteousness. We see Jesus himself insisting on the use of ἄγαθός for the idea of absolute goodness in Mk. 10:18, οὐδεὶς ἄγαθός εἰ μή ἡ ἄγαθος. Both ἄγαθός and δίκαιος occur in Lu. 23:50. In Lu. 8:15 the phrase καιρίδα ἄγαθά καὶ καλή approaches Socrates’ common use of καλός κ

Heine HEINE, G., Synonymik des neutest. Griechisch (1898).
ἀγαθός for “the beautiful and the good.” It is also the Greek way of saying “gentleman” which no other language can translate. To go no further, τέρας, δύναµις and σήµερον are all three used to describe the complete picture of a N. T. miracle. Νέος is ‘young’ and ‘not yet old,’ καινός is ‘recent’ and ‘not ancient.’

[PAGE 177] CHAPTER VI

ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONETICS

The term orthography is used to include all that pertains to the spelling of Greek words. Phonetics deals with the sounds of the letters. The orthography was constantly changing, but not so rapidly as did the sounds. Each had an independent development as is seen very strikingly in the modern Greek vernacular (Thumb, Handbook of the Mod. Gk. Vernac., p. 6). There has never been a fixed orthography for the Greek tongue at any stage of its history. There has always been an effort to have new phonetic spelling to correspond to the sound-change. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 6. The confusion in spelling grew with the centuries as in English. Many delicate questions confront us at once. It has not seemed possible to give the explanation of all the varied phonetic (true or merely analogical) and orthographic changes in the use of the vowels and consonants. An orderly collection of the facts with historical side-lights is all that is attempted.

I. The Uncertainty of the Evidence. It is difficult to tell what is the vernacular usage in N. T. times on many points, though somewhat less so since the discovery of the papyri.

(a) The Ancient Literary Spelling. The difficulty is much increased by the comparison of the phonetic spelling of the modern vernacular with the historical orthography of the ancient literary Greek. This method applied to any language may lead one into error. Modern conversational English differs widely in orthography from

Thumb


———, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*. For most of the history of the Greek language no lexicons or grammars were in use. There were the schools and the books on the one hand and popular usage on the other. The movement of the Atticists was just the opposite of the modern phonetic spelling movement in English. The Atticists sought to check change rather than hasten it. It is to be remembered also that the Atticists were the cloister copyists of the ancient Greek writings and of the N. T. Later copyists reflect local types, some more conservative, some less so. The law of life is best here, as always, without artificial impulse or restraint. In seeking to restore the orthography of the *κοινή* vernacular of the first century A.D. one must not be handicapped by the literary Attic nor the modern Greek vernacular, though each will be of service. In simple truth one has to be less dogmatic these days concerning what could or could not have been in the past. Breasted¹ calmly assures us that before 3000 B.C. “the alphabetic signs, each of which stood for one consonant,” were in use in Egypt. He adds: “Had the Egyptian been less a creature of habit, he might have discarded his syllabic signs 3500 years before Christ, and have written with an alphabet of 24 letters.” The Greek language was a growth and did not at first have 24 letters. *E*, even in early Attic,² not to mention Cretan, had the force of *ε*, *η* and sometimes *ει*. Indeed Jannaris³ asserts that “the symbols *η* and *ω*, in numerous cases also *ι*, originated at school as mere compensatory marks, to represent positional or ‘thetic’ ε or ο.” It is not surprising with this origin of vowels (and consonants do not differ) that variations always exist in the sound and use of the Greek letters. Blass⁴ is clearly right when he points out that in changes in the sounds of words “it is usual for the spelling not to imitate the new sound off-hand,” and in the case of the N. T. writers there was “no one fixed orthography in existence, but writers fluctuated between the old historical spelling and a new phonetic manner of writing.” Moulton⁵ adds that the N. T. writers had to choose “between the literary and illiterate Greek of their time,” and “an artificial orthography left the door open for not a few uncertainties.” Here is a “letter of a prodigal son” (B.G.U. 846 ii/A.D. See Milligan, *Gk. Papyri*, p. 93 f.) in which we have “phonetic” spelling in abundance: Καὶ διὰ πάντων εὐχαμαι σαί ὑγειαίνειν. Tò

¹ A Hist. of Egypt, 1906, p. 45.
² Meisterh., Gr. etc., p. 3; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 26 f.; Solmsen, Inscr. Graecae etc., pp. 52 ff.
³ Jannaris

**JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).**

———, On the True Meaning of the *Κοινή* (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

³ *Op. cit.*., p. 27.
⁴ Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 6.
⁵ Prol., p. 42.

**MILLIGAN, G., The Greek Papyri with Special Reference to their Value for N. T. Study (1912).**

———, The N. T. Documents (1913).
προσκύνημα σου [πο]ῶ κατ’ αἰκάστην ἡμαίραν παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ [Σερ]άπειδε. Γεινώσκειν σαι θέλω κτλ. There is here interchange of ε and αι, of τ and ει.

(b) The Dialect-Coloured Vernacular. The dialects explain some variations in orthography. One copyist would be a better representative of the pure vernacular κοινή, while another might [Page 179] live where Attic, Ionic, Doric or Northwest Greek had still positive influence. Often what looks like a breaking-down of the language is but the survival or revival of old dialectical forms or pronunciation. But these variations are mainly due to the personal equation. It was not till the time of Marcus Aurelius that the learned grammarians succeeded in formulating the artificial rules which afterwards prevailed for writing the old classical Greek. The first century A.D. was still an age of freedom in orthography. Even in the fourth century A.D. the scribe of Ξ prefers τ rather than ει, while in the case of Β ει often occurs where τ is the rule elsewhere. This is not mere itacism, but is also individual preference.1 “The oldest scribes whose work we possess (centuries 4 to 6) always kept themselves much freer from the schools than the later.”2 But, even if Luke and Paul did not know the old historical spelling in the case of τ mute (subscript) and ει, it is merely cutting the Gordian knot to “follow the Byzantine school, and consistently employ the historical spelling in the N. T.” and that “without any regard to the MS. evidence.” It is not the spelling of the Byzantine school nor of the Attic dialect that we are after, but the vernacular Greek of the first century A.D., and this is not quite “the most unprofitable of tasks,” as Blass would have us believe.3

(c) The Uncials. They do complicate the situation. On some points, as noted above, the great uncials Ξ and Β differ, but usually that is not true. There is a general agreement between the older uncials in orthography as against the later uncials and the cursive which fell under the spell of the Byzantine reformers, who sought to restore the classical literary spelling. The Syrian class of documents therefore fails to represent the orthography of [Page 180] the vernacular κοινή of the first century A.D. The Syrian class, for instance, reads Καπερναοῦµ, not Καφαρναοῦµ. But do the MSS. which give us the pre-Syrian types of text preserve the autographic orthography? The fourth century is a long time from the first and the presumption might seem to some extent against the Neutral, Alexandrian and Western classes also. The temptation is constant to spell as people of one’s time do. This difficulty is felt by every editor of classical Greek texts and often purely arbitrary rules are used, rules

1 Hort, The N. T. in Orig. Gk., App., Notes on Sel. Read., p. 152. But in the Intr. (p. 304) Hort is not willing to admit “peculiarities of a local or strictly dialectic nature” in the N. T. Still Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 151) allows the Doric ὅδηγε (Ὅδηγέω) in “single MS.” like Β and D, προσαχεῖν in Β, ῥάσσω in D, etc. Hirt (Handb. d. Griech., p. 53) attributes much of the vocal change to dialect-mixing and analogy. On Ξ and Β see Hort, op. cit., p. 306 f.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 6 f.
3 Ib., p. 7. Hort (p. 302 f. of the Intr. to the N. T. in Orig. Gk.) makes a strong defence of his effort to give as nearly as possible “the spelling of the autographs by means of documentary evidence.” There must not be “slovenly neglect of philological truth.” But Moulton (Prol., p. 47) does not “set much store by some of the minutiae which W. H. so conscientiously gather from the great uncials.” Certainly “finality is impossible, notwithstanding the assistance now afforded by the papyri” (Thack., Gr., p. 71).
made by modern critics. Hort is willing to admit that in some instances the spellings found in the great uncial manuscripts which are at variance with the Textus Receptus are due to the "literary spellings of the time" when the MSS. were written, "but for the most part they belong to the 'vulgar' or popular form of the language." Hort could see that before we had the new knowledge from the papyri and inscriptions. He adds: "A large proportion of the peculiar spellings of the N. T. are simply spellings of common life. In most cases either identical or analogous spellings occur frequently in inscriptions written in different countries, by no means always of the more illiterate sort." This fact showed that the unclassical spellings in the uncial were current in the Apostolic age and were the most trustworthy even if sometimes doubtful. "Absolute uniformity belongs only to artificial times," Hort argues, and hence it is not strange to find this confusion in the MSS. The confusion existed in fact in the first century A.D. and probably the autographs did not follow uniform rules in spelling. Certain it is that the N. T. writings as preserved in the MSS. vary. But itacism applies to all the MSS. to a certain extent and makes it difficult to know what vowel or diphthong was really before the scribe. In general the N. T., like the LXX, is grounded in matters of orthography on the rules of the grammarians of the time of the Caesars (Apollonius and Herodian) rather than upon those of the time of Hadrian, when they had an archaistic or Atticistic tendency (Helbing, Grammatik d. LXX, p. 1). Moulton (Prol., p. 42) thinks that "there are some suggestive signs that the great uncial, in this respect as in others, are not far away from the autographs." But Thackeray (op. cit., p. 56) denies that this conclusion can be drawn ipso facto of the LXX, since it was translated (the Pentateuch certainly) some three centuries earlier than the N. T. was written.

---


1 Op. cit., p. 303 f. Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 35) calls attention to the fact that the professional copyists not only had to copy accurately, but "in the received uniform spelling." Cf. also Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, p. 2. For further remarks on the phenomena in the LXX MSS. see Swete, O. T. in Gk. p. 300 f.
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HELBING, R., Die Präpos. bei Herodot und andern Historikern (1904).

———, Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre (1907).


Thackeray


———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).
(d) The Papyri. They strengthen the case for the uncial. Deissmann\textsuperscript{1} and Moulton\textsuperscript{2} show that the great uncial correspond in orthography not only with the contemporaneous inscriptions as Hort had seen, but also with the papyri of the better-educated writers. Among the strictly illiterate papyri writers one can find almost anything. The case of ἐὰν=ἂν in relative clauses is worked out well by Moulton to prove this point. In the papyri dated B.C. the proportion of ἐὰν to ἄν in such cases is 13 to 29, while in the first century A.D. it is 76 to 9. But in the fourth century A.D. it is 4 to 8 and the usage disappears in the sixth century A.D. Thackeray (\textit{Grammar}, vol. I, pp. 65 ff.) shows (after Deissmann\textsuperscript{3}) how the LXX confirms this conclusion for ἐὰν=ἂν. The usage appears in B.C. 133; copyists are divided in different parts of the same book as in Exodus or Leviticus; it is predominant in the first and second centuries A.D., and then disappears. Thackeray (p. 58) traces ὅθείς (=µηθείς) “from its cradle to its grave” (from 378 B.C. to end of ii/A.D.) and shows how in ii/A.D. ὅθείς is

Deissmann

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Bibliische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

1 B. S., pp. 202 ff.
2 Prol., pp. 42 ff.
supreme again. This point very strikingly confirms the faithfulness of the uncials in orthography in a matter out of harmony with the time when the MSS. were written. We may conclude then that Hort is right and the uncials, inscriptions and papyri give us the vernacular orthography of the κοινή with reasonable correctness.

II. Vowel-Changes (στοιχεῖα φωνήεντα). In the old times the vowels underwent many changes, for orthography was not fixed. Indeed is it ever fixed? If the Atticists had let the κοινή have a normal development, Dr. Rutherford would not have complained that Greek was ruined by their persistence “in an obsolete orthography instead of spelling as they speak.” But as early as 403 B.C. the orator Archinos had a law passed in Attica prescribing the use of the Ionic alphabet in the schools. The early Greek used only α, ε, ι, ο, υ, and no distinction was made in writing between ο and υ. The Ionic invented Ω for long ο. Before the introduction of the Ionic alphabet, I.E. α and Ω were represented by ε. H was at first the aspirate like Hebrew ב and then now aspirate and now long ε or α as the inscriptions amply show. It is very common in the early inscriptions to see ε thus used as long and ω likewise, as in Ευα and τεκ. Cf. ε, ο for spurious diphthongs αι, ου. The kinship of these vowels with the Phœnician alphabet is plain, as α is from נ, ε from ת, ι from י, ο from י, υ from the doubling of י (and so a Greek invention). It is interesting to note that the Sanskrit has three pure vowels, a, i, u, while ε and ο are diphthongs in origin. In Sanskrit a far surpasses all other vowel-sounds, more than twice as many as all other vowel-sounds put together. Schleicher speaks of the weakening of a into i and u, and thus he goes back to an original a sound for all the vowels. In Latin also a breaks into e, i and u. Even in Attica in the first century B.C., in spite of Archinos’ law, the inscriptions use sometimes αι and αε,
ει and ι, η and ι, υ and ι, υ and υι, ι and ει interchangeably. Uniformity did not exist in one dialect, not to mention the persistent differences between the various Greek dialects. These changes were going on constantly all over the Greek world in the first century A.D. For the alphabetical changes in the dialects see Buck’s *Greek Dialects*, pp. 15 ff. These interchanges between vowels are interesting.

(a) THE CHANGES (INTERCHANGES) WITH α. The first sound made by a baby is Α. These changes became dialectical peculiarities in many words like the Lesbian κρέτος (κράτος, “ablaut” variations), the Bœotian ἄτερος (έτερος), Doric ἱαρός (ιερός). So in the vernacular Attic we find ἔρετη (ἄρετη) where α breaks to ε before ε (vowel assimilation), as in the Ionic-Attic α sometimes changes to ε after ι and υ.


7 Hirt, Handb. der griech. Laut- u. Formenl., pp. 115, 119. Γά is the form in Doric and Bœotian, while γε is found in the Ionic, Attic and Cypriote (Meister, Griech. Dial., Bd. II, p. 29).

Overall, the changes in the vowels reflected the diversity and complexity of the Greek dialects, with various patterns emerging across different regions and times. The study of these changes provides insights into the evolution of the Greek language and its cultural significance.
assimilation) which is not so common in the papyri as in the N. T. MSS.\(^5\) In modern Greek both σαράντα and σεράντα survive. Likewise W. H. always give the preference to τέσσερα, though the papyri do not use it till the fourth century A.D.\(^6\) But in the inscriptions τέσσερα is found several times,\(^7\) one case in the first century A.D.\(^8\) Τέσσερας, however, does not occur in the N. T. MSS., though the papyri have it in the Byzantine age.\(^9\) The Ionic and the modern Greek have τέσσερες and τέσσερα. The N. T. thus differs from the κοινὴ papyri, but is in harmony with the Ionic literature and inscriptions. In some MSS. in both LXX and N. T. [Page 184] τέσσερες is accusative as well as nominative, like the Achæan dialect, but this is another story. \(\text{N}\) in Rev. 3:16 has χλιερός. The common (Ionic and Northwest Greek) use of –έω instead of –άω with verbs as in ἔρωτέω will be discussed in the chapter on Verbs.

Conversely ε is sometimes changed to α. Ἀμφιάζει is accepted by W. H. in Lu. 12:28 rather than either the late ἄμφιέζει or the early ἄμφιέννυσι. The form ἔραυνάω instead of ἔρευνάω W. H. have everywhere received into the text, and so with ἔξεραυνάω and ἰνεξεράυνητος. \(\text{NB}\) always read it so, sometimes \(\text{AC}\). It is supported by the papyri. Cf. Mayser, \(\text{Gr.}\), p. 113; Helbing, \(\text{Gr. d. LXX}\), p. 7, for similar phenomena in the LXX.

Initial ε often becomes α in modern Greek vernacular, as ἀλαφρός (Ἑλαφρός), ἄντερα (Ἕντερα), etc. Cf. Thumb, \textit{Handbook}, p. 14. So the Doric πιάζω is used in the N. T. everywhere save in Lu. 6:38, where, however, πεπεσάνης has the original idea ("pressed down," not "seized"). Both occur in the LXX. The Attic forms φιάλη, ὀλός are retained in the N. T. (as in LXX) rather than the Ionic and vernacular κοινὴ forms in ε, a mark of the influence of the literary\(^1\) κοινή.

\(^5\) Moulton, Prol., p. 46.
\(^7\) Dieterich, Unters. zur Gesch. der griech. Spr., p. 4; also Schweizer, \textit{Gr. d. perg. Inschr.}, p. 163.
\(^8\) Nachm., \textit{Laute und Formen d. magn. Inschr.}, p. 146.
\(^9\) Moulton, Prol., p. 46. For further evidence see Cröner, Mem. Graeca Hercul., 1903, p. 199. In the Apostolic Fathers and the N. T. Apoc. τέσσερα and τεσσεράκοντα are common as well as ἔκαθερίσθη (Reinhold, De Græcitate Patr. Apostol. etc., p. 38 f. On the whole subject of α and ε in the papyri see careful discussion of Mayser, \textit{Gr.}, pp. 54–60, where he mentions ἐκούω, ἐγγαρεύω, ἐπελεύσασθαι (for similar confusion of aorist and fut. inf. see ἐκφεύξασθαι, 2 Macc. 9:22 V). Τέσσερα and τεσσεράκοντα are very common also in the LXX MSS. Cf. Helbing, \textit{Gr. d. LXX}, p. 5; Thack., \textit{Gr.}, p. 62 f. This spelling occurs as early as iv/b.c. in Pergamum (Schweizer, \textit{Gr. d. perg. Inschr.}, p. 163 f.). In Egypt it hardly appears before i/a.d. and is not common till ii/a.d. (Thack., \textit{Gr.}, p. 62). The uncials give the later spelling. See "Additional Notes."

1 Dieterich Unters. etc., p. 70. Cf. Thack., \textit{Gr.}, vol. I, p. 75 f. So Δαλματία in 2 Tim. 4:10, though C has Δαλμ. as Lat. has both. Blass, \textit{Gr. of N. T. Gk.}, p. 21. Both forms are in the pap., Deiss., B. S., p. 182.
Some verbs in –έω also use –άω forms, like ἐλεάω, ἐλλογάω, ξυφάω. See the chapter on Verbs.

Changes in α take place in a few Hebrew proper names. Καπερναούμ is the Syrian reading for Καφαρναούμ (W. H.). So W. H. read Μαλελεήλ in Lu. 3:37, not Μελ. (Tisch.), and Ναθαναήλ. Σελαθιήλ (instead of Σιλάθι) appears in B. Thumb⁷ remarks that these changes between α and ε occur to-day in the Kappadocian dialect.

α and η. The Doric forms ὁδεῖς, ὁδεῖῳ are found in the koινή, though Schweizer³ calls it hardly a Dorism. So in N. T. MSS. we have προσάχεω in B (Ac. 27:27) and ῥάσσῳ in D (Mk. 9:18). The Ptolemaic papyri regularly have ὄνηλισκείν till ii/A.D. (Mayser, Gr., p. 345). For α and η see η and η under (c).

α and ο. The changes⁴ between these two vowels are seen in the Lesbian ὑπά (ὑπό), Arcadian τριακάσιοι, Doric εἰκότι (εῖκοσι), etc. W. H. give βατταλογέω in Mt. 16:7 (cf. βατταρίζω) instead of βατταλογέω. ΑΒΚ and twice Ν and many cursive have πρός Κολασσαῖς as the title, while in Col. 1:2 nearly all MSS. read ἐν Κολοσσαῖς. Blass finds the title in ο also in accordance with the coins and the profane writers; Xen., Anab. I, 2. 6, has a variant reading in Κολασσαῖ. In Mk. 13:35 B has μεσανύκτιον and D in Lu. 11:5 instead of μεσονύκτιον.¹ In 1 Tim. 1:9 W. H. give μητρολὼγις and πατρολὼγις (instead of –όλοις) on the authority of ΝΑΔΦΓΛ. Blass² compares πατρο-κτόνος.

———, Grammatik der pergamen. Inschriften (1898).

2 Hellen. (Griech. Spr.), p. 76. See also Radermacher, N. T. Gr., pp. 34 ff. Schweizer


4 K.-BL, Tl. I, Bd. I, p. 117 f. Cf. Meisterh., Gr. etc., p. 117, where Attic inscr. are shown to have Νεοπολίτης.
1 Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 152) compares μέσαβον, and Blass (Gr., p. 21) μεσαστύλον. Μετοξύ (μεταξῶ) is in 1 Clem. and Barn. (Reinhold, De Graec., p. 40. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 60 f., ἔλλοι for ἔλλοι. Illiterate scribes confused α and ο, α and ε in the LXX (as μεταξῶ) and in the pap. (Thack., Gr., p. 77).
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 21.
**α and ο.** Ἄνάγαυον is read by the most and the best MSS. in Mk. 14:15; Lu. 22:12. Ἀνόγεον, ἄνόγαιον, ἄνόγεων, ἄνάγεον have only “trifling authority.” Γάλος is Doric and Ionic.

**α and αι.** The papyri sometimes have the Epic and Ionic αἰεί, though the N. T. only reads ἄει. The τ early dropped out between the vowels. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 103. B has αἰεί in 1 Esd. 1:30. The N. T., like the LXX, has καίω and κλαίω, though the Ptolemaic papyri rarely have κάω and κλάω.

**α and αυ.** In Lu. 2:1 ΝCΔ have Ἀγούστου instead of Αὐγούστου. This spelling of ἄ for αυ is found in Pergamum by Schweizer in the reflexive pronoun ἐκτός, while Meisterhans gives examples of it as early as 74 B.C. in the Attic inscriptions. Moulton is probably correct in saying that we need not assume the existence of this spelling in the N. T. autographs, though it is not impossible. He indorses Mayor’s suggestion (Exp., VI, x, 289) “that ἄκαταπάστους in 2 Pet. 2:14 AB may be thus explained: he compares ὄμηρος 1:19 A.” This dropping of υ between vowels extended to the dropping of υ before consonants. In the modern Greek we have αὐτός (aftos) and ὀτός (in Pontus), whence comes τό (not the article). The examples of Ἀγούστος and ὀτός (ὄτογεννητόν once) in the papyri are very common. Thackeray (Gr., p. 79) finds no instances in the LXX.

[Page 186] **αι and ε.** αὶ was written αε in early Bœotian and Attic inscriptions (cf. Latin transliteration) and so gradually was pronounced as ε (Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 28). By 100 A.D. in the κοινή αι was the mere equivalent of ε. The Egyptian papyri show abundant illustrations of it. Especially do the LXX MSS. exhibit it (Thackeray, Gr., p. 78). The modern Greek pronounces both these vowel-sounds alike, as indeed did the Bœotian dialect long before the κοινή. Numerous examples of this interchange of spelling exist in the Pompeian wall-inscriptions and in the vernacular κοινή from 100 A.D. on. Indeed in the N. T. MSS. it is very common to find –σθαι and –σθε used indiscriminately, probably representing the common later pronunciation which was already developing in the first century A.D. Hort compares this “shortening of an identical sound” to the late στῦλος for στῦλος and κρίμα for κρίμα. So common did this blending become that Blass places little confidence in the N. T. MSS. on this point. Such readings occur as ἔτεσθαι for αἴτεσθαι and γυνῆκας for γυναῖκες.

---

5 Gr. etc., p. 91 f.
6 Gr. etc., p. 61. Cf. also Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 78.
7 Prol., p. 47.
8 Exp. Exp., The Expositor (London).
1 W.-Sch., p. 47.
2 Notes on Orth., p. 150. Cf. on αι and ε, Mayser, Gr., p. 107.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 9.
Sometimes only the context can decide between ε and αι where different forms result, as in ἀνάπεσε or –αι (Lu. 14:10), ἔγερε or –α (Mt. 9:5), ἐπάναγκες (Ac. 15:28), ἐρχεσθε or –σαι in ΝADL (Lu. 14:17), ἐτέροις or ἐταίροις (Mt. 11:16 Syrian reading), παρένεγκε or –αι (Mk. 14:36), etc. In Gal. 4:18 both Ν and B read ἐνθιλοῦσθε for ζηλοῦσθαι. B reads Αἰλὰρι in Ac. 2:9, from עַילָם, the rest Ελ. The authority according to Hort is “usually preponderant” for ἐξεφνής and ἐφνίδιος instead of αἰφ. So κερέα for κεραία is accepted in Mt. 11:16 Syrian reading,), παρένεγκε or –αι (Mk. 14:36), etc. In Gal. 4:18 both Ν and B read ἐλλαπος, but ἔλλας is the undoubted reading in Matthew, Luke. The uncials all have ἰδόη, not ἰδίη, in Rev. 18:13. So all the early uncials but A have Συκοµόρεα (not –αι) in Lu. 19:4. Hort accepts also φελόνης for φαιλόνης (2 Tim. 4:13), though Moulton doubts, because of the Latin paenula.

[Page 187] (b) The Changes with ε. The interchanges of ε and α have already been discussed under (a), but others took place with η, ι, ο.

ε and αι. In the Beotian these were freely interchanged and the same interchange occurs in the Doric, New Ionic and Attic as πλέον or πλείων. The Attic inscriptions show this common phenomenon. The α before a vowel easily and early loses its force and drops out. Before the adoption of the scholastic orthography at Athens (Β.C. 403) ε stood for ε, η, ι, ο. Sooner or later ει became everywhere a monophthong (Buck, Greek Dialects, p. 28). But the κοινη usually wrote ει before vowels rather than ε (Thackeray, Gr., p. 81). The LXX MSS. reveal the same traits as the N. T. Ἀρεοπαγίτης is in Acts 17:34, but Ἀρειος occurs (Ac. 17:19, 22). Ἀχρεύος is uniform in the N. T., but in Ro. 3:12 we have ἡχρεώθησαν (ΝABDG). In Lu. 3:13; Jo. 21:15; Ac. 15:28, W. H. print πλέον (Attic has even πλέονος), but elsewhere the N. T. has forms in ει. The derivatives all have ε like πλεονεκτεω. But the N. T. has only τέλεω, τελειώσας, though Herodotus always and the Attic usually used τελεόω. Τί has τελεώσμαι in Heb. 10:1. Of words with ε and ει before consonants one may note that

4 W.-Sch., p. 47.
5 ΕΠ ἀνάγκας "Alexandrian only" according to Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 151.
6 Ib.
7 Ib. Cf. the Western καινοφωνίας for κενοφωνίας in 1 Tim. 6:20. In 1 Th. 3:3 instead of σαίνεσθαι FG read σιένεσθαι. Nestle (Neut.-Zeit., 1906, p. 361) finds parallels in the forms σαίνεσθαι and σιένεσθαι. They are very numerous indeed, these changes in the pap., both ways.
8 Notes on Orth., p. 151.
1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 28, as θεός=θεός; Thumb, Handb., p. 220.
2 Meisterh., Gr., p. 20 f. Cf. Schweizer, Gr. etc., p. 44 f. The change in ε and ει was very common in vi/vii B.C. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 37.
3 But even the Arcadian dial. has πλέονα, πλείων (Solmsen, Inscr. Graec., p. 4). Πλέον is common in the N. T. Apoc. (Reinhold, De Graec. Patr. Apost. etc., p. 40). Cf. Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inscr., p. 40 f. On the whole subject of ε and ει in the pap. see Mayser, Gr., pp. 67–73. They are very numerous indeed, these changes in the pap., both ways.
4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22.
the Lesbian Greek used of the best N. T. MSS. (mention a genitive Doric characteristic. This variation appears in the inscriptions and in the papyri, especially in the case of the fact that occur in the N. T. (both Ionic and Attic). The N. T. never has η, but always ε. However, Έσω is the uniform reading in the N. T. Homer used either εσω or έσω.

ε and η. Numerous examples of long ε occur in the inscriptions like μέτε (μίτε). These changes are probably all analogical and not phonetic. But in the N. T. we have only the shortening of η, back to short ε in some words like ἄνάθεμα, though this particular word (‘curse’) came to be distinct from ἄναθημα (‘votive offering’). ἄναθημα occurs only once in the N. T. (Lu. 21:5), and even here ΝΑΔΧ, etc., have ἄνάθεμα. Tisch. quotes Moeris as saying ἄναθημα, ἄττικως, ἄνάθεμα ἐλληνικῶς. But the use of ἄνάθεμα as ‘curse’ [Page 188] “is not an innovation of biblical Greek” (Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 46). In Ac. 11:11 ΝΑΒΔΓρ read Ἡμεν, not Ἡμην. Perhaps this exchange between ε and η bears on the use of στήκετε with ίνα in Mk. 11:25; 1 Th. 3:8, and of MS. evidence for θαμάζετε in Jn. 5:20 and ἔξομολογήσεται in Ph. 2:11. Cf. also ἰδίης and ἰδεεθε in Lu. 13:28. So in 13:25. Mayser (Gr., p. 64) thinks that sometimes ε represents an original open η as in παρεστεκότες. The κοινή shows quite a preference for words in –εμα rather than –ημα (Mayser, Gr., p. 65 f.), and the LXX has new words in –εμα, though some words have both forms (Thackeray, Gr., p. 80).

In the papyri this shortening (as in the LXX) appears in words like ἐπίθεμα, πρόθεμα, etc. The interchanges between η and ε, η and εί will be discussed under η (c). Mayser (Gr., p. 63 f.) thus (η for ε) explains πλήρης as an indeclinable neuter form.

ε and ι. Dieterich mentions as one of the marks of the Attic and Egyptian κοινή the fact that ι and ε interchange when used with λ and ν. Cf. the modern Greek, and the Lesbian Greek used τέρτος for τρίτος, and the Thessalian θός for θος. It is a Doric characteristic. This variation appears in the inscriptions and in the papyri, especially in the case of λεγών, which is also λεγεών and even λεγεών, not to mention a genitive λεγένδον (ο and οι having the same sound). Λεγέων is the reading of the best N. T. MSS. (ΝΑΒΔΛ; cf. Latin legio), as in the papyri. Especially in the case of the Latin short й does the κοινή have ε. Ἀλεξίς, not Ἁλεξίς, is the reading in the

5 Solmsen, Inscr. Graecae etc., p. 1. Arcadian dial. Cf. also Meisterh., Gr., p. 3. In the Pontic dial. to-day there is a widespread use of ε instead of η, as in σέπομα (Thumb, Hellen. [Griech. Spr., referred to hereafter usually as Hellen.], p. 149).
1 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 108. Cf. also Moulton, Prol., p. 46, and Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., pp. 47 ff., has good discussion of this shortening of η to ε and also ο to ο. “E and η interchange times without number from V/b.c. down to ix/A.D.” (Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 36). Reinhold (De Graec. Patr. etc., p. 101 f.) shows how the confusion between η and ε led to forms like ἄνον ἡγάγετε. Cf. the mod. Gk. στέκω (στήκω) and θέτω (θήτω).
2 Unters. etc., p. 136.
3 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 43 f.
N. T. according to the best MSS. (Mk. 1:16, etc.). This is a natural assimilation after a liquid. The frequency of ε for ι in the Egyptian papyri may be due in part to the Coptic, which has no short OnError ([Page 189] steinodoff, Kopt. Gr., p. 13). Note a soldier’s use of χεραν for χειρα(v), B.G.U. 423 (ii/a.d.). Λέντιον (Jo. 13:4, Latin linteum) is a change in the other direction, Latin i to Greek ε. Blass 6 says that λέντιον would have looked unnatural to a Greek. Νηφάλιος also is alone well-attested, not νηφάλεος (1 Tim. 3:2, etc.). Πιτίολοι in Ac. 28:13 represents the Latin Puteoli, using ι for e (cf. Dittenberger, p. 145). Σιµικίνθιον (not –εον) is the N. T. reading (Ac. 19:12) for Latin semicinctium. So Τιβέριος (not Τεβέριος) is the N. T. rendition of Tiberius in Lu. 3:1, though the later Greek writers used Τεβέριος, Δοµέτριος, etc. 2 It is really surprising that more examples of this exchange of ε and ι do not appear. The interchanges between ει and ι are discussed under (e), those between ευ and υ under (f).

ε and ο. The Lesbian Αεolic had στρόφω for the Doric στράφω. The Ionic-Attic made it στράφω. Meisterhans 3 gives numerous examples of this change in ε and ο: Όβολος for Όβελος as early as the middle of the fourth century B.C. Dieterich 4 mentions the assimilation of ε and ο as one of the marks of the Egyptian κοινή. In Ac. 18:24 Ν 15. 180. Cop. arm. and in 19:1 Ν 180. read Απελλής for Απολλώς, though D has Απολλόνιος in 18:24. The Doric and the Attic inscriptions 5 had Απέλλον, Απελλόνιος, Απέλλιος, etc. In 1 Cor. and Titus we have only Απολλώς. Indeed Blass 6 suggests that Απελλής is the reading of the α text in Acts and that Απολλώς is an interpolation from 1 Cor. It is more likely to think that the two old forms of the name were still in use, though Απολλός is the correct text in Acts also. The MSS. of the N. T., even good uncials, have Ολοθρεύω, Εξολοθρεύω, Ὄλοθρευτής as well as the usual Ὅλοθρευόμαι, etc. (cf. Ἰβελός for Ὅβελος by assimilation), and Hort 7 accepts the ε form only in Ac. 3:23. The Syrian class has the ο form. Blass 8 who usually cares little for such points, properly insists on the documentary evidence. In Heb. 11:28 only ADE have the ε form, while in 1 Cor. 10:10 DFG read ε. The LXX according to ΣΑΒ reads ε, though the modern Greek has ξολοθρεύω. But Όλεθρος is the uniform spelling in the N. T. and is the rule in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 88).

5 Ἀλεξίς occurs in pap. also. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 307; Thackeray, p. 84.
6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22.
1 Notes on Orth., p. 151.
7 Notes on Orth., p. 152.
8 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 21. He quotes Buresch, Rhein. Mus., p. 216 f., as in favour of ε in the N. T. as well as the LXX. Ὅλεθρος appears in the Apost. Fathers (Goodspeed, Index) and Όλωθο in N. T. Apoc. (Reinhold, p. 40). For assimilation between ε and ο in mod. Gk. see Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 274.
In Mk. 8:14 B has ἐπελάθεντο as is common in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 89). Cf. also ἔπεσεν (Heb. 12:16, LXX), ἐξελθεῖτο (Mk. 12:1), ἱεροῦ (Ac. 4:35), παρεδίδετο (1 Cor. 11:23), and ἔξεκρέμετο (Lu. 19:48 ΝΒ). Hort (Appendix, p. 167 f.) explains these changes as “euphonic,” but it is a change of the root-vowel of δο, a confusion of thematic and athematic conjugations.

**ἔαν and ἄν.** See also I (d) under Papyri. This is as good a place as any to say a word further on the interchange of these two forms, not strictly vowel-changes, however. We have also ἓαν (really εἰ + ἄν) as in P Eleph. 1 (B.C. 311). See also ἓαν for ἓαν, B.G.U. 530 (i/A.D.). The use of ἓαν=modal ἄν in relative sentences, so common in the LXX, N. T. and papyri of i/ii A.D., is not an exchange of vowels, but possibly a slurring over of the ε before α. ἅν=ἔαν survives from the ancient Greek in a few instances, as Jo. 5:19 (ΝΒ); 12:32 (B and accepted by W. H.); 13:20 DEFG, etc., have ἓαν, but ΝΒ ἄν and accepted by W. H.; 16:23 (BACD, accepted by W. H.); 20:23 (twice and accepted by W. H., though AD have first ἓαν and ΝAD second). In Ac. 9:2 only ΝΕ have ἄν and W. H. read ἓαν. Blass¹ thinks that as ἓαν made encroachment into the province of ἅν “a kind of interchange of meaning between the two words” grew up. The modern Greek vernacular uses ἄν for ‘if.’ Hort² considers the whole subject of the interchange between ἓαν and ἄν after relatives “peculiarly irregular and perplexing. Predominantly ἅν is found after consonants, and ἓαν after vowels, but there are many exceptions.” Cf. ἓαν in Mt. 20:4 and ἄν in Mt. 20:26 f. Moulton³ has shown that ἓαν=ἄν is scarce in the papyri save from 100 B.C. to 200 A.D. In the Magnesian inscriptions⁴ only ἓαν appears, not ἅν nor ἄν, as ἄν=ἔαν is not in the N. T. But in the Herculaneum papyri these particles interchange freely.⁵ The Attic inscriptions uniformly have ἄν with relatives.⁶ [Page 191] Indeed Attic often contracts this particle ἓαν=ἄν.¹ But ἓαν=modal ἄν is found in Xen. Mem., ὃ ἓαν ἄρμοττῃ, in Lysis, οὗ ἓαν βουληθῶσον, etc. (see Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 421). This use of ἓαν occurs sixty-one times in the N. T. Examples occur in late Greek of εἰ—ἔαν as well as εἰ—ἄν, instead of ἓαν. Cf. Reinhold, De Graecitate Patrum Apost. etc., p. 35; Moulton, Classical Review, 1901, p. 32. Thackeray (Gr., pp. 65 ff.) finds that in the i/ii B.C. the papyri nearly always have ὁς ἄν, while in the i/A.D. they nearly always have ὁς ἓαν. In the books of Exodus and Leviticus he notes that in the first

---

¹ Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 60. Omitted by Debrunner in ed. 4.
² Notes on Orth., p. 173. Hort has a curious error here, for the references under ἄν and ἓαν should be exactly reversed. ἅν=ἔασ (‘if’) is rarely found in the pap. also. Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 434) gives ἄν μὴ ἀποδόων (AP 43, ii/B.C.). Cf. also Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 32; Mayser, Gr., p. 152 f. Mayser gives exx. of ἅν=ἔασ and of ἄν=ἔασ.
³ Prol., p. 43; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 32, etc.
⁵ Crönert, Mem. Graeca Herc., p. 130.
⁶ Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 326.
¹ Thumb, Hellen., p. 92.
Reinhold REINHOLD, H., De graecitate Patrum (1898).
half of each book both forms occur while in the second part ὦς ἕνων almost vanishes 
Each book may have been written on two rolls.

(c) THE CHANGES WITH η. The changes between η and α, η and ε have already 
been discussed.

η and ι. As already stated, originally Η was merely the rough breathing, but the 
Ionic psilosis left a symbol useless, and ἡᾶ was called Ἡᾶ. Thus the new letter took 
the old long ε value in Ionic and Attic and also largely supplanted the long α where ἄ 
became ἄ The Sanskrit used long ἄ, the Greek η and the Latin either ἄ or This new 
(in spelling) η (v/b.c.) gradually turned more to the ι sound in harmony with the 
growing itacism of the language, though there was some etacism on the other hand. As early as 150 B.C. the Egyptian papyri show evidence of the use of ι for η. By the 
middle of the second century A.D. the confusion between η and ι, η and ει, η and ει is 
very general. By the Byzantine times it is complete and the itacism is triumphant in 
the modern Greek. Reinhold thinks that the exchange between η and ι was natural in 
view of the relation between η and ε and the interchange between ε and ι. As early as 
the fifth century b.c. the change between η and ι is seen on vases and inscriptions. But 
the Ptolemaic papyri show little of it and it is rare in the LXX MSS. ΝΑΒ (Thackeray, 
Gr., p. 85). In the N. T. times the interchanges between η and ι, η and ει and ει are 
not many. In 1 Cor. 4:11 W. H. read γομνητέω, though L and most of the cursives 
have η. [Page 192] The N. T. always has δηνάριον, though δινάριον appears very 
early. For κάμυλος in Mt. 19:24 and Lu. 18:25 a few late cursive MSS. substitute 
κάμυλος ("rope"), a word found only in Suidas and a scholium on Arist. But "it is 
certainly wrong," a mere effort to explain away the difficulty in the text, an effort as 
old as Cyril of Alexandria on Luke. For Κυρήνιος B3 it. vg. sah. have Κυρίνος, while 
B* has Κυρείνος and A has Κηρύνιος, a striking example of itacism, η, ι, ει, υ having 
the same sound in these MSS. The N. T. MSS. give σιμκίνθιον in Acts 19:12, but 
Liddell and Thayer both suggest σημ. as an alternative spelling like the Latin 
semicinctium. So also the best MSS. in Rev. 18:12 read σιρκός, though some cursives 
have σιρκός (like Jos. and others), and still others συρκός. Indeed in 1 Pet. 2:3 for 
χριστός L and many cursives have Χριστός. The heathen misunderstood the word 
Χριστός and confounded it with the familiar χρηστός, pronounced much alike.

3 Thumb, Hellen., p. 98 f.
4 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 29. Cf. also Thumb, Hellen., p. 138. In Bœotia also η and ι 
interchange in ii/b.c. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 46. Maysr (Gr., p. 82) cites from a Hom. pap. of 
i/b.c. ἔθικε for ἔθηκε, and per contra (p. 84) ἄφηκετο.
5 Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 47. He gives ἐπι for ἐπι from a Byz. inscr.
6 De Graec. Patr. etc., p. 41. Cf. also Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 34 f.
1 Blass, Ausspr. d. Griech., pp. 37, 94.
2 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 151.
3 Ib., refers to σιρκοποίος in Neap. inscr. (C. I. G. 5834). In the mod. Gk. η=ι in 
θῆβην, θηβην, θείβην in Ex. 2:3–6.
3 Ib., refers to σιρκοποίος in Neap. inscr. (C. I. G. 5834). In the mod. Gk. η=ι in 
θῆβην, θηβην, θείβην in Ex. 2:3–6.
Suetonius (Claudius 25) probably confused Christus with Chrestus. In Ac. 11:26 Φ 61 have Χρηστιανούς, while B has Χρηστ. So in Ac. 26:28 Φ has Χρηστιανόν for Χριστός, while B has again εἰ. The same thing occurs in 1 Pet. 4:16.

η and εἰ. The Boeotian and the Thessalian dialects early changed η for εἰ, τίθεμι—τίθημι. Schweizer gives παράδεισος for παράδεισος (Byzantine inscription). In Lu. 14:13 (21) we have ἄναπερος (ABDEL), ἄναπηρος (GHK, etc.), and –πιρ– (ΦΡ). This itacism is condemned by Phrynichus the Atticist as vulgar. In the LXX Φ has ἄναπερος in Tob. 14:2 and AV show it in 2 Macc. 8:24 (Thackeray, Gr., p. 83). In Heb. 6:14 W. H. follow ΦΑΒΔ in reading εἰ μὴν rather than ἤ μὴν. This form occurs in the LXX and in the papyri. Moulton has shown that several times in the papyri it is obviously for ἤ μὴν by mere itacism, and so is not due to a confusion between the Hebraistic use of εἰ μὴν=ἄναπερος, thus correcting Hort. The uncials and the [Page 193] papyri here agree. Deissmann calls attention to the use of εἰ μὴν in a Doric inscription of the first century B.C. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 306) observes that a papyrus reads κηρία for κειρία (cf. Jo. 11:44, κειρ—, κηρ—, κιρ—ίαις).

Η and εἰ. In the old Attic there was no η in writing, only εἰ, since η was not used as a vowel. As early as 400 B.C. the Attic used η and εἰ interchangeably, κλήω becoming κλείω, κλής=κλεῖς, ληπτοργός=λειτουργός, etc. This usage was not very common in Pergamum nor in Magnesia. Crönert finds this interchange in the Herculaneum papyri only in the papyri copies of Epicurus and Polystratus. In the N. T. λειτουργός, –ία, –ίν, –ικός are taken over from the Attic, but they occur also in Pergamum6 and Magnesia. The Attic indeed carried the fondness for εἰ so far that it was used always in writing in the second singular indicative middle everywhere, the

5 Perg. Inschr., p. 47. Cf. also p. 56. See numerous exx. of this change in Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 47 f.
6 Cf. Bekker, Anec., I, pp. 9, 22. It is found also in 2 Macc. 8:24. Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 15) shows that διπερος (not διπηρος) is read in Herod. i. 32.
7 Prol., p. 46; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 33. See also Thackeray, p. 83.
3 Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 60 f.
Crönert

CRÖNERT, W., Memoria Graeca Herculanensis (1903).

———, Questiones Herculanenses (1898).

6 Schweizer, op. cit., p. 60.
7 Nachm., op. cit., p. 51.
other dialects using η save the Ionic. The κοινή has η save in βούλει, οἶει, δύσει. In the N. T. η is universal according to W. H. save in Lu. 22:42 where βούλει is genuine, though some MSS. have ει in other passages. Blass⁸ observes that this is a literary touch in Luke for the colloquial θέλεις. Hatzidakis⁹ notes how difficult this process made it to tell the difference between ποιήσης and ποιήσαςει, for instance, because of this Attic intermixture of the diphthongs. Blass¹⁰ will not hear of this as a possible explanation in any cases, but one must remark how well this vowel-blending harmonized with the kinship in meaning between the aorist subjunctive and the future indicative (cf. δώσῃ in some MSS. for δώσει in Jo. 17:2) and made it easy for the later so-called future subjunctive (cf. Latin) to develop. Winer-Schmiedel indeed accept as possible this vowel confusion in several instances.¹¹ In Mk. 8:35 (Lu. 17:33) ὃς ἀπολέσει, Lu. 12:8 ὃς ὧν οὐ πάρχει, ὃς ἀπόλεσει, 2 Cor. 12:9 ὁ µολουσάει, 13:2 ὃς ἀπολέσει, 2 Cor. 12:9 AB 109 have Ἐ.where ει is probably correct.

η and η. Irrational Iota. The iota subscript was iota adscript till the twelfth century A.D., but as early as the third century B.C. it was not pronounced.¹ When ει was practically equal to η in sound, it was natural that η (ηι) should be. The ι then dropped in sound long before it was subscript.² Gradually it was felt to be a matter of indifference in some words whether this iota was written or not. Examples of η instead of ι occur in the inscriptions of Pergamum³ as ἐν ηι as well as in the Attic.⁴ Moulton finds irrational ι adscript (ἔχωι, for instance) abundant in the Ptolemaic Tebt. Papyri (Classical Review, 1904, p. 106). Cf. Mayser (Gr., pp. 122–126) who gives many examples. In the N. T. ι has dropped from θνήσκω. Indeed since the second

---

⁹ Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
¹⁰ Einl. in d. neugr. Gr., p. 306. He gives exx. from the N. T. Apoc.
¹¹ W. H. read Ἰωάνει instead of ηι in Mt. 11:4=Lu. 7:18.
Forms with and without the mute iota appear in the Herculaneum papyri,² as infinitive under verb. The papyri show it in queer forms like ηστήριον, though he hesitated to put σώζω in the text. It is just as well to finish the discussion of the iota subscript here, though some of these examples go beyond the range of η. The best editors print also δημοσίευ, ιδια, μητρολόφως, πατρολόφως, πατρός, πεζή, Σαμωθρίκη, Τράφως, though μυμνήσκο and πράσκο. W. H. have forms in –οίν also, as κατασκήνον (Mt. 13:32). Moulton³ gives a curious example of the loss of the irrational ι in the case of the subjunctive η which sometimes in the papyri appears as ην, having lost the ι, and taken on irrational v. As a matter of fact iota adscript (iota [Page 195] subscript not yet, of course) does not appear in the great uncial save ηδοσαν in D (Mk. 1:34) and ξύλοι in K (Lk. 23:31).¹ Forms with and without the mute iota appear in the Herculaneum papyri,² as εἰκῆ or εἰκή. Blass³ would also restore ι to δνπτέρα(Ω). He doubts if ι was written in such new optative forms as δόην (δοίην Attic) though it should be put in the text.

η and υ. Since these two vowels came to be pronounced alike in modern Greek,⁴ it was to be expected that some interchange would come, though any early examples are wanting. However, by the second century A.D. the inscriptions give many instances such as θήρα (θόρα), μηστήριον (μυστ.,) σκύπτρον (σκιήπτρον), etc.⁵ It is already in the Egyptian κονῆ according to Thumb.⁶ Hence we are not surprised to see the N. T. MSS. get mixed over ημεῖς and υμεῖς. Especially in 1 Peter does this itacism lead to a mixing of the historical⁷ standpoint as in 1:12, where υμῆν is read by ΝΑΒCL, etc., ημῆν by K and most cursives Syrsch Cop. In 1 Pet. 5:10 the MSS. similarly support υμᾶς and ημᾶς. In 2 Cor. the personal relations of Paul and his converts are involved in this piece of orthography as in 8:7 εξ ημῶν ἐν ημῖν (NCDE, etc.) or εξ ημῶν ἐν υμῖν (B 30, 31, 37, etc.). See especially καθ ημᾶς in Ac. 17:28 (B 33 Cop., etc.) which reading would make Paul identify himself with the Greeks on this occasion.

(d) The Changes with ι. For ι and ε see under (b); for ι and η see under (c); for iota subscript (adscript), mute or irrational ι, see under (c). For irrational iota see also Infinitive under Verb. The papyri show it in queer forms like ἀληθῆ, ληπος, P. Oxy. 37 (A.D. 49).

---

5 Introductio ad N. T. Gk., p. 314.
6 Mayser, Gr., p. 121, finds no ι with άν in the pap.
4 Hatz., Einl. in neugr. Gr., p. 304.
6 Hellen., p. 171.
7 Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 310. On the subject of η and υ see Mayser, Gr., p. 85 f. He denies (p. 86) that the itacising pronunciation of η prevailed in the Ptolemaic period.
ι and ει. The interchange between these vowel-symbols began very early (certainly by the sixth century B.C.8) and has been very persistent to the present day. The inscriptions give numerous examples9 in the fifth century B.C., such as ἄποκτένη, Ἐπαφρόδιτος. This was apparently the beginning10 of itacism which was extended to υ, η, and then to η, οι, υι. Janaris11 thinks that the introduction [Page 196] and rapid spread of η contributed to this confusion as by that time ει was pronounced like ι, and η was taken by many, not as long ε, but equal to ι. The confusion apparently began in the Bœotian dialect and in postclassical times, but swept the field in all the dialects till every ει (closed and open) was pronounced as ι. By 100 B.C. the Attic inscriptions show a general interchange between ει and ι, and in the second century A.D.2 the confusion exists between ει and ι. Dieterich3 thinks that this itacism had its widest development in Egypt. The Ptolemaic papyri of II/B.C. show itacism very frequently. It is only the more illiterate scribes that use ει for ι, though B has ὀρειόν (Thackeray, Gr., p. 86 f.). Thumb4 considers the interchange between ι and ει in the κοινή on a par with that between ο and οι. In Pergamum5 the change from ι to ει is much more common than that from ει to ι, though forms in –ία for –εία occur, as ἄμελια. The same thing is true in Magnesia, where ἡμεῖν (ἡμῖν) is common.6 The Herculaneum papyri tell the same story,7 while it is so common in the Egyptian papyri that Moulton8 is unable to set much store by the minutiæ gathered by W. H. from the great uncials, “for even W. H. admit that their paramount witness, B, ‘has little authority on behalf of ει as against ι.’” Clearly the partiality of Ν for ι and of B for ει throw them both out of court as decisive witnesses on this point.9 So it is not merely itacism that we have to deal with in the numerous N. T. examples of exchange between ι and ει, but “genuine peculiarities of original orthography” also.10 Whatever Dr. Hort meant, all that is true is that different scribes merely preferred one or the other method of representing ι. The whole matter therefore remains in doubt and one is prepared for all sorts of variations in the N. T. MSS., because the κοινή no [Page 197] longer insisted in the vernacular on the distinction between long or short ι and ει. The examples here

8 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 47.
9 Ib.
10 Ib.
11 Ib., p. 41.
1 K.-Bl., p. 131. Mayser (Gr., pp. 87–94) has a full discussion of the problem in the pap. of the first three centuries B.C. and finds that in Egypt the pronunciation of ει closely approached that of ι.
2 Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 49. In the succeeding pages he gives numerous exx. in chron. order of the various interchanges between ι and ει, many of them identical with the N. T. exx.
3 Unters. etc., p. 45.
4 Hellen., p. 172. The next most common interchange of vowels in the N. T. MSS. are αι and ε, η and ι or αι, οι and υ (Warfield, Text. Crit. of the N. T., p. 103).
5 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 53 f.
8 Prol., p. 47. For the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, pp. 7 ff. Thack. (Gr., p. 86 f.) thinks that the orthography in this point is older than that of Ν and Α.
9 Warfield, Text. Crit. of the N. T., p. 103.
10 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 152.
presented will give a fair idea of the situation. For the textual evidence see careful discussion by Gregory. Where ει is written for ι it is to be pronounced like ι. ι is shortened to ı in some abstract substantives, –ια instead of –εια, as Ἀτταλία, θηγία (possibly), perhaps ήκρυβια, ἀλαζονία, ἄναδια, ἄρσεκια, perhaps ἀπεθανεῖ, ἔθελοθησιὰ (but θησεκία), εἰδολολατρία (but λατρεία), ἐλεκυνία, perhaps ήκτενία, Ἐπεικία, Ἐρυθία, Ἐρυμνία, Ἐρατία, Καισαρία, κακοθητία, κακοπάθεια, κολακία, κυβία, Λαοδίκια, μαγία, μεθοδία, δραμαλοδούλια (δουλία doubtful), possibly παιδία (cf. Ps. 53:5), πολιτία, πορία, πραγματία, πραυπαθία, probably Σαμαρία, Σελευκία, perhaps σπαρταί, φαρμακία, Φιλαδελφία, ὠφελία. Deissmann shows that it is λογεία, not λογία in the papyri and so in 1 Cor. 16:1 f. Some MSS. have ἐπάρχεια (for –ια), εὐτραπέλεια (for –ια), late MSS. κολωνεία.


Further examples of ι for ει are found as in the MSS. in ὅδιαλυπτος, ἀνέκλιπτος, ὀλίφο, ἀπαθεία, ἀπθήρη, ἀποδεδειγμένος, Ἀρεοπαγίτης, δίγμα, ἐξαλίφο, καταλελιμένος (Ac. 25:14), even κρίσιμον, λίμιμα, λιτουργός, μαργαρίτης (cf. πολύτης, τεχνίτης), μεσίτης, οἰκτίρω, παραθυματίς, πιθός, ὑπόλιμα, φιλόνικος, φιλονικία, χρεοφιλετίς. This is not to mention the verb-forms ἵδον, ἴδαν, ἴδων which W. H. count alternate forms in Revelation, but which are pure examples of itacism. In the case of Ικόνιον (Ac. 13:51; 14:1) the inscriptions give both Ικ. and Εικ. The use of ει for ι is seen in several ways also in N. T. MSS. In Mt. 28:3 W. H. give εἶδεν, not ιδεν. Γεινουματι και γεινόσκεο are very common in the best MSS. Ἰμεν and ὑμεν are rarely seen, however. Ἀξείνη, Γαλειλαία, Ἑλαμείτης, Λευείτης, Λαυετικός, λείαν, Νυευείτης, Πεληθός, Σαμαρείτης all are found, as well as τραπεζεῖτις, Φαρεσσαίοι. Τάγειον appears in John and Hebrews. In the Pastoral Epistles, Hort finds –λειπ– for –ληπ– forms. Κεριας is correct in Jo. 11:44. Hort also prefers πανοικεί, but παμπληθεί is undisputed. Such verb-forms occur as μεγίστο, μεμάκα, τείχοι.[Page 198]

Semitic proper names in ι, have ει as Ἀδδεί, Ἀρνεί, Ἐσλεί, Ἡλεί, Ἔλεχεί, Νηρεί, Νηρεῖ. Cf. also Ἀδμεί, Ἀχεί, Βεναμεῖ, Δανεί, Ἐλιακεί, Ἱσρεί, Κείς, Λειβίς, Νεφθαλείμ, Σαλείμ, Σεμείον, χερουβείν, Χοραζείν. So also Ἑλεσαβά, Ἡλίας, Ἡκάτειρα, Ἰασυρος, Ἰσηριχ, Ἰοσείς, Οξείς, Σάφωρα, Ταβειθά. Cf. also Ἡλεί, Ῥαββές, Ῥαββουνεί, σαβαχθανεί. But ει appears as ι in Ἀμιναδάβ, Μελχισεδέκ, Σινά, Εϊών. Likewise the
MSS. usually read Ἀνανίας, Βαραχίας, Ἐξεκίας, Ζαχαρίας, Ἰερεμίας, Ἰεχονίας, Μαθθίας, Ματταθίας, Οὐρίας.

In many of these examples of changes in ι and ει the testimony is greatly divided and one must not stickle too much for either spelling. The papyri and the inscriptions have nearly all of them. See 1 (c) for remarks on the difficulty of relying on the uncials in the matter of orthography. It is impossible to be dogmatic on the subject.

ι and ο. It is a peculiar change, as Blass\(^2\) observes, that we have in ὀμερόμενοι for ἠμερόμενοι (1 Th. 2:8). It appears in the LXX (some MSS. for Job 3:21 and Symm. at Ps. 62:2). The only example so far brought to light is ὑπομείρεσθαι in Iren. 60. Winer-Schmiedel\(^3\) sees no comparison in καταντροκύ for καταντικρύ. Meisterhans\(^4\) gives ἀπαντροκύ for ἀπαντικρύ.

ι and οι. Jannaris\(^5\) defends the exchange of ι and οι possibly as early as the fifth century B.C. Certainly in the first century B.C. Αὐγουστοῖς occurs in the inscriptions.\(^6\) Οι was exchanged with ει as well as with ι. In the N. T. the only example is in Mk. 11:8 where ACSVXG Or. have στοιβάς for the usual στιβάς (from στείβω). N and a few other MSS. read στυβάς. Zonar. illustrates this also by using στοιβάς. Cf. also στοιβή, στοιβάζω, etc. This word thus illustrates well the common itacistic tendency, showing forms in –ι, –οι, –υ and –ει (in the verb). The LXX has only στίχον and στιχίζω, not στοιχ. (Thackeray, Gr., p. 92).

ι and υ. These two vowels sometimes have the force of the consonants\(^7\) j (γ) and v (cf. Latin). Cf. αυ– (af) and ευ– (ef) in modern Greek, and ε in πόλεως. In modern Greek “every i- or ε-sound which collides in the middle of a word with a succeeding [Page 199] vowel, loses its syllabic value and becomes consonanted” (Thumb, Handb., p. 10). So ἄγιος=ἀγώς. The ι is the last of the five original vowel-sounds in this order: α, ο, υ, ε, ι. This relative value has persisted in modern Greek (Thumb’s Handbook, p. 12 f.). Jannaris\(^1\) gives ἄπωθούμενοι as an illustration of this gradation in sound. But as a matter of fact the interchange between ι and υ is not frequent. Meisterhans\(^2\) finds only five examples in the Attic inscriptions, two of which, βυβλίον and Μετωπηνάος, are found in N. T. MSS. (assimilation). Examples occur in the κοινή of Asia Minor, though Thumb\(^3\) agrees with Kretschmer in calling it a

---

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22. But it is quite possible (see j) that this is a case of prothetic o.
3 W.-Sch., p. 52.
4 Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 81.
6 Jann., ib., p. 52. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 112.
7 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 27, 55, etc.
1 Ib., p. 84.
2 Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 28 f.
Kretschmer
“barbarism.” Still the old distinction in sound between ι and υ slowly broke down till in modern Greek the two vowels have the same sound. Βήρυλλος in Rev. 21:20 is spelled also in MSS. βήρυλλος, βυρύλλος, βυρύλλιος, a fine illustration of itacism. D reads βυβλός for βίβλος in Mk. 12:26 and Lu. 20:42. In Ac. 20:14 Μυτυλήνη is the correct text for the old Mut., but AE have Μυτυλήνη and Λ Μυτυλήνη. For the Τρωγύλλον of Strabo and the Byzantine writers the Textus Receptus addition to Ac. 20:15 has Τρωγύλλια, other MSS. Τρωγύλλον, Τρωγύλλιον. The LXX shows also ἡμισου in Θ Dan. 7:25 (B). The Ptolemaic papyri vary in this word (Thackeray, Gr., p. 95). In Lu. 19:8 D has ἡμίσου.

\( (e) \) **THE CHANGES WITH o.** For changes with α see under (a), for o and ε under (b), for o and ι under (d).

**o and ou.** The old Attic used Διόσκορος, which Phrynichus\(^5\) prefers, though Thucyd. and Plato have the form in –ορος also (Epic or Ionic). In Ac. 28:11 only some of the cursives have the form in –ορος. Both forms appear in the inscriptions.\(^6\) This exchange is rather common in the Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser, Gr., pp. 10 f., 116 f.). In the LXX Ω shows sometimes οκ for ουκ (Thackeray, Gr., p. 91). The modern Greek dialects have much diversity of usage on this point. Cf. Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 8.

\( \text{[Page 200]} \) **o and υ.** The MSS. vary between\(^1\) πρός (Syrian) and πρως in Mt. 11:29; 1 Pet. 3:4, as well as between πρόςτης and πρωτης in Pauline Epistles. W. H. adopt the form in –υ. Von Soden varies between these forms, giving no reasons. It is the old distinction surviving in the κοινή. The LXX has the υ form. The papyri have other illustrations (Mayser, Gr., p. 97). Cf. Ποτίολοι in Ac. 28:13 for the Latin Puteoli.

---

KRETSCHMER, P., Die Einl. in die Geschichte der griech. Sprache (1906).


———, Die griech. Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht (1894).


6 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 66 f.

1 Gregory, Prol., p. 82.

Soden


———, Griechisches N. T. Text mit kurzem Apparat (1913).
ο and ω. Originally ο represented both the short and long sounds, so that it was easy with careless pronunciation for more or less confusion to exist after ω came into use. The Βœotian Pindar, for instance, has Διόνυσος instead of Διόνυσος. The New Ionic ζόη (parox.) appears in lieu of ζωή. However, the introduction of the Ionic alphabet in 403 B.C. kept the two vowels pretty distinct in Attic till the Roman time, though the change began in the third century B.C. After the second century B.C. the exchange of these two vowels was indiscriminate in the more illiterate vernacular. The confusion was earliest in Egypt, but the Attic inscriptions kept the distinction well till 100 A.D. The early uncials for the LXX and the N.T. show little evidence of the interchange (Thackeray, Gr., p. 89). Jannaris finds it common. The modern Greek makes no difference in sound between ο and ω except medial ο as in nοt. "In the early papyri the instances of confusion between ο and ω are innumerable." The inscriptions tell the same story about the κοινή in Magnesia and Pergamum. In some instances, like δόμα for δόμα and πρόδωμα, an ω is shortened to ο after the analogy of ε from η in θέμα. In the N. T. MSS. “probably the commonest permutation is that of ο and ω, chiefly exemplified in the endings –ομεν and –ωμεν." It is useless to follow the MSS. through their variations on this point. In Ro. 5:1 ξομεν is supported by all the best documents and gives a difficult sense at first, though a better one on reflection than ξομεν. In 1 Cor. 15:49 the evidence is so nearly balanced that W. H. cannot decide between ϕορέσωμεν and ϕορέσομεν (the latter in the margin). Von Soden gives –φω–. This difficulty of distinguishing between ω and α in the indicative and subjunctive increased in later κοινή times. Several further N. T. examples of interest are θυγοράσωμεν (Lu. 9:13), ἰνα θυνπαίσονται (Rev. 14:13), ἰνα ἰαπαίσονται (Rev. 6:11), ἐδω θοφισκόμεν as read by Lachmann (Ro. 14:8), ἰνα γινόσκομεν (1 Jo. 5:20), ἰνα διόκονται according to Tisch. (Gal. 6:12), ἰνα διέρχομεν according to Treg. (Jo. 4:15), δόσωμεν according to Treg. and Tisch., and preceded by θυγοράσωμεν (Mk. 6:37), ἰάσωμαι (Mt. 13:15; cf. Is. 6:10), ἰνα καυχήσομαι or καυχήσομαι (1 Cor. 13:3), ἰνα ξυρήσομεν (Ac. 21:24). In all these instances syntactical questions enter also besides the mere question of vowel interchange. 2

The ο appears instead of ω in πόμα (1 Cor. 10:4; Heb. 9:10), πρόιμος (Jas. 5:7), Στοϊκός (Ac. 17:18), συκωρόμεν, not –μωρέα (Lu. 19:4), χρισμόλετης according to W. H. and not χρισμολετής (Soden) nor χρισμολετής according to Lu, etc. (Lu.

2 K.-Bl., I, p. 141.
3 Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 24 f., gives numerous exx. of the exchange in inscr. of various dates.
4 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 37. Jann. quotes a Louvre pap. (165 B.C.) which has το ατην πρόποι. Maysier(Gr., pp. 97 ff.) finds only two exx. of this confusion of ο and ω in the Ptol. pap. of iii/b.c., but seventy in the next two.
6 Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 64.
9 Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 309.
11 W.-Sch., p. 48.

3 Hort thinks so "perhaps." The Doric had στοια. Blass (Gr. N. T. Gk., p. 22) prefers the correct Στοικός, Von Soden Στοικός.
But ω is correct apparently in ἀγαθοσύνη, ἀγιωσύνη, ἐνδώμησις (Rev. 21:18, Soden –δόμ–), ἱερωσύνη, μεγαλωσύνη, προϊνός. So also the LXX, but πρόμος (Thack., Gr., p. 90). Codex B shows others in the LXX (ib.). In Lu. 18:5 and 1 Cor. 9:27 the MSS. vary between ὑποποιαζω (from ὑποποίηκαν) and ὑποποιαζω (–πεῖζατο old form), though the best MSS. read ὑποποιαζω. 4 In Ro. 13:3 τῷ ὑπανθῷ ἔργῳ may possibly be τῷ ὑπανθεργῷ. So in 2 Pet. 3:6 δι οὐν may be 5 for δι δόν. In Rev. 4:7 f. ἔχων, not ἔχων (Soden), is read by the best MSS., though the substantive is ἔχων. Now second century B.C. papyri have ὑπόμνημα ἔχων where ω and o are exchanged. 6

(f) The Changes with υ. For the changes with υ and i see under (d), υ and o under (e).

υ and ευ. Only one example of this exchange appears in the N. T., that of πρεσβύτης in Phil. 9. Here the sense seems to demand πρεσβευτής. Bentley suggested it long ago and Lightfoot (comm. in loco) collected a number of instances of the omission [Page 202] of ε from ευ in single MSS. Hort 1 thinks it due to a scribe and not to Paul, since the earlier Greek shows no examples of this interchange. However, Wood 2 has found πρεσβευτής for πρεσβύτης in an Ephesian inscription (analogy: in modern Greek ευ = ef). Thackeray (Gr., p. 97) finds this “natural error” in the LXX MSS.

υ and ου. This has always been a rare exchange in the Greek, the Boeotian dialect having retained the original υ sound of ου after the Attic gave it up. 3 The Zacoion preserves it in the modern Greek. 4 The κοινή has sometimes χρυσός for χρυσός. 5 But ωυ was rather frequent in the κοινή to represent the Latin u as Δροῦσος. 6 In Rev. 3:18 the MSS. have κολλούριον, κολλούριον, κουλλούριον, κουλλούριον, etc. (Latin collyrium). W. H. prefer κολλούριον, though ΝΒC read –ύριον (so Soden). Blass 7 observes that we have long ύ in –ύριον. B in the LXX shows the same variations (Thack., Gr., p. 92). The Ptolemaic papyri have few instances. Cf. change of υ and ου (Mayser, Gr., p. 118). Thumb (Hellen., p. 193 f.) thinks that υ in the κοινή was pronounced like German ü, i and also u. In Rev. 1:5 the distinction between λύσαντι (AKC) and λούσαντι (BP) is more than mere orthography, though the confusion was rendered easy. ΥΙ is always so

---

4 Acc. to W.-Sch. (p. 48 f.) this is not orthographical at all, but etymological. Why not both?
5 Ib., p. 48.
6 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 37. Doubtless other vowel-exchanges in Rev. may have a similar explanation and so do not violate concord of gender.
1 Notes on Sel. Read., p. 136.
2 Disc. at Ephesus, App., p. 24.
4 Hatz., Einl. etc., p. 103.
5 Thumb, Hellen., p. 85.
7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 118.
written in the N. T. uncial MSS.,\(^8\) though the iota was sometimes dropped in the inscriptions.

\((g)\) **The Changes with ω.** For changes with ω and α see under \((a)\), for ω and ο under \((e)\).

**ω and ου.** The Thessalian dialect\(^9\) changed ω to ου as in τοῦ κοινοῦ for τῶ κοινῶ. This change reappears in Rhodes and the Αeolic-Doric.\(^10\) Buresch\(^11\) finds the change between ω and ου common in the Egyptian vernacular, as in the Sahidic dialect ου is often used for ω.\(^12\) It is, of course, possible, according to the view of Winer-Schmiedel,\(^13\) that some indicatives in ου may really \[Page 203\] be subjunctive as a result of this vowel-interchange. The contract form for the present participle τῷ νικῶντι is read by AC in Rev. 2:17 and A in 2:7, a change more likely due to confusion of –άω and –έω verbs. So with Ἰνὰ ζηλοῦτε (Gal. 4:17) and Ἰνὰ φυσιοῦσθε (1 Cor. 4:6), but the present indicative can be used with Ἰνα, and one is slow to credit this form to a mere vowel-exchange. The same remark applies to Ἰνα τρέφουσιν (W. H. marg. Rev. 12:6) as well as Ἰνα γινόσκουσιν (Tisch. and Treg., Jo. 17:3) and Ἰνα σωϕρονίζουσιν (Tisch. and Treg., Tit. 2:4). The future indicative with Ἰνα as καταδουλώσουσιν (Gal. 2:4), προσκυνήσουσιν (Rev. 9:20), σταυρώσουσιν (Tisch., Treg., Lach., Mk. 15:20), σφάξουσι (Rev. 6:4) has rival readings with ω, aorist subjunctive. It is hardly mere vocal similarity. Similar instances are μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν (Mt. 7:6), ἐὰν μετανοήσουσιν (Rev. 2:22), ὥ ἐὰν δουλεύσουσιν (Ac. 7:7). In these and similar examples where the MSS. vary between ω and ου it is probable that, as with η and ε, ο and ω, the difference in mode may have been blurred by the tendency to exchange these vowels. But the syntactical question is not essentially altered by this incidental orthographical problem.

**ω and ωυ.** Lachmann, Tregelles, W. H. all write ωυ in Μωϋσῆς, but Thayer urges that the word is a trisyllable Μωϋσῆς (Fritzsche, Gesenius, Tisch., Soden). The Ionic έωυτοῦ is a trisyllable. Cf. Mayser, \(Gr.\), p. 138. Blass\(^1\) indeed says that the diphthong ωυ is non-existent in the N. T. as in the Attic. The Text. Rec. reads Μωυσῆς, following Strabo and Josephus in the \textit{Antiquities}, though in the LXX and Josephus elsewhere we have Μωυσῆς.

\((h)\) **Contraction and Syncope.** In general the κοινὴ uses contraction of vowels from the standpoint of the Attic,\(^2\) though a strong Ionic infusion\(^3\) is present also in

\(^8\) Cf. Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 46 f.; Blass, \(Gr.\) of N. T. Gk., p. 9 f., observes that B occasionally divides thus ὕ/ώς at end of a line and so practically A and D.
\(^10\) Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 70 f.
\(^12\) Tattam’s \(Gr.\) of N. T. Gk., p. 10.
\(^1\) Pfauen, Die \(Gr.\) des \(N.\) T. Gk., p. 10.
\(^2\) Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 100.
forms like χειλέων, ὄρεων, etc. The N. T. examples of unusual contraction find
illustration in the κοινή. In the N. T. contraction is rarely neglected, as Winer saw,
though ἔδεστο (NC for Lu. 8:38, though BL 33 read ἔδεστον), ναί (1 Cor. 1:10. etc.),
ὄστεα (Lu. 24:39), ὀρέων (Mt. 23:27. etc.), ὄρεων (Rev. 6:15, Attic as well as Ionic),
χειλέων (Heb. 13:15), χρυσέων (Rev. 2:1, Lach., Treg.) show that the N. T. in this
respect was like the κοινή and not the literary Attic. Blass observes that the N. T.
Greek did not go quite as far in contracting vowels as the Attic did. In
illustration can be mentioned ἀγαθοεργεῖν (1 Tim. 6:18), though ἀγαθουργῶν is the
correct text in Ac. 14:17. But we have ἀµπελουργοῖς, ἱερουργεῖν, κακοῦργος,
οἰκουργοῖς, πανοὐργοῖς, not to mention the conjectural reading ἀγαθοεργός for Ro.
13:3 on the other hand. In Col. 2:16 νεομηνία for the Attic νουμηνία is read by W. H.,
though supported only by BFG 121 f g vg. So the LXX (Thack., Gr., p. 98). In the
case of ἐλεινὸς W. H. have the regular form in Rev. 3:17, but ἐλεεινός in 1 Cor.
15:19. Blass reminds us, however, that even ἐλεεινός may represent ἐλεινός. The N.
T. likewise has νοσσός in Lu. 2:24 (like the LXX) and νοσσία (or νοσσιά) in Lu.
13:34; Mt. 23:37. Phrynichus condemned this dropping of ε in νεοσσός. Καταµώ ς
(Mt. 13:15; Ac. 28:27, both from Is. 6:10) comes from the Epic and the old
vernacular. Κατ was an old form parallel with κατά.

There are several noteworthy points about ι. The ι is retained in ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος
(1 Pet. 4:15). The same thing is true with ἰμίουρον (Rev. 8:1), ἰημίωβολον in the
Attic inscriptions. The form έσθιον in Mk. 1:6 (already in Homer) is a twin rather
than a syncopated form of ἐσθίων (Mt. 11:19). In the N. T. the ι is not dropped in
such forms as βιώσεις, ἐθύρα, κακοῦργος, ἄνοιγμα, ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος, ἰημίωβολον,
ὑγείας, etc. When ει came to be equal to ι, the two sounds naturally blended into one.
Cf. the Ionic dative πόλι for πόλιν. In the N. T. we find παῖν (BCD), even πάν

3 Thumb, Hellen., p. 237. Cf. also ib., p. 63. For the mod. Gk. contraction see p. 249.
6 W.-Th., p. 46; W.-M., p. 51.
7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22 f.
8 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 23.
9 Rutherford, New Phryn., p. 287. For other syncopated forms in the LXX see Thack.,
Gr., p. 99.
10 Meisterh., Gr. etc., p. 23.
11 Hort., Notes on Orth., p. 145.
12 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 23. Omitted by Debrunner.
19), ταµέλιον (515. 26 ff.), ὑγείας (618. 2). For the same phenomena in the LXX see
Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, p. 10 f.
(XAL) for πείν in Jo. 4:9, and elsewhere in the N. T. In Mt. 6:6, etc., ταμιήν is read for ταμιέων.7 On the other hand in Rev. 21:20 A reads σαρδίνας for σαρδόνας. W. H. read τετσαρχέω, τετσαρχής rather than τετσαρχέω, etc. The use of γλωσσόκομον instead of the earlier γλοσσόκομεν (–ον) should be noticed also. For the use of ἕαν=modal ἰν see under (b), p. 190.

(i) Diphthongs and Diaeresis. The Bœotians monophthongized the diphthongs αι, ει, οι, ου in the fourth and fifth [Page 205] centuries B.c.1 The Bœotians pronounced χαίρει=χερί as the vernacular κοινή did. Thumb (Hellenismus, p. 228) objects to “this emphasizing of Bœotian” by Kretschmer (Die griech. Vaseninschriften; Einleit. in d. Gesch.). Moulton (Prolegomena, p. 33 f.) allows this Bœotian influence on the κοινή with a “perhaps.” The itacising process still further developed this use of the diphthongs as monophthongs. Indeed Jannaris2 insists that the term δίφθογγος as applied to συλλαβή concerned the eye rather than the ear and meant more biliteral than bivocal. The spurious diphthongs show the process in a state of completion. The papyri, unlike the inscriptions, do not dissect a diphthong at the close of a line.3 Where two vowels do not blend into one syllable, it is necessary to indicate it. Hence from very early times marks of diaeresis were used to show that each vowel has its own sound. The mark is put over the ι or υ which might otherwise be considered to unite with the preceding vowel. These marks are found in the oldest N. T. MSS. with such words as ἀλληλοῦϊα (Rev. 19:1; but in the case of proper names transliterated from the Hebrew or Aramaic W. H. follow the Hebrew or Aramaic spelling. Cf. Hort, Intr., p. 313. So in other examples below), Ἄχαία, Ἄχαϊκός (1 Cor. 16:17), Βηθσαϊδά, Γάϊος (also Γαῖος in Ac. 20:4, etc., but cf. Allen, Harvard Studies in Class. Philol., ii, 1891, pp. 71 ff.), διϋλίζειν (Mt. 23:24), Ἑβραῖστι, Ἑλῳ (Mk. 15:34), Ἐφραίμ, however, or Ἐφρέμ (ΧL in Jo. 11:54), Ἦσαίας, though B usually without,4 Ἰουδαϊκῶς, Ἰσχὺ (2 Pet. 2:11), Καϊφάς, Κάιν (W. H. Καίν), so W. H. Καίν (not Καίν nor –άμ), Λευείτης and not Λευΐτης in W. H., Λοίς (W. H. –ίς), Μωυσής in W. H., not Μωυζής, Νινευείτης and not Νινεύετης, πρόθομος according to W. H., but προή, προνώς. W. H. have Πτολεμαῖος in Ac. 21:7 and Ρομαίοις in Jo. 19:20. D reads Χοραζαίν. The Semitic etymology complicates the matter with some of these words. Many of the MSS. use diaeresis at the beginning of words as in ἰνα.6 XA regularly write η, while ω is correct also.7 See Giles8 on the subject of diphthongs. For iota subscript see under (c).

2 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 29.
4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 17. So Ἰεσσαί.
5 Ib. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 34.
6 Gregory, Prol. etc., p. 108.
7 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 10.
(j) **APHÆRESIS AND PROTHETIC VOWELS.** Θέλω, not ἐθέλω, is the only form in the N. T., as it is the common form in the κοινή and is that used in modern Greek. It is as old as Homer, and since [Page 206] 250 B.C. is the only form in the Attic and Ionic inscriptions. The augment, however, is always η. Crönert finds Θέλω after consonants. The κοινή does not follow the Ionic in the use of κεῖνος for ἐκεῖνος. Aphæresis is frequent in the modern Greek vernacular, κεῖνος, ἐκεῖνος, ἄριστος, etc. But the N. T. has only ἐχθές (so LXX) in the best MSS. (cf. Jo. 4:52 ΑΒCD; Ac. 7:28 ΒΡΑΚΔ; Heb. 13:8 ΑΚΔ), the usual Attic form, though the papyri sometimes have χθές instead of the common ἐχθές. The N. T. does not have δύροις, κέλλω, µείροις, where ο is dropped. Cf. Kühner-Blass, Tl. I, Bd. 1, p. 186. The form µείροις (cf. ὁµειρόµενοι in 1 Th. 2:8) occurs in Nicander for ἰµείροµαι. It is possible that in ὁµείροµαι we have prothetic o instead of aphæresis. Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 152; Winer-Sehmiedel, p. 141. See Additional Notes for full list.

(k) **ELISION.** Besides the use of the movable final ν and ζ the Greeks had two other methods of obviating hiatus (elision, crasis). The hiatus was distasteful to the finished writers, though more freedom was exercised in poetry. The avoidance of hiatus was always a more or less artificial matter and hiatus was unavoidable in the most careful Attic writers, as in the case of ὅτι, περί, πρό, τί, τί, the article, relative, the small “form-words” (καί, εἰ, µή), etc. But the harsher hiatus like ἐδίδοτο αὐτῷ would be avoided by the literary κοινή writers as well as by the Atticists. The inscriptions and the papyri show far less concern about hiatus than do the literary writers of the κοινή. As might be expected the N. T. books agree in this matter with the vernacular κοινή and the MSS. vary greatly among themselves. Blass considers this situation in harmony with the tendency to greater isolation of the words in the later language. Indeed he thinks that only one book in the N. T. (Hebrews) shows the care of an artistic writer in the avoidance of hiatus. By omitting the O. T. quotations and chapter 13 he finds that hiatus where there is a pause is a matter of indifference, as also with καί. He finds fifty-two other instances of hiatus, whereas Romans goes beyond that number [Page 207] as far as ch. 4:18. But even then Blass has to admit cases of harsher hiatus in Hebrews, like ὁδελφοὶ ἡγιοὶ, ἐνοχοὶ ἡσαυ, etc.
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8 Comp. Philol., pp. 158 ff.
1 Meisterh., Gr., p. 178.
6 Ib., p. 296 f. On indifference of later Gk. to hiatus see Bischoff, Neut. Wiss., 1906, p. 268; Thieme, ib., p. 265. Moulton (Prol., p. 92) quotes Kaelker (Quæst., p. 245 f.) as saying that Polyb. uses ὅστις for ὅς merely to avoid hiatus. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 160.
The Attic inscriptions show that the vernacular tongue did not care much about hiatus. The lighter elisions like δ were used or not at will, while the heavier ones like δίκαι ὅπως were rare. The same indifference to elision appears in the κοινή inscriptions and in the papyri. In general in the N. T. elision takes place regularly before pronouns and particles and before nouns in combinations of frequent occurrence like κατ ἐκ (κοινή). Blass has carefully worked out the following facts in the N. T. MSS. Τε, οὐτε, μήτε, ἄμα, ἄρα, γε, ἐμέ, ἔτι, ἔνα, ὅστε, etc., do not undergo elision nor do noun- or verb-forms. The verse of Menander quoted in 1 Cor. 15:33 is properly printed χρηστὰ ὡμείλαία by W. H. Even the compound words τεσσερακονταετής (Ac. 7:23) and ἑκατονταετής (Ro. 4:19) do not suffer elision, while τετρα-ἀρχής has no elision in א. C. ∆ (Alexandrian, Hort). Τοῦτ ἐστι or τούτεστι is the only example in the pronouns that we have in the N. T. It is in the particles then that most N. T. elisions occur, though there are comparatively few. Ἀλλά, according to Gregory, has elision in 215 cases and fails to have it in 130, though the MSS. vary much. Hort observes that in Ἀλλά elision is usual before articles, pronouns and particles, but rare before nouns and verbs. Ro. 6:14–8:32 has many non-elisions of Ἀλλά, and the elision varies before the different vowels except that it is constant before ἐ. Δέ rarely suffers elision outside of ὃς ἄν, but here frequently, while W. H. read δέ αὐτό in Ph. 2:18 after ΝΒΡ. In 2 Cor. 3:16 W. H. put ἤνικα δ ἄν in the margin, text ἤν. δέ ἣν (so Tisch., Nestle). In οὐδέ elision takes place several times, as in οὐδέ ὃν (Heb. 8:4), οὐδέ εἶ (Ac. 19:2, ΝΑΒ), οὐδέ ἵνα (Heb. 9:25), οὐδέ ὅτα (Ro. 9:7), οὐδέ οὗ (Mt. 24:21; Heb. 13:5), οὐδέ οὗτος (1 Cor. 14:21). Blass further notes that prepositions seldom use elision with proper names, since it was thought better, as on the inscriptions, to keep the name distinct and readily discernible, though W. H. read δι ἄβραμ in Heb. 7:9. Elision is most common with διά as δι ἐκσόπτρου (1 Cor. 13:12), “because there were already two vowels adjacent to each other” Blass thinks. Ἀντί has elision only in ἀνθ ὃν (Lu. 1:20, etc.). Elsewhere the prepositions show elision with pronouns and in current phrases, as in ὧν ἄρρηξ, ὧν ἄρτι, ὧν αὐτοῦ, ὧν ἐμοῦ, ὧν αὐτῶ, κατ ἐμέ.

1 Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 69 f.  
3 Crönert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 138 f. Cf. also Thumb, Hellen, etc., p. 82.  
4 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 146.  
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18. Cf. also Gregory, p. 93 f.  
6 Moulton (Cl. Rev., Feb. 31, 1901) finds that the pap. like the Lat. have a vowel not used in the metre. The inscr. concur in this practice. Moulton, Prol., p. 45. Cf. also Mayser, Gr., pp. 155–158, 160–162. He shows that in the pap. it is largely a matter of indifference. On the scarcity of elision in the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, p. 12 f.; Thackeray, pp. 22, 136 f.  
7 Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 306) refers to the Oxyrhynchus pap., which have τοῦτ εἰςῶν in Jo. 20:22.  
8 Prol., p. 93 f.  
9 Notes, p. 146.  
10 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18.  
11 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18. See Additional Notes.
κατ ἰδίαν (καθ ἰδίαν), κατ οἶκον, μετ ἐμοῦ, παρ ὄν, ὑφ ἡμῶν (ὑμῶν), ὦτ οὐδενός (1 Cor. 2:15). So the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 137).

(I) CRASIS. The Attic official inscriptions make little use of crasis, though it is fairly common in the vase-inscriptions of the fifth century B.C. In Magnesia Nachmanson finds only a few examples of καί and the article. The same thing is true of Pergamum. In the N. T. it is confined also to καί and the article. And in the case of καί crasis only occurs if the following word is a pronoun or a particle. Καί thus often, though not always, coalesces with ἐγώ and the oblique cases, as καγώ, κάμοι, κάμε. If there is a “distinct co-ordination of ἐγώ with another pronoun or a substantive,” crasis does not take place. Even the MSS. vary greatly.

καί likewise blends only occasionally with ἐγώ in the sense of ‘and if,’ as in Mk. 16:18; Lu. 13:9; Jas. 5:15. In the sense of ‘even if’ the crasis is more common, as in Mt. 26:35; Jo. 8:14. In the sense of ‘if it be but’ or ‘if only’ the crasis is uniform as in Mk. 5:28; 6:56; 2 Cor. 11:16.

The article suffers crasis very often in the older Greek, but in the N. T. it is seldom so. Hort declines to accent ταύτα for ταύτα in 1 Cor. 9:8 or ταύτα for τὰ αὐτά in Lu. 6:23; 26; 17:30, though supported in Luke by some good MSS. He does, however, accept τοῦνατο in Mt. 27:57 and τοῦναντίον in 2 Cor. 2:7; Gal. 2:7; 1 Pet. 3:9 (“stereotyped as a single word,” Blass). Crasis is quite rare in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 137).

[Page 209] III. Consonant-Changes (στοιχεῖα αὐμφωνία). The Greek, like other Indo-Germanic tongues, wrote out both vowels and consonants save in the case of iota adscript, which was not always used. But, as with the Phœnician and Hebrew, which wrote only consonants, the consonants form the backbone of the language. Both consonants and vowels are originally pictographic. “Beth” (בֵית) is ‘house,’ “gimul” (גָם) is ‘camel,’ “daleth” (דלת) is ‘door,’ etc. The Greek indeed developed the vowels α, ε, ι, ο out of the Phœnician consonants aleph, he, yod, ayin.

(a) ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF THE CONSONANTS. Though the Greek consonants undoubtedly come chiefly from the Phœnician symbols, they were not all used at once nor in the same places. At first the digraphs were used for the later Χ, Θ, Φ, and even after these letters won a foothold ΚΣ, ΧΣ, ΠΣ, ΦΣ were used in Attic for ξ, ψ. It is only since 403 B.C. that the Greek alphabet (ᾆλφα βῆτα) has had regularly twenty-four

2 For more minute details about the prep. see Gregory, Prol., pp. 94 ff.
3 Meisterh., Att. Inschr., pp. 70 ff.
4 Magn. Inschr., p. 74.
5 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 133. Cf. Mayser, Gr., pp. 158 ff., for the common pap. exx. like καγώ, ταληθές, etc.
6 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 145.
7 See Gregory, Prol., p. 96; Von Soden, I, p. 1380.
8 See Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18, and W.-Sch., p. 38; Von Soden, I, p. 1380. Blass gives καγεθμεί from D (Lu. 15:16).
9 Notes on Orth., p. 145.
10 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 19. For scarcity in LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, p. 13 f.
12 Ib. Cf. Meisterh., Gr. etc., p. 3.
letters. Jannaris gives an interesting study of the way the Greek letters looked in eighth, sixth, fifth and fourth centuries B.C. as shown by the inscriptions. In the inscriptions, however, κόππα continued to be used (like Latin Q) and βαὖ or δέγαμμα. This last, though called double γάμμα, perhaps represents the Phœnician ναυ. On the use of digamma in Homer see Kühner-Blass. It is a half-vowel in fact, as ι and υ are partly consonant in force, like Latin u (υ) and i (ι). The dropping of digamma affected many words, some of which have the rough breathing, though Thumb and Moulton think that this is an accident simply, and the rough breathing is due to analogy and not to the digamma in cases like καθ᾽ ἑτος, etc. But changes in the use of the consonants did not cease when the Euclidean spelling reform was instituted 403 B.C. As the vowels underwent steady development, so it was and is with the consonants. B early began occasionally to have the force of υ, and γ sometimes the j value of ι as in modern Greek, and it was even inserted (irrational γ). In general in the κοινή the consonant-changes are much fewer than those of the vowel. Such peculiarities as σσ, γίνοµαι, λήψοµαι are common (Thackeray, Gr., p. 100).

(b) The Insertion of Consonants. In the older Greek δ is inserted in ἄν-δ-ρός, and so with β in μεσηµ-β-ρία. The Attic used either form in ἐµπι(µ)πληµι, ἐµπι(µ)πρηµι. So in Ac. 14:17 DEP read ἐµπιµπλῶν (D ἐν-), and in Ac. 28:6 ΝιΒΗΛΠ most cursives have πιµπροσθα. The LXX MSS. show the same variation. D in Lu. 2:32, etc., has Ἰσ-τ-ραήλ. The retention of µ in all the forms (derivatives also) of λαµβάνω (root λάβω) is in accord with the usage of the papyri (“almost invariably”) and the inscriptions of the κοινή, and is due to the Ionic λάµψοµαι. Hence λήψοµαι, ἔλήµισθην, etc. In the Ptolemaic age (iii/i B.C.) the papyri give both forms. From iv/kv A.D. the papyri and uncials (LXX and N. T.) give almost wholly µ forms. In the Byzantine period (vi/viii A.D.) the classic λήψοµαι reappears. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 108 f.; Mayser, Gr., p. 194 f.; Crönert, Mem., p. 66. In the LXX the uncials give the spelling of their own date, not that of the translation. In Mk. 7:32 the extra γ in µογ(γ)µόλαν is inserted by the Syrian class only and is not to be accepted. In Heb.

3 Ib., p. 24 f. On the whole subj. of changes in the pap. see Mayser, Gr., pp. 163–248. For general remarks about consonant-changes in LXX MSS. see Swete, O. T. in Gk., p. 301.
6 Hellen., pp. 245 ff.
7 Prol., p. 44. But Sommer, Gr. Lautstudien, shows that the rough breathing is sometimes due to digamma.
1 Blass compares the insertion of consonants in Semitic names like Ἐσ-δ-ρας, Μαµ-β-ρή.
2 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34.
3 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 179 f. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 64, for full references concerning the use of µ with λαµβάνω. Cf. Gregory (Prol., p. 72) for list and references of the various compounds of λαµβάνω and λήψις in the N. T., ἄνα-, ἄνεπ-, ἄντι-, ὑπ-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, προ- προσ-. The LXX MSS. have λήψοµαι (Q λήγοντα) and ἐλήµισθην. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 22.
11:32 π is added to Σαμψών (Σαμψψών). So also in Ac. 3:7 (KABC) δ is added to σφύς(δ)ρόν which is as yet “unexplained.” \(^4\) In the case of Ἀδραμύτην(ψ) (Ac. 27:2), read by W. H. on authority of AB 16 Copt. instead of Ἀδραμύτην(ψ), a slightly different situation exists. Two ways of pronouncing and spelling the name of the city existed.

\(c\) The omission of consonants. There are not many cases where a consonant drops out of a N. T. word. In Rev. 13:2 the correct reading (all the uncials) is undoubtedly ὄρκον, not ὄρκτον. This form is found also in the LXX and in inscriptions of the first or second century A.D. \(^5\) W. H., following B and א, also (save in Mk. 3:22) read βεβελζεβούλ instead of βεβλζεβούλ. Γίνομαι and γινώσκω are the exclusive forms in the N. T., though some MSS., as in the papyri and inscriptions, have γειν-. Nachmanson\(^{[Page 211]}\) states clearly the facts. The Ionic as early as the fifth century B.C. used the γειν forms, and the Doric shows the same situation in the fourth century. Even in Athens the γειν forms appear, and in the κοινὴ the γειν forms vanish. Γόλγοθά follows the Hebrew גֻלְגּלֶת rather than the Chaldaic גֻּלִגָּלְחָא in having only one λ. According to Winer-Schmiedel\(^2\) the two forms καῦδα and καῦδα (Ac. 27:16) represent two different islands near each other, which were confused in the MSS. It is hardly worth while to remark that σάρδιον (correct text in Rev. 4:3) is a substantive, while σάρδινος (Text. Rec.) is an adjective.

\(d\) Single or double consonants. Blass\(^3\) and Winer-Schmiedel\(^4\) comment on the obscurity concerning the use of single or double consonants in the κοινὴ. The phenomena in the N. T. in general correspond to the situation in the κοινὴ. \(^5\) In the

---

4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 24; W.-Sch., p. 64.
5 Ib., p. 65.
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2 P. 65, where a full discussion of the geographical points is given.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 10.
4 P. 55; cf. also Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., pp. 225 ff.
modern Greek vernacular (cf. Thumb, Handbook, p. 27) the double consonants, except in Southeastern Greek dialects, have the value of only one. In the oldest Attic inscriptions in most cases where the doubling of consonants was possible the single consonant was used. The rule with initial ρ was that when it passed to the middle of a word as a result of reduplication or the prefixing of a preposition, etc., it was doubled. But ρ εραντισµόνος is read by ΝΑCDP in Heb. 10:22 as in Ionic and late Greek, ρεριµµόνοι in D (Mt. 9:36), and περιρηµµόνος in Ν (Rev. 19:13). Blass observes [Page 212] that the Syriac versions use Ῥωµή for Ρώµη, though some Attic inscriptions use initial ρρ. In Mt. 9:20 άµιρµοοία is correct (ΝL one ρ). In Ac. 10:29 BD 61 read ἰαντφιτως, and in Ac. 19:36 BL have ἰαντφιτων. In Ac. 27:43 W. H. follow ΝC in ἀπορίψατας, and in Lu. 19:35 all but the Syrian class read ἐπιρήµατες and ΝAB have the same form in 1 Pet. 5:7. In Mt. 9:36 the Neutral (and Alexandrian) class has ἐρµµόνοι, the Syrian ἐρρ., while D has ἐρηµµ. In Mt. 15:30 ΝDL read ἐρρων, while B and the rest have ἐρρυναν, but see Ac. 27:19. But in Lu. 17:2 ἐρρυτευµα is supported by all MSS, save II and pier. In Jo. 19:23 ἐραφως is read by W. H., though B has ἐρρ. In 2 Cor. 12:4 ἐρρητος is right as ἐρρωστος in Mk. 6:5, 13, etc. In 2 Cor. 1:22 W. H. follow BCD vs. ΝΑΛ in reading ἐρραβαν, a Semitic word which in its Semitic form has the doubling of the consonant and the metrical prosody - according to Blass, who compares also the Latin arrha. W. H. have διαρήξας in Mk. 14:63 after BN, while in Lu. 8:29 διαρήσαν is supported by ABCRÚD. In Mt. 26:65 W. H. give διαρήξεν on the authority of only Θ according to Tisch., though BL read διαρήσετο in Lu. 5:6. But προσέρηξεν in Lu. 6:48 is supported by ΝΒΔΛ and in 6:49 by BDΛ. In Ac. 16:22 περιρηκται is the reading of all uncials save P, but most cursives follow P. But in Ac. 14:14 all MSS. have διαρηχτας and in Lu. 9:42 the same thing is true of ἐρηθευν. In Mk. 2:21 ἐρραπτει is read by all the best MSS. and the Syrian class is divided, and the same is true of Mt. 26:67 ἐρρασαι. In 2 Cor. 11:25 ἐρραβδισθην is correct, while likewise ἐραντισαι (Heb. 9:19, 21) has all save late Syrian support. So –ρρ— in ἐρρήθη (BD ἐρρήθη, not W. H., Mt. 5:21, etc.) is the constant reading in the N. T. In Eph. 3:17 (18) and Col. 2:7, all MSS. have ἐρρυµοµένοι. W. H. follow B alone in 2 Cor. 1:10; 2 Pet. 2:7 with ἐρουστω, while in Col. 1:13 B is joined by FGP. In 2 Tim. 3:11 AD read ἐρουστω, and ΝΑΣ 37 give ἐροοθην in 2 Tim. 4:17. All MSS. have ἐροοοθε (Ac. 15:29). Μύρρα (B) is changed in Ex. 7:10 B has ἐρφων, Ἄρπ. Both ἐραβὼν and ἐραβὼν occur, and it is in the pap. that we can often find the true Ptolemaic spelling. A curiously has usually γένηµα and B γέννηµα.

6 Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 93.

7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 10, 328. Similar variations in usage as to ρ or ρρ appear in the inscr. of the κοινή (Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 124, ἰαντφιτως, etc.; Nachm., Magn. etc., p. 91) and even in the Attic inscr. (Meisterh., p. 95, ἰαντφιτως, etc.). Cf. Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 42, for exx. of ἐρουστο, etc.

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 10. ἰαβὼν “only Western,” Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 148. But the pap. (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 33; Deiss., B. S., p. 183 f.) frequently have ἰαβῶν, and, as Deissmann remarks, people are not always particular to preserve mere etymology.
to Μύρα in the Syrian text (Ac. 27:5; cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 160), but Winer-Schmiedel (p. 58) found only Μύρα in the inscriptions. Παραρώμεν (Heb. 2:1) is read by all the pre-Syrian classes. Παρρησία, παρρησιάζομαι (from παρνησία), not παρηϊ–, is the usual reading in the N. T. (see Additional Notes), as occasionally in the inscriptions. W. H. read πυρρός in [Page 213] Rev. 6:4 and 12:3, though the evidence is pretty evenly balanced. The Alexandrian class has πυράζει in Mt. 16:2, but W. H. reject the passage. The MSS. all have Χειμάρρου in Jo. 18:1.

The other instances outside of ρ are not so numerous. The MSS. (all but late Syrian) support βαλλάντιον, not βαλάντιον, as do the papyri. Blass argues for it also on metrical grounds. Γένη, because given by no grammarian, was “attributed by Fritzsche (on Mark, pp. 619 ff.) to the carelessness of transcribers” (Thayer), but as sometimes in the LXX (Ezek. 36:30) so in the N. T. the best MSS. distinguish between γέννημα (from γεννάω), ‘living creatures,’ as γεννήματα ἔχοντων (Mt. 3:7) and γένη (from γίνομαι), ‘the fruits of the earth,’ as ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ὑμᾶς λέξεως (Mk. 14:25). Phrynichus condemns the use of γέννημα=καρπός (Diodorus, Polybius, etc.). Root of both verbs is γεν. This distinction between γένημα and γένημα appears in the papyri also, though γενηθέντα occurs in the Fayûm Papyri (B.U. 110. 14) “undoubtedly from γεννάω.” So N. T. MSS. vary about γένημα. The grammarians (Lobeck, ad Phrynichum, p. 726) reject ἐκχύνω for ἐκχέω, but the best MSS. give ἐκχύνου everywhere in the N. T. W. H. accept this Æolic form in Mt. 23:35; 26:28; Mk. 14:24; Lu. 11:50 marg.: Lu. 22:20 (bracket the passage); and Ac. 22:20. So also ἐκχύνου (W. H.) in Ac. 9:22; 21:31. Cf. ὑπερεκχύννομεν in Lu. 6:38. Likewise MSS. support ἄναβαιννο, ὄπτάνομαι, while the Æolic ἄποκτέννο is received by W. H. in Rev. 6:11 and ἄποκτεννο in Mk. 12:5, though rejected elsewhere in N. T. on divided testimony. Ἐνατος has been restored throughout the N. T. by W. H. instead of Ἐνατως of the Text. Rec. The inscriptions support the N. T. MSS. in this change (Thayer). So W. H. give ἄνενήκοντα (Mt. 18:12 ff.; Lu. 15:4, 7) but ἄννέα always. Ἐνεός, not ἄννεός, W. H. give (Ac. 9:7) as the LXX (Is. 56:10), a word possibly identical with ἄνεως (ἄνοις). W. H. present κράβατος instead of the κράββατος of the Text. Rec., though κράβατος would more nearly represent the Latin grabatus as it appears in Etym. M. (154. 34; 376. 36). Κραβάτριος is found also for the Latin grabatarius (CIGII 2114 d v). Ν, however, has 10/11 times the strange form κράβατος (–τς– only in Ac. 5:15). Λασέα (Ac. 27:8) is Λασσαία in some MSS. Μασάοις, from Aramaic Μασαίμ, is correct. Μασάοιμα is the right reading in Rev.
The Hebrew and Aramaic proper names call for special remark. Ἄννας—Anna (Josephus Ἄνανος) may be due to the dropping of α or to the analogy of Ἄνανος. W. H. (Ac. 1:23; 15:22) prefer Βαρσαββᾶς (from בַּרְשַׁבָּא, ‘son of the Sabbath’) to Βαρσαβᾶς (from שְׁבָא בַּר, ‘son of Saba’).1 The Text. Rec. has Γενησαρέτ (W. H. Γεννησαρέτ) in Mk. 6:53, elsewhere –.2 Γόμορρα is read in LXX and N. T. (Mt. 10:15, etc.), Ἐλισαῖος. W. H. accept Ἐλισάος, not Ἐλισσ. (Syrian) in Lu. 4:27=αἰλισάος, Ἰσσαί (Lu. 3:32, etc.) comes from ὡς. The N. T. and 1 Macc. have Ἰόππη, but the ancient grammarians and lexicographers prefer Ἰόπη.3 In Lu. 3:27 Ἰωάννα (indeclinable) is the right text. W. H. prefer Ἰωάννα to Ἰωάννα in Lu. 8:3; 24:10. But more doubt exists concerning Ἰωάννης, which W. H. read everywhere save in Ac. 4:6; 13:5; Rev. 22:8, following B and sometimes D. The single ν prevails in D in Luke and Acts, while Ἰωάννης is more common in D in Matthew, Mark, John.4 has the single ν in the part written by the scribe of B.5 The inscriptions have it both ways. Blass6 finds the explanation in the Hebrew termination -an, which was treated as a variable inflection in the Greek, the LXX MSS. having now Ἰωάννα and now Ἰωάνναν. This fact opposes the derivation of the name Ἰωάννης from Ἰωάννα-ης, leaving the -ης unexplained.7 Μαρία (Μαρίας) is read by MSS. generally in the N. T., though L has Σάρας in Ro. 4:19 (vulg. Sarae). All the MSS. have υν in Σουσάννα (Lu. 8:3) after the Heb. Σουσάννα (‘a lily’). Ἰαρὰν is supported by most MSS., though D and a few cursives have Ἰαρὰν in Ac. 7:2 after the Hebrew יירא. The LXX has Ἰαρὰν and the Greek writers (Strabo, etc.) have Κάρραι, Latin Carrhae.

Doubling of the Aspirate. As a rule the aspirated mutes (ὦ, χ, ψ) are not doubled in more correct writing either in early or late Greek, but N. T. MSS. give examples of

1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 57.
2 Cf. Pliny (Nat. Hist., V, 15. 71 for Γενη.) also. In W.-Sch., p. 57, the point is made that the unpointed Targums do not distinguish between הָגְּנֵו and הָגְּנֵו.
3 W.-Sch., p. 56,=וַיָּלָה, or וְלָל. Cf. on this subject Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 26 f.
4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 328, quoting E. Lippett.
5 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 159.
6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 11.
7 W.-Sch., p. 57; E. Bibl., p. 2504 f.
8 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 11.
θθ, χχ, φφ. In Philemon 2 D has Ἀφφία, while 3 has Ἀππία (so vulg.) and FG, etc., even Ἀμφία. In Mk. 7:34 all MSS. have ἔφφαθά (or ἔφφεθά) save Δ and two Coptic MSS. which have ἔπφαθά. W. H. give Ἰαθθῶδος = Hebrew יוחנן in the N. T. (Mt. 9:9 ff., etc.), and Μαθθάν in Mt. 1:15. W. H. read Ἰαθθῶτα in Lu. 3:24, but Μαθθάτ in Lu. 3:29. In Ac. 1:23, 26 W. H. have Μαθθίας, but in Lu. 3:25 f. they prefer Ἰαθθῶτας to Μαθθδής. In Ac. 5:1, W. H. consider Σάφφεια Western and read Σάπφεια (either Aramaic שַׁפִּירָא, ‘beautiful,’ or Hebrew שַׁפִּיר, ‘precious stone’). The LXX MSS. show the same variations. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 121.

(e) ASSIMILATION OF CONSONANTS. In the early period of the Greek language the inscriptions often show assimilation of consonants between separate words. The words all ran together in the writing (scriptura continua) and to some extent in pronunciation like the modern French vernacular. Usage varied very early, but the tendency was constantly towards the distinctness of the separate words (dissimilation). However, εξ came finally to be written εκ before consonants, though εγ, εκκ, εχ and even ε (cf. Latin) are found in Attic inscriptions, as εγ νῆσων, etc. Only sporadic examples outside of εξ and εκ appear in the N. T. as ἄνεγλίπτος in D (Lu. 12:33), ἄπεγόνησα in B (Col. 2:11), ἐγγόνα in D (1 Tim. 5:4), ἐγγόνα, not ἐγγόνα.3 The Attic inscriptions even have ζ assimilated in τουκλίθους. The most common assimilation between separate words is in words ending in –ν, especially with the article and ἐν. Examples like τῆμ πόλιν, τῶλ λόγον, τὸρ Ρόδιον, ἕλ. Λέσβῳ, ἔσ Σιδῶνι, etc., are very common.1 Similar phenomena occur in the koine inscriptions, though the failure to assimilate is far more noticeable. See list of examples in Nachmanson.2 As a rule the papyri do not assimilate such cases.3 In the N. T., as in the later koine generally, only a few remnants survive of this assimilation of ν between words. Blass,4 who has used the MSS. to good purpose, finds several, as, for instance, ἐγ γαστρί in A (Lu. 21:23), ἐγ Κανᾶ in AF (Jo. 2:11), ἐμ μέσῳ in AC (Rev. 1:13; 2:1, etc.), in AP (Heb. 2:12), in LD (Mt. 18:2; Lu. 8:7), ἐμ πρατητι in N (Jas. 1:21), σύμ Μαριάμ in AE, etc. (Lu. 2:5), σύμ μῆτς in EG, etc. (Lu. 24:21). The earlier papyri (up to 150 B.C.) show a good deal of this assimilation between words (Thackeray, Gr., p. 131). This assimilation between separate words is common in modern Greek (cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 16 ff.). So τῶν πατέρα=tombatéra. But a much

1 On the whole subject see Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 159, and Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 11. Cf. also Schweizer, Perg. etc., pp. 110 f., 114 f. Cf. for the pap., Mayser, Gr., pp. 190–224; Soden, 1, pp. 1372 ff.
3 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 12; Ausspr. etc., p. 123. Alexandrian writers followed the Attic in this assimilation. Blass compares the guttural use of α in ἀμήλι (Mt. 27:46) in L and in the LXX Ἀμήλι, Ἀμηδόρ.
3 Crönert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 57; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 12.
4 Ib., pp. 11 f., 306.
more difficult matter is presented in the case of ἐν and σῶν in composition, though in general “assimilation is the rule in compounds of ἐν, retention of ν in those of σῶν.” But in 1 and 2 Peter assimilation is the rule (only two clear exceptions) for both σῶν and ἐν, due possibly to the absence of uncials. The later papyri as a rule do not assimilate σῶν, though often ἐν. In the N. T. no examples occur of ἐν or σῶν before ξ or ρ. Hort gives a list of what he considers “the certain and constant forms” of ἐν and σῶν in composition. “All other compounds of σῶν and ἐν are included in the list of alternative readings.” Hort thus reads ἐμι—before the labials (π, β, φ) and the liquid μ except ὑπερπαστήσω (2 Cor. 6:16), possibly ἐπνέων (Ac. 9:1), and ἐπνοοῦσθεν once (Rev. 4:6) and Western class elsewhere. So assimilation takes place before the liquid λ, as ἔλλογα. But before the palatals κ, γ the usage varies, though before χ we have ἔγχρισαι (Rev. 3:18) with Ρ reading ἐν. [Page 217] We read ἐνγεγραμμένη in 2 Cor. 3:2 f. (KABCDFG) and ἐνκαίνια, ἐνκαίνιω, ἐνκατοικέω, ἐνκαυχῶμαι, ἐνκεντρίζω, ἐνκρίνω, though ἐγκαλέω, ἐγκλημα, etc., and ἐγκαταλείπω except in Acts. As to σῶν here is Hort’s decision. Σων—he accepts save in σωμπόστα. On the other hand Hort has only συνβασιλεύω, συνβιβάσω, etc., elsewher σωμβ— as in σωμβάςινω; only σώνημη, σωμφών, but σωμφ— as in σωμφέρω. With the palatals Hort reads σωμν—always, as in σωμκάτωσις, σωμγεγράφω, σωμκατάσπεια, etc. He has both συνλαλέω, συνλυπο, συνλαμβάνω, συνλέγω; συμμεταθής, etc., but συμμορφίζω, συμμορφος. Hort has συνζω, etc., but σύζω, σύνψυχος, but has both συννομή, etc., and συνστρέφω, etc. For the detailed MS. evidence see Gregory. Hort also prefers παλινγενεσία, but is doubtful about κενχρεί, πανπληθεί.

(f) INTERCHANGE AND CHANGING VALUE OF CONSONANTS. One cannot here go into the discussion of the labial, palatal, dental, velar stops, the spirants, liquids, nasals. One can give only the special variations in the N. T. The b sound was rare in the older Indo-Germanic languages and easily glided into u or v. The Greek βαίνω is like venio in Latin, βίος is like vivus though different in history. In modern Greek β has sound of v. In the N. T. as in the LXX all the uncials have ν in Δαυίδ (W. H.) where the minuscules read Δαβίδ. In the case of βελίαρ (2 Cor. 6:15) it is from בֶלְיוֹן (‘lord of the forest’), while the Text. Rec. βελίαλ is from בֶלְיוֹן (‘worthlessness’). The variation between ρσ and ρρ, Moulton6 observes, runs down

5 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 149.
6 ib. In general see Wecklein, Curæ Epigr. ad Gr. Graecæ etc., 1869, p. 47 f.
8 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 149. See for LXX Thackeray, pp. 132 ff.
1 About ἐν in composition see Gregory, Profl., etc., p. 76 f.; Soden, I, p. 1383. Ἐν in MSS. appears in composition as ἐν—, ἐγ— and even ἐκ—, as ἐκκόπην. On ἐνπροσθεν in the pap. see Maysger, Gr., p. 45.
2 Profl. etc., p. 73 f. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 91–97, for the history of this subject during various stages of the language.
3 Cf. Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 98, 124
4 W.-Sch., p. 56 note.
5 Cf. ib., p. 58 note, for further discussion.
6 Profl., p. 45. Cf. also Thumb, Theol. Literaturzeit., XXVIII, p. 422.
to modern Greek. The Attic ρ did not displace the Ionic and early Attic ρς entirely in the Attic inscriptions. In the N. T., like the rest of the κοινή, usage is divided. Hort (p. 149) prefers ἄρην except ἄρην perhaps 4/4 times in Paul. In the Gospels and Acts ὅφεις and the two imperatives ὅφει, ὅφησε are uniform, but in 2 Cor. (5:6, 8; 7:16; 10:1, 2) and Heb. (13:6) [Page 218] ὅφρειν is the correct text. ζ displaces σ in a few words. Voiced σ in union with voiced consonants had the sound of z, and ζ was pronounced σζ. ζησος (Ac. 8:40) ἄνευς, Ashdod. Lagarde's LXX has Ἀσεδδώδ in Josh. 11:22 (A has Ἀσηδδώδ, B Ἀσελδώ). Ἀσεδδώδ is rendered also Ἐξρας or Ἑσδρας. But in the N. T. period ζ is changing from the ds sound to z. Ἄρμοζω, not the Attic ἀρμόττω, is the N. T. form. Lachmann has μαζος for μαστος in Rev. 1:13. In 1 Th. 5:19 BDFG (Western class) read ζβεντε,3 simply phonetic spelling. Hort considers ζµύρνα as Western only in Rev. 1:11; 2:8, but the papyri and inscriptions both give it. The most noticeable feature of all is, however, that the Attic and Boeotian ττ did not hold against the Ionic σσ (though even Thucydides and the Tragic poets used σσ). Papyri, inscriptions and N. T. MSS. all unite in using σσ as the rule, though all occasionally have ττ. It does not seem possible to reduce the usage to an intelligent rule. Ἐκπληττόµενος is accepted by W. H. in Ac. 13:12, elsewhere σσ. Both ἐλάσσων (Jo. 2:10; Ro. 9:12) and ἐλάττων (1 Tim. 5:9; Heb. 7:7) are found, but only the “literary” (so Blass) words ἐλαττόω (Jo. 3:30; Heb. 2:7, 9) and ἐλαττονέω (2 Cor. 8:15). Similar diversity exists between Ἡσσος (1 Cor. 11:17; 2 Cor. 12:15) and Ἡσσώθητε (2 Cor. 12:13) on the one hand and Ἡττηµα (1 Cor. 6:7; Ro. 11:12) and Ἡττοθαι (2 Pet. 2:19 f.) on the other. In Heb. 6:9; 10:34 W. H. read κρεσσον, elsewhere κρεττον (Heb. 1:4: 7:7, 19, 22; 8:6; 9:23; 11:16, 35, 40; 12:24), and Hebrews has some literary influence, an argument for Blass' idea above. Paul has κρεττον only in 1 Cor. 7:9, while κρεσσον is found in 1 Cor. 7:38; 11:17; Ph. 1:23. Hort accepts κρεττον in 1 Pet. 3:17 [Page 219] and 2 Pet. 2:21 (doubtful). Cf. σήµερον for the Attic τήµερον. Ὄρνιξ (Lu. 13:34) is called Western by Hort, though

---

3 Cf. Ἄζβεστος in N (Mk. 9:43), Ἑγνούζιµον, etc., in pap. (W.-Sch., p. 59).
4 Notes on Orth., p. 148.
6 Cf. Thumb, Hellen., pp. 53, 78 ff.; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 125; Nachm., Magn. etc., p. 95 f.; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 32; Prol., p. 45; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 23; Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 148; Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 43 f. Giles (Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 115) thinks that the σσ in Athens was a literary mannerism and pronounced just like ττ.
Moulton\textsuperscript{1} observes that it has some papyrus support and is like the modern Greek (Cappadocian) ὀρνίχ.

\textit{(g) ASPIRATION OF CONSONANTS.} There is besides some fluctuation in the aspiration of consonants. See under (\textit{d}) for the double aspirates like Ἀφφία, etc. This uncertainty of aspiration is very old and very common in the inscriptions and papyri,\textsuperscript{2} though the N. T. has only a few specimens. W. H. read Ἀκελδάμαχ in Ac. 1:19, Ἰμνηροῖν Ναζαρέτ. So ὑσαλοκ (Mt. 5:22), Ἰορνία, but σαβαχθανεί (B has –κτ–) in Mt. 27:46.

Γεννησαρέτ is correct; the Syrian class has –έθ in Mt. 14:34. W. H. have uniformly Καφαρναοῦ, and read Ναζαρέτ save in four passages, Ναζαρέθ in Mt. 21:11; Ac. 10:38, and Ναζαρά in Mt. 4:13; Lu. 4:16. In Lu. 11:27; 23:29 DFG have μασθοί for μαστοί, likewise ν in Rev. 1:13. Ἐθύθη is read by cursives, Clem., Or., etc., in 1 Cor. 5:7. In οὐθείς and μηθείς after elision of ε the δ has blended with the είς as if it were τ and become θ. It is first found in an inscr. 378 B.C. and is the usual form in the pap. in iii/β. c. and first half of ii/β. c. By i/a.d. the δ forms are supreme again (Thack., Gr., pp. 58 ff). Blass\textsuperscript{3} finds οὐθενός in Lu. 22:35 (ABQT); 2 Cor. 11:8 (NaBMP); οὐθέν in Lu. 23:14 (NBT); Ac. 15:9 (BHLHP); 19:27 (NABHP); 26:26 (NB); 1 Cor. 13:2 (NABCL); μηθέν in Ac. 27:33 (NAB). But ἐξουθενέω in the LXX and the N. T. prevails, though W. H. (after BD) read ἐξουδενηθ in Mk. 9:12. Ν and Ν read the Attic πανδοκείον, –εύς in Lu. 10:34 f., but W. H. accept πανδόχειον, –εύς (from δέχομαι). Ἐκεπτετα in Lu. 4:26 is the LXX rendering of Ἰρωνᾶ. Τροποφορέω and τροφοφορέω are two distinct words, though the MSS. differ widely in Ac. 13:18, the Neutral and Western supporting τροφ. Hort considers σφυρίς for σπυρίς right (Mt. 15:37, etc.). It is well attested by the papyri.\textsuperscript{4} W. H. read φόβηθρον, not φόβητρον, in Lu. 21:11.

\textit{(h) VARIABLE FINAL CONSONANTS.} The use of ν ἔφελκυστικόν (paragogic ν) cannot be reduced to any clear rule. The desire to avoid hiatus extended this usage, though it probably originally had a meaning and was extended by analogy to cases where it had none. Cf. English articles a, an (Giles, \textit{Man. of Comp. Philol.}, p. 208).

[Page 220] The same thing is true of movable final ζ. In the old Attic before 403 B.C. this movable ν was seldom used. It is more frequent in the new Attic up to 336 B.C., and most common in the κοινή, vanishing again in the modern Greek, as ν easily disappears in pronunciation. Meisterhans\textsuperscript{1} has an interesting table on the subject, showing the relative frequency in different centuries. This table proves that in the κοινή it came to be the rule to use the movable ν both before consonants and vowels.

\textsuperscript{1} Prol., p. 45. Cf. Thumb, Hellen., p. 90.
\textsuperscript{2} Cf. W.-Sch., p. 59.
\textsuperscript{4} Moulton, Prol., p. 45. The Ptol. pap. have both spellings, Deiss., B. S., p. 185. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 173.
\textsuperscript{1} Att. Inscr., p. 114.
This is shown also by the inscriptions² and the Ptolemaic papyri. Per contra note the disappearance of final ν in modern Greek vernacular, when not pronounced (Thumb, *Handb.*, pp. 24 ff.). However, as a rule, this movable final ν occurs only with the same classes of words as in the Attic as after σι, ἐστί and ε in verbs (3d sing. past tenses). The irrational ν mentioned as common later by Hatzidakis³ is rare. The older N. T. MSS. (אABC) are in harmony with the κοίνη and have the movable ν and ζ both before consonants and vowels with a few exceptions. The later N. T. MSS. seem to feel the tendency to drop these variable consonants. Moulton⁴ mentions μεῖζον (Jo. 5:36) as a good example of the irrational ν in N. T. MSS. (ABEGMA). Cf. also the irrational ν with the subjunctive in the papyri. So ἐδῶν ἀφετέρουν Π. Οxy. 744 (i/B.C.) for ἐδότε. See Moulton, *Prol.*, pp. 168, 187, for further examples. The failure to use this ν was originally most common in pause, sometimes even before vowels.⁵ Blass⁶ observes that it was only the Byzantine grammarians who made the rule that this ν should be used before vowels and not before consonants, a rule of which their predecessors did not have the benefit, a thing true of many other grammatical rules. We moderns can teach the ancients much Greek! Since the N. T. MSS.⁷ show no knowledge of this later grammatical “rule,” W. H. follow a mechanical one indeed, but the only practical guide under the circumstances. They go by the testimony of the oldest uncials. Hort gives a considerable list of examples where the ν is wanting in one or more of the older uncials, but where W. H. have ν, as in ἀφετέρων (Mt. 4:6), πᾶσιν (Mt. 5:15), etc. But in Lu. 1:3 ἐδοξε is read by ΝΒCD. In Ac. 24:27 κατέλιπε is supported by ΝΒ. There are about a dozen more instances in Hort’s long list of alternative readings where W. H. prefer the form without ν, rather more frequently after σι, than after ε.¹ W. H., however, have ἐκοσι everywhere, as was usually the case in the Attic inscriptions and always in the Ptolemaic papyri and the LXX MSS. both before vowels and consonants.² So ἐμπροσθεν, ἐξωθεν, ὀπισθεν in the N. T. Likewise πέρυσι is correct in 2 Cor. 8:10; 9:2.³

---

⁵ W.-Sch., p. 62.
⁶ Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 19.
⁷ Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 147 f.; Gregory, Prol., p. 97 f. In simple truth ν movable was not so uniform in the earlier Gk. (esp. Thuc.) as the grammars imply. Cf. Maasson, De littera νGraec. parag., 1881, pp. 47, 61.
¹ See Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 19; Gregory, Prol., p. 97.
² Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 328, and references there given. Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 135.
³ Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 19) quotes Attic usage for πέρυσιν before vowels.
The variable ζ calls for a few words more. All good MSS. give ἄντικρυς Χίου in Ac. 20:15. But as in Attic, the N. T. MSS. usually have ἄχρι and ἀντως even before vowels. Ἀχρι (always before consonants) thus precedes vowels some fifteen times, and once only do we certainly have ἄχρις (Gal. 3:19), though it is uncertain whether it is followed by θν or οὗ. Μέχρι is always used in the N. T. before a consonant and once before a vowel, μέχρι Ἰωάνου (Lu. 16:16). The early N. T. editors used to print οὗτω before consonants and οὗτως before vowels, but W. H. print οὗτος 196 times before consonants and vowels and only ten times οὗτο (all before consonants). These ten instances are Mk. 2:7; Mt. 3:15; 7:17; Ac. 13:47; 23:11; Ro. 1:15; 6:19; Ph. 3:17; Heb. 12:21; Rev. 16:18.

(i) Metathesis. Φαλόνης (2 Tim. 4:13), Latin paenula. See Additional Notes.

IV. Breathings.

(a) Origin of the Aspirate. As is well known, in the modern Greek no distinction is made in pronunciation between spiritus asper and spiritus lenis, or πνεῦμα δασύ and πνεῦμα ψιλόν. That is to say, the “rough” breathing is only a conventional sign used in writing. This sign is indeed a comparatively modern device, ‘and’, in use in the MSS. generally since the eleventh century A.D. This form was an evolution from H (Phœnician he), then and , then and . This breathing (rough or smooth) did not find a place in the Greek alphabet, and so is not found in the early uncial MSS. It becomes therefore a difficult question to tell whether the modern ignoring of the rough breathing was the rule in the first century A.D. The MSS., as Hort points out, are practically worthless on this point. The original use of H as equal to h or the rough breathing was general in the old Attic and the Doric, not the Æolic and Ionic. And even in the Attic inscriptions the usage is very irregular and uncertain. Numerous examples like ΗΕΚΑΤΟΝ occur, but some like ΗΕΝ also, so that even H was not always rough. The modern English cockneys have no monopoly of trouble

4 For the Hom. ἄντικρυ and further items see W.-Sch., p. 63 and note. Ἀντικρυ (καταντικρύ) in Attic is ‘downright,’ not ‘over against’ (Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 20). Cf. for the pap. Maysler, Gr., pp. 242 ff.
5 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 148. But W. H. read ὄχρις οὗ in Heb. 3:13, elsewhere ὄχρι οὗ. For further discussions of ὄχρι and ὑέχρι see W.-Sch., p. 63 note.
1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 63. The marking of the rough breathing was general in the earlier forms in vii/A.D., ib., p. 65.
3 Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 310. Cf. also Sitterley, Praxis in MSS. of the Gk. Test., 1898, p. 32. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 25 f., for remarks on breathings in the LXX MSS., where Ἄεolic and Ionic psilosis occur in ἐπ ὄδου κατ ἑνα as well as exx. of aspirated consonants like καθ ὑφολαμοῦς, καθ ἐνιαυτόν, ἔφρ ἔδεν, not to mention οὐκ ἐσφάκασιν and οὐχ ἵοδο. For further remarks on breathings in the LXX see Swete, O. T. in Gk., p. 302.
with h’s. In French h is silent as l’homme. The Greeks always found the matter a knotty problem. The use of H=η in the Ionic and Attic (after 403 B.C.) left the Greeks without a literary sign for h. The inscriptions show that in the vernacular H continued to be so used for some time.

(b) Increasing de-aspiration (Psilosis). But there was a steady decrease in the use of the h sound. The Ionic, like the Æolic, was distinguished by psilosis, and the κοινή largely followed the Ionic in this respect. More certain is the use of the aspirated consonants χ, θ, φ, which succeeded the older KH, TH, HH. But certainly the rough breathing was in early use as the [Page 223] inscriptions show, though not with much consistency. Sometimes the rough breathing may be due to the disappearance of a digamma, though sometimes a smooth breathing displaces it, as ἔργον from ἐργόν (cf. English ‘work’). Then again the disappearance of σ has the same result, as ἵσαρός = ἵερός. It is not strange therefore that usage in the κοινή is not uniform. Examples like ἔτερον ὢτετο, ὦφ αὐτοῦ, oúk ἐωρδουεύν, etc., appear in the Pergamum inscriptions, not to mention καθ ἐξος, καθ ἱδίαν, etc. The same story of uncertainty is told elsewhere in the κοινή as in Magnesia, Herculaneum. Some of this variation is probably due to analogy, so that though “de-aspiration was the prevailing tendency,” yet the N. T. shows several examples in the opposite direction.

(c) Variations in the MSS. (Aspiration and Psilosis). The aspiration of the consonants κ, π, τ in case of elision is therefore a matter of documentary evidence and occurs in the case of ἄντι, ἐπί, κατά, μετά, oúκ, ὑπό. The N. T. MSS. vary considerably among themselves as in the LXX, though some like D in the Gospels and Acts are wholly untrustworthy about aspiration. In general Attic literary usage

5 Cf. Thumb., p. 73 f. The Laconic Gk. used H in interaspiration as well as at the beginning (ib., p. 8). Dawes (Pronun. of the Gk. Aspirates, 1894, p. 103) is not able to reach a final decision as to whether the Gk. aspirates are genuine aspirates like the Sans. according to Brugmann, Curtius, etc.
1 Cecil Bendall, Jour. of Philol., 1904, pp. 199 ff.
2 R. Weiss, De Dig. etc., 1889, p. 47. Cf. also Paues, De Dig. Hesiodes Quest., 1887, p. 48.
3 Cf. Sommer, Griech. Lautstudien, 1905, p. 2. On metathesis in aspiration, as ἔκθα (ἔκω), see Meisterh., p. 102, exx. of ἔκθα in Attic inscr. v/b.c. See also article by Pernot in Rev. des Ét. Grq., 1906, pp. 10–23, on La Métathèse dans les Dial. de Chio.
4 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr. etc., pp. 116 ff. The Attic had only ἰδιος, but ἔορτη (Meisterh., p. 87).
7 Thumb, Hellen. etc., p. 64.
8 Moulton, Prol., p. 44. Cf. also for the inscr., Dittenb., ξφ ξθος (458. 71), καθ ἰδιαν (233. 49), and for the pap., Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901 (pp. 33, 434) and 1904 (p. 106). Cf. also Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 312.
9 Ib., p. 311.
10 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 15.
cannot be assumed to be the κοινή vernacular. Hort\textsuperscript{11} prefers Ἄδραμυντηνός (Ac. 27:2) like Hadrumetum. Ἀλοώ (1 Cor. 9:9 f.; 1 Tim. 5:18) is connected with ἄλως or ἄλω and may be compared with ἄπιλωτής (ἡλος).\textsuperscript{12} Hort (p. 144) prefers ἄλωσις (Mk. 5:3), but εἰλικρινής and εἰλικρινία, though εἰλ. has ancient authority.

Ἀφελπιζόντες is read by DP in Lu. 6:35 and the LXX has several similar instances,\textsuperscript{13} not to mention one \[Page 224\] in Hermas and in the Attic.\textsuperscript{1} In Ro. 8:20 W. H. accept ἐφ ἐπίδι, while various MSS. support it in Ac. 2:26; 1 Cor. 9:10; Ro. 4:18; 5:2; Tit. 1:2, and FG have καθ ἐλπίδα in Tit. 3:7. Hort\textsuperscript{2} thinks this is due to digamma dropped as well as in the case of ἀφίδω (Ph. 2:23), but analogy to ἀφορῆν may be the explanation.\textsuperscript{3} Ἐφιδε is read by a few MSS. in Ac. 4:29 as ἐθεοὶ in Lu. 1:25. Gregory\textsuperscript{4} gives many examples of ἀφ–, ἐφ–, καθ– with ἐλπίζω and εἰδον in the LXX. W. H. offer οὐχ ἰδού as an alternative reading in Ac. 2:7, while B reads οὐχ ἰδόντες in 1 Pet. 1:8 and οὐχ εἰδον in Gal. 1:19. A has οὐχ ἄνευσθε in Lu. 17:22. W. H.\textsuperscript{5} put οὐχ Ἰουδαίως in the margin in Gal. 2:14. Καθ ἰδιαί appears in \(\textbf{N}\) once, in B eight times, in D three times, in Δ once (Mt. 14:23; 17:1, 19; 20:17; 24:3; Mk. 4:34; 6:31; 9:28; 13:3). But W. H. nowhere accept it, not even when B combines with \(\textbf{N}\) or D.

\(\textbf{NB}\) have it in Mt. 24:3. The form καθ ἰδιαί is common in the κοινή inscriptions and the papyri. Καθεἰδώλον is read by M in Ac. 17:16. On the other hand καθ ἤτοις, so common in the κοινή (cf. Latin vetus), is not found in the N. T., all MSS. in Lu. 2:41 reading κατ ἤτος. Hort\textsuperscript{6} considers οὐκ ἔστηκεν (Jo. 8:44) to be merely the imperfect indicative of στήκω. So also as to ἔστηκεν in Rev. 12:4. \(\textbf{N}\) has ἐφορκήσεις in Mt. 5:33, a form common in the Doric inscriptions.\textsuperscript{7} DP have ἐφιορκός in 1 Tim. 1:10. In Rev. 12:11 A reads οὐχ ἡγάπησαν, while οὐχ ὅλιγος is read in the LXX and papyri as well as a number of times in Ac. (12:18 by \(\textbf{A}\), 14:28 by \(\textbf{N}\), 17:4 by \(\textbf{A}\), 27:20 by \(\textbf{A}\)). In Ac. 5:28 D has ἔφαγαγεν. W. H. print on the other hand ἀποκατιστάνει in Mk. 9:12 rather than ἀποκαταστάνει though with hesitation.\textsuperscript{8}

---

\textsuperscript{11} Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 313; App., p. 160.
\textsuperscript{12} W.-Sch., p. 40.
\textsuperscript{13} Gregory, Prol., p. 91; Thack., p. 125.
\textsuperscript{2} Notes on Orth., p. 143.
\textsuperscript{3} Moulton, Prol., p. 44; Thumb, Spir. Asper, p. 71. Moulton (Cl. Rev., Mar., 1910, p. 53) now says: “I am quite willing to be convinced that the long-lost digamma was an accessory here if no better explanation turns up.” Thumb (Spir. Asper, pp. 11, 71) admits the possibility of the digamma explanation in some cases.
\textsuperscript{4} Prol., p. 91.
\textsuperscript{5} Cf. Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 313 f., where Hort really favours ὅχ Ἰουδ. and the rough breathing for all the forms of Ἰουδάς, Ἰουδάδος, etc. For the variations in the LXX MSS. see Thack., p. 125.
\textsuperscript{6} Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 312.
\textsuperscript{7} Rutherford, New Phyrn., p. 363. For this transfer of aspiration cf. Curtius, Gk. Verb, II, 109. Nestle (Am. Jour. of Theol., July, 1909, p. 448) urges that, since the Gk. of the Bible is an “east-west language,” attention must be paid to oriental tongues. He notes that the Coptic has aspiration in helpis, hisos, for ἐλπίς, Ἰος.
\textsuperscript{8} Notes on Orth., p. 168.
So likewise W. H. give ἐπίσταται instead of ἐφίσταται [Page 225] in 1 Th. 5:3 (like B in Sap. 6:8), a wholly unusual absence of aspiration in compounds of Ἰστίμη. For the LXX phenomena see Thackery, Gr., p. 127 f. It is wholly doubtful whether ὀμείρομαι or ὄμεurrayσαι is right (1 Th. 2:8). Οὐκ εὕρον in some MSS. in Lu. 24:3, and οὐκ ἔνεκεν in 2 Cor. 7:12, Blass² considers as clerical errors, though they are common in the LXX and in the inscriptions.³ N. T. MSS. (late cursive) even have αἰτέο, ὀστεόν, ὄχλος, etc. For μηθείς, οὐθείς see this chapter III, p. 219, the Interchange of Consonants and chapter on Pronouns, pp. 750 f.

(d) TRANSLITERATED SEMITIC WORDS. The aspirate in the case of transliterated Semitic words (chiefly proper names) causes some difficulty. Blass⁴ calls it “insoluble,” though he accepts Hort’s practice as rational,⁵ expressing Χ and Ψ by the smooth breathing and Π and Π by the rough breathing. The MSS. disagree and are not consistent, but Blass calls the result of this procedure “strange.” Hence Hort argues for Αβέλ (Π), Ἀβραάμ (Χ), Ἀγαθος (Ψ), Ἀγαρ (Π), Ἀκελδάμαχ (Π), Ἀλληλούια (Π), Ἀλφαῖος (Π), Ἀνανίας (Π), Ἀννα (Π), Ἀρέτας (Π), Ἀριμαθαία (Π), Ἀρ Μαγεδών (Π), Ἑβέρ (Ψ), Ἑβραίος (Ψ), Ἑβραίτης (Ψ), Ἑλισαίος (Ψ), Ἑλλάδαμ (Χ), Ἑλωί (Χ), Ἑμιώρ (Π), Ἑνόχ (Π, but Ἑνώς, Χ), Ἑρρόμ (Π, but Ἑσλέι, Χ), Ἑδα (Π), Ἡλεί (Χ), but Ἡλει (Π), Ἡλείας (Χ), Ἠρ (Ψ), ὑσσωπος (Χ), ὑωγανά (Π), Ὑση (Π). Hort⁸ gives, moreover, the smooth breathing to all names beginning with Ἡ as Ἡσαίας. Besides he considers it a “false association”⁹ to connect Ἰερείας, Ἰερειχό, Ἰεροσόλυμα (‒μίτης), Ἰερουσαλήμ with ἱερός, though Blass retains Ἰεροσόλυμα rather inconsistently.¹⁰

(e) THE USE OF BREATHINGS WITH ρ AND ρρ. W. H. follow Tischendorf and Lachmann in dropping the breathings in ρρ as in ἀρρητα (2 Cor. 12:4), though retaining the rough breathing with initial ρ as in ῥήματα (ib.). Winer¹¹ argued that the

1 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 144.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 16.
3 W.-Sch., p. 39.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 16.
5 Hort, Intr. to N. T. Gk., p. 313. Cf. also Gregory, Prol., p. 106 f., for list of these words.
6 Strange as it may seem, “Hebrew” rather than “Ebrew” is modern (Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 313).
7 Hort (Notes, etc., p. 144), however, merely follows custom and prints ὑσσος.
8 Intr. to N. T. Gk., p. 313.
9 Ib.
Winer

WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).
Romans heard an aspiration with ρρ, since they used Pyrrhus, Tyrrhenus, etc. W. H. seem justified in using the smooth breathing with the first ρ in the word ρ ἐραντισμένοι (Heb. 10:22) by old Greek custom. The MSS., of course, give no help in the matter. The breathing with ρ is not written in the modern Greek vernacular text as in Pallis or Thumb.

(f) THE QUESTION OF Αὐτοῦ. This is somewhat knotty. It seems clear that as a rule αὐτοῦ and not αὐτοῦ is to be printed in the N. T. A number of reasons converge on this point. The older Greek often used αὐτοῦ rather than ἑαυτοῦ as shown by the aspiration of the prepositions like ἀφ αὐτοῦ, etc. In the N. T. there is not a single case of such aspiration after elision save in a few single MSS. Add to this the fact that the N. T. uses the reflexive pronoun much less than the earlier Greek, “with unusual parsimony” (Hort). Besides the personal pronouns of the first and second persons are frequently employed (Buttmann) where the reflexive might have been used. Buttmann urges also the point that in the N. T. we always have σαυτοῦ, not σαυτοῦ. The earliest uncial MSS. of the N. T. and the LXX that use the diacritical marks belong to the eighth century, but they all have αὐτοῦ, not αὐτοῦ. Even in the early times it was largely a matter of individual taste as to whether the personal or the reflexive pronoun

11 W.-M., p. 53.
1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 40 f.
Pallis

PALLIS, A., A Few Notes on the Gospel (1903).

———, Ἡ Νέα Διαθήκη (1902). The N. T. (Gospels) in modern Greek vernacular.

Thumb


———, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


2 On the whole matter see Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 144 f.; W.-M., p. 188 f.; Buttmann, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 111; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 35. Buttmann BUTTMANN, A., Grammatik d. neut. Sprachgebrauchs (1859).
was used. Blass (p. 35) indeed decides absolutely against αὕτοῦ. But the matter is not quite so easy, for the κοινή inscriptions give examples of ὄφι αὕτοῦ in first century B.C. and A.D. 3 Mayser also gives a number of papyri examples like καθα ἀὕτοῦ, μεθ' αὕτοῦ, ὃς αὕτῶν, where the matter is beyond dispute. Hort agrees with Winer in thinking that sometimes αὕτοῦ must be read unless one insists on undue harshness in the Greek idiom. He instances Jo. 2:24, αὐτός ἐδὲ Ἡσσοῦς οὐκ ἔπιστευσεν αὐτόν αὐτοῖς, and Lu. 23:12, προσηπραγον γὰρ ἐν ἑκείρῃ ὄντες πρὸς αὐτοῦς. There are other examples where a different meaning will result from the smooth and the rough breathing as in 1 Jo. 5:10 (αὕτῳ), 18 (αὕτον, αὐτοῦ), Eph. 1:5 (αὐτόν), 10 (αὐτῷ), Col. 1:20 (αὐτόν), 2:15 (αὐτῷ). W. H. print αὐτοῦ about twenty times. Winer leaves the matter “to the cautious judgment of the editors.”

V. Accent.

(a) The Age of Greek Accent. The MSS. are worth as little for accent as for breathings. The systematic application of accent in the MSS., like the regular use of the spiritus lenis, dates [Page 227] from the seventh century A.D. 1 Hort 2 caustically remarks that most modern grammarians have merely worked out “a consistent system of accentuation on paper” and have not recovered the Greek intonations of voice, though he has little to offer on the subject. Chandler 3 indeed laments that modern scholars scatter their Greek accents about rather recklessly, but he adds: “In England, at all events, every man will accent his Greek properly who wishes to stand well with the world.” It is a comfort to find one’s accents irreproachable, and Chandler rightly urges that the only way to use the accents properly is to pronounce according to the accent. The ancients were interested in Greek accent. Herodian in his Καθολικὴ προσῳδία investigated the accent of 60,000 words, but the bulk of his twenty books is lost. Chandler 4 found most help from Göttling, though others have written at length on the subject. 5 There are no accent-marks in the early inscriptions and papyri; in fact tradition ascribes the invention of these signs as a system to Aristophanes of Byzantium in the third century B.C., though the beginnings appear in the preceding

2 Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 314.
Chandler CHANDLER, H., A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation. 2d ed. (1881).
3 Gk. Accentuation (1881), p. xxiii.
4 Ib., p. xvii.
century. He and his disciple, Aristarchus, made the rules at any rate. The
Alexandrian grammarians developed these rules, which have shown a marvellous
tenacity even to the present day in the modern Greek, though, of course, some words
would naturally vary in accent with the centuries. There is the Harris papyrus of
Homer in the first century A.D. which has accents, and clearly the word had the accent
in pronunciation like English long before it was written out. After the fourth century
A.D. the use of accentual rhythm in Greek in place of quantitative rhythm had a
tendency [Page 228] to make the accent rather more stable. “Of all the phonetic
peculiarities of a language accent is the most important.” The earlier use of accents
and breathings was probably “for the text of poetry written in dialect” (cf. our
reading-books for children). They were not written out “in ordinary prose till the
times of minuscule writing,” though Euthalius (A.D. 396) made use of them in his
edition of the N. T. The Christian hymns early show signs of changing from tone
(pitch) to stress as is the rule in modern Greek. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 6.

(b) Significance of Accent in the Koiné. In Greek it is pitch, not stress, that is
expressed by the accent, though in modern Greek the accents indicate stress. “In the
ancient Sanskrit and the ancient Greek the rise and fall in musical tone was very
marked.” In English we are familiar with stress-accent. “Hadley has ably argued that
the compass of tone used by the Greeks was a musical fifth, i.e. from C=do to G=sol,
invoking also the intermediate third or E=me.” It was not a stronger current of
breath, but a higher musical note that we have. It was in a word “das musikalische
111 f.) points out that προσῳδία comes from a root meaning ‘to sing’ (like the Latin
accentus) and so ὀξύς and βαρύς answer to our high and low pitch. Giles thinks that
in the original Indo-Germanic language pitch and stress-accent were more evenly
balanced. The accent singles out one syllable sharply and raises it higher than the rest,

7 Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., p. 77.
8 Krumb., Beitr. zu einer Gesch. der griech. Spr., Kuhn’s Zeitschr. für Sprachl., 1885,
p. 521. Cf. also Hatz., Einl. etc., p. 418; Chandler, Gk. Accentuation, p. v; Brugmann,
Griech. Gr., p. 150.
Harris HARRIS, J. RENDEL, Side-Lights on N. T. Research (1908).
1 Sophocles, Lex. of Rom. and Byz. Period, p. 48.
2 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 91.
5 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 92.
6 Harris, MS. Notes on Gk. Gr. Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., p. 77 f., for a
discussion of the musical aspect of the matter.
8 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 129.
Giles

GILES, P., A Short Manual of Comparative Philology. 2d ed. (1901).

9 Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 94.
though as a matter of fact each syllable in a word has an accent or pitch lower down in the scale. Cf. the secondary accent in the English “incompatibility.” The Harris papyrus of Homer even accents every syllable in each word. Then again “the accent of a sentence is as much under the influence of a law of some kind as the accent of the word.” Language without accent or musical variety in tone would be hopelessly monotonous and ineffective. An instance of the importance of accent and breathings is seen in οὐ οὐ, Ac. 19:40.

(c) SIGNS OF ACCENT. In practical usage (in our school grammars) there is only one distinction, the accented syllable and the unaccented syllables. The Greeks themselves distinguished the pronunciation of the acute and the circumflex. The difference is well illustrated by ἐμι and ἔμι. The three signs (acute or ὑψῖνη, grave or βαρεῖνη, circumflex or περισπωμένη) come to symbolize the higher pitch of the accented syllable. Originally the accented syllable was marked by the acute and all the unaccented syllables by the grave (merely the absence of the acute), but by and by this use of the grave accent was felt to be useless and was dropped. Then the grave accentual mark of falling inflection was used for the acute when an oxytone word comes before another word (not enclitic), though this “grave” accent has the pitch of the unaccented syllable. Similarly in contraction of two syllables with acute and grave (’) arose the circumflex, the grave and the acute making acute still. The actual use in pronunciation of both acute and grave in the contracted syllable disappeared, so that the circumflex in pitch differed little, if any, from the acute. The difference, for instance, between the acute in δηλώσαι and the circumflex in δηλῶσαι was not perceptible in sound. The Greek and the Latin agree in having the accent only on one of the three last syllables and thus differ from English and French for instance. It is not necessary here to go into the rules (not wholly arbitrary) which the Greeks developed for the accent of words. In the use of unaccented words (proclitics or enclitics) Greek does not differ radically from English. If the Greek has ἐν οἴκῳ, the English has “at-home.” If the Greek has εἶπέ μοι, the English has “tell-me.”

(d) LATER DEVELOPMENTS IN ACCENT. There was not indeed uniformity among the dialects in the use of accent. They agreed only in the one point of not accenting further back than the third syllable from the end. “In other respects the Greek dialects show the widest divergencies in their accentuation. The two antipodes are Ἄρεος and Doric, which are so closely allied phonetically: Αρεῖκος throws the accent as far back as possible in [Page 230] all words, e.g. βασίλευς=βασιλεύς, …; Doric, on the contrary, faithfully preserves the original oxytone accent. Between these two dialects lie Ionic and Attic, which, however, are much nearer to Doric than to Ἄρεος. But all the

1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 66.
2 Ib., pp. 65, 68.
4 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 96. Giles thinks that words like ἐφεσμοθα originally had the accent further back. Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., p. 80, for Plato’s word of 17 syllables and Aristophanes’ word of 78.
dialects, including Doric, observe the rule that, in those forms of the verb which are capable of being conjugated, the accent goes back as far as possible.Æolic, for instance, has ἐσῆ where the Attic has ἡ σή. But all the dialects have ἐγώ, ἔγωγε. On this point in general see Kühner-Blass, I, pp. 323 ff. The Dorians even had ἀνθρώποι, ἐλέσαν, etc. Perfect uniformity was no more possible in Greek than in English. The modern Greek preserves the three-syllable accent rule. Examples like ἐπισκέψε, ἐβράδυσας are not exceptions, since the ι and υ count as consonants. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 28. French follows tone like the ancient Greek. Pêcheur is ‘fisher,’ while pêcheur is ‘sinner,’ for example, a difference only in quality, not in accent.

\[\text{(e) N. T. Peculiarities. Where so much is in doubt, excessive refinement is certainly not desirable. But the following points call for remark, and Gregory can be consulted for the actual evidence (very slight) from the N. T. MSS. on the subject of accent. D alone among the older uncials has the accent (and that the occasional circumflex) save by the hand of a corrector.}\\
\]

1. Shortening Stem-Vowels. There is quite a tendency in the κοινή towards shortening some of the stem-vowels, especially in words in –μα. Hence W. H. do not follow the Attic accent here, but that of the κοινή, and give us κλίμα, κρίμα, μίγμα (cf. ἐλίγμα), πόμα, χρίσμα, though as to χρίσμα Blass suggests that χρήσιμα is correct because of χρῆσις and because B (1 Jo. 2:20, 27) has χρῆσιμα. Analogy plays havoc with rules. Herodian says that ι and υ were usually shortened before υ. So W. H. give us κήρυξ, κηρύξαι, στήριξαι (Ro. 16:25), probably φοίνιξ, χοίνιξ. According to Winer-Schmiedel this rule applies to ψ also, but W. H. and Blass do not agree. So

---

Gregory


3 Prol., p. 99 f.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 15.
Winer-Schmiedel WINER-SCHMIEDEL, Winer’s Grammatik des neuesten Sprachidioms. 8. Aufl. (1894—).
6 P. 68.
7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 15. Blass urges that B has θλεψις, but W. H. refuse to follow B in matters of orthography. But the Herculaneum rolls here reinforce B with ἐι before
W. H. have θλίψις, ἄψιν (Lu. 4:35). [Page 231] By parity of reasoning W. H. reject the circumflex accent in ἐκλυσία, ἄνων, μύρνω, σπέλεως, στῦλως, συντερψάθαι (Mk. 5:4), though συντρίβων (Lu. 9:39) and σκῦλα (Lu. 11:22). Cf. μῦθος, μαργαρίται, νίκος, σίτος, σῶκον, etc. W. H. read ψύχος also. The length of ν in κύπτω is uncertain; ὄνακτίζων and παράκτιζων usually appear in the N. T. W. H. have, however, κραζόν in Gal. 4:6 and λαμάλων in Mk. 4:37. But ἑστάναι (Ac. 12:14) is right, though ἄραι (Mt. 24:17), θυμίσθαι (Lu. 1:9) because of long ἀ. Cf. also ἐπάραι (Lu. 18:13), ἐπιφάναι (Lu. 1:79), πράξαι (Ac. 26:9), but πιάσα (Jo. 7:30). So καταλῦσαι (Mt. 5:17), κατευθύναι (Lu. 1:79) and κωλύσαι (Ac. 10:47).

2. Separate Words. These are not so easily classified. W. H. read ἄγοραίοι, not ἄγοραιοι; ἄντικρος, not ἄντικρυ; ἄντιπερα, not ἄντιπέραν(ν); ἀπόδεκτος, not ἀποδεκτός but ἐκλεκτός, εὐλογητός, μισθωτός, ἄρεσκια (from ἄρεσκεω), with which compare ἐρύθοι (from ἐρυθεῶν); ἄρχεως (Attic ἄρχεως), as also ἔρημος (Attic ἔρημος), ἔτοιμος (Attic ἔτοιμος), μισθός (Attic μισθός), χλωρός (Attic χλῶρος); ἱδροῦς (3d decl.), ὅρησθης (3d decl.); γαζοφυλάκιον, not –ἰον and εἰδώλων, with which compare τελόνων, γλωσσόκομον being for the earlier γλωσσοκόμον; δέσμη, not δεσμή; διετής (Mt. 2:16), not διέτης (Attic), and so with other compounds of –της, like ἔκαστοτητής, etc., but ἔκαστοταχῦν (Ac. 23:17) is from –ἀρχης, not –ἀρχος; εἰςν is the imperative (Mt. 18:17), for εἰσν is only Attic, and Charax calls εἰσν Syracusan,1 with which one may compare ἵος (ἵον only Attic according to the Alexandrian grammarians, though Bornemann urged ἵος when verb and ἵος when exclamation) and λάβε (λαβέ only Attic); ρησκός (Jas. 1:26), not ρηθκός; ἰδρώς (Lu. 22:44), not ἴδρως; ἰμάντα (Mt. 1:7), not the Attic ἰμάντα; ἱσος, not the Epic ἱσος; ἰδικός (Mt. 7:10), not ἰδικός, ὀρφῶς (Mt. 3:4), not ὀρφῆς, ἰσχῦς, not ἴσχυς; κλεῖς in nominative singular (Rev. 9:1), though κλέξ (1:18) and κλέδας (Mt. 16:19) in accusative plural, etc., with which compare ποὺς (Mk. 9:45), not ποῦς, and σής (Mt. 6:19), not σῆς; κτίστης (1 Pet. 4:19), not κτιστής, ἰσοπήθες, κτίστης, as γνώστης, etc.; κρύπτη, not κρυπτῆ (Lu. 11:33); μαγγαλάς (Mk. 7:32), not –καλός; μυλόν (Mt. 24:41) is read only by DHM and most of the cursives, μύλος being correct; μυρίαδον (–ἀς) as in Lu. 12:1; Rev. 5:11, not the Attic μυριαδῶν, and so as to χυλίαδον; ὄργανο (Ac. 27:28), not ὄργανα; οὐά (Mk. 15:29), not οὐά; ποιμνίου (Lu. 12:32), not ποιμνίων, and τροφίου (Mk. 14:20) [Page 232] (called no diminutive by some),2 but ἕνων always; πλήμμωρα (Lu. 6:48) is preferred by Winer-Schmiedel3 as nominative to πλημμυρίς rather than –μύρα: πονηρός always, not πόνηρος in the physical sense (Rev. 16:2) and πονηρός in the moral (Gal. 1:4); πρόφα (Ac. 27:41), not πρόφα; σπείρα (Mk. 15:16), not σπείρα; φλαμίρος (1 Tim. 5:13), not φλαμαρός. The compound adverbs ἐπέκεισα, ὑπερέκεισα have thrown back the accent.

1 Cf. W.-M., p. 58.
2 As shown in W.-M. (p. 60), the N. T. MSS. have ἐσω, not ἐσω, though ἐις, not ἐς.
3 Cf. W.-S., p. 73.
3. Difference in Sense. With some words the accent makes a difference in the sense and is quite important. We have, for instance, ἄγια, not ἄγια, in Heb. 9:2. W. H. read ἄλλα, not ἄλλα, in Jo. 6:23. In Jas. 1:15 W. H. have ἀποκώνει (from –έω), not ἀποκόνει (from –κόνω). So W. H. print ἄρα (interrog.) in Gal. 2:17, not ἄρα (illative). Αὐτή and αὐτή are easily confused, but W. H. prefer αὐτή to αὐτή in Mt. 22:39 (αὐτῇ in margin); Ro. 7:10; 1 Cor. 7:12; and αὐτή to αὐτή in Lu. 2:37; 7:12; 8:42; Ro. 16:2. In Rev. 2:24 the adverb βαθεία is correct, not the substantive βάθεια (uncontracted from βάθος). Δεξιολάβος or δεξιόλαβος is possible in Ac. 23:23 (cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 69). So W. H. give us ἔγγραφοι (infective) in Rev. 3:18, not ἔγγραφαι (imperative). Cf. also ἔπτιμησαν (Jude 9), optative, not infinitive – ἔρισαν. Note the difference between φοβηθῆτε (subjunctive) and φοβήθητε (imperative) in Lu. 12:5. In Jo. 7:34, 36, W. H. prefer έλιμί rather than έλιμο (not elsewhere used in the N. T. save in composition with prepositions ὁπό, ἐλ, ἔξ, ἐπί, σύν). In Mk. 12:40 we have, µ (subjunctive), not µ (imperative). In Mt. 24:41, 1 Th. 4:6, 1 Cor. 15:8 and 16:16 the article τίς, not τί (future) to µ (imperative). In Lu. 19:29; 21:37 W. H. prefer Ἐλαιών, not Ἐλαιόν (the correct text in Ac. 1:12, and possibly in Luke also according to the papyri, though Ἐλαιώνa would be the form expected).4 In Mk. 4:8, 20, W. H. put ἐν in the text and ἐν in the margin. Ἐν, not ἐνί, occurs with οὐκ several times, once (1 Cor. 6:5) οὐκ ἐν ἐν. In Lu. 9:38, W. H. read ἔπιβλέψαι (infinitive). In 1 Cor. 5:11 W. H. read ἐπί βλέψαι (subjunctive), not ἐπιβλέψαι (conjunction as Rec.). In Ro. 1:30 W. H. follow most editors in giving θεοστύγεις (passive), not θεοστύγεις (active sense of the adjective). In Mk. 5:29 all editors have the perfect ἠττα, not the present ἠττα. In Lu. 22:30 W. H. read καθῆσθε (subjunctive), not καθήσοθε (indicative) nor καθήσοσθε (future, margin). In 1 Cor. 9:21 W. H. prefer κερδάνο (future indicative) to κερδαν (aorist subjunctive), and in [Page 233] 1 Cor. 6:2 κρινοῦσι (future) to κρινοῦσαι (present indicative in marg.). In Mk. 12:40 we have, μακρά not μακρῷ. In 1 Cor. 3:14 W. H. prefer μενέ (future) to μένε (present), and in Jo. 14:17 they have μέναι. In 1 Cor. 4:15 (14:19) and Mt. 18:24 no distinction can be made in the accent of μῦροι (‘innumerable’) and μῦροι (‘ten thousand’) because of the cases. Dr. E. J. Goodspeed, of Chicago University (Expository Times, July, 1909, p. 471 f.), suggests ὑψιλοθῆς in Mk. 7:11 instead of ὑψιλοθῆς. It is entirely possible. In 1 Cor. 14:7 ᾿ὁμος is correct, not ᾿ὁμος. In Jo. 18:37 W. H. give οὐκούν, not οὐκούν, in Pilate’s question. In Ac. 28:6 W. H. print πιστασθή (µ verb), not πιστασθή (o verb). In Rev. 17:5 πορνῶν (feminine) is probably right, not πόρνων (masculine). Πρωτότοκος (Col. 1:15), not πρωτοτόκος, is manifestly right. The difference between the interrogative τις and the indefinite τις calls for frequent attention. In Heb. 5:12 W. H. have τινός, not τίνα, but in Heb. 3:16 τίνες, not τινες, and in 3:17 τίςν, not τισίν, while in Mt. 24:41, 1 Th. 4:6, 1 Cor. 15:8 and 16:16 the article τῷ is to be read, not the indefinite τῷ, which form does not occur in the N. T. In 1 Cor. 10:19 τί ἐστιν (twice) is not interrogative, but the enclitic indefinite with the accent of ἐστιν. In Jas. 3:6 τρόχος (‘wheel’) is properly read, not τρόχος (‘course’). In Mk. 4:12 W. H. read

4 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 69. On accent of the vernac. see Apostolides, Γλωσσικα Μελεταί (1906).
συνίωσιν, not συνιώσιν, as συνίωσιν in Mt. 13:13. Winer\(^1\) considers the suggestion of φωτόν for φῶτων in Jas. 1:17 “altogether absurd.”

4. Enclitics (and Proclitics). Proclitics are regular in the N. T. The accent of enclitics calls for comment. As a rule W. H. do not accent them. So we have ὁμίλον τινας (Mk. 12:13), ἐδείκτη τινα (Ac. 5:36), Ἰδοὺ τινες (Mt. 28:11), ὁδὸν ἔδωκαν (Lu. 8:12), ἐσόνετοι ἔστε (Mk. 7:18), γὰρ ἔστε (Mk. 13:11), καὶ φησι (Ac. 10:31; 25:24).

However, plenty of cases call for accent on the enclitic, as, for example, in εὐρέων τινας (Ac. 19:1) for emphasis, γὰρ, φησιν (Heb. 8:5 and cf. Mt. 14:8; Ac. 25:5, 22; 26:25; 1 Cor. 6:16; 2 Cor. 10:10) for clearness in punctuation, καὶ εἴσθεν (Mt. 19:12 and cf. Ac. 5:25) for emphasis, θεοῦ ἔσμεν (1 Jo. 3:2), ὑπὸ τινῶν (Lu. 9:8) likewise, οὐκ ἐλίμ (Jo. 1:21). In ὅπως εἰμὶ (Jo. 7:34, 36) the accent is regular, though some critics wrongly prefer ἐμί.

The use of ἔστιν and ἔστιν demands special comment. When unemphatic, not at the beginning of a sentence, not preceded by ἀλλα, εἰ, καί, οὐκ, ὅτι, τοῦτο, or a paroxytone syllable, as, for example, in ὸθοδού ἔστιν (Jo. 4:22), we have unaccented ἔστιν as in ὡγίας ἔστιν (Mt. 13:38, 39), καθώς ἔστιν (1 Jo. 3:2), etc. In some examples [Page 234] of mild emphasis W. H. have ἔστιν, as in νῦν ἔστιν (Jo. 4:23; 5:25), ποῦ ἔστιν (Mt. 2:2; Mk. 14:14). But the cases are numerous where ἔστιν is correct, as when it is emphatic, and expresses existence or possibility, as in εἴδες ἔστιν (Rev. 17:18), ὁμίλου ἔστιν (Ac. 2:29), ἄγιον ἔστιν (Ac. 19:2), ὁ εἰς ἔστιν (Rev. 17:10), οὐδεὶς ἔστιν (Lk. 1:61; 7:28; 18:29). ἔστιν is also the accent at the beginning of sentences, as in Jo. 21:25; 1 Cor. 15:44; 1 Jo. 5:16 f.; Heb. 11:1. Cf. ἔστιν in Col. 1:15 and ἔστιν in 1:17. Then again we have, according to the usual rule, ἔστιν after ἀλλα. (Jo. 13:10), εἰ (1 Cor. 15:44), καί (Mk. 12:11; 2 Cor. 4:3), ὅτι (2 Th. 2:4; Mk. 6:55; Heb. 11:6), but ὅτι ἔστιν (Ac. 23:5) when the idea of existence is not stressed, οὐκ (1 Cor. 11:20; Ro. 8:9, etc.), τοῦτο (Mk. 7:2; Ro. 7:18). W. H. give only ἔστιν after ποῦ (Jo. 9:12; 11:57; Mk. 14:14).

Sometimes two enclitics come together. Here the critics differ and W. H.\(^1\) do not make clear the reasons for their practice. In Ac. 13:15 W. H. have εἰ τις ἔστιν, and in Gal. 6:15 περιτομή τι ἔστιν, because they take ἔστιν to be emphatic in both instances. In Jo. 6:51 W. H. have σάρξ μου ἔστιν. But in many examples the first enclitic is accented and the second unaccented as in Lu. 8:46 ἡματικὸν μου τις, 10:29 τις ὑπό τε ἔστι μου, Jo. 5:14 χείρισθαν, καὶ τί, 8:31 μαθηταὶ μου ἔστε, 12:47 ἐὰν τις μου, 14:28 μείζων μοῦ ἔστιν, Ac. 2:25 δεξιῶν μοῦ ἔστιν, 25:5 εἰ τί ἔστιν, 25:14 ἀνήρ τις ἔστιν, 1 Cor. 10:19 εἰς τὸν ὑπό τις ἔστιν, ἔστιν, 11:24 τοῦτο μου ἔστιν, 2 Cor. 11:16 μὴ τίς με, Ro. 3:8 καθὼς φασίν τινες, Heb. 1:10 χειρὶς σοῦ ἔστε, 2:6 δὲ ποῦ τις, Tit. 1:6 ἔι τις ἔστιν. Modern Greek only has a second accent when the accent is in the third syllable as in τι ἄρματα μας (Thumb, Handbook, p. 29).

The personal pronouns now have the accent in W. H. and now are without it, as ὁθολομοῦ σοῦ and ὁθολομοῦ σου (both in Mt. 7:4). Cf. also ἐγὼ σε (Jo. 17:4), σὺ με (17:8), but τι ἐμοί καὶ σοί (Lu. 8:28). With prepositions generally the enclitics are

---

1 W.-M., p. 62.
1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 77.
accented, as ἐν σοί (Jo. 17:21), though ἐμπροσθέν μου and ὑπίσω μου (Jo. 1:30 both, and so continually with these two prepositions). Ἐνόπιον ἐμοῦ (Lu. 4:7) and ἐνόπιον μου (Ac. 2:25) both appear. With the prepositions usually ἐμοῦ, not μου, occurs as ἐνεκα ἐμοῦ (Mt. 5:11). It is only with πρός that we have much trouble. The N. T. editors have generally printed πρός σε, but W. H. have that only in Mt. 25:39, elsewhere πρὸς εἷς in Mt. 26:18. Usually we have, according to W. H., πρὸς με as in Mt. 25:36; Jo. 6:65; 7:37, etc., and where the “me” is emphatic in sense, [Page 235] as Mt. 3:14; 11:28, in the first of which Tisch. and Griesbach have πρὸς μέ, a usage not followed by W. H., though kept in the LXX text of B, as in Is. 48:16, etc. W. H. a few times prefer πρὸς ἐμέ (not enclitic) as in Lu. 1:43; Jo. 6:35, 37 (both ways here), 44 (margin.), 45; Ac. 22:8, 13; 23:22; 24:19. Occasionally the enclitic τινὲς is found at the beginning of a sentence, as in Mt. 27:47; Lu. 6:2; Jo. 13:29; Ph. 1:15; 1 Tim. 5:24.

5. Proper Names cannot always be brought under rules, for in Greek, as in English, men claim the right to accent their own names as they will. On the accent of the abbreviated proper names see chapter V, V. It is difficult to make a clear line of distinction as to why Ἀντίπας (Rev. 2:13) is proper, but Ἀρτεμίᾶς (Tit. 3:12), save that in Ἀρτεμίδωρος the accent was already after μ. But cf. Κλεόπας (Lu. 24:18) and Κλωπᾶς (Jo. 19:25). W. H. a few times prefer πρὸς ἐμέ (not enclitic) as in Lu. 1:43; Jo. 6:35, 37 (both ways here), 44 (margin.), 45; Ac. 22:8, 13; 23:22; 24:19. Occasionally the enclitic τινὲς is found at the beginning of a sentence, as in Mt. 27:47; Lu. 6:2; Jo. 13:29; Ph. 1:15; 1 Tim. 5:24.

6. Foreign Words. These always give occasion for diversity of usage in transliterating them into another tongue. Blass lets the quantity of the vowel in Latin determine the accent in the Greek equivalent for Latin words. So Μᾶκος, Μᾶκος, etc., but W. H. do not accept this easy principle and give us Μᾶρκος in Ac. 12:25, etc., Κρίσπος (1 Cor. 1:14), etc. W. H. likewise [Page 236] throw the accent back on Latin names like Κούρατος (Ro. 16:23), Πρίσκιλλα (Ac. 18:2), Σέκουνδος (Ac. 20:4), Χριστός (Ac. 6:5), Τύχικος (Ac. 20:4) Φίλητος (2 Tim. 2:17). But Χριστός always retains the oxytone accent whether proper name (1 Tim. 1:1) or verbal adjective (Mt. 16:16). In 2 Tim. 4:21 Λίνος, not Λίνος, is read. So Τίτος (2 Cor. 2:13, etc.). In Ac. 27:17 Σύρτις is read by W. H. But Φήλιξ in Ac. 24:22, etc.


1 Cf. Lipsius, Gr. Unters., p. 61. Cf. also W.-Sch., p. 78.
2 In W.-Sch., p. 74 f., see remarks on the subject.
3 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 73. This word is, of course, not to be confounded with ἄσσον (Ac. 27:13) as Text. Rec. did.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 15.
Τέρτυλλος (24:2), but we have on the other hand Γάδος (Ro. 16:23), not Γάδος, ᾨδρωνός (Ro. 16:9), Σιλουανός (2 Cor. 1:19), Σκευάς (Ac. 19:14).

But not even Blass attempts to bring the Semitic words under regular rules. Still, it is true, as Winer shows, that indeclinable Semitic words (especially proper names) have the accent, as a rule, on the last syllable, though the usage of Josephus is the contrary, because he generally inflects the words that in the LXX and the N. T. are indeclinable. So Ἀαρὼν, Ἀβδοῦ, Ἀβιά, Ἀβιοῦδ, Ἀβραάμ, to take only the first two pages of Thayer’s Lexicon, though even here we find on the other side Ἀβελ and Ἀβιάθαρ. If you turn over you meet Ἀγαρ, Ἀδάμ, Ἀδδε, Ἀδμείν, Ἀζώρ, etc. It is not necessary here to give a full list of these proper names, but reference can be made to Lu. 3:23–38 for a good sample. In this list some indeclinable words have the accent on the penult, as Ἐλείζερ (29), Ζοροβάβελ (27), Λάμεχ (36), Φάλεκ (35). The inflected Semitic words often throw the accent back, as Ἀζωτος, Ἰάκωβος, Λάζαρος. Many of the Aramaic words accent the ultima, as Ἀββα, Γολγοθά, Κορβάν, Ἐλωί, σαβαχθανεί, etc. For further remarks on the subject see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 26–31. The difficulties of the LXX translators are well illustrated here by Helbing.

VI. Pronunciation in the Κοινή. This is indeed a knotty problem and has been the occasion of fierce controversy. When the Byzantine scholars revived the study of Greek in Italy, they introduced, of course, their own pronunciation as well as their own spelling. But English-speaking people know that spelling is not a safe guide in pronunciation, for the pronunciation may change very much when the spelling remains the same. Writing is originally an effort to represent the sound and is more or less successful, but the comparison of Homer with modern Greek is a fruitful subject. Roger Bacon, as Reuchlin two centuries later, adopted the Byzantine pronunciation. Reuchlin, who introduced Greek to the further West, studied in Italy and passed on the Byzantine pronunciation. Erasmus is indirectly responsible for the current

1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 75.
2 W.-M., p. 59.

THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).

———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

3 Cf. also Gregory, Prol., p. 102 f; W.-Sch., p. 75; Westcott, Notes on Orth., pp. 155, 159; Thackeray, pp. 150 ff.

HELBING, R., Die Präpos. bei Herodot und andern Historikern (1904).

———, Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre (1907).


pronunciation of ancient Greek, for the Byzantine [Page 237] scholars pronounced ancient and modern alike. Jannaris\textsuperscript{1} quotes the story of Voss, a Dutch scholar (1577–1649), as to how Erasmus heard some learned Greeks pronounce Greek in a very different way from the Byzantine custom. Erasmus published a discussion between a lion and a bear entitled \textit{De Recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione}, which made such an impression that those who accepted the ideas advanced in this book were called Erasmians and the rest Reuchlinians. As a matter of fact, however, Engel has shown that Erasmus merely wrote a literary squib to “take off” the new non-Byzantine pronunciation, though he was taken seriously by many. Dr. Caspar René Gregory writes me (May 6, 1912): “The philologians were of course down on Engel and sided gladly with Blass. It was much easier to go on with the totally impossible pronunciation that they used than to change it.” Cf. Engel, \textit{Die Aussprachen des Griechischen}, 1887. In 1542 Stephen Gardiner, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, “issued an edict for his university, in which, e.g. it was categorically forbidden to distinguish αι from ε, ει and οι from ι in pronunciation, under penalty of expulsion from the Senate, exclusion from the attainment of a degree, rustication for students, and domestic chastisement for boys.”\textsuperscript{2} Hence though the continental pronunciation of Greek and Latin was “Erasmian,” at Cambridge and Oxford the Reuchlinian influence prevailed, though with local modifications. Geldart,\textsuperscript{3} however, complains that at Eton, Rugby and Harrow so little attention is paid to pronouncing according to accent that most Greek scholars handle the accents loosely. The \textit{Classical Review} (April, 1906, p. 146 f.) has the scheme approved by the Philological Societies of Cambridge and Oxford for “The Restored Pronunciation of Latin,” which is the virtual adoption of the Continental principle. The modern Greeks themselves rather vehemently insist that ancient Greek should be pronounced as modern Greek is. Müller,\textsuperscript{4} for instance, calls the “Erasmian” pronunciation “false” because it treats Greek “as dead.” Geldart (\textit{Modern Gk. Language in Its Relation to Ancient Gr.}, p. vii) says: “Modern Greek is nothing but ancient Greek made easy.” It is not [Page 238] quite as simple as that. Foy\textsuperscript{1} properly distinguishes between the old Greek vocal sounds and the modern Greek and refers to the development of Latin into the several Romance languages. There is this difference in the Greek, however, that it has only

\begin{flushleft}
Jannaris
\end{flushleft}

\textsc{Jannaris, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar} (1897).

———, \textit{On the True Meaning of the Κοινή} (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

Engel \textsc{Engel, E., Die Aussprache des Griechischen} (1887).
Geldart \textsc{Geldart, The Modern Greek Language in Its Relation to Ancient Greek} (1870).
3 Guide to Mod. Gk., p. x.
4 Hist. Gr. der hell. Spr. (pp. 26, 36). In pp. 35–40 he states the case against the squib of Erasmus. Cf. Engel (\textit{Die Ausspr. des Griech.}, 1887) who defends the mod. Gk. method, as already stated.
Foy \textsc{Foy, K., Lautsystem der griech. Vulgarsprache} (1879).
1 Lautsystem der griech. Vulgarspr., 1879, p. 83 f.
one modern representative (with dialectical variations) of the ancient tongue. One must not make the mistake of comparing the pronunciation of the modern Greek vernacular with the probable pronunciation of the literary Attic of the fifth century B.C. Then, as now, there was the literary and the vernacular pronunciation. The changes in pronunciation that have come in the modern Greek have come through the Byzantine Greek from the κοινή, and thus represent a common stream with many rills. The various dialects have made contributions to the pronunciation of the κοινή and so of the modern Greek. In cultivated Athens at its best there was a closer approximation between the people and the educated classes. “Demosthenes, in his oration περὶ στεφάνου, called Ἀeschines a μισθωτόν, but had accented the word erroneously, namely, μισθωτον, whereupon the audience corrected him by crying μισθωτόν.”

Like the modern Italian, the ancient Greek had a musical cadence that set it above all other European tongues. We can indeed appeal to the old Greek inscriptions for the popular pronunciation on many points. According to this evidence in the first century B.C. in Attica αι=ae, ει=ι, η=ι, υ=ι, υι=υ, οι=ι, β=v (English v). Clearly then in the κοινή the process of itacism was already at work before the N. T. was written. What was true of the κοινή vernacular then does not of course argue conclusively for the pronunciation of cultivated Athenians in the time of Socrates. In versatile Athens “a stranger, if introduced on the stage, is always represented as talking the language or dialect of the people to which he belongs.” Blass indeed thinks that in Tarsus the school-teacher taught Paul Atticistic Greek! “Τσεμεν, Ἰστε, Ἰσασιν, he must have said, are the true forms which you must employ if you care to be considered a cultivated speaker or writer.” Yet in Paul’s Epistles he constantly has οἴδαµεν, –ατε, –ασιν. The Atticistic pronunciation was no more successful than the Atticistic spelling, forms and syntax. We may be sure of one thing, the pronunciation of the vernacular κοινή was not exactly like the ancient literary Attic nor precisely like the modern Greek vernacular, but veering more towards the latter. In Greek as in English the

Blass


———, Hermeneutik und Kritik (1892).

———, Philology of the Gospels (1898).

———, Pronunciation of Ancient Greek (translation by Purton in 1890 of 3. Aufl. of Über die Aussprache des Griech. 1888).

pronunciation has perhaps varied more than the spelling. Giles\(^1\) observes that English pronunciation “is really a stumbling-block in tracing the history of the English language.” Hadley\(^2\) has a very able and sane discussion of this matter of changes in Greek pronunciation. He insists on change all through the centuries (p. 139), which is the only rational position. If we turn to the earliest N. T. MSS. we shall find undoubtedly traces of this process of change from the old Attic toward the Byzantine or modern Greek pronunciation. Indeed in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.,\(^3\) the date of the earliest uncials, the process is pretty well complete. The N. T. scribes make no hesitation in writing \(\alpha ι \) or \(\varepsilon ι\); \(\epsilon i\), \(\epsilon ι\), \(\eta\), \(\epsilon η\), \(\alpha i\) or \(\upsilon\) according to convenience or individual taste.\(^4\) Blass,\(^5\) contrary to his former view about Tarsus, says that it is impossible to suppose that there was anybody in the schools at Tarsus who would have taught Paul the correct historical spelling or pronunciation. To the student of the \(κοινή\), as to us, in a sense “the Greek \(γράµµατα\) were dead symbols, from which must be recovered the living sounds.”\(^6\) Of one thing we may be sure, and it is that other dialects besides the Attic contributed to the \(κοινή\) pronunciation. The \(κοινή\) would be dialect-coloured here and there in its pronunciation. Alexander’s conquest, like the railroad and the steamship of the present day, levelled the dialectical variations in many points, whereas before every valley in Greece had its own pronunciation of certain words.\(^7\) One taught the \(κοινή\) in a Doric environment \([Page 240]\) would show it somewhat. As a matter of fact the Bœotian dialect contributed largely to the \(κοινή\) vernacular pronunciation (and so the modern Greek) in points where the Bœotian differed radically from the old Attic.\(^1\) Bœotian Greek “modified its vowel-system more than any other Greek dialect.”\(^2\) Thus already in Bœotian we find both \(αι\) and \(αε\) in the earliest inscriptions and finally \(η\). So in Bœotian \(η\) became\(^3\) \(\epsilon i\) in sound, as \(\epsilon \pi i δ εί = \epsilon \pi ε \alpha i \delta η\). The early Greek generally, as already shown, made no distinction in sign between \(ο\) and \(ω\), and \(η\) was a slow development from \(\epsilon\). The Ionic dialect never took kindly to the rough breathing and greatly influenced the \(κοινή\) and so the modern Greek. By the Christian era \(β\) is beginning to be pronounced as \(ν\), as the transliteration of Latin words like \(βεργίλιος\) shows. \(Z\) is no longer \(\delta s\), but \(z\), though \(\delta\) seems still usually \(d\), not \(th\). Who is right, therefore, the “Erasmians” or the Reuchlinians?

---

1 Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 103. Cf. also Ellis, Early Eng. Pronun.
3 Hatzidakis, Einl. etc.
4 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 34 f.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 6 f.
6 Nicklin, Cl. Rev., Mar., 1906, p. 116. This is precisely the objection that Jannaris (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 33) brings against the ancient grammarians as “post-Christian scribes” and unable to “speak with authority of the pronunciation of classical Greek.”
1 Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., p. 41.
2 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 540.
3 Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., pp. 41, 46. Thumb (Hellen., p. 228) warns us against overemphasis of the Bœotian influence.
Jannaris\textsuperscript{4} sums up in favour of the Reuchlinians, while according to Riemann and Goelzer\textsuperscript{5} the “Erasmians” are wholly right. As a matter of fact neither side is wholly right. In speaking of ancient Greek one must recognise other dialects than the literary Attic of the fifth century B.C. If you ask for the pronunciation of the vernacular \textit{κοινή} of the first century A.D., that will be found as a whole neither in the literary Attic alone nor in the N. T. MSS. of the fifth century A.D. The papyri and the inscriptions of the time throw light on a good many points, though not on all. But even here the illiterate papyri do not furnish a safe standard for the vernacular of a man like Paul or Luke. It is small wonder therefore that N. T. MSS. show much confusion between – \textit{σει} (future indicative) and \textit{σῃ} (aorist subjunctive), –\textit{ομεν} (indicative) and –\textit{ομεν} (subjunctive), –\textit{οθε} (infinitive) and –\textit{οθε} (indicative middle), etc. It is possibly as well to go on pronouncing the N. T. Greek according to the literary Attic, since we cannot reproduce a clear picture of the actual vernacular \textit{κοινή} pronunciation, only we must understand frankly that this \textit{[Page 241]} is not the way it was done. On the other hand the modern Greek method misses it by excess, as the literary Attic does by default. There was, of course, no Jewish pronunciation of the \textit{κοινή}. The Coptic shows the current pronunciation in many ways and probably influenced the pronunciation of the \textit{κοινή} in Egypt. Cf. a German’s pronunciation of English.

\textbf{VII. Punctuation.} In the spoken language the division of words is made by the voice, pauses, emphasis, tone, gesture, but it is difficult to reproduce all this on the page for the eye. Many questions arise for the editor of the Greek N. T. that are not easy of solution. Caspar René Gregory insists that whenever N. T. MSS. have punctuation of any kind, it must be duly weighed, since it represents the reading given to the passage.

\textit{(a) The Paragraph.} As early as Aristotle’s time the \textit{paragraph} (\textit{παράγραφος}) was known. A dividing horizontal stroke was written between the lines marking the end of a paragraph. Some other marks like (\textit{διπλῆ}) or (\textit{κορωνίς}) were used, or a slight break in the line made by a blank space. Then again the first letter of the line was written larger than the others or even made to project out farther than the rest.\textsuperscript{1} The paragraph was to the ancients the most important item in punctuation, and we owe a debt to the N. T. revisers for restoring it to the English N. T. Cf. Lightfoot, Trench, Ellicott, \textit{The Revision of the N. T.}, 1873, p. xlvi. Euthalius (A.D. 458) prepared an edition of the Greek N. T. with chapters (κεφάλαια), but long before him Clement of Alexandria spoke of \textit{περικοπαί} and Tertullian of \textit{capitula}. These “chapters” were later called also \textit{τίτλοι}.\textsuperscript{2} The \textit{στίχος} of Euthalius was a line of set length with no regard to

---

\textsuperscript{4} Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 31. “The pronunciation of ancient Gk. in the manner of the present Greeks had been traditionally accepted at all times, before and through the Middle Ages, as a matter of unquestioned fact.”

\textsuperscript{5} Phonét., p. 56. “En résumé, la prononciation grecque ancienne était, sur presque tous les points, différente de la prononciation moderne.”

\textsuperscript{1} On the paragraph see Thompson, Handb. of Gk. and Lat. Palæog., pp. 67 ff.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. Warfield, Text. Crit. of N. T., pp. 40 ff.
the sense, like our printer’s ems. W. H. have made careful use of the paragraph in their Greek N. T. The larger sections are marked off by spaces and the larger paragraphs are broken into smaller sub-paragraphs (after the French method) by smaller spaces. Another division is made by W. H. in the use of the capital letter at the beginning of an important sentence, while the other sentences, though after a period, begin with a small letter. This is a wholly arbitrary method, but it helps one better to understand W. H.’s interpretation of the text.[Page 242]

W. H.¹ have also printed in metrical form passages metrical in rhythm like the Magnificat of Mary (Lu. 1:46–55), the fragment of a hymn in 1 Tim. 3:16, etc., while Lu. 2:14 and the non-metrical hymns in Revelation are merely printed in narrower columns. The Hebrew parallelism of O. T. quotations is indicated also.

(b) SENTENCES. The oldest inscriptions and papyri show few signs of punctuation between sentences or clauses in a sentence,² though punctuation by points does appear on some of the ancient inscriptions. In the Artemisia papyrus the double point (:) occasionally ends the sentence.³ It was Aristophanes of Byzantium (260 B.C.) who is credited with inventing a more regular system of sentence punctuation which was further developed by the Alexandrian grammarians.⁴ As a rule all the sentences, like the words, ran into one another in an unbroken line (scriptura continua), but finally three stops were provided for the sentence by the use of the full point. The point at the top of the line (.) (στιγμὴ τελεία, ‘high point’) was a full stop; that on the line (.) (ὑποστιγμή) was equal to our semicolon, while a middle point (στιγμὴ μέση) was equivalent to our comma.⁵ But gradually changes came over these stops till the top point was equal to our colon, the bottom point became the full stop, the middle point vanished, and about the ninth century A.D. the comma (,) took its place. About this time also the question-mark (;) or ἐρωτηματικὸν appeared. These marks differed from the στίχοι in that they concerned the sense of the sentence. Some of the oldest N. T. MSS. show these marks to some extent. B has the higher point as a period, the lower point for a shorter pause.⁶ But still we cannot tell how much, if any, use the N. T. writers themselves made of punctuation points. We may be sure that they did not use the exclamation point, the dash, quotation-marks, the parenthesis, etc.⁷ Parenthetical clauses were certainly used, which will be discussed elsewhere, though no signs were used for this structure by the ancient Greeks. W. H. represent the parenthesis either by the comma (Ro. 1:13) or the dash with comma (1 Tim. 2:7). Instead of [Page 243] quotation-marks W. H. begin the quotation with a capital letter with no punctuation before it, as in Jo. 12:19, 21. One way of expressing a quotation was by τό, as in Ro. 13:9. In the case of O. T. quotations the Scripture is put in uncial type (Jo. 12:13). The period (περίοδος) gives very little trouble to the modern editor, for it is obviously

---

³ Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 319. For the στίχος see further Gregory, Prol., p. 112 f.
¹ Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 319 f.
³ Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 69.
⁴ Ib., p. 70; Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 67.
⁵ I follow Thompson (Handb., etc., p. 70) on this point instead of Jannaris (pp. 63 and 67), who makes the ὑποστιγμή=our comma.
⁶ Cf. Gregory, Prol., pp. 345, 348; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 17. D has the στίχος in the way of sense-lines (Blass, ib.).
necessary for modern needs. Here the editor has to make his interpretation sometimes
when it is doubtful, as W. H. give ἕν γέγονεν ἔν, not ἐν ἕν γέγονεν. ἔν (Jo. 1:4). So
W. H. read θαυμάζετε. διὸ τούτῳ Μωυσῆς in Jo. 7:22, not θαυμάζετε διὸ τούτῳ.
Μωυσῆς, etc. The colon (κῶλον), 1 ʼlimb of the sentence’ formed a complete clause.
See Jo. 3:31 for example of use of colon made by W. H. The comma (κόμωμα) is the
most common division of the sentence and is often necessary, as with the vocative. So
Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσω μεν; (Lu. 3:12) and many common examples. In general W. H.
use the comma only where it is necessary to make clear an otherwise ambiguous
clause, whether it be a participial (Col. 2:2) or conjunctional phrase (Col. 1:23), or
appositive (Col. 1:18), or relative (Col. 2:3). The first chapter of Colossians has a
rather unusual number of colons (2, 6, 14, 16, 18, 20, 27, 28) as Paul struggles with
several long sentences, not to mention the dashes (21, 22, 26). The Germans use the
coma too freely with the Greek for our English ideas, leaving out the Greek! Even
Winer defended the comma after καρπόν in Jo. 15:2 and οὐκ οὖν in Rev. 3:12, not to
mention Griesbach’s “excessive” use of the comma, Winer himself being judge.2 My
friend, Rev. S. M. Provence, D.D. (Victoria, Tex.), suggests a full stop before ιμαθῶν
in Ac. 23:27 f. That would help the character of Claudius Lysias on the point of
veracity.

(c) WORDS. The continuous writing of words without any space between them
was not quite universal, though nearly so.3 The oldest Attic inscription (Dipylon vase,
probably eighth century B.C.) is written from right to left. With the common method it
was not always easy for the practised eye to distinguish between words. Hence there
arose the διάστολή or ὑποδιάστολή, a comma used to distinguish between ambiguous
words, as ὡς, τι, not ὡς τι. But W. H. make no use of this mark, not even in ὡς τι to
distinguish it from the conjunction ὡς τι. They print uniformly ὡς τι (Lu. 10:35; Jo. 2:5;
14:13; 1 Cor. 16:2, etc.), not to mention 4 Page 244 doubtful cases like those in Mk.
9:11, 28; Jo. 8:25; 2 Cor. 3:14.1 As to the marks of diáresis reference may be had to
the discussion of diphthongs and diáresis in this chapter under ι (ι). W. H., like other
modern editors, use the apostrophe (’) (or smooth breathing) to represent elision, as
Ἄπραχς (Mt. 24:21).2 The coronis is the smooth breathing used also to show when
crasis has taken place, as in καθισμόν (Lu. 1:3).3 The hyphen, a long straight line, was
used in the Harris-Homer MS. to connect compound words, but it is not in the N. T.4
The editors vary much in the way such words as ἀλλά γε, ἵνα τι, τοῦτο ἔστιν, etc., are
printed. The MSS. give no help at all, for τοῦτο δὲ ἔστιν ἐν Ro. 1:12 is not conclusive
against τοῦτο ἔστιν elsewhere.5 W. H. prefer ἄλλα γε (Lu. 24:21; 1 Cor. 9:2), ἅρα γε

1 Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 81. So Suidas. The colon is the main semi-division of
the sentence, but mod. Eng. makes less use of all marks save the period and comma.
3 Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 67.
1 W.-Sch., p. 35.
2 See this ch. ι (ι) for discussion of elision. For origin and early use of the apostrophe
see Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 73.
4 Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 72.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 14. For the usage of Tisch. in the union and the separation
of particles see Gregory, Prol., pp. 109–111. In most cases Tisch. ran the particles
together as one word.
(Ac. 8:30), διὰ γε (Lu. 11:8; 18:5), εἶ γε (2 Cor. 5:3, etc.), καὶ γε (Ac. 2:18; 17:27), δὲ γε (Ro. 8:32), διὰ παντὸς (Mk. 5:5, etc.), διὰ τί Mt. 9:11, etc.), Ἰνα τί (Mt. 9:4, etc.), εἶ πως (Ac. 27:12), μή ποτε (everywhere save in Mt. 25:9 where μὴ ποτε), μὴ που (Ac. 27:29), μὴ πως (1 Cor. 9:27, etc.), μὴ τίς (1 Cor. 16:11, etc.). So also δὴ λον ὅτι in 1 Cor. 15:27, δοτὶς οὖν (Mt. 18:4). But on the other hand W. H. print διότι as well as εἰτε, οὗτε, μήτε, καίπερ, μὴ ποτε (once), μηδέποτε, οὐδέποτε, μηδέπω, οὐκέτι, μήτω, οὕτω, μήτις, even μήγε (Mt. 6:1), καθά, καθό, καθός, καθάπερ, καθότι, καθόλου, ὡσπερ, ὡσεί, ὡσπερεί (1 Cor. 15:8), etc. But W. H. give us καθ ϑές in Ro. 12:5, ἀνδὶ μέσον in Mt. 13:25, etc.; κατὰ μόνας in Mk. 4:10, καθὸ δεσον in Heb. 3:3. Adverbs like ἐπέκεινα (Ac. 7:43), ὑπερέκεια (2 Cor. 10:16), παρεκτός (2 Cor. 11:28) are, of course, printed as one word. W. H. properly have ὑπερ ἕγώ (2 Cor. 11:23), not ὑπερεγώ. In Ac. 27:33 τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος is one word, but W. H. have Ἱερὰ Πόλις in Col. 4:13 and Νέα πόλις in Ac. 16:11. It must be confessed that no very clear principles in this matter can be set forth, and the effort of Winer-Schmiedel at minute analysis does not throw much light on the subject.

(d) THE EDITOR’S PREROGATIVE. Where there is so much confusion, what is the editor’s prerogative? Blass boldly advances [Page 245] the German idea: “The most correct principle appears to be to punctuate wherever a pause is necessary for reading correctly.” But Winer shrinks from this profusion of punctuation-marks by the editors, which “often intruded on the text their own interpretation of it.” The editor indeed has to interpret the text with his punctuation, but certainly good taste demands that the minimum, not the maximum, of punctuation-marks be the rule. They must of necessity decide “a multitude of subtle and difficult points of interpretation.”2 Hort indeed aimed at “the greatest simplicity compatible with clearness,” and this obviously should be the goal in the Greek N. T. But the editor’s punctuation may be a hindrance to the student instead of a help. It is the privilege of each N. T. student to make his own punctuation.

[PAGE 246] CHAPTER VII

THE DECLENSIONS (ΚΛΙΣΕΙΣ)

Space will not be taken for the inflection of the nouns and pronouns, for the student of this grammar may be assumed to know the normal Attic inflections. Aristotle used the term “inflection” (πτῶσις) of noun and verb and even adverb, but practically inflection is applied to nouns and conjugation (κλίσις ὁμάτων=συζυγία) to verbs. Noun (ὄνομα) does, of course, include both substantive and adjective without entering the psychological realm and affirming the connection between name and thing (cf. Plato’s Cratylus).

---

6 P. 35.
7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 17. Left out by Debrunner.
1 W.-M., p. 63.
2 Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 318.
1 Donaldson, New Crat., p. 421. It is in the incidence that the practical identity of N. T. Gk. with the popular κοινή is best seen, here and in the lexical point of view (Deissmann, Exp., Nov., 1907, p. 434).
I. THE SUBSTANTIVE (ΤΟ ὌΝΟΜΑ)

The Substantive (τὸ ὄνομα) is either concrete (σῶμα) or abstract (πρᾶγμα), ordinary appellative (ὄνομα προσηγορικόν) or proper (ὄνομα κύριον).

1. History of the Declensions. It is only since the seventeenth century A.D. that modern grammarians distinguish for convenience three declensions in Greek. The older grammars had ten or more. In the modern Greek vernacular the first and third declensions have been largely fused into one, using the singular of the first and the plural of the third. Thumb (Handbook, pp. 43 ff.) divides the declension of substantives in modern Greek vernacular according to gender simply (masculine, feminine, neuter). This is the simplest way out of the confusion. In Sanskrit five declensions are usually given as in Latin, but Whitney says: “There is nothing absolute in this arrangement; it is merely believed to be open to as few objections as any other.” Evidently therefore the ancient Greeks did not have the benefit of our modern theories and rules, but inflected the substantives according to principles not now known to us. The various dialects exercised great freedom also and exhibited independent development at many points, not to mention the changes in time in each dialect. The threefold division is purely a convenience, but with this justification: the first has ᾀ stems, the second o stems, the third consonant and close vowel (ι, υ) stems. There are some differences in the suffixes also, the third declension having always the genitive ending in –ος. In the third declension especially it is not possible to give a type to which all the words in all the cases and numbers conform. Besides, the same word may experience variations. Much freedom is to be recognized in the whole matter of the declensions within certain wide limits. See metaplasm or the fluctuation between the several declensions.

2. The Number of the Cases (πτώσεις). The meaning and use of the cases will have a special chapter in Syntax (ch. XI).

(a) The History of the Forms of the Cases. This is called for before the declensions are discussed. The term “case” (πτώσεις, casus) is considered a “falling,” because the nominative is regarded as the upright case (πτώσεις ὄρθη, εὐθεῖα), though as a matter of fact the accusative is probably older than the nominative (πτώσεις ὄνομαστική or ὄρθη). The other cases are called oblique (πλάγιαι) as deviations from the nominative. In simple truth the vocative (κλητική or προσήγορική) has no inflection and is not properly a case in its logical relations. It is usually the noun-stem

Whitney

———, Language and the Study of Language (1867).
———, Life and Growth of Language (1875).

4 Sans. Gr., p. 111.
or like the nominative in form. There are only three other case-endings preserved in the Greek, and the grammars usually term them accusative (πτῶσις ἀτιμική), genitive (πτῶσις γενική) and dative (πτῶσις δοτική).¹ There is no dispute as to the integrity of the accusative case, the earliest, most common of all the oblique cases and the most persistent. In the breakdown of the other cases the accusative and the prepositions reap the benefit. In truth the other oblique cases are variations from the normal accusative. But this subject is complicated with the genitive and the dative. It is now a commonplace in comparative philology that the Greek genitive has taken over the function of the ablative (ἄφαιρετική) also. In the singular the Sanskrit had already the same [Page 248] ending (-as) for genitive and ablative, while in the plural the Sanskrit ablative had the same form as the dative (bhyas; cf. Latin ibus). Thus in the Sanskrit the ablative has no distinctive endings save in the singular of a stems like kamāt (‘love’) where the ablative ending -t (d) is preserved. In Latin, as we know, the ablative, dative, locative and instrumental have the same endings in the plural. The Latin ablative singular is partly ablative, partly locative, partly instrumental. Some old Latin inscriptions show the d, as bened, in altod marid, etc. In Greek the ablative forms merged with the genitive as in the Sanskrit singular, but not because of any inherent “internal connection between them, as from accidents affecting the outward forms of inflection.”¹ The Greek did not allow τ or δ to stand at the end of a word. So the Greek has πρός (not πρότ for προτί). Καλῶς may be (but see Brugmann²) the

¹ Mod. Gk. vernac. has only three cases (nom., gen. and acc.) and these are not always formally differentiated from each other. The mod. Gk. has thus carried the blending of case-forms almost as far as mod. Eng. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 31.


Brugmann

BRUGMANN, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).

——, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


——, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).
ablative καλότι and so all adverbs in –ως. The meaning of the two cases remained distinct in the Greek as in the Sanskrit. It is not possible to derive the ablative (source or separation) idea from the genitive (or γένος) idea nor vice versa. The Greek dative (δοτική) is even more complicated. “The Greek dative, it is well known, both in singular and plural, has the form of a locative case, denoting the place where or in which; but, as actually used, it combines, with the meaning of a locative, those of the dative and instrumental.” This is only true of some datives. There are true datives like ὁδός, χώρα. The Indo-Germanic stock, as shown by the Sanskrit, had originally three separate sets of endings for these cases. [Page 249] The Greek plural uses for all three cases either “the locative in –ωι or the instrumental forms in –ους.” • “The forms in –ας, Latin –is, from -ā stems, are a new formation on the analogy of ους from -o stems.” 2 Αθήναι is locative plural. In the singular of consonant, ι and ο stems, the locative ending –ι is used for all three cases in Greek, as νοκτι. In the α declension the dative ending –αι is the same as locative ιτι. The form –αι contracts with the stem-vowel α into ι or ιη. A few examples of the locative –ι here survive, as in πάλαι, Ὀλυμπίαι, Θηβαι-γενής. 3 Χαμαι may be either dative or locative. In the o declension also the dative ending –αι is the usual form, contracting with the o into οι. But a few distinct locative endings survive, like ἡκτι, ἵστοι, οἶκοι (cf. οίκος), ποι, etc. The Homeric infinitive δόμεν and the infinitive like φέρειν are probably locatives also without the ι, while the infinitives in –αι (δόμεναι, δοῦναι, λευκέναι, λέωσθαι, λύσαι, etc.) are datives. 4 The instrumental has left little of its original form on the Greek singular. The usual Sanskrit is ə. Cf. in Greek such words as əμα, ἐνεκε, ἴνα, μετά, παρά, πεδά, possibly the Doric κρυφα, Lesbian ἄλλα. Brugmann 5 thinks the Laconic πη-ποκα=Attic πό-ποτε is instrumental like the Gothic ḫā (English whô). Cf. the in “the more the better,” etc. Another Greek suffix –φι (Indo-Germanic, bhi) is found in Homer, as βίηρι, θεόφι (plural). But this –φι was used also for ablative or locative, and even genitive or dative. It is clear therefore that in Greek the usual seven (eight with the vocative) Indo-Germanic cases are present, though in a badly mutilated condition as to form. The ideas, of course, expressed by the cases continued to be expressed by the blended forms. In actual intelligent treatment it is simpler to preserve the seven case-names as will be seen later.

2 Brugmann (Griech. Gr., 1900, p. 225), who considers the ζ in οὔτως, κτλ., due to analogy merely, like the ζ in ἔγγο-ζ, κτλ. But he sees an abl. idea in ἐκ-τός. Cf. also οὐρανό-θε like coeli-tus.
3 Hadley, Ess. Phil. and Crit., p. 52.
1 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 287.
2 Ib., p. 290. For survivals of the dat. –αι see the Rhodian ταί (Björkegren, De Sonis dial. Rhod., p. 41).
4 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 278 f.
(b) The Blending of Case-Endings. This is a marked peculiarity of the Indo-Germanic tongues. Neuter nouns illustrate [Page 250] the same tendency, not to mention the dual. The analytic process has largely triumphed over the synthetic case-endings. Originally no prepositions were used and all the word-relations were expressed by cases. In modern French, for instance, there are no case-endings at all, but prepositions and the order of the words have to do all that was originally done by the case-forms. In English, outside of the old dative form in pronouns like him, them, etc., the genitive form alone remains. Finnish indeed has fifteen cases and several other of the ruder tongues have many. On the other hand the Coptic had no case-endings, but used particles and prepositions like NTE for genitive, etc. It is indeed possible that all inflectional languages passed once through the isolating and agglutinative stages. English may some day like the Chinese depend entirely on position and tone for the relation of words to each other.

(c) Origin of Case Suffixes. Giles\(^2\) frankly confesses that comparative philology has nothing to say as to the origin of the case-suffixes. They do not exist apart from the noun-stems. Some of them may be pronominal, others may be positional (postpositions), but it adds nothing to our knowledge to call some of the cases local and others grammatical. They are all grammatical. The ablative and the locative clearly had a local origin. Some cases were used less often than others. Some of the case-forms became identical. Analogy carried on the process. The desire to be more specific than the case-endings led to the use of prepositional adverbs. As these adverbs were used more and more there was “an ever-increasing tendency to find the important part of the meaning in the preposition and not in the case-ending.”\(^3\) In the modern Greek vernacular, as already stated, only three case-forms survive (nominative, genitive, accusative), the dative vanishing like the ablative.\(^4\)

[Page 251] 3. Number (ὄριθµός) in Substantives. The N. T. Greek has lost the dual (δυικός) and uses only the singular (ἔνικός) and the plural (πληθυντικός). The Sanskrit and the Hebrew had the dual, but the Latin had only duo and ambo (and possibly octo and viginti) which had a plural inflection in the oblique cases. Coptic\(^1\) had no plural nor dual save as the plural article distinguished words. English has only the dual twain, but we now say twins. The scholars do not agree as to the origin of the dual. Moulton\(^2\) inclines to the idea that it arose “in prehistoric days when men could

---

1 Farrar, Gr. Synt., p. 23.
3 Giles, op. cit., p. 273.
4 Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 149. Cf. also Keck, Über d. Dual bei d. griech. Rednern etc., 1882.
1 Tattam’s Egyp. Gr., p. 16.

Moulton
not count beyond two.” It is more likely that it is due to the desire to emphasize pairs, as hands, eyes, etc., not to accept “Du Ponceau’s jest that it must have been invented for lovers and married people.”

In the oldest Indo-Germanic languages the luxury of the dual is vanishing, but Moulton considers its use in the Attic as a revival. It never won a foothold in the Æolic and the New Ionic, and its use in the Attic was limited and not consistent. The dual is nearly gone in the late Attic inscriptions, while in the κοινή it is only sporadic and constantly vanishing in the inscriptions and papyri. In Pergamum and Pisidia no dual appears in the inscriptions. The only dual form that occurs in the LXX and the N. T. is δύο (not δύω) for all the cases (as genitive in 1 Tim. 5:19), save δυσι(ν) for the dative-locative-instrumental, a plural form found in


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.
Aristotle, Polybius, etc., and called a barbarism by Phrynichus.10 Only in 4 Macc. 1:28 A δυοῖν is found, but δυεῖν in RV, as in Polybius and the Atticists (Thackeray, p. 187). For examples of δυσί(ν) see Mt. 6:24=Lu. 16:13; Ac. 21:33; Heb. 10:28, etc. In the papyri, however, δύο, δυῶ, δυεῖν occasionally appear11 along with δυσί(ν). In the modern Greek the dual is no longer used. Ἄμφος has vanished in the N. T. while ἄμφότεροι occurs fourteen times (Mt. 9:17, etc.), [Page 252] once (Ac. 19:16) apparently in the sense of more than two, like the occasional use of the English “both” and the Byzantine use of ἄμφότεροι and “two clear examples of it in NP 67 and 69 (iv/A.D.).”11 Once for all then it may be remarked that in the N. T. both for nouns and verbs the dual is ignored. The dual was rare in the later Ionic and the κοινὴ follows suit (Radermacher, N. T. Gk., p. 184). The syntactical aspects of number are to be discussed later.

4. Gender (γένος) in Substantives. In the long history of the Greek language gender has been wonderfully persistent and has suffered little variation.2 It is probably due to the natural difference of sex that grammatical gender3 arose. The idea of sense gender continued, but was supplemented by the use of endings for the distinction of gender. This personification of inanimate objects was probably due to the poetic imagination of early peoples, but it persists in modern European tongues, though French has dropped the neuter (cf. the Hebrew) and modern English (like the Persian and Chinese) has no grammatical gender save in the third personal pronoun (he, she, it) and the relative.4 Analogy has played a large part in gender.5 The Sanskrit, Latin and Greek all gave close attention to gender and developed rules that are difficult to apply, with many inconsistencies and absurdities. In Greek ἡλίος is masculine and σελήνη feminine, while in German we have die Sonne and der Mond. Perhaps we had better be grateful that the Greek did not develop gender in the verb like the Hebrew


Thackeray


———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).

11 Deissmann, B. S., p. 187. For δυσί(ν) in the inscriptions see Dittenberger, 118. 22, etc. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 313. For similar situations in the LXX MSS. (τοῖς δύο, τοῖς δύοις, and A δυοῖν, Η δυεῖν) see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 53. Cf. also C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 25.

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 80.


5 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 64, 259.
verb. Moulton⁶ thinks it “exceedingly strange” that English should be almost alone in shaking off “this outworn excrescence on language.” The N. T., like Homer and the modern Greek, preserves the masculine (ἀρσενικόν), feminine (θηλυκόν) and neuter (οὐδέτερον). Some words indeed have common (κοινόν) sex, like ὁ ἡ παῖς, ὁ νος, θεός, while others, applied to each sex, are called epicene (ἐπίκοινον), like θεός, ἄρης. In German we actually have das Weib (‘wife’!).

(a) Variations in gender. They are not numerous. Ἡ ἀβυσσός (χώρα) is a substantive in the LXX (Gen. 1:2, etc.) and the N. T. (Lu. 8:31, etc.), elsewhere so only in Diogenes Laertes. [Page 253] In Mk. 14:3 W. H. and Nestle properly read τὴν ὀλλαστρον, though the Western and Syrian classes give τὸν ὄλ. after Herodotus, and a few of the late MSS. τὸ ὄλ. In Rev. 8:11 ὁ (not ἡ) ἄχνηθος is read, though κ and some cursives omit the article, because the word is a proper name. In Mk. 12:26 all editors have ὁ βάτος (the Attic form according to Moeris), elsewhere ἡ βάτος (Lu. 20:37; Acts 7:35). θεός may be either masculine as in Ac. 19:11 or feminine as in Ac. 19:37, but in Ac. 19:27 we have θεᾶ (Text. Rec. also in 35, 37), an “apparently purposeless variation.” Thieme (Die Inschr. von Magn., p. 10) says that ἡ θεᾶ is used in the inscriptions of Asia Minor in formal religious language. Burnet (Review of Theology and Philosophy, 1906, p. 96) says that in Athens ἡ θεᾶ was used in everyday language, but ἡ θεᾶ in the public prayers, thus taking the Ionic θεᾶ. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Papyri (Laut- und Wortlehre, 1906), p. 254 f., for papyri illustrations. Blass¹ considers ἡ Ἰερουσαλήμ (Ac. 5:28, etc., the common form in LXX, Luke and Paul) feminine because it is a place-name, and hence he explains πᾶσα Ἰερουσώλημα (Mt. 2:3) rather than by πόλις understood. Ληνός in Rev. 14:19 strangely enough has both masculine and feminine, τὴν ληνόν … τὸν μέγαν but κ fem. (bis). The feminine is the common construction, but the masculine is found in LXX in Is. 63:2 only. Λίθος is always ὁ in the N. T., even when it means a precious stone (Rev. 5 times),


Nestle


———, Novum Testamentum Graece. 8th ed. (1910).

———, Septuagint (Hastings’ D. B., 1902).


¹ Moulton, Prol., p. 60, but he adds “is explained by inscriptions.” Cf. Nachmanson, Magn. Inschr., p. 126, for many exx.

Thieme THIEME, G., Die Inschr. von Magnesia am Mäander und das N. T. (1906).

² Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 32. Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 160. Mk. and Jo. have only τὸ Ἰερουσώλημα and Mt. usually.
where Attic after 385 B.C. had ἡ. Λιμός is masculine in Lu. 4:25 as in the Attic, but is chiefly feminine in Acts and Luke, like the Doric and late Attic, as in Lu. 15:14; Acts 11:28. In Lu. 13:4, Jo. 9:7, 11 we have ὁ Σιλωάμ, while Josephus has both ἡ (War, V, 12. 2) and ὁ (War, II, 16. 2). Blass explains the use of ὁ in the Gospels by the participle ἀρχαγγέλον in Jo. 9:7. Ἀνήλιος in Heb. 9:4 is feminine after the Attic instead of the Doric ὁ στ., as in Ex. 16:33. In Rev. 21:18 (21) we read also ὁ ὧνας rather than ἡ ὧνας as is customary with precious stones. "Ὑσσωπος (Heb. 9:19; Jo. 19:29) reveals its gender only in the LXX (Lev. 14:6, 51 f.) where it is masc. in BA, fem. in E and 1 (3) Ki. 4:19 BA. The neuter τὸ ὧνας occurs in papyri as early as third century B.C. (Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, 1908, p. 177).

(b) INTERPRETATION OF THE LXX. In Ro. 11:4 Paul uses τῇ βάαλ rather than the frequent LXX τῷ βάαλ. The feminine is due, according to Burkitt, to the Q γίνεται γάρ

(αὐτοῦ) Moulton speaks of ἡ βάαλ as occurring “three times in LXX and in Ascensio Isaiae ii. 12.” But ἡ βάαλ occurs “everywhere in the prophetic books, Jer., Zeph., Hos., etc.” (Thayer), though not so common in the historical books, far more than the “three times” of Moulton. In Mk. 12:11 and Mt. 21:42 the LXX αὐτὴ is due to παντελεήμονα, though the translators may have “interpreted their own Greek by recalling κεφαλὴν γονίας.” In Gal. 4:25 Paul has not mistakenly used τῷ with Ἀγαπ, for he is treating the name as a word merely. Any word can be so regarded.

(c) VARIATIONS IN GENDER DUE TO HETEROCLOSSIS AND METAPLASM. These will be discussed a little later. Delbrück thinks that originally all the masculine

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

Burkitt, B., Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis (1867).


3 Meisterhans, Att. Inschr., p. 129.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 32.

Moulton and Milligan, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).
substantives of the first or $\alpha$ declension were feminine and that all the feminine substantives of the second or $\omicron$ declension were masculine.

5. The First or $\alpha$ Declension. There was a general tendency towards uniformity in this declension that made it more popular than ever. Here only the N. T. modifications in this general development can be mentioned.

(a) The Doric Genitive-Ablative Singular. This form survives in $\beta_0\rho\rho\varnothing$ (Lu. 13:29; Rev. 21:13) and was common in the Attic after 400 B.C. Note also $\mu\alpha\mu\omega\nu\varnothing$ (Lu. 16:9). It is frequent in the LXX, papyri, inscriptions, though mainly in proper names. These proper names in $\-\alpha\varsigma$, chiefly oriental, make the genitive-ablative in $\-\alpha$ or, if unaccented $-\alpha\varsigma$, in $\alpha$. So $\Lambda\kappa\omicron\omicron\alpha$ and $\Lambda\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ in papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. *Biblische Gräcität etc.* (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).

Deissmann


Deissmann, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


Deissmann, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

Deissmann, Licht vom Osten (1908).

Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


Deissmann, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).
Studies, p. 187), though no gen. in N. T. (only -ας and -αν) Ἀγρίππα (Ac. 25:23), Ἀνανία (Ac. 25:23), Ἀνανία (from –ας, so Thayer), Ἄνα (Lu. 3:2), Ἀντίψαξ (indeclinable here or mere slip for –α, Rev. 2:13), Ἄρετα (2 Cor. 11:32), Βαραββᾶ (gen. does not appear, only nom. –ᾶς as Mk. 15:7, and accus. –ῶν as 15:11, etc.), Βαρνάβα (Gal. 2:1; Col. 4:10; see Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 187), Ἐπαφρᾶ (Col. 1:7), Ἐμῖν (Ro. 16:14, Doric accusative), Σηνᾶ (only in nominative, as Col. 4:14, but genitive would be –ῶν), Σατανᾶ (Mk. 1:13), Σελίς (dative Σίλις in Ac., and genitive Σίλα in Jos. Vit., 17), Σκευᾶ (Ac. 19:14), Στεφανᾶ (1 Cor. 1:16). Nachmanson finds the Doric genitive fairly common with such short proper names and mentions Σηνᾶ in his list. Very common in modern Greek, cf. Hatzidakis, Einl., p. 76.

(b) THE ATTIC GENITIVE-ABLATIVE. The usual Attic form for the masculine gen. abl. (ou) is found also as in Αἰνέας (so Lobeck, Prol. Pathol., p. 487), Αἰνέας (Mk. 1:29), Βαραχίου (Mt. 23:35), Εξεκίου (so LXX), Ἡλείου (Lu. 4:25), Ἡσαίου (Mt. 3:3, etc.), Ἱσαίου (Mt. 2:17), Ἀς (Lu. 3:1), Οὐρίου (Mt. 1:6), Ζαχαρίου (Lu. 1:40). These Hebrew proper names ended in Π, but receive the regular inflection for masculine nouns of the first declension. There are likewise some proper names in –ῆς with genitive-ablative in –ου. Ἰαννῆς and Ἰαμβρῆς (2 Tim. 3:8) only appear in the N. T. in the nominative. Κρήσκης (2 Tim. 4:10) and Πούδης (2 Tim. 4:21) belong to the 3rd declension. Εὐφράτης (Rev. 9:14; 16:12) has only accusative and dative (instrumental-locative) in the oblique cases in the N. T., though the genitive-ablative form is –ου. Ἱδῖν (Mt. 2:1) and Ἰορδάνου (Mt. 3:5) follow the usual rule like Ἰδῖν (Mt. 16:18). Ἀπελλῆς (Ro. 16:10), Ἐμῖς (Ro. 16:14), like κοινῆς (Mt. 5:26) and φελόνης (2 Tim. 4:13), have no oblique case in the N. T. save the accusative (–ην). Ἐιούς in W. H. always has genitive-ablative in –ου for the Apostle and in Jo. 1:42; 21:15, 16, 17, for the father of Simon Peter, though Βαριώνᾶ in Mt. 16:17. So


Nachmanson

NACHMASON, E., Beiträge zur Kenntnis der altgriech. Volkssprache (1910).

———, Epigraphisch-grammatische Bemerkungen (Eranos 11, 1912).

———, Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften (1903).

3 Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 159. See Nachmanson (Magn. Inschr., p. 119) and Schweizer (Perg. Inschr., p. 138 f.) for illustrations of these points from the κοινή.
for John Mark (Acts 12:12). [Page 256] Σωσθένης has accusative in –ην (Ac. 18:17) for the first declension and is heteroclite.1 We have only ξεστῶν in Mk. 7:4. Words like νεανίας have the genitive- ablative in –ου (Ac. 7:58).

(c) Voc. in –α of masc. nouns in –της in δέσποτα, ἐπιστάτα, καρδιογνώστα, ὑποκριτά. Cf. ἐνή.

(d) Words in –ρα and participles in –υῖα. These come regularly2 to have the genitive- ablative in –ης and the dative- locative -instrumental in –η like the Ionic. Moulton3 indeed thinks that “analogical assimilation,” on the model of forms like δόξα, δόξης, had more to do with this tendency in the κοινή than the Ionic influence. Possibly so, but it seems gratuitous to deny all Ionic influence where it was so easy for it to make itself felt. The “best MSS.” support the testimony of the papyri and the inscriptions here.4 So W. H. read μαχαίρας (Rev. 13:14), πλημμύρας (Lu. 6:48), πρόφης (Ac. 27:30), Σαφείρης (Ac. 5:1), σπείρης (Ac. 21:31; 27:1). In Acts B is prone to have –ας, –α as with D in Ac. 5:1, but W. H. do not follow B here. In Ac. 5:2 συνειδυίης may be compared with ἐπιβεβηκυίης (1 Sam. 25:20), and other examples in the LXX,6 but the forms –υίας, –υί still survive in the Ptolemaic period.7 The preference of the LXX MSS. and the early papyri for μαχαίρας (–ρα) shows that it is a matter of growth with time. In the early Empire of Rome –ρης forms are well-nigh universal. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 142. On the other hand note the adjective στείρα (–ρα) and ἀλήθεια, μία (ιά, ια) preserve the Attic inflection in –ας, –α.8

(e) The opposite tendency to (d). We see it in such examples as Λύδδας (Ac. 9:38, but Soden reads –δης with EHLP) and Μάρθας (Jo. 11:1). Moulton9 finds the

1 W.-Sch., p. 94.
2 B. S., p. 186.
3 Prol., p. 48; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34. where a number of exx. are given like ἄρούρης, καθηκυίης, etc. Cf. Thumb, Hellen., p. 69. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 31–33, and Thack., Gr., p. 140 f., for similar phenomena in the LXX.
4 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 156.
5 Deissmann, B. S., p. 186.
7 Moulton, Prol., p. 48.
8 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 25.
Egyptian papyri giving Ταμύσθας as genitive. Θέρμα is given by Lobeck, though not in N. T. (genitive –ης, Ac. 28:3), and note πρόμα in Ac. 27:41. [Page 257] Moulton suggests that Νύσθας (Col. 4:15 according to the correct text) is not due to a Doric Νύσθαν, but by a “reverse analogy process” the genitive Νύσθα produced the short nominative Νύσθα like δόξα, δόξης. Blass calls χρυσάν (Rev. 1:13) “a gross blunder, wrongly formed on the model of χρυσάς 1:12,” but Moulton holds that we have “abundant parallels.”

(f) Double Declension. This phenomenon appears in the case of Νέαι Πόλαι (Ac. 16:11) and Ἴερᾶ Πόλει (Col. 4:13), the adjective as well as the substantive being treated separately in the first and third declensions.

(g) Heteroclisis (ἕτερόκλισις) and Metaplasm (μεταπλασμός). Blass makes no distinction in his treatment of heteroclisis and metaplasm, though the distinction is observed in Winer-Schmiedel. For practical use one may ignore the distinction and call all the examples metaplasm with Blass or heteroclisis with Moulton. The fluctuation is rare for the first declension in the N. T. In Ac. 28:8 editors properly read δυσεντέριον rather than δυσεντερία (supported only by a few cursive). The form θεά (Ac. 19:27) and the usual Attic ἡ θάος (Ac. 19:37) are both found. This variation between the first and the second declensions is well illustrated by Γούρρας (2 Pet. 2:6) and Γούρρον (Mt. 10:15; –ος, Mk. 6:11 Rec.), Λύστρα (Ac. 14:6) and Λύστροις (Ac. 14:8). Moulton finds abundant parallel in the Egyptian papyri use of place-names. In Rev. 1:11 ABC and some cursive read Θύάτειραν instead of the usual Θύάτειρα. So in Ac. 27:5 some of the MSS. read Μύρραν instead of Μύρρα as accus., a reading confirmed by Ramsay, who found the accus. in –αν and the gen. in –ων. Moulton cites Ἡ Ἰεροσόλυμα from two MSS. of χι/λ.ά. (Usener, Pelagia, p. 50).

The chief variation between the first and second declensions appears in the compounds in –αρχής and (Attic) –αρχος. Moulton finds examples of it passim in the papyri and calls the minute work of Winer-Schmiedel “conscientious labour wasted thereon.” But Hort does not think these variations in good MSS. “wholly

2 Gr., p. 25, but 4th ed., p. 28, cites P. Lond. I, 124, 26, χρυσάν η ἄργυράν.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 28 f.
5 Pp. 83 ff. Thack. (Gr., p. 153) includes heteroclisis under metaplasm.
6 Prol., p. 48.
7 Ib., p. 244.
Ramsay

Ramsay, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).

9 Ib.
10 Ib. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34.
11 Notes on Orth., p. 156.
irregular.” In the N. T. forms in –αρχης, like most of the dialects and the κοινή, are greatly in the majority.1 Thus in the N. T. we have άσιάρχης (Ac. 19:31; not in nom. in N. T.), έθνάρχης (2 Cor. 11:32), πατριάρχης (Heb. 7:4), πολιτάρχης (Ac. 17:6, 8), τετραάρχης (Lu. 3:19), but always χιλίαρχος. In the addition of the β text to Ac. 28:16 the MSS. divide between στρατοπέδαρχος (HLP) and –άρχης (cursives). Εκκτόταρχος is the nominative in Mt. (8:5, 8; 27:54), and the accusative in –γον is found once in Acts (22:25). Elsewhere in all cases in Matthew, Luke and Acts the form in –χης is read by the best MSS. (as Ac. 10:1).

The first and the third declensions show variation in δίψος (old form δίψα) in 2 Cor. 11:27, where indeed B has δίψη instead of δίψει. Νίκη (the old form) survives in 1 Jo. 5:4, but elsewhere the late form νίκος prevails (as 1 Cor. 15:54 f.). The LXX likewise shows τό δίψος, τό νίκος interchangeably with the Νίκη forms. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 49; Thackeray, Gr., p. 157. The dative Ἰωάνει (third declension) instead of Ἰωάνῃ (first declension) is accepted a few times by W. H. (Mt. 11:4; Lu. 7:18; Rev. 1:1). Σαλαμίνῃ (first declension) for Σαλαμίν in Ac. 13:5, Hort2 considers only Alexandrian.

The third declension nouns often in various N. T. MSS. have the accusative singular of consonant stems in –ν in addition to –α, as χάραν in Jo. 20:25 (NAB), 1 Pet. 5:6 (NA). This is after the analogy of the first declension. Other examples are ἄρσαναν in Rev. 12:13 (A), ὀσεβήν in Ro. 4:5 (NDFG), ὀστέραν in Mt. 2:10 (NC), ὀσφαλήν in Heb. 6:19 (ACD), Δίαν in Ac. 14:12 (DEH), εἰκόναν in Rev. 13:14 (A), μὴναν in Rev. 22:2 (A), ποδήρην in Rev. 1:13 (A), συγγενῆ ν in Ro. 16:11 (ABD), ὑγιήν in Jo. 5:11 (R). Blass3 rejects them all in the N. T., some as “incredible,” though properly recalling the Attic τριήρην, Δημοσθένην. Moulton4 finds this conformation to the “analogy of first declension nouns” very common in “uneducated papyri, which adequately foreshadows [Page 259] its victory in modern Greek.” The inscriptions1 as well as the papyri have forms like γυναῖκαν, ἄνδραν, etc. It is these accusative forms on which the modern Greek nominative in ἄρχοντας is made (cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 47) and thus blended the first and the third declensions.2 Hort3 will accept none of these readings in the N. T. because of the “irregularity and apparent capriciousness” of the MS. evidence, though he confesses the strength of the

2 Notes on Orth., p. 156.
1 Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 133.
3 Notes on Orth., p. 158. Kretschmer (Entst. der κοινή, p. 28) finds this acc. in –αν in various dialect inscriptions. Cf. also Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 24, for χάρταν, etc.
testimony for ἀσφαλὴν in Heb. 6:19, συγγενήν in Ro. 16:11, and χεῖραν in Jo. 20:25. These nouns are treated here rather than under the third declension because in this point they invade the precincts of the first. The LXX MSS. exhibit the same phenomena (Ἐξάθεν, μουνογενῆν, etc.). See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 50; Thackeray, Gr., p. 147. The opposite tendency, the dropping of ι in the first declension accusative, so common in modern Greek, is appearing in the papyri, as δεξία χεῖρα (Völker, Papyrorum Graecorum Syntax etc., p. 30 f).

(h) INDECLINABLE SUBSTANTIVES. These are sometimes inflected in some of the cases in the first declension. Βηθσαϊνά is accusative in Lu. 19:29, and so indeclinable, like Βηθφαγή, but elsewhere it is inflected regularly in the first declension (so –ιαν Mk. 11:1, etc.) save once or twice in B. Βηθσαϊδᾶ has accusative Βηθσαϊδᾶν in Mk. 6:45; 8:22, but it may be only another alternate indeclinable form (Thayer) like Μαγαδᾶν. So likewise Γολγοθᾶ has accusative in –ιαν in Mk. 15:22. Hort4 finds “the variations between Μαρία and the indeclinable Μαρίαµ” “singularly intricate and perplexing, except as regards the genitive, which is always –ιας, virtually without variation, and without difference of the persons intended.” It is not necessary to go through all the details save to observe that as a rule the mother of Jesus and the sister of Martha are Μαρίαµ, while Mary of Clopas is always Μαρία. Mary Magdalene is now Μαρίαµ, now Μαρία. In the Aramaic as in the Hebrew probably all were called Μαρίαµ. Μαρία is merely the Hellenized form of Μαρίαµ. It is probably splitting too fine a hair to see with Hort5 a special appropriateness in Μαρίαµ in Jo. 20:16, 18.

6. The Second or ο Declension. There is no distinctively feminine inflection in the ο declension, though feminine words occur, [Page 260] like Ἡ ὅδος. But the neuter has a separate inflection. Modern Greek preserves very few feminines in –ος.1 Thumb (Handb., p. 53 f). gives none. The main peculiarities in the N. T. are here noted.

(a) THE SO-CALLED ATTIC SECOND DECLENSION. It is nearly gone. Indeed the Attic inscriptions began to show variations fairly early.2 The κοινή inscriptions3 show only remains here and there and the papyri tell the same story.4 Already λαός (as Lu. 1:21) has displaced λαώς and ναός (as Lu. 1:21) νεώς, though νεωκόρος survives in Ac. 19:35. Άνώγετον likewise is the true text in Mk. 14:15 and Lu. 22:12, not ἄνώγετον nor any of the various modifications in the MSS. In Mt. 3:12 and Lu. 3:17 Ἡ ἄλως may be used in the sense of Ἡ ἄλως (see Thayer) by metonymy. The papyri show ἄλως (Attic second declension) still frequently (Moulton and Milligan, Völker
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4 Notes on Orth., p. 156.
5 Ib.
1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 111 f.
2 Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 127 f.
4 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34. See also Maysor, Gr. d. griechn. Pap., 1906, p. 259 f. For the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 38 f., where a few exx. occur.
Expositor, Feb., 1908, p. 180). Cf. same thing in LXX. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 49 f.; Con. and Stock, Sel. fr. LXX, p. 26; Thackeray, Gr., p. 144. Ἀπολλός has accusative in –ῶν in 1 Cor. 4:6 and Tit. 3:13, though the Western and Syrian classes have –ό in both instances. In Ac. 19:1 Ἀπολλό ὁ is clearly right as only A L 40 have –ῶν. The genitive is Ἀπολλῷ without variant (1 Cor. ter). So the adjective ἱλεος is read in Mt. 16:22 and Heb. 8:12, though a few MSS. have ἱλεος in both places. The best MSS. have τήν ΚΩ in Ac. 21:1, not ΚΩν as Text. Rec. Cf. 1 Macc. 15:23. Blass5 compares αἱδός of the third declension.

(b) CONTRACTION. There is little to say here. The adjectives will be treated later. Ὠστοῦν (Jo. 19:36) has Ὠστεά, accus. pl., in the best MSS. in Lu. 24:39 and Ὠστέων in Mt. 23:27 and Heb. 11:22. So also Ὠστέων in the Western and Syrian addition to Eph. 5:30. ὸρνέο (Rev. 18:2) and ὸρνέα (Rev. 19:21) are without variant. The papyri show this Ionic influence on uncontracted vowels in this very word as well as in various adjectives (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 435). For examples in the LXX (as Ὠστέων 2 Ki. 13:21) see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 82, and Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 36; Thackeray, p. 144; Con. and Stock, Sel. fr. LXX, p. 27. Moulton6 considers it remarkable that the N. T. shows [Page 261] no traces of the contraction of κύριος into κύρις and παιδίον into παιδίν, for instance, since the papyri have so many illustrations of this tendency. The inscriptions1 show the same frequency of the –ις, –ιν forms which finally won the day in modern Greek. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 61.

(c) THE VOCATIVE. In the o declension it does not always end in ε in the masculine singular. Θεός in ancient Greek is practically always retained in the vocative singular. The N. T. has the same form as in Mk. 15:34 (cf. also Jo. 20:28), but also once θεέ (Mt. 27:46). This usage is found occasionally in the LXX and in the late papyri.2 So also Paul uses Τιθεθε (1 Tim. 1:18; 6:20). Aristophanes had Ἀμφίθεθε, Lucian Τιμόθεε, and the inscriptions φιλόθεε.3 Note also the vocative νος Δαυείδ (Mt. 1:20) and even in apposition with κύριε (Mt. 15:22). The common use of the article with the nominative form as vocative, chiefly in the third declension, belongs more to syntax. Take as an instance of the second declension μι φοβο, το μικρον ποίμνιον (Lu. 12:32).

(d) HETEROCLISTIS AND METAPLASM. Variations between the first and second declensions have been treated on p. 257. The number of such variations between the second and third declensions is considerable. Νοῦς is no longer in the second declension, but is inflected like βοῦς, viz. νοος (2 Th. 2:2), νοτ (1 Cor. 14:15, 19). So

6 Prol., p. 48 f. He thinks it proof that the N. T. writers were not illiterate, since the pap. examples are in writers “with other indications of illiteracy.” Cf. also Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34.
1 Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 125; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 143. On the origin of these forms see Hatz., Einl., p. 318; Brug., Grundr., ii, § 62 n.; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34.
2 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, pp. 34, 434.
and in the second declension, as in Heb. 12:19 (cf. Lu. 4:37; Ac. 2:2), and for the 5:17 only B has
Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 29; Deiss., Light, p. 90; Raderm., Gr., p. 15.

3 P. 85. So also Thayer, the Rabbins’ name for the devil.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 29; Deiss., Light, p. 90; Raderm., Gr., p. 15.
the N. T. MSS. for Ac. 7:12 except that they divide between τὰ σῶμα and τὰ σώμα, and σώμα is the correct text. [Page 263] Blass¹ indeed objects that σώμα does not suit the sense. Στάδιον has σταδίους rather than the Attic στάδια in Lu. 24:13; Jo. 6:19 (W. H. and Nestle, but Tisch. στάδια ΝΔ), and is a marginal reading in Rev. 21:16 instead of στάδιων.

(e) THE MIXED DECLENSION. Some substantives with special inflection have this. It is particularly in foreign names in the α and ο declensions that this inflection became popular. “The stem ends in a long vowel or diphthong, which receives –ς for nominative and –ν for accusative, remaining unchanged in vocative, genitive, and dative singular. Ἰησοῦς is the most conspicuous of many N. T. examples. It plays a large part in modern Greek.”² Hence we have Ἰησοῦς nominative, Ἰησοῦς genitive-ablative, as Mt. 26:6; dative, etc., as Mt. 27:57; vocative Mk. 1:24. Some MSS. of the LXX have dative Ἰησοῦ in Deut. 3:21, etc. The accusative is Ἰησοῦν, as Mt. 26:4. Ἰωσή is the genitive of Ἰωσῆ according to the reading of Mt. 27:56 in W. H. Mg. instead of Ἰωσήφ, but in Mk. 6:3 Ἰωσήφ is the reading. So runs Λευη (nominative, Lu. 5:29), Λευε (genitive, Lu. 3:24), Λευειν (accusative, Lu. 5:27). Dative appears only in the LXX as Gen. 34:30 Λευεί. Μανασσῆς has accusative Μανασσῆ in Mt. 1:10 and the genitive in –ῆ (Rev. 7:6), but Hort³ calls attention to the fact that ΝΘΒ have Μανασσῆ instead of the nominative in Mt. 1:10, making the word indeclinable.

(f) PROPER NAMES. Ἰακώβ is indeclinable in Mt. 1:2, but we have Ἰάκωβον in Mt. 4:21. Several proper names have only the plural, as Θυάτερα (Rev. 2:18, but B ἰη and ABC –ραν, 1:11), Ἰεροσόλυμα (Mt. 2:1, but πᾶσα, 2:3), Θίλιπποι (Ac. 16:12), Καῦδα (Ac. 27:16), Μύρα (Ac. 27:5), Πάταρα (Ac. 21:1), Σάρεπτα (Lu. 4:26), Σόδο (Jude 7). The Latin words μόδιος (Mt. 5:15) and μάκελλον (1 Cor. 10:25) are inflected. So Latin proper names like Ιούστος (Ac. 18:7) and Παῦλος (Ro. 1:1). For Γομόρρας and Λύστραν see 5 (g).

7. The Third Declension (consonants and close vowels ι and υ). The third declension could easily be divided into several and thus we should have the five declensions of the Sanskrit and the Latin. But the usual seven divisions of the third declension have the genitive-ablative singular in –ος (–ως). The consonantal [Page 264] stems show more sweeping changes than the vocalic (sonantic) stems in this declension.¹ Only those changes that are related to the N. T. Greek can be here discussed.

(a) THE NOMINATIVE AS VOCATIVE. There is an increasing use of nominative forms as vocatives. This usage had long existed for nouns that were oxytone or had labial or guttural stems. Elsewhere in general the stem had served as vocative. No

2 Moulton, Prol., p. 49.
3 In the LXX proper names have great liberty in inflection. This is quite natural in a transl. Cf. Thack., Gr., pp. 160–171.
1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 121.
notice is here taken of the common use of the article with the nominative form as vocative, like ἡ παῖς (Lu. 8:54), a construction coming under syntactical treatment. According to Winer-Schmiedel the use of the singular without the article belongs also to syntax and the solution of W. H. is called “certainly false.” Hort had suggested that in the case of θυγάτηρ as vocative (Mk. 5:34; Lu. 8:48; Jo. 12:15) and πατήρ (Jo. 17:21, 24, 25) the long vowel (η) was pronounced short. Why not rather suppose that the vocative is like the nominative as in the case of labial and guttural stems? The usage is thus extended sometimes to these liquids. Indeed, in Jo. 17:25 we have πατήρ ὁ γαθέ, the adjective having the vocative form. In Mk. 9:19 (Lu. 9:41) we have ὦ γενέτορ παιδος and ὁ φορν in Lu. 12:20; 1 Cor. 15:36. See also ὦ πλήρης (Ac. 13:10) for –ες, which might be an indeclinable form like the accusative (II, 2 (f)). But these adjectives show that the usage is possible with substantives. There are indeed variant readings in the MSS. above, which have θυγάτερ and πάτερ, but in Mt. 9:22 DGL have θυγάτηρ. Note also ἄνερ (1 Cor. 7:16) and γύναι (Lu. 13:12). For peculiarities in nom. see (d).

(b) The Accusative Singular. The theoretical distinction that consonant-stems had the accusative singular in –α and vocalic stems in –ν began to break down very early. From the third century B.C. Jannaris suspects that popular speech began to have all accusative singulars with ν, an overstatement, but still the tendency was that way. The use of ν with words like πόλις, ναῦν (Ac. 27:41, only time in N. T., elsewhere vernacular πλοῖον), etc., together with the analogy of the first and second declensions, had a positive influence. See p. 258 for discussion of the double accusative ending –α plus ν, like ἄνδραν in the papyri. These forms belong in reality to the third declension, though formed after the analogy of the first, and so were presented when first reached in the discussion. [Page 265] However, there are other consonant-stems which form the accusative in –ν instead of –α. In Tit. 3:9 and Ph. 1:15 we have ἔριν instead of ἔριδα. So in Rev. 3:7 and 20:1 the Attic κλεῖν is read, for this is not a new tendency by any means, but in Lu. 11:52 the MSS. have κλεῖδα, though here also D has κλεῖν. Κλεῖδα is found in the LXX as in Judg. 3:25. Χάριτα appears in Ac. 24:27 and Ju. 4, and A has it in Ac. 25:9, but the Attic χάριν holds the field (forty times). In the LXX the Ionic and poetical χάριτα occurs only twice (Zech. 4:7; 6:14) and is absent from the papyri before the Roman period. Cf Thackeray, Gr., p. 150. For the irrational ν with μείζονο in Jo. 5:36 see Adjectives. In Ac. 27:40 the correct text is ἄρτεμων, not –ονα, from nom. ἄρτεμων.

(c) The Accusative Plural. In Winer-Schmiedel (p. 88) ἔρεις is given as nominative and accusative except in 1 Cor. 1:11 (ἔρηδες, nom.), but as a matter of fact

2 P. 90.
5 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 435.
1 Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157. For the LXX see Thack., p. 140; Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 40 f., where the N. T. situation is duplicated.
2 See Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 151, for illustr. of these accs. in the inscr. For the pap. see Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35, both χάριτα and χάριν, etc. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 271 f.
the accusative plural does not appear in the N. T. except as an alternative reading ἔρεις in ἈCKLP, in Tit. 3:9 (correct text ἔριν). In Gal. 5:20 W. H. put ἔρεις in the margin rather than ἔρις, probably “an itacistic error.” W. H. read τὰς κλεῖς in Rev. 1:18, but κλεῖδας in Mt. 16:19. In Ac. 24:27 χάριτας is supported by HP and most of the cursives against χάριν (correct text) and χάριν (NEL, etc.). The accusative in –ς has changed into –ας with –υ and –ου stems, as βόας from βοῦς (Jo. 2:14 f., cf. LXX), βότρυας from βότρυς (Rev. 14:18), ἰχθύας from ἰχθύς (Mt. 14:17). This simplification of the accusative plural was carried still further. Just as πόλεις had long ago been dropped for πόλεις, so βασιλέας has become –εας like the nominative, “and this accusative plural is regular in N. T. for all words in –ες.” In the LXX –εις appears a few times, but since 307 B.C. the Attic inscriptions show –εις as accusative. It is found indeed sometimes in Xenophon and Thucydides, though the strict Atticists disown it. Cf. γραµµατεῖς in Mt. 23:34, etc. A few forms in –εις survive in the inscriptions. The accusative in –ς (from νήςτες) is the correct accusative in Mk. 8:3 and Mt. 15:32. N 휆 here reads νήςτες, but is unreliable on this itacism (Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157). The Aeolian, Elean, Delphian and Phocian inscriptions have the accusative plural in –ς just like the nominative (cf. Latin). It is very common in the modern Greek vernacular and in the papyri. Moulton finds many examples like γυνακεῖς, μὴνες, οντες, πάντες, τέκτονες, τέσσαρες, etc. In the LXX τέσσαρες as accusative is very common as a variant in the text of Swete. So in the N. T. some MSS. read τέσσαρες (though the most still have τέσσαρας) as N

3 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 26.
1 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 150.
3 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 546.
Swete

———, The Apocalypse of St. John (1906).
———, The O. T. in Greek according to the Septuagint (1887). 3 vols.

6 W.-Sch., p. 87.
Δ in Jo. 11:17, in Ac. 27:29, in Rev. 4:4; 7:1, in Rev. 9:14. In Rev. 4:4 the best authority (N, AP, etc.) is really on the side of τέσσαρες (second example).

Indeed “in the N. T. τέσσαρες never occurs without some excellent authority for τέσσαρες.” In the first 900 of Wilcken’s ostraca, Moulton (Prol., p. 243) finds forty-two examples of accusative τέσσαρες and twenty-nine of τέσσαρας. Moulton considers it probable that other nominative forms in Revelation, like ἀστέρες in A (Rev. 1:16), may be illustrations of this same tendency.

[Page 267] (d) Peculiarities in the Nominative. In general one may say that the various ways of forming the nominative singular in Greek are blending gradually into unity, the masculine in ζ and the feminine in α or η. Many of the new substantives went over to the first declension. Luke has gen. Ἐλαιῶνος, in Ac. 1:12 from nom. Ἐλαιῶν, and the papyri give nearly thirty examples of this noun. Moulton considers it probable that other nominative forms in Revelation, like ἀστέρες in A (Rev. 1:16), may be illustrations of this same tendency.

8 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 26. Cf. Jann., p. 120.
11 Ib. This use of –ες as acc. may be compared with the common acc. pl. in –ες in the mod. Gk. vernac. Cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 47 ff. Cf. nom. like ὁ πατέρας (Psichari, Ess. de Gr. Hist. Néo-grecque, 1886, 1o partie, p. xviii). Even ἡμέρες, πολίτες, etc. In the Eleatic dial. the loc.-dat. pl. is –οις as in χρησάτοις. Cf. Meister, Bd. II, p. 61. The LXX MSS. show τέσσαρες as acc. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 54. The acc. in –ες rare in LXX MSS. outside of τέσσαρες. Thack., Gr., p. 148 f. Moulton (Prol., p. 243, ed. 2) suggests that this tendency started with τέσσαρες because it is the only early cardinal that had a separate form for the acc. plural. 1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 121.
4 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 158. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 93. Moulton (Prol., pp. 69, 235) has a full presentation of the facts.
5 Moulton, Prol., p. 235.
(Thayer), though the Doric used the oblique cases ὄρνιχος, etc. 6 Elsewhere in all MSS. the usual ὄρνις occurs, as Mt. 23:37, and in the N. T. only the nominative singular is found. 7 Another contrary tendency to the usual ζ in the nominative singular is seen in ὀδίς (1 Th. 5:3; cf. also Is. 37:3) for the usual ὀδίς. The papyri show forms like ὀξύρριν.

One or two points about neuter substantives call for remark. The inflection in –ας, –αος=–ως, has nearly vanished. 8 A few examples still survive in the inscriptions. 9 In Lu. 1:36 the Ionic form γῆρας from γῆρας is found, as often in the LXX and Test. [Page 268] XII Pat. 1 Κέρας always in the N. T. (as in LXX) has the Attic plural κέρατα (Rev. 8 times) and τέρας regularly τέρατα (11 times). The plural κρέα (from κρέας) is the only form in the N. T. (1 Cor. 8:13; Rom. 14:21) as in the LXX, though a MSS. or so in each case has κρέας (singular).

(e) THE GENITIVE-ABLATIVE FORMS. These call for little remark save in the adjective, for which see later. Σινάπεως (from σίναπι) is uniform in the N. T., as Mt. 17:20. Πήχως has no genitive singular in the N. T. though πήχεως is common in the LXX, 2 but has πηχῶν (from Ionic πηχέων or through assimilation to neuters in –ος), not the Attic πήχεως. In Jo. 21:8 only A Cyr. have πήχεως and in Rev. 21:17 only 8. 3 For the genitive singular of Ἰωσής and Μανασσής see 6 (e).

(f) CONTRACTION. It is not observed in ὄρεως (Rev. 6:15) and χειλέων (Heb. 13:15). In both instances the Ionic absence of contraction is always found in the LXX (Prov. 12:14). This open form is not in the Attic inscriptions, though found in MSS. of Attic writers and the poets especially. 4 In the κοινή it is a “widespread tendency” to leave these forms in –ος uncontracted, though ἔτων is correct in Ac. 4:22, etc. 5 So the LXX, Thackeray, Gr., p. 151.

(g) PROPER NAMES. Μωυσῆς has always the genitive-ablative Μωυσέως (Jo. 9:28), though no nominative Μωυσεύς is known. The genitive Μωσῆ appears usually in the LXX, as Num. 4:41, and the vocative Μωσῆ as in Ex. 3:4. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 163 f. W. H. have Μωυση (always with v. r. –σῆ) as in Mk. 9:4, except in Ac. 7:44.

---

6 The form ὄρνιξε appears several times in the pap. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 149.
7 W.-Sch., p. 89. LXX ὄρνιθος.
9 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 156.
3 Hort, Notes on Orth. But Xen. and Plut. (often) have πηχῶν. See W.-M., p. 75. In LXX note πήχεως and πήχεως, πήχαος and πηχῶν. Helbing, Gr., p. 45; Thack., p. 151.
4 W.-Sch., p. 88.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 27.
where the form in –tiği is due to the LXX (usual form there). The accusative is 
Μωυσέα once only (Lu. 16:29), elsewhere –βν, as in Ac. 7:35 (so LXX). Σολομών (so in
the nominative, not –ων) is indeclinable in ב in Mt. 1:6 as usually in the LXX. But
the best MSS. in Mt. 1:6 have the accusative Σολομώνα, a few –ωντα. So the genitive
Σολομώνος in Mt. 12:42, [Page 269] though a few MSS. have –ωντς. The Gospels
have uniformly the genitive in –ωνς. In Ac. 3:11 W. H. accept Σολομώντος (so
also 5:12), though BD etc. have ων in 5:12. Cf. Ξενόφωντος (from nominative –
ς). Diotréφης (3 Jo. 9) and Ερμογένης (2 Tim. 1:15) occur in nom. There are other
proper names (Roman and Semitic) which are inflected regularly like Βαβυλών (Mt.
1:11), Γαλλίων (Ac. 18:12), Ελαιών (Ac. 1:12) Καίσαρ (Mt. 22:17), Σαρών (Ac.
9:35), Σιδών (Mt. 11:21), Σιμών (Mt. 4:18). There should be mentioned also Σαλαμίς

(h) Heteroclisis and Metaplasm. Most of the examples have already been
treated under the first declension (g) or the second declension (d). The accusative
帙 (Mk. 9:50) is like the old Greek ὁ βαβυλών. Some MSS. (Western and Syrian classes)
in Mk. 9:49 have βαβυλων also. In Mk. 9:50 κλΔ have τὸ βαβυλών as nominative (cf. Lev.
2:13) like γάλα. But the best MSS. (κλΔ) give τὸ βαβυλών in the first two examples
in 9:50 and βαβυλών (accusative) in the third (so W. H.). So also Mt. 5:13 and Lu. 14:34.
Cf. dative βαβυλών in Col. 4:6. In the LXX τὸ βαβυλών is rare (Thackeray, Gr., p. 152).
Papyri show τὸ βαβυλών in third century B.C (Moulton and Milligan, Expositor, Feb.,
1908, p. 177). Instead of ὀρνέοις in Rev. 18:2 we have the genitive ὀρνέων, from ὀρνέων
(good old Greek word), ὀρνέως in Rev. 19:17, and ὀρνεά in 19:21. In Mk. 6:4 and
Lu. 2:44 συγγενευέται (cf. 1 Macc. 10:88) is probably1 from συγγενεύς, not συγγενής.
Cf. 1 Macc. 10:89. This is a good place for me to record the admiration which has
possessed me as I have tested the work of Hort through the maze of details in the MS.
evidence concerning the forms.

8. Indeclinable Words. These do not, of course, belong to any declension.
Josephus Grecized most of the Hebrew proper names like Ἀμίναβος (Mt. 1:4,
Ἀμιναδάβ). Some he put in the first declension, many in the second and third
decensions. Blass sums the matter up by observing that “the Hebrew personal
names of the O. T., when quoted as such,” are indeclinable. This is an overstatement.
But certainly many that in the LXX and the N. T. are not inflected, might have been,
such, for instance, as Ἀπρών, Ἰακώβ, Κεδρών, Σαλμών, Σαμώων, to go no further. It
is hardly worth while to give the entire list of these words. [Page 270] They include
such other words as the majority of those in the genealogy in Mt. 1 and that in Lu. 3,

6 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 158. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 58–60, for discussion of the
decl. of proper names in the LXX. The phenomena correspond to those in N. T.
MSS. Προμηθεύς had an Attic nom. –ης, gen. –εως, Thumb, Handb., § 330. 1.
1 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 158.
2 lb. for extensive list.
3 W.-Sch., p. 91.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 29.
5 Thack., Gr., p. 169, suggests that place-names in –ων are declined or indeclinable
according to rank and distance.
besides many other proper names,\(^1\) including such geographical names as Αἰνών, Βηθφαγή, Σιών, Σινᾶ, etc.

There are other indeclinable Hebrew and Aramaic words such as Κορβάν (Mk. 7:11), μάνα (Rev. 2:17), πάσχα (Lu. 2:41), σίκερα (Lu. 1:15 as in LXX). The gender (fem.) of the indeclinable οὐαί (Rev. 9:12; 11:14) is probably due, as Blass\(^2\) suggests, to θλίψις. In 1 Cor. 9:16 οὐαί is used as a substantive (so also LXX).

The use of ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος in the nominative after ὁπό in Rev. 1:4, etc., belongs more to syntax than to accident. It is evidently on purpose (to express the unchangeableness of God), just as ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος is in apposition with με (Jo. 13:13) in lieu of quotation-marks.

II. THE ADJECTIVE (ὄΝΟΜΑ ἘΠΙΘΕΤΟΝ)

Donaldson\(^3\) is probably right in saying that, in general, the explanation of the adjective belongs to syntax rather than to etymology. But there are some points concerning the adjective that demand treatment here.

1. The Origin of the Adjective. Adjectives are not indispensable in language, however convenient they may be.\(^4\) In the Sanskrit, for instance, the adjective plays an unimportant part. Whitney\(^5\) says: “The accordance in inflection of substantive and adjective stems is so complete that the two cannot be separated in treatment from one another.” He adds\(^6\) that this wavering line of distinction between substantive and adjective is even more uncertain in Sanskrit than in the other early Indo-Germanic tongues. Most of the Sanskrit adjectives have three endings, the masculine and neuter being usually ā stems while the feminine may have ā or ī this matter being “determined in great part only by actual usage, and not by grammatical rule.” So likewise Giles in his Comparative Philology has no distinct treatment of adjectives. The adjective is an added descriptive appellative (ὄνομα ἐπίθετον) while the substantive is an essential appellative (ὄνομα οὐσιαστικόν). But substantives were doubtless [Page 271] used in this descriptive sense before adjectives arose, as they are still so used. So, for instance, we say brother man, Doctor A., Professor B., etc. Cf. in the N. T. ἐν τῷ Ἰωρόνῳ ποταμῷ (Mt. 3:6), etc. This is, indeed, apposition, but it is descriptive apposition, and it is just at this point that the adjective emerges in the early period of the language.\(^1\) Other Greek adjectives in form as in idea are variations from the genitive case, the genus case.\(^2\) In itself the adjective is as truly a noun as the

---

1 See further list in W.-Sch., p. 91.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 32.
3 New Crat., p. 502.
4 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 29.
5 Sans. Gr., p. 111.
6 Ib. Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 117, for the adjectival use of the substantive.
2 Donaldson, New Crat., p. 474.
substantive. As to the form, while it is not necessary that in every case the adjective express its gender by a different inflection, yet the adjectives with three genders become far commoner than those with two or one. From the etymological point of view this inflection in different genders is the only distinction between substantive and adjective. The Greek has a much more highly developed system of adjectives than the Sanskrit, which has survived fairly well in modern Greek, though a strong tendency is present to simplify adjectives to the one declension (–ος, –η, –ον). Participles, though adjectives in inflection, are also verbs in several respects and call for separative discussion. The process of treating the adjective as a substantive belongs to syntax. The substantivizing of the adjective is as natural, though not so common in Greek as in Latin, as the adjectivizing of the substantive which we have been discussing. The distinction between adjective and substantive is hard to draw in modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 66). In modern Greek every adjective has a special feminine form. The development is complete. Cf. Thumb, pp. 66 ff.

2. Inflection of Adjectives. In Greek as in Sanskrit, the adjective has to follow the inflection of the substantive in the various declensions, the three genders being obtained by combining the first with the second or the third declensions.

(a) Adjectives with One Termination. Of course at first this may have been the way the earliest adjectives arose. Then the genders would be formed. But analogy soon led to the formation of most adjectives with three endings. Some of these adjectives with one ending were used only with the masculine or the feminine, and few were ever used with the neuter. Jannaris considers them rather substantives than adjectives, but they illustrate well the transition from substantive to adjective, like ἄπαξ, μαόρ, φυγάς. In fact they are used of animated beings. In the N. T. we have ἄρπαξ (Mt. 7:15; 1 Cor. 5:10), πένης (2 Cor. 9:9. Cf. πλάνητες, Jude 13 B), and συγγενίς (Lu. 1:36). Συγγενίς is a later feminine form like εὐγενίς for the usual συγγενής (both masculine and feminine) which Winer treats as a substantive (so Thayer). Strictly this feminine adjective belongs only to words in –τής and –εύς. Blass quotes εὐγενίδων γυναικῶν by way of comparison. Modern Greek still has a few of these adjectives in use. The ancient adjectives in –ης (εὐγενής) have disappeared from the modern Greek vernacular (Thumb, Handb., p. 72).

(b) Adjectives with Two Terminations. Some adjectives never had more than two endings, the masculine and the feminine having the same form. In the so-called Attic second declension this is true of ἔλαιος (Mt. 16:22). But a few simple adjectives of the second declension never developed a feminine ending, as, for instance,
In the N. T. ἰδιὸς has changed to ἰδιός (1 Pet. 3:4). The adjectives in the third declension which end in –ης or –ων have no separate feminine form. So εὐγενής (L. 19:12), εὐσεβής (A. 10:7) meiōs (J. 15:13), etc. Then again some simple adjectives varied in usage in the earlier Greek, especially in the Attic, and some of these have only two endings in the N. T., like ὁδιός (Ro. 1:20), ἐρῆμος (Ac. 1:20, etc., and often as substantive with γῆ or χώρα not expressed), κόσμιος (1 Tim. 2:9), οὐράνιος (L. 2:13; A. 26:19), φιλόφορος (1 Tim. 5:13), φρόνιμος (Mt. 25:46, 4, 9), ὠφελίμος (1 Tim. 4:8; 2 Tim. 3:16). With still others N. T. usage itself varies as in the case of οὐλόνιος (Mt. 25:46, etc.) and αὐλοία (Heb. 9:12; 2 Th. 2:16, and often as a variant reading); ἔτοιμος (Mt. 25:10) and ἕτοιμη (1 Pet. 1:5); μάταιος (Jas. 1:26) and ματαία (1 Pet. 1:18); ὑμιός (Rev. 4:3, second example correct text) and ὡμιοία (Rev. 9:10, [Page 273] though W. H. put ὡμιοίας in the margin instead of ὡμιοίας, 19); ἅσιος (1 Tim. 2:8) and ἅσιος (Jas. 3:17).

6 Cf. K.-Bl., I, p. 535 f., for fuller list. Some of the simple verbals in –τος also had no fem., as ὠντος.

7 In the LXX we see a very slight tendency towards giving a fem. form to all adjs.

1 Cf. Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 148. Cf. also οὐλόνιος, κόσμιος, in Magnesia (Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 140). Aristophanes used βασιλείος, βέβαιος, μακάριος, οὐράνιος, πάτριος with two endings (G. Wirth, De Motione Adjectivorum, 1880, p. 51). This is true also of Euripides (ib., p. 49 f.). For further discussion of adjectives with two endings see Wilhelm, Zur Motion der Adjec. dreier End. in Griech. etc., p. 23; Wilhelm, Der Sprachgebr. der Lukianos etc., p. 23. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 57 f. On the whole the LXX shows the extension of the fem. so that adjs. which in Attic have two or three terminations have three in the LXX (ἄγριος, βέβαιος, δίκαιος, ἐλεόθερος, μάταιος). Thack., Gr., p. 172.

2 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 289 f.

3 K.-Bl., I, p. 538.


5 K.-Bl., I, p. 538 f.

6 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 158.
papyri. In the N. T. we have several examples, as ἀργός, —ή (Attic always ἀργός, though Epimenides has —ή) in 1 Tim. 5:13; Tit. 1:12; Jas. 2:20 according to BC. In Mk. 4:28 αὐτομάτη is not entirely new, for classic writers use it. In 2 Jo. 13 (and probably also 1) we have ἐκλεκτή. In Mt. 4:13 the MSS. give παραθαλασσία, but D has —ον. However, in Lu. 6:17 παράλος is the feminine form, though occasionally the LXX and older Greek had —ια, varying like the other compounds in —ος. Other adjectives of three endings do not belong to the third and the contracted forms are practically confined to forms in —ος. The perfect active participle in —ος, —ον, —ον, like πλήρης, Δερεβία, δεξία, δεξί, πάσα, πάν, ἐκόν, ἐκούσα, ἐκόν, ἰμάλας, ἰμέλαν, ἰμέγας, ἰμαχάλα, μέγας, πολύς, πολλή, πολύ. Cf. the perfect active participle in —ος, —ον, —ον, —ον. The LXX MSS. sometimes have πάν as indeclinable (πάν τὸν τόπον, etc.) like πλήρης. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 51. Indeclinable πλήρης is retained by Swete in Sir. 19:26. Cf. Helbing, ib. See (f) below.

(d) THE ACCUSATIVE SINGULAR. Some adjectives of the third declension have ν after the analogy of the first declension. See this chapter, I, 5, (g), for the discussion in detail. W. H. reject them all, though in a few cases the testimony is strong. They are ἀστεβήν (Ro. 4:5), ἀσφαλήν (Heb. 6:19), μείζον (Jo. 5:36), συγγενήν (Ro. 16:11), ὑγιήν (Jo. 5:11). The use of irrational ν with μείζον (Jo. 5:36 μείζον in ABEGMA) is likened by Moulton (Prol., p. 49) to irrational ν with subjunctive ἤ (.HOUR). Cf. ch. VI, II (h), p. 220.

(e) CONTRACTION IN ADJECTIVES. Two points are involved, the fact of contraction (or the absence of it) and the use of α or η after ε, τ, ρ. The uncontracted forms of adjectives are not so common as is the case with substantives. Cf. this chapter, I, 6, (b). The contracted forms are practically confined to forms in —ος, like ἀπλοῦς, διαπλοῦς, ἀργυροῦς, πορφυροῦς, σιδηροῦς, χάλκους, χρυσοῦς. Here again we have a still further limitation, for the uncontracted forms occur chiefly in the Apocalypse and in Σ and in the case of χρυσοῦς. Cf. Rev. 4:4; 5:8, where Σ reads χρυσέως, —εος. But in Rev. 2:1 ΝΠΒ read χρυσῶν, while AC have χρυσόν. χρυσῶν in Rev. 1:13, though accepted by W. H. and read by ΝΑΣ, is rejected by Blass, but admitted by Debrunner (p. 28), as shown on p. 257. P. Lond. reads χρυσᾶν ἢ ἄργυρᾶν, and L. P. w (ii/iii A.D.) also has χρυσῆν ἢ ἄργυρῆν. In each instance probably analogy has been at work. Thackeray (Gr., p. 172 f.) gives a very few uncontracted forms in —ος in the LXX. W. H. accept the genitive βαθέως in Lu. 24:1 and πραέως in 1 Pet. 3:4 instead of the usual form in —ος. Hort considers the variations in ἡμισῆς as “curious.”
but they find abundant parallel in the [Page 275] papyri as does χρυσέως above.¹ In Mk. 6:23 ἡμίσους, not –εος, is the genitive form, the usual (probably only) form in the papyri.² The neuter plural ἡμίσεα has practically no support in Lu. 19:8, though ἡμίση is the Text. Rec. on the authority of late uncials and cursives. Τὰ ἡμίσυ has slight support. W. H. read τὰ ἡμίσια (BBQ 382, L having itacistic –εια) and derive it from a possible ἡμίσιος.³ But it is possible, if not probable, that ἡμίσεα was the earlier form changed by itacism to ἡμίση.⁴ The plural of νήστις is νήσεις (Mk. 8:3=Mt. 15:32), and not νήστις as already shown.⁵ For participles in –υία, –υίης see this chapter, p. 256. As a rule the forms in –υία and –ρης predominate, but note στείρα in Lu. 1:36.⁶ In the case of ὑγιῆς, whereas the Attic had accusative ὑγιᾶ (Ὕγιη in Plato, Phadr. 89 d), the N. T., like the inscriptions, papyri and the LXX, has only ὑγιῇ (Jo. 5:11, 15; 7:23).⁷ In Jo. 18:1 χειμάρρου is almost certainly from χειμάρρος instead of the classical χειμάρρους.⁸ In 2 Pet. 2:5 ὄγδοον is not contracted, though sometimes the papyri have ὄγδους, ὄγδουν.⁹

(f) INDECLINABLE ADJECTIVES. The papyri have cleared up two points of much interest here. One is the use of πλήρης in N. T. MSS. in an oblique case. In Mk. 4:28 Hort (Appendix, p. 24) suggests πλήρης ἁπτον (C* two lectionaries) as probably the original. In Ac. 6:5 W. H. put ἄνδρα πλήρης in the margin, though πλήρης is read only by B among the MSS. of importance. In Jo. 1:14 all the MSS. (save D 5 followed by Chrys. and Theoph.) have πλήρης. Moulton¹⁰ indeed suggests that πλήρης was the original text, which was changed to the vulgar πλήρης. But the argument can be turned round just as easily. In almost every N. T. instance of an oblique case of πλήρης good uncials have the indeclinable form (Moulton, Prol., p. 50). The LXX also has examples of indeclinable πλήρης (cf. Hort, Appendix, p. [Page 276] 24). So Job 21:24, ἀνήσας. The examples of πλήρης so used are “fairly common” in the papyri¹¹ and come as early as the second century B.C.¹² There seems therefore no reason
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¹ Χρυσέως is exceedingly common in the pap. (Moulton, Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 435).
² Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 294 f. Cf. also Deiss., B. S., p. 186; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34. So also the LXX, Thack., Gr., p. 179.
⁴ Cf. W.-Sch., p. 87. ἡμίσεα occurs in Antoninus Liberalis (ab. 150 A.D.) and οἰκεῖος is analogous.
⁵ Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157.
⁶ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 25.
⁷ Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. For adjs. with acc. in –η (and sometimes ν added, –ην) see Dieterich, Unters., p. 175. Cf. this ch., II, 2, (d).
⁸ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 25.
⁹ Mayser, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 294.
¹¹ Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. For the indecl. πλήρης in Acta Thomae see Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 24. Cf. Sir. 19:26. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 52. It is not till i/A.D. that it is common in the pap. Thack. (Gr., p. 176) thinks it not genuine in the LXX.
to refuse to consider πλήρης in Jo. 1:14 as accusative and to accept it as the text in Mk. 4:28 and Ac. 6:5. The other example of indeclinable adjectives is found in comparative forms in –ο, like πλείον. Moulton\(^3\) points out that in Mt. 26:53 NBD read πλείω δώδεκα λεγοῦνας, while the later MSS. have mended the grammar with πλείους. He quotes also Crönert\(^4\) who has furnished abundant evidence from the papyri and literature of such a use of these forms just like πλήρης. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Papyri, p. 63 f.

3. **Comparison of Adjectives.** The comparative is a natural development in the adjective, as the adjective itself is a growth on the substantive.

\((a)\) **The Positive** (θετικὸν ὄνομα or ὄνομα ἄπλοῦν). This is the oldest form of the adjective, the most common and the most persistent. It is not always true that the comparative and superlative forms represent an actually higher grade than the positive. The good is sometimes more absolute than better or even best. See ἀγαθός in Mk. 10:18, for instance. Sometimes indeed the positive itself is used to suggest comparison as in Mt. 18:8, καλὸν σοὶ ἔστιν εἰσελθεῖν ... ἢ δύο χήρας, κτλ. This construction is common in the LXX, suggested perhaps by the absence of comparison in Hebrew.\(^5\) The tendency of the later Greek is also constantly to make one of the degrees do duty for two. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 181. But this matter belongs rather to the syntax of comparison. Participles are, of course, used only in the positive save in a few cases where the adjective-idea has triumphed wholly over the verb-conception.\(^6\) Verbs in –τος sometimes have comparison, though μᾶλλον may be freely used with participles.

\((b)\) **The Comparative** (συγκριτικὸν ὄνομα). The stem may be (besides adjective) either a substantive (βασιλεύτερος) or an adverb (πρότερος). Cf. Monro, Homeric Grammar, p. 82. The primary comparative-ending –ιων (Sanskrit iyāns) is probably kin to the adjective-ending –ιος.\(^7\) This form along with the superlative –ησος is [Page 277] probably originally qualitative in idea and does not necessarily imply excess. In the modern Greek these forms are not used at all.\(^1\) They have disappeared before the secondary comparative form –τερος, which even in the earlier Greek is far more common. The ending –τερος does imply excess and appears in various words that are not usually looked upon as comparatives, as ἕτερος (‘one of two’), ἕκατερος (‘each
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3 Prol., p. 50.
Crönert

CRÖNERT, W., Memoria Graeca Herculaneensis (1903).

———, Questiones Herculanenses (1898).

4 Philologus, LXI., pp. 161 ff.
5 W.-M., p. 302.
1 Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 73.
of two’), ἡμὺ-τερος (nos-ter), ὑμὺ-τερος (vos-ter), ὕσ-τερος.
So also δεύ-τερος like πρό-τερος (cf. Latin al-ter, English other) is a comparative form. The comparison-
suffixes τον, ἦτος, τερος belong to the Indo-Germanic ground speech. In the N. T.
the forms in –τον, as in the papyri, hold their own only in the most common words.
Schwab (op. cit., p. 5) makes –στός older than –τατος. 

2 So also δεύ-τερος like πρό-τερος (cf. Latin al-ter, English other) is a comparative form. 

3 “The comparison-
suffixes τον, ἦτος, τερος belong to the Indo-Germanic ground speech.”

4 In the N. T.

5 the forms in –τον, as in the papyri, hold their own only in the most common words.

6 Schwab (op. cit., p. 5) makes –στός older than –τατος. 

7 Ἡσσον (neuter only) is found in 1 Cor. 11:17 as opposed to κρεῖσσον, and
as an adverb in 2 Cor. 12:15. Кάλλιον (Ac. 25:10) is an adverb.
Кρείσσων is confined
to Peter, Paul’s Epistles and Hebrews (some eighteen examples, ten of them in Heb.).
Meίζων is common (some fifty times), though some of them displace the superlative
as we shall see directly. The neuter plural (μείζονα) appears once as μείζω (Jo. 1:50).

8 Once also (3 Jo. 4) the double comparative form μειζότερος occurs, several similar
examples appearing in the papyri, as μειζότερος, μελαντότερον, πρεσβυτερότερα.
A few other examples in poetry and late Greek are cited by Winer-Moulton, like
English vernacular “lesser.” Τάχιον (W. H. ειον) is the N. T. form as we
read in the papyri also. Cf. Jo. 20:4, etc. Χείρων is found eleven times (cf. Mt. 9:16).
The ending –τερος is more and more the usual one. Cf. τομότερος (Heb. 4:12). Some
comparative adjectives are derived from positive adverbs like ἐξώτερος (Mt. 8:12),
ἐσώτερος (Ac. 16:24), κατώτερος (Eph. 4:9). These latter adjectives are common in
the LXX and the later Greek, not to say Attic sometimes. 


10 The pap. have many exx. of the form without ν as in πλείων (ους), etc. See Maysers,
Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 298 ff. But the usage varies greatly. The LXX MSS. show
similar variations. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 54 f. As LXX exx. of uniformity in
form of compl. note ἐγχώτερος and ἀλφότερος, but only ἐγγίων (–στός), not ἐγγύτερος (–τατος), C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 29. Thack. (Gr., pp. 184 ff.) gives a
careful summary of the exx. of –τον, ἦτος in the LXX.


(1882). Various eds.

13 P. 81. Cf. also Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 180, for ὅλιζότερος.

14 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. Cf. also ὅμιονότερος in the older language (Blass,
Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 34).

15 W.-M., p. 81; Thack., Gr., p. 183.

16 Dieterich DIETERICH, K., Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Sprache von der hellen.
Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrh. n. Chr. (1898).
(Radermacher, Gr., p. 56). Cf. ἀγαθότερος (Hermas, Mand. VIII, 9, 11) and ἀγαθότατος (Diod., 16, 85). The rules for the use of –ότερος and –ότερος apply in the N. T. As μᾶλλον is often used with the positive in lieu of the comparative ending, so it is sometimes with the comparative, a double comparative (μᾶλλον κράτιστον, Ph. 1:23; μᾶλλον περισσότερον, Mk. 7:36), a construction not unknown to the classic orators of Athens where emphasis was desired.3 Paul did not perpetrate a barbarism when he used ἐλαχιστότερος (Ph. 3:8), a comparative on a superlative. It “is correctly formed according to the rule of the common language.”4 Cf. also such a late form as ἐσχατότερος.5

(c) The Superlative (ὑπερθετικὸν ὅνομα). As with the comparative, so with the superlative there are primary and secondary forms. The primary superlative ending –ιστος (old Indian iṣṭḥa, Zend. and Goth. išta)6 did not perhaps represent the true superlative so much as the elative (intensive like English “very”) superlative.7 It was never very widely used and has become extinct in modern Greek.8 The κοινὴ inscriptions show only a few examples like ἄγχιστα, ἔγγιστα, καλλιστος, κράτιστος, μέγιστος, πλείστος.9 In the papyri Mayser10 notes βέλτιστον, ἐλάχιστον (–ιστα also), καλλιστη, κράτιστος, πλείστοι, ταχίστην (–ιστα), χειρίστην. In the N. T., however, the superlative in –ιστος is more common than that in –τατος, though none too frequent in itself. They are besides usually elative (intensive) and not true superlatives.11 D reads ἔγ- [Page 279] γιστα in Mk. 6:36. Ὁ ἔλαχιστος (1 Cor. 15:9) is a true superlative, a thing so rare in the N. T. that Blass1 attributes this example either to the literary language or to corruption in the text.1 But Moulton2 is able to find a parallel in the Tb.P. 22, iv/b.c. But more about true and elative superlatives in Syntax (ch. XIV, XIV). In 2 Cor. 12:9, 15 (D in Ac. 13:8), we have ἰδιστα. Κράτιστε. (Lu. 1:3, etc.) is “only a title” (Moulton, p. 78). Μάλιστα appears a dozen times only, though μᾶλλον is exceedingly common. Blass3 indeed suggests that a popular substitute for μάλιστα as for πλείστα was found in the use of περισσός. This is much more true of the use of περισσός as the equivalent of μᾶλλον or πλείστον (cf. Mt. 5:37; 27:23). Paul uses the comparative adverb περισσοτέρως (Ph. 1:14. Cf. double comparative in Mk. 7:36). In Heb. 7:15 (cf. 2:1; 13:19 –ως) περισσότερον ἦτα κατάδηλον we have more than μᾶλλον. Cf. μέγιστος (2 Pet. 1:4) and πλείστος in Mt. 11:20; 21:8; 1 Cor. 14:27. Τάχιστα (Ac. 17:15) Blass4 credits again to the literary element in Luke. In ὑψιστος

3 Schwab, Hist. Synt. etc., Heft III, p. 65.
4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 34.
5 W.-M., p. 81, Jann., p. 147.
6 K.-Bl., I, p. 554; Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 291.
8 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 144.
10 Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 298.
11 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33.
1 Ib.
1 Ib.
2 Prol., p. 79.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33 f.
4 Ib., p. 33.
we have a superlative that occurs thirteen times and always about God or heaven (as Mk. 5:7; 11:10).

When we take up the form in –τατος in the N. T. the story is soon told. Brugmann finds the origin of this ending in forms like δεκατος (cf. Latin decimus), πρωτος (cf. Latin primus), ὑπατος, ὑστατος. It has no direct parallel in the other languages. Hirt suggests –ταιος and –ατος as two forms which finally resulted in –τατος. It is true that the forms in –ατος faded away as superlatives and ἔσχατον became ἐσχατότατον in the κοινη inscriptions, but this is true also of the forms in –τατος. The papyri have “scores” of examples of superlatives in –τατος (chiefly elative). It is true that the forms in –ατος faded away as superlatives and ἔσχατον became ἐσχατώτατον in the κοινη inscriptions, but this is true also of the forms in –τατος. The papyri have “scores” of examples of superlatives in –τατος (chiefly elative). The rarity of the –τατος forms in the N. T. may be purely accidental (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 154). It is not quite true that “only one example of the –τατος superlative” (Moulton, Prol., p. 78) survives in the N. T. There are three with –τατος, besides those with –ατος: ἁγιώτατος (Ju. 20), ἀκριβέστατος (Acts 26:5), τιµιώτατος (Rev. 18:12; 21:11). Thackeray (Gr., p. 182) finds –τατος much more common in the LXX, though chiefly in the elative sense and in the more literary books of the LXX (Wisd., 2–4 Macc., Prov., Esd.). ἀκριβέστατος (Ac. 26:5) Blass again credits to the literary language. ἔσχατος and πρωτος (ω from ὦϝα, Doric ᾅ) are both very frequent in the N. T. See Mt. 19:30 for the contrasted πρωτοι ἐσχατοι κτλ. The very great number of times that πρωτος (πρωτον included) is used in the N. T. (some 200) in contrast to only ten instances of πρότερον and one of προτέρα (Eph. 4:22) deserves comment. This seems in conflict with the observed disuse of the superlative in favour of the comparative. But a counter-tendency is at work here. The disappearance of duality before plurality has worked against πρότερον. Luke does not use πρότερον at all and it appears only once in Grenfell and Hunt’s four volumes of papyri. The LXX shows πρωτος displacing πρότερος (Thackeray, Gr., p. 183). So in English we say first story of a house with only two, first edition of a book which had only two, etc. It is almost an affectation in Greek and English, however good Latin it may be, to insist on πρότερος. So in Jo. 1:15 (πρωτον μου), 15:18 (πρωτον υμων), Ac. 1:1 (τον πρωτον λόγον) we have merely first of two and in the two first instances the ablative construction as with the comparative. Winer properly saw this usage of πρωτον to be true to the Greek genius. In Mt. 27:64 we have both ἔσχατος and πρωτος used of two, ἄταται ἢ ἐσχάτη πλάνη χείρων τῆς πρώτης. Πρότερος, is indeed used in the sense of the former in Eph. 4:22, whereas πρότερον in the sense of the first of two does

6 Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 294.
7 Ib.
9 This double superl. does not appear in the N. T., but various instances are noted in the pap. and the later Gk. as ἐλαχιστότατος, μεγιστότατος, πρώτιστα. So Lat. minissimus, pessimissimus. Cf. W.-M., p. 81; Dieterich, Unters., p. 181.
10 Moulton, Prol., p. 78; Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 297 f. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 54–57, for corresponding infrequency of the superl. forms in the LXX. The compar. is driving it out. Cf. also ib., p. vii.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 79
2 W.-M., p. 306.
appear in Heb. 7:27 (πρότερον—ἐπετεῖα). It is probably a defect in both Latin and Greek that the same forms were used to express the elative and true superlative sense (so as to comparative also). As the dual vanished, so it was inevitable that with the same principle at work either the comparative or the superlative would. Outside of ἔσχατος and πρῶτος where the principle crossed with a different application because πρότερος was disappearing, it is the superlative that goes down, especially the true superlative as opposed to the elative (intensive). Hermas, though in the vernacular, still uses the superlative in the elative (intensive) [Page 281] sense very often. In the N. T. then the comparative is beginning to take the place of the superlative, a usage occasionally found in classical Greek, and found now and then in the papyri. See I Cor. 13:13 τὰ τρία ταῦτα· μείζον δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη. See also ὁ μείζον (Mt. 18:4). But this matter will call for more comment under Syntax (ch. XIV, XIII, (i)).

III. NUMERALS (ἈΡΙΘΜΟΙ).

No great space is demanded for the discussion of the non-syntactical aspects of the numerals.

1. The Origin of Numerals. Donaldson thinks that seven of the first ten numerals may be traced to primitive pronominal elements. Pronouns and numerals belong to the stable elements of language, and the numerals are rather more stable than the pronouns in the Indo-Germanic tongues. See the numerals in substantial integrity in modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., pp. 80–84). The system of numeration is originally decimal (cf. fingers and toes) with occasional crossing of the duodecimal. There possibly were savages who could not count beyond two, but one doubts if the immediate ancestors of the Indo-Germanic peoples were so primitive as that. See previous discussion in this chapter, I, 3. Counting is one of the first and easiest things that the child learns. It is certain that the original Indo-Germanic stock had numerals up to 100 before it separated. The roots are widespread and fairly uniform.

2. Variety among Numerals.

(a) DIFFERENT FUNCTIONS. The numerals may be either substantive, adjective or adverb. So ἡ χιλιάς (Lu. 14:31), χίλιοι (2 Pet. 3:8), ἐπτάκις (Mt. 18:21). Number thus embraces separate ideas.

3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 34.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33. He cites the mod. Italian also which makes no distinction between the comp. and superl.
4 New Crat., p. 294.
5 Giles, Man., etc., p. 393.
6 lb.
7 However, see Moulton, Prol., p. 58. Cf. Taylor, Prim. Cult., I, p. 242 f.
8 Moulton, Prol., p. 58.
(b) The Cardinals (ὄνοματα Ὠριθμητικά). They may be either declinable or indeclinable, and this according to no very well-defined principle. The first four are declinable, possibly from their frequent use.10 After 200 (διακόσιοι, –αι, –α) they have the regular [Page 282] inflection of adjectives of the second and first declensions. The history of ἐξ, μία, ἕν is very interesting, for which see the comparative grammars.1

The indeclinable use of ἐξ (or adverbial use of κατά) is common in later Greek. Cf. καθ ἐξ in Mk. 14:19; (Jo. 8:9); Ro. 12:5.2 So modern Greek uses ἕνα as neuter with which Mayser3 compares ἕνα as feminine on an early ostrakon. But the modern Greek declines ἔνας, μία, ἕνα in all genders (Thumb, Handb., p. 81). Οὐδείς and μηδείς are both very common in the N. T. with the inflection of ἐξ. Μηθείς. occurs only once (Ac. 27:33). W. H. admit οὐδείς only seven times (all in Luke and Paul, as Ac. 20:33), and once (Ac. 15:9) οὐδέν is in the margin. Jannaris (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 170) calls this form in θ chiefly Alexandrian, rare in Attic, but Mayser (Gr., p. 180) notes οὐδείς as “Neubildung” while οὐδεὶς is good Attic. For history of it see Orthography and Phonetics, p. 219. The frequent use of δύο as indeclinable save in the plural form δυσί in the later Greek has already been commented on in this chapter (I, 3), as well as the disappearance of ἰμφασιον Ἱμμάρτερον. Indeclinable δύο is classical, and after Aristotle δυσί is the normal dative (Thackeray, Gr., p. 186). Τρία (possibly also τρίς) is occasionally indeclinable in the papyri.4 The common use of τέσσαρες in the κοινή and the occasional occurrence of τέσσαρες as accusative in N. T. MSS. (like Northwest Greek) have been noticed in chapters VI, 2, (a), and VII, I, 7, (c).5 Πέντε, ἕνα and ἕπτά need not detain us. The originally dual form ὅκτα is found only ten times, and five of them with other numerals. ἕνεκα appears only five times, while δέκα is nothing like so common as ἕπτά, not to mention the first five cardinals. Ἐνέκα is found six times, but δώδεκα is quite common, due chiefly to the frequent mention of the Apostles. From thirteen to nineteen in the N. T., like the papyri6 and the modern Greek, δέκα comes first, usually without καί, [Page 283] as δέκα ὅκτα (Lu. 13:4), though once with καί (Lu. 13:16). But unlike the papyri the N. T. never has δεκαδύο.1 But δεκαπέντε (as Jo. 11:18) and δεκατέσσαρες (as Gal. 2:1) occur several times each. Ἐκοσί is a dual form, while τρικοντά and so on are plural.2

10 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 35.
3 Gr. d. greek. Pap., p. 312. Perhaps the earliest ex. of indeclinable ἔνα. For the LXX usage cf. W.-Sch., p. 90.
4 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 315.
5 Ib. Cf. also Dittenb., 674. 28.
6 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 316.
2 Giles, Man., p. 398.
Ἐκατόν is one hundred like ἕ-παξ. W. H. accent ἐκατονταετής, not –έτης. Usually no conjunction is used with these numerals, as ἐκοσι τέσσαρες (Rev. 19:4), ἐκατόν ἐκοιν (Ac. 1:15), but τεσσαράκοντα καί ἡξ (Jo. 2:20). Cf. Rev. 13:18. In the LXX there is no fixed order for numbers above the “teens.” Thackeray, Gr., p. 188. The N. T. uses χίλιοι often and δισχίλιοι once (Mk. 5:13) and τρισχίλιοι once (Ac. 2:41). The N. T. uses μυρίας several times for the latter idea (‘myriads’), sometimes repeated, as μυριάδες μυριάδων (Rev. 5:11). So also χιλιάς is more common in the N. T. than χίλιοι, both appearing chiefly in Revelation (cf. 5:11). In the LXX there is no fixed order for numbers above the “teens.” Thackeray, Gr., p. 188. The N. T. uses χίλιοι often and δισχίλιοι once (Mk. 5:13) and τρισχίλιοι once (Ac. 2:41). The N. T. examples of μυρίος by reason of case do not distinguish between μυρίοι, ‘ten thousand’ (Mt. 18:24) and μυρίοι, ‘many thousands’ (1 Cor. 4:15). The N. T. uses μυρίας several times for the latter idea (‘myriads’), sometimes repeated, as μυριάδες μυριάδων (Rev. 5:11). So also χιλιάς is more common in the N. T. than χίλιοι, both appearing chiefly in Revelation (cf. 5:11). In Rev. 13:18 B and many cursives have χξς = ἑξακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα ἥξ, while the cursive 5 has χξς = ἥξακόσιοι δέκα ἥξ. As a rule in the N. T. MSS. the numbers are spelled out instead of mere signs being used.

(c) THE ORDINALS (ὀνόματα τακτικά). They describe rank and raise the question of order, πόστος. They are all adjectives of three endings and all have the superlative form –τος save πρότερος and δεύτερος which are comparative. In most cases the ordinals are made from the same stem as the cardinals. But this is not true of πρώτος nor indeed of δεύτερος (not from δύο, but from δεύο). Cf. the English superlative ‘first’ (with suffix -isto). Πρώτος has driven πρότερος out of use in the N. T. except as an adverb (or το πρότερον) save in one instance, προτέραν ἄναστροφήν (Eph. 4:22). The disappearance of πρώτος before the ordinal use of ἄς belongs to Syntax. In the N. T. as in the papyri the ordinals up to twelve are regular. From 13 to 19 the N. T., like the vernacular papyri (so Ionic and κοινή generally), puts the smaller number first and as a compound with καί, only the second half of the word in the ordinal form. So τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατος (Ac. 27:27), not τέταρτος καὶ δέκατος (Attic). But the papyri show examples of the usual Attic method, as ἑναντικαὶ ὁκοστός. The distinction between the decades (like τριακοστός) and the hundreds (like τριακοστός) should be noted. In modern Greek all the ordinals have disappeared out of the vernacular save πρώτος, δεύτερος, τρίτος, τέταρτος. The article with the cardinal is used instead.

(d) DISTRIBUTIVES IN THE N. T. The multiplicative distributives (with ending –πλοῦς) occur in the N. T. also. Ἀπλοῦς as an adjective is found only twice (Mt. 6:22=Lu. 11:34), both times about the eye. Διπλοῦς appears four times (as 1 Tim. 5:17). Cf. the Latin sim-plex, du-plex, English simple, diplomatic. The proportional distributives end in –πλασίων. As examples one may note ἐκατονταπλασίον (Lu. 8:8) and πολλαπλασία (Lu. 18:30). Cf. English “two-fold,” “three-fold,” etc. One of the commonest ways of expressing distribution is by repetition of the numeral as in

4 These both have a superl., as πρώτος and δεύτερος (Hom.). Brug., Gk. Gr., p. 212.
6 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 318.
7 Ib. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 35. So the LXX also. Thack., Gr., p. 188.
2 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. And even the use of forms like Ἠν καὶ ἐκοστόν, Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 318.
δύο δύο (Mk. 6:7). Cf. συμπόσια συμπόσια (Mk. 6:39 f.). In Lu. 10:1 we have ἀνά δύο δύο in the text of W. H., a “mixed distributive” (Moulton, Prol., p. 97). The modern Greek has either ἄπο δύο or διὸ δύο (Thumb, Handb., p. 83). It is a vernacular idiom which was given fresh impetus (Brugmann, Distributiva, p. 9) from the Hebrew idiom. Deissmann cites τρία τρία from O. P. 121 (iii/AD). Moulton (Prol., p. 21) follows Thumb (Hellen., p. 152) in denying that it is a Hebraism. See further ch. XIV, XV (d).

(e) NUMERAL ADVERBS. These are of two kinds, either like ἤμα (Ac. 24:26), δίχα, ‘in two’ (not in the N. T., though see διχάζω Mt. 10:35), or like ἰπαξ, ὅς, τρίς, etc. The one kind answers to multiplicatives and the other to proportionals. The numeral adverbs continue in use in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 189 f.). The modern Greek instead of the numeral adverb uses φορά (Thumb, Handb., p. 83).

IV. PRONOUNS (ἈΝΤΩΝΥΜΙΑΙ)

1. Idea of Pronouns. It is not the idea of a subject or object that is set forth by the pronoun, but the relation of a subject or object to the speaker. Sometimes, to be sure, as in conversation, [Page 285] the pronoun does not strictly stand in the place of a substantive. When one person addresses another, “I” and “thou” are plain enough from the nature of the circumstances. The pronoun indicates, but does not name the speaker, etc. In a sense then language is a sort of drama in which there are three characters, the speaker, the person addressed and the person spoken of. Hence the first and second personal pronouns have no gender, while the third person, who may or may not be present, has gender. Giles cites the case of Macaulay who repeated the substantive so often as almost to make the pronoun useless, though the reverse tendency is more common. The right use of pronouns is a good index of style.

2. Antiquity of Pronouns. The personal pronouns are probably the oldest part of the Indo-Germanic declension. Pronouns (and numerals) are the most persistent parts of speech. They are essential to the very life of a language. Strange enough, the Coptic and the Hebrew, for instance, are only alike in their pronouns and their numerals. In Greek as in Sanskrit and English the pronouns maintain themselves with great tenacity. The pronouns are also closely akin in all the Indo-Germanic tongues. Cf. Sanskrit ahám, Greek ἐγώ, Latin ego, Gothic ik, Anglo-Saxon ic, German ich, English I, French je. They retain the case-forms better than any other parts of speech.

3. Pronominal Roots. Indeed pronouns present an independent set of roots parallel to the verbal and nominal roots. As verb, noun, adjective, adverb, preposition, conjunctions, intensive particles grow up around the old verbal (and nominal) roots,
so pronouns represent a separate history. There are two great root-stocks then (verbal or nominal and pronominal). The pronouns can be resolved into monosyllabic roots. One may not follow Donaldson (now obsolete), when he calls all the pronouns originally demonstrative, and yet something can be said for that idea. In the Sanskrit Whitney calls this “very limited set of roots, the so-called pronominal or demonstrative roots.” Monro remarks that noun-stems name or describe while pronouns only point out; the one is predicative, the other demonstrative. The difference then is fundamental. “Pronouns are found to contain the same elements as those which furnish the person-endings of verbs.” (Monro, ib.)

4. Classification. Pronouns are either substantive in signification and inflection as ἔγὼ, adjective as ἡμετέρος, or adverb as οὗτος. The other classification is into nine or ten great classes: personal, intensive, reflexive, possessive, demonstrative, relative, interrogative, indefinite, distributive. The correlative pronouns can be regarded separately also. These classes will call for special comment in detail See also ch. XV, I.

(a) The Personal Pronouns. In all the Indo-Germanic tongues the personal pronouns vary a good deal in inflection from the substantives and adjectives. The various Greek dialects show great variety in the inflection of the personal pronouns. The nominative singular has a different stem in the first personal pronoun from the other cases in all the Indo-Germanic languages. The N. T. follows current and ancient usage fairly well in the form of the first and second personal pronouns. The same thing is true as to the enclitic and the emphatic forms in the oblique cases. The MSS. vary between μου and ἐμοῦ, etc. Not only do MSS. give the regular πρός με, but the papyri furnish εἰς με, περί μου, ὑπὸ μου. The question whether σου or σοῦ should be read is a very delicate one and rests almost wholly with the editor. W. H. have, for instance, ἐκ τοῦ ὁθονοῦ σου and ἐν τῷ ὁθονοῦ σοῦ in the same sentence (Mt. 7:4. Cf. also the next verse). Nestle here has no such refinement, but σου all through

8 Ib., p. 245.
9 Sans. Gr., p. 185.
10 Hom. Gr., p. 57; Bopp, Vergl. Gr., § 105.
1 K.-Bl., I, p. 579, have only five.


———, Novum Testamentum Graece. 8th ed. (1910).

———, Septuagint (Hastings’ D. B., 1902).
these verses. The third personal pronoun gave trouble in Greek as in some other languages. In Attic the old οὗ, οἷ, ἕ (without nominative) was chiefly reflexive, though not true of the Ionic. Possibly this pronoun was originally reflexive for all the persons, but came to be used also as the simple pronoun of the third person, whereas in Latin it remained reflexive and was restricted to the third person. The N. T. is like the κοινή [Page 287] in the use of αὐτός (common also in Attic) instead of οὗ as the third personal pronoun. It is used in all three genders and in all cases save that in the nominative it usually has emphasis (cf. Mt. 1:21), a matter to be discussed under Syntax. Indeed αὐτός, whatever its etymology, is originally an intensive pronoun (like Latin ipse), not a personal pronoun. The “frequent and almost inordinate use” (Thayer) of αὐτός in the LXX (cf. Jer. 18:3 f.) and the N. T. is noticeable. So modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 86)

(b) THE INTENSIVE PRONOUN. The N. T. has nothing new to say as to the form of the intensive αὐτός. It is usually in the nominative that it is intensive like αὐτός μόνος.


5 Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 33. He illustrates by the Eng.: “I will lay me down and sleep.” Cf. ὑµῖν in Mt. 6:19 f.

6 Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., p. 341.

1 Flensberg (Über Urspr. und Bild. des Pron. αὐτός, 1893, p. 69) denies that it is from αὖ, but rather from ava. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 244.

Thayer

THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).

——, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

Thumb


——, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


(Jo. 6:15), though not always (cf. Jo. 14:11). The modern Greek uses also a shorter form τοῦ, etc. (also Pontic στοῦ), as personal pronoun. The use of ὁ αὐτός may be compared with οὗ ἰδιος. See ch. XV, III, (g).

(c) REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS. The reflexive form is nothing but the personal pronoun plus the intensive αὐτός. The reflexive is one use of this intensive in combination with the personal pronoun. They were originally separate words. So αὐτός ἔγνω (Ro. 7:25) which is, of course, not reflexive, but intensive. The Greek reflexives have no nominative and the English has almost lost “himself,” “myself” as nominative. In the N. T. the first and second persons have a distinct reflexive form only in the singular (ἐμαυτοῦ, σεαυτοῦ). In 2 Th. 1:4 αὐτοῦς ἰμᾶς is obviously intensive, not reflexive. In 1 Cor. 7:35 ἰμῶν αὐτῶν it is doubtful. See ch. XV, IV, for further discussion. The contracted form σαυτοῦ is not found in the N. T. It is common in the Kingdom books in the LXX and occurs in the papyri. See even σατὸν in σὺ βλέπε σατὸν ἃπο τῶν Ιουδαίων, B.G.U. 1079 (A.D. 41). So as to αὐτοῦ. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 190. The modern Greek uses τοῦ ἐμαυτοῦ μου for the reflexive (Thumb, Handb., p. 88). The reflexive for the third person (usually ἑαυτοῦ in the singular, about twenty times αὐτοῦ, etc., in W. H., as αὐτόν in Jo. 2:24), while the only reflexive form for all persons in the plural in the N. T. has no secure place in the N. T. for the first and second person singular. The possible reflexive (or demonstrative?) origin of οὗ made this usage natural. It appears in the papyri (τὰ αὐτοῦ, Pet. I. 15, 15) and the late inscriptions1 for the first and second person singular. In the modern Greek the same thing is true. But in the N. T. only late MSS. read ἰμοὶ ἐμαυτοῦ against ἃπο σεαυτοῦ (عائلة) in Jo. 18:34. In Gal. 5:14 and Ro. 13:9 only Syrian uncialists have ἐμαυτὸν for σεαυτὸν. This use of ἐμαυτῶν for all three persons is fairly common in classical Attic. Indeed the personal pronoun itself was sometimes so used (δοκῶ μοι, for instance).2

2 Thumb, Handb., p. 85.
3 K.-Bl., I, p. 596.
4 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 62.
5 Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 144.
6 Thackeray


———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).

7 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 303 f.
1 Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 161.
2 Thumb, Handb., p. 88.
4 Cf. Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 63; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 167.
(d) **Possessive Pronouns (κτητικα ὁνωμίαι).** It is somewhat difficult in the discussion of the pronouns to keep off syntactical ground, and this is especially true of the possessive adjectives. For the etymology of these adjectives from the corresponding personal pronouns one may consult the comparative grammars. But it is the rarity of these adjectives in the N. T. that one notices at once. The third person possessives (ὅς, σφέτερος) have entirely disappeared. Σός is found in only two of Paul’s letters: 1 Cor. and Phil., and these only three times. Σός is found about twenty-six times and ὑμέτερος eleven (two doubtful, Lu. 16:12; 1 Cor. 16:17). Ὑμέτερος appears in Paul only in 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Ro. Ὑμέτερος appears only nine times counting Lu. 16:12, where W. H. have ὑμέτερον in the margin, and Ac. 24:6 which W. H. reject. It is only ἐμός that makes any show at all in the N. T., occurring some seventy-five times, about half of them (41) in the Gospel of John. Thumb and Moulton have made a good deal of the fact that in Pontus and Cappadocia the use of ἐμός, σός, etc., is still common, while elsewhere the genitive personal pronoun prevails. The point is that the Gospel of John thus shows Asiatic origin, while

6 Theol. Literaturzeit., 1893, p. 421.
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———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

Moultón, W. F., and Gedén, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

Moultón and Milligan, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

7 Prol., p. 40 f. He admits that the other possessives do not tell the same story.
8 Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 89.
Revelation is by another writer. But one can easily go astray in such an argument. The Gospel of Luke has ἐμός three times, but Acts not at all. The large amount of dialogue in the Gospel of John perhaps explains the frequency of the pronoun there. The possessive ἐμός is naturally in the mouth of Jesus (or of John his reporter) more than σός, for Jesus is speaking so much about himself. The possessive is more formal and more emphatic in the solemn [Page 289] words of Jesus in this Gospel.¹ This is probably the explanation coupled with the fact that John was doubtless in Asia also when he wrote the Gospel and was open to whatever influence in that direction was there. The discussion of details will come later, as will the common use of the genitive of the personal pronouns rather than the possessive adjective, not to mention the article. The reflexive pronoun itself is really possessive when in the genitive case. But this as well as the common idiom ὁ ἴδιος need only be mentioned here. The Bœotian inscriptions show ἰδιός in this sense as early as 150 B.C. (Claflin, Syntax of Bœotian Dialect Inscriptions, p. 42). The line of distinction between the pronouns is thus not always distinct, as when ἐκπέμπων (οὐκέπμπων) is used in the reciprocal sense (Lu. 23:12), a usage known to the ancients. The necessity in the N. T. of using the genitive of personal pronouns in the third person after the disappearance of ὃς is like the Latin, which used ejus, suus being reflexive. Farrar (Greek Syntax, p. 34) recalls the fact that its is modern, his being originally neuter also.

(e) DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS (δεικτικαὶ ὀνοματικὰ). But deictic must have a special limitation, for all pronouns were possibly originally deictic (marking an object by its position). The anaphoric (ἀναφορικαί) pronouns develop out of the deictic by usage. They refer to or repeat. The true relative is a further development of the anaphoric, which includes demonstrative in the narrower sense. In a strict historical method one should begin the discussion of pronouns with the demonstratives in the larger sense and show how the others developed.² But here we must treat the demonstrative pronouns in the narrower sense as distinct from the original deictic or the later relative. The demonstrative thus applies both to position and relation. The declension of the demonstratives is more akin to that of substantives than any of the other pronouns.³ ὁδὲ⁴ occurs only ten times in the N. T., and eight of these in the form τάδε, seven of which come in the formula in Rev. τάδε λέγει (as Rev. 2:1, etc.). The others are τάδε (Ac. 21:11), τῇδε (Lu. 10:39), τήνδε (Jas. 4:13).⁵ [Page 290] The inscriptions and the papyri agree with the N. T. in the great rarity of ὁδὲ in the later κοινὴ.¹ But in the LXX it is commoner, and chiefly here also τάδε λέγει (Thackeray, Gr., p. 191). There are also many examples of ὃς as a demonstrative, as Ro. 14:5 and

---

¹ Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 54. Dr. Abbott (Joh. Gr., p. 295) thinks that John’s love of contrast leads him to use ὑμεῖς as often as all the Synoptists.
² Claflin CLAFLIN, EDITH, Syntax of Bœotian Dialect Inscriptions (1905). 
³ Farrar FARRAR, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).
⁴ 2 So Riem. and Goelzer in their Phonét., pp. 316 ff.
⁵ 3 Ib.
⁶ 4 Gildersleeve (Am. Jour. of Phil., 1907, p. 235) considers ὁδὲ the pron. of the first person, οὗτος of the second, ἔκεινος of the third.
⁷ 5 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 35 f. For the etymology of the dem. pron. see Brug., Gk. Gr., p. 242 f.
¹ 1 See Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 145; Dieterich, Unters., p. 197; Mays, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 308.
also cf. ὁ, ἥ, τό with δὲ, as of δέ in Mt. 27:4. This latter demonstrative construction is very common. Ἄλτος is beginning to have a semi-demonstrative sense (common in modern Greek) in the N. T., as in Lu. 13:1, ἐν ἀποθήκῃ τῷ καρπῷ. There is little to say on the non-syntactical side about ἕκαστος and ὁὐστὸς save that both are very common in the N. T., ὁὐστὸς extremely so, perhaps four times as often as ἕκαστος which is relatively more frequent in John. Blass points out the fact that ὁὐστοί-ι does not appear in the N. T. (nor in the LXX), though the adverb νον-ι is fairly common in Paul and twice each in Acts and Hebrews. Ὀὐχί is much more frequent especially in Luke and Paul. Smyth compares ἕ-καστος (καστός in Homer) to Oscan e-tanto. Modern Greek uses both forms and also ἕ-τούς and τοῦτος in the nominative.

Of the correlative demonstratives of quality τοῖς is not found in the N. T. and τοῖς only once (2 Pet. 1:17). Τοιοῦτος (neuter τοιοῦτο and –ον) occurs fifty-seven times, chiefly in the Gospels and Paul’s earlier Epistles (Gal. 5:21). We find neither τός nor τοῖσος and τοιοῦτος (the only correlative demonstrative of quality) is less frequent than τοιοῦτος (cf. Lu. 7:9). The neuter is also in –ον and –ο. Of the correlative of age τηλικοῦτος alone is found four times (cf. Jas. 3:4). See also ch. XV, VI.

(f) RELATIVE PRONOUNS (ἀναφορικά ἀντιστοιχία). Homer shows the transition of the demonstrative to the relative, using five forms (ὁ, ὁς τε, ὅς, ὅς τε, ὅς τις). Attic dropped ὁ and ὁς τε as well as ὅς τε. This use of τε with ὁ and ὅς may be compared with the common use of the Latin qui=et is. So the Hebrew מִן ('this') is sometimes relative. Cf. German der and English that. Relatives in the narrower sense grew naturally out of the anaphoric use of the demonstrative. The weakening of ὁ to the article and the introduction of the longer demonstratives (ὁδε, ὁς τοιος, ἕκαστος) left ὅς more and more for the true relative use. ὅ and ὅς have a different etymology. Relative ὅς=Sanskrit yás. There are thus only two pure relatives that survive in the N. T., ὅς and ὅς τες, for ὅσπερ and ὅσπερ τοῦτο are not found save that the Western and Syrian classes read ὅσπερ in Mk. 15:6. ὅσπερ τοῦτο in Jo. 5:4 disappears with the rejection of that verse. Already the papyri and the inscriptions show the rare occurrence of ὅς τες, confined as a rule to the nominative and gradually disappearing in the modern Greek before ὅσπειρός and even ποῦ. Compare the vulgar “whar” in “the man whar said that.” ὅς τες is, of course, merely ὅς plus the indefinite τις in the sense of ‘any one’ or again of ‘somebody in particular.’ Both of these senses occur in the N. T. usage. The N. T. follows the papyri and inscriptions in using only the nominative of ὅς τες save the neuter accusative ὅ τι (Lu. 10:35), and the genitive in set phrases like ἔως ὅ τιν (Jo. 9:18). It is used in both the singular and the plural.

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 171.
3 lb., p. 35; Thackeray, p. 191.
4 The Ionic Dial., p. 448.
1 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 310.
however, but is otherwise nearly indeclinable. Ὅς γε (Ro. 8:32) is, of course, simply Ὅς plus the intensive particle γε. Ὅς itself is many times more common in the N. T. than ὅστις and raises no questions save many syntactical ones. Ὅς, Ὅσπος, Ὅσος, ἡλίκος are also relatives of quality, quantity and age. Ὅς is found only fourteen times in the N. T., ten of them in Paul’s writings (cf. 2 Cor. 10:11). Ὅσπος can count up only five examples, four in Paul if we credit to him Ac. 26:29. This is a little strange when one recalls how common it is in the modern Greek. But the correlatives generally are weak in the vernacular. Ὅσος is not in the N. T. nor modern Greek, but Ὅσος (1 Cor. 7:39) holds its own. As to ἡλίκος, it drops to four instances, two of them in the same sentence (Jas. 3:5).

(g) INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS. Τίς (τί) is fairly common in the N. T. both in direct (Mt. 21:31) and indirect questions (Mt. 20:22) like the papyri usage. Τίς, τί in the Thessalian Greek is κίς, κί. So Sanskrit kás, Latin quis, Gothic hwas, English who, German wer. In Latin and English the relative is formed from the same root, but not so in the Greek. In modern Greek, however, τίς has vanished before ποιός (cf. ὅστις before ὅ ποιός),6 accented ποιός, though τί (indeclinable) survives strangely enough in the sense of “what sort.”7 In the N. T. the qualitative correlative [Page 292] ποῖος is used fairly often as a direct interrogative (cf. Mk. 11:28) and sometimes as an indirect interrogative (Mt. 24:42). Ποταμός is used a few times in direct (Mt. 8:27) and indirect also (Lu. 7:39). Πόσος is still used as a direct interrogative (Mt. 12:12) in quantitative questions and a few times in indirect questions (Mk. 15:4). Πηλίκος occurs only twice (one of these doubtful, Gal. 6:11, W. H. ἡλίκοις margin) and both times in indirect question (Heb. 7:4). The disappearance of duality has taken πότερος entirely away, though πότερον occurs once as an adverb in an indirect question (Jo. 7:17). In the LXX we find πότερον only once in Job (Thackeray, Gr., p. 192). Modern Greek does not use πηλίκος, though πόσος survives.

(h) INDEFINITE PRONOUNS. Like the Latin ali-quis (interrogative quis) the Greek τίς differs from the interrogative τίς only in accent. It is very common in the N. T. (as Lu. 1:5), but already it is giving way to εἷς (Mt. 8:19), a usage not unknown to the older Greek.1 In the N. T. we have εἷς τίς together (Mk. 14:47; Lu. 22:50). Modern Greek has supplanted τίς, τί by κανείς (κανέν, εἷς) and καθείς (cf. καθό εἷς in N. T.).2 The negative forms μήτις and οὔτες do not appear in the N. T. save that μήτι occurs in questions (Mt. 12:23) and μή τίς with ἵνα. But μηδείς and οὐδείς are very common. The old δείνα meets us only once (Mt. 26:18), but hangs on in the modern Greek.3 Οὐ πᾶς and μὴ πᾶς belong wholly to Syntax.

(i) DISTRIBUTIVE AND RECIPROCAL PRONOUNS. These pronouns have an insecure place in the N. T. with the exception of ἀλλος, ἀλλήλων, ἕκαστος and ἑτέρος.

6 Thumb, Handb., p. 94.  
7 lb.  
2 Thumb, Handb., p. 95 f.  
3 lb., p. 98.
Ἑκάτερος like πότερος has vanished, as implying duality. It is rare in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 192). Ἀμφω is gone, but ἄμφοτεροι lingers on in some fourteen instances (cf. Mt. 9:17). Ἀλλήλων (composed of ἄλλος, ἄλλος) is naturally only in the oblique cases of the plural, but is fairly common (cf. Jo. 4:33). It has vanished in the modern Greek. Ἐκαστος on the other hand appears only in the singular except in Ph. 2:4 (probably twice there). It too has disappeared in the modern Greek. Ἐτερος is beside ἄμφοτεροι the only surviving dual pronoun, and it goes down in the modern Greek along with ἄμφοτεροι. It is less common (97 times) in the N. T. [Page 293] than ἄλλος (150), chiefly in Matthew, Luke, Paul, Heb., never in Revelation, Peter, and only once in Jo. (19:37) and Mk. (16:12) and this latter in disputed part. It is usually in the singular (73 times, plural 24). The distinction (not always observed in the N. T.) between ἄλλος and ἔτερος belongs to Syntax. The use of ἐς τὸν ἕνα as reciprocal (1 Th. 5:11) and of ἐπάνων (1 Cor. 6:7) along with other uses of ἄλλος and ἔτερος will receive treatment under Syntax.

V. Adverbs (ΕΠΙΡΡΗΜΑΤΑ)

1. NEGLECT OF ADVERBS. A glance at the average grammar will show that the grammarians as a rule have not cared much for the adverb, though there are some honorable exceptions. Winer has no discussion of the adverb save under Syntax. Still others have not understood the adverb. For instance, Green1 says that once in the N. T. “a preposition without change is employed as an adverb,” viz. ὑπὲρ ἐγώ (2 Cor. 11:23). That is a perfunctory error which assumes that the preposition is older than the adverb. It is of a piece with the idea that regards some adverbs as “improper” prepositions. Donaldson2 says that, with compliments to Horne Tooke, “the old grammarian was right, who said that when we know not what else to call a part of speech, we may safely call it an adverb.” Certainly it is not easy nor practicable always to distinguish sharply between the adverb and preposition, conjunction, interjections and other particles.3 But the great part played by the adverb in the history of the Greek language makes it imperative that justice shall be done to it. This is essential for the clear understanding of the prepositions, conjunctions and particles as well as the adverb itself. Substantive and verb blend at many points and glide easily

4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179. The pap. (Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 312) show a few examples of ἐκτάτερος, μηθέταρος, ὀπότερος. Once (Prov. 24:21) the LXX has μηθέτερος.

Winer, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).


3 Brug., Gk. Gr., p. 250. In the Sans. the line is still less clearly drawn between the various indeclinable words (Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 403).
into each other in English, for instance. Attention has often been called to the use of “but” in English as adverb, preposition, conjunction, substantive, adjective and pronoun.4

[Page 294] 2. Formation of the Adverb. The name suggests a mere addendum to the verb, an added word (like the adjective) that is not necessary. But in actual fact adverbs come out of the heart of the language, expressions fixed by frequent usage.

(a) Fixed Cases. A large number1 of words retain the case-ending in the adverb and often with the same function. Perhaps the bulk of the adverbs are either the simple case used directly in an adverbial sense or the formation by analogy. It is just because adverbs are usually fixed case-forms or remnants of obsolete case-forms that they deserve to be treated under the head of Declensions. They have to be approached from the standpoint of the cases to understand their history. Leaving analogy for the moment let us see some examples of the cases that are so used. The cases most commonly used thus are the ablative, locative, instrumental and accusative.2 The dative and genitive are seldom employed as adverbs. The vocative never occurs in this sense, and the nominative (so occasionally in Sanskrit) only in a phrase like καθε ἑς in the addition to John’s Gospel (Jo. 8:9), τὸ καθ ης (Ro. 12:5). Cf. ὅνα-μίς. Examples of the various cases as used in the N. T. will be given without attempting to be exhaustive. The κοινή and the modern Greek illustrate the same general tendencies as to adverbs that we see in the earlier Greek. Here the N. T. is in close accord with the papyri as to adverbs in use.3

(1) The Accusative. The most obvious illustration of the accusative in adverbs is the neuter of adjectives in the positive, comparative and superlative (singular and plural). In the comparative the singular is the rule, in the superlative the plural, but variations occur.4 In the modern Greek accusative plural is more common even in the comparative (Thumb, Handb., p. 77). Take for the positive αὐριόν, εὐθύ (ς added later), ἔγγυς, μέγα, μέσον, πλησίον, πολύ, ταχύ, σήμερον, ἄλλα (ἄλλα), πολλά, μακράν. The comparative may be illustrated by ὑστερον, βέλτιον, and the superlative by πρῶτον (and πρῶτα) and ἡδίστα. Cf. also ταχίστην. Sometimes the article is used with the adjective where the adverbial idea is encroaching, as τὸ λοιπόν, τὸ πολλά, and note also τὴν ἄρχην (Jo. 8:25), substantive with article. But the substantive alone has abundant examples also, as ὄλμην, ἄρχην, δορεάν, πέραν, χάριν. [Page 295] Σχεδόν is a specimen of the adverb in –δον, –δα. Cf. also ὁμοθυμάδων, ὀμηδάν. The accusative in adverbs is specially characteristic of the κοινή (cf. Mayser, Gr. d).

2 Hirt, Handb. etc., pp. 320 ff.
griech. Pap., p. 459; Schmid, Attic., II, pp. 36 ff.). In the modern Greek the accusative for the adverbs is almost universal. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 77.

(2) The Ablative. All adverbs in –ως are probably ablatives. Καλως, for instance, is from an original καλωδ. The δ (Sanskrit τ) is dropped and a final ω is added.1 Cf. old Latin meritūd, facilum.2 The ούτως, ως of the Greek correspond exactly with the old Sanskrit tād, yād. The ending in –ως comes by analogy to be exceedingly common. Practically any adjective can by –ως make an adverb in the positive. Some, like διαλείπτως, belong to the later Greek (κοινή).3 Participles also may yield such adverbs as φειδομένως (2 Cor. 9:6), ὁμολογομένως (1 Tim. 3:16), δόντως (Mk. 11:32). Radermacher (N. T. Gk., p. 54) cites ἄρκοντως, τετολµούτως (Diod., XVI, 74. 6), etc. The bulk of the adverbs in –ως are from adjectives and pronouns. But the examples of –ως are rare in the modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 77).

(3) The Genitive. There are not many adverbs in this case outside of those ending in –ου, like αὐτου, ὅπου, πού, ὡς, ὅς (ἔξης). This use survives in modern Greek. Cf. the local use of the genitive in Ἐφέσου (Ac. 19:26). The common use of ἡμέρας, νυκτός verges toward the adverb.4 Cf. also τοῦ λοποῦ (Gal. 6:17). The genitive is almost never used adverbially in Sanskrit.5

(4) The Locative. This is a rare use in Sanskrit,6 but more frequent in Greek. Instance ἐκά, κύκλῳ, οίκῳ, πρωί. So also ἄεί, πέρυσι, etc. Hirt7 (but not Brugmann) likewise treats examples like δήμοςιθ, ἰδίῃ, πεζῇ, etc., as locative. Certainly ποι is
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BRUGMANN, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).

———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).
locative, but it does not appear in the N. T. Cf. also τῷ ὄντι (article and participle) in adverbial sense (Ro. 7:23).

(5) The Instrumental. This case lends itself naturally to the adverb where the idea of manner (associative) is so common.8 In the Sanskrit it is very common for adverbs to be in the instrumental.9 Such adverbs as ἃμα (cf. ablative ἄμος from same root), εἰκη, κρυφη(ή), λάθρα(ή), μάλα, πάντη(ή), πανταχη(ή), τάχα, etc., are doubtless [Page 296] instrumental. In some cases ἰ is added to bring it in harmony with the locative-dative cases with which it blended.1 Brugmann2 also puts here such words as ἄνο, κάτο, ἔξο, ἄνωτέρο, ἄνωτάτο, οὖ-πω. –Πω is by ablaut from –πη (so Laconic πη-ποκα).

(6) The Dative. As in the Sanskrit,3 so in the Greek the dative is very rare in adverbs. Indeed Hirt4 is not far wrong when he says that it is not easy to find any dative adverbs distinct from the locative, though he accepts παραί, χαμαί, κτλ. as dative (p. 260). Brugmann5 thinks otherwise, and one is slow to dissent from the modern master of comparative grammar. He cites πάλαι, χαμαί, καταί, παραί, κύκλῳ, σπουδῆ, etc. But Delbrück6 is against Brugmann here. Besides the dative in its proper sense is a little difficult to fit into an adverb. But we have given enough to justify the treatment of adverbs under the declensions.7

(b) SUFFIXES. Other adverbs are formed by suffixes which may be relics of lost case-endings that are no longer clear to us. Here only the main suffixes in use in the N. T. will be mentioned. For –άκις take πολλάκις and the numeral adverbs like τετράκις, etc. For –αχοῦ note πανταχοῦ. For –δε take οίκαδε. For –δον take

8 Hirt, Handb., p. 321.
1 Hirt, Handb., p. 321 f.
4 Handb., p. 321.
5 Griech. Gr., p. 252. Cf. also p. 229 f., where he acknowledges the other point of view as possible.
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6 Grundr., p. 60 f.
ὁμοθυμαδὸν (Ac. 18:12). For –ης we may note ἐξαίφνης, ἐξῆς, ἐφεξῆς. Those in –θε(ν) are numerous, like ἄνωθεν, ἔξωθεν, οὐρανόθεν, παῖδιόθεν, etc. Αὐτὸθι is common in the papyri, but not in the N. T. 8 The deictic ἰ appears in νυνὶ and οὐχ. An example of –τος appears in μόλις (cf. μόγις Text. Rec. in Lu. 9:39). For –τί note ἐβραϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί, Λυκαονιστί, Ρωμαίστι. For –κα take ἡγίκα. For –ν we have νῦν, πάλιν. For –τε we may mention ὁ-τε, πό-τε. Then –ς is added in the case of δι-ς, τρι-ς and various other words like ἄχρις, εὐθῦς, μέχρις, οὕτως, τετράκις, χωρίς, etc. Εκείνη is an instance of –σε. Then –τος appears in ἐκτός, ἐντός. Finally –χα is seen in ἔννυχα. The papyri furnish parallels for practically all these N. T. examples (and many more). 9 Πατὸς seems to stand by itself.

(c) COMPOUND ADVERBS. Some adverbs are due to the blending [Page 297] of several words into one word, perhaps with modification by analogy. The κοινὴ is rather rich in these compound adverbs and Paul fairly revels in them. As samples take ἐκπαλαι (2 Pet. 2:3), κατενώπιον (Eph. 1:4), παρατίκη (2 Cor. 4:17), ἀπροσωπολήμπτως (1 Pet. 1:17), παραχρήμα (Lu. 1:64), ἐκτός (Eph. 4:10), ἐπερείπω (2 Cor. 10:16), ἐπερευκρίγεια (1 Th. 3:10), ἐπερημίω (2 Cor. 11:5), ἐπερεπερισό(ῦ (Mk. 7:37), etc. The intense emotion in 2 Cor. explains the piling-up and doubling of some of these prepositional phrases. Occasionally a verbal clause is blended into one word and an adverb made by analogy with –ως. So (from νον ἔχω) νονεχόντως (Mk. 12:34), used by Aristotle and Polybius along with another adverb like νονεχόντως in Isocrates. 1 But in Mark it is used without any other adverb. ὑπερβαλλόντως (2 Cor. 11:23) is made from the participle and is common in Attic (Xen., Plato). There are, besides, adverbial phrases like ἀπό μακρόθεν (Mk. 15:40) ἀναθενέ, ἐς κάτω (Mt. 27:51), etc. Cf. Con. and Stock, Sel. fr. LXX, p. 47. See chapter V, p. 170, for discussion of the formation of compound adverbs which are very common in the κοινὴ. Paul uses the idiom frequently. For the use of adverbs in the κοινὴ, see Mayser’s careful list from the papyri, pp. 455 ff., and Nachmanson, Magn. Inschr., p. 138 f. New adverbs are continually made in the later Greek, though many of the older ones survive in the modern Greek. Cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 78 ff. He groups them under place, time, manner and quantity.

(d) ANALOGY. A word is needed to accent the part played by analogy in the formation of adverbs, though it has already been alluded to. The two examples mentioned above, νονεχόντως and ὑπερβαλλόντως will serve as good illustrations of the

1 Giles, Man., p. 240.
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work done by the principle of analogy. The bulk of the –ως adverbs are ablatives made by analogy.\(^2\)

\((e)\) **THE COMPARISON OF ADVERBS.** In general the adverb is like the adjective save that in the comparative the accusative singular is used, like τάχιον, and the accusative plural in the superlative, like τάχιστα. But, *per contra*, note πρώτον and κατωτέρω (Mt. 2:16), περισσοτέρως (2 Cor. 1:12), σπουδαιότέρως (Ph. 2:28), Ἐσχήτως (Mk. 5:23), πορρότερω (Lu. 24:28. AB –ρον). Cf. further ch. XII, III.

3. **Adverbial Stems.** The derivation of the adverb deserves a further word, though the facts have already been hinted at. Brief mention is all that is here called for by way of illustration.

[Page 298] (a) **SUBSTANTIVES.** As N. T. examples of adverbs from substantives may be mentioned ἄρχην, δωρεάν, χάριν.

(b) **ADJECTIVES.** It was and is always possible to make an adverb from any Greek adjective by the ablative ending –ως. Cf. both ταχύ (accusative) and ταχέως (ablative). Indeed the line between the adjective and adverb was never sharply drawn, as will be shown when we come to the study of the syntax of the adjective (cf. English “looks bad,” “feels bad,” a different idea from the adverb, however). In passing note ἐκοὐσα (Ro. 8:20) and δευτεραῖοι (Ac. 28:13) in strict accordance with the Greek idiom. The comparison of adverbs is another link between adverb and adjective. In most cases, however, it is merely the use of the comparative and superlative forms of the adjective as an adverb. But in some cases the comparative and superlative adverb is made without any corresponding adjective, done by analogy merely. So μάλλον, μάλα, ἀνώτερον from the adverb ἄνω. Cf. also ἐγγύτερον (Ro. 13:11) from ἐγγύς, κατωτέρω (Mt. 2:16) from κάτω, and πορρότερον (Lu. 24:28) from πόρρω. Comparative adjectives made from positive adverbs are, on the other hand, seen in ἐξότερος (Mt. 8:12), ἐσώτερος (Heb. 6:19), κατώτερος (Eph. 4:9). Κατωτέρω, περισσοτέρως (Heb. 2:1, often in Paul; (Gal. 1:14), σπουδαιότερος (Ph. 2:28), τόλμητερος (Ro. 15:15) rather than the forms in –τερον are due to analogy of the ablative –ως. Adverbs made from participles can be looked upon as adjectival or verbal in origin, since the participle is both verb and adjective.

(c) **NUMERALS.** All that is necessary here is to mention such words as πρώτον, δίς, ἐπτάκις, etc. In Ac. 11:26 we have πρώτος instead of πρῶτον. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 58) cites for –ως Clem., Hom. 9, 4; 16, 20; Polyb. vi, 5. 10; Diod., etc.

(d) **PRONOUNS.** The pronominal adverbs are very numerous, like οὖτος, ὑσσωτος, etc., αὐτοῦ, ποτέ, τότε, ὄδε, etc. As with the correlative pronouns, so the correlative adverbs are lessening. Of the indefinite adverbs only ποτέ, πῶ (a few times), and πος (only in ἐπως, μή πος) appear.\(^1\) Forms like οὔ, ὁποι, ποῖ have vanished before οὖ,

\(^2\) Ib.

\(^1\) Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 59 f.
ὅπου, ποῦ. Cf. English,² “where (rather than ‘whither’) are you going?” Cf. also the accusative τί (Mk. 10:18) = “why.”

(c) VERBS. Besides such words as νοεῖν (νοεῖνως, νοεῖσθαι) and participles like ὄντως, ὑπολογομένως, φειδομένως, ύπερβαλλόντως one should note Ἐβραίστι (from Ἐβραίζω), Ἑλληστὶ (from Ἑλληνίζω), [Page 299] etc. In Jas. 4:13; 5:1 ἄγε is used with the plural as an adverb, if indeed it is not in reality an interjection. The modern view of the imperative forms like ἄγε (cf. vocative ἄγε from ἄγος) is that it is merely the root without suffix.¹ In the case of δέηρο we actually have a plural δεήτε. Moulton² illustrates the close connection between interjectional adverb and verb by the English “Murder!” which could be mere interjection or verbal injunction according to circumstances.

4. Use of Adverbs. This is still another way of looking at the subject, but it is a convenience rather than a scientific principle. Blass³ in his N. T. Grammar follows this method solely.

(a) ADVERBS OF MANNER. These are very numerous indeed, like πνευματικῶς, σπουδαίως, Ἑσχάτως ἐχει (Mk. 5:23) is not like the English idiom. The phrase really means that she has it in the last stages. Cf. βερέως ἑχομαι. (Pap. Brit. M., 42). Ἐῦ, so common in Attic, has nearly gone in the N. T. (only in Mk. 14:7; Mt. 25:21, 23; Ac. 15:29; Eph. 6:3 quot.). Ἐγνε occurs also in Lu. 19:17 (W. H. text, marginΕὐ). Καλῶς is common. Βέλτιον appears once (2 Tim. 1:18) and κρεσσον often (1 Cor. 7:38). The comparative adverb διπλότερον (Mt. 23:15) is irregular in form (Ὅπλούστερον) and late.⁴

(b) ADVERBS OF PLACE. These answer the questions “where” and “whence.” “Whither” is no longer a distinct idea in N. T. Greek nor the κοινὴ generally. Even in ancient Greek the distinction was not always maintained.⁵ Blass⁶ carefully illustrates how “here” and “hither” are both expressed by such words as ἔνθαδε (Ac. 16:28; Jo. 4:16), oddly enough never by ἔντακθα, though ἄδε (especially in the Gospels) is the common word (Lu. 9:33, 41). But ἐκεῖ is very common in the sense of ‘there’ and ‘thither’ (here again chiefly in the Gospels) as in Mt. 2:15, 22. Ἐξεσθε (‘thither’) is found only twice, and both times in Acts (21:3; 22:5), which has a literary element. So ὁδ in both senses (Lu. 4:16; 10:1) and ἄδε (very common in John’s Gospel, 14:3 f.). The interrogative ποῦ (Jo. 1:39; 3:8) follows suit. The indefinite ποῦ is too little used to count (Heb. 2:6) and once without local idea, rather ‘about’ (Ro. 4:19). Ἀλλαξοῆ occurs once (Mk. 1:38), but πανταχοῦ several times (Lu. 9:6, etc.). ὅμω is found four times only (Jo. 4:36, etc.), and once D adds ἧμοσε (Ac. 20:18). [Page 300] Πανταχῆ(ṇ) likewise is read once (Ac. 21:28), Syrian class –οῦ. In Ac. 24:3 πάντη(ṇ) is contrasted with πανταχοῦ. Other adverbs of place in the N. T. are ἄνω, ἐντός,

2 Green, Handb. to N. T. Gk., p. 137.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 171.
2 Ib., p. 171 f. But adv. from verbs are “late and always rare,” Giles, Man., p. 342.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gr., pp. 58 ff.
4 Ib.
5 Ib.
6 Ib.
A number of adverbs answer to the question “whence.” They are usually words in –

\[\text{ἦκτός, ἦσω, ἦξω, κάτω.}\]

The only pronominal forms that appear in the N. T. are ἔσωθεν (Jo. 10:1) is found only once in the N. T. Ἄνωθεν (Mt. 15:38) is more frequent, though never κάτωθεν. The only pronominal forms that appear in the N. T. are ἔσωθεν (Mt. 17:20), ἐν ὑθεν (twice in Jo. 19:18, and in contrast with ἔσωθεν Rev. 22:2), πάντωθεν (Mt. 1:45), ὑθεν (Mt. 12:44), πόθεν (Mt. 21:25). The last two are fairly frequent. Blass\(^1\) notes how “stereotyped and meaningless” the ending –

\[\text{θεν} \] has become in many examples, especially with ἐ

\[\text{προσθεν} \] (common in Matthew and Luke) and ὁπαθεν (rare). See both in Rev. 4:6. In some cases by a little effort the real force of –

\[\text{θεν} \] may be seen, but the old Greek soon allowed it to become dim in these words. In the case of ἔσωθεν and ἔξωθεν Blass\(^2\) insists on the force of –

\[\text{θεν} \] only in Mk. 7:18, 21, 23; Lu. 11:7. Cf. also κυκλόθεν (Rev. 4:8). The addition of ἀπο occasionally may be due either to the weakened sense of –

\[\text{θεν} \] or to a fuller expansion of its true idea. So ἀπ  ἔσωθεν twice (Mt. 27:51, so W. H. against ΝL ἅνωθεν, Mk. 15:38), ἀπο μακρόθεν (Mk. 5:6; 15:40, etc.), ἔκ παλιόθεν (Mk. 9:21). Blass\(^3\) observes that both μακρόθεν and παλιόθεν are late words and that late writers are fond of using prepositions with –

\[\text{θεν} \] as Homer had ἀπο ὑπανόθεν. But Luke used only ὑπανόθεν in Ac. 14:17.

\(c\) Adverbs of Time. The list is not very great, and yet appreciable. Ἀεί (Ac. 7:51) is not in the Gospels at all and is largely supplanted by πάντωτε (Jo. 6:34) like the κοινή and modern Greek. Ἡνίκα is read twice only (2 Cor. 3:15 f.). Ἑπειτα (1 Cor. 12:28) and ἔτα (Mk. 4:17) are about equally frequent. Ἐτε (Mt. 9:25) occurs 101, ἐταν (Mt. 9:15) 130 times. Ὄποτε appears only in the Syrian class in Lu. 6:3 against the neutral and Western ὑτε (so W. H.). Πότε (Mt. 17:17) and ποτε (Lu. 22:32) are both far less common than ὑτε and ὑταν. But τὸτε and πάλιν amply atone for this scarcity. All the numeral adverbs (Διαξ, πρῶτον, δίς, ἐπτάκις etc.) belong here also.

5. Scope of Adverbs. Here again we are retracing ground and crossing our steps, but a brief word will be useful to show how from adverbs grew other parts of speech. The fact has been stated before. What is here called for is some of the proof and illustration.

[Page 301] (a) Relation between Adverbs and Prepositions. When we come to study prepositions (ch. XIII) a fuller discussion of this matter will be given. Here the principle will be stated. “The preposition therefore is only an adverb specialized to define a case-usage.”\(^1\) That puts the matter in a nutshell. Many of the older grammars have the matter backwards. The use of prepositions with verbs is not the original one. In Homer they are scattered about at will. So with substantives. “Anastrophe is therefore no exception, but the original type”\(^2\) like τίνος ἔνεκα (Ac. 19:32). To quote

\(^1\) Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 59.
\(^2\) Ib.
\(^3\) Ib.
Giles again, “between adverbs and prepositions no distinct line can be drawn.” As samples of cases in prepositions take παρ-ός (gen.), παρ-αί (dat.), περ-ι (loc.), παρ-ά (instr.). It is unscientific to speak of adverbs which “may be used like prepositions to govern nouns” and then term them “preposition adverbs” or “spurious prepositions.” Prepositions do not “govern” cases, but more clearly define them. When adverbs do this, they are just as really prepositions as any others. These will be treated therefore in connection with the other prepositions. They are words like ὅμως, ἀνευ, ἔξω, ὅπισον, etc.

(b) Adverbs and Conjunctions. These are usually of pronominal origin like ὅ-τε (acc. plus τε), οὐ (gen.), οὐς (abl.), ὄλλα (acc. plural), ἕνα (instr.), etc. Some conjunctions are so early as to elude analysis, like δὲ, τε, etc. But in most cases the history can be traced. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 60) remarks on the poverty of the N. T. Greek in particles, a poverty as early as the Αθηναίων Πολιτεία of Aristotle, which is much barer than the N. T. These conjunctions and other particles in the N. T. are cited by Blass: ὀλλά, ὅμως, ὅρα, ὑπερέχει, ὥστε, ὅπως, ὅπου, διόπερ, ἐνά, ἐνάντια, εἰ, εἰπερ, ἐτά, ἐτε, ἐπάν, ἐτει, ἐπειδή, ἐπειδήπερ, ἐπείπερ (only as variation in Ro. 3:30), ἐπείπτα, ἔος, ἦ or εἴ μήν, ἦδη, ἥνικα (ἥπερ only variation in Jo. 12:43), ἡτοι, ἰνα, καθά, καθάπερ, καθό, καθότι, καθώς, καί, καίπερ, καίτοι(γε), μέν, μενοῦντε, μέντοι, μέχρι(ς) οὐ (μέχρις variation for), μή, μηδέ, μήτε, μήτι, ναί, νή, ὅμως, ὅποτε, ὅπως, ὅταν, ἄτε, ὄτι, οὐ, οὐχί, οὐδέ, οὐκοῦν, οὐν, οὐτε, περ with other words, πλήν, πρίν, τε, τοι (in κατοι, μέντοι, etc.), τοι-γαρ-οὖν, τοίνυν, οὐς, οὐσάν, οὐσί, ὅπερ, ὅπερει, ὅπετε. Several of these occur only once (δήπος, ἐπειδήπερ, νή, ὅποτε, οὐκοῦν). [Page 302] But Blass has not given a complete list. Cf. also διότι, δηεν, οὐ, ὅποι, πότε, etc. Fifteen other Attic particles are absent from this N. T. list. The matter will come up again in ch. XXI.

(c) Adverbs and Intensive particles. Πέρ is an older form of περ-ι. Usually, however, as with γε, the origin is obscure. Others used in the N. T. are δῆ, δήπος, μέν, τοί (with other particles). See ch. XXI.

(d) Adverbs and Interjections. Interjections are often merely adverbs used in exclamation. So with ἄγε, δεῦρο, δεῦτε, ἔξα, ἰδε, ἰδού, οὐ, οὐάι, ὤ. Interjections may be mere sounds, but they are chiefly words with real meaning. ἄγε and ἰδε are both verb-stems and ἰδού is kin to ἰδε. The origin of the adverbs here used as interjections is not always clear. Οὐάι as in Mt. 11:21 (common in the LXX, N. T. and Epictetus) has the look of a dative, but one hesitates. As a substantive ὧν ὑμαί is probably due to ὠλίψις or ταλαιπωρία (Thayer). Cf. chapters XII, V, and XVI, V, (e), for use of article with adverb, as τὸ νῦν. For the adverb like adjective, as ἧ ὄντως χήρα (1 Tim. 5:5),
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3 Ib.
4 Green, Handb., etc., p. 138.
5 Giles, Man., p. 343.
In Lu. 12:49 τί may be an exclamatory adverb (accusative case), but that is not certain. Δεῦρο sometimes is almost a verb (Mk. 10:21). The relative adverb ὡς is used as an exclamation in ὡς ὕραμι (Ro. 10:15) and ὡς ἀνεξερεύνητα (Ro. 11:33). The interrogative πῶς is likewise so employed, as πῶς δύσκολον ἔστι (Mk. 10:24), πῶς συνέχομαι (Lu. 12:50), πῶς ἔφιλεν ὑπόν (Jo. 11:36). Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 258. Thus we see many sorts of adverbs and many ways of making them.

CHAPTER VIII
CONJUGATION OF THE VERB (ῬΗΜΑ)

I. Difficulty of the Subject. The discussion of the verb gives greater difficulty than that of the noun for two reasons especially. For one thing the declension (κλίσις) of nouns is more stable than the conjugation (συζυγία) of the verb. This difficulty applies to both the forms and the syntax of the verb. There is besides special difficulty in the Greek verb due to the ease and number of new verbal formations. Sanskrit and Greek can be compared with more ease than Greek and Latin. Giles indeed calls the Latin verb-system “only a mutilated fragment” of the original parent stock, so that “a curious medley of forms” is the result, while in the syntax of the verb no two Indo-Germanic languages are further apart than Greek and Latin. Both noun and verb have suffered greatly in the ravages of time in inflection. It is in declension (cases) and conjugation (personal endings) that noun and verb mainly differ. “These suffixes [used for the present tense], however, are exactly parallel to the suffixes in the substantive, and in many instances can be identified with them.”

II. Nature of the Verb.

(a)Verb and Noun. In itself verbum is merely ‘word,’ any word, and so includes noun also. As a matter of fact that was probably true originally. In isolating languages only position and the context can determine a verb from a noun, and that is often true in English to-day. But in inflected tongues the case-endings and the personal endings mark off noun and verb. But in simple truth we do not know which is actually older, noun or verb; both probably grew up together from the same or similar roots. Schoemann, however, is much more positive that “the first word which man spoke was essentially much more a verb than a noun.” But, whether the verb is the first word or not, it is undoubtedly the main one and often in the inflected tongue forms a sentence in itself, since the stem expresses the predicate and the ending the

---

1 Giles, Man., p. 403 f.
2 Hirt, Handb., p. 332.
3 Man., p. 404.
5 Giles, Man., p. 424.
7 Die Lehre von den Redet. etc., 1864, p. 31.
It is worth noting also that by the verb-root and the pronominal root (personal endings) the verb unites the two ultimate parts of speech. The verb and noun suffixes, as already said, are often identical (Giles, Manual, etc., p. 424). In all sentences the verb is the main part of speech (the word par excellence) save in the copula (ἐστι) where the predicate is completed by substantive or adjective or adverb (another link between verb and noun). “A noun is a word that designates and a verb a word that asserts” (Whitney, Am. Jour. of Philol., xiii, p. 275). A man who does not see that “has no real bottom to his grammatical science.”

(b) MEANING OF THE VERB. Scholars have found much difficulty in defining the verb as distinct from the noun. Indeed there is no inherent difference between nouns and verbs as to action, since both may express that. The chief difference lies in the idea of affirmation. The verb affirms, a thing not done by a noun except by suggested predication. Verbs indicate affirmation by the personal endings. Affirmation includes negative assertions also. Farrar cites also the German “abstract conception of existence” (Humboldt) and action (Tätigkeitswort), but they do not fit the facts. Curiously enough many ancient grammarians found time to be the main idea in the verb.

(c) PURE AND HYBRID VERBS. The close kinship between nouns and verbs appears in the verbal nouns which partake of both. The infinitive is a verbal substantive, and the participle is a verbal adjective. There is also the verbal in –τος and –τέος. Some of the properties of both verb and noun belong to each. They are thus hybrids. They are generally called non-finite verbs, because they do not make affirmation. They have no personal endings. They fall short of being mere verbs, but they are more than the noun. The pure verb has personal endings and is thus finite (limited). The two must be kept distinct in mind, though they run together sometimes in treatment. The finite verb has person and number expressed in the personal ending. The verbum finitum has modes while the verbum infinitum (infinitive and participle) has no modes.

III. The Building of the Verb. This is not the place for a full presentation of the phenomena concerning verb-structure. The essential facts as to paradigms must be assumed. But attention can be called to the fact that the Greek verb is built up by means of suffixes and affixes around the verb-root. So it was originally, and a number of such examples survive. Afterwards analogy, of course, played the main part. The oldest verbs are those which have the simple root without a thematic vowel like φη-μι.

1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 1. In the Sans. it is to be noted that the noun had an earlier and a more rapid development than the verb. The case-endings appear first in the Sans., the verb-conjugation in the Gk., though the personal endings are more distinct in the Sans.
3 Cf. Gr. Gén. of Port Royal; Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 38.
4 Ib. He considers the verb later than the noun because of its-complex idea. Cf. Schramm, Über die Bedeutung der Formen des Verbums (1884); Curtius, Die Bildung der Tempora und Modi im Griech. und Lat. (1846); Junius, Evolution of the Greek Verb from Primary Elements (1843); Lautensach, Verbalflexion der att. Inschr. (1887); Hogue, Irregular Verbs of Attic Prose (1889).
or ἔ-βην. This root is the ground floor, so to speak, of the Greek verb. On this root the aorist and present-tense systems were built by merely adding the personal endings. This was the simplest form of the verb. There is no essential difference in form between ἔ-φην and ἔ-στην. We call one imperfect indicative and the other second aorist indicative, but they are originally the same form. The term second aorist is itself a misnomer, for it is older than the so-called first aorist –σα or –α. The thematic stem (vowel added to root) is seen in verbs like –λιπ-ο/ε. On this model the rest of the verb is built. So all Greek root-verbs are either non-thematic or thematic. The denominative verbs like τιμ-ω are all thematic. On roots or stems then all the verbs (simple or compound) are built. The modes, the voices, the tenses all contribute their special part to the whole. The personal endings have to carry a heavy burden. They express not only person and number, but also voice. There are mode-signs and tense-suffixes, but no separate voice suffixes apart from the personal endings. The personal pronouns thus used with the verb-root antedate the mode and tense suffixes. The Sanskrit preserves the person-endings more clearly than the Greek, though the Greek has a more fully developed system of modes and tenses than the later classical Sanskrit. It seems certain that these pronominal [Page 306] suffixes, like –µι, –σι, –τι, are not in the nominative, but an oblique case connected with the stem: µε, σε, τι (cf. demonstrative τó). But the subject of personal endings is a very extensive and obscure one, for treatment of which see the comparative grammars. There is a constant tendency to syncretism in the use of these personal endings. Homer has fewer than the Sanskrit, but more than Plato. The dual is gone in the N. T. and other endings drop away gradually. The nominative pronoun has to be expressed more and more, like modern English.

IV. The Survival of –µι Verbs.

(a) A CROSS DIVISION. Before we take up modes, voices, tenses, we are confronted with a double method of inflection that cuts across the modes, voices and tenses. One is called the –µι inflection from the immediate attachment of the personal endings to the stem. The other is the –σι inflection and has the thematic vowel added to the stem. But the difference of inflection is not general throughout any verb, only in the second aorist and the present-tense systems (and a few second perfects), and even so the –µι conjugation is confined to four very common verbs (ἵµι, Ἴστµι, δόµµι, τίθµ µι), except that a number have it either in the present system, like δεῖκ-νυ-µι (with νυ inserted here), or the aorist, like ἔ-βη-ν. The dialects differed much in the use of non-thematic and thematic verbs (cf. Buck, “The Interrelations of the Greek Dialects,” Classical Philology, July, 1907, p. 724).

(b) THE OLDEST VERBS. This fact is a commonplace in Greek grammar. It is probable that originally all verbs were –µι verbs. This inflection is preserved in optative forms like λῶµι, and in Homer the subjunctive ἔθέλωµι, ἴδωµι, etc. The
simplest roots with the most elementary ideas have the –μι form. Hence the conclusion is obvious that the –μι conjugation that survives in some verbs in the second aorist and present systems (one or both) is the original. It was in the beginning λέγω-μι with thematic as well as φη-μι with non-thematic verbs.

(c) GRADUAL DISAPPEARANCE. In Latin the –μι ending is seen only in inquam and sum, though Latin has many athematic stems. In English we see it in am. Even in Homer the –μι [Page 307] forms are vanishing before the –ω conjugation. Jannaris (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 234) has an excellent brief sketch of the gradual vanishing of the –μι forms which flourished chiefly in pre-Attic Greek. The LXX MSS. show the same tendency towards the disappearance of –μι forms so noticeable in the N. T., the papyri and other representatives of the κοινή. See numerous parallel illustrations in Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 104–110. In the LXX the transition to –ω verbs is less advanced than in the N. T. (Thackeray, Gr., p. 244) and the middle –μι forms held on longest. In the κοινή this process kept on till in modern Greek vernacular εἰμι is the only remnant left. In the Attic δείκνυμι, for instance, is side by side with δεικνύω. In the N. T. we find such forms as διδώ (Rev. 3:9), ἵστω (Ro. 3:31, EKL), συνιστῶ (2 Cor. 3:1, BD).

(d) N. T. USAGE AS TO –μι VERBS. The –μι verbs in the N. T. as in the papyri are badly broken, but still in use.

1. The Second Aorists (active and middle). We take first the so-called second aorists (athematic) because they come first save where the present is practically identical. In some verbs only the second aorist is athematic, the stem of the verb having dropped the –μι inflection. A new view⁵ makes the second aorist sometimes “a reduced root,” but this does not show that in the parent stock the old aorist was not the mere root. Analogy worked here as elsewhere. Kaegi² properly calls the old aorists of verbs like βάλλω (ἔ-βλητο instead of the thematic and later ἐ-βάλετο) “primitive aorists.” In the early Epic the root-aorists and strong thematic aorists outnumber the σ

---

5 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 46.
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1 Cf. King and Cookson, Prin. of Sound and Inflexion, 1888, pp. 225 ff.
2 Gk. Gr., 1893, p. 245.
or weak aorists by three to one.\(^3\) The important N. T. \(\text{–μ} \) verbs will now be considered.

**Βαίνω.** Only in composition in N. T. (ἄνα–, προσ-ἀνα–, συν-ἀνα–, ἀπο–, δια–, ἐκ–, ἡμ–, κατα–, μετα–, παρα–, προ–, συμ–). In the LXX it is rare in *simples*. The papyri use it freely with nine prepositions.\(^4\) Note the common forms like ἀνέβη (Mt. 5:1). The “contract” forms are in the imperative as in the Attic poets (ἰδοβα, κατάβα).\(^5\) Mayser\(^6\) gives no examples from the papyri, nor does the LXX have any (LXX only ἀνάβηθι, κατάβηθι, –βητε, –βήτω, –βήτωσαν).\(^7\) So ἀνάβα (Rev. 4:1), ἀνάβατε (Rev. 11:12), κατάβα (Syrian class in Mk. 15:30), καταβάτω (Mt. 24:17; 27:42. Cf. [Page 308] also Mk. 13:15; 15:32; Lu. 17:31), μετάβα (Mt. 17:20). On the other hand note the usual κατάβηθι (Mt. 27:40, etc.), μετάβηθι (Jo. 7:3), προσανάβηθι (Lu. 14:10). The forms in –άτω, –ατε, –άτωσαν are like the Doric.

**Γενώσκω.** This verb in the Ionic and κοινὴ γνων form is very common in John’s Gospel and the First Epistle. It is used in composition with ἄνα–, δια–, ἐπι–, κατα–, προ–, the papyri adding still other compounds.\(^1\) The N. T. shows the usual second aorist forms like ἐγνῶ (Lu. 16:4). What calls for remark is the second aorist subjunctive γνῶ instead of γνῷ. W. F. Moulton’s view\(^2\) on this point is confirmed by the papyri\(^3\) parallel in ἐπιδοθ and accepted by W. H. and Nestle. Analogy seems to have worked here to make γνῶ instead of γνῷ. What calls for remark is the second aorist subjunctive γνῶ instead of γνῷ. W. F. Moulton’s view\(^2\) on this point is confirmed by the papyri\(^3\) parallel in ἐπιδοθ and accepted by W. H. and Nestle. Analogy seems to have worked here to make γνῶ instead of γνῷ. But Winer-Schmiedel (p. 115) cite γνῶ from Hermas, *Mand.* IV, 1, 5 Ν. It is in accordance with the contraction of –ω verbs when we find forms like γνῶ, δοῖ, etc., ὅπως = ὅι instead of ὅπως = ὅι. For γνῶ see Mk. 5:43; 9:30; Lu. 19:15. But see also γνῶ in Jo. 7:51; 11:57 (D has γνῶ); 14:31; Ac. 22:24 (ἐπι–). But the MSS. vary in each passage. In the LXX the regular γνῶ occurs save in Judith 14:5, where B has ἐπιγνῶ.

**Δίδωμι.** This very common verb is frequently compounded (ἄνα–, ἀντ–, ἀπο–, δια–, ἐκ–, ἐπι–, μετα–, παρα–, προ–) as in the papyri.\(^4\) The old indicative active appears only in παρέδοσαν in the literary preface to Luke’s Gospel (1:2).\(^5\) Elsewhere the first aorist forms in –κα (like ἐκα, ἔθηκα) sweep the field for both singular and plural. These κ forms for the plural appear in the Attic inscriptions in the fourth
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3 Thompson, Hom. Gr., 1890, p. 127.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 50.
1 Mayser, Gr. d. grieich. Pap., p. 391.
2 Moulton MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).
4 Mayser, Gr. d. grieich. Pap., p. 392.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 49.
century B.C.\textsuperscript{6} and rapidly grow. In the papyri Mayser\textsuperscript{7} finds only the κ aorists. The other modes go regularly δός, δῶ, etc. The indicative middle occasionally, as the imperfect, has ε for ο of the root. This is possibly due to proportional analogy (ἐξέδετο: ἐξέδομην—ἐλύετο: ἔλυμην).\textsuperscript{8} These forms are ἀπόδετο (Heb. 12:16), ἐξέδετο (Mk. 12:1; Mt. 21:33; Lu. 20:9). The usual form ἀπόδοσθε, etc., appears in Ac. 5:8; 7:9. The subjunctive active third singular shows great variation between δοῖ, δῶ (cf. γνῶθι above), and δώῃ (especially in Paul’s Epistles).\textsuperscript{9} The LXX MSS. occasionally give –δοῖ and [Page 309] even –δῆ by assimilation (Thackeray, Gr., p. 255 f.). For papyrus examples see references under γνώσκω. Mark four times (all the examples) has also δοῖ according to the best MSS. (4:29; 8:37; 14:10 f.) and John one out of three (13:2). Tisch. (not W. H.) reads ἀπόδοι in 1 Th. 5:15, but all MSS. have ἀποδῶ in Mt. 18:30. W. H. accept δῶ in Jo. 15:16; Eph. 3:16; 1 Th. 5:15 (Ἀπο—). Most MSS. read δῶῃ in Eph. 1:17 and 2 Tim. 2:25, in both of which places W. H. put δῶῃ (opt. for δοῖ). In the LLXX (Jer. 9:2) in the text of Swete. Con. and Stock, Sel. from LXX, p. 45, give δῶῃ twenty-nine times in LXX and δῶῃ three times as variant. They give an interesting list of other forms of δίδωμι and its compounds in the LXX. Hort\textsuperscript{1} is doubtful about such a subjunctive in δῶῃ except in the epic poets. Blass\textsuperscript{2} is willing to take δῶῃ, and Moulton\textsuperscript{3} cites Bœotian and Delphian inscriptions which preserve this Homeric form. He adds that the subjunctive seems “a syntactical necessity” in Eph. 1:17 and 2 Tim. 2:25. The opt. δῶῃ=δοῖ (cf. subjunctive δῶῃ=δῶ) is without variant in 2 Th. 3:16; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18.\textsuperscript{4} Blass\textsuperscript{5} scours the idea of a possible first aorist active ἔδωσα from ἴνα δῶῃ (Jo. 17:2 Ν ᾗ AC), δῶῃ (Mk. 6:37, ΝD), on the ground that ἵ and εὶ, ο and οῶ so often blend in sound in the κοινή. The so-called future subjunctive will be discussed later (ch. XIX).

---

6 Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 188 f.
7 Gr. d. grieich. Pap., p. 367 f.
9 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 49.
Swete


———, The Apocalypse of St. John (1906).

———, The O. T. in Greek according to the Septuagint (1887). 3 vols.

1 Notes on Orth., p. 168. Cf. also W.-Sch., p. 121.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48 f.
3 Prol., p. 55. Cf. Dittenb., Syll., 462. 17, etc.
4 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 49, 212.
Τημι. Not in simplex in N. T. (see p. 314 for details), but ἄφιμι is quite common (especially in the Gospels), and συνήμι less so. Besides a few examples occur also of ἄνήμι, καθήμι, παρήμι. The papyri⁶ use the various prepositions freely in composition with ἵμι. The common μ second aorists, like ἄφις (Mt. 3:15), ἄφη (Mk. 12:19), ἄνέντες (Ac. 27:40), are found. In the indicative active, however, the form in –κα is used alone in both singular and plural, as ἄφικαμεν (Mt. 19:27), ἄφηκατε (Mt. 23:23), ἄφηκαν (Mk. 11:6). This is true of all the compounds of ἵμι in the N. T. as in LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 252). The form ἄφηκες (Rev. 2:4) is on a par with the second person singular perfect active indicative as accepted by W. H. in κεκοστάκες (Rev. 2:3), πέπτωκες (Rev. 2:5), ἐλήφες (Rev. 11:17).⁷ ἄφηκαμεν is aorist in Mk. 10:28 as well as in its parallel Mt. 19:27 [Page 310] (=Lu. 18:28). So also as to συνήκατε in Mt. 13:51. The perfect in –είκα does not, however, occur in the N. T. nor in the LXX (cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 51), though the papyri have it (Maysen, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 331).

Ιστημι. This verb is used freely by itself, especially in the Gospels, and occurs in twenty prepositional combinations according to Thayer (ἀν–, ἐπ–, ἐρ–, ἐφ–, ἐφι), δι–, ἔν–, ἐπι–, κατ–, συν–, καθ–, ἀντικαθ–, ἀποκαθ–, μεθ–, παρ–, περι–, προ–, συν–), going quite beyond the papyri in richness of expression.¹ The second aorist active indicative ἔστη (ἄπαστη, etc.) is common and is intransitive as in Attic, just like ἔσταθα (cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 50). The other forms are regular (στώ, στήθι, etc.) save that ἄναστα (like ἄνάβα) is read in a few places (Ac. 9:11; 12:7; Eph. 5:14), but στήθι, ἄνάστηθι (Ac. 9:6; 34), ἔπιστηθι, στήτε, ἄντιστητε, ἄποστητε, ἄποστήτω.² Winer³ cites ἄποστα, παράστα also from late writers and a few earlier authors for ἄναστα. The LXX shows a few examples also.⁴

Ονίνημι. This classic word (not given in the papyri, according to Maysen’s Grammatik) is found only once in the N. T., the second aorist opt. middle ὅναίμην (Phil. 20).

Τηθημι. The compounds of τιθημι in the N. T. (ἀνα–, προσ–, ἀπο–, δια–, ἀντι–, ἐπι–, συν–, κατα–, καθα–, μετα–, παρα–, περι–, προ–, προσ–, συν–, ὑπο–) vie with those of ἴστημι and equal the papyri use.⁵ The first aorist active

---

7 Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 166. The evidence is “nowhere free from doubt,” some MSS. read ἔδοκες (Jo. 17:7 f.) and ἄφηκε (Mt. 23:23), not to say ἐδοξακες (Jo. 8:57), ἐλήλυθες (Ac. 21:22, B also). Moulton (Prosl., p. 52) considers –ες a “mark of imperfect Gk.” For further exx. of this –ες ending in the LXX and κοινή see Buresch, Rhein. Mus. etc., 1891, p. 222 f. For Ημι and its compounds in the LXX see C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 45 f., showing numerous –ω forms, ἄφηκα (Xen. Ηκαν), etc.
1 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 398.
2 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168.
3 W.-M., p. 94.
5 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 411.
in –κα alone appears (so LXX) in the indicative singular and plural as ἔθηκαν (Mt. 6:29), but the subjunctive in –θῶ (Mt. 22:44), imperative πρόσθες (Lk. 17:5). The middle has the regular second aorist ἔθετο (Ac. 19:21 and often).

Φημι. If one is surprised to see this verb put under the list of second aorists, he can turn to Blass,6 who says that it is “at once imperfect and aorist.” It is common in the N. T. as aorist (Mt. 4:7, for instance, ἐφη). It is not always possible to decide.

2. Some –µι Presents. It is difficult to group these verbs according to any rational system, though one or two small groups (like those in –νυµι, –ηµι) appear. The presents are more common in the N. T. than the aorists. The list is based on the uncompounded forms.

Δείκνυµι. Already in the Attic δεικνύω is common, but Blass1 observes that in the N. T. the middle-passive –µι forms are still rather common. It is compounded with ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἔν-, ἐπι-, ὑπο-. No presents (or imperfects) occur with ἄνα- and ὑπο-. The word itself is not used very extensively. The form δεικνύµι is found once (1 Cor. 12:31), –ω not at all. So on the other hand δεικνύεις occurs once (Jo. 2:18), –ς not at all. Δείκνυσιν is read by the best MSS. (Mt. 4:8; Jo. 5:20). The middle ἔνδεικνυται appears in Ro. 2:15. The –µι participle active is found in Ac. 18:28 (ἔπιδεικνύως) and 2 Th. 2:4 (ἀποδεικνύντα). The middle –µι participle is seen in Ac. 18:39; Tit. 2:10; 3:2 (–υµενος, etc.). In Heb. 6:11 the infinitive ἐνδεικνύοµαι is read, but δεικνύειν (Mt. 16:21 B –(ναι).2 The other N. T. verbs in –µι (ἀπόλλυµι, ζώννυµι, ὑποξόννυµι, δέννυµι, σβέννυµι, στρώννυµι, ὑποστρώννυµι, κτλ.) will be discussed in alphabetical order of the simplex. The inscriptions show these forms still in use (Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 178). The verbs in –νυµι were the first to succumb to the –ω inflection. In the LXX the –µι forms are universal in the middle, but in the active the –ω forms are more usual (Thack., Gr., p. 245).

Δίδωµι. See under (d), 1, for list of compounds in the N. T. Attic Greek had numerous examples from the form διδό-ω (δίδου, ἔδίδουν, –ους, –ου). This usage is

6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 50. The verb is mentioned here to impress the fact that it is aorist as well as imperfect.

1 Ib., p. 48.

2 In the pap. both –υµι and –ω, but only –υµαι. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 392. Schweizer


———, Grammatik der pergamen. Inschriften (1898).

extended in the N. T. as in the papyri\(^3\) to δίδω (Rev. 3:9), though even here BP have δίδωμι. In Wisd. of Sol. 12:19 διδός occurs, but Lu. 22:48 has the regular παραδίδως. Δίδωσι is common (in LXX, Ps. 37:21, δίδω appears) and διδόσιν in Rev. 17:13. The uniform imperfect ἔδιδον (Mt. 15:36) is like the Attic. Hort observes that Mk. (15:23) and Ac. (4:33; 27:1) prefer ἔδιδον. Jo. (19:3) has, however, ἐδιδόσιν and Acts once also (16:4). Δίδου (Attic present imperative) is read by Syrian MSS. in Mt. 5:42 for δός. In Rev. 22:2 the [Page 312] text has participle ἀποδιδοῦν for –όν (marg. –οὖς), while παραδίδον is read by Α in Mt. 26:46 and D in Mt. 14:42, etc.\(^1\) The middle-passive forms in –ετο (imperfect) from a present δίδω are like the aorist forms, which see above. So διεδίδετο (Ac. 4:35) and παρεδίδετο (1 Cor. 11:23). So also subjunctive παραδιδοῖ is found only once (1 Cor. 15:24) and is probably to be rejected (BG), though the papyri amply support it.\(^2\) In the imperfect ἔδιδοσας holds its place in the LXX, while in the present the –μι forms generally prevail (Thackeray, Gr., p. 250). The LXX is quite behind the N. T. in the transition from –μι to –ω forms.

\[\text{Δύναμι} \] The use of δύνη (Mk. 9:22; Lu. 16:2; Rev. 2:2) instead of δύνασσι argues for the thematic δύναμι. Elsewhere δύνασσι (Lu. 6:42, etc.). This use of δύνη is found in the poets and from Polybius on in prose (Thayer), as shown by inscriptions\(^3\) and papyri.\(^4\) Hort\(^5\) calls it a “tragic” form retained in the κοινή. It is not surprising therefore to find B reading δύναμι (also –όμεθα, –όμενος) in Mk. 10:39; Mt. 19:12; 26:53; Ac. 4:20; 27:15; Is. 28:20 (so Α in Is. 59:15). The papyri\(^6\) give plenty of illustrations also. MSS. in the LXX give δύνομαι and δύνη.

\[\text{Εἰμί} \] The compounds are with ἀπ–, ἐν–, ἔξ– (only ἔξεστιν, ἔξον), παρ–, συν–, συν–παρ–. The papyri\(^7\) show a much more extended use of prepositions. This very common verb has not undergone many changes, though a few call for notice. In the present indicative there is nothing for remark. The imperfect shows the middle ἤμεν, ἤμεθα regularly (as Mt. 25:43; 23:30), as modern Greek uniformly has the middle present είμαι, etc., as well as imperfect middle. Cf. already in ancient Greek the future middle ἔσομαι. The use of ἤμεν, seen in the papyri\(^8\) and inscriptions\(^9\) also, served to mark it off from the third singular ἦν. But examples of ἤμεν still survive (Ro. 7:5, etc.). Moulton\(^10\) quotes from Ramsay\(^11\) a Phrygian inscription of ἦμαι for early fourth

---

1 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 167. Cf. also W.-Sch., p. 121.
2 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 37.
3 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 177.
6 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 355; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36.
7 Mayser, ib., p. 394.
8 Ib., p. 356.
9 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 178.
10 Prol., p. 56. D (M. shows) alone has ἦν in Ac. 20:18.
11 Ramsay

**Ramsay, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).**
century A.D. He cites also the Delphian middle forms ἵτα, ἔωνται, Messenian ἵνται, Lesbian ἔσσο, as early instances of this tendency, not to mention the Northwest Greek. The peculiar classical second person ἤσθα is found in Mk. 14:67; Mt. 26:69, but elsewhere ἐς (Jo. 11:21, 32, etc.), the common form in the κοινή. ἡτε (Ro. 6:20, for instance) is regular. So with the imperative ἤσθι (as 1 Cor. 16:22) is less common than the usual ἔστω (Gal. 1:8). ἔστωσαν (never ὄντων nor ἔστον), as in Lu. 12:35, is a form found in Attic inscriptions since 200 B.C. Some of the papyri even have ἤτωσαν. Mention has already (Orthography) been made of the irrational ν with the subjunctive ἂν in the papyri, as in ὅταν ἐν—δηλώσω. The use of ἔνι = ἔνεστι (as 1 Cor. 6:5; Gal. 1:8) is an old idiom. ἔνι = ἐν and in modern Greek has supplanted ἐστι in the form ἔνε or ἔνα (so for ἔσι also). Cf. Sir. 37:2. N. T. has no example of imperative ἔστε.

Elīmu. Only in compounds (ἀπ—, ἔσ— ἔξ—, ἐπ—, συν—). The papyri and the inscriptions show only the compound forms. Blass indeed denies that even the compound appears in the popular κοινή, but this is an overstatement. The Attic employed ἔρχομαι for the present indicative and kept ἐμι for the future indicative. The κοινή followed the Ionic (and Epic) in the use of ἔρχομαι for all the tenses to the neglect of ἐμι. In the N. T. only Luke and the writer of Hebrews (once) use these compound forms of ἐμι and that very rarely. ἀπέμι only occurs in the imperfect indicative (Ac. 17:10, ἀπέμεναν). ἔσεμι appears four times, two in the present indicative (Ac. 3:3; Heb. 9:6), two in the imperfect indicative (Ac. 21:18, 26), while ἐσέρχομαι appears over two hundred times. ἔσεμι also occurs four times, all in Acts (13:42; 17:15; 20:7; 27:43), against a host of instances of ἔσερχομαι. ἔσεμι is read five times in Acts and all of them in the participle τῇ ἐπούσῃ (Ac. 7:26, etc.). Σύνεμι is found only in Lu. 8:4. B reads ἐσθισθε in Ac. 9:6, not ἐσελθε. Blass rather needlessly construes ἐξίοντων (Ac. 13:42) in the aoristic sense (so as to 17:10, 15; 21:18, 26). ἔμι is nearly gone from the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 257).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).

11 Cities and Bish. of Phrygia, II, 565.
1 Prol., p. 37.
2 W.-Sch., p. 117.
3 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 56. Both forms in pap. and inscr. On ἤμιν, ἐς, ἔμεθα, ἤτω, ἔστωσαν in the LXX see C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 31 f. Thack., Gr., p. 256 f. Beyond this the LXX goes very little.
10 Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 52, 54.
11 Ib., p. 52.
Ἐπίσταμαι. This verb occurs fifteen times in the N. T., chiefly in Acts (10:28, etc.) and always in the present tense.¹

Zeúγνυμι. Only in the compound συ-ζεύγνυμι and in the aorist active alone, συνέζευξεν (Mk. 10:9=Mt. 19:6).

Ζόννυμι. The compounds are with ἄνα-, δια-, περι-, ὑπο-, Curiously enough the verb does not appear in Mayser, Nachmanson nor Schweizer, though Mayser (p. 397) does mention ζεύγνυμι, which on the other hand the N. T. does not give save the one form above. But the uncompounded form is read in the N. T. only three times, one aorist indicative (Ac. 12:8), one future indicative (Jo. 21:18), and one imperfect (Jo. 21:18, ἐξόννυες, a form in ὑμι, not ὑμι).

Ἦµαι. It is only in the compound form κάθηµαι that this verb is seen in the N. T. and thus very frequently, twice with συν- prefixed (Mk. 14:54; Ac. 26:30). It is usually the participle καθήµενος that one meets in the N. T. (as Mt. 9:9). The imperfect is regularly ἐκάθητο, etc. (as Mt. 13:1), the future καθήσοµαι (as Mt. 19:28). No ὑο forms appear in the present, though κάθη (Ac. 23:3) is a contract form like δύνη for κάθησαι (already in Hyperides).² The short imperative κάθου for κάθησο (as Jas. 2:3) is already in the LXX (cf. Mt. 22:44 from Ps. 110:1) and indeed in the late Attic (Blass, ib.), though chiefly postclassical.³

Ἦµι. Like ἔµι this verb only appears in the N. T. in the compounded form (ἄν-, ἄφ-, καθ-, παρ-, συν-). The same thing appears to be true of the papyri as given by Mayser,⁴ though fifteen combinations greet us in the papyri. But the papyri and the κοινὴ inscriptions have not yet furnished us with the ὑµι compounds which we find in ἄφ- and συνήµι [Page 315] in the N. T.,¹ and the LXX.² But Philo³ and the N. T. Apocrypha and early Christian writers⁴ follow the LXX and the N. T. Ἀνίηµι indeed has only ἀνίέντες (Eph. 6:9) in the present stem. So also καθήµι shows only καθίµενον (μένην) in Ac. 10:11; 11:5, while παρίηµι has no present, but only an aorist (Lu. 11:42) and a perfect passive (Heb. 12:12). Ἀφήµι is the form of the verb that is common in the N. T. In Rev. 2:20 ἀφέως is probably a present from ἀφέω.⁵ But Blass (p. 51, of N. T. Grammar) compares the Attic ἀφίεις

¹ Just so the pap., Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 395.
² Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 52. Cf. also for pap., Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 38. For LXX see Thackeray, p. 272.
³ W.-Sch., p. 118; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 177; Reinhold, De Graec., p. 89.
⁴ Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 398.
and τίθεις. Only ἀφίημι (Jo. 14:27) and ἀφίησι (Mt. 3:15) occur, but in Lu. 11:4 ἀφίμενι is from the Ionic ἀφιέω (cf. δίδω). So also in Rev. 11:9 ἀφίονσιν and in Jo. 20:23 marg. W. H. have ἀφίονται. Elsewhere ἀφίονται (Mt. 9:2, etc.). In the imperfect ἦφις ἐκ τοῦ ἀφίου is read in Mk. 1:34; 11:16, ἀφέονται (Lu. 5:20, 23, etc.) is a perfect passive (Doric Arcadian, Ionic). Cf. Ionic ἐθα. Simcox (Language of the N. T., p. 38) quotes also ἄνεωντα from Herodotus. With συνήμι the task is much simpler. Blass sums it up in a word. In Ac. 7:25 συνιέναι gives us the only undisputed instance of a –µι form. All the others are –ω forms or have –ω variations. However συνίστος is correct in Mt. 13:19 and συνιέσι (Mt. 13:13), συνίοσι (Mt. 4:12), συνίον (Ro. 3:11). In 2 Cor. 10:12 W. H. read συνίδεσιν after B. In the LXX only the compounded verb occurs, and usually the –µι forms save with συνήμι (Thackeray, Gr., p. 250 f.).

Ἴστημι. Cf. also ἐπ-ιστασια (see above) and στήκω (from ἐπιστήμα, imperfect ἐπιστήκε in Rev. 12:4, στέκω in modern Greek). For the list of compounds see list of aorists (1). But the essential facts can be briefly set forth. The –µι form in the present stem has disappeared in the active voice save in καθίστησιν (Heb. 7:28; 2 Pet. 1:8), συνίστησι (Ro. 16:1) and συνίστησι (2 Cor. 10:18; Ro. 3:5; 5:8). The middle (passive) forms retain the –µι inflection regularly with ἴστημι and its compounds (ὅν-, ἄφι-, ἄνθ-, ἔξ-, ἔψ-, προ-, συν-), as καθίσταται (Heb. 5:1), περιίστασο [Page 316] (2 Tim. 2:16). Two –ω forms supplant the –µι conjugation of ἴστημι and its compounds, that in –άω and that in –άνω, though usually the MSS. vary greatly between the two. In 1 Cor. 13:2 ΚΒDEFG read μεθιστάναι, though W. H. follow ACKL in μεθίσταται. The form in –άω is found in various MSS. for ἵστατο (as ἴστομεν Ro. 3:31), ἄποκαθ- (Mk. 9:12 Rec.), ἐξιστάω, καθίσταω, μεθιστάω, συνιστάω, but is nowhere accepted in the W. H. text, though Hort prefers συνισταν to συνιστάνειν in 2 Cor. 3:1. In 2 Cor. 4:2 a threefold division occurs in the evidence. For συνιστάνοντες we have ABP (so W. H. and Nestle), for συνιστάντες ΝCD*FG, for συνιστάντες D*EKL. The form in –άνω is uniformly given by W. H., though the

6 Moulton, Prol., p. 38 f.
Simcox


———, The Writers of the N. T.

7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 51. He gives the MS. variations and parallels in Hermas and Barn. See further A. Buttmann, Gr., p. 48.
8 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 398.
9 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168; Blass, Gr. of N. T., p. 48.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T., p. 49.
2 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 49.
3 Here Hort (Notes, etc., p. 168) differs from Westcott and prefers –άναι.
4 I b.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48.
form in –ώ comes from Herodotus on and is frequent in the LXX. But the –ι forms hold their own pretty well in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 247). The form in –άω may be compared with the Cretan στανύειν and is found in the late Attic inscriptions. Instances of the form in –άνω in the W. H. text are Ac. 1:6; 8:9; 17:15; 1 Cor. 13:2; 2 Cor. 3:1; 5:12; 6:4; 10:12, 18; Gal. 2:18; Ro. 3:31; 6:13, 16). In Mk. 9:12 W. H. (not so Nestle) accept the form ἀποκατιστάνει after B, while ND read ἀποκαταστάνει (cf. Cretan στανύω). D has this form also in Ac. 1:6 and 17:15.

Κείμαι. This defective verb is only used in the present and imperfect in the N. T. as in the papyri, and with a number of prepositions in composition like the papyri also. The prepositions are ἀνα–, συν–ανα–, ἀντι–, ἀπο–, ἐπι–, κατα–, παρα–, περι–, προ–. The regular –ι forms are always used, and sometimes as the passive of τίθημι, as περίκειμαι (Ac. 28:20; Heb. 5:2). For ἄνεκμαι only the participle ἄνακειμενος appears (so Mt. 9:10) save once ἄνέκειτο (Mt. 26:20) and twice with συν– (Mt. 9:10=Mk. 2:15). In Lu. 23:53 ἦν κείμενος follows the Attic, but ΝBG have ἦν τεθεικοῦς in Jo. 19:41. So in the LXX τίθημι partially replaces κείμαι (Thackeray, Gr., pp. 255, 272).

Κρέμαμαι. This verb is used as the middle of the active κρεμάννυμι (this form not in N. T.) and does not appear in Maysers’s list [Page 317] for the papyri. The form κρέμασται is read in Mt. 22:40 and the participle κρεμάσανος(ne) in Gal. 3:13; Ac. 28:4. In Lu. 19:48 ΝBG (so W. H. and Nestle) read ἔξεκρέμετο, an –ω form and the only compound form of the verb in the N. T. The other forms are aorists which come from an active present κρεμάννυμι, –ανάω, –άω or –άζω. They are κρεμάσαντες (Ac. 5:30) and κρεμασθή (Mt. 18:6). But none of these presents occurs in the N. T. Cf. Veitch, Greek Verbs, p. 343 f., for examples of the active and the middle. So also no present of κεράννυμι (compound συν–) is found in the N. T., but only the perfect passive (Rev. 14:10) and the aorist active (Rev. 18:6).

Μίγνυμι. The only –ι form is the compound συν–ανα–μίγνυσθαι (1 Cor. 5:9, 11) and so 2 Th. 3:14 according to W. H., instead of συν–ανα–μίγνυσθε. Elsewhere, as in the papyri,2 the N. T. has only the perfect passive (Mt. 27:34) and the aorist active (Lu. 13:1).

---

6 Ib. W.-Sch., p. 122.
9 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 51.
1 In the LXX the active goes over to the –ο class. Thack., Gr., p. 273.
Veitch VEITCH, W., Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective. 2d ed. (1871).
2 Maysers, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 403.
**Ὅγνυμι.** This verb does not appear in the N. T. in the simple form, but always compounded with ἀν– or δι–αν–. Besides it is always an –ω verb as in the papyri and the LXX. It is worth mentioning here to mark the decline of the –μι forms.

**Ολλυμι.** Only in the common ἀπ– and once with συν–απ– (Heb. 11:31). In the active only the –ω forms are found as ἀπολλάει (Jo. 12:25), ἀπόλλαμ (Ro. 14:15). But in the middle (passive) only the –μι forms meet us, as ἀπόλλυμι (1 Cor. 8:11), ἀπόλλυμι (1 Cor. 10:9). So the LXX.

**Ὅμνυμι.** A half-dozen examples of the present tense of this verb occur in the N. T. All but one (ὅμνύσσει, Mk. 14:71) belong to the –ω inflection, as ὅμνύσσει (Mt. 23:21 f.). The Ptolemaic papyri also have one example of ὅμνυμι, the rest from ὅμνυμω. The LXX sometimes has the –μι form in the active and always in the middle (Thackeray, Gr., p. 279). Neither Πήγνυμι (aorist Heb. 8:2) nor προσπήγνυμι (aorist Ac. 2:23) appears in the present in the N. T.

**Πίπλημι.** No present tense in the N. T., though a good many aorists, save the compound participle ἐπιπλάθω, from the –ω verb –άω. Mayser gives no papyri examples. LXX has –ω form usually.

**Πίμπρημι.** The simple verb occurs once only, πίμπρασθαί (Ac. 28:6) according to W. H. This is the only instance where a present occurs at all in the N. T. The papyri give no light as yet. No simplex in the LXX, but ἐνεπίπρων in 2 Macc. 8:6 (Thackeray, Gr., p. 249).

**Ῥήγνυμι.** The compounds are with δια–, περι–, προς–. No presents appear save in the simple verb and διαρ–. With διαρ. only the –ω forms are used as διαφέρετο (Lu. 5:6), διαφέρεσθαυ (Lu. 8:29). But we have ῥήγνυμαι (Mt. 9:17) and ῥήσσει (Mk. 9:18). Mayser gives no papyri examples of the present.

**Ῥίννυμι** has no presents at all in the N. T., but only the perfect passive imperative ῥίννυμι (Ac. 15:29).

**Σβέννυμι.** This verb has only three presents in the N. T. and all of the –μι form, one active σβέννυτε (1 Th. 5:19, Tisch. ζβενν.), two middle σβέννυται (Mk. 9:48) and σβέννυνται (Mt. 25:8). The LXX has only –μι forms and in the more literary books (Thackeray, Gr., p. 284).

---

3 Ib., p. 404. And indeed the old Attic ἀνοίγω, Meisterh., p. 191.
4 Thack., Gr., p. 277.
5 So the pap. Mayser, Gr., p. 352; Thackeray, p. 246.
6 Mayser, ib., pp. 351 f., 404.
7 Ib., p. 406.
1 Tisch. reads ἐμπηράσθαι from πιπράω. Nestle agrees with W. H.
Στρώννυμι. The compounds are with κατα–, ὑπο–. There are only two present stems used in the N. T., ἐστρώννυον (Mt. 21:8) and ὑποστ. (Lu. 19:36). Thus the –µι form is wholly dropped as in the papyri and the LXX.

Τίθημι. For the list of compounds see Aorist (1). This verb has preferred the –µι form of the present stem as a rule in the κοινή. The inscriptions do so uniformly and the papyri use the –ω inflection far less than is true of δίδωµι. In the present indicative D has τίθη (τίθει) for τίθησι (Lu. 8:16). In the imperfect ἔτιθει is read twice (Ac. 2:47; 2 Cor. 3:13) from τιθέω, as already in the Attic. So likewise ἔτιθον (as in Attic) twice (Ac. 3:2; 4:35), but the best MSS. have ἔτιθεσαν in Mk. 6:56 (𝔓BLΔ)

and Ac. 8:17 (𝔓AC, though B has –οσαν and C –εισαν). The reading of B in Ac. 8:17 (ἔτιθεσαν) calls for a present τίθο which the papyri supply against the idea of Winer-Schmiedel, as παρατιθόµενος (ΒΜ 239), παρακατατίθοµαι (Β.Ο. 326). Good cursives show that the late language used τιθέω in the present (Mk. 10:16; 15:17). Cf. ὑποτιθοῦσα in second century papyrus (Β.Ο. 350). In the LXX –µι forms prevail in the present and imperfect (Thackeray, Gr., p. 250). [Page 319]

Φηµί. The only N. T. compound is with συν–, none in the papyri according to Mayser. In the papyri φάσκω (lengthened form) is usually employed for the participle and infinitive of φηµί. The participle is so used in the N. T. (Ac. 24:9; Ro. 1:22). Σύνφηµι appears only once (Ro. 7:16). The –µι inflection is uniform in φηµί both in the present and the imperfect (aorist). The only forms in the N. T. are φηµί (1 Cor. 7:29), φησίν (Mt. 13:29), φασίν (Ro. 3:8), and the common ἔφη (Mt. 4:7). It is regular –µι in the LXX.

Χρή. This impersonal verb had a poetic infinitive χρήναι of the –µι inflection, but Veitch (p. 627) and L. and S. get it from χράω. At any rate χρή is found only once in the N. T. (Jas. 3:10), δεῖ having supplanted it. Mayser does not find it in the papyri nor Nachmanson and Schweizer in the inscriptions.

3. Some –µι Perfects. There are only three verbs that show the active perfects without (κ)α in the N. T. (mere root, athematic).

Θνίσκω. The compounds are ἀπο– (very common), συν-ἀπο– (rare). The uncompounded verb occurs nine times and forms the perfect regularly as an –ω verb (τέθνηκα), save that in Ac. 14:19 DEHP read τεθνᾶναι instead of τεθνηκέναι, but the –µι form is not accepted by W. H. The N. T. has always τεθνηκός, never τεθνέως. In

2 Mayser, Gr., p. 352.
3 Thack., Gr., p. 286.
5 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 352 f.
6 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 49.
7 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 167.
8 P. 121.
9 Deiss., B. S., p. 192 f; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 37.
10 Ib. Mod. Gk. has θέτω.
1 Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 355.
2 lb. So inser., Nachm., p. 157
the LXX these shorter second perfect forms occur a few times in the more literary books (Thackeray, Gr., pp. 253, 270). They show “a partial analogy to verbs in –µ” (Blass, Gr., p. 50).

Ὁἶδα is a –µ perfect in a few forms (ἳσμεν, ἴστε) from root ὑ– (cf. Latin vid-eo, Greek ἱδον). The word is very common in the N. T. and σύνοιδα is found twice (Ac. 5:2; 1 Cor. 4:4). The present perfect indicative like the papyri usually has ὁἶδα, ὁἶδας, ὁἶδε, ὁἶδαμεν, ἀτε, –αςιν, which was the Ionic inflection and so naturally prevailed in the κοινή. Three times indeed the literary Attic ἴστε appears (Jas. 1:19; Eph. 5:5; Heb. 12:17). The passage in James may be imperative instead of indicative. In Ac. 26:4 ἴσασιν (literary Attic also) is read. The imperfect also runs ἤδειν, ἤδεις, etc. ἤδεισαν (Mk. 1:34; 14:40) is like ἴστηκεσαν (Rev. 7:11). The LXX usage is in accord with the N. T. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 278.

อิสระιτήμα. See Aorist (1) for compounds. The second perfect is in the N. T. only in the infinitive ἐστάναι (Lu. 13:25; Ac. 12:14; Page 320 1 Cor. 10:12) and the participle ἐστώς (Mt. 20:3, 6, etc.) though ἐστηκός (–ω form) also sometimes (Mk. 13:14; 15:35, etc.), ἐστώσα (1 Cor. 7:26; 2 Pet. 3:5), ἐστός (Mt. 24:15; Rev. 14:1) although ἐστηκός also (Rev. 5:6 text, W. H. marg. –ώς). The same variation occurs in the papyri. Curiously enough the earlier LXX books show less of the short perfect than the later ones and the N. T. Thackeray (Gr., p. 253) suggests an “Atticistic reversion” for a while. The form ἐστώσα (papyri also) belongs to the –ω form as well as the late present στήκω from the perfect stem. These –µ perfects of ἴστημι are always intransitive, while ἐστηκός is intransitive and ἐστώσα is transitive. This in brief is the story of the –µ verbs in the N. T. The new transitive perfect ἐστώσα is common in the κοινή from second century B.C. onwards. Cf. Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 185; Mayser, Gr., p. 371.

V. The Modes (Ἐγκλίσεις). The meaning and use of the modes or moods belongs to syntax. We have here to deal briefly with any special items that concern the differentiation of the modes from each other by means of mode-signs. There is no clearly proper method of approaching the study of the verb. One can begin with tense, voice and then mode or vice versa. The first is probably the historical order to a certain extent, for the matter is complicated. Some tenses are later than others; the passive voice is more recent than the other two, the imperative as a complete system is a late growth. Since no purely historical treatment is possible by reason of this complicated development, a practical treatment is best. There are reasons of this nature for taking up modes first which do not apply to syntax. The two main ideas in a verb are action and affirmation. The state of the action is set forth by the tense, the relation of the action to the subject by voice, the affirmation by mode. Tense and voice thus have to do with action and mode with affirmation. Mode deals only with

4 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 114 f. Neither ὁλοθα nor ἤδεισθα appears in the N. T.
1 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 370 f.
3 See Hoffmann, Die griech. Dial., Bd. II, pp. 572 ff., for –µ verbs in North Achaia. For the “strong” perfects, like γέγονα, see VII, (g), 2.
the manner of the affirmation. The same personal endings used for voice limit the action (hence finite verbs) in person and number.

(a) The Number of the Moods or Modes (Modi). This is not so simple a matter as it would at first appear. Modern grammarians generally agree in declining to call infinitives, participles and the verbal adjectives in –τός and –τέος moods. Some refuse to call the indicative a mood, reserving the term for the variations [Page 321] from the indicative as the normal verb by means of mode-signs. Thus Clyde¹ thinks of “only two moods, viz. the subjunctive and the optative, because, these only possess, in combination with the personal endings, a purely modal element.” There is point in that, and yet the indicative and imperative can hardly be denied the use of the term. Jannaris² admits three moods; indicative, subjunctive and imperative. He follows Donaldson³ in treating the subjunctive and optative as one mood. Others, like Mono⁴, find the three in the subjunctive, optative and imperative. Once again five moods are seen in early Greek by Riemann and Goelzer⁵: the indicative, injunctive, subjunctive, optative, imperative. On the injunctive see Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*, p. 332, though he does not apply the term mode to the indicative. So Hirt, *Handbuch*, p. 421 f. Moulton⁶ admits this primitive division, though declining to call the indicative a mode save when it is a “modus irrealis.” The injunctive is no longer regarded as a separate mood, and yet it contributed so much to the forms of the imperative that it has to be considered in an historical review. The indicative can only be ruled out when it is regarded as the standard verb and the moods as variations. Certainly it is best to let the indicative go in also. The modern Greek, having no optative, has a special conditional mode (Ὑποθετική). Cf. Sanskrit. Indeed, the future indicative is considered by some grammarians as a separate mode. Cf. Thompson, *Syntax of Attic Greek*, p. 494; Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 151. Thumb accepts the four modes in modern Greek (*Handbook*, p. 115).

(b) The Distinctions Between the Moods. These are not absolute, as will be seen, either in form or in syntax. The indicative and the imperative blend in some forms, the subjunctive and the indicative are alike in others, the injunctive is largely merged into the imperative and subjunctive, while the subjunctive and optative are closely akin and in Latin blend into one. Greek held on to the optative with separate values to each mood.⁷ Moulton⁸ indeed despairs of our being able to give the primitive root-idea of each mood. That subject belongs to [Page 322] syntax, but the

---

1 Clyde CLYDE, J., Greek Syntax (1876).
3 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 179.
4 New Crat., p. 617 f.
6 Hom. Gr., p. 49.
7 Riemann and Goelzer RIEMANN and GOELZER, Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin. I (1897), II (1901).
8 Phonét., p. 455.
9 Prol., p. 164 f. Farrar (Gk. Synt., p. 45) refers to Protagoras as the one who first distinguished the moods.
11 Giles, Man., p. 459.
12 Prol., p. 164.
history of the mode-forms is in harmony with this position. As with the cases so with the moods: each mood has fared differently in its development and long history. Not only does each mood perform more functions than one, but the same function may sometimes be expressed by several1 moods. The names themselves do not cover the whole ground of each mood. The indicative is not the only mood that indicates, though it does it more clearly than the others and it is used in questions also. The subjunctive not merely subjoins, but is used in independent sentences also. The optative is not merely a wish, but was once really a sort of past subjunctive. The imperative has the best name of any, though we have to explain some forms as “permissive” imperatives, and the indicative and subjunctive, not to say injunctive, invade the territory of the imperative. “It is probable, but not demonstrable, that the indicative was the original verb-form, from which the others were evolved by morphological changes” (Thompson, Syntax of Attic Greek, p. 494). The origin of the mode-signs cannot yet be explained.

(c) The indicative (ὁριστική ἔγκλισις). There is indeed little to say as to the form of the indicative since it has no mode-sign. It is the mode that is used in all the Indo-Germanic languages unless there is a special reason to use one of the others. In fact it is the normal mode in speech. It is probably the earliest and the one from which the others are derived. Per contra it may be argued that emotion precedes passionless intellect. The indicative continues always to be the most frequent and persists when others, like the injunctive and optative, die. It is the only mode that uses all the tenses in Sanskrit and Greek. In the Sanskrit, for instance, the future is found only in the indicative (as in Greek save in the optative in indirect discourse to represent a future indicative of the direct) and the perfect appears only in the indicative and participle, barring many examples of the other modes in the early Sanskrit (Vedas). In the Sanskrit the modes are commonest with the aorist and the present.2 And in Greek the imperfect and past perfect never got beyond the indicative. The future barely did so, never in the subjunctive till the Byzantine period. The perfect subjunctive and optative, not to say imperative, were always a rarity outside of the periphrastic forms and in the κοινή have practically vanished.1 Thus we can clearly see the gradual growth of the modes. In modern English we have almost dropped the subjunctive and use instead the indicative. In the modern Greek the indicative survives with as much vigor as ever. The N. T. peculiarities of the indicative can best be treated under Syntax. It may be here remarked, however, that besides the regular indicative forms a periphrastic conjugation for all the tenses of the indicative appears in the N. T. The present is thus found as ἔστιν προσαναπληροῦσα (2 Cor. 9:12), the perfect as ἔστιν πεπραγμένον (Ac. 26:26), the imperfect as ἦν διδάσκουσα (Lu. 5:17), the past perfect as ἦσαν προεωρακότες (Ac. 21:29), even the aorist as ἦν βληθείς (Lu. 23:19), the future as ἔσεσθε λαλοῦντες (1 Cor. 14:9), the future perfect as ἔσομαι πεποιθώς (Heb. 2:13). This widening of the range of the periphrastic conjugation is seen also in the LXX. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 195.

2 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 201.
(d) The Subjunctive (ὑποτακτική). The function of the subjunctive as of the other modes will be discussed under Syntax. Changes come in function as in form. Each form originally had one function which varied with the course of time. But the bond between form and function is always to be noted. The German grammarians (Blass, Hirt, Brugmann, etc.) call this the conjunctive mode. Neither conjunctive nor subjunctive is wholly good, for the indicative and the optative both fall often under that technical category. It is in the Greek that mode-building reaches its perfection as in no other tongue. But even in the Greek subjunctive we practically deal only with the aorist and present tenses, and in the Sanskrit the subjunctive rapidly dies out save in the first person as an imperative. In Homer ἵµεν is indicative and ἵοµεν is subjunctive so that non-thematic stems make the subjunctive with the thematic vowel ο/ε. Thematic stems made the subjunctive with a lengthened form of it ω/η. Cf. in the Ionic, Lesbian, Cretan inscriptions forms like ἔµεινεται. The same thing appears in Homer also in the transition period. Jannaris indeed calls the aorist subjunctive a future subjunctive because he conceives of the aorist as essentially past, a mistaken idea. The subjunctive does occur more freely in Homer than in the later Greek, partly perhaps because of the fact that the line of distinction between it and the indicative (especially the aorist subjunctive and the future indicative) had not been sharply drawn. Add to this the fact that ποιήσῃ and ποιήσει came to be pronounced exactly alike and one can see how the confusion would come again. Cf. ἵνα δῶσῃ (δῶσῃ) in the N. T. MSS. On the short vocal ending of the subjunctive and its connection with the indicative one may recall ἔδοµαι, πίσµαι, φάγοµαι in the N. T., futures which have a strange likeness to the Homeric subjunctive ἵµεν. They are really subjunctives in origin. It is still a mooted question whether the future indicative is always derived from the aorist subjunctive or in part corresponds to the Sanskrit syā. The only aorist subjunctives that call for special comment in the N. T. are the forms γνωī and δοī, for which see this chapter, IV, (d), 1. There are parallels in the papyri as is there shown. The form ὅψῃσθε in Lu. 13:28 (supported by AL, etc., against ὅψεσθε, BD) is probably a late aorist form like ἔδωσα (δῶσῃ) rather than the

---

2 For contrary view see Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 1.
3 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 45 ff.
5 Giles, Man., p. 458 f.
6 Ib., p. 459. In the Bœotian dial. the subj. does not appear in simple sentences (Claflin, Synt. of Bœotian, etc., p. 73)
7 Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., p. 456 f.
8 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 49.
2 Cf. already in the Attic inscr. the spelling of the subj. in –τι. Meisterh., Att. Inscr., p. 166. For this phenomenon in the pap. see Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 324.
4 Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 37, and 1904, p. 111, for subjs. ἀποδοῖ, ἐπιγνόνι in the pap.
Byzantine future subjunctive. As already pointed out, the examples in N. T. MSS. of the Byzantine future subjunctive are probably due to the blending of ὠ with ὦ, ε with ἦ, etc. N. T. MSS., for instance, show examples of ἀρκεσθήσω (1 Tim. 6:8), γνώσωσθαι (Jo. 15:8), δώσωσιν (Lu. 20:10; Rev. 4:9), εὐρήσωσιν (Rev. 9:6), ζήσωσι (Mk. 5:23), ἥξωσιν (Rev. 3:9), καυθήσομαι (1 Cor. 15:3), κερδηθήσονται (1 Pet. 3:1), πορεύσωσιν (Ro. 15:24), σωθήσηται (Ro. 11:26), etc. It is to be admitted, however, that the Byzantine future subjunctive was in use at the age of our oldest Greek N. T. MSS. Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 107. Hort dismisses them all (Appendix, “Notes on Orthography,” p. 172). The present subjunctive διδοῖ is parallel to δοῖ. No example [Page 325] of the periphrastic present subjunctive appears in the N. T. In Gal. 4:17 (ἵνα ζηλοῦτε) the contraction of οη is like that of the indicative οε, 1 unless indeed, as is more probable, we have here (cf. also 1 Cor. 4:6, φυσιοῦσθε) the present indicative used with ἵνα as in 1 Jo. 5:20 (γινώσκομεν). In Gal. 6:12 ACFGKLP read ἵνα μὴ διώκονται. Cf. Ro. 14:19. Cf. Homer. The perfect subjunctive does not exist in the N. T. save in the second perfect εἰδῶ (ἵνα εἴδομεν, 1 Cor. 2:12) and the periphrastic form as ἤ πεποιηκώς (Jas. 5:15. Cf. πεποιθότες ὤμεν, 2 Cor. 1:9) and usually in the passive as ἤ πεπληρωμένη (Jo. 16:24). In Lu. 19:40 Rec. with most MSS. read κεκράξονται (LXX). In the papyri ἤν sometimes is subjunctive=ἵνα. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 38, 1904, p. 108; Prolegomena, pp. 49, 168. He cites ὁσα ἐὰν ἤν in Gen. 6:17 E. But the modern Greek constantly uses ἤν with the indicative, and we find it in the N. T. and papyri (Deissmann, Bible

5 Cf. ἀρξησθε in Lu. 13:25, but ἀρξεσθε (BEG, etc.) and ἀρξησθε (NAK, etc.) in verse 26.

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48. But in 1 Cor. 16:2 we have regularly εὐοδῶται (marg. εὐοδοθῶν). Hort (Notes on Orth., pp. 167, 172) is uncertain whether εὐοδῶται is perf. ind. or subj. (pres. or perf.). He cites παραζηλοῦμεν (1 Cor. 10:22) and διαβεβαιοῦται (1 Tim. 1:7) as possible pres. subsjs.


Deissmann

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gracität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Hertzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).
Studies, pp. 203 ff.). Some of the papyri examples may be merely the indicative with ἐὰν, but others undoubtedly give the irrational v. In the LXX the subjunctive shows signs of shrinkage before the indicative with ἐὰν, ὅταν, ἵνα (Thackeray, Gr., p. 194).

(e) THE OPTATIVE (ἐὐκτική). Like the subjunctive the optative is poorly named, as it is much more than the wishing mood. As Giles remarks, difference of formation is more easily discerned in these two moods than difference of meaning. In the Sanskrit the subjunctive (save in first person) gave way before the optative, as in Latin the optative largely (sim originally optative) disappeared before the subjunctive.3 The Greek, as already stated, is the only language that preserved both the subjunctive and the optative, and finally in the modern Greek the optative has vanished, μὴ γένοιτο being merely “the coffin of the dead optative.”5 It is doubtful if the optative was ever used much in conversation even in Athens (Farrar, Greek Syntax, p. 142), and the unlearned scribes of the late Greek blundered [Page 326] greatly when they did use it (Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 204). Moulton (Prol., p. 240) agrees with Thumb that the optative was doomed from the very birth of the κοινή, and its disappearance was not due to itacism between οι and η, which was late. Clyde, however, suggests that the blending of sound between οι and η had much to do with the disappearance of the optative. But apart from this fact the distinction was never absolutely rigid, for in Homer both moods are used in much the same way.2 And even in the N. T., as in Homer and occasionally later, we find an instance of the optative after a present indicative, οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ἵνα δῶ Eph. 1:17, text of W. H., subj. δῶ/η or δῶ in marg., question of editing). Jannaris calls the Greek optative the subjunctive of the past or the secondary subjunctive (cf. Latin). Like the indicative (and originally the subjunctive) the non-thematic and thematic stems have a different history. The non-thematic stems use η (ιε) and the thematic οι (composed of ο and ι). The σ aorist has α+ι besides the form in –εια. This two-fold affix for the optative goes back to the

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).
———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.
———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

5 Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 84.
1 Gr. S., p. 85.
3 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 179.
earlier Indo-Germanic tongues (Sanskrit याः and य). The optative was never common in the language of the people, as is shown by its rarity in the Attic inscriptions. The Boeotian dialect inscriptions show no optative in simple sentences, and Dr. Edith Claflin reports only two examples in subordinate clauses. The optative is rare also in the inscriptions of Pergamum. The same thing is true of the papyri. Examples of the periphrastic perfect optative survive in the papyri, but not in the N. T. There are only sixty-seven examples of the optative in the N. T. Luke has twenty-eight and Paul thirty-one (not including Eph. 1:17, whereas John, Matthew and James do not use it at all. Mark and Hebrews show it only once each, Jude twice and Peter four times. The non-thematic aorist appears in the N. T. sometimes, as δώῃ (perhaps by analogy). So W. H. read without reservation in 2 Th. 3:16; Ro. 15:5; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18. This is the preferred text in Eph. 1:17; 2 Tim. 2:25, but in Jo. 15:16; Eph. 3:16, W. H. read ὄη (subjunctive). In Eph. 1:17 the margin has δώῃ (subjunctive) also. The inscriptions and the papyri show the same form (–ώην instead of –οίην). In Eph. 1:17 Moulton considers δώῃ (subjunctive) absolutely necessary in spite of the evidence for ὄη (optative). But see above. The aorist optative in –αι is the usual form, as κατεύθυνα (1 Th. 3:11), πλεονάσαι και περισσεύσαι (1 Th. 3:12), καταρτίσαι (Heb. 13:21), etc., not the Άolic-Attic –ειε. So also ποιήσαι (Lu. 6:11), ὄῆρ (Ac. 17:27) according to the best MSS. (B, etc.). Blass comments on the fact that only one example of the present optative appears in the simple sentence, viz. ὄη (Ac. 8:20), but more occur in dependent clauses, as πάσχοτε (1 Pet. 3:14). The optative is rare in the LXX save for wishes. Thackeray, Gr., p. 193.

(f) The Imperative (προστακτική). The imperative is a later development in language and is in a sense a makeshift like the passive voice. It has no mode-sign (cf. indicative) and uses only personal suffixes. These suffixes have a varied and interesting history.

5 Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 166.
6 Synt. of Boeot. Inschr., pp. 77, 81.
7 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 191.
8 Mayser, Gr. d. griesch. Pap., p. 326.
10 Mayser, Gr. d. griesch. Pap., p. 327.
11 Hort, Intr. to N. T. Gk., p. 168. Cf. LXX.
2 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 191.
6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 220.
7 K.-Bl., Bd. II, p. 41.
1. **The Non-Thematic Stem.** An early imperative was just the non-thematic present stem.\(^8\) In the imperative the aorist is a later growth, as will be shown directly. Forms like ἵστη, δείκνυ are pertinent.

2. **The Thematic Stem.** Cf. ἄγε, λέγε. This is merely an interjection (cf. vocative λόγε).\(^9\) This is the root pure and simple with the thematic vowel which is here regarded as part of the stem as in the vocative λόγε. The accent ἐπέ, ἐλθέ, εὑρέ, ἰδέ, λαβέ was probably the accent of all such primitive imperatives at the beginning of a sentence.\(^10\) We use exclamations as verbs or nouns.\(^11\) [Page 328] In Jas. 4:13 we have ἄγε νῦν οἱ λέγοντες, an example that will illustrate the origin of ἄγε. Note the common interj. use of ἰδέ (so N. T.). Cf. also accent of λάβε. The adverb δεῦρο (Jo. 11:43, Λάζαρε δεῦρο ἔξω) has a plural like the imperative in –τε (Mt. 11:28, δεῦτε πρὸς μὲ πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες).

3. **The Suffix –θι.** The non-thematic stems also used the suffix –θι (cf. Sanskrit dhi, possibly an adverb; cf. “you there!”). So γνῶθι for second aorist active, ἰσθι for present active, φάνητι, λύθι, for second and first aorist passive.\(^1\) In the N. T. sometimes this –θι is dropped and the mere root used as in ἀνάβα (Rev. 4:1), μετάβα (Mt. 17:20), ἀνάστα (Eph. 5:14; Ac. 12:7) according to the best MSS.\(^2\) The plural ἀνάβατε (Rev. 11:12) instead of ἀνάβητε is to be noted also. The LXX MSS. exhibit these short forms (ἀνάστα, ἀπόστα, but not ἀνάβα) also. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 70; Con. and Stock, Sel. from LXX, p. 46. See ἐμβα, κατάβα, etc., in Attic drama. But ἀνάστηθι (Ac. 8:26), ἐπίστηθι 2 Tim. 4:2), μετάβηθι (Jo. 7:3), κατάβηθι (Lu. 19:5), προσανάβηθι (Lu. 14:10) occur as usual. In the papyri –θι has practically disappeared save in ἰσθι.\(^3\)

4. **The Suffix –τω.** It is probably the ablative of the demonstrative pronoun (Sanskrit tād). It is used with non-thematic (ἔστω) and thematic stems (λεγέ-τω). The Latin\(^4\) uses this form for the second person also (aggō). In the case of ἔστω (Jas. 1:19) the N. T. has also ἦτω (Jas. 5:12).\(^5\) The form καταβάτω (Mt. 24:17) has the unlengthened stem, but ἐλθάτω is like the first aorist ἐπιστρέψατω. The N. T. like the κοινή generally\(^6\) has the plural only in τοσαν which is made by the addition of σαν to

---

8 Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 464.
9 Ib., p. 269.
10 Ib., p. 464. Cf. Brug., Grundr., II, § 958; Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., p. 359. It is coming more and more to be the custom to regard the thematic vowel as part of the root. Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 415.
11 Moulton, Prol., p. 171 f.
2 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168.
3 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 327.
5 So pap. and late inscr., Moulton, Prol., p. 56.
5. The Old Injunctive Mood. It is responsible for more of the imperative forms than any other single source. “The injunctive [Page 329] was simply an imperfect or aorist indicative without the augment.”

6. Forms in –σαι. These, like βάπτισαι (Ac. 22:16), are probably just the infinitive sigmatic aorist. Cf. δᾶξαι. Cf. also Latin legimini with the Homeric infinitive λεγέµαι. The infinitive is common in the Greek inscriptions in the sense of an imperative. In the N. T. as in the papyri this use is not infrequent. So χαίρειν (Jas. 1:1), στοιχεῖν (Ph. 3:16), μὴ συναναµίγνυσθαι (2 Th. 3:14). In modern Greek instead of the imperative in –σαι the form λύσου occurs with the sense of λύθητι.

7. The Form in –σον (λῦσον). It is difficult of explanation. It may be injunctive or a verbal substantive. The N. T. has εἰσόν (Mt. 4:3) rather than εἰσέ (Mt. 8:8) in about half the instances in W. H. This is merely in keeping with the common κοινή custom of using first aorist endings with second aorist stems. The form εἰσόν is traced to the Syracusan dialect.

---

7 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 343 (he cfs. ἐξέσωθο with ἐξέσοθαι); Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 430. Giles (Comp. Philol., p. 467 f.) gets it from τω by analogy of τε and σον.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 165.
3 Ib.
4 Ib.
5 Hirt, Handb., p. 429 f.
6 W.-Sch., p. 119.
7 Moulton, Prol., p. 165.
10 Moulton, Prol., p. 179 f.
13 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 164.
8. First Person. The Sanskrit used the first person subjunctive as imperative of the first person. Cf. English “charge we the foe.” The Greek continued this idiom. But already in the N. T. the use of the imperative ἄφες (cf. modern Greek ἀς and third person subjunctive) is creeping in as a sort of particle with the subjunctive. So ἄφες ἐκβάλω (Mt. 7:4). Cf. English “let” with infinitive. [Page 330] Cf. δεῦτε ὑποκτείνωμεν in Mt. 21:38. Besides ἄγε, δεῦτε we may have ὅρα with the subjunctive (Mt. 8:4), βλέπετε with future indicative (Heb. 3:12).

9. Prohibitions. Here the aorist subjunctive with μὴ held its own against the aorist imperative quite successfully. In the Sanskrit Veda the negative मā is never found with the imperative, but only with the subjunctive.1 Later the Sanskrit uses the present imperative with मा�, but not the aorist. This piece of history in the Greek2 is interesting as showing how the imperative is later than the other modes and how the aorist imperative never won its full way into prohibitions. However, in the N. T. as in the inscriptions and papyri, we occasionally find the aorist imperative with μὴ in 3d person. So μὴ καταβάτω (Mt. 24:17).

10. Perfect Imperative. In the Sanskrit the imperative is nearly confined to the present tense. The perfect imperative is very rare in the N. T. (only the two verbs cited) as in all Greek. We find ἔρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29; in 23:30 W. H. reject ἔρρωσσο) and πεφίσσομο (Mk. 4:39). The perfect imperative also occurs in the periphrastic form as ἔστωσαν περιεξόσμεναί (Lu. 12:35).

11. Periphrastic Presents. Other periphrastic forms of the imperative are ἵσθι εὐνοῶ (Mt. 5:25), ἵσθι ἔχων (Lu. 19:17), μὴ γίνεσθε ἐπιτρέποντες (2 Cor. 6:14) and even ἰστε γινόσκοντες (Eph. 5:5).

12. Circumlocutions. But even so other devices (see Syntax) are used instead of the imperative, as the future indicative (Ἀγαπήσεις, Mt. 5:43); ἴνα and the subjunctive (Eph. 5:33); a question of impatience like οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων (Ac. 13:10), etc.

VI. The Voices (διαθέσεις).

(a) Transitive and Intransitive. The point is that “transitive” is not synonymous with “active.” Transitive verbs may belong to any voice, and intransitive verbs to any voice. Take ἐδίδαξα, ἔδιδαξα, ἔδιδαξάμην, ἔδιδαξάθην, which may be transitive in each voice. On the other hand ἐλήμ, γίνομαι, ἐλύθην, are intransitive. The same verb may be transitive or intransitive in the same voice, as ὁγ. A verb may be transitive in Greek while intransitive in English, as with καταγελάω and vice versa. This matter properly belongs to syntax, but it seems necessary to clear it up at once before we proceed to discuss voice. Per se the question of transitiveness belongs to the idea of the verb itself, not to that of voice. We [Page 331] actually find Green1 making four voices, putting a neuter (οὐδέτερον) voice (using active and middle endings) on a par

1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 240.
2 Ib.; cf. also Delbrück, Synt. Forsch., IV, p. 120. Hence Delbrück argues that the aorist imper. did not come into use until after the pres. imper. The imper. was originally only positive, not negative.
1 Handb. to the Gk. of N. T., p. 55.
with the others! The Stoic grammarians\(^2\) did speak of a neuter voice as neither active
(κατηγόρημα ὑπόθνον) nor passive (ὑπτυκόν), meaning the middle (μέση). Jannaris\(^3\)
confounds transitiiveness with voice, though he properly says (p. 356) that “the active
voice is usually transitive,” i.e. verbs in the active voice, not the voice itself. Even
Whitney\(^4\) speaks of the antithesis between transitive and reflexive action being
effaced in Sanskrit. Was that antithesis ever present? Farrar\(^5\) speaks of verbs with an
“active meaning, but only a passive or middle form,” where by “active” he means
transitive. Even the active uses verbs which are either transitive (ἀλλοπαθής) or
intransitive (αὐτοπαθής). So may the other voices. If we clearly grasp this point, we
shall have less difficulty with voice which does not deal primarily with the transitive
idea. That belongs rather to the verb itself apart from voice.\(^6\) On transitive and
intransitive verbs in modern Greek see Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 112.

\(b\) The Names of the Voices. They are by no means good. The active
(ἐνεργετική) is not distinctive, since the other voices express action also. This voice
represents the subject as merely acting. The Hindu grammarians called the active
parasmai padam (‘a word for another,’) and the middle (μέση) ātmane padam (‘a
word for one’s self’).\(^7\) There is very little point in the term middle since it does not
come in between the active and the passive. Indeed reflexive is a better designation of
the middle voice if direct reflexive is not meant. That is rare. The middle voice
stresses the interest of the agent. Cf. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 155 f. In truth we
have no good name for this voice. Passive (παθητική) is the best term of all, for here
the subject does experience the action even when the passive verb is transitive, as in
ἐδιδάχθην. But this point encroaches upon syntax.

\(c\) The Relative Age of the Voices. It is a matter of doubt as
between the active and middle. The passive is known to be a later development. The
Sanskrit passive is the ṣā class.\(^1\) In Homer the passive has not reached its full
development. The passive future occurs there only twice. The aorist middle is often

\(^3\) Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 179.
used in passive sense (βλητο, for instance). That is to say, in Homer the passive uses all the tenses of the middle with no distinct forms save sometimes in the aorist. In later Greek the future middle (as τιθησομαι) continued to be used occasionally in the passive sense. The aorist passive in fact used the active endings and the future passive the middle, the passive contributing a special addition in each case (η, θη, ησ, θησ). Some languages never developed a passive (Coptic and Lithuanian, for instance), and in modern English we can only form the passive by means of auxiliary verbs. Each language makes the passive in its own way. In Latin no distinction in form exists between the middle and the passive, though the middle exists as in potior, utor, plangor, etc. Giles\(^3\) thinks that the causative middle (like διδάσκομαι, ‘get taught’) is the explanation of the origin of the Greek passive. Cf. βάπτισαι (Ac. 22:16). It is all speculation as between the active and middle. An old theory makes the middle a mere doubling of the active (as µαι-µι=µαι).\(^4\) Another view is that the middle is the original and the active a shortening due to less stress in accent, or rather (as in τιθεμαι and τίθηµαι) the middle puts the stress on the reflexive ending while the active puts it on the stem.\(^5\) But Brugmann\(^6\) considers the whole question about the relation between the personal suffixes uncertain. Of one thing we may be sure, and that is that both the active and the middle are very old and long antedate the passive.

\((d)\) The so-called “DEPONENT” verbs. These call for a word (cf. ch. XVII, III, (k)) at the risk of trespassing on syntax. Moulton\(^7\) is certainly right in saying that the term should be applied to all three voices if to any. The truth is that it should not be used at all. As in the Sanskrit\(^8\) so in the Greek some verbs were used in both active and middle in all tenses (like λάω); some verbs in some tenses in one and some in the other (like βαίνω, [Page 333] ψήσμαι); some on one voice only (like κείµαι). As concerns voice these verbs were defective rather than deponent.\(^1\) Note also the common use of the second perfect active with middle verbs (γίνοµαι, γέγονα).\(^2\) A number of verbs sometimes have the future in the active in the N. T. which usually had it in the middle in the older Greek. These are: ἄκουσω (Jo. 5:25, 28, etc., but ἄκουσµαι, Ac. 17:32), ἀµαρτήσω (Mt. 18:21), ἀπαντήσω (Mk. 14:13), ἄρπάσω (Jo. 10:28), βλέψω (Ac. 28:26), γελάσω (Lu. 6:21), διώξω (Mt. 23:34), ζήσω (Jo. 5:25), ἐπιορκήσω (Mt. 5:33, LXX), κλαύσω (Lu. 6:25), κράξω (LX. 19:40), παίξω (Mk. 10:34), πέπσω (Jo. 7:38), συναντήσω (2 Pet. 1:15), συναντήσω (Lu. 22:10). But still note ἄπωθανοίµαι, ἔσοµαι, ἐσοµαι, καθώσοµαι, λήµµαι, δύνοµαι, παύσοµαι, τέξοµαι, φάγοµαι, φεύξοµαι, etc. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 42 f.; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 107; Moulton, Prol., p. 155. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 89 f.; Thackeray, pp. 231 ff., for illustrations in the LXX. The term “deponent” arose from the idea that these verbs had dropped the active voice. Verbs do vary in the use of the voices in different stages of the language.

---

2 Sterrett, Hom. II., Dial. of Hom., p. 27.
3 Comp. Philol., p. 477.
4 Clyde, Gk. Syn., p. 55.
5 Moulton, Prol., p. 152.
1 Brug., Kurze vergl. Gr., p. 598; Moulton, Prol., p. 153.
2 Hirt, Handb., p. 334; Moulton, Prol., p. 154.
(e) THE PASSIVE SUPPLANTING THE MIDDLE. In Latin the middle and passive have completely blended and the grammars speak no more of the Latin middle. Greek indeed is the only European speech which retains the original middle form and usage. In fact, when we consider other tongues, it is not strange that the passive made inroads on the middle, but rather that there was any distinction preserved at all. In most modern languages the middle is represented only by the use of the reflexive pronoun. The Greek itself constantly uses the active with reflexive pronoun and even the middle. Jannaris has an interesting sketch of the history of the aorist and future middle and passive forms, the only forms where the two voices differ. As already remarked, the old Greek as in Homer did not distinguish sharply between these forms. In Homer the middle is much more common than in later Greek, for the passive has no distinct form in the future and not always in the aorist. In the modern Greek the middle has no distinctive form save λύσου (cf. λύσαι) and this is used as passive imperative second singular. Elsewhere in the aorist and future the passive forms have driven out the middle. These passive forms are, however, used sometimes in the middle sense, as was true of ἀπεκρίθη, for instance, in the N. T. The passive forms maintain the field in modern Greek and appropriate the meaning of the middle. We see this tendency at work in the N. T. and the κοινή generally. Since the passive used the middle forms in all the other tenses, it was natural that in these two there should come uniformity also. The result of this struggle between the middle and passive in the aorist and future was an increasing number of passive forms without the distinctive passive idea. So in Mt. 10:26 (μὴ φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς) the passive is used substantially as a middle. Cf. the continued use of τιµῆσομαι as future passive in the earlier Greek as a tendency the other way. The history of this matter thus makes intelligible what would be otherwise a veritable puzzle in language. Here is a list of the chief passive aorists in the N. T. without the passive idea, the so-called “deponent” passives: ἀπεκρίθη (Mt. 25:9 and often, as John, Luke chiefly having Attic ἀπεκρίνατο also, Ac. 3:12), διεκρίθη (Ro. 4:20), συνυπεκρίθη (Gal. 2:13), ἀπελογήθη (Lu. 21:14, but see 12:11), ἤγαλλιάθη (Jo. 5:35), ἔγενήθη (Mt. 6:10, but also ἔγενόμην often, as Ac. 20:18); cf. γέγονα and γεγένη, ἐδεήθη (Lu. 5:12); ἡγέρθη (Lu. 24:34), ἡδυνάσθη (Mk. 7:24, as New Ionic and LXX) and ἡδυνήθη (Mt. 17:16), διελέχθη (Mk. 9:34), ἐκατερώθη (Rev. 13:3, but passive sense in 2 Th. 1:10), ἐστιμήθη (Mk. 1:27), ἐνθυμήθη (Mt. 1:20), μετεμελήθη (Mt. 21:32), ἐφοβήθη (Mt. 21:46), ἔλαβηθη (Heb. 11:7), etc. For the LXX usage see Thackeray, p. 238. The future passives without certain passive sense are illustrated by the following: ἄνακληθήσομαι (Mt. 8:11), ἀποκριθήσομαι (Mt. 25:37), ἔπαναπαήσεται (Lu. 10:6), θαυμασθήσομαι (Rev. 17:8), κομηθήσομαι (1 Cor. 15:51), ἐντραπήσονται (Mk. 12:6), μεταμελήθησομαι (Heb. 7:21), φανήσομαι (Mt. 24:30), φοβηθήσομαι (Heb. 13:6). But we have γενήσομαι, δυνήσομαι, ἐπιμελήσομαι,

**Page 335** *(f)* The Personal Endings. They are probably pronominal, though Brugmann does not consider the matter as clear in all respects. One point to note is the heavy burden that is placed upon these endings. They have to express voice, person and number, everything in truth that has to do with the subject. Mode and tense are indicated otherwise. There was a constant tendency to slough off these personal endings and get back to the mode and tense-stems. Hence διδωμι becomes διδω (papyri) in late Greek. Λέγω was originally λέγομι.

**(g)** Cross-Divisions. These personal endings have two cross-divisions. The active and middle have a separate list, the passive having none of its own. Then there is another cleavage on the line of primary and secondary tenses in the indicative, i.e. the unaugmented and the augmented tenses. The subjunctive mode falls in with the primary endings and the optative uses the secondary endings. But the first person active singular of the optative has one primary ending (as λύομι). But may it not be a reminiscence of the time when there was no distinction between subjunctive and optative? The imperative has no regular set of endings, as has already been shown, and does not fall in with this development, but pursues a line of its own. As a matter of fact the imperative always refers to the future.

**(h)** The Active Endings. They have received some modification in the N. T. Greek. The imperative can be passed by as already sufficiently discussed. The disappearance of the –μι forms in favour of the –ω inflection has been carefully treated also, as ἰφίομεν (Lu. 11:4). The subjunctive δοι and optative δῷ have likewise received discussion as well as the optative –αι and –ειε. But some interesting points remain.

The use of –οσαν instead of –ον is very common in the LXX (as Jer. 5:23, 26) and was once thought to be purely an Alexandrian peculiarity (Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 37). For the LXX phenomena see Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, pp. 65–67; Con. and Stock, *Sel. from the LXX*, p. 32 f. The LXX is the principal witness to the –οσαν forms (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 195), where they are exceedingly frequent (ib., pp. 212 ff.). It is not so abundant outside of the LXX, but the Bœotians used it for the imperfect and optative. Mayser has found more examples of it in the Tebtunis

---

Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
1 Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 53.
2 Gk. Gr., p. 346.
3 Cf. Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 54. The same thing has happened in Eng. where the loss is nearly complete save 2d and 3d pers. sing.
4 It is not worth while here to take time to make a careful discussion of each of these endings. For the hist. treatment of them see Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 345 ff.; Giles, Comp. Philol., pp. 413 ff.; Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., pp. 348 ff.
2 Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 323.
Papyri, both aorist and imperfect, than Moulton\(^3\) had discovered. The inscriptions also show it.\(^4\) In the N. T. the contract verb ἐδολοῦσαν (Ro. 3:13) is a quotation from the LXX. In Jo. 15:22, 24, the imperfect ἐξήσαν has to be admitted. In 2 Th. 3:6 παρελάβοσαν is read by ΝΑΔ and W. H. put it in the margin. The text παρελάβετε is supported by BFG. This use of the –µι inflection may be compared with the use of το-σαν in the imperative. In the modern Greek it is common with contract verbs (cf. LXX) like ἐδολοῦσαν above. The modern Greek ἔρωτοῦσα is a new formation (Thumb, Handb., p. 171) modelled after it.

Blass\(^5\) needlessly hesitates to accept –αν in the present perfect instead of the usual –δσι, and even Moulton\(^6\) is reluctant to admit it for Paul and Luke, preferring to regard it “a vulgarism due to the occasional lapse of an early scribe.” It is certainly not a mere Alexandrianism as Buresch\(^7\) supposed. The ending –αντι in the Doric usually dropped ν and became –δσι in Attic, but the later Cretan inscriptions show –αν after the analogy of the aorist.\(^8\) The Alexandrian κονη followed the Cretan. The papyri examples are very numerous\(^9\) and it is in the inscriptions of Pergamum\(^10\) also. Hort (Notes on Orthography, p. 166) considers it “curious,” but has to admit it in various cases, though there is always some MS. evidence for –δσι. Thackeray (Gr., pp. 195, 212) thinks that in some instances –αν with the perfect is genuine in the LXX. The earliest examples are from Lydia, παρείληφαν (246 B.C.) and ὑπέσταλκαν (193 B.C.). Cf. Dieterich, Unters., p. 235 f. The N. T. examples are ὑπέσταλκαν (Ac. 16:36), γέγοναν [Page 337] (Ro. 16:7; Rev. 21:6), ἔγνωκαν (Jo. 17:7), εἰρήκαν (Rev. 19:3), εἴσελήλυθαν (Jas. 5:4), ἐόρακαν (Lu. 9:36; Col. 2:1), πέπτωκαν (Rev. 18:3), τετήρηκαν (Jo. 17:6). On the other hand the Western class of documents (ΝΑΔΝ Syr. Sin.) read ἡκασιν in Mk. 8:3 instead of εἰςίν. But it is in the LXX (Jer. 4:16), and Moulton\(^1\) finds ἡκαμεν in the papyri. The form of ἡκω is present, but the sense is perfect and the κ lends itself to the perfect ending by analogy.

---

3 Prol., p. 52; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36, 1904, p. 110.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 46.
6 Prol., p. 52.
10 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 167. Thumb (Hellen., p. 170) rightly denies that it is merely Alexandrian. For LXX exx. (ἐόρακαν, πέπρακαν, etc.) see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 67.

---
Another ending that calls for explanation is the use of –ες instead of –ας in the present perfect and the first aorist (in –ας especially). Hort considers the MS. evidence “scanty” save in Revelation. The papyri give some confirmation. Moulton cites ἀφήκες, ἔγραψες, etc., from “uneducated scribes” and thinks that in Revelation it is a mark of “imperfect Greek.” Deissmann finds the phenomenon common in a “badly written private letter” from Φαῦμ. Mayser confirms the rarity of its occurrence in the papyri. In the inscriptions Dieterich finds it rather more frequent and in widely separated sections. In Mt. 23:23 B has ἄφηκε; in Jo. 8:57 B has ἔδωκες; in Jo. 17:7 and in 17:8 B has ἔδωκε once more in Ac. 21:22 B gives ἐλήλυθες. It will hardly be possible to call B illiterate, nor Luke, whatever one may think of John. D has ἔπεκάλυψε in Mt. 11:25. W. H. accept it in Rev. 2:3 (κεκοπίακες), 2:4 (ἂφηκες), 2:5 (πέπτωκες), 11:17 (εἴληψες), all perfects save ἄφηκες. It is rare in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 215); found in A (Ex. 5:22, ἔπεσακες) and in ἔδωκες (Ezek. 16:21; Neh. 9:10). The modern Greek has it as in ἔδεσσα, –ες (Thumb, Handb., p. 152).

We have both ἦςθα (Mt. 26:69) and ἦς (Mt. 25:21). The form in –θα is vanishing (Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 166). Cf. also Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 321. The papyri have οἶδας, as N. T., and ἔφης. But see –μ Verbs.

Much more common is the use of the first aorist endings –α, –ας, etc., with the second aorist stem and even with the imperfect. This change occurs in the indicative middle as well as active. This matter more technically belongs to the treatment of the aorist tense, as the –α is part of the tense-stem, but it is also conveniently discussed here. The Attic already had ἔθα, ἔσεσα, ἰνέγκα. The Attic inscriptions indeed show ἐσχα, εὐράμυν and even the imperfects ἠπιξα, ἔφερα. This tendency towards uniformity spread in the κοινή somewhat extensively. Moulton finds the strong aorists with –α chiefly in “uneducated writing” in the papyri, but common in general. This process of assimilation of the strong with the weak aorist was not yet complete. Blass thinks it an “intermediate” form already in the ancient Greek which spread in the κοινή. Cf. the liquid form ήγγειλα. But both the strong and the weak aorists appear in the N. T. Thackeray (Gr., p. 195; cf. also pp. 210 ff.) notes that the –

---

2 Ib.; Prol., p. 52.
3 B. S., p. 192.
5 Unters. etc., p. 239. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 46, cites Apoll., Synt., I, 10, p. 37, as saying that ἐφηκες, ἔγραψες, γραψέτω, etc., gave the grammarians trouble.
6 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 46.
7 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 113.
1 Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 183 f.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 45. The LXX is in harmony with this tendency also. Is it Cilician according to Heraclides? W.-Sch., p. 111 note. Cf. in Hom. forms like ἤξοντο, ἔβησετο, where the sec. aorist endings go with the first aorist stem (Sterrett, Hom. II., N. 42).
an termination was finally extended to all past tenses, though in the LXX the imperfec
time forms are due to later copyists. In the modern Greek we note it regularly with κατέλαβα, ἠθέλα, ἡγα, etc. (Thumb, Handb., pp. 152, 160, etc.). Hornt has a
detailed discussion of the matter in the N. T. This mixture of usage is shown in εἴπα
and εἴπον. The –α form is uniform with endings in –τ (εἴπατε, εἴπατο, εἴπατωσαν).
Both εἴπον and εἴπέ occur. We have δεισεπάμεθα (2 Cor. 4:2) and προείπαμεν (1 Th.
4:6). The participle is usually –όν, but sometimes εἴπας. Both εἴπας and εἴπες, εἴπον
and εἴπαν meet us. We always have the ήγεγκα inflection save in the infinitive and
the imperative. And even here we once have δεισεγκα (1 Pet. 2:5) and once also
προσένεγκαν (Mt. 8:4 BC). So also with ήπεσα we have the weak or first aorist
inflection in the indicative and imperative plural πέσατε (Lu. 23:30; Rev. 6:16). But in
these two examples Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 164) favours πέσεσε on MS. grounds (NA,
B.C.). In Lu. 14:10; 17:7 ἀνάπεσε is correct. The other forms that are accepted by W.
H., are ἔβαλαν [Page 339] once (Ac. 16:37); ἔπέβαλαν twice (Mk. 14:46; Ac. 21:27);
ἔλαβαν, ἔδωκαν in a few places (Mt. 13:17; Lu. 10:24; Mt. 25:37, etc.); the indicatives ἄνεί
λαν (Ac. 10:39), ἄνειλατε (Ac. 2:23), ἄνειλατο (Ac. 7:21), ἐλατο (2 Th. 2:13),
ἔξειλάμην (Ac. 23:27), ἔξειλατο (Ac. 7:10; 12:11); ἔπασα once (Lu. 8:35, or ἄνε
ύραν), ἑόραμεν once (Lu. 23:2), and εὑράμενος once (Heb. 9:12); the imperatives ἦλατε,
ἔθατο uniformly, both ἠλθαν and ἠθων, once ἠπήλθα (Rev. 10:9),
regularly ἠθωμεν (Ac. 21:8). There are many other examples in various MSS. which
W. H. are not willing to accept, but which illustrate this general movement, such as
ἀπέθαναν (Mt. 8:32, etc.), ἀλαβαν (Jo. 1:12), ἀλάβαμεν (Lu. 5:5); ἀλαβετα (1 Jo.
2:27), ἐξεβαλαν (Mk. 12:8), ἐπαν (1 Cor. 10:4 D), ἐφυγαν (Lu. 8:34 D), κατέφα
γαν (Mk. 4:4 D), συνέεχαν (Ac. 7:57 D), γενάμενος (Lu. 22:44 Ν), etc. But let these
suffice. Moulton is doubtful about allowing this –α in the imperfect. But the papyri
support it as Deissmann shows, and the modern Greek reinforces it also as we have
just seen. W. H. receive ἤχαν in Mk. 8:7; Ac. 28:2 (παρεῖχαν); Rev. 9:8; ἤχα
μεν in 2 Jo. 5. But D has ἤχαν in Jo. 15:22, 24; Ν has ἤλεγαν in Jo. 9:10; 11:36, etc. There is a
distinct increase in the use of the sigmatic aorist as in ἠμάρτησα (Mt. 18:15), ὄψησθε
(Lu. 13:28). It appears already in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 235). But see further
under VII, (d).

6 Notes on Orth., p. 164 f. See also Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 45; W.-Sch., p. 111 f.
65; C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 35 f.
7 Notes on Orth., p. 164. Moulton (Prol., p. 51) speaks of “the functionally useless
difference of ending between the strong and the weak aorist.”
1 Prol., p. 52. So Buresch, Rhein. Mus., 46, 224. Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 165)
needlessly considers ἐκέχεσε (Rev. 16:1) a second aorist imper. instead of the present.
Cf. ἐκέχεσαν (usual form in Rev. 16:6). Cf. W.-Sch., p. 111. But κατέχεων (Mk. 14:3) is
the usual Attic aorist. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 55.
2 B. S., p. 191, ἔλεγας, etc.
The past perfect has the –εἰν forms exclusively as uniformly in the κοινή.⁴ So εἰστήκεσαν (Rev. 7:11), ἔδεσαν (Mk. 14:40), πεποιήκεσαν (Mk. 15:7). So the LXX. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 68. But the imperfect ἔξασσαν (Ac. 17:15) is to be observed.

(i) The Middle Endings. These call for less remark. βούλει (Lu. 22:42) is the only second singular middle form in –ει, for ὤψε (Mt. 27:4) displaces ὥπει. The inscriptions⁵ sometimes show βούλη. Blass⁶ regards βούλει a remnant of literary style in Luke, [Page 340] but the papyri also have βούλει. The occasional use of δόνη (Mk. 9:22 f.) has been discussed under –μ Verbs. It appears only once in the LXX, but the “poetic and apparently Ionic” ἔπιστη is more frequent (Thackeray, Gr., p. 217). Cf. also κάθοι (Jas. 2:3) as LXX and κάθῃ (Ac. 23:3). On the other hand we have φάγεσαι and πίεσαι (Lu. 17:8). This revival of the use of –σαι parallel with –μα, –ται in the perfect of vowel verbs in the vernacular amounts to a “new formation” in the view of Blass.¹ So Moulton, Prol., p. 54 f. To call this revival a “survival” is “antediluvian philology.” In the LXX πίεσαι is universal and φάγεσαι outside of the Pentateuch where φάγῃ holds on (Thackeray, p. 218). The –σαι form is universal in modern Greek. The love of uniformity made it triumph. But see Contract Verbs for further discussion. The middle form ἤμην (Mt. 25:35) and ἤμεθα (Mt. 23:30) is like the κοινή generally and the modern Greek ἤμαι. Cf. also ἤσομαι. For ἔξεκρέτο (Mt. 21:33) with loss of root ο and ω inflection (thematic ε) see –μ Verbs. Cf. also ἐξεκρέμετο (Lu. 19:48). The LXX has –ἐντο for –οντο (Thackeray, p. 216).

(j) Passive Endings. As already observed, the passive voice has no distinctive endings of its own. The second aorist passive, like ἐ-φάνη-ν, is really an active form like ἡ-βη-ν (ἐ-φάνη-ν is the proper division).² Cf. Latin tacē-re. So ἐ-χάρη-ν from χαιρέω. The first aorist in –θην seems to have developed by analogy out of the old secondary middle ending in –θής (ἐ-δό-θης) parallel with σα (Sanskrit thās).³ The future passive is a late development and merely adds the usual σα/ε and uses the middle endings. The ending in –θην is sometimes transitive in Archilochus,⁴ as the middle often is, and perhaps helps to understand how in the κοινή these forms (first aorist passive) are so often transitive (“deponents”) as in ἔπεκρίθην, ἐποβήθην, etc. The second aorist passive as noticed above is really an active form. So the passive forms have a decidedly mixed origin and history. There is nothing special to note about these passive endings in the N. T. save the increased use of them when even the passive idea does not exist. In some verbs σ is inserted contrary to Attic practice. So

---

5 Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 168. Cf. also Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 328. The pap. do not show ὦει and ὦψε, but only βούλει.
4 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 411.
κέκλεισται (Lu. 11:7), λέλουσαι (Heb. 10:22). It is a common usage in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., pp. 219 ff.). See also VII, (g). [Page 341] In Rev. 8:12; 18:23, W. H. print φάνη (first aorist active, cf. ἐφιάλται in Lu. 1:79) rather than the passive φανή. Note ἐκφύῃ (Mt. 24:32, but Rec. ἐκφύη, though ἐκφύῃ in Mk. 13:28), συνφυεῖ (Lu. 8:7) and παρεισεδύσαν (Ju. 4) for ἔδυν (Rec. Mk. 1:32) which the LXX retains (Thackeray, Gr., p. 235). In the LXX, when a verb had both first and second aorist passive forms, the first disappeared (ib., p. 237). But see VII, (d), for further discussion.

(k) CONTRACT VERBS. The use of –σαι was mentioned above. It appears1 in καυχᾶσαι (1 Cor. 4:7; Ro. 2:17, etc.) and ὀδυνᾶσαι (Lu. 16:25) where αε regularly contracts into α. See χαρίεσαι (=–έσαι) P. Oxy. 292 (A.D. 25).

Verbs in –αω. The confusion with verbs in –εω is already seen in the Ionic (Herodotus). The LXX in general preserves the distinction between –αω and –εω verbs, but ΝAB occasionally have the confusion (Thackeray, Gr., p. 241). In the modern Greek the blending is complete. One conjugation is made up, some forms from –αω, some from –εω (Thumb, Handb., p. 169 f.). The N. T. MSS. vary. W. H. receive ἦρωταν in Mt. 15:23 (ΝBCD), but ἦρωταν in Mk. 4:10 though –ουν is here supported by ΝC and by single MSS. elsewhere. Hatzidakis (Einl. in d. Neug., p. 128 f.) considers ἦρωταν due to Ionic influence. In Mt. 6:28 we have κοπιοῦσιν in B 33, but W. H. reject2 it, as they do νικοῦν in Rev. 2:7, 17; 15:2, and κατεγέλουν (Lu. 8:53). In Mk. 14:5 W. H. read ἐνεβριῶτο (ΝC –οῦντο) and in Jo. 11:38 ἐμβριομόμενος (ΝA –ούμενος). So there is a variation as to ἢττῶνται (2 Pet. 2:20) from ἢττομαι and ἢποσώθητε (2 Cor. 12:13) from ἔσσω after the analogy of ἐλασσόο.3 W. H. print τὴν (Ro. 8:12). This is a matter of much dispute with the editors, but it is more than doubtful if W. H. are correct. On the other side see Winer-Schmiedel4 and Moulton.5 But both ζῶ (Ro. 8:12) and χράομαι (1 Tim. 1:8) have the η contraction rather than α (–ησει verbs, Moulton, Prol., p. 54). In Ro. 7:9 B even has ζήν for ζων. But the κοινή uses χρῆσθαι, though not in the N. T.6 Paul [Page 342] has χρῆσαι (pres. subj.) in 1 Tim. 1:8. Elsewhere also the α forms prevail in the κοινή as in διψᾶν and πεινᾶν. So πεινᾶ (1 Cor. 11:21), πεινᾶν (Ph. 4:12), διψᾶ (Ro. 12:20) as subjunctive (so πεινᾶ same verse). The LXX keeps Attic ζήν and χρῆσθαι, but διψᾶν and πεινᾶν (Thackeray, Gr., p. 242).1

1 Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 328, for χαριζέσαι. The LXX (1 Ki. 14:6 A) shows ἀπεξενόουσαι. The only certain instance in the LXX is κτᾶσαι (Sir. 6:7). See Thack., p. 218. Cf. further Hatz., Einl., p. 188.
2 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 166.
3 Ib. Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36) cites ἐνίκεις and τιμοῦντες from pap.
6 Moulton, Prol., p. 54.
Verbs in –εω sometimes show forms in –αω. So ἐλλόγα in Phil. 18, ἐλλογᾷ in Ro. 5:13, ἐλεότε in Ju. 22, 23, and ἐλεοντος in Ro. 9:16, but ἐλεεὶ in Ro. 9:18. LXX has both forms. The κοινή usually has the –εω forms. For further examples of this confusion between –αω and –εω in LXX and isolated N. T. MSS. see Winer-Schmiedel. In 1 Cor. 11:6 all editors print ξυρᾶσθαι (cf. κείρασθαι just before), though in 1 Cor. 11:5 ξυρηναι and ξυρήσονται (Ac. 21:24) probably come from ξυρέω. Cf. ἐκώ, ἐσσει.

Contraction does not always take place with εε in verbs in –εω. In Lu. 8:38 W. H. follow BL in giving ἐδεῖτο, but Hort admits that it is not free from doubt. Blass and Moulton consider ἐδέετο correct and the contraction a mere correction, and it is supported by the LXX and papyri. AP even have ἐδεῖτο. In Rev. 16:1 ἐκχέετε is undoubtedly right and ἐξέχεεν in 16:2, but note ἐκχεῖται (Mt. 9:17). In Mk. 14:3 κατέχεεν is to be noticed also (cf. Attic aorist). On the other hand in Jo. 3:8 note πνει, ἐρρέθη (Ac. 18:18), πλεῖν, ἀποπλεῖν (Ac. 27:1 f.). In the LXX these words appear now one way, now the other. Δέω (‘to bind’), ἔω have no ee forms in the N. T. W. H. accept in text only ἔσωθενε in all the dozen examples in the N. T. (as Lu. 18:9, ἔσωθενούντας), but in Mk. 9:12 they have δ instead of θ. Observe also ἀφέσται (Lu. 5:20, etc.) instead of ἀφεῖναι or the regular ἀφεῖναι. In the N. T., W. H. give ἔρρηθη (Gal. 3:16; Mt. 5:21, etc.), but Hort thinks the Attic ἔρρηθη should appear always in Matthew.

Verbs in –οω have two knotty problems. In Gal. 4:17 ζηλοῦτε and 1 Cor. 4:6 φυσιοῦσθε are regular if indicative. But if they are subjunctive, the contraction η is like the indicative οε (cf. indicative [Page 343] and subjunctive of –οω verbs). So Blass and Moulton. Hort doubts the indicative here. If εὐοδοῦται (1 Cor. 16:2) be regarded as a present subjunctive no problem in contraction is raised. But in Col. 4:17 we have the subjunctive in ἰνα πληροῖ as in Attic for both indicative and subjunctive. In Ro. 3:13 ἐσωθενέωσαι is the common LXX form in –οσαν. The other point is the infinitive in –ον or –ον. W. H. give –ον for this infinitive everywhere

2 Hatz., Einl., p. 128 f. Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 110) cites φροινοῦντες and per contra ἄγαποῦντες from pap.
3 P. 117 note.
4 Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 166) prefers ξόραζωμεν after Plut. and Lucian.
5 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 116 f. See further on this mixing of contract verbs, Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 349. The LXX MSS. show much the same situation as to contract verbs that we find in the N. T. and the pap. Helbing (Gr. d. Sept., pp. 110–112) gives the facts in detail.
6 Notes on Orth., p. 166.
7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 47.
8 Prol., p. 54.
10 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 166.
11 lb. BD always have it.
12 Notes on Orth., p. 171 f.
13 P. 117 note.
except πληροῦν in Lu. 9:31.\(^5\) Cf. –ἂν and –ἲν in W. H. Blass\(^6\) considers the –οὖν termination “hardly established for the N. T.” since even in the N. T. the evidence is “small,” though “of good quality” Hort contends.\(^7\) In Mt. 13:32 κατασκηνοῦν is supported by BD (in Mk. 4:32 by B), in 1 Pet. 2:15 φιμοῦν has Ν, and in Heb. 7:5 ὁποδεκατοῦν has BD. Moulton\(^8\) finds no support earlier in date than B save one inscription cited in Hatzidakis (Einl., p. 193) and one papyrus of second century A.D. Mayser\(^9\) likewise finds no infinitive in –οὖν till after first century A.D. and gives some references for this late infinitive form. It looks as if the case will go against W. H. on this point. The form is probably due to some late grammarian’s refinement and is linguistically unintelligible.

Πιεῖν is often contracted (sounded finally ἰ, then ἰ) into πεῖν (so W. H., Jo. 4:7, 9, etc.) and in some MSS. (Ἀ 8/9 times) into πεῦν. But πιεῖν is the Syrian reading (Mt. 20:22, etc.).\(^10\) Contraction in –αω, –εω, –οω verbs, of course, takes place only in the present, imperfect and present participle.

**VII. The Tenses (χρόνοι).**

(a) **The Term Tense.** It is from the French word temps, ‘time,’ and is a misnomer and a hindrance to the understanding of this aspect of the verb-form. Time does come finally to enter relatively into the indicative and in a limited way affects the optative, infinitive and participle. But it is not the original nor the general idea of what we call tense.\(^11\) Indeed it cannot be shown of [Page 344] any verb-form that it had originally any reference to time. We must therefore dismiss time from our minds in the study of the forms of the tenses as well as in the matter of syntax. It is too late to get a new name, however.

(b) **Confusion in Names.** The greatest confusion prevails in the names given to the various tenses. The time idea appears in the names present, past perfect and future. The state of the action rules in the names aorist, imperfect and perfect. Thus it is clear that the time idea did not prevail with all the names that the grammarians used. In the indicative, indeed, in the past three tenses appear, in the present two, in the future one (sometimes two). In the other modes as a rule only three tenses are found; in truth, in the subjunctive, optative and imperative practically only two are in common usage, the aorist and the present.

As a matter of fact there are nine possible tenses for each voice in the indicative: the aorist present, the imperfect present, the perfect present, the aorist past, the

---

5 Hort, ib., p. 166.
6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48.
7 Notes on Orth., p. 166.
9 Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 349; Raderm., p. 74.
10 Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 170.
imperfect past, the perfect past; the aorist future, the imperfect future, the perfect future. These ideas do occur. In the past the distinction is clear cut. In the present no sharp line is drawn between the aorist and durative (unfinished or imperfect) save when the periphrastic conjugation is used or when Aktionsart comes in to help out the word itself. In the future, as a rule, no distinction at all is made between the three ideas. But here again the periphrastic conjugation can be employed. As a rule the future is aoristic anyhow. For further discussion see Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 180; Farrar, Greek Syntax, p. 120, and the references there to Harris’ Hermes, Harper’s Powers of the Greek Tenses, and H. Schmidt’s Doctrina Temporum Verbi Graeci et Latini. The modern Greek preserves as distinct forms the aorist, present, imperfect; the future, the perfect and past perfect using periphrastic forms. Mr. Dan Crawford reports 32 tenses for Bantu.

(c) THE VERB-ROOT. There were originally two types of verb-roots, the punctiliar and the durative. The tense called aorist (ἀόριστος, ‘undefined action’) is due to the use of the punctiliar verbs (the idea of a point on a line). The present tense comes out of the durative verb-root. But it is worth repeating that tenses are a later development in the use of the verb.¹

Hence it was natural that some verbs never developed a present tense, like εἶδον, and some made no aorist, like ὁράω. The defective verbs thus throw much light on the history of the tenses. [Page 345] Out of these two ideas grew all the tenses. Each language had its own development. Some aorists in Sanskrit had no presents, like the Greek εἶπον. Each tense in the Greek pursued its own way. It is a complex development as will be seen. The idea of comparing the aorist to a point and the present to a line is due to Curtius, but it has since been worked out at length.¹ Instead of saying “irregular” verbs, Delbrück (Vergl. Syntax, Tl. II, p. 256) speaks of “several roots united to one verb.”

This Aktionsart or kind of action belongs more specifically to syntax.² But it is not possible to make a modern study of the tense formations without having clearly in mind this important matter. It will come out at every turn. Along with the various tense-suffixes which came to be used to express the tense-distinctions as they were developed there remains also the meaning of the verb-root itself. This is never to be

---

Harris HARRIS, J. RENDEL, Side-Lights on N. T. Research (1908).
Hermes Hermes, Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie.
1 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 482 f.
Curtius

Curtius, G., Greek Etymology. 2 vols. (1886).

———, Studien zur griech. und lat. Grammatik (1868–1878).
2 Thumb (Handb., p. 123) likewise feels the necessity of a word about Aktionsart under Morphology.
left out of sight. Prepositions also enter into the problem and give a touch much like a suffix (perfective). So θνῆσκειν is ‘to be dying’ while ἀποθανεῖν is ‘to die’ and ἀποτεθνήκεναι is ‘to be dead.’ Cf. ἔχει, and ἔφησε, ἔφαγον and κατέφαγον. But more of this in Syntax. The point here is simply to get the matter in mind.

(d) THE AORIST TENSE (ἀόριστος χρόνος). It is not true that this tense was always the oldest or the original form of the verb. As seen above, sometimes a durative root never made an aorist or punctiliar stem. But the punctiliar idea is the simplest idea of the verb-root, with many verbs was the original form, and logically precedes the others. Hence it can best be treated first. This is clearer if we dismiss for the moment the so-called first aorists and think only of the second aorists of the –µι form, the oldest aorists. It is here that we see the rise of the aorist. Henry3 has put this matter tersely: “The ordinary grammars have been very unfortunate in their nomenclature; the so-called second perfects are much more simple and primitive than those called first perfects; the same is the case with the second aorists passive as contrasted with the first aorists,” etc. The same remark applies to second aorists active and middle. The non-thematic second aorists represent, of course, the most primitive form. The survivals of these forms in the N. T. have been discussed under –µι Verbs. The difference between the strong aorist (both thematic and non-thematic) and similar presents is syntactical and not formal.1 The point is that the strong aorists and the corresponding presents represent the simple stem of the verb. Brugmann2 indeed treats them together. It is not possible to make an etymological distinction between the imperfects ἔφην, ἔγραφον and the aorists ἔστην, ἔφυγον. The imperfect, of course, differs from the present only in the augment and secondary endings.3 The kinship between the aorist and present stems is further shown in reduplication. Reduplication in the aorist, as ἤγαγον, is supposed to be originally causative.4 Cf. the use of it with inceptive presents like γυνόσκω. The aorist was quite common in the older

1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 268.
Brugmann

Brugmann, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).

———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).

3 Cf. Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 453 f.
Sanskrit, but is rare in the later language. Cf. the blending of the aorist and the present perfect forms in Latin. The strong aorist (both non-thematic and thematic) is far more common in Homer than in the later Greek. Indeed in the modern Greek the strong aorist has wellnigh vanished before the weak aorist.

As often, the grammars have it backwards. The so-called second is the old aorist, and the so-called first is the late form of the verb. This weak form of the aorist has a distinct tense-sign, σ, the sigmatic aorist. The σ (–σα) was not always used, as with liquid verbs, like ἐστειλα. This sigmatic aorist appears also in the Sanskrit. The distinction was not always observed between the two forms, and mixed aorists of both kinds occur in Homer, like ἕξοντο, ἄνεικα. No wonder therefore that uniformity gradually prevailed at the expense of the strong aorist in two ways, the disuse of the strong aorist (so ἦξα) and the putting of first aorist endings to the second aorist stems, as ἔπα, ἔσχα.

The κ aorists in the indicative (ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, ἦκα) continued to hold their own and to be used usually in the plural also. An extension [Page 347] of this usage (after the analogy of the perfect) is seen in the Byzantine and modern Greek form ἐλύθηκα for ἐλύθην.

There is one more aorist form, the aorist passive. As already shown, the so-called second aorist passive (–ῃν), like ἐφάνη, ἐχάρη, is merely the second aorist active. The so-called first aorist passive in –θῃν is a Greek creation after the analogy of the old Indo-Germanic. Homer makes little use of either of these passive aorists, but the second is the more frequent with him and the form in –θῃν is very rare.

If this emphasis upon the aorist forms seem unusual to modern students, they may be reminded that in English we have only two tenses (apart from the periphrastic conjugation) and that they are usually punctiliar, as “I sing,” “I sang.” One is a present aorist, the other a past aorist. We do not here enter into the Aktionsart of the aorist (whether ingressive, constative or effective). That belongs to syntax.

---

5 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 298.
6 See interesting lists in Sterrett’s II., N. 38 ff.
7 V. and D., Handb. etc., p. 79 f.
10 Sterrett, Hom. II., N. 42.
1 V. and D. Handb., etc., p. 81, but in particular Thumb, Handb., p. 144.
3 Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 399 f.
4 Sterrett, Hom. II., N. 42 f.
6 Munro, ib., p. 47.
The inscriptions agree with the development shown above in the aorist and support the N. T. phenomena. Mayser gives a careful discussion of the papyri development. In brief it is in harmony with what has already been observed. The non-thematic strong aorist is confined to a few verbs like βῆναι, γνώναι, δοῦναι, ὁδύναι, θεύναι, πρίασθαι, στῆναι. The κ aorists are used exclusively in both singular and plural. The thematic strong aorist is disappearing before the weak sigmatic aorist.

In the N. T. the κ aorists ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, ἀφήκα occur always except that Luke (1:2 in the literary introduction) has παρέδοσαν. Elsewhere ἐδόκατε (Mt. 25:35), ἔθηκαν (Mk. 6:29), ἀφήκατε (Mt. 23:23), etc., and quite frequently. The LXX also nearly always has κ with these aorists in the plural.

The non-thematic aorists in the N. T. are not numerous. The list is found in the discussion of –µι verbs and includes ἄνέβην, ἔγνων, ἔστην, ἔφην, ὄνάμην, and all the forms of δοῦναι, εἶναι and θεύναι save the indicative active.

The thematic strong aorist in the N. T. shows the two developments noted above. The use of –α instead of –ιον with the strong aorist-stem is very common. See this chapter, VI, (h), for N. T. list like ἐβαλαν, etc. The MSS. vary much in the matter. The other change is the increased use of the sigmatic aorist. Here again Blass has a careful presentation of the facts. ἐβίωσα (1 Pet. 4:2) is a case in point instead of the old Attic ἐβίων. So is ἐβλάστησα (Mt. 13:26; Heb. 9:4; Jas. 5:18) rather than ἐβλαστον. Both ἐγαμῆσα (Mt. 5:32) and ἐγημα (Mt. 22:25) occur. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 93 f., and Thackeray, Gr., pp. 233 ff., for LXX illustrations.

---

9 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 119.
10 See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 94 f., for similar exx. in the LXX, and Thack., Gr., p. 255.
1 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 45 f.
2 Ib., p. 43.
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———, Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre (1907).


Thackeray

Ἦξα occurs a few times instead of the common ἥγαγον, as ἐπάξας (2 Pet. 2:5), ἐπισυνάζει (Lu. 13:34). Blass justifies it as appearing at least in dialects, LXX and late writers. It is part of the tendency towards the sigmatic aorist. Likewise ἰματήσω is slipping in beside ἰμάτρο (Mt. 18:15; Ro. 5:14, 16, cf. verse 12). Blass finds it in Emped., LXX, Lob., Phryn., 732. W. H. accept ἔξωες (Mk. 1:32 on the authority of BD (NA, etc., ἔδω)). Luke in Ac. 24:21 has the reduplicated aorist ἐκέκραξα like the LXX, but usually the N. T. has the late form ἐκραξα (Mt. 18:15; Ro. 5:14, 16, cf. verse 12). Blass finds it in Emped., LXX, Lob., Phryn., 732. W. H. accept ἔδυσε (Mk. 1:32 on the authority of BD (א, A, etc., ἔδω)). Luke in Ac. 24:21 has the reduplicated aorist ἐκέκραξα like the LXX, but usually the N. T. has the late form ἐκραξα as in Mt. 8:29 (ἐκραξατ), though once the Attic ἀνέκραγον appears (Lu. 23:18). Once Luke (Ac. 6:2) has καταλείψαντας, a form that Blass finds in Herm., Vis. VIII, 3. 5, and Mayser observes ἄντελήψαι in the papyri.

Ὅψησθε (Lu. 13:28) finds a parallel in an old Homeric aorist ὤψαμην (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 109). In Rev. 18:14 the Text, Rec. (without any known authority) has an aorist form ἐψῆσα. So in Jas. 4:13 some MSS. have ἐμπορευσόμεθα. Indeed some verbs have dropped the strong aorist form entirely like βιῶω, βλαστάνω, ἐγείρω, κτείνω. See careful discussion of Winer-Schmiedel, p. 109 f. MSS. frequently read δόσῃ, δόσωμεν, etc., as if from an aorist ἔδωσά, as Jo. 17:2; Rev. 4:9. Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 120. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 90 f., for LXX examples that further parallel these illustrations.

Conversely is to be noted a new strong aorist ἀνέθαλον (Ph. 4:10) which Blass takes in a causative sense (ἀνεθάλητε τό ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῦν). Verbs in –ζω make the aorist both in σ and ξ. Most of these [Page 349] verbs have dental stems in Attic, but some have guttural. Hence the σ forms prevail till to-day. The LXX agrees with the N. T. (Thackeray, Gr., p. 222 f.). So ἐνύσταξαν (Mt. 25:5), ἐμπαξα (Mt. 20:19), ἐπεστήριζαν (Ac. 15:32); but on the other hand ἐστήριζεν (Lu. 9:51), ἑρπασε (Ac. 8:39), ἑρμοσωμήν (2 Cor. 11:2), σαλπίγχες (Mt. 6:2). The tendency in the papyri and the inscriptions on the whole is towards the use of σ and not ξ with the verbs in –ζω. Cf. Βαπτίζω, λογίζομαι, νομίζω, etc.

Like καλέω and τελέω we have ε in ἐφορέσαμεν (1 Cor. 15:49) and ἐφρέθη (Mt. 5:21), but εφωρόσα (Lu. 12:16), ἰηθέν (Mt. 1:22) and ἐπεκόθησα (1 Pet. 2:2). Cf. also ἰνεσα, ἰρκεσε, ἐμέσα. Cf. ἐπείνασα (Mt. 4:2), but διψῆσω, though D has –α– in Jo. 6:35 and Ν in Rev.

———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).

3 Ib. Mayser (Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 369) finds it in the pap. as well as ἀγαγήσαι.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 43. Cf. καταλείψῃ Mk. 12:19 Ν.
5 Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 370.
Winer-Schmiedel WINER-SCHMIEDEL, Winer’s Grammatik des neuesten Sprachidioms. 8. Aufl. (1894—).
6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 43.
1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 105.
2 Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 360 ff., for carefyl discussion and references for further research.
3 So πονέω and φορέω(ε) in the LXX. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 105.
The liquid verbs in –αίνω and –αίρω generally retain ἃ even when not preceded by ε or ι as in Attic. So ἔβιςκανα (Gal. 3:1); once κερδαν (1 Cor. 9:21), elsewhere – Ἑς; ἔξεκάθαιρα (1 Cor. 5:7); ἔλευκκαν (Rev. 7:14); ἔσήμανα (Rev. 1:1); ἔπιφαινα (Lu. 1:79). In Rev. 8:12 and 18:23 note φάνη, not φανή. The κοινή begins to use –ἀνα and –ἀρα with all verbs, and it is well-nigh universal in modern Greek. The LXX agrees with the N. T. (Thackeray, Gr., p. 223). A few –ηνα forms survive in modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 140 f.).

The second aorist passive has a few late developments of its own. This substitution of the second aorist passive for the first is a favorite idiom in the N. T.4 The κοινή shows likewise fondness for the –ην formations.5 This is true of the inscriptions6 and the papyri.7 This development is directly the opposite of that in the case of the second and first aorist active and middle. It has already been observed that in Homer the passive aorist is very rare. Perhaps the increase in the use of –ην forms is partly due to the general encroachment of aorist passive forms on the middle, and this is the simplest one. The Attic, of course, had many such forms also. Here are the chief N. T. examples: ἁγγέλην (ἀπ–, ἀν–, δι–, κατ–, Lu. 8:20, etc.) is in the LXX and the papyri; ἁνοίγην (Mt. 7:35, etc.), but ἁνοίχθησαν also (Rev. 20:12); ἡρπάγην (2 Cor. 12:2, 4), but the Attic ἡρπάσθη (Rev. 12:5); διετάγην is read by some MSS. in Mt. 24:43; διεκαύθη (Gal. 3:19), ἐπεκαύθη (Ro. 8:20, etc.), but the Attic διαταχθέντα (Lu. 17:9 f.); [Page 350] κατεκάην (Rev. 8:7; 1 Cor. 3:15), but Attic ἐκεκάθησαν (Ro. 1:27); κατενύγη (Ac. 2:37); ἐκρύβην (Jo. 8:59). So also ἔφυσα in place of ἔφυν follows the analogy of ἐφρύω (Heb. 2:1) and ἐχάρην (Lu. 22:5). Thus we have ἔφυσα (Mk. 13:28)1 and συμφυεῖσαι (Lu. 8:6–8). Forms like ἐπλήγη (Rev. 8:12) and ἐφάνη (Mt. 1:20) are Attic. On the other hand the poetical ἐκλίθη (Mt. 14:19
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———, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 43.
1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 110, for exx. in Jos. and LXX. Cf. also Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 95 f. MSS. simply read –φη.
The present indicative, from the nature of the case, is the most frequent in actual use and hence shows the greatest diversity of development. Brugmann finds thirty-two distinct ways of forming the present tense in the Indo-Germanic tongues and thirty of them in the Greek. But some of these represent very few verbs and for practical purposes a much simpler classification is sufficient. Unfortunately the grammars by no means agree on the simplification. As samples see Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 425 f.; Hadley and Allen, p. 122 f.; Monro, Homeric Grammar, p. 9; Riemann and Goelzer, Phonétique, pp. 394 ff.; Kühner-Blass, II, pp. 88 ff. In simple truth the facts are so varied that they lend themselves to many combinations more or less artificial. One of the most satisfactory is that of Monro, who has the historical instinct at least in his arrangement.

1. The Root Class. This is the simple non-thematic present like φημι. This is the logical one to put first, as with the aorist like ἐβήν. This class is disappearing in the N. T. though δύναμαι, ἔμμι, ἔμι in composition (ἐλεύθ-, ἐξ-), κάθ-η-μαι, κεῖ-μαι, κρέμα-μαι appear.

2. The Non-Thematic Reduplicated Present. So δί-δω-μι, ἵ-η-μι, κί-χρη-μι, ὀνίνη-μι, πί-πλη-μι, τί-θη-μι. It was never a very large class, but holds on in the N. T. And –ω forms are common with these verbs.

ννυ-μι, κορέ-ννυ-μι, κρε-μά-ννυ-μι, μήγ-νυ-μι, ὄμ-νυ-μι, πήγ-νυ-μι, ῥήγ-νυ-μι, σβέ-ννυ-μι, στρω-ννυ-μι, but these all have more commonly the –ω forms.1

4. The Simple Thematic Present. So λέγω, λύω. This was a constantly increasing class at the expense of the –μι verbs. It had several branches also including root-verbs like ὄγω, γράφω, a strengthened vowel like πείθ-ω (πιθ), λειτί-ω (λιτ), φείγ-ω (φιγ), σήπω, τήκω, τρώγω, θλίβω, πνήμω, etc., Hadley and Allen’s “strong vowel class,”2 and the many contract denominative verbs like τιμά-ω, φιλά-ω, ἀξιό-ω. But see the 1 Class for these contract verbs. New verbs were added to this list from nouns and some also from verb-stems, γρηγορέ-ω from the old perfect ἐγρήγορα (this tense never in the N. T.),3 στήκ-ω (Mk. 11:25) from ἔστηκα (modern Greek στέκω).4 In Lu. 1:24 περιέκρυβεν is probably imperfect, not aorist, from κρύβω (κρύπτω). Cf. ἐκρύβην.5 The LXX shows these new presents from perfect stems (Thackeray, Gr., p. 224 f.).

5. The Reduplicated Thematic Present. So γίνομαι (γίγν-ω-μι, γι-γέν-ομαι), πάπτ-ω (*πι-πέτ-ω), τίκτ-ω (*τι-τέκ-ω), ἑγ-ν-πέτ-, –τίκ-, being weak forms of –γεν-, –πετ-, –τεκ-. The N. T. has also ἱσχ-ω from ἱσχο (ν*)

6. The Thematic Present with a Suffix. There are five (–ι, –ν, –σκ, –τ, –θ). Each of these divisions furnishes a number of verbs.

   (a) The 1 class. It is very large. This suffix is used to make verbs from roots and substantives. It is probable6 that originally the suffix was –γι. It is thought that contract verbs in –αο, –εω, –οο, etc., originally had this 1 as j or y which was dropped.7 It is thus the chief way of forming denominative verbs and is preeminently a secondary suffix.8 Some of these verbs are causative, some intensive, some desiderative.9 The special Greek desiderative in –σείω does not appear in the N. T., but forms like κοπάω are found. In particular, forms in –ιζω become so common that they no longer have an intensive, iterative or causative force.10 [Page 352] but are used side by side with the older form, as βάπτω, βαπτίζω; ἱαίνω, ἱαντίζω, etc. In all the –ζω forms the 1 has united with a palatal (guttural) or lingual (dental), a matter determined by the aorist or future. So φιλάσ-σω is from φιλά-ζω, φράζω from φράζεω. Other familiar combinations are 1 and λ, as βάλ-ζω=βάλλω, 1 with υ by transposition, as φέν-ζω=φάνω, 1 with ρ likewise, as ἀρ-ζω=ἀρφα. In καίω and κλαίω the υ has dropped between α and 1. In the N. T. verbs in –αίνω, –αίρω have –ἄνα, – ἄρα in the first aorist active as already shown under the aorist tense (d). ἄμφιας (Lu.

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48.
2 Gr., p. 122.
3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 40.
5 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 41.
7 Hirt, ib., p. 383 f.
8 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 440.
10 Jann., ib., p. 222.
12:28) is an example of a new present for ἀφιέννυμι. Cf. also ἀποκτεννόντων (Mt. 10:28) in some MSS. for the older ἀποκτείνω, –ννω, –νω. See Blass1 for the variations in the MSS. at many places in the N. T. with this word. So ἐχθρόννω (Mt. 26:28, etc.) in the best MSS. for ἐχθρόω. Only in Mt. 9:17 we have ἐχθρῆται from ἐχθρόω and in Rev. 16:1 ἐχθρῆτε2 in some MSS.

(b) The ν class is also well represented in the N. T. with thematic stems. It takes various forms. There is the ν alone, as κάµ-νω, –αν as ἄμαρτ-άνω, –νε as ἀφ-ικ-νέ-μαι. Sometimes the ν is repeated in the root, as λαµβάνω (λαβθανω, λαµβάνω), τυγχάνω (τυγχανω). In the κοινή (so LXX and N. T.) this inserted ν (μ) is retained in the aorist and future of λαµβάνω (Ελήμφθην, λήμψομαι) contrary to literary Attic. So the papyri.

(γ) The σκ class. It is commonly called inceptive,3 but Delbrück4 considers these verbs originally terminative in idea, while Monro5 calls attention to the iterative idea common in Homer with the suffix –σκε, –σκο. The verbs with σκ may be either without reduplication, as βό-σκω, θνή-σκω, ἰλά-σκομαι, φά-σκω, or with reduplication as γι(γ)νό-σκω, δι-δά-σκω (for δι-δάχ-σκο), μι-μη-σκο, πά-σκο (for πάθ-σκο). Cf. ἄρε-σκο, γαµ-ισκο, γηρά-σκο, εύρι-ισκο, μεθό-σκο. Reduplication is thus a feature with root-verbs (non-thematic) like δι-δω-µι and thematic like γι(γ)νο-µαι as well as the σκ class. For reduplication in the aorist and the perfect see (h). The iterative idea of some of these σκ verbs suits well the reduplication.

(δ) The τ class. It is not a very numerous one (about 18 verbs), though some of the verbs are common. The verb has [Page 353] always a labial stem like καλύπ-τω, βάπ-τω, τύπ-τω. The root may end in β as in καλύπ-τω, π as in τύπ-τω, or φ as in βάπ-τω. It is even possible that πτ may represent an original γ (cf. iota class).

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 41. The LXX has these new presents. Thack., p.225.
2 Blass, ib. The LXX MSS. illustrate most of these peculiarities of verbs in the present tense. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 82–84.
3 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 436.
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———, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871–1888).
5 Hom. Gr., p. 34.
(c) The θ class. Cf. ὀλή-θω, ἔσ-θω, κνή-θω, νή-θω in the present. The modern Greek has developed many new presents on the basis of the aorist or the perfect (Thumb, Handb., p. 143).

(f) The Future Tense (Ὀ μέλλων χρόνος). The origin of this tense has given rise to much discussion and some confusion. Vincent and Dickson even say that the first aorist is derived from the θ future! Like the other tenses there has been a development along several lines. No general remark can be made that will cover all the facts. As already remarked, the future tense is fundamentally aoristic or punctiliar in idea and not durative or linear. The linear idea can be accentuated by the periphrastic form, as ἔσεσθε λαλοῦντες (1 Cor. 14:9). Cf. also Mt. 24:9; Lu. 1:20; 5:10; Mk. 13:25. But as a rule no such distinction is drawn. The truth is that the future tense is a late development in language. In the Sanskrit it is practically confined to the indicative and the participle, as in the Greek to the indicative, infinitive and participle (optative only in indirect discourse, and rarely then, not at all in N. T.). And in the Rigveda the σ form occurs only some seventeen times. The Teutonic tongues have no future form at all apart from the periphrastic, which existed in the Sanskrit also. In the modern Greek again the future as a distinct form has practically vanished and instead there occurs θω and the subjunctive or θέλω and the remnant of the infinitive, like our English “shall” or “will.” Giles thinks it uncertain how far the old Indo-Germanic peoples had developed a future.

Probably the earliest use of the future was one that still survives in most languages. It is just the present in a vivid, lively sense projected into the future. So we say “I go a-fishing” as Simon Peter did, ὑπάγω ἀλειπτείν (Jo. 21:3). The other disciples respond ἔρχομεθα καὶ ἥμερος σὺν σοί. This usage belongs to the realm of syntax and yet it throws light on the origin of the future tense. So Jesus used (Jo. 14:3) the present and future side by side (ἔρχομαι [Page 354] καὶ παραλήμψομαι). We have seen already that a number of aorists and presents like φη-μι had identically the same root and with no original distinction. That is, the durative idea was not distinguished from the aoristic or punctiliar. It is not strange, therefore, to see a number of these roots with primary endings (cf. subj. and opt. aorists) used as futures without any tense-suffix at all. Some were originally either present or future in sense (cf. ἔρχομαι above), others came to be used only as future. These verbs appear in Homer naturally, as βίο-μι, ἔδο-μι, ἔτμι, πίο-μι, etc. Cf. N. T. φάγο-μι. It is possible that those with variable vowel like ἔδο-μι may really be the same form as the Homeric subjunctive (like ιμεν as opposed to ιμεν). The form φάγο-μι (LXX and N. T.) is analogous (aorist, ἔφαγο-ν). The Attic used χέω as future also, but LXX and N. T. have χε-ῶ (Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 210).

It used to be said that the σ future was merely a variation of the Sanskrit syâ, the y or j sound disappearing in the Greek. This gave a simple explanation of the σ futures. But a rival theory has been advanced which derives the σ future from the σ aorist. The frequency of the aorist subjunctive in Homer with κέ (▯) in principal clauses much like the future indicative in Attic, and the absence of a future passive, not to say future optative, in Homer give some colour to this contention. Thus δεῖξω and the Latin dixo would be identical in form and meaning. But Brugmann has perhaps solved the problem by the suggestion that both explanations are true. Thus γράψω he derives from the aorist subjunctive γράψει, a mixed tense with a double origin. The use of –σει in the Doric lends weight to the derivation of these verbs at least from the syâ (Sanskrit) type. Hirt regards σεο/ε (Doric) as a combination of the σ future and the ε future (liquid verbs, for instance) and considers it a new Greek formation. This Doric future therefore may be as old as any, [Page 355] if not the oldest suffix, in fact the really distinctively future suffix. In the N. T. this Doric form survives in προάξω (Mt. 14:28). Ῥέω has Ῥέσσω (Jo. 7:38), κλαίω has κλάυσω (Lu. 6:25), while φένγω has φένξοιμαι (Jo. 10:5). The other forms common in Attic have no future in the N. T. This mixed origin of the future (partly aorist subj., partly Indo-Germ. si) shows itself in the Aktionsart of the tense. So Moulton notes προσέξω (Mk. 14:28) as durative, but ἄξει (1 Th. 4:14) as aoristic. Cf. Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 123.

3 Ib., p. 446. Cf. also Hirt, *Handb.* etc., p. 401 f.
6 Griech. Gr., p. 320. This position is accepted by K.-Bl., II, p. 105.
7 Ib., p. 105 f.

1 And this προσέξαι is possibly not from πρετ-σούμαι, but a change of τ to σ. Cf. K.-Bl., II, p. 107; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 322; Hirt, *Handb.*, p. 404. Henry (Comp. Gr. of Gk. and Lat., p. 116) considers the Doric future to be the affix of the future twice over, as σεσο, σεο.

Moulton


———, *Characteristics of N. T. Greek* (The Expositor, 1904).

———, *Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T.* (1911).

Thus we may gain further light on the Ionic-Attic future of verbs in –ιζω. It is like the Doric –σεο/ε. So we have –πολεσω, dropping σ we get –σεσω=–ιῶ. These verbs in –ιζω are very common in the later Greek. In the N. T. the usage varies between this form of the future and the aoristic form in –σο/ε. The LXX, like the Ptolemaic papyri (Thackeray, p. 228), has usually –ιῶ in first singular and so μετοκιῳ (Ac. 7:43) and παροργιῳ (Ro. 10:19), both quotations. Elsewhere W. H.6 prefer the forms in –ίσω, and Blass7 thinks that in the original passages of the N. T. the –ίσω forms are genuine. So the forms in –ίσει (like βαπτίσει) are uniform in the N. T. (Lu. 3:16) save καθαριεί (Heb. 9:14) and διακαθαριεί (Mt. 3:12).6 MSS. vary between ἄφροιει and –ίσει, φωτιει and –ίσει, χρονιει and –ίσει. Cf. Blass.7 So in Eph. 6:8; Col. 3:25, the MSS. vary between κομιέται and κομίσεται. Some MSS. read κομιούμενι in 2 Pet. 2:13.8 All editors9 accept κομιέσθε in 1 Pet. 5:4. The active plural W. H.10 print as –τοῦσι always (as μακαριοῦσιν, Lu. 1:48) save in γνωσίσουσιν (Col. 4:9).

The syncopated futures11 from the dropping of σ do not survive in the N. T. in καλέσω, τελέσω which always retain the σ.12 So even ἄπολέσω (Mt. 21:41), though ἄπολῶ is common in the LXX and [Page 356] is quoted once in the N. T. (1 Cor. 1:19). However, the middle ἄπολοῦμαι is the N. T. form (Lu. 5:57) like ἄποθανοῦμαι. Ἐλαύνω has no future in the N. T. The N. T., like the LXX, has a future form ἄφελω (Rev. 22:19) from the aorist ἄλων of αἰρέω.


———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

3 Cf. K.-Bl., II, p. 106 f.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 42.
6 Ib. But Blass (ib.) prefers ἔγγειι (Jas. 4:8).
7 Ib. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 84 f., 87 f., for the LXX exx. of verbs in –ζο.
8 Ib.
9 Notes on Orth., p. 163.
10 Ib.
11 Giles, Man., p. 446 f.
The liquid verbs in λ, ν, ρ present few problems. They belong to the aorist subjunctive type of formation. Here again we have syncopation of the σ. Verbs like βάλλω (βαλ), μένω (μεν), αἶρο (αρ) form the future with the variable vowel ο/ε added to the stem without σ in the N. T. as in the earlier Greek.

Blass has shown that in the N. T. the future active has largely displaced the future middle with verbs that were defective in the active voice. These futures are as follows:

ἁµαρτήσω (Mt. 18:21), ἀπαντήσω (Mk. 14:13), ἀρπάσω (Jo. 10:28), βλέψω (Ac. 28:26), γελάσω (Lu. 6:21), διώξω (Mt. 23:34), κράξω (Lu. 19:40 ἙΒ), παίξω (Mk. 10:34), ἐφέσω (Jo. 7:38), σπουδάσω (2 Pet. 1:15), συναντήσω (Lu. 22:10). We see this tendency already in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 231 f.). On the other hand the future middle alone occurs with ἁποθανοῦµαι (Jo. 8:24), γνώσοµαι (1 Cor. 4:19), λήµψοµαι (Mt. 10:41), δψοµαι (Mt. 24:30), πεσοµαι (Doric, Mt. 10:29), πίσοµαι (Mk. 10:39), φάγοµαι (Lu. 14:15), φεύξοµαι (Jo. 10:5). Χαρήσοµαι (Lu. 1:14) Blass regards as Attic future from the aorist (ἐχάρην) as compared with the future χαιρήσω from the present. Both ἄκοµαι (Jo. 5:25) and ἄκοµαι (Ac. 21:22, chiefly in the Acts) are found, and ζήσοµαι (Jo. 5:25) and ζήσοµαι (Jo. 11:25).

The so-called second future passive as seen in the case of χαρήσοµαι above is really just the middle ending with σ put to the aorist active stem. There is no difference in form or sense between βήσοµαι and σταλ-ήσοµαι save the –η– which was really a part of the active stem of these verbs. The point is that fundamentally these so-called second future passives are really future middles corresponding to active aorists like the future middles and presents above (λήµψοµαι, for instance). This point is made clearer by the fact that the Doric used only active endings like ἀναγγέσαι (not –εται), Homer, besides, only has one second future passive (μιγήσοµαι, really middle) and none in –θησ–. Instead he uses the middle future as later Greek continued to do with verbs like τιµήσοµαι. Cf. γενήσοµαι from ἔ-γεν-όµην. Some verbs indeed used both this second future passive like φανήσοµαι (Mt. 24:30) which [Page 357] is punctiliar and φανοῦµαι (1 Pet. 4:18) which may be durative like the Attic as Moulton argues. So παύσονται (1 Cor. 13:8) and ἐπαναπαήσεται (Lu. 10:6). Cf. also θνητόσοµαι (Mt. 7:7), ἀληθήσοµαι (1 Th. 4:17), φανήσοµαι (Mt. 24:30), ὑποταγήσοµαι (1 Cor. 15:28), ψυγήσοµαι (Mt. 24:12), χαρήσοµαι (Lu. 1:14, see above).

The first future passive so-called is built upon the distinctively Greek aorist in – θη–. It is unknown to Homer, as stated above, and, like the second aorist passive, is aorist in origin and idea. Here again the Doric used the active endings like
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1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 321.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 42.
3 Ib., p. 43.
4 Giles, Man., pp. 410, 427.
5 Ib., p. 447.
6 K.-Bl., II, p. 111.
1 Prol., p. 150.
2 Giles, Man., pp. 420, 447.
3 Ib., p. 447.
συναχθῆσοντι. This later form in –θησ— grew continually in usage over the merely middle form like τιμήσομαι. But the passive future did not always have the passive sense, as has been shown in the case of ἄνακλιθῆσομαι (Mt. 8:11), ἀποκριθῆσομαι (Mt. 25:37), etc.4 Ἀνοιχθῆσομαι also appears in Lu. 11:9 f. in some MSS. As an example of the usual forms in the N. T. take γνωσθῆσομαι (1 Cor. 14:7). Only μνησθῆσομαι (not μεμνήσομαι) and σταθῆσομαι (not ἔστηξο) appear in the N. T.5

For a periphrastic future passive expressing continuance see ἔσεσθε μισοῦμενοι (Mt. 10:22).6 This is naturally not a very common idiom for this tense, though the active periphrastic future is less frequent as already shown.

(g) The Perfect Tenses (τέλειοι χρόνοι).

1. The Name. It does fairly well if we do not think of time in connection with the tense, a mistake that Clyde makes.7 The completed state does not of itself have reference to present time. That comes later and by usage in the indicative alone in contrast to past and future. Originally the perfect was merely an intensive or iterative tense like the repetition of the aoristic present.8

2. The Original Perfect. The Greek perfect is an inheritance from the Indo-Germanic original and in its oldest form had no reduplication, but merely a vowel-change in the singular.9 Indeed οἶδα (Sanskrit vēḍa, Latin vidi, English wot) has never had reduplication.10 It illustrates also the ablaut from ο– to οι– in the singular, seen in Sanskrit and Gothic also.11 Cf. Latin capio, cēpi (a to ē). Note also κεῖ-μαι in the sense of τέ-θει-μαι.[Page 358]

But the vowel-change characteristic of the original perfects is seen in other verbs which did use reduplication. Reduplication will receive separate treatment a little later, as it pertains to the present and aorist tenses also. It may be here remarked that the reduplicated form of some iterative presents doubtless had some influence in fastening reduplication upon the perfect tense. Note the English “mur-mur” (Greek γογ-γύζω, ἀρ-αρίσκω), where the syllable is doubled in the repetition. It was a natural process. A number of these reduplicated forms with the mere change in the vowel appear in the N. T. This so-called second perfect, like the second aorist, is a misnomer and is the oldest form.1 In Homer indeed it is the usual form of the perfect.2 These old root-perfects, old inherited perfect forms according to Brugmann,3 persist

4 See VI, (e), in this chapter.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 36.
6 Ib., p. 204.
Clyde CLYDE, J., Greek Syntax (1876).
7 Gk. Synt., p. 71.
8 Giles, Man., p. 449.
10 Giles, Man., p. 449.
11 Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 410.
1 Riem. and Goelzer, Phonét., p. 445.
2 Sterrett, Hom. II., N. 43. So γέγονα, ἔδωκα, λέλουσα, πέποιθα, etc.
3 Gk. Gr., p. 323.
in the κοινή and are reasonably common in the papyri, the inscriptions and the N. T. They are of two classes: (1) real μι perfects without any perfect suffix, like ἐστάναι (Ac. 12:14); (2) second perfects in –α, like γέγονα, λέλοιπα. As N. T. examples may be mentioned ἐκήκοα (Ac. 6:11), γέγονα (1 Cor. 13:1), εἰδοθα (Lu. 4:16), γέγραφα (Jo. 19:22), ὄδα (Jo. 10:4), ὄλωλα (ἐπ-, Mt. 10:6), etc. These forms are found in the LXX. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 103; Thackeray, Gr., p. 252 f. But the κοινή gave up the shorter (without –α) forms of the plural indicative active perfect of ἔστημι (ἔσταμεν, ἔστατε, ἔστασιν). See this chapter, IV, (d), 3, for details.

3. The κ Perfect. This is a new type created by the Greek language of which no adequate explanation has yet been offered. The Attic inscriptions already had the κ form (Meisterhans, p. 189 f.). It is apparently at first in the singular, as in ἔστηκα (pl. ἔσταμεν), etc. One might think that just as ἦκω has a perfect sense like καὶμα and finally had a few perfect forms (like ἤκασιν), so by analogy some κ verbs became the type and analogy did the rest. But Giles observes that the stems of the twelve or fourteen κ perfects in Homer all end in a vowel, a liquid or a nasal, not one in κ. And then the [Page 359] three κ aorists (ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, ἔκα) call for explanation. But per contra there are some perfects in Homer which have κ stems like δέδορκα, ἔικα, τέτηκα, etc. So that after all analogy may be the true explanation of the κ perfects which came, after Homer’s time, to be the dominant type in Greek. But the –κα perfects are rare in Homer. The examples are so common (δέδωκα, etc.), in the κοινή as in the classic Greek, as to need no list. Note ἔστηκα intransitive and ἔστακα transitive.

4. The Aspirated Perfects. They are made from labials and palatals (φ, χ) and are absent from Homer. Even in the early classical period they are confined to πέπομφα and τέτροφα. Homer did use this aspirate in the peculiar middle form like τετράφαται. He has indeed τέτροφα from τρέφω and probably just here, we may see the explanation by analogy of τέτροφα from τρέφω and so of all the aspirated forms. An important factor was the fact that κ, γ, χ were not distinguished in the middle perfect forms. As a N. T. example of this later aspirated perfect take προσενήνοχα (Heb. 11:17). Cf. also ἐκλήσαι, πέροιχα, τέταχα.

5. Middle and Passive Forms. It is only in the active that the perfect used the κ or the aspirated form (φ, χ). We have seen already that in the κοινή some active perfect forms drop the distinctive endings and we find forms like ἔδρακαν and ἔδρακες. Helbing (Gr. d. Sept., pp. 101–103) gives LXX examples of root-perfects like

5 Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 159 f.
6 Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 412 f.
8 Man., p. 450.
2 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 325.
3 Sterrett, Hom. II., N. 43.
ἔρρωγα, κ perfects like τέθεικα, ἔστηκα and transitive ἔστακα, aspirated perfects like ἔρρηχα. The middle and passive perfects did use the reduplication, but the endings were added directly to this reduplicated stem as in λέ-λυ-μαι. On the history of the ending –κα see Pförtten, Zur Geschichte des griechischen Perfectums, 1882, p. 29.

6. The Decay of the Perfect Forms. In the Sanskrit the perfect appears in half the roots of the language, but in the later Sanskrit it tends more and more to be confused with the mere past tenses of the indicative (aorist and imperf.) and grows less common also.5 In the Latin, as is well known, the perfect and the aorist tenses blended. In vidi and dedi we see preserved6 the old perfect and in dixi we see the old aorist. The Greek of the Byzantine period shows a great confusion between the perfect and the aorist, partly due to the Latin influence.7 Finally [Page 360] in the modern Greek vernacular the perfect form is lost save in the perfect passive participle like κεκλημένος. The perfect active is now made with ἔχω and the passive participle (ἐχω δεμένο) or with ἔχω and a root similar to the third singular aorist subjunctive (ἐχω δέσει or δέσῃ). Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 161. The only κ perfect in modern Greek is ἔχω, “the only certain remnant of the ancient perfect” (ib., p. 148). Cf. ἔχε με παρητημένον (Lu. 14:18). Cf. also παρφρομένην ἔχετε τῆν καρδίαν ὑμῶν (Mk. 8:17). This is much like the English perfect in reality, not like the Greek ἔχω and aorist participle (like ἔχω ἄκουσας). Cf. Sonnenschein, Greek Grammar, Syntax, 1894, p. 284. The perfect passive in modern Greek vernacular is formed like ἔχω λοθῆ (–ει) or λελυμένος εἴμαι. But we are in no position to throw stones at the Greeks, for we in English have never had a perfect save the periphrastic form. How far the perfect and the aorist may have become confused in the N. T. in sense is a matter of syntax to be discussed later.2

7. The Perfect in the Subjunctive, Optative, Imperative. Hence the perfect is practically3 confined to the indicative. No example of the perfect optative occurs even in the periphrastic form. The subjunctive perfect, except the form ιδῶ (ιδῆτε, 1 Jo. 5:13), appears only in the periphrastic conjugation, of which a few examples remain. So the active, as ἐπεσκόπεως (Jas. 5:15), πεποιθότες ὅμεν (2 Cor. 1:9), and the passive, as ὅσιν τετελειωμένοι (Jo. 17:23), ἐκλημένος (Lu. 14:8), πεπληρωμένη (Jo. 16:24). So also Jo. 17:19, 1 Cor. 1:10, etc. The imperative makes a little worse showing. We still have ἵστε (Jas. 1:19; Eph. 5:5; Heb. 12:17 all possible indicatives), πεφίω (Mk. 4:39) and ἔρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29). The periphrastic imperative perfect is also found as ἔστωσαν περιεξωσμέναι (Lu. 12:35). In simple truth, as previously remarked (see proof in Prof. Harry’s articles), the perfect subjunctive, optative and imperative never had any considerable vogue in Greek, not as much as in Sanskrit. In
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7 Moulton, Prol., p. 142.
1 Thumb., Handb., p. 165. Certainly the aorists in –κα are very common in the mod. Gk. (Thumb, Handb., pp. 140, 146 ff.).
2 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 143 f.
8. The Perfect Indicative. It is to the indicative that we turn for the real development of the perfect. Here the perfect was for long very frequent indeed, and the time element comes in also. The ancients did not agree in the names for the three tenses of perfect action in the indicative. The Stoics called the present perfect συντελικός (or τέλειος) χρόνος ἔνεστις, the past perfect συντελικός (τέλειος) χρόνος παρακείμενος, the future perfect συντελικός (τέλειος) χρόνος μέλλον. Sometimes the present perfect was called merely ὁ παρακείμενος χρόνος, the past perfect ὁ ὑπερσυντελικός χρόνος, and the future perfect ὁ μετ ὀλίγον μέλλον χρόνο (futurum exactum). The name plu-perfect is not a good one. The tense occurs in the N. T. with 22 verbs and 15 have the augment (H. Scott). Thus θεμελίωτο (Mt. 7:25) and ἐλθεῖσα (Jo. 6:17), but ἐβέβλητο (Lu. 16:20) and ἐπειδῆδετο (Jo. 11:44). Cf. ἔγον ἀποκείμενην (Lu. 19:20) in the light of modern Greek. In the N. T. the past perfect is not very frequent, nor was it ever as abundant as in the Latin. Hirt calls attention to the fact that Homer knows the past perfect only in the dual and the plural, not the singular, and that the singular ending –η is a new formation, a contraction of –εα into –η. In the N. T., however, only –εν is used. It is not certain whether the past perfect is an original Indo-Germanic form. The future perfect was always a very rare tense with only two active forms of any frequency, ἔστηξαι and τεθνηξαι. The middle and passive could make a better showing. In Heb. 8:11 εὐθύς εσίν is probably future active (from LXX), and in Lu. 19:40 some MSS., but not ΝΒΛ (rejected by W. H.), give κεκράξονται (cf. LXX). In Heb. 2:13 (another quotation from the LXX) we have the periphrastic form ἔσωσα πεποιθώ. The future perfect passive occurs in the N. T. only in the periphrastic form in such examples as ἔσται δεδεμένον (Mt. 16:19), ἔσται λελυμένα (Mt. 18:18), ἔσονται διωμερισμένοι (Lu. 12:52). Cf. ἔση κατακαθέσαι ἐν (B.G.U. 596 (A.D. 84). In the nature of the case the future perfect would not often be needed. This periphrastic future perfect is found as early as Homer. The papyri likewise show some examples. The present perfect and the past perfect also have the periphrastic conjugation. So we find with comparative indifference ἔσται γεγραμένα (Jo. 20:30) and in the next verse γέγραπται. So also ἔγεγραμένον (Jo. 19:19) and ἔπειγέγραπτο (Ac. 17:23). Cf. also

4 Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 43.
1 K.-Bl., II, p. 2 f.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201. Brug. calls the past perf. a “neue Bildung.”
3 Handb. etc., p. 415 f.
4 So Hirt follows Wackern. in seeing a new stem here εὐθύς. Cf. ib., p. 416. B in Deut. 8:3 has εὐθυσαν like the aorist εὐθύς from Arist. onwards. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 370; Thack., Gr., p. 278.
5 Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 27.
6 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 377. In the Bœotian inscr. the past perf. and the fut. perf. are both absent.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 202 f. Brug. (Griech. Gr., p. 330 f.) points out how in prehistoric times the periphrastic form alone existed in the subj. and opt. middle and passive, as indeed was practically true always for all the voices.
Lu. 2:26. The active has some examples also, though not so many, as ἔστως εἴμι (Ac. 25:10), and ἦσαν προεωράκοτες (Ac. 21:29).

9. Σ in Perfect Middle and Passive and Aorist Passive. It may be due to a variety of causes. Some of these verbs had an original σ in the present stem, like τελέ(σ)ω, ἰκού(σ)ω. Hence τετέλεσωμαι, ἰκούσαι (ἡκούσθην), etc. Others are dental stems like πείθ-ω, πέπεισμαι. Others again are ν stems which in Attic (apparently analogical) changed to σ, as φαίνω, πέφασμαι, but in the N. T. this ν assimilates to the μ as in ἡξηραμμένος (Mk. 11:20) from ἡξηραίνω, μεμιαμμένος (Tit. 1:15) from μαίνω. Then again some verbs take the σ by analogy merely, as in the case of ἐγνωσμαι, ἐγνώσθην (1 Cor. 13:12), κέκλεισμαι (Lu. 11:7), λέλουσμαι (Heb. 10:22).

(h) REDUPLICATION (διπλασιασμός or ἀναδιπλώσις).

1. Primitive. Now this primitive repetition of the root belongs to many languages and has a much wider range than merely the perfect tense. Hence it calls for separate treatment. It is older, this repetition or intensifying of a word, than either the inflection of nouns or the conjugation of verbs. Root reduplication existed in the parent language.4

2. Both Nouns and Verbs. Among nouns note ἄγ-ογός, βάρ-βαρος, Βέ-βηλος, etc. But it was among verbs that reduplication found its chief development.5

3. In Three Tenses in Verbs. It is in the aorist, the present and the perfect. This is precisely the case with the Sanskrit, where very many aorists, some presents and nearly all perfects have reduplication.6 In Homer7 the reduplication of the second [Page 363] aorist is much more frequent than in later Greek, but forms like ἤγαγον, ἤνεγκον, εἶπον, persist in N. T. Greek and the κοινή generally. Cf. ἐκέκραξα in Ac. 24:21. The Greek present shows reduplication in three classes of presents, viz. the root class (like δι-δωμι, ἤ-μι, ἦ-στημι, etc.), the thematic presents (like γί-γνο-μα, πί-πτω, etc.), inceptive verbs (like γι-γνώ-σκω, etc.). The most common reduplication in Greek is, of course, that in the perfect tense, where it is not like augment, mode-sign or personal endings. It is an integral part of the tense in all modes, voices and persons, until we see its disappearance (p. 365) in the later Greek. In the vernacular the extinction is nearly complete.1 Even presents5 like γνώσκω occur in modern Greek.

---

5 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 176. Fritzsche (Ques. de redupl. graeca; Curtius, Stud. zu griech. und lat. Gr., pp. 279 ff.) considers the doubling of the syllable (iteration) the origin of all reduplication like ἄρ-αρ-ίσκω, βι-βά-ζω.
6 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 222.
7 Sterrett, Hom. II., N. 32.
1 See Jann., Hist. Gr., p. 190 f., for exx. like ἔτακτο even in Polyb., and later γραμμένος, etc.
Dieterich\(^4\) gives numerous examples of dropped reduplication in inscriptions and papyri. It is absent in the modern Greek vernacular, even in the participle.\(^5\)

4. Three Methods in Reduplication. Perhaps the oldest is the doubling of the whole syllable, chiefly in presents and aorists, like γογ-γύζω, ἀρ-αρίσκω, ἥ-αγ-ον, etc. This is the oldest form of reduplication\(^6\) and is more common in Greek than in Latin.\(^6\) The later grammarians called it Attic reduplication because it was less common in their day,\(^7\) though, as a matter of fact, Homer used it much more than did the Attic writers.\(^8\) But perfects have this form also, as ἀκήκοα, ἐλήλυθα, etc. But the reduplication by ι is confined to presents like δί-δω, γί-γνο, etc. And most perfects form the reduplication with ε and the repetition of the first letter of the verb as λέ-λοκα. But Homer had πέπιθον and other such aorists. Εἶπον is really an example of such an aorist.

5. Reduplication in the Perfect. The history is probably as follows in the main. Originally there were some perfects without reduplication,\(^9\) a remnant of which we see in οἶδα. The doubling of the whole syllable was the next step like ἀκ-ήκοα, ἐγρή-γορ-α, ἐλ-ήλυθα, ἀπόλωλα, etc., like the present and aorist usage.\(^10\) Then comes the ε with repetition of the initial letter of a consonant-stem [Page 364] like λέ-λοιπα. But here some further modifications crept in. The aspirates did not repeat, but we have τέ-θειακα. Those with σ did not repeat it, but instead used the rough breathing as ἔστηκα or the smooth like ἔσχηκα. This was all for euphony. But forms like ἐ-ςηκα, ἐ-σπασμα fall under another line also, for, if the verb begins with a double consonant, the consonant need not be used. So ἔ-γνωκα, but βέ-βληκα, γέ-γραφα. The Cretan dialect has indeed ἕγραται=γέ-γραπται.\(^1\) So far the N. T. phenomena are in harmony with the general Greek history, as indeed is the case with the papyri\(^2\) and the inscriptions.\(^3\) In Lu. 1:27 and 2:5, we have ἐ-μνηστευ-μην, not μεμν. (cf. μέμνημαι). Just as σ verbs did not repeat, so with ρ verbs sometimes. So ἔριμενοι (Mt. 9:36), ἐρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29), etc. But in Rev. 19:13 W. H. read ῥ ῥαντισμένου, though Hort\(^4\) advocates ῥ ῥαμμένου. D has ῥ εριμμένων in Mt. 9:36 above. This
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3 Unters. etc., p. 215.
4 Thumb, Handb., p. 148 ff.
5 Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 369.
7 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 190.
8 Sterrett, Hom. II., N. 32.
10 Ib., Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 70–82, treats together augment and reduplication, not a very satisfactory method.
1 Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 408.
3 Nachm., p. 150 f.; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 171.
4 Notes on Orth., p. 170.
reduplication of initial ἰ is contrary to Attic rule. For the LXX see Thackeray, Gr., p. 204 f. This use of ε begins to spread in the κοινή and is seen in LXX MSS., as in A ἔπευραστο (Deut. 9:10). For similar forms in Ionic and late writers see Winer-Schmiedel. Once more several verbs that begin with a liquid have ει as the reduplication in the Attic and Ionic, though not in all dialects. Perhaps euphony and analogy entered to some extent in the case of εἰ-ληφα (λαμμάνω), εἴρηκα (cf. ἔρρήθην). Note also εἴληξα and εἴλοχα. With verbs beginning with a vowel there was sometimes the doubling of the syllable as ἰκήκοα, or the mere lengthening of the vowel as ἰκουσαμ, or the addition of ε alone with contraction as εθυμάνος, or uncontracted as ἰοκα (from ἰκο). Cf. εἴοθα. In Jo. 3:21 (so 1 Pet. 4:3) we have εἴργασμα as in Attic and εἶλκομένος in Lu. 16:20. In ὅραω we have ἐόρακα in Paul’s Epistles (1 Cor. 9:1) and sometimes a sort of double reduplication (like εἴοθα) as ἐόρακα (Jo. 1:18). So Attic. See Additional Note. In Col. 2:1 the form ἐόρακαν calls for notice both for its reduplication and its ending (cf. ἐόρακαν Lu. 9:36). So also ἰνέωγεν (1 Cor. 16:9; Ν ἰνεωγός, Jo. 1:51) and ἰνεωγμένης (2 Cor. 2:12). Indeed in this last verb the preposition may receive additional reduplication (treble therefore), as in ἰνεωγμένη (Rev. five times). See also ἰμεωμένον (Mt. 11:8=Lu. 7:25) from ἰμφένομι. But as a rule with compound verbs in the N. T. reduplication comes only between the prepositions and the verb. Sometimes the reduplication is not used, as in εὔαρεστηκέναι (Heb., 11:5), but ΝΕΠ have εὐηρ—. We have ἰκοδόμῃτο (Lu. 4:29), but ἰκοδομήθαι (Lu. 6:48). 1 Cf. ἰκοδομήθη (Jo. 2:20) for absence of augment. Reduplication in the perfect has disappeared from the modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 119) and is showing signs of decay in the κοινή. For suppression of reduplication in papyri see Mays, p. 341.

(i) AUGMENT (αὐξησίς).

1. The Origin of Augment. It has never been explained. It is generally conceded to be an independent word, an adverb, added to the verb, which is an enclitic after the augment like ἔλπε. 2 We have mere conjectures for the origin of the adverb, possibly a locative of the pronoun-stem. In Sanskrit it is a.

2. Where Found. It is found in Sanskrit, Iranian, Armenian and Greek, and only in the past tenses of the indicative. But in Mt. 12:20 we actually have κατεᾶξε (fut. ind. of κατάγνυμι), and in Jo. 19:31 κατεᾶξαν (aor. pass. subj.), probably to distinguish these forms from κατάγω. So Winer-Schmiedel, p. 98. This “false augment” is very common in later Greek (Hatzidakis, Einl., p. 64). Augment persists in modern Greek (Thumb, p. 117).

3. The Purpose of Augment. It denotes past time. The secondary endings do that also and with sufficient clearness at first. More than half of the past tenses of the

---

5 P. 103. Cf. also K.-Bl., II, p. 23, and Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 38.
1 Moulton (Cl. Rev., Feb., 1901, p. 36) cites ἰπαιτῆσθαι, ἐτοιμάκαμεν from the pap.
2 Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), IV, p. 25. Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 185) thinks it is an archaic form of the imperf. of εἶμι (ε, εν).
Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
Sanskrit do not have the augment. In Homer some verbs like ὤραω never had augment, and often for metrical reasons the augment is not found in Homer. He used much freedom in the matter. Jannaris is probably right in the opinion that this freedom is due to the original fulness of the verb-endings. Augment won a firm foothold in prose before it did in poetry, but never was everywhere essential. It varied greatly in its history as will be shown.

4. The Syllabic Augment (αὐξήσις συλλαβική). Its use with the past tenses of the indicative was not exactly uniform, being less constant with the past perfect than with the aorist and imperfect. The syllabic augment occurs also with some initial vowel verbs due to original digamma ϝ, σ in the anlaut. So εἴσαεσθαι (Ac. 28:4), εἴσαεσθαι (Mt. 2:2), εἴσαεσθαι (Mt. 2:8), εἴσαεσθαι (2 Th. 2:13), etc. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 200 f. In the N. T. it is absent from the past perfect more frequently than it is present, as is true of the papyri and late Greek generally. So, for instance, τεθεμελίωτο (Mt. 7:25), πεποιήκεσαν ( Mk. 15:7), παραδεδέκτοκεσαν (Mk. 15:10), ἔληλυθε (Jo. 6:17), etc. On the other hand the augment does appear in such examples as ἔπεσεν (Lu. 11:22), ἔβεβλητο (Lu. 16:20), ἔγεγον (Jo. 6:17), συνετέθειτο (Jo. 9:22), περιεδέδεστο (Jo. 11:44), etc. It was only in the past perfect that both augment and reduplication appeared. The κοινὴ strove to destroy the distinction between reduplication and augment so that ultimately reduplication vanished (Thumb, Hellenismus, p. 170). But first the augment vanished in the past perfect. The Attic sometimes had ἐστήκειν (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 100). Hort (Notes on Orthography, p. 162) contends for ἰστήκειν uniformly in the N. T. as more than mere itacism for ἐστήκειν, for even B has ἰ five times in spite of its fondness for ε. So W. H. uniformly, as Rev. 7:11 and even in Jo. 1:35 and Lu. 23:49. Cf. similar itacism between εἰδον and ἰδον in the MSS. (Hort, Notes on Orthography, p. 162). On augment in the LXX see Conybeare and Stock, Sel. from LXX, pp. 36 ff.; Swete, Intr. to O. T., p. 305; Thackeray, Gr., pp. 195

3 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 221.
4 Sterrett, Hom. II., N. 30 f.
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———, On the True Meaning of the Koινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

5 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 185.
6 Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), IV, p. 32.
1 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 333.
2 W.-Sch., p. 99.
Conybeare and Stock CONYBEARE and STOCK, Selections from the LXX. A Grammatical Introduction (1905).
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5. The Temporal Augment (αὐξησις χρονικῆ). The simplicity of the syllabic and the resulting confusion of the temporal had undoubtedly something to do with the non-use of the temporal augment in many cases.3 The κατάρα shows this tendency.4 Even the Attic was not uniform in the use of the temporal augment. At bottom there is no real distinction between the temporal and syllabic augment. Both express time and both make use of the syllabic ε. The difference is more one of the eye and ear than of fact. What we call the temporal augment is the result of the contraction of this ε with the initial vowel of the verb.5 As remarked above, this very confusion of result, difficult to keep clear as the vowel-sounds tended to blend more and more, led to the disuse of this ε and contraction with initial vowel verbs, especially with diphthongs.6 Hence in the N. T. we meet such examples as the [Page 367] following: of αἵ, ἐπαυξόμενη (2 Tim. 1:16); of εἶναι, εὐλόγησεν (Mt. 14:19), εὐδόκησα (Mt. 17:5), εὐνοῦχασαν (Mt. 19:12), εὐκαύριον (Mk. 6:31), εὐφραινόντα (Ac. 7:41), εὐπορεῖτο (Ac. 11:29), εὐθυδομήσαμεν (Ac. 16:11), εὐχαρίστησεν (Ac. 27:35).1 But on the other hand we have ἡρῴσαμεν (Mk. 14:55), προσηύξασθο (Ac. 8:15), ἡρῴσην (Ro. 9:3), ἡμδόκησαν (Ro. 15:26); of οἱ, οὐκοδομήθη (Jo. 2:20), etc., but ἡκοδομήσαν (Lu. 7:5), etc.; of εἰ, εἶχαμεν (Gal. 2:5) just like Attic; of εἶ, διερμήνευσεν (Lu. 24:27), διειλεύσατο (Jo. 6:18), ἰνεθή (Ac. 16:26), ἰφέθησαν (Ro. 4:7, Ps. 32:1); of οὗ, προσόμυνον (Ac. 2:25; Ps. 16:8), and some MSS. in Lu. 13:13 (ἄνωθεν) and Ro. 9:29 (ὑμωθήσεται); of οὗ, Ἰακώβου (Lu. 8:43), Ἰακώνοιεν (2 Cor. 3:6) and Ἰακώ (Lu. 9:11); of οὗ, ἴνεομαι has no augment, ἴνηστο (Ac. 7:16), and the same thing is true of ὠθείς, as ἄφθαστο (Ac. 7:27), ἐξώσεν (Ac. 7:45). Ἠργάζομαι has ἦ, not εἰ, as its augment according to W. H. So ἦργαζοντο (Ac. 18:3), but always εἶχον.

6. Compound Verbs (παρασύνθετα). The language varied in the way it regarded compound verbs, though usually a verb derived from a compound is treated as a unit. So ἔσωσόμεθα, ἔλθοβόλησαν, ἔμοιχοποίησαν (Ac. 7:41), ἐναυάσθη, ἐπροφήτευσαν (Mk. 7:6), ἐπαρμοσώσατο (Ac. 9:27), ἐπεφανείσθη, but εὐθυγελέσατο (Ac. 8:35) in late Greek and προευγελέσατο (Gal. 3:8). If the compound embraces a preposition, the augment as in Attic usually follows the preposition like ὑπήντησαν (Lu. 17:12). Some verbs derived from nouns already compounded are augmented like verbs compounded with a preposition, as δησκόνει (Mt. 8:15) unlike Attic. As further examples note ὑπεδήμησαν (Mt. 21:33), ἐπεθυμήσαν (Mt. 13:17), κατηγόρουν (Mk. 15:3), ἐπεσηκόρησαν (Lu. 1:1), ἀπελογεῖτε (Ac. 26:1), συνήργε (Jas. 2:22). Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 102. But in Mt. 7:22 and 11:13 the Syrian class of MSS. have προευγελέσαμεν and –σαν. Sometimes the preposition itself is treated as a part of the verb when put directly to the verb, as ἠρεύ (Mk. 1:34), ἠνοιῶν (Rev. 6:1), διήνυσαν (Lu. 24:32), ἐκάθευδον (Mt. 25:5), ἐκάθητο

---

3 See good discussion in Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 186.
6 Ib., p. 186. Hence in mod. Gk. temporal augment is nearly gone. Already in the LXX the movement toward the loss of the temporal augment is seen (Thack., Gr., pp. 196, 199 f.). The pap. often have –εμόθην for –ἡρέθην (Mayser, pp. 127, 335).
1 See W.-Sch., p. 100 f. Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 162 f.
(Mt. 13:1), ἐκάθισεν (Jo. 19:13), ἐκαθέζετο (Jo. 4:6). In Mt. 13:15 ἐκάµµωσαν (from Is. 6:10) is assimilation of καταµύω. Verbs beginning with εὐ– vary in augmented tenses between εὐ– and ἐ, but when followed by a vowel, the verb is treated as a compound like εὐηγγελίσατο above.

7. Double Augment. It is fairly common in the N. T. In the case of ἠγαγον and ἔλαυν the augment is added to the aoristic reduplication. But in ἔδρων (Jo. 6:2 in Tischendorf’s text, W. H. ἐθεώρουν) there is a clear case of double augment like the double reduplication in ἐθέρμακα. So also the N. T. regularly ἠδύνατην (Mt. 17:16) and even ἠδύνατο (Mk. 6:5) and ἠδύνατο (Mk. 14:5) appear and the MSS. vary much. This η (analogy to ἠθελον) first arises in the Attic in 300 B.C. With μέλλω, ἡμελλον is the usual form (Jo. 4:47), though ἡμελλον occurs also (Jo. 7:39). Βούλομαι in the N. T. never has η, though the Text. Rec. has it in 2 Jo. 12. On the other hand θέλω always has η (Gal. 4:20, ἠθελον) even after the initial ε was dropped. Ἀποκαθίστημι has always a double augment, one with each preposition. So Ἀπεκατέστη (Mk. 8:25) and Ἀπεκατεστάθη (Mk. 3:5). So LXX and later Greek. But in Heb. 12:4 ἄντικατέστητε is the true text. Ἀνέχο has a peculiar history. It now has single augment on the preposition, as ἥνοιξεν (Rev. 6:3), now double augment of the verb, as ἁνέθεεν (Jo. 9:14), now a triple augment on verb and preposition, as ἁνεψήθησαν (Mk. 9:30). Ἀνέχομαι, on the other hand, has only one augment, as ἁνεσίγμην (Ac. 18:14) and ἁνείρησε (2 Cor. 11:1). For double augment in the LXX see Thackeray, Gr., pp. 202 ff.

VIII. The Infinitive (ἡ ἀπαρέµφατος ἔγκλισις). The most striking development of the infinitive in the κοινή belongs to syntax, and not accidence. Hence a brief discussion will here suffice. Blass, for instance, in his Grammar of N. T. Greek, has no discussion of the infinitive under “Accidence,” nor has Moulton in his Prolegomena. But the infinitive has a very interesting history on its morphological side.

1. No Terminology at First. Originally it was a mere noun of action (nomen actionis). Not all nouns of action developed into infinitives. Brugmann quotes from Plato τοῦ ἰδίου ἰδίων ἤµων where a noun of action (δόσις) is used with the dative. This is, of course, not an infinitive. The older Sanskrit shows quite a variety of nouns of action used in a “quasi-infinitive sense,” governing cases like the verb, but having no tense nor voice.

2. Fixed Case-Forms. The first stage in the development was reached when these nouns of action were regarded as fixed case-forms. [Page 369] That stage was obtained in the Sanskrit. At first the dative was the most common case so used along with the accusative, genitive, ablative and sometimes the locative. In the later Sanskrit
the accusative supplanted the rest (*tum or itum*). Cf. the Latin supine. But the Sanskrit infinitive, while governing cases, never developed tense nor voice, and so remained essentially a substantive.

3. **With Voice and Tense.** But the second stage appears in the Greek and Latin where it had its most characteristic development. The infinitive becomes a real verbal substantive. Here voice and tense are firmly established. But while, by analogy, the Greek infinitive comes to be formed on the various tense and voice stems, that is an after-thought and not an inherent part of the infinitive. There was originally no voice, so that it is even a debatable question if τιμή-σαν, for instance, and *haberi* are not formed exactly alike. The active and the passive ideas are both capable of development from δύναμις θαυμάσσω, 'capable for wondering.' The passive infinitive had only sporadic development in single languages. The middle is explained in the same way as active and passive. The tense-development is more complete in Greek than in Latin, the future infinitive being peculiar to Greek. The Latin missed also the distinctive aorist infinitive. But here also analogy has played a large part and we are not to think of λύσαμι, for instance, as having at bottom more kinship with ἔλυσα than with λύσις. Indeed the perfect and future infinitives are both very rare in the N. T. as in the κοινὴ generally. This weakening of the future infinitive is general in the κοινὴ, even with μέλλω as well as in indirect discourse. In Jo. 21:25 late MSS. have χορήσαμι instead of χορήσων. Indeed the papyri in the later κοινὴ show a hybrid infinitive form, a sort of mixture of aorist and [Page 370] future like ἐπελεύσασθαι (even in early papyri). In the LXX we find τεύξασθαι (2 Macc. 15:7) and ἐκφεύξασθαι in 2 Macc. 9:22. In other cases the two are used side by side. It is only in the state of the action that the infinitive has any true tense-action developed save in indirect discourse where the infinitive tense represents the time of the direct discourse. The infinitive thus is like a verb in that it expresses action, governs cases, has voice and tense.

---

3 Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 433.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 203.
5 Hirt, Handb., p. 431.
6 Moulton, Prol., p. 204.
7 Votaw, Use of the Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 59.
8 Moulton, Prol., p. 204.
4. No Personal Endings. The infinitive never developed personal endings and remained undefined, unlimited. The infinitive and the participle are thus both infinitives in this sense, that they are the unlimited verb so far as personal endings are concerned. They are both participles in that they participate in both noun and verb. The terms have no inherent distinction, but serve merely as a convenience. In the nature of the case neither can have a subject in any literal sense. But it is to be admitted even here that the line between the finite and the infinite verb is not absolute. Cf. the forms φέρε and φέρειν, for instance. But the cases used with the infinitive will be discussed in Syntax.

5. Dative and Locative in Form. The infinitive continued a substantive after the voice and tense-development. At first the case-idea of the form was observed, but gradually that disappeared, though the form remained. The Greek infinitives are always either datives or locatives, “dead datives or locatives” usually. All infinitives in –αί are datives. Thus all those in –ναί, –σαί, –έναί, –μεναί (Homer), –σθαι (–θαι). Those in –σθαι alone give any trouble. It is probably a compound (σ, θαι), but its precise origin is not clear. The locative is seen in –ειν, and Homeric –µεν, but the origin of –ειν is again doubtful. But no distinction remains between the two cases in actual usage. In Homer the dative sense as well as form remain extremely common, as indeed is true of all Greek where the infinitive remains. The very common infinitive of purpose, like ἔλθον ἀγοράσαι, is a true dative. (Cf. Mt. 2:2.) But the very essence of the infinitive as a complete development is that this dative or locative form could be used in any case like any other substantive without inflection, an indeclinable substantive in a fixed case-form.

6. The Presence of the Article. After Homer’s day it was common and chiefly in the Attic, but this is a matter to be treated further in Syntax. The point to observe here is that the article did not make a substantive of the infinitive. It was that before voice and tense were used with it. But it is true that even in Homer the verbal aspect is more prominent than the substantival. In the vernacular the article was never much used with the infinitive; perhaps for convenience it was not so employed.

7. The Disappearance of the Infinitive. The old forms in –ειν and –ναί remain longest (Thackeray, Gr., pp. 210, 257). The causes for the disappearance of the infinitive in later Greek till in the modern Greek vernacular it is (outside of the Pontic dialect) dead and gone, lie largely in the region of syntax. The infinitive as a whole disappears before ὅτι and ἵνα (modern Greek νά). Farrar calls attention to the absence of the infinitive in Arabic. It was always a matter of discretion with a Greek writer whether in certain clauses he would use the infinitive or an object-clause (ὅτι, ἵνα,

ἵνα). Cf. Latin. The English infinitive has an interesting history also as the mutilated form of the dative of a gerund.

8. Some N. T. Forms. Not many N. T. forms call for special remark and those have been explained already, such as –οῦν (Mt. 13:32; Heb. 7:5), παῦν and even δύν for πείν (Jo. 4:9). In Lu. 1:79 ἐπιφάναι instead of the Attic ἐπιφήναι is noticeable. In Ph. 4:12 we have πείναν, not –ίνα. The Coptic has the infinitive μαστιγοῖν (cf. W. H. κατασκηνοῖν, Mt. 13:32=Mk. 4:32, and ὁποδεκατοῖν in Heb. 7:5). In 1 Cor. 11:6 we find both κείρασθαι and ξυρασθαι. In Mk. 14:71 ὄμναι is the regular –μι form. In Heb. 11:5 εὐρεστηκέναι is without reduplication in AKL. In Lu. 9:18 (11:1) a periphrastic infinitive appears, ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον. The augment occurs with ὄνειροθήναι in Lu. 3:21. Cf. ἐσομαί διδόναι in Tob. 5:15 B.

IX. The Participle (ἡ μετοχή).

1. The Name. This does not really distinguish this verbal adjective from the verbal substantive, the infinitive. Both are participles [Page 372] and both are infinitives. Voss calls the participles “mules” because they partake of both noun and verb, but the infinitives are hybrid in exactly the same sense. Like the infinitive, the Greek participle has voice, tense, and governs cases, and may use the article. Unlike the infinitive the participle has regular inflection like other adjectives. Clyde would include participles in the infinitive. So Kühner-Blass. Dionysius Thrax puts the participle right:

2. Verbal Adjectives. As a matter of fact no absolutely clear line can be drawn between verbal adjectives and other adjectives. An adjective may not only be used with a case like κενός with the ablative, but may even take on a verbal nature in certain connections. Some, like κλυτός, were always purely adjectival. Most of the forms in –τος in Greek are adjectival, but many of them have a verbal idea developed also, either that of completion, as ἄγαπητός (‘beloved,’ Mt. 3:17), or of possibility or capability, as παθητός (‘liable to suffering,’ Ac. 26:23). In Greek these verbals in –τος never became a part of the verb as in Latin perfect passive participle. Moulton shows how amatus est and “he is loved” represent different tenses, but scriptum est and “it is written” agree. But there was no reason why the –τος should not have had a further verbal development in Greek. For the structure of this verbal adjective see the

3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 221. Thumb (Handb. of Mod. Gk.) has no discussion of the infinitive.
1 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 169.
2 Gk. Synt., p. 94.
3 II, p. 4.
4 § 19.
5 Brug., Comp. Gr., IV, p. 605.
6 Ib., II, P. 456.
7 Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 474.
8 Ib.
9 Prol., p. 221.
chapter on Formation of Words, where a list of the chief examples is given. Moulton points out the wavering between the active and passive idea when the true verbal exists in the N. T., by the example of δούνατον in Ro. 8:3. Is it ‘incapable’ as in Ro. 15:1 or ‘impossible’ as is usual? Blass indeed denies the verbal character of the –τος form in the N. T. to any examples except παθητός (Ac. 26:23). But this is too extreme, as Moulton clearly proves. Ασύνετος is active in Ro. 1:31 while ἄσυνθετος is middle (συντίθεμαι). With the forms in –τος therefore two points have to be watched: first, if they are verbal at all, and then, if they are active, middle or passive. There is no doubt as to the verbal character of the form in –τέος, which expresses the idea of necessity. This is in fact a gerundive [Page 373] and is closely allied to the –τος form. It has both a personal construction and the impersonal, and governs cases like the verb. It is not in Homer (though –τος is common), and the first example in Greek is in Hesiod. The N. T. shows only one example, βλητέον (Lu. 5:38), impersonal and governing the accusative. It appears in a few MSS. in the parallel passage in Mk. 2:22. One further remark is to be made about the verbs, which is that some participles lose their verbal force and drop back to the purely adjectival function. So ἐκών, μέλλων in the sense of ‘future.’ Cf. eloquens and sapiens in Latin.

3. True Participles. These have tense and also voice. Brugmann indeed shows that the Greek participle endings go back to the prothetic participle. Already in the Sanskrit the present, perfect and future tenses (and in the Veda the aorist) have participles in two voices (active and middle), thus showing an earlier development than the infinitive. The endings of the Greek participles are practically the same as those of the Sanskrit. The Latin, unlike the Sanskrit and the Greek, had no aorist and no perfect active participle, and the future participle like acturus may have come from the infinitive. The Greek has, however, two endings for the active, –ντ for all tenses save the perfect, just like the Sanskrit. The perfect ending (–ως, –ός, –ος, Greek –ως, –ός, –υι) is difficult of explanation, but is likewise parallel with the Sanskrit. The perfect participle is more common in Homer than any other form of the perfect (Sterrett, Homer’s Iliad, N. 44). The middle ending –μενο is uniform and is like the

10 Ib.
11 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 37.
12 Prol., p. 222.
1 Brug., Comp. Gr., IV, p. 605.
3 Hirt, Handb., p. 438. Moulton (Cl. Rev., Mar., 1904, p. 112) finds one ex. of –τέος in the pap. and “the –τος participle is common in neg. forms.” Note that he calls it a participle.
5 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 347.
8 Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 474.
9 Hirt, Handb., p. 436 f.
Sterrett STERRETT, J. R. S., Homer’s Iliad with Grammar (1907).
Sanskrit. The Greek aorist passive participle ending (–θεντ) is peculiar to the Greek and is made by analogy from the old active form like φαν-έντ-ς (φαν-είς), [Page 374] like Latin, manens. The participles survive in modern Greek, though the active, like the third declension, takes on the form γράφοντας (γράφων).²

The modern Greek uses chiefly the present active, the past passive participle (Dieterich, Unters., p. 206), and some middle or passive participles in –ούµενος or –άµενος (Thumb, Handb., p. 167). The use of the aorist and perfect active participles gave Greek a great superiority over the Latin, which had such a usage only in deponent verbs like sequor, secutus. But Greek used the other participles far more than the Latin. English alone is a rival for the Greek in the use of the participle. One of the grammarians calls the Greeks φιλοµέτοχοι because they were a participle-loving people.³ The use of the tenses of the participle belongs to syntax. One may merely remark here that the future participle is very rare in the N. T. as in the papyri and κοινή generally (cf. Infinitive). The LXX has it seldom (Thackeray, Gr., p. 194). It is found chiefly in Luke in the N. T., as Lu. 22:49; Ac. 8:27; 20:22; 22:5; 24:11, 17.⁴ The N. T. itself presents no special peculiarities as to the forms of the participle. In Rev. 19:13 ἔραµµένον has been cited under the question of reduplication. ἔστως is more frequent than ἔστηκώς. Other perfects like ἀπολολώς call for no comment.

4. In Periphrastic Use. The participle is common in the N. T. in the periphrastic tenses. These have been given in detail under the various tenses, but a summary at this point is desirable. This use of the participle with various forms of the verb “to be” is so common in all languages, ancient and modern, as hardly to require justification. Modern English uses it largely in its verb-inflection, as does modern Greek. The use of the participle as the predicate is found all through the Indo-Germanic languages.⁵ It is very frequent in the Sanskrit, especially in the later language.⁶ Its oldest usage seems to be in the perfect tense, which exists as far back as we can go.⁷ In the N. T. the perfect optative does [Page 375] not appear, though once a good chance for the periphrastic perfect optative arises as in Ac. 21:33, ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἴη καὶ τί ἔστιν πεποιηκώς. The perfect subj. save εἰδό is seen in the N. T. only in the periphrastic form both in the active, as ᾧ πεποιηκός (Jas. 5:15), and the passive, as ᾧ πεπληρωµένη (Jo. 16:24).¹ So 2 Cor. 9:3. The periphrastic perfect imperative is illustrated by ἐπονοον περιεζωσµέναι (Lu. 12:35). No example of the periphrastic perfect infinitive appears in the N. T., so far as I have noticed, except κατεσταλµένος ὑπάρχειν (Ac. 19:36). A periphrastic perfect participle also is observed in ὅντας

4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 37. He cites elsewhere Mt. 27:49, σώσσων, Jo. 6:64, 1 Cor. 15:37; Heb. 3:5; 13:17; 1 Pet. 3:13. Then there are the doubtful forms κωσούµενα (2 Pet. 3:10, 12) and κοιµούµενοι (2 Pet. 2:13).  
5 Brug., Comp. Gr., IV, p. 444.  
6 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 394.  
7 Brug., Comp. Gr., IV, p. 446.  
1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 331. Κεκτώµατι and κεκτήµην had no following in Gk.
ἀπηλλοτριωμένους (Col. 1:21). Colloquial Attic has it (Arist. Ran. 721) and the inscriptions (Syll. 928ii / B.C.) ἰποκεκριμένης οὔσης (Moulton, Prol., p. 227). In the indicative the periphrastic form is the common one for the future perfect, both active, as ἔσομαι πεποιθός (Heb. 2:13), and passive, as ἔσται λελυμένα (Mt. 18:18). Cf. Lu. 12:52. Moulton (Prol., p. 227) finds three papyri with aorist participles in future perfect sense. With γίνομαι note γεγόνατε ἔχοντες (Heb. 5:12). Cf. Rev. 16:10, ἐγένετο ἐσκοτισμένη. Cf. 2 Cor. 6:14; Col. 1:18; Rev. 3:2. The past perfect is very common in the passive, as ἦν γεγραμμένον (Jo. 19:19), but less frequent in the active, as ἦσαν προεωρακότες (Ac. 21:29). In Ac. 8:16 we not only have ἦν ἐπιεπτοκόσιος, but even βεβαπτισμένοι ὑψηρχόν (cf. also 19:36). Cf. also ἦν κείμενος as equal to ἦν τεθειμένος (Lu. 23:53); ἦν ἔστις (Lu. 5:1); ἔστιν δεκιεμένην (Lu. 19:20), like ἔχει παρτημένον (Lu. 14:18), since καθάω is perfect in sense. The present perfect is more common in the periphrastic form than in the active, as ἔστος ἐμί (Ac. 25:10), and especially in the passive, as γεγραμμένον ἐστίν (Jo. 6:31).

The periphrastic aorist appears only in ἦν βληθείς (Lu. 23:19) and only in the indicative. But note ἐγένετο στίλβοντα (Mk. 9:3).

The periphrastic future indicative is found several times in the active, as ἔσονται πίπτοντες (Mk. 13:25), and the passive, as ἔσοσθε μισούμενοι (Lu. 21:17).

The present tense is written periphrastically in the imperative, as ἰκνὶ ἐνυνόω (Mt. 5:25; cf. Lu. 19:17), and even with γίνομαι, as μὴ γίνεσθε ἐπερομούμενα (2 Cor. 6:14). Cf. Rev. 3:2. In Col. 1:18 we find an aorist subjunctive with a present participle, Ἰνα γένηται προεώρασιμον. The present infinitive occurs in ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον (Lu. 9:18; 11:1). As an example of the present indicative active take ἔστιν ἔχοντα (Col. 2:23), and of [Page 376] the passive take ἔστιν μεθερμησμένον (Jo. 1:42), though this last is not strictly an instance in point. Cf. also ἔστιν προσαναπληροῦσα (2 Cor. 9:12).

The periphrastic imperfect is the most common of all. It is not unknown to the old Greek, and is abundant in the papyri and the κοινή generally, but it is even more frequent in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 195) and in the Aramaic. As Blass shows, not all the examples in the N. T. are strictly periphrastic, like ἦσαν . . . ἄγριαποιήμενες (Lu. 2:8). But they are abundant enough, as one can see on almost any page of the Gospels. Take ἦσαν ἀνομμένοντες καὶ ἦν προάγον (Mk. 10:32). So Ac. 2:2, ἦσαν καθήμενοι, and Gal. 1:22, ἦμιν ἄγνοιαμένως.

For list of important verbs in the N. T. see Additional Notes and my Short Grammar of the Greek N. T. (third ed.), pp. 48–56, 241–244. For such verbs in the LXX see Thackeray, Gr., pp. 258–920 (Table of Verbs); Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, pp. 128–135. For list in the papyri see Maysier, Gr., pp. 387–415.

---

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 204. I am chiefly indebted to Blass for the facts in this summary.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 203.
I. Backwardness in the Study of Syntax. What the Germans call Laut- und Formenlehre has received far more scientific treatment than has syntax. In 1874 Jolly lamented that so little work on syntax of a really valuable nature had been done. To a certain extent it was necessary that the study of the forms should precede that of syntax. The full survey of the words and their inflections was essential to adequate syntactical investigation. And yet one can but feel that syntax has lagged too far behind. It has been the favourite field for grammatical charlatans to operate in, men who from a few examples drew large inductions and filled their grammars with “exceptions” to their own hastily made rules. Appeal was made to logic rather than to the actual facts in the history of language. Thus we had grammar made to order for the consumption of the poor students.

Others perhaps became disgusted with the situation and hastily concluded that scientific syntax was impracticable, at least for the present, and so confined their researches either to etymology or to the forms. In 1891 Müller sees no hope of doing anything soon for modern Greek syntax except in the literary high style on which he adds a few remarks about prepositions. Thumb likewise has added a chapter on syntax to his Handbuch. If you turn to Whitney’s Sanskrit Grammar, you will find no separate syntax, but merely some additional remarks on the “uses” of the aorist, the present, the subjunctive, etc. Monro in his Homeric Grammar follows somewhat the
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1 Schulgr. und Sprachw., p. 71.
3 Hist. Gr. der hell. Spr., p. 172.


———, Language and the Study of Language (1867).

———, Life and Growth of Language (1875).
same plan, but with much more attention to the “uses” of cases and modes. Brugmann\(^5\) in his *Griechische Grammatik* devotes far more space to *Formenlehre*, even in the third edition, which chiefly differs from the second in the increased attention to syntax. Giles in his *Manual of Comparative Philology*, even in the second\(^1\) edition (1900), kept his discussion of the uses of the noun and verb apart and did not group them as syntax. When he wrote his first\(^2\) edition (1895) nothing worthy of the name had been done on the comparative syntax of the moods and tenses, though Delbrück had written his great treatise on the syntax of the noun. When Brugmann planned his first volume of *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik* (1880), he had no hope of going on with the syntax either with the “Grundriß” or the “Kurze,” for at that time comparative grammar of the Indo-Germanic tongues was confined to *Laut- und Formenlehre*.\(^3\) But in the revision of Kühner the Syntax by B. Gerth has two volumes, as exhaustive a treatment as Blass’ two volumes on the Accidence. In the Riemann and Goelzer volumes the one on Syntax is the larger. Gildersleeve (*Am. Jour. of Philol.*, 1908, p. 115) speaks of his convictions on “Greek syntax and all that Greek syntax implies.” No man’s views in this sphere are entitled to weightier consideration. May he soon complete his *Syntax of Classical Greek*.

As to the dialectical inscriptions the situation is still worse. Dr. Claflin\(^4\) as late as 1905 complains that the German monographs on the inscriptions confine themselves to *Laut- und Formenlehre* almost entirely. Meisterhans in Schwyzner’s revision (1900) is nearly the sole exception.\(^5\) Thieme\(^6\) has a few syntactical remarks, but Nachmanson,\(^7\) Schweizer\(^8\) and Valaori\(^9\) have nothing about syntax, nor has

---

\(^5\) P. vii.
\(^1\) P. xi.
\(^2\) P. viii f.
\(^3\) Kurze vergl. Gr., 3. Lief., 1904, p. iii f.
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The same thing is true of Thumb’s *Hellenismus*, though this, of course, is not a formal grammar. A few additional essays have touched on the syntax of the Attic inscriptions and Schanz in his *Beiträge* has several writers who have noticed the subject. The inscriptions do indeed have limitations as to syntax, since much of the language is official and formal, but there is much to learn from them. Thackeray has not yet published his *Syntax of the LXX*. nor has Helbing.

We are somewhat better off as to the papyri as a result chiefly of the work of Dr. James Hope Moulton, who has published his researches in that field as applied to the

———, *Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften* (1903).

7 *Laute und Formen der magn. Inschr.*, 1903.
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10 *Unters. etc.*, 1898.


Schanz SCHANZ, M., *Beiträge zur histor. Syntax d. griech. Sprache* (1882—).
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New Testament. Crönert in his *Mem. Graeca Hercul.* has a good many syntactical remarks especially on the cases, but no formal treatment of the subject. Völker has not finished his good beginning. No syntax has come from Mayser yet, who stopped with *Laut- und Formenlehre*, though he is at work on one. Moulton does not profess to cover all the syntactical points in the papyri, but only those that throw light on some special points in the N. T. usage.

**II. New Testament Limitations.** It is evident therefore that the N. T. grammarian is in a poorer plight when he approaches syntax. And yet, strange to say, the N. T. grammars have largely confined themselves to syntax. Winer-Moulton, out of 799 pages, has only 128 not syntax. Buttmann, out of 403 pages (Thayer’s translation), has only 74 not syntax. In Winer-Schmiedel syntax is reached on p. 145. Blass begins syntax on p. 72, out of 305 pages. Moulton in his *Prolegomena* starts syntax on p. 57 (232 in all). The present book has given the discussion of the forms more space at any rate. It is at least interesting to note that N. T. grammarians have reversed the example of the comparative philologists. Is it a case of rushing in where angels fear to tread?

———, The Science of Language (1903).
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One may plead in defence that the demands of exegesis are great and urgent, not
to say more congenial. The distinctive character of the N. T. teaching is more closely
allied to lexicography and syntax than to mere forms. That is very true, but many a
theologian’s syntax has run away with him and far from the sense of the writer,
because he was weak on the mere forms. Knowledge of the forms is the first great
step toward syntax. Deissmann even complains of Blass for assuming too much in his
Syntax and not making enough comments “to rouse up energetically this easy-going
deference of the youthful reader” (Expositor, Jan., 1908, p. 65).

Blass urges, besides, that it is just in the sphere of syntax that the N. T.
variations from the ancient Greek can be best observed, in this and the change in
the meaning of words. This is true, but just as much so of the κοινή in general. This is
just the opposite of Winer’s view, who held that the N. T. peculiarities of syntax
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WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).

were very few. The explanation of the difference lies partly in the undeveloped state of syntax when Winer wrote, though he wrote voluminously enough himself, and partly in the wider conception of syntax that Blass holds as being “the method of employing and combining the several word-forms and ‘form-words’ current in the language.”

On the other hand attention must be called to the fact that the study of the forms is just the element, along with vocabulary, mainly relied on by Deissmann in his Bible Studies to show the practical identity of the vernacular κοινή in the papyri and in the N. T. Greek. Burton puts it rightly when he says of the N. T. writers: “The divergence of their language from that of classical writers in respect to syntax is greater than in reference to forms of words, and less than in respect to the meaning of words, both the Jewish and the Christian influence affecting more deeply the meanings of words than either their form or their syntactical employment.” Deissmann readily admits that Christianity has a set of ideas peculiar to itself, as has every system of teaching which leads to a characteristic terminology.

But one is not to think of the N. T. as jargon or a dialect of the κοινή in syntax. It is not less systematic and orderly than the rest of the vernacular κοινή, and the κοινή is as much a real language with its own laws as the Greek of Athens. As remarked above, the κοινή showed more development in syntax than in forms, but it was not a lawless development. It was the growth of life and use, not the artificial imitation of the old language of Athens by the Atticists. Blass properly insists on the antithesis here between the artificial Atticist and “the plain narrator of facts or the letter-writer” such as we meet in the N. T. Deissmann (Expositor, Jan., 1908, p. 75) holds that

---

1 W.-M., p. 27.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 72; cf. p. 3 also.
3 Notes on N. T. Gr., 1904, p. 22.
4 B. S., p. 65.
6 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 3.
7 Ib., p. 72.
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Christianity in its classical epoch “has very little connection with official culture.” “It rejects—this is the second result of our inquiry—it rejects, in this epoch, all the outward devices of rhetoric. In grammar, vocabulary, syntax and style it occupies a place in the midst of the people and draws from the inexhaustible soil of the popular element to which it was native a good share of its youthful strength.” This is largely true. Men of passion charged with a great message do strike forth the best kind of rhetoric and style with simplicity, power, beauty. It is blind not to see charm in Luke, in John, in Paul, James and the writer of Hebrews, a charm that is the despair of mere “devices of rhetoric” or artificial rules of style and syntax.

It is not surprising to find variations in culture in the N. T. writers, men who had different antecedents (Jew or Greek), different environment (Palestine, Asia Minor and possibly Egypt), different natural gifts and educational advantages, as seen in Peter and Paul. These individual peculiarities show themselves easily and naturally in syntax and style. See chapter IV, The Place of the N. T. in the Κοινή, for a larger discussion of this matter of the peculiarities of the N. T. writers. But even in 2 Peter and the Apocalypse one has no difficulty in understanding this simple vernacular Κοινή, however far short these books come of the standard of Isocrates or Demosthenes. The study of N. T. syntax is a worthy subject and one entirely within the range of scientific historical treatment so far as that subject has advanced.
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III. Recent Advance by Delbrück. Just as Brugmann is the great name in the accidence of comparative grammar, so Delbrück is the great name in syntax. Brugmann gladly recognises his own indebtedness to Delbrück. He has sought to follow Delbrück in the syntax of his *Griechische Grammatik*¹ and in the *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik*.² It is not necessary here to recount the story of how Delbrück was finally associated with Brugmann in the *Grundriß*, and the *Syntax* by Delbrück brought to completion in 1900. Brugmann tells the story well in *Kurze vergl. Gr.* (pp. v ff.) and Delbrück in the *Grundriß* itself. It is a great achievement and much led up to it. Delbrück has recounted the progress of comparative grammar in his *Introduction to the Study of Language* (1882). In 1872 he had published *Die Resultate der vergleichenden Syntax*. In 1879 he brought out *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax* (“Syntaktische Forschungen,” [Page 384] Bd. IV). That marked him as the man to do for syntax what Brugmann would do for forms. Delbrück does not claim all the credit. Bernhardy in 1829 had published *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache*, but Bopp, Schleicher and the rest had done much besides. The very progress in the knowledge of forms called for advance in syntax. In 1883 Hübner
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wrote *Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die griechische Syntax*. It is not a treatment of syntax, but a systematized bibliography of the great works up to date on Greek syntax. It is still valuable for that purpose. One can follow Brugmann\(^1\) and Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, Dritter Teil, pp. xvi–xx, for later bibliography. As the founders of syntax Hübner\(^2\) points back to Dionysius Thrax and Apollonius Dyscolus in the Alexandrian epoch. The older Greeks themselves felt little concern about syntax. They spoke correctly, but were not grammatical anatomists. They used the language instead of inspecting and dissecting it.

Delbrück (*Vergleichende Syntax*, Erster Teil, pp. 2–72) gives a lucid review of the history of syntactical study all the way from Dionysius Thrax to Paul’s *Principles of the History of Language*. He makes many luminous remarks by the way also on the general subject of syntax. I cannot accent too strongly my own debt to Delbrück.

Syntax, especially that of the verb, has peculiar difficulties.\(^3\) Not all the problems have been solved yet.\(^4\) Indeed Schanz so fully appreciates the situation that he is publishing a series of excellent *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. He is gathering fresh material. Many of the American and European universities issue monographs by the new doctors of philosophy on various points of syntax, especially points in individual writers. Thus we learn more about the facts. But meanwhile we are grateful to Delbrück for his monumental work and for all the rest.

### IV. The Province of Syntax.

\(\textit{(a)}\) **THE WORD SYNTAX (σύνταξις).** It is from συντάσσω and means ‘arrangement’ (*constructio*).\(^5\) It is the picture of the orderly marshalling of words to express ideas, not a mere medley of words. The word syntax is indeed too vague and general to express clearly all the uses in modern grammatical discussion, but it is too late to make a change now.\(^1\) Gildersleeve (*Am. Jour. of Philol.*, 1908, p. 269) says that

---

1 Griech. Gr., p. 363.
2 Grundr. zu Vorles., p. 3.
3 Giles, Comp. Philol., pp. 404 f., 475.
4 Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 7.
Schanz SCHANZ, M., Beiträge zur histor. Syntax d. griech. Sprache (1882—).
5 Farrar (Gk. Synt., p. 54) quotes Suetonius as saying that the first Gk. gr. brought to Rome was by Crates Mallotes after the Second Punic War.
1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 364.
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some syntacticians treat “syntax as a rag-bag for holding odds and ends of linguistic observations.”

(b) **Scope of Syntax.** But the difficulty is not all with the term, for the thing itself is not an absolutely distinct province. What the Germans call *Lautlehre* (‘teaching about sounds’) is indeed quite to itself. But when we come to define the exact line of demarcation between syntax or the relation of words on the one hand and single words on the other the task is not always so easy. Ries\(^2\) indeed in his very able monograph makes the contrast between syntax (or construction) and single words. His scheme is this: Under *Wortlehre* (‘science of words’) he puts *Formenlehre* (‘theory of forms’) and *Bedeutungslehre* (‘meaning of words’).\(^3\) He also subdivides syntax in the same way. Syntax thus treats of the binding of words together in all relations. Brugmann\(^4\) follows Delbrück\(^5\) in rejecting the special use of syntax by Ries. Brugmann\(^6\) considers the breaking-up of the sentence by Ries into single words to be wilful and only conventional. It is in deed true that single words have a teaching both as to the word itself (form-word, as prepositions) and the form (inflection).\(^7\) That is to say, two things call for consideration in the case of single words: the facts as to the words and the inflection on the one hand and the meaning of these facts on the other. Now Ries refuses to give the term syntax to the meaning of these facts (words, inflections, etc.), but confines syntax to the other field of word-relations. One is bound to go against Ries here and side with Delbrück and Brugmann.

(c) **Construction of Words and Clauses.** We use syntax, therefore, both for construction of the single word and for clauses. But one must admit the difficulty of the whole question and not conceive that the ancients ran a sharp line between the form and the meaning of the form. But, all in all, it is more scientific to gather the facts of usage first and then interpret these facts. This interpretation is scientific syntax, while the facts of usage are themselves syntax. Thus considered one may properly think of syntax in relation to the words themselves, the forms of the [Page 386] words, the clauses and sentences, the general style. Clyde makes two divisions in his *Greek Syntax*, viz. Words (p. 126) and Sentences (p. 193). But this formal division is artificial. Here, as usual, Delbrück has perceived that syntax deals not only with words (both *Wortarten* and *Wortformen*), but also with the sentence as a whole and all its parts (*Vergl. Syntax*, Erster Teil, p. 83). How hard it is to keep syntactical remarks out of accidence may be seen in Thackeray’s vol. I and in “Morphology” in Thumb’s *Handbook* as well as in Accidence of this book.

---

Ries RIES, *Was ist Syntax?* (1894).
2 *Was ist Syntax?* 1894, p. 142.
3 Ib., p. 142 f. Ries calls it a “naive misuse of the word syntax” not to take it in this sense. But he is not himself wholly consistent.
5 Grundr., V, pp. 1 ff.
Clyde CLYDE, J., *Greek Syntax* (1876).
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(d) HISTORICAL SYNTAX. But this is not to fall into the old pitfall of the Stoic grammarians and apply logic to the phenomena of grammar, using the phenomena of various grammatical categories previously laid down. Plato indeed first applied logic to grammar.1 The method of historical grammar and comparative grammar has had a long and a hard fight against the logical and philosophical method of syntax. But it has at last triumphed. “They sought among the facts of language for the illustration of theories,” as Dr. Wheeler2 so well puts it. We still need logic and philosophy in syntax, but we call these two agents into service after we have gathered the facts, not before, and after the historical and comparative methods have both been applied to these facts. Thus alone is it possible to have a really scientific syntax, one “definitely oriented” “as a social science” dealing with the total life of man.3

(e) IRREGULARITIES. We shall not therefore be surprised to find many so-called “irregularities” in the use of syntactical principles in various Greek writers. This is a point of the utmost importance in any rational study of syntax. The personal equation of the writer must always be taken into consideration. A certain amount of elasticity and play must be given to each writer if one is to understand human speech, for speech is merely a reflection of the mind’s activities. If a tense brings one to a turn, perhaps it was meant to do so. This is not to say that there are no barbarisms or solecisms. Far from it. But it is unnatural to expect all speakers or writers in Greek to conform slavishly to our modern grammatical rules, of most of which, besides, they

---
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were in blissful ignorance. The fact is that language is life and responds to the peculiarities of the individual temper, and it is to be remembered that the mind itself is not a perfect instrument. The mind is not always clear nor logical. The ellipses, anacolutha, etc., of language represent partially the imperfections of the mind. “It often depends on the writer which of the two tenses he will use,” Winer remarks about the aorist and the past perfect. It always depends on the writer which tense and which everything else he will use. Pray, on whom else can it depend? The writer happens to be doing the writing. He decides whether he will conform to the usual construction or will give added piquancy by a variation. This assumes, of course, that he is an educated writer. If he is not, he will often have the piquancy just the same without knowing it. “Syntactical irregularities are numerous in Greek,” Clyde observes, and, he might have added, in all other living languages. Greek is not, like “Esperanto,” made to order by any one man. In point of fact what we call idioms are the very peculiarities (ἰδιώματα) which mark it off from other languages or at least characterize it. Some of these idioms spring out of the common intelligence of men and belong to many tongues, others mark the variations of certain minds which gain a following. Compare the rapid spread of “slang” to-day, if it happens to be a “taking phrase.” Hence rules of syntax ought not to be arbitrary, though many of them are. Those that really express the life of language are in harmony with the facts. In general I would say that the fewer rules one gives the better for the student and for the facts.

V. The Method of this Grammar.

(a) PRINCIPLES, NOT RULES. As far as possible principles and not rules will be sought. The Greek grammarian is an interpreter of the facts, not a regulator of the facts. This point calls for special emphasis in syntax where the subjective element comes in so largely.

(b) THE ORIGINAL SIGNIFICANCE. The starting-point therefore in the explanation of any given idiom is to find the original significance. This is not always possible, but it generally is. Historical and comparative grammar lend strong help in this endeavour. Always the best place to begin is the beginning if you can find it.

(c) FORM AND FUNCTION. I would not insist that form and function always correspond. One does not know that the two did so correspond in the beginning in all instances. It is hard to prove a universal proposition. But certainly one is justified in beginning with one function for one form wherever he finds it to be true. Burton says: “It is by no means the case that each form has but one function, and that

1 Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 4 f.
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each function can be discharged by but one form.” Certainly the same function can come to be discharged by various forms, as is the case with the locative and dative infinitive forms (λαβεῖν, ἄκοῦσαι). But that is not to say that originally the locative and dative verbal substantive were identical in idea. The Sanskrit completely disproves it. It may very well be true that each form had one function originally, whereas later the same function came to be expressed by various forms. As a starting-point, therefore, one may assume, till he learns otherwise, that form and function correspond. The necessity of getting at the ground-idea of an idiom is rightly emphasized by Delbrück (Grundlagen, p. 1). It may indeed come to pass as in the English “but,” that the one form may be used for most of the parts of speech (Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 237 f.). On the whole subject of the agreement of form and idea see Kühner-Gerth, I, pp. 64–77.

(d) DEVELOPMENT. But the beginning is not the end. The actual development of a given idiom in the Greek language up to the N. T. time must be observed. Each idiom has a history. Now it cannot be expected that the space can be given to the actual working-out of each idiom in history as Jannaris has done in his Historical Grammar, or minute comparison at every point by means of comparative grammar. What is essential is that the grammarian shall have both these points in mind as he seeks to explain the development from the etymological basis. This is the only secure path to tread, if it can be found. Burton indeed distinguishes sharply between historical and exegetical grammar and conceives his task to be that of the exegetical grammarian. For myself I regard exegetical grammar as the last stage in the process and not to be dissociated from the historical. Indeed how a Greek idiom is to be represented in English is a matter of little concern to the Greek grammarian till the work of translation is reached. The Greek point of view is to be observed all through the process till translation comes. It is Greek syntax, not English.

(e) CONTEXT. There is one more stage in the interpretation of the Greek idiom. That is the actual context in any given instance. The variation in the total result is often due to the difference in the local colour of the context. The same idiom with a given etymology may not have varied greatly in the long course of history save as it responds to the context. In a word, etymology, history, context are the
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2 Ib., p. 3.
factors that mark the processes in the evolution of a Greek idiom in a given case.
These are the things to keep constantly in mind as we approach the idioms of Greek
syntax. We may not always succeed in finding the solution of every idiom, but most
of them will yield to this process. The result is to put syntax on a firmer scientific
basis and take it out of the realm of the speculative subjective sciences.

(f) TRANSLATION. This is the translation of the total result, not of the exact Greek
idiom. Translation crisply reproduces the result of all the processes in harmony with
the language into which the translation is made, often into an utterly different idiom.
It is folly to reason backwards from the translation to the Greek idiom, for the English
or German idiom is often foreign to the Greek and usually varies greatly from the
original Greek. English is English and Greek is Greek. Syntax is not translation,
though it is the only safe way to reach a correct translation. Exegesis is not syntax, but
syntax comes before real exegesis. The importance of syntax is rightly appreciated by
Gildersleeve.1

(g) LIMITS OF SYNTAX. After all is done, instances remain where syntax cannot
say the last word, where theological bias will inevitably determine how one interprets
the Greek idiom. Take ὑδατι in Ac. 1:5, for instance. In itself the word can be either
locative or instrumental with βαπτίζω. So in Ac. 2:38 εἷς does not of itself express
design (see Mt. 10:41), but it may be so used. When the grammarian has finished, the
theologian steps in, and sometimes before the grammarian is through.

[PAGE 390] CHAPTER X

THE SENTENCE

I. The Sentence and Syntax. In point of fact syntax deals with the sentence in its
parts and as a whole. And yet it is not tautology to have a chapter on the sentence, a
thing few grammars do. It is important to get a clear conception of the sentence as
well as of syntax before one proceeds to the work of detailed criticism. The sentence
is the thing in all its parts that syntax treats, but the two things are not synonymous.
At bottom grammar is teaching about the sentence.1

II. The Sentence Defined.

(a) COMPLEX CONCEPTION. A sentence is the expression of the idea or ideas in the
speaker’s mind. It is an opinion (sententia) expressed (ἁπτωτελής λόγος). This idea is
in itself complex. It is this combination of “the small coin of language” into an
intelligible whole that we call a sentence.2 Just a mere word accidentally expressed is

1 Synt. of Class. Gk., p. iv. C. and S., Sel. fr. the LXX, p. 22, observe that the life of a
language lies in the syntax and that it is impossible to translate syntax completely.
The more literal a translation is, like the LXX, the more it fails in syntax.
pp. 73–85.
2 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 235. Opposed to this idea of a sentence as due to
synthesis is the modern psychological definition of Wundt who defines a sentence as
“die Gliederung einer Gesamtvorstellung.”
not a sentence. “The sentence is the symbol whereby the speaker denotes that two or more ideas have combined in his mind.”

(b) TWO ESSENTIAL PARTS. Only two parts are essential to this complex intelligible whole to form a sentence. These two parts are subject and predicate. A statement is made about something and thus an idea is expressed. These two parts are called substantive and verb, though the line of distinction between substantive and verb was originally very dim, as is now often seen in the English (“laugh,” “touch,” “work,” etc.). Many modern linguists hold that the verb is nominal in origin, [Page 391] since some primitive languages know only nominal sentences. We do not know which is the oldest, subject or predicate. 1 In the Greek verb indeed subject and predicate are united in the one form, the original sentence.

(c) ONE-MEMBERED SENTENCE. The sentence in form may be very brief, even one word in truth. Indeed the long sentence may not express as much as the short one. In moments of passion an exclamation may be charged with more meaning than a long rambling sentence. 2 We have plenty of examples of one-word sentences in the N. T., like ἀπέξει (Mk. 14:41), προφήτευσον (Mk. 14:65), προεχόµεθα (Ro. 3:9), θέλω (Mt. 8:3), οὐχί (Lu. 1:60). Compare also πορεύθητε, ἔρχου, ποίησον (Mt. 8:9).

(d) ELLIPTICAL SENTENCE. Indeed, as seen in the case of οὐχί (Lu. 1:60) the sentence does not absolutely require the expression of either subject or predicate, though both are implied by the word used. This shortening or condensation of speech is common to all the Indo-Germanic languages. 3 Other examples of such condensation are the vocative, as κύριε (Mt. 8:2), with which compare ὅπαγε, Σατανᾶ (Mt. 4:10), the interjections like ὅγε (Jas. 5:1), ἔα (Lu. 4:34), ἰδοὺ (Rev. 14:14), ἵδε (Jo. 1:29), οὐαί (Rev. 8:13). These interjections may be used alone, as ἔα (Lu. 4:34), or with other words, as οὐαί and ἵδε above. Cf. Martha’s Ναί, Κύριε (Jo. 11:27), two sentences. Jo. 11:35 (ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς) is the shortest verse, but not the shortest sentence in the N. T.

(e) ONLY PREDICATE. The subject may be absent and the predicate will still constitute a sentence, i.e. express the complex idea intended. This follows naturally from the preceding paragraph. The predicate may imply the subject. The subject in Greek is involved in the verbal personal ending and often the context makes it clear what the subject really is. Indeed the Greek only expressed the personal subject as a rule where clearness, emphasis or contrast demanded it. The N. T., like the κοινή in general, uses the pronominal subject more frequently than the older Greek (cf.

---

1 Thompson, Gk. Synt., 1883, p. xv. Delbrück (Vergl. Synt., 1. Tl., p. 77) quotes Schleicher as saying that nouns either have or had case-forms, verbs either have or had pers. endings, and that all words were originally either nouns or verbs. But it is not quite so easy as that unless pronouns be included in nouns.
2 K.-G., I, p. 2.
English). Often a glance at the context is all that is needed, as with καὶ παρεγίνοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο (Jo. 3:23), ἔρχονται (Mk. 2:3), etc. Sometimes indeed close attention is required to notice a change of subject which is not indicated. So καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἔχοντες καὶ ἔφυγον τῷ περισσεύον τῶν κλασμάτων (Mt. 14:20). For this change of subject with no indication see Lu. 8:29; Jo. 19:31; 2 Cor. 3:16; 1 Jo. 5:16.1 Sometimes the subject is drawn out of the verb itself, as in σαλπίσει (1 Cor. 15:52), ‘the trumpet shall trumpet.’ So in οὐτε γαμοῦσιν οὐτε γαμίζονται (Mt. 22:30) men have to be supplied with the first and women with the second verb. God is considered by some the unexpressed, but well-known subject, as with βρέχει (Mt. 5:45), ἀρηκεν (Ac. 13:34), λέγει (Eph. 4:8), φησίν (Heb. 8:5).

Often what is said is a matter of common remark or usage and the subject is designedly concealed, indefinite subject. So when Paul uses φησίν (2 Cor. 10:10) of his opponent unless we follow B and read φασί. The plural is very common in this sense as ἃν ὁνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς (Mt. 5:11), μήτι συλλέγουσιν; (Mt. 7:16), ὡς λέγουσιν (Rev. 2:24) like German man sagt, French on dit. Cf. also, not to pile up examples, Mt. 8:16; Mk. 10:13; Lu. 17:23; Jo. 15:6; 20:2; Ac. 3:2; Rev. 12:6. This general or rhetorical plural appears in προσφέρουσιν and δύνανται (Heb. 10:1) if the text is genuine. Moulton (Prol., p. 58) cites κλέπτοντες (Eurip. I. T., 1359).

1 See Viteau, Ét. sur le Grec du N. T., Sujet, Compl. et Attr., p. 55 f. Moulton
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Sometimes the plural purposely conceals the identity of the person referred to, as when τεθνήκασιν (Mt. 2:20) is used of Herod the Great. The same principle applies to οίκονσιν (Lu. 12:20). Then again the verb may imply the subject, as with ἔβρεξεν (Jas. 5:17), ἀπέχει (Mk. 14:41), ὄγει (Lu. 24:21), οὐ μέλει σοι (Mt. 22:16), εἰ τῦχοι (1 Cor. 14:10). Cf. ὦψ ἐγένετο (Mk. 11:19). So the modern Greek still (Thumb, Handb., p. 179). Usually, then, such a verb in the N. T. is in the passive voice, so that the subject is involved in the action of the verb. Thus μετρήθησεται (Mk. 4:24), ὀδηγήσεται (Mk. 4:25), πιστεύεται and ὑμολογεῖται (Ro. 10:10), σπειρέται and ἐγείρεται (1 Cor. 15:42), etc. Sometimes indeed a verb appears to be without a subject, when really it is not. So ἔστω δέ (2 Cor. 12:16) has the previous sentence as the subject. In 1 Pet. 2:6 the subject of περιέχει is the following quotation. In Ac. 21:35 ἴσον ἔχει has as its subject the infinitive ἀνταξόμενοι. So in general whenever the infinitive is used as subject, the verb is not without a subject, as ὁμοίωσιν ἔπισκέψασθαι (Ac. 7:23). The examples are numerous, as ἔξεστιν ποιέω (Mt. 12:22), ἔδωκε γράψαι (Lu. 1:3), ἦλθεν [Page 393] διέρχεσθαι (Jo. 4:4), πρέπον ἐστιν πληρῶσαι (Mt. 3:15), καθεῖκεν ἦν (Ac. 22:22), ἠνέδχεται ἄπολεόθαι (Lu. 13:33), and even ἄνενδεκτόν ἔστιν τοῦ ἡ ἐλθεν (Lu. 17:1) and ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθέν (Ac. 10:25) where the genitive infinitive form has become fixed. Ἐγένετο does indeed present a problem by itself. It may have the simple infinitive as subject, as διασκορεώθηκαν (Lu. 6:1) and εἰσελθέν (Lu. 6:6). Cf. Mk. 2:15. But often καὶ ἐγένετο or ὡς ὑπό δέ is used with a finite verb as a practical, though not the technical, subject. So καὶ ἐγένετο, ἔλαλουν (Lu. 2:15), ἐγένετο δέ, συνήντησεν (Lu. 9:37). So also καὶ ἔστι, ἔχειδο (Ac. 2:17).

One is strongly reminded of the similar usage in the LXX, not to say the Hebrew יָּכנָל. Moulton prefers to think that that was a development from the κοινὴ (papyri) usage of the infinitive with γίνομαι as above, but I see no adequate reason for denying a Semitic influence on this point, especially as the LXX also parallels the other idiom, καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ ἦν διδάσκον (Lu. 5:17, cf. 5:1, 12, etc.), a construction so un-Greek and so like the Hebrew יָּכנָל. Here καὶ almost equals δέ and makes the second καὶ clause practically the subject of ἐγένετο. The use of a δέ or ἢν clause as subject is common either alone or in apposition with a pronoun. Cf. Mt. 10:25 (ἵνα); 1 Jo. 5:9 (ὅτι); Jo. 15:12 (ἵνα). In a case like ἀρκεῖ (Jo. 14:8), ἀνήκεν (Col. 3:18), ἐλογίσθη (Ro. 4:3) the subject comes easily out of the context. So also the subject is really implied when the partitive genitive is used without the expression of τινῷς or πολλοῖς as συνήθων δέ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν (Ac. 21:16) and ἐπισκευάσθη ἦν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν (Jo. 16:17), a clear case of the ablative with ἐκ. The conclusion of the whole matter is that the subject is either expressed or implied by various linguistic devices. The strictly impersonal verbs in the old Greek arose from the conception of θεός as doing the thing.

(f) ONLY SUBJECT. Likewise the predicate may be absent and only implied in the subject. Yet naturally the examples of this nature are far fewer than those when the predicate implies the subject. Sometimes indeed the predicate merely has to be

---

1 Prol., p. 17.
mentally supplied from the preceding clause, as with θλιβόµεθα (2 Cor. 1:6), ἄγαπήσει (Lu. 7:42), ἔχει (Lu. 20:24), λοµβάνει (Heb. 5:4). Cf. Eph. 5:22. It may be that the verb would be [Page 394] slightly changed in form, if expressed, as σκανδαλισθήσοµαι (Mk. 14:29), ὑποτασσόµεθα (Eph. 5:24), τίθεµεν (2 Cor. 3:13), etc. Sometimes again the affirmative is to be inferred from a negative as in 1 Cor. 7:19; 10:24. In Mk. 12:5 the principal verb has to be drawn from the idea of the two participles δέροντες and ἀποκτεννύντες. In particular with εἰ δὲ µὴ (or µὴ γε) the verb is always absent (as Mt. 6:1), so that the idiom becomes a set phrase (Lu. 10:6; 13:9). In Ro. 5:3 with οὐ µόνον δὲ, καυχώµεθα is to be supplied, and in 5:11 σωθήσοµαι. 2 In 2 Cor. 9:7 he likewise is right in suggesting ὁδὸν from the context, as in Gal. 2:9 after ἵνα we must mentally insert εὐσεβείζωµεθα, εὐσεβείζονται. In epistolary salutations it is not difficult to supply λέγει or λέγει χαίρειν as in Jas. 1:1; Ph. 1:1; Rev. 1:4. These are all examples of very simple ellipsis, as in 2 Pet. 2:22 in the proverb. Cf. also 1 Cor. 4:21; 2 Cor. 5:13; Gal. 3:5.

(g) VERB NOT THE ONLY PREDICATE. But the predicate is not quite so simple a matter as the subject. The verb indeed is the usual way of expressing it, but not the only way. The verb εἰµί, especially ἐστι and ἐστὶν, may be merely a “form-word” like a preposition and not be the predicate. Sometimes it does express existence as a predicate like any other verb, as in ἐγὼ εἰµί (Jo. 8:58) and ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἐστιν ἐστὶ (Rev. 21:1). Cf. Mt. 23:30. But more commonly the real predicate is another word and εἰµί merely serves as a connective or copula. Thus the predicate may be complex. With this use of εἰµί as copula (“form-word”) the predicate may be another substantive, as ὁ δὲρὸς ἐστιν ὁ κόσµος (Mt. 13:38); an adjective, as τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ (Jo. 4:11); a prepositional phrase, as ἐν γυναίκα οὖν τὸ ἐστιν ἐστὶν (Ro. 10:8); and especially the participle, as ἤν διδάσκων (Mt. 7:29). Other verbs, besides εἰµί, may be used as a mere copula, as γίνοµαι (Jo. 1:14), καθίσταµαι (Ro. 5:19), ἐστηκα (Jas. 5:9), and in particular φαίνοµαι (2 Cor. 13:7), ὑπάρχω (Ac. 16:3).2 Predicative amplifications [Page 395] belong to apposition and will be so treated as an expansion of the predicate. The subject also has amplifications.

(h) COPULA NOT NECESSARY. Naturally this copula is not always considered necessary. It can be readily dispensed with when both subject and the real predicate are present. This indeed is the most frequent ellipsis of all in all stages of the language, especially the form ἐστὶ. But strictly speaking, the absence of the copula is not ellipsis, but a remnant of a primitive idiom, since some primitive tongues could do without the copula. Still, as Blass' observes, the ellipsis never became a fixed usage save in a few phrases like δῆλον ὅτι (1 Cor. 15:27) or ὅτι...δῆλον (Gal. 3:11). In ἵνα

The absence of the copula with ἢδοι is indeed like the construction after the Heb. ἦν as Blass points out, but it is also in harmony with the κοσμή that Moulton shows. But it is especially frequent in the parts of the N. T. most allied to the O. T. Like other
interjections ἵού does not need a verbal predicate, though it may have one. As examples see Mt. 17:5; Lu. 5:18; Rev. 4:1. In the last example both ἵού and ἵού occur and the construction follows, now one now the other, as is seen in verse 4.

(i) THE TWO RADIATING FOCI OF THE SENTENCE. Thus, as we have seen, the subject and predicate are the two foci of the sentence regarded as an ellipse. Around these two foci all the other parts of the sentence radiate, if there are any other parts. The sentence may go all the way from one abrupt word to a period a couple of pages long, as in Demosthenes or Isocrates. Schoolboys will recall a sentence in Thucydides so long that he forgot to finish it. Giles speaks of the sentence as a kingdom with many provinces or a house with many stories. That is true potentially. But the sentence is elastic and may have only the two foci (subject and predicate) and indeed one of them may exist only by implication. [Page 397] The context can generally be relied on to supply the other focus in the mind of the speaker or writer. Thus by the context, by look and by gesture, words can be filled to the full and even run over with meanings that of themselves they would not carry. Emotion can make itself understood with few words. The matters here outlined about the Greek sentence apply to Greek as a whole and so to the N. T. Greek.

(j) VARIETIES OF THE SIMPLE SENTENCE. It is immaterial whether the simple sentence, which is the oldest sentence, be declarative, interrogative or imperative. That affects in no way the essential idea. All three varieties occur in great abundance in the N. T. and need not be illustrated. So likewise the simple sentence may be affirmative or negative. That is beside the mark in getting at the foundation of the sentence. All these matters (and also abstract and concrete) are mere accidents that give colour and form, but do not alter the organic structure. For an extensive discussion of the various kinds of independent sentences in the N. T. (declarative, interrogative, hortatory, wish, command) see Viteau, Syntaxe des Propositions, pp. 17–40. The matter will be discussed at length in the chapter on Modes.

III. The Expansion of the Subject.

(a) IDEA-WORDS AND FORM-WORDS. There are indeed, as already seen, two sorts of words in general in the sentence, idea-words and form-words, as the comparative grammars teach us. The idea-words (called by Aristotle φωναὶ σηµαντικαί) have an inner content in themselves (word-stuff), while the form-words (φωναὶ ἄσηµα) express rather relations between words. Substantive, verb, adjective, adverb are idea-words, and pronouns, prepositions, some adverbs (place, time, etc.), the copula are form-words. In reality the form-words may have been originally idea-words (cf. ἵοι, for instance, and the prepositions). The distinction is a real one, but more logical than

6 Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 236. Viteau

VITEAU, J., Essai sur la syntaxe des voix dans le grec du N. T. (Rev. de Phil., 1894).
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practical. The form-words, when prepositions, really help out the meanings of the cases.

(b) CONCORD AND GOVERNMENT. Clyde\(^3\) offers another distinction, that between concord and government, which has something in it if it is not pushed too far. “In concord, the substantive is, as it were, a syntactical chief, and all his followers wear the same badge as himself; in government, the substantive appears, as it were, in various conditions of service, and is dressed each time according to the particular function he discharges.” [Page 398] He uses concord where the substantive is king and government where the verb rules. There is something in this distinction between the two parts of the sentence, only at bottom the verb has concord too as well as the substantive, as can be shown, and as Clyde really admits by the term congruity for the case-relations with the verb. This distinction is not one between subject and predicate, but between substantive and verb.

(c) THE GROUP AROUND THE SUBJECT. This may be formed in various ways, as, for instance, by another substantive, by an adjective, by the article, by a pronoun, by an adverb, by a prepositional phrase (adjunct), by subordinate clause.\(^1\) Each of these calls for illustration and discussion. They may be explained in inverse order for practical reasons.

1. For Subordinate Clause take Lu. 1:43.

2. With the Article. In Ro. 7:10 we have ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν. Here the article shows that this prepositional phrase or adjunct is under the wing of the substantive ἐντολή. In the chapter on the Article this matter will call for more elaborate discussion. For the article and pronoun take οὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς (Ac. 1:11).

3. The Adverb. As examples of adverbs with substantives take τῇ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ (Gal. 4:25) and ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ (verse 26).

4. The Adjective. The origin of the adjective and its close relation to the substantive was discussed under Declensions (chapter VII) and will be further shown in the chapter on Adjectives in Syntax. Take as an example ὁ ποιῆν ὁ καλὸς (Jo. 10:11).

5. The Substantive. The earliest and always a common way of expanding the subject was by the addition of another substantive. It was done in either of two ways.

(a) By an oblique case, usually the genitive. Even the dative may occur. The ablative is seen in ξένοι τῶν διαθῆκῶν (Eph. 2:12). But the genitive, the case of genus or kind, is the case usually employed to express this subordinate relation of one word to another. This whole matter will be discussed under the genitive case and here only

3 Gk. Synt., p. 126.
1 As a matter of fact any substantive, whatever its place in the sentence, may be the nucleus of a similar grouping. But this is a further subdivision to be noticed later. On the grouping of words around the subst. see Delbrück, Vergl. Synt., 3. Tl., pp. 200–221. For various ways of grouping words around the subj. in a Gk. sentence see K.-G., I, p. 52.
one example will be mentioned, ὁ πατήρ τῆς δόξης (Eph. 1:17), as illustrating the point.

(b) Apposition. This was the earliest method. Apposition is common to both subject and predicate. Sometimes indeed the genitive is used where really the substantive is in apposition, as περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σῶματος αὐτοῦ (Jo. 2:21), a predicate example where “temple” and “body” are meant to be identical. So with Ἱ ὁ λός τοῦ σκήνους (2 Cor. 5:5) and many other examples. But in general the two substantives are in the same case, and with the subject, of course, in the nominative. As a matter of fact apposition can be employed with any case. The use of ἄνθρωπος, γυνή with words in apposition seems superfluous, though it is perfectly intelligible. The word in apposition conveys the main idea, as ἀνθρωπία τοῦ προφήτη (Lu. 24:19), ἄνθρωπος οἰκοδεσπότης (Mt. 21:33). Cf. ἄνδρες ἄνδαροι (Ac. 1:16) and ἄνδρα φονέα (Ac. 3:14). So also ἄνδρες Ἰσραήλεται (Ac. 2:22), ἄνδρες Ἀθηναίοι (Ac. 17:22), an idiom common in the Attic orators. Such apposition, of course, is not confined to the subject, but is used in any case in every sort of phrase. Thus γυναῖκα χήραν (Lu. 4:26), ἄνθρωπος ὀικοδεσπότης (Mt. 13:52, but note also 21:33), Ἁμώνος Ὑσσέως (Ac. 10:32). Sometimes the word in apposition precedes the other, though not usually. Thus ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας, ἡ γλῶσσα (Jas. 3:6); καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἠμῶν ἐπιύη, Χριστός (1 Cor. 5:7). But this is largely a matter of definition. The pronoun, of course, may be the subject, as ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς (Rev. 22:16). So ἐγὼ Παῦλος (Gal. 5:2). Cf. ὅν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρίσαιοι (Lu. 11:39). The word in apposition may vary greatly in the precise result of the apposition, a matter determined wholly by the word itself and the context. Thus in Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατριάρχης (Heb. 7:4) a descriptive title is given. Cf. also εἰ ἐγὼ ἔνησα ἦμῶν τοὺς πόδας, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος (Jo. 13:14). Partitive or distributive apposition is common, when the words in apposition do not correspond to the whole, as τοῦ ὑμῶν ἵματος, ὁς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἱδιον ἔχει, ὃς ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ (Mt. 22:5). Often the word in apposition is merely epegegetic, as ἡ ἐξορθηθείς τῶν Ιουδαίων ἡ σκηνοπηγία (Jo. 7:2). Αὐτός is sometimes used in emphatic apposition, as ὁ Χριστὸς καταλήφη τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτός σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος (Eph. 5:23). The phrase τοῦτο ἔστιν is used in epegegetical apposition with the subject, as ὃλγοι, τοῦτο ἔστιν ὁκτώ ψυχάι (1 Pet. 3:20). But the phrase is a mere expletive and has no effect on number (as seen above) or case. It can be used indifferently with any case as the vocative (Ro. 7:18), the instrumental (Mk. 7:2), the accusative (Ac. 19:4; Heb. 13:15; Phil. 12), the genitive (Heb. 9:11; 11:16). Any number of words or phrases may be in apposition, as in ἐβλήθη δὴ δράκων Ṿ, ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὤφις, ὁ ἄρχαίος, ὁ καλοῦμενος Διώκιος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τῆς οἰκουμενῆς ὅλην (Rev. 12:9). [Page 400] An infinitive may be in apposition with the subject, as οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἔπαγγελε, τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὑ ὑ ὑ ὑ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κηρυνόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου (Ro. 4:13). Cf. 1 Th. 4:3; 1 Pet. 2:15. Once more, a clause with ὅπως ἢ ἤνια may be in apposition with the subject (or predicate either), as αὐτή ἔστιν ἡ μαρτυρία, ὅπως ἤνια ἔδοξεν ὁ θεὸς ἦμίν (1 Jo. 5:11) and αὐτή γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ ἐγκατάστασι τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἢ τἀς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ πράξεων (1 Jo. 5:3). Cf. Jo. 6:29, 39, 40. For many more or less interesting details of apposition in the N. T. and the LXX see Viteau, Sujet, Complément et Attribut (1896), pp. 220–236. On apposition in
IV. The Expansion of the Predicate.

(a) Predicate in Wider Sense. Here predicate must be taken in its full sense and not merely the verb, but also the other ways of making a predicate with the copula. One cannot do better here than follow Brugmann, though he makes the verb, not the predicate, the centre of this group. It is simpler just to take the predicate as the other focus answering to the subject. The predicate can be expanded by other verbs, by substantives, by pronouns, by adjectives, by adverbs, by prepositions, by particles, by subordinate clauses.

(b) The Infinitive and the Participle. These are the common ways of supplementing a verb by another verb directly. They will both call for special treatment later and can only be mentioned here. Cf. ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν (Mk. 6:48) and Ἐλαθὼν τινις ἔξεσθαις (Heb. 13:2). But sometimes two verbs are used together directly without any connective, as ποῦ θέλεις ἔτοιμόν (Mt. 26:17). See discussion of asyndeton in this chapter (XII, Connection in Sentences).

(c) The Relation between the Predicate and Substantives. This matter receives full treatment under the head of Cases, and a word of illustration suffices here. It is not the accusative case alone that occurs, but any oblique case of the substantive or pronoun may be used to express this relation, as αὕτη ἔστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία (1 Jo. 2:25).

(d) The Pronoun. It is sometimes the expanded object, as τοιούτως ζητεῖ τοῦ προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν (Jo. 4:23).

[Page 401] (e) Adjectives. They are common with predicates and as predicates. So ἀπεκτάσατο ὑγιῆς (Mt. 12:13). Cf. ἤθελεν πρῶτος (Jo. 20:4), ἐπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἀρετὴν (Heb. 7:24). The article and the participle often form the predicate, as Mt. 10:20.

(f) The Adverb. The use of the adverb with the predicate is so normal as to call for no remark. So ὁμολογοῦμένως μέγα ἐστιν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον (1 Tim. 3:16). Cf. οὕτως γὰρ πλούσιος ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται (2 Pet. 1:11).
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(g) **Prepositions.** Let one example serve for prepositions: ἣνα πληρωθήτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ (Eph. 3:19).

(h) **Negative Particles oú and μή.** These are not confined to the predicate, but there find their commonest illustrations. Cf. οὗ γὰρ τολμῶμεν (2 Cor. 10:12) and μή γένοιτο (Gal. 6:14).

(i) **Subordinate Clauses.** Most commonly, though by no means always, they are expansions of the predicate. The adverbial clauses are mainly so, as ἔγραψαν ὑμῖν ἣνα ἔδοχε (1 Jo. 5:13), and most object (substantival) clauses, as the ὥσπερ ἔδει τὸ σῶμα τῶν ἁλίτων in the same sentence. But adjectival clauses likewise often link themselves on to a word in the predicate, as ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμῶν προέθετο (Ro. 3:24).

(j) **Apposition with the Predicate and Looser Amplifications.** It is common also, but calls for little additional remark. Predicative amplifications, as Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 527) calls them, are common. So εἰς ὧν ἔγνω ἔτεθην κήρυξ (1 Tim. 2:7), ὑμῶν προέθετο ὁ θεός ἰδιαστήριον (Ro. 3:25). The participle with ὥς is frequent, as ἧμᾶς ὥς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας (2 Cor. 10:2). Cf. 1 Pet. 2:5. Note also εἰς ὡς εἶπον (Ac. 7:21), a Greek idiom parallel to the Hebrew and very abundant in the LXX. A common construction is to have a clause in apposition with τοῦτο in an oblique case. So we see the accusative as in τοῦτο γινώσκετε ὅτι ἦγγεκεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (Lu. 10:11), ablative as in μείζωνα ταύτης ὄγκην ὑπεδῆ ηνα την κηρύχην αὐτοῦ ὃς ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ (Jo. 15:13), locative ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένοιμεν (1 Jo. 4:13). Cf. λέγω τοῦτο ὅτι ἐκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει (1 Cor. 1:12). Likewise the infinitive may be in apposition with τοῦτο, as ἔκρινα ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο, τὸ μή πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔλθεν (2 Cor. 2:1). Cf. also Lu. 22:37 where τὸ καὶ μετὰ ἄνωμον ἔλογισθη is in apposition with τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί. For an extended predicate with numerous classes see Rev. 13:16, ποιῆν πάντας, τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς, καὶ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους καὶ τοὺς δουλοὺς.

[Page 402] **V. Subordinate Centres in the Sentence.** Each of the words or phrases that the subject or predicate groups around itself may form a fresh nucleus for new combinations. Thus the long sentences with many subordinate clauses resemble the cell multiplication in life. The N. T. indeed does not show so many complications in the sentence as the more rhetorical writers of Athens. In Mt. 7:19 the subject δὲνδρον has the participle ποιοῦν, which in turn has its own clause with μή as negative and καρπὸν καλὸν as object. In Jo. 5:36 the predicate ἔχετε has μαρτυρίαν as object, which has the predicate adjective μείζων, which in turn is followed by the ablative τὸ Ισραήλ. This is all too simple to need further illustration. Even adverbs may have expansive appositives as in ὅτε ἐν τῇ παρεσπόσου (Lu. 4:23). Cf. Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, pp. 222–227, for discussion of the adjective and its connection, and p. 228 for the adverb.
VI. Concord in Person. The concord between subject and predicate as to person is so uniform as to call for little remark. In Greek the person was originally expressed in the ending. In the later Greek the pronoun was increasingly used in addition (see chapter on Pronouns). But only ignorance would allow one to mix his persons in the use of the verb. The only problem occurs when the subject comprises two or even all three persons. Then, of course, the first prevails over both the second and the third. So ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐκέμεν (Jo. 10:30). Cf. Mt. 9:14; Lu. 2:48; 1 Cor. 9:6. But in Gal. 1:8 (ἐὰν ἦμεν ἤγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίσηται) the reverse is true either because Paul follows the nearest in both person and number or (Winer-Thayer, p. 518) because he acknowledges thus the superior exaltation of the angel. Then again in cases like Ac. 11:14 (σωθῆσῃ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκος σου) the speaker merely uses the person and number of the first and most important member of the group. Cf. Ac. 16:31. The subject of person thus easily runs into that of number, for the same ending expresses both. Sometimes indeed the first and second persons are used without any direct reference to the speaker or the person addressed. Paul in particular is fond of arguing with an imaginary antagonist. In Ro. 2:1 he calls him ὦ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων. So also 2:3. In Ro. 9:20 Paul is very earnest, μενοῦν γε σὺ τίς εἶ; cf. also 11:17; 14:4. In 1 Cor. 10:30 the first person may be used in this representative way. The same may be true of Gal. 2:18, but not of 2:19. Ro. 7:7–25 is not so clear. The vehemence of passion argues for Paul’s own experience, but note σε in 8:2. Cf. Blaß, Gr. of N. T. Gk., [Page 403] p. 317. On the whole subject of agreement in person see Delbrück, Vergl. Synt., p. 229 f.; Kühner-Gerth, I, p. 82. For change in person see 2 Jo. 8; 1 Cor. 10:7–10.

VII. Concord in Number. Here we have a double concord, that between subject and predicate (both verb and adjective if copula is used) and that between substantive and adjective in general. It is simpler, however, to follow another division.

(a) Subject and Predicate.

1. Two Conflicting Principles. One follows the grammatical number, the other the sense (κατὰ σῶνεσιν). The formal grammatical rule is, of course, usually observed, a singular subject having a singular verb, a plural subject having a plural verb. This is the obvious principle in all languages of the Indo-Germanic group. It was once true of the dual also, though never to the same extent. Moulton1 aptly says: “Many Greek dialects, Ionic conspicuously, had discarded this hoary luxury long before the common Greek was born.” The Attic gave it a temporary lease of life, “but it never invaded Hellenistic, not even when a Hebrew dual might have been exactly rendered by its aid.” I doubt, however, as previously shown (ch. VII, I, 3), Moulton’s explanation that the dual probably arose in prehistoric days when men could count only two. That was indeed a prehistoric time! Probably the dual was rather the effort to accent the fact that only two were meant, not more, as in pairs, etc. Hence the dual verb even in Attic was not always used, and it was an extra burden to carry a special inflection for just this idea. No wonder that it vanished utterly in the κοινή.

2. Neuter Plural and Singular Verb. But the κοινή fails to respond to the Attic rule that a neuter plural inanimate subject takes a singular verb. Homer indeed was not so insistent and the “modern Greek has gone back completely and exclusively to the use

1 Prol., p. 57.
of the plural verb in this instance as in others.” The N. T., like the κοινή in general, has broken away from the Attic rule and responds more to the sense, and also more often regards a neuter plural as really plural. It never was a binding rule, though more so in Attic than in Homer. In the vernacular κοινή the people treated the neuter plural like other plurals. (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 96.) Usually a neuter plural in the N. T. that has a personal or collective meaning has a plural verb. So ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα (Mt. 10:21), [Page 404] τά δαμώνια πιστεύουσιν (Jas. 2:19), ἔθνη ἐπιζητοῦσιν (Mt. 6:32), τά σπεύματα προσέπιπτον (Mk. 3:11). But the only rule on the matter that is true for N. T. Greek is the rule of liberty. The papyri show the same variety of usage. So does the LXX. In the examples given above the MSS. often vary sharply and examples of the singular verb occur with all of them, δαιμόνια more frequently with the singular verb, as ἐξήρχετο δαιμόνια πολλά (Lu. 8:30), but παρεκάλουν in next verse. So in Lu. 4:41 we have δαιμόνια ἔξηρχετο and a little further on ὅτι ἠδεισαν. In Jo. 10:4 we see a similar change in the same sentence, τά πρόβατα αὐτῷ ὁκολουθεῖ ὅτι οἶδασιν. The same indifference to the Attic rule appears about things as about persons. Thus ἵνα φανερωθῇ τά ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ (Jo. 9:3) and ἐφάνησαν τά ῥήματα (Lu. 24:11). In Rev. 1:19 we find ἠ εἰσὶν καὶ ἠ μέλλει γενέσθαι. The predicate adjective will, of course, be plural, even if the verb is singular, as φανερά ἔστιν τὰ τέκνα (1 Jo. 3:10). Cf. Gal. 5:19. Winer and (to some extent) Blass feel called on to explain in detail these variations, but one has to confess that the success is not brilliant. It is better to regard this indifference to congruity as chiefly an historical movement characteristic of the κοινή as shown above. Even the Attic did not insist on a singular verb with a neuter plural of animate objects when the number of individuals was in mind. The neuter plural was in origin a collective singular. In 1 Cor. 10:11 the MSS. differ much between συνέβαινεν and –ον.

3. Collective Substantives. These show a similar double usage, Thus we have ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτῶν ὅχλος (Mk. 3:32) and so more commonly with these collective substantives like ὅχλος, πλῆθος, οἰκία, λαός. But plenty of examples of construction according to sense occur. So ὁ δὲ πλεῖστος ὅχλος ἔστρωσαν (Mt. 21:8). Sometimes we have both together, as ἤκολούθει αὐτῷ ὅχλος πολύς, ὅτι ἔθεισαν (Jo. 6:2). Where there was such liberty each writer or speaker followed his bent or the humour of the moment. The same variation is to be noticed with the participle. Thus ἦ ὅχλος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον ἐκπάρατοι ἐίσων (Jo. 7:49). Here the predicate is plural with the verb. Cf. also Lu. 23:1. But in Ac. 5:16 the participle φέροντες is plural, though the verb συνήρχετο is singular like πλῆθος. Cf. also Ac. 21:36; 25:24; Lu. 2:13. It is not, of course, necessary that a predicate substantive should agree in number with the subject. So ἐστὲ ἐπιστολῆ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. 3:3).

2 W.-Th., p. 514 f.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 78.
4. The Pindaric Construction. Another complication is possible when several subjects are united. If the predicate follows this compound subject, it is put in the plural nearly always. But the “Pindaric construction” (πινδαρικόν) puts the verb in the singular. Blass says German cannot do this, and he ignores the N. T. examples. In Jas. 5:2 f. we have a striking example: ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν σέσητε, καὶ τὸ ἱματία ὑμῶν σητόρωτα γέγονεν, ὁ χρυσὸς ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος κατώτατα. Here κατώτατα is natural like the English translation, “is cankered” (A.V.). Note also Mt. 6:19, ὅπως σῆς καὶ βρῶσις ἄφανίζει (‘where moth and rust doth corrupt,’ A.V.). Other examples are Mk. 4:41, καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ; 1 Cor. 15:50, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ ἀἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύναται. Here the principle of anacoluthon suggested by Moulton will hardly apply. It is rather the totality that is emphasized by the singular verb as in the English examples. But when the predicate comes first and is followed by several subjects, anacoluthon may very well be the explanation, as in the Shakespearean examples given by Moulton. The simplest explanation (see under 5) is that the first subject is alone in mind. Thus in 1 Cor. 13:13 νοὴι δὲ μένει πίστες, ἐλπίς, ἡγίασε, τὰ τρία ταῦτα (cf. English ‘and now abideth faith, hope, love, these three,’ like the Greek). Cf. also 1 Tim. 6:4. However, in Mt. 5:18, ἐως ὅν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανός καὶ ἥ γῆ, it seems rather the totality that is emphasized as above. See Jo. 12:22. In Rev. 9:12, ἵθελεν ἐχρεῖται ἐτί δύο οὐαί μετὰ ταῦτα, probably the neuter conception of the interjection prevails, though just before we have ἢ οὕσιν ἢ μία. In Lu. 2:33, ἤν ὁ τατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες, the copula follows one plan and the participle another. So also ἤν καθήμεναι (Mt. 27:61). Just so ὅρθεν Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἡλείας συναλλαγμένες (Mt. 17:3). Cf. Eph. 4:17 f. In Rev. 21:16, τὸ μῆκος καὶ τὸ πλάτος καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Ἡσα αἰστίν, the neuter plural adjective and singular copula are regular.

5. Singular Verb with First Subject. It is very common indeed for the verb to have the singular with the first of the subjects. Cf. Jo. 2:2; 12; 3:22; 18:15; Ac. 11:14. But on the other hand we have προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ιωάννης οἱ οὗι Ζεβεδαίου (Mk. 10:35). Cf. also Lu. 23:12; Jo. 21:2; Ac. 5:24. In Ac. 25:23 one participle is singular and the other plural. So in Ac. 5:29 we meet ὅποιον δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἔπαν. With ἢ the verb is usually in the singular in the N. T. So Mt. 12:25 πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθῆσαι καθ᾽ ἔσοντις οὐ σταθήσεται. Cf. also Mt. 5:18; 18:8; Eph. 5:5. In Gal. 1:8 Blass thinks it would be impossible to have εὐάγγελωσόμεθα with ἡμεῖς ἢ ἰδίως. But the impossible happens in Jas. 2:15, ἢν ἀδελφός ἢ ἀδελφή γυμνοὶ ὑπάρχωσιν. We have a similar difficulty in English in the use of the disjunctive and other pronouns. One will loosely say: “If any one has left their books, they can come and get them.”

6. The Literary Plural. We have already mentioned the use of the plural in a kind of impersonal way to conceal one’s identity, as τεθνήκασιν (Mt. 2:20), αἰτοῦσιν (Lu. 12:20) and the general indefinite plural like ὡς λέγουσιν (Rev. 2:24). The critics

---

1 Ib., p. 79.
2 Prol., p. 58. Sometimes Shakespeare used a singular verb for the sake of metre (Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 65), at other times more like our mod. Eng.: “It is now a hundred years since,” etc. Cf. Gk. ἔστιν οἷς, etc. Cf. also Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 18; Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 263–268.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 80.
disagree sharply about it (the literary plural). Blass\(^2\) flatly denies that we have any right to claim this literary plural in Paul’s Epistles because he associates others with himself in his letters. Winer\(^3\) insists that Paul often speaks in his apostolic character when he uses the plural and hence does not always include others. Moulton\(^4\) considers the matter settled in favour of the epistolary plural in the koine. He cites from the papyri several examples. So Tb.P. 26 (ii/B.C.) ὁντι μοι ἐν Ποταμαῖδει—προσέπεσεν ἦμιν, B.U. 449 (ii–iii/A.D.) ἄκοιψας ὁτι νοσθεύῃ ἰχνονομοῦν, J. H. S. xix 92 (ii/A.D.) χαίρε μοι, μὴ δέχητε ἰγκοκτάθη, καὶ φροντίζετε ἦμιν. Dick\(^5\) has made an exhaustive study of the whole subject and produces parallels from late Greek that show how easily ἔγω and ἰμεις were exchanged. The matter can be clarified, I think. To begin with, there is no reason in the nature of things why Paul should not use the literary plural if he wished to do so. He was a man of culture and used to books even if he used the vernacular koine in the main. The late Greek writers did; the papyri show examples of it. G. Milligan (Thess., p. 132) cites Tb. P. 58 (ii/B.C.) εὐρήκαμεν—ἑυρὸν—βεβουλεύμεθα; P. Hib. 44 (iii/B.C.) ἐγράψαμεν—ὁρῶντες—οἵμην; P. Heid. 6 (iv/A.D.) παντεύόμεθα—γράφω καὶ φιλωρίσθω; and an inscription, possibly a rescript of Hadrian, O. G. I. S 484, λοῦμεν—[μετεπεμ-]ψάμην—βουληθεῖς—ἐδοξεν ἰμεῖν—ἐδοκιμαζομεν—ἐπίστευον—ἡγησόμεθα—νομίζω. Besides, Blass\(^6\) admits that we have it in 1 Jo. 1:4, where γράφομεν does not differ in reality from γράφω of 2:1. But in Jo. 21:24 οἴδαμεν probably is in contrast to John, who uses οἶμαι just [Page 407] below. In Jo. 1:14, as certainly in 1:16, others are associated with the writer. The author of Hebrews also uses the singular or plural according to the humour of the moment. Thus πεποθμεθα—ἐχομεν (13:18) and the next verse παρακαλῶ—ἀποκατασταθῶ. Cf. also 6:1, 3, 9, 11, with 13:22 f. Now as to Paul. In Ro. 1:5 he has δι’ οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν. Surely he is talking of no one else when he mentions ἀποστολὴν. Blass\(^1\) overlooks this word and calls attention to χάριν as applicable to all. Then again in Col. 4:3 ἦμιν is followed in the same verse by δέδομαι. It is clear also in 1 Th. 2:18, ἢθελήσαμεν—ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος. But what really settles the whole matter\(^2\) is 2 Cor. 10:1–11:6. Paul is here defending his own apostolic authority where the whole point turns on his own personality. But he uses first the singular, then the plural. Thus παρακαλῶ (10:1), θαρρόω, λογίζομαι (10:2), στρατεύομαι (10:3), ἰμεῖς (10:7), καυχόμοιμαι, αἰσχυνθήσομαι (10:8), δόξω (10:9), ἔσμεν (10:11), καυχηθεῖσθα (10:13), etc. It is not credible that here Paul has in mind any one else than himself. Cf. also 2 Cor. 2:14–7:16 for a similar change from singular to plural. The use of the literary plural by Paul sometimes does not, of course, mean that he always uses it when he has a plural. Each case rests on its own merits. Jesus seems to use it also in Jo. 3:11, δ’ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν καὶ δ’ ἐφαράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν. In Mk. 4:30 (πῶς
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2 Ib., p. 166.
3 W.-Th., p. 517.
4 Prol., p. 86.
5 Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus (1900).
6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 166.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 166.
κόλποι

Hebrew Jewish idea of seven heavens. In English we use “the heavens” usually for the canopy. Cf. Paul’s allusion to “third heaven” (2 Cor. 12:2), an apparent reflection of the Hebrew concept of seven heavens in adverbial sense. Cf. ταύτα (ταύτα (Jo. 15:26).

(b) SUBSTANTIVE AND ADJECTIVE. The concord between adjective and substantive is just as close as that between subject and verb. This applies to both predicate and attributive adjectives. Here again number is confined to the singular and the plural, for the dual is gone. Cf. in lieu of the dual the curious καιμους και μηνους καρού (Rev. 12:14). When adjectives and participles deviate from this accord in number or gender (Eph. 4:17 f.; 1 Cor. 12:2; Rev. 19:14), it is due to the sense instead of mere grammar, κατ’ ονομασίαν. Thus in Mk. 9:15 we have ὁ διχλος ὁδόντες, Ac. 3:11 ὁ διχλος ἑκατομμυρια, Lu. 2:13 ἀνωτέρων, Mk. 8:1 ὁ διχλος ὄντος καὶ μη ἑκόντων (note both), Ac. 21:36 πλήθος κράζοντες, etc. Cf. ὁ διχλος ἐπάρατοι (Jo. 7:49). In Ph. 2:6 τὸ ἐναὶ ἑσοθω the plural adjective differs little from ἵδιον in adverbial sense. Cf. ταύτα (ταύτα (Jo. 6:9), τι ἐν ἑαυτῇ ταύτα (Lu. 15:26).

[Page 408] (c) REPRESENTATIVE SINGULAR. But other points come up also about the number of the substantives. One is the use of the singular with the article to signify the whole class. The examples are frequent, such as ὁ ᾿αγαθός ᾿ανθρώπος (Mt. 12:35), σημεία τοῦ ἁποτελούς (2 Cor. 12:12), ὁ ἐργάτης (Lu. 10:7), τοῦ Ἰουδαίου (Ro. 3:1), τὸν πτωχόν (Jas. 2:6). This discussion about the number of nouns could more properly be treated under syntax of nouns, but I have no such chapter. Cf. Cases.

(d) IDIOMATIC PLURAL IN NOUNS. Abstract substantives occur in the plural in the N. T. as in the older Greek, an idiom foreign to English. Thus πλεονεξία (Mt. 7:22), προσωποληψίας (Jas. 2:1). Cf. also φόνοι Mt. 15:19; τὰς πορνείας 1 Cor. 7:2. In 2 Cor. 12:20 and 1 Pet. 2:1 both the singular and the plural occur in contrast. This use of the plural of abstract substantives does indeed lay stress on the separate acts. Some words were used almost exclusively in the plural, or at any rate the plural was felt to be more appropriate. So αἰῶνες in the sense of ‘world’ (Heb. 1:2) or ‘eternity,’ as εἷς τοῦς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων (Gal. 1:5), or with singular and plural, as τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων (Eph. 3:21). Cf. also τὸ ἡγίατον ὑπὸ ἡγίασεν for the sanctification (Heb. 8:2) and ἡγίατον ὑπόθεσεν for ‘the most Holy Place’ (Heb. 9:3). The word ὀφρανός is used in the singular often enough, and always so in the Gospel of John, as 1:32, but the plural is common also. Cf. Paul’s allusion to “third heaven” (2 Cor. 12:2), an apparent reflection of the Jewish idea of seven heavens. In English we use “the heavens” usually for the canopy of sky above us, but ἡ βασιλεία τῶν ὀφρανῶν uniformly in the N. T., as Mt. 3:2. The Hebrew דִּינְפִּים is partly responsible for ὀφρανοί. The so-called “plural of majesty” has an element of truth in it. For further details see Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 83. A number of other words have this idiomatic plural, such as ἐκ δεξιῶν, ἐξ ᾿ανατολίων, ἐξ εὐνομίμων (Mt. 25:33), εἰς τὸ δεξιὰ μέρισμα (Jo. 21:6), ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς (Mt. 16:5), ἀπὸ ᾿ανατολῆς (Mt. 2:1), ἀπὸ δυσμῶν (Mt. 8:11), θύρας (Ac. 5:19), πύλας (Mt. 16:18), κόλποι (Lu. 16:23). But the singular of some of them is also found, as ἐν τῇ ᾿ανατολῇ (Mt. 2:9), ἐν δεξιᾷ (Eph. 1:20), πρὸ τῆς θύρας (Ac. 12:6). The plural of ἰμάτιον seems to mean only ἰμάτιον (not γίγαντον also) in Jo. 19:23 (cf. 19:2). For the plural ἀλματα note Jo. 1:13. The names of feasts are often plural, such as τὰ ᾰγκαίνα (Jo. 10:22), τὰ γενέσια (Mt. 6:21), τὰ ἄρματα (Mt. 14:1), γάμοι (Mt. 22:2), σάββατα (Ac. 17:2). So also some cities have plural names, as Ἰεροσόλυμα (Mt. 2:1), Ἄθήναι (Ac. 17:16),
(e) **IDIOMATIC SINGULAR IN NOUNS.** On the other hand the singular appears where one would naturally look for a plural. A neuter singular as an abstract expression may sum up the whole mass. Thus πᾶς ὁ in Jo. 6:37 refers to believers. Cf. also Jo. 17:2. The same collective use of the neuter singular is found in τὸ Ἐξαττον (Heb. 7:7). So not τὸ γεγεννόμενον (Lu. 1:35) but πᾶς τὸ γεγεννημένον (1 Jo. 5:4). The same concealment of the person is seen in τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε (2 Th. 2:6). The neuter plural indeed is very common in this sense, as τὰ μισρά, τὰ ἀσθενείς, etc. (1 Cor. 1:27 f.). Then again the singular is used where the substantive belongs to more than one subject. So πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν (Mk. 8:17), ἔθεντο ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν (Lu. 1:66), ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσώπων αὐτῶν (Mt. 17:6), περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὃς ζων ὃς (Eph. 6:14), ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς στολή λευκή (Rev. 6:11), ἄπο προσώπω τῶν πατέρων (Ac. 7:45), διὰ στόματος πάντων (Ac. 3:18), ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν (Jo. 10:39). In 1 Cor. 6:5, ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἄδελφου, the difficulty lies not in μέσον, but in the singular ἄδελφοι. The fuller form would have been the plural or the repetition of the word, ἄδελφοι καὶ ἄδελφοι. In all these variations in number the N. T. writers merely follow in the beaten track of Greek usage with proper freedom and individuality. For copious illustrations from the ancient Greek see Gildersleeve, *Greek Syntax*, pp. 17–59.1

(f) **SPECIAL INSTANCES.** Two or three other passages of a more special nature call for comment. In Mt. 21:7 (Ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπὶ ἀνών αὐτῶν) it is probable that αὐτῶν refers to τὰ ἱμάτια, not to τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον. In Mt. 24:26 ἐν τῇ ἔρημῷ and ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις are in contrast. In Mt. 27:44 οἱ λῃσταὶ is not to be taken as plural for the singular. Probably both reproached Jesus at first and afterwards one grew sorry and turned on the other, as Lu. 23:39 has it. In Mt. 22:1 and Mk. 12:1 ἐπεν ἐν παραβολαῖς is followed by only one parable, but there were doubtless others not recorded. In Mt. 9:8, ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεόν τὸν δόντα ἔξοσισιν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἄθωροις, we have a double sense in δόντα, for Jesus had the ἔξοσισιν in a sense not true of ἄθωροις who got the benefit of it. So in Ac. 13:40 τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις is merely equivalent to ἐν βιβλίῳ τῶν προφητῶν (Ac. 7:42). On these special matters see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 251. Cf. χερουβείν (Aramaic dual) and κατασκιάζοντα (Heb. 9:5).

[Page 410] VIII. Concord in Gender. Here we deal only with nouns, for verbs have no gender. But gender plays an important part in the agreement of substantive and adjective.

(a) **FLUCTUATIONS IN GENDER.** The whole matter is difficult, for substantives have two sorts of gender, natural and grammatical. The two do not always agree. The apparent violations of the rules of gender can generally be explained by the conflict in these two points of view with the additional observation that the grammatical gender of some words changed or was never firmly settled. All the constructions according to

---

sense are due to analogy (Middleton in Syntax, p. 39). For further general remarks on
gender see chapter on Declensions. In Ac. 11:28 Luke has ἔλεγον μεγάλην, not μεγάν.
In Rev. 14:19 two genders are found with the same word, ἔβαλεν εἰς τῇν ληφνὸν τοῦ
θημοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μέγαν. Cf. Lu. 4:25 and 15:14. The papyri vary also in the gender
of this word (Moulton, Prol., p. 60). The common gender of θεός (Ac. 19:37, cf. θεὰ
19:27) and similar words is discussed in the chapter on Declensions. In Rev. 11:4 αἱ
ἐστώτες skips over ληψία curiously1 and goes back (the participle, not the article) to
οὗτοι (οὗτοι εἶσιν αἱ δύο ἐλάβαι καὶ αἱ δύο ληψίαι αἱ ἑνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς
ἐστώτες). But more about the Apocalypse later. In Mk. 12:28, ποιά ἐστίν ἐντολὴ
πρῶτη πάντων, Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 178) thinks that πασῶν would be beside the
point as it is rather the general idea of omnium. Is it not just construction κατὰ
σύνεσιν? In Ph. 2:1 εἰ τις σπλάγχνα is difficult after εἰ τί παραμῦθον and εἰ τις
κοινωνία. Blass2 cuts the knot boldly by suggesting εἰ τί in all the examples here
which Moulton3 accepts with the sense of si quid valet, but he cites papyri examples
like ἐπὶ τι μίαν τῶν…οἰκίων, Par. P. 15 (ii/B.C.); εἰ δὲ τι περισσὰ γράμματα, B.U.326
(ii/A.D.). See also ἔδω δὲ τι ἁλλὰ ἀπαστηθὼμεν, Amh. Pap. II, 85, 11, and ἔδω δὲ τι
ἄροις γένηται, ib., 15. Cf. Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 184. Perhaps after all this
correction may be right or the text may be corrupt. The scribe could easily have
written τις for τινα because of the preceding examples. A nodding scribe may even
have thought σπλάγχνα feminine singular. But what is one to say of θεάν in Rev.
9:12; 11:14? Shall we think4 of θείας or ταλαπωρία? In Mt. 21:42 (Mk. 12:11),
παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὐτῇ καὶ ἔστιν [Page 411] θαυμαστῇ, we may have a translation
of the Hebrew לוי (Ps. (117) 118:23), for οὗτος is used just before in reference to
λίθον. Tοῦτο would be the Greek idiom for αὐτῇ. It is even possible that οὗτη may
refer to κεφαλή γνώμας. So also τῇ Βάαλ in Ro. 11:4 comes from the LXX (Jer. 2:8;
2:28; 7:9; Hos. 2:8). Cf. τῇ Βάαλ τῇ διαμάλει in Tobit 1:5 B. See Declensions for
further remarks.

(b) THE NEUTER SINGULAR. This is not always to be regarded as a breach of
gender. Often the neuter conveys a different conception. So in the question of Pilate,
tί ἐστιν ἄλληθες? (Jo. 18:38). Cf. also τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; (Gal. 3:19), τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος;
(Heb. 2:6), τί ὃν εἴπα ταύτα; (Lu. 15:26), εἰ δικαίον τις εἶναι τι μηδὲν ὄν; (Gal. 6:3).
But on the other hand note εἶναι τινα (Ac. 5:36), αὐτῇ ἐστίν ἡ μεγάλη ἐντολὴ (Mt. 22:38),
tίς ἡ προσόλημπτις; (Ro. 11:15), τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπίς; (Eph. 1:18). In particular observe τί
ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο (Ac. 12:18) and οὗτος δὲ τί (Jo. 21:21). Cf. also τοῦτο χάρις (twice)

 Middleton

MIDDLETON, Analogy in Syntax (1892).

———, The Doctrine of the Greek Article (1855).

1 But Moulton (Cl. Rev., Apr., 1904, p. 151) cites from the pap. numerous false
gender concords like τῆν πεπτωκότα, etc. Cf. Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 57;
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 81.
3 Prol., p. 59.
4 W.-Sch., p. 255.
in 1 Pet. 2:19 f., where τούτο is predicate and really refers to εἰ ὑποφέρει τις and εἰ ὑπομενεῖται. Cf. also ἡ ποιηθησεν ἐστιν τῆς ὑποψίας (Lu. 12:23). Indeed τούτο may be the predicate with persons, as ταυτά τινες ἦνε (1 Cor. 6:11). The neuter adjective in the predicate is perfectly normal in cases like ικανῶν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ ἢ ἑπιτίμια αὐτῆς (2 Cor. 2:6). So also ἄρκετῶν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἢ κακία αὐτής (Mt. 6:34). Cf. also the reading of D ἀρετῶν in Ac. 12:3. Blass treats ἄρκετῶν above and ἰκονῶν ἔστιν in Lu. 22:38 as like the Latin satis. The neuter singular in the collective or general sense to represent persons is not peculiar to the N. T. So τὸ κατέχον (2 Th. 2:6), πᾶν ὃ (Jo. 17:2), τὸ ἀπολογισμός (Lu. 19:10), etc. So the neuter plural also as τα μορφα τοῦ κόσμου, τὰ άσθενή (1 Cor. 1:27). The neuter article τὸ ἀγαρ (Gal. 4:25) deals with the word Hagar, not the gender of the person. In Jas. 4:4 μοιχολίδες in W. H. stands without μοιχαλοί καί, but none the less may be regarded as comprehensive. 2 Cf. γενεὰ μοιχαλίς (Mt. 12:39) and Hos. 2:4, 23. In 1 Cor. 15:10 note εἰμὶ ὁ ἐμι, not δς, a different idea.

(c) EXPLANATORY ὃ ἐστιν and τοῦτ ἐστιν. A special idiom is the relative ὃ ἐστιν as an explanation (ὅ ἐστιν) and the demonstrative τοῦτ ἐστι, which are both used without much regard to the gender (not to say number) of antecedent or predicate. Thus in Mk. 3:17 ὁνομα Βασιλικός, ὃ ἐστιν ὁ θεός; 12:42 λεγεί τοῦ ὃ ἐστιν κοδράντις; 15:16 τῆς αὐλῆς, ὃ ἐστιν πρακτόριος; 15:22 Γάλλοι Δύο σωπόν, ὃ ἐστιν κρανίου τόπος (cf. Mt. 27:33); ἐβαβεί, ὃ λέγεται (Jo. 1:38); 1:42 Μεσσήνια ὃ ἐστιν; Col. 3:14 ἔχεις σάρκα, ὃ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος; Eph. 6:17 μάχεραν, ὃ ἐστιν ἰδίας ἡθού. Blass observes that it is only in the Apocalypse that this explanatory relative is assimilated to the antecedent or predicate, as λαμπάδες, ὃ εἶσαι τὰ πνεύματα (Rev. 4:5), but ὄρθιοι λάθα, ὃ εἶσαι τὰ πνεύματα (5:6). But it is otherwise with the ordinary relative, as ὃ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, οἵτινες ἔστιν ὑμεῖς (1 Cor. 3:17); Φιλίππου, ἡτίς ἐστιν πρώτη πόλις (Ac. 16:12); ὤπο τῶν ἀντικειμένων, ἡτίς ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἐνδειξις ἀκολουθεῖ (Ph. 1:28); ἐν ταῖς θλιψεῖς μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἡτίς ἐστιν δόξα υμῶν (Eph. 3:13). The use of τοῦτ ἐστιν is a common idiom in the later Greek (less so in the older) and is exactly equivalent to the Latin id est and has no regard to case, number or gender. So ἔλοι τοῦτ ἐστιν θεύ μου (Mt. 27:46); τοῦτ ἐστιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς (Heb. 7:5). Cf. Heb. 2:14; 9:11, etc. See further p. 399, and ch. XV, VII, (d), 10.

(d) THE PARTICIPLE. It often has the construction κατὰ σύνεσιν, as in Mk. 9:26, κραίσας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξας referring to τὸ πνεῦμα. Cf. Lu. 2:13 στρατιὰς αὐνοῦντων; πλήθος κράζοντων (Ac. 21:36); ὁδοίντως (25:24). But on the other hand note ἀναστὰν πλήθος (Lu. 23:1). So also in 1 Cor. 12:2 ἐσθιν ἑπαράμενοι; Eph. 4:17 f. ἔσθι στομαχέων; Rev. 4:8 ἔφθασεν, ἐν καθῆ ἐν ξίφων λέγοντες; 11:15 φαναὶ μεγάλα λέγοντες (cf. φωνήν λέγοντα, Rev. 9:14); 19:14 στρατεύσαμα ἐνδεδυμένοι. Cf. θηρίων γέμοντα (Rev. 17:3). Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 526) takes ἔσκοταιμένοι in Eph. 4:18 with ὑμᾶς. Cf. also πλήθος φέροντες (Ac. 5:16). Cf. Lu. 19:37. So (at ἑκκλησία) ἰκονίωντες (Gal. 1:22 f.). But in Rev. 21:14 τὸ τέλχος ἐξίον seems a mere slip. But ξίφον—ἐξίον (Rev. 4:7) may be mere confusion in sound of ἐξίον and ἐξίον. See also

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 76.
2 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 254.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 77.

Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 87) cites ζῶ—ἀστράπτων from Apocalypsis Anastasieae (pp. 6, 13).

(c) Adjectives. The question of an adjective’s using one form for more than one gender has already been discussed at length in the chapter on Declensions. Thus στρατιάς οὐρανίου (Lu. 2:13) is not a breach of concord, for οὐρανίου is feminine. If masculine and feminine are used together and the plural adjective or participle occurs, the masculine, of course, prevails over the feminine when persons are considered. Thus ἢν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἢ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες (Lu. 2:33). So also Ἀγρίππας καὶ Βερνίκη ἄσπασάμενοι (Ac. 25:13) and even with the disjunctive ἤ, as ἄδελφος ἢ ἄδελφη γυμνὸι (Jas. 2:15). In Rev. 8:7 the neuter plural is used of two nouns (one feminine and one neuter), χάλαζα καὶ πῦρ μεμιμένα. Cf. φθαρτοῖς, ἄργυρῳ ἢ χρυσῷ (1 Pet. 1:18), same gender. So ποικίλως νόσοις καὶ βασάνοις (Mt. 4:24), πάσις ἄρχης καὶ [Page 413] ἐξουσίας (Eph. 1:21), etc. Thus we may note πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθείσα (Mt. 12:25), the same gender. But when but different genders occur, the adjective is usually repeated, as in ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαί οἰκοδομαὶ (Mk. 13:1), πᾶσα δόσις καὶ πᾶν δόρμα (Jas. 1:17), οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινὴν (Rev. 21:1), etc. There is emphasis also in the repetition. But one adjective with the gender of one of the substantives is by no means uncommon. Thus in Heb. 9:9, δώρα τε καὶ θυσία μὴ δυνάμεναι, the last substantive is followed, while in Heb. 3:6, ἔδωκα τὴν παρθένοις καὶ τὸ καυχήματα μέχρι τέλους βεβαιάν κατάσχομεν, the first rules in gender.1 Per contra note ὁ ἰδρυς in Rev. 12:5. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 86) cites φύλα τέκνον from the Iliad, XXII, 84.

IX. Concord in Case. This is not the place for the syntax of the cases. That matter belongs to a special chapter.

(a) Adjectives. They concur in the case of the substantive with which they are used. The variations are either indeclinable forms like πλήρης2 in Jo. 1:14 (agreeing with αὐτοῦ or δόξαν) or are due to anacoluthon, as Jas. 3:8 τὴν δὲ γλώσσαν οὐδεὶς διαμάσαε δύναται ἄνθρωπον· ἀκατάστατον κακῶν, μεστὴ ἱοῦ (so W. H. punctuate).

(b) Participles. They lend themselves readily to anacoluthon in case. Thus ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, γράψατες (Ac. 15:22 ff.). See Mk. 7:19 καθαρίζων. Mk. 6:9 has ὑποδείκνυσις, whereas before we have αὐτοῖς and ἄρωσιν, but W. H. read ἔνδυσασθαί (Nestle, ἐνδύσασθε). In Mk. 12:40, οἱ κατέσθοντες καὶ

2 The exx. of this indecl. use of πλήρης are abundant in MSS. of the N. T., occurring in most passages of the N. T. See Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 81. The pap. confirm the N. T. MSS. See Moulton, ProL., p. 50. See ch. VII, 2, (f), of this book, for details.


———, Novum Testamentum Graece. 8th ed. (1910).
prosphoremenoi, we have a nominative in apposition with the ablative ὑπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θεόντων. In Ph. 3:18 f. τοὺς ἔξθεον in agreement with the case of οὗ, while of ὑποκτήνες below skips back to πολλοί. Sometimes, as in ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια (Ro. 3:2), the substantive will make sense as subject or object of the verb. In Heb. 9:10 δικαιώματα—ἐπικέιμενα in apposition with θυσία skips over the parenthetical clause between. Cf. also perhaps ἥρεμεν (Lu. 24:47), ἥρεμεν (Ac. 1:22. Cf. Lu. 23:5), ἥρεμεν (Ac. 10:37). Note this idiom in Luke’s writings.

(c) The Book of Revelation. It is full of variations (solecisms) from case-concord, especially in appositional clauses. Thus in Rev. 7:9 after ἵδοι, καὶ ἰδοὺ we first have the nominative [Page 414] with ἵδοι and then the accusative with ἵδον. Thus ὁ μάρτυς (Rev. 1:5) retains the nominative rather than the ablative ἐπὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, whereas in 11:18 τοὺς μικροὺς is in apposition with the dative τοῖς δούλοις, κτλ. Cf. 20:2 where ὁ δῆρος (text, marg. acc.) is in apposition with the accusative τοῦ δράκοντα. The papyri show the idiom. Cf. τοῦ ἄνελφου—ὁ διάτοχος (=διαδ.) in Letr. 149 (ii/A.D.), Ἀντιφόλος Ἐξάρθη—Παπύρους in B.G.U. 1002 (i/b.C.). Cf. Moulton, ProL, p. 60. The Apocalypse is thus by no means alone. See also παρὰ τοῦ Ποστάρτιομοι τῶν εὐρύντα B.G.U. 846 (ii/A.D.), Ἑκουσα Τοθήζ λέγων P. Par. 51 (b.c. 160), ἔνε λέξικας πολίς ἔφων, ib. In particular the participle is common in the nominative in the Apocalypse. In the case of ἐπὶ ὁ ὁν καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος the nominative is evidently intentional to accent the unchangeableness of God (1:4). Cf. this formula in 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 16:5. ὁ νικῶν occurs as a set phrase, the case being expressed by ἀρχός which follows. So in 2:26 ἀρχός (πρεσβύτερος also); 3:12 ἀρχόν, 21 ἀρχόν. But in τῷ νικώντα δόσω ἀρχόν 2:7, 17, the case is regularly in the dative without anacoluthon. The wrong case appears with ἔφων in 1:16 (almost separate sentence) if it is meant to refer to ἀρχῶν or gender if φονή; 9:14 (ὁ ἔφων in apposition with ἄγγελων); 10:2 ἔφων (sort of parenthesis, cf. 1:16); 14:14 ἔφων (loosely appended); 19:12 (loose connection of ἔφων). In 5:6 and 17:3 ἔφων has wrong gender and case. This participle seems to be strung on loosely generally, but in 21:11 f. the proper case and gender occur. Cf. also ἡ λέγουσα (2:20) and λέγον (14:7). In 14:12 ἐκτόνως is a loose addition like ἡ καταβαίνουσα (3:12). More difficult seems ἐν καμίνῳ πεπερασμένης (1:15), margin πεπερασμένοι. In 19:20 τήν λίμνην τοῦ πυρὸς τῆς καιομένης the participle agrees in gender with λίμνην and in case with πυρός. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 86) cites ἰπέχο γαρ ἀρχόν τὸν ὀμολογοῦσαν (Amh. Pap. II, 111 to 113, where regularly the accusative of a participle is in apposition with a genitive or ablative). He gives also ὑγός P. I N 120, 25, ὡς ἰδίας ἀρχῶν τι ὀμολογοῦντες; Flinders-Pet. Pap. III 42 C (3) 3, ἰδίοι ἀρχοῦσα ὑπὸ Ἀπολλονίου ἐμβάλλων. Dittenberger (Or. inscr. 611) gives ἰσβαστοῦ and υἱός in apposition. But the point of difficulty in the Revelation of John is not any one isolated discord in case or gender. It is rather the great number of such violations of concord that attracts

———, Septuagint (Hastings’ D. B., 1902).


attention. As shown above, other books of the N. T. show such phenomena. Observe especially Luke, who is a careful writer of education. Note also Paul in Ph. 1:30 where ἔχοντες (cf. this word in Rev.) is used with ὑμῖν, and 2 Cor. 7:5 ἡμῖν—οἰκίσκοι. Similar discords occur in the LXX, as in Jer. 14:13; Dan. 10:5–7; 1 Macc. 13:16; 1 Macc. 15:28; and indeed occasionally in the very best of Greek writers. The example in 1 Macc. 13:16 (λαὸν λέγοντες) is worth singling out for its bearing on both case and number. Nestle (Einf. in das griech. N. T., p. 90 f.) notes the indeclinable use of λέγων and λέγοντες in the LXX, like רבָנים. Cf. Nestle, Phil. Sacra., p. 7. See also Thackeray, Gr., p. 23. One must not be a slavish martinet in such matters at the expense of vigour and directness. The occasion of anacoluthon in a sentence is just the necessity of breaking off and making a new start. But the Apocalypse demands more than these general remarks. Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 534) calls attention to the fact that these irregularities occur chiefly in the description of the visions where there would naturally be some excitement. Moulton1 argues from the fact that the papyri of uneducated writers show frequent discord in case that John was somewhat backward in his Greek. He speaks of “the curious Greek of Revelation,” “the imperfect Greek culture of this book.” He notes the fact that most of the examples in both the papyri and Revelation are in apposition and the writer’s “grammatical sense is satisfied when the governing word has affected the case of one object.”2 Moulton3 cites in illustration Shakespeare’s use of “between you and I.” This point indeed justifies John. But one must observe the comparative absence of these syntactical discords in the Gospel of John and the Epistles of John. In Ac. 4:13 both Peter and John are called ἄγραμματοι καὶ ἱστάμεναι. This need not be pushed too far, and yet it is noteworthy that 2 Peter and Revelation are just the two books of the N. T. whose Greek jars most upon the cultured mind and which show most kinship to the κοινὴ in somewhat illiterate papyri. One of the theories about the relation between 1 Peter and 2 Peter is that Silvanus (1 Pet. 5:12) was Peter’s scribe in writing the first Epistle, and that thus the Greek is smooth and flowing, while in 2 Peter we have Peter’s own somewhat uncouth, unrevised Greek. This theory rests on the assumption of the genuineness of 2 Peter, which is much disputed. So also in Acts Luke refines Peter’s Greek in the reports of his addresses [Page 416] of his addresses. Now in Jo. 21:24 we seem to have the comment of a brother (or several) on the Gospel of John which he has read and approved. Moulton1 naturally suggests the hypothesis that the Gospel and Epistles of John had the smoothing hand of this brother of culture (perhaps in Ephesus), while in the Apocalypse we have John’s own rather uncultured Greek. One may add to this the idea of Winer about possible excitement and passion due to the great ideas of the book. In the Isle of Patmos John, if still there, would have little opportunity for scholarly help and the book may have gone out unrevised. There are other theories, but this matter of authorship is not the grammarians’ task.

(d) OTHER PECULIARITIES IN APPPOSITION. Further examples of apposition call for illustration. Thus in 1 Jo. 2:25, αὐτῇ ἔστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἦν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγεῖλατο ἡμῖν,
In the case of the relative (because nearer) and not in that of the antecedent. Then again in Jo. 1:38 ἐδεδήλωσεν, vocative in the predicate (cf. also 20:16), while in 1:41 Μεσσαθάν is naturally interpreted as Χριστός. In Jo. 13:13 ὁ διόδοσκαλὸς is in apposition with μὲ where we would use quotation-marks. But this passage needs to be borne in mind in connection with Revelation. In 1 Cor. 16:21, τῇ ἑπίχειρα, note the genitive in apposition with the possessive pronoun ἑπί. According to the sense of the possessive, not its case. Once more the common use of the genitive of one substantive in practical apposition has already been noted in this chapter, III, (c), 5, Apposition. Thus ἠ ἐορτή τῶν ζυμων (Lu. 22:1). The use of τοῦ ἔστιν with any case has already been alluded to under Gender. Note Mk. 7:2; Ac. 19:4; Ro. 7:18; Phil. 12; 1 Pet. 3:20; Heb. 9:11; 11:16, etc. In αὐτῶς σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος (Eph. 5:23) αὐτῶς gives emphasis to the apposition. Inverse attraction of antecedent to case of the relative (see Pronouns) is really apposition.

(c) THE ABSOLUTE USE OF THE CASES (nominative, genitive, ablative and accusative). These will receive treatment in the chapter on Cases. Some of the peculiar nominatives noted in Revelation are the nominativus pendens, a common anacolouthon. Cf. ταῦτα ὁ θεώρετε (Lu. 21:6), ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ τηρῶν (Rev. 2:26). The parenthetic nominative is seen in Jo. 1:6, ὁ ιωάνων Ἐρωτήσας, where Ἐρωτήσας might have been dative. But here merely the mention of the fact of the absolute use of the cases is all that is called for.²

X. Position of Words in the Sentence.

(a) FREEDOM FROM RULES. The freedom of the Greek from artificial rules and its response to the play of the mind is never seen better than in the order of words in the sentence. In English, since it has lost its inflections, the order of the words in the sentence largely determines the sense. Whether a substantive is subject or object can usually be seen in English only thus, or whether a given word is verb or substantive, substantive or adjective. Even the Latin, which is an inflectional tongue, has much less liberty than the Greek. We are thinking, of course, of Greek prose, not of poetry, where metre so largely regulates the position of words. The N. T. indeed enjoys the same freedom¹ that the older Greek did with perhaps some additional independence from the vernacular κοινή as contrasted with the older literary language. The modern Greek vernacular has maintained the Greek freedom in this respect (Thumb, Handb., p. 200). The Semitic tongues also have much liberty in this matter. In English it is common to see words in the wrong place that make absurd bungles, as this, for instance: “The man rode a horse with a black hat.” In Greek one may say φιλεῖ ὁ πατήρ τὸν γιόν, ὁ πατήρ φιλεῖ τὸν γιόν or φιλεῖ τὸν γιόν ὁ πατήρ, according to the stress in the mind of the speaker.²

(b) PREDICATE OFTEN FIRST. In Greek prose, where the rhetorical element has less play, the predicate very commonly comes first, simply because, as a rule, the predicate is the most important thing in the sentence. Thus μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 287.
πνεύματι (Mt. 5:3), εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν (Lu. 1:42), ἐγένετο δὲ (Lu. 2:1), καὶ ἐπορεύοντο (2:3), ἀνέβη δὲ (2:4), etc. But this is true so often, not because of any rule, but simply because the predicate is most frequently the main point in the clause. Blass even undertakes to suggest a tentative scheme thus: predicate, subject, object, complementary participle, etc. But Winer rightly remarks that he would be an empirical expositor who would insist on any unalterable rule in the Greek sentence save that of spontaneity.

(c) Emphasis. This is one of the ruling ideas in the order of words. This emphasis may be at the end as well as at the beginning of the sentence, or even in the middle in case of antithesis. The emphasis consists in removing a word from its usual position to an unusual one. So ἰδιωκόν γλυκὺ ποιήσαι ὤδορ (Jas. 3:12). Thus [Page 418] in Lu. 1:12 we have καὶ φόβος ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ αὐτόν, but in Ac. 19:17 καὶ ἐπέπεσεν φόβος ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτοῖς. Sometimes the words in contrast are brought sharply together, as in Jo. 17:4, ἐγὼ σε ἔξοδοςα, and 17:5, νῦν δέξασον με σύ. So ὤμων ἐμοῦ Lu. 10:16. Note also the intentional position of ὁ πατριάρχης in Heb. 7:4 ὁ δεκάτης ἄβραμ ἐδωκεν ἕκ τῶν ἄκροβεβληκότων, ὁ πατριάρχης. So also in 1 Pet. 2:7, ὠμὲν ἡ τιμή τοῖς πιστεύοντεσ, note the beginning and the end of the sentence. This rhetorical emphasis is more common in the Epistles (Paul’s in particular) than in the Gospels and Acts for obvious reasons. Thus observe the position of σῶ in Ro. 11:17 and of κάκεινοι in verse 23. In Heb. 6:19 ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν do not come in immediate contact with ἄγκυραν as adjectives usually do. Observe also the emphatic climax in τετελειωμένον at the end of the sentence in Heb. 7:28. Cf. ἡ—κεφαὶ in Mt. 3:10. Note the sharpness given to οὗ in 1 Cor. 1:17 by putting it first. So 10:5. In 1 Cor. 2:7 θεοῦ σοφίαν throws proper emphasis upon θεοῦ. The position of the subordinate clause varies greatly. It often comes first, as in Lu. 1:1–4.

(d) The Minor Words in a Sentence. In general they come close to the word to which they belong in sense. Thus the adj. is near the subst. and after it. So ὤδορ ζῶν (Jo. 4:10), διδάσκαλε ἄγαθε (Mk. 10:17), ζωὴν αἰώνιον (ib.). But observe ὁ λόγος ἀνθρωπον ὑπη (Jo. 7:23), both adjs. So also note ἑν ἀνδρῶν τόπων (Mt. 12:43), καλὸν σπέρμα (Mt. 13:27), ἔθρος δυνθροπος (Mt. 13:28), where the adj. gives the main idea. With the repeated article the adj. has increased emphasis in ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς (Jo. 10:11). With πνεῦμα ἄγιον this is the usual order (as Mt. 3:11), but also τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα (Ac. 1:8) or τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον (Jo. 14:26). In Ac. 1:5 the verb comes in between the substantive and adjective (ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε; ἄγιος) to give unity to the clause. So in Mt. 1:20, ἐκ πνεύματος ἔστιν θύγον. Cf. ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον (1 Jo. 5:13). In Ac. 26:24 note se thus, τὰ πολλὰ σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει. So also in 1 Cor. 10:4 ἔπιον comes between τὸ and πόμα. The position of the genitive varies greatly, but the same general principle applies. The genitive follows as in τῶν λόγων τῆς χάριτος (Lu. 4:22), unless emphatic as in τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τῆς φωνῆς (Jo. 10:5). There is sharp emphasis in τῶν ἱππῶν in Jas. 3:3. A genitive may be on each side of the substantive as in ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνως (2 Cor. 5:1). Sharp contrast may be expressed by proximity of two genitives, as in τῶν συνστρατιώτητι μου, ὤμων δὲ
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3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 287.
4 W.-Th., p. 551.
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There may be some contrast also in σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας (Jo. 13:6). But the personal enclitic [Page 419] pronouns have a tendency to come early in the sentence without emphasis, as πῶς ἦνεφθησάν σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (Jo. 9:10). Cf. Ἰνὰ σου προσκυνήσω τὴν χέραν B.G.U. 423 (ii/a.d.). Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 90) notes great freedom in the position of the genitive in the Attic authors and in the inscriptions. In the case of ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος καὶ οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος one must not look for any fine-spun distinction, though the same general principle of emphasis exists. In the matter of ταῦτα πάντα (Lu. 12:30) and πάντα ταῦτα (Mt. 6:32) the first word carries the emphasis just as in πᾶς ὁ ὄρχος καὶ ὁ ὄρχος πᾶς. Cf. πάντα τὸ μέλη τοῦ σώματος (1 Cor. 12:12) and οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες (1 Cor. 10:1) with ὁ πᾶς νόμος (Gal. 5:14). Note the common Greek σῦ τίς εἶ (Jo. 8:25). The vocative is often at the beginning of the sentence, as παύετε δίκαιε (Jo. 17:25), but not always, as in παρακαλῶ ὁ ὑπὸ τούτος ἄδελφοι (1 Cor. 1:10). In Jo. 14:9 οὐκ ἔγνωκας με, Ἐφίλητε the vocative naturally comes after the pronoun. It comes within the sentence, as ὃ Ὁθέροι (Ac. 1:1), or at either end according as occasion requires. Some set phrases come in formal order, as ἄνδρες ἄδελφοι καὶ πατέρες (Ac. 7:2), like our “brethren and sisters,” “ladies and gentlemen,” etc. Other conventional phrases are ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας (Ac. 8:3), χορής γυναικών καὶ παιδίων (Mt. 14:21), νάκτα καὶ ἡμέραν (Ac. 20:31), σάρξ καὶ αἷμα (Mt. 16:17), βριόσις καὶ πόσις (Ro. 14:17), ζόντων καὶ νεκρῶν (Ac. 10:42); τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν (Ac. 4:24), ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνη (Lu. 21:25), τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς (Mt. 11:25), ἔργω καὶ λόγῳ (Lu. 24:19), Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἐλλήνως (Ro. 3:9), δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἔλεος (Gal. 3:28). The adverb generally has second place, as ὧν ἦλθεν λίαν (Mt. 4:8), but not always, as λίαν γὰρ ἤνεκτήσε (2 Tim. 4:15). Blass notes that Matthew often puts the adverb after imperatives, as καταβάτω νῦν (Mt. 27:42), but before indicative, as ἦν ψυχή τοῦ (Mt. 19:20), a refinement somewhat unconscious, one may suppose. In general the word’s go together that make sense, and the interpretation is sometimes left to the reader’s insight. In Eph. 2:3, ἤμεθα τέκνα φιλοῦν ὑγρῆς, note the position of φιλοῖ between τέκνα and ὑγρῆς. In Ro. 8:3, κατέκρινε τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, the adjunct ἐν τῇ σαρκί goes in sense with κατέκρινε, not ἀμαρτίαν. But this matter comes up again under the Article. In Mt. 2:12, ἔδομεν γὰρ αὐτῶν τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἁνατολῇ, probably ἐν τῇ ἁνατολῇ belongs in sense to the subject (‘we being in the east,’ etc.).

(e) EUPHONY AND RHYTHM. It will not do to say that emphasis [Page 420] alone explains every unusual order of words in a Greek sentence. Take Jo. 9:6, for instance, ἔπεσεν αὐτῷ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. Here αὐτῷ is entirely removed from ὀφθαλμούς and is without particular emphasis. It was probably felt that the genitive of the pronouns made a weak close of a sentence. Observe also Jo. 9:10, σοῦ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (cf. 9:11). Thus also 9:17, 26, 30. Note ἔπεσεν αὐτῷ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας (Jo. 13:32) and οὐκ ἄν μοι ἔπεθεςν ὁ ἄδελφος (ib.). So σοῦ μοι νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας (Jo. 13:6) where some emphasis by contrast may exist in spite of the enclitic form. Cf. ὧμῖν ἐμοὶ in Ph. 3:1. But on the other hand we have ὁ ἄδελφος μου in Jo. 11:21 (cf. 11:23 σου) and τοῦ πατρός μου (Jo. 10:18). The tendency to draw the pronouns toward the first part of the sentence may account for some of this

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 289.
2 Porphyrios Logothetes as quoted by Agnes Lewis Smith in Exp. Times, Feb., 1908, p. 237.
transposition, as in τὰ πολλὰ σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει (Ac. 26:24), but the matter goes much beyond the personal pronouns, as in ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθῆσεθε ἁγίω (Ac. 1:5), μικρὰν ἑξελεύσαν ὒνομαν (Rev. 3:8), etc. But a large amount of personal liberty was exercised in such trajection of words. Is there any such thing as rhythm in the N. T.? Deissmann scouts the idea. If one thinks of the carefully balanced sentences of the Attic orators like Isocrates, Lysias and Demosthenes, Deissmann is correct, for there is nothing that at all approaches such artificial rhythm in the N. T., not even in Luke, Paul or Hebrews. Blass insists that Paul shows rhythm in 1 Cor. and that the book is full of art. He compares Paul with Cicero, Seneca, Q. Curtius, Apuleius, and finds rhythm also in Hebrews which “not unfrequently has a really oratorical and choice order of words.” He cites in Heb. 1:4 τοσοῦτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἄγγελων ἃς διαφορότερον παρ’ αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα; 1:5; 11:32; 12:1, 8, etc. In Greek in general he suggests that lively and animated discourse gives rise to dislocations of words. Now one would think Blass ought to know something of Greek style. But Deissmann will have none of it. He refers Blass to Schramm, who wrote in 1710 of De stupenda eruditione Pauli apostoli and thinks that Blass is wilful and arbitrary in his use and proof of rhythm. On the other hand Sir W. M. Ramsay contends that Paul was a better Hellenist in point of culture than some suppose, and knew Greek philosophy and used it. It is after all partly a dispute about terms. If by rhythm one means grace and charm of diction that naturally belong to the expression of elevated ideas under the stress of chastened
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passion, surely one would be hypercritical to deny it to 1 Cor. 13 and 15, Ac. 17, Ro. 8 and 12, Eph. 3, Jo. 14–17, Heb. 2 and 11, not to mention many beautiful passages that seem perfect like pearls. At white heat nature often strikes off what is better than anything mere art can do even as to beauty of form and expression. Luke may even have known Thucydides, and yet one has no right to expect the “niceties of language in the vernacular which contribute so much to the charm of Plato.” Intonation and gesture in spoken language take the place of these linguistic refinements to a very large extent. It is true that Paul’s “Greek has to do with no school, with no model, but streams unhindered with overflowing bubbling direct out of the heart.” but “yet is real Greek,” as Wilamowitz-Möllendorff remarks. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff does indeed hold that Paul knew little Greek outside of the Greek Bible, but he thinks that his letters are unique in Greek literature. On Paul’s Hellenism see chapter IV, and also G. Milligan, Epistles to the Thess., p. lv. On p. lvi Milligan takes the writer’s view that the “well-ordered passages” and “splendid outbursts” in Paul’s writings are due to natural emotion and instinctive feeling rather than studied art. Bultmann (Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die Kynisch-stoische Diatribe, 1910) finds that Paul had the essential elements of the Stoic Diatribe in his argumentative style (question and answer, antithesis, parallelism, etc.). Paul’s art is indeed like that of the Cynic-Stoic Diatribe as described by Wendland, but he does not have their refinement or overpunctiliousness. It is not surprising to find that occasionally N. T. writers show unintentional metre, as is common with speakers and writers of any language. In the Textus Receptus of Heb. 12:13 there is a good hexameter, καὶ τρυφεῖ δός ὄρφος ποιεῖ τοῖς ποιῶν| [Page 422] ὑμῶν, but the critical text spoils it all by reading ποιεῖ τοῖς ποιῶν. So also one may find two trimeters in Heb. 12:14 f. (οὐ—ἄπο), one in Jo. 4:35 (τετράμηνός—ἐρχεται), one in Ac. 23:5 (ἐρχοντα—κακῶς). Green (Handbook to the Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 356) cites the accidental English anapæstic line “To preach
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the acceptable year of the Lord,” the hexameter “Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them,” and the iambic couplet “Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace.” But surely no one would call these writers poets because occasional metre is found in their writings. There is an unconscious harmony of soul between matter and form. Paul does indeed quote the Greek poets three times, once an iambic trimeter acataleptus from the comic poet Menander (1 Cor. 15:33) φθε̄ῧροστοσκακι, though one anapest occurs (some MSS. have χρησθ̄), once half an hexameter from Aratus (Ac. 17:28) του γἀρ καὶ γενοτεσμμμεν, and a full hexameter from Epimenides of Crete (Tit. 1:12) κρῆτες θεοπροσερχονται κακαὶ θηριῶν γαστερες ἄργα. How much more Paul knew of Greek poetry we do not know, but he was not ignorant of the philosophy of the Stoics and Epicureans in Athens. Blass¹ indeed thinks that the author of Hebrews studied in the schools of rhetoric where prose rhythm was taught, such as the careful balancing of ending with ending, beginning with beginning, or ending with beginning. He thinks he sees proof of it in Heb. 1:1 f., 3, 4 f.; 12:14 f., 24. But here again one is inclined to think that we have rather the natural correspondence of form with thought than studied rhetorical imitation of the schools of Atticism or even of Asianism. We cannot now follow the lead of the old writers who saw many fanciful artistic turns of phrase.² Antitheses and parallelisms could be treated here as expressions of rhythm, but they can be handled better in the chapter on Figures of Speech. As a specimen of an early Christian hymn note 1 Tim. 3:16. Harnack (The Independent, Dec. 28, 1912) takes this as a Christmas hymn. Elizabeth (Lu. 1:42–45), Mary (1:46–55) and Zacharias (1:67–79) break forth into poetic strains with something of Hebrew spirit and form. In Eph. 5:14 we have another possible fragment of a Christian hymn. The Lord’s Prayer in Mt. 6:9–13 is given in metrical arrangement by W. H. Cf. Hort, Intr. to N. T. in Gk., p. 319 f. In general on N. T. parallelism see Briggs, Messiah of the Gospels [Page 423] and Messiah of the Apostles. In 1 Cor. 13 one can see the beauty and melody of a harmonious arrangement of words. See also the latter part of 1 Cor. 15.

(f) PROLEPSIS is not uncommon where either the substantive is placed out of its right place before the conjunction in a subordinate clause like τὴν θηρίαν ἵνα γνάτη (2 Cor. 2:4) and βιωτικὰ κριτήρια ἐὰν ἔχετε (1 Cor. 6:4), or the subject of the subordinate clause even becomes the object of the previous verb like ἵδεν τὸν Ἱησοῦν τις ἔστιν (Lu. 19:3). Cf. Ac. 13:32. But this betokens no studied art. Cf. Mk. 8:24; Lu. 10:26; Ro. 9:19, 20; 14:4, 10; 1 Cor. 15:36. So ἡμῖν in Ac. 3:12.

(g) HYSTERON PROTERON. We occasionally meet also an example of ὑστερον πρότερον like ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας (Jo. 1:51), a natural inversion from our point of view. But Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 553) does not
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admit this figure in the N. T. Certainly not all the apparent examples are real. The order of πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἔγνωκαμεν (Jo. 6:69) is just as true as that of ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ ἐπίστευσαν (Jo. 17:8). Cf. also periptatōn καὶ ἀλλόμενος (Ac. 3:8) and ἤκακο καὶ περιπατέω (Ac. 14:10) where each order suits the special case. Cf. 1 Tim. 2:4 and 2 Pet. 1:9 for alleged examples that disappear on close examination.

(h) HYPERBATON. Adverbs sometimes appear to be in the wrong place, a phenomenon common in all Greek prose writers. In 1 Cor. 14:7 ὅμως would come in more smoothly just before ἔαν, but it is perfectly intelligible where it is. Cf. also Gal. 3:15 for similar use of ὅμως. Cf. distance of ἣδη from κεῖται (Mt. 3:10). In Ro. 3:9 οὒ πάντως is our ‘not at all,’ while in 1 Cor. 16:12 πάντως οὔκ ‘wholly not,’ just as in 1 Cor. 15:1 πάντες οὖς κομπήθησόμεθα means ‘all of us shall not sleep,’ not ‘none of us shall sleep.’ Cf. also οὐ πάντως in 1 Cor. 5:9 f., an explanation of the negative μὴ συναναίγυνθαι just before, ‘not wholly.’ In the case of οὐ µόνον in Ro. 4:12, 16, the words οὐ µόνον are separated and in 4:12 the repetition of the article τοῦ makes οὐ µόνον seem quite misplaced. Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 555) is certainly right in insisting that ο}->(2 Cor. 3:5) is not to be treated as ὅτι οὐκ. Cf. οὐχ ἵνα—ἄλλ. ἴνα (2 Cor. 13:7). A more difficult passage is found in Heb. 11:3, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινοµένων τὸ βλεπόµενα γεγονέναι, where μὴ is the negative of the phrase ἐκ φαινοµένων τὸ βλεπόµενον γεγονέναι. In general the negative comes before the word or words that are negatived. Hence οὐκ ἔλον (Ac. 19:30), οὐκ ἔστιν (Gal. 3:20). But note μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε (Jas. 3:1). Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 257) notes the possible ambiguity [Page 424] in Ac. 7:48 because of the use of οὐχ before ὅ ὕπιστος instead of before κατοικία. Observe in strong contrasts how οὐ stands over against ἄλλα (Ro. 2:13). Blass¹ has little sympathy with the grammatical device of hyperbaton to help out exegesis. The construction, found in ὧς ἄπο σταδίων ἐκκατανεύει (Jo. 11:18) has been supposed to be a Latinism when compared with Lu. 24:13. So also with πρὸ ἐξ ἡµερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (Jo. 12:1) was formerly considered a Latinism. But Moultont² shows conclusively that it is Doric and Ionic before the possibility of Latin influence, and besides is common in the κοινή papyri, a mere coincidence with the Latin. See also ch. XIII, VII, (m), 5.

(i) POSTPOSITIVES. A number of words are always postpositive in Greek. In the N. T. ὅν, γάρ, γε, δὲ, µέν, µέντοι, οὖν, τε never begin a sentence, in harmony with ancient Greek usage. These words commonly in the N. T. come in the second place, always so with µέντοι (Jo. 4:27, etc.). In the case of µέν the third place is occasionally found as 1 Pet. 2:4, the fourth as 2 Cor. 10:1, the fifth in Eph. 4:11; Jo. 16:22, or even the sixth in Jas. 3:17. It occupies the seventh place in Herm. Sim. viii, 5:1 (Mr. H. Scott has noted). In general these words vary in position according to the point to be made in relation to other words. So also οὖν is more commonly in the second, but varies to the third (Jo. 16:22) and fourth (1 Cor. 8:4). The same remark applies to γάρ, for which see Mk. 1:38; 2 Cor. 1:19. As to δὲ, it may not only go to the fourth place (Jo. 8:16), but even appears in the fifth (1 Jo. 2:2), οὐ περὶ τῶν ἠμετέρων δὲ. It stands in the sixth place in Test. XII. Patr. Judah, 9:1 (Mr. H. Scott reports). In the case of γε it follows naturally the word with which it belongs as in Ro. 8:32 (ὅς γε), even in the
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case of ἀλλά γε (Lu. 24:21) which is always separated in the older Greek. Cf. also εἴ γε Eph. 3:2. Ἀν in the apodosis (not-ἔν) or with relatives or conjunctives, never begins a clause in Greek. It is usually the second word in the apodosis, either after the verb, as εἴπον ἄν (Jo. 14:2), or after οὐκ, as οὐκ ἄν (Mk. 13:20), or the interrogative, as τίς ἄν (Lu. 9:46). With the relative ἄν follows directly or as the third word, as ὅς ἄν and ὅς δ ἄν (Mt. 23:16). Τέ usually follows the word directly, as in ποιησόμεν τέ (Mt. 22:10), even after a preposition, as σύν τε χιλίαρχοι (Ac. 25:23); but note τῶν ἔθνων τέ (Ac. 14:5).

(j) FLUCTUATING WORDS. There is another group of words that vary in the matter, now postpositive, now not. Thus ἄρα [Page 425] may be first in the clause (Mt. 12:28), contrary to older Greek custom. So also ἄρα γε (Mt. 7:20) and ἄρα οὖν (Ro. 7:3). Except in a few instances like Ro. 8:1 the examples where ἄρα is postpositive in the N. T. are in questions after the interrogative or after a conjunction. Once (Ro. 10:18) μενοῦνγε begins the sentence. Τοίνυν occurs only three times and twice begins the sentence (Lu. 20:25; Heb. 13:13) as τοιγαροῦν does (Heb. 12:1). The indefinite τις sometimes comes first in the sentence, as τινὲς δὲ (Lu. 6:2). Enclitics can therefore stand at the beginning, though not commonly so. In the case of ἐξεκέν its position is usually before the word except with the interrogative, as τίνος ἐξεκέν (Ac. 19:32), or a relative, as οὗ ἐξεκέν (Lu. 4:18). But χάριν follows its case save in χάριν τίνος (1 Jo. 3:12). Χωρίς precedes the word, but note οὗ χωρίς (Heb. 12:14). The N. T. therefore shows rather more freedom with these words.

(k) THE ORDER OF CLAUSES IN COMPOUND SENTENCES. Blass\(^1\) considers this a matter of style rather than of grammar. When the whole sentence is composed of a principal clause, with one or more subordinate clauses, the order of these clauses is largely dependent on the flow of thought in the speaker’s mind. In the case of conditional as Mt. 17:4, final as in Mt. 17:27, and relative clauses as in Mt. 16:25, the dependent by rule precedes the principal clause. There is usually a logical basis for this order. But in Jo. 19:28 the final clause somewhat interrupts the flow of the sentence. Cf. also Ro. 9:11. In 2 Cor. 8:10, οἵτινες οὐ μόνον τὸ πιστεύει άλλά καί τὸ θέλειν προενήρξασθε ἀπὸ πέρυσι, there is no violent change of order. Logically the willing preceded the doing and makes the natural climax. Blass\(^2\) is undoubtedly right in refusing to take τίνι λόγῳ εὑρηκελισύνη as dependent on οἴ γε (1 Cor. 15:2). In Jo. 10:36 we meet a somewhat tangled sentence because the antecedent of ὅν is not expressed. Here λέγετε is the principal verb, the apodosis of the condition, and has two objects (the relative clause and the ὅν clause) with a causal clause added. So in Jo. 10:38 we have a good example of the complex sentence with two conditions, a final clause, an object-clause, besides the principal clause.\(^3\)

XI. Compound Sentences.

(a) TWO KINDS OF SENTENCES. The sentence is either simple or compound. The compound is nothing but two simple sentences [Page 426] put together. All that is

---

\(^1\) Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 291.

\(^2\) Ib.

\(^3\) On the whole subject of the position of words in the sentence see K.-G., Bd. II, pp. 592–604.
true of one part of this compound sentence may be true of the other as to subject and predicate. The same linguistic laws apply to both. But in actual usage each part of the compound sentence has its own special development. The two parts have a definite relation to each other. Originally men used only simple sentences. Cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 552.

(b) TWO KINDS OF COMPOUND SENTENCES (Paratactic and Hypotactic). In parataxis (παράταξις) we have co-ordination of two parallel clauses. Take Mk. 14:37 as an example, καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ εὗρεικε αὐτοῦς καθεύδοντας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ. In hypotaxis (ὑπόταξις) one clause is subordinated to the other, as in οὖν οἴδατε τί αἴτεσθε (Mk. 10:38) where τί αἴτεσθε is in the accusative case, the object of οἴδατε. Parataxis is the rule in the speech of children, primitive men, unlettered men and also of Homer. Cf. Sterrett, *Homer’s Iliad*, N. 49.


(c) PARATACTIC SENTENCES. They are very common in the Sanskrit and in Homer (cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 555) and in the Hebrew. In truth in the vernacular generally and the earlier stages of language parataxis prevails. It is more common with some writers than with others, John, for instance, using it much more frequently than Paul or even Luke. In John καί sometimes is strained to mean ‘and yet,’ as in 3:19; 4:20, etc.¹ The κοινὴ shows a decided fondness for the paratactic construction which in the modern Greek is still stronger (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 184). As in the modern Greek, so in the N. T. καί, according to logical sequence of thought, carries the notion of ‘but,’ ‘that,’ besides ‘and yet,’ introducing quasi-subordinate clauses. For details concerning paratactic conjunctions see chapter on Particles. In the use of καί (cf. Heb. י) after ἐγένετο the paratactic καί borders very close on to the hypotactic ὅτι. Thus ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ—αὕτος τὸ πρόσωπον ἔστηρισεν (Lu. 9:51).

(d) HYPOTACTIC SENTENCES. They are introduced either by relative pronouns or conjunctions, many of which are relatives in origin and others adverbs. The subject of conjunctions will demand special and extended treatment later on (chapters on Modes and on Particles), and so will relative clauses. On the use of the relative thus see Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 553. The propensity of the later Greek for parataxis led to an impoverishment of particles.[Page 427]

Hypotactic sentences, once more, are either substantival, adjectival or adverbial, in their relation to the principal or another subordinate clause. Thus in Lu. 22:2 τὸ πῶς ἀνέλοσιν is the substantive object of ἔξητον, as τὸ τίς εἰς is of συνζητεῖν in Lu. 22:23. As a sample of the subject-clause in the nominative take οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλόμεθα (Mk. 4:38). In Mt. 7:12 ὅσα ἔδω θέλητε is an adjective sentence and describes πάντα. In Mt. 6:16 ὅταν νηστεύσῃτε is an adverb in its relation to γίνεσθε.

---

Sterrett, J. R. S., Homer’s Iliad with Grammar (1907).

¹ Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 135.

XII. Connection in Sentences.

(a) SINGLE WORDS. These have connectives in a very natural1 way, as δόναμιν καί ἔξοδον—διάμόνα καί νόσους (Lu. 9:1). But common also is καί—καί (Jo. 2:14), τε—καί (2:15), and rarely τε—τε (Ac. 26:16). This tendency to break up into pairs is well shown in Ac. 2:9–11. For ἦ see Mt. 5:17, ἄλλα 2 Cor. 7:11, οὔτε Rev. 5:3. In enumerations the repetition of καί gives a kind of solemn dignity and is called polysyndeton. Cf. Rev. 7:12 ἡ ἐμοίῳ καί ἡ δόξα καί ἡ σοφία καί ἡ εὐχαριστία καί ἡ τιμή καί ἡ δόνας καί ἡ ἱσχῦς τῷ θεῷ. Cf. also Rev. 4:11; 5:12; Ro. 9:4. Note also a similar repetition of οὔτε in Ro. 8:38 f. For μήτε see Jas. 5:12. So with ἦ in Mk. 10:29. Perhaps, as Blass suggests,2 polysyndeton is sometimes necessary and devoid of any particular rhetorical effect, as in Lu. 14:21. But asyndeton is frequent also. It often gives emphasis. See Mt. 15:19; Jo. 5:3; 1 Cor. 14:24; 15:1 f. For a striking example of asyndeton see Ro. 1:29–31, where some variety is gained by change in construction (case) and the use of adjective instead of substantive, πεπλήρωμαν τιμήν Ἀδικιά πονηρία πλεονεξία κακία, μεστοὺς φόνου φόνον ἔριδος δόλω κακοθυμία, ψυχραστάς, καταλάλους, διεκτεινόν, ὑπερηφάνους, ἀλαζόνας, ἀγενέστερος κακῶν, γονεικότους ἀδικεθείς, ἀδυνάτους, ἀδυνάτους, ἀπολύτρους, ἀνελήμνοις, ἀκαθαρσίας. Cf. also 1 Cor. 3:12. Sometimes the connective is used with part of the list (pairs) and not with the rest, for the sake of variety, as in 1 Tim. 1:9 f. An example like εὐκαίρως ἄκαρπος is compared by Blass3 to nolens volens.

(b) CLAUSES. But connection is by no means uniform between sentences. This remark applies to both the paratactic and the hypotactic sentences. Asyndeton in sentences and clauses is on the whole repugnant to the Greek language in the opinion of Blass.1 Hence compound sentences in the N. T. usually have connectives, but not always.

1. Paratactic Sentences. The co-ordinating conjunctions form the most frequent means of connecting clauses into one paratactic sentence. These conjunctions will receive special treatment in the chapter on Particles and here only some illustrations can be given. Καί, τε, δέ, οὔτε, μηδέ, μέν and δέ, οὔτε, ἄλλα are the most frequent particles used for this purpose. They are more common indeed in historical writings, as in the Gospels and Acts. But in the Gospels the use of καί varies a good deal. Mark, for instance, has it more than 400 times, while John contains it only 100.2 Deissmann calls this use of καί primitive popular Greek. The presence of dialogue in John hardly

---

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 277.
3 Ib.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gr., p. 276.
explains all the difference, and even in John the first chapter uses it much more frequently than the last. As a good example of the use of καὶ to turn to Mt. 4:23–25. Cf. Lu. 6:13–17 and Mk. 9:2. Τε is common chiefly in the Acts, as 14:11–13. Sometimes the use of καὶ between clauses amounted to polysyndeton, as in Jo. 10:3, 9, 12. Καὶ is perhaps less common in clauses (Jo. 4:6) except with μὲν (Mt. 3:11). For δὲ καὶ see Jo. 2:2. Οὖδὲ is illustrated by Mt. 5:15, ἀλλὰ by 5:17, οὕτω by Ac. 28:21. But asyndeton appears also, as in Lu. 6:27 f., ἀγαπᾶτε, ποιεῖτε, εὐλογεῖτε, προσεύχεσθε, even if it be to a limited extent. Cf. Gal. 5:22. Blass points out that that is not a case of asyndeton where a demonstrative pronoun is used which reflects the connection. Cf. thus the use of τούτων in Ac. 16:3; Jo. 5:6. Winer finds asyndeton frequent in cases of a climax in impassioned discourse, as in 1 Cor. 4:8, ἢ ἡ δεικνύμενον ἐστε· ἢ δὲ ἐπλούτησατε, χωρίς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε. The absence of the connective gives life and movement, as in σιώπα, πεφίμωσο (Mt. 4:39). Observe also ὢν πρῶτον διαλλαγῇ (Mt. 5:24), ὦν πρὶν ἐλεγξον (18:15), ἐγείρεν ἄρον (Mk. 2:11), ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν (Mt. 26:46), ἐξῆ, κλαύσαστε (Jas. 5:1). This use of ἐκ is common in the old Greek (Gildersleeve, Greek Syntax, p. 29). But in Jo. 1:46 we have ἔρχοντα πάντα καὶ ἴδε. In 1 Tim. 3:16 the fragment of an early hymn is neatly balanced in Hebrew parallelism.

"Ὄς ἔφανεν πάντα ἐν σαρκί,
ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι,
ἦφα ἄγγελοις,
ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἐθνεσιν,
ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ,
ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

Here the connective would be quite out of place.

In contrast the connective may also be absent, as in ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὁ οὐκ ὁδικεῖ ἡμᾶς προσκυνοῦμεν ὁ οἴδιμι (Jo. 4:22). So Ac. 25:12. Cf. in particular 1 Cor. 15:42 ff., σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθορίᾳ· σπειρᾶται ἐν ἀθμίᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ· σπειρᾶται ἐν ὀψιθείῃ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ὑμνίῳ· σπειρᾶται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. Here the solemn repetition of the verbs is like the tolling of a bell. Cf. also Jas. 1:19, ταχὺς εἶς τὸ ἀκούει, βραδύς εἶς τὸ λαλῆσαι, βραδύς εἶς ὄργῃ. John is rather fond of repetition with asyndeton in his report of Jesus' words, as ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ἡ ὁδός καὶ ἡ ἀληθεία καὶ ἡ ζωὴ· οὐκ εἰς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ διʼ ἐμοῦ (14:6). Cf. 10:11; 15:13, etc. But this sort of asyndeton occurs elsewhere also, as in 1 Cor. 7:15, οὐ δεδομότα τὸ ἁδελφός. Cf. also 7:23; Rev. 22:13. A common asyndeton in Luke occurs after καὶ ἐγένετο without another καὶ, as εἰπέν τις (11:1).

3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 276.
4 W.-Th., p. 538.
2. Hypotactic Sentences. In the nature of the case they usually have connectives. The subordinating conjunctions are more necessary to the expression of the exact shade of thought than in paratactic clauses. The closeness of connection varies greatly in various kinds of subordinate clauses and often in clauses of the same kind. The use of the correlative accents this point, as ὁδε ὢ ἐπουράνιος ὄ, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ἐπουράνιοι (1 Cor. 15:48); ὢστε—οὕτως (Mt. 12:40). But real antithesis may exist without the correlative, as in Mt. 5:48; 6:2. In relative clauses the bond is very close and is sometimes made closer by agreement of the relative and antecedent not only in number and gender but even in case, as ὃς (Lu. 2:20) and τὸν ἄρτον ὑν (1 Cor. 10:16). There may be several relative clauses either co-ordinate (Ac. 3:2 f.) or subordinate to another (Ac. 13:31; 25:15 f.). So also the use of ἐπτα, τότε, ὥρα, καὶ, ἀλλά, δέ in the apodosis accents the logical connection of thought. Cf. Mt. 12:28; Mk. 13:14; Jo. 7:10; 20:21; 1 Cor. 15:54; 2 Cor. 7:12, etc. But much closer than with temporal, comparative, conditional, or even some relative clauses is the tie between the principal clause and the subordinate objective, consecutive, final and causal clauses. These are directly dependent on the leading clause. Interrogative sentences when in indirect discourse really become object-clauses, like τὸ τίς ἄρα εἶ (Lu. 22:23), object of σωζέσθην. The ὡς, ὡς (and ὠς rarely) clauses are closely knit to the principal clause as subject, object (direct or indirect) of the verb. There is a natural interblending between object and causal sentences, as shown by the use of ὡς for both and διότι in late Greek in the sense of ‘that,’ objective ὡς. Cf. quod and quia in late Latin, and English the “reason that” and colloquial the “reason why.” In Greek ὡς even interchanges with ἐ (cf. English “wonder if” and “wonder that”). So ἐεκάμασαν ἐ ὥς τέθηκεν (Mk. 15:44). Cf. Ac. 8:22; 26:8. Clauses with the consecutive idea usually have the infinitive in the N. T. Hypotactic sentences cannot be here discussed in detail, but only as illustrating the point of connection between sentences. Winer1 is hardly right in describing as asyndeton Jas. 5:13, κακοθείτε τις ἐν υμῖν; προσωπικέσθω, where ἐ is not used, and the structure is paratactic. He cites also ὁδοῖος ἐκλήθης; μή σοι μελέτω (1 Cor. 7:21). The questions in Jas. 2:19 f. are also paratactic. But more certain examples exist than these, where either a conjunction has dropped out or, as is more likely, we have original parataxis. Thus ἄρες ἔβρα (Mt. 7:4), ἄρες ἔδωκεν (Mt. 27:49) can be compared with δεῦτε δοῦτε (Mt. 28:6), δεῦρο ἀποστείλω (Ac. 7:34), δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν (Mt. 12:7) and the common Greek idiom with ἔγε, φέρε. Cf. Jas. 5:1. In Mk. 15:36 note ἄρετε ἔδωκεν. One verb really supplements the other much as the infinitive or participle. Cf. English “let us see.” In the modern Greek ὡς (abbreviation of ἄρες) is used uniformly as the English and almost like a particle. Of a similar nature is the asyndeton with ἔθελες συλλέξωμεν (Mt. 13:28) and βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω (Jo. 18:39). Cf. θέλετε ποιήσω (Mk. 10:36). Cf. also ἔγειρες ἔγωμεν (Mt. 26:46) above. These are all paratactic in origin, though hypotactic in logical sequence. But see chapter on Modes for further details. In the case of ἄρα, ὡς, βλέπετε, we can find examples of both the conjunctival use of μή and clear cases of asyndeton with some on the border line. Thus clearly conjunctival μή is found in βλέπετε μή πέσῃ (1 Cor. 10:12), βλέπετε μή ἐπελή (Ac. 13:40), βλέπετε μή παραιτήσητε (Heb. 12:25). Asyndeton is undoubtedly in ἄρα μηδέν μηδέν ἔσπερ (Mk. 1:44) with which compare ὑπαγε δεξίον in the same verse. Cf. also Mt. 8:4. Thus again ὑπαγε μηδὲς γενοσκέτω (Mt. 9:30) where note two imperatives as in ὡς, μή ἐρείδοθε (Mt. 24:6). But in βλέπετε μή τὶς ὑμᾶς

1 W.-Th., p. 541.
3. *The Infinitive and Participle as Connectives*. A very common connection is made between clauses by means of the infinitive or the participle, sometimes with particles like ὥστε and ἐπιν with the infinitive or ὅς, ὅσπερ, καίπερ, with the participle, but usually without a particle. The **infinitive** often is used with the article and a preposition, as ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν (Lu. 9:34). Usually the infinitive is brought into the closest connection with the verb as subject (τῷ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειται μοι, Ro. 7:18) or object (βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι ἄνδρας, 1 Tim. 2:8), or in a remoter relation, as ἔξηλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείραι (Mk. 4:3). The **participle** sometimes is an essential part of the predicate, as ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν (Lu. 5:4), or again it may be a mere *addendum* or preliminary or even an independent statement. Thus observe εἰσελθόν, διώκειμον καὶ πέιθον in Ac. 19:8. As further examples of participles somewhat loosely strung together without a connective in more or less close relation to each other and the principal sentence see Ac. 12:25; 16:27; 23:27. The genitive absolute is common in such accessory participles. The only point to consider concerning the infinitive and participle here is the frequency with which they are used in the structure of the Greek sentence. Thus long sentences are easily constructed and sometimes the connection is not clear. Frequent examples of anacoluthon come from the free use of the participle, as will be shown later. See χειροτονηθείς and στελλόμενοι as instances in 2 Cor. 8:19 f. By means of the infinitive and participle the Greek enjoyed much elasticity and freedom which the modern Greek has lost. In modern Greek conjunctions and finite verbs have very largely displaced the infinitive and the participle. Even in the N. T. a tendency in that direction is discernible, as is seen in the use of ἵνα with θέλω (Mk. 6:25), ἰδίφιμι (Mk. 11:16). One is inclined to think that Viteau’s overstates it when he says that the N. T. writers have a natural and general inability to combine and subordinate the elements of thought and so express them separately and make an abnormal use of asyndeton. I would rather say that there is a great simplicity and directness due partly to the colloquial style and the earnestness of the writers. They are men with a message rather than philosophical ramblers. But part of this absence of subordination may be due to the Hebrew temper as in John, and part to the general spirit of the time as less concerned, save in the [Page 432] case of the Atticists, with the niceties of style. Clearness and force were the main things with these N. T. writers. They use connectives or not as best suits their purposes. But the infinitive construction and the conjunction construction must not be regarded as identical even in the N. T. Note καὶ λὰς αὐτῶ καὶ οὐκ ἔγεννηθη (Mk. 14:21), ἐν τούτῳ γινόσκομεν ὃ (1 Jo. 5:2), βουλὴ ἐγένετο ἵνα (Ac. 27:42).

(c) **Two Kinds of Style.** There are indeed two kinds of style in this matter, the running (ἐνρομένη) and the periodic (ἐν περιόδοις) or compact (κατεστραμμένη), to

---
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1 Le Verbe, Synt. des Prop., p. 9.
use Aristotle’s terminology. In the words of Blass the running or continuous style is characteristic of the oldest prose as well as unsophisticated, unconventional prose like the vernacular κοινή, and hence is the usual form in the N. T. The periodic style, on the other hand, belongs to “artistically developed prose” like that of Demosthenes and Thucydides. As a matter of fact the O. T. narrative is also in the running style, while the prophets sometimes use the periodic. The longer N. T. sentences are usually connected by καί or use asyndeton as shown above. But occasionally something approaching a real period appears somewhat like that of the great Greek writers, but by no means so frequently. Interesting examples of some length may be found in Lu. 1:1–4; Ac. 15:24–26; 26:10–14, 16–18; Ro. 1:1–7; 1 Pet. 3:18–22; 2 Pet. 1:2–7; Heb. 2:2–4. In Lu. 1:1–4 Blass notes that the protasis has three clauses and the apodosis two, while in Heb. 1:1–3 he finds some ten divisions of the sentence which is not so neatly balanced as the passage in Luke. It is noticeable that Luke uses this classic idiom nowhere else in his Gospel, while the Epistle to the Hebrews has a fluent oratorical style of no little beauty. Chapter 11 finds a splendid peroration in 12:1 f., which should belong to chapter 11 as the closing period in the discussion about the promises. Cf. a similar peroration, though not in one sentence, in Ro. 11:33–36. So also Ro. 8:31–39, where verses 38 and 39 form a really eloquent period. Blass indeed gives a rather free interpretation to the term period and applies it to sentences of only two parts like a conditional sentence when the condition comes first, sentences with antithesis with μὲν—δὲ, disjunctive clauses with ἄν, or parallelisms with τε—καί. He even finds a period in a case of asyndeton like 1 Cor. 7:27. But this is to make nearly all complex sentences periods. Blass’ opinion on this point is to be borne in mind when he argues for literary rhythm on a considerable scale in the N. T. Paul indeed has some noble periods like Eph. 1:3–14; 2:14–18; 3:14–19. He would show many more than he does but for the fact that he seems to grow impatient with the fetters of a long sentence and breaks away in anacoluthon which mars the fulness and symmetry of the sentence as a period. Cf. 2 Cor. 8:18–21; Ro. 12:6–8; Col. 1:9–23. In Ro. 3:7 f. the καθώς and ὧτι clauses make a not very strong culmination. The ground element in Paul’s speech is the short sentence. Only occasionally does he combine these into a period. But Paul does use antithetic and comparative particles and apposition. One other reason for the absence of rhetorical periods is the avoidance of prolonged passages of indirect discourse. In truth none of that nature occurs at all, so that we do not have in the N. T. passages of much length in indirect discourse such as one meets in Xenophon or Thucydides (cf. Cæsar). But the quotations are usually direct either with recitative ὅτι (Mt. 9:18) or without (Mt. 9:22). Winer well remarks that what the style thus loses in periodic compactness, it gains in animation and vividness. But the use of the participle in giving periodic compactness is to be noticed, as in Ac. 23:27. The attraction of the relative to the case of its antecedent, as already observed, adds another bond of union to the compactness of the relative sentence as in Lu. 5:9.

1 Arist. Rhet., iii. 9. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 275, who amplifies this point.
2 Ib.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 280.
2 W.-Th., p. 545.
(d) **The Parenthesis** (παρένθεσις). Such a clause, inserted in the midst of the sentence without proper syntactical connection, is quite common in the N. T. Once the editors used too many parentheses in the N. T., but the number is still considerable. The term is somewhat loosely applied to clauses that really do not interrupt the flow of the thought. Thus it is not necessary to find a parenthesis in Jo. 7:39. The γάρ clause is merely explanatory. The same thing is true of Jo. 9:30 and Ac. 13:8. Certainly not every explanatory remark is to be regarded as parenthetical. On the other hand even a relative clause may be regarded as parenthetical where it is purely by the way as the interpretation of Ῥαββεί (Jo. 1:38 ὁ λέγεται) and of Μεσσίαν (ὁ ἔστιν, etc., Jo. 1:41). But see Mk. 7:11. Editors indeed will [Page 434] differ as to what constitutes a parenthesis as in the case of Mk. 3:16 where W. H. use the marks of parenthesis while Nestle does not consider this a parenthesis. In Jo. 1:15 W. H. print a double parenthesis, using the dash inside the parenthetical marks. Here again Nestle has the colon instead of the dash and the full stop in lieu of the parenthetical marks. W. H. are not uniform in the indication of the parenthesis. They do it by the curved lines () as in Mk. 3:16, or the dash as in Jo. 7:22; 10:12, or merely the comma as in the short phrases like φησίν (2 Cor. 10:10), or again with no punctuation at all as in the case of δοκεῖν (Heb. 10:29). The insertion of one or two words in the midst of the sentence is the simplest form of the parenthesis, like πολλοί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητήσουσιν (Lu. 13:24) and ἦτα κατὰ δύναμιν, μαρτυρῶ, καὶ (2 Cor. 8:3). Cf. φησίν (Mt. 14:8), ἐφη (Ac. 23:35), οὕτω θεοῦμαι (Ro. 9:1), ἐν ἀφοσίους λέγω (2 Cor. 11:21), etc. But the insertion of φησίν and ἐφη between words is rare in the N. T. Cf. Simcox, *Language of the N. T.* p. 200. A very interesting parenthesis is the insertion in the speech of Jesus to the paralytic, of λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ (Mk. 2:10). Mt. (9:6) adds τότε. Lu. (5:24) has εἶπεν τῷ παραλυτικῷ. The Synoptists all had the same source here. These phrases, common also to the ancient Greek, do not need marks of parenthesis, and the comma is sufficient. A little more extended parenthesis is found in a clause like ὁνόμα αὐτῷ Ἰωάνης (Jo. 1:6), Νικόδημος ὁνόμα ἀυτῷ (Jo. 3:1), though this again may be considered merely a form of apposition. A more distinct parenthesis still is the insertion of a note of time like ἦσαν δὲ ἡμέρας τῶν ἄνδρων (Ac. 12:3). Thackeray (Gr., p. 149 note) notes a tendency in the LXX to put numeral statements in parenthesis. Note also the explanatory parenthesis in Ac. 1:15
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introduced by τε. Cf. also ὡσεὶ ἡμέραν ὁκτώ in Lu. 9:28, which can be explained otherwise. In Mt. 24:15 the parenthetical command of Matthew or of Jesus, ὁ ναγινώσκων νοείτω, is indicated by W. H. only with the comma. In general the historical books have fewer parentheses than the Epistles, and naturally so. In Paul it is sometimes hard to draw the line between the mere parenthesis and anacoluthon. Cf. 1 Cor. 16:5; Ro. 5:12 (18); 9:11; 15:23–28. Ὑφί may look back beyond the parenthesis as in Jo. 4:7 ff. (Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, p. 470). See Jo. 10:35 καί οὐ δόναται λυθῆναι ἤ γραφή. Cf. the sharp interruption in Jo. 4:1–3. In Gal. 2:5 f. we have two parentheses right together marked by the dash in W. H.’s text, besides anacoluthon. Cf. Lu. 23:51, Col. 1:21 f. for parenthesis of some length. But see 2 Pet. 2:8 for a still longer one, not to mention 2 Cor. 9:12; Heb. 7:20 f.; Lu. 6:4. See Viteau, *Étude*, 1896, p. 11. As illustrating once more the wide difference of opinion concerning the parenthesis, Blass comments on the harshness of the parenthesis in Ac. 5:14, while W. H. do not consider that there is a parenthesis in the sentence at all. At bottom the parenthesis in the text is a matter of exegesis. Thus if in Jo. 13:1 ff. εἶς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς be regarded as a parenthesis and verses 1–5 be considered one sentence (note repetition of εἰδός) a much simpler construction is the result. Instead of a parenthesis a writer switches off to one aspect of a subject and then comes back in another sentence as Paul does in 1 Cor. 8:1–4. He resumes by the repetition of περὶ—εἰδολοθυτῶν οἰδαμέν. Cf. also a similar resumption in Eph. 3:14 τοῦτον χάριν after the long digression in verses 1–13. This construction is not, however, a technical parenthesis.

(c) **ANACOLUTHON.** But a more violent break in the connection of sentences than the parenthesis is anacoluthon. This is merely the failure to complete a sentence as intended when it was begun (ἂνακόλουθον). The completion does not follow grammatically from the beginning. The N. T. writers are not peculiar in this matter, since even in an artistic orator like Isocrates such grammatical blemishes, if they be so considered, are found. And a careful historian like Thucydides will have ἔδοξεν αὐτοίς—ἐπικαλοῦντες (iii. 36. 2). It is just in writers of the greatest mental activity and vehemence of spirit that we meet most instances of anacoluthon. Hence a man with the passion of Paul naturally breaks away from formal rules in the structure of the sentence when he is greatly stirred, as in Gal. and 2 Cor. Such violent changes in the sentence are common in conversation and public addresses. The dialogues of Plato have many examples. The anacoluthon may be therefore either intentional or unintentional. The writer may be led off by a fresh idea or by a parenthesis, or he may think of a better way of finishing his sentence, one that will be more effective. The
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very jolt that is given by the anacoluthon is often successful in making more emphasis. The attention is drawn anew to the sentence to see what is the matter. Some of the anacolutha belong to other languages with equal pertinence, others are peculiar to the Greek genius. The participle in particular is a very common occasion [Page 436] for anacoluthon. The Apocalypse, as already shown, has many examples of anacoluthon. The more important N. T. illustrations of anacoluthon will now be given. It is difficult to make a clear grouping of the examples of anacoluthon in the N. T. on any scientific principle. But the following will answer.

1. The Suspended Subject. What Abbott¹ calls the suspended subject finds illustration elsewhere than in John, though he does have his share. It may be looked at indeed as suspended object as well sometimes. The point is that the substantive, pronoun or participle is left by the wayside and the sentence is completed some other way. Thus in πᾶν ὢν Ἰησοῦς ὁ οὐκ ὅτε ἐπιστεύθη καθὼς ἐν αὐτῷ (Mt. 12:36) observe how πᾶν ὢν is dropped in the construction and ἐπιστεύθη used. In πᾶς οὖν ὅτε ὅπου ἐλθεῖ στις ἐν αὐτῷ (Mt. 10:32) the same principle holds in regard to πᾶς and ἐν αὐτῷ. But in the same verse the regular construction obtains in ὅτε ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἔφθασεν (Mt. 12:36) observe how πᾶς ὢν is dropped in the construction and ἐφθάσει used. In Lu. 6:47 πᾶς ὁ ἔρχομενος κτλ.. ὑποδέξεται ὢμι καθώς ἔστι ἐπιστεύθηκι στις ἐν αὐτῷ unless πᾶς ὁ ἔρχεται be regarded as a rather violent prolepsis of the subject, which is not so likely in this instance. In Lu. 11:11 the anacoluthon is not quite so simple, though τίνα is after all left to itself (τίνα δὲ ἦν ὄντος τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσει ὁ παῖς ἰδὼν, μὴ ἄνευ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιδόσητα:). If instead of τίνα the sentence read εἶ or ἦν, all would go smoothly except that ἦν ὄντων would be slightly awkward. Observe that αἰτήσει has two accusatives without τίνα. The apodosis is introduced by μὴ and as an interrogative clause expects the answer “no.” But in spite of the grammatical hopelessness of the sentence it has great power. In Lu. 12:48 the matter is simpler (παντὶ δὲ ὧν ἐδόθη πολύ, πολὺ ἔπειθήσεται παρὰ αὐτοῦ). Here two things are true. We not only have the stranded subject (cf. παρὰ αὐτοῦ), but it has been attracted into the case of the relative (inverse attraction), παντὶ, not πᾶς. With this compare πᾶς ὁς ἔρεθ—ὅπου ἐναπεισάλθηκεν αὐτῷ (Lu. 12:10). In 2 Cor. 12:17 we merely have the anacoluthon without any attraction, τίνα expecting a verb governing the accusative (μὴ τίνα ὄν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὤμας, διὰ ἀυτοῦ ἐπελευνάκησα ὄμας:). Here indeed ὄν is attracted into the case of τούτων unexpressed. A simpler instance is ὁ Μωυσῆς αὐτὸς—οἷς ἄν ἔλεγεν τὸν ποτέ αὐτῷ (Ac. 7:40; Ex. 32:1). Blass² finds anacoluthon in Mk. 9:20 (ἴδὼν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα συνεπαραγένεν αὐτόν), but surely this is merely treating πνεῦμα as masculine (natural gender). But in Ac. 19:34 (Ἐπιγένοντες δὲ ὤμι Ἰωάννας ἔστιν φωνή ἢγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων) there is a clear case of anacoluthon in [Page 437] the change to ἐκ πάντων. The writings of John show similar illustrations. There is no anacoluthon in Jo. 6:22 in the text of W. H., which reads ἵδων ὅτι instead of ἵδων ὅτι—ὅτι (margin of W. H.). But in 6:39 there is real anacoluthon (πᾶν ὃ δέδωκεν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσσον ἢς ἡ πρέσει ἐν αὐτῶ) in the change from πᾶν to ἢς ἡ πρέσει ἐν αὐτῶ. It is possible to regard πᾶν μὲ here¹ as equivalent to ὦδεις and not like πᾶς—μὴ in Jo. 3:16. In 7:38 another suspended subject is found in ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ (cf. αὐτοῦ further on). But 10:36 is

---

¹ Joh. Gr., p. 32.
² Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 283.
¹ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 283.
hardly anacoluthon, since one has merely to supply the demonstrative ἐκεῖνῳ or the personal pronoun αὐτῷ with λέγετε to make the sentence run smoothly. In 15:2 πᾶν κλῆμα—αὐτό we have very slight anacoluthon, if any, since both may be in the same case (cf. resumptive use of οὗτος). But in 15:5 the matter is complicated by the insertion of καθὼς ἐν αὐτῷ (ὅ μένων ἐν ἐμοί καθὼς ἐν αὐτῷ οὗτος φέρει). In 17:2 (πᾶν ὁ δέδοκας αὐτῷ δόσει αὐτοῖς) we have the more usual anacoluthon. In 1 Jo. 2:24 (عينεῖς ὃ ἢρκούσετε ὅπως ἐν ὑμῖν μενέτω) ήμεῖς may be merely prolepsis, but this seems less likely in verse 27 (عينεῖς τὸ χρίσμα δ ἐλάβετε ὅπως αὐτοῦ μένει ἐν ὑμῖν) where note the position of ήμεῖς and ἐν ὑμῖν. In Rev. 2:26 the anacoluthon (ὅ νικῶν—δόσῳ αὐτῷ) does not differ from some of those above. So also as to Rev. 3:12, 21, but in 2:7, 17 (τῷ νικώντι δόσῳ αὐτῷ) the case is the same and may be compared with Jo. 15:2, 5. Cf. the probable reading (W. H. bracket as well as Mt. 4:16 (LXX); 5:40 (τῷ θέλοντι—αὐτῷ), where there is no real anacoluthon, but a resumptive use of αὐτῷ. Cf. also ήμεῖς repeated after parenthesis in Col. 1:22. The LXX has other similar examples like Josh. 9:12; Ps. 103:15. A similar resumptive use of ὃ occurs in the text (not marg. in W. H.) of Ro. 16:27. In a similar way a relative clause may be left as a suspended subject or object, as in Lu. 9:5, ὃςοι ἂν μὴ δέχονται ήμεῖς—ἀποτινάσετε ἐπὶ αὐτοῦς. Cf. Mt. 10:14; Lu. 10:8, 10. Cf. this with the very common use of resumptive οὗτος after the article and the participle, like ὃ ήπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθῆσεται (Mt. 10:22).

2. Digression. A somewhat more complicated kind of anacoluthon is where a digression is caused by an intervening sentence or explanatory clause. Those naturally occur mainly in the Epistles of Paul where his energy of thought and passion of soul overlap all trammels. In Jo. 5:44 the participle is dropped for the indicative way a relative clause may be left as a suspended subject or object, as in Lu. 9:5, ὃςοι ἂν μὴ δέχονται ήμεῖς—ἀποτινάσετε ἐπὶ αὐτοῦς. Cf. Mt. 10:14; Lu. 10:8, 10. Cf. this with the very common use of resumptive οὗτος after the article and the participle, like ὃ ήπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθῆσεται (Mt. 10:22).

3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 283, calls it a “very awkward instance.”
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calls “impressionism” due to the writer’s desire to make his impression first and then to add the explanatory correction. He compares 4:1 with 3:22. In 1:15 οὗτος ἦν ὁν ἐπον is taken by Abbott as a part of the Baptist’s statement, but W. H. read οὗτος ἦν ὁ εἶπόν as a parenthetical remark of the writer. So in Jo. 20:18 καὶ ταῦτα ἐπεν αὕτῇ does not fit in exactly after ὃτι Ἐσόμακα τὸν κύριον. The added clause is the comment of John, not of Mary. The margin of Ac. 10:36 (W. H.) with ὤν is a case of anacoluthon, but the text itself is without ὤν. In Ac. 24:6 the repetition of ὤν καὶ leaves εὑροντες cut off from ἐκρατῆσαμεν. In Ac. 27:10 (θεορῶν ὃτι—μέλλειν) the ὃτι clause is changed to the infinitive, a phenomenon noted by Winer2 in Plato, Gorg. 453 b. The anacoluthon in Gal. 2:6 (ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων εἷναι τι—ὁποῖοι ποτε ἦσαν οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει—πρόσωπον ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπων οὐ λαμβάνει—ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδέν προσανέθεντο) is noteworthy for the complete change of construction as shown by the repetition of the οἱ δοκοῦντες in the nominative and followed by the middle instead of the passive voice. Observe the two parentheses that led to the variation. It is easier in such a case to make a new start, as Paul does here. In Gal. 2:5 Blass3 follows D in omitting οἷς in order to get rid of the anacoluthon, as he does also in Ro. 16:27 (ὦ), but it is more than likely that the difficulty of the anacoluthon with οἷς led to the omission in D. One of the most striking anacolutha in Paul’s Epistles is found at the end of Ro. 5:12 where the apodosis to the ὠςπερ clause is wanting. The next sentence (ἄχρι γάρ) takes up the subordinate clause ἡμὰρτον and the comparison is never completed. In verse 18 a new comparison is drawn in complete form. The sentence in Ro. 9:22–24 is without the apodosis and verse 25 goes on with the comparative ὦς. 2 Pet. 1:17 shows a clear anacoluthon, for the participle λαβὼν is left stranded utterly in the change to καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν. Winer4 seems to be wrong in finding an anacoluthon in the long sentence in 2 Pet. 2:4–10. The apodosis is really οὖν in verse 9 (verse 8 being a long parenthesis as W. H. rightly punctuate). However, Winer1 is justified in refusing to see anacoluthon in many passages formerly so regarded and that call for no discussion now. See further Mt. 7:9; 12:36; Mk. 2:28; 7:3 f.; Lu. 11:11 f.; 12:8, 10; 21:6; Jo. 6:39; 17:18; Ac. 15:22 ff.; 19:34; 24:20; 26:3; Ro. 16:25–27; 1 Cor. 9:15; Col. 2:2; 4:6; Eph. 3:8; 2 Cor. 7:5; 1 Th. 4:1; Heb. 3:15; 10:15 f.; 1 Tim. 1:3–5; Ju. 16. It is very common in the Apocalypse as in 2 Corinthians and Galatians.

3. The Participle in Anacolutha. It calls for a word of its own in the matter of anacoluthon, although, as a matter of fact, it occurs in both the kinds of anacoluthon already noticed. The reason is, the free use of the participle in long sentences (cf. Paul) renders it peculiarly subject to anacoluthon. The point with the participle is not that it is a special kind of anacoluthon in any other sense. Gal. 6:1, καταρτίζετε,
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σκοπῶν σεαυτόν, μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῆς may be regarded as anacoluthon in the change
of number, but it is a natural singling-out of the individual in the application. In 2 Cor.
5:12 the ellipsis of γράφομεν ταῦτα with διδόντες is so harsh as to amount to
anacoluthon. Cf. also θλίβομενοι in 2 Cor. 7:5. It is less certain about στελλόμενοι in
2 Cor. 8:20, for, skipping the long parenthesis in verse 19, we have συνεπέμψαμεν.
But in the parenthesis itself θειροτονηθεῖται is an example of anacoluthon, for regularly
ἐποίησεν would be the form. In 2 Cor. 9:11, 13, the participles πλουτιζόμενοι and
dοξάζοντες have no formal connection with a principal verb and are separated by a
long parenthesis in verse 12. But these participles may be after all tantamount to the
indicative and not mere anacoluthon. Just as sequimini (sec. pl. mid. ind.)=ἐπέσατο,
so other Greek participles may correspond to the indicative or imperative. Moulton
2 cites numerous examples from the papyri which make this possible for the κοινή. But
Moulton sees a sharp difference between the “hanging nominative” like ἔχον ὁ
νόμος in Heb. 10:1 (if δύνανται be accepted, W. H. δύνανται marg.) and ἔχοντες in Ph.
1:30, where, however, W. H. make a long parenthesis and seek to connect ἔχοντες
with στήκετε (verse 27.) These are indeed mere anacolutha, but one wonders if the

2 Moulton, Prol., p. 223.
Moulton

(1908).

———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).

———, Grammatical Notes from the Papyri (The Expositor, 1901, pp. 271–282;


———, N. T. Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery (Cambr. Bibl. Essays, 1909,
pp. 461–505).

———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-
Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

3 Ib.
4 Ib., p. 225.
connection between these and Ro. 12:6 (ἔχοντες) is so very distant after all. Participles are scattered along in this chapter in an “unending series” mingled with infinitives and imperatives. Thus in 12:9–13 we have participles, verse 14 the imperative, verse 15 infinitive, verse 16a participles, 16b imperative, 17 participles. Here the participle does seem to be practically equivalent to the imperative (cf. inf. also). See Participle (Verbal Nouns) for discussion of this point. In 2 Cor. 6:3 the participles skip over verse 2 and carry on the construction of verse 1, and it is resumed in verse 9. For a group of participles with the imperative see Eph. 5:15–22. Cf. also Col. 3:16. The point is that these various gradations in the use of the participle are not always clearly defined. As regards the nominative participle rather than the genitive absolute, Winer remarks that thus the participle gains greater prominence in the sentence. In Eph. 4:2 ἀνεχόµενοι may not be anacoluthon, but may be in accord with Ἡς ἐκλήθητε. Col. 1:26 is the case of the indicative rather than a participle (ἐφανερώθη, not παρεφανερωµένον). See 1 Cor. 7:37 where ἔχων is succeeded by ἔχει, but (W. H.) ἔγειρας καὶ καθίσας (Eph. 1:20). Cf. Rev. 2:2, 9. As to Heb. 8:10 (10:16) διδοὺς is explained by Winer as referring to διαθήσοµαι without anacoluthon, while Moulton considers it equal to an indicative and parallel to ἐφανερώθη. I am inclined to agree with Winer on this point. In 2 Cor. 5:6 ff. Paul, after using θαρροῦντες, repeats it in the form of θαρροῦµεν because of the intermediate clauses before he expresses ὑµοῦ, the main verb. Finally compare ἐφον ἂν Ἰδής τὸ πνεῦµα καταβάνων καὶ µένον ἔπ τουτόν (Jo. 1:33) with Ἐπὶ τοῦ πνευµατος ἣς περιστεράν ἔξον, καὶ ἔµεινεν ἔπ τοῦτον (verses 32), where the last clause is the comment of the Baptist to give special emphasis to that point, more than the participle would.

4. Asyndeton Due to Absence of δέ and ἀλλά. Winer considers the absence of δέ or ἀλλά to correspond with µέν as a species of anacoluthon, and Blass shares the same idea. As a matter of fact (see chapter on Particles) µέν does not require δέ either by etymology or usage. It is rather gratuitous to call such absence an instance of anacoluthon. The examples will be discussed later, such as Ac. 1:1; 13:4; Ro. 11:13, etc.

(f) Oratio Variata.

1. Distinction from Anacoluthon. Sometimes indeed the line between anacoluthon and oratio variata is not very clearly drawn. Thus in Lu. 17:31 (ὅς ἦταν ἐπί τοῦ δόµατος καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ) the second clause cannot repeat the relative δόµατος, but has to use αὐτοῦ. Cf. 1 Cor. 8:6 (ὕς οὖ?—καὶ εἰς αὐτόν), 2 Pet. 2:3 (οὗ?—καὶ αὐτῶν). So also in 1 Cor. 7:13 αὐτῆς repeats ἦτας. Cf. Rev. 17:2. [Page 441] In Ro. 2:6 ff. after the relative clause ὁ δὲ ἀποδοθεῖς there is a subdivision of the object, on the one hand (τοῖς µέν?—ζητοῦσιν ων αἰώνιον), on the other (τοῖς δὲ?—ἀδικίᾳ ὀργῇ καὶ}
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θυμός) where the nominative changes the construction and ός cannot here be repeated. In Ro. 11:22 indeed both of the phrases that extend the accusatives χρηστότητα και ἀποτομιὰν θεοῦ are put in the nominative (ἀποτομιὰ, χρηστότης). In Gal. 4:6 f. Paul changes from ἐστε to εἰ. This is all oratio variata in reality and is in accord with the ancient Greek idiom. Blass\(^1\) considers Tit. 1:2 f. an instance of oratio variata, but τὸν λόγον in all probability is to be regarded as in apposition with ἦν, which is the object both of ἐπηγγείλατο and ἐφανέρωσεν. Thus W. H., but Nestle agrees with Blass.

2. Heterogeneous Structure. That is what oratio variata really is and it can be illustrated by a number of passages other than the relative and with less element of obscurity about them. In Rev. 2:18 ὁ ἔχων is followed by καὶ αὐτοῦ just like the relative sentences above. Thus also 2 Jo. 2. In Rev. 7:9 after ἐδών καὶ ἰδοὺ we find a mixed construction, ὠντας ἑστῶτες (constr. κατὰ σύνεταν) with ἰδοῦ, περιβεβλημένως with ἐδών. Winer\(^2\) rightly distinguishes the variation in case in Rev. 18:12 f. (gen., acc., gen., acc.) and the similar phenomenon in Rev. 2:17 where there is a real distinction between the use of the genitive and the accusative. The use of ὑποδεξημένως in Mk. 6:8 is probably due to the ellipse of πορευέσθαι, for the correct text has μὴ ἐνδόσσασθαι just after. For similar ellipse and oratio variata see 2 Cor. 8:23. In Mk. 12:38 after θελόντων περιπατέων it looks like a sudden change to find ἰσπασμοῦ, but after all both are in the accusative with θελόντων. The irregularity in Mk. 3:16 is met in the text of W. H. by a parenthesis, but it could have been cleared up also by ὁ (referring to Πέτρου instead of καὶ as Winer\(^3\) suggests). In Jo. 8:53 the continuity of the interrogative form of sentence is abruptly broken by the short clause καὶ οἷς προφήτην, a very effective interruption, however. The case of 1 Jo. 2:2 is simple where instead of περὶ τῶν ὄλου τοῦ κόσμου (to be parallel with οὔ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων) John has merely περὶ ὄλου τοῦ κόσμου, a somewhat different conception. A similar example is found in Ac. 20:34 as between ταῖς χρείας μου and τοῖς οὖσι μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ. Heb. 9:7 furnishes the same point in inverse order (Ὑπὲρ ἐπιτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἄγνωστον). A lack of parallel is shown also in Ph. 2:22 between πατρὶ τέκνων and σὺν ἔμοι where Paul purposely puts in σὺν to break a too literal carrying out of the figure. In Rev. 1:6 the correct text in the parenthesis has [Page 442] ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖαν, ἱερᾶς τῷ θεῷ, a different conception from βασιλεῖς. See further Ac. 16:16 f.

3. Participles in Oratio Variata. These offer a frequent occasion for oratio variata, since they can so often be used parallel with subordinate clauses of various kinds. Thus in Jo. 5:44 λαμβάνοντες would naturally be followed by ἦντοντες, but we have ἤτε. So, on the other hand, in 1 Cor. 7:13 καὶ συνευδοκεῖ does not fit in as smoothly with ἦντον as καὶ συνευδοκοῦντα would. The same lack of parallel in the use of the participle is seen in Jo. 15:5 (ὅ μὲνον καθό) and in Lu. 17:31 where the relative and the participle are paired off. So also Ph. 1:23 and 1 Jo. 3:24. Cf. the Participle in Anacolutha. In Ro. 12:6 f. participles and substantives are placed in antithesis, as in 2 Cor. 6:3 f. we have participles, in 4–7 ἔν, in ἐν 7 f. διὰ, in 9 f.
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adjectives and participles. Cf. 2 Cor. 11:23 ff. where adverbs, adjuncts and verbs are in antithesis.

4. Exchange of Direct and Indirect Discourse. But the most striking instance of oratio variata is that between direct and indirect discourse. It is either from the indirect to the direct or from the direct to the indirect. As Blass\(^1\) justly observes, the N. T. writers, like all popular narrators, deal very little in indirect discourse. The accusative and the infinitive is not common in the old sense nor is ὅτι always the sign of indirect quotation. Frequently it is merely recitative ὅτι and corresponds to our quotation-marks, as in Mk. 14:14, ἐπεστε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ ὅτι Ο ὄδυσκαλος λέγει. So also ὅμεις λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς (Jo. 10:36). This reversion to one form of discourse from another is not unknown to the ancient Greek. But it is peculiarly in harmony with the N. T. vernacular and essentially vivid narrative style. In Lu. 5:14 we have a typical instance of the change from indirect to direct discourse (παρῆγελεν αὐτῷ μήδεν εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δείξειν σεαυτόν). Exactly parallel with this is Ac. 1:4 ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπιγέλιαν τοῦ πατρός ἢ ἦκοισατε μου where observe μου. Cf. also Ac. 17:3 where after διελέξατο ὅτι—ὁ Ἰησοῦς Luke concludes with the words of Paul ὃν ἐγὼ καταγελάω ὑμῖν. In Jo. 13:29 we have the reverse process where the writer drops from the direct to the indirect statement (ἀγόρασαν ἃν ἤρεταν ἐχομεν ἐς τὴν ἔρτην, ἢ τοις πιστοῖς ἵνα τι δῷ). So also we see the same thing in Ac. 23:23 f. (Ετοιμάσατε—τῆς νυκτὸς, κινήσε τα παραστησάτα ἵνα—διαφώθωσιν). But in Ac. 23:22 the other change occurs, as παραγελάς μηδεν ἐκλαλήσατι ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς ἐμέ. In W. H.’s text of Ro. 12:1 f. [Page 443] we have παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς παραστῆσαι καὶ μὴ συνεχηματίζοσθε (non—σθαί). In Mk. 11:32 the writer proceeds with his own remarks (ἔφοβοντο τὸν ὅχλον) after the question rather in the nature of anacoluthon, though in Mt. 21:26 φοβοῦμεθα is read as indeed a few MSS. do in Mark. So also Mt. 9:6, where the writer injects into the words of Jesus τότε λέγει τῷ παράλυτικῷ, we probably have anacoluthon rather than oratio variata (see (d), Parenthesis).

(g) Connection between separate sentences. So far we have been considering the matter of connection between the various parts of the same sentence, whether simple or compound, and the various complications that arise. But this is not all. The Greeks, especially in the literary style, felt the propriety of indicating the inner relation of the various independent sentences that composed a paragraph. This was not merely an artistic device, but a logical expression of coherence of thought. Particles like καὶ, δὲ, ἀλλά, γὰρ, οὖν, ὡς, etc., were very common in this connection. Demonstrative pronouns, adverbs, and even relative pronouns were also used for this purpose. I happen to open at Mt. 24:32–51 a paragraph of some length. The first sentence begins with δὲ. The sentences in verses 33 and 34 have asyndeton and so are without a connective. In verse 36 δὲ reappears, while the two sentences in verses 37 and 38 both have γάρ. Verse 40 begins with τὸτε, a common word in this usage in Matthew, as ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ is in Luke. Verse 42 begins with οὖν as its connective, while 43 drops back to δὲ. In 44 δὲ ὁ τοῦτο answers as a link of union while 45 uses ὅρα. verse 46 f. have asyndeton while 48 has δὲ. This long sentence completes the paragraph save the short sentence in verse 51 introduced by ἐκεῖ. I think this paragraph a fair sample of the didactic portion of the Gospels. Asyndeton occurs, but

---

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 286.
it is not the rule. In the Gospel of John οὖν is a much more frequent connective between sentences than καί, as any chapter (11 for instance) will show. The Beatitudes (Mt. 5:3–12) have no connectives at all, and are all the more effective because of the asyndeton. Winer finds this didactic asyndeton common also in James, the Gospel of John (cf. 14–17) and 1 John. But asyndeton is sometimes noticeable also in the non-didactic portions of John, as 20:14–18. No formal rules on the subject can be made, as the individual speaker or writer follows his mood of the moment in the matter. The point is to observe that, while asyndeton often occurs, in general Greek writers even in the N. T. use connectives between separate sentences.

[Page 444] (h) Connection between Paragraphs. It is only natural to carry the matter one step further and unite paragraph with paragraph. For a discussion of the origin of the paragraph see the chapter on Orthography and Phonetics. The paragraphs in our printed Greek texts are partly the work of the modern editors, yet not wholly so. But even in real or original paragraphs the connection varies greatly. In some there will be none at all, but an entirely new theme will be presented, whereas with others we merely have a new aspect of the same subject. I happen to turn to the sixth chapter of John. The chapter opens with μετὰ ταύτα, a real connective that refers to the incidents in chapter 5, which may have been a full year before. The next paragraph in W. H. begins at verse 14 and has οὖν. At verse 22 there is no connective except τῇ ἐπαύριον which may be compared with the τότε of Matthew. The paragraph at verse 41 has οὖν again, which is very common in John in this connection, as can be seen illustrated also in verses 52 and 60. At verse 66 the paragraph begins with ἐκ τούτου, a real connective. If we go into chapter 7 we find καί in verse 1, δέ in verse 10, δέ again in verse 14, οὖν in verse 25, no connective in verse 32, δέ in verse 37, οὖν in verse 45. Asyndeton on the whole is rather more frequent in the Gospel of John than in the Synoptic Gospels. Abbott gives a detailed discussion of the kinds of asyndeton in John. In Paul’s Epistles one would expect little asyndeton between the paragraphs especially in the argumentative portions. In general this is true, and yet occasionally even in Ro. asyndeton is met as in 9:1; 13:1. But in chapter 8 every paragraph has its connective particle. Note also οὖν in 12:1 at the beginning of the hortatory portion after the long preceding argument. As between sentences, there is freedom in the individual expression on the subject. For Hort’s theory of the paragraph see Intr. to N. T. in Gr., p. 319. By means of spaces he has a system of sub-paragraphs, as is plain in the text of W. H.

XIII. Forecast. There are other things to be considered in the construction of the sentence, but enough has been treated in this chapter. What remains in syntax is the minute examination of the relations of words (cases, prepositions, pronouns, verbs in mood and voice and tense, infinitives and participles), the relations of clause with clause in the use of subordinating conjunctions, the particles, figures of speech (aposiopesis, ellipsis, paronomasia, zeugma, etc.). There is a natural order in the development of these matters which will be followed as far as possible in the discussion [Page 445] of syntax. The individual words come before the relation of

1 W.-Th., p. 536.
2 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 70 f.
1 Ib. Cf. W.-Th., p. 537.
sentences or clauses. In the discussion of words either nouns or verbs could be taken up first, but, as verbs are connected more closely with conjunctions than nouns they are best treated just before conjunctional clauses. Prepositions are properly discussed after cases. The article is a variation of the demonstrative pronoun. But at best no treatment of syntax can handle every aspect and phase of language. The most that can be achieved is a presentation of the essential principles of N. T. syntax so that the student will be able to interpret his Greek N. T. according to correct grammatical principles derived from the living language of the time.

[PAGE 446] CHAPTER XI

THE CASES (ΠΤΩΣΕΙΣ)

I. History of the Interpretation of the Greek Cases.

(a) CONFUSION. Perhaps nowhere has confusion been worse confounded than in the study of the Greek cases. The tendency has been usually to reason backwards and to explain past phenomena by present conditions. The merely logical method of syntax has turned the pyramid on its apex and has brought untold error into grammar. The Stoics took interest in grammar for philosophical purposes and gave the logical bent to it in lieu of the historical. Dionysius Thrax and Apollonius Dyscolus went off on the wrong trail in the matter of the Greek cases.

(b) BOPP’S CONTRIBUTION. Bopp brought daylight out of darkness by comparative grammar. HübSchmann\(^1\) gives an admirable history of the matter. He illustrates the eight cases copiously from the Sanskrit, Zend and Persian. Thanks now to such workers as Schleicher, Brugmann, Delbrück, the eight Indo-Germanic cases are well

1 Hübschmann, Zur Casuslehre, p. v.
Bopp BOPP, Vergleichende Grammatik (1857).
Hübschmann HÜBSCHMANN, Zur Kasuslehre (1875).
2 Ib. Cf. Dewischeit, Zur Theorie der Casus (1857); Rumpel, Die Casuslehre (1875).
Hadley (Essays Phil. and Crit., Gk. Gen. as Abl., p. 46) speaks of “the Beckerite tendency, too frequently apparent in Kühner, to impose a meaning on language rather than educe the meaning out of it.”
Brugmann

BRUGMANN, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).

———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).
wrought out and generally acknowledged. Cf. brief discussion of the forms of the Greek cases in chapter VII (Declensions). Greek grammarians still differ, however, in the terminology applied to the cases. In 1911 the Oxford and Cambridge scholars issued a tract “On Terminology in Grammar,” but confusion still reigns. See also W. Havers, *Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indog. Sprachen*. When the Stoic grammarians wrote, the genitive and ablative had the same forms, and the locative, instrumental and dative likewise. There were occasional survivals of distinction like ὁκικος and ὁκιω, Cypriotic instrumental ὄφω and dative ὄφη, etc. But in general the work of syncretism was complete in the respects just mentioned, though [Page 447] in Arcadian the genitive and the locative took the same form¹ (cf. Latin Romae, domi). But the grammarians, ignorant of the history of the language, sought to explain the genitive and ablative ideas from a common source. Thus Winer² boldly calls the genitive the “whence-case” and undertakes to explain every usage of the genitive from that standpoint, a hopeless exercise in grammatical gymnastics. The same sinuosities have been resorted to in the effort to find the true dative idea in the locative and instrumental uses of the forms called dative by the grammars.

(c) MODERN USAGE. Some modern grammarians³ help matters a good deal by saying true genitive, ablatival genitive, true dative, locatival dative, instrumental dative. This custom recognises the real case-distinctions and the historical outcome. But some confusion still remains because the locative and the dative never mean exactly the same thing and are not the same thing in fact. It partly depends on whether one is to apply the term “case” to the ending or to the relation expressed by the ending. As a matter of fact the term is used both ways. Ὄνοµα is called indiscriminately nominative, vocative or accusative, according to the facts in the context, not nominatival accusative or accusatival nominative. So with βασιλεῖς or πόλεις. We are used to this in the grammars, but it seems a shock to say that πόλεως may be either genitive or ablative, that ὑμῖν may be either locative, instrumental or dative. But why more of an absurdity than in the case of Ὄνοµα and πόλεις? The only difference is that in the gen.-abl. the syncretism of form applies to all Greek words. For various examples of syncretism in the forms of the Greek cases with fragments of distinctive endings also see Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 375 f.; Brugmann, *Kurze vergl. Gr.*, II, p. 420 f.; and chapter VII (Declensions).
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DELBRÜCK, B., Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis (1867).


———, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871–1888).

Havers HAVERS, W., Untersuch. zur Kasussyntax der indog. Sprachen (1911).
2 W.-Th., p. 184 f.
3 Cf. Babbitt, A Gr. of Attic and Ionic Gk., 1902.
(d) GREEN’S CLASSIFICATION. I agree with B. Green,4 whom I shall here quote at some length: “I shall classify the uses of the cases under the heads of the Aryan Cases, as in every instance the true method of explanation of any particular idiom is to trace its connection to the general meaning of the original Aryan case, to which the case in Greek or Latin corresponds, and not arbitrarily to distinguish the uses of any case in Greek or Latin by terms which cannot be properly applied to that case; e. g., the term dative of manner is no explanation. Manner cannot be expressed by the true dative case. The correct explanation is that the use is instrumental, but the instrumental case in Greek has coalesced in form with the dative. This method of explanation has the advantage of demanding fewer set terms, while at the same time it requires a logical connection to be made between the particular use in question and the fundamental meaning of the case involved. Such an explanation is the better the simpler the words used in it are.” This is wonderfully well said and has the advantage of being true, which is not always said of grammatical comments. It is the method of history, of science, of life. It is the method pursued in the etymology and history of a word. It is the only way to get at the truth about the significance of the Greek cases.

(e) SYNCRETISM OF THE CASES. This method of interpretation does not ignore the syncretism of the cases. On the other hand it accents sharply the blending of the forms while insisting on the integrity of the case-ideas. There are indeed some instances where either of the blended cases will make sense, like τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς (Ac. 2:33), which may be locative ‘exalted at,’ instrumental ‘exalted by,’ or dative ‘exalted to’ (a rare idiom and in the older Greek), ‘the right hand of God.’ Cf. also τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθησεν (Ro. 8:24). So in Heb. 12:11 χαρᾶς and λύπης may be explained either as genitive or ablative. But such occasional ambiguity is not surprising and these instances on the “border-line” made syncretism possible. In general the context makes it perfectly clear which of the syncretistic cases is meant, just as in English and French we have to depend on the order of the words to show the difference between nominative and accusative. Yet no one would say that nominative and accusative are the same in English and French.1

(f) FREEDOM IN USE OF CASE. As a matter of fact it was often immaterial whether a writer or speaker used one of several ways of expressing himself, for the Greek allows liberty and flexibility at many points. Thus τὸ γένος and τῷ γένει would either answer for the specifying idea, προσκυνέω is used with either accusative or dative, μιμήσκομαι with accusative or genitive, etc.2 But this is not to say that one construction is used for another or is identical with the other. The difference may be “subtle, no doubt, but real” (Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 66). Moulton properly (ib.) cites the well-known distinction between the accusative and genitive with ἀκούω in Ac. 9:7 and 22:9 as disproof of apparent self-contradiction and a gentle hint not to be too ready to blur over case-distinctions in Luke or elsewhere in the N. T. He notes also genitive and accusative with γεύεσθαι in Heb. 6:4 f. and the common use of εἰς with accusative after verbs of rest and ἐν with locative even after verbs of motion.

Green Green, B., Notes on Greek and Latin Syntax (1897).
4 Notes on Gk. and Lat. Synt., 1897, p. 11.
1 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 75, illustrates the rapid disappearance of case-endings in the Irish tongue, which as late as i/A.D. had a full set of inflections, whereas by the fifth century only traces of the dat. plur. survive.
2 W.-Th., p. 180.
But it is hazardous to insist always on a clear distinction between εἰς and ἐν, for they are really originally the same word. The point is that by different routes one may reach practically the same place, but the routes are different. Indeed one may take so many different standpoints that the border-lines of the cases come very close sometimes. So ἐξ ἀριστερᾶς (abl.), ἐν ἀριστερᾷ (loc.), εἰς ἀριστεράν (acc.) are all good Greek for ‘on the left’ (we have also in English ‘at the left,’ ‘to the left’).1

II. The Purpose of the Cases.

(a) ARISTOTLE’S USAGE. He applied the term πτῶσις to verb, noun, adverb, etc., but the later grammarians spoke only2 of the πτῶσις ὀνόματος, though as a matter of fact adverbs and prepositions are in cases, and even conjunctions and other particles are usually in cases. But in ordinary parlance substantives, adjectives, pronouns, the article are in cases and have inflection. The cases originally had to do only with these. The adverbs were merely later modifications or fixed case-forms.

(b) WORD-RELATIONS. The cases were used to express word-relations, the endings serving to make it plain what the particular case was. The isolating languages, like the Chinese, show such relations by the order of the words and the tone in pronunciation. Modern English and French use prepositions chiefly besides the order of the words. These word-relations concern substantives in their relations with other substantives, with adjectives, with prepositions and with verbs. So adjectives and pronouns have all these relations. It is immaterial whether verb or substantive is the earliest in the use of a case with a substantive. In the old Sanskrit practically all the word-relations are expressed by the eight cases. This was a very simple plan, but as language became more complicated a great strain was bound to be put on each of these cases in order to convey clearly so many resultant ideas.

As a matter of fact the ground-meaning of the case-forms is not known.3 On Origin of Case-Forms see chapter VII, I, 2, (c).

[Page 450] III. The Encroachment of Prepositions on the Cases.

(a) THE REASON. The burden upon the cases was too great. Even in the later Sanskrit a number of set case-forms (adverbs) came to be used with some of the cases to make clearer the exact relations of words, whereas in the older Sanskrit no such helpers were felt to be needed. This was the beginning of prepositions. Prepositions have a wrong name. They do not come before anything essentially, and just as often in Homer came after the noun. Indeed ὁμήρου ἀπό is not anastrophe, but the original type.1 Nor was the preposition originally used with verbs. The preposition is merely an adverb that is used with nouns or in composition with verbs. But more about that hereafter (Prepositions). The point to note here is that when the burden upon the cases

1 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 67.
2 Cf. Steinthal, Gesch. der Sprachw., p. 259; Hübschm., Zur Casusl., p. 3.
3 Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 374.
1 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 341.
grew too great adverbs were called in to make clearer the meaning of the case in harmony with the analytic tendency of language.\(^2\)

\((b)\) No “GOVERNING” OF CASES. These adverbs did not govern cases. They were merely the accidental concomitants, more or less constant, of certain cases. At best “the cases could express relationship only in a very general way. Hence arose the use of adverbs to go with cases in order to make the meaning more specific. These adverbs, which we now call prepositions, in time became the constant concomitants of some cases; and when this has happened there is an ever-increasing tendency to find the important part of the meaning in the preposition and not in the case-ending.”\(^3\) This quotation from Giles puts the matter in a nutshell. In spite of the average grammarian’s notion that prepositions govern cases, it is not true. The utmost is that the preposition in question is in harmony with the case in question.\(^4\)

\((c)\) NOT USED INDIFFERENTLY. These prepositions were not used indifferently with all the cases. They are, of course, impossible with the vocative. But the nominative may be used with such adverbs, not called prepositions by the grammarians because it seems difficult to explain a preposition “governing” the nominative. But Paul does not hesitate to say ὑπέρ ἐγώ (2 Cor. 11:23) though ὑπέρ is not construed with ἐγώ. Cf. also εἷς κατὰ εἷς (Mk. 14:19), καθεῖς εἷς (Ro. 12:5). It is not certain that any prepositions are [see XII, (f)] used with the true dative and few with [Page 451] the instrumental (ὅµα, σῶν). Giles\(^1\) denies that the genitive is ever used with a preposition. Certainly what is called the genitive with prepositions is often the ablative. Probably ἐπί and ἀντί are used with the real genitive. Naturally the cases that are more local in idea like the locative (‘where’), the accusative (‘whither’) which is partly local, the instrumental (‘where-with’) and the ablative (‘whence’) are those that are most frequently supplemented by prepositions.\(^2\)

\((d)\) ORIGINAL USE WITH LOCAL CASES. Originally most of the prepositions were used with either of these local cases (loc., instr., abl.). Some few of them continued to be so used even in the N. T. This matter will come up again under the head of Prepositions, but we may note here that ἐπί and παρά are the only prepositions that use three cases with any frequency\(^3\) in the N. T., and in the case of ἐπί it is probably the true genitive, not the ablative. Πρὸς has accusative 679 times, locative 6, and

---

\(^2\) Ib.

\(^3\) Ib., p. 272 f.
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GILES, P., A Short Manual of Comparative Philology. 2d ed. (1901).


\(^4\) Cf. Delbrück, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 173. Farrar (Gk. Synt., p. 94 f.) puts the matter succinctly: “It is the case which borrows the aid of the preposition, not the preposition which requires the case.”

\(^1\) Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 341.

\(^2\) Ib. But Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 125, correctly admits the gen.

\(^3\) Moulton, Prol., p. 106 f.
ablative 1 (Ac. 27:34, a literary example). The bulk of those that have two are narrowing down to one case while δνύ, δεντι, εις, έν, πρό have only one, and ἄνφι has disappeared save in composition. If this N. T. situation, which is amply supported by the papyri, is compared with the usage of Homer, the contrast will be very great. To carry the matter a step further one may note that in late Greek there is a constant tendency for all prepositions to be used with the accusative, so that in modern Greek vernacular all the “proper” prepositions are regularly employed with the accusative. The occasional LXX use of σοὖν + accusative, while a mere error, was in line with this tendency.

(e) INCREASING USE OF PREPOSITIONS. The constantly increasing use of prepositions is one of the main reasons for the blending of the case-forms. This was already partly apparent in the Sanskrit in the assimilation of genitive and ablative singular and in the plural of ablative and dative. So the Latin locative, dative, ablative, instrumental, in most words merged their forms. Moulton accents the fact that it was the local cases (loc., abl., instr.) in the Greek that first gave way in their endings. That is true with the exception of the accusative (not a purely local case), which has shown more persistence than any case save the genitive. The genitive is a non-local case and has held on, though the dative has disappeared in modern Greek vernacular before εις + accusative, the accusative without εις, and the genitive. But this break-down of the case-endings seen in Sanskrit, much more apparent in Greek and Latin, has reached its climax in modern English and French. In modern English the six Anglo-Saxon endings, barring pronouns, have disappeared save one, the genitive (6), and even that can be expressed by the prep. of. In French the process is complete except in pron. Modern Greek vernacular shows the influence of this tendency very decidedly. The Greek of the N. T. comes therefore in the middle of the stream of this analytic tendency. In the old Sanskrit it was all case and no preposition. In modern French it is all preposition and no case-ending. The case-ideas have not disappeared. They are simply expressed more minutely and exactly by means of prepositions. By and by the case-endings were felt to be useless as the preposition was looked to entirely for the idea. The case without preposition belongs to the early stage of language history. When Delbrück speaks of a “living” case, he means the case-ending, as does Moulton when he asserts that “we can detect a few moribund traces of instrumental, locative and ablative.” If he means the case-meaning, the instances are abundant. And even in case-ending it is not all one-sided, for the locative –ι and the instrumental –οις both contributed to the common stock of forms. Henry even suggests that in άνωμα-τος we have the ablative τ(δ), for the Latin word is nomen (nominis).

4 Ib.
5 Ib., p. 105 f.
8 Prol., p. 60 f.
1 See further Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 376; Brug., Kurze vergl. Gr., II, p. 419.
3 Prol., p. 60.
Henry HENRY, Précis de grammaire du grec et du latin. 5th ed. (1894). Elliott’s tr. of 1st ed. (1890).
4 Comp. Gr. of Gk. and Lat., p. 217.
(f) DISTINCTION PRESERVED IN THE N. T. But the N. T. has not lost distinctive use of the cases and prepositions. Special causes explain some of the phenomena in the N. T. The excessive use of ἐν in the N. T. is parallel to that in the LXX (cf. Jer. 21:5 f., 9 f.) and is doubtless due partly to the Hebrew ַּ the which it so commonly translates as Moulton⁵ observes. But the so-called instrumental use of ἐν like ἐν ῥομφαῖ: (Rev. 6:8; cf. Mt. 12:26 f.) is not due entirely to the Hebrew, for, while very common in the LXX, where it is in “the plenitude of its power,”⁶ yet the papyri show undoubted examples of the same instrumental [Page 453] usage.¹ See further Locative Case and also Prepositions (ἐν). Indeed in the N. T. ἐν outnumber  eius three to two.² If these two prepositions are left out of consideration, the disappearance of the locative with prepositions is quite marked in the N. T., a decay already begun a good while before,³ only to be consummated in the modern Greek vernacular, where eius has displaced ἐν (Thumb, Handb., p. 100). When one recalls that dative and instrumental also have gone from the modern Greek vernacular and that στό with the accusative (eius τόν) replaces all three cases in modern Greek and that originally ἐν and eius were the same preposition, he is not surprised to read ὁ eius τόν ῥυρόν (Mk. 13:16) where Mt. 24:18 has ὁ ἐν τῷ ῥυρό. So Mt. 12:41, μετενόησαν eius τό κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ. Moulton⁴ has a very suggestive study of πιστεύω. He omits those examples where the verb means ‘entrust’ and finds about forty others with the simple dative. In the majority of these forty the verb means ‘believe.’ There are some debatable passages like Jo. 5:24, 38; 8:31; Ac. 5:14; 16:34; 18:8. He finds only one passage outside of Eph. 1:13 where ἐν ὁ is assimilated (cf. ἐσφραγίσθητε), viz. Mk. 1:15 (πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ), and

5 Prol., p. 61.
6 C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 82.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 61 f.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 62.
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he follows Deissmann\(^5\) in taking \(\epsilon\nu\) as ‘in the sphere of.’ \(\Pi\sigma\tau\varepsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\iota\) is found six times with the locative and seven with the accusative in the sense of ‘repose one’s trust’ upon God or Christ. But \(\pi\sigma\tau\varepsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\zeta\) occurs 45 times (37 in Jo. and 1 Jo.) in the sense of ‘mystical union with Christ,’ like Paul’s \(\epsilon\nu\ \Xr\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\).\(^6\)

**IV. The Distinctive Idea of Each of the Cases.**

\(\text{(a) Fundamental Idea.}\) The point is, if possible, to get at the fundamental idea of each of the eight original cases. To do this it is essential that one look at the Greek cases historically and from the Greek point of view. Foreigners may not appreciate all the niceties, but they can understand the respective import of the Greek cases.\(^7\) The N. T. writers, as we now know perfectly well, were not strangers to the vernacular \(\kappa\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\)\(\omicron\), nor were the LXX translators for that matter, though they indeed were hampered by translating a Semitic tongue into Greek. The N. T. writers were in their element when they wrote vernacular [Page 454] \(\kappa\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\). They knew the import of the Greek cases as used at that time by the people at large.
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\(^5\) In Christo, p. 46 f.

\(^6\) Cf. Heitmüller, Im Namen Jesu, I, ch. 4

\(^7\) Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 68.
(b) CASES NOT USED FOR ONE ANOTHER. We have no right to assume in the N. T. that one case is used for another. That is to say, that you have a genitive, but it is to be understood as an accusative. Winer properly condemns such enallage casuum. Not even in 2 Cor. 6:4 (συνιστάνοντες ἐν τῷ θεῷ διάκονοι) do we have an instance of it, for the nominative (lit. plural) means 'as minister of God I commend myself,' while the accusative (διακόνους) would be, 'I commend myself as a minister of God.' We are then to look for the distinctive idea of each case just as we find it. In the modern Greek, to be sure, the cases are in such confusion (dative, locative, instrumental gone) that one cannot look for the old distinctions.

(c) VITALITY OF CASE-IDEA. This independence of the case-idea is not out of harmony with the blending of case-forms (abl. and gen., loc. and instr. and dat.). This is a very different matter from the supposed substitution of cases alluded to above. The genitive continued to be a genitive, the ablative an ablative in spite of the fact that both had the same ending. There would be, of course, ambiguous examples, as such ambiguities occur in other parts of speech. The context is always to be appealed to in order to know the case.

(d) THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CASES. This is always to be considered. The accusative is the oldest of the cases, may, in fact, be considered the original and normal case. Other cases are variations from it in course of linguistic development. With verbs in particular which were transitive the accusative was the obvious case to use unless there was some special reason to use some other. The other oblique cases with verbs (gen., abl., loc., instr., dat.) came to be used with one verb or the other rather than the accusative, because the idea of that verb and the case coalesced in a sense. Thus the dative with πείθομαι, the instrumental with χράομαι, etc. But with many of these verbs the accusative continued to be used in the vernacular (or even in the literary language with a difference of idea, as ἄκοψα). In the vernacular κοινή the accusative is gradually reasserting itself by the side of the other cases with many verbs. This tendency kept up to the complete disappearance of the dative, locative and instrumental in modern Greek (cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 31), and the genitive, accusative and εἰς compete for the function of the old dative (ib., pp. 38 ff.). The accusative was always the most popular case. Krebs has made a useful study of the cases in the literary κοινή, and Moulton thinks that these tendencies of the literary κοινή are really derived from the vernacular. But not all the verbs fall in with the decay of the dative-locative-instrumental. Thus προσκυνεῖν in the N. T. has the dative twice as often as the accusative, just the opposite of the

1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 325.
Krebs

KREBS, F., Die Präpositionen bei Polybius (1882. Schanz’ Beiträge).


3 Prol., p. 64.
inscriptions. 4 But the papyri show little proof of the decay of the dative save in the illiterate examples. 5 The accusative gains from the genitive and ablative in the N. T. also, as Krebs found in the later literary Greek. Moulton 6 finds that out of 47 examples κρατεῖν has the genitive only 8 times, but διαφέρειν (‘surpass’) has the ablative. ἐντρέπεσθαι takes only the accusative, and the accusative appears with verbs of filling (Rev. 17:3). 7 Moulton concludes his résumé of Krebs by calling attention to the list of verbs that were once intransitive, but are transitive in the κοινή. This is a matter that is always changing and the same verb may be used either way. A verb is transitive, by the way, whether it takes the accusative or not; if it has any oblique case it is transitive. As illustrations of this varied usage Moulton cites from the N. T. ἐνεργεῖν, συνεργεῖν, ἐπέρχεσθαι, καταβαρεῖν, καταλαλεῖν, καταπονεῖν, πλεονεκτεῖν, προσφωνεῖν, ἐπερχεσθαι, ὑποτρέχειν, χορηγεῖν. He concludes his discussion of the matter with a needed caveat (p. 65 f.) against thinking that all distinctions of case are blurred in the N. T. “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.” Analogy no doubt played its part in case-contamination as well as in the blending of the case-endings. 8

[Page 456] (e) The Method of This Grammar. In the study of each case the method of this grammar is to begin with the root-idea of the particular case in hand. Out of that by means of context and grammatical history the resultant meaning in the particular instance can be reached. This is not only more simple, but it is in harmony with the facts of the linguistic development and usage. Even in an instance like ἐν μαχαίρῃ (Lu. 22:49) the locative case is not out of place. The smiting (πατάξομεν) is conceived as located in the sword. Cf. ἐν ῥάβδῳ (1 Cor. 4:21). The papyri show the same usage, as indeed the older classical Greek did occasionally. In English we translate this resultant idea by ‘with,’ but we have no right to assume that the Greeks thought of ἐν as ‘with.’ The LXX shows that the Hebrew בְּ corresponded closely to the Greek ἐν in this resultant idea. In translation we often give not the real meaning of the word, but the total idea, though here the LXX follows closely the Hebrew. One of the chief difficulties in syntax is to distinguish between the Greek idiom and the English translation of the idiom plus the context. But enough of preliminary survey. Let us now examine each case in turn.

V. The Nominative (πτῶσις ὁρθή, ἐθική, ὄνομαστική).

---

6 Prol., p. 65.
7 Ib. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 102. Cf. Thumb, Theol. Lit., XXVIII, p. 422, for mod. Gk. usage. As a matter of fact the acc. was always more popular in the vernac. Gk., and no wonder that the pap. show it to be so even with verbs usually in the lit. lang. used with other cases. Cf. Völker, Pap. Graec. Synt., 1900, p. 5 f.
For the older books on the nominative case see Hübner, *Grundriss* etc., p. 36.

(a) **NOT THE OLDEST CASE.** The first thing to observe about the nominative is that it is not the oldest case. The accusative is treated first in some grammars and seems to be the oldest. That is the proper historical order, but it seems best on the whole to treat the so-called “oblique” cases together. The term “oblique cases” (πτώσεις πλάγιαι) has a history. The nominative was not originally regarded as a case, but merely the noun (ὄνομα). So Aristotle. The vocative is not a real case, as we shall see directly. Hence a case (casus) was considered ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος πεπτωκυία, a real πτῶσις. All the true cases therefore were oblique. Indeclinable words are ἄπτωτα. When the nominative was considered a case it was still called by the word for noun (ὀνομαστική, nominativus), the naming or noun case. The Hindu grammarians indeed call the nominative prathamā (‘first’) as the leading case, not in time, but in service. This is merely the logical arrangement followed by the Western scholars. There was once no need felt for a nominative, since the verb itself had its own subject in the personal endings. But originally one may suppose a word served as subject of the verb and may have become an ending. Even the impersonal verbs like καλῶς ἔχει have the subject in the same way. The use of a special case for this purpose was an after-thought.

(b) **REASON FOR THE CASE.** Why then was the nominative used? Why was it ever originated? Its earliest use was in apposition to the verbal subject alluded to above. Greater precision in the subject was desired, and so a substantive or pronoun was put in apposition with the verbal ending. Sometimes both substantive and pronoun are employed as in αὐτός δὲ ἔγὼ Παῦλος παρακαλῶ (2 Cor. 10:1). Other languages can even use other cases for such apposition in the predicate. Cf. English *It’s me*, French *c’est moi* and Latin *dedecori est*. And the Greek itself shows abundant evidence of lack of concord of case in apposition (cf. Rev. in the N. T.). But the nominative is a constant resource in appositional phrases, whatever case the other word may be in. The whole subject of apposition was discussed in the chapter on the Sentence. Cf. ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἰδίως Ἄνανιας (Ac. 5:1). In the modern Greek this usage partly replaces the explanatory genitive, as στυρὶ σινάπι, ‘mustard seed’ (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 33).

(c) **PREDICATE NOMINATIVE.** The predicate nominative is in line with the subject nominative. It is really apposition. The double nominative belongs to Greek as to all languages which use certain verbs as a copula like ἔχω, γίνομαι, καλεῖσθαι, etc. Cf. σὺ εἰ Ἡρῴδης (Mt. 16:18). The Latin is fond of the dative in such examples as *id mihi
honori est, and the Greek can use one dative, as ὁνοματε στὶ μοι. Thus in the N. T. ἐξελήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς (Lu. 2:21), ἀνήρ καλούμενος Ζαχαρίας (Lu. 19:2), ἦν ὄνομα τὸ δοῦλο τῇ Μάλχῳ (Jo. 18:10), as well as Ἰωάνης ἐστὶν ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (Lu. 1:63). The use of the nominative in the predicate with the infinitive in indirect discourse (φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί, Ro. 1:22) is proper when the subject of the principal verb is referred to. See Indirect Discourse (Modes and Infinitive). But the N. T., especially in quotations from the LXX and passages under Semitic influence, often uses [Page 458] εἴς and the accusative rather than the predicate nom. Moulton1 denies that it is a real Hebraism since the papyri show the idiom ἐσθον παρ ὕμων εἰς δαίμονας σπέρματα, K. P. 46 (ii/A.D.), where εἰς means ‘as’ or ‘for,’ much like the N. T. usage. But the fact that it is so common in the translation passages and that the LXX is so full of it as a translation of justifies Blass2 in saying that it is formed on a Hebrew model though it is not un-Greek. Winer3 finds it in the late Greek writers, but the Hebrew is chiefly responsible for the LXX situation. The most frequent examples in the N. T. are with εἶναι (ἔσονται εἰς σάρκα μίαν, Mt. 19:5, which can be compared with Lu. 3:5; 2 Cor. 6:18; Ac. 8:23, etc.), γίνεσθαι (ἔγενεθη εἰς κεφαλήν γονιάς, Mt. 21:42, with which compare Lu. 13:19; Jo. 16:20; Rev. 8:11, etc.), ἐγέρειν εἰς βασιλέα (Ac. 13:22), ἐλογίζοντα εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Ro. 4:3 ff.). Cf. also Jo. 16:20. Probably the following examples have rather some idea of purpose and are more in accord with the older Greek idiom. In 1 Cor. 4:3, εἰς εἰς ἐλάχιστον ἔστιν, the point is not very different. Cf. also 1 Cor. 14:22 (εἰς σημεῖον). But observe μὴ εἰς κενὸν γένηται (1 Th. 3:5), εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα (Ro. 5:18), ἐγένετο ἡ πόλεως εἰς τρία μέρη (Rev. 16:19).

(d) SOMETIMES UNALTERED. As the name-case the nominative is sometimes left unaltered in the sentence instead of being put in the case of the word with which it is in apposition. Cf. Rev. 1:5; Mk. 12:38–40; Lu. 20:27; Ac. 10:37. This is in accord with the ancient Greek idiom, though the Book of Rev. has rather more than the usual proportion of such examples. See chapter on the Sentence, pp. 413 ff. In Rev. 9:11 observe ὄνομα ἐξελέασθαι δικαίας (cf. ἄδικος also), where the nominative is retained much after the fashion of our quotation-marks. The same thing4 is noticeable in Jo. 13:13 ἦμεν ζοφεῖν ἐμὸν διάκος τοῦ τοῦ κυρίου, for thus W. H. print it. This is a classic idiom. Cf. Xenophon, Ο. 6. 14 ἐξοντας, τὸ σεμινὸν τοῦτο τὸ καλὸς τὸ καγαθὸς. Cf. Lu. 19:29; 21:37, where W. H. print εἰς τὸ δρόσο τὸ καλούμενον ἐλαιόν. But we know from Ac. 1:12 (ἐπὶ δροσο τοῦ καλούμένου ἐλαιόνος) that ἐλαιόν could be in Luke a nominative (abundantly confirmed by the papyri). The most that can be said about the passages in Luke is that the nominative in lists in Bœot. inscr. in the midst of other cases (Claflin, Synt., etc., p. 46).

6 Cf. K.-G., I, p. 44.
7 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 256.
1 Prol., p. 71 f.
3 W.-Th., p. 184.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 235, endorses Blass’s view (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 85) that in Jo. 13:13 we have the voc. The nom. is hardly “incredible” (Blass). Cf. loose use of the nom. in lists in Bœot. inscr. in the midst of other cases (Claflin, Synt., etc., p. 46).
entirely possible, perhaps probable.\(^1\) In Rev. 1:4 (Ἅπω ὃ ὐν καὶ ὃ ἦν καὶ ὃ ἔρχομενος) the nominative is kept purposely, as has been shown, to accent the unchangeableness of God, not that John did not know how to use the ablative after ἄπο, for in the same sentence he has ἄπω τῶν πνευμάτων. Moulton\(^2\) considers this one of “the easiest of Latin. I (1897), II (1901).
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1 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 151 f.  
2 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 70.  
3 C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 55.  
4 Prol., pp. 69, 225.  
1 Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 151 f.

---

\(\text{e) The Nominative Absolute.}\) The nominative is sometimes used absolutely, nominatus pendens, just as the genitive (ablative) and accusative are. Cf. ablative absolute in Latin, locative in Anglo-Saxon, and nominative absolute in modern Greek and modern English. In titles the nominative is the natural case and is left suspended. Cf. Παῦλος κλητὸς ἀπόστολος (1 Cor. 1:1). The LXX has an abnormal number of suspended nominatives, due to a literal translation of the Hebrew.\(^3\) But the N. T. has some also which are due to change of structure, as ὁ νικῶν ποτήσω αὐτῶν (Rev. 3:12), ὁ νικῶν δόσω αὐτῷ (Rev. 3:21), οἱ κατʼ Μουσοῦ ὁ οὖς—οὐκ οἴδαμεν τι ἐγένετο αὐτῷ (Ac. 7:40), πάν ῥήμα ἄργῳ—ἄποδόσουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον (Mt. 12:36), ταῦτα ὁ θεωρεῖτε, ἔλευσονται ἡμέραι (Lu. 21:6). In particular is the participle (cf. Jo. 7:38, ὁ πιστεύουν εἰς ἐμέ) common in such a nominative, about which see the chapter on the Sentence (anacoluthon). Moulton\(^4\) considers this one of “the easiest of anacolutha.” Cf. further πᾶς ὁ ἐρεῖ—ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ (Lu. 12:10; cf. verse 8). Cf. Jo. 18:11. Some of the examples, like τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ὃ ἤσθενε (Ro. 8:3), may be regarded as accusative as easily as nominative. The \(\text{Page 460}\) papyri\(^5\) show plenty of examples of this suspended nominative. For classical instances see Riemann and Goelzer, Syntaxe, p. 41. For elliptical nominative see Εὐδία (Mt. 16:2). There was a constant tendency in the LXX to drift into the nominative in a long series of words in apposition (Thackeray, p. 23).

\(\text{f) The Parenthetetic Nominative}\) is of a piece with what we have been considering. So in Jo. 1:6 we have ὁνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης all by itself. Cf. 3:1 (Νικόδημος ὁνομα αὐτῷ). Similarly the nominative in expressions of time rather than the accusative may be explained.\(^2\) For example in Mk. 8:2 we read ὅτι ἢ ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσιν μοι and =Mt. 15:32. In Lu. 9:28 ὥσεὶ ἡμέραι ὡκτῶ the matter is

---

\(^1\) See extended discussion in Moulton, Prol., pp. 69, 235. See also note in this Gr. in ch. on Orthog. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 256 f.

\(^2\) Prol., p. 69.

\(^3\) C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 55.

\(^4\) Prol., pp. 69, 225.

repetition is not a mere Hebraism, since the papyri show examples of it. See Eccl. one to
suspect that the nominative form is really vocative, not nominative. Thus
(1 Cor. 6:6). Indeed in Jo. 17:25 we have a prolepsis of the nominative as in 1 Cor. 14:16 (Ro. 12:5), ἀνάχως (Rev. 21:21). Brugmann indeed considers the adverbs πρόσων, διάτομον, etc., in the nominative neuter rather than the accusative neuter singular. He cites
δνεισι as proof. Cf. the use of καὶ τοῦτο (and also καὶ ταῦτα), as καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ἐπίστων (1 Cor. 6:6). But αὐτοῦ τοῦτο (2 Pet. 1:5) is probably accusative. The prolepsis of the nominative as in 1 Cor. 14:16 (ὁ ἀναιληφῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἱδώτου πῶς Ερέθ) is natural. Cf. examples like χρόνος οὐτός in Bœotian inscriptions (Claflin, Syntax, etc., p. 47).

(g) IN EXCLAMATIONS. The nominative is natural in exclamations, a sort of interjectional nominative. So Paul in Ro. 7:24, τυλισσόμεθα ἑλώ ἐνθρωπος, and 11:33, ὁ βάθος (a possible vocative) πλούτου. So. Ro. 7:24; 1 Cor. 15:57. Cf. χάρις τῷ θεῷ (Ro. 6:17). For parallel in papyri see Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 436.

(h) USED AS VOCATIVE. It only remains to consider the nominative form which is used as a vocative. Cf. chapter VII, 7, (a), for details as to form. It all depends on what one means by the term “case” when he says that the nominative is used as a vocative. The form is undoubtedly the same as that of the vocative in a multitude of instances (all neuter nouns, for instance, singular and plural, plural of all nouns in truth). It is only in the singular that any distinction was made between the nominative and vocative in form, and by no means always here, as in the case of feminine nouns of the first declension, θυεός (usually) in the second, liquid oxytones like ποιμήν in the third, etc. But if by the vocative one means the case of address, then the nominative form in address is really vocative, not nominative. Thus σοῦ, πατήρ (Jo. 17:21) is just as truly vocative as σῷ, πάτερ (17:5). Indeed in Jo. 17:25 we have παρῆκε δίκαι, showing that πατήρ is here regarded as vocative. The article with the vocative in

3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 85.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 70; Meisterh., Gr., etc., p. 203.
Claflin CLAFLIN, EDITH, Syntax of Bœotian Dialect Inscriptions (1905).
1 Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 41; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 115 f.
address was the usual Hebrew and Aramaic idiom, as indeed in Aristophanes\(^2\) we have ὁ πατὴρ (Mk. 14:36) whether Jesus said one or both. In Mt. 11:26 (ναί, ὁ πατήρ) we have the vocative. When the article is used, of course the nominative form must occur. Thus in Rev. 18:20 we have both together, οὕρανὲ καὶ οἱ ἄγιοι. Indeed the second member of the address is always in the nominative form.\(^3\) Thus Κύριε, ὁ Θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ (Rev. 15:3). Cf. Jo. 20:28. I shall treat therefore this as really the vocative, not the nominative, whatever the form may be, and now pass on to the consideration of the Vocative Case.

VI. The Vocative (πτώσις κλητική).

(a) Nature of the Vocative. Dionysius Thrax called it also προσαγορευτική, but in reality it is not a case at all. Practically it has to be treated as a case, though technically it is not (Farrar, Greek Syntax, p. 69). It is wholly outside of syntax in that the word is isolated and has no word-relations.\(^4\) The isolation of the vocative may be compared to the absolute use of the nominative, genitive and accusative. The native Sanskrit grammarians do not name it in their list of cases, and Whitney\(^1\) merely treats it in the singular after the other cases. Indeed the vocative is sometimes as much a sentence as a case, since the word stands to itself and forms a complete idea. Thus Μαριὰμ and Ῥαββουνεί (Jo. 20:16) tell the whole story of recognition between Jesus and Mary. When Thomas said Ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου (Jo. 20:28), he gave Christ full acceptance of his deity and of the fact of his resurrection.

(b) Various Devices. The vocative has no case-ending, but has to resort to various expedients. In general it is just like the nominative in form. This is true in all pronouns, participles and various special words like θεός, besides the plurals, neuters and feminines mentioned under V, (h). Cf. the same practical situation in the Sanskrit.\(^2\) Farrar\(^3\) indeed conjectures that originally there was no difference in form at all between the nominative and vocative and that the variation which did come was due to rapid pronunciation in address. Thus πατήρ, but πάτερ. Cf. ἄνερ (1 Cor. 7:16). In most languages there is no distinction in form at all between nominative and

---

2 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 86; Moulton, Prol., p. 70.
3 Riem. and Goelzer, p. 42.
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1 Sans. Gr., p. 89.
2 Whitney, p. 105.
3 Gk. Synt., p. 70.
vocative, and in Latin the distinction is rare.4 It need not be surprising, therefore, to find the nominative form of many singular words used as vocative as noted above under the discussion of the nominative. Moulton5 indeed remarks: “The anarthrous nominative should probably be regarded as a mere substitute for the vocative, which begins from the earliest times to be supplanted by the nominative.” Even in the singular the distinction was only partial and not very stable at best, especially in the vernacular, and gradually broke down till “in modern Greek the forms in ε are practically the only separate vocatives surviving.” Thus Blass6 observes: “From the earliest times (the practice is as old as Homer) the nominative has a tendency to usurp the place of the vocative.” This nominative form in the singular is just as really vocative as in the plural when used in address. The N. T. therefore is merely in line with the oldest Greek idiom in such examples. So θυγάτηρ (Mk. 5:34; Lu. 8:48; Jo. 12:15, LXX, but see θύγατερ in Mt. 9:22. In Jo. 17:21, 24, 25, W. H. read πατήρ, but πάτερ in Jo. 12:28; 17:1, 5, 11, etc. Moulton7 rightly refuses to follow Hort in writing πάτηρ in vocative. [Page 463] In the margin of Mt. 9:27 W. H. read υἱὲ Δαυείδ rather than υἱὸς Δ. Mt. 1:20 has Ισραήλ υἱὸς Δαυείδ, and 15:22 κύριος υἱὸς Δαυείδ, all examples of apposition. Cf. Mt. 20:30. But in Lu. 8:28 and 18:38 we have υἱὸς. The adjective ἀφρων is vocative in Lu. 12:20 and 1 Cor. 15:36. Cf. also γενεὰ ἄπιστος in Lu. 9:41. In Acts 13:10 πλήρης is vocative. Cf. indeclinable use of this word. As is well known θεός was usually retained in the vocative in the older Greek, not θεέ. In the N. T. θεέ only appears in Mt. 27:46 in quotation from the LXX where it is rare.1 Jannaris2 indeed thinks that in the N. T. this idiom is rather frequent. Cf. λαὸς μου in Baruch 4:5. In Ac. 7:42 ὦ κόσμε Ἰσραήλ is vocative (from LXX). Cf. also βάθος πλούτου (Ro. 11:33), not address, but exclamation. When the vocative has a separate form in the singular it is usually merely the stem of the word, like πολῖτα, δοῦλον, λέοντα, etc. But it is more than doubtful if this usage goes back to the original Indo-Germanic stock.3 Cf. βασιλεῦ in Ac. 26:7. In the second declension masculine nouns in the singular show a change in the stem-vowel, α changing to ε. This usage has persisted in modern Greek vernacular in most words; but note θεός above and the variations about υἱός. But see ἄνθρωπος (Ro. 2:1) as usual. In γόνατα (Mt. 15:28) κ has dropped from the stem, as in forms like λέον the τ vanishes for euphony. In θύγατερ and πάτερ the mere stem suffers recessive accent. In Ps. 51:6 (γλῶσσαν δολίαν) we

4 Ib., p. 69.
5 Prol., p. 71.
6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 86.
7 Prol., p. 71. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 158.
1 W.-Sch., p. 258 f.; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 86 f.
3 Delbrück, Syntakt. Forch., IV, p. 28.

JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).
———, On the True Meaning of the Κοινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).
actually have the accusative form used as a vocative. See further discussion in ch. VII (Declensions).

(c) USE OF ο with the VOCATIVE. It is rare in the N. T., only 17 times, all but four of these in Luke and Paul. In Blass-Debrunner, p. 90, the rarity of ο is attributed to the Semitic influence. The common absence of it gives a sort of solemnity where it is found. Moulton observes that it is only in Luke’s writings that it appears in the N. T. without emphasis after the classical fashion. Take as an instance of this literary usage ο Θεόφιλε (Ac. 1:1), but κράτιστε Θεόφιλε in Lu. 1:3. Moulton likewise notes the absence of ο in prayer in the N. T. (though sometimes in the LXX) and considers “the progressive omission of ο” in Greek not easy to explain. It came up from the vernacular and then gradually vanished from the vernacular much as our O has done. Blass notes that in most of the N. T. examples it expresses emotion, as ο γίναι (Mt. 15:28), ο γενεδ άπιστος (Mk. 9:19), ο πλήρης (Ac. 13:10), etc. The tone may be one of censure as in Ro. 2:3; 9:20. But it is a mistake to think that the ancient Greeks always used ο in formal address. Simcox notes that Demosthenes often said άνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι just as Paul did in Ac. 17:22. Paul says ο άνδρες once (Ac. 27:21). But the addresses in the N. T. are usually without ο (cf. Ac. 7:2).

(d) ADJECTIVES USED WITH THE VOCATIVE naturally have the same form. Thus ο άνθρωπε κενέ (Jas. 2:20), δοῦλε πονηρέ (Mt. 18:32), πάτερ ἄγιο (Jo. 17:11), κράτιστε Θεόφιλε (Lu. 1:3). In Jo. 17:25 we read πατὴρ δίκαιε, clearly showing that πατὴρ was regarded as a true vocative form. In Lu. 9:41 ο γενεδ άπιστος the substantive has the same form in nominative and vocative and the adjective here follows suit. Cf. also Ac. 13:10; Lu. 12:20 where the adjective alone in the vocative has nominative form.

4 C. and S., Sel. from the Sept., p. 56.
6 Prol., p. 71.
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(e) APPOSITION TO THE VOCATIVE. The nominative forms and distinctive vocative forms are freely used side by side, in apposition, etc., when the case is vocative.⁴ In Mt. 1:20 we have Ἰωσήφ ὦ ἱός Δαυείδ, and in 15:22 W. H. read in the text κύριε ὦ ἱός Δαυείδ. Cf. also Mt. 20:30. So κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ (Rev. 15:3), and ὦ ἄνθρωπε, πάτερ ὦ κρίνων (Ro. 2:1). In the last instance the participle and article naturally are unchanged. See again ὡρανὲ καὶ ὡρανοῦ, etc. (Rev. 18:20). Cf. also πάτερ ἡ ὄντως ὦ ἁγιοι, etc. (Mt. 6:9). So κύριε μου πατήρ, B.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). But two vocative forms are put together also. So Ἰησοῦ ὦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (Lu. 8:28), πάτερ κύριε τοῦ ὦρανοῦ (10:21), Ἡροδοῦ ὄ Δαυείδ (18:38). In Ac. 13:10 the nominative form is followed by two vocative forms, ὦ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου κτλ., ὦ διαβόλου, ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης. But πλήρης may be here indeclinable. There is a distinct tendency among the less educated writers in the papyri to use the nominative as a convenient indeclinable (Moulton, Cl. Rev., April, 1904). So τῆς ἐπιτήρησις, N. P. 38 (iii/A.D.).

(f) VOCATIVE IN PREDICATE. The vocative is rarely found in the predicate, though not grammatical predicate. This was occasionally [Page 465] the case in the older Greek by a sort of attraction to a real vocative in the sentence.¹ But in the N. T. we only have a few examples in the nature of quotation or translation. So in Jo. 1:38, Ῥαββεί, ὃ λέγεται ἔμθεθεν ἐμον ἐνον Διδάσκαλε; 20:16 Ῥαββουνεί, ὃ λέγεται Διδάσκαλε.

(g) THE ARTICLE WITH THE VOCATIVE. This idiom is frequent in the N. T., some 60 examples.² It is a good Greek idiom and not infrequent.³ Delbrück⁴ finds it in harmony with the Indo-Germanic languages. Moulton⁵ denies that the coincident Hebrew and Aramaic use of the article in address had any influence on the N. T. But one must admit that the LXX translators would be tempted to use this Greek idiom very frequently, since the Hebrew had the article in address.⁶ Cf. 3 Ki. 17:20, 21, etc. In Mk. 5:41 the Aramaic Ταλειθά is translated τὸ κοράσιον. One is therefore bound to allow some influence to the Hebrew and Aramaic.⁷ Cf. also Ἀββά ὁ πατήρ in Mk. 14:36, Gal. 4:6, and Ro. 8:15. It is doubtless true that ἤ παῖς ἔγερε (Lu. 8:54) has a touch of tenderness, and that τὸ μικρὸν ποιμῶν (Lu. 12:32) means ‘you little flock.’ But one can hardly see such familiarity in ὁ πατήρ (Mt. 11:26). But in Mk. 9:25 there may be a sort of insistence in the article, like ‘Thou dumb and deaf spirit’ (τὸ ὄλολον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα). Even here the Aramaic, if Jesus used it, had the article. Moulton⁸ considers that βασιλεῖ in Ac. 26:7 admits the royal prerogative in a way that would be inappropriate in the mockery of Jesus in Jo. 19:3 ζημίζε, ὃ βασιλεῖς τῶν
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7 Moulton in a note (p. 235) does concede some Aram. influence. In Hebrews it only occurs, as he notes, in O. T. citations. Cf. also Dalman, Gr., p. 118.
Ἰουδαίων). But Mk. 15:18 does have βασιλεὺ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, due, according to Moulton, to “the writer’s imperfect sensibility to the more delicate shades of Greek idiom.” Possibly so, but may not the grammarian be guilty of slight overrefinement just here? In Mt. 27:29 the text of W. H. has βασιλεὺ while the margin reads ὁ βασιλεὺς. In Rev. 15:3 we have ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων. In Heb. 1:8 it is not certain whether (ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ θεός) ὁ θεός is vocative or nominative. But ὁ δεσπότης ὁ ἄγιος καὶ ἀληθινός (Rev. 6:10) is vocative. As examples of participles in the vocative take ὁ καταλύων (Mt. 27:40) and ὁ ἑπεπλησένεν (Lu. 6:25). In Rev. 4:11 we have also the vocative case in ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεός. In Jo. 20:28 Thomas addresses Jesus as ὁ κύριος μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου, the vocative like those above. Yet, strange to say, Winer calls this exclamation rather than address, apparently to avoid the conclusion that Thomas was satisfied as to the deity of Jesus by his appearance to him after the resurrection. Dr. E. A. Abbott follows suit also in an extended argument to show that κύριε ὁ θεός is the LXX way of addressing God, not ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεός. But after he had written he appends a note to p. 95 to the effect that “this is not quite satisfactory. For xiii. 13, φωνεῖ ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος, and Rev. 4:11 ἄξιος ἢ, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεός ημῶν, ought to have been mentioned above.” This is a manly retraction, and he adds: “John may have used it here exceptionally.” Leave out “exceptionally” and the conclusion is just. If Thomas used Aramaic he certainly used the article. It is no more exceptional in Jo. 20:28 than in Rev. 4:11.

 VII. The Accusative (ἡ ἀρτιατικὴ πτῶσις).

(a) The Name. It signifies little that is pertinent. Varro calls it accusandi casus from αἰτῶμαι, while Dionysius Thrax explains it as κατ ἀρτίαν (‘cause’), a more likely idea. Glycas calls it also τὸ αἴτιον. So Priscian terms it causativus. Gildersleeve (“A Syntactician among the Psychologists,” Am. Jour. Philol., Jan., 1910, p. 76) remarks: “The Romans took the bad end of αἴτια, and translated αρτιατική, accusativus—hopeless stupidity, from which grammar did not emerge till 1836, when Trendelenburg showed that αρτιατικὴ πτῶσις means casus effectivus, or causativus... The object affected appears in Greek now as an accusative, now as a dative, now as a genitive. The object affected refuses to give its glory to another, and the object affected can be subsumed under the object effected.” With this I agree. Cf. Farrar, Greek Syntax, p. 81. Old English “accuse” could mean ‘betray’ or ‘show,’ but the “showing” case does not mark it off from the rest. Originally, however, it was the only case and thus did show the relations of nouns with other words. On the small
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(b) AGE AND HISTORY. A more pertinent point is the age and history of the accusative, the oldest of all the cases. Farrar (Greek Syntax, p. 81) calls attention to the fact that ἐγών (old form of ἐγώ), Sanskrit aham, tvām, Bœotian τούν, Latin idem, all have the [Page 467] accusative ending though in the nominative. If it is true that the accusative is the oldest case, perhaps we are to think of the other oblique cases as variations from it. In other words the accusative was the normal oblique case for a noun (especially with verbs) unless there was some special reason for it to be in another case. The other oblique cases were developed apparently to express more exactly than the accusative the various word-relations. Indeed in the vernacular Greek the accusative retained its old frequency as the normal case with verbs that in the literary style used other cases. In the old Greek poets the same thing is noticeable. Pindar, for example, has “a multiplicity of accusatives.” In the modern Greek vernacular the accusative has regained its original frequency to the corresponding disuse of the other oblique cases. Cf. Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 35. “When a fine sense for language is failing, it is natural to use the direct accusative to express any object which verbal action affects, and so to efface the difference between ‘transitive’ and ‘intransitive’ verbs.” There was therefore first a decrease in the use of the accusative as the literary language grew, then an increase in the κοινή vernacular, the later Greek, and especially the modern Greek vernacular. This gain or rather persistence of the accusative in the vernacular is manifest in the N. T. in various ways. But the literary κοινή shows it also, as Krebs has carefully worked out with many verbs.

(c) THE MEANING OF THE ACCUSATIVE. It is not so easy to determine this in the view of many scholars. Delbrück despairs of finding a single unifying idea, but only special types of the accusative. Brugmann also admits that the real ground-idea of the case is unknown, though the relation between noun and verb is expressed by it. The categories are not always sharply defined in the soul of the speaker. Hübschmann
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treats the expansion [Page 468] of the verb as the ground-idea of the accusative. “The relation of the accusative to its governing verb resembles the relation of the genitive to its governing substantive.”¹ La Roche² considers it originally a local case and that the inner meaning came later. The usage of the accusative can indeed, for convenience, be divided into the outer (οἰκίαν, Mt. 7:24) and the inner (Ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν, Mk. 4:41) usage. But the whole case cannot be discussed on this artificial principle, as Monro³ rightly sees. He sees hope only in the direction of the wide adverbial use of the accusative. In the Sanskrit certainly “a host of adverbs are accusative cases in form.”⁴ Green⁵ calls it “the limitative case,” and he is not far out of the way. Farrar⁶ thinks that “motion towards” explains it all. Giles⁷ while recognising all the difficulties, defines the accusative as the answer to the question “How far?” The word extension comes as near as any to expressing the broad general idea of the accusative as applied to its use with verbs, substantives, adjectives, prepositions. It is far more commonly used with verbs, to be sure, but at bottom the other uses have this same general idea. Being the first case it is naturally the most general in idea. If you ask a child (in English) “Who is it?” he will reply “It’s me.” This is, however, not a German idiom. The accusative measures an idea as to its content, scope, direction. But the accusative was used in so many special applications of this principle that various subdivisions became necessary for intelligent study.

(d) WITH VERBS OF MOTION. It is natural to begin with verbs of motion, whether we know that this was the earliest use or not, a matter impossible to decide. We still in English say “go home,” and the Latin used domum in exactly that way. Extension over space is, of course, the idea here. One goes all the way to his home. It is found in Homer and occasionally in Greek writers.⁸ Modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 37, has a local accusative) πάμε σπίτι, ‘we are going home.’ Moulton (Prol., p. 61) notes that it is just the local cases that first lost their distinctive forms (ablative, locative, associative-instrumental); and the “terminal accusative” like ire Romam disappeared also. “The surviving Greek [Page 469] cases thus represent purely grammatical relations, those of subject, object, possession, remoter object and instrument.” The
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place-adverb does supply the place of the terminal accusative, but not entirely of the locative, ablative and instrumental.

Some MSS. in Ac. 27:2 read πλείν τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους, but the best (W. H.) have eis after πλείν. In ὑπεπλέονσαμεν τὴν Κύπρον and τὸ πέλαγος διαπλέοντες (cf. English “sail the sea”), verses 4 f., the prepositions in composition help to explain the case. In Mt. 4:15 ὁ δὸν θαλάσσης has no verb of motion and comes in the midst of vocatives in a way quite startling. Green refers to the LXX (Is. 9:1) for the explanation and quotes “Christ and Him Crucified.” But the LXX gives little relief, for, while B does not have it, several MSS. do and without a verb. B however reads ὁ ἡ παραλίαν, which presents the same difficulty as to case. Winer suggests ὁ ἡ κυρίως with ὁ δὸν, possibly correct. But even in Matthew the writer may have had in mind the general accusative notion of extension, ‘along the way of the sea.’

(c) Extent of Space. The ordinary accusative for extent of space does not differ materially from that of motion above. Here the root-idea of the case is easily perceived apart from the force of the verb. The point is that this is not a special development of the accusative, but is the normal idea of the case, extension. The application to space is natural. The Greek continues all along to have this idiom as the Latin and English. The adverb μακρὰν (Ac. 22:21) is a good example. Take Jo. 6:19 ἐληλακότες ὡς σταδίους πέντε ἢ τριάκοντα. The accusative tells “how far.” Observe in Lu. 2:44 ἥλθον ἡμέρας δὸν. Προσερχόμενοι μετ’ ὧν ἤστη λίθου βολήν. The accusative is used for duration or extension in the Indo-Germanic languages generally. Cf. τί ὡς ἡ θέλησεν ἡμέραν ἡ ἡμέραν ἡ ἡμέραν ἐκείνην (Jo. 1:39). Cf. Jo. 2:12; 11:6. In Lu. 1:75 W. H. (text) reads οἰκονομίας τῆς ἡμέρας (instr.). Another good illustration is ἔρθησαν χρόνους ικανούς (Lu. 20:9). Cf. ἔρθησαν τὴν ἡμέραν (Mt. 20:2) where the accusative well brings out the agreement between the landlord and the labourers. In νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν (Mk. 4:27) the sleeping and rising go on continually from day to day. Cf. ἡμέραν ἔτος ἡμέρας (2 Pet. 2:8). The papyri examples are numerous, like τόκους διδράχμους τῆς

Perhaps little difficulty is felt in the accusative in Ac. 24:25, τὸ νῦν ἔχον πορεύοντο. So also as to τὸ λουπόν (or λουπόν) in Mk. 14:41, τὸ πλείστον (1 Cor. 14:27), and even ἐνεκποτόμην τὰ πολλά (Ro. 15:22). But there are uses of the accusative in expressions of time that do furnish trouble at first blush. In some of these the accusative seems to be merely adverbal (Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 94) with little stress on duration. Indeed a point of time may be indicated. Cf. τὸ πρῶτον (Jo. 6:62), πρῶτον (Heb. 10:32), πρῶτον (Mt. 5:24). It is not hard to see how the accusative of general reference came to be used here, although it is a point of time. Note the article (τὸ καθ’ ἠμέραν, Lu. 19:47) in the accusative. We can now go on to τὸ τέλος (1 Pet. 3:8) and even τὴν ἡμέραν (Jo. 8:25). But a more difficult example is found in Jo. 4:52, ἔχον ἡμέραν ἐβδομήνυμ, where a point of time is indicated. See also ποιαν ἡμέραν in Rev. 3:3; πᾶσαν ἡμέραν (1 Cor. 15:30). One may conjecture that this use of ἡμέραν was not regarded as essentially different from the idea of extension. Either the action was regarded as going over the hour or the hour was looked at more as an adverbial accusative like τὸ λουπόν above. Cf. also τὴν ἠμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς γενέσθαι εἰς Ἴσοσῦλαμμα (Ac. 20:16). In Blass-Debrunner, p. 98, examples are given from Ἀεσχύλου, Euripides, Aristotle, Demosthenes, where ἡμέραν = εἰς ἡμέραν. Cf. Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 63, for τὸ πέμπτον ἐτῶς (O.P. 477, ii/A.D.) ‘in the fifth year.’ Tὸ παρόν Β. U. 22 (ii/A.D.) means ‘at present’ (Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, 1901, p. 437). In the modern Greek vernacular the accusative is used freely to designate a point of time as well as extent of time *Page 471* (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 37). So in the N. T. the accusative is widening its scope again. In Ac. 10:30 ὀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας ἡμιν τὴν ἐνάτην προσενύχθημεν we can see an interesting example where τὴν ἐνάτην is explanatory of the previous note of time, a point of time, and yet a whole hour is meant. In Ac. 10:3 (περὶ ἡμέραν ἐνάτην) observe περὶ, though some MSS. do not have the preposition. Cf. Mk. 13:35 μεσονύκτιον (acc.) ἡ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας (gen.) ἤ προῖ (loc.) for points of time.¹ The papyri have examples of a point of time in the accusative,² as already seen. But the locative is still more frequent in the N. T. for a point of time, as ποῖαν ἡμέραν ἡμέραν προσδοκόκτοντες ἄστιτοι διατελέστε (Ac. 27:33). It is good Greek with the ordinal.

(g) With Transitive Verbs. The most common accusative is when it is the object of a transitive verb. One cannot hope to pursue all the uses of the accusative in the order of historical development. For instance, no one knows whether cognate accusative (of inner content or objective result) preceded the ordinary objective use of the case. Does the adverbial accusative (so common in adjectives) precede the accusative with verbs? These points have to be left unsettled. In actual usage the accusative with transitive verbs calls for most attention. But the term “transitive” needs a word. It means a verb whose action passes over to a noun. This idea may be

¹ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 311.
intransitive in another language, as, for instance, μὴ ὃμιλεῖτε μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν (Jas. 5:12). In English ομιλέω is rendered by ‘speak to.’ Cf. ἔργαζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρέσαν (Jo. 6:27), English ‘work for.’ Not all Greek verbs are transitive, as εἰμί, for example. The same verb may be used now transitively, now intransitively, as ἔχειν ημᾶς (Ac. 20:5) and ἔχειν παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς (Ac. 18:3). So ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ (Mt. 6:4) and τί δέ βλέπεις τῷ κάρφῳ (Mt. 7:3). Cf. English word “see.” As further illustration of the freedom of the Greek verb note βλέπετε τί ὄκουετε (Mk. 4:24), βλέπετε τοὺς κόνις (Ph. 3:2), βλέπετε ἄπο τῆς ᾠνής (Mk. 8:15). There is indeed a difference between the accusative and the use of a preposition as in φεύγετε τὴν πορείαν (1 Cor. 6:18) and φεύγετε ἄπο τῆς εἴδολολατρείας (1 Cor. 10:14).

[Page 472] But for practical purposes many Greek verbs were used with liberty. In the case of φοβερομαι with accus. (Mt. 10:26, 28) or with ἄπο and ablative (Mt. 10:28) we have a Hebraism. Moulton (Prol., p. 102) admits that this use of ἄπο is a “translation-Hebraism” (תָּחָרִים). Cf. διήρχεσθε τῇ ἔρευν (Lu. 12:15) and ὄρθεστε καὶ προσέχετε ἄπο (Mt. 16:6). Xen. (Cyr., 11. 3, 9) uses ἄπο with φιλάσσω. This matter will call for further discussion directly.

But we have (pp. 330 f.) observed that transitive verbs in Greek do not always have the accusative. The transitivity may be as clearly expressed by a dative as with ἄκολουθέω, the genitive with ἐπιθυμέω, the ablative with ἄποστερέω, etc. The accusative is indeed the normal case with transitive verbs, but not the only one. Some verbs continued to use the accusative parallel with the other cases. Thus ἐπιλανθάνομαι has τὸ μὲν ὀπίσω in Ph. 3:13, but φιλάξυνας in Heb. 13:2. Sometimes the point lies in the difference of case, as ἄκολουθες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς (Ac. 9:7), but τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν (Ac. 22:9). Then again verbs otherwise intransitive may be rendered transitive by the preposition in composition. Cf. διήρχετο τὴν Ἱερείαν (Lu. 19:1), but ἔχεινς in 19:4. So παραπλεῦσαι τὴν ἔρευν (Ac. 20:16), etc. Another introductory remark about transitive verbs is that it is not a question of the voice of the verb. Many active verbs are intransitive like εἰμί; middle verbs may be either transitive or intransitive; even passive verbs may be transitive. Thus ἤκουσαν ταῦτα (Lu. 16:14), ἐκτίσσατο χορίν (Ac. 1:18), and μὴ οὖν φοβηθήτε αὐτοῦ (Mt. 10:26) are all transitive constructions. Cf. Mk. 8:38; Ro. 1:16; 2 Tim. 1:8 for ἐπαισχύνομαι (passive) with accusative.

One cannot, of course, mention all the N. T. transitive verbs that have the accusative. Here is a list of the most frequent verbs that are not always transitive, but sometimes have the accusative. ἄδικέω indeed may be either transitive (Mt. 20:13) or intransitive (Ac. 25:11), in the one case meaning ‘do wrong to,’ in the other ‘be guilty.’ Βλάπτω (only twice in the N. T., Mk. 16:18; Lu. 4:35) is transitive both times. Βορθέω has only dative ( Mk. 9:22) and ἄφαγεσθε only accusative (Mk. 8:36). In Lu. 17:2 we have ἀνεστηλεύῃ αὐτῶν. Ἀπορεῖμαι is always intransitive in the N. T. (like ἀπετρέψαμαι). Ἀποστρέφομαι as in Attic is found with the accusative in Tit. 1:14 and Heb. 12:25. In 2 Tim. 1:15 the aorist passive [Page 473] (ἀπεστράφησάν με) is so used. For like use of the aorist or future
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passive with accusative see ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱὸν μου (Mt. 21:37), where the earlier writers generally had dative (Ἐντρέπομαι); ἔπαισινομαί με (Mk. 8:38) from ἔπαισινομαι, whereas ἄγαγομαι is intransitive (ἐπό and abl. in 1 Jo. 2:28). So also οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη (Mk. 15:5) as οὐδὲν ἀπερίσκητο (Mt. 27:12), but note ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς οὐδὲν ἐν ῥήμα (Mt. 27:14). Cf. τί ἀποκρίθη (Mk. 9:6). For φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς see Mt. 10:26 and note φοβηθῆτε ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων (10:28) which happens to be in imitation of the Hebrew idiom (יִדוּ) as of the English “be afraid of.” (Cf. above.) See Jer. 1:8. In Mt. 10:31 φοβεῖσθε is intransitive.

Βασκαίνω in Attic Greek was used with the dative in the sense of ‘envy,’ but in Gal. 3:1 the accusative in the sense of ‘bewitch.’ ἐλασφημέω in the Attic had εἰς as in Lu. 12:10, but it also occurs as transitive with accusative (Mt. 27:39). In 2 Pet. 2:12 we find ἐν, not εἰς (cf. Jude 10). Ἐπηρεάζω has the accusative, not dative as Attic, in Lu. 6:28; 1 Pet. 3:16. So καταράομαι has ὑμᾶς (some MSS. ὑμῖν like Attic) in Lu. 6:28. Cf. Mk. 11:21; Jas. 3:9. For λοισβαρέω with accusative see Jo. 9:28; Ac. 23:4, and for λοισβαρόμαι see Ac. 8:3. The MSS. vary in Heb. 8:8 between αὐτοῦς and αὐτοῖς (as in Attic) with μέμφομαι, but W. H. read αὐτοὺς. In Mt. 5:11 and 27:44 ὄνειδιζω has the accusative, though Attic used the dative. The accusative alone occurs with ὑπερίζω (Lu. 11:45). So also both εὑρογεῖω (Lu. 2:28) and κακολογεῖο (Ac. 19:9) have the accusative. In Ac. 23:5 οὐκ ἔρεις κακῶς is found with the accusative. In the margin of Jo. 1:15 W. H. give ὑπὸ τοῦ. In Jo. 8:27 we have τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν, with which compare οὗς ἔλεγον (Ph. 3:18), a construction common in the older Greek. A similar construction is found in Attic Greek with εὗ (καλῶςς) ποιέω, κακῶς ποιέω, etc. In the N. T., however, note αὐτοῖς εὗ ποιεῖν (Mk. 14:7) and καλῶςς ποιητε τοῖς μισοῦσιν (Lu. 6:27).

The remaining verbs that call for discussion in this connection cannot be grouped very well. They will be treated simply in alphabetical order. In the LXX γεόμαι is fairly common with the accusative, and some examples occur in other later writers instead of the usual genitive. In the N. T. the genitive is still the usual case (θανατοῦ, Lu. 9:27; Jo. 8:52; Heb. 2:9; δείπνου, Lu. 14:24; δοκέω, Heb. 6:4; μεθένω, Ac. 23:14), but the accusative is found in Jo. 2:9 (τὸ ὕδωρ) and Heb. 6:5 (καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα). In Rev. 17:3 we even have γέμοντα ὁνόματα instead of ἰνομάτων. The accusative appears with γονυπετέω (Mk. 10:17), but absolutely in Mk. 1:40, and with ἐγκρύθην in Mt. 27:29. In Rev. 2:14 διδάσκω has the dative (τῶ βαλάκ), a construction which might a priori seem natural with this verb, but not so used in Greek (cf. Latin and English). Δυσάω and πεινάω are intransitive in the N. T. save in Mt. 5:6 where the accusative is used, not the class. genitive. Δράσομαι appears only once (1 Cor. 3:19) in a quotation from the LXX and has the accusative. ἔλεσθαι is transitive (Mt. 9:27, etc.) as is οἰκτέρω (Ro. 9:15, quotation from LXX). ἐμπορεύομαι occurs only twice, once intransitive (Jas. 4:13), once with accusative (2

1 Völker, Pap. Gr. Synt. Spec., pp. 6–8, gives the following verbs as having the acc. in the pap.: ὀλλάσσω, δουλεύω, ἔπιθυμέω, ἔπιθυμησάω, ἐπιλανθάνομαι, ἐξέρχομαι, εὐδοκεῖο, κατηγορέω, κρατέω, κυριεύω, λυπέω, παρίσταμαι, πορεύομαι, πληρόω, ὑπαντάω, χράομαι, etc.
1 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 80.
Pet. 2:3). Ἐνεδρεύω likewise occurs only twice (Lu. 11:54; Ac. 23:21) and with accusative both times. Cf. O.P. 484 (ii/A.D.) in sense of “defraud” with accusative. (Moulton, Cl. Rev., Apr., 1904). Ἡπιθυμέω is found with the genitive (Ac. 20:33) or with the accusative (Mt. 5:28) according to W. H. (BD, etc.). Ἐγγάζομαι is often transitive, but τὴν ἁλάσσαν ἐγγάζονται (Rev. 18:17) is somewhat unusual, to say the least. Ἐναγγελίζομαι (active in Rev. 10:7; 14:6; passive Gal. 1:11; Heb. 4:6, etc.) has the Attic idiom of accusative of the thing and dative of the person (Lu. 4:43; Eph. 3:8, etc.), but examples occur of the accusative of the person addressed (Lu. 3:18; Ac. 8:25). In Ac. 13:32 Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 90 note) denies two accusatives to ἐλεγείαν, construing τὴν—ἐπαγγελίαν with ὁ τιταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν. This is rather forced, but even so the ὁ τι clause would be in the accus. Ἐποδέκεο is trans. in the LXX and so appears in the N. T. twice (Mt. 12:18, quotation from the LXX; Heb. 10:6, 8, LXX also). Ἐχαριστεῖο in 2 Cor. 1:11 occurs in the passive (τὸ χάρισμα ἐχαριστηθή) in a construction that shows that the active would have had an accusative of the thing and a dative of the person. Cf., for instance, πλεονεκτηθῶμεν in 2 Cor. 2:11 with ἐπελευνήθησα ὑμᾶς (2 Cor. 12:17 f.), only ἐλεγικότα does not go so far as to have the accusative. On the other hand in the N. T. ἑρείπω is not transitive (2 Cor. 10:2 instr.), though in the older Greek it was sometimes. It occurs absolutely (2 Cor. 5:6), with ἐκ (2 Cor. 7:16), with ἐπὶ (2 Cor. 10:1). Ῥωμαίοι is accusative in Lu. 7:9, Ac. 7:31 and Ju. 16. Ἐραμβευὤ has the accusative in 2 Cor 2:14 and Col. 2:15, though the verb has a different sense in each passage. Ἐρούργηὤ occurs only once (Ro. 15:16) and with the accusative. In Heb. 2:17 Ἰλάσκομαι has accusative of the

[Page 475] thing as in LXX, Philo and inscriptions (Blass, Gr. of N. T., p. 88). Καυχάομαι has accusative in 2 Cor. 9:2 and 11:30. Κλαίω has accusative in Mt. 2:18 (O. T. quotation unlike LXX), but ἐπὶ in Lu. 23:28. However, D omits ἐπὶ. Κληρονομεύὤ has only the accusative. Ῥχτσύμα has accusative in Lu. 8:52 (Ἐπὶ Rev. 1:7). Ἐρατείὤ out of forty-seven instances in the N. T. has the genitive in eight, accusative in 37, one absolute, one τοῦ and inf.1 Μαθητεύὤ is a late word and has the accusative in Mt. 28:19 and Ac. 14:21. The other examples (Mt. 13:52; 27:57) are passive, but in Mt. 27:57 the active (intr.) is the marginal reading of W. H. Cf. old English verb “disciple.” Μέρισῳ has the accusative, not dative, in Heb. 8:8, but the text is doubtful. Μένω is usually intransitive, but in Ac. 20:5, 23, the accusative occurs (sense of “wait for”). Cf. also accusative with ὠνακέων (1 Th. 1:10), παραμένω (Ac. 1:4), ὑπομένων (Heb. 10:32) in sense of “endure.” Νεκρῶ is transitive accusative, but in Rev. 15:2 it uses ἐκ with ablative. So ξενίζομαι is transitive accusative in Heb. 13:2. Ὀμνυμ铕 usually has ἐν (Mt. 23:16, etc., cf. Hebrew ו), sometimes κατά (Heb. 6:13), or occurs absolutely (Mt. 5:34), but the accusative (sense of “swear by,” common in ancient Greek, cf. Hos. 4:15 for LXX) appears only in Jas. 5:12, except ὁ ὄρκον ὃν ὑμόσεν (Lu. 1:73), a cognate accusative. The papyri show it with the accusative, B.U. 543 (i/b.c.). Moulton, Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901. ὉνυβιζHover the accusative, not the dative, in the N. T. Ὀρκίζὤ has the accusative in both instances that occur in the N. T. (Mk. 5:7; Ac. 19:13), while ἔξωρκίζὤ (Mt. 26:63) has the accusative and κατὰ also (σὲ κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ). Ὀμολογῶ is common with the accusative or absolutely, but in Mt. 10:32 (two examples) and Lu. 12:8 (two

---

1 Moulton (ib., p. 235) comments on Wellhausen’s remark that D prefers uniformly acc. with ὁ δικεῖον, κατηγορεῖο and κατεταίρω.
examples) ἐν is used as the translation of the Aramaic กระเป๋า. Moulton is unable to find any justification for this idiom in Greek and calls attention to the fact that both Matthew and Luke have it in a parallel passage as proof of the Aramaic original as the language of Jesus. One may note περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἰματίοις (Rev. 3:5). The use of ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο (Ac. 15:7) is not parallel as Winer observes. Here ἐν ἡμῖν means 'among us.' In Ac. 27:22 παραινέω (like παρακαλέω, Blass, Gr. of N. T., p. 90) has the accusative instead of the dative of the person. In 2 Cor. 12:21 πενθέω has the accusative, but ἐπί in Rev. 18:11. Moulton (Prol., p. 67 f.) has a very helpful discussion of πιστεύω [Page 476] when not absolute and not meaning ‘entrust.’ Under the dative his remarks will be pertinent. Πιστεύω is absolute (Mt. 19:20) and often means ‘entrust’ when it has the accusative (Jo. 1:50) and often means ‘entrust’ when it has the dative (Jo. 2:24). Προσκυνέω in the ancient Greek uses the accusative regularly. In the Ptolemaic inscriptions the accusative is still the more usual case, but the N. T. uses the dative twice as often as the accusative. In Jo. 4:23 the accusative and the dative occur with little difference in result. Cf. also Rev. 13:4, 8. Abbott observes that the dative is the regular usage in the LXX. As to ὑστερέω we find it used absolutely (Mt. 19:20), with the ablative (Ro. 3:23) and once with the accusative (ἐν σε ὑπερέβη, Mk. 10:21) as in Ps. 22:1. Some of the MSS. in Mark have οἱ, as the LXX usually. Φεύγω occurs absolutely (Mt. 2:13), with ἄπο (Mt. 23:33), with ἐκ (Ac. 27:30) or with the accusative (Heb. 11:34; 1 Tim. 6:11). So ἐκφεύγω is transitive (Lu. 21:36) with accusative while ἀποφεύγω has accusative in 2 Pet. 2:20. Φυλάσσω has, of course, the accusative, but in Ac. 21:25 two accusatives occur with the sense of ‘shun.’ In Lu. 12:15 the middle is used with ἄπο and in 1 Jo. 5:21 φυλάζετε ἑαυτᾶ ὑπό. Χράομαι still uses the instrumental (cf. utor in Latin), as Ac. 27:3, 17, etc., but in 1 Cor. 7:31 the accusative is found (χράομεν τὸν κόσμον) in response to the general accusative tendency. Cf. καταχράμενοι in the same verse. The accusative with χράομαι appears in later writers.

It remains in this connection to call special attention to the intransitive verbs which have the accus. by reason of a preposition in composition. This applies to intrans. verbs and trans. verbs also which in simplex used some other case. Ἀνά furnishes one example in ἄνα-θάλλο (Ph. 4:10) if τὸ φρονεῖν there is the object of the verb after the transitive use in the LXX (Ezek. 17:24). But most probably this is the accusative of general reference. Ἀνέπλησσο (Lu. 6:35) is indeed transitive with accusative, but so is ἐπίλείψο (1 Cor. 13:7; 2 Cor. 1:13, etc.) sometimes. Here are some examples of διά: τὸ πέλαγος διαπλέσαντες (Ac. 27:5), διεπορεύοντο τὰς πόλεις (Ac. 16:4), διελθον τὴν Μακεδονίαν (Ac. 19:21; cf. acc. in Lu. 19:1 and gen. ἐκεῖνης in 19:4). In Heb. 11:29 (διεβήσαν τὴν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς) Blass notes both accusative and genitive (with διὰ). Even ἔνεργέω has the accusative in 1 Cor. 12:6,
11. As examples of κατά observe καταβάρησα ύμᾶς (2 Cor. 12:16), [Page 477] ύμᾶς καταβραβευέτο (Col. 2:18), κατηγορίσαντο βασιλεῖα (Heb. 11:33). Note also κατασυνιστάμενος τῷ γένος (Ac. 7:19). Cf. καταφρονοῦντος in 1 Cor. 7:31, but instrumental in 1 Cor. 9:18. For παρά note παραβαίνετε τόν ἐντολήν (Mt. 15:3) and παρέχοντες τόν κρίσιν (Lu. 11:42; cf. 15:29 and Mk. 6:48). Peri furnishes several examples like δόξαν γνᾶθα περίμοι (1 Cor. 9:5; cf. Mt. 9:35, etc.), but intransitive in Mt. 4:23. This verb, ὅγο, however, is both transitive (Mt. 21:7) and intransitive (Mt. 1:38) in the simple form. Περιερχόμεναι has the accusative in 1 Tim. 5:13, but elsewhere intransitive. So περίστεςαν αὐτόν in Ac. 25:7, but intransitive (περιστετάτο) in Jo. 11:42. In Mk. 6:55 we find περιέδραμον ὅλην τέν χώραν. With πρό one notes προὰγο (Mt. 14:22, προάγειν αὐτός (Lu. 22:47), with which compare προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (Lu. 1:17). In Ac. 12:10 both διέρχομαι and προάγομαι are used with the accusative. Προσφωνέω, like προσκυνέω, has either the accusative (Lu. 6:13) or the dative (Mt. 11:16). If ὁ θεός be accepted in Ro. 8:28 (πάντα συνεργεῖ ὁ θεός), which is more than doubtful, then συνεργεῖ would be transitive (cf. instr. in Jas. 2:22). For ὑπέρ observe ὑπερεκτείνωμεν ἑαυτοὺς (2 Cor. 10:14) and ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν (Ph. 4:7). With ὑπό we can mention ὑπομένον (1 Cor. 13:7, but see μένου itself), ὑπεξεύθεσαν τόν Κρήτην (Ac. 27:7) and νησίον δὲ τι ὑποδραμόντες (Ac. 27:16). Thus it will be seen that in the N. T. the accusative with transitive verbs, both simple and compound, follows the increase in the use of the accusative in line with the current vernacular.

Sometimes indeed the object of the verb is not expressed, but really implied, and the verb is transitive. Thus προσέχετε ἑαυτοὺς (Lu. 17:3) implies τὸν νοῦν. Cf. also προσέχετε ἅπα τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν (Mt. 7:15) and ἐπέρχοντο τῶς (Lu. 14:7); κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχον (1 Cor. 11:4). In ἐπιθύμεται σοι (Ac. 18:10) χεῖρας must be supplied, and with διέτριβον (Ac. 15:35) χρόνον is needed.

(h) THE COGNATE ACCUSATIVE. It may be either that of inner content, ἐξάρησαν χαράν (Mt. 2:10), objective result ἐμαρτάνοντα ἐμαρτάνει (1 Jo. 5:16), φυλάσσοντες φυλακάς (Lu. 2:8), or even a kindred word in idea but a different root, as διαρήσατα ὁλίγας (πληγάς, Lu. 12:48). Considerable freedom must thus be given the term “cognate” as to both form and idea. The real cognate accusative is a form of the Figura Etymologica as applied to either internal or external object. The quasi-cognate is due to analogy where the idea, not the form, is cognate.¹ The cognate is not very common in the papyri,¹ but in the Hebrew the idiom is very frequent.² It is perfectly good Greek to have³ this “playing with paronymous terms,” as a passage from Plato’s Protagoras 326 D illustrates, ὑπογράφαντες γραμμάς τῇ γραφοῖ ὁμοίῳ τῷ γραμματέσκειν. Cf. τίς σωμαίνει σοί (1 Cor. 13:7). So also in Lu. 8:5, ἔξηλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπέρματος. Gildersleeve (Am. Jour. of Philol., xxxiii, 4, p. 488) objects properly to Cauer’s crediting, in his Grammatica Militans, the division of the

---

¹ Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 304.
³ C. and S., Sel. from the Sept., p. 56.
⁴ Ib., p. 57.
⁵ Cauer CAUER, Grammatica Militans. 3d ed. (1912).
accusative into the object affected and the object effected” to Kern, since Gildersleeve himself was using it as far back as 1867. In modern English this repetition of the same root is condemned, but it was not so in Greek. Conybeare and Stock\(^4\) observe that the Hebrew and the Greek coincide on this point, and hence the excess of such accusatives in the LXX in various applications. And the N.T., here unlike the papyri, shows an abundance of the cognate accusatives.

The accusative of the inner content may be illustrated by τὴν δικαιόν κρίσιν κρινείτε (Jo. 7:24), τὸν φῶς ἀυτὸν μὴ φοβηθῆτε (1 Pet. 3:14), αὕτη τὴν αὐξήσειν τοῦ θεοῦ (Col 2:19), ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν (1 Tim. 1:18), ἄγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἄγγελα (1 Tim. 6:12), ὤμολογήσας τὴν καλὴν ὤμολογίαν (ib.), ἐθαύμασα ἴδον αὐτὴν θαύμα μέγα (Rev. 17:6). Cf. Rev. 16:9. In Mk. 10:38, τὸ βαπτίζον ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, and Jo. 17:26, ἣ ἂγαπῇ ἢν ἂγαπησάς με (cf. Eph. 2:4), the relative shows the use of the accusative. In Jo. 17:26 and Eph. 2:4 (ἡ ἂγαπησέν ἡμᾶς) the cognate accusative of the inner content is used along with the accusative of the person also.\(^5\) Indeed in Eph. 4:1, τῆς κληθέως ἤς ἐκλήθητε, the relative has been attracted from the cognate accusative. The modern Greek keeps this use of the accusative.

Some neuter adjectives are used to express this accusative, but far less frequently than in the ancient Greek.\(^6\) Thus, πεποιθῶς αὐτὸ τοῦτο (Ph. 1:6), πάντα ἱγχίω (Ph. 4:13), νηστεύουσιν πυκνά (Lu. 5:33), πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται (1 Cor. 9:25), perhaps even τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι (2 Cor. 13:1), μιθὲν διακρινόμενος (Jas. 1:6), οὐδὲν ὑστέρησα (2 Cor. 12:11). Cf. the interrogative τί ὑστέρησα (Mt. 19:20), [Page 479] the relative ὅ γὰρ ἰδιάθηκεν and ὅ ἐδίπλαν (Ro. 6:10). Cf. also ὅ τίνι ἐν σαρκὶ (Gal. 2:20) which may be equal to ‘in that,’ adverbial accusative.\(^1\) In 2 Cor. 12:13 the accusative relative follows the nominative interrogative τί ἐστιν δ ἡ σωσθήτηε. This neuter accusative of the adjective easily glides into the purely adverbial accusative, like πάντα τάσιν ἄρέσκω (1 Cor. 10:33), πάντα μου μέμνησθε (1 Cor. 11:2).

As a further example of the more objective result one may note ἡ χυμαλοτευχεῖν αἰγμαλοσίαν (Eph. 4:8, LXX), but Winer\(^2\) rightly shows that this type is chiefly represented in the N. T. by the relative. So μαρτυρία ἢν μαρτυρεῖ (Jo. 5:32), διαθηκὴ ἢν διαθήκωμαι (Heb. 8:10), βλασφημία ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν (Mk. 3:28), ἐπαγγελία ἢν ἐπηγγείλατο (1 Jo. 2:25).

The cognate accusative of the outward object (result also) calls for little discussion. Besides φυλάσσοντες φυλάκας (Lu. 2:8) observe ἡκοδόμησεν τὴν οἰκίαν (Mt. 7:24), δήσατε δεσμᾶς (Mt. 13:30, but NBC have eἰς).

---

Conybeare and Stock CONYBEARE and STOCK, Selections from the LXX. A Grammatical Introduction (1905).
4 Ib., p. 56.
5 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 76, finds no instance of such a construction with ἄγωνίζομαι in anc. Gk.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 91.
2 W.-Th., p. 225.
The analogous cognate accusative is seen in such constructions as μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδὲμίαν πτῶσιν (1 Pet. 3:6), βιβὸς ἐρχόνον (1 Pet. 4:2), δοκῶ μετα τὰ λόγια (Δἰμήν) in Lu. 12:47 (48), ἤδειν ἤμερας ὑδών (Lu. 2:44), ἐπορεύετο τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ (Ac. 8:39), and the relative also as in ὅρκον ὅν ὅμοιον (Lu. 1:73). Cf. the instrumental ὅρκψ ὅμοιον (Ac. 2:30), etc.

(i) DOUBLE ACCUSATIVE. Some verbs may have two accusatives. Indeed, if one count space and time, three accusatives are possible. In Mk. 10:18 (τί με λέγεις ἄγαθόν;) we have three accusatives, one being predicate. In the Sanskrit it is very common to have two accusatives with one verb. When one recalls that the accusative is the old and normal case with transitive verbs, it is not surprising that some verbs use two accusatives, just as many transitive verbs have an accusative and a dative, an accusative and an ablative, an accusative and an instrumental, an accusative and a genitive. This double accusative is common in Homer and a “multiplicity of accusatives is a characteristic of Pindar’s style.” It is a common idiom in the papyri also. It is not unknown in Latin (cf. doceo) and English (teach). It is very common in modern Greek (Thumb, Handb. p. 36), going beyond the ancient idiom. Middleton holds that the double accusative is due to analogy, since, in a number of examples, alternative constructions occur like accusative and ablative with αἰτέο (Ac. 3:2) and ὁμαρέομαι (Lu. 16:3). Cf. two accusatives with ὁμενοίζουν in Mt. 27:44.

Perhaps the simplest kind of a double accusative is what is called the predicate accusative, really a sort of apposition. Thus οὐκέτι ὦμιλς λέγω δούλους (Jo. 15:15). This appositional feature is seen also in the passive of those verbs where a double nominative occurs. For other examples with verbs of saying see λέγω (Mk. 10:18) and ἔσπουν in Jo. 10:35 (ἔκεινος ἔσπει θεοῦς), etc. Similar to this is καλέω (καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωάνην, Lu. 1:13; cf. Ἥσων verse 31; ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ—Ζαχαρίαν, 1:59). We happen to have the passive of this very construction in Lu. 2:21 (ἐκλήθη τῷ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς). Cf. further Mt. 22:43. Observe also ὅν καὶ ὁμόμοιον Ἱερον. (Lu. 6:14). Ὀμιλογέω appears with the double accusative in Jo. 9:22; 1 Jo. 4:2; 2 Jo. 7 and curiously nowhere else outside of John’s writings. Ἡγέομαι likewise has two accusatives as in τούτα ἠγείρον ἡμῖν (Ph. 3:7). See 2 Pet. 3:15; Heb. 11:26. Blass observes that νομίζω and ὑπολαμβάνω do not have the double accusative in the N. T.

3 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 82.
5 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 97.

Middleton

MIDDLETON, Analogy in Syntax (1892).

———, The Doctrine of the Greek Article (1855).
This second accusative may be either substantive, adjective or participle. As specimens of the adjective take ὃ ποιῆσαις με ἡγητή [Page 481] (Jo. 5:11), τοὺς τοιούτους ἡντίμους ἔχετε (Ph. 2:29). In 1 Cor. 4:9 indeed the adjective makes three accusatives and with ὃς four, ὃ θεὸς ἡμῶς τοὺς ἰδιοτότους ἐσχάτους ἐπεδείξεν ὃς ἐπιθυμωτός (so W. H.). As an example of the participle see κατέστησαν αὐτὸν ἡγοίμενον (Ac. 7:10). Cf. 2 Tim. 2:8. Sometimes ὃς occurs with the second accusative, as in ὃς προφητήσεως αὐτόν ἐδίω (Mt. 14:5). Cf. 21:26. In 2 Th. 3:15 note μὴ ὃς ἔχομεν ἡγεῖτο, ἀλλὰ νορμαῖτε ὃς ἀδέλφον. In 1 Cor. 4:1 observe also ἡμᾶς λογιζέσθην ἀνθρώπου ὃς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ. In 2 Cor. 10:2 we have ὃς with the participle, τοὺς λογιζόμενος ἡμῖν ὃς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας. In 2 Cor. 6:4 ὃς θεοῦ διάκονοι not exactly what ὃς διακόνους would be. Cf. ὃς with the predicate nominative in Ro. 8:36 (LXX).

Sometimes ἐναι is used as the copula before such a predicate accusative where the sense is not greatly altered by its absence or presence. As a matter of fact with ἐναι we have indirect discourse with the accusative and infinitive. So ὑπεκρινομένους ἑαυτοῦ δικαίους ἐναι (Lu. 20:20); Mk. 1:17=Mt. 4:19. Cf. συνεστήσας ἑαυτοῦ ἄγαν οὐκ ἐναι (2 Cor. 7:11), λογιζέσθη ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι νεκροῦς (Ro. 6:11), but ADEFG do not have ἐναι. In Ph. 3:7 we do not have ἐναι, while in verse 8 we do after ἠγητή.

The predicate accusative with ἐς used to be explained as an undoubted Hebraism.1 But Moulton2 is only willing to admit it is a secondary Hebraism since the papyri show a few examples like ἔσχον παρ ὑμῶν εἰς δάνειον σπέρματα, K.P. 46 (ii/44AD), “a recurrent formula,” a probable vernacular “extension of ἐς expressing destination.” Moulton pertinently remarks that “as a loan” (ὡς or just the accusative in apposition) and “for a loan” (ἐς) “do not differ except in grammar.” But certainly the great frequency of ἐς in the LXX as compared with even the vernacular κοινή is

due to the Hebrew which it so often translates. Cf. δώσετε μοι τὴν παύδα ταύτην εἰς γυνάκα (Gen. 34:12). Cf. the similar use of εἰς and the accusative instead of the predicate nominative (λογίζομαι εἰς Ro. 2:26, etc.). Winer shows parallels for this predicate accusative from the late Greek writers. The N. T. exhibits this accusative in εἰς προφήτην αὐτόν ἔχον (Mt. 21:46), ἀνθρεψάτω αὐτόν [Page 482] ἐκ τῶν άλῶν (Ac. 7:21), ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγῆς ἀγγέλου (Ac. 7:53), ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυιδ ἀυτός εἰς βασιλέα (Ac. 13:22), Τέθεικα σὲ εἰς φῶς ἑβδόμων (Ac. 13:47, LXX). When all is said, one must admit some Hebrew influence here because of its frequency. Ph. 4:16 is not a case in point. See further under εἰς.

But there is another kind of double accusative besides the predicate accusative. It is usually described as the accusative of the person and of the thing. This in a general way is true of this group of double accusatives. Some of these were also cognate accusatives, as in κατακλίνατε ἄνθρωπον ἔχον (Mt. 21:46), ἀνθρεψάτω αὐτόν [Page 482] ἐκ τῶν άλῶν (Ac. 7:21), ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγῆς ἀγγέλου (Ac. 7:53), ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυιδ ἀυτός εἰς βασιλέα (Ac. 13:22), Τέθεικα σὲ εἰς φῶς ἑβδόμων (Ac. 13:47, LXX). When all is said, one must admit some Hebrew influence here because of its frequency. Ph. 4:16 is not a case in point. See further under εἰς.

Indeed διδάσκω is just one of the verbs that can easily have two accusatives (asking and teaching). Cf. also ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα (Jo. 14:26). In Ac. 21:21 we have a normal example, ἄπαισαν ἄδιδασκες ὑμᾶς ὑμᾶς ἔχεις ἔχεις—inους ἤδικασατε (Gal. 4:12; cf. 5:2), μηδὲν βλέπων (Lu. 4:35). See also Ac. 25:10, In Mt. 27:44 the second accusative is likewise a pronoun, τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπερβίον ἀυτόν, while in Mk. 6:34 it is an adjectival, διδάσκειν αὐτούς παλλά.

Indeed διδάσκω is just one of the verbs that can easily have two accusatives (asking and teaching). Cf. also ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα (Jo. 14:26). In Ac. 21:21 we have a normal example, ἄπαισαν ἄδιδασκες ὑμᾶς ὑμᾶς ἔχεις ἔχεις—inους ἤδικασατε (Gal. 4:12; cf. 5:2), μηδὲν βλέπων (Lu. 4:35). See also Ac. 25:10, In Mt. 27:44 the second accusative is likewise a pronoun, τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπερβίον ἀυτόν, while in Mk. 6:34 it is an adjectival, διδάσκειν αὐτούς παλλά.

3 C. and S., Sel. from the Sept., p. 81 f. Cf. also W.-Th., p. 228.
4 lb. In the mod. Gk. the acc. of the thing to some extent takes the place of the dat. or abl. (Thumb, Handb., p. 37).
5 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 80.
Another group of verbs in the ancient Greek with two accusatives is that of depring, etc. Here indeed the ablative may take the place of one accusative, as in 1 Tim. 6:5 with the passive of ἀποστερέω the ablative is retained (τῆς ἀληθείας). But in the N. T. neither ἀποστερέω, nor ἀφαιρέω, nor κρύπτω has two accusatives. Either the ablative alone occurs or with ἀπό (Lu. 16:3; Lu. 19:42; Rev. 6:16). With φυλάσσεσθαι (Ac. 21:25) αὐτοῦς is the accusative of general reference (so-called “subject”) of the infinitive.

But verbs of clothing or unclothing, anointing, etc., do have two accusatives, though not always. Thus ξεδύσασα αὐτὸν τὴν χαλμῶν (Mt. 27:31; cf. Mk. 15:20; Lu. 15:22), ἔνεβασαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ (Mt. 27:31; cf. Mk. 15:20). But ἀφορένεμοι does not have two accusatives nor περιτίθημι (Mt. 27:28). In Lu. 23:11 some MSS. give two accusatives with περιβαλέων, but ΝBLT omit αὐτόν. In Jo. 19:2 the text is beyond dispute ἱμάτιον πορφυρών περιέβαλεν αὐτόν. Cf. περιβαλέται ἐν (Rev. 3:5). Moreover χρίσω has two accusatives in Heb. 1:9 (Ἐχρισθὲν σὲ θεὸς ἐλαῖον), a quotation from the LXX. In Rev. 3:18 κολλούριον is not the object of Ἐχρισθαί, but of ἀγοράσα. Ἀλείφο is not used with two accusatives, but has the thing in the instrumental case (Mk. 6:13). Πληρόω does not indeed have two accusatives in the N. T., but the passive with accusative in Ph. 1:11 and Col. 1:9 really involves the idiom.

The following causative verbs have two accusatives. Ὀρκίζω σὲ τὸν θεόν (Mk. 5:7) is a case in point (cf. ἐξορκέω in Herod.). See [Page 484] also Ac. 19:13 and one example of ἐνορκίζω in 1 Th. 5:27. The idea is really to “cause to swear by.” In Jas. 5:12 (ὅμως μὴ τὸν οὐρανόν μὴ τὴν γῆν μὴν ἄλλον τινὰ ὅρκον) we have two constructions, one “swear by,” the other the cognate accusative. So διαμαρτήσωμαι in 2 Tim. 4:1 f. Cf. P.O. 79 (ii/A.D.) ὁμώνω Ἀὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Μάρκον Ἀύρηλον—Ἀληθὴ ἑν[ai] τὰ προ-. Ὅτι ζῶ is a good example of the causative sense. Thus δὲ ἔν ποιήθη ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος (Mk. 9:41). Cf. Mt. 10:42; 1 Cor. 3:2. In Ro. 12:20 ὡμοίωζο has the accusative of the person, in 1 Cor. 13:3 the accusative of the thing (cf. Jer. 23:15 for double accusative with both these verbs). In Lu. 11:46 we have φορτίζετε τοὺς άνθρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα. Cf. ἡλίττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι in Heb. 2:7 (LXX).

Finally some words of doing good or ill have two accusatives. Thus μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν (Lu. 4:35) where the pronoun is really a cognate accusative, as is the case with ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὑφελήσατε (Gal. 5:2). Cf. Ac. 25:10 Ἰουδαίους οὐδὲν ἰδίκηκα. In Mt. 27:22 we read τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν. Cf. also Mk. 15:12, though D has τῷ

1 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 78 f., argues unsuccessfully against the idea that εὐαγγελίζομαι has two accs.
βαισλεῖ (Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 91). Elsewhere in the N. T. we meet the dative of the person as in Mt. 21:40; Ac. 9:13. See περί ὧν αὐτῆν πεποιήκασιν, P. Grenff. ii, 73 (late iii/A.D.), where ὧν is attracted from ὃ=of what they have done to her.’ Cf. μηδὲν πρᾶξῆς σεαυτῷ κακῶν (Ac. 16:28). In Mk. 7:12 the dative of the person is in keeping with ancient Greek usage. In Mt. 17:12 ἐν αὐτῷ may be more exactly ‘in his case’ (ND do not have ἐν), but note εἰς ὑμᾶς in Jo. 15:21 and the likeness of this to the modern Greek use of εἰς with accusative as the usual dative. Blass (*ib.*, p. 92) compares also the use of ἐν ἐμοί (Mt. 14:6) and εἰς ἔμε (Mt. 26:10) with ἔργαζομαι and observes that ἔργαζομαι in Attic had sometimes two accusatives. One may compare again the expression τι ὁρᾶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο (Ac. 12:18). Λέγω and ἰην indeed have two accusatives in the N. T., but in Jo. 1:15 the margin (W. H., R. V.) really has this idiom. Cf. also Ac. 23:5.

*With Passive Verbs.* Indeed the accusative may be found with verbs in the passive voice. Draeger¹ calls the accusative with passive verbs in Latin “ein Gracismus.” This accusative may be of several kinds. See *cognate accusative* in Mt. 2:10, ἔχαρησαν γαράν. It occurs with the so-called *passive deponents* like ἀπεκρίθην (οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη, Mk. 15:5). Cf. οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο (Mt. 27:12), οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη λόγον (Mt. 15:23). As further instances note ἀπεστράφησαν με (2 Tim. 1:15), ἐντραπήσονται τὸν ὑμὸν μου (Mt. 21:37), [*Page 485*] ἐπαισχύνθη με (Mt. 8:38), φοβηθήτε ἀυτοὺς (Mt. 10:26). Cf. Mt. 14:5; 2 Tim 1:16. To all intents and purposes these “deponent” forms are not regarded as passives. This use of the passive is common in the κοινή. Cf. Völker, *Synt. Spec.*, p. 15.

But the *true passive* of many verbs retains the accusative of the thing. This is true of verbs that have two accusatives in the active. So Ἐν κατηχημένος τὴν ὅδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου (Ac. 18:25), ὧς ἐδοξάσθη (2 Th. 2:15), οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον ἐνόμιση γάμου (Mt. 22:11 and cf. Mk. 1:6; Rev. 1:13; 15:6; 19:14), ἐνεδικαστεὶ αὐτῷ (Lu. 16:19), ἐκαταπαύσαντας καίμα μέγα (Rev. 16:9), διστάσατε πολλάς (πληγάς, Lu. 12:47, ὀλίγας, 48), τὸ βάπτισμα δ ὑποτιθήματο (Mt. 10:38, two examples), ἐν πνεύμα ἐπιστευθημένοι (1 Cor. 12:13), πεποιήθησα τὰ κρείσσονα (Heb. 6:9), πεπληρωμένου καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης (Ph. 1:11; Col. 1:9 ἦν πληροθήκη τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν and cf. Ex. 31:3, ἐνεπάλησα αὐτῶν πνεύμα σοφίας) and compare 2 Tim. 1:5 for genitive (ἡν χαράς πληρωθῶ, ἐξετάζοντας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ (Mt. 8:36=Mt. 16:26). Cf. also Ph. 3:8; Heb. 10:22. See ὡς ἔν ἐμοί ὠφεληθής (Mt. 15:5); τί ὠφελήθησα (Mt. 16:26); βραχύ τι παρ διαγγέλουσιν ἔλημισθέν (Heb. 2:9) with active (two accs.) in Heb. 2:7. Once more observe ἐδικασμένον μεσθον ἀδικίας (2 Pet. 2:13). The predicate accusative, it should be said, becomes the nominative in the passive, as in αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται (Mt. 5:9). Cf. Heb. 5:10; 2 Tim. 1:11.
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Völker, F., *Papyrorum graecorum syntaxis specimen* (1900).
Some verbs which have only one accusative in the active or middle yet retain the accusative of the thing in the passive with the person in the nominative. This is a freedom not possessed by the Latin. The person in the active was generally in the dative. Thus Paul a number of times uses πιστεύω (πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον 1 Th. 2:4; ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον 2 Th. 1:10; cf. also 1 Cor. 9:17; Gal. 2:7; Ro. 3:2; 1 Tim. 1:11). Then again περιβάλλω is frequently so employed, as περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα (Mk. 14:51; cf. 16:5; and especially in Rev., as 7:9, 13; 11:3; 12:1; 17:4; 18:16; 19:13). This is not the middle as Blass1 has it, though the future middle does occur in Rev. 3:5 with ἐν, and the aorist middle with the accusative in Rev. 19:8. In Rev. 4:4 we have περιβεβλημένους σινδόνα (loc.), and margin (W. H.) ἐν ἰμ. Once more περίκεισθε is used as the passive of περιτίθημι with the accusative of the thing, though the verb itself means to ‘lie around’ instead of ‘be encompassed with.’ So τὴν ἁλύσιν περίκεισθε (Ac. 28:20). Cf. also Heb. 5:2, but in Lu. 17:2 we have περὶ repeated.[Page 486]

There are once more still looser accusatives with passive verbs, partly by analogy and partly merely an extension of the principle illustrated already. Thus κατηχοῦμεν (Gal 6:6) does not really differ from ἰδίον κατηχηθῆναι above. In δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας (Jo. 11:44) we see a close parallel to περιβεβλημένους above. Note active in Mt. 22:13. In διεφθάρεν τὸ νῦν (1 Tim. 6:5), ἐραντισθήναι τᾶς καρδίας (Heb. 11:44) we see a close parallel to περιβεβλημένος above. Note active in Mt. 22:13. In δεδεμένου τὸ σῶμα (10:22) the accusative seems to be rather remote and to come close to the accusative of general reference, but not quite, for the force of the verb is still felt. This is still true of τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφοῦμεν (2 Cor. 3:18) and perhaps even of τὴν αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν πλατύνθητε (2 Cor. 6:13). In Ac. 21:3 ἀναφάναις, not ἀναφανέντες, is the correct text, as Blass1 observes.

The impersonal verbal in –τέον occurs only once in the N. T. (Lu. 5:38) and as in the ancient Greek it is used with the accusative, ὀνον νέων εἰς ἄσκος καινοῦς βλητέων. This verbal is more usually transitive than the personal form in –τέος, which is not found in the N. T.

(k) The Adverbial Accusative. It is not very common in the N. T. except in the case of pure adverbs. The adverbial accusative is really nothing more than a loose use of the accusative with intransitive verbs, with substantives or adjectives. It is rare in Homer2 and increases steadily till it becomes very common, though perhaps never quite so abundant as in the Sanskrit, where a veritable host of such accusatives occur.3 It is a perfectly normal development of the case, for extension is its root-idea. This accusative is sometimes called the accusative of general reference. As an example of such an accusative with an intransitive verb note καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Heb. 5:1). See also ἄνεπεσαν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἄργυρον τῶν πεντακισχίλιον (Jo. 6:10), τὸν τρόπον ἐκπορνεύσασα (Jude 7). ὁ τρόπον ἔρνεις ἐπισυνάγει (Mt. 23:37) and 2 Tim. 3:8 (ὁ τρόπον). Cf. ἄνεξεσθή μου μικρόν τι (2 Cor. 11:1). In Ro. 15:17 the whole

---

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 93.
2 Giles, Man., etc., p. 309.
3 Whitney, Sans. Gr., pp. 91, 93.
verbal phrase is concerned with τά πρός θεόν, but see Ro. 12:18, τό ἔξ ὑμῶν μετά πάντων ἄνθρωπον ἑρημεύοντες, where τό ἔξ ὑμῶν is acc. In Ro. 1:15 τό κατ᾽ ἐμέ may be nom. In Heb. 2:17 this adv. acc. occurs with the adj. as in πιστὸς ἄρχως τά πρός τόν θεόν. So also with a subst. as in ὁ Χριστός τό κατά σάρκα (Ro. 9:5). The Text. Recept. in Ac. 18:3 had σκηνοποιοῦσι τῇ τέχνῃ, but W. H. read σκηνοποιοῦ τῇ τέχνῃ. Indeed the [Page 487] instrumental is usual in the N. T. in such instances,1 as the following examples: Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει (Mk. 7:26), Κύπριος τῷ γένει (Ac. 4:36), παντὶ τρόπῳ (Ph. 1:18), τῷ προσώπῳ (Gal. 1:22). But, on the other hand, observe τούνομα Ισραή (Mt. 27:57), but elsewhere in the N. T. we have ὄνοματι (Ac. 18:2). In Ro. 16:19 some MSS. have τό ἔν ὑμῖν. The phrase τό καθ᾽ ἐξ (Ro. 12:5) is accusative, even though ἐξ itself is nominative in form. In 1 Cor. 11:18 see also μέρος τί πιστεύω. Perhaps thus is to be explained the accusative with the interjection in Rev. 8:13 οὕτα τοὺς κατοκουντάς. Cf. οὕτα and nominative (or vocative) in Is. 1:4. There is only one instance of an accusative with an adverb of swearing in the N. T. and that is in 1 Cor. 15:31, νὴ τῇ ὑμετέραν καυχήσιν. In Mk. 6:39 συμπόσια συμπόσια may be looked at as nominative (cf. προσωπικαί in verse 40) or accusative (cf. Lu. 9:14). Brugmann2 considers καὶ τοῦτο (1 Cor. 6:6, 8) nominative rather than accusative, but that seems hardly possible with αὐτὸ τοῦτο (2 Pet. 1:5), and καὶ τοῦτο may be accusative also (Ph. 1:29, etc.). Cf. also τοῦτο μέν—τοῦτο δέ (Heb. 10:33). In Ac. 15:11; 27:25 we have καθ᾽ ἐν τρόπον. In Ph. 4:10 (ἀνεκδόλετε τό ὑπέρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν) the infinitive is probably the accusative of general reference. Cf. τόν πόδαν πονεῖς ὑπὸ σκολάπτου, B.U. 380 (iii/A.D.).

There are indeed other expressions that come more closely to the pure adverb. Such, for instance, are τό καθ᾽ ἡμέραν (Lu. 11:3; 19:47; Ac. 17:11), τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 8:25), τό λουτρόν (Mk. 14:41; Ph. 3:1; Heb. 10:13, etc.), τό πρότερον (Jo. 6:62, etc.), τό πρῶτον (Jo. 10:40; 12:16); τό πλείστον (1 Cor. 14:27), τό πολλά (Ro. 15:22, MSS. πολλάκις), τό υἷν (Ac. 17:30), τό νῦν ἔχον (Ac. 24:25), τό τέλος (1 Pet. 3:8). In the case of τό λουτρόν (1 Cor. 7:29) it may be either accusative or nominative. In 2 Cor. 6:13 τῇ ὄντι μισθοῖς is considered adverbial accusative by some, as is πάντα with ἄρεσκο (1 Cor. 10:33) and with μέλησθε (11:2). Observe also τό αὐτό (Ph. 2:18; Mt. 27:44). Cf. οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχον (Rev. 3:17), and the common use of τί in the sense

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 117. Cf. Landgraf, Der Accus. der Beziehung nach Adj., p. 376, Archiv für lat. Lex. und Gr., vol. X.
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of ‘why’ as in Mt. 17:10 (δι’ τί in verse 19). This phase of the adverbial accusative is common in the papyri.3

But the most numerous group of adverbial accusatives is found in the adverbs themselves. The accusative is not the only case used for adverbs, but it is a very common one. In Homer4 indeed [Page 488] adverbial accusatives of substantives are almost absent. But the N. T. shows a few in harmony with the development of the language. Thus ἀκµή (Mt. 15:16), δωρεάν (Mt. 10:8), χάριν as a preposition (Eph. 3:1, etc.). But adjectives in the accusative were numerous in Homer1 both in the singular and the plural. They occur in the positive, comparative and occasionally the superlative. As examples of the positive singular may be taken πολύ (2 Cor. 8:22), ὅλον (Mk. 6:31), μέσον (Ph. 2:15), ταχύ (Mt. 5:25), λοίπον (1 Cor. 1:16, etc. Cf. B.U., iv, 1079, 6). Indeed the participle τυχόν (1 Cor. 16:6) is used as an adv. acc. (see Acc. Absolute). As an example of the plural positive note πολλά in Ro. 16:6, though this may be construed as cognate acc. with ἐκοπίασεν. Cf. Jas. 3:2; 1 Cor. 16:12, 19. For the comparative singular note μᾶλλον κρείσσον (Ph. 1:23), σπουδαίτερον (2 Cor. 8:22), δεύτερον (1 Cor. 12:28), ἅπερ (Ph. 1:23), τάχειον (Jo. 13:27), etc. Cf. πολύ σπουδαιότερον (2 Cor. 8:22) with πολλῷ µᾶλλον (Ph. 1:23), the instrumental and usual idiom in the N. T. In the superlative it is usually the plural form like ἥδιστα (2 Cor. 12:9), µάλιστα (Ac. 20:38), τάχιστα (Ac. 17:15), etc. But note πρῶτον (1 Cor. 12:28), τρίτον (ib.). The later Greek continued to exhibit a wealth of adverbs in the accusative.2

(i) THE ACCUSATIVE BY ANTIPTOSIS.3 It is not in reality a special use of the accusative, but merely a shifting of the noun or pronoun out of its usual order and into the government of the other preceding clause, and thus it becomes accusative whereas it would otherwise be nominative. So in Mk. 1:24, οἶδα σε τίς ἐί (cf. Lu. 4:34), Lu. 19:3, ἵδεν Ἰησοῦν τίς ἔστιν. But in Mt. 15:14 we have a kind of prolepsis (not the technical sort) without any change of case, τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ἐὰν ὁ δηγῇ. In the case of µή τινα ὄν ἁπεστάλκα πρὸς ὑµᾶς, δι’ αὑτοῦ ἔπλεονέκτησα ὑµᾶς; (2 Cor. 12:17) the τινα is left to one side and anacoluthon takes place and the sentence is concluded by δι’ αὑτοῦ.

(m) THE ACCUSATIVE BY INVERSE ATTRACTION. Thus ὅρκον ὃν ὠµοσεν (Lu. 1:73), τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶµεν (1 Cor. 10:16). Cf. τὸ ποτήριον (1 Cor. 10:15). In Mk. 3:16 but for the parenthesis (καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὅνοµα Σίµωνι) Πέτρον we should seem to have the dative and the accusative in apposition.

[Page 489] (n) THE ACCUSATIVE WITH THE INFINITIVE. The grammars generally speak of the accusative as the subject of the infinitive. I confess that to me this seems a grammatical misnomer. The infinitive clause in indirect discourse does correspond

4 Giles, Man., etc., p. 309.
3 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 85.
to a finite clause in English, and a clause with ὁτι and the indicative may often be used as well as the infinitive clause. But it is not technically scientific to read back into the Greek infinitive clause the syntax of English nor even of the ὁτι clause in Greek. Besides, not only is the infinitive a verbal substantive and in a case like the verbal adjective (the participle), but being non-finite (in-finitive) like the participle (partaking of both verb and noun), it can have no subject in the grammatical sense. No one thinks of calling the accusative the “subject” of the participle. Take ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν τὸν πάντα ἀνθρώπου ἔρχόμενον (Mt. 16:28). Here the accusative is the object of Ἰησοῦν and the participle is descriptive of τὸν. Now with the infinitive in indirect discourse it is as a rule the infinitive, not the substantive, that is the object of the verb. No further case is needed with the infinitive, if the pronoun or substantive be the same as the subject of the principal verb. Thus ὅτι τῆς ἄφιακενον—νομίζει (1 Cor. 7:36). If such a word is used, it may be in the pred. nom. in apposition with the subject of the verb, as φάσκετε εἶναι σοφοί (Ro. 1:22), or the accusative may be used. This accusative may be with a verb that can have two accusatives, as in ἔγνω ἐμαυτόν οὐ λογίζομαι κατευθύνει (Ph. 3:13) or the accusative of general reference as in πέποιθας τε σεαυτῶν ὅδηγον εἶναι το[L188 clue]. This latter usage is the explanation of the accusative with the infinitive in the instances where the word used with the infinitive is other than the subject of the principal verb. Typical examples are seen in οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτόν ζῆν (Lu. 24:23), νομίζοντες αὐτόν τεθνήκέναι (Ac. 14:19), boύλομαι προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἅρμας (1 Tim. 2:8). In these examples the infinitive is the object of the verb and the affirmation is made as far forth as the word in the accusative. They affirm living as to him; considering having died or death as to him; and wishing praying as to the men. This is the psychology of this accusative with the infinitive. The fact that later grammarians call it the “subject” of the participle cuts no figure in the matter of the origin of the usage. Clyde has interpreted the matter correctly. He sees that “grammarians framed this rule in ignorance of the etymology of infinitives,” and that “since the infinitive was originally a case, the accusative could not originally have been its subject.” This descriptive accusative or accusative of definition (general reference) has a very wide range in Greek, as seen above, and is the true historical explanation of the accusative with the infinitive (other than the accusative which may be the object of the infinitive itself). When the infinitive is used with the accusative, it indicates the agent who has to do with the action by the accusative, since the infinitive can have no subject in the technical sense. This use of the accusative with the infinitive is common also when the infinitive is in a prepositional clause like ἐν τῷ εἴσαγαγέν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἡσιοῦν (Lu. 2:27). Here the matter becomes clearer for the reason that the article τῷ cannot be slurred over and it becomes imperative to explain one of the accusatives as that of general reference. The context makes it clear that τὸ παιδίον is the object of εἴσαγαγέν, while τοὺς γονεῖς is the accusative of general reference. Many examples of this sort occur. Cf. Mt. 13:4. In Mt. 26:32, μετὰ τὸ ἔχερθηνα, note the accusative με rather than nothing or αὐτός or ἐμαυτόν. Cf. also Ac. 23:15. The article may be so used without a preposition, and either the nominative appear, as δέομαι τὸ μή παρῶν θαρρήσαι (2 Cor. 10:2), or the accusative, as τῷ μὴ εὑρέθη με Τίτον (2 Cor. 1

---

1 For inf. as subject and as object. see ch. on Verbal Nouns.
Clyde CLYDE, J., Greek Syntax (1876).
2 Gk. Synt., p. 139 f. Cf. also Donaldson’s Gk. Gr., § 584, and Green’s Handb. to N.
instances in the nominative. In Ph. 1:7 once with the infinitive in Heb. 5:12 (πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδόσκειν ὑμῖν τὸ στομαχία). Here we have a verb that is used with two accusatives, and των is the accusative of general reference. Cf. the three accusatives in Lu. 11:11. This subject will call for further discussion in the chapters on Indirect Discourse and Verbal Nouns. There was a constant tendency in the later Greek to exchange this use of the infinitive and accusative for the ὅτι clause.1

(o) THE ACCUSATIVE ABSOLUTE. The absolute use of the accusative is rare in the N. T. as compared with the earlier Greek.2 Usually the genitive occurs with the participle and substantive when used absolutely. In 1 Cor. 16:6 τιχόν is really the accusative absolute though used as an adverb. The most certain example in the N. T. is in Ac. 26:3 γνώστην ὄντα σε. In 1 Tim. 2:6 τὸ μαρτύριον καροίς ἰδίοις is in the accusative without any immediate connection unless it is in apposition with the preceding clause1 (Elicott in loco) or is loosely united with δοῦς. As to τὸ ὄντα τοῦ νόμου (Ro. 8:3) we have either the nominativus pendens, the accusative in apposition with the object of the sentence, the accusative of general reference or an instance of anacoluthon.2 In Lu. 24:47 the Text. Recept. reads ἄρξεμεν, which would be anacoluthon, but W. H. rightly have –νοι. Twice ἔξον occurs in the N. T., once with ἰν (Mt. 12:4) and once alone, ὅ oὐκ ἔξον (2 Cor. 12:4), but in both instances in the nominative. In Ph. 1:7 ὑμῖν ὄντας the ὑμῖς is repeated and is not accusative absolute. A subordinate sentence may also be in the accusative of general reference. Thus τὸ εἰ δονή (Mk. 9:23), τὸ τίς ἀν ἐνεκέξων αὐτῶν (Lu. 9:46). See further chapter on Verbal Nouns.

(p) THE ACCUSATIVE WITH PREPOSITIONS. Only a general remark is needed here, since each preposition will be discussed later in detail. In general one may note that the accusative is the most frequent case with prepositions.3 Indeed in modern Greek these all have the accusative. Πρὸς in the N. T. has ablative 1, locative 6, accusative 679 times.4 Here the preposition, like all prepositions, is merely an adverb that is used to express more exactly the idea of the case. The preposition does not technically govern a case. The accusative with the preposition has, of course, its usual force, extension. The following prepositions occur in the N. T. with the accusative, one example being given in each instance. Ἀνὰ μέσον (Mk. 7:31), διὰ τῶν φόβον (Jo. 7:13), εἰς τὴν πόλιν (Mt. 26:18), ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (Mt. 15:35), κατὰ τῶν νόμων (Lu. 2:22), μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς (Lu. 2:46), παρὰ τὴν ὄδον (Mt. 20:30), περὶ αὐτῶν (Mt. 8:18), πρὸς αὐτῶν (Mt. 3:5), ὑπὲρ δοῦλον (Phil. 16), ὑπὸ τῶν μοδίων (Mt. 5:15). Of these εἰς is, of course, by far the most frequent and has only the accusative. Διὰ, μετὰ, περὶ, ὑπὲρ, ὑπὸ have the genitive-ablative more than the accusative, while ἐπὶ, κατὰ, πρὸς have

1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 484 f.
2 It is rare also in the pap. Völker, Pap. Gr. Synt. Spec., p. 18.
3 For acc. in apposition with sentence in pap. see Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 152, τῷ μὴ ὄν, T.P. 1 (ii/b.c.).
4 Green, Handb., etc., p. 234.
5 Giles, Man., etc., p. 311.
6 Moulton, Prol., p. 106.
the accusative more often. For exact figures see Moulton, *Prol.*, pp. 105–107. In the chapter on Prepositions there will be further discussion of the matter.

**VIII. The Genitive (True) Case (ἡ γενικὴ πτῶσις).**

(a) **Two Cases with One Form.** It is now generally accepted by the comparative grammars that in Greek two cases appear under the form of the genitive: the genitive proper and the [Page 492] ablative.¹ It is a syncretistic form. The matter has already had some discussion in this grammar under Declensions and calls for little remark here. Moulton is not too hard on Winer when he calls it “an utterly obsolete procedure” to speak of the genitive as “unquestionably the whence-case.”² Winer is
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followed by Green. Now the ablative is the whence-case, but the genitive is a different case. Delbrück gives an interesting sketch of the fate of the ablative case in the Indo-Germanic languages. In the Sanskrit singular the two cases (gen. and abl.) have the same form, except I.-G. -ō (Sansk. -ā) stems (Sansk. gen. -āsya, abl. -ād). In the Balto-Slavic tongues ablative and genitive have the same endings. In the Italic languages, ablative, locative, instrumental (and partly dative) have the same form. Indeed in the Thessalian dialect as in the Latin some forms of the genitive and locative coincide (like domī). Dionysius Thrax had the idea that both cases flourished under one form in Greek, for he describes this case as ἡ γενικὴ κτητικὴ καὶ πατρικὴ. Thompson indeed recognises the two cases, but thinks it is not possible to group the uses of the form under these two divisions because some suit either case. There is a “debatable land” as Giles observes, but this applies to only a very small part of the examples and is very natural indeed. As a matter of fact it is not possible to give a really scientific explanation of the usage in Greek from any other standpoint. The ablative will therefore be treated as a separate case and the true genitive discussed now.

(b) NAME INCORRECT. The genitive case has the wrong name. The Latin genitivus is a translation of γενικὴ (more like the ablative in idea). It is ἡ γενικὴ πτῶσις. The name γενικὴ comes from γένος (γένος), ‘kind,’ and corresponds to the Latin
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Priscian so calls it (generalis casus). It is a pity that one still has to call it "genitive."

[Page 493] (c) THE SPECIFYING CASE. It is this and no other. The idea of the genitive case is at bottom simple. The genitive shows διαίρεσιν and something εἰδικόν. It is the case of genus (γένος) or kind. For a very full discussion of the genitive see Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, III, pp. 307–360. The genitive does indeed resemble the adjective, but it is not adjectival in origin, though the source of the genitive ending is unknown. The adjectival possessive pronoun (like ἐμός) is a mere variation of the genitive case (ἐμῶ) and the two may be in apposition with one another, as τῇ ἐμῇ χείρι Παύλου (2 Th. 3:17). But the function of the case is largely adjectival as in ἡμέρα παρασκευής (Luk. 23:54), though the adjective and the genitive are not exactly parallel, for with two substantives each idea stands out with more sharpness, as in ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς (Ro. 6:4) and ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι (1 Tim. 6:17). It is the specifying case, then, the case of appurtenance. In the Sanskrit Whitney finds the genitive adjectival in idea and defining the noun more nearly. So also Kühner-Gerth who find it qualitative with nouns or verbs. But Delbrück, followed by Brugmann, makes the verb the starting-point for explaining the genitive. One hesitates to part company with Delbrück and Brugmann, but the older view that it was first used with nouns seems here to have the best of it. It may be remarked that the genitive is the most persistent of all the cases in retaining its forms, as is seen in the English s. Indeed in the modern Greek the form shares with the accusative the result of the loss of the dative, so that we often meet a construction like αὐτόν τῷ ἔπαι ("I told him so."). One other remark is called for concerning the meaning of the genitive in Greek. It is that the case does not of itself mean all that one finds in

1 Giles, Man., etc., p. 311.
2 Cf. W.-Th., p. 236.
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translation. The case adheres to its technical root-idea. The resultant idea will naturally vary greatly according as the root-conception of the case is applied to different words and different contexts. But the varying element is not the case, but the words and the context. The error must not be made of mistaking the translation of the resultant whole [Page 494] for the case itself. Thus in Mt. 1:12 we have πετοικεσίαν Βαβυλόνως. It is translated ‘removal to Babylon.’ Now the genitive does not mean ‘to,’ but that is the correct translation of the total idea obtained by knowledge of the O. T. What the genitive says is that it is a ‘Babylon-removal.’ That is all. So in Mt. 12:31, ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία, it is the ‘Spirit-blasphemy.’ From the context we know that it is blasphemy against the Spirit, though the genitive does not mean ‘against.’ When a case has so many possible combinations in detail it is difficult to make a satisfactory grouping of the various resultant usages. A very simple and obvious one is here followed. But one must always bear in mind that these divisions are merely our modern conveniences and were not needed by the Greeks themselves. At every stage one needs to recall the root-idea of the case (genus or kind) and find in that and the environment and history the explanation.

(d) The Local Use. This is normally the first to begin with. In Greek literature it appears mainly in poetry1 and in adverbs of place like αὐτοῦ, οὗ, ποιῆς, ὅμου, πανταχοῦ. But it is possible that these are locatives like ἀλλοθι in a shortened form.2 But on the other hand in Homer the genitive undoubtedly3 appears in local relations with the archaic genitive in –οιο, though even in Homer the examples are chiefly stereotyped ones. There are in the N. T. only these examples in Luke and Acts. In Lu. 5:19 μὴ εὐροίνες ποίας ἐσκενέγκωσιν αὐτόν and 19:4 ἔκεινης ἥμελλεν διέρχεσθαι we have two undoubted examples. Blass4 indeed calls these “incorrect” on the ground that “classical Greek” would not have used the genitive thus. But it is sufficient reply to say that Luke was not writing classical Greek. Certainly Xenophon might have used ποί, ἔκεινη (as D has in Lu. 19:4). Moulton5 finds often in the papyri νότου, λιβός, though in Rev. 21:13 we have the ablative6 ἀπὸ νότου. In Ac. 19:26 we have a very striking example that the commentaries have failed to notice as Moulton7 observes. It is οὗ μόνον Ἐφέσου ἅλλα σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας ὁ Παῦλος πείσας μετέστρεψεν ἰκανόν ἄχλων. Moulton on the whole agrees with Hackett that the genitive here is dependent on ἄχλων. In Homer one has a parallel like οὕκ Ἀγρέας ἤ Σεν, but Moulton finds none in the vernacular κοινή. Still, since Luke did use ἔκεινης and ποίας, it does [Page 495] not seem difficult to believe that he was ready to employ the genitive of place in Acts.

There is another passage in Luke also (Lu. 16:24) where the genitive of place occurs, ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὄδατος. Here ὄδατος emphasizes the kind of material which the speaker clearly has in mind. Ν has ὄδατα. One may note in this connection the Homeric idiom λούεσθαι ποταμοῦ, ‘to bathe in the river.’ Cf. also

2 Delbrück, Vergl. Gr., I, p. 359.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 109.
5 Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 437.
6 Moulton, Prol., p. 73.
7 Ib.
Somewhat similar also is ἡ διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων (Jo. 7:35) and ὁ δὸς ἡμῶν (Mt. 10:5), which are objective genitives but of place also. Cf. ἔν ταρσῷ τῆς Κυλλιάς (Acts 22:3) which is described by Blass-Debrunner, p. 101, as partitive genitive.

(e) THE TEMPORAL USE. It is common enough. This is a very old use of the genitive.¹ This is the true genitive.² The accusative when used of time expresses duration over the period, the locative regards the period as a point even if it is of some length (cf. καρφίς ἱδίος, 1 Tim. 6:15), while the genitive implies nothing³ as to duration. In Mt. 24:20 this distinction can be seen in χειμῶνος καὶ σαββάτῳ, one the case of genus, the other a point of time. Brugmann⁴ indeed regards the genitive of time as a development of the partitive genitive, but this seems hardly necessary. Moulton,⁵ on the other hand, connects it with the genitive of possession and finds it very frequently in the papyri, like ἔτους B, ‘in the second year.’ So τοῦ ὄντος μηνός, F.P. 124 (ii/A.D.). On the difference between the genitive and the accusative of time see ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός (Lu. 18:7) and νόκτα καὶ ἡμέραν (Lu. 2:37), the genitive the time within which (kind of time), the accusative the time during which (all through). Cf. also νυκτός τῷ πρῶτον (Jo. 19:39). See also τοῦ λοιποῦ (Gal. 6:17) and τῷ λοιπῷ (Heb. 10:13). Once more observe μεσονύκτων ἢ ἀλεκτοροφώνιας (Mk. 13:35) where some MSS. have μεσονυκτίου. The accusative here is more like the adverb ὑψέ just preceding. Further examples of the genitive may be seen in μέσης νυκτός (Mt. 25:6), ὅρθος βαθέος (Lu. 24:1). For adverbs in expressions of time, see VIII, (h).

(f) WITH SUBSTANTIVES. This is the chief use of the case. The accusative indeed is chiefly connected with the verb, while the genitive is mainly related to substantives.⁶

1. The Possessive² Genitive. In simple point of fact it is not necessary to see any particular inner connection between the many uses of the genitive with substantives other than the common root-idea of the case. For convenience it suits us to group these usages, but one must think that the Greeks themselves looked at the whole matter much more simply. After all it is the context that varies rather than the genitive.¹ The resultant idea is therefore a matter of exegesis rather than due to any particular label to be attached.² The most obvious illustrations like πατάξας τὸν ὀφείλειν αὐτὸν τῷ ἡμίτοιον (Mt. 26:51) call for little remark. It is the high-priest’s servant, not another’s, and it is the servant’s ear, not another’s. The possessive pronouns, especially ἐμὸς in John’s Gospel, were used to some extent in

---

2 Delbrück, Grundl., etc., IV, p. 45.
5 Prol., p. 73.
6 Giles, Man., etc., p. 311.
7 Delbrück, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 344.
1 Giles, Man., etc., p. 312.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 72. Blass, also (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 95) thinks that the exact shade of the gen. idea is often a matter of theological, not grammatical interpretation.
the N. T., but usually the genitive of the personal pronoun is found. In Jo. 7:16 they occur side by side. Cf. τῇ ἐμῇ χεῖρι Παύλου (1 Cor. 16:21).

2. **Attributive Genitive.** Like an adjective the genitive may be either attributive or predicate. This is sometimes called the genitive of quality. But the name helps little, as all genitives have this idea. The sense of attribute is indeed the usual one with the genitive, as Παῦλος δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ro. 1:1). Thus observe the descriptive genitive in Mt. 18:9 εἰς τὴν γένναν τοῦ πυρός, Ro. 6:6 τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας, τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἀπεινώσεως (and τῆς δόξης, Ph. 3:21), τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκός (Col. 1:22), βάπτισμα μετανοίας (Mk. 1:4), ἡμέρας ὄδον (Lu. 2:44), ὁ ὀλοκλήρως τῆς ἀδικίας (Lu. 16:8). And even expressions like υἱὸς φωτός (1 Th. 5:5) are shown by the inscriptions and coins (Deissmann, *Bib. Stud.*, p. 165) to be not mere Hebraisms, though far more frequent in the LXX than in the N. T. because of the Hebrew. Other examples are λόγοι τῆς χαρίτος (Lu. 4:22), σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς (Ac. 9:15), σκεῦος ὁργῆς (Ro. 9:22), κριτὴς τῆς δικίας (Lu. 18:6), ἀπὸ ἁμώμιας (Ro. 1:26), υἱὸς τῆς ὀψώμος (Col. 1:13), νόμον τῆς ἐκκλησίας (Lu. 4:22), καὶ τοῦ ἀπόρρητος τῆς ἄμωμος (Col. 3:23), καὶ τοῦ ἀπείρου (Col. 1:22), ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου (Rev. 13:3), where the descriptive attributive genitive expresses quality like an adjective indeed, but with more sharpness and distinctness. Cf. again ἐν καινότητι
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being an attribute. Often the substantive or pronoun is repeated in sense before the case of the genitive at all. It is just the possessive genitive in the predicate instead of it is to be explained as a genitive with substantives. It is not the copula that affects the predicate genitive as in the LXX may be appealed to for abundant illustration.

The genitive of place or country is descriptive also. Thus Ἄρατες τῆς Γαλιλαίας (Mk. 7:1), Ἐρωτῶν τῆς Κελσίας (Ac. 22:3), Ἡτίς ἦταν πρώτη μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλες (Ac. 16:12), etc. This genitive of quality or descriptive genitive is largely extended in the LXX by reason of translation (Thackeray, p. 23).

3. The Predicate Genitive. While having the copula εἶναι, γίνεσθαι, etc., in reality it is to be explained as a genitive with substantives. It is not the copula that affects the case of the genitive at all. It is just the possessive genitive in the predicate instead of being an attribute. Often the substantive or pronoun is repeated in sense before the predicate genitive. Thus oúκ ἦταν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεός (1 Cor. 14:33). Cf. ἡμέρας oúκ ἐσμέν ὑποστολής—Ἀλλά πίστεως (Heb. 10:39), πάσα παιδεία οὐ δοκεῖ χαρίς εἶναι (Heb. 12:11). So ἔην γὰρ ἐτῶν δόδεκα (Mk. 5:42). So Lu. 2:42. Cf. also ἔαν τινας εὐρή τῆς ὄδου ὄντας (Ac. 9:2), and indeed ἔγενετο γνώμης (Ac. 20:3) is to be explained the same way. There is as much latitude in the predicate genitive as in the attributive possessive genitive. We have ὑιὸν φωτός ἦστε καὶ ὑιὸν ἡμέρας (1 Th. 5:5) and oúκ ἐσμέν νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σκότους (1 Th. 5:6) and ἡμέρας ὄντες (verse 8). We may continue the illustrations like ἐν ἑμὶ Παύλου (1 Cor. 1:12), οὐκ ἦστε ἐκατον (1 Cor. 6:19), τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ εἰμὶ (Ac. 27:23), πάντα ὑμῶν ἦστιν (1 Cor. 3:21), οὐχ ὑμῶν ἦστιν γνώσει (Ac. 1:7), ἦν δὲ θοῦ ἔγνωται ἀνὴρ ἔνας (Lu. 20:14), τίνος αὐτῶν ἦσται γονή (Mk. 12:23), τελείων ἦστιν ἦν στερεὰ τροφή (Heb. 5:14), Ἰχθυῖς εἶναι (2 Cor. 10:7), ὑμῶν ὁ Ἐφέσιος καὶ Ἑρμογένης (2 Tim. 1:15), ἦν δὲ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς ἡμέρας ὥστε εἶναι (Ac. 1:7).
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δυνάμεως ἣ τοῦ (2 Cor. 4:7), and finally, [Page 498] though by no means all that can be adduced, ὃν ἐστω ὤλη ὅ—κόσμος (1 Pet. 3:3). These passages not only illustrate the variety of the predicate genitive, but show that this is essentially a substantival genitive (cf. predicate nominative) and not a verbal genitive. As an example of the objective genitive in the predicate take σκάνδαλον εἰ ἔμοι (Mt. 16:23). In the modern Greek the predicate genitive has been still further extended (Thumb, Handb., p. 35).

4. Apposition or Definition. This is a very simple use of the case, but is not an extremely common idiom in the N. T., since the two substantives can easily be put in the same case. In the modern Greek mere apposition rules (Thumb, Handb., p. 33). But some interesting examples occur. It is a well-known idiom in Homer and certainly needs no appeal to the Hebrew for justification. Kühner-Gerth may also be consulted for other poetical examples. In the N. T. we note πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας (2 Pet. 2:6) which Blass compares with Ἱλίου πόλιν of Homer and observes that πόλεως Θυατείρων (Ac. 16:14) is merely the genitive of πόλις Θυάτειρα (cf. πόλει Ἰόππη in Ac. 11:5). In 2 Cor. 11:32 the adjective is used as τὴν πόλιν Δαμασκηνῶν, while in Rev. 18:10 we have true apposition. One may note further τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ (Jo. 2:21), τὸν ἄρρητον τοῦ πνεύματος (2 Cor. 5:5), σημεῖον περιτομῆς (Ro. 4:11, AC περιτομῆς), τὸ σημεῖον τῆς ἁπάντης (Ac. 4:22), καὶ κοίμησιν τοῦ ἦλθον (Jo. 11:13), θάρακα πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης (1 Th. 5:8), τὸ ξηρὸν τῆς πίστεως (1 Th. 1:3), ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Col. 1:5), ἁ πνεομανής τῆς κληρονομίας (Col. 3:24), ἐν ζωή κακίας (1 Cor. 5:8), ἡ σωματική τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ (2 Cor. 2:14), ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνων (Ro. 15:16), τὸ μεσάνυχτον τοῦ φραγμοῦ (Eph. 2:14), ὁ θεμέλιος τῶν ἀποστόλων (Eph. 2:20), θεμέλιος μετανοίας (Heb. 6:1), τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου (2 Cor. 1:9), ὁ ἐμπλοκής τριχῶν—κόσμος (1 Pet. 3:3), ὁ στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς (Rev. 2:10), ὁ στέφανος τῆς δόξης (1 Pet. 5:4), ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος (2 Tim. 4:8), ἡ ἔνορτή τῶν ἄζυμων (Lu. 22:1), ἡ
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The Subjective Genitive. It can be distinguished from the objective use only by the context. Sometimes the matter is not clear. This genitive is the common possessive genitive looked at from another angle. In itself the genitive is neither subjective nor objective, but lends itself readily to either point of view. The subjective genitive can indeed be applied to the merely possessive genitive noted above. Take Ro. 1:17 where δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ means the righteousness which God has and wishes to bestow on us. A typical example is found in 2 Cor. 5:14, ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς. Here it is unquestionably the love that Christ has for sinners and so for Paul that is the constraining influence in his life. In Ro. 8:39 the matter is explained indeed by the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Abbott^2 is apparently right in finding only a couple of passages in the N. T. where ἀγάπη is used with the objective genitive (2 Th. 2:10, ἡ ἀγ. τῆς ἀληθείας; Lu. 11:42, παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ). Jo. 5:42 ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς might be either subjective or objective, but see Ro. 5:5. In Ph. 4:7 ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ is probably subjective and so ‘the peace that God has and gives,’ but the meaning is richer than any phrase, as Simcox well observes. Cf. Col. 3:15. In Ro. 15:8, ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ, we seem to have the subjective genitive. Note also δικαιοσύνη πίστεως (Ro. 4:13), which is explained as subjective by Paul in the phrase
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1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 333.  
Abbott

———, Johannine Grammar (1906).  
———, Johannine Vocabulary (1905).

Simcox

———, The Writers of the N. T.

3 Lang. of the N. T., p. 87.
6. *The Objective Genitive.* It is quite frequent in the N. T., especially when it is vanishing in the later Greek. The adnominal genitive preserves a remnant of the old objective genitive in modern [Page 500] Greek (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 34). Here again we must appeal to the root-idea of the genitive as the case of genus or kind. The resultant idea is due to the context and one must not suppose that the Greek genitive means all the different English prepositions used to translate the resultant idea. Thus in Mk. 11:22 Ἐξεταστὶ πῦν θεοῦ we rightly translate 'have faith in God,' though the genitive does not mean 'in,' but only the God kind of faith. Cf. Ro. 3:22. Take Mt. 12:31, ἢ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία, where the context makes it clear that it is blasphemy 'against' the Holy Spirit. Another striking example is Ac. 4:9, ἔπλησεν ἄνθρωπον σωθῆναι, while the good deed is done 'to' a sick man. In Jo. 7:13, διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν ἤπατων, it is fear 'towards' or 'in reference to' the Jews, while Jo. 17:2, ἐκείνοις πάσης σαρκός, means authority 'over' all flesh (cf. ἐξουσίαν πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτων, Mt. 10:1, and τῆς ἕμων ἐκείνους, 1 Cor. 9:12). In 1 Cor. 10:6, τοῦ ποιμνὸν, we have types 'for' us. In Jo. 18:29 we have accusation 'against' this man, κατηγοροῦν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον, etc. Each example calls for separate treatment. So τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ (Lu. 11:29) may be the sign shown in Jonah, while νόμος τοῦ ἄνδρος (Ro. 7:2) is the law 'about' the husband (cf. δό νόμος τοῦ λεπροῦ, Lev. 14:2). In 1 Pet. 2:19, διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ, it is a good conscience 'toward' God, while ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ (Lu. 6:12) we have prayer 'to' God. Οὕτως τοῦ οἴκου σου (Jo. 2:17) is zeal 'concerning' thy house. See Ro. 10:2; cf. also Heb. 11:26, τὸν ἱεραρχὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In Col. 2:18, θησαυροὺς τῶν ἄγγελων, it is worship 'paid to' angels, while εἰς τὴν ὑπακοήν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. 10:5) is obedience 'to' Christ. But see *per contra* ὑπακοῆ πίστεως (Ro. 1:5) which is subjective genitive. In 1 Cor. 1:6, μάρτυριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, we have again witness 'concerning' Christ. Cf. also ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ (1 Cor. 1:18) and ὁκοὶ πολέμων (Mt. 24:6). So in 1 Cor. 8:7 ἢ συνείδησις τοῦ ἐλέους is consciousness 'about' the idol, not the idol's consciousness. See also the two objective uses of ἡγέσις in 2 Th. 2:10 and Lu. 11:42 and possibly also Jo. 5:42; 2 Th. 3:5; 1 Jo. 2:5. In Ro. 5:5 either will make good sense. The phrase φόβος θεοῦ (Ro. 3:18) is objective, and note also 2 Cor. 5:11 (τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου). Eph. 5:21 is objective. See also καθ ὑπομονήν ἔργον ἐργαζόμενος (Ro. 2:7), 'in' a good work, and εἰς δικαιοσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 5:18), 'to' life. Cf. ἀνάστασιν τοῦ θεοῦ—κρίσεως (Jo. 5:29). Indeed one may go on and include those genitives of “looser relation” usually set off to themselves. They are really just the objective genitive. So as to ὁδὸς ἔθνων (Mt. 10:5), way 'to' the Gentiles: ὁδὸν ἀλάσσης (Mt. 4:15), way 'by' the sea; τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων (Jo. 7:35), dispersion ‘among’ the Greeks; πρόβατα σφαγῆς (Ro. 8:36), ‘doomed to’ slaughter; θύρα τῶν προβατῶν (Jo. 10:7), door ‘to’ the sheep; μετοικεσίας Βαβυλωνίως (Mt. 1:11 f.), and even ἄπολτρωσις τῶν παραβάσεων (Heb. 9:15), though this last may be regarded as an ablative. But βαπτίσμων διάσχης (Heb. 6:2) is objective genitive. Note also τροπῆς ἀποκάλεσμα (Jas. 1:17), a shadow ‘cast by’ turning, and

4 Green, Handb., etc., p. 219.
7. Genitive of Relationship. For lack of a better name this use of the genitive is called “genitive of membership” or “of relationship.” In reality it is merely the possessive genitive of a special application. The substantive is not used because the context makes it clear. Thus Μαρία ή Ιακώβου (Lu. 24:10) is James’ Mary; whether mother, wife, daughter or sister, the context must decide. In this instance it is James’ mother. Cf. Mk. 16:1. Mk. 15:47 gives us Μαρία ή Ιωσήφτος, while in 15:40 we have both James and Joses. In Mt. 27:56 as in Mk. 15:40 we have the full construction with μήτηρ. But in Jo. 19:25 Μαρία ή τοῦ Κλωπᾶ it is the wife (γυνή) that is meant. So in Mt. 1:6 ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐριου. In Lu. 6:16 and Ac. 1:13 we have Ιουδαίας Ιακώβου, which probably means the brother (Ἄδελφος) of Jude in view of Jude 1 (Ἄδελφος Ιακώβου) rather than son. But υἱός is the word usually to be supplied, as in Ιακώβου τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου (Mt. 4:21), τὸν Ιουδαίων Σίμωνος (Jo. 6:71), Σίμων Ιωάνου (Jo. 21:15 ff.), Δαυειδ τοῦ τοῦ Ιςσαΐ (Ac. 13:22). See also Ac. 20:4, Σώφρων Πύρου. Cf. Lu. 3:2 where υἱός is used, as υἱός generally is for ‘sons of Zebedee’ (Mk. 10:35). In Jo. 21:2 we have οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου so used. [Page 502] But sometimes the article refers to the family in general as in ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης (1 Cor. 1:11). Cf. οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν (Lu. 22:49). In Mk. 5:35, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχοντος παρασκευάζων, it is possible that οἶκος is to be supplied, since the man himself (verse 22) has already come.1 In Ac. 2:27, 31, W. H. read έκ θᾶνου, while some MSS. have έκ θαύου (cf. Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 395) and the MSS. vary also in Ps. 16:10 (LXX). Cf. έν τῷ θᾶν in Lu. 16:23. It is more likely that in Lu. 2:49, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός, we have the idea of ‘house’ rather than that of ‘business.’ Cf. εκ τοῦ θῶνa (Jo. 19:27) and εκ τοῦ θῶνa and οἱ θῶν in Jo. 1:11. See έν τοῖς Κλωπῶντων, P.O. 523 (iii/A.D.), for ‘house’ of. It is a classic idiom. Cf. Lysias εχ τοῦ θῶνa. These constructions are all in harmony with the ancient Greek idiom.2 In an example like τοῦ θῆς άληθος πορομίας (2 Pet. 2:22) it is not the genitive that calls for remark so much as the article without any substantive. The discussion belongs to the chapter on the Article.

8. Partitive Genitive. Here a part of the whole is given. See έν τοῖς (Mt. 6:29), τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως (Rev. 11:13), ἕως ήμισίας τῆς βασιλείας (Mk. 6:23), ἡμισίαν καιροῦ (Rev. 12:14), τῆς ἡμίσιας μου τῶν ὕπαρχόντων (Lu. 19:8), τὸ περισσεῦν τῶν
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1 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 92.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 95.
3 W.-Th., p. 190.
1 Green, Handb., etc., p. 213.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 95 f.
9. The Position of the Genitive. In general one may note that the genitive usually comes after the limiting substantive, as τὴν γέννησαν τοῦ πυρός (Mt. 5:22), but the genitive comes first if it is emphatic like Ἐλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος (Ac. 14:1) or if there is sharp contrast like τὸν συστατισμὸν μου, ἦμων δὲ ἄποστολον (Ph. 2:25). In Eph. 6:9 both genitives precede, καί αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν ὁ κύριος. If the article is used with both words we may have the usual order, as τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Eph. 6:11), or less often the classic idiom, as τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἄρχηγόν (Heb. 12:2). Sometimes indeed the article may be repeated, as ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ (1 Cor. 1:18).[Page 503] ¹ Αὐτοῦ usually comes after the noun in the Synoptics, as τὴν ὀξείαν αὐτοῦ (Lu. 3:17), but John sometimes puts αὐτοῦ first² (1:27; 9:6; cf. σου in 9:10, σοι ὁ ὀφθαλμόι). Sometimes a word intervenes between the substantive and the genitive as in ἡμεθα τέκνα φώει ἄργης (Eph. 2:3). Cf. also Ph. 2:10; Ro. 9:21, etc. But note εἰς ἄλειφον σάτα τρία (Mt. 13:33).

10. Concatenation of Genitives. Two or more genitives may be used together. This is, of course, common in the earlier Greek. Paul in particular is fond of piling up genitives. Take 1 Th. 1:3 as a typical example, μημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τὸν ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόσμου τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Κυρίου Χριστοῦ. Here we have practically all the points, viz., two simple genitives, two in apposition, three together, one of the person and the other of the thing. A very simple case is found in Ro. 8:21, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ, and in verse 23 τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. Cf. also Jo. 6:1; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 1:6; 4:13; Col. 1:13, etc. In Rev. 16:19 we have four genitives, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οίνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὄργης αὐτοῦ, and five occur in Rev. 19:15, counting the appositives, τὴν λημνὴν τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὄργης τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος. Blass³ calls this “a really burdensome accumulation of words,” but surely the sense is clear enough. The governing genitive comes before the dependent genitive in regular order here. But in 2 Pet. 3:2 this smooth order is not observed, yet all five can be readily understood: ὑπὸ τῶν ἄγιων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἄποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου. Cf. Ph. 2:30 also. In 2 Cor. 3:18, ὑπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος, it is not clear whether κυρίου is genitive or is the ablative in apposition with πνεύματος. In Jas. 2:1 it is difficult to put into brief compass the Greek idiom, τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης. Here Ἡ. Χρ. is in apposition with κυρίου. Κυρίου has

---

1 Cf. Green, Handb., etc., p. 215.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 99.

(g) The Genitive with Adjectives. Giles\(^4\) observes how natural it is for adjectives to take the genitive, since many of them are developed from substantives in apposition. Adjectives of fulness can logically take either the genitive or the instrumental. Giles\(^5\) explains how with the Latin *plenus*, by analogy to *vacuus*, the ablative is used and also because the ablative and instrumental forms are the same in Latin. Indeed even in the case of the participle we have the genitive when the participle is regarded no longer as an adjective, but as a substantive, as τὸ ὑπάρχοντά μου (1 Cor. 13:3). Cf. Lu. 12:33; Lu. 2:27, τὸ εἴδοσάμενον τοῦ νόμου; and Ph. 3:8, τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως. The adjective itself is so used in 1 Cor. 10:33, τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ σύμφωνον. Cf. 1 Cor. 7:35. But different is συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ ιοῦ ἀντίο (Ro. 8:29). Here we have the true adjective, but the genitive is due to the principle just stated. In συνεργός, Ro. 16:21, we have the substantive also. The case with verbal in –τος may be considered genitive, but see the ablative also. Thus οἱ ἄγατοι θεοῦ (Ro. 1:7), γεννητοὶ γυναικῶν (Lu. 7:28), ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ (Ro. 8:33), κλητοὶ θεοῦ (Ro. 1:6). In διδακτοὶ θεοῦ (Jo. 6:45), οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπινής σοφίας λόγος (1 Cor. 2:13) one may question if we do not have the ablative. But in εὔλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός (Mt. 25:34) the genitive is likely the case. There is only one adjective in ἀκός in the N. T. which has the genitive, κριτικός ἐνθυμήσεων (Heb. 4:12). Ἀξιος is very common with the genitive in the N. T., as ἄξιον τῆς μετανοίας (Mt. 3:8). But ἄνωτος probably has abl. because of α—privative, as ἄνωτοι ἐκτε κριτηρίων ἐλαχίστων (1 Cor. 6:2). Delbrück\(^1\) confesses his inability to explain this genitive, though Blass\(^2\) considers it genitive of price. The figure of weighing or scales seems to be involved in the word. In 1 Cor. 9:21 (Ἐνομος Χριστοῦ) we have a very “bold use” of the genitive\(^3\) due to the substantive idea involved (νόμος). But probably in Heb. 3:12, καρδία πονηρά ἁπαστίας, the genitive is dependent on καρδία, not πονηρά. Ἐνοχος brings up an unusual genitive in Mt. 26:66 Ἐνοχος θανάτου, and Mk. 3:29 (correct text) Ἐνοχος ἔστην αἰωνίου ἐμαρτήματος. Moulton\(^4\) considers this genitive “aberrant” and still more Ἐνοχος κρίσεως in Syrian class of MSS. in Mk. 3:29. In 1 Cor. 11:27, Ἐνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος, we have the usage of the pre-Syrian classes in Mk. 3:29 and not the idiom in Mt. 26:66. The usual construction appears also as in Ἐνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει (Mt. 5:21 f.) and even Ἐνοχος εἰς τὴν γένναν (ib.). In the instance of κοινονός the construction is also interesting. In 2 Cor. 1:7 we have κοινονοί ἐστε τῶν παθημάτων, but it is debatable if the adjective has not here become a substantive as with κοινονος ἐμός (2 Cor. 8:23; cf. συνεργός in same verse). Κοινονός has also the dative, as κοινονοῖ τῷ Σίμωνι (Lu. 5:10). See συνκοινωνοῦς αὐτοῦ (1 Cor. 9:23) and in Ph. 1:7 two genitives, συνκοινωνοῦς μου τῆς χάριτος. But in Rev. 1:9 we have Ἔν with locative. Note also μεστοὶ ὑποκρίσεως [Page 505] (Mt.
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5 Ib.  
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 106.  
3 Ib.  
4 Cl. Rev., Apr., 1904, p. 152.
23:28) and πλήρης χάριτος (Jo. 1:14). The case of μέτοχος in Heb. 3:1 (κλησίως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι) is similar to that of κοινονός above, though more decidedly adjectival. Cf. μέσος ὑμῶν (Jo. 1:26). In Jo. 8:55 W. H. read ὅμοιος ὑμῖν, though NCLX have ὑμῶν, a construction sometimes found in ancient Greek. One may note also in 1 Pet. 5:9, τὰ αὐτά τῶν παθημάτων, which is perhaps to be understood as the same “kinds” of sufferings, rather than the same sufferings.

(h) The Genitive with Adverbs and Prepositions. At bottom there is little difference between the adverb and the genitive and the preposition and the genitive. The preposition is an adverb that is used with a case for clearer expression. The adverb and the genitive are not due to the verb and is a rather loose almost adverbial phrase. Some prepositions indeed are only used as prepositions, but this is in the later stages of the language. Αξίως, like the adjective ἄξιος, occurs with the genitive, as ἄξιος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Ph. 1:27; cf. Ro. 16:2). The genitive is not persistent with some of the adverbs and prepositions in late Greek. It is more especially with adverbs of time that the genitive is found. Thus ὅπας τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ (Heb. 9:7), δίς τοῦ σαββάτου (Lu. 18:12), ἐπίταξες τῆς ἡμέρας (Lu. 17:4). Giles indeed observes that it is only the genitive of place that uses prepositions. Here only specimens without discussion can be given. Thus ἄντικρυς Χίου (Ac. 20:15), ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου (Mt. 27:61), ἀντί χάριτος (Jo. 1:16), ἄχρι καιροῦ (Lu. 4:13), διὰ παραβολῆς (Lu. 8:4), ἐγγύς σου (Ro. 10:8), ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ (Lu. 1:8), ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ (Lu. 1:6), ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ (Mt. 5:11), ἐντὸς ὑμῶν (Lu. 17:21), ἐνώπιον κυρίου (Lu. 1:15), ἐπάνω ὄρους (Mt. 5:14), ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Rev. 6:10), ἐνώ ὑς αὐλῆς (Mk. 15:16), ἐνως ἡμῶν (Ac. 9:38), κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (Mt. 26:59), κατενώπιον ὑμῶν (Mk. 11:2), κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης (Ju. 24), κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου (Rev. 4:6), μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς (Ph. 2:15), μεθ’ ἡμῶν (Mt. 1:23), μεταξὺ σοῦ (Mt. 18:15), μέχρι τῆς σήμερον (Mt. 11:23), παραπλήσιον θανάτου (Ph. 2:27), πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου (Jo. 4:5), περὶ τοῦ φωτός (Jo. 1:8), τούτῳ χάριν (Eph. 3:1). Ἐμπροσθεν, ὀπίσθεν, πρό, πρὸς, ὑπέρ, etc., all have the ablative. Cf. τὸ ἐξοσθέν ὑμῶν (Lu. 11:39) where ἐξοσθέν may be looked at more as a noun. Ἐν μέσῳ has almost the force of a preposition with the genitive (ὑμῶν, for instance, 1 Th. 2:7).

(i) The Genitive with Verbs. As already remarked, Delbrück[Page 506] begins his discussion of the genitive with the verb. In Lu. 5:19, πολίς ἐξενέγκας, the genitive is not due to the verb and is a rather loose almost adverbial phrase.

1. Very Common. In Greek the genitive with verbs cuts a larger figure than in Latin. Broadus used to say that the genitive with verbs means ‘this and no other,’ while the accusative with verbs means ‘this and no more.’ Probably therefore the
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1 Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 338), after the analogy of the Lat. and the Gk. κενός, ἔνδεης, etc., considers it the abl. that we have with πλήρης.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 106.
3 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 337.
4 Giles, Man., p. 318.
5 ib., p. 319.
1 Vergl. Synt., I, p. 308.
2 Giles, Man., p. 315.
Brodus BROADUS, JOHN A., Comm. on Matt. (1886).
genitive with verbs is a variation from the accusative with verbs, the original and normal case with verbs. This point may be illustrated by ἰκούεται αὕτου (Mk. 9:7) and ἰκουσαν τὸν ἀσταμάτον (Lu. 1:41). Some verbs yield themselves naturally to the idea of the genitive, while others use the accusative. Others again use now one, now the other. The predicate genitive is passed by here, having been discussed under Substantives.

2. Fading Distinction from Accusative. But it must not be assumed that it is wholly a matter of indifference whether the accusative or the genitive is used with a verb, though the accusative in the later Greek constantly made inroads on the genitive. Even in the old Greek much freedom existed. In the modern Greek the genitive with verbs occurs only in some dialects (Thumb, Handb., p. 35). Cf. μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ (Lu. 17:32), but μνημονεύετε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους (Mt. 16:9). In πάντα μου μέμνησθε (1 Cor. 11:2) both cases occur. This is all in accord with classical usage. So also ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν (Heb. 6:10), but τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλαμβάνομενος (Ph. 3:13); γεώτερα μου τοῦ δείπνου (Lu. 14:24), but ἐγεύσατο τὸ ὑδρό (Jo. 2:9); γέμουσιν ὅστεν (Mt. 23:27), but even γέμουσα ἀνόματα βλασφημίας (Rev. 17:3). But it is perfectly proper to appeal to the distinction in the cases in the apparent contradiction between ἰκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς (Ac. 9:7) and τὴν ἀκοὴν ὑπὸ ἰκουσαν (22:9). The accusative (case of extent) accentuates the intellectual apprehension of the sound, while the genitive (specifying case) calls attention to the sound of the voice without accenting the sense. The word ἰκοῦω itself has two senses which fall in well with this case-distinction, one ‘to hear,’ the other ‘to understand.’ Cf. οὗ ὑπὸ ἰκουσαν (Ro. 10:14) and μη ὑπὸ ἰκουσαν (Ro. 10:18). And yet the genitive can be used where the sense is meant, though not stressed, as ἰκουσαν φωνῆς (Ac. 9:7) and ἰκουσαν φωνήν (Ac. 9:4; and 26:14). But see further under 3.

3. Verbs of Sensation. One of the chief classes of verbs that may be used with the genitive is verbs of sensation. One seems compelled to make some division in the verbs used with the genitive for the sake of intelligible discussion. Yet as a matter of fact each class and each verb indeed relates itself to the root-idea of the genitive. That is the thing to keep in mind and not a mere artificial grouping of the verbs. Analogy was at work, of course, but the verbs after all were separate units and had independent development. These groupings of the grammarians are mere matters of convenience. And it is a delicate matter that varies somewhat with the writer, this use of the genitive. By sensation we refer to verbs that mean to hear, smell, taste, touch, though verbs of seeing have the accusative. The most common verb of hearing is ἰκοῦω, about which some remarks have already been made. It is not necessary to give an exhaustive list of the instances of ἰκοῦω. A typical one is ἰκουσαν σημωνίας καὶ χορὸν (Lu. 15:25). The genitive is used either with things, as in this illustration, or with persons, as in ἀυτοῦ ἰκοῦετε (Lu. 9:35). For accusative with persons see Eph. 4:21. Besides the use of the accusative with this verb, both with the classic distinction as above and without, there may also be the accusative and the ablative as in Ac. 1:4 ἰκουσατέ μου. Then again the verb itself is used in the sense

3 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., pp. 87 ff., has an extensive discussion of the gen. and acc. with ἰκοῦω, but seems to miss the point after all. They heard the sound but not the words. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 103, admits this classic distinction sometimes in the N. T.
of hear, to understand, and even to obey (hearken). The sense of hearken is often in John’s Gospel with the genitive, as ὅλα ἀκούσαν αὐτῶν τῷ πρόβατα (Jo. 10:8). Cf. Rev. 3:20, etc. The apparent double genitive in the last passage τῆς φωνῆς μου is not to be attributed to the verb, for μου is merely possessive. Cf. Ac. 22:1. Blass¹ makes careful distinction between the usages in the various N. T. writers, but that is not to be pushed too far. In 2 Cor. 6:2 (LXX, Is. 49:8) we have ἔπιθησας σου, but ὑπακούω uses the dative (Mt. 8:27). But we have ἐπικροάντο αὐτῶν οἱ δέσιμοι (Ac. 16:25) in the sense of hearken. No verb of smelling is used with the genitive in the N. T., but ἐμπνεῶν ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου (Ac. 9:1) is certainly analogous. As Blass² observes, who refers to the LXX for parallels (Jos. 10:40, τὸν ἐμπνεόν ζωῆς), for both genitive and accusative. Cf. Johannessohn, Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in den Septuaginta. Teil I (1910).

1:54) and οἱ τῆς εὐφρενίας ἄντιλαβανόμενοι (1 Tim. 6:2); ἀπελάβετο αὐτῶν (Mt. 14:31), and ἐπιλαβὸν τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ τυφλοῦ (Mt. 8:23), where the part taken hold of is indicated: ἔκράτησαν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς (Mt. 9:25), where the part is again in genitive, but the whole is in the accusative in κρατήσας τὸν Ἰωάννην (Mt. 14:3); πᾶσας αὐτῶν τῆς χειρὸς (Ac. 3:7), where the whole is in the accusative and the part in the genitive. Blass³ notes that this last (πιάζω) is a “vulgar” word. But here, as usual, the N. T. is in harmony with the vernacular. The papyri⁴ show ἔχωμαι with the genitive as well as ἄντιλαβανομαι. So ἔχομενος μου, P. Par. 51 (b.c. 160). Besides Mk. 8:23 (above) the double genitive (whole and part) may be seen in Lu. 20:20, ἢνα ἐπιλάβονται αὐτῶν λόγου (cf. also verse 26), though here αὐτῶν is probably dependent on λόγου.

4. Verbs of Emotion. These naturally have the genitive, such as to desire, care for, neglect, have compassion, spare, bear with, aim after, obtain, remember, forget, enjoy, etc. ἔπιθωμοι has the genitive in Ac. 20:33, ἄργυριον ἤ χρυσίον ἤ ἱματισμοῦ οὐδενός, but the accusative probably in Mt. 5:28 (text uncertain, but LXX has

¹ Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 103.
² Ib.
⁴ Moulton, Prol., p. 66.
accentive, Ex. 20:17). ὄρεγομαι also has the genitive, as in Heb. 11:16, κρείττονος ὄρεγονται. Cf. 1 Tim. 3:1, where both ὄρεγεται and ἐπιθυμεῖ are used with the genitive. Cf. also ὑμείρομενον ὦμων (1 Th. 2:8). The verbs of concern are fairly numerous and uniform. Thus ἄνεγχομενοι ἀλλήλου (Col. 3:13) in the N. T. as in the older Greek. So μὴ ἐμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος (1 Tim. 4:14), μὴ ὁλιγόρει παιδείας κυρίου (Heb. 12:5). But these three verbs may have the ablative. Ἄνεγχομαι here is 'hold oneself back from.' Like the earlier Greek also is ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ (Lu. 10:34) and μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ; (1 Cor. 9:9). Blass3 considers οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίωνι ἔμελεν (Ac. 18:17) the personal construction, [Page 509] as often in the classical Greek. But already in the Attic inscriptions (Meisterhans, p. 211) we have ἐπιμελέομαι with the dative. So, too, περί appears with the genitive in Jo. 10:13, etc. Consider further τῶν ἱδίων καὶ μάλιστα οἰκεῖον οὐ προνοεῖ (1 Tim. 5:8) and ἵνα φροντίζωσιν καλῶν ἔργων (Tit. 3:8). In Mt. 6:34 we have μεριμνῆσει αὑτῆς, though some MSS. read τῇ ἐπιτιθής. Once again take τοῦ ἱδίου οὐκ ἐφείσατο (Ro. 8:32). These all are in regular order. In Mt. 18:27 τοῦ δούλου is more likely dependent on ὁ κύριος rather than on σπαργαζόμενα. Verbs of obtaining are illustrated by ἔλαξε τοῦ θυμίου (Lu. 1:9), not mere "appearance,"1 though the accusative is elsewhere found in the N. T. as in Ac. 1:17 (cf. classic frequency of the accusative). On the other hand τυγχάνω always has the genitive in the N. T., as τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχέν (Lu. 20:35). But with ἐπιτυχάνω we have ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιόν (Heb. 11:33) and τοῦτο οὖκ ἐπέτυχεν (Ro. 11:7). Moulton (Cl. Rev., p. 437, Dec., 1901) notes genitive and accusative with ἐπιτυχόντες—τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας καὶ ἐπιγαμίαν, B.U. 113 (ii/A.D.). In general the papyri confirm the N. T. use of these verbs. Verbs of remembering and forgetting call for little remark. Thus μνησθῆναι διαθήκης (Lu. 1:72), μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου (Jo. 15:20). Μμημήσκομαι always has the genitive and μνημονεύω usually. But ἀναμμηνήσκο (act., mid. and pass.) always has the accusative in the N. T. Cf. ἀνεμνήσθη τὸ ῥήμα (Mk. 14:72), whereas ancient Greek usually had the genitive. With ὑπομμηνήσκον the usage is divided again, as the accusative is alone used in the active (Jo. 14:26), but the genitive in the passive (deponent), as ὑπεμνήσθη τοῦ ῥήματος (Lu. 22:61; cf. Mk. 14:72 above). Ἐπαναλαμβάνομαι again has usually the genitive, as φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλαμβάνεσθε (Heb. 13:2), but the accusative once (Ph. 3:13) and X in Heb. 13:2 according to classic idiom. Cf. Oxy. P. IV, 744, 11 and 12 (i/A.D.). We once also have ἐκλέξασθε τῆς παρακλήσεως (Heb. 12:5). Of verbs of enjoying we have only ἐγώ σου δναίμην (Phil. 20). Ἀπολαύω does not occur in the N. T., and neither ἀγαλλίω nor χαίρω is used with the genitive, but only absolutely, with the instrumental, or with prepositions. Ἀισθάνομαι appears only once (Lu. 9:45) and with accusative.

5. Verbs of Sharing, Partaking and Filling. Indeed, verbs of sharing can be looked at as taking the partitive genitive. Thus with μετέχειν we have τραπέζης (1 Cor. 10:21), ἐκ τοῦ ἐνός ἄρτου (verse 17, clearly ablative) and χάριτι (verse 30, associative instrumental by analogy of συνκοινονεῖο). Cf. κεκοινώνηκεν σῶμα καὶ σαρκός (Heb. 2:14), though elsewhere in the N. T. the associative [Page 510] instrumental occurs with persons. Μεταδίδομαι has only the accusative and

3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 104.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 102.
instrumental. As to μεταλαμβάνω and προσλαμβάνω it is more doubtful if it is not ablative rather than genitive. Cf. IX, (4), 7, for discussion. The partitive idea is divided between the genitive and the ablative. 1 In the N. T. prepositions are chiefly used and with the ablative. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 102) finds in the partitive idea the explanation of the local and temporal use of the genitive, but not rightly. The true genitive is found with verbs of filling like ἐπλήθη ἢ πόλις τῆς συγχύσεως (Ac. 19:29), πεπληρώκατε τήν Ἱερουσαλήμ τῆς δίδαξης ὕμων (Ac. 5:28), γεμίσατε τας ὑδρίας ὑδάτων (Jo. 2:7), περισσεύονται ἄρτων (Lu. 15:17), ἐνέπλησαν ἄγαθῶν (Lu. 1:53). In Latin words of filling (plenus, etc.) use the ablative or instrumental, as the Greek has the ablative with words of lacking (ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης (Ro. 3:23). By analogy therefore we find ἐκ and the ablative with πληρόν, as ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὅσμης (Jo. 12:3) and γεμίζο, as ἐγέμισεν αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πυρός (Rev. 8:5). For the instrumental with the passive see Ro. 1:29, etc. Indeed the accusative is seen in Ph. 1:11 and Rev. 17:3 and some MSS. in Ac. 2:28.

6. Verbs of Ruling. These probably have the true genitive, though verbs of excelling use the ablative. Thus in Mk. 10:42 we have three such verbs in one sentence, οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύοντας αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλα οἱ αὐτῶν κατεξουσίοις αὐτῶν. Other examples are ἀνθυπατεύοντος, ἀνδρός (1 Tim. 2:12), βασιλεύει τῆς Ἰουδαίας (Mt. 2:22 ΝΒ; elsewhere ἐπί), ἠγιοπνεύοντος τῆς Συρίας (Lu. 2:2), κυριεύομεν ὕμων τῆν πίστεος (2 Cor. 1:24), καταδυναμώνων ὑμῶν (Jas. 2:6), τετραρχούντος τῆς Ἰταορίας (Lu. 3:1). These verbs all have a distinct substantive-affinity like ‘be ruler of,’ etc. See further Lu. 22:25 for κυριεύοντας ἐξουσιάζω, Mt. 16:18 for κατασχώ.

7. Verbs of Buying, Selling, Being Worthy of. It is not perfectly clear what the origin of this usage is. The use of ἐκ δηναρίου with σωφροσύνης (Mt. 20:2) may be noted, but in verse 13 δηναρίου συνεφώνης. Cf. also ἡγόρασαν ἐκ αὐτῶν (Mt. 27:7) with πραθήκην πολλοῦ (Mt. 26:9). Ἀγοράζω is used also with ἐν (Rev. 5:9). So again one may note ἐκτίσατο χωρίον ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς δικαίας (Ac. 1:18. Cf. Lu. 16:9, ἐκ τοῦ μιμοῦν) with μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν (Jun. 11). Cf. διὰ with περιποιέμαι (Ac. 20:28). These examples show that it was easy to go from the genitive to ἐκ and the ablative. Consider also ἐν ἀνθρώπω τῆς ἐφηγμονεύοντος ἀγοράς (Ac. 7:16), ἐσοφογοῦν πωλεῖται (Mt. 10:29), τοσοῦτον ἀπέδοσε (Ac. 5:8), ἠγοράσατε τιμής [Page 511] (1 Cor. 6:20). In Mk. 14:5, πραθήκη σώζοντας ἁγιάσθων ἑαυτῶν, the advt ἐπάνω has no effect on the case as is shown by ἡ βίος ἐπάνω πεντακοσίων ἄδελφοι (1 Cor. 15:6). Blass compares the use of ἐκ in the Attic inscriptions with πραθήκησα. And Monro (Homeric Grammar, p. 109) considers this the ablative, which is certainly possible. But on the other hand the undoubted genitive with ἀξίω suggests the idea of exchange or barter as the true origin and thus a real genitive. Αὐλάσσω is not so used itself, but buying and selling easily fall in with the notion of worth. Thus ἠνυμάξω ἀξίωσεν τῆς κλήσεως (2 Th. 1:11), καταξίωθηκεν τῆς βασιλείας (2 Th. 1:5). Cf. also 1 Tim. 5:17; Heb. 3:3; 10:29. On the whole one is inclined to this explanation of the usage and to treat it as a true genitive. Cf. Rev. 6:6 for the genitive of price without a verb. But the use of ἅπο

---


8. Verbs of Accusing and Condemning. Blass\(^2\) observes that the old Greek usage of the genitive of the thing has well-nigh vanished in the N. T. We do have ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως (Ac. 19:40), but περὶ with the genitive is the usual construction in the N. T. both with ἐγκαλεῖ (Ac. 23:29), κρίνω (Ac. 23:6), and even κατηγορέω (Ac. 24:13). However, in the case of κατηγορέω we do find ὧν in Lu. 23:14 and Ac. 25:11, but in each instance the genitive seems to be due to attraction to the case of the suppressed antecedent τούτον. Cf. Ac. 24:13 for περὶ. Still the point is not absolutely certain and ὧν could be due to κατηγορέω. At any rate κατηγορέω is also used with the genitive of the person as in Ἰνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ (Mt. 12:10). Cf. also Mk. 15:3 where we have genitive and accusative, κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ πολλά. Moulton (*Prol.,* p. 235) notes that D often has accusative with κατηγορέω as with ἄκοιω, κρατέω.

9. Genitive Due to Prepositions in Composition. Some verbs have the genitive because of the preposition in composition which gives a distinct change in idea to the verb. The preposition is often repeated with the noun. As a matter of fact the only\(^3\) preposition that seems to figure thus in the N. T. is κατά which is used with a number of verbs with the genitive.\(^4\) Not all the κατά compounds [*Page 512*] use the genitive. Cf. the accusative case and note as illustrations of the accusative in the N. T. καταγωνίζομαι, καταβραβεύω, καταδικάζω, κατακρίνω, κατασοφίζομαι. It may be that some of the verbs already instanced as using the genitive may owe it to κατά in composition, like κατηγορέω (Mt. 12:10). But the point seems to be reasonably plain as to κατεγέλων ἄντων (Mt. 9:24), ἐδεν καταγινώσκη ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία (1Jo. 3:20, and note verse 21), though ἡμῶν might go with καρδία), κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως (Jas. 2:13), καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων (Jas. 4:11), σου καταρρηνίσθησιν (Mt. 27:13), κατενάρκησα ἡμῶν (2 Cor. 12:13), κατασκευάσωσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Tim. 5:11), αἰχμάνις καταφρονήσας (Heb. 12:2), κατέχεσαι αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς (Mt. 14:3); but in Mt. 26:7 the text of W. H. has ἐπὶ with genitive as some MSS. in Mk.

10. Attraction of the Relative. A word only is needed about the attraction of the relative, a matter treated properly in the chapter on Pronouns, which see. Here it may only be noted that the genitive (as of other oblique cases) of the relative sometimes appears with a verb when the case is due, not to the verb, but to the antecedent. Thus we note περὶ πάντων ὧν ἦσσον (Lu. 3:19), an idiom common in Luke, but rare elsewhere, as ἄστερων οὐκ ἐδέξε (Rev. 1:20).

\(j\) The Genitive of the Infinitive. This is more properly an instance of the genitive of substantives as it is the substantival aspect of the infinitive that is in the case. The full discussion of the matter belongs to the chapter on Verbal Nouns. Here it may simply be remarked that the infinitive with τοῦ is not unknown to ancient Greek,

---

2 Ib., p. 104.
4 Jann. (*Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 341) comments on the blending of meaning between prep. and verb in the later Gk.
though nothing like so common as in the LXX as the translation of the Hebrew infinitive construct. But the Hebrew infinitive is not an exact analogy as it does not have the article.¹ But Thucydides had already shown a fondness for this idiom which is thoroughly Greek. As an example from the LXX take τοῦ ἔξελέσθαι (Dan. 6:14). For the N. T. note ἔξηλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν (Mt. 13:3). The substantival nature of this infinitive with τοῦ is well shown in καρδ. τοῦ ἔρξασθαι (1 Pet. 4:17). But in general τοῦ with the infinitive has as wide an extension of meaning in the vernacular κοινῆ as the genitive absolute.² The details come later.

(k) THE GENITIVE ABSOLUTE. It may indeed be ablative absolute as Farrar³ holds, following the analogy of the Latin. But, as Giles⁴ observes, the Latin absolute is very likely instrumental [Page 513] or locative. The various languages differ greatly, however, in the use of the absolute cases, nearly all having a turn in one language or another. Cf. dative in Anglo-Saxon. Since the Sanskrit uses genitive as well as instrumental and locative (usual construction), Giles considers the Greek genitive absolute a true genitive. In this he is perhaps correct. But Brugmann (Griech. Gr., p. 523) discusses the genitive absolute separately from both genitive and ablative. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 437. Mullach¹ observes that the genitive absolute is a mark of the higher style and was not much used in the vernacular. Jebb² remarks that in the modern Greek the genitive absolute is more commonly paraphrased in harmony with the general disuse of the participle. However, in the vernacular κοινῆ “the rapid extension of the genitive absolute is a very obvious feature,”³ and the N. T. is in line with the papyri on this point also as in most other matters of grammar. Moulton observes further that “in the papyri it may often be seen forming a string of statements, without a finite verb for several lines,” which is rather more than can be said of the N. T. It naturally occurs in the N. T. chiefly in the historical books. Abbott⁴ has felt that Mark uses the genitive absolute “somewhat monotonously to introduce the circumstances of a new narrative,” and he finds it common in Matthew in temporal clauses. John, he observes, has the construction nowhere in recording

¹ C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 59.
² Moulton, Prol., p. 216.
³ Farrar FARRAR, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).
⁴ Gk. Synt., p. 76.
⁵ Man., etc., p. 339 f.
Mullach MULLACH, F., Grammatik d. griech. Vulgarsprache (1856).
¹ Gr., p. 357.
Jebb

Jebb, R. C., Attic Orators. 2d ed. (1893).

———, Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey. (1892).

———, On the Relation of Classical to Modern Greek (Appendix to Vincent and Dickson’s Handbook to Mod. Gk., 1887).

² V. and D., Handb., p. 334.
³ Moulton, Prol., p. 74.
⁴ Joh. Gr., p. 83.
Christ’s words, though he elsewhere⁵ “employs it with more elasticity of meaning than is found in the Triple Tradition.” The LXX shows many examples of the genitive absolute and with abundant freedom also.⁶ The normal usage in the older Greek is to have a genitive absolute when a participle occurs with a noun that is disconnected from the rest of the sentence as in ἄναχορησάντων αὐτῶν (Mt. 2:13). Cf. 2 Cor. 2:12. But the older Greek did not always conform to this norm, and variations appear also in the N. T. Thus sometimes the participle is found alone as in ἐλθόντων (Mt. 17:14) and εἰσόντος (17:26), a very frequent idiom in the papyri.⁷ Cf. ἄναγνωσθέντων B.U. 925 (iii/A.D.?), δηλωθέντος B.U. 970 (ii/A.D.). The papyri also show ἐξόντος instead of the old ἐξόν.⁸ Cf. οὐκ ἐξόντος P.O. 275 (A.D. 66). Then again the genitive absolute occurs when as a matter of fact the noun or pronoun is not absolute and the participle might have merely agreed in case with the word in question. The simplest example is the repetition of the pronoun in the same case as εἰσέλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (Mk. 9:28). But more noticeable is an example like μὴ ἔχοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἄρχοντα (Mt. 18:25), or ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἕνθεμολύνετος—ἔφανεν ἄρτῳ (Mt. 1:20), a usage more common apparently in the N. T. than in the papyri. But note μου κινδυνεύσαντος εἰς θάλασσαν ἔσωσε, B.U. 423 (ii/A.D.), where με is implied with ἔσωσε. One even notes the genitive absolute when the nominative is present as in μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας—ἐφάνης (Mt. 1:18). Moulton¹ notes “a violent use” of the genitive absolute in Heb. 8:9 from the LXX, where we have ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαμβανόμενου μου. Here the participle is treated almost like the infinitive (as a substantive). Moulton regards it as due to the original Hebrew, and Westcott (in loco) cites ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντελεχομένου σου αὐτῷ (Baruch 2:28). See further under Participles.

IX. The Ablative (“Ablatival Genitive”) Case (ἡ ἄφαιρετικὴ πτῶσις). The treatment of this case will be briefer, for it never had the manifold development of the Greek genitive. In the original speech the genitive and ablative had no distinctive endings save in the o stems in the singular.⁵ See chapter VII, II, (a), for discussion of form.

(a) The Name. But the name ablativus is credited to Julius Caesar.³ Besides ἄφαιρετικὴ it is also called πατρική. The name is quite appropriate.

(b) The Meaning. The ablative is then the ‘whence’ case, the case of origin, source, separation or departure. Some of the grammars use the expression “ablatival genitive.” That implies that the case is after all kind of a genitive. That is only true as to form, not as to sense, and causes some confusion. In Greek the ablative is not a live case in form, but in sense it is.

5 Ib., p. 84.
7 Moulton, Prol., p. 74.
8 Ib.
1 Prol., p. 74.
Westcott WESTCOTT, B. F., Language of the N. T. (Smith’s B. D.).
(c) RARE WITH SUBSTANTIIVES. It is possible (though not probably correct) to regard δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ (Ro. 1:17) as ablative, θεοῦ being the source of the righteousness. More likely are the following examples: τὴν ἐκβασιν τῆς ἀναστορφῆς (Heb. 13:7), διαστολὴ Ιούδαιων τε καὶ Ἐλλήνως (Ro. 10:12), διάκρισις καλοῦ καὶ κυκοῦ (Heb. 5:14). See Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 146. In 2 Pet. 1:20 we have a clear case of the ablative in the predicate after the copula γίνεται. Here ἐπιλάσσως (‘disclosure’) is in the ablative. Cf. also τοῦ θεοῦ in 2 Cor. 4:7. One may note also ἐγένετο γνώμης (Ac. 20:3) as probably parallel. In Heb. 12:11 χαρᾶς and λόπης may be considered either true genitives or ablatives. Doubtful also are ὑποστολῆς and πίστεως in Heb. 10:39. But we have a clear ablative in Ac. 20:37 ἰκανὸς δὲ κλαυθόμες ἐγένετο πάντων. Moulton notes the obvious fact that ἄπο and ἐκ (with abl.) are freely used for the old “partitive genitive.” Delbrück thinks the genitive of material originally abl. Cf. VIII, (f), 8, for the true genitives in the partitive sense. This partitive gen. may be illustrated by ἔν τοῦτον (Mt. 6:29) which is to be compared with ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν (Mt. 10:29). In Jo. 3:25 the use of ἐκ makes clear the ablative, ἐγένετο ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν. Blass rather needlessly explains this usage by appeal to the Hebrew ἔξω. Note also τοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν (Lu. 14:33). The matter may be further illustrated by τίς αὐτῶν (Lu. 7:42) and τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν (Mt. 6:27). Indeed with τίς, as Blass observes, the N. T. nearly always uses ἐξ in such examples. He finds the opposite true of τίς save in John. Thus τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων (Mt. 12:38), but τινὲς ἐξ αὐτῶν (Lu. 11:15. Cf. Jo. 6:64). But ἄπο is also found with τίς (Mt. 27:21). One may note also τίς ἐν ὑμῶν (Jas. 5:13). A classical but curious use of this idiom, like the partitive genitive (already noted), is as the subject or object. The explanation lies, of course, in the ellipsis. Thus συνῆλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν (Ac. 21:16) may be compared with ἕπαν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν (Jo. 16:17), ἐκ τοῦ ὅχλου συνεβήσασαν (Ac. 19:33). Cf. Rev. 11:9. Take Mt. 23:34 as an example of the use as object, ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενεῖτε, ἐξ αὐτῶν μαστίγωσετε. Cf. especially ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου πεπιστευτόντας (2 Jo. 4). In Ac. 15:2 we have the full expression ὄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν. Brugmann (Griech. Gr., p. 397) notes the syncretism between the ablative and the genitive with the superlative. See a like confusion in the predicate (Monro, *Hom. Gr.*, p. 148). W. Havers (*Indog. Forsch.*, XXXI, Bd. 1, Heft 3, 1912) “on the splitting of the genitive in Greek” suggests that the partitive genitive was originally independent and adverbial.

(d) THE ABLATIVE WITH ADJECTIVES. The number is not large (cf. the Genitive with Adjectives). In Plato we have, for instance, ἐπιστήμης κενός, ἔλεος ὁδοῦ, but see Kühner-Gerth for a full list in the ancient writers. Thus in the N. T. we find with preposition καθαρός ἄπο τοῦ ἀλματος (Ac. 20:26), a clear ablative. Cf. also ἔλεος ἐπὶ τοῦ νόμου (Ro. 7:3) and ἔλεος ἐκ πάντων (1 Cor. 9:19). But the ablative occurs without prepositions. So ἔξων τῶν διαθηκῶν (Eph.

---

3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 97.
4 lb.
5 I, p. 401. The adjs. with α– privative are regarded as usually with abl.
2:12). It is probably best to regard the verbal adjectives as having the ablative in these examples: ἄγαπητός θεου (Ro. 1:7), γεννητοίς γυναικῶν (Mt. 11:11), διδακτός θεου (Jo. 6:45), διδακτός πνεύματος (1 Cor. 2:13), κλητός Ἰησου Χριστου (Ro. 1:6). One may also suggest here εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός (Mt. 25:34), but on the whole it is to be regarded as a true genitive. The ablative with adjectives with α– privative have “plentiful illustrations from papyri.” For instance ἀκίνδυνος παντός κινδύνου Tb. P. 105 (iii/b.c.), τῆς εἰς ἄπαντας εὐεργεσίας—_absolute B.U. 970 (ii/a.d.). In Mt. 27:24 we find ὃθόδος εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος with ἄπο. Cf. also ἄσπιλον ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου (Jas. 1:27). Thus we easily see the ablative in ἄκαταπάστους ἄμαρτίας (2 Pet. 2:14), ἀνάξιος κρίτηριον (1 Cor. 6:2), ἁνομος θεου (1 Cor. 9:21), ἄπειρος λόγον (Heb. 5:13), ἄπειρος κακόν (Jas. 1:13).

Moreover, the ablative after the comparative is very common in the N. T., apparently more so than in the papyri. Let a few examples suffice: ἰσχυρότερος μου (Mt. 3:11), μικρότερον ἐν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων (Mk. 4:31), πλείονας πάνω πρῶτον (Mt. 21:36), πλείον τῆς τροφῆς (Lu. 12:23), πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ (Mt. 12:45), μείζων τοῦ κυρίου (Jo. 13:16). Cf. Jo. 21:15; 1 Cor. 10:22; 1 Tim. 5:8. Here the ablative idea of difference or distinction is very plain. The Latin also uses the ablative in this sense. Cf. χῆρα μὴ ἔλαττον ἐτῶν ἔξεκοντα (1 Tim. 5:9). In Jo. 5:36, μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰησοῦν, it is not clear whether it is the witness borne by John or to him. In Ac. 4:19 θεου after ἦ is genitive, not ablative, due to ἄκουσαν. The superlative may likewise have the ablative as in πρώτως μου (Jo. 1:15), a usage found in the papyri. Abbott rather needlessly endeavours to explain πρώτος as a substantive meaning ‘chief,’ like τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς νήσου (Ac. 28:7). Note also ποιὰ ἔστη εντολή πρώτῃ πάντων (Mk. 12:28) where πάντων is neuter plural (a possible partitive genitive). Cf. ἔσχατον πάντων (1 Cor. 15:8). The positive περισσός may even have the ablative, as τὸ περισσόν τῶν (Mt. 5:37). Cf. πλείον with the verb περισσᾶω and the ablative πλείον τῶν—Φαρισαίων (Mt. 5:20). In Eph. 3:8, ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστότερῳ πάντων ἄγιων, the comparative and the superlative are combined.

(e) The Ablative with Prepositions. It is very common in the N. T. Thus ἄνευ λόγου (1 Pet. 3:1), ἄπανταί παντῶν [Page 517] (Ac. 3:16), ὀπὸ τῆς ὄρας (Mt. 9:22), ἀτέρ ὄχλου (Lu. 22:6), ἐκ τοῦ ὄντας (Mk. 1:10), ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ (Mt. 23:26; cf. ἐντὸς in same verse), ἔμπροσθεν πάντων (Mt. 26:70), ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλώνως (Ac. 7:43), ἐξ ὑπὸ ὄλκας (Mt. 10:14), ἐξωθεν τῆς πόλεως (Rev. 14:20), ὑπῆκον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Lu. 23:26), ὑπὶ τοῦ μου (Mt. 4:19), possibly ὑπὲρ σαββάτων (Mt. 28:1), παρ αὐτῶν (Mt. 2:4), παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (Mt. 5:32), πέραν τοῦ Ἱορδάνου (Mt. 19:1), πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου (Ac. 27:22), πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα (Jo. 11:55), πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας συστηρίας (Ac. 27:34), ὑπὲρ πάντων (2 Cor. 5:15, true genitive according to some), ὑπεράνω αὐτῆς (Heb. 9:5), ὑπερέκειαι ὑμῶν (2 Cor. 10:16), ὑπερεκπερισσόν ὧν (Eph. 3:20), ὑπὸ κυρίου (Mt. 1:22), ὑποκάτω τῶν ποιῶν (Mk. 6:11), χορίς παραβολῆς (Mt. 13:34). In the case of ὑπὲρ σαββάτων (Mt. 28:1) ὑπὲρ means ‘late from’ (Moulton, Prol., p. 72). Cf. ὑπὲρ τῆς ὄρας, Par. P. 35, 37 (ii/b.c.), ὑπὲρεν τῆς ὄρας Tb. P. 230 (ii/b.c.) and ὑπὲρ τοῦτον in Philostratus (Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 312). Cf. Blass-Debrunner, p.

1 Moulton, Prol., pp. 74, 235; Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 152 f.
2 Ib., 1901, p. 437, σοῦ πρῶτος εἰμι, L.P. ω (ii/iii A.D.).
3 Joh. Gr., p. 90.
101, for still other examples in late Greek. See also μετ ὀλίγον τούτων in Xen., *Hellen.*, I, 1, 2. The list of such adverbs was growing constantly. This is a considerable list, but the ablative idea is patent in all with the notion of separation. An interesting example of the ablative is τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἔπαιγαλίαν (Ac. 23:21). In ὑπέρ, πρό, πρός it is the comparative idea that is involved and that implies separation. Hence it seems likely that ἀπό is to be construed also with the ablative rather than the genitive, though this point is debatable. “In both Greek and Latin the ablative expresses the agent as the source of the action, almost invariably with prepositions” (Buckland Green, *Notes on Greek and Latin Syntax*, p. 32). There is some truth here. For the ablative with prepositions in Cypriot see Meister, Bd. II, p. 295. See chapter on Prepositions. A number of adverbs are themselves in the ablative case, like καλῶς, οὔτως, (all adverbs in –ως), ἔνω, etc.

(f) The Ablative with Verbs. The ablative is not used so frequently with verbs as the accusative, genitive or dative, and yet it is by no means uncommon. Of course, wherever ἀπό (cf. Ac. 5:2), ἐκ (cf. Mk. 1:10) and παρά (Mt. 2:4) are used with the ablative after a verb, these examples are not considered, but they throw light on the use of the same case without the preposition. ἀπό and ἐκ have only the ablative. The ablative is so common with compound verbs like ἀφίστημι, ἀποστέρεω, etc., that no effort is made to separate the simple from the compound verbs. There are examples where the ablative seems to be due purely to the preposition, as τῆς χάρτης ἔξεπέσω (Gal. 5:4); cf. same word in 2 Pet. 3:17). But in many other instances the ablative idea in the verb is due to the effect of the preposition.

1. Verbs of Departure and Removal. This is the simplest ablative with verbs. Take, for instance, οὐκ ἀφίστατο τοῦ ἱεροῦ (Lu. 2:37) where the ablative idea is perfectly plain. So also ἀποστῆσονταί τινες τῆς πίστεως (1 Tim. 4:1). The predicate ablative of source in 2 Pet. 1:20 (Ἐπιλύσεως) was noticed under the discussion of substantives. As a rule ἀπό, ἐκ or παρά will be found with the mere idea of departure. So χωρίζω ἀπό (1 Cor. 7:10). In Lu. 7:6 ἄπέξω has ἀπό, but ἕνδεικτης ἀπό

Naturally verbs meaning to free from, to separate, to deprive of, to hinder from, etc., use the ablative. ἔλευθερόω always has ἀπό (Ro. 6:18), as καθαρίζω ἀπό (1 Jo. 1:7), λύω ἀπό (Lu. 13:16), λύω ἀπό (Ac. 16:33), λυτρόω ἀπό (Tit. 2:14), ἔνω ἀπό

Green, B., *Notes on Greek and Latin Syntax* (1897).

Meister

———, *Beiträge zur Lautlehre d. LXX* (1909).


1 Indeed, as Winer (W.-Th., p. 197) remarks, the prep. is most frequently employed.
(Mt. 6:13), σῶξω ἄπο (Ro. 5:9) and ἐκ (Ro. 7:24). Cf. also μεθίστημι ἐκ in Lu. 16:4. But we have the ablative alone in ἄπληκτωριμένου τῆς ζοιῆς ( Eph. 4:18), ἀπεστηριμένον τῆς ἀληθείας (1 Tim. 6:5), ἀπολέλυσα τῆς ἀσθενείας σου (Lu. 13:12), καθαρίζομαι τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτῆς (Ac. 19:27), ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπηγγέλθει (Lu. 24:16), ἐκκόψαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ βουλήματος (Ac. 27:43). Cf. Lu. 10:42, αὐτῆς. This use of the mere ablative was not unknown to good prose in the ancient Greek. Moulton⁷ finds it also in the papyri. Thus τούτων ἀφελε L.Pb. (ii/B.C.), ἀφελεσθαι ὡν ἐδοκαν O.P. 237 (ii/A.D.). One may note here again ἐκπίπτω with the ablative in Gal. 5:4 and 2 Pet. 3:17. Cf. κολύῳ ἄπο (Lu. 6:29).

2. Verbs of Ceasing, Abstaining. So one may interpret οὐ βραδύνει κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (2 Pet. 3:9), the marginal reading in W. H. (1 Pet. 4:1) πέπαυται ἡμαρτίας, and ὑπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων (Ac. 15:28; cf. also 15:20; 1 Tim. 4:3; 1 Pet. 2:11), though ἄπο also is used with ὑπέχομαι (1 Th. 4:3; 5:22). One can only repeat that these divisions are purely arbitrary and merely for convenience. For ἐκ with ἄναπαύομαι, ἄπο with καταπαύω see Rev. 14:13; Heb. 4:4, 10.

3. Verbs of Missing, Lacking, Despairing. Thus we note ἀν πετοχήσαντες (1 Tim. 1:6), λειπόται σοφίας ( Jas. 1:5), ὑπερτοῦνται τῆς δόξης (Ro. 3:23), ἄδωσαν χρήζει (Lu. 11:8), προσδέομενος τινος (Ac. 17:25), ἐξαπορηθήσεται ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν (2 Cor. 1:8). Cf. τῶν ἀναγκαίων ὑπερτερεῖ L.Pb. (ii/B.C.), τῶν δεόντων ἐγλείπειν (ib.).


[Page 519] 4. Verbs of Differing, Excelling. Here the comparative idea is dominant. We observe πολλῶν στροφῶν διαφέρετε ὑμεῖς (Mt. 10:31), τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἡγάπην (Eph. 3:19), ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν (Ph. 2:3), ὑπερτέρηκεν τῶν ὑπερλιπαν ἀποστόλων (2 Cor. 11:5; cf. use of ὑπερτέρω in sense of lack above. Here the comparative idea of ὑπερτέρος is uppermost.

5. Verbs of Asking and Hearing. These may also use the ablative. This is the usual construction with δέομαι, especially in Luke, as δέομαι σου ( Lu. 8:28). The person is in the ablative, but the thing will be in the accusative, as δέομαι δὲ τὸ μὴ παρών θαρρήσαι (2 Cor. 10:2). So also note ἦν ἥκούσατε μου (Ac. 1:4), but both ἄπο (Lu. 22:71) and παρά (Jo. 1:40), and ἐκ (2 Cor. 12:6) occur.

6. Verbs with the Partitive Idea. Here a sharp difference exists between the accusative which presents the whole and the genitive or the ablative which accents a part. Thus in Rev. 2:17 we have δόσω ἀυτῶ τοῦ μάνα where the point lies in the idea of “some” of the manna, but B reads τὸ and Ν ἐκ τοῦ. In the same verse note the accusative δόσω αὐτῶ ὄνομα where the point lies in the idea of “some” of the name, but B reads τὸ and Ν ἐκ τοῦ. In the same verse note the accusative δόσω αὐτῶ ψήφον λειτυχ. When the whole is expressed in the N. T. the accusative is used. Thus φαγεῖν εἰδωλοθύτα (Rev. 2:14), but ἔστησα ἄπο τῶν ψυχῶν (Mt. 15:27) and ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ὑπεθέθη (1 Cor. 11:28). Thus also πίνων ὄνομα (Lu. 7:33), but πίπτε ἐξ αὐτοῦ (Mt. 26:27), δὲ δὲν πίπ τοῦ ὑδάτος (Jo. 4:14). Cf. also ἐνέγκατε ἄπο τῶν ψυχῶν (Jo. 21:10). Phrynichus says: ἔπιον ὄνομα Ἀττικοῦ, ὄνομα Ἐλληνε—ἐφαγον κρέας Ἀττικοῦ, κρέας Ἐλληνες. Cf. ἄπο τοῦ καρποῦ δοῦσον

---

1 An “impossible” reading to Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 106.
(Lu. 20:10), ἵνα λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν (Mk. 12:2). Cf. also 1 Jo. 4:13. Cf. Mt. 28:1; Ac. 21:16. See Moulton, Introduction to the Study of N. T. Gk., p. 72, where the “partitive gen.” is shown to be often ablative in idea. In modern Greek ἀπὸ is the regular construction for the partitive sense, as δόσε μου ἀπὸ τοῦτο, ‘give me some of that’ (Moulton, Prol., p. 245). Prepositions ὑπὸ and ἐκ are thus uniformly used in the N. T. with this construction of the part (clearly ablative therefore) save in Rev. 2:17 above and in προσελάβοντο τροφῆς (Ac. 27:36). In this last example the MSS. vary a good deal. Μεταλαμβάνω (see (i), 3) may be abl. or gen. in μεταλάμβανον τροφῆς (Ac. 2:46). Blass¹ notes that only Luke, Paul and the author of Hebrews, the more literary writers in the N. T., use the ablative (gen.) with μεταλαμβάνο and προσλαμβάνω. Examples like Ro. 9:16; Heb. 12:11 may be regarded as either ablative or genitive.

7. Attraction of the Relative. Thus ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος ὅ δ’ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ (Jo. 4:14), οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγον ὃν τε ὁ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν (Ac. 26:22). Cf. Pronouns.

X. The Locative (“Locativo Dative”) Case (ἡ τοπικὴ πτῶσις).

(a) The name Locative. It is derived from the Latin locus¹ and is a “grammatical neologism,” but is modelled after vocative. Still Delbrück² prefers “local” to locative and uses it. It is indeed a local case. It is worth noticing that in the Thessalian dialect the old genitive had this locative ending³ as did the Arkadian⁴ also, though this –οι may have come from –οιο. The Latin grammarians took this i for the dative.⁵ We have remnants of the ending in English here, there, where. The modern grammars generally recognise the distinction in the three cases (locative, instrumental and dative), which have usually identical endings, though Blass⁶ is correct in saying that it is not always possible to decide the case. However that uncertainty exists but seldom. Jannaris⁷ makes four cases, counting the associative as a separate case. Compare the blending in the Latin.

(b) The significance of the locative. It is indeed the simplest of cases in its etymological idea. It is the in case as Whitney⁸ finds it in the Sanskrit. It is location, a

---

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 100.
5 Riem. et Goelzer, Synt., p. 197.
7 Jannaris

JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).

———, On the True Meaning of the Κοινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

7 Hist. of Gk. Gr., p. 342.
point within limits, the limits determined by the context, not by the case itself. The word itself is the main determining factor in the resultant sense, and each example has its own atmosphere. There is indeed variation in the resultant idea. Hence, besides in, we come to the ideas of on, at, amid, among, by, with. This development was not only in the early Greek but in the still earlier Sanskrit. The use of the locative without ἐν is much more common in Homer than in the later Greek. In the modern Greek vernacular indeed the locative disappears along with the instrumental and dative before εἰς and the accusative. As to ἐν it adds so little to the locative case that it is not surprising to find it so frequently used, especially as the locative, instrumental and dative all used the same endings. Thus we may compare τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἡλὸν (Jo. 21:8) with ἐν πλοῖῳ (Mt. 14:13), ὑδατί βαπτίζω (Lu. 3:16) with βαπτίζω ἐν υδάτι (Mt. 3:11), τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 6:40) with ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 6:44). The tendency in the older Greek was constantly towards the use of ἐν, though the mere locative survived, especially in some constructions. In Mt. 13:52 MSS. vary between the mere locative τῇ βασιλείᾳ and ἐν with locative and εἰς with accusative.

(c) PLACE. This was probably the original locative. Place of rest was put in the locative without a preposition. As already indicated, this usage abounds in Homer. Some of these distinctively locative forms persisted in the Greek as in the Latin. Thus οἴκοι, ἡσυχία, Μαραθῶνι, Ἀθήναις, Θύρας, humi, Corinthi, Romae (ai). Brugmann (Griech. Gr., p. 226) thinks that χαμαί is dative. Indeed the locative forms and the dative forms used as locative, after the blending of the three case-forms into one, still occur in Pindar side by side. The orators up to the time of Demosthenes use the mere locative frequently. The Ἑλληνικόν has μέσον-ἔν μέσῳ (cf. οἴκοι and οἶκῳ). But the rule in Attic literary prose is to use a preposition with the locative of place. Thus ἐν Ἀθήναις (1 Th. 3:1), ἐν οἴκῳ (1 Cor. 11:34)=‘at home’ and usually ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ (Jo. 11:20). But observe λεστάς περιέπεσεν (Lu. 10:30), where the resultant idea is “among” and περὶ is used with the verb in composition, but none the less it is the locative. Blass indeed remarks that the “local dative” does not occur in the N. T. He means the pure locative of place without a preposition, not considering the adverb κύκλῳ (Mk. 3:34), and possibly χαμαί (Jo. 18:6). We have indeed ἐρήμῳ ἐξελάθει (Jas. 2:25), possibly instrumental. Cf. the figurative usage in 2 Pet. 2:15, etc. It is indeed a very short step to the figurative usage, πορεύεσθαι τοῖς ὀδοῖς αὐτῶν (Ac. 14:16), μηδὲ τοῖς ἑδεσιν περιπατεῖν (Ac. 21:21), στοιχεύειν τοῖς ἱερεῖσι (Ro. 4:12). I think that we have the pure locative also in τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἡλὸν (Jo. 21:8), ὑδατί βαπτίζω (Lu. 3:16), καθαρίσας τῷ λυστρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος (Eph. 5:26), τῷ ἱεροτεστικῷ παραδρέουσας (1 Cor. 9:13). Cf. also ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφάλῃ (Jo. 19:2), ἄδωνας τοῖς ποσίν (Ac. 14:8). Hence it is overstating it to assert that the locative of place without prepositions has entirely disappeared from the N. T. The scarcity of this usage in comparison with Homer is in perfect harmony with the

9 Giles, Man., etc., p. 329 f.
2 Giles, Man., etc., p. 330.
3 Main, Loc. Expr. in the Attic Orators (1892), p. 231.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 119.
linguistic development. Moulton⁶ indeed finds the locative of place [Page 522] in inscriptions as late as the sixth century A.D., B.C.H., 1903, p. 335, τῷ τύβρῳ.

(d) Time. It is expressed much more persistently with the mere locative. It has outlived the usage as to place and is “fairly frequent”¹ in the N. T. Cf. Sanskrit, Latin, older Greek, Anglo-Saxon. Here, of course, time is regarded from the point of view of a point, not of duration (accusative). But the accusative is making inroads on the locative and is already used occasionally for a point of time. See Accusative. For papyri examples take τοῖς παλαιοῖς χρόνοις B.U. 903 (ii/A.D.) and γενεσίοις, γάμοις B.U. 1 (iii/A.D.), Moulton, Cf. Rev., April, 1904, and Dec., 1901. See also τῇ ἀναβάσει, O.P. 742 (ii/b.c.). Observe the difference between the accusative (τῷ σάββατον ἡσύχασαν) and the locative (τῇ δὲ μὲ τῶν σαββάτων ἤλθαν) and the genitive (ὁρθὸν βαθέως) all in the same sentence (Lu. 24:1). The accusative is easily differentiated from both the locative and the genitive. As between the locative and the genitive the matter is not quite so clear. Brugmann² indeed thinks that originally there found as with with each (Mt. 12:2; Mk. 2:23). With ὧν we have both ὧν (Lu. 2:38) and ἐν (Lu. 12:12). Once more φυλακῇ occurs without ἐν (Lu. 14:25) and with ἐν (Lu. 12:38). With ἐτὸς we have ἐν once (as Lu. 3:1) and without ἐν twice (Jo. 2:20; Ac. 13:20), but these two examples (ἔτειν τεσσάρακοντα, ὥς ἔτειν τετρακοσίως καὶ πεντήκοντα) are probably associative-instrumental.¹ Cf. προβεβηκότας ἢδη τοῖς

---

¹ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 119.
Observe also ἐπὶ καιρὸς ἤδη (1 Tim. 6:15), but usually ἐν καιρῷ (Mt. 11:25, etc.). Ἐχομον has only ἐν (as Ac. 1:6) save the associative-instrumental usage like ἵκον κρόνον (Ac. 8:11). Observe also τοῖς γενεσίοις ὁμοῦ (Mk. 6:21). So again ἐτέραις γενεάς (Eph. 3:5), but ἐν in Mk. 8:38. Novi (chiefly in Paul, as Ro. 3:21) is a locative form (cf. ὠὐχί). Other locative adverbs to note are ὤτε (2 Cor. 6:10), ἔκειν (Mt. 6:21), πέρυσι (2 Cor. 8:10), προῖ (Mk. 16:2).

(e) LOCATIVE WITH ADJECTIVES. Thus we note of πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι (Mt. 5:3), καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ (5:8), ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσίν (Ac. 14:8), στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει (1 Pet. 5:9), νοθροὶ ταῖς ἁκοῖς (Heb. 5:11), πετασμῆς ἀκταμήρας (Ph. 3:5), ἐλεύθεροι τῇ δίκαιοτητῇ (Ro. 6:20), ταπεινοὶς τῇ καρδίᾳ (Mt. 11:29), ἀπερίτητοι καρδίαις (Ac. 7:51), ἁγία καὶ σώματι καὶ πνεύματι (1 Cor. 7:34). Cf. Ro. 12:10–13. In Blass-Debrunner, p. 118, these examples are treated as instrumental.

(f) LOCATIVE WITH VERBS. Cf. δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι (Ac. 20:22), περιβεβλημένου ἵματος λευκοῖς (Rev. 4:4, marg. ἐν). In Ro. 12:10–13 note the various examples of the locative with participles, though ταῖς χρείαις κοινονοῦντες is probably instrumental. Cf. also ἐκκοπημένου τῇ διανοίᾳ (Eph. 4:18), ξαποθείκεις πνεύματι (1 Pet. 3:18), σχήματι εὐθρεθέως (Ph. 2:8). We seem to have the locative in κατεργάσατο ξύλον (2 Cor. 6:10), but usually ἐν appears in such examples as ἐν ἑμοί (Gal. 1:24). Further examples with verbs are [Page 524] τοῖς ἑθεσιν περισταθέν (Ac. 21:21), πορευομένη τῷ φόβῳ (Ac. 9:31), ὅταν πειρασμοὶ περιπέσεῖ τοικίας (Jas. 1:2), λήσταις περιέπεσαν (Lk. 10:30), ἐςπερευόντω τῇ πίστει καὶ ἐςπερίσσειν τῷ ἁρπακόῳ (Ac. 16:5), κάμπτε ταῖς ψυχαῖς (Heb. 12:3), ἐμένειν τῇ πίστει (Ac. 14:22), ἐπιμένειν τῇ ἀπεστάτῳ (Ro. 11:23; cf. 22), ἐνεκεντροθήσονται τῇ ἱδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ (Ro. 11:24), τῷ σῷ ὄνοματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν (Mt. 7:22; cf. ἐξεβάλομεν also), ἐξον τῷ πνεύματι (Ac. 18:25; cf. Lk. 10:21 and Mk. 5:29), τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες (Ro. 12:12), and perhaps even ἐπιστέτι ὡς πνεύματι ἄγιῳ (Mk. 1:8). See Ac. 16:5. For the so-called instrumental use of ἐν (like ἐν μαχαίρῃ, Mt. 26:52) see the chapter on Prepositions (cf. also Instrumental Case). As a matter of fact ἐν always has the locative, and this use of ἐν has the locative also. The activity of the verb is conceived as finding expression in the object mentioned. It is not a mere Hebraism, for the papyri have it as indeed the earlier Greek occasionally. But as a practical matter this use of ἐν with the locative was nearly equivalent to the instrumental case. The use of ὄμολογεν ἐν (Mt. 10:32=Lu. 12:8) Moulton (Prol., p. 104) considers a Semiticism due to the common Aramaic original. Cf. the usual dative (Heb. 13:15).

(g) THE LOCATIVE WITH SUBSTANTIVES. Cf. Heb. 11:12, καθὼς τὸ ἄδερμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει. So in Col. 2:14, τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν, the adjective is used as a substantive. In 1 Cor. 14:20 we have the locative with substantive, verb and adjective, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσίν τέλειοι γίνεσθε.

(h) THE LOCATIVE WITH PREPOSITIONS. Just because the prepositions that were used with the locative were only “adverbial elements strengthening and directing its
meaning”11 they were very numerous. Originally nearly all the prepositions occurred with the locative. Thus in Homer and epic and lyric poetry generally we meet with the locative with ἄμφι, ἄνα, μετά (Buck, *Class. Phil.* II, 264), and when the so-called dative is found in Greek with ἐν, ἐπί, παρά, περί, προς, ὑπό, it is really the locative case.2 But with a compound verb the case may not always be locative, as instance προκείμενον ἡμῖν (Heb. 12:1). A number of the prepositions like ἄμφι, ἄντι, ἐν (ἐνι), ἐπί, περί, πρὸς (προτί) are themselves in the locative case. Cf. the locative adverbs of time already mentioned and ἔβραστι (Jo. 5:2), Ἑλληνιστί (Jo. 19:20), κύκλῳ (Mk. 3:34), the conjunction καί, etc. There are only four prepositions in the N. T. that use the locative. As examples note ἐν τῷ [Page 525] Ἰορδάνῃ (Mt. 3:6), ἐπί θύρας (Mt. 24:33), παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Jo. 19:25), πρὸς τῷ μνημείῳ (Jo. 20:11). But of these πρὸς has the locative only 6 times, παρά 50, while ἐπί has it 176 times.1 Ἐν, of course, having only the locative, is very common. One may note here ἐν πρῶτος (1 Cor. 15:3) almost like an adverb.

(i) THE PREGNANT CONSTRUCTION OF THE LOCATIVE. It is common in the N. T. with ἐν, as the accusative with εἰς after verbs of motion or rest. This matter comes up for discussion again under the head of Prepositions, but a few words are perhaps needed here. The identity of ἐν and εἰς in origin and early usage must be borne in mind when one approaches these two prepositions. Cf. ὁ εἰς τὸν ἄγρον in Mk. 13:16. On the other hand note ὁ ἐμβάνας μετ ἐμοῦ τὴν καρα ἐν τῷ τρυμβλίῳ (Mt. 26:23). Here Mark (14:20) has εἰς τὸ τρυμβλίον. This interchange of ἐν and εἰς is a feature of the LXX (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 245). Originally there was no difference, and finally ἐν vanishes before εἰς in modern Greek. Each writer looks at the matter in his own way. Cf. English vernacular, “come in the house,” “jump in the river,” etc. So also Mt. (3:6) has ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, while Mk. (1:9) reads ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην. Cf. ἐν οίκῳ ἔστιν, text of Mk. 2:1 and marg. εἰς οἶκόν ἔστιν. This same pregnant idiom appears with παρά as στάσα ὀψίω παρὰ τούς πόδας αὐτοῦ (Lu. 7:38). See also Mk. 4:1. Cf. again ἐμβάνατε εἰς τὸ πλοῖον (Mt. 8:23). But observe the locative with ἐν in composition (Ro. 11:24). With ὅνομα we have the mere locative (Mt. 7:22), ἐν and the locative (Mt. 21:9), ἐπί and locative (Mt. 18:5), εἰς and accusative (Mt. 10:41; 28:19).2 Cf. also Mt. 12:41.

XI. The Instrumental (“Instrumental Dative”) Case (ἡ χρηστικὴ πτῶσις).

(a) THE TERM INSTRUMENTAL. As applied to case it is modern and the adjective itself appears first in the fourteenth century.3 The Hindu grammarians, however, recognised this case.4 There are not wanting signs indeed that it survived in the Greek as a separate case-form. Meister5 concludes that in the Cyprian dialect the instrumental was still a separate case-form (a “living” case). He cites ἀρᾶ, ἐυχωλῆ,
besides σὺν τόχῳ, and in Kühner-Gerth\(^6\) we find οἴκοι locative, οἰκῶ instrumental, and οἰκώ dative. Other examples are ᾧμα, ὅχα, τάχα in later Greek, not to mention the many adverbs[Page 526]\(^1\) in –α and –η (–ά, –ή) like κρυφή, λάθρη, σιγή, βιά, etc.

This corresponds with the Sanskrit singular ending, and the plural bhīs may be compared with the Homeric φι (φιν), as θεόφι, θεόφιν. But in Homer one must note that these endings for singular and plural are used for the locative, ablative, and possibly for the dative also.\(^2\) It is not always easy to draw the line of distinction between the locative and instrumental in Greek after the forms blended.\(^3\) Sometimes indeed a word will make good sense, though not the same sense, either as locative, dative or instrumental, as τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθεῖς (Ac. 2:33; cf. also 5:31). The grammars have no Greek term for the instrumental case, but I have ventured to call it χρησικῆ πτῶσις. The increasing use of prepositions (ἐν, διά, μετά) makes the mere instrumental a disappearing case in the N. T. as compared with the earlier Greek,\(^4\) but still it is far from dead.

\[(b)\] SYNCRETISTIC? It is a matter of dispute as to whether this instrumental case is not itself a mixed case combining an old associative or comitative case with the later instrumental. Both of these ideas are present in the Sanskrit case (Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, p. 93). On the whole, however, one is constrained to doubt the existence of this so-called comitative case. Most of the difference is due to the distinction between persons (association, accompaniment) and things (means, implement, instrument). Cf. Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, I, p. 231. Hence neither term covers exactly the whole situation. We have a similar combination in our English “with” which is used in both senses. So also the Greek σὺν (cf. Latin cum) and even μετά (Εξηλόθατε μετά μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξόλων, Mk. 14:48). In Mk. 14:43, μετὰ αὐτοῦ—μετὰ μαχαιρῶν, both senses occur together. But we may agree that the associative was the original usage out of which the instrumental idea was easily and logically developed.\(^5\) The comitative usage, for instance, is very common in Homer\(^6\) and Herodotus.\(^7\)

\[(c)\] PLACE. There is no example of this usage in the N. T. except πανταχώ (W. H. text, Ac. 21:28). In Jas. 2:25, ἐκβάλοσα, we probably have the locative, though the instr. is possible.

\[(d)\] TIME. But we do find examples of the associative-instrumental used with expressions of time. This is indeed a very old use of the instrumental, as Brugmann\(^1\)

\(^6\) I, p. 405.
\(^2\) Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 239.
\(^3\) Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 438.
\(^4\) Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 116. The mod. Gk., of course, does not use the instr. case at all, but only με (μετά). Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 103.
\(^7\) Helbing, Über den Gebrauch des echten und soziativen Dativs bei Herod., p. 58 f. Brugmann

**BRUGMANN, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages** (translation by Wright, 1895).
and Delbrück show. The Sanskrit had it also as the time “by the lapse of which anything is brought about.” The singular, like χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ (Lu. 8:27; Ac. 8:11), finds parallel in the papyri, as is seen also in Pindar, Euripides, Aristophanes, Thucydides. For the papyri note πολλοῖς χρόνοις Ν.Π. 50 (iii/A.D.), χρόνῳ Α.Π. 77 (ii/A.D.). Cf. Polybius xxxii, 12, πολλοῖς χρόνοις (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 76). There is no
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doubt about the plural instrumental in Ro. 16:25, χρόνοις αἰωνίοις, a parallel to which Moulton⁶ finds in the epistolary formula in the papyri, ἔρρωσθαι σε εὔχομαι πολλοῖς χρόνοις. He rightly doubts the necessity of appealing to the Latin as W. Schulze⁷ does for the explanation of the use of the plural, since the classical τῷ χρόνῳ could easily give the impulse.

In Jo. 2:20, τεσσεράκοντα καὶ ἔτεσιν οἴκοδομήθη, we have the instrumental also, though, of course, this might be looked at as a locative, the whole period regarded as a point of time. In an example like πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν (Lu. 8:29) we probably have the instrumental also, though here the locative would give a good idea, ‘on many occasions’ (‘oftentimes’ Rev. V.), whereas the marg. (‘of a long time’) gives the instrumental idea. For the instrumental idea Moulton⁸ cites from Letronne (p. 220, fourth century A.D.) πολλοῖς ὑστερον χρόνοις. See also ὃς ἔτεσι τετρακόσιας καὶ πεντήκοντα (Ac. 13:20). Cf. also πάσαις ταῖς ημέραις (Lu. 1:75), but marg. of W. H. has accusative. As Moulton⁹ observes, only the context can decide which is locative and which instrumental in such examples and he suggests that this uncertainty had something to do with the increasing use of ἐν to make the locative clear and distinct from instrumental or dative. “Speakers of Greek were certainly beginning to feel that they could not trust the dative out alone, and we can understand the occasional employment of nursemaid ἐν in places where she would have been better left at [Page 528] home, or replaced by σόν.” Blass¹ comments on the frequency of the instrumental with expressions of time in Josephus with no perceptible difference between it and the accusative. One can hardly agree to Blass¹² explanation of the instrumental of time that it is due to the disinclination of the writer to put another accusative beside the direct object of the verb. Certainly the accusative is the most frequent idiom in the N. T. for the idea of extension of time, as can be seen in Mk. 2:19; Lu. 13:8; Ac. 13:18; Rev. 20:3, etc. In Jo. 14:9 W. H. have τοσοῦτον χρόνον in the text and put τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ in the marg. In Lu. 8:27 some MSS. have instead of the instrumental χρόνῳ ἰκανῷ the ablative ἐκ (?f) χρόνων ἰκανῶν.

———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

6 Prol., p. 75.
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7 Gr. Lat., p. 14. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 121, calls this “duration of time” “unclassical,” but incorrectly as is already shown.
9 ib.
2 ib.
(e) THE ASSOCIATIVE IDEA. The idea of association alone is responsible for a good many examples, chiefly with verbs, though adjectives are not wanting. Substantives cut no figure at all according to Blass, for τίς κοινωνία φωτί πρὸς σκότος (2 Cor. 6:14) is an example of the pure dative (cf. also Lu. 5:10, 2 Cor. 6:16), and in Ro. 15:26 we have ἐς τοὺς πτωχούς and in 1 Jo. 1:3, 6, 7 μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν. But another example in 2 Cor. 6:14, τίς μετοχῇ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἄνωμή, comes much closer to the substantive use of the associative-instrumental. But an undoubted example of a substantive followed by the associative-instrumental appears in ἐς ὑπάντησιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ (Mt. 8:34). So ἐς ἄπαντησιν ἡμῖν (Ac. 28:15). Cf. also Jo. 12:13 (αὐτῷ) and 1 Macc. 3:11 ἐς συνάντησιν αὐτῷ. There is nothing in this construction out of harmony with the Greek idiom. The verb has the associative-instrumental. The genitive with this substantive occurs in Mt. 27:32 (δ text) and 1 Th. 4:17 (but δ text has associative-instrumental). Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 14. There is no doubt as to the adjectives σύμμορφος and σύμφωτος. Thus τὸ σῶμα σύμμορφον τὸ σῶματι (Ph. 3:21) and σύμφωτοι τὸ ὁμοίωματι (Ro. 6:5), but σύμμορφος has the genitive τῆς εἰκόνος in Ro. 8:29 like a substantive. The other compounds in σῶν are treated as substantives 1 with the genitive, like συναιμώλωτος, συγγενής, συνεργός, σύντροφος, μέτοχος (Heb. 1:9). But note ἕναντίος αὐτῶς (Mk. 6:48), ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν (Col. 2:14). With verbs the associative-instrumental is very common in the N. T. as in the older Gk. The most important examples will be given in illustration. Αἰκολουθεῖν is a common instance, as ἔκολουθεν αὐτῷ (Mk. 1:18). Cf. also συνάκ. (Mk. 5:37). Rather oddly ἔσομαι is not so used, but once we find συνείπετο αὐτῷ (Ac. 20:4). So [Page 529] διελέγετο αὐτῶς (Ac. 20:7), though πρὸς (Mk. 9:34) also is used. Other compounds of διά with this case are διαλλάγη τῷ ᾧδελφῷ (Mt. 5:24), διεβαλήθη αὐτῷ (Lu. 16:1), τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος (Ju. 9), τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διακατηλέγχετο (Ac. 18:28). But closely allied to these words are κατηλλάγην τῷ θεῷ (Ro. 5:10), σοι κρίθηναι (Mt. 5:40), ὠμίλει αὐτῷ (Ac. 24:26), which last may have πρὸς and accusative (Lu. 24:14). Then again note ἔτερονυγοῦντες (2 Cor. 6:14), τοῖς πνευματικοῖς ἐκοινώνησαν (Ro. 15:27), κολλάθησαν αὐτῶς (Ac. 5:13), ἔντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ (Ro. 11:2). Cf. further ἄνδρὶ ἓδεστα (Ro. 7:2) and μεμιμημένην πρὶν (Rev. 15:2). In Rev. 8:4 we may (R. V. dative) have the associative-instrumental 2 ταῖς προσεχαῖς with ἄνεβη. Moulton cites ὑποδόσωσι σοι τῷ ἔνγιστα δοθησόμενά δυσωτόν, B.U. 69 (ii/A.D.) ‘with your next wages’ (Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901). Cf. the old Greek αὐτῶς ἄναρθραν and the “military dative” (Moulton, Prol., p. 61). The compounds that with σῶν that use this case are numerous. Thus συλλαβέσθαι (Lu. 5:7), συμβουλεύσας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις (Jo. 18:14), though this might be a dative (cf. συμβαίνω and συμφέρει), συνεφώνηθη ὑμῖν (Ac. 5:9; cf. 15:15), 3 μηδὲ συναδολοῦντες τῇ πίστει (Ph. 1:27, two examples probably of the instrumental, the first of manner), συμπολούθην αὐτῷ (Mk. 14:51), αἰ συναναφθήσαι αὐτῷ (Mk. 15:41), συνανακείμενο τῷ Ἰησοῦ (Mt. 9:10), μὴ συναναγγέλθηται αὐτῷ (2 Th. 3:14), συναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν (Ro. 15:32), συνήνθησαν αὐτῷ (Lu. 9:37), μοι συναντήθηται (Lu. 10:40; cf. Ro. 8:26), συμπολούθησι σοι (Mk. 14:31), οὗ συναπόλετο τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν (Heb. 11:31),

3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 115.
4 lb.
1 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 75.
2 Considered peculiar by Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 114.
Some N. T. adverbs illustrate this usage well, like ἐνδιέρχομαι (Ac. 16:37), εἰκόνα (1 Cor. 15:2), ἱδίῳ (1 Cor. 12:11), κρυφῇ (Eph. 5:12), λαβὼν (Mt. 2:7), πανωκεί (Ac. 16:34), παντλήθει (Lu. 23:18), πάντα (Ac. 24:3), πεζοὶ (Mk. 6:33), τάχα (Ro. 5:7). But the usage is abundant outside of adverbs, chiefly with verbs, but also with adjectives and even with substantives. Thus we find τέχναι φύσει ὄργῆς (Eph. 2:3) and Κύριος τῶν γένευ (Ac. 4:36; cf. also 18:2, ὄνοματι Ακύλαν, Ποντικῶν τῶν γένεων). See also the participle τῷ ὄντι (Ro. 7:23). Cf. also φύσει in Gal. 2:15 and τῷ προσώπῳ in Gal. 1:22. Here are some of the chief examples with verbs: χάριτοι μετέχοι (1 Cor. 10:30), προσευχομένη ἀκατακαλύπτω τῇ κεφαλῇ (1 Cor. 11:5), περιτομήτε τῷ ἔθει (Ac. 15:1), τῇ προθέτει προσμενένες (Ac. 11:23), τῷ παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴπτε προφάσει εἴπτε ἄλθείας, Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται (Ph. 1:18, all three examples), ἀνακαταλλημένῳ προσόπῳ καταστρέφομεν (2 Cor. 3:18). Blass notes also ἀραπίσαμεν αὐτῶν ἔλαβον

---

1 K.-G., I, p. 435.
(Mk. 14:65) as a vulgarism which finds a parallel in a papyrus\(^2\) of the first century

\[\text{Page 531}\]

A.D., κονδύλοις ἔλαβεν. Cf. τῇ βίᾳ, B.U. 45 (iii/A.D.). But often μετά and the genitive (μετὰ βίας, Ac. 5:26), ἐν and the locative (ἐν δέκα χιλιάσιν, Lu. 14:31), κατά and the accusative (Ac. 15:11) or the mere accusative (Mt. 23:37) occur rather than the instrumental. There is one usage in the N. T. that has caused some trouble. It is called\(^1\) “Hebraic” by some of the grammarians. The instances are rather numerous in the N. T., though nothing like so common as in the LXX.\(^2\) Conybeare and Stock quote Plato to show that it is, however, an idiom in accordance with the genius of the Greek language. Thus λόγῳ λέγειν, φεύγων φυγῇ, φύσει πεφυκυῖα, etc. They call it the “cognate dative.” That will do if instrumental is inserted in the place of dative.

Moulton\(^3\) admits that this idiom, like βλέποντες βλέψετε (Mt. 13:14), is an example of “translation Greek,” but thinks that a phrase like ἔξολεθρεύσαι οὐκ ἔξολεθρεύσαν (Josh. 17:13) is much more like the Hebrew infinitive absolute which is reproduced by this Greek instrumental or participle. Blass\(^4\) insists that the classical parallels γάµῳ γαµεῖν, φυγῇ φεύγειν are not true illustrations, but merely accidentally similar, an overrefinement in the great grammarian, I conceive. The Latin has the idiom also, like curro curriculo. Here are some of the important N. T. instances: ἄκοψε ἄκούσετε (Mt. 13:14), ἄναθεματι άνθεματισμένον (Ac. 23:14), ἐπιθύμη τελευτάτω (Mt. 15:4), ἐπιθύμη ἐπιθύμησεν (Ac. 2:30), ἐξέθήσαν ἐκστάσει μεγάλη (Mk. 5:42), παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγέλθηκαν (Ac. 5:28), προσευχῆ προσευχῆσαι (Jas. 5:17).

Cf. also σημαίνειν ποιῆθεν θανάτῳ ἠμμαθέν ὁς ὁμοήθηκεν (Jo. 18:32) and σημαίνειν ποῖῳ θανάτῳ ὁδῆσαι τὸν θεὸν (Jo. 21:19), where the idiom seems more normal. Blass\(^5\) observes that this usage “intensifies the verb in so far as it indicates that the action is to be understood as taking place in the fullest sense.” In Ro. 8:24 we more likely have the means than the manner. Cf. ἕχεσθαι τοῖς ὑψώσασιν in Lu. 3:14.

\(h\) DEGREE OF DIFFERENCE (Measure kin to idea of manner). The accusative is sometimes used here also with the comparative, as πολὺ μᾶλλον (Heb. 12:9). But in Lu. 18:39 we have πολλῷ μᾶλλον (cf. Mt. 6:30). Cf. πολλῷ μᾶλλον, P. Par. 26 (ii/B.C.). In Ph. 1:23 we find the instrumental with the double comparative πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρίσσαν. In particular observe τοσοῦτῳ μᾶλλον δοξῶ βλέπετε (Heb. 10:25) which corresponds to the English idiom “the more, the less” in “the more one learns,

\(^{1}\) Moulton, Prol., p. 75.

\(^{2}\) C. and S., p. 60 f.

\(^{3}\) Moulton, Prol., p. 75 f. Cf. θάνον θανάτῳ in Homer.

\(^{4}\) Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 119.

\(^{5}\) Ib. Thack. (Jour. of Theol. Stu., July, 1908, p. 598 f.) shows that in the Pentateuch the Hebrew infinitive absolute was more frequently rendered by the instr. case, while in the Books of Samuel and Kings the participle is the more usual. In the LXX as a whole the two methods are about equal. On p. 601 he observes that the N. T. has no ex. of the part. so used except in O. T. quotations, while several instances of the instr. occur apart from quotations, as in Lu. 22:15; Jo. 3:29; Ac. 4:17; 5:28; 23:14; Jas. 5:17. See also Thack., Gr., p. 48.
the humbler he grows.” As a matter of fact the English “the” here is instrumental also, as is seen in the Anglo-Saxon ḍý. Cf. also ἡ τοσοῦτῳ κρεῖττον (Heb. 1:4).

(i) CAUSE. The instrumental may be used also to express the idea of cause, motive or occasion. This notion of ground wavers between the idea of association and means. Here are some illustrations: ἐγὼ δὲ λειμῶ ὡς ἀπόλλυμαι (Lu. 15:17), ἵνα σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διόκοιται (Gal. 6:12), λύσῃ κατατηρή divisive (2 Cor. 2:7), τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνήθει της θόντος (1 Cor. 8:7), σύ διεκδίκησας τῇ ἡμερίᾳ ἀλλὰ ἀνευδοκομήθη τῇ πίστει (Ro. 4:20), τῇ ἀποστίῳ ἐξελέγησαν (Ro. 11:20), ἠλείθυμε τῇ τούτων ἁπλοτίᾳ (Ro. 11:30), τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ αὐτῷ νῦν ἐλεηθῶσαν (11:31), μὴ εἴπης τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρός (1 Pet. 4:12), τοιούτως γὰρ θυσίας εὑραπιστή (Heb. 13:16), τῷ μὴ εὑρεθῇ με Τίτον (2 Cor. 2:13), εὐδοκίσασθαις τῇ δοκίμῳ (2 Th. 2:12). In 1 Cor. 9:7 we have τὶς συμπεριφέρεται ίδιος ὄνομος ποτὲ; cf. τῇ ὑπερβολῇ (2 Cor. 12:7). But some verbs in the N. T. prefer a preposition for this idea, but not with the instrumental case. Thus ἡγαλλίσας ἐν τῇ θεῷ (Lu. 1:47), ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ (Mt. 7:28), ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα (Mk. 1:11), εὐφραίνοντο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις (Ac. 7:41). With θαυμάζω we find ἐν (Lu. 1:21), ἐν (Lu. 4:22), περί (Lu. 2:18), διά (Rev. 17:7), not to mention εἰ (1 Jo. 3:13), ὑπὸ (Lu. 11:38).1

(ii) MEANS. But no usage of this case is more common than that of means. With things sometimes we call it means, with persons agent, though more often the agent is expressed by ὑπὸ with genitive-ablative (cf. ab with the ablative in Latin). There is no essential difference in the root-idea. Donaldson (New Cratylus, p. 439) calls it the “implementive case.” This is, of course, an idiom found with verbs. Note especially χρῶμαι (cf. Latin utor with instrumental, not ablative), τῷ Παιώ χρησάμενος (Ac. 27:3), πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα (2 Cor. 3:12), ἐν τὸς τῆς [Page 533] νομίμου χρῆται (1 Tim. 1:8), in which examples we have both thing and person.1 Cf. 1 Cor. 9:12, 15, etc. But see accusative in 1 Cor. 7:31. Among the many examples we can only select the most striking. Thus μὴ ποτε ἱδοιν τοῖς διωκόμενοις (Mt. 13:15), ἔξεβαλεν τῷ πνεύματι λόγῳ (Mt. 8:16), πέδαις καὶ ἀλλᾶς ἀδελφός (Mk. 5:4), ψάχνοντες τοῖς χεριν (Lu. 6:1), τὸ σοῦ ἐξέμασσαν (Lu. 7:38), ἠλειπέν τῷ μάρῳ (ib.), ὑπνῶ (Lu. 9:32), φιλάμασι παραδίδοσι (Lu. 22:48), τῇ μαγίας ἑξεστάκειν αὐτοῦς (Ac. 11:18), ἔρχεται αὐτὸν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει (Ac. 10:38), ἀνέλειν Ἄκαβον μαχαίρη (Ac. 12:2), διεδαμαστεὶ τῇ φύσε (Jas. 3:7), συναπτῆθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει (Gal. 2:13), πεπληρωμένους πνεῦμα ἁλόιας, πονηρεῖς, κτλ. (Ro. 1:29), χάριτι ἐστὶν σεσυσκευασμένοι (Eph. 2:5, 8), μὴ μεθυόκεσθε δόθη (Eph. 5:18), ὅ ἐρωτευμένοις αἴματι (Rev. 19:13), πνεύματι (Ro. 8:14), οὐ ψευτάν, ἄργυρῳ ἢ χρυσῷ, ἑξιστάθηκε, ἀλλὰ τιμῶ αἴματι (1 Pet. 1:18 f.), ὃ τῷ ἤτοιται (2 Pet. 2:19), ἐσφαγησθῆτε τῷ πνεύματι (Eph. 1:13), πιθανὸς ὡς γράμμασι ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χερί (Gal. 6:11), one dative and two instrumental cases. Cf. κατακρίνοισθαι αὐτὸν θανάτῳ (Mk. 10:33, but θανάτου in D, and in Mt. 20:18 Ν has αἰς θανατον). See the frequent use of πίστει in Heb. 11, which is more than mere manner, though in verse 13 we have κατά πίστιν. Moulton (Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901) cites διήλουσον ἥ πλοιο ἐξέρχεται ἡ δόμῳ, O.P. 112 (iii/iv

1 In Herod., we find a double instr. with χρῆθω. Cf. Helbing, Der Instrumental in Herod., 1900, p. 8.
same might be true of usual way of expressing the agent in the N. T. is (Mt. 3:12) may be either locative or instrumental. The same might be true of τοῦ ἢλθον (Jo. 21:8) and ἐβάπτισεν ὄδατι (Ac. 1:5), though the locative is pretty clearly right here. Then again in Ac. 22:25, προέτειναν τοῖς ἰμάσιν, we have either the instrumental or the dative. But in 2 Pet. 1:3 ἰδία δόξη καὶ ἀρετῇ (marg. in W. H.) are clearly instrumental, not dative. In Ro. 8:24, τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν, we have either the modal instrumental or the instrumental of means. Cf. also 1 Cor. 14:15. Blass perhaps over-emphasizes the influence of the Heb. ἐν on the N. T. Greek in what is called the instrumental use of ἐν (the case with ἐν is always locative, historically considered). This is a classic idiom and the papyri give numerous illustrations of it, though the Heb. ἐν [534 Page] did make it more frequent in the LXX. Some of the uses of ἐν and locative, like ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἦπολούνται (Mt. 26:52), πολεμήσω ἐν τῇ ἱρομαρία (Rev. 2:16), ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρῃ ἦπέθανον (Heb. 11:37), are fairly equivalent to the pure instrumental case, as ἦνθα ἦπαρχω (Ac. 12:2), τεσσάρων τόπων, μαχαίρῃς (Lu. 21:24). But others without ἐν in Blass’ list are more debatable and may be construed as merely locatives after all, as seen above. Besides the examples already mentioned, πωρὶ ὀλισθήσεται (Mk. 9:49) may be compared with ἐν τίνι αὐτῷ ἄρτῳ ὑπερτύστε (9:50) and ἐν τίνι ἀλοιπόντε (Mt. 5:13). See further Mt. 7:2 and ἐν ἑρμόδῳ ἔλθο (1 Cor. 4:21) which stands over against ἐν ἄγαπῃ πνεύματι τε πραεθητος.

Some doubt remains as to whether the instrumental use is used for the agent. In the Sanskrit the instrumental is a common idiom with a perfect passive verb or participle. But the Latin uses the dative in such an example as is seen by mihi, not me. Most of the grammarians take the Greek passive perfect and verbal as the Latin with the dative. But Delbrück recognizes the doubt in the matter. The one example in the N. T. is in Lu. 23:15, οὐδὲν ἥξεν θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ. D here reads ἐν αὐτῷ and Blass suggests that the right reading is without πεπραγμένον as in Ac. 25:5. It is possible also that in 2 Pet. 2:19, ὑπὶ τος ἢπτηται, we have person, not thing, of whom (Am. St. V), not of what. Cf. also Jas. 3:7. One may mention here also as a possible instrumental καὶγὰρ ἐφερέν οὐμίν (2 Cor. 12:20), ὡς ἐγνώση αὐτοῖς (Lu. 24:35), ὥσπερ ἄγγελος (1 Tim. 3:16), but these are most probably true datives. The usual way of expressing the agent in the N. T. is ὑπὸ for the direct agent and διά for the intermediate agent, as in Mt. 1:22. But other prepositions are also used, like ἔπο (Ac. 2:22), ἐκ (Jo. 1:13), ἐν (Col. 1:17), παρὰ (Jo. 1:6), etc. See a real distinction between ἐπὸ and ἐν in Ro. 12:21.

---
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 117.  
1 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 95.  
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 112.
(k) **With Prepositions.** The Greek uses the instrumental with only two prepositions ἄρα and σύν, both with the comitative idea. In the Cypriot Greek we have συν τόγδ, the distinctive instrumental ending. Cf. the Sanskrit सम् with the instrumental and the Latin *cum*. There is only one instance of ἄρα in the N. T. with the instrumental, ἄρα αὐτοῖς (Mt. 13:29), but note ἄρα συν αὐτοῖς (1 Th. 4:17; cf. also 5:10). Σύν appears chiefly in Luke’s [Page 535] writings, as συν αυτή (Lu. 1:56). But in composition συν is very common, as has already been shown. So συναπερέτε μοι (Ph. 2:18).

**XII. The Dative (True) Case (ἡ δοτικὴ πτῶσις).**

(a) **Syncretism.** That of the locative, instrumental and dative cases has not advanced so far in Greek as has that between the genitive and the ablative. Monro¹ thinks that “distinct forms for these three cases survived down to a comparatively late period in Greek itself.” He rightly conceives that it is not difficult, as a rule, to distinguish the three cases in usage. Brugmann² gives various examples of how the three cases made contribution to the common endings for the final blending.

(b) **The Decay of the Dative.** But in modern Greek this syncretistic combination has vanished in the vernacular. Moulton³ can properly speak of the “decay of the dative,” a decay that applies for the modern Greek to the locative and instrumental also. In the Sanskrit (Lanman) the dative, after the ablative, was the most infrequent case. The modern Greek simply uses εἰς and accusative for the usual dative (and locative) ideas and με (μετά) with accusative for the instrumental. We see an approach to this use of εἰς in the N. T., ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τό ἔθνος μου (Ac. 24:17), τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς έαυτούς (Lu. 7:30). So εἰς ήμᾶς (1 Pet. 1:4). Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 213) is correct in refusing to consider εἰς with κηρύσσω or εὐαγγελίζομαι (Mk. 13:10; Lu. 24:47; 1 Pet. 1:25) as at all out of the way. The pregnant idea is in Mk. 8:19 and Ro. 8:18. Εἰς is found also with ἐνοχος (Mt. 5:22), εὐθετος (Lu 14:35), εὐχρηστος (2 Tim. 4:11), but ἄφλεμος with πρός (1 Tim. 4:8). Only in the most illiterate papyri is the decay of the dative seen, as in τίνι λόγου, N.P. 47 (iii/A.D.), and in the late inscrs. like ὁ βοηθῶν ύμων, J. H. S., XIX, 14. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., Apr., 1904. Per contra note ἐπιελήθη[η] τῷ πιστόῳ, P. Oxy. 744 (i/B.C.). Leaving out ἐν, the locative, instrumental and dative show a contraction

---

1 Hom. Gr., p. 97 f.
3 Prol., p. 62.
Winer

WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).
in the N. T. as compared with the earlier Greek. But even in the N. T. “ἐν is considerably more than a match for εἰς,” yet the vernacular revived and intensified the old identity of ἐν and εἰς seen in the early-dialects. Hatzidakis shows how this tendency increased in the later Greek till εἰς triumphed over ἐν in the modern Greek. But even in the N. T. it is often impossible to insist on the idea of motion or extension in εἰς, as ὁ ὄν εἰς τὸν κόλπον (Jo. 1:18), ὁ εἰς τὸν ἄγρον (Mk. 13:16). Cf. τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον (Lu 9:61). Moulton cites from D ἐν as equivalent to εἰς in Acts 7:12; 8:23. One may compare the disappearance of the locative with ὑπό and the use of the accusative for both motion and rest, whereas in Appian and Herodian (Atticists) the locative is in the lead. Cf. the disappearance of the dative forms in English save in the pronouns him, whom, etc. Even Wyclif had “believe ye to the gospel” (Mk. 1:15).

(c) THE IDEA OF THE DATIVE. It is that of personal interest. It is sometimes used of things, but of things personified. Apollonios Dyscolos calls the dative the case of περιποίησις. The accusative, genitive and dative are all cases of inner relations, but the dative has a distinctive personal touch not true of the others. The dative is not a local case. There was originally no idea of place in it. It is thus a purely grammatical case (rein grammatisch). Even ἐρχομαί σοι (Rev. 2:16) is used of a person, not place. Cf. ἐρχεται σοι (Mt. 21:5, from the LXX) and ἐλθεί μοι, P. Par. 51 (B.C. 160). But in physical relations the dative approaches the accusative in idea. Thus we find the dative of place in Heb. 12:22, προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζοντος (cf. 12:18) and ἐγγίζοντι τῇ Δαμασκῷ (Ac. 22:6). Cf. ἤγγισεν τῇ πύλῃ (Lu. 7:12). It is not used for the notion of time.

(d) THE DATIVE WITH SUBSTANTIVES. I am not here insisting that the dative was used first with substantives rather than with verbs, but only that the dative has often a looser relation to the verb than the accusative or the genitive. It is more common to have the verb without the dative than without the accusative or genitive (Brug., ib.). This is seen also in the common use of the dative as the indirect object of verbs that have other cases and in the use of the dative with substantives somewhat after the manner of the genitive. Not all substantives admit of this idiom, it is true, but only those that convey distinctly personal relations. But some of these substantives are allied to verbs that use the dative. So εὐχαριστιῶν τῷ θεῷ (2 Cor. 9:12), θλίψιν τῇ

4 Ib.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 122.
Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
1 Prol., p. 235.
2 Ib., p. 63.
4 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 98.
7 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 95.
9 Brug., Griech Gr., p. 399.
σαρκί (1 Cor. 7:28), ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου (2 Cor. 2:13), σκόλον τῇ σαρκί (2 Cor. 12:7). [Page 537] ἀνάσπασμα ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν (Mt. 11:29), εὐθύδια τῷ θεῷ (2 Cor. 2:15), εἰς ταράθη τοῖς ξένοις (Mt. 27:7), τοῖς ἄπολλομένοις μορφά (1 Cor. 1:18). Cf. Lu. 5:14. With some of these examples verbs occur, but the dative is not here due to the verb. Some of them are in the predicate also, as χάρις τῷ θεῷ (Ro. 7:25), with which compare marg. εὐχαριστῶ. See Lu. 10:5. Cf. τοῖς ἄσπευδεύτων (1 Cor. 8:9). So in 1 Cor. 9:2, οἱ ἄλλοι σῶκε εἰμι ἄποστολος, ἀλλὰ γε ὑμῖν εἰμι, the dative is not due to εἰμι. Cf. in next verse ἢ ἐμῇ ἀπολογίᾳ τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρίνουσιν. Cf. also αὐτοῖς in Ph. 1:28. So νόμος ἐστι τοῖς (Ro. 2:14), ἐμοὶ ἄνθρωπος (Ro. 7:13), and, not to multiply examples, τούτῳ μοι καρπὸς ἔργου (Ph. 1:22), ἢ ἐπιστάσις μοι (2 Cor. 11:28). Cf. Ro. 1:14; 8:12. In 1 Cor. 4:3 both the dative and εἰς and accusative occur, but properly so, ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστον ἔστιν. Cf. 1 Cor. 14:22 for the same thing. The dative due to attraction of the relative is seen in οἷς Lu. 9:43.

(e) With Adjectives. This dative occurs naturally. These adjectives and verbs, like the substantives, have a distinctly personal flavour. Here are the most striking examples: ἀπειθεῖς τῇ οὐρανίῳ ἁπάσῃ (Ac. 26:19), ἄρεστὰ αὐτῷ (Jo. 8:29), ἄρκετον τῷ μαθητῇ (Mt. 10:25), ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἄμωμοι αὐτῷ (2 Pet. 3:14), στειός τῷ θεῷ (Ac. 7:20), γνωστός τῷ ἄρχερε (Jo. 18:15), δοῦλα τῇ ἄκαθαρσίᾳ (Ro. 6:19), σωτράται τῷ θεῷ (2 Cor. 10:4), σωτήριος πᾶσιν (Tit. 2:11), ἐμφανή—ἡμῖν (Ac. 10:40), ἐνοχοὺς ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ (Mt. 5:22), τὸ εὐσχῆμον καὶ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ (1 Cor. 13:35), ἱκανον τῷ τοιούτῳ (2 Cor. 2:6), καλὸν σοὶ ἔστιν (Mt. 18:8), μονογενῆς τῇ μητρί (Lu. 7:12), νεκροῖς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ (Ro. 6:11), πιστῆν τῷ κυρίῳ (Ac. 16:15), πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ (Jas. 2:5), σωτήριος πᾶσιν (Tit. 2:11), ϕεύγόμενοι (Ac. 7:39), φανερὸν ἐγένετο τῷ θαρσῷ (Ac. 7:13), ὄντες αὐτῷ πῆλοι (Ac. 19:31), ὄρθωσί τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (Tit. 3:8). Wellhausen (Einp. p. 33 f.) calls ἐνοχοὺς τῷ “ungriechisch.” But note ἐνοχὸς ἔστω τοῖς ἱσοὺς ἐπιτειχίῳς, P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66). The participle in Lu. 4:16 (Ac. 17:2) almost deserves to be classed with the adjectives in this connection, τὸ εἰσοθεν αὐτῷ.

(f) With Adverbs and Prepositions. The dative is found a few times with adverbs. Thus ὡς ὀσίος καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἁμέρως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἔγνηθημεν (1 Th. 2:10), οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ (Mt. 18:7) and so frequently (but accusative in Rev. 8:13; 12:12). Blass1 compares Latin vae mihi and vae me. Brugmann2 indeed considers κατά, παρά, πάλαι, χαμάι all to be dative forms. But, while this is true, the dative is not used with prepositions in the [Page 538] Sanskrit1 and not certainly in the Greek.2 The locative is very common with prepositions, and the instrumental appears with two, but the dative is doubtful. In reality this statement must be modified a bit, for ἐγγύς has the dative twice in the N. T. (Ac. 9:38), τῇ ἱστατή; ὡς ἐγγύς (Ac. 27:8), though the genitive is the usual case employed. Cf. ἐγγύζο with dative, Ac. 9:3;

---

1 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 96.
2 Giles, Man., etc., p. 329, but see Prepositions (ch. XIII).
10:9; Jas. 4:8. Brugmann\(^3\) admits the dative with ἄντιον, ἐναντίον, πλησίον in the older Greek, though no N. T. examples occur. Delbrück (Grundl., p. 130) finds the dative with ἑπτὶ.

(g) WITH VERBS. Here the dative finds its most extensive use.

1. Indirect Object. Perhaps the earliest use. Certainly it remains the one most commonly met. Indeed there are few transitive verbs that may not use this dative of the indirect object. In the passive of these verbs the dative is retained. Some representative illustrations are here given. ἀφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱματίον (Mt. 5:40), ἀφες ήμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ήμῶν (Mt. 6:12), ἀνεβύθησαν αὐτῷ (marg.) οἱ οὐρανοί (Mt. 3:16), δώτε τὸ ἄξιον τοῖς κυρίων (Mt. 7:6), δοθήναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς (Mt. 14:5), ὑμῖν πρῶτον... ἀπέστειλεν (Ac. 3:26), ἀπειλησόμεθα αὐτοῖς μηκέτι λαλεῖν (Ac. 4:17), ὡς δὲ γράφει ήμῖν (Gal. 1:20), ἐπέβαλον αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας (Ac. 4:3), λέγει αὐτοῖς ὅτι (Mt. 14:27), ὑμῖν δείξει ἄναγκαιον (Mt. 14:15), ἔρρέθη τοῖς ἄργαίοις (Mt. 5:21), προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία (Mt. 10:13), εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην (Lu. 2:10), ὅφειλεν αὐτῷ ἕκατον δηναρία (Mt. 18:28), πάντα ἰππόδασσον σοι (Mt. 18:26), θλίψιν ἔγειρεν τοῖς δεσμῶις σου (Ph. 1:17), ποιήσω ὃς τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοι μιᾶν κτλ. (Mt. 17:4); ἴνα αὐτός ἐπιγεγράφα τόν ἵμαν (1 Jo. 2:25). An example like ἐπιεῖχεν αὐτοῖς (Ac. 3:5) is really the indirect object. Cf. Ac. 26:27. In 2 Cor. 12:7, ἐδόθη μοι σκόλον τῇ σωρκῇ, the μοι is indirect object and σωρκῇ may be either dative of advantage or locative.

2. Dativus Commodi vel Incommodi. The so-called dative of advantage or disadvantage does not differ very greatly from the indirect object. A good example is ἔρχομαι σοι (Rev. 2:5, 16). Moulton (Prol., p. 245) cites Ἑσχύλιος (P. V. 358), ἄλλῳ ἡλθεν αὐτῷ Ζηνὸς ἄγρυπνον βέλος. It is indeed rather more loosely connected at times and varies more in the resultant idea. Thus in μαρτυρεῖ ἐαυτοῖς ὅτι (Mt. 23:31) we have to translate ‘against yourselves,’ though, of course, the dative does not mean ‘against’ any more than it means ‘for’ or ‘in behalf of.’ The personal relation is expressed by the case and it may be favourable or unfavourable. [Page 539] Indeed, nowhere does the personal aspect of the dative come out more clearly than in this usage. Thus πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα—τῷ ὑμῖν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον (Lu. 18:31), γραμματέως μην οἴητε τῇ βασιλείᾳ (Mt. 13:52), νόμῳ μὴν κεκοσμημένῳ τῷ ἄνδρι (Rev. 21:2), ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτοῖς (Mt. 13:14), δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κείται (1 Tim. 1:19; note long list of datives), ἀνασταφιωτάς ἑαυτοῖς τὸν ὕμνον (Heb. 6:6), ὦ σὺ μεμαρτύρησας (Jo. 3:26), ἑκρίνα ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο (2 Cor. 2:1), μὴ μεριμνᾶτε μὴ ψυχή (Mt. 6:25) ἀσεβέσιν τεθείκας (2 Pet. 2:6), ἵνα ἐξέστειμεν, θεῷ ἐξεσεβεσθήμενοι, ὑμῖν (2 Cor. 5:13), ἐνέχειν αὐτῷ (Mk. 6:19). Blass\(^1\) notes how frequent this idiom is in Paul’s Epistles, especially in the vehemence passages. Thus μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίςιν (2 Cor. 5:15), ἰνα θεῷ ἐξίςιν (Gal. 2:19), ἀπεδάναμον ἑαυτῷ ἡμαρτήσατε (Ro. 6:2; cf. 6:10 f.), ἐθανατώσατε τῷ νόμῳ—εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμῖς ἐπερχόμενοι (Ro. 7:4), εὐφρέθη μοι (Ro. 7:10), τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἑ̣ πίστει (Ro. 14:4), κυρίῳ ἐστιν (Ro. 14:6), ἑαυτῷ ἑ̣—ἐαυτῷ ἀποθνήσκεῖ (verse 7). Cf. ἑμοὶ ἐν ῥο. 7:21, ὑμῖν in 2 Cor. 12:20 and μοι with ἐγένετο in Ac. 22:6. A good example is ἰππομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν, Lu. 10:11. See ἑαυτῷ in 2 Cor. 2:1 and τῷ
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\(^3\) Griech. Gr., p. 455.
\(^1\) Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 111.
πνεύματι (2:13). Cf. βαστάζων αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν (Jo. 19:17). In Mk. 10:33 note also the other datives, either the indirect object or the direct object like ἐμπαίζον παίζουσιν αὐτῷ. Cf. also πᾶσαι and τοίς Ιουδαίοις in 1 Cor. 9:19 f. In this connection one may note also τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος (1 Cor. 15:32), τί ἥμιν καὶ σοι (Lu. 4:34). The intense personal relation is also manifest in the examples in 1 Cor. 1:23 f. Cf. also 1:18, 30. Prof. Burkitt (Jour. of Theol. Stud., July, 1912) interprets τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοι (Jo. 2:4) to mean ‘What is it to me and thee?’ That is, ‘What have we to do with that?’ In a word, ‘Never mind!’ like the modern Egyptian mā ṣiḏh in colloquial language. The so-called ethical dative (cf. σοι in Mt. 18:17) belongs here. A very simple example is συμφέρει γάρ σοι (Mt. 5:29). Moulton cites a papyrus example for ἔρχομαι σοι (Rev. 2:5, 16), though from an illiterate document. For μέλει see Ac. 18:17; 1 Pet. 5:7.

3. Direct Object. Then again the dative is often the direct object of transitive verbs. These verbs may be simple or compound, but they all emphasize the close personal relation like trust, distrust, envy, please, satisfy, serve, etc. Some of them vary in construction, taking now the dative, now the accusative, now a preposition. But this is all natural enough. Thus καὶ ἡ πίστευσιν αὐτῶν (Lu. 24:11), ἔπειθον τῷ ὑιῷ (Ac. 5:36), ἀπείποντο αὐτῶ (Ac. 5:36), ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ (Mk. 1:27). Once we find the dative with πέποιθα (Ph. 1:14), but elsewhere prepositions, as ἐν (2 Th. 3:4) εἰς (Gal. 5:10), ἐπί (Lu. 18:9). In particular πιστεύω calls for a word. Deissmann¹ has made an exhaustive study of the subject, and Moulton² has given a

Burditt BURKITT, F. C., Syriac Forms of N. T. Proper Names (1912).
2 Prol., p. 75. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 113, calls this the ethical dative. The so-called dative of “majesty” Blass considers a Hebraism. He compares ἄστεας τῷ θεῷ with πόλις µεγάλη τῷ θεῷ (Jonah, 3:3), ‘a very great city.’ But it is doubtful if the N. T. follows the LXX here.
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clear summary of results. This verb may be used absolutely (Jo. 20:31) or with an object clause (ib.) in the sense of believe. Moreover, it often means entrust (Gal. 2:7). Leaving out these uses Moulton finds that πιστεύω occurs with the dative 39 times and always in the sense of believe or trust (especially in John, as Jo. 5:46, εἰ γὰρ ἔπιστεύετε Μοῦσεῖ ἐπιστεύετε ἐν ἡμοί). It is rather remarkable that ἐν occurs only once (Mk. 1:15, πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ) explained by Deissmann3 as meaning ‘in the sphere of,’ to which Moulton agrees. In Eph. 1:13 ἐν more properly belongs to ἐσφραγίσθητε. The LXX uses ἐν rarely with πιστεύω and no other preposition. But in the N. T. εἰς occurs 45 times (37 times in John’s Gospel and 1 Jo.) while ἐπί appears 6 times with the locative and 7 with the accusative. Moulton objects to overrefining here between εἰς and ἐπί (at most like believe in and believe on). So also as to accusative and locative with ἐπί. What he does properly accent is the use of these two prepositions by the Christian writers to show the difference between mere belief (dative with πιστεύω) and personal trust (εἰς and ἐπί). This mystic union received a further development in Paul’s frequent ἐν Χριστῷ. The relation between ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί and ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι is parallel.4

We must note other groups with the dative, like verbs of serving. Thus διηκόνουν αὐτῷ (Mt. 4:11), τῷ νοῦ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ (Ro. 7:25, both instrumental and dative here), λατρεύειν αὐτῷ (Lu. 1:74), ὑπηρετεῖν αὐτῷ (Ac. 24:23). But in Ph. 3:3 we have the instrumental with λατρεία, and προσκυνεῖ uses either the dative (Mt. 2:2) or the accusative (Jo. 4:23), not to mention ἐνώπιον (Lu. 4:7). The dative with δουλόω in 1 Cor. 9:19 is merely the indirect object.

Another convenient group is verbs to please, to suffice, to be envious, angry, etc. Thus θεῷ ἀρέσαι (Ro. 8:8), ἐνεβριμώντο αὐτῷ [Page 541] (Mk. 14:5), μετριοπαθεῖν τοῖς ἄγνοοσιν (Heb. 5:2), ὁ ὅργηζόμενος τῷ διδάσκᾳ (Mt. 5:22), ἄρκει σοι (2 Cor. 12:9), ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες (Gal. 5:26, accusative, margin of W. H.).

Once more, we may note verbs meaning to thank, to blame, to enjoin, etc. So εὐχαριστῶ σοι (Jo. 11:41), ἐγκαλεῖσαν ἀλλήλοις (Ac. 19:38), ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς (Mt. 12:16), τοῖς ἄνεμοις ἐπιτάσσει (Lu. 8:25). So also προσέταξεν αὐτῷ (Mt. 1:24), διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς (Mk. 8:15), ἔμοι χολῆτε (Jo. 7:23). But κελεύω has accusative, though the dative occurs in the papyri.

———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

1 In Christo, p. 46 f. My friend, Prof. Walter Petersen, of Lindsborg, Kan., does not believe that the dative is ever the direct object of a verb, and Dr. W. O. Carver agrees with him.
2 Prol., p. 67 f.
3 In Christo, p. 46 f.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 68; Heitmüller, Im Namen Jesu, I, ch. i.
There remain verbs meaning to confess, to lie, to help, to shine, etc. Thus we find ὁμολογοῦντον τῷ ὄνοματι (Heb. 13:15) and ἄνθρωπογένετο τῷ θεῷ (Lu. 2:38), οὐκ ἔσωσε ἄνθρωπος (Ac. 5:4), βοήθει μοι (Mt. 15:25, but ὥσπερ has accusative), ἵνα φαίνωσιν ἀντί (Rev. 21:23). In the later koine we find βοηθέω with accusative or genitive (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 110). Cf. also τῷ θεῷ προσεύχεσθαι (1 Cor. 11:13), ὑ ἀντίστητε (1 Pet. 5:9). Cf. two datives in Lu. 11:4.

4. The Dative with Intransitive Verbs. However, this is not a point that it is always easy to decide, for in ἀρκεῖ σοι (2 Cor. 12:9) one is not sure where to place it. See above. Cf. Lu. 3:14. We are so prone to read the English into the Greek. The same remark applies in a way to τί ὕμνι δοκεῖ (Mt. 18:12), ὑμῖν ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία (Ac. 2:39), τίνι ἐσται (Lu. 12:20), ἐλοίν ἡμῖν τέσσαρες ἄνδρες (Ac. 21:23), ἐστίν συνῆθεσα ἡμῖν (Jo. 18:39), ἕπε λόγον ἐκατόν πρόβατα (Mt. 18:12). The idiom is extended even to examples like οὐ θαῦ ἐστι σοι τοῦτο (Mt. 16:22), ἐστιν χαρά σοι (Lu. 1:14). Cf. Ac. 2:43; Lu. 9:38. This is a frequent idiom in the ancient Greek and a perfectly natural one. This predicative dative at bottom is just like the usual dative.

5. Possession. The Greek, like the Latin, may use the dative for the idea of possession. Thus οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος (Lu. 2:7), οὐκ ἦστι σοι μερίς (Ac. 8:21), ὑμῖν ἦστιν ἡ ἐκαταγγελία (Ac. 2:39), τίνι ἐσται (Lu. 12:20), εἰσίν ἡμῖν τέσσαρες ἄνδρες (Ac. 21:23), ἢστιν συνῆθεσα ἡμῖν (Jo. 18:39), ἔναν γένηται τινι ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκατόν πρόβατα (Mt. 18:12). The idiom is extended even to examples like οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο (Mt. 16:22), ἔσται χαρά σοι (Lu. 1:14). Cf. Ac. 2:43; Lu. 9:38. This is a frequent idiom in the ancient Greek and a perfectly natural one. This predicative dative at bottom is just like the usual dative.

6. Infinitive as Final Dative. Giles calls attention to the infinitive [Page 542] as a final dative. This was the original use of the dative in –αι, the expression of purpose. So ἡθομεν προσκυνώσαι αὐτῷ (Mt. 2:2). Here we have the dative form and the dative of purpose. Cf. the old English “for to worship.” This dative form continued, however, when the case of the infinitive was no longer dative.

7. The Dative of the Agent. It was discussed under the instrumental and there is nothing new to be said here. The one clear example is found in Lu. 23:15. But not very different is the idiom in Mt. 6:1 (προς τῷ θεῷ ἐνα αὐτοῖς) and 23:5. Cf. also 2 Pet. 3:14.

1 But note Mt. 10:32 ἐν, and ὁμολογῶ ἐν αὐτῷ in Lu. 12:8.


Giles

GILES, P., A Short Manual of Comparative Philology. 2d ed. (1901).


2 Man., p. 327.
8. The Dative because of the Preposition. We have already had examples of this. Compound verbs often have the dative where the simplex verb does not. The case is due to the total idea of the compound verb. The dative occurs with ἀντιθέμαι in Ac. 25:14; Gal. 2:2. So with ἀντι, as ὧν ἀντιστίτετε (1 Pet. 5:9), ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καῖσαρι (Jo. 19:12), ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ (Lu. 13:17), τῷ ἄγιῳ ἄντιστατε (Ac. 7:51). Ἀπὸ in ἄποτάσσομαι goes with the dative (Mk. 6:46). The same thing is sometimes true of ἐν, as ἐνέπισαξαν αὐτῷ (Mk. 15:20), ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ (Jo. 19:12), ἐνεκὼ ἀντιπίπτετε (Ac. 7:51). Sometimes with ἀντί— we have πρὸς, as with ἐν we find ἐν or πρὸς after the verb. With ἐντίχεν αὐτῷ (Mk. 6:19) we must supply θυμὸν or some such word. ἐν and ἐπί usually have a preposition after the compound verb, except that compounds of ἐπί often have the indirect object in the dative (especially ἐπιτίθημι). But compare ἐπιτάσσω and ἐπιτιμῶ above. Cf. ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς (Lu. 2:9), but ἐπὶ repeated (Lu. 21:34). With παρά we note παρέχω and παρίστημι with indirect object. In παρέστησαν αὐτῷ (Ac. 9:39) we can see either the dative or the locative. Cf. παρεδρεύειν (1 Cor. 9:13). In 2 Pet. 1:9 we may have the possessive dative with πάρεστιν. With πορεία again there is doubt as between the locative and dative in περίκειμαι (Heb. 12:1), περιπέτευμι (1 Tim. 6:10), περιστάτω (Lu. 10:30). Πρὸς with προστίθημι has the indirect object in the dative (Mt. 6:33), but with προσέρχομαι the dative directly as with ὑπεί (Heb. 12:18, 22). With προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς (Lu. 17:3) the object υοὺ has to be supplied, but this is not the case with προσκαρτέροντες τῷ διδάχῳ (Ac. 2:42), nor with ὁ προσεκλίθη (Ac. 5:36), nor with προσέπεσαν αὐτῷ (Mk. 5:33) nor with προσεφώνει αὐτοῖς (Ac. 22:2). With προσκυλίω (Mt. 27:60) the dative is merely the indirect object, but note ἐπὶ in Mk. 15:46. Compounds of ὑπὸ likewise generally have the dative, as ὑποτάσσω (1 Tim. 4:6).

(h) AMBIGUOUS EXAMPLES. Sometimes it is not easy to decide whether the case is locative, instrumental or dative. The example in Ac. 2:33, ὑψοῦν τῇ δεξιᾷ, has already been cited. This may mean ‘to lift up to the right hand,’ ‘at the right hand’ or ‘by the right hand.’ Cf. also Ro. 8:24; Jo. 21:8. But it is not often that there is any serious difficulty in the matter. In 2 Cor. 11:1, ἀνέδειξεν μου μικρὸν τῷ ἄφροσύνης, note ablative, accusative, genitive. And, if some cases remain, as with the genitive and ablative, that cannot be finally settled, the matter must simply remain in abeyance. It so happens that in Lu. 8:29 f. we have all eight cases used if πολλοῖς χρόνοις be here locative and not instrumental. It may serve as a good exercise to discriminate in this passage each of the cases and explain the distinctive meaning and the result in this special context. The cases have kept us for a good while, but the subject is second to none in importance in Greek syntax. Nowhere has comparative philology shed more light than in the explanation according to historical science of the growth and meaning of the Greek cases.

[PAGE 544] CHAPTER XII

ADVERBS (ἘΠΙΡΡΗΜΑΤΑ)

I. Special Difficulties. See chapter VII (Declensions) for discussion of the origin, formation and history of adverbs. The matter will come up again in chapter XIII (Prepositions) where the so-called “improper” prepositions are treated. Brugmann\(^1\) has no syntactical handling of the subject, though Delbrück\(^2\) gives an exhaustive presentation of the matter. But even Delbrück gives less than a page to the purely syntactical phases of the adverb (p. 643), whereas Winer\(^3\) treats the adverb only under syntax.

(a) Nature of the Adverb. The first difficulty is in deciding what is an adverb. As shown in chapter VII, the adverb not only has great variety in its origin, but also wide expansion in its use. In simple truth a large portion of the “parts of speech” are adverbs. Brugmann\(^4\) pointedly says that it is not possible to draw a sharp line between adverb, particle and preposition. The development of adverb into preposition, conjunction, intensive particle and even interjection was illustrated in chapter VII with perhaps sufficient fulness. To this list may be added the negative particles which are really adverbs. In particular in the Sanskrit is there difficulty in the treatment of preposition and conjunction as distinct from adverb, since the indeclinable words were less distinctly divided.\(^5\) But this vagueness applies to other members of the Indo-Germanic group.\(^6\) In Greek and Latin no distinct line can be drawn between adverbs and prepositions.\(^7\)

(b) The Narrower Sense of Adverb. These wider and more specialized forms of the adverb must be dropped out of view before we can do anything with the mere adverb which is not preposition, conjunction, particle nor interjection. There is a good deal that needs to be said concerning the syntax of the mere adverb, for, in spite of its being a fixed case-form, it has a varied and interesting usage in the Greek sentence. The adverb has been treated by the grammars as a sort of printer’s devil in the sentence. It has been given the bone that was left for the dog, if it was left.

II. Adverbs with Verbs.

(a) Commonest Use. This is indeed the etymology of the word and the most frequent use of the pure adverb. But one cannot say that this was the original use, as the name ἐπίρημα might suggest. The truth is that the adverb has such a varied origin that it is difficult to make a general remark on the subject that will be true. Only this may be said, that some adverbs began to be used with verbs, some with adjectives, some absolutely, etc. At first they were not regarded as strictly adverbs, but were used progressively so (cf. χάριν) until with most the earlier non-adverbial uses ceased.

(b) N. T. Usage. Winer\(^1\) suspects that the N. T. writers did not understand the finer shades of meaning in the Greek adverbs, but this is true only from the point of view.

---

3 W.-Th., pp. 462–473.
4 Griech. Gr., p. 250. On final ζ in adv. see Fraser, Cl. Quarterly, 1908, p. 265.
5 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 403.
7 Giles, Man., p. 341.
1 W.-Th., p. 462.
view of the Attic literary style and applies to the vernacular κοινή in general. But he is wholly right in insisting on the necessity of adverbs for precise definition in language. The grammarians find offence2 in the adverbs of the κοινή as in other portions of the vocabulary. Some of the “poetic” adverbs in Winer’s list are at home in the papyri as in the N. T., like εὐαρεστῶς. A few examples will suffice for the normal usage in the N. T. See the majestic roll of the adverbs in Heb. 1:1,

(c) Predicative Uses with γίνομαι and έίμι. There is nothing out of the way in the adverb with γίνομαι in 1 Th. 2:10, ώς ὑπίσχος καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐγνήθημεν. Here the verb is not a mere copula. Indeed είμι appears with the adverb also when it has verbal force. Thus καθὼς ἀληθῶς ἐστίν (1 Th. 2:13) is not equivalent to καθὼς ἀληθὲς ἐστιν. Cf. καθὼς ἐστιν ἀληθεία ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ (Eph. 4:21). So also ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἐν (Mt. 1:18), εἰ οὕτως ἐστιν η οἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Mt. 19:10), τὸ οὕτως εἶναι (1 Cor. 7:26). Cf. 1 Cor. 7:7. The adverb in all these instances is different from the adjective. Cf. τὶ με ἐποίησις οὕτως (Ro. 9:20) for [Page 546] a similar predicate use of the adverb. Cf. also οὕτως πεσὼν and ὄντως ὁ θέος ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν (1 Cor. 14:25) and ἀληθῶς in Mt. 14:33. In Ph. 4:5, ὁ κύριος ἔγγυς, the copula ἐστίν is to be supplied and here the adverb is not far from the adjective idea. Cf. also πόρρω δντος (Lu. 14:32), μακράν (Mk. 12:34), ἵσα (Ph. 2:6).

(d) With ἔχει. It has some idiomatic constructions with the adverb that are difficult from the English point of view. Thus τοὺς κακῶς ἔχουσας (Mt. 14:35), and with the instrumental case in Mk. 1:34. Cf. Lu. 7:2. In English we prefer the predicate adjective with have (He has it bad), whereas the Greek likes the adverb with ἔχει. So ἔχει τὰ δικαίως ἔχει (Mt. 5:23) and in Jo. 4:52 κομψότερον ἔχειν the comparative adverb. One must be willing for the Greek to have his standpoint. Cf. οὕτως ἔχει in Ac. 7:1 and πόρρω ἔχει (Mt. 7:6). Πῶς ἔχουσιν (Ac. 15:36) needs no comment. It is a common enough Greek idiom. Cf. βαρέως ἔχονσα, P.Br.M. 42 (b.c. 168).

(e) With Participles. Ἀμν ἐπιπλίζων (Ac. 24:26) belongs to the discussion of participles. But one may note here ἡ ὡς τς ἀγαθοίκας (Jo. 19:33) and ὡς μεθύλλοντας (Ac. 23:15). Cf. also the use of ἡ ἔκτη with παρῆλθεν (Mt. 14:15), a matter that concerns the aorist tense. But note both τῶν and ἡ ἔκτη with ἐστίν in 1 Jo. 4:3.

(f) Loose Relation to the Verb or any other part of the sentence. So ἐκμήν (cf. ἔτι) in Mt. 15:16 and τῆν ἄρχην in Jo. 8:25, for this accusative is really adverbial. Cf. also τὸ λοιπὸν (Ph. 3:1), τούτων σαμων (Gal. 2:7).

III. Adverbs Used with Other Adverbs. There is, to be sure, nothing unusual about this either in Greek or any other tongue. So πολὺ μᾶλλον (Heb. 12:9), μᾶλλον κρέσσον (Ph. 1:23), μᾶλλον περισσότερον (Mk. 7:36) are merely normal uses barring the double comparative in the two examples which, however, have their own explanation. The compound adverbs, which are common in the N. T. (as ὑπερπερισσός, Mk. 7:37; cf. πολυτρόπως in Heb. 1:1), call for no more explanation.

2 Ib., p. 463.
than other compound words. Cf. καθόλου (Ac. 4:18). The Greek, like the German, easily makes compound words, and the tendency to long compound words grows with the history of language. See ἀπειροστάτως in 1 Cor. 7:35. For compound adverbs see chapter VII, II, (c). For the comparison of adverbs see ib., II, (e).

IV. Adverbs with Adjectives. A typical illustration is found in 1 Tim. 3:16, ὄμολογουμένως μέγα. So οὐτοί μέγας in Rev. 16:18. The instances are not very numerous in the N. T., since indeed, especially in the Gospels, the adjective is not excessively abundant. [Page 547] In Ac. 24:25, τὸ νῦν ἔξων, the participle being both verb and adjective, causes no difficulty. In Ac. 23:20, ὡς μέλλον τι ᾧκριβέστερον πυθάνεσθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ, we have the adverbial use of τι as well as ᾧκριβέστερον. Cf. ἀπειροστάτως with εὐπάρεδρον in 1 Cor. 7:35.

V. Adverbs with Substantives. Here indeed one may recall that the substantive as well as the adjective gives a basis for this idiom (cf. Jordan River). Νῦν is a typical example in the N. T. Thus we find ἐν τῷ νῦν καρφῷ (Ro. 3:26), τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ (Gal. 4:25), ζωῆς τῆς νῦν (1 Tim. 4:8), τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα (2 Tim. 4:10). Here indeed the adverb has virtually the force of the adjective, just as the substantive in this descriptive sense gave rise to the adjective. The English can use the same idiom as “the now time,” though this particular phrase is awkward. The Greek has so much elasticity in the matter because of the article which gives it a great advantage over the Latin.1 Cf. also ἡ δὲ ὅντως χίρα (1 Tim. 5:5), ἡ δὲ ἂν Ἱερουσαλήμ (Gal. 4:26), τῆς ἂνω κλήσεως (Ph. 3:14), ὁ τότε κόσμος (2 Pet. 3:6).

VI. Adverbs Treated as Substantives.2 The very adverbs named above may be here appealed to. It is especially true of words of place and time. Thus ἐκ τῶν ἄνω ἐλιμ (Jo. 8:23), τὸ νῦν (2 Cor. 1:17), τὸ ἄνω (Col. 3:1 f.), τῷ νῦν (Ac. 5:38), ἔως τοῦ νῦν (Mt. 13:19), ἐπὶ τοῦ νῦν (Lu. 1:48) and often. Cf. τοῦ ἐκείν (Mt. 26:71), τῷ οὗτο (Col. 4:9). So πλησίον always in the N. T. save once as preposition with genitive (Jo. 4:5). It usually has the article (Mt. 5:43), but may be used without it in the nominative case (Lu. 10:29). A striking instance of the adverb treated as substantive appears in χωρίς τῶν παρεκτῶς (2 Cor. 11:28). Other examples of the adverb with the article are ἦχρι τοῦ δεύρῳ (Ro. 1:13), ἐκ τῶν κάτω (Jo. 8:23), εἰς τὸ ὑπίσω (Mt. 13:16), τούς ἔξω (1 Cor. 5:12), τὸ ἐξωθείκα καὶ τὸ ἐξωθῆνε (Lu. 11:40), εἰς τὸ ἐξοφθήκεν (Lu. 19:4). In τούς μακράν and τοῖς ἐγγύς (Eph. 2:17) the adverb is rather adjectival in idea. In τῆς ἐξῆς (Ac. 21:1) we have to supply, of course, ἠμέρα, though the text of Lu. 7:11 reads ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς. Here the adverb is treated rather as an adjective, but the point of distinction between the use as substantive and adjective is not always clear. Cf. also ἂν πρὸς (Mt. 6:34), περὶ τῆς σήμερον (Ac. 19:40). But it is not merely when the adverb has the article that it is treated as a substantive. Prepositions are used with adverbs without any article. Then it is not always clear whether we have two words or one. Thus editors print ὑπὲρ ἐκέννα as well as ὑπερέκεννα (2 Cor. 10:16), ὑπὲρ ἐκ περισσου as well as ὑπερεκπερισσου [Page 548] (Eph. 3:20), ὑπὲρ λίαν as well as ὑπερλίαν (2 Cor. 11:5). Cf. ἐπετα, ἐπάνο, ἐφάπαζ, and ἔσε ἄρτι in 1 Cor. 15:6. Thus ὑπὸ πέρυσι (2 Cor. 9:2), ὑπὸ ἄνωθεν ἔως κάτω (Mk. 15:38), ὑπὸ ἄρτι (Mt. 23:39),

1 Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 798.
ἀπὸ μακρόθεν (Mt. 27:55), ἀπὸ πρωί (Ac. 28:23), ἄµα πρωί (Mt. 20:1), ἐσω ἄρτι (Mt. 11:12), ἐσω τρίς (Lu. 22:34), ἐσω ἐκτάκως (Mt. 18:21 f.), ἐσω ἐξω (Ac. 21:5), ἐσω ἐσώ (Mk. 14:54), ἐσω πτός (Mt. 17:17), ἐσω ὅδε (Lu. 23:5), etc. For this doubling of adverbs see ἐκτός εἰ µή (1 Cor. 14:5) in the realm of conjunctions. Moulton (Prol., p. 99) finds in the papyri ἐκτότε, O.P. 486 (ii/A.D.), and note ἀπὸ πέρυσι (Deissmann, B. S., p. 221).

VII. The Pregnant Use of Adverbs. Just as the prepositions ἐν and εἰς are used each with verbs of rest and motion (and παρά with locative or accusative), so adverbs show the same absence of minute uniformity. Ποί, for instance, is absent from both the LXX and the N. T., as is ὁποι. Instead we find ποῦ ὑπάγει (Jo. 3:8), ὁποι ὑπάγω (Jo. 13:33), but ποθὲν ἔρχεται (Jo. 3:8) and ὅθεν ἔξηλθον (Mt. 12:44). So also ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ (Jo. 18:3) like our “come here.” But on the other hand in Ac. 22:5, ἄξων καὶ τούς ἔκατε ὄντας, the usual word would be ἔκει. But ἔκεισ is regular in Ac. 21:3. Winer calls this an “abuse” of language, which is putting it rather too strongly, since it is found in the best Greek. It is largely a matter of usage, for with ὅθεν and ἐνθάδε the ideas of hic and hoc had long coalesced, while ἔξηλθον, ἔσωθον, κάτω mean both ‘without’ (Mt. 23:27) and ‘from without’ (Mk. 7:18), ‘within’ (Mt. 7:15) and ‘from within’ (Mk. 7:23), ‘below’ (Mt. 4:6) and ‘from below’ (Jo. 8:23). Cf. μετάβα ἔνθεν ἐκεῖ (Mt. 17:20) and ἔνθεν—ἐκεῖθεν (Lu. 16:26). In Mt. 25:24, 26, συνάγων ὅθεν οὗ διεσκόρπισας, we have ἐκεῖθεν οὗ merged into ὅθεν by attraction. In oi ἐνθεν τῆς Ἰταλίας (Heb. 13:24) it is uncertain what standpoint the writer takes. With ἐκ we have not only the normal idiom like τοῖς ἐκ περιτοµής (Ro. 4:12) and oi ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας (Ph. 4:22), but the pregnant use where ἐν could have occurred. Thus ἀραὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας (Mt. 24:17) with which compare ὅ εἰς τὸν ἄγρον (Mk. 13:16, ἐν in Mt. 24:18). Cf. ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ in Lu. 11:13, though some MSS. do not have the second ὁ. The correlation of adverbs belongs to the chapter on Pronouns.

VIII. Adverbs as Marks of Style. Thus ἄρτι is not found in Mark, Luke, James, Jude nor Hebrews, though fairly often in Matthew, John and Paul. Νῦν, on the other hand, is frequent throughout the N. T. as a whole. Abbott has an interesting discussion [Page 549] of καὶ νῦν in John and Luke. Νῦν is found only in Acts, Paul and Hebrews, the most literary portions of the N. T. Then again Mark has abundant use of εὐθὺς, but not εὐθέως, while Matthew employs both. John uses each only three times. Abbott notes that wherever Matthew uses εὐθὺς it is found in the parallel part

1 W.-Th., p. 472.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 258.
Abbott


———, Johannine Grammar (1906).

———, Johannine Vocabulary (1905).

3 Joh. Gr., pp. 22 ff.
1 Ib., p. 20.
of Mark. Ἐυθέως prevails in Luke (Gospel and Acts). Abbott insists on difference in idea in the two words, εὐθέως (‘immediately’), εὐθὺς (‘straightway’). So in Matthew τότε is exceedingly common, while in 1 Cor. ἔσται is rather frequent, though the two words have different ideas. Then again ἔγγυς is more common in John than all the Synoptists together. The context must often decide the exact idea of an adverb, as with ἐκαθέξετο οὕτως (Jo. 4:6). Cf. ὃς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ (Mk. 4:36).

IX. The Adverb Distinguished from the Adjective.

(a) Different Meaning. The adjective and the adverb often mean radically different things. Thus in Jo. 8:29, οὐκ ἀφήκεν με μόνον, the adjective μόνον means that ‘he did not leave me alone.’ As an adverb, if the position allowed it, it would be ‘not only did he leave, but,’ etc., just the opposite. In 2 Tim. 4:11 μόνος means that Luke is alone with Paul. So in Lu. 24:18 σὺ μόνος may be contrasted with μόνον πίστευον (Lu. 8:50). The point is specially clear with πρῶτος and πρῶτον. Thus in Ac. 3:26 we have ὑμῖν πρῶτον ἀναστήσας, not ὑμῖν πρῶτος. It is not ‘you as chief,’ but ‘the thing is done first for you.’ So also Ro. 2:9 (Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἐξήνητος). But in 1 Jo. 4:19 note ἡμεῖς οὐχ ἠκούσαμεν, ἦτι αὐτός πρῶτος ἡγάσασεν ἡμᾶς. ‘God is the first one who loves.’ Cf. also ἠλθεν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον (Jo. 20:4) where John is the first one to come to the tomb. In Jo. 1:41 the MSS. vary between πρῶτος and πρῶτον (W. H.). One can but wonder here if after all πρῶτος is not the correct text with the implication that John also found his brother James. The delicate implication may have been easily overlooked by a scribe. Cf. also the difference between ἐλάλησεν ὅρθως (Mk. 7:35) and ἄναστηθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου ὅρθως (Ac. 14:10). The English has a similar distinction in “feel bad” and “feel badly,” “look bad” and “look badly.” We use “well” in both senses. Cf. ἔδρασος in 1 Cor. 7:37.

(b) Difference in Greek and English Idiom. But the Greek uses the adjective often where the English has the adverb. That is, the Greek prefers the personal connection of the adjective with the subject to the adverbial connection with the verb. So we have αὐτοματή ἤ γη καρποφορεῖ (Mk. 4:28) and αὐτομάτη ἡγοῦτά (Page 550) (Ac. 12:10). In Lu. 21:34 the same construction is found with ἐφνίδιος ἢ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη. The ancient Greek idiom of the adjective rather than the locative of time appears in Ac. 28:13, δευτεροαγοράν ἠλθομεν. So ὅρθρινα (Lu. 24:22). The same use of the adjective rather than the adverb meets us in 1 Cor. 9:17, εἰ γὰρ ἔκρινεν τοῦτο πρᾶσσο—εἰ δὲ ἄκων, just as we see it in the ancient Greek. Cf. the Latin nolens volens. See Ro. 8:20. In μέσος the Greek has an adjective that we have to use a phrase for. Thus μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει (Jo. 1:26), ‘there stands in the midst of you.’ Cf. a very different idea in ἡμέρας μέσης (Ac. 26:13), ‘middle of the day.’

X. Adverbial Phrases.

(a) Incipient Adverbs. Some of these are practically adverbs, though they retain the case-inflection and may even have the article. Thus τὴν ὅρχήν (Jo. 8:25), τὸ λοιπὸν (Ph. 3:1), τούναντιον (Gal. 2:7), τὸ πρῶτον (Jo. 12:16), τὸ πρῶτος (Jo. 6:62), τὸ πλέοστον (1 Cor. 14:27), τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν (Lu. 19:47), τοῦ λοιποῦ (Eph.

2 Ib., p. 19.
Prepositional Phrases. These adjuncts have the substantial force of adverbs.

Indeed there is little practical difference in structure between ἀπὸ πέρας (2 Cor. 9:2) and ὑπερβάλλαν (2 Cor. 11:5), ὑπεράνω (Eph. 4:10) and ἐῳ κάτω (Mk. 15:38). Since the uncial MSS. had no division between words, we have to depend on the judgment of the modern editor and on our own for the distinction between an adverb like παραπρήμα (Lu. 1:64) and an adverbial phrase like παρὰ τοῦτο (1 Cor. 12:15). Cf. also ἐπέκαίνα (Ac. 7:43), ὑπερέκαίνα (2 Cor. 10:16), καθόλου (Ac. 4:18). In Ro. 7:13 καθ’ ὑπερβολῆν is used with an adjective. Other examples are κατ’ οἰδίαν (Mt. 14:13), κατὰ μόνας (Mk. 4:10), κατὰ έκούσιον (Phil. 14), κατ’ ένιαυτόν (Heb. 10:1), ἐκ δεύτερου (Mk. 14:72), ἐκ ψυχῆς (Col. 3:23), ἐς ἀρχῆς (Jo. 6:64), ὑπὸ ἀρχῆς (2 Th. 2:13), ἐς κενόν (Ph. 2:16), ἐν ἄλλῃθι (Mt. 22:16), ἐν πρώτοις (1 Cor. 15:3), ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ (Ac. 17:31), ἐκ ἄλληθειας (Lu. 22:59), καθ’ ἠμέραν (Mk. 14:49), ἐν νυκτί (1 Th. 5:2), ἐν ἑκτενείᾳ (Ac. 26:7), ἀπὸ μέρους (Ro. 11:25), ἐκ μέρους (1 Cor. 12:27). Cf. μέρος τι, 11:18, κατὰ μέρος (Heb. 9:5), ὑπὸ μίκς (Lu. 14:18), ἐς τὸ παντελές (Heb. 7:25). With μέσων we have quite a list, like ἀνά μέσον (Mt. 13:25), ἐκ μέσου (Mt. 13:49), ἐν μέσῳ (Mk. 6:47), διὰ μέσου (Lu. 4:30), διὰ μέσον (Lu. 17:11), ἐς τὸ μέσον (Lu. 5:19), ἐς μέσον (Mk. 14:60), κατὰ μέσον (Ac. 27:27), μέσον (Ph. 2:15). In Mk. 14:30 adverb and phrase occur together, σήμερον τιτί τῇ νυκτί. This is not a Page 551 complete list by any means, but it will suffice to illustrate the point under discussion. A striking example is found in 1 Cor. 12:31, καθ’ ὑπερβολῆν ὃδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι, where the adverbial phrase has practically the force of an adjective with ὃδὸν. Clearly, then, many of the adverbs grew out of these prepositional phrases like παραντίκα (2 Cor. 4:17), ἐκπάλαι (2 Pet. 2:3), etc. Cf. even νουνεχως (Mk. 12:34).

Participles. Some participles come to be used adverbially. This is not merely true of adverbs made from participles, like ὄντως (Mk. 11:32), ὁμολογουμένως (1 Tim. 3:16), ὑπερβαλλόντως (2 Cor. 11:23), but it also applies to τῷ ὄντι (Ro. 7:23), τῷ νῦν ἔχον (Ac. 24:25), τοῦ (1 Cor. 16:6) and verbs like ἀναγκαστῶς (1 Pet. 5:2). Besides, the intensive use of the participle is adverbial in effect like ἐυλογήσεως σε (Heb. 6:14). Then again a case like ψευδόμενος (Mt. 5:11) is in point. Cf. θέλες in Col. 2:18. See also προσθες εἶπεν (Lu. 19:11) which Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 258) compares with προσθες ἔτεκεν (Gen. 38:5). See chapter on Verbal Nouns.

The Verb Used Adverbially. This is, of course, not true technically, but only in the result. The old Greek idiom with λανθάνω and φθάνω, where the participle expressed the chief idea and the verb was subordinate, occurs twice in the N. T. So ἔλαβον τινες ἐξενίσαντες (Heb. 13:2) and προερθάσας λέγων (Mt. 17:25). But it must be borne in mind that the Greek idiom is perfectly consistent in this construction, as ‘they escaped notice in entertaining,’ ‘he got the start in saying.’ Cf. λάθη elsewhere in N. T. It is not necessary in Ac. 12:16, ἐπέμενον κρούων, to take the verb as an adverb in sense. It is simply, ‘he continued knocking.’ The infinitive may likewise present the chief idea as in προέλαβεν μυρίσα (Mk. 14:8), προσέθετο πέμψα (Lu.
But in Mk. 12:4 we have the regular Greek idiom \( \pi \alpha \lambda \iota \nu \pi \alpha \lambda \iota \) \( \alpha \pi \epsilon \sigma \delta \tau \epsilon \iota \eta \nu \). Cf. Ac. 12:3 \( \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \theta \eta \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \nu \). This idiom is exceedingly common in the LXX.\(^2\) In Lu. 6:48, \( \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \alpha \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \kappa \iota \) \( \varepsilon \beta \alpha \theta \acute{o} \nu \varepsilon \nu \) (‘he dug and went deep’), we have an idiom somewhat like our English vernacular “he went and dug,” “he has gone and done it,” etc. Cf. Ro. 10:20 \( \acute{o} \pi \rho \sigma \tau \o \lambda \gamma \iota \kappa \iota \lambda \xi \iota \) \( \kappa \acute{i} \). Mt. 18:3 \( \acute{e} \acute{a} \nu \) \( \mu \eta \) \( \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \phi \acute{h} \iota \tau \varepsilon \kappa \) \( \kappa \alpha \gamma \iota \eta \sigma \theta \varepsilon \beta \) \( \kappa \acute{i} \). But I doubt if \( \theta \acute{e} \lambda \nu \) with the infinitive is to be taken in the N. T. either adverbially or as the mere expletive for the future tense. In Jo. 7:17 \( \theta \acute{e} \lambda \iota \) \( \pi \sigma \iota \varepsilon \nu \) means ‘is willing to do.’ So in Jo. 8:44, etc. The text is obscure in Col. 2:18 and \[Page 552\] there \( \theta \acute{e} \lambda \alpha \omicron \nu \) may have an adverbial force. Blass\(^1\) conceives that in Mt. 6:5, \( \phi \lambda \omicron \omicron \sigma \iota \iota \) \( \pi \rho \omicron \sigma \epsilon \xi \chi \sigma \theta \iota \alpha \iota \), we may translate ‘gladly pray.’ But what advantage has this over ‘love to pray,’ ‘are fond of praying’?

\[PAGE 553\] CHAPTER XIII  
PREPOSITIONS (ΠΡΟΘΕΣΕΙΣ)

I. The Name. As is often the case, so here the name describes a later development, not the original, nor the essential, idea.

(a) SOME POSTPOSITIVE. Prepositions may indeed be postpositive like the Latin \textit{me cum}, the Greek \( \tau \omicron \omicron \sigma \omicron \omicron \chi \acute{a} \rho \iota \nu \), \( \tau \kappa \nu \chi \omicron \omicron \nu \pi \acute{e} \rho \) (anastrophe). In the Turkish tongue\(^1\) they are all postpositive. And Giles (\textit{Manual}, p. 341) thinks that \( \dot{o} \mu \mu \acute{a} \tau \omicron \omicron \acute{o} \dot{o} \mu \) is earlier than \( \dot{o} \mu \dot{a} \dot{o} \dot{o} \).\(^2\)

(b) NOT ORIGINALLY USED WITH VERBS. Moreover, the name implies that they properly belong with verbs \( \textit{prae-verbia, prothéseis} \). But we now know that the use with verbs was a much later development. There are indeed in Greek no “inseparable” prepositions, which are used only in composition with verbs. In the Attic, outside of Xenophon, \( \acute{e} \omicron \nu \) was used mainly in composition.\(^2\) In the N. T. \( \acute{a} \mu \acute{f} \iota \) is found only with compound words like \( \dot{o} \mu \phi \acute{i} \beta \acute{a} \lambda \omegadotlo, \dot{o} \mu \omicron \acute{e} \nu \nu \omicron \omicron \nu \omicron \omicron \). In the Sanskrit most of the verbal prefixes can be traced to adverbs with cases.\(^3\)

(c) EXPLANATION. Hence the name must be explained. The later grammarians used the term for those adverbs which were used in composition with verbs and in connection with the cases of nouns. Both things had to be true according to this definition. But it will be seen at once that this definition is arbitrary. The use with verbs in composition was the last step, not the first, in the development. Besides, what

---

1 W.-Th., p. 468.  
2 C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 97.  
1 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 95.  
2 Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 123, 147. Courtoz (Les Préfixes en Grec, en Lat. et en Français, 1894, p. 51) says: “Outre les dix-huit prépositions que nous venons de passer en revue, il y a encore, en grec, quelques particules inséparables, qui s’emploient comme préfixes dans les mots composés. Ces particules sont \( \acute{a}, \acute{a} \rho \iota \) ou \( \acute{e} \rho \iota, \dot{d} \omicron \omicron, \dot{z} \alpha \) et \( \nu \).” But these are not the “prepositions” under discussion.  
is to be said about those adverbs that are used, not with verbs, but with cases, and no longer appear as mere adverbs? Take ὄνευ, for instance, with the ablative. It is not found in composition with verbs nor by itself [Page 554] apart from a noun. It is, of course, a preposition. The grammars call it an “improper” or adverbial preposition. It is only “improper” from the standpoint of the definition, not from that of the Greek language. The truth seems to be that by preposition one must mean a word used with cases of nouns and many of which came to be used in composition with verbs. The facts do not square with the other definition.

II. The Origin of Prepositions.

(a) ORIGINALLY ADVERBS. This is now so well recognised that it seems strange to read in Winer⁴ that “prepositions e.g. often assume the nature of adverbs, and vice versa,” even though he adds “that the prepositions are adverbs originally.” Giles² puts the matter simply and clearly when he says: “Between adverbs and prepositions no distinct line can be drawn.” Thus even in Homer ἔμφι, ἐφι, etc., appear still as adverbs.³ Delbrück⁴ goes a bit further and says that originally the prepositions were place-adverbs. Brugmann⁵ qualifies that to “mostly,” and he adds that we cannot draw a sharp line between the use as adverb and the use as pre-verb or preposition.⁶

(b) REASON FOR USE OF PREPOSITIONS. “The preposition is, therefore, only an adverb specialized to define a case-usage.”⁷ This definition gives the reason also. The case alone was enough at first to express the relation between words, but, as language developed, the burden on the cases grew heavier. The analytic tendency in language is responsible for the growth of prepositions.⁸ The prepositions come in to help out the meaning of the case in a given context. The notion, therefore, that prepositions “govern” cases must be discarded definitely. Farrar⁹ clearly perceived this point. “It is the case which indicates the meaning of the preposition, and not the preposition which gives the meaning to the case.” This conception explains the use and the non-use of a preposition like ἐν, for instance, with the locative, ὑπό or παρά with the ablative, etc. In the Sanskrit the prepositions do not exist as a separate class of words, though a good many adverbs are coming to be used with the oblique cases (except the dative) to make clearer the case-idea.¹⁰

[Page 555] (c) VARYING HISTORY. The adverbs that come to be used with the cases vary greatly in their history. Some cease to be used as adverbs, as συν, for instance. Others continue (besides the use with cases and with verbs) to be employed occasionally as adverbs (ἀνὰ ἐτς, Rev. 21:21; κατὰ ἐτς, Mk. 14:19; ὑπὲρ ἐγό, 2 Cor.
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1 W.-Th., p. 356.
2 Man., etc., p. 341.
5 Griech. Gr., p. 429.
6 Ib., p. 430.
7 Giles, Man., etc., p. 341.
8 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 94.
Farrar FARRAR, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).
9 Ib.
11:23). Some are used both with nouns, and in composition with verbs, like ἐν, περί and the other seventeen “proper” classical prepositions. ἀµφί occurs only in composition. Others are not used in composition with verbs, but are no longer mere adverbs like ὑπερ. Others are employed both as adverb and with cases of nouns, like ἀµφί, ἐξω, etc. Some occur both as preposition and conjunction, like ἔχρι, μέχρι, ἠως, πλήν. Some figure as substantive, adverb and preposition with case, like χάριν.

III. Growth in the Use of Prepositions.

(a) Once no prepositions. As already noted, in the Sanskrit there is no separate class of prepositions, though a number of adverbs are already coming to be used as prepositions, and verbs have some prefixes. Some adverbs in Greek are occasionally used with cases, like ἀξίως and the genitive, but are not prepositions. Here we see the use of prepositions started, tentatively at any rate. We may suppose a time further back in the history of the Indo-Germanic tongues when no adverbs were used with cases, when the cases stood all alone.

(b) The prepositions still used as adverbs in Homer. Not only do the “adverbial” prepositions have their usual freedom, but a considerable number of adverbs are found in composition with verbs. Homer marks a distinct advance over the Sanskrit in the increase of prepositions. There is in Homer a real class of prepositions. But in Homer the limitation of the preposition to cases of nouns and composition with verbs is far from being established. ἀµφί, ἐν, etc., may be simply adverbs, ‘on both sides,’ ‘inside.’ So common is the separation of the preposition from the verb that the term tmesis is used for it, but no strict line can be drawn between this usage and the ordinary adverb.

(c) Decreasing use as adverbs after Homer. It is not common thereafter for the eighteen classical prepositions, those used in composition with verbs as well as with cases of nouns, to occur separately as adverbs. It is not common, but still possible. This list comprises ἀµφί, ὑπά, ἀντί, ἀπό, διά, εἰς, ἐξ, ἐν, ἐπί, κατά, μετά, παρά, περί, πρό, πρός, σύν, ὑπέρ, ὑπό. Now these words were used with steady increase so that one of the marks of later Greek is the abundance of compound verbs as well as the more extensive use of these prepositions with the various cases. Not only is this true, but continually new adverbs joined the already large list of adverbial prepositions employed with cases. In a word, as Blass remarks, the use of a preposition with nouns was “a practice which in the course of the history of the language became more and more adopted in opposition to the employment of the simple case.” The Emperor Augustus was noted for his excessive use of prepositions in his effort to speak more clearly (quod quo facilius exprimeret, Suetonius). Other Latin writers show the same tendency.

(d) Semitic influence in N. T. The N. T. writers were once supposed to make such free use of prepositions because of the Hebrew and Aramaic. But the N. T. does

1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 123.
2 Ib., p. 124.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 121.
not make abundant use of all the prepositions. Ἀμφί has dropped out entirely save in composition, and ἄνα is nearly confined to the distributive use and ἄνα μέσου, a sort of compound preposition. It occurs only 12 times, omitting the adverbial use in Rev. 21:21. Ἀντί appears 22 times, but as Moulton explains, five of these are due to ἄνθ 

But ἄπό is very abundant in the N. T., as are διά, εἰς, ἕν, ἐπί, κατά, μετά, πρός. But παρά, περί, πρό, σύν, ὑπέρ, ὑπό are, like ἄνα, already going the way of Ἀμφί. Krebs has made a careful study of the prepositions in Polybius, as Helbing has done for Herodotus and Johannessohn for the LXX. They show the same general tendency towards the increased use of some prepositions to the disuse of others. For the N. T., Moulton has made a careful calculation which is worth reproducing. Ἐν and εἰς far outnumber any of the other prepositions in the N. T. And Ἐν leads εἰς by a good margin. Moulton takes Ἐν as unity and finds the other N. T. prepositions ranging as follows: ἄνα .0045, ἀντί .008, ἄπο .24, διά .24, εἰς .64, ἕκ .34, ἐπί .32, κατά .17, μετά .17, παρά .07, περί .12, πρό .018, πρός .25, σύν .048, ὑπέρ .054, ὑπό .08. The three commonest prepositions in Herodotus are εἰς, Ἐν and Ἐπί, in this order. In Thucydides and Xenophon the order is Ἐν, εἰς and Ἐπί. But Xenophon varies the order of frequency in his various books. In Polybius the three chief prepositions are κατά, πρός, εἰς; in Diodorus εἰς, κατά, πρός; in Dionysius Ἐν, Ἐπί, εἰς; in Josephus (War) προς, εἰς, κατά, (Ant.) εἰς, Ἐπί, πρός; in Plutarch Ἐν, πρός, εἰς; in Dio Cassius Ἐν, εἰς, Ἐπί. In the N. T. the three main ones, as seen above, are Ἐν, εἰς, ἕκ, though Ἐπί is not far behind ἕκ. In the literary κοινή it will be seen that the use of εἰς

3 Moulton, Prol., p. 100.
4 Ib.
Krebs
KREBS, F., Die Präpositionen bei Polybius (1882. Schanz’ Beiträge).
5 Die Präp. bei Polyb., 1882; cf. p. 3.
Helbing
HELBING, R., Die Präpos. bei Herodot und andern Historikern (1904).
———, Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre (1907).
6 Die Präp. bei Herod. und andern Hist., 1904.
8 Prol., p. 98.
9 Ib., p. 62.
10 See Helbing, Präp. bei Herod., p. 8 f., for the facts here used.
is nearly double that of ἐν, whereas in the N. T. εἰς is ahead of ἐν only in Mark and Hebrews.¹ In the vernacular κοινή, ἐν makes a rather better showing. The large increase of the adverbial prepositions in the N. T., as in the κοινή, calls for special treatment a little later. It may be here remarked that they number 42, counting varying forms of the same word like διπίσθεν, ὑπίσθο.

(e) In Modern Greek. The varying history of the eighteen prepositions goes still further.² Thus ἀντί(ζ) survives in the vernacular as well as ὅπο (ὅπε), διά (γιά), εἰς (ἐς, σέ, Ἄζ), μετά (μέ), κατά (κά) and ὡς. Cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 100 ff. The bulk of the old prepositions drop out in the mediæval period. Their place is supplied largely by the later prepositional adverbs, as ἄνυα by ἄνω, ἔξω by ἔξω, but partly also by a wider use of the remaining prepositions, as εἰς for ἐν and πρὸς, μὲ for σύν. Then again all prepositions in the modern Greek use the accusative case as do other adverbs, and sometimes even with the nominative (γιὰ σοφός, ‘as a sage’).

In a sense then the Greek prepositions mark a cycle. They show the return of the accusative to its original frequency. They have lost the fine distinctions that the old Greek prepositions once possessed when they were used to help out the ideas of the cases. They drop out before the rise of other prepositions which more clearly exhibit the adverbial side of the preposition. The so-called improper prepositions are more sharply defined in modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., pp. 107 ff.). But in the N. T. the prepositions have not gone so far in their history.

IV. Prepositions in Composition with Verbs.

(a) Not the Main Function. As has already been shown, this was not the original use of what we call prepositions, though this usage has given the name to this group of words. Besides it debars one technically from calling those numerous

---

¹ Moulton, Prol., p. 62.

Thumb


———, Die greech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


adverbs prepositions which are used with cases, but not used in composition with verbs. But no “inseparable” prepositions were developed [Page 558] in Greek,\(^1\) apart from the similar use of ἀμφί already mentioned. In most dialects ἀμφί was obsolete (Buck, *Gk. Dialects*, p. 102). In modern Greek ἀνά–, παρά– and ἐκ– (ἐκεί) are used chiefly in composition (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 99), but ὑπάρχει occurs with accusative.

(b) PREPOSITION ALONE. Sometimes indeed the preposition is used alone (ellipsis) and the verb has to be supplied, as in οὐκ ἔδει (Gal. 3:28) for οὐκ ἔδειστε. So ὑπερ ἔγιό in 2 Cor. 11:23. Cf. ἄλλα ὁ να (‘but up!’) in Homer. This ellipsis does not differ greatly from the common use of *tmesis* in Homer, where the preposition is regarded more as an adverb.

(c) INCREASING USE. The use of prepositions in composition increased with the history of the Greek language. One characteristic of the later Greek is the number of compound verbs employed.\(^2\) This is a matter partly of impression and will remain so till one “χαλκέντερος grammarian” arrives “who will toil right through the papyri and the κοινή literature.”\(^3\) No one is anxious for that task, but Krebs\(^4\) is able to say that verbs compounded with prepositions play a noteworthy rôle in the later Greek. This is not simply true of new compounds like ἐν-κακάω, etc., but “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.”\(^5\) The N. T. does not indeed show as lavish a use of compound verbs as does Polybius, the chief representative of the literary κοινή of his time.\(^6\) But these διπλά belonged to the language of the people in Aristotle’s time\(^7\) and the papyri show a common use of compound verbs.\(^8\) As compared with Polybius the N. T. makes less use of certain verbs, but the matter varies with different verbs and different writers.\(^9\)

[Page 559] (d) REPETITION AFTER VERB. Sometimes the preposition is repeated after the verb, as in the older Greek. The prepositions most frequently repeated are ἀπό, ἐξ, εἰς, ἐν, ἐπί. This is partly because these prepositions are so common in the N. T. and partly because they emphasize the local notions of ‘from,’ ‘in,’ or ‘upon,’ and ‘to’ or ‘into.’ Perhaps also the preposition in composition is a bit worn down. The

---


2 The LXX in particular shows a great variety of uses of the prep. with verbs, partly due to transl. from the Heb., partly to the κοινή. Cf. C. and S., p. 88, for list. Cf. Johannessohn, Der Gebr. d. Casus und der Präp. in der LXX.


6 Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 70.

7 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 486 ff. Kuhring (de praepositionum Graecarum in chartis Aegyptiis usu quaestiones selectae, 1906) and Rossberg (de praep. Graec. in chartis Aegypt. Ptol. aetatis usu, 1909) have both attacked the problems in the pap., as Geyer (Observationes epigraphicae de praep. Graec. forma et usu, 1880) has done for the inscr.

papyri and inscriptions show the same repetition of the preposition, though hardly so frequently, if one may judge by his impressions. See ἐπιθελθεν ἐπι αὐτοῦ (Mk. 1:42). With ἀπὸ indeed Winer finds that for the most part the preposition is repeated in the N. T. Thus we note also ἀπαρθεὶ ἀπ αὐτῶν (Mt. 9:15), ἀφαιρεῖται ἀπ ἐμοῦ (Lu. 16:3, but not so in 10:42), ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ αὐτοῦ (Lu. 12:58), ἀπεδάντε ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων (Col. 2:20), ἀπ αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες (Lu. 5:2), ἀπέπεσαν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν (Ac. 9:18), ἀποφαραγοῦντες ἄφω ὑμῶν (1 Th. 2:17), ἀφορίσε ἀπ ἀλλήλων (Mt. 25:32), ἀπεπάνθη ἀπ αὐτῶν (Lu. 22:41), ἀποστρέψῃ ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ (Ro. 11:26), ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ ἐμοῦ (Mt. 7:23), ἀπόστητε ἀπ ἐμοῦ (Lu. 13:27, but not 2:37).

Likewise ἐκ may be repeated as with ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ (Mt. 13:52), ἐκ σοῦ ἐξελεύσεται (Mt. 2:6), ἔξαροῦμεν ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ (Ac. 26:17), ἔξελεξάμην ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (Jo. 15:19), ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἔξεκόπης (Ro. 11:24), ἐξέπεσαν ἐκ τῶν χερῶν (Ac. 12:7), ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος (Mt. 15:11), ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ὅκου (Ac. 19:16).

Verbs compounded with εἰς “uniformly repeat εἰς” (Winer-Thayer, p. 430). So, for instance, εἰσήγαγον (Lu. 22:54), εἰσῆλθαν (Ac. 3:3), εἰσῆλθεν (Mt. 2:21), εἰσπορεύονται (Mk. 1:21), εἰσφέρεις (Ac. 17:20), but see Ac. 28:30 (εἰς—πρός).

With ἐν we observe the repetition in some verbs appears, though often εἰς occurs instead both where motion is implied and where the idea is simply that of rest (pregnant construction). As is well known, ἐν and εἰς are really the same word. Hence the rigid distinction between the two prepositions cannot be insisted on. There are two extremes about εἰς and ἐν, one to blend them entirely because of alleged Hebraism, the other to insist on complete distinction always. As a rule they are distinct, but εἰς frequently encroached on ἐν where one has to admit the practical identity, like εἰς οἶκον ἐστιν (Mk. 2:1, marg. in W. H.), ὃ ὕπνου ἐν τόν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός (Jo. 1:18), etc. For the frequent LXX examples see Conybeare and Stock, p. 81. Still, for the sake of uniformity, only examples of ἐν are here given, like ἐμβάψεσαι ἐν τῷ τρυφλῷ (Mt. 26:23), ἐμβιβάζομενος ἐν ἐκατὸ (Jo. 11:38), ἐνεγραμμένη ἐν τοῖς [Page 560] καρδίαις (2 Cor. 3:2), ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σῶματι (2 Cor. 5:6), ἐνεγραμμένον ἐν ὕμνῃ (Ph. 2:13), ἐνεμείναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ (Heb. 8:9), ἐνοικεῖτο ἐν ὑμῖν (Col. 3:16), ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις (2 Pet. 2:13).

A number of verbs have ἐπὶ repeated, such as ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ with accusative (Mt. 21:5), ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ with accusative (Lu. 5:36), ἐπιθελὲν ἐπι ἐμέ (Jo. 13:18), ἐφαλόμενος ἐπι αὐτοῦ (Ac. 19:16), ἐπεδέμαται ἐπὶ σε (Lu. 1:35), ἐπιδε ἐπὶ τὰς κτλ. (Ac. 4:29), ἐπέκειτο ἐπι αὐτῷ (Jo. 11:38), ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν κτλ. (Lu. 1:48), ἐπέπεσαν ἐπι αὐτῶν (Lu. 1:12), ἐπὶ οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτοκός (Ac. 8:16), ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπι αὐτῶν (1 Pet. 5:7), ἐπιπεθέασαν ἐπὶ τοὺς κτλ. (Mt. 23:4), ἐπικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν κτλ. (1 Cor. 3:12), ἐπικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ κτλ. (Eph. 2:20).

---

1 W.-Th., p. 427.
As to ὑπὸ not many verbs have it repeated, but note διαπορεύουσαι αὐτὸν διὰ σπορίμον (Lu. 6:1), διεσώθησαν διὶ ὤμος (1 Pet. 3:20), διέρχεται δὶ ἄνυδρον (Mt. 12:43), διήρχετο διὰ μέσον (Lu. 17:11).

A similar rarity as to repetition exists in the case of κατὰ, but we note κατηχορεῖτε κατα κατὰ (Lu. 23:14), κατακαυχᾶτο κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας (Jas. 3:14).

Very seldom is παρὰ repeated as in παρελάβετε παρὰ ἡμῶν (1 Th. 4:1, cf. 1 Th. 2:13; 2 Th. 3:6).

Περὶ is repeated with more verbs than παρὰ. Thus περιστράψατε περὶ ἐμὲ (Ac. 22:6), περιεξοσμένων περὶ τὰ κτλ. (Rev. 15:6), περίκειται περὶ τὸν κτλ. (Lu. 17:2), περιεσπάθει περὶ πολλῆν (Lu. 10:40).

Πρὸ, like μετὰ, shows no example of repetition in the critical text, though some MSS. read προπορεύσῃ πρὸ προσώπου (for ἐνώπιον) in Lu. 1:76.

As examples of πρὸς repeated take προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν κτλ. (Eph. 5:31), προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς κτλ. (Mk. 7:25), προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς κτλ. (Ac. 13:36). It is seldom repeated.

As a lonely example of σὺν repeated see συνεζωοποίησεν σὺν αὐτῷ (Col. 2:13).

We have no example of ὑπὸ repeated and but one of ὑπὲρ in some MSS. (not the critical text) for Ro. 8:26 (Ὑπερεντυγχάνει—Ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν).

(e) DIFFERENT PREPOSITION AFTER VERB. Once more, a different preposition may be used other than the one in composition. This is, of course, true where the meaning differs radically, as in συνακολουθοῦσαι ὑπό (Lu. 23:49), but even when the prepositions do not differ very greatly. Thus ἐὰς frequently follows compounds of ἐν, as ἐμβάντα εἰς πλοῖον (Mt. 8:23), ἐμβαίλεσθαι εἰς τὴν γέενναν (Lu. 12:5), ἐμβαπτόμενος εἰς τὸ κτλ. (Mk. 14:20), ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ κτλ. [Page 561] (Mt. 6:26), ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς κτλ. (Lu. 10:36), ἐνέστησαν εἰς τὸ κτλ. (Mt. 26:67), ἐνεκεντρίσθης εἰς καλλέλαιον (Ro. 11:24). There is little cause for comment here.

In general the varying of the preposition is pertinent and is to be noted. So, for instance, ὑπὸ, ἐκ, παρὰ. Here παρὰ calls attention to the fact that one is beside the place or person whence he starts; ὑπὸ merely notes the point of departure, while ἐκ distinctly asserts that one had been within the place or circle before departing. Cf. therefore Mt. 3:16 ἄνεβη ὑπὸ τοῦ ὦδατος and Mk. 1:10 ἄναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὦδατος. Thus ὑπὸ follows παραβαίνω in Ac. 1:25, παραλαμβάνω in 1 Cor. 11:23, παραφέρω in Mk. 14:36, and παρέρχομαι in Mt. 5:18. Verbs compounded with ἐκ (besides ἐκ) may have ὑπὸ as ἐκκλίνω in 1 Pet. 3:11, or παρὰ as ἐξέρχομαι in Lu. 2:1, while ἐκπορεύομαι shows either ἐκ (Mt. 15:18), ὑπὸ (Mt. 20:29) or παρὰ (Jo. 15:26). So compounds of κατά use either ὑπὸ as καταβαίνω (Lu. 9:54) or ἐκ as ib. (Jo. 6:41). See further discussion under separate prepositions.
Compounds of ἀνά likewise are followed by εἰς as with ἀναβαίνω (Mt. 5:1), ἀνάγω (Lu. 2:22), ἀναβιέσκω (Lu. 9:16), ἀναλαμβάνομαι (Mt. 16:19), ἀναπίπτω (Lu. 14:10), ἀναφέρω (Lu. 24:51), ἀνέγρομαι (Gal. 1:18); or by ἐπί as ἀναβαίνω (Lu. 5:19), ἀναβιβάζω (Mt. 13:48), ἀνακάμπτω (Lu. 10:6), ἀνακλίνομαι (Mt. 14:19), ἀναπίπτω with accusative (Mt. 15:35) or genitive (Mk. 8:6), ἀναφέρω (1 Pet. 2:24); or by πρὸς as ἀναβαίνω (Jo. 20:17), ἀνακάμπτω (Mt. 2:12), ἀναπέμπω (Lu. 23:7). As a rule πρὸς refers to personal relations while εἰς and ἐπί differ in that ἐπί more distinctly marks the terminus. But the line cannot be drawn hard and fast between these prepositions, because ἐπί and πρὸς show a variation. Thus verbs compounded with ἐπί may be followed by εἰς as in ἐπιβάλλω (Mt. 4:37), ἐπιβαίνω (Ac. 20:18), ἔπαύω (Lu. 18:13), ἔφυκνόμαι (2 Cor. 10:14). Ἐπιγράφω is even followed by ἐν in Ac. 17:23. On the other hand, πρὸς may be followed by ἐπί as in προστίθημι (Mt. 6:27) or ἐν as in προσέμενο (1 Tim. 1:3). And even ἑσσαμεν ἔχει πρὸς in Ac. 21:18 and ἑσσερέθω ἔχει ἐπί (Lu. 12:11). Διὰ in composition may be followed by εἰς as in διαβαίνω (Ac. 16:9), πρὸς (Lu. 16:26) or ἀνά (1 Cor. 6:5), etc.

Compounds with μετά usually have εἰς, like μεταβαίνω (Lu. 10:7 both ἐκ and εἰς), μεταλάλάσσῳ (Ro. 1:26), μετανόη (Mt. 12:41), μεταπέμπομαι (Ac. 10:22), μετάπρέπει (2 Cor. 2:20), μετασχηματίζω (1 Cor. 4:6), μετατίθημι (Ac. 7:16), μεταπερθοῦ (Jas. 4:9), μετοικίζω (Ac. 7:4). But μεταδόσῳ (Ro. 12:8) and μεταλάλασσῳ (Ro. 1:25) have ἐν. [Page 562]

Περιάγονται is followed by εἰς in Lu. 4:23. As to πρὸς in Lu. 1:17 we have προελεύσεται followed by ἐνόπιον.

Verbs compounded with σύν may have μετά (cf. the displacing of σύν by μετά in modern Greek) as in συναίρω (Mt. 25:19) συναλλαξέω (Mt. 17:3), συμπέμπω (2 Cor. 8:18), συμφιλέω (Mt. 20:2) and even συνκαταστάσεις (Mt. 1:18), συμπαίρω (Ac. 1:26). But note συνάγω εἰς (Mt. 3:12), ἐπί (27:27) and πρὸς (Mk. 7:1), ἐπί (1 Cor. 11:20) and εἰς (11:33 f.).

For ὑπερφρονεῖν παρά see Ro. 12:3. Cf. ὑπερβάλλω ἐπί in 2 Cor. 9:14 and ὑπεράρχω ἐπί in 2 Th. 2:4.

With ὑπό we find a number of prepositions especially with ὑπάγω, as μετά (Mt. 5:41), εἰς (9:6), ὑπό (13:44), πρὸς (Jo. 13:3), ἐν (Jas. 2:16), with which compare ὑπότισσον (Mt. 16:23) and μεταξύ (18:15). Cf. also ὑποστρέφω with εἰς (Lu. 1:56) and ἐπί (Ac. 8:28). Delicate shades of meaning will be found in all these prepositions without undue refinement. See Conybeare and Stock, p. 88, for different prepositions with verbs in the LXX.

(j) Second Preposition Not Necessary. But it is not always necessary for any preposition to follow the compound verb. Often the preposition with the verb may be followed by the case that is usual with the preposition without much regard to the verb itself. That is to say, the preposition in composition may be tantamount in result to the simple verb followed by that preposition. This is not always true, but it sometimes happens so. It is not necessary to give an exhaustive list. As examples we may note the following: Ἐπιπίπτεται αὕτῳ (Mk. 3:10) with the dative may be
compared with τῆς χάριτος ἔξεπέσατε (Gal. 5:4) with the ablative. Here the two prepositions and the cases correspond exactly. The instrumental case is illustrated by συνχάρητε μοι (Lu. 15:6). Cf. also the ablative in Lu. 10:42 with ἄφαρθόθεσσαί. As an example of the locative take ἔμμένειν τῇ πίστει (Ac. 14:22). An example of the ablative in Lu. 10:42 with ἀφαιρεθήσεται. As an example of the genitive is seen in σου καταρτυροῦσιν (Mt. 26:62. Cf. also Mt. 16:18) and of the accusative in τὴν ἁλυσιν ταύτην περίκειαι (Ac. 28:20) where a change of standpoint takes place, since the chain is around Paul. Cf. Heb. 12:1. In a case like διεπορεύοντο τὰς πόλεις (Ac. 16:4) one may either regard the accusative as loosely associated with the preposition (cf. διὰ μέσον in Lu. 17:11) or consider that the preposition has made an intransitive verb transitive (see next point). See ch. XI for further exx.

(g) Effect of Preposition on Meaning of the Verb. Sometimes there is no effect at all. The preposition is merely local as in ἐξέρχομαι, ‘go out.’ The preposition may be “perfective” and merely intensify the meaning of the verb, as in κατεσθίω (‘eat up’), καταδιώκω (‘hunt down’). The preposition is sometimes weakened in idea as in ἀποδέχομαι, ἀποκρίνομαι. Prepositions in composition sometimes change the meaning of the verb and blend with it. A resultant meaning arises with a new construction. The use of διά alluded to above may be a case in point. Thus take διαβαίνω with accusative (Heb. 11:29), διέρχομαι (Lu. 19:1). The use of διαπλέω with the accusative in Ac. 27:5 is probably the result of the preposition in composition. See also προάξω ὑμᾶς in sense of ‘go before’ (Mt. 26:32). Cf. further ἀποδεκατοῦν, μεταδίδω, συγκλείειν. These examples will suffice, though they could be multiplied easily.

(h) Dropping the Preposition with Second Verb. Winer¹ denies that we have in the N. T. an instance of the old Greek idiom of using the preposition with the first verb and dropping it with the repeated verb though really retained in sense. But Moulton² seems to show that the N. T. does offer some examples of this construction, like the κατήγον, ἦγον, ἦγον, of Euripides’ Bacchides, 1065 (English ‘pulled down, down, down,’ Moulton).³ He cites παρέλαβον, ἔλαβον (Jo. 1:11 f.); προεγράφη, ἔγραφη (Ro. 15:4); ἐξηραύνησαν, ἐραυνῶντες (1 Pet. 1:10 f.); ἐπενδύσασθαι, ἐνδυσάμενοι (2 Cor. 5:3); ἀντιτίθησαν, στήνα (Eph. 6:13); κατέφαγον, ἔφαγον (Rev. 10:10). These are certainly possible illustrations, though I have doubts about 2 Cor. 5:3 and Eph. 6:13. In Eph. 6:13 especially στήνα is stronger alone than with ἄντι. I do not agree that in 1 Cor. 12:2 we have an illustration in ἠγεσθε ἄπαγόμενοι.

(i) Intensive or Perfective. There is still another very common use of the preposition in composition. It is that of a mere adverb and intensifies or completes the idea of the verb. Sometimes the frequent use of the compound form tends to obscure this adverbial idea. Thus in ἀποκρίνομαι the force of ἀπό has largely faded and in ἀποθνήσκω it is quite obscure. Doubtless ‘die off’ was the original idea for the one, as ‘answer back’ for the other. The appeal to the original usage will explain the force of the preposition. But in most instances the idea is very clear, as in συνκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους (Lu. 15:6), ‘calls his friends together.’ This common function of the preposition in all the Indo-Germanic tongues was probably the original use with

1 W.-Th., p. 433.
2 Prol., p. 115.
3 Ib.
verbs. At any rate it is common enough in English, though we usually separate verb
and preposition. We say “up-set” as well as “set up,” but they [Page 564] mean
different things. We all see the adverbial force in “come home,” “come back,” “come
away,” etc., but it is the adverb just as truly in “fore-close,” “pre-clude,” etc. Indeed,
prepositions when compounded are etymologically pure adverbs. The English may be
compared with the Homeric Greek in the separateness of the adverb from the verb.1 In
German the compound use of the preposition is very extensive, but later Greek and
Latin illustrate it abundantly.2 The German prepositions are either inseparable or
detachable. As applied to the meaning of the verb the term “perfective” is used for the
force of the preposition, but it is not a very happy designation, since one is at once
reminded of the perfect tense with which it has nothing to do.3 Moulton gives a
number of luminous examples such as ἑθάνειν ‘to die (off)’; 
φεύγειν ‘to flee,’ διαφυγεῖν ‘to escape (flee clean through);’ διόκω ‘to pursue,’
cαταδιώκω ‘to hunt down’; τηρεῖν ‘to watch,’ συντηρεῖν ‘to keep safe,’ ἔργάζομαι ‘to work,’ καταδιώκομαι ‘to hunt down’;
τηρεῖν ‘to watch,’ συντηρεῖν ‘to keep safe’; ἔργαζομαι ‘to work,’ καταδιώκομαι ‘to work out (down to the end),’ etc. The preposition in this
“perfective” sense does have a bearing on the present and aorist tenses of any given
verb, but that phase of the matter belongs to the discussion of the tenses. Indeed, not
all of the N. T. verbs by any means show examples of this “perfective” use of the
preposition. Moulton4 notes this absence, as compared with Polybius, in the case of
ἀρχομαι, θεάομαι, θεωρέω, λογίζομαι, κινδυνεύω, μέλλω, ὁργίζομαι, πράσσω. He
finds that the papyri support this “perfective” use of the preposition as between
simplex and compound. N. T. illustrations are interesting. Thus σπάομαι (Mk. 14:47)
is used of Peter’s drawing his sword (note voice), but διασπασθῇ (Ac. 23:10)
expresses the fear that Paul may be drawn in two. So ἔργαζομαι is a common verb for
doing work (as Mk. 14:6), but καταδιώκομαι accents the carrying of the work through
as in Ph. 2:12, and in verse 13 ἐνεργεῖν is used for the idea of in-working as
contrasted with the out-working or development taught by καταδιώκομαι. Cf. also
μὴ δὲν ἔργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργάζομένους (2 Th. 3:11) where the whole idea turns
on περί, ‘doing nothing but doing about’ is a free rendering. The same distinction is
seen between ἐσθίω ‘to eat’ (Mt. 15:2) and κατασθίω ‘to eat up (down)’ in Lu. 20:47.
Cf. also ἐφαγόν (Mt. 6:25) and κατέφαγον (Mt. 13:4). As one further illustration note
ἀρτί γνῶσκό ἐκ μέρους (1 Cor. 13:12) and τότε δὲ ἐπηγνώσωμαι καθὼς καὶ
ἐπεγνώσθην (ib.). In general, on the whole subject of prepositions in composition see
Gr., p. 431 f. See also ch. XVIII for further remarks.

(j) DOUBLE COMPOUNDS. It is always interesting to note the significance of both
prepositions. As noted in chapter V, Word Formation, IV, (c), these double
compounds are frequent in the κοινή and so in the N. T. The point to emphasize here
is that each preposition as a rule adds something to the picture. There are pictures in
prepositions if one has eyes to see them. For instance, note ὁ ἐν-παρ-ῥήλθεν (Lu. 10:31
f.), συν-ἀντι-λάθηται (10:40. Cf. Ro. 8:26. First known in LXX, but now found in
papyrus and inscriptions third century b.c. Cf. Deissmann, Light., p. 83), ὑπερ-ἐν-

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 112.
2 Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 815.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 111.
V. Repetition and Variation of Prepositions. A few words are needed in general on this subject before we take up the prepositions in detail.

(a) Same Preposition with Different Cases. Sometimes the same preposition is used with different cases and so with a different resultant idea. Take διά, for instance. In 1 Cor. 11:9 we have οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἄνηρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα, while in verse 12 we read ἄνηρ διὰ τῆς γυναικός. In Heb. 2:10 the whole point turns on the difference in case, διὰ δὲν τὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ οὕτω τὰ πάντα. In Heb. 11:29 the verb with διά in composition has the accusative while διὰ alone has the genitive, διέβησαν τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν Ἡσαλίσσαν ὡς διὰ ἔλος γῆς. Cf. διὰ μέσου (Lu. 4:30) and διὰ μέσον (Lu. 17:11). But the resultant idea is here the same. Ἐπί is a pertinent illustration. In Rev. 5:1 we find Ἐπί τὴν δεξίαν and Ἐπί τοῦ θρόνου, while in Rev. 11:10 observe Ἐπί τῆς γῆς and Ἐπί αὐτῶν. Cf. also Rev. 14:6. So again in Mt. 19:28 note Ἐπί θρόνου and Ἐπί θρόνους and in Mt. 24:2 Ἐπί λίθου, but λίθος Ἐπί λίθῳ in Lu. 21:6. Cf. Ἐπί τοῦ and Ἐπί τῇ in Rev. 14:9. So Ἐπὶ πίστει Ἐπί with dative in 1 Tim. 4:10 and accusative in 5:5. This is all in harmony with the ancient Greek idiom.

For an interesting comparison between the Synoptic and the Johannine use of prepositions and the varying cases see Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary: pp. 357–361. The variation is especially noticeable in διά, Ἐπί and παρά. The LXX shows abundant use of the preposition after verbs. Cf. Conybeare and Stock, Selections from the LXX, p. 87 f., and Johannessohn, Der Gebrauch etc. In some stereotyped formulæ one notes even in modern Greek ἀπὸ καρδίας, μετὰ βίας, κατὰ διαβόλου (Thumb, Handb., pp. 103 ff.).

Page 566] (b) Repetition with Several Nouns. When several nouns are used with the same preposition the preposition is repeated rather more frequently than in the earlier Greek. Winer thinks that the repetition occurs only when the two or more substantives do not come easily under the same category. Within limits this is true (cf. repetition of the article), but there is rather more freedom in the later Greek on this point. In Jo. 4:23 we do have a similar idea in the phrase ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἄλληθείᾳ as in ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας in Lu. 21:26. Cf. also ἐν Λύστροις καὶ Τικνίῳ (Ac. 16:2), but in verse 1 observe καὶ εἰς Δέρβην καὶ εἰς Λύστραν, where perhaps the double conjunction plays some part. Indeed with καὶ—καὶ or τε—καὶ the preposition is commonly repeated. Thus καὶ ἐν ὅληθρῳ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ (Ac. 26:29), ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἥπαλογίᾳ (Ph. 1:7). With disjunctive conjunctions the repetition is usual also, as ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τριβόλων (Mt. 7:16). With antithesis the repetition is the rule, as μὴ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἄλλο ἐν δυνάμει (1 Cor. 2:5. Cf. also verse 4). But one cannot properly insist on any ironclad rule when he considers a case like ἀπὸ Μωυσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν (Lu. 24:27), πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς τόν ἄλλον (Jo. 20:2), ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἄγιῳ καὶ ἐν πληροφορίᾳ (1 Th. 1:5). In a comparison again the preposition is repeated, as Ἐπί αὐτοῦς—ὡσπέρ καὶ ἔφ

1 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 158.
2 W.-Th., p. 420.
κρίσεως (Ac. 11:15). But even with disjunctive conjunctions the preposition is not always repeated, as ἐπὶ διὸν Ἡ τρισίν (Heb. 10:28). In Ac. 26:18 ἀπό is not repeated, though εἰς occurs in one member of the sentence and ἐπὶ in the other. In Jo. 16:8 περὶ is repeated for rhetorical reasons, περὶ ἀμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως. Cf. Eph. 6:12 where the repetition occurs without a conjunction, πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς, πρὸς τὰς ἔξοψιας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας, etc. Cf. also Jo. 17:9.

(c) Repetition with the Relative. The preposition is not always repeated with the relative. Usually the classic authors did not repeat the preposition with the relative when the antecedent had it. So the N. T. shows similar examples, as ἐν ἡμέραις αὐς ἔπειδεν (Lu. 1:25), εἰς τὸ ἔργον δ ἀποτελέσθη (Ac. 13:2), ἀπὸ πάντων ὄν (Ac. 13:39), etc. But the repetition is seen in such examples as εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην, εἰς Ἡ (Ac. 7:4); ἀπὸ πρῶτης ἡμέρας. ἀφ Ἡς (Ac. 20:18). In Jo. 4:53, ἐκεῖνῃ τῇ ὄρφη, ἐν Ἡ, the preposition occurs with the relative, but not with the antecedent. However, there is very little difference between the mere locative case and ὄν added. Especially noticeable is a case where the antecedent is [Page 567] not expressed and the relative has the preposition of the antecedent. So περὶ ὄν in Jo. 17:9 is equal to περὶ τούτων οὗς δέδωκας μοι. Cf. εἰς ὄν (Jo. 6:29).

(d) Condensation by Variation. Once more, the variation of the preposition is a skillful way of condensing thought, each preposition adding a new idea. Paul is especially fond of this idiom. Thus in Ro. 3:22 we note δικαιοσύνη δ ὄν ὁ ἡμέρας ἐπὶ ἑλαστεῖς Ἡ Ἱσραήλ Χριστῷ εἰς πάντας. Cf. verses 25 f. A particularly striking example is ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ διὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα (Ro. 11:36). Cf. also Col. 1:16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὰ πάντα—διὶ ἀυτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν ἐκκλησία. Cf. ἐπὶ, διὰ, ἐν in Eph. 4:6. In Gal. 1:1 Paul covers source and agency in his denial of man’s control of his apostleship by the use of ἀπὸ and διὰ. See Winer-Thayer, p. 418 f. Cf. also ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (Mt. 1:22) for mediate and intermediate agent. One should not make the prepositions mere synonyms. Cf. ὑπὲρ (Ro. 5:6), ἄντι (Mt. 20:28), and περὶ (Mt. 26:28) all used in connection with the death of Christ. They approach the subject from different angles.

VI. The Functions of Prepositions with Cases.

(a) The Case Before Prepositions. Both in time and at first in order. In the Indo-Germanic tongues at first the substantive was followed by the preposition as is still seen in the Greek ἔνεκεν, χάριν, etc. The Greek, however, generally came to put the preposition before the substantive as with compound verbs.

(b) Notion of Dimension. The prepositions especially help express the idea of dimension and all the relations growing out of that, but they come to be used in

3 W.-Th., p. 422.
4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 174.
various abstract relations also. Indeed it was just the purely “local” cases (ablative, locative and instrumental) that came to lose their independent forms (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 60 f.), due partly to the increase in the use of prepositions.

*(c) Original Force of the Case.* The case retains its original force with the preposition and this fundamental case-idea must be observed. The same preposition will be used with different cases where the one difference lies in the variation in case as already noted. Take παρά, for instance, with the ablative, the locative or the accusative. The preposition is the same, but the case varies and the resultant idea differs radically.4

*[Page 568] (d) The Ground-Meaning of the Preposition.* This must always be taken into consideration.1 It is quite erroneous to say that παρά, for instance, means now ‘from,’ now ‘beside,’ now ‘to.’ This is to confuse the resultant meaning of the preposition, case and context with the preposition itself. It is the common vice in the study of the prepositions to make this crucial error. The scientific method of studying the Greek preposition is to begin with the case-idea, add the meaning of the preposition itself, then consider the context. The result of this combination will be what one translates into English, for instance, but he translates the total idea, not the mere preposition. It is puerile to explain the Greek prepositions merely by the English or German rendering of the whole. Unfortunately the Greeks did not have the benefit of our English and German. Kühner-Gerth2 well observe that it is often impossible to make any translation that at all corresponds to the Greek idiom.

*(e) The Oblique Cases Alone with Prepositions.* See also ch. XI. The vocative was obviously out of the question, and the nominative only appeared with pure adverbs like ὁνεὶς ἐκ (Rev. 21:21). Cf. Mk. 14:19; Ro. 12:5, καθις ἐκ. But not all the six oblique cases were used with equal freedom with prepositions. Certainly in the original Indo-Germanic tongues the dative was not used with prepositions.5 The dative is not originally a “local” case and expresses purely personal relations. Delbrück thinks that the Greek dative did come to be used sometimes with ἐπί as in Homer, ἔπι τρόφαις μάχεσθαι.4 Indeed some N. T. examples of ἐπί may naturally be datives like ἐπὶ πλαγχίσῃ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν (Mt. 14:14), μάκροθυμήσῃ ἐπὶ ἐμοί (Mt. 18:26). But usually even with ἐπὶ the case is locative, not dative. We do have two examples of ἐγγὺς with the dative, as Ac. 9:38; 27:8. Originally again the genitive was not used with prepositions,5 but the Greek undoubtedly uses the genitive, though not a “local” case, with some prepositions like ἄντι, διὰ, ἐπί.

*(f) Original Freedom.* That is to say, most of the prepositions could be used with ablative, locative, accusative and some with the genitive or instrumental. But the three first mentioned (‘whence,’ ‘where,’ ‘whither’ cases) called upon most of the

---

4 K.-G., I, p. 450.
2 Ib.
3 Delbrück, Grundl. etc., pp. 130, 134. Cf. also Monro, Hom., Gr. p. 125.
4 Ib., p. 130.
5 Ib., p. 134.
prepositions. The dialect inscriptions give many proofs of this matter. Thus ἀπό and ἐξ both appear in the Arcadian and Cyprian dialects [Page 569] with the locative as well as the ablative. 1 Ἀμφί originally occurred with locative, accusative and genitive. The same thing was true of ἐπί, μετά περί and ὑπό (possibly with ablative, not genitive). Indeed περί once used the ablative also. Παρά and πρός were used with locative, accusative or ablative. It is possible indeed that πρός may have been used with five cases, adding true dative and true genitive to the above. 2 In the case of ἐπί four cases occur (Delbrück) since it apparently used the dative also. Other prepositions once were used with two cases, as ὁνά and ἐν with locative and accusative (even the gen. with ἐν and εἰς like εἰς ὑδάω), whereas κατά seems to use accusative, genitive, ablative. Πρός originally had locative as well as ablative, while ὑπέρ had ablative (genitive?) and accusative and διά accusative and genitive. Ἀντί has only genitive, while σύν has only instrumental. Ἀμφί still occasionally occurs in the papyri as a free preposition.

(g) NO ADEQUATE DIVISION BY CASES. It is very difficult, therefore, to make any adequate division of the prepositions by the cases. There were indeed in early Greek two with only one case, eight with two, and eight with three cases. But the point to observe is that the usage varies greatly in the course of the centuries and in different regions, not to say in the vernacular and in the literary style. Besides, each preposition had its own history and every writer his own idiosyncrasies. For the detailed comparison of the prepositions see Helbing, 3 and for the history of the cases with the prepositions see Krebs. 4 But in the Ptolemaic times prepositions are more and more used with the accusative to the corresponding disappearance of the other oblique cases. 5 In particular one must note (cf. ch. XI) the disappearance of the locative, instrumental and dative before the accusative and the genitive, until in the modern Greek εἰς and the accusative have superseded ἐν and the locative and the dative proper also. Even σύν and the instrumental disappear in the modern Greek vernacular before μέ (μετά) and the accusative. 6

(h) SITUATION IN THE N. T. But in the N. T. the matter has not developed that far and the cases are not so much blurred, [Page 570] though the range of the prepositions in the matter of cases is greatly limited. The seventeen “proper” prepositions (Ἀμφί drops out) in the N. T. use the cases as will be now shown.

1. Those with One Case. Ἀνά, ἄντί, ἀπό, εἰς, ἐκ, ἐν, πρό, σύν use only one case, eight as opposed to two in the early Greek (ἄντί and σύν). The cases used are not the same (accusative with ἄνά and εἰς; genitive with ἄντί; ablative with ἀπό, ἐκ and πρό; locative with ἐν; instrumental with σύν), but nearly half of the prepositions have come to one case in the N. T. In the modern Greek all the prepositions occur usually with the accusative (or even the nom.). The use of the genitive (abl.) is due to literary

4 Die Präp. bei Polyb., p. 6 f.
influence. The common proper prepositions in modern Greek are εἰς, ἐπί, μέ, γιά, and less commonly κατά, παρά, ὑπό, and in dialects πρός (Thumb, Handb., p. 98). This tendency towards case simplification is well illustrated by the so-called improper prepositions which use only one case (abl., gen. or dat.), though they do not feel the movement towards the accusative.

2. Those with Two Cases. Five (as opposed to eight) use two cases: διά, μετά, περί, ὑπέρ, ὑπό. The cases used are genitive and accusative each with διά, μετά, περί; ablative and accusative with ὑπέρ and ὑπό. In the case of περί some of the examples can be explained as ablative (from around), while ὑπέρ seems, like ὑπέρ, to use the ablative (cf. Latin sub) and possibly the genitive also.

3. Those with Three Cases. Only four prepositions (as against eight) retain three cases: ἐπί, κατά, παρά, πρός, unless περί, ὑπέρ and ὑπό have both ablative and genitive. Κατά in Mt. 8:32, ὥρησεν κατὰ τοῦ κρήνην, is used with the ablative. Πρός indeed only has the ablative once (Ac. 27:34) and that is due to the literary influence on the N. T.1 If πρός drops out, only three prepositions still use three cases, barring περί, ὑπέρ and ὑπό. Of these παρά is not very common (gen. 78, acc. 60, loc. 50), still less κατά, while ἐπί is still frequent (acc. 464, gen. 216, loc. 176).

4. Possibly Four with ἐπί. In the case of ἐπί indeed we may have to admit four cases, if there are examples of the pure dative like Mt. 18:26, μακροθύμησον ἐπὶ ἐμοί. But at any rate ἐπί and παρά alone show the old freedom in the use of the cases.

(i) Each Preposition in a Case. Like other adverbs the prepositions are fixed case-forms, some of which are still apparent. Thus ἀνά is in the locative case, like ἐν(i), ἐπί, περί. Cf. also πρός (πρός). The forms διά and ὑπά occur also (datives). The old dative παρά occurs, while παρά is instrumental. So ἀνά, διά, κατά, μετά are in the instrumental case. What ὑπό is we do not know. But the case in which the preposition may be itself has no necessary bearing on the case with which it is used. It is just a part of the word’s own history, but still it is always worth observing.

VII. Proper Prepositions in the N. T.

(a) Ἄνα. The case of ἀνά is not clear. Originally it was ἀνα and may be the same as the Lesbian, Thessalian and Cyprian ὄν. Cf. English “on.” It may be compared with the Old Persian and Gothic ἀνά, the Latin and German an. One may compare the Greek ἀνά and Sanskrit ἀṇा.1 The fundamental idea seems to be “on,” “upon,” “along,” like German auf, and this grows easily to “up” like ἄνα in contrast with κατά (κάτω). Homer uses the adverb ἄνα as an ellipsis to mean “up.” The locative was once used with ἀνά, but in the N. T. only the accusative occurs. The distributive use may be up and down a line or series, and MSS. give κατά in several of these instances (a common use of κατά also). While ἀνά is very common in composition with verbs in

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 106.
the N. T. (over ten pages of examples in Moulton and Geden’s *Concordance*), only thirteen examples of the preposition alone occur in the N. T. One of these (Lu. 9:3) is absent from W. H. (Nestle retains it), while in Rev. 21:21 (ἀνά ἐς) the word is merely adverb (cf. Homer), not preposition. Of the remaining eleven instances, four are examples of ἀνά μέσον with the genitive, a sort of compound prepositional phrase with the idea of “between” (like Mt. 13:25), similar to the modern Greek ἀνάμεσα, and found in the LXX, Polybius, etc. One (1 Cor. 14:27, ἀνά μέρος, means ‘in turn,’ while the remaining six are all examples of the distributive use, like ἀνά δύο (Lu. 10:1). The distributive use is in Xenophon. For examples in papyri and inscriptions see Radermacher, p. 15. Cf. our “analogy.” In Ac. 8:30, γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις, the point turns on ἀνα—, but it is not clear how ἀνα— turns “know” to “read.” See Ac. 10:20 ἀναστάτης κατάβηθι for contrast between ἀνά and κατά. Abbott, *Johannine Gr.*., pp. 222 ff., argues at length to show that the one example in John (2:6) is distributive. ἀνά does not survive in modern Greek vernacular (Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 366). In the papyri ἀνά shows some new compounds not in the N. T., like ἀναπορεύομαι (Mayser, *Gr. d. Griech. Pap.*, p. 486). Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, p. 734, considers ἀνά, like ἀντί, one of the “proethnic” prepositions. It is rare in the papyri and the inscriptions (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 115). But ἀναστατοὶ με, ‘he upsets me’ (P.Oxy. 119, ii/iii A.D.), is strangely like Ac. 17:6 ο̣ι τῆν οίκ. ἀναστατόσαντες.

(b) ἀντί. This preposition is in the locative case of ἀντα. Cf. Sanskrit ἀν्ति, Latin ante, Lithuanian ant, Gothic and, German ant (-ent), Anglo-Saxon andlang, and-swérian (‘answer’). The root-idea is really the very word “end.” Brugmann (*Griech. Gr.*, p. 437) thinks it may mean “front.” If so, “in front of” would be the idea of the word in the locative. Cf. ante-room, ἀντίος, ἀντάω (ἄπι—, ὑπι—), ἐναντίος, ‘at the end’ (ἄντί). Suppose two men at each end of a log facing each other. That gives the etymological picture, “face to face.” The case used with it was originally the genitive and naturally so, though in modern Greek the accusative has displaced it.1 It is obviously the real adnominal genitive and not ablative (cf. Sanskrit adverb ἀντι) that we have with ἀντι and is like the genitive with the adverbs ἀντα, ἄντιον, ἄντια, and the adjective ἀντιος, etc.2 In Homer indeed ἀντι has just begun to be used in composition with verbs so that it barely escapes the list of the “improper”


3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 122, cites Polyb.
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prepositions.\textsuperscript{3} Blass\textsuperscript{4} calls it “one of the prepositions that are dying out,” but as a matter of fact it survives in modern Greek. In the N. T. it is used in composition with twenty-two verbs (single compounds) and occurs twenty-two times also with nouns and pronouns. It is not therefore very flourishing in the N. T. It does not occur often in the N. T. matter of fact it survives in modern Greek. In the N. T. it is used in composition with

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{3} Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 487.

\textsuperscript{4} Gr. of N. T. Gr., p. 124.

\textsuperscript{5} Gr. of N. T. Gr., p. 115.

\end{footnotesize}
“instead,” which is not true, but because the context renders any other resultant idea out of the question. Compare also ἄντιλυτρόν ὑπὲρ πάντων by Paul (1 Tim. 2:6) where both ἄντι and ὑπὲρ combine with λύτρον [Page 574] in expressing this idea. Cf. ἄντι-τοπος (Heb. 9:24). In Mt. 2:22 ἄντι τοῦ πατρός the substitution takes the form of succession as son succeeds father on the throne. Cf. ἄνθι-όπως (Ac. 13:7). In Jas. 4:15 ἄντι τοῦ λέγειν the result is also substitution, the points of view being contrasted. In Heb. 12:2 the cross and the joy face each other in the mind of Jesus and he takes both, the cross in order to get the joy. The idea of exchange appears also in 1 Cor. 11:15 ἡ κοµὴ ἄντι περιβολαίου. Blass\(^1\) considers χάριν ἄντι χάριτος (Jo. 1:16) as “peculiar,” but Winer\(^2\) rightly sees the original import of the preposition. Simcox\(^3\) cites from Philo χάριτας νέας ἄντι παλαιότερων ἑπιδίδωσιν as clearly explaining this “remarkable” passage. But really has not too much difficulty been made of it? As the days come and go a new supply takes the place of the grace already bestowed as wave follows wave upon the shore. Grace answers (ἄντι) to grace. The remaining examples are five of ἄνθι- ὅν in the sense of ‘because’ (‘therefore’), when two clauses or sentences correspond to each other, one the reason for the other. This is indeed classical enough (LXX also). Similar is ἄντι τοῦτου (Eph. 5:31) where the LXX (Gen. 2:24), which Paul does not quote, has ἕνεκαν τοῦτου (cf. Mk. 10:7; Mt. 19:4). There is yet another idea that comes out in composition like ἄντι-ἀπο-δίδω ὁµι (Lu. 14:14) where ἀπό has the meaning of ‘back’ and ἄντι of ‘in return’ (cf. “in turn”). Cf. ἄντι-ἀπο-κρίνοµαι (Lu. 14:6) and ἄνθι-οµιλογέω (Lu. 2:38). In Col. 1:24, ἄντι-ἀνα-πληρόω, Paul uses ἄντι in the sense of ‘in his turn’ (answering over to Christ). As Christ, so Paul fills up the measure of suffering. One may remark that prepositions in composition often best show their original import.

\((c)\) ἁπό. The etymology of this preposition is very simple. We note the Sanskrit ᾶµ, Latin ab, Gothic of, English of, off. Some of the older dialects used the form ἁπό (Arcad., Cypr., Thess.) and the Epic ἁπαί is to be noted.\(^4\) We may compare ἁψ (ἁπ-ε) with Latin aps (ab; cf. ἕκ, ἔξ). The case of ἁπό cannot be determined, but observe ἁπαί above. In the Arcadian and Cyprian ἁπό is found with the locative, but in the literary Greek only the ablative is used with ἁπό, a case in perfect harmony with the meaning of the word. The nominative ἁπό ὃ ὅν in Rev. 1:4 is, [Page 575] of course, for a theological purpose, to accent the unchangeableness of God. It is one of the most tenacious of the prepositions, being extremely frequent in the N. T. both with nouns

---

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 124.
2 W.-Th., p. 364.
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and in composition with verbs. Jannaris\(^1\) gives an interesting sketch of the history of ἀπό in the later Greek. In the modern Greek it is used with the accusative (the ablative only in set phrases). This accusative usage is found as early as Hermas.\(^2\) Ἐκ finally vanished before ἀπό (cf. ἐν before ἐκ), but in the modern Greek ἀπό also supplants to some extent ἐνά, πρός and ὑπό. The explanation of ἀπό is somewhat complicated therefore\(^3\) since the increase of its use is due partly to the general tendency regarding prepositions (cf. ἀπό with ablative instead of the “partitive genitive”) and partly to its supplanting other prepositions like ἐκ, παρά, ὑπό.

1. **Original Significance.** It can be easily perceived in the N. T. It is clear enough in ἀπό-κόπτω, for instance, ‘to cut off,’ as ἀπό-ἐκοψεν Πέτρος τὸ ὠδίον (Jo. 18:26). Cf. ἄπο-καλύπτω, ‘to take the veil off,’ ‘unveil’ (cf. Mt. 10:26 for contrast between καλύπτω and ἄποκαλ.). So ἀπό-θήκη, ‘a treasure-house for putting things away’ (Mt. 3:12). Cf. ἄπο-εἴδησεν (Mt. 21:33) for ‘a man off from home.’ So ἀπέβλεπεν in Heb. 11:26 and ἄφ-ορόντες in 12:2. It is needless to multiply examples from the compound words\(^4\) like ἄπο-χωρέω. Moulton\(^5\) seems right against Blass\(^6\) in considering ὡς ἀπό σταδίων δεκατέντε (Jo. 11:18) not a real Latinism, but a mere accidental parallel to a millibus passuum duobus. The same idiom occurs in Jo. 21:8 and also in Rev. 14:20. It is indeed rather late Greek (Strabo, Diodorus and Plutarch), but it is not such a manifest Latinism as Jannaris\(^7\) supposes. It is not the meaning of ἀπό that is unusual here, but merely the position. We say ten miles off, not off ten miles. Cf. ἀπό ὀρας 0, ‘at 9 o’clock,’ P. Oxy. 523 (ii/A.D.). The idea of “off” or “away from” is enough to explain the bulk of the N. T. passages. The context as a rule does not alter this simple idea. Thus ἀπό τῆς Γαλιλαίας (Mt. 3:13), ἀπό τοῦ ὀδατος (3:16), ἀπό ἀνατολῆς (2:1), βάλε ἄπο σού (5:29), ἀπό τοῦ πονηροῦ (6:13), ἀπό τοῦ μηνημείου (Lu. 24:2), ἀπό έμου (Mt. 7:23), κατέπαυσεν ἄπο πάντων (Heb. 4:4), ἀπό τῆς ὄρας ἐκείνης (Mt. 9:22), ἀπό τῶν ἀμαρτίων (Mt. 1:21), ἀφαντος ἐγένετο ἄπο αὐτῶν (Lu. 24:31), ἀνάθεμα ἄπο τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Rom. 9:3). Here the ablative case and

|Page 576| the root-idea of the preposition make all clear. The question of place, time, person or abstract relations cuts very little figure in the matter. Wherever the ablative case is natural in Greek, there ἄπο may appear to make clearer the case-idea of source or separation. Conybeare and Stock (p. 84) consider the idiom ἄπο Ἀβρααμ Ἐως Δαβιδ (Mt. 1:17) a Hebraism. The construction is in the LXX, but there is nothing un-Greek about it. For ἄπο in expressions of time take ἄφ- ἃς ἡμέρας (Col. 1:9). In Mt. 7:16, ἄπο τῶν καρπῶν ἐπενώσεσθε, the notion of source is the real idea. Cf. διελέξατο αὐτοῖς ἄπο τῶν γραφῶν (Ac. 17:2). In Ac. 16:33, ἔλουσεν ἄπο τῶν πληγῶν, it seems at first as if the stripes were washed from Paul and Silas and not, as here, Paul and Silas washed from the stripes. Winer\(^1\) suggests the addition in thought of “and cleansed.” Cf. καθαρίσωμεν ἐαντοὺς ἄπο παντὸς μολυσμοῦ (2 Cor. 7:1),
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which idiom Deissmann (Bible Studies, p. 216) illustrates from the inscriptions, and on p. 227 he further cites from the inscriptions three examples of λούομαι ἀπό in illustration of Ac. 16:33. Cf. ἀπ-ενίγματο τὸς χείρας (Mt. 27:24). In Ac. 15:38, τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπὸ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας, no difficulty should be found in the threefold use of ἀπό, since the Greek, unlike the English, loves to repeat words in varying relations. Here we have ἀπό in composition, with persons, with place. See Λοῦως ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄμετος (Mt. 27:24). Certainly there was never any reason for thinking καθαρός ἀπό τοῦ ὄμετος (Ac. 20:26) a Hebraism, since it is the pure ablative idea, and the usage is continuous from Demosthenes to late Greek writers and papyri. We even find πλατύς ἀπὸ τῶν ὦμων, Pap. Par. 10, 20 (Radermacher, p. 116). The Pastor Hermæ shows ἀπό after ἑγκρατεύομαι, καθαρίζομαι, παῦομαι, φυλάσσομαι (Radermacher, p. 113). Many similar examples of this simple use of ἀπό occur in the N. T. Cf. the mere ablative with ἄφιστατο (Lu. 2:37) and then with ἀπό (4:13). Cf. ἀπεθάνετε ἀπό (Col. 2:20), μετανόησον ἀπό (Ac. 8:22), etc. Like other prepositions ἀπό may occur with adverbs, like ἀπὸ τότε (Mt. 4:17).

2. Meaning ‘Back.’ We see it clearly in ἀπο-δίδωμι, ‘give back’ (Mt. 16:27). But even here the point of view is simply changed. The giver gives from himself to the recipient. In the case of a debt or reward from the recipient’s point of view he is getting back what was his due. This idea appears in ἀπολαμβάνω as in Lu. 6:34. A particularly good example is found in ἀπέχουσιν [Page 577] τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν (Mt. 6:2). Cf. ἀπ-έχει (Mk. 14:41). This notion of receipt in full is common (‘in countless instances,” Deissmann) for ἀπέχω in the ostraca, papyri and inscriptions. Cf. Deissmann, Light fr. the Anc. East, pp. 110 ff. Cf. τὸν τειμὸν ἀπέχω πᾶσαν (i.A.D., Delphi Inscr., Bull. de Corr. Hell., 22, p. 58), ‘I have received the whole price’ for the slave’s manumission. Cf. ἀπέλαβεν τὸ τροφεῖον, P. Oxy. 37 (A.D. 40). Cf. ἔξοδόμην τὴν ἀποδοχήν, P. Oxy. 1133, 16 (A.D. 396). This idiom seems to be confined to composition (cf. ἄπό-κριμα, 2 Cor. 1:9) and ἄπό-ἀρχή (Ro. 8:23).

3. “Translation-Hebraism” in φοβεθῶμαι ἄπό. Cf. Lu. 12:4.1 In Mt. 10:28, φοβεθῶμαι τὸν δον., we have the usual accusative, and in verse 26 we even see φοβήθητε αὐτούς; but verse 28 again shows φοβεθῆτε ἄπό. In Lu. 12:1, προσέξετε ἐστοιχεῖον ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης, we have the usual ablative as above. Cf. βλέπω ἄπό in Mk. 8:15. ἄπό in the LXX was used to translate the Hebrew יָדָּ֔ה, but not all the examples in the LXX are necessarily pure Hebraisms, as Conybeare and Stock imply. Besides, the papyri show βλέπε σατὸν ἄπό τῶν Ἰουδαίων, B.G.U. 1079 (A.D. 40), the first reference to the Jews as money-lenders. Some of the N. T. examples are merely for the so-called “partitive genitive.” Thus ἐκλεξάμενος ἄπό αὐτῶν δώδεκα (Lu. 6:13), ἐνέκατε ἄπό τῶν υἱῶν (Jo. 21:10), ἐκεῖνῳ ἄπό τοῦ πνεύματος (Ac. 2:17), ἐσθιεὶς ἄπό τῶν ψυχῶν (Mt. 15:27), πιθὼ ἄπό τοῦ γεννήματος (Lu. 22:18), τίνα ἄπό τῶν δύο (Mt. 27:21), etc. The point is not that all these phrases occur in the older Greek, but that they are in perfect harmony with the Greek genius in the use of the ablative and

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 102.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 126.
3 Sel., etc., p. 83.
in the use of ἀπό to help the ablative. Moulton (Prol., p. 246) cites ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, Pelagia (Usener, p. 28) as fairly parallel with ὁ υἱὸς Ἰουδαίων (Mt. 18:7). The partitive use of the ablative with ἀπό does come nearer to the realm of the genitive (cf. English of and the genitive), but the ablative idea is still present. One may note τὸν ἀπὸ Κελτῶν φόβον in Polybius XVII, 11, 2 (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 116). Cf. ἐνδομα ἀπὸ τριχῶν (Mt. 3:4) with the old genitive of material.

4. Comparison with ἐκ. But ἀπό needs to be compared more particularly with ἐκ which it finally displaced save in the Epirot ὄχι or ὦχι. But the two are never exactly equivalent. ἐκ means ‘from within’ while ἀπό is merely the general starting-point. ἀπό does not deny the “within-ness”; it simply does not assert it as ἐκ does. Thus in Mk. 3:10 we read ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὦδατος when the assertion is made by ἐκ that Jesus had been in the water (cf. κατά—εἰς, ἀνά—ἐκ in Ac. 8:38 f.). But in Mt. 3:16 we merely read ἀνέβη ἦν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὦδατος, a form of expression that does not deny the ἐκ of Mark. The two prepositions are sometimes combined, as ἐξελθεῖν ἂν αὐτῆς (Ac. 16:18) and ἀφοροῦσιν ἐκ μέσου (Mt. 13:49). Even with the growth in the use of ἀπό it still falls behind ἐκ in the N. T.1 Both ἀπό and ἐκ are used of domicile or birthplace, but not in exactly the same sense.2 Thus in Jo. 1:44 see ἦν ἐκ Φιλιπποῦ ἂπό Βηθσαιδά, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ανδρέου, where ἀπό corresponds closely with the German von and French de which came to be marks of nobility. So in verse 45, Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, where (in both verses) no effort is made to express the idea that they came from within Nazareth. That idea does appear in verse 46, ἐκ Ναζαρέτ. In Lu. 2:4 both ἀπό and ἐκ are used for one’s home (ἀπό τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ). Indeed ἐκ in this sense in the N. T. seems confined to πόλες.3 Both appear again in Jo. 11:1. Cf. also Jo. 7:41 f., ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἂπό Βηθλεέμ, where the two prepositions are reversed. The Latin versions render both ἂπό and ἐκ here by a.4 Cf. ἂπό Αριμαθαίας (Jo. 19:38). Abbott5 is clear that John does not mean to confuse the two prepositions, but uses each in its own sense, though ἂπό is not found in the older writers for domicile. The sense of variety, as in English, may have led to the use of now one, now the other, since at bottom either answers. So Luke in Ac. 23:34 has ἐκ ποιας ἐπαρχείας, but ἂπό Γαλιλαίας. Cf. Ac. 1:4. Blass6 notes that outside of John the N. T. writers use ἂπό for one’s country. So even Luke in Ac. 24:18, ἂπό τῆς Αἰγίας. The MSS. indeed vary in some instances between ἂπό and ἐκ as in Ac. 16:39 with τῆς πόλεως. Cf. MS. variation between ἂπό and παρά in Mk. 16:9. Cf. also Ac. 13:50 for ἐκ—ἀπό. In a case like of ἂπο τῆς Τραγαίνας (Heb. 13:24) the preposition does not determine whether the persons are still in Italy or are outside of Italy. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 237. But Deissmann (Light, etc., p. 186) thinks that ἂπό here means ‘in,’ like ἂπό Φιλαδεή in an ostraca from Thebes, A.D. 192. Cf. τὸν ἂπο Οξυρύγχων πόλεως, P. Oxy. 38, A.D. 49. ἂπο is also, like ἐκ (Ac. 10:45, etc.), used for members of a party in

4 Moulton, Prol., p. 102.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 102.
3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 125.
4 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 228.
5 Ib., p. 229.
6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 125.
Ac. 12:1, τινὰς τῶν ἄπο τῆς ἐκκλησίας, an un-Attic usage. But on the whole the two prepositions can be readily distinguished in the N. T.

5. *Comparison with παρά.* As to παρά, it suggests that one has [Page 579] been by the side of the one from whom he comes. In relation to God we find ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον (Jo. 8:42), παρά τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον (16:27), ἄπο θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες (16:30). Cf. πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Jo. 1:1). It would be overrefinement to insist on a wide and radical difference here between ἄπο, ἐκ and παρά; and yet they are not exactly synonymous. In the older Greek παρά was the common preposition for the conscious personal departure.¹ But in N. T. ἄπο occurs also with persons. So ἐκείνοίμεν ἄπταιτοῦ (1 Jo. 1:5), μαθεῖν ἄφι θυμῶν (Gal. 3:2), παρέλαβον ἄπὸ τοῦ κυρίου (1 Cor. 11:23). One must not, however, read too much into ἄπο, as in Gal. 2:12, where τινὰς ἄπο Ἰακώβου does not mean ‘with the authority of James,’ though they doubtless claimed it. Cf. Mk. 15:45; 1 Th. 3:6. One doubts if we are justified in insisting on a radical distinction between παρά τοῦ πατρὸς (Jo. 10:18) and ἄπο τοῦ κυρίου (1 Cor. 11:23) save as etymology throws light on the matter.²

6. *Compared with ὑπό.* The MSS. of ancient writers,³ as of the N. T., varied often between ἄπο and ὑπό. As instances of this variation in the N. T. take Mk. 8:31; Ac. 4:36; 10:17; Ro. 13:1. The MSS. often vary where ὑπό is the correct text. The use of ἄπο with the agent is not precisely like ὑπό, though one has only to compare ἄπο with Latin ab and English of to see how natural it is for ἄπο to acquire this idiom. Observe κατενεχθείς ἄπὸ τοῦ ὑπνοῦ (Ac. 20:9). So in Jas. 1:13, ἄπο θεοῦ πειράζωμαι, we translate ‘tempted of God.’ The temptation, to be sure, is presented as coming from God. Cf. also Ο μισθός τοῦ ἀφοσιωμένος ἄφι θυμῶν (Jas. 5:4), where the keeping back of the reward is conceived as coming from you. Cf. Ac. 4:36. In Mt. 16:21, παθεῖν ἄπο τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ‘at the hands of,’ is a free rendering of the idea of agency or source. In Lu. 16:18, ἄπολευχόμενη ἄπο ἀνδρός, note the repetition of ἄπο. This idea of removal is present in λαθήναι ἄπο (Lu. 6:17) and in ἐνοχλούμενοι ἄπο (6:18) it is agency. There may be a zeugma in the last clause. In Lu. 9:22, ἄποδοκιμασθήναι ἄπο τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, we have the same construction as in 16:18 above (cf. 17:25). Cf. ἠτομομασθέναι ἄπο τοῦ θεοῦ (Rev. 12:6) and Ac. 2:22 ἄποδιδομένων ἄπο τοῦ θεοῦ. The use of ἄπο after substantives throws some light on this matter. Thus τῆν ἄπο σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν (Ac. 23:21), ἄπο σοῦ σημεῖον (Mt. 12:38). This use of ἄπο after passive verbs came to be the rule in the later writers. Cf. Wilhelm, I. G. XII. 5, 29.

But it is not alone a form of agency that ἄπο comes to express. [Page 580] It may also be used for the idea of cause, an old usage of ὑπό. For instance, take ἄπο τῆς χαρᾶς σύντοι οὐράγει (Mt. 13:44), ἄπο τοῦ φόβου ἐκράζειν (14:26), οὐαί τῷ κόσμῳ ἄπο τῶν σκανδάλων (18:7), κουμομένους ἄπο τῆς λύπης (Lu. 22:45), οὐκέτι ἵσχον ἄπο τοῦ πλήθους (Jo. 21:6), οὐκ ἐνέβλεψεν ἄπο τῆς δόξης (Ac. 22:11). Cf. further Lu. 19:3; 24:41; Ac. 12:14; 20:9; Heb. 5:7, etc. The LXX gives abundant illustration.

---

² Cf. W.-Th., p. 370.
³ Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 138.

of the same idiom, the causal use of ἄπω. As a matter of sound see ἔφαντο and ἄφαντος in Heb. 7:13.

(d) Διά. Delbrück says: “Of the origin of διά I know nothing to say.” One hesitates to proceed after that remark by the master in syntax. Still we do know something of the history of the word both in the Greek and in other Indo-Germanic tongues. The form διά may be in the instrumental case, but one must note διαί (dative) in the lyric passages of Ἀeschylus, not to say the Thessalian διά.3 But there is no doubt about διά being kin to δύο, διή. Sanskrit dvā, dvī (cf. τραγάσ, ί), dvīs; Latin duo, bis (cf. Sanskrit dvis, Greek δις, b=v or v); German zwei; English two (fem. and neut.), twain (masc.), twi-ce, twi-light, be-tween, two-fold, etc.

1. The Root-Idea. It is manifest in δια-κόσμοι, δισ-χίλιοι, δι-δραχμα, δι-πλοῦς (cf. ἀ-πλοῦς). The etymology of the word is ‘two,’ δύο, as shown in these three words as well as in δις, δι-πλόω, all of which occur in the N. T. Thus it will be seen how persistent is the etymological force in the word. Cf. Mk. 6:37; Rev. 18:6; Mk. 5:13. See also δῖς μυριάδες (Text. Rec., δῶμ Μ. Rev. 9:16), δι-λόγος (1 Tim. 3:8), δι-στομός (Heb. 4:12), δι-ψυχος (Jas. 1:8), δι-δραχμον (Mt. 17:24), Δι-δύμος (Jo. 11:16). Cf. ἐκχίσθη εἰς δύο (Mt. 27:51).

2. ‘By Twos’ or ‘Between.’ But the preposition has advanced a step further than merely ‘two’ to the idea of by-twain, be-tween, in two, in twain. This is the ground-meaning in actual usage. The word δι-θάλασσα ἄπω originally meant ‘resembling two seas’ (cf. Euxine Sea, Strabo 2, 5, 22), but in the N. T. (Ac. 27:41) it apparently means lying between two seas (Thayer). The notion of interval (be-tween) is frequent in the N. T. both in composition and apart from composition. Thus in ἠμερῶν διαγενναμένων πνεύματος (Ac. 25:13), ‘some days came in between’ (διά). Cf. δια-γνώσμα τά καθό ύμᾶς (Ac. 24:22) with Latin di-gnosco, dis-cerno and Greek-English dianosis (διά-γνωσιν, Ac. 25:21). Δια-θήκη is an arrangement or covenant between two (Gal. 3:17). See δια-αίων (1 Cor. 12:11); δια-διδομένου (Lu. 11:22) ‘divide’; οὐθέν δια-ἐκρίνεται μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν (Ac. 15:9) where μεταξύ explains διά. Cf. διά-κρισις (Heb. 5:14), ‘dis-crimination’; [Page 581] δια-λείπω (Lu. 7:45), ‘intervals of delay’; δια-λῶ (Ac. 5:36), ‘dis-solve’; δια-μερίζω (Ac. 2:45), ‘dis-tribute’; δια-πήγαινον (Lu. 8:29), ‘rend asunder’; δια-σκορπίζω (Jo. 11:52), opposed to συνάγω, ‘disperse’; δια-στάτω (Mk. 5:4), ‘rend in two’; δια-στελλόμαι (Ac. 8:1) = ‘scatter abroad’; δια-στορά (Jo. 7:35), ‘dispersion’; δια-στέλλω (Heb. 12:20), ‘divide’; δια-στήμα (Ac. 5:7), ‘distance’ or ‘interval’; δια-στολή (1 Cor. 14:7), ‘distinction’; δια-τίθεμαι (Lu. 22:29), ‘dispose’; δια-φέρω (Ac. 27:27, Mt. 6:26), ‘bear apart,’ ‘differ’; διαφόρος (Ro. 12:6), ‘different’; δια-χάζω (Mt. 10:35), ‘set at variance’ (‘cleave asunder’). These

1 C. and S., p. 83.
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numerous examples ought to be sufficient to show what the real meaning of the word in itself is. A particularly noticeable instance appears in Lu. 24:51, where we have δι-έστη ὃπ  οὐτῶν.

The N. T. preserves this notion of interval in expressions of time and so it is hardly "peculiar only to literary style." Thus in Mk. 2:1 δι ἡμερῶν means 'interval of days,' 'days between,' 'after some days,' though surely no one would think that διά really means 'after.' Cf. Mt. 26:61, διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν (cf. ἔν, 27:40); διὰ ἔτοιν πλεῖόνων, Ac. 24:17; Gal. 2:1, διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἔτοιν. Cf. Ac. 5:7. In Ac. 1:3, διὰ ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ἡπτάνομενος, the appearance of Jesus was at intervals within the forty days. But see opposition to this idea in Abbott, Johannine Grammar, p. 255 f. In the phrase διὰ νυκτός (Ac. 5:19; 16:9, etc.), 'by night,' διὰ adds little to the genitive itself. It is the real adnominal genitive. The preposition is very common in the N. T., especially with the genitive (gen. 382, acc. 279),

3. 'Passing Between' or 'Through.' The idea of interval between leads naturally to that of passing between two objects or parts of objects. 'Through' is thus not the original meaning of διά, but is a very common one. The case is usually the genitive, though in Homer the accusative is common also, as we find it once in the N. T. (Lu. 17:11), διὰ μέσου Σαμαρίας (cf. διὰ μέσου, 4:30), and even here note the genitive after μέσον. Some MSS. in Jo. 8:59 read also διὰ μέσου. Blass wrongly calls the accusative an "inadmissible reading" in view of Homer and the growing use of the accusative in the vernacular with all prepositions (cf. modern Greek). This use of 'through' or 'thorough' is common in composition and sometimes has a "perfective" idea ('clear through') as in διακαθαριζέται τῇ ἄλωνα (Mt. 3:12), 'will thoroughly cleanse.' Cf. also δια-βαίνω [Page 582] (Heb. 11:29), δια-βλέπω (Mt. 7:5), δια-αγγέλλω (Lu. 9:60), δια-γρηγορεύω (Lu. 9:32), δια-ἀγω (1 Tim. 2:2), δια-δέχομαι (Ac. 7:45), δια-κατελέγχομαι (Ac. 18:28), δια-μάχομαι (Ac. 23:9), δια-μένω (Lu. 1:22), δια-νυκτερεύω (Lu. 6:12), δια-ανύω (Ac. 21:7), δια-παρατριβή (1 Tim. 6:5); δια-σειώ (Lu. 3:14), δια-σώζω (Lu. 7:3), δια-φυλάσσω (4:10). This sense of διά is used with words of place, time, agent or abstract word. In all of these relations the root-idea of the preposition is easily perceived. Thus in Mt. 12:43, διέρχεται διὰ ἁνδρόν τόπων, διὰ ξηρᾶς (Heb. 11:29), διὰ τῆς Σαμαρίας (Jo. 4:4), διὰ πυρός (1 Cor. 3:15), διὰ ἑσόπτρου (1 Cor. 13:12). Cf. Ac. 13:49; 2 Cor. 8:18. In Ro. 15:28, ἀπελεύσομαι διὰ
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ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν, Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 378) takes διὰ ὑμῶν to be ‘through you,’ i.e. ‘through your city,’ ‘through the midst of you.’ In all these examples the idiom runs just as in the older Greek. The use of διὰ with expressions of time was never very common and gradually was transferred to εἰς. But some examples occur in the N. T. like διὰ ὀλίς νυκτός (Lu. 5:5), which may be compared with διὰ παντός τοῦ ζῆν (Heb. 2:15) and the common phrase διὰ παντός (Mk. 5:5). Here the idea of through is applied to time. Rouffiac (Recherches, p. 29) cites διὰ τοῦ χειμῶνος ὅλου from inscriptions of Priene 112, 98 and 99 (i/B.C.). The agent may also be expressed by διά. This function was also performed in the ancient Greek, though, when means or instrument was meant, the instrumental case was commonly employed. ∆ιά is thus used with inanimate and animate objects. Here, of course, the agent is conceived as coming in between the non-attainment and the attainment of the object in view. One may compare γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν (Ac. 15:23) with δύο ἐπιστολὰς, διὰ Νηδύου μίαν, διὰ Κρονίου μαχαμφόρου μίαν, B.U. 1079, A.D. 41 (Milligan, Greek Pap., p. 39). So οὔ θέλει διὰ μέλλον καὶ καλόμου σοι γράφειν (3 Jo. 13), διὰ γλώσσης (1 Cor. 14:9), τά διὰ τοῦ σώματος (2 Cor. 5:10), διὰ τοῦ ὄλην (2 Cor. 6:7), μήτε διὰ πνεύματος μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε διὰ ἐπιστολῆς (2 Th. 2:2). In 2 Pet. 3:5 note the difference between ἐξ ὦδατος and διὰ ὦδατος. Abstract ideas are frequently so expressed, as σεσωσάμενοι διὰ πίστεως (Eph. 2:8), διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ (Eph. 1:1), διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (1 Cor. 4:15), διὰ νόμου (Ro. 3:27), διὰ ἀποκάλυψεως (Gal. 1:12). Cf. 1 Cor. 6:14. When διὰ occurs with the personal agent, he is regarded as the intermediate agent. Sometimes the immediate agent is also expressed by ὑπό. So ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (Mt. 1:22, etc.). Cf. also διὰ τῆς γυναικὸς—ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor. 11:12), where source and mediate agent are distinguished. In Gal. 1:1, ὅπι θαυμάζων—[Page 583] διὰ θαυμάζων, Paul takes pains to deny both ideas. In 1 Cor. 8:6, ἐξ οὗ—διὰ οὗ, the first refers to God the Father as the source of all things and the second refers to Jesus as the mediate agent by whom all things come into existence. Cf. Col. 1:16. Indeed God himself may be regarded as source, mediate agent, and ultimate object or end, as Paul does in his noble doxology in Ro. 11:36, ὅτι Winer
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ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα. There are other instances also where God is looked upon as the intervening cause or agent. So δι' αὐτοῦ (Heb. 2:10; 1 Cor. 1:9). But δι' is often used with Christ in regard to our relation to God (cf. Paul’s use of ἐν). Thus Ro. 1:8; 5:1; etc. Cf. δι' ἔμοι in Jo. 14:6, δι' αὐτῶν μαρτυρῶν (2 Tim. 2:2), δι' ἄγγελων (Heb. 2:2). The intermediate idea of δι' appears well in 1 Cor. 3:5 ἐκάκουνοι δι' ἣν ἐπιστεύσατε, Heb. 3:16 δι' Μωυσέως, Ro. 5:5 δι' πνεύματος. In 1 Th. 4:2, τίνας παραγγελίας ἐκδόκαμεν ὑμῖν δι' αὐτοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, the matter seems turned round, but, as Paul was the speaker, he conceives Jesus as also making the commands. Abbott, Johannine Grammar, p. 236, rightly argues in favour of ‘through him’ (not ‘it’) in Jo. 1:7. It is important to note δι' Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Eph. 1:5), pregnant with meaning. Cf. Schettler, Die paulinische Formel “Durch Christus,” pp. 28 ff. This use of δι' occurs in the papyri (Wenger, Die Stellvertretung im Rechte der Papyri, 1906, p. 9 f.). Christ is conceived as our representative (Deissmann, Light, etc., p. 340). It is not far from the notion of means like δι' εἰς πίστεως to that of manner like δι' ἐπιστεύσατε (Lu. 8:4). Indeed the two shade off into one another as δι' ὑπάρχοντος (Ac. 18:9). Note also δι' ἀγάπης (Gal. 5:6), δι' ἐπαγγελίας (Gal. 3:18), δι' ἐρωτήματος (Heb. 13:22), δι' ἐλεημοσύνης (1 Pet. 5:12), δι' ὁμολογίας καὶ αἰματος (1 Jo. 5:6), δι' ἀγάπης καὶ περιτομῆς (Ro. 2:27), δι' ἐπιστομοῦ (14:20), δι' ἀγάπης (2 Cor. 3:11), δι' ὑπομονῆς (Heb. 12:1), δι' πολλῶν δακρύων (2 Cor. 2:4). Cf. Rom.
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2:27. But here also the notion of between is always present. This is true even in a case like διὰ τῶν οἰκτιμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 12:1). Cf. also διὰ τῆς χάριτος in Ro. 12:3 with διὰ τὴν χάριν in 15:15.

4. ‘Because of.’ With the accusative διὰ comes to be used with the idea of ‘because of,’ ‘for the sake of,’ ‘on account of.’ The notion of between is still present. Take Mt. 27:18, διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν. Envy is the reason that prompted the betrayal and so came in between and caused the act. The accusative (extension) is natural and helps also to distinguish this idiom from the others. For instance, in Heb. 2:10, διὸν τὰ πάντα καὶ δὶ ὀὐ τὰ πάντα, the two ideas are distinguished entirely by means of the [Page 584] cases. One may note also διὰ τὴν γνάφακα and διὰ τῆς γυναικός (1 Cor. 11:9, 12). Cf. διὰ τὴν χάριν above. In Ro. 8:11 the MSS. vary between διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν and διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος (W. H., Nestle). Note also the difference between διὰ πίστεως and διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν in Ro. 3:25. Cf. also the common διὰ τὸ ὄνομα (Mt. 10:22), διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἁγάπην (Eph. 2:4), διὰ τὸν λόγον (Jo. 15:3), διὰ τὸν χρόνον (Heb. 5:12). Cf. Heb. 5:14; Rev. 12:11. The personal ground is common also as in ἐγὼ ἡμῖν διὰ τὸν πατέρα (Jo. 6:57), διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (Heb. 6:7), etc. Cf. 1 Jo. 4:9 ζησόμενες δὲ ἀντί τωῦ θεοῦ. The aim (usually expressed by ἐνεκα) may be set forth by διὰ also. So τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν δικαιὸν ἐγένετο καὶ ὁ δικαίος διὰ τὸ σάββατον in Mk. 2:27. Cf. also διὰ ἐμὲ and δὲ υμᾶς in Jo. 12:30. Cf. Mk. 13:20; Ph. 3:7. Moulton (Prol., p. 105) cites Ἰνα διὰ σὲ βασιλεῦ τοῦ δικαίου τύχο, M.P. 16
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and 20 (iii/B.C.), in illustration of Jo. 6:57. The Pauline phrase διὰ Ἰησοῦν (2 Cor. 4:5) is illustrated by διὰ τὸν Κύριον in a Berlin Museum papyrus letter (ii/A.D.) which Deissmann (Light, pp. 176 ff.) thinks curiously illumines the story of the Prodigal Son in Lu. 15. In the modern Greek γιὰ (διὰ) this notion of aim or purpose with the accusative is the usual one. A common idiom in the Græco-Roman and Byzantine Greek is the use of διὰ τό and the infinitive in the sense of ἵνα. It is practically equivalent in the N. T. to ὅτι and the indicative and is frequent. In Jo. 2:24 f. we have both constructions parallel, διὰ τό αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας, καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρείαν ἔχειν. In the modern Greek we actually have γιὰ νά (διὰ Ἰησοῦν) with the subjunctive. Cf. English “for that.” The use of διὰ τί does not differ practically from τί alone.

(e) Ἐν. Inasmuch as εἰκ (ἐν-ς) is merely a later variation of Ἐν it will be treated after Ἐν. There is an older form ἐνι (locative case), ἐνι, and in Homer ἐνί or ἐν for metrical reasons. But some of the dialects (Arcadian, Cretan) wrote ἐν like the Latin in. But compare Latin en-do, Umbrian ἐν, (Latin inter), German in (ein), English in (en-).

1. Old Use of Ἐν with Accusative or Locative. Originally Ἐν was used with either locative or accusative, not to say genitive in a case like ἐν Τίτοο which Brugmann does not consider mere ellipsis. He cites also ἐμποδῶν as being really Ἐν ποδῶν. But there is no manner of doubt as to the accusative and the locative. The inscriptions of many of the dialects show abundant illustrations of Ἐν with the accusative such as the Thessalian, Bœotian, Northwest Greek, Arcadian, etc. Cf. Ἐν τάγμα, Ἐν ὅξιτας, Ἐν ὅξαρας, etc. So ἐν τῷ Ἑραμ, etc. Indeed in Cypriote Greek Ἐν usually has the accusative. In North Arcadian Ἐν alone appears (not Ἐν-ς, εἰκ) and with either locative
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or accusative like Latin in. Besides in Homer we have ἐν-ὤσα, not to mention the common compound verbs like ἐμ-βάλλω, ἐμ-βαίνω, where one might look for εἰς. Cf. ἐμβάντι εἰς πλοίον (Mt. 8:23), ὁ ἐμβάνας ἐν τῷ τρυβλῖῳ (Mt. 26:23). This so-called pregnant use of ἐν seems very natural after all. It is only in composition that the old usage is preserved in the N. T. or a case like ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ above after a verb of motion where εἰς might at first seem more natural. Cf. Lu. 9:46; 1 Cor. 11:18; Ro. 1:25. In Ro. 1:24 ἐν occurs with παρέδωκεν, but εἰς in verse 26. Indeed (Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 130) we find ἐν with διόςωμι, ἵστησι καὶ τίθημι. Remnants of this early usage survive in the N. T., as διδόντι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ (2 Cor. 8:16), ἐν τῇ κορώ (Mt. 24:18) ἐπέσχεν χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν (Ac. 19:22), παρέδωκεν εἰς Καισαρίαν (25:4), εἰς οἷκόν ἐστιν (some MSS. in Mk. 2:1). Cf. Jo. 1:18.

2. Ἐν Older than εἰς. It seems certain that originally ἐν stood alone without εἰς, whereas in the modern Greek vernacular ἐν [Page 586] has entirely disappeared before εἰς which uses only the accusative. There is once more unity, but not exactly on the same terms. In the Greek N. T. this process of absorption is going steadily on as in the κοινή generally. There is rarely much doubt as to the significance of ἐν, whereas εἰς has already begun to resume its old identity with ἐν, if indeed in the vernacular it ever gave it up. We may compare ἐν τῷ ὀγρῷ in Mt. 24:18 with εἰς τὸν ὄγρον in Mk. 13:16. Cf. ἐπέσχεν χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν (Ac. 19:22), τηρεῖσθαι εἰς Καισαρίαν (25:4), εἰς οἷκόν ἐστιν (some MSS. in Mk. 2:1). Cf. Jo. 1:18.

7 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 147.
1 V. and D., Mod. Gk., p. 109 f.
2 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 142.
In the N. T. ἐν is so frequent (2698 instances) that it is still the most common preposition. Indeed Moulton 3 thinks that its ultimate disappearance is due to the fact that it had become too vague as “a maid of all work.”

3. Place. The simplest use is with expressions of place, like ἐν τῇ ἁγορᾷ (Mt. 20:3), ἐν δεξίῳ (Heb. 1:3), ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ (Rev. 3:21), ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ (Mt. 4:21), ἐν τῇ πόλει (Lu. 7:37), ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ (Mt. 3:6), ἐν ὕδατι (3:11), ἐν τῇ ἡμιπέλαῳ (Jo. 15:4). Cf. also ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος ἐν τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ (Lu. 7:17) and ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλάκιῳ (Jo. 8:20). For the “pregnant” construction of ἐν after verbs of motion cf. chapter XI, X, (i). Cf. examples given under 1. In these and like examples ἐν indeed adds little to the idea of the locative case which it is used to explain. See also ἐν τοίς (Lu. 2:49) in the sense of ‘at the house of’ (cf. εἰς τῷ ἱδίῳ, Jo. 19:27) for which Moulton 4 finds abundant illustration in the papyri. Cf. ἐν τοῖς Ἀπολλονίου, R.L. 38 2 (iii/B.C.). The preposition in itself merely states that the location is within the bounds marked by the word with which it occurs. It does not mean ‘near’, but ‘in,’ that is ‘inside.’ The translation of the resultant idea may be indeed in, on, at, according to the context, but the preposition itself retains its own idea. There is nothing strange about the metaphorical use of ἐν in expressions like ἐν βασάνοις (Lu. 16:23), ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ (1 Jo. 3:14), ἐν δόξῃ (Ph. 4:19), ἐν μοστηρίῳ (1 Cor. 2:7), etc.

4. Expressions of Time. Ἐν may appear rather oftener than the mere locative. Cf. ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ in Jo. 6:44, but τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ in 6:54, while in 6:40 the MSS. vary. By ἐν τρισάρχῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 2:19) it is clear that Jesus meant the resurrection [Page 587] will take place within the period of three days. Cf. τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (never with ἐν in the N. T.) in Mt. 16:21. 1 More common expressions are ἐν σαββάτῳ (Mt. 12:2), ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 11:9), ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ (11:10), ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ (Ac. 7:13), ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς (Lu. 8:1), ἐν τῷ μεταξῷ (Jo. 4:31), ἐν ταῖς ἡμεραῖς ἐκείναις (Mt. 3:1), ἐν τῇ καροσοίᾳ (1 Th. 2:19), ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει (Mk. 12:23), ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως (Mt. 10:15), ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι (1 Cor. 15:52), etc. Cf. Lu. 1:7. Another temporal use of ἐν is ἐν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῷ εἰς τῷ κρίσιμω δόξῃ (Mt. 2:19). Cf. also ἐν οἷς in Lu. 12:1. The frequent use, especially in Luke (cf. ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν, 8:40), of ἐν τῷ with the infinitive calls for a word. Examples of this idiom occur in the ancient Greek (16 in Xenophon, 6 in Thucydides, 26 in Plato) 2 and the papyri show it occasionally. 3 Cf. ἐν τῷ λογίζεσθαι, Par. P. 63 (ii/b.c.). But in the LXX it is a constant translation of ξύλῳ and is much more abundant in the N. T. as a result of the LXX profusion.

5. ‘Among.’ With plural nouns ἐν may have the resultant idea of ‘among,’ though, of course, in itself it is still ‘in,’ ‘within.’ Thus we note ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν (Mt. 11:11), ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν (Ac. 2:29), ἐν ἀυτοῖς (4:34), ἐν ὑμῖν (1 Pet. 5:1), ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰουδαίῳ (Mt. 2:6). This is a common idiom in the ancient Greek. Not very

3 Prol., p. 103. In the Ptol. papyri, Rossberg (Prāp., p. 8) finds 2245 examples of ἐν and it is the most common preposition.
1 See especially Field’s valuable note on this verse showing how impossible it is for the resurrection to have occurred on the fourth day. Cf. also Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 255 f.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 215.
different from this idea (cf. Latin apud) is the use ἐν ὑποθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν (Mt. 21:42), like Latin coram. One may note also ἐν υἱῷ in 1 Cor. 6:2. Cf. ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν (Gal. 1:16). See also 2 Cor. 4:3; 8:1.

6. ‘In the Case of,’ ‘in the Person of’ or simply ‘in.’ A frequent use is where a single case is selected as a specimen or striking illustration. Here the resultant notion is ‘in the case of,’ which does not differ greatly from the metaphorical use of ἐν with soul, mind, etc. Cf. Lu. 24:38. Thus with ἄποκαλύπτω note ἐν ἔμοι (Gal. 1:16), εἰδώς ἐν ἑαυτῷ (Jo. 6:61), γένηται ἐν ἔμοι (1 Cor. 9:15), ἐν τῷ χηρῷ τί γένηται (Lu. 23:31), ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε (1 Cor. 4:6), ἐν τῇ κλάσῃ (Lu. 24:35). One may note also ἐν τῷ Ἁδῷ πάντες ἄποθνήσκουσιν (1 Cor. 15:22), ἐν τῷ Ἡσιίου καταγγέλλειν (Ac. 4:2), ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἄγω (Ro. 15:16), ἡγίασται ἐν τῇ γυναικί (1 Cor. 7:14), etc. Paul’s frequent mystical use of ἐν κυρίῳ (1 Cor. 9:1), ἐν Χριστῷ (Ro. 6:11, 23, etc.) may be compared with Jesus’ own words, μείνατε ἐν ἔμοι, καθὼς ἐν υἱῷ (Jo. 15:4). Cf. also ἐν τῷ [Page 588] θεῷ in Col. 3:3. The LXX usage is not quite on a par with this profound meaning in the mouth of Jesus and Paul, even if “extremely indefinite” to the non-Christian.1 But Moulton2 agrees with Sanday and Headlam (Ro. 6:11) that the mystic indwelling is Christ’s own idea adopted by Paul. The classic discussion of the matter is, of course, Deissmann’s Die Neutestamentliche Formel “in Christo Jesu” (1892), in which by careful study of the LXX and the N. T. he shows the depth and originality of Paul’s idea in the use of ἐν Χριστῷ. Moulton3 doubts if even here the N. T. writers make an innovation, but the fulness of the Christian content would amply justify them if they did have to do so. See ἐν αὕτῳ ἔκτισθη τὰ πάντα (Col. 1:16). As further examples cf. Ro. 9:1; 14:14; Ph. 3:9; Eph. 4:21.

7. As a Dative? One may hesitate to say dogmatically that in 1 Cor. 14:11, ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἔμοι βάρβαρος, we have ἐν used merely as the dative (cf. εἰς in modern Greek). But τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος in the same verse looks that way,4 and Moulton5 cites τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγιασμένοις (Ju. 1) and reminds us of the common ground between the locative and dative in Sanskrit where the locative appears with verbs of speaking. Cf. also ἐν ἔμοι in Ph. 1:26. Note also ἐν ἔμοι κόψε in late LXX books (Thackeray, Gr., p. 14). One may compare ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ (Mt. 17:12). There

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 131. Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 144, considers this an “extra-grammatical” point.
2 Prol., p. 103. With this cf. ποιέω ἐν (Mt. 17:12; Lu. 23:31), an idiom paralleled in the LXX. Cf. ἐξελέξατο ἐν ἔμοι (1 Chron. 28:4), ἰδρύτικα ἐν αὐτῷ (1 Chron. 28:6).
3 Prol., p. 103.
4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 131.
5 Prol., p. 103.
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seems no doubt that ὁμολογέω ἐν (Mt. 10:32=Lu. 12:8) is due\(^6\) to literal translation of the Aramaic. The use of ἐν with ὅμνύαι (Mt. 5:34) is similar to the Hebrew \(\exists\).

8. *Accompanying Circumstance.* It is needless to multiply unduly the various uses of ἐν, which are “innumerable” in the LXX\(^7\) where its chief extension is due to the imitation of the Hebrew \(\exists\).\(^8\) But by no means all these uses are Hebraic. Thus ἐν for the idea of accompanying circumstance is classical enough (cf. ἐν ὅπλος ἤναι, Xen. *Anab.* 5. 9, like English “The people are up in arms”), though the LXX abounds with it. It occurs also in the papyri. Cf. Tb.P. 41 (119 B.C.). Here ἐν draws close to μετά and σύν in *Page 589* usage. Note, for instance, ἐν δέκα χιλάσιν ὑπαντήσατε (Lu. 14:31), ἦλθεν ἐν ὁγίας μυρίσαν αὐτοῦ (Ju. 14), ἐν πᾶσιν ἄναλαβόντες (Eph. 6:16), ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν (Mk. 12:38), ἔρχονται ἐν ἐνδόματι προβάτων (Mt. 7:15), ἐν λευκοῖς καθεξομένους (Jo. 20:12), μετεκαλέσατο—ἐν ψυχάς (Ac. 7:14), αἰσθάνεται ἐν ὁματίᾳ (Heb. 9:25), ἐν τῷ ὄντα καὶ ἐν τῷ ὁματίᾳ (1 Jo. 5:6), ἐν τῇ δόξῃ ἔλθε (1 Cor. 4:21), ἐν πληρώματι (Ro. 15:29), ἐν κελεύσματι (1 Th. 4:16), περιβαλλότα ἐν ἰματίοις (Rev. 3:5; cf. Mt. 11:8). Note also ἐν μυστηρίῳ λαλοῦμεν (1 Cor. 2:7) where in the form of is the idea. These examples show the freedom of the preposition in this direction. Somewhat more complicated is a passage like ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἄκαθάρτῳ (Mk. 1:23), which Blass\(^1\) properly compares with πνεύμα ἄκαθάρτων ἔχει (Mk. 3:30), and the double use in Ro. 8:9, ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστε ἐν σωρί ἄλλα ἐν πνεύματι, ἐπεκ πνεύματα θεού οἰκεῖ ἐν θυμίᾳ (followed by πνεύμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει). The notion of manner is closely allied to this idiom as we see it in ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ (Ac. 17:31), ἐν παρρησίᾳ (Col. 2:15), ἐν τάξει (Lu. 18:18, cf. ταξίω and ταξίως). Cf. Mt. 6:18 and Jo. 18:20.

9. *‘Amounting to,’ ‘Occasion,’ ‘Sphere.* Moulton\(^2\) considers Mk. 4:8, ἐφεβευν εἰς τρίακοντα καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἐκατόν (note similarity here between εἰς and ἐν), as showing that ἐν sometimes is used in the sense of ‘amounting to.’ Cf. also Ac. 7:14 (LXX). The idiom is present in the papyri. Moulton cites πρόκει ἐν δραχμαῖς ἐνακοσίως, B.U. 970 (ii/λ.δ.), τὴν πρώτην δόσιν ἐν δραχμαῖς τεσσαράκοντα, O.P. 724 (ii/β.с.), He. *Prol.* (p. 76) quotes Hb. P. 42 (iii/β.с.), ἰδόσομεν ἐν ὅρθοληματι, as “predicative” use of ἐν. He compares Eph. 2:15, ἐν δόγμασιν, ‘consisting in decrees.’ Certain it is that in Rev. 5:9 ἡγούρας ἐν τῷ ὁματίῳ σου we have price\(^3\) indicated by ἐν. Cf. Ro. 3:25; Ac. 20:28. In a few examples ἐν gives the occasion, as ἐφευγεν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦτῳ (Ac. 7:29), ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσκοινουθήσονται (Mt. 6:7), ἐν τούτῳ (Jo. 16:30). Note also ἐπεκείν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (Ro. 1:9) where the second ἐν suggests ‘in the sphere of.’ Cf. ἐν μέτρῳ (Eph. 4:16), ἐν τούτοις ἰσθι (1 Tim. 4:15), ἐν νόμῳ ἠμαρτον (Ro. 2:12). In simple truth the only way to know
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6 Ib., p. 104.
7 C. and S., Sel., etc., p. 82. Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 47, for the frequent use of ἐν of accompanying circumstance in the LXX.
8 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 130.
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the resultant meaning of ἐν is to note carefully the context. It is so simple in idea that it appears in every variety of connection.

10. **Instrumental Use of ἐν.** See previous discussion under Cases. Blass\(^4\) considers it due to Hebrew influence as does Jannaris.\(^1\) The ancient Greek writers did use ἐν with certain verbs as the N. T. καίῳ ἐν πυρί (Rev. 17:16, some MSS.), ἄποκαλύπτω ἐν πυρί (1 Cor. 3:13), ἀλίζω ἐν τίνι (Mt. 5:13), μετέρα ἐν ὃ ὀμηρύ (Mt. 7:2).\(^2\) The construction in itself is as old as Homer.\(^3\) Cf. ἐν ὁφθαλμός ἡμίσθαι (Il. i. 587), ἐν πυρὶ καίῳ (Il. xxiv. 38). It is abnormally frequent in the LXX under the influence of the Hebrew \(\xi\),\(^4\) but it is not so common in the N. T. Besides, the papyri show undoubted examples of it.\(^5\) Moulton finds Ptolemaic examples of ἐν μαχαίρῃ, Τb.P. 16 al.; διαλυόμεναι ἐν τῷ λιμῷ Par.P. 28 (ii/b.c.), while 22 has τῷ λιμῷ διαλύθηναι and note τοὺς ἐνεσχήσους ἐν τισιν ἄγνοήσαιν, Par.P. 63 (ii/b.c.). We can only say, therefore, that the LXX accelerated the vernacular idiom in this matter. The Aramaic probably helped it on also. The blending of the instrumental with the locative in form facilitated this usage beyond a doubt,\(^6\) and the tendency to use prepositions abundantly helped also.\(^7\) But even so one must observe that all the N. T. examples of ἐν can be explained from the point of view of the locative. The possibility of this point of view is the reason why ἐν was so used in the beginning. I pass by examples like βαπτίζω ἐν ὑδατί, βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί (Mt. 3:11) as probably not being instances of the instrumental usage at all. But there are real instances enough. Take Lu. 22:49 εἰ ποτάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ; Here the smiting can be regarded as located in the sword. To be sure, in English, we translate the resultant idea by ‘with,’ but ἐν in itself does not mean ‘with.’ That resultant idea can only come in the proper context. So ἐν τῷ Βεεζεβοὺλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλλει (Mt. 12:24). Here the casting out is located in the prince of demons. Cf. κρίνω ἐν ὁρί (Ac. 17:31), ἐν βραχίονι (Lu. 1:51), ἐν δόλῳ (Mk. 14:1), ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρῃς (Heb. 11:37). The Apocalypse has several examples, like πολεμήσω ἐν τῇ ῥοφαι (2:16), ἀποκτενάω ἐν ῥοφαι καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ (6:8), ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτενεῖ (13:10). In Rev. 14:15, κράζου ἐν φωνῇ, we do not necessarily have to explain it in this manner. Cf. Ro. 2:16; 2:28; 1 Jo. 2:3; Jas. 3:9. On the whole there is little that is out of harmony with the vernacular κοινή in the N. T. use of ἐν, though Abbott\(^8\)
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thinks that the examples of Deissmann and Moulton do not exactly parallel the N. T. instrumental use. For repetition of ἐν see 2 Cor. 6:4 ff.

(f) Εἰς. There is nothing to add to the etymology of εἰς as compared with that of ἐν save that εἰς is known to be really ἐν-ς as we find it in the inscriptions of Argos, Crete, etc. So ἐνς Ἄθανάοιαν. This γ seems to have been added to ἐν by analogy to εἰς. Usually with the disappearance of ν the form was εἰς, but Thucydides, like the Ionic and Doric writers and the poets, preferred ἐς which was current in the inscriptions before 334 B.C. So ἐς appears in a Phrygian Christian inscription. But the Ἑολικ ἐς gradually drove out all the other forms. Originally, therefore, ἐν alone existed with either locative or accusative, and εἰς appears nowhere else save in the Greek. The classic use of εἰς Αἰδου (some MSS. in Ac. 2:27, 31 and reading in Is. 14:15) is the true genitive, according to Brugmann (Griech Gr., p. 439), ‘in the sphere of Hades.’

1. Original Static Use. In Homer εἰ-κάποιοι means merely to lie within. But, though εἰς really means the same thing as ἐν, it was early used only with the accusative, and gradually specialized thus one of the usages of ἐν. The locative with ἐν, however, continued to be used sometimes in the same sense as the accusative with εἰς. The accusative indeed normally suggests motion (extension), and that did come to be the common usage of εἰς plus the accusative. The resultant idea would often be ‘into,’ but this was by no means always true. Εἰς is not used much in composition in the N. T. and always where motion is involved save in the case of εἰς-ακούω where there seems little difference between εἰς and ἐν (cf. 1 Cor. 14:21; Mt. 6:7). In itself εἰς expresses the same dimension relation as ἐν, viz. in. It does not of itself mean into, unto, or to. That is the resultant idea of the accusative case with verbs of motion. It is true that in the later Greek this static use of εἰς with the idea of rest (in) is far more common than in the earlier Greek. This was naturally so, since in the vernacular εἰς finally drove ἐν out entirely and did duty for both, just as originally ἐν did. The only difference is that εἰς used the one case (accusative), whereas ἐν used either accusative or locative. But then the accusative was once the only case and must be allowed large liberty. And even in the classic writers there are not wanting examples. These are usually explained as instances of “pregnant” construction, but it is possible to think of them as survivals of the etymological idea of εἰς (ἐν-γ) with only the general notion of the accusative case. Certainly the vernacular laid less stress on the
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1 Solmsen, Inscr. Graecae, p. 46.
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distinction between ἐς and ἐν than the literary language did. Though ἐς falls behind ἐν in the N. T. in the proportion of 2 to 3, still, as in the papyri and the inscriptions and the LXX, a number of examples of static ἐς occur. Some of these were referred to under ἐν, where the “pregnant” use of ἐν for ἐς occurs. Hatzidakis gives abundant examples of ἐν as ἐς and ἐς as ἐν. Cf. ἐς ἀλεξάνδρεαν ἐστι, B.U. ii. 385; ἐς τύβον κέμα, Kaibel Epigr. 134; κινδυνεύσαντος ἐς θάλασσαν, B.U. 423 (ii/A.D.).

Deissmann (Light, p. 169) notes Paul’s κινδύνον ἐς θαλάσσῃ and that the Roman soldier in the last example writes “more vulgarly than St. Paul.” In these examples it is not necessary nor pertinent to bring in the idea of ‘into.’ ‘Blass’ comments on the fact that Matthew (but see below) has no such examples and John but few, while Luke has most of them. I cannot, however, follow Blass in citing Mk. 1:9 ἔβαπτισθη ἐς τὸν Ἰορδάνην as an example. The idea of motion in βαπτίζω suits ἐς as well as ἐν in Mk. 1:5. Cf. νίψας ἐς (Jo. 9:7). But in Mt. 28:19, βαπτίζοντες ἐς τὸ ὄνομα, and Ro. 6:3 f., ἐς Χριστόν and ἐς τὸν θάνατον, the notion of sphere is the true one. The same thing may be true of βαπτισθῆτο ἐς ὄφειαν τῶν ἀμαρτητῶν (Ac. 2:38), where only the context and the tenor of N. T. teaching can determine whether ‘into,’ ‘unto’ or merely ‘in’ or ‘on’ (‘upon’) is the right translation, a task for the interpreter, not for the grammarian. One does not need here to appeal to the Hebrew יִשָּׂע יִשָּׂע as Tholuck does (Beiträge zur Spracherklärung des N. T., p. 47 f.). Indeed the use of ὄνομα for person is common in the papyri (Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 196 f.). Deissmann gives examples of ἐς ὄνομα, ἐς ὄνοματος, and the mere locative ὄνοματι, from the papyri. The static use of ἐς is seen in its distributive use like ἐν in Mk. 4:8, ἐς τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑξάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν. But there are undoubted examples where only ‘in,’ ‘on’ or ‘at’ can be the idea. Thus [Page 593] κηρύσσων ἐς τὰς συναγωγὰς (Mk. 1:39) where there is some excuse for the “pregnant” explanation because of ἔλθεν. So ἔλθων κατάφηκαν ἐς πόλιν (Mt. 2:23; 4:13), but note only παράφηκαν ἐς γῆν (Heb. 11:9) and ἐφέδρη ἐς Ἀζωτον (Ac. 8:40). Cf. καθημένου ἐς τὸ ὄρος (Mk. 13:3), ὦ ἐς τὸν ἄγρον (Mk. 13:16), τοῖς ἐς τῶν οἴκων (Lu. 9:61),  ἐς τὴν κοίτην εἰσίν (Lu. 11:7), ἐγκαταλείψεις ἐς ἄδην (Ac. 2:27; cf. verse 31), τοῖς ἐς μακράν (2:39), ἐς χολὴν—ὅπως (Ac. 8:23), ἐπέσχεν χρόνον ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν (Ac. 19:22), ὑποθανεν ἐς Ἴερουσαλήμ (Ac. 21:13), ἐς Ἐρυθράς (Ac. 23:11), προῆλθεν ἐς Κασαρίον (Ac. 25:4), ὦ ὅ ἐς τὸν λόγλον (Jo. 1:18), οἱ τρεῖς ἐς τὸ ἐν εἰσίν (1 Jo. 5:8), ἐς ἑν στήθης (1 Pet. 5:12). Nor is this quite all. In some MSS. in Mk. 2:1 we have ἐς οἴκων ἐστίν (RBDL ἐν οἰκῷ). In Ac. 2:5 the MSS. vary between ἐς and ἐν as in Mk. 10:10. Another instance is found in Eph. 3:16, κραταίωσῆμαι ἐς τὸν ἔσος ἄνθρωπον. Cf. Jo. 20:7; Mk. 13:9. But in ἐστι ἐς τὸ μέσον (Jo. 20:19, 26) we have motion, though ἐστι ἐς τὸν αὐγαλόν (Jo. 21:4) is an example of rest. Jo. 17:23 is normal. In Mt. 10:41 f., ἐς ὄνομα προφήτου (μαθητοῦ, δικαίου) one can see little difference between ἐς and ἐν. Certainly this is true of Mt. 12:41, μετανόησαν ἐς

4 C. and S., Sel., p. 81.
Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
Kaibel KAIBEL, Stil und Text der Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 122.
Tholuck THOLUCK, Beiträge zur Spracherklärung des N. T.
κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, where it is absurd to take εἰς as ‘into’ or ‘unto’ or even ‘to.’ See also συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὅνομα (Mt. 18:20).

2. With Verbs of Motion. But the usual idiom with εἰς was undoubtedly with verbs of motion when the motion and the accusative case combined with εἰς (‘in’) to give the resultant of ‘into,’ ‘unto,’ ‘among,’ ‘to,’ ‘towards’ or ‘on,’ ‘upon,’ according to the context. This is so common as to call for little illustration. As with εν so with εἰς, the noun itself gives the boundary or limit. So εἰς τὴν ὀδόν (Mt. 2:11), εἰς τὸ ὄρος (5:1), εἰς τὸ πραπτόριον (27:27), εἰς θάλασσαν (17:27), εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν (Rev. 10:5), εἰς τὴν ἐθνήν (Ac. 22:21), εἰς περασμόν (Mt. 6:13), εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον (Jo. 11:38), εἰς τὴν ὄδον (Mk. 11:8), εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς (Lu. 6:20), εἰς τοὺς ληστάς (Lu. 10:36), εἰς κλίνην (Rev. 2:22), εἰς τὰ δεξιά (Jo. 21:6), εἰς τὴν κεφαλήν (Mt. 27:30), εἰς τὰς ἄγκαλας (Lu. 2:28), εἰς ἄνυον τὸν κόσμον (Mk. 14:9), εἰς ὑμῖς (1 Th. 2:9). These examples fairly illustrate the variety in the use of εἰς with verbs of motion. For idea of ‘among’ see Jo. 21:23. It will be seen at once, if one consults the context in these passages, that the preposition does not of itself mean ‘into’ even with verbs of motion. That is indeed one of the resultant meanings among many others. The metaphorical uses do not differ in principle, such as εἰς ὦλινν (Mt. 24:9), συνάγειν εἰς ἑν (Jo. 11:52), εἰς τὴν ζωὴν (Mt. 18:8), εἰς κρίσιν (Jo. 5:24), εἰς ὑπακοήν (2 Cor. 10:5), [Page 594] εἰς χρήσις (Mt. 17:22), etc. For many interesting examples of εν and εἰς see Theimer, Die Präpositionen εἰς, ἑν, ἐκ in N. T., Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Sprachgebrauches im N. T., 1896.

3. With Expressions of Time. Here εἰς marks either the limit or accents the duration expressed by the accusative. Thus in 2 Tim. 1:12 we find φιλάξει εἰς ἕκειν τὴν ἡμέραν where ‘until’ suits as a translation (cf. ‘against’). Cf. Ph. 1:10, εἰς ἡμέραν χριστοῦ. Not quite so sharp a limit is εἰς τὴν αὔριον (Mt. 6:34). Cf. 1 Pet. 1:11. There is little that is added by the preposition to the accusative in such examples as εἰς τὸ μέλλον (Lu. 13:9), εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Mt. 21:19), εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς (Lu. 1:50), εἰς τὸ διηνέκες (Heb. 7:3), etc. Cf. Lu. 12:19. But a more definite period is set in cases like εἰς τὸν καιρὸν (Lu. 1:20), εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον (Ac. 13:42).

4. Like a Dative. It is not strange to see εἰς used where disposition or attitude of mind is set forth. Indeed already εἰς and the accusative occur where the dative alone would be sufficient. This is especially true in the LXX, but the papyri show examples also. Cf. ὁ εἰς Χριστόν (Mart. Pauli, II). Moulton (Prol., p. 246) cites Tb. P. 16, οὗ λήγοντες τῇ [εἰς] ἑπτάυς αὐθαδίᾳ, “where εἰς actually stands for the possessive genitive.” One must remember the complete disappearance of the dative in modern Greek1 vernacular. Note τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἄγιους (1 Cor. 16:1), πλούτῳ εἰς πάντας (Ro. 10:12), πλεονάξει εἰς (Ph. 4:17), ἕλπισμον τοὺς εἰς τὸ ἔθνος (Ac. 24:17), λειτουργίαν εἰς τὰ ἐθνεῖς (Ro. 15:16), ἀποβλέπω εἰς (Heb. 11:26), λέγει εἰς (Ac. 2:25), ὡμίνῳ εἰς (Mt. 5:34 f.), τῷ αὐτῷ εἰς ἄλλῇς (Ro. 12:16), πιστεύειν εἰς (Mt. 18:6), χρηστός εἰς (Eph. 4:32), ἐφαγάν τοὺς εἰς (Ro. 5:8), etc. If one entertains hostile feelings the resultant idea with εἰς will be ‘against,’ though the word does not of itself mean that. So in Lu. 12:10 εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰδρώμον (cf. κατὰ in Mt. 12:32) and εἰς
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1 Moulton, Prol., p. 63; C. and S., p. 82; W.-Th., p. 396 ff.
5. Aim or Purpose. Sometimes indeed εἰς appears in an atmosphere where aim or purpose is manifestly the resultant idea. [Page 595] Thus we may note ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Τρῳάδα εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (2 Cor. 2:12). Here the second εἰς suggests the purpose of his coming. Cf. also τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἡμῖν ἀνάμνησιν (1 Cor. 11:24), where εἰς does not mean ‘for,’ though that is clearly the resultant idea. So with εἰς μαρτύρων αὐτοῦ (Mt. 8:4). Take Ro. 11:36, for instance, where εἰς αὐτόν is set over against εἰς αὐτοῦ. Cf. again εἰς δοξὰν θεοῦ in Ph. 1:11, εἰς φόβον in Ro. 8:15, εἰς ἐνδείξειν in Ro. 3:25, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνον in Jo. 6:27. One may not doubt also that this is the idea in Mt. 26:28, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκρούνωμένων εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτίῶν. But it by no means follows that the same idea is expressed by εἰς ἀφεσιν in Mk. 1:4 and Ac. 2:38 (cf. Mt. 10:41), though that may in the abstract be true. It remains a matter for the interpreter to decide. One must not omit here also the frequent use of εἰς τὸ and the infinitive to express design. Cf. εἰς τὸ ἐμπαίζει in Mt. 20:19, εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι in 26:2. See chapter on Verbal Nouns for further discussion. Cf. also εἰς τοῦτο (Mk. 1:38), εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο (2 Cor. 5:5), ἄγοραῖο εἰς (Jo. 13:29), εἰς ἀπάντησιν (Mt. 25:6), εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ (Jo. 12:13). 1 Cf. ξύλον εἰς ἐλαιώνας μου (Fay. P., 50 A.D.), ‘sticks for my olive-gardens’ (Deissmann, Light, etc., p. 157), εἰς ἔπιον ἐνοχλούμενον (P. Fl.-Pet., ii. xxv, 226 B.C.), ‘for a sick horse’ (Deissmann, B. S., p. 118). Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 112) cites υἱόοδομησα—εἰς ἑαυτόν (83 N. Chr. Wadd. Inscr., 2614).

6. Predicative Use. But there remains one more use of εἰς which, though good κοινὴ, was greatly accelerated by the influence of the LXX. 2 This is where εἰς occurs in the predicate with εἰμί or γίνομαι, κτλ. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 16 f.) quotes ἤνα μὴ εἰς νομίμων γίνεται, P.Fay. 119, 276 (100 A.D.); Heliod., Ἀθηνία, VI, 14, τὴν πήραν εἰς καθέδραν πουσιμάτην; and even the Attic author Æneas 114, 5 H, γυναίκας ὑπλάσαντες ὥς εἰς ἄνδρας. Thus in Lu. 3:5, ἦτα τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείας (Is. 40:4). So ἐξεσάθα μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας (2 Cor. 6:18, LXX); ἦταν οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μιᾶν (Mt. 19:5; cf. Gen. 2:24); ἦ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν γενῆσεται (Jo. 16:20). Cf. Lu. 13:19. As already remarked, this predicative use of εἰς appears in the papyri 3 and in the Apostolic Fathers, 4 but not with [Page 596] the frequency that we find it in the LXX.

1 This can no longer be called a Hebraism, since the pap. have it. Moulton, Prol., p. 14. Cf. εἰς ἀπάντησιν, Tb. P. 43 (ii/b.c.). Rouffiac (Recherches, p. 28) finds ἐναῖ εἰς φυλακῆν in inscr. of Priene 50, 39 (ii/b.c.).
2 C. and S., p. 81 f.
Cf. pp. 481 f. Blass credits εἰς in Ἑπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην (Mk. 5:34) to the Hebrew through the LXX (cf. 1 Sam. 1:17). Cf. also εἰς διαταγὴς ἄγγελον (Ac. 7:53) where εἰς is much like ἐν. In general therefore, as with ἐν so with εἰς we must hark back to first principles and work out to the resultant idea by means of the context and the history.

7. Compared with ἐπὶ, παρὰ and πρὸς. The growth in the use of εἰς is shown by its appearance where ἐπὶ or πρὸς would be expected in the older Greek. Cf. ἐχεῖ κειμένον, ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον. In 11:38 D has ἐπὶ, not εἰς. So in Mk. 3:7, ἄνευ ὄρη πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, DHP have εἰς. Cf. Mk. 2:13, ἔρχεται εἰς πόλιν (Jo. 4:5), where the point is not ‘into,’ but ‘to.’ So 11:31, ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ ἐμπυλεῖον. In general therefore, as with ἐν so with εἰς we must hark back to first principles and work out to the resultant idea by means of the context and the history.

(g) ἐκ (ἐξ). The etymology of this word is simple. Cf. Latin ex (e), Gallie ἐκ, Old Irish ess, Cymric eh. In the Greek the form varies thus ἐκ (ἐξ before vowels), ἐγ (assimilation), ἐ (Locrian, cf. Latin e), ἐς or ἐσς like Old Irish (Arcadian, Beotic, Thessalian). The original form was ἐξ, then ἐκ like Latin ex, e. Cf. Brugmann, Griech Gr., p. 147.

1. Meaning. The word means ‘out of,’ ‘from within,’ not like ἄπο or παρὰ. It stands in contrast to ἐν (ἐν-ς). In the modern Greek vernacular ἄπο has displaced ἐκ except in the Epirot ᾗχ or ὰχ. But in the N. T. ἐκ is still ahead of ἄπο. The indifference of the scribes as to which they used is shown in the MS. variations between ἐκ and ἄπο as in Mt. 7:4; 17:9; Mk. 16:3. The writings of John (Gospel, Epistles, Revelation) use ἐκ more frequently than any other N. T. books. In the late Greek (eighth century A.D.) we find the accusative with ἐκ, and this was the last usage to survive. Brugmann indeed thinks that ἐκ may even rarely use the genuine genitive besides the ablative, but I doubt this. But it is certain that ἐκ used the locative in Arcadian, Cypriotic and Pamphylian dialects after analogy of ἐν (Buck, Greek Dialects, p. 101 f.).

2. In Composition. It is very common and sometimes with the “perfective” idea. So we note ἐξαποροῦμενοι contrasted with ἀποροῦμενοι in 2 Cor. 4:8. Cf. also ἐκδισαπεδώκατο (2 Cor. 12:15), [Page 597] ἐκ-διηγέομαι (Ac. 13:41), ἐκ-θαμβέω (Mk. 9:15), ἐκ-θαμμακέω (Mk. 12:17), ἐκ-καθαίρω (2 Tim. 2:21), ἐκ-ἐραυνάω (1 Pet. 1:10). The other uses in composition follow the root-idea of the word closely, meaning ‘out of,’ ‘away,’ etc., like ἐξέρχομαι, ἐκβάλλω, etc. ἐκ has a causative force in

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk.
3 Moulton, Prosl., p. 102. On p. 246 he cites Psichari as saying that ἐκ τῶν is still “une forme vivante.”
4 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 145.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 126.
6 Jann., Hist. Gr. Gr., p. 381.
7 Griech. Gr., p. 440.
9 Moulton, Prosl., p. 237.
composition sometimes as in ἔξαμαρτάνω, ‘cause to sin’ (LXX), and ἔκφοβεθν (2 Cor. 10:9).

3. **Place.** The preposition naturally is common with expressions of place. The strict idea of *from within* is common, as in φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν (Mt. 3:17), ἐκ τοῦ ὄφθαλμου (Lu. 6:42), ἐκ τῶν μνημείων (Mt. 8:28), etc. Often it appears in contrast with εἰς as in ἐκ τῆς Ιουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλαλαίαν (Jo. 4:47), τὸν ἐκ σκότους ὦμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ φῶς (1 Pet. 2:9), where the metaphorical follows the literal usage. In Lu. 6:42 ἐκ τοῦ ὄφθαλμου is set in opposition to ἐν τῷ ὄφθαλμῳ. In Ac. 8:38 f. we have both εἰς τὸ ὄντωρ and ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος. So in Mk. 1:10 ἄναβαινον ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος a previous presence ἐν τῷ ὕδατι is implied. In a case like καταβαινόντων ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους (Mt. 17:9; parallels in Mk. and Lu. ἀπό) we are not to suppose that they had been in a cave, but merely up in the mountain (cf. English idiom), the term “mountain” including more than the earth and rock. Cf. εἰς τὸ ὄρος in Mt. 5:1. But in Mt. 8:1 we merely have ἁπό τοῦ ὄρους. Note likewise ὅρις ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς (Lu. 21:18), ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν (Ac. 12:7). Thus we explain also κρεμάμενον τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ (Ac. 28:4), ἐκ δεξιῶν (Mt. 20:21), ἐξ ἐναντίας (Mk. 15:39), etc. It is not necessary to record all the verbs with which ἐκ occurs. In Lu. 5:3 ἔδιδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου the teaching is represented as proceeding out of the boat (Jesus was in the boat). One may compare with this ἔγειρεν ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου (Jo. 13:4), ἀναλύσῃ ἐκ τῶν γάμων (Lu. 12:36), ἀποκυλίειν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας (Mk. 16:3), διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης (Ac. 28:4).

4. **Time.** With expressions of time ἐκ gives the point of departure, like ἐκ νεότητος (Mk. 10:20), ἐξ ὀρφῆς (Jo. 6:64), ἐξ ἑκατερῶν χρόνων (Lu. 23:8), ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος (Jo. 9:32), ἐκ πολλῶν ἔτην (Ac. 24:10), ἐκ τούτου (Jo. 6:66). In cases where succession is involved the point of departure is really present. Thus with ἐκ δευτέρου (Jo. 9:24), ἐκ τρίτου (Mt. 26:44), ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας (2 Pet. 2:8). Other adverbial phrases have a similar origin as with ἐκ μέρους (1 Cor. 12:27), ἐκ μέτρου (Jo. 3:34), ἐξ ἀνάγκης (2 Cor. 9:7), ἐκ συμφόνου (1 Cor. 7:5). Cf. ἐκ πάλαι.

5. **Separation.** The use of ἐκ for the idea of separation is merely the fuller expansion of the ablative. Thus with ἔλευθερος ἐκ πάντων (1 Cor. 9:19), ἀναπαύεται ἐκ τῶν κόσμων (Rev. 14:13), ὑψωθῷ ἐκ τῆς γῆς (Jo. 12:32), ὑποστρέφει ἐκ τῆς ἐντολῆς (2 Pet. 2:21), ἀρῃ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου [Page 598] (Jo. 17:15). Cf. Jo. 17:6. Abbott doubts if in the LXX and John ἐκ always implies previous existence in the evils from which one is delivered when used with σῴζω and τηρέω. Certainly in Jo. 17 ἐκ occurs rather frequently, but τηρήσῃ ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ (17:15) may still imply that the evil one once had power over them (cf. Jesus’ prayer for Peter). Certainly in Jo. 12:27, σῶσον μὲ ἐκ τῆς ὀρας ταύτης, Jesus had already entered into the hour. Cf. δύναμεν σῶσειν ἐκ ταχύτερον (Heb. 5:7) where ἐκ may accentuate the power of God (δυνάμενον), though he had not yet entered into death. In Rev. 3:10 τηρήσῃ ἐκ τῆς ὀρας τοῦ πολέμου we seem to have the picture of general temptation with the preservation of the saints. Cf. ἐκβασις in 1 Cor. 10:13. So in Mt. 13:41 συλλέξουσιν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας the idea is ‘out from among,’ just as cheat or cockle grows in among the wheat in the same field. The two kingdoms coexist in
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1 Joh. Gr., p. 251 f.
the same sphere (the world). The notion of separation is common with a number of verbs like ἐξολεθρεύσατα ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ (Ac. 3:23), ἔγιναν ἐκ νεκρῶν (Jo. 12:1), ἢ ἀνάστασις ἢ ἐκ νεκρῶν (Lu. 20:35), ἔξερχόμεν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (Jo. 15:19), etc. This all seems simple and clear. Not quite so apparent is νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου (Rev. 15:2). Thayer and Blass both take it like τιρᾶν ἐκ, ‘victorious over’ (by separation). Cf. μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων (Rev. 16:11) and Jo. 3:25, ζήτησις ἐκ.

6. Origin or Source. Equally obvious seems the use of ἐκ for the idea of origin or source. Thus ἐξηλοθήσατο ἐκ τοῦ πατρός (Jo. 16:28), οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (17:14, 16), ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἔγειραι τέκνα (Mt. 3:9). Naturally this usage has a wide range. Cf. ἐκ Ναζαρέτ (Jo. 1:46 ἐκ), ἐκ πόλεως (Jo. 1:44), ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρίας (Jo. 4:7), ἐκ ἔβραιος ἐξ Ἐβραίων (Ph. 3:5), ἐκ τῆς γῆς (Jo. 3:31), ἐκ θεοῦ (Ph. 3:9), ἐκ ἑθνῶν (Gal. 2:15), ἐκ πλάνης (1 Th. 2:3), ἐκ πολλής ἀλήθειας (2 Cor. 2:4), τῇ ἐκ ήμων ἐν ύμιν ἀγάπη (2 Cor. 8:7). Cf. Lu. 12:15. This list is by no means exhaustive, but it is at least suggestive. One may note here στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν (Mt. 27:29), where the material is expressed by ἐξ.

7. Cause or Occasion. Closely allied to the above is the notion of cause or occasion which may also be conveyed by ἐκ. Thus note τὸ ἐκ ὑμῶν in Ro. 12:18, ἐμαυσωμένῳ ἐκ τοῦ πάνου (Rev. 16:10), ἀληθεύοντας ἐκ πίστεως (Ro. 5:1), ἐξ ἔργων (Gal. 3:10), ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζήν (1 Cor. 9:14), ἐκ σαθενείας (2 Cor. 13:4), ἐκ τοῦ μαμονοῦ (Lu. 16:9). Cf. also ἐπεθανὸν ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων (Rev. 8:11). Perhaps here belongs ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς (Jo. 12:3). Cf. γεμίζω ἐκ in Jo. 6:13 (Abbott, Johannine Gr., p. 253). At any rate a [Page 599] number of verbs use ἐκ in this general sense like φωτείω (Mk. 7:11), ἐλήμονα (2 Cor. 7:9), διδάσκαλος (Rev. 2:11), πλοῦτος (Rev. 18:3), χορτάζοντας (Rev. 19:21), κοπιάω (Jo. 4:6), ἔως (Ro. 1:17), etc. Cf. ἐπλασθηκασμόν τὸν ἥλιον ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς (Rev. 16:21). Indeed ἐκ with the notion of price does not differ radically from this idiom. Thus ἐγράφασαν ἐκ αὐτῶν τὸν ἄγνωστο ἐκ τοῦ μισθοῦ (Ac. 1:18), συμφωνήσας ἐκ διναρίου (Mt. 20:2). ἐκ διαταγῆς, ‘by order,’ was a regular formula in the papyri (Deissmann, Light, etc., p. 87). Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 248, finds the idiom ἐκ τῶν πεισάρων ἄνεμου (Mk. 13:27) in the papyri as well as in Zech. 11:6.

8. The Partitive Use of ἐκ. It is not infrequent, marking an increase over the earlier idiom.1 Thus in Jo. 16:17 ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν is even used as the subject of ἄραν. Cf. Ac. 21:16 without ἐκ. See also Jo. 7:40. John is specially fond of the partitive use of ἐκ (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 115) and the inscriptions and papyri have it also. Cf. ὁ̄νὴρ ἐκ τῶν πρωτευόντων, Petersen-Luschian, Reisen, p. 113, xviii. A. 5. Further examples are ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρασαίων (Jo. 3:1), μή τίς ἐκ τῶν ἁρχόντων (Jo. 7:48), ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀκουάσαντες (Jo. 7:40), θανατόσωσαν ἐκ ὑμῶν (Lu. 21:16), ἐκ αὐτῶν ἀποκεντείτε (Mt. 23:34), βλέποντες ἐκ τῶν λαῶν (Rev. 11:9), διηκόνουν ἐκ τῶν ἑραρχῶν (Lu. 8:13), ἐξ αὐτῶν φάγγ (Jo. 6:50), ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος δέδοκεν (1 Jo. 4:13), πίνον ἐκ τοῦ ὅποι (Jo. 4:13), οὐδεῖς ἐκ αὐτῶν (Jo. 17:12), etc.2 In Heb. 13:10 it is what is on the altar that is eaten. The use of ἐκ with a class or for a side or position may as well be mentioned here also. Thus ὁ ὅν ἐκ τῆς ὀληθείας (Jo. 18:37),

1 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 145.
2 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 100.
οἱ ἐκ νόμου (Ro. 4:14), ὁ ἐκ πίστεως (Ro. 3:26), ὁ ἐκ παρτιμηῆς (Ac. 11:2), ὁ ἐκ ἑριθίας (Ro. 2:8), etc. The partisan use is allied closely to the partitive. Cf. Ph. 4:22 ὁ ἐκ τῆς Κοίσαρος ὁλίγας. See further ch. XI, Cases.

9. Ἐκ and ἐν. A word in conclusion is needed about the so-called blending of Ἐκ with ἐν. Blass doubt if this classic idiom appears in the N. T. The passages that seem to have it are μὴ καταβάτω ἢ ραί τά ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ (Mt. 24:17) where ἐν might indeed have been employed, but Ἐκ coincides in idea with ἢ ραί. Cf. Mk. 13:15, where Ἐκ does not have τά before it. In Lu. 11:13 ὁ πατήρ ὁ Ἐκ οὐρανοῦ δόσει πνεύμα ζηγνών W. H. bracket ὁ before Ἐκ, and with ὁ the sending of the Holy Spirit by the Father has [Page 600] caused Ἐκ to displace ἐν which would otherwise have been regular. In Jo. 3:13 some MSS. add ὁ ὕν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ τῷ ἰδίῳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, thus making Jesus in heaven at that moment when he was speaking to Nicodemus. In Col. 4:16, τήν Ἐκ Λαοδίκιας, the Ἐκ assumes, of course, that an Epistle had been sent to Laodicea, and suggests that the Colossians get it from (Ἐκ) them. Cf. Ro. 3:25 f. for examples of διά, ἐν, εἰς, πρός, Ἐκ. See ὑπὸ and παρὰ.

(h) Ἐπί. See Sanskrit ἀπί (locative case), Zend aīpi, Latin ob, Lithuanian pi.

1. Ground-Meaning. It is ‘upon’ as opposed to ὑπό. It differs from ὑπέρ in that Ἐπί implies a real resting upon, not merely over. But the very simplicity of this idea gives it a manifoldness of resultant uses true of no other preposition. Sometimes indeed in the causal and ethical usages the root-idea seems dim, but none the less it is there. The only safety consists in holding on to the root-idea and working out from that in each special context. It marks a delicate shade of difference from ἐν, as is seen in ὧς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ Ἐπί γῆς (Mt. 6:10). For ἐν cf. Lu. 8:15.

2. In Composition in the N. T. It is very common, always retaining the root-idea (cf. Ἐπί-ἐν-δῶ, 2 Cor. 5:2), though sometimes the perfective idea is clear. Thus with Ἐπί-αὐτόῦ in Lu. 16:3, Ἐπί-γινώσκω in 1 Cor. 13:12, Ἐπί-γνώσις in Col. 1:9, Ἐπί-τελέω in 2 Cor. 8:11.

3. Frequency in N. T. In the N. T. Ἐπί is still in constant use, though it ultimately dropped out of the vernacular before ἔπανο. Note Ἐπίς Ἐπί διαλ[ογίσμος], P. Oxy. 294 (A.D. 22) like ὅνα εἶς, etc. But in the N. T. it is the one preposition still used freely with more than two cases (acc. 464, gen. 216, dat. and loc. 176). Most of the examples called dative in the lexicons and grammars are really locatives, but some of them are possibly true datives. So then Ἐπί really has four cases still in the N. T. In Homer Ἐπί often stands alone for Ἐπί-ἐστι. Farrar, quoting Donaldson, finds in the

3 Ib., p. 258. Cf. also Field, Ot. Norv., Pars III, Mk. 5:30, on τήν Ἐκ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν.
1 K.-G., I, p. 495.
2 Ib.
3 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 113.
5 Moulton, Prol., p. 107.
6 K.-G., I, p. 495; Delbrück, Grundl., p. 130; Vergl. Synt., I, p. 676 f.
Farrar FARRAR, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).
locative with ἐπί the idea of absolute superposition, while the genitive expresses only partial superposition and the accusative implies motion with a view to superposition and the dative would be superposition for the interest of one. There is some truth in this distinction and the case-idea must always be observed. But the growth of the accusative in the later language at the expense of the other cases caused some confusion in the usage according to the standard of the earlier Greek. Simcox considers it “almost a matter of indifference” whether in the N. T. one uses locative, genitive or accusative. This is somewhat true, but even so it does not follow that there was no difference in the cases. The locative accentuated mere location, the genitive brought out rather the kind or genus, while the accusative would present the general idea of extension modified by the fact that the accusative tended to absorb the other cases without insisting on the distinct case-idea. Thus sometimes either case with ἐπί would give substantially the same idea, though technical differences did exist. For instance, in Ac. 5:9 note ἐπὶ τῇ θύρᾳ, while in verse 23 we have ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν. So compare ἐγγὺς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύρας (Mk. 13:29) with ἔστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν (Rev. 3:20). Here the notion of rest exists with all three cases, though in Rev. 3:20 καὶ κρούω may have some effect on the presence of the accusative. Once more observe καθίσαν ἐπὶ θρόνου and καθίσασθε ἐπὶ δόξας θρόνους in Mt. 19:28. Rev. 4:2 gives us ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον καθήμενος, verse 9 (marg. of W. H., text of Nestle) τῷ καθήμενῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ, while verse 10 has τοῦ καθήμενου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, three cases with the same verb. It would be overrefinement to insist on too much distinction here. But the cases afford variety of construction at any rate. In Rev. 14:9 the single verb λαμβάνει has ἐπὶ τοῦ μετέπου αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ (cf. Ac. 27:44). Compare also λίθος ἐπὶ λίθων in Mt. 24:2 with λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ in Lu. 21:6. In Ph. 2:27 the MSS. vary between λύπην ἐπὶ λύπην and λύπην ἐπὶ λύπην. Cf. also ἐπὶ ὀλίγα and ἐπὶ πολλῶν in Mt. 25:21. The use of πιστεύω ἐπί with locative or accusative has already been discussed.

7 Greek Synt., p. 102.
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The accusative suggests more the initial act of faith (intrust) while the locative implies that of state (trust). We find εἰς also used with this verb as well as dative (both common in John). Once we have ἠτέν (Mk. 1:15). See Moulton, ProL., p. 68. But, after all is said, the only practical way to study ἐπί is from the point of view of the cases which it supplements.

4. With the Accusative. As already noted, it is far in excess of the other cases combined. It is hardly necessary to make minute subdivision of the accusative usage, though the preposition with this case follows the familiar lines. With expressions of place it is very common and very easy to understand. So ἔλθεν ἐπὶ τὸ ὑδάτα (Mt. 14:28), περιπατήσεν ἐπὶ τὸ ὑδάτα (14:29), ἄναπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν [Page 602] (Mt. 15:35), σκότους ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν (Mt. 27:45), πορεύον ἐπὶ τὴν ὄδον (Ac. 8:26), ἐπέβαινον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν ἱησοῦν (Mt. 26:50), ἄναπεσον ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος (Jo. 13:25). The metaphorical use is in harmony with this idiom. Thus φῶς ἐπέβαινεν ἐπὶ αὐτόν (Lu. 1:15), κατάερτοσας αὐτόν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργα (Heb. 2:7), βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν ὄνομα (Lu. 1:33), Ἰνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπὶ ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. 12:9). Cf. 2 Cor. 1:23, ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμίν πυρήνην. But not all the accusative uses are so simple. In a case like Mt. 7:24, ὕποκοδόμησεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, some idea of motion may be seen. But that is not true of Mt. 13:2, πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰθωμαν ἱερήκει. Cf. also καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον (Mt. 9:9) and others given above. So ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεδρόν (Mk. 4:38), πνεύμα ἦν ὄνομ ἐπὶ αὐτόν (Lu. 2:25), ἔμεινεν ἐπὶ αὐτόν (Jo. 1:32), ἐπεστήσαν ἐπὶ τὸν πυλῶνα (Ac. 10:17), ἐφ ημεῖς ἀναπαύονται (1 Pet. 4:14), κάλλιμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν καταπέσει (2 Cor. 3:15), ἔσονται ἀληθοῦσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (Lu. 17:35). Here it is hard to think of any idea of ‘whither.’ Sometimes indeed ἐπί seems not to imply strictly ‘upon,’ but rather ‘as far as.’ So with ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον (Mk. 16:2), κατέβησαν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν (Jo. 6:16), ἦρθαν ἐπὶ τὸ ἥδον (Ac. 8:36). The aim or purpose is sometimes expressed by ἐπὶ, as ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα (Mt. 3:7), ἐφ’ ὁ πάρει (Mt. 26:50). It may express one’s emotions as with πιστεύον ἐπὶ (Ro. 4:24), ἐλπίζω ἐπὶ (1 Pet. 1:13), σπαλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ (Mt. 15:32). Cf. ἐφ’ ὃν γεγονεί in Ac. 4:22 and the general use of ἐπὶ in Mk. 9:12 γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. In personal relations hostility is sometimes suggested, though ἐπὶ in itself does not mean ‘against.’ Thus ὡς ἐπὶ λήστην ἐξῆλθατε (Mt. 26:55). In Mt. 12:26 ἐφ’ ἐκατόν ἐμερώσηθη is used side by side with μερισθέντας καθ’ ἐμαυτῆς in the preceding verse. Cf. also Mk. 3:26, etc. Abbott notes that John shows this usage only once (19:33). For ἐπὶ with the idea of degree or measure see ἐφ’ ὁ σοῦ (Ro. 11:13). Cf. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in the sense of ‘all together’ (Ac. 1:15). With expressions of time ἐπὶ may merely fill out the accusative, as with ἐπὶ ξέρῃ τρία (Lu. 4:25, marg. of W. H.), ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους (Ac. 13:31), ἐφ’ ὁ σοῦ χρόνον (Ro. 7:1), or a more definite period may be indicated, as with ἐπὶ τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς (Ac. 3:1), ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον (Lu. 10:35). It is common with adverbs like ἐφ’ ἀπαξ, ἐπὶ τρίς, etc.

5. With the Genitive. The genitive with ἐπί has likewise a wide range of usages. Usually the simple meaning ‘upon’ satisfies [Page 603] all requirements, as in ἐπὶ κλίνης (Mt. 9:2), ἐφ’ οὐκ ὑποκοδόμητο (Lu. 4:29), κηρύγχειτε ἐπὶ τῶν δομάτων (Mt.

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 136. For LXX ex. of rest see C. and S., p. 85.
2 Joh. Gr., p. 259.
3 A postclassical usage, Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 147.
resultant idea of 'over,' growing naturally out of 'upon.' Thus (Gal. 3:16), ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης seems to mean 'on the sea-shore,' and so 'by the sea.' So with ἐπὶ τῆς ὀδοῦ (Mt. 21:19), the fig-tree being not on the path, but on the edge of the road. Abbott\(^1\) notes how Matthew (14:25 \(f\).) has ἐπὶ τῆν θαλάσσαν which is not ambiguous like the genitive in Jo. 6:19. Cf. Ac. 5:23 ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν. The classic idiom with ἐπὶ and the genitive in the sense of ‘towards’ is not so common in the N. T., though it has not quite disappeared as Simcox\(^2\) thinks. Cf. also ἐπὶ τοῦ χρόνου (Mt. 10:27), ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Jo. 6:21), καθίσας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Ac. 10:11), βαλοῦσα ἐπὶ τῶν ὄμοιων (Mt. 26:12), ἐπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Mk. 14:35), γενόμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου (Lu. 22:40), ὁ ἐπὶ αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον (Heb. 6:7), πεσών ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Mk. 9:20). In these examples we see just the opposite tendency to the use of the accusative with verbs of rest. Cf. πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (Mt. 10:29) with Mk. 9:20 above and βαλεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (Mt. 10:34) with Mk. 4:26. With persons ἐπὶ and the genitive may yield the resultant meaning of ‘before’ or ‘in the presence of.’ Thus ἐπὶ ἡμερῶν (Mk. 13:9), κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ὄμοιων (1 Cor. 6:1), ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δόο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων (1 Tim. 5:19), ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου (1 Tim. 6:13), ἐπὶ σου (Ac. 23:30), ἐπὶ ἐμοῦ (25:9). Blass\(^3\) observes how in Ac. 25:10 ἐπὶ τοῦ βημάτος Καίσαρος the meaning is ‘before,’ while in verse 17 the usual idea ‘upon’ is alone present (καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βημάτος). Cf. ἐπὶ Τίτου in 2 Cor. 7:14. With expressions of time the result is much the same. Thus ἐπὶ ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων (1 Pet. 1:20) where ἐπὶ naturally occurs (cf. Ju. 18). With ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου (Ro. 1:10) we have period of prayer denoted simply by ἐπὶ. Cf. ἐπεεὐχαριστεῖ ἐπὶ (Magical papyrus, Deissmann, Light, etc., p. 252). There is no difficulty about ἐπὶ τῆς μετοχεσίας (Mt. 1:11). With persons a fuller exposition is required, since ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου (Ac. 11:28) is tantamount to ‘in the time of Claudius’ or ‘during the reign of Claudius.’ Cf. also ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἀννα (Lu. 3:2), ἐπὶ Ἐλισαίου (4:27), ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως (Mk. 2:26).

### 6. With the Locative

Here ἐπὶ is more simple, though still with a variety of resultant ideas. Blass\(^3\) observes that with the purely local sense the genitive and accusative uses outnumber the locative with ἐπὶ. But still some occur like ἐπὶ πίνακι (Mt. 14:8), ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς (Jo. 4:6), ἐπὶ ἰματίῳ παλαιῷ (Mt. 9:16), ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῆς πέτρας οἰκοδομήσα (Mt. 16:18; cf. some MSS. in Mk. 2:4, ἐφ’ ὃ κατέκειτο, ἐπὶ τοῦ
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1 Joh. Gr., p. 261.
2 Lang. of the N. T., p. 147.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 137.
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1 For ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑὐσεβέτου in Prol. to Sirach see Deiss., B. S., p. 339 f.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 137.
The N. T. examples do not seem to be very numerous, and yet some occur. So I would explain διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν χάριν τοῦ θεου ἐφε ήμιν (2 Cor. 9:14). This seems a clear case of the dative with ἐπί supplementing it. The same thing may be true of ἐφε ήμιν in 1 Th. 3:7 and Ro. 16:19. Cf. also Κακοθύμησα ἐφε ήμιν (2 Tim. 2:14). This seems a clear case of the dative with ἐπί supplementing it. The resultant sense is 'against.' Cf. also προφητεύεισα ἐπί λαοῖς in Rev. 10:11. In Jo. 12:16, ἢν ἐπὶ οὐδὲν γεγραμμένα, and Ac. 5:35, ἐπί τούς ἀνθρώπους τούτοις, the idea is rather 'about' or 'in the case of.' Cf. also τῆς γενομένης ἐπί Στεφάνῳ (Ac. 11:19). Here the personal relation seems to suit the dative conception better than the locative. The notion of addition to may also be dative. Cf. Lu. 3:20 above and Col. 3:14, ἐπὶ πάσιν δὲ τοῦτοις; Heb. 8:1, ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις. In Eph. 6:16 the best MSS. have ἐν. It is possible also to regard the use of ἐπί for aim or purpose as having the true dative as in 1 Th. 4:7.
(i) **Κατά.** There is doubt about the etymology of this preposition. In ἁμείς it appears as κατά, and in Arcadian and Cypriote Greek it has the form κατό. It is probably in the instrumental case, but an apparently dative form κατάι survives a few times. Brugmann compares it with Old Irish cÚ, Cymric can, Latin com-, though this is not absolutely certain.

1. **Root-Meaning.** Brugmann thinks that the root-meaning of the preposition is not perfectly clear, though ‘down’ (cf. ἀνά) seems to be the idea. The difficulty arises from the fact that we sometimes find the ablative case used when the result is down from, then the genitive down upon, and the accusative down along. But ‘down’ (cf. κάτω) seems always to be the only idea of the preposition in itself. In the N. T. three cases occur with κατά.

2. **Distributive Sense.** Κατά came to be used in the distributive sense with the nominative, like ἀνά and σύν, but chiefly as adverb and not as preposition. Hence this usage is not to be credited to the real prepositional idiom. Late Greek writers have it. So εἷς κατὰ εἷς in Mk. 14:19 (and the spurious Jo. 8:9), τὸ καθ᾽ εἷς in Ro. 12:5. The modern Greek uses καθείς or καθένας as a distributive pronoun. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 138 f., considers also εἷς καθ᾽ ἔκαστος (A Lev. 25:10) merely the adverbial use of κατά. But see καθ᾽ ἔνα in 1 Cor. 14:31, κατὰ δὲ ἔστη (Mt. 27:15).

3. **Κατά in Composition.** It is true to the root-idea of ‘down,’ like κατέβη in Mt. 7:25, καταγωγέα in Ro. 10:6. But the various metaphorical uses occur also in composition. Often κατά occurs with “perfective” force. So, for instance, observe καταρτίσαι (1 Pet. 5:10), κατηγορώσαντο (Heb. 11:33), καταδιώκειν (Mk. 1:36), καταιδούλοι (2 Cor. 11:20), κατακαίνει (Mt. 3:12), καταμάθει (Mt. 6:28), κατανοήσατε (Lu. 12:24), κατέπαυσαν (Ac. 14:18), καταπίνοντες (Mt. 23:24), κατακαύσει (Mt. 3:12), καταθέσθε (Ph. 2:12), κατέφαγον (Mt. 13:4), καθοράται (Ro. 1:20). This preposition vies with διά and σύν in the perfective sense. Κατέχω in Ro. 1:18 is well illustrated by ὁ κατέχων τὸν θυμόν from an ostracon (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 308). In the magical texts it means to ‘cripple’ or to ‘bind,’ ‘hold fast.’ But in Mk. 14:45, κατεφίλησε, the preposition seems to be weakened, though the A. S. V. puts “kissed him much” in the margin. Cf. Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, Nov., 1907, p. 220.

4. **With the Ablative.** This construction is recognised by Brugmann, Monro, Kühner-Gerth, Delbrück. There are some examples of the ablative in the N. T.,
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1 Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 342.
3 Ib.
1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 178.
2 Ib.; Moulton, Prol., p. 105.
3 Cf. ib., pp. 115 ff.
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where ‘down’ and ‘from’ combine to make ‘down from’. Thus, for instance, is to be explained ἔβαλεν κατ' αὐτής δὲνεός τυφωνικός (Ac. 27:14), where αὐτής refers to Κρήτην, and the meaning (cf. American Standard Revision) is manifestly ‘down from’ Crete. In 1 Cor. 11:4, προφητεύων κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχον, we have ‘down from’ again, the veil hanging [Page 607] down from the head. In Mk. 5:13 we find ὠρμήσεν ἢ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ (Mt. 8:32=Lu. 8:33) where ‘down from the cliff’ is again the idea.

5. With the Genitive. It is more usual with κατά than the ablative in the N. T. as in the earlier Greek.¹ The idea is ‘down upon,’ the genitive merely accenting the person or thing affected. A good example of this sense in composition followed by the genitive appears in κατακυριεύσας ἀμφότερον (Ac. 19:16). Some MSS. in Mk. 14:3 have κατά with τῆς κεφαλῆς, but without it κατέχεων means ‘pour down on’ the head. In 2 Cor. 8:2, ἠ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία, the idea is ‘down to’ depth. But with the genitive the other examples in the N. T. have as resultant meanings either ‘against,’ ‘throughout’ or ‘by.’ These notions come from the original ‘down.’ Luke alone uses ‘throughout’ with the genitive and always with ὅλος. The earlier Greek had καθ’ ὅλου (also alone in Luke in the N. T., Ac. 4:18), though Polybius employed κατά in this sense. Cf. in Lu. 4:14 καθ’ ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου; Ac. 9:31 καθ’ ὅλης τῆς Τουδαίας (so 9:42; 10:37). The older Greek would have used the accusative in such cases. But cf. Polyb. iii, 19, 7, κατὰ τῆς νήσου διεσπάρησαν. The notion of ‘against’ is also more common” in the κοινή. But in the modern Greek vernacular κατά (κά) is confined to the notions of ‘toward’ and ‘according to,’ having lost the old ideas of ‘down’ and ‘against’ (Thumb, Handb., p. 105 f.). Certainly the preposition does not

6 I, p. 475.
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mean ‘against.’ That comes out of the context when two hostile parties are brought together. Cf. English vernacular “down on” one. This κατά then is ‘down upon’ rather literally where the Attic usually had ἐπί and accusative. Among many examples note κατά τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαρτυρίαν (Mk. 14:55), νύμφην κατά πενθερᾶς (Mt. 10:35), κατά τοῦ πνεύματος (Mt. 12:32), κατά τοῦ Παύλου (Ac. 24:1), etc. Cf. Ro. 8:33. Sometimes κατά and ἐπί are contrasted (Mt. 12:30) or κατά and ὑπέρ (Lu. 9:50; 1 Cor. 4:6). The other use of κατά and the genitive is with verbs of swearing. The idea is perhaps that the hand is placed down on the thing by which the oath is taken. But in the N. T. God himself is used in the solemn oath. So Mt. 26:63, ἐξορκίζω σε κατά τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. Heb. 6:13, 16. In 1 Cor. 15:15 ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κατά τοῦ θεοῦ may be taken in this sense or as meaning ‘against.’

6. With the Accusative. But the great majority of examples [Page 608] in the N. T. use the accusative. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 116) notes the frequency of the accusative in the papyri where περί would appear in the older Greek. Farrar suggests that κατά with the genitive is perpendicular (‘down on’ or ‘down from’) while with the accusative it is horizontal (‘down along’). Curiously enough John has only some ten instances of κατά and several of them are doubtful. On the whole, the N. T. use of the accusative with κατά corresponds pretty closely to the classic idiom. With a general horizontal plane to work from a number of metaphorical usages occur. But it appears freely in local expressions like ἄπειρες καθ’ ἄληθν τήν πόλιν κηρύσσων (Lu. 8:39), δήμηχοντο κατά τὰς κόμικας (Lu. 9:6), κατά τήν ὄδον (Lu. 10:4), ἐγένετο λίμος κατά τὴν χώραν (Lu. 15:14), κατά τὴν Κύκλικαν (Ac. 27:5), βλέποντα κατά λίβα (Ac. 27:12), κατά μεσημβρίαν (Ac. 8:26), κατά πρόσοπον (Gal. 2:11), κατ’ ὀφθαλμοὺς (Gal. 3:1), κατά σκοπόν (Ph. 3:14). The notion of rest may also have this construction as κατά οἰκον (Ac. 2:46). Cf. τὴν κατ’ οἰκον αὕτης ἐκκλησίαν (Col. 4:15). Cf. Ac. 11:1. In Ac. 13:1 a rather ambiguous usage occurs, κατά τὴν οὔσαν ἐκκλησίαν προφητεύω. But this example may be compared with τῶν κατὰ Ιουδαίους ἐθῶν (Ac. 26:3), οἱ καθ’ ὑμᾶς ποιηταί (Ac. 17:28, some MSS. καθ’ ἴμας), νόμου τοῦ καθ’ ὑμᾶς (Ac. 18:15). This idiom is common in the literary κοινή and is one of the marks of Luke’s literary style. But this is merely a natural development, and κατά with the accusative always expressed direction towards in the vernacular. Schmidt (de eloc. Joseph., p. 21 f.) calls κατά a sort of periphrasis for the genitive in late Greek. Cf. τὰ κατ’ ἐμέ (Ph. 1:12). It is more than a mere
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circumlocution for the genitive\(^5\) in the examples above and such as τὴν καθ’ ὑμᾶς πίστιν (Eph. 1:15), τὸ κατ’ ἐμὲ (Ro. 1:15), τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (Ro. 9:5), τὸ κατ’ ἐμὲ (Eph. 6:21; cf. Ac. 25:14), ἀνθράκιν τοῖς κατ’ ἔξοχήν (Ac. 25:23; cf. par excellence). Katá is used with expressions of time like κατ’ ἐκάθεν τὸν καιρὸν (Ac. 12:1), κατὰ τὸ μεσονύκτιον (Ac. 16:25), καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν (Heb. 3:13), κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον (Ac. 13:27). The notion of distribution comes easily with κατά, as in κατὰ πόλιν (Lu. 8:1), κατὰ τὰς συναγωγὰς (Ac. 22:19), κατ’ ἔτος (Lu. 2:41), καθ’ ἡμέραν (Ac. 2:46), καθ’ ἔνα πάντες (1 Cor. 14:31), καθ’ ἄνοια (Jo. 10:3), etc. See Mt. 27:15= Mk. 15:6. Cf. κατὰ δῶο, P. Oxy. 886 (iii/a.d.). As a standard or rule of measure κατά is very common [Page 609] and also simple. So κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (Ro. 16:25) with which compare the headings\(^1\) to the Gospels like κατὰ Μαθητῶν, though with a different sense of εὐαγγέλιον. Here the examples multiply like κατὰ νόμον (Lu. 2:22), κατὰ φύσιν (Ro. 11:21), κατὰ χάριν (Ro. 4:4), κατὰ θεόν (Ro. 8:27), κατὰ τὴν πίστιν (Mt. 9:29), κατὰ δύναμιν (2 Cor. 8:3), καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν (Ro. 7:13), κατὰ συνενώμην (1 Cor. 7:6), etc. Various resultant ideas come out of different connections. There is no reason to call κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν (Mt. 19:3) and κατὰ ἁγιονα (Ac. 3:17) bad Greek. If there is the idea of cause here, so in 1 Tim. 6:3, κατ’ εὐσέβειαν, the notion of tendency or aim appears. We must not try to square every detail in the development of κατὰ or any Greek preposition with our translation of the context nor with classic usage, for the N. T. is written in the koine. This preposition is specially common in Acts and Hebrews. Κατ’ ιδίαν (Mt. 14:13) is adverbial. But κατὰ πρόσωπον is not a mere Hebraism, since the papyri have it (Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 140). As a sample of the doubling up of prepositions note συνενώμην κατ’ ἄντων (Ac. 16:22).

(j) Μετά. Most probably μετά has the same root as μέσος, Latin medius, German mitt (mići), Gothic mib, English mid (cf. a-mid). Some scholars indeed connect it with άμα and German samt. But the other view is reasonably certain. The modern Greek uses a shortened form μέ, which was indeed in early vernacular use.\(^2\) Some of the Greek dialects use πεδά. So the Lesbian, Beotian, Arcadian, etc. Metá seems to be in the instrumental case.\(^3\)

1. The Root-Meaning. It is (‘mid’) ‘midst.’ This simple idea lies behind the later developments. Cf. μεταξό and ἃναμεσα. We see the root-idea plainly in μετεορίζω (from μετ-έωρος, in ‘mid-air’). In the N. T. we have a metaphorical example (Lu. 12:29) which is intelligible now in the day of aeroplanes and dirigible balloons. The root-idea is manifest also in μέτ-ωπον (Rev. 7:3), ‘the space between the eyes.’

2. In Composition. The later resultant meanings predominate in composition such as “with” in μεταδόωμι (Ro. 12:8), μεταλαμβάνω (Ac. 2:46), μετέχω (1 Cor. 10:30); “after” in μεταπέμπω (Ac. 10:5); or, as is usually the case, the notion of change or transfer is the result as with μεθίστημι (1 Cor. 13:2), μεταβάνω (Mt. 8:34), μεταμορφώω (Ro. 12:2), μεταμέλομαι (Mt. 27:3), μετανοεῖ (Mt. 3:2).

---
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1 lb.
3 Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 342.
3. Compared with σόν. Μετά is less frequent in composition than σόν, though far more common as a preposition. Simcox¹ thinks that it is useless to elaborate any distinction in meaning between μετά and σόν. The older grammars held that σόν expressed a more intimate fellowship than μετά. But in the N. T. μετά has nearly driven σόν out.

4. Loss of the Locative Use. Μετά was originally used with the locative. It is common in Homer, but even with him the genitive has begun to displace it.² Homer uses the locative with collective singulars and plurals.³ Mommsen⁴ indeed considers that in Hesiod ἃμα, μετά and σόν all use the instrumental case and with about equal frequency, while μετά with the genitive was rare. But in the N. T. μετά, along with περί and ὑπό, has been confined to the genitive and accusative, and the genitive use greatly predominates (361 to 100).⁵ The idea with the locative was simply ‘between.’⁶ With several persons the notion of ‘among’ was present also.⁷

5. With the Genitive. In Homer it occurs only five times and with the resultant idea of ‘among.’ So once (Iliad, 13. 700, μετά Βοιωτῶν ἐμάχοντο), where indeed the idea is that of alliance with the Bœotians. In Rev. 2:16, etc., μετά occurs with πολεμέω in a hostile sense, a usage not occurring in the older Greek, which Simcox⁸ considers a Hebraism. But the papyri may give us examples of this usage any day. And Thumb (Hellenismus, p. 125; cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 106) has already called attention to the modern Greek use of μέ with πολεμέω. Deissmann (Light, p. 191) finds μετά στρατιώτου with οἰκέω in an ostracon (not in hostile sense) and possibly with ἀντιλογέω, ‘elsewhere.’ In Jo. 6:43 μετά occurs in a hostile sense with γογγύζω and probably so with ξήτησις in Jo. 3:25, though Abbott⁹ argues for the idea of alliance here between the Baptist’s disciples and the Jews to incite rivalry between the Baptist and Jesus. In 1 Cor. 6:6 f. we have the hostile sense also in legal trials, ἀδελφὸς μετά ἀδελφοῦ κρίνεται. Cf. Jo. 16:19. This notion gives no difficulty to English students, since our “with” is so used. But Moulton¹⁰ admits a translation Hebraism in Lu. 1:58, ἐμεγάλυνεν Κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετὰ αὐτῆς. But what about ὁσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετὰ αὐτῶν [Page 611] (Ac. 14:27) and τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ’ ἡμῶν (1 Jo.
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4:17)? Simcox, again finds a Hebraism in “the religious sense” which appears in Mt. 1:23; Lu. 1:28; Jo. 3:2, etc. But the notion of fellowship is certainly not a Hebraism. *Metá* has plenty of examples of the simple meaning of the preposition. Thus τὸν ἄντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν (Lu. 24:5), Ἐν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων (Mk. 1:13), μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν (Lu. 5:30), μετὰ ἀνώμων ἐλογίσθη (Lu. 22:37), an idiom not common to σῦν and found in the classical poets. Cf. also σκηνή τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἄνθρωπων (Rev. 21:3), μετὰ διωγμῶν (Mk. 10:30), ἐξεζαίον μετὰ τῶν θωσίων (Lu. 13:1), όνον μετὰ χολῆς (Mt. 27:34). It is not far from this idea to that of conversation as in μετὰ γυναικὸς ἔλαλει (Jo. 4:27), and general fellowship as with εὐθεία (Ro. 12:18), συμφωνεῖ (Mt. 20:2), κοινωνίαν ἔχω (1 Jo. 1:3), συναίρω λόγων (Mt. 18:23), etc. Perhaps the most frequent use of *metá* is with the idea of accompaniment. So with ἀκολούθεω (Lu. 9:49), λαμβάνω (Mt. 25:3), παραλαμβάνω (Mt. 12:45), ἄρχομαι (Mk. 1:29), ἄναχορέω (Mk. 3:7), etc. Cf. Mt. 27:66. So with ἐμι (Mk. 3:14), but sometimes the notion of help or aid is added as in Jo. 3:2; 8:29, etc. Cf. also ἡ χαρίς μεθ’ ὑμῶν (Ro. 16:20) and often. The notion of fellowship may develop into that of followers or partisans as in Mt. 12:30. Sometimes the phrase of μετὰ οὗτοί with the participle (Jo. 9:40) or without (Mt. 12:4) means one’s attendants or followers (companions). The idea of accompaniment also occurs with things as in ἔξηλθατε μετὰ μαχιρῶν (Lu. 22:52), μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων (Mt. 25:4), μετὰ σάλπιγγος (Mt. 24:31), μετὰ βραχίωνος υγιηλοῦ (Ac. 13:17), some of which approach the instrumental idea. Cf. μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν (1 Tim. 4:14), where the idea is rather ‘simultaneous with,’ but see μετὰ ὄρκου (Mt. 14:7), μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης (Lu. 17:15). Still in all these cases accompaniment is the dominant note. See also μηδεν(α) ἀπολελύσθαι τῶν μετὰ σίτου (‘in the corn service’), B.U. 27 (ii/A.D.). Certainly it is not a Hebraism in Lu. 1:58, for Moulton (Prol., p. 246) can cite A.P. 135 (ii/A.D.) τί δὲ ἡμῖν συνέβη μετὰ τῶν ἄρχοντων: In later Greek the instrumental use comes to be common with μετὰ (cf. English “with”). In Lu. 10:37 ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετὰ αὐτοῦ Debrunner (Blass-Deb., p. 134) sees a Hebraism. But see Herm. S. V. 1, 1, ἐποίησε μετὰ έμου. The metaphorical use for the idea of accompaniment occurs also like μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης (Mt. 24:30), μετὰ σπουδῆς (Mk. 6:25), μετὰ δακρύων (Heb. 12:17), μετὰ [Page 612] φόβου καὶ τρόμου (2 Cor. 7:15), παρησιασάς (Ac. 2:29), θορύβου (Ac. 24:18), etc. Deissmann (Bible Studies, pp. 64, 265) finds in the papyri examples of μετὰ καὶ like that in Ph. 4:3. Cf. Schmid, Der Atticismus, III, p. 338. In the modern Greek vernacular μέ is confined to accompaniment, means or instrument and manner. Time has dropped out (Thumb, Handb., p. 103 f.).

6. **With the Accusative.** At first it seems to present more difficulty. But the accusative-idea added to the root-idea (“midst”) with verbs of motion would mean “into the midst” or “among.” But this idiom does not appear in the N. T. In the late Greek vernacular μετὰ with the accusative occurs in all the senses of μετὰ and the genitive, but that is not true of the N. T. Indeed, with one exception (and that of
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place), μετὰ τὸ δευτέρου καταπέτασμα (Heb. 9:3), in the N. T. μετὰ with the accusative is used with expressions of time. This example in Hebrews is helpful, however. The resultant notion is that of behind or beyond the veil obtained by going through the midst of the veil. All the other examples have the resultant notion of “after” which has added to the root meaning, as applied to time, the notion of succession. You pass through the midst of this and that event and come to the point where you look back upon the whole. This idea is “after.” Cf. μετὰ δόο ήμέρας (Mt. 26:2). In the historical books of the LXX μετὰ ταῦτα (cf. Lu. 5:27) is very common. Simcox³ treats οὖ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ήμέρας (Ac. 1:5) as a Latinism, but, if that is not true of πρό, it is hardly necessary to posit it of μετὰ. Cf. μετὰ ήμέρας εἴκοσι Herm. Vis. IV, 1, 1. The litotes is common. Jannaris⁴ comments on the frequency of μετὰ τῷ with the infinitive in the LXX and N. T. So μετὰ τῷ ἀναστήναι (Acts 10:41). Cf. 1 Cor. 11:25; Heb. 10:26, etc. This comes to be one of the common ways of expressing a temporal clause (cf. ἐπεί or ὅτε). Cf. μετὰ βραχύ (Lu. 22:58), μετὰ μικρόν (Mk. 14:70), adverbial phrases.

(k) Παρά.

1. Significance. Delbrück⁵ does not find the etymology of παρά clear and thinks it probably is not to be connected with पा́र (Sanskrit), which means ‘distant.’ Brugmann⁶ connects it with the old word पुराले like Latin por-, Gothic faúrá, Anglo-Saxon fore (cf. German vor). Giles⁷ thinks the same root furnishes παρός (gen.), παρά (instr.), παραί (dat.), περί (loc.). He also sees a kinship in these to πέραν, πέρα, πρός.

2. Compared with πρός. In meaning¹ παρά and πρός do not differ essentially save that παρά merely means ‘beside,’ ‘alongside’ (cf. our “parallel”), while πρός rather suggests ‘facing one another,’ an additional idea of contrast. This oldest meaning explains all the later developments.² Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 116) thinks that the N. T. shows confusion in the use of παρά (διελογίζοντο παρ [marg. of W. H. and Nestle, ἐν in text] ἑαυτοῖς, Mt. 21:25) and διελογίζοντο πρός ἑαυτούς (Mk. 11:31). But is it not diversity the rather?
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3. In Composition. The preposition is exceedingly common in composition, though with nouns it falls behind some of the others a good deal. \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) does not survive in modern Greek vernacular save in composition (like \(\delta\nu\alpha\) and \(\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\)) and some of its functions go to \(\acute{\sigma}\partial\) and \(\epsilon\iota\).\(^3\) All the various developments of \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) appear in composition, and the simplest use is very common. Thus \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\omicron\omicron\lambda\omicron\dot{\eta}\) (Mk. 13:28) is a ‘placing of one thing beside another.’ So \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\iota\sigma\) (Mt. 4:13) is merely ‘beside the sea.’ Cf. also \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\theta\eta\kappa\) (2 Tim. 1:14), \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\kappa\alpha\theta\varepsilon\theta\varepsilon\iota\iota\iota\) (Lu. 10:39), \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\omicron\) (Ac. 28:20), \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\kappa\lambda\iota\tau\omicron\sigma\) (Jo. 14:16), \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\lambda\acute{\gamma}\omicron\omicron\omicron\) (Ac. 27:8), \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\iota\omicron\) (Lu. 6:17), \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\mu\acute{\nu}\nu\) (Heb. 7:23); cf. \(\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\) \(\kappa\a\) \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\) Ph. 1:25), \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\omicron\) (Ac. 20:16), \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\rho\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\) (Heb. 2:1), \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\tau\iota\acute{\eta}\omicron\iota\omicron\) (Mk. 6:41), \(\pi\acute{\alpha}\rrow\) (Lu. 13:1), etc. A specially noticeable word is \(\pi\acute{\alpha}\-\omega\iota\iota\) (1 Tim. 3:3). Cf. also \(\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\-\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\acute{\eta}\acute{\lambda}\theta\omicron\nu\) in Lu. 10:31 f. Sometimes \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) suggests a notion of stealth as in \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-\epsilon\iota\sigma\-\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\) (2 Pet. 2:1), \(\pi\alpha\rho\-\epsilon\iota\sigma\-\dot{\delta}\om\) (Ju. 4), \(\pi\alpha\rho\-\epsilon\iota\sigma\-\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\) (Gal. 2:4), but in \(\pi\alpha\rho\-\epsilon\iota\sigma\-\acute{\rho}\acute{\chi}\omicron\omicron\omicron\) in Ro. 5:20 this notion is not present. Cf. Mt. 14:15, ἡ ὥρα ἡ ἀναρθηλθεν, ‘the hour is already far spent’ (‘gone by’). Note also the Scotch “far in” like modern Greek ἄναρθηλθεν. \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) with the locative does not occur in Heb. 6:6, found in the ostraca (Willken, i. 78 f.) as a commercial word ‘to fall below par.’ For \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\-
u\alpha\nu\phi\lambda\omicron\lambda\epsilon\omicron\) (Ac. 15:19) see \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\nu\phi\lambda\omicron\lambda\epsilon\omicron\) \(\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\), P. Tb. 36 (ii/b.c.). \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) occurs in the N. T. with three cases. The locative has 50 examples, the accusative 60, the ablative 78.\(^4\)

[Page 614] 4. With the Locative. \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) with the locative is nearly confined to persons. Only one example appears, ἱστήκεισαν \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ ισταρφ) (Jo. 19:25). This confining of \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) to persons is like the usual Greek idiom, though Homer used it freely with both. Homer used it also as an adverb and in the shortened form \(\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\). The only instance in the N. T. of the locative with \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) after a verb of motion is in Lu. 9:47, ἔστησεν αὐτόν \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}αυτόν,\) though here D reads \(\acute{\epsilon}αυτόν.\) The locative with \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) leaves the etymological idea unchanged so that we see the preposition in its simplest usage. Cf. ὃς ἀπέδειξεν \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ Κάρφι (2 Tim. 4:13) as a typical example of the use with persons which is much like \(\acute{\alpha}ρ\) in Latin, ‘at one’s house’ (Jo. 1:40), ‘in his society,’ etc. So καταλύει \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) (Lu. 19:7), μένω \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) (Jo. 14:17), \(\zeta\xi\nu\iota\om\) \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) (Ac. 21:16). Cf. Ac. 21:8. In Rev. 2:13; Mt. 28:15, \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) has the idea of ‘among.’ The phrase \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ θετι (Lu. 1:30) is common. The word is used in ethical relations,‘also like \(\pi\alpha\rho\) \(\acute{\epsilon}μι (2 Cor. 1:17). Cf. τί θέου θραύνει \(\pi\αρ\ ιμί (Ac. 26:8) and \(\phi\rho\ νιμοι \(\pi\αρ\ \acute{\epsilon}αυτός (Ro. 12:16). \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) with the locative does not occur in Hebrews.

5. With the Ablative. But it occurs only with persons (like the older Greek). The distinction between \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\) and \(\acute{\sigma}\partial\) and \(\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\) has already been made. In Mk. 8:11 both
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παρά and ὑπό occur, ζητούντες παρὰ αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (cf. 12:2), and in Jo. 1:40 we have both παρά and ἐκ, ἐις ἐκ τῶν δύο τῶν ἄκουσάν των παρὰ Ἰοάνου. In a case like Jo. 8:38 the locative is followed by the ablative, ἐξορκίζω παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ—颋κούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, though some MSS. have locative in the latter clause also. But the ablative here is in strict accordance with Greek usage as in a case like ἄκουσα παρὰ σοῦ (Ac. 10:22). On the other hand in Jo. 6:45 f. we find the ablative in both instances, ὑ ἄκουσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρός—ὕ ὄν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. ὶ ὄν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός in Jo. 1:18). But this last παρὰ implies the coming of Christ from the Father, like παρὰ τοῦ πατρός ἔξωθῆθην (Jo. 16:27). Παρὰ with the ablative means ‘from the side of’ as with the accusative it means ‘to the side of.’ The phrase of οἱ παρὰ αὐτοῦ therefore describes one’s family or kinsmen (Mk. 3:21). In the papyri the phrase is very common for one’s agents, and Moulton has found one or two like οἱ παρὰ ἡμῶν πάντες parallel to οἱ παρὰ αὐτοῦ in Mk. 3:21. Cf. also τὰ παρ᾽ [Page 615] αὐτῶν (Lu. 10:7) for one’s resources or property. Rouffiac (Recherches, etc., p. 30) cites ἐξαπάνθησαν παρὰ ἐκαντοῦ (cf. Mk. 5:26) from inscription from Priene (111, 117). Note also ἡ παρὰ ἐκαντοῦ διαθήκη (Ro. 11:27) with notion of authorship. With passive verbs the agent is sometimes expressed by παρά as in ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ (Jo. 1:6), τοῖς λεξιλαμβάνοις παρὰ Κυρίου (Lu. 1:45). Cf. Text. Rec. in Ac. 22:30 with κατηροῦσα παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, where W. H. have ὑπό. Παρὰ occurs with the middle in Mt. 21:42, παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο. In the later Greek vernacular παρά with the ablative helped supplant ὑπό along with ὑπό, and both παρὰ and ὑπό (and ἐκ) vanished1 “before the victorious ὑπό.”

6. With the Accusative. It is not found in John’s writings at all2 as it is also wanting in the other Catholic Epistles. The accusative is common in the local sense both with verbs of motion and of rest. The increase in the use of the accusative with verbs of rest explains in part the disuse of the locative.3 One naturally compares the encroachments of εἰς upon ἐν. We see the idiom in the papyri as in οἱ παρὰ σὲ θεοὶ, P. Par. 47 (b.c. 153). The use of παρὰ with the accusative with verbs of rest was common in Northwest Greek (Buck, Greek Dialects, p. 101). Thus in Mt. 4:18 we find περιπατῶν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν logically enough, but in 13:1 we meet ἐκάθετο παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν, and note καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν δῶδον (Mt. 20:30), ἐστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην (Lu. 5:1), ἐστὶν οἰκία παρὰ θάλασσαν (Ac. 10:6), διδάσκειν παρὰ θάλασσαν (Mk. 4:1), ἀνατεθραμμένος παρὰ τοῦς πόδας (Ac. 22:3). Cf. Ac. 4:35. So no difficulty arises from ξερισμῶν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας (Mt. 15:30). There is no example in the N. T. of παρὰ in the sense of ‘beyond,’ like Homer, but one where the idea is ‘near to,’ ‘alongside of,’ as ἢ ἔθνος παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν (Mt. 15:29). But figuratively παρὰ does occur often in the sense of ‘beside the mark’ or ‘beyond.’ Once indeed we meet the notion of ‘minus,’ as in τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν (2 Cor. 11:24). Cf. παρὰ τὰλαγνέων σοι πέρακα, B.U. 1079 (A.D. 41), where παρὰ means ‘except.’ The modern

3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 138.
4 W.-Th., p. 404. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 138, less naturally explains παρὰ here as meaning ‘by virtue of,’ but not Debrunner.
Greek vernacular keeps παρά τρίχα, ‘within a hair’s breadth’ (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 98). The notion of ‘beyond’ is common enough in classic writers and is most frequent in Hebrews in the N. T. It occurs with comparative forms like διαφορώτερον (Heb. 1:4), πλέονος (3:3), κρείττον (9:23; cf. 12:24), [Page 616] with implied comparison like ἡλάττωσας βραχύ τι (2:7), or with merely the positive like ὤμωτολοι (Lu. 13:2; cf. 13:4). Indeed no adjective or participle at all may appear, as in ὄφειλεται ἐγένοντο παρά πάντας (Lu. 13:4; cf. 13:2). The use of the positive with παρά is like the Aramaic (cf. Wellhausen, *Einl.*, p. 28). Here the notion of ‘beyond’ or ‘above’ is simple enough. Cf. παρά after ἄλλος in 1 Cor. 3:11 and ἠμέραν in Ro. 14:5; Heb. 11:11. The older Greek was not without this natural use of παρά for comparison and the LXX is full of it.1 In the later Greek vernacular the ablative and ἦ both retreat before παρά and the accusative.2 In the modern Greek vernacular we find παρά and the accusative and even with the nominative after comparison (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 75). The notion of comparison may glide over into that of opposition very easily. Thus in Ro. 1:25, ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, where ‘rather than’ is the idea (cf. “instead of”). Cf. Ro. 4:18, παρὰ ἐλπίδα ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι, where both prepositions answer over to each other, ‘beyond,’ ‘upon.’ So in 2 Cor. 8:3 κατὰ δύναμιν and παρὰ δύναμιν are in sharp contrast. Cf. Ac. 23:3. In Gal. 1:8 f. παρά ὁ has the idea of ‘beyond’ and so ‘contrary to.’ Cf. Ro. 11:24; 12:3; 16:17. To exceed instructions is often to go contrary to them. In a case like παρά νόμον (Ac. 18:13), to go beyond is to go against. Cf. English *transgression*, παράπτωμα. Once more παρά with the accusative strangely enough may actually mean ‘because of,’ like propter. So in 1 Cor. 12:15 f. παρὰ τοῦ ὄντος. Cf. D in Lu. 5:7. The Attic writers used παρά thus, but it disappears in the later vernacular.3 The notion of cause grows out of the idea of nearness and the nature of the context. Farrar4 suggests the English colloquial: “It’s all along of his own neglect.”

(1) Περί. There is some dispute about the etymology of περί. Some scholars, like Sonne,5 connect it in etymology and meaning with ὑπέρ. But the point is not yet clear, as Brugmann6 contends. Whatever may be true about the remote Indo-Germanic root, περί belongs to the same stem as παρά and is in the locative case like pári in the Sanskrit.7 Cf. also Old Persian pāriy, Zend pārī, Latin per, Lithuanian pėr, Gothic fāir-, Old High German far-, fer, German ver-. The Greek uses πέρι as an adverb (Homer) [Page 617] and the Æolic dialect1 even uses πέρι instead of περί. The intensive particle περ is this same word.

---

1 C. and S., p. 85 f.; Thack., Gr., p. 23.
3 Ib., p. 390.
4 Gk. Synt., p. 104.
1 K.-G., I, p. 491.
1. **The Root-Meaning.** It is ‘round’ (‘around’), ‘on all sides’ (cf. ἄμφι, ‘on both sides’). Cf. περί (Ac. 5:16), where the root-idea is manifest. Cf. Latin circum, circa. The preposition has indeed a manifold development,² but after all the root-idea is plainer always than with some of the other prepositions. The N. T. examples chiefly (but cf. Ac. 28:7) concern persons and things, though even in the metaphorical uses the notion of ‘around’ is present.

2. **In Composition.** The idea of ‘around’ in the literal local sense is abundant. Cf. περιγενεσθαι (Mt. 4:23), περιαστράψαι (Ac. 22:6), περιεστῶτα (Jo. 11:42), περιέδραμον (Mk. 6:55), περιφέρειν (Mk. 6:55), περί-έρχομαι (Ac. 19:13), φραγμόν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν (Mt. 21:33). In περι-βλεψάμενος τούς περί αὐτὸν κύκλω καθημένους, where κύκλω explains περί already twice expressed. Cf. also περικυκλώσουσιν σέ (Lu. 19:43). The perfective idea of περί in composition is manifest in περι-καλύπτω (Mk. 3:34), περίκρύπτω in Lu. 1:24. This is the “perfective” sense. Cf. περί-λυπος in Mt. 26:38. Per contra note περίεργος (1 Tim. 5:13) for ‘busybody,’ busy about trifles and not about important matters. In 1 Tim. 6:10 note περιέπειραν in the sense of ‘pierced through.’ But in 2 Cor. 3:16, περιωρίζεται, ‘the veil is removed from around the head.’

3. **Originally Four Cases Used.** These were the locative, accusative, genitive, ablative. The locative was never common in prose and died out in the late Greek, not appearing in the N. T. Delbrück³ is very positive about the ablative in some examples in Homer and the earlier Greek. Indeed he thinks that the true genitive is a later development after the ablative with περί. I think it probable that some of these ablative examples survive in the N. T., though I do not stress the point.⁴

4. **With the Ablative.** There is some doubt as to how to explain [Page 618] the ablative with περί. In Homer⁴ it is usually explained as like ablative of comparison. Cf. ὑπέρ. Thus περί is taken in the sense of ‘beyond’ or ‘over,’ and is allied to πέρα (πέραν) and ὑπέρ, according to the original sense.² Brugmann⁵ cites also περίειμα and περιγίγνομαι where the notion of superiority comes in. With this compare περικρατεῖσα γενέσθαι τῆς σκάφης (Ac. 27:16), which would thus have the ablative in σκάφης. But Monro⁶ admits that the origin of this notion with περί is not quite clear. On the other hand, the use of περί in composition may throw light on the subject. In 2 Cor. 3:16, περι-απερθέται τὸ κάλυμμα, ‘the veil is taken from around.’ Cf. also Ac. 27:20. The same notion occurs in περι-κάθαρμα (1 Cor. 4:13) and περίψημα (ib.), ‘off-scouring’ and ‘off-scraping.’ The same idea of from around occurs in περι-ρήζαντες τὸ ἱμάτια

---

4 Cf. also Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 447.
1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 133; Sterrett, The Dial. of Hom. in Hom. II., N 47.
4 Hom. Gr., p. 133.
(Ac. 16:22; cf. 2 Macc. 4:38). In Lu. 10:40 this idea appears in a metaphorical sense with περιστὰτο, ‘drawn away’ or ‘from around,’ ‘distracted.’ See περισσῆ, P. Brit. M. 42 (B.C. 168) for ‘occupy.’ Cf. also the notion of beyond in περιέργος (1 Tim. 5:13), περιλείπω (1 Th. 4:15), περιμένω (Ac. 1:4), περιούσιος (Tit. 2:14), περισσεύω (Jo. 6:12), περισσός (Mt. 5:37). In the last example, τὸ περισσὸν τοιῶν, note the ablative. There remains a group of passages of a metaphorical nature where the idea is that of taking something away. These may be explained as ablatives rather than genitives. So in Ro. 8:3, περὶ ἀμαρτίας, the idea is that we may be freed from sin, from around sin. Thayer (under περὶ) explains this usage as “purpose for removing something or taking it away.” This, of course, is an ablative idea, but even so we get it rather indirectly with περὶ. See Χριστὸς ἄπαξ περὶ ἀμαρτίων ἀπέθανεν in 1 Pet. 3:18. It is worth observing that in Gal. 1:4 W. H. read ὑπέρ rather than περὶ, while in Heb. 5:3 W. H. have περὶ rather than ὑπέρ. Cf. Mk. 14:24. In Eph. 6:18 f. we have δεήσει περὶ πάντων τὸν θείον, καὶ ὑπέρ ἔμω, where the two prepositions differ very little. But in 1 Pet. 3:18 (see above), ὑπέρ ἄδικον, the distinction is clearer. Cf. Jo. 16:26; 17:9. See Simcox, Lang. of N. T., p. 152 f. D has ὑπέρ with ἐκχυννόμενον in Mt. 26:28 rather than περὶ. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 134. Cf. περὶ with ἰλασμός in 1 Jo. 2:2. The ablative with ὑπέρ renders more probable this ablative use of περὶ.

5. With the Genitive. This is the common case with περὶ in the [Page 619] N. T. If the genitive and ablative examples are counted together (the real ablatives are certainly few) they number 291 as against 38 accusatives.1 But in the later Greek the accusative gradually drives out the genitive (with the help of διά also).2 The genitive was always rare with περὶ in the local or temporal sense. The N. T. shows no example of this usage outside of composition (Ac. 25:7), unless in Ac. 25:18 περὶ οὐ be taken with σταθέντες, which is doubtful.3 Curiously enough the Gospel of John has the genitive with περὶ almost as often as all the Synoptic writers and the accusative not at all in the critical text, Jo. 11:19 reading πρὸς τὴν Μάρθαν.4 This frequency in John is due largely to the abundant use of μαρτυρέω, λέγω, λαλέω, γράφω, etc. Cf. Jo. 1:7, 22; 7:13, 17, etc. Περὶ may occur with almost any verb where the notion of ‘about,’ ‘concerning’ is natural, like ἐπιλαχνίση (Mt. 9:36), ἠγανάκτησαν (20:24), μέλει (22:16), ἐλεγχόμενος (Lu. 3:19), ἐθαύμασαν (Lu. 2:18), etc. The list includes verbs like ἰκνόω, γινώσκω, διαλογίζομαι, ἐνθαμάζω, ἐπιζητέω, etc. The usage includes both persons, like προσεχθεὶς περὶ ημῶν (1 Th. 5:25), and things, like περὶ ἐνδόματος τί μεριμνήτε (Mt. 6:28). One neat Greek idiom is τὰ περὶ τῆς ὧν (Ac. 24:22), τὰ περὶ Ἱησοῦ (18:25; Mk. 5:27), τὰ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ (Ac. 24:10). Blass5 considers ποιῶν περὶ αὐτοῦ (Lu. 2:27) “an incorrect phrase,” which is putting it too strongly. Cf. λακάνω περὶ in Jo. 19:24, like classical μάχομαι περὶ. Sometimes περὶ appears rather loosely at the beginning of the sentence, περὶ τῆς λογίας (1 Cor. 16:1), περὶ Ἀπολλώ (16:12). Sometimes περὶ is used with the relative when it would be repeated if the antecedent were expressed, as in περὶ οὖν ἐγράψατε (1 Cor. 7:1) or where περὶ properly belongs only with the antecedent, as in περὶ οὖν δεδοκάς μοι (Jo. 17:9). In Lu. 19:37, περὶ πασῶν οὐ εἶδον δυνάμεων, the preposition strictly belongs

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 105.
3 W.-Th., p. 373.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 135.
only to the antecedent which is incorporated. In a case like περὶ πάντων εὖχομαι (3 Jo. 2) the subject-matter of the prayer is implied in περὶ as cause is involved in περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ (Mk. 1:44) and as advantage is expressed in περὶ αὐτῆς (Lu. 4:38). But this is merely due to the context.

6. With the Accusative. This construction in reality occurs with much the same sense as the genitive. The accusative, of course, suggests a placing around. It is rare in the N. T., but in later Greek displaced the genitive as already remarked. But it does not survive in the modern Greek vernacular. With the accusative [Page 620] περὶ is used of place, as in σκάψω περὶ αὐτήν (Lu. 13:8), περὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκέινον (Ac. 28:7). Cf. Mk. 3:8. So with expressions of time, as in περὶ τρίτην ὥραν (Mt. 20:3). Note the use of περὶ with the different parts of the body, as περὶ τὴν ὀφθαλμῶν (Mt. 3:4), περὶ τὸν τράχηλον (18:6). Cf. Rev. 15:6. Περὶ is used of persons as in περισσάτρησαν περὶ ἐμὲ (Ac. 22:6), ἅμαν περὶ αὐτοῦς (Mk. 9:14). An ancient Greek idiom occurs in ὁ περὶ Ποῦλον (Ac. 13:13), like ὁ περὶ Ξενοφώντα (Xen. Anab. 7, 4, 16), where the idea is ‘Paul and his companions.’¹ But in a case like ὁ περὶ αὐτόν (Lu. 22:49) the phrase has only its natural significance, ‘those about him.’ The still further development of this phrase for the person or persons named alone, like the vernacular “you all” in the Southern States for a single person, appears in some MSS. for Jo. 11:19, πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν, where only Martha and Mary are meant,² the critical text being πρὸς τὴν Μάρθαν. Blass³ notes that only with the Philippian Epistle (2:23, τὰ περὶ ἐμὲ) did Paul begin the use of the accusative with περὶ (cf. genitive) in the sense of ‘concerning,’ like Plato. Cf. in the Pastoral Epistles, περὶ τὴν πίστιν (1 Tim. 1:19), περὶ τὴν ἀλλήθειαν (2 Tim. 2:18). But Luke (10:40 f.) has it already. Cf. περὶ τὸ τοιαῦτα (Ac. 19:25). But κύκλῳ in the LXX, as in the κοινή, is also taking the place of περὶ (Thackeray, Gr., p. 25). Ἄμφι could not stand before περὶ, and finally περὶ itself went down. The entrance of ὑπέρ into the field of περὶ will call for notice later.

(m) Πρό. Cf. the Sanskrit ṭrā and the Zend frā, Gothic fra, Lithuanian pra, Latin pro, German für, vor, English for (for-ward), fore (fore-front). The case of πρό is not known, though it occurs a few times in Homer as an adverb.⁴ Cf. ἄπνο and ὑπό. The Latin prod is probably remodelled from an old *pro like an ablative, as prae is dative (or locative).

1. The Original Meaning. It is therefore plain enough. It is simply ‘fore,’ ‘before.’ It is rather more general in idea than ἄντι and has a more varied development.⁵ In πρὸ τῆς ὑδρας (Ac. 12:6) the simple idea is clear.

2. In Composition. It is common also in composition, as in πρὸ-ἀσπίλου (Mk. 14:68), ‘fore-court.’ Other uses in composition grow out of this idea of ‘fore,’ as προ-βαίνω (Mt. 4:21), ‘to go on’ (‘for-wards’), προ-κόπτω (Gal. 1:14), προ-έγο (Mk. 11:9; cf. ὁκο-λουθέω in contrast), πρὸ-ὁδηγός (1 Tim. 5:24), ‘openly manifest,’ [Page

---

1 W.-Th., p. 406.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 134.
3 lb.
4 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 149.
‘before all’ (cf. Gal. 3:1, προ-εγράφη; προ-έχω (Ro. 3:9), ‘to surpass’; προ-αμαρτάνω (2 Cor. 12:21), ‘to sin before,’ ‘previously’; προ-ορίζω (Ro. 8:29), to ‘pre-ordain.’ Cf. πρό-κριμα (1 Tim. 5:21), ‘pre-judgment.’ In these respects the N. T. merely follows in the wake of the older Greek. One may illustrate πρό still further by the comparative πρό-τερος and the superlative πρῶ-τος (cf. Doric πρῶ-τος). Cf. also πρό-σω, προ-πέρνησ.

3. The Cases Used with πρό. These call for little comment. It is barely possible that οὐρανόθι πρό in Homer may be a remnant of a locative use. Brugmann thinks that a true genitive is seen in πρὸ θῶν, but this is not certain. But the ablative is probably the case. In very late Greek πρό even appears with the accusative. It is not in the modern Greek vernacular. The ablative is due to the idea of comparison and is found also with the Latin pro. Πρό occurs only 48 times in the N. T. and is almost confined to Matthew’s and John’s Gospels, Luke’s writings and Paul’s Epistles (12 times).

4. Place. Thus it occurs only in four instances, πρὸ τῆς θύρας (Ac. 12:6), πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν (Jas. 5:9), πρὸ τοῦ πυλῶνος (Ac. 12:14), πρὸ τῆς πόλεως (14:13). Cf. ἔμπροσθεν (Mt. 5:24), which is more common in this sense in the N. T. Some MSS. have πρὸ in Ac. 5:23. In Cyprus (borrowing from the literary language) to-day we still have πρὸ κεφαλῆς, ‘at the head of the table’ (Thumb, Handb., p. 98).

1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 449.
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3 Griech. Gr., p. 449.
Thumb


———, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).

5. Time. This is the more common idea with πρό in the N. T. Thus we find such expressions as τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν (Mt. 5:12), πρὸ καρποῦ (8:29), πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ (Mt. 24:38), πρὸ τοῦ ἄριστου (Lu. 11:38), πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα (Jo. 11:55), πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων (1 Cor. 2:7), πρὸ χειμῶνος (2 Tim. 4:21). This is all plain sailing. Nor need one stumble much at the compound preposition (translation Hebraism) πρὸ προσώπου σου (Mk. 1:2 and parallels). Cf. Ac. 13:24; Lu. 9:52. Nine times we have πρὸ τοῦ with the infinitive, as in Lu. 2:21; 22:15; Jo. 1:48. Here this phrase neatly expresses a subordinate clause of time (antecedent). Cf. ante quam. A real difficulty appears in πρὸ ἔξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (Jo. 12:1), which does look like the Latin idiom in ante diem tertium Kalendas. [Page 622] Jannaris\(^1\) attributes this common idiom in the late Greek writers to the prevalence of the Roman system of dating. This has been the common explanation. But Moulton\(^2\) throws doubt on this “plausible Latinism” by
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showing that this idiom appears in a Doric inscription of the first century B.C. (Michel, 694), πρὸ ἴμερφιν δέκα τῶν μυστηρίων. The idiom occurs also in the inscriptions, πρὸ ἴς Καλανδόν Αὐγούστον, I.M.A. iii. 325 (ii/A.D.), and the papyri, πρὸ δύο ἴμερφιν, F.P. 118 (ii/A.D.). So Moulton proves his point that it is a parallel growth like the Latin. Rouffiac (Recherches, p. 29) re-enforces it by three citations from the Priene inscriptions. Cf. also πρὸ πολλῶν τούτων ἴμερφιν Acta S. Theogn., p. 102. Moulton thinks that it is a natural development from the ablative case with πρὸ, ‘starting from,’ and refers to ὤψ ἱσαββάτων in Mt. 28:1 as parallel. May it not be genuine Greek and yet have responded somewhat to the Latin influence as to the frequency (cf. LXX and the N. T.)? Similarly πρὸ ἔτοων δεκατεσσάρων (2 Cor. 12:2), ‘fourteen years before (ago).’ Abbott3 considers it a transposing of πρὸ, but it is doubtful if the Greek came at it in that way. Simcox4 calls attention to the double genitive with πρὸ in Jo. 12:1, really an ablative and a genitive.

6. Superiority. Πρό occurs in the sense of superiority also, as in πρὸ πάντων (Jas. 5:12; 1 Pet. 4:8). In Col. 1:17 πρὸ πάντων is probably time, as in πρὸ ἐμοῦ (Jo. 10:8; Rom. 16:7). Cf. πρὸ τούτων πάντων in Lu. 21:12.

(n) Πρός. The etymology of πρός is not perfectly clear. It seems to be itself a phonetic variation5 of προτί which is found in Homer as well as the form ποτί (Arcad.
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πός, πότ in Bœotian, etc.). What the relation is between ποτί and προτί is not certain.6 The Sanskrit práti is in the locative case. The connection, if any, between πρός and πρό is not made out, except that προ-τί and prá-τί both correspond to πρό and prá. Thayer considers –τί an adverbial suffix.

1. The Meaning.7 It is the same as ποτί and ποτί. The root-idea is ‘near,’ ‘near by,’ according to Delbrück,8 though Brugmann9 inclines to ‘towards.’ In Homer πρός has an adverbial [Page 623] use, πρός δέ, with the notion of ‘besides.’1 ‘Near,’ rather than ‘towards,’ seems to explain the resultant meanings more satisfactorily. The idea seems to be ‘facing,’ German gegen. Cf. πρόσωπον. In ὁ λόγος ἦν πρός τὸν θεόν (Jo. 1:1) the literal idea comes out well, ‘face to face with God.’

2. In Composition. Probably one sees the original notion in προσ-εδρεύω, ‘to sit near’ (cf. Eurip., etc.). Some MSS. read this verb in 1 Cor. 9:13, though the best MSS. have παρεδρεύω. But we do have προσ-κεφάλαμον (Mk. 4:38) and προσ-μένω (Mt. 15:32; 1 Tim. 5:5). Cf. also προσ-φάγιον (Jo. 21:15), and προσ-ορμίζω (Mk. 6:53). The other resultant meanings appear in composition also as ‘towards’ in προσ-άγω (Lu. 9:41), ‘to’ in προσ-κολλάω (Eph. 5:31), ‘besides’ in προσ-οφείλω (Phil. 19), ‘for’ in πρόσ-καρτερέω (Ac. 1:14), πρόσ-πεινος (Ac. 10:10).
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3. Originally with Five Cases. The cases used with πρός were probably originally five according to Brugmann,2 viz. locative, dative, ablative, genitive, accusative. The only doubt is as to the true dative and the true genitive. Delbrück3 also thinks that a few genuine datives and genitives occur. Green4 (cf. πρό, 3) speaks of “the true genitive” with πρό; it is only rarely true of πρός and ὑπέρ. The genitive with πρός is wanting in the papyri and the Pergamon inscriptions (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 117). And in the N. T. no example of the genitive or dative appears. In Lu. 19:37 πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει might possibly be regarded as dative with ἔγγιζοντος; but it is better with the Revised Version to supply “even” and regard it as a locative. In composition (προσέχετε ἑωτοῖς, Lu. 12:1) the dative is common. 2 Maccabees shows the literary use of πρὸς with dative of numbers (Thackeray, Gr., p. 188).

4. The Ablative. There is only one example of the ablative in the N. T. and this occurs in Ac. 27:34, τὸῦ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει. This metaphorical usage means ‘from the point of view of your advantage.’ It is possible also to explain it as true genitive, ‘on the side of.’ This is a classical idiom. So then πρός in the N. T. is nearly confined to two cases. Moulton5 agrees [Page 624] with Blass1 that this is a remnant of the literary style in Luke. Moulton finds the genitive (ablative) 23 times in the LXX. The true genitive appeared in examples like πρὸς τοῦ ποταμοῦ, ‘by the river’ or ‘towards the river.’ In the modern Greek vernacular πρός fades2 before εἰς and διά as the ablative use is going in the N. T. It is rarely used of place and time, and even so the usage is due to the literary language (Thumb, Handbook, p. 106).

5. With the Locative. Πρός indeed occurs in the N. T. with the locative only seven times, so that it is already pretty nearly a one-case preposition. These seven examples are all of place and call for little remark. Cf. πρὸς τῷ ὄρει (Mk. 5:11), πρὸς τῷ μνημείῳ (Jo. 20:11). They are all with verbs of rest save the use with ἔγγιζοντος in Lu. 19:37. See under 3. The correct text gives the locative in Mk. 5:11 and Jo. 20:11, else we should have only five, and D reads the accusative in Lu. 19:37. These seven examples illustrate well the etymological meaning of πρός as ‘near’ or ‘facing.’ Moulton counts 104 examples of πρός and the dative (locative) in the LXX. Four of

2 Griech. Gr., p. 448 f.
Green GREEN, B., Notes on Greek and Latin Syntax (1897).
4 Notes on Gk. and Lat. Synt., p. 163.
Thackeray


———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).

5 Prol., p. 106.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 140.
2 Jann., Gk. Gr., p. 366.
these seven examples are in John’s writings. Cf. especially Jo. 20:12. Moulton (Prol., p. 106) notes “P. Fi. 5 πρὸς τῷ πυλῶνι, as late as 245 A.D.”

6. With the Accusative. It was exceedingly common in Homer and always in the literal local sense. The metaphorical usage with the accusative developed later. How common the accusative is with πρὸς in the N. T. is seen when one notes that the number is 679. This was the classic idiom with πρὸς both literally and metaphorically. It is not necessary to say that πρὸς with the accusative means ‘towards.’ The accusative case implies extension and with verbs of motion πρὸς (‘near’) naturally blends with the rest into the resultant idea of ‘towards.’ This is in truth a very natural use of πρὸς with the accusative, as in ἄνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν (Mk. 3:7). In Mk. 11:1 note both εἰς (Ἰεροσόλυμα) and πρὸς (τῷ ὄρος) with ἔγγιξον. In Phil. 5 (W. H.) the margin has both with persons. Here Lightfoot (in loco) sees a propriety in the faith which is towards (πρὸς) Christ and the love exerted upon (εἰς) men. But that distinction hardly applies in Ro. 3:25 f.; Eph. 4:12. Cf. Mk. 5:19. In Mk. 9:17 W. H. and Nestle accent πρὸς σέ. There seems to be something almost intimate, as well as personal, in some of the examples of πρὸς. The examples of πρὸς with persons are very numerous, as in ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν (Mt. 3:5), δεῦτε πρὸς με (Mt. 11:28), etc. But one must not think that the notion of motion is essential to the use of πρὸς and the accusative (cf. εἰς and ἐν). Thus in Mk. 4:1, πᾶς ὁ δήλως πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἔπι τῆς γῆς ἤσαν, note both ἔπι and πρὸς and the obvious distinction. Cf. also θερμαίνομενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς (Mk. 14:54). It is not strange, therefore, to find πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσίν (Mt. 13:56), πρὸς σέ ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα (26:18). Cf. also ταύτης πρὸς τὴν θύραν in Mk. 2:2. The accusative with πρὸς is not indeed exactly what the locative would be, especially with persons. In Mk. 14:49 we find καθ ἡμέραν ἠμῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκοντων. Abbott properly illustrates Jo. 1:1, ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν with this passage in Mk. and with 2 Cor. 5:8, ἐνδημίσκει πρὸς τὸν κύριον. It is the face-to-face converse with the Lord that Paul has in mind. So John thus conceives the fellowship between the Logos and God. Cf. στόμα πρὸς στόμα 2 Jo. 12, 3 Jo. 14 and πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον in 1 Cor. 13:12. But, while this use of πρὸς with words of rest is in perfect harmony with the root-idea of the preposition itself, it does not occur in the older Greek writers nor in the LXX. Jannaris is only able to find it in Malalas. Certainly the more common Greek idiom would have been παρά, while μετά and σὺν might have been employed. Abbott, however, rightly calls attention to the frequent use of πρὸς with verbs of speaking like λέγω, λαλέω, etc., and Demosthenes has it with ζύω. So then it is a natural step to find πρὸς employed for living relationship, intimate converse. Two very interesting examples of this personal intercourse occur in Lu. 24:14, ὑμῖν πρὸς ἄλληλους, and verse 17, ἀντιβάλετε πρὸς ἄλληλους. Cf. also πρὸς with περιπατεώ (Col. 4:5), κοινωνία (2 Cor. 6:14), διαθήκη (Ac. 3:25 as in ancient Greek), λόγος (Heb. 4:13),

3 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 142.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 106.
6 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 155.
1 Joh. Gr., p. 273 f.
2 lb.
are combined. Delbrück is indeed in doubt as to the origin of πρὸς λίθον (Mt. 4:6). Πρὸς is not used often with expressions of time, and the notion of extension is in harmony with the accusative case. Cf. πρὸς καυρόν in Lu. 8:13, πρὸς ὤραν in Jo. 5:35, πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας in Heb. 12:10. In πρὸς ἐσπέραν (Lu. 24:29) the resultant notion is ‘toward,’ rather than ‘for.’ Blass points out that πρὸς τὸ παρόν (Heb. 12:11) is classical. The metaphorical uses of πρὸς are naturally numerous.Disposition towards one is often expressed by πρὸς, whether it be friendly as in μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας (1 Th. 5:14) or hostile as in ἐν Ἐχθρῷ ὄντες πρὸς αὐτούς (Lu. 23:12). [Page 626] Cf. met  ἄλληλων (ib.). Πρὸς does not of itself mean ‘against,’ though that may be the resultant idea as in γογγύσας—πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους (Ac. 6:1). Cf. also πρὸς πλησιμονὴν τῆς σαρκός (Col. 2:23) and πρὸς τοὺς κτλ. (2 Cor. 5:12). Sometimes πρὸς adds nothing to the vague notion of extension in the accusative case and the idea is simply ‘with reference to.’ Thus πρὸς τοὺς συγγέλους λέγει (Heb. 1:7). Cf. also Lu. 20:19. Πρὸς in the κοινὴ shares with εἰς and peri the task of supplanting the disappearing dative (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 112). In particular πρὸς αὐτόν (–οὺς) takes the place of αὐτῷ (–οῖς) after λέγω, ἔπαιν, ἄποκρίνομαι, as shown by parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels, as in Lu. 3:14, where MSS. vary between αὐτός and πρὸς αὐτούς. Adjectives may have πρὸς in this general sense of fitness, like άγαθός (Eph. 4:29), δυνατά (2 Cor. 10:4), ἰκανός (2 Cor. 2:16), λευκά πρὸς θερμομόν (Jo. 4:35), etc. Cf. also τὸ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Ro. 15:17). The phrase τὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς; (Mt. 27:4) has ancient Greek support. The notion of aim or end naturally develops also as in ἐγράφη πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν (1 Cor. 10:11), πρὸς τί ἐπιθέν (Jo. 13:28), ὁ πρὸς τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην καθήμενος (Ac. 3:10). Cf. 1 Cor. 14:26; 15:34. Some examples of the infinitive occur also in this connection, like πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς (Mt. 6:1), πρὸς τὸ κατακαύσαι αὐτὰ (13:30), etc. In πρὸς τὸ δεῖν προσεύχεσθαι (Lu. 18:1) the notion is hardly so strong as ‘purpose.’ But see Infinitive. Then again cause may be the result in certain contexts as in Μωυσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεπεν (Mt. 19:8). There is no difficulty about the notion of comparison. It may be merely general accord as in πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ (Lu. 12:47), πρὸς τὴν ἄλληλων (Gal. 2:14), or more technical comparison as in οὐκ ἢμα τὸ παθήματα τῶν νῦν καυροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἄποκαλυφθῆναι (Ro. 8:18). With this may be compared πρὸς φθόνον in Jas. 4:5, where the phrase has an adverbial force.

(o) Σύν. The older form ξύν (old Attic) appears in some MSS. in 1 Pet. 4:12 (Beza put it in his text here). This form ξύν is seen in ξύνος. In μετα-ξύν both μετά and ξύν(v) are combined. Delbrück is indeed in doubt as to the origin of σύν, but see Mommsen, and some (Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 343) consider ξύν and σύν different.

5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 139.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 139.
Mommsen

Mommsen, T., Beiträge zur Lehre der griech. Präpositionen (1886–1895).
1. The Meaning. This is in little dispute. It is ‘together with.’ Cf. Latin *cum* and English *con*-comitant. The associative instrumental is the case used with σύν as with ἤμα and it is just that idea that it was used to express originally. It never departed from this idea, for when the notion of help is present it grows naturally out of that of association. The Attic, according to Blass, confines σύν to the notion of ‘including,’ but the Ionic kept it along with μετά for ‘with.’

2. History. It is not without interest. In Homer it is sometimes an adverb (tmesis). Indeed it never made headway outside of poetry save in Xenophon, strange to say. The Attic prose writers use μετά rather than σύν. Thus in 600 pages of Thucydides we find μετά 400 times and ξύν 37, while Xenophon has σύν more than μετά. In Demosthenes the figures run 346 of μετά and 15 of σύν, while Aristotle has 300 and 8 respectively. Monro thinks that μετά displaced σύν in the vernacular while σύν held on in the poets as the result of Homer’s influence and finally became a sort of inseparable preposition like dis- in Latin (cf. ἤμφι— in N. T.). In the modern Greek vernacular σύν is displaced by μέ (μετά) and sometimes by ἤμα. The rarity of σύν in the N. T. therefore is in harmony with the history of the language. Its use in the N. T. is largely confined to Luke’s Gospel and Acts and is entirely absent from John’s Epistles and the Apocalypse as it is also from Hebrews and 1 Peter, not to mention 2 Thessalonians, Philemon and the Pastoral Epistles. It is scarce in the rest of Paul’s writings and in Mark and Matthew, and John’s Gospel has it only three times (12:2; 18:1; 21:3). It occurs in the N. T. about 130 times (over two-thirds in Luke and Acts), the MSS. varying in a few instances.

3. In Composition. Here σύν is extremely common. See list of these verbs in chapter on Cases (Instrumental). Cf. Thayer’s Lexicon under σύν. The use in composition illustrates the associative idea mainly as in συν-ἀγω (Mt. 2:4), συν-έρχο— (Mk. 3:20), though the notion of help is present also, as in συν-ἀντι-λαμβάνομαι (Lu. 10:40), συν-εργέω (1 Cor. 16:16). Cf. χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω (Ph. 2:17 f.). The “perfective” use of σύν is seen in συν-καλόπτω (Lu. 12:2), συν-κλέιο (Ro. 11:32), συν-κύπτω (Lu. 13:11). Cf. συντελέω, συντηρέω, etc. In σύνοιδα the knowing may be either with another, as possibly Ac. 5:2, or with one’s self, as in 1 Cor. 4:4.

———, Die Præp. σύν und μετά bei den nachhom. Epikern (1879).
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GILES, P., A Short Manual of Comparative Philology. 2d ed. (1901).


5 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 454.

1 Delbrück, Die Grundl., p. 133.

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 132.

3 Cf. Mommsen, Entw. etc., p. 4 f.


4 Hom. Gr., p. 147.


6 Cf. on the whole subject Mommsen, Entw., p. 395.
The verb συνέχω (Lu. 22:63; Ac. 18:5) is found in the papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 160. Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, 1911, p. 278). As already explained, the case used is the associative-instrumental. In the very late Greek the accusative begins to appear with σῶν (as indeed already in the LXX!) and both σῶν and ἃμα show1 examples of the genitive like μετά.

4. *N. T. Usage.* There is very little comment needed on the N. T. usage of the preposition beyond what has already been given.2 The bulk of the passages have the notion of accompaniment, like σῶν σοι ἀπὸθανέν (Mt. 26:35). So it occurs with μένειν (Lu. 1:56), καθίσαι (Ac. 8:31), etc. Cf. also σῶν ὁλῇ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (Ac. 15:22),

Deissmann


———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

Moulton and Milligan

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.


2 Cf. Westcott on Jo. 1:2 for discussion of distinction between σῶν and μετά.
where the use of σῶν may subordinate the church a bit to the Apostles (Thayer).3 Cf. also Ac. 14:5; Lu. 23:11, where καί rather than σῶν might have occurred. As applied to Christ, σῶν, like ἐν, may express the intimate mystic union, as in κέκρυπται σῶν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ (Col. 3:3). The phrase οἱ σῶν is used much like οἱ παρὰ, οἱ περί, οἱ μετά. Thus Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σῶν αὐτῶν (Lu. 9:32). Cf. Lu. 5:9 and Mk. 2:26. Once σῶν occurs in a context where the idea is ‘besides,’ ἀλλὰ γε καὶ σῶν πέζων τούτων (Lu. 24:21). Cf. Neh. 5:18. So probably also Ph. 1:1. It appears in the papyri in this sense also. Cf. Moulton and Milligan, “Lexical Notes on the Papyri,” The Expositor, 1911, p. 276. In Mt. 8:34 Text. Rec. reads ἕς συνάντησιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ where critical text has ὑπ—. The case of Ἰησοῦ is associative-instrumental in either instance. MSS. give σω— in other passages. The use of σῶν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου (1 Cor. 5:4) has a technical sense (‘together with’) seen in the magical papyri and in an Attic cursing tablet (iii/B.C.). Cf. Deissmann, Light, etc., p. 304 f. See also Deissmann’s Die neut. Formel “in Christo Jesu” for discussion of σῶν Χριστῷ, the notion of fellowship in Ph. 1:23. He now cites a grafittos with these words to a deceased person, εὐχόμαι καθὼς ἐν τάχυ σῶν σοι ἔλλαν (Light, p. 305). Cf. Col. 3:3. In 1 Th. 4:17 note ἰδι μι σῶν αὐτῶς and in 5:10 ἰδι μι σῶν αὐτῶ like our “together with,” which shows also the retreat of σῶν before ἰδι. For σω-επι and κατά see Ac. 16:22.

(p) Υπέρ. In Homer, by anastrophe, sometimes we have ὑπέρ. Cf. Sanskrit utrági (locative case of utrá), Zend utárá, Latin super, Gothic ufār, German über, Anglo-Saxon over, English over. The [Page 629] oldest Indo-Eur. locative1 was without i. A longer comparative occurs in ὑπέρτερος, and a superlative ὑπέρτατος shortened into ὑπατος. Cf. Latin superus, summus, and English up, upper, uppermost.

1. The Meaning. It is therefore clear enough. It is the very English word ‘over’ or ‘upper.’ Chaucer uses ‘over’ in the sense of ‘upper.’ As an adverb it does not occur in Homer, though Euripides (Medea, 627) has ὑπέρ ἄγαν. Jannaris2 calls ὑπέρ (Blass ὑπέρ) ἔγα (2 Cor. 11:23) “the monstrous construction,” which is rather overdoing the matter. The use of the preposition is not remarkably abundant in the N. T.

2. In Composition. The N. T. has also the compound prepositions ὑπεράνω (Eph. 1:21), ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ (Eph. 3:20), ὑπερέκκινα (2 Cor. 10:16) and the adverbs ὑπερπλαν (2 Cor. 11:5), ὑπερβαλλόντως (2 Cor. 11:23). The literal meaning of ὑπέρ (‘over’) appears in ὑπερ-ἀνω (Heb. 9:5), ὑπέρ αὐτήν (ib. D), ὑπερ-ων (‘upper room,’ Ac. 1:13). The notion of ‘excess,’ ‘more than’ (comparison), appears in ὑπεραύρω (2 Cor. 12:7), ὑπερ-εκπερισσοῦ (1 Th. 3:10), ὑπερ-ἐκχω (Ph. 4:7), ὑπερ-νικάω (Ro. 8:37), ὑπερ-υψόω (Ph. 2:9), ὑπερ-φρονέω (Ro. 12:3). ‘Beyond’ is rather common also, as in ὑπερ-ακμος (1 Cor. 7:36), ὑπερ-ανυγάνω (2 Th. 1:3), ὑπερ-βαίνω (1 Th. 4:6), ὑπερ-εκτείνω in 2 Cor. 10:14, ὑπερ-ἐκείνα (10:16), and this grows into the “perfective” idea as in ὑπερ-ήφανος (Ro. 1:30), ὑπερ-ὑψωσεν (Ph. 2:9), ὑπερ-σχή (1 Tim. 2:2), ὑπερ-πλεονάζω (1 Tim. 1:14). Cf. English “over-zealous,” “over-anxious,” etc. The negative notion of ‘overlook’ appears in ὑπερ-ἡδον (Ac. 17:30). The idea of ‘defence,’ ‘in behalf of,’ ‘bending over to protect,’ occurs in ὑπερ-

3 Cf. the use of σῶν καί in the pap. Deiss., B. S., p. 265 f.
1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 146; Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 228.
εντυγχάνω (Ro. 8:26). In the late Greek vernacular ὑπέρ fades before ὑπεράνω and διά and already in the N. T. the distinction between περί and ὑπέρ is not very marked in some usages, partly due to the affinity in sound and sense. Passages where the MSS. vary between ὑπέρ and περί are Mk. 14:24; Jo. 1:30; Ac. 12:5; Ro. 1:8; Gal. 1:4, etc.

3. With Genitive? A word is needed about the cases used with ὑπέρ. There is no trouble as to the accusative, but it is a mooted question whether we have the true genitive or the ablative. Brugmann views the case as genitive without hesitation and cites the Sanskrit use of upari in support of his position. But [Page 630] on the side of the ablative we note Kühner-Gerth and Monro, while Delbrück admits that either is possible, though leaning to the genitive. Where such doctors disagree, who shall decide? The Sanskrit can be quoted for both sides. The main argument for the ablative is the comparative idea in ὑπέρ which naturally goes with the ablative. On the whole, therefore, it seems to me that the ablative has the best of it with ὑπέρ.

4. With Ablative. Certainly as between the ablative and the accusative, the ablative is far in the lead. The figures are, ablative 126, accusative 19. On the whole, therefore, ὑπέρ drops back along with ὑπό. There is no example of the strictly local use of ὑπέρ in the N. T. unless οἱ βαπτίζοντες ὑπέρ τῶν νεκρῶν (1 Cor. 15:29) be so understood, which is quite unlikely. This obscure passage still remains a puzzle to the interpreter, though no difficulty arises on the grammatical side to this or the other senses of ὑπέρ. The N. T. examples are thus metaphorical. These uses fall into four divisions.

The most common is the general notion of ‘in behalf of,’ ‘for one’s benefit.’ This grows easily out of the root-idea of ‘over’ in the sense of protection or defence. Thus in general with προσέχομαι (Mt. 5:44), δέομαι (Ac. 8:24), ἀγωνίζομαι (Col. 4:12), καθίσταμαι (Heb. 5:1), προσφέρω (ib.), etc. The point comes out with special force in instances where κατά is contrasted with ὑπέρ as in εἰς ὑπέρ του ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἐπέρου (1 Cor. 4:6). Cf. also Mk. 9:40; Ro. 8:31. We must not, however, make the mistake of thinking that ὑπέρ of itself literally means ‘in behalf of.’ It means ‘over.’

It is sometimes said that ἄντί means literally ‘instead’ and ὑπέρ ‘in behalf of.’ But Winer sees more clearly when he says: “In most cases one who acts in behalf of

3 Jann., ib., p. 366.
4 Ib., p. 398.
1 I, p. 486.
2 Hom. Gr., p. 147.
4 Moulton, Prosl., p. 105.
5 Cf. W.-Th., p. 382.
6 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 156. Winer (W.-Th., p. 38) implies the same thing. Winer
another takes his place.” Whether he does or not depends on the nature of the action, not on ὄντι or ὑπέρ. In the Gorgias of Plato (515 C.) we have ὑπέρ σοῦ for the notion of ‘instead.’ Neither does πρό (nor Latin pro) in itself mean ‘instead.’ In the Alcestis of Euripides, where the point turns on the substitutionary death of Alcestis for her husband, [Page 631] ὑπέρ occurs seven times, more than ὄντι and πρό together. Cf. Thucydides I, 141 and Xenophon Anab. 7:4, 9 for the substitutionary use of ὑπέρ. In the Epistle to Diognetus (p. 84) we note λύτρον ὑπέρ ἡμῶν and a few lines further the expression is ὄντιλαχαγῆ. Paul’s combination in 1 Tim. 2:6 is worth noting, ὄντιλυτρον ὑπέρ πάντων, where the notion of substitution is manifest. There are a few other passages where ὑπέρ has the resultant notion of ‘instead’ and only violence to the context can get rid of it. One of these is Gal. 3:13. In verse 10 Paul has said that those under the law were under a curse (Ὑπὸ κατάραν). In verse 13 he carries on the same image. Christ bought us “out from under” the curse (Ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου) of the law by becoming a curse “over” us (γενόμενος ὑπέρ ἡμῶν κατάρα). In a word, we were under the curse; Christ took the curse on himself and thus over us (between the suspended curse and us) and thus rescued us out from under the curse. We went free while he was considered accursed (verse 13). It is not a point here as to whether one agrees with Paul’s theology or not, but what is his meaning. In this passage ὑπέρ has the resultant meaning of ‘instead.’ The matter calls for this much of discussion because of the central nature of the teaching involved. In Jo. 11:50 we find another passage where ὑπέρ is explained as meaning substitution, ἵνα εἰς ὄντρωσας ἀποθάνῃ ὑπέρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὄλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπολέσῃ. Indeed Abbott1 thinks that “in almost all the Johannine instances it refers to the death of one for the many.” In Philemon 13, ὑπέρ σοῦ μοι διακονη, the more obvious notion is ‘instead.’ One may note ἔγραψα ὑπέρ αὐτοῦ μὴ ἱδότος γράμματα, P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66), where the meaning is obviously ‘instead of him since he does not know letters.’ Deissmann (Light, p. 152 f.) finds it thus (ἔγραψεν ὑπέρ αὐτοῦ) in an ostracon from Thebes, as in many others, and takes ὑπέρ to mean ‘for’ or ‘as representative of,’ and adds that it “is not without bearing on the question of ὑπέρ in the N. T.” Cf. ἔγραψα ὑπέρ αὐτοῦ ἄξωμα, B.U. 664 (i.A.D.). In the papyri and the ostraca ὑπέρ often bore the sense of ‘instead of.’ In 2 Cor. 5:15 the notion of substitution must be understood because of Paul’s use of ὁρα ὁ πάντες ἀπέθανον as the conclusion2 from εἰς ὑπέρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν. There remain a [Page 632] number of passages where the notion of substitution is perfectly natural from the nature of the case. But in these passages one may stop in translation with ‘in behalf of’ if he wishes. But there is no inherent objection in ὑπέρ itself to its

WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).


7 Ib. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 135, has nothing on this use of ὑπέρ. Moulton, Prol., p. 105, merely calls ὑπέρ “the more colourless” as compared with ὄντι.

1 Joh. Gr., p. 276.

conveying the notion of ‘instead’ as a resultant idea. In fact it is _per se_ as natural as with ἄντι. In the light of the above one finds little difficulty with passages like Ro. 5:6 f.; 8:32; Gal. 2:20; Jo. 10:11, 15; Heb. 2:9; Tit. 2:14, etc. In Mk. 10:45 we have ἄντι πολλῶν and in 14:24 τὸ αἵμα μου—τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπέρ πολλῶν. But one may argue from 1 Jo. 3:16 that ὑπέρ in case of death does not necessarily involve substitution. Surely the very object of such death is to save life.

The two other uses of ὑπέρ may be briefly treated. Sometimes the resultant notion may be merely ‘for the sake of,’ as in ὑπέρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (Jo. 11:4), ὑπέρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ (Ro. 15:8), ὑπέρ τοῦ ὑνόμισματος (Ac. 5:41), ὑπέρ Χριστοῦ (Ph. 1:29), etc. This is natural in relations of intimate love.

A more general idea is that of ‘about’ or ‘concerning.’ Here ὑπέρ encroaches on the province of περί. Cf. 2 Cor. 8:23, ὑπέρ Τίτου, 2 Th. 2:1, ὑπέρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου. Perhaps 1 Cor. 15:29 comes in here also. Moulton finds commercial accounts in the papyri, scores of them, with ὑπέρ in the sense of ‘to.’ We see the free use (‘concerning’) with verbs like καυχάω (2 Cor. 7:14), φρονέω (Ph. 1:7), κράζω (Ro. 9:27), ἐρωτάω (2 Th. 2:1), etc. The Latin _super_ is in line with this idiom also. Cf. Jo. 1:30, ὑπέρ οὖν ἔγγερτον. In 1 Cor. 10:30, τι βλασφημοῦμαι ὑπέρ οὖν ἔγγερτον πρὸς ὑπαρχόντος, the preposition suits antecedent as well as relative. In 2 Cor. 1:6 and Ph. 2:13 ὑπέρ suggests the object at which one is aiming. Cf. ὑπέρ ὧν ἰδρυτόμεθα ἀπεστάλκαμεν, P. Goodspeed 4 (ii/b.c.); ὑπέρ οὖν λέγω, P. Oxy.37 (A.D. 49); ὑπέρ ἀραβζῶνος, P. Grenf. ii. 67 (A.D. 237), ‘by way of earnest-money.’

5. _The Accusative with ὑπέρ_ calls for little remark. The literal local use of ὑπέρ occurs in D in Heb. 9:5, ὑπέρ δ’ οὐτήν, “an unparalleled use,”2 in the sense of ‘above,’ the other MSS. having ὑπεράνω. The accusative with ὑπέρ has the metaphorical sense of ‘above’ or ‘over,’ as in οὐκ ἐστιν μαθητής ὑπέρ τοῦ διδάσκαλον (Mt. 10:24). Cf. also τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπέρ πάντων ὄνομα (Ph. 2:9), κεφαλήν ὑπέρ πάντα (Eph. 1:22), οὗκετί τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκκλησίαν ὑπέρ ὑπερασπίζεται (Ph. 16). This notion easily gets into that of ‘beyond’ in harmony with the accusative case. Thus ὑπέρ ἄνευ ἐγγυώσεως (1 Cor. 4:6), περισσότερος ὑπέρ ἰδίω κόσμου (1 Cor. 10:13). Cf. ὑπέρ δύναμιν (2 Cor. 1:8), [Page 633] ὑπέρ πολλῶν (Gal. 1:14), ὑπέρ τῆς λαμπρότητας (Ac. 26:13). Classical Greek only shows the beginning of the use of ὑπέρ with comparatives,1 but the N. T. has several instances. Thus the LXX often uses it with comparatives, partly because the Hebrew had no special form for the comparative degree.2 But the κοινή shows the idiom. So we find φρονεμόσετα ὑπέρ τοὺς ιερόν (Lu. 16:8), τομῷ ὑπέρ πᾶσαν θύσιν μάχαιραν (Heb. 4:12), ὑπέρ τῆς εὐλογίας (Heb. 2:9), ὑπέρ τοῦ ἐκκλησίας (Ac. 26:13).

1 Prol., p. 105.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 313.
4 C. and S., Sel. from LXX, p. 84.
5 Ibid., p. 108.
Historical writers the locative and accusative with ὑπέρ have also the idea of 'up' in Homer. But the modern editors are against him. It has disappeared in modern Greek vernacular before γά (Thumb, Handb., p. 105).

(q) ὑπό. Little is called for by way of etymology since ὑπό is the positive of ὑπέρ. Cf. the Sanskrit ुप, Latin su, Gothic uf, possibly also German auf; English up, ab-ove. The form ὑπό is of unknown case, but the Elean dialect has also ὑπαί (dative.)

1. The Original Meaning. This was probably 'upwards' or 'from under.' Unlike κατά, ὑπό never means 'downwards.' As a matter of fact, 'up' and 'under' are merely relative terms. The very English word up is probably ὑπό. Cf. ὑπό 'aloft,' ὑπ-τίος 'facing upwards,' ὑπ-ατός 'uppermost,' ὑπιστος. The meaning of under or beneath is common in the N. T., as ὑπό τὸν μύδον (Mt. 5:15).

2. In Composition. Here ὑπό appears simply with the notion of 'under' as in ὑποκάτω (Mk. 7:28), ὑπο-οπλάζω (1 Cor. 9:27), ὑπο-γραμμός (1 Pet. 2:21), ὑπο-πόδιον (Mt. 5:35), ὑπο-δέω (Mk. 6:9). Cf. also ὑπο-δείγμα (Jo. 13:15), ὑπο-ζύγιον (Mt. 21:5). In ὑπο-κρισις (Mt. 23:28), ὑπο-κριτής (Mt. 6:2) the notion of an actor under a mask lies behind the resultant idea. The idea of hospitality (under one’s roof) is natural with ὑπο-δέχομαι (Lu. 10:38), ὑπο-λαμβάνω (3 Jo. 8). In Ro. 16:4 ὑπο-τίθημι has the idea of 'put under,' as ὑπο-ζώννυμι (Ac. 27:17), 'undergird.' In ὑπο-λαβόν [Page 634] ὑπέτειν (Lu. 10:30) the notion of interrupting or following a speech comes from the idea of 'up' in ὑπό, taking up the talk, etc. The "perfective" idea appears in ὑπο-λειπο (Ro. 11:3), 'leave behind or over.' So with ὑπο-τρέχο (Ac. 27:16), 'run under or past.' Cf. ὑπο-πλέω (Ac. 27:4, 7), 'sail close by.' But in ὑπο-πνέο (Ac. 27:13) the preposition minimizes the force of the verb, 'blow softly.' Cf. our suspicion, the French soupçon. So with under-estimate. In ὑπο-βάλλω (Ac. 6:11) the notion of suggestion has an evil turn, but in ὑπο-μιμήσις (Jo. 14:26) there is no such colour. The idea of subjection (note how these ideas appear in English usage all along) occurs in ὑπο-ακούο (Ph. 2:12), ὑπ-είκο (Heb. 13:17), etc. In ὑπ-αντάω (Mt. 8:28) the special force of ὑπό has rather disappeared. Cf. our vulgar "meet up" with one. So ὑπ-εναντίος (Col. 2:14).

3. The Cases Once Used with ὑπό. The locative was originally very common with ὑπό, as in Homer, even with verbs of motion. As a matter of fact, however, in the historical writers the locative and accusative with ὑπό are very rare as compared with the ablative, though Appian and Herodian use the locative more than the accusative.

---

3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 135.
4 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 452.
5 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 139.
1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 140.
But the locative retreated before the accusative with ὑπό till in the N. T. and the modern Greek it has disappeared. In the N. T. the accusative shows 50 examples and the ablative 165, but in the vernacular of the Byzantine Greek the accusative with ὑπό disappears before ὑποκάτω and ὑποκάτω. In the modern Greek vernacular ὑπό has displaced ὑπό (Thumb, Handb., p. 102). Brugmann even thinks that ὑπό once occurred with the instrumental case, and he is clear that the ablative, as well as the genitive, was found with it. Delbrück agrees to both ablative and genitive. Thus originally ὑπό occurred with five cases (loc., instr., acc., abl., gen.). In the N. T. we meet only the accusative and ablative. No example of the pure genitive with ὑπό occurs in the N. T. In Jo. 1:50 we find εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς, but not ὑπό. So also in some other N. T. passages where a genitive with ὑπό might have been used. Cf. Mk. 7:28; Lu. 8:16, etc. The accusative with ὑπό, as in ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς, supplants the genitive also in the N. T. The use of ὑπό for agency and cause is ablative like the Latin usage with ab (a).

4. With the Accusative. It is considered by Winer to be the original use of ὑπό. This indeed would accord with the notion of 'upwards,' 'up from under.' But in the N. T., as in the later Greek, the accusative occurs with the notion of rest (cf. εἰς). The accusative in the N. T. takes the place of the local use of ὑπό with locative and genitive. Thus we find (motion) τιθέασιν αὐτόν ὑπό τὸν μόδιον (Mt. 5:15), but also (rest) ὑπό τῆς συκῆς (Jo. 1:48). Other examples with verbs of rest are ὑπό τῆς κατασκηνοῦν (Mt. 4:32), ὑπό τὸν οὐρανόν (Ac. 4:12), with εἰς, we have ὑπό τὰ χείλη (Ro. 3:13), ὑπό νόμον (Ro. 6:14 f.), ὑπό παράγωγον (Gal. 3:25), etc. These examples are as freely used as those like ἤνα μοῦ ὑπό τῆς στέγης εἰσέλθης (Mt. 8:8). The examples are both local as with ἐπισυνάγω (Lu. 13:34) and figurative as with ταπεινόω (1 Pet. 5:6). Cf. Ac. 4:12 ὑπό τὸν οὐρανόν with ὑπό Δια Ἡλιον ἔπι λότροι P. Oxy. 48, 49, 722 (A.D. 86, 100, 91). Cf. Deissmann, Light, etc., p. 332. Only one instance of the use of ὑπό with time appears in the N. T., ὑπό τὸν ὄρθρον (Ac. 5:21), where it has the notion of ‘about’ (or ‘close upon’) dawn. John uses ὑπό with the accusative only once (Jo. 1:48) and with the ablative only five times (Jo. 14:21; 3 Jo. 12 bis; Rev. 6:8, 13), an incidental argument for unity of authorship.

5. With the Ablative. In the sense of efficient cause or agent it was the commonest classical usage and it continues so in the N. T. The local and temporal uses do not occur, but only the metaphorical. These occur after passive or neuter verbs. Abbott thinks that John preferred to represent the agent as performing the act and so avoided
The ancient Greek indeed used ὑπό chiefly in this sense of agent. The use of ὁποθνήσκω ὑπό as the correlative of ἀποκτείνω is well known.7 In the N. T. once (Rev. 6:8) ὑπό actually occurs with the active of ἀποκτείνω (ἀποκτείνα ἐν ὑποφάια) —καὶ ὑπό τῶν θηρίων. This is probably due to the desire to distinguish between the living agent and the lifeless causes preceding.8 But the N. T. has neuter verbs with ὑπό, like ὀπόλλωμαι (1 Cor. 10:9), λαμβάνο (2 Cor. 11:24), πάσχω (Mk. 5:26), ὕπομένον (Heb. 12:3). In the case of passive verbs the usage follows the traditional lines. Cf. Mt. 4:1 for two examples, ἀνήχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος, [Page 636] περισσόθηκα ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. It is to be noted that in Lu. 9:8 ὑπό is not repeated with ὅλον. The bulk of the N. T. instances of ὑπό occur of personal agency like ἀπόλλω (Mt. 3:6), διεσπάσθαι ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ (Mk. 5:4), etc. Sometimes, when διὰ is added to ὑπό, a distinction is made between the intermediate and the mediate agent, as in τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (Mt. 1:22). Cf. 2:15. There is nothing peculiar about the use of ὑπό in 2 Pet. 1:17, φωνὴς ἐν ὑποθεσίᾳ ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης.1 But ὑπό is not the only way of expressing the agent. Besides διὰ for the indirect agent ἀπό is the most common2 substitute for ὑπό, though ἐκ and παρὰ both are found for the notion of agency. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 116) speaks of ἐπό as “die eigentlich prädestinierte Partikel.” The instrumental case and ἐν and the locative must also be recalled. But διὰ with the accusative (motive or cause) must not be confounded with this idea. Cf. Lu. 21:17 for ὑπὸ with ablative and διὰ with the accusative. The prepositions will richly repay one’s study, and often the whole point of a sentence turns on the prepositions. In Lu. 5:19 eight prepositions occur, counting ἐν ὑπορεσθεῖν, and many such passages are found as Gal. 2:1, 2. Cf. Joy, On the Syntax of Some Prepositions in the Greek Dialects (1904).

VIII. The “Adverbial” Prepositions. The list in the N. T. of those prepositions which do not occur in composition with verbs is considerable. As already remarked in the beginning of this chapter, what are called “proper” prepositions were originally adverbs, fixed case-forms which came to be used with nouns and in composition with verbs. We have followed the varied history of this most interesting group of words. Homer3 in particular used most of them at times merely adverbially. In Homer the “regular” prepositions often retain this adverbial force, as ἐν δὲ, παρὰ δὲ, and this separation from a verb is no longer considered a “surgical operation” (tmesis). Cf. Seymour, Homeric Language and Verse, 25, 78. Some of these prepositions gradually

7 Moulton, Prol., p. 156.
8 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 157.
1 W.-Th., p. 369.
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disappeared, but the total use of prepositions greatly increased. This increase was due
to the wider use of the remaining prepositions and the increasing use of so-called
“improper” prepositions, adverbs with cases that never came to be used in
composition with verbs. The Sanskrit had no proper class of prepositions, but a
number of [Page 637] adverbs which were sometimes used with cases. These
adverbial prepositions varied constantly in the history of the Greek. Some of them,
like ἰνευ, ἐγγύς, ἐνεκα, come right on down from Homer. Others drop by the way
while each age sees a new crop coming on. But in the late vernacular a number of
these prepositional adverbs are followed by the preposition before the case, like
ἀποκάτω ἀπό. In the modern Greek the improper prepositions are used either with the
 accusative (only with enclitic pronoun) or by the addition of ἐς, ἀπό, µε with the
accurseative. They are quite new formations, but made from ancient Greek material
(Thumb, Handb., p. 107). From our point of view any adverb that occurs with a case
may be regarded as a prepositional adverb, like ἀξίως ὑπερτής (Ps. 140:6), but surely that is going too far. Cf.
τὰ κρείσσονα καὶ ἔχοντας σωτηρίας (Heb. 6:9). There is more excuse for claiming ἐσώτερον τῆς κολυβήθρας (Is. 22:11).

[Page 638] It will pay us to take up briefly these adverbial prepositions. All of them use the
genitive or the ablative case except ἄμα (instrumental) and ἐγγύς (dative).

2 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 150.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 122, 127 f.
4 C. and S., Sel. from LXX, p. 86 f.
5 Lang. of the N. T., p. 159.
6 Conybeare and Stock CONYBEARE and STOCK, Selections from the LXX. A
Grammatical Introduction (1905).
7 B. S., p. 213 f.
8 Krebs, Die Präpositionsadverbien in der späteren hist. Gräc., I. Tl., p. 4 f., gives a
list of 61, and 31 of his list do not appear in the N. T., while 12 are in the N. T. that he
does not mention, viz. ἐναντι, ἐνάντιον, κατέναντι, κατενώπιον, κυκλόθεν, µέσον,
ὀπίσω, ὑψό, παραπλήσιον, παρεκτός, ὑπέκεινα, ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ. This list by Krebs
shows the freedom in the κοινή development of adv. prep.
1. Ἄμα. It is probably in the instrumental case itself. Brugmann\(^1\) connects the word with the root of ἄς, μία, ἕν as seen in ἂ-παξ, ἂ-πλοῦς, Cretan ἄμυκς, Latin semel, Sanskrit sāmā, English same. Cf. also ἄμυφ, ἕ-κατόν. It occurs in Homer with the associative-instrumental case.\(^2\) The word occurs in the N. T. only ten times and usually as adverb, either merely with the verb as in Ro. 3:12, LXX, or with δὲ καί (1 Tim. 5:13; Phil. 22). Cf. καί in Col. 4:3. Three of the examples are with participles (Col. 4:3 above and Ac. 24:26; 27:40). Twice we find ἄμα σῶν with the instrumental, a sort of double preposition after the manner of the later Greek (1 Th. 4:17; 5:10) and once ἄμα πρωί with adverb (Mt. 20:1). The use of ἄμα σῶν Thayer explains by taking ἄμα as an adverb with the verb. Only once does it occur as a simple preposition with the instrumental, ἄμα αὖτος (Mt. 13:29). For the later revival of ἄμα and use like μετά see Jannaris.\(^3\) In 2 Esdr. 17:3 ἄν is translated by ἄμα. In the Acta Nerei ἄμα is used only with the genitive (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 119).

2. Ἄνευ. It is of uncertain etymology.\(^4\) Homer has another form, ἄνευθεν, the Eleatic ἄνευ-ς, the Epidaurian ἄνευ-ν, the Megarian ἄνις. There is, however, no doubt as to the meaning, ‘without’ or ‘besides,’ and the case used is the ablative. There are only three examples in the N. T., not counting Mk. 13:2, where W. H. and Nestle reject ἄνευ χειρῶν. Two of these (1 Pet. 3:1; 4:9) occur with abstract words, and one (Mt. 10:29) with τοῦ πατρός. The word is rare in the late Greek, especially with a case.\(^5\)

3. Ἀντικρυς (some editors ἄντικρυ). It is a compound form that originally meant ‘straight on,’ but in later Greek occurs in the sense of ‘opposite,’ ‘face to face.’ It was common in the ancient Greek as adverb of place or as preposition. In the N. T. we find it only once (Ac. 20:15) and the case used is the genitive, ἄντικρυς Χίου. It occurs in modern Greek vernacular (Thumb, Handb., p. 109).

4. Ἀντίπερα (ἀντί-πέραν, Polybius, etc.). It is just ἄντι and πέραν combined. Thucydides uses ἄντιπέρας as adverbial preposition. Only one example occurs in the N. T. (Lu. 8:26), ἄντιπερα τῆς Γαλιλαίας. The case is open to dispute, since ἄντι comes with the genitive and πέραν with the ablative. ‘Over against’ would be genitive, ‘on the other side of’ would be ablative. Either will make sense in Lu. 8:26. Probably genitive is the case here.

5. Ἐπάναντι. It is a triple compound of ἐπό, ἐν, ἄντι. A number of adverbial prepositions were formed on ἄντι as a base. In the N.T. we find also ἐπαντί, ἐπαντίον, κατέναντι. These are late, except ἐπαντίον (from Homer on. Cf. ἐντα, ἐν-αντα). Polybius uses ἐπάναντι with the genitive, and it is common with this case in the LXX\(^1\) (cf. Gen. 3:24). In the N. T. it occurs only six times, and in two of these (Mt. 27:24; Mk. 12:41) W. H. put κατάναντι in the text and ἐπάναντι in the marg. Of the

---

3 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 397.
5 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 337. In Eleatic ἄνευς occurs with the acc. 1 C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 86.
remaining four examples two (Ac. 3:16; Ro. 3:18) have the sense merely of ‘before,’ ‘in the sight or presence of.’ One (Mt. 27:61) has the notion of ‘opposite’ or ‘over against,’ while the fourth (Ac. 17:7) takes on a hostile idea, ‘against.’ These resultant ideas all come naturally out of the threefold combination. The other compounds with ἀντί will be noted later.

6. Ἀτερ. This word is of unknown origin, but compare Old Saxon sundir, Old High German suntar, Sanskrit saññatā. It is common in Homer and the poets generally. Later prose uses it. But it occurs only once in the LXX (2 Macc. 12:15) and twice in the N. T. (Lu. 22:6, 35). The case is clearly the ablative, and the meaning is ‘without.’ One example, ἄτερ ὄχλου, is with persons and the other, ἄτερ ἀλλαγμένου, is with a thing.

7. Ἀχρι(ς). It is related to μέχρι(ς) whatever its origin. Cf. usque in Latin and ἄχρι εἰς like usque ad. As a mere adverb it no longer occurs in the N. T., but it is common both as a preposition and as a conjunction. In the form ἄχρι εἰς ὦ (Ac. 7:18) and ἄχρι ἤ ἡμέρας (Mt. 24:38) it is both preposition and conjunction (resultant temporal phrase). Leaving out these examples, ἄχρι is found 30 times in the N. T. (W. H. text) and some MSS. read ἄχρι in Ac. 1:22 and 20:4, while in Mt. 13:30 the MSS. vary between ἄχρι, μέχρι and ἐς (W. H.). The meaning is ‘up to’ and the case used is the genitive. It occurs with place (Ac. 13:6), persons (Ac. 11:5), time (Ac. 13:11) and abstract ideas (Ac. 22:4, 22). It occurs mainly in Acts, Paul’s writings and Revelation. Cf. its use with the adverb ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν (Ro. 8:22).

8. Ἐγγύς. It is a mere adverb (see comp. ἐγγύτερον, superl. ἐγγιστα) possibly related to ἐγ-γύη. It is common in Homer both as adverb and with the genitive. The late Greek added the true [Page 640] dative and all three uses (adverb, gen., dat.) occur in the N. T. There are nineteen examples of the pure adverb in the N. T. (cf. Mt. 24:32), one the comparative (Ro. 13:11) and the superlative in some MSS. in Mk. 6:36. There are eight examples of the genitive with ἐγγύς (cf. Jo. 11:54). Only four times does ἐγγύς have the dative (Ac. 9:38; 27:8), counting the indeclinable Ἱεροσολὴμ (Lu. 19:11; Ac. 1:12), in which case Luke (4) would have the dative uniformly and John (6) and Heb. (2) the genitive (H. Scott). Once (Heb. 6:8) it is postpositive.

9. Ἐκτός. It is a combination of ἐκ and the adverbial ending –τος with which may be compared Latin coelitus. The case used with it is, of course, the ablative and it is just a fuller expression of ἐκ, meaning ‘without.’ In the N. T. we find it only eight times, four of these with the ablative, as in 1 Cor. 6:18 (cf. with the relative in Ac. 26:22). Note position of Ἐκτός λέγον ὄν in Ac. 26:22. Three times we have Ἐκτός εἰ μή (1 Cor. 14:5; 15:2; 1 Tim. 5:19), which is a pleonasm due first to the use of Ἐκτός εἰ. Deissmann (Bible Studies, p. 118) cites an inscription of Mopsuestia for “this jumbled phrase,” peculiarly apropos since Paul was Cilician, Ἐκτός εἰ μὴ [ἐ]ῶν Μάγνα μονὴ θε[ς]ἡ Ἡσ. Once (Mt. 23:26) Ἐκτός is probably a mere adverb used as a substantive, though even here it may be regarded as a preposition.

---
10. Ἐπροσθεν. This is merely ἐν and πρόσθεν which adverb used the ablative\(^2\) when it had a case. In the N. T. it is still four times a mere adverb of place, as in Rev. 4:6, but it is usually a preposition with the ablative. It occurs with words of place, as in Mt. 5:24, with persons (Mt. 5:16), and sometimes with the notion of rank (Jo. 1:15). As a preposition it appears 44 times in the N. T.

11. Ἐναντί. (Cf. Ἐναντα in Homer.) It is one of the ἄντα compounds and is found with the genitive case when it has a case. It is very common in the LXX even after Swete\(^3\) has properly replaced it often by Ἐναντίον. The old Greek did not use it. In the N. T., W. H. accept it in Lu. 1:8 and Ac. 8:21 (though some MSS. in both places read Ἐναντίον) and reject it in Ac. 7:10. It is not found in the N. T. as a mere adverb.

12. Ἐναντίον. This is, of course, merely the neuter singular of Ἐναντίος (cf. Mk. 6:48), and is common in the older Greek as in the LXX. For the papyri see Ἐναντίον ἄνδρᾳ τριῶν P. Eleph. 1 [Page 641] (B.C. 311). In the N. T. it does not occur as a mere adverb, but we find it five times as a preposition with the genitive (cf. Lu. 1:6), all with persons (cf. Latin _coram_).

13. Ἐνεκα. It occurs in three forms in the N. T., either Ἐνεκα (Lu. 6:22), Ἐνεκεν (9:24) or Ἐνεκεν (18:29), but always as a preposition (‘for the sake of’), never as mere adverb. These variations existed in the earlier Greek also. In the κοινή, Ἐνεκαν is the more usual (Schweizer, _Perg. Inschr._, p. 35). Only twice, however, is it postpositive in the N. T., and this after the interrogative (Ac. 19:32) or the relative (Lu. 4:18, LXX). The case used is the genitive. The etymology is quite uncertain, but the form

---

\(^2\) Ib., p. 456.
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ένεκεν is Ionic and partially in the κοινή supersedes the Attic. 1 The preposition occurs 26 times in the N. T. Once (2 Cor. 7:12) we find it used with τοῦ and the infinitive. Cf. ένεκεν and διά Lu. 21:12, 17.

14. Ἐντός. It is like the Latin in-tus (opposite of ἐκτός) and has the same ending – τος. It means ‘within’ and as a preposition is used with the genitive. The word occurs only twice in the N. T., once as an adverb with the article (Mt. 23:26), though even this may be regarded as a preposition with the article and the genitive (cf. ἐκτός, Mt. 23:26), and once as a preposition (Lu. 17:21) with the genitive. Thayer cites two passages from Xenophon where Ἐντός may have the idea of ‘among’ and claims that this is the idea in Lu. 17:21, because of the context. But the meaning in Xenophon is disputed and Liddell and Scott give only ‘within’ for Ἐντός. Besides, in one of the new Logia of Jesus we have a similar saying in a context that makes ‘within’ necessary and would seem to settle the point about the passage in Luke: ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν Ἐντός ήμῶν ἔστιν.

15. Ἐνώπιον. This is the neuter singular of the adjective Ἐνώπιος which (Thayer) is from the phrase ἐν ὑπί (ὁ ἐν ὑπί ήν). Homer uses τά Ἐνώπια, but no example of the adverb or preposition Ἐνώπιον occurs before the time of the LXX. Deissmann 3 thinks it possible, but not probable, that it was first used in this sense as a translation of the Hebrew לִפְנֵי. A papyrus of the Thebaid from the second or third century B.C. has it also. As a preposition it is very common in the LXX and in the N. T. also. Curiously enough it does not occur in Matthew and Mark, though very [Page 642] common in Luke’s writings and Revelation. The Gospel of John has only one example and the Johannine Epistles two. Cf. also κατενώπιον. In the N. T., Ἐνώπιον is always a preposition with the genitive and it occurs 92 times. It appears sometimes with place (Rev. 4:10), but usually with persons (Lu. 5:25; 12:9 ὅπως), and especially of God (1:15). Sometimes the notion is that of judgment, as in 1 Tim. 2:3. See Wikenhauser, Ἐνώπιον—Ἐνώπιον—κατενώπιον (Bibl. Z., 1910, pp. 263–270).

16. Ἐξω. It is an adverb from ἔξω (cf. ἔσω, ἔξ), and is probably in the ablative case like οὐκώς(ς). As adverb and preposition it is common in the N. T. (16 times) as in the older Greek. It is found as preposition only with the ablative and that 19 times. It means ‘outside’ or ‘without’ and is used in the N. T. only with places, like ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας (Mt. 10:14). John’s Gospel has it 13 times, first Ep. 1, Rev. 2; Paul has it 5, and only as adverb.

17. Ἐξοθεν. It is the same word plus the suffix –θεν, ‘from without,’ and was common in the poets (cf. ἔσωθεν). The case used is the ablative. In the N. T. it is much less frequent (13 times) both as adverb and preposition than ἔξω. Indeed, if τὸ Ἐξοθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου (Mt. 23:25; Lu. 11:39) be not considered the prepositional

---

1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 457.
3 B. S., p. 213.
4 C. and S., p. 87.
usage, there would be only three left (Mk. 7:15; Rev. 11:2; 14:20). There is the same ambiguity in the two passages above that was noted about ἐκτός and ἐντός (Mt. 23:26=Lu. 11:40). Cf. 547 vi.

18. ἕνανος. This is just the preposition ἐπί and the adverb ὡς. It occurs in Attic Greek both as adverb and as preposition. As an adverb it is rare in the N. T. (4 times), once with the relative adverb ὡς (Mt. 2:9), once with a numeral with no effect on the case (1 Cor. 15:6; cf. Mk. 14:5 where the case may arise from προθήκα), once where a pronoun is really implied (Lu. 11:44). As a preposition we find it fifteen times in the N. T. Cf. ἐπάνω ὡς (Mt. 5:14) where it has the somewhat weakened sense of ‘upon’ rather than ‘above.’ The case used is the genitive. Modern Greek vernacular uses it as (ὅ)πως ζ (Thumb, Handbook, p. 109).

19. ἐπέκεινα. It is merely ἐπί and ἐκεῖνα. Thayer suggests the ellipsis of μέρη. It occurs in the Attic Greek both as adverb and as preposition. In the N. T. it appears only once in a quotation from Amos 5:27 and as a preposition with the ablative in the sense of ‘beyond’ (Ac. 7:43. Cf. ὑπερέκεινα).

20. ἐσω. It is the adverb of ἐς (cf. ἐξω) and is in the ablative case. The form ἐσώμελ (ἐς) does not occur in the N. T. nor in the LXX. Indeed the word ἐσω is found only nine times in the N. T. and only one, ἐσω τῆς αὐλῆς (Mk. 15:16), is the prepositional use. The case used with it is the genitive. This, however, is a genuine example, while ἐσωθέν (12 times) is never a preposition in the N. T., unless in Lu. 11:39, τὸ ἐσωθέν ὑμῖν (see p. 642). Cf. ἐσωτερεῖν τῆς κολυμβήθρας (Is. 22:11).

21. ἐσως. In Homer it is both demonstrative and relative adverb (from ἐς ὃς, ἐς ὅς).1 Cf. ὃς and ὅς. The use of ἐςω as a preposition appears in Demosthenes, Aristotle, Polybius, etc. In Northern England and Scotland “while” is used as “till” (Liddell and Scott) and illustrates how ἐςω as conjunction is used in the N. T. It is more common in the N. T. as preposition than conjunction, if the phrases ἐςω ὡς, ἐςω ὅς be treated as conjunctions, as indeed they are, though technically composed of the preposition ἐςω with the genitive of the relative. It is in the later Greek mainly, therefore, that it appears as a preposition (cf. LXX and papyri). The case used with it is the genitive (but very late Greek shows accusative sometimes), and it is found 86 times in the N. T. and 51 of the examples are in the Synoptic Gospels. The preposition is used with places, like ἐςω ὁδοῦ (Mt. 11:23), ἐςω αὐρανοῦ (Lu. 10:15), ἐςω ἀντισχίας (Ac. 11:22); with persons, like ἐςω αὐτοῦ (Lu. 4:42); with expressions of time, like ἐςω τῆς σήμερον (Mt. 27:8), ἐςω ἔρας ἐνάτης (27:45); with abstract expressions, like ἐςω θεώκατο (Mt. 26:38); with notion of measure, like ἐςω ἡμέρους (Mk. 6:23). See Rom. 3:12 ἐςω ἐνός (LXX). Cf. ἀπό—ἐςω in Mt. 1:17; 20:8; 27:51. Seventeen of the examples are uses of ἐςω with an adverb, like ἐςω κάτω (Mt. 27:51), ἐςω ὁπτω (Jo. 2:10), while seven instances of ἐςω πότε occur, like Mt. 17:17. Four times ἐςω occurs with another preposition, like ἐςω πρός (Lu. 24:50), ἐςω ἐπί (Ac. 17:14), ἐςω ἐπώ (21:5). In Mk. 14:54 note ἐςω ἐσοω ἐς. Once (cf. Demosthenes, Aristotle, LXX) we find it with the article and the infinitive ἐςω τοῦ ἐλθεῖν (Ac.

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 129.
1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 151.
8:40). In ἐως τέλους (2 Cor. 1:13), the phrase is almost adverbial. In D (Ac. 19:26), ἐως Ἔφεσον, Blass finds the notion of ‘within.’ In the LXX 2 [Heb.] Esdr. 6:20, ἐως εἰς πάντες, and 1 Chron. 5:10 A, ἐως πάντες, Deissmann (B. S., p. 139) sees a Hebraism.

22. Κατέναντι. It is not found in the older Greek, but appears in the LXX and the N. T. It is especially frequent in the Book of Sirach. But in poetry we find κατέναντα and the word is merely [Page 644] the threefold preposition κατά, ἐν, ἀντί. The MSS. in the N. T. often vary1 between κατέναντι and ἀπέναντι as in Mt. 21:2; 27:24; Ac. 3:16, etc. In Mt. 27:24 and Mk. 12:41 W. H. put ἀπέναντι in the margin. Κατενάντιον, found in Hesiod and Herodotus, does not occur in the N. T. There are only nine examples of κατέναντι in the N. T. One of these (Lu. 19:30) is merely adverbial, while the rest are prepositional. The idea is ‘before,’ ‘over against,’ ‘in the presence of,’ and the case used with it is the genitive. It occurs with place (Mt. 13:3) and persons (Mt. 27:24). Cf. κατέναντι θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ (2 Cor. 2:17; 12:19) and the attraction of relative (ὁ) in the dative to the genitive case of θεοῦ, the incorporated antecedent (Ro. 4:17).

23. Κατενώπιον. It is just ἐνώπιον (see above) and κατά. Homer uses κατένωπα with the genitive, but κατενώπιον appears in the LXX. The N. T. shows only three examples (cf. the frequency of ἐνώπιον), two with persons (Eph. 1:4; Col. 1:22), one with abstract word (Ju. 24). The case used is the genitive and the word means ‘in the presence of.’

24. Κυκλόθεν. It is an old adverb in –θεν that occasionally occurs in the LXX (Jer. 17:26) as a preposition. In the N. T. it appears as a preposition twice with the genitive θρόνου (Rev. 4:3 f.) and once as an adverb (4:8).

25. Κύκλῳ is, of course, merely an adverb in the instrumental case and is common from Homer down. In the LXX it is extremely frequent and occasionally as a preposition with the genitive (Is. 6:2). In the N. T. it is merely an adverb except with τοῦ θρόνου (Rev. 4:6; 5:11; 7:11). Cf. κύκλῳ μέχρι (Ro. 15:19).

26. Μέσον. As a preposition it occurs in Herodotus 7, 170, but was not common. It appears in the late Greek writers and the papyri.2 Many adverbial phrases were made from μέσον which were used as prepositions, some of which survive in the N. T., like ἄνα μέσον, διὰ μέσου (–ον), εἰς μέσον (and εἰς τὸ μέσον), ἐν μέσῳ (and ἐν τῷ μέσῳ), ἐκ μέσου, κατὰ μέσον. But these will be discussed later. The adjective μέσος occurs with the genitive (Lu. 22:55; Jo. 1:26), so that it is not strange to find the adverb with the genitive as in Ph. 2:15, μέσον γενεάς. In Mt. 14:24 W. H. put μέσον in the margin and D reads μέσον in Lu. 8:7; 10:3. See Hatzidakis, Einl., p. 214, for examples. Cf. Homeric μεσσηγύς. The modern Greek vernacular uses μέσας, μέσα ἄπο (Thumb, Handbook, p. 108).

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 127.
3 C. and S., p. 87.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 128.
Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
[Page 645] 27. Metaζο. Like so many of the adverbial prepositions, it is a compound (μετά, ξύν). As a mere adverb, we meet it only twice in the N. T., once in the sense of ‘meanwhile’ (Jo. 4:31), once in the sense of ‘afterwards’ (Ac. 13:42), as commonly in the later Greek. Cf. two-fold use of μετά. As a preposition it occurs seven times in the N. T., with places (Mt. 23:35), persons (Mt. 18:15) and in abstract relations (Ro. 2:15). A good example occurs in Ac. 15:9 where both διά and μεταζο appear.

28. Μέχρι. Like ἄχρι and ἕως, it is both preposition and conjunction as well as originally adverb. No example of the mere adverb is found in the N. T., as it was rare in the older Greek. The form is akin to ἄχρι and the sense is the same. If μέχρις οὖ be treated as a conjunction (cf. ἄχρις οὖ, ἕως οὖ), the preposition with the genitive appears fifteen times with another doubtful reading in Mt. 13:30. It is used with places (Ro. 15:19), persons (Lu. 16:16), time (Ac. 10:30), abstract expressions (Ph. 2:8). Like ἄχρι, the notion of ‘measure’ or ‘degree’ is sometimes present (Heb. 12:4).

29. Ὄπισθεν. It is of uncertain etymology, perhaps related to εἰπί. It occurs in Homer both as adverb and as preposition. In the N. T. we find it five times as adverb and twice as preposition, and some MSS. have it in Rev. 1:10. The case used with it is the ablative. So Ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Lu. 23:26). It means ‘from behind’ and so ‘after’ (Mt. 15:23). It is the opposite of ἔμπροσθεν.

30. Ὄπισω. It is the opposite of πρόσω (cf. πόρρω) and is an ablative adverb from ὅπις (as above). It is very common in the older Greek as an adverb, but it is extremely common in the LXX as a preposition. In the N. T. Ὄπισω occurs alone as an adverb only twice (Mt. 24:18; Lu. 7:38), though we meet τὰ Ὄπισω seven times as in Mk. 13:16. But as a preposition we find it 26 times, mostly with persons, as in the common Ὄπισω οὖ in Mt. 4:19. It is used with the ablative, ‘behind.’ Cf. δεῦτε Ὅπισω οὖ in Mt. 4:19.

31. Ὄψε. This word seems to be another variation of ὅπις and occurs in the ancient Greek, both as an adverb and as a preposition with the genitive (Thuc. 4, 93) with the sense of ‘late on.’ But Philostratus shows examples where Ὅψε with the ablative has the sense of ‘after,’ like Ὅψε τοῦτον = ‘after these things.’ Philostratus uses it also in the sense of ‘late on.’ The papyri use it in the sense of ‘late on’ with the genitive. So Ὅψε τῆς ὥρας P. Par. [Page 646] 37 (ii/B.C.). Hence in Mt. 28:1, Ὅψε σαββάτου may be either late on the Sabbath or after the Sabbath. Either has good support. Moulton is uncertain, while Blass prefers ‘after.’ It is a point for exegesis, not for grammar, to decide. If Matthew has in mind just before sunset, ‘late on’ would be his idea; if he means after sunset, then ‘after’ is correct. Cf. δὲς τοῦ σαββάτου (Lu. 18:12).

---

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 129.
2 C. and S., p. 87.
3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 312.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 72 f.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 72 f.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 97.
32. Παρα-πλήσιον. It is merely the neuter of the adjective παραπλήσιος. This adjective usually had the associative-instrumental, seldom the genitive. But the one example of the adverbial preposition in the N. T. (Ph. 2:27), θανάτου, has the genitive. See πλησίον.

33. Παρ-εκτός. It is a late compound for the earlier παρέκ. It appears in the N. T. only three times, save in the margin of Mt. 19:9 of W. H.’s text. Once it is a mere adverb (2 Cor. 11:28), and twice it is a preposition with the ablative (Mt. 5:32; Ac. 26:29) meaning ‘without.’

34. Πέραν. It comes from the root περ (cf. περάω, ‘fare,’ ‘ferry,’ etc.), Ionic πέρην. It is an adverb (cf. adv. πέρ), probably accusative case. Both as adverb and as preposition with ablative (sometimes with accusative), it survives from Homer. In the N. T. it occurs ten times as an adverb in the phrase εἰς τὸ πέραν (Mt. 8:18). It is found 13 times as a preposition with the ablative, chiefly in the expression πέραν τοῦ Τορδάνου (Mt. 4:15).

35. Πλήν, Doric πλάν. It is probably from πλέον, ‘more,’ and so is used with the ablative. In the N. T. it occurs only four times as a preposition with the ablative and in one of these we find πλήν—πλὴν τοῦτων (Ac. 15:28). Twice it is a mere adverb, πλὴν ὅτι (Ac. 20:23; Ph. 1:18), unless indeed the ὅτι clause is in the ablative. Cf. English “except that.” In all the other rather numerous instances πλήν is an adversative conjunction at the beginning of a clause (cf. δέ) as in Mt. 11:22. These three usages come on down from the older Greek.

36. Πλησίον, Doric πλατίον. The word is allied to πέλας and is neuter adj. from πλήσιος. In the older Greek the adverb occurs absolutely or with the art. ὁ πλησίον, ‘neighbour,’ as in the N. T. (Mt. 5:43). As a preposition it appears with the associative-instrumental or with the genitive. But in the N. T., it is found only once and with the genitive in Jo. 4:5. In Lu. 10:29, 36, the genitive is also found with πλησίον, but the word here has more of the substantive idea (‘neighbour’) than the prepositional usage.

37. Υπερ-άνω. It is a simple compound that in the late Greek [Page 647] gradually displaced ὑπέρ. It occurs in writers from Aristotle on both as adverb and as preposition and is common in the LXX. In the N. T. we find it only three times and with the ablative each time. Twice it occurs literally of place (Heb. 9:5; Eph. 4:10) and once of rank (Eph. 1:21).

38. Υπερ-έκεινα. It is merely ὑπέρ and the pronoun ἐκεῖνα (cf. ἔπι-έκεινα in Ac. 7:43) which appears in the Byzantine Greek. It occurs only once in the N. T. (2 Cor. 10:16), εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκεινα ὑμῶν, with the ablative in the sense of ‘beyond,’ ‘into the (regions) beyond you.’

39. Υπερ-εκ-περισσοῦ. It is written separately in Liddell and Scott and some N. T. editors print it ὑπέρ ἐκπερισσοῦ. It is found in Dan. 3:22 (Ald., Compl.). W. H. read it

2 Cf. Deiss., B. S., p. 283 f.
three times (Eph. 3:20; 1 Th. 3:10; 5:13), though in the last passage ὑπερεκπερισσῶς is put in the margin by W. H. As a preposition with the ablative, we find it only in Eph. 3:20 (ὢν attracted to case of omitted antecedent).

40. ὶπο-κάτω. It is another compound word which in the ancient Greek was used both as adverb and as preposition and especially in the κοινή writers (Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch). In the late Greek it gradually\(^3\) displaced ὑπό. In the LXX both ὑπεράνωθεν and ὑπερκάτωθεν occur as prepositions as well as κατόπισθεν.\(^4\) In the N. T. it is no longer adverb, but appears as preposition eleven times with the ablative, five of them with τῶν ποδῶν (as Mk. 6:11). The examples are all literal, not metaphorical. Cf. ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης (Mk. 7:28).

41. Χάριν. This word is just the accusative of χάρις and it is still common as the substantive in the accusative (Lu. 1:30). The ancients used it freely with the genitive and with the possessive pronoun, ἐμὴν χάριν. The idea of ‘for the sake of’ (cf. Latin gratia) may be due to apposition originally. The usage continues in the late Greek.\(^5\) Among the ancients it was generally postpositive, but in the LXX it is now one way, now the other. In the N. T. it occurs nine times, and is postpositive (as Gal. 3:19) always except 1 Jo. 3:12 with interrogative. It is only once in the Gospels (Lu. 7:47).

42. Χωρίς. It is of doubtful etymology (cf. χάω, χήρα), but appears [Page 648] in Homer freely as an adverb and in Pindar as a preposition. It holds on steadily in both senses. In the N. T. we have only one pure adverbial use (Jo. 20:7), while as a preposition with the ablative we find it 40 times. The usage is chiefly with persons (Mt. 14:21) or abstract relations (Mt. 13:34), though it may be used with place (Lu. 6:49). In Ro. 10:14 note χωρίς κηρύσσοντος without the article. It is postpositive once, οὗ χωρίς (Heb. 12:14). Ramsay, C. and B., II, 391 (No. 254), cites from the inscriptions χωρίς εἰ μή τι πᾶσα (Moulton, Prol., p. 239).

Of these 42 words in the N. T. the following are only used as prepositions: ἄνευ, ἀντίπερα, ἀπέναντι, ἄτερ, ἔκειν, ἐνόπιον, ἐπέκεινα, κατενώπιον, παραπλήσιον, ὑπερέκεινα, ὑπεράνω, ὑποκάτω. Of the rest µέσον is also adjective; χάρις substantive; πλησίον substantive and adjective; ἄχρι, ἐως, µέχρι, πλῆν conjunctions; and the rest are also adverbs.

IX. Compound Prepositions. A considerable number of these adverbial prepositions are compound words. So are ἄντι-κρύ(ζ), ἄντι-περα, ἄπ-έν-αντι, ἕμ-

**X. Prepositional Circumlocutions.** Blass calls these Hebraisms and it is true that the frequency of these phrases in the LXX and the N. T. is due to the influence of the Hebrew idiom. But the construction itself is good Greek, though not so common, as the papyri show.1

(a) Μέσον. This word furnishes a number, one of which, ἀνά μέσον, “has turned up abundantly in the papyri.”2 In the N. T. we find this compound preposition only four times. Moulton thinks that in 1 Cor. 6:5, διακρίνειν ἀνά μέσου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, the text is corrupt, but probably the phrase is not to be taken too literally and etymologically (cf. διά here). Διά μέσου is read once (Lu. 17:11) and διά μέσου once in W. H. (Lu. 4:30). Εἰς μέσου (Mk. 14:60) appears once, but εἰς τὸ μέσον (Lu. 4:35) six times. Εἰς μέσου, like all the circumlocutions with μέσον, is followed by the genitive (Mt. 13:49) and it occurs 7 times. Κατὰ μέσον is found once (Ac. 27:27). The commonest (27 times) of these circumlocutions is ἐν μέσῳ (ἐμμέσῳ some MSS.) as in Mt. 10:16. Ἐν τῷ μέσῳ (Mt. 14:6; Ac. 4:7) is not a prepositional phrase. Cf. ἐκ τοῦ μέσου (Col. 2:14). See also chapter XII, X, (b).

(b) Ὄνομα. It is sometimes adduced as an example of a prepositional circumlocution and as a pure Hebraism. Deissmann has given abundant illustrations from the papyri to show that the use of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι is common enough in the vernacular κοινή where, as in the LXX and the N. T., ὄνομα represents the person. It is more than doubtful if we are justified in considering these phrases as mere prepositional circumlocutions with the genitive. The examples that come nearest to it are εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου, εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου, εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ (Mt. 10:41 f.), but even here ὄνομα brings out the notion that one has the name or character of prophet, righteous man, disciple. In Mt. 28:19, ὄνομα has the idea of ‘the authority of.’

(c) Πρόσωπον. This word also furnishes a number of such phrases which in the LXX seem to be based on Hebrew originals (translation Hebraisms).2 Thus ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου (Ac. 3:19) is like יְדִיבָנ, while πρὸ προσώπου σου is like לִפְנֵי, and κατὰ πρόσωπον Πειλάτου (Ac. 3:13) Blass finds like יְדִיב. Cf. πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον (1 Cor. 13:12).

(d) Στόμα. This again is a Hebraism in the LXX due to translation. In Mt. 4:4 we have διὰ στόματος θεοῦ, a quotation from Deut. 8:3. In Mt. 18:16, ἐπὶ στόματος δύο

---

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 129 f.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 99 f.
1 B. S., pp. 146 f., 197. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 100. See also Heitmüller’s proof, Im Namen Jesu, pp. 100 ff.
2 Moulton, Prol., pp. 81, 99; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 129 f.
3 Ib.
μαρτύρων is likewise from Deut. 19:15. So in Mt. 21:16, ἐκ στόματος νηπίων is from Ps. 8:3. Cf. also ὅπω τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ (Lu. 22:71), ἐν τῷ στόματι σου (Ro. 10:8 from Deut. 30:14). But this picturesque phraseology belongs to all language as a matter of fact.

(e) Χείρ. It shows several similar examples. Thus διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν (Ac. 15:23), διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν (Ac. 14:3), εἰς χεῖρας (Lu. 24:7), εἰς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ (Lu. 15:22), ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων (Lu. 1:71), ἐν τῇ χειρί αὐτοῦ (Jo. 3:35), σῶν χειρὶ ῥήγελου (Ac. 7:35). Here again the Greek idiom follows the Hebrew particularity, but with perfect ease. The classical Greek is not without examples4 of this use of χείρ and one may note the English idiom also.5 See 2 Sam. 15:2, ὅν χείρα τῆς ὅδοι τῆς πύλης.

See also ἔξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ (Mk. 15:39) and παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας in the margin (W. H.) of Mt. 19:9.

[PAGE 650] CHAPTER XIV

ADJECTIVES (ἘΠΙΘΕΤΑ)

I. Origin of Adjectives. This matter was touched upon in the chapter on Declensions, but calls for a further word here. There is no absolute line of cleavage between substantive and adjective either in form or sense.1 The Alexandrian grammarians had no special treatment of the adjective. “The division line between substantive and adjective, always an uncertain one in early Indo-European language, is even more wavering in Sanskrit than elsewhere.”2 Indeed it is not difficult to conceive the time when there was no distinct adjective. The substantive would be used in apposition as in English, brother man, church member. Cf. the common use of titles also like doctor, president, governor, etc. This attributive use of the substantive is not a peculiarity of any language, but belongs to Hebrew, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, English, etc. It is out of this use of the substantive that the adjective as a separate part of speech developed.3 The adjective is not therefore a mere variation of the genitive, though, like the genitive, it is descriptive. The term noun (ὄνομα) is used to cover both substantive and adjective, but many substantives continue to be used in a descriptive or adjectival sense and many adjectives in a substantival sense.4 The term adjective covers words of one, two or three genders, and indeed includes numerals and some of the pronouns also. But the pronouns require treatment in a separate chapter. Participles are verbal adjectives. See later. The close relation between adjective and substantive is well illustrated by δοῦλα (Ro. 6:19). Cf. δοῦλοι.
II. The Adjectival or Appositional Use of the Substantive.

Examples have already been given in the chapter on the Sentence. Let one suffice here: ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ ποταμῷ (Mt. 3:6). Cf. further Lu. 24:19; Ac. 1:16; 3:14. This idiom is common enough in the N. T. I must demur, however, at this point to Winer’s idea (Winer-Thayer, p. 236) that “a notion which should naturally be expressed by an adjective as an epithet, is sometimes, by a change of construction, brought out by a substantive.” What I object to is the word “should.” He is right in saying that “the N. T. is by no means poor in adjectives,” but wrong in urging that the N. T. ought to use more. As already observed, substantives continued to be used in a descriptive sense not only in apposition, but also in the genitive. This original use of the substantive never ceased. Hence it is useless to talk of “this substitution of a substantive for an adjective” and to explain it as “a Hebraistic mode of expression” due to “the want of adjectives in Hebrew” and to “the peculiar vividness of the Oriental languages” (p. 237). He admits, however, that the matter is not arbitrary, but the principal word stands in the genitive. There is this difference between the substantive as an epithet and the genitive. The two substantives do not merge into one idea quite so completely. Winer’s examples illustrate this point well: μηδὲ ἡμικέναι ἐπί πλούτου ἀδηλότητι (1 Tim. 6:17), ἵνα καθαίρεται κατακρίνων περιπλούσων (Ro. 6:4), βλέπων τὸ στερέωμα τῆς πίστεως (Col. 2:5), λόγος τῆς χάριτος (Lu. 4:22), σκόπου τῆς ἀδικίας (16:8), κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας (18:6), πάθη ὑπομονῆς (Ro. 1:26), τῷ ἡμετερῷ τῆς δύναμεως (Heb. 1:3), etc. It was just the shade of difference between the substantive in the genitive and the adjective that led to the expressions above. Phrases like τὰ πνευματικά τῆς πνευματικάς (Eph. 6:12) are analogous to the use of the adjective as substantive to be discussed directly. The use of υἱὸς or τέκνον with the genitive is exactly like the Hebrew idiom with בנים and is extremely common in the LXX and fairly so in the N. T. Thus υἱὸς ἀνθρώπων (Eph. 2:2), τέκνα φωτός (Eph. 5:8), etc. But this “Hebraistic circumlocution” turns up in inscriptions and on coins,3 so that it is clearly not un-Greek. Deissmann, however, since the idiom is so common and many of the N. T. examples are quotations from the LXX or translations from the Aramaic, admits that the majority in the N. T. are due to “translation Hebraisms” and the rest to analogical formation.

III. The Adjective as Substantive. Simcox1 thinks that the N. T. shows a more frequent use of this idiom than the earlier Greek. But the earlier Greek shows abundant evidence of the use of the adjective without the substantive as a practical substantive, usually with the article, but not always.2

---

2 But his notion of adjs. “formed by the apostles themselves” vanishes sadly in the light of the papyri.
3 Deiss., B. S., p. 165 f. So υἱὸς τῆς γενεσίας, υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως, etc.
(a) ANY GENDER. Such adjectives may be of any gender, according to the gender of substantive. So ὁ καλὸς, ἡ ἤρημος, τὸ χρυσότων. This is no peculiarity of Greek alone, though it has its own development in the substantival use of the adjective. Indeed the participle was often used as a substantive. Thus ὁ σπείρων (Mt. 13:3), ἡ γούμενος (Mt. 2:6). In Ph. 3:8 we have the participle used as a substantive with the genitive, τὸ ὑπέρέχον τῆς γνώσεως. Cf. Lu. 16:1, τὸ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ. So τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ σύμφωνον (1 Cor. 10:33) where the adjective, like a substantive, has the genitive.

(b) WITH MASCULINE ADJECTIVES. With masculine adjectives the substantives naturally suggest themselves out of the context or the nature of the case.3 Thus in Mt. 11:5, τῷ τοῖς ἁναβλέποντι καὶ καθὼς περιστατοῦσιν, κτλ. Cf. οἱ ἄγιοι (1 Cor. 6:2), ἅμαρτωλοὺς (1 Tim. 1:15), δικαίου and τοῦ ἄγιοθου (Ro. 5:7), ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ (8:33), τὸν ἀληθινὸν (1 Jo. 5:20), ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (Jo. 6:69) and probably τοῦ πονηροῦ (Mt. 6:13). In Jas. 5:7, πρόμιμον καὶ δύσμον, supply ὑπότον. Sometimes only the context can determine the gender, as in Eph. 6:16; 1 Jo. 3:12).

(c) WITH FEMININE ADJECTIVES. These are usually examples of the ellipsis of ὁδὸς, χεῖρ, γῆ, γυνὴ, ἡμέρα, γλώσσα. I follow Blass4 mainly in these examples. Thus γῆ is responsible for the feminine gender in τὴν ξηρὰν (Mt. 23:15; Heb. 11:29), ἡ περίχωρος (Mt. 3:5), τὴν ὄρειν (Lk. 1:39), τῇ ἐρήμῳ (Mt. 3:2), τῆς οἰκουμένης (Ro. 10:18), etc. In ἦκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν (Lk. 17:24) Blass prefers μερίδος to γῆς and urges that we do not refine too sharply over εἰς ἑπαντίας (Mt. 15:39; Tit. 2:8). As examples of the influence of ὁδὸς note εὐθείας (Lk. 3:5), ποῖας (5:19), ἐκείνης (19:4). For χεῖρ observe ἡ δριστερὰ and ἡ δεξιά (Mt. 6:3), ἐν δεξιᾷ (Ro. 8:34), τῇ δεξιᾷ (Ac. 2:33). But ἦκ δεξιῶν (2:34) may be compared with εἰς τῇ δεξιᾷ μέρη (Jo. 21:6). The ellipsis of ἡμέρα is noticed by Blass in τῇ ἔχομενη (Lk. 13:33), τῇ ἐπιούσῃ (Ac. 16:11), [Page 653] τῇ ἑτέρᾳ (20:15), τῇ ἐπαύριον (Mt. 27:62), τῇ τρίτῃ (Lu. 13:32), τῇ ἑβδόμῃ (Heb. 4:4), τῇ μίᾳ τῶν σαββάτων (Ac. 20:7), μέχρι τῆς σήμερον (Mt. 11:23), ἀπὸ τῆς (2 Pet. 3:4), τῇ ἤτοι (Ac. 21:1). But Blass rightly supplies ὥρα with ἀπὸ τῆς in Lu. 7:45, as with ὧσιας (Mt. 8:16), πρωίας (Mt. 27:1). To conclude the list of feminine examples with τῇ πνεούσῃ (Ac. 27:40) supply αὕρα, with ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ (Rev. 9:11) supply γλώσσῃ (but cf. τῇ Ἐβραϊδι διαλέκτῳ, Ac. 22:2), with πολλάς and ἐλληνικας (Lu. 12:47 ἐ) supply πληγάς, with ἀπὸ μιᾶς (Lu. 14:18) insert φωνής. But κατ Ιδιαν (Mk. 6:31) and ἰδιὰ (1 Cor. 12:11), though stereotyped, may refer to ὁδῷ. Cf. also κατὰ μόνας (Mk. 4:10) as an instance of ὁδὸς. So δημοσία (Ac. 16:37). Words like σποτήριος (Tit. 2:11), ἀϊών (Jo. 6:47), εὐπρεπέστατον (Heb. 12:1) are, of course, feminine, not masculine. See chapter on Declensions.

(d) WITH THE NEUTER. The neuter furnishes a number of interesting examples. Thus ποτήριον ψυχρόν (Mt. 10:42), where ἔδιωκες is referred to. So ὅδιος is meant by τῷ γλυκῷ καὶ τῷ πικρόν (Jas. 3:11). With ἐν λευκῷ (Jo. 20:12), one must insert ἱματίως as with ἐν μαλακοῖς (Mt. 11:8). Cf. πορφυρόν in Rev. 18:16. With τοῦ δισετευθείς (Ac. 19:35) Blass3 suggests ἄγαλματος, and with τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς (Rev.

---

3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 140.
4 Ib., p. 140 f.
1 Ib., p. 141.
we must supply μέρος (“not classical,” Blass). Cf. εἷς τὸ ἱερόν (Mt. 21:23). In Mt. 6:13, ἐπὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ, most likely διάβολος is meant, not mere evil. In Mt. 19:17 we have περὶ τοῦ ἄγαθοῦ explained by ὁ ἄγαθός, though the American Standard Version gives it ‘that which is good.’ But cf. Ro. 5:7. The number of these neuter adjectives used substantively in the N. T. is large and varied, but the older Greek shows abundant illustrations of the same thing, especially in philosophical discussions. With prepositions in particular we meet with this use of the neuter. Thus εἰς τὸ μέσον (Jo. 20:19), ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ (Mt. 6:4), εἰς φανερόν (Mk. 4:22), μετὰ μικρόν (Mt. 26:73), ἐν μέσῳ (Mt. 10:16), ἐν ὀλίγῳ (Ac. 26:28), ἐν μεγάλῳ (26:29), μετὰ βραχύ (Lu. 22:58), etc. Cf. εἷς ἄγαθά (Jer. 24:6). Very common is the adverbial usage of this neuter like βραχύ (Ac. 5:34), μικρόν (Mt. 26:39), μόνον (Mt. 8:8), τὸ πρῶτον (Jo. 12:16), but the adjective’s relation to the adverb will receive special treatment. See XI. Cf. ἐν τῷ ὄντι. Sometimes the neuter singular was used in a collective sense for the sum total (cf. English “the all”). Thus in Jo. 6:37, 39, πᾶς ὅ, 17:24 ὅ, where persons are meant. The neuter plural is [Page 654] common in this sense like τὰ πάντα (Col. 1:16) where the universe is thus described. Cf. τὰ ὄντα and τὰ μῆ ὄντα (1 Cor. 1:28). B in the LXX (Helbing, p. 51) frequently has πᾶν=πάντα (acc. sing. masc.). (Cf. also Ps. of Sol. 3:10; 8:23 V; Test. xii, Pat. Reub. 1:10 πᾶν ἄρτον, Gad 3:1 πᾶν νόμον.) See also the common collective neuter in the LXX (Thackeray, Grammar, p. 174 f.). Usually the neuter plural is concrete, however, as in τὰ ὀρατὰ καὶ ἄρτοτα (Col. 1:16), where πάντα is thus explained. Cf. τὰ βαθέα (Rev. 2:24), ἄρχαία (2 Cor. 5:17), In Ro. 1:20, as Winer1 points out, τὰ ὀράτα makes more concrete ἢ τὰ ὀρατὰ ὄντας καὶ ὀρατά. But one must confess that in Eph. 3:10, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουργοῖς, it is not clear what the idea is, whether places, things or relations. In Jo. 3:12 ἔννοια and ἔπουράνια seem to refer to truths. In 1 Cor. 2:13, πνευματικός πνευματικά συνεργοῦντες, a like ambiguity exists, but the presence of λόγος inclines one to the notion that Paul is here combining spiritual ideas with spiritual words. The neuter singular with the article is very common for the expression of an abstract idea. One does not have to say that the adjective is here used instead of the abstract substantive, but merely as an abstract substantive. Cf. English “the beautiful and the good” with “beauty and goodness.” This is good ancient Greek. Cf. also in the papyri τὸ ἰδίον Tb.P. 40 (B.C. 117) and (ib.) τὰ κυθήκοντα. Winer2 was troubled over τὸ ἰδίον τῆς πίστεως (1 Pet. 1:7) and said that no such adjective existed and therefore

3 W.-Th., p. 235.
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1 W.-Th., p. 235. Cf. lateness of the forms in –τοῖς (only two in Hom.). Hoffmann, Über die Entw. des Begr. des Griech. bei den Alten, p. 2. In 1 Tim. 5:17 note διπλῆς (from ὁδός).

2 Ib.
this was a mere substantive. There was none in the lexica, but Deissmann has found a number of instances of the adjective in the papyri. So χρυσοῦ δοκιμίου, P.E.R. xii. 6 f. (93 A.D.), ‘good gold.’ One need not be troubled over τὸ γνωστὸν (Ro. 1:19) any more than over the other neuter adjectives. Cf. τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 2:4), τὸ δυνατὸν τοῦ θεοῦ and τὸ ὄντος τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor. 1:25), τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς (Heb. 6:17), τὸ ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως (2 Cor. 4:17), τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου (Ro. 8:3), τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ (9:22). It is thus frequent with the genitive. Cf. also τὸ κατὰ ἐμὲ πρόθυμον (Ro. 1:15). See Heb. 7:7. In Lu. 12:23, ἡ ψυχὴ πλῆθος ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς, we have πλῆθος because the abstract idea of thing is expressed. This also is a frequent Greek idiom. Cf. also ὅ (1 Cor. 7:19), ὅ (1 Cor. 15:10), ταῦτα (1 Cor. 6:11).

IV. Agreement of Adjectives with Substantives.

(a) In Number. It is not necessary to repeat what has been said on this subject in chapter X, VII, (b), on concord between adjective and substantive in number. The normal thing is for adjective and substantive to agree in number. But one must not get the idea that “construction according to sense” of the grammarians is an anomaly. “The term is unobjectionable, provided we remember that constructions according to the meaning are generally older than those in which meaning is overridden by idiom or grammatical analogy.”¹ Thus there is no cause for astonishment in seeing ἐκθαμβοῦν with ὁ λαός in Ac. 3:11, nor πλῆθος κράζωντες in Ac. 21:36.

(b) In Gender. For concord in gender see chapter X, VIII. Here again the construction according to sense is normal like στρατιᾶς ὅποιον ἄνων (Lu. 2:13), but οὖρανίου in the same phrase is the feminine (cf. αἰωνίου, etc.). The N. T. does not have the Attic idiom with ἡμίσεως of agreement with the gender of the genitive substantive, though it is still in the LXX. Cf. τῆς ἡμίσεως τῶν ὄμορφων (Ezek. 16:51). Instead see ἔως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου (Mt. 6:23). But αὐτὴ and θαυμαστῇ in Mt. 21:42 (Mt. 12:11) are probably due to the Hebrew פִּים, the Hebrew using the feminine for abstract ideas, since it had no neuter. But even here in Ps. 117:23 the context has κεφαλὴ γονίας.² One other remark is to be made which is that when an adjective occurs with more than one substantive it may agree with the gender of the nearest, as in πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον (Lu. 10:1), be repeated with each, as in πᾶσα δόσις ἡγαθῆ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον (Jas. 1:17) and ἐν ποίᾳ δύναμιν ἢ ἐν ποίῳ ὄνοματι (Ac. 4:7), or agree with the masculine rather than the feminine or neuter, as in γυμνοὶ (Jas. 2:15). With the same gender there may be repetition (Mt. 4:23; 9:35) or not (Mt. 12:31).

(c) In Case. For concord in case see chapter X, IX. The main instances of variation here belong to the participle as in Ac. 15:22 f.), and in particular the Book of Revelation furnishes illustrations (Rev. 3:12, etc.), as already shown.

---

3 B. S., p. 259 f.
1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 118.
2 Cf. W.-Th., p. 238; Moulton, Prol., p. 59.
(d) Two or More Adjectives. When two or more adjectives occur together the conjunction may be used as in πολλά καὶ βαρέα αἰτίωματα (Ac. 25:7) and even πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα (Jo. 20:30), as in Latin. But see ἐτέρων πολλῶν (Ac. 15:35) and the repetition of the adjective with the article (Rev. 2:12).

V. The Attributive Adjective. The adjective (from adjaceo) is a word joined on to another (ἐπίθετον). The adjective is by no means the only attribute used with substantives. Thus the attribute may be substantive in apposition with another substantive, like ἄνθρωπος ὁ εἰκοδεσπότης (Mt. 13:52), or a genitive, like ἦ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία (1 Pet. 3:20), or an adverb, like τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως (Ph. 3:14), or an adjunct, like ἦ κατ’ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις (Ro. 9:11), or a pronoun, like τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα (Mt. 18:20). When the article is used before the adjective or participle it is, of course, attributive, as in ὁ καλὸς (Jo. 10:11), ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ (2 Pet. 1:12). But adjectives and participles may be attributive when no article is used. Thus with στρατιάς ὑπαρνίου (Lu. 2:13), ὑδωρίζων (Jo. 4:10. Cf. τὸ ὑδωρίζων in verse 11), μονογενὴς θεός (Jo. 1:18). The unusual position of the attributive adjective, like ὁ χλοῦς πολύς (Jo. 12:9), where the substantive and adjective form “a composite idea” (Jebb, Soph. O. T., pp. 1199 ff.), may be illustrated from the papyri, O.P. 99, τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἀὐτοῦ ἀληθείας τριστέγου (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 154). Cf. also ἐκ τῆς ἀνατολῆς υἱον τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Pet. 1:18), where, however, πατροπαραδότου may very well be predicate (see vi). Cf. French La République Française.

VI. The Predicate Adjective. The adjective (like the participle) is common as a predicate, as is the substantive. Monro considers the substantive in the predicate adjectival. Cf. pronoun, adverb, etc. As examples note πολλοί (Mk. 5:9), ὅμοί (Mt. 13:31), σοστήρως (Tit. 2:11), ἐποίημα (Lu. 14:17), βαθύ (Jo. 14:17), out of many. But adjectives are predicate without a copula, as in Τί μὲ λέγεις ἀγαθόν (Mk. 10:18), ὁ ποιήσας μὲ λέγεις ἁγιασθή (I Cor. 7:11; cf. 7:23), ἀναπέραστον ἐξαντλήσας τὴν ἀναπεραστήθην (1 Cor. 7:13), ἐκ τῆς ἀνατολῆς υἱον τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor. 5:17; Jo. 3:5; 1 Cor. 11:5. As examples of the verbal in –τος take παθητός (Ac. 26:23) and γνωστόν (Ac. 4:10) with which last compare the attributive use in Ac. 4:16 γνωστὸν σημεῖον. Cf. Mk. 3:1. As further interesting examples of the predicate adjective, note δόλος (Jo. 9:34), δόκμας φανάριαν (2 Cor. 13:7), ὑγιής (Mt. 12:13), πρώτος (Jo. 20:4), ἑξάραντος (1 Cor. 7:37), ὄρθος (Ac. 14:10), μόνος (Lu. 24:18; cf. Mt.

3 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 87.
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14:23), etc. Cf. ὃλον in Lu. 13:21. The distinction between the attributive adjective and the predicate adjective lies in just this, that the predicate presents an additional statement, is indeed the main point, while the attributive is an incidental description of the substantive about which the statement is made. Cf. Ac. 4:10 and 16 above for both uses of γνωστόν. Cf. ταύτας in Ac. 1:5. [Page 657] This distinct predication1 with the adjective in an oblique case is seen in τούτο ὀδηγήσεις ἔρημος (Jo. 4:18) and is a classical idiom.2 Note the use of πάντα as predicate for ὁ θεός in 1 Cor. 15:28 as with Χριστὸς in Col. 3:11 for the totality of things.

VII. Adjective Rather than Adverb. See ch. XII, IX, for discussion of this subject. A few items are added here. Cf. πρῶτος Μωσῆς λέγει (Ro. 10:19), ‘Moses is the first who says,’ with πρῶταν διαλλαγήτα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου (Mt. 5:24), ‘Be reconciled with thy brother as the thing that you do.’ In Mt. 10:2 πρῶτος Σίμων means that first in the list is Simon, whereas πρῶτον, in Jo. 1:41, means that Andrew finds his brother Simon as the first thing which he does. Πρῶτον ἰηθον (Mt. 17:27) means the first fish that came up. Cf. ἐν ἔμοι πρῶτῳ (1 Tim. 1:16), ‘me as chief.’ The exact idea of πρῶτη in Lu. 2:2 is not certain, but most probably Luke’s idea is that there were two enrolments under Cyrenius. Cf. Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? With μόνος and μόνον a like distinction is to be observed. Take ἄνεχθρησκευα λάλειν εἷς τῷ δρόσῳ αὐτός μόνος (Jo. 6:15) and σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lu. 24:18). The difference is much like that between the English “alone” and “only.” So in Lu. 9:36, εὕρεθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος, ‘Jesus was found alone,’ and in Mt. 17:8 (cf. Mk. 9:8), οὐδένα ἔδωκεν εἰ μὴ αὐτόν Ἰησοῦν μόνον, it is adjective, not adverb. Cf. οὐκ εἶ μόνος (Jo. 16:32) with οὐ μόνον in Ac. 21:13. Cf. 2 Jo. 1. Contrast μόνον in Mt. 8:8 with μόνος in Mt. 14:23. There are some examples where either adverb or adjective would make good sense,3 as in Mk. 6:8, μηδέν εἰ μη ῥᾶβδον μόνον, where D reads μόνην; Ac. 11:19, μηδενί εἰ μη μόνον Ἰουδαίος, where D has μόνοις; and 1 Jo. 5:6, οὐκ ἐν τῷ Úδατι μόνον, where B reads μόνῳ. But this is not all. The Greek often uses an adjective where other languages prefer adverbs or prepositional phrases. Latin and English have similar expressions for other ideas.4 Naturally this idiom is common in Homer.5 For time note δειτεραίοι ἢλθομεν (Ac. 28:13), ‘we came second-day men’ (‘on the second day’). Cf. τεταρτάς Jo. 11:39. D has likewise πεπατώσα in Ac. 20:6. So γενόμεναι ὑπερεξάλθη τῷ μνημεῖον (Lu. 24:22), ἐπιστῆ ἔφοιτος (Lu. 21:34), αὐθαίρετος (2 Cor. 8:17), ὀκταήμερος (Ph. 3:5).

VIII. The Personal Construction. This matter belongs more properly to indirect discourse and the participle, but it calls for [Page 658] just a word here. The Greeks were more fond of the personal construction than we English are. Farrar1 indeed doubts if Greek has a true impersonal verb. But ἔγενετο in a passage like Lu. 1:8 comes close to it. Cf. Lu. 1:23. We have fewer examples in the N. T. of the personal

---

1 Monro, ib., p. 119.  
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 141.  
3 Ib.  
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construction, none in truth with either δῆλος (1 Cor. 15:27 is impersonal construction) or with φανερῶς. But we do have φανεροῦμεν ὅτι ἦστε ἑπιστολῆ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. 3:3). Cf. Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι in 1 Cor. 15:12. Note also ἄξιος ἦν λύσω (Jo. 1:27), but the impersonal construction is found with δίκαιον in Ph. 1:7. See also ἰκανός ἦν in Mt. 8:8. Δυνατός occurs with the infinitive (2 Tim. 1:12). This personal construction is probably due to assimilation of gender by analogy.2 Cf. δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι (1 Cor. 3:18), perfectly regular predicate nominative. See good example in 1 Cor. 15:9.

IX. Adjectives Used with Cases. Examples were given under the various oblique cases of adjectives that were construed with the several cases. A mere mention of the matter is all that is required here. Thus the genitive appears with ἔνοχος θανάτου (Mt. 26:66), the ablative with ζένοι τῶν διωθηκόν (Eph. 2:12), the dative (Mt. 20:1) and accusative with δομοῦν ἄνθρωπου (Rev. 14:14), the acc. with πιστὸς τὸ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Heb. 2:17), the dative with ἔνοχος τῇ κρίσει (Mt. 5:21) and καλὸν σοὶ έστιν (Mt. 18:8), the instrumental with ἰδεός ἠμῖν (Mt. 20:12), the locative with βραδές τῇ καρδίᾳ (Lu. 24:25). Cf. locative in Col. 2:13 f. The adjective is, of course, used with various prepositions, as τὸ ἅγιόν πρὸς πάντας (Gal. 6:10), πιστὸς ἐν ἑλαχίστῳ (Lu. 16:10), βραδύς εἰς ὅργῃν (Jas. 1:19).

X. Adjectives with the Infinitive and Clauses. If cases can occur with adjectives, it is natural that the verbal substantive known as the infinitive should come within that idiom and be in a case. The case of the infinitive will vary with the adjective. Thus in ἄξιος κληθήναι (Lu. 15:19) the infinitive is probably in the genitive case. Cf. also ἄξιος ἦν λύσω (Jo. 1:27). With δυνατός κωλύσατι (Ac. 11:17) we have the accusative of general reference. In the case of ἰκανὸς βαστάσαι (Mt. 3:11) we may see either the accusative of general reference, as above, or the dative, according to the original idea of the form and the common case with ἰκανός. Cf. also ἰκανὸς ἦν ἐλεόλῃς (Mt. 8:8). The instances of both infinitive and ἦν are numerous in the N. T. As specimens of the infinitive and preposition after the adjective, take ταχύς εἰς τὸ ὄκούσαι, βραδύς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι (Jas. 1:19). Indeed the genitive [Page 659] article τοῦ with the infinitive occurs with adjectives where it would not naturally be looked for, as in ἐξωτικοὶ ἐμεν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον (Ac. 23:15). Cf. ἐτοιμός εἰμι πορεύεσθαί (Lu. 22:33). But see further βραδές τοῦ πιστεύειν (Lu. 24:25).

XI. The Adjective as Adverb. This subject has been treated in the chapter on the Cases as well as in the one on Adverbs. Hence a few words will suffice here. The border line between adjective in the nominative and adverb gets very dim sometimes. Thus in English we say “I am well,” “He spoke well.” Farrar1 even says that it is “more correct” to use an adverb than an adjective in a phrase like ἄδειμοις ὑμᾶς ἔδωκαν. But that is going too far even if we call it antimeria. He quotes Milton (Par. Lost, vii, 161), “Meanwhile inhabit lax,” and Shakespeare (Taming of Shrew, I, i, 89), “Thou didst it excellent.” We can see the difference between ἄναστηθι ὅρθος (Ac. 14:10) and ὅρθος ἐκρίνας (Lu. 7:43). But, as already observed, the difference between μόνον and μόντι grows faint in 1 Jo. 5:6 and similar examples. Hence it

2 Middleton, Anal. in Synt., p. 15.
1 Gk. Synt., p. 90.
becomes very easy for the adjective form in the accusative to be used indiscriminately as adverb where the adjective idea disappears. Thus only the context can tell whether μόνον is adjective (Jo. 8:29) or adverb (Gal. 1:23). So as to μικρόν (Jo. 7:33 and 16:19), πολύ (Lu. 12:48 and Ro. 3:2), ὁλίγον (Mk. 1:19), etc. Πρῶτον, for instance, is very common as an adverb (cf. Mt. 7:5, and even τὸ πρῶτον is found, Jo. 10:40), but πρῶτος occurs only once (Ac. 11:26). It is needless to multiply here examples like these. Other cases are used besides the accusative to make adverbs from adjectives, as the ablative in πρῶτος above, the genitive as ὁμοῦ (Jo. 4:36), the associative-instrumental as δημοσίᾳ (Ac. 16:37). Cf. πολλῷ (Ro. 5:9). All degrees of comparison furnish adverbs, thus πολύ (Ro. 3:2; 2 Cor. 8:22), πλέον (Jo. 21:15), μάλιστα (Ac. 20:38). The accusative singular of the comparative is the common adverb of that degree as περισσότερον (Heb. 7:15), but see περισσοτέρως (2 Cor. 1:12). In the superlative both the singular as πρῶτον (Lu. 6:42) and the plural as μᾶλιστα (above). These examples sufficiently illustrate the principles involved.

XII. The Positive Adjective.

(a) RELATIVE CONTRAST. In discussing the positive adjective first one must not get the idea that the positive was originally the absolute idea of the adjective as distinct from the comparative or superlative. This notion of absolute goodness or greatness, [Page 660] etc., is itself later than the notion of comparison. Indeed the adjective itself has a relative sense and suggests the opposite, as light implies darkness. And then many of the oldest comparative forms have no positive at all and never did have, like ἀμφότερος, ὁριστερός, βέλτερος, δεύτερος, etc. More of this under the comparative. The point to get hold of just here is that the adjective per se (like many other words) implies contrast, and that originally this is what the comparative form meant. Thus in Homer some comparatives in –τερος have no notion of greater or less degree, the idea of duality, but merely contrast, like θηλυτέρα as opposed to male, ὁρέστερος as opposed to valley, ὁριστερός opposed to right, δεξίτερος opposed to left, ἔμετερος opposed to ἔμπετερος and vice versa. Cf. the comparative idea (and ablative case after) in τὸ περισσότερον τούτων (Mt. 5:37).

(b) USED AS COMPARATIVE OR SUPERLATIVE. With this notion of the relative contrast in the adjective and the first use of the comparative one is not surprised to find the positive still used alongside of the comparative. In Lu. 1:42, εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν, we do not have a mere Hebraism, though a very natural one in this translation from the Aramaic talk of Elizabeth. The Hebrew has no degrees of comparison at all and has to resort to circumlocutions. But Homer and other early Greek writers show a similar idiom, like δία θεάων, δία γυναικῶν (Eurip., Alc., 471). Other examples occur in the N. T., like ἄγια ἄγιων (Heb. 9:2 f., frequent in the LXX), ποία ἄγαθον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ (Mt. 22:36). Cf. βασιλεὺς βασιλέων (Rev. 19:16), κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων (1 Tim. 6:15), τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων (Eph. 3:21). The vernacular κοινή uses repetition of the adjective, as in μεγάλοι μεγάλοι, B. U. I, 229, μεγάλον καὶ μεγάλον αγαθῶν, Inscription of Thera (Herm. 1901, p. 445), θερμάδ...
θερμά, Herondas IV, 61. Cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 57. The positive suggests contrast clearly in τῶν πολλῶν (Mt. 24:12). Cf. of πολλοί in Ro. 5:15, 19; 1 Cor. 10:33. Here the majority is the idea, a comparative notion. Cf. Paul’s use of τοὺς πλείονας (1 Cor. 9:19) and Matthew’s ὁ πλείστος ὁχλος (21:8). See also Mk. 12:37 ὁ πολύς ὁχλος and Lu. 7:11 ὁχλος πολύς, and in 2 Cor. 8:15 τὸ πολύ καὶ τὸ ὀλίγον. Hence it is not surprising in Lu. 16:10 to see ἐν ἑλάχιστῳ and ἐν πολλῷ side by side (cf. ἐν ὅλῳ καὶ ἐν μηγαλῷ in Ac. 26:29), as in Mt. 5:19 also ἑλάχιστος and [Page 661] μέγας are set over against each other. Cf. also Mt. 22:38. In Ac. 26:24, τὰ πολλὰ γράμματα, we have an implied comparison.1

(c) WITH PREPOSITIONS. The positive may be used with prepositions also where comparison is implied. Thus ἀμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους (Lu. 13:2). Winer2 properly compares this idiom with the use of ὡς in Heb. 3:2, for in the next verse the author uses πλείονος δόξης as the sense of verse 2. But in the LXX this is a very common idiom3 and it is found in the classical Greek. The correct text in Lu. 18:14 (אBL) has also δεδικαιόμενος παρὰ ἐκεῖνον. Cf. ἐξια πρὸς in Ro. 8:18.

(d) COMPARISON IMPLIED BY ἤ. Once more the positive may occur with ἤ. It is not necessary, in view of the preceding discussion, to suggest the “omission” of μᾶλλον.4 It is true that we have only one such example in the N. T., καλὸν σοὶ ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν Ἰ ἐβληθῆναι (Mt. 18:8). Cf. Mk. 9:43, 45. But the LXX again furnishes many illustrations5 like λευκὸι ἤ (Gen. 49:12). The ancient Greek also is not without parallels. And there are N. T. examples, as in LXX, of verbs so employed like θέλω ἤ (1 Cor. 14:19) and λυσιτελεῖ ἤ (Lu. 17:2) and substantives as χαρά ἤσται ἤ (Lu. 15:7). Older Greek writers show this idiom with substantives and verbs.6 In Mt. 18:8 we have the positive adjective both before and after ἤ as καλὸν ἤ χωλὸν. But cf. 2 Tim. 3:4 for comparative before and positive after.

(e) IN ABSOLUTE SENSE. After the three grades of comparison were once established, analogy worked to form and use positive, comparative and superlative. And sometimes the positive occurs in the absolute sense. So we find Christ discussing the absolute meaning of the positive ἄγαθὸς in Mt. 19:17 (Mk. 10:18). Thus it comes to pass that sometimes the positive is more absolute than comparative or superlative which are relative of necessity. God is alone ἄγαθος in this sense, while others are βελτίονες and βέλτιστοι. Our God, ὁ ἄγαθος θεὸς, is higher in ideal and fact than Jupiter Maximus or Ζεὺς ἀριστεῖτος ἤ ἡμέρᾳ μέγιστος.7 Of καλὸς the opposite is οὐ καλὸς and this is not the positive attribute αἰσχρὸς. In Mt. 17:4 we find Peter saying

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 143.
2 W.-Th., p. 240.
3 C. and S., p. 64.
4 Though Blass does, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 143.
5 C. and S., p. 64; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 143; W.-Th., p. 241.
6 W.-Th., p. 240 f.
7 Schwab, Hist. Synt. etc., Heft i, p. 9.
fervently καλὸν ἑστὶν ἡµᾶς ὄνειρα. “The positive represents the highest absolute idea of a quality and cannot therefore be increased.”


(a) CONTRAST OR DUALITY. On the forms see chapter VII, II, 3. As already observed, the first use of the comparative form was to express contrast or duality.¹ This is clear in ἡ ἀριστερά (Mt. 6:3), though ἡ δεξιά occurs in the same verse. But Homer uses δεξιότερος as comparative. Cf. also ἀμφότερος, ἡμέτερος, ὑμέτερος, ἔτερος, ἐκτέρος, ὑπότερος, πότερος, where the notion of two is accentuated. Contrast between two or duality, therefore, is clear in these pronouns. They will receive separate treatment later. Here they are merely used to illustrate the origin of the comparative form. Ἁλλος (Latin alius) is also comparative,² ἀλίος. So is δεξιός³ which explains the disappearance of ὑπότερος. One of the comparative endings is –ιος. This leads one to remark that the oldest comparative forms are not formed from positives as such, but from their own roots. Thus δεξιός, which is obviously comparative and expresses duality, has no positive form. Cf. ἀμφότερος and the examples just mentioned.⁴ This original comparative need not be formed from an adjective at all, but from a substantive like βασιλεύτερος, κύντερος, etc., in Homer where the comparative expresses the possession of the quality “in contradistinction to objects which are without it” (Monro, Homeric Gr., p. 82). So πρότερος (from the adverb πρῶτον) is not ‘more forward,’ but ‘forward’ in opposition to ὑπότερος, ‘backward.’ Cf. Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 415. Cf. ἔλευθερος, ‘free to come.’ So ἔξωτερος is ‘outside,’ not ‘more outside.’ These oldest forms represent the original meaning which was not the comparison of greater or less, not a matter of degree, but a question of contrast or duality.⁵ So βέλτερος, ἐμείνων have no positive forms. There is indeed a distinct weakening of this original duality in adjectives as in pronouns.⁶ Cf. the dropping of the dual endings. Thus in the N. T. πρότερος as an adjective occurs only once, κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἂναστροφήν (Eph. 4:22). It is rare in the papyri (Moulton, Prol., p. 79). Elsewhere πρῶτος holds the field when only two objects or persons are in view, like πρῶτος οὖ (Jo. 1:15), πρῶτος and Ἁλλος (20:4), etc. Cf. our ‘first story’ when only two stories are contemplated, ‘first volume,’ etc. And as an adverb πρῶτον survives only ten times (cf. 2 Cor. 1:15), while πρῶτον is very common. [Page 663] Luke does not use πρῶτος (adjective or adverb) so that πρῶτος in Ac. 1:1 with λόγος does not imply τρίτος. Moulton⁷ finds πρῶτος only once in the Grenfell-Hunt volumes of papyri so that this dual form vanishes before the superlative πρῶτος. Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 244) sees this matter rightly and calls it a Latin point of view to insist on “former” and “latter” in Greek, a thing that the ancients did not do.

8 Ib., p. 19.
1 Moulton, Prol., pp. 77 ff.
5 Ib., pp. 4 ff.
7 Prol., p. 79.
(b) Degree. The next step was for the notion of degree to come into the comparative. The notion of “two-ness” remained, but it had the added idea of more in degree. They run along then parallel with each other. The comparative form, therefore, has two ideas, that of contrast or duality (Gegensatz) and of the relative comparative (Steigerung), though the first was the original. Relative comparison is, of course, the dominant idea in most of the N. T. examples, though, as already remarked, the notion of duality always lies in the background. Thus ἄνεκτότερον ἔσται (Mt. 10:15), βεβαιότερον (2 Pet. 1:19), εἰς τὸ κρεῖσσον (1 Cor. 11:17), σοφότερον and ἱσχυρότερον (1 Cor. 1:25).

(c) Without suffixes. But the comparative did not always use the comparative suffixes, though this was usual. Sometimes μᾶλλον was employed with the positive, though this idiom is not very frequent in the N. T. Thus we find μᾶλλον with καλός (Mk. 9:42), with μικάριν (Ac. 20:35), with νυγκατά (1 Cor. 12:22), with πολλά (Gal. 4:27). Once indeed (2 Tim. 3:4) μᾶλλον occurs with one adjective before ἦ and not with the other after ἦ. The Greeks preferred to put both qualities in the comparative degree when two adjectives were compared. But here we have φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἦ φιλόθεοι. “In Jo. 3:19 μᾶλλον—ἤ is used with two substantives” (H. Scott). In Phil. 16 we have a distinction drawn between μᾶλιστα and μᾶλλον with ὁδελφόν ὤγαπητόν. No example occurs in the N. T. of two comparatives with ἦ, but in Ro. 9:12 we have ὅ μείζων δουλεύει τῷ ἐλάσσονι and in Heb. 1:4, τοσοῦτῳ κρεῖττων γενόμενος ὅσῳ διαφορότερον.

(d) Double comparison. Sometimes indeed μᾶλλον occurs with the comparative form itself. This applies to adjectives and adverbs. Thus μᾶλλον περισσότερον (Mk. 7:36), περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον (2 Cor. 7:13). Cf. ἐτι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον (Ph. 1:9), περισσότερον ἐτι κατάδηλον (Heb. 7:15). Recall also the double comparative form like vernacular English “lesser,” μειζοτέραν (3 Jo. 4), and the comparative on the superlative ἐλαχιστότερος (Eph. 3:8. It occurs [Page 664] in Test. xii, Pat. Jos. 17:8). All this is due to the fading of the force of the comparative suffix and the desire for emphasis. Homer has χειρότερος, Ἀσχύλος μειζονότερος and ὑπερτερότερος, Xenophon ἔσχατοτέρος, Aristophanes προτεραίτερος. Cf. Schwab, Hist. Syntax etc., Heft iii, p. 60. Modern Greek vernacular has πλείουτερος and χειρότερος. The papyri give illustrations like πρεσβυτεροτέρα (Moulton, ProL., p. 236). Cf. Latin double comparative dexter-ior, sinister-ior. See list in Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 147. This double comparative is due to analogy and weakened sense of the form (Middleton, Analogy in Syntax, p. 38). Other means of strengthening the comparative were the accusative adverb πολύ, as in Heb. 12:9, 25 (cf. 2 Cor. 8:22), and in particular the
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instrumental πολλῷ, as in Lu. 18:39. In 1 Cor. 12:22 we have πολλῷ µᾶλλον over against ἀθενέστερα. But in Ph. 1:23 note πολλῷ µᾶλλον κρείσσον where all this emphasis is due to Paul’s struggling emotion. The ancient Greek used all these devices very often. Cf. Schwab, Hist. Syntax, etc., Heft iii, pp. 59 ff. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 143) rightly observes that in 2 Cor. 12:9 ἦσστα µᾶλλον are not to be taken together. The older Greek used also µέγα and µακρῷ to strengthen the comparison. Cf. Mayer, Verstärkung, Umschreibung und Entwertung der Comparationsgrade in der älteren Gräcität, 1891, p. 16 f.

(e) WITHOUT OBJECT OF COMPARISON. Sometimes the comparative form is used absolutely. It is beside the mark to say with Clyde1 that this idiom occurs “through politeness for the positive.” It is not used for the positive. It is true that no object of comparison is expressed, but that is because the context makes the point perfectly clear. In rapid familiar conversation this would often be true. Blass2 also thinks that sometimes the comparative is no more than a positive. Winer3 more justly holds that the point of comparison may “ordinarily be gathered from the context.” The point is always in the context. Thus ὃ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχειον (Jo. 13:27) may mean more quickly than Judas would have done but for the exposure. Note that this is a conversation and Judas would understand. In Heb. 13:19 περισσότερος and τάχειον correspond easily, and in verse 23, ἐὰν τάχειον ἔρχηται, perhaps it means ‘if he come before I leave.’ None of the examples of Blass are convincing, for πρεσβύτερος, though used of an official, is one who is older (elder) as compared with νεώτερος, and the bishop is not to be a neophyte (1 Tim. 3:6). The point, of course, lies [Page 665] more in length of experience than of age. Deissmann (B. S., p. 154 f.) finds in the papyri ὁ πρεσβύτερος ὁ κώμης, an official title. Pap. Lugd. A, 35 f. (Ptol. Per.). In Ac. 17:21 καίνοτερον means, of course, something newer than what they had recently heard. Socrates said to Hippocrates when he came in (Plato, Protagoras 309 C): µή τι νεώτερον ἄγγέλλεις. Then again, in Ac. 17:22, δεισιδαι µονεστέρους is more religious (or superstitious, as the case may be, a matter for exegesis. I prefer religious) than ordinary or than I had supposed. One does not need to deny the “elative” comparative sense of “very” here and elsewhere. The elative comparative is still comparative. But Blass2 denies even the elative comparative in a number of these examples. This is to a certain extent to surrender to translation the true interpretation of the Greek idiom. In Ac. 18:26 ἀκριβέστερον ἔξεταντο teaches that Apollos received more accurate information than he had previously had. Cf. ἀνταποδήσεται περὶ τοῦτον ἀκριβέστερον, B.U. 388 (ii/A.D.). Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 439. So in Ac. 24:22 ἀκριβέστερον εἶδος means that Felix more accurately than one would suppose, and in verse 26 πυκνότερον shows that he sent for Paul more frequently than he had been doing before. Ac. 25:10 κάλλιον ἐπιγνώσκεις is an interesting example. Paul hints that Festus knows his innocence better than he is willing to admit. Cf. βέλτιον σὺ γινόσκεις (2 Tim. 1:18), ‘better than I.’ Βελτίων occurs in the papyri as adjective.
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though not in the N. T. Thus one could go through all the rather numerous examples of elative comparative adjectives and adverbs in the N. T. and show that with proper attention to the context the point of comparison appears plainly enough. The comparative even without the expressed object of comparison is not just the positive. So in Ac. 27:13 ἄσσον παρελέγοντο clearly means ‘nearer than they could do before’ (cf. παραλεγόμενον in verse 8). Again in Jo. 4:52 κομψότερον ἔσχεν (note the construction) is ‘better than before the word of Christ was spoken.’ As further illustrations, not to overdo the point, note μᾶλλον in 2 Cor. 21:7 (cf. Ph. 1:12), σπουδαιότερος in 2 Cor. 8:17 (cf. 2 Tim. 1:17) and σπουδαιότερος in Ph. 2:28 (cf. 1 Th. 2:17), τολμηρότερος (Ro. 15:15) μείζονες (2 Pet. 2:11), κατώτερα in Eph. 4:9. The common expression οἱ πλείους (Ac. 19:32), and ὑπὸ πλείονας (1 Cor. 9:19) for ‘the majority’ should occasion no difficulty. In free translation one may sometimes use ‘very’ or ‘rather,’ but this is merely the resultant idea. Cf. ἑτέροις λόγοις πλείοσιν (Ac. 2:40). The older Greek shows this idiom.

(f) FOLLOWED BY ἡ. This ἡ is merely the disjunctive conjunction. But ἡ is not common in the N. T. in this connection. Indeed Blass considers that it does not occur where any other construction would be perfectly clear. As is well known in the ancient Greek, ἡ is not common after πλείον and ἐλάττων with numerals. This use of the comparative as a mere parenthesis is in the papyri. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 438. O.P. 274 (i/A.D.) πλείω πήχεις ἐννέα. Cf. Schwab, Hist. Syntax, Heft ii, pp. 84 ff. Cf. also ἔπανοι in Mk. 14:5 and 1 Cor. 15:6, where it has no effect on the construction. In Mt. 5:20 there is an ellipsis (πλείον τῶν Φαρ.), ‘than that of the Pharisees.’ So in Mt. 26:53 πλείον δοῦνα λεγιῶνας occurs with no change in the case of λεγιῶνας. In Ac. 4:22; 23:13; 24:11 likewise ἡ is absent without change of case. So in Ac. 25:6 οὐ πλείους ὁκτὼ ἡ δέκα, for ἡ here does not go with πλείους. But in Lu. 9:13 we do find οὐκ εἰσίν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἡ δέκα πέντε. And in 1 Tim. 5:9 the ablative construction occurs. In justification of Blass’ point above, he points out that with two adjectives we have ἡ (2 Tim. 3:4); with a conjunction, as ἐγγύτερον ἡ ὄτε (Ro. 13:11); with an infinitive, εὐκοπότερον εὐσεβοῦν ἦν (εὐσεβοῦν to be repeated, Mt. 19:24. Cf. Ac. 20:35); with a genitive (same form as the ablative would be if ἡ were absent), like ὑμῶν ὑποκύψιν μᾶλλον ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ (Ac. 4:19); with a dative, like ὄνεκτότερον γῇ Σοδόμων ἡ τῇ πόλει ἑκείνη (Mt. 10:15). These are all pertinent and striking examples. There remain others (against Blass’ view) which are not so justified, like πλέονας μᾶθητὰς ποιεῖν ἡ Ἰωάνης (Jo. 4:1), ἡγαπάσαν μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἡ τὸ φῶς (Jo. 3:19), etc. But it remains true that ἡ is becoming rare in this usage in the N. T.

(g) FOLLOWED BY THE ABLATIVE. The ablative is the most common means of expressing the standard of the comparison: so we must take the case, and not as genitive. As remarked in the chapter on the cases, this ablative construction seems rather more common in the N. T. than in the papyri. It is found in Homer. In the old Sanskrit the ablative was found with comparatives, though occasionally the locative
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or the instrumental appeared. Indeed the various constructions after the comparative (particle like ἦ, case, preposition) occur in the other Indo-Germanic languages. Schwab estimates that in Attic prose the ablative after the comparative stands in relation to ἦ as 5.5 to 1 and in poetry 18 to 1. Blass thinks that in the κοινή the ablative is three times as common in this idiom as in Attic prose. So in the N. T. this is the usual construction after the comparative. As further examples observe μείζων τοῦτον (Mk. 12:31), μείζων τοῦ πατρός Ἰησοῦν (Jo. 4:12), πλέον τοῦτον (Jo. 21:15), οὐσιώδερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων (1 Cor. 1:25), etc. Cf. 1 Jo. 3:20; Heb. 7:26.

Sometimes the comparison is a little complicated, as in Mt. 5:20, ὑμῖν ἡ δικαιοσύνη πλέον τῶν γραμματέων, where ‘righteousness’ is dropped in the second member. Note πλέον as a fixed or stereotyped form. Blass also Jo. 5:36. In Mt. 21:36, ἄλλους δούλους πλέονας τῶν πρώτων, note the use of comparative and superlative side by side.

(h) FOLLOWED BY PREPOSITIONS. Prepositions occur not infrequently after the comparative. We have already seen the positive so used with παρά, and πρός. Wellhausen considers this positive use like the Aramaic. In the classical Greek we see beginnings of this usage. In the modern Greek, the normal way of expressing comparison is to use ὑπό with the accusative and occasionally παρά with the nominative. The examples of the use of παρά are chiefly in Luke and Hebrews. Thus Lu. 3:13, μὴ δὲν πλέον παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον ὑμῖν; Heb. 1:4, διαφορώτερον παρὰ αὐτοῖς; 3:3, πλέονος δόξης παρὰ Μωσῆν; 9:23, κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας. So Heb. 11:4; 12:24. Examples of ὑπέρ in this sense occur likewise in Lu. 16:8, φρονιμώτεροι ὑπέρ τούς αὐτούς; Heb. 4:12, τομώτερος ὑπέρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν. In the LXX comparison was usually completed by means of παρά or ὑπέρ.

(i) THE COMPARATIVE DISPLACING THE SUPERLATIVE. This increase of the comparative in contrast to the corresponding decrease of the superlative is one of the most striking peculiarities of the adjective in the κοινή. Indeed one may broadly say with Blass, that in the κοινή vernacular the comparative with the article takes over the peculiar functions of the superlative. In the modern Greek vernacular the comparative with the definite article is the only idiom employed for the true superlative. The form in –τατος in modern Greek is rare and always elative.

1 Ib., p. 1.
2 Hist. Synt. etc., Heft ii, p. 92.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 329. The abl. is sometimes used with personal pronouns after the comp. in mod. Gk. (Thumb, p. 76).
4 Blass, ib., p. 108.
6 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 108.
7 Thumb, Handb., p. 75 f.
8 C. and S., Sel., pp. 84 ff. For various prepositions so used in older Gk. see Schwab, Hist. Synt., Heft i, pp. 45 ff.
9 Hermeneutik und Kritik, p. 199.
1 Thumb, Handb., p. 73.
Moulton\(^2\) finds the papyri supporting this disappearance of the superlative form before the comparative to a certain extent. “It seems fair to conclude that (1) the superlative, apart from its elative use, was dying, though not dead; (2) the comparative had only sporadically begun to be used in its place.”\(^3\) He reminds us that the literary use had as much weight as the vulgar idiom. As a matter of fact the superlative form is not essentially necessary. The Armenian has no superlative and is like the vernacular modern Greek. The root-difference between the comparative and the superlative is that between “twoness” and “moreness.” As the notion of duality vanished or was no longer stressed, the need for a distinction between the comparative and superlative vanished also. Both are in reality comparative in relation to the positive.\(^4\) In the N. T. therefore we see this blurring of distinction between comparative and superlative. Cf. 1 Cor. 13:13 μείζον μὲ τούτων ἡ ἁγάπη where three things are compared. In English we say “greatest of these.” Sir W. M. Ramsay gives πάντων μείζον in a Christian inscription.\(^5\) In Mt. 18:1 we have τίς ἥρα μείζον, etc. Cf. Mk. 9:34. So in Mt. 11:11 (cf. Lu. 9:48) ποτέ δὲ μικρότερος (but note also μείζον αὐτοῦ). In Lu. 7:42 f., πλεῖον and τὸ πλεῖον do indeed refer to the two debtors (verse 41), though it is questionable if that fine point is here insisted on. But in 1 Cor. 12:23 the comparatives have their usual force. Moulton\(^6\) cites from O.P. 716 (ii/A.D.) τὴν δοξην αἴρεισι διὸντα, ‘to the highest bidder.’ Winer\(^7\) indeed finds similar examples in Demosthenes and Athenagoras. Note the adverb ἐστερον πάντων (Mt. 22:27), obviously as superlative. So in 1 Tim. 4:1, ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς. In Eph. 4:9, τὸ κατώτερα μέρη is likewise in the superlative sense. The Epistle of Barnabas shows similar examples. Blass\(^8\) reminds us that the Italian does not distinguish between the comparative and the superlative. The modern Greek to-day says ὁ σοφώτερος ἀπὸ ὅλους ‘the wisest of all.’\(^9\) [Page 669] Moulton\(^1\) notes the fact that, while κρείττων and χείρων in the N. T. are strictly comparative, they have no superlative, but he notes (p. 236) that the papyri show χείριστος, as Tb.P. 72 (ii/b/C).

XIV. The Superlative Adjective (ὑπερθετικὸν ὀνόμα). For the forms see chapter VII, II, 3, (c). As already set forth, the superlative is moreness rather than twoness.

(a) The Superlative Vanishing. As already remarked, the superlative forms are vanishing in the N. T. as in the κοινὴ generally. Blass\(^2\) observes that ἐσχάτος and πρῶτος are the only exceptions to this disappearing tendency. Under the weakening of dualism πρῶτος goes down. Usually ἐσχάτος refers to more than two, the last of a series or last of all, like ἐν ἑσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 11:24), ἐσχάτον πάντων (1 Cor. 15:8).

---

4 Ib., Heft i, pp. 17 ff.
5 Cities and Bish. of Phrygia, II, p. 525.
6 Prol., p. 78 f.
7 W.-Th., p. 242.
8 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33.
9 Jebb, V. and D.’s Handb., p. 309.
1 Prol., p. 78.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 141 f.
3 On this word cf. Gonnet, Degrés de signif. en Grec et en Lat., 1876, p. 131.
Sometimes first and last are contrasted, like ἡ ἐσχάτη πλάνη χείρων τῆς πρώτης (Mt. 27:64). Note comparative also. Cf. Mt. 19:30. So ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἐσχάτος about Jesus (Rev. 1:17). In the LXX ἐσχάτος occurs as comparative (cf. in Deut. 24:3), and even as an adverb meaning ‘after’ in Deut. 31:29. Cf. Thackeray, p. 184. Even more common than ἐσχάτος is πρῶτος. It is used in the usual sense often (Mk. 12:20), but is also common where only two are concerned (1 Cor. 15:45; Jo. 20:4) as already shown. Sometimes πρῶτος expresses mere rank as in Ac. 17:4. In Mt. 22:38 note ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή. Cf. πρώτη πάντων in Mk. 12:28 (note gender also). These are true superlatives. Sir W. M. Ramsay (Expositor, Nov., 1912) shows that πρώτη in Lu. 2:2 is not in sense of πρότερος. It is first of a series of enrolments as we now know. But this proves nothing as to Ac. 1:1. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 60) quotes I Gr. XII, 5, 590, ἔφθασας ἀλάχου πρῶτος, where two are compared.

(b) A FEW TRUE SUPERLATIVES IN THE N. T. But a few other true superlatives survive in the N. T. Thus ὁ ἐλάχιστος in 1 Cor. 15:9 is a true superlative, ‘the least.’ But it is elative in Lu. 12:26. Cf. Mt. 2:6; 5:19. Moulton finds ἔλαχιστος as a true
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superlative in a papyrus of second century B.C. Tb.P. 24. But there are very few true superlatives in the papyri. In Ac. 17:15 ὡς τάχιστα is a true superlative. "Ὑψιστος is a true superlative [Page 670] when both applied to God, τοῦ ὑψίστου (Mk. 5:7), and the abode of God, ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις (Mt. 21:9). Some MSS. (D, etc., W. H. marg.) have ἔγγιστα in Mk. 6:36, which is a true superlative. In Ac. 20:38 μάλιστα, 'most of all,' is probably a true superlative. In 1 Cor. 14:27 τὸ πλείστον, 'at the most,' is a true superlative. In Mt. 11:20 αἱ πλείσται δυνάμεις we probably have the true superlative. Cf. τῇ ἅγιωτάτῃ ὑμῖν (Ju. 20) and τὴν ἐκκριβεστάτην αἴρεσιν (Ac. 26:5), true superlatives in –τατος. In Rev. 18:12; 21:11 τιμώτατος is probably elative. Cf. μονώτατος, 1 Kt. 8:39. The list is indeed very small.

(c) THE ELATIVE SUPERLATIVE. In the sense of ‘very’ or ‘exceedingly’ it comprises the great majority of the superlative forms that survive in the N. T. 1 In the papyri the immense majority of superlative forms are elative. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 439. Κράτιστος is elative always in the N. T. and is indeed merely a sort of title. 2 So κράτιστος in Lu. 1:3. So ἦ διστα is only elative (2 Cor. 12:9, 15). Μέγιστος occurs only once (2 Pet. 1:4) and is elative, τὸ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐκαγγέλματα (permagnus, Blass). In Lu. 12:26 ἐλάχιστον is elative as also in 1 Cor. 4:3; 6:2, while in Eph. 3:8 the comparative superlative ἐλαχιστότερος is doubtful. 3 Πλείστος, generally elative in the papyri, 4 is so in Mk. 4:1, ὅθλος πλείστος. Μάλιστα occurs some 12 times and is usually elative, as in Ph. 4:22.

(d) NO DOUBLE SUPERLATIVES. The scarcity of the superlative in the N. T. removes any ground for surprise that no double superlatives occur. In Eph. 3:8 ἐλαχιστότερῳ is indeed a superlative strengthened by the comparative. In Gal. 6:10 the elative superlative μάλιστα occurs by way of repetition with τὸ ὑγαθόν, as in Phil.

5 Prol., p. 79.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 78.
3 Ib., p. 236.
4 Ib., p. 79.
it does with ἀγαπητόν. Schwab gives a considerable list of double or strengthened superlatives from classic writers, like πλεῖστον ἥδιστος (Eurip., Alc.), μέγιστον ἔχθεστος (Eurip., Med.), μάλιστα φίλτατος (Eurip., Hippol.), μάλιστα δεινότατος (Thuc.), etc. Cf. Latin minimissimus and English “most straitest sect,” “most unkindest cut of all,” etc.

(c) FOLLOWED BY ABLATIVE. The superlative, like the comparative, may be followed by the ablative. Thus with πρῶτον ὑμῶν (Jo. 15:18), πρῶτος μου (Jo. 1:15), and possibly in ἐπὶ ἑσχάτου [Page 671] τῶν ἥμερῶν τούτων (Heb. 1:2), though this passage may be merely the genitive.

(f) NO “HEBRAISTIC” SUPERLATIVE. It is gratuitous to consider ἀστεῖος τῶθεο (Ac. 7:20) and similar passages superlatives.

XV. Numerals. For the general discussion of the forms see chapter VII, III. The ordinals are indeed adjectives, as are the first four cardinals and all after two hundred. The syntactical peculiarities of the numerals are not many.

(a) ἕξ AND ΠΡΩΤΟΣ. The use of ἕξ rather than πρῶτος is one of the most striking points to observe. Before we can agree with Blass that this is “undoubtedly a Hebrew idiom,” who follows Winer, we must at least hear what Moulton has to say in reply. To begin with, in modern Greek “the cardinals beyond 4 have ousted the ordinals entirely.” Then we learn from the inscriptions that this usage of cardinals as ordinals is as old as the Byzantine Greek. Moulton also quotes from papyri of the second and third centuries A.D. τῇ μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι, B.U. 623 (ii/iii A.D.), a construction like μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός in Haggai 2:1. The Germans, like the English, can say “page forty.” In the N. T. we only find this substitution of the cardinal in the case of εἷς, while in the modern Greek the matter has gone much further. In the classic Greek no real analogy exists, though ἕξ stands in enumerations when δεύτερος or ἅλλος follows, and in compound numerals a closer parallel is found, like ἕξ καὶ τριακοστός,
though even here the case is essentially different.\(^9\) Cf. Latin unus et vicēsimus, “a case of the formation of the ordinal being imperfectly carried out.”\(^9\) Certainly then it was possible for this development to have gone on apart from the Hebrew, especially when one considers that πρῶτος is not derived from εἷς, though Moulton\(^10\) admits that the Hebrew has the same peculiarity. Moulton\(^11\) further objects that if Semitic influence had been at work we should have had τῇ πέντε in the modern Greek, since the Hebrew used the later days of the month in cardinal numbers.\(^12\) Still, the striking fact remains that in the LXX (cf. Numb. 1:1) and in the N. T. the first day of the month is expressed by μία, not by πρώτη. This was obviously in harmony with the κοινή of a later time, but the first evidence of its actual [Page 672] use so far is in the LXX, and it is in exact imitation of the Hebrew idiom on the point. It is hard to resist the idea that the LXX at least is here influenced by the Hebrew. And, if so, then the N. T. naturally also. Later on we need not attribute the whole matter to the Hebrew influence. In the N. T. indeed we once have πρώτη σαββάτου (Mk. 16:9), which belongs to the disputed close of the Gospel.\(^1\) Cf., on the other hand, εἷς μίαν σαββάτων (Mt. 28:1), πρῶτη μιᾶ τῶν σαββάτων (Mk. 16:2), τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων (Lu. 24:1; Jo. 20:1; Ac. 20:7); κατὰ μίαν σαββάτου (1 Cor. 16:2). There is nothing peculiar in the use of ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μὴνας ἔξ (Ac. 18:11). Cf. Rev. 12:14.

\(b\) The Simplification of the “Teens.” This began in the classical period as is seen in the Attic inscriptions.\(^2\) Hence from the third century B.C. on we usually find “simplified ordinals from 13th to 19th.”\(^3\) So we have τρισκαιδέκατος, τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος, etc. So the papyri\(^4\) usually have δέκα τρεῖς, δέκα ἔξ, and even δέκα δῶο rather more\(^5\) frequently than δώδεκα. Cf. τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτη in Ac. 27:27, 33. Hence καὶ is not always inserted when the smaller number precedes and “omitted” when the larger comes first. It was never a uniform custom (Winer-Thayer, p. 250), least of all in the N. T. Cf. Gal. 3:17, etc. But three numerals may appear without καὶ, as in ἐκατὸν πεντῆκον τριῶν (Jo. 21:11). Cf. Rev. 7:4; 14:3; 21:17. See further chapter VII, III, 2, (b).

\(c\) The Inclusive Ordinal. Cf. αὐτὸς τρίτος, “he and two others.” It has one illustration in the N. T., ὡδοῦν Ὡδῶς (2 Pet. 2:5), “Noah and seven others” or “Noah an eighth.” The idiom is classical enough, though the ancient writers usually had αὐτὸς also.\(^6\) Moulton\(^7\) finds one parallel in the papyri, τρίτος ὣν in P.P. iii. 28, though
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9 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 144.
9 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 144.
10 Prol., p. 96.
11 Ib.
12 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 144.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 144, remarks that Eusebius quotes the verse as τῇ μιᾷ.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 96.
4 Ib. Δέκα occupies first place from thirteen upwards, but with ordinals the reverse is true.
5 Like the LXX. C. and S., p. 30.
6 W.-Th., p. 249.
the literary κοινή writers (Plutarch, Appian) use it. Moulton expresses no surprise at this idiom in 2 Peter where “we rather expect bookish phrases.” He comments also on the “translation English” in the Authorized Version’s rendering “Noah the eighth person,” and uses it as an illustration of the way that the LXX often rendered the Hebrew, though unlike the misprint “strain at a gnat,” it did not gain currency in English.

[Page 673] (d) THE DISTRIBUTIVES. There is no trouble over the classic use of ἀνά (Mt. 20:9) and κατά (Mk. 6:40) in this sense. We have already (chapter XIII, ἀνά and κατά) discussed ἀνά ἐξ (Rev. 21:21) and καθ ἐξ (Ro. 12:5). The point here that calls for comment is whether δόο δόο in Mk. 6:7 is a Hebraism. Cf. ἀνά δόο [δόο] in Lu. 10:1. Winer¹ termed it “properly Hebraistic,” while Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 145) more guardedly described it as “after the Semitic and more colloquial manner.” The repetition of the numeral is a Hebrew way of expressing the distributive idea. Cf. in the N. T. also συμπόσια συμπόσια (Mk. 6:39), πρασία πρασία (verse 40). Moulton² cites also δεσμάς δεσμάς, as the reading of Epiphanius for Mt. 13:30. But Winer³ had himself cited Ἀeschylus, Persae, 981, μυρία μυρία, and Blass⁴ compares in Eris, the lost drama of Sophocles, μίαν μίαν. The Atticists had censured this as “colloquial,” but at any rate “it was not merely a creation of Jewish Greek.” Deissmann⁵ besides quotes τρία τρία from the Oxy. Papyri. W. F. Moulton⁶ had

7 Prol., pp. 98, 107.
1 W.-M., p. 312.
2 Prol., p. 97.
3 W.-Th., p. 249; W.-M., p. 312.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 330.

Sophocles SOPHOCLES, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (1888).
Deissmann

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.
already called attention to the fact that modern Greek shows the same usage. Hence we must conclude, with Moulton and Thumb, that the κοινὰ development was independent of the Hebrew. Moulton comments also on the reading of B in Lu. 10:1, ἀνὰ δύο δύο, and notes how in the papyrus μεγάλου μεγάλου = the elative superlative μεγίστου. See also κατὰ δύο δύο in P. Oxy. 886 (iii/A.D.).

For the proportionals the N. T. has only –πλασίων, not the classic –πλάσιος. Cf. ἐκατονταπλασίων, Mk. 10:30 and Mt. 19:29 NCDX; πολλαπλασίων, Lu. 18:30 and Mt. 19:29 BL. Cf. Blass-Debrunner, p. 38.

(e) The Cardinal Ἐπτά. With ἐβδομηκοντάκις Ἐπτά (Mt. 18:22) rather than Ἐπτάκις D the rendering ‘until seventy times seven’ is certainly possible in itself and follows literally the Greek words. The identical expression (ἐβδομηκοντάκις Ἐπτά) occurs in Gen. 4:24 (where the Revised Version renders it ‘seventy and seven fold’) and in Test. xii, Pat. Ben. 7:4. The margin of the Revised Version for Mt. 18:22 gives “seventy times and seven” which [Page 674] Winer interprets as “seventy-seven
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8 Hellen., p. 128.


times.” Moulton\(^2\) considers rightly that the passage in Genesis settles the usage in Matthew to which an allusion may be made. He cites a possible parallel from the Iliad, xxii, 349, δεκάκις [τε] καὶ ἕκκοσι.

\(\text{(f) Substantive not expressed.}\) Sometimes with numerals the substantive for money is not expressed. Thus ἄργυρίου μυρίάδας πέντε (Ac. 19:19), but in Mt. 26:16 note ἄργυρια. The use of τρίτον τοῦτο (2 Cor. 13:1) is merely an instance of the adjective used absolutely without a substantive. Cf. the neuter τὸ δεύτερον (2 Cor. 13:2).

\(\text{(g) Adverbs with numerals.}\) They have no effect on the construction. Thus πράθηνε πράθηναι ἐπάνω τριακοσίων δηναρίων (Mk. 14:5), ὠφθη ἔκατα τε κὶ ἐκτὸς ἀπὸ τοῦτο (2 Cor. 13:1) is merely an instance of the adjective used absolutely without a substantive. Cf. the neuter τὸ δεύτερον (2 Cor. 13:2).

\(\text{(h) Ἐἷς as indefinite article.}\) The Greek, as a rule, had no indefinite article. The older Greek did occasionally use τις with no more apparent force than an indefinite article, but usually nothing was used for that idea in Greek. Still in Aristophanes (Av. 1292) Moulton\(^4\) rightly sees Ἐἷς κάπηλος, as an example of the later κοινή idiom. Aristophanes indeed preserves much of the colloquial speech. In the modern Greek ἕνας may be used.\(^5\) Ἐἷς became naturally more popular than τις since it has all three genders.\(^6\) Moulton\(^7\) finds numerous papyri illustrations. The modern languages have followed the Greek model here, for the English an (Scottish an) is really one, like the German ein and the French un. It is therefore hardly necessary to fall back on the Hebrew precedent\(^8\) in the use of תָּן, though it here coincided with the κοινή idiom. Hence N. T. usage on this point is in full accord with the development of the Greek. Cf. Ἐἷς γραμματεύς (Mt. 8:19), μία παιδίσκη (26:69), μία χήρα πτωχή (Mk. 12:42), Ἐἷς ὅφειλέτης (Mt. 18:24), etc. In Jo. 6:9 some MSS. have Ἐἷς with παιδίσκην, but the sense is not materially altered either way. Cf. ἦκουσα Ἐἷς ὀφειλέτης (Rev. 8:13), ἤλων συκῆν μίαν (Mt. 21:19), etc. [Page 675] Moulton\(^1\) properly criticizes Meyer on Mt. 8:19 for his “exegetical subtleties” in denying this idiom for Ἐἷς in the N. T.

\(\text{(i) Ἐἷς=Τις.}\) Sometimes indeed Ἐἷς stands alone with practically the same sense as τις, as in Mt. 19:16; Mk. 10:17, though in the parallel passage (Lu. 18:18) τις ἄρχων

---

3 Cf. Green, Handb., etc., p. 276.
4 Prol., p. 97.
5 Thumb, Handb., p. 81.
8 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 144.
1 Prol., p. 95.
occurs. The use of ἐπὶ with genitive (or ablativo), like ἐπὶ τῶν πολιτῶν (Lu. 15:15), ἐπὶ μὴ τῶν ἡμερῶν (Lu. 8:22), or the ablativo, like ἐπὶ ἡμῶν (Jo. 13:21), is, of course, merely the same idiom expanded. Cf. ἐπὶ τις, Lu. 22:50; Jo. 11:49. In Mk. 14:10, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν δύο δεκα, the article at first looks incongruous, ‘the one of the twelve,’ but the early papyri give illustrations of this usage also. It is as a pronoun that ἐπὶ is to be construed here and in the rather frequent alternative expressions ἐπὶ—ἐπὶ (Mt. 24:40), μία—μία (verse 41), τῶν ἔνα—τῶν ἔτερον (Mt. 6:24), ἐν ὑμῖν—τοῦ ἔτερου (ib.), ἐπὶ—τοῦ ἄνω (1 Cor. 4:6). Cf. ἐπὶ καὶ ἐπὶ (Mt. 27:38) and the reciprocal use in 1 Th. 5:11. Cf. ἐπὶ ἐκαστος, Mt. 26:22.

(j) THE DISTRIBUTIVE USE OF Ἐπὶ. So ἐπὶ καθ ἐν in Rev. 4:8 and the “barbaric” (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 247) ἐπὶ κατ ἐπὶ (Mk. 14:19), το καθ ἐπὶ (Ro. 12:5), ὁ ἐπὶ ἐπὶ ἐκαστος (Rev. 21:21). This “barbaric” idiom came to be very common in the later Greek. Cf. modern Greek κάθε, καθένας = ἐκαστος. The free adverbial use of prepositions like ἐπὶ, ἐπί, παρά, κατά is copiously illustrated in Winer-Schmiedel, p. 247, from the LXX and the late Greek writers. For the use of ὁ ὁδεῖς, ὁθεῖς, μῆθεῖς see next chapter on Pronouns. Cf. also there ὁ—πᾶς and πᾶς—ὁ.

[PAGE 676] CHAPTER XV

PRONOUNS (ἈΝΤΩΝΥΜΙΑΙ)

For the antiquity and history of pronouns see IV in chapter VII (Declensions). We are here concerned, not with the form, but with the use of pronouns. As a matter of fact all pronouns fall into two classes, Deictic (δεικτικαί) and Anaphoric (ἀναφορικαί). They either “point out” or they “refer to” a substantive. So we get the modern terms, demonstrative and relative (cf. Monro, Homeric Gr., p. 168 f.). But some pronouns may be demonstrative or relative according to the context. The demonstrative or deictic was the original usage. For practical purposes we have to follow a more minute division.

I. Personal Pronouns (προτότυποι ἢ προσωπικαὶ ἀντωνυμια). The personal pronouns (first and second persons) are deictic (I, thou). The reason for the use of pronouns, as already explained, was to avoid the repetition of the substantive. In Jo. 11:22 note the repetition of θεός. Cf. also Lu. 6:45.

(a) THE NOMINATIVE. As already explained, the verb uses the personal pronoun as personal suffixes, so that as a rule no need was felt for the separate expression of the pronoun in the nominative. All verbs had the personal endings like ει-μή, ἐσ-σί, ἐσ-τί. The use of the personal pronoun in addition to the personal ending of the verb was

2 Ib.
Winer-Schmiedel WINNER-SCHMIEDEL, Winer’s Grammatik des neuest. Sprachidioms. 8. Aufl. (1894—).
1 Cf. Schoemann, Die Lehre von den Redet. nach den Alten, p. 95: “Die Nomina benennen die Dinge nach ihren Qualitäten, die Pronomina bezeichnen sie nach ihren Verhältnissen.”
due to desire for emphasis. Then the separate expression of the pronoun led to the gradual sloughing off of the personal ending. In modern English this process is nearly complete. In Greek this process was arrested, though in modern Greek all verbs save ἐμαυ are –ω verbs. In most cases, therefore, in Greek the existence of the personal pronoun in the nominative implies some emphasis or contrast. But this is not quite true of all examples. “The emphasis of the first and second persons is not to be insisted on too much in poetry or in familiar prose. Notice the frequency of ἐγὼ, ἦμεν,”¹ in conversation it was particularly common to have the personal pronoun in the nominative. In the later Greek generally the personal pronouns show a weakening of force,² but never to the actual obliteration of emphasis, not even in the modern Greek.³ Moulton⁴ agrees with Ebeling⁵ that there was “no necessary emphasis in the Platonic ἦν δὲ ἐγώ, ἦπον ἐγώ, ὡς σύ φής.” Clearly then the frequency of the pronoun in the N. T. is not to be attributed to the Semitic influence. Even Conybeare and Stock⁶ see that it is not necessary to appeal to the well-known Hebrew fondness for pronouns for this usage. But Blass⁷ thinks that some of the MS. variations may be due to Semitic influence. We are free therefore to approach the N. T. examples on their merits.⁸

1. The First Person, ἐγώ and ἦμεν. It is easy to find in the N. T. numerous examples where ἐγώ shows contrast. So ἐγὼ χρείαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι (Mt. 3:14), ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω (5:22), ἐγὼ σε ἐδόξασα (Jo. 17:4). Cf. ἐγώ and σο in Jo. 17:23. The amount of emphasis will vary very greatly according to circumstances and may sometimes vanish entirely so far as we can determine. Different shades of meaning appear also as in ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ ἐπον (Jo. 1:30), ‘I, myself.’ Cf. κάγῳ οὐκ ἠδών αὐτόν (Jo. 1:33) and κάγῳ ἐδόξακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα (verse 34) and note absence with second verb. Cf. Jo. 6:48; 16:33; 1 Cor. 2:1, 3. Note absence of ἐγώ in Mt. 5:18, 20, λέγω ὑμῖν. Cf. also τίς ἱδεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἤθεν; (2 Cor. 11:29) with τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦ; (ib.) as proof that the point must not be pressed too far in either direction.⁹ Further examples of ἐγώ may be seen in Ro. 7:17; Jo. 5:31, 34; 10:30; Eph. 5:32; Ph. 4:11. For the plural ἦμεν see ἦμεν προσκυνοῦμεν (Jo. 4:22) in opposition to ἦμεν, but then follows merely δ ὁδόμεν. So in Ac. 4:20 note οὗ διδόμεθα ἦμεν δ ἐδώκαμεν and τί καὶ ἦμεν κηδυσώμεν. (1 Cor. 15:30). Cf. Mt. 6:12. The “editorial” ‘we’ has already received discussion (cf. The Sentence) and may be merely illustrated here. Blass¹⁰ considers ita “wide-spread tendency among Greek

1 Gildersleeve, Synt. of Cl. Gk., part i, p. 35.
3 Thumb, Handb., etc., p. 59 f.
4 Prol., p. 85.
5 Gildersleeve Studies, p. 240.
Conybeare and Stock CONYEARE and STOCK, Selections from the LXX. A Grammatical Introduction (1905).
6 Sel. from the LXX, p. 65.
7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 316.
8 In general the N. T. follows the classic idiom. W.-Sch., p. 194.
9 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 194.
10 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 166. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 86 f., who leaves the matter to the exegete.
writers, when they speak of themselves to say ἡμεῖς instead of ἐγώ. This is not always true in Paul’s Epistles (Ro. 1:5), for sometimes he associates others with him in the address at the beginning. There are undoubted examples in the N. T. like οἱ ἐσμέν (2 Cor. 10:11), παράδεμα (Heb. 13:18), γραφόμεν (1 Jo. 1:4). But sometimes the plural merely associates the readers or hearers with the writer or speaker. So ἐδοξόσωμεν (1 Cor. 15:49), ὁμοίόσωμεν (Mk. 4:30). Sometimes the first person singular is used in a representative manner as one of a class (cf. the representative article like ὁ ἀγαθός). Blass¹ does not find this idiom so common in Greek as in other languages, but it occurs in Demosthenes and certainly in Paul. So τί ἐξί τ καγὼ ὡς ἀμαρτωλός κρίνωμαι; (Ro. 3:7). Cf. in next verse βλασφημοῦμεν. See 1 Cor. 10:30; Gal. 2:18. In Ro. 7:7–25 special difficulties occur.

2. The Second Person, σύ and ὑμεῖς. Thus in Jo. 17:5 note the contrast in με σύ. Cf. Jo. 1:42 σὺ ἐὰν Σίμων—σὺ κληθήσῃ, 2:10 σὺ τετήρηκας, 4:10 σὺ δὲν βήταις, Ro. 2:3 οᵗι σὺ ἐκατέρξητι, Lu. 1:76 καὶ σὺ δέ, etc. Cf. also Mt. 27:11. Sometimes σύ has a very emphatic position, as in σὺ τίς εἶ (Ro. 9:20; 14:4). In 1 Cor. 15:36, ἀφρων, σὺ ὀ σπείρας, it is possible,² though not necessary, to take σύ with ἀφρων (cf. Ac. 1:24). In καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὑτῶν αἶ (Lu. 22:58) one is reminded of the Latin Et tu, Brute. See Lu. 10:15; Ac. 23:3; Ἡ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς (Ro. 14:10). As examples of the plural take ἐσεσθε ὑμεῖς (Mt. 5:48), δότε ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν (Mk. 6:37). See ἐκέινος and ὑμεῖς contrasted in Jo. 5:38; ὑμεῖς in verse 39 and also in 44 f. Cf. Ac. 4:7; Lu. 10:24, and in particular ὑμεῖς ὀφείλεις (Mt. 27:24). For ὑμεῖς and ἠμεῖς contrasted see Jo. 4:22. In Jo. 4:35, οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε, we have the same inclusive use of the second person that we noticed in the first. In Ro. 2:3, 17, the second person singular occurs in the same representative sense that the first has also. Cf. also Ro. 9:20; 11:17; etc. In Jo. 3:10, σὺ ἐὰν ὁ διδάσκαλος, we have a case of distributed emphasis. Cf. also Mt. 16:16; Jo. 9:34; 2 Cor. 1:23, as examples of this sustained emphasis, where the emphasis of the pronoun passes on to the remainder of the sentence and contributes point and force to the whole.³ On the whole the Greek language has freedom in the construction of the pronouns.⁴ Moulton raises⁵ the question if in σὺ εἶμαι (Mt. 26:64), σὺ λέγεις (27:11), ὑμεῖς λέγετε (Lu. 22:70), we do not have the equivalent of ‘That is right,’ [Page 679] but πλὴν (Thayer) is against it in Mt. 26:64. Σύ occurs in John more frequently than in all the Synoptics put together (Abbott, Johannine Gr., p. 297).
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¹ Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 316 f.
² W.-Sch., p. 195.
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THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).

———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

Abbott
3. **The Third Person.** It has had a more radical development or lack of development. As a matter of fact the Greek had and has no definite third personal pronoun for the nominative like ἐγώ and σο. No nominative was used for οὖ, ο, etc., and this pronoun was originally reflexive. Besides it is not used in the N. T., though literary κοινή writers like Aristides, Arrian, Lucian, Polybius use it.¹ Where another pronoun was desired for the third person besides that in the personal ending, various devices were used. The Attic writers usually employed a demonstrative (ὁ δέ, ὁ μέν, οὖτος, ἐκεῖνος, ὃς δέ, δός, etc.). The N. T. shows examples of all these constructions which will be illustrated in the discussion of the demonstrative pronouns. But the N. T. uses also αὐτός as the subject, an idiom foreign to Attic writers, but found already in Homer² and common in the modern Greek, where indeed it has come to be itself a demonstrative.³ Simcox⁴ rightly remarks that the main point to observe is not whether it has emphasis, but its appearance at all as the mere subject. All the personal pronouns in the nominative have more or less emphasis. The use of αὐτός in contrast with other persons is natural like ἀυτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ (Mk. 2:25). We are not here considering the intensive use of αὐτός as ‘self’ nor the use of ὁ ἀυτός ‘the same.’ There is no dispute as to use of αὐτός as emphatic ‘he’ in the N. T. like the Pythogorean⁵ (Doric) αὐτός ἐστι. So Ac. 20:35 αὐτός ἐστιν, as much as to say ‘The Master said.’ Cf. the way in which some wives refer systematically to their husbands as “He.” Other undoubted examples are αὐτός γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαόν (Mt. 1:21). Here the emphasis is so clear that the Revised Version renders: “For he it is that shall save.” In Mt. 12:50 αὐτός μου ὁ διδάσκαλος is resumptive, gathering up δοσις, and is distinctly emphatic. Cf. likewise αὐτός βαπτίσι, referring to ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Mt. 3:11; ὁ πηρόν—καὶ αὐτός, 1 Jo. 3:24; ὁν ἰν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν, Mk. 14:44. Strong emphasis also appears in examples like καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων (Col. 1:17). In Mt. 8:24 ἀυτός δὲ and Mk. 4:38 καὶ αὐτός Jesus is the chief person in the story and the pronoun has emphasis. Cf. likewise Lu. 1:16, 17; 24:21; Mt. 16:20. In Lu. 19:2 W. H. and Nestle [Page 680] follow B in reading καὶ αὐτόν twice. Some emphasis is present both times. In Ac. 7:21 (Rec.) the pronoun αὐτόν appears three times. As regards καὶ αὐτή, the editors differ between this accent and καὶ αὐτή in Lu. 7:12;
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2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 164.
3 Thumb, Handb., p. 90.
4 Simcox


———, The Writers of the N. T.

5 Prol., p. 86.
8:42; 1 Cor. 7:12; Ro. 7:10. In Lu. 2:37; Ro. 16:2, Nestle agrees with W. H. in καὶ αὐτή. But in Lu. 2:37 αὐτή χήρα may be a ‘widow by herself.’1 There is no real reason for objecting to the feminine use of this idiom. The plural αὐτοί appears in Mk. 7:36; Lu. 2:50; 9:36. The only remaining question is whether αὐτός occurs in the nominative free from any emphasis just like the personal ending in a word. It is in Luke’s Gospel and the Apocalypse2 that such instances occur. It is not a question whether αὐτός is so used in ancient Greek. Winer3 denies that any decisive passages have been adduced in the N. T. of such unemphatic use. Certainly the matter is one of tone and subjective impression to a large extent. And yet some examples do occur where emphasis is not easily discernible and even where emphasis would throw the sentence out of relation with the context. What emphasis exists must be very slight. Cf. Lu. 1:22; 2:50; 6:8; 8:1, 22; 15:14; 24:14, 25, 31; Rev. 14:10; 19:15. Thus we see all grades of emphasis. Abbott4 holds that in John αὐτός never means ‘he,’ either emphatic or unemphatic, but always ‘himself.’ But in Jo. 2:12 (αὐτὸς καὶ ἥ μητήρ αὐτοῦ) there is little difference between the emphatic ‘he’ and ‘himself.’ Cf. also 18:1. But the intensive idea is clear in Jo. 4:2, 12. In 4:53 it might be either way. In the LXX we find αὐτός sometimes unemphatic. Cf. Gen. 3:15 f.; 1 Sam. 17:42; 18:16.

(b) THE OBLIQUE CASES OF THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

1. Originally Reflexive. In pre-Homeric times the pronominal stem was reflexive.5 The reflexive form, as distinct from the personal pronoun, was a later development. The personal pronouns may be reflexive in Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, Pindar and the other Lyric poets.6 Indeed, the early Attic inscriptions7 show the same thing, not to mention the Dramatic poets and Herodotus.8 It was only gradually that the distinctively reflexive form came into common use in the Attic prose, first for the
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third person, and [Page 681] then for the first and second persons. The use of the personal pronoun in the reflexive sense survived longest in the vernacular. It is not “abnormal” therefore to find in the N. T. (vernacular κοινή) the personal pronouns where a reflexive form might have been used. The N. T. does not here exactly represent Attic literary prose. Cf. ὁ δόρατον τὸν σταυρόν αὐτοῦ (Lu. 9:23), μετὰ τὸ ἔγερθηναυ με προάξιον (Mk. 14:28; cf. Lu. 10:35), βάλε ὅπως σοῦ (Mt. 5:29). See Ro. 15:16, 19. It is not necessary to split hairs here as to whether the reflexive idea is present. It is in perfect harmony with the Greek history. Indeed English does not differ here from the Greek.

2. Αὕτω. The use of αὕτω rather than οὗ and σφῶν is noticeable. As a matter of fact, however, σφῶν had long been the main pronoun for the oblique cases of the third person. In archaic and poetic forms the early use of οὗ and σφῶν survived. In the N. T. αὕτω is the only form found, as in αὕτων, αὕτως, αὕτον (Mt. 17:22 f.), κτλ.

3. Genitive for Possession. The genitive of the personal pronoun is very common as a possessive rather than the possessive pronoun or the mere article. In Jo. 2:12 αὕτω occurs twice, but once (οἱ ὀδελφοί) we do not have it. These examples are so common as to call for mere mention, as ὁ πατήρ μου (Jo. 5:17), τὸν κράβαττον σου (5:8), τὸν κράβαττον αὐτοῦ (5:9). The presence of the personal pronoun in the genitive is not always emphatic. Thus no undue emphasis is to be put upon αὕτω even in its unusual position in Jo. 9:6, nor upon σοῦ in 9:10, nor upon μου in 9:15. See chapter on The Sentence. See also ἐπάρας τοὺς δυνατοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ (Lu. 6:20), ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν (Lu. 21:19). See also position of μου in Mt. 8:8 and Jo. 11:32. As a matter of fact the genitive of personal pronouns, as is common in the κοινή (Moulton, Prol., p. 40 f.), has nearly driven the possessive pronoun out. The use of the article with this genitive will be discussed in that chapter (The Article). Cf. τὸν πατήρα μου (Mt. 26:53) and φίλου μου (Jo. 15:14). Both ὑμῶν in Paul (1 Cor. 9:12) and αὐτοῦ (Tit. 3:5) may be in the attributive position. The position of αὐτοῦ is emphatic in Eph. 2:10 as is that of ὑμῶν in 1 Cor. 9:11 and ήμῶν in Jo. 11:48. The attributive position of ήμῶν (2 Cor. 4:16) and αὐτοῦ with other attributes (Mt. 27:60) is not unusual.

4. Enclitic Forms. The first and second persons singular have enclitic and unenclitic forms which serve to mark distinctions of emphasis in a general way. We may be sure that when the long [Page 682] form ἐμοῦ occurs some slight emphasis is meant, as in ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ (Rom. 1:12). But we cannot feel sure that all emphasis is absent when the short form is used. Thus ὁκοιλούμην μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (Mt. 16:18), πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου (11:27). With prepositions (the “true” ones) the long form is used as in ancient Greek except with πρός, which uniformly has με even where emphasis is obvious. Thus δεῦτε πρός με (Mt. 11:28), καὶ σὺ ἔρνῃ πρός με (3:14). Some editors here and in the LXX print πρός με. But in Jo. 6:37 πρός ἐμὲ is the true text. Cf. πρὸς ἐμὲ also in P. Tp. 421 (iii/α. d.). With σοῦ the only difference is one of accent and we have to depend on the judgment of the

---

1 Ib., 2. Abt., pp. 69, 89.
1 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 165.
editor. It is difficult, if not impossible, to lay down any fundamental distinction on this point. On σο and σου see chapter VII, IV, (a). See also ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι (Mt. 11:25) and κἀγώ δὲ σοι λέγω (16:18). Cf. ἐγώ σε (Jo. 17:4) and με σο (17:5).

Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 168) says that ἐμοῦ and σοῦ, the emphatic forms, occur only with other genitives like αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔμοι (Ro. 16:13). Simcox (Language of the N. T., p. 55) argues that the enclitic form occurs always except when there is emphasis. But the trouble is that the enclitic form seems to occur even where there is emphasis. The genitive of the third person can be used with emphasis. Cf. αὐτῶν in Lu. 24:31. See further chapter VII, V, 4.

(c) The Frequency of the Personal Pronouns. It is at bottom a differentiation from the substantive, though the roots are independent of verb and substantive and antedate historical evidence. This pronoun came into play where the sense required it. Thus καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἐπέλυσαν (Ac. 13:3). Cf. Mk. 6:5. There is no doubt of the fact that the N. T. uses the pronoun in the oblique cases more frequently than is true of the older Greek. What is the explanation of this fact? The Hebrew pronominal suffixes at once occur to one as the explanation of the situation and Blass suggests that this abundance of pronouns proves that the usage belongs to the vernacular. Thus in Lu. 6:20 note αὐτοῦ twice, ὑμῶν twice in Lu. 21:19, σοῦ in Mt. 6:17 as the reflexive twice (ἀλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον σου νίψαι). It is not necessary to go as far as Moulton does and deny that there is any Semitic influence in the N. T. on this point. It was here in harmony with the current Greek. Cf. Lu. 24:50 for three examples of αὐτοῦ (–οῦς). Cf. σε—σε in Jo. 1:48. For αὐτό—‘it’ see Ro. 7:20. In Lu. 1:62 αὐτό and αὐτοῦ both refer to παιδίον.

(d) Redundant. The pronoun was sometimes redundant. This was also a Hebrew idiom, but the vernacular κοινή shows similar examples. The two streams flow together as above. With participles note τῷ θέλοντι—ἀφεῖς αὐτῷ (Mt. 5:40), καταβάντος αὐτοῦ—ἐκλογῆσαν αὐτῷ (8:1), ἐμπάντες αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον ἐκλογῆσαν αὐτῷ (8:23). There are besides the anacolutha like ὅ νικὼν καὶ ὁ τηρῶν—δόσσῳ αὐτῷ (Rev. 2:26). Cf. also τὸ ποτῆριον—οὗ μὴ πίω αὐτό (Jo. 18:11) which does not differ radically from the other examples. Cf. also the redundant personal pronoun with the relative like the Hebrew idiom with the indeclinable הָיָה, οֹ—αὐτοֹ (Mt. 3:12), ἧς—αὐτῆς (Mk 7:25), οὗς—αὐτοὺς (Ac. 15:17), οὗς—αὐτοῖς

3 Cf. W.-Th., p. 143: Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 164.
4 Cf. also Simcox, Lang., etc., p. 53.
5 C. and S., Sel., etc., p. 65.
6 Moulton, Prol., p. 84 f.
7 Hellern., p. 108 f.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 165.
(Rev. 7:2). But this idiom appeared also in the older Greek and is not merely Semitic.\(^3\)
It occurs in Xenophon and Sophocles. Indeed in Rev. 17:9, ἐπὶ τὸ ἄδηλον, ἡ γνώ
κάθηται ἐπὶ ἀυτῶν, we have ἄδηλον in sense of relative pronoun much like modern
Greek ποῦ. For the redundant antecedent see further under Relative.

\((e)\) According to sense. See also chapter X, VII, VIII, IX. The personal pronouns
are sometimes used freely according to the sense. In Ac. 26:24, τὰ πολλά σε
γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει, the position of σε is probably a matter of euphony
and a case in point. Sometimes there is no immediate reference in the context for the
pronoun. The narrative is compressed and one must supply the meaning. So with
αὐτοῦ (Lu. 1:17), αὐτοῖς (Mt. 8:4), αὐτῶν (12:9), αὐτῶν (Mt. 11:1), αὐτῶν (Jo.
20:15), αὐτῶν (1 Pet. 3:14). But this is no peculiarity of N. T. Greek or of the koine.
It is common at all times. In Jo. 8:44, ψεῦστης ἦστιν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, the αὐτοῦ
refers to ψεῦστης suggested by ψεῦστης. In 2 Cor. 5:19 αὐτοῖς refers to κόσμον, as in
Ro. 2:26 αὐτοῦ has in mind ἄδροβοστος [Page 684] suggested by ἄδροβοστία. So in
Ac. 8:5 αὐτοῖς refers to πόλιν. In Mk. 5:41 αὐτῆ follows the natural gender of παῦλον
rather than the grammatical. But in Jo. 6:39 αὐτῷ agrees grammatically with the
abstract collective παῦν ὁ. In Lu. 6:6 we find a usage much like the original Homeric
absence of the pure relative.\(^1\) We have καὶ αὐτοῦ used with ἄνθρωπος much as oŭ
was. In Mt. 28:19 αὐτοῖς refers to ἔδοχο. In Mk. 6:46 αὐτοῖς points to ὄχλον.

\((f)\) Repetition of the substantive. Sometimes the substantive is merely
repeated instead of using the pronoun. Thus in Jo. 11:22 we have τὸν θεόν—ὁ θεός.
This is usually due to the fact that the mere pronoun would be ambiguous as in the use
of Ἰησοῦς in Jo. 4:1. Sometimes it may be for the sake of emphasis as in ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
ἀνθρώπου (Lu. 12:8) rather than ἐγὼ. Sometimes antithesis is better sustained by the
repetition of the substantive. Thus with κόσμῳ—κόσμου (Jo. 9:5), ἀμαρτία—
ἀμαρτίας (Ro. 5:12). But this is no peculiarity of Greek.

II. The Possessive Pronouns (κτητικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι).

\((a)\) Just the article. It is not merely the possessive relation that is here under
discussion, but the possessive pronoun. Often the article alone is sufficient for that
relation. Thus in ἐκτέιναις τὴν χεῖρα (Mt. 8:3) the article alone makes the relation
clear. Cf. also τὰς χεῖρας (Mk. 14:46), τὴν μάχαιραν (14:47), τὸν αὐξανοῦν (2 Cor.
12:18). The common use of the genitive of the personal pronoun is not under
consideration nor the real reflexive pronoun like ἐκτέινον.

\((b)\) Only for first and second persons. There is in the N. T. no possessive
form for the third person. The other expediencies mentioned above (usually the genitive
αὐτοῦ, αὐτῶν) are used. The personal pronouns are substantival, while the possessive
forms are adjectival. In modern Greek no adjectival possessive exists. Just the
genitive occurs (Thumb, Handbook, p. 89). The possessive ἔμοι and σοὶ are
disappearing in the papyri (Radermacher, N. T. Gk., p. 61). Originally the accent\(^2\) of

---

1 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 35.
Émós was *Émos. The forms ήµé-τερος and Ùµé-τερος are both comparative and imply emphasis and contrast, the original meaning of the comparative.3

(c) Emphasis, When Used. When these possessive forms occur in the N. T. there is emphasis. But it is not true, as Blass4 [Page 685] affirms, that there is no emphasis when the genitive forms are used. See I, (b), 4. The possessives do not occur often in the N. T. For details see chapter VII, IV, 4, (d).

(d) With the Article. The possessives in the N. T. usually have the article save when predicate.1 Thus ἡ ἐμὴ (Jo. 5:30), τῆς ἐμῆς (Ro. 10:1), τὸ ἐμὸν (Mt. 18:20), τῷ σῷ (Mt. 7:3), etc. When the article is absent the possessive is usually predicate as in τῶ ἐμὸν πάντα οὐκ ἔστιν, καὶ τῶ σῷ ἐμὰ (Jo. 17:10; Lu. 15:31). In μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἕκ νόμον (Ph. 3:9) the possessive is attributive, a righteousness of my own, though the article comes later. In Jo. 4:34 we have ἐμὸν βρῶμα ἔστιν ἵνα where the articleative use also occurs. But see Mt. 20:23. One may note ὑμῶν in predicate (1 Cor. 3:21).

(e) Possessive and Genitive Together. Paul’s free use of the possessive and genitive together as attributives is well illustrated by τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν (1 Cor. 16:18). In 1 Cor. 16:17 the MSS. vary between τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα καὶ τὸ ὑμετέρων (BCD) ὑστ. So in 1 Jo. 2:2 we have both περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτάντων ἡμῶν and also περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων. Indeed the genitive may be in apposition with the genitive idea in the possessive pronoun. Thus τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου (1 Cor. 16:21). Cf. 2 Th. 3:17; Col. 4:18; Jo. 14:24.

(f) Objective Use. The possessive pronoun may be objective just like the genitive. This is in full accord with the ancient idiom. So τὴν ἐμὴν θάνατον (Lu. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24), τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν (15:31), τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέηι (Ro. 11:31), τὴν ἡμετέραν διδιακυκλίαν (15:4). Cf. τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως (2 Cor. 1:6).

(g) Instead of Reflexive. The possessive, like the personal pronoun, occurs where a reflexive might have been used. Thus τῷ σῷ with κατανοεῖ in Mt. 7:3, ἄκοι ἀπὸ τὰ ἐμὸν τέκνα (3 Jo. 4), ἐγράφω τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί (Phil. 19). The pronoun ἑαυτός is possessive, but is best treated as a reflexive.

III. The Intensive and Identical Pronoun (σῶντονος ἄντονυμια). The use of αὐτός was originally “purely anaphoric.”² As the third personal pronoun it was, of course, anaphoric. The intensive use is more emphatic.

(a) The Nominative Use of Αὐτός. As already remarked, it is not always clear whether we have the emphatic ‘he’ or the intensive ‘self’ with αὐτός in the nominative. Cf. αὐτὸς καὶ ἦ µητρ [Page 686] αὐτοῦ (Jo. 2:12). The intensive αὐτός

3 Seymour, The Hom. Dial., p. 60.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 168. Brugmann (Vergl. Gr., ii. 283) derives the poss. from the gen., while Delbrück (V, i. 213) obtains the gen. from the poss. Who can tell?
1 Simcox, Lang., etc., p. 54.
appears in all persons, genders and numbers. Thus αὐτὸς ἐγὼ (Ro. 7:25; cf. ἐγὼ αὐτός, Ac. 10:26), αὐτὸι ἄκηκοαοίν (Jo. 4:42), δύνασαι—αὐτός (Lu. 6:42), αὐτὸι Υμεῖς (1 Th. 4:9; cf. Ac. 18:15), αὐτὸς ὶ Ἰωάνης (Mt. 3:4), αὐτὸι προφήται (Ac. 15:32), αὐτὸ τὸ βιβλίον (Heb. 9:19), αὐτὸ τὰ ἐκκουράνια (9:23), αὐτὸ τὰ ἔργα (Jo. 5:36). The article is not always used. Cf. αὐτὸς Δαυείδ (Lu. 20:42), αὐτή Σάρρα (Heb. 11:11), αὐτοὶ προφήται (Ac. 15:32). Cf. ἐγὼ δὲ αὐτός, P.Oxy. 294 (A.D. 22). In 2 Cor. 10:1 note αὐτός ἐγὼ Πάυλος. There is nothing particularly essential in the order whether αὐτὸς ἐγὼ or ἐγὼ αὐτός (see above). Ἐγώει is not in the N. T.

(b) VARYING DEGREES OF EMPHASIS. For a list of the various shades of meaning possible with αὐτός see Thompson, Syntax of Attic Greek, p. 59 f. In Ro. 15:14 αὐτός occurs with the first person and αὐτοὶ with the second in sharp contrast. In Shakespeare we have “myself” as subject: “Myself have letters” (Julius Caesar, iv. 3).1 Cf. Latin ipse. In Jo. 2:24, αὐτὸς δὲ θεούς, we have Jesus himself in distinction from those who believed on him. In 1 Cor. 11:14 ἡ φύσις αὐτή is ‘nature of itself.’ Note αὐτοὶ δόθησα (1 Th. 3:3), ‘ye for yourselves.’ In Ac. 18:15, ὄψεσθε αὐτοὶ, we find ‘ye by yourselves.’ Each instance will vary slightly owing to the context. Cf. αὐτοὶ (Ac. 16:37); αὐτός μόνος (Mk. 6:47). On αὐτός μὲν οὖν see Ac. 13:4. See ἄφ έαυτῶν (Lu. 12:57), not αὐτοὶ.

(c) Αὐτός WITH Οὐτός. In Ac. 24:15, 20, the classical idiom αὐτοὶ οὐτοὶ occurs. Cf. εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο (Ro. 9:17), πεπιθεὶς αὐτὸ τοῦτο (Ph. 1:6), αὐτὸ τοῦτο (2 Pet. 1:5, accusative of gen. reference). Cf. 2 Cor. 7:11. The other order is found in ἐγραψα τοῦτο αὐτό (2 Cor. 2:3).

(d) Αὐτός ALMOST DEMONSTRATIVE. In Luke αὐτός ὁ is sometimes almost a pure demonstrative as it comes to be in later Greek. The sense of ‘very’ or ‘self’ is strengthened to ‘that very.’ Thus αὐτή τῇ ἁρφ (Lu. 2:38), ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καρφ (13:1), ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (23:12). The modern Greek freely employs this demonstrative sense. Cf. Thumb, p. 90. Moulton (Prol., p. 91) finds this demonstrative use of αὐτός ὁ in the papyri. So αὐτόν τὸν Ἀντάν, O.P. 745 (i/a.d.). Moulton thinks that αὐτός is demonstrative also in Mt. 3:4. See VI, (h), for further discussion.

(e) IN THE OBLIQUE CASES. It is not so common as the nominative. So αὐτοῦς τοῖς κλήτος (1 Cor. 1:24). Cf. καὶ αὐτοῖς in Ac. 15:27 (cf. 15:32). But examples occur even in the first and [Page 687] second persons. Thus ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ (Ro. 16:2), σοῦ αὐτῆς (Lu. 2:35), αὐτοῦς ἡμᾶς (2 Th. 1:4), ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν (Ac. 20:30, probable text). Here the use is intensive, not reflexive. The same thing is possible with ὑμῶν αὐτῶν in 1 Cor. 7:35 (cf. 11:13). But I think this reflexive. This intensive use of αὐτός with ἐμοῦ and σοῦ is found in Attic. In αὐτῶν ἡμῶν and ὑμῶν only the context can decide which is intensive and which reflexive. Cf. Thompson, A Syntax of Attic Greek, p. 64. Cf. ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν νεκροτάφων, ‘from the grave-diggers themselves,’ P. Grenf. ii, 73 (iii/a.d.).

---

1 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 35.
(f) Αὐτός Side by Side with the Reflexive. So αὐτός ἐστιν (Eph. 5:27), αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (Ro. 8:23). Cf. 2 Cor. 1:9; 10:12. The distinctively reflexive pronouns are, of course, compounded of the personal pronouns and αὐτός. They will be treated directly. The N. T. does not have αὐτότατος (cf. Latin ipsissimus). Some N. T. compounds of αὐτός are αὐτάρκης (Ph. 4:11), αὐτοκατάκριτος (Tit. 3:11), αὐτόματος (Mk. 4:28), αὐτόπτης (Lu. 1:2).

(g) Ο Αὐτός. The use of ο αὐτός for identity (‘the same,’ ‘the very’) is close kin to the original ‘self’ idea. Cf. ipse and idem. The idiom is frequent in the N. T. Thus ο αὐτός κύριος (Ro. 10:12), ή αὐτή σάρξ (1 Cor. 15:39), τάς αὐτάς θυσίας (Heb. 10:11), and with substantive understood το αὐτό (Mt. 5:47), τῶν αὐτῶν (Heb. 2:14), τά αὐτά (Lu. 6:23). In 1 Cor. 11:5 we have the associative instrumental case with it, τά αὐτό τῇ ἐξυφρημένῃ. But in 1 Pet. 5:9 we actually have the genitive (‘the same sort of’), τά αὐτά τῶν παθημάτων.

IV. The Reflexive Pronoun (Αὐτανακλαστική Ἐντωμονία).

(a) Distinctive Use. As already explained in this chapter under Personal Pronouns, the origins of the personal pronouns in oblique cases were also reflexive.1 Only gradually the distinction between personal and reflexive arose. But even so the personal pronouns continued to be used as reflexive. Hence I cannot agree with Blass2 that έμαυτο, σαυτο, έμαυτο “have in the N. T. been to some extent displaced by the simple personal pronoun.” It is rather a survival of the original (particularly colloquial) usage. Thus we have in Mt. 6:19 f. θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροῖς, 5:29 f. and 18:8 f. βάλε ἐπὶ σοῦ, 6:2 μὴ σαλιγγός ἐμπροσθόν σου, 11:29 ἄρατε τὸν ἤγον μον ἐφ ὑμᾶς, 17:27 δός ἄντι ἑμοῦ καὶ σοῦ, 18:15 ἐλεγξον…μετοξύσοι καὶ σύτοι. Matthew has rather more of these survivals. But see ἄφιδο τῷ περὶ ἐμέ (Ph. 2:23), τὸ κατ ἐμὲ πρόθυμος (Ro. 1:15). For this idiom in Attic see Thompson, Syntax [Page 688] of Attic Greek, p. 64. This is not indeed the classic Attic idiom, but the vernacular Attic (as in the κοινή) is not so free from it. In particular the third person presents peculiar problems, since the ancient MSS. had no accents or breathings. The abbreviated reflexive αὐτοῦ and αὐτῷ would look just alike. It is a matter with the editors. See chapter VI, IV, (f), for details. Thus W. H. give ἄρατο τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ (Lu. 9:23), but οὗκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν ἀυτοῖς (Jo. 2:24). In Lu. 9:24 we have τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, but in 14:26 τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ. In the last passage ἑαυτοῦ occurs with πατέρα and ψυχήν, but not with the other words. Cf. αὐτῷ, Ac. 4:32. In the light of the history of the personal pronouns the point is not very material, since αὐτοῦ can be reflexive also. The Attic Greek used to have δοκῶ μοι. But Luke in Ac. 26:9 has ἔδοξά ἑμαυτῷ as Paul in 1 Cor. 4:4 says ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα. Old English likewise used the personal pronouns as reflexive. Thus “I will lay me down and sleep,” “He sat him down at a pillar’s base,” etc. Cf. Ac. 19:21, με twice. See also chapter VII, IV, 4, (c).

(b) The Absence of the Reflexive from the Nominative. It is impossible to have a reflexive in the nominative. The intensive pronoun does occur as αὐτός ἔγώ (2

---

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 166 f.
1 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 33.
Cor. 10:1). The English likewise, as already shown, early lost the old idiom of “myself,” “himself” as mere nominatives. 2 Cf. Ἰακχοῦ, Jo. 11:51, where ἵνατος could have been employed.

(c) The Indirect Reflexive. It is less common in the N. T. It does indeed occur, as in the ancient Greek. So ἔθελον τάνατς ἄνθρωπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐκκόμον (1 Cor. 7:7), συνειδόσθην δὲ λέγω ὅτι τὴν ἐκκόμον ὑλή τὴν τοῦ ἐκέραν (10:29). But on, the other hand, note ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαι με ἄποδόσω σοί (Lu. 10:35), παρακλώ—συναγωνίσασθαί μοι (Ro. 15:30). Cf. 2 Cor. 2:13. This on the whole is far commoner and it is not surprising since the personal pronoun occurs in the direct reflexive sense. Cf. ἢν ἐκούσατε μου (Ac. 1:4). In Thucydides the reflexive form is generally used for the indirect reflexive idea. 3

(d) In the Singular. Here the three persons kept their separate forms very well. Hence we find regularly ἐκκόμον (Jo. 14:21), σεαυτῷ (Ac. 16:28), Ἐκκόμῳ (Lu. 18:4). Indeed ἐκκόμον never stands for ἐκκόμον. 4 For σεαυτῷ or σεαυτόν some MSS. read ἐκκόμον in Mk. 12:31; Jo. 18:34; Gal. 5:14; Ro. 13:9. In 1 Cor. 10:29 ἐκκόμον=’one’s own’ (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 441; Prol., p. 87). There was some tendency towards this usage in the ancient Greek, 1 though the explanation is not perfectly clear. 2 But the usage is clearly found in the Atticists, Dio Chrys., Lucian and Philost. II. 3 In Rev. 18:24 ἐν ἑαυτῷ is a sudden change from ἐν σοί of the preceding verses, but is hardly to be printed αὐτῷ, for it is not strictly reflexive. The same 4 use of αὐτῷ rather than σε appears in Mt. 23:37 and parallel Lu. 13:34. Cf. also Lu. 1:45. But Moulton (Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 441, April, 1904, p. 154) finds in the papyri several examples of this “uneducated use of ἐκκόμον” for first and second persons singular, συγκρινῷ μετα τὴν ἐκκόμον τελευτήν, B.U. 86 (ii/A.D.). Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 61) cites ἐπέγραψα ἑαυτῷ (Petersen-Luschan, Reisen etc., p. 26, n. 32). Thucydides has a few possible examples and certainly the Latin is is in point (Draeger, Historische Synt. d. Lat. Spr., p. 84). In early Greek Delbrück finds the

2 Ib.
3 Dyroff, Gesch. etc., Bd. I, 1892, p. 19.
4 W.-Sch., p. 205.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 167.
3 W.-Sch., p. 205.
4 Ib.
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reflexive referring indifferently to either person. The recurrence is not surprising. In the modern Greek the singular ἑαυτός occurs constantly for first and second persons and even τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ μου, τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ σου for emphasis. Cf. “myself,” “thyself,” “herself” and vulgar “hisself.” See Simcox, Language of the N. T., p. 63. In translation from Semitic originals we sometimes find ψυχήν rather than ἑαυτόν as in Lu. 9:24 (cf. Mk. 8:36). Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 87; Robinson, Study of the Gospels, p. 114. The form αὔτόν (Jo. 2:24), αὔτῷ (Lu. 12:21) is preserved in some 20 passages by W. H. and Nestle.

(e) In the plural. Here the matter is not in any doubt. It is rather too much to say with Simcox that ἑαυτῶν is the only form for the reflexive plural. This is indeed true for the first and third persons as ἄνθεματίσαιμεν ἑαυτούς (Ac. 23:14). In 2 Th. 1:4 αὕτοις ἡμᾶς is intensive, as already shown (chapter VII). In the third person also only ἑαυτῶν occurs as in Mt. 18:31. In the second person plural a few examples of the reflexive ὑμῶν αὐτῶν apparently survive, as in Ac. 20:30; 1 Cor. 5:13 and probably so in 1 Cor. 7:35; ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς in 1 Cor. 11:13. But the common idiom for the second person plural is undoubtedly ἑαυτῶν, as προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς (Lu. 17:3). Cf. Mt. 25:9; Ro. 6:13; 1 Jo. 5:21, etc. There are some seventy examples of ἑαυτῶν for first and second persons plural in the N. T. (Moulton, Prol., p. 87), as is the custom in the papyri, chiefly in illiterate documents. Cf. Ἰνα γεινόμεθα πρὸς τοῖς καθ ἑαυτοῦς, Tb.P. 6 (ii/B.C.); Ἰνα κοιμισώμεθα τὰ ἑαυτῶν, Tb.P. 47. [Page 690] The LXX (Conybeare and Stock, Sel., p. 30) has this use of ἑαυτῶν for first and second persons plural. We even find reflexive and personal together like ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς (Ex. 20:23).

(f) Article with. The reflexive is used with or without the article and in any position with the article. But curiously enough σεαὐτοῦ is never so found and ἑαυτοῦ only once in sharp contrast, μὴ ἑιρθῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σύμφωνον ὀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν (1 Cor. 10:33). Instead of this reflexive genitive (possessive) we have the genitive of the personal pronoun. Cf. τιμῶ τὸν πατέρα μου (Jo. 8:49), ἰδίως τὸ δώρον σου (Mt. 5:24). The examples of ἑαυτοῦ are, of course, abundant as in τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν (Lu. 11:21), the common idiom in the older Greek. But note also the order τὸ ἑργὸν ἑαυτοῦ (Gal. 6:4), ἑαυτοῦ τοὺς πόδας (Ac. 21:11), δοῦλος ἑαυτοῦ (Lu. 19:13), κήπον ἑαυτοῦ (Lu. 13:19). These are all attributive, but the sense is not quite the same in the two last. The use of αὐτοῦ in such examples has already been noted as in Mt. 16:24. Sometimes the MSS. vary between ἑαυτῶν and αὐτοῦ as in Lu. 4:24. The plural ἑαυτῶν is likewise found thus, τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς (Mt. 8:22), τῷ κυρίῳ ἑαυτῶν (Mt. 18:31), ἑαυτῶν τῷ ἰμάτια (Mt. 21:8). See further chapter XVI, The Article.

(g) Reflexive in the reciprocal sense. This use of ἑαυτῶν does not really differ in idea from ἀλλήλων. This is in harmony with the ancient Greek idiom. The papyri show this same blending of ἑαυτῶν with ἀλλήλων.1 Cf. P.P. 8 (ii/B.C.) three times, O.P. 260 (i/A.D.), C.P.R. 11 (ii/A.D.) twice. Thus we may note ὅτι κρίματα ἔχετε μὲν ἑαυτῶν (1 Cor. 6:7), ἅλαλόντες ἑαυτοῖς (Eph. 5:19), νοοῦσθε, ὁμόνως ἑαυτοῖς (Col. 3:16), etc. Sometimes it occurs side by side with ἀλλήλων as if by way of variety, as in ἄνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς (Col. 3:13). Cf. also

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 87.
ἀλλήλων and αὐτοῦς in Lu. 23:12. In Ph. 2:3 ἀλλήλους ἤγοψεν ὑπερέχοντι ἐαυτῷ each word retains its own idea.

(h) REFLEXIVE WITH MIDDLE VOICE. Sometimes indeed the reflexive occurs with the middle voice where it is really superfluous, as in διεμερίσαντο ἐαυτοὺς (Jo. 19:24, LXX), where2 Mt. 27:35 (free paraphrase of LXX) has only διεμερίσαντο. So also σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος (Tit. 2:7). But usually such examples occur where the force of the middle is practically lost, as in ἤγημα ἐμαυτὸν (Ac. 26:2), ἀρνήσασθο ἐμαυτὸν (Lu. 9:23). On the use of the reflexive in Anglo-Saxon see Penny, A History of the Reflexive Pronoun in the English Language, p. 8. Cf. παραλήψοις ἑαυτὸν (Jo. 14:3). Moulton (Prol., p. 87) admits that sometimes ἑαυτοῦ occurs without great emphasis. This use of the reflexive with the middle may be compared with the reflexive and the personal pronoun in the LXX. So λήψοις ἑαυτῷ ὑμᾶς λαὸν ἑμοὶ (Ex. 6:7), οὐ ποιήσετε ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῦς (20:23). So English “me myself,” “you yourselves.” Cf. Thackeray, p. 191. See further chapter XVII, Voice.

(i) THE USE OF Ἰδιος. This adjective is frequent in the N.T. It is usually treated as a possessive, opposed1 to κοινὸς or δημόσιος. In the N. T. we find it, especially (17 times) in κατ' ἰδίον (cf. Lu. 9:10), in the sense of ‘private.’ So this sense occurs also in Ac. 4:32 and Heb. 7:27. Cf. Ἰδιῶται in Ac. 4:13 (1 Cor. 14:16). Sometimes also the word implies what is peculiar to one, his particularity or idiosyncrasy, as 1 Cor. 3:8; 7:7 (cf. the classic idiom). Cf. our “idiot.” But in general ὁ ἴδιος or ἴδιος without the article (cf. ἑαυτοῦ) means simply ‘one’s own,’ a strong possessive, a real reflexive.

To all intents and purposes it is interchangeable in sense with ἑαυτοῦ. The examples of this reflexive idea are many. Thus in Mt. 9:1; Lu. 6:41; 10:34; Jo. 1:41; 4:44, etc. The use of οἱ ἴδιοι for ‘one’s own people’ (cf. also οἱ οἰκεῖοι, 1 Tim. 5:8, classic idiom) is not strange. Cf. Jo. 1:11; 13:1, etc. Moultont3 finds the singular in the papyri as a term of endearment. The use of τὰ ἴδια for ‘one’s home’ (Jo. 1:11; 19:27; Ac. 21:6) is seen also in the papyri. Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 440) cites τὰ ἴδια, B.U. 86 (ii/iii A.D.), 183 (i/ii A.D.), 168 (ii/iii A.D.) ἵσι, etc. The papyri also illustrate Jo. 1:11, οἱ ἴδιοι, for ‘one’s relations.’ So πρὸς τοὺς ἴδιους, B. U. 341 (ii/iii A.D.). Examples without the article are δεσπόταις ἴδιοις (Tit. 2:9), καρποῖς ἴδιος (1 Tim. 6:15). Cf. οἱ ἴδοις λόγος, B. U. 16 (ii/iii A.D.). Moulton Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 440. In Jo. 1:41 Moultont3 rightly agrees with Westcott in seeing in τὸν ἴδιον an implication that some one else went after his brother also. The only other point that here calls for remark is the question whether ὁ ἴδιος is used in an “exhausted” or unemphatic sense. Blass4 finds it so in εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἄγρον (Mt. 22:5). Meisterhans (p. 235) finds a few examples in the Attic inscriptions and Deissmann finds the weakened use of ἴδιος in the literary κοινῆ.

Deissmann5 argues further that this exhausted sense may be assumed in the N. T. because some examples in the LXX (Job 24:12; Prov. 27:15), etc., seem to occur.

---

2 W.-Th., p. 257.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 169.
2 Prol., p. 90.
3 lb.
Westcott WESTCOTT, B. F., Language of the N. T. (Smith’s B. D.).
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 169.
5 B. S., p. 123 f.
V. The Reciprocal Pronoun (ἡ ἀμοιβαία ἀντωνυμία). The use of the reflexive in the reciprocal sense has just been discussed (cf. personal pronouns as reflexive). From one point of view it might seem hardly necessary to give a separate discussion of reciprocal pronouns. But, after all, the idea is not exactly that of the mere reflexive. ἀλλήλων is, of course, reduplicated from ἄλλος, one of the alternative pronouns. Cf. the Latin alter alteri. The Latin idiom is common in the classic Greek and is found in Ac. 2:12, ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλον λέγοντες; 19:32, ἄλλοι ἄλλο τι ἔκραζον; 21:34, ἄλλο τι ἐπεφώνουν. Cf. in the papyrus ἄλλο ἔγώ, ἄλλο πάντες, B.U. 1079 (A.D. 41). But the true reciprocal ἄλληλων has no nominative and is necessarily plural or dual (in older Greek). It occurs 100 times in the N. T. (W. H.) and is fairly well distributed. We have examples of the genitive (Ro. 12:5 ἄλληλων μέλη), the ablative (Col. 3:13 ἀνεχόμενοι ἄλληλων), the accusative (1 Cor. 16:20 ἀδικάσασθε ἄλληλους, 1 Jo. 4:7 ἄγαφον ἄλληλους), the locative (Ro. 15:5 ἐν ἄλληλοις), the dative (Gal. 5:13 δοῦλες ἄλληλους). The prepositions are used 48 times with ἄλληλων. This pronoun brings out the mutual relations involved. In 1 Th. 5:11, παρακαλεῖτε ἄλληλους καὶ οἴκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἔνα, note the distributive explaining the reciprocal. Moulton (Prol., p. 246) compares the modern Greek ὁ ἑαυτός τὸν ἄλλον. In Ph. 2:3 note both ἄλληλους and ἑαυτῶν. In 1 Th. 5:15 we have ἐκ ἄλληλοις καὶ ἐκ πάντων. [Page 693] In 2 Th. 1:3 note ἑνὸς ἐκάστου and ἐκ ἄλληλοις. The N. T. does not, like the LXX (Ex. 10:23), use ἀδελφός as a reciprocal pronoun. The middle voice is also used in a reciprocal sense as in συνεβουλεύσαντο (Mt. 26:4). Cf. chapter XVII, Voice.

VI. Demonstrative Pronouns (δείκτικα ἀντωνυμία).

(a) Nature. Curiously enough the demonstrative pronoun, like all pronouns, has given the grammarians a deal of trouble to define. For a discussion of the various theories during the ages see Riemann and Goelzer. Originally all pronouns were

---

Riemann and Goelzer RIEMANN and GOELZER, Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin. I (1897), II (1901).
1 Synt., p. 763 f.
“deictic,” “pointing.” The “anaphoric” use came gradually. Indeed the same pronoun often continued to be now deictic, now anaphoric, as ὦς, for instance, originally demonstrative, but later usually relative. Indeed the anaphoric use blends with the relative. Monro marks out three uses of pronouns, not three kinds of pronouns. The “deictic” “marks an object by its position in respect to the speaker.” Thus ἐγώ, σύ, ὦς, οὔτος, ἐκεῖνος all fall under this head. The “anaphoric” pronoun “is one that denotes an object already mentioned or otherwise known.” Thus the resumptive use of ὦς, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος, ὦς, ὅπος. The “relative” in the modern sense would be only ὦς, ὅπος, ὅς, ὅσης, etc. As a matter of fact, for practical purposes the two Greek terms “deictic” and “anaphoric” may be placed beside the Latin “demonstrative” and “relative.” See further chapter VII, IV, 4, (e).

(b) Different Shades of Meaning. The demonstrative pronouns do not indeed always have the same shade of meaning. They may point out, as far or near (ὦς, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος), as in apposition (ἐκεῖνος), as well known (ἐκεῖνος), as already mentioned (resumptive οὗτος, ὦς). These uses belong to the various demonstratives and will come out in the context. I do not care to press the parallel with the personal pronouns (first, second, third person demonstratives) as applied to ὦς, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος. The pronouns had best be treated separately, not according to the special uses.

(c) ὦ, ἥ, τό. This was the simplest demonstrative. The grammarians call this word ἄρθρον πρωτακτικόν as distinct from ὦς which is ἄρθρον ὑποτακτικόν. As a matter of fact ὦ, ἥ, τό is the same word as the Sanskrit sá (sás), sš, tád. The Lithuanian nominative singular was tâ-s, tâ, and the Greek nominative plural οἱ, αἱ came “instead of τοί, ταί” (Brugmann, Comp. Gr., vol. III, p. 327). This form, like der in German and this in English, was used either as demonstrative, article

---

3 Ib.
4 Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 779.
5 K.-Bl., I, i, p. 603.
7 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 189.

Brugmann

———, Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).

———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).
or relative. See Kühner-Gerth, I, p. 575. One is not to trace actual historical connection between ὁ and der (cf. Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 559). Its old use was a sort of personal demonstrative (cf. σῦ δὲ in Luke 1:76).1 Cf. also σῦ δὲ τί and ἥ καὶ σῦ τί (Rom. 14:10) and σῦ τίς (14:4). Cf. Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 428. This substantival use is the main one in Homer.2 Indeed, as a demonstrative it means rather contrast than far or near like δῶς, οὕτως, ἐκέκομεν, but after all δῶς is nothing but ὁ with the ending –δε. The demonstrative use of ὁ is seen in τοῦς δοὺς in Agathias3 and τῶν δοσα in Maximus of Tyre.4 This demonstrative as antecedent to the relative (τοῦς οἶ) appears in Justin Martyr5 and Tatian’s Oration to the Greeks.6 Plato shows a good many examples7 (like τὸν ὅς, τὸν δος). We meet in Xenophon and Demosthenes8 καὶ τὸν as demonstrative, especially τὸν καὶ τὸν, τὸ καὶ τὸ, τὰ καὶ τὰ. The modern Greek uses τοῦ, τῆς, τῶν, etc., as short forms of αὐτοῦ, etc., and Jebb9 pertinently asks if this is not “a return to the earliest use of ὁ, ἥ, τό as a pronoun.” The demonstrative ὁ is frequent in the comic writers. Cf. Fuller, De Articuli in Antiquis Graecis Comoedis Uso, p. 9. Völker (Syntax, p. 5) gives papyri illustrations of demonstrative ὁ, (ὁ δὲ, τοῦ δὲ, πρὸς τοῦ, πρὸ τοῦ, τὰ μὲν, τὰ δὲ etc.).10 The oblique cases have only two examples in the N. T., one a quotation from Aratus, τοῦ καὶ (Acts 17:28), the other τοὺς μὲν, τοὺς δὲ (Eph. 4:11), where contrast exists. It is possible indeed that τὸν in Ph. 1:11 is demonstrative. Cf. also τὸν ἄπειρος ἄρχαίς in 1 John 2:13 and τὴν in 1 Cor. 10:29. In Mt. 14:2 (Mk. 6:14) αὐτός is nearly equivalent to ‘these.’ In Mk. 12:5 the correct text is οὕς μὲν, etc. But in the nominative the examples of this

1 Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 67.
2 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 176.
3 Reffel, Über den Sprachgebra. des Agathias, 1894, p. 5.
4 Dürer, Sprachl. Unters., 1899, p. 27.
5 Cf. Gildersleeve’s ed. of First Apol., ch. 5 and note to p. 116.
7 Cf. Gildersleeve, Justin Martyr, p. 116, for others.
8 Hadley and Allen, Gk. Gr., p. 216.
9 Jebb

Jebb, R. C., Attic Orators. 2d ed. (1893).
——, Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey. (1892).
——, On the Relation of Classical to Modern Greek (Appendix to Vincent and Dickson’s Handbook to Mod. Gk., 1887).

9 V. and D.’s Handb., etc., p. 297.
Völker

VÖLKER, F., Papyrorum graecorum syntaxis specimen (1900).
——, Syntax d. griech. Papyri. I, Der Artikel (1903).

10 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 81.
demonstrative in the N. T. are quite numerous. There are three uses of the nominative in the N. T. (1) One is the demonstrative pure and simple without any expressed contrast. So of δὲ ἔρριπταν (Mt. 26:67), of δὲ ἐξίστασαν (Mt. 28:17). In Mt. 26:57 οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες we may have [Page 695] this usage or merely the article. In Acts we often have of μὲν οὖν in this sense, usually with the participle (Ac. 1:6; 8:4, 25). But even in these examples there is apparently an implied contrast. In Mt. 16:14 and Lu. 9:19 the use of οἱ δὲ (3, below) refers to those already mentioned in an oblique case. (2) The use of ὁ μὲν, ὁ δὲ, etc. This is no longer very frequent in the N. T.1 So ὁ μὲν οὔτως, ὁ δὲ οὔτως (1 Cor. 7:7); οἱ μὲν, ὁ δὲ (Heb. 7:20, 23); οἱ μὲν, οἱ δὲ (Ac. 14:4); οἱ μὲν, ἄλλοι δὲ, ἔτερον δὲ (Mt. 16:14 f.). In Mt. 13:23 we most likely have ὁ μὲν, ὁ δὲ not ὁ μὲν, ὁ δέ. Cf. ὁ μὲν (Lu. 8:5). In Ac. 17:18 note τνεῖς, οἱ δὲ, and in Ro. 14:2 ὁς μὲν, ὁ δὲ. (3) The most common use of the demonstrative is where ὁ δὲ, ἦ δὲ, οἱ δὲ refer to persons already mentioned in an oblique case. Thus in Mt. 2:5 οἱ δὲ refers to πᾶρ ἀρτίων. So in οἱ δὲ (Lu. 23:21) the reference is to αὐτοῖς, while ὁ δὲ in the next verse points to αὐτόν. In Mk. 14:61 ὁ δὲ refers to Ἰησοῦν, as in Ac. 12:15, ἦ δὲ to αὐτήν. In Lu. 22:70 ὁ δὲ has no antecedent expressed, but it is implied in the ἐκεῖνον πάντες before.

(d) ὁς. The grammarians call it ἄρθρον ὑποτακτικὸν or relative.2 It did come to be chiefly relative, as already the Sanskrit याः, या, याः has lost its original demonstrative force.3 But in the Lithuanian j-i-s Brugmann (Comp. Gr., III, p. 332) finds proof that the pro-ethnic i-o was demonstrative as well as relative. Cf. also I-va in Homer—both ‘there’ and ‘where’ and then ‘that.’ In Homer ὁς, like ὁς (ὁς), is now demonstrative, now relative, and was originally demonstrative.4 This original demonstrative sense continues in Attic prose, as in the Platonic ἤ δ ὁς; καὶ ὁς; ὅν μὲν, ὅν δὲ, etc.5 However, it is not certain that the demonstrative use of ὁς (καὶ ὁς, ἤ ὁς) is the same word as the relative. Brugmann6 indeed finds it from an original root, *so-s like Sanskrit sā-s. The examples of this demonstrative in the nominative are few in the N. T. Thus note in Jo. 5:11 (correct text) ὁς δὲ ἔπαθερήθη, and also ὁς δὲ οὖκ ἔμβλεψεν in Mk. 15:23. Indeed ὁς ὅ in Mt. 13:23 is close to the same idea. But this verse furnishes a good example of this demonstrative in contrast, ὁ μὲν ἐκατόν ὁ δὲ ἐξήκοντα ὁ δὲ τρίακοντα. This example happens to be in the accusative case (cf. Ro. 9:21), but the nominative appears also as in ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν (Mt. 13:4), ὁς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἱδίον ὑγρόν, ὁς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν (Mt. 22:5), ὁς μὲν πιστεύει (Ro. 14:2), ὁς μὲν γὰρ κρίνει—ὁς δὲ κρίνει (14:5). So 1 Cor. 11:21. [Page 696] Instances of other cases occur also. I see no adequate reason for refusing to consider ὅν μὲν ἐδείξαν, ὁ δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, ὁ δὲ ἐλιθῳβόλησαν (Mt. 21:35) examples of the demonstrative ὁς.1 Cf. Lu. 23:33. In the accusative plural note οὗς μὲν, οὗς δὲ, Mk. 12:5; Ac. 27:44; Eu. 22 f. For the dative singular, ὃς μὲν, ὃς δὲ, note Mt. 25:15. In 1 Cor. 12:8 we have ὁ μὲν,

---

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 145.
2 K.-Bl., I, i, p. 608.
4 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 185.
5 Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 68.
1 So Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 68, n. 3.
ἄλλῳ δὲ, κτλ. For the dative plural see ὃς μὲν, ὃς δὲ, 2 Cor. 2:16. In 1 Cor. 12:28 we have ὁς μὲν as demonstrative without any corresponding ὃς δὲ. Cf. ολ μὲν οὐν in Ac. 8:4, 25; 11:19; 15:3, 30, and ὁ μὲν οὖν in Ac. 23:18 as above in (c). The relative at the beginning of sentences or paragraphs, like ἐν ὃς in Lu. 12:1 (cf. ὁ δὲ ὃς οὖν verse 3), may indeed at bottom be a reminiscence of the old demonstrative. Cf. Latin and English usage. The demonstrative is often used to connect sentences, as in Mt. 11:25; 12:1; Mk. 8:1, etc. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 276. In Mt. 26:50, ἐφὸς ὁ πάρει, we may also have an instance of the demonstrative. But we do not have in the N. T. καὶ ὅς, καὶ τὸν, τὸν καὶ τὸν, πρὸ τοῦ. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 62) finds demonstrative ὅδε in an inscription in Heberdey-Wilhelm, Reisen. N. 170.

(e) ὅδε. Brugmann2 finds the enclitic –δε the same that we have in δε-ὑρο, δή, ἰ-δέ (?) Latin quan-de. It corresponds to the Latin hic, German der hier, English this here. It refers to what is “immediately near” in space or time,3 and is of relatively more importance than οὗτος. As a matter of fact ὅδε occurs only ten times in the N. T. In the LXX “ὁδε is much commoner than in the N. T.” (Thackeray, Gr. of the O. T. in Gk., vol. I, p. 191), especially in the more literary parts. For its rarity in papyri and inscriptions see Mayser, Gr., etc., p. 308. It is already failing in the first century B.C. (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 62). For τάδε see chapter VII, IV, 4, (e). In Lu. 16:25 ὅδε is the correct text. In Ac. 15:23 τάδε is not well supported and in 2 Cor. 12:19 τάδε is right. In one of the remaining examples, τῇδε ἐν δόξῃ λειτουργή (Lu. 10:39), Blass4 bluntly calls it “not even used correctly,” a rather curt judgment. But he cites the LXX (Gen. 25:24; 38:27). In Winer-Schmiedel5 this example is not considered as ὅδε used for ὁὗτος, but rather like the classic ὅδε ἐγὼ, οἷς ἡμεῖς (cf. Ex. 8:25; Gen. 50:18). In Jas. 4:13, πορευόμεθα εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν, it is hardly necessary to take τήνδε as like the classical τῇν δεῖνα or τῇν καὶ τὴν (cf. Plato), though that is a possible construction. Cf. [Page 697] ποιήσομεν τοῦτο ἡ ἐκεῖνο in verse 15. Plutarch1 seems to use τήνδε in this sense. More likely in James τήνδε merely means ‘this’ city which the enterprising Jew exploits for a year before he passes on to the next.

(f) οὗτος. Of doubtful etymology, possibly an original root u.2 With this combine ὁ, η, το=οὖ, αὐ, του. Then add το-ς, τῶ(η), το. In reality, therefore, οὗτος is a doubled demonstrative (combination of so and to, Giles, p. 296). It is like the Latin is-te

3 Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 65.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 170.
5 P. 216.
1 Quest. conviv. 1. 6. 1, τήνδε τῇν ἡμέραν.
Giles

GILES, P., A Short Manual of Comparative Philology. 2d ed. (1901).

Οὗτος is more often anaphoric than deictic. In Homer it expresses an object present to the speaker, but not near him. The word is limited in use in Homer and usually refers to what is previously mentioned (anaphoric). It is very common in the N. T. and on the whole the usage accords with that of the older Greek. Naturally there is much diversity in the context.

1. **The Purely Deictic.** This use is not wanting. Thus in Mt. 3:17, ὦτος ἐστιν ὦ ὦτος μου, the demonstrative identifies the one present as the Son of God. For further examples of the purely deictic use see Mt. 12:23; 17:5; 21:10 f. (a particularly good illustration); 21:38; 27:37, 47, 54; Mk. 6:3; 15:39; Lu. 4:22; 8:25, etc. But a still plainer example is in Jo. 21:21, when Simon pointed to John as ὦτος δὲ τί.

2. **The Contemptuous Use of ὦτος.** It is merely one variation of the purely deictic idiom due to the relation of the persons in question. It is rather common in the N. T. So in Mt. 26:61 ὦτος ἔφη we find a “fling” of reproach as the witnesses testify against Jesus. Cf. Mt. 26:71 (parallel Lu. 22:56 καὶ ὦτος), the maid about Peter; Mk. 2:7, the Pharisees about Jesus; Lu. 15:2; Jo. 6:42; 9:24; 12:34; Ac. 7:40, Jews about Moses; 19:26; 28:4, about Paul; Lu. 15:30, the elder son at the younger; 18:11, the Pharisee at the publican, etc. A striking example occurs in Ac. 5:28.

3. **The Anaphoric Use.** The pronoun here refers to one previously mentioned, as in Mt. 27:58 where ὦτος alludes to Ἰωσήφ in verse 57, where note the anacoluthon. So in Heb. 7:1 ὦτος points to the mention of Melchizedek in the preceding verse. There are many variations in the anaphoric idiom. The simplest is the one already mentioned, where the subject of discussion is merely continued by ὦτος, as in Mt. 3:3 (cf. the Baptist in verse 1). In particular observe καὶ ὦτος, as in Lu. 8:41; 16:1. In Lu. 22:59 [Page 698] καὶ ὦτος is rather deictic. A striking example of the continuative ὦτος occurs in Ac. 7:35, 36, 37, 38, 40. Here the pronoun is repeated as often as is desired. So Jo. 6:42. Cf. the use of the pronoun because of prolepsis (Ac. 9:20). The more frequent use is the resumptive or epexegetical use which is rather more abundant in the N. T. Here ὦτος is really in apposition. In Ro. 7:10, ἥ ἐντολή ἢ εἰς ζοφήν ἡ ἐν θάνατον, we seem to have the resumptive use with a substantive. But a clear example (different in number and gender) occurs in Mt. 13:38, τὸ δὲ καὶ ὀνομασία, ὦτοι ἐν παρακλησίᾳ. One may note a similar use of ἐκεῖνος (Jo. 12:48; 16:13) and of αὐτός (Jo. 12:49). Another plain instance is in Ac. 2:23, where τοῦτον refers to Ἱησοῦν (verse 22). Cf. also τοῦτον (2d) in Ac. 7:35. In Ac. 4:10 ἐν τούτῳ is resumptive referring to the preceding substantive followed by two relative clauses, while ὦτος is deictic. In verse 11 again ὦτος is continuative. In Ro. 9:6, οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ ὦτοι (cf. Gal. 3:7), the resumptive use is plain. The participle before ὦτος is a very common idiom, as ὠτὸς ὀπωσείν ἢς τέλος ὦτος (Mt. 10:22; 24:13); ὀ ἐμβάνσας μετ ἐμοῦ—ὁτός (26:23). Cf. 1 Cor. 6:4; Lu. 9:48; Jo. 7:18, etc. The participle, of course, often follows ὦτος, not resumptive, as in Jo. 11:37. The relative is followed by resumptive ὦτος as in δὲ ὡς ἄυς ἄν ἑπολέση—ὁτός (Lu. 9:24), δ ἑλώ

---

3 Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 65.
5 Ib.
1 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 65 f.
2 Ib.
4. In Apposition. See also chapter X, IX. Οὕτως itself may be expanded or explained by apposition. The simplest form of this construction is where a substantive \(^{4}\) is in apposition as in 2 Cor. 13:9, τοῦτο καὶ εὐχόμεθα, τὴν ὤμοιν κατάρτισιν, where agreement in gender does not occur. Cf. the nominative ἡ πίστις in 1 Jo. 5:4. Cf. 1 Th. 4:3. The genitive with τῆς ἀλήθειας occurs in the accusative also, as in 1 Th. 4:3; Ro. 14:9; 2 Cor. 2:9; 1 Pet. 3:9; 4:6; 1 Jo. 3:8. Cf. also Lu. 12:18, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, in 2 Cor. 13:10; 1 Jo. 1:3. The locative appears in ἡ τιμία τῆς ὁσίωτάτης οὖν ὑποθήκης, and Jo. 4:17. The locative appears in ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι, 1 Jo. 4:9, 10, 13. Cf. ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι (Jo. 16:30; 1 Jo. 3:19, 24) in a slightly different sense where ὅτι is really the accusative. But in general these substantive clauses have the same case as τοῦτο.

Closely allied to this use of ὅτι is that of ἤνα. Thus the nominative, πῶς ὁ τοῦτο ἤνα ἐλθη, occurs in Lu. 1:43. In Jo. 17:3, αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ ἤνα, the pronoun is feminine because of the predicate substantive. Cf. Jo. 15:12; 1 Jo. 3:11, 23; 5:3; 2 Jo. 6. The accusative as the direct object of the verb is seen in τοῦτο προσευχήσασθαι ἤνα in Ph. 1:9. Cf. also ταῦτα—ἡνα, Jo. 15:11, 17; 1 Jo. 5:13. The feminine substantive occurs in the accusative also, as in ταῦτα τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔχομεν ἄντωθεν, ἤνα, 1 Jo. 4:21. The accusative is found also with prepositions. So εἰς τοῦτο, ἤνα, Ac. 9:21; Ro. 14:9; 2 Cor. 2:9; 1 Pet. 3:9; 4:6; 1 Jo. 3:8. In Eph. 6:22 we have εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἤνα. Cf. Col. 4:8. Likewise note διὰ τοῦτο, ἤνα in 2 Cor. 13:10; 1 Tim. 1:16; Phil. 15. In 2 Cor. 2:3, ἔγραψα τοῦτο αὐτῷ ἤνα, we probably have the direct accusative, though τοῦτο αὐτῷ could be adverbial accusative, ‘for this very reason.’ The locative appears in ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ἤνα, Jo. 15:8. Cf. 1 Jo. 4:17. The ablative case appears in ἐν τούτῳ, μεῖξαν ταύτης ἐγόνησεν οὐδέκας ἔχοι, ἤνα. In 3 Jo. 4 the ablative plural is found, μεῖξτερίαν τούτων—ἡνα. The imposition in these various constructions varies in degree of directness. An example of ὅποιος with εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο

\(^{3}\) Ib., p. 66.

\(^{4}\) Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 171.

\(^{1}\) Cf. W.-Sch., p. 217, where it is observed that elsewhere often διὰ τοῦτο points to what goes before.
occurs in Ro. 9:17 quoted from the LXX (Ex. 9:16). Cf. also στελλόμενοι τοῦτο μή in 2 Cor. 8:20.

In 1 Pet. 2:19 note also the use of εί with τοῦτο (though χάρις [Page 700] is predicate), τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις εί. Here the εί clause is in the same case as τοῦτο, nominative. So in 1 Jo. 2:3 we have ἐάν in apposition with ἐν τούτῳ (locative).

In 1 Jo. 5:2 the correct text has ὅταν in similar apposition with ἐν τούτῳ. The infinitive also occurs in apposition with τοῦτο. In Heb. 9:8 the perfect infinitive in indirect discourse with the accusative is in apposition to τοῦτο which is itself accusative, τοῦτο δηλοῦτος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ὄντος, μήπω πεφανερώσθαι τὴν κτλ. In Eph. 4:17 likewise μηκέτι περιπατεῖν, in apposition to τοῦτο (after λέγω), is in indirect discourse, though here it is indirect command, not indirect assertion. But in 1 Cor. 7:37 τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον is merely explanatory of τοῦτο κέκρικεν. The same thing is true in 2 Cor. 2:1, where the article is added to the infinitive which is also in the accusative, ἢκρινα ἢμαντῶ τοῦτο, τὸ μῆ—ἐξελθὼν. In Ac. 26:16 the infinitive προχειρίσασθαι is in the accusative like εἰς τοῦτο. Cf. οὕτως, 1 Pet. 2:15.

The nominative infinitive in Jas. 1:27 is in apposition with αὕτη (θηρσεία καθαρᾶ—αὕτη, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι). So also note οὕτως ἑστίν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ—φιμοῦν in 1 Pet. 2:15.1 Cf. Ro. 1:12 where τοῦτο—συναισκελήθηναι are merely subject and predicate. In 2 Cor. 7:11 the nominative infinitive, τὸ λαπηθῆναι, occurs with αὐτό τοῦτο. Indeed in Mk. 12:24 the causal participle is really explanatory of τοῦτο (διὰ τοῦτο πλανάσθε, μή ἐλιδὼτες). It is possible to see a similar example2 in Lu. 8:21, ἀδελφοὶ μου οὕτως ἐλατείω—ἀκούστετε. Here in truth οὕτως seems unnecessary.

5. Use of the Article. The article commonly occurs with the noun when the noun is used with οὕτως. The noun is by no means always necessary with οὕτως. See 6. Indeed the resumptive dem. alone is often sufficient, as in Jo. 1:2, 7, etc. So αὐτοὶ οὕτως (Ac. 24:15, 20). In a sense a double demonstrative thus occurs, since the article was originally demonstrative. This is in exact accord with classic usage and calls for no special comment, except that it is an idiom foreign to Latin and English. The modern Greek preserves this idiom with the demonstrative. So τοῦτη ἡ γυναῖκα, αὐτός ὁ Δοῦρας (Thumb, Handb., p. 92). It is immaterial whether οὕτως comes first, as οὕτως ὁ τελώνης (Lu. 18:11), or last, as ὁ δινθροπος οὕτως (Lu. 23:47). Cf. Jo. 9:24. When an adjective is used with the substantive, then the article may be repeated with the adjective, as ἡ χάρια αὕτη ἡ πτωχή (Mk. 12:43), or οὕτως may, like the adjective, be brought within the rule of the article. So τίς ἡ [Page 701] κανή αὕτη [ἡ] ὑπὸ σοῦ λαλομένη διδαχή (Ac. 17:19).1 Even if the second article be admitted here, the point made still applies. The position of οὕτως with the article, οὕτως ὁ rather than ὁ οὕτως, does not mean simply the predicate idea, though the position is predicate. But not so τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἄρσεων in Lu. 4:6. Here the real predicate notion appears. In Kühner-Gerth (I, p. 628) the explanation is given that it is either apposition (οὕτως ὁ δινὴρ=“this, the man”) or predicative sense (ὁ δινὴρ οὕτως=“the man here”). Probably so, but in actual usage the connection is much closer than that.

1 For exx. in earlier Gk. and literary κοινῆ see W.-Sch., p. 217.
2 W.-Sch., p. 218.
1 See Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 331, for this “pseudo-attributive position.”
See Lu. 15:24, οὗτος ὁ υἱός μου. Cf. the French idiom La République Française.

Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 324) takes the predicate explanation. See also chapter XVI, The Article.

6. **Article Absent.** The article does not always occur with substantives when οὗτος is used. When οὗτος occurs with proper names in the N. T., the article is present. So Ac. 1:11 οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 19:26 ὁ Παύλος οὗτος, 7:40 ὁ γὰρ Μωϋσῆς οὗτος, 2:32 τοῦτον τὸν Ἱσσοῦν, Heb. 7:1 οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεdéék, except in Ac. 6:14 Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος, where the article is used with the adjective, not with Ἰησοῦς. So uniform indeed in the Greek is the presence of the article with the noun and οὗτος, that the absence of the article causes something of a jolt. In Ro. 9:8 the conjunction of the words τοῦτα τέκνα must not deceive us. The copula ἐστιν must be supplied between. The American Revision indeed calls in the English relative to render the idiom οὗτα τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦτα τέκνα τῷ θεῷ. Cf. the simple predicate use in 1 Cor. 6:11, καὶ τοῦτα τινὲς ἠττε. In Lu. 1:36, οὗτος μὴν ἦτος ἐστίν, the substantive is predicate. The same thing is clearly true of Lu. 2:2, οὗτη ἡ πρώτη ἐγένετο. Cf. also τούτῳ ἦμιν σημεῖον in Lu. 2:12. Some MSS. have τό, but in either case the copula is supplied. The remaining examples are not so simple, but ultimately resolve themselves into the predicate usage unless one has to except Ac. 24:21 (see below). In Lu. 7:44, τοῦτην τὴν γυναῖκα, the article does not occur in L 47.ev. Winer2 considers the reading without the article “unexceptionable,” since the woman was present. In Lu. 24:21 the predicate accusative really is found, τρίτην τοῦτην ἡ μέρα ἀγειαφοῦς οὗ τοῦτα ἐγένετο, a common Greek idiom difficult to put into English. It is not ‘this third day,’ but ‘this a third day.’ Cf. also 2 Pet. 3:1, τοῦτον δευτέραν γράφω ἐπιστολήν. In this instance the English translation resorts to the relative ‘that’ to bring out the predicate relation, ‘this is the second epistle that I write.’ In Jo. 2:11, [Page 702] τοῦτην ἐποίησεν ἄρχῃν τῶν σημείων, even the American Revision has a wrong translation, ‘this beginning of miracles.’ It is rather ‘this Jesus did as a beginning of miracles.’ But Ν and Chrys. here have τὴν. In Jo. 4:18, τοῦτο ἀληθεῖς εἶχας, the English relative is again necessary, ‘this is a true thing that thou didst say’ or ‘thou didst speak this as a true thing.’ The translation ‘truly’ rather obscures the idea. In Ac. 1:5, οὗ μετὰ πολλὰς τάξεις ἡμέρας, several difficulties appear. The litotes, οὗ μετὰ πολλὰς, does not have the usual order.1 Cf. Ac. 27:14 for μετὰ οὖν πολὺ. There is besides a use of μετὰ somewhat akin to that of πρὸ in πρὸ ἐξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (Jo.
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The order would more naturally be οὐ πολλᾶς ἡμέρας μετὰ ταύτας or οὐ πολλῶν ἡμέρων μετὰ ταύτας. However, the predicate use of ταύτας without the article permits the condensation. The free translation ‘not many days hence’ is essentially correct. It is literally ‘after not many days these’ as a starting-point (from these). In Jo. 21:14, τούτῳ ἣν τρίτων ἔφανερώθη Ἰησοῦς, the matter is very simple, ‘this already a third time,’ or to use the English relative, ‘this is now the third time that.’ So also in 2 Cor. 12:14 and 13:1, τρίτων τούτῳ. The most difficult instance to understand is in Ac. 24:21, περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς ἡς ἐκέκραξα. Here ‘concerning this one voice which I cried’ makes perfectly obvious sense. The trouble is that it is the only N. T. example of such an attributive usage without the article. Blass* takes it to be equivalent to ἡ φωνὴ ἡ ἐγένετο ἤν μία αὐτῇ. This is, of course, the normal Greek idiom and is possibly correct. But one wonders if a lapse from the uniform idiom may not occur here. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 92) cites τούτῳ πράγματος, ταῦτα δοκίματος, τούτῳ κτήμα from inscriptions in Magnesia (Petersen-Luschian, Reisen in Lykien, p. 35, n. 54) and έξῆσαν τόδε μνήμα from a Bithynian inscription (Perrot, Exploration arch. de la Galatie, p. 24, N. 34). Hence one had best not be too dogmatic as to Luke’s idiom in Ac. 24:21. After all, the predicate use may be the original use, as with ἐκέκραξα. Cf. Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 426 ff.; Thompson, Syntax of Attic Greek, p. 67. See also chapter XVI.

7. Ὁὗτος in Contrast with ἐκέκραξα. The distinction between ὁὗτος for what follows and ὅὗτος for what precedes (not strictly observed in the ancient Greek) amounts to little in the N. T., since ὁὗτος is so rare. But ὅὗτος does, as a rule, refer to what is near or last mentioned and ἐκέκραξα to what is remote. See αὐτὴ and ὅὗτος in [Page 703] 2 Jo. 6 f. and τούτῳ in 2 Cor. 13:9. This idiomatic use of ὅiệuς is plain in Ac. 7:19. In 1 Jo. 5:20 ὅὗτος really refers to οὗτοι (ἐν τῷ υἱῷ οὗτοι and so no difficulty exists. In Ac. 4:11 ὅὗτος is resumptive and takes up the main thread of the story again (cf. ὅὗτος in verse 9). In Ac. 8:26 αὐτὴ may refer to Γάζαν, but more probably (see 3, end) refers to ὁὗτος, a more remote substantive, indeed. In Lu. 16:1 again only the sense makes it clear (ἀνθρωπῶς τις ἄν πλούσιος ὃς ἐγένετο οἰκονόμος, καὶ ὅὗτος) that ὅὗτος refers to οἰκονόμον. In Lu. 18:14, κατέβη ὅὗτος διδακασμένος εἰς τὸν οἰκόν αὐτοῦ παρ ἐκέκραξαν, the two pronouns occur in sharp contrast, one pointing out the publican, the other the Pharisee. In such contrasts ὅὗτος refers to the last mentioned. This is clearly one example (besides 2 Jo. 6 f.) in the N. T., which curiously enough Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 171) does not recognise. Cf. also Jo. 13:24; ἐκέκραξα τούτῳ in Jo. 5:38, and ταῦτα ἐκέκραξας in 1 Cor. 10:11. In Jo. 1:7 f. both ὅὗτος and ἐκέκραξα are used of John and in proper idiom. Instead of ἐκέκραξα we might have had ὅὗτος properly enough because of αὐτοῦ, but ἐκέκραξα calls us back pointedly to Ἰωάννης. Cf. Abbott, Johannine Grammar, p. 236. Note ὅὗτος ὁ λόγος—ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκέκραξας in Jo. 21:23. In 1 Cor. 6:13, ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ ταύτῃ καὶ ταύτα καταργήσει, we find ὅὗτος used for both the near and the remote. The number and gender make it clear. In 1 Cor. 9:3

2 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 126, 133.
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2 Blass, ib., p. 172, explains ἐκέκραξα as showing that the discourse passes from John to Jesus. But ἐκέκραξα refers to John.
αὕτη points to what follows. In a case like ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω (Ph. 1:18), the main thought is meant by the demonstrative. So with ἐν τούτῳ δίδωμι· τούτῳ γὰρ ὑμῖν συμφέρει (2 Cor. 8:10). Cf. τούτῳ Ac. 24:14, etc.

8. As Antecedent of the Relative Pronoun. The absence of the demonstrative pronoun before the relative pronoun will be discussed later. This absence is in the case of a possible pronoun before the relative and after it also. The resumptive use of the demonstrative pronoun after the relative sentence has been already treated. But it is “the normal correlative” οὗτος—declaring. So οὗτος περὶ οὗ (Mt. 11:10), οὗτος δὲν (Jo. 7:25), οὗτος ὦς (Ac. 7:40), τούτῳ—ὁ (Ph. 2:5). See interrogative demonstrative and relative in τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὦς (Lu. 5:21; 7:49); τι τούτῳ ὦ (Jo. 16:17 f.). Cf. Lu. 24:17. On the whole, however, the demonstrative before the relative is not common in the N. T. In Gal. 2:10 both αὕτῳ and τούτῳ are incorporated into the relative clause, ὦ καὶ ἑσπούδασα αὕτῳ τούτῳ ποιῆσαι.

9. Gender and Number of οὗτος. See chapter X. In general, like other adjectives, οὗτος agrees with its substantive in gender and number, whether predicate or attributive. Cf. Jo. 2:11. In 1 Cor. 6:13, καὶ ταῦτῃ καὶ ταῦτα, note the number and gender. But sometimes the construction according to sense prevails. So the masculine, not feminine, in Ac. 8:10, οὗτος ἐστιν ἡ Δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ. So σκέψεως ἐξελεγχὸς ἐστίν μοι οὗτος (Ac. 9:15), οὗτοι καὶ Ἕδην (Ro. 2:14). Cf. also Ju. 12, οὗτοι—νεφέλαι, δένδρα, κύματα, ἄστροις; 2 Pet. 2:17, οὗτοι ἔστιν πηγαί, καὶ οὗτοι—ἐλαία (Rev. 11:4). In these examples assimilation to the gender of the predicate does not occur. Cf. ταῦτα τί, Jo. 6:9. In Mt. 21:42 (Mk. 12:11), παρὰ κυρίῳ ἐγένετο αὕτη, the feminine occurs where the neuter would be natural in Greek. This is a piece of “translation” Greek (Ps. 118:23). In Hebrew the feminine is the case for abstract words, the Hebrew having no neuter gender. In Eph. 2:8, τῇ γὰρ χαίρει ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τούτῳ οὐκ ἔξις ὑμῖν, there is no reference to πίστεως in τούτῳ, but rather to the idea of salvation in the clause before. But in 1 Pet. 2:19 f. we have two examples of the neuter (τούτῳ) on purpose to present a more separate and abstract notion than αὕτη would have done, an ancient Greek idiom, τούτῳ γὰρ χαίρεις εἰ—τούτῳ χάρις παρὰ θεῷ. In 1 Cor. 10:6 the same principle applies, ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγεννησαν. A striking example is found in 1 Cor. 6:11, καὶ ταῦτα τινες ἔπε. Here ταῦτα is much like τούτοις, but more definite and emphatic. For this use of οὗτος see also Jo. 12:34. In Ph. 3:7, ἢν μοι κέρδῃ, ταῦτα ἤγημαι—ζημίαν, assimilation to the gender of the predicate is also absent.

Sometimes the plural ταῦτα occurs where a single object is really in mind. The adverbial phrase μετὰ ταῦτα (Lu. 12:4) can refer either to one or more incidents. It is not necessary to consider ταῦτα as singular in idea in Jo. 19:36 and 1 Cor. 9:15. But the usage does appear in 3 Jo. 4, μετὰ τῶν τούτων οὐκ ἔχον χάριν (or χαρὰν), and the adverbial accusative καὶ ταῦτα in Heb. 11:12. Some MSS. have καὶ ταῦτα instead of καὶ τούτῳ in 1 Cor. 6:8.

3 Thomp., Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 66.
But assimilation to the predicate both in gender and number occurs. So in Lu. 8:14 f., τὸ … πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσον οἱ ἕκοισαντες. The same thing\(^1\) appears in Gal. 4:24, ἀτινά ἐστιν ἄλληγορούμενα: αὕτη γὰρ εἰσὶν δόο διαθήκης. Note the assimilation of αὕτη in Lu. 2:2; 8:11; 22:53; Jo. 1:19; Ro. 11:27; 1 Cor. 9:3; 1 Jo. 2:25; 5:3, 4, 9, 11, etc., and οὗτος in Mt. 7:12.

10. The Adverbial Uses of τοῦτο and ταῦτα. See chapter XII. [Page 705] Here we have καὶ τοῦτο (adverbial accusative or nominative absolute) like Latin idque (English ‘and that too’) in 1 Cor. 6:6 (CD \(^b\) ταῦτα), 8 (L ταῦτα); Ro. 13:11; Eph. 2:8 (this last could be otherwise explained). Καὶ ταῦτα, the usual classical idiom,\(^1\) appears in Heb. 11:12 with a concessive participle. In τοῦτο μὲν, τοῦτο δὲ (Heb. 10:33) Blass\(^2\) sees a literary usage. In 2 Cor. 2:3 Paul has τοῦτο αὕτω in the adverbial sense, while Peter (2 Pet. 1:5) turns the phrase around καὶ αὐτό τοῦτο δέ. Cf. the adverbial use of κεφάλαιον in Heb. 8:1. The case of οὗτος in Jo. 21:21 is noteworthy.

11. The Phrase τὸῦτο ἔστιν. See also chapter X, VIII, (c). It is used without any regard to the number, gender or case of the word in apposition with it, exactly like the Latin id est. There are eighteen examples of it given in Moulton and Geden’s Concordance, all but three of them from the Acts, Romans, Philemon and Hebrews. It is a mark of the more formal literary style. In Mt. 27:46 the case explained is the vocative, in Mk. 7:2 the instrumental, in Heb. 2:14 the accusative, in Heb. 9:11 the genitive, in Heb. 7:5 the plural, in 1 Pet. 3:20 the plural. In Ro. 1:12 the uncontracted form occurs with δέ. In 1 Macc. 4:52 οὗτος ὁ μὴν Χασελε ὦ is in apposition with the genitive.\(^3\) Here οὗτος performs the function of τὸῦτο ἔστιν. Cf. the case-irregularities in the Apocalypse.

12. In Combination with Other Pronouns. Mention may be made of ἐν τοῦτῳ οὗτος (Ac. 4:10) and other instances of the double use of οὗτος. Cf. Mk. 6:2. Cf. οὗτος οὗτῳ in Mk. 2:7, ταῦτα οὗτος (Ac. 24:9), οὗτος τοῦτο (1 Cor. 5:3), and in 2 Pet. 3:11 τοῦτον οὗτος πάντον. Examples of αὐτὸ τοῦτο are common in Paul (Ro. 9:17; 13:6; 2 Cor. 7:11; Ph. 1:6. Cf. 2 Pet. 1:5). For τοῦτο αὐτό see 2 Cor. 2:3, αὐτό τοῦτο Ro. 13:6. For αὐτοῦ οὗτοι see Ac. 24:15, 20. For τοῦτο δόλον cf. Mt. 1:22; 26:56. There is no doubt some difference between ταῦτα πάντα (Mt. 4:9; Lu. 12:30; 16:14) and πάντα ταῦτα (Mt. 6:32). “In the first expression, πάντα is a closer specification of ταῦτα; in the second, πάντα is pointed out demonstratively by means of ταῦτα.”\(^4\)

13. Ellipsis of oὗτος. The demonstrative is by no means always used before the relative. Often the relative clause is simply the object of the principal verb, as in ὃ ἔγον ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε (Mt. 10:27). Sometimes the implied demonstrative must be expressed in the English translation. The simplest form of this [Page 706] idiom is where the case of the demonstrative would have been the same as that of the
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Cf. the “adverbial” use of καθιστάσεσθαι (Jo. 19:35) be taken as an appeal to God as a witness to the truth of what the
writer is saying (possible, though by no means certain), the usage would be deictic.
Blass\(^1\) considers that “everything is doubtful” as to this verse, a doubt shared by
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Abbott. For myself I think that ἐκεῖνος is here anaphoric and refers to αὐτοῦ (cf. the similar reference of οὗτος to αὐτοῦ in 1 Jo. 5:20; but see Remote Object). Another possible deictic example is in Jo. 7:11. Jesus was not present, but in the minds of the people a subject of discussion. Cf. also 9:12.

2. The Contemptuous Use (cf. οὗτος). It appears unmistakably (see 1) in Jo. 9:28, σὺ μαθητής εἰ ἐκεῖνο. It may also exist1 in Jo. 19:21. Cf. the solemn repetition of ἐκεῖνος with ὁ ἄνθρωπος in Mt. 26:24, as well as the change from οὗτος in verse 23.

3. The Anaphoric. This is the more frequent use of this pronoun. Thus in Jo. 1:8 ἐκεῖνος takes up οὗτος of verse 7 (Ἰωάνης of verse 6). In Jo. 18:15 ὁ δὲ μαθητής ἐκεῖνος resumes the story of ἄλλος μαθητής immediately preceding. Cf. ἄλλος and ἐκεῖνος in Jo. 5:43. In Jo. 13:25 ἐκεῖνος refers indeed to the preceding τοῦτο (cf. ἐκεῖνος οὗτος). In Jo. 5:19 the reference is to πατέρα just before. Cf. Jo. 4:25. Ἐκεῖνος ὁ (Jo. 2:21) is continuing like οὗτος. The articular participle may be followed by the resumptive ἐκεῖνος. So ὁ πέμψας με—ἐκεῖνος Jo. 1:33). Cf. Jo. 5:11; 2 Cor. 10:18. So in Jo. 1:18 the pronoun refers to θέος followed by ὁ ὦν. Cf. Mk. 7:20 ἐκεῖνο. See Jo. 14:21. For distinction between ἐκεῖνος and αὐτοῦ see 2 Tim. 2:26; 3:9.

4. The Remote Object (Contrast). This is not always true, as is shown by Jo. 18:15. Cf. Tit. 3:7. It is common thus to refer to persons who are absent. So in Jo. 3:28 (cf. Jo. 7:11) John speaks of Christ in contrast to himself, ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἐμπροσθεν ἐκεῖνον. So in verse 30, ἐκεῖνον—ἐμε. In 1 Cor. 9:25 note ἐκεῖνοι μὲν—ἑμεῖς δέ. So in 10:11 ἐκεῖνοις—ἡμῶν, 15:11 εἰς ἐγώ εἰς ἐκεῖνοι. In Ac. 3:13 the contrast is sharp between ἑμεῖς—ἐκεῖνοι, and in 2 Cor. 8:14 between ὑμῶν—ἐκεῖνον (cf. ἐκεῖνον—ὑμῶν in same verse). Cf ὑμῖν—ἐκεῖνος in Mt. 13:11. In Jo. 5:39 ἐκεῖναι [Page 708] is in opposition to ὑμεῖς, as ἐκεῖνος to ὑμῖν in the preceding verse. Cf. 2 Cor. 8:9. For a contrast between those present in the same narrative see οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος in Lu. 18:14. Cf. ἐκεῖνος and αὐτός in 1 Jo. 2:6 and τοῦτο ἦ ἐκεῖνο in Jas. 4:15. It is common in expressions of place, like διὸ τῆς ὀδοῦ ἐκεῖνης (Mt. 8:28), εἰς δὴν τὴν γῆν ἐκεῖνην (9:26; cf. ἐν 9:31), etc. It is frequent also with general phrases of time, like ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις (Mt. 3:1). Cf. Mk. 8:1; Lu. 2:1. It usually occurs at a transition in the narrative and refers to something previously mentioned. Blass1 notes that Lu. (1:39) uses also τάχας in this phrase and that in 6:12 D has ἐκεῖνας rather than ταχάς. In particular observe the phrase ἐκεῖνη ἡ ἡμέρα for the Last Day (Mt. 7:22; Mk. 14:25; Lu. 21:34; 17:31; Jo. 16:23, etc. Cf. Jo. 6:40, etc.).

5. Emphasis. Sometimes ἐκεῖνος is quite emphatic. Abbott2 notes that in John’s Gospel, outside of dialogue, ἐκεῖνος usually has considerable emphasis. Instance Jo. 1:8, 18, 33; 2:21; 3:30; 4:25; 5:19, 38; 6:29; 8:42; 14:26; 15:26, etc. In the First Epistle of John he observes that it occurs only seven times and all but one refer to
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Christ. He is the important one in John’s mind. Cf. αὐτός in Ac. 20:35. But ἐκεῖνος is not always so emphatic even in John. Cf. Jo. 9:11, 25; 10:6; 14:21; 18:17; Mk. 16:10 ff; 2 Tim. 3:9.

6. With Apposition. It is not common with words in apposition. But note Jo. 16:13, ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (cf. Jo. 14:26). Note also ἐκεῖ̇νο γινόσκετε, ὅτι (Mt. 24:43) after the fashion of οὗτος with ὅτι. Cf. also the resumptive uses with participles (Jo. 1:18, etc.).

7. Article with Nouns except when Predicate. When the noun is used with ἐκεῖνος in the N. T., the article always appears, except when predicate. In Jo. 10:1, ἐκεῖνος κλέπτης ἐστίν, the substantive is predicate, as in 10:35, ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν θεούς. With adjectives we may note the repetition of the article in Jo. 20:19 and the ambiguous position of ἐκεῖνη in Heb. 8:7 due to the absence of διαθήκη. With ὅλος we find this order, εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκεῖνην (Mt. 9:26, etc.) and πᾶς the same, πάσαν τὴν ὄφειλήν ἐκεῖνην (Mt. 18:32, etc.).

8. As Antecedent to Relative. So ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν ῥ (Jo. 13:26), ἐκεῖνον ὑπὲρ ὅ (Ro. 14:15) ἐκεῖνος δὲ οὗ (Heb. 6:7). Note also ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν (Jo. 14:21) where the articular participle is the practical equivalent of a relative clause.

9. Gender and Number. Little remains to be said about variations in gender and number. Two passages in John call for remark, [Page 709] inasmuch as they bear on the personality of the Holy Spirit. In 14:26, ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγαπῶν ὁ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ δόμοματι μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει, the relative ὁ follows the grammatical gender of πνεῦμα. Ἐκεῖνος, however, skips over πνεῦμα and reverts to the gender of παράκλητος. In 16:13 a more striking example occurs, ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. Here one has to go back six lines to ἐκεῖνος again and seven to παράκλητος. It is more evident therefore in this passage that John is insisting on the personality of the Holy Spirit, when the grammatical gender is easily called for ἐκεῖνο. Cf. ὁ in Jo. 14:17, 26 and αὐτό in 14:17. The feminine ἐκεῖνης in Lu. 19:4 evidently refers to ὁδοῖ unexpressed.

10. Independent Use. The frequency of ἐκεῖνος in John’s Gospel may be noticed, but the Synoptics and Acts are not far behind. More curious, however, is the fact that in the Synoptics ἐκεῖνος is nearly always used with a substantive (adjectival) while the independent pronominal use of the singular is almost confined to the Gospel of John (and First Epistle). All the uses in the First Epistle and nearly all in the Gospel are independent. As exceptions note Jo. 4:39, 53; 11:51, 53; 16:23, 26, etc. On the other hand only two instances appear in the Apocalypse (9:6; 11:13) and both with substantives.

(h) Αὐτός. It has undoubtedly developed in the κοινή a demonstrative force as already shown on p. 686, and as is plain in the modern Greek. Moulton1 quotes plain examples from the papyri (see above). In the N. T. it is practically confined to Luke

(and Mt. 3:4 perhaps), where it is fairly common, especially in the Gospel. So ἐν αὕτῃ τῇ οἴκῃ (Lu. 10:7), ‘in that house.’ Moulton\(^3\) notes that in Mt. 11:25 (parallel to Lu. 10:21) we have ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ and in Mk. 13:11 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ; (parallel to Lu. 12:12 ἐν αὕτῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ). The tendency was not foreign to the ancient Greek and it is common enough in the modern vernacular\(^4\) to find αὐτὸς ὁ = ‘this.’

(i) The Correlative Demonstratives. Only four occur in the N.T. One of them appears only once and without the article, φωνῆς ἑνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσον (2 Pet. 1:17). It has died in the vernacular (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 63) like δὸς, τηλικός and τοσός. Τηλικόύτος appears once as predicate, τηλικάκτω τῆν (Jas. 3:4), [Page 710] elsewhere attributive. The article is not used. This correlative of age always refers to size in the N.T. (2 Cor. 1:10; Heb. 2:3). Once indeed it is in connection with οὗτος μέγας (Rev. 16:18) and so redundant. The other two are τοιούτος and τοσούτος. Τοιούτος is the demonstrative of quality (Latin talis) and it is used with a good deal of freedom. It is, of course, merely τοῦς and οὗτος combined. The compound form alone occurs in the N.T. and became more frequent generally.\(^1\) Τοιούτος without a substantive is used either without the article (Lu. 9:9) or more usually with the article in the attributive position (Mt. 19:14; Ac. 19:25; Ro. 1:13; 1 Cor. 7:28; 2 Cor. 10:11, etc.). In Jo. 4:23, τοιούτους ξητές τοὺς προσκοπούντας, the articular participle is in the predicate accusative. When used with substantives Τοιούτος may be anarthrous, as in Mt. 9:8; 18:5; Mk. 4:33; Heb. 7:26; 8:1; Jas. 4:16, etc., but the article occurs also (Mk. 6:2; 9:37; 2 Cor. 12:3). In Mk. 6:2 we have the order of δυνάμεις τοιοῦτα (cf. οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος). It comes before the substantive (Jo. 9:16) or after (Ac. 16:24). It is used as the antecedent of οἷς (Mk. 13:19; 1 Cor. 15:48; 2 Cor. 10:11) following οἷς. But note also τοιούτος ὅποιος in Ac. 26:29, τοιούτος ὡς in Heb. 7:26 f.; 8:1, and in 1 Cor. 5:1 τοιοῦτο ἦτας. We even have τοιούτος ὡς in Phil. 9. Cf. ποῖος—τοιούτος in a Logion of Jesus, P.Oxy. IV, p. 3, 1. Τοσούτος (τόσος, οὗτος) is the pronoun of degree (Latin tensus), both size, τοσοῦτος πιστὶν (Mt. 8:10), and quantity, ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι (Mt. 15:33). It occurs with the article only once, ἀ τοσοῦτως πλοῦτος (Rev. 18:16). Sometimes it appears without a substantive, as in Ac. 5:8; Gal. 3:4; Heb. 1:4, etc. It is the correlative with ὅς in Heb. 1:4 τοσοῦτος—ὅσον, 7:20—22 καθ’ ὅσον—κατὰ τοσοῦτο, and in 10:25 τοσοῦτως—ὅσωμ. It is worth while at this point to note the correlative adverbs, οὗτος ἦς (Ac. 14:1), οὗτος ὡς (1 Cor. 4:1), οὗτος—ὅπως (Mt. 5:16). Cf. ἦς—οὗτος ὄς (Ro. 15:20).

VII. Relative Pronouns (Ἀναφορικαὶ Ἀντωνυμίαι).

(a) List in the N.T. The only relatives in the N.T. (not counting adverbs) are ὁς, ὃς, ὃς, ὃς ὁ, ὃς ὡς, ὃς ἡμῖν, and ὁ in the Apocalypse. The others have fallen by the way. Some MSS. read ὁπερ in Mk. 15:6, while ὁσοὶς ὁπερ in Jo. 5:4 is not in the critical text. The LXX has ὁπερ (ὁπερ) five times,\(^2\) but ἡμῖν not at all. These

3 lb.
1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 162.
relative pronouns do not occur with uniform frequency as will be seen. Ὅς is the only one very common.

[b] THE NAME “RELATIVE.” It is not very distinctive.¹ The idea of relation (anaphoric use) belongs to the demonstrative and to the personal pronouns also. The anaphoric demonstrative use is indeed the origin of the relative.² The transition from demonstrative to relative is apparent in Homer in the case of both ὁ and Ὅς. Sometimes it is difficult in Homer to tell the demonstrative and the relative apart.³ Cf. English that, German der. Homer often used τε and τις with ὁ and Ὅς to distinguish the relative from the demonstrative.⁴ Gradually the relative use, as distinct from the anaphoric demonstrative, won its way.

(c) A BOND BETWEEN CLAUSES. The relative becomes then the chief bond of connection between clauses. Indeed many of the conjunctions are merely relative adverbs, such as ὡς, ὅτε, ὅπως, etc. The relative plays a very important part in the structure of the subordinate sentence in Greek. That matter will receive due treatment in chapter XIX, Mode. The agreement of the relative with antecedent in person, number, gender, and sometimes case, is just the natural effort to relate more exactly the two clauses with each other. These points will receive discussion under Ὅς which best exemplifies them. The assimilation is at bottom the same that we see in other adjectives (cf. demonstrative pronouns). The assimilation of the relative in person, gender, number, and even case of the antecedent may be compared to assimilation in the adjective and even verbs (compound verbs especially) and prepositions. Cf. Josef Liljeblad, De Assimilatione Syntactica apud Thuc. Questiones, 1900, p. 1).

(d) Ὅς.

1. In Homer. See discussion of the demonstrative Ὅς for origin.⁵ But already in Homer the relative sense, ἀρθρον ὑποτακτικόν, is the main one, and the demonstrative is on the decline.⁶

2. Comparison with Other Relatives. Though Ὅς in the N. T. far outnumbers all the other relatives, yet the distinction between Ὅς and the other relatives is breaking down. Indeed in the vernacular it may be questioned if it was ever preserved. One may compare the unchangeable Hebrew יְשַׁר. Moulton⁷ observes that in Polybius the distinction between Ὅς and Ὅςτς has “worn rather thin.” In the LXX Ὅς

---

1 Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 81.
7 Prol., p. 92.
This is also a perfectly natural agreement. Winer calls it “a curious example of false analogy” and finds an instance in Aristophanes (Birds, 1300), μέλη διπού. Here διπού=ἐν οίς. The vernacular carried it further. He cites modern English vernacular, “The men as he met.” Indeed in Rev. 2:13 ὅπου really points to an unexpressed παρ ὤμοιον. In Col. 3:11 ὅπου is almost personal. The occasional apparent confusion between ὅς and interrogative pronouns will be discussed directly. On the whole, ὅς in the N. T., as in the κοινή generally, is still used in accord with the classic idiom.

3. With Any Person. In itself, of course, ὅς, like all relatives, has no person. So the first person in 1 Cor. 15:10, the second person in Ro. 2:23, the third person in Mt. 5:19; Lu. 6:48 f.; 1 Cor. 4:17. These examples may suffice.

4. Gender. This is not so simple. The normal thing is for the relative to agree with the antecedent in gender, as in 1 Cor. 4:17, Τιμόθεων, ὅς ἐστίν μου τέκνον. So in Col. 1:24 ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία; Col. 2:10 ἐν αὖτῳ, ὅς ἐστίν ἡ κεφαλὴ (cf. Eph. 4:15); Col. 2:17 σαββάτων, ὃ (some MSS. ὅ) ἐστιν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων; Rev. 5:6 ὃθεν ἐπὶ στάσεως ἐπέτυχα, οἱ ἑξιὼν τὰ [ἐπιτά] πνεύματα. In Rev. 21:8, τὸ μέρος αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ λήμνῃ τῇ καιομένῃ πυρὶ καὶ θείῳ ὅ ἐστιν ὃ θάνατος ὃ δεύτερος, the agreement is regular, but the idea of ὅ may be more inclusive than merely ὃ μέρος. Cf. 1 Pet. 3:4.

On the other hand the relative is assimilated in gender to the predicate substantive. This is also a perfectly natural agreement. Winer considers that this is true particularly when the predicate presents the main idea. See Mk. 15:16, ἦς ἀὐλής, ὃ ἐστιν πραγμάτων; Gal. 3:16, τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὃς ἐστιν Χριστός; Eph. 6:17, τήν μάχαραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ἄρμα τουθείου; Rev. 4:5, λαμπάδες—ὁ ἐστιν τὸ ἐπτά πνεύματα (but some MSS. αἱ). Cf. 2 Th. 3:17. The MSS. vary in a number of instances between agreement with antecedent and predicate. So Col. 1:27, τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου—ὁς (or ὃ) ἐστιν Χριστός. Cf. also 1 Tim. 3:16, where the text ὃς is changed in the Western class of documents to ὃ to agree with μυστηρίου. See also Eph. 1:13 f., τῷ πνεύματι—ὁς (MSS. ὃς) ἐστιν ἄρρητον. So αἱ or ὃ in Rev. 5:8. In Mt. 13:31 f. κόκκῳ is followed first by ὅν and then by ὃ (cf. σπέρματιν).

In another group of passages the change is made according to the real gender rather than the grammatical. Thus in Ac. 15:17 τὰ ἐθνῆ ἐφ οὐς (cf. 26:17), Jo. 6:9 παιδάριον ὃς ἔχει, Ro. 9:23 f. σκεύη ἐλέους—οὐς, Col. 2:19 κεφαλὴν ἐξ οὗ, Phil. 10 τέκνου ὅν, Rev. 13:14 θηρίῳ ὅς. In Gal. 4:19 οὖς is preceded by both ὅμως and

---

3 V. and D., Handb., etc., p. 56. “The disuse of ὅς in common speech is characteristic; so simple a form ceased to satisfy the desire of emphasis.” Jebb in V. and D., p. 302. Vincent and Vincent and Dickson, A Handbook to Modern Greek (1887).
4 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 231 f.
5 W.-M., p. 207.
τεκνία. In 2 Jo. 1, ἐκλεκτὴ γυρίζω καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς, οὖς, the grammatical gender (feminine and neuter followed by masculine) is ignored entirely. Cf. Ph. 2:15.

In a passage like 1 Cor. 15:10, εἰμὶ ὁ ἅμα there is no mistake. See ὁς above in verse 9. It is not ‘who I am,’ but ‘what I am,’ not exactly ὅς either, but a more abstract idea than that. Cf. ὁ in Jo. 4:22, used twice for the object of worship, God. So in 1 Jo. 1:1 observe ὁ ὢδομεν, ὁ ἔφορομεν (cf. verse 3) for Jesus. One may recall here that the collective abstract neuter, πᾶν ὁ (Jo. 6:37, 39; 17:2), is used for the disciples. Cf. ὁ—κακείως (Jo. 17:24).

Sometimes also the relative agrees neither with the antecedent nor with a predicate substantive, but gathers the general notion of ‘thing.’ A good example occurs in 1 Jo. 2:8, ἐντολὴν καὶ γράφω ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς, ‘which thing is true.’1 So Eph. 5:5, πλεονέκτης, ὁ (Western and Syrian classes read ὁς) ἐστιν ἐδωλολάτρης, ‘which thing is being an idolater.’ A particularly good example is Col. 3:14 where ὁ comes in between a feminine and a masculine, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ὁ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος. In Mk. 12:42 we have a similar example, λεπτὸ δύο, ὁ ἐστιν κοδράντης.

Indeed ὁ ἐστιν comes to be used as a set expression, like τοῦτο ἐστιν, without any regard to the antecedent or the predicate, as ὁ ἐστιν ὦλοὶ βροντῆς, Mk. 3:17. Three phrases go together in this matter, ὁ ἐστιν, ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται, ὁ λέγεται. The two latter occur in the periphrastic form also. Indeed the examples just noted above may very well be explained from this point of view. So Mt. 1:23, Ἐμμανουὴλ, ὁ ἐστιν μεθηρμηνευόμενον μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, where observe [Page 714] the neuter participle like ὁ. Cf. Ac. 4:36. In Mt. 27:33, Γολγοθᾶ ὁ ἐστιν κρανίου τόπος λεγόμενος, the participle is masculine like τόπος (cf. Mk. 15:22). In 2 Jo. 1:39 ὁ λέγεται μεθηρμηνευόμενον connects two vocatives. Cf. 20:16. In Jo. 1:41 note the accusative and nominative connected with neuter participle, Μεσσίαν ὁ ἐστιν μεθηρμηνευόμενον Χριστός. So ὁ ἐστιν occurs between verb-forms, as in Mk. 5:41; 7:34; or genitives as in Heb. 7:2; Rev. 20:12; 21:17; or whole clauses, as in Mk. 15:34. But see Jo. 9:7; Rev. 20:2. In Ac. 9:36, however, the personal construction occurs, Τοβεσθά, ἦ διερμηνευόμενη λέγεται Δορκάς. See also chapter X, VIII, (c).

Once more, ὁ is used to refer to a verbal idea or to the whole sentence. Instance Mt. 12:4, τοὺς ὤδε τῆς προθέσεως ἧπαρον ὁ οὐκ ἔξεσαν ἤν αὐτῶ φαγεῖν. Here probably τῷ φαγεῖν is the idea referred to,1 though in Mk. 2:26 and Lu. 6:4 we have οὖς. The neuter gender is only natural here. In Ac. 2:32 οὗ is most likely ‘whereof,’ though ‘of whom,’ referring to Ἰησοῦν, is possible. So as to 3:15. But there is no doubt as to Ac. 11:30, ὃ καὶ ἔποιησαν; 26:10, ὃ καὶ ἔποιησα; Gal. 2:10, ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαν aυτῷ τούτῳ ποιήσα (note here the use of αὑτῷ τούτῳ in the relative clause); Col. 1:29 εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπίω (cf. εἰς ὃ in 2 Th. 1:11; 2:14; 1 Pet. 2:8). Cf. also ὃ καὶ ὦμας ἀντὶτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα (1 Pet. 3:21). Per contra see in the papyri ὅν

---

1 W.-Sch., p. 233.
used like ὃ after analogy of τοιοῦτο(ν). Note in passing ὃ ὦ in Lu. 2:15, like ἦ ἦ τε in Heb. 9:2.

5. Number. Here again, as a rule, the relative concurs with the antecedent in number, as in ἱστήρ ὄν (Mt. 2:9), θεοῦ δός (Ro. 2:6). The construction according to sense is not so frequent, as in πλῆθος of (Lu. 6:17 f.), κατὰ πόλιν πᾶσαν ἐν αἷς (Ac. 15:36, note distributive idea), μωρολογία ἦ ἐμπραπελία ἦ (Eph. 5:4, where feminine singular could have occurred because of ἦ), γενεὰς—ἦ ὑς (Ph. 2:15), δευτέραν ἕν ὑς ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς (2 Pet. 3:1, referring to both, probably). Cf. ὃ—λέγοντας (Rev. 5:13). On the other hand note the change from the plural to the singular in ἡμέραι δόδεκα ὑφ' ἦς (Ac. 24:11), and ἐν οὐρανοῖς—ἐξ οὗ (Ph. 3:20). For the neuter plural in the relative (cf. τοῦτο) to cover a vague general idea see ὧν in 1 Tim. 1:6, ὑν οὐν ὅν Lu. 1:20, ἐν ὕς Lu. 12:11 (cf. Ac. 26:12), ἐφ' ὕς Ro. 6:21, etc. Cf. Col. 2:22.

6. Case.

(a) Absence of attraction normal. The obvious way is for the case of the relative to be due to the construction in which it is used or to follow the same law as other nouns and pronouns (so [Page 715] with prepositions). That is to say, assimilation of case is not a necessity. It was indeed in a sense an after-refinement. One must not get the notion that assimilation of case had to be. Thucydides, for instance, did not use it so extensively in his rather complicated sentences, where the relative clauses stand to themselves. Indeed the absence of it is common enough in the N. T., outside of Luke. Cf. Mt. 13:31 κόκκῳ ὅν, Mk. 13:19 κτίσεως ἦν, Jo. 2:22 λόγῳ ὅν (cf. 4:50), Jo. 4:5 χωρίου ὅ (CD ὅν), Tit. 3:5 ἔργον ὅ, Mt. 27:60 μνημείῳ ὅ, Ac. 8:32 γραφῆς ἦν. Not to be exhaustive, one may refer to the rather long list in Winer-Schmiedel (Mt. 13:44, 48; 23:35; Lu. 13:19, 21; Ac. 1:4; 4:10; 1 Tim. 6:21; Heb. 6:19; 8:2; 9:7; 1 Pet. 1:8; Rev. 1:20, etc.). The absence of assimilation in case is not only common in the old Greek, but also in the LXX, the Apocrypha and the papyri. In Aristotle attraction is nearly confined to the more recondite essays (Schindler, De Attractionis Pronominum Rel. Usu Aristotelico, p. 94).

(b) Cognate accusative. The accusative in Ro. 6:10, ὃ ὁπεθανεν, ὃ τῇ, and Gal. 2:20, ὃ ζῶ, may be called adverbial. In reality it reproduces the idea of the verb (cognate acc.). Cf. Mk. 10:38 f.

(g) Attraction to the case of the antecedent. This is very common in the N. T., especially in the writings of Luke. The papyri, even “the most illiterate of them,” show numerous examples of attraction, “a construction at least as popular in late as in classical Greek.” This applies to the LXX also. The MSS. naturally vary sometimes,
some having attraction, others not. Indeed Blass finds this “always” in the passages in W. H. without attraction save in Heb. 8:2. Cf. ἤν (ἡς) in Mk. 13:19, ὅν (ὁ) in Jo. 2:22; 4:50, etc. On the whole attraction seems the more common. But this “idiomatic attraction of the relative” occurs only twice in Matthew (18:19; 24:50) and once in Mark (7:13), whereas it “is very common in Luke” (Plummer, Comm., p. li). The effect of “this peculiar construction” was to give “a sentence more internal unity and a certain periodic compactness.” No instance of attraction of a nominative to an oblique case occurs in the N. T., though this idiom is found in the ancient Greek. [Page 716]

It is usually the accusative case that is assimilated into another oblique case. Thus the accusative may be attracted into the genitive, as πράγματος ὃς (Mt. 18:19), λόγου ὁς (Jo. 15:20), πάντων ὄν (Ac. 1:1; 3:21; 22:10), διαθήκης ἦς (Ac. 3:25), ἐπαγγελίας ἦς (7:17), ἐθνῶν ὄν (7:45), πνεύματος ἐγίου ὃς (Tit. 3:6). Cf. also Ac. 9:36; 22:10; 1 Cor. 6:19; 2 Cor. 10:8, 13; Eph. 1:8; Heb. 6:10; 9:20; Jas. 2:5. In several instances it is the accusative of the inner object that is attracted. Cf. Eph. 1:19 f. So παρακλήσεως ἦς παρακαλοῦμεθα (2 Cor. 1:4), χάριτος ἦς ἐχαρίτωσεν (Eph. 1:6), κλήρους ἦς ἐκλήθητε (4:1), φονῆς ἦς ἐκέκραξε (Ac. 24:21), ἔργον συνεβεβλήκα ὃν ἡσέβησαν (Ju. 15). There are examples also of the accusative attracted to the ablative. So ἐκ τῶν κεραιών ὃς (Lu. 15:16), ἐκ τοῦ ὑδάτος ὃς (Jo. 4:14), ἅπα τῶν ἄγνωστων ὃν (21:10), ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος ὃς (1Jo. 3:24). Cf. Jo. 7:31. Then again the assimilation of the accusative to the pure dative might have been expected, but curiously enough I find so far no example of it in the N. T. In 1 Cor. 7:39 there is an instance of the relative attracted from the accusative to the dative of an omitted antecedent, ἔλευθερα ἔστιν ὃς ἥλεξαν γαμήθησαν, unless γαμήθησαν be repeated, when ὃς is the necessary case. However, several examples occur where the accusative is attracted to the locative or the instrumental. Instances of the locative are found in ἐν ὑμείρᾳ ὃ—ἐν ὁρᾷ ἦς (Mt. 24:50. This is not an instance of one preposition for antecedent and relative), ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ὃς (Lu. 2:20; 9:43; 24:25), ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι σου ὃς (Jo. 17:11 f.), ἐν τῷ μνήματι ὃς (Ac. 7:16), ἐν ἀνάρτῃ ὃς (17:31), ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃς (20:38), ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἦς (2 Cor. 12:21), ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἐγαθόως ὃς (Eph. 2:10), ἐν—θλίψεσιν ὃς (2 Th. 1:4), ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ ὃς (Rev. 18:6). This is probably true also of 1 Cor. 7:20, ἐν τῇ κλήσει ἦς ἐκλήθη, where ἦς would have been the cognate accusative. For attraction to the instrumental see παραδόσει ἦς (Mk. 7:13), δόξῃ ἦς (Jo. 17:5, but W. H. have ἠν in margin), σημείοις ὃς (Ac. 2:22), θυσίαις ὃς (Heb. 10:1, but W. H. ἃς). In a few instances it is an open question whether we have attraction or not. Thus in Jo. 13:5, τῷ λευθένῳ ὃς ἦν διεξεραμένος, either the instrumental ὃς or the accusative ὃ (cf. Jo. 21:7) is correct. In Ac. 9:17, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἦς ἤρχον, the cognate accusative ἦν is possible, though the locative originally is more likely. In 1 Th. 3:9, ἐκλῆσεν τῇ χαρᾷ ἦς χαίρωμεν, a cognate accusative was possible (ἡν) attracted to the locative or an original instrumental. In Col. 1:23, τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ὃς ἠκούσατε, either the accusative or the genitive might occur with ἀκούσατε. But in 2 Tim. 1:13, λόγων ὃν

4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 173.
5 W.-Th., p. 163.
6 Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 71; W.-Sch., p. 227.
1 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 174; Moulton, Prol., p. 93.
2 But in W.-Sch. (p. 225) ὃς is held to be essential to the structure. For attraction in John see Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 298.
3 But see per contra, W.-Sch., p. 223.
παρ ἐμοῦ ἥκουσας, the accusative was almost certainly the original form. Cf. Ac. 1:4 ἢν ἤκουστε· μου. Plummer (On Luke, p. ii) notes that this attraction in Luke is particularly frequent after παρά (Lu. 2:20; 3:19; 9:43, etc.). In Lu. 5:9, ἐπὶ τῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰχθύων ὄν (ἢ) συνέλαβον, the attraction in some MSS. is to the locative, in others to the genitive.

A few instances are found in the N. T. where the attraction is from some other case than the accusative. A clear case of a locative assimilated to a genitive appears in Ac. 1:22, ἔως ἡμέρας ἦς ἐνελήμφθη. This is in accord with the ancient Greek idiom. The very same construction appears in the LXX (Lev. 23:15. Cf. Bar. 1:19). In 1 Tim. 4:6 A reads διδασκαλίας ἦς παρηκολούθηκας, but the rest have ἦς. A dative has been attracted into the genitive along with incorporation and the preposition in Ro. 4:17, κατέναντι οὐ ἐπιστέψεσθε· θεοῦ· κατέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ὃ ἐπίστεψεν. So the phrase ὃ ἦς (Ac. 24:11; 2 Pet. 3:4, but Lu. 7:45 ὄρας) is an abbreviation of ὃ ἡμέρας ἦς (locative attracted to ablative). In Ac. 20:18 we actually have ὧν πρότισθη ἡμέρας ὃ ἦς ἐπέβην, but as a point of departure (ablative) rather than a point of location (locative). Cf. also ὃ ἦς ἡμέρας (Col. 1:6, 9) where the incorporation resolves itself into ὃ ἡμέρας ἦς. So likewise ὃ ἦς ἡμέρας (Mt. 24:38; Lu. 1:20; 17:27; Ac. 1:2) really comes from ὃ ἦς ἡμέρας ἦς (locative to genitive). In Heb. 3:9 οὐ can be regarded as adverb ‘where’ or as relative ‘wherewith’ (margin of the American Revision). If it is relative, ὁ was probably the unattracted form (instrumental to genitive like περασμοῦ). In Mk. 10:38 ὃ, τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ βαπτίζομαι, the relative is in the cognate accusative retained with the passive verb.2 See further chapter on Cases.

(d) Inverse attraction. What is called inverse attraction is due to the same tendency to identify antecedent and relative, only the assimilation is that of the antecedent to the relative. In itself this phenomenon is no more peculiar than the other. Plato, who uses the ordinary attraction very often, seldom has inverse attraction (Cleef, De Attractionis in Enuntionibus Rel. Vs. Platonico, pp. 44–46). No inverse attraction is found in Pisidian Greek (Compernass, De Serm. Gr., p. 13). The examples are not very numerous in the N. T., but the ancient Greek amply supports the idiom.1 One example, λίθον ὃν ὁ σπεδοκίμασαν, occurs in Mt. 21:42; Mk. 12:10=Lu. 20:17. It is from the LXX (Ps. 118:22). In 1 Pet. 2:7 W. H. read λίθος. Cf. also Lu. 1:73, ὅρκον ὃν ὄμοσαν, which might have been ὅρκου οὐ after μηνηθήναι.2 See also 1 Cor. 10:16, τὸν ὅρτον ὃν κλώμεν. Hence also τὸ ποτήριον ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν of verse 16. If ὃ is a part of the text (not W. H.) in Ac. 10:36, we have τὸν λόγον ὃν.3 Sometimes anacoluthon occurs also as in πᾶν ῥῆμα ὅργον ὃ—περὶ αὐτοῦ, Mt. 12:36; σὰς ὃς ἔρεῖ—ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, Lu. 12:10; παντὶ ὃς ἐδοθή—ξηπερήσαται παρ ἁπετάσει ὃ, 12:48; πᾶν ὃ δέδωκεν—ἐξ ὧν ὄμοσαν, Jo. 6:39; πᾶν ὃ δέδωκες ἀπὸ τοῦ ὃν ὃ δώσει αὐτὸς, 17:2. In 2 Cor. 12:17, μὴ τίνα ὃν—διὶ αὐτοῦ, we have anacoluthon, but not attraction. In Mt. 25:24, συνάγετε δόθην οὐ διεσκόρπισας, we

---

have ἐκείθεν ὁποὺ shortened to ὁθεν. There is not inverse attraction in οὐδείς ὃς (1 Cor. 6:5) since ἦν precedes οὐδείς.

(e) Incorporation. But the most striking instance of this close unity between antecedent and relative is the incorporation of the antecedent into the relative clause with identity of case. I count 54 such examples in Moulton and Geden. They are fairly well distributed through the different portions of the New Testament.

1) The simplest form of such incorporation is where no change of case is required. Thus Lu. 24:1, φέρουσα ἃ ἤτοιμασαν ἀρώματι; Jo. 6:14, ἰδοντες ὃ ἐποίησαν σημεία (W. H.); Mt. 7:2, ἐν ὃς γὰρ κρίνετε κρίνετε κρίθησεσθε, καὶ ἐν ὃς μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν=Mk. 4:24=Lu. 6:38; Mt. 24:44, ἥ oὓ δοκεῖτε ὃς ὑπήρξεν=Lu. 12:40 (not Mt. 24:50). For further examples of this simple incorporation see Mt. 23:37=Lu. 13:34 (the set phrase, adverbial accusative, ὃς τρόπον), so also Ac. 1:11; 7:28; 15:11; 27:25; Mk. 2:19 (ὅσον γρόνον; but not Lu. 12:46=Mt. 24:50); Lu. 17:29 f.; Jo. 9:14; 11:6; 17:3; Ac. 7:20; 25:18; probably 26:7; Ro. 2:16; 7:19; 9:24 (οὐς—ἡμᾶς note); 16:2; Ph. 3:18 (but probably only predicate accusative like Mk. 15:12); 2 Tim. 1:6 (ὁ τῆς Ἱησοῦ). In 1 Jo. 2:25 there is not exactly incorporation, but apposition to the relative. In Lu. 8:47; Ac. 22:24 and Heb. 2:11 the case is the same also, but the preposition would have been needed only with the relative. Cf. Phil. 10; 2 Tim. 1:12; Heb. 13:11. See ὁν—πονηρῶν, Ac. 25:18, where there is incorporation and attraction to the case of the antecedent. The same thing is true of the spurious passage in Jo. 5:4, where ἐπικεφαλίσα Ἰωάνην to αὐτοῦ, the substantive is incorporated, but the demonstrative is repeated afterwards. Cf. also ὁ—αὐτό τινος (Gal. 2:10). It is possible that Ro. 4:17 belongs here, the preposition κατέναντι being understood twice. The same thing may be true of Lu. 1:4, περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων ἡ σωτηρίας (either λόγων [or περὶ λόγων] περὶ ὧν or περὶ λόγων oὐς).

2) But sometimes besides incorporation there has resulted a change of case also. The antecedent may be drawn into the case of the relative (cf. inverse attraction) as in Mk. 6:16, ὃ ἐγὼ ἀπεκατάλεισα Ἰωάνην οὗτος ἤγερθη. Here the demonstrative pronoun is resumptive. The change is made from nominative to accusative. The same thing is true of the spurious passage in Jo. 5:4, ὁ δέποτε κατείχετο νοσήματι (change from genitive to instrumental). This is probably true of Ac. 21:16, ἄγοντες παρ ὃς ἐξενθήσανεν Μνᾶσωνι τινι Κυπρίῳ. The resolution of this passage is not certain, but it may be ἄγοντες Μνᾶσωνα παρ ὃ (change from accusative to locative). But πρὸς Μνᾶσωνα may be correct.

In Ro. 6:17, ὑπηκούσατε εἰς ὃ παρεδόθητε τύπον διάχεις, the resolved form would probably be τύπῳ διάχεις εἰς ὃ παρεδόθητε. In Heb. 7:14, εἰς ἦν φυλήν, the substantive would have been in apposition with εἰς Ἰουδα (the ablative). In Heb. 10:10 ἐν ὃς θελήματι the accusative τὸ θελήμα is present in the preceding sentence. The same thing is true of 1 Pet. 1:10, περὶ ᾧ σωτηρίας (σωτηρίας just before). In 2 Cor. 10:13 we have in the same sentence the substantive repeated (once incorporated and

---

4 This is more than “occasional,” as Blass says (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 174). He rightly notes the absence of the article.
1 Thompson (Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 71 f.) finds this change only in the acc. But this is not Attic.
attracted to the case of the relative, but the relative itself attracted to the case of κανόνος, κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὃ θεὸς μέτρου.

3) In a few instances the attraction has been that of the relative to the case of the antecedent, transferred to the relative clause. See Ac. 25:18, ὃς ἐκώ αὐτῶν ἐπενόειν πονηρῶν. For examples with prepositions (see chapter on Prepositions) note: περὶ πάντων ὃς ἐκοίμησεν πονηρῶν (Lu. 3:19), περὶ πασῶν ὃς ἔδωκεν δινάμεον (19:37), where the incorporation is only partial. It is clear therefore that in the great majority of instances there is no change of case required. Very many also are set phrases like ὃς τρόπον, ἧς ὡρα, ἥς ἡμέρα, ὁ ἀβία, etc. For presence of the antecedent see Jo. 16:17 f.

7. Absence of Antecedent. It so often happens that the relative has no antecedent that it calls for special consideration. [Page 720] The clause indeed often becomes a substantive rather than an adjective clause. ὃς thus occurs in general statements as in Mt. 10:14; 23:16, 18 (cf. also substantive rather than an adjective clause. So ὃς ἔχει ὡτα ἄκουεται ἄκουετο (Mk. 4:9), where the relative clause is the subject of ἄκουετο. This is the indefinite relative. Cf. Mk. 4:25. Here the relative and the antecedent (if expressed) are in the same case (nominative). Cf. 1 Cor. 15:10, εἰμὶ ὃς εἰμί; Lu. 9:50, etc. Both may be in the accusative as in ὃς δὲ ὡς ἄγω πᾶσιν λέγω (Mk. 13:37), μὴ ἔδωκεν ὃς λέγει (Lu. 9:33). Cf. Mk. 15:12; Lu. 11:6; Jo. 1:45; 6:29; 19:37, etc. But the relative may be in the accusative when the antecedent would have been in the nominative. So ὃς λαλεῖ γίνεται (Mk. 11:23). Cf. Jo. 1:26; 4:18, etc.

So both may be examples of the genitive, as συγγενῆς ὃς οὗ ἀπέκουσεν Πέτρος τὸ ὄτιον (Jo. 18:26) where οὗ=τοῦτον οὗ. So in 1 Cor. 7:1 περὶ ὃς=περὶ τοῦτον (or πραγμάτων) περὶ ὃς. But in ὃς χρι οὗ (Rev. 2:25) we really have ὃς χρι κυρίον ὃς (or ὃς ὃς). In Lu. 23:41, ἡμῖν ὃς ἐπέραζεν, the resolution is τοῦτον ὃς (gen. and acc.). So in Jo. 17:9 περὶ ὃς δεδόκας=περὶ τοῦτον οὗς ὃς. In Ac. 21:24 ὃς κατηχηταί περὶ σοῦ οὐδέν=τοῦτον ὃς, etc. Exactly so ὃς in Lu. 9:36; 23:14; Ac. 8:24; 22:15; 25:11; Ro. 15:18; 2 Cor. 12:17. In Ac. 26:16, μάρτυρα ὃς τε ἐδέξας με ὃς τε φθήνῃ με σοι, ὃς is the second ὃς that gives trouble. The antecedent would be τοῦτον and the relative before attraction either ὃς (acc. of general reference) or οἷς (locative or instrumental). In Ro. 4:7 ὃς has as its unexpressed antecedent οὗ. Cf. also Ac. 13:25. In Mt. 6:8 (so Jo. 13:29), ὃς χρεῖαν, the antecedent would be in the accusative. So also περὶ ὃς, Ac. 24:13. In Lu. 17:1 διὸ οὗ is resolved into τοῦτῳ δι᾽ οὗ (dative). In Ro. 10:14, πός πιστεύσωσιν οὐ οὐκ ἢκουσαν, we probably have οὗ=εἷς τοῦτον (or τοῦτῳ) οὗ.

The examples of the ablative are not many. See Jo. 7:31 where ὃς after πάεινα σημεῖα is to be resolved into τοῦτον ὃς (abl. and acc.). So in Ac. 26:22 ἐκτὸς ὃς=ἐκτὸς τοῦτον ὃς. In Heb. 5:8 ἄφι οὗ=ἀπὸ τοῦτον ὃς, while in 2 Cor. 2:3 ἀφι οὗ=ἀπὸ τοῦτον ὃς ὃς. Cf. Lu. 6:34, πίστω οὗ; 1 Cor. 10:30. In Ac. 13:39, ἀπὸ πάντων ὃς, the one preposition covers both ablatives.

For the dative I note οἷς δέδοται (Mt. 19:11), where the antecedent like πάντες would have been in the nominative. Cf. Lu. 7:43, 47 ὃς; Ro. 15:21 οἷς and 2 Pet. 1:9
In 1 Cor. 7:39, ἑυθεία γαμήθην, the antecedent would have been in the dative also. So also 2 Cor. 2:10 ὃ; Ro. 6:16 ὃ twice. In 2 Tim. 1:12, οὖν ὃ [Page 721] περιστέρικα, it is the accusative rather followed by dative, αὕτων ὃ. In Mt. 20:23 (Mk. 10:40) the antecedent of οὗ is probably τούτων. In Ro. 10:14 the antecedent of οὗ would be τούτῳ.

Some few examples of the locative appear also. Cf. ἑτέρῳ, oὗ, Ro. 6:21, where the antecedent would have been ἐπὶ τούτοις. So Ro. 2:1 and 14:22 ἐν ὃ implies ἐν τούτῳ (cf. also 1 Pet. 2:12; 3:16), but not so verse 21 where ἐν ὃ refers to an involved τί or μηδέν. In Ro. 7:6 ἐν ὃ may involve τούτῳ ἐν ὃ. In Heb. 2:18 ἐν ὃ (= ἐν τούτῳ ἐν ὃ really has a causal force. In Ph. 4:11 ἐν οἷς ὧν τούτῳ ἐν οἷς, but in 2 Tim. 3:14 ἐν οἷς ὧν τούτῳ ὃ Cf. 2 Pet. 2:12 (but ταύτα ἐν οἷς may be correct).

I have noticed no examples of the instrumental. But great freedom and variety are manifest.

8. Prepositions with the Antecedent and Relative. The preposition may be used twice1 “in the case of a sharper division of the relative clause.” So εἰς τῇ γῇν τοῦτῃ, εἰς ἓν, Ac. 7:4; ἕπο ἀπαρτίζει τούτῳ ἡμέρας ἑτέρῳ, ἓν, 20:18. Then again the preposition may occur with the antecedent, but with not with the relative, though implied, as in ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ ἑδηλίθεσαν, Ac. 1:21. So the margin in Ro. 2:16 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἓν. Cf. Lu. 1:25. It is possible also so to understand ἐν τῇ δόξῃ ἓν ἡγχευ, Ac. 9:17. But it is clearly true of ἕπο πάντων ἓν, Ac. 13:39.

On the other hand the preposition may occur with the relative, but not with the antecedent. Thus ἐκεῖνη τῇ ἑρῷ ἐν ἓν, Jo. 4:53.

When the antecedent is absent, the preposition may be the one common to both, as in ἑτέρῳ ἓν (2 Cor. 2:3), or which belongs to only one. Cf. παρὰ ἓν (Lu. 6:34), ἑτέρῳ ἓν (Ro. 6:21), ἐν ἑτέρῳ (Ph. 4:11), ἕπερ ὃ (1 Cor. 10:30), ἐν ὃ (Ro. 14:22), εἰς ὃν (Ro. 10:14), περί ἓν (1 Cor. 7:1), etc. This “one” may be the antecedent, as in the following examples, εἰς ὃν (Jo. 6:29)=εἰς τούτων ὅν, περί ἓν (Jo. 17:9)=περί τοι ἑτερῶν ὅν, ἕπερ ὃ (1 Cor. 4:6)=ἐπερ ὁ ταύτα ἵ, ἐφ’ ἓν (Heb. 5:8)=ἐπερ ὁ τοῦτον ἵ, εἰς ὃν (Jo. 19:37)=εἰς τοῦτον ὅν, etc. Or the “one” may be the relative, as δι’ ὃν (Lu. 17:1)=τούτῳ δι’ ὃν, ἐφ’ ὃν (Heb. 7:13)=οὔτος ἑτέρῳ ὃν, etc. The use of prepositions is common in the same way with the relative and its incorporated antecedent. See ἐν ὃ [Page 722] κρίματι (Mt. 7:2), ἔχρι ἓν ἡμέρας (Lu. 1:20), δι’ ἓν αἵτιναν (Lu. 8:47), παρά ὃ—Μνάσωνι (Ac. 21:16), εἰς ὃν—τόπον (Ro. 6:17), ἐφ’ ἓν ἡμέρας (Col. 1:9), περί ἓς σωτηρίας (1 Pet. 1:10), etc. Cf. Ro. 16:2.


---

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 174.

Adverbs show the same phenomena as other relative forms. Thus in Ro. 5:20 ὁδός has no antecedent. In 1 Cor. 16:6 ὁδός ἐκέλευσεν οὖς. So ὁδός in Jo. 11:32 ἐκέλευσεν ὁδός and in Jo. 20:19 ἐνταύθα ὁδός. In 2 Sam. 14:15 ὁδός = conjunction.

10. Pleonastic Antecedent. The redundant antecedent incorporated into the relative clause has attracted considerable attention. In Herodotus 4, 44 ὁδός = αὐτὸς occurs, and Blass cites Hyper. Eux. § 3, ἐν — τοῦτον. But in ancient Greek it was a very rare usage. In Winer-Schmiedel examples of pleonastic αὐτὸς are cited from Xenophon, Diodorus Siculus, Pausanias, Sophocles. Pleonastic αὐτὸς appears in Aristophanes, Birds, 1237, οὗ οὕτων αὐτὸς. Reference also is made to Sophocles and Lucian. In the LXX the idiom is extremely common, manifestly under the influence of the Hebrew יִלְוַשְׂנָ (cf. Aramaic זֵ). It “is found in all parts of the LXX and undoubtedly owes its frequency to the Hebrew original. But the fact that it is found in an original Greek work, such as 2 Macc. (xii, 27 ἐν ἑν… ἐν αὐτῷ) and a paraphrase such as 1 Esdras (iii, 5, 9; iv, 54, 63; vi, 32), is sufficient to warrant its presence in the κοινή.” For numerous examples of the idiom in the LXX see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 200, and Winer-Moulton, p. 185. Cf. also Conybeare and Stock, Selections, pp. 65 ff. As a matter of fact the examples are not very numerous in the N. T. It occurs several times in Rev. (3:8 ἐν—αὐτήν, 7:2 οὗ ἐδόθη αὐτός, 7:9 ὅν—αὐτόν, 13:8 οὗ—αὐτοῦ, 20:8 ὅν—αὐτῶν). Outside of the Apocalypse, which so strongly bears the influence of the LXX, the usage is infrequent. See Mt. 3:12, οὗ τὸ πτῶν ἐν τῇ χειρί αὐτοῦ, an example hardly parallel as a matter of fact. But a clearer instance is Mk. 1:7 (=Lu. 3:16 f.), ὁδός—αὐτοῦ, and still more so 7:25, ἡς ἐπέτει τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς. Cf. also οἷα—τοιαύτη (Mk. 13:19), οἶος—[Page 723] τηλικοῦτος (Rev. 16:18), οἷα—αὐτοῦς (Mk. 9:3), ὁδός—ἔκει (Rev. 12.6, 14), ὁδός—ἔπτ αὐτῶν (Rev. 17:9). In Ac. 15:17, ἐφ οὗ—ἔπτ αὐτοῦς, we have a quotation from the LXX (Amos 9:12). “The N. T. examples are all from places where Aramaic sources are certain or suspected”

Winer-Schmiedel Winer-Schmiedel, Winer’s Grammatik des neuest. Sprachidioms. 8. Aufl. (1894—).
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.
3 P. 201. Cf. also W.-M., p. 185.
Sophocles Sophocles, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (1888).
4 Thack., Gr. of O. T. in Gk., p. 46.
Conybeare and Stock Conybeare and Stock, Selections from the LXX. A Grammatical Introduction (1905).
1 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175; Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 59.
(Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 95). One almost wonders, after this admission, why Moulton, p. 94, seems so anxious to prove that the idiom in the N. T. is not a Hebraism. By his own admission it seems a practical Hebraism there, though the idiom had an independent development in the Greek. The early sporadic examples in the ancient Greek\(^2\) blossom out in the later Greek again and in the modern Greek become very common. Psichari\(^3\) considers it rather far-fetched in Moulton to appeal to the modern Greek vernacular, ὁ γιατρὸς ποῦ ἔστειλα, ‘the doctor whom I sent for,’ since the modern Greek vernacular just as readily uses ποῦ without αὐτόν. Psichari complains that Thumb\(^4\) also has not explained clearly this idiom. But Psichari believes that the
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Moulton


———, *Characteristics of N. T. Greek* (The Expositor, 1904).

———, *Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T.* (1911).


———, *The Science of Language* (1903).


MOULTON and MILLIGAN, *Lexical Notes from the Papyri* (The Expos., 1908—).

———, *The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources*. Part I (1914), II, III.

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175, cites ὁ ἡ πνοὴ αὐτοῦ, from Clem. Cor. i. 21. 9.
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PSICHERI, J., *Essai sur le grec de la Septante* (Rev. des études juives, April, 1908).

———, *Essais de grammaire historique néo-grecque* (1886–1889).

3 Essai sur le grec de la Sept., p. 182.

Thumb
idiom existed in the vernacular κοινή (and so fell in readily with the Hebrew usage) and has persisted to the present day. He considers the example from a papyrus of the third century A.D. (P.Oxy. I, 117, 15) decisive, ἐξ ὧν—ἐξ αὐτῶν. See also P. Amh. II, 11, 26, δὲ περ φανερὸν τοῦτο ἐγένετο. Moulton has given abundant examples from Old English. So in Chaucer (Knights Tale, 1851 f.):

“Namely oon,

That with a spere was thirled his brest-boon.”

He compares also the German der du bist. Simcox cites vernacular English “a thing which I don’t like it.” Evidently therefore the idiom has had independent development in various languages in the vernacular. According to Jannaris (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 353) the relative is in such cases regarded as “a mere connective.”


———, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).


4 Hellen., p. 128.
5 Cf. also Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 353.
6 Prol., p. 94.
Simcox


———, The Writers of the N. T.

Jannaris

JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).

———, On the True Meaning of the Koiνή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).
In Gal. 3:1, ὁς—ἐν ὑμῖν, W. H. reject ἐν ὑμῖν. In Gal. 2:10, δ—αὕτο τοῦτο, we have the intensive use of αὕτο, but τοῦτο is pleonastic. In 1 Pet. 2:24, δς—αὕτοςς, we have again intensive αὕτος.

11. The Repetition of ὁς. Winer8 rightly remarks that it is a misapprehension of the Greek genius to expect the relative rather than αὕτος or αὑτος in a case like Jo. 1:7; Lu. 2:36; 19:2; Ac. 10:36. [Page 724] The old Greek could, and commonly did,1 use ὁς (or more usually αὑτός) with καί to continue the narrative. Blass2 rather curiously calls it “negligent usage.” Cf. Lu. 13:4, ἐφ οὐς ἔπεσεν ὁ πύργος καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν αὑτοὺς. 1 Cor. 8:6, ἐξ οὗ—καὶ εἰς αὐτόν καὶ διι αὐτοῦ (cf. Heb. 11:4); 2 Pet. 2:3, οἶς—καὶ αὐτῶν; Rev. 17:2, μὴ ὅς καὶ αὐτής. In Lu. 17:31 καὶ ὁ occurs rather than καὶ αὐτός. Cf. Jo. 13:24. In Jo. 1:33, ἐφ ὃν—καὶ ὃν, the repetition of the relative would have been impracticable. But in 1 Cor. 7:13 Paul might very well have written ἦς καὶ ὁς rather than καὶ οὗτος (a sort of parenthesis). It is common,3 also, to have neither the relative repeated nor the demonstrative. So ὁς γε τοῦ ἱδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἔφεισάτο, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὑτόν (Ro. 8:32). Cf. Ph. 4:9.

But the relative may be repeated. A good many such examples occur in the N. T. Καὶ may be used, as ὅν καὶ ὅν (Ro. 4:7). Cf. also οὐκ—ὡ καὶ (Ac. 27:23) and ὅν τε—ὅν τε— (Ac. 26:16). Cf. 1 Cor. 15:1 f, δ—δ καὶ—ἐν ὃ καὶ—δι οὐ καὶ. See Jo. 21:20.

But examples occur also of the repetition of the relative without any conjunction, as in ὁς—ὁς—παρ ὁ (Ac. 24:6). See 1 Cor. 4:17. Cf. οὐσα—ὁςα, etc. (Ph. 4:8). This repetition of ὁς is specially frequent in Paul. Cf. Col. 1:24, 28 f.; Eph. 3:11 f.; 1 Cor. 7:7 f., though it is not exactly “peculiar” to him (Winer-Moulton, p. 209). In 1 Jo. 1:1 ὁ is repeated without conjunction three times, while in verse 3 ὁ is not repeated with the second verb. In 1 Pet. 1:6–12 four sentences begin with a relative. In Ro. 9:4 f. we have οἵτινες—ὁν—ὁν—καὶ οἱ ὅν.

The use of ὅν ὅν οὐσα together (Lu. 12:3) finds abundant parallel in the LXX, easily falling in with the Hebrew construction4 with יפה. Thus a double relative occurs.

______________________________

Winer

WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T.Usu (1834–1843).

8 W.-M., p. 186.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.
3 “Normal” indeed. Thompson, Synt., p. 70.
4 Thack., Gr. of O. T. in Gk., p. 25.
In Ro. 4:21 the conjunction ὅτι ὅ is merely accidental; but that is not true of ὅ—ὅτι in 1 Jo. 4:3. Cf. also ὅν ὅ in Ro. 9:6.

12. A Consecutive Idea. This may be implied in ὅς. Thus in Lu. 7:4, ᾳξιός ἐστιν ὃ παρέξη τῷ ὅς. One is reminded of qui in Latin. Cf. also τίς ὅτι ὅτι in Ro. 9:6.

13. Causal. ὅς may also introduce a causal sentence. So ὅς [Page 725] γε in Ro. 8:32. Cf. Latin qui et qui. This is perfectly regular in ancient Attic. Cf. Thompson, Syntax of Attic Greek, p. 374. See also chapter XIX, Mode.

14. In Direct Questions. The passage in Mt. 26:50, ἐταῖρε ἐφ ὅ πάρει, is the only one in the N. T. where such a construction is possible. There is no doubt as to the occasional use of ὅςτις (see (e), 9), ὅπος, ὅποτερος, ὃς in direct questions in the ancient Greek. For examples see Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 473 f. See further chapter XIX, Mode. This double use of relative pronouns is on a par with the double use of interrogative stems (cf. indefinite) so common in the Indo-Germanic tongues. The Latin qui and quis are kin in root and usage. Moulton rightly considers it “superfluous to say that this usage cannot possibly be extended to direct question.” Winer explained the “misuse” as belonging to late Greek. A few examples of ὅς in a direct question do occur. So in Euseb., P. E. vi, 7.257 d, Gaisford edition, ὅν ἐνεκα; Just., Cohort. 5 (p. 253 A), δι ἴν αὐτῶν—προσέχεις ὅμηρω; Apophth., 105 C, Ἀρσένιε, δι ὃ ἐξῆλθες; Certainly the idiom was chiefly in the vernacular and rare even there. Blass conjectures a slip in the text, εἶρε having been changed to ἐταῖρε, and Chrysostom had an imperative in his text. We may suppose “a rather harsh ellipsis” of the principal verb and treat it as an ordinary relative. Of may indeed here be demonstrative as suggested by Noah K. Davis. There was undoubtedly in the later Greek considerable confusion in the use of the relatives and the interrogatives. It is not impossible for ὅς here to be interrogative. That is as much as one can at present say. Blass thought it “quite incredible.”

15. In Indirect Questions. Here the matter is much clearer. Even Blass admits that “relatives and interrogatives become confused in Greek as in other languages.” In the classical language ὅς (still more ὅςτις) is “frequently” so employed. This use comes from Homer on down and occurs in Aristophanes, Sophocles, Herodotus, Xenophon, Plato, Lysias. Thucydides uses it side by side with ὅςτις. The papyri have it as

5 Cf. Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 369.
7 1 Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gr., p. 74.
8 2 Prol., p. 93.
9 3 W.-M., p. 208.
11 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 176.
12 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 68.
13 Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 178.
14 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.
15 Thompson, Synt., p. 74. Cf. also Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 473; Moulton, Prol., p. 93.
Moulton has shown. Cf. φράζοντες ἐν ἧς κώμῃ οἰκοῦσιν, R. L. 29 (iii/B.C.); φροντίδας δι ἵνα δὲ τὰ ἱερατέα ἐργασθῆναι, P. P. ii. 37 (ii/B.C.). It is a little surprising, however, to find Blass saying that this usage “is wanting in the N. T.” W. F. Moulton in his footnote gives undoubted examples of ὅς in indirect questions after verbs of knowing, declaring, etc. So οὖν—ὡς χρείαν ἔχετε, Mt. 6:8; ἀπαγγεῖλατε ὅ ἀκούσατε, 11:4; εἰδούσα τῷ γέγονεν, Mk. 5:33; ἀνέγνωτε ὅ ἐποίησεν, Lu. 6:3 (cf. Mt. 12:3 τί); μὴ εἰδώς ὃ λέγει, 9:33; δὲ ἤμεν ἤπας ἀντοῦ ἀπήγγείλεν, 8:47 (cf. Ac. 22:24); διδάξας ὃς ὃς ἐλεῖν, 12:12. But not 2 Tim. 1:12. And then in 1 Tim. 1:7 we find ὃ λέγονται and περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦται used side by side after μὴ νοοῦντες. Cf. also Jo. 18:21. One may compare also Lu. 11:6, οὐκ ἔχω τί φάγον, Mt. 8:47, and note ὃς in Lu. 23:55; 24:35, not to mention ὃςς, ὃςς.

16. The Idiom οὐδεὶς ἕστιν ὁς. It occurs in the N. T., as Mk. 9:39; 10:29; Lu. 1:61; 18:29; 1 Cor. 6:5. For οὐδείς ἕστιν ὁς οὗ see Mt. 10:26 (cf. Lu. 8:17). Here one is reminded of the old idiom οὐδεὶς ὁς. Mayser (Grammatik, p. 310) calls attention to the papyri use of ὃντις ὁς after analogy of τοσοῦτον(v). Cf. τίς ὁς oυ in Ac. 19:35. The N. T. does not use ἕστιν ὁς, εἰςον oί=τίς, τινές.

(e) ὁστις.

1. Varied Uses. The form is, of course, merely ὁς and τις. But we have seen a variety of uses of ὁς, and τις likewise is not entirely uniform. Hence the combination cannot be expected to be so.

2. The Distinction between ὁς and ὅστις. It was not ironclad in the ancient language, as may be seen by reference to the Epic, Ionic, Attic poets, and to Herodotus (once Thucydid). Blas finds that the distinction between them is no longer regularly preserved in the N. T., least of all in Luke, best of all in Paul. Moulton finds some examples in the papyri of ὅστις in the sense of ὁς, but doubts if the two relatives are ever absolutely convertible and thinks that on the whole the classical distinction remains undisturbed, though sometimes during the κοινή period it had worn rather thin. But Jannaris holds that ὅστις, having a wider scope than ὁς, in postclassical times was used indiscriminately for ὁς. He is supported by

10 Prol., p. 93; Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 441.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.
Moulton MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).
2 W.-M., p. 207 f.
3 W.-Sch., p. 237.
4 Ib., p. 236.
5 Cf. Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 69, for the exx.
6 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 172 f.
7 Prol., p. 91.
8 Ib.; Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 441 f.
Kaelker about Polybius.\footnote{1 Quest., p. 245 f.} But in the vernacular modern Greek ὅτι is alone common, other forms of ὅστις being rare, though ὅτινος and ὅτινων are found (Thumb, \textit{Handb.}, p. 93 f.). Krüger\footnote{2 Gr., p. 139. For the confusion between ὃς and ὅστις see also Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 558 f.} calls ὃς “objective” and ὅστις “qualitative and generic.” W. F. Moulton\footnote{3 W.-M., p. 209, n. 3, where a very helpful discussion occurs.} defines ὅστις as properly indicating the class or kind to which an object belongs. But no exact parallel can be drawn nor uniform distinction preserved. Each has its own history. Jebb\footnote{JEBB, R. C., \textit{Attic Orators}. 2d ed. (1893).} takes ὅστις to refer to class in ancient Greek and hence is either indefinite or causal. In the modern Greek it is still indefinite, but has also in the vernacular displaced ὃς in the masculine and feminine nominative. In the LXX ὅστις is less frequent than ὃς and is almost confined to the nominative and accusative.\footnote{4 V. and D., \textit{Handb. to Mod. Gk.}, p. 302.} In the papyri\footnote{5 Thack., Gr., p. 192.} it is less frequent than ὃς and is usually in the nominative as in the N. T. (Moulton, \textit{Cl. Rev.}, 1904, p. 154).

3. \textit{The Indefinite Use}. This is, as a matter of fact, still the least frequent in the N. T. There are about 27 of the indefinite and 120 of the definite use (Scott). Cf. ὅστις σὲ ἑαυτῷ ἔει ἔτ πὴ ἀπὸ ἀδέλφων σιαγόνα (Mt. 5:39), ὅστις ἄρνησται με (10:33), ὃς ἐν αἰτήσει (Jo. 14:13), ὅστις ἐδώ κῃ (Gal. 5:10). Thus it is used with indicative or subjunctive, with or without ἄν (ἔαν). Cf. Mt. 13:12. In Mk. 8:34 ἐὰν τι does not differ very greatly from ὅστις. Cf. also ἄν ὑμ, Mk. 10:30. ὅστις ἄν ὑμ is, of course, indefinite also. Thus Mt. 7:24; ἀν ὃ τ ἐδώ κῃ ὑμ (Col. 3:17), etc. For πάσα ψυχὴ ἦτις ἄν see Ac. 3:23 (LXX). In P. Par. 574 (iii/A.D.) note ὅστις ποτ ὃν ὑμ.

4. \textit{The Definite Examples}. These are partly causal clauses. Some indeed seem merely descriptive. Thus Mt. 7:15, τὸν ψευδοπροφητῶν οἵτινες ἐρχονται. Cf. also Mt. 7:26; 13:52; 21:33, etc. The value of the pronoun sometimes does not differ greatly from οἷος and expresses quality. Thus εὐνοοῦσης οἵτινες, Mt. 19:12; ἄλλος γεωργοῖς οἵτινες, 21:41; παρθένοις αἵτινες, 25:1, etc. Once indeed we actually have τοιαύτη ἦτις (1 Cor. 5:1). Cf. also ποταπὴ ἡ γυνὴ ἦτις (Lu. 7:39). See also Gal. 4:24, 26. Then again it may be merely explanatory as in γυναῖκες πολλαὶ—αἵτινες ἥκολοῦθησαν ἐπὶ ἦσσου (Mt. 27:55). Cf. Mk. 15:7; Lu. 12:1; Col. 3:5; Rev. 11:8, etc. This use of ὅστις is particularly frequent with proper names. \footnote{6 Mayser, Gr., p. 310.} \textit{Cl. Rev.}, Classical Review (London).

\footnotetext{3}{Jebb, R. C., \textit{Attic Orators}. 2d ed. (1893).}

\footnotetext{4}{———, \textit{Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey}. (1892).}

\footnotetext{5}{———, \textit{On the Relation of Classical to Modern Greek} (Appendix to \textit{Vincent and Dickson’s Handbook to Mod. Gk.}, 1887).}

\footnotetext{6}{Cl. \textit{Rev.}, Classical Review (London).}
εἰς πόλιν Δαυείδ ἡττις καλεῖται Βηθλεέμ. Cf. also Lu. 8:26; Ac. 16:12, etc. Abbott, 
Joh. Gr., p. 303, takes the explanatory or illustrative examples='now he,' 'one that.' 
Moulton' points out that ὅστις at the beginning of a parable (cf. Mt. 20:1) is really a 
type and so appropriate. In an example like Lu. 1:20, τοῖς λόγοις μου οἴτινες 
πληρωθήσονται, Moulton takes it to be 'which for all that' (almost adversative), while 
in Lu. 10:42 ἡττις οὖκ ἐφαρμὸδοςται αὐτῆς='and it shall not be taken away from 
her.' There is no doubt about the causal use of ὅστις (cf. qui and quippe qui). See Jo. 
8:53, Ἀβραὰμ ὅστις ἁπέδονεν ('seeing that he died'); Ac. 10:47, οἴτινες τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ 
ἄγιον ἔλαβον ('since they received the Holy Spirit'). Cf. also Ac. 7:53; Ro. 2:15; 6:2; 
Heb. 8:6; 10:35; Eph. 3:13; Ph. 4:3; Col. 3:5; Jas. 4:14; 1 Pet. 2:11, etc.

5. Value of ὅς? It is a matter of dispute whether in the N. T., as usually in modern 
Greek, ὅστις has come already to have merely the force of ὅς. There are undoubted 
examples where it is equal to ὅσπερ ('which very'). So Ac. 11:28, ἡττις ἐγένετο, ἔπι 
Κλαυδίου. Cf. also Ac. 13:31; 16:16; 1 Cor. 3:17, etc. Blass2 goes further and finds 
ὁστις in Luke purely in the sense of ὅς. He is supported by Jebb3 who says that "no 
natural interpretation can make it more in Lu. 2:4." In Acts at any rate a fairly good 
case can be made out for this weakened sense of ὅστις. Cf. 8:14 f. Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννης 
ὁτινες, 12:10 τὴν πύλην ἡττ τις, 17:10. See also Rev. 12:13. Moulton4 gives an exact 
parallel from the papyri for Mt. 27:62, τῇ ἐπαύριον ἡττις ἄστιν μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν 
(ἀὕριον ἡττις ἄστιν ἵ). He quotes Hort also (Comm., 1 Pet. 2:11) in favour of the 
position that in some places in the N. T. no distinction can be drawn between ὅς and 
ὁστις. Blass5 denies that Paul uses ὅστις as the equivalent of ὅς. I confess that I fail to 
see a great deal of difference between οἴτινες and ὅς in Ro. 16:4, οἴτινες and ὅς in 
16:7. Cf. also ὅς and ἡττις in verses 5 f.

6. Case. There is little here that calls for comment. We do not have attraction or 
incorporation. As a matter of fact only three cases occur (nom., gen., acc.).6 The 
stereotyped phrase with ἔως and the genitive, ἔως ὅτου, occurs five times.

Abbott


———, Johannine Grammar (1906).

———, Johannine Vocabulary (1905).

1 Prol., p. 92. ὅστις as ‘who indeed’ is common in Pisidia. Cf. Compernass, De 
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 173.
3 V. and D., Handb., p. 302.
4 Prol., p. 91.
Hort HORT, F. J. A., Notes on Orthography (pp. 141–173, vol. II of the N. T. in the 
Original Greek, 1882).
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 173.
6 The pap. show the same situation. Moulton, Cl. Rev., April, 1904, p. 154. Thus 
ἥντινα BM 77 (viii/A.D.), ἧντινα inscr. J.H.S., 1902, p. 349, ἔξ ὅτου BM 190 (iii/?), 
ἔως ὅτου NP 56 (iii/A.D.).
Cf. Mt. 5:25; Lu. 12:50 (Luke three times, Matthew and John once each). This is the only form of the shortened inflection. The LXX once\(^1\) (2 Macc. 5:10) has ἥστινος, elsewhere ὅτι. The accusative is found in the N. T. only in the neuter singular ὅτι (absent from modern Greek). But see (note 6, p. 728) occasional ὅτινα and Ἑντινα in the papyri. So Lu. 10:35, ὅτι ὢ προσδαπανήσῃς. Cf. ὅτι ὢν, Jo. 2:5; 14:13; 15:16; ὅτι ἕαν, Mk. 6:23; 1 Cor. 16:2 f.; Col. 3:17; ὅτι alone, Jo. 8:25; Ac. 9:6. The other examples are all in the nominative. In Ac. 9:6 the clause is nominative.

7. **Number.** In general the number of ὅστις agrees with that of the antecedent. But in a few instances ὅστις agrees with the predicate. So with 1 Cor. 3:17, ναὸς ὅστις—ὑμεῖς, Eph. 3:13, ὁλίσσειν ἡτις—ὁδόξα. Cf. Ac. 16:12.

8. **Gender.** Likewise ὅστις in general agrees with the antecedent in gender. So Eph. 1:22 f. ἔκκλησια ἡτις—τὸ σῶμα, Gal. 4:24 μία ἡτις—Ἀγαρ. Cf. Rev. 11:8. But the gender of the predicate may be followed as in Ac. 16:12, Φιλίππας ἡτις (fem., H. Scott says, but Thayer has ἐκ γυναῖκός—ἡτις—ἐκκλησία. In Ph. 1:28, ἡτις—ἐνδείξεις, the antecedent is the general idea of the preceding clause. One example of ὅτι is neuter singular (2 Cor. 3:14, ὅτι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται), and several times the neuter plural (Jo. 21:25, ὅτινα ἔδωκαν γράφηται). So Gal. 4:24; 5:19. Cf. the absence of the neuter in the modern Greek. The masculine and feminine, both singular and plural, are very frequent. Cf. Mt. 2:6; 7:15; Lu. 2:4; 23:55. See further for number, gender and case, chapter X, VII, VIII, IX.

9. **Direct Questions.** Examples of ὅστις in direct questions are found in Aristophanes and Plato as quoted by Jannaris.\(^2\) An example of it occurs also in 1 Chron. 17:6, ὅτι οὐκ ὄκοδομήσατε μοι ὅσον κέδρινον; Here the Hebrew has נַכַּל. Cf. also 2 Ki. 8:14 in AB, ὅτι where other MSS. have τί. In Barn. Ep. c. 10 we have ὅτι δὲ Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν; Vulgate has quare.\(^3\) Jannaris\(^4\) gives a number of instances for the later Greek. And yet Blass\(^5\) calls it “quite incredible,” a remark impossible to justify in the light of the facts. It is, indeed, unusual, but there is no *a priori* reason [Page 730] why the N. T. writers could not occasionally use ὅστις as a direct interrogative. One may note also the use of ὅ in a direct question.\(^6\) The N. T. examples are all confined to ὅτι. In Mt. 7:14 ὅτι is certainly merely causal, not exclamatory nor interrogative. In Mk. 2:16 ὅτι (sec.) read by BL 33, is accepted by

---

1 Thack., Gr., p. 192.
Thayer

THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).

———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 176.
6 Lachmann, Praef., p. 43.
W. H. and Nestle as interrogative. AC al. read τί, while ΝD have διὰ τί. It is possible, to be sure, that διὰ may be an “abbreviation” or “ellipsis” for τί διὰ. But it is more probable that it is here regarded as tantamount to an interrogative (τί διὰ or διὰ τί). Moulton (*Cl. Rev.,* 1904, p. 154) quotes διὰ τί in B.U. 607 (ii/λ.α.) γράψον μοι διὰ τί ἐπράξεως. But in Mk. 9:11 the Greek uncial all give the first διὰ. This is all the more remarkable since the second διὰ is clearly a conjunction. The Latin MSS. give variously *quare, quia, quid,* etc., and some Greek cursives πῶς οὖν. ‘Why’ is the natural and obvious idea. So in Mk. 9:28 διὰ is read by the great mass of MSS. (including ΝBCL), though AD and a number of others have διὰ τί, some even have διὰ διὰ τί (conflute reading), a few διὰ τί. In John 8:25 both W. H. and Nestle print as a question, Τὴν ἄρχην διὰ καὶ λαλῶν· The Latin versions have *quod or quia.* It is a very difficult passage at best. Τὴν ἄρχην διὰ may be taken to mean ‘Why do I speak to you at all?’ (πῶς ἄρχην—διὰ λαλώς). But there may be ellipsis, ‘Why do you reproach me that (διὰ) I speak to you at all?’ If necessary to the sense, διὰ may be taken here as interrogative. Moulton admits the N. T. use of διὰς in a direct question. Recitative διὰ is even suggested in Winer-Schmiedel, but the occasional interrogative use of διὰ is sufficient explanation. But the passage in Jo. 8:25 is more than doubtful.

Chrysostom takes διὰ there as relative, Cyril as causal.

10. *Indirect Questions.* In ancient Greek διὰς is exceedingly common in indirect questions, sharing the honours with τίς. The astonishing thing about this use of διὰς is its almost entire absence from the N. T. (cf. modern Greek, where it is not used in this sense). No example has yet been shown from the papyri. Indeed the relative forms, the so-called indirect interrogatives, are not common in the N. T. in that sense.

Nestle


———, *Septuagint* (Hastings’ D. B., 1902).


2 Blass, Gr. of N. T., p. 176.
3 W.-M., p. 208.
4 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 68.
5 Blas, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 176.
6 Simcox, Lang. of N. T., p. 68.
7 Prol., p. 94.
8 P. 238. The use of διὰ τί lends colour to the notion of recitative διὰ.
The direct interrogatives [Page 731] are the rule in the N. T. in indirect questions. ¹
Only one instance of ὅτι in an indirect question is found in the N. T., Ac. 9:6, λαλήσεται σοι ὅτι σε δὲ οὐκέτι. Even this reading, though supported by ΒΑΣC, Blass² rejects “in view of the general practice elsewhere,” a needless conclusion. Why not call it a “literary” mark in Luke? Ὑπὸς is so used once (Lu. 24:20), ὅτι not at all (not even Jo. 14:4), οἷος in 1 Th. 1:5, and ὑπὸς only in 1 Cor. 3:13; Gal. 2:6; 1 Th. 1:9; Jas. 1:24. See further chapter XIX.

(f) Ὑπὸς.

1. Relation to ὅς. This correlative form is related to ὅς as qualis is to qui. The antecedent τοιοῦτος is not, of course, always expressed. But it is qualitative, and not a mere relative like ὅς or even ὁστις. In the modern Greek the word has disappeared except the form ὅγιος (Ó ὑός)³ in the dialects and is rare (14 times) in the N. T. Mayser⁴ merely mentions it in his Grammatik d. griech. Papyri. It is in the N. T. usually without τοιοῦτος, as in Mt. 24:21, but it is several times followed by τοιοῦτος, as in 1 Cor. 15:48; 2 Cor. 10:11. A rather unusual instance is οἷος—τηλικοῦτος σεισµὸς (Rev. 16:18). In 2 Cor. 12:20 ὅος is, of course, first person. So ὅος 1 Th. 1:5.

2. Incorporation. No instance of attraction occurs, but an example of incorporation is found in 2 Tim. 3:11, οἷος διωγμοῦς ὑπήνεγκα. In Rev. 16:18 the addition of τηλικοῦτος ὅος μέγας after ὅος is by way of explanatory apposition. But in Mk. 13:19, οἷος γέγονεν τοιαύτη, the incorporation is redundant after the fashion of ὅν—αὐτόν.

3. Indirect Question.⁵ Like ὅς we have ὅος so used. Cf. 1 Th. 1:5, οἷον ὅος ἐγενήθησεν. In 2 Tim. 3:11 we may have an indirect question also. The Textus Receptus for Lu. 9:55 (D has ποῖος) has another instance of the use of ὅος in an indirect question, οἷον οἷος οἷος πνεύματος ἐστε ὑμεῖς.

4. Number. ὅος may agree in number with the predicate rather than the antecedent. So 1 Cor. 15:48, ὅος—τοιοῦτοι. Note the difference in the position of the negative in οὐχ ὅος and ὅον οὖ, 2 Cor. 12:20. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179, calls τὸν αὐτόν—ὁον (Ph. 1:30) peculiar.

5. οἷον τὲ ἔστιν. The only example¹ in the N. T. is in Ro. 9:6, οὐχ ὅον δὲ ὅτι, where note the absence of τὲ. It does not occur in exclamations.

(g) Ὑπὸς

---
² Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.
³ Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 87, 168; Thumb, Handb., p. 94.
⁴ P. 311.
⁵ Cf. K.-G., II, p. 439, for exx. in the older Gk.
¹ For a different explanation=οῦ δὴ ποι ἐκπεπτ. see Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179.
1. **Qualitative.** It corresponds to the interrogative ποῖος. It is very rare in the N. T. (see Declensions), but occurs in modern Greek vernacular for ‘whoever’ (Thumb, p. 93). In the literary modern Greek ὁ ὁποῖος, Jannaris\(^2\) thinks that the use of the article was due to the Italian *il quale* and the French *lequel* (cf. Old English *the which*), since educated scribes objected to the vernacular ὁπου and ποῦ.\(^3\)

2. **Double Office.** Like ὁλος, ὁσος and ἡλίκος it has the double office of relative and indirect interrogative.\(^4\) Four of the N. T. instances are indirect questions (1 Cor. 3:13; Gal. 2:6; 1 Th. 1:9; Jas. 1:24). In Gal. 2:6, ὁποίοι ποτε, we have the indefinite form (‘whatever kind’).\(^5\) Note here the use of τι and ὁποῖοι. In 1 Cor. 3:13 the antecedent is expressed and repeated by redundant αὐτό.

3. **Correlative.** Only one instance is correlative, Ac. 26:29, τοιούτου ὁποῖος. Cf. *qualiscumque*. Note here the difference in number.

(h) Ὑσος.

1. **Quantitative.** It is found in the LXX like ὁλος and ὁποῖος,\(^6\) and survives in the modern Greek.\(^7\) There are a hundred and eight instances in the N. T. (W. H. text) which display great variety of usage. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 63) notes that in Philo ὑσος is often equal to οὗ.

2. **Antecedent.** The presence of the antecedent is not common outside of πάντες ὑσοι (Ac. 5:36, 37), πάντα ὑσα (very common, as Mt. 7:12; 13:46; 18:25; Mk. 11:24, etc.), ὑσοι—αὐτοι (also frequent, as Ro. 8:14; Gal. 6:12, etc.). Cf. ὑσοι—αὐτοις in Jo. 1:12. But in Mk. 3:28 ὑσα has ὑμαρτήματα and βλασφημίας as antecedents and naturally is neuter. Cf. Ac. 3:24; 9:39; Rev. 21:16. It is common without antecedent both in the masculine (ὑσοι Mt. 14:36) and the neuter (ὑσα Mk. 9:13).

3. **Attraction.** This was possible in Jo. 6:11, ἐκ τῶν ὑμαρτίων [Page 733] ὑσον ἠθελον, but it does not occur. In Lu. 11:8, ὑσει αὐτῷ ὑσων χρηζει, the regular construction occurs. In Winer-Schmiedel\(^1\) it is stated that attraction is found in the N. T. with ὑσος. I find no real examples outside of the few cases of incorporation now to be mentioned.\(^2\)

---

3 V. and D., Handb., p. 303.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 93.
6 Thack., Gr., p. 192.
1 P. 224.
4. Incorporation. In Ac. 9:13 ὁσα κακά is an instance. Mk. 2:19 has ὁσον χρόνον. The other examples (Ro. 7:1; 1 Cor. 7:39; Gal. 4:1) are all instances of ἐφ ὁσον χρόνον.

5. Repetition. In Mk. 6:30 we have in W. H. ὁσα και ὁσα (not Tisch.). But in Ph. 4:8 ὁσα is repeated six times without και. In Heb. 10:37 ὁσον ὁσον (LXX) is in imitation of the Hebrew in Hab. 2:3. Cf. also Is. 26:20 and D on Lu. 5:3 where ὁσον ὁσον=ὁλίγον of the other MSS. But that this is not an essential Hebraism, but a vernacular idiom in harmony with the Hebrew, is now clear.

6. With ἀν. Note the use as an indefinite relative (Mk. 6:56; Lu. 9:5; Jo. 11:22; Ac. 2:39; 3:22, etc.) and with ἐκ (Mt. 7:12; 18:18; 23:3; Mk. 3:28, etc.).

7. Indirect Questions. The instances are fairly numerous. So ὀκοῦντες ὁσα ποιεῖ (Mk. 3:8); ἀπαγγέλων ὁσα—πεποίηκεν (5:19). Cf. 5:20; Lu. 8:39; 9:10; Ac. 4:23; 2 Tim. 1:18, etc.


9. Adverbial. ἐφ ὁσον (Mt. 9:15; 25:40; Ro. 7:1, etc.) and καθ ὁσον (Heb. 3:3; 7:20; 9:27) partake of the nature of conjunctions.

(i) Ἑλλικος. This form was used to express both age and size. Hence the corresponding ambiguity of ἡλικία. Cf. for age Jo. 9:21, for stature Mt. 6:27. The pronoun is absent from the LXX, never very common, but survives in the literary modern Greek. It appears also in the papyri. Like the other relatives it might have had a double use in the N.T. (relative and indirect interrogative). But the few examples are all indirect interrogatives: Col. 2:1 εἰδέναι ἡλικίων ἄγωνα ἐκεῖνος, Jas. 3:5 ἴδοι ἡλίκον πῦρ ἡλίκνην [Page 734] ἕλκεν ἄνάπτει. The examples in James may be regarded as exclamatory. Note also that ἡλίκον refers to smallness and ἡλίκην to greatness of the size. In Gal. 6:11 W. H. and Nestle read πηλίκος in the text and ἡλίκος in the margin. This again is indirect question after ἵδετε.

(j) Ο AS RELATIVE. The use of the ἰ forms of ὅ, ἦ, τό as relative is very old in Greek. It appears in Homer and is common in Herodotus. In Arkadian ὅ appears as demonstrative, as article and as relative (Meister, Die griech. Dialekten, Bd. II, p. 118).

3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179. Blass also cites Aristoph., Vesp., 213.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 97; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 330.
6 Mayser, Gr., p. 311.
1 Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 182 ff. For hist. of the matter see K.-B.I., I, pp. 608 ff. Meister

Meister, R., Beiträge zur Lautlehre d. LXX (1909).
116). Cf. also South Ach. (Hoffmann, Griech. Dial., pp. 257, 292–300). Jannaris\(^2\) gives examples of it from Ionic (where very common), Doric and Attic (inscriptions), and sporadically in the later Greek. In modern Greek it survives only in sententious sayings with τά and in Crete and Southeast Greek (Thumb, p. 94). Mayser\(^3\) finds a few doubtful instances in the papyri. Wilcken (Archiv, I) gives some examples from B. M. as τό μοι δέδωκες (p. 292), τήν ἀγάπην τήν σουμεξ (p. 301), and Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 155) quotes πρός τό δύνομε from B. U. 948 (iv/v A.D.) “very illiterate.” Mayser (op. cit.) gives numerous examples of ὁ καί which “first in Roman time” appears in the nominative. He compares this with the relative use ὁς καί and is inclined to regard ὁ καί as relative. The analogy of the Latin qui et favours the relative idea, but the article alone is sufficient in Greek. I would not insist on the relative for Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος (Ac. 13:9), though admitting the possibility of it. It means (Deissmann), not ‘Saul who is henceforth Paul,’ but ‘also Paul.’ Cf. also Hatch, Jour.


———, Prol. zu einer Gramm. d. LXX (1907).
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———, Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum (1906).
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3 Gr., pp. 310 ff.
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DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).

of Bibl. Lit., Pt. II, p. 141 f., 1908. In truth this use of ὁ καί with double names was very common in N. T. times. Dieterich sees no instance of ὁ as relative in the N. T. But in Rev. 1:4, 8; 11:17, we have ὁ Ἐ. One either has to say that here ὁ is used as a relative or that it is a relative. It all comes to the same in the end. It may be a bit artificial, ὁ ὅν καὶ ὁ Ἐ καὶ ὁ ἔρχόμενος, but the antique and vernacular relative ὁ came in as a resource when John did not wish to use γενόμενος of God, and since there is no aorist participle for εἰμί. Psychologically the article is called for here between two articles, but grammar can do nothing with it. If Ἐ is treated as a substantive, that would call for τό as in τό ὅ ἐν Ἀνέβη (Eph. 4:9). Moulton finds several examples in late papyri of ὁ as relative (for ὁ as demonstrative see pp. 693 ff.), like τῇ ὃ ἐν τῇ δέδωκεν (p. 304). The only real difficulty in Rev. 1:4, 8, etc., is the nominative use, and that was not insuperable when the exigencies of the sentence demanded it. It is possible that this phrase had come to be a set phrase among the Christians for the eternity and unchangeableness of God. For the possible use of τίς as relative see under VIII.

VIII. Interrogative Pronouns (ἀντωνυμίαι ἐρωτηματικαί).

(a) Τίς. The root of the interrogative τίς (Thess. κίς. Cf. Ionic κῶς, κότερος), indefinite τίς (cf. τέ), is at bottom the same as the Indo-Germanic root quīs and Latin quis (aliquis, que). Curiously enough some of the grammars, Monro’s Homeric Grammar, for example, give no separate or adequate discussion of the interrogative pronouns.


5 Unters., p. 199. Winer (W.-Th., p. 107) rejects ὁ καί as relative.

1 Cl. Rev., April, 1904, p. 155.

1. **Substantival or Adjectival.** Τίς is either adjectival as τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; (Mt. 5:46), or, as more commonly, substantival like τίς ὑπέδειξεν; (Mt. 3:7).

2. **The Absence of Gender.** That it appears only in the nominative and accusative is noteworthy. This fact probably had something to do with the gradual retreat of τίς before ποῖος. The neuter in the N. T. occurs with adjectives only, as τίς ὑπέδειξεν; (Mt. 3:7).

3. **Τίς=ποῖος.** An opposite tendency is seen in the use of τίς=ποῖος. Hatzidakis has shown examples of this idiom as early as Euripides. As New Testament illustrations one may note τίς οὗτός ἔστιν ὃς (Lu. 7:49), τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὗς ἀντιβάλλετε (Lu. 24:17; cf. Ποία 24:19), τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ οἶκος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Jo. 12:34). Cf. Lu. 4:36. Only once is ποῖος used with the article (Jas. 4:14, and here B omits ἣ), while we find τίς ἤ σοφία (Mk. 6:2), τίς ἤ αἰτία (Ac. 10:21), etc. Sometimes τίς and ποῖος are used together. It might seem at first as if the distinction were here insisted on, as in εἰς τίνα ἤ ποῖον καρπὸν (1 Pet. 1:11) and ποῖον ὁ ὕψος——ἐτίς τόπος (Ac. 7:49). But tautology seems plain in the last example and may be true of 1 Pet. 1:11, but not certainly. In Mk. 4:30 W. H. read ἐν τίνι, but some MSS. have ἐν ποία. Cf. also τίς καὶ ποιητικός in Lu. 7:39, which is not tautological.

4. **Indeclinable τί.** In Jo. 18:38, τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια, the neuter in the predicate calls for no special remark. So Gal. 3:19. Cf. Latin quid and English what in such a sentence. This idiom belongs to the ancient Greek and distinguishes between the essence of a thing (τί) and the classification of a thing (τίς), as Gildersleeve puts it (Syntaxis of Cl. Gk., p. 59). Cf. ὡμοί τίνες ἐστέ; (Ac. 19:15) and τί ἐστιν ἔνθροπος (Heb. 2:6). But this explanation will not hold for 1 Jo. 3:2, τί ἐσόμεθα, nor Ac. 13:25, τί ἐμὲ ἐπονοεῖτε. The text in Acts is not certain. The κοινὴ shows this development outside of the N. T. In the modern Greek ‘the neuter τί is used with all genders and cases both in the singular and plural’ (Vincent and Dickson, Handb., p. 55). Cf. τί ὥρα εἶναι: ‘what o’clock is it?’ Τί γυναίκα; ‘which woman?’ Thumb, Handb., p. 94. It

---

3 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 163.
4 Ib., p. 164.
Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
5 Einl., p. 207 f.
6 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 176.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T., p. 176.
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Vincent and VINCENT and DICKSON, A Handbook to Modern Greek (1887).
is not unusual in classical Greek to have τί as predicate to ταῦτα, as in Lu. 15:26 τί δὲν εἶ ὑμῖν ταῦτα, Jo. 6:9 ταῦτα τί ἐστιν. So probably ταῦτα ἐπέστρεψε; (Ac. 14:15), though τί here may be ‘why’ and not predicative. The usual construction appears in Ac. 17:20 τί να θέλει ταῦτα εἶναι (cf. Jo. 10:6), 11:17 ἢ γὰρ τίς ἡμῖν; cf. Lu. 8:9. In Ac. 21:33 τίς and τί are sharply distinguished. The use of τί with γίνομαι is hardly in point here (Ac. 5:24; 12:18) as it is found in the Attic. In Jo. 21:21 οὕτως δὲ τί; we must supply γενήσεται.

5. Predicate Use of τί with τοῦτο. In Ac. 23:19, τί ἐστιν ὁ ἐξεῖς, we find the full expression. In Lu. 16:2, τί τοῦτο ὡκούσα ἐστίν; we meet the abbreviated idiom. Cf. Ac. 14:15 τί ταῦτα (see also 9). Cf. Lu. 1:66; Ac. 5:24. The phrase τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς (Mt. 27:4), τί πρὸς σέ (Jo. 21:22) is matched by the Attic τί ταῦτα ἐμοί (Kühner-Gerth, II, 417; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 177). Cf. οὕτως τί (Jo. 21:21). Blass (ib.) also compares τί γάρ μοι τοὺς ἐξεῖς κρίνειν (1 Cor. 5:12) with the infinitive in Arrian, Diss. Epict., ii, 17. 14. Τί ἐμοί καὶ σοί (Jo. 2:4, etc.) is in the LXX (2 Ki. 3:13), but it is also a Greek idiom (ellipsis, Kühner-Gerth, ib.).

6. In Alternative Questions. Quality in general is nearly gone from the κοινή. Τίς when πότερος might have been used is not unknown in ancient Greek. Indeed even in Latin quis occurs sometimes instead of the more usual uter. In the LXX πότερος occurs supplanting τίς and the particle πότερον occurs only once, and that in Job (literary). Moulton finds only one example of πότερος in the papyri, and that unintelligible. So in the N. T. πότερος does not occur as an adjective. So in Mt. 9:5 τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπότερον εἰπάνειν—ἥ εἰπάνειν, 21:31 τίς ἕκεν δύο ἐποίησεν, 27:21 τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο. Cf. also 23:17, 19; 27:17; Mk. 2:9; Lu. 7:42; 22:27; 1 Cor. 4:21; 1 Thack., Gr., p. 192. Ph. 1:22. Moulton notes that “whether, adjectivally, is as archaic as πότερος,” and predicts that “the best of the two” will be the English of the future.


8. As Relative. Just as ὅς and ὅς τις came to be used as interrogatives, so τίς drifted occasionally to a mere relative. We have seen (1 Tim. 1:7) how the relative and the interrogative come to be used side by side. “In English, the originally interrogative pronouns ‘who’ and ‘which’ have encroached largely on the use of the primitive

3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 177.
4 Ib.
5 Jelf, 874, obs. 4.
6 Draeger, Hist. Synt., p. 103.
1 Thack., Gr., p. 192.
2 Prol., p. 77.
3 Ib.
4 Thompson, Synt., p. 74.
relative ‘that.’”  

Moulton’s sketch of the facts makes it clear that in the N. T. τίς may be relative if the exigencies call for it. Moulton finds it only in the illiterate papyri, but the usage is supported by inscriptions and by the Pontic dialect today. Moulton gives from the papyri, εὑρὼν γεοργὸν τις αὐτᾶ ἐλκύσῃ, B.U. 822 (iii/A.D.); τίνος ἐὰν χρήναν ἔχῃς, B.M. 239 (iv/A.D.). From the inscriptions see τίς ἄν κακῶς ποιήσει, J. H. S., XIX, 299. Moulton also quotes Jebb on Soph., O. T. 1141: “Τίς in classical Greek can replace ὅπος only where there is an indirect question.” The plainest New Testament example of τίς as ὁς appears to be Mk. 14:36 οὐ τί ἔγω θέλω ὅλλοτά τί σύ. Cf. Mt. 26:39 οὐχ ὡς ἔγω θέλω, ὅλλος ὡς σύ. But it is not much more so than Mt. 15:32 οὐκ ἔχοισιν τί φάγοσιν (cf. Mk. 8:1) and Mk. 6:36 ἢν—ἴγοράσσοισιν ἐστοιόξης τί φάγοσιν. Cf. οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ—κλίνη (Mt. 8:20), but ὅπου—φάγο (Mt. 14:14). See in the papyri, οὐδὲν ἔχω τί ποιήσω σοι, B.U. 948 (iv/v A.D.), as quoted by Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 155). But even so Xenophon has this idiom, and Sophocles, Oed. [Page 738] Col. 317, has οὐκ ἔχω τί φῶ, which looks like an indirect question. Cf. Winer-Moulton, p. 211; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 240. It is not necessary to bring under this construction οὐ γάρ ἦνε τί ἁποκριθή (Mt. 9:6) nor Mk. 13:11. Here the idiom is really that of indirect question (deliberative question). Cf. the direct question in Mt. 6:31 with the indirect in 6:25. So in Mt. 10:19 (first example) and see 9. But the second example in Mt. 10:19 (δοθήσεται—τί λαλήσητε) may be the relative use. Cf. also Lu. 17:8. In Ac. 13:25 the punctuation can (so Nestle, but not W. H.) be made so that τί is relative, τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοοῖτε ἐνα, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἔγω. It is possible also thus to construe Lu. 19:3, ὅσον ἤσον τίς ἔστιν, instead of taking τίς ἔστιν as an accusative of general reference. Cf. Mk. 1:24, οἶδα σε τίς εἶ (Lu. 4:34 also). Cf. the prolepsis σος τίς ἢν in Jo. 8:25. So Ro. 14:4, 10. The rhetorical questions in Lu. 11:5; 15:4, 8; Jas. 3:13 are not of course, instances of this usage. Perhaps the anacolouthon in Lu. 11:11 (τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα εἴλησθει—ἔπιθωσαί;) may have arisen because of this idiom. The distinction between τίς and ὁς is, of course, usually maintained (Jo. 16:18; Ac. 23:19; Heb. 12:7). It is at least noteworthy that in 1 Cor. 15:2 Paul changes from ὁς (used four times) to τίνα λόγῳ. An indirect question comes with a jolt and makes one wonder if here also the relative use of τίς does not occur. In Mt. 26:62 (οὐδὲν ἁποκρίνης τίνα οὔτοις σοι καταμαρτυροῦσιν;) we may have an indirect question (cf. Mk. 14:60), though πρός would be usual (cf. Mt. 27:14). It is better to follow W. H. with two separate questions and even so τί = τίς ἔστιν ὁ. The use of τίς as relative Blass calls “Alexandrian and dialectical.” The LXX (Lev. 21:17 θροσος τίνι ἔδω ἤν, Deut. 29:18 θροφόρος—τίνος, Ps. 40:6 οὐκ ἔστιν τίς) does show examples of

5 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 67.
7 Dieterich, Unters., p. 200.
8 Thumb, Theol. Literaturzeit., xxviii, p. 423 (quoted in Moulton, Prol., p. 94).
9 Prol., p. 93.
9 Prol., p. 93.
1 As Simcox does, Lang. of the N. T., p. 69 f.
2 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 241; Moulton, Prol., p. 93.
3 W.-Sch., p. 241; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 331.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.
it, but it is not confined to Egypt, as has been already shown.\(^5\) Brugmann (Griech. Gr., p. 561) finds τίς as relative in Böotian and even rarely in the older Attic.

9. **Adverbial Use.** The neuter accusative τί is frequently used in the sense of ‘why’ in the N. T. This is classical and common and calls for little comment. It still appears in modern Greek (Thumb, p. 94). See Mt. 7:3 (τί βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος;) 8:26 (τί δειλοὶ ἔστε;) 19:17; 20:6, etc. In Ac. 14:15 τί ταῦτα ποιεῖτε we probably have τί=‘why.’ Cf. Mk. 11:3. In Mk. 2:24 τί ποιοῦσιν τοὺς σάββατον ὃ ὦκ ἔρεστιν; note ‘why,’ though τί is followed by ὃ. It [Page 739] is interesting to note πῶς ἠ τί, Mt. 10:19; Lu. 12:11. In Jo. 14:22 τί γέγονεν ὅτι we see the full form of the idiom τί ὅτι (Lu. 2:49; Ac. 5:4, 9). Here τί still=‘why.’ But in ἐνα τί (1 Cor. 10:29 and Mt. 9:4; 27:46; Lu. 13:7; Ac. 4:25; 7:26) τί is really the subject of γένηται (ellipsis). It is not unknown in Attic Greek.\(^1\) W. H. never print ἢ νατί (cf. Mt. 9:4; Lu. 13:7). It is common in LXX.

10. **With Prepositions.** There is very little difference between τί=‘why’ and διὰ τί=‘because of what’ (Mt. 15:2, 3; 17:19; Lu. 24:38, etc.). Κατὰ τί (‘according to what’) is practically ‘how.’ Cf. Lu. 1:18. For ἐν τίνι see Mt. 5:13. But πρὸς τί (Jo. 13:28)=‘for what purpose.’ In Jo. 13:22 περὶ τίνος λέγει there is no such idea. But purpose again is expressed by εἰς τί (Mt. 14:31; 26:8; Mk. 14:4; Ac. 19:3).

11. **With Particles.** Paul in particular is fond of the rhetorical use of τί γάρ (Ro. 3:3; 4:2, etc.), τί οὐκ (3:1, 9, etc.), τί ἐστι (3:7; 9:19), ἀλλὰ τί (11:4), ἦ τί (11:2). Cf. τίς ὡς in Lu. 22:23 and τί ὡς 1:66; Ac. 12:18.

12. **As Exclamation.** In Mt. 7:14 W. H. read ὅτι (causal), not τί στενὴ ἡ πύλη. But in Lu. 12:49 καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἡ διὴ ἀνήφθη there is no doubt of the text. W. H. punctuate as a question, but Nestle as an exclamation. Examples of exclamatory τί=‘how’ are found in 2 Sam. 6:20; Song of Sol. 7:6 and in the modern Greek, τί καλὸς ἄνθρωπος! Cf. Mullach, Vulg., pp. 210, 321; Winer-Moulton, p. 562. Blass\(^2\) compares the Hebrew נל. On the whole it is best to take τί in Lu. 12:49=‘how.’
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13. Indirect Questions. It is, of course, the ancient idiom \( \textit{τίς} \) to have \( \textit{τίς} \) in an indirect question. But in the N. T. the indirect interrogative \( \textit{ὅστις} \) has disappeared in this idiom save in Ac. 9:6 (MSS. divided here). A good example of \( \textit{τίς} \) occurs in Ac. 10:29

\[ \pi\nu\theta\acute{a}νο\nu\ma\nu\tau\acute{o} \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\nu \mu\varepsilon\tau\acute{e}\nu\mu\nu\sigma\acute{a}\theta\acute{e} \mu\epsilon. \]

In Luke we meet the neuter article rather frequently before the indirect question. So \( \tau\omicr o\; \tau i\acute{o} \acute{n} \acute{e} \theta\acute{e}\lambda\omicr o\nu \) (1:62), \( \tau\omicr o\; \tau i\acute{e} \\acute{e} \nu \) (9:46). Cf. 22:23, 24, etc. Blass (\textit{Gr. of N. T. Gk.}, p. 158) sees no special point in the article (cf. English “the which”). Paul sometimes uses it also (Ro. 8:26; 1 Th. 4:1 \( \tau\omicr o\; \pi\omicr o\zeta \)). The question is brought out rather more sharply by the article. The Attic use of \( \tau\omicr o\; \tau i\acute{e} \) and \( \tau\omicr o\; \pi\omicr o\zeta \) (Thompson, \textit{Synt.}, p. 74) in reference to something previously mentioned is like our “The what?” Cf. Herm., \textit{Sim.}, VIII, i, 4, Clem., \textit{Hom.}, i, 6.

14. \( \textit{Tίς} \) or \( \tau\omicr i\acute{s} \). Sometimes it is difficult to decide whether \( \textit{τίς} \) or \( \tau\omicr i\acute{s} \) is right. So 1 Pet. 5:8 W. H. have ζητ\acute{ω}ν καταπιε\ acute{\iota}ν with τιν in the margin. But Nestle actually prints ζητ\acute{ω}ν τίνα καταπιε\ acute{\iota}ν. In Heb. 5:12 W. H. read τιν and Nestle τινα (both indefinite). In Jas. 5:13 the reading is, of course, τις, not τις. So 1 Cor. 7:18.

\( (b) \) Ηο\omicr i\omicr o\nu.\n
1. Qualitative. It occurs sixteen times in direct questions. It is still used in its original qualitative sense. Clearly this is true in Jo. 12:33, ση\acute{a}ιν\omicr o contador θανάτο\omicr o, \( \acute{e} \mu\varepsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{e} \lambda\acute{p}o\theta\nu\acute{h}\acute{i}\acute{e}κ\acute{a} \) (cf. 18:32), Ro. 3:27 (\( \delta\omicr i\; \pi\omicr o\i\omicr o\; \nu\omicr o\i\omicr o\; \tau\omicr o\; \acute{e}\gamma\omicr o\i\omicr o\)). The same thing is true of 1 Cor. 15:35 (ποι\omicr o\i\omicr o\; σώ\omicr o\i\omicr o\; ἔρχονται;), cf. also 1 Pet. 2:20. In 1 Pet. 1:11 we find both τινα and ποιον in apparent contrast. Other possible instances are Jo. 10:32; Ac. 7:49 (LXX); Jas. 4:14. The common \( \acute{e}n \; \pi\omicr o\i\omicr o\; \acute{e}\xi\omicr o\omicr o\omicr i\omicr o \) (Mt. 21:23; Mk. 11:28; Ac. 4:7, LXX, etc.) seems also to retain the qualitative force. Cf. also Lu. 24:19. The qualitative sense is clear in D ποιον πνε\acute{u}ματο\omicr o̓ς ἔστε (Lu. 9:55), a spurious passage, however.

2. Non-qualitative. But some examples clearly have lost the qualitative sense. In the modern Greek ποιός is used regularly\(^1\)=τις, and is the usual interrogative. Note the accent ποιός. Indeed examples of this weakened sense of ποιός Jannaris\(^2\) finds as early as \( \acute{E} \acute{s} \acute{c} \acute{h} \acute{y} \acute{l} \) and \( \acute{E} \acute{r} \acute{i} \acute{p} \) \( \acute{r} \)\acute{e}ς \( \acute{t} \)\acute{e}ς \( \acute{a} \)\acute{r}\acute{o}ς \( \acute{w} \)\acute{h}\acute{a} \( \acute{t} \)\acute{a} \( \acute{e} \)\acute{r}\acute{c} \( \acute{h} \acute{e} \acute{t}a \) there seems to be merely the force of τις, not quality. Cf. also 24:43 ποι\omicr a \( \acute{f} \)\omicr o\l\acute{a}k\acute{e}i, Lu. 12:39 ποιον \( \acute{w} \)\omicr o\acute{a} \( \acute{e} \)\omicr a, Ac. 23:34 ποιας \( \acute{e} \)\omicr a \( \acute{h} \)\omicr a \( \acute{e} \)\omicr i\omicr a\omicr i\omicr a, Rev. 3:3 ποιαν \( \acute{w} \)\omicr a. This is probably true also of Mt. 22:36 ποια \( \acute{e} \)\omicr o\l\acute{a}l\acute{e} (Mk. 12:28). In Lu. 5:19 ποιας and 6:32 π. ποια \( \acute{h} \)\omicr a\omicr i\omicr a either point of view will answer.

3. In Indirect Questions. It occurs sixteen times (not counting Lu. 9:55) in this construction against four for \( \acute{E} \acute{s} \acute{c} \acute{h} \acute{y} \acute{l} \) and \( \acute{E} \acute{r} \acute{i} \acute{p} \) \( \acute{r} \)\acute{a} \( \acute{e} \)\omicr i\omicr a\omicr i\omicr a. Cf. indicative in Mt. 21:24; 24:42; Jo. 12:33; 21:19, and the subjunctive in Lu. 5:19 μη \( \pi \omicr o\i\omicr a \\acute{e} \)\omicr e\omicr e\omicr a\omicr a\omicr a\omicr a. Ποιός is found in the LXX and in the papyri.

\( (c) \) Πόσος.\n
\(^1\) Thumb, \textit{Handb.}, p. 94.
1. Less Frequent than πόσος. It occurs chiefly in the Synoptic Gospels (twenty-seven times in W. H. text).

2. Meaning. It is used in the sense of ‘how much’ (πόσῳ Mt. 12:12), ‘how great’ (πόσον Mt. 6:23), and of ‘how many’ (πόσους ἅρτους ἔχετε Mt. 15:34). Eleven examples of πόσῳ occur almost like an adverb (Mt. 7:11; 10:25, etc.). The use of πόσος χρόνος—ὡς (Mk. 9:21) is noteworthy.

3. In Indirect Questions. See οὐκ ἄκοινες πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν; (Mt. 27:13). Cf. Ac. 21:20, etc.

4. The Exclamatory Use. This is found in Lu. 15:17 πόσοι μίσθοι τοῦ πατρός μου, and in 2 Cor. 7:11 πόσην κατειργάσατο ὑμῖν σπουδήν. The exclamatory use of πῶς may be mentioned (Mk. 10:23 f.; Jo. 11:36). Cf. ως in Ro. 10:15 and 11:33. Cf. πόσος—ὡς in Mk. 9:21.

(d) Πηλίκος.

1. Rare. It is found only twice in the N. T. (Gal. 6:11; Heb. 7:4) and W. H. put ἡλίκοις in the margin of Gal. 6:11. It is rare also in the LXX (cf. Zech. 2:2), and has disappeared from the modern Greek vernacular.

2. Indirect Questions. Both of the N. T. examples are indirect questions. The example in Heb. 7:4 describes greatness of Melchisedek (how great), the one in Gal. 6:11 presents the size of the letters (how large).

(e) Ποταπός. It is the late form for ποδαπός. It no longer in the N. T. means ‘from what country,’ but merely ‘of what sort’=ποῖος. It is found only once in LXX (Susanna O 54, “where it keeps something of its original local meaning”). It exists in the late Greek vernacular. It occurs once in a direct question (Mt. 8:27) and once probably in an exclamation (2 Pet. 3:11). Four times we find it in indirect questions (Mk. 13:1; Lu. 1:29; 7:39; 1 Jo. 3:1). In Lu. 7:39 it is contrasted with τίς.

(f) Πότερος. As a pronoun it has vanished from the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 192) and from the papyri (Moulton, Prol., p. 77). The only example in the N. T. (cf. LXX, Thackeray, p. 192) is in an alternative indirect question as the conjunction πότερον (Jo. 7:17). Cf. Latin utrum—an. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 176) cites Herm., Sim., ix, 28, 4.

1 Thackeray, Gr., p. 192.
2 Ib.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 95.
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IX. Indefinite Pronouns (ἀντωνυμίαι ἄδοριστοι).

(a) Τίς.

1. The Accent. Jannaris⁴ calls it “irrational” to accent the nominative τίς rather than τίς. But then the nominative singular never has an accent unless at the beginning of a sentence or in philosophical writings (Thompson, Syntax, p. 76) and cannot otherwise be distinguished in looks from τίς the interrogative.

2. Relation to τίς. The same connection is seen in the Latin [Page 742] quis, ali-quis and quis-quis (cf. τίστις in Argive dialect).¹ Brugmann² considers –κι in οὐκ – in οὐκ-κι, πολλάκις the same word as τίς and cites κὶς in the Thessalian dialect. Just as in modern Greek τίς disappears before ποιός, so τίς vanishes before κανείς (Thumb, Handb., p. 95). But in the N. T. τίς is still very common, especially in Luke and Acts. In general the usage is in harmony with that of ancient Greek. We do not have ἐνιοὶ in the N. T. In Ac. 25:26 note τι γράψαι and τί γράψω. Cf. Lu. 7:40. See τις τί, Ro. 8:24, in margin of W. H.

3. Τίς as Substantive. As a substantive τίς may be equal to ‘any one,’ ‘anybody’ or ‘anything,’ as in οὐδὲ τοῦ πατέρα τίς ἔπιγινώσκει, Mt. 11:27; πῶς δύναται τίς, 12:29; εἰ τίς θέλει, 16:24; ἐὰν τίς ὄντων εἶπη τί (note both examples like τίνος τί Lu. 19:8; cf. Mk. 11:25; Col. 3:13), Mt. 21:3. For several instances of τίς=‘anything’ see Ac. 25:5, 8, 11. But the substantive use of τίς may be=‘somebody’ or ‘something,’ as ἔρχεται τίς τίς Lu. 8:49, δραµάω δὲ τίς τίς Mk. 15:36, ὑπὸ τίνος τίς Lu. 8:46. Often the partitive genitive (or ablative) occurs with τίς as substantive. So τινὲς τῶν γραµµατέων Mt. 12:38, τίς τῶν μαθητῶν Lu. 11:1, τίς ἕκ τοῦ δῆλου 12:13. The plural is usually=‘some,’ as Mk. 9:1; 1 Cor. 9:22. In Homer τίς was sometimes “public opinion, the man in the street” (Gladstone, quoted in Thompson’s Syntax, p. 75). This idiom is very nearly represented by ἐξεν δὲ τίς ἕκ τοῦ δῆλου, Lu. 12:13 (cf. 11:1; 7:36). In Heb. 2:6, διεµαρτύρατο ποῦ τίς, the τίς is really quite definite in the writer’s mind, though he writes thus.

4. With Numerals=‘About.’ With numerals τίς sometimes in classical Greek gives an approximate idea rather than exact reckoning, like our “about.” No certain instances of this idiom appear in the N. T. Certainly not Ac. 19:14, where πῶς, not πῶς, is the correct text. In Lu. 7:19, προσκαλεσάµενος δύο τίς τῶν μαθητῶν, the meaning may be ‘about two,’ but it could mean ‘certain two’ just as well. The same thing is true of Ac. 23:23, προσκαλεσάµενος τίνας δύο, where it is even less likely that the idea is ‘about two.’ Classical also is εἰς τίς (Lu. 22:50; Jo. 11:49, and probably Mk. 14:47). The adjectival uses of τίς are quite varied.

5. With Substantives. Here τίς may=‘a kind of,’ as ἀπάρχῇν τινα, Jas. 1:18. Cf. Ac. 17:20, though this is not true of Col. 2:23 [Page 743] because of the negative.¹ But

---

⁴ Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 163.
¹ Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 244.
² Ib. Interrogative and indefinite is at bottom the same word. Cf. Hartung, Über die Casus in der griech. und lat. Sprache, p. 279.
¹ W.-Sch., p. 242.
the commonest use of τις with substantives is = ‘certain’ (really rather uncertain!). Thus ἱερεύς τις, Lu. 1:5; ὑθροπός τις, Lu. 14:2, 16; 15:11, etc. Cf. τι ὑδωρ, Ac. 8:36. Sometimes it is difficult to give more force to τις than the English indefinite article. Cf. νομικός τις, Lu. 10:25; κριτής τις ἦν ἐν τινι πόλει, Lu. 18:2. Indeed it is nearly always true that our “certain” is too emphatic.

6. With Adjectives. The effect is rhetorical. Thus Ac. 8:9, τινα μέγαν, = ‘a very great man’ (‘some great man’), in his own estimation. Blass needlessly considers this passage an interpolation. Cf. νομικός τις, Lu. 10:25; κριτής τις ἦν ἐν τινι πόλει, Lu. 18:2. Indeed it is nearly always true that our "certain" is too emphatic.

7. As Predicate. Here τις may be emphatic = ‘somebody in particular,’ as Ac. 5:36, λέγων ἐναι τινα ἐκατόν (cf. 8:9). See also Gal. 2:6, ἀπὸ τῶν δοκοῦντων ἐναι τί, where note difference between τι and τινες. In Gal. 6:3 note in εἰ δοκῇ τίς εἶναι τί μηδὲν ὑπὸ both senses of τίς. But the predicate may have the other meaning of τι (‘anyone,’ ‘anything’). So 1 Cor. 3:7; 10:19; Gal. 6:15. In Gal. 2:6 compare τι and ὑπὸ.

8. The Position of τις. It is not material. It naturally follows the substantive or adjective as in εἰς κόμην τινὰ, Lu. 10:38, but we often have the other order as in τινα χήραν, Lu. 21:2. Τινὲς may indeed begin a sentence (Ph. 1:15; 1 Cor. 8:7).

9. As Antecedent. In Mt. 16:28 τινες is the antecedent of οἵτινες, but here οἵτινες is more definite than οἱ would have been. Cf. Lu. 9:27. In 2 Cor. 10:2 note τινας τοὺς Ι.

10. Alternative. It is used to express alternative ideas, as τινὲς μὲν—τινὲς δὲ in Ph. 1:15. Cf. ὑπὸ τινῶν—ὑπὸ τινῶν—ἀλλῶν δὲ in Lu. 9:7 f. and τις—ἐξερχόμενος in 1 Cor. 3:4.

11. The Negative Forms οὔ τις, μὴ τις. These are not printed as single words by W. H., except μήτι as an interrogative particle expecting the answer No, as in Mt. 26:22, μήτι ἔγώ εἶμι, κύρε; cf. Jo. 4:33. It is all a matter with the editor whether in Ίνα μὴ τις [Page 744] εἴπῃ, 1 Cor. 1:15 (cf. Eph. 2:9), we may not really have μήτις. The separation in Heb. 3:13; 4:11 is against it. Cf., for instance, μὴ τινα (2 Cor. 12:17) and μήτι in the next verse. The anacoluthon with τινα here is noticeable.

12. Indeclinable τι. The use of τις with σπλάγχνα καὶ οἴκτιμοι (Ph. 2:1) may be compared with indeclinable τι. Indeclinable τι itself survives in modern Greek κατι (Moulton, Prol., p. 244).

---

3 Moulton in W.-M., p. 213.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 178.
(b) $\epsilon\iota\zeta=$$\tau\iota\zeta$. This is merely one usage of $\epsilon\iota\zeta$, the cardinal numeral. The idiom is common after Plutarch, but traces of it occur earlier. Moulton sees no difference between $\epsilon\iota\zeta$ and $\tau\iota\zeta$ in Aristophanes, $Av.$, 1292. The papyri furnish similar examples. “The fact that $\epsilon\iota\zeta$ progressively ousted $\tau\iota\zeta$ 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, is surely enough to prove that the development lay entirely within the Greek language, and only by accident agrees with Semitic.”

(c) $\Pi\alpha\zeta=$‘any one’ no matter who, ‘anything’ no matter what. Cf. *quidvis*. We see this construction in Ac. 2:21 (LXX), $\pi\alpha\zeta$ $\delta\zeta$ $\epsilon\acute{a}v$ $\epsilon\pi\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\sigma\eta\tau\iota$ $\alpha v$. So Gal. 3:10 (LXX); Lu. 14:33. $\Pi\alpha\zeta$ with a participle may have the same force, like $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{o}\dot{\iota}$$\delta\kappa\omega\upsilon\nu\tau\iota$$\zeta$$\tau\o\acute{a}$ $\lambda\acute{a}v\sigma\nu$ Mt. 13:19 (cf. Lu. 11:4), and $\pi\alpha\zeta$ $\delta$$\acute{a}$$\rho\gamma\zeta\acute{a}$$\mu\sigma\nu\zeta$. Mt. 5:22, etc. For $\pi\alpha\zeta$—$\upsilon$‘no one’ see negative pronouns. For the adjectival uses of $\pi\alpha\zeta$, see chapter on Adjectives and chapter on Article.

(d) $\Omega$ $\Delta\epsilon\nu\alpha$. This rare pronoun was current chiefly in colloquial speech (Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 166). It survives in the modern Greek (Thumb, p. 98). It means “Mr. So-and-So.” It occurs only once in the N. T., $\pi\rho\acute{o}\dot{\iota}$$\tau\o\acute{a}$ $\delta\epsilon\nu\alpha$, Mt. 26:18.

X. Alternative or Distributive Pronouns (Ἀντωνιμίαι διατηρίαι).

I apply a term from Æschylus in lieu of a better one. The reciprocal pronoun ἀλλήλων has been already treated.

(a) Ἀμφότεροι. Ἀμφότερος has vanished from the κοινή. Ἀμφότερος has taken its place. It continues in the later Greek, but Thumb does not give it for modern Greek. It is frequent in the LXX, but is found only fourteen times in the N. T. It occurs without the article in all but five instances. So Mt. 9:17. Once the article is used with the substantive, ἄμφοτέρα τὰ πλοῖα, Lu. 5:7. The other four examples have the article before the pronoun, like ἰδίω ἀμφότερος, Eph. 2:18. It is possible, even probable, that in two instances duality has disappeared from the word. It seems certain that three items are referred to in Ac. 23:8 and in Ac. 19:16 the seven sons of Sceva are alluded to. A corruption of the text is possible (cf. the Bezan text for 19:16), but it is hardly necessary to postulate that in view of “the undeniable Byzantine use” of ἄμφοτέροι for more than two (cf. “both” in old English). The papyri show undoubted examples also and “the Sahidic and some later versions took ἄμφοτέρων as ‘all.’”

---

1 Hatz., Einl., p. 207; W.-Sch., p. 243.
2 Prol., p. 97.
3 Ib.
4 Thompson, Synt., p. 77.
5 Moulton, Prol., p. 57.
1 Thack., Gr., p. 192.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 80.
3 Ib.
But Moulton\(^4\) hesitates to admit in Luke “a colloquialism of which early examples are so rare,” a rather surprising objection from Dr. Moulton. On the whole one is safe in the two passages in Acts here quoted to admit the free use of ἄµφοτεροι. The papyri examples bearing on this usage include N.P. 67, 69 (iv/A.D.) “where it is used of four men” (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 154), probably also B.M. 336 (ii/A.D.). See Bury, Cl. Rev., XI, p. 393, for the opposite view. Nestle (Berl. Phil. Woch., 1900, N. 47) shows that German also uses “beide” for three and more persons.

\(b\) ἕκαστος. In the LXX ἐκάτερος is still used to a limited extent (Gen. 40:5) and occasionally ἕκαστος, without dual idea (cf. ἄµφοτεροι), as often in the papyri.\(^5\) In O.P. 256 (i/A.D.) and B.M. 333 (ii/A.D.) ἐκάτερος is used of three and of four in G. H. 23\(^a\) (ii/B.C.). See Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 440, and proper use of ἐκάτερος in P.Oxy. 905 (A.D. 170), πρός τὸ ἐκάτερον μέρος. But in the N. T. ἐκάτερος does not appear. “ὅσοι ἕκαστος is common in the N. T., but comes to be replaced in modern Greek by κάθε, καθεῖς and καθένας (cf. καθ ἐς in the N. T.).\(^6\)

1. Without Substantive. This is indeed the usual idiom, as in Mt. 16:27; Jo. 6:7.

2. With Substantive. Never with the article. So Eph. 4:16; Heb. 3:13; Rev. 22:2. Thus very rare.

[Page 746] 3. With ἐς. This is very frequent. So ἐς ἕκαστος Mt. 26:22, etc. We even have ἄνα ἐς ἕκαστος, Rev. 21:21. But in Ac. 21:19, ἐξηγεῖτο καθ ἐν ἕκαστον ἄν ἐποίησαν, we must not\(^1\) connect ἕκαστον with ἐν.

4. With Genitive. It is common also with the genitive, as in Lu. 13:15; Eph. 4:7.

5. Partitive Apposition. This is frequent also. Thus ἄρῃ ἕκαστος Mt. 18:35, ἐπορεύοντο πάντες—ἕκαστος Lu. 2:3, etc. The same thing is true in Eph. 5:33 ὑμεῖς καθ ἔνα ἕκαστος. This is a classical construction.\(^2\)

6. Rare in Plural. So ἕκαστοι Ph. 2:4, but even here W. H. have ἕκαστος in the margin.

7. Repetition. Note the repetition of ἕκαστος in Heb. 8:11 (from Jer. 31:34). This translation of ὅσιος by ἕκαστος rather than ἄνηρ is an instance of independence of Hebrew literalism. Cf. Mt. 18:35 with Gen. 13:11; Ro. 15:2 and Eph. 4:25 with Is. 3:5 (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 246). For ἄνηρ=ἕκαστος in the LXX (literal books) see Thackeray, Gr., p. 192.

(c) ἅλλος. Cf. Latin alius, English else.

\(\)\(^4\) Ib.
\(\)\(^5\) Ib., p. 79. Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 192.
1 W.-Sch., p. 246 f.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179.
1. *Used absolutely=‘An-other,’ ‘One Other.’* This is the commonest use of the pronoun. Cf. 1 Cor. 12:8–10 where ἀλλώ occurs six times. So Mt. 13:5–8 where ἄλλα appears three times. But it is found alone also, as ἄλλος, Mt. 27:42. For ἄλλος τις see Lu. 22:59. Cf. οὐδὲν ἄλλο (Gal. 5:10)=‘nothing else.’ It occurs in modern Greek vernacular.

2. *For Two.* But ἄλλος occurs where the idea of two is present (pair). Here ἕτερος might have been used, but even in Euripides, *I. T.* 962 f., Blass finds θάτερον—τὸ δὲ ἄλλο, though he considers it a “most striking encroachment” for ἄλλος to supplant ἕτερος in this fashion. Moulton (*Cl. Rev.*, 1901, p. 440) cites τῆς μὲν μὴς—τῆς δὲ ἄλλης G. H. 234 (ii/v.c.); δύο, τὸν μὲν ἕνα—καὶ τὸν ἄλλον B. U. 456 (iv/a.d.).

Moulton explains the existence of καὶ τὴν ἄλλην (σιαγόνα) in Lu. 6:29 as a failure on Luke’s part to correct his source, a like failure appearing in Mt. 5:39, unless that was his source. But the matter goes much further than that. In Mt. 12:13 ἢ ἄλλη refers to the other hand (γείρ). In Jo. 19:32 note τοῦ πρώτου—καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου. Cf. also Jo. 18:16; 20:3 f. In Jo. 5:32 ἐγὼ and ἄλλος are contrasted. So Mt. 25:16, τὰ πέντε τάλαντα—ἄλλα πέντε, for which Blass finds “complete illustration in classical authors.” There are other N. T. examples such as ἄλλην in Mt. 19:9, τὰ δὲ—ἄλλα δόο Mt. 25:17, ἄλλην Mk. 10:11, ἄλλον 10:12, ἄλλον παράκλητον Jo. 14:16.

3. *As Adjective.* Common. Cf. Mt. 2:12; 4:21; and in particular Rev. 14:6, 8, 15, 17 and 1 Cor. 15:39, 41.

4. *With the Article.* It is not frequent. The article sharply refers to a preceding example. Cf. Mt. 5:39; Mt. 27:61. John alludes to himself in his Gospel as ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής (18:16; 20:2, 3, 4). The article may be repeated, as in Jo. 18:16; 19:32.

5. The Use of ἄλλος ἄλλο = ‘One One Thing, One Another.’ This is classical and is illustrated in Ac. 19:32; 21:34. In Ac. 2:12, ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλον, the idiom is almost reciprocal like ἄλληλον.  

6. In Contrast for ‘Some—Others.’ We have ἄλλη μὲν—ἄλλη δὲ, 1 Cor. 15:39 and 41; ὁ μὲν—ἄλλα δὲ, Mt. 13:4 f. (cf. καὶ ἄλλο, Mk. 4:5); οἱ μὲν—ἄλλοι δὲ—ἕτεροι δὲ, Mt. 16:14; καὶ ἄλλοι—ἄλλοι δὲ, Mk. 8:28; ὑπὸ τινῶν—ἄλλων, Lu. 9:8; ὁ εἷς—ὁ ἄλλος, Rev. 17:10.

7. Ellipsis of ἄλλος is possible in Ac. 5:29, Πέτρος καὶ οἱ (sc. ἄλλοι) ἀπόστολοι. Blass cites also Ac. 2:14, Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς (sc. λοιποῖς) ἐνδέκα. But psychologically this explanation is open to doubt.

---

3 Ib., p. 180.  
4 Prol., p. 79.  
5 W.-Sch., p. 245.  
1 Ib.
8. The Use of ἄλλος and ἕτερος Together. Blass\(^2\) finds this “probably only for the sake of variety.” Certainly in 1 Cor. 12:9 f. no real distinction can be found between ἄλλος and ἕτερος, which are here freely intermingled. But I am bound to insist on a real difference in Gal. 1:6 f. The change is made from ἕτερον to ἄλλο for the very reason that Paul is not willing to admit that it is a gospel on the same plane (ἄλλο) as that preached by him. He admits ἕτερον, but refuses ἄλλο. The use of εἰ μή by Paul does not disturb this interpretation. The same thing would seem to be true of 2 Cor. 11:4, ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν—πνεῦμα ἐτερον—ἐυαγγέλιον ἐτερον. It may be that variety (as in 1 Cor. 12:9 f.) is all that induces the change here. But it is also possible that Paul stigmatizes the gospel of the Judaizers as ἕτερον (cf. Gal. 1:6) and the Spirit preached by them, while he is unwilling to admit another (ἄλλον) Jesus even of the same type as the one preached by him.

9. = ‘Different.’ Besides, it is not to be forgotten that in ancient Greek ἄλλος itself was used for ‘different kind.’ Thompson (\textit{Syntax}, p. 76) cites ἄλλα τῶν δικαίων from Xen., Mem., IV, 4. 25. Cf. also ἄλλα in the sense of ‘but.’ Cf. ἄλλα ἄλλη in 1 Cor. 15:39. [Page 748] Indeed in 1 Cor. 15:39, 41, ἄλλη μὲν—ἄλλη δὲ, it is expressly stated that the glory is not Ἡ αὐτή. In verse 40 ἔτερα occurs. Here ἄλλος seems to be used in the sense of ‘different,’ like ἕτερος. In Latin \textit{alius} was often used where earlier Latin would have used \textit{alter}. Cf. Draeger, \textit{Hist. Synt.}, p. 105.

10. ἄλλοτρος. This variation of ἄλλος has the same relation to it that \textit{alienus} has to \textit{alius}. It means ‘belonging to another,’ and occurs fourteen times in the N. T. Cf. Ro. 15:20. The contrast with αὐτῶν is seen in Mt. 17:25. In Heb. 11:34 it has the notion of \textit{alienus}.

\(d\) ἕτερος.

1. Absolutely. So often as in Lu. 14:19 f., but it is also used more frequently with substantives than is ἄλλος. Cf. Lu. 4:43; Ac. 7:18 (LXX), etc. For ἕτερος τις see Ac. 8:34; Ro. 13:9. For the genitive with ἕτερος cf. Mt. 8:21; Gal. 1:19.

2. With Article. The article is also more common with ἕτερος than with ἄλλος. Cf. Mt. 10:23; 11:16, etc.

3. Second of Pair. A common, probably the original, use of ἕτερος is for the second of a pair. Cf. Latin \textit{alter}. It is the only surviving dual pronominal word in the N. T. (except ἰμιστήρων), and is common in the LXX\(^1\) and the papyri.\(^2\) For σὺν ἕτερον μὴ see P.Th. 421 (iii/A.D.). The examples are rather abundant in the N. T. of this dual (comparative) sense (ἕτερος). So τὸν ἔνα—τὸν ἕτερον, Mt. 6:24; σὺ—ὑ ἐτερον, 11:3; ἐν τῷ ἕτερῳ πλοῖῳ, Lu. 5:7. Cf. also Lu. 7:19 f.; 14:31; 16:13; 17:34 f.; 18:10; 20:11.\(^3\) Not radically different from this conception is the use of it for ‘next,’ as in Lu.

---

2 Ib., p. 318.
1 Thack., Gr., p. 192.
2 Mayser, Gr., p. 312.
3 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 244.
ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ, Ac. 20:15 τῇ ἑτέρῃ. Cf. also Mt. 10:23. See also, τὸν ἑτέρον in Ro. 2:1; 13:8=‘neighbour.’

4. =‘Different.’ The sense of ‘different’ grows naturally out of the notion of duality. The two things happen just to be different. Cf. Latin alius and aliicus. The word itself does not mean ‘different,’ but merely ‘one other,’ a second of two. It does not necessarily involve “the secondary idea of difference of kind” (Thayer). That is only true where the context demands it. But note how Latin alter lends itself to the notion of change. Thompson4 suggests that this sense may be “an euphemism for κακός.” The N. T. examples are rather numerous. So ἔγενε—τὸ εἰδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἑτέρον, Lu. 9:29. Cf. also Ac. 2:4; Ro. 7:23; 1 Cor. 14:21; 2 Cor. 11:4; Gal. 1:6; Heb. 7:11, 13, 15; Ju. 7. Cf. also ἑτέρος in Ph. 3:15 and ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ Mk. 16:12 (disputed part of Mark.) Cf. Ac. 17:21. We have already seen that ἄλλος may be equal to ‘different’ (1 Cor. 15:39). Ἐτέρος occurs in verse 40 in the sense of ‘different.’ Ramsay (on Gal. 1:6) argues that, when ἑτέρος occurs in contrast with ἄλλος, it means not ‘different’ (as Lightfoot in loco), but ‘another of the same kind.’ Moulton (Prol., p. 246) stands by Lightfoot in spite of Ramsay’s examples.

5. =‘Another’ of Three or More. But ἑτέρος comes also to be employed merely for ‘another’ with more than two and with no idea of difference. This usage probably grew out of the use with two groups. So Lu. 10:1, ἀνέδειξεν ἑτέρους ἔβδομακοντα δόο. In Mt. 12:45, ἐπτὰ ἑτέρα πνεύματα πνημότερα ἔκατον, the notion of difference is present. This difference may also be implied by Luke in 23:32, καὶ ἑτέροι κακοῦργοι δόο. Cf. Lu. 8:3. But this is hardly true of Ac. 2:13. In Ac. 4:12 the point of ἑτέρον is rather that no other name at all than that of Jesus, not that of difference in kind. In Lu. 19:16–20 we have this order, ὁ πρῶτος, ὁ δεύτερος, ὁ ἑτέρος. So in 1 Cor. 4:6, αἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἕνος φυσιούσθη κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου, the third is again presented by ἑτέρος. Then, again, ἑτέροι occupies third place in Mt. 16:14 and Heb. 11:36. In Mt. 15:30 it comes in the fifth place. Blass5 admits that this use of ἑτέρος “at the close of enumerations may be paralleled from Attic writers.” See further Lu. 3:18; Ro. 8:39; 1 Tim. 1:10. But in 1 Cor. 12:8–10 ἑτέρῳ occurs in the third and the eighth places. We are not surprised then to learn that the papyri furnish plenty of examples where ἑτέρος refers to more than two.6 Blass indeed considers this extension not correct, and Moulton seems surprised that Luke should change the correct ἄλλος (Mk. 4:5–8=Mt. 13:5–8) to ἑτέρον in Lu. 8:6–8. But Luke is reinforced by Paul in this laxity as to ἑτέρος. Cf. πολλά καὶ ἑτέρα in Lu. 3:18. Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 154) calls this “incorrect ἑτέρος” and finds it in the papyri, as in O.P. 494 (ii/Λ.Δ.). But we do not

4 Synt., p. 77.
1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 245.
Ramsay

RAMSAY, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 79.
need to hold ἐστήρος in leading strings. The “subtlety” (Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 440) is only called for in that case.

6. In Contrast. ἐστήρος may also be used in contrast for ‘the one,’ ‘the other.’ So 1 Cor. 15:40, ἑτέρα μὲν—ἑτέρα δὲ. It is common in contrasts with other pronouns. Thus with ἐκ in Mt. 6:24; ὁ εἰς in Lu. 7:41; Lu. 17:34 ff.; with τις, Lu. 11:15 f.; with ὁ μὲν, Lu. 8:5 f.; with ὁ μὲν and ὄλλοι, Mt. 16:14. But [Page 750] neither οὐδέτερος (μηδέ) nor οὐθέτερος (μηθ) occurs in the N. T., though μηθέτερος is read in Prov. 24:21. In Clem. Hom. XIX, 12 we have οὐθέτερος.

(e) Other Antithetic Pronouns. For εἰς—εἰς (Mk. 10:37), εἰς—ὁ δέ (Gal. 4:24 f.), ὁ εἰς—ὁ ὄλλος (Rev. 17:10) see εἰς under Numeral Adjectives. So likewise τις may be contrasted with τις (Ph. 1:15), with ὁ ὄλλος (Lu. 9:7 f.), with ἐστήρος (1 Cor. 3:4). For the very common ὁ μὲν—ὁ δέ, ὁς μὲν—ὁς δέ see Demonstrative Pronouns. The repetition of the substantive is to be noted also. So ὁς καὶ ὁς πίπτει, Lu. 11:17; ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, Mt. 12:26 (=Lu. 11:18). This notion of repetition is seen in ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα (2 Cor. 4:16; cf. Heb. ἡμέρα ἡμέρα). Cf. also εἰς καὶ εἰς (Mt. 20:21; 24:40 f.; 27:38, etc.); ὁ εἰς—ὁ ἐστήρος, Lu. 7:41. For εἰς—καὶ εἰς—καὶ εἰς see Mk. 9:5=Mt. 17:4=Lu. 9:33. This threefold repetition of εἰς is rhetorical.1 The distributive use of εἰς with κατά and ἄνα (ἐν καθ ἐν, εἰς καθ ἐς, ἄνα εἰς) was treated under Numeral Adjectives.

XI. Negative Pronouns (انياτωνιμίαι ἀνρητικαί).

(a) Οὐδές.


2. Οὐθές. This is made from οὐθε τις (sometimes also from οὐθές εἰς, ‘not even,’ Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 146) and occurs sometimes in the best N. T. MSS. Cf. W. H.’s text for Lu. 22:35; 23:14; Ac. 15:9; 19:27; 26:26; 1 Cor. 13:2; 2 Cor. 11:9. Jannaris2 finds it a peculiarity of the Alexandrian school. Meisterhans3 has shown from the inscriptions how οὐθές and μηθές came to be practically universal during the third century and the first half of the second century B.C. Thackeray4 has reinforced this position from the uncials for the LXX. The papyri are in full accord.5 In the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., the date of the great uncials, οὐθές and μηθές had disappeared from current speech, and yet a number of instances survive in the MSS. of the O. T. and the N. T., though others were probably replaced by οὐδές and

1 W.-Sch., p. 246.
2 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 170. But see Schwzyer, Perg. Inschr., p. 114, for idea that the change is due to τ and δ being pronounced alike.
3 Att. Inschr., p. 259.
4 Gr., pp. 58 ff.
5 Thumb, Hellen., p. 14; Mayser, Gr., p. 180 f.
Indeed [Page 751] οὐδείς was a sort of fashion (Moulton, Cl. Rev., Mar., 1910, p. 53) that came in iv/B.C. and vanished ii/A.D. It was nearly extinct in N. T. times. See further chapters VI, III, (g), and VII, III, 2.

3. Gender. The feminine form is less frequent in the N. T. than the masculine and neuter. The word occurs with substantives (Mt. 6:5), with other pronouns (Ἄλλος, Ac. 4:12; ἔτερος, 17:21), but usually alone, as in Mt. 5:13; 6:24. It is common with the genitive (Lu. 18:34). The adverbial use of οὐδὲν is seen in Gal. 4:1 οὐδὲν διαφέρει δοῦλου, but the cognate accusative is a possible explanation (Gal. 2:6). Cf. οὐδὲν in 1 Cor. 7:19. In Rev. 3:17, οὐδὲν χρείαν Ἐχεις, the neuter is not to be construed with χρείαν.

4. Οὐδὲ εἶς. This is, of course, more emphatic than οὐδείς. The usage appears often in Xenophon, Demosthenes and other classic writers, the LXX and the Atticists.1 For examples in the N. T. see Mt. 27:14; Jo. 1:3; Ac. 4:12; ἕτερος, 17:21. The same principle appears in οὐκ ἔστιν ἥπνος ἑος, Ro. 3:12 (Ps. 14:1, 3). Cf. also the separation of οὐ—ποτὲ in 2 Pet. 1:21.2

5. Εἷς—οὗ. It is after the analogy of πᾶς—οὐ and distinctly emphatic, and is found in Demosthenes.3 Cf. Lu. 12:6, ἐν ἐξαίτων οὐκ ἔστιν. So likewise Mt. 10:29, ἐν ἐξαίτων οὐ πεσεῖται. In Mt. 5:18 we have ἐν—οὗ μή. For οὐδείς ὅστις see ὅστις.

(b) Μηδείς. In general the history of οὐδείς is parallel to that of οὐδείς. It is naturally much less frequent and its use instead of οὐδείς belongs to the discussion of Modes and Negative Particles. It follows in that matter the fate of μή. Μηθείς appears only once in the text of the N. T., Ac. 27:33. The use of μηδὲν οὖν, Gal. 6:3, may be compared with οὐθέν εἰμι, 1 Cor. 13:2. In 1 Th. 4:12 note μηθείς χρείαν Ἐχεις.

(c) Οὕτις AND Μήτις. These were treated under τις. Following the editors in the separation of these forms, it is to be observed that μήτι as mere particle occurs not merely in questions like μήτι οὕτος ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός; Jo. 4:29, but also with εἰ. So εἰ μήτι in 1 Cor. 7:5; 2 Cor. 13:5. But in Lu. 9:13, εἰ μήτι παρεχθέντες ἡμᾶς ἑγοράσωμεν, it is possible to take μήτι as the object of ἑγοράσωμεν. Cf. Jo. 6:12, ἰνα μή τι ἄπαθηται. But note μήτης, 1 Cor. 6:3. The use of τις with the conjunction μή is not infrequent (Mk. 13:5) and with the negative adverb μή also (Jo. 3:3, 5, etc.). So we have, contrary to the usual classic idiom, οὗ—τις, μή—τις.4 The [Page 752] undoubted separation of οὗ and μή from τις in such examples as Mt. 11:27; 12:19; Lu. 8:51; 12:4; 7:4; 10:28; Ac. 28:21; 1 Cor. 4:5, etc., argues for the same thing where μή τις and μή τι happen to come together. The κοινή (Moulton, Prol., p. 246) supports the use of τις with the negative: Tb.P. 1 (ii/B.C.) ημιδιάκες κρατήσασις μηδὲ κορετάς τινὸς ἑγαίον περιγινομένης.

6 Thack., Gr., p. 60.
1 W.-Sch., p. 248; Schmid, Atticismus, II, p. 137 f.
2 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 249.
3 Ib., p. 178.
4 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 256.
1. Οὐ πᾶς. Used together the words call for little in the way of explanation. Οὐ merely negatives πᾶς as in classic Greek and—‘not every one.’ Thus in Mt. 7:21, οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων—εἰσελεύσεται, Jesus did not mean to say that ‘no one’ who thus addressed him could enter the kingdom of heaven. He merely said that ‘not every one’ would. Cf. also οὐ πᾶσα σάρξ, 1 Cor. 15:39. The same principle applies to the plural οὐ πάντες. χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον, Mt. 19:11. Cf. Ac. 10:41; Ro. 9:6; 10:16. But my friend, Mr. H. Scott, notes that in Ro. 10:16 and 1 Cor. 15:39 οὐ πᾶς can well mean ‘no,’ and that in Mt. 7:21 and the other clauses where ἀλλά occurs the ἀλλά negatives the whole of the preceding clause. This is certainly worth considering. Cf. Mt. 7:21 οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων with πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων in 7:26.

2. Οὐ—πᾶς. Here we have a different situation. The negative goes with the verb. A negative statement is made as to πᾶς. The result is the same as if οὐδείς had been used with an affirmative verb. So Mt. 24:22 (Mk. 13:20) οὐκ ἀν ἐξωθῇ πᾶσα σάρξ, the idea is ‘no flesh,’ not ‘not all flesh,’ i.e. ‘some flesh,’ would have been lost. Cf. Lu. 1:37 οὐκ ἄνωσται—πᾶν ῥῆμα, Ro. 3:20 (Gal. 2:16) οὐ δικαίωσθε πᾶσα σάρξ. See also Ac. 10:14 οὐδέποτε—πᾶς. Cf. οὐδεὶς πᾶν Rev. 7:16; 9:4. It is true that this idiom is very common in the LXX1 as a translation of לֹא—כּל. Cf. Ex. 12:16, 43; 20:10, etc. But it is not without analogy also in the papyri use of πᾶς “with prepositions and adjectives of negative meaning. Thus ἄνευ or χωρὶς πᾶσης ὑπερθέσεως, a recurrent formula, ἄνυπευθεῖς, ἀνπᾶσης ἑξουσίας, Plutarch, Cons. ad Uxor.; δίψα πᾶσης ἑξουσίας, Tb.P. 105 (ii/B.C.); δίχα πᾶσης ἑξουσίας, Plutarch, Cons. ad Uxor., 1 (cf. Heb. 7:7).”2 Clearly the construction was in harmony with the κοινή.

3. Μή—πᾶς. The same principle applies. Cf. 1 Cor. 1:29, διότι μή καυχήσηται πᾶσα σάρξ. Here it is ‘no flesh’ as above with οὐ—πᾶς. See also Rev. 7:1. On the other hand μή πᾶς (1 Jo. 4:1)='not every’ like οὐ πᾶς.

4. Οὐ μή—πᾶς in Rev. 21:27 does not differ at all from the οὐ—πᾶς and μή—πᾶς in construction.

5. Πᾶς—οὐ. Here the ancient Greek idiom to a certain extent comes to one’s relief.1 But the שָׁלֹא—לֹא lies behind the LXX translation. It is less harsh than οὐ—πᾶς. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 178. The denial about πᾶς is complete as with οὐ—πᾶς. See 1 Jo. 2:21, πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐστιν. Cf. 1 Jo. 3:15; Eph. 5:5; Rev. 22:3.

6. Πᾶς—μή falls into the same category. Cf. Jo. 3:16; 6:39; 12:46; Eph. 4:29; 5:3. Here also the denial is universal. But most probably μηδείς would have pleased an older Greek more.

---

1 W.-M., p. 215.
7. Πᾶς—οὖ μὴ. In Rev. 18:22 the same explanation holds.

8. Οὐ—πάντες. With the plural οὐκ εἰσίν πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν, 1 Jo. 2:19, the matter is not so clear. Two translations are possible, as is seen in the American Revision. The text there is: “they all are not of us.” The margin has: “not all are of us.” The analogy of οὐ—πᾶς in the singular favours the first.

9. Πάντες οὖ. With πάντες οὐ κοιμηθήσομεθα, 1 Cor. 15:51, the οὖ goes with the verb. The effect is the same as πᾶς—οὖ above. ‘We all shall not sleep’ means that ‘none’ of us shall sleep. ‘We shall all be changed.’ Per contra, see οὖ πάντες, Ro. 10:16=‘not all.’

[PAGE 754] CHAPTER XVI

THE ARTICLE (TO ἍΡΘΡΟΝ)

I. Other Uses of ὁ, ἡ, τό. For the demonstrative ὁ and the relative ὁ see chapter on Syntax of Pronouns. It is confusing to say with Seyffart 1: “Der Artikel hat die ursprüngliche demonstrative Bedeutung.” It is then just the demonstrative, not the article at all. Why call the demonstrative the article? Great confusion of idea has resulted from this terminology. It is important to keep distinct the demonstrative, the article and the relative.

II. Origin and Development of the Article.

(a) A GREEK CONTRIBUTION. The development of the Greek article is one of the most interesting things in human speech. Among the Indo-Germanic languages it is “a new Greek departure.” 3 It is not found in Sanskrit nor in Latin. It does not appear to be pro-ethnic 4 and first shows itself in Homer. Indeed, the existence of the genuine article in Homer is denied by some. 5 But it seems an overrefinement to refuse to see the article in such Homeric phrases as οἱ πλέονες, οἱ ἄριστοι, etc. 6 And it is beyond dispute that it is in the Attic prose, particularly in Plato, that the Greek article reaches its perfection. 7 The article has shown remarkable persistency and survives with very little modification in modern Greek. 8 In the N. T. the usage is in all essentials in harmony with Attic, more so than is true of the papyri. 9 But Völker 10 finds the papyri

1 Hauptr. der griech. Synt., p. 1.
2 Cf. Schneider, Vorles. über griech. Gr.
3 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 41.
5 Delbrück, op. cit. Cf. also Thompson, Synt., p. 41 f.
7 Thompson, Synt., p. 41 f.
9 Moulton, Prol., p. 80 f.
10 Völker

VÖLKER, F., Papyrorum graecorum syntaxis specimen (1900).
in practical accord at most points with Attic. Simcox\textsuperscript{11} points out that even the Hebrew article does not differ radically in use from the Greek article.

\textit{[Page 755]} (b) \textbf{DERIVED FROM THE DEMONSTRATIVE.} The Greek article is the same form as the demonstrative ὁ, ἡ, τό. Indeed the German \textit{der} is used as demonstrative, article, relative. So English \textit{the} is related to the demonstrative \textit{that} (also relative). Clyde (\textit{Greek Syntax}, p. 6) calls the article a “mere enfeeblement” of the demonstrative. So the French \textit{le}, the Italian \textit{il}, the Spanish \textit{el}, all come from the Latin demonstrative \textit{ille}. But while this is true, the demonstrative, relative and article should not be confused in idea. The Greek grammarians applied ἔρθρον to all three in truth, but distinguished them as ἔρθρον προτακτικόν (dem.), ἔρθρον ὑποτακτικόν (rel.), ἔρθρον ὅριστικόν (art.). Some, however, did not distinguish sharply between the demonstrative and the article. The article always retained something of the demonstrative force (Gildersleeve, \textit{Syntax}, Part II, p. 215). It is an utter reversal of the facts to speak of the demonstrative use of the article. It is only of recent years that a really scientific study of the article has been made.\textsuperscript{1} Even Brugmann\textsuperscript{2} gives no
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separate treatment for the article. But Part II of Gildersleeve’s Syntax (1911, pp. 215–332) has a really scientific treatment of the article. Professor Miller collected material for it. But even here I must demur against “the substantive use of the article” (p. 216) instead of plain substantival demonstrative. Gildersleeve uses “article” in two senses (form and idea). The Latin word articulus has the same root as the Greek ἄρθρον (ἀρ– as seen in ἀρ-αρ-ίσκω, ‘to fit,’ ‘join’). The origin of the article from the demonstrative can probably be seen in Homer. Monro3 thinks it due to apposition of a substantive with the demonstrative ὁ. So Iliad, 4. 501, ἤ ὁ ἔτέρω τοῦ κροτάφου πέρησεν αἰχμὴ χαλκεῖη. Here αἰχμὴ explains ἤ and ἤ wavers between demonstrative and article and illustrates the transition. So with new proper names ὁ anticipates the name which is loosely added later. “In Attic the article shows that a particular known person is spoken of; in Homer it marks the turning of attention to a person.”4 In Homer the article usually marks contrast and not mere definiteness. But this contrast or singling out of the special object is in essence the real article which is thus attributive.

III. Significance of the Article. The article, unlike the demonstrative, does not point out the object as far or near. It is not deictic. There is either contrast in the distinction drawn or allusion (anaphoric) to what is already mentioned or assumed as well [Page 756] known. The article is therefore ὁ ὁριστικὸν ἄρθρον, the definite article. The article is associated with gesture and aids in pointing out like an index finger. It is a pointer. It is not essential to language, but certainly very convenient and useful and not “otium loquacissimae gentis instrumentum,” as Scaliger1 called it. The Greek article is not the only means of making words definite. Many words are definite from the nature of the case.2 The word itself may be definite, like γῆ, ὄρανός, Ἰησοῦς. The use of a preposition with definite anarthrous nouns is old, as ἐν ὕκῳ. Possessive pronouns also make definite, as do genitives. The context itself often is clear enough. The demonstrative may be used besides the article. Whenever the Greek article occurs, the object is certainly definite. When it is not used, the object may or may not be. The article is never meaningless in Greek, though it often fails to correspond with the English idiom, as in Ἡ σοφία, ὁ Παῦλος. It is not a matter of translation. The older language and higher poetry are more anarthrous than Attic prose. Dialects vary in the use of the article, as do authors. Plato is richer in the article than any one. Its free use leads to exactness and finesse (Gildersleeve, Syntax, Part II, p. 215 f.).

IV. The Method Employed by the Article. The Greek article points out in one of three ways.3 It distinguishes:

---

2 Griech. Gr.
3 Hom. Gr., p. 178.
4 lb.
1 Quoted by Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 57.
2 The old idea that the article was necessary to make a word definite is seen in Madvig, Synt. of the Gk. Lang., p. 8.
3 Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 70.
(a) INDIVIDUALS FROM INDIVIDUALS. The article does not give the reason for the distinction drawn between individuals. That is usually apparent in the context. The translators of the King James Version, under the influence of the Vulgate, handle the Greek article loosely and inaccurately. A good list of such sins is given in “The Revision of the New Testament,” such as ‘a pinnacle’ for τὸ περίγυρον (Mt. 4:5). Here the whole point lies in the article, the wing of the Temple overlooking the abyss. So in Mt. 5:1 τὸ ὄρος was the mountain right at hand, not ‘a mountain.’ On the other hand, the King James translators missed the point of μετὰ γυναικος (Jo. 4:27) when they said ‘the woman.’ It was ‘a woman,’ any woman, not the particular woman in question. But the Canterbury Revisers cannot be absolved from all blame, for they ignore the article in Lu. 18:13, τῷ ἄμαρτολῷ. The vital thing is to see the matter from the Greek point of view and [Page 757] find the reason for the use of the article. In Mt. 13:55, ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός, it is the son of the (well known to us) carpenter. In 1 Cor. 4:4 ὁ ἐκανόνες means the praise due to each one. Cf. ὁ μισθὸς in Ro. 4:4. In 1 Cor. 5:9, ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, Paul refers to a previous letter which the Corinthians had received. In 15:8, τῷ ἐκτρόμωσεν, Paul speaks thus of himself because he alone of the Apostles saw Jesus after His Ascension. The examples of this use are very numerous in the N. T. Thus in Mt. 5:15, τὸν μύδον, τῆν λυχνίαν, the article singles out the bushel, the lampstand present in the room. In 15:26, τοῖς κυναρίοις, Jesus points to the little dogs by the table. In Lu. 4:20, τὸ βιβλίον ἀπόδοσε τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ, the roll was the usual one and the attendant was there at his place. So in Jo. 13:5, βάλλει ὤδωρ ἐκ τὸν νυστήρα, the basin was there in the room. The article in Jo. 7:17, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, means the teaching concerning which they were puzzled.

(b) CLASSES FROM OTHER CLASSES. The (generic) article is not always necessary here any more than under (a). See ποιμνιοὺς καὶ ἄγαθοὺς (Mt. 5:45); δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων (1 Pet. 3:18). Cf. in particular 1 Cor. 12:13 ἐίτε Ἰουδαῖοι ἐίτε Ἑλληνες, 12:29. So also ποὺ σοφός; ποὺ γραμματεύως; (1 Cor. 1:20). But it is quite common to use the article with different classes. So in Mt. 8:20 note οἱ ἀλόπεκες, τὰ πετεινά. So οἱ γυναῖκες (Eph. 5:22), οἱ ἄνδρες (5:25), τὰ τέκνα (6:1), οἱ πατέρες (6:4), οἱ δύο λαοὶ (6:5). In these examples the vocative often has the article. Cf. Col. 3:18 ff. A good example of the use with classes is found in Mt. 5:3–10 (the Beatitudes), οἱ παράγοντες, etc. Cf. τοὺς σοφοὺς, τὸ ἀδερφήνημα, etc., in 1 Cor. 1:27. So of ἀδερφαί and οἱ πατήρα in Ro. 2:13. Cf. Rev. 11:18; 22:14. It is very common to find the singular used with the article in a representative sense for the whole class. So in ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπος (Mt. 8:20, and often) Jesus calls himself the Son of Mankind. Cf. Lu. 10:7, ὁ ἐρασίτης, where the labourer represents all labourers. In Mt. 18:17 note ὁ ἔθνικος καὶ ὁ τελῶνης. The Gospel of John is especially rich in examples of this kind (both ideals and types). Other examples are Mt. 12:35 ὁ γάγαθος ἄνθρωπος, 12:29 τοῦ ἱσχυροῦ, Jas. 5:6 τὸν δίκαιον, 2 Cor. 12:12 τοῦ ἁπτομένου, Gal. 4:1 ὁ κληρονόμος, Mt. 13:3 ὁ σπείρων. But even here the article is not always needed. So Ἰουδαίου τοῖς πρῶτον καὶ Ἐλληνος (Ro. 2:9). Cf. καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, Heb. 5:14. In examples like ὁ ὄρανδος καὶ ἡ γῆ (Mt. 24:35), where there is only one of the kind, the explanation is not far

4 lb.
5 Lightfoot, Trench, Elicott, p. xxx f.
1 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 47. On literature upon the article see E. Schwartz in the Index to Eusebius, p. 209.
from the class from class [Page 758] idea. So θεός, like proper names, may use the article where we do not need it in English (Jo. 3:16). Völker (Syntax, p. 19) notes in the papyri examples like γυνὴ καὶ ὦ, ἡ γυνή καὶ ὦ, γυνή καὶ ὦ, ὦ ᾧ Ἰοῦ καὶ τέκνα. For the generic article see further Gildersleeve, Syntax, pp. 255 ff.

(c) Qualities from other Qualities. The English does not use the article with abstract qualities unless they have been previously mentioned. But French and German are like the Greek in the use of the article here. It is not necessary to have the article with qualities. So in 1 Cor. 12:9–11 the gifts mentioned have no article. So in chapter 13, ἀγάπη in verses 1–3, but ἡ ἀγάπη in 4, 8; but πίστις, ἐλπὶς, ἀγάπη (verse 13). In 1 Jo. 4:18 φόβος is first without the article, then is repeated with the article, while ἡ ἀγάπη each time. There is much of the same freedom as to the use or non-use of the article here as elsewhere. Cf. Ro. 12:7, 9; 13:9 ff.; Col. 3:5. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 150) from the standpoint of the German sees more difficulty in the absence than in the presence of such articles. But he is correct in saying that the relative in Col. 3:5 explains the use of the article. It is interesting to observe that in the list of attributes of God in the songs in Rev. 4:11; 5:13; 7:12, the article is expressed with each quality, while in 5:12 one article (ἡν) is used with the whole list. In Ro. 13:7 the article is used with each thing and quality. It is possible that τῷ here is the article also for which the participle has to be supplied. But for the absence of µέν and δέ one might suspect τῷ to be the demonstrative. In Ro. 16:17, σκοπεῖν τοὺς ἄγνωστας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἡν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθητε ποιοῦντας, note how neatly τοὺς, τάς, τά, τήν come in and illustrate the three uses of the article. Note also the neat classic idiom τούς—ποιοῦντας. For the article with abstract nouns see further Gildersleeve, Syntax, pp. 257 ff.

V. Varied Usages of the Article.

(a) With Substantives.

1. Context. Whether the substantive is pointed out as an individual, class or quality, the context makes clear. The English may or may not have need of the article in translation. But that point cuts no figure in the Greek idiom. Thus in Ac. 27:23, τοῦ Θεοῦ οὗ εἶμι, the article points out the special God whose Paul is and is to be preserved in English. In the very next verse, ὁ θεός, we in English do not need the article, even if, as is unlikely, the angel has the notion of “the special God.” Cf. also Jo. 1:1. In Mt. 23:2, οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ ὁ Φαρισαῖος, the two classes are distinguished as in English. In Ro. 11:36, ἡ δόξα, it is the glory due to God. See ὁ µισθός, 1 Cor. 9:18 (cf. Ro. 4:4).

2. Gender of the Article. It will, of course, be that of the substantive. Cf. τὴν—τῶν—τῷ in Lu. 2:16. But sometimes the construction is according to the sense. So in Mt. 4:13, τὴν Ναζαρᾶ, because of the implied πόλιν. Cf. also Καφαρναοῦµ ἡν. But in Gal. 4:25, τὸ δὲ Ἡγαρ, Paul purposely uses the grammatical gender of the word rather than the natural feminine. Cf. also ὁ ἰμήν (Rev. 3:14), where Jesus is meant. But note the usual τῷ ἰμήν in 1 Cor. 14:16. The N. T. does not have the neuter article
with the plural of a Hebrew word, as we occasionally see in the LXX (Thackeray, p. 34). Cf. τοῦ μεσσία (Ezek. 27:4).

3. With Proper Names. This seems rather odd to us in English, since the proper name itself is supposed to be definite enough. But at bottom the idiom is the same as with other substantives. We do not use the article with home, husband, wife, church, unless there is special reason to do so. The word itself is usually sufficient. We must rid ourselves of the notion that any substantive requires the article. But, just because proper names are so obviously definite, the article was frequently used where we in English cannot handle it. But this is very far from saying that the article meant nothing to the Greek. It meant definiteness to him. We often have the same difficulty with the article with classes and qualities. Sometimes we can see the reason for the use of the article with proper names. So τον Ἰησοῦν ὑπὲρ Παῦλου χηρόστηκεν, Ac. 19:13. But in most instances the matter seems quite capricious to us. The writer may have in mind a previous mention of the name or the fact of the person being well known. In 2 Tim. 4:9–21 the proper names are all anarthrous. The same thing is true of Ro. 16, even when the adjective is not anarthrous, as in ἄπελλην τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ (verse 10). So in the ancient Greek for the most part the article was not used with proper names (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 229). Its use with persons is a mark of familiar style, but Plato uses it for anaphora or for contrast. In some sections it is common to use the article with titles, as The Reverend Doctor So-and-So. In South Germany der is used with the name alone.1

It seems needless to make extended observations about the presence or absence of the Greek article with names of countries, cities, rivers, persons. The usage among Greek writers greatly varies about rivers, mountains, etc. Cf. Kallenberg, Stud. über den [Page 760] griech. Art. (1891). See exhaustive treatment by Gildersleeve (Syntax, pp. 236–253) and his paper in American Journal of Philol., XI, pp. 483–487. Different words vary. “Names of cities most rarely have the article when connected with prepositions,”1 but that is true of other words also. Ἰερουσαλήμ does not have the article save when an adjective is used (so Gal. 4:25 f.; Rev. 3:12) except in one instance (Ac. 5:28). Curiously Ἰεροσόλυμα has the article (in the oblique cases) only2 in Jo. 2:23; 5:2; 10:22; 11:18. As instances of the article used with a city mentioned the second time (anaphoric) see Ac. 17:10, εἰς Βέροιαν, and 17:13, ἐν τῇ Βεροίᾳ.
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1 W.-Th., p. 113.
1 W.-Th., p. 112.
17:15, ἑως Αθηνῶν; and 17:16, ἐν ταῖς Αθήναις. For further details see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 152 f.

Substantives in apposition with proper names may have the article, as in Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεύς, Mt. 2:1; and ὁ βασιλεύς Ἡρώδης, Mt. 2:3; or not, as Ἡρώδου βασιλέως, Lu. 1:5. In βασιλεύς Ἀγρίππα, Ac. 25:26, it is like our ‘King George.’ So in Xenophon, when the King of Persia is meant we find βασιλεύς. In Mt. 3:6, ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἡ πατριάς, we have the usual order, but see the order reversed and the article repeated in Rev. 9:14; 16:12. Cf. τὸ ὄρος Σινά (Ac. 7:30) and ὄρος Σινά (Gal. 4:24), τὸ ὄρος Σιων (Rev. 14:1) and Σιων ὄρει (Heb. 12:22). For the article with appositive proper names see Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 231. Cf. Ἰουδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, Mt. 10:4; Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης and Ἰωάνης ὁ Βαπτιστής, 14:1 f.; Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός, Mk. 10:47; Ac. 1:13, Σίμων ὁ ζηλωτής, etc. Here the word in apposition has the article, but not the proper name.3 Cf. 1 Cor. 1:1.

In the Gospels as a rule Ἰησοῦς has the article. Χριστός in the Gospels usually has the article—the Anointed One, the Messiah. In the Epistles it usually is like a proper name and commonly without the article,4 illustrating the development of Christology in the N. T. Indeclinable proper names usually have the article if the case would not otherwise be clear. Cf. the list in Mt. 1:2–16, where the nominative has no article, but the accusative does have it. Cf. Ἰσραήλ in Ro. 10:19, but τὸν Ἰσραήλ in 1 Cor. 10:18. See also Mt. 22:42; Mk. 15:45; Lu. 2:16; Ac. 7:8; 15:1 f.; Ro. 9:13; Heb. 11:17. The use of τὸν Βαραββᾶν in Lu. 23:18 is not abrupt. In Xenophon’s Anabasis the article is not often used with proper names unless the person is previously mentioned.1 In Homer the article appears only occasionally with a proper name when a new person is introduced, and “marks the turning of attention to a person,”2 rather than pointing to a particular person as in Attic. “In short the Homeric article contrasts, the Attic article defines.” But, as a matter of fact, no satisfactory principle can be laid down for the use or non-use of the article with proper names.3 For good discussion of the matter see Gildersleeve, Am. Jour. of Philol., XI, pp. 483 ff. In modern Greek the article occurs with all kinds of proper names (Thumb, Handb., p. 41). Moulton (Prol.,
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3 See further W.-Sch., p. 153.
4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 152.
2 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 179.
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p. 83) admits the inability of scholars to solve “completely the problem of the article with proper names.” Abbott (Joh. Gr., p. 57 f.) notes that John generally introduces a proper name without the article and then uses it. The papyri also follow this classical idiom of using the article with proper names when mentioned a second time. So when
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a man’s father or mother is given in the genitive, we usually have the article. Cf. Deissmann, *Phil. Wochenschrift*, 1902, p. 1467; Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 83. The papyri throw no great light on the subject. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 95), claims that the papyri confirm the N. T. usage. In the papyri slaves regularly have the article, even when the master does not (Völker, *Syntax*, p. 9). For Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος (Ac. 13:9) the papyri show numerous parallels. Cf. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 313 ff. Mayser (Gr. d. grieuch. Pap., p. 310 f.), as already shown, takes ὁ here as relative. See also Hatch, *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, Part II, 1908, p. 141 f. In Luke’s list (Lu. 3:23–38) Ἰωσῆφ has no article, while all the long line of genitives have τοῦ including τοῦ θεοῦ. Among the ancient writers ὁ θεὸς was used of the god of absolute religion in distinction from the mythological gods.4 Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, pp. 232–236) gives a full discussion of the subject. In the N. T., however, while we have πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Jo.
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[Page 762] 4. Second Mention (Anaphoric). The use of the article with the second mention of a word is very frequent. Thus in Jo. 6:9, ἄρτους καὶ ὄψαρια, but in verse 11 τοὺς ἄρτους—καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὄψαριῶν. See Lu. 9:13, 16. Cf. ὕδωρ in Jo. 4:10 and τὸ ὕδωρ in verse 11. So μάγοι in Mt. 2:1, but τοὺς μάγους in verse 7; ζζάνα in 13:25, but τὰ ζζάνα in verse 26. Cf. Ac. 9:4, 7; 9:11, 17; Jas. 2:2, 3; Rev. 15:1, 6. In Jo. 4:43, τάς δύο ἡμέρας, the article refers to verse 40. Cf. Jo. 20:1 with 19:41; 12:12 with 12:1; Heb. 5:4 with 5:1; 2 Cor. 5:4 with 5:1. In Ac. 19:13 we have Παῦλος, but ὁ Παῦλος in 19:15. Völker (Syntax, p. 21 f.) finds the anaphoric use of the article common enough in the papyri.

(b) With Adjectives. The discussion of the adjective as attributive or predicate comes up later. Thus καλὸς ὁ νόμος (1 Tim. 1:8) is a different construction from ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς (Jo. 10:11).

1. The Resumptive Article. The use of the article and the adjective is perfectly normal in τῶν ὄψαρων προφητῶν (2 Pet. 3:2). Cf. τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 6:40). See also Lu. 1:70; Jas. 2:7. This repetition of the article with the adjective as in ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς above is quite common also. Abbott1 thinks that this reduplication of the article “adds weight and emphasis to the article.” Cf. τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Lu. 9:22) with τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ (18:33). Abbott2 considers that as a rule John reduplicates the article with the adjective only in utterances of the Lord or in weighty sayings about him. Cf. Jo. 1:9, 41; 2:1; 3:16; 5:43; 7:18; 10:11, 14. But this is hardly true of Jo. 6:13; 18:10. He notes also that in John the possessive adjective, when articular, nearly always has the reduplicated article. Cf. τὰ πρόβατα τὰ έμά (10:27). So τὸν ὁδελφὸν τὸν Ἰδιων in Jo. 1:41. In Homer the substantive usually comes before the article and the adjective. The resumptive article “repeats the noun in order to add the qualifying word.”3 Cf. Rev. 1:17; 3:7; 22:16, where the article is repeated, twice. Cf. also Ac. 12:10. So τῶν δόσα τῶν ἄγουσάντων (Jo. 1:40). In Lu. 6:45 both the article and adjective are repeated after the form of the first part of the sentence, ὁ ποιμὴν ἔκ τοῦ ποιμηνοῦ προφέρει τὸ ποιμηνόν. See in the papyri τὸ κτώνιον ὁτῆς τὸ λευκὸν ὁ παρὰ σοι, P.Tb. 421 (iii/A.D.).

2. With the Adjective Alone. It appears so with all genders and both numbers. Cf. ὁ γιος (Mk. 1:24), τῇ ἐρήμῳ (Mt. 3:2), τῷ ἀγαθῷ (Gal. 6:10), τὸ ποιοῦ (Mt. 5:3), τάς νέας (Tit. 2:4), τῷ ὄρατα (Col. 1:16), τῷ πολλά in Ro. 15:22, τῷ σοφοῖ in 1 Cor. 1:27, [Page 763] αἰ ἐστιν in Mt. 25:10, etc. All these examples are obvious enough. The ellipsis is simple and usually supplied from the context. The three uses of the article occur with the adjective alone. The individual use appears in such examples as ὁ γιος τοῦ θεοῦ (Jo. 6:69), ὁ δίκαιος (Ac. 22:14), ὁ ἀληθινός (1 Jo. 5:20), ὁ ποιημῶς (1 Jo. 5:18), τῷ πολύ and τὸ ἄλλον (2 Cor. 8:15), τῷ ἄγαθον σου (Phil. 14), τῷ...
The Article not Necessary with the Adjective. Blass, who [Page 764] has the best discussion of the use of the article with adjectives, notes that it is not accidental that, while we have ἐν τῷ φανερῷ (Text. Rec., Mt. 6:4), yet εἷς φανερὸν ἐλθεῖν prevails (Mk. 4:22; Lu. 8:17), since the thing is not yet in existence. But it is a rather fine point, since both ἐν κρυπτῷ (Jo. 7:4, 10) and εἷς κρυπτὴν (a subst. Lu. 11:33) occur as well as ἐν τῷ φανερῷ (Mt. 6:4, Text. Rec.). In Ro. 2:28 ἐν τῷ φανερῷ is genuine. In Jas. 4:17 note καλὸν ποιεῖν. The adjective alone may express class as in Mt. 5:45; Lu. 10:21; Ro. 1:14; 1 Cor. 1:20.

4. With Numerals. The article with numbers is more common in Greek than in English and is a classic idiom (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 228). Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 315) notes that with numerals the article points out a certain number now brought forward. So ἐπτά—οἱ πέντε—ὁ ἕξις—ὁ ὀκτώ (Rev. 17:10).

(c) With Participles. In all essential respects the article is used with the participle exactly as with the adjective. The article is not necessary to the participle when used as an attribute (Jas. 4:17), though it is most commonly found (Heb. 12:1, 2). For the predicate use see Jo. 10:12. The participle with the article is common
without the substantive, as οἱ πενθοῦντες (Mt. 5:4). The neuter for a person appears in τὸ γεννώμενον (Lu. 1:35). In τὸ ὁπολολός (Lu. 19:10) we have the collective neuter singular. The abstract singular is seen in τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως (Ph. 3:8) and the abstract plural in τὰ διαφέροντα (Ro. 2:18). Cf. τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου (‘my belongings’) in 1 Cor. 13:3, for the more individual use. The representative or generic sense is found in ὁ σπείρων (Mt. 13:3). The article with the participle is very common as the equivalent of a relative clause.1 In Mt. 5:32 πᾶς ὁ ὁπολολός and δέ ἐστιν—γαμήσῃ] are parallel. See also Col. 1:8. So οἱ πεπιστευκότες (Tit. 3:8), ὁ εἰσίν (2 Cor. 4:6). Cf. Mt. 7:21. The article is repeated with participles if they refer to different persons (Rev. 1:3) or even if the same person is meant where different aspects are presented (Rev. 1:4, where ὁ Ἰησοῦς comes in between). But note τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς καὶ λύσαντι ἡμᾶς (1:5).

Winer2 makes a special point of the use of a definite participle with an indefinite pronoun like τινές εἰσειν ταράσσοντες ἡμᾶς (Gal. 1:7), μὴ τίς ἡμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγόν (Col. 2:8), ἄλλος ἔστιν ὁ μαρτυρῶν (Jo. 5:32).3 He also notes the definite subject where the German would have an indefinite one as in οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων (Ro. 3:11). Cf. also the article and the future participle in ὁ κατακρινόν (Ro. 8:34), [Page 765] Ac. 20:22 τὰ συναντήσοντα. Cf. Is. 1:31, οὐκ ἔσται ὁ σβέσων. More of this when the Participle is reached (ch. XX). For the repeated article see τῇ χάριτι τῇ δοθεὶσῃ (1 Cor. 1:4). See further vi, Position with Attributives.

(d) WITH THE INFINITIVE. This idiom is so common that it must be merely touched upon here and the discussion of it reserved for the Articular Infinitive. In general it may be said that in the Attic and the κοινή the article is used with the infinitive in any case (save vocative) and very much as with any abstract substantive. The Iliad does not have the article and the infinitive, but it occurs once in the Odyssey1 and is in Pindar. Examples of the articular infinitive may be seen in the nominative τὸ καθίσαι (Mt. 20:23), the accusative τὸ λαλεῖν (1 Cor. 14:39; cf. Ac. 25:11), the genitive ἔλπίς πᾶσα τοῦ σοῦ σώζεισαι (Ac. 27:20; cf. Lu. 24:29), the ablative ἐξαιτούντο τού μὴ ἐπιγνώναι (Lu. 24:16; cf. 2 Cor. 1:8), the locative ἐν τῷ σπειρείν (Mt. 13:4), the instrumental τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν (2 Cor. 2:13). The dative does not occur in the N. T. with the article, but see θέασασθαι (Mt. 11:7). For the articular infinitive with prepositions see pp. 1068–1075. The article is frequently missing with εἰς πάντα in the vernacular κοινή (papyri), as Herodotus three times has ἄντι εἶναι.2 Cf. Clyde, Greek Syntax, p. 13 ff. But enough for the present. The articular infinitive is curiously rare in the Gospel
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of John, “almost non-existent.” It occurs only four times and only with prepositions (Jo. 1:48; 2:24; 13:19, 17:5).

(e) **With Adverbs.** This is no peculiarity of the κοινή, not to say of the N. T. It is common in the older Greek with adverbs of place, time, quality, rank, manner. It is not necessary to repeat what is said under Cases and Adverbs concerning the adverbial expressions (really adjectives), like τὸ πρῶτον (Jo. 12:16), τὸ λοιπὸν (Ph. 4:8), τὰ πολλὰ (Ro. 15:22). The point to note is that the article is used somewhat freely with adverbs as with substantives and adjectives. As examples observe τὰ ἄνω and τὰ κάτω (Jo. 8:23), ἦ αὕριον (Mt. 6:34, ellipsis of ἡμέρα), ἦ ἐπαύριον (27:62), ἦ σήμερον (Ac. 20:26), ὁ ἰμήν (Rev. 3:14), τὸ ἰμήν (1 Cor. 14:16), τὸ νῦν (Lu. 5:10), τὰ νῦν (Ac. 4:29), ὁ πλησίον (Lu. 10:27) and note πλησίον alone=‘neighbour’ in Lu. 10:29 and 36, τὸ ναί and τὸ οὐ (2 Cor. 1:17), τὸ ἔξωθεν (Mt. 23:25), ὁ ἔξωθεν (1 Tim. 3:7), ἐν ἔξω (Mk. 4:11, W. H. text), τὸ ἐντός (Mt. 23:26), τὸ ἐμπροσθεν and τὰ ὑπίσο (Ph. 3:13 f.), etc. Note two adverbs in Heb. 12:27, [Page 766] ὁ ἕτερος ἡμᾶς (quotation). In some of these examples there is the ellipsis of a word (note different genders), but not always. There are besides the adjectival uses of the adverb, like ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (Eph. 3:16), ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος (2 Cor. 4:16), ὁ νῦν καιρός (Ro. 3:26). Clyde compares τὸ νῦν with Scotch “the noo.”

(f) **With Prepositional Phrases.** Cf. oí ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας (Heb. 13:24), oí ἐκ νόμου (Ro. 4:14), oí ἐκ περιτομῆς (Ac. 11:2), oí καθ ἔνα (Eph. 5:33), τὸ ἐκ μέρους (1 Cor. 13:10), τὰ περὶ ὕμων (Ph. 1:27), oí σὺν αὐτῷ (Lu. 9:32), τὸ καθ ἡμέραν (Lu. 11:3), τὸ κατ ἐμὲ (Ph. 1:12; cf. Ro. 1:15), τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (Ro. 9:5), τὸ ἐκ ὕμων (12:18), τὸ ἀνὰ διναρίον (Mt. 20:10, W. H. text), oí περὶ Παῦλου (Ac. 13:13, classic idiom), oí μετ ἀυτοῦ (Mk. 1:36), τὸν εν τῇ οἰκίᾳ (Mt. 5:15), τὸ κατὰ τὸν νόμον (Lu. 2:39), τὸ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς and τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Eph. 1:10), τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἄγιους (1:15), τὸ καθ ἐξ (Ro. 12:5), ὁ ὥς τῷ φανερῷ (2:28 f.), etc. In Ac. 18:15 note νόμοι τοῦ καθ ὑμῖν, where the article occurs with the prepositional phrase, but not with the substantive. On oí περὶ=a man and his followers see Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 264.

(g) **With Single Words or Whole Sentences.** Here the word is used verbatim, as τὸ ἔγω (Plato, Crat., 405 d). Cf. oí ἔτερος ἡμᾶς δήλοι above (Heb. 12:27) and τὸ Ἀγαρ (the name Hagar, Gal. 4:25). So τὸ δὲ Ἀνέβη (Eph. 4:9). With sentences the article sometimes marks the quotation as in τὸ Ἐλ δύνη (Mk. 9:23), τὸ ὠφελεῖσις—ὡς σεαυτόν (Mt. 19:18 f.), ἐν τὸ Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον ὡς σεαυτόν (Gal. 5:14), τὸ γὰρ ὡς μοιχεύσεις and ἐν τῷ Ἀγαπήσεις κτλ. (Ro. 13:9), τὸ Καὶ ἐν τῷ ἄνω τῶν ἐξολοθρεύουσαν (Lu. 22:37). In particular the article is fairly common in Luke and occurs a few times in Paul with indirect questions. The modern Greek shows this essentially classical idiom. Blass remarks that the article makes no essential
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2 Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 263.
4 Jebb, V. and D.’s Handb., p. 295 f.
difference to the meaning of the question. It does this at least: it makes clearer the
substantival idea of the indirect question and its relation to the principal clause. See 1
Th. 4:1 parælébæte par ἦμων τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς, Ro. 8:26 τὸ γὰρ τί προσενεξήμεθα,
Lu. 1:62 ἐνένενον τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι καλάσθαι, 9:46 εἰσῆλθεν διαλογισμὸς τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη
μείζων, 19:48 οὖχ ἡμῖρισκόν τὸ τί ποιήσοσιν, 22:2 ἔξητον τὸ πῶς ἰνέλεωσιν, 22:4
συνελάθησαν τὸ πῶς παραδό, 22:23 συνζητεῖν τὸ τίς εἴη, 22:24 ἐγένετο φιλονεικία
tὸ τίς δοκεῖ. Ac. 4:21 μηδὲν εὐρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσθωται, 22:30 γνώναι τὸ τί
cατηγορεῖται.

[Page 767] (h) WITH GENITIVE ALONE. This is also a common idiom in the
ancient Greek.1 The κοινὰ uses this idiom very often (Radermacher, N. T. Gk., p. 94),
as seen both in the inscriptions and the papyri. The article stands alone, but the ellipse
is usually very plain, as is shown by the gender and number as well as the context. So
Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδείαον (Mt. 10:2), where θύος is implied; Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ (Jo.
19:25), where γυνὴ is to be supplied; Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου (Lu. 24:10), where μήτηρ is
meant; τὸ τῆς δόξης (1 Pet. 4:14), where πνεῦμα is to be understood; οἱ τοῦ
Ζεβεδείαον (Jo. 21:2), where υἱός is meant, etc. In 1 Cor. 15:23 μαθηταὶ is probably to
be supplied (cf. Gal. 5:24), and διάλοφος in Lu. 6:16 (cf. Ju. 1). The neuter plural is
common for the notion of “affairs” or “things.” So τὸ ἑαυτῶν and τὸ Ἑρατου Ἡσιοῦ
(Ph. 2:21), τὸ Καίσαρος and τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (Lu. 20:25), τὸ τῆς αὐριον (marg. W. H.,
Jas. 4:14), τὸ τοῦ κόσμου (1 Cor. 7:33), τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς and τὸ τοῦ πνεύματος (Ro.
8:5), τὸ τῆς εἰρήνης (14:19), etc. One may note also here ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μοις (Lu.
2:49) for ‘house of my Father.’ Cf. ἐν τοῖς Κλαυδίου, P. Oxy. 523 (ii/Α.Α.). See εἰς
tὸ ἑδία and οἱ ἑδοι (Jo. 1:11). The neuter singular has an abstract use like τὸ τῆς
οληθούς παρομίας (2 Pet. 2:22), τὸ τῆς συκῆς (Mt. 21:21).

(i) NOUNS IN THE PREDICATE. These may have the article also. As already
explained, the article is not essential to speech. It is, however, “invaluable as a means
of gaining precision, e.g. θεὸς ἗ν οἱ λόγοι.”2 As a rule the predicate is without the
article, even when the subject uses it. Cf. Mk. 9:50; Lu. 7:8. This is in strict accord
with the ancient idiom.3 Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 324) notes that the predicate is
usually something new and therefore the article is not much used except in
convertible propositions. Winer,4 indeed, denies that the subject may be known from
the predicate by its having the article. But the rule holds wherever the subject has the
article and the predicate does not. The subject is then definite and distributed, the
predicate indefinite and undistributed. The word with the article is then the subject,
whatever the order may be. So in Jo. 1:1, θεὸς ἱν οἱ λόγοι, the subject is perfectly
clear. Cf. ὁ λόγος σαιρός ἐγένετο (Jo. 1:14). It is true also that ὁ θεὸς ἵν ὁ λόγος
(convertible terms) would have [Page 768] been Sabellianism.1 See also ὁ θεὸς
ἀγάπη ἐστίν (1 Jo. 4:16). “God” and “love” are not convertible terms any more than
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“God” and “Logos” or “Logos” and “flesh.” Cf. also οἱ θερισταὶ ἑγγελοι εἰσιν (Mt. 13:39), ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἄλθεια ἦστιν (Jo. 17:17), ὁ νῦμος ἄμαρτιας (Ro. 7:7). The absence of the article here is on purpose and essential to the true idea. Cf. also ἀνθρωποκτόνος and ἔμετρητας (Jo. 8:44). In Eph. 5:23, ἄνήρ ἦστιν κεφαλὴ, the context makes it clear (W. H. marg. ἄνήρ κεφαλὴ ἦστιν) that ἄνήρ is subject even without the article. In Jo. 9:34, ἐν ἄμαρτίας εὐ ἐγεννήθης ὄλος, the article with ὄλος is not needed, a neat use of the predicate adjective. But the article is quite frequent with the predicate in the N. T. and in strict accord with old usage. It is not mere haphazard, however, as Winer rather implied. Hence W. F. Moulton, in his note to Winer, properly corrects this error. He finds that when the article is used in the predicate the article is due to a previous mention of the noun (as well known or prominent) or to the fact that subject and predicate are identical. The words that are identical are convertible as in the older idiom. 4 If he had added what is in Winer-Schmiedel, 5 that the article also occurs when it is the only one of its kind, he would have said all that is to be said on the subject. But even here Moulton’s rule of identity and convertibility apply. The overrefinement of Winer-Schmiedel’s many subdivisions here is hardly commendable. In a word, then, when the article occurs with subject (or the subject is a personal pronoun or proper name) and predicate, both are definite, treated as identical, one and the same, and interchangeable. The usage applies to substantives, adjectives and predicate, both are definite, treated as identical, personal pronoun or proper name) and predicate, both are definite, treated as identical, υμεῖς ἐστε τῷ ἄλος τῆς γῆς (Mt. 5:13), δὲ ἄγριος ἦστιν κάρμος (13:38), σὺ εἰ ὁ Χριστός (16:16), εἰς ἦστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος (19:17), τίς ἥρα ἦστιν ὁ πιστὸς διούλος (24:45), τούτῳ ἦστιν τῷ σώμα μου, τούτῳ ἦστιν τῷ αἵμα μου (26:26, 28), σὺ εἰ ὁ βασίλευς (27:11), σὺ εἰ ὁ υἱός μου (Mk. 1:11), σὺ οὗτός ἦστιν τῇ τέκτων (6:3), οὗτος ἦστιν ὁ κληρονόμος (12:7), οὗ γάρ ἦστιν υμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες (13:11), ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τῷ φώς (Jo. 1:4), ὁ προφήτης εἶ σὺ (1:21), σὺ εἰ ὁ δεισίδακτος (3:10), οὗτος ἦστιν ὁ προφήτης (6:14), οὗτος ἦστιν ὁ θανάτος (6:50; cf. 51), τῷ πνεύμα ἦστιν τῷ ζωοποιῶν (6:63), ἡγὼ ἐμι τῷ φώς (8:12), σὺ οὗτος ἦστιν καθήμενος (9:8; cf. 19 ε.), ἡγὼ ἐμι ἡ θύρα (10:7), ἡγὼ ἐμι τῷ νοήμα (10:11), ἡγὼ ἐμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή (11:25, note both articles), ἡγὼ ἐμι ἡ ὅδος καὶ ἡ ἄλθεια καὶ [Page 769] ἡ ζωή (14:6, note three separate articles), εἰκὼν ἦστιν ὁ θανάτων με (14:21), οὗτος ἦστιν ὁ λίθος (Ac. 4:11), οὗτος ἦστιν ἡ δύναμις (8:10), σὺ οὗτος ἦστιν ὁ παρθένος (20:1), σὺ οὗτος ἦστιν ὁ κοσμος (21:28), σὺ εἰ ὁ Λίγυπτος (21:38), ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστὸς ἦστιν (1 Cor. 11:3), ὁ δὲ κύριος τῷ πνεύμα ἦστιν (2 Cor. 3:17), αὐτός ἦστιν ἡ ἐλαίη ήμῶν (Eph. 2:14), ὑμεῖς ἡ περιτοιμα (Ph. 3:3), ήμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτοιμα (3:3), ἡ ἄμαρτια ἦστιν ἡ ἀνομία (1 Jo. 3:4), ἡγὼ ἐμι τῷ Ἀλφα καὶ τῷ Ω (Rev. 1:8), ἡγὼ ἐμι ὁ παρώτος καὶ ὁ ἐσχάτω (1:17, note both articles), σὺ εἰ τὰλαϊπώρος (3:17), etc. This list is not exhaustive, but it is sufficient to illustrate the points involved. Note ὁ βασιλεὺς (Mt. 27:11) and βασιλεύς (Jo. 1:49). Even the superlative adjective may have the article as in Rev. 1:17 above. But see οἱ ἐσχάτοι παρώται καὶ οἱ παρώται ἐσχάτοι (Mt. 20:16) for the usual construction. Cf. ἐφαγάτῃ ἄρα (1 Jo. 2:18). See further ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, Jas. 5:3; 2 Tim. 3:1; ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, 1 Pet. 1:5, and τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, Jo. 6:39. For
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5 P. 159.
the common predicate accusative see chapter XI (Cases), VII, (i). In the N. T. most 
extamples are anarthrous (Jo. 5:11; 15:15), and note 1 Cor. 4:9 ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἄποστόλους ἐσχάτους ἀπέδειξεν. Cf. Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 326.

(j) DISTRIBUTIVE. Cf. ἐκ δηναρίου τὴν ὑμέραν (Mt. 20:2), ἐπάξ τοῦ ἔναντον (Heb. 9:7), δὲ τοῦ σαββάτου (Lu. 18:12), ἑπτάκες τῆς ὑμέρας (Lu. 17:4). This is, to be sure, an ancient idiom familiar also to the English (cf. our “by the yard,” “by the pound,” etc.). It is found in the papyri.1 But ἔκαστος is not used in the N. T. with the article. Cf. Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 326. Cf. Thompson, Syntax of Attic Gk., p. 51.

(k) NOMINATIVE WITH THE ARTICLE=VOCATIVE. This matter was sufficiently 
discussed in the chapter on Cases. It is an occasional Greek idiom repeated in the 
Hebrew and Aramaic regularly and frequent in N. T. As examples see ναὶ, ὁ πατήρ (Mt. 11:26), τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα (Mk. 9:25), ἡ παῖς (Lu. 8:54), ὁ βασιλεὺς (Jo. 19:3).

(l) AS THE EQUIVALENT OF A POSSESSIVE PRONOUN. The article does not indeed 
mean possession. The nature of the case makes it plain that the word in question 
belongs to the person mentioned. The French can say j’ai mal à la tête, ἀλγῶ τὴν 
κεφαλήν.2 The examples in the N. T. are rather numerous. See, [Page 770] for instance, ἄνωθεν τᾶς χερᾶς (Mt. 27:24; cf. Lu. 13:13). In Mt. 4:20 we have τὰ δίκτυα, while in verse 21 we find τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν. Cf. κατέσεισε τῇ χειρί (Ac. 21:40; cf. Mk. 7:32), τὸν ὑιὸν τὸν μονογενῆ (Jo. 3:16), τῷ νοὶ δούλευο (Ro. 7:25), τοῦ πατρός (1 Cor. 5:1), Τίτον καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν (2 Cor. 12:18; cf. also 8:18).1 Cf. Mt. 8:3; Jo. 1:41.

(m) WITH POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS. The article is always used in the N. T. with 
these pronouns unless the pronoun is predicate. So τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σὰ ἐστίν καὶ τὰ σὰ ἔμα (Jo. 17:10) ἡμέτερος (Ac. 2:11) and ὑμέτερος (Jo. 7:6; cf. Lu. 6:20). The article is 
frequently repeated as in ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς (Jo. 7:6). It was usual with possessives in 
the ancient Greek.2 The Gospel of John shows ὁ ἐμὸς very frequently. Cf. Abbott, 
Joh. Gr., p. 65 f. With ἰδίος the article is customary, as in εἰς τὴν ἱδίαν πόλιν (Mt. 
9:1). This construction is very common in the N. T. A few times we meet ἰδίος 
without the article, as in ἰδίος ὁφωνίους (1 Cor. 9:7), καιροὶ ἱδίοις (1 Tim. 2:6). The 
anarthrous examples may be only members of a class, not the particular individual in 
the case. See further ch. XV, Pronouns.

1 Völker, Synt. d. griech. Pap., p. 8. Völker notes also the presence of ἔκαστος or of 
ἄνα, κατά, ἐκ, πρός.
exx. see Völker, Synt. d. griech. Pap., p. 7.
2 Thompson, Gk. Synt., p. 51.
(n) With Ἄυτός. It is only necessary to mention the order άυτή ἣ κτίσις (Ro. 8:21), and ἣ αύτη σάρξ (1 Cor. 15:39), to set forth the distinction in the position of the article with αύτός. So αύτό τὸ πνεῦμα (Ro. 8:26), but τὸ αύτὸ πνεῦμα (1 Cor. 12:8). See Pronouns.

(o) With Demonstratives. The essential facts have been already stated in the chapter on Pronouns. Here a bare summary is sufficient. Ὅδε occurs in the N. T. once with the article, εἷς τήνδε τῆν πόλιν (Jas. 4:13). The usual position of the demonstrative with the article has already been discussed also. It may be repeated here that we must not confuse this predicate (appositional) position of οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος with the ordinary predicate position of adjectives. The construction may be paralleled to some extent by the French la république française. Still in Homer three οὗτον τὸν ἀναλτόν='this man,' ἀναλτός, 'that he is.' Here we probably see the origin of the idiom οὗτος ὁ. So fixed did the usage become that in the Attic inscriptions the construction is uniform. The Boeotian inscriptions reveal the same thing. The order is immaterial, whether ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος (Lu. 2:25) or οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος (14:30).

[PAGE 771] In general it may be noted that the absence of the article with the noun means that οὗτος is a real predicate, as in Jo. 2:11, τάυτην ἐποίησεν ἄρρητα τὸν σημείων. Cf. Lu. 24:21; Ac. 1:5. Even with proper names the article occurs, as in οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς (Ac. 1:11). For further details see chapter on Pronouns. It may be remarked that the rigidity apparent in the use of the article in connection with οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος does not exist in the case of the correlative demonstratives. The article is wanting in the N. T. in connection with τοιόσδε and τηλυκότος. Τοιότος occurs once only with the article, a true attributive, ὁ τοιότος πλούτος (Rev. 18:16). Τοιοῦτος, on the other hand, usually appears with the article and in the attributive position, as in τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων (Mk. 9:37), though once the predicate position is found, αἱ δυνάμεις τοιοῦτα (Mk. 6:2). Most of the examples have no substantive, like οἱ τοιοῦτοι (Ro. 16:18), τὸ τοιοῦτο (Gal. 5:21).

(p) With Ὅλος, Πᾶς (Ἄπας). Ἀπας is found chiefly in Luke and Acts. The MSS. vary greatly between ἄπας and πᾶς. The text of W. H. now has πᾶς in the margin (Lu. 9:15), now ἄπας (15:13). Blass fails to find any satisfactory rule for the use of ἄπας, the Attic distinction of ἄπας after a consonant and πᾶς after a vowel not holding (cf. Lu. 1:3), though in general ἄπας does occur (when used at all) after a consonant (cf. Mt. 6:32). Ἀπας, when used with a substantive in the N. T., is always with the article. Once only does it appear in the attributive position, τὴν ἄπασαν μακροθυμίαν (1 Tim. 1:16), ‘the total sum of his long-suffering.’ Elsewhere we have either the order ὁ λαὸς ἄπας (Lu. 19:48) or ἄπαντα τὸν λαὸν (Lu. 3:21). If οὗτος also is used, we have τὴν ἔξουσιαν τάυτην ἄπασαν (Lu. 4:6). Cf. οἱ αὐτοῦ ἄπαντες (Ac. 16:33).

The construction of πᾶς is varied and interesting. It is an exceedingly common adjective in all parts of the N. T. In general it may be said that the idiom of the N. T.

---
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is in harmony with the ancient Greek in the use of πᾶς and the article. In the singular πᾶς may be used without the article in the sense of ‘every.’ So πάντα πέρισσομεν (Lu. 4:13), πᾶν στόμα (Ro. 3:19), πᾶσαν συνείδησιν ἄνθρωπων (2 Cor. 4:2), πᾶν δέντρον (Mt. 3:10), etc. Blass distinguishes between ἔκαστος=‘each individual’ and πᾶς=‘any one you please.’

Πᾶς ὁ=‘all.’ So πᾶσα ή πόλις (Mt. 8:34)=‘all the city’ (die ganze Stadt). This is the order and it is very common. Cf. πᾶσαν τὴν [Page 772] γῆν (Mt. 27:45), παντὶ τῷ οίκῳ (Ac. 10:2). Even without the article πᾶς may be ‘all,’ if it is a proper noun, like πᾶσα Ἰεροσόλυμα (Mt. 2:3), πᾶς Ἰσραήλ (Ro. 11:26). In Ac. 2:36, πᾶς ὁκος Ἰσραήλ, there is only one “house of Israel,” so that ‘all’ is the idea. Winer says that it is treated as a proper name. Abstract substantives also may be used with or without the article. There is very little difference in idea between πᾶση γνώσει (1 Cor. 1:5) and πᾶσαν τὴν γνώσιν (1 Cor. 13:2). With the abstract word “every” and “all” amount practically to the same thing. There is an element of freedom in the matter. So πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν (1 Cor. 13:2), but πᾶσῃ σοφίᾳ (Ac. 7:22). There may indeed be occasionally the difference between a specific instance like πᾶσῃ τῇ ὅλῃ ἡμῶν (2 Cor. 1:4) and a general situation like πᾶσῃ θλίψει (ib.). But see πᾶσῃ ὑπομονῇ (2 Cor. 12:12), πᾶσῃ ἀγάπῃ (1 Tim. 5:2), μετὰ παρθενίας πᾶσις (Ac. 4:29), etc. See also πᾶσα σάρξ=ναόν (Lu. 3:6), usually with οὐ (Mt. 24:22). But note again πληροῦσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην (Mt. 3:15) and πᾶσις τῆς προσδοκίας (Ac. 12:11). See πᾶσα ἔξοδοία (Mt. 28:18), πᾶσις πλεονεξίας (Lu. 12:15), Cf. 2 Tim. 1:15. In Ph. 1:3, πᾶσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ, the article is pertinent as in πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις (Ro. 8:22). But in Col. 1:15, 23; 1 Pet. 2:13 πᾶσα κτίσις has its true idea of ‘every created thing.’ But what about πρωτότοκος πᾶσις κτίσεως (Col. 1:15)? See also Col. 1:9 ff. and πᾶσαν χαράν (Jas. 1:2). Other examples somewhat open to doubt are πᾶσα οἰκοδομή (Eph. 2:21) which is most probably ‘every building’ because of εἰς ναόν. So in Eph. 3:15 πᾶσα πατρία is ‘every family,’ though ‘all the family’ is possible. In 2 Tim. 3:16 πᾶσα γραφή is ‘every Scripture,’ if separate portions are referred to. Cf. Jo. 19:38, ἐνάντιον γραφῆς. Usually in the singular in the N. T. we have ἡ γραφή, but twice γραφή occurs alone as definite without the article, once in 1 Pet. 2:6, ἐν γραφῇ, once in 2 Pet. 1:20, γραφῆς. Twice in the plural (Ro. 1:2; 16:26) the article is absent. In Col. 4:12 ὦ παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ it is ‘every,’ ‘whatever be the will of God for you’ (Moffatt). In Jas. 1:17, πᾶσα δόσις, we have ‘every,’ as in παντὸς προσώπου (Ac. 17:26).

Πᾶς ὁ and the participle is a very common construction in the N. T. Here the idea is ‘every,’ and ὁ and the participle are in apposition. Thus πᾶς ὁ ὁκον (Mt. 7:26) is practically equivalent to πᾶς ὁκος ὁκοῦμεν (7:24). Cf. πᾶς ὁ ὁργιζόμενος (Mt. 5:22), πᾶς ὁ [Page 773] μαθητής (5:28), πᾶς ὁ ἀνθρώπου (5:32), πᾶς ὁ αἰτῶν (7:8), etc. But
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sometimes we find πᾶς without the article as in πάντος ὄκοντος (Mt. 13:19), πάντι ὄφειλοντι (Lu. 11:4), where some MSS. read τῷ. See πάντι τῷ πιστεύοντι (Ro. 1:16).

The abstract neuter πᾶν τό is regular. So πᾶν τό εἰςπορευόμενον (Mt. 15:17), πᾶν τό ὄφειλόμενον (18:34). Cf. πᾶν ὁ in Jo. 6:37, 39.

The idiom ὁ πᾶς=’the whole,’ ‘the totality,’ is not frequent in the singular. It occurs twice.1 See τῶν πάντων χρόνων (Ac. 20:18), ὁ πᾶς νόμος (Gal. 5:14), das gesamte Gesetz.2 Cf. also Barn. 4:9, ὁ πᾶς χρόνος. Here the whole is contrasted with a part. ὁ πᾶς νόμος=’the entire law,’ ‘the whole law.’ It was never so common a construction in the ancient Greek3 as πᾶς ὁ.

In the plural πάντες is used sometimes without the article. This is not necessary with proper names, like πάντες Ἀθηναῖοι (Ac. 17:21). Cf. πάντες Ἰουδαίοι (26:4). But the article is absent elsewhere also, as in πάντες ἔργαται ἄδικας (Lu. 13:27), πάντες ἄνθρωποι (Ac. 22:15; cf. Ro. 5:12, 18), πᾶσιν ἄγαθοῖς (Gal. 6:6; cf. πᾶσιν τοῖς in 3:10), πάντων ἄχιου (Eph. 3:8), πάντες ἄγγελοι (Heb. 1:6). These examples are not numerous, however. Cf. 1 Pet. 2:1; 2 Pet. 3:16. Blass4 considers it a violation of classical usage not to have the article in Eph. 3:8 and 2 Pet. 3:16, because of the adjectives, and in Lu. 4:20, πάντων ἐν τῷ συναγωγῇ, because of the adjunct. But that objection applies chiefly to the literary style. See of ἄγιοι πάντες (2 Cor. 13:12). The usual construction is πᾶς αἱ γενεὰ (Mt. 1:17), πάντας τοὺς ἄρχερεῖς (2:4), etc. Sometimes we have the other order like τὰς πάλεις πάσας (Mt. 9:35). Cf. 2 Cor. 13:12. Πᾶς may be repeated with separate words (Mt. 3:5). For the use with the participle see Mt. 8:16. A few examples of the attributive position are found, like of πάντες ἄνδρες (Ac. 19:7)=’the total number of the men,’ as in the ancient idiom. See, also, αἱ πᾶσαι ψυχαί (Ac. 27:37), τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἄγιους (Ro. 16:15), οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἄδελφοι (Gal. 1:2), τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς (2 Cor. 5:10). The last example=’we the whole number of us.’ Cf. Ac. 21:21.

But we also find οἱ πάντες without a substantive, as in 2 Cor. 5:15; 1 Cor. 9:22; Ro. 11:32; Eph. 4:13; Ph. 2:21. In 1 Cor. 10:17, οἱ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀρτοῦ μετέχομεν, note the contrast with τοῦ ἐνός. Still more common is τὰ πάντα for ‘the sum of things,’ ‘the all.’ Cf. Ro. 8:32; 11:36; 1 Cor. 11:12; 12:6, 19 (cf. here τὰ πάντα [Page 774] and ἐν); 2 Cor. 5:18; Col. 1:17, etc. The use of πάντες alone (1 Cor. 12:29), or of πάντα (1 Cor. 13:7), calls for no comment.

The story of ὁλὸς is brief. It is never attributable in position in the N. T. It has also an indefinite meaning which πᾶς does not have. Thus ἐνιαυτὸν ὁλὸν (Ac. 11:26)=’a whole year.’ Πᾶς does not have this idea apart from the article. So Jo. 7:23, ὁλὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑπῆρξε, ’a whole man sound.’1 Cf. Lu. 5:5; Ac. 28:30. In Mk. 12:30 compare ἔξ ὁλῆς καρδίας (ἐν ὁλῇ καρδίᾳ, Mt. 22:37) with ἔξ ὁλῆς τῆς ψυχῆς. In this sense the plural also is found as in ὁλοίς ὁίκοις (Tit. 1:11). One may compare ὁλὴ Ἰερουσαλήμ
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Here also we find usually partitive construction in the predicate position. There is no doubt of it as to µ substantive use. But in 2 Pet. 3:3 καιρ rather than predicative. The Homeric examples may be demonstrative. One may note type one idea. Gildersleeve (ἀ misplacement of the article." Moulton cites a piece of careless Greek from Par.P. 60, ch. XIV. in the case of ῥεοσόλυμα (Mt. 2:3). We usually have in the N. T. the order ὃλη ἡ πόλις (Mt. 1:33), but sometimes ἡ πόλις ὃλη (Ac. 21:30). Sometimes we have ὄλος and παραστάσεως in the same sense as in 2 Cor. 1:1; 1 Th. 4:10. The word may be repeated several times (Mt. 22:37; Mk. 12:30, 33). It occurs alone also as a predicate (Jo. 9:34), or with τούτων (Mt. 1:22).

(q) With Πολύς. There is a peculiar use of the article with πολύς that calls for a word. The regular construction with the article (attributive) like τὸ πολύ άντσον ἐξετασά (1 Pet. 1:3) occurs in the singular (cf. ὁ τὸ πολύ, 2 Cor. 8:15) and much more frequently in the plural. So of πολλοὶ alone (Ro. 5:15; 12:5; Heb. 12:15; 1 Cor. 10:17), τὸ πολλά (Ro. 15:22). With the substantive added note ὑδάτων πολλῶν (Rev. 17:1), αἱ ἀδιαφορίαι αἱ πολλαί (Lu. 7:47), τὰ πολλά γράμματα (Ac. 26:24). This is all in harmony with classic idiom as well as the frequent use of πολὺς without the article in an indefinite sense. But in ὁ δύχλος πολὺς (Jo. 12:9, 12) Moulton finds "a curious misplacement of the article." Moulton cites a piece of careless Greek from Par.P. 60, ἀπὸ τῶν πληρωμάτων δραχμῶν. It is possible that δύχλος πολὺς came to be regarded as one idea. Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 284) cites a few rare attributive examples of the type ὁ δύχλος ὑγαδός from Homer and Αeschylus where the adjective is appositive rather than predicative. The Homeric examples may be demonstrative. One may note also ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὕμων ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου (1 Pet. 1:18) and ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτοίχις ἐν σαρκί χειροποιήτου (Eph. 2:11). See VI, (c), 5. We do find the usual order ὁ πολὺς δύχλος in Mk. 12:37. But it is a fact that δύχλος πολὺς is the usual order in the N. T. (Mt. 26:47; Mk. 5:24; Lu. 7:11; 9:37; Jo. 6:2, 5). The analogy of πᾶς, ὄλος, οὗτος may have played some part in the matter. For δύχλοι πολλοί see Mt. 19:2; Lu. 14:25. In Mt. 21:8 (parallel [Page 775] with Mk. 12:37, ὁ πολὺς δύχλος) we have ὁ πλείως οὗτος, but it is difficult to lay much stress on this point of variation. One is reminded of the constant Frenchidiom, but that is merely an independent parallel. The idiom of πλείωνες may be seen in 1 Cor. 9:19. See further ch. XIV.

(r) ἄκρος, ἡ ἰμισος, ἔσχατος, Μέσος. As to ἄκρος, it does not appear as an adjective in the N. T. In Lu. 16:24 and Heb. 11:21 τὸ ἄκρον is a substantive. The same thing is probably true of ἄκρον and ἄκρων in Mk. 13:27 and Mt. 24:31. This is in harmony with the Septuagint (Ex. 29:20; Is. 5:26). The same situation is repeated in the case of ἰμισος. Cf. ἐντὸς ἤμισος τῆς βασιλείας (Mk. 6:23), ἤμισος καὶ ὑμῖν (Rev. 12:14). Cf. ἤμισον alone (Rev. 11:9, 11). But ἔσχατος is used attributively as in ἤ ἔσχατη πλάνη (Mt. 27:64), τῇ ἔσχατῃ Ἰσραήλ (Jo. 6:39, etc.), τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτόν (Lu. 12:59), etc. The construction ὁ ἔσχατος alone (Rev. 2:8) and τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἄνθρωπου (Lu. 11:26) is classical. So is indeed also πάντων ἔσχατος (Mk. 9:35), ἐν καιρῷ ἔσχατῳ (1 Pet. 1:5). Ἐπὶ ἔσχατον τῶν ἦμερῶν (Heb. 1:2) is probably a substantive use. But in 2 Pet. 3:3 ἐπὶ ἔσχατον τῶν ἦμερῶν we may have the partitive construction in the predicate position. There is no doubt of it as to καιρός.

Here also we find usually τὸ μέσον (like τὸ ἄκρον above) absolutely (Mk. 3:3), or the

---

2 Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 53.
3 Prol., p. 84.
1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 190.
2 Ib.
various prepositional phrases like εἰς μέσον (Mk. 14:60), ἐν μέσῳ (Mk. 6:47), διὰ μέσου (Lu. 4:30), ἄνθρωπος μέσον (Mk. 7:31), κατὰ μέσον (Ac. 27:27), ἐκ μέσου (Mt. 13:49) or μέσων as preposition (Ph. 2:15). But the old partitive construction occurs in μέσης νυκτὸς (Mt. 25:6), ἡμέρας μέσης (Ac. 26:13) without the article. The true predicate is found in τῷ καταπέτασμα τοῦ νοοῦ μέσον (Lu. 23:45). So μέσων in Ac. 1:18. Cf. also τὸ πλοίον μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης (Mt. 14:24, marg. W. H.), where μέσον is probably a preposition. In Jo. 19:18, μέσον τὸν Ἰησοῦν, we have ‘Jesus in the midst.’ There is, however, no example in the N. T. like the old classic idiom which is seen in the LXX. Cf. ἐκ μέσης τῆς πόλεως (Ezek. 11:23). See also ch. XIV.

(α) With ἄλλος and έτερος. The article is frequent with ἄλλος but never in the sense of ‘the rest of,’ like ancient Greek. But oi ἄλλοι (1 Cor. 14:29) is close to it. It is used where only two are meant, as in ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής (Jo. 20:3, ἦ ἄλλη Μαρία (Mt. 28:1). The order ὁ μαθητής ὁ ἄλλος occurs (Jo. 18:16). Cf. also τοῦ ἄλλου τοῦ συνταγμοθέντος (Jo. 19:32) where the article is repeated, like τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς, etc. (Rev. 2:24). Blass [Page 776] says that no Attic writer would have said ταῖς έτεραις πόλεσιν=‘the remaining cities’ (Lu. 4:43). He considers εἰς τὴν έτέραν (Mt. 10:23 ὃ) “incorrect” for ‘the next’ city, as well as ὁ έτερος=‘the third’ in Lu. 19:20. But it is not the use of the article here that displeases Blass, but the free interchange of ἄλλος and έτερος in the κοινή. See ch. XV, Pronouns.

(i) Μόνος. This need detain us but a moment. The essential facts are succinctly given by Winer-Schmiedel.1 Without the article μόνος occurs usually even with proper names, as Ἰησοῦς μόνος (Lu. 9:36). So μόνῳ θεῷ (Ro. 16:27; 1 Tim. 1:17). But the predicate use occurs also. So Mt. 12:4 τοῖς ιερεύσι μόνοις; (24:36) οὐ πατήρ μόνος (NBD); μόνοι οἱ μαθηταί (Jo. 6:22); μόνος οὗ ἄρχεται (Heb. 9:7). The articular attributive use is found a few times, as in τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ (Jo. 5:44). Cf. Jo. 17:3; 1 Tim. 6:15 f.; Ju. 4. See ch. XIV.

VI. Position with Attributives. The article does not make a word or phrase attributive. It may be attributive without the article. It is necessary to go over much of the same ground again (Adjectives and Participles, Genitives, Adverbs and Adjuncts) in order to get the subject clearly before us.

(a) With Adjectives. So ἔργον ἄγαθον (Ph. 1:6) is attributive=‘a good work,’ though it is anarthrous. Cf. also ἔργοις ἄγαθοῖς (Eph. 2:10). Cf. μικρὰ ζωή (1 Cor. 5:6). But when the article is used before a word or phrase there is no doubt about its being attributive.

1. The Normal Position of the Adjective. It is between the article and the substantive, as in τῷ καλῷ ὄνομα (Jas. 2:7), ὁ ἄγαθος ἄνθρωπος (Mt. 12:35), τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα (18:20). In this normal attributive type the adjective receives greater emphasis than the substantive.2 Cf. correct text Lu. 12:12; 1 Cor. 10:3 (correct text); 1 Jo. 5:20.

3 Ib.; Thompson, Synt., p. 53.
1 P. 190.
2 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 158.
So τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ (1 Tim. 1:11). There must be a special reason for the other construction.3

2. The Other Construction (Repetition of the Article). In the order4 ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς (Jo. 10:11) both substantive and adjective receive emphasis and the adjective is added as a sort of climax in apposition with a separate article.5 Cf. ὁ υλός μου ὁ ἁγιασμένος (Mt. 17:5), [Page 777] τὴν γῆν τὴν ἁγαθὴν (Lu. 8:8), τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν (Jo. 1:9), τὸ ὀφθαλμὸν τῷ ἄνω (4:11), ὁ καυχός ὁ ἐμὸς (7:6), ἡ ἠμμέλεια ἡ ἀληθινή (15:1), τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πνευμόνον (Ac. 19:15). Cf. also Mt. 6:6; Lu. 7:47; Jo. 6:13; 1 Cor. 12:31; 2 Cor. 6:7; Eph. 6:13; Col. 1:21; Heb. 13:20; 1 Jo. 1:2; 2:25; 4:9. There is an apparent difficulty in Heb. 9:1, τὸ τε ἄγιον κοσμικὸν, which may be compared with ὁ ἄγιος πολὺς, p. 774 (Jo. 12:9).1 Perhaps both ἄγιοι and κοσμικοὶ were felt to be adjectives.

3. Article Repeated Several Times. So in Ac. 12:10, τὴν πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν τὴν φέρουσαν. Cf. τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἁτομοσμένον (Mt. 25:41), ὁ μαθητής ὁ ἄλος ὁ γινώσκως (Jo. 18:16), τὴν ἱματιάν τὴν δίστομον τὴν ἡμέραν (Rev. 2:12). In particular note the repetition of the article in Heb. 11:12; Rev. 3:14; 17:1; 21:9. In Rev. 1:5 note four articles, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, ὁ πρωτότοκος καὶ ὁ ἄρχων. Cf. Rev. 12:9; 1 Pet. 4:14. For this common classic idiom see Gildersleeve, Syntax, pp. 328 ff. In Ph. 1:29, ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, the two infinitives following, each with τὸ, explain the first τὸ.

4. One Article with Several Adjectives. When several adjectives are used we find an article with each adjective if the adjectives accent different aspects sharply. So ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἐσχάτος καὶ ὁ ζῶν (Rev. 1:17; cf. 22:13). Cf. also ὁ ἄνω—καὶ ὁ ἐφόσιν (1:4, 8). But ordinarily the one article is sufficient for any number of adjectives referring to the same substantive. So ὁ ταλαίπωρος καὶ ἑλευθερός καὶ πτωχὸς καὶ τυφλὸς καὶ γυνῆς (Rev. 3:17). In Mt. 24:45, ὁ πιστὸς δούλος καὶ φρόνιμος, the καὶ carries over the force of the article.2 So likewise the presence of another attribute may explain the probable predicate position πατροπαραδότου (1 Pet. 1:18) and χειροποίητου (Eph. 2:11).3 See further (c), 5.

5. With Anarthrous Substantives. There is still another order.4 It is εἰρήνης τὴν ἐμὴν (Jo. 14:27). Here the substantive is indefinite and general, while the attribute makes a particular application. Cf. νόμος ὁ δικαιομένος (Gal. 3:21). Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 93) finds this idiom frequent in the κοινή. So γυναικαί τὴν εὐγενεστάτην (I. G., XII, 7 N. 240, 13).

6. With Participles. The participle may come between the article and the substantive like the attributive adjective, as in τὴν ἁτομοσμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν (Mt. 25:34). Cf. 1 Tim. 1:10; Ro. 8:18; 1 Cor. 12:22; 1 Pet. 1:13. On the other hand (cf. 5),

3 Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 47.
4 For copious classical exx. of both positions see Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 281 f.
5 In Jas. 3:7, τῇ φύσει τῇ ἄνθρωπινῃ, the repeated article makes for greater clearness.
1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 177.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 160.
3 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 181.
4 It is common enough in classic Gk. Cf. Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 283.
all else may come between the article and the participle, as in 1 Pet. 1:10, of—προφητεύσαντες. A long clause (including a relative clause) may come between the article and the participle, as in Ro. 16:17, τοῦ—παιδεύτας. Once more, the participle may come in the midst of the attributive phrases, as in 1 Pet. 1:3, ὁ—ἀναγεννησός, or immediately after the article, as in 2 Pet. 1:3. Either the participle or the modifier may occur outside of the attributive complex (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 289 f.). Gildersleeve gives copious illustrations of the various constructions of the attributive participle. The article may be repeated after the substantive, like τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν above (Jo. 4:11), οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ—καταβάντες (Mk. 3:22). Cf. Jo. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:54; 1 Pet. 1:25; 5:10; Ac. 7:37; Heb. 13:20. The article may occur with the participle when not with the substantive. This supplementary addition of the article is more common with the participle than with other adjectives. Cf. K.-G., I, p. 597; Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 49. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 243.

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 243. 1 Cf. K.-G., I, p. 597; Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 49.

1. The Position between the Article and the Substantive. This is common enough, and especially so in 1 and 2 Peter. So ἦ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία (1 Pet. 3:20); 1:17; 2:15, 3:1. See in particular demonstrative pronouns like τῇ ἐκείνῳ χάριτι (Tit. 3:7).
Plato (Soph., 254a) has τὸ τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ψυχῆς ὁμιμάτα. For a series of such genitives in this position see ὁ—κόσμος (1 Pet. 3:3). For adjective and genitive see 3:4, ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος. Cf. Mt. 12:31; 1 Pet. 5:1. In 1 Pet. 4:14 the article is repeated, τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα. See also Jo. 1:40, τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντων.

2. Genitive after the Substantive without Repetition of the Article. This is even more common. Thus τὸν φόβον τοῦ Ἰουδαίων (Jo. 20:19), τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 8:39). Cf. 2 Cor. 4:4; Ro. 8:2; 1 Th. 1:3. Sometimes the two types are combined, thus ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους (2 Cor. 5:1), τῆς τῶν ἁπάστολων ἡμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτηρίου (2 Pet. 3:2). The personal pronouns illustrate either order except that ἡμοῦ is nearly always outside (but see τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων, Gal. 1:14, and ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου ἄπολογίᾳ, 2 Tim. 4:16); either, as is usual, ὁ κύριος μου (Jo. 20:28) or μου τοὺς φθαλμούς (Jo. 9:11). We find τῇ αὐτοῦ χάρτητι (Ro. 3:24) and τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ (Mt. 1:21) and αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ (Jo. 15:10). Cf. 9:6; 11:32), τὴν ἐαυτοῦ αὐλήν (Lu. 11:21) and τὴν σάρκα ἐαυτοῦ (Gal. 6:8), τὴν γενέαν τὴν ἐαυτοῦ (Lu. 16:8) and ἐαυτῶν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ (Mt. 21:8). Cf. also τὸ ὅνομά σου (Mt. 6:9), ἡ δεξία σου χεῖρ (Mt. 5:30); but not 5:29. Cf. also 1 Tim. 5:23), σου τὴν κεφαλήν (Mt. 6:17), τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν (6:11), ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου (1 Th. 1:3), τὴν ἡμῶν ἀγάπην (Col. 1:8), etc. With the partitive the usual (but see Jo. 6:70; 9:16, 40) position is this: τῷ τρίτῳ τῆς γῆς (Rev. 8:7). Cf. 1 Cor. 15:9.

[Page 780] 3. Repetition of Article with Genitive. The genitive may follow the other substantive with a repeated article. Here the article closely resembles the original demonstrative. So ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ (1 Cor. 1:18), τὸ ἔθει τῷ Μωυσίῳ (Ac. 15:1), τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτηρίου ἡμῶν (Tit. 2:10). This construction is not very common.

4. The Article Only with Genitive. Cf. ἔξουσίας καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς τῶν ἀρχιερεῶν (Ac. 26:12). Cf. Ac. 1:12, ὄρους τοῦ, with Lu. 19:29, τὸ ὄρος τό. Here again the article is almost pure demonstrative as in Jas. 1:25, νόμων τέλειων τῶν τῆς ἐλευθερίας = 'perfect law, that of liberty.' Völker (Syntax, p. 16) finds abundant illustrations of these positions in the papyri. So with proper names like Μαρία Ἡ Ιακώβου (Mk. 15:40), Δαυείδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰσσαί (Ac. 13:22), etc. Cf. Mt. 4:21.

5. Article Absent with Both. The genitive may still be attributive and both substantives definite. Cf. πύλαι ᾽Αδού (Mt. 16:18), σημεῖων περιτομῆς (Ro. 4:11), νόμων πίστεως (3:27), etc. The context must decide whether the phrase is definite or not. Cf. θεοῦ υἱὸς (Mt. 27:54), εὐφρενείαν ἄνθρωποι (Ac. 4:9).

---

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 159.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 159.
6. The Correlation of the Article. In such cases, according to Middleton, if two substantives are united by the genitive, the article occurs with both or is absent from both. But note (H. Scott) that (1) the genitive may be anarthrous if it is a proper name, (2) the governing noun may be anarthrous if it depends on a preposition. The normal type may be well illustrated by τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἰμαρτίας (Ro. 7:23) and νόμῳ ἰμαρτίας (7:25). The genitive ἰμαρτίας is an abstract noun which may or may not have the article. But νόμῳ is definite in either instance in ‘the law of sin.’ See again τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ (7:22) and νόμῳ θεοῦ (7:25). θεοῦ can be definite with or without the article. So, again, τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος (8:6) and πνεύμα θεοῦ, πνεύμα Χριστοῦ (8:9), ὁμοιόματι σαρκὸς (8:3) and τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός (8:6). Cf. also ὁ νομὸς τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς (8:2), τήν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ (8:21), τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἅγιον πνεύματος (Ac. 2:38), βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Mt. 1:1). Cf. 1 Th. 1:3; Rev. 1:1. These examples could be multiplied indefinitely. If one member of the group is a proper name, the article does not always appear. So τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονίκης (1 Th. 1:1), but ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας (Gal. 1:2).

Note also θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (Eph. 1:2) and ὁ θεὸς [Page 781] καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (1:3). Cf. also τὸ ἔργον Κυρίου (Ph. 2:30), τὸ πνεύμα Χριστοῦ (1 Pet. 1:11; cf. Ac. 16:7). Such examples as these with proper names are after all “very rare.” See Mt. 1:12; 16:13; Ac. 2:38; Rev. 12:17. Then again other phrases otherwise definite do not require the article. So the prepositional phrase ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 8:34; cf. Heb. 1:3), but note τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ (Ac. 2:33). In general, where the word without the article is not otherwise definite, it is indefinite even when the other one has the article. One is indefinite, the other definite. So ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων (Jo. 2:11) = ‘a beginning of miracles.’ In Mk. 1:1, ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the notion may be the same, though here ἀρχὴ is more absolute as the title of the book. In Ro. 3:25 it is possible to take εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ = ‘for a showing of his righteousness,’ while in 3:26 πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ may refer to the previous mention of it as a more definite conception. Compare also τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνῃ (Ro. 10:3) and δικαιοσύνῃ θεοῦ (3:21), where, however, as in 1:17, the idea may be, probably is, ‘a righteousness of God,’ not ‘the righteousness of God.’ In examples like this (cf. θεοῦ υἱός, Mt. 27:54) only the context can decide. Sometimes the matter is wholly doubtful. Cf. υἱός ἀνθρώπου (Heb. 2:6) and τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Mt. 16:13). In an example like διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Col. 1:7), therefore, the idea is a minister of the Christ, not the minister of Christ. So σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης (Ro. 4:11), ἀπολύτητι τῆς κοινωνίας (2 Cor. 9:13). Hence υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Mt. 4:3, 6; Lu. 4:3) and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Jo. 1:49; Mt. 16:16; Jo. 11:27) do not mean the same thing. The devil is represented as admitting that Jesus is a son of God, not the Son of God. In Jo. 5:25 Jesus claims ὅτι οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσωσιν τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ
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1 W.-M., footnote, p. 146.
In Jo. 10:36 Jesus uses *argumentum ad hominem* and only claims to be
ὑιός τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. the sneer of the passers-by in Mt. 27:40 (W. H.), ὑιός τοῦ θεοῦ,
and the demand of Caiaphas in 26:63, ὑιός τοῦ θεοῦ. In Jo. 5:27 ὑιός ἀνθρώπου
may be either ‘the son of man’ or ‘a son of man.’ Cf. a similar ambiguity in the
Aramaic *bargaša*. The point may become very fine indeed. Cf. παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ἢ
κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός and κεφαλὴ γυναικὸς ἢ ἄνήρ (1 Cor. 11:3). At any rate man is not
affirmed to be woman’s head in quite the same sense that Christ is man’s head. But
see also κεφαλὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ θεός. In these examples the anthropus substantive is
predicate as is the case with ἄνηρ ἐστιν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικὸς ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς
cεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας (Eph. 5:23). Hence the matter is not to be stressed here, as
another [Page 782] principle comes into play. It is possible also that the qualitative
force of anarthrous nouns comes in here (Eph. 5:23, κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικὸς, κεφαλὴ
tῆς ἐκκλησίας, σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος). See VIII, (j). Cf. ξενοί τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς
ἐπαγγελίας (Eph. 2:12). So ἄρτι τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Jo. 5:1)=‘a feast of the Jews,’
(Mk. 1:4) and εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν (Ac. 2:38), εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ ὑιοῦ
(1 Cor. 1:9), prepositional phrase. But enough of a somewhat thorny subject.1

(c) With Adjuncts or Adverbs. In general the same usage applies to adjuncts as
to adjectives.

1. Between the Article and the Noun. Thus ἢ ἄνω κλῆσις (Ph. 3:14), ἢ κατ
ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις (Ro. 9:11), ἢ παρ ἐμοῦ διαθήκη (11:27), ὅ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἄδικος
(Lu. 16:10), τὴν ἐν τῷ σῷ δοκῆς (Mt. 7:3), οἱ ἐπερίτειμοις πιστοὶ (Ac.

2. Article Repeated.2 Thus πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Mk. 4:31), αἱ
δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς ὄρανοις (13:25), τῆς ἁπόλυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Ro.
3:24), τὰ παθήματα τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου (7:5), ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν (7:10). See further
Mt. 5:16; Lu. 20:35; Jo. 1:45; Ac. 8:1; 24:5; 26:4; Ro. 4:11; 8:39; 15:26; 16:1; 1 Cor.
2:11 f.; 4:17; 2 Cor. 2:6; 9:1; 11:3; Ph. 3:9; 1 Th. 1:8; 1 Tim. 1:14; Rev. 5:5; 11:2, 19,
etc. In Eph. 1:15 we find both constructions τὴν καθ ὑμᾶς πίστιν καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας
tοὺς ἄγιους. In Rev. 8:3 (9:13), τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσόν τὸ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἑρωνου,
the article is repeated with both adjectival and adjunct.

3. Only with Adjunct. So οἵκονομίαν τοῦ ὥς ἐν πίστει (1 Tim. 1:4), δικαιοσύνην
tὴν ἐκ πίστεως (Ro. 9:30), ἐν ἄγαπῃ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (2 Tim. 1:13). For
numerous classic illustrations of these three positions see Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, pp.
285 ff.

4. Only with the Noun. In such cases the adjunct may be either attributive or
predicate. Only the context can decide. In conversation the tone of voice, the manner,
the inflection make clear what in written speech is ambiguous. Still in most instances
in the N. T. the point is plain.3 The cases here dealt with are those that occur without

---

2 Cf. W.-Th., p. 133, for long list of exx.
3 Ib., pp. 135 ff.; W.-Sch., p. 179 f.; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 159 f.
other defining phrases. In Eph. 6:5 some MSS. read τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα. So in Lu. 16:10 we find both ὁ ἐὰν ἔλαχιστῶς δόκος and ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἔλαχιστῳ. I see no point in Blass' [Page 783] remark1 that “the closely connected predicative clause could not be severed by the insertion of the article.” The article could easily have been repeated or the same order preserved in both clauses. It is much simpler and truer to say that the need of another article was not felt. The same remark applies to τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι (1 Tim. 6:17), τῶν ἁπειθούντων ἐν τῇ ἱουδαίᾳ (Ro. 15:31), τῶν Ἰσραήλ κατὰ σάρκα (1 Cor. 10:18), τῶ δήν ἐν σαρκί (Eph. 2:11), τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν (2:15), ὁ δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ (4:1), οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ (1 Th. 4:16), τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς (2 Cor. 9:13), τῶν δοκίμων ἐν Χριστῷ (Ro. 16:10), οἱ κοιμήθηκες ἐν Χριστῷ (1 Cor. 15:18). Cf. Ph. 1:1. In Col. 1:4, τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ, and Ph. 4:19, τὸ πλοῦτος αὐτοῦ ἐν δόξῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, more than one adjunct occurs outside the article. Cf. Eph. 3:4, 13. Blass2 considers this idiom peculiar to the N. T., but pertinent examples are cited3 from Herodotus V, 108, ἡ ἁγγελία περὶ τῶν Σαρδίων, Thucydides, II, 52. 1, etc. The vernacular character of the N. T. diction renders it more frequent. It is not common in classic Greek.4

5. When Several Adjuncts Occur. “It often becomes inconvenient and clumsy to insert all of these between the article and the substantive.”5 Even so, but at bottom the matter does not differ in principle from the examples above. We have seen the same freedom with a second attributive adjective (cf. Mt. 24:45). See a good example of two adjuncts in Eph. 1:15, τὴν καθ’ ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ. The first attribute may be adjective, genitive, adverb or adjunct. So τὸ καθ’ ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν (Col. 2:14), τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (Ph. 1:26), τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει (3:9), τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποτέ ἐν τῷ ἱουδαϊσμῷ (Gal. 1:13). Cf. Ph. 1:5. The article and the participle readily yield examples like ὁ κατὰ πολὺ ἄναγκενήσας εἰς ἐλπίδα (1 Pet. 1:3), τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως (1:5). But sometimes the several adjuncts (cf. adjectives and genitives) are inserted between the article and the substantive. So τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς (2 Pet. 1:4). Cf. Ac. 21:28. For similar position of several genitives and adjuncts see 2 Pet. 2:7; Lu. 1:70. In particular note Ro. 16:17 for the various phrases between τοὺς and ποιοῦντας. Note the many adjuncts in Ro. 3:25 f. See further VI, (a), 6.

[Page 784] 6. Phrases of Verbal Origin. Phrases that are consciously verbal in origin readily do without the repeated article.1 So in Ro. 6:3 we have εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἔβαπτισθήμεν and in the next verse we read συνετάρημεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον. It is plain, therefore, that here εἰς τὸν θάνατον is to be construed with βαπτίσματος, not with συνετάρημεν. In other examples the verbal construction appears in other contexts. It is, however, possible that the usage with the verb renders the anarthrous construction more frequent. So Ph. 1:26, τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, may be compared with παρέιναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς (Gal. 4:20).

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 160.
2 Ib., p. 159.
3 W.-Sch., p. 180.
4 The three regular positions are common. Cf. Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 286.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 160.
1 W.-Th., p. 136; W.-Sch., p. 180.
Cf. also παθήματα ὑπέρ (Col. 1:24) with πάσχειν ὑπέρ (1 Pet. 2:21), θλίψεων ὑπέρ (Eph. 3:13) with θλιβόμεθα ὑπέρ (2 Cor. 1:6). The classic idiom shows similar examples.

7. Exegetical Questions. Sometimes it is quite important for doctrinal reasons to be careful to note whether the adjunct is attributive or predicate. Thus in Ro. 8:3, κατέκρινε τὴν ἄμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, if ἐν τῇ σαρκί is attributive with ἄμαρτίαν, there is a definite assertion of sin in the flesh of Jesus. But if the phrase is predicate and is to be construed with κατέκρινε, no such statement is made. Here the grammarian is helpless to decide the point. The interpreter must step in and appeal to the context or other passages for light. One conversant with Paul’s theology will feel sure that ἐν σαρκί is here meant to be taken as predicate. The same ambiguity arises in verse 2, ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἡλθενθερώσεν σε ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἄμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. Here it is reasonably clear that ἐν Χριστῷ is predicate with ἡλθενθερώσεν. So in Ro. 3:25 probably ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ αἵματι, as well as εἰς ἐνδείξιν is predicate with προϊοθετο. Another example from Romans is found in 5:8, where εἰς ἡμᾶς belongs to συνίστησιν, not ἀγάπην. So in Jo. 15:11 ἐν ὑμῖν is construed with Ἰ, not ἢ ἀμ. For further illustration see Ac. 22:18; 1 Cor. 2:7; 9:18; Eph. 2:7; 3:12; 5:26; Ph. 1:14; 3:9; Col. 1:9; Phil. 20; Heb. 13:20.

8. Anarthrous Attributives. Examples occur also of attributives when the article is absent from both substantive and adjunct. Thus ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετής (Jo. 9:1), ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθόρστῳ (Mk. 1:23), χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι θυώρ (Ro. 14:17), ἐτὶ καθ ὑπερβολὴν ὀδὸν (1 Cor. 12:31), etc. Note in particular 2 Cor. 11:23, 27. The older Greek furnishes illustration of this idiom.

[Page 785] (d) SEVERAL ATTRIBUTIVES WITH ΚΑΙ.

1. Several Epithets Applied to the Same Person or Thing. See already under VI, (a), 4. Usually only one article is then used. For classic examples see Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 330. So, for instance, ὁ ταλαίπωρος καὶ ἡ λείπον καὶ τύφλος καὶ τυφλὸς καὶ γυμνός (Rev. 3:17). This is the normal idiom in accord with ancient usage. So Mk. 6:3 ὁ νεῦτς τῆς Μαρίας καὶ ἀδέλφος Ἰακώβου, Lu. 6:49 ὁ δὲ ἄκωσε καὶ μὴ ποιήσας, Ac. 3:14 τὸν ἄγιον καὶ δίκαιον, Jas. 3:9 τὸν κύριον καὶ πατέρα, 2 Pet. 2:20 (3:2) τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος, 1 Tim. 4:3 τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἑπεξεργασθάτοις. Cf. also Gal. 1:7; Eph. 6:21; 1 Tim. 6:15; Heb. 3:1; Rev. 1:9 (both ὁ and τῇ). When a second article does occur, it accents sharply a different aspect of the person or phase of the subject. So in Rev. 1:17 ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἐσχάτος, καὶ ὁ ζῶν, one article would have been sufficient, but would have obscured the separate affirmations here made. Cf. also τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὄ in 1:8; 21:6. In Jo. 21:24 W. H. read ὁ μαρτύρων περὶ τούτων καὶ ὁ γράψας ταύτα, but they bracket καὶ ὁ. The second article is very doubtful. A similar superfluity of the second article appears in the second Ἰ (brackets W. H.) in Ac. 17:19, and in the second τοῦ in 1 Pet. 4:14, τοῦ τῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύμα (due probably to the second genitive to emphasize each). So Jo. 1:40. See pp. 762, 782. Outside of special cases like these only one article is found when several epithets are applied to the same person. The presence of a genitive with the group of words does not materially alter

2 W.-Sch., p. 180.
3 Ib. But Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 159) doubts it.
the construction. The genitive may occur with either substantive and apply to both.\(^1\) So ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ ἡμῶν (1 Th. 3:11) and κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος (2 Pet. 1:11). As a matter of fact such genitives (see above) occur either inside or outside of the regimen of the article. Cf. τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἡμῶν (Ph. 4:20), ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (1 Pet. 1:3; 2 Cor. 1:3; Eph. 1:3). The presence of ἡμῶν with κυρίου does not affect the construction any more than the use of κυρίου itself or ἡμῶν above. In Ph. 3:3 one adjunct comes before one participle, the other after the other participle, but only one article occurs. A most important passage is 2 Pet. 1:1, τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Curiously enough Winer\(^2\) endeavours to draw a distinction between this passage, “where there is not even a pronoun with σωτῆρος” and the identical construction in 2 Pet. 1:11, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which he cites\(^3\) as an example of “merely predicates of the same person.” Stranger [Page 786] still, he bases his objection on doctrinal grounds, a matter that does not per se concern the grammarian. The matter is handled in Winer-Schmiedel,\(^1\) where it is frankly admitted that the construction in 2 Pet. 1:1 is the same as that in 1:11 and also in 2:20; 3:2, 18. Schmiedel says also that “grammar demands that one person be meant.” In Ju. 4, τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, the same point holds, but the fact that κύριος is so often anarthrous like a proper name slightly weakens it. The same remark applies also to 2 Th. 1:12, τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and Eph. 5:5, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ (since θεοῦ often occurs without the article). One person may be described in these three examples, but they are not so clear as the type τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος (2 Pet. 1:11, 11). In Tit. 2:13, τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, it is almost certain that one person is again described. Cf. also τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης, where the one article unites closely the two substantives.

Moulton\(^2\) quotes most pertinently papyri examples of vii/A.D., which show that among Greek-speaking Christians “our great God and Saviour” was a current form of speech as well as the Ptolemaic formula, τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ εὐεργέτου καὶ σωτῆρος (G. H. 15, ii/B.C.). He cites also Wendland’s argument\(^3\) that the rival rendering in Titus is as great an “exegetical mistake” as to make two persons in 2 Pet. 1:1. Moulton’s conclusion\(^4\) is clear enough to close the matter: “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.”

---

1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 155.
2 W.-Th., p. 130.
3 Ib., p. 126.
4 P. 158.
2 Prol., p. 84.
Wendland

---

WENDLAND, P., Christentum und Hellenismus (1907).


3 On Σωτήρ in ZNTW, v. 335 f.
4 Prol., p. 84.
2. When to be Distinguished. Then the article is repeated. So Mt. 23:2 ὁ γραμματέας καὶ οἱ Φαρίσαοι, Mk. 2:18 ὁ μαθητὴς Ἰωάνου καὶ οἱ Φαρίσαοι, 6:21 τῶν μεγατάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν χιλιάρχων καὶ τῶν πρῶτων, 11:9 οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες, 11:18 (cf. 14:43) ὁ ἄρχων καὶ οἱ γραμματέας, Mk. 12:13 τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἡρώδιανῶν, Lu. 11:39 τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος, 15:6 τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς γείτονας, 23:4 τοὺς ἄρχων καὶ τοὺς δήλους, Jo. 4:37 ὁ σπείρων καὶ ὁ θερίζων, 1 Cor. 3:8 ὁ φυτεύων καὶ ὁ ποτίζων, Jas. 3:11 τὸ γλυκὸ καὶ τὸ πικρόν, Ac. 26:30 ὁ βασιλεύς καὶ ὁ ἱερέας, Rev. 18:20 ὁ άγιος καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος καὶ οἱ προφῆται. Cf. Rev. 11:4; [Page 787] 13:16; 2 Th. 1:8. The list can be extended almost indefinitely. But these are examples of the same number, gender and case. Nor have I referred to abstract words of quality like the list in Rev. 7:12, or examples like τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας (Lu. 12:11). It is not contended that these groups are all absolutely distinct (cf. τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων), but that they are treated as separate. Even with the scribes and Pharisees they did not quite coincide. Cf. Mt. 21:45; Ac. 11:6. The use of another attributive may sometimes be partly responsible for two articles. So Lu. 8:24 τῷ ἄνεμῳ καὶ τῷ κλώδωνι τοῦ ὄδατος, Mk. 2:18 ὁ μαθητὴς Ἰωάνου καὶ οἱ Φαρίσαοι, 11:15 τὰς τραπέζες τῶν κολλυβίστων καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλοῦντων. Cf. also Lu. 20:20; Ac. 25:15; 1 Cor. 11:27; Rev. 13:10.

3. Groups Treated as One. Sometimes groups more or less distinct are treated as one for the purpose in hand, and hence use only one article. Cf. τὰς φίλας καὶ γείτονας (Lu. 15:9), τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους (14:3), τὰς πλατείας καὶ ὅμοις (14:21), τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων (Mk. 15:1), τῶν Ἑπικουρίων καὶ Στοιχείων (Ac. 17:18), τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδουκαίων (Ac. 23:7), τῶν ἄποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν (Eph. 2:20), τῆς ἀπολογίας καὶ βεβαιώσεως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Ph. 1:7), τοῦ πλάτους καὶ μῆκος καὶ βάθος καὶ ὤψας (Eph. 3:18), τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκκλησίαν (2 Pet. 1:10). Cf. τὴν ἔκκλησιαν καὶ ἐκπίπτει μοι, 1:19 τῆς ὕμνου δεήσεως καὶ ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος, 2:17 τῆς θυσίας καὶ λειτουργίας τῆς πίστεως. Cf. also 1 Th. 2:12; 3:7; Mt. 24:3; Ro. 1:20; Col. 2:8; Eph. 3:5; 2 Cor. 1:6; 1 Pet. 2:25; Ph. 1:25. These are all the simplest and clearest illustrations.

4. Point of View. Obviously, therefore, whether one or more articles are to be used depends on the point of view of the speaker or writer. In geographical terms the matter of freedom is well illustrated. Thus in 1 Th. 1:7 we have ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαίᾳ, while in the very next verse we meet ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ Ἀχαίᾳ as in Ac. 19:21. These two Roman provinces are distinct, but adjacent. Cf. also τῆς Τουρκίας καὶ Σαιμαρίας (Ac. 8:1; cf. 1:8), τῆς Τουρκίας καὶ Γαλλίας καὶ Σαιμαρίας (9:31), where these sections of Palestine are treated together. Cf. Ac. 27:5. In Ac. 15:3 note τὴν τε Φοινίκην καὶ Σαιμαρίαν, the two sections treated together are not even contiguous. In Ac. 15:23, κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιπόλειν [Page 788] καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κυπρίαν, we have a city grouped with two countries (as in Lu. 5:17; Mt. 4:25), while in 15:41

1 Cf. W.-Th., p. 128.
2 W.-Sch., p. 156 ff.
we meet τὴν Συρίαν καὶ τὴν Κυλικίαν (W. H. text). Hence no absolute conclusions can be drawn from the one article in Ac. 16:6, τὴν Φυργίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν (cf. reverse order in 18:23) as to the separateness of the terms “Phrygia” and “Galatic region.” Cf. also Lu. 3:1, τῆς Ιτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας. But the matter is not wholly whimsical. In Ac. 2:9 f. note the τὴν with Μεσσηνίαν, which stands alone, while we have also Πόντον καὶ τὴν Ασίαν, probably because the province of Asia (not Asia Minor as a whole) is meant. Then again we meet τῷ μέρῃ τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρηνήν, because of the details stated. In Ac. 6:9 the use of τῶν twice divides the synagogues into two groups (men from Cilicia and Asia on the one hand, men from Alexandria, Cyrene and Libertines (?) on the other). The matter is simple geography but for Ἀιβερτίνου, and may be after all if we only knew what that term means. See Winer-Schmiedel, p. 158. Cf. also Rev. 14:7, where two words have articles and two do not, and Ac. 15:20, where three words in the list have articles and one, πινκτοῦ, does not. So in Ac. 13:50 we have τὸν Παῦλον καὶ, while in 15:2 we find τῷ Π. καὶ τῷ Β. Then (cf. 4) in Mt. 17:1 observe the one article with Peter, James and John, while in Heb. 11:20 we see εὐλογησαν Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακώβ καὶ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ. The articles here emphasize the distinction between subject and object as in Mt. 1:2–16. Cf. also τῶν ἄσπ. καὶ τῶν πρ. (Ac. 15:4) and οἱ ἄσπ. καὶ οἱ πρ. (15:6) with τῶν ἄσπ. καὶ πρ. τῶν (16:4).

5. Difference in Number. If the words combined differ in number, usually each one has its own article. The reason is that they generally fall into separate classes. So ὁ ἄναγνωσκόνων καὶ οἱ ἄκοινοντες (Rev. 1:3), τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν (Eph. 2:3), τῆς ἀπεβίωσας καὶ τῶς κοσμικῶς ἐπιθυμίας (Tit. 2:12). But one article may also be found, as in τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἐγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις (1 Cor. 4:9). Here, however, the anarthrous words “particularize the τῷ κόσμῳ.” Yet in 1 Jo. 2:16 πᾶν τῷ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ is “particularized” by three words each with the article.

6. Difference in Gender. So, if the gender is different, there is likewise usually the repetition of the article. Cf. Ac. 17:18 τῶν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τῆς ἀνάστασιν, Mt. 22:4 οἱ παρῴιοι μου καὶ τὰ σιστάτα, Lu. 10:21 τοῦ ύπαρνοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, Ac. 13:50 τῶς εὐσχήμονας καὶ τους πρώτους, Ro. 8:2 τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, Col. 4:1 τὸ δίκαιον [Page 789] καὶ τὴν λογίαν, Eph. 2:1 τοὺς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις, Heb. 3:6 τὴν παραφθέναι καὶ τὸ καῦσιμον. Though usual, the repeated article is not necessary. See τὰς ὀδοὺς καὶ φραγμοὺς (Lu. 14:23), τῶν ὀλκοστωμάτων καὶ ὃς ὡσίων (Mk. 12:33), τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας (Col. 2:22).

If indeed the words differ in both gender and number, in that case it is still more customary to have separate articles. Cf., for instance, Lu. 14:26, τὸν πατέρα ἣτοι καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν γυναίκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τὰς ἀδελφὰς. So also Ac. 15:4, 20; 26:30; Col. 2:13; 1 Tim. 5:23; Rev. 2:19. The papyri illustrate the

7. With Disjunctive Particle. If a disjunctive preposition be used, there will naturally be separate articles (even when καὶ is the connective), whatever be true about number and gender. So μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (Mt. 23:35=Lu. 11:51). So when the conjunction ἦ occurs as in τὸν νόμον ἦ τοὺς προφήτας (Mt. 5:17), τῷ πατρὶ ἦ τῇ μητρὶ (15:5), τὸ σκότος ἦ τὸ φῶς (Jo. 3:19), ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἦ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην (Mk. 4:21), τῷ λαῷ ἦ τοῖς ἔθεσι (Ac. 28:17). Blass² makes the point that outside of Ac. 14:5, τῶν ἔθνων τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων, we generally find the repeated article with τε καί. Even here Ἰουδαίων as a proper name does not need the article. Cf. Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων in 14:1, but ὁ τε στρατηγὸς καὶ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς (5:24) with difference in number also.

VII. Position with Predicates. It is not the use of the article with the predicate noun, like οὔτος ἔστιν ὁ κληρονόμος (Mk. 12:7), that is here before us. That point has already been discussed under V, (i). When the article occurs with the substantive, but not with the adjective, the result is the equivalent of a relative clause. Cf. μεγάλῃ φωνῇ (Ac. 14:10) and φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (7:57)=‘with a loud voice,’ with μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ (26:24)=‘with the voice elevated.’ See also ἄνακκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ (2 Cor. 3:18)=‘with unveiled face’ and ἄκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ (1 Cor. 11:5)=‘with the head unveiled.’ Cf. Mk. 3:1, ἐξηραμμένη έξον τὴν χερά. Other examples are πεπωρωμένη τὴν καρδίαν (Mk. 8:17), τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζον (Jo. 5:36), τὴν ἄγαπην ἐκτενῇ (1 Pet. 4:8), τὴν ἀναστορφήν καλῆν (2:12), ἀπαράβατον τὴν ἱεροσολύνην (Heb. 7:24), τὰ ἄλλα πράγματα γεγυμνασμένα (5:14). In all these and similar examples the point is quite different from that of the attributive position of the article. Most of the instances occur with ἐξον. Note the absence of the article with ἀπογραφῇ πρώτῃ (Lu. 2:2) because it is in the predicate. Cf. τοῦτο ἀληθῆς ἄρηκας (Jo. 4:18). The position of οὔτε τῇ καλουμένῃ (Lu. 1:36) may be noted. D in Mk. 7:5 reads κοινίας τοὺς χεριν.¹ Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 292) considers this use of the predicate position “a gnomon of artificial style” outside of the more simple combinations. See

Blass

———, Hermeneutik und Kritik (1892).
———, Philology of the Gospels (1898).
———, Pronunciation of Ancient Greek (translation by Purton in 1890 of 3. Aufl. of Über die Aussprache des Griech. 1888).

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 163.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 315.
also Milden, *The Limitations of the Predicative Position in Greek* (1900, p. 43). It is noticeable in prepositional phrases, as in Xen., *Anab.*, 1, 3, 14, διὰ φιλίας τῆς χώρας.

**VIII. The Absence of the Article.** I do not care to use the term “omission” in connection with the article. That word implies that the article ought to be present. As has been already shown, the article is not the only means of showing that a word is definite. This luxury in language did not become indispensable. The servant never became master. There remained in the classic period many parallel phrases which were intelligible without the article. Indeed, new phrases came into use by analogy without the article. I do not think it is necessary to devote so much space to this phase of the subject as is done in most grammars. Most of the cases have already come up for discussion in one way or another. It is sufficient here to give a résumé of the chief idioms in the N. T. which are without the article and are still definite. Much of the modern difficulty about the absence of the Greek article is due to the effort to interpret it by the standard of the English or German article. So Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 119) speaks of “appellatives, which as expressing definite objects should have the article”! Even Gildersleeve, in discussing the “Absence of the Article” (note the phrase, *Syntax*, p. 259), says that “prepositional phrases and other formulæ may dispense with the article as in the earlier language,” and he adds “but anaphora or contrast may bring back the article at any time and there is no pedantical uniformity.” Admirably said, except “dispense with” and “bring back,” dim ghosts of the old grammar. Moulton cites Jo. 6:68, ῥῆματα ζωῆς αἰώνιου, which should be translated ‘words of eternal life’ (as marg. of R. V.). There are indeed “few of the finer points of Greek which need more constant attention” than the absence of the article. The word may be either definite or indefinite when the article is absent. The context and history of the phrase in question must decide. The translation of the expression into English or German is not determined by the mere absence of the Greek article. If the word is indefinite, as in Jo. 4:27; 6:68, no article, of course, occurs. But the article is absent in a good many definite phrases also. It is about these that a few words further are needed. A brief summary of the various types of anarthrous definite phrases is given.1 A sane treatment of the subject occurs in Winer-Schmiedel.2

1. A brief summary of the various types of anarthrous definite phrases is given.1 A sane treatment of the subject occurs in Winer-Schmiedel.2

**With Proper Names.** Here the article is used or not at the will of the writer. So τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὄν Παῦλος κηρύσσει (Ac. 19:13), but τὸν Παῦλον in verse 15. The reason is apparent in these three examples. Words in apposition with proper names are usually anarthrous. Cf. Mt. 3:6=Mk. 1:5. See further V, (a), 3.

**With Genitives.** We have seen that the substantive may still be definite if anarthrous, though not necessarily so. Cf. ποτήριον κυρίου (1 Cor. 10:21), υἱὲ διαβόλου (Ac. 13:10), etc. In particular, personal pronouns in the
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genitive were not always felt to need the article. Cf. κῆπον ἑωρατοῖ (Lu. 13:19). See further V, (h). The LXX uses this idiom freely (Blass-Debrunner, p. 151). English can show the same construction.

“Eye of newt and toe of frog,
Wool of bat and tongue of dog,
Adder’s fork and blind worm’s sting,
Lizard’s leg and hornet’s wing.”—Macbeth.

(c) PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES. These were also often considered definite enough without the article. So ἐν οἴκῳ (1 Cor. 11:34. Cf. ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ, ‘in the house,’ Jo. 11:20)=‘at home.’ So we say “go to bed,” etc. Moulton4 pertinently cites English “down town,” “on ’change,” “in bed,” “from start to finish.” This idiom is not therefore peculiar to Greek. It is hardly necessary to mention all the N. T. examples, so common is the matter.

Thus with ἄνα observe ἄνα μέρος (1 Cor. 14:27). With ἀπὸ note ἀπὸ ἄγροι (Mk. 15:21), ἀπὸ ἄγρος (Mk. 7:4), ἀπὸ οὐρανοῦ (Lu. 17:29), ἀπὸ οὐρανῶν (Heb. 12:25), ἀπὸ ἄνατολῆς (Rev. 21:13), ἀπὸ ἄνατολῶν (Mt. 2:1), ἀπὸ ἄρχης (1 Jo. 1:1), ἀπὸ καταβολῆς (Mt. 13:35), ἀπὸ μέρους (Ro. 11:25), ἀπὸ νεκρῶν (Lu. 16:30). Cf. Rev. 21:13, ἀπὸ βορρᾶ, ἀπὸ νότου, ἀπὸ δυσμῶν. So ἀχρι καιροῦ (Lu. 4:13).

For διὰ note διὰ νυκτὸς (Ac. 5:19), διὰ μέσου (Lu. 4:30), διὰ μέσον (17:11).[Page 792]

For εἰς see εἰς ἄδην (Ac. 2:27), εἰς οὐρανόν (1 Pet. 3:22), εἰς ἄγρα (Mk. 16:12), εἰς θάλασσαν (Mt. 17:27), εἰς οἶκον (Mk. 3:20), εἰς πρόσωπον (Mk. 12:14), εἰς μέσον (Mk. 14:60), εἰς οἰκίαν (2 Jo. 10), εἰς τέλος (Mt. 10:22).

For ἐν may be noticed ἐν οὐρανῷ (Mt. 6:20), ἐν οὐρανῶν (Heb. 12:23), ἐν ὑψίστοις (Lu. 2:14), ἐν δεξιᾷ (Heb. 1:3), ἐν κόσμῳ (Col. 2:20), ἐν ἄγρῳ (Lu. 15:25), ἐν ἄγρῳ (Lu. 7:32), ἐν οἴκῳ (1 Cor. 14:35), ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ=‘at church’ (1 Cor. 14:19), ἐν προσώπῳ (2 Cor. 5:12), ἐν ἡμέρᾳ (Ro. 13:13), ἐν καιρῷ (Mt. 24:45), ἐν ἄρχῃ (Jo. 1:1), ἐν σάρκι (2 Cor. 10:3), ἐν ἄνθρωπος (Lu. 1:25), ἐν νυκτί (Ac. 18:9).

Examples of ἐξ are ἐκ μέρους (1 Cor. 12:27), ἐκ ψυχῆς (Eph. 6:6), ἐκ νεότητος (Ac. 26:4), ἐξ ἄρχης (Jo. 6:64), ἐκ δεξιῶν (Mt. 27:38), ἐξ ευθύμων (Mt. 25:41), ἐξ ἄριστων (Lu. 23:33), ἐκ μέσου (2 Th. 2:7), ἐκ καρδίας (Ro. 6:17), ἐκ νεκρῶν (Lu. 9:7), ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (Jo. 1:32).

For ἐνος observe ἐνος ἄδου (Mt. 11:23), ἐνος οὐρανοῦ (Mt. 11:23), ἐνος δυσμῶν (Mt. 24:27), ἐνος ἑσπέρας (Ac. 28:23), ἐνος τέλους (1 Cor. 1:8).

---

Examples of ἐπὶ are ἐπὶ ὑῆς (Lu. 2:14), ἐπὶ θύρας (Mt. 24:33), ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (Lu. 5:12).

For κατά see κατὰ ὀφθαλμοὺς (Gal. 3:1), κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον (Ac. 27:12), κατὰ μεσιμβρίαν (Ac. 8:26), κατὰ ἄρχως (Heb. 1:10), κατὰ πρόσωπον (Ac. 25:16), κατὰ μέρος (Heb. 9:5), κατὰ σάρκα (2 Cor. 10:3), κατὰ ἀνθρώπους (1 Pet. 4:6).

For μέχρι observe μέχρι μεσουνικίου (Ac. 20:7), μέχρι τέλους (Heb. 3:6).

For παρά note παρὰ θάλασσαν (Ac. 10:32), παρὰ ποταμὸν (Ac. 16:13).

For πρό see πρὸς καιρὸ (Mt. 8:29).

For πρὸς observe πρός πρόσωπον (1 Cor. 13:12), πρὸς ἑσπέραν (Lu. 24:29).

For ὑπὸ see ὑπὸ ὑπαρνόν (Lu. 17:24).

It will be noted that this usage after all is confined to a rather narrow range of words, some of which, like οὐρανός and γῆ, represent single objects. More of this a little later. Most of these examples have articular parallels. See also V, (f). For classic examples see Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 259 f. The papyri furnish abundant parallels (Völker, Syntax, pp. 15–17) as do the inscriptions (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 92).

(d) WITH BOTH PREPOSITION AND GENITIVE. It is not surprising to find no article with phrases which use both preposition [Page 793] and genitive like εἰς εὐαγγέλιαν θεοῦ (Ro. 1:1), ἐπὶ ὀφθαλμών σου (Lu. 19:42), ἐκ δεξιῶν μου (Mt. 20:23), ἄπι ἄρχης κόσμου (Mt. 24:21), παρὰ καιρῶν ἡλικίας (Heb. 11:11), ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ (Lu. 8:13), ἐπὶ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Mt. 25:34), ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ (Lu. 1:51), etc.

(e) TITLES OF BOOKS OR SECTIONS. These may be without the article, being already specific enough. So Ἐὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκου before the Gospel in many MSS., Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Mk. 1:1), βιβλίος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Mt. 1:1), Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Rev. 1:1). A good example of anarthrous headings may be seen in 1 Pet. 1 f. (cf. Hort, 1 Peter, p. 15), where no article occurs in the whole opening sentence of five lines. The article is used quite idiomatically in 1 Peter.

(f) WORDS IN PAIRS. These often do without the article. Very often, of course, the article is used. Words for day and night (as in English) frequently occur together. Cf. νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας (Mk. 5:5), ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός (Rev. 4:8). They occur singly also without the article, as νυκτός (Jo. 3:2), ἡμέρας (Rev. 21:25), μέσης νυκτός (Mt. 25:6). See also other pairs like ἐν οὐρανῷ ἢ ἐν γῆς (1 Cor. 8:5; cf. 2 Pet. 3:5), πατέρα ἢ μητέρα (Mk. 7:10), ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς (1 Pet. 4:5). Indeed the anarthrous construction is common in contrast with ἢ, ἢ ἢ, μήτε, μήτε, οὐ—ἀλλά (cf. Ro. 6:14).

For long lists of anarthrous words (definite and indefinite together) see Ro. 8:35; 1 Cor. 3:22; 12:13, 28; 2 Cor. 11:25 f.; 1 Pet. 1:2; Heb. 12:18, 23; 1 Tim. 3:16. Cf. also ἄνὴρ ἐκ γυναικός (1 Cor. 11:8). Some of these usages belong to proverbs, formulae and enumerations. See Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 260. The κοινὴ (inscriptions and papyri) shows the idiom (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 94).

(g) Ordinal Numeral. The article is usually absent in expressions of time. The ancient idiom is here followed. The ordinal was often felt to be definite enough alone. This was true of the predicate. Cf. ἀπὸ πρῶτην (Lu. 2:2), ἦν ὡρα τρίτη (Mk. 15:25), ἦν ὡς ἕκτη (Jo. 19:14). Cf. Eph. 6:2; Ac. 2:15. But it was not confined to the predicate by any means, nor even to prepositional phrases like ἀπὸ πρῶτης ἡμέρας (Ac. 20:18), ἢ ὡς τρίτου οὐρανοῦ (2 Cor. 11:2), ἢ ὡς τρίτη ἕκτη (Mk. 15:33), etc. Cf. Ac. 23:23. The same construction occurs also [Page 794] in διελθόντες πρῶτην φυλακὴν δευτέραν (Ac. 12:10). Cf. Mk. 15:33, γενομένης ὥρας ἐκτης. Examples with the article are not wanting. Cf. Mt. 27:64; Lu. 12:38; Ac. 10:40.

(h) In the Predicate. As already shown in V, (i), in the predicate the article is often absent. See V, (i). Cf. θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (Jo. 1:1), ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἔστιν (1 Jo. 4:8), etc. This is the rule unless the terms be convertible or the predicate is singled out as prominent. For the superlative without the article see also 1 Jo. 2:18. Cf. 1 Pet. 1:5, ἐν ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ.

(i) Abstract Words. In English the presence, not the absence, of the article with abstract words needs explanation. Hence the anarthrous lists in Gal. 5:20 f., 22 f., seem to us much more in harmony with our idiom than the lists with the article in Rev. 5:12, 13; 7:12. In German, however, the opposite is often true. The article is often absent in the Greek, where the German would have it. Cf. Ro. 1:29. See IV, (c), for discussion of article with abstract nouns. No vital difference was felt between articular and anarthrous abstract nouns (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 259).

(j) Qualitative Force. This is best brought out in anarthrous nouns. So εἰ ἔξεστιν ἄνδρι γυναῖκα ἀπολύσαι (Mk. 10:2; cf. 1 Cor. 7:10), παραδώσει ἄδελφος ἄδελφον εἰς θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνων—τέκνα ἐπὶ γονέως (13:12), ὡς μονογονοῦς παρὰ πατρός (Jo. 1:14), γονεύσαι ἀπειθεῖς (Ro. 1:30). Cf. also Eph. 5:23, ἀνὴρ ἔστιν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας and αὐτὸς σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος. In αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἄνδραίσιν (verse 24) note the generic article, class and class. See υἱὸς—πατήρ (Heb. 12:7).

(k) Only Object of Kind. These partake of the nature of proper names and often occur without the article. They also often have the article. Some of these anarthrous examples appear in prepositional phrases like ἐξ ἄριστερῶν (Lu. 23:33), ἐκ δεξιῶν

1 Cf. W.-Sch., p. 168; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 149.
2 Thompson, Synt., etc., p. 54; W.-Th., p. 126. See further J. Thompson, Cl. Rev., 1906, p. 304; Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 261.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 150.
2 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 82 f.; W.-Sch., p. 170.
(ib.), etc. These may be passed by (already discussed). The point is best illustrated by such words as γῆ and οὐρανός (2 Pet. 3:5). Cf. English “heaven and earth.” Cf. (f), Words in Pairs. Θάλασσα we find sometimes anarthrous with prepositions (Ac. 7:36; 10:32) and in Lu. 21:25 ἡ δόξα θαλάσσας καὶ σάλου. But it has the article in contrast with γῆ. See also Lu. 21:25 ἐν θαλάσσῃ καὶ σάλῳ καὶ ἀνατροφῇ, Mt. 13:6 ἡ δόξα ἀνατελλόμενης, 1 Cor. 15:41 δόξα ἡ δόξα. So we can say “sun, moon and stars,” etc. Θάνατος should also be noted. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:21; Mt. 16:28; 20:18; Lu. 23:15; Ph. 1:20, etc. It is anarthrous as subject, object, with adjectives and with prepositions. [Page 795] Many of these examples occur with prepositions like Lu. 21:25 above, or with a genitive like ὑπὲρ διαβόλου (Ac. 13:10). Cf. 1 Pet. 5:8. The word θεός, like a proper name, is freely used with and without the article. But it is “beyond comparison the most frequently in the Epistles without the article.” I doubt that. As subject ὁ θεός, but as a predicate, ὁ θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος (Jo. 1:1); as genitive, γνώσεως θεοῦ (Ro. 11:33); with prepositions, ἐν θεῷ (Jo. 3:21); with adjectives, θεὸς εὐλογητός (Ro. 9:5); with participles also, θεῷ ἐξώνυμος καὶ ἀληθινός (1 Th. 1:9); in conjunction with πατέρα (Gal. 1:1). These illustrations can be greatly multiplied. So also πνεῦμα and πνεῦμα ἔγγον may occur with and without the article. Garvie quotes Bartlet on Acts as saying that when πνεῦμα ἔγγον is anarthrous it describes the human condition, not the divine agency. But it may be questioned if this is not a purely artificial rule, as there are evident exceptions to it. The use of πνεῦμα with a genitive like πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (Ro. 8:9) and with a preposition, ἐκ πνεύματος (Jo. 3:5), accounts for some examples. An example like οὕτω ἦν πνεῦμα (Jo. 7:39) merely illustrates the use of πνεῦμα like θεός as substantially a proper name. As for Middleton’s rule that the article is present when the personality of the Holy Spirit is taught, that is illustrated by Jo. 14:26, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἔγγον, where the Holy Spirit is spoken of in distinction from the Father and the Son. Cf. also 15:26. See also τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἔγγον (Lu. 3:22), at the baptism of Jesus. Κύριος, like θεός and πνεῦμα, is often practically a proper name in the N. T. In the Gospels it usually refers to God, like the O. T. Lord, while in the Epistles of Paul in particular it nearly always means the Lord Jesus. It is not merely in a prepositional phrase like the common ἐν κυρίῳ (1 Cor. 7:22), or the genitive like τὸ ἐγγόν κυρίου (1 Cor. 16:10), but especially κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (Ph. 1:2; 2:11, etc.). In the Gospels ὁ Χριστός is usually a verbal adjective=the Anointed One, the Messiah (Mt. 2:4; Jo. 1:41). In Mt. 1:1; Mk. 1:1, we have Χριστός as a proper name and even in the words of Jesus as reported in Mk. 9:41, Χριστού, and in the address of Peter in Ac. 2:38, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. It was a natural growth. In Paul’s Epistles Χριστός is more frequent than ὁ Χριστός. There is even a development in Paul’s use of Ἰησοῦς Χριστός and Χριστός Ἰησοῦς. [Page 796] In his earlier Epistles the former is the rule (cf. 1 Th. 1:1), while in the later Epistles he prefers Χριστός Ἰησοῦς (2 Tim. 1:1). Other examples of this idiom are seen in

3 W.-Th., p. 121.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 148.
2 W.-Th., p. 122.
6 See Rose’s list for Paul’s use of κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, etc., in Middleton’s Doctrine of the Gk. Art., pp. 486 ff. It is based on Textus Rec.
κόσμος, which even in the nominative is anarthrous, ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐστιν (Gal. 6:14). Cf. Ro. 4:13. See also ἐν κόσμῳ (Ro. 5:13) and ὁπότε καταβολής κόσμου (Lu. 11:50), etc. Νόμος is a word that is used with a deal of freedom by Paul. In general when νόμος is anarthrous in Paul it refers to the Mosaic law, as in ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ (Ro. 2:17). So ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς (2:25), etc. It occurs so with prepositions, as ἐν νόμῳ (2:23), and in the genitive, like ἐν νόμῳ κόσμου (Gal. 6:15). Cf. ἐγὼ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον (2:19), ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν (Ro. 6:14). In ἐκείνου νόμου (7:23) νόμος =‘principle,’ and is here indeterminate. In 2:14, ἐθνῆ τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα, the Mosaic law is meant, but not in ἐπιτύχος ἔκλει νόμος. It is at least problematical whether νόμος in 2:13, οἱ ἀκατάστατα νόμου, and οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου (note the article with the other words) means the Mosaic law and so really definite or law as law (the hearers of law, the doers of law).1

IX. The Indefinite Article. The Greek had no indefinite article. It would have been very easy if the absence of the article in Greek always meant that the noun was indefinite, but we have seen that this is not the case. The anarthrous noun may per se be either definite or indefinite. But the Greek made an approach to the modern indefinite article in the use of ἔνας and τις. The later writers show an increasing use of these words as the practical equivalent of the present indefinite article. This matter has already been discussed under these two words (ch. XV). An example of τις is seen in νομικός τις (Lu. 10:25). The tendency was constantly for ἔνας to displace τις, so that “in modern Greek the process is complete,” i.e. ἔνας drives out τις in this sense. The use of ἔνας is seen in the papyri and need not be denied in the N. T.2 As a N. T. example of ἔνας =‘a’ see ἔνας γραμματεύς (Mt. 8:19).3 The indefinite article does not appear with predicates in the modern Greek.4 Unus in the sense of the indefinite article is one of the peculiarities of the Latin Vulgate (Jacquier, Le N. T. dans l’Égl. Chr., Tome II, p. 122).

I. Point of View. For a discussion of the nature of the verb see chapter VIII, Conjugation of the Verb, I and II.

(a) DISTINCTION BETWEEN VOICE AND TRANSITIVENESS. See II, (b), and chapter VIII, VI, for a discussion of this point. The matter might have been well reserved for syntax, but it seemed worth while to set forth at once the fundamental facts about voice. It is here assumed, therefore, that one understands that voice per se does not deal with the question of transitive or intransitive action. That point concerns the verb.

1 For a full and detailed discussion of the whole matter see W.-Sch., pp. 174 ff.
2 Moulton, ProI., p. 96. See Thumb, Handb., p. 41.
4 Cf. for LXX use, C. and S., Sel., p. 25.
5 Thumb., Handb., p. 42.
itself, not the voice. Active and middle verbs may be either transitive or intransitive. Passive verbs may even be transitive, though usually intransitive, in one sense of “transitive.” But Gildersleeve\(^1\) holds that “a transitive verb is a verb that passes over to a passive rather than one that passes over to an object.” That is truer of Latin than of Greek, which, “with a lordliness that reminds one of English,” makes a passive out of any kind of an active. Terminology in syntax is open to dispute at many points, but I see only hopeless confusion here unless voice is kept to its real meaning. In Kühner-Gerth\(^2\) it is held that “the active has a double meaning,” either intransitive or transitive. My point is that the voice *per se* has nothing to do with that question. Some verbs are intransitive, some are transitive, some are used either way. This freedom in the use of verbs increased till in the later Greek verbs that were once intransitive become transitive.\(^3\) Brugmann\(^4\) properly separates the question of transitive and intransitive verbs from that of voice (cf. iterative, intensive, inchoative, desiderative verbs). Some of the intransitive uses of verbs were due to the absence of the reflexive pronoun, as in \(\pi\rho\eta\gamma\varepsilon\)\(^{\text{περι}}\) (Mk. 6:6), \(\delta\pi\nu\rho\iota\varphi\iota\varphi\alpha\nu\alpha\zeta\)\(^{\text{περ}}\) (Ac. 27:43).\(^5\) The modern Greek preserves the same freedom in the use of transitive and intransitive verbs and has peculiarities of its own.\(^1\)

\(b\) MEANING OF VOICE. Voice relates the action to the subject. The use of voice then is to direct attention to the subject, not to the object. That concerns transitive and intransitive verbs. Stahl\(^2\) puts it crisply: “The voice of the verb describes a relation of the verb-idea to the subject.”

\(c\) NAMES OF THE VOICES. Cf. chapter VIII, VI, (b). The names come from Dionysius Thrax (about B.C. 30), but “he has no inkling of a middle sense,”\(^3\) showing that already the middle is disappearing before the passive. The terminology is very poor. Gildersleeve\(^4\) calls the fashion of the Germans “a positively indecent nomenclature,” since they call the voices *genera* \((\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta)\), “based on a fancied resemblance to the genders.” We in English follow the French *voix* (Latin *vox*), found first in this sense in the *Grammatica graeca nova* of J. Weller (A.D. 1635).\(^5\)

\(^1\) Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 279.
2 Bd. I, p. 89.
3 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 357.
4 Griech. Gr., p. 467.
5 Jebb., V. and D.’s Handb., p. 318.
1 Thumb., Handb., p. 112 f.
3 Thompson, Synt., p. 158.
5 Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 233.
(d) HISTORY OF THE VOICES. See chapter VIII, VI, (c), (d), (e). Cf. also Jannaris, *Historical Gr.*, p. 362 f.; Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 152. In the pro-ethnic language there were probably both active and middle. Cf. Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, Bd. II, p. 413. There was no passive as there was none in the Sanskrit, save in the present system. The rise of the passive meaning with the use of middle and active endings was sure to bring confusion and a tendency towards simplification. It was inevitable that the three voices should go back to two. In the actual outcome, the passive, though an interloper, ousted the middle of its forms and of most of its uses. In the modern Greek vernacular, therefore, we find only two voices as to form, for the passive has taken over the meaning of the middle also (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 111 f.). In the beginning there were only active and middle. In the end we find only active and passive.

(e) HELP FROM THE SANSKRIT. The verb development in the Indo-Germanic languages has been more independent than that of nouns. Latin, for instance, has recast its verb-system, and it is quite difficult to compare the Greek and Latin voices. Sanskrit and Greek have preserved the voices best of all. Hence the Sanskrit can throw a good deal of light on the Greek voices.1

(f) DEFECTIVE VERBS. Not all verbs were used in all the voices. Some were used only in one, some in two, some in all three. Then again, some verbs had one voice in one tense, another voice in another tense. This is just like the Sanskrit,2 and just what one would expect from a living language in contrast with an artificial one. Brugmann,3 indeed, divides verbs, as to voices, according to this principle (those with active only, middle only, with both, etc.). In the N. T. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 180) finds the same general use of the voices as in the older Greek, the same difficulty in differentiating the voices, and the same “arbitrariness” in the use of individual verbs.
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But much of this difficulty is due to coming at the matter with preconceived rules. Blass’ treatment of the voices is quite unsatisfactory. Cf. further for this matter, chapter VIII, VI, (d).

II. The Active Voice (διάθεσις ἐνεργετική). The Stoics called the active ὁρθη also.

(a) MEANING OF THE ACTIVE VOICE. In this voice the subject is merely represented as acting or existing, for state (cf. εἰμί) must be included as well as action. It is not certain whether the active or the middle is the older, but the active is far the more common.

(b) EITHER TRANSITIVE OR INTRANSITIVE. There is nothing peculiar in the N. T. about this. Each verb has its own history. One originally transitive may become intransitive and vice versa. Cf. ἂνω which may be intransitive ἄγομεν (Mt. 26:46; cf. the interj. ἂνει, Jas. 4:13) or transitive ἐγαγον αὐτὸν (Lu. 19:35). In ἔραντες (Ac. 27:13, 17) the object is probably understood (τὴν ναῦν). Cf. also αὐξάνω in Mt. 6:28 and 2 Cor. 9:10. Βάλλω is usually transitive, even in Jo. 13:2 (cf. Ac. 22:23), but it is intransitive in Ac. 27:14 (ἔβαλεν, ‘rushed’). Cf. Βλαστάνω in Jas. 5:18 (tr.) and in Mt. 13:26 (intr.). So βρέχω is transitive in Lu. 7:38, but intransitive in Mt. 5:45.

(c) EFFECT OF PREPOSITIONS IN COMPOSITION. These may make the verb transitive or the result may be just the opposite. As examples of transitive compounds from an intransitive simplex take διαβαίνω (Heb. 11:29), but intransitive in Lu. 16:26. So διήρχετο τὴν Ίερειώ (Lu. 19:1), παρέρχοσθε τὴν κρίσιν (11:42). On the other hand, intransitive compounds abound. The compounds of ἐγω (simplex either tr. or intr.) which are often intransitive are ὀπάγω (Mt. 7:13), παράγω (Mt. 9:9), περάγω (Ac. 13:11), προάγω (Lu. 18:39), ὑπάγω (Jo. 3:8), but not ἄναγω. Cf. also παραδίδω in Mk. 4:29. With βάλλω note ἐπιβάλλω in Mk. 4:37 and the peculiar ἐπιβαλλόν in 14:72. Examples of several intransitive compounds of ἐχω occur in the N. T. Thus ἐπέχω (Mk. 14:41), ἐνέχω (Mk. 6:19), ἐπέχω (Lu. 14:7; Ac. 19:22), περιέχω (1 Pet. 2:6), προσέχω (Mt. 7:15), ὑπερέχω (Ph. 4:7). Here the substantive has dropped out in most cases and the verb comes to stand alone (cf. προσέχον νοῦν). Cf. ἄνακτος (Mt. 2:12), ἐκκλίνω (Ro. 16:17) and προσκόπτω (Jo. 11:9). Καταπαύω is transitive in Ac. 14:18, but intransitive in Heb. 4:4, 10. Cf. ἀποφρίττω in Ac. 27:43. Στέρφω shows intransitive compounds with ἄνα– (Ac. 5:22), ἀπο– (Ac. 3:26), ἐπι– (Lu. 2:39).

The modern Greek surpasses even the κοινή in its facility for making all sorts of compound verbs (tr. and intr.) and in particular verbs compounded with nouns, like ἔτεκνοτρόφησεν and ἔξενοδόχησεν (1 Tim. 5:10). Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 112.

(d) DIFFERENT TENSES VARY. Thus where both second and first aorists occur, the second is intransitive and the first transitive. Cf. ἔστη (Lu. 6:8), but ἔστησεν αὐτὸ (Mk. 9:36). This distinction applies to all the compounds of ἔστημι. Acts 27:28 (διαστήσαντες) is no exception, as τὴν ναῦν is to be supplied. Some of the “strong” or primitive perfect actives are intransitive when the present is transitive. Thus ἄνεψα (1 Cor. 16:9) from ἀνοίγω, ἀπόλλω (Mt. 10:6) from ἀπόλλυμι, ἔστάναι (Lu. 13:25) from ἔστημι, πέρποσα [Page 801] (Ro. 2:19) from πέρποσα, σέσηπα (Jas. 5:2) from σήπα. Moulton\(^1\) seems to confuse “transitive” with “active,” and “intransitive” with “middle” in his discussion of these perfects: “We have a number of cases in which the ‘strong’ perfect active attaches itself in meaning to the middle.” The middle is not in itself intransitive, nor is the active in itself transitive. “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.” It is doubtless true that in the primitive –α perfect there was no distinctive middle form. But why seek for a middle sense in the primitive perfect active because it happens in many cases to be intransitive? It does happen that γέγονα (Jo. 1:4) is found with γίνομαι and ἐλήλυθα (Jo. 17:1) from ἔρχομαι, two intransitive middles. It is also true that future middles are the rule with a few verbs which have this primitive, but not always intransitive, perfect. So it is with ἄκηκοα (trans., Ac. 6:11), ἐλήφα (trans., Rev. 11:17), πέρποσα (intr. as the verb itself is, Lu. 13:2), τέτυχα (trans., Heb. 8:6). So with κέκραγεν (Jo. 1:15, intr. like the verb itself), though κεκράξομαι (some MSS. in Lu. 19:40) is future perfect middle. Ὅλα (Jo. 10:4) is transitive, though defective, while ἔστινα (Jas. 1:6), like ἔσωθα (Mk. 10:1), is intransitive. But γέγραφα (Jo. 19:22) is transitive.

(e) THE ACTIVE AS CAUSATIVE. But this usage is not due to the voice, and is, besides, common to all languages.\(^2\) Cf. the Hebrew Hiphil conjugation. Viteau (“Essai sur la Syntaxe des Voix dans le Grec du N. T.,” Revue de Philologie, 1894, p. 2) says that the Greek voices would not be strange to a Jew who was used to the seven conjugations of the Hebrew verb. But the point is not strictly parallel. In one sense this idiom is due to the fact that what one does through another he does himself.\(^3\) Cf. τὸν Ἱλίον αὐτόῦ ἄνατελεῖ (Mt. 5:45), strictly causative. But in Jo. 19:1, Ἐλαβεν ὁ Πιλάτος τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἔμαστίγωσεν, the other kind of causative occurs. So also with περιέτεμεν (Ac. 16:3). There was indeed a remarkable increase in the LXX in the

\(^{1}\) Prol., p. 154.
\(^{3}\) Gildersleeve, Synt. of Cl. Gk., p. 63.

VITEAU, J., Essai sur la syntaxe des voix dans le grec du N. T. (Rev. de Phil., 1894).

———, Étude sur le grec du N. T. I, Le Verbe (1893); II, Le Sujet (1896).
number of verbs used in the causative sense, many of which had been usually intransitive. Cf. βασιλεύω, which occurs 36 times in the causative sense in the LXX (cf. Judg. 9:6). The Hebrew Hiphil is partly responsible for this increase. See further verbs in -σω, like καταδουλόω (Gal. 2:4).

(f) ACTIVE WITH REFLEXIVES. Certainly there is nothing unusual in this construction. Cf. σῶσον σεαυτόν (Mk. 15:30), ἔβαλεν ἑαυτόν (Jo. 21:8), προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς (Lu. 17:3). Cf. Jo. 21:18. Blass indeed says that the “active for middle” occurs. One hesitates to subscribe to that dictum. It is indeed true that the use of the reflexive pronoun with the active brings out much more sharply the reflexive relation than the mere middle. It is not necessary to say that καταδουλῶ (2 Cor. 11:20) is used “for” the middle. It is true that πειράζω in the κοινή supplants the Attic πειράοµαι, but this is not due to a confusion of voice. With ποιῶ the N. T. does show a number of examples of the active where the middle was more common in the Attic, though the N. T. generally has ποιεῖσθαι ἀναβολήν, λόγον, πορείαν, σπουδήν. And the MSS. vary greatly between active and middle of ποιῶ with words like µονή (Jo. 14:23), κοπεῖν (Ac. 8:2), συστροφήν (Rev. 11:7). But this is precisely what we find in the κοινή (inscriptions and papyri). Cf. Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 120. So even ἔβαλεν and ἐπιλανθάνον (Mayser, Gr., p. 386). The same tendency appears in modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 114). Cf. διέρρηξεν τὰ ἱµάτια αὐτοῦ (Mt. 26:65). In these examples Blass has in my judgment read too much into the active voice. But it is certain that in προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς (Lu. 12:1) there is more emphasis on the reflexive idea than in φιλάσσεσθε (12:15). Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 157.

(g) IMPERSONAL ACTIVE. Some impersonal verbs occur in the active. Cf. περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ (1 Pet. 2:6), and ἔβρεξεν (Jas. 5:17).

(h) INFINITIVES. These do not always reflect the force of the voice, especially in the “epexegetic” use, like our English “fair to see,” “good to eat.” Cf. κρίθηναι and λαβεῖν, Mt. 5:40. The infinitive has no voice in Sanskrit. See further under Infinitive (ch. XX, Verbal Nouns).

(i) ACTIVE VERBS AS PASSIVES OF OTHER VERBS. Thus ἀποθνήσκω is more common than the passive of ἀποκτένω (–κτένω), though examples of this passive occur in the N. T. (Rev. 6:11, etc.). W. H. read κακῶς ἔξεστι in Mt. 17:15 rather than κακῶς πάσχει (cf. ποιῶ κακῶς, etc.). So ἔκκατω (Ac. 27:17, 26, 29) occurs as passive of ἐκβάλλω, but note ἐκβάλλεσθαι in Mt. 8:12. Cf. Gildersleeve,
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4 C. and S., Sel., p. 76.
1 Thack., Gr. of the O. T. in Gk., p. 24.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 183.
3 Cf. Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 63.
4 Thompson, Synt., p. 172.
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Gildersleeve, B. L., Editions of Pindar and Justin Martyr.
Syntax, p. 75. In 1 Cor. 11:18 ἄκούω has the classic turn ‘I am told.’ But in 5:1 ἄκούεται the passive itself occurs in the sense ‘It is reported.’ But in all such cases the distinction between the voices is not really lost.

III. The Middle Voice (διάθεσις μέση).

(a) ORIGIN OF THE MIDDLE. See chapter VIII, VI, (c), for the uncertainty as to the priority of active and middle. That question is an open one and must be left open. Both active and middle appear in Sanskrit and in Homer. The prehistoric situation is purely speculative. Logically the active would seem to come first, though the difference in form may be due to variation in sound (ablaut). ¹ Probably at first there was neither active nor middle, the distinction being a development. In the Sanskrit² we meet a full system of both active and middle forms for all the tenses (not all the modes), the participle, however, having only a partial system and the infinitive no voice at all. But each verb has its own development and that was by no means uniform. Some had a very limited use as to voice, tense and mode. In Homer indeed the middle is rather more common than in later Greek.³ It is only in the Sanskrit, Zend (Old Persian), Greek and Gothic that the middle is kept as a distinct voice.⁴ In the Gothic only remnants of the middle are found,⁵ while in Latin the middle as a separate voice disappears.⁶ It is very difficult to run a parallel between the Latin and Greek voices. But there is a considerable remnant of Latin middles like miror, sequor, utor (cf. Draeger, Hist. Syntax, pp. 145 ff.). The final disappearance of the Greek future and aorist middle before the passive is well sketched by Jannaris.⁷ But at first we are not to think of the passive at all, that interloper that finally drove the middle out of use.

———, Latin Grammar. Many editions since 1867.
———, Notes on Stahl’s Syntax of the Greek Verb (1910).
———, Numerous articles in the American Journal of Philology.

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 152.
4 Cf. O. Hoffmann, Das Präsenz der indog. Grundspr., 1889, p. 25. In the Bantu language Mr. Dan Crawford finds 16 voices (reflexive, reciprocal, intensive, etc., all having special forms).
6 Ib., p. 405.
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JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).

———, On the True Meaning of the Koivī (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

(b) MEANING OF THE MIDDLE. It is urged that the term “middle” is good because the voice in meaning stands between the active and the passive. But, unfortunately for that idea, the middle is older than the passive. It is true that the passive arose out of the middle and that the middle marks a step towards [Page 804] the passive. The passive idea existed before there was a separate passive form, a thing never true of all tenses and all verbs. The Hebrew Hithpael conjugation is somewhat parallel, but not wholly so. The only difference between the active and middle voices is that the middle calls especial attention to the subject. In the active voice the subject is merely acting; in the middle the subject is acting in relation to himself somehow. What this precise relation is the middle voice does not say. That must come out of the context or from the significance of the verb itself. Gildersleeve is clearly right in holding that the interpretation of the difference between active and middle is in many cases more lexical than grammatical. “The middle adds a subjective element.” Sometimes the variation from the active is too minute for translation into English. This “word for one’s self” is often very difficult of translation, and we must not fall into the error of explaining the force of the middle by the English translation.


(d) THE USE OF THE MIDDLE NOT OBLIGATORY. This remark may sound like a truism, but it is justified when one can read this: “As the active is used in place of the middle, so the middle [Page 805] often stands for the active which would naturally be expected.” Winer also speaks of the two voices being used “interchangeably.” But

8 Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 57.
5 Gildersleeve, Synt. of Class. Gk., p. 66.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 185.
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Winer, G. B., De verborum cum praep. composit. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).

Winer loses one of his examples, for W. H. have συγκαλεῖ in Lu. 15:9, as in verse 6. Winer correctly says that “it depended on the writer” which he would use. Of course, but that is not to say that no distinction existed. In Jas. 4:2 f., αἰτήτετε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτήσθε, the middle seems rather on purpose (‘ye ask for yourselves amiss,’ Farrar, Gk. Syntax, p. 118). Blass calls this “an arbitrary interchange,” though he admits in general the N. T. use of αἰτέω for ordinary requests (as from God), but αἰτέομαι in business transactions (its usual use in the N. T., Mt. 27:20; Lu. 23:23). This may be the very point in Jas. 4:2 f. and 1 Jo. 5:14. Moulton agrees with Mayor (James in loco) on the correctness of the distinction. Mayor (in loco) says: “When αἰτέτει is thus opposed to αἰτήσθε, it implies using the words, without the spirit of prayer.” See the same distinction drawn in Mk. 6:22–25; 10:35, 38 (Mt. 20:20, 22); 1 Jo. 5:15. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 186 note) observes that Herod’s offer to Salome gave her business relations to him justifying her use of the middle (Mk. 6:24 f.). When the active and the middle occur side by side the attention is drawn to the distinction. It is to be recalled again that the same verb varied in different stages of the language in the voice used. Hence it is hardly pertinent to bring

---

2 W.-Th., p. 256.
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4 Prol., p. 160.
an indictment against the N. T. writers, because the middle is not used with all verbs just as it was in the Attic Greek. As a matter of fact, Homer differs from the Attic. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 186) succinctly says that "the New Testament writers were perfectly capable of preserving the distinction between the active and the middle." So in Mk. 14:47 note σπασάµενος τὴν μάχαραν, while in Mt. 26:51 we have ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχαραν αὐτοῦ. In Matthew we have the pronoun αὐτοῦ and ὁπό superlating the middle in Mark (cf. Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 120 f.). Radermacher (op. cit., p. 119), however, as a result of his researches, finds in the κοινή "Unsicherheit im Gebrauch des Mediums." The point of the middle is not the same always. So in Ac. 7:24 ἐµόνεσθαι="assist," not 'ward off from one’s self,’ but the force of the middle is present. So in Col. 2:15, ἀπεκδεσάµενος τὰς ἀρχὰς, it is not ‘undress,’ but ‘throw off from one’s self.’ Cf. also πληροῦσθαι in Eph. 1:23 and πληροῦν in 4:10. Moulton shows that there is as much freedom in the papyri in the use of active and middle as in the N. T. Thus ἔδω αἱρῆτε and ἔδω αἱρῆθε (G. H. 36, b.c. 95) occur side by side. So γαμεῖσθαι=nubere fell out of use. See also II, (f).

(e) Either Transitive or Intransitive. Thus ἔδω μὴ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας (Mk. 7:3) and ἤγαν ναοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν (6:56), but ἔξεισταντο (6:52) and ἐπεξορέυοντο (6:56) are intransitive. The middle is not, therefore, intransitive in itself. That is a matter that belongs to the verb-stem. As to the future middles, like βήσομαι, see discussion a little later. Some verbs, indeed, are transitive in the active, but intransitive in the middle (ἀπόλλυμι, ἄπολλυμι, φαίνω, φαίνομαι). Cf. Hatzidakis, Einl., pp. 201 ff.; Thompson, Syntax, p. 161.

(f) Direct Middle. It is necessary to discuss the various uses of the middle, but the divisions made by the grammarians are more or less arbitrary and unsatisfactory. They are followed here merely for convenience. The middle voice is very broad in its scope and no one word, not even reflexive, covers all the ground. It is essentially the voice of personal interest somewhat like the dative case. Grosse (Beiträge zur Syntax des griechischen Mediums und Passivums, 1891, p. 4) denies that the reflexive is the original use of the middle. But Rutherford (First Gk. Syntax, 1890, p. 74), derives both passive and middle out of the reflexive use. For the various uses of the middle in Homer, who is specially fond of this voice, see Monro, Homeric Gr., p. 7. But, curiously, Monro mentions “the Intransitive use” as one of the separate idioms of the

1 Prol., p. 158 f. He cites also συνὶραι λόγον, B.U. 775 (ii/A.D.). But the pap. use the middle also.
Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
Rutherford
RUTHERFORD, W. G., A Chapter in the History of Annotation (1905).
———, The New Phrynichus (1881).

middle. Nearly every grammarian\(^2\) has his own division of these “uses” of the middle, none of which the Greeks themselves had. Gildersleeve\(^3\) is justly impatient with this overrefinement and observes that “one must needs fall back on the way of the language,” which “is capricious in such matters.” It is needless to take up philosophical abstractions like “subjective” and “objective.” It is not possible to tell whether the direct middle (reflexive middle) was the original use of the voice or not. The direct middle is comparatively rare in Homer and in the early Greek generally.\(^4\) It began in the κοινή to disappear, before the active and the reflexive pronoun (cf. N. T.), but the direct middle [Page 807] revived again as the indirect middle disappeared before the passive because of “its subtle meaning.”\(^1\) Hence in Neo-Hellenic “almost every transitive verb, if active, admits of a direct middle.”\(^2\) In modern Greek this direct reflexive is nearly the sole use of the middle.\(^3\) The modern Greek has no distinction in forms between middle and passive, but the middle signification survives. Thus λούζομαι means ‘I bathe myself’ (Thumb, *Handb.*, pp. 111, 114). Thumb finds the direct reflexive use common. Moulton\(^4\) practically confines this idiom in the N. T. to ἀπήγγειλα (Mt. 27:5), ‘he hanged himself,’ and even here Moulton suggests ‘choked’ as a truer English translation. This is indeed “a survival from classical Greek,” but there seem to be other N. T. examples also. The example cited by Winer\(^5\) from Jo. 8:59 (cf. also 12:36), ἐκρύβη, is passive, as Moulton\(^6\) points out. But in ὑς λουσαμένη (2 Pet.2:22) the direct middle is evident, as Moulton admits in the *Appendix* (p. 238). Cf. λούσασθε (Is. 1:16), ‘wash you.’ Note also ἀπελούσασθε, ‘washed yourselves’ (1 Cor. 6:11, correct translation in margin of Rev. 
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\(^3\) Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 278.
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5 W.-Th., p. 253.

6 Prol., p. 156.
A good example also is θερµαινόµενος (Mk. 14:54), ‘warming himself’ (Rev. V.). It is rather gratuitous to doubt the direct middle παρασκευάζεται, ‘prepare himself’ (1 Cor. 14:8). But Moulton adds µὴ σκόµλου (Lu. 7:6) to Winer’s list and illustrates by “the illiterate contemporary papyrus O.P. 295, µὴ σκόµλλε έστήν” (active and reflexive pronoun). So also ὁ θερµαινόµενος (W. H., Mk. 7:4) and βαπτίσουσαι (marg.) are both direct middles. Ζώσαι (Ac. 12:8), ‘gird yourself,’ is also direct middle. Δοµατίζεσθε (Col. 2:20) is probably direct middle, ‘subject yourselves to ordinances.’ And ὑποτάσσεσθε (Col. 3:18) may be also. Ἀπτοµαί (‘fasten myself to,’ ‘touch’) is really the direct middle (Mk. 8:22). Ἐπεκτείνοµενος (Ph. 3:13) is ‘stretching myself forward.’ Cf. also ὑπεστελάµην (Ac. 20:27), ‘withdraw myself’; ἄντιστασόµενος (Ro. 13:2), ‘line one’s self up against.’ In the case of περιβάλλοµαι it is probable that we have the direct middle ‘clothe one’s self’ (Mt. 6:29). The accusative of the thing is added in Rev. 3:18. It is possible to regard ἄναπαύεσθε (Mt. 26:45) as direct middle. Ἀπογράψασθαι (Lu. 2:5) may be merely the direct middle, ‘enrol himself,’ though the causative idea is possible. In Lu. 12:15 φυλάσσεσθε (‘guard yourselves from’) follows the classic idiom. Ἀνεχόµενοι ἄλληλοι (Eph. 4:2) is also the direct middle, ‘holding yourselves back from one another.’ The same thing is true of ἁπεχθαζειν ἔδοξόθτον (Ac. 15:29). In 1 Pet. 5:5 Τας εν φρονησιν ἐγκοµιόµοσας, ‘gird yourselves with humility,’ we may have the same idiom. In Ac. 18:5, συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ, we may have the direct middle, ‘held himself to the word.’ There are to be added, besides, some of the causative middles, like βάπτισαι (Ac. 22:16), ‘get yourself baptized’ (cf. ἐβαπτίσαντο, 1 Cor. 10:2). It is true that the list is not a large one, but the idiom is clearly not obsolete in the N. T. The causative middle has a wider use also, as will be shown directly.

(g) CAUSATIVE OR PERMISSIVE MIDDLE. Cf. the German sich lassen. This occasional use of the middle does not distinguish it from the active and occurs both with the direct and the indirect use of the middle.1 It is just so in modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 114 f.). It is, like transitive and intransitive, more the notion of the word than a phase of the middle voice.2 In later Greek the causative sense occurs only with the direct middle.3 It is not to be forgotten that originally there was no passive form at all. The verb-idea and the context then alone decided the voice as between middle and passive. Even in the aorist and future, where the passive later has a distinct form, the line was not always sharply drawn, especially in the future. More about this a little later. But in the aorist in particular one hesitates to find a passive voice in the middle form, though it sometimes happens. Some few of these causative middles could be explained as passives, but by no means all. Certainly ἔκλεξαµένους (Ac. 15:22) is a true middle. A considerable residuum remains. “In Tb.P. 35 (ii/B.C.) ἠµανοί αὐτός τεταµήτηκα, ‘will get himself accused,’ is a middle.”4 In Ac. 22:16, βέβασται καὶ ἀπόλογεσάµεν τὰς ἡµαρίτις σου, we have the causative middle, one a direct, the other an indirect, middle, ‘get yourself baptized and get your sins washed away.’ So then ἐβαπτίσαντο (W. H. text in 1 Cor. 10:2) is causative, though many MSS. read ἐβαπτίσθησαν. Blass5 has eccentric notions of textual criticism, for he rejects the

1 Gildersleeve, Synt. of Class. Gr., p. 67.
2 Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 162.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 162.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 187.
middle here and contends for it in Lu. 11:38 on the authority of one minuscule! Blass also argues that the sense of ‘let’ or ‘allow’ belongs to the passive rather than to the middle, but this is by no means certain. Thus ἀδικεσθε and ἀποστερέσθε (1 Cor. 6:7) may be middles (cf. actives in next verse), ‘let yourselves be wronged and robbed.’

[Page 809] This permissive sense of the middle is closely allied to the causative and approaches the passive.1 In Lu. 2:5 ἀπογράψαται may be (see (f) above) causative, ‘have himself enrolled,’ though ἄποστασθηκαί (2:1) is passive. In Mt. 5:42 ἀπειρωσθαι is ‘to have money lent’ (‘to borrow’). Mισθώσασθαι (Mt. 20:1) is ‘to let out for wages’ (‘to hire’). In 1 Cor. 11:6, κειράσθαι, κείρασθαι ἡ ξύρασθαι (or ξόρασθαι), we find the permissive middle. Cf. ξυρήσονται τὴν κεφαλὴν (Ac. 21:24).

But ἀποκόψονται (Gal. 5:12) is causative, ‘have themselves castrated’ (cf. Deut. 23:1). So ἀπελούσασθε, according to text of Rev. V. (1 Cor. 6:11). In Rev. 3:5 περιβαλεῖται comes rather close to the passive sense. See (f) above. In Lu. 14:18, 19, ἔχεμεντα τὴν ἐνον, we have a construction more like modern English. The causative idea in ἄνακεφαλώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (Eph. 1:10) is not due to the voice, but to the verb itself (–όω).

(h) INDIRECT MIDDLE. In the flourishing period of the language this was by far the most frequent use, but it finally faded before the active and the intensive (reflexive) pronoun or the passive.2 In 1 Cor. 15:28, ὑποταγήσεται, the passive may bear the middle force (Findlay, Expos. Gr. T., in loco). But in general the indirect middle is abundant and free in the N. T. In the modern Greek Thumb gives no instances of the indirect middle. The precise shade of the resultant meaning varies very greatly. The subject is represented as doing something for, to or by himself. Often the mere pronoun is sufficient translation. Each word and its context must determine the result. Thus in Heb. 9:12, οἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν ἑράμενος, Jesus is represented as having found eternal redemption by himself. He found the way. In Mt. 16:22, προσλαβόμενος αὐτόν, ‘Peter takes Jesus to himself.’ In Mk. 9:8, περιβλεψάμενοι, ‘the disciples themselves suddenly looking round.’ In Lu. 8:27, οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον, ‘did not put a garment on himself.’ In 8:52, ἐκόπτοντα αὐτήν, the word has really changed meaning, ‘they beat themselves for grief as to her’ (‘bewailed her’), actually a direct middle. “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.”3 That is precisely the case. So προσκαλεσάμενος (Mt. 10:1) represents Jesus as calling the disciples to himself. Cf. ἐκκαλοῦμαι (Ac. 10:23). So προσλαμβάνετε (Ro. 15:7; cf. also προσελάβετο) is ‘take to yourselves.’ Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι (Ac. 25:11) is ‘I call upon Cæsar in my behalf.’ Αἰρήσομαι [Page 810] (Ph. 1:22) is ‘I take for myself’ (‘choose’), while κτήσατε (Mt. 10:9), though only in the middle, means ‘provide for yourselves’ (‘procure’). In σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν (Mk. 14:47), the possessive is probably sufficient, ‘drawing his own sword’ (cf. ἀπέσπασεν—αὐτὸν in Mt. 26:51). Ἐκτιναζάμενος τὰ ἰμάτια (Ac. 18:6) is rather ‘shaking out his clothes from himself,’ while ἄπενενεμάκατο τὰς χεῖρας (Mt. 27:24) is probably ‘he himself washed his hands.’ In ἀποθέουσθαι αὐτὸν (Ac. 13:46; cf. Ro. 11:1) the idea is ‘ye push it away from yourselves’ (‘reject’). Ἀπέδοοσθε (Ac. 5:8) is ‘ye gave away for your own interest’

6 Ib., p. 185.
1 Thompson, Synt., p. 162.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 157.
‘sold’). Ἐνοσφόσετο (Ac. 5:2) means ‘kept back for himself.’ In ἐπιδεικνύει μενατίνας (Ac. 9:39) the women were ‘showing garments belonging to themselves.’ Note the fulness of meaning in περιποιήσατο (Ac. 20:28). Cf. παρατηρέσθε (Gal. 4:10), ἀπετάσμην (2 Cor. 4:2), ἐκτρέπομαι (1 Tim. 6:20). In διεξόσατο (Jo. 21:7) we have ‘he girded round himself.’ Παρατήσθησθε (Heb. 12:25) is ‘beg off from yourselves’ (’reject’). In Col. 4:5, τὸν καυρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι, we have ‘buying the opportunity for yourselves out of the open market.’ Ἀποθέμενοι (Heb. 12:1) is ‘laying aside from yourselves every weight.’ In ἐξελέξατο (Lu. 10:42) we have ‘she selected for herself’ (’chose’). Ἐνεδόθηκεν (Lu. 16:19) is ‘he put clothes on himself,’ though this may be direct middle with accusative of thing added. Κατοπτρίζομεν (2 Cor. 3:18) is probably ‘beholding for ourselves in a mirror.’ In Ro. 3:25, ὁν προέθετο ὁ θεός, note that it was God’s own Son whom he set forth. This free indirect reflexive use came to be the typical middle in the flourishing period of the Greek language. No fixed rule can be laid down for the translation of this or any other use of the middle. Even “deponents” like χράομαι may be indirect middles. This word from χρή (‘necessity’) means ‘I make for myself what is necessary with something’ (Moulton, Prol., p. 158). An interesting group of middles occurs in Ac. 24:22–25, ἀνεβάλετο, διαγνόσμαι, διατελεύσμενος, παραγενόμενος, μετεπέμπα, διαλεγόμενον, πορεύομαι, μετακαλέσμαι. These are not all “indirect” middles, as is obvious. Cf. also ἐξβαλλόμενοι (Ac. 27:38) and προσελάβετο (Ro. 14:3). It is interesting to note the difference between παρέδεχε in Ac. 16:16 (the damsel who furnished gain for her masters) and παρείχε in Ac. 19:24 (Demetrius who furnished gain for his craftsmen and himself). So πείθοι to ‘exercise suasion,’ and πείθομαι to ‘admit suasion to one’s self’ (Moulton, Prol., p. 158).

(i) Reciprocal Middle. Since ἐαυτὸν was used in the reciprocal sense, it was natural for the middle to fall in with this idiom. [Page 811] Thus συνεβουλεύσατο (Mt. 26:4), ‘they counselled with one another,’ does not differ radically from ἐξελέξατο (Lu. 14:7), ‘they selected the first seats for themselves.’1 So also ἐξουσίσατο (Jo. 12:10), συνετέθειν (9:22), συναναγινυθα (1 Cor. 5:9), κρίνεσθαι (6:1), ἐμάχοντο (Jo. 6:52), διαλεγόμενος (Ac. 19:8. In Mk. 9:34, πρὸς ἀλλήλους διελέχθησαν, we have passive deponent with reciprocal pronoun).2 The reciprocal middle survives in modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 114). For classic examples see Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 66.

(j) Redundant Middle. Here the pronoun and the middle both occur. This idiom is found as early as Homer and indicates a dimness in the force of the middle on the part of the speaker. “The effect is artificial” according to Thompson.3 Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 68) sees in this idiom the effort to bring out more clearly the reflexive force of the middle. Moulton (Prol., p. 162) cites from the papyri ἐν ουτὸν αὑτὰστα, ἰβ. 35 (ii/b.c.). This redundance probably began very naturally. Thus in Ac. 7:58, ἀπέθεντο τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτῶν, the personal pronoun is added, not the reflexive. So in ὑπόδησι τὸ σανδάλια σου and περιβαλόμενο τὸ ἱματίων σου (12:8) and ἐλεωσάτο τὴν κεφαλήν (Mt. 6:17). Cf. νίπτοντες τῶν χειράς (Mt. 15:2) without the pronoun. So in Lu. 14:1, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤσαν παρατηροῦμενοι, the αὐτοὶ wavers between mere personal

---

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 157.
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and intensive. Cf. the active in Eph. 5:27, παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ. But in Jo. 19:24 the LXX quotation is given as διεμερίσαστοι—ἐβιόν, while in Mt. 27:35 it is merely διεμερίσαστος. Note also σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος (Tit. 2:7) and ποιοῦμαι—ἐμαυτῷ (Ac. 20:24). See also ἄνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἐαυτῷ (Ac. 7:21) and 1 Tim. 3:13 ἐαυτοῖς περιτουοῦντα. Most of the examples, however, in the N. T. occur with verbs which are not found in the active. Cf. Lu. 9:23 ἀρνησάτω ἐαυτὸν, Ac. 24:10 τὰ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ ἅπολογοῦμαι, 26:2 ἢημαι ἐμαυτόν, Ph. 3:12 ἐμαυτόν οὕτω λογίζομαι.

(k) DYNAMIC (DEPONENT) MIDDLE. “I would fain call the drip-pan middle, the πανδέκτης middle, the middle that is put at the bottom to catch the drippings of the other uses.” And this is the most difficult use of the middle to explain. Some writers distinguish between the dynamic and the deponent. Others, like Thompson, make the dynamic include the deponent. The name “deponent” is very unsatisfactory. It is used to mean the laying aside of the active form in the case of verbs that have no active voice. But these verbs in most cases never had an active voice. Moulton is clearly right in his contention that the term in reality applies as well to active verbs that have no middle as to middle verbs that have no active. The term is usually applied to both middles and passives that have no active (Clyde, *Gk. Syntax*, p. 61). Others use the term for middle verbs that have no longer a reflexive idea. But “deponent” is a very poor definition. Nor is the word “dynamic” much better. Winer’s remark is not very lucid: “From Middle verbs are to be carefully distinguished Deponents.” They are indeed either transitive or intransitive, but some are in the middle voice, others passive. But the point about all the “dynamic” middles is that it is hard to see the distinctive force of the voice. The question is raised whether these verbs have lost the middle idea or never had it. “Like the rest of us, Stahl has to go into bankruptcy,” Gildersleeve remarks on Stahl’s attempt to explain this use of the middle. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 158) thinks that in these verbs “it is useless to exercise our ingenuity in interpreting the middle, for the development never progressed beyond the rudimentary stage.” But these verbs persist in the modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 113). It is possible that the Greeks were more sensitive to the exact force of this middle than we are, just as they used the intensive particles so freely. Where guessing is all that we can do, is it not clear that these “dynamic” middles represent the original verb before the distinction was drawn between active and middle? The French says *je m’aperçois*, ‘I perceive.’ The intensive force of this middle is partially seen in verbs of mental action which are so common in Greek, like ἀνεθρέψατο (Lu. 9:45), ἀρνέομαι (Lu. 12:9), προστάσιον (Ro. 3:9), ἀποθέσαμαι (Ac. 25:13), διαβεβαιοῦμαι (Tit. 3:8), καταλαμβάνω (Ac. 4:13, but note καταλαμβάνω in the same sense in Ph. 3:12), ἐντέλλουμαι (Heb. 11:22), ἐπιλανθάνομαι (Mt. 16:5), εὐχόμαι (Ro. 9:3), ἤγερομαι (Ph. 3:8), λογίζομαι (Ph. 4:8), μαίνομαι (Ac. 26:25), μέμφομαι (Ro. 9:19).

1 Prol., p. 153.
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2 Thompson, Synt., p. 161.
3 W.-Th., p. 258.
4 Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 278.
φείδομαι (Ro. 8:32). I imagine that the personal interest of the subject is not so difficult to recognise in such verbs, especially since in a word like καταλαμβάνομαι it is not “deponent,” but occurs also in the active. The papyri vary, as does the N.T. in the use of ποιοῦμαι and ποιῶ with nouns. Thus we have συμβούλλον ποιήσαντες (Mk. 15:1), but μυείων ποιούμενος [Page 813] (Eph. 1:16). There is the utmost freedom in the matter in the N.T. Not all the “deponents” of mental action are middles in the aorist. Cf. βούλομαι, ἐνθυμέομαι, ἐπιμελέομαι, εὐλαβέομαι. These are commonly called passive deponents in the present as well as in the aorist and future, but the matter is not clear by any means. At any rate there are middle verbs which are very hard to explain, like γίνομαι, (Mt. 8:26), ἠλλομαι (Jo. 4:14), ἀφικνέομαι (Ro. 16:19), διωματύρομαι (Ac. 2:40), ἔρχομαι (Jo. 1:39), ἔργαζομαι (Mt. 25:16), καθέζομαι (Mt. 26:55), κάθημαι (Mt. 13:1), συνέπομαι (Ac. 20:4; cf. sequor). Κάμαι is probably passive. It is not hard to see the reflexive idea in δέχομαι (Mt. 10:14). Περιβλέπομαι is always middle in the N. T. (cf. Mk. 3:5), accenting the movement of the eyes or concern expressed in the look. There are also passive deponents that correspond to this list that really do not seem to be passive in idea, like βούλομαι, δόνομαι, φοβέομαι. Some of these verbs have both middle and passive forms, like γίνομαι (᾿έγένετο, ἐγενήθην), δέχομαι (Ξδόξασθε, Ξδέχθην). Not all of these middle “deponents” have middle forms in all tenses. Cf. γέγονα, ἠλθον, ἐλλύθα, ἐλάθον. Then, again, some verbs have the deponent or dynamic middle only in the future, like ὁδυομαι, though Homer is fond of the middle forms of this verb. But the aorist and future middle call for special treatment.

(I) MIDDLE FUTURE, THOUGH ACTIVE PRESENT. Some verbs, active in the other tenses, have the future only in the middle. No real explanation of this phenomenon is known. For a list see chapter VIII, VI, (d). Some of them are really separate verbroots, as ὅραω, ὁδυομαι, ἐπιθύμω, φάγομαι. Others represent a special variation of the future form, like ἠποθανοῦμαι, πεσοῦμαι, πίομαι, but both κοιμοῦμαι and κοιμᾶμαι. Others are regular enough, like ἄκοιμομαι, ἁθαυμάζομαι, τέξομαι, τεξόμαι. In other instances the old classic middle has vanished in the N. T. before the active future, as in ἔμαρτήσω, ἔπαινομαι, ἐρπάσω, γελάσω, κλαύσω, κράζω, παιζό, βάδον, etc. Some verbs, like ἄκοιμοι, ἔκτιμο, ἐλάθον. Then, again, some verbs have the deponent or dynamic middle only in the future, like ὁδυομαι, though Homer is fond of the middle forms of this verb. But the aorist and future middle call for special treatment.
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Dieterich, [Page 814] *Untersuch.*, p. 205; Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 120. Moulton justly takes “the existence of this large class of futures as additional evidence of a close connection between the middle flexion and the stressing of the agent’s interest in the action of the verb.” The use of the middle future (and occasionally aorist) as passive comes under the passive voice, for it is really passive. See under iv.

**(m)** THE MIDDLE RETREATING IN THE N. T. This is happening because of the active (cf. ἄμαρτήσω above) as well as the passive. This is true of the κοινή in general. Different words had different histories in the matter. But we have just seen from the list of “dynamic-deponent” middles plenty of evidence that from the day of Homer on the function of the middle voice was indistinct in many verbs. “The accuracy with which the middle was used would naturally vary with the writer’s Greek culture.” And, it may be added, with the author’s feelings at the moment. The judgment of Simcox is right, that the middle “is one of the refinements in Greek idiom which is perhaps beginning to be blurred in some of the N. T. writers, but is preserved to a greater or less extent in most.” But it is no more “blurred” than in other writers of the κοινή. It is simply that all the distinctions of earlier times did not survive with all the verbs. On the whole, in the N. T., αἴτω is used colloquially and ἀντομαί for the more elevated style, but usage varies with different writers as in the LXX. Cf. Abbott, *Johannine Gr.*, p. 389. So ὄστερέω in Heb. 4:1, but ὄστεροῦμαι in Ro. 3:23. But the change in the N. T. is mainly in the disuse of the middle, not in a new use of it. From Homer to modern Greek plenty of middles are hard to define, and the N. T. is no more erratic than the rest of Greek, not to say of the κοινή (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 159). But the delicate distinctions between the active and the dynamic middle are lost in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 112), if indeed they ever really existed.
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IV. The Passive Voice (διάθεσις παθητική).

(a) ORIGIN OF THE PASSIVE. See chapter VIII, VI, (e), for a discussion of the rise of the passive voice. In Sanskrit the middle [Page 815] was liable to be used in the passive sense. As is well known in Homer, the future passive forms do not occur except two, μιγήσεσθαι and δαήσεαι (Stahl, Syntax, p. 66), and the distinction between aorist middle and aorist passive is indistinct. Indeed, strictly speaking, there was no passive voice as to form in Greek, as there was none in the original Indo-Germanic speech. The passive sense was developed in various languages in different ways. This sense may be due to verbs of state, but Greek fell upon various devices like the active of some verbs (κακῶς ἔχω, πάσχω), the mere use of the middle, the development of two special tenses by the use of active endings (aorist) and middle (future) with a special suffix. In Homer3 ἔβλημην, ἐκτάμην, ἐσχόμην occur as passives just like βάλλομαι, ἔχομαι. “Even in Attic ἐσχόμην appears as a passive, ἐσχέθην being late.” In Homer also the distinctive aorist passive form sometimes has practically the active or middle signification. This much of repetition is necessary to get the position of the passive clearly before us. It is really no voice at all in form as compared with the active and middle. Cf. French je me trouve and the use of reflexive pronouns in English.

(b) SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PASSIVE. The subject is represented as the recipient of the action. He is acted upon. The name “passive” comes from patior (cf. πάσχω ὑπό in Mt. 17:12). Ἀποκτανθῆναι (Mk. 9:31) occurs as well as ἀποθνήσκειν. The use of περίκειμαι as the transitive passive (Ac. 28:20) of περιτίθη is somewhat different. The idea of having an experience is very vague and allows wide liberty. The point to note is that at first this idea had no distinctive form for its expression. Only the context and the force of the verb itself could make it clear. The future passive, being built upon the earlier aorist passive, reflects the Aktionsart of the aorist.

(c) WITH INTRANSITIVE OR TRANSITIVE VERBS. “Theoretically the passive ought to be formed from transitive verbs only with an accusative object.” But Greek follows no such narrow rule. That is an artificial rule of the Latin which Greek knows nothing about. Cf. κατηγορεῖται ὑπό τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Ac. 22:30). Other N. T. examples are διακονηθῆναι (Mk. 10:45), ἔγκαλεῖσθαι [Page 816] (Ac. 19:40), εὐαρεστεῖσθαι (Heb. 13:16), κατεγνωσόμενος (Gal. 2:11), μαρτυρεῖσθαι (Ac. 6:3), χρηματίζεσθαι (Mt. 2:12). Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 185) notes that “only in Lu. 2:26 do we have ἐγενόμην αὐτῷ κερηματισμένόν.” The passive is used with both active and middle verbs. Thus we have from λογίζομαι both ἔλογισάμην and ἔλογισθην. Cf. ἐγενόμην and ἐγενήθην from γίνομαι.

2 Thompson, Synt., p. 162.
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(d) THE PASSIVE USUALLY INTRANSITIVE. But it is not necessarily so. Διδάσκω, for instance, is transitive in the passive. Ἄς ἔδωκεν (2 Th. 2:15), and note κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν (Ac. 18:25). See also 1 Cor. 9:17; Lu. 7:25; 9:25; Gal. 2:7. Transitive passives are usually verbs that in the active have two accusatives or an accusative of the thing with the person in the dative or ablative. This accusative of the thing is retained in the passive. Cf. ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 3:2), περιβεβλημένους στοιχεῖον λευκάς (Rev. 7:9). For full list see “Accusative” in chapter XI, Cases. Cf. also τὴν ἄλλην ταύτην περίκεμα (Ac. 28:20). The transitive passive “deponents,” like μὴ φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς (Mt. 10:26), call for special discussion a little later. Certainly there is no “passive” sense in περιθυόμα (Ac. 13:2; 25:12; Ro. 4:21; 1 Pet. 4:1; Jo. 9:22). The dividing-line is a fine one at best” (Moulton, ProI., p. 162). Only the context and the verb-idea can decide. So with έγείρομαι (Mt. 27:63), περισπάτητο (Lu. 10:40) and θορυβάζεται (10:41), μισέται (Mt. 11:12). Cf. perfects in Ac. 13:2; 25:12; Ro. 4:21; 1 Pet. 4:1; Jo. 9:22.

(e) AORIST PASSIVE. This tense calls for special comment. As already stated, in Homer the aorist middle form, like the other middle forms, was sometimes used as passive.3 In itself there is no reason why this should not be so. The distinctive passive aorist (second and first) grew up side by side with this use of the aorist middle. Ἐφάνην and Ἐβην are really the same form at [Page 817] bottom.1 Out of this intransitive aorist active (cf. ἀπόλλωλα) grew the so-called second aorist passive forms (–νην) with active endings. We have ἔκρυβην (Jo. 8:59) from the transitive κρύπτω (cf. ἔστάλην from στάλω, etc.) and ἔχαρην (Jo. 14:28) from the intransitive χάρω. It is probable that ἔγραψα (1 Th. 4:14), ‘was put to sleep’ (Moulton, ProI., p. 162). Moulton quotes from the papyri “a purely middle use of κοιμηθήναι, ‘fell asleep’, ἤνικα ἔμελλον κοιμηθῆναι ἔγραψα, Ch.P. 3 (iii/b.c.). He finds a “clear passive” in ἐν τῷ πρὸβατα ἐκεῖ κοιμηθῆ, F.P. 110 (i/A.D.), but ἐκκολλήθη (Lu. 15:15) can be explained as passive or middle in sense. In a few verbs (Ἴστην, ἔστάθην) a distinction was developed.2 W. F. Moulton thinks (Winer-M., p. 315, n. 5) that “a faint passive force” may be observed in σταθήναι in the N. T., but hardly in Mk. 3:24. Cf. also intransitive σταθήμοναι in Mt. 12:25, 26. Ἑστάθηκα in modern Greek is aorist passive for στέκω, ‘stand,’ and ἔστηθηκα for στήνω, ‘place’ (Thumb, Handb., p. 145).

1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 359.
2 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 185.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 181.
correct text (W. H.) in Ac. 21:3 is ἀναφάναντες τὴν Κύριον (active), not ἀναφανέντες (passive). But still some MSS. do have this transitive second aorist passive participle. If one keeps in mind the origin of this aorist passive form (from the active), he may be the less surprised to find it also transitive like the active. Already in Homer this was true.

The so-called passive "deponents," verbs which had no active, formed the aorist with the passive form. But they were not always intransitive. Some of them were so, like πορεύομαι (Mt. 8:9), μεταμέλομαι (Mt. 27:3), δῶμαι (Mt. 17:16), but most of them are really transitive. They probably represent a survival of the old active origin of the aorist passive forms. As examples of the transitive passive deponents note ἔβουλήθη (Mt. 1:19), ἐδεήθη (Lu. 5:12), ἔνθυμηθέντος (Mt. 1:20), ἐκεμελήθη (Lu. 10:34), ἐφοβήθη (Mt. 14:5). These passive aorists have precisely the construction that the middle or active would have so far as case is concerned. The distinctive passive sense is absent. Some of the "deponents" have both a middle and a passive aorist with a distinct passive sense. Thus note the middle and passive voices side [Page 818] by side in ἰδρυμόνος and ἰδρυνηθήσεται (Lu. 12:9). It so happens that this context is full of passive forms. Some of them in the strict passive sense, like ἐταυτοποιεῖσθαι (12:1), συγκεκαλυθήσθαι (12:2), γνωσθήσεται (12:2), ἰδρυθήσεται and κηρυχθήσεται (12:3), πωλοῦνται and οὕτως ἐκείνη ἐπιλεξθήσεται (12:6), ἠρίθμηται (12:7), ἰδρυθήσεται (12:10). But note also the passive deponents φοβήθητε (12:4 f.), φοβήθησε (12:5), φοβέσθηκε (12:7). Cf. also ἀποδέξασθαι (Ac. 18:27) and παρεδέχθησαν (15:4), where the voices are distinguished, θεᾶσθαι τούς ἀνακειμένους (Mt. 22:11) and πρὸς τὸ θεᾶθαι αὐτὸς (Mt. 6:1), λογισάμενος (Heb. 11:19) and ἐλογίσθη (Lu. 22:37), ἰάσατο (Lu. 9:42) and ἰάθη (Mt. 8:13), ἐρύσατο (Col. 1:13) and ἐρύθησαν (2 Tim. 4:17), ἔχαρισατο (Lu. 7:21) and χαρισθήσαται (Ac. 3:14). One may note also παρηγήσατο (Heb. 12:19) and ἦσε με παρηγήσαμον (Lu. 14:19, perfect passive); ἐξεδέξατο (Mk. 13:20), but ἐκελευθήμενος (Lu. 9:35); κοινήθηκε τροφῆς (Ac. 27:38) and ἠδὲ κεκορεσμένο πλάσμα (1 Cor. 4:8). It is possible to see a difference also between έγένετο (Jo. 1:14) and γενεθήσατο (Mt. 6:10). Ἀδεκρίθη (Mt. 25:9) steadily drove out ἀπεκρίνατο (Ac. 3:12), though both are used transitively with no difference in sense. The papyri more frequently have ἀπεκρινάμην, though both forms continue in the koine. Cf. also ἀπολογηθῆναι (Lu. 21:14), διελέξθησαν (Mk. 9:34), ἐθυμωμάσθη (Rev. 13:3), though with passive sense in 2 Th. 1:10. As a result of this inroad of the comparatively new passive forms the aorist middle forms vanished. In modern Greek the passive aorist form is almost invariably used for both the middle and the passive ideas. This tendency seen in the N. T. (and the rest of the koine) has triumphed over the aorist middle. In Ro. 10:3, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ οὕτω ὑπετάγησαν, the Rev. V. translates "they did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God."

(f) Future Passive. As has been mentioned several times already, Homer has only two future passive forms (second futures). The passive voice indeed occurs but

3 See ch. VIII, VI, (e), for list of these N. T. passive aorists.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 161.
rarely in the Bœotian dialect. The future in –θήσομαι is comparatively late. At first, certainly, the distinction between passive and middle (and active also, –ην, –θην) was “a distinction of function, not of form.” It is not surprising to find the middle future form in Homer used with the passive sense (cf. all the other tenses save aorist), where the forms [Page 819] for the two voices are identical. In later prose the future middle form continued to be used in the passive sense even in the great prose writers (Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes). In the LXX Conybeare and Stock (Selections, p. 75 f.) find the same idiom. Cf. Ex. 12:10, οὐκ ἀπολείψεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐξος προὶ, καὶ στοῖν οὐ συντρίψεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. It is quite within bounds, therefore, to speak of “medio-passives” in the future as in the aorist. The idiom appears in the papyri. So narrow is the dividing-line between middle and passive. Is περιβάλεται (Rev. 3:5) middle or passive in sense? The same ambiguity exists as to ἀποκόψονται (Gal. 5:12). Considering the rather large list of verbs that once used the middle future as passive in sense the idiom is rare in the N. T. In general, therefore, the future passive form has made its place secure by the time of the κοινή. Even verbs that have no active form have the future passive as well as the future middle. Thus ἄπαρνήσομαι (Mk. 14:31), but ἄπαρνηθήσομαι (Lu. 12:9); ἰάσομαι (Ac. 28:27), but ἰαθήσεται (Mt. 8:8); and in Ro. 2:26 λογισθήσεται is passive in sense. But the future passive form was destined, like the other futures, to disappear as a distinct form. Only the compound tense occurs in the modern Greek. But, meanwhile, the future passive form took over the uses of the vanishing future middle forms. It is possible to find a passive sense in ἐπαναπαίδευσεται (Lu. 10:6), μεταμελήθησεται (Heb. 7:21), ἰδικλήθονται (Mt. 8:11), κομπηθήσεται (1 Cor. 15:51), κολληθήσεται (Mt. 19:5). Cf. also θαυμασθήσονται (Rev. 17:8), παραιθήσονται (Lu. 16:31), φανερώσεται (Mt. 24:30), ὑποταγέται (1 Cor. 15:28). In 1 Cor. 15:28 note also ὑποταγῇ, which reinforces the argument for the true passive. But the future passive may also be devoid of the passive idea and even transitive just like the aorist passive. Cf. ἀποκριθήσομαι (Mt. 25:37), ἐντραπήσονται τὸν οἶνον (Mt. 21:37), φωνηθήσομαι (Heb. 13:6). The passive ἀφαιρεθήσεται (Lu. 10:42) has the usual sense, but one wonders if in ὅν τε ὁφθήσομαι σοι (Ac. 26:16) the passive voice is transitive and even causative (cf. Is. 1:12). Cf. the examples of reflexive passives in the LXX (Conybeare and Stock, Sel., p. 76), like ὁφητὶ=’show thyself’ (1Ki. 18:1). [Page 820] It is possible, of course, for ὅν to be attracted to the case of τούτων from φίς (‘in which,’ ‘wherein’). Then ὁφθήσομαι should be ‘I will appear to thee.’ Note the new present ὑπάνοιμαι (Ac. 1:3). But the future middle persisted in γενήσομαι, δινήσομαι, ἐπιμελήσομαι, πορεύσομαι.

3 Claflin, Synt. of the Bœot. Dial., p. 67.
4 Gildersleeve, Synt. of Class. Gk., p. 61.
Conybeare and Stock CONYBEARE and STOCK, Selections from the LXX. A Grammatical Introduction (1905).
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 162.
4 Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 61; Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 171.
5 Cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 115, 125.
7 Moulton, Prol., p. 163. Cf., for the LXX, Helbing, Gr., p. 98.
(g) The Agent with the Passive Voice. As already noted, the Greek has no difficulty in using a verb in the passive which was not used with the accusative in the active. Thus note ἐγκαλεῖσθαι (Ac. 19:40), κατηγορεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Ac. 22:30), πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (Gal. 2:7). 1 A few verbs idiomatically use the dative with the passive. Thus ἔγνωσθη τῷ Σαῦλῳ (Ac. 9:24), εὑρέθην (Ro. 10:20), ἔφανεν (Mt. 1:20), ὁφθη (1 Cor. 15:7 f.), θεαθῆναι (Mt. 6:1). 2 The direct agent is most commonly expressed by ὑπὸ (Mt. 4:1), the intermediate by διὰ (Mt. 1:22). The agent (see chapter on Prepositions) is also expressed by ἦπο (2 Cor. 3:18), ἐκ (Gal. 4:4), παρά (Jo. 17:7). See also discussion under Instrumental Case (chapter XI, Cases) for discussion of ἀντὶ with ἐστὶν πεπαγμένον (Lu. 23:15), whether dative or instrumental. In the N. T., as in ancient Greek (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 72), the instrument is sometimes personified and treated as an agent. Cf. κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλεύομεν; (Mt. 11:7).

(h) Impersonal Construction. This is the usual idiom in the Coptic in lieu of the absence of the passive. But it is often rather rhetorical than syntactical as Moulton shows. 3 He compares also the French on, the German man, the English one. Wellhausen 4 shows how in the Aramaic this impersonal plural was common. One notes αὐτοῖς (Lu. 12:20), where a passive would be possible. Cf. συνάγουσιν καὶ βάλλουσιν καὶ καίεται (Jo. 15:6) where the passive occurs in καίεται. Note in particular ἔξηράνθη καὶ συνάγουσιν αὐτά (Jo. 15:6). Cf. also τρέφωσιν αὐτά (Rev. 12:6). The use of the impersonal passive like πιστεύεται and ὁμολογεῖται (Ro. 10:10) is another matter and calls for no comment. It is rare in Greek as compared with Latin (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 77). Cf. the plural in 10:14 f. See also the personal construction in 1 Cor. 15:12 εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὁτι.

[PAGE 821] CHAPTER XVIII

TENSE (ΧΡΟΝΟΣ)

I. Complexity of the Subject.

Probably nothing connected with syntax is so imperfectly understood by the average student as tense. This is due to various causes.

1. The Difficulty of Comparing Greek Tenses with Germanic Tenses. “The translators of our English version have failed more frequently from their partial knowledge of the force of the tenses than from any other cause.” 1 Ignorance, one may add, both of English and Greek still stands in the way of proper rendering of the

---

1 Cf. Gildersleeve, Synt., etc., p. 77.
2 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 185.
3 Prol., p. 58 f.
1 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 123.
Greek. The English, like the other Germanic tongues, has only two simple verb-forms. We have a great wealth of tenses in English by means of auxiliary verbs, but they do not correspond with any of the Greek tenses. It is the commonest grammatical vice for one to make a conjectural translation into English and then to discuss the syntactical propriety of the Greek tense on the basis of this translation. Burton indeed justifies this method for the benefit of the English student of Greek. But I submit that the practice brings more confusion than help. “The Aorist for the English Perfect, and the Aorist for the English Pluperfect” Burton urges as “a pertinent illustration.” But that method keeps the student at the English standpoint, just the thing to be avoided. The Greek point of view affords the only sure basis of operation. Winer laments that “N. T. grammarians and expositors have been guilty of the greatest mistakes” here, though it cannot be said that Winer himself always lives up to his just ideal. Translation into English or German is the least point to note in judging a tense.

2. BAD INFLUENCE OF THE LATIN ON GREEK GRAMMARIANS. Most of the older Greek grammars were made by men who knew Latin better than Greek. Even to-day the study of the Greek tenses is hampered by the standpoint of Latin idioms which developed under very different conditions. This is true of school grammars in particular, whereas Latin has had no influence on the Greek tenses themselves by the time of the κοινή. The perfect and the aorist blend in Latin, while that is not true in Greek till a very late date (1000 A.D.). The separate Greek development (cf. the Sanskrit) was due to the genius and spirit of the Greek people and has continued throughout the history of the language, though in modern times the Greek tenses have suffered serious modification. The Latin tenses must be left to one side. The time element is more prominent in the Latin.

3. ABSENCE OF HEBREW INFLUENCE. There is no time element at all in the Hebrew tenses. Hence it is not strange that the LXX translators had much trouble in rendering the two Hebrew tenses (perfect and imperfect) into the Greek with its richness of tense. A similar difficulty exists for the English translators. Curious devices (possibly slips) sometimes occur, like ἐγώ ἐμμικαθίσομαι (B in Ju. 6:18), ἔσομαι διδόναι (BA in Tob. 5:15). But such translation Greek left no lasting impress on the Greek of the N. T. save in προσέθετο πέψαι (Lu. 20:12; cf. Ex. 25:21). The problems of the Greek tenses are not to be solved by an appeal to the Semitic influence.

---

4 Cf. Broadus, Comm. on Matthew, p. 54 note.
5 N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 4 f.
6 W.-Th., p. 264.
1 Mutzbauer, Die Grundl. d. griech. Tempusl., 1893, p. i.
2 K. Roth, Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Dion. von Hal., p. 5.
5 Cf. Swete, Intr. to O. T. in Gk., p. 308.
4. **Gradual Growth of the Greek Tenses.** There is no future optative in Homer and no future passive. The aorist passive is also rare. The past perfect is rare in Homer, and it does not occur with the idea of relative time. “In the examination of tense usages, we must be careful to observe that *tenses*, in the sense in which the word is now used, are of comparatively late development.”

In the beginning the verb-root was used with personal suffixes. At first this was enough. Some verbs developed some tenses, others other tenses, some few all the tenses.

5. **“Aktionsart” of the Verb-Stem.** Aktionsart (“kind of action”) must be clearly understood. The verb-root plays a large part in the history of the verb. This essential meaning of the word itself antedates the tense development and continues afterwards. There is thus a double development to keep in mind. There were originally two verb-types, the one denoting durative or linear action, the other momentary or punctiliar action. Hence some verbs have two roots, one linear (durative), like φέρω (fero), the other punctiliar (momentary), like ἔγεγκον (tuli). So ἔρνεω, εἶδον; τολμάω, ἔπλην. With other verbs the distinction was not drawn sharply, the root could be used either way (cf. φη-μί, ἔ-φη-ν, λέγ-ω, ἔ-λεγ-ο-ν). All this was before there was any idea of the later tense. So ἔφαγ-ον is punctiliar, while ἔσθιο is linear or durative. Moulton rightly observes that this is the explanation of “defective” verbs. Moulton notes ἔχω as a word that can be used either for durative, as in Ro. 5:1, or punctiliar, like aorist ἔσχον (cf. ἔσχες and ἔχες in Jo. 4:18). The regular idiom for a papyrus receipt is ἔσχον παρὰ σοῦ. This matter of the kind of action in the verb-root (Aktionsart) applies to all verbs. It has long been clear that the “tense” has been overworked and made to mean much that it did not mean. The verb itself is the beginning of all. But scholars are not agreed in the terminology to be used. Instead of “punctiliar” (punktuelle Aktion, Brugmann), others use “perfective” (Giles, *Manual*, p.

---

6 Sterrett, Dial. of Hom., N. 42.
7 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 44.
8 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 482.
1 Giles, Man., etc., p. 477 f.
2 Prol., p. 110 f.
3 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 469.
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———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).
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Giles

478). But this brings inevitable confusion with the perfect tense. All verbs may be described as “punctiliar” (punktuell) and “non-punctiliar” (nicht-punktuell). But the “non-punctiliar” divides into the indefinite linear (durative) and the definite linear (completed or perfect). The notion of perfect action as distinct from point action came later. The three essential kinds of action are thus momentary or punctiliar when the action is regarded as a whole and may be represented by a dot (.), linear or durative action which may be represented by a continuous line ———, the continuance of perfected or completed action which may be represented by this graph. The distinction between punctiliar and perfected action is not clearly drawn in the verb-root itself. That is a later refinement of tense. Brugmann credits this “perfected” idea to the perfect stem. “Iterative” action belongs to certain [Page 824] stems (reduplicated, like γίγνομαι), but it is not a fundamental kind of action.

6. THE THREE KINDS OF ACTION EXPRESSED IN TERMS OF TENSE. These ideas (punctiliar, durative, perfected state) lie behind the three tenses (aorist, present, perfect) that run through all the moods. The forms of these tenses are meant to accentuate these ideas.1 The aorist stem presents action in its simplest form (ἀ-οριστος, ‘undefined’). This action is simply presented as a point by this tense. This action is timeless. The present is also timeless in itself as is the perfect.2 It is confusing to apply the expression “relations of time” to this fundamental aspect of tense, as is done by some grammars.3 Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 121) uses Zeitart and Zeitstufe, but why Zeitart instead of Aktionsart? It is better to keep “time” for its natural use of past, present and future, and to speak of “kind of action” rather than “kind of time.”4 These three tenses (aorist, present, perfect) were first developed irrespective of time. Dionysius Thrax erred in explaining the Greek tenses from the notion of time, and he has been followed by a host of imitators. The study of Homer ought to have prevented this error. The poets generally do not bring the time relations to the fore.5 Even Paul (Principles of the History of Language, p. 300) falls into this error. It is doubtless easier6 to trace the history of the verb than of the noun, but as many mistakes lie along the way.

7. TIME ELEMENT IN TENSE. But for the indicative the Greek tenses would have had a simple history. There are no past tenses in the subjunctive. The future subjunctive is an anomaly of very late Greek. The future optative occurs only in indirect discourse and is not found in the N. T. The time element in the infinitive is confined to indirect discourse and μέλλω. Time in the participle is only relative to the principal verb. It is thus kind of action, not the time of the action, that is expressed in


5 Griech. Gr., p. 472.
1 K.-G., Bd. I, p. 130.
2 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 469.
3 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 433; Gildersleeve, Synt. of Class. Gk., p. 79.
4 Cf. Benard, Formes Verb. en Grec, 1890, p. 279.
5 Mutzb., Die Grundl. d. griech. Tempusl., 1890.
these forms. But in the indicative the three grades of time had tenses of their own. The Greeks evidently felt that there was no need for time in the other modes except in a relative sense. As a matter of fact, the real time of subjunctive, optative, and imperative is future [Page 825] in relation to speaker or writer. It was evidently with difficulty (cf. absence of time in Hebrew) that time was expressed in a positive (non-relative) sense even in the indicative. It is only by the augment (probably an adverb) that past time is clearly expressed. “Homer and later Greek writers often use the present with an adverb of time instead of a past tense, a construction which has an exact parallel in Sanskrit and which is therefore supposed to be Indo-Germanic.” There is no really distinctive form for the present indicative. The future was a later development out of both the present and aorist. See chapter VIII, Conjugation of Verb. The augment was not always used. Homer used it only when it suited him. But past time was objective and the three kinds of action (punctiliar, durative, perfected) were regularly expressed with the tenses (aorist, imperfect, past perfect). There is Aktionsart also in the present and future time, but the tense development did not go on to the full extent here. There are only two tense-forms in the present and practically only one in the future. But both punctiliar and linear action are expressed, but not differentiated, in the present time by the same tense, as is true also of the future. The kinds of action exist, but separate tense-forms unfortunately do not occur. There might thus have been nine tenses in the indicative: three punctiliar (past, present, future), three linear (past, present, future), three perfect (past, present, future). Because of this difference between the indicative and the other moods in the matter of time some grammars give a separate treatment to the indicative tenses. It is not an easy matter to handle, but to separate the indicative perhaps accents the element of time unduly. Even in the indicative the time element is subordinate to the kind of action expressed. A double idea thus runs through tense in the indicative (kind of action, time of the action).

8. FAULTY NOMENCLATURE OF THE TENSES. There is no consistency in the names given the tenses, as has already been explained. Cf. chapter VIII, VII, (b). The terms aorist, imperfect and perfect (past, present, future) are properly named from the point of view of the state of the action, but present and future are named from the standpoint of the time element. There is [Page 826] no time element in the present subjunctive, for instance. But the names cannot now be changed, though very unsatisfactory.

9. THE ANALYTIC Tendency (Periphrasis). This is the common way of expressing tense in the Germanic tongues. It was not unknown to the older Greek and was very frequent in the LXX under the Hebrew influence. See an extended list in Conybeare and Stock, Selections from the LXX, pp. 68–71. The tendency is strong in the N. T. See the summary already given (pp. 374–376). In the modern Greek the periphrastic form has displaced the usual inflected forms in all the tenses but the

7 Cf. Spyridis, Lang. grec. actuelle ou mod., 1894, p. 287.
1 Goodwin, Gk. Moods and Tenses, 1890, pp. 23, 27.
3 Giles, Man., etc., p. 487.
5 Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 120 f.
6 Cf. Goodwin, Gk. Moods and Tenses, pp. 8, 22.
present, imperfect and aorist. These are “simple.” The rest are “compound” (Thumb, *Handb.*., p. 115). This analytic tendency affected the durative and perfect kinds of action. It did not suit the purely punctiliar idea.

10. THE EFFECT OF PREPOSITIONS ON THE VERB. This is another aspect of Aktionsart. This subject has already been briefly discussed from the standpoint of the prepositions. Delbrück has worked the matter out with thoroughness and he is followed by Brugmann. Moulton has applied the principle to N. T. verbs. The point is that often where the simple verb is durative it is rendered “perfective” by the preposition in composition. This peculiarity is common to all the Indo-Germanic tongues and reaches its highest development in the Germanic (cf. English and German) and the Balto-Slavic languages. Thus we in English say bring and bring up, burn and burn up, carry and carry off, come and come on, drive and drive away (home, in, off, out), drink and drink up, eat and eat up, follow and follow up, go and go away, grow and grow up, knock and knock down, make and make over, pluck and pluck out, run and run away, speak and speak out, stand and stand up, take and take up, wake and wake up, work and work out. The “imperfective” simplex becomes “perfective” in the compound. Prof. A. Thumb has a paper “Zur Aktionsart der mit Präpositionen zusammengesetzten Verba im Griechischen,” in which he compares some tables of Schlachter for Thucydides with some by Prof. S. Dickey for the N. T. Thucydid shows for the present tense 260 simplicia verbs to 83 compound, for the aorist 158 to 199. Dickey has investigated about thirty N. T. verbs like ἀπέχω, etc. He reports for the present tense a proportion of 1160 simplicia to 83 compound, for the aorist 885 to 226. It is unfortunate that the term “perfective” is

---

1 Jebb in V. and D.’s Handb., pp. 323, 326.
2 Cf. ch. XIII, IV, (i).
Delbrück

**DELBRÜCK, B.,** Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis (1867).


———, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871–1888).

6 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 482.
7 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 112.

used for this idea, since it inevitably suggests the perfect tense. Some writers\(^1\) use “perfective” also for the aorist or punctiliar action, a means of still further confusion. Brugmann\(^2\) uses “Perfektive Aktion” for the effect of the preposition in composition and “Perfektische Aktion” for the perfect tense, a distinction hard to draw in English. Latin and Greek both show abundant illustrations of this use of prepositions. Cf. *sequor* and *consequor*, *facio* and *efficio*, *teneo* and *sustineo*. Moulton\(^3\) thinks that the freedom in the position of the preposition in Homer helped the adverb to retain its force longer than in later Greek and Latin. The point of the preposition here is best seen in the prepositions ἀπό–, δια–, κατά–, συν–.\(^4\) But even in these the actual majority of examples preserve the original local meaning and so are not perfective. But in Lu. 8:29, πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν, the perfective sense of σύν combines with the past perfect tense and the locative (or instrumental) πολλοῖς χρόνοις to denote “not the temporary paroxysm, but the establishment of a permanent hold” (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 113). So γινώσκω is durative (‘gaining knowledge,’ as in Mk. 13:28), ἔγνων is effective (‘grasping the point,’ as in Lu. 16:4, ἔγνων τι ποιήσαο), ἐπιγνῶσκω is perfective (‘knowing my lesson,’ as in 1 Cor. 13:12), and ἐπιγνώναυ also (‘recognising,’ as in Mt. 14:35). Moulton (*ib.*, p. 114) calls particular attention to οἱ ἀπολλόμενοι (1 Cor. 1:18), ‘the perishing,’ where the destiny is accented by ἀπό, and the process is depicted by the tense. In Heb. 6:18, ὁ καταφυγόντες, the perfective sense of κατά coincides with the effective aorist. So even when the tense is durative, the notion of completion is expressed in the preposition as contemplated or certain. In τέθνηκεν (Lu. 8:49) the perfect tense of the simplex is sufficient, but not so in ἀπέθανεν (Lu. 8:53). Θνήσκω as simplex became obsolete outside of the perfect, so that ἀπέθανεν (Lu. 8:42; cf. 2 Cor. 6:9; Heb. 11:21) occurs for the notion of ‘dying.’ “The linear perfective expressed its meaning sufficiently, denoting as it does the whole process leading up to an attained goal.”\(^5\) Moulton notes also the iterative use of ἀποθνήσκω in 1 Cor. 15:31, and the frequentative in 1 Cor. 15:22. See also the “perfective” use of ἀποκτείνω, the active of ἀπέθανεν. In ἀπόλλοιμι and ἀπόλλωμι (ἀπόλλωλι) the simplex [Page 828] is obsolete. Even in the present tense the force of ἀπό– is obvious. Cf. τοῖς ἀπολλομένοις (1 Cor. 1:18), ἀπόλλωμι (Lu. 15:17), ἀπόλλωμεθα (Mt. 8:25), where Moulton’ explains ἀπό– as suggesting “the sense of an inevitable doom.”\(^6\) Cf. also φεύγω (Mt. 2:13), ‘to flee,’ with διαφεύγω (Ac. 27:42), and ἐκφεύγω (Heb. 2:3), ‘to escape,’ καταφεύγω (Heb. 6:18), ‘to find refuge’; τηρέω (Ac. 24:23), ‘to watch,’ with διατηρέω (Lu. 2:51), and συντηρεω (Lu. 2:19), ‘to keep together (safely)’; σπάω (Mt. 14:47), ‘to draw,’ with διασπάω (Mt. 5:4), ‘to draw in two’; καίω (Jo. 15:6), ‘to burn,’ with κατακαίω (Ac. 19:19), ‘to burn up’; κρίνω (Jo. 5:30), ‘to judge,’ with κατακρίνω (Mt. 12:41), ‘to condemn’; λύω (Lu. 3:16), ‘to loosen,’ with καταλύω (Mt. 24:2), ‘to destroy’; ἔχω (Ac. 13:5; Rev. 10:2), ‘to have’ or ‘hold,’ with ἔπεκμω (Ac. 3:5), ‘to hold on to,’ and συνέχω (Lu. 8:45), ‘to hold together’ or ‘press,’ and ἔπχω (Mt. 6:5), ‘to have in full,’ etc. As to ἔπεκμω for ‘receipt in full,’ see Deissmann, *Light*, p. 110 f. The papyri and

3 *Prol.*, p. 112.

Deissmann
ostraca give numerous illustrations. It is not necessary to make an exhaustive list to prove the point. Cf. μενῶ καὶ παραμενῶ (Ph. 1:25), χαίρω καὶ συνχαίρω (2:17), where the point lies in the preposition, though not “perfective” here. So γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη (2 Cor. 3:2), ἀναγινώσκετα ἢ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε (1:13), μετέρχεται ἄντιμετρηθήσεται (Lu. 6:38), ἐχοντες—κατέχοντες (2 Cor. 6:10). Cf. έκβαλε (Mt. 22:13). In some verbs² the preposition has so far lost its original force that the “perfective” idea is the only one that survives. Dr. Eleanor Purdie (Indog. Forsch., IX, pp. 63–153, 1898) argues that the usage of Polybius as compared with Homer shows that the aorist simplex was increasingly confined to the constative sense, while the ingressive and effective simplex gave way to the “perfective” compounds. Moulton³ is inclined to agree in the main with her contention as supported by the papyri (and Thumb thinks that modern Greek supports the same view). At any rate there is a decided increase in the number of compound verbs. The ingressive and effective uses of the aorist would naturally blend with the “perfective” compounds. But it remains true that the Aktionsart of the verb-root is often modified by the preposition in composition.

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

2 Ib., p. 112.

Indog. Indog. Forsch., Indogermanische Forschungen (Straßburg).

3 Ib., pp. 115–118.
11. “AKTIONSART” WITH EACH TENSE. It is not merely true that three separate kinds of action are developed (punctiliar, durative, perfected), that are represented broadly by three tenses in all the modes, though imperfectly in the present and future tenses of the indicative. The individual verb-root modifies greatly the resultant idea in each tense. This matter can only be hinted at here, but must be worked out more carefully in the discussion of each tense. The aorist, for instance, though always in itself merely point-action, “punctiliar,” yet may be used with verbs that accent the beginning of the action or the end of the action. Thus three distinctions arise: the unmodified point-action called “constative,” the point-action with the accent on the beginning (inceptive) called “ingressive,” the point-action with the accent on the conclusion called “effective.” The names are not particularly happy, but they will answer. “Constative” is especially awkward. In reality it is just the normal aorist without any specific modification by the verb-meaning. Hirt does not use the term, but divides the aorist into “ingressive” and “effective” when there is this special Aktionsart. But the use of these demands another term for the normal aorist. As an example of the “constative” aorist for the whole action take ἐσκήνωσεν (Jo. 1:14), for the earthly life of Jesus. So also ἔζηγήσατο (1:18), while ἔγένετο (1:14) is “ingressive,” and accents the entrance of the Logos upon his life on earth (Incarnation). Ἑθεασάμεθα (1:14) is probably “effective” as is ἐλάβομεν (1:16), accenting the result (“resultative,” Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 475). So likewise in the so-called “present” tense various ideas exist as set forth by the various “classes” of verbs or “conjugations.” The perfect and the future likewise have many variations in resultant idea, growing out of the varying verb-idea in connection with the tense-idea. These must be borne in mind and will be indicated in the proper place in discussing each tense.

12. INTERCHANGE OF TENSES. The point here is not whether the Greeks used an aorist where we in English would use a perfect, but whether the Greeks themselves drew no distinction between an aorist and a perfect, a present and a future. It is not possible to give a categorical answer to this question when one recalls the slow development of the Greek tenses and the long history of the language. There was a time long after the N. T. period when the line between the aorist and the perfect became very indistinct, as it had been largely obliterated in Latin. It is a question for discussion whether that was true in the N. T. or not. The subject will receive discussion under those tenses. The future grew out of the present and the aorist. The present continued to be used sometimes as vivid future, as is true of all languages. But it is a very crude way of speaking to say that one tense is used “for” another in Greek. That would only be true of ignorant men. In general one may say that in normal Greek when a certain tense occurs, that tense was used rather than some other because it best expressed the idea of the speaker or writer. Each tense, therefore, has its specific idea. That idea is normal and can be readily understood. Various modifications arise, due to the verb itself, the context, the imagination of the user of the tense. The result is a complex one, for which the tense is not wholly responsible. The tenses, therefore, are not loosely interchangeable. Each tense has a
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1 Moulton, Prol., p. 109.
3 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 475.
separate history and presents a distinct idea. That is the starting-point. Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 264) is entirely correct in saying: "No one of these tenses strictly and properly taken can stand for another." Writers vary greatly in the way that the tenses are used. A vivid writer like Mark, for instance, shows his lively imagination by swift changes in the tenses. The reader must change with him. It is mere commonplace to smooth the tenses into a dead level in translation and miss the writer’s point of view. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 124) is doubtful whether in the N. T. we are justified in making “sharp distinctions between the imperfect, aorist or perfect; a subjunctive, imperative, or infinitive of the aorist or present.” But for my part I see no more real ground in the papyri and inscriptions for such hesitation than we find in the ancient Attic Greek. Thumb (Handb., p. 116) notes that modern Greek, in spite of heavy losses, has preserved the distinction between linear and punctiliar action even in the imperative and subjunctive. I shall discuss the tenses according to the three ideas designed by them rather than by the names accidentally given.

II. Punctiliar Action.

This is the kind of action to begin with. It is probably not possible always to tell which is the older stem, the punctiliar or the linear. They come into view side by side, though the punctiliar action is logically first. The aorist tense, though at first confined to verbs of punctiliar sense, was gradually made on verbs of durative sense. So also verbs of durative action came to have the tenses of punctiliar action. Thus the tenses came to be used for the expression of the ideas that once belonged only to the root. The Stoic grammarians, who gave us much of our terminology, did not fully appreciate the aorist tense. They grouped the tenses around the present stem, while as a matter of fact in many verbs that is impossible, the root appearing in the aorist, not in the present. Cf. ἔστη-ν (ἵστη-µι), ἔλαβο-ν (λαµβάν-ω), etc. This error vitiated the entire theory of the Stoic grammarians. Grammatical forms cannot express the exact concord between the logical and the grammatical categories, but the aorist tense came very near doing it. By Homer’s time (and Pindar’s) the distinction between the aorist and imperfect tenses is fairly well drawn, though some verbs like ἔφη-ν remain in doubt. So we start with the aorist tense. In modern Greek the ancient aorist is the base-form on which a number of new presents are formed (Thumb, Handb., p. 143). J. C. Lawson (Journ. of Th. St., Oct., 1912, p. 142) says that Thumb would have smoothed the path of the student if he had “dealt with the aorist before proceeding to the present.”

1. THE AORIST (ἀόριστος). The aorist, as will be shown, is not the only way of expressing indefinite (undefined) action, but it is the normal method of doing so. The Greek in truth is “an aorist-loving language” (Broadus). In the κοινή the aorist is

1 Steinthal, Gesch. d. Sprach., p. 306 f.
2 Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 300.
Broadus BROADUS, JOHN A., Comm. on Matt. (1886).
4 Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 137.
even more frequent than in the classic Greek (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 120), especially is this true of the N. T.

Gildersleeve⁵ does not like the name and prefers “apobatic,” but that term suits only the “effective” aorist. The same thing is true of “culminative.” The name aorist does very well on the whole. I doubt if the aorist is a sort of “residuary legatee,” taking what is left of the other tenses. The rather, as I see it, the aorist preserved the simple action and the other tenses grew up around it. It is true that in the expression of past time in the indicative and with all the other moods, the aorist is the tense used as a matter of course, unless there was special reason for using some other tense. It gives the action “an und für sich.” The common use of the “imperfect” with verbs of speaking (ἐφη, ἐλεγε) may be aorist in fact.

(a) Aktionsart in the Aorist.

(a) Constative Aorist. There is still a good deal of confusion in the use of terms. Gildersleeve (*Syntax of Attic Gr.*, p. 105) prefers “complexive” to “constative.” Moulton⁶ comments on Miss Purdie’s use of “perfective” in the sense of “punctiliar.” [Page 832] So Giles¹ uses “perfective or momentary” for the aoristic action, but he also (p. 478 note) uses constative. But Moulton² also makes a distinction between “constative” and “punctiliar,” using “punctiliar” for real point-action and “constative” for what is merely treated as point-action. That is a true distinction for the verb-root, but the growing number of constative aorists was in harmony with the simple idea of the tense. Brugmann³ rests constative, ingressive and effective aorists, all three on the punktuell idea and draws no sharp distinction between “punctiliar” and “constative.” Delbrück⁴ divides the punktuell or aorist into Anfangspunkt or Ingressive, Mittelpunkt or Constative and Schlußpunkt or Effective. The constative accents the “middle point.” The idea of Delbrück and Brugmann is that punktuell action is “action focused in a point.”⁵ “The aorist describes an event as a single whole, without the time taken in its accomplishment.”⁶ It seems best, therefore, to regard “constative” as merely the normal aorist which is not “ingressive” nor “effective.” The root-difference between the aorist and the imperfect is just this, that the aorist is “constative” while the imperfect “describes.”⁷ The “constative” aorist just *treats* the act as a single whole entirely irrespective of the parts or time involved.⁸ If the act is a point in itself, well and good. But the aorist can be used also of an act which is not a point. This is the advance that the tense makes on the verb-root. All aorists are punctiliar in statement (cf. Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 109). The “constative” aorist treats an act as punctiliar which is
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⁵ Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 397 f.
¹ Man., p. 481 f.
⁶ Moulton, Intr. to the Stu. of N. T. Gk., 1895, p. 190.
⁸ Moulton, Prol., p. 109, prefers “summary” to “constative.”
not in itself point-action. That is the only difference. The distinction is not enough to make a separate class like ingressive and effective over against the purely punctiliar action. Thumb (Handb., p. 122) passes by “constative” as merely the regular aorist “to portray simply an action or occurrence of the past,” whether in reality punctiliar or not. He finds both ingressive and effective aorists in modern Greek. But Thumb uses “terminative” for both “ends” (initial and final), a somewhat confusing word in this connection. The papyri show the same Ak téon sárt of the aorist. So note constative [Page 833] ὅτι με ἐπαύδευσας καλός, B.G.U. 423 (ii/AD.). Thus in Jo. 2:20, ἡμερήσιμον καὶ ἔστη ἡμίδομήθη ὅ νῦν οὖτος, we have a good example of the constative aorist. The whole period of forty-six years is treated as a point. In Mt. 5:17, ἐλθον, we have a very simple constative aorist, just punctiliar and nothing more, describing the purpose of Christ’s mission. It is true that the constative aorist in this sense is far more frequent than the ingressive and the effective uses of the tense. This has always been so from the nature of the case. The increasing number of “perfective” compounds, as already shown, increased the proportion of constative aorists.1 When the action is in itself momentary or instantaneous no difficulty is involved. These examples are very numerous on almost any page of the N. T. Cf. in Ac. 10:22 f., ἐλλημνισθή λεγε τίτδ, ἠκοῦσα, ἐξένισεν, ἱστήλθον. See the aorists in Ac. 10:41 f. Cf. Mt. 8:3; Ac. 5:5. This is the normal aorist in all the moods. But verbs that are naturally durative may have the aorist. In ἐκατέρθεσεν (Heb. 11:27) we have a verb naturally “durative” in idea, but with the “constative” aorist. Cf. also ἐκρύβη τρίμηνον (Heb. 11:23), where a period of time is summed up by the constative aorist. Cf. ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ὁπό Αὐτῷ μέχρι M. (Ro. 5:15). A good example is ἔζησαν καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ χίλια ἔτη (Rev. 20:4). Here ἔζησαν is probably ingressive, though ἔζησαμεν is constative in 1 Th. 5:10, but ἐβασίλευσαν is clearly constative. The period of a thousand years is merely regarded as a point. Cf. also Jo. 7:9 ἐμείνεν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, 10:40 ἐμείνεν ἐκαπάτη. See also Ac. 11:26 ἔγένετο αὐτῶς ἐναυτῶν ἡλίον συναχθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡκλήσῃ, 14:3 ἰκανὸν χρόνον διάτριβων, 18:11 ἐκάθισεν ἐναυτῶν καὶ μήνας ἔξ, ἐν ἐνέμειν διετίαν ὅλην. Cf. Eph. 2:4. See ἁλ—διετέλεσα in B.G.U. 287 (A.D. 250). Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 105) calls this “aorist of long duration” (constative).

For a striking example of the constative (summary) use of the aorist, note ἐψ—ὁ πάντες ἢμαρτον (Rom. 5:12). Note in particular the summary statements in Heb. 11, as ἰπέθανον οὖτοι πάντες (13). οὖτοι πάντες—οὐκ ἔκομισαντο (39). Gildersleeve’s “aorist of total negation” (Syntax, p. 106) is nothing more than this. Repeated or separate2 actions are thus grouped together, as in Mt. 22:28, πάντες ἔσχον αὐτήν. So τρὶς ἐραβδίσθην, τρὶς ἐνανάγασα (2 Cor. 11:25). In Mk. 12:44, πάντες—ἐβαλων, αὕτη δὲ—ἐβαλεν, the two actions are contrasted sharply by the aorist. There is no difficulty in ἐς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἰπέθανεν ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἰπέθανον (2 Cor. 5:14). The same verb may sometimes be used either as constative (like ἐβασίλευσαν, [Page 834] ‘reigned,’ Rev. 20:4 above) or ingressive (καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν, ‘assumed rule,’ Rev. 11:17, though true here of God only in a dramatic sense). Thus ἐσιγησαν (Ac. 15:12) is ‘kept silence’ (constative), but στηῆσαι (verse 13) is ingressive as is ἐσιγησαν (Lu. 9:36). Cf. Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 21. In Gal. 5:16, οὖ μὴ τελέσητε, we have the
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1 Moulton, Prol., p. 115.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 193.
constative aorist, while πληρῶσαι is effective in Mt. 5:17. In line with what has already been said, βαλεῖν may mean ‘throw’ (constative), ‘let fly’ (ingressive) or ‘hit’ (effective). Cf. Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 130. Illustrations occur in the N. T. in ἔβαλεν αὐτόν εἰς φυλακῆν (Mt. 18:30, constative, ‘cast’ or ‘threw’), βάλε σεαυτὸν ἐντεῦθεν κάτω (Lu. 4:9, ingressive, ‘hurl.’ Note ἐντεῦθεν, as well as “perfective” force of κάτω. Cf. Mt. 5:29), ἔβαλεν κατʼ αὐτῆς (effective, ‘beat,’ Ac. 27:14).

(β) Ingressive Aorist. This is the inceptive or inchoative aorist. It is not, however, like the “constative” idea, a tensenotion at all. It is purely a matter with the individual verb.1 Thus ἐπτώχευσεν, 2 Cor. 8:9, is ‘became poor’; ἔζησεν, Ro. 14:9, is ‘became alive’ (cf. ἀπέθανεν just before).2 Perhaps in Jo. 16:3, οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, the meaning is ‘did not recognise.’3 But this could be constative. But it is clear in Jo. 1:10. So in ἔσοι ἔλαβον αὐτόν (Jo. 1:12) the ingressive idea occurs, as in οὐ παρέλαβον in verse 11. Cf. ἐκλάωσαν (Lu. 19:41)=‘burst into tears’ and ἔγνως (vs. 42)=‘comest to know.’ So ἔδάκρυσεν (Jo. 1:35). In Mt. 22:7 ὑφεγήθη=‘became angry.’ Cf. also μὴ δόξητε (Mt. 3:9), ἀφύσπασσέτε (Lu. 8:23), ἔθωμόν (Mt. 2:16). In Lu. 15:32 ἔξησεν is ingressive, as is ἐκοιμήθη (Ac. 7:60), ἴσχύσασθε γῆς (Ac. 27:16), μισήσασθεν (Lu. 6:22), ἤγάπησαν (Mt. 10:21), ἔλυτησε (2 Cor. 7:9), πλουτήσητε (2 Cor. 8:9). The notion is common with verbs expressing state or condition (Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, p. 16). Moulton quotes βασιλεύσας ἄναπαήσεται, ‘having come to his throne he shall rest,’ Agraphon, O.P. 654. See also ἔλαβα βιάτικον παρὰ Καίσαρος, B.G.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 248) cites Jo. 4:52, κοιμότερον ἔσχην, ‘got better,’ and compares it with ἔδωκεν κοιμῶς συχό, Tb.P. 414 (ii/A.D.). Another instance is ἤγαγεν Mt. 21:1.4 Cf. ἔκτησα (Ac. 1:18).

(γ) Effective Aorist. The name is not particularly good and “resultant aorist” is suggested by some scholars. Gildersleeve5 [Page 835] suggests “upshot aorist.” Giles1 calls it aorist of the “culminating point,” following Monro.2 But the idea is that emphasis is laid on the end of the action as opposed to the beginning (ingressive). This is done (if done) by the verb itself (Aktionsart). The following examples will make the matter clear: ποιήσατε καρπόν (Mt. 3:8), κλείσας (6:6), ἔτέλεσαν (7:28), ὑμοίωθη (13:24), ἐνέπρησαν (22:7), ἐκέρδησα (25:20), ἔπεισαν (27:20), ἐλύθη (Mt. 7:35), ἐστάθησαν (Lu. 24:17), ἐκρύβη (19:42), ἤγαγεν (Jo. 1:42), ἀπέστησε (Ac.
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4 These ingressive aorists are often denominative verbs. Cf. Gildersl., Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 104.
5 Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 104.
1 Man., p. 498.
5:37), πληρώσαντες (12:25), ἔσπερεν (20:9), ἐπαύσαντο (21:32), ἐκώλυσεν (27:43), ἔμαθον (Ph. 4:11), ἔνικησεν (Rev. 5:5). A good example of the effective aorist in the papyri is ἔσωσε, B.G.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). So then in the case of each aorist the point to note is whether it is merely punctiliar (constative) or whether the verb-idea has deflected it to the one side or the other (ingressive or effective). It needs to be repeated that there is at bottom only one kind of aorist (punctiliar in fact or statement). The tense of itself always means point-action. The tense, like the mode, has nothing to do with the *fact* of the action, but only with the way it is stated. Sometimes it will not be clear from the context what the Aktionsart is. The “perfective” force of prepositions applies to all the tenses. It must be said also that the Aktionsart in the aorist (ingressive, effective) applies to all the modes. Indeed, because of the time-element in the indicative (expressed by the augment and secondary endings) the real character of the aorist tense is best seen in the other modes where we do not have notes of time. It is merely a matter of convenience, therefore, to note the aorist in the different modes, not because of any essential difference (outside of the indicative). One is in constant danger of overrefinement here. Gildersleeve criticises Stahl for “characteristic proximity” in his treatment of the tenses. A few striking examples are sufficient here.

(b) Aorist Indicative. The caution must be once more repeated that in these subdivisions of the aorist indicative we have only one tense and one root-idea (punctiliar action). The variations noted are incidental and do not change at all this fundamental idea.

(a) The Narrative or Historical Tense. It is the tense in which [Page 836] a verb in ordinary narrative is put unless there is reason for using some other tense. Hence it is enormously frequent in the Greek historians. Writers vary greatly, of course, in the use of the tenses as of words, but in the large view the point holds. The aorist holds its place in the papyri and in the modern Greek as the usual tense in narrative (Thumb, Handb., p. 122). Almost any page in the Gospels and Acts will show an abundance of aorist indicatives that illustrate this point. Cf., for instance, the eight aorists in Ac. 13:13 f. (no other tense), the eight aorists in 21:1 f. (no other tense), the three aorists in 25:1 f. (no other tense). In these instances the tenses are not all in indicative mood, though predominantly so. See again the fifteen aorists in Ac. 28:11–15 (one perfect). The aorist was used in narrative as a matter of course. Note the many aorists in Heb. 11.

The redundant use of the verb as in λαβὼν ἔσπειρεν (Mt. 13:31)=’took and sowed’ is not a peculiarity of the aorist tense. Cf. ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἔπεμψεν (Jo. 5:15)=’went and told.’ Nor is it a peculiarity of Greek. It belongs to the vernacular of most languages. But we no longer find the iterative use of ὅν with the aorist according to the classic idiom (Moulton, Prol., p. 167).

3 Moulton, Prol., p. 129.
4 Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 400.
(β) The Gnomic Aorist. Jannaris calls this also “empiric aorist,” while Gildersleeve uses “empirical” for the aorist with a negative or temporal adverb, a rather needless distinction. The real “gnomic” aorist is a universal or timeless aorist and probably represents the original timelessness of the aorist indicative. This aorist is common in Homer in comparisons and general sayings. The difference between the gnomic aorist and the present is that the present may be durative. But general truths may be expressed by the aoristic present. Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 109) compares this use of the aorist to the generic article. Winer denies that this idiom occurs in the N. T., but on insufficient grounds. Abbott rather needlessly appeals to the “Hebrew influence on Johannine tense-construction” to explain ἐβλήθη καὶ ἔξηράνθη. (Jo. 15:6) after ἔδω μή τις μένῃ ἐν ἔμοί. It is a general construction here and is followed by three presents (aoristic). This is a mixed condition certainly, the protasis being future (Page 837) (third class, undetermined with some likelihood of determination). But ἐδοξάσθη (Jo. 15:8) is possibly also gnomic. Cf. πάντες ἠμαρτον καὶ ὑπερούνται (Ro. 3:23). But in Jo. 15:6, 8, we may have merely the “timeless” aorist, like ὅταν ἴησεν ἐξηρᾶσθαι, ἐξελθὼν ἐπί τῆς ἡμέρας. In Epictetus, IV, 10, 27. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 124) so thinks and adds, what I do not admit: “The genuine gnomic aorist appears to be foreign to the Hellenistic vernacular.” It survives in modern Greek, according to Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 436. Moulton (Prol., pp. 135, 139) admits it in N. T., but (p. 134) considers Jo. 15:6 the “timeless” aorist, like ἵπτειν ἐν ἐν ἐν οἱ—ἐβαλον (13:44) which is followed by presents ὑπάγει, πολεῖτ, ἄγοράσεν (13:46), συνέβαλεν—ἐβαλον (13:48), ὄμουοθη (18:23), ἐκάθισαν (23:2), εὐρύκερα (Lu. 3:22), ἐξελθὸν (7:35), ἐξῆλθεν (Jo. 8:28), ἐνέτειλεν and the other aorists in Jas. 1:11, ἐκάθισε—ἐδόξασε (Ro. 8:30), ἐξηράνθη—ἐξελθεσαι (1 Pet. 1:12; LXX, Is. 40:7). It is true that the timeless Hebrew perfect is much like this gnomic aorist, but it is a common enough Greek idiom also. Cf. further Lu. 1:51–53. It is not certain that εὐδόκησα (Mt. 3:17; 17:5; Mk. 1:11; Lu. 3:22) belongs here. It may be merely an example of the timeless aorist used in the present, but not gnomic. See under (β). Burton (N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 29) finds it difficult and thinks it originally “inceptive” (ingressive).

(γ) Relation to the Imperfect. The aorist is not used “instead of” the imperfect. But the aorist is often used in the midst of imperfects. The Old Bulgarian does not distinguish between the aorist and the imperfect. In modern Greek, aorists and imperfects have the same endings (Thumb, Handb., p. 119), but the two tenses are distinct in meaning. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 122) thinks that in the κοινή he finds the imperfect used as aorist, as in ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων ἔποιει (ἐποίει) τὸν βομμόν (Inscr. de la 1 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 436.
2 Synt., p. 112.
4 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 48 f.
5 Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 54.
6 W.-Th., p. 277.
7 Joh. Gr., p. 327.
8 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 46; Leo Meyer, Griech. Aoriste, p. 97; Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 243; Moulton, Prol., p. 128. Ἥν may be either aorist or imperfect.
Syrie 2413\textsuperscript{a}), and διεσάφεις for διεσάφης (P. Lond., XLII, Kenyon 30). But I venture to be sceptical. In both passages the imperfects make perfectly good sense. Radermacher urges the common use of ἐπελεύσατα, but that may be merely descriptive imperfect. I grant that it is “willkürlich” in Herodotus (in 1214) to say διεφθάρη καὶ τελεύτα, as in Strabo (C 828) to have ἐπελεύσατα—διαδέδεκτα. It is “rein stilistisch,” but each writer exercises his own whim. Winer\textsuperscript{2} properly remarks that it “often [Page 838] depends on the writer” which tense he will use. Why “often”? Why not “always”? The presence of aorist, imperfect and past perfect side by side show how keen the distinction was felt to be.\textsuperscript{1} Blass\textsuperscript{2} seeks to distinguish sharply between ἔλεγον and ἔπον, but with little success. The trouble, as already stated, is probably that ἔλεγον may be either aorist (like ἔλθον) or imperfect. He admits that Thucydides introduces his speeches either with ἔλεγε or ἔλεξε. Gildersleeve,\textsuperscript{3} like Stahl, denies “an actual interchange of tenses.” In any given incident the speaker or writer may have the choice of representing it in narrative by the aorist (punctiliar) or the imperfect (durative). An interesting example is found in Mk. 12:41–44. The general scene is presented by the descriptive durative imperfect ἐθέωρε and the durative present βάλεi. It is visualized by πολλοὶ—ἔβαλεν. But the figure of the widow woman is singled out by the aorist ἔβαλεν. The closing reference by Jesus to the rest is by the constative aorist πάντες ἔβαλον. Note also the precise distinction between ἔβαλεν and ἔβαλεν at the end. Where the aorist and the imperfect occur side by side, it is to be assumed that the change is made on purpose and the difference in idea to be sought. In juxtaposition the aorist lifts the curtain and the imperfect continues the play. Cf. ἐνύσταξαν (ingressive, ‘fell to nodding’) and ἐκάθευδον (‘went on sleeping’) in Mt. 25:5. So Τίς μου ἤψατο; καὶ περιεβλέπετο (Mk. 5:32), ‘He began to look around because of the touch.’ See also ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλαλε ὁ οὐρα (7:35). A similar distinction appears in ἄγγελοι προσήλθον καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ (Mt. 4:11); ἔπεσεν καὶ ἔπεσεν (13:8); κατέβη καὶ κατέβη (Jo. 5:9); ἀνέβη—καὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός (7:14); ἔβαλεν καὶ ἔκραυγαζον (12:13). In Lu. 8:53 note κατεγέλων and ἔπεδαν. Once again note ἐθαμβάτων—καὶ ἀναφέρουσαν in 9:49 and κατενόουν καὶ ἔδωκεν (Ac. 11:6). Cf. further Ac. 14:10; 1 Cor. 3:6; Mt. 21:8; Mk. 11:18; Jo. 20:3 f. In 1 Cor. 10:4 note ἔπον—ἔπινον; in 11:23, παρεδόκα, παρεδίδετο. The same sort of event will be recorded now with the aorist, as πολὺ πλήθος
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ἤκολούθησεν (Mk. 3:7), now with the imperfect, as ἤκολούθει ὅχλος πολύς (5:24). Cf. Lu. 2:18 and 4:22. But the changing mood of the writer does not mean that the tenses are equivalent to each other. A word further is necessary concerning the relative frequency of aorists and imperfects. Statistical syntax is interesting. Schlachter¹ has applied statistics to Homer. In both Iliad and Odyssey the aorists in the indicative are more numerous than the imperfects. Gildersleeve² found a similar result in Pindar. Jacobsthal (Der Gebrauch der Tempora und Modi in den kretischen Dialektinschriften) finds the aorist surpassing the imperfect. But Hultsch³ found the imperfect very abundant in Polybius, and Prof. Miller⁴ has added statistics for other writers. “The imperfect divides the crown with the aorist in different proportions at different times and in different spheres.”⁵ A further extended quotation from Gildersleeve⁶ is pertinent: “Not the least interesting is the table in which Schlachter has combined his results with Professor Miller’s and from which it appears that the use of the aorist indicative gradually diminishes until it finds its low-water-mark in Xenophon. Then the aorist thrusts itself more and more to the front until it culminates in the N. T. The pseudo-naïveté of Xenophon suggests an answer to one problem. The Hellenica has the lowest percentage of imperfects, but it mounts up in the novelistic Kyropaideia. The other problem, the very low percentage of the imperfect in the N. T.—e.g. Matthew 13 per cent., Apocalypse 7—Schlachter approaches gingerly, and well he may. It stands in marked contrast to Josephus whose 46 per cent. of imperfects shows the artificiality of his style, somewhat as does his use of the participles (A. J. P., IX 154), which, according to Schlachter, he uses more than thrice as often as St. John’s Gospel (41:12). This predominance of the aorist indicative can hardly be dissociated from the predominance of the aorist imperative in the N. T. (Justin Martyr, Apol. I, 16. 6), although the predominance of the aorist imperative has a psychological basis which cannot be made out so readily for the aorist indicative. Besides, we have to take into consideration the growth of the perfect and the familiar use of the historical present, which is kept down in St. Luke alone (A. J. P., XX 109, XXVII 328).” The personal equation, style, character of the book, vernacular or literary form, all come into play. It largely depends on what the writer is after. If he is aiming to describe a scene with vividness, the imperfect predominates. Otherwise he uses the aorist, on the whole the narrative tense par excellence.¹ “Hence the aorist is the truly narrative
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tense, the imperfect the truly descriptive one; and both may be used of the same transaction."

(δ) Relation to the Past Perfect. It is rather shocking, after Winer’s protest that the tenses are not interchanged, to find him saying bluntly: “In narration the aorist is used for the pluperfect.” Burton helps the matter by inserting the word “English” before “pluperfect.” Winer meant “German pluperfect.” Gildersleeve does much better by using “translated.” “We often translate the aorist by a pluperfect for the sake of clearness.” Goodwin adds more exactly that the aorist indicative merely refers the action to the past “without the more exact specification” which the past perfect would give. That is the case. The speaker or writer did not always care to make this more precise specification. He was content with the mere narrative of the events without the precision that we moderns like. We are therefore in constant peril of reading back into the Greek aorist our English or German translation. All that one is entitled to say is that the aorist sometimes occurs where the context “implies completion before the main action,” where in English we prefer the past perfect. This use of the aorist is particularly common in subordinate clauses (relative and temporal and indirect discourse). It must be emphasized that in this construction the antecedence of the action is not stressed in the Greek. “The Greeks neglected to mark the priority of one event to another, leaving that to be gathered from the context.” Strictly therefore the aorist is not used for the past perfect. The Greeks cared not for relative time. In Mt. 14:3 it is plain that ἔδεσεν and ἀπέθετο are antecedent in time to ἠκούσαν, verse 1, and εἶπεν in verse 2, but the story of the previous imprisonment and death of John is introduced by γάρ in a reminiscential manner. In Mt. 2:9 ὅν εἶδον points back to verse 2. Cf. also ὅτι ἔριμοσεν (Mt. 22:34); ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτόν (27:31). So in 28:2 [Page 841] ἐγένετο is antecedent to ἦλθεν in verse 1. In 27:18 note in particular ἠδεί ὅτι παρέδωκαν and compare with ἐγίνωσκεν ὅτι παραδεδώκεισαν in Mk. 15:10 (cf. ὅτις πεποίηκεσαν in verse 7). Here Mark did draw the distinction which Matthew did not care to make. In Lu. 19:15 we have ὅτι διεπραγματεύσατο. Other examples where the antecedence is not expressed, though true, and the aorist is used, are ἐπελάθοντο (Mk. 8:14), ἐπειδή ἐπεχείρησαν (Lu. 1:1), ὥς ἐτέλεσαν (2:39), ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν (7:1), ἐνεδύσατο (8:27), ὁ ἡτοίμασαν (Lu. 24:1), ὡς ἐγένετο (Jo. 2:9), ὁτι ἠκούσαν (4:1), ὃν εἶπεν (4:50), ἐξένευσεν (5:13), ὡς ἐγένετο (6:16), ὁτι ἀνέβλεψεν (9:18), ὁτι ἐξεβαλόν (9:35), ὅπου ὑπήντησαν (11:30 and note ἐγκλήθη), ὁτε ἔπιστευσαν (13:12), ὃς ἐπέβασεν (21:9), οὗς ἐξελέξατο (Ac. 1:2), οὗς προέγνω (Ro. 8:29. Cf. 30 also). In Jo. 18:24, ἀπέστειλεν οὖν, the presence of οὖν makes the matter less certain. If οὖν is transitional, there would be no antecedence. But if οὖν is inferential, that may be true, though Abbott considers it “impossible.” Clyde calls the aorist “an aggressive tense, particularly in
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the active voice, where it encroached on the domain of the perfect, and all but supplanted the pluperfect.” That is true, and yet it must not be forgotten that the aorist was one of the original tenses, much older than the perfects or the future. In wishes about the past (unattainable wishes) the N. T. uses ὤψελων (shortened form of ὤψελων) with the aorist indicative (1 Cor. 4:8) ὣψελων γε ἔβασιλεύσατε. A similar remark applies to use of the aorist indicative in conditions of the second class (past time), without ἕν in apodosis (Gal. 4:15) or with ἕν (Jo. 11:21). In both cases in English we translate this aorist by a past perfect.

(e) Relation to the Present. The so-called Dramatic Aorist is possibly the oldest use of the tense. In Sanskrit this is the common use of the tense to express what has just taken place.\(^3\) One wonders if the gnomic or timeless aorist indicative is not still older. The absence of a specific tense for punctiliar action in the present made this idiom more natural.\(^4\) This primitive use of the aorist survives also in the Slavonic.\(^5\) Giles suggests that “the Latin perfect meaning, like the Sanskrit, may have developed directly from this usage.” The idiom appears in Homer\(^6\) and is found chiefly in the dramatic poets where a sudden change comes,\(^1\) or in colloquial speech or passionate questions.\(^2\) It is a regular idiom in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 123) as πείνασα, ‘I grew hungry,’ ‘am hungry still.’ This aorist is used of actions which have just happened. The effect reaches into the present. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 247) quotes a traveller in Cos who “had a pleasant shock, on calling for a cup of coffee, to have the waiter cry Ἔφθασα.” The Greek can still use a past tense in passionate questions affecting the present.\(^3\) Moulton\(^4\) speaks of “cases where an aorist indicative denotes present time,” though he adds: “None of these examples are really in present time, for they only seem to be so through a difference in idiom between Greek and English.” This latter statement is the truth. The aorist in Greek, particularly in dialogue, may be used for what has just happened. It seems awkward in English to refer to this past time, but it is perfectly natural in Greek. So we translate it by the present indicative. From the Greek point of view the peculiarity lies in the English, not in the Greek. The examples in the N. T. are numerous enough in spite of Winer\(^5\) to be worth noting. Moulton\(^6\) has made a special study of Matthew concerning the translation of the aorist. “Under the head of ‘things just happened’ come 9:18 ἔτελευτήσεν (with ἄρτοι), 5:28 ἔμοιχνεσσεν, and 14:15 παρήλθεν and 17:12 ἦλθε (with ἡμῖν); 6:12 ἄφθασαν, 12:28 ἔφθασαν, 14:2, etc., ἥγερθη, 16:17 ὀπεκύλωσε, 18:15 ἐκέρδησας, 20:12 ἐποίησαν –ας, 26:10 ἥργάσατο, 26:13 ἐποίησε, 26:65 ἐβλασθήσεν, ἤκουσατε, 26:25, 64 ἔπαιξας, 27:19 ἐπαθον, 27:46 ἐγκατέλειψες, 28:7 ἔπον, 28:18 ἐδόθη (unless 11:27 forbids) and perhaps ἐγενήθη.” Certainly this is a
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respectable list for Matthew. Add ἐμερίσθη (Mt. 12:26). These all can be translated by the English ‘have.’ Ἑδόκησα (Mt. 3:17 and parallels) is a possible example also. Cf. ὁν εὐδοκήσει ἡ ψυχή μου (12:18, LXX). It is a “timeless” aorist7 and may be gnomic, as already pointed out. Cf. 2 Pet. 1:17; Mk. 10:20, ἐφυλάξαμην ἕκ τῆς νεότητος; ἐξέστη in Mk. 3:21; ἀπέχει, ἤλθε—παραδίδοται (14:41). Other examples of the aorist for what has just happened are ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ἔστα (Mk. 16:6); ἠγέρθη— ἐπεκάθισεν (Lu. 7:16); ἡγόρασα, ἔγειρα (14:18–20); ἐξήστη, εὑρέθη (15:32); ἔγνων (16:4); ἐκρύβη (19:42); ὁντώς ἠγέρθη (24:34); προσεκύνησαν (Jo. 4:20); [Page 843] ἥκουσας (11:41); ἄπεξῆθεν (12:19); ἤλθον εἰς τὴν ὠραν ταύτην (12:27); ἤλθεν (13:1); νῦν ἠδόξασθη (13:31), but ἠδόξασα (17:4) points backward, ‘I did glorify thee,’ while ἠδοξάσθη in 15:8 is possibly gnomic; ἐπιάσατε νῦν (21:10); ἐδούλωσα, ἔγνωμην (1 Cor. 9:19, 20, 22. Cf. ποιῶ in verse 23); ἐδεικνύει, ἐδεικνύεν (Rev. 14:8; 18:2).1 With this use of the aorist adverbs of time are common to make clear the present relation of time. Cf. τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον ἐφανερώθη (Jo. 21:14) where τοῦτο has the effect of bringing the action forward. For a sharp contrast between the aorist and present see ἔσεχες, καὶ νῦν ὁ ἔχεις (Jo. 4:18). So ἔθυσα καὶ ἔζησα, B.G.U. 287 (A.D. 250). Cf. also Lu. 10:24. See in particular ἔγνω, ἔγνων and ἔγνωσαν in Jo. 17:25. The timeless aorist is well illustrated in the participle in Lu. 10:18, ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν πεσόντα.

(ζ) Relation to Present Perfect. The problem just here is not whether the present perfect is ever used as an aorist. That will be discussed under the present perfect. If the distinction between the two tenses was finally2 obliterated, as early happened in Latin,3 there would be some necessary confusion. But that has not happened in the N. T. period. Jannaris3 notes it regularly about 1000 A.D. It is undeniable that the early Sanskrit used the aorist chiefly for “something past which is viewed with reference to the present” and it disappeared before the growth of the other more exact tenses.5 The perfect may be said to be a development from the aorist, a more exact expression of completed action than mere “punctiliar” (aorist), viz. state of completion. But in the Greek the aorist not only held its own with the other tenses, but “has extended its province at the expense of the perfect,” particularly in the N. T. period, though different writers vary greatly here.6 But was the aorist used “for” the perfect? Clyde7 says: “The aorist was largely used for the perfect.” Winer8 replies: “There is no passage in which it can be certainly proved that the aorist stands for the perfect.” Gildersleeve9 more correctly says: “The aorist is very often used where we should expect the perfect,” i.e. in English. But the translation [Page 844] of the aorist into English will call for special discussion a little later. What is true is that the action in
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such cases “is regarded as subordinate to present time,”1 in other words, the precise specification of relative time which we draw in our English perfect is not drawn in the Greek. The Greek states the simple undefined punctiliar action in a connection that suggests present time and so we render it in English by our “have.”2 But Farrar3 is right in insisting that we do not explain the Greek tense by the English rendering. In truth, the examples given under the head of “Relation to the Present” (e) may often be rendered by the English “have” with tolerable accuracy.4 Sometimes the use of an adverb or particle helps the English. The examples are rather numerous in the N.T., as in the papyri,5 where the aorist and the present perfect occur side by side. Thus ἔχως ἔναν ἄπεγραψάμην καὶ πέπρακα, O.P. 482 (ii/A.D.); τῇς γενομένης καὶ ἀποτελεσματικοῦς γυναικῶς, N.P. 19 (ii/A.D.). Moulton adds: “The distinction is very clearly seen in papyri for some centuries.” In most instances in the N.T. the distinction is very sharply drawn in the context, as in ὅτι ἔταφη, καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται (1 Cor. 15:4). So ἐκτίθησα, ἐκτίστησα (Col. 1:16). Cf. Ac. 21:28. In most instances where we have trouble from the English standpoint it is the perfect, not the aorist that occasions it, as in πέπρακαν καὶ ἠγόρασαν (Mt. 13:46). We shall come back to this point under the present perfect. As a rule all that is needed is a little imagination on the part of the English reader to sympathize with the mental alertness expressed in the changing tenses, a sort of “moving picture” arrangement. Cf. κατενόησεν γὰρ Εαυτὸν καὶ ἄπελθάθαν καὶ εὐθείως ἐπελάθθει ὁποῖος ἦν (Jas. 1:24). The single point to note concerning the aorist in those examples where we use “have” is that the Greeks did not care to use the perfect. Cf. οὐκ ἔληλθα καλέσαι δικαιούς (Lu. 5:32) with οὐ γὰρ ἠλθον καλέσαι δικαιούς (Mt. 9:13), just two ways of regarding the same act. That is the whole story and it is a different thing from saying that the aorist is used “for” the present perfect. Here are some of the most interesting examples in the N.T. where “we” in English prefer “have”: ἠκούσατε (Mt. 5:21); εὗρον (8:10); ἀνέγνωτε (12:3); ἔπαχύνθη καὶ ἠκούσαν καὶ ἔκάμμυσαν (13:15, LXX, Is. 6:10. [Page 845] Likely the timelessness of the Hebrew perfect may have caused this translation into the aorist so common in the LXX), ἠμωρόσατε (Mt. 15:6); συνέξειον (19:6); ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι κατηρτίσα (21:16); ἀφίκατε (23:23); κατέστησαν (24:45); ἐποίησαν (27:23); ἔγνωσθη (28:6); ἔξεστι (Mk. 3:21); ἀπέθάνεν (5:35); cf. τί ἔτι σκύλλες; 5:35. Cf. ἀλλὰ καθεύδει; ἔδωκεν (Lu. 5:26); παρεδόθη (10:22); ἐμαρτυρον (15:21); ἔγνωσαν (Jo. 7:26); ἀφίκητε (8:29); ἔλαβον (10:18); ἔδειξα (10:32); ἔδοξα (12:28). Cf. δοξάσω; ἔνωσα (13:14); ἐξέλεξαμεν (13:18); ἡγάπησα (13:34); ἔγνωσα (15:15); οὐκ ἔγνωσαν (16:3); ἦν—ἔθηκαν (20:2); ἐπίσταται (21:10).2 Cf. Mk. 14:8. Abbott remarks, that the Greek perfect does not lay the same stress on what is recently completed as does the English “have.” Cf. also οὐκ ἔγνω (1 Jo. 4:8. Cf. 1 Cor. 8:3); ἔφανερόθη (1 Jo. 4:9. Contrast ἂπεσταλκεν in verse 9 and ἐγνωσμαι, ἐγνωσμαι in margin, in verse 10 with ἔγνωσεν and ἂπεστευεν in verse 10); ἔλαβον (Ph. 3:12); ἐμαθον (4:11); ἔκαθαν (Heb. 1:3); ἔξεστημεν (2 Cor. 5:13). The same event in Mk.
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15:44 is first mentioned by ἤδη τέθνηκεν and is then referred to by ἤδη (or πάλαι) ἀπέθανεν. The distinction is not here very great, but each tense is pertinent. However, τέθνηκεν means practically ‘to be dead,’ while ἀπέθανεν = ‘died,’ ‘has died.’ Cf. Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 108.

(*η*) **Epistolary Aorist.** This idiom is merely a matter of standpoint. The writer looks at his letter as the recipient will. It is probably due to delicate courtesy and is common in Latin as well as in the older Greek, though less so in the later Greek. The most frequent word so used was ἐγράψα, though ἐπεμψα was also common. The aorist has its normal meaning. One has merely to change his point of view and look back at the writer. In 1 Jo. 2:12–14 we have the rhetorical repetition of γράψα, ἐγράψα (note the perfects after ὅτι). But in 1 Jo. 2:21 ἐγράψα may be the epistolary use, though Winer protests against it. Here as in 2:26, ταῦτα ἐγράψα, the reference may be not to the whole epistle, but to the portion in hand, though even so the standpoint is that of the reader. Cf. also 5:13. In 1 Cor. 9:15 also the reference is to the verses in hand. In Eph. 3:3, καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ, the allusion may be to what Paul has just written or to the whole epistle, as is true of ἐπέστειλα (Heb. 13:22). Certainly γράψα is the usual construction in the N. T. (1 Cor. 4:14; 14:37; 2 Cor. 13:10, etc.). ἐγράψα usually refers to an epistle just finished (Phil. 19; 1 Pet. 5:12; 1 Jo. 5:13), but even so the standpoint veers naturally to that of the reader. This is particularly so in Gal. 6:11 which probably refers to the concluding verses 11–18 and, if so, a true epistolary aorist. In Ro. 15:15 the reference may be to another portion of the same epistle or to the epistle as a whole. In 1 Cor. 5:9, 11, ἐγράψα refers to a previous letter, as seems to be true also in 2 Cor. 2:3, 4, 9; 7:12; 3 Jo. 9. But ἐπεμψα is found in undoubted instances as in Ac. 23:30; Eph. 6:22; Ph. 2:28; Col. 4:8. So ἰδέσπαισα in Phil. 12 and ἰδέσπαισα in Text. Rec. 2 Jo. 12. Curiously enough Gildersleeve says: “The aorist in the N. T. [Ep. aor.] is clearly due to Roman influence, and is not to be cited.” The epistolary aorist is more common in Latin (cf. Cicero’s *Letters*), probably because of our having more epistolary material. The idiom occurs often enough in the papyri. Cf. ἐπεμψα, B.G.U. 423 (ii/A.D.), ἐγράψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ ἱδέοις γράμματα, P.Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66). There is therefore no adequate reason for denying its presence in the N. T. examples above.

(*θ*) **Relation to the Future.** The future was probably (cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 480) a late development in the language, and other devices were at first used, like the present indicative, the perfect indicative, the aorist subjunctive. The aorist indicative was also one of the expedients that never quite disappeared. It is not exactly, like the epistolary aorist, a change of standpoint. It is a vivid transference of the action to the future (like the present ἔρχομαι, Jo. 14:3) by the timeless aorist. The augmented form is still used, but the time is hardly felt to be past. This idiom survives in the Slavonic also. It is a vivid idiom and is still found in modern Greek. Thumb (*Handb.*, p. 123) cites κ’ ὃν μὲ σοβαλίστετε, ἐνας Γραικὸς ἐχάθη, ‘even if you impale me only one
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Greek perishes.’ Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 124) cites from Epictetus, ὅταν θέλησς, ἔξηλθες. Gildersleeve5 calls it “a vision of the future.” Burton6 considers it “rather a rhetorical figure than a grammatical idiom,” but the idiom is not so strange after all. Cf. Eur., Alc., 386, ἀπολέσμεν ἐὰ με λέιψεις=’I perish if you leave me.’ The examples are not numerous in the N. T. and some of them may be gnomic. Cf. ἐάν σου ἀκούσῃ, ἐκέρδησας τὸν ἄδελφόν σου (Mt. 18:15. Cf. παράλαβε as the next apodosis in verse 16 and ἔστω in verse 17); ἐὰν καὶ γαμήσῃς, οὐχ ἦμαρτες (1 Cor. 7:28); [Page 847] ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἔτελσθη (Rev. 10:7), probably also ἐὰν μὴ τις μένῃ ἐν ἐμοί, ἐξηράνθη—καὶ ἐξηράνθη (Jo. 15:6), though this may be merely gnomic, as already stated. Cf. the use of ἐμερίσθη and ἔφθασεν in Mt. 12:26, 28 in a condition of the present time. In Jo. 13:31 ἔδοξάσθη (twice) is explained (verse 32) by δοξάσει καὶ εὐθύς δοξάσει. Cf. p. 1020 (standpoint).

(i) Aorist in Wishes. The special use of the aorist indicative in wishes about the past and conditions determined as unfulfilled will be discussed in chapter XIX, Modes.

(k) Variations in the Use of Tenses. Where so much variety is possible, great freedom is to be expected. In modern English we make a point of uniformity of tense in narrative. The Greeks almost made a point of the opposite. It is jejune, to say no more, to plane down into a dead level the Greek spontaneous variety. Cf. ἦμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦντα (Ro. 3:23). In Matt. 4:11, for instance, we have ἀφίησιν (historical pres.), προσήλθων (aor.), δημόσιων (imperfect). In Mt. 13:45 f. note ἔστιν, ζητοῦντι, ἐφών, ἀπελθόντων, πάπρακε, ἐκεῖν, ἡγόρασεν. “When they wished to narrate a fact, or to convey a meaning, there is good ground for holding that they employed the tense appropriate for the purpose, and that they employed it just because of such appropriateness.”1 That is well said. The explanation is chiefly psychological, not mere analogy, which is true of only a few tenses, especially in late Greek (Middleton, Analogy in Syntax, 1892, p. 6). Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 437, lays probably too much stress on “the terminal homophony of the two tenses” (aor. and perf.).

(κ) Translation of the Aorist into English. The Greek aorist ind., as can be readily seen, is not the exact equivalent of any tense in any other language. It has nuances all its own, many of them difficult or well-nigh impossible to reproduce in English. Here, as everywhere, one needs to keep a sharp line between the Greek idiom and its translation into English. We merely do the best that we can in English to translate in one way or another the total result of word (Aktionsart), context and tense.2 Certainly one cannot say that the English translations have been successful with the Greek

5 Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 114.
6 N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 23.
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aorist. Weymouth in his *New Testament in Modern Speech* has attempted to carry out a consistent principle with some success. Moulton\(^4\) has thought the matter important enough for an extended discussion. He makes clear that the Greek aorist is true to itself, however it is rendered into English. Take τινὲς ἐκομηθήσαν (1 Cor. 15:6), for instance, ‘fell asleep (at various times),’ Moulton explains, “and so have fallen asleep.” In Mt. 3:7 ὑπέδειξεν may be translated by ‘has warned,’ but ‘warned’ will answer. The English past will translate the Greek aorist in many cases where we prefer “have.” Burton\(^1\) puts it clearly thus: “The Greek employs the aorist, leaving the context to suggest the order; the English usually suggests the order by the use of the pluperfect.” The Greek aorist takes no note of any interval between itself and the moment of speaking, while the English past takes note of the interval. The Greek aorist and the English past do not exactly correspond, nor do the Greek perfect and the English perfect.\(^2\) The Greek aorist covers much more ground than the English past. Cf. διὸ ἐκλήθη ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἐκεῖνος Ἀγαθὸς Ἀἵματος ἡ σήμερον (Mt. 27:8), where the Greek aorist is connected with the present in a way that only the English perfect can render. See also ἐξεὶ ἔρις οὐκ ἤτρισατε (Jo. 16:24). From the Greek point of view the aorist is true to its own genius. The aorist in Greek is so rich in meaning that the English labours and groans to express it. As a matter of fact the Greek aorist is translatable into almost every English tense except the imperfect, but that fact indicates no confusion in the Greek.\(^3\)

(c) **The Aorist Subjunctive and Optative.** The aorist of these two “side-moods”\(^4\) may very well be discussed together. The two moods are not radically different as we shall see.

(a) **No Time Element in the Subjunctive and Optative.**\(^5\) There is only relative time (future), and that is not due to the tense at all.\(^6\) The subjunctive is future in relation to the speaker, as is often true of the optative, though the optative standpoint is then more remote, a sort of future from the standpoint of the past.

(b) **Frequency of Aorist Subjunctive.** As between the aorist and present in subjunctive and optative, the aorist is far more common. For practical purposes the perfect may be almost left out of view; it is so rare. As a rule in these moods the action is either punctiliar (aorist) or durative (present). The contrast between point and linear action comes out simply and clearly here. It is just that [Page 849] seen between the aorist and the imperfect indicative.\(^1\) In the classical Sanskrit the subjunctive exists only in a remnant of the first person, which is treated as an
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imperative, but it is common enough in the early language. In Homer (both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*) the aorist is in great preponderance over the present (65 to 35 for the average between subjunctive and optative, about the same for each). Gildersleeve considers the difference due to the nature of the constructions, not to mere lack of differentiation in the early stage of the language. The subj. is more common in Homer than in the later Greek and the aorist subj. is correspondingly abundant. There is no doubt that the aorist is gaining in the *κοινή* over the present in the subj., opt., imper. (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 123). The distinction is understood. Cf. μέχρις ὃν ἦλιος δύῃ (aim) and ἐξίρις ὃν ἐπίκαιρον δοκῇ (duration), I. G., XII, 5, 647. Radermacher cites also ὅπως λαμβάνωσιν and ὅπως λάβωσιν, ὅπως ὑπάρχῃ and ἵνα δοθῇ from a Pergamum inscr., N. 13 (B.C. 300). He fears that this proves confusion between the tenses, and appeals also to the papyrus example ἵνα γράφω καὶ φλοιαρήσω (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 204). But there is no necessary confusion here. The modern Greek preserves clearly the distinction between punctiliar and linear action in the subj. and uses the aorist and present side by side to show it (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 124). The situation in the N. T. is even more striking. Mr. H. Scott, Birkenhead, England, writes me that he finds only five present subjs. in Acts and one (13:41) is a quotation. In the Pauline Epistles (13) he notes 258 dependent aorist subjs. and 161 dependent pres. subjs. Gildersleeve complains of Stahl’s wearisomeness in proving what “no one will dispute.” The point is that the aorist subj. or opt. is used as a matter of course unless durative (linear) action is to be emphasized or (as rarely) the completed state is to be stressed (perfect). But variations occur even here. Thus Abbott notes only two instances of the pres. subj. [Page 850] with ἐὰν in Mk. (9:45; 14:31) and two in Lu. (6:33; 19:31), apart from μή and except clauses with ἔχω and θέλω. The aorist subjunctive with ἔναν occurs in Synoptics 24 times, present 79. But in John there is more diversity between the two tenses. “Most Greek writers observe the distinction between the aorist and present subjunctive, as Englishmen observe that between ‘shall’ and ‘will,’ unconsciously and without any appearance of deliberately emphasizing the difference. But we have seen above (2511) that John employs the two forms with great deliberateness, even in the same sentence, to distinguish between the beginning of ‘knowing’ and the development of it.” Cf. ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γνώσκετε (10:38) and ἀνεάρτα οἶδατε, μακάριοι ἔστε ἔδω ποιήτε αὐτά (13:17), where the pres. is again used purposely. Note also John’s τί ποιήσωμεν (6:28) and Luke’s τί ποιήσωμεν (3:10). We need not follow all the details of Abbott, but he has made it perfectly clear that John makes the sharp distinction between the aor. and pres. subj. that is common between the aor. and imperf. ind. Cf. ἐὰν τις τρήσῃ (Jo.
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8:51) and ἐὰν τιρώμεν (1 Jo. 2:3); ὅτι ἐν αἵτις καὶ τίς οὗ στεφανοῦται (1 Jo. 2:3). But Paul also knows the punctiliar force of the aor. subj. Cf. ἁμαρτήσωμεν (Ro. 6:15) with ἑπιμένομεν (6:1), where the point lies chiefly in the difference of tense. See also 2 Tim. 2:5, ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἁθίκ ἐὰν καὶ τίς οὗ στεφανοῦται ἐὰν μὴ νομίμῳ ἁθίκῃ. Cf. ποιήσατε in Gal. 5:17. In deliberative questions the aorist subj. is particularly common, as in ἐὰν ἰδώμεν ἢ μὴ ἱδώμεν (Mk. 12:14). In εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν (Ro. 5:1) the durative present occurs designedly=‘keep on enjoying peace with God,’ the peace already made (δικαιωθέντες). Moulton (Prol., p. 186) thinks that the aorist subj. in relative clauses like ὃς ἄν φονεύσῃ (Mt. 5:21), or ὅπου ἐὰν καταλάβῃ (Mk. 9:18), or conditional sentences like ἐὰν ὀπάσησθε (Mt. 5:47) “gets a future-perfect sense.” But one doubts if after all this is not reading English or Latin into the Greek. Cf. Mt. 5:31. The special construction of the aorist subj. with oū μή (Jo. 6:35; 18:11) comes up for discussion elsewhere (pp. 929 ff., 1174 ff.).

(γ) Aktionsart. The three kinds of point-action occur, of course, in the aorist subj. Thus in ἤνα μαρτυρήσῃ (Jo. 1:7) the aorist is merely constative, as is ἐὰν μείνῃ ἐν ἔμοι (Jo. 15:7). Cf. ἐὰν μή τις μένῃ ἐν ἔμοι (15:6). In Jo. 6:30, ἥνα ἱδώμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμέν πολὺ, the ingressive use is evident in πιστεύσωμεν=‘come to believe’ (cf. ἤνα πιστεύσῃ in verse 29). Cf. also ἤνα πιστεύσημεν καὶ ἄγαπημέν (1 Jo. 3:23); περιπατήσωμεν (Ro. 6:4; 13:13). The [Page 851] effective aorist is seen in πῶς πληρωθῆσιν (Mt. 26:54). Cf. ὅταν καταργήσῃ (1 Cor. 15:24) for the “perfective” use of the preposition also. In the modern Greek the aorist subj. preserves Aktionsart (Thumb, Handb., p. 124).

(δ) Aorist Subjunctive in Prohibitions. It seems clear1 that originally both in Sanskrit and Greek prohibition was expressed only by the subj. Hence the growth of the imperative never finally displaced it. In particular the aorist subj. held its place in prohibitions as against the aorist imper. (a late form anyhow). This distinction has held in the main right on through. In the N. T. examples of the aor. imper. in prohibitions do occur in the third person, but the aor. subj. survives. In the second person the rule is still absolute. Moulton2 has given a very interesting discussion of the development of the discovery of the distinction between the two constructions. The aorist subj. is of course punctiliar, and the present imper. linear. Inasmuch as the prohibition is future, the aorist subj. would naturally be ingressive. Gottfried Hermann long ago made the distinction, but a few years ago Dr. Henry Jackson tells how one day he got the idea from a friend (quoted by Moulton2): “Davidson told me that, when 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 instance, 20 E, μὴ θορυβήσητε, ‘before clamour begins,’ and 21 A, μὴ θορυβάτε, ‘when it has begun.’” This distinction is clearly in harmony with the punctiliar aorist subj. and the durative present imper. It is maintained in ancient Greek
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and in modern Greek, and Moulton shows how the papyri abundantly illustrate it. Unfortunately the present imperative is rare in the papyri from the nature of the subject-matter, but the few examples agree to the distinction drawn. The aorist subjunctive is abundant enough. Moulton (Prol., p. 123) finds in O.P. (all ii/A.D.) six aorist subs. with μή. Thus μὴ ὑμελήσῃς refers to a request in a letter. Cf. also μὴ ἀλλὰς ποιήσῃς. But τούτο μὴ λέγε, ‘stop saying this,’ is in a letter in reference to what had already been said. So μὴ ἰγνοεῖα, ‘don’t go on worrying.’ Another good example is in Hb.P. 56 (iii/b.c.), σὺ οὖν μὴ ἐνόχλει αὐτὸν. Moulton clinches it by the modern Greek μὴ γράφῃς (to one already writing) and μὴ γράψῃς (to one who has not begun). The distinction is not admitted by all modern scholars. But the difficulty lies mainly in the use of the present imperative, not in the aorist subj. Examples like μὴ θαυμάσῃς (Jo. 3:7) do occur, where the thing prohibited has begun. Here it is the constative aorist rather than the ingressive which is more usual in this construction. Moulton quotes Dr. Henry Jackson again: “Μὴ δράσῃς 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 φροντίσῃς, ‘Oh, never mind!’ μὴ δείσῃς, ‘Never fear!’ μὴ θαμασήσῃς, ‘You mustn’t be surprised!’” Add also μὴ φοβήθῃς (Mt. 1:20). But, as a rule, it is the ingressive aorist subj. used in prohibitions to forbid a thing not yet done or the durative present imper. to forbid the continuance of an act. The N. T. is very rich in examples of both of these idioms because of the hortatory nature of the books. Moulton finds 134 examples of μὴ with the pres. imper. and 84 of μὴ with the aorist subj. In Matthew there are 12 examples of μὴ with the pres. imper. and 29 of μὴ with the aorist subj. But these figures are completely reversed in the Gospel of Luke (27 to 19), in James (7 to 2), in Paul’s Epistles (47 to 8) and John’s writings (19 to 1). The case in Jo. 3:7 has already been noticed. It may be said at once that the excess of examples of pres. imper. over aorist imper. is the old situation in Homer. In the Attic orators, Miller (A. J. P., xiii, 423) finds the proportion of μὴ ποίει type to μὴ ποιήσῃς type 56 to 44, about the same as that in the N. T., 134 to 84. In the N. T. this predominance holds except in Matthew, 1 Peter and Rev. (Moulton, Prol., p. 124). The aorist imper. was an after-growth, and yet is very common in the N. T. (and LXX) as compared with the older Greek. In the Lord’s Prayer, for instance, every tense is aorist (Mt. 6:9–13). Gildersleeve remarks that the aorist suits “instant prayer.” But cf. Lu. 11:2–4. However, the point is here that in the N. T., as a rule, the idiom gives little difficulty. Cf. μὴ νομίσητε (Mt. 5:17); μὴ ἐπισημάνῃς ἧμας (Mt. 6:13; Lu. 11:4); μὴ
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στήσες αὐτοῦ ταύτην (Ac. 7:60). Cf. μὴ σαλπίσης (Mt. 6:2), ‘don’t begin to sound,’ and μὴ θησαυρίζετε (6:19), ‘they were already doing it.’ Note again μὴ δότε μηδὲ βάλλετε (Mt. 7:6) and μὴ κρίνετε (7:1). With Mt. 3:9 μὴ δόξητε λέγειν compare Lu. 3:8 μὴ ἀρξησθε λέγειν. But in Lu. 3:14, μὴδένα διασέσητε μηδὲ συκοφαντήσητε, we have the constative aorist rather than the pres. imper. (the soldiers were present, if John spoke in Greek to them, more restrained at any rate). In Lu. 11:7, μὴ μιν κόπους πάρεχες ‘quit troubling me,’ while in Rev. 10:4, μὴ αὐτά γράψῃς ‘do not begin to write.’ (Cf. ἠμελλόν γράφειν in same verse.) It is not necessary to labour the point.

But in Mt. 6:25 we have μὴ μεριμνάτε, implying that they were anxious; in 6:34, μὴ οὖν μεριμνήστε, a general warning in conclusion. Once more, in Mt. 10:26, note μὴ οὖν φοβηθήτε αὐτοῦς, the warning against fearing evil men; in 10:31, μὴ οὖν φοβεῖσθε ‘quit being afraid.’ In Jo. 5:45, μὴ δοκεῖτε, it is implied that ‘they had been thinking that’; in 2 Cor. 11:16, μὴ τίς με δόξη, ‘no one did, of course.’ In Jo. 6:43 μὴ γογγύζετε is interpreted as ἔγογγυζον in verse 41. Cf. μὴ κλαίετε (Lu. 8:52), ‘they were weeping.’ In μὴ δοξη (2 Cor. 11:16) and μὴ ἔξουσθενήση (1 Cor. 16:11) the normal use of μὴ with the aorist subj. occurs with the third person. A good double example occurs in Lu. 10:4, μὴ βαστάζετε βαλλάντιαv (‘don’t keep carrying’), and in μηδένα ἀπεσάσηθε (‘don’t stop to salute’). In Col. 2:21 μὴ ἄφη is a warning to the Colossian Christians not to be led astray by the gnostic asceticism. In 2 Cor. 6:17, ὁκαθάρτου μὴ ἀπεσθε, the prophet (Is. 52:11) assumes that the people were guilty, if ἐκαθάρισθε as followed as by Paul, but B has ἀναστήσατε. In Jo. 20:17, μὴ μου ἔπτω, Jesus indicates that Mary must cease clinging to him. Cf. μὴτε ὀμόσης (Mt. 5:36) and μὴ ὀμοίωσότε (Jas. 5:12). As to the present imperative further discussion belongs elsewhere, but a word is necessary here. Moulton2 thinks that ‘rather strong external pressure is needed to force the rule upon Paul.’ John has only one case of μὴ with the aorist subj., and yet Moulton holds that all his uses of the present imper. fit the canon completely. Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 164) says: “μὴ with the present imperative has to do with a course of action and means sometimes ‘keep from’ (resist), sometimes ‘cease to’ (desist).” So ‘continue not doing,’ or ‘do not continue doing.’ One of the imper. presents is merely exclamatory [Page 854] (cf. ἀγε, Jas. 5:1). Another, like ὑμα with μηδὲν εἶχης (Mt. 8:4), is almost like a “sort of particle adding emphasis.” If “a negative course of action” (Gildersleeve) is enjoined, it is not necessarily implied that one is doing the thing. Moulton’s difficulty about Paul is thus obviated. Hence the answer2 to μὴ ποιεῖ, which usually=‘Stop doing,’ may be in a given case=‘Do not from time to time,’ ‘Do not as you are in danger of doing,’ ‘Do not attempt to do’ or simply ‘Continue not doing.’ In Eph. 5:18 μὴ μεθοδεύετε may mean that some of them were getting drunk (cf. even at the Lord’s Table, 1 Cor. 11:21), or a course of action (the habit) may be prohibited. In μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε (Eph. 4:26) the imminent peril of sin may be implied (cf. ὑπεξεῖθε). So in μὴ γεύεσθε (Col. 3:9) we may have the course of action, though the usual linear notion is pertinent. But cf. μὴ ἄμελε (1 Tim. 4:14), μηδὲν ἔπιτιθει and μηδὲ κοινώνει (5:22),3 and μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς οὶ ὑποκριταί (Mt. 6:16), as illustrations of the point in dispute. In the modern Greek “as a prohibitive the
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aorist subj. is on the whole less commonly used than the pres. subj.” (Thumb, Handb., p. 127). Μή with the present imper. survives in a few instances, but the subj. in modern Greek does practically all the work of prohibiting.

(c) Aorist Subjunctive with οὔ μή. It is merely the tense that calls for comment here, not the mode nor the negative. The present subj. was sometimes used with οὔ μή in the ancient Greek, but no examples occur in the N. T. The aorist is very natural as the action is distinctly punctiliar. Of the 100 examples of οὔ μή in the W. H. text, 86 are with the aorist subj., 14 are future inds.4 Cf. οὔ μή εἰσέλθητε (Mt. 5:20); οὔκέτι οὔ μή πίω (Mk. 14:25). The other aspects of the subject will be discussed elsewhere (chapters on Modes and Particles).

(ζ) Aorist Optative. It is more frequent than the present in the N. T. This is partly due to the relative frequency of μή γένοιτο (cf. Gal. 6:14) and the rarity of the optative itself. The distinction of tense is preserved. Cf. μηδέξι φάγοι (ingressive, Mk. 11:14); πληθυνθῆτε (effective, 1 Pet. 1:2); κατευθύνω—πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι (constative, 1 Th. 3:11 f.). Cf. δῶ (2 Tim. 1:16, 18). Cf. 2 Tim. 4:16. These are wishes. The aorist occurs also with the potential opt. as in τί ἄν ποιήσασιν (Lu. 6:11). Cf. Ac. 26:29. In the N. T. certainly the optative usually refers to the future (relatively), though Gildersleeve5 is willing to admit [Page 855] that Homer uses the potential opt. with ἄν a few times of the past. The opt. in indirect questions has to be noted.

(d) The Aorist Imperative. In Homer the aorist imperative, as already stated, is not so common as the present, while in the N. T. it is remarkably frequent.1 This frequency of the imper. is characteristic of the κοινή generally,2 though in the end the subj. came to be used in positive commands like the Latin.3 There is no complication in the positive command, like the ban put upon μή ποίησον from the beginning of our knowledge of the Greek language.4 Hence in the positive imperative we are free to consider the significance of the aorist (and present) tense in the essential meaning. Here the distinction between the punctiliar (aorist) and the durative (present) is quite marked.5 Indeed Moulton (Prol., p. 129) holds that to get at “the essential character of aorist action, therefore we must start with the other moods” than ind. It is easier, for the time element is absent. Cf. περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἵματίν σου καὶ ἄκολοθόθει μοι (Ac. 12:8). It is exactly the distinction between the aorist and imperf. ind. (cf. ἐξελθὼν ἡκολούθει in verse 9). The constative aorist, περιβαλοῦ, is like the preceding, ζῶσαι καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου. In Jo. 5:8 note ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περισσάτε (the ingressive aorist and the durative, ‘walking,’ ‘went on walking’), and the same tense-distinction is preserved in verse 9, ἐρε—καὶ περισσάτε (cf. further 5:11). In ὑπάγε νῦνα (Jo. 9:7) the present ὑπάγε is exclamatory (cf. ἔγαρ ἄρον in 5:8). Cf. Mk. 2:9, 11. In the midst of the aorists in Jo. 2:5–8 (the effective ποιῆσατε, γεμίσατε,
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ἀντλήσατε νῦν) the present φέρετε stands out. It is probably a polite conative offer to the master of the feast. In the Lord’s Prayer in Mt. (6:9–11) note ὃγιασθήτω, γενηθήτω, δός, ἄφες and εἰσελθε—πρόσευξαι in 6:6. In opposition to δός σήμερον in Matthew we have δίδου τῷ καθ ἥμέραν in Lu. 11:3, a fine contrast between the punctiliar and the linear action.6 So τῷ αἴτουντι δός (Mt. 5:42) and παντὶ αἴτουντι δίδου (Lu. 6:30); χαρίστε ἐν ἐκείνη τῇ ἥμέρᾳ (Lu. 6:23) and χαίρετε (Mt. 5:12); ἀρατε ταῦτα ἐντεύθεν, μη ποιήτε (Jo. 2:16, a very fine illustration). In Ro. 6:13 a pointed distinction in the tenses is drawn, μηδὲ παραστάσατε τῷ μέλῳ ὑμῶν ὁπλα ὀδύκιας τῇ ἐμαρτησίᾳ, ὑλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς (one the habit of sin forbidden, the other the instant surrender to God enjoined). Cf. also νῦν [Page 856] παραστάσει in verse 19. In Lu. 7:8, πορεύθητι—πορεύεται, ποίησον—ποιεῖ, the presents are also aoristic. As with the ind. the aorist (constative) may be used with a durative word. So μείνατε ἐν τῇ ὑγίᾳ τῇ ἑμή (Jo. 15:9). The action, durative in itself, is treated as punctiliar. Cf. Mt. 26:38, μείνατε ὅως καὶ γηγορεῖ μετ’ ἐμοῦ (Mk. 14:34). So with μακροθυμήσατε ἐξὸς τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου (Jas. 5:7); τῆν παραθήκην φύλαξον (1 Tim. 6:20. Cf. 2 Tim. 1:14; 1 Jo. 5:21); ταῦτα παράδοσαν (2 Tim. 2:2); συννοικοπάθησον (2:3); σπούδασο (2:15). Cf. the aorists in Jas. 4:9. Most of them call for little comment. Cf. Jo. 4:16, 35. Abbott1 notes the avoidance of the aorist imper. of πιστεύω, possibly because mere belief (aorist) had come to be misunderstood. The pres. imper. presses the continuance of faith (cf. Jo. 14:11). The real force of the effective aorist is seen in λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον (Jo. 2:19). In Mk. 15:32, καταβάτω νῦν, the “perfective” force of the preposition is added. Moulton2 notes that 1 Peter shows a marked liking for the aorist (20 aorists to 5 presents in commands, H. Scott), while Paul’s habit, as already noted, is just the opposite. Moulton3 has an interesting comment on the fact that “in seven instances only do the
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two evangelists [Mt. 5–7 and Luke’s corresponding passage] use different tenses, and in all of them the accompanying variation of phraseology accounts for the differences in a way which shows how delicately the distinction of tenses was observed.” There may be variations in the translation of the Aramaic original (if the Sermon on the Mount was spoken in Aramaic?), “but we see no trace of indifference to the force of the tenses.” In the imperative also different writers will prefer a different tense. One writer is more fond of the aorist, another of the present. Note the impressive aorists, ἀρατε τὸν λίθον, λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἅφατε αὐτὸν ὑπάγετα (Jo. 11:39, 44). Abbott rightly calls the aorist here more authoritative and solemn than the present would have been. The aorist here accords with the consciousness of Jesus (11:41, ἤκουσας). The aorist imper. occurs in prohibitions of the third person, like μη γνῶτο (Mt. 6:3); μη καταβάτω (24:17); μη ἔπιστρεψάτω (24:18). This construction occurs in ancient Greek, as μηδε σε κινησάτω της, Soph. Ai. 1180. But μη and the aorist subj. was preferred. In the N. T. this is rarely found (1 Cor. 16:11; 2 Th. 2:3; 2 Cor. 11:16).

(e) The Aorist Infinitive. In Homer the durative (present) idea is more common than the punctiliar (aorist) with the infinitive, [Page 857] as with the imperative. There is, of course, no time in the inf. except relative time in indirect discourse. The history of the inf. belongs elsewhere, but here we have only to do with the excellent illustration of punctiliar action afforded by the aorist inf. Radermacher, p. 123, finds the aorist and the pres. inf. together in the Carthaginian inscr. (Audollent, 238, 29, iii/A.D.), μηδε τρέχειν μηδε περιπατεῖν μηδε νικῆσαι μηδε ἐξελθεῖν. So in the papyri B.G.U., I, 183, 25. The features of the tenses in the inf., once they are fully established, correspond closely to the use in the moods. As a matter of fact originally the inf., because of its substantival origin, was devoid of real tense-idea (Moulton,
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H. Scott’s figures for the Synoptics:

διά (Mt. 6:1); προκατήγγειλεν. Here the constative aorist is perfectly natural for the proposed journey. But see the outcome, Ποῦλος δὲ ἧξιον—μὴ συνπαραλαμβάνειν τοῦτον. Paul was keenly conscious of the discomfort of Mark’s previous desertion. He was not going to subject himself again to that continual peril (durative). Cf. also Mt. 14:22, Ἰανόκτασε τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβηναί (constative aorist), καὶ προάγειν αὐτόν (durative, ‘go on ahead of him’). An interesting example occurs in Jo. 13:36 f., οὐ δύνασαι μοι νῦν ἁκολουθήσαι (constative aorist most likely); διὰ τι οὐ δύναμαι οὐκ ἁκολουθεῖν ἄρτι (durative, ‘keep on following,’ is Peter’s idea). The aorist inf. is the predominant construction with δύναμι, δυνατός, θέλω, κελεύω, etc. The distinction in tenses is well observed. For δύναμι see further λαμβάνειν (Jo. 3:27) and λαβέν (14:17); βαστάζειν (16:10) and βαστάσαι (Rev. 2:2); πιστεύειν (Jo. 5:44) and πιστεύειν (12:39). Abbott notes also that ποιήσα εἰσὶν occurs in John with δύναμι only in Jo. 11:37, whereas ἰδίω, εἰσελθεῖν, γεννηθήναι are natural (3:3 ff.). So with θέλω note λαβέν (Jo. 6:21); πίσαι (7:44), but ἐρωτάν (16:19). In Mt. 5:17 f. καταλῦσαι καὶ πληρῶσαι are effective, but συγῆσαι (Ac. 15:13) is ingressive, while αὕτη αἱ (Mt. 6:8) is constative. Cf. Lu. 7:24 f. The aorist inf. is rare with μέλλω (Ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, Ro. 8:18; Gal. 3:23, though Αποκαλύπτεσθαι in 1 Pet. 5:1). So ἐμελλόν ἀποδοθεῖν (Rev. 3:2). Cf. Rev. 3:16; 12:4. A good example of the constative aorist [Page 858] inf. occurs in Ro. 14:21. The aorist inf. is used with an aorist as the ind., οὐκ ἠλθον καταλῦσαι (Mt. 5:17), the subj., εἴπομεν πῦρ καταβήναι (Lu. 9:54), the imper., ἄφες θάσαί μοι (Mt. 8:22). But the aorist inf. is common also with durative tenses like ἔχετον κρατήσει (Mk. 12:12); οὐκ ἥθελεν—ἐπῆρα (Lu. 18:13). There is apparently no instance in the N. T. of an aorist inf. used to represent an aorist ind. in indirect discourse. In Lu. 24:46, ὅτι οὗτος γέγραπται παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστήσει θανάτου, we have the usual timeless aorist, the subject of γέγραπται. So μὴ ἰδεῖν (2:26). In Ac. 3:18 παθεῖν is the object of προκατήγγειλεν. The aorist and pres. inf. with prepositions vary a good deal. The aorist occurs with μετά (Mt. 26:32; Lu. 12:5, etc.), with πρό (Lu. 2:21; Jo. 1:48); πρός (Mt. 6:1); εἰς (Ph. 1:23); and even with ἐν sometimes (Lu. 2:27), but only once with διὰ (Mt. 24:12). Cf. Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 49 f. The following are Mr. H. Scott’s figures for the Synoptics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Moulton, ib., p. 130.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 196 f.
6 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 360 f.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 197.
There are more articular presents than aorists in N.T.

(f) The Aorist Participle. The tenses got started with the participle sooner than with the inf. (cf. Sanskrit), but in neither is there time except indirectly. The Sanskrit had tenses in the participles. The aorist part. is not so frequent in Homer as is the present. But “the fondness of the Greeks for aorist participles in narrative is very remarkable.”

(a) Aktionsart. That is present here also. Thus we find the ingressive aorist, μεταμελήθεις (Mt. 27:3); ἀγανήθη ησπάντες (Ac. 13:27); ἀγαπήσας (2 Tim. 4:10). The effective [Page 859] aorist appears in πληρώσαντες (Ac. 12:25), the constative in συνπαραλαβόντες (ib.). Further examples of the effective aorist are πείπταντες τοὺς ἄγγλους καὶ λαβάσαντες τὸν Παῦλον (Ac. 14:19); δικαιοθέντες (Ro. 5:1). The constative is seen again in παραδοόμενος (Mt. 27:4); πιστεύσαντες (Jo. 7:39).

The aorist participle in itself is, of course, merely punctiliar action.

(b) Ὅ and the Aorist Participle. The punctiliar force of the aorist part. is well illustrated in this idiom. It differs from the relative (ὅς + verb) in being a more general expression. In Mt. 23:20 f., Ὅ ὀμόσας ὄμινος, we have identical action, not antecedent. The aorist is, strictly speaking, timeless (Burton, Moods and Tenses, p. 69). Ὅ ὀμόσας writer, Ὅ λαβον = ‘the receiver,’ etc. Cf. Seymour, “On the Use of the Aorist Part. in Greek,” Transactions of the Am. Philol. Ass., 1881, p. 89. In John the examples, however, are usually definite. Contrast Ὅ λαβον (Jo. 3:33) probably Ὅ ὀμόσας writer with πᾶς Ὅ ὀκούσας—μαθὼν (6:45) and οἱ ὀκούσαντες, οἱ ποιήσαντες (5:25, 29). Ὅ+aorist part. may be used with any tense of the ind. Thus Ὅ λαβον in Jo. 3:33 occurs with ἔσφραγισε, πᾶς Ὅ ὀκούσας (6:45) with ἔρχεται, οἱ ποιήσαντες (5:29) with ἐκποιήσονται. Cf. Mt. 26:52, πάντες οἱ λαβόντες μάχαραν ἐν μαχαίρῃ ῥύπολονται. In simple truth the aorist in each instance is timeless. It is not necessary to take it as=future perf. in an example like Ὅ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὕτος

3 Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 244.
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σωθῆσεται (Mk. 13:13). So Mt. 10:39. Note the resumptive οὗτος. Cf. ὁ γνωὺς—καὶ μὴ ἔτομάμας ἢ ποιήσας διαρίσεται (Lu. 12:47). Cf. Jo. 7:39; 16:2; 20:29, in all of which examples the simple punctiliar action is alone presented in a timeless manner. But in Jo. 3:13, οὐδείς ἀναβεβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, the content suggests antecedent action. Cf. also 6:41, ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβάς 3 τὸν ἁποστείλαντα in Mt. 10:40; Jo. 5:15, ὁ ποιήσας; Heb. 10:29. Ὁ and the aorist part. is sometimes used of an act past with reference to the time of writing, though future with reference to the action of the principal verb. 4 This classic idiom occurs in the N. T. also. Cf. Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαρίωτης ὁ καὶ παραδοοῦς αὐτὸν (Mt. 10:4; cf. also 27:3); usually the phrase is ὁ παραδοοῦς (26:25; Jo. 18:2, 5). So in Ac. 1:16 both γενομένου and συλλαβοῦσιν are future to προείπε. In Col. 1:8 ὁ καὶ ἀπιστώσας is future to ἐμάθητε. So Jo. 11:2 (cf. 12:3) ἦν δὲ Μαριὰμ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον μόρῳ καὶ ἐκμαξάσα τοὺς [Page 860] πόδας αὐτοῦ. Cf. Ac. 7:35 τοῦ ὀφθέντος, 9:21 ὁ πορθήσας. This development, though apparently complex, is due to the very indefiniteness (and timelessness) of the aorist participle and the adjectival force of the attributive participle.

(γ) Antecedent Action. This is the usual idiom with the circumstantial participle. This is indeed the most common use of the aorist participle. But it must not be forgotten that the aorist participle does not in itself mean antecedent action, either relative or absolute. 1 That is suggested by the context, the natural sequence of events. As examples of the antecedent aorist part. (antecedent from context, not per se) take ἡμετέρωςας—ἐπιένεσαν (Mt. 4:2); ἰδὼν—μεταμελῆθεις ἔστρεψαν (27:3); ῥίγας—ἀνεχόρθησεν, ἀπελθὼν ἀπῆλθε τι (27:5). These so-called antecedent aorists do not have to precede the principal verb in position in the sentence. Thus ἦγερεν αὐτῆν κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς (Mk. 1:31), εὐχαριστοῦμεν—ἀκοῦσαντες (Col. 1:3, 4), μέλλει κρίνειν—παρασχῶν (Ac. 17:31), ἐκάθισον—γενομένος (Heb. 1:3). This idiom is very common in the N. T. as in the older Greek. 2 Indeed, one participle may precede and one may follow the verb as in Lu. 4:35, ῥίγαν—ἐξῆλθεν—βλάψαν. In Heb. 6:10 the aorist is distinguished from the present, ἐνεδείξασθε—διακονήσατες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες. In Ro. 5:16, δι’ ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος, there is a reference to Adam (verse 14). The principal verb may itself be future as in ἀρας—ποιήσω (1 Cor. 6:15). In Lu. 23:19 ἦν βλήτης is punctiliar periphrastic (aorist passive), ἦν being aoristic also. Moulton (Prol., p. 249) cites ἦν ἀκούσασα from Pelagia (inscr. 18). Cf. ἦσαν γενόμενοι in Thuc. 4, 54, 3, and εἶ ἤρεισας in Herod. 3:27. See Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 125.

3 Ib., p. 364 f.  
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(δ) But Simultaneous Action is Common also. It is so with the circumstantial participle as with the supplementary. Here again it is a matter of suggestion. It is simple enough with the supplementary participle as in ἔλαθον εξενίσαντες (Heb. 13:2), though rare, the present suiting better (cf. Mt. 17:25). The usual idiom is seen in ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν (Lu. 5:4). Indeed this simultaneous action is in exact harmony with the punctiliar meaning of the aorist tense. It is a very common idiom (chiefly circumstantial) in the N. T.3 as in the older Greek.4 So πέψας—εἶπεν (Mt. 2:8); ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (22:1); ἠμαρτων παραδους αἶμα δίκαιον (27:4); σὺ [Page 861] τε καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος (Ac. 10:33); χρησάμενος ἔπιστρεψεν (27:3). Cf. Ac. 1:24; Ro. 4:20; Heb. 2:10. It is needless to press the point except to observe that the order of the part. is immaterial. Note Ac. 10:33 above. So in σῶσον καταβάς (Mk. 15:30); ἤλθαν σπεύσαντες (Lu. 2:16. Cf. σπεύσας κατάβηθι, Lu. 19:5); ἐμαρτύρησεν δοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα (Ac. 15:8); διέκρινεν καθαρίσας (15:9); ἐποίησαν ἀποστείλαντες (11:30); ἐγκατέλειπεν ἁγιάσμας (2 Tim. 4:10); ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες (Ac. 19:2). This construction of the part. after the verb is very common in the N. T. The coincident use of the aorist tense occurs also with the imperfect, as συνήλλασσεν—εἰπών (Ac. 7:26), ἐπιβαλών ἐκλαίγειν (Mk. 14:72); the present, as ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει (Mk. 8:29); the perfect, as ἐκπεπλήρωκεν—ἀναστήσας (Ac. 13:33); and the future, as καλῶς ποιήσεις προσέρχεσθαι (3 Jo. 6).1 In many examples only exegesis can determine whether antecedent or coincident action is intended, as in Heb. 9:12, εἰσῆλθεν—εὐφράμενος (Moulton, Prol., p. 132). So Moulton (ib., p. 131) notes εἰποῦσα for

3 Moulton, Prol., p. 131.
4 Goodwin, Gk. Moods and Tenses, p. 49 f.
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antecedent and εἴπασα (BC*) for coincident action in Jo. 11:28. The coincident aorist part. is common enough in the ancient Greek (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 141). The papyri show it also. Cf. εὐ ποίησας δούς, F.P. 121 (i/ii A.D.), a constant formula in the papyri (Moulton, Prol., p. 131). Moulton (ib.) illustrates the obscure ἐπιβαλὼν in Mk. 14:72 by ἐπιβαλὼν συνέχεσαι Tb.P. 50 (b.c.), ‘he set to and dammed up.’ If it is coincident in Mark, it is so “with the first point of the linear ἐκλαίειν.”

(c) Subsequent Action not Expressed by the Aorist Participle. Some writers have held this as possible, though no satisfactory examples have been adduced. Gildersleeve\(^2\) denies that Stahl succeeds in his implication. “Coincidence or adverbiality will explain the tense.” Burton\(^3\) likewise admits that no certain instance of an aorist part. used to express subsequent action has been found. He claims the idiom in the N. T. to be due to “Aramaic influence.” But we can no longer call in the Aramaic or Hebrew, alas, unless the Greek itself will not square with itself. The instances cited by Burton are all in Acts (16:23; 22:24; 23:35; 24:23; 25:13). “In all these cases it is scarcely possible to doubt that the participle (which is without the article and follows the verb) is equivalent to καί with a co-ordinate verb and refers to an action [Page 862] subsequent in fact and in thought to that of the verb which it follows.”\(^1\) This view is held by Prof. Sir W. M. Ramsay\(^2\) to apply to Ac. 16:6, and is
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in fact essential to his interpretation of that passage. Rackham\(^3\) adds Ac. 12:25 and regards these examples as “decisive.” Another instance urged is Ac. 21:14. But are they “decisive” after all? Gildersleeve\(^4\) is still unconvinced. Blass\(^5\) bluntly says that such a notion “is not Greek” and even refuses to follow the uncials in Ac. 25:13 in reading ἁπασάμενοι rather than ἁπασομένοι. Moulton\(^6\) refuses to follow Rackham in his interpretation of Ac. 12:25: “But to take συνπαραλαβόντες in this way involves an unblushing aorist of subsequent action, and this I must maintain has not yet been paralleled in the N. T. or outside.” And, once more, Schmiedel\(^7\) comments on Ac. 16:6: “It has to be maintained that the participle must contain, if not something antecedent to ‘they went’ (διῆλθον), 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.” The matter might safely be left in the hands of these three great grammarians. But an appeal to the examples will be interesting. As to Ac. 12:25, ἐπεστρέψαν — πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συνπαραλαβόντες Ἰωάννην, there is no problem at all unless εἰς be read rather than ἐξ or ὑπό. It is true that ΒBL read εἰς, but that reading is contradicted by the context. In 11:30 it is plain that Barnabas and Saul were sent from Antioch to Jerusalem, and in 13:3, 5, they are in Antioch with John Mark. The great uncials are not always correct, but if they are right in reading εἰς, the text has been otherwise tampered with. Even granting the genuineness of εἰς and the “subsequent” aorist, we are absolutely in the dark as to the sense of the passage. With εἰς the coincident aorist is good Greek, but still leaves us in the dark. With ἐξ or ὑπό there is no problem at all, πληρώσαντες being antecedent, and συνπαραλαβόντες coincident. In 16:6, διῆλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν [Page 863] χώραν, κωλύθησαν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄγιου πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, the participle is naturally antecedent (or coincident). Paul was headed west for Asia, but, being forestalled by the Spirit, he turned farther north through “the Phrygian and Galatic region.” Later he tried to push on into Bithynia, but the Spirit again interposed and he deflected northwest to Troas (16:7 f.). One is not entitled to make κωλύθησαν=καὶ ἐκκολύθησαν because of the exigencies of a theory that demands that “the Phrygian and Galatic region” be Lycaonia (southern part of the Roman province of Galatia), which had already been traversed (16:1 f.). Besides, the narrative in 16:6 seems to be not resumptive, but a new statement of progress. Whatever the fate of the much discussed “South Galatian” theory, the point of grammar here is very clear. Another so-called instance is in 16:23, ἔβαλον εἰς φυλάκην, παραγγείλαντες τῷ δεσμωτήριῳ. This is so obviously a case of coincident action that it would never have been adduced but for need of examples to support a theory elsewhere. Certainly “in 17:26 ὁ ῥίσας is not ‘later’ than the ἐποίησαν in time” (Moulton, Prol., p. 133). Still worse is the instance in 21:14, μὴ πιεθομένου δὲ σὺτοῦ ἡσυχάσαμεν εἰκόνες:
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Τοῦ κυρίου τὸ θέλημα γινέσθω. The participle is here necessarily antecedent or coincident (this last remark of acquiescence). So in 22:24, ἑκέλωσεν—ἐπα, the participle is coincident like the common ἐπικρήθης ἐπεν. Cf. λέγον in Heb. 2:11 f.; Ac. 7:35. Precisely the same thing is true of ἔφη—κελεύσας in 23:35. In 24:23, ἢνεβάλετο is expanded by three coincident aorist participles, εἰδὼς—ἐπα—διαταξάμενος. There remains 25:13, κατήντησαν εἰς Καισαρίαν ὑπασσάμενοι τὸν Ἐφσατον. Here Blass, as already noted, accepts the future ὑπασσάμενοι, but the aorist is probably correct. But even so, if one simply notes the “perfective” force of the proposition in κατήντησαν, ‘went down,’ he will have no difficulty at all with the coincident action of the aorist part. Κατήντησαν is the effective aorist and accent the end (reinforced by κατ—). ‘They came down saluting’ (‘by way of salutation’). The salutation took place, of course, when they were “down” (κατ—). Findlay (in loco) connects ἀπό with the initial act of κατήντησαν. Thus vanish into air the examples of “subsequent” action with the aorist part. in the N. T., and the construction is not found elsewhere. Moulton (Prol., p. 132) cites from the papyri, ἐξ ὧν δίσεις Σ.—λυτρώσασά μου τὰ ἵματα ὁ ἐκατόν Ο.Ρ. 530 (ii/A.D.), a clear case of coincident action. The redemption of the clothes is obtained by paying the hundred drachmæ.

[Page 864] (Q Aorist Participle in Indirect Discourse (Complementary Participle). It is a rare construction on the whole,1 though more frequent with ὅραω than with ἦκοῦω.2 This aorist part. is absolutely timeless, not even relatively past. It is another instance of the coincident aorist part. So ἔσα ἠκουόμεμεν γενόμενα (Lu. 4:23), ἐθέωρον τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀναφεύγει ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ πεσόντα (10:18). In πεσόντα we have the constative aorist.3 Contrast the perfect in Rev. 9:1, ἔδον ἀστέρα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πετοκότα ἐς τὴν τὴν, and the present in Rev. 7:2, ἔδον ἄλλον ἀναβαίνοντα (linear), and ἐδομεν τινα ἐν τῷ ὅνοματι του ἔβαλλον δαιμόνια (Lu. 9:49). Cf. ἔδον ἄνδρα—ἐσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα (Ac. 9:12. So in 10:3; 26:13); ἠκουόμεμεν—ἐνεχεθέασαν (2 Pet. 1:18).

2. PUNCTILIAR (AORISTIC) PRESENT (ὁ ἐνεστῶς χρόνος). The present tense is named entirely from point of time which only applies to the indicative. But a greater difficulty is due to the absence of distinction in the tense between punctiliar and linear action. This defect is chiefly found in the indicative, since in the subj., opt., imper., inf. and part., as already shown, the aorist is always punctiliar and the so-called present practically always linear, unless the Aktionsart of the verb itself is strongly punctiliar. Cf. discussion of the imper. But in the ind. present the sharp line drawn between the imperf. and aorist ind. (past time) does not exist. There is nothing left to do but to divide the so-called Pres. Ind. into Aoristic Present and Durative Present (or Punctiliar Present and Linear Present). The one Greek form covers both ideas in the ind.4 The present was only gradually developed as a distinct tense (cf. the confusion about ἐ-φη-v, whether aorist or imperf.). The present is formed on punctiliar as well as linear roots. It is not wise therefore to define the pres. ind. as denoting “action in progress” like the imperf. as Burton5 does, for he has to take it back on p. 9 in the

1 Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 408.
2 Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 51.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 134.
5 N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 6.
discussion of the “Aoristic Present,” which he calls a “distinct departure from the prevailing use of the present tense to denote action in progress.” In sooth, it is no “departure” at all. The idiom is as old as the tense itself and is due to the failure in the development of separate tenses for punctiliar and linear action in the ind. of present time. “The forms εἰμί, ἔμει, φημί, ἔγω, γράφω, etc., in which the stem has the form generally found only in aorists (§ 11, § 31) may be [Page 865] regarded as surviving instances of the ‘Present Aorist,’ i.e. of a present not conveying the notion of progress. We may compare the English use of I am, I go (now archaic in the sense of I am going), I say, (says she), etc.”1 Hear Monro again: “The present is not a space of time, but a point,” and, I may add, yields itself naturally to aoristic (punctiliar) action. Some presents are also “perfective” in sense like ἥκω. The so-called “present” tense may be used, therefore, to express an action simply (punctiliar), a process (durative or linear), a state (perfective or perfect).2 Some of the root-presents (like φη-μί) are aoristic. The perfect came originally out of the root-meaning also (cf. ἥκω, οἶδα) and grew out of the present as a sort of intensive present.3 The notion of state in νικῶ, κρατῶ, ἱπτῶμαι is really that of the perfect. So the momentary action in βη (Ē-βη-ν) becomes linear in the iterative βή-βά-ω, ‘patter, patter.’ Moulton4 clearly recognises that “the punctiliar force is obvious in certain presents.” The original present was probably therefore aoristic, or at least some roots were used either as punctiliar or linear, and the distinctively durative notions grew up around specially formed stems and so were applied to the form with most verbs, though never with all. In the modern Greek we find “the creation of a separate aorist present (πάγω),” while παγαίνω is linear. So παγαίνω is ‘I keep going,’ while πάγω is ‘I go’ (single act). Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 119. “As a rule the present combines cursive (durative, continuous, etc.) and aorist action” (ib., p. 120). The aoristic present=undefined action in the present, as aoristic past (ind.)=undefined action in the past. In the case of ὁγω we see a root used occasionally for punctiliar, linear and even perfected action. There are, besides

1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 45.
2 Giles, Man., p. 484.
3 Ib., p. 491 f.
4 Prol., p. 119 f.
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the naturally aoristic roots, three special uses of the aoristic present (the universal present, the historical present, the futuristic present).5

(a) The Specific Present. Gildersleeve6 thus describes this simplest form of the aoristic present in contrast with the universal present. It is not an entirely happy description, nor is “effective present,” suggested by Jannaris,7 since there may be ingressive and constative uses also. The common εἰμί (Jo. 10:11) is often aoristic. A fine example of the constative aorist present occurs in Lu. 7:8, πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται—ἐρχονται, καὶ ἔρχεται—ποίησον, καὶ ποιεῖ. Cf. ἔξορκίζω σε (Mt. 26:63); ὁρῶ (Ac. 8:23); [Page 866] ἄρτι βλέπω (Jo. 9:25). The frequent ἔγω δὲ λέγω (Mt. 5:22, 28, etc.) is example of the specific aoristic present (constative). So ἀληθῶς λέγω (Lu. 12:44). Cf. σοι λέγω (Mk. 5:41); φησίν (Mt. 14:8); οὐ λαμβάνω—ἀλλά λέγω (Jo. 5:34), etc. In Mk. 2:5 ἁμαρτειν is effective aorist present as in ἰᾶται (Ac. 9:34). Cf. οὐκ ἠκούσας, ἐσὲ μὴν ἠκούσας (Rev. 2:24); πόθεν ἦλθον and πόθεν ἔρχομαι (Jo. 8:14); ἔχει—ἡλθον (Jo. 16:21). Moulton (Prol., p. 247) notes how in Mt. 6:2, 5, 16, ἀπέχουσί, the combination of the aoristic pres. and the perfective use of ἀπό makes it very vivid. “The hypocrites have as it were their money down, as soon as their trumpet has sounded.” The “perfective” ἀπέχω (Mk. 14:41) is copiously illustrated in the papyri and ostraca (Deissmann, Light, etc., p. 111).

5 Giles, Man., p. 485. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 120.
6 Synt. of Cl. Gk., p. 81.
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(b) The Gnomic Present. This is the aorist present that is timeless in reality, true of all time. It is really a gnomic present (cf. the Gnomic Aorist) and differs very little from the “Specific Present.” In Mt. 23:2 ἔκάθισαν is gnomic, and in verse 3 we have the aoristic presents (gnomic also), λέγουσιν γὰρ καὶ οὐ ποιοῦσιν. Note Jo. 9:8. Cf. also ὡς λέγουσιν (Rev. 2:24). Good instances are found in 1 Cor. 15:42 ff., σπείρεται. So ὅσπερ οἱ ὑποκρίται ποιοῦσι (Mt. 6:2). Abbott has great difficulty with ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας προφήτης οὐκ ἐγείρεται (Jo. 7:52). It is this gnomic present. It is not true, to be sure, but this was not the only error of the Sanhedrin. Cf. Mt. 7:8.

(c) The Historical Present. This vivid idiom is popular in all languages, particularly in the vernacular. “We have only to overhear a servant girl’s ‘so she says to me’ if we desiderate proof that the usage is at home among us.” Cf. Uncle Remus. Curiously the historic present is absent in Homer. But Gildersleeve applauds Stahl for agreeing with his position “that it was tabooed as vulgar by the epos and the higher lyric” (A.J.P., xxiii, 245). It is absent from Pindar and the Nibelungenlied. Gildersleeve also observes that it is much more frequent in Greek than in English and is a survival of “the original stock of our languages.” “It antedates the differentiation into imperfect and aorist.” The “Annalistic or Note-Book Present” (like γίγνονται παῦδες δύο) is practically the same use of the aorist present. Moulton excludes γεννᾶται in Mt. 2:4, for that is more like the [Page 867] futuristic (prophetic) use of the present. Brugmann divides the hist. pres. into “dramatic” and “registering” or
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3 Moulton, Prol., p. 120 f.
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6 Syntax of Cl. Gk., p. 86.
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Brugmann
annalistic presents (cf. Gildersleeve). This vivid idiom is preserved in the modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 120). It is common enough in the LXX, since Thackeray (*Gr.*, p. xx) notes 151 examples in 1 Samuel, though it is rare in 2 Samuel and 2 Kings (“absent,” Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 24). But Hawkins (*Horae Synopticae*, p. 213) finds it 32 times in 2 Samuel and twice in 2 Kings. Hawkins (*ib.*) finds the hist. pres. in the LXX 337 times. Josephus uses it also. The N. T. examples are thus “dramatic.” The hist. pres. is not always aoristic. It may be durative like the imperfect. This point has to be watched. Blass considers that the historical present “habitually takes an aoristic meaning,” but room has to be left for the durative meaning also. It is common in the Attic orators and in the N. T., except in Luke where it is rare. Luke’s Gospel has it only 9 times (possibly 11) and the Acts 13 times. Hawkins, from whose *Horae Synopticae* (2d ed., pp. 143 ff.) these figures are taken, finds 93 historic presents in Matthew (15 of them in *Parables*), but 162 in John and 151 in Mark. It is rare in the rest of the N. T. It is most frequent in Mark, John, Matthew and in this order. Mark indeed uses it as often as 1 Samuel, though a much shorter book. John’s Gospel is much longer than Mark’s, but when the discourses and dialogues are eliminated, the difference between John and Mark is not great. Moulton adds that the idiom is common in the papyri. Cf. Par. P. 51 (ii/b.c.) ἀνύγω—ὁρῶ—κλάγω—ἐπορεύομαι—καὶ ἔρχομαι—ἔλεγον, etc. Moulton illustrates λέγει Ἰησοῦς in the Oxyrhynchus Logia by Καὶ σαλέγει, Syll. 376. See also ὁρῖσατε καὶ βούλετει, P. Oxy. 37 (A.D. 49). Luke’s manifest reluctance to use it (changing Mark’s historical presents except in 8:49) is due to the fact that in Luke’s time the construction was regarded as “too
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familiar for his liking.” He is the scientific historian, while Mark and John are the dramatists. Different writers would feel differently about it. “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 the 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.” But what about John? Jannaris remarks that the idiom was common in the late Greek as in the early. The personal equation may have to explain the variations in the Gospels. Blass undertakes to give a philosophy of the matter on the theory that the “circumstances,” “incidents” and “final results” are expressed in the past tenses of the ind., while the “principal actions” are found in the historical present. He cites Jo. 1:29–42 in illustration (βλέπει—λέγει— ἔμαρτυρήσεν—ςτήκει—λέγει—ηκουσαν—λέγει—εἰπαν—λέγει—ηλθαν καὶ εἶδαν— ἦν—ην—εὑρίσκει—λέγει—ἐγγαγεν—ἐκεν). One doubts if the phenomena can be brought under any rule. Matthew and Luke use ἵδον to enliven the narrative, while Mark and John avoid it. Mark has a habit of using καὶ before the historical present, while John often employs asyndeton. But there is no doubt of the vividness of the narrative in Mark and John which is largely due to the historical presents. Modern literary English abhors this idiom, but it ought to be preserved in translating the Gospels in order to give the same element of vividness to the narrative. The historical present may begin a paragraph (often so), occur in the midst of aorists and imperfects, or alternate with aorists. In Mt. 3:1 παραγίνεται Ἰωάνης is preceded by a note of past time. In Mk. 5:15 ἔχρονται καὶ θεοροῦσιν occur between aorists. In Mk. 4:37 the realistic γίνεται λαύλαν is followed by the imperfect. As specimens of this present in parables see Mt. 13:44. Sometimes the MSS. vary as between φαίνεται and ἐφάνη (Mt. 2:13). The variation in parables may be partly due to obscuration of the gnomic nature of the narrative. In such a wealth of material for illustration it is hard to select, but note John 20. In verse 1 f. note ἔρχεται—βλέπει—τρέχει—ἔρχεται, all indicating the excitement of Mary. Then the narrative goes on with aorists and imperfects till Peter and John draw near the tomb, when we have βλέπει—ἔρχεται—θεωρεῖ (5–7) with two parenthetic aorists interjected (οὐκ εἰσῆλθεν, εἰσῆλθεν). In verse 8 the narrative is resumed by aorists. In verse 12 again θεωρεῖ shows the surprise of Mary at seeing the angels (λέγουσιν—λέγει, verse 13), as in verse 14 the present is used when she sees Jesus. Historical presents run through the dialogue with Jesus (15–18). Then the resumptive τοῦτα ἐπεν. That is enough to say on the subject.

(d) The Futuristic Present. This futurist present is generally punctiliar or aoristic. The construction certainly had its origin in the punctiliar roots, but some of the N. T. examples (cf. English “I am going,” as well as “I go”) are durative, as
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1 Prol., p. 121.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 188.
4 Hawkins, Hor. Synop., p. 144.
6 W.-Th., p. 267.
2 Giles, Man., p. 485.
Moulton\(^3\) shows. Thus in 1 Cor. 16:5 διέρχομαι (in contrast with διέλθω) means ‘I am going through’ (Macedonia). Γίνομαι leans to the aoristic\(^4\) and so γίνεται (Mt. 26:2) may be punctiliar. “In αὑρινὸν ἄποθνήσκομεν (1 Cor. 15:32) we have a verb in which the perfective prefix has neutralized the inceptive force of the suffix –ίσκω: it is only the obsoleness of the simplex which allows it ever to borrow a durative action.”\(^5\)

The aoristic origin of many present-stems has already been shown (and some perfectives like ἔρχομαι). Thus all three kinds of action are found in the present (punctiliar, durative, perfect). All three kinds of time are also found in the present ind. (historical present= past, futuristic present= future, the common use for present time). Some of these “momentary presents” are always future. So ἔμι in old Greek prose,\(^6\) but Homer uses ἔμι also as a present.\(^7\) The N. T. uses ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι in this futuristic sense (Jo. 14:2 f.), not ἔμι. Indeed “the future of Greek was originally a present” (Jebb in Vincent and Dickson’s Handbook, p. 323). That is too strong, for the future ind. often comes from the aorist subj. In the N. T. such so-called futures as πέπλασεν and φάγεται (Lu. 17:8) are really old aorist subjs. Cf. Mt. 24:40 f. The futuristic pres. occurs in the inscriptions and papyri, as in Petersen-Luschan, p. 160, N. 190, ἄν δὲ τις ἐπικήρυξ, ἔρχεται. See ἔμι μὴ παύσεται, ἔρχεται, B. M. II, 417 (iv/A.D.), ἀντίγραφον κἀγὼ ἀναβαίνω, O. P. 1157, 25 f. (A.D./iii), γράψον μοι καὶ πέμπω αὐτῷ ἑπιθήκην, O. P. 1158, 23 f. (A.D./iii). Cf. Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 124. In South Italian Greek the futuristic present is the only means of expressing the future ind.\(^8\) The other use of the futuristic present is the dramatic or prophetic.\(^9\) “This present—a sort of counterpart to the historic present—is very frequent in the predictions of the N. T.”\(^{11}\) It is not merely prophecy, but certainty of expectation that is involved. As examples note Mt. 17:11 Ἡλείας ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα, 24:43 ποῦ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, 26:18 ποῦ τὸ πάσχα, 27:63 ἑγερόμασται καὶ θαυμάσσεται, 19:8 δυνάμει καὶ ἀποδίδωμι, Jo. 4:35 ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται, 8:14 ποῦ ὅπως ἔρχεται, 8:21 ὅπως καὶ ζητήσετε, 10:15 τὴν ψυχὴν μου τίθημι, 12:26 ὅπως ἔμι ἔγω, 20:17 ἀναβαίνω, 21:23 οὐκ
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ἀποθνήσκει, 1 Cor. 15:26 καταργεῖται. In Jo. 10:15 ff. τίθημι really covers the whole of Christ’s life viewed as a unit (constative aorist). In Mk. 9:31 we have παραδίδοται, in Mt. 17:22 μέλλει παραδίδεσθαι. This use of μέλλω and inf. is a sort of half-way station between the futuristic present and the punctiliar future. Cf. Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 443. The futuristic pres. startles and arrests attention. It affirms and not merely predicts. It gives a sense of certainty. Cf. in Mt. 18:12, ἀφήσει καὶ πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ together, and φεύγει (Rev. 9:6).

3. THE PUNCTILIAR (AORISTIC) FUTURE (ὅ μέλλων χρόνος).

(a) Punctiliar or Durative. The future is a “mixed tense” both in origin and meaning. The mixed origin was discussed in ch. VIII, vili, (g). It was a late tense, little used in the early Vedic Sanskrit, and as a distinct form gradually disappeared from the modern Greek, where the periphrastic forms like θὰ λάμω (λάμω) alone occur. But the modern Greek has developed thus two futures, θὰ λάμω punctiliar, θὰ λάμω durative (Thumb, Handb., pp. 116, 125). The Germanic languages (cf. English shall and will) have only the periphrastic future. For the history of the future ind. see Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 552 ff. In Sanskrit the fut. had no modes, i.e. it was confined practically to the ind. (Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 201). The oldest roots are derived either from punctiliar presents (ind.) or aorist (punctiliar) subjunctives. Cf. πίομαι, βήσομαι. Gradually the future was formed on durative roots also. Thus μενῶ, ‘I shall remain.’ Some verbs formed two futures, one punctiliar, like σχήσω from ἔσχων ’I shall obtain,’ the other durative, like ἔξω, ‘I shall have.’ The κοινή has dropped σχήσο, as it has “generally got rid of alternative forms.” So also θρέξομαι (τρέχω) was durative and ὑπομοῦμαι (Εὔρομον) punctiliar, though both are absent in the N. T. It is probable that in the future passive we have with most verbs a purely punctiliar future formed on the aorist stem. The middle future was usually durative, the future passive punctiliar. Very few of the list of examples given by Jannaris can be illustrated in the N. T. owing to the disappearance of the future middle before the future passive. In 1 Pet. 4:18 φανεῖται (LXX, Prov. 11:31) is durative and certainly φανήσεται (Mt. 24:30) is punctiliar. So in Lu. 16:31 πεισθήσονται is punctiliar (effective), but πείσομαι does not occur in the N. T. So κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς
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ὑμῶν (Lu. 21:19) seems to be durative, though no fut. passive of this verb appears in the N. T. So also συναχθήσονται (Mt. 24:28) is punctiliar (effective). But the very disappearance of the future middle (as with the Attic φοβήσομαι) threw the burden of the durative future2 on the future passive. So φοβηθήσομαι in Heb. 13:6 is durative. Cf. the durative ἄρκεσθησόμεθα (1 Tim. 6:8). So also ἄλλα καὶ χαρήσομαι (Ph. 1:18) is durative. Cf. also Jo. 16:20, 22, though χαρήσονται in Lu. 1:14 is ingressive punctiliar, as πλησθήσεται (1:15) is effective punctiliar. But in Jo. 16:20 both λυπηθήσεσθε and γενήσεται seem ingressive. In Heb. 9:28 δοθήσεται (cf. Ac. 26:16) is ingressive, but ὄνομα may be either durative (Mt. 5:8; Jo. 1:50; 19:37; Rev. 22:4) or punctiliar (Jo. 1:39; Heb. 12:14, etc.). An excellent example of the effective future is found in ὅ ὑπομείνας εἷς τέλος σωθήσεται (Mt. 10:22). So the same form in the future may be either punctiliar or durative, as προέξω υμᾶς (Mk. 14:28) is durative, while ἄξει is punctiliar (effective = ‘bring’).3 Πείσομεν is punctiliar (effective) in Mt. 28:14 and durative in 1 Jo. 3:19. So γνώσομαι is punctiliar or durative (Rev. 2:23). As punctiliar this verb may be either ingressive (1 Cor. 14:7, 9), effective (1 Cor. 4:19) or merely constative (Jo. 8:28, 32). From the nature of the action as future this Aktionsart of the verb will not be as prominent4 in the future aorist as in the other punctiliar constructions. Blass5 even goes so far as to say that the future “is the one tense which does not express action [kind of action, he means], but simply a time relation, so that completed and continuous action are not differentiated.” But it must be borne in mind that the future tense in itself makes as much distinction between punctiliar and durative [Page 872] action as the present tense does. The difference is that the future is usually punctiliar, while the present is more often durative. The point need not be pressed. Other examples of the punctiliar aorist are καλέσεις (Mt. 1:21) ingressive; παρακληθήσονται (Mt. 5:4) effective, and so χορτασθήσονται, but ἐλευθερώσει is ingressive while κληθήσονται is effective. In 1 Cor. 15:22, 28 note ζωοποιηθήσονται and ὑποταγήσεται (effective). In Jo. 8:32 note ἐλευθερώσει effective = ‘set free’ (cf. ἐλευθεροθεί πενήνεσθε, verse 33).1 So then both in origin and use the future is chiefly punctiliar.

(b) The Modal Aspect of the Future. The future indicative is not merely a tense in the true sense of that term, expressing the state of the action. It is almost a mode on a par with the subjunctive and imperative. Gildersleeve2 puts the matter plainly when he says: “The future was originally a mood.” In both Greek and Latin the forms of the future come for the most part from the subj. and it must be treated as a mode as well as a tense. Indeed Delbrück3 and Giles4 put it wholly under moods. It partakes, as a
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3 Ib., p. 149.
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matter of fact, of the qualities of both mood and tense, and both need to be considered. The modal aspect of the fut. ind. is seen in its expression of will and feeling. Like the subj. the fut. ind. may be merely 
 futurist, volitional or deliberative. We have a reflection of the same thing in our shall and will. The fut. ind. has had a precarious history in Greek. Its place was always challenged by the present and even by the aorist ind., by the subj. and imper. modes, by periphrastic forms. It finally gave up the fight as a distinct form in Greek. See under 3, (a). In the modern Greek the distinction between the periphrastic fut. and the subj. is practically lost. The modal aspects of the fut. ind. appear clearly in subordinate clauses where the tense is common. In indirect discourse the future ind. merely represents the direct discourse (cf. Ro. 6:8). The future with the descriptive or identifying relative (Jo. 6:51) shows no modal features. But it is found in other relative clauses where purpose (Lu. 7:27) or result (Lu. 7:4) is expressed. The future has also a modal value in temporal clauses (Rev. 4:9; 17:17), in final clauses (Lu. 20:10; Heb. 3:12), in conditional sentences (Lu. 19:40), in wish (Gal. 5:12). In Rev. 3:9 the fut. ind. and the aorist subj. occur side by side with ἵνα. But in independent sentences also the modal aspects of the future appear.

(a) Merely Futuristic. This is the most common use of the future and in itself would not be modal. It is the prospective, what lies before the speaker. The predictive (or prophetic) future has to be classed as aoristic (usually constative), though the question as to whether the action is durative or punctiliar may not have crossed the speaker’s mind. Cf. Mt. 21:37 ἐντραπήσονται, 41 ἀπολέσει, 43 ἀρθήσεται—δοθήσεται, 24:31 ἀποστελεῖ, etc. Cf. Mk. 13:24–27. Further good examples of the predictive future are in Mt. 11:28 f.; 12:31. Unfortunately in English we have no established principle for the translation of the predictive future. In the first person it is done by “shall,” and naturally by “will” in the second and third persons. It is not always easy to distinguish the merely futuristic from the volitive future, “but we have to reckon with an archaic use of the auxiliaries which is traditional in Bible translations.” The use of “shall” in the second and third persons is almost constant in
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4 Man., pp. 500, 505; Thompson, Synt., p. 218.
6 Blass, Hermeneutik und Krit., 1892, p. 199.
7 Gildersle., Synt., p. 115.
2 Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 34 f.
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the R. V. both for the volitive and the futuristic uses. If “shall” could be confined in these persons to the volitive and “will” to the futuristic, even “the solemnly predictive,” it would be a gain. If “shall” could be confined in these persons to the volitive and “will” to the futuristic, even “the solemnly predictive,” it would be a gain. If “shall” could be confined in these persons to the volitive and “will” to the futuristic, even “the solemnly predictive,” it would be a gain. Thus in Mk. 14:13 ἀπαντήσεω would be ‘will meet.’ In Mt. 11:28 f. ἀναπάύσω would be ‘shall give you rest’ (R. V. ‘will’), εὑρήσετε ‘will find’ (R. V. ‘shall’). But ἀναπάύσω here may be volitive. If so, ‘will’ is correct. So in Mt. 12:31 ἰδέαθεσαι would be ‘will be forgiven’ (R. V. ‘shall’). Cf. also Mt. 26:13, λαλήσεται = ‘will be preached.’ Moulton notes that ἀπαρνήση (Mt. 26:34; Mk. 14:30; Lu. 22:61) is often misunderstood because of the rendering ‘shalt deny me.’ “It could not therefore be Peter’s fault if Jesus commanded him.” Here “will” is free from that peril. Cf. Mt. 25:29, 32; Lu. 19:43. With the negative the English “shall” becomes volitive when the Greek is not. Cf. Mk. 13:31, οὐ παρέλθησαν (cf. οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ in 13:30). Sometimes (very rarely) οὐ μὴ occurs with the predictive fut. (cf. the usual aorist subj.) as in οὐ μὴ παρέλθοσιν (Lu. 21:33); οὐ μὴ εὑρήσουσιν (Rev. 9:6); οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ εὑρήσουσιν (18:14); cf. ὁ ἄχθος, [Page 874] ἀπόλετο). The construction of οὐ μὴ with the fut. ind. is “moribund” in the N. T., only 14 and some of these doubtful (MSS. vary greatly between aorist subj. and fut. ind.). Some of the 14 are examples of the volitive future. In Mt. 15:5 οὐ μὴ τιμήσει is probably volitive, though some hold it predictive.

(b) The Volitive Future. The three divisions (futuristic, volitive, deliberative) glide into one another both in the subjunctive and the future ind. The volitive future is practically an imperative in sense, for the will is exercised. The futuristic glides imperceptibly into the volitive “as in the colloquial οὐ διψέ, ‘you will see to that,’ Mt. 27:4." Cf. ὑμᾶς ἄνεασθε (Mt. 27:24), ἐκκόψε (Lu. 13:9). In Heb. 8:5 the imperative and the fut. ind. occur together, ὅρα ποιήσεις. The impatient οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων (Ac. 13:10) is almost imperatival, certainly volitive. “The future ind. is exceedingly common in this sense (volitive).” In legal precepts the fut. ind. is unclassical. But the idiom itself is classical and “is not a milder or gentler imperative. A prediction may imply resistless power or cold indifference, compulsion or concession.” It is exceedingly frequent in the LXX. It is chiefly found in the N. T. in quotations from the O. T. Cf. καλέσεις (Mt. 1:21), οὐκ ἔσεσθε (6:5); ἔρεθε (21:3)=ἔπατε (Mk. 11:3). Cf. Jas. 2:8; Ro. 13:9; Gal. 5:14. The volitive future really includes purpose (will) in the first person, as well as in the second and (rarely) in the third. Thus προσεύξομαι, ψαλῶ (1 Cor. 14:15)=‘I will pray,’ ‘I will sing,’ not mere futurity. So in ἄναστας πορεύσομαι (Lu. 15:18) we seem to find ‘will,’ not mere declaration. Most of the examples are in the second person, like οὐκ ἔσεσθε (Mt. 6:5), and are chiefly negative (4:7; Ac. 23:5; Ro. 7:7). But some examples occur in the third person also; though
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6 Ib., p. 150.
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9 Moulton, Prol., p. 184.
10 Ib., p. 177.
11 Ib., p. 176.
12 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 209.
Burton\(^8\) is sceptical. Cf. ἔσται in Mt. 20:26 f. (note θέλη). So Mk. 9:35. In Lu. 10:6 we have ἔπανοπτάσεται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἢ ἐληφήνη, while in Mt. 10:13 ἔλθατο ἢ ἐληφήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτήν.\(^9\) In the volitive future ‘will’ is the English translation for the first person, ‘shall’ for the second and third. The rare use of μὴ with the fut. ind. shows a volitive use. Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 117) is sceptical, but Moulton (Prol., p. 177) cites from Demosthenes μὴ ἤκουσαν μελετήν to which Blass\(^1\) quotes μὴ ἤκουσαν τιμήθησατε. Blass\(^2\) quotes μὴ ἤκουσαν διδάσκαλον. Cf. Mt. 7:6, with μὴ ἤκουσαν or aorist subj. In Lu. 11:5, μὴ ἤκουσαν τιμήθησαν. Cf. W.-Th., p. 279.

Burton\(^8\) is sceptical. Cf. ἔσται in Mt. 20:26 f. (note θέλη). So Mk. 9:35. In Lu. 10:6 we have ἔπανοπτάσεται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἢ ἐληφήνη, while in Mt. 10:13 ἔλθατο ἢ ἐληφήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτήν.\(^9\) In the volitive future ‘will’ is the English translation for the first person, ‘shall’ for the second and third. The rare use of μὴ with the fut. ind. shows a volitive use. Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 117) is sceptical, but Moulton (Prol., p. 177) cites from Demosthenes μὴ ἤκουσαν μελετήν to which Blass\(^1\) quotes μὴ ἤκουσαν τιμήθησατε. Blass\(^2\) quotes μὴ ἤκουσαν διδάσκαλον. Cf. Mt. 7:6, with μὴ ἤκουσαν or aorist subj. In Lu. 11:5, μὴ ἤκουσαν τιμήθησαν. Cf. W.-Th., p. 279.

\(^1\) Ib.
\(^2\) N. T. Moods and Tenses, pp. 36, 76 f.
\(^3\) Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 211.

\(^8\) N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 35.
\(^9\) Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 209.
Ro. 3:5; 6:1 (the common τί ἐρωμέν); 9:14; 1 Cor. 14:7, 9, 16; 15:29, 51; 1 Tim. 3:5. Cf. Lu. 20:15. Cf. ἄγοράσωμεν καὶ δώσομεν (Mk. 6:37).

(c) The Future in the Moods. The future differs from the other tenses in this respect, that in the moods where it occurs it has always the element of time. This is not true of any other Greek tense.1

(a) The Indicative. It is far more common here than in the other moods. In direct discourse the fut. ind. expresses absolute time. Cf. τότε ὑψονται (Lu. 21:27). In the gnomic future the act is true of any time (cf. gnomic aorist and present). So μόλις ὑπὲρ δικαιον τις ὑποθανεται (Ro. 5:7); χρηματισε (7:3), etc. In indirect discourse the time is relatively future to that of the principal verb, though it may be absolutely past. So with ἐνόμισαν δει λήμψονται (Mt. 20:10); ἔπευ σημαίνων ποῖσθανάτῳ δοξάση τὸν θεόν (Jo. 21:19).2

(b) The Subjunctive and Optative. There never was a fut. imperative. The so-called fut. subjs. in the N. T. have already been discussed. W. H. admit ὑψηθηκε to the text in Lu. 13:28, but claim it to be a late aorist subj.3 The same thing may be true of δοσῇ, read by MSS. in Jo. 17:2; Rev. 8:3, but not of καυχήσωμαι in 1 Cor. 13:3. This may be a lapsus calami4 for καυχήσωμαι. Harnack (The Expositor, May, 1912, p. 401) quotes Von Soden as saying: “Καυχήσωμαι—not καυχήσομαι—is to be recognised as the traditional form in families of MSS. which do not give καυχήσωμαι.” But Harnack refuses to “saddle” Paul with this Byzantine “deformity.” Jannaris5 thinks that these sporadic examples in late Greek are the fut. ind. “spelt with the thematic vowel (η and ω) of the subjunctive.” One naturally thinks of the Latin subj. future. The fut. opt. never had a place save in indirect discourse, and that is lost in the N. T.

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201.
2 Ib.
3 Appendix, p. 172.
4 Ib.; Moulton, Prol., p. 151.
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(γ) The Infinitive. The future inf. was never a common construction and was almost confined to indirect discourse.⁶ The six [Page 877] examples in the N. T. seem to be punctiliar save two (Ac. 11:28; Jo. 21:25). Μέλλω has the fut. inf. three times, but only in the case of ἔσεσθαι (Ac. 11:28; 24:15; 27:10). The three other instances of the fut. inf. in the N. T. belong to ind. discourse. One (χωρίςειν) occurs with οἴματι (Jo. 21:25), one (ἔσεσθαι) with μήνω, or more exactly after ἐπιθυμή (Ac. 23:30, genitive absolute, μηθεύεται μοι ἐπιθυμή ἔσεσθαι), one (εἰσελθόσθεν) with ὤμνυω (Heb. 3:18). So that the fut. inf. “was already moribund for practical purposes.”² In the papyri Moulton found the fut. inf. often a mere blunder for an aorist. In Ac. 26:7, B has the fut. inf. after ἐλπίζω. In the fut. inf. the time relation is only relative, as with all infinitives, not absolute as in the ind.³ Elsewhere with such verbs the aorist inf. occurs as with ἐλπίζω (1 Cor. 16:7); μέλλω (Ro. 8:18); ὄμνυο (Ac. 2:30); ὁμολογέω (Mt. 14:7); προσδοκάω (Ac. 27:33); προκαταγγέλλω (Ac. 3:18); or the present inf. as with μέλλω (Ac. 3:3); or the perfect inf. as with ἐλπίζω (2 Cor. 5:11).

(δ) The Participle. The future part. was later in its development⁴ than the other tenses of this very ancient, even prehistoric,⁵ verbal adjective. The fut. part. was never developed in the Beotian Dialect.⁶ It is by no means dead in the papyri. Moulton⁷ notes “the string of final fut. participles in O. P. 727 (ii/Α.D.); B. U. 98 (iii/Α.D., etc.” See also κοινολογησόµενον P. Goodspeed 4 (ii/Β.C.) τα—(σ)ταθησόµενα P. Tb. 33 (Β.C. 112), and the list in O. P. 1118, 10f (i/Α.D.). It seems to me to be more common in the papyri than in the N. T. Simcox⁸ suggests that its rarity in the N. T. is due to the use of other phrases. Cf. μέλλω in Ac. 18:14; 20:3, 7 and ἔχοµενος in Rev. 1:4, etc. The time is, of course, only relative to that of the principal verb, as in ἔληλύθη προσκυνήσων (Ac. 8:27). The anarthrous examples are volitive⁹ and are the most frequent.¹⁰ They are used for purpose or aim. Cf. Mt. 27:49 ἔρχεται σώσων, Ac. 8:27 ἔληλύθει προσκυνήσων, 22:5 ἔπτερον ἔξων, 24:11 ἄνεβη προσκυνήσων, 24:17 ποιήσων παραγενόµην, Heb. 13:17 ἄγιουν ὡς ἀποδώσοντες. Cf. also v. l. ὡς εὐρήσων in Mk. 11:13. These all seem to be punctiliar. Some MSS. also read

---

6 See the list in Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 486.
1 Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 120, suggests omission of μέλλω.
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ἀσπασόμενοι in Ac. 25:13. This is surely a slim showing compared with the classic idiom. Some MSS. read κομίσομεν in 2 Pet. 2:13, rather than ἀδικοῦμεν. The future participle with the article is futuristic, not volitive. So with τὸ ἔσομεν (Lu. 22:49); ὁ παραδώσων (Jo. 6:64); τὸ συναντήσοντα (Ac. 20:22); ὁ κυκώσων (1 Pet. 3:13); τὸ γεννησόμενον (1 Cor. 15:37); ὁ κατακρινών (Ro. 8:34); τῶν λαληθησόμενων (Heb. 3:5).

(d) The Periphrastic Substitutes for the Future. The periphrastic future is as old as the Sanskrit and has survived the inflected form in Greek. Some of these forms are durative, probably most of them, but a few are punctiliar. Jannaris notes in Sophocles, O. C. 816, λυπηθεὶς ἔσει, and O. T. 1146, οὐ σιωπήσας ἔσει, but no examples of the aorist participle and ἔσομαι occur in the N. T. They are all present parts. (like ἔσεσθε μισοῦμεν, Lu. 21:17) and so durative. In the LXX we actually have the inf. with ἔσομαι (Num. 10:2; 2 Sam. 10:11; Tob. 5:15). The use of μέλλω with the aorist inf. approaches the punctiliar future. Cf. ἠμέλλειν προσαγαγεῖν (Ac. 12:6); μέλλοσαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι (Ro. 8:18. Cf. Gal. 3:23), with which compare the pres. inf. in 1 Pet. 5:1. The aorist inf. occurs also in Rev. 3:2, 16; 12:4. The volitive future was sometimes expressed by θέλω and in the later Greek helped drive out the future form. It is disputed whether in the N. T. θέλω is ever a mere future. But in a case like θέλεις ἐλθεῖν (Lu. 9:54) we note the deliberative subj. Cf. Mt. 13:28. So βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω (Jo. 18:39). Βούλομαι is less frequent in the N. T. than θέλω and can hardly be resolved into a mere future. It is purpose. Cf. examples with the aorist inf. in Mt. 11:27; Ac. 5:28; 17:20. With θέλω the aorist inf. is the usual construction, and it is nearly always easy to see the element of will as dominant. In a few cases θέλω seems to shade off towards the volitive fut. ind. Cf. Jo. 5:40, οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με, Ac. 25:9, θέλεις—κρίθηναι; Here we have an approach to the later usage, but the auxiliary has not yet lost its force. Cf. also Jo. 6:67; 9:27; Jas. 2:20, where the formula is polite. But in Jo. 7:17 the R. V. rightly preserves “willeth.” So in Mt. 16:24. Herodotus shows a fondness for ἔθέλω as a quasi-auxiliary, and the connection between him and the modern Greek usage is doubtless through the vernacular. Cf. Jebb in Vinc. and Dickson, p. 326. Even [Page 879] δύναμαι may contain an “inceptive future.” In Lu. 20:36 the MSS. vary between δύνανται and μέλλουσιν. But in the N. T. δύναμιν retains its real force even in examples like Mk. 2:19; 3:24; 10:38; 14:7; Jo. 13:37; Ac. 17:19. In Ac. 25:26 note γράψαι οὐκ ἔχω (cf. σχῶ τι γράψω).

III. Durative (Linear) Action.

The principles underlying the use of the tenses have now been set forth with sufficient clearness to justify brevity.

---

1 Cf. Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 335.
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1. **Indicative.**

(a) **The Present** (ὄ ἐνεστός) for Present Time. It has already been seen that the durative sense does not monopolize the “present” tense, though it more frequently denotes linear action. The verb and the context must decide.

(b) **The Descriptive Present.** Its graph is (-----). As with the imperfect, so with the present this is the most frequent use. Cf. ἰππολλόμεθα (Mt. 8:25). Contrast aorist σώσον. So Mk. 4:38; Lu. 8:24); σβέννυται (Mt. 25:8); ἔν ὢ ἔρχομαι (Jo. 5:7); φαίνει (1 Jo. 2:8); συνχύννεται (Ac. 21:31); τελέσθαι (2 Cor. 12:9); θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε (Gal. 1:6); ἔσπερέφθεται (4:9); ἔχουσιν (Mk. 2:19). Cf. 1 Th. 3:8. In these examples the durative action is very obvious and has to be translated by the progressive (periphrastic) form in English, ‘We are perishing,’ ‘Our lamps are going out,’ etc. But in the case of θαυμάζω (Gal. 1:6) ‘I wonder’ brings out the durative idea, though ‘ye are changing’ is necessary for μετατίθεσθε. Cf. ἔχει (Jo. 3:36) where ‘has’ is durative. Cf. ζητοῦμεν (Lu. 2:48), οὐ θέλομεν (Lu. 19:14).

β) The Progressive Present. This is a poor name in lieu of a better one for the present of past action still in progress. Usually an adverb of time (or adjunct) accompanies the verb. Gildersleeve calls it “Present of Unity of Time.” Cf. ἐστὶν ἔως ἄρτι (1 Jo. 2:9). Often it has to be translated into English by a sort of “progressive perfect” (‘have been’), though, of course, that is the fault of the English. “So in modern Greek, ἔξεντα μήνας σὲ ἄγαπω (Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 222). The durative present in such cases gathers up past and present time into one phrase” (Moulton, Prol., p. 119). Cf. Ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἄφος ἔρχομαι (Lu. 13:7); τοσαῦτα ἔτη δοῦλωσοι (15:29); πολύν ἥδη χρόνον ἔχει (Jo. 5:6); τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἶμι (14:9); ἄπαν ἀρχῆς μετ᾽ ἔμοι ἔστε (15:27); πάλαι δοκεῖτε (2 Cor. 12:19). Cf. ὧπο βρέφους οἶδας (2 Tim. 3:15). [Page 880] It is a common idiom in the N. T. Cf. 2 Pet. 3:4; 1 Jo. 3:8. In Jo. 8:58 εἶμι is really absolute.

γ) **The Iterative or Customary Present.** Its graph is (. . . . .). Cf. ἐγκρατεῖται (1 Cor. 9:25); πυκτεύω καὶ ὑποπίαζω καὶ δουλαγωγῶ (9:26 f.). So νηστεύω δίς τοῦ σαββάτου, ἀποδεκατεύω πάντα δῶς κτῶμαι (Lu. 18:12); δίδωμι καὶ ἐποδίδωμι (19:8, more likely it is a new purpose in Zaccheus, when it would be aoristic); ὧδε εὐλογοῦμεν (1 Cor. 10:16); ὧν κλώμεν (10:16); προλαμβάνει (11:21); καταγγέλλετε (11:26); ἔσθητε καὶ πίνει (11:29); κοιμῶνται (11:30); οὐχ ἄμαρτάνει (1 Jo. 3:6); ἄμαρτάνει (3:8). Cf. Mt. 9:17. Probably also ἐφίσμεν (Lu. 11:4).

δ) **The Inchoative or Conative Present.** Either an act just beginning, like γίνεται (Mk. 11:23), εὕθυς σκανδαλίζονται (4:17), λιθάζετε (Jo. 10:32), νίπτες (13:6), ποιεῖς (13:27), ᾶγαί (Ro. 2:4), or an act begun but interrupted like πείθεις (Ac. 26:28; cf. 2 Cor. 5:11), ἀναγκάζεις (Gal. 2:14), δίκαιούσθε (5:4), ἀναγκάζουσιν (6:12). Indeed λιθάζετε (Jo. 10:32) and νίπτες (13:6) may be regarded as conative also. This idiom is more common in the imperfect. Cf. Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 82. In English we have to use “begin” or “try.”

---

2 Moulton, Prol., p. 119.
(e) The Historical Present. These examples are usually aoristic, but sometimes durative.¹ In Mk. 1:12 we have ἔκβάλλει which is durative. Cf. Ἴγετο in Lu. 4:1 (but Mt. 4:1, Ἰνήση). So in Mk. 1:21 ἐσπορεύονται is durative. The same thing seems to be true of ἀκολουθοῦσιν in 6:1.

(ζ) The Deliberative Present. Rhetorical deliberative questions may be put by the present ind., but it is rather a rhetorical way of putting a negation than a question of doubt. Cf. τί ποιοῦμεν; (Jo. 11:47), ‘What are we doing?’ Cf. τί ποιήσει (Mt. 21:40) with τί ποιῶμεν (Jo. 6:28) and τί ποιήσωμεν (Ac. 6:1). The implication of the question in Jo. 11:47 is that nothing was being done. In Mt. 12:34, πῶς δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλῆν; a durative deliberative question is expressed by means of δύνασθε and the pres. inf. Cf. a similar construction with δεῖ in Ac. 16:30.² Cf. the same idiom in an indirect question (Col. 4:6; 2 Th. 3:7; 1 Tim. 3:15). The use of the pres. ind. in a deliberative question is a rare idiom. Blass³ finds parallels in colloquial Latin and an example in Herm., Sim., IX, 9, 1.

(η) The Periphrastic Present. The examples are not numerous in the LXX.⁴ Cf. Num. 14:8; 1 Ki. 18:12, etc. It is rare in [Page 881] the N. T. Moulton¹ warns us that ἐχων ἐστί and δέον ἐστί (with other impersonal verbs) are both classical and vernacular.” In the present tense the idiom is on purely Greek lines, not Semitic. For classical examples see Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 81). So the impersonal verbs (and ἔχω) stand to themselves² in support from ancient Greek and the koine. Cf. ἐστιν ἔχοντα (Col. 2:23); πρέπον ἔστιν (Mt. 3:15); ἔστον (sc. ἐστὶ) in Ac. 2:29 and 2 Cor. 12:4; δέον ἐστὶν (Ac. 19:36. Cf. 1 Pet. 1:6). Other examples are ἔστως εἶμι (Ac. 25:10), ἔστιν κατερχομένη (Jas. 3:15), ἔστιν προσαναπληροῦσα—ἄλλα καὶ περισσεύουσα (2 Cor. 9:12), ἔστιν άλληγοροῦμενα (Gal. 4:24) and, in particular, explanatory phrases with ὅ ἐστιν (Mt. 1:23; 27:33; Mk. 5:41; Jo. 1:41). Cf. further Ac. 5:25; Col. 1:6; 3:1; 2 Cor. 2:17.

(θ) Presents as Perfects. Here the form is that of the present, but the root has the sense of completion. The action is durative only in the sense of state, not of linear action. This is an old use of these roots.³ Cf. Lu. 15:27, ὁ διδάσκαλος ἦκε (‘has come,’ ‘is here’). Cf. ἔξηλθον καὶ ἦκο (Jo. 8:42). See ch. VIII. So with κάθισε (Mt. 3:10), ‘the axe lies at the root of the trees’ (has been placed there); ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστιν (Jo. 11:28) = ‘the Teacher is come.’ Sometimes νικάω is so used (cf. Ro. 12:21; Rev. 15:2). So ἤπτονται (2 Pet. 2:20). Cf. ἀκούω in 1 Cor. 11:18. See also ἀκούεται (1 Cor. 5:1) which is rather iterative. Ἀδικῶ in Mt. 20:13 is durative, but approaches a perfect in Ac. 25:11 (cf. πέρασα).¹

(ι) Perfects as Presents. Some perfect forms have come to be used as practical durative presents, though not of the same word. Thus ἤδα from ἤδον=’I have seen,’

1 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 11.
3 Ib.
4 C. and S., Sel., p. 68.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 204.
3 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 9; Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 10; Gildersl., Synt., p. 87.
‘I know’ (cf. Mt. 6:8). So ἑστηκα (Lu. 8:20), μέμνημαι (1 Cor. 11:2). As to ἀπόλωλα that occurs in the N. T. in the participle (Mt. 10:6) and the same thing is true of ἔλωθα (Lu. 4:16), which occurs in past perfect. So βέβηκα, γέγονα, δέδοικα, ἡμφίεσαι, ἔγρήγορα, ξοικα, κέκλημαι, κέκτημαι, πέποιθα, πέφυκα, τέθνηκα. Cf. Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 438.

(k) Futuristic Presents. These are usually punctiliar, but some are durative.4 Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 83) calls this “Praesens Propheticum.” The absence of ὅμι in the N. T. is noticeable. The papyri illustrate abundantly this futuristic present (Moulton, Prol., p. 120). Since the pres. ind. occurs for past, present [Page 882] and future time it is clear that “time” is secondary even in the ind. In the other moods it has, of course, no time at all. As examples of the durative present in this sense take παραδίδοται (Mt. 26:45), ἄναβαινομεν (Mk. 10:33), ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν and ἐρχόμεθα (Jo. 21:3), διέρχομαι (1 Cor. 16:5), ἔχομεν (2 Cor. 5:1). Μέλλω and the pres. inf. is, of course, a prospective present. This idiom is very common in the N. T., 84 examples with the pres. (6 aor., 3 fut.) inf., though, of course, μέλλω is not always in the pres. ind. Cf. Mt. 2:13; 16:27, etc.

(b) The Imperfect for Past Time (Ὅ παρατατικός). Here we have the time-element proper, the augment probably being an old adverb for “then,” and the action being always durative. “The augment throws linear action into the past.”1 The absence of a true imperfect in English makes it hard to translate this Greek tense.

(a) Doubtful Imperfects. They are sometimes called “aoristic” imperfects. This term is not a happy one, as Gildersleeve2 shows in his criticism of Stahl for his “synonym-mongering” and “multiplication of categories.” The only justification for the term is that, as already shown in the discussion of the aorist, it is not possible always to tell whether some forms are aorist ind. or imperf. ind. The same root was used for both forms, as only one form existed and it is hard to tell which tense the form is. A certain amount of obscurity and so of overlapping existed from the beginning.3 We see this difficulty in ἐγν, ἔφην, ἔλεγον, etc., particularly in verbs of saying, commanding, etc.4 Modern Greek conceives of ὑπῆγα, ἐπῆγα and ἔφερα as aorists (Thumb, Handb., p. 143). Thumb (Th. L.-Z., xxviii, 423) thinks that in the N. T. ἔφερον had begun to be treated as aorist, but Moulton (Prol., p. 129) demurs, though he admits the possibility of punctiliar action in πρόσφερε τὸ δῶρον in Mt. 5:24 (ib., p. 247). See also φέρε καὶ ἥκε, φέρε καὶ βάλε in Jo. 20:27. But one must not think that the Greeks did not know how to distinguish between the aorist and the imperfect. They “did not care to use their finest tools on every occasion,”5 but the line between aorist and imperf. was usually very sharply drawn.6 The distinction is as old

4 Moulton, Prol., p. 120.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 128.
2 Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 394.
3 Giles, Man., p. 488; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 487; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 46.
Th. Th. L.-Z., Theologische Literaturzeitung (Leipzig).
5 Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 17.
6 Gildersl., Synt., pp. 91, 94.
as the Sanskrit.\(^7\) In modern Greek it still survives, though the difference [Page 883] between ἔλεγεν and ἔπειν is well-nigh gone,\(^1\) if it ever existed. The same thing is true of the usage of Achilles Tatus.\(^2\) Hence we need not insist that ἔγεν (Jo. 1:1) is strictly durative always (imperfect). It may be sometimes actually aorist also. So as to ἔφη (Mt. 4:7); ἔλεγεν (Mk. 4:21, 24, 26, 30, etc.), etc. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 192, fails to make a clear distinction. Note ἐκέλευον (Ac. 16:22).

(\(\beta\)) The Descriptive Tense in Narrative. But the linear action may be insisted on in the true imperfect. It is properly “nichtpunktuell.” Though less frequent in Homer than the aorist it often “divides the crown with the aorist.”\(^3\) The imperfect is here a sort of moving panorama, a “moving-picture show.” The modern Greek preserves this idiom (Thumb, Handb., p. 121). In 1 Cor. 10:3 f. ἔφαγον and ἔπιασα give the summary (constative) record, while ἔπιασα presents an explanatory description. See further προσήλθον ν καὶ διηκόνουν (Mt. 4:11); ἔπαινον καὶ ἔδιδον (13:8); ένυστάζαν καὶ ἔκάθευσαν (25:5). Sometimes the change from aorist to imperf. or vice versa in narrative may be due to the desire to avoid monotony. In Mt. 26:60 we have ὡσε ἐγόνον, in Mk. 14:55 ὡσ ἐγόσικνον. The aorist passes before the eye the flowing stream of history. It is the tense of Schilderung.\(^4\) Cf. ἔβαλεν τὸ ἓνύμομα αὕτοῦ (Mt. 3:4), ἔξησεν ἐπεξερήτησα (3:5), ἓβαστιζοντο (3:6). The whole vivid scene at the Jordan is thus sketched. Then Matthew reverts to the aorist (3:7). Cf. ἐρώταν in Jo. 19:3. So ὡς ὁμήλιον ἁτύδο (Mt. 18:28) aptly describes a debtor as ἐπινιγεν, ‘the choking in his rage.’ See the picture of Jesus in ἐθυώρει (Mt. 12:41). Cf. ἐθυώρων (Lu. 10:18), ἔξελεγοντα (14:7), περιεβλέπετο (Mk. 5:32), ἕξισταντο (Lu. 2:47; cf. Ac. 2:12). Cf. Lu. 9:43–45; 16:19; Mt. 8:24. A good example is ἐκλέπτα ὄφριζον (Mk. 9:20). Cf. further, ἔπιστεῦν καὶ προσήξετο (Mk. 14:35), the realistic scene in Gethsemane (Peter’s description probably); ἔπεσον καὶ ἐπέπεπες ἐδίδον (Lu. 15:16); ἐδίδον πρὸς ἄλληλος (24:14); ἔξεπλήσσουντο (Mt. 7:28); ἐτίθει (2 Cor. 3:13); ἥκιλοῦθε καὶ ἑκάθευτο (Mt. 26:58). A splendid example of the descriptive durative is ἐπιώπα (Mt. 26:63)="kept silent.” So ἐπέλευον (Ac. 21:3). Note ἐνόμευ (Ac. 21:29) between past perfect and aorist. Cf. ἐφίλετε [Page 884] (Jo. 11:36), διετήρει (Lu. 2:51. Cf. 2:19). See the picture of Noah’s time in Lu. 17:27. Cf. ἐπεστρέφοντο καὶ ἐπηρεάσαντες (Ac. 5:41). Quite striking is ἡρπιζομεν in Lu. 24:21. See further for the “imperfect and aorist interwoven” in narrative Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 91. An artist could describe his work by ἐποίησα or ἐπιούσιν. Gildersleeve notes (ib., p. 93) that in the inscriptions of the fourth cent. B.C. the imperfect is absent. It becomes common again in the imperial time.

(\(\gamma\)) The Iterative (Customary) Imperfect. Sometimes it is difficult to tell whether an act is merely descriptive or is a series. Cf. πολλοὶ πλούσιοι ἔβαλλον (Mk. 12:41); ἐπινιγοῦσα (5:13), where the separate details are well described by the vivid imperfect. The notion of repetition is clearly present in ἡρωτά ἐλεμοσόνῃ (Ac. 3:3); ἡρωτά

---

7 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 201 f.
4 Hultsch, Der Gebr. d. erzählenden Zeitf. bei Polyb.
αὐτὸν (Mk. 7:26). Cf. Jo. 4:31. The modern Greek keeps this usage (Thumb, Handb., p. 122). It is not necessary to see any “aoristic” notion here.\(^1\) Cf. παρεκάλουν σπουδαίος (Lu. 7:4, W. H.); παρῆνε τι (Ac. 27:9). It is well shown in Ἀφροδίτης ἐξούλετο, Παῦλος ἤξιον (15:37 f.), the one opposing the other. In Ac. 24:26 repetition is shown in ὑώμεια by πυκνότερον μεταπιθομένους. Cf. ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλα τι ἐπεφόνουν (21:34); ἐπυνάνετο in verse 33; καθ’ ἠμέραν ἐκαθεξόμην (Mt. 26:55); ἐπιτυγχανον (27:30); ἤποι ἤκουν (Mk. 6:55); κατηγόρουν πολλὰ (15:3); ἀπέλευν ὅν παρητούσην (15:6). Cf. ἀιώνια ἀπολύειν ὅν ἤθελον, Mt. 27:15; ἑνένευον (Lu. 1:62); ἐβάπτιζον (Jo. 3:22); ἔλεος (5:18); ἐδίδοσαν (19:3); ἔχονυνες (21:18); ἐπίθουν (Ac. 3:2); ἐπίθεσαν καὶ διεμέρισαν (2:45. Cf. 4:34). Moulton (Proli., p. 128) represents the iterative imperfect by the graph ( . . . . . .). Cf. in Ac. 16:18; 18:8; Mk. 3:11; 4:33 f. A good example is in Lu. 2:41, ἐκπειρασών κατ’ ἔτος.

(δ) The Progressive Imperfect. Sometimes the imperfect looks backward or forward, as the case may be.\(^2\) Thus Τί ὅτι ἐξητείτε μὲ (Lu. 2:49); ἕν ἐβέβηκε ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς (1 Jo. 2:7); ἕνεκοσποτῆν (Ro. 15:22); ἐμελλέον (Rev. 3:2). This idea is, however, often expressed by μέλλω,\(^3\) but without the backward look also. Cf. Lu. 9:31; 10:1; Jo. 4:47; 6:71, etc. In ἐκνοῦνεον (Lu. 8:23) the verb itself expresses peril or danger. Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 97) calls this idiom “Imperfect of Unity of Time.” Cf. the “progressive” present in (a), (β). The Text. Recept. gives a good example in ἦν πάλαι τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης (Mk. 6:47). See also ἦν γὰρ ἐξ ἰκανῶν χρόνων θέλων ἵδιον αὐτὸν (Lu. 23:8).

[Page 885] (ε) The Inchoative or Conative Imperfect. Here the accent is on the beginning of the action either in contrast to preceding aorists (just begun) or because the action was interrupted (begun, but not completed). The two sorts of inchoative action may be represented by two graphs, thus (−) for the first, (−) for the second.\(^4\) In English we have to say “began” for the one, “tried” for the other. The modern Greek maintains this idiom (Thumb, Handb., p. 121). As examples of the first sort where “began” brings out the idea, note ἐδίδασκε (Mt. 5:2. Cf. Jo. 7:14); ἐλάλει (Mk. 7:35. Cf. Lu. 1:64); ἐκλάει (14:72); διερήσετο (Lu. 5:6); διελάλουν (6:11); συνεπλήρουντο (8:23); ἐπεσκέπασαν (9:34). Note ingressive aorist ἐθοβῆθησαν; ἐπέφωσκεν (23:54); ἐπεγίνοντο (Ac. 3:10); ἐκήρυσσαν (9:20); διεκρίνοντο (11:2); κατηγέλλουν (13:5); ἐθορύβουν (17:5); παρωξύνετο (17:16); ἀπελογήτο (26:1); ἐπουσίνετο (27:18); ἐλύετο (27:41). Cf. Lu. 13:13, 17. In ἐκάλουν (Lu. 1:59) we see both ideas combined. The action was begun, but was sharply interrupted by οὔχι, ἀλλὰ from Elizabeth. Cf. οὔν ἐξήτουν (Jo. 11:8). A good instance of the interrupted imperf. is προεύρετον in Heb. 11:17. Examples of the conative imperfect (action begun, but interrupted) are διεκώλυσαν (Mt. 3:14); ἐδίδουν (Mk. 15:23, in contrast with οὐκ ἔλαβον); ἐκολούθουν (Lu. 9:49); ἐξήτουν (Jo. 10:39; cf. 19:11); ἐνόμιζεν (Ac. 7:25. Note οὐ συνήχαν); συνήθλασαν (7:26. Note ἀπόστατο); ἐπείθειν (Ac. 18:4); ἕναγκαζον (26:11); but not Gal. 1:13. Moulton (Proli., p. 247) cites the conative pres. ἀναγκάζον (Gal. 6:12).

---

The “Negative” Imperfect. This is not a very happy piece of nomenclature, to use Gildersleeve’s remark about Stahl’s overrefinement, and yet it is the best one can do. “The negative imperfect commonly denotes resistance to pressure or disappointment.” As examples note ὅ δὲ οὐκ ἤθελεν (followed by ἔβαλεν, Mt. 18:30) and preceded by παρεκάλει (iterative), οὖδεὶς ἔδιδου (Lu. 15:16), οὖκ ἤθελεν (15:28). Note ὅργίσθη, οὐκ ἔπιστευεν (Jo. 2:24), οὔ γὰρ ἤθελεν (Jo. 7:1), οὐδεὶς ἔτόλμη (21:12), οὐκ ἔδω (Ac. 19:30). Cf. Mt. 22:3.

The “Potential” Imperfect. This is a peculiar use of the tense for present time, where the present ind. fails to meet the requirement of the situation. Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 97) calls it “modal” use, ἔδει, etc. The unfulfilled duty comes as a surprise. This “modal” force of the imperfect ind. appears still in the modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 128). There are several varieties of it. Verbs of wishing form one class of passages. In a case like ἐβουλόμην (Ac. 25:22), βούλομαι would be too blunt (cf. 1 Tim. 2:8). The exact idea is ‘I was just on the point of wishing.’ It is freely rendered ‘I could wish’ or ‘I should wish.’ In 2 Cor. 1:15 ἐβουλόμην πρότερον has its usual signification. In Phil. 13 f. ἐβουλόμην (a past preference) is set over against οὐδὲν ἠθέλησα (a past decision). Another example is ἠθελον παρεναι πρὸς ύμᾶς ἅρτη (Gal. 4:20). Note ἅρτη. For the force of the present see 1 Cor. 10:20; Col. 2:1; and especially Lu. 19:14, οὐ θέλομεν. In Jo. 6:21, ἠθελον, the usual notion occurs. An example is found in Ro. 9:3, ηὐχόμην, where Paul almost expresses a moral wrong. He holds himself back from the abyss by the tense. He does not say εὐχόμαι (cf. 2 Cor. 13:7), nor εὐξαίμην ἄν (Ac. 26:29). Note οὐ ψεύδομαι in Ro. 9:1. In Ac. 27:29 ηὐχόντο has its usual force.

Wishes about the present are naturally unattainable. In the ancient idiom ἔθεο or εἰ γάρ was used with the imperf. ind. or ὄψευλον and the inf. Callimachus, b.c. 260, uses ὄψευλον with the ind. The augmentless form ὄψευλον appears in Herodotus (Moulton, Prol., p. 201). In the N. T. only ὄψευλον is used with the imperf. for wishes about the present. Cf. ὄψευλον ἄνείχεσθε (2 Cor. 11:1); ὄψευλον ἦς (Rev. 3:15).

Verbs of propriety, possibility, obligation or necessity are also used in the imperfect when the obligation, etc., is not lived up to, has not been met. Winer has stated the matter well. The Greeks (and the Latins) start from the past and state the real possibility or obligation, and the reader, by comparing that with facts, notes that the obligation was not met. The English and the Germans start from the present and find trouble with this past statement of a present duty (an unfulfilled duty). A distinction is usually drawn between the present and the aorist infinitives when they occur with these verbs (ἔδυνατο, ὄψευλον, ἔδει, καλὸν ἦν, κρεῖττον ἦν, ἄνήκεν,

---

1 Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 15.
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WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).
2 W.-Th., p. 282.
The present inf. refers more directly to the present, the aorist to an action in the past. This is, however, only by suggestion. Thus in Mt. 18:33, ὃς ἔδωκα καὶ σὲ ἐλεήσασε, note ὃς κάγῳ σὲ ἠλέησα. Cf. also Mt. 23:23 ταῦτα δὲ ἔδωκε ποιῆσαι κάκεινα μὴ ἄφεναι, (25:27) ἔδωκε σὲ βαλεῖν, (26:9) ἔδωκεν τριάδα καὶ δοθήναι, (26:24) καὶ ἔκλει τὴν αὐτῷ (no inf. here), (Ac. 22:22) οὐ γὰρ καθήκεν αὐτὸν ἐξῆν, (24:19) οὐς ἔδωκε ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι, (26:32) ἀποκλείσατα ἐδούνατο (note perf. inf.), (27:21) ἔδωκε μὴ ἀναγέσθαι [Page 887] κερδήσαι τε, (2 Pet. 2:21) κρεῖττον ἔκλεις μὴ ἐπεγωγέκανα (perf. inf.), (2 Cor. 2:3) ἄρ ἔδωκε με χαίρειν, (Col. 3:18) ὃς ἄνηκεν ἐν κυρίῳ. (Cf. Eph. 5:4) But it must not be supposed that these imperf. cannot be used in the normal expression of a past obligation or possibility that was met. The context makes the matter clear. Cf. Lu. 13:16; 22:7; 24:26; Jo. 4:4, etc. In Lu. 15:32 ἔδωκε applies to both the past and present, probably with an implication against the attitude of the elder brother. In Heb. 2:10 ἐπρέπεν and 2:17 ὁφειλέν have their natural past meaning.

Another instance where the imperfect refers to present time is in the second-class conditional sentences (see chapter XIX, Mode). When a condition is assumed as unreal and refers to present time, the imperfect tense is used both in the protasis and the apodosis in normal constructions. See apodosis in Mt. 26:24 and in Ac. 26:32 (both quoted above). It is only the tense that calls for discussion here. Cf. ἀμαρτήσας οὐχ ἔχοσαν (Jo. 15:22, 24), where νῦν δὲ is used to explain the point. So οὐκ ἔχες (Jo. 19:11). In 1 Cor. 5:10, ὀφείλετε ἃρα—ἔξελθεν, and Heb. 9:26, ἐπεὶ ἔδωκε—παθεῖν, we only have the apodosis. Cf. εἴ ἐν ἐγινόκες ἄν (Lu. 7:39) as a type of the more usual construction with ἄν. Cf. Lu. 17:6. In Heb. 11:15 the imperf. describe past time.

(θ) In Indirect Discourse. In general the imperfect in indir. discourse represents an imperfect of the direct discourse. But sometimes with verbs of perception it is relative time and refers to a time previous to the perception. Thus ἔχει τὸν Ἰωάννην ὅτι προφήτης ἦν (Mk. 11:32); ἔδειν ὅτι οὐκ ἦν (Jo. 6:22. Cf. οὐκ ἔστιν in verse 24); ὅτι προσάτις ἦν (9:8); ἐπεγινώσκον ὅτι ἦν ὁ καθήμενος (Ac. 3:10), while in 4:13 ἦσαν is rightly antecedent to ἐπεγινώσκον, ἦσαν ὅτι—ὑπήρχον (16:3). In Ac. 3:10 the idiom approaches that in Jo. 1:15, οὔτος ἦν ὁ ἐπόων (a parenthesis), where the verb is thrown back to past time. Our idiom more naturally calls for ἐστιν here. Gildersleeve calls this the “imperfect of sudden appreciation of real state of things.”

(i) The Periphrastic Imperfect. It is easy to see how in the present, and especially in the future, periphrastic forms were felt to be needed to emphasize durative action. But that was the real function of the imperfect tense. The demand for this stressing of the durative idea by ἦν and the present participle was certainly [Page 888] not so great. And yet it is just in the imperfect in the N. T. that this idiom is most frequent. It is not unknown in the ancient Greek. Schmid finds it rare in the κοινή, especially in the imperfect, where the N. T. is so rich in the idiom. He suggests the Aramaic

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 192; Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 339. This imperfect is particularly common in John.
2 Synt., p. 96 f.
2 Schmid SCHMID, W., Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern. 4 Bde. (1887–1897).
2 Atticismus, III, p. 113 f.
influence, particularly as that language is fond of this periphrasis. Periphrasis is thoroughly Greek, and yet in the N.T. we have unusual frequency of a usage that the κοινή has not greatly developed except “where Aramaic sources underlie the Greek” (Moulton, Prol., p. 226). Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 124) gives classical examples from Pindar, Thuc., Isocrates, etc. It is true that in the N.T. the pres. participle with ἔχει occurs chiefly in Mark (19 times), Luke (31), Acts (28, but 17 of them in chapters 1–12), and just in those portions most subject to Aramaic influence (possible Aramaic sources). Only 7 occur in Acts 13–28, and these mainly in the speech in 22 delivered in Aramaic. The LXX gives abundant illustration of this analytic tendency in the imperfect. Cf. Gen. 37:2; Deut. 9:24; Judg. 1:7. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 24. From Pelagia (p. 18) Moulton (Prol., p. 249) cites ἐμὴν ἀπερχόμενος. For a papyrus illustration see ὅσα ἦν καθήκοντα, P. Oxy. 115 (ii/A.D.). The idiom itself is therefore Greek, but the frequency of it in the N.T. is due to the Hebrew and Aramaic. Matthew has it 10 times, John 11, Paul 5. The Pauline examples (Gal. 1:22 f.; Ph. 2:26) are more like the classic independence of the participle. It is usually the descriptive imperfect that uses the periphrastic form. So ἦν διάδασκον (Mt. 7:29); ἦν ἐχον (Mk. 10:22); ἦσαν ἄναβαινοντες (10:32); ἦν προσευχόμενον (Lu. 1:10); καιομένῃ ἦν (Lu. 24:32). But sometimes it is the iterative imperfect as in ἦν διανεύων (Lu. 1:22); ἦν διάδασκον τὸ καθ ἡμέραν (19:47). In Lu. 5:17 the periphrastic imperfect and past perfect occur in the same sentence. In Lu. 23:12 note προϋπήρχον ἄντες (cf. Ac. 8:9).

(k) Past Perfects as Imperfects. The present perfects of these verbs are merely presents in sense when compared with other verbs. So the past perfects have only an imperfect force. Thus ἦσει (Mt. 27:18); ἐλθεῖ (27:15); ἱστήκη (Jo. 18:5).

(c) The Future for Future Time. The future is mainly aoristic (punctiliar), as has already been shown, but sometimes durative. The broad lines of the problem have already been drawn. As already shown, the modern Greek has a special durative future by means of ἔτη λόγο (pres. subj.). See Thumb, Handb., p. 160. A summary statement of the durative future is given.

(a) The Three Kinds of Action in the Future (futuristic, volitive, deliberative). These occur here also. Thus merely futuristic are σώσει (Mt. 1:21); βαστάσει (Mt. 3:11); ἐλπιοῦσιν (12:21); ἔσται (Lu. 1:14 f.); ἐπιστρέψει and προελεύσεται (1:16 f.); ἔλκυσε (Jo. 12:32); ζήσοι (Ro. 6:2); κυριεύσει (6:14); ἐπιτελέσει (Ph. 1:6); θάλψοι (1:18); ἔσται (Rev. 9:6). Burton calls this “the progressive future.” Cf. Ac. 7:6. Durative also is ἀδικήσει with οὐ μὴ (Lu. 10:19). So οὐ μὴ διψήσει (Jo. 4:14; cf. 6:35); οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσωσιν (Jo. 10:5). Examples of the volitive future are the legal precepts (common in the LXX) so often quoted in the N.T. Cf. οὐ φανερώσεις (Mt. 5:21); οὐ μοιχεύσεις (5:27); οὐκ ἐπικρίθησις (5:3); ἀποδώσεις (5:28); ἀγαπήσεις (5:43; cf. ἐκατοκράτει, verse 44); ἔσσεθε (5:48), etc.
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Perhaps οἴκοδομήσω (Mt. 16:18) = ‘I will’ rather than ‘I shall.’ In 1 Tim. 6:8, τούτους δεικνύωμεν, the resolution is volitive. It is possible that we have the volitive use in Mt. 4:4, οὐκ ἔτερῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ο δῆθρος. The deliberative future may also be durative. Cf. Mt. 18:21, ποσάκις ἄμαρτήσαι; (merely interrogative) and Lu. 14:34, ἐν τίνι διήρθησαι; (rhetorical). Cf. aor., pres. and fut. ind. in Mt. 28:7.

(b) The Periphrastic Future. The very failure of the future to express durative action clearly led to the use of the present participle with ἔσομαι. In Lysias (2), 13, note ἔσονται γενόμενοι more like a future punctiliar (or perfect). Cf. Mt. 10:22 and 24:9, ἔσοντας μισοῦμεν (Mk. 13:13; Lu. 21:17); (Mk. 13:25) ἔσονται πιλτοντες, (Lu. 1:20) ἔσοντας σωπῶν, (5:10) ἔσοντας Ἵωγρόν, (17:35) ἔσοντας ἄληθουσαι, (21:24) ἔσται πατομένη, (1 Cor. 14:9) ἔσοντας καλοῦντες. Cf. Gen. 4:12, 14; Deut. 28:29; Mal. 3:3, etc. The frequent use of μελλῶ and the pres. inf. (durative) has already been mentioned. The fut. of μελλῶ itself occurs (Mt. 24:6) with the pres. inf.

2. Subjunctive and Optative. The rarity of the pres. subj. (and opt., of course) has already been commented upon. The aorist is used as a matter of course here unless durative action is to be expressed. A few examples will suffice. Thus τί ποιῶμεν: (Jo. 6:28); ἔδω ἔχετε (Mt. 17:20); ἔχομεν (Ro. 5:1). The subjunctive is very common indeed, but not in the present tense. There is in the N. T. no instance of a periphrastic present subj. [Page 890] or optative. John’s free use of the pres. subj. has already been noted (Abbott, Joh. Gr., pp. 369 ff.). Cf. ἔδω ποιῆτε (13:17); ἔδω μαρτυρῶ (5:31). In Col. 1:18 note γένηται προτεύων like ἔγενετο στίλβοντα (Mk. 9:3). The present opt. survives in δυναίμην (Ac. 8:31); ἔχοι (Ac. 17:11); βούλοιτο (Ac. 25:20); θέλοι (Ac. 17:18; Lu. 1:62); ἐν (9:46; 15:26; 18:36; 22:23; Ac. 10:17).

3. Imperative. The contrast between the present imperative and the aorist subj. in prohibitions had to be set forth in connection with the punctiliar-aorist subj. The present imper. was found to be regularly durative. In Paul’s frequent use of the pres. imper. with μή the inchoative or conative or customary (prohibiting a course of conduct) use of the present is noticeable, as in μή ἀμέλει (1 Tim. 4:14); μηδὲν ἔπιτιδει (5:22); μηδὲ κοινώνει (ib.); μή μεθύσκεσθε (Eph. 5:18); μή πτώσθε (Col. 3:9). Cf. μή ἀπαίτα (Lu. 6:30). In general μή is used with the present imper. to forbid what one is already doing. Cf. μή φοβηθείτε (Jo. 6:20); μή κρίνετε (Mt. 7:1); μηκέτι διαμάρτητε (Jo. 5:14); μή θυμάμεθε (5:28); μή δοκεῖτε (5:45); μηκέτι σκύλε (Lu. 8:49). The durative force of the pres. imper. is well seen in καθεύδετε καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε (Mt. 26:45). Cf. also πάντοτε χαίρετε, ὄντας προσεύχεσθε, ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστήτε (1 Th. 5:16–22). A good example is seen in Ac. 18:9, Μή φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ λάλει καὶ μή σιωπήσῃς, ‘He had been afraid, he was to go on speaking, he was not to become silent.’ Cf. 2 Tim. 2:16, 22 f. The contrast between aorist and pres. imper. is often drawn in the N. T., as in Jo. 5:8; Mt. 16:24. We note the periphrastic pres. imper. in ἔσονται (Mt. 5:25); ἔσοντας ἄμαρτῆσαι (Lu. 19:17); ἔσοντας κατάλεμενοι (Lu. 12:35). Cf. Judg. 11:10; Prov. 3:5; γίνον γηγορόν (Rev. 3:2); 2 Cor. 6:14. Moulton (Prol., p. 249) cites from Pelagia (p. 26) ἔσον γινόσκοιν.

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 204.
4. INFINITIVE. The present inf. can be assumed to be durative. The matter has had some discussion in connection with the aorist inf. (punctiliar), but a few further examples will illustrate the usage. Cf. το αυτα γράφειν ὑμῖν (Ph. 3:1) and το ἔγερσαν αὐτόν (Mk. 12:33) where the linear action is obvious. Indeed the force of the pres. inf. is so normal as to call for little comment. Cf. οὐ δύναται ποιεῖν (Jo. 5:30. Cf. Mt. 6:24); τὸ θέλειν (Ro. 7:18); ὑματίαν (1 Jo. 3:9); προσεύχεσθαι (1 Cor. 11:13); τὸν πατέαν (Lu. 10:19), etc. For the distinction between the [Page 891] aorist and pres. inf. see ἐμβῆναι—καὶ προάγειν (Mt. 14:22). Cf. ἢτε in Ac. 3:2. The frequent use of μέλλω and the pres. inf. has already been twice mentioned. In indirect discourse the pres. inf. merely represents the pres. ind. of the direct discourse. Cf. εἶναι (Mt. 22:23; Ro. 1:22); ἔβαλεν (Lu. 11:18), etc. There is one instance in the N. T. of a pres. inf. in indir. discourse representing an imperfect ind. Luke has a periphrastic pres. inf., ἐν τῷ ἐλαυν αὐτόν προσευχόμενον, which occurs twice (9:18; 11:1). Cf. 2 Chron. 15:16. Only two fut. infs. in the N. T. seem to be durative (Ac. 11:28; Jo. 21:25). The pres. inf. is most natural with ἐν (cf. Lu. 8:40), and is common with διά (cf. Mt. 13:5 f.); εἰς (Ro. 12:2); but not (pres. 3, aor. 9) with πρός (Mk. 13:22). It is used only once with πρό (Jo. 17:5) and is not used with μετά. Cf. Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 49 f.

5. PARTICIPLE. The present participle, like the present inf., is timeless and durative.

(a) The Time of the Present Participle Relative. The time comes from the principal verb. Thus in πωλοῦντες ἔφερον (Ac. 4:34. Cf. πωλήσας ἤνεγκεν in verse 37) the time is past; in μεριμνῶν δόντας (Mt. 6:27) the time is present; in ἔσεσθαι μισοῦμενοι (Mt. 10:22), ὁ βλέπον ἀποδέσσεται (Mt. 6:18), ὁ ὁμοίωμα τόν ὕδων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχομεν (24:30) it is future. Cf. Mt. 24:46; Lu. 5:4; 12:43. Further examples of the pres. part. of coincident action are seen in Mt. 27:41; Mk. 16:20; Jo. 6:6; 21:19; Ac. 9:22; 10:44; 19:9.

(b) Futuristic. Just as the pres. ind. sometimes has a futuristic sense, so the pres. part. may be used of the future in the sense of purpose (by implication only, however). Cf. εὐλογοῦντα (Ac. 3:26); ἀπαγγέλλοντας (15:27); διακονοῦν (Ro. 15:25). In Ac. 18:23, ἐξῆλθον διερχόμενοι τὴν Γαλατικῆς χώρας, the pres. part. is coincident with the verb. In 21:2 f. the pres. parts. διαπεράζοντας and ὑποφορτιζόμενον are futuristic (cf. 3:26; 15:27). Blass, page 189, notes ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Jo. 11:27) and ἐρχόμενον (1:9). This use of the pres. part. is common in Thuc. (Gildersleeve, A. J. P., 1908, p. 408).

(c) Descriptive. But usually the pres. part. is merely descriptive. Cf. Mk. 1:4; Ac. 20:9; 2 Cor. 3:18; 4:18. There is no notion of purpose in ἔφοντες (Ac. 21:16). In τούς σωζομένους (Ac. 2:47) the idea is probably iterative, but the descriptive durative is certainly all that is true of τούς ἔγοντες in Heb. 10:14 (cf. 10:10).

5. PARTICIPLE. The present participle, like the present inf., is timeless and durative.

(a) The Time of the Present Participle Relative. The time comes from the principal verb. Thus in πωλοῦντες ἔφερον (Ac. 4:34. Cf. πωλήσας ἤνεγκεν in verse 37) the time is past; in μεριμνῶν δόντας (Mt. 6:27) the time is present; in ἔσεσθαι μισοῦμενοι (Mt. 10:22), ὁ βλέπον ἀποδέσσεται (Mt. 6:18), ὁ ὁμοίωμα τόν ὕδων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχομεν (24:30) it is future. Cf. Mt. 24:46; Lu. 5:4; 12:43. Further examples of the pres. part. of coincident action are seen in Mt. 27:41; Mk. 16:20; Jo. 6:6; 21:19; Ac. 9:22; 10:44; 19:9.

(b) Futuristic. Just as the pres. ind. sometimes has a futuristic sense, so the pres. part. may be used of the future in the sense of purpose (by implication only, however). Cf. εὐλογοῦντα (Ac. 3:26); ἀπαγγέλλοντας (15:27); διακονοῦν (Ro. 15:25). In Ac. 18:23, ἐξῆλθον διερχόμενοι τὴν Γαλατικῆς χώρας, the pres. part. is coincident with the verb. In 21:2 f. the pres. parts. διαπεράζοντας and ὑποφορτιζόμενον are futuristic (cf. 3:26; 15:27). Blass, page 189, notes ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Jo. 11:27) and ἐρχόμενον (1:9). This use of the pres. part. is common in Thuc. (Gildersleeve, A. J. P., 1908, p. 408).

(c) Descriptive. But usually the pres. part. is merely descriptive. Cf. Mk. 1:4; Ac. 20:9; 2 Cor. 3:18; 4:18. There is no notion of purpose in ἔφοντες (Ac. 21:16). In τούς σωζομένους (Ac. 2:47) the idea is probably iterative, but the descriptive durative is certainly all that is true of τούς ἔγοντες in Heb. 10:14 (cf. 10:10).

5. PARTICIPLE. The present participle, like the present inf., is timeless and durative.
(e) Antecedent Time. By implication also the pres. part. may be used to suggest antecedent time (a sort of “imperfect” part.). So τυφλὸς ὄν ὃρτι βλέπω (Jo. 9:25). See further Mt. 2:20; Jo. 12:17; Ac. 4:34; 10:7; Gal. 1:23. Cf. ὁ βαπτίζων (Mk. 1:4).

(f) Indirect Discourse. Cf. p. 864. An example of the pres. part. with the object of a verb (a sort of indir. disc. with verbs of sensation) is found in εἴδαµεν τὴν ἐκβάλλοντα δαμόνα (Lu. 9:49). The pres. part. is common after εἶδον in Rev. (10:1; 13:1, 11; 14:6; 18:1; 20:1, etc.). Cf. Ac. 19:35, γινώσκει τὴν πόλιν οὖσαν.

(g) With the Article. The present participle has often the iterative (cf. pres. ind.) sense. So ὁ κλέπτων (Eph. 4:28) = ‘the rogue.’ Cf. ὁ καταλύων (Mt. 27:40); οἱ ζητοῦντες (2:20). The part. with the article sometimes loses much of its verbal force (Moulton, Prol., p. 127; Kühner-Gerth, I, p. 266). He cites from the papyri, τοῦ γαμοῦσα, C. P. R. 24 (ii/A.D.). Cf. τοῦς σωζομένους (Ac. 2:47). So in Gal. 4:27, ἤ οὖ τίκτουσα, ἤ οὖκ ὄδινουσα.

(h) Past Action Still in Progress. This may be represented by the pres. part. So Mk. 5:25; Jo. 5:5; Ac. 24:10. Cf. Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 59.

(i) “Subsequent” Action. Blass finds “subsequent” action in the pres. parts. in Ac. 14:22 and 18:23. But in 14:22 note ὑπέστρεψαν ἐς τὴν Ῥώστρα— ἔπιστρεψάντες τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μαθητῶν, the aorist ind. is “effective” and accents the completion of the action. The pres. part. is merely coincident with the “effective” stage. It is a point, not a process in the aorist.

(j) No Durative Future Participles. The few fut. parts. in the N. T. seem to be punctiliar, not durative, unless τὸ γεννησόμενον (1 Cor. 15:37) be durative, but this example is pretty clearly ingressive punctiliar.

IV. Perfected State of the Action (ὁ τέλειος ἢ συντελικός).

1. THE IDEA OF THE PERFECT.

(a) The Present Perfect. The oldest of the perfects. “The perfect is a present perfect.” Such it was in the beginning undoubtedly. The past perfect and future perfect are both built upon the present perfect stem. Both are comparatively rare, especially the future perfect. The use was at first also confined to the indicative. Moulton (Prol., p. 140) calls it the most important exegetically of the Greek tenses.
as we have already seen, in ἤκω (Lu. 15:27); ἀκοῦω (1 Cor. 11:18); ἀδικῶ (Ac. 25:11). Reduplication, though not always used, was an effort to express this intensive or iterative idea. So likewise the aorist of an action just accomplished, like ἔγνων τί ποιήσω (Lu. 16:4), is near in idea to the present perfect, though there is a difference. More about the intensive perfect a little later.

(c) The Extensive Perfect. This comes to be the usual force of the tense. Gildersleeve⁴ has put the thing finely: “The perfect looks at both ends of an action.” It “unites in itself as it were present and aorist, since it expresses the continuance of completed action.”⁵ That is to say, the perfect is both punctiliar and durative. The aorist (punctiliar) represents an action as finished, the linear present as durative, but the perfect presents a completed state or condition. When the action was completed the perfect tense does not say. It is still complete at the time of the use of the tense by speaker or writer. In Jo. 1:32 τεθέαμαι in the mouth of John the Baptist refers to the baptism of Jesus some weeks before, but he still has the vision. Cf. 1:34, ἔδρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρησα, where there is a difference of time between the two words. When Andrew said to Peter εὑρήκαµεν (1:41) his discovery is recent and vivid. No single graph for the perfect can therefore be made. In some cases the line of connection from the act (punctiliar) to the time of speaking would be very short, in others very long. This line of connection is just the contribution of the perfect tense as distinct from aorist and present. As a matter of fact, in the combination of punctiliar and durative in the perfect it begins with the punctiliar and goes on with the durative thus, but the emphasis may be now on the punctiliar, now on the durative. In others the two are drawn almost to a point, but not quite. In still others there is a broken continuity thus (A · · · · > · · · · B).⁶ It is the perfect of repeated action. Cf. Jo. 1:18; 5:37; 2 Cor. 12:17.

[Page 894] (d) Idea of Time in the Tense. In the ind. it appears in three forms with the notion of time (past perfect, present perfect, future perfect). In the other modes only the present perfect occurs, but it has no time in itself and in the imper. and subj. is naturally future. Often in the N. T., as in the Attic writers,¹ a sharp distinction is drawn between the perfect and the aorist or the present. Cf. μαρτυρεῖ with ἀπέσταλκεν and μεμαρτύρηκεν in Jo. 5:36 f.; εὐήγαγεν—καὶ κεκοίνωκεν (Ac. 21:28); ὅτι ἔταφη, καὶ ὅτι ἔγινεται (1 Cor. 15:4); ἔκτισθη—ἔκτισται (Col. 1:16); ἠσαν, ἔδοκες, τετήρηκας (Jo. 17:6). The perfect active is frequently intransitive,² as has been already shown under Voice. Cf. ἰστήμι, ἔστηκα, ἀπόλλυμι, ἀπόλωλα, etc.

2. THE INDICATIVE.

(a) The Present Perfect (ὁ ἐνεστὼς συντελικῶς ἂν παρακείμενος). It is not clear how the notion of present time is conveyed by this tense in the ind. since it is absent in the subj. and imper., not to say inf. and part. Gildersleeve suggests that it “comes from the absence of the augment and from the fact that a completed phenomenon

3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 198.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 144.
1 Giles, Man., p. 493.
2 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 23.
cannot complete itself in the future.” But that explanation is not very satisfactory. The
tense does occur sometimes in the future, and the present perfect is older than the past
perfect which rests on it. Perhaps at first it was just the perfect tense (cf. aoristic
presents and timeless aorists) and was timeless. By degrees it came to be used only for
present time. The rise of the past perfect made it clear. The pres. perf. is much more
common in the κοινή than in the earlier Greek. “The perfect was increasingly used, as
the language grew older, for what would formerly have been a narrative aorist”
(Moulton, Prol., p. 141). In particular this is true of the vernacular as the papyri show.

(a) The Intensive Present Perfect. Moulton3 calls these “Perfec ts with Present
Force.” They are Perfecta Praesentia. In reality they are perfects where the punctiliar
force is dropped and only the durative remains (cf. past perfect). Gildersleeve4
distinguishes sharply between the intensive use of emotional verbs and what he calls
the “Perfect of Maintenance of Result.” But it is questionable if the difference does
not lie in the nature of the verb rather than in a special modification of the tense. A
real distinction exists in 1 Jo. 4:14 between τεθαμέθα and μαρτυρούμεν. Burton5
follows Gildersleeve, but he admits the doubt on [Page 895] the subject.1 In these
verbs when the perfect has lost the punctiliar notion it is due to the change in meaning
of the verbs.2 The list is rather large in Homer, particularly where attitude of mind is
expressed.3 Giles (Man., p. 481) thinks that originally the perf. was either intensive or
iterative like ἔστηκα, and that the notion of recently completed action (extensive) is a
development. These almost purely durative perfects in the N. T. may be illustrated by
ἔοικα (Jas. 1:6); ἀνάφορα (2 Cor. 6:11); οἶδα (Mt. 6:8); ἔστηκα (Rev. 3:20); ἐνέστηκα
(2 Th. 2:2); πέμπουσα (Ph. 2:24); κέκραγεν (Jo. 1:15) which is an example of
Gildersleeve’s emotional intensives and due according to Blass4 to the “literary
language,” μένημαι (1 Cor. 11:2); τέθνηκα (Lu. 8:49). Most of these verbs have an
inchoative or conative or iterative sense in the present. Moulton5 has shown from the
LXX and the papyri that κέκραγα is vernacular κοινή and not merely literary. He
thinks that, while κράζω in the LXX is durative, κέκραγα is merely punctiliar. See (0)
The Aoristic Perfect. It is possible also that πεπιστεύκατε καὶ ἔγνωκατε (Jo. 6:69)
belong here. It is less open to dispute that καταβέβηκα (Jo. 6:38) is a present state. Cf.
κεκοίμηται (Jo. 11:11). But more doubtful are ἤλπις (Jo. 5:45); ἥγιμα (Ac. 26:2);
πέμπεσα (Ro. 8:38).3 But τετάρακται (Jo. 12:27) seems to fall under the intensive
perfect. Cf. ἔστως ἐμί (Ac. 25:10).

(b) The Extensive Present Perfect=a completed state. This act may be durative-
punctiliar like ἡγιάσκεν (Mt. 3:2) with a backward look. Cf. thus ἡγόνωσα, τετέλεκα,
tετήρηκα (2 Tim. 4:7). This consummative effect is seen in τετήρηκαν (Jo. 17:6),
ἔδωκας με πεπίστευκας, the culmination is just reached a few moments before. But

3 Prol., p. 147.
4 Synt., p. 99 f.
5 N. T. M. and T., p. 37 f.
2 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 15.
3 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 22.
5 Prol., p. 147.
6 Ib.; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 199.
more frequently it is the punctiliar-durative perfect where the completed act is followed by a state of greater or less duration. In Jo. 19:22, ὁ γέγραψα γέγραψα, we have an example of each. Cf. the common γέγραπται (Mt. 4:7). ‘It was written (punctiliar) and still is on record’ (durative). Thus is to be explained instances like ἐδρήκεν in Heb. 10:9 (cf. ἔποιον in 10:7). ‘The statement is on record.’ It is only in appearance that προσενήκεν and πεποίηκεν (Heb. 11:17, 28) seem different. This common usage in Hebrews has been compared to that in Thuc. vol. I, pp. 2, 6, etc.

Page 896] Cf. further Heb. 7:6, 9, 11, 13, 16, 20, 23, where the permanence of the Jewish institutions is discussed. Jo. 6:25 γέγονας has punctiliar and durative ideas (‘camest and art here’). Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 347. In Col. 1:16 ἔκτισθη is merely punctiliar, while in same verse ἔκτισται adds the durative idea, whereas in verse 17 again συνέστηκεν has lost the punctiliar and is only durative. In 1 Cor. 15:4 ἐγίγνεται stands between two aorists because Paul wishes to emphasize the idea that Jesus is still risen. Usually γέγραπται was sufficient, but not here. Cf. ἐστήκεται (Lu. 16:26). Cf. ἄφεωνται (Lu. 5:23); ἐκκένωσαν (Ro. 5:5). John is especially fond of this use of the present perfect. Cf. 3:12, 34, 41; 5:33, 36 ff. In chapter 17 the present perfects call for special attention. Cf. 1 Jo. 1:1 for contrast between the present perfect and the aorist.

(γ) The Present Perfect of Broken Continuity. As already explained, we here have a series of links rather than a line, a broken graph (· · · · > · · · ·). Perhaps πέπραχά τι in Ac. 25:11 is to be so understood. But certainly it is true of ἀπέσταλκα (2 Cor. 12:17) where Paul refers to various missions to the Corinthians. In particular Moulton notes the examples with πώποτε, as οὐδὲς ἔδρακεν πώποτε (Jo. 1:18). Cf. further μεμαρτύρηκεν (5:37); δεδουλεύκαμεν (8:33).

(δ) The Dramatic Historical Present Perfect. Here an action completed in the past is conceived in terms of the present time for the sake of vividness. Burton doubts if any genuine examples of the vivid historical perfect occur in the N. T. Certainly κέκραγεν (Jo. 1:15) is a vivid historical tense even if only intensive in sense. Cf. μαρτυρεῖ just before. But by the term “historical” it is not meant that this use of the perfect is common in all narrative. But the Vedic Sanskrit has it often in narrative. It is a matter of personal equation after all. Thus Xenophon, who “affects naïveté,” uses the present perfect much more frequently than Herodotus and Thucydides. It is rather the tense of the orator or the dramatist and is often rhetorical. Hence Isocrates and Demosthenes surpass Plato in the use of the present perfect. “The nearness of any department of literature to practical life may readily be measured by the perfect.” Moulton notes how in the papyri there is an increasing use of the present perfect just because it is so largely the language of life. He notes also how Socrates in Plato’s Crito uses this vivid present perfect: “τεκμαίρομαι ἐκ τινος ἔννοιας, ὧν ἐστέκει ὀλίγον πρῶτον τοισὶν τις νυκτός, ὃς δὲ ἔδοον as inevitable as the aorist is in English, had not Socrates meant to

1 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 144.
2 lb.
3 N. T. M. and T., p. 38.
5 Thompson, Synt., p. 216.
7 Prol., p. 141.
emphasize the present vividness of the vision.” This vivid perfect is found in John’s Gospel in particular. One only needs to have some imagination himself. Cf. τεθέαμεν (1:32). John still has that vision. So ἐλήφη (1:41). The aorist would have been prosaic. Cf. also ἀπεστάλκατε (5:33), a realistic change. (Cf. 1:19 ff.) So also ἀπέσταλκεν in Ac. 7:35; κεκοίμηκα καὶ ἐπεσένει in 2 Cor. 11:25. A striking instance of it is seen in Rev. 5:7, ἔληφεν, where John sees Jesus with the book in his hand. It is dull to make ἔληφεν here = ἔλαβεν. Another example of this vivid perfect is ἔσχήκαμεν (2 Cor. 1:9), a dreadful memory to Paul. So with ἔσχηκεν in 7:5. A particularly good instance is ἐσχήκα in 2 Cor. 1:9. Blass has observed that it occurs sometimes in parables or illustrations, and quite naturally so, for the imagination is at play. Thus is to be explained ἀπελήλυθεν (Jas. 1:24) between two aorists. James sees the man. ‘He has gone off.’ Cf. Mt. 13:46, ἀπελθὼν πέρασεν πάντα διὰ εἶχεν καὶ ἠγόρασεν αὐτόν. In Lu. 9:36 ἔφρακεν is “virtually reported speech.” Cf. ἀκηκόαμεν (Ac. 6:11, but ἦκούσαμεν in 15:24).

(e) The Gnomic Present Perfect. A few examples of this idiom seem to appear in the N. T. The present was always the more usual tense for customary truths, though the aorist and the perfect both occur. Cf. τετελείωται (1 Jo. 2:5); δέδεται (1 Cor. 7:39); κέκριται and πεπίστευκεν (Jo. 3:18); κατακέκριται (Ro. 14:23); πεπλήρωκεν (13:8). Cf. Jo. 5:24; Jas. 2:10.

(ζ) The Perfect in Indirect Discourse. It is misleading to say, as Blass does, that “the perfect is used relatively instead of the pluperfect” in such instances. This is explaining Greek from the German. Blass does not call this construction “indirect discourse,” but merely “after verbs of perception”; but see my discussion of Indirect Discourse in ch. XIX. Cf. Lu. 9:36 σφηνί ἀπήγγελαν σφῆν ἰδέα ἔφρακαν, Ac. 10:45 ἔξεστησαν ὅτι ἐκκέχυται. In Mk. 5:33, εἰδού τε γέγονεν αὐτῇ ἦλθεν, the perfect preserves the vividness of the woman’s consciousness. Here the past perfect or the aorist could have been used (cf. Mk. 15:10; Mt. 27:18; Ac. 19:32), but it is akin to the reportorial vividness of the historical perfect. It is not the perfects here that call for explanation from the Greek point of view. It is rather the occasional aorists, imperfects or past perfects. Cf. MS. differences in Mk. 3:8.

(η) Futuristic Present Perfect. Since the present so often occurs in a futuristic sense, it is not strange if we find the present perfect so used also = future perfect. This proleptical use of the perfect may be illustrated by δεδόξασαι (Jo. 17:10), δέδωκα (17:22), τετέλεσται (19:28), σφηνεῖ καὶ γέγονεν καὶ κατίοσαν in Jas. 5:2 f. (cf. ἔσται καὶ φάγεται). This use is sometimes called “prophetico-perfect.” Indeed some of the examples classed as gnomic are really proleptical also. Cf. Jo. 3:18; 5:24; Jas. 2:10; Ro. 13:8; 14:23.1

---

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200.  
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 144.  
3 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 53 f.  
4 Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 39  
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200.  
The "Aoristic" Present Perfect. The Present Perfect is here conceived as a mere punctiliar preterit like the aorist ind. We have seen how in some verbs the punctiliar idea drops out and only the durative remains in some present perfect forms (like ὤδια). It is not per se unreasonable to suppose that with some other verbs the durative idea should disappear and the form be merely punctiliar. We seem to have this situation in κέκραγα in the LXX (Moulton, Prol., p. 147). The action, itself took place in the past though the state following its completion is present. By centering attention on the former, while forgetting the latter, the perfect becomes aoristic. We must distinguish between the aoristic (punctiliar) and the preterit notions. We have seen that originally the tense was probably timeless. Nothing, then, but an appeal to the facts can decide whether in the N. T. the present perf. ind. ever=the aor. ind. (i.e. is preterit punctiliar). The Sanskrit shows a deal of confusion and freedom in the use of the pres. perf. ind. The blending of the perfect and aorist forms in Latin is also a point to note in spite of the independence of the Greek tense development. E. J. Goodspeed (Am. J. Theol., X, 102 f.) regards Latin as having some influence on the ultimate confusion in the Greek. There is no doubt of the ultimate confusion in the
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late Greek\(^3\) (from A.D. 300 on) between the perfect and the aorist (see later). The use of –\(\text{-δηκα}\) and –\(\text{-ηκα}\) in the aorist pass. ind. in modern Greek illustrates one way confusion could arise (Thumb, *Handb.* p. 144). Cf. \(\text{ἔδωκα, δέδωκα}\). In the modern Greek all other remnants of the old perfect form are gone save in the participle, which has lost its reduplication, like δεμένος. But had it begun in the older Greek? Jannaris\(^1\) answers Yes and cites Thuc. 1, 21, οὐδε ὡς ποιητὶ ὑμνήκασι—οὔτε ὡς λογογράφοι ἔσθε γεγονοῦσι. But this may be the dramatic historical perfect. Jebb\(^2\) answers Yes and quotes Demosthenes and Lucian; but these again may be merely the rhetorical dramatic perfect. The grammarians and scholiasts, under the influence of the Latin, did come to lose all consciousness of any distinction and explained one tense by the other.\(^3\) The present perfect was always more common in every-day life, as we have noted. The papyri prove this abundantly.\(^4\) Moreover, the present perfect

\[3\] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 440; Moulton, Prol., p. 142.
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grew in popular use at the expense of the aorist, where the aorist might have been employed. There is thus no strong presumption against the possibility of such confusion in the N. T. Besides, “the line between aorist and perfect is not always easy to draw.”5 This is especially true of an event just past which may be described by either tense. Moulton6 admits 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” thus early. But Moulton rightly rejects ἤδων ὅ λαδς ὅτι κεχρόνικε Μωϋσῆς (Ex. 32:1) as an instance (merely oratio obliqua). Simcox7 says that “no one but a doctrinaire special pleader is likely to deny that in Rev. 5:7; 8:5, ἐλησθεν, and in 7:14, ἐρῆκα, are mere preterits in sense.” Well, I do deny it as to ἐλησθεν in Rev. 5:7 and 8:5, where we have the vivid dramatic colloquial historical perfect. The same thing is possible with ἐρῆκα in 7:14, but I waive that for the moment. Burton8 is more cautious. He claims that the N. T. writers “had perfect command of the distinction between the aorist and the perfect,” but admits that “there is clear evidence that the perfect tense was in the N. T. sometimes an aorist in force,” though “the idiom is confined within narrow limits.” Some of the examples claimed by him for this usage I have explained otherwise already. Moulton9 sees that this confusion may exist in one writer, though not in another, but he admits a [Page 900] “residuum of genuinely aoristic perfects.” He admits γέγονα to be “perplexing,” though in the 45 examples in the ind. in the N. T. “it has obviously present time” and “the aoristic sense is not really proved for any of them.” That is certainly true. There are instances in the N. T., as in the later Greek generally,1 where γέγονα approaches a present in sense, as in 1 Cor. 13:11, but its use as a mere preterit is not shown, not even by the examples quoted by Moulton2 from the papyri (O. P. 478 and B. U. 136). The first has προσβεβήκεν—γεγονέν—τετελευκέν, all three apparently vivid historical perfects. The example in Josephus (Apion, 4:21) may be the same. We have left ἐλησθα, ἐρῆκα, ἔσχηκα, πέπρακα. The last Moulton3 refuses to admit as an aorist in sense, since “the distinction is very clearly seen in papyri for some centuries” between πέπρακα and ἠγόρασα. He cites O. P. 482 (ii/A.D.), χωρὶς ὧν ἄπεγραψάμην καὶ πέπρακα. Besides in Mt. 13:46 πέπρακεν is in a vivid parable (dramatic historical perfect). Moulton notes the confusion as worse in illiterate papyri, like ὅσκε ἐλοσόμην ὅσκ ἠλιμε (= ἠλειμμα). O. P. 528 (ii/A.D.). As to ἔσχηκα the matter is more plausible in one example (2 Cor. 2:13).

5 Ib.
6 Ib., p. 142.
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———, The Writers of the N. T. (1890).

7 Lang. of the N. T., p. 104.
8 N. T. M. and T., p. 44.
9 Prol., pp. 143 ff.
1 Cf. Buresch, Γέγοναν (Rh. M., 1891, p. 231 note).
2 Prol., p. 146.
3 Ib., p. 142.
Blass\textsuperscript{4} affirms the true present perfect sense for ἔσχηκα elsewhere in the N. T. (Mk. 5:15; 2 Cor. 1:9; 7:5; Ro. 5:2). Moulton\textsuperscript{5} replies that “we must, I think, treat all the Pauline passages alike.” But why? He does not claim such uniformity for γέγονα in any N. T. writer.\textsuperscript{9} There is some analogy between ἔσχηκα and ἔθηκα and ἀφήκα, and ἔσχον may be ingressive, not constative. Moulton (\textit{Prol.}, p. 145) makes a good deal out of the fact that ἔσχον occurs only 20 times in the N. T. and that thus ἔσχηκα may have come to mean ‘possessed’ (constative), but he admits that this does not suit in Ro. 5:2. He cites a possible example from B. U. 297 (i/ii A.D.) τοῖς δικαίων αὐτῶν ἔσχηκόσι καὶ ἄνευ τινὸς ἀμφισβητήσεως ἐν τῇ νομῇ γενομένους (=–οις). Radermacher (\textit{N. T. Gr.}, p. 122) thinks that the perfect in the \textit{koinē} comes within the sphere of the aorist at times. Thackeray (\textit{Gr.}, p. 24) thinks that εἴληφα in Dan. \textsc{Θ} 4:30\textsuperscript{b} and ἔσχηκα, 3 M. 5:20, belong here. But if the whole case has to be made out from one example (2 Cor. 2:13; cf. 2 Cor. 7:5), it is at least quite problematical. The only substantial plea for taking ἔσχηκα as preterit here is the fact that Paul did have ἄνεσις for his spirit after Titus \textsuperscript{[Page 901]} came. But it was a partial ἄνεσις as the Epistle shows. It is therefore possible that in 2 Cor. 2:13 we do have a present perfect=preterit punctiliar (cf. ἔξηλθον), possible but not quite certain. Paul may have wished to accent the strain of his anxiety up to the time of the arrival of Titus. The aorist would not have done that. The imperfect would not have noted the end of his anxiety. It was durative plus punctiliar. Only the past perfect and the present perfect could do both. The experience may have seemed too vivid to Paul for the past perfect. Hence he uses the (historical dramatic) present perfect. That is certainly a possible interpretation of his idea. Moulton (\textit{Prol.}, p. 238) in the Additional Notes draws back a bit from the preterit use of ἔσχηκα. He had advanced it “with great hesitation” and as “a tentative account.” “The pure perfect force is found long after Paul’s day: thus in the formula of an IOU, ὁμολογῶ ἔσχηκέναι παρὰ σοῦ διὸ χειρός ἐξ οἴκου χρῆσαι ἐντοκον (B. U. 1015 in the early \textsc{iii}/\textsc{a.d.}), ’to have received and still possess,’” We have ἐλήφα and ἔρηκα left. Take ἐλήφα. In Rev. 3:3 we have μημόνευε ὅλης ἐλήφας καὶ ἥκουσας καὶ τῆρα, καὶ μετανόησον. It is preceded by ἔρηκα in the proper sense. This is an exhortation about the future. If ἥκουσας had been ἀκήκοας no difficulty would exist. The perfect would emphasize the permanence of the obligation. It is as easy to say that ἥκουσας=a perfect as that ἐλήφας=an aorist. Both are abstractly possible and neither may be true. The reception may seem more a matter to be emphasized as durative than the hearing (punctiliar). It is a fine point, but it is possible. Cf. πεποίηκεν καὶ ἔλησαν in Mk. 5:19. Cf. Jo. 3:32. The mere fact of the use of aorists and perfects side by side does not prove confusion of tenses. It rather

\textsuperscript{4} Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200.
\textsuperscript{5} Prol., p. 145.
\textsuperscript{6} Ib., p. 146.
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argues the other way. It is possible with Blass\(^1\) to see the force of each tense in ἔλαβεν and ἤκουσεν in Jo. 3:32 (cf. 1 Jo. 1:1–3). Note also εἰσῆγαγεν καὶ κεκοίνωκεν (Ac. 21:28). Cf. Lu. 4:18 where the change is natural. Moulton\(^2\) does find such confusion in the illiterate documents among the papyri. Simcox (Lang. of the N. T., p. 105) wishes to know what “distinction of sense” exists between ἔλαβον and τετελείωμα in Ph. 3:12. It is very simple and very clear. ἔλαβον denies the sufficiency of Paul’s past achievement, τετελείωμα denies it as a present reality. Cf. Ro. 13:12. I have already explained εἰλήφα in Rev. 5:7 and 8:5. There is surely no trouble about εἰλήφα in 2:28. In 11:17 again, δια εἰλήφες τὴν δόναμίν σου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἔβασιλεύσας, it is not εἰλήφες (punctiliar-durative, [Page 902] ‘receivedst and still hast’) that calls for explanation, but ἔβασιλεύσας, which may be used to accent the ingressive idea or as a practical equivalent of the perfect. The use of ἔρηκα (Rev. 7:14) and ἔρηκαν (19:3) seems more like a real preterit than any other examples in the N. T. In 7:14, B reads εἶπον. I would not labour the point over these two examples. If such a confusion of tenses occurred anywhere in the N. T., the Apocalypse would be the place to expect it. And yet even the Apocalypse is entitled to a word in its defence on this point in spite of the fact that Moulton\(^1\) “frankly yields” these instances and Blass\(^2\) says that “the popular intermixture of the two tenses appears undoubtedly in the Apocalypse.” It is to be remembered that the Apocalypse is a series of visions, is intensely dramatic. It is just here that the rhetorical dramatic (historical) perfect so freely granted in the orators would be found. It is wholly possible that in this use of ἔρηκα we have only this idiom. “In history the perfect has no place outside of the speeches and the reflective passages in which the author has his say.”\(^3\) It is curious how aptly Gildersleeve here describes these very instances of the present perfect which are called “aoristic.” So I conclude by saying that the N. T. writers may be guilty of this idiom,\(^4\) but they have not as yet been proven to be. Cf. ἔχαρην δια εὕρηκα in 2 Jo. 4. The distinction between the perf. and pres. is sharply drawn in Jas. 3:7, δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται.

(i) The Periphrastic Perfect. For the origin of this idiom see discussion in connection with the Past Perfect, (b), (η). The use of ἔχω (so common in later Greek

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 199.
2 Prol., p. 142 f.
1 Prol., p. 145.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200.
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———, Numerous articles in the American Journal of Philology.

4 E. J. Goodspeed (Am. Jour. of Theol., Jan., 1906, p. 102 f.) shows that the ostraca confirm the pap. in the free use of the perfect.
and finally triumphant in modern Greek) has a few parallels in the N. T. Cf. ἔχει με παρετημένον (Lu. 14:19) with Latin idiom “I have him beaten.” Cf. ἔχει κείμενα (Lu. 12:19, pres. part. used as perf.), ἔχειμεν τὴν χείρα (Mk. 3:1). Cf. Mk. 8:17; Heb. 5:14; Jo. 17:13, ἔχεωςιν—πεπληρωμένην. Here the perf. part. is, of course, predicate, but the idiom grew out of such examples. The modern Greek uses not only ἔχο δεμένο, but also δεμένα, but, if a conjunctive pron. precedes, the part. agrees in gender and number (cf. French). So τὴν ἔχων ἰδιωμένη, ‘I have seen her’ (Thumb, Handb., p. 162). Passive is ἔμαυ δεμένος. The use of γίνομαι is limited. Cf. γέγεντο ἔχοντας ἐκτὸς ἡμῶν (Rev. 16:10), a mixture of tenses (cf. Mk. 9:3). See Ex. 17:12; Ps. 72:14. Peculiar is γεγονὼν τῆς ἐκτος ἐν ἡμῖν in Heb. 5:12. It is εἰμί that is commonly used (about 40 times in the N. T.) with the perfect part. Cf. Num. 22:12; Is. 10:20. Burton notes that the intensive use of the perfect tense (cf. past perfect) is more common than the extensive. As examples of the intensive (=present) take πεπραγένος ἔστιν (Lu. 20:6). So Jo. 2:17; Ac. 2:13, etc. For the extensive use (=completed act) note ἐστίν πεπραγμένον (Lu. 23:15). So Jo. 6:31; Heb. 4:2, etc. In Ac. 26:26 the main accent is on the punctiliar aspect (at the beginning, as in Jo. 6:31).

(k) Present as Perfect. These examples, like ἡκο, πάρειμι, ἤττάομαι, κεῖμαι, have already been discussed under 1, (a), (η). Cf. ἰπόκειται (2 Tim. 4:8).

(b) The Past Perfect (ὁ ύπερσυντελικός).

(a) The Double Idea. It is the perfect of the past and uses the form of the present perfect plus special endings and often with augment. The special endings show kinship with the aorist. As the present perfect is a blending in idea of the aoristic (punctiliar) and the durative present (a sort of durative aoristic present combined), so the past perfect is a blend of the aorist and the imperfect in idea. It is continuance of the completed state in past time up to a prescribed limit in the past. As in the present perfect, so here the relation between the punctiliar and the durative ideas will vary in different verbs. The name ύπερσυντελικός (plus-quam-perfectum) = more than perfect in the sense that it always refers to an antecedent date, “a past prior to another past” is not always true.

(b) A Luxury in Greek. The Greeks cared nothing for relative time, though that was not the only use for the past perfect, as just stated. Ordinarily the aorist ind. was sufficient for a narrative unless the durative idea was wanted when the imperfect was ready to hand. Herodotus shows a fondness for the past perfect. It disappeared in Greek before the present perfect, though in the N. T. it still survives in current, but
not common, usage. It was never so frequent in Greek as the past perfect was in Latin. The N.T. idiom conforms to that of the older language.

(i) The Intensive Past Perfect. Present perfects that had come to be mere presents through accent on the durative idea and loss of emphasis on the aoristic (punctiliar) are virtual imperfects when turned into the past. Cf. ὁς εἶδον (Mk. 10:1). So ἦδεν (Jo. 1:31), ἔτηκισαν (Jo. 19:25; cf. Ac. 1:10 f.), ἐπεποίθει (Lu. 11:22) and even ἐγνώκετε (Mt. 12:7). For ἔγνωκα sometimes is used like οἶδα (1 Jo. 2:4). So with ἤν ἀπολογώς (Lu. 15:24; cf. εὐρέθη). Here we have a mere existing state in the past with the obscuration of the idea of completion (aoristic-punctiliar). But it is to be noted that the durative sense is usually a changed meaning from the aoristic sense. Cf. οἶδα from εἶδον. For this idiom in classic Greek see Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 103. Cf. also E. Schwartz, Index to Eus., pp. 214 ff.

(ii) The Extensive Past Perfect. The past perfect usually presents a completed state or fixed condition in past time. As already said, it is not necessarily "a blend of past and praeterpast." In Latin the past perfect shows no trace of the Aktionsart of the perfect; the past perfect is just time relatively past. The Greek past perfect expresses a state following a completed act in past time. Sometimes it is made clear by the context that a considerable space of time had intervened, though this is quite incidental with the Greek. Take Jo. 6:17, καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγέγονε καὶ οὕπω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἱσοῦς. The verb in the sentence before is ἤρχοντο (descriptive) and the verb following is διεγείρετο (inchoative). The time of these imperfects is, of course, past. But the two intervening past perfects indicate stages in the going (ἤρχοντο) before they reached the shore. Both ἤδη and οὕπω help to accent the interval between the first darkness and the final appearance of Jesus which is soon expressed by the vivid historical present, θεωροῦσιν (6:19). Here we have a past behind a past beyond a doubt from the standpoint of the writer, and that is the very reason why John used the past perfect here. In verse 16, ὅς δὲ ὑψία ἐγένετο κατέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ, he had been content with the aorist in both the principal and the subordinate clauses. He had not cared there to express relative time, to stress the interval at all. The tenses in Jo. 6:16–21, by the way, form a very interesting study. John does, as a matter of fact, use the past perfect more frequently than do the Synoptists. He uses it to take the reader "behind the scenes" and often throws it in by way of parenthesis. Thus in 1:24 the past perfect ᾧσταλμένοι ἦσαν points back to the aorist ἰπεστελαγαν in 1:19. In 4:8 ἀπεληλύθεσαν is a parenthetical explanation of what the disciples had done before this incident with the woman. So in 9:22 συνετέθειαν has ἦδη and notes a previous agreement. In 11:13 εἰρήκει points to a time just before, but note έδοξαν. The tenses in 11:11–13 are all interesting (ἐπε, λέγει, ἔπον, εἰρήκει, κεκοίμηται, παρεύομαι, σωθήσεται). In 11:19 ἐληλύθεσαν denotes antecedent action, and in 11:30, οὕπω ἔλ[--], the interval is marked. Cf. also 11:44, περιεδέδετο. In 11:57 δεδόκεισαν points backward as is true of οὐδέπω οὐδὲς ἦν τεθεμένος (19:41). In 3:24 and 7:30; 8:20, the standpoint is later than the event

8 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 148.
4 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 349.
described, but none the less it stretches backward though from a relatively future time. But this distinction is not confined to John. Cf. Mt. 7:25, τεθεμελιωτο, which points back to verse 24. So in Mk. 14:44 δεδωκε refers to Judas’ previous arrangement. Cf. also ἐξεβληθη in Mk. 16:9 with ἔφανη. The tenses in Mk. 15:6–10 are interesting. The three past perfects all refer to antecedent action. Cf. ἡμαρτον in Lu. 4:29, and with ἐπορευότο in verse 30. In Lu. 16:20 ἐξεβληθη suggests that the poor man had been at the door some while. In Ac. 4:22 γεγόνε (cf. τὴ γεγονότι) does not precede ἐπέλυσαν (verse 21) by any great amount of time, yet the interval is real (cf. 3:1–10).1 In Ac. 9:21 ἐξηλύθει is contrasted with ἐστιν ὁ παρόθησας. In 14:23 cf. πεπιστεύκεισαν with ἐστίν ὁ πορθήσας. The tenses in Mk. 15:6–10 are interesting. The three past perfects all refer to antecedent action. Cf. αἵματης with ἠγαγον in Lu. 4:29, and with ἐπορευότο in verse 30. In Lu. 16:20 ἐξεβληθη suggests that the poor man had been at the door some while. In Ac. 4:22 γεγόνε (cf. τὴ γεγονότι) does not precede ἐπέλυσαν (verse 21) by any great amount of time, yet the interval is real (cf. 3:1–10).1 In Ac. 9:21 ἐξηλύθει is contrasted with ἐστιν ὁ παρόθησας. In 14:23 cf. πεπιστεύκεισαν with παρέθεντο. Cf. Ac. 4:27 and 31. In 14:26 the reference is to the beginning of the tour from Antioch. In 20:16, κεκρίκει, and 20:38, ἐφηκε, the two ends of the action nearly come together, but in 21:29 the antecedent action is clear. In Jo. 11:30, οὐκ ἐληλύθει—ἀλλ’ ἦν ἔτι—ὁπου ὑπήντησεν, the three past tenses of the ind. come out well. In 11:56 f. τὸ δικαί ὑμῖν; ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλοθη εἰς τὴν ἔορθην; δεδωκεσαν, the three kinds of time (present, future, past) are all employed. But in 12:16 the aorist ind. is employed, οὐκ ἐγνωσαν τὸ πρῶτον—τότε ἐμνήσθησαν. Here the past perfect would more exactly have marked off τὸ πρῶτον. If the previous time is to be depicted in its course, the past perfect is used (Thumb, Handb., p. 163).

(c) The Past Perfect of Broken Continuity2 (· · · · > · · · ·). This is true of Lu. 8:29, πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν. It is an [Page 906] iterative past perfect in a series of links instead of a line, like the present perfect of broken continuity in Jo. 1:18. Cf. the perf. inf. in Ac. 8:11.

(ζ) Past Perfect in Conditional Sentences. Usually the aorist ind. occurs in these conditions of the second class determined as unfulfilled in relation to the past. But sometimes the past perfect appears. Cf. Jo. 19:11; Ac. 26:32; 1 Jo. 2:19. See Conditional Sentences, ch. XIX.

(η) The Periphrastic Past Perfect. This construction had already begun in ancient Greek. In the third person plural of liquid and mute verbs it was uniformly done for the sake of euphony. It was occasionally found also with other verbs. In the modern Greek1 we find εἶχα δεμένο, ‘I had bound,’ ἢμουν δεμένος or ἠμα δεθ. ἠχο was at first more than a mere auxiliary, though in Herodotus it appears as a true auxiliary. The dramatists also use it often.2 In the N. T. the examples with εἶχον are not pertinent. Cf. συκῆν εἶχαν τις περιπεμεμένην (Lu. 13:6); ἦν εἶχον ἀποκειμένην (Lu. 19:20), really predicative accusative participles with ἠχο. But the past perfect with the perfect partic. and ἦν is rather common. Cf. Jo. 19:11. Burton3 notes that about two-thirds of them are intensive and only one-third extensive. As examples of the intensive use see Mt. 26:43, ἦσαν βεβηρημένοι; Lu. 15:24, ἦν ἀπολωλός. Cf. also Lu. 1:7. Examples of the extensive type are ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες (Lu. 5:17); ἦσαν

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 148.
1 Thumb, Handb., pp. 161, 165.
2 Jebb in Vinc. and Dickson’s Handb., p. 329.
3 N. T. M. and T., p. 45.
προεωρακότες (Ac. 21:29). For examples in the LXX see 2 Chron. 18:34; Judg. 8:11; Ex. 39:23, etc. See also βεβαπτισµένοι ὑπῆρχον (Ac. 8:16).

(θ) Special Use of ἐκείµην. This verb was used as the passive of τίθηµι. The present was = a present perfect. So the imperfect was used as a past perfect, as in Jo. 20:12, ὅπου ἐκείνο τὸ σῶµα—‘where the body had lain’ or ‘had been placed.’ So in Jo. 2:6 ἦσαν κείµεναι is a periphrastic past perfect in sense. Cf. Lu. 23:53, ἦν κείµενος. See also 19:20. Perhaps a similar notion is seen in ὁµοθυµαδόν παρῆσαν (Ac. 12:20).

(c) The Future Perfect (Ὄ µέλλων συντελικός). There was never much need for this tense, perfect action in future time.4 It is rare in ancient Greek and in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 194). The only active forms in the N. T. are εἰδήσω (Heb. 8:11, LXX, possibly a mere future) and the periphrastic form ἔσοµαι πεποιθώς (Heb. 2:13, LXX also). Both of these are intensive. Most of the MSS. [Page 907] read κεκράξονται in Lu. 19:40, but ἩΒΛ have κράξουσιν. This is also intensive (cf. κέκραγα), if it is accepted, as it is not by W. H. nor by Nestle. I note ἔση µοι µεγάλην χάριν καταιθεὶµεν (ἔνοι), B. G. U. 596 (A.D. 84). The modern Greek has a fut. perf. in θὰ ἔχω δεµένο (Thumb, Handb., p. 162). In ἦξουσιν (Lu. 19:43) we have a practical future perfect (intensive). For the rest the futurum exactum is expressed only by means of the perfect part. and εἰµι. This idiom is found in the LXX (the active in Gen. 43:8; 44:32; Is. 58:14, etc. The passive in Gen. 41:36; Ex. 12:6). N. T. examples are ἔσται δεδεµένων and ἔσται λελυµένων (Mt. 16:19); ἔσται λελυµένα (18:18); ἔσονται διαµειψµένον (Lu. 12:52). These all seem to be extensive. For a sketch of the future perfect see Thompson, Syntax of Attic Greek, p. 225 f. This tense died before the future did.

3. The Subjunctive and Optative. The perfect optative is not found in the N. T. It was always rare in the Greek of the early period. See Hatzidakis, Einl., p. 219. The only inflected perf. subj. in the N. T. is εἰδῶ, which occurs ten times (Mt. 9:6; Mk. 2:10; Lu. 5:24, etc.). But in this form the perfect sense is gone. See ἵνα εἰδῆτε, P. B. M. 1178 (A.D. 194). Indeed, the perf. subj. was always very rare in Greek. In the Sanskrit the perf. tense, outside of the Vedic language, never developed to any extent except in the ind. and the participle.1 In the classic Greek it was in subj. and opt. a mark of the literary style and did not really belong to the life of the people. The perf. subj. is absent from the vernacular modern Greek. A little reflection will show how usually there was no demand for a true perfect, combining punctiliar and durative, in the subj. Even in the literary style of the older Greek, when the perf. subj. did occur it was often the periphrastic form in the active and nearly always so in the passive.2 “The perfect of the side-moods is true to the kind of time, completion, intensity, overwhelming finality.”3 By “kind of time” Gildersleeve means kind of action, not past, present or future. Cf. the LXX also, Is. 8:14; 10:20; 17:8. In Lu. 14:8 there

Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
3 Gildersleeve, Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 401.
appears to be a conscious change from κληθῇς to μήποτε ἤ κεκλημένος, possibly suggesting a long-standing invitation by the latter. In Jo. 3:27, ἔαν μὴ ἤ δεδομένου, it is punctiliar-durative. In 16:24, ἵνα ἤ πεπληρωμένη (cf. 1 Jo. 1:4), the consummation is emphasized (durative-punctiliar), extensive perfect [Page 908] (completed act). The same thing is true of 17:19, ἵνα ὦσιν ἧγισμένοι, and 17:23, ἵνα ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι. In Jas. 5:15, κἂν ἤ πεποικώς, we seem to have the perfect of “broken continuity.” In 2 Cor. 1:9, ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες ὦμεν, it is merely intensive.

4. THE IMPERATIVE. What has been said of the rarity of the perf. subj. can be repeated concerning the perf. imper. Out of 2445 imperatives in the Attic orators the speeches themselves show only eight real perfects (Gildersleeve, Syntax, Part I, p. 158. Cf. also Miller, “The Limitation of the Imperative in the Attic Orators,” A. J. P., xiii, 1892, pp. 399–436). In Is. 4:1 one may note κεκλήσθω intensive. The perfect imper. is common in Homer.1 In the late Greek it occurred most frequently in the purely intensive perfects or in the third person singular of other verbs.2 But it is gone from the modern Greek and is nearly dead in the N. T. In Jas. 1:19 ἵστε may be imperative (intensive) or ind. See the formula ἔρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29) and ἔρρωσο in Text. Rec. (23:30).3 The only other example is found in Mk. 4:39, σιώπα, πεφίσωσο, where it is also intensive like the others. The durative idea is in both σιώπα (linear pres.) and πεφίσωσο, ‘put the muzzle on and keep it on.’ The periphrastic perf. imper. occurs in Lu. 12:35, ἔστωσαν περιεζώσασαν (intensive). Cf. καιόμενοι. The time of the perf. imper. and subj. is, of course, really future. Cf. p. 848 (a).

5. THE INFINITIVE. There were originally no tenses in the inf. (see Sanskrit), as has already been stated. But the Greek developed a double use of the inf. (the common use, and indir. discourse).

(a) Indirect Discourse. In indir. discourse (cf. ch. XIX) the tenses of the inf. had the element of time, that of the direct. But in the N. T. there is no instance of the perf. inf. representing a past perf. ind.4 The tense occurs in indir. discourse, but the time is not changed. Cf. Ac. 14:19 ἔστωσαν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, νομίζοντες ἢδη εὐθυνικέναι, (12:14) ἐπήγαγαλεν ἐστάται. So ἐλέεσαι in Lu. 22:34; γεγονέναι (Jo. 12:29); γεγονέναι (2 Tim. 2:18). These examples are also all intensive perfects. So with Col. 2:1, ἰδοὺ ὑμῖν ἐλέεσαι. In 1 Tim. 6:17, παράγαγαλλε ὑπηλοφυρονέν οὐχ ἥλικεν (indir. command), the intensive perf. again occurs. In Lu. 10:36, δοκά σοι γεγονέναι, we have “the vivid present of story-telling.”5 Cf. πεπραχέναι (Ac. 25:25). On the whole the [Page 909] perf. inf. is rather common (47 times, according to H. Scott) in the N. T.1 See further Jo. 12:18; Ac. 16:27; 27:13; Ro. 15:8; Heb. 11:3.

(b) Perfect Infinitive not in Indirect Discourse.

1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 22.
2 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 23 f.
3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200 f.
4 Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 52.
5 Moulton, Prol., p. 146. So Heb. 4:1.
1 W.-Th., p. 334.
(a) Subject or Object Infinitive. Cf. 2 Pet. 2:21, μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι, where the tense accented the climacteric aspect (durative-punctiliar) of the act and rather suggests antecedence (extensive) to ἕν. In Ac. 26:32, ἀπολελύσθην αὐτόν, we have an instance of the obj. inf. with implied antecedence (extensive). Note also δὸς ἔργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθη (Lu. 12:58). In Ac. 19:36 κυτεσταλμένους ὑπάρχειν is a periphrastic form of the subject inf. In 2 Cor. 5:11 note πεφανερῶσθαι with ἐλπίζω. Cf. 1 Pet. 4:3 (with ἀρκετός). Not very different is the use with ὅστε (Ro. 15:19).

(b) With Prepositions. At first it may seem surprising that the perfect tense should occur with the articular inf. after prepositions. But the inf. does not lose its verbal character in such constructions. It is still a verbal substantive. It is, of course, only by analogy that the tense function is brought into the infinitive. For the papyri note ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονέναι, P. Oxy. 294 (A.D. 22); ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀπολελύσθαι σε, P. B. M. 42 (B.C. 168). Cf. µετά τὸ εἰρήκεναι (Heb. 10:15), the only instance with µετά. Here the tense has the same force as εἴρηκε in 10:9. It stands on record as said. We find it with εἰς (twice), as in Eph. 1:18, εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι (intensive) and εἰς τὸ γεγονέναι (Heb. 11:3). It is most frequent with διά and the acc. (7 times). So Mk. 5:4, δεδέσθαι καὶ διεσπάσθαι καὶ συντετρίφθαι (extensive). See οἰκοδομήσθαι (Lu. 6:48). Cf. Ac. 18:2; 27:9. In 8:11 we have the perf. inf. of “broken continuity.” In the N. T. the perf. inf. with prepositions appears only with διά, εἰς and µετά.

6. The Participle.

(a) The Meaning. The perf. part. either represents a state (intensive) or a completed act (extensive). Examples of the former are κεκοπιάκως (Jo. 4:6); ἑστώς (18:18); τὸ ἐλθός (Lu. 4:16). Instances of the latter occur in ὁ ἐληφώς (Mt. 25:24); πεποιηκότες (Jo. 18:18). The perf. part. is quite common in the N. T. and preserves the usual idea of the tense.

(b) The Time of the Tense. It is relative, not absolute. It may be coincident with that of the principal verb, usually so in the intensive use.² Cf. Jo. 4:6 κεκοπιάκως ἔκαθεντο, (19:33) ἔδεν ἤδη τεθηκότα, (Ro. 15:14) ἔστε—πεπληρωμένοι. But by suggestion the act may be represented as completed before that of the principal verb and so antecedent action. Thus ἵστηκας—πεποιηκότες (Jo. 18:18); προφάτος ἔληλυθότα (Ac. 18:2); ἀπολελυμένην (Lu. 16:18); εἰρήκτος (Mt. 26:75). This antecedent action may be expressed also by the intensive perfect as in ἐξῆλθον ὁ τεθηκός (Jo. 11:44), but δεδεμένος is coincident action. So in Mk. 5:15 ἰματισμένον is coincident, but τὸν ἔσηκότα antecedent. Cf. Rev. 6:9. The modern Greek keeps the perf. part. (Thumb, Handb., p. 167).

(c) The Perfect Tense Occurs with Various Uses of the Participle. The part. is used as attributive. Cf. ὁ ἀπεσταλμένοι (Ac. 10:17). Sometimes a distinction is drawn between the aorist and the perf. part. Cf. ὁ λαβὼν in Mt. 25:20 with ὁ εἰληφὼς (25:24); ὁ καλέσας in Lu. 14:9 with ὁ κεκληκός (14:10). Cf. 2 Cor. 12:21; 1 Pet. 2:10. The predicate participle also uses it. Cf. Lu. 8:46; 16:18, 20 f.; Jo. 19:33; Ac.

18:2; Heb. 13:23. With Rev. 9:1, ἀδὸν πεπτωκότα, compare Lu. 10:18, ἔθεροὺν πεσόντα (the state, the act).

(d) The Periphrastic Participle. There are two examples of this unusual idiom. Cf. Eph. 4:18 ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανόης ὄντες, (Col. 1:21) ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους. The durative aspect of the perfect is thus accented. Cf. Heb. 5:14 for ἔχω used periphrastically.

[PAGE 911] CHAPTER XIX

MODE (ἘΓΚΑΙΣΙΣ)

Introductory. For a brief sketch of the number of the modes and the reasons for treating the indicative as a mode see Conjugation of the Verb, chapter VIII, V, (a). References are there given to the pertinent literature. The use of ἕν is given a brief treatment below in connection with the modes. The subject of conjunctions is divided for logical consistency. The Paratactic Conjunctions belong to the same division with Paratactic Sentences, while Hypotactic Conjunctions fall under Hypotactic Sentences. The conjunctions could of course be treated in separate chapter or as a division of the chapter on Particles (XXI). That will be there done (v, 1) for Paratactic Conjunctions. Hypotactic Conjunctions will there receive only summary treatment and can best be discussed in detail in connection with subordinate clauses. And there are advantages in the present method. It needs to be said also that the division of the treatment of modes into those of Independent and Subordinate Sentences (A and B) is purely arbitrary and for the sake of clearness. There is no real difference in the meaning of a mode in an independent and a dependent sentence. The significance of each mode will be sufficiently discussed under A (Independent Sentences). The inclusion of all the subordinate clauses under mode is likewise for the sake of perspicuity. Voice, tense, mode thus stand out sharply.¹ The difficulty of making a clear distinction in the significance of the modes has already been discussed in chapter VIII, pp. 321 ff. A mood is a mode of statement, an attitude of mind in which the speaker conceives the matter stated.² Apollonius Dyskolos first described moods as ψυχικαὶ διαθέσεις. That is a correct description of the function of mood as distinct from voice and tense.³

[Page 912] The mode is the manner of the affirmation, while voice and tense have to do with the action of the verb (voice with relation of the subject to the action of the verb, tense with the state of the action). But even so the matter is not always clear. The mode is far and away the most difficult theme in Greek syntax. Our modern grammatical nomenclature is never so clumsy as here in the effort to express “the delicate accuracy and beauty of those slight nuances of thought which the Greek reflected in the synthetic and manifold forms of his verb.”⁴ So appeal is made to psychology to help us out. “If the moods are ψυχικαὶ διαθέσεις, why is not every utterance modal? Why does not every utterance denote a state of the soul? A universal

¹ Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 445 ff., has this plan. I had already made my outline before reading his treatment of the subject.
² Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 185.
psychology would be a universal syntax.”2 Every utterance does denote a state of the soul. This is one argument for treating the indicative as a mode. The verb is necessarily modal from this point of view. But the term is naturally confined to the finite verb and denied to the infinitive and participle. Dionysius Thrax does call the infinitive a mode, but he is not generally followed.3 Gildersleeve4 notes also that “moods are temporal and tenses modal.” He sees that the order moods and tenses is the natural sequence in the English (cf. chapter VIII, V, p. 320), but he follows the order tenses and moods in his Syntax of Classical Greek, though it is hard to separate them in actual study. Gildersleeve5 laments also that διάθεσις came to be applied to voice and ἔγκλησις to mode (cf. enclitic words as to accent), “but after all tone of utterance is not so bad a description of mood.” It is possible that at the beginning the indicative was used to express all the various moods or tones of the speaker, as the accusative case originally included the whole field of the oblique cases. It was only gradually that the other moods were developed by the side of the indicative (thus limiting the scope of the ind.) to accent certain “moods of mind, i.e. various shades of desire,”6 more sharply. Thompson calls this development “artificial,” since no other race but the Greeks have preserved these fine distinctions between indicative, subjunctive, optative, imperative, not to say injunctive and future indicative (almost a mode to itself). But that is too severe a term, for the modes were a gradual evolution. The injunctive was the unaugmented indicative, like λύο, λύεσθε, λύσασθε, λύσαςθε, λύθητε, λύετε, λύσατε, σχές.1 Moulton2 says: “Syntactically it represented
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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 the 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 N. T. (Mk. 11:14), we see how much common ground is shared by all the subjective moods.” Yes, and by the indicative also. The present indicative is often a practical future. Originally the subjunctive had the short vowel (cf. ἔος in Homer). The distinction between the indicative and subjunctive is not always clear. The subjunctive in Homer is often merely futurist. The affinity between the subjunctive and the optative is very close. The indicative continued to be used in the volitive sense (past tenses) and of command (future tense). Thus the other modes were luxuries of the language rather than necessities, while the indicative was the original possessor of the field. As already shown (chapter VIII, V) the injunctive survived in the imperative and subjunctive. The future indicative continued to fulfil the function of all the modes (cf. the indicative before the rise of the other modes). Thus the future indicative may be merely futurist, or volitive, or deliberative. The same thing is true of the subjunctive and the optative. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 184 f. Thompson (Syntax, p. 186) curiously says that “the indicative, however, assumed some of the functions of the other moods.” If he had said “retained,” he would have it right. He had just said properly enough: “It would be an error, with regard both to their origin and functions, to regard the moods as separate and water-tight compartments.” The early process was from simplicity to variety and then from variety to simplicity (cf. again the history of the cases). The struggle between the modes has continued until in the modern Greek we have practically only the
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indicative and the subjunctive, and they [Page 914] are in some instances alike in sound (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 115 f.). The subj. is “considerably reduced” in use in the modern Greek. The optative has disappeared entirely, and the imperative, outside the second person, and the future indicative are expressed by periphrasis. Even the infinitive and the participle in the κοινή have felt the inroads of the subjunctive.¹ It is true that as a rule we see the modes to best advantage in the simple sentence,² though essentially the meaning in the compound sentence is the same. But it is true, as Gildersleeve³ urges, that “the predominance of parataxis over hypotaxis is a matter of style as well as of period. Hypotaxis holds fast to constructions that parataxis has abandoned. The futural subjunctive abides defiantly in the dependent clause of temporal sentences and dares the future indicative to invade its domain. The modal nature of the future, obscured in the principal sentence, forces itself upon the most superficial observer in the dependent clause.” In a broad sense the indicative is the mode of objective statement in contrast with the subjective modes developed from it. But the description needs modification and is only true in a general sense. The N. T. idiom as of the κοινή in general will be found to differ from the classic Greek idiom here more than is true of the construction of the tenses.⁴ The disappearance of the optative is responsible for part of this change. But the effort must now be made to differentiate the four modes in actual usage whatever may be true of the original idea of each. That point will need discussion also. The vernacular in all languages is fond of parataxis. See Pfister, “Die parataktische Darstellungsform in der volkstäumlichen Erzählung” (*Woch. f. klass. Phil.*, 1911, pp. 809–813).

**A. INDEPENDENT OR PARATACTIC SENTENCES (ΠΑΡΑΤΑΚΤΙΚΑ ἈΞΙΟΜΑΤΑ)**
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¹ Thompson, Synt., p. 494. In the Sans. it was the subjunctive that went down in the fight. Cf. Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 201 f.

² Ib., p. 495.


⁴ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 205.

I. The Indicative Mode (λόγος ἀποφαντικός or ἡ ὁριστικὴ ἐγκλίσις).

1. MEANING OF THE INDICATIVE MODE.

The name is not distinctive, since all the modes “indicate.” It is not true that the indicative gives “absolute reality,” though it [Page 915] is the “modus rectus.” It does express “l’affirmation pure et simple.” The indicative does state a thing as true, but does not guarantee the reality of the thing. In the nature of the case only the statement is under discussion. A clear grip on this point will help one all along. The indicative has nothing to do with reality (“an sich”). The speaker presents something as true. Actuality is implied, to be sure, but nothing more. Whether it is true or no is another matter. Most untruths are told in the indicative mode. The true translation into Latin of ὁριστική would be finitus or definitus. Indicativus is a translation of ἀποφαντικός. The indicative is the most frequent mode in all languages. It is the normal mode to use when there is no special reason for employing another mode. The assertion may be qualified or unqualified. This fact does not affect the function of the indicative mode to make a definite, positive assertion. Cf. Jo. 13:8, for instance. A fine study of the indicative mode is afforded in Jo. 1:1–18, where we have it 38 times, chiefly in independent sentences. The subjunctive occurs only three times (1:7 f.). The use of ἤν, ἐγένετο, ἤλθεν, οὐκ ἤγαν, παρέλαβον, ἔλαβον, ἐδωκεν, ἔλαβον, ἠθεασάμεθα, etc., has the note of certitude and confident statement that illustrate finely the indicative mode.

2. KINDS OF SENTENCES USING THE INDICATIVE.

(a) Either Declarative or Interrogative. The mere declaration probably (and logically) precedes in use the question. But there is no essential difference in the significance of the mode. This extension of the indicative from simple assertion to question is true of all Indo-Germanic tongues. Cf. Mt. 2:2; Mk. 4:7; Jo. 1:19. The simple assertion is easily turned to question. Cf. ἔπεινασα γὰρ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν, ἔδιψησα καὶ ἐποτίσατε με, κτλ., and πότε σε ἐδόμεν πεινῶντα καὶ ἔθρεψαμεν, κτλ. (Mt. 25:35–39). For the change from question to simple assertion see πιστεύεις τοῦτο; ἔγω πεσάτωκα (Jo. 11:26 f.). Cf. Ac. 26:27. The formula σὺ λέγεις is sometimes used for the answer, as in Mt. 27:11; Lu. 22:70; Jo. 18:37. So also σὺ ἐλπίζεις in Mt. 26:25, 64. The question without interrogative words is seen in Mt. 13:28; Jo. 13:6; Ac. 21:37; Ro. 2:21–23; 7:7, etc. Sometimes it is difficult [Page 916] to tell whether a sentence is declarative or interrogative, as in 1 Cor. 1:13; Ro. 8:33 f.

1 Vandacle, L’Optatif Grec, 1897, p. 111.
3 Ib. Der Redende stellt etwas als wirklich.
5 Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 297 f.
6 Burton, M. and T., p. 73.
8 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 205.
For this very reason the Greek used various interrogatory particles to make plain the question. Thus ἆρα γε γνώσκεις ἃς ἀναγινώσκεις; (Ac. 8:30. Note the play on the verb). Cf. Lu. 18:18; Gal. 2:17. It is rare also in the LXX (cf. Gen. 18:9; 37:10; Jer. 4:10), but ἄρα is common.¹ It is a slight literary touch in Luke and Paul. The use of εἰ in a question is elliptical. It is really a condition with the conclusion not expressed or it is an indirect question (cf. Mk. 15:44; Lu. 23:6; Ph. 3:12). It is used in the N. T., as in the LXX quite often (Gen. 17:17, etc.). This construction with a direct question is unclassical and may be due to the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew נָבָל by εἰ as well as by µή.² Cf. Mt. 12:10, Εἰ ἔξεστιν τὸς σάββασιν θεραπεύσαι; see also Mt. 19:3; Mk. 8:23; Lu. 13:23; 22:49; Ac. 1:6; 7:1; 19:2; 21:37; 22:25. Note frequency in Luke. In Mk. 10:2 (parallel to Mt. 19:3) the question is indirect. The idiom, though singular, has “attained to all the rights of a direct interrogative”³ by this time. The idiom may be illustrated by the Latin an which in later writers was used in direct questions. So si, used in the Vulgate to translate this εἰ, became in late Latin a direct interrogative particle. A similar ellipsis appears in the use of εἰ (cf. Heb. 3:11) in the negative sense of a strong oath (from the LXX also).⁴ The particle τί is found in the LXX Job 25:5 B, but not in the N. T.⁵ So far the questions are colourless.

The use of interrogative pronouns and adverbs is, of course, abundant in the N. T. Thus τίς, either alone as in Mt. 3:7, with ἄρα as in Mt. 24:45, with γάρ as in Mt. 9:5, with ὅλον as in Lu. 3:10.⁶ See the double interrogative τίς τί in Mk. 15:24. For τί τοῦτο (predicative use of τοῦτο) see Lu. 16:2. For the ellipsis with ἵνα τί (cf. διὰ τί in Mt. 9:11; εἰς τί in Mk. 14:4) see Mt. 9:4, and for τί ὅτι note Lu. 2:49 (cf. τί γέγονεν ὅτι in Jo. 14:22). The use of τί in Ac. 12:18 and 13:25 is interesting. Τί is an accusative adverb in Mk. 10:18. A sort of prolepsis or double accusative occurs in οἶδα σὲ τίς ἦν (Mk. 1:24). Other pronouns used in direct questions are ποίος (Mk. 11:28), πόσος (Mk. 6:38), [Page 917] ποταπός (Mt. 8:27). The sense of ὅ in Mt. 26:50 is disputed, as of ὅτι in Mk. 2:16; 9:11, 28; Jo. 8:25.¹ The use of interrogative adverbs is frequent. Cf. πότε (Mt. 25:38); ἐως πότε (Mt. 17:17); πῶς (Lu. 10:26); ποῦ (Lu. 8:25); ποσάκις (Mt. 18:21).

Alternative questions are expressed by ἦν alone as in 1 Cor. 9:8, or with τί—هة as in Mt. 9:5. The case of ἦν τίς is different (Mt. 7:9).

Exclamations are sometimes expressed by the relative forms, like ὡς ὠρᾶοι in Ro. 10:15, but more frequently by the interrogative pronouns like πόσα (Mk. 15:4); πηλίκος (Gal. 6:11); τί (Lu. 12:49); ποσάκις (Mt. 23:37). Cf. πόσον in Mt. 6:23.

---

¹ Viteau, Étude sur le Grec du N. T. Le Verbe, p. 22. Some editors read ἄρα in Gal. 2:17, but see Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 259. See ἄρα in Mt. 18:1.
³ W.-Th., p. 509.
⁴ Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 179.
⁵ Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 22.
⁶ Cf. Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 178.
¹See ch. XV, Pronouns.
(b) Positive and Negative. If an affirmative or negative answer is expected, then that fact is shown by the use of οὐ for the question expecting the affirmative reply and by μή for the negative answer. As a matter of fact, any answer may be actually given. It is only the expectation that is presented by οὐ or μή. This use of οὐ is like the Latin nonne. So οὐ τῷ σῷ ἄνωματι ἐξορθεύσασεν; (Mt. 7:22). Cf. Mt. 6:25; 13:27; 13:55; Lu. 12:6; 15:8; 17:17; 1 Cor. 9:1; 14:23; Jas. 2.5; Heb. 3:16, etc. This is the common classic construction. The use of οὐ may suggest indignation as in οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃς οὐδὲν; (Mk. 14:60. Cf. οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδὲν in verse 61). So with οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων; (Ac. 13:10). Surprise is indicated by οὐκ ἄρα in Ac. 21:38. Οὐχὶ is common. Cf. Lu. 6:39. Ὀκουῦ occurs once in the N. T. (Jo. 18:37). The presence of μή shows that the answer “no” is anticipated (the only instance of μή with the indicative in a principal sentence). Gildersleeve² calls οὐ “the masculine negative” and μή “the feminine negative.” There is certainly a feminine touch in the use of μή by the woman at Jacob’s well when she came to the village. She refused to arouse opposition by using οὐ and excited their curiosity by μή. Thus μήτι οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός; (Jo. 4:29).³ The examples in the N. T. are very numerous. The shades of negative expectation and surprise vary very greatly. Each context supplies a slightly different tone. Cf. Mt. 7:9, 16; 12:23; 26:22, 25; Mk. 4:21; Lu. 6:39; Jo. 6:67; 7:26, 35, 47, 51 f.; 21:5; Ro. 9:14; 11:1. Both οὐ and μή may occur in contrast in the same sentence. So μή κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ, ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει; (1 Cor. 9:8). Cf. Lu. 6:39 μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγῆναι; οὐχὶ ἐμφάνισε ἐλεῖς βόθυνον ἐμπότισεν [Page 918] σοῦντα; The use of μήτι is common (cf. οὔχι).¹ The combination μή oὐ will be discussed in the chapter on Particles, but it may be noted here that oὐ is the negative of the verb while μή is the interrogative particle expecting the answer “no.” The English translation expects the answer “yes,” because it ignores μή and translates only οὐ. Cf. 1 Cor. 9:4, 5; 11:22; Ro. 10:18, 19. The construction is in the LXX (Judg. 6:13, etc.) and in classic Greek. It is a rhetorical question, not a simple interrogative.² The kinds of sentences overlap inevitably so that we have already transgressed into the territory of the next group.

As already shown, the indicative is used indifferently with or without the negative in either declarative or interrogative sentences. The groups thus overlap. Cf., for instance, Jo. 1:2–8. The negative of a declarative independent sentence with the indicative is οὐ. This outright “masculine” negative suits the indicative. With questions, however, it is different, as has already been shown. Thus it is true that μή made a “raid” into the indicative, as οὐ did in the early language into the subjunctive.³ The optative uses either oὐ or μή, but that is another story. The indicative with οὐ makes a pointed denial. Note the progressive abruptness of the Baptist’s three denials in Jo. 1:20 f.

3. SPECIAL USES OF THE INDICATIVE.

(a) Past Tenses.

² Am. Jour. of Philol., Jan., 1910, p. 78.
³ Cf. also Jo. 4:33.
¹ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 254.
² Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 179.
For Courtesy. It is true that the indicative “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.” That is perfectly true. The indicative is the normal mode for saying a thing. The other modes Gildersleeve aptly terms “side moods.” I consider, as already explained, the indicative the mode par excellence, and I doubt the value of such language as “the modal uses of the indicative.” It is not so much that the indicative “encroached upon the other moods, and in so doing assumed their functions, especially in dependent sentences,” as that the indicative, particularly in dependent sentences, retained to some extent all the functions of all the modes. It is true, as already said, that the indicative was always the most virile of all the modes and has outlived them all. But, after the other modes became fully developed, these less frequent uses of the indicative seemed anomalous. The courteous or polite use of the imperfect indicative is the simplest of these special constructions. Here the indicative is used for direct assertion, but the statement is thrown into a past tense, though the present time is contemplated. We do this in English when we say: “I was just thinking,” “I was on the point of saying,” etc. So Ac. 25:22, ἐβουλόμην καὶ ἀυτὸς τοῦ ἰδίου ἀκούσαι. Agrippa does not bluntly say Βουλόμαι (cf. Paul in 1 Tim. 2:8; 5:14) nor ἐβουλόμην ἄν, which would suggest unreality, a thing not true. He does wish. He could have said Βουλοίμην (cf. Ac. 26:29, where Paul uses the optative), but the simple ἐβουλόμην is better. The optative would have been much weaker. In 2 Cor. 1:15 ἐβουλόμην πρότερον has its natural reference to past time. Cf. ἐβουλήθην in 2 Jo. 12 and Phil. 13, ἐβουλόμην, not ‘would have liked’ as Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 207) has it. In Gal. 4:20, ἤθελον δὲ παρέναι πρὸς ὑμῖν ἀρτί, Paul is speaking of present time (cf. ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι). He puts the statement in the imperfect as a polite idiom. The use of θέλω is seen in Ro. 16:19. The usual force of the mode and tense appears in ἤθελον in Jo. 6:21. The negative brings out sharply the element of will (cf. Lu. 19:14; Mt. 22:3). In Ro. 9:3, ηὐχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ὅπω τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the same courteous (even passionate) idiom occurs. It is not θέλω as in 2 Cor. 13:7 (he does not dare pray such a prayer), nor did he do it (cf. ηὐχοντο Ac. 27:29). He was, however, on the verge of doing it, but drew back. With this example we come close to the use of the indicative for unreality, the so-called “unreal” indicative. See also chapter on Tense.

(b) Present Necessity, Obligation, Possibility, Propriety in Tenses of the Past. This is the usual “potential” indicative. The imperfect of such verbs does not necessarily refer to the present. Thus in Jo. 4:4, ἔδει αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὸ τῆς Σαμοαίας, it is simply a necessity in past time about a past event. So δὲι in Jo. 4:20, 24 expresses a present necessity. This use of the imperfect ἔδει thus differs from either the present or the ordinary imperfect. The idiom is logical enough. It was a necessity and the statement may be confined to that phase of the matter, though the necessity still exists. So Lu. 24:26, οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν; Cf. also Mt.

---

4 Moulton, Prol., p. 199.
7 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 186.
1 W.-Th., p. 283.
2 K.-G., Bd. I, p. 204 f.
3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 206.
18:33; 23:23; 25:27; Lu. 11:42; 13:16 (cf. [Page 920] δει in verse 14); Ac. 27:21. It is an easy step from this notion to that of an obligation which comes over from the past and is not lived up to. The present non-fulfilment of the obligation is left to the inference of the reader or hearer. It is not formally stated. It happens that in the N. T. it is only in the subordinate clauses that the further development of this use of ἔδει comes, when only the present time is referred to. Thus in Ac. 24:19, οὐκ ἔδει ἔπλησθαι σοῦ παρέξην. They ought to be here, but they are not. Our English “ought” is likewise a past form about the present as well as about the past.1 So 2 Cor. 2:3, ἄφες ἐὰν ἔδει με γνίσθαι. In Heb. 9:26, ἦγετε ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν, there is an implied condition and ἔδει is practically an apodosis of the second-class condition, which see. The same process is seen in the other words. Thus in 2 Cor. 12:11, ἐγὼ ὑπὲρεστήκας ἀπαντῶμαι, we have a simple past obligation. So in Lu. 7:41; Heb. 2:17. Note common use of the present tense also, as in Ac. 17:29. Cf. ὃ ὠφείλετε ποιῆσαι πεποίηκα (Lu. 17:10), where the obligation comes on from the past. But in 1 Cor. 5:10, ἔποιεσθε ἑαυτούς ἐπεξερευνήσαντες ἐπὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἔξεστιν, we have merely present time under consideration and a practical apodosis of a second-class condition implied. I do not agree with Moulton2 that ἄν in such instances has been “dropped.” It simply was not needed to suggest the unreality or non-realization of the obligation. The context made it clear enough. Χρή occurs only once in the N. T. (Jas. 3:10), whereas προσήκει (Attic) is not found at all, nor ἐξεστι (but ἐξόν) nor ἐξήν.3 But ἐδώνατο is used of the present time. So Jo. 11:37. Cf. the apodosis in the second-class condition without ἄν in Jo. 9:33; Ac. 26:32. The use of ἄν ἐνήκεν (Col. 3:18) and ὁ oúκ ἐνήκεν (Eph. 5:4) are both pertinent, though in subordinate clauses. Note in particular ὃς ἐφανερώθη καθήκεν αὐτὸν ἔναν (Ac. 22:22), ‘He is not fit to live.’ In Mt. 26:24, καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ oúκ ἐγεννήθη, we have the apodosis without ἄν of a condition of the second class (determined as unfulfilled). There is no condition expressed in 2 Pet. 2:21, κρείττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκόκην τὴν ὄδον τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Moulton4 finds the origin of this idiom in the conditional sentence, but Winer5 sees in it merely the Greek way of affirming what was necessary, possible or appropriate in itself. So Gildersleeve.6 The modern Greek preserves this idiom (Thumb, [Page 921] Handb., p. 128). The use of ἔμελλον in Rev. 3:2 approaches this potential indicative. Cf. Thompson, Syntax, p. 274. For the use of the infinitive rather than the indicative see ἦν—παρεισέλθην in Lu. 16:17. So also ἰνα and subjunctive as in Jo. 6:7. Cf. Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 21. The use of

2 Prol., p. 200.
3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 206.
4 Prol., p. 200.
5 W.-Th., p. 282.
Viteau

WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).


(7) The Apodosis of Conditions of the Second Class. This matter has already been touched on slightly and is treated at length under Conditional Sentences. It can be merely sketched here. The condition is not always expressed and ἄν usually is present. The use of ἄν, however, in the apodosis is not obligatory. We know very little about the origin and meaning of ἄν anyhow. It seems to have a demonstrative sense (definite, then, in that case) which was shifted to an indefinite use. Cf. τὸν καὶ τόν, τά καὶ τά. Gildersleeve interprets it as a particle “used to colour the moods of the Greek language.” With the past tenses of the indicative in independent sentences it is a definite particle. The effort to express unreality by the indicative was a somewhat difficult process. In Homer “the unreal imperfect indicative always refers to the past.” So in Heb. 11:15. Nothing but the context can show whether these past tenses are used in opposition to the past or the present. The κοινή received this idiom of the unreal indicative “from the earlier age as a fully grown and normal usage, which it proceeded to limit in various directions.”

In Jo. 15:22 we have a good illustration of this construction. We know that ἁμαρτίαν oúκ εἴχοσαν is in opposition to the present reality because it is followed by νῦν δὲ πρόφασιν oúκ ἔχοσαν. The same thing is seen in verse 24 when νῦν δὲ ἔφρακας follows. In verse 19 ἄν ἐφίλει is used, the usual construction. In Lu. 17:6 ἐλέγετε ἄν and ὑπήκουσεν ἄν are used after the protasis εἴδε (first-class condition). This is a mixed condition. So also the marginal reading in W. H. in Jo. 8:39 is ἐποίετε after εἴστε and is followed by νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτε (cf. above). The absence of ἄν seems more noticeable in John’s Gospel. Cf. Jo. 19:11, oúκ εἴχες ἔχοσαν κατ' ἐμοῦ οὐδεμίαν εἰ μή ἔν δεδομένον σοι ἄνωθεν. Paul has the same idiom. Thus Gal. 4:15 εἴ δυνατὸν τούς φιλαθλούς ὑμὸν ἔφροσνας ἐδόκις, ὁμιλοῦντις καὶ Ro. 7:7 τὴν ἁμαρτίαν oúκ ἔγνων εἰ μή ὁ νόμος, τῇ τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν oúκ ἤδειν εἰ μή ὁ νόμος. The MSS. vary in the support of ἄν as in Gal. 4:15, where EKLP (and Δ) have it. In Jo. 18:36, B does not have ἄν, while in 8:19,

VITEAU, J., Essai sur la syntaxe des voix dans le grec du N. T. (Rev. de Phil., 1894).

———, Étude sur le grec du N. T. I, Le Verbe (1893); II, Le Sujet (1896).
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JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).

———, On the True Meaning of the Κοινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 205.
4 Moulton, Proil., p. 199.
5 Here ΝΑ read ἔχεις.
D does not have it, and the other MSS. differ in the position of ὅν.¹ This particle comes near the beginning of the clause, though not at the beginning. It does not precede οὐκ (cf. Gal. 1:10). It is sometimes repeated in successive apodoses (cf. Jo. 4:10), but not always (cf. Lu. 12:39). Cf. Kühner-Gerth, Bd. I, p. 247. On the use of ὅν in general see Thompson, Syntax, pp. 291 ff. Hoogeveen (Doctrina Partic. Linguae Graecae, ed. sec., 1806, p. 35) makes ὅν mean simply debeo, a very doubtful interpretation. “The addition of ὅν to an indicative apodosis produced much the same effect as we can express in writing by italicizing ‘if.’”² This emphasis suggests that the condition was not realized. The papyri likewise occasionally show the absence of ὅν.³ The condition is not always expressed. It may be definitely implied in the context or left to inference. So καὶ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ὅν ἔπραξα αὕτῳ (Lu. 19:23) and καὶ ἐλθὼν ἢγὼ ἐκομισάμην ὅν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ (Mt. 25:27). Here the condition is implied in the context, a construction thoroughly classical. But, in principal clauses, there is no instance of ὅν with a past tense of the indicative in a frequentative sense.⁴ It only survives in relative, comparative or temporal clauses (cf. Mk. 6:56; Ac. 2:45; 4:35; 1 Cor. 12:2; Mk. 3:11; 11:19). So D in Mk. 15:6, ὅν ἔρρυντο. Both the aorist and the imperfect tenses are used thus with ὅν in these subordinate clauses. There was considerable ambiguity in the use of the past tenses for this “unreal” indicative. No hard and fast rule could be laid down. A past tense of the indicative, in a condition without ὅν, naturally meant a simple condition of the first class and described past time (cf. Heb. 12:25). But in certain contexts it was a condition of the second class (as in Jo. 15:22, 24). Even with ὅν it is not certain⁵ whether past or present time is meant. The certain application to present time is probably post-Homeric.⁶ The imperfect might denote⁷ a past condition, as in Mt. 23:30; 24:43 (Lu. 12:39); Jo. 4:10; 11:21, 32; 1 Jo. 2:19; [Page 923] Heb. 11:15, or, as commonly, a present condition (cf. Lu. 7:39). The aorist would naturally denote past time, as in Mt. 11:21. The two tenses may come in the same condition and conclusion, as in Jo. 14:28. The past perfect is found in the protasis, as in Mt. 12:7; Jo. 19:11. Once the real past perfect meets us in the conclusion (1 Jo. 2:19). And note ὅν ἤδειτε in Jo. 14:7.

(δ) Impossible Wishes. These impracticable wishes were introduced in Attic by εἴθε or εἰ γάρ, which used also ὅφελον with the infinitive. From this form a particle was developed ὅφελον (augmentless) which took the place of εἴθε and εἰ γάρ. The dropping of the augment is noted in Herodotus (Moulton, Prol., p. 201). As a matter of fact, this unfulfilled wish occurs only three times in the N. T.: once with the aorist about the past, ὅφελον γε ἔβασιλεύσατε (1 Cor. 4:8), and twice with the imperfect

---

2 Moulton, Prol., p. 200.
7 Moulton, Prol., p. 201.
about the present (2 Cor. 11:1; Rev. 3:15). Ὄφελον occurs once also with the future (Gal. 5:12). Many of the MSS. (D'EFGKL) read Ὄφελον in 2 Cor. 11:1, and a few do the same in 1 Cor. 4:8. The idiom occurs in the LXX and in the inscriptions. Cf. Schwyzer, Perg., p. 173. The modern Greek expresses such wishes by νά or ἀς and imperf. or aorist (Thumb, p. 128). For ἔδραμον in Gal. 2:2, of unrealized purpose, see Final Clauses. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 127) quotes Ὄφελον ἔμεινας, Achilles Tatius, II, 24, 3 and Ὄφελον ἐγὼ μᾶλλον ἐπώρεσον, Epict., Diss., 22, 12.

(b) The Present. In Mt. 12:38, διδάσκαλε, θέλο μεν ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον ἱδεῖν, the present seems rather abrupt.1 In Jo. 12:21, κύριε, θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἱδεῖν, this is felt so strongly that it is translated: ‘Sir, we would see Jesus.’ See also Jo. 6:67. Cf. ἔβουλομην in Ac. 25:22 and εὐξαίμην ἄν in 26:29. There does not seem to be the same abruptness in θέλω in 1 Cor. 7:7. Cf. also φείδομαι in 7:28. There were probably delicate nuances of meaning which sufficiently softened these words, shadings which now escape us. There is no difficulty about ἀρκεῖ in 2 Cor. 12:9. In a case like ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν (cf. ἔρχόμεθα) in Jo. 21:3, the suggestion or hint is in the fact, not in the statement. The indicative is a definite assertion. The nature of the case supplies the rest. In 1 Cor. 10:22, ἠ παρακλησίων τὸν κύριον, the indicative notes the fact, while the surprise and indignation come out in the interrogative form. The question in Jo. 11:47, τί ποιήσεις: is very striking. It may be questioned2 if the point is the same as τί ποιῶμεν; (cf. Jo. 6:28), like the Latin Quid faciamus? The subjunctive of deliberation suggests doubt on the whole subject or expresses a wish to do something. Blass1 cites the colloquial Latin for parallels for this idiom. But we do not need such parallels here. The inquiry of Caiaphas is rather indignant protest against the inactivity of the Sanhedrin than a puzzled quandary as to what they should do. The indicative suits exactly his purpose. He charges them with doing nothing and knowing nothing and makes a definite proposal himself. Winer sees the point clearly.2 The same use of θέλω noted above appears in questions of deliberation as in θέλεις συλλέξω μεν (Mt. 13:28). So βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω; (Jo. 18:39). Cf. Lu. 18:41. Possibility or duty may be expressed in questions also, as in πῶς δύνασθε συζευγάω λαλεῖν πνευμο ὄντες; (Mt. 12:34); τί με δεῖ ποιῆν ἵνα σωθῶ; (Ac. 16:30). This is the analytical method rather than trusting to the mode.3 “It is found possible, and more convenient, to show the modal character of a clause by means of particles, or from the drift of the context, without a distinct verbal form.”4

(c) The Future. The future indicative “was originally a subjunctive in the main”5 and it has a distinct modal development. This fact comes out in the fact that the future

Schwyzer SCHWYZER (SCHWEIZER), E., Die Weltsprachen des Altertums (1902).
1 Ib. Cf. Thompson, Synt., p. 187.
2 W.-Th., p. 284.
5 Moulton, Prol., p. 199.
tense of the indicative is a rival of the subjunctive, the optative and the imperative.6
Like the subjunctive and optative the future may be merely futuristic (prospective) or
deliberative or volitive. This matter has been discussed at length under Tenses, which
see. As an example of the merely futuristic note Mt. 11:28, of the volitive see Lu.
13:9, of the deliberative note Jo. 6:68.

II. The Subjunctive Mode (ἡ ὑποτακτικὴ ἔγκλισις).

Some of the Greek grammarians called it ἡ διστακτική, some ἡ συμβουλευτική, some ἡ ὑποθετική. But no one of the names is happy, for the mode is not always
subordinate, since it is used freely in principal clauses, nor is it the only mode used in
subordinate clauses. But the best one is ἡ διστακτική.

1. RELATIONS TO OTHER MODES.

The development of the modes was gradual and the differentiation was never
absolutely distinct.

(a) The Aorist Subjunctive and the Future Indicative. These are closely allied in
form and sense. It is quite probable that the future indicative is just a variation of the
aorist subjunctive. Cf. ἔδοµαι, πίµαι, φάγοµαι. The subjunctive is always future, in
[Page 925] subordinate clauses relatively future. Hence the two forms continued side
by side in the language. There is a possible distinction. “The subjunctive differs from
the future indicative in stating what is thought likely to occur, not positively what will
occur.”1 But in the beginning (cf. Homer) it was probably not so. Brugmann (Griech.
Gr., p. 499) pointedly contends that many so-called future indicatives are just
“emancipated short-vowel conjunctives.” Cf. Giles, Manual, pp. 446–448; Moulton,
Prol., p. 149.

6 Thompson, Synt., p. 218.
1 Thompson, Gk. Synt., 1883, p. 133.
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(b) The Subjunctive and the Imperative. These are closely allied. Indeed, the first person imperative in Greek, as in Sanskrit, is absent in usage and the subjunctive has to be employed instead. There is a possible instance of the subjunctive as imperative in the second person in Sophocles, but the text is uncertain. The use of μή and the aorist subjunctive in prohibitions of the second and third persons is also pertinent. Thus the subjunctive is in close affinity with the imperative.

(c) The Subjunctive and the Optative. They are really variations of the same mode. In my Short Grammar of the Greek N. T. I have for the sake of clearness grouped them together. I treat them separately here, not because I have changed my view, but in order to give a more exhaustive discussion. The closeness of the connection between the subjunctive and the optative is manifest in the Sanskrit. “Subjunctive and optative run closely parallel with one another in the oldest language in their use in independent clauses, and are hardly distinguishable in dependent.” In the Sanskrit the subjunctive disappeared before the optative save in the imperatival uses. It is well known that the “Latin subjunctive is syncretistic, and does duty for the Greek conjunctive and optative.” Delbrück, indeed, insists that the two modes originally had the same form and the same meaning. Delbrück’s view has carried the bulk of modern opinion. But Giles is justified in saying: “The original meaning of these moods and the history of their development is the most difficult of the many vexed questions of comparative syntax.” It is true that the subjunctive in Greek refers only to the future, while the optative is not bound to any sphere. But the optative is usually relatively future like our “should,” “could,” etc. The use of the subjunctive was greater in Homer’s time than afterwards. The independent subjunctive in particular was more freely used in Epic than in Attic. In the modern

2 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 216.
Sophocles SOPHOCLES, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (1888).
5 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 216.
6 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., 1907, p. 191.
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Greek the subjunctive has not only displaced the optative, but the future indicative and the infinitive. But even so in modern Greek the subjunctive is relatively reduced and is almost confined to subordinate clauses (Thumb, *Handb.*, pp. 115, 126). The fut. ind. in modern Greek is really θά (θανά) and subj. G. Hamilton overstates it in saying: “This monarch of the moods, which stands absolute and alone, has all the other moods dependent on it.” It is possible that originally these two moods were used indifferently. Vandacle argues for a radical difference between the two moods, but he does not show what that difference is. There were distinctions developed beyond a doubt in actual use, but they are not of a radical nature. The Iranian, Sanskrit and the Greek are the only languages which had both the subjunctive and optative. The Sanskrit dropped the subjunctive and the Greek finally dispensed with the optative as the Latin had done long ago.

2. ORIGINAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE. Delbrück is clear that “will” is the fundamental idea of the subjunctive, while “wish” came to be that of the optative. But this position is sharply challenged to-day. Goodwin denies that it is possible “to include under one fundamental idea all the actual uses of any mood in Greek except the imperative.” He admits that the only fundamental idea always present in the subjunctive is that of futurity and claims this as the primitive meaning from the idiom of Homer. Brugmann denies that a single root-idea of the subjunctive can be found. He cuts the Gordian knot by three uses of the subjunctive (the volitive, the deliberative, the futuristic).

---
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———, The *Cum* Constructions (Studies in Class. Phil., 1887).

futuristic uses as the same. Sonnenschein sees no distinction between volitive and deliberative, to which Moulton agrees. “The objection to the term ‘deliberative,’ and to the separation of the first two classes, appears to be well grounded.” He adds: “A command may easily be put in the interrogative tone.” That is true. It is also true “that the future indicative has carried off not only the futuristic but also the volitive and deliberative subjunctives.” But for practical purposes there is wisdom in Brugmann’s division. Stahl sees the origin of all the subjunctive uses in the notion of will. The future meaning grows out of the volitive. Mutzbauer finds the fundamental meaning of the subjunctive to be the attitude of expectation. This was its original idea. All else comes out of that. With this Gildersleeve agrees: “The subjunctive mood is the mood of anticipation,” except that he draws a sharp distinction between “anticipation” and “expectation.” “Anticipation treats the future as if it were present.” He thinks that the futuristic subjunctive is a “deadened imperative.” But Monro on the whole thinks that the futuristic meaning is older than the volitive. So the grammarians lead us a merry dance with the subjunctive. Bäumlein denies that the subjunctive is mere possibility. It aims after actuality, “a tendency towards actuality.” At any rate it is clear that we must seek the true meaning of the subjunctive in principal clauses, since subordinate clauses are a later development, though the futuristic idea best survives in the subordinate clause. In a sense Hermann’s notion is true that three ideas come in
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2 Cl. Rev., XVI, p. 166.
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Mutzbaeuer


5 Konjunktiv und Optativ, p. 8 f.
7 Ib., p. 148.
8 Hom. Gr., p. 231.
Bäumlein

BÄUMLEIN, Untersuchungen über die griech. Modi und die Partikelνκέν und ὤν (1846).

———, Untersuch. über griech. Partikeln (1861).

10 Hammerschmidt, Über die Grundb. von Konjunktiv und Optativ, p. 4.
the modes (Wirklichkeit, Möglichkeit, Notwendigkeit). The indicative is Wirklichkeit, the imperative is Notwendigkeit, while the subjunctive and the optative are Möglichkeit. I have ventured in my Short Grammar\(^{14}\) to call the subjunctive and optative the modes of doubtful statement. [Page 928] while the indicative is the mode of positive assertion and the imperative that of commanding statement. The modes, as already seen, overlap all along the line, but in a general way this outline is correct. The subjunctive in principal sentences appears in both declarative and interrogative sentences. Cf. εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Ro. 5:1), τί ἐπι ὑμῖν; (1 Cor. 11:22). It is found in both positive and negative statements. Cf. δομέν ἡ μὴ δομέν; (Mk. 12:14), μὴ σχίσωμεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λάχομεν (Jo. 19:24). It is the mood of doubt, of hesitation, of proposal, of prohibition, of anticipation, of expectation, of brooding hope, of imperious will. We shall, then, do best to follow Brugmann.

3. THREEFOLD USAGE. The three uses do exist, whatever their origin or order of development.\(^1\)

(a) Futuristic. This idiom is seen in Homer with the negative οὐ as in οὐδὲ ἤμι, ‘I never shall see.’ It is an emphatic future.\(^2\) This emphatic future with the subjunctive is common in Homer with ἄν or κεν and once without. Gildersleeve\(^3\) calls this the “Homeric subjunctive,” but it is more than doubtful if the usage was confined to Homer. Moulton (Prol., p. 239) quotes P. Giles as saying: “This like does for many dialects what the subjunctive did for Greek, putting a statement in a polite, inoffensive way, asserting only verisimilitude.” Note the presence of the subjunctive in the subordinate clauses with ἐάν (ἐ).\(^4\) The presence of οὐ here and there with the subjunctive testifies to a feeling for the futuristic sense. See ἂν οὐ κατοικισθῇ (Jer. 6:8). In the modern Greek, Thumb (Handb., p. 195) gives ἀ δὲν πιστεύῃς, where δὲν is for οὐδὲν. The practical equivalence of the aorist subjunctive and the future indicative is evident in the subordinate clauses, particularly those with ἐ, ἰνα, ὡς and ὅστις. Cf. ὃ προσενέγκῃ (Heb. 8:3). This is manifest in the LXX, the N. T., the inscriptions and the late papyri.\(^5\) Blass\(^6\) pronounces ὃς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ (Mk. 4:26) “quite impossible” against ΝΒΔΛΔ. But Moulton\(^7\) quotes οὐ τεθῇ from inscriptions 317, 391, 395, 399 al. in Ramsay’s Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, ii, 392. For the papyri, Moulton (Prol., p. 240) notes B. U. 303 (vi/α.δ.) παράσχω=‘I will furnish,’ A. Ramsay
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Ramsay, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).
P. 144 (v/A.D.) ἔλθω=‘I will come.’ The itacisms in –ση and –σει prove less, as Moulton notes. The examples in the papyri of itacistic –σει, –ση are “innumerable.” In Ac. 5:15, W. H. [Page 929] print ἵνα—ἐπισκιάσει (B, some cursives). Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 136) is quite prepared to take πῶς φύγητε (Mt. 23:33)=πῶς φεύξεσθε. This is probably deliberative, but he makes a better case for ἐν τῷ ζηρῷ τῷ γένηται (Lu. 23:31). Blass¹ notes that “the mixture of the fut. ind. and aorist conj. has, in comparison with the classical language, made considerable progress.” He refers to Sophocles, Lexicon, p. 45, where ἐπω σοι is quoted as ἐρῶ σοι.² In a principal clause in Clem., Hom. XI. 3, we have καὶ οὗτος—δονηθῇ, and Blass has noted also in Is. 33:24 ὄφειθη γὰρ αὕτοις ἥ ἁμαρτία. We cannot, indeed, trace the idiom all the way from Homer. “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.”³ It was certainly primitive in its simplicity⁴ even if it was not the most primitive idiom. The use of οὗ with the subj. did continue here and there after Homer’s day. We find it in the LXX, as in Jer. 6:8 (above) and in the Phrygian inscription (above). In fact, in certain constructions it is common, as in μὴ οὗ after verbs of fearing and caution. Cf. 2 Cor. 12:20 and MSS. in Mt. 25:9 (μὴ ποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ). It is even possible that the idiom οὗ μὴ is to be thus explained. Gildersleeve⁵ remarks on this point: “It might even seem easier to make οὗ belong to αἰσχυνθῶ, thus combining objective and subjective negatives, but it must be remembered that οὗ with the subjunctive had died out (except in μὴ οὗ) before this construction came in.” The vernacular may, however, have preserved οὗ with the subj. for quite a while. Jannaris⁶ confidently connects οὗ in this idiom with the subj. and explains μὴ as an abbreviation of μην. If either of these explanations is true, the N. T. would then preserve in negative principal sentences the purely futuristic subjunctive. Burton⁷ is clear that anyhow “the aorist subjunctive is used with οὗ μὴ in the sense of an emphatic future indicative.” The ancient Greek sometimes employed the present subjunctive in this sense, but the N. T. does not use it. But the LXX has it, as in Jer. 1:19. So in Is. 11:9 we find οὗ μὴ κακοποιήσουσιν οὐδὲ μὴ δύνονται. The future ind. with οὗ μὴ is rare in the N. T., but οὗ μὴ with the aorist [Page 930] subj. appears in the W. H. text 100 times.¹ It cannot be said that the origin of this οὗ μὴ construction has been solved. Goodwin² states the problem well. The two negatives ought to neutralize each other, being simplex, but they do not (cf. μὴ οὗ). The examples are partly futuristic and partly prohibitory. Ellipsis is not satisfactory nor complete

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 208.
2 See also Hatz., Einl., p. 218.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 186.
5 Justin Martyr, p. 169.
separation (Gildersleeve) of the two negatives. Perhaps οὐ expresses the emphatic denial and μή the prohibition which come to be blended into the one construction. At any rate it is proper to cite the examples of emphatic denial as instances of the futuristic subjunctive. Thus οὐ μή σε ἄνω, οὔδε οὐ μή σε ἔγκαταλίπω (Heb. 13:5); οὖ μή ἄπολέσῃ (Mk. 9:41); οὐκέτι οὖ μή πίω (Mk. 14:25). Cf. Lu. 6:37 etc. See οὖ μή in both principal and subordinate clauses in Mk. 13:2. See also Tense.

It is a rhetorical question in Lu. 18:7 (note also πακροθυμεῖ) rather than a deliberative one. In Rev. 15:4 we have the aor. subj. and the fut. ind. side by side in a rhetorical question, τίς οὖ μή φοβηθῇ, κύριε, καὶ δοξάσει τὸ θνόμα; See also the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔξει φίλον καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτόν—καὶ ἐξετή αὐτῷ. (Lu. 11:5). It is difficult to see here anything very “deliberative” about εἰπη as distinct from ἔξει. It may be merely the rhetorical use of the futuristic subj. in a question. Have the grammars been correct in explaining all these subjunctives in questions as “deliberative”? Certainly the future ind. is very common in rhetorical and other questions in the N. T.

(b) Volitive. There is no doubt about the presence of the volitive subjunctive in the N. T. The personal equation undoubtedly cuts some figure in the shades of meaning in the moods, here as elsewhere. Gildersleeve would indeed make this “imperative sense” the only meaning of the mood in the standard language after Homer. He does this because the deliberative subjunctive expects an imperative answer. But, as already seen, that is a mooted question. Brugmann takes pains to remark that the element of “will” in the volitive subjunctive belongs to the speaker, not to the one addressed. It is purely a matter of the context. It occurs in both positive and negative sentences and the negative is always μή. The usage is common in Homer. Monro interprets it as expressing “what the speaker resolves or insists [Page 931] upon.” In principle the hortatory subjunctive is the same as the prohibitive use with μή. It was a necessity for the first person, since the imperative was deficient there. Moulton ventures to treat this hortatory use of the first person subj. under the imperative, since the Sanskrit grammars give the Vedic subjunctive of the first person as an ordinary part of the imperative. The other persons of the Sanskrit subj. are obsolete in the epic period. Thus bharāma, bharāta, bharantu are compared with φέρω, φέρετε, φερόντον (Attic for κοινῆ φερέτωσαν). Moulton appeals also to the combination of the first and second persons in constructions like ἔγειρε τὸν φίλον (Mk. 14:42). This example illustrates well the volitive idea in ἔγομεν. The first person is usually found in this construction. Cf. also ἔγομεν (Jo. 11:7); φάγομεν καὶ πίωμεν (1 Cor. 15:32); ἔχομεν (Ro. 5:1, correct text); φρονῶμεν (Ph. 3:15); γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν (1 Th. 5:6). Cf. Lu. 9:33 in particular (infinitive and subj.). In 1 Cor. 5:8, ἡστε ἐσταύρωμεν, the subjunctive is hortatory and ἡστε is an inferential particle. Cf. further Heb. 12:1; 1 Jo. 4:7. As examples with μή see μή σχίσωμεν (Jo. 19:24); μή καθεύδωμεν (1 Th.

3 See 1 Cor. 10:7–9 for the change from first to second persons.
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The construction continued to flourish in all stages of the language. We have δεύτε ἀποκτείνωμεν (Mt. 12:7. Cf. δεύτε Ἰστε, Mt. 28:6) and ἄφες ἱδομεν (Mt. 27:49). In ἄφες the singular has become stereotyped. This use of ἄφες was finally shortened into ἄς in the modern Greek and came to be universal with the hortatory subjunctive of the first person and even for the third person imperative in the vernacular (as ἄς ἔχων for ἔχεων). In the N. T. ἄφες is not yet a mere auxiliary as is our "let" and the modern Greek ἄς. It is more like "do let me go," etc. Radermacher (N. T. Gk., p. 134) quotes ἄφες δείξω μεν, Epict. I, 9, 15. In the first person singular the N. T. always has ἄφες or δεῦρο with the hortatory subjunctive. Thus δεῦρο ἔκβαλο (Mt. 7:4) = Lu. 6:42 and δεῦρο ἁποστείλω (Ac. 7:34, LXX). Moulton cites ἄφες ἔγω αὐτὴν θρηνήσω from O. P. 413 (Roman period). We do not have to suppose the ellipsis of ἵνα, for ἄφες is here the auxiliary. In Jo. 12:7, ἄφες ἤτην ἵνα τηρήσῃ, it is hardly probable that ἄφες is just auxiliary, though in the modern Greek, as already stated, ἄς is used with the third person.

In the second person we have only the negative construction in prohibitions with the aorist subjunctive, a very old idiom (see Tenses, Aorist). “The future and the imperative between them carried off the old jussive use of the subjunctive in positive commands of 2d and 3d person. The old rule which in (‘Anglicistic’) Latin made sileas an entirely grammatical retort discourteous to the Public Orator’s sileam?—which in the dialect of Elis” (to go on with Moulton’s rather long sentence) ‘produced such phrases as ἐπιμέλειαν ποιήται Νικόδρομορ—’let Nicodromus attend to it,’ 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 26f. (ii/A.D.).” See Moulton, Prol., p. 176.

5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 208. But see ἄφετε ἱδομεν (Mk. 15:36), though ND here read ἄφες.
7 It was rare in classic Gk. not to have ἄγε or φέρε or some such word. Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 88; Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 148 f. The volitive subj. is common in mod. Gk. (Thumb, Handb., p. 126) both for exhortations, commands, prohibitions and wishes. It occurs in the late pap. for wish, as καταξιώσῃ, P.Oxy. I, 128, 9. So in the inscr. τοιαῦτα πάθη, Pontica III, 62, 8 (Anderson-Cumont-Grégoire). Radermacher (N. T. Gk., p. 128) cites also συντ τηείςαν κοι γένωνται, Acta Thomae, p. 129.
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These forms occur with the third person also, as "βλέπετε μή τις ύμιάς πλανήση"
(Mt. 24:4). But, per contra, see 1 Cor. 10:12 (μή ἔσται in Col. 2:8). In 1 Th. 5:15, "ὅρατε μή τις κακὸν ὄντι κακοῦ τινὶ ἄποδῷ, parataxis is probable. But the third person aorist subj. occurs with μή alone as in μή τις οὖν αὐτὸν ἐξουθενήσῃ (1 Cor. 16:11); μή τίς με δοξῆ ἄφοραν ἔναι (2 Cor. 11:16); μή τις ύμιὰς ἐξαπατήσῃ (2 Th. 2:3). Elsewhere μή and the aorist imperative occur in the third person. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 134) quotes μή and 3d person aor. subj. from κοινῆ writers, inscr. and papyri. Careless writers even use μή οὖν ἄλλως ποιήσῃς, B. G. U. III, 824, 17. Even Epictetus (II, 22, 24) has μή αὐτότεν ἄποφαινη. No less volitive is an example with οὖ μή, like οὖ μή ἐσθάλητε (Mt. 5:20), which is prohibitive. So οὖ μή νῦν ἔσται (Jo. 13:8); οὖ μή πιθή (Lu. 1:15). There is the will of God in ἔρια συν ἵπτα μία κεραία ὑμᾶς παρέλθῃ (Mt. 5:18) in the third person. In Mt. 25:9, μή ποτὲ οὖ μή ἀρκέσῃ ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν, the subj. is probably future (or deliberative). In a late papyrus, O. P. 1150, 6 (v/A.D.), note δέξον τὴν δύναμιν σων καὶ ἐξέλθῃ where the 3d pers. subj. = imperative like Latin. There are examples in the N. T. where ἵνα seems to be merely an introductory expletive with the volitive subjunctive, Thus ἵνα ἐπίθεις (Mt. 5:23); ἵνα ἀναβλέψῃ (10:51); ἵνα περισσεύῃς (2 Cor. 8:7); ἵνα μημονεύομεν (Gal. 2:10. Note present tense); ἵνα φοβηθίτε (Eph. 5:33) parallel with ἄγαπατόν. Cf. ἵνα—δόῃ (δῷ) margin of W. H., Eph. 1:17. Moulton finds 2 in the papyri (B. U. 48, ii/iii A.D.) ἐδών ἀναβής τῇ ἑορτῇ ἵνα ὄμος γενόμεθα. So also he cites εἶνα αὐτόν μή δυσχónησης, F. P. 112 (99 A.D.), and ἵνα μηδὲ τῶν τόκων ὄλγωρθήσης (Cicero, Att. vi. 5). The modern Greek uses νά and subj. as imperative for both second and third persons (Thumb, Handb., p. 127 f.). Note also μή ἵνα ἀναστατῶσῃς ἡμᾶς, B. G. U. 1079 (A.D. 41), not ἵνα μή. Moulton (ProL., p. 248) quotes Epict., IV, 1, 41, ἵνα μή μορὸς ἰνὰ ἄλλο ἵνα μάθην. The use of ἢ ἓκα ξὰ ἓνα (cf. Mk. 6:25; 10:35; Jo. 17:24) preceded this idiom. Moulton 3 even

1 But Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 278) holds the opposite view.
2 Prol., p. 179.
3 Ib., p. 178.
suggests that προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν (Mk. 14:38) is as much parataxis as ὁ ἄρετε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε (Lu. 12:15). This "innovation" in the κοινή takes the place of ὅπως and the future ind. Moulton (Prol., p. 177 note) cites ὅπως μοι μὴ ἔρεις, Plato, 337 B, ‘don’t tell me,’ where ὅπως =‘in which case.’ The use of μὴ after words of caution and apprehension is probably paratactic in origin.1 Moulton2 notes the use of the present subj. with expressions of warning as well as the aorist. Thus in Heb. 12:15, ἐπισκόποῦτες μὴ τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἐνοχῇ. But this construction borders so closely on subordinate clauses, if not clear over the line, that it will be best discussed there.

Subordinate clauses show many examples of the volitive subjunctive (as clauses of design, probably paratactic in origin, Moulton, Prol., p. 185). See δι θεός λατρεύω (Heb. 12:28). See discussion of Sub. Clauses.

(c) Deliberative. There is no great amount of difference between the hortatory (volitive) subjunctive and the deliberative. The volitive is connected with the deliberative in Mk. 6:24 f., τί αἰτήσωμαι; θέλω ἵνα δῷς. Thus ποιήσωμεν, ‘suppose we do it,’ and τὶ ποιήσωμεν; ‘what are we to (must we) do?’ do not vary much. The interrogative3 is a quasi-imperative. Gildersleeve4 notes in Plato (rare elsewhere in Attic) a “number of hesitating half-questions with μὴ or μὴ οὐ and the present subjunctive.” It is possible that we have this construction in Mt. 25:9, μὴ ποτε οὐ μὴ (W. H. marg. just οὐ) ἄρεκτη ἤμιν καὶ ὑμῖν. It is but a step to the deliberative question.5 This is either positive or negative, as in Mk. 12:14, δῷς μὴ δῷς; So also οὐ μὴ as in Jo. 18:11, οὐ μὴ πιέω αὐτό; Cf. also Lu. 18:7; Rev. 15:4. The aorist or the present tense occurs as in Lu. 3:10, τὶ οὖν ποιήσωμεν; and in Jo. 6:28, τὶ ποιῶμεν; so λέγω in Heb. 11:32. Cf. the indicative τὶ ποιῶμεν; in Jo. 11:47 and the future τὶ οὖν ἔροιμεν; (Ro. 9:14). The question may be rhetorical (cf. Mt. 26:54; Lu. 14:34; Jo. 6:68; Ro. 10:14) or interrogative (cf. Mt. 6:31; 18:21; Mk. 12:14; Lu. 22:49).6 The kinship between delib. subj. and delib. fut. ind. is seen in Mk. 6:37, ἀγορᾶσομεν καὶ δώσομεν; The first person is the one of most frequent occurrence (cf. Ro. 6:1), τί αἰτήσωμαι (Mk. 6:24). But examples are not wanting for the second and third persons. Thus πῶς φύγητε ἄπο τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεέννης; (Mt. 23:33); τί γένηται; (Lu. 23:31).

1 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 212 f.
2 Prol., p. 178.
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See further Mt. 26:14; Ro. 10:54. It is sometimes uncertain whether we have the subjunctive or the indicative, as in ἔτερον προσδοκῶμεν; (Mt. 11:3) and ἔπινεσσον ὑμᾶς; (1 Cor. 11:22). But note τί εἶπον ὑμῖν: in the last passage. In Lu. 11:5 we have both τίς εἴξει and εἴπῃ. So τί δοῦ (Mk. 8:37, ACD δῶσει) may be compared with τί δόσει (Mt. 16:26).\(^1\) This ambiguity appears in τί ποιήσω; and ἔγνω τί ποιήσω in Lu. 16:3 f. The deliberative subj. is retained in indirect questions. Cf. Mt. 6:31 with Mt. 6:25. The kinship between the deliberative subj. in indirect questions and the imperative and the volitive subjunctive is seen in Lu. 12:4 f., μὴ φοβηθῆτε—ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβήθητε: φοβήθητε κτλ. The deliberative subj., like the volitive, has various introductory words which make asyndeton (parataxis). These become set phrases like ἄφες, ὅρα. Thus ποῦ θέλεις ἔταμασομεν; (Mt. 26:17), θέλεις εἴπωμεν; (Lu. 9:54). In Lu. 18:41 we have τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω; and ἰνα ἀναβλέψω as the reply, using ἰνα in the brief answer. Cf. further Mt. 13:28. In Jo. 18:39, βούλεσθε οὖν ἄπολέσανται, we probably have the subj. also. Some MSS. have εἰ πατάξωμεν; in Lu. 22:49.\(^2\) We may leave further discussion of the subj. to the subordinate clauses. We have no examples in the N. T. of ἄν with the subj. in independent sentences (but see κέ and the subj. in Homer). In subordinate clauses ἄν is very common, though not necessary, as will be seen.\(^3\) (Cf. discussion of εἰ, ὅστις.) But Janarris\(^4\) gives instances of ἄν with the subj. in principal clauses (futuristic) in Polybius, Philo, Plutarch, Galen, etc. With the disappearance of the fut. ind., the opt. and the imper., the subj. has the field as the “prospective mood.” It is found in the modern Greek as in τί νὰ γίνῃ (Thumb, Handb., p. 126).
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III. The Optative Mode (ἡ ἑύκτικὴ ἔγκλισις). It has already been shown that the optative does not differ radically from the subjunctive. Jannaris calls the optative the “secondary subjunctive.”

1. HISTORY OF THE OPTATIVE. For the facts see chapter on Conjugation of the Verb. It is an interesting history and is well outlined by Jannaris in his Appendix V, “The Moods Chiefly Since A. (Ancient Greek) Times.” It retreated first from dependent clauses and held on longest in the use for wish in independent sentences like γένοιτο. But even here it finally went down before the fut. ind. and subj. The optative was a luxury of the language and was probably never common in the vernacular. Certainly it is very rare in the vernacular κοινή (both inscriptions and papyri). It is a literary mood that faded before the march of the subj. In a hundred pages of the Memorabilia of Xenophon the optative occurs 350 times. He had a “hyperorthodox love of the mood.” Plato’s Phaedo shows it 250 times in a corresponding space, but Strabo has it only 76, Polybius 37, Diodorus Siculus 13 times in a hundred pages. The 67 examples in the N. T. are in harmony with the κοινή usage. Gildersleeve pithily says: “The optative, which starts life as a wish of the speaker, becomes a notion of the speaker, then a notion of somebody else, and finally a gnomon of obliquity” (A. J. of Phil., 1908, p. 264). In the LXX the optative is rare, but not so rare as in the N. T., though even in the LXX it is replaced by the subj. (Thackeray, Gr., p. 193) as in the late papyri and inscriptions (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., pp. 128, 135).

2. SIGNIFICANCE. There is no definite distinction between the subjunctive and the optative in the Sanskrit. The Latin put all the burden on the subj., as the Greek finally did. The Sanskrit finally made the optative do most of the work. In a word, the optative is a sort of weaker subjunctive. Some writers make the opt. timeless and

5 Ib., p. 450.
6 Ib., pp. 560–567.
Thackeray


———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).

3 Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 218. In the original speech there was no clear distinction between the subj. and the opt. (Curtius, Temp. und Modi, 1846, p. 266).
used definitely of the past. It is rather a “softened future” sometimes flung back into the past for a Standpunkt. We do not know “whether the opt. originally expressed wish or supposition.” The name does not signify anything. It “was invented by grammarians long after the usages of the language were settled.” They just gave it the name εὐκτική because at that time the only use it had without ὅν was that of wishing. The name is no proof that wishing was the primitive or the only function or the real meaning of the mode. We have precisely the same difficulty as in the subjunctive. Indeed, the [Page 937] optative has three values, just like the subjunctive, viz. the futuristic (potential), the volitive (wishes) and the deliberative. In the first and third kinds ὅν is usually present, but not always. Brugmann notes only two, omitting the deliberative as some scholars do for the subj. He does reckon a third use in indirect discourse, but this is merely the opt. in subordinate sentences and may be either of the three normal usages. The rare fut. opt. in indirect discourse illustrates the point (not in the N. T.). There is no doubt of the distinction between the futuristic (potential) with negative οὐ (cf. futuristic subj. in Homer) and the volitive use with µή (cf. subj. again). But there was also a “neutral sense” that can hardly be classed either as futuristic or volitive. Gildersleeve calls this the “optative in questions,” usually with ὅν. This is the deliberative use.

3. THE THREE USES.

(a) Futuristic or Potential. We begin with this whether it is the first in time or not. Delbrück has taken several positions on this point. The use of the negative οὐ here

5 Bäumlein, Griech. Modi, p. 177.
7 Ib., p. 231.
8 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 375.
1 Giles, Man., p. 510.
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———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).

3 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 375.
4 Ib., p. 4.

5 Synt., Pt. I, p. 154. Stahl (Krit.-hist. Synt., p. 236 ff.) notes a “concessive opt.,” which is an overrefinement. It is merely a weakened form of wish (K.-G., Bd. I, p. 228) or of the potential use.

Delbrück

DELBRÜCK, B., Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis (1867).
shows its kinship with the future (cf. fut. ind. and aorist subj. in Homer).\(^7\) The āν was not always present in Homer and it is not the āν that gives the potential idea to the mode. In poetry the use without āν continued. “The optative is the ideal mood of the Greek language, the mood of the fancy.”\(^8\) Moulton\(^9\) puts it clearly: “It was used to express a future in a milder form, and to express a request in deferential style.”

Radermacher cites from Epictetus, II, 23, 1, āν ἡδίον ἀναγνώρῃ—ἀν τις ῥόδιον ἀκούσει,


\[\text{———, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871–1888).}\]

6 Cf. his Konjunktiv und Optativ, Syntaktische Forschungen, Att.-indische Synt. In the last of these he suggests that the potential and wishing functions are distinct in origin.
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9 Prol., p. 197.
showing clearly that the opt. and the fut. ind. are somewhat parallel. Moulton (Prol., p. 194) cites Deut. 28:24 ff., where the opt. and fut. ind. alternate in translating the same Hebrew. I do not agree with Radermacher (N. T. Gk., p. 128) in seeing in ἠθελον παρεῖναι (Gal. 4:20) a mere equivalent of θέλομι ἂν. See imperfect ind. The presence of ἂν gives “a contingent meaning”10 to the verb and makes one think of the unexpressed protasis of the fourth-class condition. The [Page 938] idiom has vanished as a living form from the vernacular κοινή in the N. T. times.1 It appears only in Luke’s writings in the N. T. and is an evident literary touch. The LXX shows it only 19 times outside of 4 Maccabees and 30 with it.2 Moulton3 notes one papyrus which does not have ἂν (cf. Homer), though he would suspect the text and read as Mahaffy does οὐθὲν ὃ[ν] ἔπειταμι, Par. P. 63 (ii/b.c.). But curiously enough Luke has only one instance of this “softened assertion” apart from questions. That is in Ac. 26:29 (critical text) εὐξαίμην ἂν. This fact shows how obsolete the idiom is in the κοινή.

The use of ἂν here avoids the passionateness of the mere optative (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 157). The other examples in Luke’s writings are all in questions and may be compared with the subj. in deliberative questions. Only two examples appear of the opt. with ἂν in direct questions. They are πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην ἐὰν μὴ τίς ὀφειλήσει με; (Ac. 8:31). The only instance of a protasis in connection with an optative apodosis in the N. T.) and τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμομόνος οὕτος λέγειν; (Ac. 17:18). Both are rhetorical questions and the second has a deliberative tone; see (c). In Ac. 2:12, E has τί ἂν θέλοι. Moulton (Prol., p. 198). cites τίς ἂν δῷ from Job 31:31 and holds that it does not differ from τίς δῷ elsewhere (Num. 11:29). The other instances of ἂν and the opt. are all in indirect questions, but the construction is not due to the indirect question. It is merely retained from the direct. The use of the optative in an indirect question when the direct would have the indicative or the subjunctive is not the point. This is merely the classic sequence of modes in indirect questions. See Lu. 8:9, ἔπηρότων τίς ἔρ. So Lu. 22:23 (cf. δοκεῖ in 24). Cf. Ac. 21:33. In Lu. 1:29, D adds ἂν and MSS. vary with some of the other examples (cf. Lu. 18:36). So ἂν is correct in Lu. 15:26. Moulton (Prol., p. 198) cites Esth. 13:3 πυθόμενον—πῶς ἂν ἅχθειν and inscr. Magnes. 215 (i/A.D.) ἐπερωτᾶ—τί ἂν ποιήσῃς δώσῃς δισταλοί. Moulton

10 Ib., p. 166.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 197 f.; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 220.
2 Prol., p. 197.
3 Ib., p. 198. He notes also 4 Macc. 5:13, συγγνώσεις without ἂν. In the pap. ἂν is usually present with the potential opt. (Radermacher, N. T. Gk., p. 129). Sometimes ἴσως occurs with the opt., as ἴσως—Ἀπορήσεις in Joh. Philop.
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(Prol., p. 198) argues for “a minimum of difference” in the examples of indirect questions with and without ἄν. The difference is in the direct question. The examples with ἄν (W. H.’s text) in indirect questions are Lu. 1:62; 6:11; 9:46; 15:26; Ac. 5:24; 10:17.4 In all of these instances the deliberative element is undoubtedly present; see (c). The same thing is true of Lu. 3:15 (µή ποτε), Ac. 17:27 (εἰ), but Ac. 25:16 (πρὶν ἦ) in indirect discourse for subj. of the direct is future.

(b) Volitive. Moulton1 calls this use the “Optative Proper,” a curious concession to the mere name. It has been the most persistent construction of the optative, and (in independent clauses) thirty-eight of the sixty-seven examples of the N. T. come under this category.2 Fifteen of the thirty-eight instances belong to µή γένοιτο, once in Lu. 20:16, and the other fourteen in Paul’s Epistles (10 in Romans, 1 in 1 Cor., 3 in Gal.). Thumb considers the rare use of µή γένοιτο in modern Greek (the only relic of the optative) a literary phenomenon, but Moulton3 notes that Pallis retains it in Lu. 20:16. Moulton compares the persistence of the English optative in the phrase “be it so,” “so be it,” “be it never so humble,” etc.4 So he notes it in the papyri for oaths, prayers and wishes.5 O. P. 240 (i/A.D.) ἐλεη, O. P. 715 (ii/A.D.) ἐνοχεῖ ἐμε, O. P. 526 (ii/A.D.) χαίρον. L. Pb. (ii/B.C.) ζε διότι σοι, B. M. 21 (ii/B.C.) σοι δε γένοιτο. The N. T. examples are all in the third person except Phil. 20, ἔγνω σοι ὅναμί. One is a curse μηκέτι μηδεὶς φάγοι (Mk. 11:14) and is equivalent to the imperative. “There is a strong inclination to use the imperative instead of the optative, not only in requests, where the imperative has a legitimate place in classical Greek as well, but also in imprecations, where it takes the place of the classical optative: ἁνάθεμα ἔστω, Gal. 1:8 f. Cf. 1 Cor. 16:22.”6 Only in Mk. 11:14 and Ac. 8:20, τὸ ὑγήρυν σου σῦν σοι εἰπ, do we have the optative in imprecations in the N. T. The opt. comes very near the imper. in ancient Greek sometimes (Gildersleeve, p. 155). Cf. γίνοτο, P. Par. 26 (b/c. 163). In Ac. 1:20, where the LXX (Ps. 109:8) has λάβοι, Luke gives λαβέτω.7 There are only 23 examples of the volitive optative in independent clauses outside of µή γένοιτο. Paul has 15 of this 23 “(Ro. 15:5, 13; Phil. 20; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18; 4:16, and the rest in 1 and 2 Th.), while Mark, Luke, Acts, Hebrews, 1 Peter and 2 Peter have one apiece, and Jude two.”8 They are all examples of the aorist optative except the present in Ac. 8:20. The negative is µή and ἄν is not used. In [Page 940] 2 Th. 3:16 δόῃ is opt., not the subj. δώῃ. In 1 Th. 3:12 the context shows that περισσεύσαι is opt. (not

4 Burton, M. and T., p. 80; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 220.  
1 Prol., p. 194.  
2 Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 79; Moulton, Prol., p. 194.  
3 Ib., p. 240.  
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6 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 220.  
7 Ib.  
8 Moulton, Prol., p. 195.
The rare use of the volitive opt. with εἰ (twelve cases in the N. T., but four belong to indirect questions), will be discussed under Conditional Sentences. If ἵνα δῷ ἡ εἰ, we probably have a volitive optative, the ἵνα being merely introductory (cf. examples with the subj.). It is hardly a case of final ἵνα with the optative. Blass reads δῷ here subj. after B. In modern Greek Dr. Rouse finds people saying not μὴ γένοιτο, but ὁ θεὸς νὰ φυλάξῃ (Moulton, Prol., p. 249), though νὰ is not here necessary (Thumb, Handb., p. 127). The ancient idiom with οἴθει and εἰ γὰρ is not found in the N. T., as stated already several times. Οπέθην with the future ind. occurs for a future wish (Gal. 5:12).

(c) Deliberative. There is little more to add here. The LXX gives instances of τίς δῷ; (Num. 11:29; Judg. 9:29; 2 Sam. 18:33, etc.) without ὁν as in Homer, where a deliberative subj. would be admissible. See also Ps. 120 (119):3, τί δοθεῖ σοι καὶ τί προστεθεῖ σοι; In Lu. 6:11 Moulton remarks that τί ὁν ποιήσατεν in the indirect question is “the hesitating substitute for the direct τί ποιήσατεν.” Why not rather suppose a “hesitating” (deliberative) direct question like τί ὁθεὶν ὁ σπερμολόγος οὐτος λέγειν; (Ac. 17:18). As already remarked, the context shows doubt and perplexity in the indirect questions which have ὁν and the opt. in the N. T. (Lu. 1:62; 6:11; 9:46; 15:26; Ac. 5:24; 10:17). The verbs (ἐνένευον, διελάλουν, εἰσήθεσαν διαλογισμοῦς, ἐπιθυμάτοι, ὀψισέρουν) all show this state of mind. See indirect question ὁ βουλόμεθα in Ac. 25:20 after ἔπορούμενος. Cf. 27:39. The deliberative opt. undoubtedly occurs in Lu. 3:15, διαλογιζόμενοι μὴ ποτὲ αὐτῆς ὁ Χριστός. It is not therefore pressing the optative unduly to find remnants of the deliberative use for it (cf. subj. and fut. indicative).

[Page 941] IV. The Imperative (ἡ προστατικὴ ἔγκλισις).

1. ORIGIN OF THE IMPERATIVE. See chapter on Conjugation of the Verb for discussion of the various devices used by this latest of the modes in order to get a foothold. Giles, after giving the history of the imperative forms (five separate strata), curtly dismisses it as not properly a mode and declines to discuss it under syntax. So

Radermacher passes it by in his *N. T. Gr.* Moulton, on the other hand, takes it up “first among the moods” because “it is the simplest possible form of the verb.” It is the simplest in one of its forms like the interjectional ἄγε, but it is also the latest of the modes and is without a distinct set of endings. Besides, it never dislodged the aorist subj. from the second person in prohibitions and finally gave up the fight all along the line. The modes were slower than the tenses in making sharp distinctions anyhow, and in the Sanskrit “no distinction of meaning has been established between the modes of the present-system and those (in the older language) of the perfect- and aorist-systems.”

The ambiguity of the imperative persists in the second person plural present where only the context can decide the mode. Thus ἔραυνάτε (Jo. 5:39); πιστεύετε (14:1); ἱστε (1 Pet. 1:6); ὀκονομεῖσθε (2:5); τελεῖτε (Ro. 13:6); καθίστε (1 Cor. 6:4); cf. Jo. 12:19. The perfect form Ἰστε (Jas. 1:19; Heb. 12:17) shows the same situation.

2. **Meaning of the Imperative.** In its original significance it was demand or exhortation. But, as will be shown, it was not confined to this simple idea. Besides, the notion of command (or prohibition) was expressed in various ways before the imperative was developed. These uses of the other modes continued to exist side by side with the imperative till the N. T. time. Examples of this will be given directly. The imperative itself was extended to include various shades of the future ind., the subj. and the opt. There is a general sense in which the imperative is distinct, as is seen in ἀγαπᾶτε τούς ἔχθροὺς ὑµῶν (Mt. 5:44), but this idea of command easily softens to appeal as in κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα (Mt. 8:25).

3. **Disappearance of the Imperative Forms.** It was the last mode to get on its feet. It followed the optative into oblivion save in the second person (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 154). There the forms held on in the main, but the present subjunctive with µή came also into use instead of µή and the present imper., and finally the hortatory (positive) subj. also appeared as imper. In the third person (both positive and negative with µή) Ος and the subj. drove out the imperative. Thus the imperative forms in modern Greek present a wreck, if indeed they were ever much else. The imperative, like the subjunctive, is always future in time, though it may apply to the immediate future as in “quit that.”

4. **Alternatives for the Imperative.** These, under all the circumstances, can be logically treated before the imperative itself. Indeed, they have already been discussed in the preceding remarks on tense and mode, so that little in addition is required.

(a) **The Future Indicative.** See ch. XVIII, Tense, where it is shown that the Volitive Future is the equivalent of the imperative. The fut. ind., like the subj. and the opt., may be merely futuristic or volitive, or deliberative. The volitive future is a matter of context and tone of voice, to be sure, but that is true also of the subj. and opt., and, in truth, of the real imperative. But more of the “tone of the imperative” further on. English, as well as Greek, continues to use this volitive future. Both

---

2 Prol., p. 171.
4 Delbrück, *Die Grundl.*, p. 120.
positive and negative (οὐ) commands are given by the fut. ind. The negative is sometimes μὴ as in μὴ βουλήσασθε ἑλέναι (Demosthenes), μὴ ἐξέσται (B. U. 197, i/A.D.), μηδένα μισήσετε (Clem., Hom., III, 69). So also οὐ μὴ with the fut. ind. is sometimes prohibition, as in οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο (Mt. 16:22). Cf. also Gal. 4:30.

But it is commonest in the simple future like σὺ ὀψῇ (Mt. 27:4); ἔμεινεν ἀγωγὴν (27:24); ἐκκόψες (Lu. 13:9); οὐκ ἐσεσθε (Mt. 5:5), etc. It is true that this use of οὐ proves the origin of this idiom to be “a purely futurostic form,” as is the case with the question οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων; (Ac. 13:10), but the tone of this future is volitive (imperatival). The Latin use of the volitive future coincides with that of the Greek. Gildersleeve4 says: “It is not a milder or gentler imperative. A prediction may imply resistless power or cold indifference, compulsion or concession.” The exact shade of idea in this volitive future must be watched as closely as in the imperative itself. Cf. κυλέας (Mt. 1:21) with σὺ ὀψῇ (Mt. 27:4). Blass5 denies that this is a “classical” idiom (against [Page 943] Gildersleeve) and rather minimizes its use in the N. T. Many of the examples do come from the O. T. (LXX) legal language. Certainly in the LXX the fut. ind. often replaces the imperative under the influence of the Hebrew (Thackeray, Gr., p. 194). But examples occur where the two are equivalent. Cf. ἐναπήεσης in Mt. 5:43, with ἐναπῆτε in 5:44, ἔρεῖτε in Mt. 21:3, with ἔπατε in Mk. 11:3. Some MSS. have ἔστω rather than ἔσται in Mt. 20:26.

(b) The Subjunctive. The volitve subjunctive is quite to the point. In the first person this use of the subj. held its own always in lieu of the imperative. It is needless to repeat the discussion of this matter (see Subjunctive in this chapter). The use of ὅνα with the subj. in an imperatival sense is seen in Mk. 5:23 (6:25); Eph. 5:33 is there discussed also. Cf. Tit. 2:4. Let μὴ σχίσωμεν αὐτὸν, ἄλλα λάχωμεν (Jo. 19:24) serve as an example. So in the second person the aorist subj. held its place in prohibitions past κοινή times to the practical exclusion of the aor. imper. with μὴ. The two constructions existed in the κοινή side by side with the third person. Thus μὴ γνώτῳ (Mt. 6:3) and μὴ τις ἐξουθενήσῃ (1 Cor. 16:11). Cf. δός and μὴ ἀποστραφῇς in Mt. 5:42. The final triumph of the subj. over the imperative (save in the second person) has been shown. Cf. the fate of the opt. before the subj.

(c) The Optative. There is only one example, ἡμκέτι μηδείς φάγοι (Mk. 11:14), in the N. T. The distinction between a curse and a prohibition is not very great. The parallel passage in Mt. 21:19 has1 οὐ μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ καρπὸς γένηται (volitive subj.).

(d) The Infinitive. The idiom is very frequent in Homer.2 It occurs chiefly after an imperative. The command is carried on by the infinitive. There is no need for surprise in this construction, since the probability is that imperative forms like δεῖξει (like the Latin legimini, Homeric λεγέ-νεναι) are infinitive in origin.3 It is true that the accent of the editors for the aorist active optative is different from the aorist active inf. in
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3 Moulton, Prol., p. 177.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 209.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 179.
2 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 162.
3 Giles, Man., p. 468.
forms like κατευθύναι, περισσεύσαι (1 Th. 3:11 f.), but the MSS. had no accent. We could properly print the infinitive if we wished. So as to παρακαλέσαι (2 Th. 2:17) where the accent is the same for both infinitive and optative (the imper. form aor. mid. sec. singl. is παρακάλεσαν). Cf. βάπτίσας and βαπτίζον, one and the same form. The idiom is less frequent in the Attic outside of laws and maxims, [Page 944] but happens to be the one infinitive construction that is alive in the Pontic dialect to-day.1 Moulton2 expresses surprise at the rarity of this use of the inf. in the N. T., since it is common in the papyri. Cf. ἔξειναι, μισθοῦσαι, A. P. 86 (v. A.D.). Moulton (Prol., p. 179) notes that Burkitt (Evang. da-Mepharr. ii, 252 f.) reads ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσα αὐτόκεινα μὴ ἄφηναι in Mt. 23:23. Blass3 notes also a revival of the simple inf. or the accusative and infinitive in the later language in legal phraseology. He explains the idiom as an ellipsis, but Moulton is undoubtedly correct in rejecting this theory. There is no need of a verb of command understood in view of the etymology of a form like βάπτισαν. The use of χαίρειν as greeting in epistles (with the nominative) is explained in the same way. Cf. Ac. 15:23; 23:26; Jas. 1:1. It is the absolute use of the infinitive as often. It is very common in the papyri, as Πολυκράτης τῷ πατρὶ χαίρειν, P. Petr. II, xi, 1 (iii/B.C.). So Moulton (Prol., p. 180) denies the necessity of the ellipsis of a verb of command. In Ro. 12:15 χαίρειν and κλαίειν are clearly parallel with εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρθήσε, so in Ph. 3:16 στοιχεῖν is to be compared with the hortatory φρονῶμεν. Blass4 needlessly wishes to emend the text in 2 Tim. 2:14, so as not to read μὴ λογομαχῆσθαι. This use of the inf. occurs also in Tit. 2:9. We probably have the same construction in μὴ συνανακατανοθήσα (2 Th. 3:14), though it may be explained as purpose. In 1 Cor. 5:12 κρίνειν is the subject inf. In Lu. 9:3 after εἶπεν the quotation begins with μηδὲν αἵρεσθε and is changed to μητε ἔχειν (indirect command). In Mk. 6:8 f. both forms are indirect (one with ἵνα μὴ δέχῃσθαι, the other with μὴ ἔνδοξασθαι). The marg. in W.H. has μή ἐνδοξασθεί. The MSS. often vary between the middle inf. and imper. or subj. Winer5 thinks that expositors have been unduly anxious to find this use of the infinitive in the N. T. But it is there. See further chapter XX, Verbal Nouns.

(e) The Participle. Winer6 found much difficulty in the absolute use of the participle in the N. T. The so-called genitive absolute is common enough and the participle in indirect discourse representing a finite verb. It would seem but a simple
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step to use the participle, like the infinitive, in an independent sentence without direct
dependence on a verb. Winer admits that Greek prose writers have this construction,
though “seldom.” He explains [Page 945] it on the ground of ellipsis of the copula as
is so common with adjectives (cf. Mt. 5:3–11). He passes the poets by (often the truest
index of the vernacular) and admits “the Byzantine use of participles simply for finite
verbs.” T. S. Green¹ says: “The absolute use of the participle as an imperative is a
marked feature of the language of the N. T.” He explains it as an “Aramaism.” To this
W. F. Moulton² expresses surprise and admits only “the participial anacoluthon,”
which, by the way, is very much the same thing. But J. H. Moulton³ has found a
number of examples in the papyri where the participle is fairly common for the
indicative. The instances in the papyri of the participle in the sense of the imperative
are not numerous, but one of them seems very clear. Thus Tb. 59 (i/b.c.) ἐν οἷς ἔδω
προσδέησθε μοι ἐπιτάσσοντες μοι προθυμότερον. It is preceded by a genitive
absolute. Moulton gives another equally so: G. 35 (i/b.c.) ἐπιμελήμενοι ἵν
ὑγαίνητε. Moulton⁴ cites also the Latin form sequiminīs (=ἐπόμενοι) for the second
middle plural present indicative. The similar looking form sequiminīs imperative has
an infinitive origin, as already shown. See chapter XX, Verbal Nouns, for other
examples and further discussion. On the whole, therefore, we must admit that there is
no reason per se why the N. T. writers should not use the participle in lieu of the
imperative. It is, of course, a loose construction, as ellipsis is and anacoluthon is, but

1 Gr., p. 180.
Moulton MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament
(1897).
2 W.-Moulton, p. 732, n. 5.
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———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).

———, Grammatical Notes from the Papyri (The Expositor, 1901, pp. 271–282;


———, N. T. Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery (Cambr. Bibl. Essays, 1909,
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3 Prol., p. 223.
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it is not the mark of an uneducated person. In the papyrus example (Tb. 59) given above Grenfell and Hunt call the writer “an official of some importance.” Moulton\(^5\) also translates Thumb\(^6\) concerning the “hanging nominative” (common in classical and koine Greek) as saying that the usage “is the precursor of the process which ends in modern Greek with the disappearance of the old participial construction, only an absolute form in –οντας being left.” In the ellipsis of the copula it is not always clear whether the indicative or the imperative is to be supplied. Cf. εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός (2 Cor. 1:3). Shall we supply ἔστιν or ἦτο (ἔστω) as we have it in 1 Cor. 16:22? In a case like 1 Pet. 3:8 f. it is plain that the unexpressed ἔστε would be imperative, but Moulton notes the curious fact that ἔστε (imperative) does not appear in the N. T. at all, though we have ἦτο five times, ἔστω or ἦτο fourteen, and ἔστοσαν twice.\(^7\) There are instances [Page 946] more or less doubtful, as ἐπιρίψαντες (1 Pet. 5:7), which is naturally taken with ταπεινώθητε as Moulton\(^1\) now admits. He evidently reacted too strongly against Winer. This use of the participle should not be appealed to if the principal verb is present in the immediate context. Sometimes it is a matter of punctuation as in Lu. 24:47, where W. H. give in the margin ὁ Ἰερουσαλήμ ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν ἵνα ἀρξάµενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλῆμ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτόν ἄρτυρες τῶν, instead of Ἰερουσαλήμ ὑμεῖς. The marginal punctuation takes the participle as an imperative. The MSS. sometimes vary, as when \(\text{NC}\) give ἐνδείξασθε in 2 Cor. 8:24, while B, etc., have ἐνδεικνύοντο.\(^2\) But a number of unmistakable examples appear both in Paul and Peter, though “Paul was not so fond of this construction as his brother apostle.”\(^3\) Thus ἔχοντες (1 Pet. 2:12) must be so explained or taken as anacoluthon (cf. ἄπέχεσθαι). So ὑποτασσόµενοι (1 Pet. 2:18; 3:1) reminds one of Eph. 5:22, an “echo” according to Moulton. Other examples occur in 1 Pet. 3:7, 9, possibly 16 also; 4:8 ff. Besides ὑποτασσόµενοι and σπουδάζοντες (Eph. 4:2 f.) and ὑποτασσόµενοι (5:2) in Paul the most outstanding example is in Ro. 12:9 f., 16 f. These participles occur in the midst of imperatives or infinitives as imperatives (12:15). The asyndeton makes it impossible to connect with any verb. In verse 6 ἔχοντες appears as a practical indicative, Moulton\(^4\) adds to these 2 Cor. 9:11 f. and Col. 3:16. See also Heb. 13:5. But Lightfoot\(^5\) put in a word of caution when he said: “The absolute participle, being (so far as regards mood) neutral in itself, takes its colour from the general complexion of the sentence.” The participle is not technically either indicative, subjunctive, optative or imperative. The context must decide. In itself the participle is non-finite (non-modal) like the infinitive, though it was sometimes drawn out into the modal sphere.

5. Uses of the Imperative.

---

5 Ib., p. 225.
6 Hellen., p. 131.
7 Mr. H. Scott notes the absence of ἔστε in the H. R. Conc. of the LXX, in Veitch, in Kühner-Bl., Mayser, Helbing, Thackeray. In Goodspeed’s Index Pat. he finds it only in 1 Clem. 45:1, and the accent is doubtful here. He finds it also in Test. XII Pat. Reub. 6:1. It could have been used in Napht. 3:2 and in Ign. Eph. 10:2.
1 Prol., p. 181, against his former view in Expositor, VI, x. 450.
2 Ib.
3 Ib.
4 Ib.
5 On Col. 3:16 f.
(a) Command or Exhortation. In general the imperative keeps within the same limits observed in the classical language, but that is not a narrow groove. It is the mood of the assertion of one’s will over another or the call of one to exert his will. Thus [Page 947] ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (Mt. 5:44); εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ ταμίευν σου καὶ πρόσσεξαι (6:6); πάντωτε χαίρετε (1 Th. 5:16). Moulton finds the imperatives “normal in royal edicts, in letters to inferiors, and among equals when the tone is urgent, or the writer indisposed to multiply words.” The imperatives in Rev. 22:11 are probably hortatory.

(b) Prohibition. This is just a negative command and differs in no respect save the presence of the negative μή. Thus μὴ κρίνετε (Mt. 7:1), μὴ φοβεῖσθε (Jo. 6:20). Often the presence of the imperative in the midst of indicatives is shown by μὴ as in μὴ πλανᾶσθε (1 Cor. 6:9). We do, indeed, have οὐ with the imperative in marked contrast, where the force of the negative is given to that rather than to the mode. Thus in 1 Pet. 3:3, ἔστω οὐχ ὁ—κόσμος, ἀλλὰ ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπους. The same explanation applies to οὐ μόνον—ἀλλὰ καὶ in 1 Pet. 2:18, but μὴ μόνον is regular in Jas. 1:22, etc., because of γίνεσθε understood. In cases of contrast with οὐ—ἀλλὰ (with participles and imperatives) the reason for οὐ is thus apparent (H. Scott). In Mt. 5:37 οὐ οὐ (like ναι ναι) is the predicate (like a substantive), not the negative of ἔστω. In 2 Tim. 2:14 ἐποῦ δὲ νὰ χρησίμου (a parenthetical expression of μὴ λογομαχεῖν used as an imperative), the negative goes specifically with the single word χρησίμου. Cf. also 1 Cor. 5:10. The upshot is that μὴ remains the negative of the imperative. Cf. μὴ μοι κόπους πάρεξε (Lu. 11:7).

(c) Entreaty. A command easily shades off into petition in certain circumstances. The tone of the demand is softened to pleading. Moulton notes that the imperative has a decided tone about it. “The grammarian Hermogenes asserted harshness to be a feature of the imperative; and the sophist Protagoras even blamed Homer for addressing the Muse at the beginning of the Iliad with an imperative.” The N. T. shows a sharp departure in the use of the imperative in petitions (rare in the older Greek and in the κοινή). The prophet pleads with the imperative, not with potential optative or future indicative. Jesus spoke with authority and not as the scribes. “Moreover, even in the language of prayer the imperative is at home, and that in its most urgent form, the aorist. Gildersleeve observes (on Justin Martyr, p. 137), ‘As in the Lord’s Prayer, so in the ancient Greek liturgies the aorist imper. is almost exclusively used. It is the true term for instant prayer.’” Gildersleeve denies that the N. T. shows “the absolute indifference that some scholars have considered to be characteristic of Hellenistic Greek” in the use of the imperative. He
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6 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 221.
1 Prol., p. 173.
3 Prol., p. 172.
4 Ib.
5 Mt. 7:29.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 173.
credits Mr. Mozley with the observation that “the aorist imperative is regularly used in biblical Greek when the deity is addressed; and following out this generalization Herr Krieeckers, a pupil of Thumb’s, has made a statistical study of the occurrences of the two tenses in Homer, Hesiod, Sappho, Ἀσχίλος, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, with the result that in prayers addressed by men to men both present and aorist are often used, whereas in prayers addressed by men to gods the aorist largely predominates.” Examples3 of the imperative in petitions appear in Mk. 9:22, βοήθησον ἡμῖν, (Lu. 17:5) πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν, (Jo. 17:11) τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὄννόματί σου.

(d) Permission. All this is in strict line with the ancient Greek.4 A good illustration is seen in Mt. 26:45, καθεδεῖτε λουθὸν καὶ ἀνασκειβοθείε. This is not a question nor necessarily irony. It is too late to do Christ any good by keeping awake. He withdraws his plea for watchfulness. There is irony in πληρώσατε (Mt. 23:32), though it is the permissive use of the imperative. The note of permission is struck in ἔλθατο and ἐπιστραφήτο (Mt. 10:13). Cf. the fut. ind. in Lu. 10:6. See further χωρίζεσθο (1 Cor. 7:15); ὄγνοετο (14:38, W. H. marg.). In 2 Cor. 12:16 ἔστω ὃς is like our ‘Let it be so’ or ‘Granted.’ In Mt. 8:31 ἄποστειλολ is entreaty, ὑπάγετε (32) is permissive. In 1 Cor. 11:6 κεράσθω is probably hortatory.

(e) Concession or Condition. It is an easy step from permission to concession. This also is classical.5 Take Jo. 2:19, λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερὼ αὐτῶν. This is much the same as ἐδν λύσητε. It is not a strict command. We have parataxis with καί, but it is equivalent in idea to hypotaxis with ἔν. So with ἀντίστητη τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται ἢ ἡμῶν (Jas. 4:7 f.); ἀνάστα ὡ ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (LXX), καὶ ἑπιφώσκεις σοι ὁ Χριστός (Eph. 5:14). See also μή κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μή κριθήτε καὶ μὴ καταδικάσθητε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθήτε ἀπολύσετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσασθε δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ἡμῖν (Lu. 6:37 f.). Then again μακροθύμησον ἐπ ἐμοῖ, καὶ πάντα ἁποδῶσω [Page 949] σοι (Mt. 18:26). So also τοῦτο ποιεῖ καὶ ζησή (Lu. 10:28); ἔρχετε καὶ ὄψεθε (Jo. 1:39). Cf. δεῦτε καὶ ποιήσω (Mt. 4:19). Sometimes two imperatives are connected by καὶ when the first suggests concession. Thus Eph. 4:26, ὅργιζεθε καὶ μὴ ἄμαρτάνετε. So also ἐράνησον καὶ ἰδε (Jo. 7:52). Cf. ἔρχου καὶ ἰδε (Jo. 1:46). This seems simple enough.

(f) In Asyndeton. It is a regular classic idiom1 to have ἤγε, φέρε with another imperative. ἤγε with κλαύσατε (Jas. 5:1) is an interjection like δεῦτο ἀκολούθει μοι (Mt. 19:21) and δεῦτε ἰδετε (Mt. 28:6). See also Jo. 4:29; 21:12; Rev. 19:17. More common is ὑπαγε καὶ ὑπάγετε with another imperative. So ὑπαγε πρότον διαλλάγητι (Mt. 5:24); ὑπάγετε ὑπαγειλατε (28:10). See further Mt. 8:4; 18:15; 21:28; 27:65;

Sophocles SOPHOCLES, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (1888).
Mk. 1:44; 6:38, etc. In Mt. 16:16 we have ὁρᾷς καὶ προσέχετε. Cf. also Lu. 12:15. But asyndeton occurs in Mt. 24:6, ὁρᾷς μὴ ὑπεξήςθε. So ὁρᾷς βλέπετε (Mk. 8:15). In Mt. 9:30 the persons and numbers are different, ὁρᾷς μηδὲς γνωσκέτο. In Rev. 19:10, ὅρα μὴ, the verb with μὴ is not expressed. For ὅρα ποιήσεις see also Heb. 8:5 (LXX). The simplest form of asyndeton is seen in Ph. 3:2, βλέπετε, βλέπετε, βλέπετε.

(g) In Subordinate Clauses. The reason for treating this subject here is that it is so rare that one may not catch it in the discussion of subordinate clauses. It is well established, though rare, in Demosthenes, Lysias, Plato, Thucydides and the tragic poets. The case of ὅστε at the beginning of a clause is not pertinent, for there it is a mere inferential conjunction, as, for instance, 1 Cor. 3:21, ὅστε μηδὲς καυχάσθω. Here ὅστε is not a hypotactic conjunction. Neither is the recitative ὅστε in point, as in 2 Th. 3:10, τοῦτο παρηγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰ τις ὧθελε ἐργάζεσθαι, μηδὲ ἐσθίετο. In 1 Cor. 1:31 there is probably an ellipsis of γένηται after ἵνα, and the imperative καυχάσθω is in the direct quotation after γέγραπται. In 1 Pet. 1:6, ἐν ὧθελασθε (probably imperative), W. H. begin a new sentence, but ὧθελε points back directly to καυχάσθω as its antecedent. The same situation occurs in 1 Pet. 3:3 with ἵνα ἔστω. In both examples the imperative appears with the relative. Two other instances of this construction are found in 1 Peter (a peculiarity of this Epistle). They are ὧθελε ὁντίστητε (5:9) and εἰς ἵνα στήτε (5:12). We see it also in Heb. 13:7, ἵνα—μημεῖο, and in 2 Tim. 4:15, ἵνα καὶ σὺ φιλάσσου. Cf. O. P. 1125, 19 (ii/A.D.), ἵνα θέμα καθαρὸν ὅποι πάντων ἀναδότο. [Page 950] Δίο at the beginning of the sentence was hardly felt as a relative (inferential particle), but see 1 Cor. 14:13, δίο προσευχήσομαι.¹

(h) The Tenses. This matter received adequate discussion under Tenses. It may simply be noted here that in positive sentences the aorist imperative is naturally common, especially frequent in the N. T. Cf. ἐσελή—πρόσεξαι (Mt. 6:6). The distinction between the present and the aorist is well seen in ἔσον τὸν κρύβαττόν σου καὶ περιπατέα (Jo. 5:8). See also Jo. 2:16 and Ac. 12:8. As an example of the periphrastic present note ἵνα ἔχον (Lu. 19:17). The perfect is almost non-existent, but note περίμωσο (Mk. 4:39). The present imper. second person alone occurs in prohibitions which are forbidden as in course of action or as a present fact (‘quit doing it’).² Cf. Ro. 6:13 for sharp differences in idea between μὴ παριστάνετε (course of action) and παριστάτε (at once and for all). In the third person a prohibition may be either in the aorist imperative or the aorist subj. See the subj. mode for further remarks concerning the failure of the second person imperative aorist in prohibitions.

(i) In Indirect Discourse. This subject will receive adequate treatment under this head (see below). All that is attempted here is to indicate that, when the imperative is not quoted directly (cf. 2 Th. 3:10), it may be expressed in an indirect command either by the infinitive (cf. λέγων μὴ παριστάτεν μηδὲ πεπράγμαται in Ac. 21:21) or by a conjunction like ἵνα as in Mk. 6:8, or thrown into a deliberative question as in ὑποδείξω τίνα φοβηθήτε (Lu. 12:5).

B. Dependent or Hypotactic Sentences (ΥΠΟΤΑΚΤΙΚΑ ἈΞΙΩΜΑΤΑ)

---

2 Lb., p. 167.
2 Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 164. See also Thompson, Synt., p. 190 f.
Introductory.

(a) Use of Modes in Subordinate Sentences. There is no essential difference in the meaning of the modes in subordinate clauses from the significance in independent sentences. The division is not made on the basis of the modes at all. Leaving out the imperative because of its rarity in subordinate sentences, the other three modes occur in almost all the subordinate clauses. The same mode-ideas are to be sought here as there. The subordinate clauses make no change in the meaning of mode, voice or tense. Burton\(^3\) does say: “Others, however, give to the mood or [Page 951] tense a force different from that which they usually have in principal clauses. Hence arises the necessity for special treatment of the moods and tenses in subordinate clauses.” I cannot agree to this as the reason for the separate treatment. Sometimes in indirect discourse after secondary tenses there may be a sequence of modes (true also in ancient Greek with final clauses after secondary tenses), but that is so slight a matter that it bears no sort of proportion to the subordinate clauses as a whole. Gildersleeve (\textit{A. J. of Phil.}, XXXIII, 4, p. 489) regards the subordinate sentence as “the Ararat in the flood of change” and parataxis and hypotaxis as largely a matter of style. Some of the modal uses have survived better in the subordinate clauses, as, for instance, the futuristic aorist subj. (cf. δόταις ἄρνησται in Mt. 10:33), but the subordinate clause did not create the idiom. Originally there were no subordinate sentences.\(^1\) “In dependent clauses the choice of the mood is determined by the nature of each individual case”\(^2\) as is true also of independent sentences. The qualification made above about the sequence of modes was always optional and is absent from the N. T. except a few examples in Luke. The great wealth of subordinate clauses in Greek with various nuances demand separate discussion. But we approach the matter with views of the modes already attained.

(b) The Use of Conjunctions in Subordinate Clauses. In chapter XXI, Particles, full space will be given to the conjunctions (co-ordinating, disjunctive, inferential, subordinating). Here it is only pertinent to note the large part played in the Greek language by the subordinating conjunctions. It must be admitted that the line of cleavage is not absolute. The paratactic conjunctions were first on the field.\(^3\) Popular speech has always had a fondness for parataxis.\(^4\) In the modern Greek vernacular “the propensity for parataxis has considerably reduced the ancient Greek wealth of dependent constructions” (Thumb, \textit{Handb.}, p. 185). Hence long periods are rare. So the Hebrew used \(\textit{וְ} \) both as paratactic and hypotactic. In the Greek καί we see a partial parallel.\(^5\) In Mt. 26:15, τί θελετέ μοι δοῦναι καγὼ ὑμῖν παραδώσω, the καί is almost equivalent to \(\textit{ἐὰν} \). So often in Luke, as in 9:51, \(\textit{ἐγένετο} \) \(\textit{καί} \), the καί clause is (like \(\textit{ὅτι} \)) the logical subject of \(\textit{ἐγένετο} \). The common use of the recitative \(\textit{ὅτι} \) illustrates well the close connection between subordinate and independent sentences. The \(\textit{ὅτι} \)

\(^{1}\text{Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 552.}\)
\(^{2}\text{Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 452.}\)
\(^{3}\text{Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 552.}\)
\(^{4}\text{Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 451.}\)
\(^{5}\text{Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 194.}\)
shows [Page 952] that the clause is the object of the preceding verb, but the clause is preserved in the direct (co-ordinate) form. Cf. λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς (Jo. 10:36). Thus again a subordinate clause may be so loosely connected with the principal clause as to be virtually independent.1 Thus the relative, as in Latin, often introduces a principal sentence, a paragraph, forsooth, as ἐν ὃς (Lu. 12:1) and ὅν ὃ (12:3). But, on the whole, we can draw a pretty clear line between the independent and the dependent clause by means of the conjunctions. The case of asyndeton, treated elsewhere (cf. The Sentence), concerns chiefly parataxis, but some examples occur in hypotaxis, as in καὶ ἔγενετο—ἔπεν τις (Lu. 11:1) where the ἔπεν τις clause is the logical subject of ἔγενετο.

(c) Logical Varieties of Subordinate Clauses. Each subordinate clause sustains a syntactical relation to the principal clause after the analogy of the case-relations. The normal complete sentence has subject, predicate, object. Each of these may receive further amplification (see chapter X, The Sentence). The predicate may have a substantive (as subject or object). This substantive may be described by an adjective. An adverb may be used with predicate, adjective or substantive. Thus the sentence is built up around the predicate. In the same way each subordinate sentence is either a substantive (subject or object like an ὅτι clause), an adjective like ὅστις or an adverb like ὅπου. This is therefore a point to note about each subordinate clause in order to get its exact syntactical relation to the principal clause. It may be related to the predicate as subject or object, or to the subject or object as adjective, or to either as adverb. A relative clause may be now substantive, now adjective and now adverb. In simple truth most of the conjunctions have their origin as relative or demonstrative pronouns. In Kühner-Gerth2 the subordinate clauses are all discussed from this standpoint alone. Thumb (Handb., pp. 186 ff.) follows this plan. One questions the wisdom of this method, though in itself scientific enough. Burton3 has carefully worked out all the subordinate clauses from this standpoint, though he does not adopt it. Then, again, one may divide these clauses according to their form or their meaning.4 Viteau5 combines both ideas and the result is rather confusion than clarification. There may be a series of subordinate clauses, one dependent on the other. So in 1 Cor.1:14, [Page 953] εὐχαριστῶ ὅτι οὐδένα ὑμῶν ἔβαπτε εἰ μὴ Κρίσπον καὶ Γοίον, ἣν μὴ τις ἔπαθε ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἔβαπτε. See also Mk. 6:55 and section 10 in this chapter. The infinitive and the participle are used also in subordinate clauses, but they do not directly concern the problem of the modes save in indirect discourse. They are so important and partake of the functions of both noun and verb to such an extent that they demand a separate chapter—XX.

1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 194.
3 N. T. M. and T., p. 82.
4 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 194 f.
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VITEAU, J., Essai sur la syntaxe des voix dans le grec du N. T. (Rev. de Phil., 1894).
———, Étude sur le grec du N. T. I, Le Verbe (1893); II, Le Sujet (1896).
1. RELATIVE SENTENCES.

(a) Relative Sentences Originally Paratactic. The relative ὃς, as is well known, was first an anaphoric substantive pronoun.² At first the relative clause was paratactic, a principal sentence like the other.³ Cf. ὃς γάρ in Homer, where ὃς may be taken³ as demonstrative or relative. In its simplest form the relative was unnecessary and was not even a connective. It was just a repetition of the substantive.⁴ "The relative force arises where ὃς (and its congeners) connects and complements."⁵ Indeed, the relative sentence is probably the oldest form of parataxis.⁶ It is only by degrees that the relative clause came to be regarded as a subordinate clause.⁷ As a matter of fact, that was not always the case, as has been seen in such examples as ἐν ὃς, ἀνθ.writerow (Lu. 12:1, 3). But it is not true that this subordination is due to the use of the subjunctive mode.⁸ The effect of case-assimilation (cf. gender and number) and of incorporation of the antecedent was to link the relative clause very close to the principal sentence.⁹ Cf. Heb. 13:11.

(b) Most Subordinate Clauses Relative in Origin. This is true not merely of ὅτι and ὅτε which are accusative forms¹⁰ of ὅ, but also of other adverbs, like the ablative ὡς, ὡς ὧς, ἡμῶς. These subordinating conjunctions therefore are mostly of relative origin.¹¹ [Page 954] Cf. ἵνα, ἵππος and perhaps εἰ. Πρώτων, εἰπάω, ἵππος, μείκτη are not relative. Thus the subordinate clauses overlap. Burton,¹ indeed, includes ἵππος under relative sentences. That is not necessary, since thus nearly all the subordinate clauses would properly be treated as relative sentences. See the relative origin of various conjunctions well worked out by Schmitt,² Weber³ and Christ.⁴ These clauses are mainly adverbial, though objective (and subject-clause also) ὅτι (indirect discourse) is substantive simply. The word ὡς occurs in Homer with the three values of ὡς, ὡς, ὡς.
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5 Le Verbe: Syntaxe des Propositions, pp. 41–144.
1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 556.
2 Ib., p. 559.
3 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 186. Stahl, Hist.-krit. Synt., p. 523, points out that the relative sentence is either "synthetic or paratetic."
5 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 383.
7 Thompson, Synt., p. 383.
8 Baron, Le Pronom Relat. et la Conj. en Grec, 1892, p. 61.
11 Thompson, Synt., p. 384.
1 N. T. M. and T., pp. 126 ff.
2 Über den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartik. im Griech.
Weber WEBER, P., Entwick. der Absichtssätze. Heft I (1884), Heft II (1885).
3 Entwickelungsgesch. der Absichtssätze.
4 Der Substantivs. und das Rel. ὡς.
demonstrative, relative and conjunction (cf. English “that”). But here we pass by these conjunctions from relative or demonstrative roots. The relative pronoun alone, apart from the adverbial uses, introduces the most frequent subordinate clause, probably almost equal in some authors to all the other classes put together. In 1 Peter the relative construction is very common. Cf. 1 Pet. 1:6–12; 2:21–24. At any rate it is the chief means of periodic structure. Take as an instance the period in Ac. 1:1–2.

Note ἧν, ἄχρι ἡμέρας, οἷς, ὁίς, all the subordinate clauses in the sentence except infinitive and participles. See also 1 Cor. 15:1–2, where four relatives occur and τίνι λόγῳ is almost like a relative. Cf. further Ro. 9:4 f. The relative sentence may be repeated indefinitely with or without καί.

(c) Relative Clauses Usually Adjectival. They are so classed by Kühner-Gerth. The descriptive use followed the original substantive idiom just as the relative itself was preceded by the demonstrative. Thus the use of the relative clause as subject or object like ὁ and the participle is perfectly consistent. So ὃς ὅν ἐμὲ δέχεται δέχεται τὸν ὀποστελλόντα με (Lu. 9:48). Cf. also Mk. 9:37; Ac. 16:12. The descriptive character of the relative clause is well shown in τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος ὃ έστιν ῥήμα θεοῦ (Eph. 6:17). Cf. ὃς in 1 Tim. 3:16. The adjectival use of the relative sentence is accentuated by the use of the article with it in Ro. 16:17, σκοπεῖν τοὺς τάς δικτυστικίας καὶ τά σκάνδαλα παρά τὴν διδαχήν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἔμαθετε πιστούντας. Here the relative clause is adjectival, but in itself a mere incident between τοὺς and πιστούντας. The clause is simply adjectival with πᾶς ὃς in Lu. 12:8. That comes to be its most usual character. So with δι ής in Heb. 12:28.

(d) Modes in Relative Sentences. There is nothing in the relative pronoun or the construction of the clause per se to have any effect on the use of the mode. The relative, as a matter of fact, has no construction of its own. In general in dependent clauses the choice of the mode is determined by the nature of the individual case. Outside of relative clauses the choice in the N. T. is practically confined to the indicative and the subjunctive. The optative holds on in one or two examples. With the relative some examples of the imperative occur, as has already been shown. Cf. 1 Cor. 14:13; Tit. 1:13; 2 Tim. 4:15; 1 Pet. 5:9; Heb. 13:7. Cf. ὅθεν κατανόησατε (Heb. 3:1). But the mode is not due at all to the relative. In a word, the relative occurs with all the constructions possible to an independent sentence. The indicative is, of course, the natural mood to use if one wishes to make a direct and clear-cut assertion. Thus οὐδεὶς ἦστιν ὃς ἀφήκεν τὴν οἰκίαν (Mk. 10:29). Cf. Jo. 10:12. The various uses of the subjunctive occur with the relative. The deliberative subj. is seen in ποῦ ἦστιν τὸ κατάλοιμα μου ὃποιον τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; (Mk. 14:14; Lu. 22:11).
Prof. Earle, in a fine paper on “The Subj. of Purpose in Relative Clauses in Greek” (Class. Papers, 1912, pp. 213 ff.) shows how Xenophon, Soph., Eurip., Plato and other Attic writers use the idiom. Cf. Xen., Anab., II, 4, 20, οὐχ ἔξουσιν ἔκεινοι ὅτοι φύγοσιν. See also Tarbell, Class. Review, July, 1892, “The Deliberative Subj. in Relative Clauses in Greek.” The subj. may be volitive as in Ac. 21:16, ὅγιοντες παρ ὧν ἔξουσιν τινι, and in Heb. 8:3, δέν ἄνωγκαῖον ἔχουν τι καί τοῦτον ἐπροσενέγκῃ (cf. ὥστε in Heb. 9:7). In Heb. 12:28, διὰ τῆς λατρείας, the subj. may be conceived as either volitive (hortatory) or merely futuristic, more probably volitive like ἔχομαι. Clearly futuristic is the subj. in Mt. 16:28, οἱ ὑπεριστάνουν Μνάσωνί τινι. These examples appear isolated. Cf. subj. with ὥστε (not relative) as in 1 Cor. 5:8, ὥστε ἔστνεμον (deliberative). But the futuristic subj., so rare in the independent sentence after Homer, is very common in the relative clause with [Page 956] ὅν and sometimes with ἄν. It is not the ἄν that determines the subj., but the subj. usually has ἄν. Thus ὅς γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἔρχεται and ὅς ἄν ἀπολέσῃ Rec. (Mk. 8:35). Cf. ὅστες τηρήσῃ (Jas. 2:10), though AKLP read τηρήσει (itacism). Cf. Mt. 10:33 and 38. In such relative sentences the future indicative is also very common, the two forms being closely allied in form and sense. Cf. ὅς ἄν ἀρνήσηται (Mt. 10:32 f.).

(e) Definite and Indefinite Relative Sentences. Goodwin has made popular the custom of calling some relative sentences “conditional relatives.” He has been followed by Burton. Jannaris considers conditional relative clauses “virtually condensed clauses capable of being changed into conditional protases.” Almost any sentence is capable of being changed into some other form as a practical equivalent. The relative clause may indeed have the resultant effect of cause, condition, purpose or result, but in itself it expresses none of these things. It is like the participle in this respect. One must not read into it more than is there. Cf. ὅς ἔχει ὑπατία (Mk. 4:9) and ὃς ἔχον ὑπατία (Mt. 13:9). Cf. ὥστε τις in Mk. 4:23. One might as well say that ὃ λαμβάνον (Jo. 13:20) is the same thing as ὃς λαμβάνει (cf. Mt. 10:38). There is a change from participle to relative clause in Mt. 10:37 f., 41 f. Cf. Mt. 12:30, 32; Lu. 9:50. So then ἄν τινα πέμψω (Jo. 13:20) is a conditional clause. It is true that ἄν τινα does not occur in the N. T., but ὥστε and ὅστες differ in conception after all, though the point is a fine one. The MSS. sometimes vary between ὥστε τις and ὅστες as we see in Mk. 8:34; 1 Cor. 7:13. In Jo. 14:13 f. note ὥστε τινι ἀπείσηται and ἄν τι ἀπείσηται. Note the distinction between ὃ κεχάρισμαι and ἔστε κεχάρισμαι in 2 Cor. 2:10. In Mk. 8:34 f. note ὥστε τηλείων ὥστε τῆς ἀνθρώπων ἐδώκει. What is true is that the relative sentences are either definite or indefinite. It is not a question of mode nor of the use of ἄν, but merely
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whether the relative describes a definite antecedent or is used in an indefinite sense. The definite relative is well illustrated by 2 Th. 3:3, πιστὸς δὲ ἦστιν ὁ κύριος δ᾽ στηρίζει, or Mk. 1:2, τὸν ἄγγελόν μου δὲ κατασκευάσει τήν ὀδὸν μου. So also χάριν δι᾽ ἣς λατρεύωμεν (Heb. 12:28). Cf. δ᾽ ουσενέγκῃ (Heb. 8:3). But indefinite is δὲ ἐξεί, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ (Mk. 4:25). In the same verse καὶ δὲς οὖκ ἐξαὶ is indefinite, but καὶ δὲ ἐξαι is definite. Indefinite also is ὅσοι ἰσχύετο (Mt. 14:36) and [Page 957] ὅσοι ἀν ἰσχύετο (Mk. 6:56). So also with πᾶς δὲς ἐρεί (Lu. 12:10) and πᾶς δὲς ἄν ὄμολογήσει (12:8). Cf. δὲς ἔσται (17:31) with δὲς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ (17:33) and δὲς δὲν ἰσχύετο. Cf. Ac. 7:3, 7; Gal. 5:17. That it is not a question of mode is thus clear. Cf. δὲς ἐὰν θέλῃ with δὲς δὲν ἰσχύετο (Mk. 8:35). Thus note in Mk. 4:25 δὲς γὰρ ἐξεί δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, but in Lu. 8:18 δὲς δὲν γὰρ ἐξη δοθήσεται αὐτῷ. So in Lu. 12:8 we have πᾶς δὲς δὲν ὄμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί, but in Mt. 10:32 πᾶς δὲς ὅστις ὄμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί. The use of ὅστις is pertinent. It is either indefinite, as here, from the sense of τες="any one' or definite from the sense of τες="somebody in particular,ʼ as in Lu. 9:30, ἄνδρες δόο ςυνελάλουν αὐτῷ οὔτες ἦσαν Μωϋσεῖς καὶ Ηλείας. Examples of the definite use of ὅστις may be seen in Mt. 7:26; 16:28; 22:2; 27:55, 62, etc. The indefinite use is seen in πᾶς ὅστις ἄκουε (Mt. 7:24), ὅστις ἐξεί (Mt. 13:12), ὅστις θυσία (Mt. 23:12), but apparently no instance of ὅστις ἄν and the future ind. occurs. The indefinite use of ὅστις with the subj. and ἄν is uniform (11 examples), as in ὅστις ἄν λείν (Gal. 5:10), ὅστις ἄν θυσία (Mt. 12:50). Cf. Col. 3:17. We also find ὅστις ἀρνήσεται (Mt. 10:33), ὅστις ταξίδησεν (Jas. 2:10), but the definite use in Mk. 9:1. In 2 Cor. 8:12, εἰ ἰ προθυμία πρόκειται, καθ' ἐὰν ἐξη, εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὔ καθὸ ὀὐκ ἐξεί, there is a pointed distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative modes. Thus the indicative occurs with either the definite or the indefinite and the subjunctive with the indefinite 122 times, the definite only Mk. 9:1=Mt. 16:28. One may make a positive statement about either a definite or an indefinite relative or a doubtful assertion about either. The lines thus cross, but the matter can be kept distinct. The distinction is clearly perceived by Dawson Walker. The subjunctive with the indefinite relative, like that with ὅταν and ἔὰν, is futuristic (cf. also future indicative). Moulton (ProL., p. 186) argues that, since this subj. is futuristic and the aorist describes completed action, the aorist subj. here is really a future perfect. “Thus Mt. 5:21, δὲς ἄν φονευσῆ, ‘the man who has committed murder.’” But this seems rather like an effort to introduce the Latin idiom into the Greek and is very questionable.

(f) The Use of ἄν in Relative Clauses. This is the place for more discussion of ἄν, though, sooth to say, the matter is not perfectly clear. See also Conditions. It is probably kin to the Latin an and the Gothic an, and had apparently two meanings, [Page 958] ‘else’ and ‘in that case rather.’ Monro argues that the primary use of ἄν and κἂν is with particular and definite examples. Moulton (ProL., p. 166) translates Homeric ἐτὸν δὲ κἂν αὐτός ἐξωμαί by the Scotch ‘I’ll jist tak her mysel’. There was thus a limitation by circumstance or condition. The use of ἄν with relative, temporal

1 Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 139.
Walker Walker, D., Elementary Greek Syntax (1897).
I Hom. Gr., p. 263 f.
and conditional clauses “ties them up to particular occurrences” (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 186). It is not always quite so easy as that. This use of modal ἂν appears rarely in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 188). “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” (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 165). That is putting it a bit strong. I should rather say that it was an interpreter of the sentence, not a transformer. Moulton counts 172 instances of modal ἂν (ἔαν) in the N. T. (p. 166). Matthew leads with 55, then Mark 30, Gospel of Luke 28 and Acts only 10, Paul’s Epistles 27, the Johannine writings only 20, Hebrews 1, James 1. Mr. H. Scott fears that these figures are not correct, but they are approximately so. The MSS. vary very much. These examples occur with ind. or subj. Moulton finds 739 cases of modal ἂν in the LXX (Hatch and Redpath). Of these 40 are with opt. (26 aorist), 56 with ind. (41 aorist, 6 imp., 1 plup., 1 pres., 7 fut. ind.), the rest with subj. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 165) finds modal ἂν in the κοινή decreasing and unessential with ind., subj. or opt. in relative, temporal, final or conditional clauses. The use with indefinite or general statements was rare in Homer, but gradually came to be more frequent. But in the N. T. some examples of the definite use of ἂν survive especially in temporal clauses. So in Rev. 8:1, ὅταν ἤνοιξεν. But ὅταν στῆκετε (Mk. 11:25) may be general. There is doubt also about ὅταν ὦν ἐγένετο (11:19). But in Mk. 6:56, ὅσοι ἂν ἤσπασαν, the construction is rendered more definite by ἂν, though ὅποιον ἂν ἔστησεν ὃσοι in the same verse is indefinite. In Mt. 14:36 we have ὅσοι ἤσπασαν, which is not more definite than Mark’s construction. In Rev. 14:4, ὃποι ἂν ὑπάγεται, the construction is indefinite. In Ac. 2:45 and 4:35, καθότι ἂν τις ἔρχεται, we have repetition and so a general statement to that extent. In Mk. 3:11, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἔθεσαν, it is general. In most instances in the N. T., therefore, the use of ἂν is clearly in indefinite relative clauses whether with the indicative or subjunctive. It cannot be said that ἂν is necessary with the indefinite relative and the indicative. It does not occur in the N. T. with ἄστις and the future ind., but we have both ὅστις ἕμοιλογήσει (Mt. 10:32) and ὅς ἂν ἕμοιλογήσει (Lu. 12:8); ὅς ἔσται (Lu. 17:31) and ὅς ἂν ἐπολέσει (Mk. 8:35). For ὅς ἂν and fut. ind. see Compernass, *De Sermone Pis.* p. 38. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 145) cites ὅς ἂν δὲ ἀνίκησι, Inscr. Petersen-Luschan, *Reisen*, p. 174, N. 223, 21. As already seen, the relative with the subj. usually has ἂν, as εἰς ἂν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησο (Lu. 10:8); ὅτι ἂν προσδόκασαντίς (10:35). Cf. ὃ ἂν βούλῃται (10:22). In a few examples the best MSS. do not have ἂν, as in ὅστις ἀφήσηται (Mt. 10:33); ὅστις τρήσῃ—πταίσῃ ἂν (Jas. 2:10). The use of ἔαν like ἂν has been shown (cf. Orthography) to be very common with relatives at this period. It is immaterial which is found. So ὅς ἂν λύσῃ and ὅς ἂν ποίησῃ (Mt. 5:19). The MSS. often vary between ἔαν and ἂν, as in Mt. 10:14; Ac. 7:7. So also ὅσα ἂν ἔδωκαν ἔληπτε (Mt. 7:12) and ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε (Mt. 21:22). But in the N. T., as in the papyri, ἂν is twice as common in relative clauses. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 145) quotes ὅσοι—ἐγήλπισαν, Inscr. Perg. 249, 26, and ὅς ἀνασπαράξῃ (or ἂν ἁσπ.) I. Gr. XII, 1, 671. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 169) cites C.P.R. 237
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Compernass COMPERNASS, *De Sermone Gr.* Volg. Pisidiae Phrygiaeae meridionalis (1895).
(ii/A.D.), ὅσα αὐτῷ προστέκηται. He (ib., p. 168) quotes ὃς ἀν πάσχετε F.P. 136 (iv/A.D.), ὅσα ἐὰν παρελαβόμην B.M. 331 (ii/A.D.). The ὃν is not repeated with the second verb. So ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ καὶ διδάξῃ (Mt. 5:19). There is no instance of ὃν in a relative clause with an optative in the N. T. But in Gen. 33:10 the LXX has ὅς ἂν τις Ἰδοι πρόσωπον θεοῦ. So ὃς ἂν τύχοι, F.P. (see Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 32).

Radermacher (N. T., Gr., p. 131) cites ἄν μέρος στρέφοιτο from Philo. There is one instance of ἄν with the infinitive in the N. T. (2 Cor. 10:9), ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ ὃς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν ὑμᾶς, but ἄν is here probably the same as ἐὰν and ὃς ἂν =‘as if.’ The upshot of it all is that ἄν has no peculiar construction of its own. It is more frequent with the subjunctive than with the indicative in relative sentences, but is not absolutely essential with either mode. In the Attic the subj. is invariable with ἄν, but “in the less cultured Hellenistic writers” (Moulton, Prol., p. 166) it occurs with the ind. also. Curiously in the Gospel of John ἄν occurs with ὅστις only in the neuter (Abbott, Johannine Grammar, p. 304). Always in the N. T. ὃτι ἂν ὃτι ἂν unless in Mk. 6:23 the correct text is ὃτι ὃ ἂν as in margin of W. H. The text is probably correct (cf. Lu. 10:35; Ac. 3:23, etc.).

[Page 960] (g) Special Uses of Relative Clauses. As in Latin, the relative clause may imply cause, purpose, result, concession or condition, though the sentence itself does not say this much. This is due to the logical relation in the sentence. The sense glides from mere explanation to ground or reason, as in ὃ καὶ ἑσπούδασα αὐτῷ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι (Gal. 2:10). In 1 Cor. 3:17, ὃ ναός τοῦ θεοῦ ἄγιος ἐστιν οἵτινες ἐστε ὑμεῖς, there is an argument in οἵτινες. This is clearly true in Ro. 6:2, οἵτινες ἁπεθάνουμεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, τῶς ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ἰδίῳ ἐπείσατο. Cf. also Ac. 10:41, οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ. See Gal. 5:4, οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ ἐκκοιμοῦσθε. Cf. Latin qui, quippe qui. A good example is seen in Ro. 8:32, ὃς γε τοῦ ἱδίου ὑλοῦ ὑμῶν ἐφείσατο. Cf. also ὃς ἐμελέλειν (Rev. 3:2) and the common ἄν ὃν (Lu. 1:20). Cf. Ac. 10:47; Ro. 1:25, 32; Ph. 2:20; Col. 3:5. Only the ind. mode occurs in the N. T. in this construction. Purpose is also found in relative clauses (cf. Latin qui=ut is). Either the future ind. or the subj. is used for this construction. When the subj. occurs it is probably volitive. So Burton would explain all the cases of subj. of purpose with relatives, but wrongly. The use in Mk. 14:14 is analogous to the retention of the subj. of deliberation in an
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indirect question. Cf. the subj. of purpose with relative clause in Attic Greek. But the subj. construction is Homeric (like Latin also). The Attic idiom is the future ind., and the future ind. also appears in the N. T. So ὃς κατασκευάζει (Mk. 1:2=Mt. 11:10=Lu. 7:27), ὃς ὠμᾶς ἰδιομήνησε (1 Cor. 4:17) which may be contrasted with the merely explanatory relative ὃς ἐστίν μου τέκνον in the same sentence. So οἵτινες ἀποδόθησαν αὐτῷ (Mt. 21:41); ὦ προστατεύσατο (Ac. 7:40; Ex. 32:1); οὗκ ἔχω ὁ παραθέθη (Lu. 11:16) where the Attic Greek would7 have ὤτι. Sometimes ἦν occurs where a relative might have been used. So 2 Cor. 12:7 ἐξόθη μοι σκόλοψ— ἦνα με κολαφίζη (Jo. 5:7) οὐκ ἔχω ἰδιομήνησον ἦνα βάλη με, (9:36) ἦν πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτῶν. Cf. Gal. 4:5; Rev. 19:15. Viteau8 strikingly compares Mt. 10:26, ὦ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται and ὦ οὐ γνωσθήσεται, with Mk. 4:22, ἦν μὴ ἦνα φανεροθῆ and ἦν ἔλθη εἰς φανερόν. The variety of construction with ὃς is illustrated by Mt. 24:2 (Lu. 21:6), ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται, and Mk. 13:2, ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ. The classic idiom preferred the fut. ind. for purpose with the relative (Schmid, Atticismus, IV, p. 621), but Isocrates (IV, 44) has ἐπὶ οἷς φιλοτιμήθησιν. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 138) cites for the κοινή Diod. XI, 21, 3, ὃς οὐ τρόπου— ἀνέλθη; XIV, 8, 3, ὃς ἦν ἔξελωσιν; Ach. Tatius, IV, 16, 13, ἰσον— λάβῃ, etc.

Purpose is often contemplated result so that the consecutive idea follows naturally that of design. Only the ind. future is used in the N. T., unless one follows Blass1 in taking ὃ προσενέγκῃ (Heb. 8:3) as result. A good instance of the future ind. is in Lu. 7:4, ἂξιος ἦστιν ὃ παρέξη, which may be profitably compared2 with the non-final use of ἦνα in Jo. 1:27, ἂξιος ἦνα λύσσω. Burton3 prefers to call this a “complementary limitation of the principal clause,” a sort of secondary purpose. But the notion is rather that of contemplated result. The relative denotes a kind of consequence from a particular quality or state.4 See also Ph. 2:20 οὐδένα ἔχω ἰδιομήνησον δότις— μεριμνήσει, Mk. 10:29 οὐδός ἐστιν ὃς ἀφήκην τὴν οἰκίαν, Lu. 7:49 τίς οὗτος ἐστιν ὃς καὶ ἄμαρτως ἐφίην; Cf. 2 Th. 3:3 πιστός ὃς with 1 Jo. 1:9 πιστὸς ἦν.

An example5 of the concessive use of οἵτινες is seen in Jas. 4:14, οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπιστασθε τῆς άφρον ποιά ἦ ᾶφοι ὠμῶν.

The conditional use of the relative clause is only true in a modified sense, as already shown. The relative ὃς and ὃς τις, whether with or without ὅ, does not mean ἐκ τις or ἐκν ὃς, though the two constructions are very much alike. There is a similarity between ἐκ τις τῆς θελής (Mk. 9:35) and ὃς ἦν ἀπέλη (10:43). But I do not agree to the notion of Goodwin6 and Burton7 that in the relative clauses we have a full-
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fledged set of conditional sentences on a par with the scheme with the conditional particles. That procedure is entirely too forced and artificial for the Greek freedom and for the facts. There is a general sort of parallel at some points, but it is confusion in syntax to try to overdo it with careful detail as Viteau does. Ἀν is not confined to the relative and conditional sentences, but occurs with ἐρετὰς, πρίν, ὡς, and ὀπως (temporal and final clauses). The indefinite relative like ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ (Mt. 8:35) or ὅπως ὀμολογήσει (Mt. 10:32) is quite similar in idea to a conditional clause with ἐὰν τις or εἴ τις. But, after all, it is not a conditional sentence any more than the so-called [Page 962] causal, final, consecutive relative clauses are really so. It is only by the context that one inferentially gets any of these ideas out of the relative. All that is true about the indefinite relative clauses has already been explained under that discussion. I therefore pass by any treatment of the kinds of conditional sentences in connection with the relative clauses.

(h) Negatives in Relative Clauses. When the subj. occurs the negative is μὴ, as in ὃς ἐὰν μὴ ἔχῃ (Lu. 8:18), but οὐ μὴ is found in Mk. 13:2, ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλύῃ. So in Mk. 9:1=Mt. 16:28 we have οὐ μὴ. With the indicative the negative is οὐ, as in ὃς οὐ λαμψάει (Mt. 10:38); ὃς ἔρῃ οὐκ ἔστι καθ' ὢμων (Lu. 9:50). Occasionally when the relative is indefinite the subjective negative μὴ occurs with the indicative. So ὃς μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα (2 Pet. 1:9); ὃς μὴ ὀμολογήσῃ (1 Jo. 4:3); ὃς μὴ δεῖ (Tit. 1:11). So also D in Ac. 15:29. Moulton (Prol., p. 171) calls this use of μὴ a survival of literary construction. He gives also some papyri examples (ib. p. 239) of μὴ in relative clauses: B.U. 114 (ii/A.D.) ἢν ἐποδέδωκεν αὐτῷ μὴ ἔσται λαβεῖν, C.P.R. 19 (iv/A.D.) ὃς μὴ συνεργήσῃ. The use of μὴ in relative clauses is more common in the κοινή than in the classic Greek (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 171). He cites examples from late Greek writers. There is nothing gained by explaining οὐ in relative clauses after the fashion of ἐἰ οὖ in conditional sentences as is done by Burton.1

2. CAUSAL SENTENCES.

(a) Paratactic Causal Sentences. These do not properly belong here, but there are so many of them that they compel notice. The common inferential particle γάρ introduces an independent, not a dependent, sentence. Paul uses it usually to introduce a separate sentence as in Ro. 2:28; 1 Cor. 15:9. In 1 Cor. 10:17 both ὅτι and γάρ occur. It will be treated in the chapter on Particles. Phrases like ὃν ὣν (Lu. 12:3), διό (Mt. 27:8), διὸπερ (1 Cor. 8:13), δὴν (Ac. 26:19), διὸ ἢν αὕτη (2 Tim. 1:6, 12), οὐ χάριν (Lu. 7:47) are not always regarded as formally causal. The construction is sometimes paratactic. Indeed, the subordination of the ὅτι and διότι clauses is often rather loose.2 Thus there is very little difference between ὅτι (begins the sentence with W. H.) in 1 Cor. 1:25 and γάρ in 1:26. Cf. also ἐπειδὴ in 1:22. See further ὅτι in 2 Cor. 4:6; 7:8, 14, and διότι in Ro. 3:20; 8:7. The causal sentence is primarily paratactic. [Page 963] See Mt. 6:5; Lu. 11:32; 1 Cor. 15:29; Heb. 10:2. The subordinate relative is a later development.1

8 Le Verbe, pp. 136 ff.
(b) With Subordinating Conjunctions. One may say at once that in the N. T. the mode is always the indicative. There is no complication that arises save with ὅτι when the apodosis of a condition of the second class is used without the protasis as in Heb. 10:2, ἐπεί οὐκ ὤν ἐπαινόσαντο. Here the construction is not due at all to ἐπεί. In the same way we explain ἐπεί ἔδει in Heb. 9:26 and ἐπεί ὥρα ἔφευλετε ἄρα in 1 Cor. 5:10. There is ellipsis also in the rhetorical question in 1 Cor. 15:29, ἐπεί τί ποιήσουσιν; But in Ac. 5:38 f. two complete conditional sentences (ἐάν and εἴ, protasis and apodosis) occur with ὅτι. In a word, it may be said that the indicative is used precisely as in the paratactic sentences. Cf. Jo. 14:19, ὅτι ἔγὼ ζῶ καὶ ὑμεῖν ζήσετε.

The negative is usually οὐ as in 1 Jo. 2:16. Once in the N. T., Jo. 3:18, ὅτι μὴ πεπιστευκέν, we have μή, but οὐ is seen in 1 Jo. 5:10, ὅτι οὐ πεπιστευκέν. “The former states the charge, quod non crediderit, the latter the simple fact, quod non credidit” (Moulton, Prol., p. 171). Cf. ὅτι μὴ in Epictetus IV, 4, 11; IV, 5, 8–9. Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., pp. 162, 535. The distinction is subtle, μή being more subjective and ideal. In Heb. 9:17, ἐπεί μὴ τότε (or μὴ ποτε) ἵσχεται, we likewise meet μή. In B. G. U. 530 (i/A.D.), ἔπει μὴ ἀντίδογμας αὐτῆ—ὅτι οὐκ ἔκμενας πρὸς σε, note ἔπει (εἴ) μή and ὅτι οὐκ with true distinction. With οὐ we have the objective fact, with μή the element of blame (μέμφεται) appears. “The comparison of Plutarch with the N. T. shows a great advance in the use of ὅτι μὴ” (Moulton, Prol., p. 239). Cf. also E. L. Green, Gildersleeve Studies, pp. 471 ff.; Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 171. He cites ὅτι μὴ ἔχεις, Epictetus IV, 10, 34. It is making inroads on ὅτι οὐ.

We sometimes have ὅθο ὅν in a truly causal sense as in Lu. 1:20, and that is true also of ὅθον in Mt. 14:7. In Heb. 2:18 ἔν ὃν is practically causal. So also ἔφο ὃν is causal in Ro. 5:12; 2 Cor. 5:4; Ph. 4:10. Cf. καθόθο (‘if right,’ P. Oxy. 38 (A.D. 49). The classical ἔφο ὃτε does not occur in the N. T. See ἔφο ὃν δῶσει, ‘on condition that he give,’ P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66).

Then ὃς may have almost the force of a causal particle as in Jo. 19:33; Mt. 6:12 (cf. Lu. 11:4, καὶ γὰρ); 2 Tim. 1:3. The same thing is true of καθός in Jo. 17:2. Καθός ὅσον is causal in Heb. 7:20 (9:27) and ἔφο ὅσον in Mt. 25:40, 45. So καθότι in Lu. 19:9 (cf. 1:7). In Ac. 17:31 HLP. read διότι. None of these particles are strictly causal, but they come to be so used in certain contexts in the later Greek. We have ὃς διότι in 2 Cor. 5:19; ὃς διότι θέός ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ (cf. our “since that”). Here the Vulgate has quoniam. But in 2 Cor. 11:21 the Vulgate renders ὃς διότι by quasi, as in 2 Th. 2:2, ὃς διότι ἐνέστηκεν. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 321 f. It is found also in Esther 4:14 and is post-classical.1

Διότι is found in the Lucan writings, the Pauline Epistles, Hebrews, James and 1 Peter. In the modern Greek2 it takes the form γιατί. Once (Ro. 8:21) some MSS. (W. H. read διότι) have διότι in the sense of objective διότι (‘that’) as in later Greek (cf. late


1 Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 98.
Latin *quia=quod*). Instances of causal διότι may be seen in Lu. 1:13; Ro. 1:19, etc. It is compounded of διά and ὅτι (cf. English “for that”). In Ph. 2:26 διότι is causal and ὅτι is declarative. In modern Greek διότι survives in ἥπατειώφασσα. The vernacular has ὅφοι, ἐπείδη, γιατί (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 194).

But all other causal particles are insignificant beside ὅτι which grew steadily in use. It was originally merely relative and paratactic. In 1 Jo. 4:3 note ὅ—ὁτι and ὅτι ὅ in Ro. 4:21. It is accusative neuter rel. ὅτι (cf. ὅτι ὅν προσδοκανήσησεν, Lu. 10:35) and more common as the objective particle in indirect discourse (subject or object clause) than as a causal conjunction. In 1 Jo. 5:9 ὅτι occurs twice, once as causal and once as objective particle. In 2 Th. 3:7 f. exegesis alone can determine the nature of ὅτι. In Jo. 3:19 Chrysostom takes ὅτι=‘because.’ Cf. also Jo. 16:8–11 (see Abbott, *Johannine Gr.*, p. 158). The English “the reason that” (vernacular “the reason why”) is similar. It is very common in 1 John in both senses. In Jo. 1:15 ff. causal ὅτι occurs three times in succession. In Lu. 9:49, ἐκολούθουσαν ὦτον ὅτι ὦκ ἐκολούθετο μεθ' ἡμῶν, the present is used because of a sort of implied indirect discourse. In Mk. 9:38 W. H. read ὅτι ὦκ ἐκολούθετο. A good example of causal ὅτι is seen in Ro. 5:8. The precise idea conveyed by ὅτι varies greatly. In Jo. 9:17, τὶ σὺ λέεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἤνεξεν σου τοὺς φθαλμοὺς; the use of ὅτι wavers between objective and causal. Cf. also Mk. 6:17. But we need not appeal to the Hebrew for a justification of this balancing of two ideas by ὅτι. So in Jo. 2:18, τὶ σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς. Akin to this construction is that in *Page 965* Jo. 14:22, τὶ γένοντο ὅτι, which is shortened into τὶ ὅτι in Ac. 5:4, 9. There is a correspondence sometimes between διὰ τοῦτο and ὅτι (Jo. 10:17); διὰ τὶ and ὅτι (Ro. 9:31 f.). Οὐχ ὅτι may be either objective or causal as in Ph. 4:11, 17; 2 Th. 3:9. In the ancient Greek it meant ‘not only do I say that, but I also say.’ But in the N. T. it either means ‘I say this not because’ or ‘I do not mean to say that,’ and usually the latter according to Abbott.

We must have a word about ἐπεί, ἐπείδη, ἐπείδησερ. As a matter of fact ἐπεί-ὁν-περ (note the composition) appears in the N. T. only in Lu. 1:1 (Luke’s classical introduction). This is undoubtedly a literary touch. ἐπείδη is read by W. H. in Lu. 7:1 and Ac. 13:46, but ἐπεί δὲ is put in the margin. Eight other examples remain, all in Luke (Gospel and Acts) and Paul (1 Corinthians and Philippians). Cf. Lu. 11:6; 1 Cor. 1:21 f. ἐπεί, obsolescent in the late Greek, is almost confined to Luke, Paul, the author of Hebrews. Elsewhere in Matthew, Mark and John. Two of these are examples of the temporal use (Mk. 15:42; Lu. 7:1 W. H. marg.). The ordinary causal sense is well illustrated in Mt. 21:46, ἐπεῖ ἐξερχόμενος ἐξέβαλον. The classical idiom of the ellipsis with ἐπεί has already been mentioned and is relatively frequent in the N. T. Cf. Ro. 3:6; 11:22; 1 Cor. 14:16; 15:29; Heb. 9:26; 10:2. It occurs in the simplest form in ἐπεί πῶς (Ro. 3:6) and ἐπεί τί (1 Cor. 15:29). In 1 Cor. 14:16, ἐπεῖ ἐνα, it is

---

3 Ib.
4 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 189.
5 As Viteau does in *Le Verbe*, p. 100. The LXX does show the idiom, as in 1 Ki. 1:8, τὶ ἐστὶ σοι ὅτι κλαίεις;
1 Joh. Gr. p. 162.
equivalent to ‘otherwise’ and in Ro. 11:22 to ‘else,’ ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ. The apodosis of a condition of the second class occurs in 1 Cor. 5:10; Heb. 9:26; 10:2.

Verbs of emotion in classical Greek sometimes used ἐ (conceived as an hypothesis) rather than ὅτι (a direct reason). The N. T. shows examples of θαυμάζω ἐ in this sense (Mk. 15:44; 1 Jo. 3:13), though θαυμάζω ὅτι is found also (Lu. 11:38; Gal. 1:6). ὅτι is the N. T. construction with ἰδανακτέω (Lu. 13:14); ἐξομολογόμαι (Mt. 11:25); εὐχαριστέω (Lu. 18:11); μέλει (Mk. 4:38); χάριν (Lu. 10:20); χολάω (Jo. 7:23). Cf. ὅτι and ἐφ᾽ ὧν in Ph. 4:10. On the possible causal use of ὅτε and ὅταν see article by Sheppard, The Cl. Rev., Sept., 1913.

(c) Relative Clauses. This matter received sufficient discussion under Relative Clauses. For examples of ὅς take Ro. 8:32; [Page 966] Heb. 12:6. For ὅστις note Mt. 7:15; Ro. 6:2. See also ὧν χαρίν (Lu. 7:47) and ὅτι ἴν αἰτήσαν (8:47).

(d) Διὰ τὸ and the Infinitive. The construction is common in the N. T., occurring thirty-two times according to Votaw as compared with thirty-five for the O. T. and twenty-six for the Apocrypha. It is particularly frequent in Luke. Cf. Lu. 2:4; 18:5; Ac. 4:2; 8:11, etc. It is not in John except in 2:24, διὰ τὸ αὐτόν γνώσκειν. Blass rejects it here because the Lewis MS. and Nonnus do not have the passage. Here note that ὅτι is used side by side with διὰ τὸ. So in Jas. 4:2 f. we have διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτάσθαι ἡμᾶς and διὰτο ἡμᾶς ἀπείτησθαν on a parity. Cf. Ph. 1:7, καθὼς and διὰ τὸ. In Mk. 5:4, διὰ τὸ διερήσθαι καὶ διεσπάρθαι καὶ συντετρίφθαι, note the perfect tense and the repetition of the infinitive. Burton thinks that here διὰ gives rather the evidence than the reason. Why not both? There is one example of the instrumental use of the infinitive to express cause, τῷ μή εὑρεθῇ με (2 Cor. 2:13). The text of B has six examples in the LXX (cf. 2 Chron. 28:22, τῷ θαλῆν αὐτόν). No examples of ἐπὶ τῷ occur.

(e) The Participle. We do not have ἐπεὶ, ὧν, ὃς, as in classical Greek, to give the real reason. That is given simply by the participle as in δίκαιος ὧν καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτήν δειγματίσαι (Mt. 1:19). It is “exceedingly common” (Moulton, Pri., p. 230).

4 Cf. ib.
1 The Use of the Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20. Mr. H. Scott notes pres. 24, aor. 1 (Mt. 24:12), perf. 7 times.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236.
3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236.
4 Votaw, The Use of the Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 29.
Moulton
Cf. Jas. 2:25; Ac. 4:21. But ὡς occurs with the participle to give the alleged reason, which may be the real one or mere assumption. Thus in Mt. 7:28 f., ὡς ἔξοστάν ἔξων καὶ ὡς ὡς ὁ γραμματέας, the first ὡς gives the ostensible (and true ground) of the astonishment of the people. Cf. also Lu. 16:1; Ac. 2:2. But in Lu. 23:14, ὡς ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν λαόν, Pilate does not believe the charge against Jesus to be true. So also with ὡς μελλόντων in Ac. 27:30.

3. COMPARATIVE CLAUSES. The discussion in my Short Grammar forms the basis of this section. The conjunctions employed are all of relative origin, but the construction deserves separate treatment.

(a) The Relative ὃς. This is a classic idiom and occurs only in Hebrews, except once in Mark. In Heb. 1:4 the correlative is expressed and the comparative form of the adjective is found [Page 967] in both clauses. Both correlative and relative are here in the instrumental case, τοσοῦτῳ κρεῖττων γενόμενος τῶν ἁγγέλων ὃς ἄγγελος διαφορώτερον παρὰ ἑαυτοῦς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὅνομα. The same phenomena are present in 8:6, save that the correlative is absent. In 10:25 there is no comparative in the relative clause. The others are examples of καθ’ ὃς. In 3:3 there is no correlative, but the comparative appears in both clauses. In 7:20 f. the correlative is κατὰ τοσοῦτο, but
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there is no comparative in the relative clause. This is probably causal in idea, as is true of καθό ἐσον in 9:27, where there is no comparative, though we have the correlative οὖτως καί. The example in Mk. 7:36, ἐσον δὲ αὐτῶις διεστέλλετο αὐτόι μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσον, lacks the correlative and has no comparative with the relative, but has a double comparison in the principal clause. In Jo. 6:11 and Rev. 21:16, ἐσον is simply relative, not a conjunction. The causal and temporal uses of ἐσον are discussed elsewhere.

(b) Relative ὡς with κατά. The singular καθό is found only in Ro. 8:26 καθό δὲ, 1 Pet. 4:13 καθό κοινοινεῖε, and 2 Cor. 8:12 καθό ἐδών ἐξῆθε εὐπροσδέκτως, oü καθό οὐκ ἐξῆθαι, where a good distinction is drawn between the subjunctive and the indicative. Cf. O. P. 1125, 14 (ii/α.δ.) καθό μισθοὶ μέρος. The construction with ἔδων is like that of the indefinite relative with ἦν (Ḍnv) and the subj. The plural καθαί is found only once in the N. T. (Mt. 27:10). Καθάπερ, however, is found seventeen times (three doubtful as compared with καθός, Ro. 9:13; 10:15; 2 Cor. 3:18) and all in Paul’s writings save in Heb. 4:2 (without verb). It is thoroughly Attic and a slight literary touch. Cf. 1 Cor. 10:10. The mode is always indicative, but cf. καθὸ ἄρεσκῃ in Gen. 19:8. In Ro. 12:4 the correlative is οὖτως.

(c) Καθότι in a Comparative Sense. It occurs only twice (Ac. 2:45; 4:35) and the same idiom precisely each time, καθότι ὃν τοῖς χρείαν ἔχειν. Here ἐδών seems to particularize each case from time to time (note imperfect tense), the iterative use of ἐδών (Moulton, Pro l., p. 167). This usage approaches the temporal in idea. The classic idiom of the aorist ind. with ἐδών no longer appears with these conjunctions.

(d) Οὐς and its Compounds. These are the most common comparative particles. The most frequent of all is ὦς itself which has various other uses as exclamatory (ὦς ὄραϊοι ιλ πόδες in Ro. 10:15), declarative like ὅτι (Ac. 10:28), causal (Mt. 6:12), temporal (Lu. 12:58), with the infinitive (Lu. 9:52; Heb. 7:9), as a final particle (ὦς τελειώσω, Ac. 20:24, W. H. text), with superlative (Page 968) adverbs (ὦς τάχιστα, Ac. 17:15), with the sense of ‘about,’ as ὦς δισχίλιοι (Mt. 5:13) and with participles (ὦς μέλλων, Ac. 23:20). The richness of this particle is thus illustrated. But the comparative relative adverb is the origin of them all. In Heb. 3:11; 4:3 ὦς may be consecutive ‘so,’ but ὦς is more often comparative than anything else. Usually ὦς has a correlative. Thus οὖτως—ὡς (1 Cor. 4:1); ὦς—οὖτως (Ac. 8:32); ὦς—οὖτως καί (2 Cor. 7:14); ὦς—καί (Gal. 1:9); ἰσος—ὡς καί (Ac. 11:17); καί—ὡς καί (Mt. 18:33). But often no correlative is expressed (cf. Mt. 8:13).1 The verb is not always expressed. Thus ὦς οἰ ὑποκριται (Mt. 6:5). This predicate use of ὦς is very extensive. Cf. ὦς καί (1 Cor. 7:7). The mode is usually the indicative, as in Mk. 10:1, but the subj. occurs in Mk. 4:26, ὦς ἄνθρωπος βαλη (cf. ὦς οὖκ οἶδεν. Blass considers this “quite impossible,” but it is read by RBD. Some late MSS. add ἐδών and others read ὅταν, but surely ἐδών (Ḍnv) is not “indispensable” to the subj. (cf. Mt. 10:33). In Gal. 6:10, ὦς καρφῶν ἐξωμεν, the temporal ὦς is likewise minus ἐδών. See Relative Clauses and discussion of ἐκ which is by no means necessary in these subj. clauses. Cf.

1 In general correlatives are rare in the LXX. Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 142. 2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 321.
4. LOCAL CLAUSES. These are all relative adverbial sentences and are usually treated with relative sentences, but they are worthy of a separate note. The adverbs (conjunctions) used are ὅποιος, οἷς, ὅπου. With ὅποιος only the indicative is found as in Lu. 11:24, ὅποιον ἐξήλθον. More common than ὅποιος is οἷς as in Mt. 2:9, οἷς ἦν τὸ παιδίον. Cf. past perfect in Ac. 20:8. It occurs mainly in Luke’s writings and always with the indicative save once in 1 Cor. 16:6, οἷς ἔχων πορεύομαι. Here the indefinite relative naturally has ὅν and the subjunctive. οἷς is used with verbs of motion as well as with those of rest as this passage shows. Cf. also Lu. 10:1, οἷς ἤμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι. But ὅπου is the usual local conjunction in the N. T., particularly in Matthew, Mark and John (Gospel and Revelation). It occurs with verbs of rest as in Mk. 2:4, ὅπου ἦν, and of motion as in Jo. 7:34, ὅπου ὑπάγω. The indicative is the usual mode. Once, Mk. 6:56, ὅπου ἔστειλεν ὁ Χριστός, we find ὅν to emphasize the notion of repetition in the imperfect tense, but this is not necessary. Cf. ὅποιος οὖν ἔλεις (Jo. 21:18). Note the emphatic negative in ὅποιος οὖν ἔλεις (ib.). Cf. also ὅποιον ὑπάγει (Rev. 14:4) where ὅν occurs with the present ind. (indefinite relative). In ὅποιου φάγῳ (Mk. 14:14; Lu. 22:11), as noted on p. 964, the subj. is probably deliberative, answering to ποῦ φάγω in the direct question. Cf. οὖκ ἐξελεῖσθαι ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ (Lu. 9:58). But the subj. with ἐὰν in ὅποιον ἔκακον ἐπέρχεται (Lu. 9:57) is the common futuristic subj. So in the parallel passage in Mt. 8:19. See further Mt. 24:28; 26:13; Mk. 6:10; 9:18; 14:9, 14. Curiously enough all the N. T. instances of ὅποιος with the subj. are found in the Synoptic Gospels. There is ellipsis of the copula in Rev.

2:13, as is not infrequent with relatives. ὅπου is used also in metaphorical relations, as in Heb. 9:16. The correlative adverb ἐκεῖ occasionally appears with ὅπου as in Lu. 12:34; 17:37; Jo. 12:26. Καί is a correlative in Jo. 17:24. The use of ὅπου in classical Greek is confined to indefinite sentences, but the N. T. shows a frequent use (especially in John) [Page 970] where there is a definite antecedent.\(^1\) Cf. Jo. 1:28; 4:46; 7:42; 10:40; 12:1, etc.

5. TEMPORAL CLAUSES.

(a) Kin to Relative Clauses in Origin and Idiom. Blass\(^2\) bluntly says that temporal clauses introduced by ὅτε and ὅταν “are generally only a special class of relative sentence, and exhibit the same constructions.” The same thing is true of local sentences. Burton\(^3\) carries this conception to such a point that he has no separate treatment of temporal sentences at all. This is surely going too far. Thompson\(^4\) sees the matter rightly when he says: “The vague original relative import becomes specialized.” Hence we expect to find both definite and indefinite temporal clauses as with other relative (and local) clauses. Definite temporal clauses may be illustrated by Mt. 7:28, ὅτε ἔτελεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ δύναμις. The indefinite is shown in Jo. 15:26, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος. The temporal clause may be indefinite in its futurity, frequency and duration.\(^5\) Indefinite futurity is the most common, indefinite duration the least common. The modes used in temporal clauses in the N. T. are the indicative and the subjunctive. These uses conform to the historical development of the two modes. There is one example of the optative in a temporal clause (Ac. 25:16, ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπερήπτης ὑποτελεί ἡ ἑτοίμασις ἔργον τοῦ Ἰησοῦς, ἐξῆκε τῷ ἔργῳ τῆς ἁγίας τόπον τῇ ἀκολογίᾳ νόμου περὶ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος). Here, as is evident, the optative is due to indirect discourse, not to the temporal clause. The subjunctive with ὅν(πρὶς ἡ ὅν ἐξήκει—νόμος) occurs rather than the optative according to sequence of modes. This sequence was optional and a classic idiom, and so is found in the N. T. only in Luke’s writings. Observe that ἔστιν is retained in the indicative. This sentence is a fine illustration of the Greek subordinate clauses. In the context in Acts it is seen that four dependent clauses precede the πρὶς ἡ clause in the long sentence. The use of ὅν or ἐὰν in temporal clauses has very much the same history as in other relative clauses. The usage varies with different conjunctions and will be noted in each instance. The point of time in the temporal clause may be either past, present or future. It is a rather complicated matter, the Greek temporal clause, but not so much so as the Latin cum clause, “in which the Latin language [Page 971] is without a parallel.”\(^1\) The different constructions may be conveniently grouped for discussion. Just as the optative with temporal clauses vanished, so there came a retreat of various

---

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 218.
3 N. T. M. and T., pp. 118, 126 ff.
4 Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 329.
5 Ib., p. 328.
temporal conjunctions. As a result in the later Greek the construction is much simpler.\(^2\)

\(b\) **Conjunctions Meaning 'When.'** The classic use of the optative for repetition with such clauses has been effectually sidetracked in the vernacular κοινή (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 130). Only the ind. and subj. modes occur in these clauses. Ἐπεί has vanished\(^3\) in this sense, save in Lu. 7:1 where it is a variant (margin in W. H. and Nestle) for ἐπειδῇ, the correct text. Curiously enough this is also the only instance of the temporal use of ἐπειδῇ in the N. T., ἐπειδῇ ἐπλήρωσεν. It is a definite point of time in the past and naturally the indicative occurs. There are three examples of ἐπὰν, all with the subjunctive (Mt. 2:8, ἐπὰν εὕρητε; Lu. 11:22, ἐπὰν νκήσῃ; 11:34, ἐπὰν ἠ where it is parallel with δὲν ἠ). There are only two instances of Ἑνίκα (2 Cor. 3:15, 16, Ἑνίκα ἄν ἄναγινώσκηται, Ἑνίκα ἀν ἐπιστρέψῃ). It is the indefinite idea as the subjunctive shows. Note ἄν and ἠ (indefinite also and with notion of repetition). Nestle (AEH) reads ὁπότε ἐπείνασεν in Lu. 6:3, but W. H. and Souter (*NBCD*) have ὁπότε. ὁπόταν does not occur in the N. T. ὁτὲ and ὁταν are both common and in all parts of the N. T. The connection between ὁτὲ (cf. ὅ-θεν, Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 254) and Homeric ὁτὲ and ὅς τε (Monro, *Hom. Gr.*, p. 191) is disputed.\(^4\) Cf. the conjunction ὅτε from ὅς and ὅτι from ὅστες. Homer used ὁτὲ as a causal conjunction like ὅτι. Only the indicative (see below) mode appears with ὁτὲ in the N. T., but it occurs with past, present and future. Usually the events are definite, as in Mt. 21:1, ὁτὲ ἤγγισαν ἐν Ἰεροσόλυμα. The present time is rare, as in ὁτὲ γέγονα ἄν Ἰν in 1 Cor. 13:11; ὅτε θῇ in Heb. 9:17. In Mk. 11:1 ἐγγίζουσιν is the historic present. The great bulk of the examples are in the past with the aorist indicative, though the imperfect occurs for custom or repetition, as in Jo. 21:18; Col. 3:7. The future indicative is naturally indefinite even when ὁτὲ is preceded by a word like ὅρα (Jo. 4:21, 23) or ἡμέρα (Ro. 2:16. Incorporated in W. H.). Souter’s Rev. Text (so W. H.) has *Page 972* ἦς ἐπήτε in Lu. 13:35, but Nestle still reads ἦς
The text is in much confusion, but at any rate here is manuscript evidence for the subjunctive with ὅτε without ἄν. This is in harmony with what we saw was true of ὃς and ὅστις. It is also a well-known Homeric idiom. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 164) cites ὅτε ἀρξηται (Vettius, pp. 106, 36). ὅταν naturally occurs more frequently with the subjunctive for indefinite future time. It is usually the aorist tense, as in Mt. 24:33, ὅταν ἔρχεται. The present subj. does occur when the notion of repetition is implied, as in Mt. 15:2, ὅταν ἄρτον ἔσται. Cf. Mt. 6:2. Once the idea of duration seems manifest (Jo. 9:5, ὅταν ἔν τῷ κόσμῳ ὄν), but usually it is future uncertainty simply. It is not necessary to take the common aorist subj. here as the Latin futurum exactum. Cf. ὅταν παραδοσῶ in Mk. 4:29. The ἄν (ὅτε ἄν) is always present save in the doubtful ὅτε ἔσπητε of Lu. 13:35. ὅτε with the subj. is found in poetry and in the Byzantine writers. So Test. XII Pat. Levi 2:10 ὅτε ἄνελθῃ ἐκεῖ. On the other hand a number of examples occur of ὅταν with the indicative (cf. ἐάν and ὅσον ἄν with the indicative). Homer, Iliad, 20, 335, has ὅτε κεν ἐξιμβλήσατο αὐτῷ. So in Rev. 4:9 we find ὅταν δώσουσιν. The close affinity in form and meaning of the aorist subj. with the future indicative should cause no surprise at this idiom. In Lu. 13:28 BD read ὅταν ὦσσθε, though W. H. put ὄψησθε in the text. A good many manuscripts likewise have ὅταν with the future ind. in Mt. 10:19 and 1 Tim. 5:11. Cf. ὅταν ἔσται in Clem., Cor. 2, 12, 1. Moulton (Prol., p. 168) notes in the papyri only a small number of examples of ὅταν with temporal clauses and the ind. Thus ὅταν ἔβημεν in Par. P. 26 (ii/iii A.D.); ἔδωκαν ἐσπερᾷν in B. U. 424 (ii/iii A.D.); ὅταν ἄναρκται in B. U. 607 (ii/iii A.D.). It is common in the LXX, Polybius, Strabo, etc. See Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 463; Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 164. Ramsay (Cit. and B., ii, p. 477, no. 343) gives ὅταν ἔζων ἐγώ a “curious anti-Christian inscription” (Moulton, Prol., p. 239). A few instances occur of ὅταν with the present indicative. So ὅταν στήκετε in Mk. 11:25. Here some MSS. have the subj., as in Ro. 2:14 some read ὅταν ποιεῖτε. Cf. also various readings in Mk. 13:4, 7. This construction is not unknown in earlier writers, though more common in the κοινή. Cf. Ex. 1:16; Ps. 101:3; Prov. 1:22; Josephus, Ant., xii, 2, 3; Strabo, I, 1, 7; Act. Apocr., 126. In 2 Cor. 12:10, ὅταν ἀσθενῶ, we probably have the present subj. Cf. 1 Th. 3:8, ἄν στήκετε. The examples of ὅταν with the aorist or imperfect indicative are more numerous. In Thucydides ὅτε
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was always definite and ὁπότε indefinite. 1 Ὅταν with the optative appears in Xenophon. 2 The Atticists have ἐπειδ' ὁταν and ὁπόταν (sic) with the opt. (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 165). In the κοινή the field of Ὅταν is widened, as already shown. Agathias uses Ὅταν with the aorist indicative. 3 It is common in the Septuagint to have Ὅταν with past tenses (Gen. 38:11; 1 Sam. 17:34, Ὅταν ἦρχετο; Ps. 119:7, Ὅταν ἐλάλουν; Num. 11:9; Ps. 118:32; Dan. 3:7). 4 The usual notion is that of indefinite repetition. Thus we note it in Polybius 4, 32, 5, Ὅταν μὲν οὐτοὶ ἦσαν, ἐγένετο τὸ δέον. Strabo I, 1, 7 has Ὅταν φησίν. Cf. also 13, 7, 10. In Tobit 7:11 observe ὁπότε ἔαν. In Mk. 3:11 we have Ὅταν αὐτόν ἔθεωρον, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ. Cf. Ὅτου ἄν and Ὅτοι ἄν in Mk. 6:56. But the κοινή writers used Ὅταν with the aorist indicative for a definite occurrence. This is common in the Byzantine writers. In the modern Greek Ὅταν is freely used with the indicative. 6 See Philo II, 112, 23, Ὅταν εἰς ἔνω ᾦδεν. Blass 7 calls this quite incorrect, though the LXX has ως ἐν ἔξηλθεν Ἰακώβ (Gen. 27:30; cf. 6:4) of “a single definite past action.” There are two examples in the N. T., Mk. 11:19, Ὅταν ὑψε ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως (possible to understand it as repetition), and Rev. 8:1, Ὅταν ἰησοῦν τῆς σφραγίδας τῆς ἄβδομης. But, as Moulton (Prol., p. 248) observes, it is possible to regard ἐξεπορεύοντο in Mk. 11:19 as pictorial rather than iterative and the papyri examples of Ὅταν, as seen above, allow either usage. Simcox 9 explains this “lapse” on the ground that Mark and the author of the Apocalypse are the least correct of the N. T. writers. But the idiom belonged to the vernacular κοινή Ὅφελον ἀπεθάνωμεν—_OLD_ Ὅταν ἐκαθίσαμεν ἐπὶ τῶν λεβήτων καὶ ἠθίμοι ὅρτους. See Ex. 16:3, Ὅσάκες is only used with the notion of indefinite repetition. It occurs [Page 974] four times in the N. T. (1 Cor. 11:25 f.; Rev. 11:6), each time with ἔαν and the subjunctive. These points are all obvious.

Ὡς is rather common in the N. T. as a temporal conjunction. It is originally a relative adverb from ὡς and occurs in a variety of constructions. The temporal use is closely allied to the comparative. Cf. ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὄδῷ (Lu. 24:32). So Jo. 12:36. The temporal aspect is sharp in Mk. 9:21 where ὡς means ‘since.’ The examples in the N. T. are usually in the aorist or imperfect indicative as in Jo. 6:12, 16; Ac. 8:36 and chiefly refer to definite incidents. In 1 Cor. 12:2, ὡς ἄν ἦγεσθε, we

---

1 Winifred Warren, A Study of Conjunctional Temp. Clauses in Thucydides, 1897, p. 73. Ὅτε is found twice in 1 Thuc. with the optative, but Miss Warren reads ὁπότε.
2 Bäumlein, Unters. über die griech. Modi und die Partik. κέν und ἄν, 1846, p. 322.
5 W.-M., p. 389.
6 Ib.; Mullach, Vulg., p. 368.
7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 218.
8 W.-M., p. 389.
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have the imperfect ind. with ἄν for the notion of repetition (cf. ὅταν). So in Aristeas 7, 34, ὦς ἄν ἡμέραντο. In modern Greek οὖν (from ὦς ἄν) is used for ‘when’ (Thumb, Handb., p. 192). The use of ὦς ἄν=‘as if’ is that of conditional, not modal, ἄν, and is very common in the papyri (Moulton, Prol., p. 167). See Conditions. As early as i/b.c. the papyri show examples of ὦς ἄν=ὅταν (originally ὦς ἄν=‘as soon as’). Cf. Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 164; Rhein. Mus., 1901, p. 206; Hib. P. I, 44, 45. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 164) gives ὦς ἄν οἶμαι, Dion. Hal. and Dio Chrys., ὦς ἄν ὑμείν ἐδοξεν, Luc. Alex. 22. But ὦς is used a few times with the subjunctive, thrice with ἄν (Ro. 15:24; 1 Cor. 11:34; Ph. 2:23), once without ἄν (Gal. 6:10), ὦς καὶ ἄν ἐξανε. In classical Greek this futurist subj. would have ἄν (Moulton, Prol., p. 248 f.). With the last construction compare Mk. 4:26. In the temporal use ὦς ἄν is not common in Attic. In Mk. 9:21 note πόσος χρόνος—ὡς. In Ac. 17:15 we have ὦς τάχιστα, a remnant of the rather frequent use of ὦς with superlative adverbs. It is possible that καθώς has a temporal sense in Ac. 7:17 (cf. 2 Macc. 1:31).

(c) The Group Meaning ‘Until’ (‘While’). The words in this list have a more complex history than those in the preceding one. They are ἄχρι, μέχρι, ἐως and πρὶν, ἄρτι (twice in the N. T., ἄρτις, Gal. 3:19 and Heb. 3:13) is more frequently a preposition (cf. ἄρτι καὶροῦ, Lu. 4:13) than a conjunction. It is rare in Greek prose and ἄρτι ἄν only in poetry.1 But Philo (I, 166, 20) has ἄρτις ἄν—σβέσαε. But the simple conjunction is less frequent than the compound form (preposition and relative), as ἄρτι μὲν (Lu. 21:24) and ἄρτι ἡ ἡμέρας (Mt. 24:38). Sometimes the MSS. vary between ἄρτι, μέχρι, and ἐως, as in Mt. 13:30 (preposition). Cf. Ac. 1:22. Past tenses of the indicative are used of an actual historical event. No example of the simple ἄρτι appears [Page 975] in this construction in the N. T., but we have ἄρτι μὲν ἄνεση (Ac. 7:18) and ἄρτι ἡ ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθεν (Lu. 17:27). The only instance of the present ind. is in Heb. 3:13, ἄρτις ὦ ἄν τὸ σήμερον καλέσαν. Here the meaning is ‘so long’ (linear) or ‘while’ (cf. ἐως). The more common use is with reference to the indefinite future. In two instances (Rev. 17:17, ἄρτι τελεσθήσονται, and 2:25, ἄρτι ὦ ἄν ἡ ἔρως. This latter could be aorist subj.) the future indicative is read. Elsewhere we meet the
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1 Meisterh.-Schwyzer, Gr. d. attisch. Inschr., p. 251.
subjunctive, either without ἄν (ἀχρις σφαγίσωμεν in Rev. 7:3 and ἄχρι τελεσθῇ in 20:3, 5; ἄχρι οὗ ἔλησα in 1 Cor. 11:26; ἄχρι ἤς ήμέρας γένηται in Lu. 1:20) or with ἄν (ἀχρίς ἄν ἔληση in Gal. 3:19, though W. H. put just ἄχρις οὗ in the margin). Here the time is relatively future to the principal verb προσετέθη, though it is secondary. The subj. is retained instead of the optative on the principle of indirect discourse. As a matter of fact ἄν occurs only twice, the other instance being Rev. 2:25 above. Cf. ἄχρις ἰδαν πληρωθῇ, O. P. 1107, 3 (v/A.D.). Μέχρις (so twice, Mk. 13:30; Gal. 4:19, and once µέχρις, Eph. 4:13) occurs only three times as a conjunction. In Eph. 4:13 it is µέχρι simply, in the other examples µέχρις οὗ. In all three instances the aorist subj. is used without ἄν for the indefinite future. The use as a preposition is more frequent. Cf. µέχρι ᾮωνου (Lu. 16:16) and µέχρις αἵματος (Heb. 12:4). It means ‘up to the point of.’

The κοινή writers show a rather varied use of µέχρι (cf. Diodorus, Strabo, Polybius, Josephus, Justin Martyr). They, like the papyri, have µέχρι and µέχρις οὗ with and without ἄν (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 140). Ἐως is much more frequent in the N. T. both as preposition (cf. Ἐως οὐρανοῦ, Mt. 11:23) and as conjunction. The prepositional use is illustrated also in Ἐως τοῦ ἔλθεν (Ac. 8:40). The prepositional use (more frequent than the conjunctional) goes back as far as Aristotle and denotes the terminus ad quem. Ἐως is Attic for Homeric Ἑς and Doric ὁς.2 As with ἄχρι and µέχρι, we find Ἐως alone as a conjunction (Mt. 2:9), Ἐως οὗ (Mt. 14:22) and Ἐως ὅτου (5:25). It is used both with the indicative and the subjunctive. When an actual event is recorded in the past only the aorist indicative is used. This is the usual classic idiom.3 So Ἐως ἦλθεν (Mt. 24:39), Ἐως οὗ ἔτεκεν (1:25), Ἐως ὅτου ἀφώνησαν (Jo. 9:18). When the present ind. appears with Ἐως the notion is ‘while,’ not ‘until,’ and it is either a contemporaneous event, as in Ἐως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν δῆλον (Mk. 6:45). [Page 976] Note dependence on ἣνάγκασεν, like indirect discourse), or a lively proleptic future in terms of the present, as in Ἐως ἔρχομαι πρόσεχε τῇ ἄναγνώσει (1 Tim. 4:13) and in Jo. 21:22 f. It is possible to take Mk. 6:45 as this proleptic future.1 Indeed some MSS. here give also ἀπολύσῃ and –τα. In Mt. 14:22 the reading (in the parallel passage) is Ἐως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ. Cf. the construction with the Latin dum. In Lu. 19:13 W. H. read ἐν ὕ ἔρχομαι instead of Ἐως ἔρχομαι. Instead of Ἐως ἠμέρα ἐστίν (Jo. 9:4) W. H. have ὅς in the margin, though keeping Ἐως in text (as does Nestle). If Ἐως is
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genuine, it is clearly ‘while,’ not ‘until.’ In Jo. 12:35 f. W. H. read in the text ὡς, not ἐός. We have, besides, ἐός ὅτου ἐι in Mt. 5:25. Most of the examples of ἐός deal with the future and have only the subj. after the classic idiom. The future, being identical in form with the aorist subj., is possible in the cases of ἐός ὃν ἀναπέμψω (Ac. 25:21) and ἐός ὅτου σκάψω (Lu. 13:8), but the regular subj. is the probable idiom. In Lu. 13:35 some MSS. have ἐός ἥξει (see (b)), but W. H. reject ἥξει ὅτε. Both ἐός ὃν and ἐός ὅτου are used, but always without ἄν. So ἐός ὃν ἀνέλωσιν (Ac. 23:21) and ἐός ὅτου πληρωθῇ (Lu. 22:16). With simple ἐός it is more common to have ἄν. So ἐός ἄν ἀποδῶ τὸ ὄρεστόν (Mt. 5:26), but note ἐός ἔλθῃ (10:23). ἄν is not essential in this construction. Cf. Lu. 12:59; 15:4; 22:34. In Mk. 14:32, ἐός προσέπωμαι, the notion is rather ‘while’ than ‘until.’ Cf. Mt. 14:22; 26:36; Lu. 17:8. But the note of expectancy suits the subjunctive. In Mt. 18:30, ἐβάλεν αὐτόν αἰς φυλακὴν ἐός ἀποδῶ τὸ ὄρεστόν, the subj. is retained after secondary tense of the indicative as in indirect discourse. ἐός occurs after negative verbs also (cf. πρίν), as in Lu. 22:34. Moulton (Prol., p. 169) quotes Tb. 6 (ii/b.c.) ἐός μένωσιν, G. H. 38 (i/b.c.) ἐός καταβῇς. In the papyri ἄν, as in the N. T., is often absent from these conjunctions meaning ‘until.’ Rademacher (N. T. Gr., p. 140) finds ἐός and the subj. common in the papyri, the inscrs. and the κοινὴ writers. Blass3 thinks he sees a certain affinity with final sentences in the subj. with these conjunctions for the future indefinite. At any rate it is good Attic and should cause no trouble. The κοινὴ fully agrees with the ancient idiom. It is, of course, a matter of taste with the writer whether he will regard a future event as a present reality or a future uncertainty to be hoped for and attained.

Πρίν is a comparative form (cf. superlative πρῶτος) like the Latin [Page 977] prius. It is the neuter accusative singular. It is really the same in idea as πρῶτος, ‘before,’ ‘formerly.’ Pindar uses it as a preposition with the ablative πρὶν ὧρας=πρὸ ὧρας. The original construction with πρὶν was the infinitive, though the subj. and the optative occur with it in Homer. Homer has it 81 times with the infinitive, 6 with the subj., once with the opt. and not at all with the indicative. The word developed so much importance in the later Greek that Goodwin in his Moods and Tenses gives it a separate extensive discussion (pp. 240–254). In the N. T. there are only fourteen examples of it and all of them in the Gospels and Acts. Eleven of the fourteen are with the infinitive (cf. Homer). Cf. πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν (Jo. 4:49), πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι (8:58). Six times we have πρὶν η, as in Mt. 1:18. Luke alone uses the classic idiom of πρὶν with the subj. or opt. after negative sentences. In both instances it is only relative future after secondary tenses, but in Lu. 2:26, μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον πρὶν [ἡ] ἄν ἰδῇ τὸν
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Christ's kuriou, the subj. is retained according to the usual rule in indirect discourse in the koine (so often in the Attic). In Ac. 25:16, as already explained (p. 970), πρὶν ἧ ἔχεται—λάβειν after ἀπεκρίθην ὅτι ὦκε ἔστιν is changed from the subj. to the opt. as is possible in indirect discourse, a neat classic idiom found in Luke alone in the N. T. Some of the MSS. do not have ὅν in Lu. 2:26 and ἦ Δεῦ here. A few MSS. have πρὶν ἦ in Lu. 22:34. The papyri writers do not show the same consistency as Luke in the use of πρὶν. But note μήτε διότι—πρὶν αὐτῷ ἡττεύτησιν, O. P. 34 (ii/AD.). For ‘until’ ἦ Δεῦ kept the field. Indeed in Lu. 22:34, ο mallocis σήμερον ἅλεκτορ ἦσος τρὶς ἔπαρνηται, we see ἦ Δεῦ where πρὶν would usually come (Radermacher, N. T. Gk., p. 164). Very early πρὸ τοῦ and inf. also began to displace πρὶν (see Verbal Nouns). In the modern Greek πρὶν holds its place (also πρὶ νά, δὲ, πρῶτος) with ind. and subj. (Thumb, Handb., p. 193). The N. T. does not have ἦ Δεῦ, but the papyri show it. Cf. ἦ Δεῦ ἦ Δεῦ, Amh. P. II, 81, 11 (iii/AD.). See also Job 13:22 ἦ.

(d) Some Nominal and Prepositional Phrases. We have already seen in the case of ἔχρι, μεχρὶ and ἦ Δεῦ how they occur with relative pronouns as conjunctive phrases. The same thing occurs with a number of temporal phrases. Thus ἦκο ὦ. In Lu. 13:7 ἦκο ὦ is preceded by τριὰ ἔνη as the terminus a quo. It means ‘since.’ Cf. τρίτην ταῦτην ἡμέραν ἔγει ἦκο ὦ in Lu. 24:21. In Rev. 16:18 it is the simple equivalent of ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἔκτε as in the Attic Greek and Herodotus. In these examples the indicative occurs, but in Lu. 13:25, ἦκο ὦ ἦ ἔγει ἔρορῆ, the construction of ἦ Δεῦ is used for the uncertain future, the subj. with ὅν. The conception of ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἔκτε has to be appealed to, ‘from that moment when,’ ‘when once’ the master arises. In like manner we see ἦκο ἦς ἦς used for ‘since’ in Lu. 7:45; Ac. 24:11; 2 Pet. 3:4. In Col. 1:6, 9 we have the form ἦκο ἦς ἦς ἦς ἐρμήρας. ἦν ὅ is not always temporal. It may be merely local (Ro. 2:1), instrumental (Ro. 14:21) or causal (Ro. 8:3). The temporal use is much like ἦ Δεῦ in the sense of ‘while,’ as in Mk. 2:19 (Lu. 5:34) ἦν ὅ νομφριός μετα αὐτῶν ἐστίν. Cf. Jo. 5:7, ἦν ὅ ἐρμομαί with ἦς ἐρμομαί in Jo. 21:22. In Lu. 19:13 the Text. Rec. has ἦ Δεῦ ἐρμομαί, but ἦν ὅ is the true reading. In 1 Pet. 1:6 ἦν ὅ has its antecedent expressed in the preceding sentence and means ‘wherein.’ In Mk. 2:19 we see ὅ σον ὄνων for duration of time. In Mt. 9:15 the shorter ἦκο ἦσον occurs, while in Heb. 10:37 note ὅ σον ὅ σον (a Hebraism from the LXX, though paralleled in the papyri). In Ro. 7:1 we read ἦκο ἦσον ὄνων, the fullest form of all. Moulton (Prol., p. 169) cites C.P.R. 24, 25 (ii/AD.) ἦκο ὅ ὅ σον (note absence of ἦ).

(e) The Temporal Use of the Infinitive. There are nine examples of πρὸ τοῦ and the infinitive. In the LXX there are 35 examples (Votaw, The Infinitive in Bibl. Gk., p. 20). These examples all have the accusative with the infinitive, as in πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αὐτῆσα αὐτόν (Mt. 6:8. Cf. Lu. 2:21; 22:15; Jo. 1:48 f.; 17:5; Ac. 23:15; Gal. 2:12; 3:23), except Jo. 13:19, πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, but even here it is implied. The tense is aorist except a present in Jo. 17:5. The sense is quite like πρὶν (see before). The inscriptions (Moulton, Prol., p. 214) show scattered examples of πρὸ τοῦ and inf. The use of ἦν τῶν as ‘when’ or ‘while’ is much more common. It occurs only 6 times in

5 Moulton, Prol., p. 169 note.
Thucydides, Plato 26 times, Xenophon 16 times. But it is very common in the Septuagint as a translation of the Hebrew ב and the infinitive construct. Moulton admits a Hebraism here in the sense of ‘during,’ a meaning not found in the vernacular κοινή so far. The construction is, however, very common in Luke, the most literary of the N. T. writers, and in all parts of his Gospel. It is found both in the sense of ‘while’ and ‘when.’ Usually it is the present tense that has the notion of ‘while’ and the aorist that of ‘when.’ So in Lu. 1:8 note ἐν τῷ ἱερατεύειν αὐτόν, (2:27) ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονέοις τῷ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν. The examples are numerous (55 in the N. T.), but the LXX shows 500 instances, undoubted proof of the influence of the Hebrew there, where it is nearly as common as all other prepositions with the infinitive. This use of ἐν τῷ and the infinitive is not always temporal. In Lu. 12:15 it is rather the content than the time that is meant. In Lu. 1:21 it may be causal. Μετὰ τὸ and the infinitive we find fifteen times in the N. T. In the LXX the construction appears 108 times according to Votaw. It has the resultant meaning of ‘after’ and always has the aorist infinitive except the perfect in Heb. 10:15. It is found in Luke, Paul, Matthew, Mark, Hebrews, and chiefly in Luke. A good example is found in μετὰ τὸ ἄποκτεναι (Lu. 12:5). See also Ac. 7:4; 10:41. Mention should also be made of ἔως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν in Ac. 8:40, as in the LXX (Judith 1:10; 11:19). It occurs 52 times in the O. T. and 16 in the Apocrypha. But note μέχρι τοῦ πλεῖν, P. B. M. 854 (i/A.D.). On prepositions and inf. see Verbal Nouns.

(f) Temporal Use of the Participle. This subject will demand more extended treatment under the head of the Participle (Verbal Nouns). Here it may be noted that the participle does not of itself express time. We may in translation render the participle by a temporal clause with ‘as,’ ‘while,’ ‘since,’ ‘when,’ ‘after,’ etc., like the Latin cum. As a rule the unadorned participle in English is enough to bring out the idea. The participle may be co-ordinated in translation with the principal verb by the use of ‘and.’ The present participle is merely descriptive and contemporaneous, as ἄποθνήσκων (Heb. 11:21). The aorist participle has either simultaneous action, as ἔστασάμενοι (Ac. 25:13), or antecedent, as ἐμβάντα (Mt. 13:2). The wealth of participles gave the Greek a great advantage over the Latin in this matter. In the flourishing period of the language the temporal participle vied with the conjunctions in the expression of temporal relations. In the κοινή this use of the participle is still quite live, as almost any page of the N. T. shows, though it has manifestly in places shrunk before the analytic tendency to use conjunctions and finite verbs. This tendency to use conjunctions is still more noticeable in modern Greek.

Page 980 6. FINAL AND CONSECUTIVE CLAUSES.

(a) Kinship. It is a difficult matter to correlate properly these subordinate clauses. They nearly all have relative adverbs as conjunctions. Often the same conjunction is
used indifferently in a number of different kinds of clauses. So ὡς in comparative, declarative, causal, temporal, final, consecutive, indirect interrogative, exclamatory. In like manner ὅπως has a varied use. Cf. the Latin ut, which is comparative, final, apprehensive, consecutive. The English that and German daß have a like history. Goodwin, therefore, treats “final and object-clauses” together as pure final clauses, object-clauses with verbs of care and effort, clauses with verbs of fearing. He gives a separate discussion of consecutive clauses. Burton practically follows Goodwin. Viteau blends them all into one. Winer practically ignores consecutive clauses. Jannaris pointedly says that the popular speech “avoids the consecutive construction” and uses ὡστε and the infinitive for either final or consecutive (cf. Latin ut and English that) “thus confounding consecutive with final clauses.” It was not quite that. As a matter of fact the various points of view shade off into one another very easily and sometimes quite imperceptibly. It is not always easy to distinguish purpose and result in the mind of the writer or speaker. The very word finis may be the end aimed at (purpose) or attained (result). My colleague, Prof. W. O. Carver, D.D., has suggested grouping these ideas all under result, either contemplated, feared or attained. Some such idea is near the true analysis and synthesis. The later Greek showed a tendency to gather most of these ideas under ἵνα.

(b) Origin in Parataxis. It seems clear that these final clauses had their origin in parataxis, not hypotaxis. The conjunctions, when used, were an after-development. The step from parataxis to hypotaxis has already been taken when we meet the Greek of Homer, though the paratactic construction continued side by side in isolated instances. Examples like ὅφες ἐκβάλω (Lu. 6:42), βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω; (Jo. 18:39), θέλεις ἑτοι ἐν (Mk. 14:12) are probably instances of this original idiom rather than of a mere ellipsis of ἵνα. Cf. also the possible origin of οὔ· μή. This disconnected idiom was felt to be especially bare in the positive form, but the negative paratactic construction with μή with verbs of fearing is present in Homer. Gildersleeve quaintly says: “Parataxis, which used to be thrust into the
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background, has come forward and claimed its rights.” This grammatical sage, barring
the infinitive and participle, adds: “Nihil est in hypotaxi quod non prius fuerit in
parataxi.” The subjunctive, therefore, in final clauses is merely the volitive subj. of
parataxis. It was natural that the parataxis should be plainer in negative sentences, for
alongside of μή (originally the mere negative in parataxis and the negative
conjunction in hypotaxi) there came ἵνα μή, ὅπως μή. The whole matter is carefully
worked out by Weber with careful discussion of each construction in the various
writers during the long course of Greek linguistic history from Homer through the
Attic writers.

(c) Pure Final Clauses. Here conscious purpose is expressed. This class
constitutes the bulk of the examples and they are the easiest to understand. The Greek
is rich in variety of construction for this idea. We can deal only with the idioms in the
N. T. Ὄφρα is not in the N. T. or LXX, nor is the idiom of ὅπως with the future
indicative after verbs of striving.

(a) ἵνα. The etymology of ἵνα is not certain. A fragment of Hesiod has ἵν αὔτῳ.
Perhaps ἵ-α is derived from this form. But at any rate in Homer ἵνα = ἔκει in Iliad, 10,
127. After Homer, especially in the poets, it has the meaning ‘where,’ ‘in what place,’
‘whither.’ The exact connection between this local demonstrative and relative sense
and the final ‘that’ (ut) is not clear. But we have a similar transition in the Latin ut,
English that, German daß. Sophocles in his Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine
Periods gives nineteen uses of ἵνα for the Greek of that era. They may all be whittled
down to three, viz. the pure final, the object-clauses or sub-final, the consecutive.
There is no doubt that ἵνα came to be used in all these ways in the Byzantine period.
In the κοινή of the N. T. time the first two are abundantly shown. The ecbatic or
consecutive use is debatable in the N. T. But each in its order. Curiously enough the
Attic inscriptions make a very sparing use [Page 982] of ἵνα, much preferring ὅπως
and ὅπως ἄν. So in epic and lyric poetry ἵνα is overshadowed by ὅφρα and in tragedy
by ὃς, though Aristophanes uses it in three-fourths of his final sentences and Plato
and the Attic orators use it almost exclusively (Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 109).
The original use of ἵνα, after the demonstrative and the relative stage, was the pure
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final. It is so in Homer, though Monro admits one instance of the object-clause. Only the subj. occurs with it in Homer in this construction. This is the natural mode for the expectant note in clauses of purpose. But it must not be overlooked that ἵνα in no way controls the mode, for the idiom is at bottom paratactic in origin. But the indicative had a use also as well as the optative, as will presently be shown. A word further is needed concerning the tremendous development in the use of ἵνα.

Thucydides used διός three times as often as ἵνα, and ὡς as a final particle only twice. Xenophon in the first three books of the Anabasis has ἵνας one and a half times as often as ἵνα, and ὡς nearly as often as ἵνα. But Polybius (books I–V) uses ἵνα exclusively, and the N. T. has ἵνα about twelve times as often as διός, and ὡς perhaps once. It is thus not simply that ἵνα displaced διός and ὡς, but it gradually usurped the final use of the infinitive also. It comes to be almost the exclusive means of expressing purpose, and in the modern Greek vernacular every phase of the subj. and the old future ind. can be expressed by νά (ἵνα) and the subj. Nά is used also with the ind. The intention in modern Greek is brought out a bit more sharply by γά νά (Thumb, Handb., p. 197). But the distinction is sometimes faint. All in all it is one of the most remarkable developments in the Greek tongue. The eight and a half pages of examples in Moulton and Geden’s Concordance bear eloquent testimony to the triumph of ἵνα in the N. T. Nearly a page and a half of these examples are in the Gospel of John. But we are now specifically concerned with the pure final use of ἵνα.

Here ἵνα is in the accusative case of general reference. Thus in ἔληλυθα ἵνα μάθω (cf. *veni ut discam*, ‘I am come that I may learn’) ἵνα is really a demonstrative. ‘I am come as to this,’ viz. ‘I may learn.’ The conjunction is supplied to avoid the asyndeton and is in apposition with μάθω. As already explained, the subj. is the predominant mode, as in τούτῳ δὲ δὸν γέγονεν ἴνα πληρωθῇ (Mt. 1:22). [Page 983] Cf. Ph. 3:8. The negative with ἴνα is μή, as in ἴνα μὴ κριθήτε (Mt. 7:1). The aorist subj. is the normal tense, of course, as in ἴνα μεταδῶ (Ro. 1:11), though the present occurs to denote a continuous action, as in ἴνα πιστεύητε (Jo. 13:19). Cf. ἴνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε (Jo. 10:38). The perfect subj. occurs in ἔληλυθα, as ἴνα εἰδῆς (1 Tim. 3:15); ἵνα εἰδῶμεν (1 Cor. 2:12); ἵνα εἰδήτε (1 Jo. 5:13). Cf. also Jo. 17:19, 23; 1 Cor. 1:10; 2 Cor. 1:9 (ἵνα μὴ πεποιθήτε ὤμεν); ἴνα παρεσκευασμένου ἰτε (2 Cor. 9:3). The subj. is regularly retained after a secondary tense of the indicative as in ἀνέβη ἴνα ὤθη (Lu. 19:4); ἐπετίμησεν ἴνα μὴ δοκήσα ς ἐπαισχύνα (Mt. 16:20). Cf. Mk. 8:6. There is no instance in the N. T. of the optative used with ἵνα after a secondary tense of the indicative. It is true that W. H. read ἴνα δῶθη in the text of Eph. 1:17 (ἵνα δῶθη or δῶς in the margin), but this is after a primary tense, οὐ παύομαι. It is the volitive use of the optative and is not due to ἵνα. It is like the optative in a future wish. This use of the opt. with ἵνα after a wish is not unknown to classic Greek. It is the subj., not the opt., that is seen in ἴνα πληροῖς (Col. 4:17), ἴνα παράσοδον (Mk. 14:10) and in the sub-final ἴνα γονόν (Mk. 9:30). In Homer and the early writers generally the rule was to use the opt. with the
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final clauses after secondary tenses, but in the Attic orators the two modes (subj. and opt.) are on a par in such a construction, while Thucydides prefers the subj., though Xenophon is just the reverse. In the N. T. the optative in final clauses after secondary tenses is non-existent. In 2 Tim. 2:25 mu δη is after a primary tense as in Eph. 1:17, and here again the text is uncertain (cf. δη in margin and δηναιησωσιν in text.) The Atticists (Arrian, Appian, Herodian, 4th Macc., Plutarch) made a point of the opt. with ἰνα as "the hall-mark of a pretty Attic style" (Moulton, Prol., p. 197). The N. T. writers, more like Diodorus and Polybius, fail "to rival the littérateurs in the use of this resuscitated elegance." Moulton speaks also of "the [Page 984] riot of optatives" in the artificial Byzantine writers. On the whole subject of final clauses see Gildersleeve on "The Final Sentence in Greek," 1883, p. 419, A. J. of Philol., IV, pp. 416 ff., VI, pp. 53 ff. There is no trouble to find in the papyri, inscr. and κοινη writers generally abundant examples of ἰνα and the subj. in pure design (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 138). But while the subj. is the normal construction, the indicative is also present. In classical Greek ἰνα was not used with the future ind. It was not common even with ἄτιν, ὄς and μη. The similarity in form and sense (not to mention itacism of –η and –ε) made the change very easy and, indeed, the text is not always certain as between the aorist subj. and the future ind. Thus in 1 Cor. 13:3 ἰνα καυχησωμαι is supported by ΝΑΒ, ἰνα καυχησωμαι by ΚΚ and ἰνα καυχησωμαι by late documents. In Gal. 2:4 the best documents have ἰνα καταδουλωσουσιν instead of –ωσιν. In Jo. 17:2 the MSS. vary between ἰνα δώσει and δοση. So in Jo. 15:8 note ἰνα μέρη και γέννησθαι (γενησθαι in margin of W. H.); Eph. 6:3, ἰνα γέννηται και ἔξει. But the idiom is well established in the N. T., especially in the Apocalypse. Thus ἰνα θεωρήσουσιν (Jo. 7:3); ἰνα ξυρήσωσαι (Ac. 21:24); ἰνα ἔρθη (Lu. 14:10); ἰνα θήσω (1 Cor. 9:18); ἰνα δώσουσιν (Lu. 20:10); ἰνα κενώσει (1 Cor. 9:15); ἰνα κερδηθήσονται (1 Pet. 3:1); ἰνα σφάξουσιν (Rev. 6:4); ἰνα δώσει (8:3); ἰνα ἥξωσιν—γνώσωσιν (3:9); ἰνα ἢσται και εἰσέλθωσιν (22:14), etc. This last example may be non-final. In some of these examples the subj. and ind. future occur side by side. In Mk. 6:56 and Ac. 5:15 note ἰνα κάνω (only instances of ἰνα with ἰνα in the N. T.). This is not modal ἰνα, but κάν as 'even'=καί (Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 165; Moulton, Prol., p. 167). In Rev. 13:15 the MSS. vary between ἰνα ποιήσω and –ει, and in 16 between ἰνα δώσων and δώσει (ποιε ἰνα sub-final). The usage is thus on a firm foundation in the N. T. It is in the LXX also. See ἰνα ἢσται in Lev. 10:6 and in other writers of the κοινη (Iren., 584 A, ἰνα ἢση). But ἰνα occurs also with the present ind. This is a rare construction in the N. T. and is not a classic idiom. It occurs only three times in the N. T. Thayer calls it "a

20 ff. See also Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 132. Moulton (Prol., p. 197) notes how the Atticists revelled in the opt. with ἰνα, ὄτως, ὄς. Josephus has 32 per cent. opts., Plut. 49 (Lives), Arrian 82, Appian 87! Polyb. has only 7, Diodorus 5. These are true κοινη literati. Moultom finds only one pap. of this period with opt. with ἰνα, O.P. 237 (late ii/ii-ad.), ἰνα—δονηθεινην. In iii/λα. he notes L.Pw., ἰν —ει in primary sequence.

Tb. 1 (ii/ii-b.c.) actually has ἥξωσω χρηματισθοησοιτο.
1 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 115.
2 Approved by Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 212.
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Thayer
solecism frequent in the eccl. and Byzantine writers.” It is so common in late writers as not to surprise us in the N. T. Thus 1 Cor. 4:6 ἵνα μὴ φυσιόσθε, Gal. 4:17 ἵνα ζηλοῦτε and 1 Jo. 5:20 ἵνα γινώσκομεν. The first two are possible subjunctives. W. H. read ἵνα μήτις δύναται in the margin of Rev. 13:17, and various MSS. support the present ind. with ἵνα in Jo. 4:15; 5:20; 17:3; Gal. 6:12; 1 Th. 4:13; Tit. 2:4; 2 Pet. 1:10; Rev. 12:6. In the earlier Greek writers we do find ἵνα used with past tenses of the indicative. The idea was to show that the purpose was dependent on an unfulfilled wish or unattained action. But this refinement does not appear in the N. T. except in two examples with μὴ ποιῶς. With all the wide extension of ἵνα in Western Hellenistic, at the heart of it there is the pure telic idiom. ἵνα with the imperative in 1 Cor. 1:31 is due, of course, to the quotation. ἵνα is repeated three times in 2 Cor. 12:7. In Jo. 11:37, ποιῆσαι ἵνα καὶ οὕτως μὴ ὡς ποθάνῃ, one is reminded of the Latin facere ut (sub-final). Westcott (Hebrews, p. 342 f.) gives a list of all the examples of ἵνα in the Epistle (20). Only two of ὡς.

(β) ὡς. It is compounded of the neuter accusative relative οὗ and the indefinite adverb πῶς. It occurs in indirect questions as in Lu. 24:20 in the sense of ‘how,’ the usual interrogative sense, and note article also as in τὸ πῶς (Lu. 22:2). ὡς in a sense is the connecting link between the various kinds of final sentences. Thucydides and Xenophon preferred ὡς to ἵνα, and Aristotle has ἵνα only a few times (W. Schmid, Atticismus, III, p. 87). Polybius does not use ὡς at all in books I–V. The N. T. has ἵνα 493 times, ὡς 52 (Jannaris, p. 417) as far as Colossians. Scott counts ἵνα 746 times in text of W. H. (not including 6 of ἵνα τί—) and 58 of ὡς. Thumb does not give ὡς as a final particle in modern Greek (Handb., p. 197). Even in later Greek ὡς was a sign of literary affectation. As already noted, in the fourth and fifth centuries b.c. ὡς was quite the rule in the Attic inscriptions. It is rare in Homer and never has κέ or ἄν in pure final clauses in the Homeric language. This idiom with ἄν first appears in Æschylus. In the great Attic writers and the Attic inscriptions the subjunctive, the future indicative and the optative after secondary tenses, all are found. The future indicative occurred chiefly with verbs of striving,
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though sometimes in pure final clauses.\(^9\) The negative with this future indicative was μή (ὅπως μή), though no example occurs in the N. T. Moulton (Prol., p. 177 note) finds in the papyri a few survivals of ὅπως μή and the fut. ind., though mostly ousted by ἵνα μή. Cf. Hb. P. 45, 60, 168 (iii/b.c.), Tb. P. 414 (ii/a.d.). Stahl (Syntax, p. 360) calls ὅπως μή and fut. ind. Attic. In the N. T. the optative does not occur in this construction. In the Atticists it is revived as with ἵνα.\(^1\) The fut. ind. with ὅπως in pure final clauses has practically vanished from the N. T. The one example in Ro. 3:4, ὅπως ἀν δικαίωθης καὶ νικήσεις, is a quotation from the LXX (Ps. 51:6), but changed from subj. there. But ὅπως θανοτέσσορονι is a variant reading in Mt. 26:59, and the future ind. is possible in Mt. 2:8, ὅπως προσκυνήσω, though it is probably the aorist subj. Other variant readings where the future ind. is supported with ὅπως are 1 Cor. 1:29, καυχήσεται, and Mk. 5:23, ὅπως ζήσεται (here W. H. reads ἵνα ζήσῃ). But at any rate the use of the future ind. with ὅπως in pure final clauses is not quite dead in the N. T. period, though surely dying. Elsewhere the aorist subj. alone occurs save in Lu. 16:26 (bis), 28 and Mt. 6:4. ὅπως no longer\(^2\) has ἄν in final clauses save in the quotation from Ps. 51:6 (Ro. 3:4) and three passages in Luke’s writings (Lu. 2:35 ὅπως ἄν ὁποκαλύψεσθαι Ac. 3:19 ὅπως ἄν ἐλθοῦσιν καὶ ὁποστέλλη, 15:17 ὅπως ἄν εξετήσεσθαι from Amos (so A, but B without ἄν) 9:12). ἄν is a variant reading in Mt. 6:5 and is found very often in the LXX. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 158) finds ὅπως ἄν in Diodorus XIV, 80, 8, Aristeas, § 239, inscr. of Halicarnassus (iii/b.c.), Jahrb. d. Öst. Inst. XI, 56. But it is rare and ὅπως steps into the background before ἵνα. The revival of ὅπως in the third and fourth cent. A.D. was Atticistic and did not affect the vernacular. The inscriptions and the papyri for the first century A.D. show the prevalence of ἵνα over ὅπως (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 157 note). The negative is, of course, always μή, as in Ac. 20:16, ὅπως μή γένηται. The subj. is used indifferently after primary tenses (Mt. 6:2, ποιοῦσιν ὅποις δοξασθήσονται) and secondary tenses (Ac. 9:24, παρατηροῦντα ὅποις αὐτοῦ ἀνέλασον). Cf. Ro. 9:17. It is interesting to note that in the N. T. ὅπως is almost confined to Matthew and Luke’s writings. The literary flavour of Luke explains his use of the idiom, but we do not look for literary ear-marks in Matthew. The one example in John (11:57) occurs side by side with ἵνα ἵνα μηνυσθῇ, ὅπως πιάσωσιν and may be used for the sake of variety as in ἵνα γένηται ὅπως γένηται (2 Cor. 8:14). Cf. also Lu. 16:28; [Page 987] 1 Cor. 2:29; 2 Th. 1:12, though ἵνα ἵνα appear in 1 Cor. 4:6; Gal. 4:5.\(^1\) In 1 Cor. 1:17 note ἵνα μή and ὅπως μή in 1:29. ἵνα has “invaded the territory of ὅπως, as with φιλοτέχνειν and σπουδάζειν” (Moulton, Prol., p. 206). In modern Greek ὅπως has lost all telic force (Thumb, Handb., p. 198). Sometimes ὅπως represents the main purpose and the infinitive the subordinate purpose, a construction amply illustrated in the papyri.\(^2\) So then, though ὅπως as a pure final conjunction is disappearing in the N. T., it yet occurs with the same concept on the whole.

---
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(µ) Ως. It was not a favourite final particle with Thucydides (only twice), though Xenophon used it nearly as much as ἴνα. It is not surprising to find only one instance of it in the N. T. and that one not certain. ΝΒ read ὦς τελειώσω in Ac. 20:24 instead of ὦς τελειώσα (cf. Lu. 9:52). W. H. and Nestle read τελειώσω, but Souter (Rev. V.) gives τελειώσω. It is the last leaf on the tree and a fluttering one at that. The form could be the future ind. or aorist subj. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 158) finds final ὦς merely a reminiscence in the κοινή, but it is needless to cite Mk. 4:26 f., ὦς ἄνθρωπος βάλη, since this is not final at all, but comparison. On ὦς ἁν in final sentences see Schmidt, Joseph. eloc., p. 139, for statistics. Radermacher quotes F. P. 118 (110 A. D.), πορεύου—ἐξος τόν ἐκεῖ ἠλιαίνα ποτίσης, where ἐξος is used as final ὦς. Per contra in modern Greek, Moulton (Prol., p. 249) notes that ὦς takes the meaning of ἐξος as well as its own.

(δ) Μή, μή ποτε, μή πως. Negative purpose is expressed by ἴνα μή, ὅπως μή also, but originally it was done merely by μή in a paratactic sentence. In Homer and the early writers μή is far in excess of ἴνα μή, ὅπως μή, but in Aristophanes and Herodotus the reverse is true, while in Plato and Xenophon μή as a final conjunction has about gone. It is rare in the Attic historians and orators generally. Originally a negative adverb (subjective negative) it came to be used also as a conjunction. Cf. Latin ne. The idiom μή οὗ appears in Homer in a few final clauses, and after Homer μή οὗ is used with verbs of fearing. In the N. T. ἴνα μή (1 Cor. 1:17) and ὅπως μή (1:29) have the run over the conjunction μή. Only the subj. is used, though in Ac. 27:42 μή τις διαφύγοι is a variant reading, but διαφύγη is correct after the secondary tense of the ind. In Mk. 13:36, μή εὐρή, a primary tense occurs in the principal verb. In Col. 2:4 W. H. read ἴνα μηδείς [Page 988] παραλογίζηται instead of μή τις (the variant reading). See also μή τις λογίσηται (2 Cor. 12:6). Both μή and μή πως are preserved as final conjunctions in the modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 198). The use of μή ποτε and μή πως is practically the same. Μή πως appears with the subj. (Paul) after secondary and primary tenses. So ἐξεμψα μή πως καταισχυνθόμεν (2 Cor. 9:3 f. Note also ἴνα μή in 9:3, 4) and μή πως γένομαι (1 Cor. 9:27). In Gal. 2:2 (μή πως ἐδραμον) and 1 Th. 3:5 (μή πως ἐπείρασεν) we have a difficult construction. One view is to take it as an indirect question. This is possible in Gal. 2:2, but not in 1 Th. 3:5. Even in Gal. 2:2 there would be an ellipsis of a participle like ζητοῦν μαθέων. Moulton (Prol., p. 201) suggests that ἐδραμον as an “after-thought” in Gal. 2:2 has plenty of classical parallels. Cf. Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, § 333. In 1 Th. 3:5 we have μή πως ἐπείρασαν καὶ γένηται side by side. It is better therefore to take τρέχο in Gal. 2:2 as subj. also. Thus in both examples we have the subj. and the aorist ind. This is in accord with the ancient idiom where in pure final sentences a past tense of the ind. was used if it is distinctly implied that the purpose was not attained. That is precisely the case here. Paul did not run in vain. The tempter did not succeed with the Thessalonians. It is thus unfulfilled purpose that Paul neatly expresses in accord with the Attic diction. Μή ποτε loses the notion of time in ποτε and has rather the idea of
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contingency, ‘but perchance’ rather than ‘lest at any time.’ Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 158) thinks that ποτε and πώς often distinguish deliberative (dubitative) from final μή. As a strictly final particle it occurs either with the subj. or the future ind., though the subj. is more common. For the fut. ind. note Mt. 7:6 μή ποτε καταπατήσοσιν (correct text, though the aorist subj. has support), Mk. 14:2 μή ποτε ἔσται. In Lu. 12:58 note μή ποτε κατασφήνη καὶ ἀποδόσαι. Both subj. and fut. ind. likewise occur in Mt. 13:15 (Ac. 28:27) μή ποτε ἱδοσαι—καὶ ἱάσομαι (LXX, Is. 6:10). So also in Lu. 14:8 f., μή ποτε ἦ δεκαλέωςον (note perfect subj.) καὶ ἔρει (cf. ἵνα ἔρει in verse 10). The normal subj. is seen in Lu. 14:12, μή ποτε ἄντικαλέσωσιν. The opt. in the N. T. is wanting in final sentences as in cases of repetition (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 131). W. H. read μή ποτε δῆν (opt.) in 2 Tim. 2:25. But even so, if true, it is not a pure final clause but a kind of indirect question as in Lu. 3:15, only in 2 Tim. 2:25 the opt. occurs after a primary tense. It is hardly just to say [Page 989] with Moulton1 that here Paul “misused an obsolete idiom,” since the opt. after primary tenses occurs occasionally with ἰνα in the papyri. Cf. μή ποτε αὕτων χρεία γένοιτο, εὐθέως αὐτούς ἐξέλασον, P. Oxy. I, 118, 38. But it is more than likely, as Moulton argues, that in 2 Tim. 2:25 we should read subj. δόῃ, since ἄνανθίωνσιν undoubtedly is subj. The epic δόῃ is supported by ἐὰν γνώῃ, Clem., Paed., III, 1. (Moulton, Prol., p. 193.)

Relative Clauses. This construction in the earlier Greek, like the Latin, had either the subj. or the opt. The Attic added the future ind. which largely displaced the subj. and the opt.3 The N. T. follows the Attic use of the fut. ind. Cf. ὅπερ άποδόσοσιν (Mt. 21:41); οὕς κατασφήμοιν (Ac. 6:3). See 1 Cor. 4:17, δὲ άναμνήσας. Blass4 explains the occasional return to the subj. as due to ἰνα. See ὅπων φάγω (Mt. 14:14); παρὰ ὃν εξενσθῶμεν (Ac. 21:16); ὅ προσενέγκῃ (Heb. 8:3); διὰ ἦς λατερεύωμεν (12:28). Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 138) quotes B, U. III, 822 (ii/A.D.) εὔρον γειρόγον τίς (=δὲς) αὕτα ἐλκύσῃ, Diodorus, XIV, 8, 3, διὰ ὅν εξέλασον τὸ τείχη. The N. T. hardly uses the relative clause of purpose as freely as the Attic Greek.

The Infinitive. A brief statement is alone necessary here, since the infinitive receives full discussion in the next chapter. Suffice it to say that the infinitive is exceedingly common in the N. T. for the notion of pure purpose. Votaw5 counts some 1,285 such instances of the simple infinitive of purpose in “biblical Greek.” He gives the figures for the N. T. alone as 211. He notes that “this use of the infinitive is second only to that of general object in order of relative frequency of occurrence.” Moulton (Prol., p. 205) notes that the inf. of purpose is more common in the N. T. than in Attic, and he agrees with Thumb (Theol. Lit., 1903, p. 421) in the theory that this frequency of the inf. of purpose in the κοινή is due to the Ionic dialect. It has survived in the Pontic dialect of modern Greek, though elsewhere displaced by νά and the subj. Cf. ἐτοιμάσομεν φαγεῖν (Mt. 26:17) and ἐτοιμάσομεν ἵνα φάγῃς (Mk. 14:12). The telic inf. is common in the κοινή writers generally (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 152). Cf. Xenophon of Eph., 393, 28, ἐληλύθει προσετίσαθα. It is commonest
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4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 217.
5 The Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 10.
with verbs of movement (Moulton, _Prol._, p. 205), as in ἐὰν ἀναβῇ κάγῳ προσκυνήσῃ, Par. P. 49 (ii/b.c.). This infinitive may be resolved easily into the original dative (or locative), as in Jo. 21:3, [Page 990] ὑπάγω ἄλλωσιν, 'I go a-fishing’; Mt. 2:2, ἦλθομεν προσκυνήσας, ‘we went up for worshipping.’

It is easy to see the purpose in the dative form of προσκυνήσας, but less clear in the original ἄλλωσιν (probably due to syncrétism). Moulton suggests that the locative was originally a sort of designed result and gradually the line of cleavage vanished between the two forms as was true of ἴνα (and *ut*). “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.” This idiom has a much wider range in Homer than in Attic writers and is again more prevalent in the N. T. than in the Attic. A few examples must suffice: ὅπερ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι, ἄλλα πληρῶσαι (Mt. 5:17); ὁ Ἱσραὴλ ἀνήλθε—πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου (4:1); ὅπερ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους (Mk. 2:17); πάρεσαν ἄκοψαί (Ac. 10:33). Cf. Lu. 18:10; Ac. 11:25; 12:13; 13:44, etc. Less frequent is the inf. with τοῦ for the idea of purpose. Votaw notes but 34 such examples of direct purpose in the N. T., though the O. T. shows 734. These 34 are almost confined to Matthew, Luke and Acts. Cf. τοῦ ἐπολέσας (Mt. 2:13); τοῦ σπεύρα (Lu. 8:5); τοῦ ἀπεβ. (Ac. 3:2). See both together in Lu. 1:76 f., 79; 2:22, 24, παραστήσας—and τοῦ δοῦνα. For a full discussion see “Articular Infinitive” (Verbal Nouns). Paul seems to avoid it as a rule. But see Ro. 6:6; Ph. 3:10. The use of ὅποιον and the inf. for pure purpose is rare in the N. T., some half-dozen instances. Only probable examples should be claimed (p. 1089). Thus ὅποιον ἐκβάλλειν (Mt. 10:1). Cf. Mt. 15:33; 24:24; 27:1; Lu. 4:29; 20:20. Radermacher (_N. T. Gr._, p. 160) cites P. Oxy. I, 52, 7 (325 A.D.), ἐπισταλέντος ὅποιον τὴν διάθεσιν ἐγγραφὼν προσφωνήσας. For further examples of telic ὅποιον in the inscriptions and writers of the koine see Koch, _Observationes grammaticae_, p. 20. It is more frequent in the LXX. Radermacher even cites a case of final ὅποιον with the subj. in a late papyrus, B. G. U. III, 874, γεγραμμένα ὅποιον ἔγραψεν ἡμεῖς. There are two examples of ὅποιον in W. H., ὅποιον ἔτοιμασα (Lu. 9:52, other editors ὅποια) and ὅποιον ἔκπεπλευ (Heb. 7:9). In Ac. 20:24 most editors have ὅποιον τελειώσας, but not W. H. The articular infinitive with prepositions is very common in the N. T. as in the LXX, about one-half of all the examples of the articular infinitive.

For a discussion of prepositions with the inf. see Verbal Nouns. Both εἰς τό and πρό τό to occur with the inf. in the papyri, the latter [Page 991] more frequently. They both seem “to carry the thought of a remoter purpose.” (Moulton, _Prol._, p. 220.) Moulton cites B. U. 226 (i/a.d.) ὅπος εἰδῆ παρέσεσται (=θαμ)—πρός το τυχοῦ, O. P. 237 (ii/a.d.) ὅπος φροντίσῃς—πρός το μὴ—ἐντυγχάνειν. The papyri have εἰς τό ἐν μηδὲν μεμφηθῇν as a “recurrent formula.” Cf. P. Fi. 2 (iii/a.d.) 4 times. Moulton gives numerous papyri references for telic εἰς τό. The examples with εἰς τό are the most common of all in the N. T. (72 instances). As a rule these indicate purpose more or less strong, though not always. It is particularly common in Paul (50 exx., H. Scott). So εἰς τό στήριξθηναι (Ro. 1:11), εἰς τό ἐναν (8:29). Cf. 1 Th. 3:5; Eph. 1:12;
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Ph. 1:10). The instances of \( \pi\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \) are few (12) and chiefly in Matt. and Paul. Cf. \( \pi\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \ \theta\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\gamma\nu\) (Mt. 6:1); \( \pi\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \ \delta\omicron\omicron\nu\sigma\sigma\sigma\omicron\alpha\omicron\omicron\) (Eph. 6:11).\(^1\)

(\( \eta \)) The Participle. The future participle, so common in this construction in the Attic Greek, has nearly vanished from the N. T. as from the rest of the κοινή. A few remnants survive like \( \dot{\epsilon}r\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \ \tilde{H}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\sigma\omicron\) (Mt. 27:49), \( \dot{\alpha}n\beta\beta\epsilon\iota\nu \ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu\nu\sigma\omicron\nu\) and \( \pi\omicron\nu\pi\omicron\nu\) (Ac. 24:11, 17). Cf. Ac. 8:27. So also the present participle occasionally occurs where purpose is implied. Thus \( \dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\kappa\alpha\omicron\nu\ \dot{\alpha}\tau\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\ll\nu\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ς\) (Ac. 15:27). Cf. \( \dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\mu\psi\omicron\nu\ \dot{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\ll\nu\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ς\) (Thuc. VII, 26, 9).\(^2\) Cf. also Mk. 3:31. A good example is Ac. 3:26, \( \dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu\ \dot{\alpha}r\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\nu\) and \( \dot{\alpha}n\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\). See Participle (Verbal Nouns) and Tense for further remarks.

(d) Sub-Final Clauses (really object or subject clauses like \( \dot{\omicron}t\) clauses). There are a considerable number of clauses which are not pure purpose and yet are not result. They are the bridge, in a sense, between the two extremes. They are found with verbs of striving, beseeching, commanding, fearing. In some instances the clause is hardly more than an object-clause. The same conjunctions are here used in general, and this shows that no hard and fast line was drawn in the matter. Various divisions are made of these verbs.\(^3\) Burton\(^4\) calls them object-clauses of exhorting, of striving, of fearing, of subject and predicate, of complementary and epexegetic clauses, of conceived result. But even so they overlap and run into one another.

(\( \alpha \)) \( \dot{\omicron}n\alpha\). Here again the main conjunction is \( \dot{\omicron}n\alpha\). All these varieties noted by Burton are seen with \( \dot{\omicron}n\alpha\) save with verbs of \[Page 992\] fearing. As we have seen,\(^1\) there were two tendencies in the κοινή. One was the spread of the Ionic use of the inf. of purpose, the other was the wide extension of \( \dot{\omicron}n\alpha\) in Western Hellenistic. So the \( \dot{\omicron}n\alpha\) in the non-final or sub-final sense, once rare,\(^2\) now comes to be exceedingly common. The development came on soon after the close of the classical age.\(^3\) But Thackeray (Gr., pp. 24, 194) finds it rare in the LXX. It came to be used in almost any sense that the infinitive bore and finally displaced it. This weakened use of \( \dot{\omicron}n\alpha\) is one of the characteristics of the κοινή and is richly illustrated in the N. T., particularly in the writings of John. Thus in Mt. 5:29, \( \sigma\mu\omicron\phi\epsilon\omicron\dot{\omicron}n\alpha \ \dot{\alpha}p\omicron\lambda\omicron\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\) the \( \dot{\omicron}n\alpha\) clause is the subject of \( \sigma\mu\omicron\phi\epsilon\omicron\dot{\omicron}n\alpha\) and is a subject-clause in the nominative case. There is a great

---

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 198.
4 N. T. M. and T., p. 83.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 205.
2 It is seen as early as Demosthenes (IV, 28).
3 Jebb in V. and D.’s Handb., p. 320.
Thackeray


———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).
variety of phrases⁴ which thus use ἵνα. So ἁρκετὸν ἵνα γένηται (Mt. 10:25; 18:6). Cf. 1 Pet. 4:3 (inf.). See also ἢκανῶς ἵνα (Mt. 8:8), though elsewhere inf.; ἔξωσ ἵνα (Jo. 1:27), but inf. in 1 Cor. 16:4; as often; συνήθεια ύμιν ἵνα (Jo. 18:39); ἑλήσθης ὄφρα ἵνα (Jo. 12:23); ἐμοὶ εἰς ἑλάχιστὸν ἔστιν ἵνα (1 Cor. 4:3); ἐμὸν βρῶμα ἔστιν ἵνα (Jo. 4:34); λυπέσθη ἵνα (Lu. 17:2); τοῦτο, ἵνα ἔλθῃ (Lu. 1:43); ζητεῖται ἵνα (1 Cor. 4:2); χαρᾶν ἵνα (Ph. 2:2). Thus the ἵνα clause is seen to be either nom. or acc., simply, or in apposition with a substantive. In John the appositional use is very frequent. So αὐτῇ ἵνα (Jo. 17:3); μείζωνα ταύτης, ἵνα (15:13, ablative); ἐν τούτῳ, ἵνα (15:8, locative); χάριν, ἵνα (3 John 4, accusative). Cf. also ἐστὶν ἵνα μὴ ἄποκτείνωσιν αὐτούς, ἄλλῳ ἵνα βασανισθῆσονται. In Jo. 17:3 some MSS. read ἵνα γινώσκουσιν (read by Treg. and Tisch.). Object-clauses with ἵνα after verbs of striving, beseeching, etc., largely displace ἓκανόν. In Rev. 9:5 we have ἵνα μὴ ἄποκτείνωσιν αὐτούς, ἄλλῳ ἵνα βασανισθῆσονται. In Jo. 17:3 some MSS. in Mt. 16:20); δόγμα (Lu. 1:43); διδάσκω (μικρώς, (many MSS. in Mt. 16:20); δόξα; (Mk. 11:3); θυσίαν διδοὺμαι (λαμβάνων, so in Jo. 11:57 (13:34; 15:12); ἐντελλομαι (Mk. 13:34); ἐπετιμάω (Mk. 12:16; 16:20, W. H.); ἐξορκίζω (Mt. 26:63); ἐροτάω (Mk. 7:26); εἴπων (Mt. 4:3); and λέγω (Ac. 19:4); ἠκούσα (Mt. 6:25); ἐστίν θέλημα (Mt. 18:14); ἠκόλου (1 Cor. 14:1); ζητέω (1 Cor. 4:2); κηρύσσω (Mk. 6:12); μεριμνάω (1 Cor. 7:34); παρακαλέω (Mk. 14:36); πειθόω (Mt. 27:20); ποιεῖται (Jo. 11:37); προσεύχομαι (Mk. 14:35); ηλίθμειμα (Jo. 9:22 and inf.); τίθημι (Jo. 15:16); φυλάσσομαι (2 Pet. 3:17). This is a most interesting list. Kälker (Questiones de elocutione Polybiana, 1880. Cf. Moulton;

4 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 228.
5 W.-Th., p. 338 f.
6 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 225 f.
7 Ib.
1 It is found in Hom. Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 128.
Kälker Kälker, F., Questiones de elocutione Polybiana (1880).
Prol., p. 20) has shown how Polybius favours ἵνα with verbs of commanding like ἀντέχωμαι, παραγγέλλω, etc. No real distinction in sense can here be drawn between the inf. and ἵνα. The later κοινή (and so the N. T.) carried this use of ἵνα much further than did Polybius, who had more affinity with the old literary Greek. There is no need to appeal to Latin influence for this sub-final use of ἵνα, as Moulton (p. 208) abundantly shows from the papyri. So O. P. 744 (i/β. C.) ἑρωτῶ σε ἵνα μὴ ἱγυνάσῃς, N. P. 7 (i/α. D.) ἔγραψα ἵνα σοι φυλαχθῶσι, B. U. 531 (ii/α. D.) παρακαλῶ σε ἵνα κατάσχῃ, O. P. 121 (iii/α. D.) εἶπά σοι ἐδώσωσιν. Moulton (Prol., pp. 177, 208) recalls the old jussive subj. as sufficient explanation of this use of ἵνα. Radermacher (Rh. M., LVI, 203) and Thumb (Hellen., p. 159) support Moulton against the Latin influence theory. Per contra see Goetzeler, De Polybii El., pp. 17 ff.; Kälker, Quest.; Viereck, Sermo Graecus, [Page 994] p. 67. Moulton scores his point and observes also that the inf. was not driven out by ἵνα in the papyri, see (ε). Cf. A. P. 135 (ii/α. D.), ἑρωτῶ σε μὴ ἃμελέτην μου. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 155 f.) gives numerous other examples of non-final ἵνα in papyri and inscriptions. The subj. is the usual mode employed even after secondary tenses. Thus ἐβουλεύσαντο ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν (Jo. 12:10). In Mk. 9:30, οὐκ ἥθελεν ἵνα τις γνῶ, we have still the subj., not the opt. As already noted, ἵνα δῷ in Eph. 1:17 is an optative of wish after a primary tense. It is here also the subfinal ἵνα. Cf. Phil. 14; Col. 4:12. Moulton1 points out how closely akin are προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε (Mk. 14:38) and ὅρθεν καὶ φυλάσσεσθε (Lu. 12:15). The paratactic origin of the ἵνα construction is thus well illustrated. “An innovation in Hellenistic is ἵνα c. subj. in commands, which takes the place of the classic ὅπως c. fut. indic.”2 Moulton cites a moderate number of examples of this abrupt use of ἵνα in the papyri. So F. P. 112 (99 A.D.) ἐπέχων (=ον) Ζωίλωι καὶ ἵνα ἀὐτὸν μὴ ἄνωθεν μὲν, πρῶτον μὲν, ἵνα πάντα σῴζῃται δεύτερον δὲ, ἵνα μηδὲ τῶν τόκων ὅλογραφήσῃς, B. U. 48 (ii/iii A.D.) ἵνα δῶσῃ γενώμεθα. There is a doubtful ex. of this sense of ἵνα in Soph., Oed. C. 155, though ὅπως was so used.3 It appears in Arrian and Epictetus. In the modern
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Greek the νά clause sometimes “approaches the nature of a principal sentence” (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 198). But this elliptical imperative is undoubted in the N. T. Cf. Mk. 5:23, ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς. So also Mt. 20:32; 1 Cor. 7:29; 2 Cor. 8:7; Eph. 4:29; 5:33. With this construction compare the asyndeton without ἵνα in Mk. 10:36, τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν; As already explained (p. 430), this may be parataxis (two questions). Cf. ἵνα in Mk. 10:35 and Gal. 5:17.
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Mk. 3:6), and all three after συμβουλητών ἔλαβον (ἔδιδον). The clause thus partakes of the nature of an indirect deliberative [Page 995] question (cf. Mk. 11:18, πῶς). They are all after secondary tenses. There are some instances in the N. T. of ἐπὶ ὑποτὰς after verbs of beseeching, though many verbs that in Attic had this idiom no longer have it. Thus ὑποτῆς and the subj. occur with δέομαι (Mt. 9:38), αἰτέομαι (Ac. 25:3), ἐρωτάω (Lu. 7:3), παρακαλέω (Mt. 8:34), προσεύχομαι (Ac. 8:15).

(?) Μή, μὴ ποεῖ, μὴ ποτε. The usual construction in the negative sub-final clauses is ἣν μή, but a small list of verbs commonly have μή as the conjunction. This is true of verbs meaning ‘to take heed,’ ‘to care for,’ ‘fear.’ It is a much narrower range than the sub-final use of ἦν. In the N. T. the subj. always occurs with μή except in Col. 2:8 βλέπετε μή τις ἔσται. Thus βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ (Mt. 24:4). Treg. and Tisch. read the fut. ind. in 2 Cor. 12:21, but W. H. and Nestle rightly have ταπανώσῃ (cf. verse 20). The pres. subj. occurs in Heb. 12:15 ἐπισκοπούντες μή ἐνοχῇ. Elsewhere we have only the aor. subj. Thus after βλέπω (Mk. 13:5); διάφορα (Mt. 18:10); σκοπεῖ (Gal. 6:1); φοβέομαι (Ac. 27:17). In Ac. 23:10 some MSS. have εὐλαβέομαι, but φοβέομαι is correct. This construction with φοβέομαι is rare in the N. T. (Luke, Paul and Hebrews) and is apparently a literary touch. Cf. Ac. 27:29. In Ac. 5:26, ἔφοβοντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν μὴ λατσυθῶσιν (note subj. after secondary tense), there is a prolepsis of τὸν λαόν. Mή ποεῖ is found after βλέπω with the aor. subj. (1 Cor. 8:9) and φοβέομαι (2 Cor. 11:3; 12:20). Cf. Gal. 2:2 in 6, (c), (δ) Pure Final Clauses. If the fear is about an object in the present or past, the ind. is used. Cf. p. 1045. Thus in Lu. 11:35, σκοπεῖ μή—ἔσται, and in Gal. 4:11, φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς μὴ ποεῖς εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς. This is in strict accord with Attic idiom. The papyri show it also (Moulton, Prol., p. 193). So Par. P. 49 (ii/b.c.) ἔγνωμι μή ποτε ἄρριστοι, N. P. 17 (iii/a.d.) ὑποροφοῦμε μή ἄρα ἑνδροθέοι έλαθεν ὑδατί. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 141) adds examples of fut. ind., as Enoch 6:3, φοβοῦμαι μή οὐ θελήσετε; Dio Chrys., xxxii, 44, οὐ γὰρ ἔστι κινδύνος, μή Μαλλωτῶν ἐσωμένων ἀσθενεστέροι δώσετε. The negative in such a clause is οὐ. Thus φοβοῦμαι μή ποεῖς οὔχ οἷος θέλω εὐρό (2 Cor. 12:20). This is to show contrast to μή. Cf. Col. 2:8, μή τις ἔσται—καὶ οὐ. Sometimes a verb of fearing is implied, though not expressed (cf. elliptical use of ἦνα and ἦνα μή). Thus Ac. 5:39, μὴ ποτε εὑρεθήτε. This is a possible explanation of μὴ ποτε οὐ μὴ ἄρχεται (or μὴ ποτε οὕκ) in Mt. 25:9 [Page 996] (note negatives) and μὴ ποτε δῶη (2 Tim. 2:25). Μή ποτε is used with the aorist subj. after προσέπῃ (Lu. 21:34; Heb. 2:1), with a present subj. after φοβεομαι (Heb. 4:1), with a pres. opt. after διαλογίζομαι (Lu. 3:15, ind. question), with a fut. ind. after βλέπω (Heb. 3:12). These clauses are of paratactic origin. This paratactic construction survives in the use of ἄρα with the imperative (Mt. 9:30; 24:6), but even so the clause may be dependent in actual use as in Mt. 18:10; 1 Th. 5:15. Some doubt arises concerning the clauses with βλέπω which have a paratactic origin, but are practically dependent. Those in the third person are clearly
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so (Mk. 13:5; Ac. 13:40, etc.). This argues for a like usage in Lu. 21:8; Gal. 5:15; Heb. 12:25.

(δ) The Relative Clause. It is a classic idiom for complementary relative clauses to be used in a sub-final sense. As examples of this idiom in the N. T. note ἤξιος ἔστιν ὁ παρέξιος (Lu. 7:4); οὐκ ἔχω ὁ παραθήσω (11:6); οὐδένα ἔχω ὅστις μεριμνήσα (Ph. 2:20). Cf. συγώ τί γράφω (Ac. 25:26) and τί γράψαμι οὐκ ἔχω (ib.). Rademacher (N. T. Gr., p. 138) quotes from Achilles Tatius, IV, 16, 3, ἄπογεύσομαι τοσοῦτον ὅσον κάκειν κάλβῃ.

(ε) The Infinitive. With verbs of exhorting, beseeching, etc., the infinitive was the normal idiom in the ancient Greek. In the N. T. it still occurs twice as often as ἵνα and ἵνας together. Some of these verbs have only the inf. in the N. T., as αἰσχύνομαι, ἤξιος, ὅσκειον, βούλομαι, δικαίος, ἠδικός, ἐπιθυμοῦμαι, ἐπιποθέω, ἐπιτρέπομαι, ἐπιχείρομαι, κελεύω, ὅκκενόμοιο, παρακινοῦμαι, πεπόνθομαι, σπουδάζομαι, τάσσω and compounds, φοβερόμαι in the sense of ‘to be afraid to do’ (Mt. 2:22). Many of the verbs that use sub-final ἵνα may have the inf. also. Thus ποιήσω ὧμᾶς γενέσθαι (Mk. 1:17). So also βουλέουμαι, αἰτεῖμαι, προσεύχομαι, λέγομαι, etc. Cf. ἤξιος λύμασι (Ac. 13:25) and ἤξιος ἵνα λύμασι (Jo. 1:27). In 2 Cor. 9:5 the inf. is used after the ἵνα clause to express an epexegetic or complementary purpose (ταῦτα ἔτοιμα ἐναῖ), a rather common usage. Cf. in 1 Cor. 9:15 both ἵνα and the inf. in a broken sentence. Moulton argues that in Paul the majority of cases of τῶν with the inf. are epexegetic (Ro. 1:24; 7:3; 8:12; 1 Cor. 10:13) or adnominal (Ro. 15:23; 1 Cor. 9:10; 16:4; 2 Cor. 8:11; Ph. 3:21) or the ablative construction (Ro. 15:22; 2 Cor. 1:8). Certainly τῶν μὴ ἐλθῶν in Lu. 17:1 is not purpose, nor τῶν ἐσελθὼν in Ac. 10:25. Cf. also Mt. 21:32, τοῦ πιστεύσαμαι. Luke uses τῶν and the inf. more than any other N. T. writer. The papyri show this non-final use of τῶν and the inf. (Moulton, Prol., p. 219 f.). So B. U. 1031 (ii/ii A.D.) φρονίσσων τῶν ποιήσαμαι, B. U. 164 (ii/iii A.D.) πείσω τῶν ἐλθον, B. M. 23 (ii/ii A.D.) προσωπούμενον μου τῶν περιποιησαί. In Lu. 18:1, πρὸς τὸ δὲν is not final. E.g. τὸ and the inf. we find chiefly in Paul (44 examples, Moulton, Prol., p. 218. Mr. H. Scott makes 50 by counting the verbs instead of the preposition). The construction is always final in the other N. T. writers. But Paul has non-final uses, as in 1 Th. 2:12; 4:9.

(ζ) ἵνα and ὅτι. In Lu. 17:2 we have λοιπελατι ἢ ἤρπηται ἵνα σκανδαλίζῃ, where ἢ and ἵνα introduce subject-clauses. Cf. also ἤρπηται in Mk. 9:42. In Lu. 19:21, ἐφοβοῦμαι δὲ ὅτι ἤνθρωπος αὐστηρὸς εἶ, the rare use of ὅτι with φοβίζομαι may be causal. It is made easier by the proleptic use of ἐν. The usual object-clause with ὅτι belongs to indirect discourse.

(η) ἵνα. It is debatable whether ἵνα has the ecbatic use in the N. T. There is in itself no reason why it should not have it, since undoubtedly it was so used in the later

4 Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 87.
5 Prol., p. 218 f.
Greek. It occurs also in modern Greek, as ἐϊναι νὰ χάσῃ κανεὶς τὸ μυωλὸ του, ‘that is for one to lose his reason’ (Thumb, Handb., p. 197). The parallel of the Latin ut may have had some influence on this late Greek. The development, however, was in the vernacular, and out of the subfinal use of ἵνα, and the Latin influence was not needed. There is not space to follow the long debate in the grammars and commentaries on this subject. Kühner held that ἵνα had the ecbatic sense, but Thayer boldly accepts the verdict of Fritzsche and Winer who “have clearly shown that in all the passages adduced from the N. T. to prove the usage the telic (or final) force prevails.” W. F. Moulton agreed with Winer as against Fritzsche in the admission of the sub-final use of ἵνα, but he balked at the consecutive idea. “But it does not follow that the weakened ἵνα is generally equivalent to ὡστε: this use of ἵνα is rather, as we can still perceive in most cases, an extension of eo consilio ut.” Yes, in most cases, beyond a doubt. I once had just this feeling and stood against the admission of the consecutive

1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 455.
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force of ἵνα. J. H. Moulton\(^6\) confesses to a similar development of opinion on this subject. He had once\(^7\) committed himself against the ecletic [Page 998] ἵνα, but now he confesses himself “troubled with unsettling doubts.” He boldly advocates\(^1\) the freedom of commentators to interpret ἵνα as the context demands (final, sub-final, consecutive). Ellicott\(^2\) had defended just this principle, and he is the most severely grammatical of commentators. The commentator must have grammar, but he needs the grammar of the author on whose work he is making comments. So also Sanday and Headlam on Ro. 11:11 (μὴ ἐπτασαν ἵνα πέσωσιν;) pointedly interpret it thus: “ἵνα expresses the contemplated result.” They appeal to Ellicott, Lightfoot and Evans in support of this laxer use of ἵνα as against Winer and the Germans. They also (p. 143) quote Chrysostom’s exposition of ἵνα in Ro. 5:20: τὸ δὲ ἵνα ἐνταῦθα οὐκ ἀπολογίας πάλιν ὀλλ. ἐκβάσεώς ἔστιν. Lightfoot admits the consecutive force of ἵνα in Gal. 5:17; 1 Th. 5:4. He is correct in both instances. See also Lu. 1:43. In Jo. 16:2, ἔρχεται ὡρα ἓνα δόξῃ, it is almost temporal. It is argued that, where ἵνα seems to be used in a consecutive clause, it is the divine purpose that is to be considered. But
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certainly no such explanation is possible in Ro. 11:11. There is such a thing as the divine purpose and it is seen\(^3\) in Lu. 9:45, ἵνα paraēkekαλυμμένον ὁτ' αὐτῶν ἵνα μὴ αἰθοῦνται αὑτό. Cf. also Mt. 1:22, ἵνα πληρωθή. But surely no such purpose\(^4\) appears in Jo. 6:7, οὕτω δροκούσιν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἔκαστος βραχὺ λάβῃ. Here we have contemplated result, it is true, but it is result just the same. It is probably just out of this idiom (conceived result) that the use of ἵνα for actual result came. Burton\(^1\) admits this conceived result as in Heb. 10:36, and seeks to explain Jo. 9:2, τίς ἡμαρτεν—ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ. But the effort is not successful. He denies that there is a certain, “scarce a probable, instance in the N. T. of a clause denoting actual result conceived as such.”\(^6\) He considers\(^2\) Rev. 13:13, τοιῇ σημεῖα μεγάλά, ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιῇ ἐκτού οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνειν, as the most probable instance of ἵνα denoting actual result. But there are others just as plain, if not clearer. Thus 1 Jo. 1:9, πιστῶς ἔστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἄφη τὰς ἡμαρτιάς. Blass\(^3\) places this beside δίκαιος ἐπιλαθέσθαι (Heb. 6:10) and thinks that the consecutive use of ἵνα grew out of the infinitive in that sense. With this Moulton\(^9\) agrees. Cf. also Rev. 9:20, οὕτω μετενόησαν, ἵνα μὴ προσκομισθῶσιν, with οὕτω μετενόησαν δοῦνα αὐτῷ δόξαν [Page 999] in 16:9. Note in particular 1 Jo. 3:1, where the clause καὶ ἐσμὲν accents the ecbatic force of ἵνα. This use is possible also in Jo. 9:36; Mk. 11:28. In Mk. 4:22, ἔδαν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθή, we have ἵνα (cf. ὅλη ἵνα) used like ὡστε and the inf. (cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 218). In Mk. 2:10 ἵνα we have real purpose. The consecutive ἵνα appears outside of the N. T. as in Arrian (Diss. Epict., II, 2, 16) οὕτω μορφὸς ἵνα, ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ. Sophocles in his Lexicon gives a quite extensive list of passages in the κοινὴ writers where ἵνα has the consecutive sense. He has probably claimed too many, but some of them are real instances. Even Josephus has ἵνα in the sense of conceived result.\(^1\) Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 156) cites Epictetus, IV, 3, 9, ἔλεοθερωκός γάρ ἐμι καὶ φίλος τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα ἐκῶν πείθωμαι αὐτῷ. Several other examples occur in Epictetus. So, then, we conclude that ἵνα has in the N. T. all three uses (final, sub-final, consecutive), and thus runs a close parallel with the infinitive which it finally displaced.\(^2\) Sophocles cites several examples of consecutive ἵνα from the LXX. One of these is certainly pertinent, Wisdom of Sol. 13:9, for ἵνα δύνονται follows τοσοῦτον and ἵνα has the force of ὡστε.

(β) ὡστε. This conjunction is merely ὡς and τέ = ‘and so.’ In Homer ὡς is both a demonstrative and a relative. Either idea may appear in ὡστε. It is really a comparative particle.\(^3\) In the early writers the inf. was more common than the ind. with ὡστε. Thus in Euripides the inf. occurs 130 times to 20 indicatives. In

---
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Thucydides it is 144 to 82, but in Plato it is 253 to 240. The consecutive sentence began with the inf. and was extended to the finite verb. In late Greek it returned to the inf. construction. Cf. Green, *Diodorus and the Peloponnesian War*, 1899, p. 21. Of the 95 instances of ὥστε in the N. T. probably 30 do not come up for discussion under either final or consecutive clauses. The word in these examples is merely an introductory inferential particle like οὖν. The structure is wholly paratactic. In this sense of ‘therefore’ the particle occurs with the ind. nineteen times. Cf. Mt. 12:12, ὥστε ἔξεστιν. Once the subj. appears, 1 Cor. 5:8, ὥστε ἔφορτάζομεν. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 161) even quotes P.Oxy. IV, 743, 27 (ii/b.c.), ὥστε ὁν τούτῳ σε θέλω γινόσκειν, and there are other instances like it. The other eleven instances have the

[Page 1000] imper. (pres.). Cf. ὥστε βλέπετω (1 Cor. 10:12). See 1 Cor. 3:21; 11:33, etc. Of the hypotactic examples 62 have the infinitive and only two the indicative. In the Attic Greek actual result was expressed by ὥστε and the indicative, while ὥστε and the inf. (‘so as to’) denoted a result naturally or necessarily following the preceding cause. In the N. T. there are only two instances of the ind. with ὥστε (as a hypotactic conjunction). They are Jo. 3:16, ὥστε γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον ὥστε τὸν οἶδαν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, and Gal. 2:13, καὶ συνεπεκρίθησαν αὐτῶ ὁ λοιπὸς Ιουδαίως ὥστε καὶ Βαρνάβας συνεπιχύμην αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. Here the actual result is distinctly accented. Blass on the flimsiest grounds seeks to oust ὥστε in Jo. 3:16 by ὥστε and to put the inf. in Gal. 2:13, so as to get rid of this construction entirely in the N. T. Moulton rightly shows small patience with such “summary” methods in textual criticism. The construction with the ind. is not quite obsolete in the vernacular κοινή, but only to make the contrast sharper. Of the 62 instances of ὥστε with the inf. in the N. T. they are nearly all consecutive, not final nor even sub-final. Even in the classical Greek the ind. with ὥστε in the sense of actual result was displacing the ind. and in the vernacular it grew rapidly. Cf. ὥστε—ἐπολελύσθαι, B. G. U. 27 (ii/a.d.). This is a distinct encroachment on the old idiom and has a wider range than in Attic.

In Ac. 14:1 note ὥστε ὥστε. See Mt. 13:32 ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τα πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκηνοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ, (Mk. 4:37) ὥστε ἥδη γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλαῦν, (Ac. 15:39) ὥστε ἐποχορισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ὥστε ὁλλάλων. Tatian took ὥστε consecutive in Lu. 4:29 (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 249). Consecutive ὥστε and inf. is too common in the inscriptions and papyri for Radermacher to mention (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 160). We do not have ὥστε after a comparative (ἡ ὥστε) in the N. T. There is no example of ὥστε nor of ἐφ’ ὥστε in the sense of ‘on condition that.’ In Gal. 2:9 ἤνά has practically that idea.

(p) Ὢς. Thayer considers that in Heb. 3:11 and 4:3 we have the consecutive use of Ὢς. It is a quotation from the LXX (Ps. 94:11) and is possible, though the simple ‘as’

---

5 Mr. H. Scott makes 95 times by counting the verbs, Geden 83.
1 Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 223 ff.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 224.
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is sufficient. But [Page 1001] ὡς has kept its place as a consecutive particle in the κοινή (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 160).

(δ) ὤτι. There is no doubt about the consecutive use of ὦτι in the later Greek. We find it in the LXX, as in Ex. 3:11, τίς εἴμι ἔγω ὦτι πορεύσομαι πρὸς Φαραώ; Cf. also 2 Ki. 8:13. The instances in the N. T. are not numerous, but they are very clear. Thus Mk. 4:41, τίς ὁ ὄφρα ὀὐτός ἔστιν ὦτι καὶ ὃ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει ὦτῷ: In Mt. 8:27 note ποταπῆς ὦτι (cf. οὐτος ὦστε). See also Heb. 2:6 (Ps. 8:5); Lu. 4:36. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 160) quotes Acta Christophori, 68, 18, τοιοῦτος ὦτι. There is no doubt about the consecutive use of ὦτι in the later Greek. We find it in the LXX, as in Ex. 3:11, τίς εἰμι ἔγω ὥστε ὑμῖν ἐγὼ ἐπὶ γυναῖκας ἐκινήσασαν. Moulton (Prol., p. 249) gives τί διδοῖς τοῖς ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ; In Mt. 8:27 note ποταπῆς ὦτι (cf. οὕτως ὥστε). See also Heb. 2:6 (Ps. 8:5); Lu. 4:36. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 160) quotes Acta Christophori, 68, 18, τοιοῦτος ὦτι. There is no doubt about the consecutive use of ὦτι in the later Greek. We find it in the LXX, as in Ex. 3:11, τίς εἰμι ἔγω ὥστε ὑμῖν ἐγὼ ἐπὶ γυναῖκας ἐκινήσασαν. Moulton (Prol., p. 249) gives τί διδοῖς τοῖς ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ; In Mt. 8:27 note ποταπῆς ὦτι (cf. οὕτως ὥστε).

(ζ) The Infinitive. The inf. with ὥστε has been discussed, but we have left the simple inf., the articular (τοῦ) inf., εἰς τό and the inf. There are apparently examples of each construction in the N. T. Thus the simple inf. of result is seen in Lu. 1:54, ἄντελάβετο Ἰσραήλ παιδὸς αὕτου μητρὸν ἔλεος; at any rate it is used here very freely. Blass considers the infinitives in Lu. 1:72 used “quite incoherently.” But in Ac. 5:3 ἔπεσασθαί has a consecutive idea, as has ἐπιλαθέσθαι in Heb. 6:10. See also ἄνοιξαί in Rev. 5:5 and δοῦναι in 16:9. Cf. Lu. 1:76, 78 f. It is probable that originally the dative –αί in the inf., δόμεναι as opposed to δόμεν, [Page 1002] expressed
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“designed result” (Moulton, ProL., pp. 204, 207), but this idea shrank into the background. This idiom is found in the papyri,\(^1\) as in O. P. 526 (ii/a.d.), ὠάκ ἤμην ἀπαθῆς ἀλόγως σε ἄπολεξεν. Meyer on Ro. 7:3, τοῦ μὴ ἔμα, argues that τοῦ and the inf. never expresses result, a position which I once held.\(^2\) But the evidence is too strong to resist. See Infinitive for distinction between actual and hypothetical result. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 154) quotes Acta Barnabae, 10, μὴ βλάπτῃ Βαρνάβαν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι, as consecutive. The idiom is not common in the papyri as is true of τοῦ and inf. (Moulton, ProL., p. 220). It belongs chiefly to the LXX and Byzantine writers, and Moulton puts it in “the higher stratum of education in the main.” The epexegetic use occurs, as in C. P. R. 156 ἔξουσίαν—τοῦ—θέσθαι, O. P. 275 τοῦ ἀποσπασθῆναι ἔπειται. This construction (τοῦ and the inf.) had a very wide development in the N. T. in opposition to the encroachments of ἵνα. See Lu. 17:1 and Ac. 10:25, where τοῦ and the inf. is practically the subject of the verb (cf. original dative and locative cases). Luke has two-thirds of the examples of τοῦ and the inf. in the N. T. Only half of these (in Gospel and Acts) seem clearly final according to Moulton.\(^3\) He holds that of the 13 examples in Paul none are unmistakably final, though Ro. 6:6 and Ph. 3:10 are probably so. In both instances τοῦ and the inf. is epexegetic of a ἵνα clause (Moulton, ProL., p. 218). In Paul ‘so as to’ will usually express his idea with τοῦ and the inf. A clear instance in Luke is seen in Ac. 7:19, ἐκάκωσεν τοὺς πατέρας τοῦ ποιεῖν—‘so as to make.’ Blass\(^4\) cites a parallel from the LXX (1 Ki. 17:20), σὺ ἐκάκωσας τοῦ θανατώσαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς. Other LXX instances are Gen. 3:22: 19:21; Is. 5:14. Cf. Ro. 7:3 (epex., consec., p. 1067), τοῦ μὴ ἔμαι. It is probable in Lu. 9:51; Ac. 18:10; 20:3; 27:1; Ro. 1:24. Cf. τοῦ ἐρωτῆσαι and ἵνα καταγάγεις in Ac. 23:20. So with εἰς τὸ and the inf. Its most natural signification is aim or purpose, but, just as with ἵνα, so here result is sometimes the idea. Meyer in his note on Ro. 1:20, εἰς τὸ ἔμαι αὐτοῦ ἀναπληρῶσαι, insists that the meaning of εἰς τὸ is always purpose. In this particular instance divine purpose may be the idea, though result is the probable conception. See Sanday and Headlam in loco. Ellicott on 1 Th. 2:12, εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν (after παρακαλοῦντες κτλ.), admits the sub-final use of εἰς τὸ (cf. ἰνα) after verbs of exhorting (cf. 1 Th. 3:10), though denying the ecbatic use. But it is only a step to go on and that [Page 1003] the N. T. writers took. See the epexegetical use of εἰς τὸ in 1 Th. 4:9. Winer\(^1\) admitted the consecutive use of εἰς τὸ and the inf. as in 2 Cor. 8:6, εἰς τὸ παρακάλεσαι ἤμας Τίτον, ‘so that we besought Titus.’ This idiom is not present in the Johannine writings, though it is very frequent in Paul’s writings (especially Ro. and 1 Th.) and Hebrews. Notice ταχύς εἰς τὸ ἄκουσαι, βραδύς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι (Jas. 1:19). In Heb. 11:3, εἰς τὸ γεγονόναι, we have a clear example of result. Note the perfect tense with notion of permanence.\(^2\) See also φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν (Ro. 12:3), where purpose is impossible. Cf. Gal. 3:17. As to πρὸς τὸ and the inf. the point is not clear. Purpose is undoubtedly present as in Mt. 6:1; Eph. 6:11, and there is total absence of purpose in

---

2 Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 156.
3 ProL., p. 217.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236.
1 W.-M., p. 413 f.
2 Moulton, ProL., p. 219.
7. WISHES. The use of the optative for a future wish like ἀγιάσαι (1 Th. 5:23), μὴ γένοιτο (Gal. 6:14), is not a hypotactic construction. This is pure parataxis and has already been discussed under the Optative. See Optative Mode. The only hypotactic sentence for the expression of a wish in the N. T. is that with ὄφελον, which comes in the late Greek to be used as a particle. Even here it is possible to regard the construction as paratactic, but note εἴ γάρ and εἴθε. It is the second aorist ind. of ὄφελον without the augment. ὄφελον with the inf. occurs in Herodotus, and the form is thus probably Ionic. For κοινή parallels see “Impossible Wishes” under Indicative Mode. Cf. ὄφελον συνίστασθαι in 2 Cor. 12:11. It is found in the LXX as a conjunction, as in Ex. 16:3, ὄφελον ἰπεθάνομεν. Cf. Num. 14:2; 20:3. Moulton suggests that its application to the second and third persons is due to the meaning ‘I would’ rather than ‘thou shouldst.’ As a matter of fact its use in the N. T. is very limited, though εἴθε and εἴ γάρ are wanting as particles of wishing. For a wish about the past we have the aorist ind. So ὄφελον γε ἐβασιλεύσατε (1 Cor. 4:8). Cf. Ps. 118 (119):5. For a wish about the present we have the imperfect ind. So 2 Cor. 11:1, ὄφελον ἰνίσισθε, and Rev. 3:15, ὄφελον ἦς. The Text. Rec. here has ὄφελον ἦς, but it is baseless. However, we do find the fut. ind. for a future wish. So Gal. 5:12, ὄφελον ἰποκόψονται. Wishes as a separate idiom are vanishing in the N. T. But ὄφελον appears in Lucian, Athenagoras, Greg. Naz., Socrates. Cf. Sophocles’ Lexicon. To compensate for this loss we have the strong asseverations with οὐ μή (Mt. 13:14), the use of εἴ like the Hebrew דָּרָשׁ (Mk. 8:12; Heb. 4:3), εἴ μήν (Heb. 6:14), the use of the participle like the Hebrew inf. absolute (Mt. 13:14). The distinction between wish and supposition with εἴ was sometimes hard to make in Homer. The relation between wishes and conditions is not clear.

8. CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

(a) Two Types. No hypotactic clause is more important than this. For some reason the Greek conditional sentence has been very difficult for students to understand. In truth the doctors have disagreed themselves and the rest have not known how to go. The theory of Hermann, followed by most Germans (Winer, W.-M., p. 363 ff.

3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236.
4 W.-M., p. 414 note.
5 Prol., p. 218. See further Ogden, De infinitivi finalis vel consecutivi constructione apud priscos poetas Graecos, 1913.
7 Moulton, Prol., p. 201.
8 In W.-Sch., p. 29, reference is made to εἴ ὄφελον ἰφόλαξας in Job 14:13 and εἴ γάρ ὄφελον δυνατίμην in Job 30:24. Evidently ὄφελον was not felt to be sufficient alone.
9 Prol., p. 201.
Blass\textsuperscript{3}), is the one that I learned from Broadus and have expounded in my \textit{Short Grammar}.\textsuperscript{4} It is also that of Gildersleeve.\textsuperscript{5} This theory in brief is that there are four classes of conditions which fall into two groups or types. The two types are the determined and the undetermined. The point in “determined” is that the premise or condition is \textit{assumed} to be true (or untrue). A positive statement is made in either case and the conclusion follows logically from this premise. The indicative is the one used for this type (the first and second class conditions, real and unreal, or fulfilled and unfulfilled). The other type is the undetermined condition. Naturally the indicative is not allowed here. The element of uncertainty calls for the subj. or the optative. The difference therefore between the third and fourth class conditions is just that between the subj. and the opt. They are both modes of doubtful, hesitating affirmation, but the optative \textbf{[Page 1005]} is more remote than the subj. In this type the premise is not assumed to be either true or untrue. The point is in the air and the cloud gathers round it. But there is less mist over the subj. than the opt. In broad outline this is the classification of the conditional sentences which I hold to be true. Thompson\textsuperscript{1} is surely right in saying that no division can claim any higher right than that of convenience and intelligibility, except that I should like to add that the exposition should be in harmony with the facts of the historical development of the Greek language. There is no nobler achievement in syntax than the Greek conditional sentence before it broke down from the loss of the optative and the future indicative. In the modern Greek it is therefore a wreck, and there is corresponding obscurity between the various classes of conditions, as in English, in spite of special developments to make atonement for the loss.\textsuperscript{2} In broad outline these four classes of conditions may be termed Reality, Unreality, Probability, Possibility. The word Probability is, however, too strong a term for the third-class condition (\textit{ἐάν} and the subj.). La Roche\textsuperscript{3} prefers “objektive Möglichkeit” for the third class and “subjektive
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Möglichkeit” for the fourth class (εἰ and the opt.). This is also the language of Winer,4 “objective possibility” and “subjective possibility.” Farrar5 prefers the words Possibility, Impossibility, Slight Probability, Uncertainty. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 142) calls εἰ with ind. “objektiv,” ἐὰν with subj. “an sich objektiv,” εἰ with opt. “subjektiv,” εἰ with past tenses of ind. “Irrealität.” So it goes. Radermacher thinks also that, to understand the Greek conditions, we must distinguish sharply between the vernacular and the κοινή (“so müssen wir scharf scheiden zwischen Volksprache und der Koiné”), a mistaken view in my judgment. It is best to use κοινή for both the vernacular and literary language. This brings us face to face with the other theory, the one adopted by Farrar. It was expounded by Goodwin6 and has had quite a vogue in America and England.7 This theory calls for “particular” and “general” suppositions as a fundamental element. This is a false step in itself. As [Page 1006] Gildersleeve1 shows, each of the four classes of conditions may be particular or general. That point has no bearing on the quality of the condition. Goodwin’s past general supposition, where alone a show of distinct structure is made, is a mixed condition (see later under fourth class condition). But the point on which I wish to attack Goodwin’s scheme is chiefly in his definition of the first and second class conditions. That involves the third also, as will be seen. Goodwin confuses the “fact” with the “statement” of the fact. He describes the first condition thus: “When the protasis simply states a present or past particular supposition, implying nothing as to the fulfilment of the condition, it takes a present or past tense of the indicative with εἰ.” The words to which I object, besides “particular,” are “implying nothing as to the fulfilment of the condition.” This condition pointedly implies the fulfilment of the condition. It is the condition of actuality, reality, Wirklichkeit, and not mere “possibility” as Farrar has it (see above) à la Goodwin. This is the crux of the whole matter. Once see that the first class condition with the ind. implies the reality of the premise, all else follows naturally. In the discussion of the second class condition Goodwin2 properly says: “When the protasis states a present or past supposition, implying that the condition is not or was not fulfilled, etc.” This is the condition of unreality as the other is that of reality and the indicative is, of course, used with both. Hence the subj. and the opt. conditions fall apart to themselves as undetermined. The point about all the four classes to note is

3 Beitr. zur griech. Gr., 1893, pp. 14, 18. He uses “Wirklichkeit” and “Irrealität” (pp. 8, 28) for the others.
4 W.-M., p. 364.
Farrar FARRAR, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).
5 Gk. Synt., p. 156 f.
Goodwin GOODWIN, W. W., Greek Grammar. Various editions.


7 Adopted by Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 296.
2 M. and T., p. 147.
that the form of the condition has to do only with the *statement*, not with the absolute truth or certainty of the matter. Examples will be given directly to show that the second class condition is sometimes used where the fact is just the opposite. The same thing is true of the first class condition. We must distinguish always therefore between the fact and the *statement* of the fact. The conditional sentence deals only with the *statement*. This point is clearly seen in Kühner-Gerth, II, p. 465, except that the third class is lost sight of and merged with the first. Burton follows Goodwin through all his [Page 1007] ramifications. A word further is demanded by way of warning. One must not try to explain the Greek condition by the English or German translation. The English is often hopelessly ambiguous, while the Greek is perspicuous if one will only give it a chance to speak for itself. The true explanation is only possible by the approach from the Greek standpoint. And that is by the *mode*, not by *εἰ* or *ἐάν*. *Εάν* is nothing but *εἰ ᾗ*. The *ἄν* is not essential to either protasis or apodosis. Homer used *εἰ* with the subj. with or without *κέ* or *ἄν*. The Attic Greek sometimes has *εἰ ᾗ* with the opt. and Demosthenes used *εἰ ᾗ* with the past ind. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 127) quotes Joh. Philop. *De aeternitate* 430, 28 (iii/A.D.) *εἰ—ἠδύνατο ᾗ*. He gives also (p. 163) *κἀν—βοηθοῖς*, Diod. XI, 37, 3; *ἔἀν μὴ—ῥύσαι*, Diod. I, 77, 3. The modern Greek uses *ἄν* (for *ἐάν*) with any tense of the ind. (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 194). There is no principle involved in *ἄν*, simply custom. In modern Greek the subj. is used, of course, more freely since the fut. ind. and the opt. have vanished. Jolly holds that the ind. was a later development with conditional sentences in Greek and that the first attempt was made with the subj. and the opt. He thinks that the use of the ind. was the result of a clearer conception of the logical possibilities of the conditional clause. The subj. was more common in the Zend and the Sanskrit (and Latin) than in the Greek. Here as always *ἄν* is difficult to explain. “Now it has a definite reference, now it is indefinite. Sometimes the reference is supplied by the context, sometimes by the opposite.” See The Use of *ἄν* in Relative Sentences in this chapter. We shall first examine the standard forms of the conditional sentence and then note the variations and modifications.

(b) Four Classes.


3 N. T. M. and T., pp. 100 ff. Farnell (Gk. Conditional and Rel. Sent., 1892) also follows Goodwin, as does R. H. Smith (The Theory of Cond. Sent. in Gk. and Lat., 1894).

2 Bäumlein, Unters., pp. 352 ff.
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———, Geschichte des Infinitivs im Indog. (1873).

(a) Determined as Fulfilled. This class of condition assumes the condition to be a reality and the conclusion follows logically and naturally from that assumption. Gildersleeve (Am. Jour. of Philol., 1882, p. 435) observes that this is the favourite condition: “It is the favourite condition when one wishes to be or seem fair, the favourite condition when one is sure of the premiss.” The construction is εἰ (sometimes ἐὰν) and any tense of the indicative in the protasis. The apodosis varies very greatly. It all depends on what one is after, whether mere statement, prediction, command, prohibition, suggestion, question. Hence the apodosis may be in the indicative (any tense) or the subjunctive or the imperative. There is no necessary correspondence in tense between protasis and apodosis. The variation in the mode of the apodosis has no essential bearing on the force of the condition. This condition, therefore, taken at its face value, assumes the condition to be true. The context or other light must determine the actual situation. The apodosis is the principal clause, but since the protasis is the premise, the protasis usually precedes the apodosis. The apodosis may be declarative or interrogatory, positive or negative. This condition is so frequent in the N. T. that no exhaustive list can be given, but representative examples must suffice. Thus in Mt. 12:27, εἰ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεεζεβοῦλ ἔκβάλλω τα δαίμονια, οὐ νικὸν ὤμων ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλονσιν; This is a good example (cf. also Gal. 5:11) to begin with, since the assumption is untrue in fact, though assumed to be true by Jesus for the sake of argument. The question is a redactio ad absurdum.

In verse 26, εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς τὸν Σατανᾶν ἔκβαλλει, ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη, there is the additional point of change of tense in the apodosis. He was already divided against himself, in that case, before he casts himself out. But the tense may be merely due to a quick change of view-point as accomplished (timeless aorist in reality). This point comes out well in verse 28, εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τα δαίμονια, ὥσ τι ἐφθασεν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἦ βασιλεία. Note ὥσ with the aorist. For the past ind. in both clauses see Ac. 11:17 (εἰ ἔδωκεν, τίς ἥμην); 1 Cor. 15:2; Rev. 20:15 (εἰ τις οὐχ εὐρέθη, ἔβλήθη). For the present ind. in both clauses note Mt. 19:10 (εἰ οὗτος ἔστιν—οὕ τωσ συμφέρειν); Ro. 8:9; Jo. 15:18; 1 Cor. 15:12. The presence of the perfect in protasis (15:14, 17, 19) or apodosis (15:13, 16) does not vary the point. In 2 Cor. 2:5, the perfect is followed by the imperfect. The fut. ind. may, though rarely in the N. T., occur in both clauses, as in Mt. 26:33 (εἰ σκανδαλισθόνται, σκανδαλισθόμαι). Cf. Mk. 14:29; Lu. 19:40; 1 Cor. 3:15; 2 Tim. 2:12; 1 Cor. 3:14 f. But such little niceties cut no figure in this construction. There is perfect liberty to mix the tenses ad libitum. So past and present (Lu. 19:8 f.; 11:18; 2 Cor. 7:8, 14; Ro. 4:2; [Page 1009] 15:27; 1 Jo. 4:11), past and future (Jo. 3:12; 15:20; Lu. 16:11), present and future (Mt. 17:4; Jo. 5:47; 11:12; Ac. 5:39; 19:39; Ro. 8:11). In 1 Cor. 9:11 εἰ ἐσπείρομεν and εἰ θερίσομεν occur side by side. Examples of the imperative in the apodosis occur as in Mk. 4:23 εἰ τίς ἔχει ὄτα ἄκουσιν, ἄκουστο. Cf. Mt. 5:29; 8:31; Lu. 4:3; Ac. 16:15; Jo. 7:4; 18:23. In Lu. 4:3, εἰ υἱὸς εἰ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰπὲ, we have a good example of the first class condition. The devil would not, of course, use the second class (assumed to be untrue), for that would be an affront to Christ. The third and fourth classes would throw doubt on the point. The temptation, to have force, must be assumed as true. The devil knew it to be true. He accepts that fact as a working hypothesis in the

---

6 The origin of εἰ is uncertain. Εἰ is the same as οὐ in Homer (and Doric). Lange (Der hom. Gebr. der Partikel Εἰ) makes it exclamatory. But Hale (The Orig. of Subj. and Opt. Cond. in Gk., Harv. Stu. in Class. Philol., 1901) treats it as a demonstrative in the locative case, meaning ‘in that case.’ This is more probable.
temptation. He is anxious to get Jesus to prove it, as if it needed proof for Christ’s own satisfaction and for his reception. If the devil used Aramaic, then we have Christ’s own translation of it or that of the Evangelist. In Jo. 18:23 (ἐλαλήσας ἔλθῃ κακοῦ, ἐὰν μητρύθησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ), however, the assumption is not a fact, though Christ treats it as such for argument’s sake. Cf. Lu. 23:35, 37. In Jo. 20:15 note the aorist ind. (ἐβοστασας) and the imper. (ἐπέ). Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 215 takes εἶ θέλεις in the late κονή to be like the French s’il vous plait. Cf. Mt. 17:4. For the subj. in the apodosis note Gal. 5:25, εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχίωμεν. The use of ἐὰν with the ind. is rather more frequent in the late κονή. Finally εἰ came to be “a mere literary alternative.”1 In the κονή in Pisidia and Phrygia ἐὰν occurs with the aorist ind., the pres. ind. and the future ind. as well as with the subj.2 The papyri examples are unmistakable, as ἐὰν δὲι in Tb. P. 58 (ii/b.c.), ἐὰν οἴδει B. U. 546 (Byz.), ἐὰν φαίνεται A. P. 93 (ii/a.d.), ἐὰν δὲ εἰσίν O. P. (ii/a.d.), ἐὰν κελεύεις O. P. 1150, 2 f. (vi/a.d.), ἐὰν μαχοῦσαι Par. P. 18, ἐὰνπερ ἐκπληρώσοσιν Par. P. 62 (ii/b.c.).3 Radermacher (N. T. Gr., pp. 83, 163) cites others from the papyri and inscriptions. So Heberdey-Wilhelm, Reisen, p. 137, ἐὰν δὲ τς θήσει; Eum. Hippiatr., p. 244, 30, ἐὰνπερ ἐνορχήσεις ἐστίν. Perhaps examples like ἐὰν ἦν are not to be counted as instances, since ἦν for ἦς is sometimes subj.4 In general, the difference between εἰ and ἐὰν is considerably lessened in the κονή, though it must be remembered that ἐὰν was never confined to the subj. nor εἰ to the ind. and opt. ἐὰν ἦσθα occurs in Job 22:3, and Moulton1 quotes it from Hb. P. 78 (iii/a.d.) as “certainly subj.” Cf. also ἐὰν ἦσαν Tb. P. 333 (iii/a.d.), and a number of undoubted examples of ἐὰν with past, present and future tenses of the ind. from κονή writers are given in Sophocles’ Lexicon under ἐὰν. Thayer calls it “a somewhat negligent use, met with from the time of Aristotle on.” It was just a normal development in the κονή till in the modern Greek ἐὰν is used indifferently with either ind. or subj. So ὅτι κανες, ‘if you did so,’ ἐὰν δυψάσεης ‘if you thirst’ (Thumb, Handb., p. 194 f.). Theophylact in his Proem to Luke has ἐὰν μὴ ἐθαρρεῖ, In the N. T. we note ἐὰν οἴδαμεν (1 Jo. 5:15); ἐὰν στήκετε (1 Th. 3:8), where the distinction is clear between the two modes (ind. and subj.). In 1 Th. 3:8 ND have στήκετε, but in Lu. 6:34 there is considerable support for ἐὰν δανείζετε, as there is for ἐὰν τε ἀποθνήσκομεν in Ro. 14:8. In Gal. 1:8 a few MSS. read ἐὰν εὐαγγελίζεται. It is possible to treat ἐὰν μαρτυροῦ as pres. ind., Jo. 5:31; 8:14. There is undue scepticism on Blass’ part concerning ἐὰν and the fut. ind. It is true that the MSS. are generally divided, but there is no real room for doubt about following NBC in Ac. 8:31, ἐὰν δοκήσει, except for possible itacism with – η. That is possible also in Rev. 2:5 where W. H. read ἐὰν μετανοήσῃς. But there is no room for itacism in Mt. 18:19 ἐὰν συμφονήσουσιν, supported by NBDELΔ 33, although rejected by W. H. and Nestle (FGKM have –ώσιν), nor in Lu. 19:40 ἐὰν σιωπήσουσιν, nor in Rev. 2:22 ἐὰν μη μετανοήσουσιν. In Mt. 18:19 the editors seem

2 Compernass, De Sermone, p. 35 f.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 168.
1 Prol., p. 168.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 215.
unwilling to follow the MS. evidence for the fut. ind. It is mere tradition to feel that ἐὰν has to have the subj. Besides, we have ἐὰν ἔσῃ and ἐὰν μήκετί προσθήσομαι in Hermas, Mand. V. 1. 2 and Mand. IV. 3. 7. In Lev. 22:9 we find ἐὰν βεβηλώσομαι. There is at any rate no great difference in the resultant sense between the fut. ind. and the aor. subj. and it was a very natural development. Cf. Homer’s use of κέ with both. But, when all is said, as a matter of fact, in the N. T. as in the κοινή generally, the rule is for εἰ to appear with the ind. and ἐὰν with the subj. In 1 Cor. 7:5 we have εἰ μήτι ἐν (bracketed by W. H.) without a verb. It is matched by the papyri. Thus B. U. 326 εἰ τι ἐὰν—καταλίπω, O. P. 105 (ii/Α.Δ. ) εἰ τι ἀλλὰ αἱ ἐαν (Ε)χω , B. M. 233 (iv/Α.Δ.) εἰ τι ἀν—ἀναλώσῃς, Tb. P. 28 (ii/Β.С.) εἰ κἀν δύναται. In these the modal ἀν (ἐάν) is separated from εἰ and used as if with ὅς, ὅπου. Radermacher [Page 1011] (N. T. Gr., p. 162) cites also Joh. Philop., De œtern., p. 85, 19, εἰ οὐκ ἀν—ὑπάρξῃ. Deissman1 sees no analysis of ἐὰν μή τι in this, though Moulton contends for this explanation. The use of εἰ περίκειται in Mk. 9:42 in the sense of ὅτι Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 215) calls “quite incorrect.” He means it is not “classic.” Note the irony in 1 Cor. 14:38, εἰ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἀγνοεῖται.

The negative of the protasis in the first class condition is practically always οὐ in the N. T. We have εἰ οὐ as a rule, not εἰ μή. In the classic Greek the rule was to use εἰ μή, and εἰ οὐ appeared only where the οὐ coalesced with a single word (the verb generally) or for sharp antithesis or emphasis.2 But in the N. T., as in the κοινή generally and occasionally in the Attic,3 we meet εἰ οὐ in the condition of the first class. Jannaris4 notes 34 examples of εἰ οὐ in the N. T., but Moulton5 finds only 31 of this class of condition. There are only two in the second, so that there is a slight discrepancy. In truth εἰ μή occurs only five times with the simple logical condition, and the examples are not quite normal except the one in Mk. 6:5, οὐκ ἔδωκα εἰ μή ἔθεράπευσεν (a simple past condition), and in 1 Tim. 6:3, εἰ τις—μή προσέρχεται (Blass calls this an “abnormal” instance from the literary style and unlike the N. T. idiom). But see 1 Cor. 15:2 ἐκτὸς εἰ μή εἴκῃ ἐπιστέψατε, 2 Cor. 13:5 εἰ μήτι ἄδοκμοι ἔστε, Gal. 1:7 εἰ μή τινες εἶσαι. Elsewhere the negative is οὐ. This is in harmony with the meaning of οὐ and the ind. mode. The definite negative goes with the definite mode. This is the condition of supposed reality and εἰ οὐ is the natural combination. In general Blass6 is correct in saying that οὐ is the negative of the ind. and μή of the other modes including the inf. and part. This, of course, was not the

3 Moulton, Prol., p. 169.  
1 B. S., p. 204.  
2 W.-Th., p. 477.  
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———, On the True Meaning of the Κοινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).
Attic standard, but that was hopelessly gone even for the Atticists. In the modern Greek ἐφεσάτε (from οὐδὲν) supplants οὐ with the ind. and μὴ(ν) goes with the subj. That is the goal, as Moulton observes, which is not yet reached in the N. T., for μὴ occurs in questions of doubt with the ind. and εἰ μὴ still holds on. Even in the modern Greek, Thumb (Handb., p. 195) gives ἐφεσάτε with subj. or ind. in conditions as ὁ ἐδὲν πιστεύης and ὁ ἐδὲν πίηκανα. Radermacher [Page 1012] (N. T. Gr., p. 172) cites P. Wess. xxvi, εἰ οὖ δίδοσαι. But the point to get clear is that in the first class condition the normal negative in the κοινὴ is εἰ οὖ. Moulton counts the idiom 6 times in Luke, 3 in John, 16 in Paul, 2 in James, and one each in Matthew, Hebrews, 2 Peter and Revelation. As examples take Lu. 18:4 εἰ καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐ φοβοῦμαι οὐδὲ ἐνθρώπου ἔντρεπομαι and Jo. 1:25 εἰ οὐ οὐκ εἰ ὁ Χριστός. In the latter case the negative is very emphatic. So in Jo. 5:47 εἰ οὖ πιστεύετε. Cf. further Lu. 12:26; 16:11, 31; Jo. 3:12; Ro. 11:21; 1 Cor. 15:13, 15–17; 2 Th. 3:10. Sometimes οὖ practically coalesces with the verb, as in Lu. 14:26; 1 Cor. 7:9; 11:6; 16:22; 1 Tim. 5:8; Rev. 20:15. The notion of contrast is seen in Jo. 10:37 εἰ οὖ ποιῶ, εἰ δὲ ποιῶ. Note also κἂν μὴ πιστεύετε. So in 5:46 f. εἰ πιστεύετε, εἰ δὲ—οὐ πιστεύετε. See further Lu. 11:8; Jas. 2:11; 2 Pet. 2:4. In Mt. 26:42 note εἰ οὐ δύναται τοῦτο παρελθεῖν ἐὰν μὴ πίω. In Ro. 11:21, εἰ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, οὐδὲ σοφοὶ ἐφείσατο, it is hardly possible to translate εἰ οὖ by ‘unless.’ The same thing is true in 1 Cor. 9:2 and 15:29. Cf. ἐὰν μὴ in 9:16.

(b) Determined as Unfulfilled. In this somewhat difficult condition only past tenses of the ind. occur. The premise is assumed to be contrary to fact. The thing in itself may be true, but it is treated as untrue. Here again the condition has only to do with the statement, not with the actual fact. A good illustration is found in Lu. 7:39 οὗτος εἰ ἦν ὁ προφήτης, ἐγίνομαι δὲν. The Pharisee here assumes that Jesus is not a prophet because he allowed the sinful woman to wash his feet. Jesus is therefore bound to be ignorant of her true character. The form of the condition reveals the state of mind of the Pharisee, not the truth about Jesus’ nature and powers. As a matter of fact it is the Pharisee who is ignorant. For this reason I cannot agree with Moulton’s statement that the ind. is not suited to the expression of contingencies, wishes, commands or other subjective conceptions. On p. 201 Moulton recovers himself by saying that these sentences of unfulfilled condition state nothing necessarily unreal in their apodosis,” and “the sentence itself only makes it untrue under the circumstances.” I should add “as conceived by the speaker or writer.” Surely the ind. is the mode for positive and negative statements, for directness of statement and clarity of expression. But one must emphasize the words “statement” and “expression.” The ind. does not go behind the face value of the record. Most untruths are told in the ind. mode. The [Page 1013] statement of unreality here from the standpoint of the speaker or writer, is as clear cut and positive as that of reality in the first class condition. The term “unreal” as applied to this use of the ind. properly belongs only to the standpoint of the user. To him the case is impossible and he makes a positive statement to that effect with the ind. By the ind. mode the condition is determined. Whether it is fulfilled or unfulfilled is a more difficult matter. This idea has to be conveyed by suggestion. It is not a question of positive or negative, but of

definite assumption of unreality. The “unreality” does not come from the ind. That in its origin is a matter wholly of the context. Take Mk. 6:5, for instance, οὐκ ἔδόνατο εἰ μὴ ἔδεράτυκεν. In the abstract it is not possible to tell which class of condition we have here. It is either first or second, we know. If the writer is talking about the present time in terms of past time, then it is a second class condition determined as unfulfilled. The Greek fell upon the use of the past tenses of the ind. as a device to help in this matter. An unfulfilled condition about present time was expressed in terms of the imperfect ind. An unfulfilled condition about past time was expressed in terms of the aorist or the past perfect ind. There is the analogy of wishes to justify it, if, indeed, wishes did not come out of this construction (εἴθε, εἰ γάρ). The origin of this precise point is obscure. In the context one must seek for light and help. In Mk. 6:5 (οὐκ ἔδόνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμιᾷ δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ ὀλίγος ἄρρόστους ἐπιθεῖς τὰς χεῖρας ἔθεράτυκεν) it is clear that a definite past event is chronicled. So it is a condition of the first class, determined as fulfilled. But in Jo. 15:22 (and 24) εἰ μὴ ἤλθον καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτοῖς, ὅμως οὐκ ἔχοσαν, how is it? Is it a simple historical narrative about a past situation? Is it a hypothesis about the present time in terms of past time to suggest its unreality? Fortunately here the context shows. The very next words are ζεῦ δὲ πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχοσιν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. (Cf. also ζεῦ δὲ in verse 24). The contrast with the present and actual situation is made in plain terms. In Jo. 9:41 we have ζεῦ δὲ even after ᾨν. This is not always done in the context and one is either left to his wits or ᾨν is added to the apodosis. In verse 19 of John 15 we have εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἤτε, ὅ κόσμος ἦν τὸ ἱδίον ἐφίλε. “The addition of ἦν to an indicative hypothesis produced much the same effect as we can express in writing by italicising ‘if’” or by adding [Page 1014] to the apodosis ‘in that case.’ This is the definite use of ᾨν. But it is a mistake to say, as some writers do, that ᾨν in the apodosis is essential to the second class condition. Even Moulton says: “The dropping of ἦν in the apodosis of unfulfilled conditions was classical with phrases like ἔδει, ἐχρήν, καλὸν ἦν.” The absence was so undoubtedly, but was ἦν ever really necessary with these verbs? When ᾨν was used with them, there was a slight change of meaning. The N. T. is in perfect accord with ancient idiom when it has καλὸν ἦν εἰ oὐκ ἔγεννηθη (Mt. 26:24); ἔδόνατο εἰ μὴ ἔπεκέκλητο (Ac. 26:32); εἰ μὴ ἦν, oὐκ ἔδόνατο (Jo. 9:33), not to mention the apodosis alone in Mt. 25:27; Lu. 19:23; Ac. 22:22; 27:21; 2 Cor. 2:2; 12:11; 2 Pet. 2:21. In Ac. 24:19, οὐκ ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρέναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν εἰ τι ἔχοσιν πρὸς ἐμέ, it is a mixed cond. (protasis in fourth class) and the apodosis is itself a relative clause. But the idiom goes further than these verbs of propriety and possibility and obligation, as is seen in Gal. 4:15, εἰ δύνατον, ἐδόκατε μοι; Jo. 15:22, 24; 19:11, oὐκ ἐξῆς, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένων; Ro. 7:7, oὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου καὶ oὐκ ἤδειν εἰ μὴ ἔλεγεν. In 1 Cor. 5:10, ἐπεὶ ὀφείλετε, we have the apodosis of this condition. Moulton (Prol., p. 200 note) cites O. P. 526 (ii/ii.A.D.) εἰ καὶ μὴ ἄνεβεν, ἔγῳ oὐ παρέβενον; O. P. 530 (ii/ii.A.D.) εἰ—παρέκκλητο, ἀπεστάλκειν; Rein. P. 7 (ii/ii.B.C.) oὐκ ἀπέστημι, εἰ μὴ ἤνάγκασε. But in most cases the ᾨν regularly appears

---

1 Cf. Wilhelmus, De Modo Irreali qui Vocatur, 1881, p. 3. Mod. Gk. no longer has this idiom. It uses ᾨν with the past ind. and ἦν in the apodosis for ᾨν.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 200.
2 Prol., p. 200.
in the apodosis, though not as the first word. Thus *ἐλ ἐγένοντο, πάλαι ὁν μετενόησαν* (Mt. 11:21). In Ac. 18:14 f. we have the second and first class conditions side by side, *εἰ μὴν ἦν δικία σα· ἢ ἡ ῥαδιούργημα ποιηθήν, ὡς ἦν δίκη, κατὰ λόγου ἓν ἀνθρώπον ἦμων· εἰ δὲ ἐπίθηκον ἐστιν περὶ λόγου καὶ ἀνθρώπων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ ὑμᾶς, ὀδεχοῦτε αὐτόι·* Here Gallio neatly justifies his own impatience by the first condition (second class) and shows his own opinion by the second condition (first class).

Sometimes ἓν is repeated with two verbs as in *εἰ ἦδει, ἔγρηγόρησεν ὁν καὶ οὐκ ἑδότεν* (Mt. 24:43), but it is not repeated in the parallel passage in Lu. 12:39 *εἰ ἦδει, ἔγρηγόρησεν ὁν καὶ οὐκ ἄφηκεν*, though W. H. have one verb in the margin. ἓν is repeated also in Jo. 4:10.

The simplest form of this condition is when the imperfect occurs in both clauses or the aorist in both. In the former case present time is generally meant, as in Lu. 7:39 *εἰ ἦν, ἐγίνωσκεν ὁν; Jo. 5:46 εἰ ἐπιστεύσετε, ἐπιστεύσετε ὁν. So also Jo. 8:42; 9:41; 15:19; [Page 1015] 18:36; 1 Cor. 11:31; Gal. 1:10; Heb. 8:4, 7.1 In Jo. 8:19, εἰ ἠδίκετε—ἐν ἢ ἠδίκετε, we have the same construction, for this past perfect has the sense of the imperfect. In Heb. 11:15, *εἰ ἐννυμίασωσί—ἐννυμίασωσί ἂν, however, the reference is to past time as the context makes clear. It is descriptive of an unreal hypothesis in the past of a continuous nature. ‘If they had kept on remembering, they would have kept on having.’ This is a classical idiom, though uncommon. Another example is seen in Mt. 23:30, εἰ ἦμεθα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἦν ἡμεθα. Only the context can help one tell the kind of condition in 1 Cor. 12:19 and Heb. 7:11, for the apodosis appears in the form of a question without ἵν and the verb. The other normal condition of this class is where the aorist ind. occurs in both clauses, as in Mt. 11:21 εἰ ἐγένοντο, πάλαι ὁν μετενόησαν, Mk. 13:20 εἰ μὴ ἔκολόβοσεν, οὐκ ἔν ἔσωθη. This refers to past time. Cf. Mt. 25:27; 1 Cor. 2:8; Jo. 14:2; Heb. 10:2 (only apodosis). Sometimes one tense occurs in one clause, another in the other. The standpoint is shifted. Thus in Jo. 14:28 εἰ ἦγειτε, ἐχάριτε ὁν, Gal. 3:21 εἰ ἔδοθη, ἢν ἐν, Heb. 4:8 εἰ κατεπέσασθε, οὐκ ἔν ἐλάλει. Cf. also Jo. 15:22, 24. It is not always certain that the present reference of ἐν can be insisted on, since there was no separate aorist form of εἰμί. Sometimes ἓν is aorist. So as to Jo. 11:21, 32, εἰ, ἢς, οὐκ ἔν ἔπεθανεν. But the point of difference is certainly made in Jo. 18:30, εἰ μὴ ἦν ποιῶν, οὐκ ἔν παρεδώκαμεν. Cf. Ac. 18:14; Mt. 26:24. In Jo. 4:10, εἰ ἦδεις, σὺ ἐν ἐν τησας, we have the same thing. Cf. also Mt. 24:43. In Ac. 18:14 note in the next verse εἰ δὲ ἔστιν, ὀδεχοῦτε (first class). In 1 Jo. 2:19 we have the past perfect in the apodosis εἰ ἦσαν, μεμνημένοις αὐτος, the solitary example.2 But the past perfect occurs in the protasis as in Ac. 26:32, ὀπολολοζθα ἐδοτατο, ὁ ἐνθρωπος πος τοτος οι μὴ ἐπέκεκλετο Καίσαρα. Cf. also εἰ ἔγνοκετε, οὐκ ἔν καταδικάσατε (Mt. 12:7), though Westcott3 takes this as a “real imperfect” like ἔδειν above. The periphrastic past perfect we find in Jo. 19:11 οὐκ ἔγεισε, εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον. Moulton4 has given a list of the times that ἓν appears in the apodosis in the N. T. with the ind. imperf. (17 times), the ind. aor. (24) and the

---

1 Cf. Westcott on Heb., pp. 111 ff., for an excellent summary of the second class conditions.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 201.
Westcott WESTCOTT, B. F., Language of the N. T. (Smith’s B. D.).
3 On Heb., p. 113.
4 Prol., p. 166.
past perfect (1). In Lu. 17:6 we have the pres. ind. and the imperf. combined, εἴ ἔχετε, ἔλεγετε ὄν. This is really a mixed condition (first and second classes). Cf. Jo. 8:39, εἰ [Page 1016] ἔστε, ἐποίεῖ (the margin of W. H.). Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 163) quotes P. Oxy. IV, 729 (137 a.D.) ἔαν δὲ μὴ ἐκώλυσεν Ζεύς—ἐξησεν ὄν, where note ὄν with aorist ind. like the modern Greek ὄν τὸ ἰξευρά (Thumb, Handb., p. 195).

The negative of the second class condition is in the N. T. always μὴ except twice, Mt. 26:24 (Mk. 14:21) καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἔγνων ἡθ. Here the οὐ is very emphatic. Elsewhere we have εἰ μὴ as in Mt. 24:22 (note μὴ in protasis, οὐ in apodosis); Jo. 9:33; 15:22, 24; 18:30; 19:11; Ac. 26:32; Ro. 7:7. In itself εἰ μὴ is three times as common in the N. T. as εἰ οὐ, but outside of the five examples of εἰ μὴ in the first class conditions above and one in the third class (Lu. 9:13) εἰ μὴ is confined to the second class condition and to the elliptical use like πλὴν in the sense of ‘except’ or the phrase εἰ δὲ μὴ meaning ‘otherwise’ without a verb (cf. εἰ μὴ thus in Mt. 12:4; Lu. 4:26; εἰ δὲ μὴ in Jo. 14:11).1 See a bit later on this point. As already noted, modern Greek uses ὄν δὲν in this condition (Thumb, Handb., p. 195).

1 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 254; Moulton, Prol., p. 171.
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Gildersleeve finds the [Page 1017] prevalence of the subj. in conditional (as in temporal) clauses due to the greater exactness of the subj. here. It enables one, since it has a “tendency to realization” (Tendenz zur Wirklichkeit), to make a difference between the indicative and the optative conditions, though it has more affinity with the optative, except in the case of some future indicative conditions which come very close to the subj. idea. The kinship in origin and sense of the aorist subj. and fut. ind. makes the line a rather fine one between εἰ and the fut. ind. and ἐὰν and the subj. Indeed, as we sometimes have ἐὰν and the fut. ind. in the first class condition, so we occasionally meet εἰ and the subj. in the third class condition. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 162) notes εἰ and subj. at first as a “vulgarism,” but surely the classic usage answers that. The inscriptions have usually only ἐὰν and aorist subj. he finds. But he finds also abundant instances of εἰ and subj. in κοινή and late writers. So Epictetus, II, 18, 11 εἰ μή τις ἔξαλείψη, Vettius, 274, 11 εἰ δὲ τις λογίηται, Hippiatr., 177, 2 εἰ προσπήίζει, Demetrius, De eloc. 21, 11 εἰ γένηται, Pausanias, II, 35, 3 εἰ—ὕδρευσαντα. So in Lu. 9:13 εἰ μήτης γιορτᾶσαμον, 1 Cor. 14:5 ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ διερμήνευς, Ph. 3:12 εἰ καταλάβω (possibly also εἰ ποιεῖ καταντήσω in verse 11), Rev. 11:5 εἰ τις θελήσῃ (text of W. H., but margin θέλει or θελήσει). In Ro. 11:14, εἰ ποιεῖ παραζηλώσω καὶ σώσω, we may also have the aorist subj. In 1 Th. 5:10 we have εἰς γηγορώμεν εἴτε καθεύδωμεν. It is in the midst of a final sentence with ἵνα. In 1 Cor. 9:11 some MSS. read εἰ θερίσωμεν. This construction occurs occasionally in classical Greek. It was frequent in Homer and in the Attic poets, but is rare in our normalized texts of Attic prose, though a few examples occur in Thuc., Plato, Xenophon. This “laxity” increased till finally εἰ, like ὅτε, vanishes before ἐὰν (ἄν) which is used indiscriminately with ind. or subj., while εἰ is a mere “literary alternative.” In modern Greek ἄν has driven εἰ out of the vernacular. In Deut. 8:5 AF have εἰ τις παιδεύσῃ. Cf. Judg. 11:9. Moulton finds the same construction in the papyri as does Deissmann, [Page 1018] though it

5 Am. Jour. of Philol., 1909, p. 11.
1 Bäumlein, Griech. Modi, p. 177.
2 Gildersl. (Am. Jour. of Philol., XXXIII, 4, p. 490) complains that in Germany no standing is given to his distinction between the “minatory and monitary” use of εἰ with the future indicative. He first promulgated it in 1876.
Deissmann
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———, Biblische Gräciität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).

is rare in the early papyri.¹ Moulton (Prol., p. 187) cites O. P. 496 (ii/A.D.) ἐὰν ἤν (=ἦν), though he² seems curiously unwilling to admit the examples in the N. T. As to ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ in 1 Cor. 15:2, we have the ind. with this combination. Deissmann (B. S., p. 118) cites inscr. ἐκτός εἰ μὴ ἔδω—θελήσῃ. It is true that in the N. T. as a rule εἰ goes with the ind. and ἔδω with the subj. It is mainly in the future conditions that the line is breaking down. In Mt. 12:29 we have ἔδω μὴ ὁδήσῃ and then διαρράσει, but W. H. break the sentence into two. Besides the normal ἔδω and the occasional εἰ in this condition we have also ἔν (shortened form of ἔδω, not the modal ἔν). Thus Jo. 12:32 ἔν ὑψωθῶ, 13:20 ἔν τινα πέμψα, 16:23 ἔν τι αἴτήσητε. It occurs in the N. T. only six times (cf. ἔν μὴ in Jo. 5:19) and all in John. Cf. Ac. 9:2 ἔν. But note Lu. 12:38, κἂν—κἂν ἔλθῃ καὶ εὐρή (contraction of καὶ+ἔδω). Cf. Mt. 21:21; Lu. 13:9. It is absent from the Attic inscriptions, but supplants ἔδω in modern Greek. It is not clear why ἔδω disappeared thus in modern Greek. The Ionic form is ἦν.³ The future conditions are naturally the most frequent of all.

Just as the second class condition was debarred from the future, so the third class condition is confined to the future (from the standpoint of the speaker or writer). The first class condition covers past, present and future. In 1 Cor. 10:27 note εἰ τις καλεῖ and ἔδω τις εἰπῇ. In Ac. 5:38, ἔδω ἶκανον εἰ—ἔστιν, a real distinction is preserved. Gamaliel gives the benefit of the doubt to Christianity. He assumes that Christianity is of God and puts the alternative that it is of men in the third class. This does not, of course, show that Gamaliel was a Christian or an inquirer. He was merely willing to score a point against the Sadducees. Here, indeed, the supposition is about a present situation, but ἔδω and the subj. contemplate the future result (turn out to be). So ἔδω

---

2 Prol., p. 187.
3 Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 43; Meisterh.-Schw., p. 225 f. In Jo. 5:19 we have both uses of ὁδω (conditional and modal). In Mk 5:28 note ἔδω δψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἰματίων, not a repetition of modal ἔδω, but a particle κἂν='even.'
The tense is usually the aorist, though sometimes the pres. subj. occurs. Thus ἔδωκεν ἰκουσίαν (Mt. 18:15); ἔδωκεν δυσόη (Jo. 7:37). In 2 Tim. 2:5 note ἔδωκεν δὲ καὶ ὅθλῃ τις, οὗ στεφανοῦται ἔδωκαν μη νομίμως ἄθλησιν, where the distinction is drawn between the two tenses. I doubt the propriety, however, of reading a future perfect sense à la Latin into this aorist subj. as Moulton² does. He cites Mt. 5:47, ἔδωκαν ἄσπασθε, but surely the simple aorist conception is sufficient. John’s fondness (see Tenses) for the pres. subj. with ἔδωκεν has been discussed.³ In Jo. 3:27 we have the periphrastic perfect, ἔδωκαν μη ἡ δεδομένων. Cf. also Jas. 5:15, καὶ ἦν πεποιηκός. The conclusion of this condition is naturally most frequently the future ind. Thus Mt. 9:21 ἔδωκαν ἄσωμα, σωθήσομαι; Jo. 16:7 ἔδωκαν πορευθήσασθαι, καταλυθήσεται. So Mt. 5:13; 28:14; Jo. 7:17; 12:26; 14:15; Ro. 2:26. But this normal apodosis is by no means universal. Thus note οὗ μὴ ἔλθῃ in Jo. 16:7 after ἔδωκαν μη ἀπέλθω. See also Jo. 8:51. Cf. Ac. 13:41. In Mk. 14:31 note οὗ μη ἄπαρνήσομαι. The imperative may occur in the apodosis as in Mt. 18:15, ἔδωκεν ἁμαρτήσης, ὑπαγε ἔλεγξον. So Mt. 10:13; 18:17; 26:42; Ro. 12:20; 13:4; Ph. 2:1. But ofttimes the conclusion is stated in terms of the present either as a present hope or a vivid projection into the future (futuristic present). So in 2 Cor. 5:1, ἔδωκαν καταλυθῆναι, ἔχομεν. The condition is future in conception, but the conclusion is a present reality, so confident is Paul of the bliss of heaven. Cf. Mt. 18:13. In 18:12 both the fut. and the pres. ind. appear in the apodosis. A lively sense of present need is seen in Mt. 8:2. A practical turn is given by the pointed question in Mt. 5:47. In Ro. 14:8 note ἐὰν τε—ἐὰν τε. A maxim often has the pres. ind. in the apodosis. Thus οὗ δώναται οὕδεις—ἔδωκαν μη πρῶτον δήση (Mk. 3:27). Cf. Jo. 8:16, 54; 11:9; 12:24; 1 Cor. 7:39, 40; 2 Tim. 2:5. The pres. perf. is likewise so used, as in Ro. 14:23, ὅ δὲ διακρινόμενος ἔδωκεν φάγη κατακέκριται. So Jo. 20:23; Ro. 2:25; 7:2. More difficult seems the aorist ind. in the apodosis. The aor. ind. is sometimes timeless as is always true of the other modes (see chapter on Tenses where papyri parallels are given). That may be the explanation here. It is possible also to explain it as a change of standpoint. The protasis looks to the future, while the apodosis turns back to the past. Such vivid changes in language are due to the swift revolution in thought. See Mt. 18:15, ἔδωκεν ἰκουσίαν, ἐκέρδησας; Jo. 15:6, ἔδωκαν μη τις μᾶνῃ ἐν ἔμοι, ἐβλήθη ἔξω καὶ ἔξηράνθη (cf. ἔδοξα ἵνα φέρῃ also of the future); 1 Cor. 7:28, ἔδωκαν καὶ γαμήσας, οὐχ ἡμαρτες· καὶ ἔδωκαν γῆμη ἑ παρθένος, οὐχ ἡμαρτεν. For a similar idiom see Ignatius, Ep. to Romans 8:3; to Polycarp 5:2. Moulton (Prol., p. 247) cites Epict., ἄν μὲν στρατεύσωμαι, ἀπηλλάγην. See also Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 586. In Mk. 10:30, ἔδωκαν

---

2 Prol., p. 186.
μὴ λάβῃ, we have ἔδω μὴ almost in the sense of ὃς μὴ. Cf. also ἔδω μὴ ἵνα in Mk. 4:22. The use of ἔκ οὗ and ἔδω μὴ side by side is seen in Mt. 26:42, ἔκ οὗ δύναται τὸῦτο παρελθεῖν ἔδω μὴ αὐτό πίω. Cf. also Jo. 10:37, ἔκ οὗ ποιῶ and κἂν μὴ πιστεύητε.

(δ) Remote Prospect of Determination. Hale¹ attributes “the Greek optative assumption to a fusion of the true opt. and the potential opt.” The use of the opt. in the protasis of this condition is probably volitive, since the negative² is μὴ. That is certainly true of the optative in wishes with ἔκ or ἔκ γὰρ (εἴδε).³ But the deliberative use occurs a few times with ἔκ in indirect questions. The potential opt. in the apodosis with ἔκ is more difficult to explain. It is certainly not volitive any more, not more than mere fancy (Vorstellung), the optative of opinion,⁴ and apparently futuristic. This fourth class condition is undetermined with less likelihood of determination than is true of the third class with the subj. The difference between the third and fourth classes is well illustrated in 1 Pet. 3:13 f. So Jesus draws a distinction in Lu. 22:67. The use of the opt. in both apodosis and protasis accents the remoteness of the hypothesis. And yet it is not in the category of unreality as in the second class. It floats in a mirage, but does not slip quite away. It is thus suitable not merely for real doubt, but also fits well the polite temper of courteous address. It is evident that this condition will be comparatively infrequent. It is an ornament of the cultured class and was little used by the masses save in a few set phrases (or wishes). It is not strange, therefore, that no complete example of this fourth class condition appears in the LXX, the N. T. or the papyri so far as examined.⁵ Radermacher (N. T. Gr., pp. [Page 1021] 133, 143) with all his diligence produces no example of the opt. in both condition and conclusion in the current κοινή. In the modern Greek it has disappeared completely. In the N. T., as in the LXX, the instances of the protasis are very few. Moulton¹ notes only 13 in the LXX apart from the Atticistic 4 Maccabees. Of these he observes that 2 are wishes, 5 are cases of ὧς (περ) ἔκ τις and 2 are indirect questions. There are in the N. T. only 11 examples. Some of these are indirect questions. Thus in ἔλεγον ἔκ ἄρολπον πορεύεσθαι (Ac. 25:20) we have the opt. of ind. discourse. The direct was ἔκ βούλῃ. The same thing is true of 27:39, ἔβουλεντο ἔκ δύνατο ἐκσώμαι τὸ πλοῖον. There is implied indirect discourse or purpose (cf. the classic use of ἔκ for purpose).² So we see aim in Ac. 17:27, ζητεῖν ἔκ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτόν καὶ ἐμφοβοῦν, and 20:16, ἔσπευδεν ἔκ δύνατον ἐν. In 27:12, ἔκ πως δύναμιν, we have both purpose and implied indirect discourse. In 24:19, ἔκ τι ἔχοιεν, the protasis is more nearly that of the proper fourth class condition, but even so it is a mixed condition, since the apodosis ἔδει belongs to the second class. Blass³ ventures to suggest ἔκ τι ἔχοιεν as more correct. But it is needless to change the text. These examples are all in Acts, one of the more literary books of the N. T. Paul has only the stereotyped phrase ἔκ τύχοι (1 Cor. 14:10; 15:37), which is a true example of this protasis, “if it should happen.” The

² Moulton, Prol., p. 196.
⁵ Moulton, Prol., p. 196.
¹ Ib.
² Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 228 f.
³ Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 221.
two other examples are in 1 Pet. 3:14 εἰ καὶ χάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι, and 3:17 κρέβετον ἕθεσον τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, πάσχειν. The idiom is a mere torso, as is evident. In O. P. 1106, 7 (vi/A.D.), εἰ γὰρ ἐπιμένοιεν, πλήθος ἐπιστήσεται στρατιωτικῶν, we have a mixed condition.

The apodosis with ἄν (the less definite ἄν) is more frequent and occurs both in direct and indirect discourse. Since the potential opt. in the N. T. never occurs in connection with the protasis, the matter was discussed sufficiently under The Optative Mode in Independent Sentences (see this chapter, III, 3, (b)). This potential opt. is practically the apodosis of an unexpressed protasis. But the exx. occur in questions save one (Ac. 26:29). Twice the questions are direct (Ac. 8:31; 17:18). The rest are indirect (opt. preserved as in the direct). Cf. Lu. 1:62 τί ἂν θέλοι, Ac. 5:24 τί ἂν γένοιτο. So Lu. 6:11. The deliberative element in some of these questions is well illustrated in Lu. 9:46; Ac. 10:17. The MSS. vary in some cases about the presence of ἄν, as [Page 1022] in Lu. 18:36. The examples are all in Luke’s writings. In Ac. 8:31 we do indeed have a protasis, but not of the fourth class. It is a mixed condition. The disappearance of this opt. condition led to the enlarged use of the first and third classes. In Ro. 3:6 and 1 Cor. 15:35 the fut. ind. is used where the potential opt. would have suited the Attic idiom.¹

(c) Special Points.

(a) Mixed Conditions. The human mind does not always work in stereotyped forms, however excellent they are. Grammatical construction is merely the expression of the mental conception. Freedom must be acknowledged without any apology. I say these somewhat commonplace things because of the bill of “exceptions” which meet us in so many grammars at this point. It would have been a miracle if the four classes of conditions were never “mixed,” that is, if the protasis did not belong to one class, while the apodosis fell in another. In P. Goodsp. 4 (ii/B.C.), εἰ ἔρρωσαι, ἂν εἰ, we have the protasis of the first class and the apodosis of the fourth. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 132) quotes Pastor Hermæ, Sim. IX, 12, 4 οὔτες εἰσελύσεται εἰ μὴ λάβοι, Theoph. Ad Autolycum εἰ γὰρ λάβοι—ἐκκάυσε. Thus in Lu. 17:6, εἰ ἔχετε, ἔλεγετε ἄν, we have a protasis of the first class (determined as fulfilled) and the apodosis of the second (determined as unfulfilled). The same thing is true of the marginal reading in the text of W. H. in Jo. 8:39, εἰ ἔστε, ἐποιεῖτε. In Ac. 24:19, οὕς ἐδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορῶν ἔτ τι ἔχοις πρὸς ἐμὲ, we find a protasis of the fourth class with an apodosis of the second class. Then again in Ac. 8:31, πῶς γὰρ ἄν δύναιμην ἄν μὴ τὶς ὀδηγήσει με; we have a protasis of the first class (barring itacism) and an apodosis of the fourth. The examples like 1 Cor. 7:28 do not amount to mixed condition, since it is merely a question of the standpoint in time of the apodosis, though this apodosis does more naturally go with the first class condition. There may be two protases, as in 1 Cor. 9:11, and both of the same class, or the two may belong to different classes, as in Jo. 13:17.

(b) Implied Conditions. Sometimes the apodosis is expressed, while the protasis is merely implied by a participle, an imperative or a question. In such examples one must not think that the participle, for instance, means ‘if.’ Thus in Ro. 2:27 τελοῦσα

¹ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 220.
κρινεῖ suggests a condition of either the first or the third class according as one conceives it. The condition is hinted at, not stated. The same thing is true of λαμβανόμενον in 1 Tim. 4:4 [Page 1023] and μετατιθημένης in Heb. 7:12. Cf. also Heb. 2:3; 1 Cor. 11:29; Gal. 6:9. This use of the participle is still very frequent in the N. T. In Mt. 16:26 we have ἐὰν κερδήσῃ, while in Lu. 9:25 note κερδήσας. In Lu. 19:23, καὶ γῆς ἔλθων σύν τόκῳ ἄν αὐτό ἔπραξα, the apodosis calls for a condition of the second class (context). The imperative is used where a protasis might have been employed. Thus in Mk. 1:17, δεῦτε δεύσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω. The adverb δεῦτε has the force of an imperative. There is an implied condition here. So also 11:24, πιστεύετε καὶ ἐλθὼν σὺν τότε ἀστυν. This use of the participle is still very frequent in the N. T. In Mt. 16:26 we have ἐὰν κερδήσῃ, while in Lu. 9:25 note κερδήσας.

In Lu. 19:23, κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σύν τόκῳ ἄν αὐτό ἐπράξα, the apodosis calls for a condition of the second class (context). The imperative is used where a protasis might have been employed. Thus in Mk. 1:17, δεῦτε δεύσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω. The adverb δεῦτε has the force of an imperative. There is an implied condition here. So also 11:24, πιστεύετε καὶ ἐλθὼν σὺν τότε ἀστυν. This use of the participle is still very frequent in the N. T. In Mt. 16:26 we have ἐὰν κερδήσῃ, while in Lu. 9:25 note κερδήσας.

In Lu. 19:23, κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σύν τόκῳ ἄν αὐτό ἐπράξα, the apodosis calls for a condition of the second class (context). The imperative is used where a protasis might have been employed. Thus in Mk. 1:17, δεῦτε δεύσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω. The adverb δεῦτε has the force of an imperative. There is an implied condition here. So also 11:24, πιστεύετε καὶ ἐλθὼν σὺν τότε ἀστυν. This use of the participle is still very frequent in the N. T. In Mt. 16:26 we have ἐὰν κερδήσῃ, while in Lu. 9:25 note κερδήσας.

In Lu. 19:23, κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σύν τόκῳ ἄν αὐτό ἐπράξα, the apodosis calls for a condition of the second class (context). The imperative is used where a protasis might have been employed. Thus in Mk. 1:17, δεῦτε δεύσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω. The adverb δεῦτε has the force of an imperative. There is an implied condition here. So also 11:24, πιστεύετε καὶ ἐλθὼν σὺν τότε ἀστυν. This use of the participle is still very frequent in the N. T. In Mt. 16:26 we have ἐὰν κερδήσῃ, while in Lu. 9:25 note κερδήσας.

In Lu. 19:23, κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σύν τόκῳ ἄν αὐτό ἐπράξα, the apodosis calls for a condition of the second class (context). The imperative is used where a protasis might have been employed. Thus in Mk. 1:17, δεῦτε δεύσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω. The adverb δεῦτε has the force of an imperative. There is an implied condition here. So also 11:24, πιστεύετε καὶ ἐλθὼν σὺν τότε ἀστυν. This use of the participle is still very frequent in the N. T. In Mt. 16:26 we have ἐὰν κερδήσῃ, while in Lu. 9:25 note κερδήσας.
μήν and Ἦ μήν and would take εἰ in Heb. 6:14 as the true εἰ. But Moulton\(^2\) makes out a good case from the papyri and the inscriptions for taking it as merely a variation of Ἦ μήν. He finds eleven papyri examples of εἰ μήν from ii/β.с. to i/α.δ. Particularly clear is the Messenian Mysteries inscr., Michel 694, εἰ μὴν ἔξειν. If so, it does not come in here. But the use of εἰ in questions is pertinent. Thus εἰ ὄλγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι; (Lu. 13:23). Cf. Mt. 12:10; Lu. 12:26; 22:49; Ac. 17:27; 19:2. Radermacher (Ν. Τ. Gr., p. 136) takes εἰ in questions=ἤ as in Lu. 22:49. This is possible on grounds of itacism, but it does not entitle Radermacher to say “werden muß.” The use of the condition in the sense of “to see if” borders on this elliptical construction. Something has to be supplied before the protasis in order to make the idea clear. The apodosis is virtually contained in the protasis. It is a classic\(^3\) idiom and reappears in the papyri.\(^4\) So O. P. 743, ὁλος διαπονοῦμαι εἰ Ἐ. χαλκοῦς ἀπόλεσεν. The protasis here may conform to the first class condition as in εἰ ἔξει (Lu. 14:28); εἰ ποις ἤδη ποτὲ εὑροδόθησομαι (Ro. 1:10). So Mk. 11:13; Ac. 8:22. In Ph. 3:12, εἰ καὶ καταλάβω, we have the third class and possibly also in Ro. 11:14. But in Ac. 27:12 it is the fourth class, εἰ ποις δύναιτο. The use of εἰ in the indirect question, as in Mk. 3:2, εἰ θεραπεύσεται, corresponds closely with the preceding. Cf. also 11:13. The same thing is true of εἰ in the sense of ὅτι, as in Ac. 26:23. This is also true of εἰ with verbs of wonder, as in Mk. 15:44; Ac. 26:8.

The protasis itself is sometimes abbreviated almost to the vanishing point, as in εἰ μή without a verb, in the sense of ‘except’ (Mt. 5:13). Here εἰ and μή seem to coalesce into one word like πλήν. Cf. 11:27, οὐδείς ἔπιγινώσκει τὸν μὴν εἰ μὴν ὁ πατήρ. This is very common as in classic Greek. Sometimes we have εἰ μὴ μόνον as in [Page 1025] Mt. 21:19. The origin of this use of εἰ μή was the fact that the verb was identical with the preceding one in the apodosis and so was not repeated. From this ellipsis the usage spread to mere exceptions to the previous statement, a limitation simply. Εἰ μή may make exception to a preceding negative as in Gal. 1:19, ἔτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ Ἰακώβου τὸν ἄδελφον. The effect here is to make εἰ μή seem adverative instead of exceptional. Cf. Mt. 12:4. For ἕναν μὴ in this construction see Gal. 2:16. In 1 Cor. 7:17 εἰ μή has the sense of ‘only’ and is not to be construed with παρατατέω. The use of εἰ μή occurs in questions expecting a negative answer, as in Mk. 2:7, τίς δύναιται ἄφεναι ἀμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἶς ὁ θεός; In 1 Cor. 7:5, εἰ μὴτι [ἐν], we have τι (cf. εἰ τι in Mt. 18:28) added and possibly also ἕν. B here omits ἕν, possibly to “ease a difficulty” as Moulton\(^1\) suggests. If genuine, it would be a sort of analysis of ἕνα into εἰ ἕν that occurs in the illiterate papyri. For examples see under 8, (b), (α). For εἰ μὴτi with the ind. pres. see 2 Cor. 13:5 and the subj. aorist. See Lu. 9:13. The use of ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ probably comes by analogy from ἐκτὸς εἰ (cf. Latin nisi), but it occurs in the N. T. without verbs only in 1 Tim. 5:19. Elliptical also are εἰ μὴ ἵνα (Jo. 10:10); εἰ μὴ ὅτι (2 Cor. 12:13); εἰ μὴ ἤταν (Mk. 9:9). In Jo. 14:11 note εἰ δὲ μὴ in the sense of ‘but if not,’ ‘otherwise.’ Cf. Mk. 2:21; Rev. 2:5, 16. For εἰ δὲ μὴςει see Lu. 5:36. Other forms of εἰ used elliptically are εἰ πέρ (Ro. 3:30); ὥσει (Mt. 3:16);

\(^2\) Prol., p. 46.
\(^3\) Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 180 ff.
\(^4\) Moulton, Prol., p. 194.
\(^1\) Prol., p. 169.
The use of εἰ or (more probably) of the third class must be supplied. So in Ro. 3:6; 11:6, εἰ ἐὰν—κἂν. The suppression of the protasis occurs in all the examples of the potential opt. already discussed, as in Ac. 26:29. Even in the deliberative questions of the opt. with ἄν the same thing is true. Cf. Ac. 17:18 (direct); Lu. 1:62 (indirect). The protasis is also suppressed sometimes with ἐπει. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:29, ἐπει τί ποιήσουσιν; Here a protasis of the first or (more probably) of the third class must be supplied. So in Ro. 3:6; 11:6, [Page 1026] 22. In 1 Cor. 14:16, ἐπει ἐὰν εὐλογῇς πῶς ἐρεῖ, the ellipsis still occurs in spite of ἐὰν. In Heb. 9:26, ἐπει ἔδει, and 10:2, ἐπει οὐκ ἄν ἔπαυσαντο, the protasis would belong to the second class, as is true also of ἐπει ἡμεῖς ἴπτε ἄρα in 1 Cor. 5:10. In 7:14, ἐπει ἄρα ἔστιν, the protasis would be of the first class.

(δ) Concessive Clauses. These are really just conditional clauses with the addition of καί. In καί εἰ and καί ἔὰν (κἂν) the sense is ‘even if’ and is climacteric. Burton8 seeks to draw quite a distinction between concessive and conditional clauses. He cites Mt. 26:33, εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθῆσιν ἐὰν σοί, ἔγω οὔδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι, as an instance of the concessive idea without καί. It is possible that we may read the idea into this passage because in the parallel passage in Mk. 14:29 we read εἰ καί—ἂλλ. ἔγώ. Cf. also κἂν δὲ ἦν in Mt. 26:35 with ἔὰν δὲ in Mk. 14:31. The use of εἰ (ἕὰν) in the sense of ‘though’ shows that there is at bottom no essential difference. The structure is precisely the same as the conditional sentence. They are, to repeat, nothing but conditional sentences of a special tone or emphasis. The use of καί was to sharpen this emphasis either up or down.

With καί εἰ the supposition is considered improbable. With καί εἰ the truth of the principal sentence is stoutly affirmed in the face of this one objection. It is rhetorically an extreme case. In 1 Cor. 8:5, καί γὰρ ἐπερ εἰσίν—[ἆλλα] ἦμιν εἴς θεός, we have an instance. In Mk. 14:29 the true text is εἰ καί, not καί εἰ. In 1 Pet. 3:1 W. H. read simply εἰ. In late Greek καί εἰ vanishes before καί ἄν (ἕὰν). So in the N. T. we have καί ἔὰν κρίνο (Jo. 8:16). So also Gal. 1:8. For καί see Jo. 8:14, κᾱν μαρτυρῶ. So Mt. 21:21; 26:35. See Jo. 10:38, εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ πιστεύῃτε. The clauses with ἔὰν and the subj. are, of course, third class conditions. Sometimes καί εἰ and κᾱν can hardly be considered as strong as ‘even if.’ They may be resolved into ‘and if.’ So Mt. 11:14; Lu. 6:32; Mk. 16:18; Jo. 8:55; Rev. 11:5.

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 215.
2 N. T. M. and T., p. 112.
3 Paley, Gk. Part., p. 31.
5 Thayer’s Lexicon.
Much more common is εἰ καί. This phrase means ‘if also.’ Here the protasis is treated as a matter of indifference. If there is a conflict, it makes no real difficulty. There is sometimes a tone of contempt in εἰ καί. The matter is belittled. There is often some particle in the conclusion in this construction as in Lu. 18:4: εἰ καί τὸν θεόν οὐ φοβοῦμι οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπων ἑπτάκοσμαι, διά γε τὸ παρέχειν, κτλ. Note γε as in 11:8. Cf. Col. 2:5, εἰ καί—ἄλλα. [Page 1027] There is considerable variety with εἰ καί. Thus in 2 Cor. 7:8 we have a condition of the first class (so Lu. 11:8; 18:4, etc.), while in 1 Pet. 3:14, εἰ καί πάσχοιτε, we have one instance of the fourth class. With εἰδὲ καί and the subj. we find, of course, the third class. So Gal. 6:1, εἰδὲ καί πρόλημφθη. Cf. 2 Tim. 2:5. In 1 Cor. 7:28, ἐὰν καί γαμήσης, the notion is ‘if even’ rather than ‘also’ (cf. καί ἐὰν γήμη). In Mt. 18:17 note ἐὰν παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν and ἐὰν δὲ καί τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρακούσῃ. There is nothing peculiar about Ro. 14:8, ἐὰν τε ζῷον—ἐὰν τε ἄποθνήσκομεν. (Cf. Ex. 19:13.) Cf. ἐὰν—ἐὰς with the ind. (1 Cor. 3:22) or the subj. (1 Th. 5:10). The use of the participle for concession (see κατέρω ὃν. Heb. 5:8) will be treated under the Participle. For the use of κἂν even after ἐὰν see Mk. 5:28.

(c) Other Particles with ἀ and ἐὰν. These have no effect on the condition as a distinct class, though they modify the precise idea in various ways. This point will be treated more exactly under Particles. But note εἰ ἄρα (Mk. 11:13; Ac. 8:22); εἰ γε (Eph. 4:21); εἰ ἄρα γε (Ac. 17:27 opt.); εἰ γε καί (2 Cor. 5:3); εἰ δὲ μήγε (Lu. 5:36); εἰ οὐν (Mt. 6:23; Heb. 7:11); ἐὰνπερ (Ro. 3:30); ἐάνπερ (Heb. 3:14; 6:3); εἰ πος (Ro. 1:10, the fut. ind.; Ac. 27:12, the opt.). In Mk. 8:23 εἰ τι is in direct question.

9. INDIRECT DISCOURSE (Oratio Obliqua).

(a) Recitative ὅτι in Oratio Recta. Direct quotation is more frequent in primitive language, in the vernacular, and in all vivid picturesque narrative. It is the dramatic method of reporting speech. It is natural in Homer, in the Old Testament and in the Gospels, in Aristophanes and in Shakespeare, and in Uncle Remus. The prolonged indirect discourse in Thucydides and in Livy, in Xenophon and Caesar, is more or less artificial. In the LXX little use is made of indirect discourse. The direct quotation may not be as verbally exact as the indirect, but it is more lively and interesting. As a rule the direct discourse is simply introduced with a word of saying or thinking. The ancients had no quotation-marks nor our modern colon. But sometimes ὅτι was used before the direct quotation merely to indicate that the words are quoted. We find this idiom occasionally with ὅτι, more seldom with ὅς, in the Attic writers. 2 It is very rare3 in the LXX, since the Hebrew so frequently has a special participle like ‘saying.’ But see Gen. 28:16. In the N. T. Jannaris 4 counts 120 instances of recitative ὅτι. [Page 1028] The idiom appears chiefly in the historical books. See Mt. 7:23, ὁμολογήσων ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἐξίνων ὑμᾶς. This particular instance can be looked upon as indirect discourse, since the person is the same in both clauses and the tense and mode are unaffected. It is probable that indirect declarative clauses grew out of constructions of this nature. 1 But in Mt. 27:43, ἐπεν ὅτι θεοῦ ἐμὶ ὑλός, there is no doubt at all. See

1 Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 130.
3 Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 50; but see on the other hand Con. and Stock, Sel., p. 114.
1 Schmitt, Über den Urspr. des Substantivsatzes, 1889, p. 66.
26:74, ὥμωνεῖν ὃτι οὐκ ὁδὸν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, and 26:75, εἰρήκοτος ὃτι πρὸν ἄλλητορα φωνῆσαι τῆς ὑπαρνήσῃ με. So Mk. 1:37; 2:12, 16; 4:21; 8:28; Jo. 10:36; Ac. 25:8; Ro. 4:17. In Mt. 16:7 we have (W. H., but R. V. marg. has causal) recitative ὃτι (ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν); while in verse 8 the indirect (probably causal) use, ὃτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; in Mk. 6:23 (W. H. marg.) we have a direct quotation with ὃτι, in Mt. 14:7 the same thing appears as indirect discourse without ὃτι. In Jo. 10:34, ἄπεκρίθη—οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμένον ὃτι ἐγώ ἐπά, θεοί ἐστε, note a treble direct quotation, once with ὃτι and twice without. In Jo. 1:50 the first ὃτι is causal, the second is indirect discourse. The ὃτι in the beginning of Jo. 20:29 is causal. In Jo. 20:18 ὃτι is recitative, causal in 3:18, declar. in 3:19. It is doubtful whether first ὃτι is recitative or causal in Jo. 21:17. In Ro. 3:8, ὃτι ποιήσωμεν (hortatory subj.), ὃτι is also recitative. So in 2 Th. 3:10 ὃτι is merely recitative. The instances of direct quotation without ὃτι are very numerous. Cf. Mt. 8:3; 26:25. Sometimes the same thing is reported with ὃτι (Mt. 19:9) or without ὃτι (Mt. 10:11). For single words quoted without agreement with the word with which they are in apposition note ὃ διδάσκαλος and ὃ κύριος in Jo. 13:13. W. H. seek to indicate the presence of recitative ὃτι by beginning the quotation with a capital letter as in all their quotations. Cf. Jo. 9:9. This redundant ὃτι may occur before direct questions as in Mk. 4:21; 8:4. It continues common in the koine and the modern Greek uses πῶς in this idiom.2

(b) Change of Person in Indirect Discourse. Sometimes this was not necessary, as in Jo. 18:8. So in Mt. 16:18, κύριον ἐς τοῦ λέγον ὃτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, there is no change in the second person. Cf. also Jo. 11:27; Gal. 2:14. But in Mt. 20:10, ἐνόμισαν ὃτι πλέον ἔμυαν, the direct discourse would have λήμψεται. So Lu. 24:23. Compare ἐλάβομεν in Mt. 16:7 with ἔχετε in v. 8. Note τι φάγωμεν (direct) in Mt. 6:31, but τι φάγητε (indirect) in 6:25. In Mk. 9:6, οὕ ἐδει τί ἀποκριθῆ, the direct would be τι ἀποκριθῶ. [Page 1029] The person may be both ways in the same sentence, as in Ac. 1:4, παρηγγελεῖν—παριμένει τὸν ἐπαγγελιον τού πατρός ἢν ἱκουσιτέ μου. See further under Mixture.

(c) Change of Tense in Indirect Discourse. Mr. H. Scott objects to the wide scope here given to the term “indirect discourse” to cover “object clauses” after ὃδε, κτλ., but I conceive the principle to be the same. After primary tenses there is, of course, no change in mode or tense. Note Mt. 16:18 above. See also Mk. 11:24, παρεπιτεῦτε ὃτι ἐλάβετε καὶ ἕστατο ὑμῖν. It is only after secondary tenses that any change occurs. Usually even then there is no change of tense in Greek. Thus ὃποι ἠκούσαν ὃτι ἔστιν (Mk. 6:55). So with ἰδοὺς ὃτι ἐπιστείλει—ἐφοβηθή (Mt. 2:22). So ἠκούσαμεν ὃτι αὐτός ἔστιν (Lu. 24:21). See also Mt. 21:45; Mk. 6:49; Lu. 1:22; Jo. 2:17; 6:24. Cf. Gal. 2:14, έδόχον ὃτι οὐκ ἡχοῦσατος. So Jo. 11:13. In Jo. 21:19 the future ind. is retained after ἔπειν σημαίνων. Cf. Mt. 20:10. So in Lu. 5:19 the aorist subj. occurs. In Mk. 2:16 we have ὃτι ἔσθιεν twice, the first in ind. discourse and the second with interrogative ὃτι. But sometimes the ancient Greek, even the Attic, used a past tense of the indicative in ind. discourse where the direct had the tenses of present time. The N. T. shows occasionally the same construction. In a case like Jo. 1:50, εἶπον σοι ὃτι

2 Thumb, Handb., p. 192. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 472. Καὶ τότες εἶπε πῶς Δέ σου τὸ λέγα ἔγω; ‘then he said, Didn’t I tell you so?’
1 Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 263.
the optative occurs where the subj. with (cf. Lu. 2:26) or without 3 Madvig, Bemerk. über einige Punkte der griech. Wortfüg. 1848, p. 23.
2 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 263.
1 In archaic Lat. the ind. was used in indirect discourse as in Gk. Cf. Draeger, Hist. Synt., Bd. II, p. 460.
2 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 263.
3 Madvig, Bemerk. über einige Punkte der griech. Wortfüg. 1848, p. 23.

In archaic Lat. the ind. was used in indirect discourse as in Gk. Cf. Draeger, Hist. Synt., Bd. II, p. 460.

2 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 263.
3 Madvig, Bemerk. über einige Punkte der griech. Wortfüg. 1848, p. 23.

\[ \text{90x303} \text{the optative occurs where the subj. with (cf. Lu. 2:26) or without} \]

\[ \text{3 Madvig, Bemerk. über einige Punkte der griech. Wortfüg. 1848, p. 23.} \]

\[ \text{2 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 263.} \]

\[ \text{1 In archaic Lat. the ind. was used in indirect discourse as in Gk. Cf. Draeger, Hist. Synt., Bd. II, p. 460.} \]

\[ \text{2 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 263.} \]

\[ \text{3 Madvig, Bemerk. über einige Punkte der griech. Wortfüg. 1848, p. 23.} \]

\[ \text{4 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 273.} \]
tenses we should have ἐὰν and the subj. or εἰ and the future ind. Cf. Ph. 3:12; Ro. 1:10. Cf. τί γράψω in Ac. 25:26. As already explained also, the indirect questions with εἰ and the optative (Ac. 25:20; 27:39) are instances where the indicative would be used in the direct. Even in indirect questions Luke usually keeps the mode of the direct. So the indicative as in τὸ τίς...—δοκεῖ (Lu. 22:24), the subjunctive as in τὸ πῶς—ἀποδῆ (22:4) or the optative as in τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι (1:62). The indicative is never changed to a subjunctive as in Latin. When the subj. in Greek occurs in an indirect question it does so because it was the subj. in the direct. Thus οὐ γὰρ ἦδει τί ἄποκριθη ( Mk. 9:6). Cf. Mt. 6:25, 31, τί φάγητε, τί φάγωμεν. So Lu. 22:2, 4; Ac. 4:21. Cf. subj. with ἣν after secondary tenses (Ro. 1:13; 1 Pet. 4:6). The use of the optative (as distinct from subj.) in indir. discourse was a Greek development. We see the beginning of it in Homer. The optative, however, does occur in Lu. (18:36, W. H. text, margin ἂν) in an indirect question where the direct had the indicative. Cf. ποταπὸς ἐθη in 1:29. So 8:9, ἑπηρώτων τίς ἐθη. In Ac. 21:33, ἑπνοοῦντο τίς ἐθη κἂν τί ἐστιν πεποιηκός, both constructions occur side by side. The variation here in the mode (retention of the ind.) gives a certain vividness to this part of the question. See Optative in Paratactic Sentences where the κοινή parallels are given. In γίνοιτο κράτειν...πάσης ἂν ἁρχήσθε...χώρας, P. Par. 26 (B.C. 163), there is no sequence of mode. The subj. is with the indefinite relative and the opt. is a wish. It has been already (under Optative) shown that ἂν and the opt. in an indirect question is there because it was in the direct (cf. Ac. 17:18, τί ἂν θέλοι; with Lu. 1:62, τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι). Sometimes, one must admit, the difference between the two is reduced to a minimum, as in the papyri occasionally.1 So in Lu. 9:46, τὸ τίς ἂν εἶη (cf. τὸ τίς ἂν in Lu. 22:23). See also Lu. 15:26; Ac. 10:17. But there is always a shade of difference. The manuscripts reflect this haziness in the variations between ind. and opt. as in Lu. 22:23; Ac. 2:12, et cet. In Lu. 3:15, μὴ ποτε ἐθη, we also have the opt. in an indir. question. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 165) quotes Diod. I, 75, 5, ἐπειδὰν—πρόσθοιτο. The Atticists used it often.

(e) The Limits of Indirect Discourse. It is not always easy to draw the line between indirect discourse and other constructions. Thus Jannaris2 uses it only for declarative clauses with ὅτι or ὡς. Burton3 confines it to indirect assertions and indirect questions, but admits that it also covers indirect commands and promises. Take Mt. 14:7, ὠμολογήσειν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσητα. The infinitive [Page 1032] δοῦνα is the direct object of the verb and does not seem to be in indir. discourse, for in Mk. 6:23 the direct form has δοῦσιν. But, after all, it is practical indir. discourse, though the analogy of tense construction breaks down in this instance. But note fut. infinitive with ὠμολογεῖ in Heb. 3:18, according to the principle of indirect discourse. On the whole it is best to consider three classes or kinds of indirect discourse: declarative clauses, indirect questions, indirect commands.

(f) Declarative Clauses (Indirect Assertions).

---

1 Moulton, Prol., p. 198.
3 N. T. M. and T., p. 131. So most of the grammars.
(a) ὅτι and the Indicative. There is no clear instance of ὡς in this sense in the N. T. It was common in the ancient Greek. Just as final ἄρως retreated before ἢνα, so declarative ὡς did before ὅτι. In late Greek ἢνα monopolized the field as a final particle and divided it with ὅτι as a declarative conjunction. We do have ὡς in indirect questions a few times as will be shown. This is more likely the meaning even in Ac. 10:28, ἐπίστασθε ὡς ἀδείμων. Reeb points out that Demosthenes uses ὡς for what is false and ὅτι for what is true. The German wie is used like ὡς with verbs of reading, narrating, testifying. With these verbs ὡς is more than just ὅτι (>‘that’). ὅτι expresses the thing itself and ὡς the mode or quality of the thing (Thayer). With this explanation it is possible to consider it as declarative, though really meaning ‘how.’ Cf. Lu. 24:6, μνήσθητε ὡς ἔλαλησεν. So in Lu. 8:47 with ἀπαγγέλλω, 23:55 after θεάο, Ac. 10:38 after αἴδα, Ac. 20:20 with ἐπίσταμαι, Ro. 1:9 with μάρτυς (so Ph. 1:8; 1 Th. 2:10). The manuscripts vary in some passages between ὡς and ὅτι and πῶς. W. H. bracket ὡς in Lu. 6:4 and read πῶς in Mk. 12:26 and ὅτι in Jude 5, though ὡς is retained in 7. In all these passages it is possible to regard ὡς as the ‘how’ of indirect question rather than declarative. The encroachment of πῶς on ὅτι is to be noticed also. Cf. Mt. 12:4 after ἄναγνωσκό (and Mk. 12:26), Mk. 12:41 after θεωρέω, Mk. 5:16 after διηγόμαι, Lu. 14:7 after ἔπεξένων, Ac. 11:13 after ἀφανεγέλλω (so 1 Th. 1:9). In the later Greek πῶς comes gradually to be equivalent to ὅτι. Gradually πῶς gained the ascendancy over ὅτι till in the modern Greek it became the regular declarative particle. See Thumb, Handb., p. 190. In Ro. 10:15; 11:33, ὡς is exclamationary. The κοινη writers and the papyri show this same retreat of ὡς before ὅτι and the inroad of πῶς on ὅτι (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 159). Cf. B. U., I, 37 (51 A.D.), οἰδας πῶς—χρηστω, and Epictetus often after ὅρω. There is, however, no doubt of the use of ὡς ὅτι in the declarative sense=‘that.’ It is an unclassical combination, but it appears in the LXX (Esther 4:14) and in the κοινη writers. It is like the Latin quasi in the Vulgate. The late papyri (fourth cent. A.D.) show that ὡς ὅτι came in the vernacular to mean simply ‘that.’ Moultont cites also two Attic inscriptions from the first century B.C. which have ὡς ὅτι in the sense of ὡς or ὅτι alone. The editors have removed ὅτι from ὡς ὅτι in Xenophon’s Hellen. III, ii, 14, ἐπὶ δὲ ὃς ὅτι οἰκον. Moulton agrees to Blass’ stigma of “unclassical” on ὡς ὅτι, but Paul has κοινη support for his use of it in 2 Cor. 5:19; 11:21; 2 Th. 2:2. But ὅτι has won its place in the N. T. not only over ὡς, but also over the infinitive. The use of the inf. in indir. discourse3 takes quite a subordinate place in the N. T. Luke alone uses it to any extent. The periphrasis with ὅτι has superseded it in nearly all the N. T. writers. The use of ὅτι is the common way of making a declaration in indirect

1 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 258.
3 De Particulorum οτι et ὡς apud Demosthenum Usu, 1890, p. 38.
4 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 230 f.
5 Hatz., Einl., p. 19.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 212.
3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 231.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 211.
discourse in the N. T. There arose also διότι in the declarative sense\(^5\) (cf. late Latin quia=quod), but no example occurs in the N. T. The classic causal sense of διότι prevailed. It is sometimes doubtful whether διότι is causal or declarative as in Ac. 22:29. The context must decide. Finally, as noted, πῶς came to be the normal declarative conjunction in the vernacular (over the inf. as over ὡς and διότι) as the infinitive disappeared from indir. discourse.\(^6\) The only mode used with διότι in the N. T. is the ind. In Ro. 3:8 (subj.) διότι is recitative. At bottom διότι is just διό τι, and Homer sometimes used διό τι in the declarative sense (and διότι). Cf. διότι διότε together in 1 Cor. 12:2.

The verbs after which διότι is used in the N. T. cover a wide range. Indeed, διότι comes also after substantives like ἄγγελια (1 Jo. 1:5); κρίσις (Jo. 3:19); λόγος (Jo. 15:25); μαρτυρία (1 Jo. 5:11); μάρτυς (2 Cor. 1:23); παρρησία (1 Jo. 5:14), causal in Ac. 22:14; φάσις (Ac. 21:31). It is in apposition also with ἐν ὧνόματι (Mk. 9:41). We see also ἐν τούτῳ διότι (1 Jo. 3:16). Sometimes [Page 1034] διότι itself seems to imply ἐν τούτῳ (Ro. 5:8) or περὶ τούτου (Mk. 1:34) or ἐκ ἐκείνου (Jo. 2:18). Cf. τούπτο διότι (Rev. 2:6). Another irregularity of construction is the prolepsis of the substantive before διότι (and change of case) as in 1 Cor. 16:15. This idiom is sometimes called the epexegetical use of διότι. Cf. further Ac. 9:20. It is a rather common idiom. Cf. Mt. 25:24. See especially Jo. 8:54. In Ro. 9:6 note ὁδὴ διόν δὲ διότι. In 1 Cor. 15:27 δῆλον διότι is almost adverbial, but that is not true of πρόδηλον διότι in Heb. 7:14. The elliptical τι διότι (Lu. 2:49) may be compared with τι γέγονεν διότι in Jo. 14:22. The elliptical ὁδὴ διότι (cf. Jo. 6:46) is like the corresponding English “not that.” The διότι clause may be in the nominative (subject clause) as in Mk. 4:38, οὐ μέλει σοι διότι ἀπολλύμεθα: More usually it is, of course, in the accusative (object clause) as in Jo. 11:27, πεπίστευκα διότι. The διότι clause may also be in apposition with the locative as in Mk. 9:41. In Gal. 1:20, ἰδοὺ ἐνόπτων θεοῦ διότι, we have a solemn oath as in ἀλλήλων διότι (2 Cor. 11:10); πιστὸς διότι (1:18); μάρτυς διότι (2 Cor. 1:23); ἄριστος διότι (Rev. 10:6); ζῶ διότι, διότι (Ro. 14:11, LXX). Rarely the personal construction occurs with διότι, as in 1 Cor. 15:12, Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται διότι. In Jas. 1:13 we either have recitative διότι or oratio variata. In Jo. 4:1 we have one διότι clause dependent on another. Ὡτι may be repeated in parallel clauses as in Jo. 6:22; Ac. 17:3; 22:29; 1 Cor. 15:3 ff. In 1 Jo. 5:9 we have two examples of διότι, but one is causal. In Jo. 1:15 ff. the three are all causal. In Jo. 11:50 we have διότι and ἴνα in much the same sense. Not so 1 Jo. 5:13. Cf. ἴνα in 1 Jo. 5:3 with διότι in 5:11.

The verbs that use declarative διότι in the N. T. are very numerous. A few have only διότι. Thus Mk. 11:32, ἀπαντεὶς ἐχὼν τὸν Ἰωάννην διότι πρωφήτης ἦν (note ἦν). Blass\(^1\) calls this use of ἔχω a Latinism like habeo. Cf. also ὑπολειμμάνει διότι (Lu. 7:43), a classical construction. So also λαλέω (Heb. 11:18); συμβάλλω (Ac. 16:10); σφραγίζω (Jo. 3:33); γνωρίζω (1 Cor. 12:3); ἐμφανίζω (Heb. 11:14); ἐξομολογήσας (Ph. 2:11); κατηχέω (Ac. 21:21); κηρύσσω (1 Cor. 15:12); ἀποδείκνυμι (2 Th. 2:4); μηνύω (Lu. 20:37); ὑποδείκνυμι (Ac. 20:35); φανερόμας (2 Cor. 3:3); ἀποκαλύπτω (1 Pet. 1:12);

---

5 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 413.
6 Mitsotakis, Praktische Gr. der neugriechischen Schrift- und Umgangssprache, 1891, p. 235.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 231.
Thus µἀτι or the infinitive. In Lu. 9:18 f. [Page 1035] with λέγω we have the inf. and ὅτι side by side. So also in Ac. 14:22 with παρακαλέω. Outside of the verbs λέγω, ἐπιμαρτυρέω, κατακρίνω and παρακαλέω the infinitive in indir. discourse in the N. T. is confined to the writings of Luke and Paul and Hebrews according to Viteau,1 “comme vestige de la langue littéraire.” But even with Luke and Paul the rule is to use ὅτι. Blass2 has a careful list of the uses of these verbs. In margin of W. H. in Jo. 5:15 we have ἄναγγέλλω with ὅτι, but the text has ἐπέπνεον. But see ὅτι also in Ro. 2:4 (ἄγνοεω), Mt. 12:5 (ἀναγνώσκω), Lu. 18:37 (ἀπαγγέλλω), Ac. 25:16 (ἀποκρίνομαι), 1 Jo. 2:22 (ἀφίνομαι), Ac. 17:6 (βοῶ), 1 Pet. 2:3 (γεύομαι), Ro. 10:5 (γράφω), Mt. 16:21 (δεικνύω), 1 Cor. 1:11 (δηλώω), Ac. 10:42 (διαμαρτύρομαι), Ac. 17:3 (διανοοῦμαι), Mk. 8:31 (διδάσκω), Mt. 6:7 (διηκόμαι), Lu. 24:21 (ἐξείπεω), Mt. 6:26 (ἐμβλέπω), 1 Cor. 11:2 (ἐπαίνοι), Ac. 13:32 (εὐαγγελίζομαι), Lu. 18:11 (ἐξερχομένω), Rev. 2:4 (ἐχω κατά τινος), Lu. 11:38 (θαμμαζόω), Jo. 6:5 (θεάομαι), Ac. 4:13 (καταλαμβάνομαι), Lu. 12:24 (κατανικοῦ), 2 Cor. 5:14 (κρίνω), 2 Pet. 3:5 (λανθάνω), Mt. 3:9 (λέγω), Ac. 23:27 (μαρτυρώ τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι), Heb. 7:8 (μαρτυρέω), Ac. 20:26 (μαρτύρομαι), Mt. 27:63 (μυστήρισκο), Mt. 5:17 (νομίζω), Mt. 15:17 (νοεῖ), Mt. 26:74 (ὁμνύω), Jas. 1:7 (οἴομαι), Ro. 9:1 (οὐ ψεόδομαι), 1 Cor. 15:3 (παραδίδωμι), Heb. 13:18 (πείθομαι), Jo. 6:69 (πιστεύω), Ro. 4:21 (πληροφορεῖο), 2 Cor. 13:2 (προείρηκα καὶ προλέγω, cf. Gal. 5:21), Ac. 23:34 (πονθύνομαι), Lu. 15:6, 9 (συγχαίρω), Jo. 18:14 (συμβουλεύω), Ro. 8:16 (συμμαρτυρέω), Mt. 16:12 (συνήμι), Ju. 5 (ὑπομνήμασκο), 1 Cor. 10:19 (φημί), Lu. 10:20 (χαίρω), 1 Tim. 1:12 (χάριν ἔχω τιν). I cannot claim that this is a complete list, but it is the best I can do with the help of H. Scott, Blass, Thayer, Moulton and Geden, and Viteau’s list. At any rate it gives one a fairly clear idea of the advances made by ὅτι on the classic infinitive idiom. Some verbs still share the participle with ὅτι, but not verbs of showing. These no longer appear in the N. T. with the participle.3 So with ὅτι note βλέπω (Heb. 3:19); θεωρέω (Mk. 16:4). Cf. Ac. 19:26, θεωρέω and ἄκοψο. So also ἐπιγνώσκεω (Lu. 7:37); ἐπίστασαι (Ac. 15:7); εὐπρίσκεω (Ro. 7:21); μνημονεύω (Ac. 20:31); ὄραω (Mk. 2:16). Besides some verbs appear with either ὅτι, the infinitive or the participle. Thus ἄκοψω (Mt. 5:21; Jo. 12:18; Lu. 4:23); γνώσκω (Mt. 21:45; Heb. 10:34; Lu. 8:46); λογίζομαι (Ro. 8:18; 2 Cor. 10:2 both inf. and part.); οἶδα (Ac. 16:3; Lu. 4:41; 2 Cor. 12:2); ὑμολογέω (Mt. 7:23 unless recitative ὅτι; [Page 1036] Tit. 1:16; 2 Jo. 7). In Ac. 27:10 we find ὅτι used with the infinitive “quite irregularly” Blass1 calls it. But it is just the classic mingling of two constructions seen in the more usual form in Ac. 14:22, where a change is made from
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the inf. to ὅτι and δεῖ. Different verbs had varying histories in the matter of ὅτι. It was not a mere alternative with many. With ἄκοιμο, for instance, ὅτι is the usual idiom. The same thing is true with γινώσκω, οἶδα, λέγω, νομίζω, πιστεύω. But with φημ, in classical Greek almost always with the infinitive (Ro. 3:8), we twice have ὅτι (1 Cor. 10:19; 15:50). For ὅτι and then the inf. see Mk. 8:28 f. The substantive nature of the ὅτι clause is well shown in 1 Th. 3:6. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 159) cites ὅτι— ὑπάρχειν from Proklos’ In rem publ., II, 225, 22. The ὅτι clause is often called an object clause and may be in the nominative or in the accusative.

(b) The Infinitive. With some verbs we have only single instances of the infinitive of indir. discourse in the N. T. So with βοάω (Ac. 25:24); γινώσκω (Heb. 10:34); καταλαβάνομαι (Ac. 25:25); ἥγεομαι (Ph. 3:8); νοέω (Heb. 11:3). Ἀποκρίνομαι has it only thrice (Lu. 20:7; Ac. 25:4). See also ἰδανθέλλω (Ac. 12:14); ἀπαρνέομαι (Lu. 22:34); δισευρίζομαι (Ac. 12:15); δηλόω (Heb. 9:8); ἐπαγγέλλομαι (Mk. 14:11; Ac. 7:5); ἐπιμαρτύρομαι (1 Pet. 5:12); κατακρίνω (Mk. 14:64); μαρτυρέω (Ac. 10:43); προστατάμοι (Ro. 3:9); προκαταγγέλλω (Ac. 3:18); σημαίνω (Ac. 11:28); χρηματίζω (Lu. 2:26). Some of these are words that are not used with any construction very often, some occur only with the infinitive, like ἐπιθέουκυν (Ac. 18:28); προσδοκάω (Ac. 3:5; 28:6); ὑποκρίνομαι (Lu. 20:20); ὑπονοέω (Ac. 13:25; 27:27). There is, besides, the inf. with βούλομαι, θέλω, κελεύω, etc., more exactly the simple object inf. Other verbs that have occasionally the inf. are in the list given under (a), those with either ὅτι or the inf. like ἄρνεομαι (Heb. 11:24); γράφω (Ac. 18:27); δεικνύω (Ac. 10:28); διδάσκω (Lu. 11:1); διαμαρτύρομαι (Ac. 18:5); διανοίγω (Ac. 16:14. Cf. τοῦ in Lu. 24:45); εὔαγγέλιζομαι (Ac. 14:15); συμβουλεύω (Rev. 3:18). In Luke and Paul the inf. of indir. discourse is fairly common with λέγω (Lu. 9:18, 20, etc. Cf. Mt. 12:24; Mk. 3:28) and with νομίζω (Lu. 2:44; Ac. 7:25, etc.).

In the old Greek the inf. was the favourite construction in indirect discourse. The Latin had it in all its glory, but the gradual disappearance of the inf. from late Greek made it wither away. Indeed, it was a comparatively late development in Greek [Page 1037] anyhow and is rare in Homer. It is not easy to draw the line between βούλομαι and κελεύω with the inf. on the one hand and λέγω and νομίζω with the inf. on the other. At bottom the construction is the same. The question of the case of the substantive or adjective used with this inf. is not vital to the idiom. It is really a misnomer to call it “the accusative and infinitive.” That is, in fact, more frequently the case found with this inf., but it is so, not because the idiom calls for it per se, but simply because the infinitive can have no subject, not being a finite verb (cf. the participle). Hence when a noun (not the object) occurs with the inf. in indir. discourse it is put in the accusative of general reference, if there is no word in the sentence in another case for it naturally to agree with by apposition. This matter was discussed under Cases, but will bear some repetition at this point since it is so often misunderstood. Clyde correctly sees that, since the inf. itself is in a case and is non-

1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 162.
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3 Gk. Synt., p. 139.
finite, it cannot have a subject. Monro\textsuperscript{4} thinks that the accusative was a late
development to assist the “virtual” predication of the later inf. Sometimes this acc.
itself is the direct object of the principal verb (so verbs of asking, etc.). Gildersleeve
has a pertinent word: “I look with amazement at the retention [by Cauer in his
\textit{Grammatica Militans}] of Curtius’ utterly unsatisfactory, utterly inorganic explanation
of the acc. c. inf. in \textit{oratio obliqua}, against which I protested years ago (\textit{A. J. P.},
XVII, 1896, 517): \textipa{ηγγείλαν ὃτι ὁ Κῦρος ἔνικησε} becomes \textipa{ηγγείλαν τὸν Κῦρον ὃτι ἔνικσεν},
but \textipa{ὅτι ἔνικησεν=νικῆσαι} (\textit{A. J. P.}, XXXIII, 4, p. 489). To go no further,
Gildersleeve shows that the \textipa{ὅτι} construction is \textit{later} than the acc. c. inf. But the
grammarians went astray and called this accusative the “subject” of the inf., and,
when some other case appears with the inf., it is an “exception” to the rules of the
grammarians, though in perfect harmony with the genius of the Greek inf. Even
Moulton\textsuperscript{5} says: “In classical Greek, as any fifth-form boy forgets at his peril, the

\begin{itemize}
\textit{4 Hom. Gr.}, p. 162.
\item \textit{Gildersleeve}
\item \textit{Gildersleeve}, B. L., \textit{Editions of Pindar and Justin Martyr}.
\item \textit{———}, \textit{Latin Grammar}. Many editions since 1867.
\item \textit{———}, \textit{Notes on Stahl’s Syntax of the Greek Verb} (1910).
\item \textit{———}, \textit{Numerous articles in the American Journal of Philology}.
\item \textit{Cauer} CAUER, \textit{Grammatica Militans}. 3d ed. (1912).
\item \textit{Curtius}
\item \textit{Curtius}, G., \textit{Greek Etymology}. 2 vols. (1886).
\item \textit{———}, \textit{Studien zur griech. und lat. Grammatik} (1868–1878).
\item \textit{Moulton}
(1908).
\item \textit{———}, \textit{Characteristics of N. T. Greek} (The Expositor, 1904).
\item \textit{———}, \textit{Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T.} (1911).
\item \textit{———}, \textit{Grammatical Notes from the Papyri} (The Expositor, 1901, pp. 271–282;
\item \textit{———}, \textit{Introduction to N. T. Greek} (1895). 2d ed. (1904).
\item \textit{———}, \textit{Language of Christ} (Hastings’ One-vol. D. B., 1909).
\end{itemize}
nominative is used regularly instead of the accusative as subject to the infinitive when
the subject of the main verb is the same. Now, there is no doubt about the presence
of the nominative in such an instance. But why say “instead of the accusative”? The
nominative is normal and natural in such a construction. This construction probably,
almost certainly, antedated the accusative with the inf. We still meet it in the N. T. The oldest idiom was to have no noun with the inf., as in Lu. 24:23,
ἦλθαν λέγουσαι καὶ ὄπτασιν ἄγιλελον ἐωρακέναι. The context makes it perfectly
clear that the word ὄπτασιαν is the object of ἐωρακέναι and the rest is matter of easy inference. Cf. Ac. 26:9 (with δὲν); Jas. 2:14; 1 Jo. 2:6, 9; Tit. 1:16. In the majority of
cases in the N. T. the noun is not repeated or referred to in the predicate. So in Lu.
20:7 we have ἄπεκρίθησαν µὴ εἶδέναι, but in Ac. 25:4 Φήστος ἄπεκρίθη τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον εἰς Καισαρίαν, ἐστὼν δὲ μέλλειν. It is easy to see why Παῦλον has to be
in the acc. if expressed at all. We could have had αὐτός rather than ἐστὼν which
probably is just co-ordinated with Παῦλον. Cf. κριτὴς εἶναι in Ac. 18:15; Mt. 19:21
τέλειος εἶναι, Ph. 4:11 Ἰμαθὸν αὐτόρκης εἶναι, where the principle is the same, though
not technically indirect discourse; it is the predicate nominative. So with βούλομαι,
θέλω, ζητέω, etc. The personal construction is a good illustration of the nominative.
Cf. Heb. 11:4, ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος. The nominative occurs also in Ro. 1:22,
φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί. See further Ro. 9:3; 1 Cor. 3:18; 8:2; 14:37; 2 Cor. 10:2; Heb.
5:12; Jas. 1:26; Jo. 7:4 (W. H. text). In a case like Lu. 20:20 δικαίος εἶναι is
inevitable because of ἐπικρινομένους. But there are a good many examples in the N.
T. where the nominative could have been properly retained and where the accusative
has crept in, perhaps owing to a tendency towards uniformity rather than to any
special Latin influence as Blass supposed. Moulton notes the same tendency in the
κοινή outside of Latin influence. Moulton (Prol., p. 249) refers to Æschylus, P. V.
268 f., with the note of Sykes and Wynne-Wilson, and to Adam’s note on Plato,
Apol., 36 B., for classical examples of acc. with inf. where nom. could have occurred.
Cf. Ro. 6:11, ὦμες λογίζεσθε ἐαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς. It is rare in the classical Greek
for the accusative to occur in such sentences. The N. T. undoubtly shows an
increase of the acc. where the nominative was the rule for the older Greek. So Ro.
2:19, πέποιθες σεαυτὸν δοθήν ἐστὶν τυφλῶν, where αὐτός (cf. Ro. 9:3) would have
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been sufficient. Cf. also Ac. 5:36 (cf. 8:9) λέγων ἐβαλεί τινα ἑαυτόν, (Ph. 3:13) ἐγὼ ἐμαυτῶν ὁμοίως λογίζομαι κατελθηθείν, (Heb. 10:34) γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοὺς κρείσσονα ὑπάρξειν, (Eph. 4:22) ἀποθέσατε ὑμᾶς (some distance from the verb ἐδοξάσθητε). See also Ac. 21:1; Ro. 1:20 f. Blass, p. 238, thinks that in 2 Cor. 7:11 the class. Greek would have had ὅταν, not εἶναι. Even so, but the N. T. has εἶναι. An example like Lu. 20:20 (see above) is hardly pertinent, since the participle on which the inf. depends is itself in the accusative. Cf. Lu. 6:4. In Ac. 25:21, τοῦ Παύλου ἐπικαλεσμένου τηρεῖσθαι αὐτόν, the pronoun could have been assimilated to the case of Παύλου (αὐτοῦ). So also in Rev. 2:9; 3:9, τῶν λεγόντων Ιουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτοὺς (different order in 3:9). We find the same lack of assimilation in Ac. 22:17, μοι—μου—με, and in 25:27 μοι—πέμποντα and in Heb. 2:10 αὐτῷ—ἀγαλμάτα. In 2 Pet. 3:3, γινώσκοντες is due to anacoluthon (cf. 1:20) as with ἀπέκτεινεν—ἔχοντες (1 Pet. 2:11 f.) and with στελλόμενοι (2 Cor. 8:20). So Lu. 1:74 ἡμῖν ρυθμόνος, 5:7 μετέχοις ἐξοντας. The Greek of the N. T. did sometimes have assimilation of case as in Ac. 16:21, διὸ ὡκ ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν παραδέχεσθαι οὐδὲ ποιεῖν ῥομαίους οὕσιν. So also 15:25, ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκλεξαμένοις (−ous margin of W. H.) πέμυναι (cf. accusative retained in verse 22, ἐκλεξαμένους). Cf. also Lu. 1:3; 9:59; 2 Pet. 2:21. Contrast ἔδοξε μοι of Lu. 1:3 with ἔδοξα ἑμαυτῷ of Ac. 26:9. The same situation applies to the cases with the articular infinitive. Cf. Mt. 26:32, μετὰ τὸ ἐξερήθηναι με πρᾶξο. Here the με is not necessary and αὐτός could have been used. So with Lu. 2:4, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτόν. The αὐτόν is superfluous, as in Heb. 7:24. Cf. Lu. 10:35, ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανάρχεσθαι με ἀποδόσω σοι. See further Lu. 1:57; 2:21; 24:30; Ac. 18:3. It is easy to show from this use of the articular inf. that the inf. has no proper “subject.” The accusative is due to other reasons. Take Lu. 2:27, ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγέν] τοὺς γονέας τῷ παῖδιν Προφήτην, where the context makes plain that παῖδιον is the object of εἰσαγαγέν and γονέας the acc. of general reference. The article τὸ must be considered in explaining this instance. Cf. Lu. 18:5; Ac. 1:3; 27:4; Heb. 5:12 (three accusatives in W. H.’s text). The acc. with the inf. was normal when the substantive with the inf. was different from the subject of the principal verb. Cf. Ro. 3:8, φασὶν τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν ὅτι (note inf. after φημί, and ὅτι after λέγω, but it is recitative ὅτι). In Lu. 24:23, λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ἦν, we see λέγω with the acc. and inf. Typical examples are seen in Mt. 17:4, καλὸν ἐστίν ἡμᾶς ὡς εἶναι, Ac. 12:14; 14:19; 16:13; 24:15; 1 Pet. 3:17; 5:12; 1 Cor. 14:5; Heb. 9:8. See further Verbal Aspects of Inf., (ad), in next chapter.

The tense of the original is preserved in the inf. as a rule. A case like Mt. 14:7, ὁμολογήσαντες αὐτῷ δοῦναι δὲ ἐὰν αἰτήσηται, may [Page 1040] seem a bit disconcerting since in the direct discourse in Mk. 6:23 we find δόσω. But the future is aoristic anyhow. The line between indir. discourse and the simple object inf. is not sharply drawn. Cf. Ac. 23:12. In Lu. 20:6, ἐπεισεδικεῖος γὰρ ἔστιν Ιουδαίων προφητήν εἶναι, the inf. represents ἔγερσιν of the direct. There was no help for this, since there is no imperfect inf. The future inf. in indir. discourse is rare, but see Jo. 21:25; Ac. 23:30 (see Tenses). Examples of the perfect inf. in this idiom occur in Ac. 12:14; 14:19; 16:27; 25:25; Heb. 9:8. Cf. ὁμολογεῖ εἴληφέναι, P. Oxy. 37 (A.D. 49).

1 See also Lu. 23:2, λέγοντα αὐτῶν ἦναι.
There is little more to say. The use of τοῦ and the inf. as subject has been noted (pp. 996, 1002). See τοῦ ἐλθεῖν, Lu. 17:1, where τὸ σκάνδαλα is the acc. of general reference while this genitive inf. is itself in the nominative case. See also Ac. 10:25. We do not have ὁν with the inf. in indir. discourse. In 2 Cor. 10:9, ἵνα μὴ δοξῶ ὡς ὁν ἐκφοβηθῶμεν, we have ὡς ὁν = ‘as if.’ It is not the ὁν in apodosis. Nestle in his N. T. gives at 1 Pet. 5:8 ἐκπυρώθην τίνα καταπιεῖν, but surely τίνα is the correct accent. W. H. places even this in the margin. Souter prints τινα, departing from R. V. which has τινα. But Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 147) cites Callinicus in Vita Hypatii, 57, 12, ποῦ εὑρεῖν, and 113, 11, ὁ ποιῆσαι (cf. German Was tun?). It may be worth while to add that frequently we meet an inf. dependent on an inf. (cf. inf. on part. in Lu. 20:20). I have noticed the idiom in Luke, Paul, Mk., Heb. Cf. Lu. 6:12, ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐλς τὸ ὅρος προσεύξασθαι, where the first is in indirect discourse, and Ac. 18:2, διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, where the second is indirect discourse (indir. command). Cf. Ro. 15:8.

(γ) The Participle. Middleton1 suggests that the use of the participle in indir. discourse is older than the inf. This may be true, since in the Sanskrit it developed much more rapidly than the inf. But there were cross-currents at work in indirect discourse. Just as the inf. was circumscribed by the declarative ὅτι, so the participle was limited by ὅτι or the infinitive. Thus verbs of showing (δείκνυμι, δηλόω) and of manifesting (φανερόω) no longer occur with the participle in the N. T. However, we have the participle with φαίνομαι (‘appear’), as in Mt. 6:16. Besides, the participle has disappeared from use with αἰσθάνομαι, μανθάνω, νέμομαι, συνήμι. The participles with μανθάνω in 1 Tim. 5:13 are additional statements, as the Revised Version
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correctly translates. With the inf. μανθάνω means ‘to learn how,’ not ‘to learn that.’

[Page 1041] Cf. Ph. 4:11; Tit. 3:14. But some verbs in the N. T. still have the participle in indir. discourse. They are verbs of perception by the senses (hearing, seeing, knowing). In the ancient Greek the nominative was used when the participle referred to the subject of the verb. Thus ὁρῶ ἐμαρτηκός meant ‘I see that I have sinned.’ In the N. T., however, we have declarative ὅτι in such clauses (Mk. 5:29; 1 Jo. 3:14).1 Viteau2 rightly insists on a real difference between the participial conception and the declarative ὅτι or the inf. If the idea is one of intellectual apprehension merely, an opinion or judgment, we have ὁρῶ ὅτι (Jas. 2:24). If it is a real experience, the participle occurs as in Mk. 8:24, ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας. So in Ac. 8:23, εἰς σύνδεσμον ὁρῶ σε ὅτι. There is something in this distinction. Cf. βλέπω ὅτι (Jas. 2:22), but the participle in Heb. 2:9, Ἱησοῦν ἐστεφανομένον. In Mk. 8:24 we have ὅτι with βλέπω and the part. with ὁρῶ. The realistic quality of the part. is finely brought out in Mk. 9:1, ἔξως ἂν ἔδωκαν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐν δυνάμει. Note the tense as in Lu. 10:18, ἐθέρησαν τὸν Σατάναν—πεσόντα. Cf. 9:49; 21:20; Ac. 11:13; 17:16. See Jo. 19:33, ὥς εἶδον ἦδη αὐτὸν τεθνηκότα. The tense of the direct is preserved. See for ἔθερεθον, Mk. 16:4 and Lu. 24:39, καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα. For ἑπίσταμαι take Ac. 15:7 and 24:10. Cf. also μνημονεύω with ὅτι (Ac. 20:31) and the part. (2 Tim. 2:8). It is very clear in εὑρίσκω (see ὅτι in Ro. 7:21) which, as in classic Greek, is commonly used with the participle. See Mt. 1:18; 12:44; Lu. 23:2; Ac. 9:2. In Mt. 1:18 we have the passive construction εὑρέθη ἔχονσα. In Lu. 23:2 we find three participles. Ἀκούσα ὁ N. T. has only the inf. (Ro. 1:28) and the participle (2 Cor. 8:22). So with ἡγέομαι (Ph. 2:6; 3:7). Cf. also ἔχε με παρθημένον (Lu. 14:18). In 2 Jo. 7 note the part. with ὁμολογέω. In verse 4, περιπατοῦντας with εὑρίσκω, the case agrees only in sense with ὑ τῶν τέκνων. The difference between ὅτι with οἶδα (Ac. 23:5) and the part. is clear (2 Cor. 12:2), though this is the only instance of the part. with this verb. It prefers ὅτι, but may have the inf. (Lu. 4:41). The difference is even clearer in γινώσκω. See ὅτι in Mt. 21:45, the inf. in Heb. 10:34. The usual idiom is ὅτι, but note Lu. 8:46, ἔχοντο δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθότας ὅτι ἔμοι, where Christ thus graphically describes the terrible nervous loss from his healing work. He felt the power “gone” out of him. In our vernacular we speak of a sense of “goneness.” See also Ac. 19:35; Heb. 13:23. But see Mk. 5:29, ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἤτα. In [Page 1042] Mk. 5:30 ἐπιγνώσκω has the attributive participle after it. Ἀκούω also occurs with declarative ὅτι (Mt. 5:21; 32 times), the inf. (Jo. 12:18; 1 Cor. 11:18) or the part. (Ac. 7:12; 14:9; 3 Jo. 4; 2 Th. 3:11, etc.). These examples have the accusative when the thing is understood. Blass1 curiously calls the acc. incorrect in Ac. 9:4; 26:14. The genitive with φωνῇ does occur in 11:7; 22:7.

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 246.
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Blass has an overrefinement on this point. As with the acc. construction of the part. with ἀκούω, so most of the genitive examples are found in the Acts. So 2:6; 6:11; 14:9, etc. But see also Mk. 12:28, ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων. So 14:58; Lu. 18:36; Jo. 1:37. The perfect part. in this construction is seen in Lu. 8:46; Jo. 19:33, etc. For the aorist see Lu. 10:18. In Mk. 6:8 we have oratio variata. The sentence starts with ἰόν and concludes with the inf. Hence the part. ὑποδεδεμένους is construed with the inf. See the acc. part. in Rev. 4:4 as explained by εἶδον in verse 1, though ἰδού and the nominative have come between.

(δ) Καὶ ἔγένετο. One hardly knows whether to treat this construction as indirect discourse or not. It is a clear imitation of the Hebrew יְהִי and is common in the LXX with two constructions. It is either καὶ ἔγένετο καὶ with finite verb (or ἔγένετο δὲ) as in Gen. 24:30; 29:13; Josh. 5:1, etc.), or we have asyndeton, καὶ ἔγένετο plus finite verb (Gen. 22:1; 24:45, etc.). For ἔγένετο we often find ἔγεννηθή (1 Sam. 4:1; 11:1, etc.). This asyndeton is also common in the future as καὶ ἔσται with finite verb (Is. 9:16; 10:20, 27, etc.). This καὶ ἔσται construction is quoted a few times in the N. T. (Ac. 2:17, 21; Ro. 9:26) from the LXX. For καὶ ἔσται καὶ see Ex. 13:11 f. W. F. Moulton2 has pointed out that the idiom occurs when the principal sentence has some note of time. J. H. Moulton3 quotes Driver (Tenses, § 78) as describing the יְהִי construction in a similar fashion, “a clause specifying the circumstances under which an action takes place.” All the examples of these two constructions in Luke fit this
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description. Luke has in the Gospel eleven of the καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ examples and twenty-two of the καὶ ἐγένετο type. For καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ see Lu. 17:11; without the second καὶ 17:14. See in particular Lu. 8 and 9. It is frequently the case that Luke has ἐν τῷ and the inf. with the idiom. So 9:51, ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι—καὶ αὐτός ἔστηρισεν. Here καὶ is almost equivalent to ὅτι. So καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι—εἰπὲν τις (11:1). We have καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ also in [Page 1043] Mt. 9:10. The form καὶ ἐγένετο Moulton1 counts outside of Luke only twice in Mark and five times in Matthew with the phrase ἐγένετο ὅτε ἔτέλεσεν. Cf. Mt. 7:28. Moulton is concerned to show against Dalman that the idiom is not Semitic. He admits the Hebraism in καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ, but doubts as to καὶ ἐγένετο (asyndeton). But surely the LXX has left its mark in this point also. The LXX does not have ἐγένετο (or γίνεται) and the infinitive (but cf. 2 Macc. 3:16 ἦν—τιτρώσκεσθαι). In the N. T. we find it in Mt. 18:13; Mk. 2:15; five times in Luke and seventeen times in Acts. Cf. ὑμῖν γίνοιτο κράτεῖν, P. Par. 26 (b.c. 163–2). The other two constructions are absent from the Acts, showing that in the Gospel Luke was more directly using Semitic sources or imitating the LXX on the point. But even so inf. with ἐγένετο is not ancient Greek, which used συνέβη. We do have συνέβη and the inf. in Ac. 21:35. The modern Athenian vernacular has συνέβη ὅτι while the country districts use ἐπηχε νά. Moulton finds the inf. with γίνεται in the papyri and rightly sees in the vernacular κοινή the origin of this idiom. There is no essential difference between the inf. with γίνεται and ἐγένετο. Cf. Ac. 9:32; 16:16; 9:32, 37, 43; 11:26, etc. Outside of Luke (Gospel and Acts) the inf. with ἐγένετο is confined to Mk. 2:23, which Moulton calls “a primitive assimilation of Lu. 6:1.” See Ac. 10:25, ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθέν. This is Moulton’s presentation, which is certainly more just than the mere description of “Hebraism” for all these constructions.3 We do not have the ὅτι clause with γίνεται or ἐγένετο in the N. T.

(g) Indirect Questions.

(a) Tense. See (c) under Indirect Discourse. It may here be simply stated that when the principal verb is primary no change in tense occurs. When it is secondary, still no change appears as a rule, though occasionally one does see it, as in Jo. 2:25; 6:6; 18:32. But note ἐπθαύνετο ποῦ γεννᾶται (Mt. 2:4); ἔθεσαν ποῦ τέθειται (Mk. 15:47). Cf. Ac. 10:18. Note difference between present perfect in Mk. 15:44 and the aorist in the same verse. For the future ind. see Jo. 21:19; Mk. 11:13.

(b) Mode. It is only necessary to say that as a rule the same mode is retained in the indirect question that was in the direct. Thus see Mk. 5:14; 15:47; Lu. 8:36; 23:55;
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Ac. 10:29, where the indicative occurs. We have the ind. after secondary as well as primary tenses. This is the common idiom in the N.T. as in [Page 1044] the κοινή. In all instances where a subj. appears in this construction it is due to the fact that the subj. would have been present in the direct (deliberative subj.). Note τί φάγωμεν: in Mt. 6:31 and τί φάγητε (6:25). See also ποῦ μένεις: of Jo. 1:38 and εἴδαν ποῦ μένεις of verse 39 for the retention of the indicative. The Latin changed the ind. to the subj. in indirect questions, but the Greek did not. This deliberative subj. occurs after primary tenses as in Lu. 9:58, οὖκ ἔχει ποῦ θελεῖν κλίνῃ, and after secondary tenses also as in Mk. 9:6, οὖ γὰρ ἔστι τί ἀποκριθή. Cf. also Mk. 6:36; Lu. 5:19; 12:36. So also the optative occurs a few times where it was in the direct. This is the construction with ὅν which has already been discussed twice. See Ac. 17:18, τί ὅν θέλω, for the direct form, and Lu. 1:62, τί ὅν θέλω, for the indirect. Cf. Lu. 9:46; Ac. 5:24. In 2 Tim. 2:25, μὴ ποτε δῷ (W. H. have δῶν in margin), we have the optative without ὅν after a primary tense if δῶν be correct. Moulton considers the subj. here a “syntactical necessity.” We need not moralize, therefore, on this instance of the optative even if it is genuine. Radermacher (Neut. Gr., p. 132) shows that the Atticists frequently used the opt. after a primary tense, as copyists often fail to catch the spirit of a thing. The papyri (ib.) have some illustrations of the same idiom. The other examples of the opt. in indirect questions are all after secondary tenses and the change is made from an indicative or a subj. to the optative. These examples all occur in Luke. As instances of the opt. where the direct had the ind. see Lu. 1:29; 3:15; 18:36. See Ac. 21:33 for both modes. In Ac. 17:27, εἴ ἄρα ἔρχεται ἡ ἡμέρα, the opt. represents a subj. with ἔρχεται after a primary tense. So in Ac. 27:12. In no instance where the opt. without ὅν occurs in the indirect discourse is it necessary. In all these examples the indicative or the subj. could have been retained. The infinitive with τίνα in 1 Pet. 5:8 is read by Nestle, but not by W. H. or Souter. See under (f), (β).

(g) Interrogative Pronouns and Conjunctions Used. One notes at once the absence of ὅς, ὅς, ὅς in this construction, the common classical idiom. We do have ὅτι once in Ac. 9:6, λαληθήσεται σοι ὅτι σε δέ ποιεῖν. Elsewhere the most usual pronoun is τίς and τί as in Ac. 10:29; 21:33. We even have τίς τί ὅτι in Mk. 15:24 (double interrogative). Tischendorf reads τίς τί in Lu. 19:15, but W. H. have only τί. This double use appears rarely in the older Greek. As a rule the distinction between τίς and ὅς is pre-served in [Page 1045] in indirect questions, as in Jo. 13:24 (cf. 13:12). The occasional confusion between τίς and ὅς was discussed under Pronouns. See 1 Tim. 1:7 and Jas. 3:13. Now and then the simple relative pronoun or adverb is used in an indirect question, as was true of classical Greek also. So Mk. 5:19 f. ὅσοι, Lu. 8:47 δι᾽ ἐν αἷς, Ac. 15:14 καθὼς, 1 Th. 1:5 οἷον, and the various examples of ὅς discussed in connection with Indirect Assertions (Lu. 8:47; Ac. 10:28, 38, etc.) which are more likely to be understood in the sense of ‘how,’ and so indirect questions. Cf. Lu. 6:3 f. (ὅ and ὅς), Mt. 10:19 (δοθήσεται πῶς ἂν τίς λαλήσητε) Lu. 17:8 (τί). Other interrogative words used are ποῦ (Mt. 2:4), πόθεν (Jo. 8:14), πῶς (Rev. 3:3), πότε (Lu. 12:36), πῶς (Lu. 8:36), πρᾷκτος (Gal. 6:11), πῶς (Mt. 16:9), ποταπός (Lu. 1:29). The correlative words, besides the lone instance of ὅτι in Ac. 9:6, are ὅπως (Lu. 24:20), ὅποιος (1 Th. 1:9). In Mk. 14:14 (Lu. 22:11) ποῦ—ὅπου φάγω; most likely the ὅπου clause is an indirect question with the deliberative subj., but it may be the

2 Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 68.
volitive subj. simply. There are plenty of instances of εἰ in indirect questions (see Conditional Sentences) as in Mk. 15:44 after θαυμάζω and ἐπεροτάω; Lu. 14:28 after ψηφίζω; 14:31 after βουλεύομαι; Mt. 26:63 after εἶπον; 27:49 after ὁρῶ; Mk. 3:2 after παρατηρῶ; Jo. 9:25 after οἶδα; Ac. 4:19 after κρίνω; 10:18 after πονήνομαι; 19:2 after ὑκοῦω; 2 Cor. 2:9 after γινόμοι; 13:5 after πειράζω. There are, besides, those passages where a word is suppressed, like Mk. 11:13; Eph. 3:2; Ph. 3:12; 2 Th. 2:15. See also the optative with εἰ in Ac. 17:27; 25:20; 27:12. This is all quite classical and gives no trouble. We find μὴ also used like an indirect question after σκοπέω (cf. p. 995) with the ind. (Lu. 11:35) and μὴ ποτὲ after διαλογίζομαι with the opt. (Lu. 3:15). In Jo. 7:17 an alternative indirect question occurs with πότερον—ἤ. The only other alternative construction in an indirect question is in 2 Cor. 12:2 f. after οἶδα, and is εἴρε—εἴρε. In all these points the N. T. is in harmony with the koiné. The use of τί with the subj. (Mk. 6:36) or the future ind. (Ac. 25:26 possibly subj. aor.) may be compared with ποῦ after ἔχω in Lu. 9:58. In Col. 4:6 πῶς after οἶδέναι is to be distinguished from the use of the inf. after οἶδα (‘know how to do.’ Cf. Lu. 11:13). In Mk. 2:24, ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν; the ἴδε is probably just the interjection as in Mt. 25:25. For the acc. and the ind. question side by side see Mt. 16:9.

(b) The Article with Indirect Questions. This classical idiom appears in Luke and Paul. See τὸ τί (Lu. 1:62), τὸ τίς (9:46), τὸ πῶς (22:4). So Paul has τὸ πῶς in 1 Th. 4:1 and τὸ τί in Ro. 8:26 (cf. τί τὸ in 8:27). See also Lu. 22:23 f.; Ac. 4:21; 22:30. The substantive nature of the indirect question is well shown also in Jo. 4:10. Cf. Lu. 24:19 f.

(h) Indirect Command. As already explained, this construction is somewhat vague and the line is hard to draw between this and other idioms.

(a) Deliberative Question. A direct command may be turned into a deliberative question in the indirect with the subjunctive. The volitive idea of the imperative thus glides into the deliberative. In Lu. 12:5, ὑποδείξω δὲ υμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε: φοβηθῆτε τὸν, κτλ., we have the point illustrated both in the direct (imperative) and the indirect (deliberative subj.). Here the only difference between the two forms is the accent. Cf. μὴ φοβηθῆτε in verse 4. In Mt. 10:28 we have φοβεῖσθε. Obviously this is a natural, though not very frequent, turn for the command to take.

(b) The Conjunctions ἵνα and ὅπος. These may be used after verbs of commanding and beseeching. This idiom does not differ clearly from the sub-final construction. It is a species of purpose (or sub-final. See Final Clauses). The examples given might suffice, but note the following: Mk. 6:8 παρῆγγελεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἰροῦσιν, Mt. 16:20 ἐπετίμησεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδὲν ἔποιος, 2 Th. 3:12 παραγγέλλωμαι καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστί ἵνα—ἐσθίωσιν, Ac. 25:3 αἰτοῦμεν ὅπος μεταπέμπηται. See further Mt. 8:34; Lu. 16:27; 1 Cor. 1:10. In Lu. 16:27 f. we have the purely final idea in both ὅπος and ἵνα which are subordinate to the first ἵνα after ἐρωτῶ. But we cannot follow this use of ἵνα after θέλω and such verbs where it is more or less purely objective. The recitative ὅτι with the imperative in 2 Th. 3:10 is not an instance of indirect command, but simply the direct command preserved.

(γ) The Infinitive. It seems more obvious and is still common in the koine, though retiring before ἵνα. The negative is, of course, μὴ. This use of the infinitive must not be confounded with the idiom for indirect assertion (declarative) as in Mk. 12:18, οἵνες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι. Note Ac. 21:21, λέγων μὴ περιτέμεναι αὐτοῦς τὸ τέκνα μηδὲ τοῖς ἔθεσιν περιπατεῖν, where we have prohibition, not assertion (note incidentally the two accusatives) with λέγων (same verb as above). So also 23:12, λέγοντες μὴ φαγεῖν μὴ τε ἐπέν. Cf. 21:4. Simple enough is the construction after ἐπα in Lu. 9:54, εἴπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι; See also Mk. 8:7. [Page 1047] In Mt. 16:12, συνήκαν δὴ οὐκ ἐπέν προσέχειν (cf. προσέχειν in verses 6 and 11), we have the declarative δὴ and the indicative followed by the inf. in indirect command. In Lu. 2:26, ἂν αὐτῷ κεχρησμενόν μὴ ἰδέν θάνατον, the construction is like that of indirect command, but the sense comes nearer to the mere object infinitive. See the direct δῶσο in Mk. 6:23 reproduced in the indirect by δῶσαι (Mt. 14:7). There is a certain amount of freedom taken in such transference to the indirect. In Ac. 18:2, διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαών διαφωνεῖ Κύρου, ἡ τοιχοί κεφαλή δυνατή ἐρώτησαν the inf. is dependent on an inf. Other instances of the inf. in indir. command are seen in Ac. 25:24, βοῶντες μὴ δεῖν αὐτόν ζήν, 26:20, ἐπηγγέλλον μετὰνεόν. In 2 Th. 3:6 we have παραγγέλλων στέλλεσθαι, while in verse 12 we have ἵνα. In verse 10 the direct quotation follows this same verb. In Mk. 6:8 f. we have both ἵνα μὴ ἄρωσιν and μὴ ἐνούσασθαι (marg. of W. H., Μὴ ἐνδόσῃς) after παρήγγελεν. Luke (9:3–5) gives it all in the direct form. In 2 Th. 3:14, τούτον σημειούσθη, μὴ συναναγίνοσθαι αὐτῷ, the inf. is not in indirect command, but rather the inf. used in the direct as the equivalent of the imperative. But in 1 Cor. 5:11, ἔγραψα ἴματα μὴ συναναγίνοσθαι (so also verse 9), we do have indirect command.

(i) Mixture. Strictly this point belongs to the chapter on Figures of Speech (cf. also, Oratio Variata, The Sentence), but a word is called for here. We have mixture of several sorts as in the classic Greek. In Ac. 19:1 f., Παῦλον ἔλθαν καὶ εὐρέαν, ἔπειν τε, we have the infinitive (object-clause subject of ἔγενεν) and the finite clause ἔπειν τε side by side. Cf. Ac. 4:5 f. for inf. followed by καί and the indicative. So in Lu. 9:19 we have the infinitive construction and the δὴ construction side by side after ἀποκρίθηντες ἔπαιν. In Ac. 14:22, παρακαλοῦντες ἐμέμενεν τῇ πίστει καὶ δὴ τῇ δὲ, the construction glides from the inf. into δὴ. In Ro. 3:8 the recitative δὴ is dependent on the inf. λέγειν after φασίν. In Ac. 9:27, δηλήσαντο πῶς ἐν τῇ δοῦ ἐδέν τὸν κύριον καὶ δὲ ἐλάλησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ πῶς κτλ., we have a change from ind. question to indirect assertion and then back again to indirect question. The change may be from the indirect to the direct as in Ac. 1:4, περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός ἂν ἦκούσατε μου. Cf. also 23:22. See also Jo. 12:29. This change appears in Mk. 6:8 f., if the true text is ἐνδόσῃς. But the change may be just the reverse, from the direct to the indirect, as in Ac. 23:23, ἐπέν Ἐσομάσατε—κτήνη τε παραστήσας. In 27:10 δὸτι occurs with the inf., a mixture of the δὸτι and the infinitive constructions in indirect assertions. This use of δὸτι with the inf. appears in [Page 1048] classic Attic (cf. Xen., Cyr., 1, 6, 18, etc.). See Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 570. Moulton (Prol., p. 213) gives a
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papyrus example, O. P. 237 (ii/3 A.D.), δὴλὼν ὅτι εἶ τὸ ἀληθῆ φανεῖν μηδὲ κρίσεως δέσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα. See further Winer-Moulton, p. 426.

(j) The Subordinate Clause. A complex sentence may be quoted in indirect discourse as readily as the simple sentence. This principal clause follows the usual laws already discussed. Secondary tenses of the indicative in the subordinate clause suffer no change at all in mood or tense. This is obviously true after primary tenses, as in Gal. 4:15, μαρτυρῶ ὑμῖν ὅτι εἶ δυνατόν—ἐδοκιμακτε μοι. Here the copula ἦν is suppressed. In Lu. 19:15 note εἶπεν φωνηθήναι—οἷς δεδόκει. So after primary tenses the primary tense follows, as in Mk. 11:23, λέγω ὅτι ὦν ἐπὶ—ἔσται αὐτῷ. Cf. Ac. 25:14 f. But even after secondary tenses the rule is to retain the tense and mode of the direct much more than in the Attic where the mode was quite optional. See Lu. 9:33, εἶπεν μὴ εἰδῶς ὅ λέγει. Another example of the relative clause appears in Mt. 18:25, ἐκέλευσαν—πραξῆναι—καὶ δῶσα ἔχει. Even after a condition of the second class the primary tense may be retained, as in Lu. 7:39, ἔγινοσκεν ὅν τις καὶ ποιηθῇ ἡ γνῶ ἢτις ἀπηται αὐτῷ ὅτι ἀμαρτωλὸς ἔστιν. For a causal sentence see ἐκολοομένος αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν (Lu. 9:49). A temporal clause with the subjunctive appears in Mt. 14:22, γυνάκεισαι—προάγειν—ἔως οὗ ἄπολυσῃ. See also Ac. 23:12, ἀνεθημάτισαν—ἔως οὗ ἀποκείμενοιν. In 25:16, however, we have the optative in the subordinate clause of time with πρὸν ἦ (ἔχοι, λάβοι) after ἄπεκριθην, the sole example. It is in Luke, as one would expect. The change here is from the subj. to the opt. In Lu. 7:43, ὅτι ὃς, only the subordinate relative clause is given.

10. SERIES OF SUBORDINATE CLAUSES. It is interesting to observe how rich the Greek language is in subordinate clauses and how they dovetail into each other. It is almost like an endless chain. The series may run on ad infinitum and yet all be in perfect conformity to the genius of the language. I have collected quite a number of examples to illustrate this complexity of structure, some of which are here given. A typical one is Mk. 11:23. After λέγω ὅτι we have ὅν ἐπίπη which has ὀρατο ῆκτα, but the relative clause proceeds with καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ ὅτι ὁ λαλεῖ γίνεται. The relative ὁ λαλεῖ is the fourth involution of subordinate clauses after λέγω. Cf. also Jo. 17:24. A similar multiplicity of subordinate clauses is found in Ac. 25:14–16. [Page 1049] After ἀνέθετο λέγων we have ὀρατο ῆκτα. The first step is the relative clause περὶ οὗ—ἐνεφάνισαν, on which hangs πρὸς οὗ ἄπεκριθην, which in turn is followed by ὅτι οὗ ἐστιν and that by χαρίζεσθαι, and this again by πρὸν ἦ ἔχοι—λάβωι. The πρὸν ἦ clause is the fifth involution in the ὀρατο ῆκτα. Cf. also Ac. 3:19 ff. (πρὸς τὸ ἐξαλισθήναι, ὅποιος ἦν, ὃν δὲ ἐξασθηκεν, ἔν). In Ac. 11:13 there are five involvements. The complications are not, of course, always so many. In Lu. 7:39 the ὀρατο ῆκτα has a series of three (τὶς—ἡτὶς—ὅτι). See the threefold series in Ro. 3:8, καθὼς φασίν τινες ἢμιοὺς λέγειν ὅτι, κτλ. So also Mk. 6:55, περιφέρειν ὅποιο ἱκουν ὁτι ἔστιν (infinite, relative, declarative). So again 1 Cor. 11:23 f. (ὅτι, ἦ, εἶπεν and ὀρατο ῆκτα). Here also the ὅ clause is in apposition with the ὅτι clause. Cf.
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Lu. 19:15 (inf., ἵνα, τί). In Ac. 7:25, ἐνόμιζεν συνιέναι τοὺς ἄδελφοὺς ὅτι, κτλ., we have two forms of indirect assertion (the inf., then ὅτι), one dependent on the other. So also ὅτι follows διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι in Lu. 9:7 f. In Ph. 4:10 we have the ὅτι clause and then the articular inf. In Ac. 7:25, ἐνόμιζεν συνιέναι τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ὅτι, κτλ., we have two forms of indirect assertion (the inf., then ὅτι). In Jo. 6:24 the ὅτι clause is subordinate to the ὅτε clause. In 1 Jo. 5:9 we have a ὅτι clause dependent on a ὅτι clause. In Jo. 4:1 we have ὡς—ὅτι. In Mt. 16:20 the sequence is ἵνα—ὅτι. In Ph. 4:10 we have the ὅτι clause and then the articular inf. In Jo. 16:4; 17:23, we have two cases of oratio recta, one dependent on the other. In Mt. 16:20 the sequence is ἵνα—ὅτι. So Jo. 1:9 the ἵνα clause and the infinitive περιπατῆσαι are parallel. The instances are numerous where one infinitive is dependent on another infinitive. Thus ἐξελθεῖν προσεύξασθαι (Lu. 6:12); δοθῆναι φαγεῖν (8:55); πρὸς τὸ δεῖν προσεύχεσθαι (18:1); διὰ τὸ τεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι, after ἐληλυθότα (Ac. 18:2); δεῖν πρόξαι (26:9); γεγονέναι εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι (Ro. 15:8); κατηρτίσθαι εἰς τὸ γεγονέναι (Heb. 11:3). In Ac. 23:30, μην ἑξελθίσαι τὸν ἄνδρα ἑσεσθαι, the future inf. in indirect discourse is dependent on the participle in the genitive absolute. In Heb. 9:8, τούτῳ δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ὕψους περιπατῆσαι, the perfect inf. follows the genitive absolute. There are various other combinations. These are given as illustrations. No rules are called for about the using of a series of subordinate clauses. The presence of so many of them in Luke, Paul and Hebrews shows the literary quality of a more periodic structure.

I. Kinship. The finite verb, verbum finitum (das bestimmte Verb), has now been discussed as adequately as the space in this grammar allows. Originally there was no difference between verb and noun (see Conjugation of the Verb). But gradually there was developed a difference. It was done largely by the help of the pronouns which were added to the verb-stems. Nouns also had their own inflection. But a considerable body of words partook of the nature of both verb and noun and yet did not cut loose from either. In a sense therefore the finite verb is a combination of verb and pronoun while the non-finite verb combines verb and noun. These verbal nouns are the non-finite verb, verbum infinitum (das unbestimmte Verb). They failed to add the personal pronominal endings of the finite verb and so did not become limited to a subject (finite). And yet they developed tense and voice and were used with the same cases as the finite verb. In so far they are true verbs. On the other hand they are themselves always in a case like other nouns. The verbal substantive comes to drop its inflection (fixed case-form) while the verbal adjective is regularly inflected in the singular and plural of all three genders just like any other adjective. These verbal nouns may be regarded either as hybrids or as cases of arrested development, more properly deflected development, for they continued to develop in a very wonderful way. The Greek of the Attic period would be barren indeed if robbed of the infinitives and the participles. The names are not distinctive, since both are participles (partake of the nature of both verb and noun) and both are non-finite or infinitives (are not limited to
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a subject by personal endings). The root-difference between these lies not [Page 1051] in the verbal idea, but in the noun. It is the difference between substantive and adjective. Both are verbals, both are nouns, but one is a substantive and the other is an adjective. These general remarks may help one to understand the history and usage of both infinitive and participle.

II. The Infinitive (ἡ ἀπαρέμφατος ἐγκλήσις or τὸ ἀπαρέμφατον ῥῆμα).

1. ORIGIN. There is no real ground for difference of opinion on this subject, however much scholars may argue as to the significance of the infinitive.¹ In the Sanskrit the infinitive did not have tense or voice. The root used was that of a substantive closely connected with a verb.² But it is verbal in Sanskrit also in the notion of action, nomina actionis. In the Veda and Brāhmaṇa the number of these verbal nouns is very large. They are used with cases, the cases corresponding to the verb, but that phenomenon appears in Latin and Greek. 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 examples of a noun or adjective governing the case appropriate to the verb with which it is closely connected.”² The same thing occurs in the N. T. also. Cf. κοινωνία φωτί (2 Cor. 6:14). See chapter on Cases. These substantives have enough “verbal consciousness” to “govern” cases.³ In the old Sanskrit these verbal substantives occur in any case (except the vocative, which is not a real case). The later Sanskrit has only one such case-ending so used, the accusative in -tum or -itum (cf. the Latin supine).³ But for the developments in other languages, especially in the Greek and Latin, these Sanskrit verbal substantives would not have been called infinitives. But they show beyond controversy the true origin of the infinitive before tense and voice were added. They were originally substantives in any case, which were used as fixed case-forms (cf. adverbs) which had a verbal idea (action), and which were made on verbal roots. The Latin shows three cases used in this way: the locative as in regere, the dative as in rég and the accusative as in the supine rectum.⁵ The Greek infinitive shows only two case-endings, the dative –α as in λῦσαι (cf. also δοιέναι, δοῦναι, with Sanskrit dāvānḥ Homeric ðoimeναι with Sanskrit vidmāṇoḥ or the [Page 1052] locative in λῦειν.¹ Thus in the Greek and Latin it is only oblique cases that were used to form the infinitives.² It is then as a substantive that the infinitive makes its start. We see this in the Sanskrit dāvānḥ vāṃ ᦍᾱ=δοῖναι τῶν ἀγαθῶν.³ This substantive aspect is clearly seen in the use of παντός with τοῦ ἔρ ῥ ν in Heb. 2:15. The first⁴ step towards the verbal idea was in the
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construction δούναι τὰ ἀγαθά. Moulton illustrates the border-land of the English inf. by the sentence: “He went out to work again.” If we read “hard work” we have a substantive; but if we read “work hard,” we have a verbal notion. Strictly speaking, δούναι τὰ ἀγαθά=’for giving the good things,’ while ἴδεν τὰ ἀγαθά=’in seeing the good things.’ This was the original etymological sense as the Sanskrit makes clear. See further chapter on Conjugation of Verb.

2. DEVELOPMENT. In the Sanskrit we see the primitive infinitive without tense or voice. In the modern Greek the infinitive, outside of the Pontic dialect, has disappeared save with auxiliary verbs, and even so it is in a mutilated state, as with θέλει λάει, ἠθέλει δεθεῖ, ἔρχεται, δέσα, remnants of the ancient infinitives λύειν, δεθήναι, δέσαι (Thumb, Handb., pp. 162, 167). Between these two extremes comes the history of the rise and fall of the Greek infinitive. We may sketch that history in five periods.

(a) The Prehistoric Period. The infinitive is simply a substantive with the strict sense of the dative or locative case. Cf. the Sanskrit. We may infer also that there was no tense or voice. This original epexegetical use of the inf. as the dative of limitation has survived with verbs, substantives and adjectives. So ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκάν (Lu. 1:57). Cf. our “a wonder to behold.” See ὁνότατο δουλεύειν (Mt. 7:11), ὁ ῥυμή ὑβρίσαι (Ac. 14:5), ἰκανός λῦσαι (Mk. 1:7). See also Jas. 1:19, ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἄκούσαι, where εἰς τὸ reproduces the dative idea.

(b) The Earliest Historic Period. The case-form (dative or locative) begins to lose its significance. In Homer the dative idea is still the usual one for the infinitive, in harmony with the form. With verbs of wishing, commanding, expecting, beginning, being able, etc., the dative idea is probably the original explanation of [Page 1053] the idiom. Cf. οἶδατε διδόναι (Mt. 7:11), ‘knows how to give’ (for ‘giving’). Homer
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has βῆ δὲ ἔναι = ‘stepped’ for ‘going.’ But already in Homer there are signs that the case-form is getting obscured or stereotyped. It occurs as apparent subject with impersonal verbs and as the logical object of verbs of saying in indirect discourse. The use of ἐπὶ with the inf. is common also in Homer. ἐπὶ would naturally be used with the ablative, like परा and the infinitive in Sanskrit, and so the Greek idiom must have arisen after the dative or locative idea of the inf. in Greek was beginning to fade. In Homer the inf. is already a fixed case-form. The disappearance of –αι as a distinct case-ending in Greek may have made men forget that the usual inf. was dative. This dative inf. was probably a survival of the old and once common dative of purpose. Gradually the inf. passed from being merely a word of limitation (epexegetical) to being subject or object. We see the beginning of this process in Homer, though there is only one instance of the article with the inf., and that is in the Odyssey (20. 52), τὸ φυλάσσειν. But even here τὸ may be demonstrative. But in Homer the inf. has tense and voice, a tremendous advance over the Sanskrit inf. This advance makes a distinct access of the verbal aspect of the inf. But there was no notion of time in the tense of the inf. except in indir. discourse where analogy plays a part and the inf. represents a finite mode. This use of the inf., afterwards so common in Latin, seems to have been developed first in the Greek. But it was the loss of the dative force as an essential factor that allowed the inf. to become distinctly verbalized. As it came to be, it was an imperfect instrument of language. As a verb it lacked person, number and time except in indirect discourse. As a substantive it lacked inflection (without case or number) after it came to be limited to two cases. Even after the case-idea vanished and it was used in various cases it was still indeclinable. The addition of tense and voice to the fixed case-form of the substantive with verbal root was possible just because of the obscuration of the case-idea.

(c) The Classic Period from Pindar on. The articular infinitive is often used and there is renewed accent on its substantival aspects. The inf. is freely used with or without the article in any case (except vocative) without any regard to the dative or locative ending. Pindar first uses the neuter article τὸ with the inf. as the subject. “By the assumption of the article it was substantivized again with a decided increment of its power.” It is to be remembered, however, that the article itself is a development from the demonstrative and was very rare in Homer with anything. Hence too much must not be made of the later use of the article with the inf. Hesiod shows two
examples of the article with the inf. Pindar has nine and one in the accusative. The absence or ambiguous character of the article in early Greek makes it necessary to be slow in denying the substantival aspect or character of the inf. in the Homeric period. Hence it is best to think of the article as being used more freely with the inf. as with other nouns as the article made its onward way. The greatly increased use of the article with the inf. did serve to restore the balance between the substantival and verbal aspects of the inf. now that tense and voice had come in. The enlarged verb-force was retained along with the fresh access of substantival force. “The Greek infinitive has a life of its own, and a richer and more subtle development than can be found in any of the cognate languages.” The infinitive, thus enriched on both sides, has a great career in the classic period of the language, especially in Thucydides, the Orators, Xenophon and Plato. It has a great variety of uses. In general, however, it may be said that the inf. was not as popular in the vernacular as in the literary style for the very reason that it was synthetic rather than analytic, that it lacked clearness and emphasis. But it was not till the κοινή period that the inf. began to disappear.

\(d\) The κοινή Period. The inf. begins to disappear before Ἰνα [Page 1055] on the one hand and ὅτι on the other. Jannaris outlines the two chief functions of the inf. in its developed state to be prospective (purpose like Ἰνα) and declarative (subject or object like ὅτι, and Ἰνα ultimately also). The fondness for analysis rather than synthesis, particularly in the vernacular, gradually pushed the inf. to the wall. The process was slow, but sure. There is indeed a counter tendency in the enlarged use of τοῦ and the inf. in the κοινῇ, particularly in the LXX under the influence of the Hebrew infinitive construct, and so to some extent in the N. T. So from Polybius on there is seen an increase of τοῦ and the inf. side by side with the enlarged use of Ἰνα and ὅτι. The two contradictory tendencies work at the same time. On the whole in the κοινῇ the inf. has all the main idioms of the classic age (with the marked absence of ἐφ᾽ ὃτι) and the new turn given to τοῦ and ἐν τῷ. The Hebrew did not use the inf. as much as the Greek and never with the article. Certainly the inf. is far less frequent in the LXX than in the comparatively free Greek of the N. T., about half as often (2.5 to the page in the LXX, 4.2 in the N. T.). But the Hebrew has not, even in the LXX, introduced any new uses of the inf. in the Greek. The Hebrew inf. construct had no article and was thus unlike τοῦ and the inf. The total number of infinitives in the N. T., according to Votaw, is 2,276. The number of anarthrous infs. is 1,957, of articular 319. The inroad of Ἰνα and ὅτι is thus manifest as compared with the Attic writers. The writings of Luke show the largest and most varied use of the inf., while the
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Johannine writings have the fewest. Paul’s use is very uneven. Votaw finds the same inequality in the case of the apocryphal books. The papyri show a similar situation. Different writers vary greatly, but on the whole the inf. is dying save in the use with auxiliary verbs, and it is going even there as is seen from the use of ἵνα with θέλω in the N. T. Cf. Mk. 9:30. In the κοινὴ we find ἵνα with βούλομαι and δύναμαι in Polybius, the LXX and later κοινὴ writers. As the inf. disappears in the later Greek strange combinations appear, as in Malalas and Theophanes we meet πρὸ τοῦ with the subjunctive (πρὸ τοῦ ἐπιρρήψωσιν, πρὸ τοῦ ἐνοθῶσιν). The inf. never had a monopoly of any construction save as the complement of certain verbs like βούλομαι, θέλω, etc. This was probably the original use of the inf. with verbs and it was true to the dative case-idea. It was here alone that the inf. was able to make a partial stand to avoid complete obliteration.

(e) The Later Period. Outside of the Pontic dialect the inf. is dead, both anarthrous and articular, save with the auxiliary verbs. The use of θέλω as a mere auxiliary is common enough in Herodotus and probably was frequent in the vernacular then as it was later. "The fortunes of the infinitive were determined by its nature." The increased use of abstract nouns made it less needed for that purpose, as the fondness for ἵνα and ὅτι made it less necessary as a verb. The N. T. is mid-stream in this current and also midway between the rise and the end of this river. The writers will use the inf. and ἵνα side by side or the inf. and ὅτι parallel. Even in the classical Attic we find ὅπως after πειράματι (Xenophon). As ὅπως disappeared ἵνα stepped into its place. In Latin ut was likewise often used when the inf. could have occurred. The blending of ἵνα and ὅτι in the κοινὴ helped on the process.

In the N. T. the exclusive province of the inf. is a rather narrow one. It still occurs alone with δύναμαι and μέλλω. It has a wide extension of territory with τοῦ. But on the whole it has made distinct retreat since the Attic period. The story is one of the most interesting in the history of language.

3. SIGNIFICANCE. Originally, as we have seen, the infinitive was a substantive, but a verbal substantive. This set case of an abstract substantive has related itself closely to the verb. The Stoic grammarians called it a verb, ἀπαρέμφατον ῥῆμα,
Ἀπαρέμφατος ἔγκλισις. Apollonius Dyskolos\textsuperscript{10} called it a “fifth mode” and the later grammarians followed his error. Some of the Roman grammarians actually took infinitivus in the sense perfectus, \[\text{Page 1057}\] just as they mistranslated γενική by genitivus.\textsuperscript{1} Bopp\textsuperscript{2} rightly perceived that the inf. has a nominal origin and was later adjusted to the verb in Greek. It is not a real verb in the very height of its glory.\textsuperscript{3} And yet the consciousness of the nominal origin was partially obscured even in the time of Homer. The original case-form is so far forgotten that this dative may appear in the nominative and the accusative. The tenses and voices have developed. But Brugmann\textsuperscript{4} seems to go too far in saying that already the inf. was “only” a verb in the popular feeling. Moulton,\textsuperscript{5} indeed, harks back to Apollonius Dyskolos: “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.” He states, it is true, that every schoolboy knows that in origin and part of the use the inf. is a substantive, but “nearly all that is distinctive is verbal.”\textsuperscript{6} I venture to say that this is overstating the case. It is not a mere question of the notion of the user of the infinitive in this passage or that. The history is as it is. In the full development of the inf. we see the blending of both substantive and verb. In this or that example the substantival or the verbal aspect of the hybrid form may be dominant, but the inf. in the historical period is always both substantive and verb. It is not just a substantive, nor just a verb, but both at the same time. The form itself shows this. The usage conforms to the facts of etymology. It is not true that the article makes the inf. a substantive as Winer\textsuperscript{7} has it. As a matter of fact, therefore, the
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inf. is to be classed neither with the noun nor with the verb, but with the participle, and both stand apart as verbal nouns. The article did enlarge the scope of the inf. just as the use of tense did. The Germans can say das Trinken and French le savoir like the Greek τὸ γνῶναι. There is no infinitive in Arabic. As a matter of fact, the inf. because of its lack of endings (here the participle is better off with the adjective endings) is the least capable of all parts of speech of fulfilling its functions. In its very nature it is supplementary. It is either declarative or prospective, but always a verbal substantive. There is a difference between τὸ πρᾶσσειν and ἡ πρᾶξις. Both have verbal stems and both are abstract. The difference lies in the tense and voice of πρᾶσσειν. But πρᾶσσειν has all that is in πρᾶξις plus tense and voice. I decline, therefore, to divide the infinitive into the anarthrous and articular uses so popular in the grammars. These uses do exist, but they simply represent two uses of the inf. in its substantival aspects. They do not affect the verbal side of the inf. at all. The inf. may properly be discussed under its substantival and its verbal aspects. But even so a number of uses cross over as indirect discourse, for instance, or the inf. to express purpose (with or without the article). We must look at both sides of the inf. every time to get a total idea of its value. A number of points of a special nature will require treatment.

4. SUBSTANTIVAL ASPECTS OF THE INFINITIVE.

(a) Case (Subject or Object Infinitive). Here I mean the cases of the inf. itself, not the cases used with it. The inf. is always in a case. As a substantive this is obvious. We have to dismiss, for the most part, all notion of the ending (dative or locative) and treat it as an indeclinable substantive. A whole series of common expressions has the inf. as subject besides the ordinary verbs. Thus note 1 Cor. 9:15 καλὸν μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν, (Heb. 4:6; 9:27) ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἁπάξ ἀποθανεῖν, (Mt. 18:13) ἔδω γένηται εὐτέρῳ αὐτῷ, (3:15) πρέπον ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι, (Ac. 21:35) συνέβη βαστάζεσθαι, (Lu. 6:12) ἐγένετο ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν, (18:25) εὐκοπῶσον ἐστίν ἐξελθεῖν, (Jo. 18:14) συμφέρει ἀποθανεῖν, (Mt. 22:17) ἔξεστιν δοῦναι, (Heb. 9:5) οὐκ ἐστὶν νῦν λέγειν, (Ac. 27:24) δεῖ παραστῆσαι, (Ac. 2:24) ἢν δυνατόν κρατεῖσθαι, (Ph. 3:1) τὸ αὕτω γράφειν οὐκ ἐκθεσθείην. So Ac. 20:16; 2 Pet. 2:21. All this is simple enough. The articular inf. is likewise found in the nominative as in Mk. 9:10, τί ἐστιν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἄναστησαι. Here the article is not far removed from the original demonstrative. Cf. 10:40, τὸ καθίσαι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, where δοῦναι is probably the original dative ‘for giving.’ One naturally feels that the articular inf. is more substantival than the anarthrous, as in Ro. 7:18, τὸ θέλειν παράκειται μοι, but that is not correct. The subject-inf. occurs freely both with and without the article in the N. T. as in the κοινὴ generally. See Mt. 15:20 τὸ φαγέναι, (Mk. 12:33) τὸ [Page 1059] ἀγαπᾶν, (Ro. 7:18) τὸ θέλειν and τὸ κατεργάζεσθαι. Add 1 Cor. 7:26; 11:6; 2


8 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 298.
9 W.-M., p. 399.
Cor. 9:1; Ph. 1:21, 24, 29; Heb. 10:31; Ro. 14:21. The origin of this nominative or subject is probably due to its use with impersonal expressions. Moulton1 illustrates it by the Latin humanum est errare, where the force of the locative form errare may be seen by translating: ‘There is something human in erring.’ This may have been the original idiom, but it has gone beyond that to mean: ‘Erring is human.’ English students often forget that ‘erring’ is here infinitive, not participle, both in sense and history. It is a step further in the N. T. to see τοῦ and the inf. used as subject nominative. Cf. Lu. 17:1; Ac. 10:25; 1 Cor. 16:4. In 2 Cor. 7:11 the substantival aspect of the inf. is shown by the use of the pronoun αὐτὸ τοῦτο θλιπθήναι in the nominative with κυαργάσατο. Cf. the inf. in the predicate nom. with τοῦτο in Ro. 1:12, τὸν δὲ ἐστιν συνπαρακληθήναι. So in Ro. 13:11, ὃρα ἡδὴ ύμᾶς ἔν προσερθήναι, where the inf. is in predicate apposition with ὥρα. Originally it was doubtless ‘time for arising.’ In 1 Th. 4:6 we have both the anarthrous and articular inf. in apposition with τοῦτο. Cf. also the appositive inf. in Ac. 15:28; Jas. 1:27; 1 Th. 4:3; Ro. 4:13.

The object-infinitive in the accusative is quite common both with and, particularly, without the article. In the N. T. more than half of the instances of the inf. come in here, the object-inf. with verbs of various sorts.2 In the LXX, however, it is rare in proportion to the other uses. The accusative case is to us more manifest when the article occurs. See Ph. 2:6, οὐχ ἄφηγον ἡγησάτο τὸ εἶναι ἵσα θεοῦ, where the articular inf. is the direct object of ἡγησάτο. So in 2:13, with ὁ ἐνεργὸν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν. Cf. Ac. 25:11, οὗ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἰποθανεῖν. See further 1 Cor. 14:39; 2 Cor. 8:10. In Ph. 4:10, ἀνεθάλητε τὸ ὑπέρ ἐμοῦ φονεῖν, the acc. may be that of general reference. Certainly in 1 Th. 3:3, τὸ σαίνεσθαι, this is true. Blass3 calls it here “quite superfluous.” In Ro. 14:13 τὸ μὴ τιθέναι is in apposition with the accusative τοῦτο, as in 2 Cor. 2:1. In 2 Cor. 10:2, δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν ἀρρηθῆναι, we should naturally look for the ablative with δέομαι. The instances without the article are more numerous. A fairly complete list of the verbs in the N. T. that have the inf. in indirect discourse was given in the chapter on Modes (Indirect Discourse, pp. 1036 ff.). These inf. are in the acc., though some of them may possibly preserve the original dative or locative idea. But the acc. with the inf. is that of general reference, while the inf. itself is in the acc. case, the object of the verb of saying or thinking. Cf. Lu. 2:44, νομίσαντες αὐτὸν εἶναι. The occasional use of the nom. predicate, as in Ph. 4:11, ἐμαθὼν αὐτάρκης εἶναι, accents the acc. character of the object-inf. This point is clear also in the case of indirect commands where the noun or pronoun is in the dative and the inf. in the acc., as in 1 Cor. 5:11, ἔγραψα ύμῖν μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι. The illustrations are numerous and need not be multiplied (see list under Indirect Discourse). With βούλομαι, δόναμαι, θέλω the dative makes a good idea and was probably so understood in the beginning.4 It may be questioned, however, if in actual usage this idiom is not also the acc. Cf. Mt. 1:19 ἔβουλήθη ἄπολλυσαι, (1:20) μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν, (5:34) λέγω ύμῖν μὴ ὡμόσαι, (16:12) οὐκ ἐὰν προσέχειν, (Lu. 18:1) πρὸς τὸ δὲν προσεχεῖσθαι (both infns. in the acc., one with πρός, the other general reference with δέν), (Ro. 15:8) λέγω Χριστὸν διάκονον

2 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 57.
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γεγενήσθαι (cf. Ac. 27:13), (2 Cor. 10:2) λογίζομαι τολμήσαι, (1 Th. 4:11) παρακαλοῦμεν περισσεύειν καὶ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἢσυχάζειν καὶ πρᾶσσειν τὰ ἴδια καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι (note the interrelation of these infs.). See further Mk. 9:28; 12:12; Lu. 16:3; Jo. 5:18; Ro. 14:2; Gal. 3:2; 1 Cor. 10:13. In the acc. also are the articular infs. with prepositions like εἰς (Ro. 1:11); διὰ (Ac. 8:11); μετὰ (Lu. 22:20); πρὸς (Mt. 5:28).

But the inf. occurs in the other oblique cases also with more or less frequency. The genitive, for instance, appears with the prepositions ὄντι (Jas. 4:15); διὰ (Heb. 2:15, διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν); Ἕλεκα (2 Cor. 7:12); ἐκ (Ac. 8:40). The only instance of an attribute with the infinitive in the N. T. is Heb. 2:15, except in apposition with τοῦ. It was rare in classic Greek and confined to pronouns. Cf. τὸ αὐτό τοῦ πράττειν, Plato, Rep. 433. The genitive may be found with ἑσπανθάνομαι as in Mk. 8:14, ἔπελαθόντο λαβέν (cf. ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου in Heb. 6:10. But we have τὸ ὅπισώ in Ph. 3:13). At any rate in Lu. 1:19, ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμῆσαι (cf. 1 Sam. 14:47), we have an undoubted genitive. Cf. also μετεμελήσητε τοῦ πιστεῦσαι (Mt. 21:32). The very common use of τοῦ with the inf. must also be noted. Most of these are genitives, as in τοῦ ἀπολέσαι (Mt. 2:13). The free use of τοῦ with the inf. where the case is not genitive will be discussed under a special section under the article with the inf. Cf., for instance, Lu. 17:1; Ac. 10:25; 20:3; 27:1. The gen. occurs [Page 1061] with substantives just as other substantives are used. This is a fairly common idiom. See Ac. 27:20 Ἐλπίς πᾶσα τοῦ σώζεσθαι, (1 Cor. 9:10) ἐπὶ ἔπληθε τοῦ μετέχειν, (Ro. 15:23) ἐπιποτήσαντες δὲ ἔχον τοῦ ἐλεβέθι, (1 Pet. 4:17) καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξεσθαι, (Heb. 5:12) χρείαιν τοῦ διδάσκειν. Note, in particular, Ro. 11:8, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὁφθαλμοῦς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ ἄτα τοῦ μὴ σκοτείνειν, where the infs. are parallel with κατανύξεως. Cf. Lu. 1:57, 74; 2:6; 10:19; 21:22; 22:6, etc. Note especially Ph. 3:21, κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτῶν καὶ ὑποτάξαι. Let these illustrate well how the inf. continued to be regarded as a real substantive. The genitive occurs also with adjectives as in βραδεῖς τοῦ πιστεῦσαι (Lu. 24:25); ἔτοιμοι ἐσμεν τοῦ ἀνελεῖν (Ac. 23:15). The genitive is found with δὲ (the anarthrous inf.) as in Lu. 15:19, 21, δὲς κληθήσεται (cf. Rev. 5:4, 9). In 1 Cor. 16:4 τοῦ πιστεύειν may be due to ἐξενω, but is probably used as subj. nominative in a rather loose way. The inf. in the genitive is specially common in Luke and also in Paul. 1

The ablative illustrations are not very numerous, but they are clear. Thus we have the abl. with verbs of hindering as in Mt. 19:14, μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὸ ἔλθειν πρὸς με, and Lu. 4:42, κατέχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ περισσεῖν. The classical Greek had also τὸ and the infs., as in 1 Cor. 14:39, and τὸ μὴ after verbs of hindering, which last does not occur in the N. T., so that it is probable that an inf. without the art. as in Mt. 19:14 is in the abl., though not certain. Moulton (Prol., p. 220) illustrates Lu. 4:42 and Ac. 14:18 by B. U. 164 (ii/iii l.d.) πέσαι αὐτὸν τοῦ ἐλθεῖν, J. H. S., 1902, 369 (Lycaonian inscription) τῷ διχοτομήσαντι με τοῦ τὸ λοεπὸν ζῆν, B. U. 36 (ii/iii l.d.) τοῦ ζῆν μεταστῆσαι, N. P. 16 (iii/l.d.) κυλώντες τοῦ μὴ σπείρειν. See further Lu. 24:16 ἐκρατείον τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτῶν, Ac. 10:47 δύναται κωλύσαι τις τοῦ μὴ
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βαπτισθῆναι, 14:18 κατέπαυσαν τοῦ μὴ θέων. Cf. also Ac. 20:20, 27; Ro. 11:10; 15:22; 2 Cor. 1:8; Heb. 7:23; 1 Pet. 3:10. Cf. in the LXX, Gen. 16:2; 20:6; Ps. 38:2; 68:24 (quoted in Ro. 11:10); Is. 24:10; 1 Sam. 8:7; Jer. 7:10. The abl. occurs also with prepositions as ἐκ in 2 Cor. 8:11, ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν and πρὸ, in Mt. 6:8 πρὸ τοῦ αἰτῆσαι. In Ac. 15:28, τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες, ἀπέχεσθαι, the inf. is in the abl., in apposition with the preceding words.

The only instance of the inf. in the instrumental in the N. T. occurs in 2 Cor. 2:13, τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με τίτον. The inf. is not found with σύν in the N. T. Votaw (Inf. in Biblical Greek, p. 29) notes six examples of the instrumental τῷ and the inf. in the LXX text [Page 1062] of B (2 Chron. 28:22; Eccl. 1:16; Is. 56:6; 4 Macc. 17:20, 21). But other MSS. vary. Moulton (Prol., p. 220) cites L. Pb. (ii/b.c.), ἄλλως δὲ τῷ μηθέν ἔχειν.

The locative occurs with ἐν as in ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν (Lu. 24:51). It is extremely frequent in the N. T., especially in Luke. The possible Hebraistic aspect of the idiom comes up under Prepositions with the Inf. There remains, of course, a possible locative use of a form like λοεὶν. But one doubts if this original idea is preserved in the N. T. Cf. Mt. 16:3, γινώσκετε διακρίνειν, which is more naturally explained as a dative: ‘ye have knowledge for discerning,’ though ‘in discerning’ makes sense. But with the dative it is different. There is no instance of the dative inf. with a preposition, but the original dative is clear in all examples of purpose without τοῦ or a preposition. Thus Mt. 5:17, οὐκ ἠλθον καταλῦσαι, ἀλλά πληρῶσαι, ‘I came not for destroying, but for fulfilling.’ So Lu. 12:58, δὸς ἐγραφισάν ἄπηλλάχθαι, ‘give diligence for being reconciled.’ Cf. Mt. 7:11; 16:3 with οἶδα and γινώσκω. See further Mt. 2:2, ἠλθομεν προσκυνήσαι, ‘we came for worshipping’; Jo. 21:3, ὑπάγω ἄλλειν, ‘I go a-fishing.’ So Ro. 3:15, Ὀξεῖς ἔχεια ἄμα, ‘swift for shedding blood.’ The substantive also has the dative inf. in Ro. 9:21, ἔξουσίαν ποιῆσαι, ‘power for making.’ See further 1 Pet. 4:3, κυταιράσσατα, ‘for having wrought’; Gal. 5:3, ὅφειλεν σαρκαίς, ‘debtor for doing’; Heb. 11:15, καὶ ρόδων ἰχθύμας, ‘time for returning.’ This was the original idiom and, with all the rich later development as verbal substantive, the inf. did not wholly get away from the dative idea.

(b) The Articular Infinitive. We have to cross our tracks frequently in discussing the inf. in a lucid fashion. Numerous examples of the articular inf. have already been given in treating the cases of the inf. But the matter is so important that it calls for special investigation. If we pass by the doubtful articular inf., τὸ φυλάσσειν, in the Odyssey, we still find (cf. p. 1054) a few examples in the oldest Greek (two in Hesiod, nine in Pindar, nine in the Lyrics). The use of the article with the inf. grew with the growth of the article itself. But it is not to be overlooked that in Homer the anarthrous inf. had already developed nearly [Page 1063] all the constructions of this
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The addition of the article made no essential change in the inf. It was already both substantive and verb. But the use of the article greatly enlarged the range of the inf. It is extended to new uses, especially with prepositions. The article was first used with the nom., then the acc. and then the other cases. The use of τοῦ and τῷ with the inf. is wholly post-Homeric. In the Dramatists and Herodotus it is still chiefly in the nom. and acc., though we do find τοῦ and τῷ, and we see the inf. used with prepositions also. In Thucydides the articular inf. suddenly jumps to great prominence, occurring 298 times, especially in the speeches. Of these 163 occur with prepositions. He even uses τὸ with the future inf. and with ὁ and the inf. The orators likewise use the art. inf. very freely. It was especially in Demosthenes that “the power of taking dependent clauses” was fully developed. Only the Pontic dialects, as already noted, keep the inf. as a living form, and a few substantives preserve a mutilated form, like τὸ φαγί (= τὸ φαγεῖν, τὸ φιλί (= τὸ φιλεῖν) (Thumb, Handb., p. 117). In the N. T. we see all this power still retained with the further development in the use of τοῦ. The inf. itself, as we have seen, is retreating in the N. T., but it still possesses the full range of its varied uses. The articular inf. has all the main uses of the anarthrous inf. Votaw (The Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 51) finds 22 uses of the inf. (19 anarthrous, 15 articular), but some of these overlap and are artificial. Moulton (Prol., p. 214) concludes from a study of the inscriptions that the articular inf. only invaded the dialects as the κοινή was starting. There is no essential difference in idea, and the mere presence or absence of the article is not to be pressed too far. Jannaris admits that sometimes the verbal character is completely obscured. On that point I am more than sceptical, since the inf. continues to have the adjuncts of the verb and is used with any voice or tense. Jannaris thinks that in late Greek the substantival aspect grew at the expense of the verbal and the articular inf. had an increasing popularity. I admit the popularity, but doubt the disappearance of the verbal aspect. Jannaris makes the mistake of taking “substantival inf.” as coextensive with “articular inf.” Blass questions if the article always has its proper force with the inf. and suggests that perhaps sometimes it merely occurs to show the case of the inf. Here again I am sceptical. Why does the case of the inf. need to be shown any more than other indeclinable substantives? In Mt. 1 the article does serve to distinguish object from subject. I have never seen an articular inf. where the article did not seem in place. Moulton considers the use of the article “the most characteristic feature of the Greek infinitive in post-Homeric language.” Blass seems puzzled over the frequency of the articular inf. in the N. T., since it is chiefly confined to Luke and Paul, whose writings have most affinity with the literary language.
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Jannaris\(^4\) notes how scarce it is in the writings of John and in unlearned papyri and inscriptions, doubtful in the mediaeval period, and absent from the modern vernacular. “The articular infinitive, therefore, could not resist any longer the tendency of the time, whether it was conceived as a noun or as a verb.”\(^5\) The analytic tendency drove it out finally. Moulton\(^6\) has made some researches on the use of the articular inf. in the dialect inscriptions. He does not find a single instance in Larfield’s Bœotian inscriptions. He finds one from Lesbos, one from Elis, one from Delphi, a few from Messene, etc. He notes the silence of Meisterhans on the subject. The conclusion seems to be inevitable that the articular inf. is as rare in the Attic vernacular as it was common in the Attic orators. It is “mainly a literary use, starting in Pindar, Herodotus and the tragedians, and matured by Attic rhetoric.” Aristophanes uses it less than half as often as Sophocles and Aristophanes gives the Attic vernacular. And yet it is not absent from the papyri. Moulton\(^7\) counts 41 instances in vol. I of B. U. The N. T. uses it about as often to the page as Plato. He scores a point against Kretschmer’s view that the Attic contributed no more to the κοινή than any one of the other dialects, since from the literary Attic “the articular inf. passed into daily speech of the least cultured people in the later Hellenist world.”\(^8\) Polybius\(^9\) deserves to rank with Demosthenes in the wealth of his use of the inf. He employs the articular inf. in all 11,265 times, an average of 7.95 to the page. He has the articular inf. 1,901 times, an average of 1.35 to the page. In the N. T. the inf. occurs 2,276 times, an average of 4.2 times to a page. The articular inf. is found in the N. T. 322 times, an average of .6 times to a page. The N. T. shows fewer uses, in proportion, of the articular inf. than the O. T. or the Apocrypha. Of the 303 (Moulton) instances, 120 are in Luke’s writings and 106 in Paul’s Epistles. But Votaw\(^1\) counts 319 in all. The MSS. vary in a number of instances and explain the difference. Moulton\(^2\) gives the figures for all the N. T. books thus: James 7, Hebrews 23, Gospel of Luke 71, Paul 106, Acts 49, 1 Peter 4, Matthew 24, Mark 13 (14), John 4, Revelation 1, not in Col., Philem., Past. Eps., Joh. Eps., 2 Pet., Jud. Luke has the most varied use of the articular inf., and Paul’s is somewhat uneven.\(^3\) The use of the articular inf. in the various cases has already been sufficiently discussed. In general one may agree with Moulton\(^4\) that “the application of the articular infin. in N. T. Greek does not in principle go beyond what is found in Attic
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writers.” The special use of the articular inf. with prepositions is reserved for separate discussion. There is little doubt that the first use of τὸ with the inf. was demonstrative as it was with everything. In Mk. 9:10, τί ἔστιν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ὄντα, the article is almost demonstrative, certainly anaphoric (cf. verse 9). The same thing is true of 10:40 where τὸ καθίσαται refers to καθίσαμεν in verse 37. It is not necessary to give in detail many examples of the articular inf. in the N. T. I merely wish to repeat that, when the article does occur with the inf., it should have its real force. Often this will make extremely awkward English, as in Lu. 2:27, ἐν τῷ ἐσσαγαγέν τοῦ γονεῖ τῷ παιδίον. But the Greek has no concern about the English or German. It is simply slovenliness not to try to see the thing from the Greek standpoint. But we are not to make a slavish rendering. Translation should be idiomatic. It is hardly worth while to warn the inept that there is no connection between the article τὸ and the English to in a sentence like Ph. 1:21, ἐμὶ γὰρ τὸν Ἱησοῦν και τὸν ἀποθανέν κέρδος. Here the article τὸ has just the effect that the Greek article has with any abstract substantive, that of distinction or contrast. Life and death (living and dying) are set over against each other. See further Mt. 24:45; Lu. 24:29; Ac. 3:12; 10:25; 14:9; 21:12; [Page 1066] 25:11; Ro. 4:11, 13, 16, 18; 13:8; 14:21; 2 Cor. 8:10 f.; 9:1; Ph. 1:23, 29; 2:6; 4:10; 1 Th. 3:2 f.

Some special words are needed about τοῦ and the inf. The question of purpose or result may be deferred for separate discussion. We have seen how the genitive inf. with τοῦ occurs with verbs, substantives, adjectives and prepositions. The ablative inf. with τοῦ is found with verbs and prepositions. The ablative use is not here under discussion, since it involves no special difficulties save the redundant µή. We may note that in Critias τοῦ was very common with the inf. It we see it also in Polybius in various uses named above. It is an Attic idiom that became very common in the postclassical and Byzantine Greek. Cf. µή ἁμελήσῃς τοῦ ἐνοχλῆσαι Θωνίῳ, O. P. 1159, 11–13 (iii/α. d.). There is no special difficulty with τοῦ and the inf. with verbs as object except in a case like Mt. 21:32 where τοῦ πιστεύσαι “gives rather the content than the purpose of µετεμελήθησε.”

The instances with substantives like Ac. 14:9, ἔχει πίστιν τοῦ σωθῆναι, give no trouble on the score of the article. It is the case (objective genitive) that has to be noted. So with Ph. 3:21, τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δυνασθαι. As to adjectives, as already noted, it is doubtful if in 1 Cor. 16:4, ἐὰν δὲ ἄξιον ἴ τοῦ καµὲ πορεύεσθαι, the inf. is to be taken with ἄξιον as genitive. Moulton so regards it, but it may be a loose nominative, as we shall see directly. But there is a use of τοῦ and the inf. that calls for comment. It is a loose construction of which the most extreme instance is seen in Rev. 12:7, ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ ὁ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολεμῆσαι μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος. This inf. (note the nom. with it) is in explanatory apposition with πόλεμος. Moulton cleverly illustrates it with the English: “There will be a cricket
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match—the champions to play the rest.” It is a long jump to this from a case like Ac. 21:12, παρακαλοῦμεν τοῦ μὴ ἄνωβαινεν αὐτόν, where the simple object-inf. is natural (cf. 1 Th. 4:10 f.). Cf. also Ac. 23:20, συνέθεντο τοῦ ἔρωτῆσαι σε ὅπως καταγάγῃς. “This loose inf. of design” is found twelve times in Thucydides, six in Demosthenes and five in Xenophon.⁷ These writers prefer the prepositions with τοῦ and the inf. Polybius in his first five books has this simple τοῦ and the inf. only six times, all negative.⁸

The normal use of τοῦ with the inf. was undoubtedly final as it was developed by Thucydides, and in the N. T. that is still its chief use.¹ But many of the examples are not final or consecutive. It is only in Luke (Gospel 24, Acts 24) and Paul (13) that τοῦ with the inf. (without prepositions) is common.² They have five-sixths of the examples.³ And Luke has himself two-thirds of the total in the N. T. Matthew has seven. John avoids it. Moulton⁴ shows that of Paul’s “thirteen” examples three (Ro. 6:6; 7:3; Ph. 3:10) either final or consecutive, two (Ro. 15:22; 2 Cor. 1:8) are ablative, five occur with substantives (Ro. 15:23; 1 Cor. 9:10; 16:4; 2 Cor. 8:11; Ph. 3:21), four are expegegetic (Ro. 1:24; 7:3; 8:12; 1 Cor. 10:13). In Luke about half are not final. It is this loose expegeetical inf. that calls for notice. We find it in the LXX (cf. Gen. 3:22; 19:19; 31:20; 47:29, etc.).⁵ It is possible that this very common idiom in the LXX is due to the Hebrew.⁷ It does not occur in Polybius.⁶ In the LXX also we see τοῦ and the inf. used as the subject of a finite verb in complete forgetfulness of the case of τοῦ. Cf. 2 Chron. 6:7, ἐγένετο ἔπὶ κυριότερον Δαβίδ τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἀκοδομήσαι οἶκον. So 1 Sam. 12:23; 1 Ki. 8:18; 16:31; Ps. 91:3; Is. 49:6; Jer. 2:18; Eccl. 3:12; 1 Esd. 5:67.⁷ One must recall the fact that the inf. had already lost for the most part the significance of the dative ending -ατ and the locative -τ (-ἐν). Now the genitive τοῦ and the dative -ατ are both obscured and the combination is used as subject nominative. We have this curious construction [Page 1068] in Lu. 17:1, ἄνενδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν. See also Ac. 10:25, ἐγένετο τοῦ

---

Mr. H. Scott gives the following list for τοῦ and the inf.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pres.</th>
<th>Aor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synoptics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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⁸ Jann., ib.
¹ Moulton, Prol., p. 216.
² Ib., p. 217.
³ Mr. H. Scott gives the following list for τοῦ and the inf.:

---

⁵ Cf. W.-M., p. 410 f.
⁷ Votaw, The Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 28.
εἰσελθε, and 27:1, ἔκρίθη τοῦ ἀποπλείν. Cf. further 20:3. It is naturally rarer in the N. T. than in the LXX. Moulton (Prol., p. 220) gives a papyrus example closely allied to it, O. P. 86 (i/ii A.D.) ἔθος τοῦ παραστηρεθανα. See Winer-Moulton, p. 411, for numerous examples in LXX. But very much like it is the use of τοῦ as object-inf., with ἐντέλλομαι in Lu. 4:10 (Ps. 90:11); κυτανεώ in 5:7; στηρίζω in 9:51; ποιῶ in Ac. 3:12; κακῶ in 7:19; ἔπιστέλλω in 15:20; παρακαλέω in 21:12; συντίθεμαι in 23:20. Cf. also ἔτοιμος τοῦ in Ac. 23:15. This is surely “a wide departure from classical Greek.” It is, however, after all in harmony with the genius and history of the inf., though the nominative use of τοῦ comes from the LXX.

The vernacular papyri show a few examples of τοῦ and the inf. It is found in the inscriptions of Pisidia and Phrygia. Cf. Compernass, p. 40. Moulton illustrates Lu. 1:9 with ἀμελεῖν τοῦ γράφειν, B. U. 665 (i/ii A.D.); Mt. 18:25 and Jo. 5:7 (ἔχω) with ἐν ἔχει τοῦ πωλεῖν, B. U. 830 (i/ii A.D.); 1 Cor. 9:6 with ἔχουσιν—τοῦ—θεσποιατι, C. P. R. 156; Lu. 22:6 with εὐκαρίας—τοῦ εὑρεῖν, B. U. 46 (ii A.D.). He concludes that the usage is not common in the papyri and holds that the plentiful testimony from the LXX concurs with the N. T. usage to the effect “that it belongs to the higher stratum of education in the main.” This conclusion holds as to the N. T. and the papyri, but not as to the LXX, where obviously the Hebrew inf. construct had a considerable influence. Moulton seems reluctant to admit this obvious Hebraism.

(c) Prepositions. We are not here discussing the inf. as purpose or result, as temporal or causal, but merely the fact of the prepositional usage. The idiom cannot be said to be unusual in classical Greek. Jannaris agrees with Birklein that classical writers show some 2000 instances of this prepositional construction. The writers (classic and later) who use the idiom most frequently are Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Diodorus, Dionysius, Josephus, Plutarch, Dio Cassius. The most prolific user of the construction is Polybius (1053 instances) and Josephus next (651 times). If the prepositional adverbs be added to the strict list of prepositions, the number is very much enlarged, especially in Polybius, who has 90 with χάριν, 115 with ἰδία, 504 with διὰ, 160 with πρὸς, 74 with ἐκ, 24 with ἐν, 90 with ἐπί, 33 with μετά, 41 with περί, only one with παρά. The idiom was here again later than the articular inf. itself and was also Attic in origin and literary. But it is common also in the Greek inscriptions according to Granit. It is rare in the papyri, according to

Moulton, 3 save in the recurrent formula, eis to ev mηδενι μεμφθηναι, and (cf. 990) in the case of prōs to. Cf. prōs to tov 2, B. U. 226 (i/A.D.); prōs to mh—εντυγχανειν, O. P. 237 (i/A.D.); prōs to—δεηθηναι (ib.). Votaw 4 finds the prepositional inf. almost one-half of all the articular infs. in the O. T., the Apocrypha and the N. T., the proportion being about the same in each section of the Greek Bible.

Not quite all the prepositions were used with the inf. in ancient Greek, the exception 5 being ανα. Άμφα had it only with the genitive, κατα with the accusative, παρα with the acc., περι with the acc. and gen., prōs with acc. and loc., υπερ with the ablative, υπο with the ablative. 6 It was not therefore freely used with all the usual cases with the different prepositions. As a rule the article was essential if a preposition occurred with an inf. The reason for this was due to the absence of division between words. It was otherwise almost impossible to tell this use of the inf. from that of composition of preposition with the verb if the two came in conjunction. Cf. αντι του λέγειν in Jas. 4:15. A few instances are found without the article. Thus αντι δε δραπεσθαι (note presence of δε between) in Herodotus I, 210. 2. It appears thus three times in Herodotus. So also in Αeschines, Eum. 737, we have πλην γαμου τυγχειν. 7 So Soph., Ph., 100. Winer 8 finds two in Theodoret (cf. IV, 851, παρα συγκλώθεσθαι). The papyri give us eis βάψαι, O. P. 36 (i/A.D.), and the common vernacular phrase 9 εις πειν (‘for drinking’). Cf. δος μοι πειν in Jo. 4:10. Moulton 10 cites also an example of άχρι from Plutarch, p. 256 D, and one from an inscription of iii/b.c. (O. G. I. S. 41, Michel 370) επι—λαμβανειν. The instances without the article are clearly very few. Moulton (Prol., p. 81) suggests that the significant frequency of [Page 1070] eis πειν in the papyri is due to Ionic influence. The LXX furnishes several instances of anarthrous eis, as eis εκφυγειν in Judg. 6:11 (cf. 2 Esd. 22:24; Sir. 38:27; Judith 4:15). Note also έος έλθειν in 1 Macc. 16:9; έος ου οικτερήσασα in Ps. 122:2 (so Ruth 3:3); μέχρις ου έγγίσαι in Tob. 11:1. Cf. also πλην with anarthrous inf. in Polybius, etc.

The tenses have their full force in this prepositional construction, as in Mk. 5:4, δια το δεδέσθαι και διεσπάσθαι και συντετρίφθαι. Naturally some tenses suit certain prepositions better, as ειν with the present tense. 1 The principles of indirect discourse apply also to the inf. with prepositions. Cf. μετα το εγερθηναι με προαξω (Mk. 14:28). In the N. T. the accusative seems to occur always even when the nominative predicate would be possible, 2 as in δια το μένειν αυτόν (Heb. 7:24). So also Lu. 11:8. But note Xen., Cyr., 1, 4. 3, δια το φιλομαθής ειναι.

It is not necessary for the article to come next to the inf. as in Mt. 13:25. Several words may intervene and the clause may be one of considerable extent. Cf. Mk. 5:4; Ac. 8:11; Heb. 11:3; 1 Pet. 4:2. But the N. T. does not have such extended clauses of this nature as the ancient Greek, and the adverbs usually follow the inf. The English “split inf.” is not quite parallel.

In the O. T. there are 22 prepositions used with the inf. and the Apocrypha has 18, while the N. T. shows only 10. Of these only eight are the strict prepositions (ἀντί, διά, εἰς, ἐν, ἐκ, μετά, πρό, πρὸς) and two the prepositional adverbs ἐνεκα and ἐως. It remains now to examine each in detail.

Ἀντί τοῦ is not rare with the inf. and is chiefly found in the Greek orators. But we have it in Thucydides, Xenophon and Plato. Herodotus has only 11 instances of the preposition with the inf., but 5 of them are with ἀντί. It does not occur in Polybius. In the N. T. we have only one instance, Jas. 4:15, ἀντί τοῦ λέγειν. Votaw gives one for the LXX, Ps. 108:4, ἀντί τοῦ ἀγαπᾶν.

Διά has 33 instances in the N. T., all but one (genitive, Heb. 2:15, διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν) in the accusative. Mr. H. Scott reports the 33 exx. thus: Phil. 1, Jas. 1, Heb. 4, Mk. 5, Mt. 3, Lu. 9, Ac. 9, Jo. 1. The O. T. has it with the inf. 35 times and the Apocrypha 26, all with the accusative. The idiom διὰ τὸ is so frequent in Xenophon and Thucydides that as compared with ὅτι it stands as 2 to 3. In later Greek (κοινή and Byzantine) it comes to displace even ἦνα and ἤπως, though finally shifting to διὰ νά in modern Greek (cf. English “for that”). It is not surprising therefore to find it in the N. T. with comparative frequency. Διά τὸ is frequent in Luke’s writings, and once in Paul’s Epistles, and rare in the other N. T. writers. It is always the cause that is given by διὰ τὸ, as in Mt. 13:5 f., διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν. It is not merely the practical equivalent of ὅτι and διότι, but is used side by side with them. Cf. Jas. 4:2 f., διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς—διότι κακὸς αἰτεῖται. It may stand alone, as in Lu. 9:7; 11:8, or with the accusative of general reference as in indirect discourse, as in Lu. 2:4; 19:11. Note two accs. in Ac. 4:2. The perfect tense occurs seven times, as in Mk. 5:4 (ter); Lu. 6:48; Ac. 8:11; 18:2; 27:9. In Mk. 5:4 it is the evidence, not the reason, that is given. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236) unnecessarily rejects Jo. 2:24.

Εἰς τὸ is common also with the inf. without much difference in sense from ἐπὶ τῷ and πρὸς τῷ with the inf. But the N. T. does not use ἐπὶ with the inf. There is no doubt about the final use of εἰς τῷ whatever is true of the consecutive idea. In the late

---

3 Ib., p. 413.
4 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
5 Birklein, Entwick., p. 104.
6 Helbing, Die Präpositionen bei Herod., p. 148.
1 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
3 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 373 f.
4 Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 165.
6 Birklein, Entwick., p. 107.
Greek Jannaris\textsuperscript{7} notes a tendency to use εἰς τὸ (cf. βραδύς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι in Jas. 1:19) rather than the simple inf. Cf. 1 Th. 4:9. But this tendency finally gave way to ἵνα. The O. T. has εἰς τὸ 124, the Apocrypha 28 and the N. T. 72 times.\textsuperscript{5} In the N. T. it is more common than any other preposition with the inf., ἐν coming next with 55 examples. Moulton\textsuperscript{9} counts only 62 instances of εἰς τὸ in the N. T., but Votaw is right with 72. Paul has it 50 times. There are 8 in Hebrews and only one each in Luke and Acts, a rather surprising situation. The papyri\textsuperscript{10} show scattered examples of it. Cf. εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφοθήκηναι, P. Fi. 2 (iii/A.D.) 4 times. In 1 Pet. 4:2, εἰς τὸ—βιῶσαι, note the long clause. There is no doubt that in the N. T. εἰς τὸ has broken away to some extent from the classic notion of purpose. That idea still occurs as in Ro. 1:11, εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι. This is still the usual construction. Cf. Ro. 3:26; 7:4; 8:29; Eph. 1:12; Ph. 1:10; 1 Th. 3:5; Jas. 1:18; [Page 1072] 1 Pet. 3:7; Heb. 2:17, and other examples in Mt. and Heb., to go no further. In Paul we notice other usages. In Ph. 1:23, ἐπιθυμοῦν εἰς τὸ ἄναλῦσαι, we have it with a substantive and in Jas. 1:19 it occurs with the adjectives ταχύς and βραδύς. It is epexegetic also with the verbal adjective θεοδίδακτοι in 1 Th. 4:9. Besides, we find it as the object of verbs of command or entreaty giving the content of the verb as in 1 Th. 2:12; 3:10; 2 Th. 2:2, ἐρωτῶμεν εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι. Cf. also 1 Cor. 8:10. So in Mt. 20:19; 26:2; 1 Cor. 11:22 there is a really dative idea in εἰς τὸ. Just as ἵνα came to be non-final sometimes, so it was with εἰς τὸ, which seems to express conceived or actual result (cf. τοῦ also) as in Ro. 1:20; 12:3; 2 Cor. 8:6; Gal. 3:17. Cf. the double use of ὡστε for ‘aim’ or ‘result.’\textsuperscript{1} The perfect tense can be used with εἰς τὸ as in Eph. 1:18 εἰς τὸ εἰλήφαναι and Heb. 11:3 εἰς τὸ γεγονόντα, the only instances. But the present occurs 32 times, the aorist 38, the perfect 2=72. These developed uses of εἰς τὸ occur to some extent in the LXX (1 Ki. 22:8; 1 Esd. 2:24; 8:84).

Ἐν τῷ appears in the tragedies.\textsuperscript{2} It is found 6 times in Thucydides, 16 in Xenophon, 26 in Plato.\textsuperscript{3} But Blass\textsuperscript{4} observes that the classical writers did not use ἐν τῷ in the temporal sense of ‘while’ or ‘during.’ Moulton\textsuperscript{5} sought to minimize the fact that in the O. T. ἐν τῷ occurs 455 times (45 in the Apocrypha) and that it exactly translates the Hebrew א and held that it did not in principle go beyond what we find in Attic writers. But he took that back in the second edition\textsuperscript{6} under the suggestion of Dr. E. A. Abbott that we must find Attic parallels for ‘during.’ So he now calls this

\begin{enumerate}
\item[8] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
\item[9] Prol., p. 218.
\item[10] Ib., p. 220.
\item[2] Birklein, Entwick., p. 108.
\item[6] P. 249.
\end{enumerate}
“possible but unidiomatic Greek.” In the N. T. we have ἐν τῷ and the inf. 55 times and 3/4 in Luke. In the Greek Bible as a whole it is nearly as frequent as all the other prepositions with the inf. The Semitic influence is undoubted in the O. T. and seems clear in Luke, due probably to his reading the LXX or to his Aramaic sources. Cf. Lu. 1:8; 8:5 (ἐν τῷ σπείραν); 24:51; Ac. 3:26; 4:30; 9:3, etc. Jannaris sees here a tendency also to displace the participle. The [Page 1073] idiom is not confined to Luke’s writings. Cf. Mt. 13:4; 13:25; Mk. 4:4; Heb. 2:8; 3:12, etc. Ordinarily it is the present inf. as in Mt. 13:4; Lu. 8:5; Ac. 3:26, where the Attic writers would have the present participle. But in Luke we have also the aorist inf. as in 2:27 ἐν τῷ σισαγαγεῖν, (3:21) ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι, where Blass sees the equivalent of the aorist participle (cf. Ἱησοῦ βαπτισθέντος) or a temporal conjunction with the aorist indicative. One questions, however, whether the matter is to be worked out with so much finesse as that. The aorist inf. with ἐν τῷ occurs only 12 times in the N. T. It is more correctly just the simple action of the verb which is thus presented, leaving the precise relation to be defined by the context, like the aorist participle of simultaneous action. Cf. ἐν τῷ ὑποτάξασθαι in Heb. 2:8; Gen. 32:19, ἐν τῷ εὐρεῖν. This is all that ἐν τῷ should be made to mean with either the present or the aorist. Cf. Mt. 13:4; 27:12; Lu. 8:40; 9:29. The idea is not always strictly temporal. In Ac. 3:26 (cf. Jer. 11:17), 4:30, it is more like means. Votaw sees content in Lu. 12:15; Heb. 3:12. In Heb. 8:13, ἐν τῷ λέγειν, the notion is rather causal. The conception is not wholly temporal in Mk. 6:48; Lu. 1:21.

7 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
8 But Dalman, Worte Jesu, p. 26 f., denies that it is an Aramaic constr.
10 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 237.
11 Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 50.
12 Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
13 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 237.
14 Birklein, Entwick., p. 106. It is found in Polyb. also. Cf. Kälker, Questiones, p. 302; Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 35. Lutz (Die Casus-Adverbien bei Att. Redn., 1891, p. 18) finds it “zuerst bei Antiphon.”

Sophocles SOPHOCLES, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (1888).
result. Votaw gives no illustration from the O. T., but three from the Apocrypha. Blass takes it in 2 Cor. 8:11, to be equivalent to καθὸ δὲν ἔχῃ. More likely it is meant to accent the ability growing “out of” the possession of property, whatever it may be. In Polybius ἐκ τοῦ with the inf. has a more varied use (departure, source of knowledge, source of advantage). He uses it 25 times.

Ἑως τοῦ, likewise, occurs but once (Ac. 8:40, Ἑως τοῦ ἔλθεν), and with the genitive. Birklein does not find any instances of Ἑως τοῦ and the inf. in the classic writers, though he does note μέχρι τοῦ and less frequently ἔχῃ τοῦ. Cf. μέχρι τοῦ πλέειν, P. B. M. 854 (i/ii A.D.). But in the O. T. Votaw observes 52 instances of Ἑως τοῦ and 16 in the Apocrypha. Cf. Gen. 24:33; Judith 8:34. We have already noted the anarthrous use of Ἑως ἔλθεν in 1 Macc. 16:9 A. Cf. Gen. 10:19, 30, etc. So also Ἑως οὗ and μέχρι(ς) οὗ and the inf., 1 Esd. 1:49, and Tob. 11:1 B. It is rather surprising therefore that we find only one instance in the N. T. and that in the Acts. The construction is probably due to the analogy of πρὶν and the inf.

Μετὰ τό is found only a few times in Herodotus, Plato and Demosthenes. It appears, however, thirty-three times in Polybius and usually with the aorist tense. The idea is temporal and the aorist is a practical equivalent for the aorist participle. In the O. T. Votaw finds it 99 times and only 9 in the Apocrypha. There are 15 examples in the N. T. and the case is the accusative always. Μετὰ τό vanished with the inf. in modern Greek. The aorist is always used in the N. T. save one perfect (Heb. 10:15). See Mk. 1:14; 14:28, μετὰ τῷ ἔγερθηναι μ. Eight of the examples occur in Luke’s writings (Lu. 12:5; 22:20; Ac. 1:3; 7:4; 10:41; 15:13; 19:21; 20:1). See also Mt. 26:32; Mk. 16:19; 1 Cor. 11:25; Heb. 10:15, 26.

Πρὸ τοῦ in the ancient writers was used much like πρὶν and in the temporal sense. It gradually invaded the province of πρὶν, though in the N. T. we only meet it 9 times. It is not common in the papyri nor the inscriptions. See Delphian inscr. 220, πρὸ τοῦ παραμείναi. Polybius has it 12 times. In the O. T. we find it 46 times, but only 5 in the Apocrypha. The tense is always the aorist save one present (Jo. 17:5). Cf. Gal. 3:23, πρὸ τοῦ ἔλθεν τὴν πίστιν. There is no essential difference in construction and idea between πρὶν and the inf. and πρὸ τοῦ and the inf. The use of πρὶν with the inf. was common in Homer before the article was used with the inf. The

6 Birklein, Entwick., p. 105. 7 Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20. 8 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 237. 1 Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 34 f. 2 Entwick., p. 105. 3 Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20. 4 Birklein, Entwick., p. 108. 5 Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 41. 6 Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20. 7 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 386. 8 Birklein, Entwick., p. 105. 9 Moulton, Prol., p. 214. 10 Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 33. 11 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
usage became fixed and the article never intervened. But the inf. with both πρίν and πρὸ is in the ablative case. Cf. ablative\(^1\) inf. with πριν̣ in Sanskrit. Πρίν was never used as a preposition in composition, but there is just as much reason for treating πρίν as a prepositional adverb with the ablative inf. as there is for so considering ἔως τοῦ, not to say ἔως alone as in ἔως ἔλθεν (1 Macc. 16:9). The use of the article is the common idiom. The fact of πρίν and the inf. held back the development of πρὸ τοῦ. In modern Greek πρὸ τοῦ as προτοῦ occurs with the subj. (Thumb, Handb., p. 193). In the N. T. πρίν is still ahead with 13 examples. The instances of πρὸ τοῦ are Mt. 6:8; Lu. 2:21; 22:15; Jo. 1:48; 13:19; 17:5; Ac. 23:15; Gal. 2:12; 3:23.

Πρὸς τὸ is the remaining idiom for discussion. It was used by the ancients in much the same sense as εἰς τὸ and ἐπὶ τῷ, ‘looking to,’ ‘with a view to.’\(^2\) The idiom is very common in Polybius,\(^3\) 150 examples, and there are 10 of πρὸς τῷ. But in the O. T. we have only 14 examples and 12 in the Apocrypha.\(^4\) The N. T. shows 12 also. Some of the LXX examples are of πρὸς τῷ (Ex. 1:16; 2 Macc. 7:14), but in the N. T. they are all πρὸς τὸ. In the papyri Moulton\(^5\) finds πρὸς τὸ rather more common than εἰς τὸ. In the N. T. Matthew has it five times (5:28; 6:1; 13:30; 23:5; 26:12). These express aim unless 5:28 is explanatory of βλέπων.\(^6\) Mark has it once, 13:22. Luke has it twice (18:1, where πρὸς τὸ δεῖν means ‘with reference to’; Ac. 3:19 only ΝΒ, while other MSS. read εἰς).\(^7\) Paul’s four examples (2 Cor 3:13; Eph. 6:11, DEFG εἰς; 1 Th. 2:9; 2 Th. 3:8) all give the “subjective purpose.”\(^8\) Both present (3 times) and aorist (9 times) tenses occur. Cf. πρὸς τὸ θεωρήναι in Mt. 6:1.

\(^{(d)}\) The Infinitive with Substantives. Numerous examples of the inf. with substantives were given in the discussion of the cases of the inf. The matter calls for only a short treatment at this point. The use of the inf. with substantives was ancient\(^9\) and natural, first in the dative or locative and then in the genitive [Page 1076] with τοῦ. It was always common in the classic Greek.\(^1\) The usage is common in Polybius with both the anarthrous and the articular inf.\(^2\) The same thing is true of the O. T. and the Apocrypha.\(^3\) It is so frequent as not to call for illustration. The meaning is that of complement and the inf. most frequently occurs with words of time, fitness, power, authority, need, etc. It is abundantly used in the N. T. both with and without the article. Some anarthrous examples are (Mt. 3:14) χρείαν βαπτισθῆναι, (Lu. 2:1) δόγμα ἀπογράφεσθαι, (Jo. 1:12) ἐξουσίαν γενέσθαι, (19:40) ἔθος ἐνταφιάζειν, (Ac. 24:15)

---

1 Whitney, Sans. Gr., § 983; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 158. Homer used πρίν with the inf. after both positive and negative clauses.
3 Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 33.
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7 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236.
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2 Allen, Inf. in Polyb., pp. 23, 32.
The Infinitive with Adjectives. This idiom is likewise classical and is common from Homer on. As already shown, the case varies with different adjectives. This inf. is complementary as with substantives. It is natural with adjectives as any other substantive is. It held on longest with δυνατός, ἰκανός, but other adjectives in late koine began to give way to εἰς τό (cf. Jas. 1:19, ταχὺς εἰς τό ἄκοψασα, βραδύς εἰς τό λαλῆσαι) rather than the simple inf. and finally this disappeared before ἰνα (cf. Mt. 8:8, ἰκανός ἰνα). In the LXX and the N. T. the inf. with adjectives is less frequent than with substantives. We have it with both the anarthrous and the articular inf. See (Mt. 3:11) ἰκανός βαστάσαι, (Mk. 10:40) ἐμὸν δοῦναι, (Lu. 15:19) ἄξιος κληθῆναι, (Jas. 3:2) δύνατός χαλαναγωγῆσαι, (1 Cor. 7:39) ἐλευθέρα γαμηθῆναι, (Heb. 5:11) δυσερχημένων λέγειν, (1 Pet. 4:3) ὁρκετὸς κατεργάσθαι, etc. It is [Page 1077] more common with ἄξιος, δυνατός, ἰκανός. The only adjective that often has τοῦ and the inf. in the O. T. is έιτομος. We find it also with adverbs as in Ac. 21:13, δεθῆναι ἀποθανεῖν έποιμος ξεόω (so 2 Cor. 12:14). The articular examples are less frequent. But note (Lu. 24:25) βραδές τοῦ πιστεύειν, (Ac. 23:15) ἐποιμοι τοῦ ἄνελαν. Some would add 1 Cor. 16:4, ἄξιον τοῦ πορεύεσθαι, but see Cases of the Inf.

The Infinitive with Verbs. This usage came to be, of course, the most frequent of all. It started as a dative or locative, then a sort of accusative of reference, then the object of verbs with whatever case the verb used. It is both anarthrous and articular. It is not necessary to go over again (see Cases of the Inf.) the varied uses of the inf. with verbs, whether the object of verbs of saying or thinking in indirect discourse, verbs of commanding or promising, the direct object of verbs (auxiliary inf.), verbs of hindering, etc. As a matter of fact they are all object-infs. whatever the case (acc., gen., abl., dat., instr.). Votaw notes that in the N. T. this use of the inf. is four times as common as any other. It is usually the anarthrous inf., but not always. Even δόναμαι and ἄρχομαι (not N. T.) are used with τοῦ and the inf. Jannaris has made a careful list of the verbs that continued for a while in late Greek to use the inf. against

---

4 Ib., p. 27.
5 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 155 f. For Polyb. see Allen, Inf. in Polyb., pp. 23, 32.
1 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 27.
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the inroads of Ἰνα. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 150) argues that in general the N. T. use of the inf. with verbs is like that of the koine. The inf. λαλήσας with ἔπαρθησασάμεθα (1 Th. 2:2) is not a Hebraism, but a Hellenism. But surely it is not necessary to call this usage an Atticism. In the discussion of Ἰνα (see pp. 430, 994) the displacement of the inf. by Ἰνα even after verbs like θέλω was sufficiently treated. Schmid6 "shows how this 'Infinirevsurrogat' made its way from Aristotle onwards."7 In the N. T. it is chiefly in the Gospel of John that we find this use of Ἰνα. "The strong volitive flavour which clung to Ἰνα would perhaps commend it to a writer of John’s temperament."8 But after all, the inf. with verbs has not quite disappeared from John’s Gospel. Janarri9 has worked out the situation in John’s Gospel as between this use of the inf. and Ἰνα. [Page 1078] He finds Ἰνα about 125 times and the inf. with verbs about 129 times. Of these 57 belong to δόναμαι (37) and θέλω (20). There are besides, 10 with ἐδίδω and 12 each with ζητέω and with μέλλω. The rest are scattered with διδομι, ἔχω, ὄφειλο, δοκέω, ὑψίμπι, αἰτέω, ἔρωτάω, ἄρχομαι, etc. It is clear, therefore, that the inf. with verbs is by no means dead in the N. T., though the shadow of Ἰνα is across its path. As illustrations of the great wealth of verbs with the inf. in the N. T. note (Mt. 11:20) ἤρξατο ἓνεδίζειν, (27:58) έκέλευσεν ἰποδοθήναι, (Mk. 12:12) ἔξητον κροτήσαι, (Lu. 16:3) σκάπτειν οὐκ ἵκχω, ἐπαιτεῖν αἰσχύνομαι. Almost any verb that can be used with a substantive can be used with the inf. The use of the inf. with προστίθεμαι is a Hebraism. Cf. Ex. 14:13. See Lu. 20:11 f., προσέθετο πέμψα. It means 'to go on and do' or 'do again.' It is the one Hebraism that Thumb1 finds in Josephus, who is Atticistic. The articular inf. with verbs is much less frequent. But note τοῦ ὄγαζον after ὄφειλο (Ro. 13:8); παραποτοῦμαι τὸ ὀψθανέιν (Ac. 25:11); τοῦ περιπατέον after ποιέω (Ac. 3:12); ἐπιστέλατο τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι (15:20); κατεχόν τοῦ μή προέλθησα (Lu. 4:42). In 1 Ki. 13:16 we have τοῦ ἐπιστρέψας with δόναμαι. These are just a few specimens. See Cases of the Inf.

(g) The Appositional Infinitive. The grammars draw a distinction here, but it is more apparent than real as Votaw2 well says. The inf. in apposition is that with nouns; the expegetical inf. is used with verbs. But at bottom the two uses are one. They are both limitative. With nouns the appositional inf. restricts or describes it. It is a common enough idiom in classical Greek3 and is found also in the LXX. In the N. T. observe Ac. 15:28 πλήν τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες, ἀπέχεσθαι, (Jas. 1:27) θηρσεία καθαρά και ἀμάντος—αὕτη ἐστίν, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι. Cf. further Ac. 26:16; 2 Cor. 10:13; Eph. 3:6, 8; 4:17; 1 Th. 4:3 f.; Heb. 9:8; 1 Pet. 2:15 (οὕτως). The articular inf. may also be appositional as in Ro. 14:13, τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τιθέναι. So also 2 Cor. 2:1; 7:11; Ro. 4:13; 1 Th. 4:6 bis. In the N. T. and the Apocrypha it is only τó (in the articular use) that is appositional, but in the O. T. 15 out of the 17 instances have τοῦ without any reference to the case of the noun.4 It is worth noting that Ἰνα is

7 Moulton, Prol., p. 211.
8 Ib.
9 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 572 f. For an extended list of the verbs in the N. T. used with the complementary inf. see Viteau, Le Verbe, pp. 157 ff.
2 Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 17.
3 Cf. Hadley and Allen, § 950; Goodwin, § 1517.
4 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 29.
common also in appositional clauses (cf. Lu. 1:43; 1 Cor. 9:18), especially in the writings of John (Jo. 4:34; 15:8; [Page 1079] 17:3; 1 Jo. 3:11, 23; 4:21; 5:3, etc.). We find ὃτι also in 1 Jo. 2:3; 3:16).

5. VERBAL ASPECTS OF THE INFINITIVE. It is worth repeating (p. 1057) that the inf. is substantive as well as verb. Each inf. does not, of course, have all the substantival and verbal uses, but each inf. has both substantival and verbal aspects. The uses vary with each example. The verbal aspects do not exclude the substantival, though some writers say so. Per contra, Jannaris holds that “the verbal nature of the substantival infinitive was sometimes completely lost sight of.” This I do not concede. After tenses came to the verbal substantive its dual character was fixed. But, pp. 1050, 1056 f., the inf. did not come to the rank of a mode.

(a) Voice. The Sanskrit inf. had no voice. In Homer the inf. already has the voices, so that it is speculation as to the origin. It is possible that the original Greek inf. had no voice. This is an inference so far as the Greek is concerned, but a justifiable one. Moulton illustrates it well by δυνατος θαυµασαι, ‘capable for wondering,’ and ἄξιος θαυµάσεις, ‘worthy for wondering,’ when the first means ‘able to wonder’ and the second ‘deserving to be wondered at.’ They are both active in form, but not in sense. “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 connection of such nouns with the verb.”

There was so much freedom in the Greek inf. that the Sanskrit -tum did not develop in the Greek as we see it in the Latin supine. Gradually by analogy the inf. forms came to be associated with the voices in the modes. Practically, therefore, the Greek inf. came to be used as if the voices had distinctive endings (cf. the history of the imper. endings). Thus in Lu. 12:58, δῶς ἐργασίαν ἀπιλλάξει ἃν αὐτοῦ, it is clear that the passive voice is meant whatever the origin of the form –σθαι. The reduplication shows the tense also. The same remark applies to Mk. 5:4, διὰ τὸ δεδέσθαι καὶ διεσπάσθαι ὑπὸ αὐτῶν τὰς ἀλάσεις. See also 5:43, εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῷ φαγεῖν. No special voice significance is manifest in φαγεῖν, which is like our [Page 1080] ‘eating’ and is the acc. of general reference with δοθῆναι which in turn is the direct object of ἐπιλαμβάνειν. But δοθῆναι has the passive force beyond a doubt. Cf. further ἄπολεξισθαί ἔδωκατο in Ac. 26:32 and ἔνεκεν τοῦ φανερῳθῆναι in 2 Cor. 7:12. In general, therefore, after the inf. is fully developed, the voice in the inf. appears exactly as in the modes. So τοῦ ἄπεξεσθαί (Ac. 15:20); ἀπογράφασθαι (Lu. 2:5); ἐπιλάθεσθαι (Heb. 6:10); γαμμηθῆναι (1 Cor. 7:39); κληθῆναι νίός (Lu. 15:19). Cf. θεάσασθαι (Lu. 7:24) and θεαθῆναι (Mt. 6:1).

1 See Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 229.
2 As, for instance, Szczurat, De Inf. Hom. Usu, 1902, p. 17. He claims that the Hom. inf. came to serve almost all the ideas of the finite verb.
4 Prol., p. 203.
5 Ib.
6 In Ac. 26:28, πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι, one notes a possible absence of the strict voice in ποιῆσαι. But it is a hard passage.
(b) Tense. See chapter on Tenses for adequate discussion of this point. Some general remarks must here suffice. As the Sanskrit inf. had no voice, so it had no tense. In the original Greek there was possibly no tense in the inf., but in Homer the tense is in full force.¹ There is no time-element in the inf. (cf. subj., opt. and imperative) except as the future inf. echoes the expectation of a verb like ἔλπίζω (or μέλλω) or as the inf. represents a fut. ind. in indirect discourse (see Indirect Discourse under Modes). It is probably true that originally there was no distinction between aorist (punctiliar) and present (linear) action in the inf. In Sanskrit and Latin the infinitives and supines have no necessary connection with the present stem (cf. supine tactum and inf. tangere).² “The σ in λῦσαι has only accidental similarity to link it with that in ἔλυσα.”³ Moulton⁴ tersely adds: “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.” But even so at first the tense of the inf. had only to do with the kind of action (punctiliar, linear, state of completion), not with time.

In general, as with the subj., opt. and imper., the aorist inf. came to be the natural⁵ one unless some reason for the present or perf. or fut. existed. Cf. καταβῆναι (Lu. 9:54); παθεῖν (Lu. 24:46); καταλῦσαι (Mt. 5:17); προσεύξασθαι (Lu. 18:10); ἁκοῦσαι (Ac. 10:33); ἔχειται (Ro. 3:15), etc. Sometimes, as in ἔδει ποιῆσαι (Mt. 23:23), the inf. was used to suggest antecedent action. But the timeless aorist may point to what is future, as in Lu. 24:46 above. Cf. also Lu. 2:26; Ac. 3:18. Essentially, it does neither. Cf. μέλλω with aor. inf. So μέλλοντα ἔνεγκ[ε]ὺ, P. Grenf., [Page 1081] ii, 77 (iii/A.D.). In indirect assertions the aorist inf. represents the aor. indicative, but the N. T. seems to show no instance like this.¹ However, that is a mere accident, for note ἐν τῷ ἐλεομαργεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτοῖς (Lu. 2:27) where the same principle applies. Contrast the tense of ποιῆσαι and πείθεις in Ac. 26:28. In Lu. 24:46, γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν, we have the timeless aorist in indirect discourse.

The present inf. with some verbs would accent linear action and with others the inf. would not draw the point sharply. Some writers have a fondness for the present.² One can see the force of linear action in ἡμᾶς δὲ ἐργάζεσθαι (Jo. 9:4) and in τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτῶν (Mk. 12:33). Cf. also στοιχεῖν in Ph. 3:16. In 1 Jo. 3:9, οὐ δόναται ἰμαρτάνειν, the linear notion is prominent (cf. οὐχ ἰμαρτάνει in verse 6). It is also quite normal with μέλλω, with which it occurs 84 times in the N. T. to 6 of the aorist. See Mt. 14:22 for both aorist ἐμβῆναι and present προάγειν in same sentence. Cf. also Ac. 15:37 f. The usual tense-distinction may be assumed to exist, though in a case like
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λέγειν (Heb. 5:11) the point is not to be stressed. The present inf. in indirect assertion represents the same tense of the direct, as in Mt. 22:23; Lu. 11:18, etc. Rarely the present inf. represents an imperfect indicative as in Lu. 20:6.

The perfect inf. is common also in indirect discourse to stand for the same tense of the direct, as in Jo. 12:29; Ac. 12:14; 14:19; 16:27. This is natural enough. But the perfect inf. is found also in the complementary inf. as Ac. 26:32, ἀπολέλυσθαι ἔδοντο. Note Lu. 12:58, διὸς ἑργασίαν ὑπηλάγθητα. But we also find the perfect tense with the articular inf. (So aorist and present) as in Ac. 26:32, ἀπολέλυσθαι σέ, P. Br. M. 42 (B.C. 168).

The future inf. is increasingly rare. Thucydides even used το with the future inf. The same construction is found in Polybius. But in the κοινή the future inf. is weakening rapidly. This disappearance of the fut. inf. is partly due to the retreat of the future [Page 1082] tense in general and partly to the apparent kinship between the future and aorist forms. In the papyri Moulton notes that the future inf. is sometimes used in the κοινή as equivalent to the aorist or even the present, since the sense of the future was vanishing. Cf. χωρήσειν in Jo. 21:25 (RBC), while the other later MSS. give χωρήσει. In the O. T. the fut. inf. (anarthrous always) occurs only 14 times and only 6 in the N. T. The Apocrypha has, however, 54, but almost all in 2 and 3 Maccabees. Three of the N. T. examples are with μέλλω (Ac. 11:28; 24:15; 27:10). Another is in Ac. 23:30 and is dependent on a participle after a past indicative. In Ac. 26:7 the margin of W. H. (after B) has καταντήσειν (text – ἧσι) with ἐλπίζει. In Heb. 3:18 note ὡμοσεν μή εἰσελεύσεται (LXX). Another example is in Jo. 21:25, after οἴμαι. Moulton (Prol., p. 219) cites χρῆ ἐκοιμάσειν, B. U. 830 (i/A.D.).

(c) Cases with the Infinitive. In general the inf. uses the same case that the finite verb does. So the genitive in Heb. 6:10 ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου, the dative in 1 Cor. 7:39 ὁ θέλει γαμήθη, the acc. in Ac. 23:15 τοῦ ἀνελέν, the instrum. in Mt. 15:20 τὸ ἄνιστος χρησὶν φαινέν, the locative in Ac. 21:21 μηδὲ τοῖς ἔθεσιν περιπατέν, the ablative in Ac. 15:20 τοῦ ἀπεξήσθαι τῶν ἀλεγημάτων, the predicate nominative in Ac. 17:18 καταγγελέως εἶναι, the predicate accusative in Ro. 2:19 πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὀδηγόν εἶναι, or the acc. of general reference in ind. discourse in Mk. 12:18. But this brings us again to the acc. in indirect assertion, a matter already treated at some length. (See Accusative Case, Indirect Discourse, and the next section.) But the thing to note is the real verbal nature of the inf. in the matter of cases. Note the three accusatives with τοῦ ὀδήσκειν in Heb. 5:12, two objects, one of general reference. The cognate neuter plural is seen in πολλά παθῶν (Mt. 16:21).

3 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 59.
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(d) *The Infinitive in Indirect Discourse*. The frequent obscuration of the cases with the inf. in indirect discourse justifies some additional remarks besides those in the chapter on Modes. The inf. is not finite and, like the participle, has no subject. By courtesy the grammars often say so, but it beclouds more than it clears to do so. The case of the predicate with the inf. is the [Page 1083] place to start. Cf. Mt. 19:21, εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι. See also 2 Cor. 10:2, δέομαι τὸ μὴ παράνυ ταρρῆσαι, where the nominative occurs within the domain of the accusative articular inf. But note Mk. 14:28, μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με προέξω. The true nature of the acc. with the inf. as being merely that of general reference comes out well in the articular inf., as in Jas. 4:2, οὐκ ἔχετε διὸ τὸ μὴ αἰτήσθωμι μηδὲς. It is not necessary here to go over again the steps taken under Modes, but simply to insist on the true nature of the accusative with the inf. It stands, indeed, in the place of a finite verb of the direct statement, but does not thereby become finite with a subject. From the syntactical standpoint the construction is true to both the substantival and verbal aspects of the inf. The subject of the finite verb, when thrown into the acc., takes this turn because of the limitations of the inf. When it is retained in the nominative, it is by apposition with the subject of the principal verb or by attraction if in the predicate. Draeger sees this point clearly in his treatment of the matter in Latin where the acc. with the inf. is much more frequent than in Greek.1 “The name is confessedly a misnomer,” say King and Cookson.2 Schmid3 also sees the matter clearly and makes the acc. with the inf. the acc. of general reference. The usual beaten track is taken by Jolly,4 but the truth is making its way and will win. Schmitt5 admits that the acc. is not the grammatical subject, but only the logical subject. But why call it “subject” at all? Schroeder6 properly likens it to the double accusative with διδάσκω, as in διδάσκω αὐτόν περιπατεῖν. The late Sanskrit shows a few examples like English “if you wish me to live.”7 The use of the

4 Cf. Delbrück, Vergl. Synt., Tl. II, p. 460. Brug. (Griech. Gr., p. 518) takes the acc. as originally the obj. of the verb. That was not always true, as we have seen in Indirect Discourse (pp. 1037 ff.).
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Jolly


————, Geschichte des Infinitivs im Indog. (1873).

4 Gesch. des Inf., p. 247.


5 Über den Urspr. des Substantivsatzes, p. 5.
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acc. with the inf. early reached a state of perfection in Greek and Latin. Schlicher\(^8\) notes 130 instances of it in Homer with φημί alone as against 15 with ὤς, ὅτι. We see it in its glory in historians like Xenophon and Thucydides in Greek and Caesar in Latin. Votaw\(^9\) notes the rarity of the construction in the O. T. and Apoc. (46 verbs), while the N. T. has 27 (83 exx.) verbs which use the idiom. But even in the N. T., as compared with the ancient Greek, the construction is greatly narrowed. The particular [Page 1084] verbs in the N. T. which may use the acc. and the inf. in indirect assertion were given under Modes. A general view of the matter discloses a rather wide range still. But the idiom, being largely literary, is chiefly found in Luke, Rom. and 1 Cor. The other writers prefer ὅτι. Luke, in fact, is the one who makes the most constant use of the idiom, and he quickly passes over to the direct statement. There is with most of them flexibility as was shown. Blass\(^1\) has a sensible summary of the situation in the N. T. There is, in truth, no essential difference in the Greek construction, whether the inf. is without a substantive, as in Ac. 12:15 διεσχορίζετο οὗτως ἔξειν, with the acc., Ac. 24:9 φάσκοντες ταῦτα οὗτως ἔξειν, or with the nom. Ro. 1:22 φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί. Cf. Ac. 17:30; 1 Pet. 3:17. Words like δέ, ἄντικη may be followed by no substantive (Mt. 23:23; Ro. 13:5). Cf. Lu. 2:26. In 1 Pet. 2:11, we have only the predicate ὃς παροίκους—Ἀπέχοσθαί. Freedom also exists. In Mk. 9:47 we have καλὸν σὲ ἔστιν μουόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν, while in Mt. 18:8 we read καλὸν σῷ ἔστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν. Even in Matthew the predicate adj. is acc., though it might have been dative, as in Ac. 16:21. Further examples of the predicate dative when an accusative is possible are seen in Lu. 1:3; 9:59; Ac. 27:3 (NAB); 2 Pet. 2:21. But see Ac. 15:22, 25; Heb. 2:10. The case of the inf. itself is not the point here. There are besides verbs of willing, desiring, allowing, making, asking, beseeching, exhorting, some verbs of commanding, the inf. with πρὶν, ὧστε, τό, τοῦ, prepositions and the articular infinitive. With all these the acc. may occur. A difficult inf. occurs in Ac. 26:28, ἐν οὔλῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανόν ποιήσαται. Is μὲ the object of πείθεις or of ποιήσαται? Can πείθεις be ‘try by persuasion’? Prof. W. Petersen suggests that this is a contamination of ἐν οὔλῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανόν εἶναι and ἐν οὔλῳ με ποιήσαται Χριστιανόν. But verbs differ. Κελέσκο, for instance, always has the acc. and the inf., while the dative comes with τάσσω (Ac. 22:10), ἐπιτάσσω (Mk. 6:39), and verbs like ἐντέλλομαι, ἐπιτρέπω, παραγγέλλω, and impersonal expressions like συμφέρει, ἔδοξε ἔστιν, ἔθετον, ἀσχορῶν, etc. As shown above, καλὸν ἔστιν is used either with the acc. or the dative, as is true of λέγω (cf. Mt. 5:34, 39 with Ac. 21:21; 22:24). Blass\(^2\) adds also Ac. 5:9, συνεργόν ὑμῖν πειράσαι. He notes also that προστάσσω occurs with the acc. (Ac. 10:48) as is true of ἔπιτάσσω (Mk. 6:27) and τάσσω (Ac. 15:2). Even συμφέρει appears with the acc. and inf. (Jo. 18:14) and ἔξειν (Lu. 6:4, where D has the dative, as is true of Mt. 12:4). [Page 1085] With ἔγγενετο Blass\(^1\) observes how clumsily is ἔγγενετο μοι—γενέσθαι με (Ac. 22:17). The acc. and inf. occurs with ἔγγενετο (Ac. 9:32) and the dative also in the sense of it ‘befell’ or ‘happened to’ one, as in Ac. 20:16. In Ac. 22:6, ἔγγενετο μοι—
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περιαστράψαι φῶς, the two constructions are combined. Blass further observes the independence of the inf. in adding an acc. of general reference besides the acc. with a verb of asking, as in Ac. 13:28 ἤττήσαντο Πειλᾶτον ἀναφεθῆναι αὐτῶν, (1 Th. 5:27) ὄρκιζον ὄμος ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν. In Ac. 21:12, παρεκαλοῦμεν—τοῦ μὴ ἀναβάναντι αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, the αὐτὸν is acc. of general reference with the inf., which is itself in the genitive as to form, though the real object of the verb. There is no instance in the N. T. of the inf. in a subordinate clause unless we follow Nestle in 1 Pet. 5:8, ζητῶν τίνα καταπιεῖν. There are sporadic examples of such a construction due to analogy of the inf. in the main clause.3 Cf. O. P. 1125, 14 (ii/A.D.), οὐς καὶ κυριεύειν τῶν καρπῶν.

(e) Personal Construction with the Infinitive. Many verbs and adjectives allowed either the personal or the impersonal construction with the infinitive. The Greek developed much more freedom in the matter than the Latin, which was more limited in the use of the impersonal.4 In the N. T. the impersonal construction occurs with fixed verbs like δεῖ, Ac. 25:24, βοῶντες μὴ δὲν αὐτῶν ζην μηκέτι, where note inf. dependent on inf. as is common enough (Ac. 26:9; Lu. 5:34; Heb. 7:23; Mk. 5:43; Lu. 6:12; 8:55). So also with ἔξεστιν, etc. The impersonal construction is seen also in Lu. 2:26; 16:22; Ph. 3:1; Heb. 9:26, etc. The inf. with impersonal verbs is somewhat more frequent in the N. T. than in the LXX. On the whole the personal construction with the inf. is rare in the N. T.5 But in the N. T. δοκέω has the personal construction, as in Ac. 17:18, δοκεῖ καταγγελεῖν εἶναι (cf. Jas. 1:26; Gal. 2:9, etc.), but we find ἔδοξε μοι in Lu. 1:3 (cf. Ac. 15:28, etc.) and even ἔδοξε ἐμαυτῷ δὲν πρέξαι (Ac. 26:9). The κοινή seems to use it less frequently than the ancient Greek. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 148) quotes Vett. Valens, p. 277, 19, δόξει—ὑπάρχειν αὐτὴν τὴν αἴρεσιν. We have δεδοκίμασεν πιστεύθηναι (1 Th. 2:4) and ἐμαρτυρήθη ἔναι (Heb. 11:4). One may compare the personal construction with ὅτι (1 Cor. 15:12; 2 Cor. 3:3; [Page 1086] 1 Jo. 2:19). The personal construction occurs with πρέπεται (Heb. 7:26). The impersonal has the acc. and the inf. (1 Cor. 11:13), the dative and the inf. (Mt. 3:15), both the dative and the acc. (Heb. 2:10). Cf. W. F. Moulton in Winer-Moulton, p. 402. The love of the passive impersonal appears in Ac. 13:28 ἤττήσαντο Πειλᾶτον, ἀναφεθῆναι αὐτῶν, and in 5:21, ἄνεστελλαν σχηματίζαι αὐτοῦς (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 148). The nominative predicate with the inf. and the nom. in indirect discourse is to be noted also.

(f) Epexegetical Infinitive. As already remarked, there is no essential difference between the appositional and the epexegetical use of the infinitive. The epexegetical inf. is added to a clause more or less complete in itself, while the merely appositional is more simple.1 It is common in the dramatists. This use is probably adnominal2 in origin, but it drifts into the verbal aspect also. We see a free use of the limitative3 inf.

---

2 Ib.
4 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 239.
5 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 239.
1 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 239.
3 Grünewald, Der freie formelhafte Inf. der Limit. im Griech., p. 21 f.
in ὧς ἔπος εἰπεν, which only occurs once in the N. T. (Heb. 7:9). Brugmann does not agree with Grünewald that this is the original epexegetical or limitative inf., though it is kin to it. Blass' applies “epexegetical” merely to the appositional inf. It is in the epexegetical inf. that we see more clearly the transition from the original substantive to the verbal idea. It is hard to draw the line between δόγμα ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τῆν οἰκουμένην (Lu. 2:1) and παρέδωκεν αὐτοῦς εἰς ἄδοκίμονον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα (Ro. 1:28). The first is appositional, the latter epexegetical. A good instance of the epexegetical inf. is seen in 2 Cor. 9:5, where τούτην ἐτοίμην εἶναι ὧς εὐλογίαν is subsidiary to the ἰνα clause preceding, as is often the case. Viteau notes that the construction is frequent in the Epistles. Cf. Eph. 1:16–18 (ἡ εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι); 3:16 f. (ἡ—κραταιωθήναι, κατοικῆσαι), Col. 1:10 (ἡ—περιπατήσαι), 4:3 (ἡ—λαλῆσαι). Further examples occur in Lu. 1:54 μνησθῆναι, 1:72 ποιῆσαι καὶ μνησθῆναι, 1:79 ἐπιφῶναι τοῦ κατευθύναι, Ac. 17:27 ζητεῖν, 2 Pet. 3:2 μνησθῆναι.

The LXX shows rather frequent instances of the articular inf. in this sense (cf. Gen. 3:22; Judg. 8:33; Ps. 77:18). The N. T. shows very few. Indeed, Votaw finds only one, that in Gal. 3:10, ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ ὦκ ἐμένει πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. But certainly [Page 1087] τοῦ ὀτιμᾶσθαι (Ro. 1:24) after παρέδωκεν is just as truly epexegetical as is ποιεῖν in verse 28 after παρέδωκεν. So also Ro. 7:3; 8:12; 1 Cor. 10:13. Burton looks at the epexegetical inf. as “an indirect object,” as in Lu. 10:40, ἡ ἀδελφή μου μόνη με κατέλειπεν διακονεῖν. There is no doubt that in such instances the inf. is in the original dative case with the dative idea. See further Mk. 4:23; 6:31; Lu. 7:40; 12:4; Ac. 4:14; 7:42; 17:21; 23:17, 18, 19; Tit. 2:8, etc.

(g) Purpose. It is but a step from the explanatory or epexegetical inf. to that of design. Indeed, the epexegetical inf. sometimes is final, a secondary purpose after ἰνα, as in Eph. 1:18; 3:17; Col. 1:10, etc. The sub-final or objective use of the inf. is also a step on the way. This use was very common in the ancient Greek, but was partially taken up by ἰνα in the N. T. But many verbs, as we have seen, retain the sub-final inf. in the N. T. as in the rest of the κοινή. Blass' careful lists and those of Viteau were given under Indirect Discourse. This notion of purpose is the direct meaning of the dative case which is retained. It is the usual meaning of the inf. in Homer, that of purpose. It goes back to the original Indo-Germanic stock. It was always more common in poetry than in prose. The close connection between the epexegetical inf. and that of purpose is seen in Mk. 7:4, ἂν παρέλαβων κρατεῖν (‘for keeping’, to keep’). So Mt. 27:34, ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν οἶνον (‘for drinking,’ to drink’). So Mt. 25:35,

4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 229.
5 Le Verbe, p. 161.
1 N. T. M. and T., p. 147.
is not necessary to multiply illustrations of \( \omega \) used especially by Thucydides.\(^6\) Hence Thumb\(^7\) thinks its abundant use in the κοινή is due to the influence of the Ionic dialect. Moulton\(^8\) agrees with this opinion. This is true both of the simple inf. of purpose and τοῦ and the inf. The Pontic dialect still preserves the inf. of purpose after verbs like ἀναβάωνο, etc. It is noteworthy that this inf. was not admitted into Latin except with a verb of motion. Moulton (\textit{Prol.}, p. 205) cites Par. P. 49 (i/ii B.C.) \( \epsilonν \) ἀναβάω καγὼν προσκυνήσαι, as parallel to Lu. 18:10, \textit{[Page 1088]} ἀνέβησαν—προσεύξασθαί. Moulton\(^1\) notes this correspondence between the ancient and the modern vernacular and agrees with Thumb’s verdict again that the result is due to the two conflicting tendencies, one the universalizing of ἵνα, which prevailed in Western Hellenism and resulted in the disappearance of the inf. in modern Greece, while the localizing of the inf. in Pontus serves to illustrate to-day the N. T. idiom. The N. T. use of the inf. of purpose includes the simple inf., τοῦ and the inf., \( ελς \) τό and the inf., \( πρδς \) τό and the inf., \( \omegaστε \) and the inf. There is no example of \( \epsilonφ \) ὑ τε. First note the simple inf., all in the original dative case. This use had a wider range in Homer than in the Attic writers. Thus Mt. 2:2 ἦλθομεν προσκυνήσαι αὐτῷ; (5:17) οὐκ ἤλθον καταλύεισαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι; (7:5) διαβάλλεσαι ἐκβαλέν τὸ κάρφος; (11:7) τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θέασασθαι (so verse 8, ἰδεῖν); 20:28; (Mk. 3:14) ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτούς κηρύσσειν; (5:32) περιβλέπετο ἰδεῖν; (Lu. 18:10) ἀνέβησαν προσεύξασθαι; (Jo. 4:15) διέρχομαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν; (Ac. 10:33) πάρεσμεν ὄκουσαι; (2 Cor. 11:2) ἡμοσάμην ἡμᾶς—παραστῆσαι; (Rev. 5:5) ἔνίκησαν—ἀνοίξαί; (16:9) οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι. These examples will suffice. It is very common in the N. T. It is not necessary to multiply illustrations of τοῦ after all the previous discussion. The O. T. shows the idiom in great abundance, though the construction is classic. It was used especially by Thucydides.\(^2\) This was a normal use. We have already noticed that Paul makes little, if any, use of this idiom.\(^3\) It is possible in Ro. 6:6; Ph. 3:10. Indeed, Voltaw\(^4\) notes only 33 instances of τοῦ and inf. of purpose in the N. T., and these are chiefly in Matthew, Luke and Acts. Note (Mt. 2:13) ζητεῖν τοῦ ἄπολέσαι, (13:3) ἐξήλθεν τοῦ σπείρειν, (Lu. 21:22) τοῦ πλησθῆναι πάντα, (24:29) τοῦ μένα. See further Ac. 3:2; 5:31; 26:18; 1 Cor. 10:7; Gal. 3:10; Heb. 10:7, etc. The use of τοῦ μή is, of course, the same construction. Cf. Ro. 6:6, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεείσθαι ἡμᾶς. Cf. Ac. 21:12. In Lu. 2:22 note παραστῆσαι, and in verse 24 τοῦ δούναι. Purpose is also expressed by εἰς τό as in 1 Th. 3:5, ἔπεμψα εἰς τό γνώναι, and by πρὸς τό as in Mt. 6:1, πρὸς τό θεαθῆναι. In the N. T. ὡστε with the inf. of purpose is rare. Originally purpose was the idea with ὡστε, or conceived result. Actual result with ὡστε was expressed by the indicative. \textit{[Page 1089]} In the LXX the notion of purpose is still

---

5 Voltaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 10.
6 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 240.
7 Theol. Lit., 1903, p. 421.
8 Prol., p. 205.
1 Prol., p. 205. Allen gives no ex. of the simple inf. of purpose in Polyb., only τοῦ ὡστε, ἐφ᾽ ὡ στε. Cf. Inf. in Polyb., p. 22.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 216. Thuc. was the first to use τοῦ and the inf. for purpose (Berklein, Entwickelungsgesch., p. 58).
3 Ib., p. 217 f.
4 Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 21.
common, especially in the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus. In the N. T. there are only 8 instances, leaving out Ac. 20:24, according to W. H., and only 7 if we follow W. H. in Lu. 9:52. See Mt. 10:1, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν ὢστε ἐκβάλλειν καὶ θεραπεύειν. And ὢστε (= ὡς, τε, ‘and so’) is simply ‘so as,’ not ‘so that.’ See also Lu. 4:29, ὢστε κατακρημνίσασα. Cf. further Mt. 15:33; 27:1; Lu. 20:20. Burton² thinks that in Mt. 27:1 ὢστε gives rather content than purpose. One must not confuse with τοῦ and the inf. of purpose the somewhat analogous construction of τοῦ and τοῦ μὴ after verbs of hindering. This is in reality, as was shown, the ablative and the regular object-inf. (substantival aspect). Cf. Lu. 4:42; Ac. 20:27; Ro. 15:22. Votaw³ notes 22 verbs in the LXX and the N. T. that use this idiom. The only common one is κωλύω. See further Final Clauses in chapter on Modes for papyri examples.

(h) Result. Purpose is only “intended result,” as Burton⁴ argues. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 153) says that the difference between purpose and result in the inf. is often only in the more subjective or objective colouring of the thought. It is hard to draw a line between conceived result and intended result. Blass⁵ explains a number of examples as result that I have put above under Purpose, as Rev. 5:5; 16:9. It is largely a matter of standpoint. The line of distinction is often very faint, if not wholly gone. Take Rev. 5:5; for instance, ἐνίκησεν ὁ λέων ἄνοιξεν. The lion had opened the book and so it was actual result. So also Ac. 5:3, σιὰ τί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαι σε. Ananias had actually lied. In the ancient Greek also the distinction between purpose and result was not sharply drawn.⁶ The inf. may represent merely the content⁷ and not clearly either result or purpose, as in Eph. 3:6, ἐξελεύσει τὰ ἔθνη. Cf. also 4:22, ἄποθέσθαι. This is not a Hebraistic (Burton) idiom, but falls in naturally with the freer use of the inf. in the koine. See also Ac. 15:10 ἐπιθέσθαι ἄρχαι. Where it is clearly result, it may be actual or hypothetical.⁸ The hypothetical is the natural or conceived result. The N. T. shows but 12 instances of the simple inf. with the notion of result, according to Votaw.¹ In the O. T. it is quite common. The 12 examples in the N. T. are usually hypothetical, not actual. So Ro. 1:10 εὐδοκήσασα ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, (Eph. 3:17) κρατάται, κατακρημνίσασα, (6:19) γνώρισαι, (Col. 4:3) λαλήσασα, (4:6) εἴδοντες, (Heb. 6:10) ἐξακούσας. It is here that the kinship with purpose is so strong. Cf. Rev. 16:9. But some examples of actual result do occur, as in Lu. 10:40; Ac. 5:3; Rev. 5:5. In the O. T.² we have actual result with τοῦ and the inf., but no examples occur in the N. T.

¹ Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 10.
² N. T. M. and T., p. 150.
⁵ Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 224.
⁶ Bäumlein, Modi, p. 339.
⁸ Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 21.
¹ Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 13.
² Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 25. Cf. Ruth 2:10, τί ὅτι εἴρον χάριν ἐν ὑφαλμοίς σου τοῦ ἐπιτυγώναι με; See also 2 Chron. 33:9; 1 Macc. 14:36.
³ Moulton, Prol., p. 217.
result. See discussion of Result in chapter on Mode for further discussion and papyri examples. It is rather common in the O. T., though not so frequent in the N. T.\(^4\) It is possible to regard Mt. 21:32, μετεμελήθη τοῦ πιστεύσα, thus, though in reality it is rather the content of the verb.\(^5\) There is similar ambiguity in Ac. 7:19, ἐκάκωσεν τοῦ ποιεῖν. But the point seems clear in Ac. 18:10, οὐδέξ ἐπιθήσεται σοι τοῦ κακῶσαι σε, and in Ro. 7:3, τοῦ μὴ ἐίναι αὕτην μοιχαλίδα. If τοῦ can be occasionally used for result, one is prepared to surrender the point as to εἰς τό if necessary. It is usually purpose, but there is ambiguity here also, as in Mt. 26:2; 1 Cor. 11:22, where the purpose shades off toward hypothetical result. In Ac. 7:19 we seem to have hypothetical result, εἰς τό ὑπακούειν. So also Ro. 6:12, εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν. It is true also of Heb. 11:3, εἰς τὸ γεγονέναι. See further Ro. 12:3; 2 Cor. 8:6; Gal. 3:17.\(^6\) Votaw\(^7\) argues for actual result in Ro. 1:20, εἰς τὸ ἐἶναι αὐτοῦς ἀναπολογήτους. It is hard to deny it in this passage. But it is ὡςτε and the inf. that is the usual N. T. construction for this idea with the inf. As already shown (see Mode) nearly all of the 62 examples of ὡςτε and the inf. in the N. T. have the notion of result. Once Votaw\(^8\) notes an instance of hypothetical result in the N. T., 1 Cor. 13:2, κἂν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὡςτε ὅρη μεθιστάναι. Burton\(^9\) goes further and includes in this category Mt. 10:1; 2 Cor. 2:7. But these debatable examples are in harmony with the usual ambiguity [Page 1091] as to result and purpose. There is no doubt about the examples of actual result with ὡςτε. Thus Mt. 13:54 ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοῦς ὡςτε ἐκπλήσσεσθαι καὶ λέγειν, (Mk. 9:26) ὡςτε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν, (Lu. 12:1) ὡςτε περιπατεῖν ἀλλήλους, (Ac. 5:15) ὡςτε ἐκφέρειν. See also Ac. 15:39; Ro. 7:6; 2 Cor. 7:7; Ph. 1:13, etc.

There is one instance in the text of W. H. where ὡς occurs with the inf., Lu. 9:52, ὡς ἑτοιμάσας with the idea of purpose involved. Cf. ὡς ὑπολ. O. P. 1120, 19 f. (iii/A.D.). The use of ὡς ἔπος εἰπεν (Heb. 7:9) is the absolute idea, as already shown. Different also is ὡς ὅν ἐκφοβεῖ (2 Cor. 10:9)=‘as if.’ A clear case of result occurs in Epictetus, IV, 1, 50, ὡς—μὴ ἀποδύρασθαι.

(i) Cause. There is only one example in the N. T. of the articular inf. without a preposition in this sense. That is in 2 Cor. 2:13, τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν, and it is in the instr. case as already shown. The LXX shows a half-dozen examples, but all with variant readings.\(^1\) But it is common with διὰ τό to have the causal sense, some 32 times in the N. T.\(^2\) See Prepositions and Substantival Aspects of the Infinitive. Cf. Mt. 13:5 f.; Mk. 5:4; Lu. 6:48; Jas. 4:2 f. There is one instance of ἐνεκεν τοῦ in 2 Cor. 7:12.

(j) Time. Temporal relations are only vaguely expressed by the inf. See Tense in this chapter for the absence of the time-element in the tenses of the inf. except in

---

4 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 25.
5 Moulton, Prol., p. 216.
7 Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 21.
1 Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 29.
indirect discourse. Elsewhere it is only by prepositions and πρὶν (an adverbial preposition in reality) that the temporal idea is conveyed by the inf. Antecedent time is expressed by πρὶν or πρὸ τοῦ. For πρὸ τοῦ, see Mt. 6:8; Lu. 2:21, etc. Πρὶν or πρὶν ἦ (so in Mt. 1:18; Mk. 14:30; Ac. 7:2; W. H. have πρὶν ἦ in the margin in Ac. 2:20) occurs with the inf. 11 times, all aorists (all in Gospels and Acts). We have it only twice with finite verb after negative sentences, once with the subj. (Lu. 2:26), once with the opt. (Ac. 25:16), both in Luke (literary style). See, for the inf.,3 Mt. 26:34 πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φονῆσαι, (Jo. 4:49) πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν. See further Mt. 26:75; Mk. 14:72; Lu. 22:61 (five of the instances are practically identical); Jo. 8:58; 14:29; Ac. 2:20. In Herodotus, under the influence of indirect discourse, the inf. occurs with ὅκως, ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, εἰ, διότι and the relative pronouns.4 Contemporaneous [Page 1092] action is described by ἐν τῷ, especially in Luke. Cf. Lu. 1:21, ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν. See Prepositions with Infinitive for further remarks. Subsequent action is set forth by μετὰ τὸ as in Mt. 26:32; Lu. 12:5, etc. In Ac. 8:40, ἐκ τοῦ ἔλθειν, we have the prospective future.

(k) The Absolute Infinitive. This idiom is very common in Homer, especially as an imperative and in the midst of imperatives.1 R. Wagner2 notes that in Homer this use of the inf. occurs with the nom. The papyri still show examples like ὁ δὲνα τῷ δὲνα χαίρειν.3 Gerhard4 holds that in such cases there is ellipsis of λέγει. The Attic inscriptions5 frequently have the absolute infinitive as imperative. Deissmann (Light

3 The inf. with πρὶν is common in Hom. See Monro, p. 158.
4 Bénard, Formes verbales en Grec d’après le Texte d’Hérodote, 1890, p. 196. See also Sturm, Die Entwick. der Konstrukt. mit πρὶν, 1883, p. 3.
1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 162.
Wagner WAGNER, R., Questiones de epigrammatis graecis ex lapidibus collectis grammaticae (1883).
3 Reinach, Pap. grecs et démotiques, 1905.
5 Meisterh., p. 244.
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———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


from the Anc. East, p. 75) notes that, as in German, it is common in edicts and notices. Cf. imperative use of infinitive in modern French. He quotes from the “Limestone Block from the Temple of Herod at Jerusalem” (early imperial period): Μηθένα ἀλλογενὴ εἰσπορεύεσθαι ἐν τῷ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τρυφάκτου καὶ περιβόλου, ‘Let no foreigner enter within,’ etc. See also Epictetus, IV, 10, 18, ἵνα δὲ ταῦτα γένηται, οὐ μικρὸ δὲξοσθαι οὐδὲ μικρῶν ἀποτυχεῖν. The imperative use was an original Indo-Germanic idiom.6 It flourishes in the Greek prose writers.7 Burton8 and Votaw9 admit one instance of the imperative inf. in the N. T., Ph. 3:16, τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν. But Moulton10 rightly objects to this needless fear of this use of the inf. It is clearly

———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

6 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 516.
7 W.-M., p. 397.
8 N. T. M. and T., p. 146.
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present in Ro. 12:15, χαίρειν, κλαίειν. The case of Lu. 9:3 is also pertinent where μὴ ἔχειν comes in between two imperatives. Moulton himself objects on this point that this inf. is due to a mixture of indirect with direct discourse. That is true, but it was a very easy lapse, since the inf. itself has this imperative use. In 1 Th. 3:11; 2 Th. 2:17; 3:5 there is the nominative case and the whole context besides the accent to prove that we have the optative, not the aorist active infinitive. See Mode for further discussion. Moulton quotes Burkitt as favouring the mere infinitive, not ἔδει, in Mt. 23:23, ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαι κάκεινα μὴ ἄφεναι, after the Lewis Syriac MS., and also καυχᾶσθαι—in 2 Cor. 12:1 after N. The [Page 1093] imperative use of the inf. was common in laws and maxims and recurs in the papyri. So A. P. 86 (i.A.D.) ἔξειναι, μισθόσα. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 146) quotes Theo, Progymn., p. 128, 12, φέρε ζητέν, where the inf. is used as a deliberative subj. would be. He gives also the Hellenistic formula, εἰς δύναμιν ἐσνα τὴν ἔμην, Inscr. Pergam., 13, 31; 13, 34. Hatzidakis notes that in the Pontic dialect this construction still exists. The epistolary inf. has the same origin as the imperative inf. It is the absolute inf. This is common in the papyri. See Ac. 15:23; 23:26; Jas. 1:1, χαίρειν. The nom. is the nominative absolute also. Cf. 2 Jo. 10, where χαίρειν is the object of λέγετε. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 146) notes how in the later language the acc. comes to be used with the absolute inf., as in C. Inscr. lat. V. 8733, δοῦνε αὐτῶν = δοῦναι αὐτόν. It is just in this absolute inf. that we best see the gradual acquirement of verbal aspects by the inf. It is probably the oldest verbal use of the inf. The construction in Heb. 7:9, ὡς ἔπος εἶπαι εἰςεῖν, is but a step further on the way. There is but one example of this absolute inf. with ὡς in the N. T. Cf. τοῦ πολεμῆσαι in Rev. 12:7, where it is an independent parenthesis.

(i) Negatives. The ancient Greek used μὴ chiefly with the inf. except in indirect assertion where οὐ of the direct was retained. But we see οὐ with the inf. after verbs of saying as early as Homer, φῆς οὐχ ὑπομείναι, Iliad, XVII, 174. Thus οὐ won a place for itself with the inf., but many verbs retained μὴ as verbs of swearing, hoping, promising, etc. But special phrases could have οὐ anywhere and strong contrast or emphasis would justify οὐ. Votaw finds 354 instances in the Greek Bible where the
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10 Prol., p. 179.
11 Ib., p. 248.
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1 Ib., p. 179.
Hatzidakis HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
2 Einl., p. 192.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 203.
4 For the variety of uses of the absolute inf. in ancient Gk. see Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 310 ff.
5 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 414.
inf. itself is modified by the negative. Of these 330 have μή and the rest have compounds of μή. The anarthrous inf. with μή he notes 59 times in the O. T., 32 in the Apocrypha and 47 in the N. T., 139 in all. The articular inf. with μή he finds in the O. T. 136 times (τοῦ 99, τὸ 37), in the Apocrypha 21 times (τοῦ 10, τὸ 11), in the N. T. 35 times (τοῦ 15, τὸ 20), 192 in all (τοῦ 124, τὸ 68). With the anarthrous inf. the negative more frequently occurs with the principal verb as in οὐ oélo. We do have οὐ in infinitival clauses, as will be shown, but in general it is true to say that the inf. directly is always negativated by μή in the N. T. This is true of [Page 1094] all sorts of uses of the inf. So the subject-inf. uses μή, as κρέξτον ἦν αὕτος μή ἐπεγνωκέναι (2 Pet. 2:21), both the anarthrous as above and the articular as in Lu. 17:1. The object-inf. likewise has μή, as in Lu. 21:14, θέπα ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ύμων μή προμελετάν. For the articular accusative with μή see Ro. 14:13. We have it with indirect commands as in Mt. 5:34, λέγω ύμιν μή ὀμόσατ, and in indirect assertion as in Ac. 23:8, λέγουσιν μή εἶναι ἄνόστασιν μήτε ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα. We have it with τοῦ μή as in Jas. 5:17, τοῦ μή βρέξα, and with prepositions as in 2 Cor. 4:4, εἰς τὸ μή αὐγάσσα. With verbs of hindering and denying the negative μή is not necessary, but it was often used by the ancients as a redundant negative repeating the negative notion of the verb, just as double negatives carried on the force of the first negative. It was not always used. When the verb itself was negatived, then μή οὐ could follow. 1 But we do not find this idiom in the N.T. Examples of the N.T. idiom have already been given in this chapter. The variety in the N. T. may be illustrated. See Lu. 23:2 κολύσαντα φόρους Καίσαρι ὠδόνω, (Ac. 4:17) ἔπεισασθοῦσα αὕτος μηκέτε λαλεῖν, (Gal. 5:7) τίς ύμᾶς ἐνέκουσεν ἀληθεία μή πείσθαι, (Ro. 15:22) ἐνεκκοσμήν καὶ ἔτηλεῖν, (Lu. 4:42) κατέξων αὐτὸν τοῦ μή πορεύεσθαι, (Mt. 19:14) μή κολύσετε αὐτὸ ἔτηλεῖν πρὸς με, (1 Cor. 14:39) τὸ λαλεῖν μή κολύσετε, (Ac. 14:18) μόλις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς δύχους τοῦ μή θύειν αὕτος, (Ac. 8:36) τί κολύει με βαπτισθῆναι, (10:47) μή τοῦ ὕδωρ δύναται κολυσαί τίς τοῦ μή βαπτισθῆναι, (20:20) οὐδὲν ὑπεστελάμην τοῦ μή ἄναγγελ. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 149) illustrates “the Pauline τὸ μή with the infinitive” by Sophocles’ Electra, 1078, τὸ τε μή βλέπειν ἐτοίμα, and the inscr. (Heberdey-Wilhelm, Reisen in Kilikien, 170, 2), τὸ μηδὲν ἄλλον—ἐπεισενεκέν. We may note also Ac. 4:20, οὐ δύναμεν μή λαλέω, where the negative is not redundant. Cf. also Jo. 5:19, οὐ δύναται πουλὲν οὐδέν, where the second negative is redundant, but it repeats the οὐ. Some MSS. have a redundant negative μή with εἶδόναι in Lu. 22:34 (cf. 1 Jo. 2:22 after οἴτι) and with προστήθηναι in Heb. 12:19. So AP read ἄντιλέγοντες in Lu. 20:27.

Even in indirect discourse the same negative is repeated, as in Ac. 26:26, λανθάνειν αὕτον τοῦτον οὐ πείθομαι οὐδέν. Here οὐδέν strictly goes with λανθάνειν in spite of its position after πείθομαι, but οὐ is construed with πείθομαι, and so οὐδέν is used rather than μηδέν or μηδέν. But in Mk. 7:24, οὐδένα ἤθελεν γνῶναι, it is not best to explain οὐδένα with the inf. in this fashion. This looks like the retention of the old classic use of οὐ with the inf. which [Page 1095] the grammars are not willing to
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allow in the N. T. Epictetus uses οὐ with the inf. as in IV, 10, 18, οὐ μικρὰ δέξασθαι οὐδὲ μικρῶν ἄποικον. As a matter of fact we have a number of other examples of οὐ with the inf., too many to rule out without ceremony. There is the case in Heb. 7:11, τίς εἶ νεῖα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἔτερον ἀντίστοιχον καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν λέγεσθαι. It is true that οὐ comes just before κατὰ τὴν τάξιν, but it is rather forced to deny it any connection with λέγεσθαι. See also Ro. 8:12, ὅφειλέται οὐ τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ἔζην, where, however, οὐ occurs outside of τοῦ and is directly concerned with τῇ σαρκί. Other examples of sharp contrast by means of οὐ are found, as in Ac. 10:40 f., ἐδοκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι, οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ ἄλλῳ μάρτυς; Ro. 7:6, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος; Heb. 13:9, βεβαιοθῆται οὐ βρῶσιν (but here no contrast is expressed). In Ro. 4:12, 16, with εἰς τό, we find οὐ μόνον—ἄλλο καί.

(m) Ἀν with the Infinitive. This classic idiom has vanished from the N. T. save in 2 Cor. 10:9, ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν. Even here it is not a clear case, since ἐκφοβεῖν depends on δόξα and ὡς ἂν comes in as a parenthetical clause, ‘as if’ (‘as it were’).

The treatment of the infinitive has thus required a good many twists and turns due to its double nature.

III. The Participle (ἡ μετοχή).

1. THE VERBALS IN –τος AND –τέος. These verbals are not exactly participles inasmuch as they have no tense or voice. They are formed from verb-stems, not from tense-stems, and hence are properly called verbal adjectives. In the broadest sense, however, these verbals are participles, since they partake of both verb and adjective. Originally the infinitive had no tense nor voice, and the same thing was true of the participle. For convenience we have limited the term participle to the verbal adjectives with voice and tense. The verbal in –τος goes back to the original Indo-Germanic time and had a sort of perfect passive idea. This form is like the Latin -tus. Cf. γνωτός, πτυς; ἄγνωτος, ἴγνωτος. But we must not overdo this point. Strictly this pro-ethnic -tos has no voice or tense and it never came to have intimate verbal connections in the Greek as it did in Latin and English. Thus amatus est and ἄγαπητός ἔστιν do not correspond, nor, in truth, does ‘he is loved’ square with either. “Even in Latin, a word like tacitus illustrates the absence of both tense and voice from the adjective in its primary use.” Already in the Sanskrit voice and tense appear with some of the participles, but “the division-line between participial and ordinary adjectives is less strictly drawn in Sanskrit than in the other Indo-European languages.” The ambiguity due to the absence of voice in the verbal in –τος was inherited from the original Indo-Germanic time. It becomes, therefore, a lexical, not a syntactical problem to decide in a given instance whether the verbal is

1 Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255.
2 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 262.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 221.
1 Moulton, Prol., p. 221.
“active” or “passive” in signification. In itself it is neither. A similar problem is raised in compound adjectives like θεο-μάχοι (Ac. 5:39), ‘fighting God.’ In modern Greek the verbal in –τος is rare and is little more than an adjective (Thumb, Handb., p. 151), though the new formation in –άτος has more verbal force. This ambiguity appears in Homer and all through the Greek language. Blass overstates it when he says that in the N. T. “the verbal adjective has practically disappeared, with the exception of forms like δυνατός, which have become stereotyped as adjectives.” As a matter of fact the verbal in –τος is still common in the N. T. as in the κοινή in general. Take, for instance, ἄγαπητός, ἄγνωτος, ἄδυνας, ἰκατάγνωτος, ἰκαμάρτητος, ἰκεκτός, ἰδρότος, ἰδιστός, ἰπόβλητος, ἰρκετός, γεννητός, γεννατός, διδακτός, δυνατός, εὐλογητός, εὔστος, θαυμαστός, θυσιάστικος, ὀριζότος, πάθητός, παρείσκοντος, πιστός, φθαρτός, χρηστός, etc. It is true that the tendency is rather to accent the adjectival aspect at the expense of the verbal idea of these words. But this also was true at the start, as we have just seen in the Sanskrit. The point to note is that the verbal does not denote voice. In Ac. 14:8; Ro. 15:1, ἰδύνατον is ‘incapable,’ whereas usually it is ‘impossible,’ as in Mt. 19:26=Mk. 10:27, etc. In Ro. 8:3, therefore, it is doubtful whether τὸ ἰδύνατον τοῦ νόμου is the ‘impotency’ or the ‘impossibility’ of the law. There is no notion of tense or of Aktionsart in these verbals in –τος and so ἰγαπητός does not distinguish between ἰγαπηθείς and ἰγαπήθης. Moulton thus properly notes the fact that in Mt. 25:41 we have κατηράγη, ‘having become the subjects of a curse,’ not κατάρατοι, ‘cursed.’ It is interesting to note χαρᾷ ἰνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ ἰδεδοξασμένῃ in 1 Pet. 1:8, but here ἰνεκλάλητος is active in sense, ‘inexpressible.’ The ambiguity comes also in our English participle ‘borne’ used for ἰρόμενον in Mk. 2:3, and the punctiliar ‘brought’ used for ἰνεχθηκαί in 2 Pet. 1:18. With these Moulton contrasts
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ἠρμένον (‘taken away’) in Jo. 20:1. It is worth while to study a few more examples from the lexical point of view. In general, the passive sense is more common, as in ἄγαπητός (Mt. 3:17); ἐθύτης (Lu. 9:62); διδακτός (Jo. 6:45; θεόπνευστος (2 Tim. 3:16); θεοδίδακτος (1 Th. 4:9); γραπτός and κρυπτός (Ro. 2:15 f.). Here (Ro. 2:15 f.) τὰ κρυπτὰ is used just like a substantive (neuter adjective in plural). But ζεστός (Rev. 3:15) is active in sense as is ἁμείτης (Ro. 1:31), though ἁμείτης next to it (paronomasia) is made from the middle συντίθημι (‘covenant’). Συνετός, sometimes passive in sense in the old Greek, is always active in the N. T., as in Mt. 11:25, but θνητός (Ro. 6:12) is ‘liable to death,’ not ‘dying,’ as παθητός (Ac. 26:23) is ‘capable of suffering.’ Cf. the Latin adjectives in -bilis.

The verbal in –τέος is later than that in –τος and does not occur in Homer. It is probably a modification of the verbal –τος to express the idea of the predicate-infinitive, like ‘this is not to eat (to be eaten).’ It is really a gerundive and is used in the personal or impersonal construction, more commonly the latter. The personal is always passive in sense, while the impersonal is active and may be formed from transitive or intransitive verbs. It expresses the idea of necessity. It was never as common as the verbal in –τος and is not unknown in the papyri, though not frequent. It is more like the verb (and participle) than the verbal in –τος in one respect, that it often uses the cases of the regular verb. This is seen in the one example in the N. T. (Lu. 5:38) οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁμητέον βληθέον. It is the impersonal construction, though the agent is not here expressed. This example of –τέον in Luke is a survival of the literary style (cf. Viteau, “Essai sur la Syntaxe des Voix,” Revue de Philologie, p. 38). See Theo, Progymn., p. 128, 12, ἐ ὑπηρέτον.

2. HISTORY OF THE PARTICIPLE.

(a) The Sanskrit Participle. This was more advanced in its development than the Sanskrit infinitive, which had no voice or tense. In the Veda the aorist, present, perfect and future tenses have participles. The distinction in the structure of the participle as compared with the other verbal adjectives lies just in this point. The mere

2 Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 707.
3 In Sans. the verbal adj. in -tá are sometimes called passive participles (Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 340). This form does not belong to the tense system.
4 Moulton, Prol., p. 222.
5 Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 184, 525.
6 Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 707.
7 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 368 f.
8 Moulton, Prol., p. 222.
9 But even with –τος this sometimes appears as in διδακτός θεοῦ (Jo. 6:45) where we have the ablative. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 522.
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verbal is formed on the verb-stem, while the participle is formed on the tense-stem. In the Sanskrit also both voices (active and middle) show these participles. Thus already in the original Indo-Germanic tongue it appears probable that the participle existed with voice, tense, *Aktionsart* and government of cases. The Greek participle is thus rooted in this pro-ethnic participle as seen by the very suffixes -nt-, -meno-, -wos- (-us).

(b) Homer’s Time. Already in Homer and Hesiod the participle occurs as a fully developed part of speech. It occurs on an average of $8^{1/6}$ times per page of 30 lines. In Hesiod the participle is chiefly attributive, while the predicate participle is less common than in Homer. This use of the participle as the practical equivalent of the hypotactic clause is a purely Greek development (copied by the Latin to some extent) within historical times. The participle is a literary device, and flourished best with writers of culture who were φιλοµέτοχοι. Broadus used to call the Greek “a participle-loving language,” and, taken as a whole, this is true. Certainly the participle had its most perfect development in the Greek. The aorist participle died in the Sanskrit and did not appear in the Latin. It is the aorist active participle which made the participle so powerful in Greek. The English, like the Sanskrit and the Greek, is rich in participles, though the German is comparatively poor. “We gain a certain grandeur and terseness by the construction, a certain sweep, a certain περιβολή, such as Hermogenes recognises as lying in the participle.” This wealth of participles gives flexibility and swing to the language.

(c) The Attic Period. In Herodotus the participle jumps to $17^{1/2}$ times per page of 30 lines. But Sophocles has it only 9 times on the same scale. Williams runs the parallel on with 13 for Thucydides, $12^{3/5}$ for Xenophon, $10^{1/6}$ for Plato, $10^{3/4}$ for Demosthenes. It is thus in the historians and orators and not the poets, that we see the participle in its glory.

(d) The Κοινή. Here we note a sharp difference in the several styles of writing. The Atticists like Josephus with 20, and 2 Maccabees with $23^{1/2}$, lead in conscious imitation of the ancients. They go beyond them in fact. But the writers of the literary κοινή follow close behind, as Polybius with $17^{4/5}$, Strabo with $13^{1/2}$ and Plutarch with 14. Certainly there is no sign of decay here. But in the LXX, Exodus, Deuteronomy and Judges give only $6^{1/6}$ while the papyri show $6^{4/5}$. This confirms the judgment that
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the vernacular was not fond of the participle and found it clumsy. Jannaris\textsuperscript{4} quotes striking passages from Thucydides, Plato and Demosthenes which illustrate well the clumsiness and ambiguity of the participle in long, involved sentences. Even in the older Greek in unconventional or unscholarly composition the accumulation of participles is shunned. The clearer and easier analysis of co-ordinate or subordinate clauses was used instead.\textsuperscript{5} In the N. T. we see the participle used on the whole more frequently than in the LXX and the papyri. The Hebrew had a certain restraining influence on the participle in the LXX. In the vernacular papyri the participle was held back on the principle just stated above. It is Luke who makes most frequent use of the participle with 16\textsuperscript{2}/\textsuperscript{3} in the Gospel and 17\textsuperscript{1}/\textsuperscript{6} in the Acts per page of 30 lines.\textsuperscript{6} But 1 Peter follows close behind with 15\textsuperscript{2}/\textsuperscript{3} and Hebrews with 14. In the other Gospels Matthew has it 12\textsuperscript{1}/\textsuperscript{2}, Mark 11\textsuperscript{2}/\textsuperscript{3} and John 10\textsuperscript{2}/\textsuperscript{5}.\textsuperscript{7} James has it 10 per page, while in the Epistles and Revelation it drops back to 8 and 9. On the whole it is much as one would expect. The more literary books lead (after Paul with only 9 per page average in Gal., 1 Cor., and Rom.).\textsuperscript{8} The historical books surpass the Epistles, while Hebrews here reveals its hortatory, sermonic character. For a succession of participles see Ac. 12:25; 23:27; Heb. 1:3 f.; Mk. 5:15. The details of the N. T. situation will come later.

\textit{(e) Modern Greek.} The participle more and more came to be [Page 1100] scholastic and dropped out of the vernacular.\textsuperscript{1} In particular was this true of the circumstantial participle. The classic Greek by means of the participle developed the periodic style (\textit{λέξις κατεστραµµένη}) and is seen at its highest in Isocrates. See, for example, the “Ciceronian period” in Isocrates, p. 82. Jebb\textsuperscript{7} contrasts this with \textit{λέξις εἰροµένη}, simply tacking clause to clause as in Mt. 7:25, 27 and colloquial repetition of finite verbs as in Jo. 1:47; 7:4. But \textit{βλέπετε, βλέπετε, βλέπετε} (Ph. 3:2) has rhetorical effect. In the vernacular modern Greek, therefore, we see a retreat of the participle all along the line. It is not dead as the infinitive, but is dying, though some
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vernacular writers are bringing back the use of the participle for literary purposes (Thumb, Handb., p. 168). The analytic tendency of modern language is against it. See Jebb’s remarks for the various devices used instead of the participle. The only participles left in modern Greek are the indeclinable present active in –οντας (cf. gerund in Latin), some middle (or passive) parts. in –οµένος or –άµενος and perfect passives like δεµένος (no reduplication).3 A few are made from aorist stems like ἰδοµένος (Thumb, Handb., p. 150). The use of the part. in the modern Greek is very limited indeed.

3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARTICIPLE.

(a) Originally an Adjective. The infinitive was originally a substantive, as we have seen. In the Sanskrit it did not acquire voice and tense, though it had the verbal idea of action. The participle, as we have seen, had made more progress in the Sanskrit, but it was also originally an adjective. It never got away from this original adjectival idea.4 But we are not left to history and logic to prove this point. It so happens that some participles in form never became participles in fact. They are merely adjectives. Homer shows a number of such words.5 Cf. ἅσµενος. We see remnants of this usage in the N. T. like ἐκὼν (Ro. 8:20), ἴκων (1 Cor. 9:17). Other participles come in certain uses to be only substantives (adjectives, then substantives), though the true participial use occurs also. Cf. ἄρχων, ‘a ruler’ (Mt. 20:25); ἔγοµένος, ‘a governor’ (Ac. 7:10); τῶ ὑπάρχουντα ὑµῶν, ‘your belongings’ (Lu. 12:33). In general “the adjective represents a quality at rest, the participle represents a quality in motion.”6 But [Page 1101] not all verbs express motion. The mere adjectival notion is more common in the Latin, as in prœteritus, quietus, tacitus, etc. In Mt. 17:17, γενεάντις ἀπιστος καὶ διεστραµµένη, the verbal adjective and participle occur together.

(b) The Addition of the Verbal Functions. These functions are tense, voice and case-government. There was originally no notion of time in the tense, nor does the tense in the participle ever express time absolutely. It only gives relative time by suggestion or by the use of temporal adverbs or conjunctions.1 The verbal idea in the participle thus expands the adjectival notion of the word.2 But the addition of these verbal functions does not make the participle a real verb, since, like the infinitive, it does not have subject.3

(c) The Double Aspect of the Participle. The very name participle (pars, capio) indicates this fact. The word is part adjective, part verb. Voss calls it mules, which is part horse and part ass.4 Dionysius Thrax says: Μετοχὴ ἔστι λέξις μετέχουσα τῆς τῶν ῥηµάτων καὶ τῆς τῶν ὄνοµάτων ἰδιότητος. In the true participle, therefore, we are to look for both the adjectival and the verbal aspects, as in the infinitive we have the
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The emphasis will vary in certain instances. Now the adjectival will be more to the fore as in the attributive articulard participle like ὁ καλῶν.3 Now the verbal side is stressed as in the circumstantial participle. But the adjectival notion never quite disappears in the one as the verbal always remains in the other (barring a few cases noted above). One must, therefore, explain in each instance both the adjectival and verbal functions of the participle else he has set forth only one side of the subject. It is true that the verbal functions are usually more complicated and interesting,6 but the adjectival must not be neglected.

(d) Relation between Participle and Infinitive. As already explained, they are closely allied in use, though different in origin. Both are verbal nouns; both are infinitival; both are participial. But the participle so-called is inflected always, while the infinitive so-called has lost its proper inflection. The infinitive, besides, expresses7 the action in relation to the verb, while the participle expresses the action in relation to the subject or the object of the verb (or some other substantive or pronoun).1 The distinction between the participle and the infinitive thus becomes quite important. Thus in Lu. 16:3, ἐπαιτεῖν αἰσχύνομαι, the idea is ‘I am ashamed to beg and do not do it,’ while ἔρχομαι would be ‘I beg and am ashamed of it.’2 Cf. the analytic expression in 2 Tim. 1:12. In Xenophon, Mem., 2, 6, 39, we have αἰσχύνομαι λέγων. So ἔρχομαι in Attic Greek took the infinitive as a rule, linking the infinitive with the verb. But sometimes the participle occurred, linking the action to the subject (or object) and so contrasting the beginning with the end.3 In the N. T. all the examples have the present infinitive except Lu. 13:25 ἐστάναι. In Lu. 3:23, ἔρχομαι ζῶσεi ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, we have neither with ἔρχομαι. Cf. Lu. 14:30, ἤρξατο οἰκοδομεῖν. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 169) compares ἔρχομαι ἐξετίθετο (Ac. 11:4) with ἔρχαμεν—κατέχομαι (Xen. of Eph., p. 388, 31). On the other hand, in the N. T. παύομαι occurs only with the participle, as in Lu. 5:4, ἐπαύεσα ἐλαῖαν. Cf. Ac. 5:42; 6:13; Eph. 1:16; Col. 1:9; Heb. 10:2. But in Ac. 14:18 note κατέπαυσαν τῶ ν ἀνθρώπου, which well illustrates the difference between the inf. and the part. The use of ἔτελεσεν διατάσσων (Mt. 11:1) Blass4 calls unclassical. The part. alone occurs with ἔκκακε (Gal. 6:9; 2 Th. 3:13). Note also ἐπέμενον ἔρωτον: (spurious passage in Jo. 8:7), but φαίνει διατελεῖτε (Ac. 27:33) without ἰδέας. Cf. Ac. 12:16, ἐπέμενεν κρούων, and Lu. 7:45, οὗ διελπεν καταφίλοισα. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 169) finds the part. with ἐπιθυμεῖν in “vulgar literature.” He observes that these many of these neater classical idioms with the part. do not appear in the N. T. Contrast with this the inf. in Ac. 20:20, 27, οὗ γὰρ ὑπεστελεύθην τοῦ μὴ ἄναγκελλον. There is no example of the inf. with φαίνομαι in the N. T., but the part. occurs in Mt. 6:16, 18 (νηπιώτων). The adjectival alone is seen in Mt. 23:27, 28. Cf. also Ro. 7:13. It is hardly on a par with the participle in Mt. 6:17 in spite of Blass’s insistence.5
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3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 245.
4 Ib.
5 Ib.
Thorougly classical also are προφθάσειν αὐτὸν λέγον (Mt. 17:25) and ἐλαθον ἔχενονται (Heb. 13:2), specimens of literary style. The infinitive with προφθάνον occurs in Clem., Cor., II, 8, 2. The part. with τυχάνοι does not occur in the N. T. In the later κοινή the inf. takes the place of the participle with λανθάνοι, παύομαι and φθάνοι (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 169). The part. is found with ὑπάρχον [Page 1103] (Ac. 8:16) and προφάραξ (Lu. 23:12). It is doubtful if the participle belongs to the verb in 1 Tim. 5:13, ἄργαι μανθάνουσιν περιερχόμενα, but, if so, it is not to be understood as like the inf.1 In Ph. 4:11; 1 Tim. 5:4, the inf. occurs with μανθάνοι according to classic idiom. At any rate, if περιερχόμεναι (1 Tim. 5:13) is a circumstantial part., something has to be supplied with ἄργαι. The part. in 1 Tim. 1:12, πιστόν μὲ ἡγήσατο θέμενος, is certainly circumstantial. The distinction between the inf. and the part. comes out sharply in indirect discourse also. The inf. is more objective. Thus note ἰκουσαν τὸ ὑπότο αὐτὸν οὐκούμεναι τὸ σημεῖον (Jo. 12:18) and ὅκουμεν γὰρ τινας περιπατοῦντας (2 Th. 3:11). The participle is a descriptive adjective even though in indirect discourse (cf. Lu. 4:23; Ac. 7:12). See 1 Cor. 11:18 for the inf. again. In Mt. 7:11, οἶδατε δόματα ἁγιατὰ διδόναι, the inf. with οἶδα means ‘know how to give.’ But in Lu. 4:41, ἤδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτόν εἶναι, it is mere indirect discourse. For the part. see 2 Cor. 12:2, οἶδα—ἄρα παγεύεται τὸν τοιοῦτον (cf. Mk. 6:20). In Ac. 3:9 note ἔδεεν αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα. Here we have the same root, though a different sense. οἶδα is common with ὄντι. But γινόμεθα occurs both with the inf. as in Heb. 10:34, γινόμεθα ἔχειν εὐαγγελισθον ὑπαρξίν, and the participle as in Heb. 13:23, γινόσκετε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἡμῶν ἡμῖν Τιμόθεου ἄπολειπέμενον. Cf. Lu. 8:46, ἔχειν ἔργαν δύναμιν ἔξελεσθήσεως, where the tense and participle both accent the vivid reality of the experience. But note the inf. in Mt. 16:13. The same thing is true of ὑμολογέω as in Tit. 1:16, θέν ὑμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, and 1 Jo. 4:2, ὁ ὑμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐξιλθεότα (cf. 2 Jo. 7). Cf. also Ac. 24:10 ὅτα ἔνει ἐκρίθη ἐπιστάμενος καὶ δοκιμάζοι 1 Th. 2:4 and 2 Cor. 8:22. Note difference between ἵνα ἐμφάσον κατηγοροῦν αὐτοῦ (Lu. 6:7) and εὐρίσκει αὐτοῦ καθεύδοντας (Mk. 14:37). Cf. Indirect Discourse. Further examples of the supplementary participle come later. These sufficiently illustrate the difference between the use of inf. and part.

(e) Method of Treating the Participle. The hybrid character of the participle has led to a great deal of diversity in its treatment in the grammars. Prof. Williams2 gives an interesting summary in his monograph. None of them are satisfactory because they do not follow a consistent plan. Part of the divisions are from the adjectival, part from the verbal point of view. They are not parallel. Thus we have Kühner’s complementary, attributive, adverbial participles; Goodwin’s attributive, circumstantial, supplementary; Burton’s adjectival, adverbial, substantival; [Page 1104] Jannaris’s adjectival and adverbial; Blass’ attributive and in additional clause;

1 W.-M., p. 436.
2 The Part. in Acts, pp. 1 ff.
Goodwin
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Hadley and Allen’s attributive and predicate; Delbrück-Brugmann’s external, objective, adverbial. Then Williams adds another that is no better, ascriptive, adverbial, complementary. Thompson gives the attributive and the supplementary participle after saying that the nominal and the verbal classification is more elastic. The only way to get symmetry in the treatment of the participle is to follow the line of its double nature (adjectival and verbal) and discuss the adjectival functions and the verbal functions separately. See the discussion of the infinitive. That is to say, each participle must be considered as both adjectival and verbal. Not all the adjectival aspects will be true of any one participle nor all of the verbal, but each one will have some adjectival and some verbal functions. Thus alone can one get a clear statement of the many participial combinations and permutations. As an adjective the participle is attributive (anarthrous or articular) or predicate. It may even be substantival, especially with ὁ. It is always declinable. As a verb there is always voice and tense and there may be cases. But any given anarthrous predicate participle may be either supplementary (complementary) or circumstantial (additional) or wholly independent (as indicative or imperative). The articular participle is ruled out of this three-fold alternative, though it still has voice, tense and governs cases. The articular participle is always attributive (or substantival). The lines thus cross and recross in the nature of the case. But a clear statement of all the essential facts can be made by taking the adjectival and the verbal aspects separately. In any given instance there is thus a double problem. Both sides of the given participle must be noted.

4. ADJECTIVAL ASPECTS OF THE PARTICIPLE.

(a) Declension. The free declension of the participle in number and gender and case (cf. *per contra* the infinitive) makes the task of noting the adjectival aspects comparatively simple. There are anomalies of agreement in these three points as with other adjectives. Thus in Rev. 3:12 ἡ καταβαίνουσα in apposition with τῆς καινῆς Ἱερ does not conform in case. There is a difficulty of both case and gender in πεπυρωµένης in Rev. 1:15. See also πλῆθος κράζοντες (Ac. 21:36) where the number and gender both vary. In Mk. 4:31 note ὅς—ὦν πάντων τῶν σπερµάτων where ὅν takes the gender of σπέρµα. Cf. also ἦν καθήµεναι (Mt. 27:61). [Page 1105] But these matters are discussed adequately in chapter on The Sentence.

(b) Attributive Participle.

(a) Anarthrous. The article is not of course necessary with the attributive participle any more than with any other attributive adjective. Thus we have ὕδωρ ζων (Jo. 4:10), ‘living water,’ which is just as really attributive as τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ ζῶν (Jo. 4:11). When the article is used there is no doubt about the participle being attributive. When it is absent, it is an open question to be examined in the light of the context. Note also 1 Cor. 13:1, χαλκὸς ἐχζῶν ἡ κύβαλαλον ὑπολαλάζων. This construction (the anarthrous attributive) is not so common as the other uses of the participle,1 and yet it

---

is not wholly absent from the N. T. See ἧς ὦστερ φερομένην πνοῆς βιαίας (Ac. 2:2) and θόρα ἠνεῴγμη (Rev. 4:1). It is not always easy to draw the line between the anarthrous attributive participle and the predicate participle of additional statement. Cf. ἀνήρ γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ (Ac. 22:3). If ὃ occurred before these participles, we should have the articular-attributive participle which is equivalent to a relative. So in Ac. 10:18, we have ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος, but in 10:32, ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος. Cf. Lu. 6:48, ὃς κατιστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἶκιαν, with Mt. 7:24, ἀνδρὶ ὀστὶς ὄκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τῇ οἰκίᾳ. See also Lu. 6:49. Cf. Ro. 8:24, ἔπις βλέπομένη ὡς ἐστιν ἔλπις. Cf. Mt. 27:33. The problem is particularly real in Mk. 5:25, 27. W. H. indicate by the comma after ἐλθοῦσα that they regard the participles with γινεῖ (ὡς, παθοῦσα, ὄσαν, ἔλθοῦσα) up to that point as attributive. They describe the woman who comes. Then the sentence proceeds with the predicate-circumstantial participles (ἤκοισασα, ἔλθοῦσα) before ἦσαν. Luke (8:43) makes the matter plainer by putting a relative clause after the first participle. The anarthrous attributive participle is closely bound to the substantive or pronoun even when it is an additional statement. See Mt. 12:25, πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθείσα καθ ἑαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται. See also Lu. 6:40; 2 Th. 2:4; Rev. 2:15. In Mt. 13:19, παντὸς ἰκώντος, we probably have the genitive absolute and so predicate circumstantial, but even here αὐτοῦ occurs, though remote. Cf. πᾶς ὁ ἰκώνων (Mt. 7:26) and πᾶς ὀστὶς ἰκώνει (7:24), where we see how nearly these constructions approach each other. But the anarthrous [Page 1106] indefinite participle is clearly found in Jas. 4:17, εἰδότες οὖν καλὸν ποιήν, καὶ μὴ ποιοῦντι, ἡμαρτία αὐτῶ ἐστίν. This passage may throw some light on Mt. 12:25. In Mt. 13:35, διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, we probably have the articular attributive participle, since the Greeks did not always place the attributive participle between the article and the substantive. The use of ἐξελθεῖν is interesting in Rev. 15:1, εἰδὼν ἄγγελον ἐπτὰ ἐχοντας πληγάς. The anarthrous indefinite participle is seen also in a few constructions like προσετίθεντο πιστεύοντες τῷ κυρίῳ (Ac. 5:14), where the participle means ‘believing men’ and has πλήθη in apposition with it. See also φονῇ βοῶντος (Mk. 1:3, LXX), ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος (Mt. 2:6, LXX), οὐκ ἐστιν συνιών and οὐκ ἐστιν ἐκξητῶν (Ro. 3:11, LXX) where ὁ is more common, ἐχεῖς ἐκατ' κρατοῦντας (Rev. 2:14). It is worth noting in this connection also the fact that occasionally a preposition occurs with an anarthrous participle (cf. infinitive). So χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος (Ro. 10:14). Here the idea is not ‘without preaching,’ but ‘without one preaching,’ ‘without a preacher.’ For ‘without preaching’ we must have χωρὶς τοῦ κηρύσσειν. See once more χαίρειν μετὰ χαίροντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων (12:15) and ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας (1 Pet. 3:12). In 1 Cor. 15:27, ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος, we have the usual articular construction.

(β) Articular. The articular participle occurs a few times in Homer. In general the Book of Acts has the articular participle in about the same proportion as the great Attic writers. All articular participles are, of course, attributive. But the matter has

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 242.
3 This use of πᾶς without art. occurs occasionally in class. Gk. See K.-G., II, p. 608 f.
some points of interest and cannot be dismissed with this general statement. The examples are very numerous. The substantives may be expressed as in τὴν ἰησούμενην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν (Mt. 25:34); οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες (Mk. 3:22). Like other adjectival participles, the participle may come between the article and the substantive, as in τῇ ὑγαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ (1 Tim. 1:10); τοῦ φανομένου ἄστερος (Mt. 2:7); τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς (Heb. 12:2). Cf. Jude 3. The substantive may precede and the article may be repeated, as τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν (Jo. 4:11); τὸ σῶμα τὸ γεννησόμενον (1 Cor. 15:37); τῷ θεῷ τῷ διδόντι (1 Cor. 15:57). Cf. Mt. 26:28; 27:44; Jas. 5:1; Ro. 2:10. In Mk. 12:38 the article is repeated as in 12:40 (apposition) when the nominative reminds us of the common anacoluthon in Revelation.

Ramsay, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).
term which it marks out as having a technical sense (cf. 5:17; 13:1; 28:17), and is almost equivalent to τοῦ ὄνομα χωμένου.” An ingenious person might apply this in Eph. 1:1 to the text with ἕν Ἐφέσσω absent; but the usual view needs no defence against such an alternative. [Page 1108] With αἱ οὖσαι in Ro. 13:1 we may compare Par. P. 5 (ii/B.C.), ἐφ’ ἵπποις καὶ ἵππατος τῶν ὄντων καὶ οὐσίων. So N. P. 49 (iii/A.D.), τοῦ ὄντος μηνός ‘the current month.’ The passage in Ac. 5:17 reads ἥ οὖσα αἱρέως, and 28:17 has τοῦς ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρόσωπος. Moulton agrees, we may note, with Sanday and Headlam (in loco) in taking ὁ ὄνω τάντων (Ro. 9:5) as referring to Jesus. As is well known, the difficulty here is a matter of exegesis and the punctuation of the editor will be made according to his theology. But it may be said in brief that the natural way to take ὁ ὄνω and θεός is in apposition to ὁ Χριστός. It is a very common thing in the N.T., as already noted, to have ὁ and the participle where a relative clause is possible. But this idiom is common in the older Greek. See Ac. 10:18, 32, and chapter on Article. It remains then to speak of the frequent use of the articular participle without a substantive or pronoun. This idiom is too common for exhaustive treatment, but some examples are given. Cf. Mt. 10:40, ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀπόστειλαντά με. Note also ὁ δεχόμενος and the next verse and ὅς Ὀν ποτίσῃ in verse 42. See further Mt. 10:37; Ac. 10:35; Rev. 1:3. The question of the tense is interesting in some of these examples, as in ὁ εὐρόν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν in Mt. 10:39, but that will be discussed a bit later. Like a relative clause, the articular participle may suggest the notion of cause, condition, purpose, etc., as in Mt. 10:37, 39, 40, 41; Lu. 14:11; Ro. 3:5. But this notion is very indefinite.

(c) Predicate Participle. From the adjectival standpoint all participles that are not attributive are predicate. This aspect of the participle must be elucidated further. The verbal aspect comes into special prominence with all the predicate participles. They will be treated very lightly here and receive full discussion under Verbal Aspects. It may be said at once that all the supplementary and circumstantial participles are predicate. One must not confuse the articular participle in the participle like σὺ εἰ ὁ ἔρχόμενος (Lu. 7:19) with the real predicate participle. Cf. Lu. 16:15; 22:28. The predicate participle is simply the adjective in the predicate position. That is, it is not attributive. There are obviously many varieties of the predicate participle. But the predicate adjective has had adequate treatment. Cf. ἦσα με παρθησιμένον (Lu. 14:18). Cf. also Heb. 5:14; Ac. 9:21.

(d) The Participle as a Substantive. The adjective, though a variation from the substantive, is sometimes used as a substantive [Page 1109] as in τὸ ὑγαθὸν. It is not strange, therefore, that the participle also shows substantive uses. These are sometimes anarthrous, as in ἀργον (Mt. 9:18), ἢγούμενος (Mt. 2:6). But, as a rule, the participle as a substantive is articular. Cf. Lu. 12:33, τὸ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν, where the genitive shows the substantive character of this participle. Cf. further 2:27 τὸ εἶλθενόν τοῦ νόμου, (1 Cor. 7:35) πρὸς τὸ ὑμῶν ἅματων συμφέρον, (Ph. 3:8) διὰ τὸ ὑπερῆχον τῆς γνώσεως, (Mt. 14:20) τὸ περισσεῖον τῶν κλασμάτων, (Ro. 7:23) τῷ ὄντι, (Heb. 12:11) πρὸς τὸ παρόν, etc. There are also the many examples where ὁ and the part. is used without a subst. or pron., as in Mt. 10:39, ὁ εὐρόν and ὁ ἀπολέσας.

1 Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 167.
2 Ib., p. 169.
The substantive use of the participle is a classic idiom. The use of the neuter participle as an abstract substantive is not so common in the N. T. as in the ancient Greek. But see further τὸ γεγονός (Lu. 8:56), τὸ γινόμενα (9:7), τὸ ἄπωλός (19:10), τὸ ἐργόμενα (Jo. 16:13), τὸ νῦν ἔχον (Ac. 24:25), τὰ μῆ δύνα, τὰ ὄντα (1 Cor. 1:28), τὸ οὐλομένον (14:7), τὸ διδοξασμένον (2 Cor. 3:10 f.), τὸ δοκοῦ (Heb. 12:10), etc. In Lu. 22:49 note τὸ ἔσομεν. One is not to confuse with this idiom the so-called “substantive participle” of some grammars, which is a term used for the substantivizing of the verbal force of the participle, not the adjectival. Thus Burton calls the supplementary participle like that in Ac. 5:42, οὐκ ἔπαιντο διδάσκοντες, and in Lu. 8:46, ἔγνων δύνα μιν ἐξεληλυθὼν ὅπε ἔμοι, the “substantive participle.” I confess that I see nothing to be gained by applying “substantive” to the purely verbal aspects of the participle. Confusion of thought is the inevitable result. See 5, (d), (δ).

(c) The Participle as an Adverb. The formation of adverbs from participles is due to its adjectival function. Cf. ὄντως (Mk. 11:32), ὁμολογομένως (1 Tim. 3:16), ὑπερβαλλόντως (2 Cor. 11:23). Besides, the participle itself (cf. neuter adjective πολύ, etc.) sometimes has an adverbial force. In particular note τοῦχον (1 Cor. 16:6). See also ἐπιβαλλόν τόκλαεν (Mk. 14:72). This obscure participle expresses coincident action (cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 131). Cf. ἐσθαν σπεύσαντες (Lu. 2:16), σπεύσας κατάβητι and σπεύσας κατέβη (19:5 f.). We cannot always draw a distinction between this use and the circumstantial participle of manner. The verbal and the adjectival standpoints come together. A number of the grammars apply the term “adverbial” to all the circumstantial participles. But it is more than doubtful if one gains as much as he loses thereby. It is true that logically a sort of adverbial relation may be worked out, an adverbial addition to the sentence. But it does not help much from the syntactical point of view to insist on this fact in the exposition of the circumstantial participle. As to form the circumstantial participle is still adjectival. The adverbial notion is inferential and purely logical. There is something, however, to be said for the adverbial aspect of the redundant participle in βλέποντες βλέπετε (Mt. 13:14, LXX), which is on a par with ἔκοψεν ἔκοψε. Both are attempts to translate the Hebrew inf. absolute. Moulton has found the idiom in Αἰσχυλος and Ηροδοτος, but the N. T. usage is clearly due to the LXX, where it is very common. Cf. also ὅτι ἔδω (Ac. 7:34), εὔλογων εὔλογήσω (Heb. 6:14), from the LXX again. Blass (Gr. of the N. T. Gk., p. 251) calls this construction “thoroughly un-Greek.” There are other pleonastic participles like the common ἁπακρωτίας εἶπεν (Mt. 3:15) which is somewhat like the vernacular: “He ups and says” (Moulton Prol., p. 15 f.). Cf. also τῷ θεῷ εἰπὼν λέγει (Jo. 21:19), ἀπελθὼν πέρακεν (Mt. 13:46), ‘he has gone and sold.’ So also ἄναστας ἔβλεψεν (Lu. 15:20), ‘he arose and came.’ Once again note ἄβουσα ἐνέκρυψεν (Mt. 13:33), ‘she took and hid.’ This idiom is more Aramaic than Hebraic and is at any rate picturesque vernacular. But it is also Greek. Pleonasm belongs to all tongues. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 179) quotes Herod. VI, 67, 10, εἴπε ϕας; VI, 68,

1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 523.
2 Prol., pp. 14, 76.
5, ἔφη—λέγων. Mr. Dan Crawford finds in the Bantu language “dying he died” for the irrevocableness of death. We now turn to the verbal aspects of the participle, which are more complex.

5. VERBAL ASPECTS OF THE PARTICIPLE.

(a) Voice. There is nothing of a distinctive nature to say about the voice of the participle in addition to what has already been said (see ch. on Voice). The voices run in the participles precisely as in the verb itself. We find the voice in the earliest Greek as in the Sanskrit. All the nuances of the voices appear in the participle. Cf. the active in διδάσκων (Lu. 13:10), ζῶν (Jo. 4:10); the middle in προσδεχόμενος (Lu. 12:36), ἐπικαλούμενος (Ac. 22:16), σπασάμενος (Mk. 14:47); the passive in λυπούμενος (Mt. 19:22), τὴν ἀποκρυμμένην (1 Cor. 2:7), ἀπολειψάμενον (Heb. 13:23), ἔπιστρεφεῖς (Mk. 5:30), καλυθέντες (Ac. 16:6). We may note in particular ἔχε με παρρητήμενον (Lu. 14:18 f.), ἔσεσθαι μισούμενοι (Mt. 10:22) and ἔσεσθαι λαλοῦντες (1 Cor. 14:9). In Mk. 5:26, [Page 1111]παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ιατρῶν, the active participle has the construction of the passive, but this is due to the verb πάσχω, not to the voice. Cf. also Gal. 4:9, γνόντες θεοῦ μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ.

(b) Tense.

(a) Timelessness of the Participle. It may be said at once that the participle has tense in the same sense that the subjunctive, optative and imperative have, giving the state of the action as punctiliar, linear, completed. In the beginning1 this was all that tense meant in the participle. The participle was timeless. Indeed the participle in itself continued timeless, as is well shown by the articular participle.2 Thus in Mk. 6:14, Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτίζων, it is not present time that is here given by this tense, but the general description of John as the Baptistizer without regard to time. It is actually used of him after his death. Cf. οἱ ζητοῦντες (Mt. 2:20). In Mt. 10:39, ὁ εὐρών ἀπολέσει, the principal verb is future while the participle is aorist, but the aorist tense does not mean past or future time. So in Mt. 25:20 and 24 ὁ λαβὼν and ὁ ἐληφὼς have no notion of time but only the state of the action. But the tenses of the participle may be used for relative time. In relation to the principal verb there may be suggested time. Thus ὁ εὐρών ἀπολέσει above implies that εὐρών is antecedent to ἀπολέσει which is future. In Ac. 24:11, ἀνέβην προσκυνήσων, the principal verb is past, but the participle is relatively future, though absolutely past. The relative time of the participle approximates the indicative mode and is able to suggest antecedent (aorist, present, perfect tenses), simultaneous (aorist, present tenses) and subsequent (present, future tenses) action. The tenses of the participle must be studied with this distinction in mind. But this notion of relative time “is deeply imbedded in the nature of the participle and the use is universal.”3 Certainly this notion of relative time is more obvious in the Greek participle than in the Latin or in the modern languages.4 In the chapter on Tense the participial tenses were treated with reasonable completeness, but

1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 522.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 126. He notes Heb. 10:14, τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους, as a good ex. of the timelessness of the part.
some further remarks are necessary at this point. A word needs to be said about the idiom οὗτος ἦν ὁ εἶπὼν (Jo. 1:15), οὗτος ἦν ὁ—καθῆμενος (Ac. 3:10), where the principal verb is thrown into the past.

[Page 1112] (β) The Aorist. The Aktionsart of the aorist participle is sufficiently illustrated in the discussion of the aorist tense. There is, of course, no reason for not having the constative, ingressive or effective aorist in the participle. Schaefer argues that in most cases the participle uses the effective aorist. That may be true, though there is nothing in the nature of the participle itself to cause it. Blass thinks that the aorist participle contains the idea of completion, but even so that notion may be merely constative or ingressive. Goodwin holds that the aorist participle generally represents the action as antecedent to the principal verb. Burton has it more nearly correct when he insists that the aorist participle conceives of the event indefinitely or simply. So Blass denies that the aorist tense implies antecedent action. It is usually assumed that the proper use of the aorist participle is antecedent action and that only certain verbs (as exceptions) may occasionally express simultaneous action. But this is a misapprehension of the real situation. It is doubtless true, as Burton notes, that the antecedent use furnishes the largest number of instances, but that fact does not prove priority or originality of conception. “The aorist participle of antecedent action does not denote antecedence; it is used of antecedent action, where antecedence is implied, not by the aorist tense as a tense, but in some other way.” Moulton is equally explicit: “The connotation of past time was 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 past time relative to that of the main verb.” It is probable that the original use of the aorist participle was that of simultaneous action. From this was developed quite naturally, by the nature of the various cases, the antecedent notion. Cf. νηστεύσας ἐπείνασεν (Mt. 4:2) where the fasting expressed by the participle is given as the reason for the hungering expressed by the principal verb. For further examples of antecedent action see Mt. 2:14; 2:16; 27:3; 2 Cor. 2:13. For the articular aorist see Mt. 10:39; Lu. 12:47; Jo. 5:15. While this came to be the more common idiom from the nature of the case, the original use of the aorist participle for simultaneous action continued. One has no ground for assuming that antecedent action is a necessary or an actual fact with the aorist participle. The aorist participle of simultaneous action is in perfect accord with the genius and history of the Greek participle. For numerous examples of both uses see the chapter on Tense. A good instance is seen in Mt. 27:4, ἓμαρτον παραδοὺς σήμα άθών. So also ὑπολαβόν ἐπεν (Lu. 10:30). See Ac. 2:23, τούτων προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε, where the slaying
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was manifestly done by the impaling on the cross. The two actions are identical *per se*. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 131) observes that when the verb precedes the aorist participle it is nearly always the participle of coincident action. He (*Prol.*, p. 132) cites O. P. 530 (ι᾽ι.Α.Δ.), ἔξ ὑν δόσεις—λυτρώσασα μου τὰ ἰμάτια. It so happens that the N. T. shows a great number of such examples. See Mk. 15:30 σῶσον καταβάς, (Lu. 2:16) ἰἳδαν σπεύσαντες, (Ac. 10:33) καλῶς ἔποιήσας παραγενόμενος. Cf. Mt. 26:75. In Ac. 10:29, ἰἳδον μεταπεμφθείς, the participle is antecedent in idea. Acts, however, is particularly rich in examples of the coincident aorist participle which follows the verb. See 10:39; 11:30; 13:33; 15:8, 9; 19:2; 23:22, 25, 30; 25:13; 26:10. It is in point of fact a characteristic of Luke’s style to use frequently the coincident participle (both aorist and present) placed after the principal verb. This fact completely takes away the point of Sir W. M. Ramsay’s argument for the aorist of subsequent action in Ac. 16:6, where, however, it is more probably antecedent action, as is possible in Ac. 23:22. The argument made against it under Tense need not be repeated here. Burton assents to the notion of the aorist of “subsequent” action in the participle, but no real parallels are given. I have examined in detail the N. T. examples adduced and shown the lack of conclusiveness about them all. See chapter on Tense. It is even claimed that subsequent action is shown by the participles (present as well as aorist) in Ac. 5:36; 6:11; 8:10, 18; 14:22; 17:26; 18:23; 28:14, but with no more evidence of reality. Actual examination of each passage shows the action to be either simultaneous or antecedent. See also Lu. 1:9, ἔλαχε τὸ ὅμισας εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν νοῦν, where it is obviously coincident. The same thing is true of Heb. 11:27, κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον, μὴ φοβηθείς. Cf. also Ac. 7:35 ὁ ἤνθησαντο [Page 1114] ἐπόντες, (13:22) εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας. A case like 1 Pet. 1:20 f. is not, of course, pertinent. However, the common use of the aorist participle in indirect discourse (as with all the supplementary participles) without any notion of time is to the point. So Ac. 9:12, εἶδεν ἄνδρα εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθυμία. So ἔθεψαν τὸν Σατανᾶν πεσόντα (Lu. 10:18). The action is purely punctiliar with no notion of time at all. It is true that the articular participle is occasionally used (see chapter on Tense) for time past to the time of the writer, but future to the time of the principal verb. As a matter of fact this aorist participle is timeless, as is shown by the use of ὁ παραδός in Mt. 10:4 and ὁ παραδίδος in 26:25. So ὁ εἴπων in Jo. 5:12; ὁ ποιήσας 5:15; ἡ ἔλειψα 11:2. It is the action alone that is under consideration, not the time of its performance. See, *per contra*, ὁ γνών—καὶ μὴ ἐτούμισας ἢ ποιήσας δαρήσει (Lu. 12:47) where the aorist participle gives the simple action with a future verb. Cf. Lu. 6:49 for the articular aorist part. with the present indicative. Burton feels the weakness of his contention for “subsequent” action in the aorist participle when he explains that it is “perhaps due to Aramaic influence.” There is no need for an appeal to that explanation, since the fact does not exist. It is only in the circumstantial participle that any contention is made for this notion. It is certainly gratuitous to find subsequent action in Ro. 4:19, μὴ ἄθεθησας τῇ πίστει κατενόησεν, not to mention 4:21; Ph. 2:7; Heb. 9:12. Burton reluctantly admits that, though in 1 Pet. 3:18 ἐφοσποθείς is “clearly subsequent to ἀπέθανεν,” yet it “is probably to be taken together with θανατωθείς as defining the whole of the preceding clause.” This latter view is, of course, true, since the order of
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the participles is θανατωθείς, ζωοποιθείς. The timelessness of the aorist participle is well shown in Jo. 16:2, ὁ ἀποκτείνας [ὑμᾶς] δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ. Cf. also ἄγαγόντα—τελειώσα (Heb. 2:10). This coincident use of the aorist participle is by no means so rare in the ancient Greek as is sometimes alleged. The action was specially likely to be coincident if the principal verb was also aorist. Like the other articular participles, the aorist participle may be the practical equivalent of the relative. So in Lu. 12:8 f. ὃς ἦν ὀμολογήσας and ὁ ἄρνησάμενος are used side by side.

[Page 1115] (γ) The Present. As the aorist participle is timeless and punctiliar, so the present participle is timeless and durative. The participle is thus, like the infinitive, ahead of the present indicative, which does not distinguish between punctiliar and durative action. A careful treatment of the force of the present participle has been given under Tense. The real timelessness of this participle is shown in the fact that it is used indiscriminately with past, present or future tenses of the indicative. So πωλοῦντες ἔφερον (Ac. 4:34); ὄποιοί ἕρμην ἐλέγχειν (Heb. 11:21); καὶ προτέρῳ ὑπὸ ἔμαθεν (Heb. 5:8); μεριμνῶν δύναται (Mt. 6:27); ἔστωσε λαλοῦντες (1 Cor. 14:9). The articular present especially shows the absence of time. So ὁ διδάκτος ὑμῶν προσανέθεντο (Gal. 2:6); προσεπίθηκα τοὺς σωζόμενος (Ac. 2:47); ὁ δεχόμενος ὡμᾶς ἔμε δέχεται (Mt. 10:40); ἔστωσε τὰ παρατίθεμενα (Lu. 10:8); ὁ βλέπον ἐν τῷ κρυφαίῳ ἀποδώσει (Mt. 6:18). There will be Aktionsart in this participle also. Some of these words are really punctiliar (δέχομαι, for instance). But, in general, the present participle gives linear action. The present participle may have relative time. This relative time is usually simultaneous or coincident. This is only natural. Sometimes, however, this relative time may be antecedent action, a classic idiom. Examples of this idiom were given under Tense, but add Jo. 9:8, οἱ θεωροῦντες το πρῶτον, where the adverb of time helps to throw the participle back of ἔλεγον, as ἄρτε with βλέπω makes the verb later than τυφλῶς ὢν in 9:25. Cf. also Gal. 1:23, ὁ διώκων ὡμᾶς ποτὲ νῦν εὑρεθηκές, where both participle and verb have adverbs of time by way of contrast. For other instances like these see Mt. 9:20=Mk. 5:25=Lu. 8:43; Jo. 5:5; Ac. 24:10; Eph. 2:13; Col. 1:21; 1 Tim. 1:13, etc. There are also undoubted instances of the present participle to express the notion of purpose, futuristic in conception, though present in form. Add to the instances already given the following: Mk. 3:31, ἡκὼ στῆκοντες ἀπέστειλαν καλοῦντες. Here the first participle is only noticeable as the usual linear action (with aorist indicative). The second participle, however, is practically purpose. ‘They sent to him calling him.’ ‘They sent to call him.’ So also Lu. 13:6 ἦλθεν ζητῶν, (13:7) ἔρχομαι ζητῶν. It is not strictly true that here the present participle means future or subsequent time. It is only that the purpose goes on coincident with the verb and beyond. This prospective present part. (cf. present ind.) appears in Ac. 21:3, ἦν ἄποφορτασμένον τὸν γύμον. ‘The ship was appointed to unload her cargo.’ Cf. Mt. 6:30; [Page 1116] 11:3; 26:28; Lu. 7:19; 1 Cor. 15:57; Jas. 5:1; Ac. 3:26. The future is “simulated” also by the present participle when it is used for conative action. It is, of course, not the participle that brings out this notion. See (Mt. 23:14) οὖν τοῦ ἐξηρακημένου ἄφιετε ἀπεστάλθην, (27:40) ὁ
καταλύων τὸν ναὸν, (Ac. 28:23) πείθων αὐτοῦς. The notion of repetition (iterative present) occurs also as in Ac. 2:47, προσέτιθει τοὺς σωζομένους, ‘kept adding those saved from time to time.’ So πολοῦντες ἔφερον καὶ ἔτίθησαν (Ac. 4:34). ‘They would from time to time sell and bring and place at the feet of the apostles.’ There is thus a sharp contrast from the specific instance of Barnabas, of whom it is said: πολήσας ἤγεγκεν (4:37). It is not clear, however, why the present participle occurs in 3:8, Εξαλλόμενος ἔστη καὶ περεπάτησε, unless it is to note that he kept on leaping and walking (alternately). Cf. this notion in verse 8, περιπατῶν καὶ ἀδλόμενος. Cf. also in 5:5, ἰδοὺν πεσόν ἔξευξεν, where πεσόν is antecedent to the verb, but ἰδούν is descriptive (linear). The notion of distribution is perhaps present in Heb. 10:14, τοὺς ἀγαζομένους, ‘the objects of sanctification.’ Certainly ὁ κλέπτουν is iterative in Eph. 4:28. Cf. Ac. 1:20; Col. 2:8. It is interesting to note the difference between the present and the aorist participle in Mt. 16:28, ἔως ὅ ἐνδου τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχομεν, and in Ac. 9:12, ἔδει τὸν ἄνδρα ἐπεκλάδοντα. The perfect participle of the same verb and in the same construction occurs in Mk. 9:1, ἔως ὅ ἐνδου τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθοῦσαν ἐν δυνάμει. The three tenses of the participle of πίπτω may also be illustrated by the periphrastic notion of the aorist in πεσόντα in Lu. 10:18, the durative notion of πιπτόντων in Mt. 15:27 and of πιπτοντες in Mk. 13:25, the perfect notion of πεπτωκότα in Rev. 9:1.

(δ) The Perfect. This tense brings little that is distinctive in the participle. Cf. τετελειωμένοι (Jo. 17:23), πεπρομένας (18:18), προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα (Ac. 18:2), κεκοπιακώς (Jo. 4:6), πεπτωκότα (Rev. 9:1), ἐληλυθότα (1 Jo. 4:2), ὁ εἰληφός (Mt. 25:24). The distinction between intensive and extensive was drawn under Tense. Some of the intensive uses have lost the notion of completion (punctiliar) and hold on to the linear alone in the present sense. Cf. ἔστως ἐμι (Ac. 25:10), εἰδὼς (Mt. 12:25) with which contrast ἐγνοκότες (2 Jo. 1), συνειδυίης (Ac. 5:2), τεθνηκός (Lu. 7:12), παρεστηκός (Jo. 18:22). The periphrastic use of the perfect participle in past, present and future time has been sufficiently illustrated already. So has the rare combination of perfect and present participle in Eph. 4:18; Col. 1:21. The perfect participle also is either articular or anarthrous, attributive or predicate. For the predicate use see in particular Lu. 13:6 συκῆν ἔδειξεν τις περιπετευμένην, (Heb. 5:14) τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνωμένα ἔχοντων. It needs to be noted again that the perfect participle has no time in itself. In the nature of the case the act will be antecedent except where the tense has lost its true force as in ἔστως, τεθρηκός, εἰδός. But it is only relative time, not absolute, and the leading verb may itself be punctular, linear or perfect, in the past, present or future. Just as the present participle may suggest antecedent action and so be a sort of “imperfect” participle (past time), so the perfect participle is sometimes used where a sort of past perfect sense results. The action was finished and is now no longer the fact, though the state represented by the perfect once existed. So ἐπὶ τῷ συμβεβηκότα αὐτῷ in Ac. 3:10. Cf. Mk. 5:15, θεωροῦσιν τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον καθήμενον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα, τὸν ἐσχῆκα τὸν λεγιῶνα, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. This is a most instructive passage. The historical present and the aorist indicative here occur side by side. The attributive and the predicate participles appear side by side. The present and the perfect participles come together.

2 Moulton, Prol., p. 127.
Of the two perfect participles, one, ἰματισμένον, is still true (punctiliar plus linear) and describes the man’s present state; the other, τὸν ἐσχηκότα, is no longer true and describes the state of the man before Jesus cast out the demon, which casting-out is itself in the past. This participle is therefore a sort of past perfect. Cf. also Jo. 8:31. Another striking example is Jo. 11:44, ἔξηλθεν ὁ τεθνηκός δεδεμένος. Here δεδεμένος is still true, though τεθνηκός is not. Lazarus had been dead, but is not now. We see the same situation in 1 Cor. 2:7, τὴν ἄποκρυμμένην. The wisdom of God is no longer hidden. The point is still clearer in Ro. 16:25 f., μοστηρίου χρόνος αἰώνιος σεσηκημένον φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν, where the long silence is now expressly said to be broken. Note the sharp contrast in the aorist participle with νῦν. This distinction between the perfect and aorist participle is often clearly drawn. See 2 Cor. 12:21 τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων, (1 Pet. 2:10) οἱ οὐκ ἠλεηθέντες; The same act may be looked at from either standpoint. One may not always care to add the linear aspect to the punctiliar. Cf. ὁ γεγενημένος καὶ ὁ γεγενηθείς in 1 Jo. 5:18, τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεηφώνα in Mk. 5:15 and ὁ δαμονισθεὶς in 5:18. (Page 1118) ὁ λαβὼν in Mt. 25:18 and ὁ ἐληφώς in 25:24. Cf. ἐγένον δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθότων ὑπὸ ἐμοῦ (Lu. 8:46) and ἐπίγενος τὴν ἔξαυτον δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν (Mk. 5:30). Adverbs of time may occur with the perfect as with other tenses of the participle. Cf. Jo. 19:33, ἦδη τεθνηκότα. There is a sort of harmony in ὁ ἔορακὼς μεμαρτήρηκεν (19:35). The difference between the perfect and present tenses after ἐδού is strikingly shown in Revelation. Cf. εἶδον τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων (6:9), ἄλλον ἀγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα (7:2), ἀστέρα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεπτωκότα (9:1). Cf. also Mk. 5:33, φοβηθέθησα καὶ τρέμουσα, εἰδῆ. One must not confuse the perf. part. in Gal. 2:11 and Rev. 21:8 with a present like ψηλαφομένῳ in Heb. 12:18 (‘touchable’).

(e) The Future. The future participle, like the future tense in general, was later in its development than the other tenses. It is usually punctiliar also and has something of a modal value (volitive, futuristic) like the subjunctive (aorist). 1 See discussion under Tense. The future participle is always subsequent in time to the principal verb (cf. the present participle by suggestion), not coincident and, of course, never antecedent. Hence the future participle comes nearer having a temporal notion than any of the tenses. But even so it is relative time, not absolute, and the future participle may occur with a principal verb in the past, present or future. This idiom grew out of the context and the voluntative notion of the future tense. 2 This point is well illustrated by the parallel use of μέλλων to express intention. Cf. ὁ παραδόσον αὐτὸν (Jo. 6:64) and ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι (12:4). As already shown, the future participle is much less frequent in the N. T. (as in LXX) than in the koine generally (as in the papyri). Another rival to the future participle is ἔρχομενος (Jo. 1:9), ὁ ἔρχόμενος (Lu. 7:19). Both μέλλων and ἔρχομαι (cf. εἴμι) are anticipatory presents. 3 Cf. ἐνεστώτα and μέλλοντα in Ro. 8:38. Nearly all the N. T. examples of the future participle (see chapter on Tense for discussion) are in Luke and Paul and Hebrews (the three best specimens of literary style in the N. T.). But see Mt. 27:49, σῶσον; Jo. 6:64, ὁ παραδόσον; 1 Pet. 3:13, ὁ κακώσον. For the Gospel of Luke see 22:49, τὸ ἐσόμενον. The rest of his examples are in the Acts, as 8:27, προσκυνήσον (20:22) τὸ

3 There is an expectant note in τὸ ἐκχωνόμενον (Mt. 26:28).
(c) Cases. There is no need to tarry here to prove the verbal force of the participle as to cases. Precisely the same cases occur with the participle as with the finite modes of the verb. Cf. ἔκβαλών πάντας (Mk. 5:40) and κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου (5:41). These illustrations illustrate the point and that is enough.

(d) The Supplementary Participle. The term supplementary or complementary is used to describe the participle that forms so close a connection with the principal verb that the idea of the speaker is incomplete without it. The participle does not differ in reality from the adjective in this respect, and it is still an adjective like πιστὸς μένει (2 Tim. 2:13). But it is the verbal aspect of the participle that is here accented. The participle fills out the verbal notion.

(a) The Periphrastic Construction. The general aspects of this idiom were treated in chapter on Tense (cf. also Conjugation of Verbs). It is only necessary here to stress the close connection between this participle and the principal verb as in ἐὰν ἔξον δαιμόνιον κωφόν (Lu. 11:14). In Ac. 19:36, δέον ἐστίν ὡμᾶς κατεσταλένους ὑπάρχειν, we have two examples of this idiom. Cf. Lu. 13:11. Sometimes we find the periphrastic participle alone without the copula as in ἔξον (Ac. 2:29), ἢδεον (1 Pet. 1:6). But note ἔξον ἦν (Mt. 12:4) and δέον ἐστίν (Ac. 19:36). So πρέπον ἐστίν (Mt. 3:15). Particularly interesting is ἐὰςν γεγονότες (Heb. 7:23). The periphrastic participle, as already noted, was far more common in the N. T. and the LXX than in the older Greek. But the reverse is true of certain verbs frequently so used in the Attic. Radermacher³ thinks that the commonness of the periphrastic participle in the N. T. is due to the rhetorical tendency. [Page 1120] This might apply to Hebrews, but surely not to the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Moulton (Prol., p. 226) admits that the Semitic sources of part of the Gospels and Acts account for the frequency of the periphrastic imperf. (cf. Aramaic). Certainly the LXX is far ahead of the classic Greek and of the κοινή in general. The papyri (Moulton, Prol., p. 226) show it often in fut. perfects and in past perfects. Schmid (Attic., III, p. 113 f.) finds it rare in literary κοινή save in fut. perfects. Moulton finds periphr. imperf. in Matthew 3 times, Mark 16, Luke 30, John 10, Acts (1–12) 17, Acts (13–28) 7, Paul 3. And even so some of these examples are more adjectival than periphrastic. Cf. Ph. 2:26. See p. 888.

1 Cf. Jebb in V. and D., p. 335.
3 N. T. Gk., p. 166.
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(β) A Diminution of the Complementary Participle. This decrease is due partly to the infinitive as with ἄρχομαι, δοκέω. See discussion in this chapter on Relation between the Inf. and the Participle. But it is due also to the disappearance of the personal construction and the growth of the impersonal with ὅτι or ἵνα. In Mk. 2:1, εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμι ὅτι ἡμερῶν ἡκούσθη ὅτι ἐν οἴκῳ ἔστιν, the personal construction is retained even with the circumstantial participle. Cf. also 2 Cor. 3:3, φανεροῦμεν ὅτι ἔσται ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ. But it is vanishing with the verbs where it was once so common. See under Infinitive, 5, (e), for further remarks.

Jannaris¹ has made a careful study of the facts in the later Greek. It may be noted that ὅχομαι does not occur at all in the N. T., though the LXX (and Apocrypha) has it 24 times, twice with the inf. It disappeared from the vernacular. As to τυγχάνω it occurred only once with the participle (2 Macc. 3:9). It has the inf. as well as ἵνα (νά) in the later Greek, though it is very abundant with the participle in the papyri.² Cf. τυγχάνει Νεῖλος ῥέον, P. B. M. 84 (ii/A.D.). But τυγχάνω φίλος without ὅν occurs also in the κοινή (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 169). Curiously enough λανθάνω appears once with the participle in the LXX (Tob. 12:13) as in the N. T. (Heb. 13:2). In the κοινή the inf. supplants the part. as it had already gained a foothold in the old Greek.³ Note also the adverb as in λάθρᾳ ἐκβάλλουσιν (Ac. 16:37). Φθάνω continued in use through the κοινή, but with the sense of ‘arrive,’ ‘reach,’ not the idiomatic one ‘arrive before.’ This latter notion appears in προφθάνω (cf. προλαμβάνω), which has it once only in the N. T. (Mt. 17:25), while the inf. is seen in προέλαβεν μουρίσαι (Mk. 14:8). As early as Thucydides the inf. is found with φθάνω, and see also 1 Ki. 12:18. It is common in the κοινή.⁴ The [Page 1121] tendency to reverse the construction by using one of these verbs in the participial form is seen in τυχόν (participial adverb) in 1 Cor. 16:6. It is possible that φαίνομαι still shows the participial construction in Mt. 6:16, 18, but not in Ro. 7:13, where the participle is circumstantial, not complementary. The impersonal construction gains¹ on the personal in the κοινή. In the N. T. we no longer have δήλος ἔλιμεν φανερός ἔλιμεν. But we do have εὐρέθη ἐκούσα in Mt. 1:18. Ἀρχόμαι has lost the part. in the N. T., but ὑπάρχω holds on to it, but not in the sense of ‘begin,’ rather of ‘existing.’ Cf. both adjective and part. in Jas. 2:15 and 1 Tim. 4:3. It tends to sink into the level of ἔλιμεν as an auxiliary verb with the periphrastic participle, as in Ac. 8:16; 19:36. The same thing is true of προφθάνας in Lu. 23:12, but not in Ac. 8:9 where μαγεύσων is circumstantial. We have seen that παύομαι is true to the part. (cf. Lu. 5:4; Ac. 5:42, etc.) and that the part. occurs also with ἐξερεύνασα (Jo. 8:7), τελέω (Mt. 11:1), and that διατελέω has the adj. without ὅν (Ac. 27:33). Cf. also διαλέιπον in Lu. 7:45. See also the part. with ἐγκακέω in Gal. 6:9; 2 Th. 3:13. The part. with κατερέω in Heb. 11:27 is circumstantial, as is that with ἀνέχομαι in 1 Cor. 4:12 and with κάμνω in Heb. 12:3. The doubtful participle with μανθάνω in 1 Tim. 5:13 has already been discussed (Relation between Inf. and Part., 3, (d)). Moulton² is positive that the absolute construction advocated by Weiss is intolerable and that we must either admit the supplementary participle here or

1 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 493.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 228.
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boldly insert εἶναι with Blass. Moulton\(^3\) is probably right in opposing the incorrectness of the part. with εὖ πράσσω in Ac. 15:29, ἐξ ὅν διατηροῦντες ἐαυτοῦς εὖ πράξετε. At bottom this is the same idiom as we have in 10:33, καλῶς ἐποίησες παραγενόμενος. Cf. also Ph. 4:14; 2 Pet. 1:19; 3 Jo. 6. Blass\(^4\) is right in including here τί ποιεῖτε λύσθης (Mt. 27:4).

Verbs of Emotion. As a matter of fact it is not beyond controversy that the part. with these verbs of emotion is the supplementary and not the circumstantial participle. At any rate the idiom comes to the border-line between the two constructions. I do not wish to labour the point and so treat the construction as complementary. The connection is not, however, so close with these verbs as is true of those in the two preceding lists. Indeed, the connection varies with different verbs and with the same verb in different contexts. It seems clear enough in Ac. 16:34, ἡγαλλίσατο πεπιστευκώς, and in 2 Pet. 2:10, οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες. The examples with φυγανακτέω (Mt. 21:15, etc.) and χαίρω (Mt. 2:10, etc.) all seem to be circumstantial.\(^1\) The same thing is true of λυπέω. The participle does not occur in the N. T. with αἰσχύνομαι. The step over to the circumstantial participle of manner or cause is not very far to take.\(^2\)

(δ) Indirect Discourse. This participle is clearly supplementary and in the N. T. is usually connected with the object of the principal verb. The nom.\(^3\) of the part. ἔχουσα appears with the passive εὑρέθη in Mt. 1:18 as noted above. The active in the N. T. would have had ὅτι and the ind., if the reference was to Mary. The classic Greek could have said εὑρεθέν ἔχουσα, but the N. T. Greek, εὑρεθέν ὅτι ἔχει. Cf. also εὑρεθεῖς ὅς ὅν θροπος in Ph. 2:8. But 1 Tim. 5:13 has to be noted. This subject was treated in detail under Indirect Discourse (see Modes). See that discussion for details about the different verbs, some of which, besides the participial construction, may instead use the inf. or ὅτι and the indicative. Here it is sufficient to give enough illustrations of this participle in indirect discourse with verbs of mental action to show the real complementary nature of the participle. The tense, of course, represents the tense of the direct. With most of these verbs (especially ὡς ἄνθρωποι, μανθάνω, ὁμολογέω) the participle is giving way to the inf. or ὅτι, but still the idiom is common enough to attract notice in all parts of the N. T. Cf. γείνωσκε σαυτὸν ἔξοντα, P. B. M. 356 (i/A.D.). It is common to explain this participle as the object of the principal verb after the analogy of the inf. in indirect discourse. So Jannaris\(^5\) calls it “the objective participle” and Burton\(^6\) “the substantive participle as object.” Blass\(^7\) more correctly perceives that it is the substantive or pronoun that is the object while the participle is a
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3 Ib., p. 228 f.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 245.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 245.
2 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 495.
3 Blass, ib., p. 247.
4 The pap. show the same tendency. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 229. See Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 169.
6 N. T. M. and T., p. 176.
7 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 246.
predicate adjective agreeing with this object. It is easy to see this point where no indirect discourse occurs, as in Heb. 7:24, ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἐμφάνισιν, where ἔχει does not mean to ‘opine’ and where the verbal adj. occurs. But see the participle in 5:14, τῶν τὰ ἀδιεσθητία γεγυμνασμένα ἔχοντων, or, still better, Lu. 14:18, ἔχει με παρητημένων, where ἔχει means ‘consider’ and we have the participle. [Page 1123] Cf. Mk. 3:1; Ac. 9:21, ἵνα διεξενίων αὐτούς ἁγάγῃ. See also 24:27. Then note Ph. 2:3, ἀλλήλους ἔργουμενοι ὑπερέχουντας. The addition of ὦ does not change the real construction as in τούς λογιζομένους ἡμᾶς ὦς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας, 2 Cor. 10:2; ὄς ἐξερρον ἠμέβοτε, 2 Th. 3:15. In principle it is the double accusative, too common with some verbs, only the second acc. is a predicate adj., not a substantive. Cf. Ro. 10:9 (margin of W. H.), ἐδὲν ὡμολογήσες κύριον Ἰησοῦν, and 2 Jo. 7, ὡμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἔρχομεν ἐν σαρκί. The presence or absence of the copula does not materially change the construction when an adj. or substantive is the second acc. Thus note 2 Cor. 8:22, ὅ ἐσκοιμαζόμεν πσώθοντα ὄντα, and Mk. 6:20, ἐστίν ἀυτῶν ἄνδρα δίκαιον. So we have no part. after ἐδον in Jo. 1:50; Mt. 25:37, 38, 39; Ac. 8:23; 17:16. Blass calls this an “ellipse” of the participle, an idiom common in classical Greek. It is hardly necessary to appeal to the “ellipse” to explain it. The predicate force of ὄντα comes out well in Ac. 8:23. If no substantive or adjective is used, the participle is itself the full predicate and represents the predicate of the direct discourse. Cf. Mk. 12:28 ἄκοινας αὐτῶν συνζητοῦντων, (Lu. 8:46) ἔγων δύναμιν ἔξελησθησθαι ἀπὸ ἐμοῦ. The point to note is that even here in indirect discourse, where the participle represents the verb of the direct, the participle is still an adjective though the verbal force has become prominent. The examples are too numerous to discuss in detail or even to quote in full. As representative examples see Mt. 16:28 after ἐδον (ἔρχομεν, but Mk. 9:1 has ἔλησθη), Mk. 5:30 after ἐπιγνώσκει, 7:30 after εὐρίσκο (cf. also Lu. 23:2), Lu. 10:18 after θεωρεῖ (cf. in particular Ac. 7:56), Jo. 1:38 after θεόμαι, 7:32 after ἀκούω, Ac. 19:35 after γινώσκω, 24:10 after ἐπίσταμαι, Heb. 2:9 after βλέπω, Heb. 13:23 after γινώσκω, 2 Cor. 8:22 after δοκιμάζω, Ph. 2:3 after ἥγεομαι, 2 Jo. 7 after ὡμολογέω. The punctiliar idea is present as in πεσόντα in Lu. 10:18, or the linear as in ἐγγίζουσαν (Heb. 10:25), or the perfected state as in πεπτωκότα (Rev. 9:1). Cf. also Ac. 2:11; 24:18; Mk. 9:38; 1 Jo. 4:2. Burton explains as “the substantive participle” (see 4, (d)) also Jo. 4:39, τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυροῦσις, and Heb. 8:9, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐξπλατομένου μου. The first example is really the attributive participle like τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (Mt. 21:4). The second example is more difficult, but it is a quotation from the LXX (Jer. 31:32) and is not therefore a model of Greek. The μου has to be taken with ἡμέρᾳ and the [Page 1124] participle would be a circumstantial temporal use. It is probably suggested by the original Hebrew, as Moulton (ProL., p. 47) admits. Cf. Barn. 2:28, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντευλαμένου σου αὐτῷ. Cf. ἔπι παροῦσιν ὑμᾶίν, B. G. U. 287 (A.D. 250). The reference of Burton to Josephus, Ant. 10, 4, 2, does not justify the interpretation which he gives.

(c) The Circumstantial Participle or Participial Clauses.

2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 246.
3 N. T. M. and T., p. 176.
(a) *The General Theory*. There is but one difference between the supplementary and the circumstantial participle. It lies in the fact that the circumstantial participle is an additional statement and does not form an essential part of the verbal notion of the principal verb. The circumstantial participle may be removed and the sentence will not bleed. It is still a true participle, predicate adjective as well as circumstantial addition to the verb. In point of agreement the circumstantial may be related to the subject of the principal verb or the object, or indeed any other substantive or pronoun in the sentence. It may have also an independent construction with a substantive or pronoun of its own (genitive or accusative absolute) or have no substantive or pronoun at all. Once again the participle may be so independent as to form a sentence of its own and not merely be a subordinate clause. See the section on The Independent Participle as a Sentence. Here we are dealing with the independent participle in a subordinate clause with various stages of independency from mere addition and agreement with a substantive or pronoun to complete isolation though still subordinate. Some of the grammars, Burton¹ for instance, call this the “adverbial” participle. There is a slight element of truth here, but only so far as there is a sort of parallel with the subordinate conjunctional clauses which are adverbial (cf. ὅτε, ἵνα, ὡς, etc.). But it is distinctly misleading to treat this participle as adverbial. In fact, there is a constant tendency to read into this circumstantial participle more than is there. In itself, it must be distinctly noted, the participle does not express time, manner, cause, purpose, condition or concession. These ideas are not² in the participle, but are merely suggested by the context, if at all, or occasionally by a particle like ἃμα, εὐθὺς, καίτερ, ποτέ, νῦν, ὡς. There is no necessity for one to use the circumstantial participle. If he wishes a more precise note of time, cause, condition, purpose, etc., the various subordinate clauses (and the infinitive) are at his command, besides the co-ordinate clauses. The vernacular increasingly [Page 1125] preferred the co-ordinate or the subordinate clause with conjunctions to the rather loose circumstantial participle.¹ We see the triumph of this analytic tendency in the modern Greek.² But it remains true that the participial clause was one of the great resources of the Greek language and in contrast the Latin seems very poor.³ The English comes next to the Greek in its rich use of the circumstantial participle. Moulton⁴ notes the failure of the English, even with the help of auxiliary verbs, to express the precise difference between λύσας and λελυκώς (Ὁ λαβὼν and Ὁ εἰληφὼς, for instance, in Mt. 25:18, 24). He rightly also calls attention to the weakness of the Greek because of its wealth of participles, since so much ambiguity is possible. Does a given circumstantial participle bear the notion of ‘because’ or ‘although’? Only the context can tell, and men do not always interpret the context correctly. One more remark is necessary. By means of the circumstantial participle the sentence may be lengthened indefinitely. Good illustrations of this freedom may be seen in the periodic structure in Thucydides, Isocrates, Lysias and Demosthenes. But the N. T. itself has examples of it as is seen in 2 Pet. 2:12–15, βλασφημοῦντες, ἀδικοῦμενοι, ἠγούμενοι, ἐντερφοῦντες.

¹ N. T. M. and T., pp. 169 ff.
² Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 247.
² Jebb, in V. and D., p. 333.
³ Moulton, Prol., p. 229.
(β) Varieties of the Circumstantial Participle. Here are treated only those examples which have syntactical agreement in case with some substantive or pronoun in the sentence. It may be repeated that this participle does not express the ideas called by the usual classification into participles of time, manner (means), cause, purpose, condition, concession. Hence it is proper to group the examples together. The classification is only justified by the context and occasional use of a particle. The same classification is possible also for the absolute use of the participial clause. The examples are too numerous for exhaustive treatment. A few must suffice.

Time. It is not the tense that is here under discussion, though naturally the different tenses will vary in the way that time is treated (antecedent, simultaneous, future), as already shown. The point more exactly is whether a given circumstantial participle occurs in a context where the temporal relation is the main one rather than that of cause, condition, purpose, etc. It is usually a mistake to try to reproduce such participles by the English ‘when,’ ‘after,’ etc., with the indicative. To do this exaggerates the nuance of time as Moulton1 observes. It is generally sufficient to preserve the English participle or to co-ordinate the clauses with ‘and.’ The slightness of the temporal idea is well seen in the pleonastic participles ἀναστάς (Mt. 26:62), ἀποκριθεὶς (Mt. 3:15, very common in the Synoptic Gospels. John usually has ἀπεκρίθη καὶ ἔπειν as in 1:49), ἀπελθὼν (Mt. 13:46), λαβὼν (13:31, cf. verse 33), παραλαβόντες (21:6). Here the notion is temporal, but very slightly so. Cf. also προσθε εἶπεν in Lu. 19:11. The use of ἐρχόμενος as a note of time is seen in Mt. 20:8 f.; Lu. 23:5; 24:47; Ac. 1:22. In Ac. 11:4, ἐρχόμενος Πέτρος ἔξετίθετο αὐτοῖς καθεξῆς, the part. is slightly pleonastic, but note contrast with καθεξῆς as with ἐξει τῶν πρῶτων in Mt. 20:8. Cf. ἐρχόμενος[ς] ἔρχομαι, P. Tb. 421 (iii/A.D.). Sometimes the temporal idea is much more prominent, as in διοδεύσαντες (Ac. 17:1), ἔλθον ἐκέινος ἔλεγξει τὸν κόσμον (Jo. 16:8). So also Mt. 6:17, σὺ δὲ νηστεύον ἀδειψήσαι. Here the descriptive force of the participle is distinctly temporal. In examples like Mk. 1:7 κύψας λύσαι τὸν ἰμάντα, Ac. 21:32 παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας κατέδρασεν ἐπʼ αὐτοῖς, there is precedence in order of time, but it is mere priority with no special accent on the temporal relation.3 Cf. Mt. 2:16; 13:2. In Ac. 24:25 f. we have some interesting examples of the participle. In διαλεγομένου αὐτοῦ we see the temporal notion of ‘while’ with the genitive absolute. In τοῦ μέλλοντος the temporal notion in this attributive part. is due to μέλλω. In γενόμενος it is mere antecedence with ἀπεκρίθη (almost simultaneous, in fact). In τῷ νῦν ἔχον the attributive participle again has the temporal idea due to the words themselves. In μεταλαβόν we have antecedence emphasized by καίρον. In ἣμα καὶ ἔπλεξαν we have the linear notion stressed by ἦμα. In πυκνότερον αὐτὸν μεταπεμφόμενος ὤμιλε αὐτῷ the note of repetition in πυκνότερον reappears in participle and verb. An interesting example is also seen in Heb. 11:32, ἐπιλείπεται με δηηγομένον ὃ χρόνος, where in a poetic way time is described as going off and leaving the writer discoursing about Gideon and the rest. In 1 Pet. 5:10, ὄλιγον παθόντας, the adverb of time makes it clear. The note of time may appear in any tense of the participle and with any tense in the principal verb. It is not
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5 Certainly we cannot admit the idea that the part. itself has different meanings. Cf. Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 158.
1 Prol., p. 230.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 249.
3 Ib., p. 248.
always easy to [Page 1127] discriminate between the temporal participle and that of attendant circumstance or manner. Moulton1 and Blass2 make no distinction. These two uses are the most frequent of all. A good example of this ambiguity occurs in Ac. 21:32, where παραλαβόν (cf. λαβόν in ancient Greek) may be regarded as merely the attendant circumstance. So also the notion of occasion wavers between time and cause. Cf. ἰκοόντες (Lu. 4:28). For ὦς with this participle see 1 Cor. 7:29 ff.

**Manner.** The ancient use of ἔξων in the sense of ‘with’ occurs in Mt. 15:30 ἔχοντες μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν χωλούς, Mk. 14:3 ἔχουσα ἀλήβαστρον μύρου, Ac. 21:23 εὑρήν ἔχοντες ἄν’ ἑαυτῶν. Cf. also φέρων in Jo. 19:39. In Jo. 18:3 we have λαβόν used in practically the same sense as μετά in Mt. 26:47. Cf. also λαβόν in Mt. 25:1. In Lu. 1:64, ἐλάλει εὐλογόν, the part. is one of manner, as in Mt. 19:22 ἀπήλθον λυπούμενος, (Mk. 1:22) ὃς ἔξουσίαν ἔχον, where ὦς makes the point plainer, (1:4) κηρύσσων, where the participle is not the periphrastic construction with ἔγνευτο, (1:5) ἔξωμολογούμενοι, (Ac. 3:5) ἐπέθεν αὐτοῖς προσδοκόν τι (a picturesque bit of description), (2 Th. 3:11) μηδέν ἔργαζομένους ὁλῶ περιεργαζόμενους (a real pun). It is hard to tell how to classify a participle like that in Gal. 6:3, μηδέν ὄν. It makes sense as temporal, causal or modal. But there is no doubt in a case like Lu. 19:48 ἐξεκρέμετο αὐτοῦ ἰκούσιν or Ac. 2:13 διαχειρίζοντες ἐλεγον or ὦς ὄχι ἄφα δέρων (1 Cor. 9:26). This notion of manner appears in the participles that have an adverbial notion like σπεύσας (Lu. 19:5 f.), ἐπιβαλὼν (Mk. 14:72), τυχόν (1 Cor. 16:6), βλέποντες (Mt. 13:14); προσθεῖς ἔπειν (Lu. 19:11). Cf. also ἄναβλέψας ἔπειν in verse 5. So also the pleonastic participles like ἐπακριθείς (see above) may be looked at either as temporal or modal or even adverbial. See further κρεμάσαντες (Ac. 5:30), σωματεύθησιν (9:22) as good examples of the modal participle. Burton1 makes a separate division for the participle “of attendant circumstance,” but this is not necessary and leads to overrefinement. These examples are either temporal as in ἐξελθόντες (Mk. 16:20), ἐκλεξαμένους (Ac. 15:22) or modal as δοξαζόμενος (Lu. 4:15), ἀναλαβόν (2 Tim. 4:11) or pleonastic as ἀπεκρίθησαν ἐγγοῦσα (Mt. 25:9). Blass’ term “conjunctive” (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 249) throws no particular light on the point. In 1 Tim. 1:13 ἄγνοον is manner. In Ac. 18:18, [Page 1128] κεράμομενος, we have in truth both the temporal and the modal. But it is easy to split hairs over the various circumstantial participles and to read into them much more than is there. Cf. 2 Cor. 4:1 f. See βαπτίζοντες and διδάσκοντες in Mt. 28:19 f. as modal participles. So ἁγνοῦν in 1 Tim. 1:13. Cf. κατὰ ἁγνοίαν in Ac. 3:17.

**Means.** It is usual1 to distinguish means from manner in the participle. There is a real point, but it is not always clear where manner shades off into means. But some instances are clear. Cf. Mt. 6:27, τίς μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθέναι: So also μαντευμένη in Ac. 16:16. Thus the maid furnished the revenue for her masters. In Heb. 2:10 ἁγαγόντα and 2:18 πειρασθείς we may also have instances of this notion,
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1 Prol., p. 230.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 248.
3 N. T. M. and T., p. 173. Cucuel and Riemann (Règles Fondamentales de la Synt. Grecque, 1888, p. 110) consider this notion an “exception,” but it is not necessary to do that.
1 Goodwin, M. and T., p. 333.
but the first may be temporal and the second causal. Jannaris\(^2\) blends the treatment of manner and means and notes how this participle disappears in the later Greek.

**Cause.** The ground of action in the principal verb may be suggested by the participle. Cf. δίκαιος ὡς καὶ µὴ ἥλιον αὐτῆν δειγματίσαι ἐβουλήθη, Mt. 1:19; ἡμαρτον παραδόσει ἀμα, 27:4; ἐκάμαι αὐτοῖς, Jo. 20:20. As a matter of fact this idiom is very frequent. Cf. further Mt. 2:3, 10; Jo. 4:45; 21:12; Ac. 4:21; 9:26; 24:22; εἰλός—ἐπάγοντας, Ro. 6:6; γνώσκοντες, and 9; εἰλότας; 2 Pet. 3:9; Col. 1:3 f.; 1 Tim. 4:8; Jas. 2:25. For ὡς with this participle see 1 Cor. 7:25, ὡς ἦλεμεν. In Ac. 24:22 εἰλός may be taken as ‘wishing to know,’ though Felix may also have actually had some knowledge of Christianity (cf. Paul’s appearance before Gallio). So also αἰλός (24:22) may mean ‘wishing to know.’ The N. T. no longer has ἄτε, ὅλον, ὅν with the part. as classic Greek did.\(^3\) In Jo. 5:44 a causal participle λαμβάνοντες is co-ordinate with ζητεῖτε.

**Purpose.** The use of the participle to express aim or design has already been discussed several times from different points of view (Tense, Final Clauses, Tense of the Participle). This fine classic idiom is nearly gone in the N. T. Purpose is expressed chiefly by ἵνα or the inf. For the future part. of purpose see Mt. 27:49; Ac. 8:27; 22:5; 24:11, 17. In Heb. 13:17, ὡς ἀποδόσοντες, there is as much cause as purpose. Blass\(^4\) wrongly accepts ἄπασασθεῖν in Ac. 25:13. The present part. is also used in the sense of purpose where the context makes it clear. So Ac. 3:26, ἀπέσταλεν αὐτὸν εὐλογοῦντα. Cf. Lu. 13:6 f.; Ac. 15:27; [Page 1129] Ro. 15:25. But it is not absent from the papyri. Cf. P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66), διακονοῦντα καὶ ποιοῦνσαι. So also the present part., P. Goodsp. 4 (ii/B.C.) ἀπεστάλκακαι—κοινολογησάντοι σοι. Moulton\(^3\) denies that the participle stands in the N. T. for a condition of the second class (unreal condition). In Lu. 19:23, κἂν ἐλθὼν σὺν τοῖς ἰν αὐτὸς ἐκπαίδευσα, the participle is part of the apodosis, while the condition is implied in the preceding question. Moulton\(^3\) rightly notes that one can no longer decide by the presence of µὴ with the participle that it is conditional or concessive, since µὴ has come in the κοινῆ to be the usual negative of participles. There is no instance of ἰν with the participle in the N. T., though Moulton (Prol., p. 167) quotes

\(^2\) Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 504.
\(^3\) Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 335.
\(^4\) Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 248.
\(^1\) Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 502.
\(^2\) Prol., p. 230.
\(^3\) Ib., p. 229.
one in a koivē inscr., I. M. A. iii., 174, δικαιότερον ὁν σωθέντα (in a despatch of Augustus). For ὡς ὁν see Particles with Participles.

Concession. This is also a frequent construction. Cf. Mt. 14:9, λυπηθείς. The context calls for the adversative idea in 7:11, πονηροὶ ὁντες. See further Mt. 26:60; 14:5; Mk. 4:31; Jo. 12:37; 21:11; Jas. 3:4; Ac. 13:28; Ro. 1:21, 32; 9:22; 1 Cor. 9:19; Jude 5. To avoid ambiguity the Greek often used particles to make the concessive idea plain, and this idiom survives in the N. T. Cf. καὶ γε—ὑπάρχοντα (Ac. 17:27), καὶ τοι γενηθέντων (Heb. 4:3), καὶπερ more frequently as in Ph. 3:4; Heb. 5:8; 7:5; 12:17; 2 Pet. 1:12. In Heb. 11:12 we also have καὶ ταῦτα νεκρωμένων. Καίσιμ occurs only with the finite verb as in Jo. 4:2.4 So καὶτοι in Ac. 14:17. It is worth while to note the survival of οὐ with καὶ γε in Ac. 17:27.5 Moulton (Prol., p. 231) admits Wellhausen’s (Einl., p. 22) claim that λαλεῖ βλασφημεῖ (Mk. 2:7) is an Aramaism for two Aramaic participles, “the second of which should appear as a participle” as in Lu. 22:65, βλασφημοῦντες ἐλεγον. But W. H. punctuate λαλεῖ βλασφημεῖ.

(g) The Absolute Participle in Subordinate Clauses. It is not strange that the participle should have been used in clauses that stand apart from the rest of the sentence. There it has its adjectival agreement. It is but a step further than the ordinary circumstantial participle which makes an additional statement. All the varieties of the circumstantial participle can appear in the absolute participle.

Nominative Absolute. It is possible thus to explain some examples of anacolutha in ancient Greek and the N. T., though Blass demurs. Cf. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ—ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ἱδεῖσον (Jo. 7:38); ἐμπνέωντες, ἐδε—φωνῇ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων (Ac. 19:34); ὁ νυκτὸς δόσω ἀνήπτυ (Rev. 3:21). Cf. also τῶν θελόντων and οἱ κατέσθοντες (Mk. 12:40). So Mk. 7:19; Rev. 2:26. At any rate it is the nominativa pendens, and there is not any special difference. In the modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 169) the nominative absolute with the participle occurs, though rare, and usually a conjunctional clause has supplanted the genitive absolute.

Accusative Absolute. This construction was used with impersonal verbs or phrases like ἰδέων, ἐξόν, παρόν, etc. It was probably an appositional addition to the sentence.3 It has nearly, if not quite, disappeared from the N. T. The adverb τοιχόν (1 Cor. 16:6) is really an instance of it, but not so ἐξόν in Ac. 2:29, where ἐστίν is probably to be supplied. Cf. ἐξὸν ὃν (Mt. 12:4) and δέον ἐστίν (Ac. 19:36). Cf. also οὐ συμφέρον μὲν in 2 Cor. 12:1. But a possible accusative absolute is γνώστην ὃντα (Ac. 26:3), though it is very rare to see the accusative absolute with a substantive of its own. In such instances it was usual to have also ὡς or ὃσπερ.5 The accusative is an old idiom,

4 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 248.
5 Moulton, Prol., p. 230.
1 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 259.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 251. He calls it “antiquated.” It was never very common.
3 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 524.
5 Thompson, Synt., p. 261.
appearing in the oldest Greek title known to us. But it came to be rather common in Thucydides. It was rare in the Attic orators. Luke avoids the accusative absolute in Ac. 23:30, by an awkward use of the genitive absolute, μηνυθείσης δὲ μοι ἐπιβουλής εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα ἔσεσθαι. The papyri use ἔξοντος rather than ἔξόν. We do not have the acc. absolute in Ph. 1:7, since ὑµᾶς ὄντας is a resumption (apposition) of ὑµᾶς before.

**Genitive Absolute.** It is by no means certain that the case is always genitive. Indeed, it is pretty clear that some of these examples are ablative. Probably some are real genitives of time. The Sanskrit uses chiefly the locative in these absolute constructions. It is possible that the Latin ablative absolute may sometimes be locative or instrumental. The use of the true genitive in the Greek idiom is probably to be attributed to expressions of time in the genitive case with which participles were used. Then the temporal circumstantial participle was right at hand. It is in Attic prose, particularly the orators, that we see the highest development of the idiom. The accusative absolute was just as idiomatic as this genitive-ablative construction, but it did not get the same hold on the language. See Cases for further remarks. The κοινή shows a rapid extension of the genitive absolute. “In the papyri it may often be seen forming a string of statements, without a finite verb for several lines.” In the N. T. different writers vary greatly, John’s Gospel, for instance, having it only one-fourth as often as the Acts. The most frequent use of the idiom is when the substantive (or pronoun) and the participle stand apart with no syntactical connection with any part of the sentence. Cf. Mk. 4:17, ἐπὶ γενοµένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγµοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται; Ac. 12:18, γενοµένης δὲ ἡµέρας ἢν τάραξος οὐκ ὀλίγος; Eph. 2:20; Mk. 8:1; 2 Pet. 3:11; Heb. 9:6–8, 15, 19. These are perfectly regular and normal examples. But sometimes the genitive absolute occurs where there is already a genitive in the sentence. So Mt. 6:3, σοῦ δὲ ποιοῦντος—ἡ ἀριστερὰ σου; Jo. 4:51; Ac. 17:16. In Mk. 14:3 we find a double gen. absolute ὄντος αὐτοῦ—κατακείµενον αὐτοῦ. Even in the classical Greek the genitive absolute is found when the participle could have agreed with some substantive or pronoun in the sentence. It was done apparently to make the participial clause more prominent. The papyri show illustrations of the same thing, as in B. U. 1040 (iii/A.D.) χάριν ὅτι μιαίνητα ἐποίησας, ἠµῶν µεταµελοµένου περὶ µηδενός. It is fairly common in the N. T. We have it even when the part. refers to the subject of the verb, as in Mt. 1:18, µητρείας τῆς µητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας—εὐρέθη ἔχουσα. In Ro. 9:1 the ---
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construction is regular, though μοι and μου occur. In Mt. 8:1 we find καταβάντος αὐτῶι—ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Cf. 5:1; 9:18; 17:22; 2 Cor. 4:18, etc. Likewise the genitive and the accusative come together as in Jo. 8:30, αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος— ἐπιστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν. Cf. also Mt. 18:25; Ac. 28:17. Quite unusual is Ac. 22:17 where we have μοι ὑποστρέφαντι, προσευχομένου μου and γενέσθαι με. The N. T. occasionally uses the participle alone in the genitive absolute according to the occasional classic usage.2 In the papyri it is more frequent than in the N. T.3 In particular note the common ἐξόντος, P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66). Cf. also δηλωθέντος, B. U. 970 (ii/a.d.). See Mt. 17:14, ἔλθόντων; 17:26, ἐπίντος; Ac. 21:31, ζητοῦντων. In Lu. 12:36, ἔλθόντος καὶ κρούσαντος ίπτός ἰππιστησαν αὐτῷ, we have the genitive participle although αὐτῷ is present. Cf. B. G. U. 423 (ii/a.d.) ὁντοσ κινδυνεύσαντος εἰς ἔσωσε, where με the object of ἔσωσε is not expressed.

(f) The Independent Participle in a Sentence. There is no doubt that the use of the absolute participle (nominative, accusative, genitive-ablative) is a sort of “implied predication.”4 It remains to be considered whether the participle ever forms an independent sentence. We have seen that the inf. is occasionally so used. It is but a step from the independent clause to the independent sentence. Did the participle take it? The nominative absolute as a sort of anacoluthon appears in the ancient Greek. Cf. Plato, Apol. 21 C, καὶ διαλεγόμενοι αὐτῷ, ἔδοξε μοι ὁ αὐτός αὐτός ἐστι σοφός. As the genitive-absolute, like other circumstantial participles, retreated before the conjunctival clauses, there was an increasing tendency to blur or neglect the grammatical case agreements in the use of the participles. The N. T., like the κοινή in general, shows more examples of the anacoluthic nominative participle than the older Greek.5 The mental strain of so many participles in rapid conversation or writing made anacolutha easy.6 “Hence even writers of systematic training could not but occasionally blunder in the use of the circumstantial participle.” Jannaris had thus concluded that the late Greek showed an independent use of the participle as anacoluthon.2 Blass3 would go no further than this. Viteau4 found abundant illustration of the independent use of the anacoluthic participle in the LXX. Viteau explains it as a Hebraism. But Moulton5 claims that the subject is removed from the realm of controversy by the proof from the papyri. Thum6 finds the idiom in classical Greek and in the κοινή (in the LXX, N. T., papyri, inscriptions, etc.). It is easy to be extreme on this point of dispute. In the chapter on Mode (the Imperative) adequate discussion appears concerning the participle as imperative. That discussion need not be repeated. It may be insisted, however, again that the participle in itself is never imperative nor indicative, though there seem to be examples in the N. T., as in the papyri, where, because of ellipsis or anacoluthon, the participle carries on the

3 Moulton, Prol., p. 74. This idiom is common in Xen. Roche, Beitr., p. 128.
5 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 259.
1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p 505.
2 Ib., pp. 500, 505.
3 Gr. of Gk. N. T., p. 283.
4 Le Verbe, pp. 200 ff.
5 Prol., pp. 180 ff., 222 ff.
6 Hellen., p. 131.
work of either the indicative or the imperative. In examples like 2 Cor. 1:3, εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός, either ἐστίν or ἔστω may be supplied with the verbal adjective. It must not be forgotten that this is the work of the interpreter to a large extent rather than of the grammarian. The manuscripts often vary in such examples and the editors differ in the punctuation. But the grammarian must admit the facts of usage. The papyri and the N. T. show that sometimes the participle was loosely used to carry on the verbal function in independent sentences. Cf. ἀποστυγντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἁγαθῷ (Ro. 12:9), for instance, where we have a complete sentence without connection with anything else. The preceding sentence is ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνοπόκριτος (an independent sentence itself) and it is followed by a series of independent participles (verses 10–13). In verse 14 we have abruptly εὐλογεῖτε—καὶ μὴ καταρσθε (imperatives) and then the absolute infinitive χαίρειν (imperatival also). The point seems to be incontrovertible. Cf. also Col. 3:16. It is only necessary to add a word about the independent participle in the midst of indicatives, since this use is far more frequent than the imperative idiom just noted. In general it may be said that no participle should be explained in this way that can properly be connected with a finite verb. In Ro. 12:6, ἐχοντες δέ, it is clear that we cannot carry on the participle as subordinate to ἐχομεν or ἐσμεν in the preceding verses. W. H. boldly start a new sentence. In either case, whether we have comma or period before, we must take ἐχοντες as imperatival or indicative, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, supply ἐσμεν or ὑμεν as ποιεῖτε is supplied in Ro. 13:11 with καὶ εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν. But other examples leave no such alternative. We may first summarize Moulton’s satisfactory exposition of the matter. There is a striking similarity between the third person plural indicative and the participle in the Indo-Germanic tongues (*bheronti, ferunt, φέρουσι, bairand, etc.). The frequent ellipsis of est in the Latin perfect and passive is to be noted also. The probability that the Latin second plural middle indicative is really a participle which has been incorporated into the verb inflection (cf. sequimini and ἐπόμενοι) is also suggestive. This fact may point to the prehistoric time when the Latin used the participle as indicative. The papyri re-enforce the argument strongly. We quote a bit from Moulton: “Tb. P. 14 (ii/B.C.), τῷ οὖν σημαινομένοι Ἦρῳ παρηγγελκότες ἔναι στόν, ‘I gave notice in person’ (no verb follows). Tb. P. 42 (ib.), ἥδικημενος (no verb follows). A. P. 78 (ii/A.D.), βίαν πάσχων ἴκαστοτε, etc. (no verb).” This may serve as a sample of many more like it. Moulton (Prol., p. 223) adds that use of the part. as ind. or imper. in the papyri is “not at all a mark of inferior education.” See 1 Pet. 2:12 where ἐχοντες does not agree with the παροίκους. We may now approach the passages in dispute between Winer and
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Moulton. Moulton passes by Winer’s suggestion that in 2 Cor. 4:13 ἔχοντες is to be taken with πιστεύομεν. This is probable, though awkward. So in 2 Pet. 2:1 the participles can be joined with παρεισάξουσιν. But in Ro. 5:11 it is, Moulton argues, somewhat forced to take οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἄλλα καὶ καυχόμενοι otherwise than as independent. If we once admit the fact of this idiom, as we have done, this is certainly the most natural way to take it here. Moulton is silent as to στελλόμενοι in 2 Cor. 8:20. Winer connects it with συνεπέψαμεν in verse 18 and he is supported by the punctuation of verse 19 as a parenthesis by W. H. But even so in verse 19 we have οὐ μόνον δὲ ἄλλα καὶ χειροτονηθεῖς (cf. Ro. 5:11) stranded with no verb. Moulton also passes by Heb. 6:8 and 2 Pet. 3:5. In Heb. 7:1 Moulton follows W. H. in reading ὅ (not [Page 1135] δ广泛) συναντήσας on the authority of C*LP against ABC2DEK 17. So he sees no necessity for taking ἐρμηνευόμενος as an indicative. In Heb. 8:10; 10:16, Moulton takes διδούς as parallel with ἐπιγράψω, whereas Winer would resolve ἐπιγράψω into a participle. Here Moulton is clearly right. In Ac. 24:5, ἐμφάνισέ μοι γάρ, we have anaclathon as both Winer and Moulton agree. Moulton adds: “Luke cruelly reports the orator verbatim.” Moulton omits to comment on Winer’s explanation of the parenthetical anaclathon in 2 Pet. 1:17, λαβὼν γάρ. It is a violent anaclathon and Winer does not mend it. Note 2 Cor. 5:6, θαρροῦντες, where after a parenthesis we have θαρροῦμεν δὲ (resumptive). But Moulton takes 2 Cor. 7:5 θλιβόμενοι as an example of the “indicative” participle. So does he explain Ro. 12:6 ἔχοντες, and ἔχων in Rev. 10:2. In Ac. 26:20 the MSS. vary between ἀπαγέγειλον and ἀπήγειλον. In Heb. 10:1 ἔχων will also be independent if δόναται be read. In Ph. 1:30 ἔχοντες has ὑμῖν above and halts in the case agreement. On the whole, therefore, we may conclude that, while every instance is to be examined on its merits, a number of real examples of the idiom may be admitted in the N. T. Viteau has entirely too large a list of such instances. Many of them admit a much simpler explanation as in Ph. 1:30 above. In Revelation, it is true, there is more than usual laxity in the agreement of the participle, especially when it is in apposition. There is also a change from nominative to accusative between ἰδοῦν and ἔδωκαν as in Rev. 4:1–5; 7:9; 14:1–3; 14:14, etc. But there are real examples in Rev., as καὶ ἔχων (1:16), λέγον (11:1). With all this development along a special line we must not forget that the participle is both adjective and verb. Blass has a careful discussion of “the free use of the participle.” In Col. 1:26 he notes that the participle ἀποκεκρυμμένον is continued by the indicative ἐφανερώθη. Cf. Jo. 5:44.

(g) Co-ordination between Participles. Blass uses the term “conjunctive” participle instead of a special use of the “circumstantial” participle. It is not a particularly happy phrase. But it does accent the notion that this participle, though an addition to the principal verb, is still joined to it in grammatical agreement. Blass shows clearly how identity of action may be expressed by two finite verbs, as well as by the pleonastic participle of identical action. Cf. Jo. 1:25 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔπαν (Mt. 15:23 ἠρώτησαν λέγοντες), 12:44 ἔκραξεν καὶ ἔπεν [Page 1136] (Mt. 8:29
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ἔκραξαν λέγοντες), 13:21 ἐμαρτύρησεν καὶ ἔπε (Ac. 13:22 ἔπεν μαρτυρίας), 18:25 ἤρνηστο καὶ ἔπε (Mt. 26:70 ἤρνηστο λέγον), where John prefers the particularity of the finite verb. But see also Lu. 6:48, ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἔβάθυνεν, ‘he dug and deepened’=‘he dug deep.’ Cf. Jo. 8:59. There remains the relation of participles to each other when a series of them comes together. There is no rule on this subject beyond what applies to other words. Two or more participles may be connected by καί as in Ac. 3:8, περιπατῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος καὶ αἰῶν τὸν θεόν. But we have asyndeton in Ac. 18:23, διερχόμενος τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, στηρίζων τοὺς μαθητάς. Cf. Lu. 6:38, μέτρον καλῶν πεπεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεχθυμόνεν δόσουσιν. Sometimes καί occurs only once as in Mk. 5:15, καθῆμεν ίματσιμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα. There may be a subtle reason for such a procedure as in Ac. 18:22, κατελθὼν εἰς Καίσαριαν, ὄναβάς καὶ ἀσπασάμενος, where the first participle stands apart in sense from the other two. Cf. also Mk. 5:32. In a list of participles one may be subordinate to the other as in Mk. 5:30, ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἔξω αὐτοῦ δύνασθαι ἔξελθον ἐπιστραφέας. This accumulation of participles is only occasional in the Synoptic Gospels (cf. Mt. 14:19; 27:48; and, in particular, Mk. 5:25–27), but very common in Acts and the Pauline Epistles. Blass concedes to Luke in Acts “a certain amount of stylistic refinement” in his use of a series of participles, while with Paul it is rather “a mere stringing together of words,” an overstatement as to Paul. Luke was not an artificial rhetorician nor was Paul a mere bungler. When Paul’s heart was all ablaze with passion, as in 2 Corinthians, he did pile up participles like boulders on the mountain-side, a sort of volcanic eruption. Cf. 2 Cor. 3:8–10; 6:9 ff.; 9:11 ff. But there is always a path through these participles. Paul would not let himself be caught in a net of mere grammatical niceties. If necessary, he broke the rule and went on (2 Cor. 8:20). But Moulton is right in saying that all this is “more a matter of style than of grammar.” It is rhetoric.

(h) Οὐ and μὴ with the Participle. It is worth noting that in Homer οὐ is the normal negative of the participle, μὴ occurring only once, Od. 4. 684, and in an optative sentence of wish. It cannot be claimed that in Homer μὴ has won its place with the participle. In modern Greek μὴ alone occurs with the present participle (Thumb, Handb., p. 200). It is generally said that [Page 1137] in classical Attic οὐ is always the negative of the participle unless condition or concession is implied when the negative is μὴ. But if one looks at all the facts up to 400 B.C. he will go slow before he asserts that μὴ is proof that the participle shows a conditional or concessive force. Jannaris claims the rule only for Attic, “though even here οὐ is not rarely replaced by μὴ,” that is to say, the rule does not apply even in Attic. The use of “replaced” is wholly gratuitous when it is admitted that the rule does not apply outside of Attic. It is so hard to be historical always even in an historical grammar. If one takes the long view, from Homer with its one use of μὴ to the modern Greek with nothing but μὴ, he sees a steady progress in the use of μὴ which gradually ousted οὐ
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altogether. The Attic marks one stage, the κοινή another. It is true that in the Attic there is a sort of correspondence between οὗ and the participle and the indicative with οὗ on the one hand, while, on the other, μὴ and the participle correspond to the subjunctive or the optative with μὴ. But οὗ occurred in Homer with the subj. and μὴ persisted with the indicative. The lines crossed and the development was not even, but on the whole μὴ gradually pushed οὗ aside from the participle. In the N. T., as in the κοινή generally, the development has gone quite beyond the Attic. In the Attic the use of οὗ was the more general, while in the κοινὴ the use of μὴ is normal. In the N. T. there is no need to explain μὴ with the participle. That is what you expect. Cf. Lu. 12:33 μὴ παλαιομένα, Jo. 5:23 ὁ μὴ τιμῶν, Ac. 17:6 μὴ εὐδρόντες, Heb. 11:13 μὴ κοιμασάμενοι. In the N. T. it is οὗ that calls for explanation, not μὴ. But it may be said at once that the N. T. is in thorough accord with the κοινὴ on this point. Even in a writer of the literary κοινὴ like Plutarch 3 one notes the inroads of μὴ. The papyri go further than Plutarch, but still have examples of οὗ, like οὗ κεκοιμημέναι P. Par. (B.C. 163), τὸν οὗκ ἐν λευκαῖς ἔσθησιν ἐν θεάτρῳ καθίσαντα O. P. 471 (ii/A.D.), οὐδέπω πεπληρωκότων O. P. 491 (ii/A.D.), οὐ δυνάμενος A. P. 78 (ii/A.D.). 4 Moulton 5 thinks that in many of these papyri examples there is “the lingering consciousness that the proper negative of a downright fact is οὗ.” In general it may be said of the κοινὴ that the presence of οὗ with the participle means that the negative is clear-cut and decisive. Cf. Mt. 22:11 οὗκ ἐνδεδομένον ἔνδυμα γάμου, (Lu. 6:42) οὗ βλέπων, (Jo. 10:12) ὁ μισθωτός καὶ οὗκ ἄνω ποιμήν, (Ac. 7:5) οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ τέκνου, (17:27) καὶ γε οὗ μικρὸν—ὑπάρχοντα, (26:22) οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων, (28:17) οὐδὲν ποιήσας, (1 Cor. 4:14) οὗκ ἔντρεψαν, (9:26) οὕς οὗκ ἄρα δέρα δέρων, (2 Cor. 4:8) ὠλ. οὗ στενοχωρούμενοι, (Ph. 3:3) καὶ οὗκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες, (Col. 2:19) καὶ οὗρ κρατῶν, (Heb. 11:1) πραγμάτων οὗ βλέπομένων, (11:35) οὗρ προσδεξάμενοι, (1 Pet. 1:8) οὗκ ἰδόντες, (2:10) οὗκ ἂλεψεμένοι. In all these we have no special departure from the Attic custom, save that in Ac. 17:27 the participle is concessive. But we have just seen that the Attic was not rigid about οὗ and μὴ with the participle. In two of the examples above οὗ and μὴ come close together and the contrast seems intentional. Thus in Mt. 22:11 we have οὗκ ἐνδεδομένον ἔνδυμα γάμου, while in verse 12 we read μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου. The first instance lays emphasis on the actual situation in the description (the plain fact) while the second instance is the hypothetical argument about it. In 1 Pet. 1:8 we read οὗκ ἰδόντες ἰδανάτε, εἰς ὅν ἄρτι μὴ ὀρθῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλάτε. Here οὗ harmonizes with the tense of ἰδόντες as an actual experience, while μὴ with ὀρθῶντες is in accord with the concessive idea in contrast with πιστεύοντες. Cf. Hort in loco who holds that the change of particles here is not capricious. “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 a reason.” 6 It may be admitted further that “in Luke, Paul and Hebrews we have also to reckon with the literary consciousness of an educated man, which left some of the old idioms even where μὴ had generally swept them away.” 7 See also τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα
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(Ro. 1:28) and Text. Rec. τὰ οὐ ἀνήκοντα (Eph. 5:4). Cf. μὴ and οὐ in Ac. 9:9. Blass³ notes that the Hebrew הָיָה is regularly translated in the LXX by οὐ without any regard to the Greek refinement of meaning between οὐ and μὴ with the participle. Hence in the N. T. quotations from the LXX this peculiarity is to be noted. Moulton⁴ observes also that, while this is true, the passages thus quoted happen to be instances where a single word is negated by οὐ. Cf. ῥο. 9:25 τὴν οὐκ ἦγαρσίμεν, (Gal. 4:27) ἦ οὐκ τίκτουσα, ἦ οὐκ ὄδινουσα. A case like Ac. 19:11, οὐ τὸς τυχόντας, is, of course, not pertinent. It is a "common vernacular phrase,"⁵ besides the fact that οὐ is not the [Page 1139] negative of the participle¹ any more than it is in Ac. 19:11; 28:21. Moulton² also rules out οὐκ ἔξον (2 Cor. 12:4) on the ground that it is the equivalent of the indicative. The copula is not expressed. But note οὐκ ἔξοντος, P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66). On this count the showing for οὐ with the participle is not very large in the N. T. Luke has οὐ five times with the participle (Lu. 6:42; Ac. 7:5; 17:27; 26:22; 28:17). Paul leads with a dozen or so (Ro. 9:25; Gal. 4:27 twice; 1 Cor. 4:14; 9:26; 2 Cor. 4:8, 9; Ph. 3:3; Col. 2:19; 1 Th. 2:4). Hebrews has two (11:1, 35) and Peter three (1 Pet. 1:8; 2:10; 2 Pet. 1:16, οὐ—ἄλλα). Matthew has only one (22:11), and note μὴ ἔξον in the next verse. The MSS. vary also between the negatives as in Mt. 22:11, where C¹D have μὴ which Blass³ adopts with his whimsical notions of textual criticism. At any rate Matthew, Luke (Gospel) and John use μὴ almost exclusively with the participle, while Mark, James, the Johannine Epistles and Revelation do not have οὐ at all with the participle. In Ro. 8:20, οὐχ ἔκοισα, the old participle is merely an adjective as in Heb. 9:11. In Ro. 9:25, τὸν οὐ λαὸν, the negative occurs with a substantive (quotation from LXX). The ancient Greek would usually have added ὄντα.

(i) Other Particles with the Participle. The ancient Greek⁵ had quite a list of adverbs (particles) that were used with the circumstantial participle on occasion to make clearer the precise relation of the participle to the principal verb or substantive. Some of these (like ἄτε, οἷον, οἷα) no longer occur with the part. in the N. T. But some remain in use. These particles, it should be noted, do not change the real force of the participle. They merely sharpen the outline. The simplest form of this usage is seen in the adverbs of time like τὸ πρῶτερον (Jo. 9:8); ποτὲ (Gal. 1:23. Cf. Eph. 2:13; Lu. 22:32); παντεύοντα (Ac. 24:26). In Mk. 9:20; Jo. 5:6 note other expressions of time. More idiomatic is the use of εὐθὺς as in εἴπερδεούσα εὐθὺς (Mk. 6:25). Cf. also ἤδη ὅψιας γενομένης (Mk. 15:42), ἔτι ὄν (2 Th. 2:5) and ἢρτι ἔλθόντος Τιμοθέου (1 Th. 3:6). Blass⁵ denies that ἢμα with the participle in the N. T. suggests simultaneousness or immediate sequence. He sees in ἢμα καὶ ἐλπίζον (Ac. 24:26) only 'withal in the expectation,' not 'at the same time hoping.' I question [Page 1140]
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the correctness of Blass’ interpretation on this point. Cf. also ἅμα ἄνεντες (27:40); προσευχόμενοι ἅμα καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν (Col 4:3), where it requires some overrefinement to refuse the classic idiom to Luke. Under the concessive participle we saw examples of καὶ γε (Ac. 17:27), καίτοι (Heb. 4:3), καίπερ (Heb. 5:8, etc.). There is also the use of ὅμως in the principal sentence to call attention to the concessive force of the participle (1 Cor. 14:7). So οὕτως points back to a participle of time or manner (Ac. 20:11). Worth noting, besides, is καὶ τοῦτο as in Ro. 13:11, though here a finite verb may be implied. So also καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρομένον (Heb. 11:12). There remain ὡς, ὡσεί, ὡσπέρ. The use of ὡσεί (Ro. 6:13) and of ὡσπέρ (Ac. 2:2) is limited to condition or comparison. It is only with ὡς that there is any freedom or abundance. Blass¹ notes the absence of the accusative absolute with ὡς in the N. T. and its absence from the future participle save in Heb. 13:17, where it is not strictly design. There is nothing specially significant in the phrase οὕς ὡς, ‘not as if,’ in Ac. 28:19; 2 Jo. 5. The N. T., like the classical Greek, uses ὡς without the participle in abbreviated expressions like ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ (Col. 3:23); ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ (Ro. 13:13); ὡς δὲ ἡμῶν (2 Th. 2:2), etc., where the participle is easily supplied from the context.² In some instances one must note whether the particle does not belong with the principal verb. But, common as ὡς is with the participle, it does not change the nature of the participle with which it occurs.³ The participle with ὡς may be causal, temporal, conditional, manner, etc. Then again ὡς may be used to express the notion of the speaker or writer as well as that of one who is reported. In truth, ὡς implies nothing in itself on that point. The context alone must determine it.⁴ The various uses of ὡς itself should be recalled. There may be nothing but comparison, as in ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων (Mk. 1:22); ὡς οὐκ ἔρπα ἔρεων (1 Cor. 9:26). So also Mk. 6:34; 2 Cor. 6:9 f.; 1 Pet. 2:13, 16. In Lu. 22:26 f. observe ὡς ὁ διακόνων. The causal idea is prominent in ὡς ἡλεψανός (1 Cor. 7:25). Cf. Heb. 12:27 and D in Ac. 20:13, ὡς μέλλουν. The concessive or conditional notion is dominant in 1 Cor. 7:29 f.; 2 Cor. 5:20, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δὲ ἡμῶν. So also in Ac. 3:12; 28:19; 2 Jo. 5. In Lu. 16:1, ὡς διασκορπίζων, the charge is given by Jesus as that of the slanderer (ἀδελφότηθ) and the context implies that it is untrue (only alleged).¹ Pilate makes a similar use of ὡς ἐποιεστρέφοντα τὸν λαὸν in Lu. 23:14. He declines by the use of ὡς to accept the correctness of the charge of the Sanhedrin against Jesus. For a similar use see ὡς μελλόντας (Ac. 23:15); ὡς μέλλουν (23:20); προφάσει ὡς μελλόντων (genitive absolute 27:30). But in 2 Cor. 5:20 (see above) Paul endorses the notion that he is an ambassador of God and ὡς is not to be interpreted as mere pretence. God is speaking through Paul. There is no instance of ἄν with the participle in the N. T. as appears in classic Greek. Winer² notes two instances of ὡς ἄν with the participle in the LXX (2 Macc. 1:11; 3 Macc. 4:1). To these Moulton³ adds another (2 Macc. 12:4) and a genitive absolute example in the papyri, Par. P. 26 (ii/b.c.), ὡς ἄν

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253.
2 Ib.
3 Führer, De Particulae ὡς cum Particiiis et Praepositionibus punctae Usu Thucyideo, 1889, p. 7.
6 W.-M., p. 378.
7 Prol., p. 167.
The word particle is a Latin diminutive, *particula* (cf. French *particule*) from *pars*. It is a small part of something. Longinus terms this part of speech παραθήκη with the notion that it was a word placed beside another. No portion of syntax is treated with so little satisfaction in the grammars. The grammarians are not agreed as to what parts of speech should be called “particles.” Riemann and Goelzer treat under this term (*Les Particules*) negative particles, particles of comparison and prepositions. Jannaris includes prepositions, conjunctions and negative particles. Kühner-Gerth here discuss conjunctions, prepositions and the modal adverbs, though they use the phrase “die sogenannten Partikeln.” Blass almost confines the discussion of particles to conjunctions. He makes the two terms equivalent: “Particles (Conjunctions).” Winer uses the word broadly to cover all adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. Monro limits the designation to certain conjunctions and adverbs “that are mainly used to show the relation between other words and between clauses.” But he does not treat all conjunctions (paratactic and hypotactic) nor all modal adverbs. He passes by prepositions. Brugmann sees clearly that, as there is no real distinction

---

4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253.
Riemann and Goelzer Riemann and Goelzer, Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin. I (1897), II (1901).
1 Synt., pp. 802–820.
3 II, pp. 113–347.
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Brugmann, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).
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between adverbs and prepositions, so there is no fast line (“keine feste Grenze”) between “particles” and other adverbs. All languages have a large group of words that pass over into the category of particles, but Brugmann cuts the Gordian knot by declaring that it is not a function of scientific grammar to delimit these words. That is a matter of subjective standpoint. He takes little interest in the various subdivisions of the particles, but he extends the term to its widest sense to [Page 1143] cover all modal adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. Brugmann notes that many of these particles go back to the Indo-Germanic time and hence their etymology is unknown. He treats the particles from the standpoint of their origin so far as known. Hartung\(^1\) takes a much narrower view of particles. He discusses the paratactic conjunctions and the intensive particles. He\(^2\) conceives that the greater portion of the particles have no meaning in themselves, but are merely modifications on other words or on whole sentences. This is not strictly correct. We are not always able to discover the original import of these words, but it is probable that they originally had a definite meaning. It is true that the particles are all subordinated to other words in various ways. In a broad way it may be stated that there are four classes of words (verbs, nouns, pronouns, particles) in the sentence. From this point of view the word particle covers all the adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections. But it is impossible, as Brugmann holds, to make a perfectly scientific treatment of the particles without much overlapping. The interjections in one sense do not belong to grammar. The negative and the interrogative particles cannot be properly treated under adverbs, though they are adverbs. So also conjunctions are adverbs, but a good deal more. Intensive particles again are adverbs, but more. It is not worth while to recount the story of the adverbs and the prepositions at this stage. They are particles, but they have received sufficient discussion in special chapters. In the same way the construction of hypotactic conjunctions came in for somewhat careful treatment in connection with subordinate sentences under Mode. Hence, hypotactic conjunctions do not here demand as much discussion as the paratactic conjunctions. One has to be, to a certain extent, arbitrary in this field, since the ground is so extensive and so much remains to be done. There is still need of a modern and exhaustive treatise on the Greek Particles. It was in 1769 that the Dutch scholar Hoogeveen\(^3\) wrote his book. He was followed by Hartung\(^4\). Klotz\(^5\) reworked the writings of Devarius. In [Page 1144] 1861 Bäumlein produced his Untersuchungen über griech. Partikeln. Paley\(^1\) has

\(^1\) Lehre von den Partikeln der griech. Spr., Tl. I, 1832; Tl. II, 1833.
\(^2\) Ib., Tl. I, p. 37. Schroeder (Über die formelle Untersch. der Redet., 1874, p. 35 f.) writes well on the obscurity of the origin of particles and the use of the term.
\(^3\) Doctrina Particularum Linguae Graecae. Ed. Secunda, 1806.
\(^4\) See above.
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Bäumlein, Untersuchungen über die griech. Modi und die Partikeln κέν und ὄν (1846).

———, Untersuch. über griech. Partikeln (1861).
carried the work on, as has Navarre. There are, to be sure, a great number of monographs on special groups or on single particles. "If any particular section of Greek grammar were taken as a specimen to illustrate the historical evolution of the Greek language, no better representative could be selected than the section of the particles." Jannaris speaks thus, not because the grammars have treated the particles with such skill, but because the particles best show the growth and decay of parallel words before other new synonyms that are constantly coming into existence. The particles come to a sharp point and gradually lose the edge and whittle down into platitudes. Then they give way to others with more freshness. In general, the particles mark the history of the effort to relate words with each other, clause with clause, sentence with sentence, paragraph with paragraph. They are the hinges of speech, the joints of language, or the delicate turns of expression, the nuances of thought that are often untranslatable. We must here confine our attention to Intensive Particles, Negative Particles, Interrogative Particles, Conjunctions and Interjections. This order is chosen for logical reasons simply, not because this was the order of development. That we do not know. The particles that are linked to single words logically come before conjunctions which have to do with clauses and sentences. Interjections stand apart and so are put last in the list. Some of the particles are employed with words, clauses and sentences (like ἀρα, δέ, οὖν), so that a strict division on this basis is not possible.

II. Intensive or Emphatic Particles (παραθήκαι ἐμφατικαί or παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι according to Dionysius Thrax).

1. LIMITATIONS. Here again there is no absolute agreement as to what particles are considered "emphatic" or "intensive." Winer, indeed, has no separate discussion of the intensive particles like γε, περ. He admits that, while the Greek of the N. T. uses adverbs well in an extensive sense, it is defective in the intensive use. Adverbs of...
place, time, manner, all come in abundance in the N. T. Thompson\(^7\) follows Winer in the absence of discussion of the intensive particles. The intensive particles, in [Page 1145] fact, as a rule receive poor handling in the grammars.\(^1\) But Paley\(^2\) properly sees that they are “an elaborately finished part of a most complex and beautiful machinery.” Poetry, especially tragic poetry, uses these emphatic particles more than other kinds of writing. In Homer “they sustain and articulate the pulses of emotion. By them alone we can perceive that Greek was the language of a witty, refined, intellectual, sensitive and passionate people. It would be impossible in any book to tabulate the delicate shades of meaning, the subtle, intricate touches of irony or pathos, the indescribable grace and power which the particles lend to many of the grandest passages in ancient literature.”\(^3\) It is only by a close study of the entire context that these can be felt. They can never be fully translated from one language to another. Thus it is impossible to reproduce in English the various shades of meaning of μὲν and δὲ when in contrast. “The attempt to translate a particle leads to curious results. Dr. Cyril Jackson used always to render Τρῶς ἄρα by ‘the Trojans, God help them,’ and a former head-master of Eton always distinguished between σοι, ‘Sir, to you’, and τοι, ‘at your service’” (Coleridge, Greek Classic Poets, p. 221).\(^4\) Indeed, it is not possible to put into mere written language all that the look, the gesture, the tone of voice, the emphasis of the accent carried when heard and seen. Cf. a Frenchman in conversation. The spoken vernacular thus has all the advantage of the written style. All the vernacular cannot be reproduced on the page. Cf. the charm of the actual speech of Jesus and Paul. The N. T. is in the vernacular κοινή, but even so it does not reproduce to any great extent the witchery of the old Greek particles. Time has worn them down very much. Still, we do find them here and there. There is a good example in Ph. 3:8, ἀλλὰ μὲν οὐν γε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι. So also εἰ πως ἡδη ποτέ (Ro. 1:10) and τί ἐπὶ καγώ ὠς (3:7). Cf. P. B. M. 42 (B.C. 168) οὐ μὴν ἄλλα ἔπει καί and O. P. 1164, 5 (vi/vii A.D.) οὐ μὴν δὲ ἄλλα καί. This shows that Paul at least knew how to indicate the finer shades of thought by means of the Greek particles. Blass\(^5\) notes that, in comparison with the Semitic languages, the N. T. seems to make excessive use of the particles, poor as the showing is in comparison with the classic period. “Modern Greek has lost the classical Greek wealth of connective and other particles which lend nicety and [Page 1146] precision of thought. Only καί (οὐτε, οὐδέ), ἢ and the less commonly used conjunctions ἄλλα, πλήν, ὡς have been retained. The loss of γάρ, ἄρα has been compensated by new formations; but the ancient Greek τέ, δέ, μὲν—δέ, μέντοι, μὴν, οὖν (γοῦν), ἔτι, δή, γέ, πέρ have left no successors” (Thumb, Handb., p. 259).

---

7 Synt. of Attic Gk.
2 Ib., p. ix.
4 Ib.
5 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 259.
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The papyri seem barren of intensive particles in comparison with the older Greek. Jannaris\(^1\) observes how these postpositive particles (γέ, δή, μέν, πέρ, τοί and their compounds) tend in the later Greek either to disappear or to become prepositive. The N. T. is in harmony with this result. The same thing occurs with ἃρα, which sometimes becomes prepositive, but that is not true of γάρ, δέ, οὖν. Dionysius Thrax\(^2\) has a very extensive list of “expletive particles” or παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι (εἰς ἒ ὀδέ: δή, ῥά, νῦ, πού, τοί, θῆν, ἃρ, ἃθη, πέρ, πώ, μήν, ἄν, ἄν, νῦ, οὖν, κέν, γέ, ἀλλά, μήν, τοίνυν, τοιγαροῦν). Some of these (like ἃρα, οὖν, ἀλλά, and one might add γάρ, δέ) are so prevailingly conjunctival that they are best treated under conjunctions. Others (like κέν, ῥά) belong to earlier stages of the language. The discussion of ἀν could have come here very well, since it is undoubtedly intensive whatever its actual meaning, whether it is blended with εἰ into ἐάν or used with ὃς, ὃς τις, ἵνα, ὁποῖς, ὠς, etc., or used with the verb itself in the apodosis of a condition. It is a modal adverb of emphasis (now definite as in Rev. 8:1, now indefinite as in Mt. 23:18). It is like a chameleon and gets its colour from its environment or from its varying moods. This fickleness of meaning is true of all the intensive particles. Indeed, Dionysius Thrax is rather slighting in his description of these words, ὃς τις παρόντες οὐδέν ὑφελεῖν δύναται ὡς μήν χρωσθέντες λυμαίνονται. He contradicts his disparagement by the use of μήν in this very sentence.

The adverbial nature of the intensive particles is well shown by the variety of usage of the modal adverb οὖτος. See Thayer’s Lexicon for the N. T. illustrations, which are very numerous (some 200). In Jo. 4:6, ἐκαθέζετο οὖτος ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ, we have a good example of the possibilities of οὖτος. The local adverb πού dwindles from ‘somewhere’ (Heb. 2:6) to ‘somewhat’ in Ro. 4:19. Cf. also δή ποῦ (‘surely’) in Heb. 2:16. Some of the temporal adverbs also at times approach the emphatic particles. Cf. τὸ λοιπὸν in Ph. 3:1; 4:8 (see Kennedy in loco) almost\(^3\)=οὖν. But in the

1 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 400.

THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).

———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).

Kennedy
N. T. ἄρτι and ἤδη are always strictly temporal. However, [Page 1147] ποτέ sometimes loses its notion of ‘once upon a time’ (Gal. 1:23) and fades into that of ‘ever’ as in 1 Cor. 9:7; Eph. 5:29. In ἤδη ποτέ (Ro. 1:10; Ph. 4:10) it is more the notion of culmination (‘now at last’) than of time. But in μή ποτέ the notion of time may be wholly gone before that of contingency (‘lest perchance’), as in Lu. 12:58. In the N. T. we find undoubted instances of the non-temporal use of νῦν and νυνί where the sense differs little from δὴ or οὖν. Some of the passages are in doubt. But the logical and emotional use, as distinct from the temporal, is clear in Jo. 15:22, 24 where νῦν δέ gives the contrast to the preceding conditions, ‘but as it is.’ Cf. also 1 Jo. 2:28, καὶ νῦν, τεκνία, where John’s emotional appeal is sharpened by the use of νῦν. Cf. likewise καὶ νῦν δεύρῳ in Ac. 7:34 (LXX). Cf. καὶ νῦν, B. U. 530 (i/A.D.). In general, the N. T. language, like the English, leaves most of the emotion and finer shades of thought to be brought out by the reader himself. “The historical books of the N. T., and especially their dialogues and discourses, are only fully and truly intelligible to us in reading them in high voice in the original Greek text, and in supplying the intonation, the gestures, the movement, that is to say, in reconstituting by the imagination the scene itself.”

2. THE N. T. ILLUSTRATIONS.

(a) Γέ. We may begin with γέ. The origin of γέ is by no means certain. In the Boeotian, Doric and Eleatic dialects it is γά. It seems to correspond2 to the k in the Gothic mi-k (German mi-ch). Cf. Greek ἑκ-γε. Brugmann sees also a kinship to the g in the Latin ne-g-otium, ne-g-legere, ne-g-are. Hartung3 connects it with the adverb

KENNEDY, H. A. A., Recent Research in the Language of the N. T. (The Expos. T., xii, 1901).
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3 So mod. Gk., Thumb, Handb., p. 184.
1 Viteau, Étude sur le grec, 1896, p. ii.
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ξα. It may also be the same word as the Vedic Sanskrit ġha, which is used in the same way.\(^4\) Cf. further qui in the Latin qui-ādem. It is not so common in the koine as in the classic Attic (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 29). Its function is to bring into prominence the particular word with which it occurs. It is enclitic and so postpositive. The feelings are sharply involved when γε is present. It suits the Greek,\(^5\) which "delights in pointed questions, irony and equivocal assent." But there is no English equivalent and it frequently cannot be translated at all. Hartung\(^6\) sees in γε a comparative element, while [Page 1148] καί is cumulative and arithmetical. As a matter of fact, γε brings to the fore the idea of the word with which it is used, but adds no distinctive notion of its own.\(^1\) Hübner\(^2\) calls it a concessive particle on a par with ὅμως. But that is not always true of γε. The distinction made by γε may be either the least important or the most important (Thayer). The resultant idea may be ‘at least,’ this much if no more, a concessive notion. We find this to be the significance of γε in Lu. 11:8, διά γε τὴν ὀναόδιαν αὐτοῦ. Here, however, the γε more properly belongs to ὀναόδιαν, since that is the point, not the preposition διά. The same slight variation from the classic idiom appears in 18:5, διά γε τὸ παρέχειν μοι κόσμον τὴν χήραν ταύτην. The concessive minimizing idea comes out clearly in Jo. 4:2, καίτοι γε Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῦ. See further ἃρα γε and καί γε in Ac. 17:27, and, in particular, ἀλλά γε ὑμῖν ἐλπὶ (1 Cor. 9:2) where again the ancient idiom would prefer ὑμῖν γε, ‘to you at least’ (if not to others). Once more note εἰ γε in Eph. 3:2; 4:21; Col. 1:23, and εἰ δέ μή γε in Mt. 6:1; 9:17, etc.

There is a keen touch of irony in Ro. 9:20, ὥσπερ ἐγερθείς, μενοῦνγε σὺ τίς εἰ. Cf. ἃραγε in Mt. 17:26. On the other hand γε means ‘this much,’ ‘as much as this,’ in other contexts. So in Lu. 24:21, ἀλλά γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις, where the ascensive force is accented by καί, σῶν and ἀλλά (affirmative here, not adversative), and the climax of the crescendo is reached in γε. The same climactic force of the particles occurs in Ph. 3:8, ἀλλά μὲν οὖν γε καὶ ἡγοοῦμαι πάντα ἥμισυν ἄναι. ‘I go,’ says Paul, ‘as far as to consider all things to be loss.’ Cf. ἃραγε in Mt. 7:20 and καί γε in Ac. 2:18 (Joel 3:2). So we have ἃρα γε in Ac. 8:30. A fine example is δὸ γε τῶν ἱδίων υἱῶν οὐκ ἑφεισάτο (Ro. 8:32). So 10:18. There is irony again in καί ἑφελὼν γε ἔρισασθάτο (1 Cor. 4:8), and note the position of γε apart from καί. In Homer γε is very common with the pronouns,\(^3\) but in the N. T. we have only δὸ γε (Ro. 8:32). We no more find ἐγώ γε, but ἐγὼ μεν (Mt. 3:11), ἐγώ—σὺ (3:14), ἐγώ δὲ (5:22), αὐτός ἐγώ (Ro. 9:3). Indeed all of the thirty examples of γε in the N. T. occur with conjunctions (paratactic or hypotactic) or other particles except those in Lu. 11:8; 18:5; Ro. 8:32. Cf. ἄμαρτια γε ἐστίν (‘indeed it is sin’) in Hermes, *Vis.*, i, 1.8. The particles with which γε is found in the N. T. are ἀλλά γε (Lu. 24:21); ἃρα γε (Mt. 7:20); ἃρα γε (Ac. 8:30); εἰ γε (Eph. 3:2); εἰ δέ μή γε (Mt. 6:1); [Page 1149] καί γε (Ac. 17:27); καίτοι γε (Jo. 4:2); μήτι γε (1 Cor. 6:3); ἑφελὼν γε (1 Cor. 4:8); μενοῦνγε (Ro. 9:20). Cf. διά γε in Lu. 11:8; 18:5.

---

4 K.-G., II, p. 171.
6 Partikellehre, I, p. 326.
1 Bäumlein, Griech. Partikeln, 1861, p. 54.
Hübner HÜBNER, E., Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die griech. Syntax (1883).
2 Grundr., p. 85. Cf. also Nagelsbach, Comm. de particulae γε usu Hom. 1830, p. 4.
3 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 258.
Γάρ is compounded of γέ and ἄρα, but it will be treated under conjunctions, though it is sometimes not much more than an intensive particle. Cf. τί γάρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν (Mt. 27:23).

(b) ∆ή. It has likewise an uncertain etymology. It appears in the Attic poets as δαί (cf. νή, ναί) and is seen in composition with δαί-τα, δή-που, ἐπειδή, ἦν-δή. In ἦν-δή we probably have ἦν and δή. It was originally temporal in idea and goes back to the Indo-Germanic period. Jannaris thinks that δέ and δή are one and the same word (cf. μέν and μήν) and holds that the difference is due to the transliteration from the old to the new alphabet when alone a distinction was made between ε and ε (η). Thus the spelling δή was confined to the intensive particle, while δέ was the form for the conjunction. It is certain that in Homer there is confusion between δέ and δή before vowels. In Homer also δή may begin a sentence, but in the N. T. as elsewhere all the examples are postpositive (but not enclitic). Blass does not treat it as an intensive particle, but as a consecutive particle. It is hard to follow Blass’ theory of the particles. Like the other intensive particles it has no English or German equivalent and is a hard word to translate. It is climacteric and indicates that the point is now at last clear and may be assumed as true. Cf. Latin jam nunc, vūn—δή (1 Jo. 4:3); ἦν ποτέ (Ro. 1:10). The similarity in sense between δή and one usage of δέ may be seen in Ac. 6:3, ἐπισκέψασθε δέ (δή), where W. H. put δή in the margin. Cf. καὶ ὅποι δέ in Lu. 1:76. Δή is not genuine in 2 Cor. 12:1. There are left only six N. T. illustrations, counting δή ποι in Heb. 2:16, οὗ γάρ δή ποι ὅγγελων ἐπιλαμβάνεται. In Mt. 13:23, ὃς δή καρποφορεῖ, it occurs in a relative sentence, ‘who is just the man who.’ The other examples are all with the hortatory subjunctive (Lu. 2:15; Ac. 15:36) or the imperative (Ac. 13:2; 1 Cor. 6:20) in accord with the classical idiom. There is a note of urgency in ἀφορίσατε δή (Ac. 13:2) and δοξάσατε δή (1 Cor. 6:20). The passage with δή ποτε in Jo. 5:4 has disappeared from the critical text.

[Page 1150] (c) Ἔι μήν, νῆ and vai. Somewhat akin to the positive note in δή is the use of ἦ μήν which is read by many MSS. in Heb. 6:14. The etymology of this adverb is again quite uncertain, though it is possible that it may have the same root as ἦ (ἡ, ἤ, ἠ). In ἠκέρ (Jo. 12:43) and ἠτοι (Ro. 6:16) we have the comparative or disjunctive ἦ. In Homer it was often used in connection with other particles. We may pass μήν for the present. If ἦ were genuine in Hebrews the usage would be in strict accord with classic construction for a strong asseveration. But certainly ἐι μήν is the true text. This queer idiom appears a few times in the LXX (Ezek. 33:27; 34:8; 38:19, etc.). It occurs also in the papyri and the inscriptions after

1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 547.
2 Ib.; Prellwitz, Et. Wörterbuch, p. 73.
3 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 256.
5 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 256.
6 Gr. of N. T. Gr., p. 273 f.
7 Klotz ad Devar., II, p. 392.
8 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gr., p. 274.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 46.
iii/B.C. Cf. εἰ ἡμήν, P. Oxy. 255 (A.D. 48). So that it is mere itacism between Ἡ and εἰ. The Doric has εἰ for Ἡ where Moulton⁴ holds against Hort⁵ that the distinction is strictly orthographical. See further chapter VI, Orthography and Phonetics, II, (c). So then εἰ ἡμήν has to be admitted in the κοινή as an asseverative particle. It is thus another form of Ἡ ἡμήν. Jannaris⁶ gives a special section to the “asseverative particles” νή and µά. We do not have µά in the N. T. and νή only once in 1 Cor. 15:31, καθ ἡµέραν ἄποθετός τιν τῇ ὑµετέρων καύχησιν. Νή is a peculiarity of the Attic dialect and is used in solemn asseverations (oaths, etc.) and means ‘truly,’ ‘yes.’ It is probably the same word as ναὶ, the affirmative adverb which occurs over thirty times in the N. T. Ναί may be simply ‘yes,’ as in Mt. 13:51. It may introduce a clause as ‘yea’ or ‘verily,’ as in Mt. 11:9. It is used in respectful address, Ναί, Κύριε (Jo. 11:27). It may be used as a substantive (like any adverb) with the article (2 Cor. 1:17) or without the article (Mt. 5:37), where it is repeated. It occurs with άµήν in Rev. 1:7. It stands in contrast with οὐ in Mt. 5:37 and 2 Cor. 1:17. There was an old form ναὔ-χι
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(d) Μέν. We know a little more about μέν, which is postpositive, but not enclitic. It is only another form of μήν which occurs in the N. T. only in Heb. 6:14. The Doric and Lesbian use μάν and the Thessalian μᾶ—δῆ. So then it seems probable that μάν [Page 1151] (μᾶ used with words of swearing after a negative), μήν and μέν are one and the same word. Indeed, in Homer¹ all three forms occur in the same sense. That original sense is affirmative, meaning 'surely,' 'indeed,' 'in truth.' It is overrefinement to find in μέν (μήν) the subjective confirmation and in δῆ the objective attestation.² It is probable that in the change from the old alphabet to the new the transcribers adopted the two ways of spelling, common in Attic and Ionic (μέν and μήν) with a notion that μήν was merely emphatic with single words, while μέν was correlative (forwards or backwards) or antithetical.³ Questions of metre may also have entered into the matter. But there is no doubt at all that in itself μέν does not mean or imply antithesis. The original use was simply emphatic confirmation of single words, usually the weightiest word in the sentence. This use was gradually left more and more to μήν and other particles, but it is not anacoluthic, as Winer⁴ holds, for μέν to occur without the presence of δῆ or ἄλλα. The older language is naturally richer in this original idiom with μέν, but it survives in the N. T. and is not to be regarded as unclassical or uncouth. For an example in the papyri see B. U. 423 (ii/AD.), πρὸ μέν πάντων. The old idiom survived best in the vernacular and in poetry, while the literary prose was more careful to use the antithetical or resumptive μέν. This μέν solitarium, as the books call it, may have a concessive or restrictive force.⁵ Cf. εἰ μέν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος (2 Cor. 11:4), where there is no thought of δῆ or ἄλλα. It is seen also rather often in the Acts. Cf. 1:18 οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτῆσατο χωρίον, (3:13) ὴν ὡμείξει μὲν παρεδώκατε (cf. ὡμείξις δὲ in next verse which is copulative, not adversative), (3:21) ὴν δὲ ὑπάνθον μὲν δὲξασθαι, (3:22) Μουσῆς μὲν εἴπεν, (17:12) πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν ἔξο αὐτῶν ἐπίστευσαν, (21:39) ἐγὼ δὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος μὲν εἴμη, (23:18) ὢ μὲν οὖν παραλαβὸν (cf. also 23:31), (27:21) ἔδει μὲν, (28:22) περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς αἵρεσεως ταῦταις, and the instances of οἷ μὲν οὖν like Acts 1:6; 2:41; 5:41; 8:25, where no contrast is intended. See εἰ μὲν οὖν in Heb. 7:11; ἢ μὲν εὔδοκια in Ro. 10:1; ἢ φῦν ὡς μὲν οὖν εἶμη ἐγὼ in 11:13. Cf. 2 Cor. 12:12; 1 Th. 2:18, ἐγὼ μὲν. Cf. also the single instance of μενοῦ as one word (Lu. 11:28) which is obviously without contrast. The same thing is true of μενοῦγε (Ro. 9:20; 10:18; Ph. 3:8) however it is printed. The main word is sharpened to a fine point and there is a hint of contrast in Ph. 3:8. Indeed, most [Page 1152] of the instances of μέν οὖν in the N. T. are resumptive, not correlative or antithetical.⁶ There remain the instances where μέν

---

7 Griech. Gr., p. 544.
8 Ib.
1 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 251.
4 W.-Th., p. 575.
6 Hartung, Partikellehre, II, p. 404.

(cf. οὖ-χ’). But we do not know the etymology, though Brugmann⁷ compares it with the Latin ἡ and nē and possibly also with the old Indo-Germanic ὡ and ἂ (‘so—so’).
imply contrast. It is just a step in advance of the original idiom. Cf. Mt. 8:21, ἐπιτέρειν μοι πρῶτον ὑπελθέν, where there is nothing to correspond to πρῶτον. The ἔπειτα is involved in what precedes. So with πρῶτον and τε—καί in Ro. 1:16 and πρῶτον—καί in 2 Cor. 8:5. The καί does not answer to the πρῶτον. Just so we have τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον in Ac. 1:1 without a δεύτερον δέ, though the clear implication is that the Acts is the second book. In 1 Cor. 11:18, πρῶτον μὲν γάρ, the contrast is implied in verses 20 ff., but in Ro. 1:8, πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ, there is no hint of other grounds of thanksgiving. This instance may be a change of thought on Paul’s part (anacoluthon), or it may be the original use of μὲν, meaning ‘first of all in truth.’ Cf. πρῶτον μὲν in Ro. 3:2. In Ro. 7:12, ὁ μὲν νόμος, there is no contrast stated, but in verse 14 it is given by δέ, yet without μὲν. In Col. 2:23, ἔτινα ἔτινα λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας, the antithesis is really stated in οὐκ ἐν τμῆ, κτλ., without an adversative particle. In 1 Cor. 5:3 the μὲν stands alone, while οπῶν and παρὼν are contrasted by δέ. In Heb. 12:9 there is contrast between the μὲν clause and the next, which has no particle (only πολὺ μᾶλλον). In Ac. 26:4, 6, μὲν is followed by καί υἱν by way of contrast and by τα υἱν in 17:30. Cf. μὲν—καί in 1 Th. 2:18, μὲν—τε in Ac. 27:21, where there is practically no contrast. But see δ μὲν—καί ἔτερον in Lu. 8:5 ff., δ μὲν—καί ὢν ἐκ πόλεως in Mk. 4:4 ff. We have μὲν—ἔπειτα in Jo. 11:6; Jas. 3:17; 1 Cor. 12:28. These are all efforts to express antithesis. We see this also in μὲν—πλήν in Lu. 22:22 and in μὲν—μᾶλλα in Ac. 4:16; Ro. 14:20; 1 Cor. 14:17. In Mk. 9:12 f. ὢν μᾶλλα is independent of the μὲν. But it is the μὲν—δέ construction that is the most frequent in the N. T. as in the Attic Greek. There are two and a half pages of examples of μὲν in its various uses in the N. T. given in Moulton and Geden’s Concordance, but even so the particle has made a distinct retreat since the Attic period. It is wholly absent from 2 Peter, 1, 2 and 3 John, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, Titus (critical text) and Revelation. It occurs thrice in Jude, only once in Eph. (4:11), Col. (2:23), 1 Th. (2:18), Jas. (3:17). It is most frequent in Matthew, Acts, Romans, 1 Corinthians and Hebrews. Paley1 thinks that μὲν and δέ may contain the roots of one (μία) and two (δύο). But certainly the correlative antithesis is not necessary to either of them, with δέ there is the notion of addition. Cf. in this connection μὲν—καί (Mk. 4:4; Lu. 8:5) and τοῦτο μὲν (Jo. 11:6). There are varying degrees of contrast where μὲν and δέ occur together. There may be no emphasis on the μὲν and very little on the δέ, which is not essentially adversative. The μὲν may preserve almost its original idiom while δέ has slight contrast. So Lu. 11:48, ὃς μάρτυρες ἔστε καὶ συνενδοκέετε τοὺς ἔργον τῶν πατέρων, ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἄπεκτειναν αὐτοὺς ὑμεῖς δέ οἰκοδομεῖτε. The whole sentence is quoted to show that it is agreement (correspondence), not opposition, that is here accented. In verse 47 we have δέ, but not μὲν, which is hardly felt in 48. See also Ac. 13:36 ff.; Ph. 3:1; Heb. 7:8. In particular we note this slight contrast when a whole is distributed into its parts as in Mt. 25:14 ff.; 1 Cor. 9:25. Cf. also Ac. 18:14 f. But the distribution may amount to sharp division, as in 1 Cor. 1:12, Ἔγώ μὲν εἰμί Παῦλος, Ἔγώ δέ Ἀπολλών, Ἔγώ δέ

2 Cf. W.-Th., p. 576.
3 But Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 267) takes it to be ‘from the very outset’ and so the original use of μὲν.
4 Ib., p. 266.

Moulton Moulton, W. F., and Geden, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).
1 The Gk. Particles, p. 34.
It is thus the context that decides how pointed is the contrast. It is not the words μὲν and δὲ that inherently mean opposition. Indeed, the contrast may be indicated by δὲ alone as in Mt. 5:22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44; 25:46; Ac. 12:9; Heb. 2:8; 4:13; 6:12. We see a good illustration of clear antithesis in John’s words about his baptism and that of Christ in Mt. 3:11, ἕγὼ μὲν—ὁ δὲ. See further 20:23; 22:8; 23:28; 25:33, καὶ στήσει τὰ μὲν προβάτα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ δὲ ἑρίφα ἐξ εὐωνύμων. The examples are numerous. See οἱ μὲν—οἱ δὲ (Ph. 1:16 ff.); οὐς μὲν—οὐς δὲ (Jude 22); τινὲς μὲν—τινὲς δὲ (Ph. 1:15); ἐς μὲν—ἐς δὲ (Heb. 9:6 f.); οἱ μὲν—ἄλλοι δὲ (Mt. 16:14); ἄλλη μὲν—ἄλλη δὲ (1 Cor. 15:39); τοῦτο μὲν—τοῦτο δὲ (Heb. 10:33); πρῶτον μὲν—ἐπείτα δὲ (Heb. 7:2); ἐι μὲν οὖν—ἐὶ δὲ (Ac. 19:38 f.); οἱ μὲν—ύν δὲ (Heb. 11:15 f.), etc. These examples fairly exhibit the N. T. usage of μὲν. It is often a matter of one’s mood how much emphasis to put on μὲν and δὲ, as in Mt. 9:37 and Mk. 14:38. In μὲντοι there is always strong contrast. As examples of μὲν—ἄλλα in sharp contrast see Ro. 14:20; 1 Cor. 14:17. So also μὲν—πληθ (Lu. 22:22).

(e) Πέρ. It is probably a shortened form of περὶ (cf. perfect) or πέρι more exactly. It is both postpositive and enclitic and is usually in the N. T. printed as a part of the word with which it [Page 1154] occurs. But in Homer this is not true, while πέρ follows καὶ only once. There is no doubt about the etymology of this particle. Some even connect it directly with πέραν or πέρα. Cf. περατέρω (critical text in Ac. 19:39). But this idea does not conflict with the other, for πέρι is the locative of πέρα. It is an Indo-Germanic root, and the original notion of πέρι occurs in περ-πίμπλημι, περι-πληθής, πυ-περ, περ-μανερ, περ-τιναξ, σε-περ, etc. It means then to do a thing to the limit (beyond), thoroughly. There is a note of urgency in πέρ. It is intensive as γε, but probably tends to be more extensive also. Sometimes the emphasis in πέρ is in spite of opposition as as καίπερ which occurs six times in the N. T. (Ph. 3:4; Heb. 5:8; 7:5; 12:17; 2 Pet. 1:12), and always with participles, as καίπερ ὄν νόμις (Heb. 5:8). The Textus Receptus has ὄνπερ in Mk. 15:6, but W. H. read only ὄν, but ὄνπερ appears twice as an inferential conjunction (1 Cor. 8:13; 10:14). See ὄνπερ, O. P. 1125, 6 (iii/A.D.). The other examples are all with conjunctions, as ἐκ ὄνπερ (Heb. 3:14; 6:3); ἐπὶ περ(α) (a half-dozen times, all in Paul, as Ro. 8:9; 1 Cor. 15:15; ἐπιπερ (some MSS. in Ro. 3:30, but the best MSS., as W. H. give, have ἐπιπερ); ἐπιείδηπερ (only Lu. 1:1); ἔπερ (only the critical text in Jo. 12:43); καθόπερ (some 17 times, all in Paul save Heb. 4:2), καθόπερ (Heb. 5:4 and a varia lectio in 2 Cor. 3:18), ὄνπερ (some 36 times, chiefly in Matthew, Luke and Paul, as Mt. 6:2), ὄνπερ (once only, 1 Cor. 15:8).

(f) Τοĩ does not occur alone in the N. T., but only in composition. It is enclitic as in ἵνα, καίτοι, μέντοι, but it comes first in τοιγαροῦν and τοιγαρο. The etymology is not certain. Brugmann takes it to be a fixed form of the ethical dative σοῦ (τοὶ).
Others\textsuperscript{7} take it as the locative of the demonstrative τό. Kühner-Gerth\textsuperscript{8} consider it the locative of the indefinite ἓ. There seems no way of telling for certain. But it seems to have the notion of restriction and in Homer\textsuperscript{9} is often combined with adversative particles. In the N. T. we find ἦτοι once (Ro. 6:16), καίτοι twice (Ac. 14:17; Heb. 4:3), καίτοιγε once (Jo. 4:2), μέντοι eight times, five in John’s Gospel as Jo. 4:27 and once in Paul (2 Tim. 2:19), τοιαύταν twice (1 Th. 4:8; Heb. 12:1), τοῖν three times (Lu. 20:25; 1 Cor. 9:26; Heb. 13:13). Ὄμοιος is an adversative particle [Page 1155] that occurs three times in the N. T. (Jo. 12:42, here with μέντοι; 1 Cor. 14:7; Gal. 3:15), twice with a participle.

III. Negative Particles (στερητικῶ or παραθεταί). The use of the negative particles has been discussed already in various parts of the grammar in an incidental way in connection with the modes, verbal nouns and dependent clauses. But it is necessary at this point to treat the subject as a whole. It is not the logical negative that one has here to deal with. Many words are negative in idea which are positive in form. Thus “empty” is negative, “cold” is negative, “death” is negative. Aristotle uses στερητικῶ for this negative conception. It is in reality an ablative idea as στερεό implies. But the grammarian is concerned simply with those words that are used to make positive words (or clauses) negative. This is the grammatical negative. There are, indeed, in Greek, as in English, negative post-fixes.\textsuperscript{1} But there is a common negative Greek prefix ἀ(v) called alpha privative, Sanskrit ḍ(ṇ), Latin in, Gothic Ṽ, English un. In Sanskrit this prefix does not occur with verbs and is rare with substantives. It is there found chiefly with adjectives and participles.\textsuperscript{2} In Greek it occurs with verbs, but chiefly denominative verbs like ἀγοραίος.\textsuperscript{3} The use of ἀ– (ἀν– before vowels) is in the Greek still more common with adjectives and verbs. See the chapter on Formation of Words for details. Cf. ἀδόκιμος, ἀδικία, ἀπεθανός, ἀδύνατος, ἀστοργος, ἀνελημμένον (Ro. 1:28–30).

1. The Objective Οὐ and its Compounds.

(a) Origin. This is unknown. Hübschmann\textsuperscript{4} sees a connection with the Latin haud as do other scholars.\textsuperscript{5} Fowler\textsuperscript{6} takes it as an original intensive particle like pas in the French ne pas and –γί (Indo-Ger. -gī) in oū-γί. The Zend ava is also noted and the

\textsuperscript{7} Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 252.
\textsuperscript{8} II, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{9} Hom. Gr., p. 252.
1 Anon., Notes on Negative Postfixes in Gk. and Lat., 1884, p. 6.
2 Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 447.
3 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 529.
Hübschmann HÜBSCHMANN, Zur Kasuslehre (1875).
Latin *au* (*au-fero*). But there is no doubt that οὐ in the Greek took the place of the Sanskrit *ná*, Latin *nē* (*ne-que, ne-scio*; the relation of *nē* to *nē*-quidem, *nē*quam to this *nē* is not known), Gothic *nī*. The use of the Greek οὐ corresponds to the Sanskrit *ná*

**[Page 1156]** *(b) History.* As far back as Greek goes we find οὐ, but οὐ did not hold its own with μή in the progress of the language. Within the past century οὐ has become obsolete in modern Greek outside of a few proverbs save in the Laconian and the Pontic dialects. The Pontic dialect uses κί from Old Ionic οὐκ. But modern Greek has οὔδε and οὔτε (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 200). In the Bœotian dialect, it may be noted, οὐ never did gain a place. We have seen οὔδεν used as an adverb, an idiom that goes back to Homer. Jannaris explains that the vernacular came to use οὔδεν and μηδέν for emphasis and then on a par with οὐ and μή. Then οὔδεν dropped οὐ and μηδέν lost δέν, leaving δέν and μή for the modern Greek. At any rate this is the outcome. Δέν is the negative of the ind. in modern Greek except after νά and final clauses when we find νό μή (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 200). And δέν is the regular negative in the protasis of conditional sentences both with ind. and subj. The distinction between οὐ and μή did become more or less blurred in the course of time, but in the N. T., as in the κοινή generally, the old Greek idiom is very well preserved in the main. Buttmann even thinks that the N. T. idiom here conforms more exactly to the old literary style than in any other point. Δέν may represent μηδέν (Rendel Harris, *Exp.*, Feb., 1914, p. 163).

*(c) Meaning.* Οὐ denies the reality of an alleged fact. It is the clear-cut, point-blank negative, objective, final. Jannaris compares οὐ to ὅτι and μή to ἢνα, while Blass compares οὐ to the indicative mode and μή to the other modes. But these analogies are not wholly true. Sometimes, indeed, οὐ coalesces with the word as in οὐ φημί=not merely ‘I do not say,’ but ‘I deny.’ So οὐκ ἔω (Ac. 16:7)=‘I forbid.’ Cf. οὐκ θέλω (Mk. 9:30); οὐκ ἔχω (Mt. 13:12); οὐκ ἀγνοεῖο (2 Cor. 2:11). See also τὸν οὐ λαόν in Ro. 9:25 (LXX) where οὐ has the effect of an adjective or a prefix. Delbrück

---
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2 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 259.
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8 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253.
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thinks that this use of où with verbs like the Latin ne-scio was the original one in Greek. In the LXX où translates νέον.

(d) Uses. Here it will be sufficient to make a brief summary, since the separate uses (pp. 917 f., 929 f., etc.) are discussed in detail in [Page 1157] the proper places. The point here is to show how all the varied uses of où are in harmony with the true meaning of the particle.

(i) The Indicative. We meet où with the indicative in both independent and dependent clauses.

(a) Independent Sentences. Here the negative où is universal with the indicative in declarative sentences. The force of où (oùk before vowels, oùχ before aspirate) is sometimes very powerful, like the heavy thud of a blow. Cf. oùk ἔδοκε, oùk ἐποτίσατε, où πυγνήγαγε, où περιβάλλετε, oùk ἐπεσκέψασθε (Mt. 25:42 f.). The force of all these negatives is gathered up in the one où in verse 44. In verse 45 où and oùδε are balanced over against each other. See oùk ἔπεσεν in Mt. 7:25. Cf. où παρέλαβον in Jo. 1:11. In Mt. 21:29 see the contrast between ἔγῳ, κύριε and oùκ ὀσηλθέν. Note the progressive bluntness of the Baptist’s denials till où comes out flat at the last (Jo. 1:21 f.). In the N. T. où alone occurs with the future indicative used as a prohibition, though the classic idiom sometimes had μη. Cf. où οὐκονέσσας (Mt. 5:21); oùκ ἔσοσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριται (6:5), etc. Still, Blass1 quotes μηδένα μισήσετε in Clem., Hom., III, 69. The volitive subjective nature of this construction well suits μη, but où is more emphatic and suits the indicative. In Mt. 16:22, où μη ἔσται σοι τοῦτο, we have où μη in the prohibitive sense. When où occurs alone=‘no,’ as at the end of a clause, it is written où as in où, μη ποτὲ (Mt. 13:29); το ΟÙ où (2 Cor. 1:17).

But in interrogative (independent) sentences où always expects the answer ‘yes.’ The Greek here draws a distinction between où and μη that is rather difficult to reproduce in English. The use of a negative in the question seems naturally to expect the answer ‘yes,’ since the negative is challenged by the question. This applies to où. We may leave μη till we come to it. Où in questions corresponds to the Latin nonne. Cf. Mt. 7:22, où το σο oùνοματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν κτλ., where où is the negative of the whole long question, and is not repeated with the other verbs. See further Mt. 13:55; Lu. 17:17; 1 Cor. 14:23. In 1 Cor. 9:1 we have où four times (once oùχι). The form oùχι is a bit sharper in tone. Cf. Mt. 13:27; Lu. 12:6. In Lu. 6:39 we have μη with one question, μητὶ δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὀδηγεῖν; and oùχι with the other (side by side) oùχι ὁμορθεροίς εξ δύονον ἔμπεσονται. There is a tone of impatient indignation in the use of où in Ac. 13:10, où παύσῃ διαστρέφων τας ὠδοὺς του κυρίου τας εὐθείας; In Ac. 21:38, oùκ ἀρα σοι εἰ ὁ Ἀγιότπιος; the addition of ἀρα


———, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871–1888).

9 Synt. Forsch., IV, p. 147.
1 Gr. N. T. Gr., p. 254.
means ‘as I supposed, [Page 1158] but as I now see denied.’1 In Mk. 14:60 note the measured use of oú and oúδεν in both question, oúκ ἀπεκρίνῃ oúδεν; and the description of Christ’s silence, καὶ oúκ ἀπεκρίνατο oúδεν. In Lu. 18:7, oú μή πονησῇ—καὶ μακροθυμητ ἐπ αὐτός; we come near having oú μή in a question with the present indicative as well as with the aorist subjunctive. In a question like µὴ oúκ ἐχοῖ—καὶ µὴ κατὰ οὐδῆς παῦν ταῦτα λαλῶ, ἢ καὶ οὐ νόμος ταῦτα oú λέγει; In Mt. 22:17 (Lu. 20:22; Mk. 12:14) we have ἢ oú; as the alternative question, and Mark adds ἢ μή. Babbitt2 holds that “oú is used in questions of fact, while in other questions (e.g. questions of possibility) μή is used.” I doubt the correctness of this interpretation.

In declarative sentences the position of oú is to be noted when for emphasis or contrast it comes first. Cf. oú and ἀλλά in Ro. 9:8. So oú γάρ—ἀλλά in 7:15. In 7:18 f. note oú: oú side by side. Cf. also position of oú in Ac. 1:5; 2:15; Ro. 11:18 (oú σο—ἀλλά). So ἀλλά oúκ ἔγω in 1 Cor. 6:12.

(b) Subordinate Clauses. In principle the use of oú is the same as in independent sentences. But there are some special adaptations which have already been discussed and need only brief mention here.

In relative clauses with the indicative oú is almost the only negative used in the N. T., the examples of μή being very few as will be seen directly. This is true both with definite relative clauses where it is obviously natural, as in 2 Cor. 8:10, οἵτινες oú μόνον—προενήρξασθε (cf. Ro. 10:14; Jas. 4:14), and in indefinite relative clauses where μή is possible, but by no means necessary, as in Mt. 10:38, ὃς oú λαμβάνει (cf. Lu. 9:50; 14:33, etc.). The use of oú in the relative clause which is preceded by a negative is not an encroachment3 on μή. Cf. oú μή ἀφεθῇ ὡδε λίθος ἐπι λίθον ὃς oú καταλυθήσεται (Mt. 24:2). It is a common enough idiom in the old Greek, as we see it in 10:26 (Lu. 12:2), oúdeν ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ oúκ ἄποκαλυφθήσεται. Cf. Lu. 8:17, where the second relative has oú μή γνωσθῇ, and Ro. 15:18 for the negative oú in principal and relative clause. In Mk. 4:25 note ὃς ἔχει and ὃς oúκ ἔχει. Cf. ὃ θέλω and ὃ oú θέλω (Ro. 7:15, 19). Practically the same4 construction is oú with the relative in a question, as τίς [Page 1159] ἐστιν ὃς oú in Ac. 19:35; cf. Heb. 12:7. For further illustration of oú with relative clauses see Mt. 12:2=Mk. 2:24; Jo. 6:64; Lu. 14:27; Jo. 4:22; Ro. 15:21; Gal. 3:10; Rev. 9:4.

---

1 W.-Th., p. 511.
3 W.-Th., p. 481.
4 Thouvenin, Les Négations, etc., p. 233 f.
In *temporal* clauses with the indicative οὗ comes as a matter of course.¹ This is true of a definite note of time as in Ac. 22:11, ὃς οὗκ ἐνεβλέπεν, and of an indefinite period as in Jo. 4:21, ὃρα ὅτε οὕτε (cf. also 9:4, νῦν ὅτε οὕδεις).

In *comparative* clauses with the indicative the negative comes outside in the principal sentence, since comparison is usually made with a positive note. So οὗ καθῆπερ (2 Cor. 3:13); οὗ καθὼς ἦλπίσαμεν (8:5); οὗκ εἶμι ὥσπερ (Lu. 18:11); οὗχ ὡς (Ro. 5:15 f.). We do have ὡς οὗκ ἄφρα δέρων in 1 Cor. 9:26 (participle) as in 2 Cor. 10:14 we have οὗ γάρ, ὡς μὴ ἔφικνούμενοι, where the two negatives are in good contrast.

In *local* clauses likewise the use of οὗ is obvious, as in διὸν οὗκ ἔχειν γῆν πολλήν (Mt. 13:5); διὸν οὗ θέλεις (Jo. 21:18. Here the οὗ is very pointed); οὗ δὲ οὗκ ἔστιν νόμος (Ro. 4:15).

In *causal* sentences οὗ is not quite universal, though the usual negative. Cf. Mt. 25:45 Ἐφ' ὅσον οὗκ ἐποίησάτε ἐξί τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, (2:18) ὃτι οὗκ εἴσιν, (Heb. 6:13) ἔπει ἐκτὸς οὗδενς εἶπεν, (1 Cor. 14:16) ἔπει θάνατος οὗκ ἐστιν. See further Lu. 1:34; Jo. 8:20, 37; Ro. 11:6. In Heb. 9:17 ἔπει μὴ τότε [μὴ ποτε marg. of W. H.] ἵσχεν may be a question as Theophylact takes it, but W. H. do not print it so in the text. But it is not a departure from ancient Greek idiom to have μὴ with the ind. in causal sentences as will be shown. Cf. Jo. 3:18 with 1 Jo. 5:10.

In *final* clauses with the ind. οὗ does not occur. The reason for μὴ in clauses of purpose is obvious even though the ind. mode be used (cf. Rev. 9:4, 20). It is only with clauses of *apprehension* that οὗ is found with the verb when μὴ occurs as the conjunction. Cf. 2 Cor. 12:20, φοβοῦμαι μὴ πώς οὗχ εὑρο. But this is the subj., not the ind. Cf. here οὗχ οἴους θέλω and οἶνον οὗ θέλετε. Cf. also Mt. 25:9. In Col. 2:8 we have βλέπετε μὴ τὶς ἔσται—καὶ οὗ κατὰ Χριστὸν. The καὶ οὗ is in contrast with κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, though as a second negative it would properly be οὗ anyhow. But in Rev. 9:4 we have Ἰᾶ μὴ ἄδικησον—οὐδὲ—οὐδὲ. This² does seem unusual and is almost an example of Ἰᾶ ν οὗ. No example of a clause of result with a negative occurs in the indicative, but it would, of course, have οὗ.

The use of οὗ in conditional sentences has already received [Page 1160] adequate treatment. See Conditional Sentences, ch. on Mode. The details need not be gone over again here. There is no doubt of the fact that εἰ οὗ made encroachments on εἰ μὴ in the later Greek.¹ Blass² puts it “in direct contradistinction to the classical language.” Thouvemin³ likewise treats this use of εἰ οὗ as “contrairement à l’usage classique—où on le trouve exceptionnellement.” It is only the frequency, the normality of εἰ οὗ in the N. T. that is remarkable. This is in full accord with the κοινή development, since⁴

---

¹ Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255.
³ 1 Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 429.
⁴ Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 254.
⁵ Les Négations, etc., p. 233.
in the modern Greek δὲν “is regularly used in the protasis of a conditional sentence, alike with the indicative and with the subjunctive mood.” So ὁ δὲν πήγαινα, ‘if I had not gone’ (Thumb, Handb., p. 195). See Mt. 26:42; Lu. 12:26; Jo. 1:25; 3:12; 5:47; 10:37; 2 Pet. 2:4; Ro. 8:9; 11:21; 1 Cor. 16:22; 2 Cor. 12:11; Heb. 12:25, etc. They are all conditions of the first class (determined as fulfilled) save one of the second class (determined as unfulfilled) in Mt. 26:24. In 26:42 εἰ οὖ and ἦν μὴ stand out sharply. It is so nearly the rule with conditions of the first class in the N. T. that it is hardly necessary to follow out the analysis of Winer5 to bring the examples into accord with ancient usage. It is gratuitous to take εἰ οὔδε as causal in Lu. 12:26, or to make εἰ οὐκ εἰμὶ in 1 Cor. 9:2 a denial of a positive idea. There are cases of emphatic denial, as εἰ τὶς οὐ φύλετι (1 Cor. 16:22). Cf. also 2 Jo. 10, εἰ τὶς ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ φέρει. Cf. also εἰ οὐ ποιῶ and εἰ ποιῶ in Jo. 10:37 f., where the antithesis is quite marked. See also the decisive negation in Jo. 1:25. But, when all is said, εἰ οὐ has made distinct inroads on εἰ μὴ in the later Greek.

As to the negative in indirect discourse with the indicative, it only remains to say that the use of οὐ is universal. Cf. Mt. 16:12, συνήκαν ὅτι οὐκ ἔπευξεν προσέχειν. In 16:11 note πῶς οὐ νοεῖ τοῖς οὐ περὶ ἄρτων εἶπον ὑμῖν: where each negative has its own force. Cf. also 1 Cor. 6:9.

(ii) The Subjunctive. In Homer οὐ was the negative with the futuristic subjunctive6 as in οὐ δὲν ἤδομα, Iliad, I, 262. This futuristic use of the subj., as we have seen (Modes), largely passed over to the future indicative,7 so that οὐ disappears from the subjunctive almost entirely both in principal and subordinate clauses. [Page 1161] One may compare the final disappearance of οὐ before μὴ with participles. In Jer. 6:8 B reads ἦτίς οὐ κατοικισθήσεται where ἸΑΩ* have κατοικισθῆσεται. It is to be remembered also, as already noted, that in the modern Greek δὲν occurs in the protasis with subjunctive as well as with the indicative, as ὁ δὲν πιστεύεις (Thumb, Handbook, p. 195). This is partly due, no doubt, to the obscuration of the οὐ in δὲν, but at bottom it is the futuristic use of the subj. We have already noted the use of μὴ οὐχ in 2 Cor. 12:20 with εὖροι after φοβοῦμαι, where the οὐ is kept with the subj. (classic idiom) to distinguish it from the conjunctional μὴ. It is also a case of the futuristic subj., not volitive as in final clauses with ἵνα or δὲν. In Mt. 25:9 the margin of W. H. has μὴ πτερο οὐκ ἔρχεσθαι without a verb of fearing, though the notion is there. The text has μὴ πτερο οὐ μὴ. Jannaris1 boldly cuts the Gordian knot by denying that μὴ in οὐ μὴ is a true negative. He makes it merely a shortening of μὴν. If so, all the uses of οὐ μὴ with the subj. would be examples of οὐ with the subj. Some of these, however, are volitive or deliberative. This view of Jannaris is not yet accepted among scholars. It is too simple a solution, though Jannaris argues that οὐ μὴν does occur as in Soph. El. 817, Eur. Hec. 401, and he notes that the negation is continued by οὐ δὲ, not by μὴ δὲ. Per contra it is to be observed that the modern Greek writes μὴν as well as μὴ, as vâ μὴν ἄχρι παράδεξε, ‘because he had no money’

5 W.-Th., pp. 477 ff.
6 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 198.
1 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 433.
(Thumb, Handb., p. 200). But, whatever the explanation, we do have οὐ μὴ with the aorist subj. in the N. T. We have had to discuss this point already (Tense and Mode), and shall meet it again under Double Negatives. But in Jo. 18:11, οὐ μὴ πίω: the answer is in accord with οὐ.

(iii) The Optative. In the N. T. there are no instances of the use of οὐ with the optative. It is only in wishes (volitive) that the optative has a negative in the N. T. and that is naturally μὴ. But this is just an accident due to the rapid disappearance of the optative. There is no reason why οὐ should not be found with the potential optative (futuristic) or the deliberative which was always rare.

(iv) The Imperative. The most striking instance is 1 Pet. 3:3, ἔστω οὐχ ὁ—κόσμος, ἀλλ. ὁ κρυπτός, κτλ. It is the sharp contrast with ἀλλ. that explains the use of οὐχ. Cf. also οὐ μόνον in 1 Pet. 2:18, where the participle stands in an imperative atmosphere. [Page 1162] Cf. also οὐ with the inf. in the imperative sense in 1 Cor. 5:10. Elsewhere with the imperative we have μὴ μόνον (Jo. 13:9; Ph. 2:12; Jas. 1:22). Οὐ is used in an imperative connection with the fut. ind. (Mt. 5:21) and in questions of like nature (Ac. 13:10).

(v) The Infinitive. It is common to say that in the N. T. οὐ does not occur with the infinitive, not even in indirect assertion. In Homer and in the classic Attic we do find οὐ with the inf. in indirect assertion. This is usually explained on the ground that the οὐ belonged to the original indicative in the direct and is simply preserved in the indirect. Monro (Hom. Gr., p. 262) observes that in the old Sanskrit only finite verbs have the negative particles. This question received full discussion under Mode and Verbal Nouns. Only a brief word is allowed here. The oldest use of the negative in indirect discourse was in the form οὐ ψησιν δώσειν where οὐ formally goes with ψησιν, but logically with δώσειν. From this use Monro conceives there came οὐ with the inf. itself. But the situation in the N. T. is not quite so simple as Blass makes it. In Jo. 21:25, οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ομιλεῖ οὐραίωσε, the negative does go with ομιλεῖ. But this is hardly true in Mk. 7:24, nor in Ac. 26:26. Besides οὐ occurs in a number of clauses dependent on the inf., as in Heb. 7:11; Ro. 8:12; Ac. 10:41; Ro. 7:6; 15:20; Heb. 13:9; 1 Cor. 1:17; Ac. 19:27. For the discussion of these passages see Infinitive, ch. XX, 5, (l). It is proper to say that in the N. T. we still have remnants of the old use of οὐ with the inf., though in general μὴ is the negative. In Ro. 15:20 οὐχ ἐπειδὴ after ἐγκαθιστήσωσθαι stands in sharp contrast with ἀλλα καθός. In 2 Cor. 13:7 we have μὴ ποιήσαι ώμίς κακόν μηδέν, οὐχ ἵνα—ἀλλα ἵνα where the οὐχ is clearly an addendum. Burton explains εἰς οὐθέν λογισθῆναι in Ac. 19:27, “as a fixed phrase,” but even so it is in use. Besides, there is μὴ λογισμαχέν ἐπὶ οὐθέν χρήσιμον in 2 Tim. 2:14. See also καὶ οὖ οὔστε δουλεύσεται in Ro. 7:6. The use of οὐδέν with the inf. after οὐ with the principal verb is common enough. Cf. Mk. 7:12; Lu. 20:40; Jo.

2 Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 200.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255.
3 N. T. M. and T., p. 184.
(vi) The Participle. There is little to add to what was given on [Page 1163] the subject of oú and µή with the participle under the Verbal Aspects of the Participle (see Verbal Nouns). Galloway1 thinks that it was with the participle that oú was first used (as opposed to the Sanskrit negative prefix) before the infinitive had oú. At any rate oú is well established in Homer. We may simply accent the fact that the encroachment of µή on oú with the participle gives all the greater emphasis to the examples of oú which remain. Cf. ὃ oúk ἕν ποιµήν (Jo. 10:12); ὦς oúk δέρον (1 Cor. 9:26). There is no trouble in seeing the force of oú wherever we find it with the participle in the N. T.

(vii) With Nouns. Here we see a further advance of the negative particles over the Sanskrit idiom which confined them to the finite verb. The Greek usually employs the negative prefix with nouns, but in a few instances in the N. T. we have oú. So τόν oú λαόν in Ro. 9:25 (LXX), oú λαός in 1 Pet. 2:10 (LXX), ἐπι γάρ oúκ ἐθνεῖ in Ro. 10:19 (Num 32:21). But this is by no means a Hebraism, since it is common in the best Greek writers. Cf. ἢ oú διάλωσε in Thuc. 1, 137. 4 and ἢ oúκ ἔξουσία in 5, 50. 3. Cf. oúκ ἄρχερέως in 2 Macc. 4:13. As Thayer well says, oú in this construction “annuls the idea of the noun.” The use of oú to deny a single word is common, as in oú τοῦτον (Mt. 9:13). Cf. oúκ ἔμε in Mk. 9:37. In general for oú with exceptions see oúκ ἐν σοφίᾳ (1 Cor. 1:17), oú μέλαιν (2 Cor. 3:3). In 2 Tim. 2:14, ἐπι γὰρ oúδέν χρήσιμον, it is possible that χρήσιμον is in the substantival sense. There is, of course, nothing unusual in the use of oú with adjectives like oú πολλοί σοφοί (1 Cor. 1:26). What is noteworthy is the litotes so common in the N. T. as in the older Greek. Cf. μετ oú πολύ (Ac. 27:14); μετ oú πολλάς ἡμέρας (Lu. 15:13); oúκ ἄλγα (Ac. 17:4); oúκ ἀσήμιον (21:39). Cf. oúκ ἐκ μέτρου (Jo. 3:34); oú μετρίως (Ac. 20:12). Oú πᾶς and πᾶς oú have received discussion under Adjectives, and so just a word will suffice. Oú πάσα σάρξ (1 Cor. 15:39) is ‘not every kind of flesh.’ Cf. oú παντὶ τῷ λαῷ (Ac. 10:41); oú πάντες (Mt. 19:11); oú πάντως (1 Cor. 5:10). But oúκ ἔν ἐσώθη πάσα σάρξ (Mt. 24:22) means ‘no flesh,’ like the Hebrew נא—יר. The construction in both senses is more common in John than in the Synoptic Gospels. It is perhaps worth while to note the use of oúδέν or oúθέν (1 Cor. 13:2) as an abstract neuter in the predicate. In general, attention should be called to the distinction made by the Greeks between negativating a word and a sentence. This is one reason why with the imper., subj. and inf. we find oú with [Page 1164] single words or phrases, where µή is the normal negative of the clause.

(c) Kai Oú. In general when a positive clause is followed by a negative we have καὶ oú as in classic Greek. Cf. Ro. 7:6 (with inf. as in Heb. 7:11). See also Col. 2:8,

---

4 Ib., p. 183 f.
Galloway GALLOWAY, W. F., On the Use of Μή with the Participle in Classical Greek (1897).
1 On the Use of Μή with the Participle in Class. Gk., 1897, p. 6.
19. So Lu. 8:14, συντένονται καί οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν. 1 Cf. Mt. 9:13. Once, indeed, in a peculiar case, we find καὶ connecting two negative clauses, Lu. 6:37, καὶ μὴ κρίνετε καὶ οὐ μὴ κρίθητε.

(f) Redundant or Pleonastic Οὐ. There is one instance of οὐ in indirect discourse where it is pleonastic according to the classic idiom (see also the French ne). It is in 1 Jo. 2:22, ὥρονομενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν. Some MSS. have the pleonastic οὐ in Mk. 9:39.

(g) Repetition of Οὐ. When the second is a single negative, the full force of each is retained. It is seldom that we find two examples of οὐ in the same clause, as in 1 Cor. 12:15 f., οὐ παρὰ τούτῳ οὐκ ἔστιν ἕκ τοῦ σῶματος, ‘It is not therefore not of the body.’ There are instances of οὐ followed by μὴ where both preserve the full force, Ac. 4:20, οὐ δύναμθα—μὴ λαλέσθων. Cf. also οὐ—μὴ in 1 Cor. 9:6. So also οὐ μὴ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ἕκ τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Jo. 3:10), Cf. 5:12. The examples are numerous enough when the second οὐ is in a dependent clause. So οὐδὲν ἦν ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὅ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται (Mt. 10:26); πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι οὐ, κτλ. (16:11); οὐ τολμήσω τι λαλέσθων ὅν οὐ κατειργάσατο Χριστός (Ro. 15:18); οὐκ ὀδηγέτε ὅτι—οὐκ κληρονομήσουσιν (1 Cor. 6:9). In Mt. 24:2 οὐ follows οὐ μὴ. See also Lu. 8:17. The uses of μὴ οὐ and οὐ μὴ are treated later. But note οὐ, μὴ ποτε—ἐκρίζωσθε (Mt. 13:29) where οὐ stands alone. The solemn repetition of οὐ—οὐ in 1 Cor. 6:10 is rhetorical.

(h) The Intensifying Compound Negative. We have seen how οὐ can be made stronger by ζή (οὔζή, as in Lu. 1:60). Brugmann 2 considers this an intensive particle and different from the Homeric 3 κί (οὔκ-κί) which is like τί (κις, κι, τις, τί). So also οὔδέ was originally just οὖ δέ (‘and not,’ ‘but not’) and is often so printed in Homer. 4 In the sense of ‘not even’ see Mt. 6:29. The forms οὔδες is intensively also, originally ‘not one indeed’ 5 and was sometimes printed οὔδε δείξ (Ro. 3:10) for even stronger emphasis. But οὐ—τίς also occurs (Jo. 10:28). Cf. also οὔδε τίς (Mt. 11:27); οὐ δύνη ἔστι (Lu. 16:2); οὔτε—τίς (Ac. 28:21); [Page 1165] οὐ—ποτέ (2 Pet. 1:21). The adverbial form οὔδεν occasionally occurs in Homer. The form οὔθες is (cf. Ac. 26:26), which flourished for a limited period in the κοίνη, has already had sufficient discussion. Various other compound negatives were built up on οὐ, as οὔδαμως (Mt. 2:6); οὔδαμοι (Jo. 20:9); οὔδαμον (Mt. 7:23); οὔκετοι (Mt. 19:6). Οὐκοῦν was used so much in questions that it lost its negative force (Jo. 18:37), unless one writes it οὕκον. Οὔτε is, of course, only οὐ and τέ. These compound negatives merely strengthen the previous negative. This emphatic repetition of the compound negative was once good vernacular in both English and German, but it gave way in literary circles before the influence of the Latin. It was always good Greek. This discussion does not apply to subordinate clauses (as in Jo. 8:20) where each negative has its own

2 Grie. Gr., p. 528.
4 lb.
5 Brug., Grie. Gr., p. 528.
force. The use of oὐ̄δε and oὐ̄τε belongs to the discussion of conjunctions (cf. oὐ̄τε—
oὐ̄τε—οὐ̄δε in Ac. 24:12 f.), but the examples in the N. T. of the other compound negatives with οὐ are numerous. Farrar² gives some good illustrations of old English. “No sonne were he never so old of years might not marry,” Ascham, Scholemaster. Modern English vernacular refuses to give up the piling-up of negatives. “Not nohow, said the landlord, thinking that where negatives are good, the more you heard of them the better” (Felix Holt, ii, 198). Again: “Whatever may be said of the genius of the English language, yet no one could have misunderstood the query of the London citizen, Has nobody seen nothing of never a hat not their own?” So likewise the Hebrew uses two negatives to strengthen each other (cf. 1 Ki. 10:21; Is. 5:9). A good example is Mk. 5:3, oὐ̄δε oὐ̄κέτι οὐ̄δείς. So οὐ̄δείς οὔπω (11:2). The commonest kind of example is like οὐ δύνασθε ποιῆν οὐ̄δὲν (Jo. 15:5). Cf. 2 Cor. 11:8. Another instance of triple negative is Lu. 23:53, οὐκ ἐν οὐ̄δείς οὔπω. The οὐ is sometimes amplified¹ by oὔτε—oὔτε as in Mt. 12:32, as well as by οὐ̄δε—οὐ̄δὲ as in Jo. 1:25. Plato shows four negatives, οὐ̄δὲν οὐ̄δαμὴ οὐ̄δαμῶς οὐ̄δεμιὰν κοινωνίαν (Phaedo 78 d). The combinations with οὐ μὴ may also be noticed, as οὐ̄δὲν οὐ μὴ (Lu. 10:19); οὐ μὴ σε ἄνω οὐ̄δὲν οὐ μὴ σε ἔγκαταλλασσα (Heb. 13:5); οὐ̄κέτι οὐ μὴ (Rev. 18:14). There is no denying the power of this accumulation of negatives. Cf. the English hymn

“I’ll never, no never, no never forsake.”

(i) The Disjunctive Negative. We frequently have οὐ “where one thing is denied that another may be established.” Here [Page 1166] there is sharp antithesis. The simplest form is οὐ—οὐ̄δε as in Jas. 2:11, or οὐ—ἄλλα as in Mt. 15:11; Mk. 5:39; Lu. 8:52; Ac. 5:4; 1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 3:3, etc. In Jo. 7:22 we have οὐ̄χ ὅτι—ἄλλα, as also in Ph. 4:17. In Ph. 4:11 οὐ̄χ ὅτι occurs alone without ἄλλα. In 2 Cor. 7:9 we have οὐ̄χ ὅτι—ἄλλα ὅτι. In 1 Jo. 2:21 we have οὐ̄χ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ὅτι—ἀλλα. ὅτι where more naturally we might expect ἔγραψα οὐ̄χ ὅτι—ἄλλα ὅτι. Winer¹ makes rather overmuch of the possible rhetorical distinctions between the varying shades of emphasis in the different contexts where οὐ—ἄλλα occur. Cf. further οὐ̄χ ἵνα—ἄλλα (Jo. 6:38); οὐ̄χ ἵνα—ἄλλα ἵνα (Jo. 3:17). We usually have οὐ̄χ μόνον—ἄλλα καὶ (Jo. 5:18; Ro. 1:32, etc.), but sometimes merely οὐ̄χ μόνον—ἄλλα (Ac. 19:26; 1 Jo. 5:6). Sometimes the negative is not expressed, but is to be supplied in thought as in Mt. 11:7–9. Then again we may have only the negative as in οὐ̄ρίωμασιν (Heb. 13:9), leaving the contrast to be supplied in the thought. The contrast may even be expressed by καὶ οὐ as in Mt. 9:13, Ἐλεος Θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν (A, LXX). But we have already entered the sphere of the conjunctions as in the parallel oὔτε—καὶ in Jo. 4:11. So 3 Jo. 10.

2. The Subjective Negative Μὴ and Its Compounds.

(a) The History of Μὴ. The Ionic, Attic and Doric dialects have μὴ, the Eleatic has μᾶ, like the Sanskrit mā. In the old Sanskrit mā was used only in independent

Farrar Farrar, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).
2 Gk. Syntax., p. 189.
3 Cf. W.-Th., p. 499.
4 Thayer’s Lex., p. 461.
1 W.-Th., pp. 495 ff.
sentences, while ἃδ occurred in dependent clauses. In the later Sanskrit mā’ crept into the dependent clauses also. It was originally a prohibitive particle with the old injunctive which was in the oldest Sanskrit always negative with mā. In the later Sanskrit mā was extended to the other modes. In the Greek we see μή extended to wish and then denial. Wharton undertakes to show that μή is primarily an interrogative, not a prohibitive or negative particle, but that is more than doubtful. Already in Homer μή 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. The distinction between οὐ and μή goes back to Indo-Germanic stock and has survived into modern Greek. But from the very start μή made inroads on οὐ, so that finally μή occupies much of the field. In the modern Greek μή is used exclusively with participle, in prohibitions and with the subj. except in conditions, and occurs with νά (νά μή) and the ind. Gildersleeve has shown in a masterly way how μή made continual encroachments on οὐ. In the N. T., outside of ἐλ οὐ, the advance of μή is quite distinct, as Gildersleeve shows is true even of Lucian. So as to the papyri and the inscriptions. The exact Attic refinements between οὐ and μή are not reproduced, though on the whole the root-distinction remains.

(b) Significance of Μή. Max Müller gives an old Sanskrit phrase, mā’kāphalā́ya, ‘not for unsteadiness,’ which pretty well gives the root-idea of μή. It is an “unsteady” particle, a hesitating negative, an indirect or subjective denial, an effort to prevent (prohibit) what has not yet happened. It is the negative of will, wish, doubt. If οὐ denies the fact, μή denies the idea. Μή made one advance on οὐ. It came to be used as a conjunction. We see this use of mā’ in the late Sanskrit. But the origin of this

2 Thompson, Synt., p. 448; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 528.
3 Thompson, ib., p. 499.
6 Moulton, Prol., p. 170.
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conjunctional use of μη is undoubtedly paratactic in clauses of both fear and purpose. It is obviously so in indirect questions where μη suggests ‘perhaps.’ Campbell argues that “the whole question of the Greek negatives is indeterminate.” This is an extreme position, but there is no doubt a border-line between ο and μη which is very narrow at times. One’s mood and tone have much to do with the choice of ο or μη. Cf. Jo. 4:29, μητι ουτος ετιν δ Χριστος: where ο would have challenged the opposition of the neighbours by taking sides on the question whether Jesus was the Messiah. The woman does not mean to imply flatly that Jesus is not the Messiah by using μη τι, but she raises the question and throws a cloud of uncertainty and curiosity over it with a woman’s keen instinct. In a word, μη is just the negative to use when one does not wish to be too positive. Μη leaves the question open for further remark or entreaty. Oű closes the door abruptly. The LXX uses μη for ου.

Page 1168 (c) Uses of Μη. In general we may follow the outline of οű.

(i) The Indicative. Blass expounds the two negatives by saying that “οű negatives the indicative, μη the other moods, including the infinitive and participle.” But, unfortunately, the case is not so simple as that. “In reviewing Blass, Thumb makes the important addition that in modern Greek δεν belongs to the indicative and μη(v) to the subjunctive.” But δεν occurs in the protasis with the subj. in modern Greek, as we have seen. Besides, as Moulton adds, “μη has not been driven away from the indicative” in the N. T. It may be said at once that μη with the indicative is as old as historic Greek. The Sanskrit suggests that originally μη was not used with the indicative. But already in Homer μη occurs with the indicative in prohibition, wish, oath, fear, question. “The essence of these idioms is the combination of the imperative tone—which shows itself in the particle—with the mood proper to simple assertion.” But in the N. T. we no longer have μη with the fut. ind. in prohibition, except in case of οű μη.

In independent sentences we have μη with the indicative only in questions. “It’s use in questions is very distinct from that of οű and is maintained in the N. T. Greek without real weakening.” In Jo. 21:5, παιδια, μη τι προσφαγιον έχετε; we have a typical example with the answer οű. Blass expresses needless objection to this “hesitant question,” as Moulton rightly expounds it. Cf. Jo. 4:33; 7:26; and Ro. 11:1, μη Ἀπώσατο; with the answer in verse 2, οűκ Ἀπώσατο. See Jo. 7:51, where

5 Moulton, Prol., p. 192 f.
6 Ib.
7 On Soph. Trach., 90.
1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253.
2 Moulton, Prol., p. 170.
3 Ib.
4 Vierke, De μη Particulae cum Indicativo Conjunctae Usu Antiquiore, 1876.
6 Ib., p. 261.
7 Moulton, Prol., p. 170 f. Moulton gives an interesting note on the use of παιδια as “lads” in the mod. Gk.
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Nicodemus adroitly uses μη in a question and the sharp retort of the other members of the Sanhedrin μη και σω: The difference between ου and μη in questions is well shown in Jo. 4:33, 35. In the use of μη the answer in mind is the one expected, not always the one actually received as is illustrated in the question of the apostles at the last passover. They all asked μη τι ἐγω ειμι, ἥραββει; The very thought was abhorrent to them, ‘It surely is not I.’ 19 But Judas, who did not dare use ου, received the affirmative answer, σω εἰπας (Mt. 26:25). Μητι comes to be used intensively much like ουχι (both chiefly in questions). In the case of μη ου [Page 1169] in questions (Ro. 10:18 f.; 1 Cor. 9:4 f.; 11:22) μη is the interrogative particle while ου is the negative of the verb.

In dependent clauses μη occurs with the indicative with the second class conditions (ει μη) always except in Mt. 26:24 (Mk. 14:21). Cf. ει μη in Jo. 15:22, etc. There are also five instances of ει μη with the ind. in conditions of the first class. 1 So Mk. 6:5; 1 Cor. 15:2; 2 Cor. 13:5; Gal. 1:7; 1 Tim. 6:3. Cf. μη in a few relative clauses, as δι μη δαι (Tit. 1:11); ῥι μη παιρεστιν ταῦτα (2 Pet. 1:9); δι μη ὄμολογει (1 Jo. 4:3, W.H. text). Cf. Ac. 15:29 D. There is a certain aloofness about μη here that one can feel as in Plato who, “with his sensitiveness to subtle shades of meaning, had in μη an instrument singularly adapted for purposes of reserve, irony, politeness or suggestion.” 2 This use of μη with the relative and indicative is clearly a remnant of the literary construction. 3 This literary use of μη with the relative was often employed to characterize or describe in a subjective way the relative. There is a solitary instance of μη in a causal sentence, ἃτι μη πεπιστευκεν (Jo. 3:18), which may be contrasted with ἃτι ου πεπιστευκεν (1 Jo. 5:10). For ἃτι μη ἐξεις see Epictetus, IV, 10, 34, and ἃτι σοι ου, IV, 10. 35. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 171) quotes φασιν ἃτι μη δαι, Diog. of Oinoanda, Fragm. IV, 1. 9. There is, besides, ἐπει μη τοτε ἵσχυει in Heb. 9:17, according to the text of W. H., though they give in the margin ἐπει μη ποτε—διαθέμενος: In that case (the marginal reading) μη ποτε would introduce a question. See further Causal Clauses. In clauses of design we have Ινα μη with the ind., as in Rev. 9:4, ἰνα μη δοκιμασουσιν. The margin of W. H. in 13:17 has ἰνα μη τις δονατει. Moulton 4 explains μη with the ind. after verbs of apprehension as not originally a conjunction, but μη in the sense of ‘perhaps’ (paratactic, not hypotactic). So Lu. 11:35, σκοτει μη το φως—σκοτεις ἐστιν. Cf. also Col. 2:8; Heb. 3:12; Gal. 4:11; 1 Th. 3:5. The papyri give abundant parallels. Moulton (Prol., p. 193) cites γηγονται μη ποτε ἄρρωστει, P. Par. 49 (ii/b.c.). The use of μη as a conjunction in clauses of design and fear with the indicative is parallel to the use of the negative particle μη, but does not fall here for discussion.

(ii) The Subjunctive. After all that has been said it is obvious that μη was destined to be the negative of the subj., first of the volitive and deliberative uses and finally of the futuristic also. The few remnants of ου with the subj. have already been discussed. For the rest the normal and universal negative of the [Page 1170] subj. is μη. Cf. μη ἐνκακωμεν (Gal. 6:9). In Mk. 12:14, δωμεν ἦ μη δωμεν; (cf. ου just before), we see
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how well μὴ suits this deliberative question. The use of μὴ with the aor. subj. in prohibitions need not be further stressed. Wherever the subj. in a dependent clause has a negative (save after the conjunction μὴ after verbs of fearing) the negative is μὴ. Cf. ὁς αὖ μὴ ἔχη (Lu. 8:18); ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε (Mk. 14:38), etc. It is needless to give more examples.

(iii) The Optative. It is only the optative of wish that uses μὴ. It was rare to have the negative precative optative in the old Sanskrit. But already in Homer μὴ is used with the optative for a future wish. In the N. T. there is no example of μὴ with the optative except in wish. It is seen chiefly in μὴ γένοιτο, as in Ro. 3:4, 6, 31; Gal. 6:14, etc. But note also the curse of Jesus on the fig-tree in Mk. 11:14, μηδεξις καρπαν φάγοι.

(iv) The Imperative. It seems that the imperative was originally used only affirmatively and the injunctive originally only negatively with μᾶ. The oldest Sanskrit does not use μᾶ with the imperative. In Homer we find once μὴ ἔνθεο (Il., IV, 410) and once μὴ καταδύσεο (Il., X VIII, 134) and once μὴ ἀκουσάτω (Od., XVI, 301). The second person aorist imper. in prohibitions did not take root and the third person only sparingly (cf. p. 856). See Mt. 6:3, μὴ γνῶτω. The original negative injunctive appears in the form μὴ ποιήσῃς (Latin ne feceris). The imperative in Greek follows the analogy of this construction and uses μὴ uniformly. Cf. Lu. 11:7, μὴ μοι κόσσως πάρεχε. For the difference between μὴ with the present imperative and μὴ with the aorist subjunctive see Tenses and Modes. Cf. Mk. 13:21, μὴ πιστεύετε, with Lu. 12:11, μὴ μαρτυρήσετε, and μὴ φοβερῶθε μὴ φοβηθῆτε (Mt. 10:28, 31). It is obviously natural for μὴ to be used with the imperative. For a delicate turn from οὐ to μὴ see Jo. 10:37. But Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 171) cites οὐδὲν ἔξεστω from an inscr. (Benndorf-Niemann, Reisen in Lykien und Karien, 129 N. 102).

(v) The Infinitive. As we have already seen, the oldest Sanskrit inf. did not use the negative particles, and in Homer οὐ appears to be the original negative. But there are a few instances of μὴ with the inf. in Homer. They occur when the inf. is used as an imperative (cf. in the N. T. 1 Cor. 5:9; 2 Th. 3:14), for an oath, a wish or an indirect command. It is thus from the imperative and other finite modes that μὴ crept into constant use with the inf. It came to be the normal idiom with the inf. outside of indirect assertion and in antithetical or emphatic phrases (see under οὐ). Thompson challenges the statement of Gildersleeve: “Not till the infinitive came to represent the indicative (in indirect statement) could οὐ have been tolerated with the infinitive.” Thompson adds: “But this toleration is established in Homer.” Thus as we saw μὴ make inroads on οὐ in other constructions (cf. participles), so it was with the inf. Even in indirect statement μὴ came to be the rule (cf. the Atticist Lucian). Even in the Attic οὐ did not always occur with the inf. in indirect statement. The facts as to the use of μὴ with the inf. in the N. T. have been already given (see Infinitive and
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Indirect Discourse). Cf., for instance, λέγουσιν ἄνασταιν μὴ ἐλθέω (Mk. 12:18); ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ ἐλθέω (Lu. 20:7). In short, Blass\(^3\) says that in the N. T. “μὴ is used throughout.” That is not quite true, as we have seen, but the limitations have already been given under οὐ. Cf. Lu. 11:42, ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι κάκεινα μὴ παρεῖναι. Cf. 21:14. The use of μὴ λαλεῖν after οὐ δυνάμεθα (Ac. 4:20) has already been noticed. Here μὴ retains its full value. We need not pursue the matter. Cf. τοῦ μὴ (Ac. 21:12); πρὸς τὸ μὴ (2 Cor. 3:13); εἰς τὸ μὴ (4:4); διὸ τὸ μὴ (Mt. 13:5); τῷ μὴ (2 Cor. 2:13); ὅπερ μὴ (Mt. 8:28), etc. The redundant or pleonastic use of μὴ with the inf. has likewise come up for consideration under the Infinitive. In Lu. 20:27 some MSS. read ἀντὶ-λέγοντες and thus μὴ is redundant after ἀντὶ—, but NBDCL do not have ἀντὶ—.

Then in 22:34 NBLT reject μὴ with ἐλθέω after ἀπαρνήση. In Heb. 12:19 W. H. put μὴ in the margin after παρθήσαντο. But there is no doubt of the use of the redundant μὴ in the N. T. Cf. Lu. 17:1 ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τῶν σκάνδαλα μὴ ἔλθεν, (24:16) ἐκρατούντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιθνάναι αὐτόν. See also Lu. 4:42; 1 Pet. 3:10; Gal. 5:7. But this pleonastic μὴ is by no means necessary (cf. Ac. 8:36; Ro. 15:22). It does not usually occur with κοιλύω in the N. T., but note Ac. 10:47, μήτι τὸ ὑδωρ δύναται κοιλύσαι τίς τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι; Here μήτι is the interrogative particle expecting the answer ‘no,’ while μὴ is redundant after κοιλύσειν. But in Ac. 24:23 μηδένα is not pleonastic. We do not have μὴ οὐ with the inf. in the N. T. Here (after οὐ) μὴ stands alone and is not redundant (cf. Ac. 4:20) or is redundant (20:20, 27), as the case may be. The use of μὴ and μὴ οὐ was not compulsory in the ancient Greek.\(^4\)

**[Page 1172]** (vi) **The Participle.** We have seen already how the oldest Sanskrit did not use the negative particles with the participle. In Homer we have only one instance of μὴ with the participle (Od., IV, 684).\(^1\) But μὴ gradually made its way with participles even in Attic Greek. In the modern Greek μὴ has driven οὐ entirely from the participial use. In the N. T. οὐ still hangs on, as we have seen, but that is all. The drift of the κοινὴ is for μὴ, and a writer like Plutarch shows it.\(^2\) Μὴ is the usual negative of the participle. The details were given in connection with Participles. In the N. T. we need pay no attention to the Attic refinements on this point, which were not always observed even there. We have μὴ with the participle in the N. T. as a matter of course. Cf. Mt. 12:30 ὃ μὴ ὅνων and ὃ μὴ συνάγων, (1 Tim. 5:13) τὸ μὴ δέοντα, (Lu. 4:35) μηδὲν βλάπτων, (Ac. 20:22) μὴ εἰλοῦς. In Mt. 22:11 f. and 1 Pet. 1:8, a distinction, as was shown, seems to be drawn between οὐ and μὴ with the participle. Cf. Mt. 18:25; Lu. 12:33; Jo. 7:15; Ac. 9:9; 17:6; 1 Th. 4:5 (cf. Gal. 4:8), etc. The downright denial of οὐ lingered on awhile in the κοινὴ (cf. papyri), but μὴ is putting οὐ to rout.\(^3\)

(vii) **Nouns.** The ancient Greek\(^4\) used μὴ with substantives as ὃ μὴ ἵππος (Plato, Gorg. 459 b), adjectives as οἱ μὴ καθαροὶ (Ant. v. 82), or adverbs as τὸ μὴ ἐμποδόν (Thuc. ii, 45. 1). In the N. T., so far as I have noticed, μὴ with substantives and
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adjectives occurs only in contexts where it is natural. Thus in Lu. 10:4, μη πήραν, μη Ἵποδήματα, we have just before μη βασταύετε βαλλάντινον. In Jo. 13:9, μη τούς πόδας μου μόνον, we have no verb, but νῦνε is to be supplied from the preceding sentence. Cf. also Eph. 5:15; Jo. 18:40. So in Ro. 12:11 μη ὄκνηροι is in the midst of participles used in an imperatival sense. In 1 Tim. 3:3, μη πάροινον, μη πλήκτην, the construction is δεί ἐναντία. This infinitival construction is carried on in verse 6 (in spite of the parenthesis in verse 5) by μη νεόφυτον. So as to verse 8 and Tit. 1:7. There is no difficulty as to the use of μη in Col. 3:2 and 2 Th. 3:6.

(d) The Intensifying Compounds with Μη. The same story in the main that we found with οὐ is repeated with μη. There is no μηζι, but we have μητι in this sense. The examples in the N. T. are all in questions (cf. Mt. 7:16; Jo. 18:35) except one, ει μητι (Lu. 9:13). The position of μη may give it emphasis as in Jas. 3:1 (cf. οὐ in Mt. 15:11). The use of the compound [Page 1173] Negative as a second (or third) negative is simply to strengthen the negative as is true of οὐ. Cf. Mk. 11:14 μηκετι μηδεις φίγοι, (Ac. 25:24) ἐπιβοώντες μη δειν αὐτόν ζην μηκετι, (Ro. 13:8) μηδειν μηδεν οφελετε, (2 Cor. 13:7) μη—μηδεν, etc. Besides μηδεις there is μηθεν (Ac. 27:33), μηθεν in the sense of ‘not even’ (Eph. 5:3), μηθε (Mt. 6:1), μηδεποτε (2 Tim. 3:7), μηδεποτε (Heb. 11:7), μηκετι (Mk. 9:25), μηποτε (margin of W. H. in Heb. 9:17). Elsewhere in the N. T. a conjunction, μηδαιμος (Ac. 10:14), μηπο (Ac. 27:29), μηπο (Ro. 9:11), μηπε (1 Cor. 6:3), μηπε (2 Th. 2:3). Μηπε, is only a conjunction in the N. T. If μη is followed by οὐ as in 1 Jo. 3:10, δ μη ποιων δικαιοσυνην ουκ ἔστιν ξ το θεω, the last negative retains its force. So vice versa in Ac. 4:20. In Gal. 6:3 there is a sharp contrast between τι and μηθεν (both neuter abstracts referring to a person.).

(e) Και μη. We saw that after a positive statement the negative was carried on by και οὐ. So also we have και μη as in Eph. 4:26, ὄργιζοντες και μη ἄμαρτάνετε, and in Lu. 1:20; 2 Cor. 12:21 In Ac. 18:9 note μη φοβοω ἄλλα λάλει και μη σωπησης, where a positive command comes in between the two examples of μη. In Jas. 3:14, per contra, μη κατακαυχοσθε και ψευδοσθε κατα της ἀληθειας, the negative μη seems to cover both verbs connected by και rather than μηδε. Cf. also Lu. 3:14. We have instances also of και connecting a clause with the conjunction μη ποτε (Mt. 13:15=Mk. 4:12).1 In Lu. 14:29, Ἰνα μη ποτε θεντος αὐτοῦ θεμέλιον και μη ἰσχύοντος—ἀδρέωνται, we have μη ποτε with ἀδρέωνται and μη with ἰσχυοντος.

(f) Disjunctive Use of Μη. The simplest form of this contrast is μη—δε as in Lu. 10:20, μη χαιρετε—χαιρετε δε. Then we have μη—ἀλλα as in μη τουτον ἄλλα τον Βαροββάν, Jo. 18:40; μη φοβοου ἄλλα λάλει, Ac. 18:9. We have μη—πλην in Lu. 23:28. In Lu. 10:20 we really have μη δτι—δε δτι. Moulton (Prol., 240) does not find μη δτι in the N. T., but considers μητινε in p. 1 Cor. 6:3 as tantamount to it. See Jo. 13:9 for μη μονον—ἀλλα και. So Ph. 2:12. We need not trench further upon the conjunctions.

3. COMBINATION OF THE TWO NEGATIVES.

1 Cf. W.-Th., p. 494.
(a) **Μὴ** οὐ. This is very simple. It is in the N. T. confined to questions where μή is the interrogative particle and οὐ is the negative of the verb. Each negative thus has its own force, though it is a bit difficult to translate the combination into good English. But it is good Greek. Moulton (Prol., p. 192) quotes Plato’s Protag. 312 A, ὅλλον ὧν ὃμικος ὑπολαμβάνεις. Cf. also μή οὐχί in Jer. 23:24. So Ro. 10:18, μή οὐκ ἔκκουσαν: We may render it ‘Did they fail to hear?’ expecting the answer ‘No.’ Paul repeats the same idiom in 10:19. See further 1 Cor. 9:4 ff.; 11:22. 1 Cor. 9:8 is not an instance, since μή comes in one part of the question and οὐ in the other. We do have μή πώς οὐχ ἕκαστος ἀπετρέπετο ἐν τοίς. Cf. also μή οὐχί in Jer. 23:24. So Ro. 10:18, μή οὐχί ἵνα ἐκτεθήναι; We may render it ‘Did they fail to hear?’ expecting the answer ‘No.’ Paul repeats the same idiom in 10:19. See further 1 Cor. 9:4 ff.; 11:22. 1 Cor. 9:8 is not an instance, since μή comes in one part of the question and οὐ in the other. We do have μή πώς οὐχ ἕκαστος ἀπετρέπετο ἐν τοίς. Cf. also μή οὐχί in Jer. 23:24. So Ro. 10:18, μή οὐχί ἵνα ἐκτεθήναι; We may render it ‘Did they fail to hear?’ expecting the answer ‘No.’ Paul repeats the same idiom in 10:19. See further 1 Cor. 9:4 ff.; 11:22. 1 Cor. 9:8 is not an instance, since μή comes in one part of the question and οὐ in the other. We do have μή πώς οὐχ ἕκαστος ἀπετρέπετο ἐν τοίς. Cf. also μή οὐχί in Jer. 23:24. So Ro. 10:18, μή οὐχί ἵνα ἐκτεθήναι; We may render it ‘Did they fail to hear?’ expecting the answer ‘No.’ Paul repeats the same idiom in 10:19. See further 1 Cor. 9:4 ff.; 11:22. 1 Cor. 9:8 is not an instance, since μή comes in one part of the question and οὐ in the other. We do have μή πώς οὐχ ἕκαστος ἀπετρέπετο ἐν τοίς. Cf. also μή οὐχί in Jer. 23:24. So Ro. 10:18, μή οὐχί ἵνα ἐκτεθήναι; We may render it ‘Did they fail to hear?’ expecting the answer ‘No.’ Paul repeats the same idiom in 10:19. See further 1 Cor. 9:4 ff.; 11:22. 1 Cor. 9:8 is not an instance, since μή comes in one part of the question and οὐ in the other. We do have μή πώς οὐχ ἕκαστος ἀπετρέπετο ἐν τοίς. Cf. also μή οὐχί in Jer. 23:24. So Ro. 10:18, μή οὐχί ἵνα ἐκτεθήναι; We may render it ‘Did they fail to hear?’ expecting the answer ‘No.’ Paul repeats the same idiom in 10:19. See further 1 Cor. 9:4 ff.; 11:22. 1 Cor. 9:8 is not an instance, since μή comes in one part of the question and οὐ in the other. We do have μὴ πῶς οὐξ ἐδώκω ἀπειούμεναι in 2 Cor. 12:20, but here μή is a conjunction and οὐχ is the negative of εἶπον, both retaining their full force. The construction in 1 Jo. 3:10 is not pertinent.

(b) Οὔ μή. The use of οὔ—μή in Ac. 4:20 is not under discussion, nor the redundant μή after οὔ (Ac. 20:20, 27), but only the idiomatic οὔ μή with the aorist subj. (rarely present) or occasionally the fut. ind. Cf. οὔ μή φάγω, οὔ μή πείνω in the boy’s letter, P. Oxy. 119 (ii/iii A.D.). See Is. 11:9, οὔ μή κακοποιήσουσιν οὖδὲ μή δύνονται. Whatever the origin of this vexed problem, the negative is strengthened, not destroyed, by the two negatives. We need not here recount the various theories already mentioned. See Tense and Mode. Let it go at Gildersleeve’s suggestion that it was originally οὔ· μή. Moulton (Prol., p. 249) quotes Giles to the effect that this explanation was offered in the Middle Ages (the ancients have all our best ideas) and notes “in one if not both of the best MSS. of Aristophanes it is regularly punctuated οὔ· μή.” In Mt. 13:29 we have οὔ· μή ποτε—ἐκριζώσητε where μή is a conjunction. Gildersleeve notes that οὔ μή is more common in the LXX and the N. T. than in the classic Greek. But Moulton (Prol., pp. 187–192) will not let it go at that. “In the LXX οὔ· is translated οὗ or οὗ μή indifferently within a single verse, as in Is. 5:27.” It seems probable that the force of οὔ μή has worn down in the LXX and the N. T. In the non-literary papyri “οὔ μή is rare, and very emphatic,” Moulton notes. He urges also that in spite of the 100 examples in the text of W. H. the idiom in the N. T. is as rare as in the papyri when the 13 LXX quotations and the 53 from the words of Christ are removed, “a feeling that inspired language was fitly rendered by words of a peculiarly decisive tone.” But in these examples the force of οὔ μή is still strong. Of the other 34 some are probably weakened a bit as in Mt. 25:9; Mk. 13:2; Jo. 18:11. It is only in the Gospels and the Apocalypse (66 and 18 respectively) that οὔ μή occurs with frequency. It is interesting to observe that on this point Moulton gets the Gospels and Revelation in harmony with the papyri by eliminating the 70 passages due to Semitic influence. Cf. Gildersleeve (A. J. P., iii, 202 ff.) and Ballentine (ib., xviii, 453 ff.). But Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 172) explains Mt. 24:21,
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οὐ—οὐδὲ οὐ μὴ γένηται, not as a Hebraism, but as a “barbarism” like the Wesseley Papyrus xxvi, οὐδὲ οὐ μὴ γένηται μοι γυνὴ. He quotes also Pap. Lugd. II, p. 107, 9, ἐὰν θέλῃς γυναῖκας οὐ μὴ σχεθήναι. Cf. οὐ μὴ ἀδικήθη (Rev. 2:11); οὐ μὴ ἔσται (Mt. 16:22). There is a climax in Rev. 7:16, οὐ—οὐδὲ—οὐδὲ μὴ πέσῃ. Even οὐ μὴ was not strong enough sometimes, so that we have οὐδὲ and οὐ μὴ in Heb. 13:5, οὐ μὴ σε ἄνδρον οὐδὲ οὐ μὴ σε ἡγεῖσαι. So also οὐδὲν οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσει (Lu. 10:19). In Mk. 13:2 we have οὐ μὴ in both the principal and the subordinate (relative) clause.

IV. Interrogative Particles (ἐπερωτηματικαὶ παραθέτοντο). It is not the mode that we have under discussion here, but simply the particles used in the various forms of questions.1

1. SINGLE QUESTIONS.

(a) Direct Questions.

(i) No Particle at all. So συνήκατε τὰτα πάντα; (Mt. 13:51). So 13:28 and very often. Here the inquiry is colourless except as the tone of voice or context may indicate one’s attitude. In fact, most interrogative sentences have no interrogative word at all. Cf. Lu. 13:2; Jo. 7:23; 13:6; Ac. 21:37, etc. Hence it is sometimes a matter of doubt whether a sentence is interrogative or declarative. Cf. Jo. 16:31; Ro. 8:33; 14:22; 1 Cor. 1:13; 2 Cor. 3:1; Heb. 10:2; Jas. 2:4, etc. It may be doubtful also at what point the question ends. Cf. Jo. 7:19; Ro. 4:1. Winer2 rightly says that on this point grammar cannot speak.

(ii) The Use of Negative Particles. They are used to indicate the kind of answer expected. This subject has already had sufficient discussion. See under οὐ and μὴ. Οὐ expects the answer ‘yes’ (cf. Mt. 7:22) and μὴ the answer ‘no’ (cf. Jo. 7:31). In Jo. 18:37 we have οὐκοῦν, according to W. H., which has lost its negative force, but οὐκοῦν would preserve it. Probably Pilate was hardly ready to go that far unless in jest. The use of μὴ varies greatly in tone. The precise emotion in each case (protest, indignation, scorn, excitement, sympathy, etc.) depends on the context. Cf. Jo. 4:29; 6:67; 7:47; Lu. 6:39; Ro. 10:18; 11:1. In Jo. 3:10 the first part of the question has no negative and the second part has οὐ.
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Other Particles. There are not many. There is ἄρα (akin to root of ἄρ-ἀρ-ἱσκω, 'to join'), an illative particle which occurs with ὀὖν as in Ac. 21:38, μήτι as in 2 Cor. 1:17, or with τίς as in Mt. 18:1. This classic use is not strictly interrogative, but illative in the interrogative sentence. But ἄρα, from the same root with more vocal stress, is interrogative. Indeed, it is sometimes doubtful which accent is correct, as in Gal. 2:17, where ἄρα is probably correct. In Ro. 14:19, however, W. H. give ἄρα οὖν. We have ἄρα in Lu. 18:8 and ἄρα γε in Ac. 8:30. ἄρα looks backward, ἄρα forward. But the accent is a question of editing. The use of εἰ in direct questions is either a Hebraism or involves ellipsis. Cf. Mt. 12:10, εἰ ἔξεστιν τίς σάββασιν θεραπεύειν; So also 19:3. It is common in the LXX (cf. Gen. 17:17) but is foreign to the old Greek. The classic Greek, however, did use εἰ in indirect questions, and this fact may have made it easier for the direct use of εἰ to arise. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 136) takes this εἰ = ἦν. The N. T. does not use ἦν, but the papyri have it: ἦν μείνῃ ἐν βακχιάδι; ἦν µείνωι ἐντυνχάνιν; P. Fay. 137 (i/A.D.). So the question to the oracle.

Interrogative Pronouns. The most common in the N. T. is τίς (cf. Mt. 3:7). Other words are frequently added, as ἄρα (24:45); γάρ (9:5); οὖν (Lu. 3:10). The various uses of τί as adverb (Mk. 10:18, Lu. 16:2); with prepositions, as διὰ τί (Mt. 9:11) and εἰς τί (Mk. 14:4) or χάριν τίνος (1 Jo. 3:12); or elliptically, as τί διτι (Lu. 2:49) and ἣν τί (Mt. 9:4), need not detain us. The double interrogative τίς τί appears in Mk. 15:24. Both τίς and ποίος occur in 1 Pet. 1:11. For ποταπός see Mt. 8:27, and πόσος see 15:34. We need not tarry longer on these elementary details.

Interrogative Conjunctions. These are common besides τί (as in Mk. 10:18). The possible exclamatory use of τί in Lu. 12:49='how fine.' Cf. ποσάκις (Mt. 18:21); πότε (25:38); ἐώς πότε (17:17); ποῦ (Lu. 8:25); πῶς (10:26); πόθεν (Mt. 13:27), etc.

Indirect Questions. Here there must be either a pronoun or a conjunction.

(a) Pronouns. The use of τίς (τί) is common. Cf. Mt. 6:25; Lu. 9:46; Jo. 2:25; Ac. 19:32. We find ὅτι so used in Ac. 9:6 and ὅ apparently so in 1 Tim. 1:7. Certainly ὅποιος occurs in this construction (1 Cor. 3:13). The same thing is true of ὅσος (Mk. 5:19) and ὅποιος (Jas. 1:24). Cf. also ποίος (Mk. 11:29); πόσος (Mt. 27:13); ποταμός (Lu. 7:39); πηλίκος (Heb. 7:4), and ἥλικος in Gal. 6:11 (margin of W. H.) if this reading be accepted. Cf. τί in Ac. 12:18.

(b) Conjunctions. These are also common, as εἰ (Mk. 15:44); πόθεν and ποῦ (Jo. 3:8); πότε (Mk. 13:33); πῶς (1 Th. 1:9); ὅποιος (Lu. 24:20); ὅπου (Mk. 14:14); μὴ ποτε (Lu. 3:15), etc.

Double Questions. These are rare.

---

1 Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 411) notes the pre-Attic ἦ ὅρα.
2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 260.
(i) **Direct.** There is no instance of πότερον—ἢ. We do have τίς—ἢ (Mt. 9:5; 23:17; 27:17), the later Greek caring little for the dual idea in πότερον. We more commonly have simply ἢ with the second part of the question and nothing in the first, as in Lu. 20:2, 4; Ro. 2:3 f. We may have ἢ oū (Mt. 22:17) and ἢ μή (Mk. 12:14). Sometimes we have simply ἢ at the beginning of the question with a reference to an implied alternative (1 Cor. 9:6; 2 Cor. 1:17). This ἢ may come in the middle of the sentence as in 1 Cor. 9:8. The ἢ may even precede τίς as in Mt. 7:9.

(ii) **Indirect.** There is one instance of πότερον—ἡ in an indirect question (Jo. 7:17).

V. **Conjunctions (σύνδεσμοι).** In the nature of the case much had to be said about the conjunctions1 in the treatment of the Sentence and also Subordinate Clauses. The syntactical principles controlling both paratactic and hypotactic sentences have received adequate discussion. But conjunctions play such an important part in the language that it is best to group them all together. They connect words, clauses, sentences and paragraphs, and thus form the joints of speech. They have a very good name, since they bind together (con-jungo) the various parts of speech not otherwise connected, if they need connection, for asyndeton is always possible to the speaker or writer. The point here is to interpret each conjunction as far as possible so that its precise function may be clear.

1. **Paratactic2 Conjunctions (σύνδεσμοι παρατακτικοί).**

(a) **Copulative.** Conjunctions which connect words and clauses are evidently later in development than the words and clauses. The use of conjunctions came to be very common in the Greek so that the absence was noticeable and was called asyndeton.[Page 1178] But it is a mistake to suppose that these connectives are necessary. One may fail to use them as a result of rapidity of thought as the words rush forth, or they may be consciously avoided for rhetorical effect. Cf. βλέπετε, βλέπετε, βλέπετε in Ph. 3:2, with Tennyson’s “Break, break, break.” All this is entirely within the province of the speaker. Cf. 1 Cor. 3:12, χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, λίθους τιμίους, ξύλα, χόρτον, καλά μην. Cf. also 1 Cor. 13:4–7 where the verbs follow one another in solemn emphasis with no connective save one δέ. In the same way contrast may be expressed without conjunctions as in 1 Cor. 15:43 f. In Luke and John there is a pleasing alternation of asyndeton and conjunctions. Cf. Gal. 5:22. The first conjunctions were the paratactic or co-ordinating, since language was originally in principal sentences.3 The copulative (connecting) conjunctions are the simplest and earliest type of the paratactic structure. They simply present the words or clauses as

---

1 The distinction between adv. and conj. is, of course, arbitrary. Conjs. are advs. just as the other particles are. Cf. Paul, Principles of the Hist. of Lang., p. 406.
2 “Co-ordinating” is from co-ordino, to range together.
1 Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 551.
2 Cf. W.-Th., p. 538.
3 Brug., ib., p. 552.
on a par with each other. The primitive conjunctions were monosyllabic like καί, τέ, δέ.5

(i) Τέ. This word appears to be related to the Sanskrit cā, the Latin que (with labio-velar qʰ), and the Gothic -h.6 These words are all enclitic and postpositive. The Sanskrit is almost devoid of conjunctions which were so highly developed by the Greek and Latin, but cā is one of the few possessed by this ancient tongue.7 There is a striking connection between quis, que, quis-que and τίς, τέ, τίς. The Thessalian dialect has κίς for τίς and κίς-κς. We have τίς τέ in the old Greek. Τέ shows this double pronominal origin in its use for and and ever (just like que, quis-que).8 The indefinite use is distinctly H omeric.9 The use of έπεί τέ, ὁς τέ was old Ionic and continued in Attic tragedy, as οἶός τέ did in Attic prose. Cf. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 5). Indeed, some scholars10 hold that the correlative use (τέ—τέ) was the original one, but this is doubtful. It seems certain that τέ indicates a somewhat closer unity than does καί. This close correlative use is certainly very old. Cf. σοῦ τέ έγώ τέ in Homer.11 In the N. T. it is rare except in the Acts, where it occurs some 175 times. It is common in all parts of the book and is thus a subtle argument for the unity of the work (we-sections and all). It is something additional, but in intimate relation with the preceding. We find τέ alone as in Ac. 2:33, where ὑψωθές καὶ λαβών are united by τέ. Cf. also 10:22, where again two participles are connected. In 22:24, κτήνη τέ παραστήσαται, the change from the direct to the indirect discourse is marked by τέ, whereas καί is used twice before to join minor phrases. Τέ puts παραστήσαται on a par with έποιμάσατε.1 In the same way in 20:11 the first two participles are joined by καί and then both are related to the next by τέ. The same idiom occurs in Jo. 6:18, where τέ gives an additional item somewhat apart from the καί—καί just before. In Jo. 4:41 καί—τέ are not co-ordinate. Καί introduces the whole sentence and τέ connects the two parts. Cf. thus δέ—τέ in Ac. 2:37. But τέ—τέ is strictly correlative. Cf. the Latin que—que, English as—so. See Ac. 2:46 where the two participles are co-ordinated. In Ro. 14:8 we have τέ four times in succession with ἐάν. There are here two pairs of conditions. The parts of each pair are balanced carefully. The disjunctive εἴτε—εἴτε (cf. 1 Cor. 12:26) is at bottom this same correlative use of τέ. So as to οὖτε—οὖτε (Mt. 12:32) and μήτε—μήτε (Ac. 27:20). The use of τέ—καί is also common where there is an inner bond, though no hint is given as to the relative value of the matters united. Cf. ἀρχιερεῖς τέ καί γραμματέας (Lu. 22:66); ποιεῖν τέ καί διδάσκειν (Ac. 1:1); ἄνδρες τέ καί γυναῖκες (8:12); ἐκκλησίας τέ—καί ἐγένετο (21:30); δικαίων τέ καί ἀδίκων (24:15); μικρῷ τέ καί μεγάλῳ (26:22); ἔλθῃ τέ καί θανάτος (Ro. 1:14); Ἰουδαίου τέ πρῶτον καί Ἑλλήνος (2:9), etc. For τέ καί—τέ see Ac. 9:15, and for τέ
καὶ—τέ—καὶ 26:20. In Jo. 4:11, οὗτε—καὶ, we really have the τέ—καὶ (‘both—and’) construction. Cf. Latin non que—et. We even have οὗτε—οὗτε—καὶ in Jo. 5:37 f. In Ac. 27:20 μήτε—μήτε stand together and both are parallel to τέ following. Per contra we find τέ—δέ in Ac. 19:2 and also 3. The manuscripts often vary between τέ and δέ (cf. Ac. 3:10; 4:14, etc.). We have τέ γάρ (common from Aristotle on2) in Ro. 1:26 followed by ὁμοίως τέ καὶ. In Heb. 2:11 note τέ γάρ—καὶ. As a rule τέ stands after the word or words that are paralleled, but this is not always so.

(ii) Καί. The etymology of this conjunction is disputed. Curtius3 makes it the locative case of the pronominal stem κα—, κο—, so that it would ultimately come from the same root as τέ (que). It would thus mean ‘in this respect,’ ‘this besides.’ Brugmann1 finds its original sense in κοινός, Latin co-, cum, Gothic ὅ. The idea would then be ‘together with,’ ‘in addition to.’ The Arkadian, South Achæan and Cypriote dialects use κᾶς and κὰ=καί. Whatever the origin, it all comes to the same thing in the end. It is by far the most frequent of all the conjunctions or other particles in the N. T. It is so common in fact that Moulton and Geden do not list it in their concordance. This in itself is in accord with the later Greek idiom, as Thumb2 notes in Aristotle and in the modern Greek and Moulton3 in the papyri. Moulton cites Par. P. 18, ἔτι δόο ἡμέρας ἔχομεν καὶ ρήσομεν εἰς Πηλούσια, as parallel to Mk. 15:25; Jo. 4:35. But there can be little doubt that the extreme fondness for parataxis in John’s Gospel, for instance, is partially due to the use of καί in the LXX for the Hebrew 7 which “means a hook and resembles a hook in shape.”4 It was certainly used to “hook” together all sorts of sentences. There is not the same unity in the older Greek in the matters united as is true of τέ. Καί “connects in a free and easy manner”5 and the Hebrew 8 still more loosely. There are three main uses of καί which appear in the N. T. as in all Greek.

The Adjunctive Use (‘Also’). This is possibly the original use, though one cannot tell. It is thus like the Latin et-iam, English too (to)=addition to something already mentioned, and is common enough in all stages of the language.6 A good example of this use of καί is seen in Mt. 8:9, καὶ γὰρ ἔγνω ὅθεν ἡρωπός ἀµη ὧν ἔζωσαν. The καί here points to Christ’s relation to the boy. The centurion, like a true soldier, does not say that he is a man who gives orders, but rather one who obeys them. He has the true
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1 Griech. Gr., p. 542.
2 Hellen., p. 129.
3 Prol., p. 12.
4 Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 196.
5 Jann., Gk. Gr., p. 401.
military spirit and know therefore how Jesus can cure the boy without going to see him. The καὶ is here very significant. Cf. οὗτος καὶ ὢν μὲν in Mt. 7:12, where the Golden Rule is applied to Christ's hearers by καὶ. Cf. Jo. 7:3 ἦν καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου, (12:10) ἦν καὶ τὸν Δαρίδα. This use of καὶ is more frequent in Luke than elsewhere in the N. T. Cf. κἂν (Lu. 20:3); ἦ καί (Lu. 12:41); δὲ καί (12:54, 57); τί καί (1 Cor. 15:29); καὶ γὰρ (Mt. 8:9); ἕν καί (Gal. 6:1); ἵν καί (2 Cor. 11:15); καὶ δὲ (Mt. 10:18);

The Mere Connective ('And'). The difference between καὶ as 'and' and καὶ as 'also' is very slight, whichever was the original idea. The expository or explicative use of καὶ occupies a middle ground between 'also' and 'and.' Blass² treats it under 'also.' Cf. Lu. 3:18, πολλα ὁ ἑτέρα παρακαλῶν, where the "connective" force of καὶ is certainly very slight. So also Jo. 20:30, πολλα ὁ καὶ ἄλλα σημεία. See further Jo. 1:16, καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, where the clause is an explanatory addition. Cf. (Ac. 22:25) καὶ ἄνθρωπον, (1 Cor. 2:2) καὶ τοῦτον ἑπταευρήμονα, (Ro. 13:11) καὶ τούτο (Latin idque) which is our 'and that too' where we combine 'and' and 'also' ('too') in the καὶ, (Heb. 11:12) καὶ ταύτα (frequent in ancient [Page 1182] Greek). See in particular Eph. 2:8, καὶ τούτο οὖν ἦν ὁ ὄρος, where τούτο refers to the whole conception, not to χάριν. The simple copulative idea is, however, the most common use of καὶ where words are piled together by means of this conjunction. Sometimes the connection is as close as with τέ. Thus ὃ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ (2 Cor. 1:3); καὶ ἂν καὶ

7 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 140.
1 Cf. Deiss., B. S.; Hatch, Jour. of Bib. Lit., 1908, p. 142.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 263.
ἀγαθῇ (Lu. 8:15). But the words may be very loosely joined in idea, as οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι (Mt. 16:1). Καὶ may be used to connect all sorts of words, clauses and sentences. Thus λέγω Ἐρχομαι, καὶ ἔρχεται (Mt. 8:9). The use of καὶ after the imperative is seen in Mt. 11:29. The chain with καὶ as the connective may go on indefinitely. Cf. the four examples in Ph. 4:9; five in Ro. 9:4; the six in Rev. 7:12 (so 5:12). So we have καὶ ὅτι three times in 1 Cor. 15:4 (καὶ to connect ὅτι clauses). In Rev. 12–16 every paragraph and most of the sentences begin with καὶ. In fact it is true of much of the Apocalypse. If one turns to First Maccabees, it is true even to a much greater extent than in the Apocalypse. In First Maccabees καὶ translates the Hebrew י. But Thumb has found this repetition of καὶ in Aristotle so that the Hebrew influence simply intensified a Greek idiom. We have noted the use of καὶ with τέ (τέ—καὶ Cf. Ro. 1:20). The use of καὶ—καὶ is far more common in the sense of ‘both—and’ as in Ac. 2:29, καὶ ἐκτελεῖται καὶ ἔκφυγεν. Cf. Mk. 4:41; Ph. 2:13; Ac. 26:29. Sometimes the connection almost amounts to ‘not only, but also.’ In Col. 2:16 note καὶ—ἡ. Cf. κἀν—κἀν (Lu. 12:38). A. Brinkmann contends that in the papyri and late Greek κἀν is sometimes ‘at any rate’ and is never a mere link (Scriptio continua und Anderes, Rhein. Mus. LXVII, 4, 1912). In Lu. 5:36 we have καὶ—καὶ—καὶ οὐ (so Jo. 6:36), and in Jo. 17:25 καὶ οὐ—ὁ̄κ—καὶ. It is usual to have καὶ οὐ after an affirmative clause as in Jo. 10:35. Cf. καὶ μὴ in 2 Cor. 9:5. See Negative Particles. In Lu. 12:6 καὶ οὐ follows a question with οὐχί. Καὶ connects two negative sentences in Lu. 6:37. For οὐκε—καὶ see Jo. 4:11. Sometimes καὶ begins a sentence when the connection is with an unexpressed idea. Children use “and” thus often in telling stories and asking questions. Cf. καὶ οὐ ξησα in Mt. 26:69 (and 73) like Et tu, Brute. See also Mk. 10:26, καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι. So also Lu. 10:29; Jo. 9:36; 2 Cor. 2:2. Cf. also the use of καὶ in parenthesis as in Ro. 1:13, καὶ ἐκτελεῖτο καὶ τῷ δὲ θρόνῳ. The context gives other turns to καὶ that are sometimes rather startling. It is common to find καὶ where it has to bear the content ‘and yet.’ So Jo. 3:19; [Page 1183] 4:20; 6:49; 7:30; 1 Jo. 2:9. The examples are common in John’s Gospel (Abbott, Joh. Gr., pp. 135 ff.). See Jer. 23:21. In Mk. 4:4 note μὲν—καὶ. In 1 Cor. 10:21 we have οὐ—καὶ in contrast. Cf. also Mt. 3:14, καὶ σὺ ἐγένετο πρὸς με; So also Ph. 1:22, καὶ τί αἱρήσωμαι. This idiom occurs in Plato, and Abbott notes a number of them in the Gospel of John. Cf. 1:5; 2:20; 3:13; 5:39 f.; 7:27 f.; 8:57, etc. In Lu. 12:24 καὶ is almost equal to ὅλλα, that is, the context makes contrast. Cf. also Mt. 6:26 (οὐ—καὶ); Mk. 12:12; Lu. 20:19; Jo. 18:28. Tholuck so takes καὶ in Ro. 1:13 (the parenthetical καὶ). Sometimes καὶ seems imitative of the Hebrew י by almost having the sense of ὅτι or ἵνα (‘that’) as in Mt. 26:15; Mk. 14:40; Lu. 9:51; 12:15. In particular note καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ (as in Lu.

---

1 Hellen., § 129.
Abbott


———, Johannine Grammar (1906).

———, Johannine Vocabulary (1905).

Tholuck THOLUCK, Beiträge zur Spracherklärung des N. T.
1 Beitr. zur Spracherklärung d. N. T., p. 35.
In Mt. 16:6 observe ὃρθε καί. So Lu. 12:15 and Mt. 26:15. In modern Greek καί has so far usurped the field that it is used not only in all sorts of paratactic senses like ‘and,’ ‘but,’ ‘for,’ ‘or,’ ‘and so,’ but even in hypotactic senses for υά or ποῦ, declarative and even consecutive (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 184). In Mk. 3:7 καί comes near taking the place of ὃ, for in the next verse there are five instances of καί co-ordinate with each other, but subordinate to καί in verse 7. Sometimes after καί we may supply ‘so’ as in καί λάμπει, Mt. 5:15; καί βλέπομεν, Heb. 3:19. See also Ph. 4:7. This is a kind of consecutive2 use of καί. Cf. Lu. 24:18. The fondness for co-ordination in the Gospels causes the use of καί where a temporal conjunction (ὅτε) would be more usual. Cf. Mk. 15:25, ἃν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν (Lu. 23:44). But Blass3 admits that this is a classic idiom. Cf. Mt. 26:45; Lu. 19:43, where καί drifts further away from the ancient idiom. Cf. also καὶ ἵδοι in the apodosis, ‘and behold,’ as in Lu. 7:12. In 2 Tim. 2:20 note καί followed by ἀ μέν—ἀ δὲ. In Ph. 4:16 note καί thrice (one='even,' two='both—and').

(iii) Δέ. This conjunction is generally ranked wholly as an adversative particle.4 Monro5 says: “The adversative δέ properly indicates that the new clause stands in some contrast to what has preceded. Ordinarily, however, it is used in the continuation of a narrative.” As a matter of fact, in my opinion, Monro has the matter here turned round. The ordinary narrative use (continuative) I conceive to be the original use, the adversative the developed and later construction. The etymology confirms [Page 1184] this explanation, though it is largely conjectural. Brugmann1 associates it with the ἀκόλουθον ending –δέ (οἰκος-δέ, ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν), while Hartung3 connects it with δύο, δις, and Bäumlein4 with δεύ-τερος. The enclitic –δέ thus means ‘again,’ ‘back,’ while the conjunction δέ would mean ‘in the second place’ or ‘a second comment’ or ‘an important addition’ (δῆ). But, however we take it, there is in the word no essential notion of antithesis or contrast. What is true is that the addition is something new5 and not so closely associated in thought as is true of τέ and καί. I prefer therefore to begin with the narrative and transitional (copulative) use of δέ. Kühner-Gerth6 call this use of δέ for ‘something new’ (etwas Neues) copulative and give it separate discussion. Abbott7 has the matter correctly: “In classical Greek, δέ, calling attention to the second of two things, may mean (1) in the next place, (2) on the other hand.” The first of these uses is the original one and is copulative. The second is adversative. Abbott notes also that δέ in both senses occurs in Matthew and Luke nearly three times as often as in Mark and John. Its use is mainly in the historical books of the N. T. It is so common there that, as with καί, Moulton and Geden do not give any references. A good place to note

2 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 262.
3 Ib.
5 Hom. Gk., p. 245.
3 L, p. 156 f.
4 Part., p. 89.
5 W.-Th., p. 443.
6 II, p. 274.
7 Joh. Gr., p. 104.
the mere copulative force of δέ is in the genealogy in Mt. 1:2–16 where there is no notion of opposition at all. The line is simply counted from Abraham to Christ. In verses 6 and 12 there are breaks, but the contrast is made by repetition of the names, not by δέ, which appears with every name alike. In Mt. 23:4 we have both uses of δέ. The first is properly translated ‘yea’ and the second ‘but’ (adversative). See further 1 Cor. 4:7 (δέ and δὲ καί) where there is a succession of steps in the same direction. So 15:35; 2 Cor. 6:15 f.; Heb. 12:6; and in particular the list of virtues in 2 Pet. 1:5–7. Sometimes a word is repeated with δέ for special emphasis, as δικαιοσύνη δέ in Ro. 3:22 (cf. 9:30). A new topic may be introduced by δέ in entire harmony with the preceding discussion, as the Birth of Jesus in Mt. 1:18 (‘Now the birth of Jesus Christ,’ etc.). The use of δέ in explanatory parenthesis is seen in Jo. 3:19 (‘And this is,’ etc.); 19:23 (‘Now the coat,’ etc.). For ὥς δέ (‘and when,’ ‘so when’) in John see 2:9, 23. In John [Page 1185] as elsewhere it is sometimes not clear whether δέ is copulative or adversative. Cf. 3:1, ἢν δέ. Is Nicodemus an illustration or an exception?1 The resumptive use of δέ, after a parenthesis, to go on with the main story, is also copulative. Cf. Mt. 3:1; Lu. 4:1. There is continuation, not opposition, in the use of καὶ δέ, as in Lu. 1:76, καὶ σὺ δέ, where δέ means ‘and’ and καὶ ‘also’ Cf. further Mt. 10:18; 16:18; Jo. 15:27. In Jo. 6:51 we have καὶ δέ in the apodosis of the condition in this sense. Δέ is always postpositive and may even occupy the third place in the sentence (Mt. 10:11) or even the fourth (Jo. 6:51) or fifth (1 Jo. 2:2) or sixth (Test. xiii, Patr. Jud. 9:1) as shown in chapter on Sentence.

In accord with the copulative use of δέ we frequently have οὔδε and µηδέ in the continuative sense, carrying on the negative with no idea of contrast. Cf. Mt. 6:26, οῦ σπείρουσιν οὔδε θερίζουσιν οὔδε συνάγουσιν. So also 6:28; Mk. 4:22, etc. In Jo. 7:5, οὔδε γάρ, we have οὔδε in the sense of ‘not even’ as often (Mt. 6:29, etc.). In Mt. 6:15 οὔδε means ‘not also’ (cf. also 21:27, etc.). All three uses of καί are thus paralleled in οὔδε (merely οὔ δέ). For µηδέ in the continuative sense see Mt. 7:6. It means ‘not even’ in 1 Cor. 5:11. For the repetition of continuative µηδέ see 1 Cor. 10:7–10. In Mk. 14:68, οὔτε οὔδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι (some MSS. οὐκ—οὔδε), we come pretty close to having οὔτε—οὔτε in the merely continuative sense as we have in οὔτε—καί (Jo. 4:11; 3 Jo. 10).

(iv) Ἀλλά. Here there is no doubt at all as to the etymology. Ἀλλά is a virtual proclitic (cf. ἔπι and ἐπί), and the neuter plural was ἄλλα (ἄλλα, ‘other things’). Bäumlein2 does take ἄλλα as originally an adverb. But in reality it is ‘this other matter’3 (cf. τοῦτα and τοῦτο). In actual usage the adversative came to be the most frequent construction, but the original copulative held on to the N. T. period. It is a mistake to infer that ἄλλος means ‘something different.’ In itself it is merely ‘another.’ Like δέ the thing introduced by ἄλλα is something new, but not essentially in contrast.4 So the classic Greek used ἄλλα µήν in the emphatic continuative sense.5

---

5 Ib.
Blass\(^6\) observes that “the simple ἄλλα also has this force of introducing an accessory idea.” Cf. 2 Cor. 7:11, πόσην κατευγάσατο ὑμῖν σπουδήν, ἄλλα ἀπολογίαν, ἄλλα ἀγανάκτησιν, ἄλλα φόβον, ἄλλα ἐπιστολήν, ἄλλα ἐκδίκησιν. All these six examples are confirmatory and continuative. See further Lu. 24:21, ἄλλα γε καί σὺν πάσιν τούτοις, where it is climacteric, [Page 1186] not contradictory. The story is carried on by ἄλλα καί in verse 22. Cf. also 2 Cor. 1:9; Lu. 12:7; 16:21. In Ph. 1:18, γαῖρο, ἄλλα καί χαρῆσομαι, the connection is very close. The most striking example of all is Ph. 3:8, ἄλλα μενοῦνγη καί ἤγοιμαι. In 2 Cor. 11:1, ἄλλα καί ἀνέχεσθε, the tone of irony makes it doubtful whether to take ἄλλα as copulative or adversative. These and similar passages are not a dropping of the adversative idea, but merely the retention of the original copulative meaning. Abbott\(^7\) sees that “it is hard to find a satisfactory explanation of Jo. 8:26” along the usual line. If one no longer feels impelled to translate by ‘but,’ the trouble vanishes. Just make it ‘now’ or ‘yea’ and it is clear. Abbott\(^8\) likewise considers ἄλλα “inexplicable” in 4:23, because it has to mean ‘but.’ Cf. Jo. 16:2, ἄλλα ἔχεται ἡρα, ‘yea, the hour comes.’ The same use of ἄλλα occurs also in negative sentences. In 1 Cor. 3:3, ὦδὲ νῦν δύνασθε after ὦπο ἐδύνασθε. In 4:3, ἄλλα ὦδὲ after an affirmative clause. In Ac. 19:2, ἄλλα ὦδὲ, the thought answers the preceding question and is probably adversative, as is possible in 1 Cor. 3:3. The ἄλλα at any rate is negative like the ὦδὲ. So as to ἄλλα ὦδὲ Ἡρῴδης (Lu. 23:15).

(b) Adversative. It should be stated again that not all of these conjunctions mean contrast (antithesis) or opposition, but the context makes the matter clear. The modern Greek keeps ἄλλα, ὄμως, πλὴν, but not δὲ and µέντοι (Thumb, Handb., p. 185).

(i) Δὲ. In Jas. 1:13 f. note the two uses of δὲ (continuative and adversative). Sometimes the positive and the negative are sharply contrasted and then δὲ is clearly adversative as in Mt. 23:4, αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐ θέλουσιν. More obvious still is 6:14 f., ἔδιν ἄφητε—ἔδω δὲ µὴ ἄφητε. Cf. also 6:23. So µὴ θησαυρίζετε—θησαυρίζετε δὲ (6:19 f.). Cf. 1 Cor. 1:10, etc. The contrast may lie in the nature of the case, particularly where persons stand in contrast as in ἐγὼ δὲ (Mt. 5:22, 28, 32, etc.), αὐτὸς δὲ (Mt. 6:6; 1 Tim. 6:11); ἡμεῖς δὲ (1 Cor. 1:23); ὑμεῖς δὲ (Mk. 8:29); the common ὅ δὲ (Mk. 1:45), οἱ δὲ (Mt. 2:5); αὐτοὶ δὲ (Lu. 8:37), αὐτοὶ δὲ Ἰησοῦς (Jo. 2:24), etc. The contrast is made more manifest by the use of µέν (see Intensive Particles) as in Mt. 3:11. In 1 Cor. 2:6, σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου, an exception is filed to the preceding. This adversative use of δὲ is very common indeed. Cf. further Mk. 2:18; Lu. 5:5; 9:9, 13; 24:21; Ac. 12:15; Ro. 8:9 ff.

(ii) ἄλλα. Just as ἄλλος (cf. 2 Cor. 11:4) can be used in the sense of ἕτερος (when it means ‘different,’ not merely ‘second’), so [Page 1187] ἄλλα can mean ‘another’ in contrast to the preceding. With a negative the antithesis is sharp as in Lu. 1:60, οὐχὶ, ἄλλα κληθήσεται Ἰωάννης. So Jo. 6:32, οὐ Μωυσῆς—ἄλλλ. ὁ πατήρ (cf. 6:38). Cf. Mk. 9:37; 1 Cor. 15:37. In verse 39 of 1 Cor. 15 note ἄλλα ἄλλη µὲν—ἄλλη δὲ where both ἄλλα and ἄλλη have the notion of difference due to the context. In 1 Cor. 9:12

\(^{6}\) Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 269.
\(^{1}\) Joh. Gr., p. 100.
\(^{2}\) Ib., p. 99.
note ἀλλά twice. In Mt. 15:11 οὐ begins one clause and ἀλλά the other. Cf. 2 Cor. 4:5, οὐ γὰρ ἐκατοντές κηρύσσομεν, ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν κύριον. So Mt. 5:17. In Lu. 12:51 note οὐχί, ἀλλ. ἢ, and in 2 Cor. 1:13, ἀλλὰ—ἀλλ. ἢ, a sort of pleonastic use of ἀλλά. This is a classical idiom. Cf. also οὐ μόνον—ἀλλά (Ac. 19:26) or ἀλλά καί (Ro. 5:3). See Negative Particles. For οὐχ ὅτι—ἀλλά see Jo. 7:22, for οὐχ ἵνα—ἀλλά see 6:38. For ἀλλά γε in apodosis see 1 Cor. 9:2, for ἀλλά Col. 2:5; for ἀλλά οὐ, 1 Cor. 4:15. Sometimes ἀλλά ἵνα may be elliptical as in Mk. 14:49; Jo. 1:8. ἀλλά alone may refer to an interruption in thought not expressed, as in Jo. 12:27. One of the most striking instances of ἀλλά occurs in Ac. 16:37, οὐ γὰρ, ἀλλά, where οὐ γὰρ means ‘not much’ with fine scorn (cf. καί vūv: just before). Both Winer and W. F. Moulton (W.-M., p. 566) felt certain that ἀλλά never equalled εἰ μή, not even in Mt. 20:23 and Mk. 4:22. But J. H. Moulton (Prol., p. 241) quotes Tb. P. 104 (i/B.C.), καί μή ἑξέστω Φυλίσκωι γυνάκεια ἄλλην ἐπαγαγέσθαι ἀλλά Ἀπολλωνίαν, where ἀλλά means practically ‘except.’ See also Gen. 21:26. Moulton suggests that, since εἰ μή (brachylogy) in Lu. 4:26 f.; Rev. 21:27, means ‘but only,’ the same may be true of ἀλλά.

(iii) Πλὴν. Curtius gets it from πλέον (‘more’), but Brugmann2 finds its original meaning to be ‘near by.’ At any rate it was a preposition (Mk. 12:32). Cf. Ac. 15:28, πλέον πλῆν τούτον where the two words exist together. Probably its original use as a conjunction is seen in the combination πλῆν ὅτι (Ph. 1:18). It is chiefly confined to Luke’s writings in the N. T. As a conjunction it is always adversative (cf. Lu. 6:24; 12:31, etc.). In Mt. 26:39 note πλῆν οὐχ ως—ἀλλ ὡς. The classical language used it

1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 269.
Moulton


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

as a preposition and with ὅτι, but Aristotle\(^3\) shows the existence of πλήν as a conjunction which developed in the vernacular. Blass\(^4\) notes that Paul uses it at the end of an argument to single out the main point. Cf. 1 Cor. 11:11; Eph. 5:33; Ph. 3:16; 4:14.

**[Page 1188]** (iv) Ἔντοι. This word is a combination of two intensive particles (µέν, τοί), and is used to mean ‘however.’ Cf. Jo. 4:27; 12:42. It occurs in the N. T. only eight times.

(v) Ὄμοιος. This word is even more rare than µέντοι. It occurs with two participles (1 Cor. 14:7; Gal. 3:15) and once with µέντοι (Jo. 12:42).

(vi) Εἰ µή. This phrase marks an exception, as in Mt. 12:4; Jo. 17:12. We even have ἕκτος εἰ µή (1 Cor. 14:5; 15:2; 1 Tim. 5:19).

(c) **Disjunctives.** Dionysius Thrax calls this construction σύνθεσις διαζευκτική. It was always possible to express alternative ideas without any conjunction (cf. the Latin nolens volens) or by copulative conjunctions (δέ, καί), a construction common in the vernacular\(^1\) (cf. Hebrew י). Dissimilar things may be united by καί as in Col. 3:11, but we do not have to take καί as being ἢ or vice versa.\(^2\)

(i) Ἡ. Its origin from ἦ (enclitic) is held by Brugmann.\(^3\) They are equivalent in Homer. We may have just ἦ as in Mt. 5:17. For ἦ καί see Mt. 7:10; Lu. 18:11. In the sense of ‘or’ ἦ may be repeated indefinitely (Ro. 8:35). In Ro. 1:21 we have οὐχ—ἤ as in 4:13. See µήποτε—µηδὲ—ἤ (Ro. 9:11). This use in negative clauses appears in Thuc. 1, 122, and later writers. In 1 Th. 2:19 note ἦ οὐχ καί. In Mt. 21:23 we have καὶ τίς, while in Lu. 20:2 (parallel passage) the reading is ἦ τίς. This does not prove καί and ἦ to be synonymous. The logion was translated differently. The modern Greek retains οὔτε, µήτε and ἦ (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 185). In 1 Cor. 11:27, ὠς ἐκθή—ἤ τὸν δρότων ἦ πιστοτερον τοῦ κυρίου, some MSS. have καί, but ἦ is the true text. This, however, does not mean that some partook of one element and some of the other, but that, whatever element was taken in this way, there was guilt. The correlative use of ἦ—ἤ (‘either—or’) is also frequent.\(^4\) Cf. Mt. 6:24; 1 Cor. 14:6. In Ro. 6:16 note ἦ ἐκτοτε—游戏装备. As a disjunctive we have πότερον—游戏装备 in Jo. 7:17 and游戏装备—游戏装备 in Mk. 13:35. For πρὶν ἦ see Mt. 1:18; for ἦ after θέλω see 1 Cor. 14:19; after καλὸν, Mt. 18:8; after χαρά, Lu. 15:7; for ἄλλο ἦ, Lu. 12:51. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 27) finds ἦ τοι—游戏装备, B. G. U. 956;游戏装备—游戏装备, [Page 1189] Vett. Val., p. 138, 11;游戏装备—游戏装备, I. G. XII, 2, 562, 5 (Roman time);游戏装备—游戏装备, *Quaest. Barth.*, pp. 24, 30.

---

3 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 268.
4 Ib.
2 W.-Th., p. 440.
3 Griech. Gr., p. 541.
(ii) ἐγὼ—ἐγὼ (ἐγὼ—ἐγὼ). These conditional particles are like the Latin sive—sive. Cf. 1 Cor. 10:31, ἐγὼ—ἐγὼ—ἐγὼ. So 12:13; 14:7. We have ἐγὼ eight times in 3:22. In 14:7 it follows ἢ—ἀντι in verse 6. For ἐγὼ—ἐγὼ see Ro. 14:8.

(iii) Οὐκέ—Οὐκέ (μήτε—μήτε). We have seen that there is nothing inherent in οὐκέ to make it disjunctive. Cf. Jo. 4:11; 3 Jo. 10. It is simply οὗ and τέ (cf. οὗ δέ), a negative copulative conjunction. In Rev. 5:3 f. we have οὗδέ—οὐκέ (cf. Gal. 1:12) and the next verse οὗδεις—οὐκέ. In Ac. 24:12 f. we have οὐκέ—οὐκέ—οὐκέ—οὐκέ. Cf. Lu. 20:35 f. In Jo. 5:37 f. note οὐκέ—οὐκέ—καὶ οὗ. In 1 Cor. 6:10 note οὐκέ—οὐκέ—οὗ—οὗ. In Jas. 3:12 cf. οὐκέ after question. A good example of the correlative οὐκέ—οὐκέ is 1 Cor. 3:7. In Ro. 8:38 f. οὐκέ occurs ten times. In Ac. 23:8 we find μή—μήτε—μήτε. This is also just a copulative negative conjunction (μή τέ). In Mt. 5:34–36 we have μή—μήτε—μήτε—μήτε—μήτε. In 2 Th. 2:2 we have μηδέ—μήτε—μήτε. In Lu. 7:33 μή—μήτε, while in 9:3 μηδέν is followed by μήτε five times. There is often some confusion in the MSS. between μηδέ and μήτε, οὗδε and οὐκέ. Blass1 rejects οὐκέ οὐδα οὐκέ ἐπίσταμαι in Mk. 14:68 (BDL), but on whimsical grounds.

(d) Inferential Conjunctions. It is not easy to draw a distinction between “inferential” and “causal.” There is no doubt about ἄρα and οὗ. These are inferential paratactic particles. What about γάρ? Monro2 calls it causal. Kühner-Gerth3 treat all three as causal. Perhaps it is just as well to reserve the term “causal” for the hypotactic particles οὗτος, ἐπεί, etc. One has to be arbitrary sometimes. And even so these particles (ἄρα, οὗ, γάρ) were originally just transitional or explanatory in sense. Blass4 calls them “consecutive” co-ordinate conjunctions.

(i) ἄρα. The etymology seems to be clear, though not accepted by all scholars. The root ἄρ—(ἄρ—ἀρ—ἐσκις, ‘to fit’) suits exactly. It means then ‘fittingly, accordingly.’ Cf. our “articulate” (ar-ticulus). The word expresses some sort of correspondence between the sentences or clauses. It was postpositive in the ancient Greek, but in the N. T. it is not always so. Cf. [Page 1190] Mt. 12:28; Ac. 17:27. It occurs some 50 times in the N. T., in Matthew, Mark, Luke, Acts, Paul’s Epistles, and Hebrews. The original notion of mere correspondence is apparently preserved in Lu. 11:48, ἄρα μάρτυρες ἔστε, ‘so ye are witnesses.’ Cf. also Ac. 11:18. In Mk. 11:13; Ac. 17:27, εἰ ἄρα has the idea of ‘if haply.’ Klotz takes ἄρα to describe the unexpected and strange, something extrinsic, while Bäumlein considers it a particle giving point to what is immediately and necessarily conclusive. Most of the N. T. instances seem to be clearly illative. Cf. Mt. 17:26 f.; Ro. 7:21. It has γε added three times (cf. Mt. 7:20; 17:26 f.; Ac. 17:27). Paul is specially fond of ἄρα οὗ (Ro. 5:18; 7:3, 25, etc.). Once he has ἄρα νῦν (Ro. 8:1). ἄρα occurs also in the apodosis (Mt. 12:28; Gal. 2:21). We have μήτι ἄρα in a question in 2 Cor. 1:17.

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 265.
3 II, p. 317.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 272.
(ii) Гάρ. There is no doubt as to the origin of this word. It is a compound of γέ and ἄρα and is always postpositive. It is called σύνδεσμος αἰτιολογικός, but it does not always give a reason. It may be merely explanatory. We have seen that ἄρα itself was originally just correspondence and then later inference. So then γέ can accent as an intensive particle either of these ideas. It is a mistake, therefore, to approach the study of γάρ with the theory that it is always or properly an illative, not to say causal, particle. It is best, in fact, to note the explanatory use first. Thayer wrongly calls the illative use the primary one. The word is common in all the larger books of the N. T. It is least common in the Gospel of John and in Revelation. In Matthew and Luke it is much more frequent in the discourses and is rare in the strict narrative. In Mark and John it is about half and half. In general the N. T. use of γάρ is in accord with that of the classic period. The explanatory use is common in Homer. The N. T. examples are numerous. Cf. Mt. 19:12; Mk. 5:42; 16:4; Lu. 11:30; 18:32. Here the explanation follows immediately. Sometimes the explanation comes in by way of appendix to the train of thought. So Mt. 4:18, ἥσαν γάρ ὅλικα. Cf. also Mk. 2:15; Ro. 7:2. In questions we have good examples, particularly τί γάρ. So Mt. 27:23, τί γάρ κακὸν ἔποιησεν; Cf. Ro. 3:3. In Ac. 16:37, οὗ γάρ, ἀλλά, we have to resolve γάρ into its parts and make the phrase=‘not much, but.’ In Jo. 9:30, ἐν τούτῳ γάρ, the man uses γάρ with fine scorn, ‘why, just in this,’ etc. In Jo. 19:6 it is hardly creditable to Pilate’s common sense to take γάρ as illative. Cf. also Jo. 7:41; Ac. 19:35; Mt. 9:5. Γάρ sometimes gives the major premise (Mt. 26:52), more often the minor premise (2 Pet. 1:15 f.), sometimes both (Jo. 3:19 f.). The purely illative use of γάρ is simple enough, though the force of the ground or reason naturally varies greatly. See Mt. 1:21, αὕτη γάρ σώσει; (6:24) ἦ γάρ; (Ro. 8:18) λογίζομαι γάρ. Paul begins every sentence with γάρ in Ro. 8:18–24. For καὶ γάρ see Ro. 11:1; 15:3. The precise relation between clauses or sentences is not set forth by γάρ. That must be gathered from the context if possible. Cf. Jo. 4:44. Note γάρ—ὅτι in 1 Tim. 6:7.

(iii) Οὖν. The etymology of Οὖν is unknown. Brugmann thinks it probable that it is derived from *ὁ ἐν or ὁ ὄν (cf. ὄντως, τῷ ὄντι). The Ionic also has οὖ (so Lesbian, Doric, Boeotian). But, however that may be, it is important to note that the particle is not illative nor even consequential in Homer. It is merely a transitional particle relating clauses or sentences loosely together by way of confirmation. It was common in this sense in Homer, though rare in the Attic writers save in μὲν οὖν. But it is very frequent in the Gospel of John as a mere transitional particle. In this Gospel it occurs about 200 times, nearly as frequent as all the rest of the N. T., though it is rare in the other Johannine writings. In John’s Gospel, outside of 8 examples in the words of Jesus, the rest occur in the narrative portion. Abbott seems puzzled over the many non-illative instances of οὖν in John and suggests that “the writer perhaps had in view the objections of controversialists.” But this is wholly gratuitous and needless in the light of the history of the particle. Probably a majority of the instances in John’s

1 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 102.
3 Griech. Gr., p. 549.
4 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 255.
5 Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 165.
6 Ib., p. 168.
Gospel are non-illative as in Homer, the original use of the word. Luke preserves the literary Attic idiom by the common use of μὲν οὖν as in Ac. 15:3, 30, etc. But John boldly uses οὖν alone and needs no apology for doing so. It just carries along the narrative with no necessary thought of cause or result. It is, because of John’s free use, one of the commonest particles in the N. T. and is oftener in the narrative books than in the epistles. It is interesting in John to take a chapter and note when οὖν is merely continuative and when illative. Cf. ch. 11, for instance, verses 3, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 31, 32, 33, 36, 38, 45, 47, 54, 56. So we start off again in 12:1 with ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς [Page 1192] (continuative). It is the commonest connective between sentences in this Gospel. We moderns do not feel the same need for connecting particles between independent sentences. The ancient Greeks loved to point out these delicate nuances. The interrogative οὐκ οὖν occurs only in Jo. 18:37. A good instance of the purely illative use is in Mt. 3:8, ποιήσατε οὖν καρπόν. It is common in Paul’s Epistles (Ro. 5:1; 6:12, etc.). Paul is fond also of ἄρα οὖν (Ro. 8:12) and of τί οὖν (6:1, 15; 7:7; 8:31, etc.). Οὖν is always postpositive.

2. HYPOTACTIC CONJUNCTIONS (συνδέσμοι ὑποτακτικοί). The conjunctions used in the N. T. with subordinate clauses have been discussed and the constructions given in detail already. See Modes (Subordinate Clauses). The relative, temporal, comparative, local, causal, final and consecutive, apprehensive, conditional and declarative conjunctions make a goodly list. But it is not necessary to go over the same ground again. Most of these conjunctions, as previously shown, are of relative origin. All are adverbs. It was necessary to treat at length the paratactic conjunctions which antedate the hypotactic in origin and were always exceedingly abundant in the vernacular. The hypotactic belong to the more highly developed speech, but one must not think that the hypotactic conjunctions regulate the construction of the sentence. They get their meaning from the sentence, not the sentence from the conjunction. The other view is a mechanical theory of language out of harmony with the historical growth of both mode and particle. Hypotaxis grew out of parataxis. This paratactic origin survives in many ways. Cf., for instance, the relative at the beginning of sentences, as ἐν οἷς (Lu. 12:1). So also ὅτι in 1 Jo. 3:11 f. The Greek is particularly rich in its subordinating conjunctions as compared with the Sanskrit and the Hebrew. Each subordinate clause possesses a case-relation toward the principal sentence as substantive, adjective or adverb, so that the sentence expansion is on the lines of the word-relations. In general the disappearance of the ancient Greek conjunctions from the modern Greek is noticeable. ὇πότε (ὀπόταν), ἄχρις, μέχρις, ἐπί, ἐφ’ ὦ “have entirely disappeared” (Thumb, Handb., p. 186). Thumb goes on with the story. We

6 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 272.
1 On the relative origin of conjs. like ὅτι, ὅτε, ὅπως, ὡς, ἐφ’ see Baron, Le Pronom Relatif et la Conjonction, 1891, pp. 95 ff.

have ως in σαν and ωστε να=‘until.’ Ὡτι is gone before ποῦ and να, though διως has revived. [Page 1193] Να has greatly extended its functions. Some survive greatly modified, like ἄφω, ἒν, ἕτε—ἔτε, ἕν, ἑπειδή, πρίν, ως ποῦ (ἐως), ποῦ (ὅπου), προτοῦ, etc. The paratactic conjunctions are “pressed into service to form dependent clauses” as at the beginning. Parataxis turns into hypotaxis.

VI. Interjections. Winer¹ considers interjections to be mere sounds, and so entirely outside of the sphere of syntax and indeed of grammar. But one² of the imperatival forms (ἄγε) is exclamatory in origin. Or is the interjection an imperative in origin? We see this form still used as an interjection in Jas. 4:13. So also ἴδε in Jo. 1:29, ἴδε ὁ ἄνω μος τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. δεῦρο (Mk. 10:21), δεῦτε (Mt. 11:28). Δεῦρο is very vivid in Jo. 11:43, Λάζαρε δεῦρο ἔξω. Ἰδοῦ is either used absolutely (Mt. 11:10) or with the nominative (Rev. 4:1) and is of frequent occurrence. Καὶ ἵδε is good Greek, but its frequency reminds one of the Hebrew idiom. We have ἔα in Lu. 4:34. Once οὔα occurs (Mk. 15:29) with the vocative. So οὐαί is found with the vocative in Lu. 6:25. It is found absolutely in Rev. 18:10, 16, 19, οὐαὶ, οὐαί. Twice it is used with the accusative (Rev. 8:13; 12:12), as the object of thought. Usually the dative is found with οὗατ as in Mt. 11:21; Lu. 6:24 f.; 11:42. The word occurs mainly in Matthew and Luke. Sometimes we have ὦ with the vocative as in Mt. 15:28, ὦ γυνα. So Ac. 13:10; Ro. 2:1; Gal. 3:1. There is usually some vehemence or urgency when ὦ is used. But not always. See Ac. 1:1; 18:14. In Ro. 10:15 οὐς is an exclamatory particle, as τί is in Lu. 12:49. It is not quite true, therefore, to say that interjections lie quite outside of grammar. Indeed, language may come from just these ejaculatory sounds, like “mama” with the babe. Tragedians³ naturally use interjections more frequently. People differ greatly in the use of “Oh” and “Ah.” The English audiences are fond of “Hear, hear,” while the American crowds love to clap their hands or stamp their feet.

——, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).
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Farrar\textsuperscript{4} follows Scaliger and Destutt de Tracy in regarding them as words \textit{par excellence} and as having high linguistic importance. Grammar can deal with emotion as well as with thought.

\textbf{[PAGE 1194] CHAPTER XXII}

FIGURES OF SPEECH (ΓΟΡΓΙΕΙΑ ΣΧΗΜΑΤΑ)

\textbf{I. Rhetorical, not Grammatical.} Strictly speaking there is no need to go further in the discussion of the points of syntax. There are various matters that the grammars usually discuss because there is no N. T. rhetoric. These points belong to language in general, though in some of them the Greek has turns of its own. Each writer has, besides, his own style of thought and speech. See discussion in chapter IV. Under The Sentence we have already discussed the ellipsis (of subject, predicate or copula), matters of concord, apposition, the position of words (emphasis, euphony, rhythm, poetry, prolepsis, ὑπότετον ἀρχαῖον, postpositive words, hyperbaton, order of clauses), simple and compound sentences, connection between words (polysyndeton and asyndeton), connection between clauses and sentences (paratactic and hypotactic) and asyndeton again, running and periodic style, parenthesis, anacoluthon, \textit{oratio variata}, connection between paragraphs. These matters call for no further comment. They could have been treated at this point, but they seemed rather to belong to the discussion of sentences in a more vital way than the remaining rhetorical figures. For attraction and incorporation see Cases and Relative Pronouns. The points now to be discussed have not so much to do with the orderly arrangement (σύνθεσις)\textsuperscript{1} as with the expression and the thought.

\textbf{II. Style in the N. T.} The characteristics of the N. T. writers received treatment in chapter IV. The precise question here is whether the writers of the N. T. show any marks of rhetorical study. We have seen already (The Sentence, Rhythm) that the scholars are divided into two camps on this subject. Blass\textsuperscript{2} (but not Debrunner) argues that Paul’s writings and the Epistle to the Hebrews show the influence of the rules of rhythm of the literary prose of Asia (Asianism) and Rome (Pausanias, Cicero, \textbf{[Page 1195]} Curtius, Apuleius). Deissmann\textsuperscript{1} will have none of it. It is a pretty quarrel and,

\textsuperscript{1} Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 295.
\textsuperscript{2} Die Rhythmen der asianischen und römischen Kunstprosa, 1905.
\textsuperscript{4} Gk. Synt., p. 201.
as usual, there is truth in both views. One must get his bearings. We can all agree with Blass at once that the N. T. writers are not to be compared on this point with the literary masters of Attic prose, but with writers like Polybius. We are surely not to look for the antithetic style of the Attic orators (Isocrates, Lysias, Demosthenes). If there is æsthetic beauty in 1 Cor. 13 or Heb. 11, it may be the natural æsthetic of Homer’s rhapsodies, not the artificialities of Isocrates. Blass admits the poverty of the Oriental languages in the matter of periods and particles and does not claim that the N. T. writers rose above the O. T. or rose to the level of Plato. And yet Norden in his Antike Kunstprosa claims that in his best diction Paul rises to the height of Plato in the Phædrus. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff likewise calls Paul “a classic of Hellenism.”

1 Theol. Lit., 1906, p. 434; The Expositor, 1908, p. 74. See also his St. Paul (1912).
2 Hermeneutik und Kritik, 1892, p. 198. The true grammanian is but too willing to see the other point of view. Cf. Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 266.
3 Hahne, Zur sprachl. Ästhetik der Griech., 1896, p. 4.
4 Hermeneutik und Kritik, p. 198.
Wilamowitz-Möllendorff


———, Über die Entstehung der griech. Schriftsprachen (Verf. deutscher Phil. und Schulm., 1879, pp. 36–41).
Sir W. M. Ramsay is a stout advocate for the real Hellenic influence on Paul’s life. But Ramsay scouts the word “rhetoric” in connection with Paul: “I can hardly imagine that one who had ever experienced the spell of Paul could use the word rhetoric about the two examples which he mentions from First Corinthians, and Romans.” There was in Paul’s time artificial rhetoric with which Paul evidently had no connection, nor did any of the writers of the N. T. One cannot believe that Paul, for instance, studied at one of the famous schools of rhetoric nor that he studied the writings of the current rhetoricians. This much may be freely admitted about all of the N. T. writers, who wrote in the language of the people, not of the schools. Deissmann correctly says: “The history of Christianity, with all its wealth of incident, has been treated much too often as the history of the Christian literary upper class, the history of theologians and ecclesiastics, schools, councils and parties, whereas Christianity itself has often been most truly alive in quarters remote [Page 1196] from councils.” This is all pre-eminently true and we must never forget that Jesus was a carpenter, John a fisherman and Paul a tentmaker. And yet Deissmann himself will say of John: “St. John has no liking for progress along an unending straight road; he loves the circling flight, like his symbol, the eagle. There is something hovering and brooding about his production; repetitions are in no wise abnormal with him, but the marks of a contemplation which he cherishes as a precious inheritance from St. Paul and further intensifies.” There is a perfection of form in the Parables of Jesus that surpasses all the rules of the grammarians and rhetoricians. The eagle flight of John makes the cawing of the syntactical crows pitiful. The passion of Paul broke through all the traditional forms of speech. He lacked the punctilious refinements of the Stoic rhetoricians, but he had the cyclonic power of Demosthenes and the elevation of Plato. Even Blass sees that “the studied employment of the so-called Gorgian assonances is necessarily foreign to the style of the N. T., all the more because they were comparatively foreign to the whole period; accident, however, of course produces occasional instances of them, and the writer often did not decline to make use of any that suggested themselves.” This would seem modest enough to satisfy Deissmann. In particular Blass notes “the absence of rhetorical artifice in the Johannine speeches.” He finds little of that nature in Mark and Luke. “But in Matthew there really is some artistic sense of style,” but it is “mainly drawn from Hebrew and not from Greek.” The many quotations in this Gospel show a close use of the LXX and the Hebrew O. T. And yet, on the whole, the Greek runs smoothly enough. König has a valuable article on “Style of Scripture” in the Extra Volume of Hastings’

Ramsay

RAMSAY, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).

5 Cf. the controversy between him and Principal Garvie in The Expositor for 1911 anent Garvie’s book, Studies of Paul and His Gospel (1911).
7 Light from the Ancient East, p. 404.
1 Light from the Anc. East, p. 410.
2 J. Weiss, Beitr. zur paulinischen Rhetorik, 1897, p. 168.
3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 298.
4 Ib., p. 302.
Dictionary of the Bible, but he deals mainly with the O. T. There is in truth little that is distinctive in the style of the N. T. apart from the naturalness, simplicity, elevation and passion of the writers. It is only in the Epistle to the Hebrews that Blass\textsuperscript{5} finds "the care and dexterity of an artistic writer" as shown by his occasional avoidance of hiatus, but even here Blass has to strain a point to make it stick. Bultmann\textsuperscript{6} draws a definite parallel between the style of Paul and the Cynic-Stoic \textit{Diatribe} and makes his point, but even so one wonders if after all Paul uses question and answer so skilfully by reason of definite study of the subject or because of his dialectical training as a rabbi and his native genius in such matters. It is \textit{per se}, however, entirely possible that Paul knew the common Stoic dialectic also as he did the tenets of current Stoicism (cf. Paul’s work in Athens). The examples of figures of speech in the N. T. are due to the nature of speech in general, to the occasional passion\textsuperscript{1} of the writer, to the play of his fancy, to unconscious expression of genius, to mere accident. We must not make the mistake of rating men like Luke, Paul, James and the author of Hebrews as boorish and unintellectual. They lived in an age of great culture and they were saturated with the noblest ideas that ever filled the human brain. As men of genius they were bound to respond to such a situation. They do show a distinct literary flavour as Heinrici\textsuperscript{2} has so well shown. In 1 Cor. 13 we have finish of form and thought. Even John, called ἄγραμματος καὶ ἰδιώτης (Ac. 4:13), rose to the highest planes of thought in his Gospel. Deissmann in his \textit{St. Paul} goes to the extreme of making Paul a mere man of affairs devoid of theological culture,—an untenable position in view of Acts and Paul’s Epistles when he says: “His place is with Amos, the herdsman of Tekoa, and Tersteegen, the ribbon-weaver of Mülheim” (p. 6). We may brush aside the artificial rules of Gorgias as too studied efforts for the N. T. Indeed, the men of the time had largely refused to follow the lead of Gorgias of Sicily, though his name clung to the figures of speech. His mannerisms were not free from affectation and pedantry.\textsuperscript{3} The Attic orators of the fourth century B.C. had their own rules for easy and flexible practical speech. The writers and speakers of the later time modified these in their own way. We are not concerned here to follow Blass\textsuperscript{4} in his effort to prove that Paul and the writer of Hebrews were students of the current rhetoricians. This we fail to see, but we do see that the language of the N. T. was a living organism and exhibits many of the peculiarities of human speech which the rhetoricians have discussed. For convenience, therefore, we adopt their terminology.

\textbf{III. Figures of Idea or Thought (σχήματα διανοίας).} Blass\textsuperscript{1} observes that these figures of thought belong more to the later period of Attic oratory. Some of them are distinctly rhetorical in character, as the \textit{rhetorical question} of which

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{5} Ib., p. 296.
\item \textsuperscript{6} Bultmann, R., \textit{Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe} (1910).
\item \textsuperscript{1} Bultmann, R., \textit{Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe}, 1910.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Norden (Die ant. Kunstprosa, Bd. II, p. 508) speaks of Paul’s use of rhetorical figures as due to his “Ton.” Heinrici (Zum Hellen. d. Paulus, Komm. zu II Kor.) sees Paul’s “Eigenart.”
\item \textsuperscript{3} Heinrici, K. F., \textit{Der literarische Charakter der neutest. Schriften} (1908).
\item \textsuperscript{4} Der literarische Charakter d. neut. Schriften, 1908.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 295.
\item \textsuperscript{6} Die Rhythmen der asianischen und römischen Kunstprosa, 1905.
\item \textsuperscript{1} Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 304.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Paul makes abundant use, especially in the Epistle to the Romans. Blass makes a good critique of such questions as showing dialectical liveliness and perspicuity, as in Ro. 3:1 τί ὅν τὸ περισσόν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου; (4:10) πῶς οὖν ἐλογίζῃ; ἐν περιτομῇ ὅντι ἢ ἐν ἄκροβοστίᾳ; This is quite like the diatribe in Epictetus and other κοινή writers (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 182). Cf. 1 Cor. 7:18 ff. Other questions are quite emotional, as in 2 Cor. 11:22. In Ro. 8:31–35 we have a “brilliant oratorical passage,” worthy of any orator in the world. There are others almost equal to it, Ro. 6, 7, 9, 10, 11; 1 Cor. 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15; 2 Cor. 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13. Here we have oratory of the highest kind with the soul all ablaze with great ideas. The words respond to this high environment and are all aglow with beauty and light. Certainly the Epistle to Hebrews is oratory of the highest order, as are the addresses in Acts. Blass thinks that Luke is distinctly “unprofessional (idiotisch)” in his manner of presenting the great speeches in Acts, ἰδιωτικῆς φράσεως, not τεχνικῆς φράσεως. That is true, but one would have a martinet spirit to cavil at the word eloquence here. The discourses of Jesus in Matthew, Luke and John are above all praise in content and spirit. One cannot think that Jesus was a technical student of rhetoric, but he sang with the woodrobin’s note, and that far surpasses the highest achievement of the best trained voice whose highest praise is that she approaches the woodrobin or the nightingale. There is perfection of form in the thoughts of Jesus whether we turn to the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew, the Parables in Luke 15, or the Discourses in the Upper Room and On the Way to Gethsemane in John 14–17. The style of the reporters does not conceal the consummate skill of Christ as the “Master Preacher” of the ages.

There is undoubted use of irony (ἐιρωνεία) in the N. T. We see it in the words of Jesus. See the high scorn in καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν (Mt. 23:32). This is the correct text, not πληρόσετε. So also καλῶς ἀδετέετε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ (Mk. 7:9) and ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lu. 13:33) [Page 1199] There is more of it in Paul’s writings. Cf. 1 Cor. 4:8; 2 Cor. 11:19 f.; 12:13; Ro. 11:20. There was never a more nimble mind than that of Paul, and he knew how to adapt himself to every mood of his readers or hearers without any sacrifice of principle. It was no declaimer’s tricks, but love for the souls of men that made him become all things to all men (1 Cor. 9:22). He could change his tone because he loved the Galatians even when they had been led astray (Gal. 4:20). The rhetoricians call it prodiorthosis, as in 2 Cor. 11:21, ἐν ἀφοσίων λέγω (cf. also 11:1 f., 16 f., 23) and epidiothrosis, as in Ro. 3:5, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. Cf. also 1 Cor. 7:6; 12:11; Ro. 8:34; Gal. 4:9. So Paul uses paraleipsis, as in 2 Cor. 9:4, μὴ πας κατασχυνθῶμεν ἡμεῖς, ἵνα μὴ λέγωμεν ὑμεῖς, instead of μὴ ποτε κατασχυνθῶμεν. As Blass suggests, Paul’s innate delicacy of feeling makes him take the reproach on himself. Cf. also Phil. 19, ἵνα μὴ λέγω ὅτι καὶ σεαυτόν μοι προσοφείλεις. So in Ro. 7:4 Paul says καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ rather than bluntly assert καὶ ὁ νόμος ἀπέθανεν (or ἐθανατώθη). There is sometimes a lack of parallelism (heterogeneous structure). Cf. 1 Jo. 2:2, ἱλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἐμαρτημάτων ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἡμῶν.

3 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 305.
1 Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 304.
IV. Figures of Expression (σχήματα λέξεως). What Winer\(^2\) calls “Broken and Heterogeneous Structure” (anacoluthon, oratio variata) has had sufficient discussion under The Sentence. So as to asyndeton. There remain a number of other points which may be grouped for convenience.

(a) PARALLELS AND CONTRASTS (Parallelismus membrorum). There are many illustrations of this idiom in the N. T., both in the Gospels and Epistles. The O. T. is full of such words and phrases, particularly in the Psalms. One who read these hymns would naturally have his eye and ear trained to this form of rhythm. We do not need to see conscious effort at poetry, though in 1 Tim. 3:16 we probably have a fragment of an early Christian hymn. The Hebrew parallelism is manifest in Lu. 1:42–45 (the song of Elizabeth), 46–56 (the song of Mary), and 68–79 (the song of Zacharias), 2:29–32 (the song of Simeon). One does not have to go to the Greek rhetoricians. The spirit of rhapsody here shown is due to the Spirit of God moving the heart and stirring the highest impulses of the soul. There are other examples of primitive Christian song in the N. T., as in Eph. 5:14; [Page 1200] Jude 24 f.; Rev. 5:12–14, and often in this book. There is the perfection of poetic form in the noble prose in 1 Cor. 13; 15:54–7; Col. 1:10–12. One hesitates to think that this use of antithesis or parallelism is artificial even if it is conscious. This parallelism may be synonymous (Mt. 10:26; Jo. 1:17; Ro. 11:33) or antithetic (Jo. 3:6; Ro. 2:7).\(^1\) There are also examples of Chiasm or Reverted Parallelism (from the letter X) as in Philemon 5, τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις εἰς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἄγιους. So Mt. 7:6; Ph. 1:15 f.; 1 Th. 5:6; Ph. 3:10.\(^2\) I doubt very much if Paul was at all conscious of the stilted parallelism that Blass\(^3\) sees in 1 Cor. 1:25 ff. with anaphora (the first words alike) as in οὐ πολλοί—οὐ πολλοί, or antistrophe (the last words alike) as in τοῦ θεοῦ—τοῦ θεοῦ—τῶν ἀνθρώπων—τῶν ἀνθρώπων, or symploce (both alike) as in ἔκελέξατο ὁ θεὸς Ἰνα κατασχύνῃ, ἔκελέξατο ὁ θεὸς Ἰνα κατασχύνῃ. Cf. Heb. 2:16. The manuscripts vary a deal in 1 Cor. 1:25 ff., and Blass has to juggle the text in order to make it come out in “rounded periods of three sections.” What if this finesse was made by dilettante rhetoricians when they found it in Demosthenes or Cicero? Surely Paul was not a “stylist” of the fashion of Cicero nor even of Demosthenes. Perhaps no orator “would have regarded the eloquence of this passage with other feelings than those of the highest admiration.” Doubtless so, but for the passion and force, not for the mere word-play. Just so the three poetical quotations (Ac. 17:28; 1 Cor. 15:33; Tit. 1:12) do not justify straining after accidental lines in Ac. 23:5; Jas. 1:17; Heb. 12:12 f., or elsewhere. Blass\(^4\) is so fond of finding poetic parallelism in the Gospels that he actually makes it tilt the scales against the best manuscripts in some passages as in Mt. 5:45; 7:13 f.; 25:35. This seems much like eisegesis.

\(^2\) W.-Th., p. 566.
\(^1\) W.-Th., p. 639.
\(^2\) Green, Handb. to N. T. Gk., p. 355.
\(^3\) Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 300 f.
\(^4\) Ib., p. 302.
(b) CONTRASTS IN WORDS. There is the solemn repetition of a word with powerful effect (the epanadiplosis of the rhetoricians), but Blass does not claim this as a rhetorical device in the N. T. It is natural to strong emotion. Cf. ἐπιστάτα ἐπιστάτα (Lu. 8:24); κόριε κόριε (Mt. 25:11); σταυρόσων σταυρόσων (Jo. 19:6); Rev. 18:2, ἔσχεν ἔσχεν. See Ph. 3:2. Cf. also the two hours of shouting in Ac. 19:34. Climax is as old as Homer. This is again a perfectly natural method of emphasis. Cf. the links in the list of virtues in 2 Pet. 1:5–7. See also Ro. 5:3–5; 10:14. There is a cumulative force in the repetition. Per contra, zeugma puts together [Page 1201] words that do not properly go together, as in 1 Cor. 3:2, γάλα ύμιὸς ἐλότσα, οὐ βρῶμα. So also Lu. 1:64, ἄνευ χρήτη τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἡ γλώσσα αὐτοῦ. Cf. 1 Tim. 4:3. This construction is usually explained as elliptical, one verb (as above) being used where two are necessary for the full statement. Kühner-Gerth treat it as a species of brachylogy. The use of synonyms is not absent in the N. T., though not in the richness of the classic idiom. Cf. Lu. 8:15, ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ, and the use of ἀγαπᾶω and φιλέω side by side in Jo. 21:15–17 where Peter makes a point of using φιλέω. See chapter on Formation of Words.2 The play on words takes many turns. The onomatopoetic words like γογγύω (cf. our “murmur”) are very simple. Cf. Jo. 6:41. Examples of initial alliteration occur, like πονηρία, πλεονεξία (Ro. 1:29); ὑβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους (1:30; ἁπειθέσις, ἀσυνθέτους, ἀστράγλανος, ἀνελεήμονας (1:30 f.). It is hard to tell whether this is conscious or unconscious. There are also instances of paronomasia and annominatio. Paronomasia is rather loosely applied in the books. Winer3 uses it only for words of similar sound, while Blass4 confines it to the recurrence of the same word or word-stem, like κακοῦ κακῶς (Mt. 21:41); ἐν παντί πάντοτε πάσαν (2 Cor. 9:8); ὁ νόμος νομίμος (1 Tim. 1:8), and uses parecasis for different words of similar sound, like λημοί καὶ λοιμοί (Lu. 21:11); ἐμαθέν ἰδιν ἐπαθεν (Heb. 5:8); φθόνου φόνου (Ro. 1:29); ἁσυνθέτους ἁσυνθέτους (1:31). See also 2 Cor. 10:12; Ro. 11:17. The point is a fine one and need not be pressed. But annominatio deals with the sense as well as the sound. Thus Πέτρος and πέτρα in Mt. 16:18; γυνόσκεις ἀναγνώσκεις (Ac. 8:30); ὑπερφρονεῖν—φρονεῖν—σωφρονεῖν (Ro. 12:3); μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους (2 Th. 3:11). Cf. also Mt. 27:9; Lu. 9:60; Ac. 23:3; 2 Cor. 3:2; 1 Cor. 11:29 ff.; Ph. 3:2 f.; 2 Cor. 4:8 f.; Ro. 1:20; 5:19; 12:15; Eph. 4:1. Even so there is a certain amount of overlapping in the two figures. The ancients did not smile because a pun was made. It was merely a neat turn of speech and was very common. So Jesus says to Thomas, μὴ γίνοι ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός (Jo. 20:27).

(c) CONTRACTION AND EXPANSION. It is difficult to draw lines between groups among these figures of speech. Zeugma, as we have seen, can very well come in here as a sort of ellipsis. The ellipsis of subject or predicate came up for discussion under [Page 1202] The Sentence. But a few more words are needed here. Cf. παρέστοις ὁ θεός (2 Cor. 1:18); ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς (Ph. 4:5) as samples of the absence of the copula. So Jo. 14:11; Ac. 19:28, 34; 2 Cor. 11:6. It is not always clear what verb is to be supplied.

1 II, p. 570.
2 Cf. Trench, N. T. Synonyms; Heine, Synonymik d. neut. Griech.
3 W.-Th., p. 636.
4 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 298.
though εἰμὶ and γίνομαι are the most common. Cf. φωνῇ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν, Ac. 10:15; οὐκ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ ὡς δυνάμει, 1 Cor. 4:20. Cf. Jo. 21:21; 1 Cor. 5:12. Usually the context makes clear what verb is wanting, as in Mt. 27:25; Ac. 18:6; Ro. 4:9; 5:18; 2 Cor. 9:7; Gal. 2:9; Rev. 1:4. In 2 Cor. 8:15 the participle ἔχων must be supplied with ὁ according to a common Greek idiom. Cf. also Ro. 13:7, τὸν φόρον, where Winer supplies ἁπατόντα κελεύοντες. Cf. also 1 Cor. 4:6. It is easy to supply ὁ θεὸς in passages like Heb. 1:7 λέγει, 4:3 ἐδήμηκε. The context supplies the noun in a case like Ac. 21:31, ζητούντων τε αὐτόν ἀποκτείναι. Cf. Jo. 20.2, ἤραν τὸν κύριον (‘people took away’). In Ac. 21:16, συνήλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν, supply τινές as in Lu. 11:49, τινάς. Many verbs are considered clear enough without the object. So διάγω (sc. ἔρων) in Tit. 3:3; προσέχω (sc. νοῦν) in Lu. 17:3, ἐπέκειος in 14:7, ἔνεχω (sc. χόλον) in Mk. 6:19; σωμβάλλω (sc. λόγους) as in Ac. 4:15 (cf. Lu. 24:17, ἀνιβάλλετε with object); συλλαμβάνω in Lu. 1:31. It is unnecessary (see Adjectives) to recount the many instances of the adjective without a substantive where the gender and number and context make it clear. A few common examples suffice. For the absence of ἡμέρα note τῇ τρίτῃ (Lu. 13:32); ἡ αὐριαν (Mt. 6:34); τῆς σήμερον (Mt. 27:8); τῇ ξειονέν (Lu. 13:33); τῇ ἐποίηση (Ac. 16:11); ἡ ἐξής (21:1); τῇ ἐτέρῳ (Ac. 20:15). Γῇ is easily supplied in Mt. 23:15, ἡ ἐξέρινα, and in Heb. 11:26, ἐν Αἰγυπτίου. Supply γλώσσα in Rev. 9:11, έν τῇ Χάλασικῃ. So with ὅδος in Lu. 5:19, ποιάς; 19:4, ἐκείνης. We miss ἐμίτον in Jo. 20:12, ἐν λευκοῖς, and ὧδε in Mt. 10:42, ποιήσον. So with χειρ in Mt. 6:3, ἡ δεξιά, ἡ ἀριστερά and χώρα in Lu. 17:24, ἐκ τῆς—εἰς τὴν. Much more serious is the ellipsis in Mt. 26:5, and Gal. 5:13, where the context must supply both verb and subject. Cf. also οὐχ ὅτι—ἀλλὰ in Jo. 7.22. In a case like 2 Th. 2:3 f., ὅτι ἐὰν—ὅτι, there is no apodosis expressed. These are but samples of the ellipses common to Greek (cf. ei δὲ μή) as to all languages more or less. It is not worth while to try to bring under this rhetorical figure all the lapses and turns of style in each writer. Cf. the absence of the verb with ἵνα in 1 Cor. 1:31, with τὸ μή in 4:6, with ἐν δὲ in Ph. 3:13, with τὸντο δὲ in 2 Cor. 9:6, with ἵνα [Page 1203] again in Gal. 2:9. Cf. also Mk. 14:29; 1 Cor. 10:24; 2 Cor. 5:13.

Aposiopesis stands to itself since it is a conscious suppression of part of a sentence under the influence of a strong emotion like anger, fear, pity. Curiously enough Blass,1 who sees so many rhetorical tropes in the N. T., denies that any instances of aposiopesis occur in the N. T. I do not consider his objections well founded. We may dismiss Mk. 7:11 and Lu. 22:42 because of the true text (see W. H.), and need not quibble over ὅρα μή in Rev. 22:9. We may agree with Winer2 that we have simply anacolutha in 2 Th. 2:3 ff. But we have left others like Mk. 11:32, ἀλλὰ ἐκπομήν- ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;—ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ἸΗλλων. See also Lu. 13:9, καὶ μὲν ποιήσα καρπὸν εἰς τῷ μέλλον—εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, ἐκκόψωσεν οὐτήν. So again 19:42, εἶ ἐγνω καὶ τὸ ὅποι οὐκ᾽ καὶ τὸ ὅποι ὁνθοῦ ἀναβίαντα δισεμαλλόν ἱκ τὸ πρότερον; Then again Ac. 23:9, εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐξολόθριον αὐτῶ τῇ ἄγγελος—. It is possible to regard Ro. 7:24 as aposiopesis. What differentiates these passages from ellipses or abbreviations of other clauses (cf. Mt. 25:14; Mk. 13:34; 2 Cor. 3:13) is the passion. One can almost see the gesture and the flash of the eye in aposiopesis.

1 W.-Th., p. 590.
2 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 294.
2 W.-Th., p. 600.
We need not follow minutely the various sorts of *breviloquence* or *brachylogy* that are possible. Thought moves more rapidly than expression and the words often crowd together in a compressed way that may be not only terse, but at first obscure. A good illustration occurs in Mt. 9:6, Ἰνά δὲ εἰδόθη τινὶ ἑξοςιῶν ἔχει οὐ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ ἀφίεναι ἀμαρτίας—τοῦ λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ Ἕγειρε ἢρόν σου τῇ κλίνῃ, κτλ. Here the Evangelist has inserted τοῦ λέγει τῷ παρ. before the conclusion to make it clearer. The same thing is done in the parallel passages in Mk. 2:10; Lu. 5:24 (an incidental argument for a common document for this paragraph). Cf. also Mk. 14:49, ἀλλ. Ἰνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί. So Jo. 13:18; 15:25. Cf. Ac. 1:1, where ἤρξετο implies καὶ διετέλεα before Ποιεῖν ταὶ διὰ διόφθαλμα ἦς ἡμέρας, κτλ. See a similar use of ἀρξάμενος in Mt. 20:8, Lu. 23:5. A case like Lu. 24:47, ἀρξάμενοι, amounts to anacoluthon or the use of the participle as a principal verb. Cf. also καθαρίζων in Mk. 7:19. Various examples of ellipsis-like *zeugma* are also instances of brachylogy. No clear line of distinction appears. So in comparisons we sometimes have to fill out the sense. Cf. Rev. 13:11, εἴπερ κέρατα δύο ἄκρια ἀρνίπ, i.e. κέρασιν ἄρνιου. Cf. 1 Jo. 3:11 f.; 2 Pet. 2:1. Other instances of brachylogy may be seen in Lu. 4:26 f.; Jo. 5:36; [Page 1204] 15:11; Ac. 27:22; Gal. 2:16. The so-called *constructio praegnans* belongs here also. Cf. 2 Tim. 4:18, σῶσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν, though εἰς of itself does not mean ‘into.’ But note διασώσεσι πρὸς Φήλικα (Ac. 23:24) where the notion is that of taking to Felix and so saving Paul. Cf. also ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν δόδον (Mk. 10:46). See also Lu. 11:13 ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἔχει οὕρανοι. (Col. 4:16) τὴν ἐκ Λαοδίκιας. Blass distinguishes brachylogy from ellipsis in that brachylogy affects the thought rather than the grammatical form, but both ideas are usually present. Cf. Ro. 11:18. It would be wearisome to endeavour to put a name or tag upon every structure that seems defective from the standpoint of formal grammar or rhetoric. “It will be seen that many of them are due to that agility and acuteness of the Greek intellect which enables the Hellene or Hellenist readily to sacrifice the grammar of a sentence to its logic, or in other words its form to its meaning. Hence arose the many forms of the *sense-figure* (σχῆμα πρὸς τὸ σημανόμενον, *constructio ad sensum*).”

We have seen illustrations of this construction κατὰ σύνεσιν under Concord (The Sentence) and only a few further are called for here. Indeed, this section is largely an illustration of this principle. In Jo. 15:6 αὐτὰ refers to τὸ κλῆμα; in Ac. 17:16 αὐτοῦ points to Christ, who has not been mentioned; in 7:24, τῶν Ἀγίουτων, though no Egyptian had been mentioned; in 1 Cor. 7:36, γαμεῖτωσιν, the subject being drawn from the context (the two young people). Winer was glad to note a decline in emphasis on these overrefinements in his day. These supposed abnormalities were called *hypallage*. From the present standpoint Winer himself yielded entirely too much to the very thing that he condemned. What is the use in figuring out the various ways that Paul could have expressed himself in 2 Cor. 3:7, for instance? The papyri have taught us to be chary about charging John with being ungrammatical in πλῆρης χάριτος (Jo. 1:14). These matters simply show that the N. T. writers used a live language and were not automata. It is doubtless true that no other writer used repetition of word and phrase

---

1 Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 294.
3 W.-Th., p. 634.
as did the author of the Fourth Gospel, but no one will deny that he did it with consummate skill and marvellous vividness and dramatic power.\[Page 1205\]

There are many instances of pleonasm in the N. T. as in all vernacular speech. It is of many sorts. The same word may be repeated for clearness as in ὕμνοις—ὕμνοις (Col. 2:13); ἀποτελοῦσαν—ἀποτελοῦσαν (2 Tim. 4:9). This redundancy is usually due to the custom of the language with no thought of the repetition,\(^1\) as in ἡ—ἀντίθεσις (Mk. 7:25); περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον (2 Cor. 7:13); οὐ—μή (Ac. 20:20, 27); ἐκτὸς εἰ μή (1 Cor. 15:2); ἀπεκρίθη λέγων (Mk. 15:9); ἀνάστησι καὶ πορεία (Ac. 8:26); τῷ οἰκοδεσποτῷ ἡ οἰκίας like our “church-house” (Lu. 22:11); ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο (Jo. 11:7); προδραμῶν ἐμπρόσθεν (Lu. 19:4); ἐξάγειν ἔξω Rec. (24:50); ὑδήμοσεν (Ac. 2:30); ἄρνομενος ὃτι οὐκ ἔστιν (1 Jo. 2:22); πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου (Ac. 10:15), etc. Cf. also the cognate accusative. Redundances like these examples are not linguistic vices. They seem pleonastic to the technical student who is unwilling to allow for the growth of the language. Emphatic words have the constant tendency to become less so and to need re-enforcement. This love of emphasis in the N. T. is natural to conversation and to a certain extent has the Oriental richness and wealth of colour.\(^2\) We see the same thing in the O. T. and in the papyri letters. It is a sign of life and in particular life in the East. These vivid details give life and beauty to the picture. Cf. ἐκεῖνας τὴν χείρα (Mt. 26:51); ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει (Jo. 21:13); γράφωντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν (Ac. 15:23); ὠμολόγησαι καὶ οὐκ ἤρνησατο (Jo. 1:20). Epexegetical clauses are common. Cf. τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ἦμων (Ro. 12:1), in apposition with the infinitive clause, παραστῆσαι, κτλ. So 1 Cor. 7:26, ὃτι καλὸν ἀνθρώποι, as an expansion of τοῦτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν. In Jo. 7:35 ὃτι is probably causal.

We meet hyperbole in Jo. 21:25, οὐδὲ αὐτῶν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χαρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία. Cf. also Mt. 13:32. Litotes is common enough, as in Ac. 1:5, οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας; 14:28, χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον. See also 15:2; 19:11, 23 f.; 21:39; 27:14, 20; 28:2. Meiosis is, of course, only a species of hyperbole by understatement. Cf. Paul’s use\(^3\) of it in 1 Th. 2:15; 2 Th. 3:2, 7. We may put together two remarks of Milligan.\(^4\) “St. Paul had evidently not the pen of a ready writer, and when he had once found an expression suited to his purpose found it very difficult to vary it.” “St. Paul had evidently that highest gift of a great writer, the instinctive feeling for the right word, and even when writing, as he does here, in his most ‘normal’ style, and with an almost complete absence of the rhetorical figures, so largely practised in his day, he does not hesitate to avail himself of the more popular methods of adding point or emphasis to what he wants to say.” There is no necessary inconsistency in these two statements. Add another from Milligan\(^1\) which will help to reconcile them. “We readily recognise that the arresting charm of the Apostle’s style is principally due to ‘the man behind,’ and that the highest form of all eloquence, ‘the rhetoric of the heart,’ is speaking to us.” So it is with all the N. T.

\(^{1}\) Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 295.
\(^{4}\) Ib., p. lvi f.
\(^{1}\) Comm. on Thess. Epistles, p. lvi f.
writers more or less. They are men of genius, of varying degrees of culture, and men of love for Christ and man. Language with these men is not an end in itself. They do not say “pretty” things and toy with them. As the words of Jesus are spirit and life, for they throb and pulse to-day (Jo. 6:63), so the Letters of Paul are βαρέ ικά ϊσχυραί, as even his enemies admit (2 Cor. 10:10). The Judaizers at Corinth did not discuss the rhetorical niceties of these Letters. They felt the power of the ideas in them even when they resisted Paul’s authority. Paul used tropes,² but he smote hearts with them and did not merely tickle the fancy of the lovers of sophistry.³ Paul denied that he spoke ἐν πιθός σοφίας λόγοις, though his words seem to the lover of Christ to be full of the highest appeal to the soul of man. One must discount this disclaimer not merely by Paul’s natural modesty, but by contrast with the Corinthian’s conception of πιθός. They loved the rhetorical flights of the artificial orators of the time.

(d) Metaphors and Similar Tropes. We need not tarry over antiphrasis, ambiguity, hendiadys, hypokorisma, oxymoron, periphrasis, polyptoton, syllepsis, and the hundred and one distinctions in verbal anatomy. Most of it is the rattle of dry bones and the joy of dissection is gone. We may pause over Μεταφορά, since little progress could be made in speech without the picture of the literal and physical carried over to the moral and spiritual as in ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός (Jo. 10:11). Cf. the greatest metaphor in the N. T., Paul’s use of σῶμα for the church (Eph. 1:22 f.). The Simile is just a bit more formal, as is seen in the use of ὁμοίως in Mt. 13:52, πᾶς γραμματεύς δυνατός ἑστιν ἄνθρωπος αἰκονιστότης. Parables are but special forms of the metaphor or simile and form the most characteristic feature of the teaching of Jesus in so far as form is concerned. The parable (παραβολή) [Page 1207] draws a comparison between the natural and the moral or implies it. It may be a crisp proverb (Lu. 4:23) or a narrative illustration of much length, as in the Sower (Mt. 13). The Allegory (Ἀλληγορία) is a parable of a special sort that calls for no explanation, a speaking parable (cf. the Good Shepherd in Jo. 10 and the Prodigal Son in Lu. 15). Μετονομα (μετονομαία) and Συνεκδοχή (συνεκδοχή) are so much matters of exegesis that they must be passed by without further comment.

It is certain that no words known to man are comparable in value with those contained in the N. T. Despite all the variety of diction on the part of the reporters, probably partly because of this very fact, the words of Jesus still fascinate the mind and win men to God as of old. Καὶ ἔγενετο δὴ ἐκέλεσεν ὁ Ιησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ἔξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐπὶ τῇ δίδαξι αὐτοῦ. Ἡ ἄρδεν διδάσκον Αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτὸν (Mt. 7:28 f.). It is the constant peril of scribes and grammarians¹ to strain out the gnat and to swallow the camel. I may have fallen a victim, like the rest, but at least I may be permitted to say at the end of the long road which I have travelled for so many years, that I joyfully recognise that grammar is nothing unless it reveals the thought and emotion hidden in language. It is just because Jesus is greater than Socrates and Plato and all the Greek thinkers and poets that we care so much what Luke and Paul and John have to tell about him. Plato

² Cf. Heinrici, Zum Hellen. des Paulus, Komm. zu 2 Kor.
3 1 Cor. 2:4.
1 Gildersle. is scornful of those who fear “that anthropology is going to invade the sacrosanct realm of syntax, which belongs, strictly speaking, to the microtomists and statisticians—otherwise known as Dead Sea Apes.” Am. Jour. of Philol., 1907, p. 235.
and Xenophon hold us because of their own message as well as because they are the interpreters of Socrates. It matters not if Jesus spoke chiefly in the Aramaic. The spirit and heart of his message are enshrined in the Greek of the N. T. and interpreted for us in living speech by men of the people whose very diction is now speaking to us again from the rubbish-heaps of Egypt. The papyri and the ostraca tell the story of struggle on the part of the very class of people who first responded to the appeal of Paul (cf. 1 Cor. 1:26 ff.). Christianity is not buried in a book. It existed before the N. T. was written. It made the N. T. It is just because Christianity is of the great democracy that it is able to make universal appeal to all ages and all lands and all classes. The chief treasure of the Greek tongue is the N. T. No toil is too great if by means of it men are enabled to understand more exactly the mind of Christ. If one is disposed to think less of the N. T. because it stands in the vernacular κοινή, let him remember that the speech of these Christians was rich beyond measure, since out of it came the words of Jesus. These were carried in the common tradition of the period and written down from time to time (Lu. 1:1–4). Paul was not a rhetorician, though a man of culture, but he cared much for the talk of the Christians that it should be worthy. Ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι ἄλατι ἠρτυμένος, εἰδέναι τῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἕν ἐκάστῳ ἰσχυρίσθαι (Col. 4:6). That was good advice for the Colossians and for all speakers and writers, grammarians included, and makes a fitting bon mot to leave with the rhetoricians who might care to quibble further over niceties of language.

Ταῦτα μελέτα, ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι.

[PAGE 1209] ADDITIONAL NOTES

1. Καθαρίζω or καθερίζω (p. 183). Mr. H. Scott furnishes me the following table for the variations between α and ε in the augmented tenses of καθαρίζω:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Εκαθερ</th>
<th>Εκαθαρ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ν</td>
<td>0/8</td>
<td>8/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2/7 Mt., Mk.</td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syr.</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For LXX see Helbing and Thackeray.

2. Prothetic Vowels in the N. T. (p. 206). The following is a table of (probable) prothetic vowels in N. T. (supplied by Mr. H. Scott):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>ε</th>
<th>ο</th>
<th>ι</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>ἐ-ρυθρός</td>
<td>ὀ-ῥύσσω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Elision (p. 208). Mr. H. Scott adds οὐδὲν (Lu. 16:31, W. H. text), οὐδὲν ἦ (Tisch., οὐδὲ ἦ W. H.), οὐδὲν αὐτὸν (Jo. 21:25). We have both καθαρὸς and κατὰ ἄτομα, but κατὰ ἐκατόν (Mk. 6:40). There is much variation with prepositions before nouns.

4. Παρρησία (p. 212). Mr. H. Scott notes that out of 40 occurrences in the N. T. 24 read παρρ— without variant. In the remaining 16 Ν reads παρρ— 13/16, B 10/16, A 14/14, C 9/10, D 7/14, L 8/9, Syr. 16/16. In Gospels B always has παρρ— except in Jo. 11:14, א only in Jo. 11:14.

5. Assimilation of ἐν μέσῳ (p. 216). Mr. H. Scott notes that the phrase ἐν μέσῳ occurs 27 times in the N. T., of which 2 (Jo. 8:3, 9) are in a spurious passage. Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 150) observes that ΝΒΔ never have ἐμμέσῳ. But A of Gospels and E of Acts always have ἐμμέσῳ, while C has it 9/12 times.

6. **Rules for Assimilation of Consonants** (p. 216). The familiar rules are given in all the school grammars (cf. Hadley and Allen, Goodwin, etc.), and need not be given here in detail. Note only these:

Before a τ mute a π or κ mute is co-ordinated.

Before μ a π mute changes to μ,

Before μ a κ mute changes to γ,

Before μ a τ mute changes to σ (analogy).

Before σ a π mute makes ψ,

Before σ a κ mute makes ξ,

Before σ a τ mute drops out.

Before a labial ν changes to μ.

Before a palatal ν changes to γ (nasal).

Before λ or ρ, ν is assimilated.

Before σ, ν is dropped, and the preceding vowel is lengthened.

Between two consonants σ is dropped.

The insertion of σ in some tenses is treated in the chapter on Conjugation of the Verb.

7. **Metathesis** (p. 221). We find φαινόλιον in P. Oxy. III, 531, 14 (ii/A.D.), but also φαιλονίων, B. U. iii, 816, 24 (iii/A.D.). So the modern Greek φελόνι. Φάτνη (Lu. 2:7, etc.) is the Homeric and Attic form. Moeris (212, 9) says that πάθνη is the Hellenistic form. Modern Greek has πάθνη. Some LXX MSS. have it so. Cf. Thackeray, p. 106; Blass-Debrunner, p. 20.

Hadley and Allen Hadley and Allen, Greek Grammar (1895).

Goodwin

Goodwin, W. W., Greek Grammar. Various editions.


Thackeray

8. Enclitics and Proclitics (p. 233 f.). Rules for accent by Mr. H. Scott:

**ENCLITICS**

Indefinite, τίς in all its forms.

Pers. pron., μοῦ, μοί, μέ;

σοῦ, σοί, σέ.

Pres. indic., εἶµι (except 2d sing. εἶ);

φηµί, φησίν, φασίν.

Particles, γέ, τέ and the inseparable –δέ.

Indef. adverbs, ποτέ, ποῦ, πέρ, πώ, πώς.

Enclitics incline their accent when the preceding word is

(a) proparoxytone,

(b) properispomenon,

(c) a proclitic.

Enclitics lose their accent when the preceding word is

(a) oxytone,

(b) perispomenon,

(c) paroxytone.

Enclitics retain their accent:

(a) if they begin or end a sentence;

(b) if dissyllables, after a paroxytone;

(c) if dissyllables, after perispomena;

(d) after an elided vowel;

(e) if dissyllables, after a proclitic.

———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).

If two or more enclitics occur together, each one receives the accent of the preceding, the last being unaccented. Editors differ in practice as to this rule.

**PROCLITICS**

Art., ὁ, ἡ, οἱ, οἱ.

Prep., ἐς, ἐκ, ἐξ, ἐν.

Conj., εἰ, ὡς.

Negative, οὐ (οὐκ, οὐχ).

Proclitics receive the acute accent:

(a) when they are at the end of a sentence;

(b) when followed by an enclitic.

9. **Βουστροφηδόν** (p. 243). The Greeks first wrote from right to left and then alternately. This alternate method (right to left, left to right) was called βουστροφηδόν, ‘as oxen turn at the plow.’ Cf. Geddes, *A Compendious Greek Grammar*, 1888, p. xiv. The Greeks had a fine system of abbreviations in frequent use. For full particulars see Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography*, pp. 86–96.


11. **Augment in the Past Perfect** (p. 366). Mr. H. Scott notes that of the 15 out of 22 verbs with past perfects in the N. T. the active verbs are equally divided as to augment. Of the 7 [Page 1212] passive verbs only θεμέλιω is unaugmented. Βάλλω is augmented in the passive, but not in the active. Γίνομαι and Ἰστημι have both the augmented and the unaugmented forms in the active.

12. **List of Important Verbs.** (Purely normal verbs are not listed here. Only the tenses are given that occur in the N. T.) Mr. H. Scott has rendered valuable aid in preparing it.

Ἀγαλλιάω. Pres. act. in 1 Pet. 1:8 and Rev. 19:7; aor. act. ἡγαλλίασα (Lu. 1:47), but the active does not occur in LXX. The middle is in LXX (Ps. 15:9) and the N. T. (Jo. 8:56, etc.). The aor. passive appears in Jo. 5:35 (Ἀγαλλιάθηναι, BL –σθηναι).

---

Ἀγγέλλω (comp. ἰν-, ἰπ-, δι-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, προ-ἐπ-, κατ-, προ-κατ-). Simplex only in Jo. 20:18 ἀγγέλλονομα, and Jo. 4:51 in RD. –ἀγγελῶ, –ἵγειλα, –ἵγειλμαι, – ἤγελην. The classic aor. pass. ἤγελθην does not occur in LXX or N. T.

Ἀγνυμ (only κατ-ἀγνυμ as in Attic and LXX). Three forms in N. T.: a fut. act. κατ-ἐαξε (Mt. 12:20; LXX has κατάξω), an aor. act. κατ-ἐαξαν (Jo. 19:32 f.), an aor. pass. κατασπαν (Jo. 19:31. Cf. κατεσφηναι in Plato, etc.). The copyists kept the augment where it did not belong, so that even a pres. act. κατεύσω is found. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 253.

Ἀγω (comp. ἰν-, ἰπ-ἀν-, ἰπ-, συν-ἀπ-, δι-, εἰσ-, παρ-ἐἷσ-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, κατ-, μετ-, παρ-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ἐπι-συν-, ὰπ-). The principal parts are regular save the aorist active (usually the reduplicated second aorist form ἠγαγων, but sometimes the rare sigmatic aorist ηναεας in Hesiod).

Αἱρέω (comp. ἰν-, ἰφ-, δι-, ἐξ-, καθ-, περι-, προ-). Simplex only middle. –ἐλΩ (as LXX), ἀφηςμαι, –αφεθήσαμαι; –ἐλιν and –ἐλα (middle also); –ηρούμεν, – ἠρημαι, –ηρεθην.

Αἱρο (ἀπ-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, μετ-, συν-, ὰπερ-). Principal parts regular. Only note imperative aor. act. ἄρων and inf. aor. act. ἄραι, while ind. aor. act. is ήρα and fut. act. ἄρῳ.

Αἰσθάνομαι. Only once in N. T. (Lu. 9:45), aor. mid. ἀισθῶνται.

Ακοψ (δι-, εἰσ-, ἰπ-, παρ-, προ-, ὰπ-). Ακούσω, ἦκουσα, ἢκῆκα ("Attic perf."). ἀκοούσαμαι, ἀκουσθήσαμαι, ἢκουσθην.

Ἀλλάσσω (ἀπ-, δι-, κατ-, ἀπο-κατ-, μετ-, συν-). Ἀλλάζω, ἡλλαξα, ἡλλαξάμεν (Ro. 1:23, LXX); pass. –ηλλαγμαι, –ηλλάγην, ἠλλαγήσωμαι (1 Cor. 15:51).

Ἀλλομαί (ἐξ-, ἐφ-). Aor. –崄μαι and –崄μην. Conformed to Acts save Jo. 4:14.

Ἀμαρτάνω (προ-). Ἀμαρτήσω, ἤμαρτον and ἡμάρτησα, ἢμάρτηκα.


Ἀμφιέννυμι, ἢμφιέσσαι.

Ἀναθάλλω (only comp.). Ἀνεθάλετε (Ph. 4:10).

Ἀναλίσκο (only comp., also κατ-ἀν-). Other tense-stems from ἄναλω; ἄναλωσ; aor. act. inf. ἄναλωσαι; aor. pass. ἄναλωσηε (N. T. forms do not show augment). In 2 Th. 2:8 W. H. in margin give ἄναλοι as present (so Attic and LXX).

Ἀνοίγω (δι-, ἐξ-, Ac. 12:16 D). The simplex ὀννω, ὀνγυμ does not occur in LXX or N. T. Imperf. ἀνήνοιγε (Lu. 24:32); fut. ἀνοίξω; aor. act. ἠνοίξε, ἀνέμεξε, ἢνέμεξε. The aor. ind. (22 times) is confined (H. Scott) to John (6), Acts (5), Rev. (10),
except δήνουξεν (Lu. 24:45). The predominant form is [Page 1213] ἡνοῦξ- (16 times without v. r.) and read by W. H., except ἄνεφξεν (Jo. 9:14), and ἄνεφξεν (Jo. 9:17, 32). Pass. fut. ἄνοιξεσταὶ (Lu. 11:9 f. A); ἄνοιξεστα (W. H., Mt. 7:7, 8=Lu. 11:9, 10). Aor. indic. occurs 9 times: ἡνοῖχθη- (Rev. 20:12 (bis), δι-, Lu. 24:31); ἄνεφξηθη- (Lu. 1:54); ἄνεφξηθη- (Mt. 3:16; 9:30; 27:52; Jo. 9:10; Ac. 16:26). 2d aor. indic. ἡνοῖχθη- (4 times, Mk. 7:35; Ac. 12:10; Rev. 11:19; 15:5); subj. Mt. 20:33. Perf. part. (only) 11 times: δι-ἡνοιγμένος (Ac. 7:56); ἄνεφγμένος (Ac. 9:8; 10:11; 16:27; Ro. 3:13; 2 Cor. 2:12); ἄνεφγμενος (Rev. 3:8; 4:1; 10:2, 8; 19:11).

Ἀντάω (ἀπ-, κατ-, σὺν-, ὑπ-). The simplex does not occur. The parts are regular. Fut. infin. κατ-ἀντίσεων (Ac. 26:7, W. H. marg.); fut. part. σὺν-ἀντίσεσσα (Ac. 20:22).

Ἀπο-κτέινω. The simplex does not occur. Pres. varies between –κτέινο, –κτέννω (2 Cor. 3:6 W. H. alt., Mt. 10:28 W. H. alt., Lu. 12:4 W. H. alt.) and –κτέννομι (Mk. 12:5); fut. ἀπο-κτενώ; aor. ἀπ-ἐκτεινα; pass. inf. ἀπο-κτέννεσθαι (Rev. 6:11); 1st aor. ἄπ-ἐκτάνθην.

Ἄπτω (ἄν-, καθ-, περι-). Ἡψα, ἦψάμην, ἦφθην.

Ἀρνέομαι (ἀπ-, ἄρνησομαι, -ἀρνηθήσομαι, -ἀρνηθήσαμαι, ἢρνημαι.

Ἀρπάζω (δι-, σὺν-). Ἀρπάζω, ἢρπασα; pass. 2d aor. ἢρπαγή; 1st aor. ἢρπάσθην; 2d fut. ἄρπαγήσομαι.


Βάλλω (ἀμφι-, ἄνα-, ἄντι-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, παρεπ-, περι-, προ-, συν-, ὑπερ-, ὑπο-). Imperf. ἐβάλλων (ἐξ- ἐπ- συν-); fut. βαλῶ (ἐκ-, ἐπ- παρ-ἐμ-, περι-). 1st aorist ("Alexandrian") ἐβαλαν (Ac. 16:37); ἐξ- (Mt. 7:22 W. H. alt.; 21:39 W. H. alt.); ἐπι- (Ac. 21:27; Mk. 14:46); 2d aorist, ἐβαλων (ἐξ-, ἐπ-, παρ-, περι-, συν-, ὑπ-); perf. βεβληκα; pluperf. ἐκ-βεβληκα. Mid. fut. περι-βαλεταία (Rev. 3:5); 2d aor. ἄν-, περι-, σὺν-εβαλόμη; pass. fut. βληθήσομαι, ἐκ-; 1st aor. ἄν-, ἐξ-, ἐβλήθην; perf. βεβληκα, περι-; pluperf. ἐβέβλητο.

Βαρέω (ἐπι-, κατα-). Ἐβάρησα, βεβάρησαι, ἐβαρῆθην (2 Cor. 1:8, Lu. 21:34). Only passive save in compounds.

Βαρόνω. The older verb is ousted in N. T. by βαρεω except in Mk. 14:40, κατα-βαρονόμενοι. It is read in Lu. 21:34 Rec. βαρυνωσει.

Βλαστάω. This is the old form of the pres. The pres. in N. T. is βλαστάω (Mk. 4:27). The aor. ἐβλάστησα may be from βλαστάω or βλαστέω, a form of the pres. occurring in LXX.
Βλέπω (ἀνα—, ἀπο—, δια—, ἐμ—, ἐπι—, περι—, προ—). Ἐβλέπον, βλέψω, ἐβλεψα; περι-εβλέπετο; περι-προ-βλεψαμένος.

Γαμίζω. Ἐγάμουν, Attic Ἐγιμα, late ἐγάμησα, γεγάμηκα, ἐγαμήθην. Γαμίζω is a late form and only pres. active and pass. and imperf. pass. ἐγαμίζοντο appear in N. T. Γαμίζοκο likewise in pres. pass. stem appears in Lu. 20:34 (W. H.) and ἐκ-γαμίσκο in some MSS. in Lu. 20:34 Rec.

Γίνομαι (ἀπο—, δια—, ἐπι—, παρα—, συν-παρα—, προ—). Never γίγνομαι like Attic.

Ἐγίνομαι; γεγίνομαι; part. γεγίνομενος (1 Cor. 15:37), Ἐγενόμην and Ἐγενήθην.

Opt. γένοιτο; part. γεγομένος. The frequent use of the part. in comp., ἀπο—, δια—, ἐπι—, παρα—, συν-παρα—, is noteworthy. Γεγομενος is a frequent variant. J. H. Moulton counts 69 instances of the part. (simple and comp.) in Luke’s writings, and 48 in remainder of N. T. It does not [Page 1214] occur at all in the Johannine writings. “Strong perfect,” γέγονα, γεγένη. A in 1 Macc. 14:30 has ἐγένη, probably an error (cf. γέγονα). Pluperf. γεγόνει (Ac. 4:22), and ἐγεγόνε (Jo. 6:17). Γειν— is a rather frequent spelling, e.g. Ac. 21:14 ΝB*AD; 23:10 B*; Lu. 22:26 ΝBD; 42 ΝΒΔ; 1 Cor. 10:20 Β*D*, etc.

Moulton


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.
Gamma (άνα-, δια-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-). Γνώσομαι, ἔγνω, ἔγνωκα, ἔγνωκεν, ἔγνωσαμαι, ἔγνωσθην, γνωσθησόμαι. Subj. aor. both γνώθη (Jo. 7:51) and γνῶ (Mk. 5:43; 9:30; Lu. 19:15); imper. γνώθι; inf. γνώναι; part. γνώς.

Gamma (άπο-, ἐγ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-). Ἐγραφόν, γράφω, ἔγραφα, γέγραψα; pass. γέγραμμα, –εγγράμμη, ἐπι-, ἔγραφη, προ-. Mid. 1st aor. ἁπό-γράψασθαι (Lu. 2:5).

Deiknu and deiknu (άνα-, ἀπο-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, ὑπο-). Δείξω, ἔδειξα; pass. ἐδείχθην (Heb. 8:5); perf. ἁπό-δεικισμένος, mid. 1st aor. ἐν-δεικισμήν. The pres. has forms from –νωμι and –νόμι.

Deiro. Ἐδειρα, δαρήσομαι.


Deo (προσ-). Ἐδείμιν, ἐδέηθην. In Lu. 8:38 W. H. read ἐδέητο rather than ἐδέητο (W. H. alt.) or ἐδέητο. Impersonal δεί and ἐδεί.

Deo (κατα-, περι-, συν-, ὑπο-). Δήσω, ἔδος, δέδεκα; pass. δεδεμαι, περι-δεδεμένη, ἐδόθην; mid. ἐδησάμην.

Didoimi (άνα-, ἁντ-απο-, ἁπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, μετα-, παρα-, προ-). Pres. para-δίδος (2d sing.), 3d pl. διδόσαν (Rev. 17:13); subj. para-διδό (1 Cor. 15:24, — διδοὶ BEG); imperf. διδόσαν (Jo. 19:3), παρ- (Ac. 16:4); fut. δόσω; part. ἁπο- (Heb. 13:17), παρα- (Jo. 6:64) δόσων; —κα aor. ἐδοκα, 3d pl. ἐδοκαν; 2d aor. 3d pl. παρ-δόσαν (Lu. 1:2); imper. δός; subj. δό, δός (Mk. 6:25), δό (Jo. 15:16); subj. 3d sing. cont. δό (Mk. 8:37), παρα- (Mk. 4:29), δόθη or δόθη (2 Tim. 2:25, Eph. 1:17); opt. 3d sing. δόθη (Ro. 15:5; 2 Th. 3:16; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18); inf. δούναι; part. δοῦς; perf. δδοκα; plup. δδώκειν; mid. fut. δόσομαι, ἐκ- (Mt. 21:41); 2d aor. ἐδέστο (N Mt. 21:33=K-Mt.=Lu.) with variant l. —οτο in each passage; plur. without variant, ἁπ-δόσθην, —δόντο. Pass. pres. and imperf. —ἐδίδοτο, —τ— (Ac. 4:35), παρ— (1 Cor. 11:23), with variant —το in each case; fut. δδόσμαι, ἀνταπο-, παρα-. 1st aor. ἐδόθην, ἀπ-, ἐπ-, παρ-; perf. δδόμαι. Dr. Hort considers the change of the vowels in imperf. and 2d aor. from —το to —το as probably euphonic. Διδώ (ἀπο-, δια-, παρα-). Pres. διδώ (Rev. 3:9); imper. διδού (Lu. 6:30; 11:3); part. ἁπο-διδού (Rev. 22:2); imperf. ἐδίδουν (Mk. 3:6; Ac. 1:20), ἐπ-, παρ-; fut. δια-διδόσουσι (Rev. 17:13 Rec.) ex fictione Erasmi.

Dunmain. Pres. 2d sing. δόνασαι (Mt. 5:36; 8:2; Mk. 1:40; Lu. 6:42). Opt. δυναμίν (Ac. 8:31; 27:12, 39). Εὐθυμίν and ἑυμάτημα, δυνάσμαι, ἑυμάτημα and ἑυμανάσθην. Δύναμαι, 2d sing. δύνη (Mk. 9:22 f.; Lu. 16:2; Rev. 2:2). There are traces of this late Greek form in B in present tense in Mt. 19:12; 26:53; Mk. 10:39; Ac. 4:20; 27:15.

Δυώ (ἐκ-, ἀπ-ἐκ- [mid.], ἐν-, ἐπ-ἐν-, παρ-εἰσ-, ἐπτ-). Simplex only, Mk. 1:32. Pres. ἐπὶ-δύεται; 2d aor. ἔδυν, ἔδυσα (Mk. 1:32); mid. –ἐδυσάμην; pass. παρεῖσ-εδύην. 2d aor. (Ju. 4) εὐ-δεδυμένος.

Δύνω (ἐκ-). In pres. only.

Ἑαω (προσ-). ἦλθον, ἐλάσω, εἰλασά. Augt. ἐσαφεῖσ=εσαφεῖτ-. See Jannaris, § 719.

Ἑγγίζω (προσ-). Ἑγγίζον, ἑγγίσω and ἑγγιζέ (Jas. 4:8 W. H. alt.), Ἑγγίσα, Ἑγγίκα.[Page 1215]

Ἑγείρω (δι-, ἓξ-, ἓπ-, συν-). Ἑγεύω, Ἑγεύρα, ὅ-εγεύρετο (Jo. 6:18 δι-ηγ. alt.), Ἑγήγερμαι, Ἑγήρθησαμαι. In Mk. 2:9 Ἑγείρου, but usually intransitive Ἑγείρε (cf. ἤγε, Ἑγείει) as Mk. 5:41. Ἑγεύραι not in N. T., nor Ἑγρήγορα.

Ἑδαφίζω. Ἑδαφίζω (“Attic“ fut.).

Ἑθο. Obsolete in pres. Ἑθῶθα, ἑθῶθειν.

Εἰδέω and εἴδω (ἄπ-, ἐπ-, προ-, συν-, ὑπερ-). Not used in pres. Fut. εἰδήσω (Heb. 8:11, LXX). 1st aor. εἶδα, ἐλάμεν, ἑλάτε, ἐλάν (W. H. text 18 times and 2 alt.). 2d aor. ἐλάνων and ἐλάων (ind. both complete); imper. ἐλα; subj. ἐλα; inf. ἐλάν; part. ἐλαν. 2d perf. ἐλάα complete, and ἐλέτα (?), ἐλάειν (Ac. 26:4); imper. ἐλέτε (?); subj. ἐλαίο; inf. ἐλάνει; part. ἐλάός; pluperf. ἐλέειν complete. As ἐλάων and ἐλαα have the same root they are put together. It does not seem reasonable to divide the same root between ἐλάων and ἐράω. See ἐλα.

Εἰμί (ἄπ-, ἐν-, ἓξ-, παρ-, συν-, συμ-παρ-). Ἡν and mid. ἡμιν, ἡσθα, ἡμεθα; imper. pres. ἤμη, ἤστω, ἤστωσαν (<ddue 2 pl. does not occur); opt. ἤπν ἤσομαι, ἤσσαμα, ἤσσεμνος (Lu. 22:49).

Εἰμι. Only in comp. (ἄπ-, ἥσ-, ἓξ-, ἓπ-, συν-). Only pres. (fut. sense) 3d pl. –ἰδοι, εἶ- (Heb. 9:6); imper. εἰ-ιθεί (Ac. 9:6 β) and imperfect. –ἰείν).

Ελαύνω (i.e. ἐλαύνων) (ἄπ-). Pres. inf. ἐλαύνειν. 1st aor. ἀπ-ἐλάσα; perf. ἐλαύνα-κώς; imperfect pass. ἐλαύνετο.

Ελκω. Pres. act. and pass. ἓξ-; imperfect. ἐλκων; other tenses from ἐλκύω. Ἐλκύσω, Ἐλκύσα.
Ἐπο (ἀντ–, ἀπ–, προ–). Pres. not used. Fut. ἔρω. 1st aor. ἐπα, etc.; imper. εἰπόν (?), εἴπάτω, –ατε, –ἀτοσαν; part. ἐπας. 2d aor. ἐπον; imper. εἰπέ; subj. ἐπω; inf. ἐπειν; part. ἐπόν. Perf. εἰρήκα, 3d pl. –καν and –κασιν (Ac. 17:28); inf. εἰρηκέναι; part. εἰρήκως. Pluperf. εἰρήκει. Mid. 1st aor. ἄπε-επάμεθα. Pass. 1st aor. ἔρρηση and ἔρρεθη; part. ῥηθεῖς; perf. ἐρήται; part. εἰρημίνος.

Ἐργάζομαι (κατ–, περι–, προσ–). Ἐργαζόμεν (Ac. 18:13 HIP) and ἔργαζόμην (W. H.), ἐργαζόμην (Gosp.) and κατ-εργάζομαι (2 Cor. 7:11), ἐργαζόμαι (passive). 1st aor. κατ-εργάσθην κατ-ηρ (BDC, W. H. alt.).

Ἐρχομαι (ἀν–, ἐπ–, ἀπ–, δι–, εἰσ–, ἐπ–-εισ–, παρ–-εισ–, συν–-εισ–, ἐξ–, δι–-εξ–, ἐπ–, κατ–, παρ–, ἀντ–-παρ–, περι–, πρό–, προσ–, συν–). Ἐρχόμην, ἐλευσομαι, ἠλθον and ἠλθα, ἐληλυθα. Pluperf. ἐληλύθειν.

Ἐρωτάω (δι–, ἐπ–). Ἡρώτων καὶ θρώτων, ἐρωτήσω, ἠρώτησα; ἐπ-ερωτηθεῖς, 1st aor. pass.

Ἐσθιω and ἔσθιο (κατ–, συν–). Pres. only. Ἑσθιων, φάγομαι, 2d sing. φάγεσαι (Lu. 17:8); ἔφαγον complete; opt. φάγοι (Mk. 11:14).

Εὐαγγελίζω (προ–). Active only, 1st aor. (Rev. 10:7; 14:6). Προ–, εὐηγγελίζομην, εὐηγγελίσαμήν, εὐηγγελίσαμα, εὐηγγελίσθην.

Εὐδοκέω (συν–), (εὖ, ἡ)δοκοῦμεν (1 Th. 2:8), (εὖ, τη)δοκῆσα (εὖ– in Gospels. In the Epistles the reading varies).

Εὐρίσκω (ἀν–). Εὐρίσκων καὶ ἡρώ, εὐρήκωσα, εὐρόεν, εὐραμεν, etc.) and εὐρήκα (some MSS.), εὐρήκα, ἡρώ, εὐρίσκομεν, εὐρέθησα, εὐρεθησοµαι. Mid. εὐρίσκομεν.

Ἐχο (ἀν–, ἀντ–, ἀπ–, ἐν–, ἐπ–, κατ–, μετ–, παρ–, περι–, πρό–, προσ–, συν–, ὑπερ–, ὑπο–). Ἐχον (ἐχαμεν, εἴχοσαν, as well as εἴχαν and εἴχον), ἔχω, ἔσχον, ἐσχήκα, εἴχόμην, ἔχομαι; 2d aor. mid. ἀν-εσχόμην.

Ζῶω (ἀνα–, συν–). Pres. ὅω, χής, χήθ, inf. χήν. Ἐζώων, χήσω, χήσωμαι, ἔζησα.

Ζώννυμι and ζώννυμι (i.e. χω-νυ–) (ἀνα–, δια–, περι–, ὑπο–). Ζώννυμον, χόσω – ἐξώσα, mid. fut. περι-ζώσομαι. 1st aor. ἐξωσάµην, –ἐξώσαµαι.

Ἦκω (ἀν–, καθ–). Ἡκων, ἥξω, ἥξα (in subj.). Ἡκα in Mk. 8:3. Some MSS. have Ἡκοσιν instead of Ἡκασιν. BLA (W. H.) read elsiv. [Page 1216]

Ἦσσομαι once (2 Cor. 12:13). Elsewhere Ἡστάοιμα, Ἱττημαι, ἱττήθην.

Θάπτω (συν–). Ἐθαψα, ἐτάφην.

Θανατίς (ἀν–). Θανάτω, θανάσα, θανατίσθην, θανασθῆσομαι and mid. θανάσομαι (Rev. 17:8 NB).
**Thēśko** (ἀπο-, συναπο-). Simplex perf. only, ἅπι-ἐθνησκον; –θανοῦμαι, –ἐθανον, τέθηκα. Both tevthnai and tēthnēkēnai (Ac. 14:19), but tēthnēkōs.

**Tarámi.** Pres. ἰδίαι, ἱόμην; mid. ἱσομαι, ἱασόμην; pass. ἱμαι (ἵσται Mk. 5:29), ἱαθη, ἱαθήσομαι.

**Tóo** obsolete. For ἔδω and ἔδα see ἔδω (ἔδεω).

**Th-k-néomai** (ἄφ-, δι-, ἔφ–). Simplex not found in N. T. Pres. –κυνούμενος; 2d aor. ἄφικετο; inf. ἐφ-ικέσθαι; part. ἰχ-ικύμενος.


**Kathairó (δια-, ἐκ–).** –ἐκάθαρα, κεκάθαρμαι. Inf. καθάραι.

**Katharίζω (δια–).** Καθαρίζω, ἐκκαθάρισμαι, κεκαθάρισθην and Καθαρίσθη (Mt. 8:3=Mk.).

**Kathēzomai** (παρα–). The simplex έζομαι does not occur in LXX or N. T. Pres. part. καθεζόμενος; imperf. Καθεζόμην. 1st aor. part. παρα-καθεζοθείς.

**Káthmhai** (συν–). Pres. 2d sing. κάθη (Ac. 23:3); imper. κάθοι (Jas. 2:3); subj. καθήσθοι (Lu. 22:30); inf. καθήσαται; part. καθήμενος; imperf. Καθήμην; fut. καθήσομαι.

**Kathízo (ἀνα-, ἐπι-, παρα– [Rec.], συν–).** The simplex ίζω does not occur in LXX or N. T. Fut. καθίζω; 1st aor. ἐκάθισα; perf. κεκάθικα; mid. fut. καθίσεσθε (Mt. 19:28).

**Káio (ἐκ–, κατα–).** Κατ-έκαιον, κατα-καῦσω, κατ-έκαωσα, κέκαωμαι, κατ-εκάην, ἐξεκαύθην, κατα-καήσομαι, κατα-καυθήσομαι. In 1 Cor. 13:3 some MSS. have καυθήσομαι (fut. subj., Byz.).
Kαλέω (ἀντι-, ἐν-, εἰς—[—μαί], ἐπι—, μετα—, παρά—, συνπαρα—, πρό—, προσ—, συν—).

Σκάλα, καλέω, καλεσά, κέκλημα, κάτα, κατακλήμα, ἐπ-εκέκλητο, ἐκλήθην, κληθήσομαι. Mid. fut. ἐπι—, μετα-καλέσομαι, ἔπι—, μετα—, προσ-εκαλεσάμην.

Κάμνω. Ἐκαμων, κέκμηκα.

Κερά-νν-μι, κερα-ννύω (συν—). The present does not occur in N. T. Ἐκέρασα, κεκέρασμα, συν—.

Κερδαίνω. Pres. and imperf. do not occur. Fut. κερδανῶ (1 Cor. 9:21 W. H.); aor. subj. κερδάνῳ: a matter of editing. [Page 1217]

Κερδάω. Fut. κερδήσω (Jas. 4:13); aor. ἐκέρδησα; subj. κερδήσῳ (1 Cor. 9:19–21). Pass. fut. κερδήθησομαι (1 Pet. 3:1).

Κλάω (ἐκ-, κατα—). Ἐκλάσα, ἐκλάσθην, ἔξ—.

Κλίνω (ἀπο—, ἐκ—, κατα—, συν—). Κλίσω, ἐκλίσα, κέκλησομαι, ἐκλείπω.

Κλίνο (ἀνα—, ἐκ—, κατα—, προσ—). Ἀνα-κλινώ, ἐκλίνα, κέκληκα, προεκλίθην, ἀνα-, κατα—, προσ—.

Κομιζω (ἐκ—, συν—, συμμισσα, συν—). Pass. τε-εκομίζοτο; mid. κομίζομαι and κομίσομαι (1 Pet. 5:4; some MSS. in Col. 3:25), ἐκομίσαμην.

Κόπτω (ἀπο—, ἐκ—, ἐν—, κατα—, προ—, προσ—). Ἐκοπτον, ἐκ—, προ-κόψο, ἐκοψα; pass. 2d aor. ἔξ-ἐκόπην; 2d fut. ἐκ-κοπήσομαι, ἐκοψάμην, κόψομαι, ἀπο—.

Κορέννυμι, κεκορεσμένος, κορεσθεῖς.

Κράζω (ἀνα—). Ἐκφράζω, κράζω, ἐκφραζα καὶ ἐκκραζα; 2d aor. ἄν-ἐκφραγον; 2d perf. κέκραγα. Some MSS. have κεκράζωμαι in Lu. 19:40.

Κρέμαμαι, κρεμαννύω, κρεμάζω and κρεμάω (ἐκ—). The active pres. does not occur. Ἐκρέμασα, ἐκρέμασθην. In Lu. 19:48, ἔξ-ἐκρέμετο and —ματο.

Κρίνω (ἀνα—, ἀπο—, ἄνταπο—[—μαί], δια—, ἐν—, ἐπι—, κατα—, συν—, ὑπο—, συνυπο—).

Διέκρινα, κρινώ; pass. ἐκρινόμην; κατα-κρίνων (both a question of accent), ἐκρίνα, κέκρικα, κεκρίκειν, κέκριμα, ἐκρίθην, κρίθησομαι. Mid. 1st aor. ἄπ-ἐκρινάμην.

Κρύπτω (ἀπο—, ἐν—, περι—). Ἐκρυψα; 2d aor. περι-ἐκρυβεν (Lu. 1:24). [This may be the imperf. of κρύβω.] Ἐκκρύμμαι, ἐκρύβην.

Κυλίω (ἀνα—, ἀπο—, προς—). Ἀπο-κυλίσω, ἀπο—, προς-εκύλισα; pass. ἐκυλίεστο, κεκύλισμαι, ἀνα—, ἀπο—.
Λακέω or λάσκω. Both presents could give ἐλάκησε (Ac. 1:18).

Lambda. (ἐν-, ἔν-, συν-παρα-, συν-παρα-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, προσ-περι-, ὑπο-). Ἐλαμβάνω, λήψομαι, Ἐλαβον; opt. λάβοι. Λάβε, not λαβέ; Ἐλάβατε (1 Jo. 2:27); παρ-ἐλάβοσαν (2 Th. 3:6), Ἐλαβαθ (Jo. 1:12). Ἐλήψα: Ἐλήψες (Rev. 11:17); –ἐλημαί, Ἐλήμφησην. Pass. fut. παραλημφθήσομαι; mid. 2d aor. Ἐλαβόμην; imper. Ἐπ-, προσ-λαβόμεν.

Λανθάνω (ἐκ-, ἐπ-). Simplex active only, Ἐλαθον. Ἐπ-ἐλαθόμην, –ἐλέλημαι (ἐκ-, Ἐπ-).

Λέγω, ‘say’ (ἐντ-, δια-, ἐπ-, προ-). The simplex has pres. and imperf. act. and pres. mid. only. Imp. Ἐλεγον, ὁντ-, προ--; Ἐλεγαν (Jo. 11:56 ἩΝΩ). Pass. imperf. ἐλέγημην, 1st aor. ἐλέγχθην; mid. 1st aor. ἐλέεξάμην.

Λέγω, ‘choose’ (ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, συλ-). Simplex has not this meaning. Συλ- is the only compound with active forms. Fut. συλ-ἐλέξω; 1st aor. συν-ἐλέξα; mid. pres. κατα-, παρα-, συλ--; imperf. εξ-, παρ-ἐλεγόμην; 1st aor. δι-, ἐκ-, Ἐπι-ἐλέεξάμην; pass. perf. ἐκ-ἐλεεξέμενος.

Λείπω (ἐπ-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπ-, κατα-, ἐν-κατα-, περι-). Simplex only pres. (act. and pass.) except Tit. 3:13 W. H. marg. Ἐλειπον, –λείψω, –ἐλέψα, Ἐλιπον; pass. – λέελιμμα, –ἐλείφθην. (Some MSS. have a compound of λι-μ-παν in pres. and imperf., Ac. 8:24.)

Λογίζομαι (ἀνα-, δια-, παρα-, συλ-). Ἐλογιζόμην, Ἐλογισάμην, Ἐλογίσθην, λογισθήσομαι.

Λούω (ἐπ-). Ἐλουσα; pass. λέλουμαι and λέλουσα (Heb. 10:22); mid. 1st aor. Ἐλουσάμην.

Μανθάνω (κατα-). Ἐμαθον, μεμάθηκα.


Μέλλω. Ἐμελλόν and ἡμέλλων, μελλήσω.[Page 1218]

Μένω (ἀνα-, δια-, ἕν-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, συν-παρα- [Rec.], περι-, προσ-, ὑπο-). Ἐμενον, μενό, Ἐμενα, –μεμένηκα, μεμενήκειν.

Μιαίνω. Μεμίαμαι, ἐμμαίνην.

Μίγνυμι and μίσγο (συν-ανα-). Ἐμίζα, μέμγμαι.

Μιμνήσκω (ἀνα-, ἐπ-ανα-, ὑπο-). –μνήσω, μέμνημαι, ἐμνήψοθν, μνησθήσομαι.

Μνηστεύω. Ἐμνήστευμαι, ἐμνηστεύθην.
Nósso (κατα—). Ἑνυξά; 2d aor. pass. κατ-ενύην.

Ξηραῖνο. Pres. does not occur. Ἐξηρᾶνα, ἐξήραμαι, ἐξηράνθην.

Ξυράω. The form ἔξυρασθαι occurs (1 Cor. 11:6), which may be accented ἔξυρασθαι (pres. inf.) or ἐξυρασθαι (1st aor. mid. inf.). Ἐξύρημαι, ἐξυρήσομαι.

Οἴκοδομέω (όν—, ἔπ—, συν—). Οἰκοδόμοιν, Οἰκοδομήσω, οἰκοδόμησα (also οἰκοδ—), οἰκοδομημαι, οἰκοδομήσω, οἰκοδομήθην (also οἰκοδ—), οἰκοδομηθήσομαι.

Ὄλλυμι and Ὄλλω. Simplex does not occur in N. T. It is confined in LXX to Job, Prov. and part of Jer. (Thackeray, p. 279). Comp. Ὄλλω, ὀλλούν, ὀλλοῦμι; imperf. ὀλλοῦμυντο (1 Cor. 10:9); fut. ὀλλοῦσα (1 Cor. 1:19 Q); 1st aor. ὀλλοῦσα; 2d perf. ὀλλοῦσα; mid. imperf. ὀλλοῦμνην; fut. ὀλλοῦμαι; 2d aor. ὀλλοῦμην, συν-απ--; inf. ὀλλοῦσθαι; part. ὀλλοῦμένος.

Ὀμοιόω (ὁφ—). Ὀμοιώσω, Ὀμοιώθην (also ὀμοιώθην), Ὀμοιωθήσομαι, Ὀμοιωθομένος.

Ὀράω (ὁφ—, κῳ—, προ—). Pres. complete. Imper. ὃρα, ὃρατε; imperf. ὅρων (3d pl., Jo. 6:2); perf. ἐξόρακα (Gospels and Acts. In Paul and 1 John variation between ἔω— and ἐω—); plup. ἐξόρακε; pass. pres. κῳ-ορᾶται; imperf. προορῶμεν (LXX). Stem Ὅρα: fut. ὃρωμαι; fut. pass. ὃρθόσαιμαι; 1st aor. pass. ὃρθην; 1st aor. mid. subj. ὃρθεθε (Lu. 13:28). Stem Ὅρα—; see ἐξέω.

Ὀρύσσω (δι—, ἕξ—). Ὀρυξά, ἕξ—, δι-ορυγθήναι or δι-ορυγήναι (W. H alt.).

Πάσχοι (προ—, συμ—). Ἐπαθον, πέπονθα.

Παύω (ἀνα—, ἐπ-ἀνα—, συν-ἀνα [-μαι], κατα—). Simple aor. act. once only. Παύσω, Ἐπαύσα; mid. παύσαι, ἐπαύσαι, Παύσαι, ἐπαυσάμην, παύσαιμαι, πέπαυμαι, —πάσμαι.

Πείθω (ἀνα—). Ἐπειθον, Ἐπείθα, πέπεθα, Ἐπειθείθειν; pass. Ἐπειθόμην, πέπεθημαι, Ἐπείθῆς, πειθήσομαι.

Πιάζω and πιέζω, Ἐπίσκοπος, πεπίεσαι, Ἐπιάζοντας.

Πίμπλημι. Pres. part. Ἐμπίπλων, Ἐπλήσα, Ἐμ-πεπλησμένος, Ἐπλήθηθη, πληθήσομαι.

Thackeray


———, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).
Πίνω (κατα-, συμ-). Πίομαι (πίεσαι, Lu. 17:8), ἔπιον (both πεῖν and πιεῖν, but only πίε), πέπωκα, κατ-επόθην.

Πιπράσκω, πέπρακα, πέπραμαι, ἐπράθην.


Πιλέω (ἐμ- only comp.), πλέκωμαι; aor. act. part. πλέχας; 2d aor. pass. ἐμπλακείς.

Πλήσσω (ἐμ- , ἐμ- , συμ-). Πράξω, ἑπραξα, πέπραχα, πέπραγμα.

Πινίγω (ἄνα-, ἐπι-, συμ-). Ἐπινιγώ, ἐπινιγήμαι, ἀπ-ἐπινίγην.

Πράσσω. Πράξω, ἑπραξα, πέπραχα, πέπραγμα.

Πανθάνομαι. Επονθᾶνόμην, ἐποθῆμην.

Ῥαντίζω. Ἐράντισα (some MSS. ἐρράντ.), ῥ ἐράντισμαι (so W. H., but some MSS. ἐρράντ.). Mid. 1st aor. subj. ῥαντίσθηται (Mk. 7:4).[Page 1219]

Ῥέω (παρα-). Ρέως; 2d aor. pass. –ἐρρύην.

Ῥήσσω (ἐμ- , περι-, προς- and ῥήγνυμι). The active forms belong to ῥήσσω and the passive to ῥήγνυμι. Act. pres. ῥήσσει, δια-; fut. ῥήξει; 1st aor. ῥήσω(ῥησα), δι-, περι-, προς-, pass. pres. ῥήγγνυται; imperf. δι-ἐρ(ῥήγνυτο (Lu. 5:6). The reading of Lu. 5:6 varies between δι-ἐρ(ῥήγνυτο and δι-ἐρ(ῥήσσετο.

Σβέννυμι and σβεννύω, σβέννυμαι, stem σβε(σ)–. Pres. σβέννυτε, σβέσω, ἐσβέσα; pass. σβέννυμαι.

Σείω (ἀνα-, δια-, κατα-). Ἀν-δι-κατ-ἐσώσα, σέεσω; pass. pres. σειώμενος; 1st aor. ἐσείσθην.

Σκάπτω (κατα-). Ἑσκαψά, –ἐσκαμμαί (Ac. 15:16 Rec.).

Σκέπτομαι is not found in N. T. save in ἑπισκέπτεσθαι (Jas. 1:27; Heb. 2:6 Q), ἑπισκέψομαι; 1st aor. mid. ἑπι-εσκεψάμην.

**Σπείρω** (δια–, ἐπι–). Ἐσπειρα, ἔσπαρμαι, ἔσπαρην, δι–.

**Στέλλω.** Simplex only in pass. pres. (Ἀπο–, ἔξ-ἀπο–, συν-ἀπο–, δια–, ἐπι–, κατα–, συν(v)–, ὑπο–). Ὕπ-ἔστελλον, ὁ-εστελλόμενη, –στελλώ, –ἔστελλα, ὁπ-ἔσταλκα (ἅπεσταλκαν in Ac. 16:36), –ἔσταλμαι, ὁπ-ἔστάλην, ὁδι–, ὑπ- eius-στελλάμην.

**Στήκω.** Cf. modern Greek στέκω from ἔστηκα. Imperf. ἔστηκον in Jo. 8:44 and Rev. 12:4 according to W. H.

**Στηρίζω** (ἐπι–). Στηρίζω (–ίσω in MSS., 2 Th. 3:3, W. H. alt.; cf. –ιῶ in LXX), ἔστηριζα and ἔστηρισα, στηρίζαι (opt. and inf.), ἔστηριγμα, ἔστηρίζην.

**Στρέφω** (ἄνα–, ἀπο–, δια–, ἐκ–, ἐπι–, κατα–, μετα–, συν(v)–, ὑπο–). Ὕπ-ἔστρεφον, -στρέψω, ἔστρεψα, –ἔστραμμαι, ἔστραφην, μετα-στραφήσομαι.

**Στρέψω or στροννύω** (κατα–, ὑπο–). Present does not occur. Ἐστρόννυον, ἔστρωσα, ἔστρωμαι, κατ-εστρώθην.

**Σφάξω** (κατα–). Present does not occur. Σφάξω, ἔσφαζα, ἔσφαγμαι, ἔσφαγνην.

**Σώζω** (δια–, ἐκ–). Σώζω, ἔσωσα, σέσωκα, ἐσωζόμην, σέσωσα, ἔσωθην, σωθήσομαι.

**Τάσσω.** (ἄνα– [-μαι], ἀντι–, ἀπο–, δια–, ἐπι-δια– [-μαι], ἐπι–, [προ–] προσ–, συν–, ὑπο–). Ἐταζα, δια-τεταζέωνι, τεταγ– [-μαι]; 2d aor. ὁδι-, ὑπ-ἐτάγην, δια-τάζομαι; 2d fut. ὑπο-ταγήσομαι; 1st aor. δια-ταγήςες; 1st aor. ἐταζάμην.

**Ταξάμω** (ἀπο–, δια–, ἐκ–, ἐπι–, συν–). –τελέσω, ἔτέλεσα, τετέλεκα, τετέλεσαμαι, ἔτελεσθην, τελεσθήσομαι.

**Τάσσω.** (ἄνα–, ἔξανα–, ἐν–). Simplex does not occur in N. T. 1st aor. ἄν–, ἔξαν-ἐτελα; perf. ἄνα-τεταλκα; mid. pres. ἐν-τάλλομαι; fut. ἐν-τάλημαι; perf. ἐν-τέταλμαι; mid. 1st aor. ἐν-ἐταλάμην.

**Τέσμω** (περι–, συν–). Simplex does not occur. 2d aor. περι-ἐτέμων; inf. περι-τεμένων; pass. pres., 1st aor. περι-τεμήθην; perf. περι-τετεμένος.

**Τίθημι** (ἄνα–, προσ-ἀνα–, ἄπο–, δια–, ἀντι-δια–, ἐκ–, ἐπι–, συν-ἐπι–, κατα–, συν-κατα–, μετα–, παρα–, περι–, προ–, προσ–, συν–, ὑπο–). Act. pres. complete. Imperf. ἔτιθην and ἔτιθεσαν, ἔτιθον (from τιθεν). fut. θήκω; aor. ἔθηκα, –κας, –καν (3d pl.); imper. θές (ἐπι–, προ–); subj. θέω (complete); inf. θέων; part. θείς; perf. τέθεικα; mid. and pass. τέθεμαι, τέθεμαι, συν-τεθείντο, ἔτιθέμην (ἐξ–, προσ–); mid. fut. δια–; ἐπ-θήσομαι; 2d aor. ἔθεμην (complete); imper. θεύ (παρα–); θάδε (ἄπο–); inf. θέσθαι (ἀπο–, κατα–); part. θέμενος (ἀπο–, δια–). Pass. fut. τεθή-σομαι; aor. ἔτεδθην; inf. τεθήναι; part. τεθείς.

**Τίκτο.** Τέξομαι, ἔτεκον, ἔτεχθην.
Τρέπω (ἄνα--, ἀπο--, ἐκ--, ἐν--, ἐπι--, μετα--, περι--, προ--). Simplex not in N. T. 1st aor. ἀν--, ἑπ-έτρεψα; mid. pres. imperf. ἐν-ετρεπόμην; 1st aor. part. προ-τετραβάμενος;

[Page 1220] pass. “strong” fut. ἐκ--, ἐν-τραπήσονται; 2d aor. ἐκ--, ἑπ-ετράπην; perf. ἑπι-τέτραπται (1 Cor. 14:34 Rec.).

Τρέφω (ἀνα--, ἔκ-, ἐν--). Ἐθρεψα, -ἐθρεψάμην, τέθραμμα, -τράφην.

Τρέχω (εἰσ-, κατα--, περι--, προ--, προσ--, συν--, ἑπι-συν--, ὑπο--). Pres. complete. Ἐτρέχον, ἐδραμον.

Τρίβω (δια--, συν--). Simplex does not occur. Pres. δια--, συν--; imperf. δι-έτριβον; fut. συν-τρίπω; 1st aor. δι-, συν-τρίψα; pass. pres. συν-τρίβομαι; 2d fut. συν-τριβίσομαι; perf. inf. συν-τετρίψα; part. συν-τετριμμένος.

Τυγχάνω (ἐν--, ύπερ-ἐν--, ἐπι--, παρα--, συν--). Ἐτύχον, opt. τύχιον, τέτυχα (Heb. 8:6, N*AD*KL), τέτυχα (Rec., BE, or even τετύχηκα in MSS.).

Φαινω (ἄνα--, ἑπι--). Pres. ἐφάνα (φανή, Rev. 8:12, 18:23 is variously accented), ἐφάνην, φανίσομαι and φανοῦμαι (LXX).

Φείδω. Φείδομαι, ἐφείδομην.

Φέρω (ἀνα--, ἀπο--, δια--, εἰς--, παρ-εἰς--, ἐκ--, ἑπι--, κατα--, παρα--, περι--, προ--, προσ--, συν--, ὑπο--). Ἐφέρον, ἐφερόμην, οἰσω, ἐφερόκα, indic. ἐφέρεκον; other parts ἐφέχθην; 2d perf. act. προσ-ἐφηνοχα.

Φεύγω (ἀπο--, δια--, ἐκ--, κατα--). Mid. fut. φεύξομαι; 2d perf. ἐκ-φεύξετε, ἐφυγον.

Φθάνω (προ--). Ἐφθασα, Ἐφθασα (1 Th. 2:16 W. H. marg.).

Φθείρω (δια--, κατα--). Imperf. (?) Ἐφθειρεν (Rev. 19:2). Φθερῶ, Ἐφθειρα, -ἐφθαρμαι, Ἐφθάρην, φθαρήσομαι.

Φράσσω. Ἐφραξά, Ἐφράγην, φραγήσομαι.

Φύω (ἐκ--, συν--). Pres. part. φύων; pass. 2d aor. part. φυέ, συν-φωίσσα. A further form ἐκ-φη (Mt. 24:32=Mk.) may be accented –φη (W. H.) and will then be active pres. subj. or 1st aor. subj.; or –φη and will then be pass. 2d aor. subj. In this case τὰ φύλλα is considered the subject.

Χέω (ἐκ--, ἑπι--, κατα--, συν--). Simplex does not occur in N. T. and χύννω (simplex not in LXX or N. T.). Comp. ἐκ--, ὑπέρκε-, συν-. Active part. ἑπι-- (Lu. 10:34); imperf. συν-ἐχύννειν (Ac. 9:22); fut. ἐκ-χύννω (LXX); 1st aor. ἐκ--, κατ-έχεα; inf. ἐκ-χέα (Ro. 3:15, LXX); 2d aor. (?) imper. ἐκ-χέετε (Rev. 16:1), συν-ἐχεω (Ac. 21:27). Hort. (II, p. 165) would refer the above forms “to an otherwise virtually unknown 2d aor.” Pass. pres. ἐκ-χέσσται (Mt. 9:17) and ἐκ-συν-, –ὑπερ-ἐκ-χύννομαι; imperf. ἐκ-ἐχύννετο (Ac. 22:20); fut. ἐκ-χύνθεσσαι; 1st aor. ἐκ--, συν-ἐχύθην; perf. ἐκ--, συν-κέχωμαι.
Χρίω (ἐγ—, ἐπι—). Aor. ἔχρισα, ἔγ-χρισαı (Rev. 3:18) may be inf. of 1st aor. active (W. H.) or imper. of 1st aor. mid. (ἐγγρισαı).

Χαίρω (συν—). ἔχαρων, ἐχάρην, χαρῆσομαι, some MSS. χαρῶ (Rev. 11:10).

Χαρίζω. Mid. χαρίσομαι, ἔχαρισάμην; pass. κεχαρίσαμαι, ἔχαρισθην, χαριθήσομαι.

Χράω (κατα—). ἔχρισα, ἔχρισσα, ἐχρίστηθα; pass. κεχρήσαμαι, ἔγχρηστηθα, ἔγχριστηθαı. Impers. ἐχρῆ only once (Jas. 3:10).

Ψύχω (ἀνα—, ἀπο—, ἕκ, κατα—; ἄν, ἕκ—, κατ-έψυξα). Ἠγητομαι.

Ωνέω. ὁνεσάμην, not ἐπριάμην.

13. Ablaut. It is important for the student to note the part played in Greek words, both root-syllables and other syllables, by ablaut or vowel-gradation. We find qualitative ablaut, as φέρω, φόρος and λείπω, λέλοιπα. Then there is quantitative or qualitative-quantitative ablaut, as in ἵμεν, ἵμι and λείπειν, λείπον. [Page 1221] The subject is still more or less obscure as to the precise order of these vowel-changes and the precise factor in each change (accentuation, vowel-contraction, compensative lengthening). For a brief account see Wright, Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language, 1912, pp. 49–61; Brugmann, Kurze vergl. Gr., pp. 138–50; Hirt, Handbuch der griech. Laut- und Formenlehre, pp. 84–105. For a fuller discussion see Hirt, Der indogermanische Ablaut; Brugmann, Grundriß, vol. I, pp. 482–505.
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———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).

ε: see Sinaiticus.

α-text: see Syrian text.

A: see Alexandrinus.

Abbreviations: of personal names, 171–3.

Ablative case: form, 248; Doric genitive-ablative, 254; Attic gen.-abl., 255 f.; name, 514; meaning, 514; rare with substantives, 514 f.; with adjectives, 515 f.; with prepositions, 516 f. and ch. XIII; with verbs, 517–20 (of departure and removal 518, of ceasing and abstaining 518, of missing, lacking, despairing 518, of differing, excelling 519, of asking and hearing 519, with the partitive idea 519, attraction of relative 519 f.); after comparative, 667.

Ablaut: 1220 f.

Absolute: use of cases, 416; nominative, 459 f.; accusative, 490 f.; genitive, 512–4; positive adjective in absolute sense, 661; inf., 1092 f.; participle, 1130–2.

Abstract nouns: 152, 794.


Accidence: in the vernacular κοινή, 72 f.; in the N. T., 82; part II, 141–376.

Accumulation of prepositions: see prepositions.

Accusative case: form, 248; double accusative, 257; singular in third decl., 264 f.; plural, 265 f.; like nom. in –ες, 266; singular of adjectives, 274; name, 466 f.; meaning of, 467 f.; with verbs of motion, 468 f.; extent of space, 469; for time, 469–71; with transitive verbs, 471–7; cognate, 477–9; double, 479–84; with passive verbs, 484–6; adverbial, 486–8; by antiptosis, 488; by inverse attraction, 488; with the infinitive, 489 f.; acc. absolute, 490 f., 1130; with prepositions, 491 and ch. XIII; compared with genitive, 506–10.

Achæan: origin, 16; Achæan-Doric, 17, 54, 266; Achæan-Dorian κοινή: 53, 63.

Active voice: endings, 337–9; displacing future middle, 356; meaning of, 799; transitive or intransitive, 799 f.; effect of prepositions, 800; variation in tenses, 800 f.; causative, 801 f.; with reflexives, 802; impersonal, 802; infinitives, 802; as passive of another verb, 802 f.

Adjectives: with formative suffixes, 157–60 (primitive, 157 f.; secondary, 158–60: from verbs 158, from substantives 158, from adjectives 159 f., from adverbs 160); compound, 161–9 (with inseparable [Page 1224] prefixes 161 f., agglutinative or juxtapositive 168 f.); declension of adjectives, 270–6 (origin of the adjective 270 f., inflection of adjectives with one termination 271 f., with two terminations 272 f., with three 273 f., the accus. singular 274, contraction in 274 f., indeclinable 275 f.); comparison of, 276–81 (positive 276, comparative 276–8, superlative 278–81); in predicate, 401; and substantive, 407; gender in, 412 f.; with vocative, 464; with genitive, 503–5; with ablative, 515 f.; with locative or instrumental, 523; with dative, 537; distinguished from adverbs, 549 f., 657; syntax of, ch. XIV, 650–75; origin of, 650; adjectival or appositional use of substantive, 651 f.; as substantive, 652–4 (any gender 652, masculine 652, feminine 652 f., neuter 654 f.); agreement with substantives, 654 f. (number 654 f., gender 655, case 655, two or more adjectives 655); attributive, 655 f.; predicate, 656 f.; personal construction, 657 f.; with cases, 658; with the inf. and clauses, 658 f.; as adverb, 659; positive, 659–61 (relative contrast 659 f., as comparative or superlative 660 f., with prepositions 661, comparison implied by ἤ 661, in absolute sense 661); comparative, 662–9 (contrast or duality 662 f., degree 663, without suffixes 663, double 663 f., without object of 664–6, followed by ἤ 666, by the ablative 666 f., by prepositions 667, displacing the superlative 667–9); superlative, 669–71 (vanishing 669, few true in N. T. 669 f., elative 670, no “Hebraistic” 671); numerals, 671–5; with inf., 1076 f.; part. originally, 1100 f.; adjectival aspects of part., 1104–10; negatives with, 1163 f.

Adverbs: with formative suffixes, 160; agglutinative compounds, 169–71; neglect of adverbs, 293; formation of, 294–7 (fixed cases 294, accus. 294 f., ablative 295, genitive 295, locative 295, instrumental 295 f., dative 296, suffixes 296, compound adverbs 297, analogy 297, comparison of adverbs 297); adverbial stems, 297–9 (substantives 298, adjectives 298, numerals 298, pronouns 298, verbs 298 f.); use of adverbs, 299–300 (manner 299, place 299 f., time 300); scope of, 300–2 (relative between adverbs and prepositions 301, adverbs and conjunctions 301 f., adverbs and intensive particles 302, adverbs and interjections 302); adverbial accusative, 486–8; genitive with, 505; dative with, 537 f.; syntax of, ch. XII, 544–52; special difficulties, 544; nature of, 544; narrower sense of, 544 f.; adverbs with verbs, 545 f. (commonest 545, N. T. usage 545, predicate uses 545 f., with ἐξειλα 546, with participles 546, loose relation 546); with other adverbs, 546; with adjectives, 546 f.; with substantives, 547; as substantives, 547 f.; frequent use of, 548; as marks of style, 548 f.; distinguished from adjective, 549 f. (different meaning 549, difference in Greek and English idiom 549 f.); adverbial phrases 550–2 (incipient adverbs 550, prepositional phrases 550 f., participles 551, 1109 f.); the verb, 554 f.; prepositions, 554 f.; adjective as, 659; article with, 765 f.

Adversative particles: 1187 f.

Æolic: lyric odes, 17; persistence of, 52; relation to Doric, 17, 53; influence on κοινή, 63; on the N. T., 82; and here and there, ad libitum.

Æschylus: see Index of Quotations.
Affixes: 146.

Agent: words expressing, 153 f.; dative of, 542; with passive, 820.

Agglutinative: type of languages, 37; compounds, 163–71.

Agreement: see concord.[Page 1225]

Aktionsart 344 f., 823 f., 828 f., 831–5, 850 f., 858 f.

Alexander the Great: 44, 49–51, 53 ff., 60–3, 66–8, 71, 239, etc.


Alexandrian type of text: 180 and passim.

Alexandrinus: 179 and passim.

Allegory: 1207.

Alliteration: 1201.

Alphabet: original Greek, 178; law enforcing Ionic alphabet, 181, 209, 222.

Alternative: pronouns, 745–50 (see distributive); questions, 736 f.

Amplification: of subject, 398–400; of predicate, 400 f.

Anabasis: passim. See Index of Quotations.

Anacoluthon: discussion of, 435–40 (suspended subject 436 f., digression 437–9, participle in 439 f., asyndeton 440); distinction from oratio variata, 440 f.; kinds of, 1203 f.

Analogy: passim.

Anaphora: 1200.

Anaphoric: see article, demonstrative, relative.

Anarthrous: attributive, 782–4; predicate, 790–6; participle, 1105 f.

Anominatio: 1201.

Antecedent: see demonstrative, relative, preposition.

Antiptosis: 488.
Antistrophe: 1200.

Antithesis: 1199 f.


Aoristic: see punctiliar, present, perfect, future.

Aphæresis: 205 f.

Apocalypse: 101, 135 f.; solecisms in, 413–6 and passim. See Index of Quotations.

Apocrypha: passim. See Index of Quotations.

Apodosis: see 921–3 and conditional sentences, 1007–27.

Aposiopesis: 1203.

Apostrophe: use of, 244.

Appian: see Index of Quotations.

Apposition: with substantive, 368–400; partitive, 399; predicative amplifications, 401; peculiarities in, 413 ff.; to vocative, 464; genitive of, 498 f.; appositional use of substantive, 651 f.; with οὐτος, 698–700; ἐκεῖνος, 708; appositional inf., 1078 f.

Aquila: see Index of Quotations.

Aramaic: 24; spoken by Jesus, 26–9; distinct from the Hebrew, 102; portions of the O. T. in, 103; the vernacular of Palestine, 103 f.; Josephus' use of, in his War, 104; signs of, in the N. T., 104 f.; possible use by Mark and Matthew, 105; proper names, 214 f., 236; on prepositions, 556 f.; and passim.

Arcadian: 63, 67, 82, 84, 184, passim.[Page 1226]

Aristophanes: and the vernacular, 66. See Index of Quotations.

Arrangement: see sentence.

Arrian: see Index of Quotations.

Article: use by Peter, 127; with vocative, 465 f.; as possessive, 684; with possessive, 685; with reflexive, 690; with οὗτος, 700–2; with ἐκάνος, 708; origin and development of, 754 f. (a Greek contribution 754, derived from demonstrative 755); significance of, 755; method employed by, 756–8 (individuals from individuals 756, classes from classes 757, qualities from qualities 758); varied usages of, 758–76 (with substantives, context, gender, proper names, anaphoric 758–62, with adjectives, resumptive, adj. alone, with numerals 762–4, with participles 764 f., infinitive 765, with adverbs 765 f., with prepositional phrases 766, with single words or whole sentences 766, with genitive alone 767, nouns in predicate 767–9, distributive 769, nominative with = vocative 769, = possessive 769 f., with possessive 770, with αὗτος 770, with demonstratives 770 f., with ὁλος, πᾶς [ἲπας] 771–4, with πολος 774 f., ἄβρος, ἱμισυς, ἐσχατος, μέον 775, with ἀλλος and ἔτερος 775 f., with μόνος 776); position with attributives, 776–89 (with adjectives, normal, repetition, one with several, anarthrous substantives, participles 776–9, with genitive, between article and gen., after gen. without repetition, repetition with gen., absent with both, correlation of article 779–82, with adjuncts or adverbs, between article and noun, repeated, only with adjunct, only with noun, when several adjuncts occur, phrases of verbal origin, exegetical questions, anarthrous attributive 782–4, several attributives with καί, same person or thing, when distinguished, treated as one, point of view, difference in number or gender, with disjunctive particle 785–9); position with predicates, 789 f.; absence of, 790–6 (with proper names 791, with genitives 791, prepositional phrases 791 f., with both preposition and genitive 792 f., titles 793, words in pairs 793, ordinal numerals 793 f., in predicate 794, abstract words 794, qualitative force 794, only object of kind 794–6); with inf., 1062–8; articular part., 1106–8.

Article, indefinite: ἦς, 674; τις and ἦς, 796.

Articular infinitive: 1062–8.

Articular participle: 1106–8.

Artistic prose: see literary κοινή.

Asianism: 60, 73, 87 f., passim.

Aspirate: 191, 209; doubling of, 215; aspiration of consonants, 219; origin of the aspirate, 221 f.; variations in MSS., 223–5; transliterated Semitic words, 225; use with ῥ and ῥρ, 225 f.; question of αὕτου, 226.

Assertion, sentence of: see indirect discourse.

Asseverative particles: 1150.

Associative case: see instrumental.

Asyndeton: 427–44; imperative in 949.

Athens: losing its primacy in culture, 67, passim.

Attendant circumstance, participle of: see participle.

Attic: 16, 17, 20, 22, 35 f., 41–4; triumph of, 51; vernacular, the base of the κοινή, 60–2; influence on N. T., 82; Attic inscriptions show indifference to hiatus, 207; genitive-abl., 255 f.; “Attic” declension 260; ad libitum in the book.

Attica: 181 f.

Atticism: not part of the κοινή, 50; the [Page 1227] Atticistic reaction and its influence, 58–60, 73; conservative influence of, 177 f.; pronunciation, 239, passim.

Attraction of relative: inverse, 488; to genitive, 512; to ablative, 519 f.; with ὅς, 714–9; ὅσος, 732 f.

Attributive: adjective, 655 f.; positive article, 776–89. See participle.


Authorized version: influence of, on English language, 92.

B

B: see Vaticanus.

β-text: see Neutral text.

Bezae, Codex: 179 f., passim.

“Biblical” Greek: 5; view of E. Hatch refuted by Deissmann, 24 f.; the new point of view, 30; N. T. not “biblical Greek,” 77–9, 88, 92, 112 f., passim.

Bilingualism: in Palestine, 27–30; in Brittany, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, 30, 69, 102 f.

Blending: see cases.

Boeotian: 16, 52; influence of, 61, 63; monophthongizing, 204 f.; pronunciation, 240; passim.
βουστροφηδόν: 1211.

Brachylogy: 1201, 1203.

Breathings: 221–6; use with ρ and ρρ, 225 f.; in Ionic, 240.

Breviloquence: see brachylogy.

Brittany, bilingual: 29.

Broken continuity: see perfect and past perfect.

Byzantine Greek: literature on, 22–4, 43, 155, 179, 183, 191, 210, passim.

C

C=Codex Ephraemi: passim.

Cardinals: see numerals.

Cases: number of, 247–50 (history of the forms 247 ff., blending of case-endings, syncretism of the forms 249 f., origin of case-suffixes 250); concord in, 413–6 (adjectives 413, participles 413, the Book of Revelation 413–6, apposition 416, absolute 416); syntax of, ch. XI, 446–543; history of interpretation of, 446–9 (confusion 446, Bopp’s contribution 446 f., modern usage 447, Green’s classification 447 f., syncretism of the cases 448, freedom in use of 448 f.); purpose of the cases, 449 (Aristotle’s usage, word-relations); encroachment of prepositions on, 450–3 (reason 450, no “governing” of cases 450, not used indifferently 450 f., original use with “local” cases 451, 567, increasing use of 451 f., distinction preserved in N. T. 453); distinctive idea in each case, 453–6 (fundamental idea 453 f., cases not yet interchangeable 454, vitality of case-idea 454, historical development of the cases 454 f., method of this grammar 456); nominative, 456–66; vocative, 461–6; accusative, 466–91; genitive, 491–514; ablative, 514–20; locative, 520–5; instrumental, 525–35; dative, 535–43; functions of prepositions with, 567–71; see discussion of each preposition in ch. XIII; adjective and substantive, 655; with adjectives, 658; ὅς, attraction and incorporation, 714–9; ὃς τίς, 728 f.; of inf., 1058–62; with inf., 1082; participle, 1119.

Causal participle: see participle and causal clauses.

Causal particles: see conjunctions and causal sentences (hypotacti).

Causal sentences: use of ὅς, 724 f.; paratactic, 962 f.; with hypotactic conjunctions, 963 f.; relatives, 965 f.; ὅτι and the infinitive, 966; participle, 966, 1128; inf., 1091.

Causative verbs: 150; active, 801 f.; middle, 808 f.
Cautious assertion: see final and consecutive sentences.

Chaldee (Aramaic): 211. See Aramaic.

Chiasm: 1200.

Chinese: 250.

Christian element in N. T. Greek: chiefly lexical, 112–6; new connotations of familiar words, 115 f.

Chrysostom: passim.

Circumlocutions: 330, 648 f.

Circumstantial participle: see participle.

“Classical Greek”: 5, 89, passim.

Clause: paratactic, 428 f.; hypotactic, 429–31; inf. and part., 431 f.; clauses with the adjectives, 658 f.

Climax: 1200.

Collectives: see gender and number.

Colloquial: see vernacular.

Colon: 243.

Comma: origin of, 243.

Common speech: see κοινή.

Comparative: see adjectives.

Comparative clauses: with relative ὅσος, 966 f.; relative with κατά, 967; καθότι, 967; ὡς and its compounds, 967 ff.

Comparative grammar or philology: 8–12; the linguistic revolution, 8; sketch of Greek grammatical history, 8–10; the discovery of Sanskrit, 10; from Bopp to Brugmann, 10 ff.; importance of, 36; the original Indo-Germanic speech, 38; Greek as a “dialect” of, 39 f.; applied to N. T. word-formation, 144; system of affixes, infixes, prefixes, suffixes, 146–247, 250, passim.

Comparison: of adjectives, 276–81; of adverbs, 297; syntax of, 661–9.

Complementary infinitive: see infinitive (with verbs).

Complementary participle: see participle.

Compound sentences: order of clauses in, 425; two kinds of sentences, 425 f.; two kinds of compound or complex, 426; parataxis, 426; hypotaxis, 426 f.

Conative action: 880, 885.

Concessive: imperative as, 949; clause, 1026; partiple, 1128.

Concord: and government, 397 f.; in person, 402 f.; in number, 403–9; in gender, 410–3; in case, 413–6.

Conditional sentences: apodosis of second class, 921–3; two types, 1004–7; four classes, 1007–22 (determined as fulfilled 1007–12, determined as unfulfilled 1012–6, undetermined, but with possibility of determination 1016–20, remote possibility of determination 1021 f.); mixed conditions, 1022; implied conditions, 1022 f.; elliptical, 1023–6; concessive clauses, 1026 f.; other particles with εἰ and ἐάν, 1027; partiple, 1129.

Conjugation of verb: ch. VIII, 303–76.


Consecutive: use of ὅς, 724; clauses, see final and consecutive.

Consonants: changes, 209–21 (origin and character of the consonants 209 f., the insertion of 210, the omission of 210 f., single or double 211–5, assimilation of 215–7, interchange and changing value of 217–9, aspiration of 219, variable final 219–21, metathesis 221).[Page 1229]

Constative action: see aorist.

Constructio ad sensum: illustrated in, 400–424, 683 f., 1204.

Constructio praegnans: 1204. See also prepositions.


Contrasts: in Greek words, 175 f.; in comparison, 662 f.

Co-ordination: 443 f.; between participles, 1135 f.
Coptic: 215, 250 f., passim.

Copula: not necessary, 395 f.

Copulative conjunctions: 1177–86.

Coronis: 244.

Correlation of article: see article.

Correlative pronouns: 289 f., 298, 709 f., 732.

Crasis: 208.

Cretan dialect: passim.

Crete: early Greek culture in, 43.

Culture: variations in N. T. writers, 381.

Cynic-Stoic diatribe: 420 f., 1196 f.

Cyprus: as purveyor of Greek culture, 43; language and N. T. Gk., 82, passim.

D: see (Codex) Bezae.

δ-text: see Western text.

Dative: form, 248 ff.; syncretism, 535; decay of dative, 535 f.; idea of, 536; with substantives, 536 f.; with adjectives, 537; with adverbs and prepositions, 537 f. and ch. XIII; with verbs, 538–43 (indirect object 538, dativus commodi vel incommodi, 538 f., direct object 539–41, with intransitive verbs 541, possession 541, infinitive in dative 541 f., of the agent 542, because of preposition in composition 542 f.); ambiguous examples, 543; eth., 539.

Declarative clauses: 915 f., and see indirect discourse.

De-aspiration: increasing, 222 f.

Declensions: ch. VII, 246–302; history of the, 246 f.; first or α declension, 254–9 (Doric genitive-ablative singular 254 f., Attic genitive-ablative 255, vocative in –α 256, words in –ρα and participles in –υα 256, retention of –α in gen.-abl. 256, double declensions 257, heteroclisis and metaplasm 257–9, indeclinable substantives 259); second or ο, 259–63 (the “Attic” 260, contraction 260 f., vocative 261, heteroclisis and metaplasm 261–3, mixed declension 263, proper names 263); third decl., 263–9 (nominative as vocative 264, accus. singular 264 f., accus. plural 265 f., peculiarities in the nominative 267 f., gen.-abl. 268,
contraction 268, proper names 268 f., heteroclisis and metaplasm 269; indeclinable words, 269 f.; declension of adjectives, 270–81; numerals, 281–4; pronouns, 284–93; adverbs, 293–302.

**Defective verbs**: in voice, 799. See verbs.

**Deictic**: see demonstrate.

**Deliberative**: future, 875 f.; subjunctive, 934 f.; opt., 940; questions, 1046.

**Delphian**: 266.

**Delta**: 91.

**Demonstrative pronouns**: inflection of, 289 f.; nature of, 693; shades of meaning, 693; ὁ, ἡ, τό, 693–5; ὁς, 695 f.; ὧς, 696 f.; οὗτος, 697–706 (the deictic use 697, the anaphoric use 697 f., in apposition 698–700, use of article 700 f., without article 701 f., contrast with ἐκεῖνος 702 f., antecedent of relative 703 f., gender and number 704, adverbial uses 704 f., phrase τοῦτο ἦν 705, with other pronouns 705, ellipsis 705, shift in reference 706); ἐκεῖνος 706–9 (the purely deictic 707, the contemptuous use 707, the anaphoric 707, the remote object 707 f., emphasis 708, with apposition 708, [Page 1230] with article 708, antecedent to relative 708, gender and number 708 f., independent use 709); ἀὑρός, 709; correlative demonstratives 709 f.); article derived from, 755; article with, 770 f.

**Demosthenes**: in the New Attic, 52; pronouncing Greek, 238. See Index of Quotations.

**Denial and prohibition**, with οὐ μὴ: see aorist subj. and fut. ind.

**Denominative verbs**: 147.

**Deponents**: 332 f., 811–3, 817 f.

**Derivation**: derivative verbs, 147–50.

**Design, sentences of**: see final.

**Diacritical marks**: 226.

**Diæresis**: 204 f.; marks of, 244.

**Dialects**: fuller knowledge of the dialects, 16 f., 39 f., 41–4, 46, 52 f., 71, 79, 110 f.; dialect-coloured vernacular, 61–9, 82, 178 f.; accent in, 229–31, 238 ff.; declension in, 247; passim.

**Diatribes, Cynic-Stoic**: 420 f., 1196 f.
Diffuseness: see pleonasm.

Digamma: 209, 223 f.

Digraphs: 209.

Digression: 437 f.

Diminutives: frequent in the N. T., 82; less common than in modern Gk., 155.

Diodorus Siculus: see Index of Quotations.

Diphthongs: 204 f.

Direct discourse: exchange with indirect, 442 f.; with recitative ὅτι, 1027 f.

Discord: see concord.

Disjunctive particles: negative, 1165 f., 1173; conjunctions, 1188 f.

Dissimilation: see assimilation.

Distributive numerals: see numerals.

Distributive pronouns: inflection of, 292 f.; syntax of, 743, 744–50; ὁ-φότεροι, 744 f.; ἕκαστος, 745 f.; ἄλλος, 746–8 (absolutely, for two, adjective, with article, ἄλλος ἄλλο, ellipsis, ἄλλος and ἕτερος, different, ἄλλοτριος); ἕτερος, 748–50 (absolutely, with article, pair, different, three or more, contrast, antithetic); article as, 769.

Division of words: not in old MSS., 243 f.

Doric: purest Hellenic, 17; tenacity of, 52; Doric-Æolic, 53; influence on the κοινή, 63; on the N. T., 82; genitive-ablative, 254, passim.

Doric: 16 f., 52–4, 62 f., 82, 118, 184 f., 193 f., 211, 224, 229, 240, 249, 254 f., 267, passim.

Double comparative and superlative: 663, 670.


Double consonants: 211–5.

Double declension: 257.

Double interrogative: 737.

Dual: origin and disappearance of, 251 f.
Duality: in the comparative adjective, 662 f.; with ἕτερος, 749.

Durative (linear) action: 823 f., 879–92.

Dynamic: see middle voice.

Ecbatic Ἴνα: see consecutive clauses.

Ecbatic infinitive: see consecutive clauses and infinitive.

Editor’s prerogative: 244 f.

Effective action: see aorist.


Elative: 278 f., 670.

Elean: 266.

Elision: 72, 206–8, 223, 226, 1210.

Ellipsis: of subject or predicate, 391; of οὐτος, 705 f.; in general, 1201 f.


Enallage: 454.


English: best English spoken in Edinburgh and Louisville, 69.

Epanadiplosis: 1200.

Epexegetical infinitive: 1086 f.

Epexegetical apposition: 399. [Page 1231]

Epic: 185, 204, passim.

Epicene: gender, 252.

Epidiorrhosis: 1199.

Epimenides: see Index of Quotations.
Epistles: distinction from letters, 70 f., 85 ff., 197, 200, 239.

Epistolary aorist: see aorist.

Erasmus: on pronunciation of Greek, 237, 240.

Etatism: 191.

Etymology: work of the philosophers, 31; use of term, 143 f.

Euphony: 419–23.

Euripides: see Index of Quotations.

Euthalius: 241.

Exclamation: 461, 739, 741.

Fayûm Papyri: see Index of Quotations.

Feminine: see gender.

Figures of speech: ch. XXII, 1194–1208; rhetorical, not grammatical, 1194; style in the N. T., 1194–7; figures of thought, 1198 f. (rhetorical question, oratory, irony, prodiorthosis, epidiororthosis, paraleipsis, heterogeneous structure); figures of expression, 1199–1208 (parallels and contrasts: parallelism, synonymous or antithetic, chiasm or reverted parallelism, anaphora, antistrophe, poetry 1199 f.; contrasts in words: epanadiplosis, climax, zeugma, brachylogy, synonyms, onomatopoeic, alliteration, paronomasia, annominatio, parechysis, pun 1200 f.; contraction and expansion: ellipsis, aposiopesis, breviloquence or brachylogy, constructio praegnans, constructio ad sensum, hypallage, pleonasm, hyperbole, litotes, meiosis 1201–6; metaphors and similar tropes: metaphor, simile, parable, allegory, metonymy 1206 f.).

Final and consecutive clauses: kinship, 980; origin in parataxis, 980 f; pure final, 981–91 (ἵνα 981–5, ὅπως 985–7, ὣς 987, μή, μή ποτε, μή πως 987–9, relative 989, infinitive 989–91, participle 991, 1128 f); sub-final, 991–7 (ἵνα 991–4, ὅπως 994 f., μή, μή ποτε, μή πως 995 f., relative 996, infinitive 996 f., 1087–9, εἰ and ὅτι 997); consecutive, 997–1003 (ἵνα 997–9, ὅπως 999 f., ὣς 1000 f., ὅτι 1001, relative 1001, infinitive 1001 ff., 1089–91).


Finnish: 250.

First or ι declension: 254–9, 267.
Foreign words: 108–11, 235 f. See Latinisms.


Forms, rare: see declensions and conjugation of verbs.

Formulas of citation: 1027 f.

Fourth Book of Maccabees: see Index of Quotations.

Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse: see Index of Quotations.

French: accent, 230; cases and prepositions of, 252; gender, 252; passim.

Future: conjugation of, 353–7 (origin of 353 f., Ionic-Attic 355, syncopated 353 f., of liquid verbs 356, active and middle 356, second passive 356 f., first passive 357, periphrastic 357); syntax of middle, 813 f.; passive, 818–20; relation of aorist to, 846 f.; punctiliar (aoristic), 870–6 (“mixed” tense, punctiliar or durative 870–2, modal aspect of, merely futuristic, volitive, deliberative 872–6, in the modes 876–9: indicative 876, subjunctive and optative 876, infinitive 876, participle 877 f., periphrastic substitutes for 878 f.); durative (linear), 888–9 (three kinds of action 889, periphrastic 889); fut. ind. and aor. subj., 924 f.; fut. ind. as imperative, 942 f., 1118 f.


Futuristic: modal aspect of future, merely futuristic, 872–4; present, 869 f., 881; pres. part., 992; present perfect, 898; subj., 928–30; optative, 937–9.

\[G\]

γ-text: see Alexandrian text.

Gender: of adjectives, 156 f.; in substantives, 252–4 (grammatical gender 252, kinds of 252, variations in 252 f., LXX illustrations 254); no feminine inflection in second declension, 259, 261 f.; concord in, 410–3 (fluctuations in 410 f., neuter singular 409, 411, explanatory ὃ ἐστιν and τοῦτο ἐστιν 411 f., the participle 412, adjective 412 f.); of adjectives without substantives, 652–4; agreement with substantives, 654; οὗτος, 704; ἐκεῖνος, 708; ὃς, 712 ff.; ὃστις, 729.

Genealogy in Matthew: 270.

Genitive: form, 248, 263, 491 f.; Doric genitive-abl., 254 f.; Attic genitive-abl., 255 f.; name, 492; specifying case, 493 f.; local use, 494; temporal use, 495; with substantives, 495–503 (possessive 495 f., attributive 496 f., predicate 497 f., appositive or definitive 498 f., subjective 499, objective 499–501, of relationship 501 f., partitive 502, position of 502 f., concatenation of 503); with adjectives, 503–5; with adverbs and prepositions, 505 and ch. XIII; with verbs, 505–12 (very
common 506, fading distinction from acc. 506, verbs of sensation 507 f., of emotion 508 f., of sharing, partaking, filling 509 f., of ruling 510, of buying, selling, being worthy of 510 f., of accusing and condemning 511, due to prepositions in composition 511 f., attraction of relative 512); of infinitive, 512; absolute, 512–4, 1131 f.

**German:** passim.

**Gerundive:** 157. See verbal adjectives.

**Gnomic:** aorist, 836 f.; present, 866; present perfect, 897.

**Gorgian figures:** 1197 ff.

**Gothic:** passim.

**Grammar:** the ideal grammar, 3; the pre-Winer period, 3; the service of Winer, 4; the modern period, the service of Deissmann, Thumb, Moulton, etc., 5–7; the new grammatical equipment, 8–31; sketch of Greek grammatical history, 8–10; advance in general Greek grammar, 12; critical editions of Greek authors, 13; grammatical monographs, 13; grammatical commentaries, 29; new point of view, 30; comparative, 31–48; in Alexander’s time, 58–61; Greek grammarians and Latin, 822; Alexandrian grammarians and adjectives, 650; passim.

**Greek authors:** 13 f., 55, 57–9, 86 f., 94, 109, 121, 128 f., 147, 191, 199, 203, 218, 227, 238, 251, 265 f., chapter on Formation of Words, and passim. See Index of Quotations.

**Greek language:** sketch of Greek grammatical history, 8–13; relation to earlier tongues, 39; regarded as a whole, 40–45; unity of, 41 f.; periods of, 43; the Greek point of view, 46–48; passim.

**Greek culture:** 14 ff., 35; subject to non-Greek influences, 49, 58, 67, 75, 84 f., 111 f., passim.

**Greek, later:** see Byzantine or modern Greek.

**Greek point of view:** 46–8.

**Headings, anarthrous:** see article.

**Hebraisms:** 3; the old view, 24 ff.; the revolt of Deissmann, 25 f.; number of, in N. T., 76 ff., 89; the traditional standpoint, 88 f.; translation, 89 f.; papyri and inscriptions disprove many, 90 f.; real, in [Page 1233] N. T., 94–6; greater indirect influence of the LXX, 96–102; transliterated words, 225; variety in N. T. writers, 106–8; on prepositions, 556 f.; φοβεσθαι ῥπό, 577; use of εἰς, 595 f.; superlative, 671; tense, 822; passim.
Hebraists: 76 ff., 88 f., 90 f.

Hebrew: proper names, 214; transliterated Hebrew words, 225; accent of proper names, 236, 259, 263, 268 ff., passim.

Hebrews: literary quality of, 106; peculiarities of, 132 f.; alone of the N. T. books avoids hiatus, 206, 218; rhythm in, 1196 f.

Hellenism: influence on Paul, 86.

Hellenistic: see κοινή.

Hendiadys: 1206.

Herculaneum: 196, 223, passim.

Hermas: see Index of Quotations.

Herodotus: 13, 57, 59, 266, passim.

Heteroclisis: 257–9 (the first and second decls., the first and third); between second and third, 261 f.; between masculine and neuter of second, 262 f.; third decl., 269.

Heterogeneous structure: 441 f., 1199.


Historic present: see present.


History of words: 173 f.

Homer and Homeric Greek: 249, 252, passim. See Index of Quotations.

Hypallage: 1204.

Hyperbaton: 423 f.

Hyperbole: 1205.

Hypocoristic: 171–3.


Hypothetical sentences: see conditional sentences.
Hysteron proteron: 423.

I

Identical pronouns: see intensive pronouns.

IIlative particles: see (inferential) conjunctions.

IIliterate: in the papyri, 70 f.; diversity of culture, 85; passim.

Imperative: origin of, 320, 327–30 (non-thematic stem 327, thematic stem 327 f., suffix –θι 328, suffix –τω 328, old injunctive 328 f., forms in –σαι 329, form in –σον 329, first person 329 f., prohibitions 330, perfect 330, periphrastic 330, circumlocutions 330); perfect, 360 f.; use of aorist, 855 f.; present, 890; perfect, 908; imper. and subj., 925; origin of, 941; meaning of, 941; disappearance of imperative forms, 941 f.; alternatives for, 942–6 (fut. ind. 942 f., subj. 943, opt. 943, infinitive 943 f., participle 944–6); uses of, 946–50 (command or exhortation 946 f., prohibition 947, entreaty 947 f., permission 948, concession or condition 948 f., in asyndeton 949, in subordinate clauses 949 f., tenses 950, in indirect discourse 950); negative with, 1161 f., 1170.

Imperfect: relation of, to aorist, 837–40; doubtful, 882 f.; descriptive tense in narrative, 883 f.; iterative or customary, 884; progressive, 884; inchoative or conative, 885; “negative,” 885; potential, 885–7; in indirect discourse, 887; periphrastic, 887 f.; past perfect as, 888.

Impersonal verbs: active, 802; construction, 820.

“Improper” prepositions: see prepositions, 554, 636 ff.

Inceptive action: 150.

Incorporation of antecedent: 718 f., 731, 733.[Page 1234]

Indeclinable words: accent, 236; substantives, 259; various foreign words, 269 f.; adjectives, 275 f.; τί, 736; τι, 744.

Indefinite article: 674 f., 796.

Indefinite pronouns: inflection of, 292; τίς, 741–4 (accent 741, relation to τίς 741 f., as substantive 742, with numerals 742, with substantives 742 f., with adjectives 743, as predicate 743, position of 743, as antecedent 743, alternative 743, negative forms 743 f., indeclinable τι 744); τίς, 744; οἶδα, 744; ó δείκνυα, 744.

Independent sentences: see parataxis.

Indicative: real mode, 320 f.; no mode sign, 322 f.; use of aor. ind., 835–48; future, 876; meaning of, 914 f.; kinds of sentences using, 915–8 (declarative or interrogative 915–7, positive or negative 917 f.); special uses of, 918–24 (past
tenses, for courtesy 918 f., present necessity, obligation, etc. 919–21, apodosis of
second class conditions 921–3, impossible wishes 923, present 923 f., future 924);
in indirect discourse, 1032–6; negative with, 1157–60, 1168 f.

**Indirect discourse**: exchange with direct, 442 f.; aorist participle in, 863 f.; imperfect
ind., 887; present part., 992; perfect in, 897; inf. perf., 908; recitative ὅτι in oratio
recta, 1027 f.; change of person in indirect discourse, 1028 f.; change of tense in,
1029 f.; change of mode in, 1030 f.; limits of indirect disc., 1031 f.; declarative
clauses (indirect assertions), 1032–43 (ὅτι and indicative 1032–6, infinitive 1036–
40, 1082–5, participle, 1040–2, 1122–4, καὶ ἐγένετο 1042 f.); indirect questions,
1043–6 (tense 1043, mode 1043 f., interrog. pronouns and conjunctions used 1044
f.); indirect command, 1046 f., 1082–5 (deliberative questions 1046, conjunctions
ὅνα and ὅπως 1046, infinitive, 1046 ff.); mixture, 1047 f.; the subordinate clause,
1048.

**Individuality of N. T. writers**: 116–37.

**Indo-European**: see Indo-Germanic.

**Indo-Germanic**: 10, 37 ff., 145 ff., 209, 217, *passim*. See comparative philology
(grammar).

**Inferential conjunctions**: 1189–92.

**Infinitive**: ending, 246; forms of, 368–71 (original terminology 368, fixed case-forms
368 f., with voice and tense 369 f., no personal endings 370, article with 371,
disappearance of inf. 371, N. T. forms 371); in apposition, 399 f.; in clauses, 431
f.; accusative with, 489 f.; in genitive, 512; in dative, 541 f.; with adjectives, 658
f.; article with, 765; and voice, 802; use of aorist, 856–8; future, 876 f.; perfect,
908 f.; as imperative, 943 f.; causal use of διὰ τὸ, 966; temporal use of, 978 f.;
purpose, 989–91; sub-final, 996 f.; consecutive, 1001–3; in indirect discourse,
1036–40; in indirect command, 1046–8; origin of inf., 1051 f.; development,
1052–6 (prehistoric period 1052, earliest historic period 1052–4, classic period
1054–6, later period 1056–8); substantival aspects of inf., 1058–79 (case, subject
or object 1058–62, articular 1062–8, prepositions with 1068–75, with substantives
1075 f., with adjectives 1076 f., with verbs 1077 f., appositional and epexegetical
1078 f.); verbal aspects of, 1079–95 (voice 1079 f., tense 1080–2, cases with
1082, in ind. disc. 1082–5, personal construction with 1085 f., epexegetical inf.
1086 f., purpose 1087–9, result 1089–91, cause 1091, time 1091 f., absolute 1092
f., negatives with 1093–5, 1162, 1171, ὅv with 1095); relation between part. and
inf., 1101–3.

**Infixedes**: 146.

**Inflectional languages**: 37.

**Ingressive action**: see aorist.[Page 1235]

**Injunctive mood**: 321, 328 f., 913.

Inseparable prefixes: 161–3.

Instrumental case: endings, 249 f.; term, 525 f.; syncretistic, 526; place, 526 f.; time, 527 f.; associative idea, 528–30; with words of likeness and identity, 530; manner, 530–2; with adjectives, 523, 530; measure, 532; cause, 532; means, 532–4; with prepositions, 534 f. and ch. XIII.

Instrumental use of ἐν: 589–91. See also locative.

Intensive particles: adverbs, 302; prepositions, 563 f.; limitations, 1144–7; γέ, 1147–9; ὡς, 1149; ὡς μήν, ώς ήν, 1150; μέν, 1150–3; πέρ, 1153 f.; τοί, 1154 f.

Intensive perfect: see perfect tense.

Intensive pronouns: declension of, 287; nominative use of αὐτός, 685 f.; varying degrees of emphasis, 686; ἀυτός with οὔτος, 686; αὐτός almost demonstrative, 686, in oblique cases, 686 f.; side by side with reflexive, 687; ὁ αὐτός, 687.

Interjections: 302, 1193.

Interrogative particles: single questions, 1175–7 (direct, no particle, negative, others, interrogative pronouns, conjunctions, indirect, pronouns, conjunctions); double questions, 1177 (direct, indirect).

Interrogative pronouns: inflection of, 291 f.; τίς, 735–40 (substantival or adjectival 735, absence of gender 735, τίς, 735–40 (substantival or adjectival 735, absence of gender 735, =ποιός 735 f., indeclinable τί 736, alternative questions 736 f., double 737, as relative 737 f., predicate τί 738, adverbial 738 f., with prepositions 739, with particles 739, as exclamation 739, indirect questions 739, τίς or τις 739 f.); ποιός, 740 (qualitative, non-qualitative, indirect questions); πόθος, 741 f. (rarity, meaning, indirect, exclamatory); πότερος, 741 (rare, indirect questions); ποταπός, 741; in indirect questions, 1044 f.

Intransitive: 330 f., 797 f., 806, 815 f.

Inverse attraction: 488, 717 f.


Iota adscript: 194 f., 209.

Iota subscript: 194 f.

Ireland, bilingualism in: 30.
Irony: 1198 ff.


“Irregular” verbs: see list, 1212–20.

Isolating languages: 37.

Isolation of Greek, not true: 36–39.


J

James, peculiarities of: 123 f. See Index of Quotations.

Jesus, language of: both Aramaic and Greek, 26–9.

“Jewish” Greek: see “Biblical” Greek, Hebraisms, Aramaic, κοινή.

Jews: 83, 98 f., 102, etc.

John, peculiarities of: 133–7. See Index of Quotations.

Josephus: 28; an illustration of Atticistic Gk. in contrast with 1 Maccabees, 87, 236, 269, passim. See Index of Quotations.

Jude: peculiarities of, 124 f. See Index of Quotations.

Justin Martyr: see Index of Quotations.

K

Καθαρεύουσα: 18; artificial modern Greek, 36, 60, passim.

Kinship of Greek words: 174 ff.

[Page 1236] Κοινή: 17, 18, 21–4, 32, 46; chapter on, 49–74; term, 49; origin, 49; triumph of the Attic, 51; fate of the other dialects, 52 f.; influence of the dialects on the κοινή, 53; partial koinés, 53; effect of Alexander’s campaigns, 53 f.; spread of the κοινή, 54–60; a real world-speech, 54–56; vernacular, 56; literary, 57 f.; the Atticistic reaction, 58–60; characteristics of the vernacular κοινή, 60–73; vernacular Attic, the base of the κοινή, 60–2; the other dialects in the κοινή, 62–64; non-dialectical changes in, 64 f.; new words in, 65; new forms of old words, 65 f.; poetical and vernacular words, 65; new meanings to old words, 66; i.A.D. the

climax of the κοινή, 66; provincial influences in, 66–9; κοινή in Asia Minor and in Alexandria, 67 f.; in Palestine, 69; κοινή a single language, 69; personal equation, 69–71; résumé of the characteristics of the vernacular κοινή, 71–4 (phonetics and orthography 71 f., vocabulary 72, word-formation 72, accidence 72 f., syntax 73 f.); adaptability of the κοινή to the Roman world, 74 f.; place of the N. T. in the κοινή, 76–140, 152 f., 159 f., 161–3, 171; accent in, 228 f.; pronunciation in, 236–41; ad libitum in the book.

L

Labials: assimilation before, 216, 264, 1210.

Language of Jesus: 26–9, 99, 102 f., 105. See Jesus.

Language, study of: the fascination of, 3; the new point of view, 8–12; as history, 31; a living organism, origin of, evolution in, changes in vernacular, 33 f.; Greek not isolated, 36; common bond in, 37, passim.

Late Greek: see Byzantine.

Latin: 36, 39, 46 f.; late Latin as in κοινή, 55, 74, 79, 103; Latinisms in the N. T., 108–11, 131, 137, 144, passim.

Latin authors: 85, 108 f., 128, passim. See Index of Quotations.

Latin versions: passim.

Latinisms: 108–10, 131, etc.

Lesbian: 17, 184, 249. See Æolic.

Letters: as distinct from epistles, 70, 85 ff.

Lewis Syriac: passim.

Lexical: new knowledge of words, 65 f.; N. T. lexicography needing reworking, 144, passim.

Limitative infinitive: see infinitive.

Linear action: see durative.


Literary κοινή: true part of the κοινή, 50, 57 f.; literary elements in the N. T., 83–8, 106; high standard of culture in the Græco-Roman world, 85.

Literary plural: 406 f., 677 f.

Litotes: 1205.
Local cases: 451. See cases.

Local clauses: 969 f.

Locative: form, 249 f.; name, 520; significance, 520 f.; place, 521 f. time, 522 f.; with adjectives, 523; with verbs, 523 f.; with substantives, 524; with prepositions, 524 f. and ch. XIII; pregnant construction, 525.

Lucian: see Index of Quotations.


Luther’s German Bible: influence of, 92.

LXX: see Septuagint.

Lycaonian: vernacular surviving in κοινή, 55 f.

M

Macedonian: influence on the κοινή, 63 f.; words, 111.

Magnesia: 196, 200, 208, 223, passim.

Manner: see adverbs, instrumental case, participle.

Manuscripts of N. T.: vary in orthography, 179–89, 191–231; show [Page 1237] changes in pronunciation, 239 ff.; have beginnings of chapters and paragraphs, 241 f.; uncials have no distinction between words, 242 ff.; ad libitum.

Mark: Aramaic influence in, 106; Latin, 110; peculiarities of, 118 f. See Index of Quotations.

Masculine: see gender.


Means: see instrumental case, ἐν, participle.

Meiosis: 1205 f.

Metaphor: 1206.

Metaplasma: 257–9, 261–3, 269.

Metathesis: 221, 1210.
Metonymy: 1207.

Middle: passive displacing, 333 f.; endings, 339 f.; giving way to active, 356; perfect, 359; with reflexive pronoun, 690 f.; origin of, 803; meaning of, 803 f.; acute difference from active, 804; use of not obligatory, 804–6; transitive or intransitive, 806; direct, 806–8; causative or permissive, 808 f.; indirect, 809 f.; redundant, 811; dynamic (deponent), 811–3; middle future though active present, 813 f.; retreating in N. T., 814.

Minuscules: 217, passim.

Mixed declension: 263. See declensions.


Modern Greek: literature on, 22–4; importance for N. T. Gk., 44–6; illustrating N. T. Gk., 137 f., 147, 150, 155, 177 f., 557, ad libitum.

Mood: see mode.

Music: 228.

Mycenæan age: 43 f.

Names of persons: see proper names.

Narrative, tenses in, in Greek: see aorist, imperfect, present, present perfect.

Negative particles: in relative clauses, 962; with inf., 1093–5; with participle, 1136–9; objective οὐ and its compounds, 1155–66 (origin 1155, history 1156, meaning 1156 f., with the indicative, independent sentences, subordinate clauses 1157–60, with the subjunctive 1160 f., with the optative 1161, with the imperative 1161 f., with infinitive 1162, with the participle 1162 f., with nouns 1163 f., κοί οὐ 1164, redundant or pleonastic οὐ 1164, repetition of οὐ 1164, intensifying compound 1164 f., disjunctive 1165 f.); subjective μὴ and its compounds, 1166–75 (history of μὴ 1166 f., significance of 1167, uses of μὴ, indicative 1168 f., subjunctive 1169 f., optative 1170, imperative 1170, infinitive 1171, participle 1172, nouns
1172, intensifying compounds 1172 f., καὶ μὴ 1173, disjunctive use 1173); combination of two negatives, 1173–5 (μὴ οὐ 1173 f., οὐ μὴ 1174 f.).

Negative pronouns: οὐδὲς, οὐθείς, οὐδὲ, εἰς, εἰς—οὐ, 750 f.; οὐτίς, μὴ τίς, 751 f.; οὐ πᾶς, μὴ πᾶς, 752 f.[Page 1238]

Neuter: as substantive, 156, 267 f.; see gender.

Neutral type of text: 180, 212, 219, passim.


New Testament, Greek of: place in the κοινή, 76–140; chiefly the vernacular, 76–83; not a biblical Greek, 77–79; proof that in the vernacular, 79–83; the lexical proof from the papyri and inscriptions, 80–2; accidence corroborated by papyri and inscriptions, 82; syntactical peculiarities, 82 f.; phrases common to N. T. and papyri, 83; literary elements in N. T. Gk., 83–8; literary quality in the N. T., 84; controversy now whether there is appreciable Semitic colouring in the N. T., 88 f.; view of Deissmann and Moulton, 89–93; some real Hebraisms in the N. T., 92 f;

Deissmann

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).


———, Die neut. Formel “in Christo” (1892).


———, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck’s Realencyc., VII, 1899).

———, Licht vom Osten (1908).

———, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Strachan.


———, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).

Moulton
little direct Hebrew influence, list of probable Hebraisms, 94–6; deeper impress of
the LXX in vocabulary, accidence and syntax, though great variety in the LXX,
96–102; Aramaisms in the N. T., in vocabulary and in syntax, 102–5; variation in
Aramaic and Hebrew colouring in different parts of the N. T., 106–8; Latinisms in
the N. T., names of persons and places, military terms, words and phrases, syntax,
108–11; sporadic foreign words in the N. T., 111; the Christian addition, 112–6;
transfiguration of the vocabulary, 116; individual peculiarities of N. T. writers,
116–37; see separate writers by name; N. T. Gk. illustrated by modern Gk., 137
ff.; syntax of, 381–3.

N. T. authors: 28 f., 76–139. See Index of Quotations.

Nominative: nominativus pendens in the vernacular κοινή, 73; form as vocative, 264,
461; N. T. forms in, 267 ff.; not the oldest case, 456; reason for, 457; predicate,
457 ff.; sometimes unaltered, 458 ff.; absolute, 459 ff.; parenthetic, 460; in
exclamations, 461; absolute, 1130.

Non-thematic present stems: see present tense.

Northwest Greek: remains of, in the κοινή, 53; influence of, 61, 63; on the N. T., 82,
266, passim.

(1908).

———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).

———, Grammatical Notes from the Papyri (The Expositor, 1901, pp. 271–282;


———, N. T. Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery (Cambr. Bibl. Essays, 1909,
pp. 461–505).

———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-
Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.
Nouns: root-nouns, 145; substantive and adjective, 246; verbal, ch. XX; negatives with, 1163 f., 1172.

Number: in substantives, 251 f.; concord in, 403–9 (subject and predicate 403–7, substantive and adjective 407 f., representative singular 408, idiomatic plural in nouns 408, idiomatic singular in nouns 409, special instances 409); adjective and substantive, 654 f.; οὖτος, 704; ἐκεῖνος, 708; δέ, 714; διότι, 729; οἷς, 731.

Numerals: declension of, 281–4 (origin of 281, different functions of 281, cardinals 281–3, ordinals 283 f., distributives 284, proportionals 284, adverbs 284); syntax of, 671–5 (εἷς and πρῶτος 671 f., simplification of the ’teens 672, inclusive ordinal 672, distributives 673, cardinal ἑπτά 673 f., substantive not expressed 674, adverbs with 674, εἷς as indefinite article 674 f., εἷς = τις 675, distributive use of εἷς 675; τις with, 742; article with ordinals, 793 f.

Object of verb: see cases.

Object-clauses: see hypotaxis.

Oblique cases: 247. See cases.


Onomatopoetic: 1201.

Optative: origin of form, 320, 325–7; perfect, 360 f., 907 f.; use of aorist, 854 f.; future, 876; present, 889 f.; opt. and subj., 925 f.; history of, 935 f.; significance, 936 f.; three uses, 937–40 (futuristic or potential 937–9, volitive 939 f., deliberative 940); as imper., 943; in indirect discourse, [Page 1239] 1030 f., 1043 f.; negative with, 1161, 1170.

Oratio obliqua: see indirect discourse.

Oratio recta: see direct discourse.

Oratio variata: 440–3 (distinctive from anacoluthon 441 f., heterogeneous structure 441 f., participle in 442, exchange of direct and indirect discourse 442 f.).

Oratory: in Hebrews, 1198.

Ordinals: see number.

Orthography: in the vernacular κοινή, 71 f.; ch. VI, 176–245; the ancient literary spelling, 177 f.

Ostraca: 17–21; texts of, 22, 91, 191, 266, passim.
Oxyrhynchus papyri: see Index of Quotations.

P

Palatals: 216 f., 1210.

Papyri: literature on, 17–22, 52, 56 f., 66 ff.; illustrate the vernacular κοινή, 69; illiteracy in, 70 f.; and the N. T. Gk., 80–3; agreeing with the uncials in orthography, 181; accidence and syntax of, 381; ad libitum through the book.

Parable: 1206 f.

Paragraph: discussion of, 241 f.; connection between, 444.

Paraleipsis: 1199.

Parallelism: 1199 f.

Paraleipsis: 1199.


Parenthesis: 1201.

Parenthesis: 433–5; parenthetic nominative, 460.

Paronomasia: 1201.

Participle: in –υῖα, 256; forms of, 371–6 (name 371 f., verbal adjectives 372 f., with tense and voice 373 f., in periphrastic use 374–6); gender in, 412; case, 413; in clauses, 431 f.; in anacolouthon, 439 f.; in oratio variata, 442; acc. absolute, 490 f.; gen. absolute, 512–4; adverbs with, 546; as adverbs, 551; article with, 764 f.; aorist, 858–64; future, 877 f.; present, 891 f.; perfect, 909 f.; participle as imperative 944–6; causal, 966; temporal use, 979; purpose, 991; in indirect discourse, 1040–2; history of part., 1098–1100 (Sanskrit 1098, Homer’s time 1098, Attic period 1098 f., κοινή 1099, modern Gk. 1099 f.); significance, 1100–4 (originally an adjective 1100 f., addition of verbal functions 1101, double aspect of 1101, relation between part. and inf. 1101–3, method of treating 1103 f.); adjectival aspects of, 1104–10 (declension 1104, attributive, anarthrous, articular 1105–8, predicate 1108, as a substantive 1108 f., as an adverb 1109 f.); verbal aspects of, 1110–41 (voice 1110 f., tense 1111–9, possibility 1111, present 1115 f., perfect 1116–8, future 1118 f., cases 1119, supplementary 1119–24, periphrastic construction 1119 f., diminution of complementary 1120 f., with verbs of motion 1121 f., indirect discourse 1122–4; circumstantial, participial clauses 1124–32 (general theory 1124, varieties of, time, manner, means, cause, purpose, condition, concession 1125–30, absolute nominative, accusative, genitive 1130–2); independent, 1132–5; co-ordination between, 1135 f.; οὐ and μὴ with, 1136–9, 1162 f., 1172; other particles with, 1139–41).
**Particles**: elision with, 207; with subordinate clauses, 950–1049; with participle, 1036–41; scope, 1142–4; intensive or emphatic, 1144–55; negative, 1155–75; interrogative, 1175–7; conjunctions, 1177–93 (paratactic, 1177–92, hypotactic 1192 f.); interjections, 1193.

**Partitive**: apposition, 399, 746; genitive, 502, 519; ablative, 519; use of ἐκ, 599; with ἕκαστος, 746.


**Past perfect**: relation of aorist to, 837–40; double idea, 903; a luxury in Greek, 903 f.; intensive, 904; extensive, 904 f.; of broken continuity, 905 f.; in conditional sentences, 906; periphrastic, 906; ἐκείμην, 906; augment in, 1211 f.

**Patronymics**: 155.


**Perfect, future**: see future perfect.

**Perfect, past**: see past perfect.

**Perfect, present**: of –μ verbs, 319 f.; imperative, 330; conjugation of, 359–62 (name 359, original perfect 359 f., κ perfect 358 f., aspirated 359, middle and passive 359, decay of perfect forms 359 f., in subjunctive, optative, imperative 360, indicative 360–2, σ in middle and passive 362); reduplication in, 363–5; completed state, 823 f.; relation of aorist to, 843–5; present as perfect, 881; perfect as present, 881; idea of, 892–4 (present, intensive, extensive, time); present perfect indicative, 894–903 (intensive 894 f., extensive 895 f., of broken continuity 896, dramatic historical 896 f., gnomic 897, in indirect discourse 897 f., futuristic 898, “aoristic” present perfect 898–902, periphrastic 902 f.); subj. and opt., 907 f.; infinitive, 908 f. (indirect discourse 908 f., not indirect disc., subject or object, preposition 909); participle, 909 f. and 1116–8 (meaning, time, various uses, periphrastic).

“**Perfective**”: use of prepositions, 563 f.; ἄπό, 576 f.; διά, 581 f.; ἐκ, 596 f.; ἐπί, 600; κατά, 606; παρά, 613; περί, 617; πρός, 623; σύν, 627 f.; ὑπέρ, 629; “perfective” and “imperfective,” 826–8.

**Pergamum**: a centre of culture, 56 ff., 61, 63, 66, 75, 111, 208, 223, *passim*.

**Period**: use of, 242 f.

**Periodic structure**: 432 f., 1200.

Periods of the Greek language: 43 f.

Periphrasis: with participle, 330, 357, 374–6, 826, 878, 887 f., 889, 906, 1119 f.

Persian: words in N. T., 111.

Person: concord in, 402 f., 712; change in ind. disc., 1028 f.

Person-endings: 329, 335; active, 335–9.

Personal construction: with adjective, 657 f.; with inf., 1085 f.

Personal equation: in the κοινή, 69 ff., 179.

Personal pronouns: question of αὐτοῦ, 226; inflection of, 286 f.; nominative, 676–80 (emphasis in 676, first 677 f., second 678, third 679 f.); oblique cases, 680–2 (originally reflexive 680 f., αὐτοῦ 681, genitive for possessive 681, enclitic forms 681 f.); frequency of, 682 f.; redundant, 683; according to sense, 683 f.; repetition of substantive, 684.

Peter: peculiarities of, 125–7. See Index of Quotations.

Philo: see Index of Quotations.

Philology: see comparative grammar.

Phocian: 266.

Phœnician: words in N. T., 111, 182, 209, passim.


Phrygia: old dialect of, 67.

Pindar: see Index of Quotations.

Pindaric construction: 405.

Plato: see Index of Quotations.

Play on words: 1201.


Pluperfect: see past perfect.

Plural: 251. See number.
Plutarch: see Index of Quotations.

Poetry: see rhythm.

Point-action: see punctiliar.

Polybius: see Index of Quotations.

Polysyndeton: 1194.

Pompeian: 186, passim.

Pontic infinitive: 1056, 1063.


Possessive pronouns: inflection of, 288 f.; article as, 684; only first and second in N. T., 684; emphasis, 684 f.; with article, 685; possessive and genitive, 685; objective use, 685; instead of reflexive, 685; article as, 769 f.; article with, 770.

Postpositive: 424; some prepositions, 553.


Predicate: essential part of sentence, 390 f.; only predicate, 390 f.; verb not the only, 394 f.; copula not essential, 395 f.; one of the radiating foci, 396 f.; expansion of, 400 f. (predicate in wider sense 400, inf. and part. 400, relation between predicate and substantive 400, pronoun 400, adjective 401, adverb 401, prepositions 401, negative particles 401, subordinate clauses 401, apposition and looser amplifications 401); agreeing with subject, 403–6; position, 417; pred. nominative, 457 f.; vocative in, 464 f.; adjective, 655 f.; nouns with article, 767–9; article with, 789 f., 794; participle, 1108.

Prefixes: 146; inseparable, 161–3.

Pregnant construction: 525, 548, 584 f., 591–3.

Prepositional adverbs: new ones, 169 f.

Prepositions: double in composition, 160, 165; adverbs, 301; encroachment on cases, 450–3; accusative with, 491; genitive with, 505; effect of compound preps. on case, 511 f., 542 f.; with ablative, 516 f.; with locative, 524 f.; with instrumental, 534 f.; with dative, 537 f.; phrases, 550 f.; ch. XIII, 553–649; name, 553 f. (some postpositive 553, original use not with verbs 553, explanation 553 f.); origin of,
554 f. (originally adverbs 554, reason for use of 554, varying history 555); growth in use of, 555–7 (once none 555, still adverbs in Homer 555, decreasing use as adverbs 555 f., Semitic influence in N. T. 556 f., modern Greek 557); in composition with verbs, 557–65 (not the main function 557 f., prep. alone 558, increasing use 558, repetition after verb 559 f., different preposition after verb 560 ff., second preposition not necessary 562 f., dropped with second verb 563, intensive or perfective 563 f., double compounds 565); repetition and variation of, 565–7 (same prep. with different case 565, repetition with several nouns 566, repetition with the relative 566 f., 721, condensation by variation 567); functions of, with cases, 567–71 (case before prep. 567, notion of dimension 567, original force of the case 567 f., ground-meaning of the prep. 568, oblique cases alone with 568, original freedom 568 f., no adequate division by cases 569, situation in the case 569 f., separation 569 f., origin or source 569 f., partitive use of 599, instrumental use of 589–91); ἐ, 591–3, with verbs of motion 593 f., time 594, like a dative 594, aim or purpose 594 f., predicative use 595 f., compared with ἐπί, παρά and πρὸς 596); ἐκ, 596–600 (meaning 596, in composition 596 f., place 597, time 597, separation 597 f., origin or source 598 f., partitive use of 599, ἐκ and ἐν 599 f.); ἐπί, 600–5 (ground-meaning 600, in composition 600, frequency in N. T. 600 f., with the accus. 601 f., with the gen. 602–4, with the loc. 604 f., the true dative 605); κατά, 605–9 (root-meaning 605 f., distributive sense 606, in composition 606, with ablative 606 f., with genitive 607, with accusative 607–9); μετά, 609–12 (root-meaning 609, in composition 609 f., loss of locative use 610, with genitive 610–2, with accusative 612); παρὰ, 612–6 (significance 612, compared with πρὸς 613, in composition 613, with the locative 614, with the ablative 614 f., with the accusative 615 f.); περί, 616–20 (root-meaning 617, in composition 617, originally with four cases 617, with the ablative 617 f., with the genitive 618 f., with the accusative 619 f.); πρὸς, 620–2 (original meaning 620, in composition 620 f., cases used with 621, place 621 f., superiority 622); πρὸς, 622–6 (meaning 622 f., in composition 623, originally with five cases 623, with ablative 623 f., with the locative 624, with the accusative 624–6); σύν, 626–8 (meaning 626 f., history 627, in composition 627 f., N. T. usage 628); ὑπέρ, 628–33 (meaning 629, in composition 629, with genitive 629 f., with ablative 630–2, with accusative 632 f.); ὑπό, 633–6 (meaning 633, in composition 633, cases once used with 634 f., with the accusative 635, with the ablative 635 f.); the “adverbial” or “improper” prepositions, 636–48 (ὁμο 638, ὀνειρο 638, ὀντεκρυν 638 f., ἰπέεναινει 639, ἰτερ 639, ἰχθυς 639 f., ἐκτός 640, ἐπιρόσθεν 640, ἰναντι 640, ἰναντιον 640, ἰκενα 641, ἰντος 641, ἰνώπιον 641 f., ἰξὶο 642, ἰπάνω 642, ἰπέκειαια 642, ἰσοι 642 f., ἰξὸς 643, κατέεναι 643, κατενώπιον 644, κυκλόθεν 644, κύκλῳ 644, μέουν 644, μεταξο 645, μέχρι 645, ὧπισθὲν 645, ὧπασφο 645, ὧψ 645 f., παρετέλισσων 646, παρεκτος 646, πέραν 646, πλῆν 646, πλησίον 646, ὑπεράνω 646 f., ὑπερέκειαια 647, ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ 647, ὑποκάτω
647, χάριν 647, χωρίς 647 f.); compound prepositions, 648; prepositional circumlocutions, 648 f. (μέσον, άνω, πρόσωπον, χείρ); adjectives of comparison with, 661, 667; article with, 766; effect on active voice, 800; with infinitive, 1068–75.

Present tense: 73, 119 f., 123, 145, 150, 203; of –μι verbs, 311–9; classes of present stems, 350–3 (non-thematic reduplicated 350, non-thematic with –νι and –νι 351, simple thematic 351, reduplicated thematic 351, thematic with suffix 351, 351–3, with σ dropped 353); relation of aorist to, 841–3; punctiliar (aoristic), 864–70 (specific 865 f., gnomic 866, historical present [Page 1243] 866–9, futuristic 869 f.); durative (linear) indicative, 879–82 (descriptive 879, progressive 879 f., iterative or customary 880, inchoative or conative 880, historical 880, deliberative 880 f., as perfect 881, perfect as present 881, futuristic 881 f.); durative subj. and opt., 889 f.; durative imperative, 890; durative infinitive, 890 f.; durative participle, 891 f. and 1115–6 (relative time 891, futuristic 891, descriptive 891, conative 892, antecedent time 892, indirect discourse 892, with the article 892, past action still in progress 892, “subsequent” 892, durative future 892).

Principal parts of important verbs in N. T.: 1212–20.

Proclitics: accent of, 235; rules for accent of, 1211.

Prodiorthosis: 1199.

“Profane Greek”: 5, 89.

Prohibition: see imperative, aorist subj., future indicative, infinitive.

Prolepsis: 423.

Pronouns: 226, 234; declension of, 284–93 (idea of 284 f., antiquity of 285, pronominal roots 285 f., classification of 286–93); syntax of, ch. XV, 676–753; personal, 676–84; possessive, 684 f.; intensive and identical, 685–7; reflexive, 687–92; reciprocal, 692 f.; demonstrative, 693–710; relative, 710–35; interrogative, 735–41; indefinite, 741–4; alternative or distributive, 744–50; negative, 750–3.

Pronunciation: 71 f., 236–41.

Proper names: abbreviated, 171–3, 184, 205; doubling of consonants in Hebrew and Aramaic, 214 f.; accent of, 235; foreign names, 235 f.; mixed declension of, 263; in third decl., 269 f.; article with, 759 ff., 791, passim.

“Proper” prepositions: 554, 636 f.

Προσωπία: 228.

Protasis: see conditional clauses, 1007–27.

Prothetic vowels: 205 f., 1209.

Psychological treatment of grammar: 32.

Ptolemaic: 210, 220, 256, *passim*.

Pun: 1201.


Purpose: see final clauses.

Q

Qualitative use of anarthrous nouns: see article.

Questions: ὃς in direct, 725; ὃς in indirect, 725 f.; ὅς τις, direct 729 f., indirect 730 f.; ὅς ὁς, 731; ὅς ὅς, 733; see direct discourse, indirect discourse, interrogative pronouns, interrogative particles, mode; indirect, 1043–6; deliberative, 1046; single, 1175–7; double, 1177; particles in direct, 1175 f.; indirect, 1176 f.

Quotations in O. T.: 206, 242 f.

R

Reciprocal pronouns: inflection of, 292 f.; reflexive as, 690; syntax of, 692 f.

Recitative ὅτι: 1027 f.; see direct discourse.

Redundance: see pleonasm.


Reflexive pronouns: inflection of, 287 f.; personal originally so, 680 f., 685; distinctive use, 687 f.; no nominative, 688; indirect, 688; in [Page 1244] singular, 688 f.; in plural, 689 f.; article with, 690; in reciprocal sense, 690; with middle voice, 690 f., 811; use of ἵδιος, 691 f.; with active voice, 802.

Relative pronouns: inflection of, 290 f.; inverse attraction, 488; attraction to genitive, 512; attraction to ablative, 519 f.; repetition of prepositions with, 566 f.; list in the N. T., 710 f.; name, 711; bond between clauses, 711; ὃς, 711–26 (in Homer 711, comparison with other relatives 711 f., with any person 712, gender 712 ff., number 714, case 714–9, absence of antecedent 719 ff., prepositions with
antecedent and relative 721, phrases 721 f., pleonastic antecedent 722 f., repetition of ὃς 723 f., consecutive idea 724, causal 724 f., direct questions 725, indirect questions 725 f., idiom ὤδεις ἔστιν ὃς 726); ὅστις, 726–31 (varied uses 726, distinction between ὃς and ὅστις 726 f., indefinite use 727, definite exx. 727 f., =value of ὃς 728, case 728 f., number 729, direct questions 729 f., indirect 730 f.); ὅς ὃς, 731 f. (relation to ὃς 731, incorporation 731, indirect question 731, number 731, ὅν ἐστιν ὃς 732); ὅσος, 732 (qualitative, double office, correlative); ὅσος, 732 f. (quantitative, antecedent, attraction, incorporation, repetition, with ἄν, indirect question, comparison, adverbial); ἡλίκος, 733 f.; ὅ, 734 f.; τίς as, 737 f.

Relative sentences: originally paratactic, 953; most subordinate clauses relative in origin, 953 f.; usually adjectival, 955 f.; modes in, 955 f.; definite and indefinite, 956 f.; use of ἄν in, 957–9; special uses of, 960–2; negatives in, 962; causal, 965 f.; purpose, 989; subfinal, 996; consecutive, 1001.

Relative time: see tense.

Repetition: of substantive, 684; of ὃς, 723 f.; of ὅσος, 733.

Result: see consecutive clauses.

Reuchlinian pronunciation: 240.

Revelation: see Apocalypse.

Rhetoric: figures of speech, 1194–1208.

Rhetorical questions: with the ind., 924; with the subj., 930; in Paul, 1198.

Rhythm: metrical passages so printed in W. H., 242; position as showing, 417–23; poetry, 421 f.

Roman Empire and the κοινή: 74 f.

Romans: passim. See Index of Quotations.

Roots: in Sanskrit, 38; discussion of, 144–6; verb-root, 344 f.

Running style: 432 f.

Sahidic: 202, passim.

Sanskrit: the discovery of Sanskrit, 10, 36 f., 39 f., 47, 143, 145 f., 246–8; voice in, 798 f., ad libitum.

Second Epistle of Peter: passim. See Index of Quotations.
Second or o declension: 257, 259–63.

Semitic: 37, 88–108, 198, 205, 212, 225, 236, passim. See Aramaic and Hebrew.

Sentence, the: punctuation of, 242 f.; discussion of, ch. X, 390–445; the sentence and syntax, 390; sentence defined, 390–7 (complex conception 390, two essential parts 390 f., one-membered sentence 391, elliptical 391, only predicate 391–3, only subject 393 f., verb not the only predicate 394 f., copula not necessary 395 f., two radiating foci 396 f., varieties of the simple sentence 397); expansion of the subject, 397–400; expansion of the predicate, 400 f.; subordinate centres in the sentence, 402; concord in person, 402 f.; concord in number, 403–9; concord in gender, 410–3; concord in case, 413–6; position of words in, 417–25; compound sentences, 425–7; connection in sentences, 427–44 [Page 1245] (single words 427, clauses 428–32, two kinds of style 432 f., parenthesis 433–5, anacoluthon 435–40, oratio variata 440–3, connection between sentences 443, between paragraphs 444, forecasts 444 f.); independent or paratactic, 914–50; subordinate or hypotactic, 950–1049.


Sequence, rules of: see indirect discourse.

Simile: 1206.

Sinaiticus, Codex: spelling of, 179, passim.

Singular: 251. See number.

Socrates: 75 f.

Solecisms: in the Apocalypse, 413–6.

Sophocles: see Index of Quotations.

Sources for study of κοινή: see ch. I and κοινή.

Southeast dialects: 211, passim.

Spoken Greek: see vernacular.

Stoic: grammarians, 143; dialectic, 1197.

Style: in Scripture, 87; two kinds of, 432 f.; in the N. T., II6–39, 1194–7. See individual peculiarities.

Sophocles SOPHOCLES, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (1888).
Sub-final: see final and consecutive.

Subject: essential part of sentence, 390 f.; ellipsis of, 391; only subject used, 393 f.; one of the radiating foci, 396 f.; expansion of the subject, 397–400 (idea-words and form-words 397, concord and government 397 f., group around 398–400, subordinate clause 398, with the article 398, the adverb 398, the adjective 398, the substantive in an oblique case 398, or in apposition 398–400); subject and predicate as to concord, 403–7 (two conflicting principles 403, neuter plural and singular verb 403 f., collective substantives 404 f., singular verb with first subject 405 f., literary plural 406 f.); suspended, 436 f.

Subjective: see genitive case, possessive pronoun and middle voice.

Subjunctive: origin of form, 320, 323–5; perfect, 360 f., 907 f.; use of aorist, 848–54; future, 876; present, 889 f.; relation to other modes, 924 ff. (aor. subj. and fut. ind., subj. and imper., subj. and opt.); original significance of, 926–8; threefold usage, 928–35 (futuristic 928 ff., volitive 930–4, deliberative 934 f.); as imper., 943; negative with, 1160 f., 1169 f.

Subordinate sentences: see hypotaxis.

Subsequent action in participle: see participle.

Substantives: root-substantives, 145; with suffixes, 150–7 (primitive 150 f., derivative 151–7: from verbs 151–4, from substantives 154–6, from adjectives 156 f.); compound, 161–8 (inseparable prefixes, 161 f.; agglutinative 165–8); declension of, 246–70; number in, 251 f.; gender in substantives, 252–4; with genitive, 495–503; with ablative, 514 f.; with locative, 524; with dative, 536 f.; appositional use of, 651 f.; adjective as, 652–4; agreement of adjective with, 654 f.; substantival aspects of infinitive, 1058–79; with inf., 1075 f.; participle as, 1108 f.; negatives with, 1163 f.

Suffixes: 146; comparative without, 663.

Superlative: forms, 278–81; positive as, 660 f.; displaced by comparative 667–9; syntax of, 669–71.

Supplementary: see participle.

Syncope: 203 f.

Synonyms: in Greek words, 175 f.; phrases, 1200 f.[Page 1246]

Syntax: in the vernacular κοινή, 73 f.; in the N. T., 82 f.; of LXX, 100; part III, 379–1208; meaning of syntax, ch. IX, 379–89 (backwardness in study of 379–81, N. T. limitations 381–3, advance by Delbrück 383 f., province of 384–7, the word 384

Delbrück

DELBRÜCK, B., Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis (1867).
f., construction of words and clauses 385 f., historical 386, irregularities 386 f., method of this grammar 387–9, principles 387, original significance 387, form and function 387 f., development 388, context 388 f., translation 389, limits 389); the sentence and syntax, 390).

**Syriac versions:** *passim.*

**Syrian text (α-text):** 179 f., 189, 210 f., 214 f., 219, 260, *passim.*

**Tarsus:** new centre of culture, 67; Paul learning Greek in, 239.

**Temporal clauses:** kin to relative, 970 f.; conjunctions meaning “when,” 971–4; group meaning “until,” 974–7; some nominal and prepositional phrases, 977 f.; use of inf., 978 f., 1091 f.; participle, 979, 1125 f.


**Textual criticism:** *passim.*

**Textus receptus:** 199, 213, 217, *passim.*

**Thematic vowel:** see present tense.


———, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871–1888).
Thessalian: 192, 202, *passim*.

Third declension: 258, 263–9.


Transitive verbs: 330 f.; with accusative, 471–7; with genitive, etc., 506 ff.; transitiveness and voice, 797 f., 799 f., 806, 815 f.

Translation Greek: in the LXX and portions of Gospels and Acts, 89 f., 91 f., 93, 100 ff.

Transliteration of Semitic words: 225.

U


Uncontracted vowels: see contraction.

Unfulfilled condition: see conditional sentences.[Page 1247]

Unification of Greek dialects in the κοινή: 53–4; finally complete, 67.

Universal language: the Greek, 49 f.; Panhellenic, 49; origin of, 53 f.; march towards universalism, 54; a real world-speech, 54–56; limitations in, 64.

V

Vase-inscriptions: see inscriptions.

Vaticanus, Codex: 179, *passim*.


Verbal nouns: ch. XX, 1050–1141; kinship between infinitive and participle, 1050 f.; the infinitive, 1051–95; the participle, 1098–1141.

Verbs: root-verbs, 145; with formative suffixes, 146–50 (primitive verbs 146 f., secondary verbs 147–50); compound verbs, 161–5 (with inseparable prefixes 161 f., agglutination or juxtaposition 163–5); conjugation of, 303–76 (difficulty of the subject 303, nature of the verb, relation to noun 303 f., meaning of 304, pure and hybrid 304, survival of –µι verbs, cross division 306, oldest verbs 306, gradual disappearance 306, second aorists 307–11, presents 311–9, perfects 319 f., modes

**Vernacular:** 17 f., 22 f., 34 ff., 44; “vulgar” Greek, 50; vernacular κοινή, 60–73; vernacular Attic, 60–2; N. T. chiefly in the vernacular κοινή, 76–83; vernacular writers in the N. T., 76; dialect-coloured, 178 f.; indifferent to hiatus, 207; ad libitum.

**Verner’s law:** 11, footnote.

**Verses:** see rhythm.

**Vocabulary:** 65 f.; in the vernacular κοινή, 72, 80–3, 87, passim.

**Vocative:** 247; in first declension, 256; in second declension, 261; in third decl, 264; nominative form, 264, 461; nature of, 461; various devices 462 f.; use of ὦ, 463 f.; adjectives with, 464; apposition to, 464; in predicate, 464 f.; article with, 465 f.

**Voice:** conjugation of, 330–43 (transitive and intransitive 330 f., names of voices 331, relative age of 332, “deponent” 332 f., passive supplanting middle 333 f., personal endings 335, cross divisions 335, active endings 335–9, middle endings 339 f., passive endings 340 f., contract verbs 341–3); with infinitive, 369 f., 1079 f.; with participle, 373 f., 1110 f.; syntax of, ch. XVII, 797–820; point of view, 797–9 (distinction between voice and transitiveness 797 f., meaning of voice 798, names of the voices 798, history of 798, help from Sanskrit 798 f., defective verbs 799); syntax of active, 799–803; middle, 803–14; passive, 814–20.

**Volitive:** future, 874 f.; subj., 930–4; opt., 939 f.

**Vowels:** original of vowel symbols, 178; the original Greek vowels, 181 f.; vowel changes, 181–203 (changes with α 182–6, with ε 186–91, with η 191–5, with ι 195–9, with ο 199–201, with υ 201 f.; with ω 202 f.); contraction and syncope, 203 f.; diphthongs and diæresis, 204 f.; apɔ̆hæresis and prothetic vowels, 205 f.; elision, 206–8; crasis, [Page 1248] 208 f.; shortening stem-vowels, 230 f.

**Vulgate:** passim.

W

**Wales, bilingualism in:** 30.

**Weltsprache:** 44 f., 49–56, 64, 66, 79, passim. See universal or κοινή.

**Western text (δ-text):** 180, 214, 216, 218 f., 253, 260, ad libitum.
Wish: mode and tense in impossible wishes, 923; ways of expressing, 1003 f.

Word-formation: see formation of words.

Words: number in the N. T., 81, 87, 115; relation of words in origin, 145; with formative suffixes, 146–60; composita, 160–71; history of, 173 f.; kinship of Greek, 174 f.; contrasts in, 175 f.; punctuation of, 243 f.; idea-words and form-words, 397; position of, in sentence, 417–25; connection between, 427; word-relations, 449; glory of the words of the N. T., 1207 f.

World-language: see κοινή.

X

Xenophon, forerunner of the κοινή: 55.

Z

Zeugma: 1200 f.

[PAGE 1249] INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

Only words are here given which are discussed, not the words in the lists of examples, many thousands of which are given in the text. See Index of Quotations.

A

ἀ– (ἀ-): prefix, 161 f., 168, 170, 273, 516, 1155.

ἀ–: collective or intensive, 161.

α: vowel, 181 f.

–α: voc. ending, 151, 256; vowel-changes with, 182–6, 191, 274, 341 f., 326; Doric gen. abl., 254 f.; stems in, 258, 267; acc. ending, 264 f.; imper. ending, 337; aor. ending, 305, 337–9, 348 f.; 2d perf. in, 358, 801; adverbs in, 526; prothetic, 1209.

–α: dat. ending, 249, 256.

ἀβαδδών: 95.

Ἄββά: 26, 105, 131, 236; case, 461.

ἀ-βαρίς: 161.

ἀγαθο-εργέω: 163, 204.
ἀγαθο-ποιέω: 163.
ἀγαθο-ποιία: 165.
ἀγαθο-ποιός: 166, 168.
ἀγαθός: meaning, 176, 276, 653, 661; reading, 201; forms, 273.
ἀγαθούργεω: 163, 204.
ἀγαθωσύνη: reading, 201.
ἀγαλλιάω: constr., 509; formation, 150; forms, 1212.
ἀγανακτέω: c. ὅτι, 965; c. part., 1122.
ἀγαπάω: constr., 478, 482; use, 1078, 1201.
ἀγάπη: in κοινή, 152; gen. use, 14, 65, 80, 115, 499; and art., 758; meaning, 115, 768.
Ἄγαρ: 254, 411, 759, 766.
ἀγγαρεύω: 111.
ἀγγελία: ὅτι with, 1033.
ἀγγέλλω: compounds and forms of, 338, 349, 1212.
ἀγιάω: 97, 115, 125, 131, 147; constr., 855, 1003; part., 891.
ἀγιασμός: 151.
ἀγιος: accent, 232; use, 115, 125, 777.
ἀγιότατος: 125.
ἀγιότης: 65, 156.
ἀγιωσύνη: form, 156, 201.
ἀγνίζω: voice of, 816.
ἀγνισμός: 151, 280.
ἀγνόημα: 153, 161.
ἀγνότης: 65, 156.
ἀγνυμι: compounds and forms of, 1212. See κατ-ἀγνυμι.
ἀγοράζω: constr., 483, 510.
Ἀγοστος: spelling, 185.
ἀγρι-έλαιος: 161, 166, 168.
ἀγωγός: 326.
ἀγωνίζω ἀγώνα: 478.
ἀδελφός: 80, 81, 115.
ἀδελφότης: 154.
ἀδηλότης: 156, 161.
ἀδιάκριτος: 124, 161.
ἀδιάλειπτος: 161.
ἀδιαλείπτως: form, 170, 295.
ἀδιαφορία: 161.[Page 1250]
ἀδικέω: voice of, 472, 808, 816; use, 878, 881, 889; c. two acc., 482, 484.
–ἀδος: 62.
Ἀδραμυντηνός: spelling, 210, 223.
ἀδυνατέω: 161.
ἀδύνατος: 372.
–ἀζω: verb ending, 147 bis and n., 151.
ἀεί: form, 185, 295; use, 300.
ἀθανασία: 130.

ἀθέμιτος: 161; c. inf., 1084.

ἀθεσμος: 65, 161.

ἀθέτω: 130, 161.

ἀθέτησις: 65, 80, 161.

Ἀθήνησι: case of, 249.

αι—: c. augment, 367.

αι: =æ, 238; =e, 186, 239; vowel-changes, 186, 204, 327, 367.

—αι: dat. ending, 249, 370, 542; inf. ending, 249, 370, 542, 1001, 1051 ff., 1067; opt. ending, 327, 335.

αιάν: form, 190.

ἄδιδιος: form, 272.

αίματεχυσία: 166.

—αινω: verb ending, 147, 150, 349, 352.

αίρετιζο: 149.

αίρέω: voice of, 806, 809 f.; compounds and forms of, 339 (—αλαν), 1212.

αίρόμενος: use, 1097.

αῖρω: class, 352; fut., 356; transitive, 799; voice of, 799; constr., 855 f., 1097; compounds and forms of, 1212.

—αιρω: verbs in, 349, 352.

—αις: dat. ending, 249.

αἰσθάνομαι: 131; constr., 509; in or. obl., 1040; form of, 1212.

αἰσθητήριον: 132, 171.

αίσχρια: 156.

αἰσχρόν ἔστιν: c. inf., 1084.

αἰσχρότης: 130.
αἰσχύνομαι: intransitive, 473; use, 1102; and part., 1122.

αίτεω: constr., 480, 482, 850, 857, 1085; voice of, 805, 814, 820.

αίτιατική: name of acc., 466.

αίτίωμα: 153.

αίχμαλωτεύω: 148, 479.

αίχμαλωτίζω: 149.

αίώνιος: 159, 272.

ἀκαθάρτης: 156.

ἀκαιρέω: 147, 161.

ἀκατάγνωστος: 80, 161.

ἀκατάλυτος: 65, 161.

ἀκαταπάστους: form, 161; spelling, 185.

Ἀκελδαμάχ: 105.

–ἀκι-ς: suffix, 296.


ἀκολουθέω: constr., 472, 528; in mod. Gk., 138 n.; use, 880.

ἀκούω: ἄκικοα, 358, 363 bis, 364, 801; ἰκουσμαί, 362, 364; c. cases, 449, 454, 506 f., 511, 519; in D always c. acc., 475 n.; in mod. Gk., 138 n.; fut., 356, 813; voice of, 803; in or. obl., 864, 1035, 1042; c. ἃν, 1035, 1042; c. compl. part., 864, 1042, 1103; c. inf., 1042; use, 881, 901, 1103, 1116; compounds and forms of, 1212.

ἀκριβέστατος: form, 280 bis.

ἀκριβέστερος: meaning, 665.

ἀκροατήριον: 65, 154.

ἀκροβυστία: 102, 166.

ἀκρογονιαίος: 168 bis.

ἀκρός: and art., 775.
Ἀκύλας: 82.
ἀλας: 145, 254, 269.
ἀλεεύς: pl. form of, 188.
ἀλείφω: constr., 483.
ἀλεκτοροφωνία: 471.
ἀλέκτωρ: 63, 65 n.
ἀλήθεια: 134–5, 256.
ἀληθής: 135.
ἀληθινός: 135, 158.
ἀλήθω: 149, 353.
ἀλλά: elision, 207; accent, 232–4; form, 244, 294, 301; c. negative, 424, 752, 1166;
use, 427 ff., 443; and asyndeton, 440; in mod. Gk., 1146; discussed, 1185 ff.
ἀλλα: form, 249, 294.
ἀλλάσσω: constr., 473 n., 511; compounds and forms of, 1212.
ἀλληγορέω: 81, 163.
ἀλληλούϊα: spelling, 95, 205, 225.
ἀλλήλων: form, 292; use, 690; discussed, 692 f.[Page 1251]
ἀλλογενής: 80, 168.
ἀλλό: compounds and forms of, 1212.
ἀλλος: use, 292 f., 692; in comparison, 662; c. ἂς, 671; c. art., 695, 775 f.; discussed, 746 ff.; and ἕτερος, 749; antithetic, 750.
ἀλλοτρι(o)επίσκοπος: 65, 82, 165, 166, 204.
ἀλλότριος: and ἄλλος, 748.
ἀλογος: form, 273.
ἅλς: root of, 145.

ἅμα: origin, 249; num. adv., 284, 295, 301; case with, 451, 534, 638; and μετά, 609; and σῶν, 627; c. inf., 1069; c. part., 1124, 1139; use, 1126, 1139.

ἀμαράντινος: 158.

ἀμαρτάνος: compounds and forms of, 348, 1212; constative aor. of, 833; c. ἀμαρτίαν, 477; use, 850, 854.

ἀμαρτία: use, 134, 780.

ἀμαρτολός: 157.

ἀμείνων: form, 277; use, 662.

–ἀμενος: ending, 374.

ἀμετανόητος: 80, 162.

ἀμήν: and art., 759; Heb. influence, 95, 131.

ἀμπελόν: 154 and n.

ἀμφί: in comp., 451, 553, 555 f., 558; use in Homer, 524; case form, 524; origin, 555; original use, 569; disuse, 451, 569; and πέρι, 620; nonuse with inf., 1069.

ἀμφιάζω: reading, 184; compounds and forms, 352, 1212.

ἀμφιέννυμι: constr., 483; forms of, 352, 364, 1212.

ἀμφο-οδον: 166.

ἀμφότεροι: use, 80, 251 f., 282, 292; discussed, 744 f.; and art., 769.

ἀμφοι: use, 282, 292, 744.

ἀν: form, 181, 190; =ἐάν, 190 f., 1018; crasis, 208, 984; position, 424; in LXX, 938, 958; use, 424, 841, 855, 887, 920, 922 f., 935 f., 937 ff., 956–9, 961, 967–71; c. temporal particles, 961, 970; and ὁσος, 733; meaning, 921; c. ὠς, 976; c. ἴνα, 984; c. ὧσος, 985 f.; c. ὡς, 968–9, 974; in conditions, 961, 1007, 1010 f., 1013–8, 1021 f., 1025 f.; c. indic., 957, 959, 969, 1007, 1010; c. opt., 854 f., 936–8, 959, 1007; c. ὅστις and subj., 957, 959; c. inf., 959, 969, 1040, 1095; c. part., 1129, 1141; in apodosis, 841, 887, 920–3; not in indep. subj. sentences, 935; not repeated with second verb, 959; in or. obl., 1030, 1040, 1044; statistics, 958. See ὧς ὁς ὅστις, etc.

–αν: ending, 73, 155, 257; verb ending, 336, 338; for –ὅσι, 73; verb-stem in, 352; acc. s. in 3d decl., 67, 68, 82, 97.
-ἀν: inf. ending, 194, 343.

ἀνά: cases with, 451, 491, 524, 569 f.; in comp., 163, 166, 168, 170, 476, 561, 571; use, 556; in mod. Gk., 557 f.; case-form, 570; discussed, 571 f.; with ἄτο, 575, with εἰς, 673; in prepositional phrases, 791.

-ἀνα: in verbs, 349, 352.

ἀναβαίνω: forms, 328.

ἀναβάλλω: use, 863.

ἀνάβλεψις: 151.

ἀνάγαιον: 185, 260.

ἀναγεννάω: 65.

ἀναγινώσκο: ὅτι with, 1032.

ἀναγκάζω: constr., 857.

ἀνακαστᾶς: 126.

ἀνάγκη: c. inf., 1084.

ἀναζήν: 80, 130, 147, 163.

ἀναθάλλω: forms of, 348, 1212; constr., 476.


ἀναθεματίζω: 149.

ἀνακαινόω: 65, 149, 152.

ἀνακαίνωσις: 152.

ἀνάκειμαι: 66.

ἀνακεφαλαίω: voice of, 809.

ἀνακλίνω: voice of, 66, 819.

ἀναλίσκο: compounds and forms, 1212.

ἀναλύω: 82, 130.
ἀναμένω: c. acc., 475.
ἀναμμενήσκομαι: constr., 482, 509.
ἀνα-μίξ: fixed case, 294, 460.
ἀνάξιος: constr., 504.[Page 1252]
ἀναπαύω: voice of, 807; use, 873.
ἀναπίπτω: forms, 66, 338; c. acc., 486.
ἀναστατόω: 80, 149, 163.
ἀναστρέφομαι: 80.
ἀναστροφή: 126, 166.
ἀνατρέφω εἰς: 481.
ἀναφαίνω: constr., 486; voice of, 817.
ἀναφέρω: 80.
ἀνεκδοήγητος: 82, 162.
ἀνεκλάλητος: use, 1096.
ἀνεμίζω: 149.
ἀνενέγκαι: form, 338.
ἀνεξεραύνητος: 82, 162.
ἀνεσις: use, 900 f.
ἀνετάζω: 163.
ἀνεν: use, 301, 553, 638.
ἀνέχομαι: c. augment, 368; constr., 508; voice of, 807; c. acc., 486; c. part., 1121.
ἀνεψιός: 162.
ἀνήκω: use, 886.
ἀνθός ὁν: 208, 223, 556, 574, 963.
ἀνθρωπάρεσκος: 65, 168 bis.

ἀνθρωπος: use, 120.

ἀνίστημι: forms, 310, 328.

ἄνοιγω: c. augment, 368; compounds and forms of, 82, 349, 364, 368, 371, 895, 1212; intransitive, 800.

ἄνταναπληρώ: 160, 165.

ἄνταπόδομα: 151.

ἄντάω: compounds and forms, 1213.

ἄντι: elision, 208, 223; cases with, 451, 569 f.; case-form, 524, 570; in comp., 163, 165, 170, 542, 563, 572; use, 556; in mod. Gk., 557; in condensation, 567; ἄντις in mod. Gk., 570; discussed, 572–4; ὄντο ὃν, 208, 223, 556, 574, 696, 714, 722, 724, 953, 962–3; c. πρό, 620; and ὑπέρ, 630; and ἄντιπερα, 639; base of compound prepositions, 639; c. ὃν causal, 963; c. inf., 1060, 1069 f.

–αντι: ending, 336.

ἄντικαθίστημι: 133.

ἄντικρυς: use, 221, 231, 638.

ἄντιλαμβάνομαι: 131, 163.

ἄντιλέγοντες: reading, 1171.

ἀντιλέγω: meaning, 66; c. inf., 1035.

ἀντιλήμπτορ: 80.

ἀντιλήμψις: 80.

ἀντίλυτρον: 65, 166.

ἀντιμισθία: 115.

ἀντίπερα: use, 231, 638.

ἀντίτυπος: 115.

ἀντίχριστος: 115, 166.

ἀντλῆμα: 153.
ἀντοφθαλμέω: 81, 164.
ἀνοι: in adj., 160; use, 296; adv., 298, 300.
–ἀνω: verbs in, 147, 316, 352.
ἀνοθεν: 300.
ἀνοτερικός: 160.
ἄξιος: constr., 658, 996; c. gen., 504; c. inf., 369, 996, 1077, 1079.
ἀξιώ: meaning, 149; class, 351; constr., 511.
ἀξίως: constr., 505.
–αος: equal to –ος, 267.
ἀπαγγέλλω: in or. obl., 1032, 1036.
ἀπάγχοαι: voice of, 807.
ἀπαι: form, 272.
ἀπαντάω: use, 873; in mod. Gk., 138 n.
ἀπάντησις: 65, 152; c. εἰς, 91.
ἀπάνωθεν: use, 637.
ἀπαξ: use, 284, 296, 300.
ἀπαρνέομαι: fut., 818, 819; voice of, 819; use, 873; in or. obl., 1036.
ἀπαξ: and art., 771 ff.
ἀπαύγασμα: 153.
ἀπειπάμεθα: spelling, 338.
ἀπελπίζω: constr., 476; form, 164.
ἀπέναντι: use, 170 bis, 639, 644.
ἀπέρχομαι: use, 905.
ἀπέχω: meaning, 828; use, 80, 577, 827, 866.

ἀπλοῦς: use, 284.

ἀπό: anticipatory position, 110; elision, 208; cases with, 111, 469, 482, 534, 554, 568, 570; in adv. phrases, 297, 300, 548, 550; c. ὅ ὄν, 135, 414, 459, 574 f.; “translation-Hebraism,” 472; c. verbs, 511, 517 f., 559, 562, 566; for “partitive gen.,” 515, 519; in comp., 164 f., 542, 563, 827 f.; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 138, 557; use, 561, 977 f.; in condensation, 567; c. ἄντι, 574; discussed, [Page 1253] 574–80; and ἐκ, 596; and παρά, 613 f.; and πρός, 624; and ὑπό, 634; in prepositional phrases, 791; for agent, 820.

ἀπογραφή: formation, 151; meaning, 82.

ἀπογράφω: form, 164; voice of, 807, 809.

ἀποδείκνυμι: constr., 480, 481.

ἀποδίδωμι: voice of, 810.

ἀποδοχή: 151.

ἀπόθεσις: 125.

ἀποθνήσκω: constr., 479; meaning, 345, 827, 838, 845; use, 635, 869; voice of, 802, 815.

ἀποκαθίστημι: augment of, 73, 368.

ἀποκάλυψις: 152.

ἀποκαραδοκία: 81, 166.

ἀποκαταλλάσσω: 160, 165.

ἀποκατάστασις: 152.

ἀποκατιστάνει: reading, 316.

ἀποκόπτω: voice of, 809, 819.

ἀπόκριμα: 80.

ἀποκρίνομαι: “deponent,” 66, 334; aor. pass., 334, 340; aor. pass. part., 1126; constr., 473, 484; c. πρός, 626; voice, 818; c. ὅτι, 1036; c. inf., 1036.

ἀποκτείνω: use, 635; pass. voice of, 802, 815; meaning, 827; forms, 352, 1213.
ἀποκτέννω: 73, 82.

ἀπόλλωμι: 311; formation, 147; fut., 335; perf., 358, 363, 800; voice of, 800, 804; meaning of, 827 f.

Ἀπολλώς: reading, 172, 189, 235, 260.

ἀπολοῦω: voice of, 807, 809.

ἀπολύτρωσις: 115, 175.

ἀπονίπτομαι: voice of, 810.

ἀποπλέω: contract verb, 342.

ἀπορέομαι: intransitive, 472.

ἀποσκίασμα: 153.

ἀποστασία: 65, 152.

ἀποστέλλω: forms, 336; use, 894, 896, 905.

ἀποστέρέω: constr., 472, 483; voice of, 808, 816.

ἀποστολή: 115.

ἀπόστολος: meaning, 53 n., 65, 65 n., 115.

ἀποστρέφομαι: and case, 472, 484.

ἀποτάσσομαι: 80.

ἀποτίθημι: voice of, 810.

ἀποτομία: 156.

ἀποτόμως: 170 bis.

ἀποφεύγω: constr., 476.

ἀπτο: compounds and forms, 353, 1213; ἀπτομαί: constr., 508, 853; c. μή, 853; voice of, 806 f.

ἀπωθέομαι: voice of, 810.

ἀπόλεια: 115.
ἄρα: accent, 232; reading, 244; in interrogation, 916 f.; use, 1176.


–ἄρα: in verbs, 349, 352.

ἄραβῶν: spelling, 81, 105, 211 n., 212.

ἀραγε: use, 425, 1190.

ἀρεσκεία: 152, 231.

ἀρέσκω: constr., 479, 487; c. dat., 540; ἄρ. ἑνώπιον τινος, 94.

ἀρετή: 80, 101, 126 n., 148 n.

–ἀριν: diminutive, 66.

ἀριστερά: 449.

ἀρκετός: 80.

ἀρκέω: forms, 210, 324; constr., 541; use, 889.

ἀρκ(τ)ος: 210, 252.

Ἀρμαγεδδών: 95.

ἀρνέομαι: in or. obl., 1035 f.; compounds and forms, 1213.

ἀροτριώ: 65, 150.

ἀρπαγμός: 130, 151.

ἀρπαξω: compounds and forms, 349, 1213; ἑρπάξην, 82.

ἀρπαξ: use, 272.

ἀρραβών: 81, 95, 111, 212.

ἀρρητα: breathing, 212, 225.

ἀρσενοκόιτης: 166.

ἄρτη: use, 548, 1146; c. part., 1139.
ἀρτος: 115.


ἀρχ:- prefix, 161 f.

ἀρχι: in comp., 257.

ἀρχερεύς: 115, 162.

–αρχος: in comp., 257.

ἀρχω: ἀρξάμενοι reading, 49; ἀρξατο redundant, 107; use, 1102, 1121, 1126; c. inf., 1077–8, 1102; not used with part. in N. T., 1102, 1121; ἀρξάμενος, 1126; and ellipsis, 1203.

ἄς: in mod. Gk., 430, 923, 931.


ἀσθένημα: 153.

–ἀσι: ending (perf.), 336.

Ἀσία: c. art., 788.

Ἀσιανός: 155 n.

Ἀσιάρχης: 80, 166.

ἀσπάζομαι: constr., 80, 853, 862 f.

ἀσημος: 80.

ἀσπύλος: 64, 162.

ἀσσον: meaning, 665.

ἀσύνετος: voice, 372; use, 1097.

ἀσύνθετος: voice, 372; use, 1097.

ἀσχημονέω: 147.

–ατε: per. end., 308.

ἀτενίζω: 149, 162.
ἀτερ: use, 639.

ἀτοπος: 80.


–ατος: ending, 277, 279 f.

–άτω: per. end., 308.

–άτωσαν: per. end., 308.

αὐθεντέω: 80, 148, 164.

αὐξάνω: constr., 478; trans., 799.

αὐριον: form, 294.

αὔτο: in comp., 168.

αὐτόι: use, 296.

αὐτομάτη: form, 273.


ἄφαιρέωμαι: constr., 480, 483; voice of, 819.

ἀφεδρόν: 154.

ἀφελής: 156, 162.

ἀφεσ: use, 82, 329, 430, 855 f., 931 f., 935.

ἀφεσις: 97.

ἀφέωνται: 63, 82, 342.

ἀφηκα: 900.
ἀφήκες: 135.

ἀφίμμ: forms of, 107, 315, 329, 337, 342, 347; constr., 855 f.; use, 931; c. inf., 855–8; c. Ἰνα, 431; aor., 900.

ἀφιλάργυρος: 80, 162.

ἀφίω: forms of, 315, 335.

ἀφοράω: 132.

ἀφρον: voc. of, 463.

ἀφυπνόω: 149.

–αχοῦ: suffix, 296.

ἀχρι: with final ζ, 221, 296; use, 639, 954, 974; in prepositional phrases, 791; c. Ἁν, 975; c. inf., 1074.

–άω: confused with –έω, 73, 82, 341; verbs in, 147 ff., 184, 203, 316, 341 ff., 351.

Β: 209; =v, 238, 240; in mod. Gk., 217; verb root in, 353.


βάαλ: 254, 411.

Βαβυλών: 269, 494.

βαθέα: 232.

βαθέως: 160, 274.

βαίνω: forms and compounds, 305–8, 800, 1213; –έβην, 348, 350.

βαίνον: 111.


βαπτίζω: βαπτίσαι accent, 943 f., and form, 329, 332, 944; formation, 149; meaning, 66, 81, 115; constr., 389, 478, 482, 485, 520, 525, 533, 590, 592; voice of, 807 f.; use, 1073, 1111, 1128.

βάπτισμα: 65, 115, 153 bis.
βαπτισμός: 65, 115, 152 f.
βαπτιστής: 65, 153.
βάπτω: 149, 353.
βαρ—: 105.
βάρβαρος: form, 272, 362.
βαρέω: compounds and forms, 1213.
βαρύνω: forms, 1213.
βασιλεία: 115, 116, 125; β. τῶν οὐρανῶν, 119.
βασιλεύς: meaning, 116; “cases” of pl., 447; voc. of, 465; and art., 760, 769.
βασιλεύω: causative, 801; constative, 833; use, 902.
βασιλισσα: 55, 65, 155.
βασκαίνω: and cases, 473.
βαστάζω: constr., 80, 853.
βάτος: 95, 253.
ββ—: 213 f.
βεβαίωσις: 80.
βεβήλος: 362.
βέβηλος: form, 362.
βέλτερος: form, 662.
βέλτιον: form, 277 f., 294, 299; adv., 488; meaning, 665.
βήρυλλος: reading, 199.
βιαζο: 80, 816.
βιαστής: 153.
βιβάζω: 362 n.
βιβάω: meaning, 865.
βιβλαρίδιον: 155.

βίβλος: spelling, 111, 199.

βιβρόσκω: 65 n.

βιώω: forms, 348 bis, 354; constr., 479.

βίωσις: 152.

βλάπτω: constr., 472, 482, 484.

βλαστάνω: trans. and intrans., 799; forms, 348, 1213.

βλασφήµέω: and case, 473; constr., 479.

βλέβω: c. subj., 82; in John, 134 n.; constr., 330, 996; and asyndeton, 430; and case, 471; c. ἄπο, 73, 91, 577; use of βλέπετε, 330, 932 f., 955, 1110; in or. obl., 1035, 1041; compounds and forms, 1213.

βλητέον: 157, 373, 486. See –τέον.

βοανηρές: 95.

βοάω: in or. obl., 1036.

βοηθέω: case with, 472, 541.

βούλοµαι: forms, 339; βούλε, 82, 193, 339; ἐβουλόµην, 886, 919; ἐβουλήθην, 817; use, 80, 430, 876, 878, 886, 919; c. subj., 876–8; c. ἵνα (not in N. T.), 1055; in or. obl., 1036–8; c. inf., 1038, 1055 f., 1060.

βουνός: 111.

βραδεῖον: 154.

βραδύνω: forms, 230.

βραδύς τῇ καρδίᾳ: 487.

βρέχω: trans. and intrans., 799, 802.

βροχή: 80.

βύσσος: 95 bis, 105, 111.

Γ
γ: 209, 216, 359.


γάζα: 111 bis.

γαζοφυλάκιον: 166.

Γαλατική: with art., 788.

γαμέω: constr., 111, 1204; forms, 348, 1213.

γαμίσκο: 150.

γάμου: 408.

γάρ: use, 242, 433, 443, 962, 1189; in interrogation, 916; c. ἐ, 886, 940, 1003 f., 1020; c. τέ, 1179; discussed, 1190 f.

γέ: use, 244, 291, 302, 424, 1144; καὶ γε c. part., 1129; discussed, 1147 ff.; enclitic, 207, 244, 1211.

γέεννα: 97, 105.

γεμίζω: constr., 506, 510.

γέμω: c. acc., 455, 474.

γενεσία: 65.

γένη: reading, 80, 211, 213.

γεννάω: use, 866 f.

γένος: 448, 487.

γενομαι: 105, 449; and case, 473, 507 f.

γῆ: and ellipsis, 272, 652, 1202.[Page 1256]

γηράσκω: 150.

–γι: in verbs, 351.

γιά: prep. in mod. Gk., 570, 982.

γίνομαι: 55, 61, 73, 82, 210; itacism in, 197, 210; ἐγένετο with καὶ, 95, 102, 107, 122, 122 n., 393, 426, 1042 f.; ἐγένετο c. acc. and inf., 1085; ἐγενώμην, 82; aor., 816; frequency in Mt., 122; followed by asyndeton, 429; in periphrastic forms, 330,
902; γίνεσθαι cases with, 497; c. advs., 545 f.; ἔγένετο, 658, 829; voice of, 801, 818, 820; γένοιτο with µή, 325, 854, 935, 939 f., 1003; imper. of, 855; use, 869, 871, 896 f., 905, 951, 1085, 1202; omission of, 396; pred. nom., 457; subj. forms, 890; perf., 900; γέγονα, 333, 358, 358 n., 801, 896, 900; γέγοναν, 68, 336; γέγονεν ὅτι, 1034; compounds and forms, 350–1, 1212 f.

γινώσκω: compounds and forms, 82, 134, 210, 308, 324, 328, 330, 346, 1214; perf. redupl., 364; use of γνωστόν, 656; meaning, 827 f., 834, 904; aor. of, 843, 856; use, 871; plupf.=impf., 904; in or. obl., 1035 f., 1041; c. inf., 1062, 1103; c. part., 1103.

γινώσκει: meaning, 115; and ellipsis, 652, 1202.

γινωσκόμον: various readings, 204; formation, 166; accent, 231.

γνόστης: 151, 231.

γνωστός: 157.

γογγύζω: meaning, 80; formation, 150; form, 358, 363; constr., 853.

γογγυστής: 153.

Γολγοθά: spelling, 211; form, 105, 236, 259.

γονυ–: in comp., 164.

γονυπετέω: formation, 164; and case, 474.

γραφή: and πᾶς, 772.

γράφω: compounds and forms, 80, 346, 351, 406, 1214; γέγραφα, 358, 364; ἔγραψα, 845; ἔγραφα, 346; constr., 845 f., 853; in mod. Gk., 851; use, 875, 895; in or. obl., 1035 f.

γραφής: 168.


γυμνιτεύω: 148, 191.

γυμνότης: 156.

γυναικάριον: 155.
γυνή: and ellipsis, 652.

Δ

δ: 210, 240, 248.

–δ̄: inserted, 210 bis.

–δα: adv. end., 295.

δαμόνια: constr., 66, 404.

δάκρυ(ον): 262.

δάνειζω: voice of, 809.

δέ: elision, 207; origin, 301; c. art., 290, 694 f.; conj., 301, 428 f., 440, 443 f.;
postpositive, 424, 1188; δὲ καί, 122; c. ὃς, 695 f.; c. οὗτος, 705; c. ἐκάνος, 707;
antithetic, 750, 1145, 1153; c. έλι μή, 1025; c. negative, 1164; discussed, 1183–5;
adversative, 1186.

–δε: suffix, 296, 1211.

δῆ: form, 319; use, 880, 919 ff.; ἔδα, 886, 919; c. inf., 1058 (as subject), 1078, 1084 f.

δειγματίζω: 149.

δέκνυμι: use, 55, 135; compounds and forms, 174 f., 306 f., 311, 327, 1214.

δεικνύω: compounds and forms, 307, 311; in or. obl., 1035 f.

δένα: use, 292, 744.

δειπνέω: meaning, 80.

δεισιδαιμονία: 65, 81, 166.

δέκα: use, 282; in comp., 169, 283.

δεκατόω: 65, 149.


δέομαι: forms, 342; ἔδεσθα, 203, 342; c. abl. and acc., 519; c. obj.-inf., 1059.

δέον: use with ἔστι, 80, 881, 1130.
δέρω: constr., 477 bis, 485; forms of, 1214.
δέσμη: 231.
δέσμιος: 65 n.[Page 1257]
δέσμος: 262, 263 n.
δεσμοφύλαξ: 166.
δεῦρο: form, 299, 302, 328; use, 430, 931, 949, 1193.
δεύτερος: form, 299, 302; use, 328, 330, 430, 931, 949; in conditions, 1023.
δευτεραίοι: use, 298.
δεύτερος: adv., 460, 488.
δευτεροπρῶτος: 168.
δεύτερος: form, 277; ordinal, 283 f.; and ἐς, 671; ἐκ δευτέρου, 597.
δέχομαι: voice of, 813; compounds and forms, 1214.
δέο: δέο δεσμάς, 479, 482; pass. of, with acc., 486; compounds and forms, 342, 1214.
δή: use, 302, 443; discussed, 1149.
δηλ.-αυγῶς: 170.
δήλων: c. ὡς, 244, 1034.
διήλων: in or. obl., 1036.
δημόσιος: loc. form, 295; use, 691.
δήπου: use, 302.
διά: elision, 208; c. enclitic, 244; in comp., 164, 168, 476, 529, 558, 561, 563, 800, 827 f.; cases with, 491, 534, 565, 569 f.; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 557; c. verbs, 560; in condensation, 567; case-form, 570; discussed, 580–4; and κατά, 606; and ὑπέρ, 629; and ὑπό, 636; c. μέσον, 648; διά τί..., 244, 730, 739, 916, 1176; in prepositional phrases, 791; for agent, 820; c. inf., 584, 858, 891, 909, 966, 1060, 1069 f., 1091; c. τοῦτο, 965.
διαβαίνω: constr., 476, 800.
διαβάλλω: meaning, 80.

diαζώννυ: voice of, 810.

diαθήκη: 116.

diακονέω: 540.

diάκονος: 115.

diακρίνομαι: constr., 478.

diαλείπω: c. part., 1121.

diαμαρτύρομαι: constr., 484; in or. obl., 1035 f.

diανοίγω: in or. obl., 1035 f.

diαπαρατριβή: 165–6.

diαπλέω: 476.

diαπορεύομαι: 476.

diαπορέω: 472.

diασπάω: meaning, 564, 828.

diασπορά: 97, 151.

diάστημα: 151.

diαταγή: 151.

diαταγή: 151.

diατελέω: c. part., 1121.

diατηρέω: meaning, 828.

diατίθεμαι: 479.

diατρίβω: constr., 477.

diαφεύγω: meaning, 828; constr., 987.

diαφθείρω: 486.

didάσκω: 150; form, 331; constr., 474, 482 bis, 485, 486, 1083; voice of, 816; in or. obl., 1035 f.
δίδωμι: compounds and forms, 190, 306, 307 ff., 311, 324, 326 f., 335, 337, 347, 409, 876, 1044, 1214; δίδω, 311 n., 312, 335; διδῷ, 135, 307, 311; διδόσας, 82; ἐδίδετο, 190, 312; ἐδίδοσαν, 82, 312; ἐδοκα, 55; ἐδοσά, 309, 324, 348; δέδοκες, 82; δόθη, 326; δός, 329; constr., 855, 940, 983 f., 1032; use, 135, 905, 1062, 1080, 1135; δεξίαν δ., 83; =πιθέναι, 95, 102; in indirect command, 1047; δούναι, 1052, 1058, 1132.

διερμηνευτής: 166.

διερμηνία: 166.

διέρχομαι: constr., 472, 476, 477, 800, 869.

διηγέομαι: ὅτι with, 1032.

δισχυρίζομαι: in or. obl., 1036.

δικαιοκρίσια: 65, 166.

δικαιος: meaning, 80, 115, 174, 176; c. three endings, 273.

δικαιοσύνη: with subjective gen., 499; use, 781.

δικαιώ: 149, 174.

δίκη: 174.

διό: use, 132, 950.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ: reading, 200.

διόπερ: use, 1154.

ΔΙΟΣΚΟΡΟΣ: 199.

διότι: use, 80, 244, 430, 962, 964.

διπλότερον: form, 278, 299.

διπλοῦς: use, 284.

δίς: adv., 284; spelling, 296, 298, 300.

δισχύλιοι: use, 283.

δίχα: adv., 284. [Page 1258]

διχοτομέω: meaning, 80.
διψάω: formation, 147; aor. forms, 342; and case, 474, 508.
δογματίζω: formation, 149; voice of, 807.
δοκέω: constr., 541, 853, 1085.
δοκιμάζω: in or. obl., 1041; c. inf., 1085.
δοκίμων: 80, 126 n., 156, 158.
δόκιμος: 80.
δολόω: formation, 149; form, 336, 343.
–δον: adv. suffix, 295 f.
δόξα: 134, 148 n.
δοξάζω: aor. of, 837, 843, 847, 853.
δουλ–: in comp., 164.
δουλεύω: 473 n., 540.
δουλόω: constr., 540.
δράσσομαι: use, 474.
δύναμαι: augment ε– and η–, 368; compounds and forms of, 312, 340, 350, 351, 368, 1214; δόντι, 312, 314; voice of, 820; constr., 857; use, 879 f., 886, 920; c. inf., 1055 f., 1060, 1077 f.; c. τοῦ+inf., 1077; c. ἰνα, 1055–6; in John, 1078.
δύναμις: use, 176.
δυναμόω: formation, 149.
δυνατέω: formation, 147.
δύναιμαι: reading, 312.
δύνοω: intrans., 800; compounds and forms, 1214.
δύο: forms, 251, 282; δύο δύο Hebraism (?), 74, 91, 284, 673; δυσί, 72, 82, 251; and art., 769.
δύρομαι: spelling, 206.
δύσ—: in comp., 161 ff.

δύω: compounds and forms, 348, 1214.

δώδεκα: use, 282.

δωδεκά-φυλον: 166.

δῶδα: use, 65 n., 66, 80, 138; spelling, 200.

δωρεάν: 294, 298, 488.

Ε: short vowel, 178, 181 f.; vowel-changes with, 178, 183–91, 324; instead of ο, 308; inserted by analogy, 349; with Doric fut., 354; reduplication and augment, 363–7; voc. ending, 462 f.; prothetic, 1209.

ἐα: use, 302, 391, 1193.

ἐάν: form, 181, 190 f.; for ὣν, 72, 80, 83, 97, 181, 190 f.; ὣν for ἐάν, 190 f.; crasis, 208; constr., 220, 325, 850, 928, 967, 969, 1129; c. indic., 82, 325, 1009; and ὄστις, 727; and ὄσος, 733; and ὄσου, 969; use, 948, 968, 971, 1129; c. ὃς, 957, 959; ὃς ὣν (ἐάν) not=ἐάν τις, 961; c. ἑπεί, 965; in conditions, 1005–27.

ἐάνπερ: use, 1154.

ἐάντε—ἐάντε: use, 1189.

ἐαντού: form, 185, 226, 287; use, 287, 289, 687–90; for all three persons, 73, 97, 287–8; and ἰδιος, 691 f.; and art., 779; with mid. voice, 810.

ἐαω: ἔλασεν, 365; c. οὐκ, 1156; compounds and forms, 1214.

ἐβδομάς: 125.

ἐβραϊκός: 159.

ἐβραϊστί: form, 95, 205, 296, 298; use, 104, 106, 524.

ἐγγίζω: meaning, 81; formation, 149; constr., 623 f.; compounds and forms, 1214.

ἐγγύς: form, 248 n., 294, 298; in comparison, 298; constr., 538, 638; adjectival, 547; use, 549, 568, 639 f.

ἐγείρω: voice of, 799, 816, 817; usually trans., 799; use, 866, 896; gnomic, 866; c. εἴς, 482; ἐγείρθη intrans., 817; ἐγείρετο, 896; compounds and forms, 186, 1215.
ἐγκακέω: c. part., 1121.

ἐγκαλέω: constr., 511.

ἐγκομβόμαι: voice of, 808.

ἐγκρατεύομαι: 148, 478.

ἐγγρίω: 81, 232.

ἐγώ: crasis, 208; accent with enclitic, 230, 234 f., 286, 420; interchange with ἡμεῖς, 406; ἐγών old form of, 285, 466; discussed, 677 f.; enclitic forms of, 682, 1211; use, 685, 689, 693; and ἐκείνος, 707; and ἐκεῖνος, 746; position of µου, 779; use of ἡμῶν, 785; c. particles, 1148.

ἐδαφίζω: forms of, 1215.

ἐδίδοσαν: 82. [Page 1259]

ἐθελοθρησκία: 166.

ἐθελώ: form, 205 f.; use, 878, 886, 919.

ἐθίζω: εἰθισμένος, 364.

ἐθνικός: 158.

ἐθνικῶς: 160.

ἐθνικός ἐστίν: 1084.

ἐθνω: forms of, 358, 364, 1215; εἰωθα, 801.

ἐι: vowel-change, 187, 191–4, 195 f., 198, 204, 324, 367; = İzmir, 196, 238, 239; proper names in, 198.

ἐι: augment of, 367.

ἐι—: 2d pers. mid. ending, 339.

ἐι—and—in, 72.

ἐι: accent, 233 f., 244, 1211; and ὅτι, 430, 965; and οὗτος, 699 f.; and γάρ, 886, 940, 1003 f., 1020; use, 916, 928, 997, 1176; in interrogation, 122, 916; c. opt., 127; c. τις, 956; c. αὐτός, 962, 1011, 1160; c. µήν, 1004; c. µή, 1160; c. καί, 1026; in conditions, 1005–27, 1129; εἰ δοθήσεται σημείων, 94, 1024; in or. obl., 1030, 1045; proclitic, 1211.
–εία: ending, 152, 196 f., 326.

ειδέω: compounds and forms, 1215.

εἴδον: forms, 223 f., 325, 339, 344, 360, 366; no present, 344; εἴδαν, 339; perf. subj., 325, 360, 907, 983; use, 413 f., 437, 441, 892, 1135; in or. obl., 1041.

εἴδος: meaning, 80.

εἴδω: ἱμεν, ἱστε, ἱσαν, 87, 238–9, 319; perf. subj., 325, 360; εἴδυλα, 62; compounds and forms, 361, 906 f., 1215.

εἴδωλέον: 154.

εἴδολο-λατρεία: 161, 166.

εἴδολο-λατρεύω: 161.

–ειε: opt. end., 327, 335.

εἰθε: in wish constr., 886, 940, 1003 f.

–εικα: perf. end., 310.

εἰκή: 295.

Εἰκόνιον: spelling, 197.

εἰκοσι: form, 221, 283.

εἰκω: perf. ἔοικα, 124, 364, 895.

εἰκών θεοῦ: 97.

εἷλη-κρίνεια: 166, 223.

εἷ μῆ: use, 192 f., 747, 1011, 1014, 1016, 1024 f., 1160, 1169, 1187–8. Also see εἰ and μῆ.

εἷ μῆν: discussed, 80, 1150.

εἷμι: compounds and forms, 188, 194, 220, 232 ff., 312 f., 325, 327 f., 330, 337, 340, 350, 395, 908, 1215; εἷμαι, 145, 307, 312, 340; ἥσθα, 312, 337; ἥς, 337; ἢμην, 68, 312, 340; ἢμιθα, 312, 340; ἦν in papyri sometimes is subj. ἦ, 220, 313, 325; ἔστω, ἔστοσαν, 328; ἦτω, 82, 328; in periphrastic forms, 118, 122, 330, 860, 877 f., 887–90, 903, 906 ff., 950; constr., 330, 392 ff., 472, 481, 497, 545; c. nom., 457; c. gen., 497; c. dat., 457; inf. c. nom., 457; omission of, 395; c. εἰς, 95, 97,
ἔστιν: accent, 232 f.; compounds and forms, 313, 350, 396, 1215; use, 869, 881.

–ἐἶν: inf. ending, 342, 370.

–ἐαν: inf. ending, 249, 370, 388; pluperf. ending, 339, 361.

–ἐινος: ending, 197.

–ἐινος: ending, 197.

εἰπέρ: use, 1154.


εἰπον: accent, 229, 231, 329; augment, 368; no present, 345; forms of, 327, 329, 338, 345 f., 363, 368; εἰπα, 55, 61, 73, 338 bis, 346; εἰπέ, 327, 329, 338; redupl., 363 bis; constr., 480, 484, 626, 902; c. pred. acc., 480, 484; c. subj. in question, 930; c. ὁτι, 1035; c. πρὸς αὐτόν, 626; and λέγω, 838, 883; use, 930; in or. obl., 1048.

εἰρηνεῖο: constr., 486.

εἰρήνη: Hebraic use, 95, 105, 115; εἰρήνην δίδοναι, 105.

εἰρηνο–: in comp., 164.

εἰς: spelling, 187; meaning, 80, 389, 449, 561; in idiom, 401; case with, 451, 481, 484, 491, 524, 535, 569 f.; [Page 1260] in mod. Gk., 453, 535, 557; Semitic influence, 457 f.; c. verbs, 469, 481, 540, 542, 559 ff., 562, 566; in “pregnant construction,” 525, 1204; in adv. phrases, 550; frequency, 556; in LXX, 481; c. pred. acc., 481 f.; εἰς ἄνθρωπον, 91, 528; εἰς τί..., 739; rather than διά, 582; and ἔν, 97, 123, 449, 453, 584 ff.; discussed, 591–6; and παρά, 613; and πρός, 624, 626; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. inf., 658, 858 (aor.), 891 (pres.), 909 and 1072 (perf.), 990 f., 997, 1001 ff., 1060, 1069–72, 1088, 1090; c. subst. and adj., 1072; reading, 862; anarthrous, 1070; proclitic, 1211.

εἰς: root of, 145; and οὐ, 232, 751; indeclinable use, 282 f.; supplanting τίς, 83, 292; case, 460; and πρός, 671; εἰς καθ ἐν, 105, 450, 460; καθ ἐν, 292, 294, 450, 460; τό καθ ἐν, 487; ἐξ ἕμοιν, 675; as indef. art., 674, 796; equal to τίς, 675, 744; distributive, 675; and ὡς, 747; antithetic, 750.

–ἐἰς: nom. and acc. plural ending, 265.

–ἐἰς =ἐντ-ς in aor. pass. part., 373.
εἰσέρχομαι: constr., 855.

εἰσπορεύομαι: voice of, 806; use, 880.

ατε: use, 300, 429.

ατε: ετε—ατε, 1025, 1045, 1179, 1189.


α τις θέλει: 961.

ἐκ: in comp., 163 f., 168, 170, 215, 828; c. τούτου, 444; c. verbs, 510, 517 f.; for “partitive gen.,” 515, 519; case with, 534, 570; in adv. phrases, 548, 550; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 558; use, 561; c. ἀπό, 575, 577; discussed, 596–600; and παρά, 614; and ὑπό, 636; for agent, 820; c. inf., 1061, 1073; proclitic, 1211.

ἐκαστος: use, 61, 292; discussed, 745 f.; c. plu. verb, 746; c. ας, 746; and art., 745, 769; and πας, 771.


ἐκατόν: use, 283.

ἐκβάλλω: voice of, 803; use, 880.

ἐκδύω: c. two acc., 483.

ἐκει: and aphaeresis, 206; loc. form, 249, 295; meaning, 299; constr., 443, 548; as root, 706; use, 969.

ἐκείθεν: 300.

ἐκεῖνος: Ionic κεῖνος, 206, 706; use in John, 134, 290; meaning and use, 693; resumptive, 698, 707; ἐκεῖνης in Luke, 494; and ὑπερφ, 707 f.; and οὗτος, 702 f., 707; discussed, 289 n., 706–9; and art., 770.

ἐκεῖσε: form, 296; meaning, 299; constr., 548; and ὅπου, 722.

ἐκζήτησις: 152.

ἐκκακέω: 65.

ἐκκλησία: meaning, 97, 115, 130; absent in John’s Gospel, 134; origin, 174.

ἐκκρέμαμαι: form, 340.

ἐκλογθάω: constr., 509.
ἐκλέγωμαι: constr., 480; voice of, 808, 810 f.
ἐκλεκτός: meaning, 115; accent, 231; forms, 273.
ἐκμυκτηρίζω: 65.
ἐκπίπτω: voice of, 802.
ἐκπλέω: form, 342.
ἐκπορνεύω: c. acc., 486.
ἐκτένεια: 80, 166.
ἐκτινάσσω: use, 65 n.; meaning, 80; voice of, 810.
ἐκτός: use, 80, 296, 300, 640, 1025.
ἐκφεύγω: constr., 476; meaning, 828.
ἐκχέω: forms, 213, 342, 352.
ἐκών: formation, 157 n.; three end., 274; use, 298, 373.
ἐλάσσων: form, 72, 218, 277 f.; constr., 484 f.; adv., 488.
ἐλάττων: 72, 218.
ἐλαύνω: compounds and forms, 1215.
ἐλαφρία: 156.
ἐλάχιστος: form, 278 f., 669; double superlative, 278, 670.
ἐλεάω: forms of, 184, 342.
ἐλεέω: forms of, 342; transitive, 474.
ἐλεημοσύνη: 65, 156.[Page 1261]
ἐλεινός: 204.
ἔλεος: 261, 262 n.

ἐλεύθερος: meaning, 662.

ἔλιγμα: accent, 230.

ἔλκω: compounds and forms, 1215; ἐλκωμένος, 364.

ἐλληνίζω: 150, 153.

ἐλληνιστής: 153.

Ἐλληνιστί: form, 160, 296, 298; use, 104.

ἐλλογέω: formation, 148, 184; forms, 342.

ἐλπίζω: meaning, 115, 125; aspiration of, 223 f.; forms, 338; constr., 476; use, 877, 884, 1080, 1082.

ἐλπίς: meaning, 115; ἐφ’ ἐλπίδι, 72, 224.

ἐλοῖ: 105, 205, 236.

–εμα: ending, 188.

ἐμαυτοῦ: use, 287, 687–90.

ἐμβαίνω: forms, 328.

ἐμβατεύω: 65 n., 164.

ἐμβριμάμαι: forms, 341.

ἐμμέσω: assimilation of, 1210.

ἐμός: statistics, 69; ἐμοῦ compared with μου, 234, 286; use, 69, 134, 288, 496, 684; “case” of ἐμοί, 447; ἐμοὶ with ἔν, 588; ἐμοῦ, 682; with αὐτός, 687; and art., 770.

ἐμπορεύομαι: transitive, 474.

ἐμπροσθεν: use, 300, 621, 640.

ἐμφυτος: 124.

ἔν: c. inf., 91, 107, 122, 431, 490, 587, 858, 891, 978 f., 1042, 1062, 1069, 1072 f., 1092; ἐν τῷ c. inf., 91, 95, 107, 107 n., 122, 587; ἐν τῷ c. inf. in Luke, 91, 95, 107, 107 n., 122, 431, 587, 1042, 1062, 1092; in LXX, 452; assimilation, 216 f.; accent, 229, 1211; meaning, 80, 449; and case, 451, 484 f., 520, 522–5, 527, 531,
533 ff., 554, 569 f., 721; frequent use, 452 f., 556; in mod. Gk., 557; c. μέσω, 505, 521, 1210; c. verbs, 510, 540, 559 f., 562; case-form, 524, 570; in “pregnant construction,” 525, 548, 559, 585, 592; in comp., 164, 542; as adverb, 554 f., 585; in adv. phrases, 550; origin, 555; discussed, 584–90; instrumental, 73, 91, 95, 102, 452, 525–34, 589; locative, 520, 522–5, 527, 531; agent, 534; place, 586; time, 586; accompanying circumstance, 588; sphere, 589; repetition, 566–7; ἐν τοῖς, 83; ἐν κυρίῳ, 587; ἐν Χριστῷ, 587; and εἰς, 453, 484, 520, 525, 559, 569, 585, 591–3; and ἐκ, 599; and ἐπί, 600; and ὑπό, 636; in prepositional phrases, 792, 978; c. ὃ, 963; proclitic, 1211; statistics, 556, 572, 586–7, 801, 858, 1069.

ἐν: accent, 232.


–ἐναι: inf. ending, 370.

ἐναντι: 80; form, 170; use, 639 f.

ἐναντίον: form, 170; use, 573, 639 f.

ἐνατος: 213.

ἐνδείκνυμι: reading, 946.

ἐνδεκα: use, 282.

ἐνδεςις: 57.

ἐνδιδύσκω: use, 80; formation, 150; acc. c. pass. of, 485; voice of, 810.

ἐνδόμησις: 152.

ἐνδομα: 151.

ἐνδύω: c. two acc., 483; acc. c. pass. of, 485; voice of, 809.

ἐνδυόμησις: spelling, 152, 201.

ἐνδρεύω: meaning, 80; and case, 474.

ἐνδρον: 166.

ἐνεκα: origin, 249; position, 301, 425, 641; use, 641; c. inf., 1060.

ἐνεκε: spelling, 183, 187; aspiration, 225; position, 425; use, 55, 641; c. τοῦ+inf., 1073, 1091.

ἐνεργέω: transitive, 455; c. acc., 476; meaning, 564.
ἐνθάδε: meaning, 299; use, 548.
ἐνκακέο: formation, 164; use, 1102.
ἐννέα: use, 282.
ἔνορκίζω: constr., 484, 1085.
ἔνοχος: meaning, 80; constr., 504, 535, 537; c. gen., 504; c. dat., 504, 537; c. εἰς, 535.
–ἐντ–: part. ending, 373.
ἐνταῦθα: use, 299.
ἐνταφιάζω: 147.
ἐνταφιασμός: 152.[Page 1262]
ἐντέλλομαι: c. dat., 1084; c. inf., 1068.
ἐντεῦθεν: 300.
ἐντός: use, 296, 300, 641.
ἐντρέπω: c. acc., 65 n., 455, 473, 484.
ἐντροπή: 82.
ἐντυγχάνω: 80.
ἔξ: form, 215; in mod. Gk., 557; in comp., 170; c. verbs, 558; cases with, 568; in prepositional phrases, 792; proclitic, 1211.
ἔξαγοράζω: voice of, 810.
ἔξακολουθέω: 148.
ἔξανάστασις: 166.
ἔξαντῆς: 170 bis.
ἐξειμί: forms, 314, 339.
ἐξέραμα: 153.
ἐξέρχομαι: 473 n.
ἐξέστι: constr., 491, 1084 f.
ἐξηγέομαι: meaning, 829.
ἐξῆσεν: 87, 339.
ἐξή: adv., 296; constr., 547.
ἐξιστάνω: voice of, 806.
ἐξολεθρεῖο: 148.
ἐξομολογέω: forms, 188; c. ὅτι, 965.
ἐξόν: use, 1130.
ἐξορκίζω: constr., 475.
ἐξορκιστής: 153.
ἐξουθενέω: 149.
ἐξουθενόω: 149.
ἐξουθενέω: spelling, 219; forms, 342; constr., 853.
ἐξουσία: 115, 134 n., 148 n.
ἐξουπνίζω: 149.
ἐξω: adj. stem, 160; form, 296, 301; use, 300, 642.
ἐξωθεν: use, 296, 300, 548, 642.
ἐξώτερος: formation, 160, 278, 298; meaning, 662.
ἐοικα: intransitive, 801.
ἐορτή: c. ἐν, 523.
ε-εος: in contraction, 274.
ἐπαγγελία: 125, 479.
ἐπαγγέλλω: constr., 479, 1036.

ἐπαισχύνομαι: and case, 472, 485; trans., 473.

ἐπαιτέω: 65 n.

ἐπακοῦο: constr., 507.

ἐπάνω: use, 971.

ἐπαναστάτωμαι: voice of, 819.

ἐπάνω: use, 642, 666.

ἐπάνωθεν: use, 637.

ἐπεί: use, 132, 954, 963, 965, 971, 1025 ff.; not relative, 954.

ἐπειδή: use, 965, 971.

ἐπειδήπερ: use, 965, 1154.

ἐπεικῶς: 204.

ἐπείπερ: use, 1154.

ἐπείτα: use, 300, 549.

ἐπέκεινα: accent, 232, 244; use, 642.

ἐπεκτείνω: voice of, 807.

ἐπέρχομαι: transitive, 455.

ἐπέχω: meaning, 477, 828; ὅτι with, 1032.


ἐπὶ: in comp., 164 f.; elision, 223; ἐφ , 223–4; ἐφ ἐλπίδι, 224; cases with, 451, 491, 524, 565, 568 ff.; case-form, 524, 570; in “pregnant construction,” 525; c. verbs, 540, 542, 559 ff., 562, 566; in adv. phrases, 550; frequency, 556; meaning, 561; and ἐγ, 596; discussed, 600–5; and κατά, 607; and πρός, 625; c. ὅσων, 733, 963; ἐφ ὥστε not in N. T., 963, 1000, 1055, 1088, 1088 n.; ἐφ ὡ, 963; in prepositional phrases, 792, 963, 978; ἐπὶ τῷ+inf. in papyri, 909; c. inf., 1069, 1071.

ἐπιβαλών: 80.
ἐπιγινώσκω: meaning of, 827; use, 125, 909; in or. obl., 1035, 1042.
ἐπιγράφω: use, 1135.
ἐπιδείκνυμι: voice of, 810.
ἐπιδεικνύω: in or. obl., 1036.
ἐπίθεμα: spelling, 188.
ἐπιθυμέω: and cases, 472, 473 n., 474, 508.
ἐπικαλέω: voice of, 809.
ἐπικατάρατος: 80.
ἐπιλανθάνομαι: constr., 472, 473 n., 509; c. inf., 1060.
ἐπιλησις: abl. use, 514.
ἐπιμαρτύρομαι: in or. obl., 1035, 1036.
ἐπιμελέομαι: constr., 509; voice of, 820.[Page 1263]
ἐπιμένω: use, 850; c. part., 1121.
ἐπιούσιος: meaning, 80; origin, 159.
ἐπιπόθεια: 152.
ἐπιπόθησις: 152, 168.
ἐπισείω: 65 n.
ἐπίσκοπος: 80, 115.
ἐπίσταμαι: forms, 224, 314, 328, 340; in or. obl., 1035, 1041.
ἐπιστάτα: 122.
ἐπιστάτης: 151.
ἐπιστέλλω: meaning, 66; epistolary aor. of, 845; c. inf., 1068.
ἐπιστρέφω: meaning, 115; constr., 856; use, 948.

ἐπισυνάγω: 160, 486.

ἐπισυναγωγή: 80, 166.

ἐπιτάσσω: constr., 542, 1084.

ἐπιτίθη: σοί, 477; ἐπί, 560.

ἐπιτιμάω: accent, 232; constr., 542.

ἐπιτρέπω: constr., 1084.

ἐπινυγώ: constr., 473 n., 509.

ἐπιφαινώ: form, 341, 349, 371 (–φανεί). Lýra

ἐπιφάνεια: 81.

ἐπιφανής: 81.

ἐπίφανης: 81.

ἐπιχορηγέω: 81, 164, 166.

ἐπτά: use, 282; cardinal, 673.

ἐπτάκις: use, 281, 298, 300.

ἐπω: constr., 473; ἐρηκα, 364, 899, 902; ἐρήκει, 905; compounds and forms, 342, 349, 1215.

ἐραυνάω: compounds and forms, 184, 329.

ἐργάζομαι: augment, 367; constr., 474, 484; meaning, 564; compounds and forms, 1215; ἐργασμένος, 364.


ἐργον: ἔργα, 115; breathing, 223.

ἐρημός: form, 231, 272 f.

ἐριθεία: 152, 231.

ἐρις: form, 265 bis, 267.

ἐρμηνεύω: use of part., 1135.
ἔρχομαι: constr., 313, 478 f., 538; compounds and forms of, 327 f., 800 f., 1215; ἥρ., 82, 97; ἥρ., σαν, 68, 97; ἐλθότο, 328; ἐλθότο, 327; ἐλήλυθα, 363, 801, 905; constative aor. of, 833; use, 869, 904, 905, 948; periphrastic use, 118; futuristic sense, 869; ἐλθοῦσα, 1105; use of part., 1118.

ἔρωτάω: meaning, 66, 80, 90; compounds and forms, 184, 341, 1215; ἤρώτου, 63, 184, 341; constr., 482; in papyri, 90; in indirect command, 1046.

–ς: ending in mod. Gk., 138; acc. pl., 62, 63, 82, 139, 184, 266; perf. and aor., 82, 337.

ἔσθιο: compounds and forms, 204, 340, 1215; φάγομαι, 324, 354, 813; φάγεσαι, 340; meaning, 564; stems of, 823.

ἔσθω: compounds and forms of, 204, 353 f., 1215.


ἔσπερινός: 158.

ἔσχατος: form, 279 f., 669; and art., 769, 775.

ἔσχατος: use, 299, 546, 799.

ἔσω: use, 187, 231 n., 300, 642.

ἔσωθεν: use, 300, 505, 548, 643.

ἔσωτερος: 160, 278.

ἔταξο: 143.

ἔταίρος: use, 186, 725.

ἔτεις: 143.

ἐτερο—: in comp., 164, 168.

ἐτεροδιδασκαλέω: 115, 164.

ἐτεροζυγέω: form, 330.

ἔτερος: form, 277; use, 292; and ὀλλος, 746 f.; discussed, 748–50; and art., 775 f.

–της: suffix, 231.

ἕτοιμος: accent, 231; form, 272; c. inf., 1068, 1077.

Ετος: form, 268; καθ. Ετος, 223–4; c. έν, 523.

Ετυμολογία: 143.

Ετυμος: 143.

Εν: vowel-changes, 198, 201f.

Εῦ—: verbs begin. with, 367 bis.

Εὖ: in comp., 164, 367; adv., 299; c. πράσσω, 1121.

Εὐαγγελίζω: meaning, 115, 125, 134; augment, 367; reduplication, 365; constr., 474, 483; trans. and intrans., 799; in or. obl., 1035 f.; compounds and forms of, 1215.

Εὐαγγέλιον: 115, 133, 134.

Εὐαγγελιστής: 115, 153.[Page 1264]

Εὐάρέστος: 80, 168.

Εὖγε: use, 299.

Εὐγενής: form, 272.

Εὐδαιμονία: 156.

Εὐδία: case of, 460.

Εὐδοκέω: meaning, 81; trans., 473 n., 474; compounds and forms of, 164, 837, 842, 1215.

Εὐθέως: use, 549.

Εὐθυ—: in comp., 164, 296.

Εὐθύ(ς): form, 294, 296; use, 549; c. part., 1124, 1139.

Εὐκαρέω: 81.

Εὐλογέω: and case, 473.

Εὐλογία: 53 n.

Εὐνοέω: forms, 330.
εὐοδόω: form, 325 n., 343.
εὐπερίστατος: 133.
εὐπροσωπέω: 80, 148, 164.
εὐρακύλων: 108, 166.
εὐρίσκοι: 150; compounds and forms, 327, 338, 360, 1215; εὐρέ, 327; aspiration, 225; voice of, 809; use, 873, 883, 893, 1103, 1122, 1135; in or. obl., 1035, 1041.
–εύς: ending, 272.
εὐσεβής: form, 272.
εὐσχήμων: 80.
εὐφραίνω: 150.
εὐχαριστέω: meaning, 66, 80; voice of, 474; c. ὅτι, 965.
εὐχαριστία: 81.
εὐχομαι: use, 886, 919.
–εύω: verbs in, 147 ff., 152.
ἐφισθά: 105, 215.
Ἐφεσος: form, 295.
ἐφίστημι: form, 328.
ἐ(α)φνίδιος: form, 272.
ἐχθές: 206.
ἐχω: compounds and forms, 200 f., 206, 319, 338, 346, 367, 870, 897, 900 f., 1215; εἵχοσαν, 63, 73, 82, 336, 887, 921; ἔσχα, 73; εἵχον, 68, 73, 339; σχές, 329; ἔσχον, 823; ἔσχηκα, 364, 900; intrans., 799; intrans. in its compounds, 800, 802, 815, 828; aspiration, 223; periphrastic forms, 330, 360; in Rev., 414, 441; in anacolutha, 439; ἔχει impersonal, 457; constr., 477, 480, 487, 508, 789, 838, 843, 850; c. pred. acc., 480–1; c. adv., 299, 546, 799; voice of, 799 f., 809, 815; c. κακῶς, 802, 815; stems of, 823; meaning, 828; use, 879, 902, 906, 930, 946, 1122; ἔχον, 135, 881, 1106, 1122, 1126 f., 1134 f., 1202; “Latinism,” 108, 1034.
–ἐω: verbs in, 147 ff., 184, 203, 341 ff., 351; confused with –ἀω, 73, 82, 184, 341 f.
ἕως: use, 80, 297, 550, 643, 674, 953, 975 f.; in phrases, 550, 792; c. κάτω, 297, 550, 643; c. ὅτι, 291, 729, 975–6; c. πότε, 643; c. ἄν, 976; preposition, 643, 674, 792, 975; adv., 643, 1075; conjunction, 953, 975 f.; c. inf. (ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν), 975, 979, 1060, 1070, 1074, 1092.

ἕωτοῦ: Ionic, 203.

Ϝ: 365.

Ϝίδιος: 289.

Ζ: 218, 240.

ζάος: formation, 147; constr., 479; compounds and forms, 194, 341 f., 1215; future, 356, 813, 889; voice of, 807; meaning, 833 f.; ζήν, 341; ζῶν, 1105.

ζεστός: use, 1097.

ζεύγνυμι: compounds and forms, 314.

ζευκτηρία: 157.

ζηλευόμαι: 148.

ζῆλος: 261, 262 n.

ζηλόω: forms, 148, 203, 342; ζηλοῦτε, 203, 325, 342.

ζημιόω: acc. c. pass., 485.

Ζηνᾶς: 172 bis.

ζητέω: c. inf., 1038, 1078; c. ἴνα, 1078.

ζζώννυμι: 311; compounds and forms, 314, 1215.
ζωννύω: compounds and forms, 314, 1215.

ζωοποιέω: 82, 164.

ζωοποιηθείς: use, 1114.

Η: breathing, 222.

η: origin, 178; long vowel, 178, 182, 191, 240; vowel-changes with, 184, 187, 191–6, 324, 341, 361; η=ι, 191, 192 n., 238–9; η and ει, 192, 240, 324; η and υ, 195; nom. end., 267; after ε, ι, ρ, 274; augment, 286, 368; in fut. pass., 356; in 2d aor., 340.

ἣ: use, 406, 412, 427, 432, 661, 663, 666, 789, 1158; “or,” 406, 427, 666, 789, 1158; “than,” 616, 661, 663 (οδύλλων ἰ), 666, 789 (μοδύλλων ἰ); after comparative, 666; and παρά, 616; in interrogation, 917; ἰ τίς, 917; in mod. Gk., 1146; in comp., 1150; in double questions, 1177; discussed, 1188 f.

ἡ: use, 1150.


η: vowel-changes, 194 f., 198, 324; η=ι, 239; η=οί, 326; in aor. subj. and fut. ind., 193; iota subscript, 194.

ἡγέομαι: meaning, 80; constr., 480, 481; in or. obl., 1036, 1041.

ἡδή: position, 423; constr., 546; use, 1146.

ἡδιστα: form, 294; meaning, 670; adv., 488.

ἡδύ-οσμος: 166.

ηι: vowel-changes, 193 f.


ἡκω: compounds and forms, 337, 358, 907, 1215; perf. sense but pres. form, 337, 358, 865, 869, 893; ἵγα, 82.

ἡλεί: 95, 105.

ἡλικία: 80.

ἡλίκος: use, 291 f., 710, 741; discussed, 733 f.

ἡλιος: gender of, 252.

 pktéra: Hebraic use, 95; gen. use, 295, 497; loc. use, 522; gen.-abl. of, 256; and ellipsis, 652, 1202.

 pktéra kai nuktoi: 495.

 pktěro: form, 277; use, 286, 288, 684.

 -h: form, 192, 1024; use, 1150.

 -mi-: prefix, 161, 163.

 pktīν: form, 199, 274 f.; c. art., 775.

 -mion: 204.

 -ην: noun end., 256; acc. sing. of adj. in –ν, 62, 72, 97; verb end., 347, 349; in 2d aor. pass., 340, 347, 349.

 -ην: inf. end., 343.

 -ηνα: adverbs, 349.

 -ήνη: suffix, 151.

 -vika: 301; use, 300, 971.

 pktper: disputed reading, 633; use, 1154.

 -premos: 159.

 Hrōdōi: gen.-abl. of, 255; and art., 760.

 Hrōdianoi: 110, 155.

 -ης: adj. in, 272; suffix, 296.

 -ης: proper names, 172, 214, 255; gen.-abl. end., 255, 256, 295.


 -sdomai: constr., 479; forms, 1216.

 -sso: form, 218, 277.

 -suvxia: 80.

 -sucho: form, 272.
ἤτοι: use, 1154.

ἤττάομαι: form, 341, 1216; meaning, 865.

生产总: 153, 218.

ἡ: vowel-changes, 205.

Θ: consonant, 222.

–Θ—: verb-stem, 353.


–Θα: ending, 337.

–Θαι: inf. end., 370.

Θάλασσα: constr., 794.

Θαλάσσιος: 159.

Θάλπω: 65 n.

Θάνατος: meaning, 115; use, 784, 794.

Θανατωθείς: use, 1114.

Θάπτω: compounds and forms, 1216.[Page 1266]

Θαρρέω: in anacolutha, 440, 1135; constr., 474.

Θάρσος: spelling, 217.

Θαυμάζω: various readings, 188; constr., 474, 532, 965; use, 879; 0. θαύμα, 478; 0. εἰ, 965; aorists, 818; compounds and forms, 1216.

Θέλω: aorists, 818; meaning, 829, 893 f.

Θεατρίζω: 149.

Θέαω: 116.

Θειότης: 65.

Θέλημα: 151.
θέλησις: 151.

θέλω: form, 205 f.; augment, 368; in mod. Gk., 353; constr., 353, 391, 430, 431, 551, 857, 878; for fut., 67; use, 919, 923 f., 933; as auxiliary verb, 1056; θέλω ἵνα, 431, 933, 1046, 1055–6; οὗ θέλω, 1093; in or. obl., 1036; in indirect command, 1046; c. inf., 551, 1038, 1055 f., 1060, 1078, 1093; c. aor. inf., 878; inf. of, 1058 f.; in John, 1078.

θέμα: spelling, 153, 200.

θεμέλιον: 80, 262, 263 n.

θεμέλιον: formation, 149; form, 1212.

–θεν: suffix, 250 n., 296, 300.

–θεντ–: in aor. pass. part., 373.

θεο: in comp., 168.

θεόπνευστος: 65, 168.

θεός: gender of, 252, 253; double decl., 257; vocative of, 261, 261 n., 463, 465; θεός, 463; reading, 477; use of gen., 499 f., 516; abl. of, 514; meaning, 116 bis, 768; and art., 758, 761, 780, 786, 795; omitted, 1202.

θεόφιν: form, 269.

θέτω: in mod. Gk., 149.

θεωρέω: durative meaning, 80, 838; in John, 134 n.; impf. of, 843; in or. obl., 1032, 1035, 1041.

–θη–: aor. suffix, 332, 357.


–θην: aor. pass. end., 334, 340, 347.

θηριο: in comp., 164.


θησαυρίζω: constr., 853.


–Θ: imper. suffix, 328.
θιγγάω: constr., 508.
ολίβω: class, 351; use of part., 1135.
θλίψις: accent, 230.
θνήσκο: compounds and forms of, 319, 1216; meaning, 345, 827, 845, 893; use of
inf., 1030.
θνητός: use, 1097.
θορυβέω: aor. of, 851.
θησεία: 124, 231.
θησκός: 124, 231.
θριμβέω: meaning, 81, 108; formation, 148; constr., 474; voice of, 800.
θυγάτριον: 118.
θυμάω: 150.
θυμός: 151.
θυσιαστήριον: 138.
–θῶ: subj. end., 310.
–θω: verbs in, 149, 353.

I

ι: vowel-changes with, 187 f., 191 f., 195–9, 204 f., 207, 230, 237; ἵ, 205; loc. end.,
249, 452, 520, 1067; class of verbs, 351, 363; in reduplication, 363; in augment,
366 f.; dat. end., 520; prothetic, 1209.

ι–: verbs begin. with, 367.

–ί: adv. suffix, 296, 452.


–ιανός: suffix, 155.

ἵαομαι: fut., 819; voice of, 819; compounds and forms, 232, 1216; aorists, 818.

–ιας: gen. end., 259.
–ιάω: verbs in, 150, 351.

ιδε: accent, 231; adv., 302; interj., 328, 391; ιδε, 327, 328.

ιδίος: compared with, ούτος, 62, 80, 83, 134, 287, 289; ιδίαν with κατά, 223–4, 609; discussed, 691 f.; and art., 770.

ιδού: adv. and interj., 302; καί ιδού, 120, 122, 396; in elliptical sentences, 391, 396; case with, 413, 441, 460; c. nom., 460; use, 1193.

ιδω: forms, 1216.

Ἱερᾶ Πόλει: declension, 257.

ἱερατεία: 152.

ἱεράτευμα: 153.

ἱερατεύω: 80, 148.

ἱερός: 115.

ἱερός: spelling, 223, 225.

Ἱεροσόλυμα: spelling of, 225; gender of, 253, 257; and art., 760; use, 120, 253, 253 n., 257, 263.

ἱερουργέω: form, 204; constr., 474.

Ἱερουσαλήμ: use, 120, 253.

ἱεροσόνη: spelling, 156, 201.


–ιζω: verbs in, 147, 149 ff., 351 f., 355; fut. of, 355.

ιη: in opt., 326.


Ἱησοῦς: form, 263; and art., 760.


ικανῶ: constr., 480.

ικνέομαι: compounds and forms, 1216.
Ἰκόνιον: spelling, 197.

–ικός: words in, 158 f.; three terminations, 273; constr. of words in, 504.

ἵλασκομαι: constr., 474.

ἵλαστήριον: 80, 154, 157.

ἵλεως: spelling, 62; meaning, 80; reading, 260; form, 272.

ἵματιζο: 80, 149.

ἵματιον: meaning, 408; and ellipsis, 1202.

ἵματισμός: 152.


ἵνα: in John, 24, 64, 69, 74, 82, 134, 138, 1055, 1077; rather than inf., 111, 371, 996, 1054 f., 1071, 1077; use, 120, 244, 393 f., 400, 430 f., 584, 907 f., 928 f., 933, 935, 940, 943, 950, 960 f., 980, 1054 f., 1087 f.; ἰνα πληρωθῇ, 120; c. pres. indic., 325; ἰνα μὴ c. indic., 127, 194, 984, 1169; c. fut. indic., 127, 194; = an auxiliary, 933; constr., 201, 203, 292, 325, 330, 850; origin, 249, 301; c. οὖτος, 699; c. μή, 134, 983–4, 987, 995, 1169; ἰνα clause as subject, 393, 430, 992; in apposition clauses, 1078; in final clauses, 981–5, 991–4; non-final, 1072; ἰνα τί, 244, 739, 916; and ὅπως, 983–4, 987, 1002; and ὅτι, 1032, 1049, 1055, 1056; in indirect command, 1046 f.; and ὄλλα, 1187; and ellipsis, 1202; statistics in N. T., 985.

–ινος: suffix, 158, 197.

–ιον: ending, 154–6, 197, 273; dimin. end., 66.

Ἰόππη: spelling, 214.

–ιω: ending, 159, 197, 273, 276.

Ἰονδαίζο: 150.

Ἰονδαϊκῶς: 160, 205.

Ἰονδαίος: 95.


–ις: ending, 261, 296.


ίσθι: 328, 330.

–ίσκω: verb suffix, 869.

ίσμεν: 87, 238–9, 319.

ίσο−: in comp., 168.

ίσος: accent, 231.

 Ipsum: and art., 760.

–ίσσα: suffix, 155.

ίστάνω: 316.

ίστάω: compounds and forms, 316.

ίστε: 87, 238–9, 319, 329, 360, 941.

ίστημι: compounds and forms, 225, 231, 305, 306, 310, 315 f., 319 f., 346, 359, 366, 1212, 1216; ἵστω, 307; ἵστη, 327; ἴστην, 346–8, 800, 817; ἴστάθην, 817; ἴστακα, 320, 359; ἴστηκα, 320, 358–9, 364, 895; (ἐ)ἰστήκειν, 366; ἴστῶς, ἴστηκώς, 320, 734 f.; voice of, 800, 817.

ίστορέω: 80.

–ιστος: ending, 276 ff.

ίσχύς: 148 n., 231.

ίσχύω: 351; constr., 478.


Τουραία: c. art., 788.

ίχθυδίον: 155.

–ιῶ: fut. in, 355.

Τούνης: forms, 194, 214, 255, 258.

–ίων: ending, 276 f.

Τωσῆς: form, 263, 268.
Ἰωσήφ: and art., 761.
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κ: 216, 223, 346 f., 358 f., 1210; in perf., 358.


καθάίρω: compounds and forms, 1216.

καθάπερ: use, 967, 1154.

καθαρίζω: meaning, 80; formation, 150; augment of, 1209; compounds and forms, 183, 183 n., 1216.

καθαρός: 80.

καθέξοµαι: forms and other compounds, 1216.


καθε: 68.

καθεξής: 171.

καθηγητής: 138.

καθήκω: use, 886.


καθηµερινός: 158.

καθίζω: use, 866; compounds and forms, 1216.

καθίστηµι: constr., 480, 481, 486.

καθό: use, 967; c. ἐάν, 967.

καθότι: use, 722, 963, 967; c. ἃν, 967.


καθός: use, 433, 963, 968; in or. obl., 1045.

καθώσπερ: use, 968, 1154.
καί: crasis, 208, 984; use, 94, 133, 134, 135, 393, 426–9, 432, 443 f., 680, 947 f., 951, 1041, 1136, 1188; δὲ καί, 122; καί ἵνα, 120, 122; καί αὐτός, –ῆ, 122; καί = ὅτι, 393, 426; καί = ‘and yet,’ 426; καί ταῦτα, 1129, 1140; c. αὐτοῖ, 441; c. τοῦτο, 460, 487, 1140; c. καί, 427, 566; c. numerals, 672; c. art., 694 f., 724; and οὖν, 705; with several attributives, 785–9; and ὡς, 968; correlative, 969; in concessive clauses, 1026; in or. obl., 1047; c. γε, 1129, 1140; in mod. Gk., 1146; c. negatives, 1164, 1173; discussed, 1179–83.

καινός: meaning, 80, 176.

καίπερ: use, 431, 1129; c. part., 1124, 1129, 1140.

καιρός: form and meaning, 522 f.

καίτοι: use, 1129, 1140, 1154.

καίτοιγε: use, 1129, 1154.

καίω: meaning, 828; compounds and forms, 185, 350, 352, 1216.

κακ–: in comp., 164.

κακοί: 208.

κακεῖνος: crasis, 208.

κακολογέω: and case, 473.

κακοπάθεια: 80, 156.

κακόω: ὁ κακός ὁσίων, 127; c. inf., 1068.

κακῶς ἔχειν: 546, 799.

καλέω: meaning, 115; constr., 478, 480; as copula, 394, 457; c. pred. acc., 480, 485; use, 485, 885; imperf. tense, 885; καλέσω, 349, 355; compounds and forms, 349, 355, 907 f., 1216.

καλλιον: form, 277 f.; meaning, 665.

κάλλιον: in compounds, 164, 166.

καλός: meaning, 661; c. infinitive, 1084; καλὸν c. ἐμί, 276, 886, 1084.

καλύπτω: class, 353.


κάμηλος: 95, 192.
καμμόω: 204.
κόμνο: c. part., 1121; forms of, 1216.
κάνω: 208, 984, 1025.
καραδοκέω: 164.
καρδία: instr., 487; loc., 523.
καρτερέω: forms of, 833; c. part., 1121.
κατ: 204.
κατ: 207.
κατά: form, 80, 204, 223; in comp., 163–5, 166, 169, 476, 511, 558, 561, 827 f.; cases with, 491, 531, 569 f.; in adv. phrases, 550; κατ ὃναρ, 83; τὸ καθ ἠμέραν, 487; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 557, 570; with verbs, 560; case-form, 570; contrasted with ὁνά, 571; contrasted with ὄντι, 523; discussed, 605–9; and παρά, 616; and ὑπέρ, 630; with ἐς, 673; with ὅς, 967; in prepositional phrases, 792; with inf., 1069.[Page 1269]
καταβαίνω: forms, 328, 330; constr., 856; use, 895.
καταβαρέω: trans., 455, 476.
καταβραβεύω: c. acc., 477.
καταγελάω: 330, 838.
καταγονίζω: 477.
καταδουλόω: voice of, 802.
καταί: case-form, 296, 605.
κατακαίω: meaning, 828.
κατακλίω: constr., 482.
κατάκριμα: 80, 156, 166.
κατακρίνω: constr., 784; meaning, 828; in or. obl., 1035 f.
κατάκρισις: 156.
καταλαλέω: trans., 455.
καταλαμβάνω: voice of, 812; in or. obl., 1036.
καταλέγω: form, 341.
καταλλαγή: 115.
καταλλάσσω: 115.
κατάλυμα: 151, 166.
καταλύω: meaning, 828; constr., 857.
κατανεύω: c. inf., 1068.
καταντάω: use, 80, 863.
κατάνυξις: 151.
καταπαύω: trans. and intrans., 800.
καταπέτασμα: 80, 167.
καταπονέω: 455.
καταράομαι: and case, 473.
κατάρατος: use, 1096.
καταργέω: aor. of, 851.
κατασκηνόω: form, 343.
κατασοφίζω: c. acc., 477.
καταστέλλω: 65 n.
καταφεύγω: meaning of, 827 f.
καταφρονέω: c. gen., 573.
καταχέω: form, 342.
κατέναντι: formation, 160, 171, 297; use, 639, 643 f.
κατενόπιον: formation, 160, 171, 297; use, 644.
κατεργάζομαι: meaning, 564.
κατεσθίω: meaning, 564.
κατέχω: 139.
κατηγορέω: constr., 136, 473 n., 475 n., 511.
κατήγωρ: 80, 166.
κατήχεσις: 65.
κατηχέω: 65, 485, 486.
κατισχύειν: trans., 455.
κατόπισθεν: use, 647.
κατοπτρίζω: voice of, 810.
κατόρθωμα: 153.
κάτω: adj. stem, 160; case, 296; use, 298, 300.
κατώτερος: 160, 278, 297, 298.
καῦδα: spelling, 211.
καυματίζω: acc. c. pass., 485.
καυσόω: 149.
καυχάομαι: forms of, 341, 876; constr., 475.
καφαρναούµ: 180, 184, 219.
κέ: use, 354.
κείµαι: compounds and forms of, 316, 350, 357, 375; voice of, 813; special use of ἐκείµην, 906.
κεῖνος: Ionic, 206.
κειρία: form, 197.
κείρω: voice of, 809.
κελεύω: constr., 514, 1084; in or. obl., 1036 f.; c. acc. and inf., 111, 857, 1078, 1084; c. obj. inf., 1036 f.
κέλλω: spelling, 206.
κέν: in rel. clauses, 958.
κεν–: in verbs, 164.
κενός: in comp., 169; c. abl., 372.
κενώς: 160.
κεράννυµι: compounds and forms, 317, 1216.
κεραννύω: compounds and forms, 1216.
κερδαίνω: forms of, 232, 349, 1216.
κερδάω: forms of, 1217.
–κες: 2d pers. sing. end., 309, 337.
κεφαλαιόω: 149.
κεφαλή: use, 781.
κεφαλίζω: 149.
κεφαλιόω: 149.
κῆρυξ: accent, 230.
κηρύσσω: meaning, 115; use of part., 1106.
Κηφᾶς: 105.
–κι–: 742.
κινδυνεύω: use, 884. [Page 1270]
κιννάμομον: 111.
κίς (κί): Thessalian Gk., 291.
–κκ–: 214.
κλαίω: constr., 475, 853; meaning, 834; forms, 185, 352, 355, 1217.
κλαύδα: form, 211.
κλάω: compounds and forms, 185, 1217.
κλείς: accent, 231; forms, 265.
κλείῳ: compounds and forms, 340, 1217.
κληρονομέω: constr., 475.
κλητός: 115, 125.
κλίβανος: 63.
κλίμα: spelling, 230.
κλινάριον: 155.
κλίνη: 80, 119.
κλινίδιον: 155.
κλίνω: trans. and intrans., 800; compounds and forms, 1217.
κνήθω: 149, 353.
κοιμάω: 65 n.; voice of, 817, 819; aor. of, 817, 848.
κοινός: readings, 202; use, 691.
κοινωνία: 115.
κοινωνός: constr., 504.
κόκκινος: 80, 158.
κολάζομαι: 80.
κολαφίζω: 80, 149.
κολλάω: meaning, 80; voice of, 817, 819.
κολλυβιστής: 120, 154.
κολλούριον: readings, 202.
κολοβόω: 149.
Κολοσσαι: form, 184 f.
κομίζω: use, 878; compounds and forms, 813, 1217.
kόπος: 65 n., 80.
kόπτω: constr., 475; voice of, 809; compounds and forms, 1217.
kοπιάω: meaning, 150; forms, 341.
kοράσιον: 64, 80, 118, 155.
kορβάν: 95, 236, 270.
kορέννυμι: forms, 1217.
kοσμικός: use, 777.
kόσμος: meaning, 115, 134; and art., 796.
kράβατος: spelling, 65, 119, 213.
kράζω: intrans., 801; use, 895 f.; compounds and forms, 325, 348, 361, 907, 1217; κέκραγα, 896, 898.
kραταίω: 149.
kρατέω: constr., 455, 473 n., 475, 475 n., 508, 511; kind of action, 865.
kράτιστος: 278.
kράτος: 148 n.
kρείσσων: form, 218, 277 f., 299, 669; superlative of, 670; κρέσσων with ἦν, 886.
kρείττων: 72, 218.
kρέμαμαι: compounds and forms, 316 f., 350, 1217.
κρεμαννύω, κρεμάζω and κρεμάω: compounds and forms, 317, 1217.
κρη: root, 175.
κρήμα: 153.
κρῆμα: accent, 186; form, 230.
κρίνω: constr., 478, 511; meaning, 828; use, 905; compounds and forms, 233, 1217.
κρίσις: in John, 134; ὃ τι with, 1033.
κρύβω: new pres., 147; imperf. of compound, 351.
κρυπτός: and art., 764.
κρύπτω: constr., 483; voice of, 807, 817; compounds and forms, 1217.
κρυσταλλίζω: 150.
κρυφά: Doric, 249, 295.
κτάοιμα: meaning, 80; constr., 472; voice of, 810; forms of, 871.
κτίζω: use, 896.
κτίσις: and πᾶς, 772.
κτίσμα: 151.
κτιστής: 151, 231.
κυκλόθεν: use, 644.
κυλίω: compounds and forms, 1217.
κύμινον: 95, 105, 111.
κυνάριον: 118, 155.
κυρία: 81, 173.
κυριακός: 80, 116, 158.
κυριεύω: 473 n.
κύριος: voc. of, 466; gen. or abl., 503; and art., 761, 785 f., 795; meaning, 80, 81, 97, 116; ἐν κυρίῳ, 115.

κυριότης: 154.

κωλύω: use, 838, 863; constr., 1089, 1171.

κωμόπόλις: 167.

Λ

λ: 211, 216, 352, 356.

λα–: in comp., 164, 169.

λαγχάνοι: c. inf., 1060.

λάθρα: 295.

λακέω or λάσκω: form, 1217.

λαλέω: use of fut., 873; c. ὧτι, 1034; in or. obl., 1048; a Hellenism, 1077.

λαμά: 105.

λαμβάνω: compounds and forms of, 210, 231, 327 f., 939, 1217; ἔλαβα, 82; ἔλαβον, 339; λάβε, 231, 327–8; ἔλαμψα, 359, 364, 899, 901; c. pred. acc., 480; c. ἐς, 482; use of aor. part., 859, 1127, 1135; perf. use, 897, 899 ff.; meaning, 829.

λανθάνω: constr., 551, 1102, 1120; compounds and forms, 1217.

λαός: 63, 65 n., 407.

λατομέω: 164.

λατρεύω: constr., 540.

λεγίων: 108, 188.

λέγω: compounds and forms, 329, 339, 1217; λέγων, 136; ἔλεγας, 82; constr., 97, 473, 479, 480, 484, 626, 1084; λέγων and λέγοντες, indecl. in LXX, 415; and ἐπον, 838, 883; use, 866; c. pred. acc., 480, 484; c. acc. and inf., 1084; in or. obl., 1035 ff., 1039, 1048.

–λειπ–: root, 197, 351.

λείπω: compounds and forms, 348, 351, 358, 1217; constr., 541; ἔλεψα, 82.

λειτουργία: 81, 193.
λειτουργικός: 80, 158, 169.
Λευείς: 263.
ληνός: 253, 410.
ληστής: forms, 409.
λίβανος: 95, 96, 105.
Λιβερτῖνος: use, 109; constr., 788.
λιθο–: in comp., 164.
λίθος: gender of, 253; reading, 718.
λικμάω: 80.
λιμός: gender of, 63, 63 n., 253, 253 n., 410.
λιμπάνω: 65 n., 147.
–λιπ–: root, 197.
λίψ: 80.
–λλ–: 214.
λογεία: 80, 152, 197.
λογία: 65.
λογίζομαι: voice of, 816, 819; c. εἰς, 481; c. two acc., 489; ὅτι with, 1035; compounds and forms, 1217.
λογο–: in comp., 164, 167.
λόγος: meaning, 97, 134–5; formation, 151; forms, 327; ὅτι with, 1033.
λοιδορέω: and case, 473.
λοιπόν: τὸ λοιπόν, 294, 487, 488; τοῦ λοιποῦ, 295.
λούω: compounds and forms, 80, 340, 1217; constr., 486.
λυμαίνομαι: and case, 473.

λυπέω: use, 871; c. acc., 473 n.; c. part., 1122.

λύπη: gen., 515.

λυσιτελέω: c. dat., 472.

λύτρον: 115, 175.

λύτρω: 97, 115.

λυτρωτής: 154.

λυγνία: 65.

λύπη: accent, 230; reading, 202; form, 328, 333, 347; constr., 856; in mod. Gk., 870; meaning, 828.

μ: 210, 216, 362.


μαθητεύω: formation, 148; constr., 475; trans., 65, 800.

Μαθθαῖος: spelling, 215.

–μαι: per. end., 340.

μάκαρ: adj., 272.


μακρόν: adv., 294; adjectival, 547.

μακρο–: in comp., 164, 169.

μακρόθεν: ὁπό μακρόθεν, 297, 300, 548.

μάλλα: use, 279, 298, 488, 663, 670.

μᾶλλον: constr., 276, 278 f., 298, 663; [Page 1272] positive, 278, 663; μᾶλλον c. comparative, 278, 488; adv., 298, 663.

μαμονᾶς: 95, 105, 111, 214, 254.
Μανασσῆς: form, 268.

µανθάνοι: in or. obl., 1040; c. inf., 1038, 1040, 1103, 1122; c. part., 1040, 1122; compounds and forms, 1217.

µάννα: 95, 270.

µαρανά, θά: 105.

Μαριάμ: 96, 214, 259.

µαρτυρέω: µαρτυροῡμαι, 80; aor. of, 850; use, 134, 135, 894; constr., 479, 1085; in or. obl., 1036.

µαρτυρία: use, 135; ὅτι with, 1033.

µάρτυς: c. art., 136, 414; ὅτι with, 1033.

µαταιότης: 156.

µάχαρα: 82, 256.

µέ: prep. in mod. Gk., 535, 570.

µεγαλιότης: 148 n., 156.

µεγαλωσύνη: spelling, 156, 201.

µέγας: forms, 294; use, 661; superlative of, 278–9, 670.

µεγιστάν: 155.

µεθοδεία: 152.

µεθόριον: 156.

µεθύσκο: formation, 150; constr., 854.

µείζον: forms, 272, 274, 277; µειζότερος, 80, 277; in comparison, 80, 663.

µείρομαι: spelling, 206.

µελαντότερον: use, 277.

µελίσσιος: 159.

µέλλω: augment, 82, 368; forms of, 368 f., 1217; and tense, 824; constr., 857, 870, 877 ff.; in periphrastic forms, 889, 891; imperf., 884; use, 882, 884, 921, 1082, 1126; as adj., 157 n.; µέλλων=‘future,’ 373; c. inf., 1056, 1078; c. pres. inf., 870,
882, 889, 891, 1081; c. fut. inf., 369, 877, 882, 1080, 1082; c. aor. inf., 857, 878, 882, 1056, 1078, 1081; c. part., 877–8, 1118, 1126; use of part., 373, 1118.

μέλος: μέλει c. ὅτι, 965; compounds and forms, 1217.


μέμνημαι: in or. obl., 1040.

μέμφομαι: constr., 473, 475.

μέν: particle, 302; postpositive, 424; c. δέ, 127, 132, 135, 428, 432, 747, 749, 1145, 1186; without δέ, 440; and asyndeton, 440; and art., 694; c. ὁ, 695 f.; c. οὐτος, 705; c. ολλος, 747; c. έτερος, 749; antithetic, 750, 1145; discussed, 1150–3; c. κατ, 1183; c. οὖν, 695, 1151, 1191.

–μεν: per. end., 370; Homeric inf. end., 249.


–μενο–: part. suffix, 373.

μενοῦνγε: use, 80, 425.

μέντοι: use, 424, 1154, 1188.

μένω: constr., 475; compounds and forms, 233, 475, 1218; fut., 356; aor. of, 850, 856.

μέριμνα: 62.

μεριμνάω: c. μη and imperative, 853.

μεριστής: 154.

μέρος: use, 487.

μεσιτεύο: 148.

μέσον: adverb, 488; use, 294, 644, 648.

μεσονύκτιον: 471.

Μεσοποταμία: c. art., 788.

μέσος: in comp., 167; use, 550; c. δια, 581; and art., 775; μέσω c. ἐν, 1210.

μετά: in comp., 164, 561; elision, 223; in phrases, 226; origin, 249; cases with, 491, 524, 531, 533, 569 f.; and σῶν, 526, 626 f.; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 557; c. verbs, 560, 562; case-form, 570; and ἑν, 588; and κατά, 607; discussed, 609–12; and πρός, 625; c. ταῦτα, 704; c. inf., 626, 858, 909, 979, 1039, 1060, 1069, 1074, 1092; c. perf. inf., 909; statistics c. inf., 858, 979, 1069, 1074, 1092.

μεταβαίνω: forms, 328.

μεταδίδωμι: constr., 510.

μεταλαμβάνω: constr., 510, 519.

μεταμέλομαι: voice of, 819.

μεταμορφῶ: constr., 486.

μετανοέω: meaning, 115, 134; reading, 1010.

μεταξύ: c. verbs, 562; origin, 626; use, 645; c. art., 789.

μέτοχος: constr., 505.

μετρίοιι: in comp., 164.

μέχρι: and final ζ, 221, 296; and ὅχρι, 639; use, 645, 954, 975; not relative, 954; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. ὅν, 975; c. inf., 979, 1074.

μή: form, 244; in mod. Gk., 1167; encroaches on οὗ, 74, 82, 1167; use, 330, 401, 423, 430, 436 f., 751, 850–4, 890, 916, 925, 931, 933 f., 937, 941 f., 962 f., 981; in interrogation, 436, 850, 917 f., 1157, 1168, 1175; meaning, 930; in prohibitions, 630, 851 f., 854–6, 947; in relative clauses, 962, 1169; c. ind., 963, 1168–9; c. pres. imp., 430, 851–4, 890, 1170; c. aor. imp., 330, 851 ff., 856, 925, 933, 1170; c. subj. in prohibitions, 330, 850 ff., 854, 925, 930–3, 934, 941, 943, 981, 1169–70; c. subj., 437; c. nouns, 1172; c. ὃρα, 430, 854, 932; c. βλέπετε, 430, 932; c. γένοτο, 325, 401, 854, 939 f., 1003; c. πᾶς, 292, 437, 752 f.; c. οὗ (see οὗ), 874 f., 917, 929, 934, 962, 1004, 1156–66; μή οὗ….; 1169, 1171, 1173; c. τίς, 951; c. ἰνα (see ἰνα); c. πῶς, 985, 987 ff., 995 f.; c. ὅπως, 985 f.; c. ποτε, 987 ff., 995 f.; c. εἰ, 1011, 1024 f., 1169; ὅτι μή, 1169; in final clauses, 987 ff., 995 f.; in conditions, 1011 f., 1016 ff.; in indirect command, 1046; c. inf., 423, 1061, 1066, 1093 ff., 1170–1; c. part., 74, 127, 1136 ff., 1172; discussed, 1166–77; in or. obl., 1045.

–μή: suffix, 151.

μηδέ: use, 428, 1173, 1185.
| μηδείς | form, 219; use, 282, 292, 750 f., 1094, 1156 ff. |
| μηδέν | use, 1156 ff. |
| μηθείς | form, 72, 181, 219, 282; use, 282, 750 f., 1094, 1156 ff. |
| μήν | form, 929, 1151; c. ἐ, 1004, 1024; c. οὖ, 1161. |
| μήποτε | use, 135, 203, 244, 1173; c. fut., 203, 988, 1147; c. subj., 988. |
| μήπος | use, 135, 244, 1173; discussed, 988, 995. |
| μήτε | use, 427, 1179; discussed, 1189. |
| μήτηρ | constr., 501. |
| μήτι | use, 292, 917, 1172. |
| μήτις | form, 292; use, 743, 751, 933. |
| –μι: suffix, 306; in opt., 335. |
| μιαίνω | forms, 1218. |
| μίγμα | spelling, 230. |
| μίγνωμι | compounds and forms, 317, 1218. |
| μικρός | 80. |
| μίλλον | 109. |
| μμηνήσκο | constr., 448, 487, 509; c. gen., 482; c. ὅτι, 1035; c. πάντα, 479, 487; compounds and forms, 893, 1218. |
| μίσγω | compounds and forms, 1218. |
| μισθαποδοσία | 65, 167. |
| μίσθιος | 159. |
| μισθόω | voice of, 809. |
| Μιτυληναῖος | use, 199. |
| Μιτυλήνη | readings, 199. |
| –μμ— | 214. |
μνῆ: 111.

μνημονεύω: c. gen. and acc., 509; c. ὥττ, 1035, 1041; c. part., 1041; in or. obl., 1035, 1041.

μνηστεύω: forms, 364, 1218.

μογυλάλος: 80, 169, 210, 231.


μόλις: use, 296.

μονή: 80.

–μονή: suffix, 151.

μονο–: in comp., 164.

μονογενής: 97.

μόνος: use, 423, 549, 657, 659; μόνον adv., 657, 659; and art., 776; μόνον c. οὗ, 947, 1161 f.; μόνον c. μή, 947, 1162.

μονόφθαλμος: 62, 65, 120.

–μός: suffix, 151 f.

μοσχο–: in comp., 164.

μυκτηρίζω: 150.

μυλόν: 154, 231.

μυριάς: 283.

μύριοι: use, 233, 283.[Page 1274]

μυστήριον: 81, 133, 146.

μωρέ: 95.

Μωσῆς: spelling, 203, 205; forms, 268.

N

ν: acc. sing. end. in 3d decl., 258, 264, 274; adv. suffix, 296; becomes –μ, 362.
ν: class. in pres., 352; in root of verb, 352.
να: in verbs, 351.
ναί: discussed, 1150.
ναι: inf. end., 370 f.
ναός: 55, 63, 97.
νάρδος: 96.
ναῦς: 80, 145.
νε: in verbs, 352.
νεανίας: type, 256.
νεκροί: 80.
νεκρῶ: 149.
νεκρώ: 149.
νέος: meaning, 176; comparative of, 664.
νεόφυτος: 80, 169.
νεωτερικός: 159.
νή: discussed, 80, 487, 1150.
νη: prefix, 161, 163.
νήθω: 149, 353.
νηπιάζω: 147.
νηστεία: 53 n.
νηστεύω: constr., 478.
νήστις: form, 266, 275.
νικάω: use, 135; νικῶν with art., 136, 243, 414; forms, 203; constr., 475; meaning, 865.
νίπτω: new pres., 147; voice of, 806.
νίτρον: 96.
—νν: 213 ff.
—ννω: in verbs, 352.

νοέω: in or. obl., 1036.

νομίζω: constr., 480; in or. obl., 1036 f.

νόμος: in Paul, 129 n.; in comp., 167; use, 780; and art., 796.

νοσσός: 204.

νοσφίζω: voice of, 810.

νοθεσία: 65.

νομηνία: 204.

νουνεχός: use, 297, 298; form, 170, 171.

νοῦς: 261.

—νς: acc. end., 265.

—ντ: part. end., 373.


νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν: 470, 495.

—νμι: verbs in, 311.

νῦν: constr., 546 f.; form, 296; use, 424, 548, 1117, 1147; ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, 83; ὁ, τὰ τῶν νῦν, 487; c. ἕνεκεν, 1013.

νυνί: use, 290, 1147; loc. form, 296, 523.

νῦξ: dat. form, 249; gen. merging into adverb, 295; acc. νῦκτα, 97; c. ἐν, 523.

νύσσω: compounds and forms, 1218.

—νος: verbs in, 147, 352.

Ξ

–ξα: aor. in, 349.
ξενίζομαι: constr., 475.
ξενοδοχέων: 138.
ξενοδοχέω: 138, 163 n.
ξηραίνω: compounds and forms, 836, 847, 1218.
ξυράω: forms of, 184, 342, 1218; voice of, 809.

Ο

ο: vowel, 178, 181 f.; vowel-changes, 189 f., 196, 198–201, 367; o-verbs, 308, 324, 367; o/e suffix, 147, 305, 323, 327; prothetic, 1209.

ό, ἥ, τό: c. δέ, 290; c. νυκῶν, 136, 243, 414; crasis of τοῦ, 208; as demonstrative, 290; constr., 502; c. ἐπτίν, 411; τοῦ and inf. as subject, 1059; τοῦ and inf., 97, 122, 512, 858, 990, 996, 1067, 1077, 1086–88 f.; as ablative, 1061; after nouns, 1061, 1063, 1066; and inf., 765, 858, 1053–4, 1059, 1065; τῶ and inf. (see c. inf.); c. inf., 122, 512, 584, 587, 659, 858, 990, 996, 1001 f., [Page 1275] 1039 f., 1042, 1054–69, 1078, 1080; reading, 599; discussed, 693–5, 754–96; ὁ Ἔν, 135; τό, τά c. prep., 486, 487; c. οἰρος, 700; c. ἐκάντος and ὅλος, 708; in Homer, 711; as relative, 734 f.; c. τίς, 739; c. ἄλλος, 747; and aor. part., 859 f.; in relative clauses, 956; in or. obl., 1045; c. ὄν, 1107; proclitic forms of, 1211.

ὁγδοος: uncontracted, 275.

ὁδε: use, 289 f., 693 f., 709; discussed, 290, 696 f.; and οὐτος, 696, 702 f.; and art., 770.

ὁδηγέω: reading, 1010.

ὁδός: meaning, 115; ὁδὸς true dative, 248; gender, 260; ὁδὸς οὐτοῦ, 105; and ellipsis, 652, 1202.

ὁδυνάω: forms, 341.

οε: contraction of, 325, 342.


οη: contraction of, 325, 342.
οη: contraction of, 308.

ὄθεν: constr., 132, 300, 548, 962, 963, 969.

οι: vowel-change, 195, 198, 204, 326; 326; 326; 326; o+t=οι, 326; and augment, 367; old dat. end., 520.

οι-verbs, 357.

οὗγνυμι: compounds and forms, 317, 1212.

οῖ: forms, 239, 319, 329, 337, 357–8, 360, 363, 406; οἴδας, 337; οἴδες, 82; ἵστε, 87, 319, 329, 360, 908, 941; ἰδει=imperf., 904; pres. perf., 898; non-redupl. perf., 357, 363; intrans., 801; use, 135, 838, 1122, 1128; meaning, 881, 895, 904; in or. obl., 1035 f., 1045; c. ὃτι, 1035, 1103, 1122; c. inf., 1045, 1062, 1103, 1122; oἰο. τί, 1044, 1045.

οἰκαδε: form, 296.

οἰκία: 80.


οἰκοδομέο: compounds and forms of, 365, 1218; constative aor., 833; fut., 889; oἰκ. οἰκίαν, 479.


οἰκιο: adv., 249, 295.

οἰκονόμος: 161.

οἰκτέρο: 474.

οἰκτήριον: 65 n.

οἴμα: use, 406, 1082; c. οὐ, 1162.


–οιο: archaic gen. end., 494.

οἴος: use, 291, 429, 1139; and τοιοῦτος, 710; discussed, 731 f.; and ὃτι, 1034; in or. obl., 1045.

–οις: dat. end., 249, 266; loc. end., 452.

οἱ τῆν παραλίαν: disputed reading, 469.
όχομαι: use, 1120.

όκ: for οὐκ, 199.

όκτω: use, 282.

όλεθρεύω: compounds and forms, 189 f.

όλίγον: adv., 488.


όλίγος: 160.

όλλημι: use, 893; compounds and forms, 317, 1218.

όλλώ: compounds and forms, 1218.

όλοθρεύω: 148, 189, 189 n.

όλος: in comp., 167, 169; c. κατά, 607; c. οὖτος, 705; c. art., 708, 768, 771 ff.; c. πολύς, 774.

όμείρομαι: form, 164, 198, 206, 225.

–ομεν: per. end., 200.

όμνημι: compounds and forms, 317, 371; constr., 475, 479, 484, 1032; c. ἐν, 120, 588; c. εἰς, 120; use of aor. part., 859.

όμνυω: constr., 479, 484.


όμοιος: constr., 530, 1206; accent, 135, 231; fem., 272.

όμοιώ: constr., 530; compounds and forms, 1218.

όμολογέω: meaning, 80; forms from, 295, 298; constr., 475, 478, 480, 541, 1103, 1122; ὁμολ. ομολογίαν, 478; c. ἐν, 108, 524, 588; in or. obl., 1035, 1041.

όμολογομένος: 160, 298.

όμοι: in comp., 164; adv. of place, 295, 299.

όμος: accent, 233; adv., 295; use, 423, 1140, 1154, 1188; in mod. Gk., 1146. [Page 1276]
–ον: per. end., 335, 348.

.ordinal: κατ ὅναρ, 120.

ὁνάριον: 155.

ὁνείδιζοι: constr., 473, 475, 480, 482.

ὁνείδισμός: 66, 152.

ὁνικός: 158.

ὁνίνημι: forms, 310, 348, 350.

ὁνομα: in “pregnant construction,” 525; “cases” of, 447; ὅνοματος, 452; ὅνοματι, 487; c. έκ, έν, έπι, 120; in circumlocution, 649; of God, 135; meaning ‘person,’ 80, 91; ὅνις in apposition with, 1033.

ὁνομάζω: constr., 480.

ὁντερ: reading, 291, 710, 1154.

–οντο: per. end., 340.


ὁπερ: use in LXX, 710.

ὁπισθεν: use, 300, 645.

ὁπίσω: c. verbs, 562; use, 301, 645.

ὁπόδος: use, 291, 1176 f.; and τούτος, 710; and ποῖς, 740; discussed, 732; in or. obl., 1045.

ὁπόταν: use, 971.

ὁπότε: use, 300, 971; origin, 954.

ὁπου: adv., 295, 298 f., 548; use, 712, 722, 969; ὅποιον ἐν c. ind., 972 f.; in or. obl., 1045.

ὁπητάνω: new pres., 73, 147; voice of, 820.

ὁπτασία: 66.
ὅπως: in John, 134; use, 430, 731, 933, 953, 980, 982; discussed, 985–7; c. μή, 980, 987; c. ὅν in N. T. and LXX, 986; and ἱνα, 992 f., 994; ὅπως πληροθῇ, 120; in final clauses, 994 f.; in or. obl., 1045; in indirect command, 1046; c. inf., 1056; dis-appearance of, 980 n., 981, 1056.

ὅρα: use, 330, 430, 874, 932, 935, 949.


ὅραω: in John, 134 n.; compounds and forms, 188, 324, 339, 344, 348, 364, 368, 876, 1211, 1218; fut., 813; no aorist, 344; ὅψει, 193, 339; ἓόρακες, 68, 359; ἓόρακα, 364; ἓόρακα, 97, 134 n., 359, 365, 368; ἓόρατον, 368; voice, 819 f.; roots, 823; in or. obl., 864, 1035, 1038, 1041; use, 871, 893, 901; use of ὅρα and ὅρατε, 932 f., 949; use of parts., 1118; perf. of, 1211.

ὁργίζομαι: meaning, 834.

ὁρέγομαι: constr., 508.

ὁρθο—: in comp., 164.

ὁρθός: use, 549, 659.

ὁρθρίζω: 65, 150.

ὁρθρινός: 158.

ὁρθolvency: use, 549, 659.

ὁρίζω: constr., 863.

ὁρκίζω: constr., 475, 483.

ὁρνεων: 269.


ὁρος: contraction, 203, 268; and art., 760.

—ὁρος: ending, 199.

ὁρύσσω: compounds and forms, 349, 1218.

ὁς: demonstrative, 290; relative, 291; followed by pronoun, 97; c. ὅν and ἕάν, 72, 191; c. γε, 244, 291; c. τε, 290; ὅν not expressed, 425; reading, 438; ὅν with verbs, 511; ὃ with ὥν, 587; ὅν with ὅν, 696, 714, 722, 953; use, 693, 706, 928, 953 f., 956, 959; discussed, 695 f., 711–26; and ὅν, 698, 703; and τοιοῦτος, 710; in Homer, 711; ὃ with ἔστιν, 411, 713; and ἔστις, 726; value of,
728; and οὐς, 731; and μὲν antithetic, 750; and attraction, 820; c. ἐὰν, 959; and ἢν, 961; c. κατὰ, 967; in consec. clauses, 1001; in or. obl., 1044 f.


Ὄσάκις: use, 973.

–οσαν: per. end., 63 bis, 73, 335, 343; in mod. Gk., 138.

ὅς ἐν θέλη: use, 961.

Ὄσδήπερ: reading, 710.

Ὄσδήποτε: use, 291.

Ὄσμή εὐωδίας: 97.

Ὄσος: form, 291; and οὐτος, 698; and τουτος, 710; discussed, 732 f., 966 f.; καθοσов and ἐφ ὅσον, 963; in rel. clauses, 956 ff.; in or. obl., 1045; use, 1177.

Ὄσπερ: use, 291.

Ὄστέα: 62, 203.[Page 1277]

Ὄστέων: 203, 225, 260.

Ὄστις: form, 290 f.; in LXX, 727, 729; use, 693, 928; for ὅς, 67; and τουτος, 710; discussed, 726–31; and τις, 737; ὅ for ὅτι, 960; ἐμός ὅτι, 291, 729; in rel. clauses, 956 f., 959–61; in or. obl., 1044 f., 1176.

Ὄστράκινος: form, 158.

–οτ–: in perf. part., 373.

Ὄταν: use, 300, 325; in LXX, 325, 927 f.; and οὐτος, 700; c. ind., 82, 118, 972; in temp. clauses, 958, 970 ff.

Ὄτε: adv., 296, 300 f.; origin, 953; use, 953, 970 ff.; c. subj., 972.

ὁ τε: in Attic, 290.

–ότερος: compar. end., 278.

ὅτι: in John, 134; origin, 953; wider use, 74, 82, 97, 111, 134; consecutive, 1001; recitative, 97, 120, 433, 442, 951, 1027; epexegetical use, 1034; repetition of, 1034; driven out by πῶς, 1032 f.; drives out ὡς, 1032; position of verbs with, 965, 1034 f.; and inf., 111, 120, 371, 437, 442, 489 f., 584, 1047, 1054 ff.; in place of inf., 111, 371, 489–90, 584, 1055 f.; ousts inf., 1054 f.; ὅτι and ἰνα blending, 1055–6; causal, 962, 964, 997, 1192; and hiatus, 206; c. ἐστίν, 233; and ὅ τι, 243, 291; ὡς
ὅτι, 964, 1033; τί ὅτι, 916, 1034; ὅτι clauses, 120, 393, 400, 426, 430, 951, 952, 954, 1001; ὅτι clause as subject, 393, 430, 1034; in apposition, 400, 699, 1034, 1079; as object, 430, 951, 1034; with verbs of saying, 120; ‘prolepsis’ of subst. before, 1034; and ὅτι, 699; and ἐκεῖνος, 708; use, 724, 951–3, 962–5, 997, 1054 f., 1085 f., 1122, 1192; in interrogation, 730, 916; in or. obl., 1027–49; c.

c. negatives, 963, 965, 1034, 1173; c. καί, 1182; c. πλήν, 1187.

ὅτι: see ὅστις.

οὐ: vowel-changes, 199, 202 ff.


οὖ, οὐκ, οὐχ: use, 401, 418, 423 f., 928 f., 937, 962 f., 965, 995; οὐχ, 224; c. τις, 751; c. ές, 751; c. μή, 850, 854, 873 ff., 889, 929, 933, 942, 962, 980, 987, 1004; οὐ μή c. fut., 874–5, 889, 929, 942, 962, 980, 987, 1004; οὐ μή c. subj., 854, 929, 934, 962, 1004, 1161, 1174; οὖδ οὐ μή, 854, 1165, 1175; οὐ c. fut., 889, 1157, 1162; μή οὐ, 987, 1161, 1169; οὐ...πᾶς, 94; in interrogation, 917 f.; meaning, 930; c. μόνον—ἔλλαθα καί, 947; in conditions, 1011 f., 1016 ff.; c. inf., 947, 1093 ff., 1162; c. part., 1136 ff.; discussed, 1154–77; c. καί, 1183; proclitic, 1211.

οὖ: accent, 229; personal pronoun (not in N. T.), 286, 679; relative, 229, 298 f., 301 bis; adverb, 717, 722, 969; use, 286, 298 f., 301, 717, 722, 969.

οὖά: accent, 231; use, 302, 1193.

οὖαί: gender, 270, 410; interjection, 302; in ellipsis, 391; case with, 135, 487; use, 1193.

οὖδέ: elision, 207, 1210; and ές, 741; use, 1156, 1165, 1185.

οὖδείς: form, 219; use, 282, 292, 1094; c. έστιν οὐ, 726; discussed, 750.

οὖδέν: adverb, 487; use, 1156 ff.

οὖθείς: form, 72, 97, 181, 219; use, 282, 750, 1094.

οὖκοῦν: accent, 233, 1165, 1175; use, 917, 1165, 1175.


οὖν: in Mark, 119; in John, 133–4, 134 n., 841; position, 424, 1192; use, 133, 424, 434, 443 f., 841; τί οὖν...; 916; in interrogation, 916; discussed, 1181 f.

–ον: verb end., 341, 343.

οὖπω: form, 296.

οὐρανόθεν: 296, 300.
οὐρανός: use, 408.
–ουρος: ending, 199.

οὖς: 145, 156.
–ους: adj. end., 274.

οὔτε: use, 428, 1156 ff., 1179; discussed, 1189.

οὔτις: form, 292; use, 743, 751.

οὔτος: c. ἔστι, 207, 233, 244, 289 n., 399, 411 f., 416; use, 290, 401, 411, 419, 437, 693, 720, 843; with proper names, 701; resumptive, 437, 693, 698; deictic, 693, 697; relative, 693, 710; anaphoric, 697; contemptuous use, 697; preceded by articular part., 698; preceded by ὅς, 698; followed by ὅτι, 699; followed by ἵνα, 699; followed by εἰ, ἓν, 700; followed by τό-clause, 700; c. αὐτός, 686; αὐτοὶ ὅτοι, 700, 705; αὐτὸ τοῦτο, 705; and ὅς, 696, 702; discussed, 697–706; and ἐκεῖνος, 270, 708; pleonastic, 722 f.; and ὅς, 732; τοῦτο with τι, 736; τοῦτο ἔστιν, 207, 233–4, 244, 399, 411, 412, 416, 705; and art., 419, 770; c. articular noun, 419, 701, 770; c. ἄπας, 771; ταῦτα πάντα and πάντα ταῦτα, 705; and ὅς, 723; c. πολὺς, 774; ὅτι with prep. and, 1033 f.; c. inf., 700, 1059; in idioms, 1111; c. καί, 460, 487, 1181; τοῦτο with clause in apposition, 401, 698.

οὔτος(ς): form, 221, 248 n., 295 f.; adv., 286, 298, 710; and οὔτος, 705; use, 965, 968, 1140, 1146.

οὐχί: form, 290; use, 296, 391, 917.

ὁφειλή: 80, 153.

ὁφείλημα: 153.

ὁφείλω: use, 841, 886; constr., 1003.

ὁφέλον: use, 82, 841, 886, 923, 940, 1003 f.

ὁφθαλμός: 95, 102.

ὁφρα: not in N. T., 981–2.

ὁχλο:– in comp., 165.

ὁχλος: breathing, 225; use, 404, 407; c. πολύς, 774.

ὁψάριον: 65, 66, 155.
ὀψέ: constr., 517, 645 f.; meaning, 517.

ὀψία: 119.

ὀψόνιον: 65, 66, 80, 155.

–όω: verbs in, 147, 149, 342 f., 351.

Π

π: 210, 223, 353, 1210.


παγάνω: meaning, 865.

παγιδεύω: 148.

πάγω: meaning, 865.


παιδάριον: 66.


παιδίοθεν: 119.

παιδίον: 155.

παιδίσκη: 1361.

πάλαι: form, 249, 296.

πάλιν: in comp., 167; form, 296; use, 300, 551.

παμπληθεί: form, 170, 171; spelling, 197.


πανήγυρις: 132.

πανοικεί: form, 170, 171; spelling, 197.

πανταχ: form, 295, 300, 526.

πανταχού: form, 296, 300; use, 299.

πάντη(η): 295.
πάντοθεν: 300.

πάντοτε: form, 170, 171; use, 300.

πάντως: 423.

παρά: in comp., 80, 165, 169, 565; elision, 208; origin, 80, 249, 301; case-form, 301, 482, 570; cases with, 451, 491, 524, 534, 554, 555, 565, 567, 569 f.; instrumental case, 301, 613; c. abl., 482, 517–8, 554, 614; c. acc., 477, 491, 614, 792; c. loc., 524–5, 542, 614; c. three cases, 451, 567, 569–70, 613; constr. in comp., 132, 477, 542; c. verbs, 517 f., 560, 562; agent, 534, 636, 820; παρα—παρά, 560; παρα— ἀπό, 561; ὑπέρ—παρά, 562; ἐκ—παρά, 561; παρα—, in mod. Gk., 558, 570, 613, 615, 616, 625; in “pregnant construction,” 525; adv. phrases, 550; in comparison, 83, 132, 615–6, 667; frequency, 556; use, 561; ‘beside,’ 613; and ἀπό, 578 f.; and εἰς, 596; and ἐκ, 596; discussed, 612–6; and πρός, 625; and ὑπό, 636; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. inf., 1069.

παραβαίνω: 477.

παραβολεύω: 80, 148, 165.

παραβολή: 134.

παραγγέλλω: constr., 1047, 1084; c. ὅτι, 1035; c. ἶνα, 1046.

παράδεισος: 80, 111.

παραδίδω: forms, 309, 347.

παραθαλασσία: form, 273.

παραθήκη: 80, 166.

παραί: form, 260, 296, 301, 537.

παρατεω: constr., 475.

παρατέω: voice of, 810.

παρακαλέω: meaning, 66; form, 943; constr., 475, 1035, 1085; c. τοῦ and inf., 1068.

παράκλητος: 115, 161, 167.

παρακάπτω: 80.

παραλαμβάνω: readings, 336.

παράλλος: form, 273.
παραπλέω: 472.
παραπλήσιον: use, 646.
παραντίκα: 297.
παραφρονία: 66, 156.
παραφυλακή: 57.
παραχρήμα: use, 297, 550.
παρεισδύω: forms, 341.
παρεισφέρω: 80, 126 n.
παρεκτός: form, 171, 244; use, 646.
παρεμβολή: 64.
παρέχω: voice of, 810; constr., 480, 853.
παρεισχώ: meaning, 950.
παρεχθήμα: constr., 473 n., 542, 855.
παροικός: 65, 80, 102.
παράνοια: c. acc., 477, 800.
πάρεσις: 80.
παράξενοι: voice of, 810; constr., 480, 853.
παρεισάγω: meaning, 950.
παρίστημι: constr., 473 n., 542, 855.
πάροικος: c. art., 708, 771 ff., 1107; c. ὅστις, 727; c. ὅσος, 732; c. πολύς, 774; c. ὅς, 957.
πάσχα: 95, 105, 270.

πάσχω: compounds and forms of, 327, 1218; c. κακῶς, 802; constr., 858.

Πάτερα: use, 183.

πατήρ: voc., 461 f., 464; art. with voc. of, 465; ὁ πατ. ὁ οὐράνιος, 120; ὁ πατ. ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, 120.

πατροπαράδοτος: 80, 169.

Παῦλος: and art., 788; use, 1038.

παύω: c. part., 1102, 1121; compounds and forms, 1218.

πεδά: case of, 249; for μετά, 609.

πες: form, 295.

πειθαρχεῖν: 163 n.

πειθός: 157.

πείθω: constr., 454, 478, 540, 1084; acc. c. pass., 485; voice of, 801, 810; compounds and forms of, 351, 871, 895, 1218; πέπονθα intrans., 801; πέποιθα, 895.

πεινάω: aor. form, 342, 371; and case, 474, 508.

πειράζω: voice of, 802.

πειρασμός: 152.

πεισμόνη: 151.

πελεκίζω: 150.

πέπω: 359; epistolary aor. of, 845 f.

πένης: use, 272.

πενθέω: constr., 475.

πεποιθήσις: 151.

πέρ: intensive, 302, 617, 1144; discussed, 1153 f.; enclitic, 1211.

πέραν and ἀντίπερα: c. acc., 294; use, 646.
περί: in comp., 165, 167, 477, 487, 542, 562, 564; form, 301 f., 524, 570; c. cases, 471, 491, 509, 524, 569 f.; c. verbs, 511, 560, 566; frequency, 556; in condensation, 567; and κατά, 608; discussed, 616–20; and πρός, 626; and ὑπέρ, 629, 632; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. inf., 1069; use, 616.

περιάγω: c. two acc., 480; trans. and intrans., 477; followed by ἐν, 562; literal sense, 617.

περιβάλλομαι: constr., 475, 483, 485 f., 855; voice of, 807, 809, 819.

περιβλέπω: voice of, 809, 813; meaning, 838.

περιέρχομαι: constr., 477; use, 1103.

περιέχω: 800, 802.

περιζώννυμι: form, 330.


περιλαβάνω: constr., 483.

περιμένω: c. acc., 475.

περιούσιος: etymology of, 159.

περιπατέω: constr., 855.

περιπτοιέω: voice of, 810.

περιρραίνω: reading, 211.

περισπάομαι: 66, 80.

περισσεία: 80, 156.

περισσεύσαι: form, 940.

περισσός: use, 279; constr., 516; in comparison, 664; περισσότερος, 279, 298, 488.

περιτέμνω: 80.

περιτίθημι: constr., 477, 483, 485; voice of, 815.

περιτομή: 167.

περιτρέχω: c. acc., 477.
περπερεύομαι: 148.
πέρυσι: form, 221, 295.
πέτρα: use, 1201.
πήγνυμι: and compounds, 317.
πηλίκος: use, 292; discussed, 741; in or. obl., 1045.
πήξιος: forms, 80, 268.
πιάζω: forms, 184, 1218.
πιέζω: forms, 184, 1218.
πιθός: use, 1206.
πίστις: meaning, 115, 134; gen. use, 499, 515, 704; πίστις in Heb., 11, 533.
πιστός: 115, 125.
πλανήτης: 125.
–πλασίων: proportional, 284, 673.
πλαστός: 126.
πλατύνω: constr., 486.
πλεῖον: constr., 516, 666; stereotyped form, 667.
πλείον: spelling, 187; use, 665; superlative of, 278, 670, 775; τὸ πλεῖστον, 487; πλεῖο indecl., 276, 277 n.; in idiom, 775.

πλέκω: compounds and forms, 1218.

πλεονεκτέω: 80, 455.

πλέω: compounds and forms, 1218.

πλήθος: 80, 407.

πληθύνω: use, 125, 127, 871.

πλημμύρα: 155, 214, 232, 250.

πλήν: use, 646; in mod. Gk., 1146; discussed, 1187.

πλήρης: indecl., 72, 97, 188, 274 ff., 413, 463, 464; voc., 264, 463 f.; constr., 1204.

πληρο—: in comp., 72, 165.

πληροφορέω: 72, 147, 165.

πληροφορέω: 72, 80, 147, 165.

πληρόω: forms of, 119, 133, 325, 343; constr., 473 n., 483, 485, 510, 857; ὁπως, ἵνα πληρωθῇ, 120; meaning, 834; aor. of, 851; use, 948.

πλήρωμα: 105.

πλησίον: form, 294; use, 547, 646.

πλήσσω: compounds and forms, 1218.

πλοιάριον: constr., 82, 521.

πλούς: 261.

–πλούς: adj. end., 284.

πλοῦτος: 63, 262, 262 n.

πνεῦμα: meaning, 97, 115, 125; use, 436, 590, 709; and art., 761, 795.

πνευματικός: 115, 158 f.

πνευματικῶς: use, 299.

πνέω: form, 342.

πνίγω: class, 351; compounds and forms, 1218.
πόθεν: 300; constr., 548; in or. obl., 1045; in questions, 1176.

ποῖ: form, 295.

ποιέω: forms, 325, 327; act. and mid., 802, 812; c. ἑὖ and κακῶς, 473; c. [Page 1281] καλῶς, 473; c. καρτόν, 105; c. σωμμούλλων, 105; μή c. pres. inf. and aor. subj., 852, 854, 856; constr., 480, 850, 852, 854, 856; c. τί and subj., 850, 923, 934; c. pred. acc., 480; c. two acc., 484; voice, 802, 812; use, 884, 923, 934; in narrative, 884; c. inf., 1068.

ποιμαίνω ποίμνη: 478.

ποῖς: interrogative, 291 f., 916; ποίας in Luke, 494; and ὁ ποῖος, 732; equal to τίς, 735; c. art., 735; discussed, 740; in or. obl., 1045; in indirect question, 1176.

πόλις: dat. form, 204; πόλεως, 447; c. Ὅθυάτειρα, 498; c. ἐκ, 578.

πολλάκις: form, 296.

πολλὸς: in comp., 169, 171; acc. form, 294; πολὺ adv., 488; τὰ πολλά, 487; πολλὰ adv., 120, 488; constr., 532, 600; in comparison, 664; c. art., 774 f.

πόμα: spelling, 230.

Πόντος: and art., 788.

πορεύομαι: voice of, 816–7, 820; constr., 473 n., 479, 856; use, 122, 869, 874.

πόσος: use, 292; discussed, 740 f.; in direct question, 292, 916; in or. obl., 1045.

ποταμῆς: origin, 160; use, 292, 917; discussed, 741; c. τίς, 736; in or. obl., 1045.

πότε: adv., 296, 298, 300; c. μὴ, 987 ff., 995 f., 1173; c. part., 1124, 1139; meaning, 1147; enclitic, 1211.

πότε: adv., 300; interrogative, 915, 917, 1176; in or. obl., 1045.

πότερον: in double questions, 1177.

πότερος: use, 292; and τίς, 736; discussed, 741; πότερον an adv., 292, 741, 1177.

ποτίζω: constr., 484, 485.

ποῦ: accent, 234; adv. (gen.), 295; use, 291, 298 f.; in mod. Gk., 723; in or. obl., 1045.

πού: use, 298 f., 1146; enclitic, 1211.

–πουλος: suffix, 146.
πούς: use, 95; root, 145; accent, 231.

πράγμα: 80.


πράκτορ: 81.

πρᾶος: readings, 200; form, 274.

πρασιαί: in Mark, 119; case, 487; distributive, 673.

πράσσω: c. two acc., 484; use of inf. of, 1058; c. εὖ, 1121; compounds and forms, 359, 1218.

πρέπω: constr., 541, 1086.

πρεσβύτερος: meaning, 81 bis, 90, 115; in comparison, 277, 664.

πρεσβύτης: spelling, 201.

πρίν: use, 431, 954, 976 f., 1049, 1053; origin, 954; as prep., 977; c. subj., 977; c. opt., 970, 977, 1049; c. ἢ, 970, 1049; use in Homer, 977, 1075, 1091 n.; common in Homer c. inf., 977, 1053, 1075; c. inf., 431, 977, 1074 f., 1091; statistics, 977, 1091.

πρό: position, 110; elision, 206; cases with, 451, 569 f.; constr. in comp., 165, 167, 169, 477; separation implied, 517; frequency, 556; c. verbs, 560; discussed, 620–2; and πρός, 622 f.; and ὑπέρ, 630; πρὸ τοῦ c. subj., 1056; c. abl., 1061; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. inf., 621, 858, 891, 977, 978, 1061, 1074 f., 1091; c. pres. inf., 891; statistics of c. inf., 858, 977–8.

προάγω: constr., 477, 857, 871.

προαιτιάο: in or. obl., 1036.

προγράφω: old word, 81, 125; epistolary aor. of, 845.

πρόδηλον: c. ὅτι, 1034.

πρόδομα: spelling, 200.

προείπον: spelling, 338.

προέρχομαι: constr., 477.

πρόθεσις: 80.

προκαταγγέλλω: in or. obl., 1036.
προορίζω: constr., 480.

πρός: in comp., 165, 167; accent, 234; final letter of, 248; frequency of use, 122, 451, 491, 556; cases with, 491, 524, 569 f.; c. acc., 122, 451; separation implied, 517; case-form, 524, 570; c. verbs, 542, 560 ff., 566; c. verbs of speaking instead of αὕτη, etc., 625–6; in mod. Gk., 570; [Page 1282] and ἄπο, 575; and εἴς, 596; and παρά, 613; discussed, 622–6; c. με, 234, 286, 682; πρός τί, 736, 739; in prepositional phrases, 234, 792; in papyri, 990–1, 1069; c. inf., 858, 990 f., 1003, 1060, 1069, 1075, 1088; c. purpose inf., 1088; statistics c. inf., 858, 1003, 1069, 1075.

προσαναβαίνω: form, 328.

προσδοκάω: in or. obl., 1036.

προσέρχομαι: use, 120.

προσευχή: 80, 91, 151.

προσεύχομαι: form, 328; use, 874.

προσέχω: 81, 477.

προσήλυτος: 157.

πρόσθεμα: spelling, 188.

πρόσκαιρος: 65, 169.

προσκαλέω: voice of, 809.

προσκαρτερέω: 81.

προσκαρτέρησις: 80, 167.

πρόσκομμα: 115, 151.

προσκυλίω: constr., 543.

προσκυνέω: constr., 448, 455, 476 f., 540, 990.

προσκυνητής: 80, 154.

προσλαμβάνω: constr., 510, 519; voice of, 809.

προςμένο: 623.

προστάσσω: constr., 1084.

προστίθημι: c. inf., 87 n., 94, 96 n., 1078.
προσφάγιον: 156, 167.
προσφάτος: 171.
προσφέρο: form, 338.
προσφονέω: use, 65 n.; trans., 455; constr., 477.
προσωπο—: in comp., 165, 167.
προσωπολημπτέω: 94, 165.
προσωπολημψία: 165, 167.
πρόσωπον: use, 94, 95, 97, 102, 285 n., 649; c. λαμβάνειν, 94, 97.
πρότερος: form, 280, 283; adv., 487; meaning, 662; use, 669.
προτίθημι: constr., 480; voice of, 810; in periphrastic forms, 822.
προϋπάρχω: c. part., 1103, 1121.
προφήτης: 81, 116.
προφητικός: 169.
προφθάνω: use, 1120.
πρωί: spelling, 205; use, 295, 471; and ἄμα, 638.
πρῶτος: comparison, 73, 280; ordinal, 283 f.; πρῶτον adv., 294, 297, 298, 300, 460, 487, 488, 657, 659, 1152; πρῶτος numeral, 160, 298; meaning, 516; use, 73, 97, 280, 306, 549, 657, 659, 662, 669 f.; and ἐίς, 671.
πρωτότοκια: 132.
πρωτότοκος: 80, 169, 233.
—πτ—: in verbs, 351, 353.
πτερύγιον: 156.
πτώμα: 66.
πτωχεύω: meaning, 834.
πυκνότερος: meaning, 665; c. part., 1139.
πυρθόνωμαι: forms, 1218.
πύρινος: 158.
πυρράζω: 147, 213.
πυρρός: spelling, 212 f.
πω: enclitic, 1211.
–πω: origin, 296.
πώποτε: form, 249; use, 896.
πως: use, 298; c. μή, 987 ff., 995 f.; enclitic, 1211.

ρ-verbs: redupl., 364.
–ρα: words in, 256.
ῥοββεῖ: 95, 416, 433.
ῥοβουνεῖ: 105.
ῥακά: 105, 219.
ῥαντίζω: 66, 149; forms of, 211 f., 225, 1218; ῥεραν–, 211, 225, 364; voice, 807; constr., 486.
ῥαντισμάς: 152.
ῥάπισμα: 153.
ῥέδη: 111.
ῥέω: compounds and forms, 212, 342, 355, 1219.[Page 1283]
ῥήμα: =‘thing,’ 94; breathing, 225.
—ρης: ending, 72, 82, 256, 275.

ρήσσω: compounds and forms, 212, 318, 1219.

ρητώς: 160.

ρίπτω: forms, 211, 364; ἔρμμένων, 364; ῥερ– in D, 211.

ρομφαία: 65.

—ρρ—: 217.

ρύμη: 64.

ρύμαι: aor. of, 818.

Ῥωμαϊκός: 159.

Ῥωμαῖος: 159.

Ῥωμαϊστί: 160, 205, 296.

Ῥώμη: initial ῥ, 212.

ρώννυμι: forms, (ἔρρωσθε), 212, 318, 330, 364, 908.

Σ


—σ—: in fut., 354; in pres., 362; in perf. pass., 340, 362.

—ς: 221, 296 (adv.).

—σα: per. end., 305, 339, 346; 1st aor. end., 346.

σαβαχθανεί: 105, 219, 236.

σαβαώθ: 95.

σαββατισμός: 152.

σάββατον: 95, 105, 262; c. ἐν, 523.

σαγήνη: 151.

σαλπίζω: constr., 853.
–σαν: 3d pl. end., 82.
σανδάλιον: 111.
Σαούλ: 96.
σάρκινος: 95, 96.
σαρκίκος: etymology, 158 f.
σάρκινος: etymology, 158.
σάρξ: meaning, 115; use, 784.
σαρόω: 149.
σατανάς: 95, 105.
σατόν: in papyri, 105, 287.
σβέννυ: forms, 318, 1219.
σβεννύω: forms, 1219.
–σε: suffix, 296.
σεαυτῶ: form, 226, 287; use, 288, 687–90.
–σει: itacism in, 240, 928.
–σείω: verbs in, 150, 351.
σείω: compounds and forms, 1219.
σελήνη: gender of, 252.
σεο/ε: fut. suffix, 354 f.
–ση: itacism in, 240, 928.
σημαίνω: in or. obl., 1036.
σημεῖον: use, 176.

σημείω: 149.

σήμερον: form, 219, 294.

σήμα: class, 351; voice of, 801.


σθε: per. end., 186, 240.

σθενώ: 149.

σθω: per. end., 328.

σθωσαν: per. end., 61, 73, 82, 328.

σι: dat. end., 249; pronominal suffix, 306.

σιό: verbs in, 150.

σιγάω: meaning, 834; constr., 857.

σικάριος: 108.

σίκερα: 105.

σιλωά: 95.

σιμακίνθιον: 108, 189, 192.

σίναπι: forms, 111 bis, 268.

σινδόν: 111.

σινιάζω: 147.

σι–ς: denoting action, 151 ff.

σιτιστός: 158.

σιτομέτριον: 80, 167.

σιωπάω: use, 883, 908; reading, 1010.

σκ-verbs: 150, 352.

σκάνδαλον: history of, 174.
σκάπτω: compounds and forms, 1219.
–σκε: verb suffix, 352.
σκέπτομαι: root, 145–6; compounds and forms, 1219.
σκηνο–: in comp., 167.
σκηνόω: meaning, 829.
σκληρο–: in comp., 167, 169.
σκληρόνω: 150.
–σκο: verb suffix, 150, 352.
σκόλοψ: 81.
σκοπός: 146.
σκορπίζω: 150.
σκότος: 134, 262.[Page 1284]
σκύλλω: meaning, 65 n., 81; voice of, 807.
–σκο: verbs in, 150, 352.
σμαράγδινος: 81.
–σο: per. end., 340.
Σολομόν: spelling, 268.
σός: form, 288; use, 288, 684.
σουδάριον: 81, 108.
σοφία: 134.
σπάω: meaning 564, 828; redupl. in perf., 364; voice of, 805, 810; compounds and
forms, 364, 1219.
σπείρης: 62, 82, 232, 256.
σπείρω: constr., 478; compounds and forms, 1219.
σπεκουλάτωρ: 81, 108.
σπλαγχνίζοµαι: 150.
σπλάγνα: form, 410.
σπουδαίως: comp. adv., 488; use, 299.
σπουδή: form, 296.
–σσ–: 55, 61, 62, 72, 97, 218.
στασιαστής: 154.
στύσις: 81.
σταυρός: 115.
στέγη: 65 n.
στείβω: form, 198.
στείρω: form, 275.
στέλλω: compounds and forms, 346, 1219; use of part., 1134.
στερέω: 153.
στήκω: reading, 65, 66, 150, 1010; forms, 188, 224, 315, 320, 351, 1219.
στερέωσις: compounds and forms, 230, 1219.
στ(ο)ιβάς: 198.
στοιχέω: use, 329.
στόµα: use, 95, 102, 649.
στρατεύοµαι: 81; στρ. στρατεύαν, 478.
στρατο–: in comp., 165, 167.
στρέφω: trans. and intrans., 800 bis; compounds and forms, 1219.
στρώννυ: compounds and forms, 318, 1219.
στροννύω: compounds and forms, 1219.
στυγνάζω: 147.

στῦλος: accent, 186, 231.

σῦ: position of, 418; voc., 461; discussed, 678 f.; use, 693; c. αὐτός, ἐαυτοῦ, 687, 689; and ἐκεῖνος, 707; σοῦ, position of, 779; enclitic forms of, 234, 286, 682, 689, 1211.

συγγενής: 81, 272.

συγκρίνω: 66.

συζεύγνυµι: 314.

συκάµινος: 95, 96, 105.

συµβαίνω: συνέβη in or. obl., 392, 1043.

συµβουλέω: voice of, 811; in or. obl., 1036 f.


συµµορφίζω: 150.

σύµµορφος: constr., 528.

συµπόσια: form, 460; case, 487; distributive, 119, 284, 673.

συµφέρω: impersonal, 1058, 1084; c. dat., 539, 1084; c. ἵνα clause, 992; c. acc. and inf., 1084; inf. subject of, 1058, 1084.

σύµφυτος: constr., 528.

συµφύω: form, 341.

συµφονέω: reading, 1010; constr., 1084.

σῦν: in comp., 165, 167, 169, 216 f., 527 f., 528 ff., 558, 562; LXX use, 451; case with, 451, 534, 569 f.; σὺν— c. dat., 528; σὺν=καί, 111; c. acc., 451, 628; c. gen., 138 n., 628; σὺν—…μετά, εἰς, ἐπί, πρός, 562; use in Attic, 553; frequency, 122, 556; c. verbs, 560; and ἐν, 588; and κατά, 606; and μετά, 526, 610; and πρός, 625; and ἃμα, 627; oi σὺν…, 628; discussed, 626–8.

συνάγω: use, 120, 871.

συναγωγή: 65, 124.

συναντάω: 65 n.; use of part., 1135.
συναντιλαμβάνομαι: 72, 80, 160, 163, 171.

συνείδησις: 81, 115.

συνεργέω: trans., 455, 477.

συνεργός: substantival, 504.

συνετός: use, 1097.

συνευδοκέω: 81.

συνευωχέομαι: 81.

συνέχω: voice of, 808; meaning, 81, 828.[Page 1285]

σύνη: ending, 156.

συνίη: accent, 233; forms, 315; in or. obl., 1040.

συνιστάνω: constr., 480.

συνίστημι: meaning, 81; use, 896.

συνπαραλαμβάνω: constr., 857, 862.

συνσταυρόω: 115.

συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος: 120.

συντηρέω: meaning, 627, 828.

συντίθεμαι: c. inf., 1068.

σφάγιον: 157.

σφάζω: compounds and forms, 1219.

σφραγίζω: 81.

σφυ: (δ)ρόν: 210.

σφυρίς: 81, 219.

σχεδόν: form, 295.

σχολή: 66, 82.

σώζω: Aramaic, 105; meaning, 115; constr., 598; part., 891; compounds and forms, 1219.
σώμα: meaning, 81; use, 1206.

σωματικός: 160.

σωτήρ: meaning, 81 bis, 115, 116; and art., 786.

σωτηρία: old word, 81, 97, 115, 116, 125, 157.

σωτήριος: form, 157, 272.

σωφρονισμός: 152.

τ: 218, 223, 248, 352, 1210.

–τ–: verbs, 352.


τάδε: use, 289 f., 696.

–ται: per. end., 340.

ταλειθά: spelling of, 105; voc. of, 465.

ταμέον: 66, 72, 204.

–ταμος: early end., 279.

ταπεινός: 115.

ταπεινοφροσύνη: 115, 156, 167.

ταρταρόω: 126.

τάσσω: constr., 1084; compounds and forms, 349, 359, 1219.


ταυτά: crasis, 208.

τάφος: 120.

τάχα: 295.

τάχιον: adv., 488; use, 197, 278, 664.

ταχέως: 298.
ταχινός: 158.

τάχιον: form, 278 f., 297.

τάχιστος: form, 294, 297, 669; adv., 488.

ταχύ: form, 294, 298, 488.

τέ: origin, 301; c. rel., 290; conj., 301, 1178 f.; position, 424; c. τέ, 427; c. καί, 122, 427 f., 432, 566, 789; use, 135 n., 207, 434; in Luke, 122, 135 n., 428 (Acts); in Heb., 132; in Homer, 711; enclitic, 1211.

–τε: adv. end., 296.

τεκνίον: 66, 232.

τεκνο—: in comp., 163 n., 165, 167.

τέκνον: c. gen., 497, 651.

τεκτο—: in comp., 165.

τελειώ: reading, 987.

τελειωτής: 154.

τελέω: meaning, 834; use, 901; c. part., 1121; fut. τελέσω, 349, 355; pres. τελ(έ)σω, 362; compounds and forms, 349, 1219.

τέλλω: compounds and forms, 1219.

τελώνιον: 65, 154.

τέμνω: compounds and forms, 1219.


τέρας: use, 176.


τέσσερα, τεσσεράκοντα: form, 62, 63, 97, 183, 282–3.

τέταρτος: form, 284.

τέτρα—: in comp., 165, 167, 204.
τετράδιον: 154.

tetradion: form, 296.

tήκω: 351.

teliko: use, 709.

telikoútos: form, 290; use, 709, 731; and art., 771.

tηρέω: constr., 598, 850; meaning, 828; te térhēka, 895.

tērēsis: 81.


–τι: adv. suffix, 296.

ti Ón thelou: in or. obl., 1044.

tidhumi: constr., 480; use, 900; tiódo, 318; tió 318; tióò, 82; òz, 329; [Page 1286]
tiòeika, 364; c. elz, 482; compounds and forms, 306, 310, 318, 347, 350, 1219.

tiktos: class, 351; forms, 1219.

timáw: formation, 147; forms, 305, 334, 351.

timē: 151.

tiç: ti for póteros, 61, 736; ti and hiatus, 206; e. opt. in LXX and N. T., 940;
teteroga; interrogative, 291 f., 916, 940; ti...; ‘why,’ 298, 487, 738–9; ti...; ‘what,’: 739, 916; ti...; ‘how,’ 739, 1176; ti òtι...; 730, 739, 965, 1034; ti toúto...; 736; ti γάρ..., 132, 739; ti oúv..., 132, 739; Ína ti, 739; kathē ti, 739; ðið ti, 584, 739; òz ti, 739; indeclinable ti, 736; ti ēmi (ēmīn) koi soi, 395, 539, 736; tiç...Ñ...; 1177; as relative ‘who,’ 737 f.; in object clauses, 739; for òstis, 67, 72; ti in idioms, 395, 539, 730; c. gen., 515; discussed, 735–40, 1176; c. ðoios, 740; and tiç, 233, 739, 741, 1040; in subj., 934 f.; ti c. òtis, 1034; accent of tín, 233, 740, 1040; in or. obl., 1044.

tiç: ti and hiatus, 206; enclitic, 233, 234 f., 1211; position in sentence, 235, 425; tinó
constr., 490; c. gen., 515; ti adv., 547; and oútoç, 698; in Homer, 711; and tiç,
233, 292, 739; ti c. dh, 584; c. elz, 292; discussed, 741–4; antithetic, 750; e.
negative, 751, 987 f., 1164; and art., 778, 796.

τό: substantivized neut. adj., 156 f.; τό before clauses, 118, 122; not the art., 185; denoting quotation, 243; c. Ἁγαρ, 254, 411; forming adv. phrase, 249 f., 487; c. λοιπόν, 470, 487; c. inf., 118, 966.

toí: use, 302; discussed, 1154 f.

toigaroúv: use, 425, 1154.

toínun: use, 425, 1154.

toítos: form, 290; use, 709; and art., 771.

toioútoç: use, 290, 710, 731; and ὁποῖος, 732; and art., 771.

tolmáwo: roots of, 823.

tópoç: 81.

–toç: verbal form, 157 f., 276, 304, 320, 372 f.; adv. form, 296; comparison of verbals in, 276; superlative end., 283; constr., 504; discussed, 1095 ff.

tosósdoç: use, 709.

tososoitoç: use, 290, 710; and art., 771.

tóté: pronominal, 298; use, 300; constr., 429; in Mt., 119, 443, 549.

–tou: gen., 262.

touñantion: 208.

touñóma: 208.

toút Æstin: see oítoç.

Τραχωνῖτις: c. art., 788.

tréiz: forms, 282.

trépeo: compounds and forms, 359, 1219.

tréfwo: use, 203; compounds and forms, 359, 1220.

tréxw: compounds and forms, 870, 1220.

tríakonta: form, 283.

triakestóz: 284.
τρίβω: compounds and forms, 1220.
τρίς: form, 284, 296; τρία, 282; τρία τρία, 91, 284.
τρισχίλιοι: use, 283.
τροπο—: in comp., 165, 219.
τρόπον: ὁν τρόπον, 486, 487.
τρόποι: 487.
τροφο—: in comp., 165, 219.
τρόγω: 351.
τυγχάνω: constr., 509, 1120; τέτυχα trans., 801; compounds and forms, 1220.
τυπικῶς: 160.
τύπτω: class, 353.
Τυχικός: 159.
τω: accent, 233.
–τω: per. end., 328, 338.
–τωρ: suffix, 151.
–τωσαν: per. end., 55, 61, 63 n., 73, 82, 328, 336, 338.
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υ: vowel-changes, 185, 195, 198–202, 205, 230, 265; υ=ι 238; dropped, 185; stems in, 247, 249.

Ūαλος: 184, 253.

Ūβρίζω: and case, 473.
ὑγεία: 204.
ὑγιής: 275.

οὖδερ: gen. use, 495; loc. use, 521, 533, 590.

ὑστός: 65 n.
-ὑζω: verbs in, 150.

υι: 1, 238.
-ὑία: participles in, 256, 274 f.
-ὑίης: forms in, 275.

ὑίος: meaning, 81 bis, 91, 95, 115, 116; voc. of, 463; c. gen., 102, 497 f., 501, 651, 781; ὑίος φωτός, 133.


οὐλη: 124.

ὑμεῖς: form, see σοῦ, 195 f.; discussed, 289 n., 678.

ὑμέτερος: form, 277; use, 288, 684.
-ὑμι: verbs in, 311.
-ὑνω: in comp., 147, 150, 213.

ὑπάγο: constr., 855; use of ὑπαγε with another imperative, 428, 949.

ὑπακούου: constr., 507; meaning, 634.

ὑπαντάω: constr., 473 n.; meaning, 634.

ὑπάντησις: 152; ἐς ὑπάντησιν, 528.

ὑπάρχω: c. part., 1102, 1121.

ὑπείκο: meaning, 634.

ὑπέρ: in comp., 165, 167, 171, 477; adv., 293, 450; constr., 784; cases with, 491, 569 f.; ὑπέρ ἐγώ, 244, 450; separation implied, 517; frequency, 556; c. verbs, 560; in condensation, 567; c. ὑπότι, 573 f.; and ἐπί, 600; and κατά, 607; and περί, 616, 618; and πρὸς, 623; discussed, 628–33; c. comparatives, 83, 667; c. inf., 1069.

ὑπεράνω: form, 161, 170, 171, 297; use, 550, 646.
ὑπεράνωθεν: use, 647.

ὑπερβαλλόντως: origin, 160, 297 f.

ὑπερβίαν: use, 550.

ὑπερέκεινα: form, 171 bis, 244, 297; use, 647.

ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ: form, 170, 171, 297; –σῶς adv., 171, 297; use, 647.

ὑπερεκτείνο: 477.

ὑπερεντυγχάνο: 82, 165.

ὑπερέχο: c. acc., 477.

ὑπερκάτωθεν: use, 647.


ὑπηρετέω: constr., 540.

ὑπό: elision, 208; form, 223, 226; constr. in comp., 165, 167, 477, 542; cases with, 491, 517, 524, 532, 534, 536, 569 f.; case-form, 524, 570; frequency, 556; c. verbs, 560, 562; in condensation, 567; c. ἀπό, 575, 579; and διά, 582; and ἐπί, 600; and παρά, 615; and ὑπέρ, 630; discussed, 633–6; in prepositional phrases, 792; for agent, 820; c. inf., 1069.

ὑποβάλλω: meaning, 634.

ὑποδείκνυμι: aor. of, 848.

ὑποδέχομαι: meaning, 633.

ὑποζύγιον: 81.

ὑποζώννυμι: meaning, 633.

ὑποκάτω: use, 637.

ὑποκάτωθεν: use, 637.

ὑποκρίνομαι: in or. obl., 1036.

ὑπόκρισις: meaning, 633.

ὑποκριτής: meaning, 633.
ὑπολαμβάνω: constr., 480; meaning, 633; c. ὁτι, 1034.

ὑπολείπω: c. acc., 477; meaning, 634.

ὑπολήνιον: 157, 167.

ὑπομένω: c. acc., 477.

ὑπομυμήσκω: constr., 483, 509; meaning, 634.

ὑπονοέω: in or. obl., 1036.

ὑποπλέω: meaning, 634.

ὑποπνέω: constr., 475; meaning, 634.

ὑποπόδιον: 65, 81, 167.

ὑπόστασις: 81.

ὑποστολή: gen., 515.

ὑποταγή: compounds, 167; use, 819.

ὑποτάσσω: voice of, 807, 809, 817; use, 946.

ὑποτίθημι: trans., 455; meaning, 633.

ὑποτρέχω: constr., 477; meaning, 634.


Ὕσσωπος: 95.[Page 1288]

ὕστερεο: constr., 476, 478, 519, 541; voice of, 814.

ὕστερος: form, 294; meaning, 662; adv., 488.

ὕψηλοφρονέω: 163 n.

ὕψιστος: form, 279, 669.

ὑψόω: constr., 480.

–ώω: verbs in, 62.

–φα: perf. in, 359.


φάγω: form., 340; φάγομαι, 324, 354; use, 883, 1063.

φαίνω: class, 352; futs., 356; compounds and forms, 328, 341, 349, 871, 1220; ἐφάνη, 340, 347, 350; φάνη, 349; use, 868; in or. obl., 1040; c. part., 1040; 1102, 1120.

φανερός: and art., 764.

φαρισαῖοι: 105.

φάσις: ὅτι with, 81, 1033.

φείδω: origin, 295, 298; compounds and forms, 295, 298, 1220.


φείδωλος: 157.


φέρω: compounds and forms, 338, 363, 430, 1220; ἰνέγκα, 55, 338; –ἐνέγκαι, 338; ἰνέγκον, 338, 363; roots, 823; constr., 855; use, 81, 882, 1097; use of φέρε, 949.

φέγγο: compounds and forms, 346, 351, 355, 828, 1220; constr., 476.

φημι: compounds and forms, 144–5, 305, 310, 319, 337, 346, 434, 902; ἐφην, 337, 346; punctuation, φησι, 434; ‘aoristic’ pres., 865; in or. obl., 1036, 1039; c. ὅτι, 1036, 1039; constr., 1083; c. inf., 1036, 1039, 1083; c. οὖ, 1156, 1162; enclitic forms of, 1211.

φθάνω: meaning, 66, 81, 138; constr., 551; use, 842, 1102, 1120; compounds and forms, 1220.

φθέρω: compounds and forms, 1220.

–φι: suffix, 249.

φιάλη: 184.

φιλαδελφία: 65, 81.

φιλέω: use, 1063, 1201; and ἄγαπάω, 1201.
Φιλιπήσιοι: 110.

φιλο—: in comp., 81, 165, 169.

φιλοπρωτεύω: 80, 165.

φίλος: 81.

φιλοστοργία: 81.

φιλοτιμόμαι: 81.

φιμόο: reading, 330; use, 908.

φοβέω: accent, 232; and case, 472 f., 485; constr., 479; φοβ. φόβον, 478; ἐφοβηθήσα, 817–8; c. ἄπο, 577; aor. of, 852 f.; use, 472, 871, 995, 997; in indirect command, 1046.

φόβος: and art., 758.

φοινικίσσα: 155.

φοίνιξ: accent, 230.


φορέω: spelling, 201; forms, 349.


φορτίζω: constr., 484.


φράζω: 352.

φρεν—: in comp., 165, 167, 169.

Φρυγία: c. art., 788.

φυγάς: use, 272.

φυλακή: c. ἐν, 523.

φυλακίζω: 150.

φυλάσσω: constr., 476, 477, 483; form, 352; c. ἀπό, 111; φυλ. φυλακάς, 477, 479; voice of, 807.

φυσικός: 160.

φυσιώ: spelling, 203, 342.

φω: intrans., 800; compounds and forms, 350, 1220.

–φφ–: 215.

φωνή: in or. obl., 1033, 1042.

φῶς: in John, 134; gen. use, 496 f.


–χα: adv. suffix, 296.

χαίρω: inf. with imp. sense, 329; χ. χαρά, 477; constr., 509, 855; voice of, 817; aor. pass., 817; aor. mid., 818; use, 871; use of χαίρειν, 944, 1093; c. ὅτι, 965; c. part., 1122; [Page 1289] compounds and forms, 1220; fut., 356.

χαμαι: case-form, 249, 296, 521, 537.

χαρά: gen., 515.

χάραγμα: 81, 116.

χαρίζομαι: forms, 341, 1220.

χάριν: adv., 294, 298; position, 425; prep., 488; use, 72, 647; c. inf., 1069.

χάρις: 81, 115, 265 bis.

χαριτώ: 149.


χείμαρρος: forms, 275.

χείρ: in comp., 167, 168, 169; use, 95, 102, 649; and ellipsis, 652, 1202.
χειρόγραφον: 72, 167.
χείρον: form, 278, 669.
χερουβίμ: 95.
χέω: accent, 354; compounds and forms, 342, 352, 354, 1220.
χθές: form, 206.
χιλιάς: 283.
χίλιοι: use, 281 f., 283.
χίς: 283.
χῖτων: 105, 111.
χξς: 283.
χοῖνιξ: accent, 230.
χολάω: c. ὧτι, 965.
Χοραζίν: spelling, 205.
χορηγέω: trans., 455.
χορτάζω: meaning, 66, 82, 138.
χράο: compounds and forms, 319, 341, 1220; constr., 454, 473 n., 476, 530, 532, 920.
χρέια: 81.
χρεοφειλέτης: 168, 201.
χρή: 124, 319.
χρῆζω: c. gen., 518.
χρηματίζω: in or. obl., 66, 1036.
χρηστεύο: 149.
χρίσμα: accent, 230.
χριστιανοί: 110, 155.
Χριστός: meaning, 97, 101, 115; spelling, 192, 230; c. ἐν, 115, 587, 784; c. αἷς, 592; and art., 760 f., 795; and Ἰησοῦς, 795 f.

χρίο: constr., 483; compounds and forms, 1220.

χρόνος: c. ἐν, 523; case, 527 f., 543.

χρόνοι: in comp., 165.

χρυσός: in comp., 168, 169; form, 202; reading, 274.

χύννω: new pres., 147, 213, 352.

χώρα: form, 248; and ellipsis, 272, 1202.

χωρέω: form, 369; use of inf., 1030; reading, 1082.

χωρίς: form, 296; position of, 425; use, 647 f.

ψ: 209, 230.

ψάλλω: use, 874.

ψευδάδελφος: 115, 168.

ψευδαπόστολος: 115, 168.

ψεύδοµαι: constr., 854.

Ψηλαφάω: opt. form, 327; constr., 508.

ψηλαφάω: opt. form, 327; constr., 508.

ψυχή: meaning, 81, 115, 126; instr., 487; use, 689.

ψυχικός: meaning, 115, 125; origin, 158.

ψύχω: compounds and forms, 1220.
ψομίζω: constr., 484.

ψομίνον: 81.

Ω

ω: 178, 182, 196, 199–203, 324, 367; ω and o, 200 f.

ω=: augment of, in verbs, 367.

–ω: compar. end., 276; verb end., 306, 315 f., 335, 350 f.

ὦ: use with voc., 111, 264, 302, 463, 1193.

ὦδε: pronominal, 298; use, 299, 548; reading, 696.

ω/η: thematic vowel, 323.


–ωμεν: per. end., 200.

–ων: nom. end., 154, 272; gen. end., 257; part. end., 374.

ὦνέομαι: forms, 1220.

ὦρα: ὦραν acc. of time, 470; c. ἐν, 523.

ὦς: origin, 295, 301; constr., 302, 401, 431, 481, 661, 674; c. pred. acc., [Page 1290] 481; and τοὐτος, 710; temporal (in Lu. esp.), 122, 974; use, 953 f., 963, 967 f., 974, 980, 982, 1032, 1130, 1140, 1193; causal, 963; ὦς ‘about’ c. numeral, 674, 968; c. ὄτι, 964, 1033, 1049; c. part., 966, 1124, 1127; in indirect questions, 1032; discussed, 987, 1032; disappearance of, 980 n.; c. inf., 990, 1091, 1093; in consec. clauses, 1000 f.; in conditions, 1021, 1025; in 1 Peter, 127; in Homer, 954; in Lu., 122, 974, 1030; c. ὃν, 974, 1040 f.; οὐχ ὦς, 1140; proclitic, 1211.

–ὦς: names, 172; adv., 248.


–ωσαν: 62.

ὦσαννα: 95.

ὦσαύτος: adv., 298.

ὦσεί: use, 674, 968, 1140.

ὦσπερ: use, 431, 969, 1130, 1140, 1154.
ὤσπερε: use, 1154.

ὤστε: connecting particle, 431; c. inf., 431, 909, 990, 1000, 1088, 1090; c. perf. inf., 909; c. indic., 999 f., 1088; c. subj., 931, 990, 999; pure purpose, 990, 1072, 1089, 1090; and ἵνα, 999; intro. inferential particle, 999; in consec. clauses, 999 f., 1088; use and statistics, 135, 999.

–ωσύνη: 201.

ὤτάριον: 82, 156.

–ὁτερος: compar. end., 278.

ὤτίον: 65, 82, 156.

οὐ: 203, 205.

ὤφελέω: accent, 233; constr., 472, 483 f., 485, 541.

–ως: in perf. part., 373.
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<th>Reference</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:28</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:5</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tobit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>97, 371, 822, 878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:11</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>1070, 1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:13</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:2</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judith**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:18</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:34</td>
<td>1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:19</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:5</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1 Maccabees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:11</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:52</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:88</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:89</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:16</td>
<td>415 bis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:36</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:23</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15:28  415
16:9   1070, 1074, 1075

2 Maccabees
1:8    159
1:11   1141
1:31   974
3:9    1120
3:16   1043
3:16   1043
4:13   1163
4:38   618
5:10   729
6:2    260
7:8    28
7:14   1075
7:21   28
8:6    318
8:24   192 bis
9:22   183, 370
12:4   1141
12:15  639
12:27  722
15:7   370

3 Maccabees
4:1    1141
5:20   900

4 Maccabees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:28</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:13</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:7</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20, 21</td>
<td>1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enoch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:3</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psalms of Solomon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:23</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susanna O</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS**

**Reuben**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Levi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>424, 1185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gad**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Joseph**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:8</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benjamin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:4</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Naphtali**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:2</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audollent

Defixionum tabellae, ed. Audollent (Paris, 1904)
No. 238, 29  857

Benndorf-Niemann

Reisen in Lykien und Karien
129 N. 102  1170

B C H

Bulletin de correspondance hellénique
1901, p. 416 (lead tablet at Amorgus)  109
1903, p. 235  522

C I G

Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum
5834  192

C. Insc. Lat. (C I L)

Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum
v, 8733  1093

Deissmann

Light from the Anc. East, p. 75
“Limestone Block from the Temple of Herod at Jerusalem”  1092

Delphian Inscription

Inscriptions recueillies à Delphes (Wescher et Foucart)
220  1074

Heberdey-Wilhelm

Reisen in Kilikien
170, 2  1094
137  1009

Inscr. of Magn.
Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander (von O. Kern)

16, 29  511

215  938

90, 12  994

Inscription of Thera

Hermes

1901, p. 445  660

IG

Inscriptiones Graecae

xii, 2, 562, 5  1189

7 N. 240, 13  777

5, 647  849

5, 590  669

1, 671  959

5, 29  579

IMA

Inscriptiones Maris Aegaei

iii, 174  1129

325  622

JHS

Journal of Hellenic Studies (Hellenic Society)

xix, 14  535

92  406

299  737

1902, p. 349  728

xxii, 1902, 369  1061

Kaibel

Epigrammata Graeca
1878, p. 269  274
p. 134  592

Letronne (Letr.)

Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l’Égypte, ed. Letronne (1842)

No. 70, 79, 92  478
149  414
220  521

Michel

Recueil d’inscriptions grecques, ed. C. Michel (Brussels, 1900)

No. 370  1069
694  622, 1024

O G I S

Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae, ed. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1903–5)

No. 41  1069
90, 23  1141[Page 1367]
484  406
458, 71  223
223, 49  223
177, 15  213
748, 20  213
117, 17  193
352, 66  193
458, 41  218
565, 19  204
515, 26 f.  204
618, 2  204

P A S
Papers of American School at Athens

ii, 397 172

iii, 375 172

Pergamon Inscr.

Die Inschriften von Pergamon von M. Fränkel

N 13 (B.C. 300) 849

249, 26 959

13, 31 1093

13, 34 1093

Perrot

Exploration arch. de la Galatie

p. 24, N 34 702

Petersen-Luschan

Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien

p. 113, xviii A 5 599

160, N 190 869

174, N 223, 21 959

Pontica

Studia Pontica (Anderson-Cumont-Gregoire)

iii, 62, 8 931

Priene

Inschriften von (herausg. von F. Hiller von Gaertringen)

112, 98 f. 582

50, 39 595

111, 117 615

Ramsay, C. and B.

Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, by W. M. Ramsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1895, 1897)

ii, 292 1018
317, 391, 395, 399 928
343 972
391 (No. 254) 648
525 668

**Syll.**

Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum, ed. Dittenberger
No. 326, 12 160
928, 52 375

**Viereck**

Sermo Graecus quo senatus populusque Romanus...usi sunt, by P. Viereck
(Göttingen, 1888)

p. 38 958

**Waddington**

Inscr. de la Syrie

2413a 837
2614 595

*(D) PAPYRI AND OSTRACA*

**A. P.** (P. Amh. and Amh. Pap.)

Amherst Papyri, part ii (1901)

No. 11, 26 723
31 154
50 470
77 527
78 1134, 1137
81, 11 977
86 944, 1093
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>939, 994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>299, 546, 618, 875, 909, 1081, 1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>318, 737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>979, 1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1178</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. M. (P. B. M.)**

British Museum Papyri, ed. F. G. Kenyon (London, 1893, 1898)


**B. U. (B. G. U.)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>522</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>611, 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>933, 994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>689, 691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>997, 1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>691, 857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>991, 1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>833, 843, 1124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vol. ii. Nos. 362–696 (1898)

No. 363  692

380  487
385  592
388  665
423  188, 419, 464, 514, 592, 833, 834, 835, 846, 1132, 1151
424  972
530  190, 963, 1147, 1181
449  406
456  746
531  993
543  475
546  1009
596  361, 907, 1129
607  730, 972
623  671
664  631
665  1068

Vol. iii. Nos. 697–1012 (1903)

No. 775  806
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822</td>
<td>737, 989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>1068, 1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>843</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>178, 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>734, 737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>513, 589, 1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1031</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>287, 488, 577, 582, 615, 692, 933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Page 1369] Ch. P.

Greek Papyri from the Cairo Museum, ed. E. J. Good-speed (Chicago, 1902)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. P. R. and P. E. R.
Corpus papyrorum Raineri, ed. C. Wessely (Vienna, 1895)

No. 11      690
12      654
19      962
24      892, 978
156      1002, 1068
237      959

Deissmann

Ostracon, Thebes, 32–3 A.D.      828

Eudoxus

Papyrus of the Astronomer Eudoxus, ed. Blass      692

F. P. (Fay. P. and P. Fay.)

Fayûm Towns and their Papyri (1900)

No. 110      817
112      933, 994
118      622, 987
119, 276      595
121      861
124      495
136      959
137      1176

G.

An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic (1896)

No. 35      945

G. H.

Greek Papyri, series II (1897)

No. 15      82, 786
23a  745, 746
36  614, 806
38  976

**Hb. P.** (P. Hib. and Hib. P.) Hibeh Papyri (all iii/B.C.) (1906)

No. 42  589
44  406
44, 45  974
45, 60, 168  986
56  851
78  1010

**K. P.**

Papyri from Karanis, ed. E. J. Goodspeed (Chicago, 1900)

No. 46  458, 481, 595

**L. P.**

Papyri Graeci Musei antiquarii publici Lugduni-Batavi, ed. C. Leemans (1843)

a 35 f.  665
b  518 bis, 939, 1062
w  274, 516, 983

**M. P.**

Papyri from Magdola, in B C H 1902 ff., Jouget’s ed. (1912)

No. 16 and 20  584

**N. P.**


No. 7  993
16  1061
17  995
19  844
O. P. (P. Oxy. and Oxy. P.) Oxyrhynchus Papyri

Vol. i. Nos. 1–207 (1898)

No. 34  977

36  1069[Page 1370]

37  195, 577, 632, 867, 1040

38  578, 963

48, 49, 722  635

52  990

79  484

86  1068

99  656

105  1010

112  533

115  888

117  723

118  989

119  70, 572, 1174
Vol. ii. Nos. 208–400 (1899)
No. 237  518, 983, 991, 1048, 1069 bis
240  939
255  1150
256  745
260  690
274  666
275  513, 537, 631, 846, 963, 1002, 1129, 1131, 1132, 1139
292  341
294  600, 686, 909, 1081
295  807
299  682
Vol. iii. Nos. 401–653 (1903)
No. 413  932
471  1137
477  470, 471
478  900
482  844, 900
484  474
486  548
491  1137
492  469
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Paris Papyri, in Notices et Extraits, xviii, part 2, ed. Brunet de Presle (1865)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 5</td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>576, 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1009, 1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>532, 574, 939, 972, 1031, 1043, 1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35, 37</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>995, 989, 1087, 1169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>414, 508, 536, 682, 867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 1 190, 640

P. Fi.

Florence Papyri, ed. Vitelli (Lineci Academy: fasc. 1., Milan, 1905)

No. 2 991, 1069, 1071

5 624

P. Goodspeed (P. Goodsp.)

No. 4 632, 877, 1022, 1119, 1129

P. Grenf.

No. 67 632

73 484, 687

77 1080

P. Heid.

Heidelberg Papyri (mainly LXX), ed. G. A. Deissmann (1905)

No. 6 406

Pap. L.

Dieterich, Abraxas, 195, 9 789

P. Lond

Kenyon, Greek P. in British Museum 274

xlii 837

P. P.

Flinders Petrie Papyri, ed. J. P. Mahaffy (in Proc. Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs, viii, 1891)

No. 8 690

i, 15, 15 287
Rein. P.

Papyrus Th. Reinach (Paris, 1905)
7 (ii/B.C.) 922, 1014

R. L.

Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphia (Oxford, 1896)
Col. 29 726
38$^2$ 586

Rhein. Mus.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie
lxvii, 4, 1912 1182

Tb. P. (P. Tb., Tebt. P. and Tb.)

Tebtunis Papyri (University of California Publications, Part II)
No. 1 752, 983
1, 66 165
6 689, 976
8 633
14 1134
16 590, 594
19\textsubscript{12f}. 148
24 279, 669
26 406
28  1010
33  877, 1119
35  808, 811
36  613
40  162, 168, 654
41  588
42  1134
43  91, 595
47  689
50  861
58  406, 1009
59  945
72  669
104  1187
105  516, 669, 752
230  517
333  1010
414  834, 932, 986
421  682, 748, 762, 1126

T. P.

Turin Papyri, ed. Peyron (1826)
  No. 1       491
  7          148

Wess. P.

Papyrorum scripturae Graecae Specimen
  xxvi     1012, 1175
(E) GREEK LITERATURE

I. CLASSICAL

Homer (? x/viii B.C.)

Iliad i, 137 958
i, 262 1160
i, 587 590
iii, 289 1016
iv, 410 1170
iv, 501 755
x, 127 981
xiii, 700 610
xvi, 301 1170
xviii, 134 1170
xx, 139 1016
xx, 335 972
xxii, 349 674
xxiv, 38 590
Odyssey iv, 684 1136, 1172

xx, 52 1053

**Hesiod** (? viii/B.C.)
Fragment 981

**Æschylus** (v/B.C.)
Prom. Vinct. 268 f. 1038

358 538

Persae 981 673

**Sophocles** (v/B.C.)
Oedipus Coloneus 155 994

317 738

816 878

Oedipus Tyrannus 1141 737

1146 878

Philoctetes 100 1069

300 932

Electra 817 1161

1078 1094

Ajax 1180 856

**Euripides** (v/B.C.)
Alcestis 386 837, 846

471 660

Bacchides 1065 563

Hecuba 401 1161

Iphig. in Taur. 962 f. 746

1359 392
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>Page 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medea</td>
<td></td>
<td>627</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>822</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes (v/B.C.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aves</td>
<td></td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>674, 744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran.</td>
<td></td>
<td>721</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus (v/B.C.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 210, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii, 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v, 108</td>
<td></td>
<td>783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi, 67, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi, 68, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii, 170</td>
<td></td>
<td>644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td></td>
<td>837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides (v/B.C.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 52, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 122</td>
<td></td>
<td>1188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 137, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 141</td>
<td></td>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 45, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 52, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii, 36, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 54, 3</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 93</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v, 50, 3</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii, 26, 9</td>
<td>991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[Page 1373] Isocrates (iv/B.C.)**

| iv, 44 | 961 |

**Xenophon (iv/B.C.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anabasis</td>
<td>i, 2, 6</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 3, 14</td>
<td>790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 4, 20</td>
<td>955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v, 9</td>
<td>588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii, 4, 9</td>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii, 4, 16</td>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>i, 4, 3</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 6, 18</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii, 3, 9</td>
<td>472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mem.</td>
<td>ii, 6, 39</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 4, 25</td>
<td>747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellen.</td>
<td>i, 1, 2</td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii, 2, 14</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oec.</td>
<td>vi, 14</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plato (iv/B.C.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apologia</td>
<td>20 E</td>
<td>851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 A</td>
<td>851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 C</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 B</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crito 44 A 897
Theat. 155 C 857
Protag. 309 C 665
  312 A 1174
  326 D 478
Repub. 337 B 933
  433 1060
Crat. 399 A-B 228
  405 D 766
Soph. 254 A 779
Polit. (p. 289 C) 149
Phaedr. 78 D 1165
  89 D 275
Gorg. 453 B 438
  459 B 1172
  515 C 630
Æschines (iv/B.C.)
Eum. 737 1069
Aristotle (iv/B.C.)
Rhet. iii, 9 432
Æneas (iv/B.C.)
114, 5 H 595

II. KOINH

Theocritus (iii/B.C.)
ix, 25 1001
x, 14 1001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristeas</strong> (iii/ii B.C.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7, 34 974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demetrius</strong> (iii/B.C.)</td>
<td>De eloc. 21, 11</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Herondas</strong> (iii/B.C.)</td>
<td>iv, 61</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polybius</strong> (ii/B.C.)</td>
<td>iii, 19, 7</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv, 32, 5</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi, 5, 10</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvii, 11, 2</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxxii, 12</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diodorus</strong> (i/B.C.)</td>
<td>i, 75, 5</td>
<td>1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i, 77, 3</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xi, 21, 3</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xi, 37, 3</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv, 8, 3</td>
<td>961, 989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv, 80, 8</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvi, 74, 6</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvi, 85</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strabo</strong> (i/B.C.)</td>
<td>i, 1, 7</td>
<td>973 bis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii, 5, 22</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv, 41</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c, 828</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philo</strong> (i/A.D.)</td>
<td>i, 166, 20</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 112, 23</td>
<td>973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius Josephus (i/A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiq. v, 82</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii, 9, 2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x, 4, 2</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii, 2, 3</td>
<td>973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii, 5, 2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell. ii, 16, 2</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v, 6, 3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v, 12, 2</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi, 2, 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apion iv, 21</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vit. 17</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius Thrax (i/A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 34, 372, 492, 1101, 1146 bis</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutarch (i/A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 256 D</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 592 B</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 694 C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest. Conviv. i, 6, 1</td>
<td>697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons. ad Uxor. 1</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Barnabas] (i/A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:28</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:9</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:11</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement of Rome (i/A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. i, 21:9</td>
<td>723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 45:1</td>
<td>946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 8:2</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 12:2</td>
<td>972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dio Chrysostom (i/A.D.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiv, 44</td>
<td>995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcus Aurelius (ii/A.D.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi, 42</td>
<td>595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justin Martyr (ii/A.D.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apol. i, 16, 6</td>
<td>839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort. 5 (p. 253 A)</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrian (ii/A.D.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epictetus i, 9, 15</td>
<td>931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, 11, 32</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 2, 16</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 17, 14</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 18, 11</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 22, 24</td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii, 23, 1</td>
<td>937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 1, 41</td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 1, 50</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 3, 9</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 4, 11</td>
<td>963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 5, 8–9</td>
<td>963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 10, 18</td>
<td>1092, 1095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 10, 27</td>
<td>837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 10, 34</td>
<td>963, 1169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv, 10, 35</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascensio Isaiae</td>
<td>ii/A.D.</td>
<td>ii, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement of Alexandria</td>
<td>ii/A.D.</td>
<td>Paidagogus iii, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermas</td>
<td>ii/A.D.</td>
<td>Vis. i, 1, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i, 3, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv, 1, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>viii, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sim. v, 1, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>viii, 1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>viii, 5, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ix, 9, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ix, 12, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mand. iv, 1, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v, 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>viii, 9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle to Diognetus</td>
<td>ii/A.D.</td>
<td>p. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irenaeus</td>
<td>ii/A.D.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>584 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Clement]</td>
<td>iii/A.D.</td>
<td>Homilies i, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix, 4</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi, 3</td>
<td>929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi, 20</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix, 12</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[Page 1375] Pausanias (ii/A.D.)**

| ii, 35, 3 | 1017 |

**Ignatius (ii/A.D.)**

- Ep. to Romans 8:3 | 1020 |
- Ep. to Ephesians 10:2 | 946 |
- Ep. to Polycarp 5:2 | 1020 |

**Lucian (ii/A.D.)**

- Alexander 22 | 974 |

**Theophilus (ii/A.D.)**

- Ad Autolycum 2, 34 | 994 |
- I, 6 | 1022 |

**Origen (iii/A.D.)**

- 1 Cor. 5:7 | 219 |
- Contra Celsus vii, 59 f. | 85 |

**Heliodorus (iii/A.D.)**

- Æthiop. vi, 14 | 595 |

**Acta Christophori (iii/A.D. ?)**

- 68, 18 | 1001 |

**Acta Barnabae (iii/A.D. ?)**

- 10 | 1002 |

**Eusebius (iv/A.D.)**

- Eccl. Hist. vi, xxv, 11 | 88 |
- P. E. vi, 7, 257d | 725 |

**Mark 16:9** | 672 |

**Epiphanius (iv/A.D.)**

| Matthew 13:30 | 673 |
Theodoret (iv/A.D.)
iv, 851  1069

Gregory of Nazianzus (iv/A.D.)
ii, 13 A  137

Gregory of Nyssa (iv/A.D.)
iii, 557 B  137

Proclus (v/A.D.)
In rem publ. ii, 225, 22  1036

John Philoponus (v/A.D.)
De aetern. 430, 28  1007
  p. 85, 19  1011

Achilles Tatius (v/A.D.)
ii, 24, 3  923
iv, 16, 3  996
iv, 16, 13  961

Callinicus (v/A.D.)
Vita Hypatii 57, 12, 113, 11  1040

Priscian (v/A.D.)
Lib. V. de Casu  492

Apophthegmata Patrum (vi/A.D.)
105 C  725

N. T. Apocrypha
Gospel of Pet. 35  673
Acta Thomae (Radermacher, N. T. Gk., p. 128)  932
Acta Pauli et Theclae  29, 993
Martyrium Pauli  594
Quaest. Barthol., pp. 24, 30  1189

Apocalypsis Anastasiae
6, 13  412

Acta S. Theogn.
The very numerous illustrations of the vernacular modern Greek idiom (cf. p. 481) are not referred to authors.

(F) LATIN

Cicero (i/B.C.)
Pro Archia 10 108
Att. 6. 5 933, 994
Cato Maj. 23, 3 108

Pliny (i/A.D.)
ADDENDA TO THE SECOND EDITION


Page xxx. Among numerous other works that should be noted is A. Meillet’s *Aperçu de la Langue Grecque* (1913). So on p. xxxv some notice should have been made of the Greek Grammar by Prof. E. A. Sonnenschein, of Birmingham, and of his other writings. Note also W. Larfield, *Griechische Epigraphik* (2. Aufl., 1913); O. Hoffmann and P. Gärtchen, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, Bd. IV, Heft 4, Abt. 2 (1913), with grammar and index to the whole group; M. N. Tod, “The Progress of Greek Epigraphy” (*Journal of Hell. Studies*, Jan., 1915).

Page 64, line 16. Add “a speaker” after “render.”

Page 138, line 1. Add “ends” after “usually.”


Page 172, note 6. Add: It should be noted that Ἕρμᾶς is the short form of any name that contains this name-element, like Ἕρμοδωρος, Ἕρμοκράτης, Ἕρμαρχος, Ἕρμόφυλος, Ἕρμογένης. In many cases the original unabridged name can only be guessed at. Cf. Fick-Bechtel, pp. 113, 132.

Page 180. On pp. 19–26 of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels (Part I) by Sanders, there is a good discussion of the spelling, grammatical forms, and scribal errors of this interesting document. See also The Freer Gospels by E. J.


———, *L’aoriste en lat.* (Revue de Phil., 1897, p. 81 f.).

———, *Notes d’Étymologie Grecque* (1896).


Goodspeed (1914) in which monograph W is carefully compared with Westcott and Hort’s text.

Page 180. Of the inscriptions on the tombs in Phrygia, Ramsay says that the Greek was bad, even that of “persons of high rank in their cities” (Expos. T., Jan. 17, 1915, p. 174).


Page 304. Add this from Westphall: “The noun is a verb at rest, and the verb is a noun in motion.”


Page 326, line 16. It should have been noted that the middle optative uses only the suffix –ι (τιθείμι, δοι), as originally did the active dual and plural (σταίμεν, τιθεῖτε).


Page 414. The sudden change from accusative with ἰδον to nom. so common in the Apocalypse is found in Ezek. 3:13, ἰδον φωνήν—καὶ φωνή.


Ramsay

Ramsay, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).

———, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).


Brugmann

Brugmann, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).

———, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).


———, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).
Page 417. Note the careful balancing of words in 1 Cor. 14:20. In 14:26 note the asyndeton and repetition of ἔχει.

Page 424 (i), line 7. Add “Mt. 23:28” as another example of μέν in the fifth place and “Ro. 7:25” in sixth place.

Page 424 (i), line 12. Add “Mt. 22:28” as another example of οὖν in the fourth place.


Page 537, line 15 from bottom. Add ὑιός after μονογενής.

Page 539. A good instance of the ethical dative appears in Gal. 6:11 ὑμῖν (‘mark you’).

Page 560, line 6. With ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἰμάτιον (Lu. 5:36) compare ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἰματίῳ (Mt. 9:16).

Page 561. I gave no example of εἰς— followed by ἐν. I note one in Rev. 11:11 πνεῦμα ζοφῆς ἐσφάλματο ἐν αὐτοῖς, the reading of A 18. 28** 36. 79. 95. But CP 1. 7. 12. 17. 38 have simply αὐτοῖς, while R B al+[Page 1379] give εἰς αὐτοῖς, and 49. 91. 96 have ἐν αὐτοῖς. W. H. doubtfully print ἐν αὐτοῖς in brackets. The variation shows how ἐν is giving way before εἰς.

Page 576. The force of ᾧ ό in composition as meaning ‘in full’ comes out finely in Lu. 16:25 ὅτι ἀπέλαβες τὰ ὅγαθά σου ἐν τῷ ζωῆς σου.


Page 587, line 4. Add: ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν (Lu. 5:17; 8:22; 20:1).

Page 594. On εἰς like a dative, note τῇς δεδομένης εἰς σέ (Ezek. 3:3).

Page 599. On the partitive use of ἐξ in the κοινή see Radermacher’s review of Lietzmann’s “Griechische Papyri” (Zeitschrift f. d. österr. Gymn., 1914, III. Heft, 2)


Page 607, line 10 from bottom. With κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος compare ἥ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία in Mt. 12:31.

Page 608. The distributive use of both ἄνα and κατὰ occurs in 1 Cor. 14:27.

Page 609. For κατὰ with acc. in sense of ‘like’ (standard), note Gal. 4:28 κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ.


Page 644. Μέσον as preposition appears in Epictetus, Bk. II, ch. xxii, § 10, Βάλε καὶ σοῦ καὶ τοῦ παιδίου μέσον ἁγρίδιον (Sharp, Epict. and N. T., p. 94).

Page 657. On ἐχόμενα as possible preposition see Ezek. 1:15, 19.

Page 669. As examples of the true superlative in –τατος, note λαμπροτάτ[η] πόλει O. P. 1100 (A.D. 206), and ἐν τοῖς τῶν νομῶν φανερωτάτοις (ib.). Cf. also O. P. 1102, 4 f. (A.D. 146).

Page 686, line 2 from bottom. After καὶ αὕτοὺς add Mk. 1:19.


Page 720, line 9. In 1 Cor. 15:10 the neuter gender is to be noted.

Page 753. Sharp, in his Epictetus and the N. T. (1914), which is full of suggestive parallels between the idiom of Epictetus and that of the N. T., quotes (p. 13) Bk. II, ch. xxii, § 36, εἰδὼς [Page 1380] ἔκριβδως τοῦ τοῦ Πλάτωνος, ὅτι πᾶς ψυχὴ ἡ ἄκουσα στέρεται τῆς ἀληθείας, 'knowing accurately the teaching of Plato that no soul is willingly deprived of the truth,’ a striking parallel to πᾶς—οὐ in the sense of “no one.” He quotes also from the Rylands Papyri, vol. II, a papyrus dated 133 A.D., the μὴ—πᾶς idiom, μὴ ἔχοντας πᾶν πράγμα πρός ἐμέ.

Page 760. Note αὕτη ἡ Ἰερουσαλήμ in Ezek. 5:5.

Page 811. See example of redundant middle in Hos. 3:2, ἐμισθωσάμην ἐμαντῷ.

Page 812. Ramsay notes εἰσέλθοτοι on a tomb in Phrygia and adds that the middle voice was loved in Phrygia (Expos. T., Jan., 1915, p. 174).

Page 823. The aorist is a sort of flashlight picture, the imperfect a time exposure. Iterative action is like the repetition in moving pictures.

Sharp SHARP, G., Remarks on the Definitive Article in the Greek of the N. T. (1803).
Perhaps a word more should be said as to the point of view of the speaker or writer. The same action can be viewed as punctiliar or linear. The same writer may look at it now one way, now the other. Different writers often vary in the presentation of the same action.

Prof. C. W. Peppler, of Trinity College, Durham, N. C., contributes this note: “Ἐσχον, ‘I got,’ is the only aorist that is always ingressive. Hence ἔχον, ‘I had,’ has to do duty as both imperfect and aorist.”

Page 844. In The Expositor (May and June, 1915), Rev. Frank Eakin, of Allegheney, has a very interesting discussion of “The Greek Aorist” or more exactly “An Investigation into the Usage of the Greek Aorist in the New Testament, and its Proper Translation into English.” By a study of 800 aorist indicatives in the Gospel of John he shows that Weymouth uses other tenses than the simple past in English in 21 per cent, Moffatt in 22, the A. V. in 18, and the R. V. in 8. He argues that modern knowledge as seen in Weymouth and Moffatt, is freeing itself from the bondage of Winer’s mistaken conception of the Greek aorist which was followed by the Revisers. Nothing is now clearer than that the Greek aorist indicative cannot be made to square regularly with the English past. It more commonly does so in narrative than elsewhere, but no ironclad rule can be laid down. Mr. Eakin concludes that the aorist is “to be regarded as what it essentially [Page 1381] is—an indefinite tense—except when it is seen to derive definition from the context.”


Page 889. A good example of the linear future appears in Gal. 6:16 στοιχήσουσιν.

Page 895. Moulton (Exp., April, 1901, p. 280) quotes Plato, Apol. 28C ὅσοι ἐν Τροίᾳ τετελευτήκασι, a reference to the Greek Bible (Homer).

Weymouth Weymouth, On the Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect (1894).


Winer

Winer, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834–1843).


Moulton


——— , Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

——— , Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


Page 927. Prof. Sonnenschein’s more developed theory of the subjunctive is to be seen in his little volume on The Unity of the Latin Subjunctive (1910). He plausibly argues that originally the subj. and opt. were identical in meaning like the first and second aorist tenses and “only gradually differentiated in Greek through a long process of development.” He makes the subj. (p. 54) stand midway between the ind. and the imper.

Page 929. Sonnenschein (Cl. Rev., April, 1902, pp. 165–169) suggests “the interrogative imperative” or “the interrogative prohibition” as the explanation of the origin of the use of οὐ μή with the subjunctive and even for οὐ μή with the future indicative by analogy or because of the future indicative of command. But R. Whitelaw replies (Cl. Rev., June, 1902, p. 277) that the notion of a prohibitive μή with future indicative is untenable. On the whole one must admit that the origin of the οὐ μή construction is unsolved.


Page 958. Note οὖ ἂν ἦν in Ezek. 1:12, 20, and ὡς ἂν συνετελέσθησαν in Job 1:5.


———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.

Page 959. Note καθώς ἀν εἴη in Ezek. 1:16.

Page 964. See declarative διότι (= ὅτι) in Ezek. 5:13 ἐπιγνώσῃ διότι ἐγὼ Κύριος λελάληκα. Cf. also 6:10, 13. Dr. James Moffatt (The Expositor, Feb., 1915, p. 187, “Professor Robertson’s [Page 1382] N. T. Grammar”) says: “The use of διότι for ὅτι may be illustrated from Polybius, where the former seems to be used after a preceding vowel to avoid hiatus; a similar practice may explain the interchange of ὃς and ὅτι, and of πηλίκος and ἠλίκος.”

Page 968. For καθώς at the beginning of a sentence (1 Tim. 1:3) see καθώς ἐνετειλάμην σοι Oxy. P. 1299, 9–10.

Page 994. J. Rendel Harris in a review of Moffatt’s “New Translation of the N. T.” (The Expositor, Dec., 1914, p. 537) commends his rendering of Eph. 3:17 (the inf. κατοικῆσαι) and of Jo. 17:21 ff. and Col. 2:2 (Ἰνα) as wishes, and adds: “These new renderings are a great improvement, even if for the present grammarians are ignorant of them and the classical scholars acknowledge them not.”

Page 1018. In Lu. 16:31 we have the first and third class conditions side by side.

Page 1043. But μὴ γένοιτο and the inf. does occur often enough in the LXX, as in Gen. 44:7, 17; Josh. 22:29; 24:16; 1 Ki. 21:3; 1 Macc. 9:10; 13:5.

Page 1069. In the Papyrus de Magdola 11 three examples of παρὰ τὸ and the inf. occur: παρὰ τὸ ἐίναι (line 5), παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι (line 7), παρὰ τὸ ἐίναι (line 15).

Page 1137. About negatives with the participle Robison (Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers, 1913, p. 39) says that in the Apostolic Fathers μὴ with its compounds occurs 168 times, while οὐ with its compounds is found 29 times. He adds that about 5 1/2 per cent of the participles have negatives, an increase in comparison with classical Greek “and shows the growth of the feeling that a participle is equivalent to a subordinate clause.” But Robison still endeavours to preserve the purely subjective meaning of μὴ with the participle like the classic idiom.

Page 1145. Add Lu. 14:26 ἔτι τε καί as a good illustration of particles bunched together.

Robertson


———, Syllabus on N. T. Greek Syntax (1900).

Harris HARRIS, J. RENDEL, Side-Lights on N. T. Research (1908).
Page 1154. Gildersleeve, *Am. J. of Ph.*, 1912, p. 240, calls τοί “the confidential particle” and τοίνυν “doubly so.” “Τοί is an appeal for human sympathy, as που is a resigned submission to the merciless rerum natura.”

Page 1179. The use of τε καί in pairs is well illustrated in Jas. 3:7.

**[Page 1383]** Page 1183. The adversative use of καί occurs in Ezek. 3:18, 19, 20.

Page 1186. In 1 Cor. 14:20, 22 note the use of ἀλλά—δέ side by side where the main contrast is presented by δέ and the minor one by ἀλλά.

Page 1200. The zeugma in Rev. 1:12 βλέπειν τὴν φωνήν appears in Ezek. 3:13 ἰδον φωνῆν πτερύγων.

Page 1206. An example of hendiadys occurs in Jas. 4:2, φονεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε.

Page 1286. Add “Mk. 5:22…502.”

Page 1287. Add “Mk. 9:7…506.”

Page 1292. Add “7:2…546.”

Page 1349. Add “2 Macc. 6:21…184.”

**[PAGE 1385] ADDENDA TO THE THIRD EDITION**

Page 37. In the *Expos. T.* for Dec., 1916, the late J. H. Moulton accepts the suggestion of Hrozný and E. Meyer that the Hittite language is a member of the Indo-European family as is true of the Tokharian.

Gildersleeve

GILDERSLEEVE, B. L., Editions of Pindar and Justin Martyr.

———, Latin Grammar. Many editions since 1867.

———, Notes on Stahl’s Syntax of the Greek Verb (1910).

———, Numerous articles in the American Journal of Philology.

Moulton


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

Page 109, line 9 ab imo. Τὸ ἰκανόν ποιῆν (Mk. 15:15). Mr. J. F. Springer, of New York, furnishes me several citations of this Latin idiom in Greek for 350 years, so that Mark’s use of it was neither at the beginning of the use nor when it was dying out. The examples appear in Polybius, Historiae 32. 3 (7). 13 (cited in J. Schweighäuser) and in Diogenes Laërtius, De Vitis, etc., 4. 50 (cited by Liddell and Scott); Hermas, Pastor Sim. 6. 5. 5; Appian, Bell. Pun., p. 68; Arrian, Exped. Alex. 5, p. 370. Evidently Mark’s idiom was current for centuries.

Page 115. Mr. H. Scott has counted the entire number of the words in the text of W. H. for Matthew as 18,302; for Luke 19,461; for Acts 18,296.

Page 118, line 10 ab imo. To Mk. 3:11 add “6:56; 8:35.”

Page 119, line 5. Mr. Scott gives this table for οὖν in Synoptics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>MATT.</th>
<th>LUKE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Narrative or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>0[16]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Speeches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without parallels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not used in the</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallels occurs also</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in parallels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

Liddell and Scott LIDDELL and SCOTT, Greek-English Lexicon. 8th ed. (1882).

1 Matthew has 4=with Mark and 7 with Luke. Luke 7=are with Matthew only. See Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary, p. 360.


Page 190 f. Prof. Walter Petersen calls attention to the fact that, so long as ὅν (‘if’) and modal ὅν were distinguished in vowel quantity, there was little confusion. When they became alike in quantity, the syncretism in usage came. Mr. Scott furnishes this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>ἐὰν for ὅν (see Geden, p. 237) with</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δὲς  δὺς  δὺσ  δὺτς  δὺκ  ὦ  ἡμίκα</td>
<td>καθό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>12  6  3  1  1  1  1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>6  1  4  1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jo.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Jo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27  9  7  2  1  1  1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1  3  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5  3  3  1  1  1  1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32  9  7  5  4  1  1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 205, line 13. For example ἵσχυι.

Pages 208, 984. For κἂν=καί note these examples: Οὐκ [Ἐ] ὀδηλωσάς μοι κἂν περὶ τῆς ὀλοκληρίας. Οξυ. P. XII. (iv/α.δ.) 1593, l. 5. Κἂν νῦν, ἀδέλφε, πάντα ἀπερθέμενος ἀντίγραψόν μοι (ib., l. 7). Κἂν μοσθίον οἴνου μοι φολέτρισαν (ib., l. 16).

Page 224, line 5. Cf. Lightfoot’s note on Phil. 2:23 concerning ἅφιόω. Papyri examples are common. Cf. ἅφιορκόϊντι Tb. [Page 1387] P. 78, l. 17, b.c. 110–8;
τὸ ἐφαύριον Tb. P. 119, l. 17, B.C. 105–1; τοῦ ἐφετινοῦ Oxy. P. XII, 1482, l. 12 (ii/A.D.).

Pages 232, 267. Note about Ἐλαιών Fay. P. 112, ll. 14, 15 (99 A.D.) ἐπίγνοντι εἰ ἐσκάφη ὡς Διονυσιάδος Ἐλαιών. Cf. also nom. Ἰβίον, gen. Ἰβίονος (Ibis-shrine) Tb. P. 62, l. 23; 64, ll. 10, 11; 82, l. 43. So Ἰβίον (gen.) in phrase Ἰβίον τροφῇ Tb. P. 5, l. 70; 62, l. 19; 63, l. 28; 82, l. 38 (all ii/B.C.).

Page 233, line 8. *Per contra* Mr. Scott notes his inability to find an aorist indic. with ὃς ἔν (ἄν) in the N. T. Cf. Mt. 16:19. See Moulton’s comment on p. 317 of the German Ed. of his Proleg.


Page 256 (c). Cf. τῷ Ὀμήρῳ (Jo. 20:27).

Page 264, end of (a). See γόναι in 1 Cor. 7:16.


Pages 279, 516. For περισσός as a positive see Mt. 5:47; Jo. 10:10; 2 Cor. 9:1.

Page 292 (h), line 10. Note ἀπὸ τοῦ δ(ε)ἡνα in P. Par. 574, l. 1244 (iii/A.D.).

Page 299, 4 (a). The use of ἔσχάτως ἔχειν (Mk. 5:23) appears, Mr. Springer reports, in *Diod. Siculus* (ii/B.C.), *Bibl. Historica*, 10. 3. 4. Cited by Toiller in note to ἔσχάτως ἔχειν in Thomas Magister (Blancardi’s edition, about 1757). Both Sallier and Toiller cite Artemidorus, Oneirocritica (ii/A.D.) 3. 60 (61) as using it. Phrynichus (grammarian) also gives it (ii/A.D.), *Eclogæ Nominum Atticorum ad ἔσχάτως ἔχει*. There is also an example from Galen of doubtful genuineness τοῦ ἔσχάτως ἔχουσιν and a genuine one in *Vita Porphyrii* 99 by Marcus Diaconus.

Page 308. The form γνῶ imperative occurs in B. M. CXXI, 613 (iii/A.D.). Mayser (p. 327) says: “Die Endung –θι findet sich nur noch in Ἰσθη (≜ἰσθη, von ἵναι) und Ἰσθη (von οἴδα).”


Jannaris

JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).

———, On the True Meaning of the Κοινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).

Davis furnishes προδώσας from Hesychius: προδώσας Hesychio condonandum, quem etiam συνθήσας admisisse certum est. Vide Lobeck, Phryn., p. 723.


Pages 325, 360. Mr. Scott offers the following table on the use of the perfect subjunctive in the N. T.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>μὴ ποτὲ</th>
<th>ἐὰν</th>
<th>ἵνα</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εἰδῶ, etc.</td>
<td>Perfect Participle</td>
<td>εἰδῶ, etc.</td>
<td>Perfect Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>2:29</td>
<td>2:12</td>
<td>16:24; 17:9, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5:15 (active)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>13:2; 14:11</td>
<td>2:12</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:9 (active); 9:3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Periphrastic: 12 (all passive, except Jas. 5:15; 2 Cor. 1:9).

εἰδῶ, etc. 10.

Page 334, line 19. For ἀπεκρίνατο-form see also Mk. 14:61; Mt. 27:12; Jo. 5:17, 19.

Page 335 f. Examples of –οσαν-forms occur in ἔφαγοσαν Oxy. P. 1007, l. 29 (Gen. 3:16, vellum leaf of Gen. 2 and 3, iii/A.D.) and in a fragment of Xenophon’s Hellenica in Oxy. P. 226, l. 16 (i/ii A.D.) ἐπεπόμφοσαν.

Page 337, line 16. For the –ες-form note ὡς ἔπεμψες μοι Oxy. P. 1489, l. 4 (iii/A.D.); ἄφηκες and οἶδες Oxy. P. 1067, ll. 5, 20 (iii/A.D.); δέδωκες Oxy. P. 903, l. 30 (iv/A.D.). It is not quite so rare in the papyri as Mayser thought.

Page 348, line 12. T. Nicklin (Cl. Rev., Aug., Sept., 1918, p. 115) says re ἦξα: “One would like to know if any other instances can be adduced, and to have some fresh
consideration of the evidence.” It so happens that I have just come across συνάξας in vol. XII, Oxy. P. 1414, l. 21 (A.D. 270–5). I have learned to be chary about saying that the κοινή does not show this form or that. A fresh papyrus may turn up and prove me false. So we shall have to admit the ἥξα-form.

Pages 348, 1215. The form ἥξα (from ἥκω) occurs in Oxy. P. 933, l. 13 (ii/A.D.). Note also the infinitive φάγαι Oxy. P. 1297, l. 10; μετῆλθαι (note augment) P. Tor. i. 5. 27; ἐπενέγκαι B. G. U. 250. 8 (all iv/A.D.).

Page 360, 7, line 9. Mr. Scott counts 6 perf. imperatives out of 1623 imperatives and 22 perf. subs. out of 1872 subs. in the N. T. An undoubted perfect imperative occurs in Oxy. P. 1409, l. 21 (A.D. 298) ἵστω.

Pages 360 (cf. 109), 361, 375, 480, 809, 818, 902, 1108, 1110, 1122. In these references to the idiom ἔχεµε̂παρ̅αῑτην (Lu. 14:18, 19) it is not meant that this is what is usually called the periphrastic perfect, but only that it furnishes a kind of analogy to the modern Greek perfect and the modern English. The syntax of the Greek idiom is, of course, plain enough, the predicate participle agreeing in case with the object of ἔχω as in Mk. 3:1; 8:17; Lu. 19:20.


Page 363. Note Ἰκουκέναι, Oxy. P. 237, l. 23 (A.D. 186).

Page 375, line 15 ab imo. Mr. Scott counts 32 present passive and 6 active perfects in the periphrastic form.


Pages 392, 1058. Re subject infinitive Votaw finds 289 anarthrous insfs. with 39 verbs as predicates. Scott notes that ἀδὴ has 122 insfs., γίνωμαι 36 (32 Lu.), ἔκειστιν 31 (Syns. and Acts 29), καλὸν (ἔστιν) 21, εὐκοπότερον (Syn.) 13. Of verbs peculiar to authors Mk. has 2, Mt. 4, Lu. (Gospel and Acts) 14, Heb. 3, Paul 3, Jas. 1. For further details see Viteau, i. 151–2. There are 23 subject το insfs. (12 pres., 11 aor.) confined to Mt. 2, Mk. 4, Paul 16, Heb. 1.

Viteau

VITEAU, J., Essai sur la syntaxe des voix dans le grec du N. T. (Rev. de Phil., 1894).
———, Étude sur le grec du N. T. I, Le Verbe (1893); II, Le Sujet (1896).
Page 394, line 6. For εἰ δὲ μὴ Mk. has 2 exx. (parallels in Mt. and Lu. εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔγε), Jo. (Gospel) 2, Rev. 2=6. For εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔγε Mt. [Page 1390] shows 2 exx., Lu. 5, 2 Cor. 1=8. Mr. Scott observes that ἔδων δὲ μὴ (or μὴ ἔγε) is not in the N. T.

Page 394, line 14 ab imo. If δότω is correct in 2 Cor. 9:7 Mr. Scott affirms that it is the only instance of μὴ and 3d sing. aor. imp. by Paul.

Page 395, line 10. For omitted ἐσμέν add “Jo. 17:11, 22; Gal. 2:15.”

Page 404, 3. Mr. Scott notes that of the 174 N. T. examples of ὄχλος, sing. and plural, 118 are in the singular. Of these 63 are in an oblique case, 55 in nom. sing. Of these 55 there are 44 with singular verb and 11 with plural verb. When ὄχλος is subsequently referred to in narrative or by some speaker, the reference is always in the plural, whether verb or pronoun ὑποτιθέ, etc., except Rev. 7:9 where proximity is probably the cause of the sing. That also is the only passage where the relative is used.

Of the 31 exx. of πλῆθος only one (Ac. 5:14) is in the plural; 12 are in oblique cases; 14 have nom. with sing. verb. Only 4 (Mk. 3:8; Lu. 2:13; 19:37; 23:1) have plural verbs. Where further reference is made (7 times), the verb is always plural (κατὰ σύνεσιν, p. 412).

As to λαός out of 141 exx. 123 are in oblique cases. Of 24 with sing. nom. only two (Ac. 3:11; Rev. 18:4) have plural verb and there are only four plural noms. Where repeated reference occurs, the reference is in the plural except Lu. 20:6; Ro. 11:2.

Mr. Springer finds numerous examples in LXX (Ex. 19:8, 9; Lev. 9:5; Dt. 22:18, 19, etc.) where a collective noun is used with singular and with a plural verb as in Mk. 5:24; Ac. 3:9, 10.

Page 404, line 2 ab imo. Add “1 Thess. 2:20.”

Page 408, line 8 ab imo. Add ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς (Rev. 21:13).

Page 414. Add “Ro. 12:6–8” for examples of acc. and nom. in apposition (after εἴτε).

Page 424 (i), line 6. For μὲν in fourth place add “Lu. 22:22.”

Page 460 (f). Mr. J. F. Springer furnishes the following note which is pertinent:

Mk. 13:19, ἔσονται ἄι ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίψις. This expression is abundantly supported whether we regard ἄι ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι as subject or as the nominative of time.

[PAGE 1391] I

AS SUBJECT
καὶ ἔστω ὑμῖν ἢ νῦς προφυλακῆ, καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐργον (LXX Neh. 4:22 (16)); ἡ νῦξ ἕκειν εἶ ὑπὶ σκότος (LXX Job 3:4); οὐχὶ σκότος ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ οὐ φῶς;
καὶ γνόθες οὐκ ἔχον φέγγος αὕτη; (LXX Am. 5:20); ἐξάλειψίς σου ἡ ἡμέρα ἕκειν (LXX Mi. 7:11).

II

AS EXPRESSION OF TIME

LXX: Job 1:6, 13; 2:1
Esth. 4:11; 9:27
Hos. 2:3 (5); 7:5
Mi. 7:14
Is. 11:16
Jr. 11:5; 39 (32):20; 43 (36):2; 51 (44):6
Ba. 1:15, 20; 2:6, 11, 26
Theodotion: Dn. 9:7, 15 (cf. LXX).

Examples of the formula, ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη, are: LXX 1 Ki. 22:13; 3 Ki. 8:24, 61;
Neh. 9:10.

The plural ἔσονται in Mk. 13:19 may be explained, he supposes, as due to its
position near αἱ ἡμ. ἐκ.

Page 464 (d). Add φαρισαῖος τυφλέ (Mt. 23:26). With πατήρ δίκαιε in Jo. 17:25
compare κύριε μοι πατήρ B. G. U. 423, l. 11 (ii/A.D.).

Page 466 (b). Cf. “you” (acc. form) used as nom. like “ye.”

Page 475, line 6. Κρατεῖν τῆς χειρὸς occurs in the Gospels five times. Mr. Scott notes
Hermas, Vis. 3. 8. 3 ἡ κρατοῦσα τοῦ χερᾶς and Lightfoot’s translation “the
woman with the strong hand.” Cf. Mt. 28:9 τοῦς πόδας.

Page 476, line 6. Mr. Scott reports that προσκυνέω occurs 60 times in the N. T., 30
with dative, 14 with acc., 16 other constructions.

Page 477, line 6 ab imo. Add πολλάς and read 12:47 f. in next line.

1 ἡ νῦξ is reading of B and S1, ἡ ἡμέρα of AS3.2 C. The example is suitable with
either.
Page 480, line 25. For ποιεῖν with acc. and inf. see Mt. 5:32; Mk. 1:17; 7:37; Lu. 5:34; Jo. 6:10; Ac. 17:26; Rev. 13:13.

[Page 1392] Pages 487, line 7 ab imo, 518, 3. For χρείαν ἔχω absolutely see Mk. 2:25, with ablative see Mt. 6:8, with τοῦ and inf. see Heb. 5:12, with inf. see Mt. 3:14, with ἵνα Jo. 2:25.

Page 504, line 14 ab imo. Mk. 14:64 is probably the origin of ἔνοχος θανάτου in Mt. 26:66, but the idiom is still unusual.

Pages 514, 1132. Mr. Springer notes unnecessary genitive absolutes (like Mk. 6:22) in Thucydides 1. 114; Xenophon, Cyr. 1. 4, 20; LXX (Numb. 6:7; Dt. 15:10; 1 Ki. 9:11; 2 Macc. 9:2, etc.); (Aratus of Soli) Eratosthenes, Catasterismi 40.

Page 522, line 10. Add “Mk. 6:21=Mt. 14:6” to γενεσίοις.

Page 527 (d), line 5. Prof. Robert Law, of Knox College, Toronto, sends me this example of χρόνῳ ἰκανῷ in Plato, Leges 678 D.

Page 530 (f), line 4 from end. It should be noted, Mr. Scott reminds me, that ὁμοόο is also used, with acc. of person (Lu. 7:31) or thing (Mk. 4:30), while to whom or to what the acc. is likened is put in the instrumental (assoc.). In the passive, as usual, the acc. becomes the nom. and the instrumental is retained (Mt. 13:24).

Page 535. The syncretism of the dative forms (locative, instrumental, true dative) is ably and clearly discussed by Prof. Walter Petersen under the caption “Syncretism in the Indo-European Dative” (Am. J. of Ph., xxxvii and xxxix, 2, Jan. and April, 1918). With great pains and skill he shows how the psychology of the cases appears in the process of blending. He supports the thesis that the dative is not a purely local case in origin and is not a purely grammatical case, but syncretistic. Originally a case without ending, which “secondarily received its endings by association with local cases, and that these local cases then in turn thrust upon the dative certain meanings like that of direction which were foreign to it.” It was originally a suffixless case of indirect object and borrowed its endings from certain local cases.

Page 537, line 10. Note ὑμῶν and αὐτοῖς in Phil. 1:28.


Page 566 (b). The preposition is not always repeated, even when words intervene as in Mk. 2:21 τὸ καὶνὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ; Lu. 9:8; Ac. 26:18. Mr. Springer notes same idiom in Const. Ap. 7:25.

Page 570, line 9. Add “Mt. 27:48” λαβὼν σπόγγον πλήσας τε δέξους.

[Page 1393] Page 572. Note local sense in ὃνις τοῦ μαρτυρίου opposite the martyr’s shrine Oxy. P. 941, l. 3 (vi/A.D.).

Page 596, 7. Mr. Springer notes examples in LXX (2 Ki. 14:4); N. T. (Mk. 1:10; Mt. 26:10; Lu. 6:20, etc.) and later writings (Didache 1:4; Hermas, Vis. 4. 3. 1) of εἷς where ἕξι would have been used in the earlier Greek. In the modern Greek εἷς is very common in such constructions.


Page 604, 6, line 6. The reading of Text. Rec. in Mk. 2:4 ἐφὸς ἐφὸς ὁ in Lu. 5:25.

Page 606. 3. Sharp (Epictetus and the N. T., p. 104) quotes Epict. IV, x, 20 τὰς χεῖρας καταφιλῆσαι for weakened sense of κατα—, just “kiss.”

Page 607, middle. Mr. Scott supplies some examples for the phrase ἐχεῖν τι κατὰ τινος Mt. 5:23; Mk. 11:25; Rev. 2:4, 14, 20.

Page 623, line 1. For καὶ πρός (adverb)=and more see Oxy. P. 488, l. 18 (ii/iii A.D.).

Pages 625, middle, 626, line 9. For πρὸς αὐτόν rather than αὐτῷ with verbs of speaking to, Mr. Scott gives this table based on Hawkins’ Horæ Syn., ed. 2, p. 45.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>ἐπον</th>
<th>λαλεῖν</th>
<th>λέγειν</th>
<th>ἐφὸς</th>
<th>ἐπεκρίθη, etc.</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ὄμιλέοι 1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>1 Th. 1</td>
<td>1 Ro. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 632, middle. The use of ὑπέρ and εἰς with the same words is interesting in Fay. P. 77, l. 3 εὑρασται ὑπέρ χωματικῶν ἔργων (A.D. 147) and Fay. P. 78, l. 4 εὑρασται εἰς χωματικῷ ἔργα (A.D. 147).

Page 643, 21, line 6. As prep. ἐως occurs 86 times, as conj. 62.

[Page 1394] Page 643, line 12 ab imo. Of the seven examples of ἐως πότε Mr. Scott observes that five Mt. 17:17 and=) have the future, leaving Jo. 10:24; Rev. 6:10 with pres. ind.

Page 653, line 10 ab imo. It is, of course, possible that τόπος or χρόνος may be supplied in some of these examples. In that case they would come under (b), p. 652.

Page 661 (d). With καλὸν…ἡ in Mt. 18:9 cf. καλὸν…ἡ in Ign., Ro. 6:1.


Page 688, line 3 ab imo. RADL read σεαυτὸν instead of ἐαυτὸν in Mk. 12:33.

Pages 695, 696. Mr. Scott furnishes some very informing data concerning the use of the demonstratives ὁ and ὅς.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>μὲν</th>
<th>ὅ</th>
<th>ὅ</th>
<th>ὅλλοι ὅ</th>
<th>ἔτεροι ὅ</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>16:14</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td>16:14</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td>16:14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td>14:4</td>
<td>14:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>17:32</td>
<td>28:24</td>
<td>28:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>7:21</td>
<td>7:24</td>
<td>7:21</td>
<td>7:24</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>7:7</td>
<td>7:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>4:22</td>
<td>4:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td>4:11</td>
<td>τοῦς 11</td>
<td>τοῦς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.</td>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>1:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hebrews ter οἱ μὲν…ὁ ὅ ἐστι are oppositive: the rest partitive. [Page 1395]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>PARTICIPLE</th>
<th>FINITE VERB</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pres.</td>
<td>Aor.</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>μὲν</th>
<th>δέ</th>
<th>ὅς ὅς ὅς ὅς ὅς</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOOK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>27:44</td>
<td>27:44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>11:21</td>
<td>11:21</td>
<td>12:8 (7)</td>
<td>12:8 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>12:8</td>
<td>12:28</td>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>2:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Line 6, 1 Cor. 12:8. Read ὅλλῳ δέ (6 times) ἐτέρῳ δέ (bis).

In Mt. 22:5 ὃς μὲν...ὁς δὲ is completed by οἱ δὲ λοιποί...

[Page 1396] Page 696. The use of relative ὃς and demonstrative ὃς in the same sentence appears in Oxy. P. 1189, II. 6–7 (A.D. 117) ἐπιστολῆς ὃς δύο ὃς ἐγραψα ἦν μὲν σοὶ ἦν δὲ Σαβεῖνῳ κτλ. So in II. 11–16 we see demonstrative and article τὴν μὲν...τὴν δὲ εἰς τὸν κτλ. Mr. Springer notes καὶ ὃς (dem.) in Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 2. 2. 7; 2. 2. 30; 3. 2. 18; 4. 1. 11. So Agathias scholasticus (vi/A.D.) has καὶ ὃς *Historiae* 2. 9; 4. 18 and Menander Protector (vi/A.D.) *Excerpta e Menandri Historia*, 30.

Page 700, line 2 ab imo. Add “Mt. 12:45” (2d); Ac. 2:40 where οὕτως is last, and Mk. 9:38 where there are two adjectives. In Ac. 1:25 there are two nouns.
Page 701, line 6. Mr. Scott gives these examples of οὗτος in genitive absolute Mt. 11:7; Lu. 21:28; Ac. 19:36; 28:9; Heb. 9:6; 2 Pet. 3:11. An instance of οὗτος joined to an adverb appears in Ac. 15:8. In Rev. 19:9 the translation is “these are,” but in 21:5 and 22:6 “these words are.” In Ac. 17:6 Moffatt translates “these upsetters.” See Rev. 7:13.

Page 702, line 1. Add “Jo. 4:54.”

Page 709, line 10. Mr. Scott offers this table, showing Synoptics and Acts compared with John:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἐκάνος with articular noun</th>
<th>ἐκάνος as pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 730, line 5. With Mk. 2:16 see οὗ at cf. διὰ τι in Mt. 9:11. Mr. Springer notes that οὗ is “why” in a direct question in Barnabas, Ep. 8:5 οὗ δέ το ἐρων ἐπὶ το ξύλον; οὗ ἠ βασιλεία Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ξύλου κτλ.; Od. 10:1; οὗ ποιῶν; Aristophanes, Ranae 198; Gospel of Nic., Pass I, A. 14. 3. The use of οὗ in a direct question seems clearly established by these examples. He finds οὗ in indirect questions in Hom., Od. T. 464; Lucian, De Asino, 32; Aristophanes, Plutus, 965; Xenophon the Ephesian, De Anth. et Habr. 4. 2.

Page 738, line 2 ab imo. Moffatt translates τι in Mk. 2:24 by “what” and Scott argues ἢδε as favouring “what.”


Page 759 f. Prof. Eakin (The Greek Article in First and Second Century Papyri, Am. J. of Ph., July, 1916) shows that in the papyri, as the N. T., the article is frequently absent in titular expressions. He finds the same obscurity and uncertainty about the use of the article with proper names in the papyri as in classic Greek. He gives numerous examples of the anaphoric use (the aforesaid and the use of the article before the genitive of the father’s or mother’s name is very frequent as Deissmann

Deissmann

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).

———, Biblische Gräcität etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).
showed, cf. p. 767). But Prof. Miller (Am. J. of Ph., July, 1916, Article before Genitives of Father’s Name) shows that in official language in the papyri the article only appeared (as in classic Greek, Gildersleeve’s Synt. of Cl. Gk., § 580) before the genitive when the name of son or daughter is in the genitive (or ablative), and even this use vanished from the second century A.D. onward. But the vernacular idiom has the article in nominative as in Mt. 10:2.

Page 760. On Ἰησοῦς with article see von Soden, p. 1406.

Page 762, line 11 ab imo. For full construction see Mt. 12:35.

Page 764 (c). In Col. 1:7 f. note ὅς ἐστιν and ὁ καὶ δηλώσας as parallel clauses.

Page 770, bottom. Mr. Scott gives this note: ὁ…οὖτος or οὖτος ὁ. οὖτος (and cases) stands last (296 times), three times as often as it stands first (98 times). The position of οὖτος (and cases) varies in the same phrase without any apparent reason, e.g., Ac. 23:17, 18; Mt. 26:31–34.
Ἐκεῖνος first 40 times, last 104 times.

Page 773, line 5 ab imo. Mr. Scott remarks that οἱ πάντες is subject of verb in 3d person in Phil. 2:21, apparently of verb in 1st person in 1 Cor. 10:17; 15:51; Eph. 4:13, etc., and of 2d person in Jo. 7:21; 1 Jo. 2:21; 1 Pet. 5:5; 1 Cor. 1:10—apposition to the pronoun implied in the ending of the verb. See Jo. 1:16; 1 Cor. 12:13; Jas. 3:2.

Page 773, bottom. For ὁ πᾶς see Jo. 5:22; 16:13; Rev. 13:12.

Page 774. Ὅλος. Add “Lu. 11:36 (bis).”

Page 774, line 4 ab imo. Mr. Scott notes that ὄχλος πολύς occurs 22 times in N. T. and ὄχλοι πολλοί 7 (Mt. 5, Lu. 2). Ὅχλος ἱκανός occurs in Mk. 10:46; Lu. 7:12, and thrice in Acts.

[Page 1398] Page 779, 2, line 6. It should be understood that this is the usual Attic idiom. See further Col. 1:8 τὴν ὑμῶν ἁγάπην. In Phil. 1:25 note τὴν ὑμῶν προκοπήν, but τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν in 1:26.

Page 783, line 5 ff. Observe that all these examples are prepositional adjuncts.


Page 788, line 21. Mr. Scott thinks we may over-refine on the use and non-use of the article with proper names, and cites the variations in Mk. 9:2; Mt. 17:1; Lu. 9:28 in the mention of Peter, James, and John as in point.

Page 791 (c). Prof. Eakin (Am. J. of Ph., July, 1916) shows that in the papyri “anarthrous prepositional phrases” are common as in the N. T. Many of the identical phrases are frequent like κατὰ καιρὸν, ἐν οἴκῃ, ἐν χερσί, κτλ.

Page 807, line 3 ab imo. Mr. Springer cites examples of middle voice (φυλάσσομαι=‘Observe’) from LXX (Ex. 12:25; 13:10; Lu. 18:4, 5; 18:26; 19:3; 19:19; Dt. 5:25; 10:12, 13; 3 Ki. 8:25; 1 Macc. 8:26; Aquila’s translation Dt. 11:22 (ii/A.D.). He finds active in sense of ‘observe’ in Gen. 18:19; 26:5; Ex. 15:26; 19:5; Lev. 18:30; 22:9; Dt. 5:10; 6:17; 33:9.

Page 839, line 8 ab imo. Mr. Scott makes out 859 present imperatives and 760 aorist imperatives in the N. T. It is Paul’s usage that makes this situation, 323 presents and 99 aorists.

Page 847. Note the change of tense in Jo. 11:13–15.

Page 848 (c). Mr. Scott counts 459 present subjunctives, 1409 aorists, 22 perfects=1890 subjunctives in N. T. Readers of this grammar have learned to be grateful to Mr. H. Scott for his statistical knowledge of N. T. syntax so freely furnished. Here follow some of his most valuable tables:[Page 1399]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BO</th>
<th>HORTATORY</th>
<th>INTERROGATIVE</th>
<th>ASSERTORY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>GRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Plural</td>
<td>1st Plural</td>
<td>1st Pers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Let'</td>
<td>'Let'</td>
<td>3rd Sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δοφές</td>
<td>δοφέτει</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Plur</td>
<td>τίς</td>
<td>τί;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ποῦς</td>
<td>ποῦ;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δοποῦ</td>
<td>δοποῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εἰς</td>
<td>εἰ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>θέλεις</td>
<td>θέλετε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μὴ</td>
<td>μὴ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>οὐ</td>
<td>οὐ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toal</td>
<td>Toal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must</td>
<td>Must</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>3 15:36</td>
<td>6 2:14; 4:12</td>
<td>10 3:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>2 27:7:49</td>
<td>9 23:33; 26:7</td>
<td>11 5:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>6 23:26:54</td>
<td>10 22:9; 11:11</td>
<td>11 9:54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>2 δεῦρο</td>
<td>3 6:5; 12:27</td>
<td>4 18:39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 3:7; 18:39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>17:1; 21:9</td>
<td>2 19:10; 29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ΒΟΥΛΕΣ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ΘΟΕΣ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 2:6; Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2:6; Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pet.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2:6; Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>4:1 11(2)</td>
<td>2 (3 Q) 5 Q</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Th.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Th.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament Books</td>
<td>Aorist Subjunctive—Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 11:23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor. 7:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal. 6:15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro. 6:14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>2:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim.</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8 —</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1 —</th>
<th>4 —</th>
<th>7 —</th>
<th>3 —</th>
<th>90 —</th>
<th>96 —</th>
<th>86 —</th>
<th>18 —</th>
<th>272</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE—DEPENDENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>ἵνα</th>
<th>ὅπως</th>
<th>ὠήµή</th>
<th>ὁποτε</th>
<th>ἐὰν</th>
<th>ἐὰν</th>
<th>ἐὰν</th>
<th>ἐὰν</th>
<th>ὅπως</th>
<th>ὁποτε</th>
<th>ἀνέστως</th>
<th>ὑπὸ</th>
<th>ὁποτε</th>
<th>ἀνέστως</th>
<th>ὑπὸ</th>
<th>ὁποτε</th>
<th>ἀνέστως</th>
<th>ὑπὸ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aec.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R e v.</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H e b.</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J a s.</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 P e t .</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 P e t .</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 T h .</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 T h .</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 C o r .</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 C o r .</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 1 3 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. O.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. H.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. O.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. P.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. I.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. M.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. T.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. T.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Page 1401] AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE—DEPENDENT (Cont.), TEMPORAL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<|ọtaν, Mk. 13:28=Mt. 24:32 counted as aorists.>

[Page 1402] PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVES IN N. T.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>Ἰναμὴ</th>
<th>ζηποτε</th>
<th>ἶναντι</th>
<th>ὅταν</th>
<th>ὅτεν</th>
<th>ὅτομ</th>
<th>Ἀν</th>
<th>νν</th>
<th>Ἀν</th>
<th>νν</th>
<th>Κα</th>
<th>Κα</th>
<th>Ἀν</th>
<th>Ν</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 : 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4:39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>1 =</td>
<td>7 : 6</td>
<td>1 : 2</td>
<td>1 : 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7 : 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 : 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fut.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOK</td>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td>DEPENDENT</td>
<td>TEMPORAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>μη</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 2 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | 2 1 3 2 1 0 4 1 7 0 3 4 2 3 3 4 1 2 2 7 1 2 8 1 2 3 1 5 1 7 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 7 1 8 1 2 3 7 1 3 1 1 1 8 4 6 8 1 2 1 3 1 5 1 7 |
| 3 8 3 3 1 9 1 2 3 3 4 5 3 1 1 3 4 1 3 7 2 3 5 1 1 2 1 3 4 3 45 9 |

ἱνα Mk. 6:8 counted as 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural 'Letters'</th>
<th>Plur Int err.</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>π</th>
<th>ω</th>
<th>ε</th>
<th>τε</th>
<th>ετ</th>
<th>τμ</th>
<th>τό</th>
<th>τα</th>
<th>τς</th>
<th>ἰκ</th>
<th>ἀκ</th>
<th>τα</th>
<th>ΑΝ</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Th.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Th.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga l. R.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>:2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Phil. Eph.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cliff.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph. 1 Ti m.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ti m. Tit.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Íva Gal. 4:17 counted present subjunctive.

[Page 1404] SUBJUNCTIVE TENSES—SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>AORIST</th>
<th>PERFECT</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pages 854 (ε), 929, line 3 ab imo, 1174 (b), line 3. In Heb. 13:5 (LXX) ἐγκαταλείπω is read by ΝACD potassium 17. Mr. Scott thinks it odd that this reading escaped Text. Rec. But it is rather Alexandrian than Syrian.
Mr. Scott again presents useful data on **οὐ μὴ** constructions (see inset facing this page).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>QUOTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td>CONTINGENT</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>13:31 mg.</td>
<td>14:31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>16:22</td>
<td>15:5</td>
<td>26:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>10:19; 21:33</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6:35; 10:5</td>
<td>4:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>9:6; 15:4; 18:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Th.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Page 1405] **W. H. Marginal Readings for οὐ μὴ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>MARGIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>13:31, οί λόγοι μου οὐ παρελεύσονται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>12:32, δὲ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνῃ οὐκ ἁφεθήσεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:42, δὲ ἀνάμετρω καὶ αἰτήσεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>10:19, οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22:68, ἐὰν ἑρωτήσω σας οὐ μὴ ἀποκρίθητε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>3:3, καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς ποίαν ὧραν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:6, καὶ οὐ μὴ εὐρήσουσιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of these 7 readings only 3 (Mk. 13:31; Mt. 12:32; Lu. 22:68,) add to the examples of οὐ μή. The remaining 4 are only variations of existing examples.

Readings are in the judgment of W. H. (Introduction, § 385) “outside the pale of probability as regards the original text”: so that only Mk. 13:31, Mt. 12:32 can claim any right to be counted as additional examples of οὐ μή.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>SPEAKERS IN GOSPELS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>8 [16:18]</td>
<td>14:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16:22;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 (58)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jesus spoke the Quotation.

Page 854 (ζ). Mr. Scott gives the data for aorist and present optative. Aorist occurs 45, present 22 times. But Paul has aorist 31 and present 0 times, while the rest have aorist 14, present 22 times. Μὴ γένοιτο occurs 15 times and γένοιτο without μή twice. Opt. 67 times in all.

Pages 856, line 8 ab imo, 933, line 9. Mr. Scott notes that 3d sing. aor. imper. occurs 8 times in N. T.: Mk. 13:15 (twice)=Mt. 24:7=Lu. 17:31; Mk. 13:16=Mt. 24:18=Lu. 17:31; Mt. 6:3.

Page 858, line 12. Mr. Scott gives the data for aor. inf. with prepositions (μετά 14 times, πρό 8, πρός 9, εἰς 38, ἐν 12, διὰ acc. [Page 1406] 1, ἔφυλεν 1, ἔως l=84). There should be added to the table on p. 858 for articular inf. in N. T.: pres. 164, aor. 148, perf. 10=322.

Page 891, line 10. Mr. Scott’s figures for pres. inf. with preps. are with ἐν τῷ 43 times, διὰ τῶ 24, πρὸς τῶ 3, εἰς 32, ἐκ τοῦ 1, πρὸ τοῦ 1, ὀντὶ τοῦ 1, διὰ τοῦ 1=106.

Page 894, 2. Mr. Scott counts 868 perfect indicatives in the N. T. of which 37 are periphrastic (5 active and 32 passive). John (Gospel 205, 1 Ep. 60) has far the most and 1 Cor. (73) comes next. Οἶδα alone occurs 208 times (Gospel of Jo. 61, 1 Ep. 13).

Pages 903, 906, line 20. Mr. Scott reports his count of pluperfects in the N. T. as 142 in all. (Mk. 13 and one in 16:9, Mt. 11, Lu. 31, Ac. 33, Jo. 46, 1 Jo. 1, Rev. 3, Gal. 2, Ro. 1.) Of these 88 are simple and 54 periphrastic forms, divided again into

Moulton


———, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).

———, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).


———, The Science of Language (1903).

MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).

MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908—).

———, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.
active (simple 81, periphrastic 13) 94 and passive (simple 7, periphrastic 41) 48.
These statistics are based on *form* only (ἵεν gives 34, ἰστήμι 20).

Page 908, line 4. Add “1 Cor. 1:10; 2 Cor. 9:3.” There are 22 perf. subjs., 10 εἰσί, 12 periphrastic (ten passive, two active).

Page 909. Mr. Scott, by the table on page 1407, corrects Votaw’s error as to the number of *perfect infinitives* in the N. T.

Further investigation has shown that the number of perfect infinitives in N. T. is 47 (of which ten (10) are articular—31 separate verbs, but 47 instances). This may account for Votaw’s statement on p. 50, but he is undoubtedly in error in making only 8 articular instances.

Page 917, middle. Όὐχί, Mr. Scott notes, occurs 54 times in N. T. It is a favourite word of Luke (Gospel 17, Acts 3) 20, Mt. 9, but not in Mk. It occurs in questions 43 times, 9 times in denials (qualified by ἀλλά) of a previous question or statement. In Lu. 18:30 it is the equivalent of οὐ μή. Όὐχί in Lu. 4:22 is οὐκ in Mt. and Mk., but Mt. has οὐχί like Lu. 12:6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>διὰ τὸ</th>
<th>εἰς τὸ</th>
<th>μετὰ τὸ</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ANARTHROUS</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>5:4 ter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>6:48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>8:11; 18:2; 27:9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>11:3 10:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Th.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (+ 4:1 mg.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prof. F. H. Fowler (Class. Weekly, April 16, April 23, 1917) subjects Sonnenschein’s theory of “determined futurity” in “The Unity of the Latin Subjunctive” to a sharp critique. He objects that Sonnenschein makes no room for the personal determinant and ignores the Greek. Fowler holds that in Greek “the subjunctive, starting with the will meaning, developed the meaning of determined futurity, that the optative, starting with the wish meaning, did the same thing, and that the optative developed still another meaning, that of contingent determined futurity.”

Page 928 (a). An instance of the futuristic subjunctive in an independent sentence occurs in Oxy. P. 1069, ll. 13–18 (iii/A.D.) τάχα γὰρ δυνασθόμεν φο[ρ]υτρέεισε σοι δύο καμήλους [πυ]ροῦ καὶ πέμψε πρὸ σέν. The use of τάχα with this subjunctive is to be observed.

Page 931, line 3 ab imo. Jannaris, § 1914, quotes this and other examples from Epictetus.

Page 932, line 1. Add δεῦρο δείξω (Rev. 17:1; 21:9).

Page 934 (c). Mr. Scott notes that τί in independent aorist subjunctive sentences occurs in Synoptics 28 times, Acts 3, John 1 (Jesus, τί εἶπον), 1 Cor. 1, and not in any other book.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT SENTENCES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT SENTENCES</th>
<th>TOTAL GRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WISHES</td>
<td>DIRECT QUESTION</td>
<td>INDIRECT QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without ἀν</td>
<td>With ἀν</td>
<td>With ἀν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jannaris

JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).

------, On the True Meaning of the Κοινή (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1:3</th>
<th>8:2</th>
<th>1:6 (2</th>
<th>2:8</th>
<th>4:2</th>
<th>1:5</th>
<th>3:1</th>
<th>1:1</th>
<th>2:1</th>
<th>4:2</th>
<th>8:2</th>
<th>2:2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>6:3</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>5:3</td>
<td>1:0</td>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>6:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>3:7</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>3:7</td>
<td>7:7</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pet.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In independent present subjunctive sentences ὅπερ occurs only in Jo.

Page 936. Mr. Scott has a complete table on page 1408 for the optatives in the N. T.

its inherent meaning. This I have recognised in my Greek Grammar, § 504 (c) (e.g., ἐσεῖος ἔν ταῦτα τοιῶν ἂ ἂποιεῖ, ‘the things which you should say’); for the corresponding meaning in present time see Demosth. de Pace 11, πλὴν διὰ ἂν ὑμῖν ἔποιο δόο, ‘the two things which I shall tell you,’ where ἂν with the subjunctive expresses pure futurity, not generality.”

Page 940 (c), line 7. Mr. Scott thinks that the direct question here would be τί ποιήσωμεν. I still adhere to my position in the text.

Page 940, line 7 ab imo. In Lu. 1:29; 3:15 there is the optative without ἂν, the simple change of mode in indirect question (indicative to optative).

Page 941. Mr. Scott offers this table for the imperatives in N. T.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>AORIST</th>
<th>PERFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2d Pers</td>
<td>3d Sing</td>
<td>3d Pl.</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet.-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lu. 9:3; 10:4; 14:12 are counted as one each.

[Page 1410] ἂν (ἐὰν) CONSTRUCTIONS IN N. T.
Page 949, line 11. The other imperative in this idiom is in the aorist except Mt. 21:28 and perhaps Rev. 16:1 (durative present). The idiom is not used by Luke and the word is not used in Acts or by Paul. So Mr. Scott.


Page 956. Mr. Springer notes ὃς ἀν and future indicative in Athenische Mitteilungen 25. 470; Papers of the Am. School II. 159; Inser. Graecae, Senats Dekr. 73 a.

Page 957, middle. The 122 indicatives with the indefinite relative are: pres. tense 52, imperf. 13, fut. 9, aor. 45, perf. 2, pluperf. 1. So Mr. Scott.

Page 958. Mr. Scott counts 191 examples (as against Moulton’s 172, Prol., p. 166) of ἀν and ἐὰν constructions in the N. T. according to the table on page 1410.


Page 969, line 4 ab imo. ὅτε occurs (Scott) in Mk. 15 times (10 in speeches), 13 in Mt. (12 in speeches), 5 in Lu. (all in speeches), 30 in Jo. (17 in speeches).

Page 969, line 6 ab imo. Ellipsis also in Lu. 17:37; 1 Cor. 3:3; Col. 3:11; Jas. 3:16.

Page 969, line 8 ab imo. Mr. Scott gives this table for ὅτε with subjunctives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>MATT.</th>
<th>LUKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὅτε...</td>
<td>6:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅτε...</td>
<td>14:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅτε...</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅτε...</td>
<td>14:9v</td>
<td>26:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅτε...</td>
<td>14:14</td>
<td></td>
<td>22:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅτε...</td>
<td>24:28</td>
<td></td>
<td>17:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅτε...</td>
<td>8:19</td>
<td>9:57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 = 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 971, line 11 ab imo. Ἡτε (only ind.) 101 times in the N. T. (Scott), pres. 3, imperf. 16, aor. 75, fut. 6, perf. 1.

Page 972, line 7. Ἡταν with subj. 125 times (Scott), pres. 35, aor. 90, as given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Revelations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul 8 16 James 1
27 70 8 20 = 125

ἅταν with indicative (Mk. 3, Rev. 2) 5

Page 972, line 18. ἅταν with the ind. only 5 times, pres. 1, aor. 2, imperf. 1, fut. 1.

Mr. Springer notes ἅταν with ind. in Ignatius, Ep. ad Eph. 8:1; Barnabas, Ep. 10:3; 15:5. He also offers ἅταν δὲ πέμπτες in L. P. (ed. C. Leemans, 1888) III, 4.

Page 974 (c). ἄχρι(ὁς) prep. 30, conj. 18 (ind. 7, subj. aor. 11). So Scott gives this table for ἄχρι(ὁς) as conjunction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>INDICATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>24:38</td>
<td>17:27</td>
<td>1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>27:3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>3:13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>11:2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>15:2</td>
<td>5 Q</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>11:2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tota l</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note Oxy. P. 933, II. 14, 15 (ii/A.D.) περὶ τῆς μικρᾶς ἐγενάμην ἄχρις ἀν καταπλέσῃ.

Page 975, middle. ἔως as preposition (Scott) 86 times, conj. 62 (ind. 13, subj. 49)=148. ἔως alone ind. 7, subj. 13, ἔως ἀν subj. 19; ἔως ἄταν ind. 2, subj. 3; ἔως ἀν ἀν ind. 4, subj. 14 (Scott).

Page 977. Πρὶν (ἥ). Scott notes in LXX as preposition πρὶν γενέσεως αὐτῶν Dan. Sus. 350 420; as adverb Aquila and Sym. Prov. 8:26 πρὶν ἥ; with subj. Ps. 57 (58):10; Jer. 40 (47):5; with inf. pres. 4 Macc. 9:27; Numb. 11:33 (B).


1 Gal. 3:19 mg.
Page 983, line 1. Mr. Scott gives data for ἵνα μὴ in the N. T.

There are 117 instances of ἵνα with μὴ in N. T. (indic. 4, subj. pres. 37, aor. 75, perf. 1 (2 Cor. 1:10)). When the construction with ἵνα is continued in a further clause by μὴ, μὴ alone is repeated Mk. 4:12 LXX, Jo. 6:50, 11:50, 1 Jo. 2:28, 1 Cor. 1:10, 2 Cor. 4:7, Rev. 3:18, 8:12; and so with ἵνα μὴ Jo. 4:15, Rev. 7:1. In Rev. 18:4 ἵνα μὴ is repeated, but in Rev. 16:15 neither is repeated. When the construction is continued with ἀλλὰ ‘but on the contrary,’ ἵνα is not repeated, Jo. 3:16, 6:39, 18:28, 2 Jo. 8, 1 Cor. 12:25. So with δὲ Heb. 12:13. In Rev. 9:5 ἵνα is repeated.

Page 984, middle. See Oxy. P. 1068, 1. 19 (iii/a.d.) ἵνα μοι μαρτυρήσουσιν ἀνελθόντες, example of ἵνα and future indicative.

Page 986, line 6 *ab imo*. Mr. Scott notes that ὡς is almost confined to Matthew and Luke, and gives the following data for ὡς in N. T.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>INDICATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>24:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Th.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9:17 Q (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 1 5 46 5 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ro. 3:4 (Ps. 50:6 Swete has aor. subj. twice).

[Of the 18 exx. in Matthew only two have any parallels: Mt. 12:14=Mk. 3:6; Mt. 9:38=Lu. 10:2.]

[Page 1414] ὡς CONSTRUCTION IN N. T.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>INDICATIVE</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJ.</th>
<th>INFINITIVE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Th.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9:17 Q (2)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 1 5 46 5 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Page 1414] ὡς CONSTRUCTION IN N. T.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>2:13</th>
<th>4:29</th>
<th>2:13</th>
<th>4:29</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>2:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>5:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>3:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Th.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Th.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5:8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>2:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose inf. 7 times, pres. 3 (Mt. 10:1 bis; Lu. 24:24), aor. 4 (Mt. 15:33; 27:1; Lu. 4:29; 20:26).

ὡστε with ind. aors. dependent twice (Jo. 3:16; Gal. 2:13).

ὡστε not in James, 2 Pet., Jude, 1, 2, 3 Jo., Col., Phil., Eph., 1, 2 Tim., Titus (11 books).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RENDERINGS BY R. V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in somuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wherefore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Page 1415] Page 988. Mr. Scott gives this table for μὴ πτε constructions in N. T.:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>INTERROGATIVE AND INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>DEPENDENT CONJUNCTION</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDICATIVE</td>
<td>OPT.</td>
<td>INDICATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>14:2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>5:25; 7:6; 13:15 Q</td>
<td>5 Q ( (12) )</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>3:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>12:58 bis; 14-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28:27 Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>Ind. 7:26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>(9:17 mg.)</td>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subj. 1:6; 2:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lu. 12:58 has same form for pres. and aor. subj. I have counted it as aor. Mt. 25:9 may be independent.

Page 990, middle. Blass, p. 235, points out that τοῦ is added to the second infinitive. Add “Ac. 26:18.”

Pages 995, line 6 *ab imo*, 1174, line 7. Mr. Scott thinks that Οὐχ…Οὐ simply belongs to θέλω according to ordinary rule.

Page 999 (β). Votaw counts εὐαγγελίζεσθαι with ὅστε, but it is more likely to be construed with the participle φιλοτιμοῦμένον which with οὖτως δὲ loosely carries on the ὅστε clause. Leaving out this example there are 95 exx. of ὅστε in the N. T. (See Mr. Scott’s tables on page 1414).

Page 1001 (d), line 12. Moulton, Germ. ed. (p. 332 n.), says that Jo. 14:22 is consecutive.

Page 1003, 7. Note Oxy. P. 1489, l. 6 (iii./a.d.) ἔθε πάντας πεπλήρωκα ὡς Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμων.

Pages 1007-16. Mr. Scott has valuable tables on pages 1416–17 for the constructions of εἰ with indicative. The examples cover both (α) and (β), the two first classes (determined as fulfilled and unfulfilled).
### Table: WITH PRESENT INDICATIVE IN PROTASIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>APODOSIS</th>
<th>GRAND TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDICATIVE</td>
<td>IMPERATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>FUTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>9:42</td>
<td>9:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Pet.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Th.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Th.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tit.</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protasis: ἵ with Aorist Indicative</td>
<td>ἵ with Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APODOSIS</td>
<td>APODOSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDICATIVE</td>
<td>IMPERATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>3:26</td>
<td>ἀν 13:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>ἀν 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ἀν 10:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jo.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ἀν 4:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ἀν 2:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>7:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>2:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Tim.</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td>2:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>PROTAGOS: ἐὰν with Perfect Indicative</th>
<th>ἐὰν with Pluperfect (8 protases)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APODOSIS</td>
<td>APODOSIS (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pres ent</td>
<td>Fut ure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>9:42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>17:2</td>
<td>11:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Ac.  | 25:1    | 1       | 16:15   | 2           | 26; 32 | 1 |
| Jo.  | 13:17   | 11:12   | 2       | 2           | 19; 4:10 | 8:19; 14:7 | 5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>APODOSIS</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDICATIVE</td>
<td>IMPERATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>1:40 (Triple)</td>
<td>14:31 (οὐ μή)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>5:12 6:33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>5:38</td>
<td>26:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jo.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>6:3 ἐὰν πέρ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>4 13:23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above is the number of apodoses.

### ἐὰν WITH SUBJUNCTIVE AORIST IN PROTASIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>APODOSIS</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDICATIVE</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[16:18]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>15:6</td>
<td>27:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>10:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above is the number of apodoses.
Page 1011, line 15 ab imo. Mr. Scott doubts if Mk. 6:4 is a real condition, and thinks 1 Tim. 6:3 the only normal example of εἰ μὴ with first class condition.

Page 1016, line 10. Mr. Scott observes that Moulton (p. 171) divides εἰ μὴ into three classes:

1. in protasis

2. ‘except’ (1) without verb expressed:
   (a) preceded by negative
   (b) τις…εἰ μὴ…;
(2) with verb expressed (Mt. 6:5; Gal. 1:7)
   εἰ μὴτι
   ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ

3. ‘otherwise’: εἰ δὲ μὴ 6, εἰ δὲ μὴν 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8 Q</th>
<th>πνεύμ</th>
<th>2:3, 3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>2:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet.</td>
<td>3:13</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:8;</td>
<td>6:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7:2; 14:2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td>6:8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim.</td>
<td>2:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td>2:21</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 1011, line 15, 1012, line 4. Scott remarks that Moulton follows MG εἰ οὕτως, p. 262, with addition of Jo. 1:25, but there are other doubtful examples (Jo. 3:12; 10:35; 2 Jo. 10; Lu. 14:26; Jas. 1:23) so that Jannaris with 34 may be correct.
Page 1017. Mr. Scott gives two tables on pages 1418 and 1419 for ἐάν and the subjunctive: one for the present subjunctive, one for the aorist subjunctive. He finds it difficult to be accurate, because of the compound protases and apodeses as in Mt. 5:23; 24:49; Lu. 20:28; 1 Cor. 13:1–3; Jas. 2:1–3.

Page 1019, line 16. As already seen, ἐάν with present subjunctive has future apodoses 30 times; ἐάν with aorist subjunctive has future apodoses 81 times. Mr. Scott adds figures for ἐάν with perfect subjunctive and with the indicative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἐάν WITH PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE (Protasis)</th>
<th>(Apodosis)</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jo. 3:27 ἐὰν μὴ ἦν δεδοµένον...</td>
<td>... ὧν δύναται</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo. 6:65 ἐὰν μὴ ἦν δεδοµένον</td>
<td>... ὧδε ἡ δύναται</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas. 5:15 κἂν ἀμαρτίας...</td>
<td>... ἀφεθήσεται</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 13:2 καὶ (ἐάν) εἶδω...</td>
<td>... ὦδεν ἐμί</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 14:11 ἐὰν μὴ εἶδω...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἔσομαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jo. 2:29 ἐὰν εἴδητε...</td>
<td>... γινώσκετε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[PAGE 1421] BOOK</th>
<th>ἐάν WITH INDICATIVE (Protasis)</th>
<th>(Apodosis)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐάν</td>
<td>ἐάν</td>
<td>ἐάν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. 18:19 W. H. alt.</td>
<td>18:19</td>
<td>18:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu. 19:40</td>
<td>19:40</td>
<td>19:40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. 18:31</td>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>5:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jo. 5:15</td>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>5:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. 2:22 3:8</td>
<td>2:22 3:8</td>
<td>2:22 3:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Th. 3:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 4 1 2 2 1 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 1023, line 7. For δεῦτε ὅπισω... see 4 Ki. 6:19.

Page 1027 (c). Add to examples of ἐὰν ὡς Ro. 11:14; Phil. 3:11 which can be construed as aorist subjunctive with σκοπῶν implied (so Thayer).

Thayer

THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).
Pages 1027 (a). Recitative ὦτι occurs in Oxy. P. 1066, ll. 11, 12 (iii/A.D.). Mr. Scott finds, taking R. V. as basis, 184 exx. of recitative ὦτι in N. T.

Pages 1028, line 9, 1029, line 17. Mr. Scott considers Mk. 2:16 a doubtful example. In favour of the interrogative is the fact that Mt. and Lu. (the earliest commentators) read δὲ ὦτι t…;

Page 1029. Mr. T. Nicklin (Cl. Rev., Aug.–Sept., 1918, p. 116) suggests that a case like Ac. 4:13 shows that a distinction was preserved between ἐστιν and ἦσαν in the indirect discourse. The imperfect carries the idea of “had been.” He insists on this meaning in Ac. 16:3; and even in Jo. 2:25; 6:6; 9:8. Something can be said for this view.

Page 1030 f. Note Oxy. P. 1204, l. 24 (A.D. 299) ἵνα δὲ ἐννοιμότερον ἐκουσθεὶ after an aorist imperative.


Page 1033. For double indirect discourse see Jo. 4:1.

Page 1034, line 1. In Mk. 1:34=Lu. 4:41 ὦτι is treated as causal by some.

Page 1034, line 12. Subject clause. Add “1 Cor. 6:7.”

Page 1035. Add γνωστὸν ἐστω…ὀτι Ac. 4:10; 13:38; 28:28; [Page 1422] χάρις τῷ θεῷ ὦτι Ro. 6:17; σύνφημι ὦτι Ro. 7:16; and perhaps μέλει ὦτι Mk. 4:38; Lu. 10:40.

Page 1036, line 6. Mr. Scott observes that ἀκούω ὦτι occurs 32 times, acc. and inf. 2 (Jo. 12:18; 1 Cor. 11:18). Ἀποκρίνομαι ὦτι (recitative) 3 times (Mk. 8:4; 12:29; Ac. 25:16), acc. and inf. 3 (Lu. 20:7; Ac. 25:4 bis). Νομίζω ὦτι 4 times, inf. 10 (Luke and Paul). Λέγω ὦτι 162 (and about 900 object clauses without ὦτι), inf. 35. Οἶδα ὦτι 133, inf. 12. Πιστεύω ὦτι 25, inf. 2. Γνώσκω ὦτι 71, inf. 3. Βοάω ὦτι 1, inf. 1.

Page 1042, line 2. Mr. Scott has this table for the constructions of ἀκούω in N. T.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOO</th>
<th>Absolue</th>
<th>Accus.</th>
<th>Accus.</th>
<th>ὦτι Clause</th>
<th>Object Clause</th>
<th>Accusative Object</th>
<th>Genitive Object</th>
<th>Two Objects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Objec</td>
<td>with Infin.</td>
<td>with Part.</td>
<td>ὦτι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

———, Language of the N. T. (Hastings’ D. B., 1900).
| Book | 8 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 2 |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ac.  | 2 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 2 |
| Jo.  | 1 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | | | | | |
| Jo.  | 1 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | | | | | | |
| Rev. | 8 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Heb. | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Jas. | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2    | 5 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | |
| Pet. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Th.  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 1    | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Cor. | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2    | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Gal. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Ro.  | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Ph.  | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Col. | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Phil.| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Eph. | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 1    | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Ti m.| 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 2    | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
Mr. Scott expands the data for ἐγένετο construction with note of time and without follow here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>Noun: ἐν, μετά</th>
<th>ὡς</th>
<th>Gen. Abs.</th>
<th>No note of time</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>1:9; 2:23</td>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>3:21, 21; 11:14</td>
<td>18:13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>1:59; 2:1; 46; 5:17; 6:1, 6; 12; 7:11; 8:1; 22; 9:28; 37; 20:1</td>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>3:21, 21; 11:14</td>
<td>16:22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ac. 10:25 not included.

Lu. 9:29

Mr. Scott expands the data for ἐν τῷ with ἐγένετο thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>ἐγένετο δὲ</th>
<th>4 = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gospel</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγένετο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐγένετο καὶ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:29</td>
<td>ἐγένετο with noun as subj.</td>
<td>1 = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8 = 22 out of 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 1043, line 8. Mr. Scott gives this table for ἐγένετο with infinitive: Mt. 1, Mk. 2 (2:15, 23), Lu. 9 (6:1, 6, 6, 12; 16:22, 22; 3:21, 22, 22), Ac. 22 (4:5; 9:3, 32, 37, 43; 10:25; 11:26, 26, 26; 14:1, 1; 16:6; 19:1, 1; 21:1, 5; 22:6, 17, 17; 27:44; 28:8, 17). ἐγένετο with infinitive occurs 25 times, but ‘governs’ 34 infinitives. This raises the old difficulty of counting verb or construction. In this case, as it is a construction of ἐγένετο+infin., the infinitive clearly should be counted.

Mk. 2:15 is the only example of γίνεται in this construction.


Pages 1059, line 11, 1078, line 15. For τοῦ infinitive as subject add “Ac. 27:1.” Mr. Scott has this table for τό infinitive in N. T.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>APPPOSITION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>12:33</td>
<td>9:10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>15:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td></td>
<td>25:11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>10:31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Th.</td>
<td>7:26</td>
<td>11:6</td>
<td>14:39</td>
<td>4:6 bis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>11:6</td>
<td>8:10, 11;</td>
<td>8:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>7:18</td>
<td>14:21</td>
<td></td>
<td>4:13; 14:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.</td>
<td>1:21, 22, 24, 29 bis</td>
<td>1:21, 26, 13; 4:10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Mk. 10:40 and=were classed as subject the difference would be increased.

Mr. Scott notes that there are 992 anarthrous object infinitives in N.T.(Votaw’s b.), occurring in every book of the N.T., but most numerous in Luke, and Acts (179) more than the Gospels (156); in Paul 235 times, in John and Epp. 102. There are 109 finite verbs producing these infinitives (δύναμαι has 212, θέλω 128, μέλλω 95, |
ἀρχομαι 91, βούλομαι 137, ζητέω 33, παρακάλεω 29, ὀφείλω 23). For the tenses see Votaw’s table, p. 49.

Pages 1060, line 15, 1094. R. V. takes Mt. 5:34 as aorist middle imperative (μὴ ὑμοσαι) instead of aorist active infinitive μὴ ὑμόσαι.

Page 1061, line 5. In Ro. 11:8 bis the quotation here differs significantly from the LXX text of Dt. 29:4.

[Page 1425] Page 1061, line 16. Lu. 48 (Gospel 24, Ac. 24), Paul 17, Mt. 7, Mk. 0, rest 8=80. So Mr. Scott counts.

Pages 1061, 1089, 1094. Mr. Scott presents this table for “verbs of hindering”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>ANARTHROUS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>Lu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπειλέω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κολύω</td>
<td>19:14</td>
<td>23:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 1 1 4 1 1 — — 1 — 1 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICULAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κατέχω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρατέω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταπαύω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑποστέλλω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνκόπτω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔξαπορέω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κολύω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 — 2 5 — — 1 1 — 1 — 10

Votaw does not class Ac. 10:47 with “verbs of hindering,” but with ‘result,’ and 1 Cor. 14:39 as an ‘object’ verb. See Votaw, p. 24.

Pages 1062-75. Mr. Scott’s table for articular infinitive in N. T., W. H. text, is shown on pages 1426–27.
Page 1067, note 2. Mr. Scott expands his data for τοῦ-infinitives thus: 3 presents and 4 aorists in Mt., 6 presents and 18 aorists in Luke; 3 presents in 1 Cor., 2 in 2 Cor., 1 aorist in Gal. (quotation), 7 presents and 2 aorists in Ro., one of each in Phil.

Page 1068, line 8. Mr. Scott thinks Lu. 5:7 surely “aim or purpose.”

Page 1069. See Tb. P. 27, l. 73 (B.C. 113) ἄνευ τοῦ δοῦναι τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.

Page 1069, line 2. Cf. p. 647, 41 and note 5. There are examples of χάριν τοῦ with infinitive in the papyri. See Tb. P. 38, l. 17 (B.C. 113); Tb. 27, l. 35 (B.C. 113); Tb. P. 6, l. 37 (B.C. 140–39); Tb. P. 61 (a), l. 47 (B.C. 118–7); Tb. P. 61 (b), l. 44 (B.C. 118–7), ib., l. 353.

[Page 1426] ARTICULAR INFINITIVE IN N. T., W. H. TEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>τό</th>
<th>εἰς τό</th>
<th>διὰ τό</th>
<th>μετὰ τό</th>
<th>πρὸς τό</th>
<th>τοῦ</th>
<th>διὰ τοῦ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Jo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ro.</td>
<td>Ph.</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>Perf.</td>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td>1 Tim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “Prepositional Infinitive” = Votaw’s k. [Page 1427]

ARTICULAR INFINITIVE IN N.T., W.H. TEXT (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ἐκ τοῦ</th>
<th>πρὸ τοῦ</th>
<th>ἀντὶ τοῦ</th>
<th>τῷ</th>
<th>ἐν τῷ</th>
<th>ἐνεκτῇ τοῦ</th>
<th>ἐνος τοῦ</th>
<th>ἐκτὸς τοῦ</th>
<th>To tal</th>
<th>Prepositional Infinitive</th>
<th>BO OK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres.</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>BO OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Es.</td>
<td>Es.</td>
<td>Es.</td>
<td>Es.</td>
<td>Es.</td>
<td>Es.</td>
<td>Es.</td>
<td>Es.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Book | Jo | Re | v. |
|      |    |    |    |
|      | 1  | 7  | 6  |
|      | 4  | 2  | 1  |
|      | 2  | 3  | 2  |
|      | 18 | 18 | 18 |
|      |    |    |    |
|      | 1  | 3  | 9  |
|      | 2  | 3  | 8  |
|      | 8  | 1  | 1  |
|      | 2  | 1  | 1  |
|      | 1  | 1  | 1  |
|      | 13 | 10 | 1  |
|      | 8  | 8  | 2  |
|      | 16 | 16 | 8  |
|      | 19 | 19 | 8  |
|      | 19 | 19 | 8  |
|      | 16 | 16 | 4  |
|      | 35 | 35 | 4  |
|      | 3  | 3  | 3  |
|      | 1  | 1  | 1  |
|      | 2  | 2  | 2  |
|      |    |    |    |
|      | 1  | 2  | 3  |
|      | 5  | 4  | 4  |
|      | 16 | 16 | 16 |
|      | 35 | 35 | 35 |
|      |    |    |    |
|      | 1  | 2  | 1  |
|      |    |    |    |
|      | 3  | 3  | 3  |
|      |    |    |    |
|      |    |    |    |
|      |    |    |    |
|      |    |    |    |
|      |    |    |    |
|      |    |    |    |
|      |    |    |    |
|      |    |    |    |
|      |    |    |    |
|      |    |    |    |
Mr. Scott gives exact figures for relation of prepositional infinitives to total articular infinitives: O. T. 800 to 2107, Apocr. 161 to 349, N. T. 200 to 322, total 1161 to 2778.

Page 1070, line 9. The figures for ἐν τῷ and infinitive are: with pres. 43, aor. 12, perf. 0 in the N. T. (Scott).

Page 1070, line 10. Mr. Scott refers to Vulgate “postquam” as translation of μετὰ τῷ and infinitive as reason for taking the infinitive clause as “absolute.” So Blass, p. 239, “an independent position.” But the Greek idiom with the infinitive was not “absolute” and the principles of indirect discourse do apply. The acc. in Lu. 11:8; Ac. 18:3 is predicate adjective only. In Lu. 2:4; 19:11; Ac. 27:4 the acc. of general reference occurs for what would be subject with a finite verb.

Διὰ τὸ is not repeated with the second infinitive (Mk. 5:4; Lu. 19:11; Ac. 4:2).

Mr. Scott notes that διὰ τὸ with aorist occurs only in Mt. 24:12 (passive). There are 8 other passives (pres. 4, perf. 4).

Page 1075, line 13 ab imo. Four of Matthew’s 5 examples are peculiar to him and in 26:12=Mark has a different construction. In Mk. 13:22 (=Mt. 24:24, p. 990) Matthew has ὡςτε (“pure purpose”). Paul has 4 examples.

Page 1084, line 12 ab imo. Prof. Walter Petersen thinks that γενέσθαι, not ἔναι, was the original idiom, loosely changed to ἔναι.

Page 1088 (cf. 990). Mr. Scott adds this note: Votaw shows on p. 46 how his 211 anarthrous purpose infinitives (δ) are distributed in N. T. These infinitives are the product of 71 verbs; ἔρχομαι (40) and its compounds (36) [Ἐξέρχομαι 17], ἀποστέλλω 18, διάδομι 15, are the most frequent. I make 213 anarthrous infinitives: pres. 36, aor. 176, perf. 1 (Lu. 12:58 which Votaw has not counted on p. 49). Matthew’s 38 infinitives are all aorists, while Mark has 3 pres. and Luke 10. (It is odd that the passages with infinitive presents in Mark and Luke have no=in Matthew, or have not infinitive where the passages are =.)

Page 1106, line 7 ab imo. Add “Mt. 2:2” ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεύς.


Page 1120, line 6, ab imo. Cf. Oxy. P. 935, ll. 20, 21 (iii/A.D.) ἔφθανε γὰρ προβαστάξας.

Page 1126, line 9. Mr. Scott offers these tables:

Finite verb followed by λέγον and καὶ ἐπεν:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>NARRATIVE</th>
<th>NON-NARRATIVE, etc.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Participle see next table</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>λέγον</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπεν</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ἀποκριθείς (–ἐντες) followed by ἐπεν, ἔφη, λέγει, Ἐλέγην and Ἐρεῖ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>ἐπεν</th>
<th>ἔφη</th>
<th>λέγει</th>
<th>Ἐλέγην</th>
<th>Ἐρεῖ</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Page 1163, line 21. Οὐ belongs to implied θέλω in Mt. 9:13.

Page 1166, line 4. Note οὐχ ὅτι in Phil. 3:12; 4:11, 17 to correct misunderstanding and not in classic sense of “not only.” This is a distinctive N. T. formula (cf. Jo. 6:45; 7:22; 2 Cor. 1:24; 3:5). When not followed by second clause in classic Greek the meaning is “although.”
Page 1169, line 5 (cf. 1011). In Jo. 15:22, 24; 18:30; Ac. 26:32 εἰ μὴ is in condition of second class. Mk. 6:5 can be regarded as simply “except” (“if not” in origin, of course).


Page 1183 f. Gildersleeve is brilliant, as usual, in his comment on δέ, γέ, ἄρα (Am. J. of Ph., July, 1916): “For generations δέ has been translated with distressing uniformity by ‘but’; and head-master of Grayfriars school apostrophizes Pendennis thus:

‘Miserable trifler! A boy who construes δέ and instead of δέ but, at sixteen years of age is guilty not merely of folly and ignorance and dulness inconceivable but of crime, deadly crime, of filial ingratitude which I tremble to contemplate.’

If the doctor had been spared to read Sir John Sandy’s translation of Pindar in which the ‘but’ translation is dodged at every turn, one ‘trembles to contemplate’ the consequences.”

Of γέ Gildersleeve says that “emphasis is the refuge of poverty” and gives it up. “As for ἄρα, science tells us that it is short for ἄραρότως. The full translation would be ‘accordingly,’ but what after it is reduced to the canina littera ‘ρ’? There is an ἄρα of accord, there is an ἄρα of discord, the familiar ἄρα of surprise.”

Page 1177 (i). There is also Mt. 20:15 οὐκ…; Ἰ…;

Page 1187, line 15. For ἀλλὰ ἰνα see also Jo. 13:18; 15:25.

Page 1187, line 8 ab imo. After Phil. 1:18 add “Ac. 20:23.”

Page 1234. Add: Infinitive depending on infinitive, 1040, 1047, 1049, 1085.

Page 1378. Add to “Page 560, line 6,” this: Cf. also Mt. 14:14 σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ= Mk. 6:34 ἐπὶ αὐτοῦς and Mk. 9:22 ἐφ’ ἡμῖς and Lu. 7:13 ἐπὶ αὐτῇ. With this verb Mark has accusative only, Luke dative (loc.?) only, Matthew accusative and dative. See also ἐξουσία ἐπὶ with genitive and accusative (Rev. 2:26; 16:9).

Jesus noticed small points of language (ἰῶτα ἐν Ἰἴδα κερέα Mt. 5:18), though we have no documents from his pen. The preacher can be accurate in details and have all the more power in his speech. Τὰ ὅμωσε ἐὰν ἴωδε καὶ κερέα ἔστιν (Jo. 6:63). All the people still hang on the words of Jesus, listening (ἐξεκρέμετο αὐτοῦ ὅκονον Lu. 19:48) [Page 1431] for hope and guidance in a world of disorder and despair. The world will find the way out if it follows the leadership of Jesus. I could not close these three years of further toil on this grammar without this tribute from my heart to the Master, who makes all work worth while and who challenges us
all to share his own work while it is still day, before the night comes when no one can go on with his work (ἐργάζεσθαι Jo. 9:4).¹

[PAGE 1433] INDEX TO ADDENDA TO SECOND AND THIRD EDITIONS

[PAGE 1435] INDEX OF SUBJECTS IN THE ADDENDA

B. O. HERRING

References to pages.

A

א: see Sinaiticus.

Ablative: c. χρείαν ἔχω, 1392, 1397.

Absolute genitive: 1392; c. ὁὗτος, 1396.

Accent: of the vocative, 1387.

Accusative: change to nom., 1378; κατά and acc., 1379; ὁ in 1 Cor. 15:10, 1379; nom. in apposition, 1390; c. προσκυνέω, 1391; c. infinitive after ποιεῖν, 1391; of a person or thing, 1392; acc. and inf. after verbs, 1422; as predicate adjective, 1428; general reference, 1428.

Action: iterative, 1364 bis.

Active voice: original suffix in opt., 1378; periphrastic perfects, 1389, 1406; in LXX, 1398; pluperfects, 1406; aorist inf., 1424.

Adjuncts: prepositional, 1398.

Adverb: καὶ πρός as adv., 1393; c. ὁὗτος joined, 1396; πρὶν ἦ in LXX, 1412.

Adversative use of καὶ: 1383.

Anaphoric use of article: 1397.

¹ The Exp. Times for April, 1919, has the last article from the late Prof. Robert Law, of Knox College, Toronto, on “Note on the Imperfect of Obligation, etc., in the New Testament.” I find myself in hearty agreement with his explanation of an antecedent obligation a debitum, not always lived up to. It is already set forth in this volume, pp. 886–7, 919–21, 1014.
**Aorist:** compared with imperfect, 1380; indicatives in John, 1380; participles, 1381; first and second identical, 1381; with ὃς ἔαν, 1387; imperfect c. μή, 1390; imperatives and subjunctives in N. T., 1398 f.; table of subjunctives c. οὗ μή, opp. 1404; optative, 1405; inf. c. preposition, 1405; subj. c. ἐὰν, 1420; subj. c. εἰ ποις, 1421; imperative in papyri, 1421; middle imperative, 1424; active inf., 1424; infinitives in Matt., 1428; indicative c. οὐ μή, 1430.

**Apocalypse:** 1378.

**Apodosis:** indicative and optative, a table, 1410; statistical tables, 1416 ff.; future, 1420.

**Apostolic Fathers:** 1382.

**Apposition:** acc. and nom., 1390; to pronoun in verb, 1397.

**Article:** 1379; c. demonstrative, 1396; absence in papyri, 1397; anaphoric use, 1397; c. Ἰησοῦς, 1397; c. proper names, 1398.

**Articular infinitive:** 1406; table of, 1426 f.; relation to prepositional infinitives, 1428.

**Associative instrumental:** 1392.

**Asyndeton:** 1378.

**Attic idiom:** 1398.

**Augment:** of an infinitive, 1389.

B

B: see Vaticanus.

**Balancing of words:** 1378.

C

**Case:** 1389; oblique, 1390, 1392; after σπλαγχνίζομαι, 1430.

**Clauses:** subordinate, 1382; parallel, 1397; subject, 1421; object, 1422; infinitive, 1428.

**Collective noun:** 1390.

**Composition:** ἀπό in, 1379.
Compounds: of μῆ and οὐ in Apostolic Fathers, 1382; protases and apodoses, 1420.

Conditions: first and third class, 1382; conditional ἐάν, 1410; statistical tables, 1416 ff.; first class, 1420; second class, 1429.

Conjunctions: ἐνος, 1393, 1412; ἄχρι(ς), a table, 1412.

Construction: οὐ μῆ, a table, opp. 1404, 1430; ὁν in N. T., 1410; ὡςτε, 1414; [Page 1436] μὴποτε, 1415; ἀκοῦω, 1422; ἐγένετο, 1422 f.

Contrast: c. ἀλλὰ—ὁ, 1383.

D

Dative: ethical, 1378, 1379; c. προσκυνέω, 1391; discussed, 1392.

Declarative διότι: 1381.

Demonstratives: tables, 1394 f.; ὃς, 1396; dem. and article, 1396.

Direct Questions: 1396.

Direction: in dative case, 1392.

Distributive use of ἄνω and κατά: 1379.

Dual: original suffix in opt., 1378.

Durative present: 1411.

E

Ellipsis: of the verb, 1379; ellipses cited, 1411.


Epictetus: 1378, 1379 bis, 1381, 1407.

Ethical dative: 1378.

F

Finite verb: a table, 1429.
Future: linear, 1381; indicative, 1381, 1411, 1413; futurity in subj. and opt., 1407
bis; ὅν c. subj., 1409; apodoses, 1420.

G

Genitive: 1387; absolutes, 1392; c. οὗτος, 1396, 1397.

Gospel of John: 1380.

Grammar: grammatical forms of W, 1377; dative not a grammatical case, 1392; readers of, 1398.

H

Hendiadys: 1383.

Hiatus: 1382.

History of subj. and opt.: 1381.

Hittite language: 1385.

I

Imperative: 1381 bis; form γνῶ, 1387; perfect imperatives in N. T., 1389; aor. imp. c. μή, 1390; aor. and pres. imp. in N. T., 1398; table of, 1409; aor. imp. in Matt., 1411; in papyri, 1421; aor. middle, 1424.

Imperfect: compared with aorist, 1380; opt., 1405; periphrastic, 1406; in indirect discourse, 1421.

Indefinite: aorist, 1381; relatives, 1411.

Independent sentences: c. futuristic subj., 1407; τί c. aorist subj., 1407.

Indicative: 1381 bis; c. ὅς ἔσαι, 1387; perfect, 1406; future, 1411, 1413; c. indefinite relatives, 1411; c. ὅτε, 1411; c. ὅταν, 1412; c. ἔσαι, 1420; aor. c. οὗ μή, 1430.

Indirect discourse: 1421 bis: principles of, 1428.

Indirect Questions: 1396; change of mode, 1409.

Indo-European: family of languages, 1385; stem-suffixes, 1386.
**Infinitive:** 1382; c. μὴ γένοιτο, 1382; in Papyrus de Magdola, 1382; c. ἐν τῷ, 1385, 1428; c. augment, 1389; as subject, 1389; acc. and inf., 1391, 1422; c. τοῦ, 1392, 1415, 1424 f.; aorist c. prep., 1405; articular, 1406 bis, 1426 f.; present c. prep., 1406; perfect, 1406 f.; inf., and διὰ τό, 1411; in LXX, 1412; purpose, 1414, 1428; after ἔγενετο, 1423; aor. act., 1424; prepositional and articular related, 1428, 1430.

**Inscriptions:** in Phrygia, 1378.

**Instrumental case:** 1392 bis.

**Interchange of ὡς and ὅτι:** 1382, 1389.

**Iterative action:** 1380.

**J**

**Judas Iscariot:** primacy of, 1394.

**L**

**Language:** study of, 1377; small points of, 1430.

**Linear action:** 1380; future, 1381.

**Locative case:** 1392.

**M**

**Margin:** marginal readings for οὐ μὴ, 1405.

**Middle voice:** optative, 1378; redundant, 1380; in Phrygia, 1380; in LXX, 1398; aor. imp., 1424. [Page 1437]

**Mode:** change of, in indirect discourse, 1409; in conditional sentences, a table, 1416 ff.

**N**

**Names:** name-element, 1377; c. article, 1398.

**Negatives:** c. participle, 1379 bis; preceding εἰ μὴ, 1420.
**New Testament**: idioms, 1379; perf. subj., 1387; anarthrous phrases, 1398; pres. and aor. imperatives, 1398; articular inf., 1406; imperatives, 1409; constructions c. ἄν, 1410; ἴνα μή, 1413; data for ὅπως, 1413.

**Nominative**: changed from acc., 1378, 1387; of time, 1390.

**Noun**: definition, 1378.

O

**Object**: clauses, without ὅτι, 1422; verb, 1425.

**Obligation**: verbs of, 1431.

**Oblique case**: 1390 *bis*.

**Optative**: suf. for middle, 1378; c. subj., 1381; hist., 1381; aor. and imp., 1405; futurity, 1407; table, 1408; past prospective, 1409; without ἄν, 1409.

**Origin**: of οὐ μή c. subj., 1381; of Indo-European stem-suffixes, 1386.

P

**Papyri**: see List of Quotations.

**Parallels**: 1379; clauses, 1397.

**Participle**: aor. and perf., 1381; c. negatives, 1382 *bis*; bunched, 1382; “confidential participle,” 1382; predicate, 1389; c. οὐτος δέ, 1415.

**Partitive use of ἐκ**: 1379.

**Passive**: 1392; pluperfects, 1406; perf. subjunctives, 1406, 1428.

**Past tense**: compared with aor. ind., 1380; subj., 1409.

**Paul**: style in preaching, 1386; use of μή and aor. imp., 1390; pres. and aor. imp., 1398; pres. subj., 1403; aor. and impf. opt., 1405.

**Perfect**: participles, 1381; subjunctives, 1388; imperatives and subjunctives, 1389; periphrastic, 1389 *bis*; subjunctives in N. T., 1398, 1406; indicatives, 1406; infinitives, 1406 f.; subj. c. ἔλθω, 1420.

**Periphrastic**: number of forms, 1388; perfect, 1389 *bis*; impf., 1406.

**Phrases**: prepositional, 398 *bis*. 
Phrygia: inscriptions in, 1378, 1380.

Plato: teaching of, 1380, 1381.

Pluperfects: number in N. T., 1406.

Position of οὖ: 1397.

Positive: τερισσός cited, 1387.

Preaching: style of Paul, 1386.

Predicate: participle, 1389; adj., 1428.

Prepositions: μέσον and ἔχομενα, 1379; not repeated, 1392; ἔως, 1393, 1412; prepositional adjuncts, 1398; phrases, 1398; c. present infinitive, 1406; in LXX, 1412; prepositional infinitive, 1426 ff.; δέ, γέ, and ὁρα, 1430.

Present imperatives: number in N. T., 1398.

Present infinitive: c. prepositions, 1406.

Present perfect: periphrastic form, 1389.

Present subjunctive: number in N. T., 1398; tables, 1402 f.; c. τί in independent sentences, 1409; c. ἔλαβ, 1420.

Prohibitions: 1381 bis.

Protasis: c. relative or conjunction, 1410; in statistical tables, 1416 ff.

Punctiliar action: 1380.

Recitative ὅτι: 1421 bis, 1422.

Redundant middle: 1380.

Relative pronoun: 1390, 1396.

Repetition: of ἔχει, 1378; of ἰνα, 1413; of διὰ τό, 1428.

Scepticism: of Blass, re ἔδωσα, 1387.
Sentence: καθώς at beginning of, 1382; independent, 1407 bis.

Septuagint: cited, 1382, 1390 f., 1393, 1397, 1412, 1424. [Page 1438]

Sinaitius codex: 1378, 1394.

Speakes: in Gospels, 1405.

Spelling: in W, 1377.

Statistics: on pluperfects, 1406; further, see Tables.

Subject: infinitive, 1389, 1424; in Mk. 13:19, 1390 f.; clause, 1421.

Subjective meaning of μῆ: 1382.

Subjunctive: theory of, 1381; c. oṻ μῆ, 1381; history, 1381; table on perf. subj., 1388, 1389, 1406; statistics, 1398 ff.; tenses, 1404; futurity, 1407; present subj. c. τί in independent sentences, 1409; ὅπως c. subj., 1411; ὅταν c. subj., 1411 f.; in LXX, 1412; ἐάν and subj., 1418 f., 1420; aor. c. εἰ ποὺς, 1421.

Subordinate clauses: 1382.

Substitutionary use of ἄντι: 1393.

Suffixes: for middle optative, 1378.

Summary: of subj. tense, 1404.

Superlative: in –τατος, 1379.

Syncretism: 1386; of dat. forms, 1392.

Synoptics: uses of ἔκεινος, 1396; τί in ind. aor. subj. sentences, 1407.

Syntax: 1378, 1389; statistical knowledge of, 1398.

Tables: oṻv in Synoptics, 1385; ἐάν and ἐάν, 1386; uses of perf. subj., 1388; verbs of speaking, 1393; demonstratives, 1394 f.; uses of ἔκεινος, 1396; aor. subj., 1398 ff.; pres. subj., 1402 f.; aor. subj. in oṻ μῆ constructions, opp. 1404; subj. tenses, 1404; speakers in Gospels, 1405; perf. inf., 1407; opt. in N. T., 1408; imperatives, 1409; ἐν constructions, 1410; ὅπως c. subj., 1411; ὅταν c. subj., 1412; ὅρθρ(ς) as conj., 1412; ὅπως, 1413; ὡστε, 1414; μήποτε, 1415; conditional sentences, 1416 ff.; ἐάν c. perf. subj., 1420; c. indicative, 1421; ἔχοντο, 1422; ἔγένετο, 1423; τό infinitive, 1424; verbs of hindering, 1425; finite verb, 1429.
Teaching of Plato: 1380.

Tense: change of, 1398; subjunctive, a summary, 1404; in conditional sentences, a table, 1416 ff.

Theory: of subjunctive, 1381; of determined futurity, 1407.

Time: nominative of, 1390 f.

U

Uses: of τε καί, 1382; of ἀλλά—δέ, 1383.

V

Vaticanus codex: cited, 1378.

Vellum: leaf of Gen. 2 and 3, 1388.

Verb: definition, 1378; of speaking, 1393; finite, 1424; hindering, 1425.

Verbs of obligation: 1431.

Vernacular: 1397.

Vocative: accent, 1387.

Voice: middle, 1380; passive, 1392; middle and active in LXX, 1398.

Vulgate: translation of, 1389, 1428.

W

Washington MS.: 1377 f.

Wishes: 1382; in opt., 1407.

Words: number in Matt., Lu., Acts, 1385; of Jesus, 1430.

Z

Zeugma: 1383.
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A

ἀκοῦω: table of use, and c. ὅτι, 1422.

ἀλλά: c.—δέ, 1383; ἧνα…ἀλλά, 1413; c. ἧνα, 1430.

ἁλλας (οι)—δέ: table of use, 1394 f.

ἂν: in rel. clause, 1381; spelling, 1386; tables c. subj., 1400, 1402; table c. opt., 1408; in indir. quest., 1409; tables of constr., 1410 f.

ἂνά: distributive, 1379.

ἂντι: case of, 1393; table c. anart. inf., 1427.

ἂντολής: form, 1390.

ἀπειλέω: c. anart. inf., 1425.

ἁπό: in composition, 1379.

ἁποκρίνομαι: form, 1388; c. ὅτι, 1422; table c. verbs of saying, 1429.

ἁποστέλλω: c. anart. inf., 1428.

ἄρα: meaning, 1430.

ἄρχωμαι: c. anart. inf., 1424.

αὐτός, ἡ: without art., and in oblique cases, 1379; c. prop. noun, 1380; case, 1392.

ἄφες: table c. subj., 1399.

ἀφίδω: spelling, 1386.

ἄχρι(ς): tables of use, 1401, 1412.

B

βάλλω: predicate part., 1429.

βοῶ: c. ὅτι, 1422.
βούλομαι: table c. subj., 1399; c. anart. inf., 1424.

Γ

gέ: meaning, 1430.

gενεσίοις: case of, 1392.

γένομαι: c. inf., 1389; γένοτο, 1405; ἔγένετο, tables of use, 1422 f.; γενέσθαι, 1428.

γενόσκω: form, 1387; c. ὅτι, 1422.

γίναι: case of, 1387.

Δ

δέ: ἵνα…δέ, 1413; meaning, 1430.

δέ: subj. inf., 1389.

δένα: indef. pronoun, 1387.

δεῦρο: table, 1399; c. subj., 1407.

δεῦτε: in conditions, 1421.

διά: c. art. (table), and anart. inf., 1405 ff., 1426, 1428; c. τί, 1421.

διδωμί: form, 1388; c. inf., 1428.

δίκαιε: case of, 1391.

διότι: for ὅτι, 1381 f.

δύναμαι: c. anart. inf., 1424.

Ε

έαν: table, for ἄν, 1386; tables c. subj., 1388, 1400, 1402 f., 1418–20; c. δὲ μὴ, 1389 f.; table c. πέρ, 1400; table c. ind., 1421.

έαντόν: replaced by σεαυτόν, 1394.

έγκαταλείπω: reading, 1404.

έδωσα: form, 1387.

έθελομι: ending, 1378.
εἰ: c. δὲ μή, 1389 f.; c. μή, 1399, 1402, 1420, 1429; table c. opt., 1408; tables c. ind.,
1415 ff.; c. ou, 1420; c. τίς and πῶς, 1400, 1421.

ἐδῶ: constr., 1378; perf. subj., 1388, 1406.

ἐμί: subj. inf., 1389; constr., 1390 f.; in indir. disc., 1421, 1428.

εἰς: c. ἔν, 1378 f.; like dat., 1379; for ἐπί and ὑπέρ, 1393; c. inf., 1405 f.; tables c. art.
inf., 1407, 1426.

ἐῖς: for πρῶτος, 1394.

εἰσέλθοιτο: voice of, 1380.

εἴτε: constr., 1390; tables c. subj., 1402 f.

ἐκ: partitive, 1379; table c. art. inf., 1427.

ἐκένοις: table as pronoun, 1396; c. art., 1397.[Page 1440]

ἐκτός: tables c. ἐι μή, 1402 f.

Ἐλαίων: case of, 1387.

ἐν: c. expressions of time, 1379; c. art. inf., 1385, 1427; without art., 1398; c. inf.,
1405 f.; table c. τῷ and ἐγένετο, 1423.

ἐνεκέν: c. inf., 1405 f.; table c. art. inf., 1427.

ἐνκόπτο: c. anart. inf., 1425.

ἐνοχος: c. gen., 1392.

ἐξαπορέω: c. art. inf., 1425.

ἐξουσία: c. ἐπί, 1430.

ἐπάν: tables in dep. sent., 1401 f.

ἐπί: repeated, 1362; c. loc., 1393; replaced by εἰς, 1393; constr., 1430.

Ἐρμᾶς: spelling, 1377.

Ἐρχομαι: c. anart. inf., 1428.

–ες: ending, 1388.

Ἐσχάτως: c. ἔχω, 1387.
ἕτερος: table c. δὲ, 1394 f.

ἕτα: c. τε καί, 1382.

ἔσωλενίζον: constr., 1415.

ἔξωπότερον: subj. inf., 1389.

ἔχομεν: prep., 1379.

ἔχω: constr., 1378, 1389; meaning, 1380.

ἔως: prep., 1393, 1412; c. πότε, 1394; tables c. ἀν, οὔ, and ὅτου, 1401; c. inf., 1405 f.; c. art. inf., 1427.

Ζ

ζηλόω: hendiadys, 1383.

ζηλέω: c. anart. inf., 1424.

Η

η: in comparison, 1394.

ηδειν: form, 1406.

ηκο: form, 1389.

ηερά: case of, 1390 f.

ηεσθον: form, 1406.

ηνίκα: tables c. ὁν and εάν, 1401 ff.

ηξα: form, 1388 f.

ηθαν: meaning, 1421.

Θ

θέλεις: table in interrog. sent., 1399.

θέλω: constr., 1415; c. anart. inf., 1424.

θερμαίνομενος: form, 1406.

θομῆ: case of, 1387.
I

–ι: suffix, 1378.

ἲβίων: case of, 1387.

ἠδὲ: meaning, 1396.

Ὑερονσαλήμ: c. art., 1380.

Ὑησοῦς: c. art., 1397.

ἲνα: in wishes, 1382; tables c. subj., 1388, 1400, 1402 f., 1413; c. fut. ind., 1413.

–ισκος, –ίσκη: suffix, 1377.

ἲστηµι: form, 1406.

ἲστω: perf. impv., 1389.

ἲσχύει: spelling, 1386.

Κ

καθός: beginning sent., 1382.

καί: adv., 1383; crasis, 1386; c. ὁς, 1396; c. διαλογίζοµαι, 1406; c. ἔπειν, 1429.

καλόν: c. ἔστιν, 1389; c. ἥ in comparison, 1394.

κατά: c. acc., 1379; in composition, and c. gen., 1393; anart. prep. phrase, 1398.

καταπαύω: c. art. inf., 1425.

κατέχω: c. art. inf., 1425.

κατοικῆσαι: meaning, 1382.

κρατέω: c. gen., 1391; c. art. inf., 1425.

κωλύω: c. anart. inf., 1425.

Λ

λαός: case of, 1390.

λέγω: c. ὁτι, 1422; meaning, 1428; table of λέγων c. finite verb, 1429.
λύοι: ending, 1378.

M

μέλλω: c. anart. inf., 1424.

μέν: postpositive in fifth and sixth place, 1378; in fourth place, 1390.

μετά: c. inf., 1405 f.; tables c. art. inf., 1407, 1426 ff.

μέσον: as prep., 1379.

μέχρις: table in dep. sent., 1401.

μή: c. πᾶς, 1380; after oū, 1381; c. part., 1382; c. γένοιτο and inf., 1382, 1405; table c. ποτε, 1388, 1390, 1400, 1402, 1408, 1415; table c. τίς, 1399; tables c. subj., 1399 f., [Page 1441] 1402; table c. που, 1400; table c. πως, 1400, 1402 f.; c. ὅμοιοι, 1424.

N

νομίζω: c. ὅτι, 1422.

O

ὁ, ἡ, τό: c. ἱκανόν and inf., 1385; subj. inf., 1389; tables c. μεν and ὅν, 1394 f.; as rel. and dem. 1396 f.; c. πᾶς, 1397; not repeated, 1398; tables c. art. inf., 1415, 1425 ff.; tables c. inf., 1424, 1426.

οἶδα: c. ὅτι, 1422.

ὁμοίω: constr., 1392.

ὁμόσαι: form, 1424.

ὁποὺ: tables c. (ἤν) subj., 1399 f., 1402, 1411.

ὁποὺς: tables c. subj., 1400, 1402 f.; table of use, 1413.

ὁς: ὅ, 1379; c. ἵνα, 1387; tables c. subj., 1400, 1402 f.; oū ὅν, 1403; c. ἵνα and fut. ind., 1411.

ὁσύκις: tables c. ἵνα and ἓν, 1401 ff.

–οσαν: ending, 1388.

ὁσοῦ: tables c. ἵνα, 1400, 1402.
ὅστις: tables c. subj., 1400, 1402 f.
ὅταν: tables c. subj., 1401 ff., 1411 f.
ὅτε: c. ind., 1411.
ὅτι: c. ἕ, 1379; in dir. quest., 1396; recitative, 1421 f.
οὗ: after πᾶς, 1379 f.; tables c. µῆ, 1381, 1399; c. compounds, 1382; inset facing 1404, 1405, 1430; constr., 1415, 1429; c. ὅτι, 1429; οὐκ...ὅ, 1430.
οὖν: postpositive in fourth place, 1378; table of use, 1385.
οὐχί: use, 1406.
οὔτος: use, 1396 f.
ὁφεῖλω: c. anart. inf., 1424.
ὀξυς: form, 1390; c. ἱκανός and πολύς, 1397.
Π
παιδίσκη: meaning, 1377.
παρά: c. art. inf., 1382.
παρακάλεω: c. anart. inf., 1424.
πᾶς: c. οὗ and µῆ, 1380; case of πάντες, 1387.
περί: use, 1379.
περισσός: positive, 1387.
πηλίκος: for ἡ λίκος, 1382.
πιστεύω: c. ὅτι, 1422.
πλῆθος: use, 1390.
ποιεῖν: tense of ποιεῖ, 1381; c. acc. and inf., 1391; constr., 1409.
ποῖος: table c. subj., 1400.
πολλάς: case of, 1391.
ποταμός: table c. opt., 1408.
πότε: table c. subj., 1401.
ποῦ: meaning, 1382; tables c. subj., 1399, 1402.
πρίν: table c. ὧν, 1401; table c. ἦ, 1408; use, 1412.
πρό: c. inf., 1405 f.; table c. art. inf., 1427.
πρὸς: c. καί as adv., 1393; table c. ἀντόν and verbs of speaking, 1393; c. inf., 1405 f.; table c. art. inf., 1426.
προσκυνέω: constr., 1391.
πρῶτος: replaced by 'εἷς, 1394.
πῶς: tables c. subj., 1399 f.
Σ
σεαυτόν: for ἑαυτόν, 1394.
σπλαγχνίζομαι: c. ἐπί, 1430.
στοιχήσουσιν: linear fut., 1381.
Τ
–τατος: superlative ending, 1379.
τάχα: c. subj., 1407.
τε: c. καί, 1382.
τέσσαρες: case of, 1378.
τεχθείς: art. part., 1428.
τί: meaning, 1396; tables c. subj., 1399 f., 1402 f.; use, 1407 ff.
τίς: tables c. τί, 1408; c. ὧν, 1408.
τοι: meaning, 1382.
τοίνυν: meaning, 1382.
τόπος: substantive, 1394.
τυφλέ: case of, 1391.
τυχόν: adv. acc., 1378.

υμίν: case of, 1378.

υμῶν: case of, 1392. [Page 142]

ὑπέρ: for ἐκ, 1393.

ὑποστέλλω: c. art. inf., 1425.

Φ

φθάνω: meaning, 1429.

φοβέω: constr., 1378.

φονεύω: hendiadys, 1383.

φυλάσσω: voice of, 1398.

φωνή: case of, 1378; zeugma, 1383.

Χ

χάριν: c. art. inf., 1425.

χρεία: c. ἔχω, 1392.

χρόνος: substantive, 1394.

Ω

ὁς: for ὅτι, 1382; tables c. ( ὃν) subj., 1400–3.

ὡς: table of constr., 1414 f., 1428.
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[PAGE 1451] (B) OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA
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Genesis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:19</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:5</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:7</td>
<td>1382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:17</td>
<td>1382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exodus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:55</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:10</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:26</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:5</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:8</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:9</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leviticus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:5</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:9</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Numbers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:7</td>
<td>1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>1412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deuteronomy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:10</td>
<td>1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25</td>
<td>1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:17</td>
<td>1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:13</td>
<td>1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:22</td>
<td>1389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15:10 1392
22:18 1390
22:19 1390
29:4 1424
33:9 1389

Joshua
22:29 1382
24:16 1382

1 Samuel (1 Kings)
9:11 1392
21:3 1382
22:13 1391

2 Samuel (2 Kings)
14:4 1393

1 (3) Kings
8:24 1391
8:25 1398
8:61 1391

2 (4) Kings
6:19 1421

Nehemiah
4:22 1391
9:10 1391

Esther
4:11 1391
9:27 1391

Job
1:5 1379, 1381
Psalms
50:6 1413
57 (58):10 1412

Proverbs
8:26 1412

Isaiah
11:16 1391

Jeremiah
11:2 1391
11:5 1391
11:6 1391
11:20 1391
11:39 1391
11:43 1391
11:51 1391
44 (47):5 1412

Ezekiel
1:12 1381
1:15 1379
1:16 1381
1:19 1379
1:20 1381
2:6 1378
3:3  1379
3:9  1378
3:13 1378, 1383
3:18 1383
3:19 1383
3:20 1383
5:5  1380
5:13 1381
6:10 1381
6:13 1381

Hosea
2:3  1391
3:2  1380
7:5  1391

Amos
5:20 1391

Micah
7:11 1391
7:14 1391

Baruch
1:15 1391
1:20 1391
2:6  1391
2:11 1391
2:26 1391

1 Maccabees
8:26 1398
2 Maccabees
“6:21…184” 1383
9:2, etc. 1392

4 Maccabees
9:27 1412

Aquila and Sym. (ii/A.D.)
Deuteronomy 11:22 1398
Proverbs 8:26 1412

Theodotion
Daniel 9:7, 15 1391
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B. G. U.
No. 250 1389
423 1391

B. M.
No. 613 1387

F. P.
No. 77 1393
78 1393
112 1387
115 1387

[Page 1453] L. P.
III, 4 1412

M. P.
No. 11 1382

O. P.
1450 1393
1482 1387
1483 1421, 1430
1489 1388, 1415
1593 1386

Par. P.
No. 574 1387

P. Tor.
i. 5. 27 1389

P. Rylands
Vol. ii 1380

Tb. P.
No. 5 1387
6 1425
27 1425 bis
38 1425
61 (a) 1425
61 (b) 1425
62 1387 bis
63 1387
64 1387
78 1386
82 1387 bis
119 1387
(E) INDEX OF GREEK LITERATURE IN THE ADDENDA

R. F. PALMER

I. CLASSICAL

Homer (? x/viii B.C.)
Odyssey T. 464 1396

Aristophanes (v/B.C.)
Plutus 965 1396
Ranae 198 1396

Thucydides (v/B.C.)
i, 114 1392

Demosthenes (iv/B.C.)
de Pace 11 1409

Xenophon (iv/B.C.)
Cyro. 2. 2. 7 1396
2. 2. 30 1396
3. 2. 18 1396
4. 1. 11 1396
Cyrus 1. 4, 20 1392
Hellen., Ox. P. 226, 1. 16 1388

Plato (iv/B.C.)
Apol. 28C 1381
Leges 678D 1392

Page 1454] Eratosthenes (iii/B.C.)
Catasterismi 40 1392

Polybius (ii/B.C.)
32. 3 (7). 13 1385

Diodorus Siculus (ii/B.C.)
Bibl. Hist. 10. 3. 4 1387
II. KOINH

**Barnabas** (i/A.D.)
8:5  1396
10:1  1396
10:3  1412
15:5  1412

**Appian** (ii/A.D.)
Bell. Pun. 68  1385

**Arrian** (ii/A.D.)
Epictetus ii, 22, 10  1379
  ii, 22, 36  1379
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