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PREFACE TO THE SIXTH EDITION.

When this Grammar first made its appearance, in 1822, the object proposed was to oppose the unbridled license with which the diction of the New Testament was then, and had long been, handled in commentaries and exegetical lectures; and to apply, as far as practicable, the results of an enlightened philology, as deduced and taught by Hermann and his school, to the study of the language of the New Testament. It was high time that some voice should be raised against the inveterate empiricism of expositors, and that some effort should be made to emancipate the writers of the N. T. from the bondage of a perverted philology, which styled itself sacred and yet showed not the least respect towards the sacred authors and their well-considered phraseology.

The fundamental error — the πρῶτον ψεῦδος — of the Biblical philology and exegesis to which we refer, consisted ultimately in this, that neither the Hebrew nor the language of the N. T. was regarded as a living idiom (Herm. Eurip. Med. p. 401.), designed to be used by men as the medium of intercourse. Had scholars deliberately inquired, whether those departures from the current laws of speech which were assumed to exist in the Bible in such prodigious multitudes, were compatible with the essential principles of a language intended for the ordinary purposes of life, they would not so arbitrarily have held every kind of anomaly to be permissible; and would not have delighted to attribute to the Apostles in almost every verse an enallage or a substitution of the wrong construction for the right.

The older commentaries belonging to the period of the Reformation are comparatively free from such perversions; but when

▼
we read certain commentaries of the 18th and 19th centuries still current, we are constrained to conclude that the main characteristic of the language of the N. T. is a total want of precision and regularity. For these interpreters are continually showing how here a wrong tense is used, there a wrong case, here a comparative for a positive, there ἀ for τις, but instead of for, consequently for because, on the other side for on this side (what for so Isa. viii. 20). Such exegetical learning makes a reader quite impatient with the sacred writers for their ignorance of the ordinary principles of language. He cannot comprehend how such men in oral discourse, where this lawlessness of speech must certainly have been still more conspicuous, could have made themselves understood even, much less how they could have won over to Christianity a great number of persons of education.

But this system of explaining every difficulty by a pro or an idem quod had a serious as well as a ludicrous aspect. For does not Scripture become, as an eminent linguist long ago intimated, like a waxen nose, which every one can twist as he pleases, in proportion to his ignorance of the learned tongues? Would it have been impossible, or even difficult, for such a man as Storr, for example, had the task been assigned him, to have found in the words of the Apostles any favorite notion whatever? And does such a view of N. T. diction accord with the dignity of sacred writers? ¹ Every one who now-a-days should insist on using in the ordinary intercourse of life such perversions of language as the following: I shall come to thee to-day for I came to thee to-day; no prophet ever came out of Galilee for no prophet will ever come out of Galilee (Jno. vii. 52); I call you no longer servants for I did not call you mere servants (Jno. xv. 15); for Jesus himself testified, that a prophet has no honor in his own country for although Jesus himself testified, etc. (Jno. iv. 44); I saw the forest that was magnificently covered with foliage for a forest that was, etc. (Jno. v. 13); send me the book, and I will read it, for thou wilt

¹ Herm. ad Vigcr. p. 786: Diligenter caveant tirones, ne putent, viros spiritu sancto afflatos sprevisse sermonem mortalium, sed meminerint potius, illum interpretandi rationem, qua nonnulli theologorum utuntur, nihil esse nisi blasphemia.

² To what extent expositors of the old school were devoid of all sense of expression may be seen (instar omnium) in Köhler’s reasoning, Mt. p. 120 sq.
send me the book, etc.; to whom it was revealed that for to whom this was revealed, yet so that, etc. (1 Pet. i. 121); Christ is dead therefore risen again for but risen again; he is not more learned for he is not learned; he rejoiced that he should see, etc., and he saw and rejoiced, for he would have rejoiced if he had seen, etc., he rejoiced even at what he already saw (Jno. viii. 56); he began to wash for he washed (Jno. xiii. 56), and the like,—would be regarded as having lost his reason. Were all the instances of a quid pro quo which many expositors during the decennaries just past have put into the mouth of the Apostles to be collected, the list could not fail to be astounding.

When, at the commencement of my career as a university tutor, I undertook to combat this absurd system of interpretation, I was aware that there were scholars far more competent for the task than myself; and, in fact, what I accomplished in the earlier editions of this book was but imperfect. My attempt, however, was cordially encouraged by distinguished men, and in particular by Vater and D. Schulz. Others pointed out, sometimes indeed in a spirit of bitterness, the imperfections of the work; and to these unsparing critics I have been greatly indebted, not only in this publication, but in all my exegetical labors. By discussions annexed to the second edition (1828) the grammatical contents of the work were enlarged, and the third edition came out greatly improved, both in copiousness and accuracy, by a more extensive study of the writings of the Greek prose authors and of the Hellenistic Jews. From that time forward I have labored incessantly to improve the work; and I have been animated by the aid which philological and exegetical publications suited to my purpose have furnished me in rich abundance. At the same time, the intelligent investigation of the N. T. diction has been daily gaining ground; and the use of the Grammar by commentators has been growing more and more evident. The work began to attract the attention of professed philologists even. At the same time I have always been far from thinking the correct grammatical elucidation of the N. T. to be its only proper exposition; and I have, in silence, allowed some to regard me even as an opponent of what is now called the theological interpretation.

1 On this passage see my Erlanger Pfingstprogr. 1830. 4to.
The present edition — the sixth — will show again on every page, that I have spared no effort to arrive at truth. Deeply, however, do I regret, that in the midst of my labors I was overtaken by a nervous affection of the eyes, which has brought me to the verge of total blindness. This calamity has compelled me to employ the eyes and hands of others to complete this edition. I cannot omit this opportunity of expressing publicly my sincere thanks to all the young friends whose indefatigable assistance only has enabled me, in spite of my frequent forebodings, to accomplish my task.

The change in the arrangement of the matter in Part III. will, I trust, be approved. In other respects, it has been my especial aim to treat every point with greater completeness, and in smaller space, than in previous editions; (the text of the Grammar now occupies eight sheets fewer than before). With this view I adopted all possible abbreviations in the Biblical and Greek citations. It is hoped, however, that these, as well as those for the names of more recent authors, will everywhere be intelligible. The citations have been verified anew throughout; and, so far as I know, not a single work that has appeared since 1844 has been left unused, or at least unnoticed.

The text of the N. T. I have uniformly, that is except when there was a question of various readings, quoted in accordance with the second Leipsic edition of Dr. Tischendorf, which at present has probably the most extensive circulation.

May this new revision — the last the work will ever receive from me — contribute to the diffusion of Biblical truth, so far as any such work can.

1 The Greek writers are only quoted by the page when the division by chapters has not obtained currency: Plato, according to the edition by Stephan.; Strabo and Athenaeus, by Casaubon; Demosthen. and Isocrates, by H. Wolf; Dionys. Hal., by Reiske; Dio Cass., by Reimar.; Dio Chrysost., by Morell.

2 It may be remarked here, that instead of Kuinoel (the Latinized form of the name), Kühnel, as the family wrote their name in German, is used everywhere, except in Latin citations.

Leipsic, October, 1855.
PREFACE TO THE SEVENTH EDITION.

Winer's foreboding that the sixth edition would be the last revision from his hand has unfortunately been realized. But even while sensible of his approaching death, the indefatigable man took incessant interest in his Grammar, and labored to the very end of his life to perfect it. Without altering the general distribution of matter as it appeared in the sixth edition, he constantly improved the book in details,—by additions of greater or less extent in more than three hundred and forty places, by erasures and reconstructions, by the multiplication of parallel passages from biblical and from profane literature, by a more precise definition of thoughts and expressions, by the correction of trivial oversights and mistakes, etc. etc. Thus he has not left us without bequeathing to us in this book a legacy richer than ever.

When the publisher confided to me the preparation of the new edition which had become necessary, I could not hesitate a moment what course to adopt. It was clear to me, in the first place, that the book must retain absolutely and throughout the character of a work by Winer. This was demanded, on the one hand, by reverence towards the departed author; whom no one has hitherto surpassed—who hardly any one among those now living will surpass—in a department which he cultivated with especial fondness for more than a generation. It appeared also, on the other hand, to be a sacred duty towards the theological public, to whom Winer's work, on account of its scholarly exactness and copious erudition, justly became long ago a precious possession and a universally acknowledged authority. I considered myself, therefore, as bound to abstain from every radical
alteration of the text, either as respects the general arrangement or as respects the development of details. My task, rather, I perceived to be merely this: while preserving in its integrity the character of Winer's book, to increase as far as possible, in the spirit and intent of Winer, its usefulness for students of the present day. I have taken especial pains to work into the text the numerous manuscript notes from Winer's hand. In doing this, Winer's own words have been retained as far as it was any way feasible; and changes, when necessary, have always been restricted so closely, that they affect merely what is unessential, never the matter itself. Further, I have made it a point, not merely to correct silently the obvious oversights and mistakes I met with—and they proved to be more numerous than I expected—and to give to the cross-references a definiteness in which they were often deficient, but also to consult, as far as pertinent, the theological and philological works which have appeared since Winer's death, and to use in this new edition what they contained worthy of attention. Whenever, too, a question of textual criticism is involved, regard has been paid to the readings of the Codex Sinaiticus. Yet great self-restraint has been imposed throughout, in order not to augment excessively a work already of considerable bulk.

Winer's additions and alterations have been directly incorporated with the text without being indicated by a particular sign. They will be plain to every one who will take the pains to compare the seventh edition with the sixth. On the other hand, the additions which I have made have been in all cases marked by square brackets. The square brackets already used by Winer here and there, have consequently been made to give place to other signs; such as round brackets, dashes, etc. In conclusion it may be remarked that very great care has been taken to secure typographical accuracy.

And now may the book, in this its seventh edition, subserve its purpose to afford the interpretation of the New Testament a stable foundation.

DR. LÜNEMANN.

GÖTTINGEN, August 19, 1880.
AMERICAN EDITOR'S PREFACE.

Winer's Grammar is now for the fourth time rendered accessible to English readers. A translation of the first edition was made by the late Professors Stuart and Robinson, and published at Andover in 1825. The fourth edition of the original, rendered into English by Professors Agnew and Ebbekke, appeared in 1839. Twenty years later Professor Masson's translation of the sixth German edition was published at Edinburgh (and Philadelphia). The present work was originally announced (in April 1866) as a revision of Professor Masson's. The labor of revision was drawing towards completion, and nearly three hundred pages of the book had been stereotyped, when appeared the seventh German edition, under the supervision of Dr. Lünemann. Some unavoidable delay ensued before the revision and the printing were begun anew in conformity with this new edition. These facts explain why the publication of the present volume follows the original announcement so tardily.

The book still remains, substantially, a revision of Professor Masson's translation. The changes introduced have been such as could be made upon the printed sheets of that work. This circumstance has frequently affected their form and sometimes their number. But although Professor Masson's version has been retained as the basis of this, it is believed that hardly a paragraph of his work remains altogether unaltered; and sometimes the alterations amount in effect to a new translation,—a translation which for entire pages has but a few phrases in common with its predecessor.

In making the changes described it has been the editor's aim to render the version a faithful reproduction of the original. A faithful translation, he believes, should not only be free from
intentional addition,¹ omission, or alteration, but in a work of this kind should adhere as closely to the author's expression as English idiom will permit. Accordingly, should the renderings seem, here and there, to have lost a little in ease, a compensation will be found, it is hoped, in their increased accuracy.

It has not been judged necessary to annotate any interpretation having a doctrinal bearing, even though such interpretation be debatable on grammatical grounds, or to qualify an expression or two respecting the sacred writers which may strike many English readers as unwarrantably free; for the book is likely to be used either by students with mature understandings in exercise, or by pupils under the guidance of competent teachers. The reasons which have led the editor to disregard the request that he would abridge and otherwise alter the original work will be suggested by Professor Lünemann's remarks upon this point.

The notation of the sections, etc., has been carefully retained throughout. When it could be done conveniently, the cross-references have been rendered more definite by subjoining the number of the page. To aid those who may use this book in connection with Commentaries which refer to the Grammar by pages, the paging of the sixth and seventh German editions, as well as of Professor Masson's translation, has been noted on the outer margin of the leaves. The indexes have been revised, and that of Greek words has been considerably enlarged. Further, the Index of Passages in the New Testament has been made complete, and the references themselves have been carefully verified; this laborious work has been performed by Mr. G. W. Warren, formerly a student in this Seminary, at present Professor of Biblical Interpretation in the Baptist Theological Seminary at Chicago, Illinois. This Index, it is believed, will be highly valued by students. A glance at it will show with how little exaggeration the book may be called a grammatical commentary on the more difficult texts of the New Testament. Other references the editor has been content simply to transfer to the pages of the translation. This will account for their frequent want of uniformity.

Pains have been taken to give the work that typographical

¹ In a single passage it seemed necessary to append a note; see page 598.
accuracy which is a leading requisite in a satisfactory manual. On this point, however, the editor would not speak too confidently; for even in the seventh German edition, which is as superior to the sixth in accuracy of typography as it is in elegance, errata have been discovered by the score. It is hoped that the mistakes which have slipped in, will not exceed in number those detected, and silently rectified, in the German original.

In conclusion, the editor would express the desire that the book in its present form may both facilitate and increase that patient, reverent study of the letter of the Inspired Word, which is indispensable to the fullest reception of it as spirit and life.

J. HENRY THAYER.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ANDOVER, MASS.
October, 1863.

——

NOTE.

In this new impression the Biblical references, both in the body of the work and as collected in the N. T. Index, have been verified again. A few of the former, which appear to be wrong as they stand but which the editor had not the means of correcting, have been marked with [?]. The alterations in the N. T. Index are so numerous, that it has been found convenient occasionally to sink an added reference into a foot-note; and, in inserting other references to the pages, to disregard sometimes the strict numerical order. In some instances, also, the gap left by the removal of erroneous references has not been closed up. The re-examination of this index proves it to be not quite "complete"; but there are no omissions, it is believed, which a student will regret.

J. H. T.

ANDOVER, September, 1873.
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INTRODUCTION.

ON THE SCOPE, TREATMENT, AND HISTORY OF N.T. GRAMMAR.

§ 1. The language of the N.T., like every other, presents two aspects for scientific consideration, inasmuch as the words which we find in the N.T. following one another in connected discourse may be considered either by themselves, in reference to their origin and their meaning (the material element); or as respects their legitimate employment in the structure of clauses and periods (the formal element). The former is the business of Lexicography; the latter belongs to Grammar, which must be carefully distinguished from N.T. Stylistics (Rhetoric).

On distinguishing Lexicography from Grammar, see Pott in the Kieler Allgem. Monatsschr. 1851. Juli. The Lexicography of the N.T., of which Synonymy forms a very important part, though its importance was not duly recognized till of late, has always been cultivated in a merely practical manner. A theory of it, however, may be laid down; which might be styled Lexicology,—a term that has recently come into use. That this theory has not as yet been fully developed and perfected is the less surprising, since even the classic tongues remain destitute of a Lexicology; and in the department of Exegetical Theology a theory of Biblical Criticism (higher and lower) is still a desideratum. This deficiency, however, has had a decidedly unfavorable effect on practical lexicography, as might be easily shown by a close examination of the lexicographical works on the N.T. which have hitherto appeared, even the most recent not excepted.¹

N.T. Stylistics or Rhetoric (the latter appellation has already been employed by Glassius and by Bauer, author of Rhetorica Paulina), should exhibit the characteristics of N.T. style in its freedom and individuality,

¹ For some remarks on the theory of lexicography, see Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik, S. 49. 84. A commencement towards a comparative lexicography has been made by Zeller, in his theolog. Jahrb. II. 443 ff.
14 restricted only by the character and aim of the composition; and this it should do both generally, and in reference to the peculiarities of the *genera dicendi* and of the respective writers (cf. IIand, Lehrb. d. lat. Styls. p. 25 sq.). In this department much remains to be done, (particularly as respects the theory of rhetorical figures, erroneous views respecting which have at all times caused much mischief in the interpretation of the N. T.).

The preparatory labors of Bauer and Dan. Schulze,¹ however, are of service; and Wilke has made a compilation (N. T. Rhetorik, Dresd. 1843. 8vo.) worthy of attention. Schleiermacher had already given excellent hints in his Hermeneutik. As respects the discourses of Jesus and the apostolic epistles, it would be best to follow the example of the ancient rhetoricians, and treat in Biblical Rhetoric of the style of reasoning. This would prevent the excessive subdivision of N. T. Exegetics, and the separation of kindred subjects, which, when treated in connection, afford mutual light. Cf., besides, Gersdorf, Beiträge zur Sprachcharakterist. d. N. T. 1 Bd. S. 7; Keil, Lehrb. der Hermeneutik, S. 28; C. J. Kellman, Diss. de usu Rhetorices hermeneutico. Gryph. 1766. 4to.

It may be incidentally remarked, that in their exposition of Exegetical Theology our Encyclopaedias still leave much to be desired. And in practice, too, N. T. Hermeneutics is not properly distinguished from N. T. Philology,² as we may call that entire department of Exegetical Theology which has just been sketched.

§ 2. A grammatical exposition of the idiom of the N. T., in so far as it is a variety of the Greek language, would strictly considered involve only a systematic comparison of that idiom with the grammatical structure of the later Greek literary language; for with this last the idiom of the N. T. is closely connected, both chronologically and generically. As, however, this later Greek itself has not yet been delineated in its peculiarities as a whole, and as the idiom of the N. T. also exhibits throughout the influence of a foreign tongue (the Hebrew-Aramaic) upon the Greek, N. T.

15 Grammar must be so far extended as to comprise a scientific


² I should prefer this old and intelligible appellation, "Philologia sacra N. T." (cf. *J. Ch. Beck*, conspect. system. philol. sacrae. Bas. 1760. 12 Section. 4to.) to that which *Schleiermacher*, following classic usage, proposes, "Grammar"; see *Lücke*, on his Hermeneutik, S. 10.
INTRODUCTION.

exposition of the mode in which the Jewish authors of the N. T. wrote the Greek of their time.

If it were proposed e.g. to write a grammar of the Egyptian or Alexandrian variety of the Greek (as this variety had been moulded there in the mouths of Greek-speaking residents from various parts of the world), it would be enough to collect all its distinctive peculiarities, that is to say, all that make it a separate dialect; not indeed simply stringing them together in a fragmentary way, but arranging them systematically under the several divisions of grammar, and pointing out how and to what extent they respectively modified the general laws of the Greek language (by abandoning niceties, misusing analogies, etc.). The idiom of the N. T., as it is a variety of the later Greek, should it require a grammar of its own, could only be exhibited as a species of a species; and thus a grammar of the N. T. would presuppose a grammar of the later Greek. But N. T. Grammar cannot easily be so restricted even in thought, still less can the idea be carried out to advantage. For, on the one hand, the Grammar of later Greek, especially in its oral popular form, has not yet been scientifically investigated; consequently, the groundwork for N. T. Grammar exists in thought rather than in fact. On the other hand, the idiom of the N. T. displays also the influence of a non-cognate language, the Hebrew-Aramaic, upon the Greek. N. T. Grammar, therefore, must extend its limits in two directions: Presuming the reader to be acquainted with the Grammar of classic Greek, it must point out in the manner already described the peculiarities of the later Greek, as exhibited in the N. T.; and likewise show, in the same scientific way, how and to what extent the Greek was modified by Hebrew-Aramaic influence. It would be wrong, however, to attempt to keep the two quite separate, for the mingling of the (later) Greek with the national (or Jewish) element in the mind of the writers of the N. T., produced a single composite syntax, which must be recognized and exhibited in its essential unity.

1 Valuable information, though rather lexical than grammatical, will be found in Lobeck's notes on Phrynichi Eclog. Lips. 1820 8vo. Previously Irmisch (on Herodian) and Fischer (de vitiis Lexicor. N. T.) had collected much useful matter. Copious hints relative to the graecitas fatisensis have been more recently presented in the improved texts of the Byzantine writers, and the indices (of very unequal merit) appended to most of them in the Bonn edition; as well as in Boissonade's notes in the ancidot. graec. (Paris, 1899 ff. V. 8.), and in his editions of Marinus, Philostratus, Nicetas Eugen., Babrius, etc.; and, lastly, in Mullach's ed. of Hierocles (Berl. 1853. 8vo.), [cf. also his Grammatik der griech. Vulgarsprache in histor. Entwickelung. Berl. 1856. 8vo.]. To the later Greek element appropriate reference is made likewise in Lobeck's Paralipomena grammaticae Gr. Lips. 1837. 2 pts. 8vo., in his Pathologiae sermonis Gr. proleg. Lips. 1843. 8vo., and pathol. Graeci serm. elementa, Königh. 1853. I. 8vo., and also in praevarucis s. verbor. Gr. et nomenium verbal. technologia, ib. 1846. 8vo.

2 For judicious remarks on the lexical treatment of Hebraisms, see Schleiermacher's Hermeneutik, S. 65.
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This mode of treating N. T. Grammar will undergo a partial change whenever the grammar of the later Greek language shall have received an independent exposition; for then it will not be necessary to prove the peculiarities of this later language by examples,—a task from which the N. T. grammarians cannot for the time be released. But one portion of the present contents of a grammar will gradually disappear, viz. the polemic, which opposes inveterate and deeply rooted prejudices, or errors which have again made their appearance. As yet, however, this negative vindication of the true character of the diction of the N. T. still continues indispensable; for, well-known expositors even of very recent date (Kühnöl, Flatt, Klausen in his Evangeliencomm.) have shown us again how deeply rooted is that old grammatical empiricism which deems it an abomination ultra Fischerum (or even Storrium) sapere.

Special grammars of separate portions of the N. T., as of the writings of John, of Paul, are clearly out of the question. The distinctive qualities that mark the diction of these writers in particular, consist almost entirely in the use of certain favorite expressions, or relate to the department of Rhetoric, as may be seen from the observations of Blackwall in his Crit. Sacr. N. T. II. 2. 8. p. 322 sqq. ed. Lipsa. To this also peculiarities in the collocation of words are mostly to be assigned. Grammar is but seldom affected by these peculiarities of individuals. Accordingly Schulze and Schulz¹ have, on the whole, formed a more correct estimate of such peculiarities of diction than Gersdorf, whose well-known work—no great contribution of sure results even to verbal criticism—must have almost proved its own refutation, if it had had to be continued on the principles hitherto laid down.

§ 3. Although investigation into the language of the N. T. is the basis of all sound interpretation, yet N. T. Grammar has been till a recent period almost entirely excluded by Biblical philologists from the range of their inquiries. While the lexical element of the N. T. language has been the subject of repeated investigation, the grammatical has been treated at the most only so far as it stood connected with the discussion of the Hebraisms of the N. T.²

¹ His remarks on the character of the N. T. diction are contained in his dissertation on the Parable of the Steward (Bresl. 1821. 8vo.) and that on the Lord’s Supper (Leipsig, 1824; 2d improved edit. 1831. 8vo.), and also in several articles in the Wachlersch. theol. Annalen. In both dissertations, which are of an exegetical character, his observations, mostly acute, seem out of place, as they throw very little light on exegesis. Textual criticism, however, might have turned his views to good account, if the distinguished writer had only been pleased to give them to us in full. Cf. also Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik, 8. 129.

² An honorable exception among earlier expositors is the nearly forgotten G. F. Hrumpel, who in his copious and almost purely philological Commentary on the Gospel of Mark (Strassburg, 1716. 8vo.) makes many excellent grammatical observations
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Only Casp. Wyss (1650) and G. Pasor (1655) conceived more completely the idea of a N. T. grammar; but their efforts were unavailing to accomplish its recognition as a special department of exegetical discipline. During a period of one hundred and sixty years after them, Haab was the first to publish a special treatise on the Grammar of the N. T.; but his rather uncritical work, besides being restricted to the Hebraisms, was adapted to retard the science, rather than to promote it.

The first author who in some degree collected and explained the peculiarities of the N. T. diction, was the celebrated Sal. Glass (†1656) in his Philologia Sacra, the third book of which is entitled Grammatica Sacra, and the fourth Grammaticae Sacrae Appendix. But as he everywhere makes the Hebrew his point of departure, and touches upon the language of the N. T. only so far as it coincides with that, his treatise, to say nothing of its deficiencies, can be mentioned in a history of N. T. Grammar only as a weak performance. It serves to remind us, however, of the two writers mentioned above, whose very names, as well as their productions, which belong here, had fallen into almost total oblivion. The one, Casp. Wyss, Prof. of Greek in the Gymnasium of Zurich (†1659), published Dialectologia Sacra, in qua quicquid per universum N. F. contextum in apostolica et voce et phraesi a communi Graecor. lingua eoque grammatica analogia discrepat, methodo congrua disponitur, accurate definitur et omnium sacri contextus exemplorum inductione illustratur. Tigur. 1650. pp. 324 (besides the appendix), small 8vo. In this treatise the grammatical peculiarities of N. T. diction are arranged under the following heads: Dialectus Attica, Ionica, Dorica, Aelotica, Boeotica, Poetica, Ἐβραϊκώσα. This arrangement is awkward in the extreme, since kindred topics are separated and frequently are discussed in four different places. The writer's acquaintance with the Greek dialects, also, was clearly not beyond the ordinary scholarship of his time, as the very mention of a special dialectus poetica shows, and an examination of what he calls Attic renders still more manifest. Still, as a collection of examples, which in several sections is absolutely complete, the volume has value; and as respects the grammatical Hebraisms of the N. T. the author's moderation might well have been imitated by his contemporaries.

George Pasor, Prof. of Greek at Franeker (†1637), known by his small Lexicon of the N. T.,—which has been several times republished, finally by J. F. Fischer,—left among his papers a grammar of the N. T., which his son, Matthias Pasor, Prof. of Theology at Gröningen (†1658), pub-


1 In Dathe's edition this Grammatica Sacra forms, as is well known, the first book.
lished, with additions and improvements of his own, under the following title: G. Pasoris Grammatica Graeca Sacra N. T. in tres libros distributa. Gröning. 1655. pp. 787. 8vo. This work is now a literary rarity, though it is far more fitted than the Lexicon to transmit the author’s name to posterity. It is divided, as the title indicates, into three books. The first contains the Inflections; the second, the Syntax (244–530); the third, seven appendices: de nominibus N. T., de verbis N. T., de verbis anomalis, de dialectis N. T., de accentibus, de praxi grammaticae, de numeris s. arithmetica graeca. The second book and the Appendix de dialectis N. T. are the most valuable portions of the work. For in the first book, and in most of the appendices which form the third, he treats of the ordinary subjects of a general Greek grammar, superfluously inserting e.g. full paradigms of the Greek nouns and verbs. The syntax is elaborated with great accuracy and copiousness. The writer points out what is Hebraistic, but seldom adduces parallels from native Greek authors. This useful volume, however, is without a full index.

During the interval from Pasor to Haab, the Grammar of the N. T. was treated but incidentally in treatises on the style of the N. T., e.g. by Leusden (de Dialectis N. T.) and Olearius (de Stylo N. T., pp. 257–271). But these authors confined themselves almost exclusively to Hebraisms, and by representing as Hebraistic much pure Greek phraseology, they involved in confusion again the whole inquiry concerning the Grammar of the N. T. Georgi was the first to vindicate the Greek character of numerous constructions usually regarded as Hebraistic, although even he did not escape one-sidedness. His writings attracted but little attention; while the works of Vorst and Leusden now obtained through the efforts of Fischer new currency, and Storr’s well-known book was allowed for many years to exert its pernicious influence on the interpretation of the N. T. without restraint.

From the school of Storr appeared Ph. H. Haab (rector of Schweigern, in the kingdom of Württemberg, †1833) with his Hebrew-Greek Grammar of the N. T., prefaced by F. G. v. Süskind. Tübing. 1815. 8vo. Overlooking the pure Greek element in the N. T. diction, he directed his


2 Pasor had already himself added this appendix, under the title Idea (syllabus brevis) Graecar. N. T. Dialectorum, to the first edition of his Syllabus Graeco-Lat. omnium N. T. vocum. Amstel. 1633. 12mo. At the end he promises the above full Grammatica N. T.

3 Observat. ad analog. et syntaxin Hebr. Stuttg. 1779. 8vo. Some acute grammatical observations, especially on enallage temporum, particularum, and the like, are to be found in J. G. Straube, diss. de emphasi graecae linguae N. T. in v. d. Honert, p. 70 sqq.
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attention merely to grammatical Hebraisms, and in the arrangement of
the whole he followed the works of Storr and Weckherlin (Hebr. Gram. 19
2 Pts.). If the reviewer in Bengel’s Archiv (1 B. S. 406 ff.) is to be
credited, “the author has accomplished his task with such diligence, such
sound judgment, such accuracy, and such nice and comprehensive knowl-
edge of language, as must obtain for it the approbation of all friends of
the well-grounded interpretation of the N. T.” A very different and
almost entirely opposite opinion has been expressed, however, by two
scholars who must be regarded as most competent and impartial judges in
this department: in the n. theol. Annal. 1816. 2 B. S. 859–879, and (by
deWette?) in the A. LZ. 1816. N. 39–41. S. 303–326. After long and
various use of the book, I am compelled to say that I entirely concur in
their decision. The principal fault of the book consists in the author’s
not having correctly distinguished the classic Greek element from the
Hebraistic in the diction of the N. T., and in his having consequently
adduced as Hebraistic much either that is common to all cultivated lan-
guages, or that occurs as frequently in the classics as in the N. T.; while
from his partiality to Storr’s views, he has quite misinterpreted numerous
passages of the N. T. by forcing Hebraisms upon them (see proof below).
Moreover, the book is full of confusion, the matter is arranged most
arbitrarily, and the whole begins with a section on Tropes!—a subject
not belonging to Grammar at all. The last of the reviewers mentioned
above does not, accordingly, seem too severe in concluding his criticism
with these words: “Seldom have we met a work which was so complete
a failure as this, and against the use of which we must warn the public so
emphatically.”

§ 4. Further, the detached grammatical remarks in commentaries
on the books of the N. T., in miscellanies, and in exegetical mon-
ographs, though sometimes exhibiting creditable research, failed
to furnish, all taken together, a complete discussion of the Gram-
mar of the N. T. These contributions, moreover, were rendered
useless by that uncritical empiricism which controlled Greek
Philology till the beginning of the present century, and Hebrew
till a much more recent period; just as this same empiricism has
impacted to the interpretation of the N. T. the impress of uncer-
tainty and arbitrariness. The philosophical method of handling
philological subjects,—that method which seeks in national and
individual peculiarities of thought the grounds of all phenomena
of speech, anomalies even not excepted,—has effected a complete
revolution in the study of Greek; and the application of the same
method to the language of the N. T. can alone invest the Grammar 20
of the N. T. with a scientific character, and elevate it to the dignity
of a safe guide in interpretation.
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The empiricism that pervaded Greek philology manifested itself in the department of Grammar mainly in the following particulars: a. The grammatical structure of the language was apprehended merely in the rudest outline; hence the relation of kindred forms, e.g. of the Aor. and Perf., of the Subjunctive and the Optative, of the twofold order of negatives (οὐ and μή), matters in which the genius of the Greek language is especially conspicuous, was left quite uncertain. b. In regard to those forms the distinctive power of which had been in general discerned, an unlimited interchange was asserted, according to which, one tense, one case, one particle, was used for another; and even direct opposites (e.g. Pret. and Fut., ἔξω and ἔπος, etc.) were supposed to be interchanged. c. A multitude of ellipses was devised, and in the most simple expression something was said to be understood. This method of procedure, still exhibited in Fischer's copious Animad. ad Welleri Grammat. Gr. (Lips. 1798 ff. 3 Spec. 8vo.), was applied by expositors to the N. T. They thought themselves warranted in using still greater liberties than Greek philologists, because the Hebrew, after which the diction of the N. T. was modelled, is characterized by want of precision in forms, and want of regularity in syntax, (which, therefore, was not treated systematically but only under the head of enallages and solecisms). ⁰ The natural consequences of such views were abundantly apparent in the N. T. commentaries of the time; and Storr had the honor of reducing to a sort of system this farrago of grammatical empiricism. Apart from all other evils resulting from such principles, they afforded unbounded license to the caprice of expositors, and made it easy for them to discover in the words of the sacred authors sentiments quite contradictory. ²

¹ This empiricism was but occasionally and partially combated by enlightened scholars. Thus numerous misapprehensions of expositors were pointed out, very intelligently on the whole, by the Wittenberg professors Balth. Stolberg, in his Tractat. de solecism. et barbarism. graecae N. F. dictioni false tributis. Vit. (1681.) 1685. 4to., and Franz Wokes, in his dissertation entitled: Piaetas critica in hypallagas bibl. Viteb. 1718. 8vo., and particularly in his Enallagae e N. T. graec textus praecipuis et plurimis locis exterminatae. Viteb. 1730. 8vo. Also J. Const. Schwartz evinces highly respectable research and judgment in his Lib. de opinatis discipulor. Chr. solecismis. Cob. 1730. 4to. Such protests, however, either obtained no attention, or were drowned by a contorta ! artificioso !

² How entirely different from his acute countryman Alb. Bengel, in his Gnomon, who, though he is often drawn into over-refined expositions, and attributes to the apostles his own dialectic conceptions, might have served for years as a model of careful and instructive exposition. While he turned attention to grammatical inquiries (cf. e.g. Acts iii. 19; xxvi. 2; 1 Cor. xii. 15; Matt. xviii. 17; Heb. vi. 4.), he devoted special diligence in lexical matters to synonyms. ³

³ Sunt, says Tittmann (de scriptor. N. T. diligentia gramm. Lips. 1813. 4to., in Synonym. N. T. i. p. 206), qui grammaticarum legum observationem in N. T. interpretatione parum current et, si scriptoris cujusdam verba grammaticae i.e. ex legibus linguae explicata sententiam . . . . ab ipsorum opinione alienam prodant, nullam illarum legum rationem habeant, sed propria verborum vi neglecta scriptorem dixisse
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The Greek philologists were the first to abandon this empiricism. Reitz's pupil, Gottfr. Hermann, by his work De Emendanda Ratione Grammaticae Gr., gave the first powerful impulse to the rational investigation of the noble Greek tongue. This method has now, after the lapse of more than fifty years, become so general, and produced such important results, and of late has allied itself so successfully to historical research, that Greek grammar has become transformed. The treatment of the subject has been rational, because

a. The primary import of all grammatical forms (the cases, tenses, moods), that is, the notion corresponding to every such form in the Greek mind, was distinctly settled; and to this primary notion all actual uses of the same form were referred. Thus a multitude of ellipses disappeared, and enallage was reduced within its natural and narrow bounds.

b. Even in the case of such deviations from the established laws of the language as had been adopted, either generally or by individual authors,—anacolouthon, confusio duarum structurarum, attractio, constructio ad sensum, brachylogia, etc.,—pains were taken to show how they originated in the mind of the speaker or writer.

The Greek language is thus exhibited as the expression of Greek thought—as a living idiom. Every form and turn of expression is not merely stated as a matter of fact, but is traced back to the thinking mind, and an attempt is made to comprehend it in its origin within the soul. By such a method every unintelligible usage disappears of itself, such as the assumption that a writer wishing to express a past event has employed a fut. tense; that intending to say out of, he has said at; that wishing to call some one learned, he has called him more learned; that meaning to subjoin a cause, he has written consequently; that desirous of saying I saw a man, he has said I saw the man, etc.

For a long time, however, Biblical philologists took no notice of all this progress in Greek grammar (and lexicography). They clung to old Viger and to Storr, and kept aloof from classical philology, under the impression (by no one distinctly avowed, to be sure, in recent times) that N. T. Greek, because Hebraistic, could not be subjected to the same philosophical method of inquiry. They would not perceive that Hebrew itself, like every other human language, admits and requires a philosophical treatment. Through the persevering efforts of Ewald, this truth is now universally acknowledged. No one now denies that the ultimate explanation of Hebrew modes of expression must be sought for in Hebrew modes of

contendunt, quae talibus verbis nemo sana mente praeditus dicere unquam potuit. Hermann's (ad Vig. 788) satirical remarks were just.

1 I should prefer this epithet to philosophical, because the latter may easily give rise to misunderstanding. All merely empirical philology is irrational; it regards language as something merely external, and not as the expression of thought. Cf. Tischmann, as above, S. 205 sq.

thought, and that a simple-minded people would be the last to repudiate the fundamental principles of human speech. Scholars are no longer content to give a preposition, for instance, the most diverse meanings according to the assumed requirements of a context superficially examined. But an endeavor is made to point out the transition from the primary import of every particle to every one of its secondary meanings; and without this, every alleged signification is regarded as an unscientific assumption. A student is no longer satisfied with the vague remark that to a Hebrew, non omnis — which in reason can only mean not every one — is the same as omnis non, that is, nullus; on the contrary, he refers to the true principle in every such case to be kept in view.

N. T. Grammar, therefore, must strive after a rational exposition of the language of the N. T. if it will attain a scientific basis itself, or secure the same in turn to exegesis. All that has been already achieved in Greek philology must be carefully turned to account. It must, however, be remembered, that not every nice distinction propounded by the linguists is to be viewed as established (and even the text perhaps altered accordingly), but that philology is constantly progressive. Many views have already required to be considerably modified (those, for instance, relating to the use of et with the subjunctive); others are still matters of dispute even among the best scholars (for instance, certain uses of áv).

Since 1824, N. T. Grammar in particular has received valuable contributions from Fritzscbe, in his Dissertatt. in 2 Epist. ad Cor. (Lips. 1824.), in his Commentaries on Matthew and Mark, in his Conject. in N. T. Lips. 1825. 2 Spec. 8vo., and especially in his Comment. on the Epistle to the Romans, Hal. 1836. 8vo. To these must be added the Dissertations of Gieseler and Bornemann in Rosenmüller’s Exeget. Repert. 2 B., as well as the latter’s Scholia in Lucae Evang. Lips. 1830. 8vo., and, in part, his edition of the Acts of the Apostles (Acta Apost. ad Cod. Cantabrig. fidem rec. et interpr. est. Grosenhain, 1848. 8vo. I.). Finally, many grammatical questions have been discussed in the controversial correspondence between Fritzscbe and Tholuck.

1 Rational investigation must be founded on historical. The whole field of language must first be historically surveyed, before we can explain individual phenomena. A simple language supposes simplicity of thought; and the explanation of forms and expressions is more easy in Hebrew, than in languages of less simplicity. The rational investigation of Hebrew implies tracing out all transitions from one signification of a word to another, all constructions and turns of expression, as they occurred in the Hebrew mind; since language is merely the image of thought (as thinking is, according to the Hebrew view itself, unuttered speech). To attempt to delineate a priori the laws of language is absurd. It is readily conceded that the rational method of investigation may be now and then misapplied, as even the Greek philologists have not escaped over-refinements. Adherence, however, to empirical stupidity from the apprehension of such danger is disgraceful.

2 Fritzscbe, Über die Verdienste D. Tholuck’s um die Schriftenklärung. Halle. 1831. 8vo. Tholuck, Beiträge zur Sprachklärung des N. T. Halle. 1832. 8vo. Fritzscbe,
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Philological investigation into the language of the N. T. has not remained wholly without influence on any of the numerous commentaries which have recently appeared, whether emanating from the critical, evangelical, or philosophical school of theology; although but a few of them have treated philological points attentively and independently (as van Hengel, Lücke, Bleek, Meyer). An intelligent estimate of improved philosophical principles in their application to the N. T., has been given by H. G. Hölemann, Comment. de interpretatione sacra cum profana feliciter conjungenda. Lips. 1832. 8vo.


[In Germany, too, works upon N. T. Grammar have since been issued by Alex. Buttmann (Grammatik des N. T. Sprachgebrauchs. Im Anschluß an Ph. Buttmann’s griech. Grammatik. Berl. 1859. 8vo.) and S. Ch. Schirllitz (Grundzüge der N. T. Gräciität nach den besten Quellen für Studirende der Theol. u. Philol. Giessen. 1861. 8vo.).]


1 Even on the commentaries of the excellent BCrusius, whose weakest side is undoubtedly the philological.
PART I.

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION, ESPECIALLY IN ITS GRAMMATICAL ASPECTS.

§ 1. VARIOUS OPINIONS CONCERNING THE CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION.

1. Though the character of the N. T. diction is pretty distinct and obvious, Biblical philologists long entertained erroneous, or at least imperfect and one-sided, views on the subject. For, dogmatic considerations, combined with ignorance of later Greek dialectology, rendered minds in other respects intelligent incapable of perceiving exegetical truth.

From the beginning of the 17th century various distinguished scholars (Purists) repeatedly attempted to demonstrate that the style of the N. T. reaches in every respect the standard of classical purity and elegance; while others (Hebraists) not only recognized its Hebrew coloring, but in part at least grossly exaggerated it. Towards the end of the 17th century the opinion of the Hebraists obtained the ascendancy; though it did not altogether suppress that of the Purists, which found very learned defenders. About the middle of the 18th century, however, the Purist party became extinct, and the principles of the Hebraists, slightly modified in some particulars, became universal. Not until very lately have scholars begun to perceive the one-sidedness of these principles, and to adopt the correct intermediate views which Beza and H. Stephanus had already in the main pointed out.

The history of the various opinions which from time to time were advanced, often with great controversial bitterness, respecting the Greek style of the N. T., is briefly related in Morus, Acros. acad. sup. Hermeneut. N. T., ed. Eichstättd, Tom. i. p. 216 sqq.; in Meyer, Gesch. der Schriftenklärr. iii. 342 ff. (cf. Eichstättd, Pr. sententiar. de dictione scriptor. N. T. brevis censura. Jen. 1845. 4to.); with several important inaccuracies, in Planck, Einleit. in d. theol. Wissensch. ii. 43 ff. (cf. Stange, theol. Symmikta,
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For the bibliography of the subject see Walch, biblioth. theol. iv. 276 sqq. From these sources, with occasional corrections, we present the following remarks as sufficient for our purpose:

Th. Beza, in his Digestio de dono linguarum et apostol. sermone (on Acts x. 46), in reply to Erasmus's assertion Apostolorum sermo non solum impolitus et inconditus verum etiam imperfectus et perturbatus, aliquoties plane solocissans, defended the simplicity and force of the N. T. diction; and its Hebraisms in particular, which, as is well known, he was far from denying, he represented in a very advantageous light as ejusmodi, ut nullo alio idiomate tam feliciter exprimi possint, imo interdum ne exprimi quidem, — in fact as gemmæ, quibus (apostoli) scripta sua exornarint. After him, H. Stephanus, in the preface to his edition of the N. T. of 1576, combate the views of those qui in his scriptis inculta omnia et horrida esse putant; and labored to show, by specimens, what fine Greek turns of expression occur in the style of the N. T.; and that even the admixture of Hebraisms imparts to it inimitable force and expressiveness.

Though the beauties pointed out are rhetorical rather than linguistic, and the Hebraisms are overrated, yet the judgment of these two masters of Greek is not so one-sided as it is generally said to be, and on the whole comes nearer to the truth than that of many later expositors.

After Drusius and Glass had specified and explained Hebraisms in the N. T. without opposition, extravagant notions were first promulgated by Seb. Pföchen, in his Diatribë de linguæ graecæ N. T. puritate (Amst. 1629; ed. 2, 1633. 12mo.). Having in the preface stated the subject of his inquiry to be: an stylos N. T. sit vere graecus nec ab aliorum Graecorum stylo alienior talisque, qui ab Homero, Demosthene aliisque Graecis intelligi potuisse §§ 81–129, he endeavors to demonstrate by copious quotations, graecos autores profanos eisdem phrasibus et verbis loquutos esse, quibus scriptores N. T. (§ 29). This juvenile treatise (though in substance approved by Erasmus Schmid, as afterwards appeared from his Opus posthumum, 1658) seems, with its strict Purism, to have produced at the time no great impression.

The Hamburg rector Joach. Junge (1637, 1639) in reality, though indirectly, first gave rise to a controversy on the nature of the N. T. diction. His opponent, the Hamburg pastor Jac. Grosse (1640), though not endorsing Junge's real opinion respecting the Hellenism (not barbarism)² of the

1 See also Baumgarten, Polemik, iii. 176 ff. The opinions of the (apologetical) Fathers on the style of the N. T. are given summarily in J. Lami, de erudit. apostolor. p. 138 sqq. They treat the subject less under a philological than a rhetorical point of view. Theodoret, gr. affe. cur. s., triumphantly opposes the σολωμισμος ἀληθινος to the ἐξωλοθημων ἀντικ. ¹

² Junge himself thus states his true opinion, in a German memorial addressed to the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs in 1637 [cf. Joach. Jungius Uber die Originalsprache des N. T. vom Jahre 1637. Aufgefunden, zuerst herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Joach. Gräffchen. Hamb. 1863. 8vo.]: I have distinctly said, and I still say, that the style
§ 1. OPINIONS ON THE N. T. DICTION.

13 N. T. style, admitted its harmless. Dan. Wulser, however, came forward the same year with Inuocentia Hellenistarum vindicata (see 1, etc.), in which he asserted that Grosse's reasoning was neither clear nor convincing. Grosse had now to contend against Wulser, whose misunderstandings he exposed, and also against Joh. Musaeus, the theologian of Jena (1641–42), who had charged him with vacillation and contradiction, but had in view rather his doctrinal opinions (respecting verbal inspiration); so that Grosse published, in all, five short dissertations (1641–42), vindicating, not indeed the Grecian elegance, but the purity and dignity of the language of the N. T.

Without mingling in these controversies, which descended into odious personalities and were nearly fruitless to science, Dan. Heinius (1643) asserted the Hellenism of the N. T. diction; and Thom. Gataker (de novi instrum. stylo dissert. 1648) wrote expressly against the Purism of Pfochen, with learning, but not without exaggeration. Joh. Vorst now published (1658, 1665) an elaborate and perspicuous list of the Hebraisms of the N. T. which Hor. Vitringa shortly afterwards animadverted upon as highly partial.

J. H. Böcler (1641) and J. Olearius (1668) adopted intermediate views, carefully discriminating between the Greek and the Hebrew elements in the style of the N. T., and J. Leusden agreed with them in the main, although he is inferior to Olearius in discretion.

of the N. T. is not classical Greek. The question an N. T. scateat barbarismis, is so outrageous, that no Christian man ever entertained it before; I never could be brought to admit that there are barbarous expressions in the N. T., because the Greeks themselves regard a barbarism as a vitium.

1 His two leading positions are thus expressed: quod quamvis evangelistae et apostoli in N. T. non adeo ornato et nitido, tumido et affectato (!) dicendi genere usi sint . . . . impium tamen, imo blasphfixum sit, si quia inde S. literarum studiosus graecum stylium . . . . sugillare, vilipendere et juventuti suspectum facere ipsique vitia et notam sololecismorum et barbarismorum attricare contendat . . . . Quod nec patres, qui sololecismorum et barbarismorum meminrent et apostulos idiotas fusisse scripsissent, nec illi autores, qui stylium, N. T. hellenicum esse statuerint, nec isti, qui in N. T. Ebraismos et Chaldaismo esse observaverunt, stylium S. apostolorum contemserint, sugillari etaeq. impuritatis alicujus accusarint ce.

2 Grosse's dissertation was specially directed against a possible inference from the proposition that the N. T. is not written in so good Greek as that employed by native Greek authors; and, essentially, refers to adversaries that (at least in Hamburg) had then no existence. Moreover his whole argument is rather of a negative kind, as appears for example from the résumé (p. 40 of Grosse's Tracts): etiamsi graecus stylius apostolor. non sit tam ornatus et affectatus, ut fuit ille qui fuit florento Graecia, non atticus ut Athenis, non dorius ut Corinthi, non ionicus ut Ephesi, non aeolicus ut Troade, fuit tamen vere graecus ab omni sololecismorum et barbarismorum labre immunis.

3 Vorst in the preface utters his conviction: sacros codices N. T. talibus et vocabulis et phrasisibus, quae hebraeam linguam sapiant, scatere plane. Cf. further, his Cogitata de stylo N. T., prefixed to Fischer's edition of the work of Hebraismis.

4 J. Corcæi stricturæ in Pfochen. distrib. were first printed solely for private distribution, and afterwards published in Rhenford's collection.
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It now came to be very generally admitted that Hebraisms constitute a prominent element in N. T. diction, and give it a coloring, not indeed barbarous, but widely removed from classic purity (see also Werenfels, Opusc. i. p. 311 sqq.).\(^1\) The same view was advanced by Mos. Solanus, in a tardy but very sensible pamphlet against Pfochen. Even J. Heinr. Michaelis (1707) and Ant. Blackwall (1727) did not presume to deny the existence of Hebraisms, but tried to prove that the style of the N. T. writers, notwithstanding the Hebraisms, has all the properties of an elegant style, and in this respect is not inferior to the purity of the classics. The last-named scholar begins his work, which abounds in excellent remarks, thus: tantum abst, ut hebraismos in N. T. reperiri inutilium, ut eorum potius insignem, qua hic divinus abundat liber, copiam ad commoditatem ejus et elegantiam majorem afferre accessionem arbitremur. As little effect, however, had these scholars on the now established opinion as the erudite Ch. Siegm. Georgi, who, in his Vindicacae N. T. ab Ebraismis (1732), returned to the strongest Purism; and in a new work, Iliocriticus sacer (1733), defended his assertions. He was followed, but with no greater success, by J. Conr. Schwarz, whose Commentarii crit. et philol. linguae gr. N. T. Lips. 1736. 4to., chiefly aimed at demonstrating the Greek purity even of expressions taken for Hebraisms.\(^2\) To these must be added, as the last who opposed the misuse of IIebraisms, El. Palairot (observat. philol. crit. in N. T. L. B. 1732. 8vo.),\(^3\) and H. W. van Marle (florileg. observ. in restaur. L. B. 1758. 8vo.). Through the influence of the school of Ernesti, the more correct estimate of the language of the N. T. was generally diffused over Germany.\(^4\) Cf. Ernesti’s Institut. Interpret. i. 2. cap. 3.

\(^1\) *Hemsterhuis ad Lucian. dial. mar. 4, 3*: corum, qui orationem N. T. graecam esse castigatissimam contendunt, opinio perquam mihi semper ridicula fuit via. Also, *Bith. Stolberg*, de soloeccisim et barbarismis N. T. Viteb. 1681. 4to. and 1685. 4to., wished merely to vindicate the N. T. diction from blemishes unjustly ascribed to it; but, in fact, attempted to explain away many real Hebraisms.

\(^2\) In the anticipation of certain victory he says in p. 8 of his preface: olim hebraismi, syrismi, chaldaismi, rabinismi (sic!), latinismi cetera celebrabantur nomina, ut vel scribendos sacri suam graecae dictionis ignorantiam prodere aut in graeco sermone tot linguarum notitiam ostentasse viderentur vel saltem interpretant illorum literatissimis et singularum locutionum perspicacissimis judicarentur. Sed *consta haec ineptiarum et vanitatis ita sunt etiam a nobis convicta*, ut si qui cetera. A satire on the Purists will be found in Sonnium in quo praeter eetera genius sec. vapulat. Alteburg. 1761, p. 97 sqq.

\(^3\) Supplements by Pal. himself may be seen in the Biblioth. Brem. nova Cl. 3 and 4. On the whole, Pal. produces passages almost exclusively in defence of such significations and phrases, as no judicious person would take to be Hebraisms.

\(^4\) Ernesti’s view of the N. T. diction (dis. de difficult. interpret. gramm.) N. T. § 12) may be recalled here: genus orationis in libris N. T. esse et pure græcis et ebraicam maxime consistuintem referentibus verbis formulis dicendi mixtum et temperatum, id quidem adeo evidens est iis, qui satis græce sciunt, ut *plane misericordia digni sint*, qui omnia bene graecæ esse contendant.
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29 Most of the above-mentioned old dissertations (besides others), written in the Purist controversy, are collected in J. Rhenferd's Dissertat. philolog. theol. de Stylo N. T. syntagma, Leov. 1702. 4to., and in (what may be considered as a supplement to Rhenferd's collection) Taco Hajo van den Honert, Syntagma dissertat. de stylo N. T. graeco. Amst. 1703. 4to.¹

15 Let us endeavor briefly to characterize the efforts of those who attributed classical purity to the N. T. diction.²

Their great object was to collect from native Greek authors passages in which those very same words and phrases occur which are found in the N. T., and are there explained as Hebraisms. Now, apart from the circumstance that what is strictly speaking the body of the language was not in general distinguished from the rhetorical element, the Purists entirely overlooked the following considerations:

a. That numerous expressions and phrases (particularly such as are figurative), owing to their simplicity and naturalness, are common to all, or at least to many languages, and cannot with propriety be called either Grecisms or Hebraisms.³

b. That a distinction is to be made between the diction of prose and that of poetry, and also between figurative expressions employed very rarely and by individual authors to give composition a peculiar elevation (as lumina orationis), and those which have become the common property of the language; and that, if in plain prose like that of the N. T. expressions used by Pindar, Æschylus, Euripides,⁴ etc. occur, or if such expressions, as well as rare Greek figurative phrases, recur as ordinary phraseology, this by no means proves the classical purity of the N. T.

c. That when an expression is found alike in Hebrew and in Greek, the training and history of the writers of the N. T. render it in general more

1 The dissertations of Wulfer, Grosse, and Musaeus, though of trifling importance compared to their size, are missed with regret from this collection, and more of Junge's than the sententiae doct. vir. de stylo N. T. should have been admitted. Besides, cf. Blessig, praevidia interpret. N. T. ex auctorib. graec. Argent. 1778. 4to., and Mittenzwey, locorum quorumdam e Hutchinsoni ad Xenoph. Cyrop. notis, quib. purum et elegans N. T. dicendi genus defenditur, refutatio. Coburg. 1763. 4to. An essay by G. C. Draudius, de stylo N. T., in the Primit. Alsfeld., Nürnberg. 1736. 8vo., I have not seen; (see Neubauer, Nachr. von jetzt lebenden Theol. i. 253 ff.).

² Mittenzwey made some remarks on this in his Essay, already mentioned.

³ Simplicity and graphic expression are common to Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek with the diction of Homer; and particular phrases having these characteristics could with as little propriety be called Hebraisms in the latter as Grecisms in the former. In general, languages have points of contact, especially in popular speech, which is universally simple and graphic; while cultivated diction, as it is coined by the learned, is more isolated. Hence in Latin, for instance, most of what are called Germanisms are to be found in the style of comedies, epistles, etc.

⁴ See, on the other hand, Kreds, observ. praeuf. p. 3. Leusden, de dialectt. p. 37, says, with great absurdity: nos non fugit, carmina istorum hominum (tragicor.) innumeris hebraismis esse contaminata. Accordingly Fischer, ad Leusden, p. 114, finds Hebraisms in the poems of Homer.
probable that such expression is copied immediately from the Hebrew,
than that it is borrowed from the choicer literary language of Greece. 30
Not to mention,
d. That those uncritical collectors huddled together many passages out
of Greek authors where, a. the same word indeed occurs, but in a different 17
signification; or, β. expressions are found only similar, not identical. 
Further,
e. That they unhesitatingly used even the Byzantine writers, into
whose language, through the influence of the church, many elements of the
Hebraizing N. T. phraseology may have been transferred (as in particular 16
instances can be proved to be extremely probable; cf. Niebuhr, Index to θιο
Agath. under ζημοιοσὰς); and, at all events, these Byzantine authors are
not standards of classic Greek purity. Finally,

f. That they passed over, and were forced to pass over, many expres-
sions in silence, because they are undeniable Hebraisms.1

Thus the evidence produced in favor of Purism was partly defective
and partly irrelevant. Besides, most of the Purists restricted themselves
mainly to the lexical side of the question; Georgi alone discussed the
grammatical with a fulness sustained by stores of erudition.

In proof of the preceding statements, we subjoin several striking exam-
amples (cf. also Mori acrosa. l. c. p. 222 sqq.): And as respects

a. Matt. v. 6, πενθοὺς καὶ δυσπνεῖς τὴν δυσκολούμην. Examples are pro-
duced from Xenophon, Ἀσχίνας, Lukan, Artemidorus, to prove that
dυσπνή, in this (figurative) sense, is pure Greek. But it is so used in Latin
also, and in nearly all languages; it cannot, therefore, be regarded as a
Grecism any more than a Hebraism. The same holds of ἔστημ (κατοικί-
σω) in the figurative sense of consume, waste. This cannot be proved from
Iliad 23, 182 to be a Grecism, nor from Deut. xxxii. 22 etc. to be a He-
braism; but it is common to all languages. In the same way we might
dispense with parallels to γενέσεως generation i.e. the individuals of a par-
cular generation (Georgi, Vind. p. 39), to χείλεως power, to ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας,
and the like. And it is really ridiculous when Matt. x. 27 κηρύσσας ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων is authenticated by Ἐσοπ. 139, 1, ἔφυσος ἐπὶ τίνος
δωμάτων δωμάτων. Pfchen's dissertation contains a great number of such
idle and preposterous remarks.

b. That κομψὸς signifies mori is proved from the Iliad 11, 241
(Georgi, vind. p. 122 sqq.) κομψὸς ὁ χίλκυον ἐπικα, and Soph. Electr.
510; that στέρμα is used also by the Greeks for proles is proved chiefly
from the poets, as Eurip. Iph. Aul. 524; Iph. Taur. 987; Hec. 254, and
Soph. Electr. 1508 (Georgi, vind. p. 87 sqq.); that πομαίνειν means regere,
from Anacr. 57, 8; that ἔσθαι and Ἰωφαίν Ἰάπατον are good Greek, from 31
Soph. Elect. 205 (Schwarz, Comm. p. 410), or from δερκεῖσθαι κτύπων,

1 This applies also to J. E. Ostermann, whose Positiones philologicae graecum N. T.
contextum concernentes have been reprinted in Crenii exercitatt. fasc. ii. p. 485 sqq.
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σκότον, in tragedians. For ποιήμαν πίνεω in a figurative sense (Matt. xx. 22), Schwarz quotes Ἀeschyl. Agam. 1397. That πίνεω signifies ἰrritum esse, the established meaning in Hebrew, the same writer proves by Plato’s figurative expression, δοκεῖ ἢδονή σου πεπωκόμαι καθαπερὶ πληγείσα ἕπο τινὶ δέλαγω, Phileb. p. 22. e.

c. The phrase γινώσκεω ἄδρα, though not unknown in Greek (Jacobs, Ἀδ. Philos. inag. p. 583), may be derived with assurance directly from ἄδρα, the common Hebrew phrase וְנָפַל, and regarded in our authors as a Hebraism. In like manner σπλάγχνα compassion, ἐγράμμα land as opposed to water (Fischer ad Leusden dialect. 31), χείλος in the sense of shore, στόμα for edge of a sword (cf., however, Boissonade, Nic. p. 282), παχύνεω to be stupid, foolish, κυρίος κυρίων, εἰς δαίμονας εἰς τὸν κόσμον are primarily, no doubt, copied from the Hebrew, and are not to be proved to be pure Greek by parallels from Herodot., Ἀθία, Xenophon, Diodor. Sic., Philostratus, and others.

d. a. That ἕν is used by Greek authors to express the casus instrumentalis — which with certain limitations is true — Pfochen tries to prove by such quotations as: πλέων ἕν ταῖς ναυσὶ (Xenoph.), ἵλιθε ἐπὶ μελαίγνυ (Hesiod)! That good Greek authors use ἰβέμα for ἐσ is said to be apparent from Platt. legg. 797 c. (τοῦτον ἰβέματος καὶ τοῦ δόγματος οὐκ ἐστιν ἵλιθα μαίζω), where ἰβέμα may be translated verdict, decision. Χορτάζων to fill, (of persons), is proved to be pure Greek from Plat. rep. 2, 372, where it refers to σώττε! Ζητεῖν ψυχῇ τῶν is affirmed to be classical, from Eur. Io. 1112; Thuc. 6, 27, etc., where ζητεῖν alone, occurs in the sense of insidiari, or rather seek for (in order to kill). That ὀφελημα in good Greek signifies peccatum, Schwarz tries to prove by Plat. Cratyl. 400 c., where, however, ὀφεληλομέα denotes as elsewhere debita. Equally inappropriate are most of the passages from which Georgi (Hierocrit. p. 36 sq., 186 sq.) attempts to show that in the best Greek authors the prepositions εἰς and ἕν are interchanged, as they are in the N. T. Cf. also Krebs, Obs. p. 14 sq.

β. That εὑρίσκεων χάριν (Ἠλεος) παρά τινι is not a Hebraism, Georgi (Vind. p. 116) tries to demonstrate from a passage of Demosthenes containing the words εὑρίσκεσθαι τὴν εὑρήνην, τὴν δωρεάν, as if the Hebraism in question did not lie rather in the whole phrase (for there is nothing peculiar to Hebrew in using find for obtain), and as if nothing depended on the middle voice. Palairret quotes Aristoph. Acharn. κρατήρ αἴματος, and similar expressions, to justify the use of ποιήμαν for sors; and Schwarz defends πίπτεω irritum esse by a reference to Plat. Euthyphr. 14 d. ότι χείλει παστιναί διί ἐν εἰσοχ. Passages containing the words συντε μέγα συνε σμικρόν were quoted to show that the well-known Merismus ἀνὸ μικρὸν ἔως μεγάλου is pure Greek (Georgi, Vind. p. 810 sqq.; Schwarz, Comment. p. 917; cf. Schäfer, Julian. p. xxi.). In such Merismus itself, 82 however, there is nothing Hebraistic, but only in the particular formula
§ 1. OPINIONS ON THE N. T. DICTION.

given above ἀπὸ μεκρ. ἦς μεγ. Theophan. Cont. p. 615 Bekk. is the first writer in whom this form occurs. Καρπὸς τῆς κολλᾶς, ὀσφύος, Georgi (Vind. p. 304) supports by passages in which καρπὸς alone is used to denote the fruit of the human body. Aristoph. Nub. πλέον πλέον, more and more, is not sufficient to prove that διό δὲ, two and two, is a Grecism; it would be necessary to produce examples where the repeated cardinal is employed for ἀνά διό, ἀνὰ τρεῖς, etc., § 37, 3. In the same way ὡσα δὲ ἀκούσα ἐκείθεν ἐστιν vacantly quoted from Callimachus to prove that τυδέναι εἰς τὰ δόα is pure Greek, as the two phrases are essentially unlike each other. Yet such specimens might be multiplied without end. What Georgi, Vind. p. 25, produces from Arrian. Epictet. in defence of ὁ ἄδελφος 7th ed. alter, seems peculiarly ridiculous.

e. Schwarz, p. 1245, asserts, on the usage of Nicetas, the pure Greek character of the phrase στηρίζειν τὸ πρόσωπον and the word ἐνωτίεσθαι; and Palairot proves that of ἦ ἐγρά in the sense of continent, from Jo. Cinnan. hist. iv. p. 183. Pfochen still more oddly vindicates the use of κοινός to signify inmundus, from Lucian, Mort. Peregrin. c. 13, where Lucian derisively employs a Judeo-Christian expression.

f. Of the numerous Hebraistic words and phrases which the Purists passed over in silence, it will suffice to mention: πρόσωπον λαμβάνεις, σάρξ καὶ αἷμα, νόσοι εἰρήνης, ἐξερχόμεθα ἐς ὁσφύος τινός, τοιεῖν ἄλογον (χάριν) μετὰ τινός, ἀνορκίσειθαι without a preceding question, ἐξομολογεῖσθαι θεῷ (to praise God) and many others; see § 3.

After Salmasius, whose work De Lingua Hellen. later scholars had quite forgotten, Sturz’s dissertation De Dialecto Alexandrina (Lips. 1784, 4to., and Ger. 1788–93, 4to.), 2d enlarged ed. Lips. 1809, 8vo., led the way to a correct estimate of N. T. diction, particularly as respects its basis, the Greek. (For able observations on Sturz, see the Heidelb. Jahrb. 1810. 18 Heft. S. 266 ff.) On this subject, therefore, Keil (Lehrb. der Hermeneut. S. 11 f.), Bertholdt (Einleitung in d. Bibl. 1 Th. S. 155 f.), Eichhorn (Einleitung ins N. T. 4 Bdl. S. 96 ff.), and Schott (Isagoge in N. T. p. 497 sqq.) have written more satisfactorily than many earlier critics, but without exhausting the subject, and without exhibiting the requisite scientific precision. In both these respects the younger Planck has surpassed his predecessors; and (avoiding a fundamental mistake into which Sturz fell) he was the first to unfold clearly, and on the whole correctly, the character of the N. T. diction, in his De vera natura atque indole orationis graecae N. T. comment. Gott. 1810, 4to. (reprinted in Commentatt. theol. v. Rosenmüller, l. i. p. 112 sqq.). Cf. his Pr. Observatt. quaedam ad hist. verb. gr. N. T. ibid. 1821, 4to. (and in Commentatt. theol. v. Rosenmüller, l. i. p. 193 sqq.). See also (de Wette) A. Lit. Z. 1816, No. xxix. S. 306.
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In the age of Alexander the Great and his successors the Greek language underwent an internal change of a double nature. On the one hand, a literary prose language was formed, which was founded on the Attic dialect, yet differed from it by adopting a common Greek element, and even admitting numerous provincialisms (ἡ κοινὴ or ἡλληνικὴ διάλεκτος). On the other hand, a popular spoken language arose, in which the previously distinct dialects spoken by the various Greek tribes were blended, with a predominance of the Macedonian variety.¹ This latter compound, varying in some respects in the various provinces of Asia and Africa subjected to the Macedonian rule, constitutes the special foundation of the diction of the N.T., as it does also of the Septuagint and Apocrypha. Its peculiarities,—further modified by a disregard of nice distinctions, and by an effort after perspicuity and also after commodious forms of expression,—may be fitly ranged under two heads: Lexical and Grammatical.

The older dissertations on Greek Dialectology, so far as regards the κοινὴ διάλεκτος in particular, are now nearly useless. The subject is well, though briefly, treated by Matthiae (ausführli. Gramm. § 1–8) and still more thoroughly by Buttmann (ausführli. griech. Sprachlehre, S. 1–8), and also, though not with complete accuracy, by Plancik l. c. p. 13–23. Cf. besides, Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 262 sq., and Bernhardy, S. 28 ff.

The Jews in Egypt and Syria,—and to these we confine our remarks—learned Greek principally from oral intercourse with Greeks, and not from books.³ It is not surprising, then, that even in writing they retained,

¹ Sturt, de dial. maced. et alex. p. 26 sqq. Yet the subject requires a new and thorough investigation; decisions such as that in Thiersch de Pentat. LXX. p. 74, can by no means settle the question.

² A precise distinction cannot be drawn between what belonged to the language of Alexandria, and what was peculiar to the variety of Greek used in Syria (and Palestine); and even if it could, it would be of little importance as respects the N.T. Eichhorn's attempt (Einl. ins N. T. IV. 124 ff.) is a failure, and could not be otherwise, as it was conducted with little judgment. Ἐκχαριστήριον, used by Demosthenes even, and from the time of Polybius by many writers, he pronounces an addition to the Alexandrian diction! ξυπίζουσιν hospitio exciperē, which is found not only in Xenophon but even in Homer, is labelled as an Alexandrian word! To what extent Greek was spoken by the Jews of Syria (and Palestine) we need not here inquire; on this point see Paulus, de Jud. Palæst. Jesus et apostolor. tempore non aram. dialecto sed graces quoque locutis. Jen. 1803. II. 4; Jüng, Einleitung, II. 31 ff.; my Realwörterb. II. 502.; Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik, S. 61 f.

³ That the style of the Greek-speaking Jews was affected by the perusal of the Septuagint makes no essential difference here, where we have in view mainly the classic
§ 2. BASIS OF THE N. T. DICTION.

for the most part, the peculiarities of the popular spoken language. This was the case with the LXX., the writers of the N. T., and the authors of many (the Palestin.) Apocrypha. Only a few learned Jews, who prized and studied Grecian literature, such as Philo and Josephus, attained a style approximating to literary Greek. Though that popular variety of Greek is no longer perfectly known, yet, from a comparison of the Hellenistic language (Hebraisms excepted) with the later literary prose, it appears that, departing still more noticeably from classic elegance, it had adopted in greater abundance new and provincial words and forms, and begun to neglect more decidedly nice distinctions of construction and idiom, to violate grammatical proprieties (their origin and grounds being lost sight of), and to extend many corruptions already manifesting themselves in the literary diction. Its main characteristic, however, continued to be such an intermixing of the previously distinct dialects (Lobeck, Pathol. p. 9.), that each province retained its own local variety as the basis of the provincial style; — the Alexandrian retaining a predominance of Atticisms and Doricisms.

We shall now endeavor to portray more minutely the later elements, both lexical and grammatical — of which the former are the more obvious — of the Hellenistic Greek which took its rise from the dialect spoken in Egypt, particularly in Alexandria (dialectus Alexandrinus). In doing Greek element. Moreover, that no profound Greek scholarship can be ascribed even to the Apostle Paul (see, among others, Peschen, p. 178) is now generally admitted. He undoubtedly possessed a greater mastery of Greek than such of the sacred writers as were natives of Palestine. This, however, he might easily attain in Asia Minor, and by his considerable intercourse with native Greeks, some of whom were persons of learning and distinction. Köster, in the Stud. und Krit. 1854. 2 (ob P. seine Sprache an der des Demosth. gebildet habe) brings together Demosthenic words and phrases, of nearly all of which it must be said that either Paul might have learned them from the spoken language of the educated, or that they are unlike the diction of the Attic orator. Copious command of Greek in the case of men who associated so much with Greeks does not suffice to prove them students of Greek literature.

1 A comparison of portions of the earlier books of the Antiquities with the corresponding portions of the Septuagint, proves particularly that the style of Josephus is not to be put on a level with that of the Septuagint, or even of the N. T., and renders obvious the difference between a Jewish and a Greek narrative style. Cf. besides, Schleiermacher, Herm. S. 63.

2 Hence a "complete view of the language of common life," which Schleiermacher, Herm. S. 59, would fain see, can never be given.

3 On this (περι τῆς Ἀλεξανδρινὸς διαλέκτου) the grammarians Ireneus (Pacatus) and Demetrius Ixion had written special works, which are now lost. See Sturz, dial. maced. et alex. p. 24, not. 4, cf. p. 19 sq. As extant specimens of this dialect, besides the well-known Rosetta inscription, are to be considered: Papyri graeci reg. Taurin. musei aegyptii ed. et illustr. a A. Peyrum. Turin, 1827. 2 Vol. 4to., and the same author's Illustrazione di due papiri graeco-egizi dell' imper. museo di Vienna, in the Memorie dell' academ. di Torino, Tom. 33, p. 151 sqq. of the histor. class; Description of the Greek Papyri in the British Museum, Lond. 1839. 4to. Tom. 1; J. A. Letronne, Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Egypte, etc. Paris, 1842 and 1848, 2 Tom. 4to.
this, we shall constantly avail ourselves of the researches of Sturz, Planck, 35 Lobeck, 1 Boissonade, and others. For the passages they quote in proof (chiefly from the writers of the κων, Polybius, Plutarch, Strabo, Ἀelian, Artemidorus, Appian, Heliodorus, Sext. Empiricus, ‘Arrian, etc.) 2 the reader must be referred to the works of these critics themselves. What appears to have belonged exclusively to the popular spoken language, and 22 is not to be found in any profane Greek author, we shall mark with an 23 asterisk. 3

21 1. Lexical Peculiarities: a. The later dialect comprised words 6发展空间 and forms from all the Greek dialects, without distinction; as, for instance, from the Attic: ἁλος (Lob. 309), ὑκτός, ἀδικός (Herm. Praef. ad Soph. Ai. p. 19), φαίλη, ἀσέδω (Lob. 151), πρώτα (Lob. 331), ἕλωτ; from the Doric: παιὼς (παιεῖν), ἄλκανος (Lob. 179), ἕ λαμος, ποιά (grass, instead of ποης or ποια), βεμπβράνα, which Zonaras quotes from 2 Tim. iv. 13, where however all our Codd. give μεμβράν, see Sturz, Zonarae glossae sacrae. Grimmae, 1820. 4to. P. II. p. 16; from the Ionic: γογγοῦς (Lob. 358), ἄγος, προης (yet already used in Aristot., see Lob. 431), βαβαυς (Lob. 324), σκοριῆς (Lob. 218), ἄγος (Bttm. I. S. 84, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 78). Ionic and Doric is (ἐλληνος Rev. vi. 14 var.; cf. Mth. I. 69) φω in an intransitive sense (Heb. xii. 15, cf. Balr. 64.). Grammarians note as Macedonic, παρμπαλοι camp (Lob. 377, cf. Schwarz, Soloec. ap. 66), βύη street; as of Cyrenaic origin, βουνος hill (Lob. 355 sqq.); as νυρσαν, the imperative εἰδον (Fritzsche, ad Mr. p. 515).

b. The later dialect attached new significations to words already existing in the ancient language: παρακάλων and ἡμπτων<sup>4</sup> entreat, πανδευνε chastise,

---

1 Yet see even Olear. de stylo, p. 279 sqq.
2 In studying the peculiarities of later Greek, the church Fathers and the books of Graeco-Roman law have hitherto been turned to scarcely any account. To the latter frequent reference will be made in the course of this treatise. How far the N.T. diction, through the influence of the church, affected the later Byzantine Greek, is reserved for separate inquiry. The Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. and the Apocrypha of the N.T., that is certain portions of them, are now available more completely, and in a better text; the latter through the labors of Tdf. The style of these clumsy compositions, though not by any means uniform, is on the whole so poor that the N.T. diction seems like classic Greek in comparison. Cf. besides, Tdf. de evangel. apocryph. origine et usu, in the Verhandelingen uitgeven door het Haagsche Genootschap, etc. 12 Thl. 1851. 8vo.
3 The Greek grammarians, particularly Thomas Mag. (the latest edition by Ritschl, Halle, 1832. 8vo.), specify as common Greek much that is not unknown even to standard Attic (see e.g. θυμάλλος, Th. M. p. 437, and ἐρενῶμας, p. 363), and even fall sometimes into gross mistakes. Cf. Oudendorp, ad Thom. M. p. 903. Much that, after Alexander the Great, forced its way into the written language, undoubtedly was current before in the popular speech (as, perhaps, αὐτρικας, which first appears in the poets of the New Comedy). Besides, the N.T. writers frequently employ forms and words preferred by the Atticists, instead of those characterized as common Greek; e.g. γρηγορίς, Thom. M. p. 921, ἕ (not ὅ) λαλεψ, Thom. M. 864.
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εἰχαριστεῖν thank (Lob. 18), διακλίνων, διαπίπτειν, διακείσθαι, to recline at table (Lob. 216), ἀποκρύπτων answer (Lob. 108), ἀπειλέγων oppose, ἀπο-τάσσοντας valere jubere, renuntiare (Lob. 23 sq.), συγκρίνων compare (Lob. 278), δαίμων, δαιμόνια, evil spirit, εἴλων (living) tree (Passow, sub verb.), διαφορώτας aegre ferre*, στέψων hold off, endure, σεβάζοντας revere (equivalent to σέβεσθαι, Fr. Rom. I. 74), συνήγημα prove, establish (Fr. Rom. I. 159), ἔρωμα to be called (Fr. Rom. II. 9), φύονται come, arrive (Fr. Rom. II. 356 sq.), κεφαλής volume (roll) of a book (Bleek on Heb. x. 7), ἐσσυχήμων a respectable, prominent, man (Lob. 333), ψυμβιος and χρυσάζων (fodder) feed, nourish*, φύονταν wages (Sturz, 187), οἰκονόμων fish, ἔργον συνεχεῖς elogui (Lob. 63 sq.), ἑπιστάλλων write a letter (ἐπιστολή), περιπτώσθαι negotiis distracti (Lob. 415), πτώμα corpse (Lob. 375), γεννήματα fruges (Lob. 286), σχολή school (Lob. 401), θυρεός large (door-shaped) shield (Lob. 366), δώμα house-top, λοβή offering (Babr. 23, 5), βυζιά street (Lob. 404 sq.), ταφφονία assurance, confidence, λαλία speech (dialect), λαμπάρα lamp, καταλαλός long robe*, νυν now (in Attic, this instant) Fr. Rom. I. 182, στάμνος, which in the classics denotes a vessel for holding 23 liquids, was used to signify also a vessel for dry articles, Babr. 108, 18.

A special peculiarity was to give neuter verbs the transitive or causative signification; as, μαθητεύων (Matt. xxviii. 19), θραμβεύων (2 Cor. ii. 14? yet see Mey.), in the Sept. even ἵππα, βασιλεύω, and many others; cf. especially, Psalm xli. 3; cxviii. 50; cxxxviii. 7, etc., cf. § 32, I. see Lydias de re mil. 6. 3, esp. Lob. Soph. Ai. p. 382 sqq. Lastly, in the case of μέθυνος, usage at least so far changed that the word, previously confined to females, was applied to both sexes (Lob. 151 sq.; Schäfer, ind. ad Esop. p. 144).

c. Words and forms which in classical Greek were seldom used, or only by poets and in the more elevated kinds of style, became ordinary and favorite, and were employed even in common prose; such as, ἀφθεντών to lord it (Lob. 120), μεσονύκτων (Thom. M. 609; Lob. 53), ἀλάκτρος (?), θεοτυγχ. (Pollux 1, 21), θυάτηρα (Th. M. 370), ἀλέκτωρ (αλέκτρων, Lob. 229), βρέχων irrígare (Lob. 291), ἱσόβα (for ἱσούμ) Bttm. II. 185. To

1 That is, as its inherent signification; for, from the context, the word means this in the Iliad, 8, 166, as also in Dinarch. adv. Demosten. § 30, p. 155, Beek., a passage quoted by recent scholars. Even the Byzantines for precision add κατά to δαίμων, Agath. 114, 4.

2 This extended meaning might be considered also as a Hebraism; ψυμβιος was commonly used as quite equivalent to בָּשָׁם (cf. Grünm on Wisd. xvi. 20), like χορδή-ζως, which in Greek authors is not applied to persons. (In opposition to Pföchen, see Solanus in Rhenferd, p. 297.) It is uncertain whether δεκάδο for διδέκα belongs to the later popular Greek, or was first formed by the LXX. The first seems to me the more probable, for to μικρό τίνα διδέκα corresponds more exactly than δεκάδο.

3 Transitive verbs are more convenient in construction than intransitive. Later Greek even employed the construction προστάτευτων τιν (Acta apoc. p. 172); just as in German etwa wiedersprechen is the more familiar phrase; in the language of trade we bear, das Rübel ist gefragt.
the same head Eichhorn (Einl. ins N. T. IV. 127) refers the phrase θέωθα τι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, employed it is said in solemn style by the poets particularly the tragedians, since it occurs in the N. T. in the plainest prose. But the Homeric phrase ἐν φρεσὶ δίοσθα is only similar, not identical. The expression συντηρεῖν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, cited by the same author as a solemn formula, is used also in the N. T. as emphatic. Κοράσιον, on the other hand, is to be regarded as an example of a word which, dropping its secondary import, was adopted into the literary style from the colloquial (Lob. 74), cf. Germ. mädel.

d. Many words which had long been in use received another form or pronunciation, which generally supplanted its predecessor; such as, μετοκεσία (μετοκια Ιασοβ. Lo. 504), ἀνάθεμα (ἀνάθημα, Schäff. Plutarch. V. p. 11), ἀνάστημα, γενεία (γενεώλα, Lob. 104), γλυσσόκομον (γλυσσοκομίου, Lob. 98 sq.), ἐκπαλαί (πάλα, Lob. 45 sq.), ἔθης (θῆς), ἐκάτω (κατή), αἰτία (αίτης), ψεύδα (ψεύδος, Saltier ad Th. M. 927), ἀπάντησις (ἀπάντημα), ἡγησία (ἡγημονία), λυχνία (λυχνίων, Lob. 314), νίκος (νίκη, Lob. 647), οἰκοδομή (οικοδόμης, Lob. 490), ἀνείδος, Lob. 512 (ἀνευώδος, ἀνεύωδος, Her. 2, 133), ὀπτασία (ὄψις), ἡ ὀρκωμοσία (τὰ ὀρκωμόσια), μυθα-
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τηδοσία (μυθατοδοσία), συγκυρία (συγκυρίως), ἀσοφασία (ἀσοφάσας, Lob. 528), νουθεσία (νουθήθης, Lob. 512), ἀπαρμοσιμος (ἀπαρμοσίμος, Μελίσσων, τοπατός (τοπατος, Lob. 56), βασιλώσα (βασίλεια, 1) μυχαλίς (μυχάς Lob. 452), μονόβαλμος (μερόβαλμος, Lob. 136), καμείων (καμείων, Sturz, p. 123), ψυμος (ψυμος, Lob. 52), δ ἀπηλια (ἀπηλεία), κοινοτης (κοινός, Valcken. ad Ammon. p. 32), φυσοῦνθαι (φυσῶν) to be puffed up (trop. Babr. 114), ἀνενίκειν since Polybius for ἀνενίκεισθαι (Passow), ἐκχίνει (ἐκχίνει, Lob. 726), στήχω (from στήκα stand, Bttm. II. 36), ἄργος, ἦ, ὢν (as an adject of three terminations, Lob. 105), πειθός, νοσσό, νοσσα (νευσσό, νοσσα, Thom. M. 626; Lob. 206 f.), πετόμαι (πετόμαι, Lob. 581), ἀπελτίχει (ἀπογνεύσομαι, Lob. 581), ἀπνικεῖ (ἀπνικῶ, Lob. 224), βαντίζει (βαντικῶ, Lob. 224), δεκατίον (δεκατικόν, Lob. 224), ἄροι (ἀροῦ, Lob. 254 sq.), βιβλιάδες (βιβλιάδων, λόγον, ψιλίον (ψιλίς), τακτοί (τακτῶν, Lob. 493, κατακριτεῖν (κατα-

22

κριτέων, Lob. 361), παραφρονία (παραφροσύνη), πτούν (πτόν, Lob. 321), ψυμοῦτης (for ψυμοῦς) Thom. M. 927, ἀτάρων (as most of the diminutives in -αρων, e.g. παιδάρων, ὄναρων, Fr. Mr. p. 638). Purely Alexandrian (LXX.) are ἀκρόβυτος and ἀκροβυτία, Fr. Rom. I. 136; verbal forms in ω pure, instead of in μ, e.e. ὅμως for ὅμων, Thom. M. 648. Cf. also ἕρως for ἑρώω, Thom. M. 642; Phot. Lex. 313 (Lob. 205, and ad Soph. Aias. p. 181), pres. ἀρπάω (ἀρπῶ, Thom. M. p. 142), σαρόνν for σχίρου (ob. Sch., Ad locis Lyiae, p. 60 sq.). Active forms were adopted instead of the middle or deponent verbs usual in the earlier language; as, ὕφωσσαν Act. iv. 25, from Ps. ii., ἅγιαλαν Luke i. 47, ἀδαγγελέσων Lob. 269. Compound verbs, in which

1 Similar to which is ἔρωσα from ἔρεως, which is found in Papyr. Taurin. 9, 14. Cf. Sturz, p. 173.
the preposition did not add to the meaning, were preferred to the less imposing and less sourous simple forms. Further, as even many compound verbs did not seem expressive enough, numerous double compounds made their appearance (Siebelis, Pr. de verb. composit. quae quatuor partibus constant. Budiss. 1832. 4to.). For members of the human body, however, forms originally diminutive became sometimes the current forms in colloquial speech; as, ὁ ἄνδρον, cf. Fischer, prollus. p. 10 sqq.; Lob. 211 sqq., φόρτιον. Lastly, many substantives received a different gender and in part a corresponding change of termination; see § 8 note, and § 9 note 2.

Entirely new words and phrases were constructed, mainly by composition and for the most part to meet some sensible want; as, ἀλλοτριωποσκότος, ἀνθρωπαρέσκος (Lob. 621), διάλκης, ἄγεναλγης, ἀλατεκχυσία, διακωφρία, στομάτης, νυχήμερον (Sturz, 186), πληροφορία (Theopan. 132), καλοτοίν (Lob. 199 sqq.), αἰχμαλοτίζων καὶ αἰχμαλοτείνων (for αἰχμαλωτον τοίν, Thom. M. p. 23; Lob. 442), μεσιτείνων, γυμνητείνων, ἄγαθοτοίν (ἀγαθοκρηφύς) for ἄγαθον τοίν (Lob. 290), ἀγαλλίας, ὀροβεία, ἄντλυτος, ἐκμυκτρίζων, ἀλεκτροφωμία (Lob. 229), ἀποκαφαλίζων (Lob. 341), ἀνταποκρύνοντας (Ἑσ. 172 de Furt.), ἔνθεσιν (Lob. 182; Schäff. ind. Ἐσ. p. 135), ἔκκακείς (the literary Greek knows only ἔκκακείς, see my Comment. ad Gal. p. 134, and Mey. on 2 Cor. iv. 1), εἰσόδευς (Sturz, p. 168; Fr. Rom. II. 370 sq.), ὄμειδας, ἄγαθοργυρέως, ἄγαθωσύνη, διασχορίζων, ὀφθάλμων (τρυφώ, Lob. 381), ἔκτατομασία (Lob. 442), οἰκοδοκώστης, οἰκοδοκώστοις (Lob. 373), λαδόβαλεις, προσφάγοις (ἄνου, Sturz, 191), λογία, κράββατος (σκίμπος, Lob. 63; Sturz, 175 sq.), πεποίθον, μύθος (κηλίς, Lob. 28), μάμμη (τηθή, Lob. 133 sqq.), βαφής (βελόνη, Lob. 90), ἀγρίλαιος (κότνος, Mooreis, p. 68), ἀγούτης, ἀγωύτης, ἀγανώτης, ἀκτινώδες καὶ ἀκτινέα (Lob. 311), ἀπαράβατος (Lob. 313).

It belongs alike to d. and e. to remark that the later Greek especially abounded: — in substantives in μα, e.g. κατάλυμα, ἀνταπόδομα, κατόρθωμα, βάσταμα, γάνυμα, ἄγριμα (Lob. 200), βασμικασία, ἔνταλμα, ἱερογλυφώμα (see Pasor, Gramm. N.T. pp. 571–574); — in substantives compounded with σω, e.g. συμμαθητής, συμπολίτης (Lob. 471); — in adjectives in ὅς, e.g. ὅρθον ὅσον ἡ ὅσον ἡ ὅσον ἡ ὅσον ἡ ὅσον
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(Sturz, p. 186), προώνα, καθήμερος, διστάκτων, δεμάτους (Lob. 51 sq.), — in verbs in ὁ, εγγ., e.g. ἀνακαίνω, διαμαίνω, ἀφεντικό, ἐξουδενώ, σθενός, ὅρθριζω, διεγματίζω, θεαρίζω, φυλακίζω, ιματίζω, ἀκούζω, τελείω (Lob. 341), αἱρετιζο (Babr. f. 61; Boisson. anec. II. 318), συνάζω. To these may be added also the presents formed from preterites στήκω (see above), γρηγορᾶ Lob. 118 sq. Cf. also such adverbs as πάντοτε (διαπαντός, ἐκάστοτε), παυδόν (ἐκ παυδό, Lob. 93), καθός (Sturz, p. 74), πανοκί (πανοκώ, πανοκράτια, Lob. 515), see Sturz, 187 sq. 1 Ἐσχάτως ἠκούν is a later phrase (for κακῶς, πανηρός ἠκού) Lob. 389; and καλοτόιο (see above) 2nd ed. was used for the more ancient phrase καλὸς ποιέω.

It cannot be denied that the preceding list contains many words formed, agreeably to the prevailing analogy of the time, by the Greek-speaking Jews, or even by the N. T. writers themselves (especially Paul, Luke, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; cf. Origen. orat. § 27); cf. particularly ὅρθριζω (ἀφεντικό), λαβοβολέω, αἰματεκχυσία, σκληροκαρδία, σκληροτράχηλος, ἀγαθοφειά, ὄρθοποδεῖ, ὄρθοτομεῖς, μομχοτοπίω, μεγαλωτήν, τα-πανοφρονίη, παραβάτης, πατριάρχης, ἄγενναλόγητος, ἄποστόλων (Sturz, 199), 25 χρυσοδακτυλίως. However, the circumstance that no traces of these words are to be found in the Greek writers still extant of the first centuries after Christ (but these have not yet been fully explored) must not be regarded as altogether decisive. Many of the words in question may have been already current in the popular speech of the Greeks. But words denoting Jewish institutions, or heathenism as idolatry, originated of course among the Greek-speaking Jews themselves; such as, σκηνοτηγία, εἰδωλολατρία, εἰδωλολατρεία. Lastly, many words assumed among the Jews a peculiar meaning resting on special Jewish modes of thought; as, ἐπιστρέφωσθαι, ἐπιστροφή, absolutely used, to convert, conversion, προσήλυτον, παντεκοστὴ Whitunsute, κόσμος (in a figurative sense), φυλακτήρων, ἐπιγαμβρεύων of the levirate marriage. In reference to Christian apostolic words and forms (such as βαπτισμα) see § 3 end, p. 35.

2 Grammatical Peculiarities: These are confined mostly to inflections of nouns and verbs, which were either unknown in the earlier language, or not used in certain words, or at least foreign to the literary Attic: for in this respect also the intermixture of dialects previously distinct became manifest. Moreover, the use of the Dual became rare.

1 Popular Greek naturally adopted single foreign words (appellatives), with slight alterations, from the languages in use in the different provinces along with the Greek. On this, however, we cannot dwell in an inquiry so general as the above. With regard to the Egyptian element in the Septuagint and elsewhere, see Sturz, dialect. Alex. p. 84 sqq. Also Latin and Persian words and expressions have been pointed out in the N. T.; cf. Olear. de stylo N. T. p. 366 sqq. 368 sqq.; Georgi, Hierocrit. I. p. 247 sqq. and the whole of II. (de latinismis N. T.). Cf. Dredig, de N. T. gr. latinismus merito et falsa suspexit. Lips. 1726, 4to., and Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik, S. 62 f.

2 Most of this description appear subsequently in the Byzantine authors, who abound in double compounds and lengthened forms of words. What had fallen into disuse was eagerly restored and revived.
The later Greek has few syntactical peculiarities. Certain verbs, for instance, are construed with cases different from those they formerly used to govern (§ 31, 1. cf. Boissonade, anec. III. 136, 154); conjunctions which previously took only the Subjunct. or Optat. are used with the Indic.; the use of the Optat., particularly in the oratio obliqua, decreases sensibly; the use of the future participle after verbs of going, sending, etc., recedes before that of the present (or the infinitive); Active verbs with ἀφαίρον begin to be substituted for Middle, when unemphatic. Also, in general, more forcible expressions lose their emphasis. On the other hand, additional expressiveness is aimed at even by grammatical forms, cf. μελόερος, ἓνα instead of the Infinitive, etc. But the later varieties of inflection will most appropriately find place in § 4.

Later popular Greek had, beyond doubt, different peculiarities in different provinces. Critics, accordingly, have professed to discover Cilicisms in the style of Paul (Hieron. ad Algasiam quaest. 10. Tom. IV. ed. Martianay, p. 204). The four examples, however, which this Father adduces are not conclusive (Michaelis, Einl. ins N. T. 1 Thl. S. 161); and as we know nothing respecting the provincialisms of Cilicia (see, however, Sturz, Dial. Alex. p. 62), it is better at present to dismiss the investigation altogether, than to rest it on empty conjectures. Cf. B. Stolberg, de Ciliciae mis a Paulo usurpatis, in his tr. de soloeisismis N. T. p. 91 sqq.

§ 3. HEBREW-ARAMAIC TINGE OF THE N. T. DICTION.

This popular variety of Greek, however, was not spoken and written by the Jews without foreign admixture. They not only imparted to their Greek style the general complexion of their mother tongue, which consists in vividness and circumstantiality as well as uniformity of expression, but also introduced particular Jewish turns of expression. Yet both these peculiarities are more apparent in their translations directly from Hebrew, than in their original composition in Greek.¹

Lexical Hebraisms (and Aramaisms) are more numerous than grammatical; and consist partly in the extension of the signification of words, partly in the imitation of entire phrases, and partly also in the analogous formation of new words to express corresponding Hebrew terms. Thus originated a Jewish-Greek, which native Greeks did not entirely understand,² and which they even sometimes turned into ridicule.

¹ Herein lies an argument, which has received little attention, why the text of the N. T. is not to be regarded as a translation from the Aramaic, and that too, in a great measure, clumsily executed.

² Though the opinion of L. de Dieu (praefat. ad grammat. orient.) : faciulus Euro-
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All the nations which after the death of Alexander continued under Graeco-Macedonian rule and which gradually adopted the Greek language of their conquerors even in common life, particularly the Syrians and Hebrews, spoke Greek less purely than native Greeks, and imparted to it more or less the impress of their mother tongue (Salmas. de lingua Hellen. p. 121, cf. Joseph. antt. 20, 9).1 As the Greek-speaking Jews are usually denominated Hellenists, this Oriental variety of Greek, known to us only in the writings of Jews, has not improperly obtained the name of the Hellenistic idiom; see Buttm. I. S. 6.2 Accordingly, the diction of the LXX. and of the N. T. (of the Pseudepigrapha of the O. T. and the Apocrypha of the N. T.) has been especially called Hellenistic; yet it was not Drusius (ad Act. vi. 6), but Scaliger (animad. in Euseb. p. 134), who first employed this term.

The Hebraisms of the N. T.—for these only, and not the oriental cast of the periods and arrangement of words, were usually attended to—have been collected frequently and thoroughly; in particular by Vorst, Leudens (in his Philol. hebr., from which the dissertatio de dialectis N. T. sing. de ejus hebraismis was separately printed by J. F. Fischer, Lips. 1754,

paeis foret Platonis Aristotelisque elegantiam imitari, quam Platonis Aristotelisci et al. nobis interpretari, is decidedly an exaggeration. Still, the circumstance mentioned above may in general explain the fact that learned Greek transcribers, or possessors of MSS. of the N. T., often took the liberty of making corrections in order to bring the diction nearer to Grecian elegance; see Hug, Einl. ins N. T. I. S. 129.

1 It is well known that Greek subsequently became Latinized, also, when the Romans began to write in that language. The Latin coloring, however, is not very marked before the Byzantine literature, even in Greek translations from Latin authors, such as that of Eutropius by Paenius, of Cicero’s Cat. Maj. and Somn. Scip. by Theodorus (published by Götz. Nürnberg. 1801. 5vo.). This was partly owing to the much closer affinity between Greek and Latin than between Hebrew and Greek, and partly because these authors had made Greek a special study.

2 This appellation ought to be resumed as a technical term, it is so thoroughly appropriate. For ἰλλαμωττα in the N. T. (Acts vi. 1) denotes a Greek-speaking Jew; (for compilations respecting ἰλλαμωττα rather than ἰλλαμωττα, see Weltein II. p. 490; Lob. p. 379 sq.). The notion of Salmasius, that in the N. T. Hellenist means a Greek proselyte to Judaism, is a rash conclusion from Acts vi. 5, and Eichstädt (ad Mori acros. hrm. I. p. 227) should not have adopted it. Moreover, the controversy between Dn. Heinius (exercit. de lingua heellenist. L. B. 1643. 8vo.), and Salmasius (hellenistica L. B. 1643. 8vo.; funus linguae helen. ib. 1643. 8vo.; osseilugium linguae helen. ib. 1643. 8vo.), on the appellation dialectus helenistica, related not merely to the word Hellenistic, but still more to the term dialectus, for which Salmasius wished to substitute character or stylos idioticus (de Hellenist. p. 250), compare also Tittmann, Synonym. I. p. 259 sq. Yet the term dialect (διαλεκτος τοιου) might be allowable to denote, particularly in accordance with the very extensive meaning of the verb διαλεγεσθαι (see, e.g. Strabo 8. 514), that variety of Greek spoken by Hellenistic Jews. Other dissertations on the designation dialect. hellenist. see in Walch, bib. theol. IV. p. 278 sq. and Fabric. biblth. graec. ed. Harles. IV. p. 893 sq. Thiersch and Rost have begun to call the language of the Greek Bible the ecclesiastical dialect. This, however, is too narrow for the subject discussed above, and the word dialect is inappropriate.
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1792, 8vo.), and Olearius (de Stylo N. T. p. 232 sqq.), cf. also Hartmann, linguist. Einl. in das Stud. d. A. T. S. 382 ff. Anm. Still, this matter ought to have been executed with more critical precision.\(^1\) Nearly all who have written on this subject hitherto, are chargeable, more or less, with the following errors:

a. They did not give sufficient attention to the Aramaic elements in the diction of the N. T.\(^2\) In the time of Christ, as all know, the popular speech of the Jews in Palestine was not the old Hebrew, but Syro-Chaldaic; accordingly, many of the most current expressions of common life\(^3\) must have been introduced into Jewish-Greek from this dialect. Among the older writers Olearius has a special section de Chaldaeo-Syriasmis N. T. p. 345 sqq. (cf. Georgi, Hierocrit. I. p. 187 sqq.). More recently, a great deal relating to this subject has been collected by Boysen (krit. Erläuterungen des Grundtextes d. N. T. aus der syrischen Uebersetzung. Quad. 1761, 8vo., 3 Stücke), Agrell (oratio de dictione N. T. Wexion. 1798, and otiola Syriaca. Lund. 1816, 4to. pp. 58–58), and Hartmann (as above, 382 ff.). Already had several earlier commentators occasionally directed attention to Aramaisms; see Michaelis, Einleitung in N. T. 1 Thl. S. 138 ff.; Fischer ad Leusden, p. 140; Bertholdt's Einleitung. 1 Thl. S. 158. — Under this head come also the (few) Rabbinisms (see Olear. l.c.p. 360 sqq.; Georgi l.c. p. 221 sqq.), for the elucidation of which much may still be derived from Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. They are mostly terms that may have been used in the Rabbinical schools as early as the time of Christ.

b. They overlooked almost entirely the difference in style of the several writers; so that according to their collections all the books of the N. T. appear to abound in Hebraisms to the same extent. But in this particular no little dissimilarity exists, and Matthew, Luke, John, Paul, James, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews ought by no means to be thrown together promiscuously.\(^4\) Those learned collectors failed also

\(^1\) A new and complete treatise on the Hebraisms of the N. T., elaborated critically and on rational principles, is certainly needed. Meanwhile, the commencement recently made (D. E. F. Bücker, de hebraismis N. T. Spec. 1. Lips. 1840, 8vo.) deserves to be gratefully recognized.

\(^2\) Many of the peculiarities pointed out by the Hebraists might with equal propriety be called either Hebraisms or Syriisms: e.g. א" for an indefinite article, and the frequent use of participles with א" for a finite verb. It is preferable, however, to regard these and the like as Aramaisms, since they are far more common and more distinctly established in the Aramaic, and occur almost exclusively in those later Hebrew writings the style of which approaches the Aramaic. This refers principally to the diction of the N. T., for the Septuagint exhibits but few Aramaisms. Cf. Olear. p. 308; Green. Com. zu Jes. I. 63.

\(^3\) To these the Aramaisms of the N. T. are, essentially, confined. For the religious expressions are to be connected (through the medium of the Sept. in the case of the majority of extra-Palestinean Jews) with the Ancient Hebrew, the sacred language. To the same class also belongs αὐταρωτα, pestilence, Rev. vi. 8; xviii. 8 (ץִּלְּכָה, 12320) cf. Ewald, Com. in Apoc. p. 122.

\(^4\) Even in one and the same writer we find a want of uniformity. Thus Luke in his
to show the relation between the diction of the N. T. and that of the Septuagint; though, great as the resemblance is, considerable dissimilarity exists, and, speaking generally, the style of the LXX. as a direct and in part a literal translation of the Hebrew text is more Hebraistic than that of the N. T.

c. They included in their list of Hebraisms many expressions which are not unknown to the Greek prose writers, or are the common property of many languages; and, in general, they were guided by no distinct notion of what constitutes a Hebraism; see Tittmann, de causis contortar. interd. pretatt. N. T. p. 18 sqq. (Syonunym. I. p. 269 sqq.); de Wette in the A. L. Z. 1816. N. 39. S. 306.

They made a threifold use of the term Hebraism, viz. to designate

1. Such words, phrases, and constructions, as are peculiar to the Hebrew (Aramaean) tongue, and to which there is nothing corresponding in Greek prose; e.g. ἄνωγγεζεβαί, ὀφειλήματα ἄφιέναι, πρόκωποι λαμβάνειν, εἰκοδομέων (in a figurative sense), πλατώνειν τῆν καρδίαν, ποιεῖσθαι ὀπίσω, οὗ . . . . . . πᾶς (for οἶδες), ἔξομολογοῦσθαι τινι καὶ ἐν τινι, etc.

2. Such words, etc. as, though occasionally occurring in Greek authors, are imitated by the writers of the N. T. directly from their native tongue; e.g. στέρμα for proles (Schwarz, Comm. p. 1235) hebr. πρᾶς; ἄναγκη distress, calamity (cf. D. Sic. 4, 43; Schwarz, as above, p. 81) hebr. קָנָה, קָנָא.

3. Such words, etc., as are equally common in Greek and in Hebrew, and with regard to which, accordingly, there is room for doubt whether they are to be considered as portioin of the popular Greek adopted by the Jews, or as currently employed by them through the influence of their native tongue; e.g. φιλάσσων νόμον, αἷμα caedes, ἀνὴρ joined to an appellative (ἀνὴρ φονεῖς), πάρι slave, μεγαλύτερον to praise, ἰδώνων to pursue, (cultivate) a virtue. To this head may be referred many of the grammatical illustrations contained in Haub's grammar.

4. Lastly, it cannot be denied that in a great many passages expositors introduced imaginary Hebraisms (Aramaisms); as, Eph. v. 26, εἰν ῥήματι ἤν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ (see Koppe); Matt. xxv. 23, χείρα convivium from Aram.

Gospel, where he had to follow the evangelical paradosis, hebraizes more than in the Acts; the deterioration in the diction after the proem of the Gospel was long ago pointed out. The hymns, also, and the speeches, have more of a Hebrew coloring than the narrative part; cf. e.g. Luke i. 13-20, 42-55, 68-79. The linguistic relation of Luke to the Synoptics has not yet been systematically exhibited.
§ 3. HEBREW-ARAMAIC TINNGE OF N. T. DICTION.

It is obvious from what has been said that there are two kinds of Hebraisms in the N. T., one of which may be called perfect, and the other imperfect. By perfect Hebraisms we mean those words, phrases, and constructions which are strictly peculiar to the Hebrew (Aramaean) language, and therefore were transferred directly thence into the Hellenistic idiom, (the diction of the N. T.). On the other hand, we call imperfect Hebraisms all words, phrases, and constructions which, though to be found also in Greek prose authors, are in all probability introduced directly from the Hebrew (Aramaean): first, because the N. T. writers were more familiar with Aramaean than with Greek; and secondly, because the phraseology in question was of more frequent occurrence in the former language than in the latter. De Wette also perceived this distinction, and stated it as follows (as above, S. 319): “Certainly it makes an essential difference whether a form of speech is wholly foreign to the Greek, or, on the other hand, finds in Greek a point of contact to which it can attach itself.”

This whole investigation must be carried farther back; and first of all the origin of the so-called Hebraisms must be considered. In doing this, however, we cannot take the LXX. as our basis, since they, as translators, furnish no sure testimony respecting that Greek diction of the Jews which was formed independently and by oral intercourse. Nor can we immediately use for this purpose the doctrinal parts of the N. T., as the religious phraseology of the Jews in Greek was naturally a close imitation of the Hebrew, and formed on the model of the Septuagint. But it is preeminently from the narrative style of the Apocrypha, the Gospels, and the Acts, that the influence of Hebrew on the Greek of Jews is to be most clearly determined.

In the first place, it is plain that original writers, scarcely less than translators, unconsciously gave their Greek style the general impress of the Hebrew-Aramaic idiom, from the influence of which, as their mother

---

1 In the title of Kaiser’s dissertation de linguac aramaceae suo cet. Norimb. 1831. 8vo. the word abusus would be nearer the truth.
2 Blessig’s definition is: Hebraismus est solius hebraei sermonis propria loquendi ratio, cujusmodi in graecam vel alienam linguam sine barbarismi suspicione transseire non licet.
3 The most important work that has yet appeared on the linguistic element of the Septuagint, is H. W. Jos. Thiersch, de Pentateuchi versione alex. libb. 3. Erlang. 1840. 8vo., from which I have obtained many acceptable illustrations for the later editions of this Grammar. But a complete exhibition of the diction of the Septuagint is very much needed.
tongue, they could not rid themselves without great attention and long practice. This general impress consists, partly in explicitness (hence the use of prepositions with cases instead of cases alone, the latter construction implying more abstraction), and a predilection for circumstantiality (φημεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου τινός, γράφη δὴ ἁέρος τ., πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἱματίου μεγάλου, καὶ ἑσταί — καὶ ἐκχει, and the like; the frequent use of the pers. and dem. pron. particularly after the relative, the narrative expression καὶ ἐγένετο, etc.); partly in the simplicity, and even monotony, with which the Hebrew (agreeably to a co-ordinating, rather than subordinating principle) constructs periods, and links clause to clause. Hence the sparing use of conjunctions in Jewish-Greek (in which respect the classic authors display so copious a variety); hence the uniformity in the use of the tenses; hence the absence of periodic combination of several subordinate clauses into a single sentence, and, in connection with this, the scanty use of participial constructions, so frequent and so diversified among the Greeks.

In narration, a further prominent peculiarity of Hebrew-Greek consists in this, that the words of another are almost always quoted directly; whereas the indirect introduction of quotations gives a distinctive cast to the Greek historical style, and occasions particularly the diversified use of the Optative, a mood almost unknown in the Greek writings of Jews.

From this general Jewish influence alone the Greek of the Jews must have received a strongly marked character; but in particulars it received a great additional influence, and it is these particulars which are usually styled Hebraisms.

a. Attaching the derivative meanings of a vernacular word to that foreign word which corresponds to it in primary signification was the simplest mode of Hebraizing (cf. ἔρωτας λατά to interrogate and to request). Hence it would not be strange if the Jews had used διακωστάνη for alms, according to the use of προσωποποιοί. Less dubious instances are διαλογικά pec- catum, after the Aram. רבי; νάσφη (bride) also daughter-in-law Matt. x. 35, 31 as ἴδια denotes both (Sept. Gen. xxxviii. 11); ἐσ for primus (in certain cases) like ἔρα, ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τινι also praise one (thanking), like ἔρα (Ps. cv. 47; cxxii. 4, and elsewhere in Sept.); ἐλεοῦσα bless, i.e. make happy, like ἐλήλυτο: κτίσω thing created, creation, cf. Chald. יִּצְבַּא; δόξα brightness, like νίππα; διάμεως miracles, νησίδα. The transfer of figurative senses is the most frequent; as, περιήγησιν sors, portio Matt. xx. 22 (ἡμί); σκάνδαλον stumbling-block in a moral sense (ἵπτω); γνῶσις for nation (ἡγήμων); χειλος for speech (ἱλός); ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (ἡγήμων, ἐπιτ) according to God's judgment; καρδία εἰσθαία (ἡισθαία); περιπατεῖν walk, of one's course of life; ὀδός (ὁδός) cf. Schiř. ind. ad Aesop. p. 148; ἀπάθεια not merely what is consecrated to God, but, agreeably to the Heb. יריע, to be destroyed, Rom. ix. 3, Deut. vii. 26, Josh. vi. 17, and elsewhere; λένω Matt. xvi. 19 for declare lawful, after the Rabbin. יריע.

b. Numerous Hebraisms arose from the verbal translation of certain
very common vernacular expressions; as, πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν for ἴππη μάχα; τοὺς βασιλείας for τῆς βασιλείας; τοῦ τιμοῦς ἄρεσκεν (τοῦ) μετὰ τιμοῦς, for τὸ ῥῆτορ τιμοῦς; τοῦ φασιν (χάρις) μετὰ τοῦ φασιν; ἀνάγει τοῦ ἀβαλλομενον τὸ στόμα τινος (μᾶς); γαθεσθαι βασιλείας μακρὰ τῆς βασιλείας (Talm.); ἄρων φαγεῖν (coenaere) for καῦτα βασιλείας; αἷμα ἰσχεῖν (τῆς βασιλείας) kill; μαρτυρεῖ οὐκ ἡμέρα τις for τοῦ καθὼς ἡμέρα; τόν διαναστῆνα for τοῦ μετέχει τούτων (αἱ ἡμέρας τοῦ νυμφάδος); καρπὸς δοσφος for ἱδρυμα ψυχῆς; καρπὸς κολασις for ὀμονή καρπος; ἵππος ἴππος ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας κυρίων for τὸ ἱππότην κύριος; ἵππος κολασις μητρος for τὸν μητόρα ἱπποτῆν; ἄφιλομα ἀμφικαίνων for ἀμφικαίνων κυρίων (Talm.); also σταθεῖν ἐν πρόσωπον αὐτὸν for 33 

The formation of foreign derivatives in imitation of vernacular, implies more reflection and contrivance; as, ὀλοκαυτωμα (from ὀλοκαυτων, Lob. 524) for τὸν; σταθεῖσθαι (from ἐκλάγχον, as πατὴρ is connected with πατρί); σκακαλίζων, σκακαλίζοντα, like βασιλεία, βασιλεῖς; ἀγανήθων and ἀγανήθων, like ἀγανήθων; σκακαλίζοντα, like ἐπιζήν; perhaps ἐπιζήνθαι, like ἐπιζήν, cf. Fischer ad Leusden dial. p. 27. Ἡνοστολακτέων, for which even the Hebr. has no single corresponding word, goes still further.

All this easily accounts for the predominant Hebrew-Aramaic complexion of the style of the N.T. writers, who were not, like Philo and Josephus, acquainted with Greek literature, and did not aim at writing correct Greek. Hence, the whole cast of their composition (particularly the want of compactness, especially in narration) must have offended a cultivated Greek ear; indeed, numerous single expressions must either have conveyed to a native Greek an erroneous meaning, or have been entirely unintelligible (such as ἄφιλομα ἐπιζήνθαι, πρὸςωπον λαμβάνειν, ἡμίακοι εἰς ἐκκατοστύντων, and the like); cf. Gataker de Stylo N.T. cap. 5. Hence also is explained why such Hebraistic turns of expression are less frequent in the original authors of the N.T. than in the translators of the O.T., and in the Hellenistic writers of the N.T. (Paul, Luke, particularly in the

---

1 A similar Grecism in Latin is e.g. a teneris unguculis (Cic. fam. 1, 6, 3), which although a Greek phrase was quite intelligible to the Romans, as e.g. καρπος χειλειων, though it must have had a strange sound, was unquestionably intelligible to the Greeks; cf. καρπος φρονιων, Pind. Nem. 10, 22. Still more easily must the Greeks have understood καρπος κολασις, since frout, by itself, (for fruit of the body) was used in unambiguous connections, as well among the Greeks (Arist. polit. 7, 16; Eurip. Bacch. 1305), as elsewhere; cf. Ruhnken, ad Hom. in Cerer. 23.

2 Though even Josephus, when narrating Old Test. history after the Septuagint, does not always avoid Hebraisms; see Scharfenberg, de Josepho et LXX. consensus, in Pott's sylloge, VII. p. 306 ff.

3 That is, in the significatio of remitting sine, so far, therefore, as regards ἀδελφήματα. For, ἄφιναι remit, even applied to offences, occurs in Her. 6, 30, in the expression ἀφέναι αἰτίαν, and ἀδελφήματα ἄφιναι δεῖον remittere (obligatory acts), is quite common. In later Greek we find ἄφιναι τινι τῆς ἀδελφίας, Plutarch, Pomp. 34; see Coraes and Schäf, in loc. The well-known phrase ἐφροίκεσθαι χάριν would likewise have been understood by a native Greek, though it would have sounded strange to him (instead of ἐφροίκεσθαι).
second part of the Acts, John, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; cf. Tholuck, Com. Cap. I. § 2. S. 25 sqq.) than in those more strictly Palestinian (Matthew, Peter). And it is obvious, further, that not all the Hebraisms in the diction of the apostles were adopted unconsciously (van d. Honert, Synt. p. 103). Religious expressions — and of these the main portion of N.T. Hebraisms consist — they must have been influenced to retain by the circumstance that in these expressions their religious ideas themselves were embodied, and because Christianity had to be built on a Jewish foundation. The existing Greek, too, possessed in fact no phraseology for the profound religious phaenomena which apostolic Christianity disclosed. Still, it is an exaggeration to assert, with Eichhorn and Bretschneider (Prefat. ad Lexic. N. T. ed. 2. II. p. 12), that the authors of the N.T. in composition did all their thinking in Hebrew or Aramaic. That is the process of a tyro. We moderns even, in writing Latin, after we have attained a certain proficiency, gradually (though never altogether) cease to think first in our vernacular. Men who, though not regularly trained in the study of language, were constantly hearing Greek spoken and very frequently, yes ordinarily, speaking it themselves, must soon have acquired such a command of its words and phrases and such skill in expression, that in composition the Greek would present itself directly, and not solely through the medium of Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic words and phrases. The comparison of the authors of the N.T. with modern beginners in writing Latin, or even with (uneducated) Jews speaking

1 The Grecian training of individual writers appears particularly in the appropriate use of verba composita and decomposita.
3 Some good remarks on this point are to be found in Hooelaer, spec. de usu graecitatis lex. in N. T. (Upsal. 1794. 4to.) p. 6 sq. Van den Honert went even so far as to assert: vel ipsa Demosthenes, si eandem rem, quam nobis tradiderunt apostoli, debita perspicuitate et efficacia perscribere voluisset, hebraismorum usum evitare non potuisset.
4 The latter, however, recalled this opinion, so far at least as regards Paul (Grundlage des evang. Pietism. u. s. w. S. 179).
5 How easily do we, who never heard Latin spoken by a native Roman, attain the power of at once conceiving in Latin, dixit verum esse, or quam virtutem demonstravit alius praestare, and the like, without first mentally construing dixit quod verum sit, or de qua virtute demonstravit, quod ea, etc. Thinking in conformity to the genius of one's mother tongue, appears particularly in phrases and figures which have become habitual, and which one introduces unconsciously in speaking or writing a foreign language. So it was with the apostles, who constantly employed, and with perfect propriety, along with many Hebraistic expressions, numerous Greek phrases entirely foreign to the genius of Hebrew.
German, is as incorrect as it is unworthy; cf. Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 54, 59, 257. Besides, it is forgotten that the apostles found a Jewish-Greek idiom already current, and therefore did not first frame for themselves most of their phraseology by thinking it out in Hebrew.

(Many Greek words are used by the N. T. writers with a specific reference to the Christian system (even in contrast with Judaism), so to speak, like religious technical terms. Hence arises, apparently, a third element of N. T. diction, viz. the distinctively Christian (see Olear. de Stylo N. T. p. 380 sqq. ed. Schwarz; Eckard, technica sacra. Quedlinb. 1716. 4to.). Compare particularly the words ἔργα (ἐργάζομαι Rom iv. 4), πίστις, πιστεύω εἰς Χριστόν or πιστεύων absol., ὑμνολογία, δικαιοσύνη and δικαιοσύνην, ἐκλέγομαι, οἱ αὐτοῖ, οἱ ἐκλεκτοί, οἱ ἄγιοι (for Christians), οἱ πιστοί and οἱ ἀναπόφημη, ὄλοδομη and ὄλονομην in the figurative sense, ἀπόστολος, εἰςγεγονότα and κράτεων absol. for Christian preaching, the appropriation of βαπτίζωνa for Christian baptism, perhaps ἔλαυν ... των ... ἀρτον for the holy repasts (the Ἀγών with the Communion), ὁ κόσμος, ἡ σάρξ, ἡ καὶ ὁ σάρκωτος, in the familiar theological sense, etc. Most of these expressions, however, already existed in the O. T. and in rabbinical writings. Accordingly it will not be easy to prove any phraseology to be altogether peculiar to the apostles—to have been introduced by them. This apostolic element, therefore, is restricted rather to the meaning and application of words and phrases, and lies on the very outskirts of the province of philological inquiry. Cf., however, Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 56, 67 f. 138 f. [and G. v. Zeeschwitz, Profangäricität u. biblisch. Sprachgeist. Eine Vorl. üb. die bibl. Umbildung hellenischer Begriffe, bes. der psychologischen. Leipz. 1859. 8vo.] In the historical vocabulary πάρχεω to suffer, and παράδοθομαι to be delivered up, absol., had established themselves as technical expressions for the last earthly fate of Jesus.

Grammatical Hebraisms will be discussed in the next section.
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As respects the grammatical character of the N. T. diction, those same two elements above mentioned may be distinctly traced. That is to say, here also the peculiarities of the N. T. phraseology are, fundamentally, those of the later (common) Greek language, and consist more in certain forms of inflection than in syntactical combinations. With these are occasionally mingled (though far

---

1 To attempt to explain such expressions in the Christian terminology of the apostles by quotations from Greek authors (cf. Kreeb, observ. praef. p. 4) is extremely absurd. But, on the other hand, it is necessary to distinguish the diction of the apostles, far more tinged as it was with Old Testament peculiarities, from the terminology of the Greek Church, which was constantly growing more and more peculiar.
less copiously) Hebrew turns and constructions in the use of all the parts of speech. A predilection for prepositions where the Greeks employ cases alone is especially noticeable. In general the grammatical character of the N. T. idiom conforms to the laws of the Greek language; the authors of the N. T. have even adopted many constructions peculiarly Greek (attraction of the relative and the preposition), and have observed strictly, though as by mere instinct, numerous distinctions entirely foreign to Hebrew (e.g. that between the negatives ōu and μή, etc.).

49 We find it true in Greek, as in almost all languages the history of whose growth can be traced, that changes produced by time are lexical in their nature far more than grammatical (compare, for instance, the German of Luther’s translation of the Bible with that of the present day). For the later common Greek exhibits but few grammatical peculiarities, and these almost all relate to inflections. We find, that is to say, first and foremost, a number of inflections in nouns and verbs which either were not used at all previously, and were first formed in later times by the abbreviation or the extension of the original forms, or which pertained exclusively to some one of the dialects. Of the latter sort are, for example, a. Attic inflections: τιθανον, ἐβολήθην, ἡμέλλε, βούλει (βούλη), ὕπειρον; b. Doric: ἡ λιμός as fem., ἡπότο εἰσίν (ἀφείσττα); c. Ἑλληνικαί oep.: the Optat. in εω in 1st Aor. (yet this was early adopted into Attic); d. Ἑλληνικαί γρήγορος, στείρος, εἰστα (1st Aor.). As forms quite unknown in the earlier language must be mentioned, Datives like νοτ, Imperat. καθω, Perfects like ἔγνωκαν (for ἔγνωκασι), 2d Aorists and Imperfects like καταληπτοσαν, ἐδολοφοναν, 2d Aorists like εἰδομεν, ἔφορον, the Subjunctive Future § 13, 1. e., the Imperf. ἡμέθα. To this head specially belong many tenses, regular indeed according to analogy, but in place of which the earlier language used other forms; as, ἡμάρτησαν for ἡμαρτον, αἰτεῖ for αἰτεῖα, ἢςα from ἡςω, φάγομαι for ἐδομαι, etc.; indeed, the multiplication of tense and mood forms, of which for euphony’s sake only a few had been previously in use, is one of the characteristics of the later language. Further, many nouns received a new gender, as ἵ for ὁ βύνος, and acquired thus a twofold declension; as, ἀδ. πλοῦτος, Ὑλος; see § 9 note 2, p. 65.

35 Peculiarities of syntax are less numerous in the later language, appearing chiefly in a careless use of the moods with particles. The following are instances under this head in the N. T.: ὅταν with the Indic. Pret., εἰ with the Subj., ἢν with the Indic. Pres., verbs such as γενέσθαι, καταλήψειν construed with the Acc., προσκυνεῖν and προσφέρειν with Dat. of pers. (see Lob. 463; Mth. II. 902), the weakening of ἢν in phrases like θλεο ἢν, ἢκο ἢν, etc., the employment of the Gen. Inf. (τοῦ ποιεῖν) beyond its original and natural bounds, the use of the Subj. for the Optat. in narration after Preterites, and in general the infrequent use of the
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Optat., which in Modern Greek has entirely disappeared. Μᾶλλαν, θάλαν, etc., are more commonly followed by the Aor. Inf. (Lob. 747). The neglect of declension is just beginning to appear; thus, μετ' ῥα οὐ, and the like (which is, however, put designedly), § 10 end. Subsequently the misapplication of cases and tenses in some instances also occurs. Thus σοῦ with the Gen. in Niceph. Tact. (Hase ad Leon. Diacon. p. 38), ἄρσ with the Acc. in Leo Grammat. (p. 232) and then in Modern Greek, the interchange of the Aor. and Pres. participles in Leo Diacon. and elsewhere. The Dual was gradually superseded by the Plural.

In a grammatical point of view the N. T. idiom bears few traces of Hebrew influence. True, the grammatical structure of the Hebrew (Aramaic) language differs essentially from that of the Greek; but this must have tended rather to prevent the Greek-speaking Jews from mixing vernacular with Greek constructions. (Such mixture of constructions would be far easier to a German in speaking Latin or French.) Besides, every one makes the grammatical laws of a foreign language his own, more easily than he does its store of words and phrases and its general idiomatic peculiarities (cf. Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 73). This is so because the rules of syntax are but few in comparison with the number of words and phrases, and because these rules too (especially the principal ones, which are fundamental to accurate, not elegant, composition) by oral intercourse are far more frequently brought before the mind. The Jews, therefore, must have been able readily to acquire such a mastery of the grammatical rules of the Greek then current—which by no means possessed all the niceties of Attic—as sufficed for their simple mode of communicating their thoughts. Even the Seventy have succeeded for the most part in recasting Hebrew constructions into accurate Greek. 1 Only a few vernacular idioms of frequent occurrence, and not at variance with the rules of Greek Grammar, have been retained to the letter (such as instead of the Optat. an interrogative clause expressing a wish, 2 Sam. xv. 4, τίς με κατασκευάζει κρατήρ; xxiii. 15; Num. xi. 29; Deut. v. 26; 2 Sam. xxviii. 67; Cant. viii. 1), or, where it could be done, rendered in accordance at least with Greek analogy (as, θανάτῳ ἀποθνῄσκει Gen. iii. 4, τίνι θανάτῳ Deut. xx. 17; 1 Sam. xiv. 39; Isa. xxx. 19) or by a construction already usual in Greek (see, however, § 45, 8), Judg. xv. 2 μοῦν ἐμφύσης for μοῦν ἐμφύσει, Gen. xliii. 2; Ex. xxii. 17; xxiii. 26; 1 Sam. ii. 25, etc.;

1 Certain Greek idioms became quite habitual to them, such as the article with qualifying words and phrases after a noun (δ ἴδῃσι δ ἐν ὁποιαδήποτε, and the like), the attraction of the relative, etc. Negatives, also, they almost always distinguish correctly. The more extended use of the Greek cases is exhibited by the better translators, as e.g. Gen. xxvi. 10, ἐπεζητείνα ἐπεζητείνα it wanted little that, etc.

2 Cf. Rom. vii. 24, where Fr. adduces similar instances from Greek poets. The construction with ὥσ (ὡς) followed by the Optat. or Subjunct. is discussed by Schaefer, ad Soph. Oed. Col. p. 523, and Melet. p. 100.
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cf. also Inf. with τοῦ. Hebrew constructions thoroughly repugnant to the genius of the Greek, the Septuagint have usually rejected. For instance, the Fem. for the Neut. occurs only in a few passages, where the translators have not duly adverted to the meaning of the text, or have given it a nervously literal rendering; as, Ps. cxix. 50; cxviii. 28; and it is hardly allowable to suppose that they designedly employed it for the Neut. In other passages the Heb. Fem. refers manifestly to a feminine subject indicated in the context; as, Judges xix. 30. On the other hand, ἐν ταύτῃ in Neh. xiii. 14 is probably equivalent to ταύτῃ in Greek authors, in this respect, hoc in genere (Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 5) or therefore (cf. ταύτῃ ὅτι propria quod, Xen. Anab. 2, 6, 7); see also 1 Sam. xi. 2. The construction of Hebrew verbs with prepositions is imitated oftenest; as, φειδεσθας ἐν τῷ Deut. vii. 16, or ἐν τῷ Ezek. vii. 4, ὀκοδομεῖν ἐν τῷ Neh. iv. 10 (γ θη), ἐπεφυστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ (παρ' ἑαυτῷ) 1 Sam. x. 22, ἐποικεῖν ἐν τῷ (γ τῇ Fr. Rom. II. 371). These imitations sound harsh in Greek, it must be confessed, yet in that flexible idiom they might find some point of affinity. (Cf. the Germ. bauen an etwas, fragen bei, etc.)

Even, however, if the Septuagint contained numerous other slavish imitations of Hebrew constructions, that would prove nothing in reference to the N. T. idiom. For, as has already been said, the style of these translators who, moreover, adhered for the most part with rigid exactness to the very letter of the Hebrew,—which sometimes indeed they did not even understand,—was by no means the model followed by the Jews in original composition or conversation. So far as regards the several rules of grammar, the N. T. is written thoroughly in Greek, and the few undoubted grammatical Hebraisms it contains become hardly discernible.

To Hebraisms of this sort may be referred, with more or less assurance, the use of prepositions where the Greeks employ cases alone (ἀποκρύπτειν τὶ ἀπὸ τῶν, ἐκθέν ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν, ἀναφέρει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁίματος, κοιμῶν ἐν τῷ, ἀφέοκειν and προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιον τῶν, ἐποικεῖν and θέλειν ἐν τῷ). Many such peculiarities, however, pertain to antique simplicity, and are accordingly in use among the Greeks themselves, especially the poets, and con-

---

1 Hemsterhuis, ad Lucian. dial. mar. 4, 3: saepenúmero contingit, ut locuto quaedam native graeca a LXX. interpretibus matura paululum potestate ad hebraeam apte expressimandam adhibeatur.

2 The translation of the Psalms is, in general, one of the most heedless. That of Nehemiah is little better. Aquila, who translated word for word (absurdly rendering for instance, the nota acc. ἔν τῇ by σὺν), cannot be taken into consideration at all in an inquiry into the grammatical character of Hellenistic Greek. In order to give a literal translation he violates without hesitation the rules of grammar; as, Gen. 1. 5, ἐνδεικνὺς ὁ θεὸς τῷ φωτὶ ἡμέρα. And yet he always uses the article with propriety, and even employs the attraction of the relative; so deeply were both rooted in the Greek language!

3 Imaginary Hebraisms are, the supposed Plur. excell., the Σ εσσείαται, combinations erroneously regarded as circumlocutions for the superlative like ὅλος ἐστιν τοῦ θεοῦ, the use of the Fem. for the Neut., and probably the Hypallage already mentioned τὰ ἤματα τῆς ἑως ταῦτας for ταῦτα τὰ ἤματα τῆς ἑως.
sequently do not exactly conflict with the genius of the language; as, 
παῦειν ἀπὸ τυιος.

Special and more decided instances are:

a. The verbal imitation of such Hebrew constructions as offend against
Greek propriety; as, ὀμολογεῖν ἐν τω, βλέπειν ἀπὸ σιβί καυρε α, προσθετε
πέμψαι, ἐδοθήσεται as a form of negatory oath;

b. The repetition of a word to denote distribution, as δῶο δῶο ἰνι',
instead of ἵνα δῶο;

c. The imitation of the Inf. absol. (see above);

d. The use of the Gen. of an abstract noun for the kindred adjective,
and probably the very frequent use of the Inf. with a preposition (and its
subject in the Acc.) in narration.

The peculiarities classed under a. and b. may be regarded as pure
Hebraisms.

When, however, it is considered that by far the majority of construc-
tions in the N. T. are genuine Greek, and that the N. T. writers have
constantly employed such peculiarities of Greek syntax1 as differed entirely
from their vernacular idiom,—as the distinction of the different past
were tenses, the use of ἐν with verbs, the attraction of the relative, such an
expression as οἰκονομίας πετίστεμαι, the use of the Sing. with Neuters,
etc.,—we shall not be disposed to join in the cry about countless gram-
matical Hebraisms in the N. T. That the diction of the N. T. is grammat-
ically far less Hebraistic than that of the Septuagint and the Palestinian
Apocrypha, as might naturally be expected, will be manifest, if, when the
expressions just specified as Hebraistic are observed in the Septuagint, it
is also noticed that many a vernacular idiom in the LXX. never occurs
in the N. T., or (such as an interrogative clause for the Opt.) only in soli-
tary cases in impassioned style. A circumlocution for the Fut., as ἐγνομα
δοδῶνας Tob. v. 14, or the repetition of a substantive to denote every (Num.
ix. 10; 2 Kings xvi. 29; 1 Chron. ix. 27), never occurs there.2

The N. T. writers considered separately exhibit extremely few purely
grammatical peculiarities. Only the book of Rev. requires particular
attention in a treatise on the grammar of the N. T.

Finally, throughout the investigation into the grammatical character of
the N. T. diction, it is obvious that the diversity of readings must be care-
fully attended to; on the other hand, it is also plain that verbal criticism
can be successfully practised only in connection with a thorough acquain-
tance with the linguistic (lexical) peculiarities of the several N. T. writers.

1 The more refined elegances of literary Attic are not to be found in the N. T., partly
because they were unknown in the popular language adopted by the N. T. writers, partly
because they were unsuited to the simple cast of thought of the sacred authors.

2 Yet in the better translated portions of the O. T. and in the Palestin. Apocrypha
we find single Greek constructions, on the other hand, instead of which the authors of the
N. T. use the corresponding Hebraisms; thus, in 3 Esr. vi. 10; Tob. iii. 8, the Gen. is
used with strict Grecian propriety. Further, cf. Thierack, de Pentat. aleg. p. 95 sq.
PART II.

THE GRAMMATICAL FORMS AS RESPECTS THEIR FORMATION.
(Inflection.)

§ 5. ORTHOGRAPHY AND ORTHOGRAPHIC PRINCIPLES.

1. The best manuscripts of the N. T. (like those of the Greek classics, see Poppo, Thuc. I. 214; Mth. I. 183) exhibit extraordinary variations of orthography, especially in regard to particular words and forms. Amid such diversity it cannot always be determined on satisfactory grounds what is correct. However, editors of the text should lay down precise rules, and carry them out consistently.

Though the various Codd. have recently been collated with greater diplomatic exactness, still, on many points, a more careful settlement of the facts is to be desired.

We submit the following remarks:

a. The use of an apostrophe to prevent a hiatus is of much rarer occurrence in the Codd. of the N. T. and of the Sept., than in the texts of native Greek authors (especially the orators; cf. G. E. Benseler, de hiatus in scriptorib. gr. P. I. Friberg. 1841. 8vo.; the same, de hiatus in Demosth. Friberg. 1847. 4to.): ἀμά, ἀπα, ἀρα, γέ, ἐμέ, ἐτι, ἦνα, ἐκτε, never suffer elision of the last vowel; δέ (before ἄν) and οὖδέ very seldom (Matt. xxiii. 16 and 18; xxiv. 21; Rom. ix. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 21; Heb. viii. 4; Luke x. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 16; xi. 21; Phil. ii. 18; 1 John ii. 5; iii. 17). Only the prepositions ἄπό, διά, ἐπί, παρά, μετά, and the conjunction ἅλλα regularly suffer elision, the former particularly before pronouns and in phrases of frequent occurrence, as ἄπὸ ἄρχης, etc.; ἄντι only in ἄνθ' ὄν. Yet the manuscripts vary in those cases, and even the best in particular passages, especially in regard to ἅλλα. Thus the Cod. Alex. [Sin.] and some others, have in Acts xxvi. 25 ἅλλα ἅληθείας; vii. 39 ἅλλα ἀπώσωντο; 2 Pet. ii. 5 ἅλλα
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δύσοιν. The best Codd. have 2 Cor. xii. 14 ἄλλα ὑμᾶς, and Gal. iv. 7 ἄλλα νίς. So also the authority of manuscripts is in favor of, Luke ii. 36 μετὰ ἀνδρός; xiv. 31 μετὰ εἰκοσι; 2 Cor. vi. 15 μετὰ ἀπίστου; Rev. xxi. 13 ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν; Heb. xi. 34 ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, Jude 14 ἀπὸ Ἄδων; 2 Cor. v. 7 διὰ εἰδοῦς. Cf. also Acts ix. 6; x. 20; xvi. 37; 2 Cor. iv. 2; v. 12; Luke xi. 17 ἐπὶ ὁλον; Matt. 54 xxi. 5 ἐπὶ δοιν., etc. There is a preponderance of authority for Luke iii. 2 ἐπὶ ἀρχιερεῖος, and Matt. xxiv. 7 ἐπὶ ἐθνος; 1 Cor. vi. 11 ἄλλα ἀπελούσασθε, ἄλλα ἐδικαιώθητε; whereas the authority is equal in Rom. vii. 13 for ἄλλα ἡ ἀμαρτία and the other reading. Cf. besides, Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 125. That among Ionic authors the same indifferance about shunning a hiatus prevails is well known; and accordingly this peculiarity in the N. T. is styled by the earlier biblical philologists an Ionism. Elision is neglected, however, by Attic prose authors, though the instances which Georgi produces from Plato cannot all be trusted (Hierocrit. N. T. I. p. 143). See Bttm. I. S. 123 ff.; Heupel, Marc. p. 33; Beuseler, Exc. to his edition of Isocr. Areop. p. 385 sqq.; Jacobs, praef. ad Aelian. anim. p. 29 sq.; Thucyd. ed. Poppo III. II. 358. Perhaps this variation is without principle, as e.g. Sinentis (Plutarch. vit. IV. p. 321 sqq.) has reduced to rules the use of the hiatus in Plutarch. In the N. T., too, the omission of the elision might be occasionally traced to the writer's intent, on one ground or another; not that the apostles bestowed attention on such things, but so far as they were guided by an instinctive sense of propriety. On this point, however, there is a risk of trifling (Bengel on 1 Cor. vi. 11).

Even in Lchm. the poetic quotation from Menander, 1 Cor. xv. 33, is written with the elision — χρησθ (for χρηστὰ) ἄμιλα κακά; cf. Georgi, Hierocrit. I. 186. The best Codd., however, of the N. T. [Sin. also] have χρηστὰ, which Tdf. has adopted.

b. In regard to final ε in ὅτες, μέχρις, and the so-called ν ἐφελεκυστικόν (Voemel, de ν et ε adductis literis. Fcf. a. M. 1853. 4το; Haake, Beiträge z. griech. Grammat. I. Heft), editors have mostly followed the known rule, which, however, has been restricted by more recent grammarians (Bttm. I. 92 ff.). But it is more advisable to be guided in every case by the authority of the best Codd., and accordingly recent N. T. critics have printed ὅτες and ν ἐφελεκυστικόν throughout, agreeably to the uncial Codd. (Tdf. praef. ad N. T. p. xxiii. [ed. vii. p. liii.]). Critics have tried to deduce from the Greek prose authors a fixed rule for determining when ὅτες or ὅτα, ἐπεν or ἐπε, etc., should be used (Bornem.
and οὐδ᾽ ἐκν). The former οὐν, however, is usually found disunited in the Codd., and by the authors themselves is sometimes separated by the interposition of a conjunction; see Jacobs, praef. Aelian. anim. p. 25. As for the rest, much must be left to the editor’s judgment in each particular instance. However, he could hardly find clear ground for writing διαπαυτός, or even ἐπερεγό (2 Cor. 59 xi. 23, Lehm.) and the like; although in general it must not be forgotten that in the language of the N. T., as closely approaching popular speech, orthographic combinations are especially frequent.

In the editions of the N. T. the pronoun δὲ was invariably so written (with the hypodiastole), Luke x. 35; Jno. ii. 5; xiv. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; etc., till Lehm., after Bekker, introduced δ τι (as δὲ τις, ἢ τις). Some think even this separation unnecessary (as Schneider, Plat. civ. I. praef. p. 48 sq.); cf. Jen. Lit. Z. 1809, IV. 174. The non-separation, besides other recommendations, has in its favor the consideration that an arbitrary exposition of the text is not forced upon the reader. (In the N. T. particularly it has often been doubtful which of the two is to be read, as Jno. viii. 25; Acts ix. 27; 2 Cor. iii. 14.) Once, however, we decide between pron. and conj., it is safest to write δ τι with a space, or even to retain the hypodiastole.

3. Crasis occurs on the whole but seldom, and only in particular forms of frequent recurrence. In these, however, it is found almost without var. The most common instances are κἀγὼ, καὶ, κἀκεῖ, κἀκεῖθεν, κἀκεῖνος, also κἀμοι, Luke i. 3; Acts viii. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 1; xv. 8; κἀμέ, Jno. vii. 28; 1 Cor. xvi. 4; τοῦναντίον, 2 Cor. ii. 7; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 9; once τοῦνομα, Matt. xxvii. 57. On the other hand, good Codd. have throughout τὰ αὐτά, Luke vi. 23; xvii. 30; 1 Thess. ii. 14. Instances like τούτεστι, καθά, καθάτερ, are not properly called crasis.

Contraction, where usual, is rarely neglected; cf. on δστα, χειλέων, νοι, and the like §§ 8 and 9, besides ἐδέρτο, Luke viii. 38, according to the best Codd., cf. Fr. de conform. crit. p. 32, as often in Xenoph. See Bttm. II. 150; Lob. 220. The verb καμμώνει exhibits a contraction of a peculiar sort; cf. Lob. 340.

There is good authority for καὶ ἐκεῖ, Matt. v. 23; xxviii. 10; Mark i. 35, 38; καὶ ἐκεῖθεν, Mark x. 1; καὶ ἐκείνος, Matt. xx. 4, etc.

4. In the earlier editions of the N. T. the Iota subscript [?] was too frequently introduced. This abuse was first censured by Knapp. The iota must be decidedly rejected:

1 Ahrens, de crasi et aphaeresi. Stollberg, 1845. 4to.
a. In cases of crisis with καὶ when the first syllable of the second word does not contain an ι (as καὶτα from καὶ εἶτα), therefore in κοίνω, κύμοι, κάκεινος, κάν, κάκει, κάκειθεν, etc. See Hm. Vig. p. 526; Bttm. I. 114. The ι subs., however, is defended by Thiersch, Gr. § 38 note 1, and Poppo has retained it in Thucyd. after the best MSS. (Thuc. II. I. p. 149).

b. In the 2d perf. and 1st aor. act. of the verb αἴρω and its compounds, thus e.g. ἤρκεν Col. ii. 14; ἄραι Matt. xxiv. 17; ἄρον Matt. 60 ix. 6; ἄραν Matt. xiv. 12; ἄρας 1 Cor. vi. 15, etc. See Bttm. I. 413, 439; Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 150.

c. In the Doric Inf., used also by the Attics (Mth. I. 148), διφήν, πεινήν, χρήσθαι. 'According to ancient grammarians 1 (who flourished after Christ) the iota ought to be rejected also in contract verbs in ἀω; as ἀγαπᾶν, ὕπαν, τιμᾶν, probably inasmuch as these forms arose from (the Doric) τιμεῖν, like μισθόν from 47 μισθεῖν; see Wolf in the lit. Anal. 19. 419 ff. Bengel favored this form, and it has been defended and followed by several scholars (Reiz, Lucian. IV. p. 393 sq. ed. Bp.; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. v. 69, and praef. ad Soph. Oedip. R. p. 9 sq.; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 14 sq.) Bttm. I. 490, and Mth. I. 437, declare themselves undecided, and many editors have retained the old mode of writing (as Lobeck, cf. his technol. p. 188). Schulz, Lehm. and Tdf., however, have rejected the ι subs. from the N. T.; cf. Eph. v. 28; Rom. xiii. 8; Mark viii. 32; John xvi. 19.

d. There is nothing decisive for πρόνος (Lob. Phryn. 408; pathol. serm. gr. p. 442), yet see Bttm. I. 255. Neither has πρετ, from πρό, an ι subs.; see as to this word in general, Bttm. ad Plat. Crit. p. 43, and Lexilog. 17, 2.

e. As to πάντη Acts xxiv. 3, see Bttm. II. 360. The ι, which has a right to stand in ἀληθῶ, ταυτῆ, as actual Datives, should be rejected in πάντη, which has no corresponding Nom. The old 46 grammarians, however, are of a different opinion (Lob. paralip. 56 sq.), and Lehm. has printed πάντη. Also κρυφή (Dor. κρυψά) Ephv. v. 12, cf. Xen. conv. 5, 8, and εική (Bttm. II. 342) have been received into the N. T. text; cf. Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 150. Lehm. still writes λάθρα, though λάθρα is more correct; Schneider, Plat. civ. I. p. 61 praef.; Ellendt, lex. Soph. II. p. 3 sq. Lastly,
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de gemina Cyrop. recens. p. 89, whom Poppo in his Index to the Cyrop. follows; Frotscher, Xen. Hier. p. 9; Bremi, Aeschin. Ctesiph. 3 and 4; Schäf., Demosth. I. p. 207; Mätzner, ad Antiphont. p. 192), and it is in itself not unlikely that the more careful authors were guided in this by euphony (Franke in Jahn's Jahrb. 1842. S. 247) and other considerations,¹ though ancient grammarians affirm (Bekkeri Aneod. III. p. 1400) that even the Attics wrote υ ἔφελ-κυοῦ, indiscriminately before consonants even (Jacobs, praef. ad Aelian. anim. p. 23 sq.), and so it appears in the Codd.; cf. also Bachmann, Lycophr. I. 156 sq.; Benseler, Isocr. Areopag. p. 185 sq. On μέχρι and μέχρις, ἀχρι and ἀχρὶς in particular, see Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 479. According to the grammarians the Attic orthography requires μέχρι and ἀχρι even before a vowel (Th. M. p. 135; Phryn. p. 14; cf. Bornem. Xen. Cyrop. 8, 6, 20), and so they are printed by recent editors; cf. Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 183 and Sympos. p. 128; Schäf., Plutarch. V. p. 268. See in general Klotz, Devar. p. 231. Yet even in Attic authors good Codd. have not unfrequently the form with ς. In the N. T. the best Codd. give μέχρι invariably, and ἀχρὶ even before vowels, Acts xi. 5; xxviii. 15; but ἀχρὶς οὐ, Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. xi. 26; xv. 25, etc., preponderates (also Acts vii. 18).

Codd. vary also as to υ in ἐκοῦς, but the best are said to omit it, see Tfl. praef. ad N. T. p. 23 [ed. vii. p. 54], though in the appar. this matter is but seldom noticed. On ἀρτικρίς, as most authorities [Sin. also] have in Acts xx. 15, not ἀρτικρῖ; see Lob. Phryn. p. 443 sq.; Bttm. II. 366.

c. In compounds whose first part ends in ς, Knapp, after Wolf (liter. Analect. 1 Bd. S. 460 ff.; cf. Krüg. S. 12), introduced the form ς for σ, and has been followed in this by Schulz and Fr., e.g. ὁστερ, ὁστίς, ὀσκέλως, εἰσφέρειν. Still, Matthiae's objections (I. S. 26) deserve great consideration; and this orthography, as it has no historic warrant, has no great claim to adoption. Schneider in Plato, and Lchm. in the N. T., write ὁστερ, ἐσακοῦειν, etc. Hm., however, committed himself to the former method. That it is inadmissible in such words as πρεσβύτερος, βλασφήμειν, τελεσφορεῖν, is obvious.

d. Of more importance than all this is the unusual mode of spelling certain words and classes of words which is found even

¹ The disputed question, whether οὐτος or οὐτο was the original spelling (for the former see Schaf. Plutarch. V. p. 219, for the latter Bttm. II. 264), and whether ν ἔφελκε. really belongs to the forms to which it is annexed (see Ross, Gramm. S. 71; Krü. 30) is not relevant here.
in the manuscripts of the N.T. and has been almost without exception adopted into the text by Lchm. and Tdf. This comprehends peculiarities of Alexandrian orthography (and pronunciation). We notice the following particulars:

1. For ἐνεκα we find in MSS. (and in the text, rec.) several times the Ionic form ἐνεκα or ἐνεκεν (Wolf, Dem. Lept. p. 388; Georgi, Hierocr. I. 43182), elsewhere ἐνεκεν: the last e.g. Matt. xix. 29; Rom. viii. 36; the first ἐνεκα. Luke iv. 18; 2 Cor. iii. 10; vii. 12. The authority of good Codd. must alone here decide; cf. Poppo, Cyrop. p. xxxix and Ind. Cyrop. and W. m. Buttm. II. 369. In the N.T. at least no distinction can be fixed between the two forms; Weber, Demosth. 403 sq. See also Bremi, exc. VI. ad Lysiam p. 443 sqq.

2. According to good MSS. even of the N.T. (e.g. Codd. [Sin. and] Cantabr.) and according to the Etymol. Mag. ἐνεκτικόντα Matt. xviii. 12, 13; Luke xv. 4, 7, is better written ἐνεκτικόντα; see Bttm. I. 277; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 47. So also ἔκτος occurs according to good Codd. in Matt. xx. 5; xxvii. 45; Luke xxiii. 44; Acts x. 30, etc.; cf. also Rinck, lucubratt. p. 33, a form very common in Greek prose authors (see Schäff. Melet. p. 32; Scholiast ad Apollon. Argon. 2, 788), and also found in the Rosetta Inscription, 4th line. It was preferred by Bengel, appar. ad Matt. xx. 5.

3. The Ionic form (Mttth. I. 54) τισερες, τισεράκτων occurs several times in good Codd. (particularly Alex. [Sin.] and Ephraemi); e.g. Acts iv. 22; vii. 42; xiii. 18; Rev. xi. 2; xiii. 5; xiv. 1; xxii. 17, and Lchm. and Tdf. have admitted it into the text. It frequently occurs also in Codd. of the Sept. (Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 118). In these ancient documents, however, α and ε are often interchanged, and one would scarcely consent to write Matt. viii. 3 ἐκαθορίζηθ. Luke xvii. 14 ἐκαθερίζησαν, or Heb. x. 2 ἐκαθερισμάνιον with A, and the like.

4. For βαλλάντων in every place where it occurs, Luke x. 4; xii. 33; xxii. 33, 36, good Codd. have βαλλάντων, and this Lchm. and Tdf. have printed. Also in MSS. of Greek authors we find this doubling both in βαλλάντων itself (Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 100) and in its derivatives. Bekker in his Plato has adopted it. Yet see Dindorf, Aristoph. ran. 772, and Schneider, Plat. civ. I. p. 75, III. p. 38. The word κράββατος is but seldom written with a single β (and then mostly κράββατος).

5. As to ὑποπόλεως (ὑποπόλεως) for ὑποπόλεος (from ὑπώπων), Luke xviii. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 27 var., see Lob. p. 461. It is probably merely a mistake of the copyists; for Paul undoubtedly used the more characteristic ὑποπόλεως and that has now long stood in the text. Whether we should write ἄναγμα or ἄναγμα can hardly be determined, the authorities for each being nearly equal. The former is derived from the adv. ἄνα, the latter from ἄνα (Fr. Mr. 611). See, besides, Lob. p. 297.

6. The well-known controversy about the right way of spelling adverbs in έ or α (Hm. Soph. Ai. p. 183; Sturz, opusc. p. 229 sqq.), affects the
N. T. only in regard to ταυωτι Acts xvi. 34; cf. Plat. Eryx. 392 c.; Aesch. dial. 2, 1; Joseph. Antt. 4, 4, 4; 3 Macc. iii. 27. Bloomfield, glossar. in Aesch. Prom. p. 131 sq., is perhaps right in thinking that such adverbs from nouns in -ος should be written with ι only (ταυωτι, properly ταυωκολ, as some Codd. have in Acts, as above). Still, nearly all the Codd. are in favor of ι; see Poppo, Thuc. II. i. 1540; Lob. 515.

7. Should we write Δασξ or Δαβδι? See Gersdorf, Sprachchar. I. 44, who leaves it undecided, yet adopts the spelling with β. The Codd. usually have it abbreviated, Δαξ, yet occasionally the older and better, where they give it at full length, have Δαβδι (Δαβδι), as Knapp, Schulz, Fr., Tdf. have printed it. Montfaucon, Palaeograph. graec. 5, 1, decided for the latter. Lchm. has invariably Δαβδι; cf. besides Bleek on Heb. iv. 7.

8. The name of Moses is written Μωυσης in the principal Codd. of the N. T. (as in the Sept. and Josephus), and this has been adopted by Knapp, Schulz, Lchm., Tdf. Still, it is a question whether this properly Coptic form, which in the Sept. is justifiable, should not in the N. T. give place to the form Μωυσης, which comes nearer the Hebrew and is certainly more usual; this passed over also to the Greeks (Strabo 16, 760 sq.) and Romans, and has been retained by Scholz. On the diaeresis in Μωυσης, dropped by Lchm., see Fr. Rom. II. 313.

9. As to Κολοσσαι and Κολοσσαι see the expositors on Col. i. 1. The first of these forms is found not only on the coins of that city (Eckhel, doctrina numer. vett. I. III. 147), but also in the best Codd. of the classics (cf. Xen. Anab. 1, 2, 6); hence it was preferred by Valckenaer, ad Her. 7, 30. In the N. T., however, the form with a has more authority, and has been adopted by Lchm. and Tdf. It exhibits probably the popular pronunciation.

10. For ἄννος Acts ix. 7, it is better to write ἄννος (cf. ἄννος), agreeably to the best Codd.

11. The un-Attic form ὀθηλος, ὀθην, is found altogether in the N. T. only in single though good Codd., Luke xxiii. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 2 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 8; Acts xv. 9; xix. 27; μυθην Acts xxiii. 14; xxvii. 33; see Lob. Phryn. p. 181 sq. It occurs also in the Sept. (Bornem. Act. p. 115) and in Greek papyrus rolls.

12. Ἔθοθη 1 Cor. v. 7, text. rec., for which all the better Codd. have ἢτοθη (Bttm. I. 78), is unusual, but rests on an unexceptionable retaining of the radical θε where there is no reduplication (Ἀθωθηναι, καθωθηναι), though both the verbs θεων and θειναι (the only ones of which the stem begins with θ and which form a 1st Aor.) change the radical θ in the 1st Aor. into τ (Lob. Paralip. 45). The participle θείεις, analogous in form to the above example, occurs in Dio Cass. 45, 17. (In Aesch. Choeph. 242, the editions have νθείς). It is not improbable that the first form was employed by Paul, and suppressed by the copyists.

13. For χρωματιλγης the best Codd. have χρωματιλγης Luke vii. 41;
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xvi. 5, which Zonaras rejects, and it occurs only once in the MSS. of Greek authors; see Lob. Phryn. p. 691.

14. The rough mutes for the smooth in ἐφαύς Acts iv. 29, and ἀφαύς Phil. ii. 23, Lchm. has already adopted on the authority of MSS. Other similar forms are ἐφ' ἔλπις 1 Cor. ix. 10; ἀφελεξιγοννεῖς Luke vi. 35; οὐχ ἀφεξαθεί Luke xvi. 22; οὐχ ἱσοδαίκως Gal. ii. 14; οὐχ ἀλγός Acts xii. 18, etc., (cf. Bornem. Acts, p. 24). Analogous forms occur in the Sept. 58 (Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 127) and in Greek inscriptions (Bückh, Inscript. I. 301, and II. 774), and are explained by the fact that many of those words, as ἄλπις, ἄλιν, had been pronounced with the digamma.

15. Πρᾶς and πρᾶδγες appear in the N. T. to be the better attested readings, though Photius, in his Lexicon, p. 386, Lips., prefers πρᾶς; yet see Lob. Phryn. p. 403 sq.

16. ἔχθες (not χθες, Lob. path. p. 47) Lchm. has already received into the text, agreeably to the best Codd.

2. Whether such words as διὰ τι, ἵνα τι, διὰ γε, ἀλλὰ γε, ἀπ ’ ἄρτι, τοῦτ’ ἔστι should be written separate or united, can hardly be determined on any general principle; and the matter is of the less moment as the best Codd. themselves vary extremely. Knapp has printed most such words combined; and, in fact, two small words in expressions of frequent recurrence are wont readily to blend thus in pronunciation (as the cases in διὰ, διότι, καθά, ὡστε, also μηκέτι and others, show). Schulz, on the contrary, defends their separation. Would he write also εἰ γε, τοι νῦν, οὐκ ἔτι, etc.? How much the Codd. in the main favor their junction may be seen from Poppo, Thuc. I. p. 455. Schulz himself, too, has printed διαπαύτως Mark v. 5, Luke xxiv. 58; and Schneider in his Plato follows almost invariably the united mode of writing them. Many inconveniences, however, would arise from carrying out strictly either mode of writing; and as the oldest and best Codd. of the N. T. are written continuously, thus affording no guidance on this point, it would probably be advisable constantly to combine such words in the N. T. in the following cases: a. Where the language supplies an obvious analogy, e.g. οὐκέτι like μηκέτι, τούτωρ like τούτων, ὡστε cf. ὡστον. b. Where one of the words does not elsewhere occur separately (in prose); therefore, εἰπέρ, καίπερ. c. When an enclitic follows a monosyllable or disyllable with which it usually constitutes a single idea, as εἰς, εἰγε, ἐραγε; but not διὰ γε τὴν ἀναίθενα Luke xi. 8 (Lchm. divides). d. Where the words have a different signification according as they are separated or united; as, ὡστιοῦν quicumque, but ὡς τις οὖν Matt. xviii. 4 quisquis igitur (Bttm. I. 308), ἕξαυτής adv. and ἕξ αὐτῆς (not to mention οὐδεὶς.
particularly Lehrs, de Aristarchi studii Homer. p. 276 sq. (In
the same way also ἐπέεσσα, ἐπὶδῆ, ἰπερέβενα were accented,
when these forms, compounded of ἐπ' ἐκείνα, etc., were used as
adverbs.)

m. Indeclinable oriental names are regularly accented on the
last; (cf. however, Ἰοῦδα, Θαμαρ, Ζωροσάβελ, Ἰωάθαμ, Ἑλειώμη,
and the segholite form Ἑλέγερ Luke iii. 29, Ἱεζήβελ Rev. ii. 20
according to good Codd., Μαθαούλα Luke iii. 87). The accent,
even on long vowels, is for the most part the acute; as, Ἰσαὰκ,
Ἰσραήλ, Ἰακώβ, Γεννησάρ, Βηθσαιδά, Βηθεσῶ, Ἑμμαοῦ, Ἀδρα-
ναοῦ. On the other hand, the MSS. have Κανᾶ, Γεβσαμανή
(though there is more authority for Γεβσαμανι, which Lchm. and
Tdf. prefer; see Fr. Mr. p. 626), also Βηθφαγή (cf. also Ννευή).
Names which occur as indeclinable and as oxytone, Josephus, with
whom declension predominates, makes barytone; as, Ἀβία (in the
N. T. 'Ἀβία). The oldest MSS. are said (Tdf. prolegg. p. 86 [ed.
vii. p. 61]) to give Πιλᾶτος, not Πιλᾶτος, as it is usually written
65 even by Lchm. (and by Cardwell in his ed. of Joseph. bell. jud.).

Yet even on the earlier editors, agreeably to the Codd., write Κορολᾶος
(Plutarch. Coriol. c. 11; Dion. H. 6, p. 414, Sylb.), Κηκυνάτος
(Dion. H. 10, p. 650), Τορκούατος (Plut. Fab. Max. c. 9; Dio C.
34, c. 34), Κοδράτος (Quadratus) Joseph. antt. 20, 6, 'Ονοράτος,
etc. As to Τίτος and Τίτος see Sinten. Plut. vit. II. 190. For
Φηλίξ, not Φηλιξ, see Bornem. Acta, p. 198.

The accentuation ὰμιοῦς, ἐφισμός, ἱπιοῦς, μώρος (Boisson. Anecd. V. p. 94),
which grammarians (Greg. Cor. p. 12, 20 sqq.) refer to the Ionians and
earlier Attics, and which Bekker for instance follows, is certainly inad-
missible even in Attic prose (Poppo, Thuc. I. 213. II. I. 150; Bttm. I. 55);
still more so in the N. T. On the other hand, we must without doubt
52 invariably write ἦς; cf. Bornem. Luke, p. 4; Fr. Mr. p. 649. The N. T.
MSS. have uniformly ἦς for ἦς, though they have always ἦς and never
ἦς. Thuc., on the recent editors, who mostly uses ἦς, has ἦς 1, 134; see
Poppo, I. p. 212. Recent editors reject ἦς in Attic prose; see Schneider,
84 sq. Lips.) As to whether we should write in Jas. i. 15 ἄπωκειοί or
ἄπωκοι, see below, § 15 p. 88.

In regard to the dim. τεκνίου as paroxytone, like τεχνίων in Athen. 2. 55,
see Bttm. II. 441.; later editors, however, prefer τέχνων in Athen. and
Plat. rep. 6. 495 d. In the N. T. the only part of τεκνίον that occurs is
the Plur. τεκνία; see Janson in Jahn's Archiv VII. 487. Ποιμνίον (from
ποιμένον) should be unhesitatingly preferred to ποιμνίον, Janson as above,
507. On ἄδροτης, βραδυτής as oxytones, see Bttm. II. 417. This accord-
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ing to the grammarians is the old accentuation, an exception to the rule; Lchm. has, on the other hand, ἀναμέλησα 2 Cor. viii. 20, but βραδυνή 2 Pet. iii. 9. The later Greeks seem to have pronounced these words regularly as paroxytones; Reiz, accent. inclin. p. 109. On ωἴκων and ωἴκον, ἀφα and ἀφα, see § 57, 3, pp. 510, 512.

2. Many forms, as is well known, of the same spelling but differing in meaning, are distinguished from each other by the accents; as, εἰμι sum and εἶμι eo (μύριοι ten thousand and μυρίοι innumerable, Bttm. I. 278). The accented Codd. and even the editors of the N.T. sometimes waver between these two modes of accentuation. Thus for μενει 1 Cor. iii. 14, Chrysost., Theod., Vulg., etc., read μενει (Fut.), which Knapp and Lchm. have admitted into the text, cf. v. 13; Heb. i. 11. In Heb. iii. 16, there is more authority for τίνες than τινές, and accordingly recent critics have almost unanimously preferred the former. For ὡστερεῖ τῷ ἐκτρόματι 1 Cor. xv. 8, some Codd. have ὡστερεῖ τῷ i.e. τινι ἐκτρόματι, which Knapp has unnecessarily admitted into the text, (it is clearly the correction of persons who took offence at the use of the article here, and besides, has but little authority in its favor); 66 so in 1 Thess. iv. 6 ἐν τῷ πρόγαματι, just as unnecessary. In 1 Cor. x. 19, many recent editors write ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτον τι ἐστιν, ἢ ὅτι εἰδωλον τι ἐστιν (Knapp and Mey.), because there is an emphasis on τι (antithetic to οὐδέν), and the other accentuation εἰδωλόθυτον τι ἐστιν (Lchm.) produces ambiguity, since this might signify: that there is anything offered to idols. Yet even supposing the 51 former interpretation unquestionable, it is not necessary to reject the usual accentuation, in so far as it gives the sense: that an offering to idols is something (not only appears to be, but is in reality). Critics still contend about the accentuation of John vii. 34, 36, ὅπως εἰμι ἑγὼ, ὑμεῖς οὖν δύνασθε δι' ἐμοῦ ὁ ὅπως εἰμι ἑγώ, etc. (as several Fathers and versions read); and in Acts xix. 38 almost all recent editors have accented ἁγοραῖος (adj. signifying judicial) instead of ἁγοραῖος. With regard to the first of these passages, John's use of language (xii. 26; xiv. 3; xvii. 24) gives the preference to εἰμί (see Lücke on the passage, after Knapp, comm. isagog. p. 32 sq.); but in the second, the acute would probably be correct, if we listen to Suidas, and with Kulencamp read in Ammon. p. 4: ἁγοραῖος μὲν γὰρ ἐστίν ἡ ἡμέρα, ἁγοραῖος δὲ ὁ Ἑρμής ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγορᾶς; cf. Lob. paralip. p. 340.

In the same way we must decide on Rom. i. 30, where some taking the word as active accent it θεοστύγεις, because θεοστυγεῖς
must mean Deo eoxei; but the analogy of adjectives like μητρόκτονος and μητροκτόνως (Btmt. II. 482) proves nothing respecting adjectives in ἅς. Besides, Suidas says expressly that θεοστυγεῖς means both οἱ ἐν τῷ θεῷ μισοῦνειν and οἱ θεοὶ μισοῦντες; (though he distinguishes θεομίσης from θεομίσης in signification). The form θεοστυγεῖς, which alone is according to analogy, (compound adjectives in ἅς being oxytones,) is consequently the only correct form. As to the active sense of the word, however, Suidas does not appear to have quoted it as Greek usage, but only to have adopted it in the preceding passage of Paul. At least, this meaning of the word cannot be positively established from any Greek author; see Fr. Rom. I. 84 sqq. To be sure, the word occurs but a few times in all. On the other hand, there is good ground for the distinction between τροχός (wheel), which the text and the accented Codd. have in James iii. 6, and τρόχος (course), as according to Grotius, Hottinger, Schulthess, etc., it should be read (see Schäf. Soph. II. 307). The figure τροχὸς γενέσεως (joined to φλογίζουσα) is neither incorrect, nor in James particularly strange; accordingly, no alteration of the accent is required.

In regard to other passages where alterations of accent have been proposed, as '1 Cor. xiv. 7 (δύνας for δύνας), Col. i. 15 (πρωτοτόκος for πρωτότοκος, see Mey.), or even James i. 17, πατὴρ τῶν φωτῶν for φωτῶν, these proposals have originated partly in doctrinal prejudices, partly in ignorance of the language. The last is positively absurd.

8. It is still an unsettled question whether in prose (for to poetry peculiar considerations apply, cf. e.g. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 476) the enclitic forms of the pronoun, where no emphasis is intended, should be joined to a preposition: whether, for instance, we should write παρὰ σου, ἐν μοι, εἰς με, and not παρὰ σοῦ, ἐν ἐμοί, etc. In the editions of the N. T., even in Lchm.'s (and elsewhere also in Greek books), we constantly find πρὸς με, πρὸς σε, but ἐν σοι, ἐν ἐμοὶ, ἐπὶ σε, εἰς ἐμέ, ἐπὶ ἐμέ, etc.; and only in connection with those enclitic forms in a few passages, Luke i. 43; Acts xxii. 8, 13; xxiii. 22; xxiv. 19; cf. Bornem. on the last passage, (mostly at the end of a sentence) from Cod. B and some others the orthotoned pronouns are noted as various readings. Partly on the authority of ancient grammarians, and partly for the reason laid down by Ημ. emend. gr. gr. I. 75 sq. that in such combinations the pronoun has the force of a noun, one must be disposed to decide generally for the orthotoned form; (only πρὸς με is defended by a portion of the grammarians, and occurs frequently in Codd.) see also Btmt.
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I. 285 f.; Jacobs, Anthol. Pal. I. praeef. p. 32; Mtth. Eurip. Orest. 884, Sprachl. I. 110; Krü. 76; also Ellendt, Arrian. I. 199. Yet Reisig, conject. in Aristoph. p. 56, and Bornem. Xen. conviv. p. 163, decide otherwise; and it must be confessed that good MSS. of Greek authors (even besides the case of πρὸς μὲ) often have the enclitic forms. Where the pronoun is emphatic, the enclitic forms of course do not occur; accordingly Knapp and Schulz properly give Jno. xxi. 22, τῇ πρὸς σέ.

In editions of the N. T. text, the enclitic forms are in general employed agreeably to the established rules of grammarians; hence even Fr., notwithstanding Hermann's authority (emend. rat. I. 71, 73), still writes ὁ παῖς μου (Matt. viii. 6), ἐκ ὁμοῖων τῶν (Jno. vi. 64), ὑπὸ τινῶν (Luke ix. 7), and not παῖς μου, ἐκ ὁμοῖων τῶν, ὑπὸ τινῶν. Lchm.1 began to accent the pronoun in the last two instances, and also to write ποῦ ἐστίν, Matt. ii. 2; μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστίν, Mark ii. 19; but παῖς μου he left unchanged. He has been followed by Tdf. See, however, the judicious decision of Bttm. I. 65 f.

§ 7. PUNCTUATION.2

1. In all editions of the N. T. down to that of Griesbach inclusive, the punctuation was not only deficient in consistency, but also suffered from the mistake that in order to facilitate the understanding of the text editors punctuated too much, especially with commas. In this way, too, they forestalled the reader and imparted to the text their own exegetical views; cf. also Bttm. I. 68; Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 76.

The first person who directed keener attention to punctuation, and attempted to reduce it to fixed principles, was Knapp. He has been followed, and with additional restrictions, by Schulz, Lchm., and Tdf. (the last adhering mostly to Lchm.).3 None of them, however, gave a general exposition of his principles.4

Punctuation was originally contrived as an aid in reading, especially in reading aloud, by marking the various resting-places for

---

1 Yet he (Lchm.) has printed in Acts xxvii. 44, ἐν τινῷ; Jno. xx. 23, ἑν τινῷ.
2 Cf. in particular Poppo, in the Allg. Lit. Zeit. 1826. 1 B. S. 506 ff.; Mtth. I. 172 ff.; [Lipsius, as above, S. 81 ff.].
3 Among the editors of Greek authors J. Bekker has begun to punctuate with greater moderation and consistency, and W. Dindorf still more sparingly. Both, however, seem to have carried the exclusion of the comma too far.
4 Rinck has proposed (Stud. u. Krit. 1842. S. 554 f.) with regard to punctuation to return to the principles of the ancient Greek grammarians (Villoison, Anecd. II. 138 sqq.). This, however, would be hardly practicable.
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the voice. At present, however, independently of the circumstance that punctuation is indispensable in any extended system of vocal signs, its main object is to enable the reader in the act of reading to understand correctly, so far as this depends on perceiving the connection of the words (Bttm. as above). Punctuation therefore must be regulated by the logical, or rather — since the thought is clothed in language — by the grammatical and rhetorical, relations of the words to each other. Hence it is too much to expect that the exegetical views of an editor should in no degree whatever be suggested by his punctuation, as he has to employ not merely commas, but colons and points of interrogation.

As to the proper use of the colon and period in the text of the N. T. there can be no reasonable doubt; for, the omission of the colon before the direct words of a speaker (Lchm. Tdf.) and the substitution of a capital letter, is an innovation for which there appears to be no sufficient ground. On the other hand, the propriety of inserting or not inserting a comma is more uncertain.

Thus much, however, is clear, that only a grammatically complete proposition¹ having a close connection with another proposition should be separated from it by a comma; and that for this special purpose the comma was devised. But a grammatically complete proposition comprehends not only a subject, a predicate, and a copula, — three elements that may be either expressed or understood, — but all qualifying words also which are introduced to define these main elements more precisely, and without which the proposition would convey but an imperfect sense. Hence it was a mistake in Griesbach e.g. to separate the subject from the verb by a comma whenever it was accompanied by a participle or consisted of a participle with adjuncts (Mark vii. 8; x. 49; Rom. viii. 5; 1 Jno. ii. 4; iii. 15). It is a mistake to divide 1 Thess. iv. 9 περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας, οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε γράφειν ύμῖν, Matt. vi. 16 μὴ γίνεσθε, ἀκτέροι ὑποκρηταί (for μὴ γίν. conveys by itself no idea), v. 32 δὲ ἀν ἀπολύῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορείας (the last words contain the most essential part of the statement), xxii. 3 καὶ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ, καλέσας τοὺς κεκλημένους

¹ A grammatical proposition usually coincides with a logical, but not always. In Luke xii. 17, for instance, and in John vi. 29 (see above) we find, logically, two propositions which, however, as the second is through the relative included in the first, form grammatically but one. The same remark applies to every condensed statement in which two clauses are contracted into one. Also in 1 Tim. vi. 3, εἰ τινὶ ἐπερωτήσατε καὶ μὴ προσῆκατε ὑμᾶς λόγοι, we have, logically considered, two propositions; but grammatically, they appear in this construction as only one (see above, near the close).
etc., 1 Thess. iii. 9 τίνα γὰρ εἰχαριστήνα δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι περὶ ὑμῶν, ἐπὶ τάσις ἡ χαρά etc., 1 Cor. vii. 1 καὶ λέγω ἀνθρώπω, γυναῖκός μὴ ἀπεσταθεῖ, Acts v. 2 καὶ ἐνοπλισθεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, συνειδών οὖ καὶ τῆς γυναίκος. But the notion of a complete proposition is still more comprehensive. Even a relative clause is to be considered as a part of the preceding proposition when the relative (pronoun or adverb) includes also the demonstrative, as Ἰν. vi. 29 ἢ χαριστήσαι εἰς δὲ ἐντείνεσθαι ἔκεισθε, Matt. xxiv. 44 η δοκεῖτε ἢ ὑμῶν τῶν ἁμαρτ. ἕρχεσθαι, Luke xii. 17 ὅτι οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συμφέρω τῶν καρποὺς μου; or when there is an attraction of the relative, as Luke ii. 20 ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἠκούσαν (cf. Schäf. Demosth. II. 657); or when the relative clause is so necessary a complement to a foregoing word that both must be taken together to complete the sense, as Luke xii. 8 πᾶς δὲ ἐν ὑπομονῇ, Matt. xiii. 44 πάντα δὲ ἡ ἐχει; or when the preposition is not repeated before the relative, as Acts xiii. 39 ἀπὸ πάντων δὲ οὐκ ἠδύναμηττε etc., Luke i. 25.1 So where the subject, predicate, or copula of a clause consists of several words connected by καί (or οὐδὲ), all these words must be regarded grammatically as a compound whole, though logically they may form several clauses; as, Mark xiv. 22 λαθὼν ὁ Ἰ. ἀρτον εὐλογήσας ἐκλαυσ καὶ ἐδοκεῖ ἄντων, Ἰν. vi. 24 Ἰ. οὐκ ἔστω ἐκεῖ οὐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶς, Matt. xiii. 6 ἡ καὶ τῶν μὴ ἔχειν μήπω ἐξηράνθη (so correctly Lchm.), 1 Tim. vi. 3; Matt. vi. 26. (Otherwise in Mark xiv. 27 πατάξω τὸν ποιμήνα, καὶ διασκορπισθησεται τὰ πρόβατα, Matt. vii. 26 ὕπερ, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν. The comma is here required, because two complete propositions are connected by καί. It is required also when two propositions are separated by ἡ.)

Further, the comma is to be omitted between such clauses as Luke xxiv. 18 σοὶ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἴερους καὶ οὖκ ἔγνως etc., since they both belong together and must be read without a pause, for only in their connection do they convey the proper sense. Also Mark xv. 25 ἢ χαρίζω τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, and Matt. viii. 8 οὐκ εἰμὶ ικανός ὑμῶν ὑπὸ τὴν στέψην εἰσελθεῖ, must be written without punctuation. Finally, before ἀλλὰ the comma can be properly omitted if the following clause is incomplete, and has, as 55 it were, essential roots in the preceding; as, Rom. viii. 9 ὑμεῖς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστε ἐν σειρᾷ ἕλκῃ ἐν πνεύματι, and 4 τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα (where Fr. retains the comma). 57

1 To omit the comma before every relative clause (as e.g. Bekker does in his edition of Plato), seems to me to be going too far.
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2. On the other hand, we must not include too much in a grammatically complete proposition, and so omit commas where they are necessary. Hence we remark:

a. The Vocative is never a constituent part of the proposition with which it stands connected, but is to be regarded as its prelude, particularly when the proposition is in the first or third person. Hence we punctuate in Jno. ix. 2 ῥαββί, τίς ἡμαρτεν, Mark xiv. 36 ἀββᾶ δὲ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σου, 2 Pet. iii. 1; Luke xv. 18; xviii. 11, etc.

b. A comma is properly put after a word which is the subject of a clause immediately following, beginning with a conjunction, and also of the principal clause; as, Jno. vii. 31 ὁ Χριστὸς, ὃν ἔλθη, . . . . . . . ποιήσει. Lchm. otherwise.

c. If a grammatically complete clause be followed by a supplementary statement which might properly form a clause of itself, they must be separated by a comma; as, Rom. xii. 1 παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ξύσαν . . . . τῇ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν (i.e. ἄτις ἐστὶν ἡ λογ. λ.), 1 Tim. ii. 6 ὃ δὲ ὥστε ἐκαίνων αὐτῶν ἀντιλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον καρπὸς ἡδίους. So also in 71 the case of participles, etc.; as, Col. ii. 2 ὃν παρακ. αἱ καρδιαί αὐτῶν, συμβεβασθεῖτε ἐν ἁγάπῃ, Jno. ix. 18 ἐγγονοὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους, τῶν ποτὲ τυφλῶν, Rom. viii. 4 ἐν τῇ δικαιώμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν, τοὺς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν etc., verse 20; Eph. i. 12.

d. When a single (logical) proposition contains a twofold construction (e.g. an anacoluthon), it must be written with a comma and read with a pause between the two parts; as, Jno. xv. 2 πᾶν κλήμα ἐν έμοι μὴ φέρον καρπόν, αἱρεί αὐτό. By the addition of αὐτό the words πᾶν κλήμα . . . . . . . καρπ. become a casus pendens which is only the prelude to the proposition, and hence no one reads on without a pause. Rev. iii. 12 δὲ μεγάν, ποιήσω αὐτόν στόλων etc.; Heb. ix. 23 ἀνάγκη τὰ μὲν ἱποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι. It is quite obvious that inserted complete clauses must be separated from the principal clause by commas, Luke ix. 28; Acts v. 7, and elsewhere.

e. If a sentence contains ἄνωθεν (without καλ) several words following one another in the same construction, or simply enumerated in succession, they must be separated from each other by commas; as, 1 Pet. v. 10 αὐτός καταρτίσει, στηρίζει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει; Luke xiii. 14 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος, ἀγανακτῶν ὅτι . . . . . . . ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔλεγε.
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If the use of the comma in all the cases specified be well founded, a subordinate point, a half comma, would be desirable, to separate to the eye those words which in a continuous proposition, though they do not form, so to speak, a grammatical group, the reader might easily construe together. Thus, for instance, every one in reading Luke xvi. 10 ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστὸς ἢστι will be apt to go wrong, as καί entails the expectation of a second expression co-ordinate with πιστὸς ἐν ἑλ. The same holds true of the following passages: Rom. iv. 14 εἰ γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει νόμον κληρονόμοι, Jas. v. 12 ἢ γε ὡς οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ ἐν τῇ νομιμότητι εἰσαχθῇ, 1 Cor. xv. 47 δὲ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς θανάτου, Heb. v. 12 ὁφειλόμενος εἶναι διδασκαλίαν διὰ τὸν χρόνον πάλιν χρείαν ἔχει τοῦ διδαχῆσθαι ὑμᾶς, Jno. v. 5 ἢ γε τὸς ἄνθρωπος ἑκάτερον τρία ἄκατα καὶ ὡς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐξοχῇ, Rom. iii. 9 τὶ οὖν, προεξομολογοῦμεν δὲ πάντως (οὗ, πάντως). A half comma would at once remove all ambiguity. As, however, no such point exists, we might employ an ordinary comma, just as it is used in writing and print to distinguish ἢστι from ὡς. Modern editors, however, do not punctuate at all in these passages, and this is perhaps most advisable.

3. It is on many accounts desirable that an editor’s exposition of a passage should not be introduced into the text by means of punctuation. This is easily avoided where punctuation is unnecessary, as for instance in Rom. i. 17; vii. 21; Matt. xi. 11. But there are passages where punctuation—a period, a colon, a comma, or even a mark of interrogation—is indispensable, and yet cannot be employed without thereby adopting some distinct exposition of the text. In Jno. vii. 21 sq., for instance, every editor must determine whether to prefer ἢ γε ἢ
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εἰσι, and thus the existence of faith, in the manner indicated by
the words in apposition, is historically proved. However, it now
appears to me more proper to omit the comma after πίστις, so
that a definition of faith is given, the correctness of which is then
illustrated by the succeeding historical examples; see Bleek on the
passage. In punctuating Jno. xiv. 30 sq. expositors vary between
ἐν ἔμοι οὐκ ἔχει οὐδὲν, ἄλλ' ἵνα ... ποιῶ, ἑγείρεσθε and οὐδὲν
ἄλλ' ἵνα ... ποιῶ, ἑγείρεσθε; and in punctuating, if the text of
the N. T. is to be punctuated at all, it will not be possible to
evade this difference. Compare further, Rom. iii. 9; v. 16; vii. 21;
viii. 33; ix. 5; xi. 31; 1 Cor. i. 13; vii. 4; xvi. 3; Acts v. 35
(see Kühnöl); Heb. iii. 2; Jas. ii. 1, 4, 18; v. 3 sq.

The same reason, viz. to avoid prejudicing the reader in advance in
favor of any one interpretation, may have been the chief motive with recent
editors (Tdf.) for excluding from the text altogether the parenthesis, for-
merly the source of so much abuse. Lchm. had still retained it. See
below, § 62.
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1. Masculine proper names in ἄς of the 1st Decl. — mostly oriental, but formed in accordance with well-known Greek analogy —
end in the Gen. Sing. uniformly in ἄ; as, Ἰωαννᾶ Luke iii. 27,
Ἰωάννα Matt. xii. 39; Jno. i. 43, etc. Κλωνᾶ Jno. xix. 25, Στεφάνα,
1 Cor. i. 16; xvi. 15, Σκεφᾶ Acts xix. 14, Κρῆφα 1 Cor. i. 12, Σατανᾶ
Mark i. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 9, Ἐπαφρᾶ Col. i. 7.

Likewise those ending in unaccented ἄς make the Gen. in σ;
as, Καίσαρ Jno. xviii. 13, Ἀννᾶ Luke iii. 2, Ἀρέτα 2 Cor. xi. 32
(Joseph. antiqu. 17, 3, 2; 18, 5, 1), Βαρνάβα Gal. ii. 1; Col. iv.
10, Ἀγρίππα Acts xxv. 23; cf. Joseph. antiqu. 16, 2, 3; 16, 6, 7;
20, 7, 1, etc. (Σίλα Joseph. vit. 17, Ματθεία Acta apocr. p. 133),
Ἰουδᾶ often.

The same form in proper names is often used by Attic authors;
5, 150 a., cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 156; Krü. 42; Ellendt, Arrian.
Al. I. 83; V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 566; and on Βορᾶ, Luke
xiii. 29, Rev. xxi. 13, especially Bttm. I. 147, 199; Bekker, Anecd.
III. 1186.

1 So also Ἐωμᾶ in the Act. Thom., Λουκᾶ Euseb. H. E. 3, 24, Ἐρμᾶ Euseb. 3, 3.
2 On the other hand, we find occasionally Ἀγρίππα in Joseph. (antt. 18, 7, 1 and 2;
18, 8, 8, etc.) and Euseb. H. E. 2, 19. Codd. of Xenoph. also vary between Γωβρία
and Γωβρεία.
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On the other hand, those in ας pure have the usual Attic form (e.g. Αἰνελας) in ou (Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 487 sqq.); as, 'Ανδρεου Mark i. 29; Jno. i. 45 (Joseph. antiquq. 12, 2, 3; Acta apost. p. 158, 159), Χριστο Luke i. 17; iv. 25, Χριστο Matt. iii. 3; xiii. 14; Acts 60 xxviii. 25 and elsewhere, Ἰησου Matt. ii. 17; xxvii. 9, Σαχαριου ἱδ Ἰου Matt. xxiii. 35; Luke i. 40 and elsewhere, Δασανιου Luke iii. 1, Βαρακιου Matt. xxiii. 35. So always in Joseph. 'Ομια, 'Οινιο; in other places Τωσιου (Geo. Synell. chronogr. p. 164; but usually 58 Τωβια). See, in general, Geo. Choerobosci dictata in Theodosii canon. ed. Gaisford, I. p. 42.

Several names of places that might have been declined according to the 1st Decl. are indeclinable in the N. T.; as, Κανα (Dat. Jno. ii. 1, 11; Acc. iv. 46), Βηθσαϊδα, Βηθφαγη, Γολγοθα, Ραμα. Βηθβαρα Jno. i. 28 would not come under this head, since Origen uses it as a Neut. Plur.; recent editors have printed Π Βηθβαρα. Αιδδα is unquestionably inflected as 74 feminine in Acts ix. 38 (αιδδης), on the other hand in vs. 32 and 32 Αιδδα as Neut. Acc. has respectable Codd. in its favor; cf. my RW. II. 30.

Words in αρχας 1 commonly follow in the N. T. and later Greek the first declension, and end in αρχας; 2 as, πατριάρχης Heb. vii. 4, Plur. Acts vii. 8, 9, coll. 1 Chron. xxviii. 22, πατριάρχης Matt. xiv. 1; Luke iii. 19; iv. 7, coll. Joseph. antiquq. 18, 7, 1, πατριάρχας Euseb. H. E. 1, 7, 4; πολτάρχης Acts xvii. 6; ἀνάρχης 2 Cor. xi. 32, coll. 1 Macc. xiv. 47, ἀνάρχης 1 Macc. xv. 1, 2, ἀνάρχης Joseph. antiquq. 17, 11, 4, ἀνάρχης Euseb. Const. 1, 8; ἀνάρχης, hence ἀναρχῶν Acts xix. 31, and ἀνάρχης Euseb. H. E. 4, 15, 11 (Asiarcha, Cod. Theodos. 15, 92); ἐκατοντάρχης Acts x. 1, 22; xxi. 32; xxii. 26, coll. Joseph. b. j. 3, 6, 2, ἐκατοντάρχης Acts xxiv. 23; xxvii. 31; Matt. viii. 13 where, however, a few Codd. have ἐκατοντάρχης, just as in Joseph. b. j. 2, 4, 3, ἐκατονταρχος is found besides ἐκατοντάρχης. On the other hand, ἐκατονταρχος occurs almost without var. in the following passages: Matt. viii. 5, 8; Luke viii. 6; Acts xxii. 25; (the Gen. Sing. Luke vii. 2, and Plur. Acts xxiii. 23, the former with the same accent and the latter with a circumflex on the last, may be cases of ἐκατοντάρχης also).

1 The MSS. even of ancient Greek authors vary, indeed, between αρχας and αρχης, but later critics, in them, give the form αρχας the preference; cf. Bornem. Xen. conv. 1, 4; Poppo, Xen. Cyrop. 2, 1, 22, p. 109. This also corresponds best with the etymology (from ἀρχη). So τιναρχος, Aeschyl. Choeph. 692. Γυμναιαρχης, however, is undoubtedly the correct reading in Aeschin. Tim. ed. Bremi I. 23.

2 That this was the predominant termination in the Apostolic age appears further from the circumstance that the Romans in rendering such words into Latin gave to them this or a similar form, when they might just as well have chosen the form in archa. Hence Tetrarchos, Hirt. bell. Alex. c. 67; Liv. epitom. 94; Horat. serm. 1, 3, 12; Lucan. 7, 227; Alabarchos, Cic. Attic. 2, 17; Juven. Satir. 1, 130; Togarcha, Spartan. in Hadrian. 13; Patriarcha, Tertull. de anim. c. 7, 55, and elsewhere. Cf. Schäff. Demosth. II. 151. Byzantine authors still more fully attest the predominance of this form.
Finally, for ἀρχῇ Acts xxviii. 16 (Const. Man. 4412, etc.) the better Codd. have ἀρχῇ. Elsewhere, besides, in the Greek Bible and in authors of the first Christian centuries we find the following vouchers for the form ἀρχῇ: ἁγιοτάρις Wisd. xiii. 8, κομάρχῃς Esth. ii. 8, κυπριάρχῃς 2 Macc. xii. 2, τοπάρχῃς Gen. xli. 34; Dan. iii. 2, 3; vii. 7; Euseb. H. E. 1, 13, 3, θεατάρχῃς Lucian. peregr. 11, μεδάρχῃς Arrian. Tact. p. 30, φαλαγγάρχῃς ibid. p. 30, εἰλάρχῃς ibid. p. 50, ἀλεφαντάρχῃς 2 Macc. xiv. 12; 3 Macc. v. 4, 43, ἀλαβάρχῃς Joseph. antiqq. 19, 5, 1, γενάρχῃς Lycochr. 1807; 59 Joseph. antiqq. 1, 13, 4, ταξάρχῃς Arrian. Al. 2, 16, 11; Euseb. Constant. 6th ed. 4, 63 (though ibid. 4, 51 and 68 also ταξαρχος; see Heinichen, index p. 585), ἐλάρχῃς Arrian. Alex. 1, 12, 11; 2, 7, 5, συμφάρχῃς Acta apoc. p. 52, νομάρχῃς Papyr. Taur. p. 24, νεκτομάρχῃς Boisson. Anecod. V. 73. To quote from the Byzantine writers all the compounds of this kind would be endless; examples occur in almost every page. Of other compounds the form in ἀρχῇ is exclusively used in the N. T.; as, χιλιάρχῳ in all passages (22).

75 On the other hand see χιαρχῇς in Arrian. Al. 1, 22, 9; 7, 25, 11 (Ellendt, Arrian. II. 267), besides in Sept. Ex. xvii. 11, 25; Deut. i. 15; Num. i. 16, where we find also δεκάρχος (δεκαδαρχία Arrian. Tact. p. 98). In the Byzantines κένταρχος Cedren. 1, 705, 708, νυκτεπαρχός Leo Diac. 6, 2, must be considered as isolated instances.

Dialectic inflection in the 1st Decl. occurs in Acts x. 1; xxvii. 31; xxvii. 1, where we find the Ionic form στέφης from στέφα, only in the first passage with some var. in the Codd. (cf. Arrian. acies contra Alanos, pp. 99, 100, 102); and in good Codd. we find μαχαίρη Rev. xiii. 14; Heb. xi. 34, 37, and μαχαίρῃ Rev. xiii. 10; Luke xxii. 49; Acts xii. 2 (cf. Ex. xv. 9) [likewise πναρῆς Acts xxvii. 30 in A and Sin., which Lchm. has adopted]; cf. also Σαπφήρις Acts v. 1 (Lchm. Σαπφήρα), and συνειδής v 2, according to good Codd. See Mth. I. 183.

2. In the Second Declension the following forms occur:

a. Ἀπολλω in Acc. Sing. for Ἀπολλῶν from Ἀπολλῶς (Acts xviii. 24) Acts xix. 1; 1 Cor. iv. 6 (the Gen. regularly Ἀπολλῶ 1 Cor. iii. 4; xvi. 12). Good Codd. (Bttm. I. 155; Krü. 45) have Acts xxi. 1 τῆν Κῶ (1 Macc. xv. 23; Joseph. antiqq. 14, 7, 2), where the usual form τῆν Κόω has but little authority. However, together with Κῶς, Κῶ is found as indeclinable in Strabo 10, 489; cf. further, Duker, Thuc. 8, 41.

b. Νοῦ, as Dat. (after the 3d Decl.) of νοῦς, 1 Cor. i. 10; xiv. 15; Rom. vii. 25; and νοὸς as Gen. for νοῦ, 1 Cor. xiv. 19. Greek authors, instead of νοῦ, usually employ νοφ, or contr. να. Νοῦ occurs besides only in Simplic. ad Aristot. phys. 31, 25; Philo I. 63 (Bekker, Anecod. III. p. 1196), the Byzantines (e.g. Malalas, see index in Bonn ed. Theophan. 28), and the Fathers; see Lob. Phryn. 453; Boissonade, Marin. p. 93 sq. Likewise πλοῦς Acts
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xxvii. 9, as Gen. (for πλοῦτος), as in Arrian. peripl. p. 176; Malalas, 5, p. 94; Cinnam. p. 80; cf. Lob. as above.

c. The Vocative θεί Matt. xxvii. 46 without var. (Judg. xxi. 3; Wisd. ix. 1; Acta Thom. 25, 45, 57; Τμύδηθε 1 Tim. i. 18; vi. 20), of which scarcely an instance is to be found in Greek authors; cf. Bttm. i. 151. Even the Sept. has usually Voc. θεία.

d. We find the Plur. of ὀστέων without contraction ὀστεία Luke 62 xxiv. 39, and ὀστέων Matt. xxiii. 27; Heb. xi. 22, and elsewhere. οδ. The latter, however, occurs not very unfrequently in Greek prose: Lucian. necym. 15; Plat. Locr. 102 d. (cf. besides, Eurip. Orest. 404; Troad. 1177). ὀστεία is more rare; cf. Plat. Locr. 100 b.; Aristot. anim. 3, 7; Menand. ed. Meincke, p. 196.

As Metaplasms we must notice:

1. Ὠ δεσμὸς Plur. τὰ δεσμὰ Luke viii. 29; Acts xvi. 26; xx. 23, only 60 once of δεσμοὶ Phil. i. 13, everywhere without var. In Greek authors, 6th ed. too, δεσμοὶ is more rare than δεσμὰ Thom. Mag. p. 204 (Bttm. i. 210; cf. 76 Kühnöl, ad Act. p. 558).

2. From σάββατον we find only Gen. Sing. and Plur. and Dat. Sing., but the Dat. Plur. σάββαται (which occurs also in Melag. 83, 4) comes, according to Passow, from a Sing. σάββατ, Gen. σάββατα.

3. The Masc. σῖτος has in the Plur. (besides σῖτοι) σῖτα Acts vii. 12 var., as often in Greek writers. (A Sing. σῖτον was never in use; see Schütz. Soph. Elect. 1366.) The best Codd., however, [Sin. also] give in Acts vii. 12 σῖτα, which has now been received into the text.

In regard to gender be it observed:

1. λμῶς in Luke xv. 14; Acts xi. 28, according to some good Codd. (also according to a very few authorities in Luke iv. 25), is construed as Fem., agreeably to the Doric dialect (Lob. 188); cf. Malalas 3, p. 60. See Bornem. ad Acta, as above.

2. βάτος is Masc. in Mark xii. 26 (though not without var.), and Fem. in Luke xx. 37; Acts vii. 35, (Fr. Mr. p. 532). Compare in general, Lob. paralip. 174 sq. (ἡ ψλῆ Const. Man. 2239, 2764, etc.).

3. Instead of ὁ ῥώτος, the later form, some Codd. in Rom. xi. 10 have τὸ ῥώτον, the form used by the earlier writers; see Fr. on the passage.

1 We find in the Sept. the Dat. Plur. also of this form, σοαββάτων 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4; viii. 13; Ezek. xlvii. 3, as well as in Joseph. antt. 16, 6, 4, together with σοαββατ. In the N. T. it occasionally appears among the var. as in Matt. xii. 1, 12, according to good Codd.
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Among these belong, 1. In the Singular:

a. The Genitive ἡμέρας Mark vi. 28, from the Neut. ἡμέραν (used as a substantive), instead of the usual form ἡμέρας; cf. Dio Chr. 7, 99; Schwartz, comment. p. 652; Bttm. I. 191.

b. The Dative γῆρει (Ionic), for γηρεῖ Luke i. 36 (as ὀδεῖ from οἶδος in Homer), for which the text. recept. has γηρᾷ; cf. Ps. xci. 15; Sir. viii. 6; Theophan. p. 36, and the Fathers, e.g. Theodoret in Ps. cxxix. (ed. Hal. I. 1393); Fabric. Pseudoepigr. II. 630, 747; Boissonade, Anecd. III. 19.

c. The Accusative ἴγκη Jno. v. 11, 15; Tit. ii. 8 (Lev. xiii. 15.). The Attic authors use ἴγκὴ, but the former occurs also in Plat. Phaed. 89 d., and similar forms in other passages (Mthth. I. 288).

77 d. Ἀρπέμου, Acts xxvii. 40, has, according to A [Sin.] and several other Codd., ἀρπέμονα, which Lehm. has adopted (cf. γλίκων Homer. Cerer. 209), as also Lob. Soph. Ai. p. 171, in preference to the usual form ἀρπέμονα: appellativi declinatio sine dubio eadem quae proprii (Anacr. fragm. 27, and Fischer's note).

2. In the Plural:

a. The Accusative in ἐς (instead of ἐς) from Nom. Sing. in ἐς, e.g. γονεῖς, Matt. x. 21; Luke ii. 27; γοναματεῖς, Matt. xxiii. 34, etc. So also in Attic writers; e.g. Xen. (see Poppo, Cyrop. p. 32 sq.; Weber, Dem. p. 492 and 518), though the Atticists reject it; see Mthth. I. 235.

61 b. The Dative of the Numeral δυόν (Thom. M. 253), Matt. xxii. 40; Luke xvi. 13; Acts xii. 6, follows wholly the analogy of the 3d Decl. It occurs also in Thuc. 8, 101 (δυόν ἡμέρας), in Plutarch, Aristotle, Hippocrates, and others, instead of the usual δύων; see Lob. 210 sq.; Bttm. I. 276. In the Genitive, δύο is always indeclinable; Matt. xx. 24; xxi. 31; Jno. i. 41; 1 Tim. v. 19, etc., as sometimes in Greek authors, e.g. Lucian. dial. mort. 4, 1; Aesop. 145, 1. (Mthth. I. 337).

c. As uncontracted forms appear — contrary to the general usage — ὄρκων Rev. vi. 15 (Ezek. xi. 10; 1 Kings xx. 28; Isa. xiii. 4, etc.), and χειλέων Heb. xiii. 15 (Prov. xii. 14; xxxi. 31; Wisd. i. 6; Ecclus. xxii. 27, etc.), the other cases being declined regularly. Such genitives, however, are not unfrequent even in Greek prose; cf. Gæorgi, Hierocr. I. 145; Poppo, Xen. C. p. 218;
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Jacobs, Achill. Tat. 2, 1. As to the poets, see Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. pp. x. xii.

d. The contraction of the Neut. ἡμιὸν Luke xix. 8 (as a substantive, cf. Theophr. ch. 11), to which applies what we have said above of ἡμίσων. The usual form is ἡμίσεια (which is the reading here in some Codd.; Tdf., however, has ἡμίσεια from B L [Sin.], cf. Btmt. I. 248); cf. Fischer, prol. p. 667; Btmt. I. 191.

e. The contracted Gen. πηγάων Jno. xxi. 8; Rev. xxi. 17, instead of πηγέων (as the Cod. Al. has in the first passage [and Cod. Sin. in the last]). Πηγάων is a later form (see Lob. p. 246), yet it occurs in Xen. An. 4, 7, 16, and frequently in Plutarch.

From κλεῖς we have the more common form κλεῖδα Luke xi. 52 and in a few Codd. Rev. iii. 7; xx. 1 (frequently in Sept. Judg. iii, 25; Isa. xxii. 22) for (the Attic) κλεῖν (Thom. M. p. 536; Lob. 460). Yet in the Plur. κλεῖδας, Matt. xvi. 19, has more authority than κλεῖς, which, on the other hand, in Rev. i. 18 is the best attested reading. Just so ἐκδεικνύει 1 Cor. i. 11 and ὤπιες (as Nom. and Acc.) 2 Cor. xii. 20, occur; in Gal. v. 20, however, the correct reading is probably ὤπει. Κρέας has the regular Plur. contraction (Btmt. I. 196), κρέα, Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. viii. 13 (Exod. xvi. 8, 12), as in Xen. C. 1, 3, 6; 2, 2, 2. On the other hand, κέρας has κέρατα Rev. v. 6; xiii. 1, 11; xvii. 12 (Amos iii. 14), κεράτων Rev. ix. 13; xiii. 1 (1 Kings i. 50; ii. 29), and never the contracted κέρα, κέρων (Btmt. I. as above; Bekker, Anecd. III. p. 1001). Lastly, τέρας has always τέρατα Matt. xxiv. 24; Acts ii. 48; v. 12; Jno. iv. 48; τέρατων, Rom. xv. 19, instead of τέρα, τερών, the forms which pass for Attic; see Moeris, p. 339; Btmt. as above.

Note 1. In 1 Thess. v. 3 (Isa. xxxvii. 3) we find ὠς for ὡς, Nom. 64 Sing. of ὡς, like δελφός in later writers not unfrequent, see Btmt. I. 162 267 (cf. also κλεῖδι Const. Porph. 14, 208).

Note 2. In several passages in good MSS. πλοῦτος, contrary to general usage, is used as Neuter, Eph. ii. 7; iii. 8, 16; Phil. iv. 19; Col. ii. 2 (Acta apocr. p. 76), a peculiarity probably originating in the language of the people, as the modern Greeks use indiscriminately both τὸ πλοῦτος and ὁ πλοῦτος, see Coray, Plutarch. vit. II. p. 58; Isocr. II. 103, 106. In the same way we find τὸ χρυσός 2 Cor. ix. 2 in Codd. B [and Sin.]; Phil. iii. 6 in A B [Sin.] (Clem. ep. p. 17 Ittig.) and perhaps τὸ χρυσός Luke xxi. 25, (if the Gen. be accented χρυσός, as it is by Lchm.), according to good Codd., 62 as Malal. p. 121, 436. Compare in later writers, τὸ κλάδος Theophan. 617 ed. contin. ed. Bekker, p. 222; see, in general, Benseler, Isocr. Areopag. p. 106. On the other hand, we find in later writers δ κυρίως Luke xiv. 16 B D; see Hase, ad Leon. Diac. p. 239; Schäf. ind. Aesop. pp. 128, 163; Boisson. Herod. Epim. p. 22, and Anecd. I. 51; and δ τέχνας Ducas p. 266 Bonn.; Acta apocr. p. 84. The heteroclite σκύρος (Poppo, Thuc. I. 225)
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is found only once as Masc. (Heb. xii. 18 σκότη, but not certain), else always Neut. (σκότος, σκότειν) without a single var. noted. As to Ἴμη, which the Sept. sometimes use as Masc. (so too Philo I. 284), in N.T. MSS. the Neut. predominates (var. only Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7; xxiii. 28; Tit. iii. 5; Heb. iv. 16). Θάμβος has, Acts iii. 10, Gen. θάμβος in C.

Note 3. The MSS. have several instances of ν subjoined to the Acc. Sing. in a or ἤ (ἀλήθειαν, συγγενήν, cf. Sturtz, dial. alex. p. 127; Lob. paralip. p. 142), as Matt. ii. 10 ἀπήριπαν, Codd. [Sin' and] Ephr. Jno. xx. 25, ἄρσαν Cod. Alex., and in same Cod. Rev. xii. 13 ἀφανὲς, xiii. 14 ἐκόναν, xxii. 2 μῆναν, Acts xiv. 12 Ἀκαί according to several Codd., and Rom. xvi. 11 συγγενήν, Heb. vi. 19 ἄρσαν (this also in Codd. Ephr. and Cantab.); Rev. i. 13 ποτηριαν. Likewise in the Byzantine writers we find similar forms (see Index to Leo Grammat. p. 532; Boisson. anecod. V. 102), as also in the Apocr. (Tdf. de evang. apocr. p. 137), and in Rev. Lchm. has received into the text the forms quoted above. This subjoined ν is probably not to be considered, with Ross, as an original termination (transmitted in the popular speech), but as an arbitrary extension of the ν usual in the Acc. of many sorts of words (Mth. 208), Lob. paralip. as above. In adjectives of two terminations in η, this form is said to be Aeolic, Mth. 289. Moreover, see also Bornem. on Acts as above.

79 § 10. FOREIGN WORDS AND WORDS WHICH ARE INDECLINABLE.

1. In the case of certain Hellenized Oriental names the Sept. and the N.T. writers have introduced a simple mode of inflection, according to which the Gen., Dat., and Voc. coincide for the most part in one and the same form, and the Acc. is designated by ν. To this class of nouns belong the following: Ἰσραήλ, Gen. Ἰσραήλ Matt. xxvi. 69, Dat. Ἰσραήλ Matt. xxvi. 17, Voc. Ἰσραήλ Mark i. 24, Acc. Ἰσραήλ Matt. xxvi. 4; Acts xx. 21. Δεού or Δεοῦ (Luke v. 29), Acc. Δεοῦ Mark ii. 14. Ἶοσῆ, Gen. Ἶοσῆ Matt. xxvii. 56; Luke iii. 29, etc. (but B D and L have everywhere in Mark Ἰωσῆτος), Bttm. I. 199. Like Ἰσραήλ is declined the Egyptian name Θαμὼν (Plat. Phaed. 274 d.) Mth. I. 198. The word Μωσῆς (Μωῖσῆς) is declined in two ways. The Gen. (also in the Greek Fathers and Byzant. authors) is invariably Μωσῆς (cf. Diod. S. Ecl. 34, p. 194, Lips.). As to the Dat., however, even good Codd. vary between Μωσέω and Μωσῆ (also in Euseb. and Theophan.) and Μωσῆ, cf. Matt. xvii. 4; Mark ix. 5; Luke ix. 33; Jno. v. 46; ix. 29; Acts vii. 44; Rom. ix. 15; 2 Tim. iii. 8. The Acc.

1 Along with these forms, the Codd. of the Sept. often have for the Dat. (Deut. iii. 21, 28; xxxi. 23) and even for the Gen. (Exod. xvii. 14) the form Ἰσραήλ.
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Μωσῆς, Acts vi. 11; vii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 2; Heb. iii. 3 (Diod. S. 1, 94); only Luke xvi. 29 has without var. Μωσία (as Euseb. H. E. 1, 3, and often in Clem. Alex., Geo. Syncell., Glycas, etc.). All these forms, with the exception of Μωσέως, may be derived unhesitatingly from Nom. Μωσῆς (see the analogies Bttm. I. 198, 210, 221). For Μωσέως, a Nom. Μωσεῖς has been demanded; but it does not occur, and after all it is not necessary, since Ἄρης also has sometimes Gen. Ἄρεως (Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 224). Outside of the N. T. the Gen. Μωσῆ is also found in LXX. and Geo. Phrantz., and Μωσῆ in Bauer, glossar. Theodoret. p. 269. Μωσή occurs as Voc. in Exod. iii. 4. Μανασσή in Matt. i. 10 has Acc. Μανασσῆ, according to others Μανασσην.

The name of Solomon in text. rec. is declined Σαλομῶν Matt. i. 6, Σαλομώντος Matt. xii. 42; Luke xi. 31; Jno. x. 23; Acts iii. 11; v. 12 (like Ξανοφῶν, Ξανοφώντος). But the better MSS. have Σαλομῶνος, Σαλο-
μῶνα, see Wetsten. I. 228; and this, being according to analogy and also the received form in Joseph. ed. Haervencamp, deserves probably to be admitted into the text, since the termination ὄν, ὄντος implies derivation from a participle (Bttm. I. 169; Lob. paralip. 347). But then we must write in the Nom. (not Σαλομῶν, as Lehm. even has printed, but) Σαλομῶν 80 agreeably to the better authorities, like Βασιλῶν, etc. (cf. also Pappelb. Cod. Diez. p. 9). Ποσειδῶν (Ποσειδῶνος), being contracted from Ποσειδάων, is not analogous. In the Sept. Σαλομῶν is indeclinable; see 1 Kings iv. 7, 29; v. 12, 15, 16; vi. 18, and elsewhere.

2. Many Hebrew proper names which might have been inflected according to the 3d Decl. are used in the Sept. and in the N. T. as indeclinable; e.g. Ἀαρόν Gen., Heb. vii. 11; ix. 4; Dat., Exod. 66 vii. 9; Acts vii. 40; Acc., Exod. vii. 8; cf. in particular Matt. i. and Luke iii. 23 sqq.; besides Συμεὼν Luke iii. 30, Σαλμών Luke iii. 32, Κεδρὼν Jno. xviii. 1 var. So Ἰεριχώ, Gen. Dent. xxxii. 49; Matt. xx. 29; Heb. xi. 30; Acc., Luke x. 30; xviii. 35 (Glyc. p. 304). Ἰερουσαλήμ, for which, however, in Matt. Mark and Jno. the Grecized form Ἰερουσαλήμ might on the authority of MSS. be preferred, which is regularly declined as Neut., Matt. iv. 25; 64 Mark iii. 8; Luke xxiii. 7; Jno. ii. 23. It is Feminine only in 6th ed.

1 In Glycas Bekker has had printed, even in the new edition, Σαλομώντος, Σαλομώνα, but for the Nom. Σαλομῶν.

2 Elsewhere, on the other hand, we find a twofold mode of declining the word: a. Gen. Ἰεροπόλεις 3 Estr. v. 44, Dat. Ἰεροπόλης Procop. de aedif. 5. 9; Theodoret. V. p. 81, Hal., or Ἰεροπόλη; Joseph. b. j. 1, 21, 4. Said. under Ἡριενή; and ὃ from Ἰερούς (Ptol. 5, 16, 7), Gen. Ἰερεύς Strabo 16, 763, Acc. Ἰερεύς 16, 760, and usually in Josephus.
Matt. ii. 3 (iii. 5 ?). The Sept. has only the form Ἰερουσαλήμ; Joseph., on the contrary, Ἰεροσόλυμα. Τὸ πάσχα, Luke ii. 41; Jno. ii. 23; as in Sept.¹ So also (τὸ) σίκέρα Luke i. 15, and in Sept. Lev. x. 9; Num. vi. 3; Isa. xxiv. 9, etc. (Euseb. praep. ev. 6, 10, has Gen. σίκερος).² The Hebrew Plural termination occurs only in Heb. ix. 5, Ιερουβιμ; this word, however, as in the Sept., is construed as Neut. (Gen. iii. 24; 1 Kings viii. 7; Ezek. x. 5, etc.) like πνεύματα.

Also in Rev. i. 4 a whole phrase (the Greek equivalent for τῷ Θεῷ) is treated as indeclinable: ἀπὸ τοῦ και τῆς ἑα, καὶ τῶν ἵραπον, perhaps with design (as the name of the immutable One) like ἰδίον, μηθέν, etc. in Greek philosophical writings, even in Aristotel. e.g. polit. 5, 3; Procl. theol. Plat. 2. ed. Hoeschel μετὰ τοῦ ἐστιν, χωρίς τοῦ ἐστι (Stollberg, de solocis. N. T. p. 14 sqq.). On the other hand, in Creuzer’s edition of the writings of Proclus we find invariably ἐκ τοῦ ἱερᾶ, ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. Cf. also τὸν ὅ θεον, Schäf. Demosth. III. 282.
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§ 11. INFLATION AND COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES.

1. Adjectives of three terminations, particularly those in ὅσος, μορός, ἔνος, are not unfrequently (especially in Attic authors) used as adjectives of only two terminations (Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. p. 77, Lips.; Monk, Eurip. Hippol. p. 56, and Eurip. Alcest. 126, 67 548,1043; Mtth. 295ff.). In the N. T. we find Luke ii. 13 στραταὶ οὐράνιος, Acts xxvi. 19, κόσμος 1 Tim. ii. 9; also Rev. iv. 3 Ἰρᾶς (Fem.) κυκλῳδέω τοῦ βρόντου ὅμοιος (the best established reading) σμαραγδίνα, etc.; see my exeget. Stud. I. 152. On the other hand, in 1 Tim. ii. 8 ὅσιος χεῖρας (for χειρὰς, which some Codd. in fact have), ὅσιος may possibly be construed with ἐπαίροντας, though that is not necessary (Fr. Rom. III. 16). Cf. also Tit. iii. 9 μάταιοι referring to a Fem. subst., and Jas. i. 26 μάταιος ἡ θησακεία.

On the other hand, later Greek has used adjectives of two terminations as adjectives of three terminations; as, ἄργος Lob. p. 105,

¹ So also in the Fathers; see Suicer, thes. II. 607 sqq.; Epiphani. haer. II. 19 gives inflection even to the Plur. τὰ πάσχα.

² Most of these names are declined in Josephus, who generally, in conformity to the genius of the Greek language, gives terminations to almost all proper names (of persons), and consequently declines them; e.g. Ἀδώμος, Ἰσμαήλος, Νάχος, Ἰσακος, and others. The instances of undeclined foreign names, which Georgi, Hierocr. I. 138, produces from Plato and Pausan., are partly not to the point, and partly prove nothing against the tendency to inflection. Even Ptolem., besides the large number of declined names of places, used some as indeclinable; Notis, schedae Ptolem. I. (Lips. 1641. 8vo.) p. 23 sq.
§ 11. INFLECTION AND COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES.


Ἀλώνος has in the N. T. usually but two terminations; but in 2 Thess. ii. 16; Heb. ix. 12 ἀλωιας occurs in the text, and in the latter passage without var.; also, according to single Codd., in 2 Pet. i. 11; Acts xiii. 48; cf. Num. xxv. 13, Plat. Tim. 38 b. Βεστια Rom. iv. 16, etc., which the fastidious Thom. M. 149 declares to be corrupt, is found in Isocr., Demosth. (Weber, Dem. p. 133), Xenoph., etc., cf. Duker, Thuc. 2, 43. Ἐρημος, which even in Attic varies (cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 262; Mtth. 306), in the N. T. always has two terminations. As to ἀσφαλην Heb. vi. 19, i.e. ἀσφαλη [so too Lchm. in his stereotype ed., while in his larger ed. he writes ἀσφαλη] see § 9. note 3, p. 66.

The N. T. Lexicons [Grimm, however, has it correctly] give γνῆσιος as an adjective of two terminations (Phil. iv. 3?) without sufficient reason, since the Fem. in the form γνῆσιος cannot be shown to occur.

2. On the Comparison of adjectives we have only to observe,

a. The Compar. Neut. of ταχύς is τάχιον (Jno. xx. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 14; Heb. xiii. 19, 23, etc.), for which in earlier Greek θάσσου, and in Attic θάττον, was usual. Τάχιον occurs regularly in Diod. S., Dion. H., Plutarch and others, Lob. p. 77; Meineke, Menandr. p. 144; cf. also 1 Macc. ii. 40; Wisd. xiii. 9.

b. In 3 Jno. 4 we find a double Comparative μείζονερος, and in Eph. iii. 8 a Compar. formed from the Superlative ἐλαχιστότερος (cf. ἐλαχιστότατος Sext. Emp. 9, 406, and in Latin, minimissimus, pessimissimus). Such forms belong specially to the diction of poetry (Apoll. Rhod. 2, 368, μείζονερος), or to the later language which sought thus to strengthen the Comparative that had become weak to the popular mind; cf. κρείττονερος Ducas 27, 29, 37, μείζονερος ibid. c. 27, and Malal. 18, p. 490, μείζονερος Constant. Porph. III. 257, πλειώτερος Theophan. p. 567. Yet some such instances are found even in earlier authors (see Wetst. II. 247), though, as in the case of ἑχωριώτερος Aristot. Metaph. 10, 4, not as already existing and current, but as arbitrary formations; see 7th ed. Bttm. I. 274 f., Lob. Phryn. p. 136. In German compare the form mehrere from mehr.

c. The Comparatives κατωτερος Eph. iv. 9, ἀνωτερος Luke xiv. 10, ἐσωτερος Acts xvi. 24, from the adverbs κάτω, ἄνω, ἐσω, are groundlessly questioned by Bttm. I. 271. They are the undoubted read-
ings in the N. T. and Sept., and not only occur frequently in later authors, as Leo Diac. 10, 1, but even in Attic, Mth. 328.

On the form of the Comp. of other Adverbs derived from Adjectives, as περισσοτέρως 2 Cor. i. 12; Gal. i. 14; Phil. ii. 28, etc., which is not unknown to classic Greek writers, see Bttm. II. 345; Elmsley, Eurip. Herac. p. 100 Lips.

The Positive ἤμερος 1 Tim. ii. 2 is not found in earlier Greek (Bttm. I. 271, II. 343); Lob. pathol. p. 158 has shown that it occurs in Inscript. Olbiopol. 2059, 24.

§ 12. AUGMENT AND REDUPLICATION OF REGULAR VERBS.

1. A temporal Augment instead of the syllabic occurs,
   a. In the Imperfect ἡμελλε Jno. iv. 47; xi. 51; xii. 38; xviii. 32; Luke x. 1; Acts xvi. 27; xxvii. 33; Rev. x. 4, with decided preponderance of authority. On the contrary, ἡμελλε in Luke ix. 31; Jno. vi. 71; Heb. xi. 8, is better attested. See in general Böckh, Plat. Men. p. 148 sq.
   b. In the Imperfect ἠδύνατο Matt. xxvi. 9; Mark vi. 5, 19; xiv. 5; Jno. ix. 33; xi. 37; Luke viii. 19; xix. 3, with preponderance of authority; there is good evidence on the other hand for ἠδύνατο Luke i. 22; Acts xxvi. 32, and Rev. xiv. 3, and ἠδύνασθε 1 Cor. iii. 2. The Aorist ἠδύνηθην is fully established in Matt. xvii. 16, 19; Mark ix. 28; Luke ix. 40; 1 Cor. iii. 1. See on these current Attic forms Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 32; Bttm. I. 317; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 554; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. p. 208; Boisson. Aen. Gaz. p. 173, and Anecd. V. p. 19; cf. Bornem. Act. p. 278.
   c. But neither ἠκολούθην Acts xv. 37; xxviii. 18 nor ἠκολούθην 2 Jno. 12 (Mth. 375) is sufficiently attested; see Bornem. Act. 233.

2. The syllabic Augment in a verb beginning with a vowel occurs, Jno. xix. 32f. κατέσααν 1st Aor. from κατάγηθι (cf. Thom. M. 498), and even in the other Moods, as κατεσεῖ η Jno. xix. 31, Bttm. II. 97; cf. Thuc. 3, 89; Aristot. anim. 9, 43; Plat. Cratyl. 389 b. and c. Also Fut. κατέσαα Matt. xii. 20 and Sept., to distinguish it from the Fut. of the verb κατάγω. On the other hand, instead of ἐωνησάμην, in which verb the syllabic Augment is most usual in Greek authors, we find Acts vii. 16 ἐωνησάμην, as sometimes in classic Greek (Lob. 139); and for ἐωσα, ἐωσάμην Acts

1 In Cinnam. p. 190, we find besides an unusual form of the Perfect, κατέγηθε.
vii. 27, 39, 45, ὁσα, ὁσάμην, see § 15. Cf. similar instances in Poppo, Thuc. III. II. p. 407; Index to Leo Gramm. p. 538.

3. In verbs beginning with εὐ we find


b. With Augm. ἔχομαι preponderating Rom. ix. 3 (without Augm. see Xen. Anab. 4, 8, 25; Cyrop. 3, 2, 15, yet not without var.), ἐχαριστήσαμεν Rom. i. 21, ἐχαρίσθησαν Luke xii. 16 (doubtful), ἔλκαιρων Mark vi. 31 (on the other hand Acts xvii. 21 doubtful), ἔφρασθη Acts ii. 26 (from Sept.). Cf. generally Bttm. I. 321; Poppo, Thuc. I. 227, also Lehm. Lucian II. p. 456. Ἐναγγελζ. has the Augm. after εὐ, and that without var. Acts viii. 35, 40; xvii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 1; Gal. iv. 13; Rev. x. 7, etc. (see Lob. p. 269), even προευγγελίσατο Gal. iii. 8. So also εἰσαρέστει Ἡβ. xi. 5 (yet Cod. A and several others, without Augm.). Of προ- 84 εἴχεσθαι the forms nearly always have Augm. without var., as προσηγείρατο Matt. xxvi. 44, προσηγίζετο Mark i. 35; Acts viii. 15; Luke xxii. 41, etc.

4. The only verb beginning with οὖ which occurs in past tenses, οἰκοδομέω, has, not indeed without var., but on vastly preponderating authority, the regular Augment; as, φικοδόμησε Matt. vii. 24; 67 xxii. 33, φικοδόμησα Luke iv. 29, φικοδομητή Οι. 28, φικοδομήθη 69 vi Jno. ii. 20. Only in Acts vii. 47, good Codd. have οἰκοδομήσε, on which latter form see Lob. 153.

5. Προφητεύεω has in Jude 14 with preponderating authority the Augment after the preposition, as usual (Bttm. I. 335); but the better Codd. give elsewhere forms like ἐπροφήτευσαν Matt. xi. 13, ἐπροφητεύσαμεν Matt. vii. 22, ἐπροφήτευσε Matt. xv. 7; Mark vii. 6; Luke i. 67; Jno. xi. 51, ἐπροφήτευσα Acts xix. 6. Schulz ad Matt. vii. 22, advised that the latter should be everywhere received into the text, and this Lchm. and Tdf. have done. In later writers the Augment is often put before the preposition; as,
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ἔπρόσθηκεν, ἐσμμυβούλευν (see Index to Ducas, to Jo. Cananus and others, in the Bonn ed.), ἐκατήχου Επιφαν. Mon. 33, 16. In προφητεύω, however, this is less surprising, as there was no simple φητεύω; cf. Num. xi. 25 f; Sir. xlvi. 13.

6. The Augment of the form εἶληφα (for the unusual λέληφα, Bttm. I. 316), is transferred also to the 1st Aor., κατειλήφθη for κατειλήφθη Jno. viii. 4, not without var. (see Maiattle, dialectt. ed. Sturz, p. 58); traces of this already existed in Ionism.

7. A double Augment occurs,


b. In ἄνερφεν Jno. ix. 14, 30, ἄνερψθη Luke i. 64 (Bttm. II. 250), once even in Aor. Inf. ἄνερψθηνai Luke iii. 21. Good Codd. give, further, many other forms in this verb, viz. ἵναφεν Rev. xii. 16 etc., ἴναιχθησαν Rev. xx. 12, ἵναίην Acts xii. 10; Rev. xi. 19; xv. 5, as in Sept. and later writers (Bttm. as above 251; Lob. p. 153), and with a threelfold augment, Matt. ix. 30 ἰναίχθησαν; Jno. ix. 10; Acts xvi. 26; Acts ix. 8; Rev. xix. 11 ἰναιγμένου (Nicet. Eugen. 2, 84, 128, var.); var. Jno. ix. 14; Rev. xx. 12 (Gen. vii. 11; viii. 6; Dan. vii. 10; 3 Macc. vi. 18). Cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 669.

c. In ἰνερχεσθε 2 Cor. xi. 1, 4, text. rec. (cf. Thuc. 5, 45, Herod. 8, 5, 9) and ἰνερχόμην, for ἰνεχ. Acts xviii. 14 (cf. Her. 7, 159; Thuc. 8, 28) exactly as in Greek writers, who in these forms hardly admit the single Augm. (Bttm. II. 189); yet in 2 Cor. the better Codd. have ἰνερχεσθε.

8. Ἐργάζομαι has, according to Codd., several times ἦργαζατο for ἐργάζατο Matt. xxxv. 16; xxvi. 10; Mark xiv. 6; Luke xix. 16; Acts xviii. 3 (Exod. xxxvi. 4). The same form occurs also in a good MS. of Demosth. (Schäf. appar. V. p. 553); cf. Sturz, p. 125. On the other hand, good Codd. (Lehm. and Tdf.) have from ἐλυκοῦν in Luke xvi. 20, ἐλυκομένος; cf. also Clem. Al. p. 348 Sylb.

9. The Augm. is for the most part entirely omitted in the forms of the Pluperf.; as, Mark xiv. 44 δεδώκει (xv. 10; Jno. xi. 57),

2 Compare also ἦρχοψτενον Leo Gramm. pp. 33, 35, and 36, ἰνερχόκεθα ποιεῖ Παναρ. 462, ἰνερχόκεθαν ibid. 478, ἰνάρχοχται Theophan. 112, ἰναιγεῖ Θεodor. Gramm. 40, 8. As to the Attic Authors, see V. Frisseche, Aristoph. I. 55.
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Mark xv. 7 πεποιήκεισαν (xvi. 9 ἐκβεβλήκει), Luke vi. 48 [var.; 68 Matt. vii. 25] τεθεμελίωτο, 1 Jno. ii. 19 μεμενήκεισαν, Acts xiv. 8 περιπετατίκες (see Valckenaer on the passage), vs. 23 πεπιστεύκεισαν.

In consistency, these forms are to be preferred in the N. T. text. Ionic prose authors also (Her. 1, 122. 3, 42. 9, 22) and Attic (e.g. Plato) drop the Augm. in the Pluperf. often, especially in forms that would offend the ear (Bttm. I. 318), particularly in compounds (cf. Acts xiv. 8); (see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 179; Poppo, Thuc. I. p. 228; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 272; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 68; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. pp. 265, 284); cf. Thuc. 8, 92; Xen. C. 8, 2, 24. As to the later writers see especially the Index to Joa. Cinnam. Bonn ed.

10. The reduplication after the analogy of μέμνημασι (Bttm. I. 315) appears in μημ橐εόςθαι Luke i. 27; ii. 5 μεμνηστευμένη, not, however, without the opposition of good Codd. Cf. Sept. Deut. xx. 7; xxii. 23 sqq. On μεραντισμένοι Heb. x. 22, see § 13, 1. b.

In the best Codd. the Aor. of the compound ἐπαιχινομαι 2 Tim. i. 16, is formed without the temp. Aug. ἐπαιχινόθη, and recent editors have admitted it into the text. So also Luke xiii. 13, ἀναθομῆθη.

§ 13. RARE FORMS IN THE TENSES AND PERSONS OF REGULAR VERBS.

1. a. Tenses which in other respects follow completely the 71 analogy of the 2d Aor., have in the Sept. the termination α and ἀδ so forth (of the 1st Aor.) (see Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 61; Valckenaer, Herod. p. 649, 91; Dorville, Charit. p. 402; Wolf, Demosth. Lept. 86 p. 216), e.g. εἰδαμεν 1 Sam. x. 14, εἰδαν and ἐφυγαν 2 Sam. x. 14, εὗραν xvii. 20, ἐφάγαμεν xix. 42, ἔλθατο Esth. v. 4 (Prov. ix. 5; Amos vi. 2; 2 Chron. xxix. 17), etc. In the N. T. modern editors have restored this form, agreeably to the concurrent testimony of the best Codd.1: Matt. xxv. 36 ἠλθατε, ἐξῆλθατε, Matt. xxvi. 39 παρελθατω, 2 Thess. ii. 13 έξάτατο, Acts vii. 10; xii. 11 ἐζείκατο, vii. 21 ἀνείκατο, Gal. v. 4 ἐκέπεσατε, Rev. vii. 11 (Heb. iii. 17; Jno. xviii. 6) ἐσέσατ, Jno. vi. 10 ἀνέπεσαν, Heb. ix. 12 ἐφράμενος, (Epiph. Opp. I. 619; Theodoret, Opp. II. 837, Hal.) cf. Acts ii. 23; xvii. 6; xii. 7; xvi. 37; xxii. 16; Matt. vii. 13, 25; xi. 7 f.;

1 Respecting the MSS. which have this form, see Hug, Einleit. I. S. 238, 242, 244, 247, 249, 253; Scholz, curae crit. p. 40; Rinck, lucubratt. p. 37; Tyl. prolegg. ad Cod. Ephraemi, p. 21.
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In many passages where this form appears in only a few Codd. it might be attributed to the transcribers, particularly where similar flexions in a precede or follow; see Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 282 Lips.; Fr. Mr. 638 sqq. Further, it is found mainly in the 1st Per. Sing. and Plur. or 2d or 3d Per. Plur. In the 2d Sing., on the other hand, the Imperative and the Partic., it very seldom occurs. On instances of such Aor. in Greek authors (e.g. Orpheus) see Bttm. I. 404. Προσέπεσα occurring in Eurip. Troad. 293 Seidler has changed into προσέπεσον; and in Alcest. 477, undoubtedly πέσοι should be read for πέτεςει, see Herm. on the passage.


b. The past tenses of verbs beginning with ρ are found in the best Codd. with a single ρ (cf. § 5 No. 4); as, 2 Cor. xi. 25 ἐραβδιθν, Hcb. ix. 19 ἐρανυτε (x. 22 ἐρανυτμενοι), Matt. xxvi. 67 ἐπιτασσαν, according to AD 2 Tim. iii. 11 ἐρύσατο, according to AC [Sin.] iv. 17 ἐρύσαθν; cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 18; Exod. v. 29; vii. 10; Lev. xiv. 7, 51; Num. viii. 7. Such forms are confessedly poetical, Bttm. I. 84; Mthh. I. 124, yet they frequently occur also in the Codd. of Greek prose, Bast, comment. crit. p. 788. In the Perf. the Codd.

1 They are mostly verbs whose 1st Aor. is not in use.
2 Λάδεσαν, which, according to good Codd., occurs in Luke xxiv. 10; xvii. 7 (a trace of it appears in Polyb. 6, 37, 4, ἐπεσαμενοι var.), must be the Imperat. of a similarly formed Aor. Mid. (Ανακώσων). As, however, the latter nowhere occurs, Λάδεσαν is probably to be regarded as a mistake of the copyist (copyists often interchanged e and ai) for Λάδεσα, which, in fact, is the reading of the best Codd., and has been recently received into the text; cf. also Rinck, Lucubratt. p. 330. Besides, it is only the 2d Aor. Act. of this verb that is found, Matt. xv. 35; Mark vi. 40; Luke xi. 37; xxii. 14; Jno. vi. 10, etc. The Fut. (as πεσαν), for which Fr. Mr. p. 641 is disposed to take these forms, does not accord well with the construction, particularly as in the second passage Imperatives immediately follow.
3 On the other hand, a Greek inscription in Bockh, II. 220 has, distinctly, ὑψωσα.
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Al. [Sin.] and Ephraem. Heb. x. 22, give the reduplicated form ἰεραντισμένοι, of which, besides the Homeric (Odyssey. 6, 59) ἰερυ-στϊμενα, several examples occur in later writers, Lob. paralip. 13. So in Matt. ix. 36 the Cod. Cantab. gives ἰερυμμένοι, which Lohm. has adopted.

c. The Futures of verbs in ἵσω sometimes are found (with unimportant var. in Codd.) in the contracted form; as, μετονιῳ Acts vii. 48, ἀφορεῖ Matt. xxv. 32, ἀφοροῦσι Matt. xiii. 49, γνωρίοῦσι Col. iv. 9, καθαρεῖ Heb. ix. 14, διακαθαρεῖ Matt. iii. 12, ἐλπίοῦσι Matt. xii. 21, μακαρόνοι Luke i. 48, etc. This is an Atticism (though the same form was not foreign to the Ionians also); cf. Georgi, Hieroc. I. p. 29; Fischer, Weller. II. p. 355; Mtth. I. p. 402. Of ἀπεικόνω the common form ἀπεικόνη is used Matt. iii. 11. On στηρίζω see § 15. In the Sept. verbs in ἵσω also are inflicted after the same analogy in the Future, e.g. ἔργάται Lev. xxv. 40, ἀρπά xix. 13, etc. Such Attic Futures of contract verbs some have wished to find in Matt. ii. 4 γεννάται, Jno. xvi. 17 θεωρεῖται (on account of ἐπιστευθείς following), Matt. xxvi. 18 παῖδε; but all these are Presents. See § 41, 2; cf. Fr. Mt. as above, Mtth. p. 403 f.

d. Of verbs in ἀνω, λεναῖν has in the Aor. the Attic form (Bttm. I. 439) λεναῖα Mark ix. 8, and βασκαίνω Gal. iii. 1 in var. has the equally classic form ἐβδομάς. But στήμαν ἀνω has Aor. ἐστήμανα Acts xi. 28; Rev. i. 1, see below, § 15. Μαραίνω 1 Cor. i. 20 and ἥραίνω Jas. i. 11, have the a as verbs in χαίνω do regularly. Respecting φάνα see § 15, p. 89.

e. Futures Subjunctive are occasionally noted in individual passages, from a greater or less number of Codd., e.g. 1 Cor. xiii. 3 καυθοῦσαι (adopted by Griesbach), 1 Pet. iii. 1 κερδοθήσωνται, 1 Tim. vi. 8 ἀρκεοθεσώμεθα (in both passages without much authority). In the better class of authors such forms probably originate with the transcribers, see Abresch in Observatt. misc. III. p. 13; Lob. 721; but in later writers, and the Scholiasts particularly (cf. Thuc. 3, 11 and 54), they cannot be rejected (see Niebuhr, ind. ad Agath. p. 418, and ind. to Theophan. p. 682). In the N. T., however, there is very little authority for these Subjunctives. Quite isolated are ἐπισκόπη Rev. xviii. 14 and ἐπισκοποῦ Rev. ix. 6 (yet an Aor. ἐπισκόπα also occurs, see Lob. p. 721), γνώσονται Acts 88 xxi. 24 (yet cf. Lob. p. 735). (ἐπιστευθείς Luke xiii. 28 and ἐπιστεύ Jno. xvii. 2, are unquestionably Aor.)

2. Peculiar personal endings are:

a. The 2d Per. Sing. Pres. and Fut. Pass. and Mid. in εἰ for ἦν;
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as, ὁμιλεῖ Luke xxii. 42, παρέξει vii. 4 (var.), ὁψεῖ Matt. xxvii. 4 and Jno. xi. 40 (var.). Cf. also Matt. xxvii. 4; Acts xvi. 31; xxiv. 8 (var.). In the two verbs ἀπετέθαι and ὁμιλεῖσθαι this is the form invariably used in Attic (Bttm. I. 348); in other verbs it seldom occurs, and almost exclusively in the poets (cf. Valcken. ad Phoen. p. 216 sq.; Fischer ad Weller. I. p. 119, II. p. 399; Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 34; Schwarz ad Olear. p. 225), yet it appears in good MSS. even of Attic prose, Bttm. as above; but cf. Schneider, praef. ad Plat. civ. I. p. 49 sqq.

b. In the 2d Per. Sing. we find the original uncontracted form not only in δύνασαι (Matt. v. 36; viii. 2; Mark i. 40) where it continued to be the usual form, Bttm. I. 502 (yet cf. δύνη Mark ix. 22; Rev. ii. 2, and var. Luke xvi. 2,1 which at first was used only by the poets, subsequently by prose authors also, e.g. Polyb. 7. 11. 5; Aelian. 18. 32, see Lob. 359), but we find it also in contract verbs, ἤδυνασαι Luke xvi. 25 (Aeschyl. Choëph. 354), κακάσασαι Rom. ii. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 7, and κατακακάσασαι Rom. xi. 18; cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 184; Bttm. I. 347; Boisson. Anecd. IV. p. 479. See πίνω below.

c. In the 3d Per. Plur. of the Perfect av for aσί (from the 71 old termination aντι); as, ἔγρωκαν Jno. xvii. 7, τετήρηκαν xvii. 6, ἐπιδέρκαν Rev. xix. 3, also Luke ix. 36 and Col. ii. 1 ἔωρακαν in very good Codd., likewise Rev. xxi. 6; Jas. v. 4. So also in Sept., e.g. Deut. xi. 7; Judith vii. 10 (Acta apocr. p. 235). This form belongs to the Alexandrian dialect; cf. Sext. Emp. 1, 10, p. 261, and the Papyri Taurin. p. 24 (κεκυρίεκαν); but occurs also in Lycophr. 252 (πεφρικαν), in inscriptions and often in the Byzantine writers (cf. Index to Lucas p. 639, to Codin. and Leo Gramm.); see Bttm. I. 345. Tdf. has received it into the text in all the above passages of the N. T. But in Rev. ii. 3 he has rejected [yet not in ed. vii.] the form κεκοπίακεν (Exod. v. 22) found in AC.


e. The 3d Per. Plur. of the Imperative in τωσαν occurs repeat-

---

1 As to this form, which some would exchange for δύνη, compare Porson, Eurip. Hec. 257; Schäfl. and Hm. Soph. Philoct. 787; Oudem. ad Thom. M. p. 252; Lob. p. 359.
edly in the N. T.; as, 1 Cor. vii. 9 γαμησάτωσαν, vii. 36 γαμεῖτωσαν, 1 Tim. v. 4 μαθανεῖτωσαν (Tit. iii. 14), cf. Acts xxiv. 20; xxv. 5. The assertion of Elmsley, Eurip. Iphig. T. p. 232, ed. Lips., that this form did not become usual till after Aristotle's time, has been fully refuted by Mth. I. 442 and Bornem. Xen. An. p. 38.

f. The 3d Per. Plur. of the historical tenses has often, in good Codd., the termination οσαν (Bttm. I. 346); as, Jno. xv. 22, 24 εἶχοσαν for εἶχον, xix. 3 εἶδοσαν for εἴδον, 2 Thess. iii. 6 παρελθοσαν, and Rom. iii. 13 from Sept. ἐδολῳδον. This termination is much used in the Sept. and by the Byzantines; as, Exod. xv. 27 ἡλθοσαν, Josh. v. 11 ἐφάγοσαν, Exod. xvi. 24 κατέλποσαν, xviii. 26 ἐκφύοσαν, Niceph. Greg. 6, 5, p. 113 εἴδοσαν, Nicet. Chron. 21, 7, p. 402 κατηλθοσαν, Niceph. Bryenn. p. 165 μετήλθοσαν, Brunck, Analect. II. p. 47; cf. also 1 Macc. vi. 31; Cant. iii. 3; v. 7; vi. 8; Josh. ii. 1; iii. 14; v. 11; vi. 14; viii. 19; Judg. xix. 11; i. 6; Ruth i. 4; Lam. ii. 14; Ezek. xxii. 11; Exod. xxxii. 8, etc., Fischer, Weller. II. p. 336 sq.; Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 165 sq.; Lob. Phryn. 349, and pathol. 485; Sturz, p. 58 sqq. In the N. T. however, with the exception of Rom. as above, only single Codd. give this form, and it may possibly be attributable everywhere to the Alexandrian transcribers.

3. Of contracted verbs we must note

a. The Future ἔκεχω Acts ii. 17, 18 Sept., after the manner of verbs in α, ρ, v, ρ, cf. LXX. Ezek. vii. 8; xxi. 31; Jer. xiv. 16; Hos. v. 10; Zech. xii. 10; Bttm. I. p. 369. Were it accented ἔκεχω, it would be, according to Elmsley, the Attic Fut., as this form is both Pres. and Fut.; see Bttm. II. 325. But in Sept. with the same accent it is further inflected, ἐκεχεικ, ἐκεχείτε, Exod. iv. 9; xxix. 12; xxx. 18; Deut. xii. 16.

b. The usual forms of the two verbs διψῶ, πενῶ, in the (Attic) literary language were Inf. διψήν, πενήν, and Indic. διψής, διψῆ, etc., Bttm. I. 487. In the N. T. we find instead διψᾶν, διψᾶ Rom. xii. 20; Jno. vii. 37, πενῶν Phil. iv. 12, πενᾶ Rom. xii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 21, which first occurs after the time of Aristot. (Anim. 72 9, 31, cf. Sallier ad Thom. M. p. 699; Lob. 61). According to the same analogy we find Fut. πενῶσα (for πενῆωσ) Rev. vii. 16; 90 Jno. vi. 35 var. (Isa. v. 27; Psalm xliii. 12), and 1st Aor. ἐπείνασα Mark ii. 25; xi. 12; Matt. xii. 1, 3; xxx. 35; Luke iv. 2. Both forms are peculiarities of later Greek; see Lob. 204.

c. Of verbs in ο, retaining η in the Fut. etc. (Lob. paral. 435), we find in the N. T. καλέω, τελέω (Bttm. I. p. 392), also φορέω
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and ἐφόρεσα 1 Cor. xv. 49 (Sir. 11, 5; Palaeph. 52, 4). In the classics the usual form is φορήσω; yet even Isaeus has φορέσαι, see Bttm. II. 315. (On the other hand εὐφόρησεν Luke xii. 16.) On ἀπολέσω and ἐπανεῖσω, see below, § 15.

§ 14. RARE INFLECTIONS OF VERBS IN MI AND OF IRREGULAR VERBS.

1. Of verbs in μι we find:


b. 3d Per. Plur. Pres. τιθέασι for τιθεῖσι Matt. v. 15, περιτιθέασι Mark xv. 17, ἐπετιθέασι Matt. xxiii. 4. This is the better and more usual form; cf. Thuc. 2, 84; Aristot. Metaph. 11. 1; Theophr. plant. 2, 6; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 145 sq., who adduces many instances, and Mtht. I. 488; Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 250. Similarly διδάσας Rev. xvii. 13, according to the best Codd.; cf. Her. I. 93; Thuc. I. 42. The contracted forms τιθεῖσι and especially διδοσι belong to the later language; Lob. p. 244.

c. In the Imperf. the 3d Per. Plur. has the contracted form ἠδίδουν for ἠδίδοσαν in compounds, Acts iv. 33; xxvii. 1; cf. Hesiod. ἔργ. 123. In the Sing. the form ἠδίδουν is more common; Bttm. I. 509.

d. On the abbreviated but very (perhaps only) common Inf. Perf. Act. ἔστάναι (for ἐστηκέναι) 1 Cor. x. 12, see Bttm. II. 26 f., cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 182 sq.

e. The Imperative Pres. Pass. in several Codd. is περιτότασο 2 Tim. ii. 16; Tit. iii. 9 (ἀφίστασο 1 Tim. vi. 5 var.) for which περιτοτω etc. is more usual; see Th. M. p. 75; Mtht. I. 495.

f. There are weighty authorities for forms like ἵστωμεν Rom. iii. 31, εὐμπιτὼντες 2 Cor. vi. 4; x. 18 (Niceph. Bryenn. p. 41, cf. καθιστῶν Agath. 316, 2), ἀποκαθιστά Mark ix. 12 (Dan. ii. 21; 2 Sam. xviii. 12; Fabric. Pseudep. II. 610; ἐνιστά Plat. Tim. 38a.) from the form ἵσταω (Her. 4, 103, as ἀφίσταω Joa. Cinnam. p. 121, ἐφιστάω p. 65, καθιστά p. 104); see Grammatici gracci, ed. Dind. I. 251; Dorville, Charit. p. 542; Mtht. I. 482. Similarly ἐμπιτπλών (from ἐμπιτπλάω) Acts xiv. 17, cf. ἐμπιτρπόν Leo Diac. 2, 1.

g. Optat. Pres. δοήν for δοή Rom. xv. 5; 2 Tim. i. 16, 18 (ii. 7); Eph. i. 17; iii. 16; Jno. xv. 16, ἀποδόη 2 Tim. iv. 14. This is a
AND OF IRREGULAR VERBS.

later form, (in Plat. Gorg. 481 a., Lys. c., Andoc. p. 215, T. IV. 73 recent editors have restored δέφ, and in Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 35 even Schneider changed δέφης into δοίης), see Sept. Gen. xxi. 28; xxviii. 4; Num. v. 21; xi. 29, etc., Themist. or. 8, p. 174 d.; Philostr. Apoll. 1. 34; Dio Chr. 20. 267; Aristaes, p. 120, Haver. etc., which the ancient grammarians reject (Phryn. p. 345; Moeris p. 117); cf. Lob. 346; Sturz, 52; Bttm. in Mus. antiqu. stud. I. 238.\(^1\)

h. From βαίνω, 2d Aor. ἔβην, we find the Imperative ἀνάβα Rev. 76 iv. 1, κατάβα Mark xv. 30 var. (on the contrary κατάβηθι. Matt. xxvii. 40; Jno. iv. 49, μετάβηθι vii. 3; cf. Thom. Mag. p. 495, and Oudendorp, h. l.). Similarly Eurip. Electr. 113; Aristoph. Acharn. 202, and Vesp. 979; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 153 sq.; Bttm. II. 125. Quite analogous is ἀνάστα Acts xii. 7; Eph. v. 14; cf. Theocrit. 24, 36; Menand. p. 48; Mein. Aesop. 62, de Fur. (but ἀνάστηθι Acts ix. 6, 34, ἐπίστηθι 2 Tim. iv. 2), also ἀπόστα protev. Jac. 2., παράστα Acta apocr. 51.

i. The N. T. Codd. vary as to the form of the Perf. Part. Neut. of ἱστημι. Yet the better Codd. have in the two passages Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14 [A.C. Sin. also in Rev. xiv. 1] ἐστός (ἐστηκός), exactly as the oldest and best Codd. of Greek authors (Bttm. II. 208), and this form Bekker in Plato prefers throughout. Elsewhere the uncontracted forms of this participle not unfrequently occur in good MSS. of the N. T., as Matt. xxvii. 47 ἐστηκότων Mark ix. 1; xi. 5, ἐστηκός Jno. iii. 29; vi. 22, παραστηκόσιν Mark xiv. 69, and, for the most part, have been received into the text.

The (pretty well attested) form δώσῃ Jno. xvii. 2; Rev. viii. 3 (xiii. 16 δώσωσιν) occurs also Theocrit. 27, 21, and is, according to some, Doric. In Theocrit. indeed it has for a long time been corrected to δώῃ; yet δώσῃ occurs often enough in later writers (Lob. 721; cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 871; Index ad Theophan.), and probably may be classed among the corrupt forms in which the popular speech indulged.

2. From εἰμι we find:

a. The Imperat. ἐγὼ for ἐστώ (which in the N. T. is also the usual form) 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Jas. v. 12 (Ps. civ. 31; 1 Macc. x. 31; cf. Clem. Alex. strom. 6, 275; Acta Thom. 3, 7) Bttm. I. 529; only once in Plato, rep. 2, 361 d., see Schneider, h. l. According to Heraclides (in Eustath. p. 1411, 22) the inflection is Doric. The other Imperative form ἐσθι occurs in Matt. ii. 18; v. 25; Mark v. 34; Luke xix. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 15 (Bttm. I. 527).

\(^1\) This form is surprising also in the N. T., as it everywhere stands where otherwise according to the idiom of the N. T. the Subjunctive would stand.
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b. The form ἤμων Imperf. Mid. 1st Per. Sing. (Bttm. I. 527), which is rejected by the Atticists and became quite usual (particularly with ἦς, as in the N.T. once in Gal. i. 10) only in later writers (Lob. 152; Schäf. Long. 423; Valcken. in N.T. I. 478), is the common form; as, Matt. xxv. 35; Jno. xi. 15; Acts x. 30; xi. 5, 17; 1 Cor. xiii. 11, etc.; cf. Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 3; ἤμεθα for ἤμων occurs (Matt. xxiii. 30) twice in very good Codd., and has already been received into the text by Griesbach. Also Acts xxvii. 37; Lchm., agreeably to A [Sin.] and B, adopted it. On the other hand, in Gal. iv. 3; Eph. ii. 3 it has little authority. The form does not occur in any good writer; yet see Epiph. Opp. II. 383; Malal. 16, p. 404.

c. For ἵσθαι Mark xiv. 67, Codd. of little weight have ἵς, rare in Attic, and almost doubtful (Bttm. I. 528). As to its use in later Greek, see Lob. 149.

Note. Ἰς. Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11; Jas. i. 17 (doubtful in 1 Cor. vi. 5), cf. Sir. 37, 2, is usually considered (with the ancient grammarians, cf. Schol. ad Aristoph. Nub. 482) to be contracted from ἵστο, and this opinion is defended also by Fr. Mr. p. 642. It is probably better, however, with Bttm. II. 375, to take it for the preposition Ἰς (ἔν, ἐν with the accent thrown back) which, like ἐς, πάρα, etc., is used without ἵαυ; as the supposed contraction would be harsh, and without example. Bttm.'s view, moreover, is supported by the analogy of ἐς and πάρα, the latter of which can hardly be a contraction from πάρεστι, cf. Krü. 26. This Ἰς is very frequent in Attic, both in poetry and prose; Georgi, Hierocr. I. 152; Schwarz, Comm. 486. The poets use it for ἵστο, as ἐς for ἵστο, II. 20, 248; Odys. 9, 126; πάρα, however, is connected even with the 1st Person.1

3. With the primitive verb ἡμεῖς the following forms are connected:

a. ἄρενυρει Matt. ix. 2, 5; Mark ii. 5; Luke v. 20, 23; vii. 47; 1 Jno. ii. 12. Ancient grammarians are not agreed in accounting 93 for this form. Some, as Eustathius (Iliad, 6, 590) consider it equivalent to ἄρενυρε, in the same way as ἄφεπ is used by Homer for ἄφη. Others, more correctly, take it for the Preterite (instead of ἄρενυρει); so Herodian, the Etymol. Mag. and Suidas,—yet with this difference, that the last ascribes it to the Doric dialect, the author of the Etymol. to the Attic. Suidas is undoubtedly

1 The Etymol. M. p. 357, regards Ἰς, not as a contraction of ἵστο, but as an ellipsis, requiring the suitable person of the verb ἵαυ to be supplied. Moreover, whether Ἰς also occurs for Ἱς, is doubtful, Hm. Soph. Trach. 1090.
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b. ἄφιέναι Mark i. 34; xi. 16 (Philo leg. ad Cajum p. 1021) is the Imperf. of ἄφιέναι (cf. ἄφιέναι Eccl. ii. 18, and ἄφιέναι Matt. vi. 12 var.), like ξύνον for ξύνεσαι Iliad, 1, 278 (Bttm. I. 523), with the Augm. on the preposition (which occurs elsewhere also in this verb, as ἄφεσθη Plutarch, Sulla 28) for ἄφιέναι (Bttm. I. 521) see Fischer, Weller. II. 480.

c. The 1st Aor. Pass. of ἄφιέναι in Rom. iv. 7 (Ps. xxxii. 1) according to most Codd. is ἄφετησαν. Some Codd., however, here and in Sept. give ἄφεσθησαν with Augm. which is the usual form in Greek authors (Bttm. I. 541).

In Rev. ii. 20 ἄφιες (Exod. xxxii. 32) from ἄφιέναι has on the authority of good Codd. been received into the text, like τιθέης for τιθήνει Bttm. I. 506. 62 e.

From οὐνιόμημεν we have οὖνιομεν Matt. xiii. 13 (3d Per. Plur.), 2 Cor. x. 12 (either 3d Plur. or Dative Participle) and Participle οὖνιων Matt. xiii. 23 var. (Rom. iii. 11, from Sept. οὖνιος) for οὖνιος, which Lchm. and Tdf. have in the text. The first form is from οὖνια (which still survives in the Inf. οὖνιον, Theogn. 565). The Participial form, however, especially common in Sept. (1 Chron. xxv. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Ps. xl. 2; 7th ed. Jer. xx. 12) would perhaps more correctly be written οὖνιον (from οὖνια, see above, and Bttm. I. 523). Accordingly Lchm. has printed οὖνιομεν Matt. xiii. 13. Cf. in general Fr. Rom. I. 174 seq.

4. From the verb κάθημαι we find Imperat. κάθου Matt. xxii. 44; Luke xx. 42; Acts ii. 34; Jas. ii. 3 (1 Sam. i. 23; xxii. 5; 2 Kings ii. 2, 6, etc.) instead of κάθησο. Only in Mark xii. 36 has Tdf. adopted from B κάθισον. The form κάθου never occurs in the earlier Greek authors, and therefore Moeris p. 234 and Thom. M. p. 485 class it among spurious forms. So also κάθη for κάθησαι Acts xxiii. 8 (Lob. 395; Greg. Cor. ed. Schäf. p. 411).
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Not a few verbs present in the N. T. single forms, regularly constructed, which are rejected for the most part by ancient grammarians, on the ground that they do not occur in Greek authors, or only in the later. Among such forms are reckoned in particular a number of Futures Active, for which standard writers use the Futures Middle (Bttm. II. 84 f.; Monk, Eurip. Alcest. v. 159, 645); but this subject has not yet been completely investigated. We subjoin a list of all such forms as have been declared unclassical,
but mark with an asterisk those about which the grammarians, and in particular Thom. Mag. and Moeris, have been manifestly too fastidious.

ἀγγέλλω. The 2d Aor. Active and Passive, rare in the better authors, are in many passages suspicious, Bttm. II. 94 f.; yet, see Schäf. Demosth. III. 175; Schoem. Isae. p. 89. In the N. T. we find ἄγγελον η 1 Pet. i. 12, and (from the Sept.) Rom. xv. 21, διαγγέλη from Sept.) Rom. ix. 17, καταγγέλη Acts xvii. 13.

ἀνυμία. On the Fut. κατέαξι Matt. xii. 20 and Aor. κατέαξα see § 12, 2.

*ἀγω. On the 1st Aor. ἡξα, which occurs 2 Pet. ii. 5 in the compound ἐπάναξ, see Bttm. II. 98; Lob. p. 287, 735. In compounds also the form is not rare (2 Sam. xxii. 85; 1 Macc. ii. 67; Index to Malal. under ἀγω; Schäf. ind. ad Aesop. p. 135) even in good prose authors Her. 1, 190; 5, 84; Xen. Hell. 2, 2, 20; Thuc. 2, 97; 8, 25.

*αἰρέω. The Fut. ἀφιέρω, in comp. ἀμφελώ Rev. xxii. 19, is rare, see Bttm. II. 100. Yet it is found in Agath. 269, 5, and in the Sept. frequently: Exod. v. 8; Num. xi. 17; Deut. xii. 92; Job xxxvi. 7; cf. also Menand. Byz. p. 316. In opposition to Reisig, Comm. crit. in Soph. Oed. C. p. 365, who claims it for Aristoph.

*ἀκούω. Fut. ἀκούσω Matt. xii. 19; xiii. 14; Rom. x. 14; Jno. xvi. 13, for ἀκούσομαι, which even in the N. T. is the more frequent, particularly with Luke, as Acts iii. 22 (vii. 87); xvii. 32; xxi. 22; xxviii. 28, also Jno. v. 28. Ἀκούσω occurs not only in poets (Anthol. gr. III. 134; Jac. Orac. Sibyll. 8, 206, 345), but occasionally also in prose authors of the κοινή, as Dion. Η. 980, 4. Reisk., cf. Schäf. Demosth. II. 232; Wurm, Dinarch. p. 153; Bachmann, Lycophr. I. 92. In Sept. cf. Isa. vi. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 16.

*ἀλλομαί varies between Aor. ἡλάμην and ἡλόμην Bttm. II. 108. The same variation exists in the Codd. Acts xiv. 10 (even with double λ), yet ἡλαμα preponderates.

ἀμαρτάνω, ἀμαρτέω. 1st Aor. ἀμαρτήσα for 2d Aor. ἀμαρτεῖν Rom. v. 14, 16; Matt. xviii. 15; Luke xvii. 4; Rom. vi. 15 (1 Sam. xix. 4; Lam. iii. 411) Thom. M. p. 420; Lob. p. 732; yet see Diod. S. 2, 14 ἀμαρτήσα, Agath. 167, 18. Also the Fut. Act. ἀμαρτήσω Matt. xviii. 21 (Sir. vii. 36; xxiv. 22; Dio Ch. 59, 20) is not very common. Cf. Monk, Eurip. Alcest. 159; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 361.

1 Still, in the Sept. the 2d Aor. ἀμαρτεῖν predominates. See especially 1 Kings viii. 47, ἀμαρτουμεν, ἀμαρτοσμε, ἀμαρτοσυν.
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*ἀνέχομαι. Fut. ἀνέχομαι Matt. xxvii. 17; Mark ix. 19; Luke ix. 41; 2 Tim. iv. 3, for which Moeris from pure caprice would have ἀνασχήμομαι. The former occurs very frequently; cf. e.g. Soph. Elect. 1017; Xen. C. 5, 1, 26; Plat. Phaedr. 239 a.

ἀνοίγω. 1st Aor. ἄνοιξε Jno. ix. 17, 21, etc. for ἀνέφεξα (yet cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 5, 18), 2d Aor. Pass. ἄνοιγη Rev. xv. 5, see § 12, 7.


ἀποκτείνω. 1st Aor. ἀπεκτάθη, ἀποκτανθήσαι Rev. ii. 13; ix. 18, 20; xi. 18; xiii. 10; xix. 21; Matt. xvi. 21; Luke ix. 22, etc.; cf. 1 Macc. ii. 9; 2 Macc. iv. 86. This form occurs indeed in Homer, but belongs peculiarly to later Greek prose (Dio C. 65, c. 4; Menander, Hist. p. 284, 304, Bonn ed.). See Bttm. II. 227, Lob. 36, 757.1 For the un-Attic Perf. ἀπέκτασα see 2 Sam. iv. 11; Bttm. 226 f.)

ἀπολέλαμβ. Fut. ἀπολέσω Matt. xxi. 41; Mark viii. 35; Jno. vi. 39; xii. 25; cf. Lucian. asin. 33; Long. pastor. 3, 17; Bttm. II. 254. Yet see Lob. 746. (In 1 Cor. i. 19, we find the regular form ἀπολέω.)

ἀρπάζω. Aor. ἀρπάγην 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4 for ἀρπάσθην (Rev. xii. 5) Thom. Mag. p. 424; Moeris, p. 50; Bttm. I. 372, Fut. ἀρπαγήσομαι 1 Thess. iv. 17. (Also ἀρπάζω for ἀρπάσομαι Jno. x. 28 is said to be a rare form; it occurs, however, in Xen. mag. eq. 4, 17.)

*aΔείων. The primitive form ἀδείω Eph. ii. 21; Col. ii. 19 is frequent in Plato and Xen., Mtth. 541.

βαρίω. From this comes not only βεβαρημένος Matt. xxvi. 43; 96 Luke ix. 32, but also, contrary to Attic prose usage (Bttm. II. 88), βαροῦμενοι 2 Cor. v. 4 (Mark xiv. 40), βαρείσθω 1 Tim. v. 16, and the Aor. ἐβαρήθην Luke xxii. 34; 2 Cor. i. 8, for which last the Greek literary diction employs ἐβαρήθην (var. Luke as above).

βασκαίνω. The Aor. Gal. iii. 1 is given in text. rec. ἐβάσκανε, but in many Codd. ἐβάσκαψε (without an i subs.); cf. Bttm. I. 438. The latter in Dio C. 44, 39; Herod. 2, 4, 11, and the later writers.

1 ἀποκτένεσθαι (others ἀποκτένωσθαι) occurring in Rev. vi. 11, and ἀποκτένεσθαι (ἀποκτενεῖται var.) in 2 Cor. iii. 6. (Rev. xiii. 10) are considered as Aeolic, the Aeolians being accustomed to change ει before λ, μ, ν, π, σ into ι, and double the following consonant; therefore, κτίσω for κτίσω, like στέφω for στείφω, Koenig, Gregor. Cor. pp. 587, 597 Schaeff., Mtth. I. 74; cf. Dindorf, praef. ad Aristoph. XII. p. 14. Also in Tob. i. 18; Wisd. xvi. 14, we find the first form among the var. Present ἀποκτένω is probably not, with Wahl, to be assumed for Matt. x. 28 and Luke xii. 4; xiii. 34. Ἀποκτενοῦω in those passages (if not to be taken for an Aor. Particip., see Fr. Mt. p. 383) may be considered as a corruption of ἀποκτενίσων, which a few, but good, Codd. have, and which Lehm. and, in part, Tdf. have printed. Cf. besides, Bornem. ad Luc. p. 81.
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βίω. 1st Aor. Inf. βίωσαι in 1 Pet. iv. 2, for which the 2d Aor. βίωναι is more usual in Attic, Bttm. II. 130 f., yet see Aristot. Nic. 9, 8; Plutarch. Opp. II. 367 f., and often in compounds, Steph. Thes. II. 260, ed. nov. The other forms of the 1st Aor. are more frequent, the participle βίωσας the most so.

βλαστάνω. Aor. ἐβλαστήσα for ἐβλαστῶν Matt. xiii. 26; Jas. v. 18 (Gen. i. 11; Num. xvii. 8, etc.; Acta apoc. p. 172); cf. Bttm. II. 131. Since Aristotle's time the form is not unusual even in the Greek literary language; Stephani Thes. II. 273.

*γαμέω. Aor. ἐγάμησα Mark vi. 17; Matt. xxii. 25; 1 Cor. vii. 9 stands for the older form ἐγάμα (from γάμω), as Luke xiv. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 28; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 29; Lob. 742. Yet ἐγάμησα is found (if not in Xen. Cyr. 8, 4, 20) Lucian, dial. deor. 5, 4; Apollodor. 3, 15, 3. Better attested is ἐγαμήθην Mark x. 12 (though not fully established), 1 Cor. vii. 39; Lob. 742.


γήγομαι. Aor. Pass. ἐγέγονε for ἐγενόμη Acts iv. 4; Col. iv. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 14, etc.; cf. Thom. M. p. 189,—an originally Doric form frequently found in the writers of the κοινή, Lob. 109; Bttm. II. 136.

διδώμι. The 1st Aor. ἔδωκα is avoided in the 1st and 2d Per. Plur. by Attic writers, and the 2d Aor. used instead, Bttm. I. 509.

78 In the N. T., however, we find ἔδωκαμεν 1 Thess. iv. 2, ἔδωκατε Matt. xxv. 35; Gal. iv. 15, etc. as in Demosth. On δώσῃ see § 14, 1 Remark p. 79.


δύναμαι. We have merely to remark here that besides the Aor. ἰδνήθην, the (Ion.) form ἰνάσωκά, with the Augm. ἦ too, is noted from B among the var. Matt. xvii. 16 (Bttm. II. 155).

δύνω, δύνω. In several good Codd. we find Mark i. 32 the 1st 97 Aor. ἰδνήσω, which among the earlier Greeks has only a causative meaning, Bttm. II. 156. On the other hand the 1st Aor. δύναντος, as inferior authorities give in Luke iv. 40, is found also Ael. 4, 1; Pausan. 2, 11, 7.

εἰδω in the sense of know. Pret. οἰδαμεν Mark xi. 33; Jno. iii. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 1, etc. for ιομεν (Poppo, Xen. An. 2, 4, 6), οἰδατε Mark x. 38; xiii. 33; 1 Cor. ix. 13; Phil. iv. 15 for ιοτε, οἰδασιν Luke xi. 44; Jno. x. 5 for ιοσωsi; see Bttm. I. 546 (yet cf. Aristoph. av.
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599; Xen. Oec. 20, 14). The 2d Per. Sing. οἰδὼς 1 Cor. vii. 16; Jno. xxi. 15 is rather Ionic and Doric (for οἰδοθα), yet it occurs Her. 4, 157; Xen. M. 4, 6, 6; Eurip. ALC. 790, and frequently in later Greek; see Lob. 236 sq. The 3d Per. Plur. of the Plup. is written ὑδεισαυ Mark i. 34; Jno. ii. 9; xxi. 4, etc. for ὑδεσαι; Bttm. I. 547.

eἰπεῖν (2d Aor. ἐποῦ). 1st Aor. ἐπα in the N.T. in the 2d Per. Sing. Matt. xxvi. 25; Mark xii. 32, and frequently. This person also occurs in Attic, Xen. Oec. 19, 14; Soph. Oed. C. 1509 (along with ἐπερε, as often in Plato); but it is originally Ionic, see Greg. Corinthis. ed. Schäf. p. 481; Schäf. Dion. H. p. 486 sq. Imper. ἐπατε Matt. x. 27; xxi. 5; Col. iv. 17, ἐπατέσσαν Acts xxiv. 20; likewise very common in Attic, Plat. Lach. 187 d; Xen. C. 3, 2, 28. We find, besides, in good Codd. 3d Per. Plur. Indic. ἐπαν Matt. xii. 2; xvii. 24; Mark xi. 6; xii. 7, 16; Luke v. 33; xix. 89; xx. 2; Acts i. 11, 24; vi. 2; xxviii. 21, etc. (Diod. S. 16, 14; Xen. H. 3, 5, 24 a var.), the Participle ἐπας Acts vii. 37; xxi. 24 which is chiefly Ionic, and even the more unusual 1st Per. ἐπα Heb. iii. 10; Acts xxvi. 15 (ἐποῦ, on the contrary, predominates in the N.T.); see Sturz, dial. alex. p. 61.1 Recent editors have adopted these forms wherever they are attested by several Codd. In composition we find ἀπεπαμῆν 2 Cor. iv. 2 (Her. 6, 100), and προεπαμεν 1 Thess. iv. 6 (ἐπαμεν in the 1. Turin. Papyrus, p. 10). Ἐπόν (not ἐποῦ, see § 6, 1, k.) Acts xxviii. 26 (according to good Codd.) is to be regarded as 2d Aor. Imperative, a form which we now find also in the text of Mark xiii. 4; Luke x. 40, while in other passages ἐπετε preponderates. The 1st Aor. Pass. of this verb, ἔφησθην (from ἰη, see Bttm. II. 166), is sometimes written in MSS. of the N.T. Matt. v. 21, 31, 33 ἔφησθην, as often in Codd. of later (non-Attic) authors, though this form occasionally appears in Attic writers also; Lob. 447 (but not in Plato, see Schneider, Plat. civ. II. p. 5 sq.).


*ἐλεάω for ἐλέαω occurs in several good Codd. in various passages of the N.T., as Rom. ix. 16, 18 ἔλεωτος, ἔλεά, Jude 23 ἐλεάτε. 98 Also Clem. Al. p. 54, Syll. (the Florent. edition) has ἐλεά. Cf. also Etymol. M. 327, 30. Similar is ἐλλογάν Rom. v. 13; Philem. 18, also in good Codd. The latter has been adopted by Lchm.,

---

1 ἐποῦ occurs also in the well-known Rosetta inscription, at the end of line 8.
and after him by Tdf. Fr., Rom. I. 811, declares all these forms to be errors in copying.

ἐλκω. From this we find, as regularly in Greek authors, a Pres. and an Imperf. Jas. ii. 6; Acts xxi. 30. On the other hand, for the Fut. ἐλξω (Mtth. 573) the more unusual ἐλκυσω occurs Jno. xii. 32 from the other form ἐλκω; cf. Job xxxix. 10.

*ἐπανέω. Fut. ἐπανέσω 1 Cor. xi. 22, for ἐπανεσομαι; see Bttm. I. 388. Yet cf. Xen. An. 5, 5, 8; Himer. 20. In general, however, this form is not uncommon; see Brunck, Gnom. p. 10, 64; Schaeff. Demosth. II. 465; Stallb. Plat. Symp. p. 139.

*ἐπιορκέω. Fut. ἐπιορκήσω for ἐπιορκέσομαι Matt. v. 83. See Bttm. II. 85.

ἐρχομαι. The Fut. ἐλεύσομαι, both in the simple verb and its compounds, is of frequent occurrence, but particularly in later prose authors (Arrian. Al. 6, 12; Philostr. Apoll. 4, 4; Dio Chr. 83, 410; Max. Tyr. 24, p. 295); in Attic, on the contrary, ἐλμ is used instead (Phryn. p. 37 sq.; Thom. M. p. 88, 386). Yet in the earlier authors ἐλεύσομαι also is not altogether infrequent, Her. 1, 142; 5, 125; Lys. Dardan. 12 (p. 238, Bremi); see in general Lob. 37 sq.; Schaeff. Soph. II. 323; cf. Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. 210. Instead of the Imperf. ἐρχόμην Mark i. 45; ii. 13; Jno. iv. 30; vi. 17, etc. Attic authors commonly use the Imperf. of ἐλμ, Bttm. II. 183; yet see Bornem. Luc. p. 106, cf. Thuc. 4, 120, 121; Xen. An. 4, 6, 22. In Attic the imperatives ἢθε, ἢνε from ἐλμ are used for ἐρχον, ἐρχεσθε Jno. i. 47. Also ἐρχόμενος is said to be rare in earlier Attic, Bttm. as above; yet it occurs in Plato, Crit. c. 15. (ὢθε for ἐληλυθε Gal. iv. 4; Jno. xix. 39, etc. has been too hastily rejected by Thom. M. p. 418; see Sallier on the passage.)

ἐσθιω. From the poetic form ἐσθω (Bttm. II. 185) we find the Participle ἐσθων among the var. Mark i. 6; Luke vii. 33, 34; x. 7; xx. 47; xxi. 80, which Tdf., on the authority of (a few) good Codd., has received into the text; see Praef. p. 21. From Sept. cf. Lev. xvii. 10; xix. 26; Sir. xx. 16.

ἐφρισκω. Aor. Mid. εφράμην for εφρόμην Heb. ix. 12, see § 13, 1 (Paus. 7, 11, 1; 8, 30, 4, etc.; cf. Lob. p. 139 sq.). A 1st Aor. εφρησα appears in the Subjunctive form εφρησης Rev. xviii. 14 and 99 εφρησουσιx. 6 (as at least many Codd. have it), unless we take 83 these forms for the Subjunctive Fut. (see § 13, 1. e). Lob. 721, however, produces a Participle εφρησαντος.

ζαω. Fut. ζησω Rom. vi. 2, 8; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Jno. vi. 51, 58 f. (σεζησω Rom. vi. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 11), ζησομαι Matt.
§ 15. DEFECTIVE VERBS.

iv. 4; Mark v. 23; Jno. vi. 51; xi. 25, etc. 1st Aor. ἐγραφα Rev. ii. 8; Luke xv. 24; Rom. vii. 9, etc. (and often in Sept.). These are principally later forms, which occur but seldom in early authors (see Bttm. II. 192). The Aor. is peculiar to later writers. Earlier authors used in the Fut. and Aor. the corresponding tenses of βιῶ.

ἡκω. From the 1st Aor. ἡξα, a later form, Bttm. II. 194; Lob. 744, we find the Subjunctive ἡξωσι Rev. iii. 9, where, however, better Codd. have the Fut. ἡξουσι. The Preter. ἡκα (Deut. xxxii. 17; Phot. biblioth. 222; Malal. pp. 136 and 137; Leo Gramm. p. 98, etc.; Lob. 744) in the form ἡκασι Mark viii. 3 is by no means established, though Lchm has adopted it.

θάλλω. 2d Aor. ἀνεβάλετε Phil. iv. 10, a form not occurring in prose, and everywhere rare, Bttm. II. 195.

ἰστημι. The Pres. ἱστάνω Rom. iii. 31, and in composition συνιστάνω 2 Cor. iii. 1 (iv. 2); v. 12; vi. 4; x. 12, 18; Gal. ii. 18, was used in Attic (Mth. I. 482), but more frequently in later Greek (e.g. Cinnam. 214 and 256 ἐφιστάνεω). On the later form ἱστάω see § 14, 1, f. p. 78.

κατακαίω. Fut. κατακαῆσομαι 1 Cor. iii. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 10 (from Aor. κατεκάψῃ Hor. 1, 51; 4, 79) for κατακαἴθησομαι Rev. xviii. 8, which the Attics use, see Thom. M. p. 511; Bttm. II. 211.

καταλείπω. 1st Aor. κατέλειψα Acts vi. 2; Lob. 714.

κεράννυμι. Perf. Pass. κεκέραςσαι Rev. xiv. 10, for the more usual κέκραμαι; see Bttm. II. 214. Analogous is the Participle συγκεκέρασμένος Heb. iv. 2, in very good Codd.

κερδαίω. Aor. ἐκέρδησα Matt. xxv. 20; xviii. 15, κερδήσα Acts. xxvii. 21, κερδήσα Luke ix. 25, κερδήσω Subj. 1 Cor. ix. 19, 20; Matt. xvi. 26 and frequently, forms peculiar to Ionic prose, Bttm. II. 215; Lob. 740. In Attic the verb is inflected regularly; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 21.

κλαίω. Fut. κλαίω (properly Doric) for κλαῖσσομαι (as in Sept. always) Luke vi. 25; Jno. xvi. 20; Rev. xviii. 9; cf. Babr. 98, 9; Bttm. II. 85, 220.

κλέπτω. Fut. κλέψω for κλέψομαι Matt. xix. 13; Rom. xii. 9, Bttm. II. 85, 221. In Sept. never, but in Lucian, dial. deor. 7, 4.

κράζω. Fut. κράξω Luke xix. 40 according to good authorities for κεκράξομαι (as always in Sept.), Aor. ἐκραζά for ἐκραγὸn Matt. 100 viii. 29; xx. 30, etc., Bttm. II. 223.

κρέμαμαι. The form ἐκεκρέμετο Luke xix. 48 in Codd. B [and Sin.] of which Griesb. and Schulz take no notice, is undoubtedly a mistake of the transcriber. Lchm. also has not noticed it.
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κύω (to be pregnant) has the Fut. and Aor. regular in the forms κυήσω, ἐκύνησα (Bttm. II. 230). So Jas. i. 18 ἀπεκύνησε. In the Pres. κυέω occurs, but not, as Eustath. p. 1548, 20 insists, only in the sense of bring forth; see Lob. Aiac. p. 182 sq. and paralip. 556.

Hence in Jas. i. 15 ἀποκόμει may be written as well as ἀποκύνει, but it is not necessary to prefer the former on account of the form of the Aorist in vs. 18. The N. T. Lexicons recognize only the form κυέω.

λάσκω. To this belongs the Aor. ἐλάκησα Acts i. 18, usually referred to the Doric Pres. λακέω; but Bttm. II. 233 derives it directly from the 2d Aor. λακέω, universally in use in Attic.

*μιαίνω has Tit. i. 15, according to good Codd., in the Perf. Participle μεμαμμένοι for the usual μεμιμένοι, cf. Lob. 35.

νίπτω Jno. xiii. 6, 14, νίπτομαι Matt. xv. 2. Instead of this Pres. the earlier writers use νίζω; see Bttm. II. 249; Lob. 241.

οἴκτείρω. Fut. οἰκτειρήσω Rom. ix. 15 (as if from οἰκτειρέω) for οἰκτερῶ; cf. Ps. ci. 15; Jcr. xxi. 7; Mic. vii. 19, etc.; also in the Byzantines, see Lob. 741.

ὁμύνω for ὁμυγμι (Bttm. II. 255) Matt. xxiii. 20 ff.; xxvi. 74; Heb. vi. 16; Jas. v. 12. But in the better MSS. we find Mark xiv. 71 ὁμυνάι for ὁμυνέω, and Griesb. received it into the text.

*ὁράω. Imperf. Mid. ὁράμην Acts ii. 25 (from Ps. xvi.), for which ὁράμην was used in Attic (Bttm. I. 325). From ὁπτεσθαί we find Luke xiii. 28, though not without var., the 1st Aor. Subj. ὁπτήσθη, which occurs in Liber. and the Byzantines; see Lob. 734.

παίζω. Aor. ἐνέπαιξα Matt. xx. 19; xxvii. 31 (Sept. Prov. xxiii. 35), for which in Attic ἐπαισα was used; see Bttm. I. 372. But ἐπαιξα, παίξαι Lucian, dial. deor. 6, 4, and encom. Demosth. 15; cf. V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 378; and Lob. 240. The Fut. παίζω Anacre. 24, 8.

πέτομαι. Part. πετόμενον Rev. xiv. 6 in B for πετόμενον, from the form πετόμαι which occurs only in Ionic (Her. 8, 111) and later writers (e.g. Lucian, dial. mort. 15, 3 var.), see Bttm. II. 271. The Pres. πέταμαι, found even in Pindar, is cited by Wetst. and Matthai among the var. Rev. xii. 14.

πινω. From the Fut. πίμαι the complete form πίξαι is established in Luke xvii. 8 (Bttm. I. 347), as in the very same passage φόγεσαι from φόγομαι. Both are found also in Ezek. xii. 18; Ruth ii. 9, 14. On the Inf. πίνω Jno. iv. 9, which on the
authority of good Codd. [also Sin.\textsuperscript{*}] Lchm. and Tdf. [ed. II.] have inserted in the text, see Fr. de crit. conformat. etc. p. 27 sq. Only the form πειν is found in later writers, and this reading of several 85 Codd. [and Tdf. ed. VII.] might perhaps be adopted, if at least the Cod. A vs. 7, 10 had not distinctly πειν, thus showing πειν vs. 9 to be a mistake of the transcriber.

πιττω. Aor. ἐπέσεα, see § 13, 1 p. 73.

ῥέω. Fut. ῥεύω Jno. vii. 38 for ῥεῦσαι. In Attic, however, ῥυήσαι is the usual form, Lob. 739; Bttm. II. 287. (As to the 1st Aor. ῥεῦσατοσῦν Cant. iv. 16, also used only in later Greek, cf. Lob. 739.) The regular and usual 2d Aor. ἔριν occurs in the compound παραρνώμεν Heb. ii. 1.

σαλπίζω. Fut. σαλπίσω for σαλπίζεω 1 Cor. xv. 52, cf. also 82 Mechan. vett. p. 201 (Num. x. 8; also 1st Aor. ἑσάλπησα for ἑσάλπησα Xen. An. 1, 2, 17 is frequent in Sept.), see Phryn. 191; Thom. M. p. 789.

σημαίνω. 1st Aor. ἕσημανσ Acts xi. 28; xxv. 27 (Judg. vii. 21; Esth. ii. 22; Plutarch, Aristid. 19; Menandri Byz. hist. pp. 308, 309, 358; Act. Thom. p. 32), which is found indeed even in Xen. Hell. 2, 1, 28, but for which in early Attic ἕσημαν was the usual form, see Bttm. I. 488; Lob. 24. Cf. under φαίνον.

σκέπτομαι. The Pres. (Heb. ii. 6; Jas. i. 27; cf. Ps. viii. 5; 1 Sam. xi. 8; xv. 4, etc.) and Imperf. occur but seldom in Attic, Bttm. II. 291.

*σπουδάζω. Fut. σπουδάσω for the usual σπουδάσαμει 2 Pet. i. 15; Bttm. II. 85.

στηρίζω. Imperat. Aor. according to good Codd. is στήρισεν Luke xxii. 32; Rev. iii. 2, and Fut. 2 Thess. iii. 3 in B στηρίζει, instead of the forms preferred by Greek authors, στηρίζειν and στηρίζω, Bttm. I. 372; cf. Judg. xix. 5; Ezek. xx. 46, and often; also ἔστησα 1 Macc. xiv. 14, etc.

τυγχάνω. Of the Perf. we find Heb. viii. 6 in text. rec. the (properly Ionic, then Attic, Bttm. II. 301) form τέτυχε; but in other Codd. the usual Attic τέτυχε, and in A D [Sin.\textsuperscript{*}] et al. τέτυχε. On the latter see Lob. 395.

φαγεῖν. Fut. φάγομαι Jas. v. 3; Rev. xvii. 16 [Jno. ii. 17] (Gen. xxvii. 25; Exod. xii. 8, etc.), whence 2d Per. φάγεσαι Luke xvii. 8. For this Greek authors use ἔσδομαι from ἔσω, Bttm. II. 185.

φαίνω. 1st Aor. Inf. ἐπιφάναι (ἐπιφηναί) Luke i. 79, contrary to the best usage. In later Greek, however, similar forms occur; Lob. 26; Thilo, Acta Thom. 49 sq. (Aelian, anim. 2, 11; and epil. 102 p. 396, Jac.).
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\( \phi a i \sigma k w \). Hence \( \epsilon p i f a w s e i \) Eph. v. 14; cf. Gen. xliv. 3; Judg. xvi. 2; 1 Sam. xiv. 36; Judith xiv. 2. As to the analogical proof of this form, not found in Greek authors, by means of the Subs. \( \iota p o f a w s i s \), see Bttm. II. 312.

*\( \phi e p o w \). Aor. Partic. \( \epsilon n e k a k s \) Acts v. 2; xiv. 13 (\( \epsilon n e k a k t e s \) Luke xv. 23 var.) for \( \epsilon n e k a k w \) Bttm. II. 313; yet see Xen. M. 1, 2, 53; 86 Demosth. Timoth. 703 c.; Isocr. paneg. 40. The Indic. \( \eta n e k a k s \) occurs frequently in Attic, as also the Imperat. forms with \( \alpha \) Jno. xxi. 10.

*\( \phi \theta \acute{a} w \). According to several Atticists the 2d Aor. \( \epsilon p h \eta p \) is to be preferred to the 1st Aor. \( \epsilon p h \acute{a} s a \), which, however, often occurs even in Attic writers (Bttm. II. 316), and prevails in the N. T. Matt. xii. 28; Rom. ix. 31; 2 Cor. x. 14; Phil. iii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 16. In the last passage several Codd. have the Perf. \( \epsilon p h \acute{a} s e k \).

\( \phi w \). 2d Aor. Pass. \( \epsilon p h \eta p \), \( \phi w e k \) Luke viii. 6, 7, 8 (since Hippocrat. very much used), for which the Attics employ the 2d Aor. Act. \( \epsilon p h \eta p \), \( \phi w \); see Bttm. II. 321. In Matt. xxiv. 32 and Mark xiii. 28 very good Codd. have \( \epsilon k f h \) (Aor. Pass. Subj.) for \( \epsilon k f h \); and the former reading may be regarded as preferable; see Fr. Marc. 578 sq.

83 \( \chi a i \rho w \). Fut. \( \chi a i r h s o m a i \) for \( \chi a i r h s o w \) Luke i. 14; Jno. xvi. 20, 22; Phil. i. 18 (Hab. i. 16; Zech. x. 7; Ps. xcv. 12, and often), see Moer. 120; Thom. Mag. 910; Lob. 740; Bttm. II. 322. It occurs also Diod. Exc. Vat. p. 95.

*\( \chi a i r h s o m a i \). Fut. \( \chi a i r h s o m a i \) Rom. viii. 32 is the non-Attic form for \( \chi a r h s o m a i \).

\( \omega \theta \acute{e} w \). Aor. \( \acute{a} p \omega s a t o \) Acts vii. 27, 39 (Mic. iv. 6; Lam. ii. 7 and often, Dion. H. II. 759), for which the better writers used \( \epsilon \omega s a t o \) with syllabic augment (Thom. M. p. 403; Pol. 2, 69, 9; 15, 31, 12). 1st Aor. Pass. \( \acute{a} p \omega s \theta \eta p \) Ps. lxxvii. 6; cf. Xen. Hell. 4, 3, 12; Dio C. 37, 47. Also Aor. Act. \( \epsilon \omega s e s e n \) Acts vii. 45 for which some Codd. have \( \epsilon \omega s e s e n \) (Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 181). That remark, however, respecting the syll. augm. holds strictly only of the Attic authors; see Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 407.

*\( \omega n e o m a i \). 1st Aor. \( \omega n e o s \acute{a} m n \) Acts vii. 16, as frequently in writers of the \( \kappa o v \) (e.g. Plut., Pausan.), Lob. 139. In Attic \( \epsilon p r \acute{i} m a m p h \) is preferred.

Note. The later verbal forms are not always used in the N. T. where 103 they might be expected. We find for instance \( \pi o m a i \) 2d Fut. from \( \pi w w \),

1 After the Fut. \( \delta o w \) (from \( \theta o w \)). The Aorist form from the other Fut. \( \theta o h o w \) occurs only in later authors, as e.g. the Particip. \( \epsilon i s o \theta \acute{e} r h s a s \) in Cinnam. p. 193.
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and not παῦμαι Rev. xiv. 10 (see Bttm. I. 395); Aor. κομὼσα Mark vii. 15, 18 etc.; Moeris, ed. Piers. p. 434; Locrilla, Xen. Ephes. p. 254; Fut. φεύγωμα, θαυμάσωμα, and not φεύγω, θαυμάσω (Bttm. II. 85). Among the various readings occurs Heb. iv. 15 πεταμάμιν from the older form περάω instead of πεταμαμίαν from περάω; the former Tdf. has received into the text.

That the same forms sometimes come by inflection from entirely different verbs is well known; we shall only specify ζένω Jno. v. 13, which grammatically may come equally from έκνεω (Bttm. II. 248) and from έκνεω.

§ 16. FORMATION OF WORDS. 1

The N. T. contains a number of words never occurring in Greek authors, but borrowed from the spoken language of the time, and in part new formations (particularly in the writings of Paul). The greater number of these peculiar forms, the more necessary it becomes to compare them with the established principles of Greek derivation (from stems). In doing this, it will be instructive to note analogies not altogether unknown to Greek authors, but far more prominent in the idiom of the N. T. Our remarks will be founded on the luminous exposition of Bttm., which comprehends whatever is of essential importance (II. § 118 ff.), cf. Krü. § 41 ff.

1. A. DERIVATION BY TERMINATIONS. a. VERBS: Of derivative verbs (mostly but not entirely from nouns) those in οω and ιω are peculiarly frequent. Forms in οω partly superseded those in ένω or ιω; as, δεκατω (δέκατων Xen. An. 5, 8, 9, etc.), έξουθενω (ξουθενίω in Plutarch, yet see in general Lob. 182), σαρω (for σαίρω Lob. 89), κεφαλαιο (κεφαλίζω Lob. 95), δυναμω and ἐνυδαμόω (Lob. 605, note), ἀφυντω (ἀφυνίζω Lob. 224), 104 ἄνακαμω (ἀνακαμίζω Isocr. Areop. c. 3), besides μεστω, δολω. From δεκατω comes ἀποδεκατω; with ἀφυντω compare καθυντω Χεν. M. 2, 1, 30. Κραταιω occurs also for κρατηνω, σθενω for σθενω, ἀναστατων for ἀνάστατων τοιευ; but χαριτω is formed from χάρις, δυνατω from δυναμις (Lob. Phryn. 605).

Verbs in ιω come from the most diverse stems: ὁβριζω from ὁβρος, αἰγκυματιζω from αἰγκυματως, δεγματιζω from δεγμα.
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πελεκίζω from πελεκοσ, μυκτηρίζω from μυκτήρ, σμυρνίζω, ἀνεμίζω, φυλακίζω, ἵματίζω, ἀναθεματίζω (also in Byzantine authors), θεατρίζω (Cinnam. p. 213), σπανχυνίζομαι, αἱρετίζω, συμμορφίζο (Phil. iii. 10 according to good Codd.). Σκαρπίζω (διασκαρπίζω) has no distinct stem in the Greek literary language; it was, however, a provincial, perhaps a Macedonic, form (Lob. 218).

As to verbs in ἵζω from names of nations and persons, see Bttm. II. 385. We have only to mention ιουδαίζω, with which compare the later word δαυίδιζω, Leo Gram. p. 447.

There are also a few verbs in αἴξω seldom or never occurring elsewhere, e.g. νηπίάξω, σωκάξω (σῆθω).

Also in ενω, as μεσιτεύω, μαγεύω, ἕμπρατεύομαι, αἰχμαλωτεύω (Lob. 442), παγιδεύω, γυμνιτεύω. The last is from γυμνιτής, which, according to Bttm. II. 431, is only to be vindicated as a collateral form of γυμνής. From γυμνός, on the other hand, one would expect γυμνιτής, and accordingly the best Codd. [Sin. also] have 1 Cor. iv. 11 γυμνιτέα, which therefore we must not, with Fr. (conform. crit. p. 21) and Mey., take for an error of the copyist.\footnote{1}

Among verbs in νυώ, which signify a rendering what the (concrete) root denotes (as ἰλαρύνεω, i.e. ἰλαρόν ποιεῖν) Bttm. II. 387, σκληρύνω is to be noticed as a collateral form of σκληρόω, which never occurs in the N. T.

Verbs in αἰνώ (ἀνυλών, ἥραίνω, εὐφραίνω Bttm. II. 65 f.; Lob. prolegg. pathol. 37) require no special remark.

The formation of verbs in θώ, from primitives in ενω, which is not unknown in Attic (Bttm. II. 61; Lob. 151), seems to have been practised more frequently in later Greek; νῆθος, κνήθω, ἀλήθω, are not used at least by the earlier writers. Yet cf. Lob. 254.

Verbs in σκω (except εἰφλακώ and δεδύσκω) are rare even in 105 the N. T. (Bttm. II. 59 f.). We find γηράσκω as an inchoative (Bttm. II. 393), but μεθύσκω, causative from μεθύω, only in the Pass. Γαμίσκω, equivalent to γαμίζω, is sufficiently attested only in Luke xx. 34. Lastly, we note as altogether singular in formation γρηγορέω (from the Perf. ἐγρηγορά), with its cognate ἐγρηγορεύω, Lob. 119; Bttm. II. 158. With this verb,\footnote{2} derived from a reduplicated Perfect, may be compared, however, ἐπικεχειρέω Papyri Taurin. 7, lin. 7.

\footnote{1} Cf. Lob. Soph. AI. p. 387. Ἀλαβρεῖν Heb. xi. 28 is, in some good Codd., written ἀλεβρεῖν (from ἀλεβραίον), and Lchm., and with him Td., has so printed. I am not aware that the latter form of this Alexandrian word has been preserved anywhere else.

\footnote{2} Döderlein on reduplication in Greek and Latin derivation in his Reden und Aufsätze II. no. 2.
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To derivative verbs in ενω belongs also παραβολεύωναι Phil. ii. 30, (which Griesb., Lchm., and others, agreeably to the weightiest critical evidence, have admitted into the text). From παράβολος might have been formed most naturally παραβολεύωναι; but the termination ενω was selected to make the verb signify παράβολον εναί, as ἐπικοπεύων in later Greek denotes ἐπικοποῦν εναί (Lob. 591), and, what is more to the purpose, there is πιστεύων from πιστεύω. It would be unwarrantable to grant admission to παραβολεύοναι only on the assumption of a simple verb βολεύοναι, (which certainly does not occur).

2. b. SUBSTANTIVES: Derived a. from Verbs (cf. Lob. paralip. p. 397 sqq. and particularly lib. 3 of technologia p. 253 sqq.).

With the termination μος (Bttm. II. 398) from a verb in αξω is to be noted ἀγαπόμοι which does not occur in Greek authors, like πειρασμός from πειράζω, ἔνταφμασμός from ἐνταφίζω; from verbs in άξω we find μακαρισμός, ὄνειδισμός (Lob. 551), βασανισμός, παροργισμός, βαντισμός (βαντιζειν), σαββατισμός (σαββατιζειν), ἦδεισμός, ἀπελευμός.

The most numerous formations, however, are those in μα (Lob. as above 391 sqq.) and σις, the former mostly confined to the N. T. yet always conformed to Greek analogy; as, βάπτισμα, ράπτισμα from βαπτίζειν etc., ψεύσμα from ψεύδομαι, ἱεράτευμα, κατάλημα (καταλύων), also ἐξέραμα (Lob. 64), ἀποθέμα, ἀντλημα, ἀντπελαγμα, ἀποσκέψιμα, πρόκοπμα, ἀπαύγασμα, ἡπτημα, αἰτημα, κατόρθωμα, στερέωμα from contract verbs (like φόνημα, etc.), mostly in the sense of product or state. Only ἄντλημα denotes an implement (as substantives in μος often do), and κατάλημα the place of καταλύων (Eustath. Odysse. p. 146, 33).

Substantives in σις, particularly numerous in the Epistle to the 106 Hebrews, nearly all belong to literary Greek. Only θέλησις, κατάπαυσις, πρόκρυσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, δικαίωσις, βίωσις, πεποίθεσις Lob. 295 (ἐπιτόθεσις) require notice. As to παρασκευή, formed from the stem of a verb in αξω, see Bttm. II. 404. As to οἰκοδομή, see Lob. 490. As to the very common διαθήκη (from 1st Aor. of 86 τιβέναι), see Bttm. II. 401; Lob. paralip. 374.

Among abstract nouns from verbs are some in μονή. We find in the N. T. πλησμονή Bttm. II. 405. On the contrary, ἐπιληπτική comes directly from ἐπιλήπτεον. Πεισμονή, however (also in

---

1 Cf. G. Curtius, de nomin. gr. formatione linguar. cognat. ratione habita. Berol. 1342 (Zeitschr. f. Alterth. 1846, no. 68 f.).

2 The form κρύς appears to have been employed only in words compounded with other nouns. Compare the N. T. word ἀμαστευχυσία (Leo Gramm. p. 287) with ἀμαστευχυσία (Theophras. p. 510), φεστευχυσία and βεγγιξύσία.
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Pachym. II. 100 and 120), is another form of πείσμα, though πεισμονή may be referred directly to πείσω, as πλησμονή to πλέω. Among abstract nouns in the N.T. derived from verbs in εω must be mentioned ἐρημέλα.1

Verbal nouns with a concrete signification present little that is peculiar. From verbs in αἶω, ἐμα, υμαι, we find in the N.T. κτίστης (paroxyst.) and the oxytones (Bttm. II. 408) βιαστής, βαπτιστής, μεριστής, εὐαγγελιστής, γογγυστής, and ἐλληνιστής,2 forms rare or unknown elsewhere. Only κολλυβιστής, (which is not peculiar however to the N.T.), cannot be traced to a verb κολλυβίζειν. From τελειῶν we have τελειώτης (cf. ἐγκλητής and λιτρατής). From προκοπεῖν comes προκοπητής (Constant. Man. 4670). On ἐπενδύτης see Bttm. II. 411. The earlier writers prefer διωκτήρ to διώκτης; just as δότης appears as a secondary form by the side of δότιρ.

Very strange would be the formation of κατάνυξις from κατανυστάζω Rom. xi. 8 (from Sept.) as was formerly supposed. But its connection with κατανύσσειν is evident from Dan. x. 9, Theod., and thus it very probably denotes stupification (τίθεμι Ps. lx. 5), and thence torpor; see Fr. Excur. Rom. II. 558 sqq.

From careless pronunciation arose the form ταμεῖον, as all good Codd. have Luke xii. 24 and many Codd. have Matt. vi. 6, for ταμεῖον (from ταμεῖον) see Lob. Phryn. 498 and paralip. 28, and the compound γλωσσόκομον for γλωσσοκομεῖον or γλωσσοκόμον (from κομεῖον) without var., see Lob. 98 sq.

β. From Adjectives. Under this head come,

Various abstract nouns in τῆς, οὖς, as ἀγνῆς, ἀγνῶτης, ἀδελ-
φότης, ἀδρότης, ἀπλότης, ἰκανότης, ἀφελότης
(ἀφελεία in earlier authors), σκηνότης, τιμίοτης, τελειότης, μαται-
ότης, γυμνότης, μεγαλειώτης, κυριότης, αἰσχρότης, πιστότης (ἀγαθότης
Sept.), see Lob. 350 sqq. (ἀκαθάρτης Rev. xvii. 4 is not well
attested);

1 The connection of ἐρημέλα with ἐπις is not prevented by the θ alone (for that occurs in the cognates ἐρήθεια, ἐρημιςειν), but its whole structure is such that it can only be referred to ἐρημέλα. But Fr. Rom. I. 143 sqq. has satisfactorily shown that ἐρημέλα even in the N.T. is nothing else than the ἐρημέλα, labor for wages, already known to the Greeks. Among earlier writers see Stob. de s. loc. N. T. p. 136 sqq.

2 Ἐλληνίςεως signifies in general to comport one's self as a Greek (Diog. L. I. 102), and most usually to speak Greek, especially of foreigners, Strabo 14, 662; then often it has no unfavorable secondary meaning, (erroneously de Weite, Bibel, reprinted from the Hall. Encycl. S. 17), Xen. A. 7, 3, 25; Strabo 2, 98. Ἐλληνιστής, therefore,—a substantive which never occurs in Greek authors,—means very naturally a Greek-speaking non-Greek (e.g. a Jew). That in Christian Greek phraseology Ἐλληνίςεως also signifies to be a heathen (e.g. in Malalas p. 449) is a fact lying beyond our present inquiry.
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And such substantives in συν (denoting mental qualities) as ἑλευσόνια and ἀγκυρόσυνη (from ἑλεύσιον and ἀγκυρόματι, cf. σωφροσύνη from σωφρόν), or ἀγωνισμόν, ἀγαθωσία, ιεροσύνη, μεγαλοσύνη, with ο, because the penult of the adjectives is short (Etym. M. p. 275, 44) — all later words found only in Hellenistic writers; cf. in general Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 235 sqq.

Also among those in ια which come from adjectives in ος, ρος (Bttm. II. 415) are many later formations (Lob. 848); as, ἐλαφρία (like αἰσχρία in Eustath. from αἰσχρός); and as ἐνδαιμονία from εἴδαιμον, so 2 Pet. ii. 16 παραφυσία from παραφύς (Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 238); some Codd., however, have the more usual παραφύσιν.

Lastly, we often find Neuters of adjectives in ος used as substantives; as, ὑποτύμων, μεθόριον, ὑπολήμων, σφάγων (προσφάγων), etc., see Fr. Prälimin. S. 42.

γ. From other Substantives (Bttm. II. 420 ff.) are derived εἰδωλείον (εἰδωλον), ἐλαίων (ἐλαια), μυλών (μυλός, μύλη) Bttm. II. 422 fr. and the Fem. βασιλίσσα (Bttm. II. 427). 'Αφεδρόν, peculiar to the N. T., comes from ἀφρα. The Gentile Fem. from Φαίνεται is Φόινίσσα; therefore also Mark vii. 26 Συρο-φόινισσα, as from Κλιστός comes Κλίσσα (Bttm. II. 427). Perhaps, however, the Fem. was also formed from the name of the country Φοινίκη; for, a large number of good Codd. [Sin. also] have in the above passage in Mark Συροφόινισσα, cf. Fritzschel, and this might come directly from an original form Φωινίκη, as βασιλίσσα is connected with βασιλής, and, at least among the Romans, Scythissa occurs for Σκυθίς, or in later Greek φυλάκισσα by the side of φυλακίς. See in general Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 413 sqq.

To the later and Latinizing formation belong, of Gentile and Patronymic nouns, Ἡρωδιάνος Matt. xxii. 16 and Χριστιανός Acts xi. 26, etc. (cf. Καισαριανός Arrian. Epict. 1, 19, 19; 3, 24, 117). In the earlier language, the termination ἄνος was employed only in forming Gentile names from cities and countries not Greek; Bttm. II. 429.

1 Yet in Glycas, p. 11, even in the later edition, μεγαλοσύνη is printed. Bttm. II. 420, shows that nearly all substantives in συν belong to the later language. On the termination συν in general, see Aufrecht in the Berl. Zeitschr. f. vergleich. Sprachforsch. 6 Heft; [and on the termination τος G. Bühler, das griech. Secundärsuffix τος. Ein Beitrag z. Lehre v. d. Wortbildung. Gött. 1858. 8vo.]

2 Of substantives derived from adjectives in ια, some, as is well known, end in πια instead of ια (Bttm. II. 416). In others, the spelling varies between ια and πια, as in κασταθία (cf. Ποππυ, Thuc. II. I. 154. Ellendt, præf. ad Arrian. p. 30 sqq. Weber, Demosth. p. 511). In regard to this word, however, the preponderance is for ια.
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Among Diminutives deserves to be mentioned βιβλαρίδιον, primarily from βιβλάριον, quoted by Pollux, instead of the older forms βιβλιδιον and βιβλιδάριον (like ἴματιδάριον from ἴματιδιον), Lob. pathol. 281. Τυνακάριον follows the usual analogy, but seems to have been of rare occurrence in Greek authors; the same may be said of ὠτάριον Mark xiv. 47; Jno. xviii. 10, καλάριον, παιδάριον. On diminutives in ιον (of which ψιχίον is unquestionably a later form), see Fr. Prælim. S. 48, and a dissertation De vocib. in ἵον trisyllabis by Janson in Jahn's Archiv VII. 485 ff.

Substantives in ἱον are properly Neuters of adjectives (Bttm. II. 412 f.); as, λαστύριον, θυματύριον, φυλακτύριον. (Such become still more numerous in later writers, e.g. ἀνακαλυπτήριον Niceph. Gregor. p. 667, δεσπύριον Cedren. II. 377, δεσπάριον ibid. I. 679, ἡματύριον I. 190, etc.) Φυλακτύριον, directly from φυλακτύριον, has like it an active meaning—guarding, protecting. Λαστύριον properly signifies something that propitiates, but may be applied to the place where the propitiation is accomplished (just as φυλακτύριον denotes a guard-post), and consequently to the cover of the ark of the covenant. In Rom. iii. 25 the signification propitiatory offering (Index to Theoph. contin.) is equally appropriate, which Philippi without sufficient reason has recently denied. A Fem. subst. of the same sort is ζυκτυρία (cf. στυκτυρία). Στυρία is connected immediately with στυρί; side by side with it occurs σωτύριον also as a substantive. Υπερῴων, that is ὑπερῴων, is to be regarded in like manner as a Neuter from ὑπερῴων, which, like παρῴος from παρή, is formed from the preposition ὑπερ, for there is no intermediate adjective ὑπερός.

109 3. c. ADJECTIVES: a. To adjectives derived directly from a verbal root belongs the fully established πενθός I Cor. ii. 4; cf. ἐδός from ἐδώ, ἑσσός from ἑσσάω, φειδός from (φειδω) φειδομαι (Lob. Phryn. p. 434). These derivatives are all oxytones, φειδός alone occurring in the grammarians as also a paroxytone (Lob. paralip. 135), and it is written as such in the N. T.

Among those in ὀλός, ἀμαρταλός is the most frequent (Bttm. II. 448). To be referred to the same formation, however, is εἰδώλων

92 Neut. from εἰδώλος (Lob. pathol. p. 134).

Verbals in τος (Bttm. I. 443 ff.; Lob. paralip. 478 sq.; Mois-zisztzig, de adj. graec. verbal. Conitz 1844, 4to.) correspond in signification, sometimes to the Latin participle in tus, as γνωστός notus, συνετός saginatus, ἀπαιδευτός (untrained, awkward) cf. θεοπενευστός inspíratus 1; sometimes to adjectives in δήλος, as ὃρατος,

1 That this word in 2 Tim. iii. 16 is to be taken in a passive sense, there can be no doubt; this acceptation is confirmed by ἐγκυνεύστος, though several derivatives of the same class have an active signification, as ἐκυνεύστος, ἐκτυνεύστος.
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δυσβάστακτος, ἀνεκτός, ἀκατάσχετος, ἀκαταπαυστός, ἀνεκδύνητος, ἀνεκκλήστης; sometimes they have an active meaning (Fr. Rom. II. 185), as απταυστός not stumbling, i.e. not sinning (certainly, however, not ἀλάλος Rom. viii. 26).

Ἀπειραστός (like the ἀπειρατός usual in Greek authors) means either untempted, or that cannot be tempted; both amount to the same thing in Jas. i. 13. Only παθητός Acts xxvi. 23, signifies who is to suffer; cf. φευγτός, πρακτός Aristot. de anima 3, 9, p. 64 Sylb.; Cattier, gazophyl. p. 34. The verbal προσήλωτος, akin to the forms ἐπηλυκος, μετέηλυκος, is an extended formation of which no example is to be found in classic Greek.

β. Among adjectives derived from other adjectives (or participles) a few are deserving of special notice. Such are περιούσιος, ἐπιούσιος, like ἐκούσιος, ἐθελούσιος (Lob. Phryn. p. 4 sq.), which are extended formations from ἐκόν and ἐθέλων like the feminines ἐκωθα, ἐθελοθα; but ἐπιούσιος [according to Leo Meyer, in Kuhn’s Ztschr. für vergleichende Sprachforschung. Bd. VII. Berl. 1858. pp. 424 sq. 428, formed by means of the suffix io from ἐπι and διν, and that denoting “what is ἐπι,” so that ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος signifies “bread that is serviceable, or suited, or necessary for life, for subsistence, that which answers our needs, is adequate for them”) has probably direct relation to the Fem. (ἡ) ἐπιούσια or: ἡμέρα, and accordingly ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος means bread for the following day, cf. Stolberg, diss. de pane ἐπιούσιος in his tractat. de solecism. N. T. p. 220 sqq.; Valcken. Select. I. 190; Fr. ad Mt. p. 267 sq. (also against the derivation from ὀσία, which would be grammatically 89 possible, cf. ἔνοιος). Besides, περιούσιος in the Bible does not mean simply proprius, in opposition to what belongs to a stranger, any more than περιούσισμος in the Sept. means property merely.

Πιστικός (Mark xiv. 3; Jno. xii. 3) from πιστός, according to 110 several ancient expositors equivalent to genuine. In classic authors the word signifies convincing, probably also persuasive (Plat. Gorg. 455 a.; Diog. L. 4, 37; Dion. H. V. 681; Sext. Emp. Math. 2, 71; Theophrast. metaph. 258 Sylb.), though in nearly all the passages Codd. have πιστικός, and critics have usually given this the preference (see Bekker and Stallb. on Plato, as above; cf. Lob. Soph. Ai. v. 151); in later writers faithful, trustworthy, of persons (Lücke, Joh. II. 496; see Index to Cedren. p. 950). The transition to the signification genuine as the predicate of a material object, is not impossible, particularly when it is considered that technical expressions (such as νάρδος πιστική may be), and espec-
ially mercantile terms, are often strange. Others, after Casaubon, take πιστικός for drinkable (Fr. Mr. 598 sqq.) from πιπίσκω or the root πίω, like πνεύμονες drinkable Aeschyl. Prom. 480, πιστή, πιστρα, πίστρων, etc., quoted in old Lexicons. That the ancients drank oil of spikenard, we are told by Athenæus 15, 689. I cannot, however, quite understand why both Evangelists subjoined this epithet; if the thin, liquid nard used for pouring out (Mark καταχέειν) in no respect differed from what was drunk, it would have been just as superfluous to add the epithet πιστ. as to call nard fluid. The νάρδος λεπτή of Dioscorides, however, means fluid nard, as opposed to thick, viscid nard. Besides, the drinkable nard would not be suited to the manipulation indicated by ἀλειφέω in John. Lastly, Frizsche’s translation of πιστ. (ad Mr. p. 601), “qui facile bibi potest, lubenter bibitur,” does not appear to be sufficiently established; not to mention that πιστικός cannot be positively shown to have signified drinkable. Even πιστός itself was not much in use (in Aeschyl. it occurs in a pun), and was superseded by the unambiguous πνευματικός, πνέωμα.

γ. To adjectives derived from substantives belong, among others, σάρκικος and σαρκικός. The former means fleshly 2 Cor. iii. 3 (as pro-paroxystome adjectives in νος almost without exception denote the material of which a thing is made, e.g. λίθων of stone 2 Cor. iii. 3, ξύλων wooden, πέπλων of clay, ἀκάμφωνος, βύσσων, etc., Bttm. II. 448), the latter (σαρκικός) means fleshly. There is, however, in Rom. vii. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 1 (2 Cor. i. 12); Heb. vii. 16, where one might have expected σαρκικός, preponderating or respectable authority for σάρκινος, and even Lehn. has placed it in the text. But how easily might σαρκικός, which does not occur outside of the N. T., be confounded in the Codd. with the very common σάρκινος (Fr. Rom. II. 46 sq.)! Had Paul, however, written σάρκινος, he must have intended some peculiar emphasis, somewhat in the way that Mey., 1 Cor. as above, insists upon. But on the one hand, a notion of the natural man for which only the material term σάρκινος would be adequate finds no sanction in the doctrinal teaching of Paul, while σαρκικός, as opposed to πνευματικός, fully meets the demands even of the text in question; and on the other

1 They have in particular this peculiarity, that words elsewhere used only of persons are transferred to articles of merchandise. Compare flat, properly equivalent to feeble, and the expressions. “Sugar dull — white unasked for.” Lob. paralip. 31 upholds Scaliger’s derivation from πίσκω (Fr. Mr. p. 595), as t after t elsewhere also for euphony’s sake is thrown away (cf. πιρον, πυριν, but particularly περιποιον and the Latin pisco). Mey. has not been induced to abandon the interpretation genuine.
hand, 1 Cor. iii. 3, taken in connection with 2, shows that in both passages Paul employed the same expression. In the passage from Heb. (vii. 16) ἐντολὴ σαρκίνη is hardly admissible.1

Among oxytone adjectives in ὄσος, expressing a notion of time (Bttm. II. 448), are καθημερινός, ὀρθρινός, πρωινός, later forms for which earlier authors used καθημέριος, etc. The like holds true of ταχύος.

Some adjectives derived from substantives end in εὐος; as, σκοτεινός, φωτεινός. But ἐλεεινός (a form not unfrequent in Attic also V. Fritzche, Aristoph. I. 456) comes from the verb ἔλεεω, as ποθεινός from ποθεω (Bttm. II. 448).

To the later adjectival formations specially belongs κεραμικός (κεράμειος, κεράμος).

Among adverbs derived from verbs φειδομενος seems to be peculiar to the N. T.

4. B. Derivation by Composition. a. The N. T. contains numerous compound substantives whose first part also is a substantive. Although many of these compounds, however, cannot be shown to have existed in the written language of the Greeks, yet in their formation there is nothing noticeably at variance with analogy. Compare in particular δικαιοκρισία (Leo Gr. p. 163), αἵματεκχυσία, ταπεινόφρον (like εὐσεβόφρον, κραταίοφρον Constant. Porphyr. II. 33, by later authors even ιουδαϊόφρον, ἐλληνόφρον Cedren. I. 660; Theoph. I. 149) and ταπεινοφροσύνη (cf. ματαιοφροσύνη Constant. Man. 657), σκληροκαρδία, σκληροτράχηλος (from which we find σκληροτραχηλία and σκληροτραχηλίνια in Constant. Man.), ἀκροβυστία, ἀκρογωνιαῖος, ἀλλοτριοπτικοπος (cf. ἀλλο-

1 It might perhaps be assumed in general that the later popular Greek interchanged these forms, and used ἀδράτως also in the sense of σαρκίνη: especially as not all adjectives in ὄσος signify the material of which a thing is made, cf. ἀδράτως (see Fr. Rom. II. 47; Tholuck, Hebr.-Br. 301 f.). Somewhat similar in German is the expression das Inwendige of man for das Inneres. The former had originally a more restricted meaning. Since, however, the term σαρκίνη had already established itself undeniably in the language of the N. T., the above assumption loses here all foundation.

2 Wenn dieses Wort anders von βῆς, βῆς mit Etymol. m. abzuleiten ist, was neuerlich Fr. Rom. I. 136 bestritten hat, theils weil βῆς nicht scheine tegere gelesen zu haben (wie bei dieser Etymologie angenommen wird), theils weil das Wort nicht be-stimmt das Glied bezeichnet, dessen Extremität bedeckt sei, also nicht verstanden worden sein würde. Jener erste Grund scheint mir durchgreifender als der zweite. Ich möchte aber glauben, dass ἀκροβυστία nicht eine absichtlose Umbildung des griech. ἀκροτοιον, sondern gefühlsmäßige Umgestaltung sei, welche aus Scham die Sache verdeckt aus-drücken sollte: ἀκροβυστός vor (an der Spitze) strotzend von Unbeschnitten im Gegensatz der Beschrittenen, deren vorderes Schaamglied glatt und saftig war. Es ist
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91 τρισπραγμοσύνη Plato, rep. 4, 444 b.), ἀνθρωπάρεσκος (Lob. 621), ποταμοφόρος (cf. υδατοφόρος Const. Man. 409), καρδιογιώτης (καρδιώπλητης Theoph. I. 736, καρδιοκολάπτης Leo Gr. 441), σπηλαβρωτός, ὕφελμοδουλεία, εἰδολολάτρης, εἰδωλόντων (Cedren. 95 I. 286, cf. the abstract εἰδωλολογία Theophan. 415), δεσμοφύλαξ (νοτοφύλαξ Theophan. I. 608), ὥρκωμος (cf. ἀπωμοσία, κατωμοσία), πατροπαράδοτος (θεοπαράδοτος Theophan. I. 627), ἱσάγγελος (Theoph. I. 16), εὐπερίστατος, πολυποίκιλος, the Adverb παμπληθεί (the Adj. παμπληθής is found in good authors), εἰλκρίνης, εἰλκρίνεια (Fuhr, Dicaearch. p. 198).

To the compound δευτερόπρωτος in Luke vi. 1 (?) comes nearest δευτεροδεκάτη found in Jerome on Ezek. c. 45. As the latter means second-tenth, so the former second-first.

Δευτερόφυλος, the Neut. of which is used as a noun in Acts xxvi. 7, is sustained by τετράφυλος Her. 5, 66.

More rarely is the first part of the compound a verb, as in ἑρεθσκεεία self-chosen worship; cf. ἑρεθσκοιλία.

Compound adjectives whose first part is a private exhibit nothing anomalous, though perhaps many of them were not current in written Greek (ἀμετανόητος, ἀνεξερεύνητος, ἀνεξίχθιατος); only ἀνέλεος Jas. ii. 13, which Lchm. on the authority of good Codd. [Sin. also] has received into the text instead of ἀνέλεως, is singular, as the Greeks used ἀνηλεύς, or at least ἀνελεύς (Lob. 710).

Ἀνέλεως would be formed like ἀνελπις, ἀπαῖς, and may have been intended as a verbal antithesis to ἀλεος. Even Bttm. II. 467 considered the a of the verb ἀτευνίζω, derived from the Adj. ἀτευνικός, to be the so-called a intensive; but it is better to take it, with Lob. pathol. I. 35, for a formative. See besides Döderlein, de ἀλφα intensivo sermonis graeci, Erl. 1830, 4to.

b. When the last part of the compound is a verb — in compound verbs therefore — the verbal stem is regularly found unaltered only in combination with the so-called old prepositions (Scaliger in Lob. Phryn. 266; Bttm. II. 469 f.); in other cases with a change so far forth as the verb strictly speaking first adopts its ending from a noun formed out of the stem, as ἀδιματεῖς, ὁμολογεῖσθαι, νουθετεῖν, εὐεργετεῖν, τροποφορεῖν, ὀρθοτομεῖν (cf. ὀρθοτομία

so in der Art euphemistischer Ausdrücke, dass sie allgemein gehalten werden; die, unter welchen sie gangbar werden, verständigen sich bald über ihren Sinn.

1 Cf. ἀνθρωπολάτρης Ephraem. p. 743, τρισπραγμόσυνη Pachym. 134; Geo. Páisd. Hrncl. 1, 14, 182, φιλοσολάτρης Theodos. acria. 2, 73, likewise χριστολάτρης frequent in Byzantine authors.
Theophan. cont. p. 812), ἀγαθοργεῖν and ἀγαθουργεῖν, μετροπαθεῖν, etc.

This rule, however, has some undoubted exceptions; Scaliger 113 long ago pointed out δυσθυήσκο in Eurip. (cf. Bttm. II. 472). Ἐνδοκεῖν, therefore, is directly formed from δοκεῖν, and not, as Passow maintained, from an intermediate noun δόκος (Fr. Rom. II. 370); it arose simply from a combination of the words in speaking; cf. Bttm. II. 470. The same remark applies to καραδόκειν (not to be referred to δοκεῖν, Fritzschier. opusc. p. 151); no noun καραδόκος exists. Even ὀμείρεσθαι, which in 1 Thess. ii. 8 the 6th d. better Codd. [Sin. also] have instead of ἵμείρεσθαι, might be admissible, were it to be derived from ὤμοι, ὤμος and εἴρεω (Fr. Mr. p. 792). To be sure, no verb of the kind with ὦμ. is to be found elsewhere; for ὄμαιδεω comes from ὄμαδος; and ὄμοδρομεῖν, ὄμοδρομεῖν, ὄμεννετεῖν, ὄμεννετεῖν, ὄμογχεῖν, ὄμλειν, even ὀμονοεῖν (Bttm. II. 473), are likewise derived from nouns. Besides, the Genitive, governed as above by the verb, would be strange (cf. Mthh. II. 907). Perhaps, however, the first objection should not be pressed in the case of a word formed in the language of the people. If μείρεσθαι, which occurs in Nicand. Ther. 400 for ἵμείρεσθαι, were the original form, μείρεσθαι and ἵμείρεσθαι might exist side by side as well as δύρεσθαι and ἰδύρεσθαι; indeed ἵμείρεσθαι is perhaps the true reading (Lob. Pathol. 72).

A formation peculiar to the Hellenistic idiom is προσωποληπτεῖν (προσωπολήπτης, προσωποληπτικά Theodos. acros. 1. 32, ἀπροσωπολήπτως, Acta apocr. p. 86). A corresponding verb is ἀκαταληπτεῖν in Sext. Emp. I. 201; for the concrete derivative, however, compare διερολήπτης and ἐρολήπτης in the Sept.; and for the abstract προσωποληπτικά, cf. ἐροληπτικά Ephraem. pp. 3104, 7890; Nicet. Eugen. 4, 251.

Many other compound nouns of this sort, in which, as in προσωπολήπτης, θανατηφόρος, the second part is derived from a verb while the first denotes the object, etc. (Bttm. II. 478), occur in the N. T. but are unknown to the Greeks: e.g. δεξιολάβος he who takes position at one’s right, hence an attendant.

From such compounds arise in turn, not only abstract nouns (σεπνοπηγγία even, belongs to this class, as though from σεπνοπηγγός,

---

1 On these forms see Bttm. II. 457. Against οἰκουργεῖν and οἰκουργός (Tit. ii. 5 var.) cf. Fr. de crit. conform. p. 29.

2 Also ἀσθένης is a compound of this description, from ἄσθρος and ἱδέω, ἱδέω Bttm. II. 458.
according to numerous analogies, as κλιμακηγία, but also verbs: λιθοβολείν from λιθοβόλος (cf. ἄνθρωπος, θηροβολεύν, ἠλιοβο-
114 λέως, etc.), ὅφωποείν from ὅφωπος, δεξιολαβείν Leo Gram. 
p. 175 (Bttm. II. 479).

In decomposite verbs, the preposition which constitutes the double 
composition is naturally put first, as ἀπεκδέχομαι, συναντάμβάνομαι. 
Διαπαρατρίβη in 1 Tim. vi. 5 would violate this rule, if it must mean mis-
placed diligence or unprofitable disputing. For this word can only signify 
continued (endless) hostilities, collisions; παραδιατρίβη would be required 
to express the former meaning. The majority of the Codd., however, 
[Sin. also] have διαπαρατρίβη and this Lchm. has printed. A transposition 
of the prepositions is accordingly assumed (even by Fr. Mr. p. 796). Yet 
διαπαρατρίβη continued dissent, is not unsuited to the passage. The 
other compounds beginning with διαπαρα which occur, viz. 1 Kings vi. 4 
διαπαρακύπτοντας, and 2 Sam. iii. 30 διαπαραγι'ων, would be regular 
according to their respective import, if no doubt existed regarding the former;
see Schleusner, thes. philol. sub voc. The double compound παρακαταθήκη 
and the compound παραθήκη are equivalent in meaning (Lennep ad Phalar. 
ep. p. 198, Lips.; Lob. 312). The latter, however, is better established 
in the N. T. The Codd. exhibit variations of both forms even in Thuc. 
2, 72 (see the commentators), and in Plutarch. ser. vind. see Wytenb. 
II. 530. Cf. besides Heinichen, ind. ad Euseb. III. 529.

Many verbs, compound as well as decomposed, are found in Biblical 
Greek which do not occur in the classic language. In particular, verbs 
which the older writers used as simple, appear strengthened with prepositions 
which exhibit as it were to the senses the mode of the action (for 
the later language loves, in general, what is graphic and expressive); e.g. 
καταλθάζω to stone down to death, ἐξορίζω to get a declaration on oath 
out of one, ἑκατράπτων to flash forth, Ιάκωμι to give away (out of the 
family) in marriage (eucare), ἔκτημα, ἑκατέταλλω, ἐξομολογεῖ, and many 
others; see my five Progr. de verborum cum praepositt. compositor. in 
N. T. usu. Lips. 1834-43, 4to.

In the same way, and for the same reason, compound and double com-
ound adverbs (prepositions) were used in later Greek; as, ἔπανω, κατ-
ενώτων, κατενωτι. In Byzantine authors such formations are carried to a 
greater extent than in Biblical Greek; cf. e.g. κατεπάνω in Constantin. 
Porphyrogen.

Note 1. Proper names, particularly such as are compounds, frequently 
appear in the N. T. in those contracted forms which are peculiar to the 
language of the people, and which are in part very bold (Lob. 434, cf. 
Schmid on Horat. ep. 1, 7, 55); as, Ἀπολλώνος for Ἀπολλώνιος, Ἀρτεμάς for 
Ἀρτεμίδωρος Tit. iii. 12, Νυμφᾶς for Νυμφόδωμος Col. iv. 15.1 Ζηνᾶς for

1 Keil in the Philologus II. 468 expressed his conviction that he had found this name 
in an inscription in Böckh.
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For Δημᾶς, Δημήτριος or Δήμαρχος Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 10, probably also Ὠλυμπᾶς for Ὀλυμπιάνος Rom. xvi. 15, Ἐπαφρᾶς for Ἐπαφρῶδης Col. i. 7; iv. 12, and Ἐρμᾶς for Ἐρμόδωρος Rom. xvi. 14, Θεόδας for Θεόδωρος i.e. Θεόδωρος, and Λουκᾶς for Λουκανός (in Greek authors cf. Λεξᾶς for Ἀλέξανδρος Jos. bell. 6, 1, 8, Μυῖᾶς for Μυῖδωρος, Πυθᾶς for Πυθόδωρος, Μετρᾶς Euseb. H. E. 6, 41). Many also in as not circumflexed appear to be abbreviated; as, Ἀμπλιάς for Ἀμπλιάτου Rom. xvi. 8, Ἀντίπας for Ἀντιπάτρου Rev. ii. 13, Κλοῦτας for Κλεόπατρος Luke xxiv. 18, perhaps Σιλᾶς for Σιλουανός; see Heumann, Poecile III. 314. Σωταρίας for Σωτιάρως Acts xx. 4 (which even some Codd. give) would be likewise a very violent contraction, though nearer the beginning. Σωταρίας, however, may be an original form. On the other hand, proper names in λαός, which probably not (Mt. I. 149) the Dorians alone contracted into λας, occur in the N. T. uncontracted: Νικόλαος, Ἀρχέλαος. Moreover, how even the earlier Greeks contracted names of persons for the sake of euphony, K. Keil has shown by examples in his spec. onomatolog. gr. (L. 1840, 8vo.) p. 52 sqq. The German affords examples of similar abbreviations and contractions in great numbers, some very forced, as Klaus from Nikolaus, Kätte (Kathi) from Katharina; many of them have become independent names which even occur in literature, as Fritz (Friedrich), Heinz (Heinrich), Hans, Max. Cf. Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 504 sqq. In general, however, on Greek names of persons see Sturz, Progr. de nominib. Graecor., also in his Opusc. (Lips. 1825, 8vo.), W. Pape, Wörterb. der griech. Eigennamen. Brschw. 1842, 8vo. (Hall. L. Z. 1843. No. 106–108), and the Beiträge zur Onomatalogie by Keil in Schneidewin, Philologus, vols. 2 and 3.

Note 2. Latin words adopted into the Greek of the N. T.,—mostly substantives denoting Roman judicial institutions, coins, or articles of dress,—exhibit nothing peculiar with regard to form. Latin verbs made to assume Greek forms make their first appearance later, in the Greek style of the Pseudepigrapha, the Byzantines, etc. See Thilo, Acta App. Petri et Pauli, Hal. 1837, 4to. I. p. 10 sq.
PART III.

SYNTAX.

A. IMPORT AND USE OF THE SEVERAL PARTS OF SPEECH.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE ARTICLE.¹

§ 17. THE ARTICLE AS A PRONOUN.

1. The article ὧ, ἧ, τό was originally a demonstrative pronoun, and is regularly employed as such in epic poetry,—to which belongs the quotation from Aratus in Acts xvii. 28: τοῦ γὰρ γένος ἄσμεν; cf. Soph. Oed. R. 1082 τῆς γὰρ πέφυκα μητρός (Mtth. 737. For prose cf. Athen. 2, p. 37).

In prose on the other hand the article is ordinarily equivalent to a demonstrative pronoun only —

a. In the current formulas ὧ μὲν ... ὧ δὲ, οἱ μὲν ... οἱ δὲ,² sometimes in reference to a subject previously mentioned: this ... that, the one ... the other Acts xiv. 4; xvii. 32; xxviii. 24; Heb. vii. 20 f.; Gal. iv. 23 (Scheaf. Dion. 421), sometimes partitively without such reference, Eph. iv. 11 ἐσώκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ, etc. (some ... others).

b. In the course of narration, in the simple phrase ὧ δὲ, οἱ δὲ, 100 but he, etc. (as opposed to some other subject) ; as, Matt. xiii. 29 ⁷th ed. ὧ δὲ ἐφη, ii. 9 οἱ δὲ ἄκουσαντες ἐπορεύθησαν, ii. 14; ix. 31; Luke


² On the accentuation see Hm. Vig. p. 700. On the other side, Krüy. p. 83.
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iii. 13; viii. 21; xx. 12; Jno. i. 39; ix. 38; Acts i. 6; ix. 40, etc. 117
(Xen. A. 2, 3, 2; Aesch. dial. 3, 15, 17; Philostr. Ap. 1, 21, 5;
Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 29, 29 etc.)

For oi μέν ... oi δέ are found also oi μέν ... ἄλλοι δέ Jno. vii. 12, oi μέν 96 ... ἄλλοι δέ ... ἐτέροι δέ Matt. xvi. 14 (Plato, legg. 2, 658 b.; Ael. 2, 34; Palaeph. 6, 5), τοιούτα ... oi δέ Acts xvii. 18, cf. Plato, legg. 1, 627 a. and Ast on the passage. Similar expressions are still more diversified in Greek authors (Muth. 742).

Instead of the Article, the Relative also is employed in such antithetical statements; as, 1 Cor. xi. 21 δέ μέν ... ὧν, δέ δὲ μένι, Matt. xxv. 35 δεν μέν ... τῷ, δὲν δὲν δέν, etc., Acts xxvii. 44; Rom. ix. 21; Mark xii. 5; cf. Polyb. 1, 7, 3; 3, 76 4; Thuc. 3, 66; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 109 sqq.; Hm. Vig. 706. Once δὲ μέν ... ἄλλοι δέ 1 Cor. xii. 8 (Xen. A. 3, 1, 35); δ μέν (Neut.) ... καὶ ἐτέρον Luke viii. 5 f.; in 1 Cor. xii. 28 an anacoluthon is easily perceived. See in general Bhdy. 306 f. (In Rom. xiv. 2 ὁ δὲ is not related to ὁ δὲν, but δ is the Article belonging to ἀσθενῶν.)

2. In Matt. xxvi. 67; xxviii. 17 oi δέ is used of a second party without a first's having been designated by oi μέν. The former passage ἐνεπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφσαν αὐτὸν, oi δὲ ἐφάπτεται would more regularly run thus: καὶ oi μέν ἐκολάφ.; but as he writes ἐκολάφ. the author has no second distributive clause definitely in mind as yet; but when he subjoins oi δὲ ἐφά. it becomes self-evident that ἐκολάφ. applies to a part only of the actors; cf. Xen. H. 1, 2, 14 oi αἰχμαλώτων ... ἵππου ἐσθενεῖ, oi δὲς Μέγαρα, Cyr. 3, 2, 12; see Poppo ad. Cyr. p. 292; Bremi, Demosth. p. 273. So, in Matt. xxviii., it is first stated in general terms oi ἐνδεκα μαθηταὶ ... ἐδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν; that this, however, is to be understood only of the greater number is clear from what follows—oi δὲ ἐδιστασαν. In Luke ix. 19 oi δὲ refers regularly to the previously mentioned μαθηταὶ vs. 18, and should seem to denote that all gave the answer which follows; but the expressions ἄλλοι δὲ ... ἄλλοι δὲ show that the answer was given by only a part of the disciples. Matt. xvi. 14 is more regular: oi δὲ εἶπον· oi μέν Ἰωάννην ... ἄλλοι δὲ ... ἐτέροι δέ.
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1. When ὁ, ἦ, τό is employed as strictly an Article before a noun, it marks the object as one definitely conceived,1 whether in
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101 consequence of its nature, or the context, or some circle of ideas assumed as known; as, Mark i. 32 ὅτε ἔδω ὁ Ἡλίως, Jno. i. 52 ὥσπερ ἦν ὁ ὄραμα. Acts xxviii. 8 ὡσπερ ἦν ἡ ἐκτρώματος ὁ ὄμοι (the only abortion among the apostles), Luke iv. 20 πνεύμα τὸ βασιλείαν (which had been handed to him vs. 17) ὑπόδοιον τῷ ἱπποτῇ (the beadle of the synagogue), Jno. xiii. 5 βάλλει ὑδρὸς εἰς τὸν νεπτύρα the basin (that stood there, as usual), cf. Matt. xxvi. 26 f.; Jno. vi. 3 ἀνῇθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος into the mountain (situated just there on the farther shore vs. 1), 1 Cor. v. 9 ἑραφά σα εἰς τῇ ἐπιστολῇ (which Paul had previously written to the Cor.), Acts ix. 2 ἡμῖν ἐπίστολα εἰς Ἀδαμάσκον πρὸς τὰς συναγωγάς to the synagogues (there in Damascus), Rev. xx. 4 ἐβασιλεύσαν μετὰ Χριστοῦ τὰ χιλιά ἐτη the thousand years (the known duration of the Messiah's kingdom), Jas. ii. 25 Ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς ἀνωτέρας ἀνδρὸς τῶν ἀγγέλων the spies (mentioned in the history of Rahab), Heb. ix. 19 λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τῶν τραύματος with allusion to Exod. xxiv. 8. So 1 Cor. vii. 3 τῇ γυναικὶ ὃ ἀνήρ τὴν ὀφειλῇ ἐνοδίνου the (i.e. matrimonial) attention due, vii. 29 ὃ καὶρὸς συνεπεσετάλμενος ἐστὶν; cf. vs. 26 διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην. The Article thus refers to certain facts, arrangements, or opinions, Acts v. 37; xxi. 38; Heb. xi. 28; 1 Cor. x. 1, 10; 2 Thess. ii. 3; Jno. i. 21; ii. 14; xviii. 3; Matt. viii. 4, 12, or to something previously mentioned, Matt. ii. 7 (1); Luke ix. 16 (13); Acts ix. 17, (11); Jno. iv. 43 (40); Acts xi. 13 (x. 3, 22); Jas. ii. 3 (2); Jno. xii. 12 (1); xx. 1 (xix. 41); Heb. v. 4 (1); Rev. xv. 6 (1). Accordingly ὁ ἐρχόμενος is the Messiah, ἡ κρίσις the (last) judgment, ἡ γραφή the holy Scripture, ἡ σωτηρία Christian salvation, ὁ πειράτης the Tempter — Satan, etc. So also of geographical designations, ἡ ἔρημος the desert, so called by way of eminence, ἡ ἐρημία, i.e. according to the context, either the Arabian desert (of Mount Sinai) Jno. iii. 14; vi. 31; Acts vii. 30, or the desert of Judea Matt. iv. 1; xi. 7.

119 To be particularly noticed, further, is the use of a Singular with the Article to express in the person of a definite individual a whole class; as when we say, the soldier must be trained to arms: 2 Cor. xii. 12 τὰ συμμεία τοῦ ἀποστόλου, Matt. xii. 35 ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος . . . ἐκβάλλει ἄγαθα, xv. 11; xviii. 17; Luke x. 7; Gal. iv. 1; Jas. v. 6. Allied to this is the Singular in parables and allegories: Jno. x. 11 ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τίθησιν, where the Good Shepherd is brought forward as an ideal; Matt. xiii. 3 ἤγανθεν ὁ σπειρων τοῦ σπειρῶν (where Luther incorrectly has, a sower). See Krü. 86 f.
Note. According to Kühnöl the Article (cf. the emphatic ὅς in German) sometimes includes the force of the pronoun this (cf. Siebelis, Pausan. I. 50; Boisson. Babr. p. 207), Matt. i. 25 τὸν ὕδωρ for τοῦτον τὸν ὕδωρ, Jno. vii. 17 γνώσεται οἱ τῆς διδαχῆς, vs. 40 ἐκ τοῦ δόξαν, Acts xxvi. 10 ὡς τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερῶν ἐξουσίας λαβών, Mark xiii. 20; Acts ix. 2; but the definite Article is quite sufficient in all such cases. Heumann has gone still further in conceding this import of the Article, and is followed by Schulthess (n. krit. Journ. I. 285), who, with Kühnöl, quite erroneously refers to Mth. § 286, where this use of the Article, which can hardly occur in prose (except Ionic), is not discussed. Col. iv. 16 ἐστιν ἀναγκασθῇ τὴν ἑμῶν ἡ ἐπιστολή we also say, when the letter is read (not the (this) letter — no such underscoring is needed, since the letter in hand could be the only one thought of); some authorities add ἀργά, but the ancient versions ought not to be reckoned in. In 1 Tim. i. 15 even in German the Demost. ὅς ἐν ὧν ὧν. Pronoun is not required, nor in vii. 13. In 2 Cor. v. 4 the Art. in ὅν τῷ σκῆραι is not put διευκτικῶς for τοῦτον, but simply refers back to σκῆρος mentioned in vs. 1. In Col. iii. 8 Ἀπόστολος καὶ ὁμοίας τὰ πάντα is not, all this (or that) (intensive), but the whole, viz. what is immediately (a second time) adduced. Also in Rom. v. 5 ἡ ἡμεῖς (ὑπός) is simply the Article; see Fr. Least of all must ὁ κόσμος be taken for ὁνομ δοῦν ὁ κόσμος; it means the world as distinguished from heaven, the kingdom of heaven; not this world as opposed to another κόσμος. The same judgment must be passed also upon those passages which might be adduced as proofs of this usage in classic authors, Diog. Laert. 1, 72 and 86. One cannot possibly comprehend how the apostles could have been induced, in certain passages where they thought the demonstrative pronoun, to employ — not that, but — the article, which is much weaker in every instance. One's sense of linguistic propriety revolts against such a use of language. Besides, explicitness is the very characteristic of the later language in general (and of that of the N. T. also).

By Greek authors, particularly Ionic and Doric (Mth. 747; cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 204), and afterwards by the Byzant. (Malal. p. 95, 102), the Art. was sometimes used for the Relative. Some have asserted that the same use is found in the N. T. in Acts xiii. 9 Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος (see 120 Schleusner s. h. v.); but incorrectly, for ὁ καὶ Π. is here equivalent to ὁ καὶ καλούμενος Παῦλος (Schaef. L. Bos. p. 213), and the Article retains its ordinary import, just as in Σ. ὁ Ταρσεύς. Compare the similar Πιπός ὁ καὶ Ζείφ Malal. ed. Bonn. p. 19 sq.; Act. Thom. p. 34. On the other hand, compare in Hellenistic writers, Psalt. Sal. xvii. 12 ἐν τοῖς κρήμασι, τὰ ποιεῖ ἐν τῷ γίνεται, if the reading is correct. In Wisd. xi. 15, where ὃν the reading of the Cod. Alex. is probably a correction, τὸν is to be regarded as the Article.

2. The use of the Article which has just been discussed is common to the Greek with all languages that possess an Article.
The following cases on the other hand (cases where in German the definite Art. is not used) are to be noticed as peculiar:

103 a. Rev. iv. 7 τὸ ζῶον ἔχων τὸ πρόσωπον ὡς ἀνδρώπου (Xen. C. 5, 1, 2 ὁμοιὰν ταῖς δουλαῖς ἔχει τὴν ἐσθήτα, Theophr. ch. 12 [19] τοὺς δυνάμεις μεγάλους ἔχων, Polyben. 8, 10, 1 a.), Acts xxvi. 24 μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ ἐφη, xiv. 10; 1 Cor. xi. 5 (Aristot. anim. 2, 8 and 10; Lucian. catapl. 11; D. S. 1, 70, 83; Pol. 15, 29, 11; Philostr. Ap. 4, 44). We say, he had eyes like, etc.; he spoke with a loud voice, etc. The Greek here by the Article designates what belongs to the individual in a definite form, as is more obvious from Heb. vii. 24 ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην he hath the priesthood as unchangeable (predicate), Mark viii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 12; iv. 8; Eph. i. 18 and from Matt. iii. 4 ἐχεῖ τὸ ἐνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμηλῶν, Rev. ii. 18 (differing from the preceding examples by the addition of the pronoun). From Greek authors, for the former cf. Thuc. 1, 10 and 23; Plato, Phaedr. 242 b.; Lucian. dial. deor. 8, 1; fugit. 10; eun. 11; D. S. 1, 52; 2, 19; 8, 84; Ael. anim. 13, 15; Pol. 3, 4, 1; 8, 10, 1; see Lob. Phryn. 265; Krü. Dion. H. 126. (The Art. is sometimes omitted e.g. in 2 Pet. ii. 14; cf. Aristot. anim. 2, 8 and 10 with 2, 11.)

b. 1 Cor. iv. 5 τότε ὁ ἐπαινὸς γενησται ἐκάστῳ the praise which is due him, Rom. xi. 36 αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, xvi. 27; Eph. iii. 21; Gal. i. 5; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Rev. v. 13; Rev. iv. 11 ἀξιός εἶ Ῥαβείν τῇ δόξᾳ καὶ τῷ τιμῆν, Jas. ii. 14 τὸ δόθη εἰς πίστιν λέγου τις ἔχει the advantage to be expected, 1 Cor. xv. 32; 1 Cor. ix. 18 τίς μοι ἐστών ὁ μυσθός (Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 212). In general the Art. here denotes that which is due, requisite, etc., Krü. 84. Accordingly it is often used where we employ a Possessive Pronoun; as, Rom. iv. 4 τῷ ἐργαζόμενῳ ὁ μυσθός οὗ λογίζεται his reward, ix. 22; Luke xviii. 15. Cf. Fritzsch, Aristot. Amic. pp. 46, 99.

121 On the other hand, no example occurs of the use of the Art. discussed by Mth. 714 and Rost 438 in appellations (Schaef. Demosth. IV. 365); for in Rev. vi. 8 ὅνομα αὐτῷ ὁ θάνατος, viii. 11 τὸ ὅνομα τοῦ ἀτέρος λέγεται ὁ ἄφινθος, xix. 13 κέλευται τὸ ὅνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, a name is mentioned in every case which belongs individually and exclusively to the object.

3. Adjectives and participles used substantively are, like substantives, rendered definite by the Article; as, 1 Cor. i. 27 οἱ σοφοὶ, Eph. vi. 16 βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ, Gal. i. 23 ὁ διώκων ἔμας, Tit. iii. 8 οἱ πεπιστευκότες τῷ θεῷ, 1 Cor. ix. 13 οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι, Matt. x. 20; 2 Cor. ii. 2; x. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; Heb. xii. 27.
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But the place of the noun may be occupied also by an indeclinable part of speech, as an Inf. or an Adverb, 2 Cor. i. 17, or by a phrase, Rom. iv. 14 ὁ ἐκ νόμου, Heb. xiii. 24 ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας (D. S. 1, 83), Acts xiii. 13 ὁ περὶ Παῦλου, Phil. i. 27 τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν etc. 1 Cor. xiii. 10 (Krü. 92); and indeed (after τὸ) by a whole proposition, Acts xxii. 80 γνώναι τὸ τῇ κατηγορεῖται (iv. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 1; Luke xxii. 2, 23, 37), Mark ix. 23 εἴπετε αὐτῷ τὸ· εἰ δύνῃ; Gal. v. 14 ὁ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνί λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τοῦ ἀγαπήσει τὸν πλησίον σου, Rom. viii. 26; xiii. 9; Luke i. 62; [Matt. xix. 18]. (Sentences thus made prominent are usually 104 quotations or interrogations.) Cf. Plato, Gorg. 461 e. and Phaed. 62 b.; rep. 1, 352 d.; Demosth. Con. 728 c.; Lucian. Alex. 20; Mth. 730 f.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyph. p. 55, and Men. 25. Even an Adverb or a Genitive connected with the Art. (particularly the Neut.) becomes a virtual Substantive (Ellendt, Arrian. Al. 1. 84; Weber, Demosth. p. 237) as, Luke xvi. 26 ὁ ἐκείδεν, Jno. viii. 23 τὰ καίω, τὰ ἄνω, Jno. xxi. 2 ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, Luke xx. 25 τὰ Καίσαρος, Jas. iv. 14 τὸ τῆς αἵματι, 2 Pet. ii. 22 τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας, 1 Cor. vii. 33 τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, 2 Pet. i. 3; 2 Cor. x. 16; Phil. i. 5; Jno. xviii. 6, etc. Krü. 28, 93. So too, in German we can say briefly, das droben, das des morgenden Tages (what will happen to-morrow), die des Zebediäus (those belonging to him, e.g. sons), see § 30, 3. Often, however, we must use a periphrasis; 100 was dem Kaiser gebührt; etc. As a mere periphrasis, like τὸ τῆς θαῦμας θεός for ὁ θαῦμα 1 Pet. iv. 14, the neut. Art. is not used in the N.T. (Huther in loc. [1st ed.] to the contrary.)

The Neut. τὸ is sometimes put before nouns to designate them in the abstract, as sounds or combinations of sound: Gal. iv. 25 τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ etc., the (word) Hagar.

In many connections a participle used substantively occurs with an article (which is not admissible in German) as a definite predicate to an indefinite subject, Gal. i. 7 τινὲς ἦσαν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς, Col. ii. 8 μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ἵσται ὁ σωλάγαγων, also Jno. v. 32; Luke xviii. 9; or as a definite subject where, logically, an indefinite was to be expected, Rom. iii. 11 οὐκ ἢστω ὁ σωμάτων (Jno. v. 45), 2 Cor. xi. 4 εἰ ὁ ἄρχομενος ἣλλον ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει. But in Greek in all such cases the quality is conceived of as a definite concrete, 122 only the person, who is this concrete in action, remains indefinite. The ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς really exist, only as individuals they are not more closely designated.1 If he that cometh (the preacher who will not fail to appear

1 Cf. in Latin sunt qui existimant as distinguished from sunt qui existimant; see Zumpt, S. 480.
among you,—person and name are of no consequence), etc.; *he that understandeth is not* (to be found), etc. So Lucian. abdic. 3 ἓσαν τινίς οἱ μανίας ἀρχὴν τοῦτ’ ἐσαν νομίζοντες, Lysias bon. Aristoph. 57 εἰσ’ τινες οἱ προσαναλήκοντες, Dio Chr. 38, 482 ἥτιν τινες ἤσαν οἱ καὶ τοῦτο δεδοκινέται, and the frequent εἰσ’ οἱ λέγοντες Mtth. 713, also Xen. A. 2, 4, 5 ὁ ἄγγελός μου ὑμεῖς ἔσται, Thuc. 3. 83 οὐκ ἦν δὲ διαλέον, Porphyry. abst. 4, 18 οὐδεὶς ἐστιν ὁ κόλασσων, (Sept. Gen. xl. 8; xli. 8; Deut. xxii. 27; 1 Sam. xiv. 39). See Bhdly. 318 f.; IIm. Soph. Oed. R. 107; Doederl. Soph. Oed. Col. p. 296; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 238. Acts ii. 47 ὁ κύριος προσεκάθισε τοὺς σωκόμοις

between τολλοί and οἱ τολλοί put substantively (the latter is very rare in the N. T.) we find the usual distinction. Οἱ τολλοί means the (known) many 2 Cor. ii. 17 contrasted with unity, Rom. xii. 5 οἱ τολλοί ἐν σώμα έσον (1 Cor. x. 17), or opposed to a definite individual Rom. v. 15, 19, or, without such contrast, the generality, the (great) mass, the vulgus (all but a few) Matt. xxiv. 12; cf. Schaefer. Melet. p. 3. 65.

4. Nouns rendered more distinctly definite by οὗτος or έκεῖνος as adjectives,1 always have the Article, inasmuch as they distinguish some individual from the mass (not so in German—nor in English): ὁ ἀκρωτός οὗτος Luke ii. 25, οὗτος ὁ ἀκρωτός xiv. 30, τὸν ἄγρων έκεῖνον Matt. xiii. 44, ἐν έκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ Matt. vii. 22, ὁ κακός δοῦλος έκεῖνος Matt. xxiv. 48. Also in Luke vii. 44 the accredited reading is βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα, though ταύτην γυναῖκα,—as the woman was present,—according to Wolf in Dem. Lept. p. 263; 101 Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 243; Krü. 108, would be unexceptionable.

Names of persons also with οὗτος usually have the Article; as, Heb. vii. 1; Acts i. 11; ii. 32; xix. 26 (vii. 40).

A noun with πάς may either have the Art. or not; πάσα πόλις means every city, πάσα ἡ πόλις the whole city Matt. viii. 34 (Rom. iii. 19 ἵνα πάν στόμα φρασῇ καὶ ἤπόδικος γένηται πάς ὁ κόσμος); πάσαι γενεάς all generations, whatever their number, πάσαι αἱ γενεάς Matt. i. 17 all the generations, known as a definite plural 123 either from the context or some other source. Cf. Sing. Matt. iii. 10; vi. 29; xiii. 47; Jno. ii. 10; Luke vii. 29; Mark v. 33; Phil. i. 3; Plur. Matt. ii. 4; iv. 24; Luke xiii. 27; Acts xxii. 15; Gal. vi. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 16 (where there is not much authority for the Art.).

1 It is otherwise when these pronouns are predicates; as, Rom. ix. 8 τἀντα τέκνα τοῦ ὅσι, Luke i. 36 οὖν ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἦσαν, Jno. iv. 18 τούτο ἄλληθες εἶχαν, ii. 11, etc. Cf. Fr. Mt. 663; Schaefer, Plut. IV. 377.
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The following are not exceptions: 1 Matt. ii. 3 πᾶσα 'Ierosolyma all Jerusalem (for 'Ierosolyma is a proper name, see paragraph 5); Acts ii. 36 πᾶς ὁκεος 'Iσραη the whole house of Israel (for this too is treated as a proper name 1 Sam. vii. 2 f.; Neh. iv. 16; Judith viii. 6). In Eph. iii. 15 πᾶσα πατρί obviously means every race, Col. iv. 12 ἐν παρθι θείματι τοῦ θεοῦ in every will of God (in everything which God wills), 1 Pet. i. 15 ἐν πᾶσι ἀναστροφῇ in omni vitæ modo.

Still less are the following instances to be considered as exceptional: Jas. i. 2 πᾶσιν καράν ἡγίσασθε, Eph. i. 8 ἐν πᾶσιν σοφίᾳ (2 Cor. xii. 12; Acts xxiii. 1) all (full) joy, in all (full) wisdom — for they are abstracts denoting a whole, where every wisdom and all wisdom substantially coincide, Krü. 106. Only in Eph. ii. 21 there is preponderating authority for πᾶσα οἰκοδομή, though, since the church of Christ as a whole is spoken of, the whole building is the proper translation; A C [Sin**] however, actually give the Art., which owing to the Itacism might easily have fallen out.

Πᾶς joined to a participle not equivalent to a noun demands particular notice: πᾶς δρογίζομεν means every one angry (when, if, while he is angry), cf. 1 Cor. xi. 4, but πᾶς ὁ δρογίζομεν Matt. v. 22 every angry person i.q. πᾶς δύνας δρογίζεται; cf. Luke vi. 47; xi. 10; Jno. iii. 20; xv. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Thess. i. 7, etc.; Krü. 89. This distinction must guide our judgment respecting the double reading Luke xi. 4 παρὶ δειλοντι and παρὶ τῷ δειλοντι, see Mey.

Τουκοτος is joined to a noun without an Art. when such, any such, of this sort, is meant; as, Matt. ix. 8 ἔχοςις τουκοτι, Mark iv. 53 τουκοτι παραβολαι, Acts xvi. 24 παραγγελία τουκοτι, 2 Cor. iii. 12. When, on the other hand, a particular object is pointed out as such a or of such a sort, the noun naturally takes the Art.; as, Mark ix. 37 ἐν τοῖς τουκοτοις παιδιον (with reference to παιδιον in vs. 36 that represents childhood), Jno. iv. 23; 2 Cor. xii. 3, cf. 102 vs. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 13; Schaef. Demos. III. 186; Schneider, Plat. civ. II. p. 1. 6th ed.


1 Only nouns of the class mentioned in § 19, 1. can, even when joined to πᾶς (the whole), dispense with the Article, e.g. πᾶσα γὰρ; cf. Thuc. ed. Poppo, III. II. p. 224. In the N. T. this word always has the Article; as, Matt. xxvii. 45 ἐν πᾶσιν τῷ γὰρ, Rom. x. 18, etc. Finally, the passages Thiersch, de Pentat. Alex. p. 121, has quoted to prove the omission of the Art. with πᾶς (the whole) in the Sept., are for the most part quite irrelevant.
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Τὸ ἀνυόν μεανεῖ the same Spirit; but ἀνυόν τὸν ζευς the Spirit Himself, Krü. 107. Compare for the former Rom. ix. 21; Phil. i. 30; Luke vi. 38; xxiii. 40; 2 Cor. iv. 13; for the latter Rom. viii. 26; 1 Cor. xv. 28; 2 Cor. xi. 14; Jno. xvi. 27. In both cases the Art. is never omitted in the N. T. with appellatives,—(Luke xx. 42; xxiv. 15 therefore are no exceptions; Bornem. Schol. p. 158.) — as it is sometimes in Greek authors, that is to say in the former case, especially in epic poetry, Hm. Opusc. I. 332 sqq., and in later prose (index to Agath. ed. Bonn. p. 411); in the latter case, even in the better prose authors, Krü. Dion. H. 454 sq.; Bornem. Xen. An. p. 61; Poppo, index ad Cyr. sub verb.

5. Proper names, as they already denote a definite individual, do not require the Art., nevertheless, as the established sign of definiteness, it is often joined to them. First, in regard to geographical names:

a. The names of countries (and rivers) more frequently take the Art. than those of cities (cf. die Schweiz, die Lausitz, die Lombardei, das Elsass, das Tyrol, etc.).

The following never or very seldom occur without the Art.: ᾿Ιούδα, ᾿Αχαία, ᾿Ιορδανῆς, ᾿Ιταλία, ᾿Ιαλωσία, ᾿Μυσία, ᾿Ασία (Acts ii. 9, yet see vi. 9; 1 Pet. i. 1), Σαμαρεία (Luke xvii. 11), Συρία (Acts xx. 3), Κρήτη (yet Tit. i. 5). Only Ἀλβανία is always used without the Art., and with Μακεδονία usage varies.

b. Names of cities most rarely have the Art. when connected with a preposition (Locella, Xen. Ephes. pp. 223, 242), particularly with ἐν, εἰς, or ἐκ; cf. the words Δαμασκός, ᾿Ιερουσαλήμ, ᾿Ιεροσόλυμα, Τάρσος, ᾿Εφεσος, ᾿Αντιόχεια, Καπηλεοῦμι in the concordance. Only Κασσάρεια, Ὁριμ and Τροάδες vary strangely.

c. Sometimes it is to be observed that a geographical name, when it occurs for the first time in the narration, has not the Article, but takes it on being repeated; as, Acts xvii. 15 ἐκεῖ Ἀθηνῶν first time, then vs. 16, xviii. 1, with the Art.; Acts xvii. 10 εἰς Βέροιαν, then vs. 13 εἰς τῆς Β.; Acts xvi. 9 ἰδίᾳ ἐς Μακεδονίαν, then six times with the Art. (only in xx. 3 without it); Acts xx. 15 ἦλθομεν εἰς Μιλησίαν, vs. 17 ἀπ’ τῆς Μιλησίας.

῾Ιεροσολύμα has the Art. only when accompanied with an adjective; Rev. iii. 12; Gal. iv. 25 f.; besides in Acts v. 28 in the Acc. (on the contrary, Luke xxiv. 18; Acts i. 19, etc.). ᾿Ιερώνυμος occurs in the oblique cases with the Art. only in Jno. (v. 2; x. 22; xi. 18).

6. The use of the Art. with names of persons (Bhdy. 317; Mdv. 17) can hardly be reduced to rule. A comparison of separate

1 In Matt. xii. 50 it is quite unnecessary with Fr. to take abdôs for ã abôðs.
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passages will easily convince one of the capricious irregularity of writers,¹ and that he cannot go far with the distinction (Hm. praef. ad Iphig. Aul. p. 16; Fr. Mt. p. 797; Weber, Demosth. p. 414) that a proper name is first introduced without the Art. but takes it when repeated (cf. Matt. xxvii. 24, 58 with 62; Mark xv. 1, 14, 15 with 43; Luke xxiii. 1 ff. with 6 and 13; Jno. xviii. 2 with 5; Acts vi. 5 with 8 f.; viii. 1 with 3 and ix. 8; Acts viii. 5 with 6, 12);² nor with that other (Thilo, Apocr. I. 163 sq.), 'proper names when in the Nominative usually did not take the Art., but frequently had it when in the oblique cases.'³ Hence the authority of the best MSS. must decide mainly whether the Art. shall stand or not.⁴ Proper names which are rendered definite by subjoined names of kindred or of office, usually (even in the classics Ellendt, 108 Arrian. Al. I. 154, yet see Schoem. ad Isæum p. 417 sq.; Diod. S. 204 Exc. Vat. p. 37) dispense with the Art. (since they first become definite by means of the predicate): Gal. i. 19 Ἰάκωβου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου, Matt. x. 4 Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰςκαρίωτης; ii. 1, 8; iv. 21; xiv. 1; Mark x. 47; xvi. 1; Jno. xviii. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 2; Rom. xvi. 8 ff.; Acts i. 13; xii. 1; xviii. 8, 17. Thus Pausan. e.g. 2, 1, 1; 3, 9, 1; 7, 18, 6; Aeschin. Tim. 179 c.; Diog. L. 4, 32; 7, 10, 13; 8, 58, 63; Demosth. Theocr. 511 c. and Ap. 581 b.; Phorm. 605 b., etc.; Conon. 728 b.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 8; 2, 1, 5; Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 20. 22. 39. 41. 42. 51. 69. 95 etc. On the other hand, with inde- 126 clinal names of persons where the case is not at once apparent from a preposition, appended title, etc. (as in Mark xi. 10; Luke i. 32; Jno. iv. 5; Acts ii. 29; vii. 14; xiii. 22; Rom. iv. 1; Heb. iv. 7) perspicuity seems to require the Art.: Matt. i. 18; xxii. 42; Mark xv. 45; Luke ii. 16; Acts vii. 8; Rom. ix. 13; xi. 25; Gal.

¹ In German, as is well known, the use of the Article before names of persons is provincial. Der Lehmann, common in Southern Germany, would sound strange in Northern Germany.

² Even a person who is mentioned for the first time may take the Article when one well known to the reader, or otherwise sufficiently particularized.

³ Compare in particular the want of uniformity in the use of the Article with Παῦλος and Πέτρος in the Acts. Παῦλος in Jno. has always the Article; but in the Acts, never; in Matt. and Mark we find with few exceptions διὰ Παῦλος. Τίτος has never the Article.

⁴ That in the addresses of letters the names of persons are without the Article may be seen from the collections of Greek letters, from Diog. L. (e.g. 3, 22; 8, 49, 80; 9, 13) from Plutarch, Apophth. lae p. 191, from Lucian, parasit. 2, etc. Cf. 2 Jno. 1. The address in 1 Pet. i. 1 Πέτρος . . . ἐπισκόπων παρεκτικοῦ, and also Rev. i. 4, are probably to be referred to this rule. Even characterizing predicates dispense with the Article in addresses, Diog. L. 7, 7 and 8.
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iii. 8; Heb. xi. 17, etc. (Hence Paul in Rom. x. 19 would undoubtedly have written μὴ τῶν Ἰσραήλ οὐκ ἔγραω; had he regarded 104 Ἰσραήλ as the object; cf. 1 Cor. x. 18; Luke xxiv. 21). In the genealogies Matt. i. and Luke iii. this is observed throughout, but also where the names are declineable. With regard to proper names, too, the Codd. often vary.

It may be remarked here that the proper name Ἰούδα, where it is to be taken as the name of a country, never runs in the Sept. Ἰούδα, τῆς Ἰούδας, etc., but always Ἰούδα (1 Kings xii. 32; 2 Kings xxiv. 2), or the inflected Ἰούδας is used instead (2 Chr. xvii. 19). Hence in Matt. ii. 6 the conjecture τῆς Ἰούδας is even philologically quite improbable.

7. A Substantive with an Article may be the predicate as well as the subject of a proposition, since even the predicate may be conceived of as a definite individual; (though from the nature of the case the substantive which has the Art. will more frequently be the subject). In the N.T. the predicate has the Art. much more frequently than is usually thought, Krü. 91: Mark vi. 3 οὗχ οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων is not this the (known) carpenter? vii. 15 ἐκεῖνα ἐστὶ τὰ κοινώτατα τῶν ἀνθρωπων those are the things that defile etc. xii. 7 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος, xiii. 11 οὗ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς 109 οἱ λαλοῦντες, Matt. xxvi. 26, 28 τοῦτο ἐστι τὸ σῶμα μου, τούτῳ ἐστι τὸ αἵμα μου, Jno. iv. 42 οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, 1 Cor. x. 4 ἢ δὲ πέτρα ἢν ὁ Χριστός, xi. 3 παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ἢ κεφαλή ὁ Χριστός ἐστι, xv. 56 ἢ δύναμις τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ νόμος, 2 Cor. iii. 17 ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεύμα ἐστιν, 1 Jno. iii. 4 ἢ ἀμαρτία ἐστιν ἢ ἀνομία, Phil. ii. 13 ὁ θεὸς ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν; cf. also Matt. v. 13; vi. 22; xvi. 16; Mark viii. 29; ix. 7; xv. 2; Jno. i. 4, 8, 50; iii. 10; iv. 29; v. 35, 39; vi. 14, 50, 51, 63; ix. 8, 19, 20; x. 7; xi. 25; xiv. 21; Acts iv. 11; vii. 32; viii. 10; ix. 21; xxi. 28, 38; Phil. iii. 3, 19; Eph. i. 23; ii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 2; 1 Jno. iv. 15; v. 6; Jude 19; Rev. i. 17; iii. 17; iv. 5; xvii. 18; xviii. 23; xix. 10; xx. 14. In the following passages the Codd. vary more or less: Rev. v. 6, 8; Actsiii. 25; 1 Jno. ii. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 28; Jno. i. 21. In one instance, one of two nouns in the predicate has not, and the other has, the Art.: Jno. viii. 44 ὡς ψεύτης ἐστι 127 καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ (ψεύτων) he is a liar and the father of it (falsehood). In Greek authors likewise the Article often occurs before

1 Fr. ad l. has quoted passages not to the purpose, and for Gal. vi. 6 he must have meant vi. 16.
2 Probably also Jno. iv. 37; see Meyer.
the predicate; cf. Xen. M. 3, 10, 1; Plato, Phaedr. 64 c.; Gorg. 488 b.; Lucian. dial. m. 17, 1; see Schaeff. Demosth. III. 280; IV. 35; Mth. 706 f. [A copious collection of examples (yet without any real advance as respects the theory) is contained in Dorisseffen, de articulo ap. Graec. ejusque usu in praedicato. Amstel. 1856. 8vo.]

Hence it follows that the oft-repeated rule: 'the subject of a proposition may be known from its having the Art.' is incorrect, as Glassius and Rambach (Instit. herm. p. 446) long ago perceived. Cf. besides, Jen. Lit. Z. 1834, No. 207.

8. In the language of living intercourse it is utterly impossible that the Article should be omitted where it is decidedly necessary (cf., however, § 19), or employed where it is not demanded. 1 ὁρὸς 105 can never denote the mountain, nor τὸ ὀρὸς a mountain (Kühnöl 66 ed. on Matt. v. 1; Jno. xix. 32 and iii. 10). The N. T. passages— and they were formerly very numerous—in which δ', η', το' has been taken for the indefinite Article 2 (as is pretended after the manner of the Hebrew Art. Gesen. Lg. 655) may be easily disposed of by the attentive student. 1 Thess. iv. 6 πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι means to overreach in business (cf. im Handel u. Wandel), Jno. ii. 25 ἐγνωσκεν τῇ ἡν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ in the man with whom he (at the time) had to do, (in every man), Krü. 84; cf. Diog. L. 6, 64 πρὸς τὸν συνυστάνα τὸν παίδα καὶ λέγοντα ὡς εὐφυέστατός ἐστι . . . 110 ἔστε, etc. to the person (to every one) recommending the boy, etc., ἦν ed. Jno. iii. 10 σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Nicodemus is regarded as the teacher of Israel καὶ ἔφορόν, as he in whom all erudition is concentrated, so that the contrast καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γνώσκεις may be, made the more palpable (cf. Plato, Crit. 51 a. καὶ οὐ φήσεις ταῦτα ποιών δικαία πράττειν ὁ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελέσαν; Stallb. Plat. Euth. p. 12; Valcken. Eur. Phoen. p. 552; Krü. 87). In Heb. v. 11 ὁ λόγος is the (our) discourse, the exposition to be presented by us; cf. Plato, Phaedr. 270 a.

On the other hand, the Article may sometimes, with equal (objective) correctness, 3 be either employed or omitted (Förtsch ad

---

1 Sturz, Lexic. Xenoph. III. 232, quotes passages even from Xenoph. where the Article is alleged to be put for τις. Here applies what Schäfer ad Plutarch. somewhere says: tanta non sinit vis barbarae linguæ, ut græccae ipsa fundamenta convellere possent.

2 This thoughtless rule is not vindicated by reference to such expositors as have attributed to the Art. in certain passages a false emphasis (Glass. 138 sqq.) or have pressed it unduly. The adjustment between the old view and the new, which Böhmer (Introd. in Epist. ad Coloss. p. 291) thinks he has discovered, is unique.

3 Thus it is easy to explain why one language even regularly employs the Article in
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Lys. p. 49 sq.); as, Jas. ii. 26 τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρὸν τὸν body without spirit (χωρὶς τοῦ πνεύματος would be without the spirit — requisite for the individual body). In Luke xii. 54 good Codd. have ἦταν ἐνθεν νεφέλων ἀνατέλλουσαν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, whereas the text. rec. has τὴν νεφέλην. Both readings are admissible. With the Article the words mean, when you see the cloud (which appears in the sky) rising from the west, — if the direction of the moving cloud is from the west. In Col. i. 16 εὑρίσκοντα lig. εὐτάρειαν τὰ πάντα signifies the (existing) all, the sum of things, all things collectively (das All); πάντα would mean, everything that exists, cf. Col. iii. 8 where the two are united. The meaning is but slightly altered by the Article; yet there is a difference between the two conceptions. In Matt. xxvi. 26 we have λαβὼν ὃ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ἄρτον (which lay before him); but in Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 23 (according to the best Codd.) ἄρτον bread, or a loaf. Cf. besides, Matt. xiii. 1 with Mark ii. 23 and Luke vi. 1; Matt. xix. 3 with Mark x. 2; Luke ix. 28 with Mark ix. 2. We find the same alternate omission and use of the Article in parallel clauses: Luke xviii. 2 τὸν θείον μὴ φοβοῦμενοι καὶ ἀνθρώπου μὴ ἐντρεπόμενοι; vs. 27 τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώπους δυνατά ἐστι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; xvii. 34 ἐσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς· εἰς paralipometai, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀφεθήσεται (one ... the other); cf., however, Matt. vi. 24; xxiv. 40 f.; 1 Jno. iii. 18 μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγον μηδὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ (according to the best Codd., cf. Soph. Oed. Col. 786 λόγῳ μὲν ἐσθάλα, τόσοι δὲ ἐργοσὺν κακά); 2 Thm. i. 10; 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15; Rom. ii. 29; iii. 27, 30; Heb. ix. 4; xi. 38; Jude 16 and 19; Jno. xii. 5, 6; Jas. ii. 17, 20, 26; Rev. xx. 1. See Porson, Eurip. Phoen. p. 42, ed. Lips.; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 58 and his Lex. Soph. II. 247; cf. Plat. rep. I. 332 c. and d.; Xen. A. 3, 4, 7; Galen. temper. 1, 4; Diog. L. 6, 6; Lucian. Eunuch. 6; Porphyr. abstin. 1, 14. (The antithesis ἐν χρυσῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is nowhere fully established Matt. xxviii. 18; 1 Cor. viii. 5; in both phrases the Art. is wanting without variant in Eph. iii. 15.)

But the necessity of the use and of the omission of the Article is obvious in Luke ix. 13 οὗκ ἔσοντα ἢμιᾶς πλίνθων ἢ πέντε ἄρτοι καὶ ἰχνὸς δύο, vs. 16

certain cases (ἀνθρώπως, τοῦς φιλοὺς τοιῶνθα) in which another does not (this man, to believe in gods). Cf. Sintenis, Plut. Themist. p. 190: Multa, quae nos ininde copiata pronuntiamus, definite proferre soli sunt Graeci, ejus, de quo sermo esset, notitiam animo informatam praesumentes. Such remarks Kühn. misuses, ad Mt. p. 123.

1 This gives support to my exposition of Gal. iii. 20, to which it has always been objected that I have taken εἰς for δ εἰς.
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laβων τοῦ πόντε ἄρτους καὶ τοῦς δῶν Ἰηθών; Rom. v. 7 μόλις ὑπὲρ δικαιον τις ἀποθανεῖται, ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγάθου τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾶ ἀποθανεῖν for a righteous (upright, blameless) man ... for the good man (he, namely, who has proved himself such to him, his benefactor), etc. Rückert has unquestionably misunderstood the passage. In Col. iii. 5 we find four nouns in apposition without the Article, and then a fifth, πλεονεκία, marked by 129 the Article, as denoting a sin well-known and especially to be avoided,1 one which the apostle further characterizes straightway,—for in ἡμεῖς etc. I cannot find a reference to all the preceding nouns. In 2 Cor. xi. 18 Paul no doubt designedly wrote καυχώνται κατὰ τὴν σάρκα, different from κατὰ σάρκα (as an adverbial expression), though all recent critics regard both as equivalent. See besides Jno. xviii. 20; Rev. iii. 17, and in connection with an apposition, Rom. viii. 23 νικηθὼν ἰσχυρισμοῖς, τὴν ἀναλυσιμασίαν τοῦ σώματος, waiting for adoption (that is) the redemption of the body.

9. The Indefinite Article, (which, when necessary, was denoted by τῆς), is expressed [disputed by Meyer on Matt. viii. 19] in certain instances by the (weakened) numeral εἰς, — as was especially the case in the later writers;2 as, Matt. viii. 19 προσελθὼν εἰς γραμματείας, etc., Rev. viii. 13 ἢ ἵππος ἕνος ἀντών. But ἐν in Jno. vi. 9 is probably not genuine (cf. Matt. ix. 18), and μὴν σωκὴν in Matt. xxi. 19 means perhaps one (solitary) fig-tree. Εἰς τῶν παρεστηκότων in Mark xiv. 47 resembles the Latin unus adstantium; cf. Matt. xviii. 28; Mark xiii. 1; Luke xv. 26 (Herod. 7, 5, 10; Plutarch. Arat. 5 and Cleom. 7; Aeschin. dial. 107 2, 2;3 Schoen. ad Isaeum p. 249). In Jas. iv. 13 ἐναιντὸν ἐνα the numeral retains its signification; and still more in 2 Cor. xi. 2; Matt. xviii. 14; Jno. vii. 21. See, in general, Boisson. Eunap. 345; Ast. Plat. legg. 219; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 398; Schaeff. Long. 399.4 In Matt. xviii. 24 εἰς ὀφειλέτης μυρίων ταλάντων, there 112

1 Weber, Dem. p. 327. Another case, in which only the last of several connected nouns has, for emphasis' sake, the Article, is discussed by Jacobitis, Lucian. pisc. p. 209, ed. min.

2 So also sometimes the Heb. "ם"; see Gesen. Lg. S. 655. The use of εἰς in this sense is founded on the above-mentioned peculiarity of the later language, a predilection for expressiveness.

3 Τῆς τῶν παρ. would have expressed the same meaning, cf. Luke vii. 36; xi. 1 and elsewhere, like suorun aliquis etc. in Latin. Both expressions are logically correct, but not precisely alike. Unus adstantium implies a numerical unity — one of several.

4 Bretschneider tried, very infelicitously, to reduce to this head also 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6 μὲν γὰρ ἱεροφόρος ἀρπ giving it the meaning, he shall be the husband of a wife, that is, a married man. But besides the fact that the apostles' demand that none but married men should undertake the supervision of a church is not sufficiently substantiated by 1 Tim. iii. 4 f., no careful writer can use εἰς for the indefinite Art. where an ambiguity
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130 is probably a designed antithesis. Also in Mark xiv. 51 var. εἰς τις unus aliquis (partitive in Mark xiv. 47; Luke xxii. 50; Jno. xi. 49) τις does not take away the arithmetical force of εἰς (Heindorff, Plat. Soph. 42; Ast as above, and Plat. Polit. 532; Boisson. Marin. p. 15).

Note 1. In a few particular instances the use or omission of the Article is characteristic of the individual style of the various writers. Thus Gersdorff (Sprachchar. I. 39, 272 ff.) has shown that the four Evangelists almost always write ὁ Χριστὸς (the expected Messiah, like ὁ ἐξωκομίας), while Paul and Peter employ Xριστός (as the appellation had become more of a proper name). In the Epistles of Paul and Peter, however, those cases must be excepted where a noun on which Χριστός depends preceeds, (as, τὸ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡ ἐπισκοπή τοῦ Χρ., τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χρ.), since with this noun the Art. is never wanting, Rom. vii. 4; xv. 19; xvi. 16; 1 Cor. i. 6, 17; vi. 15; x. 16; 2 Cor. iv. 4; ix. 13; xii. 9; Gal. i. 7; Eph. ii. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 5, etc. Elsewhere, too, Paul not unfrequently employs the Article before Χριστός, not merely when accompanied by a preposition, but even when in the Nom., as in Rom. xv. 3, 7; 1 Cor. i. 13; x. 4; xi. 3, etc. Similar diversity on this point occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews, see Bleek on v. 5.

Note 2. MSS. vary extremely in reference to the Article, particularly in those passages where its use or omission is matter of indifference. Here critics must be guided more by the authority of the Codd. than by the supposed style of individual writers. Cf. Matt. xii. 1 στάχνας, Mark vi. 17 ἐν φυλακῇ (better attested than ἐν τῇ φυλ., vii. 37 (διάλογος), x. 2 Φαρισαίων, x. 46 νίος, xi. 4 πῶλον, xii. 33 θυσίων, xiv. 33 ἱδρύμων, xiv. 60 οἱ μέσοι, Luke ii. 12 ἐν φαρισαίοις, iv. 9 δοιος, iv. 29 ἐν δορυφόροις τοῦ ὀρος, vi. 35 ἰσίων, Jno. v. 1; Rom. x. 15; xi. 19; Gal. iv. 24; 2 Pet. ii. 8, etc.

Note 3. Strange to say, most expositors—when contrary to their custom they have paid attention to the Article in the N.T.—have given an erroneous opinion respecting it. Bengel, to be sure, is an exception. But Kühnöl is an example. After Krause (a sorry voucher), he supposes that in Acts vii. 38 ἐν γῆ εἰκληρία, owing to the use of the Article, signifies certa populi concio. This meaning may be rendered probable from the context; but ἐν εἰκλ. considered grammatically merely may (as Grotius and others maintain) just as well denote the congregation οἰκείων, and the Article would be as regular in that case as anywhere. Again, the

would be occasioned, for men speak and write in order that others may understand. The expression, there came a man, supposes also numerical unity, and every one thinks of homo aliquis as homo unus; but μὲν γυνᾶκα έχων cannot be used for γυνὰκα έχων, as it is possible to have several wives (at the same time, or one after another); and consequently numerical unity alone is suggested to everybody. Besides, a person would hardly say, the bishop must be the husband of a wife, for, a husband, or married.
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observation of the same scholar on Acts viii. 26 is but half true. ὁ ἔρημος (ἀδανος) must have been used, if Luke wished to distinguish from the rest one particular road known to his readers. But if his meaning was, this (road) is (now) deserted, untravelled, lies waste, the Article would be as little appropriate as in German. Expositors have taken notice of the Art. 131 also in 2 Thess. iii. 14 διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, and have on its account denied the possibility of connecting these words with the following σημαίωσθε. Perhaps even the omission of the Article in two Codd. may be thus accounted for. Paul, however, might with perfect propriety say διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς σημαίωσθε if at the time he presumed upon an answer from the Thessalonians: 'Note him to me in the epistle (viz. which I hope to receive from you, or which in that event you must send me).’ Yet see Lünem.

Note 4. The place of the Article is immediately before the noun to which it belongs; but conjunctions which cannot begin a sentence are regularly inserted between the Article and its noun: Matt. xi. 30 ὅ γὰρ ζωγράφος μου, iii. 4 ὃ δὲ τροφή, Ινο. vi. 14 ὁ ὅλον ἀνθρωπὸν etc. This is well known, and needs no further illustration. Rost, 436; cf. Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 146.
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1. Appellatives, which as expressing definite objects should have the Article, are, not merely in the N. T. but in the best Greek authors, employed in certain cases without it. (See Schaefer, Melet. p. 4). This omission, however, only takes place when it produces no ambiguity and leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader whether the object is to be understood as definite or indefinite, i.e.

a. With words which denote objects of which there is but one in existence, and which therefore approximate closely to proper names: thus ἠλως is almost as common as ὁ ἠλως, and γῆ (Earth) not infrequent for ἡ γῆ, (Poppo, Thuc. III. III. 46); hence the abstract names of virtues and vices, etc.,¹ as ἀρετή, σωφροσύνη, νεόλα (see Schaefer. Demosth. I. 329; Bornem. Χεν. conv. p. 52; Krü. 87), likewise the names of the members of the animal body (Held, Plut. Aem. P. p. 248), very often dispense with the Article.

The Article is omitted also before many other appellatives, as 109

¹ To which must be added the names of sciences and arts (as ἑρμην, see Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 98), of magisterial dignities and offices (Schaefer. Demosth. II. 112; Held, Plutarch. Aem. P. p. 138), of seasons of the year, of corporations (Held, l.c. p. 238), and many others (Scheom. ad Isaeum p. 303 and ad Plutarch. Cleom. p. 199). See also Krü. 87.
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In the N. T., where in general this omission of the Art. is less frequent than in Greek prose,1 the following instances of abstracts2 may be noted: 1 Tim. vi. 11; Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8, and in particular διακοσίην Matt. v. 10; Acts x. 85; Rom. viii. 10; Heb. xi. 33, etc., ἄγαπη Gal. v. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 8, πίστις Acts vi. 5; Rom. i. 5; iii. 28; 2 Cor. v. 7; 1 Thess. v. 8, etc., κακία 1 Cor. v. 8; Tit. iii. 3; Jas. i. 21, πλεονεξία 1 Thess. ii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 3, ἀμαρτία Gal. ii. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 1; Rom. iii. 9; vi. 14, etc., σωτηρία Rom. x. 10; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. i. 14; vi. 9. Here belong also, ἀγαθόν Rom. viii. 28 (cf. Fr. in l.), πνημόνων 1 Thess. v. 22, καλόν τε καὶ κακόν Heb. v. 14.

Besides these, we often find in the N. T. without the Article the concretes ἡμέρα, γῆ (Earth), θεός, πρόσωπον, νόμος, etc., and many others, at least when in connection with prepositions etc. they form phrases of frequent occurrence (Kluit, II. 377; Heindorf, Plat. Gorg. p. 265). We arrange them in the following list, founded on the most approved readings:

ἡμέρα (Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 467), as in Matt. xiii. 6 ἡμέραν ἀνατέλλεινος (Polyaen. 6, 5; Lucian, ver. hist. 2, 12; Aelian. 4, 1); particularly when joined as genitive to another noun it expresses one idea, as ἀνατολή ἡμέρας sunrise Rev. vii. 2; xvi. 12; (Her. 4, 8), φῶς ἡμέρας sunlight Rev. xxii. 5 var. (Plat. rep. 5, 473 e.), δόξα ἡμέρας splendor of the sun 1 Cor. xv. 41; or when the sun is mentioned in an enumeration (in connection with the moon and stars), as Luke xxi. 25 ἄστρα σημεῖα ἐν ἡμέρα καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἄστρον in sun, moon, and stars, Acts xxvii. 20 (Aesch. dial. 3, 17; Plat. Crat. 397 d.).

γῆ, earth 2 Pet. iii. 5, 10; Acts xvii. 24, ἐν γῇς Luke ii. 14; 1 Cor.

---

1 So we find in Greek authors usually γῆνει by nation, παλαιόν, etc., in the N. T. invariably τῇ γῇνει Acts iv. 36; xviii. 2, 24, also τῇ παλαιόν Heb. xi. 12. In Greek authors the omission of the Article before a Nom. is not unusual, as ἡμέρα ἐδότου Xen. A. 1, 10, 15; Lucian. Scyth. 4; in the N. T., on the contrary, Mark i. 32 βία ἐφ' ἡμέρας, Luke iv. 40 δόνων τοῦ ἡμέραν, Eph. iv. 26 ἡμέρας μη ἐνιαύτων. So also in the N. T. never σελήνην in the nominative, and there are more instances of the same kind.

2 The assertion (Harless on Eph. 8. 320) that the Article can only be omitted before abstracts when they denote virtues, vices, etc., as properties of a subject, is unproved, and cannot be proved on rational grounds. Cf. also Kriy. in Jahn's Jahrh. 1838. I. 47.
§ 19. OMISSION OF THE ARTICLE BEFORE NOUNS.

viii. 5; Eph. iii. 15 (Heb. viii. 4), ἀν' ἀγρον γῆς Mark xiii. 27; cf. Jacobs, Philostr. Imag. p. 266; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 91; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 257. But this word usually has the Art. when it signifies earth; in 133 the sense of land, on the other hand, the Art. is regularly wanting when 115 the proper name of the country follows, as Matt. xi. 24 γῆ Σωδόμων, [iv. 15] 79 ed. Acts vii. 29 εν γῇ Μαδαμί, vii. 36 εν γῇ Αλγυντού, xiii. 19 εν γῇ Χανών, etc. 110 (but Matt. xiv. 34 εἰς τὴν γῆν Γανναφατ). See below, 2. b. Van Hengel's remark on 1 Cor. xv. p. 199 is not to the point.

οὐρανός, οὐρανοί, is seldom without the Article (cf. Jacobs in the Schulzeit. 1831, No. 119, and Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 135): a. In the Gospels only in the phrase εν οὐρανῷ, εν οὐρανοῖ, εξ οὐρανοῦ, εξ οὐρανοῦ, but by no means always, even in this case (cf. Matt. vi. 1, 9; xvi. 19; Mark xii. 25; Luke vi. 23, for John except in i. 32 constantly uses εκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ); b. By Paul the Art. is regularly omitted in phrases like ἀν' οὐρανοῦ, εξ οὐρανοῦ (εκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ—van Hengel on 1 Cor. xv. p. 199—is never used by Paul); in 2 Cor. xii. 2 we find also δος τρίτων οὐρανοῦ (Lucian. Philoprat. 12) see b. below, and Peter has even in the Nom. οὐρανοί 2 Pet. iii. 5, 12; c. The Article is never omitted in Rev.

θάλασσα, e.g. Acts x. 6, 32 παρὰ θάλασσαν, Luke xxi. 25 ἡχοῦσα θαλάσσας καὶ σαλα; cf. Demosth. Aristocr. 450 c.; Dio S. 1, 32; Dio Ch. 35, 436; 37, 455; Xen. Eph. 5, 10; Arrian. Al. 2, 1, 2, and 8; Held, in Act. Philol. Monac. II. 182 sqq. Even εν ἐφυθαθα θαλάσσῃ Acts vii. 36; (on the other hand, we find the Art. in Heb. xi. 29). It regularly has the Art., however, when opposed to ἡ γῆ.

μεσημβρία in the phrase κατά μεσημβρίαν southwards Acts viii. 26, περι μεσημβρίαν xxii. 6, cf. Xen. A. 1, 7, 6 πρὸς μεσημβρίαν, Plat. Phædr. 259 a. εν μεσημβρία. So, in general, with the names of the quarters of the heavens, Rev. xxi. 13 ἀπὸ ἀνωτέρων, ἀπὸ βορρᾶς, ἀπὸ νότου, ἀπὸ δυσμῶν (πρὸς νότον Strabo 16, 719, πρὸς ἐκτέραν D. S. 8, 28, πρὸς ἀρκτόν Strabo 15, 715 and 719; 16, 749, πρὸς νότον Plat. Crit. 112 c. βασιλεία νότον Matt. xii. 42, where, however, it is a sort of proper name), or of a division of the day, as Luke xxiv. 29; Acts xxviii. 23; Krüt. 85.

ἀγορά (cf. Bremi, Lys. p. 9; Sintenis, Plutarch. Pericl. p. 80) Mark viii. 4 καὶ ἀν' ἀγοράς, ἠν μὴ βασιλιῶντα, οἶκ ἐσθίουν. So in Greek authors often, as Her. 7, 223; 3, 104; Lys. Agor. 2; Dion H. IV. 2117, 6; 2230, 2; Theophr. ch. 19; Plat. Gorg. 447 a; Lucian. adv. ind. 4 and eunuch. 1, particularly in the phrase πληθυνάτας ἀγοράς Her. 4, 181; Xen. M. 1, 1, 10; Anab. 1, 8, 1; Aelian. 12, 30; D. S. 13, 48 a.

ἀγόρας Mark xv. 21 ἀρχιμαν ἀν' ἀγορὰ (Luke xxiii. 26), Luke xv. 25 ἡν ὁ νόος ἐν ἀγορᾷ. Here, however, the word means, not a single definite field (ἀν' τοῦ ἀγορᾶ), but is used generally, from the country (as opposed to the town, etc.). So εἰς ἀγορὰ Mark xvi. 12, cf. Judg. ix. 27, εἰς ἀγορά Gen. xxx. 16; 1 Sam. xi. 5, etc.; Plat. Theaet. 143 a.; legg. 8, 844 c.

θεός occurs frequently (cf. HM. Aristoph. nub. v. 816; Bornem. Xen.
CONV. P. 142; JACOB, LUCIAN. TOXAR. P. 121), AND BEYOND COMPARISON THE MOST FREQUENTLY IN THE EPISTLES, WITHOUT THE ART., PARTICULARLY WHEN IT IS 134 DEPENDENT AS A GEN. UPON ANOTHER (ANARTHROUS) NOUN, AS LUKE III. 2; ROM. III. 5; VIII. 9; XV. 7, 8, 32; 1 COR. III. 16; XI. 7; 2 COR. I. 12; VIII. 5; EPH. V. 5; 1 THESS. II. 13, IN THE PHRASES THEOS PATRIS 1 COR. I. 3; 2 COR. I. 2; 116 GAL. I. 1; PHIL. I. 2; II. 11; 1 PET. I. 2, ΨΙΛ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟν ΜATT. V. 9; ROM. VII. 14, 16; GAL. III. 26; PHIL. II. 15; 1 JNO. III. 1, 2 (WHERE THESE NOUNS ARE ALSO WITHOUT THE ART.), WITH PREPOSITIONS ἐν ΘΕΩ JNO. III. 2; XVIII. 30; ROM. XIII. 1; 1 COR. I. 30; VI. 19, ἐν ΘΕΩ JNO. III. 21; ROM. II. 17, ἐν ΘΕΩ Acts. V. 39; 2 COR. V. 1; PHIL. III. 9, κατὰ ΘΕΩRom. VIII. 27, παρὰ ΘΕΟ 2 THESS. I. 6; 1 PET. II. 4, ALSO WITH ADJUNCT 1 THESS. I. 9 ΘΕΟ ζωτικός καὶ άληθινός. (IN JNO. I. 1 ΘΕΟΣ ἦν ὁ ΛΟΓΟς THE ART. CANNOT NOT HAVE BEEN OMITTED IF JOHN HAD INTENDED TO DESIGNATE THE ΛΟΓΟS AS ὁ ΘΕΟΣ, BECAUSE IN THIS CONNECTION ΘΕΟΣ ALONE WOULD BE AMBIGUOUS. BUT THAT JOHN DESIGNEDLY WROTE ΘΕΟΣ IS APPARENT, PARTLY FROM THE DISTINCT ANTITHESIS ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟν VERSES 1, 2, AND PARTLY FROM THE WHOLE DESCRIPTION OF THE ΛΟΓΟΣ. SIMILARLY STANDS IN 1 PET. IV. 19 θεοῦς κτίστης WITHOUT THE ART.)

πνεύμα ἁγιον, seldom πνεύμα θεοῦ Acts VIII. 15, 17; Rom. VIII. 9, 14; Heb. VI. 4; 2 PET. I. 21; 1 COR. XII. 3, πνευμα Phil. II. 1, ALSO ἐν πνεύμαTHeph. II. 22; VI. 18; COL. I. 8, ἐν πν. ἁγίῳ Jude 20. (The baptismal formula εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρός καὶ τοῦ νικοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος is cited in Acts Barn. P. 74 thus: εἰς ὄνομα πατρός κ. νικοῦ κ. ἁγίου πν.)

πατήρ, Heb. XII. 7 ὤν ὦ πάτερ, Jno. I. 14 ἰμνογένος πατὴρ πατρός, and in the formula ΘΕΟΣ πατήρ (ἡμῶν); μήτηρ only in the phrase ἐν κοιλίας μητρός Matt. XIX. 12.

ἀνήρ (husband), 1 TIM. II. 12 γυναικὶ διδάσκεις όικ ἐπιτρέπω, οθεὶ αὐθεντῶν ἀνδρῶν Eph. V. 23 (but 1 COR. XI. 3); Luke Xvi. 18 πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναίκα αὐτοῦ ... πᾶς ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γυμνῶν, does not necessarily come under this head, though the first γυνὴ has the art.; for the last words are to be translated: he who marries a woman dismissed from a husband. But in Acts I. 14 one would expect the art. before γυναῖκι (see de W.), NOT so much in Acts XXII. 5; cf., however, above.

πρόσωπον, e.g. Luke V. 12 περὶ πρόσωπον, XV. 16; 1 COR. XIV. 25; cf. SIR. L. 17; TOB. XII. 16; HELIOD. 7, 8 ΡΩΤΗΣ ἦν τῶν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, Achill. Tat. 3, 1; EUSTATH. AMOR. ISMEN. 7, p. 286 (HELIOD. 1, 16), Acts XXV. 16 κατὰ πρόσωπον, 2 COR. X. 7 (EXOD. XXVIII. 27; XXXIX. 13, etc.).

δεξιά, ἀριθμητικός and the like, in the formulas ἐν δεξιών Matt. XXVII. 38; XXV. 33; Luke Xxix. 33, ἐς ἐνωπῖν Matt. XX. 21; XV. 41; Mark X. 37; KRÜ. 86.

ἐκκλησία, 3 JNO. 6 ὁ ἐμπρόσθησάν σου τῷ ἐγκατ οὐκών ἐκκλησίας, 1 COR. XIV. 4 (ἐν ἐκκλησία 1 COR. XIV. 19, 35?).

θανάτος, Matt. XXVI. 38 ἔως θανάτου (SIR. XXXVII. 2; LI. 6), PHIL. II. 8, 30 μέχρι θανάτου (PLAT. REP. 2, 361 C.; ATHEN. 1, 170), JAS. V. 20 ἐν θανάτου (Job V. 20; Prov. X. 2; PLAT. GORG. 511 C.), Luke II. 26 μὴ θείων θανάτων,
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Rom. vii. 13 κατεργαζόμενη θάνατον, i. 32 ἡξιοῦθανάτον, 2 Cor. iv. 11 ἐσθάνατον παραδοδόμεθα, etc.; cf. Himer. 21 μετά θάνατον, Dion. H. IV. 2112, 135 2242; cf. Grimm, Buch der Weisch. S. 26.

θῶρα, in the Plur. τῶι θῶραι ad fores Matt. xxiv. 33; Mark xiii. 29; cf. Plutarch, Themist. 29; Athen. 10, 441; Aristid. Orat. Tom. II. 43 (on the other hand in the Sing. τῷ τῷ θῷρα Acts v. 9). See Sintenis, Plutarch. Them. p. 181.

νόμος, meaning the Mosaic law, Rom. ii. 12, 23; iii. 31; iv. 13, 14, 15; 117 v. 13, 20; vii. 1; x. 4; xiii. 8; 1 Cor. ix. 20; Gal. ii. 21; iii. 11, 18, 21; 118 iv. 5; Phil. iii. 6; Heb. vii. 12, etc.; always as a Gen. where the principal noun has no Art.: ἵγα νόμοι, and the like. (In the Gospels, except Luke ii. 23, 24, where, however, a qualifying Gen. follows, we find constantly ὁ νόμος.) As to the Apocr., see Wahl, clav. 343. Also cf. Bornem. Acts p. 201.

ῥήμα, meaning God’s word, followed by θεοῦ Rom. x. 17; Eph. vi. 17; Heb. vi. 5; without θεοῦ Eph. v. 26.

νεκρός, the dead, always (except in Eph. v. 14) in the phrases ἐγείρεσθαι, ἀναστήσει ἐν νεκρῶν Matt. xvii. 9; Mark vi. 14, 16; ix. 9, 10; xii. 25; Luke ix. 7; xvi. 31; xxiv. 46; Jno. ii. 22; xii. 1, 9, 17; xx. 9; xxxi. 14; Acts iii. 15; iv. 2; x. 41; xiii. 30; xxvi. 23; Rom. iv. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 20, etc., and also ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν (both without Art.) Acts xvii. 32; xxiv. 21; Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 18, 21, 42, etc. Only in Col. ii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 10 is a var. noted. (On the other hand, almost always ἐγείρεσθαι, ἀναστήσει ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Matt. xiv. 2; xxvii. 64; xxvii. 8.) Νεκρός elsewhere designates dead persons (Luke vii. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 15, 29, 32, also 1 Pet. iv. 6 etc.), but of νεκρός, the dead, as a definitely conceived totality, Jno. v. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 2 Cor. i. 9; Col. i. 18.1 The Greeks, too, regularly omit the Art. before this word.


κόσμος, always in the phrases ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου Luke xi. 50; Heb. iv. 3, πρὸ κατ. κ. Jno. xvii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 20, ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου Rom. i. 20, ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς κόσμου Matt. xxiv. 21; in the Epistles also ἐν κόσμῳ Rom. v. 13; 1 Cor. vii. 4; xiv. 10; Phil. ii. 15; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. v. 9. The Nom. is but rarely without the Art., as Gal. vi. 14 ἐν κόσμῳ ἐστιν καταθλίψας; and according to the best Codd. Rom. iv. 13 must be read: κληρονόμον εἶναι κόσμον.

κτίσις, creation (i.e. thing created, the world), in the phrase ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς

1 The distinction alleged by van Hengel on 1 Cor. xv. p. 135 between νεκρός and οἱ νεκροὶ has no foundation (either in principle or in usage).
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κρίσις Mark x. 6; xiii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 4. Yet πᾶσα κρίσις 1 Pet. ii. 13;
136 Col. i. 15 (see Mey.) is everywhere distinguished from πᾶσα ἡ κρίσις Mark
xvi. 15; Rom. viii. 22; Col. i. 23.

ἀφα, as in 1 Jno. ii. 18 ἐσχάτη ἀφα ἐστι; particularly with numerals, as
ἐν ἀφα τρίτη Mark xv. 25; Jno. xix. 14, πέρι τρίτην ἀφα Matt. xx. 3; Acts
x. 9, εἰς ἅφα ἀνάβης Mark xv. 33, ἀπό ἕκτην ἀφα Matt. xxvii. 45, etc.; cf.
Aelian. 7, 13, ἀφα λουτροῦ Polyæn. 6, 7.) But so with other nouns also
when joined to ordinal numerals, as πρώτη φαλάκη Heliod. 1, 6; Polyæn.
2, 35; cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 152, and ἀπό πρώτης ἡμέρας Phil. i. 5.

καιρός, in the phrases πρὸ καιροῦ before the time Matt. viii. 29; 1 Cor.
118 ἐκ λε. iv. 5, κατὰ καιρὸν Rom. v. 6 (Lucian. Philops. 21) and ἐν καιρῷ Luke xx. 10
113 (Xen. C. 8, 5, 5; Polyb. 2, 45; 9, 12, etc.); also ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτη 1 Pet. i. 5
like ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις 2 Tim. iii. 1; Jas. v. 3.

ἀρχή (Schaef. Demosth. III. 240), especially in the common phrases ἀρχὴ
ἀρχῆς Matt. xix. 8; Acts xxvi. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Jno. i. 1; ii. 7, etc.
(Her. 2, 113; Xen. C. 5, 4, 12; Aelian. 2, 4), ἐκ ἀρχῆς Jno. vi. 64; xvi. 4
(Theophr. ch. 28; Lucian. dial. mort. 19, 2, and merc. cond. 1) and ἐν
ἀρχῇ Jno. i. 2; Acts xi. 15; (Plat. Phaedr. 245 d.; Lucian. gall. 7). All
these regularly in the Sept. also.

κύριος, which in the Gospels usually designates God (the O. T. Lord, cf.
Thilo, Apocr. I. 169), and in the Epistles especially Paul's (in accordance
with the growth of Christian phraseology) most frequently Christ, the Lord
(Phil. ii. 11; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff.; Krehl, N. T. Wörterb. S. 360), like
θεός often dispenses with the Article, particularly when it is joined to a
preposition (chiefly in established phrases like ἐν κυρίῳ) or occurs in the
Gen. (1 Cor. vii. 22, 25; x. 21; xvi. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 18; xii. 1) or pre-
cedes Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; Gal. i. 3; Eph. vi. 23;
Phil. ii. 11; iii. 20). It had already become almost a proper name. It
has been erroneously maintained (Gabler, in his newest. theol. Journ. IV.
S. 11-24) that the meaning of the word depends on the insertion or omission
of the Article. Christ, the Lord, whom all knew as such and who
was so often mentioned, the apostles could most easily style κύριος, just
as θεός nowhere occurs more frequently without the Article than in the
Bible; cf. my Progr. de sensu vocum κύριος et ὁ κύριος in Actis et Epist.
Apostolor. Erlang. 1828. 4to. Even in Paul's writings, however, the
Article predominates.

Δαίβολος the devil, usually has the Article. Only in 1 Pet. v. 8 we find
ὁ δάιβολος ὑμῶν Δαίβολος in apposition, and in Acts xiii. 10 ὁ δαίβολος.1

1 Ἀγγέλος does not belong to the class of words of which a list is given above. When
used in the Sing. without an Article, it always signifies an angel (one of the many), and
so in the Plur. ἄγγελος, angels, e.g. 1 Tim. iii. 16; Gal. iii. 19, etc.; on the other hand
ὁ ἄγγελος the angels as a class of beings. Accordingly 1 Cor. vi. 3 ὁι ἄγγελοι καρπούμεν
must be translated, that we shall judge angels,—not the angels, the whole multitude of
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That appellatives (particularly in the Nom.) are without the Article in 137 titles and superscriptions also, is easily accounted for; cf. Matt. i. 1 βιβλίος γενέων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Mark i. 1 ἀρχή τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Rev. i. 1 ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

2. b. The Article is likewise often omitted before a noun followed by a Gen. designating the singly existing object as something appertaining to this individual 1 (Schaef. Soph. Oed. C. 1468; Bornem. 119 Xen. Cyr. p. 219; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 421; ad Plut. Agid. p. 105; Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 277; Herm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 290), e.g. Matt. [xvi. 18 πῦλαι ἄνω] xvii. 6 ἐπέσεων ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ cf. xxvi. 39 (Isa. xlix. 23 ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς; on the other hand, Matt. xxvi. 67 εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, Rev. vii. 11), Luke i. 51 ἐν βραχίων αὐτοῦ, Rom. i. 1 εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ (where Rück. still makes unnecessary difficulties), Eph. i. 20 ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ (Heb. i. 3; Matt. xx. 21), Luke xix. 42 ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου, 1 Cor. ii. 16 τίς γὰρ ἐγνώ νοῦν κυρίου, 1 Pet. iii. 12, 20; Jas. i. 26; Mark viii. 3; xiii. 27; Rom. i. 20; ii. 5;Luke i. 5; ii. 4, 11; xiii. 19; xix. 13; Heb. xii. 2; 1 Cor. x. 21; xii. 27; xvi. 15; Phil. ii. 16; iv. 3; Eph. i. 4, 6, 12; iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 8; 2 Thess. i. 9; ii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 6; iii. 10; Jude 6 (Acts viii. 5), etc. The same occurs very frequently in the Sept. also, as 1 Sam. i. 3, 7; iv. 6; v. 2; Exod. iii. 11; ix. 22; xvii. 1; Cant. v. 1; vii. 2; Judith ii. 7, 14; iii. 3, 9; iv. 11; v. 8; vi. 20; 1 Macc. ii. 50; v. 66; 3 Esr. i. 26. (But in 1 Cor. iv. 14 ὡς τέκνα μου ἀγαπηταί it was necessary to omit the Article, since the Cor. were not alone the beloved children of Paul. In Luke xv. 29 οὐδέποτε ἐντολὴν σου παρῆλθον means a command of thine, but in Acts i. 8 λήψεθε δύναμιν ἐπεκληρώντος τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος must be translated: ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost shall have descended.)

The Article is thus omitted sometimes when a numeral defines angels, but—angels, who, and as many of them as, fall under the κρίσις. On uiotheta Rom. viii. 23, see Fr. against Rückert. That the word in apposition sometimes has the Article, when the principal noun is anarthrous, has been remarked by Geel, ad Dion. Chr. Olymp. p. 70.

1 Accordingly Jno. v. 1 ἐσπράλ τῶν ἰουδαίων could not be translated: the festival of the Jews (Passover). The Article, however, has much authority in its favor, and has been admitted into the text by Tif.

2 The Hebrew language, as is well known, does not in this construction employ an Article before the governing noun. On this Hengstenberg, Christol. II. 565, founded a new discovery, which Lücke on Jno. v. 1 has suitably appreciated.

3 Gersdorff, L 316 ff., has not duly distinguished the cases. The Article is both used and omitted in one and the same clause, Luke xxiii. 46 εἰς χειρὶς σου παραπτώματος τὸ πνεῦμα μου etc.
the noun more nearly; as, Acts xii. 10 διεσθόντες πρότην φιλακήν καὶ δευτέραν, Mark xv. 25 ἦν ὁ ρα τρίτη καὶ ἑσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, xv. 138 33 ἔως ὁ ρα ἕννής, Luke iii. 1 ἐν ἔτει παντεκατδέκτω τῆς ἡγεμονίας etc., 2 Cor. xii. 2; Eph. vi. 2 (Phil. i. 5 var.); cf. from Greek authors Lysias 7, 10 τρίτω ἐτεῖ, Plato, Min. 319 c. and Hipp. maj. 286 b.; Antiph. 6, 42; Andoc. 4, 17; Diog. L. 7, 135, 138, 141 sqq. (but 7, 150, 151, 153). See above, 1. a. under ὁ ρα, p. 124.

By this usage may be defended also Matt. xii. 24 ἐν τῷ Ἑβραί-βολ, ἀρχοντι τῶν δαμονίων, the reading found in all MSS. Fr. (ad Mt. p. 774), without the authority of MSS., substituted ἐν Β. τῷ ἀρχ. etc., as he deemed this omission of the Article strange.

In Greek authors such omission of the Article, especially when the noun is preceded by a preposition, is by no means rare; cf. Xen. C. 6, 1, 13 οἱ καταλύτην τῆς στρατιάς, Apol. Socr. 30 ἐν καταλύσει τοῦ βίου, Mem. 120 1, 5, 2 ἐπὶ τελευτ. τοῦ βίου, 4, 3, 16; Plat. Phaedr. 237 c.; Lys. Agorat. 2 ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἱεραπόστου, and further on πατρίδα σφηνάρην αὐτῶν 115 καταλύτην, Lucian. Scyth. 4 βίον αὐτῶν, Dio Chr. 38, 471 ἐπὶ γενέσεως αὐτῶν, Strabo 15, 719 ὑπὸ μῆκος τῶν δδῶν (17, 808), Thuc. 2, 38 διὰ μέγεθος τῆς πάλαις, 7, 72. So in German, also, the Article is usually omitted after a preposition, e.g. über Auflösung des Räthsels etc. In Greek authors, however, in such cases even the Gen. is frequently anarthrous, or if not, it precedes; as, τῶν χαρίων χαλεπότερα; cf. Krü. Dion. H. p. 168; Jacobs, Athen. p. 18 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 130. (Xen. C. 8, 6, 16; Mem. 1, 4, 12; Thuc. 1, 1; 6, 34; 8, 68).

3. c. When several consecutive nouns1 connected by καὶ and denoting different objects2 agree in case and number, each of them regularly takes the Article if they differ in gender; — not merely when they signify persons, as Acts xiii. 50 τῶν σεβομένων γυναικῶν . . . καὶ τῶν προτόν τῆς πάλαις (Luke xiv. 26; Eph. vi. 2; Acts xxvi. 30), but also inanimate objects Col. iv. 1 τῷ δίκαιον καὶ τίν πλάτην καὶ τῶν δακτυλίων παρέχεσθε, Rom. viii. 2 ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως, Matt. xxii. 4; Luke x. 21; Rom. xvi. 17; Phil. iv. 7; 1 Cor. ii. 4; Eph. ii. 1; Rev. i. 2; xiv. 7; Heb. iii. 6; cf. Xen. C. 2, 2, 9 σὺν τῷ θόρακι κ. τῇ κοτίδε, Plut. virt. mul. p. 210 διὰ τῶν ἀνδράς κ. τὴν ἀρετήν, Dion. H. IV. 2245, 4 ἐπὶ τοῦ τόκου καλ

1 Benson, Isocr. Areopag. p. 290 sqq., has collected much from Isocrates on the repetition and the non-repetition of the Article with connected nouns (Subst. Adjunct. Particip. also Inf.), but without throwing entire light on the subject. Cf. also Tholuck, Literar. Anzeig. 1837, No. 5.

2 For a repetition of the Article is not admissible before connected nouns which, for instance, are merely predicates of one and the same person, as in Col. iii. 17 τῷ θεῷ καὶ παρι, 2 Pet. i. 11 τοῦ πυροῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος τ. Χρ., Eph. vi. 21; Mark vi. 3; Acts iii. 14.
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In these connections the repetition of the Article appeared grammatically necessary, while at the same time the ideas connected are mostly such as require to be grasped separately. See under 4.

Where, however, the ideas do not require to be sharply distinguished, or where an adjective is joined to the first noun and to be extended also to the second, the repetition of the Article does not take place even when the nouns differ in gender; and the one Article that precedes serves alike for all the nouns that follow; as, Col. ii. 22 τὰ ἐνταῦμα καὶ δίδασκαλίας τῶν ἁνθρώπων, Luke xiv. 23 ἐξελθεὶς τὰς ὕδατις καὶ φρυγμοῖς, i. 6 ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι τοῦ κυρίου, Mark xii. 33; Rev. v. 12.

Such passages are to be found likewise in Greek authors,—and far more frequently indeed,—in poetry (Hm. Eurip. Hec. p. 76) 7th ed. as well as in prose, without any very precise reference to the sense, e.g. Plat. rep. 9.586 d. τῷ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ λόγῳ, legg. 6,784 ὁ σωφρονόν 116 καὶ σωφρονύσα, 6. 510 c.; apol. 18 a.; Crat. 405 d.; Aristot. anal. 6th ed. post. 1, 26; Thuc. 1, 54; Lycurg. 30; Lucian. parasit. 13; Herod. 8, 6, 11; Ael. anim. 5, 26; cf. also Krü. Dion. p. 140, and Xen. Anab. p. 92, Bornem. Cyrop. p. 668.

When such nouns are disjoined by η, the Article is invariably repeated; as, Matt. xv. 5 τῷ πατρὶ η τῇ μητρί, Mark iv. 21 ὑπὸ τῶν μοδίων η ὑπὸ τὴν κλίτην, Rev. xiii. 17.

When the connected nouns differ in number the repetition of the Article is naturally and grammatically almost indispensable; as, Col. ii. 13 ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ τῇ ἄκροβυστίᾳ, Eph. ii. 3 τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν, 1 Tim. v. 23; Tit. ii. 12; Acts xv. 4, 20; xxvii. 17; Matt. v. 17; Rev. ii. 19. Cf. Plato, Crito 47 c. τὴν δόξαν καὶ τῶν ἐπαίνοντος. Dion. H. IV. 2238, 1 ὑπὸ τῆς παρθένου καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτῆς γυναικῶν. Yet Xen. A. 2, 1, 7 ἐπιστήμων τῶν περὶ τὰς τάξεις τε καὶ ὀπλομαχίαις, Agath. 14, 12 τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ πόλεμον. But 1 Cor. iv. 9 θέατρον ἐγειρθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἐγγέλου καὶ ἁνθρώπως does not come under this head; the last two nouns without the Art. particularize the τῷ κόσμῳ: the world,—angels as well as men.

4. d. If, however, such nouns connected by καὶ are of the same gender, the Article is omitted

1) When the connected nouns are regarded as only parts of one whole, or members of one community (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex.
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p. 253; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 455); as, Mark xv. 1 συμβούλιον
πουσάντες οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων
140 (where the elders and scribes are designated as only one class
of individuals, in distinction from the high priests), Luke xiv. 3, 21;
Col. ii. 8, 19; Eph. ii. 20; v. 5; Phil. i. 7; ii. 17; Acts xxiii. 7;
2 Pet. i. 10 (Xen. A. 2, 2, 5; 3, 1, 29; Plat. Phil. 28 e.; Dion.
H. IV. 2235, 5; Plutarch. aud. poët. i. 12 in.).

2) When the first noun and its Article a Gen. or some other
attributive intervenes, which also qualifies the second; as,
1 Thess. ii. 12 εἰς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν, iii. 7 ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ
θελήσει καὶ ἀνάγκῃ ἡμῶν, Rom. i. 20 ἣ τε ἀδιός αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ
θεωρία, Phil. i. 25; Eph. iii. 5. Cf. Dion. H. IV. 2246, 9 τὰς
αιτίων γνωάκας καὶ δυνατέρας, 2089, 4; D. S. 1, 86 τὴν προερημένην
ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τιμήν, 2, 18; Ael. anim. 7, 29; Aristot. eth. Nicom.
4, 1, 9; 7, 7, 1.1 So also when the common Genitive follows the
second noun; as, Phil. i. 20 κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐπιτίθε
122 μοῦ, i. 7 ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ κ. βεβαιώσει τοῦ εἰσαγγελίου, 1 Pet. ii. 25
τὸν κλ. (on Phil. i. 19 see Mey.). Cf. Benseler p. 293 sq.

Under 1. it should be noted, that in a series of nouns forming a single
category, only the first has the Article; as, Acts xxii. 25 φιλάσσεσθαι αὐτοῖς
... τὸ αἷμα καὶ τιμίων καὶ τοπνείαν, Eph. iii. 18 τῇ πλάτος κ. μῆκος κ. βάθος
117 κ. ὕψος, Jno. v. 3; 1 Cor. v. 10; cf. Her. 4, 71 θάνατοι καὶ τῶν ἄνθρωπος κ.
ὑμᾶς καὶ νησίων κ. ἀνθρώπων κ. αἰγελιοφόρον, etc.; Plato, Euthyph. p.
7 c. For instances with proper names, see Acts i. 13; xv. 23.

5. On the other hand, the Article is used in the case under
consideration, commonly

a. When each of the connected nouns is to be regarded as inde-
pendent (Schlaef. Dem. V. 501; Weber, Dem. 268), 1 Cor. iii. 8
ὁ φυτεύων καὶ ὁ ποτίζων ἐν εἰσιν, Acts xxvi. 30 ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεύς
καὶ ὁ ἤγεμών, etc., Mark ii. 16 οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι (two
separate classes of Christ’s adversaries combined for one object),
Jno. xix. 6 οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται τῶν ἀρχηγῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχηγῶν κ. ἀνθρώπων κ. ἀγγέλων κ. ἀγγέλων,
Plato, Euthyph. p. 7 c. For instances with proper names, see Acts i. 13; xv. 23.

1 In this case, even when the nouns are of different gender, as in Lysias in Andoc. 17
τῆς ἀνδρείας ἱππά καὶ κράτους ἰσαβεί.
adv. Nicom. 3; Isocr. Areop. p. 352; permut. 736; D. S. 1, 30 141
(διὰ τὴν ἀναδρόμων καὶ τὴν στάσεις τῆς ἀπάτης τροφῆς) 3, 48; 5, 29;
17, 52; Plut. virt. mul. p. 214 ἐπεμψε τὴν γυναῖκα κ. τὴν θυγατέρα,

So especially when the two nouns are connected by τε ... καὶ
or καὶ ... καὶ, and thus more prominently exhibited as independent
xvii. 10, 14; xviii. 5; Phil. iii. 10; Heb. ix. 2; cf. Ael. anim. 7,
29; Theophr. char. 25 (16); Thuc. 5, 72; Xen. C. 7, 5, 41; Mem.
1, 1, 4; Aristot. pol. 3, 5; Isocr. Demon. p. 1 and 12; permut.
738; D. S. 1, 69; 4, 46; Lucian. fug. 4; Arrian. Ind. 34, 5, etc.
Even in this case, however, if there be no special antithesis Greek
authors (according to good Codd.) sometimes omit the Article;
see Poppo, Thuc. I. 196 sq.; III. I. 395; Geel, Dion. Chr. Ol. p.
295; cf. Xen. M. 1, 1, 19 τὰ τε λεγόμενα καὶ πραττόμενα (where,
as an antithesis to these two participles, immediately follows καὶ
τὰ συγγ. βουλευόμενα) Thuc. 5, 37; Plat. rep. 6, 510 c. and Phaed.
128 b.; Dion. H. IV. 2242, 2; Diod. S. 1, 50; 2, 30; Arrian. Ind.
5, 1; Dio Chr. 7, 119; Mr. Ant. 5, 1. Cf. also Mtth. 715.

When the influence of a disjunctive particle comes in, the repe-
tition of the Article is obviously necessary; as, Luke xi. 51 μεταβα
τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οίκου, Matt. xxiii. 35; 1 Cor. xiv. 7 πῶς
γνωσθῆσαι τὸ αυλούμενα ἢ τὸ κυθαριζόμενον; Matt. x. 14; xvii.
25; xxiii. 17, 19; Mark xiii. 32; Luke xiii. 15; xxii. 27; Jno. iii.
19; Acts xxviii. 17; Rom. iv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Cf. Isocr. permut.
b. When the first noun is followed by a Gen., and the second,
therefore, is appended to an independent group; as, 1 Cor. i. 28
τὰ ἄγενέ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ έξουθενίμενα, v. 10.

If each of the connected nouns has its Genitive, the repetition
of the Article before the second noun is unnecessary, since the two
nouns are separated without it; as, Phil. i. 19 διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως
καὶ ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος, etc.

Note 1. Variants occur in a very great number of passages, e.g. Matt.
xxvii. 3; Mark viii. 31; x. 33; xi. 15; Luke xxii. 4; Acts xvi. 19; Rom.
iv. 2, 11, 19; 1 Cor. xi. 27; 1 Thess. i. 8.

1 We find the Article both used and omitted before nouns of the same gender in
Art. Epict. i. 18, 6 τὴν δέων τὴν διακριτικήν τῶν λεικῶν καὶ μελανῶν ... τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ
tῶν κακῶν. Somewhat differently in Acts vi. 9 τὰς τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης
Διδυμῶν καὶ Κυρην. καὶ Ἀλεξάβατον, καὶ τῶν ἀντὶ Καλλίας καὶ Ἀδαλ, where Κυρην. and
Ἀλεξ. combined with Διδυμ. constitute one party (with a synagogue in common), as
the other synagogue corporation was formed of the Asiatic and Cilician Jews.
Moreover, the view taken of the mutual relation of the connected nouns may frequently be a matter of indifference; it depends upon the writer how he will regard it; (in 1 Thess. i. 7 we find ἐν τῷ Μακεδονία καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαίᾳ but in 8 καὶ Ἀχαίᾳ). Hence there are passages where the reader would not miss the Article, e.g. 1 Tim. v. 5; while in others it might perhaps be used, as in Eph. ii. 20 (Mey. in l.). See in general, Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 253; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 395.

In Tit. ii. 13 ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ίησοῦ Χρ., for reasons which lie in the doctrinal system of Paul, I do not regard σωτῆρος as a second predicate by the side of θεοῦ, as if Christ were first styled ὁ μεγάς θεός and then σωτήρ. The Article is omitted before σωτῆρος, because the word is made definite by the Genitive ἡμῶν, and the apposition precedes the proper name: of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Similar is 2 Pet. i. 1, where there is not even a pronoun with σωτῆρος. So also in Jude 4 two different subjects may be referred to, since κύριος, as made definite by ἡμῶν, does not require the Article in order to mean Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δότι κύριος ἡμῶν. (In 2 Thess. i. 12 we have simply an instance of κύριος for ὁ κύριος.)

Note 2. The omission of the Article in Luke x. 29 τίς ἔστι μου πλησίον, and 36 τίς τούτων ... πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμῶ, seems strange, as one would have expected ὁ πλησίον (see Markland, Eur. Suppl. 110), since, moreover, πλησίον is an adverb. A similar instance has been quoted by Döderlein (Synon. I. 59) from Aeschyl. Ἄρησθ' 938 ὁμιὸς ὁ θάνατον Ζηνὸς ἡ μηδὲν μέλλει, where μηδὲν appears to be put for τοῦ μηδὲν. In both the passages from Luke, however, the adverb also is allowable: who is near me? See Bornem. in l.

1 As the words run: προσευχόμενες ταῖς δεήσεως καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, prayer is distributed into its two kinds; without the repetition of the Article, prayer and petitions would be blended into one.

2 In the above remarks I did not mean to deny that σωτῆρος ἡμῶν can grammatically be regarded as a second predicate dependent on the Article τοῦ; only, doctrinal conviction, deduced from Paul's teaching, that this apostle could not have called Christ the great God, induced me to show that there is also no grammatical obstacle to taking καὶ σωτῆρος Χριστὸν by itself as a second subject. Since the anonymous writer in Tholuck's Liter. Anzeiger (as referred to) has not proved that, according to my acceptance of the passage the Article must have been repeated before σωτῆρος (the passages quoted as parallel are not analogous, see Fr. Rom. II. 268), still less that to introduce Christ as ὁ μεγάς θεός is in harmony with Paul's representation of the relation of Christ to God, I adhere to the above interpretation. Examples, such as those quoted § 19, 2, will at once satisfy the impartial inquirer that the Article was not necessary before σωτῆρος; and the fact that elsewhere σωτήρ is applied also to God, is nothing to the purpose. Enough that σωτήρ ἡμῶν our Saviour is a perfectly definite predicate, just as his face is; προσευχόμενος is applicable to a far greater number of individuals than σωτήρ. The words S. 38: If the expression σωτήρ ἡμῶν invariably occurred in the N. T. of a single definite individual only etc. contain an arbitrary assumption. Matthies has contributed to the discussion nothing decisive.
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1. ATTRIBUTIVES (Adjectives, Genitives, or Adjuncts formed with Prepositions) annexed to a noun which has the Article, are placed either

a. Between the Article and the noun, as ὁ ἄγαθος ἀνθρωπός Matt. xii. 35, τὸ ἱμίον ὁμοία Matt. xviii. 20, τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, ἡ τοῦ 143 θεοῦ μακροθυμία 1 Pet. iii. 20, ἡ ἁίν ἐκλήσις Phil. iii. 14, ἢ ἐν φόβῳ ἁγιά ἀναστροφὴ 1 Pet. iii. 2, ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη Rom. xi. 27, ἡ καὶ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις ix. 11, τὸ καινὸν αὐτοῦ μυθημένον Matt. xxvii. 30; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 7; Heb. v. 14; vi. 7. Or,

b. After the noun; in which case

a. If they are adjectives, or adjuncts with prepositions, they uniformly take the repeated Article, but

β. If Genitives of nouns, they usually take it only aa. when these additions are to be strengthened, or to be made more prominent (1 Cor. i. 18 ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, Tit. ii. 10 τὴν διδακτικὴν ἀναλογίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν; see Schaeff. Melet. p. 8, 72 sq.; Mthh. 727), particularly when relationship is added for distinction's sake, as Juno xix. 25 Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλαπᾶ, Acts xiii. 22 Δαβίδ ὁ τοῦ Ἰεροσαλήμ.

1 Genitives of personal pronouns are joined to nouns, as is well known, without the aid of the Article, as ὁ παῖς μου. They blend, as it were, with the substantive.

2 It is obvious that this applies only to adjectives used as attributives to substantives. Ὀντὶ ἐκεῖθεν ὁ κατακτήτωρ τοῦ πολεμίου, the word μέσον belongs to the verb: was rent ... in the middle; τὸ μέσον κατακτήτωρ would have a different meaning. So the similar adjectives of space or number ἐσχάτος, διαίομα, μέσος, ἡμέρας always appear without the Article when they are not really epithets, — either a. after the noun, as Matt. xvi. 26 ἔρχεται τὸ κόσμον ἐκείνῳ, or b. before it, Matt. iv. 23; Heb. ix. 7 μέσον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, Jno. vi. 22; see Gerhard, I. 371 ff., who has collected examples with little judgment. Cf. Jacob, Lucian. Al. p. 51; Krül. 104 f.; Rost, S. 435.

3 Statilb. Plut. Gorg. p. 55; Mdc. p. 12. This construction, however, gradually lost its force, and many authors almost invariably put the Article before such a Genitive even when no emphasis is intended. So, in particular, Demosth., Isocr. and Xen. Ephes. The orators might have some reason for this in spoken discourse. Cf. Siebelis, Pausan. I. 17.

4 The precise meaning of the above is: among the women called Mary, the (particular one) of Clopas (the wife of Clopas). The Article is not used where the annexed Genitive is not intended to convey any sharp distinction, as Luke vi. 16 ἰουλικὴ ἢ ἱππάνθη, Acts i. 13 Ἰδιωτὸς Ἀλφαῖος, just as Her. 1, 59 Λυκόφρος Ἀριστοκλῆς and Dion. H. comp. 1 Δωδεκάρχην Ἀλέξανδρον (in both passages, however, Schaeff. would insert the Article), or Aristot. polit. 2, 6 ἦπεδείκτως ἐκφάντως, and Thuc. i. 24 Φήλιος Ἐρατοκλῆδου (Poppo, Thuc. I. 195), Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 3; cf. Ἰμ. Vig. 701. On the other hand, in Luke xxiv. 10 we must unhesitatingly read, with the most approved MSS., Μαρία ἡ
120 Matt. iv. 21; x. 2; Mark iii. 17; ββ. when the noun has already its (personal) Genitive, as Matt. xxvi. 28 τὸ ἀλμᾶ μου τὸ θές καὶ τῆς διαθήκης, yet the Art. here is not quite established.

c. Rarely such attributives, particularly if adjectives, are put before the noun and its Article; as, Acts xxvi. 24 μεγάλη τῇ φονῇ ἐφή see above § 18, Matt. iv. 23 περιήγησεν ἐν ὀλη τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ.

144 In case a. more than one attributive may be inserted between the Article and the noun; as, ὁ ἄγιος καὶ ἀμώμοις ἀνθρώπος. The Article then is usually not repeated. With qualifying Genitives or adjuncts appended by means of Prepositions, there are instances of the repetition of the Article; as, Luke i. 70 διὰ στόματος τῶν ἄγιων τῶν ἀπ' αἰώνων προφητῶν, 1 Pet. iv. 14 τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύμα, i.e. the Spirit of glory and (consequently) the Spirit of God,—the Spirit of glory, which is no other than the Spirit of God himself. Similar is Thuc. 1, 126 ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς τῇ μεγάτῃ ἐορτῇ, and Plat. rep. 8, 565 d. περὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ierōn, only that καὶ is wanting here.

In case b. also, there is no objection to the accumulation of adjuncts, as Heb. xi. 12 ἢ ἅμοι ἢ παρὰ τὸ χείλος τῆς θαλάσσης, ἢ ἀναρίθμητος, Rev. ii. 12 τῆν ῥομφαίαν τὴν διοίκησιν τὴν ὄξειαν, Krū. 102; except that when the last are not connected by καὶ (§ 19, 4) the Article must be repeated.¹

It will be necessary to explain here more minutely, and to confirm by examples, the case b. a.

126 a. Adjectives and possessive pronouns with the Article are placed after the noun, either

Quite alone, as Jno. x. 11 ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς, Acts xii. 10 ἐπὶ τὴν πόλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν, Jno. vii. 6 ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός, i. 9; iv. 11; xv. 1; Luke ii. 17; iii. 22; viii. 8; Acts xix. 16; Eph. vi. 13; Col. i. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 7; 1 Cor. vii. 14; xii. 2, 31; 1 Jno. i. 3; Jas. i. 9; iii. 7 (in which case the adjective sometimes is subjoined for greater perspicuity, cf. particularly Jas. iii. 7, sometimes is to be made more emphatic, Bornem. Luc. p. xxxvi.; Mdv. 11). Or

When the governing noun is amplified by a Gen. or in some other way, as Matt. iii. 17 ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 2 Cor. vi. 7 διὰ τῶν διπλῶν τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν, Jno. vi. 13 τῶν πέντε ἄρτων τῶν κριθίνων, Matt. vi. 6; Luke vii. 47; Tit. ii. 11;

¹ ἀνακόλουθοι. In general cf. Fr. Mr. p. 696 sq. The collocation of words in Pausan. 2, 22, 6 τῇ Φοράνων Νάδης does not occur in the N. T.

¹ A rare repetition of the Article, in accordance with the above rules, occurs in Rev. xxi. 9 ἦλθεν ὅς ἐκ τῶν ἐκτὰ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐχόντων τὰς ἐκτὰ φιλασ (τάς) γεμοῦντας (τῶν) ἐκτὰ πληγῶν τῶν ἐχάσατον.
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Heb. xiii. 20, etc. (The N. T. writers liked to avoid the construction τὸν μονογ. θεοῦ νῖν as intricate; cf. Jno. iii. 16; 1 Jno. iv. 9.)

In the text rec. of 1 Jno. v. 20 ἡ ζωή αἰώνιος we find the adj. 121 without the Article after the noun. The better Codd., however, omit the Article before ζωή also. The common reading in itself considered is by no means to be rejected, as in such cases later writers begin to omit the Article (Bhd. S. 323), although the examples from Long. past. 1, 16; Heliød. 7, 5; Diod. S. 5, 40 are 145 not quite parallel to that from John. Besides, ζωή αἰών. had already come to be regarded as a single idea, cf. Jno. iv. 36. In Luke xii. 12, Griesb. and Schott have τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἄγιον, but Knapp and all recent editors give τὸ γὰρ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, without noting any variants. In 1 Cor. x. 3; Gal. i. 4 τὸ βρόμα πνευματικόν and ὁ αἰών πνηματικός are to be considered as blending together into one leading idea; and αὐτό and εὐεργ., as frequently, have been inserted as epithets between the Article and the Substantive; cf. 1 Pet. i. 18. See also Heb. ix. 1 τὸ ἄγιον κοσμίκων. With Jno. v. 36 εἰς ἐκ τῆς μαρτυρίας, μελέτω τοῦ 'Ιωάννου (a predicate: the witness that I have is greater than, etc., Rost 455) may be compared Isocr. Philipp. c. 56 τὸ σῶμα θυτοῦ ἀπαντῆς ἐχομεν. Further, cf. Schaef. Plut. V. 80.

b. The Article is used with subjoined amplifications of the principal noun consisting of a noun and preposition: 1 Thess. i. 8 ἡ πλοτις ὄμων ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, 2 Cor. viii. 4 τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους, Jas. i. 1 ταῖς φιλοίς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, Acts xv. 23 τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιφύλευ... ἀδελφῶν, τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, xxiv. 5 πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην, iii. 16; iv. 2; viii. 1; xi. 22; xxvi. 4, 12, 22; xxvii. 5; Mark iv. 31; xiii. 25; Jno. i. 46; Luke xx. 35; Rom. iv. 11; vii. 5, 10; viii. 39; x. 5; xiv. 19; xx. 31; xvi. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 11 f.; iv. 17; xvi. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 6; vii. 12; ix. 1; xi. 3; Phil. i. 11; iii. 9; 1 Thess. i. 1; iv. 10; 1 Tim. i. 14; 2 Tim. i. 1; Eph. i. 15; Rev. xiv. 17; xvi. 12; xix. 14; xx. 13. (Variants occur in Acts xx. 21; Luke v. 7; Jno. xix. 38; Rom. x. 1.) For examples from Arrian (yet the like are to be found in every page of the Greek prose authors) see Ellendt, Arrian Al. I. 62.

This mode of annexing an attributable (by bringing it in afterwards), as the more simple, is far more frequent in the N. T. than the insertion of it between the Article and the noun. The LXX.

1 According to the testimony of good Codd. even the earlier writers in certain cases did the same; cf. Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 319, and Krü. in Jahn's Jahrh. 1838. I. 61.
also, as a slight inspection will show, have regularly observed the use of the Art. in this case.


c. Participles, as attributives, in as far as they have not entirely dropped the notion of time, are not treated in this case altogether like adjectives. They take the Article only when some relation already known or especially noteworthy (is qui, quippe qui) is indicated, and consequently the idea expressed by the participle 146 is to be made more prominent, e.g. 1 Pet. v. 10 ὁ θεὸς ... ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αἰτίον δοξαν ... διόνυσον παθόντας, αἰτὸς καταρτίσαι God ... who hath called us unto his eternal glory, ... after that we have suffered a while etc., Eph. i. 12 εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐπανω τοὺς προπηλαφώτας εν τῷ Χρ. we, the we who (quippe qui) 122 have hoped (as those who have hoped), cf. vs. 19; Heb. iv. 8; vi. 18; Rom. viii. 4; 1 Cor. viii. 10; Jno. i. 12; 1 Jno. v. 13; 1 Thess. i. 10; iv. 5; 1 Pet. i. 8; iii. 5; Jas. iii. 6; Acts xxii. 38; cf. Dion. H. III. 1922; Polyb. 3, 45, 2; 3, 48, 6; Lucian. dial. m. 11, 1 a.

On the other hand, the participle occurs without the Article in Acts xxiii. 27 τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλληφθέντα ἵνα τῶν Ἰουδαίων hunc virum comprehendam (who was seized, after he had been seized), 2 Cor. xi. 9 ἵστημι μοι προσαναπήρωσαν οἱ ἄδελφοι ἑλθόντες ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας the brethren, after they had arrived, Acts iii. 26 αναστήσας ὁ θεὸς τὸν παῖδα αἰτίον ἀπεσταλείν αἰτίον, etc., God, having raised up (causing to appear) his Son, sent him, etc. (on the other hand, Heb. xiii. 20), Rom. ii. 27 κρίνει ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυσσία τῶν νόμων τελοῦσα σὲ etc., if or thereby that it fulfils etc. Cf. Luke xvi. 14; Jno. iv. 6, 39, 45; 1 Cor. i. 7; xiv. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 2; Heb. x. 2; xii. 23; 1 Pet. i. 12 (Fr. Mt. p. 432; Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 14). So Acts xxi. 8 εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φίλιππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ δύτων εκ τῶν ἐπτά is to be translated: qui erat, as being one of the seven (yet some authorities give τοῦ here, which introduces into the passage a false emphasis), Rom. xvi. 1 cf. Demosth. Con. 728 c. Εὐξίθεου τούτου δύτη ἡμῶν συγγενή, D. S. 17, 38 ὁ παῖς δύν εξ ἐτῶν, 3, 23 τὸν πτύσσοντα καρπὸν δύτα καλόν, Philostr. Apoll. 7, 16 ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἀνύδρως οὗτος πρὸτερος, Thuc. 4, 3; 8, 90; Demosth. Polycl. 710 b.; Isocr. Trap. 870; Lucian. Hermot. 81; dial. m. 10, 9; Alciphr. 3, 18; Strabo, 3, 164; Long. 2, 2; Philostr. Her. 3, 4 and Sophist. 1, 23, 1.

In Eph. vi. 16 ἀλβὴ τῶν πεπρωμένων the Article is not fully established (Lchm. has cancelled it); if it is not genuine, the meaning of the passage is: the darts, when they burn, or though they burn (to quench the darts of Satan ... burning as they are). In 2 Jno. 7 ἄρχόμενον belongs to the
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predicate; and in Gal. iii. 1 Ἰησοῦς Χρ. προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἡταυτομένος is 128 to be translated: Jesus Christ as one who has been crucified; cf. 1 Cor. 7th ad. i. 25; (otherwise in Matt. xxviii. 5).

The above passage, 1 Pet. v. 10, ὁ θεός, ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς ... ἀλίγον παθόντας is peculiarly instructive respecting the use and the omission of the Article with Participles. Whether the Article is to be used or omitted before the Participle, depends sometimes on the subjective view of the writer. 147 Rom. viii. 1 τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιστατούσιν etc., with a comma after Ἰησοῦ, means: to those who are in Christ Jesus, inasmuch as they walk not after the flesh. On the other hand, τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιστατούσιν, with greater prominence of the apposition, means: to those who are in Christ Jesus, as persons who walk not etc., to those who walk not etc.; cf. Mth. 718. The whole clause, however, μὴ ... πνεύμα is undoubtedly spurious.

When a Participle with the Article is subjoined in apposition to a noun, or put in the Vocative (as if in apposition to σοῦ), it sometimes denotes ridicule or disapprobation, or prominently points out some peculiarity as a subject of ridicule or disapprobation. Expositors of Greek authors have frequently attributed to the Article itself a derivative force (articulus irrisi- oni inservit, Valcken. Eur. Phoen. 1637; Markland, Eurip. Suppl. 110; 128 Stalib. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 12, and Apol. p. 70); this, however, lies only in the thought and its special prominence (and in speaking may also be conveyed by the voice). Here, for instance, may be referred from the N. T. Rom. ii. 1 τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσει σὲ κρίνων, Matt. xxvii. 40 δ καταλύνων τὸν ναὸν ... κατάβαθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ [Jno. v. 12] etc. See Hm. Eur. Alcest. 708; Mth. 722.

2. To the rule explained under b. there are unquestionable — indeed, well-nigh standing — exceptions, viz.

When an adjunct (consisting of a noun and preposition) which in reality forms with the substantive but one leading idea, is to be linked to the preceding noun simply by the voice, the grammatical connective of the written language (i.e. the Article) is wanting, e.g. Col. i. 8 δηλώσας ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι your love in the Spirit, see Huther, 1 Cor. x. 18 βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα (opp. to Ἰσρ. κατὰ πνεύμα), 2 Cor. vii. 7 τὸν ὑμῶν ζηλῶν ὑπὲρ ἐμαυ, Eph. ii. 11. This takes place especially,

a. In the oft-recurring apostolic (Pauline) phrase, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, or ἐν κυρίῳ, or κατὰ σάρκα, as Col. i. 4 ἀκούσατες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χρ. Ι. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους, Eph. i. 15 ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πιστὶν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ι. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους, Rom. ix. 3 τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα, 1 Thess. iv. 16 οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον the dead in Christ (1 Cor. xv. 18), with which in vs. 17 is contrasted ἤμεις οἱ ζωντες, for these are ζόντες ἐν Χριστῷ (of the resurrection of
non-Christians Paul has here no occasion to speak), Phil. iii. 14; Eph. iv. 1 (where Paul, if ἐν κυρίῳ is to be connected with παρακαλώ, would have placed this latter word after ὑμᾶς; δέσμος ἐν κυρίῳ gives the proper emphasis to the admonition that follows), ii. 21; vi. 21. Not unlike this is 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ 148 Ἑσσαλονικεῖων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ, etc. Likewise in 1 Tim. vi. 17 τῶν πλουσίων ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰώνι 1 are to be connected. Cf. besides, Acts xxvi. 4; Rom. xvi. 3, 8, 10; Eph. ii. 15; Phil. i. 1.

b. When the primitive verb was construed with a particular preposition, or when the adjunct is half-implied in the noun (Held, Plut. Timol. p. 419; Krü. 103), as Eph. iii. 4 δύνασθε νοήσαι τὴν σύνεσιν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ (Josh. i. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Esr. i. 31) cf. Dan. i. 4 συνυπότευ εἰς πάσῃ σοφία; Rom. vi. 4 συνετάφθης αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτισμοῦ εἰς τὸν θάνατον (vs. 3 εὐβαπτίσθης εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ), Phil. i. 26 διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 2 Cor. ix. 13 ἀπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντας, Col. 124 i. 12 (Job xxx. 19) cf. Bähr in loc.; Eph. iii. 13 ἐν ταῖς θλίψεις μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (cf. vs. 1), 2 Cor. i. 6; Col. i. 24. So Polyb. 3, 48, 11 τὴν τῶν δύκων ἀλλομόρφη τὸ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, D. S. 17, 10 ὑπὸ Ἀλεξανδροῦ παρουσίας ἐπὶ τὰς Ὀθῆς, Her. 5, 108 ἡ ἀγγελία περὶ τῶν Σαρδίων, Thuc. 5, 20 ἡ ἐς βολή ἐς τὴν Ἀττικήν 2, 52 ἡ συγκομιδὴ ἐκ τῶν ἄγρων εἰς τὸ ἄστυ 1, 18; Plutarch. Coriol. 24 ἡ τῶν πατρικίων δυσμένεια πρὸς τὸν δήμον, and Pomp. 58 αἱ παρακλήσεις ἑπέρ Καίσαρος. From the LXX. compare Exod. xvi. 7 τῶν γονόμων ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ, which Thiersch considers as paene vitium!

Case a. is to be referred no doubt to the colloquial language, which, having the more expressive aid of the voice, scarcely employed the Article anywhere; whereas the literary language, for the sake of precision, could less easily dispense with it. Yet from the literary language a few instances even of this omission of the Article may be produced; cf. Polyb. 5, 64, 6 διὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς δόξαν ἐκ τῆς ἅβλησεως, Sext. Emp. hypot. 3, 26 ἵπτομεν περὶ τοῦ τόπου πρὸς ἄκριβειαν γιὰ τοῦ πρὸς α., as appears from what precedes, Thuc. 6, 55 ὅτε βιωμός σημαίνει καὶ η στῆλη περὶ τῆς τῶν τυράννων

---

1 According to Paul’s view we are likewise probably to take ἥθεως ἐκ πίστεως together in the quotation from the O. T. in Rom. i. 17 and Gal. iii. 11. In the former passage he wishes to establish by the words of the prophet the proposition δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐκ πίστεως etc., and not ἥθεως ἐκ δικαιοσύνης. Cf. Rom. x. 6 ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη. But in Heb. x. 38 ἐκ πίστεως must undoubtedly be joined to ζητοῦσα; see Bleek.

2 Accordingly, in Rom. v. 2 there would be no objection in this respect to connecting τῇ πίστει (which however Lcmm. and Tdf. have rejected) ἐς τὸν χάρων ταῦταν. There are, however, other difficulties.
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άδικαι (where Bekker from conjecture has inserted ἡ before περὶ), cf. Krü. Dion. p. 158; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 234.

In classifying such constructions, however, we must be cautious; 1 149 many that seem to come under this head we shall find, on closer 130 examination, to be different; cf. Ellendt, Arrian. al. I. 315.

a) Sometimes, for instance, a slight transposition of the words may have ensued, as 1 Tim. i. 2 Τιμοθέω γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει, where the words ἐν πίστει construed according to the sense with γνησίῳ would mean genuine in faith; cf. Xen. A. 4, 8, 28 κατὰ τὰς προσκούσας δόξας ἐπὶ τῶν ποταμῶν, i.e. κατὰ τὰς ἐπὶ τ. τ. προσήκ. δόξας. For several reasons, however, it is preferable to take ἐν πίστει there as an adjunct to the compound notion, — genuine child. On the other hand, in 1 Pet. i. 2 it may be that the qualifying clauses κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ ... εἰς ἑπακολουθεῖν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν etc. should be joined to ἐκλεκτοῖς.

b) Elsewhere the adjunct belongs as a closer limitation directly to the verb, as Col. i. 6 ὃς ἡμέρας ἱκουσάτε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (see Bähr and Mey.), Rom. iii. 25 ὥστε καταποθέτω διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἴματι (see Fr. and de Wette in l.); viii. 2 ὁ νόμος του πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰ. ἡλευθεροσφείται με ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς άμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου where it is evident, partly from the antithesis νόμος τοῦ θανάτου (to which νόμος τῆς ζωῆς correctly corresponds), and partly from vs. 3, that ἐν Χριστῷ must be connected with ἡλευθεροσφείται, as Koppe has done; Phil. i. 14 τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν κυρίῳ πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (cf. a similar construction in Gal. v. 10 πέποιθα eis ὕμια ἐν κυρίῳ and 2 Thess. iii. 4), ἐν κυρίῳ has a real meaning only when joined to πεποιθότας; Jas. iii. 13 δειξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν πράγματι σοφίας, where the words ἐν πράγματι σοφίας are an explanatory adjunct to ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς. Further, cf. Rom. v. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 7; ix. 18; Phil. iii. 9; iv. 19, 21; Col. i. 9; Eph. ii. 7; iii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 16; Phil. eim. 20; Heb. xiii. 20; Jno. xv. 11, see Lücke; 1 Jno. iv. 17; Jude 21. Likewise in Acts xxii. 18 οὗ παραδείστην σου τὴν μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἕμοι may be translated: they will not receive concerning me thy testimony, i.e. in reference to me no testimony from thee; τὴν

1 Harless on Eph. i. 15 and Mey. on Rom. iii. 25 etc., have taken the same view as the above. Fr. also, who in his letter to Thuleck, p. 35, had declared it a blunder to connect διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἴματι, has stated (Rom. I. 195, 365) his altered opinion, and also in Rom. vi. 4 the combination διὰ τοῦ βαπτισμοῦ ἐν τῷ θάνατον, which in p. 32 of his letter he had pronounced grammatically faulty, he has defended as alone admissible.
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μαρτυριαν τὴν περὶ ἐμοῦ would be thy testimony to be given, or given, concerning me. In Eph. v. 26 ἐν ῥήματι does not belong to τῷ λαυτρῷ τοῦ ἔσητος, but the passage is probably to be arranged thus: ἵνα αὐτὴν ἐγνάσῃ, καθαρίσας τῷ λ. τ. ὑ., ἐν ῥήματι. The καθαρίζειν precedes the ἤγαζεν and denotes something negative, as the latter denotes something positive; see Rück. and Mey. In Heb. x. 10 it was not necessary to write διὰ τῆς προσφοράς τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐφάπαξ; the latter word may just as well be referred to ἤγαζεν, see Bleek. On Eph. ii. 15 and Col. ii. 14 see § 31, note 1, p. 220.

In Eph. vi. 5 for τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα good Codd. have τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, which Lchm. has adopted.

3. An appellative in apposition to a proper name, 131

a. Usually has the Article, e.g. Acts xxv. 13 Ἀγριππᾶς ὁ βασιλεὺς, Luke ix. 19 Ἰωάννην τοῦ βασιλείου, Acts xii. 1; xiii. 8; xxiii. 24; xxvi. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 32; Matt. xxvii. 2, etc. In such a case the appellative always denotes a dignity, or the like, already known, and thus renders definite the proper name which may be common to many individuals. Agrippa the king, is properly that Agrippa who among those called Agrippa is king, etc. Cf. § 18, 6, p. 112 sq.

b. On the other hand, in Acts x. 32 Σίμων ἴωρος: Simon a tanner (a certain Simon who was a tanner), Luke ii. 36 Ἀννα προφήτις Anna a prophetess, viii. 3 Ἰωάννα, γυνὴ Χοφά, ἑπτάριον Ἡρώδου, Acts xx. 4 Γαύς Δερβάιος Gaius of Derbe (not the already known Derbean), x. 22. In all these instances a predicate in apposition is simply annexed, without any precise intention of distinguishing the person from others of the same name. Likewise in Luke iii. 1 ἐν τει πεντεκαὶ δέκατῳ τῷ ἱρσεμονίᾳ Tiberiūn Caesareos must strictly be translated: of Tiberius as emperor. Gersd. p. 167 is incorrect. In Acts vii. 10 ἐναντίων Φαραώ βασιλέως, Αιγύπτου does not mean: before Pharaoh, the (known or then) king of Egypt; but before Pharaoh king of Egypt, i.e. before Pharaoh who was king of Egypt. Cf. Plutarch. parallel. 15 Βριγὰς Γαλατῶν Βασιλέως, c. 30 Ἀτενόμαρος Γαλλῶν βασιλέως, etc.

With other words in apposition, also, the use or the omission of the Article is determined by the general rule; and it is strange that any one should assert, in absolute terms, that a word in apposition never has the Article. Your father, an unlearned man, would be expressed, to be sure, even in Greek without the Article; but in the expression, your father, the field-marshal, the Article stands with entire propriety. Grammatically this applies to Jno. 151 viii. 44. In general, the use of the Article may be regarded as more common than its omission (Rost 489).
The Article may be omitted, in accordance with the principles explained in § 19, even when the intention is to express a characteristic predicate distinctive of the particular individual; as, Rom. i. 7 ἄνωθεν θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, 1 Tim. i. 1 κατ’ εὐπνεότητα θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, 1 Pet. v. 8 ὁ ἀντίδοκος ἡμῶν διάβαλος. So also if the appellative predicate precedes the proper name, as κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός 2 Cor. i. 2; Gal. i. 3; Phil. iii. 20, etc.; although in the latter case the Article is used for the most part, as 1 Cor. xi. 23 ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς, and 2 Tim. i. 10 τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ, Tit. iii. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 11; Phil. 5, etc.

4. A limiting attributive joined to an anarthrous noun (appellative), properly dispenses with the Article; as, Matt. vii. 11 δόματα ἀγαθά, Jno. ix. 1 εἴδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετηρίας, [Matt. ii. 1 μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀναστολής αὐτοῦ], 1 Tim. iv. 3 ὁ θεὸς ἐκτισάει εἰς μετάληψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας, i. 5 ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας, Tit. i. 6 τέκνα ἔχων πιστά, μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἄστως ἡ ἀνυπόκτητα, Rom. xiv. 17 δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρά ἐν πνεύματι ἄγιῳ, cf. Plat. rep. 2,378d."Ἡρας δὲ δεσμοίς ὑπὸ νίετο καὶ Ἡφαιστοῦ ρύσεις ὑπὸ πατρός, μελλοντος τῇ μητρὶ τυπομένη ἠμόνειν, καὶ θεωμαχάς, ἰδιὸς ὁμορο πεποίηκεν, οὐ παραδεκτόν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, Theoprh. ch. 29 ἄστι δὲ ἡ κακολογία ἄγων τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸ χείρον ἐν λόγωι, Aelian. anim. 11, 15 ἔσκα λέξεων ἐλέφαντος ὀργῆν εἰς γάμον ἀδικουμένου. Cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 91, 110, 152; Krü. 101.

Not unfrequently, however, it happens that such attributives are joined to an anarthrous noun by means of the Article; and that not merely when the noun belongs to the class specified in § 19, 1 (1 Pet. i. 21), but also in other cases, though never without adequate ground; e.g. 1 Pet. i. 7 τὸ δοκίμων ἡμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμῶτερον χρυσόλου, τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, which is to be resolved: more precious than gold (that gold) which is perishable, Acts xxvi. 18 πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμὲ by faith, namely, the faith in me, 2 Tim. i. 13 ἐν ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Tit. iii. 5 ὅπερ ἐξ ἐργῶν, τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνη, Rom. ii. 14 ἔθνῃ τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα gentiles that have not the law, see Fr. in l. (compare on the other hand, 1 Thess. iv. 5); ix. 30; Gal. iii. 21 (compare here Liban. oratt. p. 201 b.), Heb. vi. 7; Phil. iii. 9.

In such passages, the noun is first presented to the mind as 152

1 So κλέπτης ἐν νυκτί might signify a nocturnal thief; but in 1 Thess. v. 2 with ἐς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτί an ἐρχεται is to be supplied from the following clause: that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night (cometh). Even adverbs are joined without the article—that is to say, prefixed—to such anarthrous nouns, as μέλα χειμῶν Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 14 a severe winter. See Krü. in Jahn's Jahrb. 1838, I. 57.
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127 indefinite,1 and is then rendered definite by the attribute, whose import receives, by this very construction, special prominence.

See further, Acts x. 41; xix. 11, 17; xxvi. 22; Phil. i. 11; iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 4; iii. 13; iv. 8; 2 Tim. i. 14; ii. 10; Heb. ix. 2; 2 Jno. 7; Jude 4; Jas. i. 25; iv. 14; 1 Pet. v. 1. Cf. Her. 2, 114 ἐς γῆν τὴν σήν, Xen. M. 2, 1, 82 ἀνθρώπως τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς men, that is the good, Hiero 3, 8 ἐπὶ γυναικῶν τῶν ἐαυτῶν, Mem. 1, 7, 5; 4, 5, 11; Dion. H. IV. 2219, 4 εὐνοία τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν, 2221, 5 ὀπλασμός ὁ τοῖς τηλεκοίτοις πρέπων, Aelian. anim. 8, 23 ὁμδὲ ἐπὶ κέρδει τῷ μεγιστῷ, 7, 27; Her. 5, 18; 6, 104; Plato, rep. 8, 545 a.; legg. 8, 849 b.; Demosth. Neaer. 517 b.; Theophr. ch. 15; Schneid. Isocr. Paneg. c. 24; Arrian. Ind. 34, 1; Xen. Ephes. 2, 5; 4, 3; Heliod. 7, 2; 8, 5; Strabo 7, 302; Lucian. asin. 25, 44; scyth. 1; Philostr. Apoll. 7, 30; cf. Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 409; Herm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 106; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 241; Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 226; Mdv. S. 14.

In Phil. ii. 9 the text. rec. has ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα a name that is above every name. Yet good Codd. [Sin. also] have the Article before ὄνομα: the name (which he now enjoys), which etc., the (known) dignity, which etc.

---

CHAPTER II.

PRONOUNS.

§ 21. THE PRONOUNS IN GENERAL.

1. In the use of the Pronouns the language of the N. T. deviates from the earlier prose of the Greeks, or even from Greek usage in general, only in these two particulars: First, it multiplies the personal and demonstrative pronouns for the sake of greater perspicuity (or emphasis) § 22 sqq. Secondly, it neglects—more frequently than do the later Greeks even—many forms which ranked rather among the luxuries of the language, or were not felt by Orientals to be necessary (such as the correlatives δια, ὑπότος, ὑπότος, τηλίκος in indirect discourse); whereas those modes of expression by which the Greek aimed at conciseness (e.g. attraction), have become very frequent in the N. T. writers

---

1 This appears most plainly in sentences like Mark xv. 41 ἄλλα ἐνόλα σὺναφάσθαι αὐτῷ εἰς ἱερουσαλήμ.
§ 24. On the other hand it has been erroneously asserted that aυτός in the N. T. is equivalent to the unemphatic he. Further, the Hebraistic distribution of οὐδείς into οὐ ... τὰς occurs almost exclusively in aphoristic propositions or set phrases.

2. It is a peculiarity common to the Pronouns, whether personal, demonstrative, or relative, that they not unfrequently take a different gender from that of the nouns to which they refer, regard being had to the meaning of the nouns, not to their grammatical sex (constructio ad sensum). This happens especially when an animate object is denoted by a neuter substantive or a feminine abstract; the Pronoun is then made to agree grammatically with the sex of the object in question, either masc. or fem.; as, Matt. xxviii. 19 μαθητεύσατε τά ἑσφη, βαπτίζωνες αὐτούς, Rev. xix. 15 (cf. Exod. xxiii. 27; Deut. iv. 27; xviii. 14, etc.) Rom. ii. 14; Acts xv. 17; xxvi. 17; Gal. iv. 19 δεκα δοῦμα μον, οὖς πάλιν ὃδε, 2 Jno. 1 (similarly Eurip. Suppl. 12 ἐπὶ γενναίων τέκνων, οὖς Aristoph. Plut. 292), Jno. vi. 9 ἐστι παιδίαν ἐν ὀδε, ἐς ἔχει, as the majority of better Codd. have for the common reading ὅ, Mark v. 41 (Esth. ii. 9); Col. ii. 15 τὰς ἄρχας κ. τ. ἐξουσίας ... θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς, Col. ii. 19 τὴν κεφαλήν (Χριστόν), ἐς οὖ πάν τὸ σῶμα, etc. (Jno. xv. 26 does not come under this head, as πνεῦμα is merely in apposition). For instances from Greek authors, see Mtth. 976; Wurm, Dinarch. 81 sq. ; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 308; cf. Drakenborch, Liv. 29, 12. There are variants in Rev. iii. 4; xiii. 14, etc.

Under this head comes also Rev. xvii. 16 καὶ τὰ δίκα κήρατα καὶ ἐδοκιμάζεται τὸ θηρίον, οὗτοι μωσήσατο, where, agreeably to the symbolical language of prophecy, κήρατα and θηρίον are to be understood as denoting persons.

3. In the same way, these Pronouns when referring to a Singular noun are put in the Plural, if that noun has a collective signification, or is an abstract used for the concrete; as, Matt. i. 21 τὸν λαὸν ... αὐτῶν, xiv. 14; Phil. ii. 15 γενεά, ἐν οἷς, 3 Jno. 9 η ἐκκλησία ... αὐτῶν, Eph. v. 12 σκότος (ἐσκοτισμένοι) ὑπ’ αὐτῶν, Mark vi. 46 ... τὸν δίκλον, καὶ ἀποσταζόμενος αὐτοῖς, Jno. xv. 6, see Lücke in loc.; Luke vi. 17, cf. § 22, 3 (but Acts xxii. 5 does not belong here); cf. Soph. Trach. 545; Thuc. 6, 91; 1, 136; Plat. Tim. 24 b. and Phaedr. 260 a.; Xen. Cyr. 6, 3, 4; Diod. S. 18, 6. This is very frequent in the Sept., Isa. lxv. 1; Exod. xxxii. 11, 33; Deut. xxi. 8; 1 Sam. xiv. 34; cf. Judith ii. 3; iv. 8; Ecclus. xvi. 8; Wisd. v. 3, 7.1 In Phil. iii. 20 ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ἐς οὖ, it was supposed

1 In this way some expositors (e.g. Reiche) explain also Rom. vi. 21 τίνα καρπὸς ἐπέκειται τότε ὑπ’ ὃς (that is, καρποῖς) κἀν ἐπικηρύσθη. See, however, § 23, 2, p. 158.
that the opposite construction occurs, that is, a Sing. pronoun referring to a Plural noun (Bhdy. 295); but ἐκ οὗ has become in usage nothing more than an adverb, exactly equivalent in sense to unde. On the other hand, in 2 Jno. 7 oὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ πλάνος, etc., appears a transition from the Plural μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες, etc. to the collective Singular.

Different from this is Acts xv. 36 καὶ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐν αἷς, where πᾶσα πόλις of itself (exclusively of the inhabitants), implies a plurality (πᾶσαι πόλεις) cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 92, and 2 Pet. iii. 1 ταῦτα ἡ δεύτερα ἡμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς, etc., where δῶς is implied in δεύτερα. I do not know of an exact parallel, but the opposite construction πάντες δότες, which occurs not unfrequently, may be compared with it (Rost 468).

Note 1. According to some expositors (e.g. Kühnöl) the pronoun now ἔθελε καὶ and then refers to a noun not expressed till afterwards; as, Matt. xvii. 18 155 ἐπείρησεν αὐτῷ, namely τῷ δαμασκίω, Acts xii. 21 ἔδημηγόρως πρὸς αὐτούς, cf. vs. 22 ὁ δὴμος (Fr. Conject. I. p. 18 sq.), see Gesen. Lg. S. 740; Bornem. Xen. conviv. p. 210. But neither of these two passages proves anything in respect to N. T. usage. In the former, αὐτῷ refers to the demonic himself, since in the Gospels, as is well known, the person possessed and the demon possessing him are often put for each other — (against which it is of no weight that Mark ix. 25 has ἐπείρησεν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκάθαρτῳ); in the latter passage, αὐτοῖς refers to the Tyrians and Sidonians (deputies), mentioned in verse 20, as even Kühnöl has acknowledged; cf. Georgi, Vind. p. 208 sq. The verb δημηγορεῖν does not interfere with this, as the king's statement was made in a full assembly of the people.

Note 2. The Neut. of the interrogative pronoun τι, and of the demonstrative οὗτος (αὐτός), are often employed adverbially, to denote wherefore 135 (why) therefore. The former is so used also in Latin and German: quid th. cunctariis? was zögertest du? and originally these pronouns were considered as real Accusatives (Hm. Vig. 882; Bhdy. 130). With regard to the strengthened demonstrative αὐτό τοῦτο compare 2 Pet. i. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες (Xen. Anab. 1, 9, 21; Plat. Protag. 310 e. αὐτὰ τα ἄντα νῦν ἕκο παρὰ σε), Mthh. 1041; Ast. Plat. legg. pp. 163, 169, 214. Gal. ii. 10 does not belong here, see § 22, 4. As to τί see passages according to their various relations in Wahl, clav. 483. The Greeks use also δ and ἐ for δὲ δ and ἐδ (Mthh. 1062); but Mey. is wrong in transferring to Acts xxvi. 16 the more poetic use of ἐ (see § 39, note 1), whereas he himself on Gal. ii. 10 rejects on this very ground the proposal of Schott to take δ for ὧδι! Likewise the distributive τὸ τοῦτο μὲν ... τοῦτο δὲ partly ... partly Heb. x. 33 is used adverbially (Her. 1, 30; 3, 132; Lucian. Nigr. 16); cf. Wetsten. II. 423; Mthh. 740. (On 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταυτὰ των ἢς, where two constructions are blended, see § 23, 5.)
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ignation of degree, in Matt. vii. 14 το ορέων how strait is the gate! Luke xii. 49 το θέλω how would I (how much I wish!). This use is unknown to the classics, but is found in the Sept., e.g. 2 Sam. vi. 20, where the Hebrew נֶ הָיָ is rendered in this way.
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1. The personal pronouns, in accordance with Hebrew circum-stantiality, are far more frequently employed in the Greek of the N. T. than in the classics. Particularly,

Αὐτῶν, σοῦ, etc., with substantives (especially in connection with the Middle Voice § 38, 2), as Jno. ii. 12; Luke vi. 20; vii. 50; xi. 34; xxiv. 50; Matt. vi. 17; xv. 2; Mark xii. 30; 1 Pet. iii. 11; Rom. ix. 17; xvi. 7; Acts xxv. 21, etc. (cf. 1 Macc. i. 6; Josh. xxxiii. 2; xxiv. 1; Neh. ix. 34).

The subject Acc. with the Inf., as Luke x. 35 ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρ-χεσθαι με ἀποδόσῳ, Jno. ii. 24; Heb. vii. 24; Acts i. 3; ob cil.

Oblique cases with a participle and at the same time with the principal verb, as Mark x. 16 ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει τιθεῖς τὰς χεῖρας ἐν' αὐτά, ix. 28; Acts vii. 21; Luke xvi. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 16; (cf. below, no. 4.) So especially in the Apocalypse. On the other hand, in Matt. xxii. 37 and Rev. ix. 21 the repetition of the pronoun is probably to be charged to the account of the rhythm.

In connection with this tendency to multiply pronouns, only a few passages occur where the pronoun is wanting when it might have been expected, e.g. Acts xiii. 3 καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἀπέλυσαν (αὐτοῦς), Mark vi. 5; Eph. v. 11; Phil. i. 6; 2 Thess. iii. 12; Heb. iv. 15; xiii. 17; 1 Tim. vi. 2; Jno. x. 29; Luke xiv. 4 (cf. Demosth. Conon. 728b. ἐμὸν περίπετεόντες . . . ἐξέδυσαν). On the other hand, in Matt. xxi. 7 the better reading is ἐπεκάθισεν, and in 1 Cor. x. 9 πειράζων may be taken absolutely; in 2 Tim. ii. 11 κόπων αὐτῷ would be heavy in an aphoristic saying. In 1 Pet. ii. 11 ὕμᾶς, which appears in the MSS. now after παρακάλω now after ἀπέχεσθαι, is certainly not genuine. In acclamations, such as Matt. xxvii. 22 σταυρωθήτω, the omission of the pronoun is very natural (in German the Inf. would likewise be used without a

1 In the language of Homer, however, the possessive pronoun δι is quite parallel. Later (and sometimes earlier) prose authors use also abrōs thus abundantem. Schaeff. ind. Aesop. p. 124; Schom. ad Isaecum, p. 382.

2 In Latin compare Sallust, Juv. 54, 1 universos in concione landat atque agit gratias (ii), Cic. Orat. 1, 15 si modo erunt ad eum delata et tradita (ei), Liv. 1, 11 and 20. Cf. Kritz on the first passage.
pronoun: kreuzigen!); yet the parallel passage Mark xv. 13 has σταυρωσαν αὐτόν. (In Greek authors the omission of the Pronoun is carried much further; see Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 294; Bremini, Lys. p. 50; Schaeff. Demosth. IV. 78, 157, 232; V. 556, 567.)

In Eph. iii. 18 τι το πλάτος, etc., the addition of αὐτὸς (ἀγάπης) would hardly help the passage; see Mey. Many (e.g. Kühnöl) quite erroneously hold the pronoun to be redundant in Matt. xxi. 41 κακοὶς κακῶς ἀπαλάτησι αὐτῶς. Without αὐτῶς the statement would be altogether general. λtraits is required to connect it with the case in hand,—with the γεωργοὺς spoken of.

2. Instead of the personal pronouns the nouns themselves are sometimes employed:—either from the writer’s inadverence, or with a view to relieve the reader’s uncertainty when more than one reference of the pronoun is possible, or because the noun stands at a great distance; as, Jno. iii. 23 f.; x. 41; Luke iii. 19; Eph. iv. 12; cf. 1 Kings ix. 1; xii. 1 (Xen. Eph. 2, 13; Thuc. 6, 105; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 29); Ellendt, Arrian. I. 55.

But in Jno. iv. 1 Ἰησοῦς is repeated because the apostle wishes to quote the express words which the Pharisees had heard; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 23. Further, those passages in Christ’s discourses must not be referred to this head, in which, instead of the pronoun, the name of a person or of an office is repeated for the sake of emphasis; as, Mark ix. 41 ἐν ὀνόματι ότι Χριστοῦ ἔστε, Luke xii. 8 πάς δὲ ἐν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἑμοί ... καὶ ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ, Jno. vi. 40; 1 Cor. i. 8, 21; 1 Jno. v. 6; Col. ii. 11, and often. Cf. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 5 e.; Aeschyl. Prom. vinct. 312; Cic. fam. 2, 4. In all these instances the pronoun would be out of place, and would mar the rhetorical effect. Least of all does the familiar appellation ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, under which Jesus speaks of himself in the Synoptic Gospels as of a third person, stand for ἐγώ.

At other times the repetition of the noun is intended to denote an emphatic antithesis; as, Jno. ix. 5 ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὃς ἡμᾶς εἰμι τού κόσμου, xii. 47 ὅν ἦθος ἦνα κρίνω τῶν κόσμων ἀλλὰ ἦνα σώσω τῶν κόσμων (Xen. An. 3, 2, 23 οἵ βασιλεῖς ἰκανοὺς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ χώρα ... οἰκονίαν), Arrian. Al. 2, 18, 2; Kr.ii. 114 (Liv. 1, 10, 1; 6, 2, 9; 38, 56, 3). Accordingly, even in the following passages no one will regard the repetition of the noun as idle: Rom. v. 12 δι’ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἢ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, Jno. x. 29 ὁ πατήρ μου, δε δέδωκε μοι, μείζον πάντων ἐστι· καὶ οὕτως διώκει άρπάζειν ἐκ τῆς χειρός τοῦ πατρὸς μου. Cf. besides, Acts iii. 16. See § 55.
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In Acts x. 7 the better Codd. have the personal pronoun (see Kühnöl in loc.) and ἐγὼ Κορνηλίῳ is evidently a gloss. The passages which Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 190 quotes from Greek authors are not all to the point, nor is the reading in all of them fully established.

The assertion that it is especially characteristic of Mark to repeat the noun instead of the pronoun αὐτός or ἐκεῖνος (Schulze in Keil's Analect. II. II. 112) is not entirely correct. In Mark ii. 18 the nouns were indispensable,—(the writer could not put into the mouth of the inquirers an ἐκεῖνοι referring to his, the historian's, words); in vi. 41, and also in xiv. 67, the pronouns would have been quite unsuitable; in ii. 27 the nouns were employed for the sake of antithesis; in i. 34; iii. 24; v. 9; x. 46 we find circumstantiality (as often in Caesar), and not strictly the use of nouns for pronouns. Compare Ellendt, as above.

3. The pronoun αὐτός is frequently so employed, through the negligence of the writer, that in the propositions immediately preceding there is no substantive expressed to which it can be directly referred.

Such cases may be reduced to four classes:

1) Αὐτός in the Plur. very frequently refers to a collective noun, particularly the name of a place or country (cf. § 21, 8), which includes the idea of the inhabitants; as, Matt. iv. 23 ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, that is Γαλιλαίων (from δόξῃ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν), ix. 35 (Luke iv. 15); Matt. xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 9 cf. vs. 8; Acts viii. 5; xx. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 12, 18 εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ... ἀποσταζόμενος αὐτοῖς, v. 19 θέες ἢ ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμων καταλλάσσων ἐκεῖνῳ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοίς τὰ παραπτώματα, Jno. xvii. 2. This usage is common enough in Greek authors, cf. Thuc. 1, 27, 136; Lucian. Tim. 9; dial. mort. 12, 4; Dion. H. IV. 2117; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 59.3

Akin to this is, 2) the use of αὐτός in reference to an abstract noun to be deduced from a preceding concrete, or vice versā; as, Jno. viii. 44 ψεύτης ἐστί καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ (ψεύδους), see Lücke 138 in loc.,9 Rom. ii. 26 εὰν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσῃ, οὐχ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ (of such an ἀκροβυστοῦ) εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθῆται; cf. Theodoret. I. 914 τούτῳ τῆς ἀποστο-

---


2 Simpler is the reference of αὐτός in the Plur. to an abstract signifying in itself nothing more than a community of individuals, as ἐκκλησία. On this see § 21, 3. On Col. iv. 15 according to the reading αὐτῶν, see Mey. in loc.

3 The other explanation: father of the liar, appears neither grammatically simpler nor preferable in meaning. Indeed, father of falsehood is a more comprehensive idea, and John has a predilection for abstract expressions.
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λικής χάρτος ἰδιον· αὐτοὶς γὰρ (ἀποστόλοις) etc. In Luke xxiii. 51 αὐτῶν refers to the Sanhedrim, implied in the predicate βουλευτῆς verse 50. Cf. Jonah i. 3 εὑρε τοιούτων ἐκ Θαρσίς ... καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦ πλευσα μετ’ αὐτῶν, etc., see above, No. 2. Sallust. Cat. 17. 7 simul confessum, si coniuratio valuisse, facile apud illos (that is, coniuratos) principem se fore. Similar to this passage from Luke would be Matt. viii. 4 (Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14) εἰς μαρτύρων αὐτοῖς, if the pronoun referred to the foregoing ἱερεῖ, and thus αὐτοῖς agreed with the Plur. ἱερεῦι understood; but, if the cured man has already received from the priests permission to present the purification-offering prescribed by the law, the priests would need no further μαρτύρων of his being cleansed. See 4) below.

.159 3) Αὐτός sometimes refers to something implied in a preceding word, or even in the verb of the sentence; as, 1 Pet. iii. 14 τῶν δὲ φαβοῦν αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, that is τῶν κακούντων ἵμας, or those from whom you must suffer (πᾶσχειν), see Hm. Vig. 714; Eph. v. 12 τὰ κρυφὴ γινόμενα ὑπ’ αὐτῶν, that is τῶν τὰ ἐγγα τοῦ σκότους ποιοῦντων verse 11; Acts x. 10. Cf. Aristoph. Plut. 566; Thuc. 1, 22, 1 and Poppo, in loc.; Heinichen, ind. ad Euseb. III. 589. On Acts xii. 21 see § 21, note 1, p. 142.

.159 4) Αὐτός sometimes has no antecedent grammatically implied in what precedes, but must be referred to some subject assumed to be known; as, Luke i. 17 αὐτὸς προελεύσεται αὐτοῦ (i.e. before the Messiah), see Kühnöl in loc.— (αὐτός of an individual recognized in a certain circle as head or leader, as in αὐτός ἐφα; so of Christ in 1 Jno. ii. 12; 2 Jno. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 4). In Luke v. 17 εἰς τὸ ἱερατεῖον αὐτοῖς, the pronoun expresses the general notion the sick, those who required healing (among the persons present in the synagogue); the pronoun cannot be referred to verse 15 (though this is done even by Bengel). On the other hand, αὐτῶν in Acts iv. 5 refers to the Jews, among whom the events occurred (in verse 1, moreover, their priests et al. are mentioned; and several times λαὸς in the same verse and sequel has pointed to the Jews). In Matt. xii. 9 the pronoun refers to those (Galileans) among whom Jesus was at the same time; in Heb. iv. 8; viii. 8;

1 With the relative compare Testament. patr. p. 608 ἀπεκάλυφα τῆς Χαραλίδη Βησσού, οἷς (Χαραλίδης) εἶχαν ὁ δὲ θεοὶ μὴ ἀπεκάλυφα. Compare also the passage of an ancient poet in Cic. orat. 2, 46, 193: neque paternum aspectum es veritas, quem (patrem) aetate exacta indigem Liberum lacerasti, and Gell. 2, 30, 6.

2 Otherwise in Epiphani. II. 368 a. εἰδαλ μοι, πάτερ, δεῦς ὑγιαλῶ ... πίστεως, τέκνων, τῷ ἐσταυρωμένῳ, καὶ ἔξεις ταῦτην (ὑγιαλ).
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xi. 28 it refers to the Israelites, suggested to the reader by the 133 antecedent particulars. The above-mentioned εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς Matt. viii. 4 comes under this head; those meant by αὐτοῖς are the Jews (the public, the community among whom the precepts of Moses, ἡ προσέταξε Μωϋσῆς, are recognized). In Jno. xx. 15 αὐτῶν presupposes that the inquirer knew who was meant, inasmuch as it was thought he had taken him away; or Mary in answering, engaged with the thought of the Lord, attributes to the inquirer her own impressions. Cf. besides, Poppo, Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 81; 5, 4, 42; Thuc. III. I. 184; Lehmann, Lucian. II. 325; IV. 429; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 286, and, generally, van Hengel, annotat. p. 195 sqq.

In Luke xviii. 34 αὐτοὶ refers to τοὺς δώδεκα and αὐτοῖς in verse 31 (what intervenes being a statement of our Lord's). So also in Heb. iv. 13 160 αὐτοῦ relates to τοῦ θεοῦ in 12; and αὐτῆς in Luke xxii. 21 to Ἰεροσολύμῳ in 20. Lastly, in 2 Cor. vi. 17 ἐκ μᾶς αὐτῶν, in a somewhat transformed quotation from the Old Test., refers to ἐπιστολοι in verse 14; and in Rom. x. 18 αὐτῶν suggests to every reader the preachers, who were also mentioned concretely in 15. On Acts xxvii. 14, where some have referred αὐτῆς to the ship, see Kühnöl in loc. In Luke ii. 22 αυτῶν points to mother and child (Mary and Jesus). Expositors are not agreed whether in Heb. xii. 17 αὐτήν refers to μετάνοιαν or to εὐλογίαν; from the correlation between εὐρίσκειν and ἱκτηνεῖν, however, the former reference is the more probable. In Matt. iii. 16 αὐτῷ and εν αὐτῶν relate unquestionably to Jesus.

A slight inadvertence of another sort appears in Matt. xii. 15; xix. 2 ἁρκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ καὶ θεράπευσαν αὐτοὺς πάντας. Here the pronoun grammatically refers to ὄχλοι, but logically this reference can be only a loose one: he healed them, that is the sick in the crowds, collectively (xiv. 14 θεράπευσαν τοὺς ἅφροςτους αὐτῶν). Compare also Luke v. 17.

According to some expositors the demonstrative also is, in a similar way, construed ad sensum in 2 Cor. v. 2. After ἐν τούτῳ they supply σώματι, as being implied in ἡ ἐπίγνωσιν ἡμῶν οἷς τοῦ σκύνον. But it is much simpler to supply σκύνον, from verse 4. That the Greeks, however, did employ the demonstrative as well as αὐτός with a want of precision in the reference is well known, cf. Mätzner, Antiph. p. 200. In fact, Acts x. 10 would be an instance of this, if the reading ἐκεῖνων for αὐτῶν were correct.

4. A repetition of this pronoun (αὐτός), and also of the other personal pronouns, occurs,

a. When subjoined for the sake of perspicuity, in sentences where the principal noun is followed by a number of other words; as, Mark v. 2 ἐξελθόντι αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εἰδέως ἀπόημησαν αὐτῷ, ix. 28; Matt. iv. 16; v. 40; viii. 1; xxvi. 71; Acts vii. 21; Jas.
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iv. 17; Rev. vi. 4; Col. ii. 13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκρῶς δύτας ἐν τοῖς παρα-
140 πτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβατείᾳ τῆς σαρκός ὑμῶν συνεζωοσελήσαν ὑμᾶς,
etc. Phil. i. 7. In the majority of these passages a participial construc-
tion, equivalent to an independent clause, precedes; in this same case even the Greek authors often add the pronoun, Paus.
c. 194 21; Xen. C. 1, 3, 15, and Oec. 10, 4; Paus. 2, 3, 8; Arrian. Epict.
3, 1; also Cic. Catil. 2, 12, 27; Liv. 1, 2; Sall. Catil. 40, 1; HM.
Soph. Trach. p. 54; Schwarz, Comment. p. 217. The pronoun is
used for the sake of emphasis in Jno. xviii. 11 τὸ ποτήριον δὲ δέδωκέν
μοι ὅ πατέρ, οὖ μὴ πῖω αὐτό; Matt. vi. 4; 1 Pet. v. 10 (Acts ii. 23);
Rev. xxi. 6. (After a case absolute, the pronoun, in the case
161 required by the verb, is introduced almost indispensably; as, Rev.
iii. 12 ὁ μεῖκόν, τοιήσο ἀυτόν, Jno. xv. 2; Matt. xii. 36; Acts vii. 40,
cf. Plat. Theaet. 173 d.; Ael. anim. 5, 34; 1, 48 a.)

b. This redundancy occurs more frequently in relative clauses,
as Mark vii. 25 γυνῆ, ἦς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτερον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάρπατον,
i. 7; Rev. vii. 2 οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτῶις ἀδικήσας τὴν γῆν, etc., iii. 8;
vii. 9; xiii. 8; xx. 8; similar to which is Mark xiii. 19 θελὺς, οἷα
οὐ ἂν γέγονε τοιαύτη ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. So also with a relative
adverb, as Rev. xii. 6, 14 ὅπου ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖ τόπον etc.

In the Sept. (in accordance with the Hebrew idiom, see Gesen.
Lg. 743), such usage is far more frequent, as Exod. iv. 17; Lev.
xi. 32, 34; xiii. 52; xv. 4, 9, 17, 20, 24, 26; xvi. 9, 32; xviii. 5;
Num. xvii. 5; Deut. xi. 25; Josh. iii. 4; xxii. 19; Judg. xviii. 5, 6;
Ruth i. 7; iii. 2, 4; 1 Kings xi. 34; xiii. 10, 25, 31; 2 Kings
xix. 4; Baruch ii. 4; iii. 8; Neh. viii. 12; ix. 19; Isa. i. 21; Joel
iii. 7; Ps. xxxix. 5; Judith v. 19; vii. 10; x. 2; xvi. 3; 3 Esr.
iii. 5; iv. 54; vi. 32, etc.; see Thiersch, de Pentat. alex. p. 126 sq.

Even in Greek prose, however, αὐτός (Götting, Callim. p. 19 sq.;
Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 550), or a demonstrative, is sometimes super-
added in a relative clause: Xen. C. 1, 4, 19; D. S. 1, 97; 17, 35;
Paus. 2, 4, 7; Soph. Philoct. 316 (cf. in Latin Cic. fam. 4, 3;
 Acad. 2, 25; Philipp. 2, 8). Yet the demonstrative could very
seldom be found so closely connected with the relative as in most
of the preceding passages (which are almost all furnished by a
style that has a Hebraistic tinge).1 See, further, HM. Soph. Philoct.

In Acts iii. 13 the writer drops the relative structure in the second clause

1 In Aristoph. Av. 1238 the Cod. Rav. has ὁς θωρωματίδεις for the rec. ὁς θωρ.
αὐτοῖς. On another accumulation of the pronoun see below, § 23, 3.
(see just below). In Rom. vii. 21 the first ἵμωι does not appear to me to belong to the same proposition as the second, see § 61.5. Different also are those passages in which with the pers. pron. still another word is joined by which the relative is epexegetically defined, as Gal. iii. 1 ὃς καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος Ἰσραήλ Ἰησοῦς Χρ. προεγράφῃ ἐν ὑμῖν (in animis vestris) ἔπαιραμένος (Lev. xv. 16; xxi. 20; xxii. 4; Ruth ii. 2); Rev. xvii. 9 ἵππον ἦ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπ' αὐτῶν, xiii. 12; cf. Gen. xxxiv. 3, 37; Judg. vi. 10; Exod. xxxvi. 1; Lev. xvi. 32; 141
Judith ix. 2. Likewise in Gal. ii. 10 ὁ καὶ ἐπικεφαλὰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιήσαι μὴ ἐκ
the emphasis in the subjoined αὐτό, strengthened by τοῦτο, is evident (Bornem. Luc. p. LIV). We must not bring under this head 1 Pet. ii. 24 ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἤμων αὐτὸς ἀνήγαγεν etc., where αὐτός obviously stands by itself, and gives additional force to the antithesis with ἡμῖν.

In Matt. iii. 12 οὐ τὸ πτερόν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, the relative serves 162 instead of τοῦτο to connect what follows with the preceding clause, and both pronouns are to be taken separately, as if it read, ἥν ἔχειν ancient shovel in his hand. Eph. ii. 10 ὃς προσποίμασον is to be considered 135 as an attraction for ἅ προσ. Lastly, in Eph. ii. 21 ἐν κυρίῳ belongs 163 probably with ἐς νὰν ἐγών.

Sometimes αὐτός is repeated in quick succession, though referring to different subjects: Mark viii. 22 φέρονων αὐτῷ (Χριστῷ) τυφλὸν καὶ παρακαλοῦν τοὺς αὐτῶν (Χριστὸν), ἵνα αὐτόν (τυφλὸν) ἄφηση, Mark ix. 27, 28. So ἔστοις in Jno. xi. 37. See below, § 67.

In a clause following a relative clause, and where ὃς or its continued influence might be expected, Greek authors frequently—indeed, almost uniformly (Bhdy. 804) —employ καὶ αὐτός (ὁτός), the writer modifying the construction, (Hm. Vig. 707; Ast. Plat. legg. p. 449; Boisson. Nic. p. 32; Bornem. Xenoph. conv. p. 196; Stallbl. Plat. Protag. p. 68; rep. I. 197; Foertsch, observ. in Lysiam, p. 67; Weber, Dem. 355; Teipel, Scriptores Graec., Germ., Lat. a relativa verbor. construct. saepe neque injuria semper discessisse. Coesfeld, 1841, 4to.; cf. Grotefend, lat. Gramm. § 143, 5; Kritz, Sallust. II. 540). From the N. T. may be quoted under this head, 2 Pet. ii. 3 ὃς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαιδεύεται ὅς ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νοὐτάρει, Acts iii. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 6, with less appropriateness Rev. xvii. 2 μεθ' ἦς ἐπάργυρον ... καὶ ἐμπνεύσαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τῆς ποιημάτων αὐτῆς, where it was necessary to avoid the construction with the relative on account of the nouns to be connected with the pronoun. In Hebrew, as is well known, owing to its great simplicity, the continuing of a sentence without the relative is very common; yet an idiom foreign to the genius of the language should not be introduced into the text by supplying ὃς with the following clause. (In passages such as Jno. i. 6; Acts x. 36; Luke ii. 36; xix. 2, to require the relative instead of αὐτός, or ὃς, is to mis-apprehend the simplicity of N. T. diction; particularly as even Greek authors not unfrequently employ the same idiom; see Aelian 12, 18; Strabo 8, 371; Philostr. Soph. 1, 25; cf. Kypke I. 347. On the other
§ 22. PERSONAL AND POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS.

hand, in 1 Cor. vii. 13 for ἦτοι ἤχει ἀδρα ἀπωτον καὶ αὐτὸς συνεδοκαῖ etc. the expression δε συνεδ. etc. might have been used.)

In the N.T. δ αὐτὸς, the same, takes after it a Dat. of the person when it denotes the same (identical) with, as 1 Cor. xii. 5; cf. Her. 4, 119; Xen. M. 1, 1, 18; 2, 1, 5; Cyr. 3, 3, 35; 7, 1, 2; Isocr. Paneg. c. 28; Plat. Menex. 244 b; Dio. Ch. 332, 97.

Note. Αὐτός in the Nom., as is well known, never stands in classic Greek for the unemphatic he (Krü. 109, 114). From the N.T. also¹ no decisive 142 passages can be produced to prove this usage [which Bttm. Gramm. des ἑινοῦ neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 93 f. wrongly conceives] (cf. Fr. Mt. p. 47); even in Luke, who employs αὐτός the most frequently (cf., in particular, Luke 163 v. 16, 17; xix. 2), it never occurs without a certain emphasis. It denotes.

a. Self, in complex antitheses, and for all the three persons, as Mark 136 ii. 25 ἐπείκεσαν αὐτός καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, Acts xviii. 19 ἐκεῖνος καθιστεῖ, αὐτός καὶ ἐκεῖσθαι, etc., Luke v. 37; x. 1; xviii. 39; 1 Cor. iii. 15; Mark i. 8; Jno. iv. 2; vi. 6; ix. 21; Luke vi. 42 πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν ... αὐτὸς τὴν ὑπὸ ὑμᾶς δόξαν, Heb. xi. 11 πιέζεται καὶ αὐτὴ Σάφηρι δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπάματος θλασθεν even Sara herself (who had been incredulous), Jno. xvi. 27 αὐτός ὁ πατὴρ φυλεῖ ὑμᾶς ἑαυτῷ, of himself (without entreaty on my part, verse 26), Rom. viii. 28. Αὐτός was thus used by the disciples in speaking of Christ (compare the well known αὐτός ἑαυτῷ): Mark iv. 38; Luke v. 16; ix. 51; xxiv. (15) 36. Cf. Fischer, ind. Theoph. under αὐτός. See, in general, the Lexicons.

b. Emphatic he, even he: Matt. i. 21 καλίτευτο τὸ δομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτός γὰρ σῶσε τὸν λαὸν, xii. 50; Col. i. 17. Αὐτός is not used for the unemphatic he also in Luke i. 22 (he himself, as distinguished from the rest: ἐπέγνωσαν), ii. 28 (he Simeon, as distinguished from the parents of Jesus, verse 27), iv. 15; vii. 5 (he, of himself, from his own resources), Acts xiv. 12 (he Paul, as leader, verse 11), Mark vii. 36; [1 Thess. iii. 11; iv. 16; v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 16; iii. 16.] (On the antithesis in Rom. viii. 23 αὐτόλ ... ἐν εαυτοῦ see Fr. in loc.)

5. The reflexive pronoun ἐαυτῷ, etc., which originally (as compounded of ε and αὐτός) belongs to the third person, and in the N.T. is regularly so employed (frequently in antithesis and with emphasis, 1 Cor. x. 29; xiv. 4; Eph. v. 28, etc.), is also, when no ambiguity is to be apprehended, employed in reference to the first and second persons. It is used

a. In the Plural, — as well for the first person, Rom. viii. 23 (ὡς ἐμεῖς) αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν, 1 Cor. xi. 31; 2 Cor. i. 9; x. 12; Acts xxiii. 14, etc., as for the second, Jno. xii. 8 τοὺς πιστοὺς πάντοτε

¹According to Thiersch, de Pent. vers. Alex. p. 98, the LXX often use the masc. αὐτός for he; but not αὑτή or αὑτό, instead of which the demonstrative is regularly employed. In reference to the Apocrypha, Wahl, clavis p. 80, utterly denies such a use.
§ 22. PERSONAL AND POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS.

ἔχετε μὲν ἐαυτῶν, Phil. ii. 12 τὴν ἐαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε, Matt. iii. 9; xxiii. 31; Acts xiii. 46; Heb. iii. 13; x. 25, etc.

b. In the Singular, though far less frequently (Bhdy. 272), in reference to the second person, as Jno. xviii. 34 ἃφ’ ἐαυτοῦ σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις, where σεαυτόν in Codd. B [Sin.] and others is undoubtedly a correction; in Rom. xiii. 9; Matt. xxii. 39 Sept. and Gal. v. 14 σεαυτόν is preponderant.


In the classic (Attic) writers ἄντων etc. is of frequent occurrence as a reflexive (Arndt, de pronom. reflex. ap. Græco. Neobrandenb. 1836, 4to.); in many passages, however, the Codd. vary between ἄντων and ἄντων. It is the more difficult to determine on internal grounds which of these in each particular case is the true reading, because in Greek a reflexive may occur at a considerable distance from the principal subject, and because it often depended entirely on the writer whether he would use a reflexive or not; see Bttm. 10 exc. ad Demosth. Mid. p. 140 sqq.; F. Hermann, comm. crit. ad Plutarch. superst. p. 37 sq.; Benseler, Isocr. Areop. p. 220. Likewise in the N. T., in which since Griesbach ἄντων has often been adopted, cautious editors have frequently been at a loss in deciding whether ἄντων or ἄντων should be preferred. Sometimes either would be appropriate. In Matt. iii. 16, for instance, ἔσε σὺ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἐρχόμενον ἐκ ἄντων might be used from the narrator’s point of view; on the other hand, ἃφ’ ἄντων would refer directly to the subject of the verb ἔσε, that is, Jesus (Krü. 110). In the N. T. it is, in general, unlikely that a reflexive should be used in reference to a remote subject, that is, one which is not in the

1 In the later writers, as Aesop, the Scholiasts, etc. ἄντων seems to predominate; see Schaeff. ind. ad Aesop. p. 124. Cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 163.

2 Cf., however, Held, Plut. Timol. p. 373.

3 Bremi, in the Jahrb. der Philol. IX. S. 171, says: “On the use of ἄντων and ἄντων it is easy to lay down rules, but in certain cases the decision will always remain doubtful; and it is far more difficult in Greek than in Latin to hit the mark,” etc. “When the reference to the subject predominates in the mind, the reflexive is used; but when the subject is viewed as a more remote object, the pronoun of the 3d person. In Greek one must yield rather to his individual impression, if you please, his mood at the moment.” Further, see some good remarks on reciprocal pronouns in general by Hoffmann, in the Jahrb. d. Philol. VII. S. 38 ff.
same proposition as the pronoun; this is owing to the simplicity of its narrative style, which, in like manner, disdains to adhere closely to the relative construction, see above p. 149. Accordingly, in Matt. in the passage referred to and in Eph. i. 17 αὐτῶν, αὐτοῦ, should be adopted without hesitation, but αὐτοῦ in Acts xii. 11; Heb. v. 7; Rom. xiv. 14; see Fr. Exc. 5 ad Matt. p. 858 sqq. (where the view of Matthiae ad Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 800 and Gramm. I. 355 is examined); Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 159 sq. On the other hand, it deserves attention, as remarked by Bengel, appar. ad Matt. i. 21, that in the Codd. of the N.T. the prepositions ἐν, ἐπί, ἐπά, κατά, μετά, [ἀντί] are never written ἀφ’, ἕφ’, etc. before αὐτοῦ. Hence, with Bleek (Epist. to the Heb. II. 69), it might be inferred that the N.T. writers never employed the reflexive form αὐτοῦ, (but used, wherever necessary, τὸ αὐτοῦ instead of it). In fact, recent editors have printed the form αὐτοῦ almost everywhere; as the uncial Codd. of the N.T. and of the Sept. that have diacritic marks recognize αὐτοῦ almost exclusively (Tdf. praef. N. T. p. 26 sq. [ed. vii. p. 58 sq.]). These Codd., to be sure, are not of greater antiquity than the eighth century, and the expression "fere constanter" suggests the desirableness of a more accurate collation. Now it is true that in most passages a reflexive is not absolutely required; yet it is difficult to believe that Paul in Rom. iii. 25 could have written εἰς θεόν τὸς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ (in the face of ἐν αἰματι αὐτοῦ), or Jno. in ix. 21 αὐτός περὶ αὐτοῦ; compare also Eph. i. 9; Rom. xiv. 14; Luke xix. 15; xiii. 34; Mark viii. 35; Rev. xi. 7; xiii. 2. Hence in the N. T. also, the choice between αὐτοῦ and αὐτῶν must be left to the discreet judgment of editors.

6. The personal pronouns ἐγώ, σὺ, ἡμεῖς, etc. are indispensable in the oblique cases, but in the Nom. they are regularly employed only when emphasis — and mostly in consequence of an antithesis — is expressed or implied in them; as, Phil. iv. 11 ἐγώ ἐμαθὼν ἐν ὦς εἰμι αὐτάρκης εἶναι, Jno. ii. 10 πάς ἄνθρωπος ... σὺ τετήρηκας etc., Rom. vii. 17; Luke xi. 19; Acts x. 15; Mark xiv. 29; Jno. xviii. 38 ff.; Gal. ii. 9; Acts xi. 14 σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ ὅλος σου, Jno. x. 30; Acts xv. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 12; Luke i. 18; Matt. vi. 12 ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ἀφειλήματα ἡμῶν ως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν etc., Jno. iv. 10 σὺ ἁν ἂν τίττος αὐτῶν (while I asked of thee, verses 7, 9), Mark vi. 37 δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φανεῖν (ye, since they themselves have no provisions with them vs. 36), Jno. vi. 30; xxi. 22; Mark xiii. 9, 23; 1 Cor. ii. 3 ff.; Matt. xvii. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 6.

So when the person is described in apposition, as Jno. iv. 9 πῶς σὺ Ἰουνάιός ὄν etc., Rom. xiv. 4 σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριου σκέπουν, Jno. x. 33; Acts i. 24; iv. 24; Luke i. 76; Eph. iv. 1; or reference is made to some preceding description, as Jno. v. 44 (42, 43); Rom. ii. 3; or such description is assumed as
something known, as Jno. i. 30; Luke ix. 9 (i, — one who as king is certain of what has taken place); Eph. v. 32 (I as apostle); Jno. ix. 24; Gal. vi. 17; 1 Cor. xi. 23. Σύ is used in addresses particularly when one out of many is meant, as Jno. i. 43; Jas. ii. 3; or when the person addressed is made prominent by an attributive, as 2 Tim. ii. 1; Matt. xi. 28.

These pronouns nowhere occur wholly without emphasis and where they might have been dispensed with (Bornem. Xen. Conv. 187). For when in Eph. v. 32, for instance, we find ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστόν, but in 1 Cor. i. 12; Rom. xv. 8 λέγω δὲ, — in the first passage an emphasis is intended, in the other two, none. Moreover, the Codd. vary much with regard to the use or omission, as well as the position, of these pronouns; and each case must be decided, not according to any fancied peculiarity of style in the separate writers (Gersd. I. 472 f.), but according to the nature of the sentence.

The personal pronoun is both used and omitted in close succession in 166 Luke x. 23, 24 of βλέποντες & βλέπετε ... πολλοι προφήται ... ἰδίων ὑμ. & ὑμεῖς βλέπετε. Only the latter case, however, contains a real antithesis (ὑμεῖς opposed to προφήται, βασιλ., etc.); in the first, the ὀφθαλμοι βλέποντες & βλέπετε are properly none other than those of which the βλέπετε is predicated. Compare 2 Cor. xi. 29 τίς ἀδελφεῖ καὶ οὗκ ἀδελφῶ; 145 τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὗκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι; where it must be noticed that in the latter member πυροῦμαι (which the apostle applies to himself) is a stronger word than σκανδαλίζομαι. In 1 Cor. xiii. 12 τοῖς ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπιγνώσθην, some authorities add ἐγώ to the latter verb; but incongruously, since the antithesis is expressed by the vox verbi.

It may be remarked, in passing, that in some books of the Old Test. the emphatic ἐγώ with a verb has been translated by the Sept. ἐγώ εἰμι, with which the first person of the verb is then connected; as, Judg. xi. 27 τῷ Μαχαήλ αὐτῷ καὶ νῦν ἐγώ εἰμι οὗκ ἤματον; cf. v. 3; vi. 18; 1 Kings ii. 2.

On αὐτός ἐγώ (in Acts x. 26 καὶ ἐγώ αὐτός) see Fr. Rom. ii. 75.

7. The possessive pronouns are sometimes to be understood objectively; as, Luke xxii. 19 ἐμῇ ἀνάμνησις memoria mei (1 Cor. xi. 24), Rom. xi. 31 τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει, xv. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 31; xvi. 17 139 (not in Jno. xv. 10). So also in Greek authors (especially the poets); as, Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 28 εἰναι καὶ φιλία τῇ ἐμῇ, Thuc. 1, 77 τῷ ἡμετερον δέος, 6, 89; Plato, Gorg. 486 a.; Antiphon. 6, 41, etc. On the Latin cf. Kritz, Sallust. Cat. p. 243.

Instead of a possessive pronoun ἰδίως is occasionally employed in the N. T. — an impropriety similar to the use of proprius instead of suus or ejus in later Latin (and of oikeios by the Byzantine
writers, see e.g. Index to Agath., Petr. Patric., Priscus, Dexipp., Glycas, and Theophanes in the Bonn edit.), — as Matt. xxii. 5 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ἰδιον ἅγρων, without any emphasis (that is, without any antithesis to κοινός or ἄλλοτριος), its parallel in the second member is ἐπὶ τὴν ἑμπορίαν αὐτοῦ; xxv. 14 ἐκάλεσε τῶν ἱδιῶν δοῦλων, Tit. ii. 9; Jno. i. 42. So oἱ ἰδιοί ἄνδρες, husbands, in Eph. v. 22; Tit. ii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5, where oἱ ἄνδρες with or without a personal pronoun was sufficient; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 2. Yet on the whole this usage is but rare, and from Greek authors no appropriate instance can be produced; for all that has been quoted by Schwarz, Comment. p. 687, and Weiske, de pleon. p. 62, is unsatisfactory or at most but plausible; so also D. S. 5, 40. Occasionally, vice verba, σφέτερος is found for ἰδιος; see Wessel. Diod. S. II. 9. On the other hand, the Fathers undoubtedly sometimes employ ἰδιος for the personal pronoun, cf. Epiphani. Opp. II. 622 a.

In by far the greater number of passages in which ἰδιος is used, there is an antithesis either evident or concealed; as, Jno. x. 3; v. 18; Matt. xxv. 15; Acts ii. 6; Rom. viii. 32; xi. 24; xiv. 4, 5; 1 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 12; xiii. 12, also Matt. ix. 1. The parallels in 1 Cor. vii. 2 ἐκαστὸς τὴν ἐναυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἑξέτασθαι, καὶ ἑκαστὴ τὸν ἰδιον ἄνδρα ἑξέτασθαι mean: let each man have his wife, and let each woman have her own husband. Isocr. Demon. p. 18 σκότει πρωτοῦ, πῶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ διώκειν ὁ γὰρ κακὸς διανοηθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱδίων etc. Böhme, Kühnöl, and others, improperly regard ἰδιος in Heb. vii. 27 also, as used for the simple possessive pronoun; to ἰδιοι ἀμαρτιαί there, αἱ τοῦ λαοῦ (as ἄλλοτριαι) are expressly opposed; cf. also iv. 10. When ἰδιος, as in Tit. i. 12 ἰδίον αὐτῶν προφήτης (Wisd. xix. 12), is added to a personal pronoun, the pronoun merely expresses the idea of possession (their poet), and ἰδιος makes the antithesis, their own (not a foreign) poet. Similarly in Aeschin. Ctesiph. 294 c.; Xen. Hell. 1, 4, 13; Plato, Menex. 247 b. See Lob. Phryn. p. 441; Wurm, Dinarch. p. 70.

Ḳατά with the Acc. of a personal pronoun is considered as a circumlocution for the possessive pronoun, as Eph. i. 15 ἥ καθ' ὑμᾶς πιστίς ὑμῖν faith, Acts xvii. 28 οἱ καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιήσατε, xviii. 15 νόμος ὁ καθ' ὑμᾶς, xxvi. 3, 140 etc. This is in the main correct; it results, however, quite naturally from the signification of ᾗ: ἦ καθ' ὑμᾶς πιστίς is properly fides quae ad vos

1 Meg. attributes to these passages an emphasis which is either quite out of place (Matt. xxv. 14), or which could have been fully expressed by the pronoun. Even this strengthening of the pronoun by ἰδιος where there is no trace of an antithesis is foreign to the classics.
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Note 1. The Genitive of the personal pronouns, especially μοῦ and σου (more rarely ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν, ἀντων), is, even when no particular emphasis is intended, very often 1 put before the governing substantive (and its Article); as, Matt. ii. 2; vii. 24; viii. 8; xvi. 18; xvii. 15; xxii. 8; Mark v. 30; ix. 24; Rom. xiv. 16; Phil. ii. 2; iv. 14; Col. ii. 5; iv. 18; 1 Cor. viii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 16; iii. 10, 13; 2 Thess. ii. 17; iii. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 15; 2 Tim. i. 4; Philem. 5; Luke vi. 47; xii. 18; xv. 30; xvi. 6; xix. 35, etc. Jno. ii. 23; iii. 19, 21, 33; iv. 47; ix. 11, 21, 26; xi. 32; xii. 40; xiii. 1, etc. 168

1 Jno. iii. 20; Rev. iii. 1, 2, 8, 15; x. 9; xiv. 18; xviii. 5, etc. This takes place even in connection with a preposition; as, Jno. xi. 32 ἐπαν ἀντων ὡς τοῖς τοῖς ἡμῖν; yet in many such passages variants are noted. See, in general, Gersdorff as above, 456 ff.

The Gen. of the pronoun is designedly put before the substantive, as, for emphasis, Eph. ii. 10 ἐν Χριστῷ ἡμῶν τοίχῳ, more emphatic than ἡμῖν γὰρ τοῖς ἀντων, Luke xii. 30; xxii. 53; b. for the sake of contrast, 1 Cor. ix. 11 μέγα, ἡ ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ σαρκίῳ, τῷ θεῷ, Phil. iii. 20; c. when the Gen. belongs to two nouns, 2 Jno. xi. 48 ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν τόπων καὶ τοῦ ἐθνος, Acts xxii. 11; Luke xii. 35; Rev. ii. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. i. 15; 1 Thess. i. 3; ii. 19 (D. S. 11, 16). (The form ἐμὸν depending on a noun, and placed after it, occurs only in such combinations as Rom. i. 12 πίστεως ἡμῶν τῇ καὶ ἐμὸν, xvi. 13 μητέρα ἄντων καὶ ἐμὸν.) The insertion of a personal pronoun between an article and a noun, as in 2 Cor. xii. 19 ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμῶν οἰκοδομής, xiii. 9; i. 6, occurs on the whole but rarely. Cf. in general, 147

Krüger, Xen. Anab. 5, 6, 16.

When the noun is preceded by an adjective, the Genitive of the personal pronoun if placed before the noun is inserted between it and the adjective; as, 2 Cor. v. 1 ἡ ἔπιγυμνὴ ἡμῶν ὡκία, 2 Cor. iv. 16 ὁ ἐκὼ ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος.

Note 2. The Dative of the personal pronouns in easy and familiar speech is sometimes in Greek and Hebrew (just as it is with us) apparently superfluous (dativus ethicus, Bttm. 120, 2, and Dem. Mid. p. 9; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 138). As instances of this usage from the N. T.—where certainly it might have been expected — are enumerated sometimes Matt. xxi. 5, a quotation from the Old Test., sometimes Matt. xxi. 2; Rev. ii. 5; 16; Heb. x. 34. But in the first of these last three passages, ἐκάκυς μοι means bring him to me, and ἐκάκυς alone would have been defective. In Rev. ii. ἔρχομαι σοι ταχὺ signifies I will come (punishing, cf. 14 ἔλθω κατὰ

1 ὁ πικήρ καὶ ὁ πικήρ καὶ ἐκάκυς is the usual order even in the N. T. Likewise the Gen. of ἀντων is regularly (see, however, Rosc p. 459) put after the substantive.

2 When this arrangement is not adopted, the pronoun must, for perspicuity, be repeated, Acts iv. 28 ὅτα ἐλπίζω σοι καὶ ἐκάκυς σοι πρόσωπος, etc. Matt. xii. 47; from the Sept., Luke xviii. 20; Acts ii. 17.
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σοῦ ὅλη, and 16 μερανίσσου) to thee, on thee (ἐν σέ iii. 8) quickly. 1 In the third passage ἔσχω λαύοις ὑπερὶ ἐκκλησίας means repositam or destinatam sibi habere, for themselves, as belonging to themselves. Even in Matt. xxi. 5 σοί is not without force.

Note 3. Likewise ἡ ψυχή μου, σου, etc., is commonly regarded as a circumlocution for the personal pronoun (Weiske, Pleon. p. 72 sq.), now in quotations from the Old Test., as Matt. xii. 18; Acts ii. 27; Heb. x. 38, now in the N. T. itself, and this use of the word is usually considered as a Hebraism (Gesen. Lg. S. 752 f.; Vorst, Hebr. p. 121 sq.; Rück. on Rom. xiii. 1). In no passage of the N. T., however, does ψυχή stand completely devoid of meaning, any more than ψῆς in Hebrew (see my edition of Simonis); it signifies the soul (the spiritual principle on which Christianity operates 1 Pet. i. 9) in such expressions as 2 Cor. xii. 15 ἵκεσανηπράγματι ἣν τῶν ψυχῶν ὄμων, 1 Pet. ii. 25 ἐπίσκοποι τῶν ψυχῶν ὄμων, Heb. xiii. 17, or the heart (the seat of the affections and desires), as in Rev. xviii. 14 ἐπιθύμια τῆς ψυχῆς σου, Matt. xxvi. 38 περιλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου, Acts ii. 43 ἀγένευ πάση ψυχή φόβος. Even in Rom. ii. 9 ψυχή is not a mere redundancy; it denotes that in man which feel the θλύμας and στενοχωρ, even should these come upon the body. In Rom. iii. 1 πάσα ἡ ψυχή ἐξουσιας ὑπερχεόνσας ὑποτασσόντως, the words πάσα ψυχή standing thus alone (cf. 1 Pet. iii. 20) may mean every soul, i.e. every person; but even in an enumeration of the inhabitants in any place, so many "souls" (Lat. capita) is not precisely the same as so many "men" (persons). Cf. also Acts iii. 23 Sept. And so the use of the word ψυχή contributes everywhere to vivacity or circumstantiality of discourse, which is totally different from pleonasm. Besides, ψυχή is not unfrequently so used in Greek authors also (cf. Xen. Cyr. 5, 1, 27; Aelian. 1. 32), particularly the poets (Soph. Philoct. 714; Oed. Col. 499, 1207); 2 and this use must be deemed not a Hebraism, but a relic of antique vivacity of expression. See further Georgi, Vind. p. 274; Schwarz, ad Olear. p. 28; Comment. p. 1439. 3

1 See on the similar phrase ἔσχω σου Ἡμ. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 179 (e.g. Lucian. p. 16 ἐγὼ ὑμῖν ἐκδιδόσα γὰρ τὴν δίκην). It is a sort of dativus incommodi, § 31, 4 b.; cf. 1 Kings xv. 20, LXX.

2 In these passages it is easy to discern the notion of anima, and I do not know why Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 979, takes ψυχή here for a mere circumlocution. Likewise the passages from Plato which Ast, Lexic. Plat. III. 575, quotes, are deprived of their peculiar shade of meaning by the canon: orationem amplificat.

3 Matt. vi. 25, where ψυχή is opposed to σῶμα, can present no difficulty to any one acquainted with the anthropological notions of the Jews. Likewise καρδία is not a mere circumlocution in Acts xiv. 17 ἐμπεκλάω τροφῆς κ. ἐνθρονωρίας τὰς καρδιάς ὄμων, and Jas. v. 5 ἐκθέσαι τὰς καρδιάς ὄμων, for otherwise it would have been possible to say, he smote his heart, for him, etc. Yet καρδία is probably used here not merely — as ἐν is sometimes — in a material sense, agreeably to the physiological views of antiquity: to strengthen the heart, i.e. primarily the stomach, and through that the heart (even in Greek the signification stomach in καρδία has not altogether disappeared), but includes the idea of the pleasures of eating; see Baumgarten on the latter passage.
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1. The pronoun ὁτός sometimes refers, not to the noun locally nearest, but to one more remote, which, as the principal subject, was mentally the nearest, the most present to the writer's thoughts (Schaef. Demosth. V. 322; Stallb. Plat. Phaedr. p. 28, 157; Foertsch, obs. in Lysiam p. 74); as, Acts iv. 11 ὁτός (‘Ἰησοῦς Χριστός verse 10, the nearest preceding noun being ὁ θεός) ἐστιν ὁ λίθος, 1 Jno. v. 20 ὁτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός, that is, ὁ θεός, not Χριστός (which immediately precedes) as the older theologians on doctrinal considerations maintained; for in the first place, ἀληθινὸς θεός is a constant and exclusive epithet of the Father; and secondly, a warning against idolatry follows, and ἀληθινὸς θεός is invariably contrasted with εἰδωλα. A passage admitting of question is Acts viii. 26 αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἐρήμου, where some supply the nearest subject 170 Ἰάκωβος, and others ὁ διὸ, see Kühnöl in loc. and my bibl. RWB. I. S. 395; I prefer the latter decidedly. The construction is more obvious in Acts vii. 19; 2 Jno. 7. (For examples from Greek prose, see Ast, Plat. Polit. 417; legg. p. 77.) On the other hand, ἐκεῖνος in Acts iii. 13 must be referred to the nearest subject (Bremi, Lys. p. 154; Schoem. Plut. Agid. p. 78; Foertsch, as above; Krü. 118). So also in Jno. vii. 45, where ἐκεῖνος denotes the members of the Sanhedrin (ἀρχιερ. καὶ Φαρισ.) grouped together (by the use of a single Article) as one body. For ὁτός and ἐκεῖνος so connected that the former refers to the more remote subject and the latter to the nearer, see Plut. vit. Dem. 3. (For ἐκεῖνος where only one subject is spoken of and ὁτός, or simply αὐτός, was to be expected, see 2 Cor. viii. 9; Tit. iii. 7.)

In Phil. i. 18 καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χάρω, the demonstrative points merely to the main thought Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται; and in 2 Pet. i. 4 διὰ τούτων refers ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκαταγγέλματα.

The Relative also is sometimes thought to refer thus to a more remote subject (cf. Bhdy. 297; Gölter, Thuc. II. 21; Siebelis, Pausan. III. 52; Schoem. Isae. p. 242 sq.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. 369, and, in regard to Latin, Kritz, Sallust. II. 115) e.g. in 1 Cor. i. 8 (Pott, in loc.) where δὲ is referred to θεός as the principal subject vs. 4, though Ἡσ. Χριστ. immediately precedes. This, however, is not necessary, either on account of τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἡσ. Χρ. at the end of the vs. (cf. Col. ii. 11; Eph. iv. 12), or of πιστὸς ὁ θεός immediately following; for what is here asserted of God, the calling εἰς κοινωνίαν Ἡσ. Χριστοῦ, is at the same time a calling to βεβαιωθῆναι through Christ, which can take place only in the fellowship
of Christ. To evade antiquarian difficulties this rule has been applied also to Heb. ix. 4 (see Kühnöl in l.), and on doctrinal grounds to ἐφ' Ἐ in Rom. v. 12, but in both cases very erroneously. In Heb. v. 7, and 2 Thess. ii. 9 there is no difficulty. In 2 Pet. iii. 12 δὲ ἔγνω can very well be referred 148 to the nearest noun ἡμέρας, and Ἐ in 1 Pet. iv. 11 to the principal subject ὁ ἦ θεός. On Heb. iii. 6 ουκ ὁ λόγος modern expositors are correct.

2. A demonstrative pronoun preceding a relative clause, if it has no special emphasis, is usually included in the relative pronoun (Ḳrū. 124 f.). This occurs not only

a. When, if expressed, it would regularly or by attraction stand 171 in the same case with the relative, as a) Acts i. 24 ἀνάδειξιν ἐν ἐξελέξει τοῦτον δὲ, Rom. viii. 29; Jno. xviii. 26 συγγενῆς δὲν οὗ ἀπέκοψαν Πέτρος τὸ ὁφέιον, 1 Cor. vii. 39; 2 Cor. xi. 12; Phil. iv. 11; b) Acts viii. 24 δόντως μηδὲν ἐπέλεβη ἐπ' ἐμὲ δὲν εἰρήκατε πρὸ τούτων δ' εἰρ. xxi. 19; xxii. 15; xxvi. 16, 22; Luke ix. 36; Rom. xv. 18; Eph. iii. 20; 2 Cor. xii. 17; cf. Isa. ii. 8; Wisd. xii. 14; Tob. i. 8; xii. 2, 6. Plato, Gorg. 457 e.; Phaed. 94 c.; Isocr. Phil. p. 226, and de pace 888; Plut. virt. mul. p. 202; Xen. A. 1, 9, 25; Dem. cp. 5 in. and Olyn. ἐν. p. 2 a.; Elednt. Lex. Soph. II. 368. But also,

b. When the demonstrative would require a different case, as Jno. xiii. 29 ἐγόρασαι δὲν χρείαν ἔχομεν (ταῦτα δὲν), Rom. vi. 16; Matt. xix. 11; Acts xix. 19; xiii. 87; 1 Cor. xv. 36; 2 Pet. i. 9, cf. Xen. C. 6, 2, 1 ἀπήγγειλας δὲν ἐδέου, Eurip. Med. 735 ἐμμένων ἂ σου κλώο i.e. τούτως ἃ, see Elmsley in loc.; Lysias p. 152 Steph. μὴ καταγγείωσκετε ἀδικίαν τοῦ . . . δαπανῶντος ἀλλὰ σοι . . . εἰδο- σμένων εἰσὶν ἀναλίσκειν τοῦτων σοι, see Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 139; cf. Kritz, Sallust. II. 301. And in this instance even the prepoSition on which the case of the demonstrative depends is also omitted; as, Rom. x. 14 πῶς πιστεύσων οὗ οὐκ ἦκουσαν i.e. εῖς τούτων δὲ, etc.1

150 If, when the demonstrative before the relative is omitted, a preposition precedes, the preposition belongs logically either,

a) To the relative clause; as, Rom. x. 14 πῶς ἐπικαλέσονται εἰς δὲν οὐκ ἐπιστευσαν, vi. 21 τύια καρπῶν ἔχετε τότε (viz. τούτων) ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπιστευσαν,2 xiv. 21; Jno. xix. 37 (Sept.) ; Luke v. 25;

1 Similar to this would be 1 Tim. ii. 10 ἆλλ' ἐ πρέπει γνωσθῆναι ἐπαγγελλόμεναι θεοτ- βείαι, if we unite with Matthies in resolving ἆλλα' δ into ἆλλα δ 'ἐν τούτων δ' ἐν. But it is simpler and easier to explain the passage by joining δ' ἐγεναι with κοσμείν verse 9. Had Paul intended to convey the former meaning, he would have expressed himself distinctly by writing ἐν δ' ἐγεναι etc.

2 Reiche has obviously stated more than the truth in asserting that in all other in- stances the only demonstrative omitted, is one governed by a verb, and never one gov-
2 Pet. ii. 12; 1 Soph. Phil. 957; Aristot. rhet. 2, 1, 7; Isocr. Demon. p. 2. Or,

b) To the demonstrative understood; as, Jno. vi. 29 ἐγὼ πιστεύση ἐὰς ἐν ἄπεσταλεν ἐκεῖνος, xvii. 9; Rom. xiv. 22; 2 Cor. v. 10; xii. 6; Gal. i. 8 f.; Heb. v. 8 (Num. vi. 21). Also Heb. ii. 18 εν 144 ὁ πέπουθεν αὐτὸς πεισαθεὶς, δύναται τὸς πειρασμένος βοηθήσαι 6th ed. might be resolved thus: ἐν τούτῳ δ ἐπέπουθεν . . . δύναται . . . βοή-172 θήσαι. Cf. Xen. M. 2, 6, 34 ἐγγύς ντατα εὐνοία πρὸς αὐτὸν ἦν ὑπολαμβάνε τοιοικὸς ἐχει πρὸς ἐμέ, Anab. 1, 9, 25; Hell. 4, 8, 33; Demosth. Con. p. 729 a.; Olynth. I. p. 2; ep. 4 p. 118 b.; Plato, rep. 2, 375 d.; and Phaed. 61 c.; Arrian. Alex. 6, 4, 3; Diog. L. 9, 67; 6, 74. Or,

c) To both clauses; as, 2 Cor. ii. 3 ἦν μὴ λατρεύει ἐγώ αὐτῷ ὁ δὲ ἔδει με χαίρειν, 1 Cor. vii. 39; x. 30; Jno. xi. 6; Rom. xvi. 2 (cf. Isocr. Evag. p. 470 πλείου ἐν τούτους τοῖς τούτοις διατίβευ, ἡ παρ' οἷς πρότερον εἰσάγοντες ἦσαν. Cic. Agrar. 2, 27). Also 1 Cor. vii. 1, and Phil. iv. 11 may be so construed.

Relative Adverbs, in like manner, often include definite; as, Jno. xi. 32 ἦλθεν διὸ ποιεῖν ἢν ὁ Ἰησοῦς (i.e. ἐκεῖνος ὁ οὗ), vi. 62; Mark v. 40 εἰσπορεύεται διὸ ποιεῖν ἡ ἡ παιδίον (cf. Bttm. Philoct. p. 107), 1 Cor. xvi. 6; Matt. xxv. 24 συνάχων δὲ εἰς ὁ διακόρποις ἐν ἐκείνῳ, cf. Thuc. 1, 89. Still more free is the construction in Jno. xx. 19 τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμάτων διὸ ποιεῖν ἦσαν οἷς μαθηταί etc.

It has already been mentioned, that in such condensed sentences (where a Greek would not properly supply a demonstrative, Kri. 124) a comma should not be inserted before the relative. In Jno. vi. 29 a comma would be absurd.

3. In emphatic passages the demonstrative is repeated in connected clauses several times in succession; as, Acts vii. 35 τοῦτον τῶν Μωϋσεῖ . . . τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀπέσταλε . . . οὗτος ἐξήγαγον . . . οὗτος ἐστώ ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ ἐπτάς . . . οὗ ἐτῶν . . . ἐξήγαγες εἰς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ etc.; and, in a different spirit, Jno. vi. 42 οὗ οὗτος ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ νῦν Ἰωσήφ . . . τῶν σῶν λέγει οὗτος etc. See Bornem. bibl. Stud. der sächs. Geistl. L. 66 f., who, among other 151 passages, quotes as parallel Xen. M. 4, 2, 28 καὶ οἱ τῇ ἀποταγή-

νοντες τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιθυμοῦσα τοῦτον ὕπερ αὐτῶν βουλεύεσθαι, καὶ προϊστασθαι τε ἐναυτῷ τούτον, καὶ τὰς ἐξεχώρεις τῶν ἄγαθῶν

earned by a noun; cf. Jno. xviii. 26; Luke xxiii. 41. Besides, were the assertion correct, it would prove nothing against the above explanation, see Fr. Moreover, ἐν ὅς might perhaps also be taken in the sense discussed by Weber, Demosth. p. 492.

1 Αγγείον ἐν Paraphr. abst. 2, 53. Some also refer to this head Rom. vii. 6, supplying ἐκεῖνον (νόμον) before ἐν ὅς; but ἐν ὅς refers back to ἐν τῳ ὁμοιον, and ἀποθαν. is annexed absolutely to denote the modus of κατηγίᾳ. See Philippi.
ἐν τούτοις ἔχουσι καὶ διὰ πάντα ταῦτα πάντων μᾶλλον τούτος ἄγατωσιν. From Latin cf. Cic. Verr. 3, 9, 23 hunc in omnibus stupris, hunc in fenorum explicationibus, hunc in impuris conviviis principem adhibebat (Verres). This Anaphora occurs with a relative adjective in Phil. iv. 8 ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνὰ, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα ἁγνὰ, ὅσα προσφιλή, ὅσα εὐφημα; cf., further, § 65.

4. It is far more common to repeat οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος in the same clause after the subject, or the predicate if it precedes; the pronoun is inserted immediately before (more rarely after) the verb.

This occurs when the subject (or predicate) consists of several words and is to be made more perspicuous or emphatic; as, Matt. xxiv. 13 ὁ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται, Jno. i. 18 ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός ὁ ὄν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο, Mark vii. 15 τὰ ἐκπορεύματα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐκεῖνα ἔστι τὰ κοινοῦτα τῶν ἄνθρωπων, vii. 20; xii. 40; 1 Cor. vi. 4 τοὺς ἐξουθενμένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τούτους καθίστε, Rom. vii. 10, 15 f. 19 f.; ix. 6, 8; xiv. 14; Jno. v. 11; 145 xii. 48; Phil. i. 22 etc.; cf. Thuc. 4, 69 (Xen. conv. 8, 33; Ages. 4, 4); Plato, Protag. p. 889 d.; Isocr. Evag. c. 23; Paus. 1, 24, 5; Lucian. fug. 3; Ael. 12, 19, etc. See Schaeff. Melet. p. 84; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 78, 144, and Lucian. Alex. p. 7; Siebelis, Pausan. I. 63; Weber, Demosth. 158. As to Latin see Kritz, Sallust. I. 171. (The further strengthening of such emphasis by δὲ—Bttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 152; Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 252—does not occur in the N. T. Neither do the sacred writers exhibit any trace of that consequent anacoluthon which is not infrequent in the classics —Schwarz, de discipulor. Chr. solocism. p. 77—; unless one choose to refer the attraction in 1 Pet. ii. 7 to this head.)

Still more frequently are these pronouns thus used after a protasis beginning with a conjunction or a relative; as, Jno. ix. 31 εὰν τις θεοσθήσης ἢ καὶ τὸ δέλμα τοῦ θεοῦ ποιῆ, τούτου ἵκονε, Jas. i. 23; Matt. v. 19; xii. 50; Phil. iii. 7; iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 2.

The repetition of the demonstrative pronoun in Luke xix. 2 καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἡ ἄρχητελωθησε καὶ ὄστις ἢ πλούσιος, is deserving of attention. The meaning is: he was a chief publican and besides (as such) was rich, ἐσκερά κλέεις fuit (Mtth. 1040); Lchm. has adopted from B the reading καὶ ἀνθρώπων (ἡ) πλούσιος, which has less to recommend it. Cf., also, Xen. Cyr. 8, 3, 48.

The case is different when, for the sake of perspicuity, in a lengthened sentence, a preceding substantive is again brought under the notice of the reader by means of a pronoun; as, 2 Cor. xii. 2 οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χρυσῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων... ἦτε ἐν σώματι... ἁρπαγινὰ τοῦ τοιοῦτον 152 etc. (Plato, rep. 8, 898; Xen. C. 1, 3, 15) 1 Cor. v. 3, 5; Acts i. 21 f. 1614; cf. § 22, 4, p. 147.
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5. A demonstrative pronoun is often placed before ὁ, ἦν, and similar particles, to give special prominence to the clause that follows (particularly in Paul and John); as, 1 Tim. i. 9 εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὁτι etc. Acts xxiv. 14 ὁμολογῶ τοῦτο σου, ὁτι etc. Rom. vi. 6;¹
1 Cor. i. 12; xv. 50; 2 Cor. v. 15; x. 7, 11; 2 Thess. iii. 10; Phil. 174 i. 6, 25; Jno. xvii. 3; 2 Pet. i. 20; 1 Jno. i. 5; iii. 11, 23; iv. 9, 10; v. 3, 11, 14; 2 Jno. 6; cf. Plato, Soph. 234 b. So εἰς τοῦτο before ἦν Acts ix. 21; Rom. xiv. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 9; Eph. vi. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Jno. iii. 8, ἐν τοῦτῳ ὁτι 1 Jno. iv. 13, ἐν τοῦτῳ ἦν Jno. xv. 8; 1 Jno. iv. 17 (see Lücke in loc.), ἐν τοῦτῳ ἐὰν 1 Jno. ii. 3, ἐν τοῦτῳ δειν 1 Jno. v. 2; cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 461; Franke, Demosth. p. 40.

Likewise when an Infinitive (Mth. Eurip. Phoen. 520; Sprachl. 1046) or a noun follows as predicate, a demonstrative is employed for emphasis; as, 2 Cor. ii. 1 ἐκεῖνα ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἅλθεν, vii. 11 αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ θεὸν ἡπειθήμαν, 1 Cor. vii. 87; Eph. iv. 17; Jas. i. 27 (cf. Xen. Hell. 4, 1, 2, and Ages. 1, 8; Plat. Hipp. mai. 302 a.; Gorg. 491 d.; Isocr. Ævag. c. 3; Porphy. abstin. 1, 13; Dion. H. VI. 667, and de Thuc. 40, 3; Epictr. enchir. 31, 1 and 4; Stallbh. Plat. rep. II. 261); 2 Cor. xiii. 9 τοῦτο καὶ ἐξχωμα, τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν, 1 Jno. iii. 24; 146 v. 4 (cf. Achill. Tat. 7, 2 φάρμακον αὐτῷ τοῦτο τῆς ... λύπης ἦ πρὸς ἄλλον εἰς τὸ παθεῖν κοινωνία, Plat. rep. 3, 407 a.; Lucian. navig. 3; Eurip. suppl. 510; cf. Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 136; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 466).

Even εἰς τοῦτο is so used, as Acts xxvi. 16 εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὁβηθὲν σοι προχειρίσασθαι σε ἵππρείην καὶ μάρτυρα etc., and οὕτως 1 Pet. ii. 15 (1 Cor. iv. 1), and ἐνεπεθέν Jas. iv. 1.

Lastly, a demonstrative is thus prefixed to a participial construction; as, Mark xii. 24 οὗ διὰ τοῦτο πλανάσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς etc., for this cause ... because ye know not etc.; cf. Antiphon 6, 46 οὐκ ἀπεγράφωντο τοῦτον αὐτοῦ ἑνεκα, οὔχ ἡγούμενοι με ἀποκτεῖναι etc., see Maetzner, Antiph. p. 219; Schoem. Isaesc. p. 370.

The use of the demonstrative pronoun in such expressions as Acts i. 5 οὗ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας after (in) a few days, is easily explained. It does not depend, as Kühnöl thinks, on a transposition of τολύς, but is to be explained like the Latin ante hos quinque dies, etc.; cf. in Greek ὡς ἐλέγων πρὸ τοῦτων ἡμερῶν (Achill. Tat. 7, 14), οὗ ἐροεὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν (Heliod. 2, 22, 97). Αὕτω ἡμέραι are, these very days just past; and ante hos quinque dies strictly means: before these (reckoning from the present

¹ In Rom. ii. 3 an amplified Voc. intervenes between τοῦτο and the clause with ὅτι.
time) last past five days. The demonstrative, therefore, connects the period specified with the present. Expositors and lexicographers are able to explain the force of the demonstrative in Jas. iv. 13 τηνδὲ τὴν πόλιν into such and such a city, only by a reference to the well-known ὁ δεῖνα; but δεῖ is also used by the Greeks in exactly the same way, e.g. Plutarch. Symp. 1, 6, 1 τηνδὲ τὴν ἡμέραν such and such a day. [The full and ordinary demonstrative signification, however, is claimed, both for the passage in James and for that in Plutarch, by Bttm. Gramm. des neusten. Sprachgebr. p. 90; and Huther on James, 2nd. ed., agrees with him.]

The Plur. ταῦτα is not unfrequently in Greek employed in reference to a single object, and stands therefore, strictly taken, for ταῦτα (Plat. Apol. 19 d.; Phaedr. 70 d.; Xen. Cyr. 5, 3, 19; see Schaefer. Dion. p. 80; cf. also Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 524; Stallb. Plat. Apol. p. 19 d.; Maetzner, Antiphon p. 153). Instances of this in the N. T. are 3 Jno. 4 (where several Codd. give the correction ταύτης) see Lücke, and also Jno. i. 51; but undoubtedly not Jno. xix. 36, see van Hengel, annotat. p. 85 sq.; in Luke xii. 4 the adverbial phrase μετὰ ταῦτα means afterwards. Nearly the same is to be said of the well-known καὶ ταῦτα, idque, Heb. xi. 12. On 1 Cor. ix. 15 see Mey. In 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτα may have a contemptuous secondary signification: καὶ ταῦτα των ἵστας, and such a set, talis farinæ homines (Bhdy. 281; Stallb. Plat. Rival. p. 274); yet perhaps this was far from the apostle's thought, and ταῦτα is frequently used in reference to a series of predicates: of such a description, ex hoc genere fuistis; Kypke and Pott in loc. have blended things quite dissimilar.

In 1 Jno. v. 20 Lücke thinks he finds a prozeugma of the demonstrative pronoun (cf. also Stud. und Kritik. II. S. 147 ff.): οὖτος ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ (ἀλήθη) ζωὴ αἰώνιος,—not impossible, but in my opinion unnecessary.

Note. Respecting the position of οὖτος and ἐκεῖνος, it must be remarked that the former, from the nature of the case, usually stands before, and the latter after, the substantive; as, οὖτος ὁ θεὸς, ὁ ἀνθρωπός ἡμῶν. Yet the opposite order also occurs in the case of οὖτος (Matt. xxviii. 15 ὁ λόγος οὖτος, Luke i. 29 etc.) without essential difference of meaning, with ἐκεῖνος (Luke xii. 47; Heb. iv. 11) particularly in the connecting phrases ἐν ἐκεῖνος ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἐν ἐκεῖνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ or ἡμέρᾳ, ἐν ἐκεῖνῳ τῷ καιρῷ (Gersdorf 433). It must not, however, be imagined that a writer has so committed himself to the one arrangement, that the other should be altered when it is confirmed by approved Codd. or by the sense.

1 Friske, quaestio. Lucian. p. 128, qualifies this remark as follows: Plur. ponit de una re tantummodo sic, si neque ulla emergat ambiguitas et aut universe, non definit quid locatur, aut una res plurius vi sit praedita.
2 In the same way ἦτο ὅς and ἦτο ὅτι are used in Greek, where the Sing. would suffice. Fr. Rom. I. 299.
1. In accordance with the law of attraction (cf. Hm. Vig. 891 sqq.; Bhdy. 299 ff.), the relative pronoun ὅς (never in the N. T. δότια), which by reason of the governing verb should stand in the Accusative, is so drawn by the oblique case (Gen. or Dative) of the 176 preceding noun with which it has a logical connection (that of a subordinate with a principal clause), as to pass over into this oblique case. This peculiar construction, which gives a sentence more internal unity and a certain periodic compactness, was frequent even in the Sept., and in the N. T. it regularly occurs (though not everywhere without var.) as, Luke ii. 20 ἐπὶ πάσην ὅς ἡκούσαν, Jno. ii. 22 (iv. 50) ἐπιστευσαν τῷ λόγῳ ὃς εἶπεν, Acts iii. 21, 25; vii. 17; x. 39; xvii. 31; xx. 38; xxii. 10; Jas. ii. 5; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Jno. vii. 31, 39; xv. 20; xvii. 5; Mark vii. 13; Luke v. 9; xii. 37; Matt. xviii. 19; 1 Cor. vi. 19; 2 Cor. x. 13; xii. 21; 2 Thess. i. 4; Tit. iii. 6; Heb. vi. 10 (ix. 20); x. 1; Eph. i. 8; ii. 10; Rev. xviii. 6, etc. (in all which cases the comma in the text before the relative is to be rejected, see § 7, 1). Jude 15 ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν ἐργῶν ἀσεβελᾶς αἰτῶν ὅν ἰσέβησαν deserves particular attention, see § 82, 1, p. 222.

There are, however, passages in which this construction is neglected; as, Heb. viii. 2 τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθείας, ἂν ἐπηξεν ὁ κύριος, and, according to good Codd., Mark xiii. 9; Jno. vii. 39; iv. 50; Tit. iii. 5. Besides, compare the var. in Jno. xviii. 11; Heb. vi. 10; Acts vii. 16; Rev. i. 20. So frequently in the Sept. and the Apocrypha (Wahl, clav. p. 360), likewise in Greek authors; see Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 30; Weber, Dem. 543; Krü. 121.

Eph. i. 6 τῆς χαράς ὃς ἐχαρίτωσεν (var. ἐν ἦ), iv. 1 τῆς κλήσεως ὃς ἐπελευσθη, 2 Cor. i. 4 διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ὃς παρακάλουμεθα, where ὃς seems 6th ad to stand for ἦ, appear to transcend the above rule. But these passages may be accounted for by the well-known expressions κλήσιμον καλῶν, παράκλησιν παρακάλειν, χάριν χαριτῶν, ἀγάπην ἀγαπῶν (§ 32, 2), and by the equally well-known construction of the Passive; see Gieseler in Rosenm.

1 Cf. also the thorough treatise of G. T. A. Krüger (relating more directly to Latin) in his Untersuch. a. d. Gebiete der lat. Sprachlehre. 3 Hefte. Braunschw. 1827, 8vo.; K. W. Krüger, in his Sprachl. 121, prefers the term assimilation.

2 The form ὃς occurs in the N. T. only as nominative.

3 Here, however, we may, with Wahl, consider the Gen. as dependent on the omitted preposition δι; see § 50, 7, p. 421 sq.
§ 24. THE RELATIVE PRONOUN.

Reptor. II. 124.1 Also in Acts xxiv. 21 φωνῆς ἃς ἔκραζα ὅστως etc., probably ἃς is not used for ὅς (φωνῆ κράζειν Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark i. 26; 155 Rev. vi. 10, etc.) cf. Boisson. Nicet. p. 33, but φωνῆ means cry, exclamation (loud utterance); the construction accordingly resolves itself into the phrase φωνῆ κράζειν (Rev. vi. 10 var.), which, though unusual, is not inadmissible; cf. Isa. vi. 4 φωνῆς ἃς ἔκκραζεν. (In Eph. i. 8 ἃς ἐπεκράζοντον, the verb is to be taken transitively, as γνωρίσας in vs. 9 shows.) That attraction nevertheless may affect even the Dative of the relative (so as 177 to change it into a Gen.) is shown by G. Krüger, as above, 274 f.; cf. Heinichen, Euseb. II. 98 sq. Accordingly Cod. A in 1 Tim. iv. 6 has τῆς καλῆς διακαλαίας ἃς παρηκαλοῦθης. Many expositors, too, as recently Fr. also, resolve Rom. iv. 17 κατέναντι οὗ ἐπιστευον θεοῦ into κατ. θεοῦ φ ἐπιστ.: but this is not necessary; see 2 below.2 On the other hand, Matt. xxiv. 38 ἃσαν ... γαμοῦντες καὶ λεγομένης ἄχρι ἃς ἡμέρας εἰσήλθα Νωκ εἰς τὴν καισαρίαν is probably contracted from ἄχρι τῆς ἡμ. ἃς εἰσῆλθεν. Similarly Luke i. 20; Acts i. 2, 22. In Lev. xxiii. 15 ἄτο τῆς ἡμέρας ἃς ἔν προσευχήστη etc. Bar. 1, 19, we find the same attraction of the Dative of the relative when the two clauses are not merged into one; for though ἃς ἡμέρας (on which day) also occurs, yet in the Sept. the Dative of time predominates.

2. Sometimes the opposite construction occurs: that is to say, the noun to which the relative refers is drawn into the construction of the relative clause and put in that case in which the governing verb requires the relative to stand. When this occurs, the noun either

a. Precedes the relative clause; as, 1 Cor. x. 16 τῶν ἀρτου δν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος; Matt. xxii. 42 (LXX.) λίθου δν ὑπεδοκίμασαν οἰ ὁκοδομοῦντες, ὁτος ἐγενήθη, 1 Pet. ii. 7; Luke xii. 48 παρὰ γ ο ἐδοθή ποιλ., ποιλ. ἐπηρθήσεται παρ’ αὐτοῦ, probably also Luke i. 72, 73 μην ἤσθιαν διαθήκης ὁγιας αὐτοῦ, ὦρκον δν ὀμοσε πρὸς Ἀβραάμ, but probably not Acts x. 36, see below § 62, 3. (cf. Gieseler as above, 126; Krü. 224 f.); Or,

b. As respects position also is incorporated directly into the relative clause; as, Mark vi. 16 δν ἐγὼ ἀπεκατάλεισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτος ἐστι, Philem. 10; Luke xix. 37. Likewise Rom. vi. 17 ἵππον κύριον τοῦ τῶν τυπῶν διδ. δν παρ., an Acc. with a Passive, for δν παρεδόθη ἰμάν—(for a similar attraction affecting the Acc. of a more remote object see Demosth. Mid. 385 c. δικαίων ἰμας βουλομένους λαβεῖν, δν ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἔτεκεντο ὑπερθ. ὡς ὃν ἔσει, is for ἃ, i.e. ἐν οἷς,

1 And so, probably, should be taken Aristoph. Plut. 1044 τῆς ἀρσ. ἐν τῆς δρασ. ἃς δεῖλαιαν.
to be joined with ἰδιαὶ, and Dion. Hal. 9, 565 ἄγανάκτησις ἰμῶν περὶ δὲ ὑβρίσθησθε ὑπὸ τῶν πυλεμάτων, Demosth. ep. 4 p. 118 b.)—or more simply (as Bornem., Rück., Fr., and others have maintained) ἰππα. (τὸ) τὐπὸ δι. εἰς δὲ παρ., since the construction ἰππα. τῷ ¹ is the only one admissible here. Some explain even Acts xxii. 16 ἰππατες παρ' ὁ ἔνωθομεν Μυσᾶων etc. by 156 attraction: ἰγ. παρὰ Μυσᾶων ... παρ' ὁ ξεν., yet see § 31, 5. On 2 Cor. x. 13 see § 59, 7, p. 530.


Under b. would come also Rom. iv. 17 κατέναντι οὐ διώτευκον θεοῦ, if it were to be resolved into κατ. θεοῦ, ὁ ἐπίστ. This would be an extension of the attraction, become so common, to the Dative, of which no doubt occasional instances occur, KRÜ. 247 f. (Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 39 ἄκες τῶν ἐκτού τῶν τε πτωτῶν, οἷς ἄκες καὶ ἄκες (i.e. τούτων οἷς ἄκες τολλύων); see Fr. Rom. I. 237. But the passage may be explained more simply thus: κατ. θεοῦ, κατ. οὐ ἐπίστ. (see above, 1 p. 164). The exposition proposed Bretsch. Lex. man. p. 220 is artificial in more respects than one.

The mere incorporation of the antecedent into the relative clause without a change of case occurred: Matt. xxiv. 44 ὃ ὀφεῖν ὑπὸ δοκεῖν, ὁ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφέτει (Gen. ii. 17; Ex. x. 28; xxxii. 34; Num. vi. 13; xxx. 6), Matt. vii. 2 ἐν ὧν μέτρῳ μετρεῖται, μετρηθῆσται ὑμῖν, Jno. xi. 6; Mark xv. 12 (Heb. xiii. 11); Luke i. 4. Here belongs, too, Rom. iv. 17, see above. The Greeks generally inserted in the subsequent principal clause a corresponding demonstrative, and separated also the relative by some word from the antecedent, KRÜ. 123.

Attraction with omission of the (demonstrative) word which occasioned it:

¹ On ἰππα. τῷ 1 is particularly in Josephus, see Kyphi, observatt. II. 167, though exception can be taken to some of his examples.
§ 24. THE RELATIVE PRONOUN.

a. With the intervention of a preposition; as, Heb. v. 8 ἐμαθεὶς ἀφ' ἦς ἔπαθε, i.e. ἀπ' τοῦτον ἀφ' ἦς ἔπαθε, Rom. x. 14; Jno. vi. 29; xvii. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 1 (Demosth. Enerv. 684 b. δάκρυνσασα ἀφ' αὐτ' ἐγὼ ἔπεσόνθες, Plat. Cratyl. 386 a.; Xen. An. 1, 9, 25; Arrian. Al. 4, 10, 3; Lysias II. 242 ed. Auger.). See § 23, 2. And

b. Without a preposition; as, Rom. xv. 18 οἵ τολμῆσαι λαλῶν τις ἐν τῷ κατεργάσατο etc. Acts viii. 24; xxvi. 16 (Soph. Phil. 1227; Oed. R. 855).

179 Cf. § 23, 2; and the same place for attraction with an adverb of place (G. Krü. 302 ff.).

3. Sometimes the relative pronoun agrees in gender and number with the following noun which is predicate in the relative clause (ὅς ... ἄστι) annexed by way of explanation; (this, too, is a species of attraction, Ἡμ. Vigg. 708): Mark xv. 16 τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἄστι πραγμόν, Gal. iii. 16 τῷ σπέρματι σου, ὅ ἄστι Χριστός, 1 Tim. iii. 15 ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ, ὃς ἄστι εἰκονία θεοῦ, Eph. vi. 17; i. 14; Phil. i. 28; Eph. iii. 13 μὴ ἐκκακείν ἐν ταῖς Θλίψεωι μοι ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὃς ἄστι δοξά ὑμῶν (for ὅ), also 1 Cor. iii. 17 (where Mey., without reason, makes a difficulty about αἰτίως). Cf. also, Rev. iv. 5; v. 6, 8 var. On the other hand, Eph. i. 28 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὃς ἄστι τῷ σώμα αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor. iv. 17; Col. i. 24; ii. 17.

Some have erroneously referred to this head Col. iii. 5 οὗτος ἐστίν εἰδωλολατρεία (ὁντίς for ἄτωμα, viz. μέλη); the reference is only to πλεονεξία (Huther in loc.). In Col. iii. 14 δ, the better attested reading, appears to be a pure Neut. without reference to the gender of the preceding or the following noun. On Eph. v. 5 see note 1. In Matt. xxvii. 83, and similar passages, δ is quod sc. vocabulum. With regard to Heb. ix. 9 expositors are divided in opinion; but most of them now refer ὅτις to ἡ πρώτη σκηνή verse 8, so that this passage does not fall under the above rule. Commentators differ still more widely in reference to Col. i. 27; but it is better to connect δς with δ πλούτος, as the principal noun, than with μνημονίου.

It should seem, then, that the relative conforms to the gender of the following noun mainly when the latter is viewed as the principal subject; consequently, when the specific appellations are given of things, which, in the principal clause, were mentioned in general terms (Mark xv.; 1 Tim. iii., cf. Pausan. 2, 13, 4; Cic. pro Sest. 42, 91 domicilia coniuncta quas urbes dicimus), especially with names of persons (Gal. iii., cf. Cic. legg. 1, 7, 22 animal, quem vocamus hominem), or where the relative should have been a Neut. used absolutely (Eph. iii.). On the other hand, the relative
retains the gender of the noun in the principal clause, when the subordinate clause contains an explanatory amplification, a predicate of the principal object (as in Eph. i.; 1 Cor. iv.); (cf. Bremini on Nep. Thrasybul. 2). See, in general, G. Krü. as above, 90 ff., and, for the Latin, Zumpt, Grammat. § 372; Kritz, Sallust. I. 292.

4. The relative appears to be put for the interrogative in a direct question,¹ Matt. xxvi. 50 εὐαγγελεῖ, ἐφ’ ἐδ (that is, ἐν τί Aristoph. Lysistr. 1101) παρεῖ. This is an impropriety of declining Hellenism 180 (Schaef. Demosth. V. 285), which Lob. Phryn. p. 57 has substantiated as respects other relative pronouns (Plat. Alcib. 1 p. 110 c.), 151 and which cannot be thought very surprising when the affinity between the words qui and quis is considered. This usage is unknown in classic prose. (In Plat. Men. 74 d. recent editors, apparently without MS. authority, have substituted τί. On Plat. rep. 8, 559 a. see Stallb.) But it is not necessary, on this account, to assume (with Mey.) that the above passage contains an aposopesis, or, with Fr., to take the sentence as an exclamation: vetus 158 sodalis, ad qualem rem perpetrandam ades! By a question Jesus 7th d. might effectively call the attention of Judas to the wickedness of his design. (It would be more allowable in Mark ix. 11 λέγοντες · δε τι λέγοντι οἱ γραμματέες etc. to regard δε τι, with Lchm., as put for τί (that is, διὰ τί), just as in Helioc. 4, 16; 7, 14, quoted by Lob. as above, δε τις is used in a direct question. But δε τι never occurs in the N. T. as an interrogative pronoun (certainly not Jno. viii. 25, see § 54, 1), not even in an indirect question. As δε τι immediately follows the words quoted above, it might easily have been written by mistake also before λέγοντι for τί, see Fr. If δε τι, however, be the true reading, it should rather be taken for δε τι because, see § 53, 10, 5, p. 456.)

Note 1. It is peculiar to Paul to connect sometimes two, three, or more clauses by a repetition of the relative pronoun, even when it refers to different subjects; as, Col. i. 24 f., 28, 29; Eph. iii. 11, 12; 1 Cor. ii. 7, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 22. Elsewhere the relative in the Sing. is thought to point to a series of nouns, and to be used, as it were, in a collective sense: as, Eph. v. 5 δε τι πάς πόρος ή ἄκαθαρτος ή πλακόντης, δε ἡ τιτιν εἰδώλων λατρείας etc. Cf. Fritzschsche de conformat. crit. p. 46. But this is arbitrary, and would suppose just such a forced explanation of Col. iii. 5 (see above).

Note 2. The relative clause beginning with δε, δε τις, is usually placed after the clause containing the antecedent; where, however, the former

¹ Or in an indirect question occurs in Soph. Oed. R. 1068; see Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 372. Also cf. Passow, under the word.
clause is to be made prominent, it is put first (Krű. 123); as, 1 Cor. xiv. 37
d,gajóv $μν$ ἢτι κυρίων ἐστών, Heb. xii. 6 δν ἄγαπη κύριος παντελείν, Rom. vi. 2
οτε βιον απεθάνομεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, πώς ἢτι ζήσομεν, Mark viii. 34, etc.; with
a demonstrative in the second clause, Phil. iii. 7 ἄτινα ἵν μοι κέρδη, ταῦτα
ζημμα etc. Jas. ii. 10; Jno. xxi. 25; xi. 45; Matt. v. 39; Luke ix. 50;
Acts xxv. 18; 1 Cor. iv. 2; Heb. xiii. 11.

Note 3. The Neut. $δ$ before a whole clause, in the sense of as to etc.
(like quod in Latin), occurs in Rom. vi. 10 δ δι ζημ, ζημ τῷ θεῷ, Gal. ii. 20
δ $δ$ δι ψέν ζω ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πνεύμα ζω etc. cf. Mth. II. 1063. In both passages,
however, $δ$ may also be taken for an objective case: quod vivit, vita, quam
vivit. See Fr. on Rom. as above.

Note 4. During the reign of empiricism it was believed by many expos-
itors that $δ$ is used in prose, besides the well-known cases (Mth. 742 f.),
for the demonstrative. Now, every beginner knows how to construe such
passages; e.g. 2 Cor. iv. 6 δ θεὸς δ εἰς ἐκκλήσις φῶς λάμψας, δε θαμβηθε
ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις etc. In 1 Cor. ii. 9 and Rom. xvi. 27 the construction is
anacoluthic.

152 § 25. THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN, AND THE INDEFINITE
PRONOUN $τί$.

1. Not only is the Interrogative Pronoun $τί$, $τί$ ordinarily used,
even in indirect questions and after verbs of knowing, inquiring,
even etc., while διο, δ,τι is never so employed in the N. T. (Matt. xx. 22;
Luke xxiii. 34 (Mark xiv. 36) Jno. x. 6; Acts xxi. 38; Rom. viii. 26;
Col. i. 27, etc.; cf. Xen. C. 1, 1, 6; 1, 3, 17; Mem. 1, 6, 4, etc.;
Hm. ad Aeschyl. p. 461; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 823), but $τί$, in
particular, stands even in cases where the Greeks would certainly
have used δ,τι, so that the interrogative is weakened apparently
into the German was (Eng. what); as, Matt. x. 19 δεθψεται υμῖν
... $τί$ λαλήσετε quod dicatis, Luke xviii. 8 ἑτοιμασον, $τί$ δειπνήσω,
para, quod comedam (not quid comedam, which in this connection
would hardly be allowable in Latin), cf. Bhdv. 448. "O,τι occurs
once, Acts ix. 6. The transition to this usage of $τί$ appears in the
construction Mark vi. 36 $τί$ φάγωσιν οὐκ ἤχουσι (Matt. xv. 32),
for which with little difference of meaning δ,τι φάγωσιν οὐκ ἤχ.
might have been employed, exactly as in Latin one may say either
non habent quid comedant or non hab. quod com. (Ramshorn, lat.
Gramm. 368). In the latter form of expression, $ἐχεω$ and habere
simply convey the notion of having or possessing (that which they
might eat, they have not); the former comprises the notion of inquiry
(accordingly, habeo quid must sometimes be directly trans-
lated *I know, what* : inquiring what they should eat, they have nothing (to eat). Similarly Xen. C. 6, 1, 48 οὐκ ἔχω τι μείζον εἰπω, Hell. 1, 6, 5; Soph. Oed. C. 317 οὐκ ἔχω τι φῶ; see, in general, 182 Heindorf, Cic. N. D. p. 347. (The relative and interrogative are combined in 1 Tim. i. 7 μὴ νοοῦντες μὴτε ἀληθεύει μὴτε περὶ τῶν διαβεβαιώντων non intelligentes nec quod dicunt nec quid asserant. So in Greek authors are τι and διε coupled in parallel clauses. Cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 248; II. 261; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 641.)

Schlesner, Haab (S. 82 f.), and others, refer to this usage many examples which are of an entirely different nature; that is to say, in which a. τι retains its interrogative force, and must be rendered in Latin by quis or quid, as Matt. vii. 9 τίς ἐστος έτι άνθρωπος etc., quis erit inter vos homo etc., cf. Matt. xii. 11; Luke xiv. 5; xi. 5 f.; or in which b. τις is not an interrogative, but the indefinite aliqua, as 1 Cor. vii. 18 περιτερμιθέντος τις κληθη, μη ἐπιπάσταο, was any one called that is circumcised (I suppose the case), let him not become uncircumcised; Jas. v. 13 κακοπαθεί τις, προσευχάθω. It is inaccurately asserted that τις is used here for τι. See appendix, § 64. In Jas. iii. 13 we must punctuate with Pott, Schott, and others, τις σοφός . . . ἐν άνθρ.; δεσπότω etc. Likewise Acts xiii. 25 may be read: τίνα με ἐππονεύτη ἐίναι; οὐκ εἰμί ἐγώ. Still, I think the usual acceptance of τίνα for δινω not to be rejected; cf. Soph. El. 1167; Callim. epigr. 30, 2.

Τις is used sometimes, when only two persons or things are spoken 153 of, for the more precise πότερος (which never occurs in the N.T. as an adverb). ; as, Matt. ix. 5 τί γάρ ὑστεν εἰκοστόρον; xxii. 31 τίς ἐκ τῶν διο ἐνοίκους; Luke viii. 42; xxii. 27; Phil. i. 22. This occurs also in Greek authors (Stallb. Philib. p. 188), who do not make so nice a distinction 160 between τις and πότερος as the Romans do between their quis and uter τις (though even as respects these last, exceptions are not wanting).

It ought not to be asserted that in phrases such as Luke xv. 26 τί εἶ διὰ τούτων, Jno. vi. 9; Acts xvii. 20, the Sing. of the interrogative is put for the Plur. The Sing. τί sums up the plurality into one comprehensive whole: what (of what sort) are these things (hence also quid sibi volunt)? On the other hand, in τίνα ἵστη etc. (cf. Heb. v. 12) there is a definite reference to the plurality: quae (qualia) sunt; cf. Plat. Theaet. 154 e.; 155 c. (Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. 101; Weber, Dem. 192).

The interrogative τί is sometimes placed at the end of the clause; as, Jno. xxi. 21 οὖν τι; The same occurs frequently in the orators with πώς; Weber, Demosth. 180 sq.

In the N.T. and the Sept. ήνα τί for what, wherefore, is also used as an interrogative; as, Matt. ix. 4 ήνα τί ήμεις ἔντυμενε τῶν πορεί; xxvii. 46; Luke xiii. 7, etc. The expression is elliptical (as ut quid in Latin) for: ήνα τί γάνητα (after a past tense γάναρο), see Hm. Vig. 849; Lob. Soph. 183
§ 25. THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN,

Aj. p. 107, and occurs not unfrequently in Greek authors, particularly the later, Plat. apol. 26 d.; Aristoph. eccles. 718; Arrian. Epict. 1, 24 a. (cf. Ruth i. 11, 21; Sir. xiv. 3; 1 Macc. ii. 7).

2. The indefinite pronoun τις, τι is joined to
a. Abstract nouns, in order (among other purposes) to soften their import somewhat; as, Xen. Cyr. 9, 1, 16 τούτον ἡγεῖτο ἡ ἄκρατες των ἡ ἄδεικτα ἡ ἀμέλεια ἀπείνα — from a certain (a species of) incontinence or injustice, etc., Plut. Coriol. 14. Hence, when an unusual or a too bold figure of speech is used; as, Jas. i. 18 ἀπαρχὴ τις quaedam (quasi) primitiae, Bttm. I. 579; Schoem. Plutarch. Agis p. 78.

b. Numerals, when the approximate number is to be taken, and not precisely; as, Acts xxiii. 23 δύο τινὰς some two (about two), xix. 14, see Schaefer. Demosth. III. 269; Mttth. 1080.

c. Adjectives of quality or quantity, for rhetorical emphasis; as, Heb. xx. 27 φοβερὰ τις ἐκδίκεσος terribilis quaedam (Klotz on Cic. Lael. p. 142, and Nauck in Jahn’s Jahrb. Bd. 52 S. 183 f.), a positively (or very) terrible punishment (cf. Lucian. philop. 8 φοβερὸν τι διαμα, D. S. 5, 39 ἐπιπονός τις βίος, Aeschin. dial. 8, 17; Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 14; 6, 4, 7; Heliod. 2, 23, 99; Lucian. dial. m. 5, 1; Plutarch. Phoc. c. 13, cf. Boisson. Nicet. p. 268); hence Acts viii. 9 μέγας τις some great personage (of a man Xen. Eph. 3, 2; Athen. 4, 21, etc.). In these instances τις is equivalent to the emphatic a (Germ. ein: das war eine Freude, das ist ein Mann): that was a joy (a great joy), that is a man (a clever man); cf. Acts v. 36 λέγων εἶναι των ἐαυτόν pretending to be somebody (of 154 importance); see Bhdy. 440; Krü. 129. To this corresponds quidam in Latin, and, where no substantive or adjective is to be made prominent, aliquis; as, aliquem esse Cic. Att. 8, 15. (On 161 the other hand, τις τις does not occur in the N. T. In 1 Cor. ix. 22 some would insert it, after a few authorities, instead of πάντως τινάς, see Boisson. Eunap. p. 127; but without necessity, and even without critical probability. In Jno. xi. 49 εἷς τις unus aliquis may have been used for emphasis.)

In Matt. xx. 20 the Neut. τι aliiquid may be used with emphasis for aliquid magni (see Fr. in loc.), but probably not. On the other hand it must be taken so in the phrase εἶναι τι Gal. ii. 6; vi. 3, etc. (the well-known aliiquid esse in Latin). The emphasis depends on the connection of the passage (cf. Hm. Vig. 731), and is therefore of a rhetorical description. In classic Greek τι λέγων, τι πράσσων, are especially frequent.

Note. When joined to a substantive, τις may stand either before or after
it; as, ῥεῖ διάρρη and διάρρη τῷ Acts iii. 2; v. 1; x. 1. The latter order is the more usual one in the N.T. On the other hand, it has been doubted 184 (Mth. S. 1081) whether ῥεῖ can stand at the very beginning of a proposition; yet Hm. emend. rat. p. 95 makes no objection to this. In the N.T. compare 1 Tim. v. 24 τούς διαρρής τῷ ἀμαρτία προδηλοὶ εἶναι ... τοῖς δὲ etc. Acts xvii. 18; xix. 31. The abbreviated forms του, τῷ (Bttm. I. 301) are not used in the N.T.; they have been unwarrantably introduced in 1 Cor. xv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 6.

§ 36. HEbraisms in connection with certain pronouns.

1. Instead of ὁδέλες, μηδέλες, we find sometimes in the N.T., according to the Hebrew idiom (Leusden, diall. p. 107; Vorst, Hebr. p. 529 sq.; Gesen. Lg. 831), ὁ (μη) ... πᾶς, the verb being always connected directly with the negative; as, Matt. xxiv. 22 οὐκ ἔσοδη τάσα σάρξ, Rom. iii. 20 ζέ ἐργον νόμου οὗ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ, Luke i. 37 οὐκ ἀδινατήσει παρὰ θεοῦ πᾶν ρήμα, 1 Cor. i. 29 ὅπως ἐκ οὐ καυχήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ, etc., cf. also Rev. xxi. 27 οὐ μὴ εἰσέβη εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κοινών, Acts x. 14 οὐδεποτε ἐφανον πᾶν κοινών, Rev. ix. 4 (Judg. xiii. 4; Susan. 27).

On the other hand, οὐ πᾶς (μη πᾶς) without an intervening word denotes (like non omnis) not every; as, 1 Cor. xv. 39 οὐ πᾶσα σάρξ ἡ αὐτὴ σάρξ, Matt. vii. 21 οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων κύριε, κύριε, εἰσελθότα αἰς τὴν βασ. ... ἄλλῳ ὁ ποιῶν, etc. not every one that calls me (readily) Lord, but (among such as do so) only he who doeth the will etc.;¹ not the mere saying 'Lord' fits for entering 155 the kingdom of heaven, but etc., Acts x. 41. So in the Plur. οὐ τῶν πάντες non omnes Matt. xix. 11; Rom. ix. 6; x. 16.

This distinction is founded in the nature of the case: In the 162 former instance οὐ negatives the notion of the verb (something ʰad negative is asserted in reference to πᾶς: every man ... will fail to be justified; the predicate, will not be justified, applies to every man, i.e. no man will be justified);² but in the latter case οὐ negatives the notion of πᾶς. On the whole, however, this mode 185

¹ I cannot concur in Fr.'s explanation (see also Präliminar. S. 72 f.), according to which οὐ is here to be connected with the verb, so as to make the sense, no Lord-sayer. The second clause ἄλλῳ ὁ ποιῶν by no means excludes saying Lord; ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου involves, on the contrary, the acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord.

² Gesenius, as above, merely sets down this linguistic phenomenon, without troubling himself to explain it. Evwald, on the contrary (S. 657), has at least indicated its proper acceptation. See even Drusius, ad Gal. ii. 16, and Beza on Matt. xxiv. 22; Rom. iii. 20. Gesenius's distinction between οὐ κᾶς and μὴ πᾶς I have never comprehended.
of expression is rare, and, as more expressive, appears to have been purposely adopted in the passages in question, (which are mostly aphoristic sayings). It is confined mostly to the rendering of the O.T. πᾶς; whereas the LXX. as translators have it frequently.¹ (What Georgi, Vind. p. 317, adduces to show that this construction is pure Greek, is wholly irrelevant. In all the passages he quotes, πᾶς belongs to the substantive in the sense of whole, as μονε τῶν ἀπανταχον οἵναι, or full, complete, πᾶσα ἀνάγκη.)²

Strictly this Hebraism should be limited to the above expression οὗ (μη) . . . πᾶς; for clauses with πᾶς . . . οὗ (μη) ³ contain for the most part nothing foreign to the classic idiom, ⁴ or the reason is obvious why the writer made choice of this particular turn of expression. ¹ Jno. ii. 21 πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν all falsehood (every lie) is not of the truth any Greek might have written. Jno. iii. 16 ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πνεύματος εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἄλλα etc. (var.) that every one believing on him may not perish, but ¹⁵⁶ etc. In Eph. v. 5 πᾶς πόρον ἕκαστος ἐκ πλεονέκτης . . . οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the apostle had perhaps at the beginning of the sentence an affirmative predicate in mind ¹⁶³ (Ezek. xlv. 9). Only in Eph. iv. 29; Rev. xviii. 22, and perhaps ἃ οὗ Rev. xxii. 3 οὗδεν would have been more agreeable to a Greek ear.

¹⁸⁶ In Matt. x. 29 (Luke xii. 6) occurs ὅ εἰνα αὐτῶν ὅπις πεσάται (vel) unum non, ne unum quidem (contrasted with δόο: two for an assurion, and not even one, etc.) Matt. v. 18. This construction (with a negative) occurs

¹ For instance, Exod. xii. 16, 44; xx. 10; Deut. v. 14; xx. 16; Judg. xiii. 4; 2 Sam. xv. 11; Ps. xxxiii. 11; cxlii. 2; Ezek. xxxi. 14 (Tob. iv. 7, 19; xii. 11). Quite as frequently, however, they use the good Greek ὅ . . . οὐδεὶς (οὐδέν), Exod. x. 15; Deut. viii. 9; Josh. x. 8; Prov. vi. 35; xii. 21; or just the simple οὐδεὶς, Josh. xxxii. 9.

² If Schleusner means to prove from Cic. Rosc. Amer. 37 and ad famil. 2, 12 that non omnis is equivalent to nullus, he cannot have looked at these passages.

³ That is, in the Singular; for in the Plural it is the current mode of expression in classic Greek also. Under this head comes the passage which, to explain the above Hebraism, Weiss, pleon. p. 58, has quoted from Plut. Phaed. 91 e. πέτρου, ἐφ', πνεύμα τοῦ ἑκατέρου λόγου ὅπις ἀνακτήσει, ὅ τοις μέν, τοῖς δ' οὖ: do you receive not — i.e. reject — all, or do you receive some and reject others? How otherwise should this (with simplicity) have been expressed? In the Sept. cf. Num. xiv. 23; Josh. xi. 13; Ezek. xxxi. 14; Dan. xi. 37.

⁴ When a writer attaches the negative to the verb at the beginning of his sentence (ὁδικακουθήσεται), he has already, in advance, the subject in his mind (πᾶς), and might therefore employ οὐδεὶς. But if he begins with πᾶς, either he has not decided whether to use an affirmative or a negative verb, or it seems to him more suitable to make a negative assertion in reference to every one (πᾶς ὃ πνεύματων . . . ὃ μὴ ἀνακτήσει) than an affirmative in reference to no one. The statement, no believer shall perish, assumes as it were an apprehension which the speaker means to obviate.
also in Greek authors; as, Dion. H. comp. 18 (V. 122) μίαν ὁδὸν ἐν ὑποτελαμβάνεις, antiqu. II. 980, 10 μία τῆς οὐ καταλέπτο (according to Schaef's emendation), Plut. Grach. 9, see Schaef. on this passage and on Dionys. compos. p. 247; Erfurdt, Soph. Antig. p. 121. From the Hebr. cf. Exod. x. 19; Isa. xxxiv. 16. This construction cannot be called either a Hellenism or a Hebraism; it is everywhere designed to give greater emphasis than resides in οὐδὲς (properly the same in signification, but weakened by usage).

Luke i. 37 οὐκ ἄδυνατης παρὰ θεῷ πάντα ρήμα nothing, no thing (cf. ἵνα and in Greek ἐποικεῖτο), is doubtless taken from Gen. xviii. 14 of the Sept. Matt. xv. 23 οὐκ ἀκόρηθη αὕτη λόγον is quite simple: he answered her not a word (there is no need of ἐνa here; just as we, too, do not emphasize the α). The Greeks, too, could employ the same mode of expression; and its occurrence in 1 Kings xviii. 21 does not prove it to be a Hebraism.

2. The one, the other is expressed sometimes by ἕς ... καὶ ἕς,

a. In antithesis, Matt. xx. 21; xxiv. 40; xxvii. 38; xvii. 4; Mark x. 37; Jno. xx. 12; Gal. iv. 22 (but in Luke xvii. 34 ὁ ἕς ... ὁ ἐρεσ, cf. xvi. 13; xvii. 10; Aesop. 119 de Fur.) (so in Heb. ἡ ἐκκλησία Exod. xvii. 12; Lev. xii. 8; xv. 15; 1 Sam. x. 8, etc.), for which Greek authors use ἕς μή, ἕς δὲ or ἕς μή, ὁ δὲ; see Fischer, ad Leusden. diall. p. 35; Mth. 742. What Georgi, Vind. p. 159 sq., and Schwarz, Comment. p. 421, quote as parallel to the N. T. expression, are more properly enumerations, or calculations of a sum total, e. g. eight, one ... one ... one etc.

b. In reciprocal statements; as, 1 Thess. v. 11 οἰκοδομεῖτε ἕς τὸν ἑνα, 1 Cor. iv. 6. This is rather Aramaic (Hoffmann, Gramm. Syr. p. 330)—hence the Peschito also puts a double ματωρ for ἄλληλα.

(Matt. xxiv. 10; Jno. xiii. 35)—though not at variance with Greek syntax, Her. 4, 50 ἐν πρᾶγμα ἐν συμβάλλεται, Lucian. conscr. hist. 2 ὅσον ἐν, φασίν, ἐν παραβάλλεται, asin. 54. Compare also the phrase ἐν ἄνθρωπος ἐνοσ (Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 339; Bhd. Dionys. perieg. p. 853) and Kypke II. 339.

As cuneus cuneum trudit, some translate Matt. xii. 26 ὁ σαρανᾶς τὸν 157 σαρανᾶς ἐκβάλλει the one Satan casts out the other; but note the Art. ὁ ... ὁ ἐκβάλει. On the other hand, cf. Luke xi. 17.

The Heb. construction, a man ... to his friend or brother, is imitated by ὁ ἐκβάλει.

---

1 Hence likewise οὐδὲ ἕς are conjoined, nemo quisquam, nemo unus (Matt. xxvii. 14 οὖν δὲ τὴν ἐφύσην ne unum quidem, Jno. i. 3; Rom. iii. 10; 1 Cor. vi. 5) Hn. Vig. 487; Weber, Dem. 501 (Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9; 4, 1, 14). In the Sept. this occurs frequently (particularly for ἐποικεῖτο), Exod. xiv. 28; Num. xxxii. 49. Cf. besides ob ... nort 2 Pet. i. 21.

2 Nor will any discriminating student think ἐνα necessary in the above passage because ἕς is elsewhere expressed (Matt. xxii. 26 ἐπιταγεῖ οὕμας καὶ ὁ λόγον ἐνα).
CHAPTER III.

THE NOUN.

§ 27. NUMBER AND GENDER OF NOUNS.

1. A Masculine noun in the Singular, with the Article, is often used collectively to denote the whole class; as, Jas. ii. 6 ἡγμάσατε τῶν πτωχῶν (Plur. in 1 Cor. xi. 22), v. 6; Rom. xiv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 18; Matt. xii. 35. This construction is especially common with national names; as, Ἰουδαῖος Rom. iii. 1 (so Romanus for Romani frequently) Markland, Eurip. suppl. v. 659. The Singular in all such cases presents the distinctive characteristic more exclusively and more forcibly than the Plural,—designating, as the latter does, a multitude of individuals.

Similar to this construction is the use of the Singular to express, in reference to a plurality, an object which belongs to each of the individuals; as, 1 Cor. vi. 19 ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τ. ἅγ. πνεύματος (according to the best Codd.); Mark viii. 17 πεπωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν (Jas. iii. 14; Luke i. 66; 2 Pet. ii. 14, etc.); Matt. xvii. 6 ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν (Luke ii. 31; 2 Cor. iii. 18; viii. 24);¹ Rev. vi. 11 ἔδοθη αὐτοῖς στολὴ λευκὴ (Luke xxiv. 4; Acts i. 10?); Eph. vi. 14 περικωσμασθεὶς τὴν ὄσφυν ὑμῶν etc. This distributive Singular, as it may be called, is frequent in classic Greek; as, Χελ. A. 4, 7, 16 εἶχον καινίδας καὶ κράτης κ. μαχαίριον ... δόρυν etc. Cyr. 4, 3, 11; Eurip. Cycl. 225; Thuc. 3, 22; 4, 4; 6, 58; Pol. 3, 49, 12; Ael. an. 5, 4; cf. Cic. Rab. 4, 11; Sen. ep. 87. In the Sept. cf. Gen. xlviii. 12; Lev. x. 6; Judg. xiii. 20; Lament. ii. 10; 1 Chron. xxix. 6; see also

¹ The phrases ἀνδρὶ or πρὸς ἑαυτόν αὐτῶν or ὑμῶν, κατὰ πρὸς πάντων etc. Luke ii. 31; Acts vii. 45; Exod. xxxxiv. 11; Deut. iii. 18; vii. 19; viii. 20, etc., I should prefer, however, not to refer to this head, as they had already become adverbial.
testam. patr. p. 565.¹ In the N. T. the Plural is the usual con-
struction in this case (also Luke xxiv. 5; Acts i. 10). See in

The collective use of the Singular is not to be extended beyond its
natural bounds. In 1 Cor. vi. 5 δικρύνα αὐτὰ μέτων τοῦ δὲλφοῦ, τοῦ δὲλφοῦ
does not stand for τῆς δὲλφότητος; moreover, nothing would be gained
in this way, since αὐτὰ μέτων between requires not a collective whole, but single
individuals (the case is different in Matt. xiii. 25). It ought to have run
αὐτὰ μέτων δὲλφοῦ καὶ δὲλφοῦ (Gen. xxiii. 15), or at least τῶν δὲλφῶν ἀυτῶν
(see Grotius), cf. Pol. 10, 48, 1; or the construction is a concise inaccuracy.
Meyer’s explanation takes for granted also an expression which is inac-
curate as it is without example.

2. Conversely, the Plural of class (masc. or fem.) is used
although the predicate refers primarily to only one individual,
when the writer wishes to keep the thought somewhat vague; as,
Matt. ii. 20 ταύτης ὁι ξητούντες τῇ ψυχῇ τοῦ παιδίου (Herod
the Great alone is meant, vs. 19), cf. Exod. iv. 19. See Aesch. Prom.
67; Eurip. Hec. 403; Aeschin. adv. Timarch. 21 and Bremi in loc.
Porson, Eur. Phoen. p. 36; Reisig, Conject. in Aristoph. p. 58, and
C. L. Roth, gramm. quaest. e C. Tacito. Norimb. 1829, 4to. § 1.

On the other hand, in Matt. ix. 8 ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τῶν δώτα
ἐξουσίων τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, the reference certainly is
not to Christ alone, but the expression must be taken as actually
universal, like Heb. ix. 23. In οἱ λρσταί Matt. xxvii. 44 a different
tradition from Luke xxiii. 39 must be recognized. Lastly, in 1 Cor.
xxv. 29 ἵππος τῶν νεκρῶν cannot easily be referred to (the dead)
Christ (for then it would have been εἰς τοὺς νεκροὺς), but (unbap-
tized) dead men are meant.

The expression τὸ ἐπιμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις Acts xiii. 40; Jno. vi. 45
(ἐν βιβλίῳ τῶν προφητῶν Acts vii. 42) is a general form of quotation, like
in Paul’s Epistles, etc., employed when one does not wish, or is not able,
to indicate the passage precisely. Essentially similar is Matt. xxiv. 26 189
ἐν τοῖς παμείνοντας, opposed to ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, cf. Liv. 1, 3 Silvius casu quodam
in silvis natus.

In Matt. xxii. 7 ἔταν ἀντῶν probably refers to Ἰουνία. There would,
however, be no intrinsic absurdity in referring it to the two animals, any
more than the expression ἐπιβεβηκός ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον, verse 5, is absurd.
We also say, loosely, he sprang from the horses, though only one of the
team, the saddled horse, is meant.

¹ In 1 Thess. i. 7 ἦττα γεγονα ἥμισε τῶν τίνης τοῖς πνεύμων, the Singular is
used quite regularly, as Paul had in view the church as a whole. 1 Cor. x. 6, 11; 1 Pet.
v. 3 are passages of a different kind, where the Singular would be surprising.
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Quite erroneously has the Plural ἑντομοὶ in 1 Cor. xvi. 3 been taken for the Singular (Heumann in loc.). Though this Plural may be thus used of a single letter (Schaef. Plutarch. V. 446; Poppo, Thuc. 1, 182), yet here the words ἕτοιμοι are certainly to be joined to πρόλογον; and the sending of several letters to different persons is in itself not at all unlikely.

3. Not a few nouns which are used by us ordinarily in the Singular, were employed exclusively, or at least predominantly, in the Plural; this is owing to the objects denoted by them having—from a general or from a Grecian or a Biblical point of view—some sensible or ideal manifoldness or comprehensiveness (Krü. 9 f.); as, αἰώνες Heb. i. 2 world (κόσμος), οὐρανοὶ coeli (Schneider, lat. Gr. II. 476) cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2, τὰ ἁγία the sanctuary Heb. viii. 2; ix. 8, 12, etc., ἀναρκτία, δυσμαί (East, West) Matt. viii. 11; xxiv. 27 (Plato, def. 411 b.; epin. 990 a.; D. S. 2, 43; Dio. C. 987, 32; Lucian. peregr. 39), τὰ δεξιά, ἄρωτερα, εὐώνυμα, the right, the left (frequently), θύραι (fores, folding-door) Acts v. 19; Jno. xx. 19 (in Greek also θύλα, but θύρα is a regular Plural in Acts xvi. 26 f.; Matt. xxiv. 33), κόλποι bosom Luke xvi. 23 (22 Sing.) cf. Pausan. 6, 1, 2; Ael. 13, 31; also τὰ ἱμάτια of a (single) upper-garment, Jno. xix. 23; xiii. 4; Acts xviii. 6; the names of festivals ἑορτά, γενέσια, ἐξωμα (Παναθήναια, Saturnalia, Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 20), also γάμως marriage Matt. xxii. 2; Luke xii. 36 (cf. Tob. xi. 20); likewise ὁφέια (Germ. Löhnung, soldier’s pay) Rom. vi. 23 (Fr. Rom. I. 428), and ἀγάρθια (pieces of money, Shekel-pieces) Matt. xxvi. 15; xxviii. 12.

When the names of countries or cities are Plural, this is due to their consisting (originally) of several provinces (as Galliae) or settlements; as, Ἀθῆναι, Πάταρα, Φιλίπποι, probably also τὰ ἱεροσολύματα.

Lastly, nouns denoting a feeling, disposition, or state, express in the Plural the modes or acts in which the feeling, etc. manifests itself; as, 1 Pet. ii. 1 ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν κακίαν ... κ. ὑποκρίσεις κ. φθόνους κ. πάσας κατάλαλιάς, 2 Cor. xii. 20 ἑρικ., ζῆλος, θυμόλ. ἐριθεῖαι, καταλαλιαλ. ψιθυρισμολ. φυσιώσεις, ἀκαταστασίαι, 2 Cor. xi. 23 ἐν θανάτωις τοῦλακι, Eph. vi. 190 11; Gal. v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 3; Jas. ii. 1 (2 Cor. ix. 6) Jude 13; 1 Cor. vii. 2; Fr. Rom. III. 6; Kritz, Sallust. I. 76. So ὀκτυρμολ. εὐρύτερ is more common than the Singular (only in Col. iii. 12 var.). Here belongs also Eph. ii. 3 θελήματα τῆς σαρκός. See, in general,

The Plural αἷματα Jno. i. 13 of blood as generative matter, has a direct parallel only in Eurip. Ion. 693 in the poetic language; but it is as easily accounted for in reference to a fluid as τὰ ὀίδαρα and τὰ γαλάκταρα Plat. legg. 10, 887 d. In Rev. xviii. 24 αἷματα is a real Plural, and accordingly does not come under the above rule; — a remark true also of αἱ γραφαί, τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, αἱ διαθήκαι Rom. ix. 4; Eph. ii. 12 (the covenants which God in patriarchal times repeatedly renewed with Abraham, Jacob, through Moses, cf. Wisd. xii. 21; 2 Macc. viii. 15). Similar is ἐπαγγελίαι in Heb. vii. 6. A Hebraistic Plur. majest. is not to be assumed in these words, nor in Jno. ix. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 1, 7 or Heb. ix. 23, where the statements are general. Τὰ σάββατα when only the weekly day of rest is meant, Matt. τὰ άπότομα xii. 1; Luke iv. 16, etc., is either a transfer of the Aramaean form נירנ, or framed after the analogy of names of festivals. More easily might δύνα δύνων, Heb. ix. 3, denoting the most holy place of the temple at Jerusalem, be pronounced a Plur. excell., unless with Erasmus and others, we prefer the accentuation δύνα δύνων (cf. δισύλας δισύλων Soph. El. 839). However, though this portion of the Israelish sanctuary is mentioned in the Pentateuch under the designation τῶν δύνων (Exod. xxvi. 33; Num. iv. 4), cf. Joseph. Antt. 3, 6, 4, yet in 1 Kings viii. 6 the holy of holies is actually called τὰ δύνα τῶν δύνων. Cf. the Latin penetralia, adyta (Vir. Aen. 2, 297).

In reference to Phil. ii. 6 τὸ ισια Ισρα Θεοφ, where Ισρα is used adverbially, compare the classic usage Iliad. 5, 71; Odysse. 1, 492; 15, 520; Soph. Oed. R. 1179; Thuc. 8, 14; Philostr. Ap. 8, 26, etc. See Reisig, Oed. Col. 526.

4. The Dual of nouns—except the numeral δύο—does not occur in the N. T., but in its stead only the Plural is used (with δύο in Matt. iv. 18; xviii. 9; xxvi. 37; Jno. iv. 40; Acts xii. 6, etc.); likewise in later Greek, generally, the dual-form is rare. Only in Rev. xii. 14 τρίφθεται καὶφῶν καὶ καὶφῶνς καὶ καὶφῶν καὶφῶν does the Plural of itself denote two years; this, however, is an imitation of the Chaldee יָעֵש Dan. vii. 25 in the Greek versions, and in this connection it may be remarked that the Chaldee regularly has no dual (my Chald. Grammat. S. 77). Accordingly the Plural, placed between one year and half a year, was allowable made to signify two. In later Greek, χρόνος, χρόνων, came more and more to signify year, years. See also Evang. apoc. p. 60, 61; Epiphan. Mon. 29, 28.

Bornem. supposes he has found a trace of the Dual in Acts xv. 12 in 191 the reading ἡγγομένος (ν is added above the line) of one Cod. from which
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Tdf. notes the reading ἐπηγούμενος, and joyously hails the discovery of this number!

5. The Neuter, sing. or plur., is sometimes employed to denote a person, when the writer purposely expresses himself in general terms; as, 2 Thess. ii. 6 τὸ κατέχων οἶδατε (7 ὁ κατέχων), Heb. vii. 7 τὸ ἐλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρέττους εὐλογεῖται (Theodor. in loc.), [Matt. xviii. 11], Luke i. 35; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28 τὰ μορφὰ τ. κόσμου . . . τὰ ἀσθενή, τὰ ἐξουθενημένα (26. οἱ σοφοί), Jno. vi. 37; 1 Jno. v. 4 cf. 1; (1 Cor. xi. 5, but not Col. i. 20; Heb. vii. 19; Jno. iii. 6; see the more recent expositors. In Rom. xi. 32 the established reading is τοῦς πάντας). Similarly, Thuc. 3, 11 τὰ κράτιστα ἐπὶ τοῦ υποδεικτέρως ξυνεπηγούμενος, Xen. A. 7, 3, 11 τὰ μὲν φεύγοντα καὶ ἀποδιδράκουντα ἤμεν ἵκανοι ἐστόμεθα διάκεισαι καὶ μαστέων, ὃν ὑπὲρ ἀνθίστηται etc., Poppo, Thuc. I. 104; Seidler, Eurip. Troad. p. 61; Kritz, Sall. II. 69.

6. The Neuter seems to be employed for the Feminine in Mark xii. 28 ποια ἐστιν ἐντολή πρώτη πάντων (for πασών, which is a correction). But πάντων has no relation to the gender of the noun, but is equivalent to the general expression omnium (rerum); cf. Lucian. piscat. 13 μα πάντων ἦγε ἁληθῆς φιλοσοφία (according to the common reading; otherwise πάντως), Thuc. 4, 52 τὰς τε ἄλλας πόλεις καὶ πάντων μάλιστα τὴν Ἀντανδρόν, see d’Orville, Charit. p. 549 sq.; Porson, Eur. Phoen. 121; Fr. Mr. I. c.

On the other hand, we cannot say with d’Orville (p. 292 sq.) that in Acts ix. 37, λούσαντες αὐτήν ἐθνεῖν, the masc. λοῦσα is used for λουσάσαι because the washing of corpses was the business of women. The writer expresses himself in the most general terms (Hm. Soph. Trachin. p. 39) and without reference to persons: they washed and laid. Had Luke intended to refer to that custom with historical precision, he would have employed more definite language. Cf. Xen. M. 2, 7, 2 συνεληθοῦσαι . . . ἀδελφοι τε καὶ ἀδελφίδαι καὶ ἀνεψάι τοσαῦτα, δι’ εἶναι ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τεσσαρακοίτεκα τοὺς ἐλευθέρους the free (free persons) were fourteen, where the Masculine is used though by the free (as it appears) females are to be understood. Suet. Ner. 33 acceptum a quadam Locusta, venenariorum inclita. (Luke xxii. 58, cf. Matt. xxvi. 71 — the accounts are different; see Mey.)

Neither is the Masculine used for the Feminine in the Sept. in Gen. 192 xxiii. 3 ἄντικον Ἀβραὰμ ἀπὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ αὐτοῦ . . . 4 θάφῳ τῶν νεκρῶν μου (15), though Sarah is meant; nor in the History of Susann. 61 ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς δὲ τρόπου ἐπονομαζάντο τῷ πλησίον, though the reference is to
§ 28. THE CASES IN GENERAL.

1. Foreigners found no difficulty in comprehending in the general the respective import of the Greek cases (Hm. de emend. rat. I. 137 sqq.; Bhdy. S. 74 ff.). And even the Jews were able to express in their language plainly enough the common relations of case, although without the aid of terminations; the mode of denoting the Genitive in particular, approximated in Aramaic to that of the Occidental tongues. It remained, however, a matter of more difficulty to learn to catch the impressions made upon a Greek by the oblique cases in all their manifold and sometimes far-extended applications. Such a use of cases, moreover, did not

1 A monograph on this subject is, J. A. Hartung, über die Casus, ihre Bildung und Bedeut. in der griech. u. lat. Sprache. Erlang. 1831, 8vo. (Rumpel, üb. die Casuslehre in Beziehung auf die griech. Sprache. Halle 1845, 8vo.)
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accord with the graphic and explicit phraseology of Orientals; and we find, accordingly, that in the N. T., agreeably to the Eastern idiom and sometimes in direct imitation of it, prepositions are frequently employed where in classic Greek the simple cases would have sufficed even in prose; for instance, διδόναι ἐκ, ἐσθίειν ἀπό, μετέχειν ἐκ for διδόναι, ἐσθίειν, μετέχειν τινός (cf. § 30), πολεμεῖν μετὰ τινὸς for τυι, κατηγορεῖν and ἐγκαλεῖν κατά τινος (Luke xxiii. 14; Rom. viii. 33) for τινι, ἔγειρεν τινὰ εἰς βασιλέα Acts xiii. 22 (§ 32), βασιλεῖν ἐπὶ τινὶ or τινὰ (ἐπὶ ἡμῖν) for τινός, ἠθῶν ἀπὸ τ. for the Genitive alone (Krebs, obs. e Josepho p. 73 sq.). [Hither may be referred also without hesitation μενεσθαι εν τ. Phil. iv. 12 for τινι; see Wiesinger in loc.] From the Sept. cf. φείδεσθαι ἐπὶ τινὶ or τινος or ῥεῖν τινος (ἐπὶ καὶ ῥεῖ).

This use of prepositions with cases instead of cases alone, is, however, in general characteristic of (antique) simplicity, and occurs therefore in Greek, not only in the earlier poets, as Homer, but in prose writers also, as Lucian; see Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 11 sq. Hence even from good writers many instances of the kind may be quoted, such as παῖειν ἀπό, cf. Mtth. 833.

2. No case is ever in reality put for another (enallage casuum). Sometimes, however, two cases can be used with equal correctness in one and the same connection when the relation to be expressed may be viewed in two different ways; for example Ἀσσύρως τῷ γένει and τῷ γένος, προσκυνεῖν τινὶ to show reverence to one, and προσκυνεῖν τινα to reverence one, καίδειες τοιει τινα and τινι (Thilo, Act. Thom. 38), ἐνοχὸς τινι and τινος (Fr. Mt. p. 223), δομοῖς τινος and τινι, πληροῖσθαι τινος (made full of something) and τινι (filled with something). Also μμνήσκεσθαι τι and τινος (like recordari rei and rem); in the former case (with the Acc.) I conceive of the remembering as directed (transitively) to the object; with the Gen. (meminisse rei) the remembrance is conceived of as emanating or coming from the object. It cannot be said, therefore, that in any instance the Dat. or Acc. is put for the Gen., or vice versa; but both cases, logically, are alike correct, and it only remains to notice which construction has become the more usual, or whether one of them belongs especially to the later language or to any particular writer (as εἰνογγελίζεσθαι τινα, προσκυνεῖν τινι).

1 As the Byzantines sometimes say: ἀγαπᾶτειν ἢ ἐγγίζοντας κατά τινος, or Dio Chr. 38, 470 ἐγγίζοντας πρὸς τινα.

2 The distinction which Schnef. Demosth. V. 323, lays down between these two constructions is not confirmed by the N. T. Cf. besides, Mtth. 850.
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Perhaps the most absurd instance of *enallage casuum* that could be alleged, would be 2 Cor. vi. 4 συμμετέχησα λαυρίως ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι for διάκονος. Both expressions, indeed, can be used, but in different significations. *I commend myself as instructor* (Nom.) means: in the office of an instructor which I have undertaken; but *I commend myself as an instructor* (Acc.) means: as one who wishes or is able to be an instructor.

3. Every case, as such, stands in a necessary connection, according to its nature, with the structure of the sentence in which it occurs. This connection is most direct as regards the Nom. and Acc., the former as the case of the subject, the latter as that of the object; — for secondary relations, the Gen. and Dat. There are also, however, *casus absoluti* i.e. cases which are not wrought into the grammatical structure of the sentence, — cases which are grammatically isolated, and have only a logical connection with the sentence. Nominatives absolute are the most frequent and the most distinctly marked (Bengel on Matt. xii. 36). Real Accusatives absolute are more rare (§ 63. I. 2 d.), cf. Fr. Rom. III. 11 sq., for what is called an Accusative absolute is often dependent, though loosely, on the construction of the sentence. As to Genitives and Datives absolute, the import of these cases proves them to be regular component parts of the sentence. See, in general, A. de Wannowski, syntaxeos anomalae graecae pars de constructione, quae dicitur, absoluta, etc. Lips. 1835, 8vo.; F. W. Hoffmann, 171 observata et monita de casibus absol. ap. Graecos et Lat. ita positis 7cad ut videantur non posse locum habere. Budiss. 1886, 4to. (it treats only of the Gen. and Dat. absolute); J. Geisler, de graecor. nominativis absol. Vratisl. 1845, 8vo., and E. Wentzel, de genitivis et dat. absol. Vratisl. 1828, 8vo. But the whole subject of the Nominative absolute comes under the head of Structure of Sentences.

§ 29. NOMINATIVE AND VOCATIVE.

1. A noun considered simply and solely in itself is represented by the Nominative; and is either subject or predicate in a sentence, according to the latter's structure; as, Ινο. i. 1 εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, Eph. ii. 14 αυτὸς εστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν.

Sometimes, however, a Nominative, without being wrought into 164 the structure of the sentence to which it belongs, is either placed 66ad at its head as a sort of title or topic (Nom. absol.), or inserted as 195 a term of designation (Nom. tituli) as if it were an indeclinable

Usually, however, names, where an oblique case is necessary, take that case, and so are construed as part of the sentence (and ὄνομα merely interposed); as, Acts xxvii. i. ἰκατοντάρχη ὄνοματι Ἰουλίῳ, ix. 11, 12 ἀνδρα Ἀπανιὰν ὄνοματι ἐκελθόντα (xxvii. 2; Matt. xxvii. 32; Luke v. 27), xviii. 7 οἰκίᾳ τυφός ὄνοματι Ἰούστου, also Matt. i. 21, 25 καλέσει τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, Luke i. 13 (as an apposition to ὄνομα), even Mark iii. 16 ἐπεδήμης ὄνομα τῷ Σιμώνι Πέτρον. (Different modes of expression are combined in Plut. Coriol. 11.)

In Rev. i. 4 the Nom. ὁ ἐν κ. ὁ ἐπίρχομαι (τιττι, the Immutable) τὸ αὐτὸ is designedly used as indeclinable. See § 10. p. 68.

2. Coincident with a, above is the use of the Nom. (with the Article) in addressing, particularly in calling or commanding; consequently, instead of the Vocative, which was intended for this purpose (Fischer-Weller III. 1. 319 sq.; Markland, Eurip. Iph. Aul. 446). This use of the Nom. sometimes occurs, also, in the N. T., as Matt. xi. 26 καὶ, ὁ πατὴρ (ἐξουσιοδοτοῦσαν τὸν 25), δικὸν ὄντως ἐγένετο, Heb. i. 8; x. 7 (in the Sept. cf. Ps. xxxii. 2; xxii. 2), especially in the Imperat., as Luke viii. 54 ἢ παῖς ἐγερεῖ, Matt. xxvii. 29 χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τ. Ἰσραήλ. Jno. xix. 3; Mark v. 41; ix. 25; Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 18; Rev. vi. 10. This form of expression may have originally possessed some degree of roughness or harshness (Bhdy. 67), and retains it even in Greek prose. Afterwards, however, it was employed without special emphasis, and also in the kindest ad-

1 In all earlier editions (including that of Lehmi.) we find ἡλαῦν. I am not prepared, with Fr., to pronounce this accent positively wrong. Luke, intending his Gospel for foreign readers, in mentioning for the first time the Mount of Olives, well enough known in Palestine, might naturally say, the so-called Mount of Olives, as in Acts i. 12. But the expression πρὸς τὸ δρός τὸ λέγουμεν ἡλαῦν would have to be resolved into τὸ λέγουμεν δρός ἡλαῦν ad montem qui dicitur olivarum; and the Article before ἡλαῦν would be by no means necessary. Perhaps even the Syriac translator read 'Ἐλαιῶν; he renders the above as he does Acts i. 12: | ἡλαῦν | δαὺς | δαὺς | δαὺς but δρός τῶν ἦλ. Matt. xxvi. 1, simply | δαὺς | δαὺς | xxiv. 3 etc.

2 We find even τὸν ἀνθρωποτέκος φωνῆ Theodoret. IV. 1804, τὸν θεός προφητεύτων III. 241; IV. 454, where the Romans (a circumstance which modern writers of Latin generally overlook) always employ the Genitive.
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addresses, as in Luke xii. 32 μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν πολὺν, viii. 54 (Bar. 4, 5), even in prayers, as in Luke xviii. 11; Heb. x. 7.

On the other hand, Jno. xx. 28, though directed to Jesus (ἐλπιον 196 αὐτῷ), is rather exclamation than address; and, in the Greek authors, such a Nom. has early and strong prominence (Bhdy. as above, Krü. 12). So also Luke xii. 20 (according to the reading 165 ἄφρων, and 1 Cor. xv. 36, where ἄφρων has little authority in its favor), likewise Phil. iii. 18, 19 πολλοί γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν, ὁδὲ πολλάκις ἐλευθ... τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χρ., δὲν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια... oii tā ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες, perhaps also Mark xii. 38–40 βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων, τῶν θελῶν... καὶ ἀπασμοῦ... καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρία... oii κατεσθίοντες τὰς οἰκίας... οὕτω λήψονται περισσότερον κρίμα (yet here the words oii κατεσθ. may also be joined with οὕτω λήψονται).¹—Vocative and Nominative are united in Rev. xviii. 20.

8. In the N. T., however, the Vocative, with or more frequently without ὁ, is far more common than the Nom. in addresses. We find ὁ only in addresses, Acts i. 1; xxvii. 21; xviii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 11, mostly of adjuration and censure (Lob. Soph. Aj. 451 sq., see Fritzschte, Aristoph. I. 4), Rom. ii. 1, 3; ix. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 20; Jas. ii. 20; Gal. iii. 1, or in exclamations, as Luke xxiv. 25; Acts xiii. 10. On the other hand, in mere accosting or calling the Vocative without ὁ is employed, as Luke xiii. 12; xxii. 57; xxiii. 28; Matt. ix. 22; Jno. iv. 21; xix. 26; Acts xiii. 15; xxvii. 25. Even at the beginning of a speech, where ὁ is regularly prefixed by the Greeks, we find in the N. T. for the most part the Vocative alone: Acts i. 16; ii. 14; iii. 12; xiii. 16; xv. 13 (see, however, Franke, Demosth. p. 193).²

An adjective belonging to a Vocative is put in the Voc. also; as, Jas. 173 ii. 20 ἀδνοματε κανέ, Matt. xviii. 32; Jno. xvii. 11 (but cf. Jacobs, Achill. 771 Tat. p. 466); on apposition with the Vocative, however, see § 59, 8.

Note. Some have erroneously attributed to the language of the N. T. a Hebraistic circumlocution for the Nominative,

a. by means of the Acc. with eis, in the phrases εἰς να, or γένος eis τυ, (Leusden, diall. p. 182). By far the greater number of the passages adduced are quotations from the Old Test. or expressions taken from it that have become standing phrases (Matt. xix. 3; 1 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. v. 31:

¹ Hm. praef. ad Eur. Androm. p. 15 sq. says, mihi quidem ubicque nominativus, quem pro vocativo postum volunt, non vocantis sed declarantis esse videtur: o tu, qui est talis. This applies to some of the above passages but not to all, and ought probably to be asserted primarily only of the poets.
² On ὁ before the Vocative, see, in general, Doberein, Progr. Hildburgh. 1844, 4to.
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Heb. viii. 10, etc.). Besides, it was overlooked that the expression 197 γίνεσθαι εἰς τι σιαρί i.e. abire (mutari) in aliqua. (Acts v. 36; Jno. xvi. 20; Rev. viii. 11) may be used in Greek (Georgi, Vind. 387; Schwarz, Comment. 285), and is used, by the later authors at least, even in reference to persons (Geo. Pachymer. I. 345 εἰς χρώματα αὐτοῦ γίνονται); further, it was not considered that in the Hebrew expression equivalent to εἰς τι, the b does not properly express the Nom. but corresponds to our (turn or serve) to or for something, (Heb. viii. 10; 1 Cor. xiv. 22, cf. Wisd. ii. 14; Acts apocr. 169). In 1 Cor. iv. 3 εἰς τὸν τοῦτον ἔστω signifies, to me (for me) it belongs to what is of least importance, most insignificant (I rank it as such). Εἰς οἶδαν λογοπῆναι Acts xix. 27 is similar: to be accounted as nothing (Wisd. ix. 6). 1 In Luke ii. 34 καίρα εἰς πᾶσαν the preposition διά indicates in like manner the destination, and does not conflict with Greek analogy, see Phil. i. 17 (16); 1 Thess. iii. 3, cf. Aesop. 24, 2 εἰς μείζόνα σου ὅψειν ἐπομαί, and the Latin auxilio esse (Zumpt, Gr. S. 549). See, further, § 32. 4. b. p. 228.

b. by means of εἰς as an imitation of the Hebrew Beth essentiae (Gesen. Lgb. 888; Knobel on Isa. xxviii. 16), in the passages Mark v. 25 γινηγ τις εἰς οὖν τοις εἰσαγωγοίς, Rev. i. 10 γενόμενος εἰς πνεύματα εἰς τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ (Glass. I. 31), Eph. v. 9 δ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός εἰς πάση διάδοσιν (Hartmann, linguist. Einl. 884), and Jno. ix. 30 εἰς τούτων θαμαστῶν έστι (Schleusner, under εἰς). But, in the first passage, εἰς τό είτε is to be in the state of, etc. In the second, γίνεσθαι εἰς πνεύματα εἰς is to be present anywhere in spirit. In the third, εἰς εἰς is equivalent to contineri, positum esse in (see the expositors). The last passage may be aptly rendered: herein is a marvelous thing. Gesenius too has attributed this Hebraistic construction to Greek and Latin writers unwarrantably; for εἰς εἰς σοφοῖς, in magnis viris (habendum) esse, assuredly contains nothing anomalous, but is quite a natural combination, and is to be rendered, belong to the number of. Εἰς and in would be equivalent to a Beth essentiae only in case the expression were: εἰς σοφῶ, in sapienti viro, for σοφοῖ, sapientis. But no reasonable man can talk so, and in a word the Hebraistic Beth essentiae construction 174 is a pure figment of empirical grammarians; 2 see my edition of Simonis 7th ed. p. 109, and Fr. Mr. p. 291 sq. The other examples adduced by Haab (S. 337 f.) are so manifestly inadmissible that we will not tarry a moment upon them.
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1. The Genitive is acknowledged to be the whence-case — (the case denoting source, departure, or descent; cf. Hartung, Casus

1 Quite different the expression χρήματα εἰς ἀργύρου λογίσθαι Xen. C. 3, 1, 33.

2 With the entirely misunderstood μετὰ τοῦ, Exod. xxxii. 22, compare Ael. 10, 11 ἄποθεν ἐν καλῷ ἔστω. Should this too be taken for καλῶν ἔστω?
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S. 12), and is most clearly recognized as such in connection with words expressive of action, and accordingly, with verbs. Its most common and most familiar appearance in prose, however, is in connecting two substantives; here, through its gradually extended signification, it denotes every sort of dependence or belonging;¹ e.g. ὁ κύριος τοῦ κόσμου, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου.

We shall consider first this use of the Genitive—(in connection with which even a Pronoun or the Article cf. § 18, 3 may hold the place of the governing word). And since even this comprehends, 167 in plain prose alone, a great diversity of significations (Schaef. Eurip. Or. 48) exclusive of the common instances,—to which belong particularly the Gen. of quality, Rom. xv. 5, 13 etc., and the partitive Genitive, Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 15,—we notice,

a. The Genitive of the Object after substantives which denote an internal or an external operation—a feeling, judgment, action (Krü. 30 f.); as, Matt. xiii. 18 παραβολή τοῦ οὐράνιου παρόλη of i.e. concerning the sover, 1 Cor. i. 6 μαρτύρων τοῦ Χριστοῦ testimony concerning Christ (ii. 1 cf. xv. 15), viii. 7 ἡ συνείδησις τοῦ εἰδώλου consciousness about the idol, i. 18 δ ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ, Matt. xxiv. 6 ἀκολούθων τιμών των ωρίμων (concerning wars), cf. Mthth. 814; Acts iv. 9 εἰρήνη ἔναντίον τούτου (conferred on) a man (Thuc. 1, 129; 7, 57; Plat. legg. 8, 850 b.), Jno. v. 13; xx. 19 φῶς Ὀρθαίων fear in reference to the Jews (Eurip. Andr. 1059), xvii. 2 δίκαια πάσης σκοτίας power over (Matt. x. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 12), 2 Pet. ii. 13, 15 μαθητεύει δικαία wages for unrighteousness, Rom. x. 2 ἐλπίς θεοῦ zeal for God (Jno. ii. 17; 1 Macc. ii. 58; otherwise 2 Cor. xi. 2), Heb. ix. 15 ἀπολύσεως τῶν παραβάσεων redemption from (Plato, rep. i. 329 c.). Compare likewise Matt. xiv. 1 (Joseph. antt. 8, 6, 5) Luke vi. 12 (Eurip. Troad. 895) Eph. ii. 20; Rom. xv. 8; 2 Pet. i. 9; Jas. ii. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 15; Heb. x. 24. For examples from Greek authors, see Markland, Eur. suppl. 199 888; d’Orville, Char. p. 498; Schaef. Soph. II. 201; Stahlb. Plat. rep. II. 201, and Apol. p. 29; Poppo, III. I. 521.

The following phrases are of frequent recurrence in the N. T.: 175 ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ or Χριστοῦ love to God, to Christ, Jno. v. 42; 1 Jno. 71 ii. 5, 15; iii. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 5 (but not Rom. v. 5; viii. 35; 2 Cor. v. 14; Eph. iii. 19), φῶς θεοῦ or κύριον Acts ix. 31; Rom. iii. 18;

¹ If the Genitive is viewed not so much as respects its origin as abstractly, its nature may be defined as follows (Em. Opusc. I. 175 and Vig. p. 877): Genitivum proprium est id indicare, cujus quid aliquo quocumque modo accidens est. Cf. de emendanda rat. p. 139. Similarly Mdo. 49. See, moreover, Schneider on Caesar, Bell. Gall. I, 21, 2.
2 Cor. v. 11; vii. 1; Eph. v. 21, πίστεως τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ or Ἰησοῦ Μακρ. xi. 22; Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16; iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12; Phil. iii. 9; Jas. ii. 1; Rev. xiv. 12 (πίστεως ἄλληλων) 2 Thess. ii. 13), ὑπακοῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ or τ. πίστεως etc. 2 Cor. x. 5; Rom. i. 5; xvi. 26; 1 Pet. i. 22 (2 Cor. ix. 13). But δικαιοσύνη τοῦ, in the doctrinal phraseology of Paul (Rom. i. 17; iii. 21 f.; x. 3 etc.) is,—agreeably to his teaching concerning θεός ὁ δικαιός (cf. iii. 30; iv. 5),—righteousness which God bestows (on man), and, the meaning once fixed, δικαιος θεοῦ might be predicated even of believers themselves, 2 Cor. v. 21. Others, with Luther, understand the expression thus: the righteousness that avails before God (qua deo satisfact, Fr. Rom. i. 47), δικ. παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. The possibility of this explanation lies in δικαιος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ Rom. ii. 13 antithetic to δικαιοσύνη, and still more immediately in δικαιοσύνη παρὰ τῷ θεῷ Gal. iii. 11, or ἐνόπτων τοῦ θεοῦ Rom. iii. 20. Both expressions would be appropriate according to the nature of the δικαιοσύνη in question. But the interpretation δικαιος ὁ θεός τῶν ἀνθρωπων is the more rigorous, and in Rom. x. 3 a better antithesis is gained if δικ. θεοῦ denotes righteousness which God imparts. Compare also Phil. iii. 9 ἡ ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη.

It is obvious from the preceding considerations that the decision between the Subjective and the Objective Genitive rests in many passages not with the grammarian but with the exegete, and the latter in making it must give careful attention to parallel passages also.

In Phil. iv. 7 εἰρήνη θεοῦ can only mean the peace (of soul) that God gives, according to the custom of the apostles to wish their readers εἰρήνην ἀπὸ θεοῦ; and this parallelism is more decisive here than Rom. v. 1 εἰρήνην ἐκμετάλλησεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν (according to which peace with God must be the translation). Likewise in Col. iii. 15 εἰρήνη Χριστοῦ I take the Genitive to be Subjective, cf. Jno. xiv. 27. That δικαιοσύνη πάντως (a single notion: faith-righteousness), Rom. iv. 13, signifies righteousness which faith brings with it, is manifest from the more frequent expression ἡ δικ. ἡ ἐκ πάντως Rom. ix. 30; x. 6. In Eph. iv. 18 ἀπηλλαττημένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ is God's-life; the life of Christian believers is so called as being a life communicated, inwardly excited, by God.

Whether the Genitive in the phrase εὐαγγελίων τοῦ Χριστοῦ is to be taken as Subjective (the Gospel made known by Christ), or Objective (the Gospel concerning Christ), may be doubted. For my part I prefer the latter, because in some passages we find the entire expression εὐαγγελίων τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τοῦ νῦν αἴτου (e.g. Rom. i. 3), of which the other is probably but an abridgment; cf. also εὐαγγελίων τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ Acts xx. 24, and εὐαγγελίου τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35. Mey. (on
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Mark i. 1) declares himself now for one view, now for the other. Likewise in Col. ii. 18 expositors are not agreed whether in ἡρκεῖα ἐγγύς the 176 Gen. is to be taken as Subjective or as Objective; the latter is preferable: 2nd ed. worship paid to angels, angel-worship; cf. Euseb. H. E. 6, 41 ἡρκεῖα τῶν δαιμόνων (var.), Philo II. 259 ὅρ. ἡθῶν (ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ λατρεία Plat. Apol. 23 c.).

In 1 Tim. iv. 1 δαιμόνων is undoubtedly a Subjective Genitive. But in βαπτισμόν διάκονος, Heb. vi. 2, if the latter be considered as the principal noun (see below, 3. note 4), βαπτισμόν can only denote the object of the διάκονος. In Rom. viii. 23 ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος, according to Paul's teaching, appears rather to signify liberation of the body (from that διαλέει τῆς φθορᾶς 21) than liberation from the body. Likewise in Heb. i. 3; 2 Pet. i. 9 καθαρισμὸς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν might mean purification of sins (removal of sins, cf. Deut. xix. 13), just as one may say καθαρίζωναι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (cf. καθαρίζεις ἄλμα to remove by purification, Iliad 16, 667); but it is simpler to take τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν as an Objective Genitive. In Rom. ii. 7 ὑπομονὴ ἐργον ἐγκαθοῦ, 1 Thess. i. 3 ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἑλπίδος, is simply: steadfastness of well-doing, steadfastness of hope. Isa. ii. 4 is probably an indignant question: would ye not in this become judges of evil thoughts (your own)?

2. But the Genitive is likewise employed, b. to denote relations of dependence still more remote (cf. Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 108 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Tim. p. 241 sq.; Bhdv. 160 ff.). In this way, by a kind of condensed expression, compound designations are formed which must be resolved variously, according to the relation of the ideas composing them. We distinguish,

a. The Genitive which expresses relations entirely external (of 169 place or of time); as, Matt. x. 5 ὅδε ἐθνῶν the way to the gentiles (Heb. ix. 8 cf. Gen. iii. 24. ὅδε τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, Jer. ii. 18; Judith v. 14) 1, Jno. x. 7 θύρα τῶν προβάτων door to the sheep (Mey.), Matt. i. 11, 12 μετοικεῖσα βαβυλώνος the carrying away to Babylon (Orph. 200 ἐπὶ πλῦν Ἀξείουν quod expeditionem in Axinum, 144 νόστος οίκου domum reeditus, Eurip. Iph. T. 1066 cf. Schaeff. Melet. p. 90; Seidler, Eurip. Electr. 161; Spohn, Isocr. Paneg. p. 2; Bttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 67), 2 Jno. vii. 35 ἐν διασπορᾷ τῶν Ἑλλήνων the dispersion (the dispersed) among the Greeks, Mark viii. 27 κώμαι Κασπαρείας τῆς Φιλίππων towns about Caesarea Ph., situated on its territory (Isa. xvii. 2), 3 Col. i. 20 ἄλμα τοῦ σταυροῦ blood of the 201.

1 But Matt. iv. 15 ὅδε ἐθνῶν undoubtably way by the sea (of Tiberias).
2 Vice versa Plat. Apol. 40 c. μετοικεῖσα τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ τῶν τού διάβε (away from this place).
3 This finally comes back to the common topographical (Krü. 27) Genitive, as Jno. ii. 1 Καρᾶ τῆς Ῥημαλᾶς, Acts xxvii. 3 Ταρετής τῆς Κολομᾶς, xiii. 13 f.; xxvii. 5; Luke iv. 26; cf. Xen. H. 1, 2, 12; D. S. 16, 52; 17, 63; Diog. L. 8, 3; Arrian. Al. 2, 4, 1, see Eelendt, Arrian. Al. I. 151; Rams horn, lat. Gr. I. 167 — and this is simply the Genitive of belonging.
cross i.e. blood shed on the cross, 1 Pet. i. 2 ἐγκαινιάσθη αἵματος sprinkling (purifying) with blood, 2 Cor. xi. 26 κίνδυνοι ποταμῶν dangers on rivers (followed immediately by κίνδυνοι ποταμῶν etc.), cf. Heliod. 2, 4, 65 κίνδυνοι θαλασσών.

Designations of time: Rom. ii. 5 (Zeph. ii. 2) ἡμέρα ὥρισις day of wrath, that is, day on which the punitive wrath of God will be manifested, Jude 6 κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας judgment (at) on the great day, Luke ii. 44 ἡ διήνυσις ἡμέρας a day’s journey (distance travelled in a day, cf. Her. 4, 101; Ptol. 1, 11, 4), Heb. vi. 1 ὁ τῆς ἁρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος primary Christian instruction. So also τεκμήρια ἡμερῶν τεσσάρακοντα Acts i. 3 according to D.¹

An external (local) relation also is expressed in ἀλάβαστρον μύρου Mark xiv. 3 and κεράμον ἐδατος verse 18, cf. 1 Sam. x. 3 ἄγγεια ἄρτων, ἄσκος οίνου, Soph. El. 758 χαλάζεις σποδοῦ (see Schaeff. Longi Pastor. p. 386), Dion. H. IV. 2028 ἀσφαλτοῦ καὶ πίσσης ἄγγεια, Theoph. Ch. 17; Diog. L. 6, 9; 7, 3; Lucian. asin. 37; fugit. 31; Diod. S. Vatic. 32, 1. Under this head also comes Jno. xxi. 8 ὁ δίατον τῶν ἰχθύων (11 μεστῶν ἰχθύων), even ἄγγελoν χοίρον Matt. viii. 30 and ἐκατον βατόν ἐλαίου Luke xvi. 6. See on this Genitive of contents, Krii. 32.

¹Ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν is nowhere in the N.T. equivalent to ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν, but denotes even in Rom. i. 4 the resurrection of the dead, absolutely and generically, although consummated only in a single individual. The doctrinal remarks of Philippi on this expression are mere trifling.

β. The more remote internal relations are especially expressed by the Genitive in the writings of John and Paul; as, Jno. v. 29 170 ἀνάστασις Ἰωάννης, κρίσις, resurrection to life, resurrection to judgment (Genitive of destination, Theodor. IV. 1140 ἱερώτητις κεφαλοντων to the priesthood, cf. Rom. viii. 36 Sept. πράβατα σφαγῆς), Rom. v. 18 ἰδιωματικός Ἰωάννης justification to life, Mark i. 4 βάπτισμα μετανοια, baptism engaging to repentance, Rom. vii. 2 νόμος τοῦ ἄνδρος law of the husband, i.e. which lays down the relation to the husband (cf. Dem. Mid. 390a. ὁ τῆς βαλμείας νόμος the law of damage, frequently in the Sept. as in Lev. xiv. 2 ὁ νόμος τοῦ λεπροῦ, vii. 1; 202 xv. 32; Num. vi. 13, 21, see Fr. Rom. II. 9), vi. 6 σώμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας body of sin, i.e body which belongs to sin, in which sin has tenancy and lordship (in which sin is carried into effect), very like σώμα τῆς σαρκός Col. i. 22 body in which carnality permanently dwells;

¹ Others, with less probability, take ἡμέρων τεσσάρα, by itself: during forty days (Jacobs, Achill. Taž. p. 640 sq.); yet see below, No. 11, p. 207.
Rom. vii. 24 σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου τούτου body of this death, i.e. which (in the way described vs. 7 sqq.) leads to death, vss. 5, 10, and 13. See, further, Tit. iii. 5.

In Luke xi. 29 τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωάνᾶ is simply the sign once exhibited in Jonah (now to be repeated in the person of Christ). In the same way must Jude 11 be explained; but in Jno. xix. 14 παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα does not mean the day of preparation for the Passover, but simply and naturally the resting-day of the Passover (the day of rest belonging to the Paschal festival). In Heb. iii. 13 ἀνάτατη τῆς ἁμαρτίας is the Subjective Genitive, and ἁμαρτία is to be taken as a personification (Rom. vii. 11 etc.). Yet in 2 Thess. ii. 10 ἀνάτατη τῆς δικαιας is, deceit leading to unrighteousness. On Eph. iv. 18 see Mey., and on Jas. i. 17 de Wette. Further, in Eph. iii. 1; 2 Tim. i. 8; Philem. 1, 9 δεσμὸς Χριστοῦ a prisoner of Christ means one whom Christ (the cause of Christ) has made and keeps a prisoner,1 cf. Wisd. xvii. 2; in Jas. ii. 5 οἱ πτωχοὶ τοῦ κόσμου (if the reading is correct) the poor of the world signifies, they who in their position in the world are poor, poor therefore in worldly goods (though κόσμος itself does not on this account mean worldly goods). In Jno. vi. 45 διδασκόντων τοῦ θεοῦ instructed of God, that is by God, as in Matt. xxv. 34 οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς means blessed by the Father. In Eph. vi. 4, 11, 13 κυρίων and θεοῦ are genitivi auctoris, as also τῶν γραφῶν Rom. xv. 4. Likewise Phil. i. 8 ἐν συνάγωγοι Χριστοῦ Ἰ. is to be taken as the Subjective Genitive, though the more precise interpretation may be various. Cf. also Eph. vi. 4 and 171 Mey. Lastly, the correct interpretation of 1 Pet. iii. 21 does not depend so much on the Genitive συνειδήσεως ἁμαρτίας as on the meaning of ἐπιρρήμα; sponsio would accord perfectly with the context, but this rendering has not been lexically established either by de Wette or Huther. On Heb. ix. 11 see Bleek. In 1 Cor. i. 27 τοῦ κόσμου is the Subjective Genitive; see Meyer. In 1 Cor. x. 16 τὸ πονηρόν τῆς εὐλογίας means simply the cup of blessing, that is, over which the blessing is uttered; and in 21 ποτ. κυρίων 203 means cup of the Lord, where the closer relation of the Genitive is to be gathered from 16, just as in Col. ii. 11 that of Χριστοῦ is to be deduced from 14. Mey. gives a correct decision on Col. i. 14. In Acts xxii. 3 νόμον depends on κ. ἀκριβείαν.

1 As in Philem. 13 δεσμὸς τοῦ ἐναγ. means bonds which the Gospel has brought. Without reference to the parallel passages the above might be rendered: a prisoner belonging to Christ. Others translate it, a prisoner for Christ's sake. In the N.T. the Genitive is frequently so explained (Mth. 851; Krü. 31), yet always incorrectly. Heb. xiii. 13 τῶν ὀνειδισμῶν Χριστοῦ φέρωτε is: bearing the reproach which Christ bore (and still bears). So also 2 Cor. i. 5 παρασκευὴ τὰ πάθημα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς the sufferings which Christ had to endure, i.e. from the enemies of divine truth, come (new) abundantly upon us: for, the sufferings which believers endure (for the sake of divine truth) are essentially one with the sufferings of Christ,—only a continuation of them (cf. Phil. iii. 10). So also probably Col. i. 24 οἱ δόλοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ and 2 Cor. iv. 10. On the first passage, which has been very variously explained, see Lücke, Progr. in loc. Col. i. 24 (Götting. 1833, 4to.) p. 12 sq., and Huther and Mey. in loc.
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Some refer the Genitive ὀικοῦ in Heb. iii. 3 to τιμήν, greater honor of the house (i.e. in, from, the house), etc. This construction, though not of itself inadmissible, is, for this writer, stiff, and clearly opposed to his design; see Bleek.

On the Genitive of apposition in particular, as πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γορώπας 2 Pet. ii. 6 (urbs Romae), σημεῖον περιτομῆς Rom. iv. 11, see §§ 59, 8, p. 531.

3. It was long usual to regard the Genitive of Relationship as a Genitive with an ellipsis; as, Μαρία Ἰακώβου, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, 179 Δαιδὸς τοῦ Ἰσσα. But as the Genitive is the case of dependence, and as every relationship is a sort of dependence, there is no essential notion wanting in such expressions (Hm. Ellips. p. 120); only the thought which the Gen. expresses in a very general way (Plato, rep. 3, 408 b.) is left to be defined by the reader according to the facts in the case. Most frequently this Gen. implies son or daughter; as, Matt. iv. 21; Jno. vi. 71; xxi. 2, 15; Acts xiii. 22. But μήτηρ is to be understood in Luke xxiv. 10; Mark xv. 47; xvi. 1, cf. Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40 (Aelian. 16, 30 ὄλμπιας ἡ Ἀλεξάνδερου sc. μήτηρ), πατήρ in Acts vii. 16 Ἐμμὼν τοῦ Συχεί (cf. Gen. xiii. 19; similar in Steph. Byzant. under Δαίδαλο: ἡ πόλις ἀπὸ Δαίδαλον τοῦ Ἰκάρου), γυνὴ in Matt. i. 6 ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου and Jno. xix. 25 (see my RWB. II. 57 f.) cf. Aristoph. eccl. 46; Plin. epp. 2, 20 Verania Pisonis; ἀδελφὸς perhaps, in Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13 Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, if the same apostle is mentioned in Jude 1 (cf. Alciphr. 2, 2 Τιμοκράτης ὁ Μητροδώρου sc. ἀδελφός). Such designation in the circle of the Apostles might have arisen from the circumstance that James, the brother of Judas, was better known or more prominent than the father of Judas. See, in general, Bos, ellips. ed. Schaef. under the words; Boisson. Philostr. her. p. 307.

In 1 Cor. i. 11 οἱ Χλόης are, accordingly, Chloe's people, as in Rom. xvi. 10, 11 οἱ Ἀρωτοβούλων, οἱ Ναρκίσσου. A more definite explanation must be supplied by the facts of the case. Perhaps we should here understand, with most expositors, the members of the household of these persons. Others understand the slaves. To the original readers the expression was clear. Further, see Valcken, in loc.

204 Note 1. It is not unusual, especially in Paul's style, to find three Genitives connected together, and grammatically governed one by another. 172 Frequently, however, one of them is employed instead of an adjective:
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p. 44; Boisson. Babr. p. 116. In Rev. xiv. 10 (xix. 15) οὐς τοῦ θυμοῦ must be taken together: wine of wrath, burning wine, according to an O.T. figure. Four Genitives occur in Rev. xiv. 8 ἐκ τοῦ οἴου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς, xvi. 19; xix. 15 (Judith ix. 8; x. 3; xiii. 18; Wisd. xiii. 5, etc.). On the other hand, in 2 Cor. iii. 6 διακόνους καυχώς διαθήκης σου γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος the last two Genitives must, on account of verse 7, be considered as both dependent on the principal noun. In Rom. xi. 33 all the three Genitives, in the same way, refer to βάσις.

Note 2. Sometimes, particularly in Paul's epistles, the Genitive (when placed after) is separated from its governing noun by another word; as, 180 Phil. ii. 10 ἵνα τῶν γόνων κάμψη ἐσμενίων καὶ ἐπηγείων καὶ καταραθμίων (Genitives subjoined in explanation of τῶν γόνων), Rom. ix. 21 ὡς οὐκ ἔχει ἐκχύσειν ὅ ἄρμασιν τοῦ πειρατού; 1 Tim. iii. 6 ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα ἐμπίπτῃ τοῦ διαβόλου (probably for emphasis), 1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 7; Heb. viii. 5; Jno. xii. 11; 1 Pet. iii. 21. Otherwise still in Rev. vii. 17. On the other hand, in Eph. ii. 3 ἵμαν τέκνα φύσει ὄργαν, a different position of the words was hardly possible, if an unsuitable stress (ἵμαν φύσει τέκν. ὄργρ.) was not to fall on φύσει. See, in general, Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 46; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 241; Fr. Rom. II. 381.

Note 3. Rarely two Genitives of different relations (particularly the one of a person, the other of a thing), mostly also separated from each other by position, are joined to a single noun (Krat. 83), e.g. Acts v. 32 ἴτεις ἔσωμεν αὐτοῦ (Χριστοῦ) μάρτυρες τῶν ἁμάτων τούτων, 2 Cor. v. 1 ἐμένες ἢμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνου, Phil. ii. 30 τὸ ὑμών ἑστήκημα τῆς λευτερίας, 2 Pet. iii. 2 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐνοχῆς τοῦ κυρίου, [Matt. xxvi. 28 τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης,] Heb. xiii. 7, cf. Her. 6, 2 τὴν ἱλαρίν τὴν ἕκαμην τοῦ προς Δαρείων πολέμου, Thuc. 3, 12 τὴν ἐκείνην μέλλῃν τῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς δεινῶν, 6, 18 ὁ Νικόν τῶν λόγων ἐκφάνησαν, Plat. legg. 3, 690 b. τὴν τοῦ νόμου ἐκόπτων ἀρχήν, rep. 1, 329 b. τὰς τῶν οἰκείων προπληκάσεσι τῶν γῆς, Diog. L. 3, 37 and very strained Plat. Apol. 40 c. μετακόψες τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ τάφου τοῦ ἐνθῶν, see Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 329; ad legg. p. 84 sq.; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 219; Bttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 17, and Soph. Philocet. v. 751; Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 111 sq.; Bhd. 162; Mth. 864 (Kritz, Sallust. II. 170).

To this head we may also refer 1 Pet. iii. 21 σαρκὸς ἀπόστειλεν ῥύπον the flesh's putting away of filth (σὰρξ ἀποστείλεις ῥύπον), unless there be here a transposition.

In a different way two Genitives are connected together in Jno. vi. 1 ἧ ἐλασσάνα τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβερίας the Sea of Galilee, of Tiberias. 205 Under the last name alone it occurs the second time in Jno. xxi. 1. Perhaps for the sake of foreign readers John annexed the more definite to the more general designation (cf. Pausan. 5, 7, 3) that they might determine the locality more certainly. Beza in loc. takes a different view. Kühnöl's suspicion, that the words τῆς Τιβ. are a gloss, is hasty. The explanation 173 of Paulus, however, setting sail from Tiberias—if not at variance with 6th id.
classic prose, is opposed to the style of the N. T. (cf. Bornem. Acta p. 143), which, in such circumstances, prefers to the simple case the more vivid mode of expression by means of the preposition. ὥσ. cannot be made to depend on the ἀνά in ἀντίθεν.

Note 4. The Genitive, when placed before the governing noun, either a. belongs to two nouns at the same time, as in Acts iii. 7 ἀποκάλεσεν αὐτόν καὶ σφυρά, Jno. xi. 48, or b. is emphatic (Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 118; Mdv. 13), as e.g. in 1 Cor. iii. 9 θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσομαι συνεργός, θεοῦ γεώργος, θεοῦ ὀλοκληρόμενος, Acts xiii. 23 τοῦτον (Δαυΐδ) ὁ θεός ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος...

181 ἦγαγε σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦ, Jas. i. 26 ἀπὸ τοῦτου μάταιος ἡ θυρεόκεια, iii. 8; Heb. x. 36; Eph. ii. 8. The emphasis is not unfrequently founded in an expressed antithesis: Phil. ii. 25 τὸν συντραπέζην μου, ὡμ. δὲ ἀπόστολον καὶ λατρευόν τῆς χρείας μου, Matt. i. 18; Heb. vii. 12, 1 Pet. iii. 21; Eph. ii. 10; vi. 9; Gal. iii. 15; iv. 28; 1 Cor vi. 15; Rom. iii. 29; xiii. 4. The Genitive, however, for the most part contains the principal notion: Rom. xi. 13 ἰδοὺν ἀπόστολον ἀπόστολον τῶν Gentiles, 1 Tim. vi. 17 ἐπὶ πλούσους ἐν κληρονομίᾳ upon riches which are perishable, Tit. i. 7; Heb. vi. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 14. That the placing of the Genitive before the governing noun belongs to the peculiarities of diction of a particular author (Gersdorff 296 ff.), though not in itself impossible (since emphatic combinations are weakened by individual writers), at least cannot be shown to be probable. Cf. moreover, Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 248. Heb. vi. 2 is a difficult passage; βαπτισμὸς ἱδαχής (depending on θεμίλων) certainly belong together, and ἱδαχής cannot be torn away so strangely and regarded as the governing noun to all four Genitives, as Ebrard still maintains. But the question is, whether we should here admit a transposition for ἱδαχής βαπτισμοῦ, as most later expositors do. Such a transposition, however, would be at variance with the whole structure of the verse; and if βαπτισμοῦ ἱδαχής is translated doctrinal baptisms, baptisms in connection with instruction, to distinguish them from the legal baptisms (lustrations) of Judaism, this appellation is confirmed as distinctively Christian by Matt. xxviii. 19 βαπτίζοντες αὐτούς... ἱδαχής καινότες αὐτοῖς. Ebrard’s objection, that Christian baptism is distinguished from mere lustrations, not by instruction, but by the forgiveness of sins and regeneration, amounts to nothing, for Matt. xxviii. says nothing about the forgiveness of sins. As regards the use of the word βαπτισμός, and in the Plural too, what Tholuck has already remarked may be used also in support of the above explanation.

206 Note 5. Kühnöl and others consider περὶ with the Acc. in Mark iv. 19 αὐτὸν τὸ λοιπόν ἐπιθυμεῖ as a circumlocution for the Genitive. But, though Mark might have written αὐτόν τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπιθ., yet the former expression is not only more definite, but περὶ obviously retains its force: cupiditates, quae circ. rel. versatur (Heliod. 1, 23, 45 ἐπιθυμία περὶ τῷ Χαρίκλειον, Aristot. rhet. 2, 12 αὐτὸν τὸ σῶμα ἐπιθυμεῖ), just as (with the Gen.) in Jno. xv. 22. It is another thing when, in
Greek authors, \(\text{περί} \) with the Acc. is used as a circumlocution for the Genitive of an object to which a certain quality is ascribed, e.g. Diod. S. 66 \textit{ad} 11, 89 \(\text{ἡ περί τὸ \text{ιερὸν ἄρχαιον,} \) and again \(\text{περί τοὺς κρατήρας} \text{ιδῶμα} \) (cf. Schaeff. Julian, p. VI. and Dion. comp. p. 23). With more reason might it be said that in 1 Cor. vii. 37 \(\text{ἐξουσία περί τοῦ} \text{ἵλου} \text{θελήματος} \) this preposition is used with the Gen. as a circumlocution for the Genitive, because the Genitive alone might also have been employed; but \textit{power over} (with respect to) \(\text{his own will,} \) is at all events the more definite and full expression. Expositors find a similar circumlocution for the Gen. by means of \(\text{ἐπί} \) and \(\text{ἐκ} \) in Acts xxiii. 21 \(\text{τὴν} \) \(\text{ἐπί} \text{σου} \text{ἐπαγγέλλω,} \) 2 Cor. viii. 7 \(\text{τὴν} \) \(\text{ὑμῶν} \) \(\text{ἀγάπη.} \) This, however, is literally \(\text{amor qui a nobis proficiscitur, promissio a te 182} \) profecta, and is more precise than \(\text{ἡ} \) \(\text{ὑμῶν} \) \(\text{ἀγάπη,} \) which might also mean \(\text{ἡ} \) \(\text{amor in vos.} \) So Thuc. 2, 92 \(\text{ἡ} \) \(\text{ἐπί} \) \(\text{τῶν} \) \(\text{Ἀθηναίων βοήθεια,} \) Dion. H. IV. 2235 \(\text{πολὺ} \) \(\text{ἐκ τῶν} \) \(\text{παράστασεις καὶ} \) \(\text{θηλῶν,} \) Plato, rep. 2, 363 a. \(\text{τὰς} \) \(\text{αὐτῆς} \) \(\text{εἰδοκυμήσεις,} \) Demosth. pac. 24 b.; Polyaen. 5, 11; D. S. 1, 8; 5, 39; Exc. Vat. p. 117; Lucian. conscr. hist. 40; cf. Jacobs, Athen. 321 sq. and Anthol. pal. I. 1, 159; Schaeff. Soph. Aj. p. 228; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 329. Also Rom. xi. 27 \(\text{ἡ} \) \(\text{παρ'} \) \(\text{ὑμῶν} \) \(\text{διαθήκη} \) must be explained in the same way. Cf. Xen. C. 5, 5, 13; Isocr. Demon. p. 18; Arrian. Al. 5, 18, 10 (Fr. in loc. and Schoen. ad Isaeum p. 193). On Jno. i. 14 see Lucke. None of these passages contains an unmeaning circumlocution. And in 1 Cor. ii. 12 \(\text{φο} \) \(\text{τὸ} \) \(\text{πνεῦμα} \) \(\text{κοι} \) \(\text{όμου} \) \(\text{ἐλάβομεν,} \) \(\text{ἀλλὰ} \) \(\text{τὸ} \) \(\text{πνεῦμα} \) \(\text{ἐκ} \) \(\text{θεοῦ,} \) the apostle has of set purpose employed in the parallel \(\text{ἐκ} \) \(\text{θεοῦ} \) (not \(\text{ἐπὶ} \) \(\text{θεοῦ} \) \(\text{or} \) \(\text{ἐκ} \) \(\text{θεοῦ).} \) No tolerably attentive reader will admit the alleged circumlocution for the Gen. by means of \(\text{ἐν} \) (see Koppe, Eph. p. 60), in proof of which 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. ii. 21; Tit. iii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 7 are adduced. Nor does \(\text{kατά} \) constitute a mere circumlocution for the Genitive in the examples usually quoted. In Rom. ix. 11 \(\text{ἡ} \) \(\text{κατὰ} \) \(\text{κλάνθος πλάσθη} \) \(\text{means the purpose} \) according to, in consequence of, election. In Rom. xi. 21 \(\text{οί} \) \(\text{kατά} \) \(\text{φύσιν} \) \(\text{kλάδω} \) \(\text{are the branches according to nature i.e. the natural branches. So} \) Heb. xi. 7 \(\text{ἡ} \) \(\text{kατὰ} \) \(\text{πιστῶν διακοσμήσης.} \) In Heb. ix. 19, too, \(\text{kατὰ} \) \(\text{τῶν} \) \(\text{νόμων,} \) if referred to \(\text{πάρτι} \) \(\text{ἐντολῆς,} \) would not be put for \(\text{τῶν} \) \(\text{νόμων,} \) as Bleek perceived. Yet, see above, § 22, 7. More pertinent examples are found in Greek writers; as, Diod. S. 1, 65 \(\text{ἡ} \) \(\text{kατὰ} \) \(\text{τὴν} \) \(\text{ἄρχην} \) \(\text{ἀπόθεσις} \) \(\text{the abdication of the government} \) (literally, as regards the government), 4, 13; Exc. Vat. p. 103; Arrian. Al. 1, 18, 12; Mth. 866. On \(\text{εὐαγγ. κατὰ} \) \(\text{Matt.} \) etc. see 207 Fr. (cf. instances in the nova biblioth. Lubec. II. 105 sq.). It is quite erroneous to take \(\text{τὰ} \) \(\text{ἐς} \) \(\text{Χριστῷ παθήματα} \) 1 Pet. i. 11 for \(\text{τὰ} \) \(\text{Χριστοῦ} \) \(\text{παθήματα} \) (v. 1). It means (similar to \(\text{περὶ} \) \(\text{τής} \) \(\text{ἐς} \) \(\text{ὑμῶν χάριτος vs. 10}) \) \(\text{the sufferings} \) (destined) for Christ.

It is a different matter, when a Genitive dependent on a noun is rendered by means of a preposition because the (corresponding) verb prefers this construction; as, \(\text{kοινωνία} \) \(\text{ὑμῶν} \) \(\text{ἐς} \) \(\text{τὸ} \) \(\text{εὐαγγέλιον} \) Phil. i. 5 cf. iv. 15.

\footnote{2 Cor. ix. 2 ἐς ὑμῶν \(\text{ζήσας} \) \(\text{πρόθεσι} \) \(\text{τοὺς} \) \(\text{πλεονας} \) \(\text{is referable to attraction.} \)}
§ 30. GENITIVE.

So probably also ἐπεράτημα ἐσθ ὑμῶν (after God) 1 Pet. iii. 21, cf. 2 Sam. xi. 7 ἐπεράτην ἐσθ ὑμῶν.

4. The same sort of direct dependence occurs in the connection of the Genitive with verbal adjectives and participles whose signification is not such that they (the verbs from which they come) could regularly govern the Genitive (2 Pet. ii. 14 μεστοῦς μοιχαλίδος, Matt. x. 10 ἄξιος τῆς τροφῆς, Heb. iii. 1 κλήσεως μέτοχοι etc. see No. 8; Eph. ii. 12 ἔνοι τῶν διαθήκων etc.); as, 1 Cor. ii. 13 λόγοι διδακτοί πνεύματος ἄγλου, see above, p. 189, 2 Pet. ii. 14 καιρίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλευρομίας cf. Iliad. 5, 6 λειτουργοῦν ὧκεννου, Soph.

183 Aj. 807 φῶς ἡμετερίη, 1353 φίλων νικώμενος, and with 1 Cor. especially Soph. El. 344 κελών διδακτα, with 2 Pet. Philostr. her. 2, 15 θαλάττης οὗτοι γεγυμνασμένοι, 3, 1 Νείστορα πολέμου πολλῶν γεγυμνασμένον, 10, 1 σοφίας ἡδὴ γεγυμνασμένον, see Boisson. Philostr. her. p. 451. We resolve all these Genitives by a preposition: taught of (by) the Holy Spirit, bathed in the ocean, inured to the sea, etc. And perhaps in the simple language of antiquity the Genitive in such constructions was regarded as the whence case; see Hartung, S. 17. According to this view the two following passages also are easily explained: Heb. iii. 12 καιρίαν πονηρά ἄπτησις a heart evil (with respect to) unbelief (where ἄπτησις is that which establishes the πονηρία; substantively πονηρία ἄπτησις the Genitive (of apposition) would seem quite natural; similarly Wisd. xviii. 3 ἑλον ἄβλαβη φιλοτήμου χιενείας παράσχετε, see Monk, Eurip. Alcest. 751; Mth. 811, 818. Secondly, Jas. i. 13 ἀπειραστὸς κακῶν, which most expositors render: untempted (that cannot be tempted) by evil (cf. Soph. Antig. 847 ἀκλαύτως φίλων, Aeschyl. Theb. 875 κακῶν ἀτρυμονες Schwenck, Aeschyl. Eumen. 96); Schulthess, however, translates it: inexperienced in evil. The parallelism with πειράζει does not favor the last interpretation. The active acceptance in the Ethiopic version, not tempting to evil, is to be rejected more on the ground that the πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα following would be tautological (for the apostle, as the δὲ shows, 208 must intend to say something different from ἀπειρεῖ.), and also that ἀπειρεῖ does not occur in the active sense, than, as Schulth. thinks, on account of the Genitive κακῶν. The Genitive has great latitude of import, at least in the poets and in such writers as approach a poetic or rhetorical diction. Ἀπειρεῖ κακῶν might denote not tempting in respect to evil, just as well as in Soph. Aj. 1405 λοντρῶν

1 On the active and passive acceptance of verbals see Wcr, Soph. Antig. I. 162.
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όσιν ἐπικαρπός suitable for holy washings, or in Her. 1, 196 παρθένοι γάμων ὑπαίει ripe for marriage.

Paul’s expression ἐλθοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Rom. i. 6 should not be brought under this rule, as it is still done by Thiersch. It means, according to the apostle’s view of ἐλθοῦ elsewhere, Christ’s called, i.e. called (by God) who are Christ’s, belong to Christ. On the other hand, we may refer to this head ὅμοιος τινος Jno. viii. 55 (this adj. regularly governs the Dat. [which case, indeed, even in the passage just mentioned Lchm. placed in the text, but against the balance of authorities and against Cod. Sin. also]) Mttth. 873; 176 Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 104; III. 46 (on similis alicuius and the like, see Zumpt, lat. Gr. S. 365 f.), and ἔγγος with the Gen. Jno. xi. 18; Rom. x. 8; xiii. 11; Heb. vi. 8; viii. 13, etc., the usual construction here, along with which, however, ἔγγος τίνι occurs; see Bleck, Hebr. II. II. 209; Mttth. 812. Even adjectives compounded with σῶν are sometimes followed by the Genitive; as, σύμμορφος τῆς εἰκόνος Rom. viii. 29 (Mttth. 864).

5. Most closely related to the simple Genitive of dependence after substantives and in reality only an expansion of that Genitive into a clause, is the very common εἶναι or γίνεσθαι τινος. This construction has a still more diversified use in Greek prose (Kriu. 28 f.; Mdv. 57 f.; Ast, Lexic. Platon. I. 621), than in the N. T.; and was formerly explained by assuming that a preposition or a substantive was understood.

In the N. T. may be distinguished,

a. The Genitive of the whole, of the class (Plur.) and of the sphere (Sing.) to which one belongs, 1 Tim. i. 20 ἐν ἐστίν Ἰησοῦς of whom is (to whom belongs) Hym., 2 Tim. i. 15; Acts xxiii. 6 (1 Macc. ii. 18; Plato, Protag. 342 e.; Xen. A. 1, 2, 3), 1 Thess. v. 5, 8 οὐκ ἐσμέν νυκτὸς οὔδε σκότους ... ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας δύναται belonging to the night, to the day, Acts ix. 2.

b. The Genitive of the ruler, master, possessor, etc., Matt. xxii. 28 τῶν τῶν ἐπτὰ ἐσται γυνή; 1 Cor. iii. 21 πάντα ἡμῶν ἐστιν (Xen. A. 2, 1, 4; Ptol. 1, 8, 1), vi. 19 οὐκ ἐστίν ἐστὲν γερανόν ye are not your own — do not belong to yourselves, 2 Cor. iv. 7 οὐὴ ἡ ἐπερυμβολή τῆς δύναμεως ἧ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἢ ἡ ἡμῶν that ... may be God’s and not of us, x. 7 Χριστοῦ εἶναι, Rom. viii. 9 (similarly 1 Cor. i. 12 of heads of parties ἐγώ εἰμι Παῦλου, cf. Diog. L. 6, 82). Close to 209 this comes Acts i. 7 οὐκ ἡμῶν ἐστιν γυναι etc. it does not belong to you — it is not in your power to know (Plato, Gorg. 500 a.; Xen. Occ. 1, 2), Mark xii. 7 ἡμῶν ἐσται ἡ ἐλπισμομα (Matt. v. 3), 1 Pet. iii. 3, further Heb. v. 14 τελείων ἐστὶν ἡ στεραὶ τροφὴ belongs to (is for) mature persons, etc.
c. The Genitive of a quality in which one participates (sing. abstract), in diversified applications, 1 Cor. xiv. 38 οὐκ ἔστων ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεός, Heb. x. 39 ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἔσμεν ὑποστολής ... ἄλλα πίστεως etc. (Plato, apol. 28 a.). Likewise the concrete Gen. Acts ix. 2 τινὰς τῆς ὁδοῦ δίνας, particularly the Genitive of age, Mark v. 42 ἤμ᾽ ἐτῶν δόξεως, Luke ii. 42; iii. 23; Acts iv. 22; Tob. xiv. 2. 11; Plato, legg. 4, 721 a. In these passages the subject is a person, but in the following it is a thing: Heb. xii. 11 πᾶσα παιδεία οὗ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι is not (matter) of joy (this, however, might be referred also to a.), 2 Pet. i. 20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἵδιας ἐπιλύσεως οὗ γίνεται. Moreover, this construction of εἴμαι, when persons are the subject, is sometimes made more animated, in Oriental style, by the insertion of νῦν or τέκνον; cf. 1 Thess. v. 5 ὑμεῖς νῦν φωτίζε ἐστε καὶ νῦν ἡμέρας.¹

The same relations are expressed by the Genitive when the verb εἶναι is omitted, Phil. iii. 5 ἐγώ ... φυλίς Βεναμίν.

6. The Genitive, as the clearly defined case of departure, motion whence, appears, too, in the diction of the N. T., joined to verbs (and adjectives), with a diversity of application natural to this relation. (This diversity, however, is more copious in Greek prose, and in the N. T. the Gen. is frequently strengthened by prepositions.) As separation from is related to proceeding from, and as that which departs and is separated may often be conceived as a part of the remaining whole, the Genitive, because the case of proceeding from, is also naturally the case of separation and of partition. The former, the Genitive of separation and removal, as the more limited, we shall illustrate first.

As words which express the idea of separation or removal are usually construed with the Genitive by the Greeks even in prose,—e.g. ἀλευθεροῦ τινὸς to free from something, καλλίου, ἵπποχείου, παινείου, διαφέρειν, ὑστερεῖν τινὸς, see Mth. 829 ff., 845; Blay. 179 ff. (although in such circumstances suitable prepositions are pretty frequently inserted),—so in the N. T. also the following verbs are construed with the Genitive: μετασταθήναι Luke xvi. 4, ἀποστείλω 1 Tim. i. 6, παύεται 1 Pet. iv. 1, καλλίου Acts xxvii. 43 (cf. Xen. C. 2, 4, 23; Anab. 1, 6, 2; Pol. 2, 52, 8 a.), διαφέρειν Matt. x. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 41 etc. (Xen. C. 8, 2, 21, cf. Krü. Dion. H. p. 462), ἀπο- 210 στερείσθαι 1 Tim. vi. 5,² also ὑστερεῖν to be behind one 2 Cor. xi. 5;

¹ We Germans also say both du bist des Todes and du bist ein Kind des Todes. But this does not prove that the former expression is elliptical (Kuinoel ad Heb. x. 39).
² Lachm., on the authority of good Codd., has adopted in Acts xix. 27 ... μέλλειν τῷ
xii. 11, see Bleek on Heb. iv. 1 and ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν Eph. ii. 12.

The interposition of prepositions, however, predominates:

a. With verbs of disjoining, freeing, and being free, invariably (Mth. 665; Bhdv. 181); as, χαριζομαι ἀπὸ Rom. viii. 35; 1 Cor. vii. 10; Heb. vii. 26 (Plat. Phaed. 67 c., but Polyb. 5, 111, 2); λέειν ἀπὸ Luke xiii. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 27; ἐλευθεροῦν ἀπὸ Rom. vi. 18, 22; vii. 2, 21 (Thuc. 2, 71, also with ἐκ Mth. 880); ῥύεσθαι ἀπὸ Matt. vi. 18 (2 Sam. xix. 9; Ps. xvi. 13 f.), with ἐκ Luke i. 74; Rom. vii. 24, etc., Exod. vi. 6; Job xxxiii. 30; Ps. lxviii. 15; σώζειν ἀπὸ Rom. v. 9 (Ps. lxviii. 15), and more frequently with ἐκ, as in Jas. v. 20; Heb. v. 7 (2 Sam. xxii. 8 f.; 1 Kings xix. 17); ἀνεβάλλων ἀπὸ Tit. ii. 14; Ps. cxviii. 134 (but λ. τινος Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 710); καθαρίζων ἀπὸ 1 Jno. i. 7; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Heb. ix. 14, accordingly καθαρῶ ἀπὸ Acts xx. 26, cf. Tob. iii. 14; Demosth. Nesar. 528 c. (with ἐκ Appian. Syr. 59) and ἀθέω ἀπὸ (τῷ τῷ) Matt. xxvii. 24, cf. Krebs, observ. 78; Gen. xxiv. 41; Num. v. 19, 31, with Dat. Josh. ii. 17, 19 f.; similarly λάεσθαι ἀπὸ (concisely for by washing cleanse from) Acts xvi. 33; Rev. i. 5.

b. Where the construction with the Genitive alone is also used; as, ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐκ τῶν κόπων Rev. xiv. 13, πανσάτω τὴν γλώσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ 1 Pet. iii. 10 (Esth. ix. 16; Soph. Electr. 987; Thuc. 7, 186 73); ἑστερέω ἀπὸ Heb. xii. 15 is probably a pregnant construction. 178 ed.

The notion of separation and removal lies at the basis also of the Hellenistic construction κρύπτειν (τι) ἀπὸ τινος Luke xix. 42 (for which classic authors use κρύπτειν τινα τι); it is properly a constructio praenens (cf. Sept. 178 ed. Gen. iv. 14; xviii. 17; 1 Sam. iii. 18, etc.). To verbs of remaining behind anything (ἑστερέω τινος) may be referred 2 Pet. iii. 9 ὁ βραδύνει ὁ κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (ὁ βραδύνει ὁ κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας), cf. ἑστερέω τῆς βοηθείας Diod. S. 13, 110. Even the Syriac has joined ἐγγυ· with βραδινὴν.

7. The Genitive of proceeding from and of derivation occurs in prose in its simplest form in ἀρχομαι τινος I begin from (with) something (Hartung, 14), δέχομαι τινος I receive from somebody (Hm. Vig. 877), δέχομαι τινος I beg of some one (Mth. 844), ἀκούον τινος I hear from somebody; then γενομαι, ἐσθιοῦν τινος (e.g. ἄρτου, μέλιτος) I taste, eat, of something, ὄνυμμω τινος I derive advantage, enjoyment, 211 from something; finally δίδωμι τινος, λαμβάνω τινος I give, take, of something; Hm. Opusc. I. 178. The Genitive denotes in all these cases the object out of which hearing, eating, giving etc. comes;
§ 30. GENITIVE.

from which that proceeds which is eaten, tasted, given, etc.; and, in the last expressions, indicates the mass, the whole, of which a part is enjoyed, given, etc. Consequently these Genitives may be regarded also as Genitivi partitivi; for when the whole, or the object simply, is meant, the strict Object-case, the Accusative, is used. In the diction of the N. T. the Genitive, in many of those constructions, is strengthened by a preposition. As respects details we notice,

a. Ἀλομαί has without exception the Genitive of the person (Matt. ix. 38; Luke v. 12; viii. 28; Acts viii. 22, etc.), the object of request being subjoined in the Acc.; as, 2 Cor. viii. 4 δεόμενοι ἡμῶν τὴν χάριν etc. (Weber, Demosth. p. 168).

b. Of verbs of giving with the Genitive we have only one instance, Rev. ii. 17 δῶσον αὐτῷ τοῦ μάνα (where some Codd. have δ. α. φα-γεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ μ. as a correction). On the other hand, in Rom. i. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 8 the apostle could not have written μεταδίδων χαρίσματος or εὐαγγεῖου (Mtth. 798), as in the first passage a particular charisma as a whole (in fact he says χάρισμα τι) is meant; and in the second, the Gospel as something indivisible. Paul did not purpose to communicate a portion of (from) a spiritual gift, or a portion of (from) the Gospel.

c. Verbs of enjoying or partaking: προσλαμβάνεις τρόφης Acts xxvii. 36, μεταλαμβάνεις τρόφης Acts ii. 46; xxvii. 38 f., γεύεσθαι τοῦ δείπνου Luke xiv. 24 (figuratively Heb. vi. 4 γεύεσθαι τῆς δωρεᾶς; 187 τ. ἐποναριών, γεύεσθαι διδόντω Matt. xvi. 28; Luke ix. 27; Heb. ii. 9, etc.), and with Gen. of pers. Philem. 20 ἐγὼ σοὶ όναίμων ἐν κυρίῳ (cf. also Odys. 19, 68), Rom. xv. 24 ἦν ὑμῶν ... ἐμπληγαθώ. But γεύεσθαι governs also the Acc.: Jno. ii. 9 ἐγεύσατο τὸ ὄζωρ, 179 Heb. vi. 5 (as frequently in Hebraizing Greek, Job. xii. 11; Sirach xxxvi. 24; Tob. vii. 11; but probably never in Greek authors). 3

---

1 This very passage clearly shows the distinction between the Genitive and the Acc., for καὶ δῶσον ψῆφον λευκῇ follows; cf. Heliod. 2, 23, 100 στρέφεσθαι δ. μὲν τοῦ διατόμος, ὁ δὲ καὶ αἰσθήσεως.

2 Bengel, on Heb. vi. 4, appears to trifle in attempting to make a distinction in this passage between γεύεσθαι with the Gen. and with the Acc.

3 In the sense of eating up, consuming, φαγεῖν and ἔστειλεν have regularly the Acc. (Matt. xii. 4; Rev. x. 10): cf., for distinction, 1 Cor. ix. 7. They also take the Acc. when one’s food in general, merely, is described, — of which he ordinarily makes use, which he lives upon; e.g. Mark i. 6 ἐν ἑωράσεις ... ἔστειλεν ἄριστας καὶ μὴν ἥγησον, Rom. xiv. 21; Matt. xv. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 7; x. 3 f. (Jno. vi. 58), cf. Diog. L. 6, 45. It may be stated generally, that ἔστειλεν τί would in no passage be found to be entirely without justification (cf. even 2 Thess. iii. 12) and thus the absence of ἔστειλεν τῶν (together with ἂν or λεῖ παρασκευής) would cease to be strange. Luke xv. 16 ἂν τῶν ἐστειλαίμην ἐν ἑωράσεις καλ ἀνιμητοι πόλεως is probably an attraction. Besides, we find ἔστειλεν, πέμψας τί regularly in the Sept. also; only in Num. xx. 19 ἂν τοῦ διατόμος σου πάμεν occurs.
Verbs of eating of as well as giving and taking of are, moreover, 212 in the N. T. invariably joined to their nouns by prepositions:

a) By ἀπό; as, Luke xxiv. 42 ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ... ἀπὸ μελισσοῦ κηρίου, xx. 10; Matt. xv. 27 τὰ κυνάρια ἔσβλει ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχιῶν τῶν παιδίων (cf. τῷ ἔργῳ and φαγεῖν ἀπὸ Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 706), Luke xxii. 18 οὐ μὴ πῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἄμπελου, cf. Jer. li. (xxviii.) 7, Acts ii. 17 ἐκχεῖ ἀπὸ τ. πνεύματος μου (LXX.), v. 2 καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τυμῆς, Jno. xxi. 10 ἐνεγκατα ἀπὸ τῶν όψα-ριων, Mark xii. 2 ἦν ... λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἄμπελων.

b) By ἐκ; as, 1 Cor. xi. 28 ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἑσθιέτα, ix. 7 (2 Sam. xii. 3; 2 Kings iv. 40; Sir. xi. 17; Judith xii. 2); Jno. iv. 14 ἃν τῇ ἐκ τοῦ ἐδατος,1 vi. 50 ἰ ἄρτος ... ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ, 1 Jno. iv. 13 ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν. But we must not refer to this head Heb. xiii. 10 φαγεῖν ἐκ θυσιαστηρίου, as if it were equivalent to ἐκ τυραμίσ; for τυραμίσ means altar. To eat of the altar is simply equivalent to, of the sacrifice (offered on the altar). Probably there is no instance of ἐσθιέν ἀπὸ or ἐκ in classic Greek; but ἀπολαυέν ἀπὸ τιμὸς is akin to it, Plat. rep. 3, 395 c.; 10, 606 b.; Apol. 31 b.

c) Of verbs of perceiving, ἀκοῦω is constrained with the Genitive of the person (to hear from — out of — one), to hear one; as, Matt. xvii. 5; Mark vii. 14; Luke ii. 46; Jno. iii. 29; ix. 31; Rev. vi. 1, 3; Rom. x. 142 — (the object is expressed in the Acc., Acts i. 4 ἢ ἥκου-σατε μου, Lucian. dial. deor. 20, 13). Yet we find likewise ἂκούεν 188 τι ἀπὸ in 1 Jno. i. 5, ἐκ in 2 Cor. xii. 6 (also Odysse. 15, 374), παρὰ Ἰσραηλ. in Acts x. 22, where in classic Greek the Gen. alone would have been sufficient. A Genitive of the thing occurs with ἄκοινων in Jno. v. 25; Heb. iv. 7 ἅκ. φωνῆς, Luke xv. 25 ἥκουσε συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν, Mark xiv. 64 ἥκουσατε τῆς βλασφημίας, 1 Mac. x. 34; Bar. iii. 4 (Lucian. Halc. 2; gall. 10; Xen. C. 6, 2, 13, etc.). On the 180 other hand, the Accusative follows in Luke v. 1 ἄκοινων τὸν λόγον τ. θεοῦ, Jno. viii. 40 τῆς ἀλήθειας, ἢν ἥκουσα παρὰ τ. θεοῦ etc. In the last passages the object is referred to as a connected whole, and the hearing meant is intellectual; while in the previous passages

1 Otherwise in 1 Cor. x. 4 ἑκ τοῦ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθοῦσας πίτας, where Flatt's explanation is a failure.
2 Others, Rück. and Fr., take the Genitive of the person here ἄν ὁν ἥκουσαν thus: of ἀκον (de quo) they have not heard (as ἂκον τῶν 190 is used also in Ilid. 24, 490). This does not appear to me probable (the construction in this sense is entirely poetical), much less necessary: one hears Christ when one hears the Gospel in which he speaks; and thus ἂκον ἡμῶν ἡμᾶς Ἐφ. iv. 21 is said of those who have not heard Christ in person. Philippi on the passage is superficial.
the object is primarily certain sounds only, or words received by the bodily ear. Cf. Rost 582 f.

The Genitive with τουχάνεω (τουτοχάνεω) which invariably occurs in the N.T. (on the Acc. see Hm. Vig. 762; Bhdy. 176), as in Luke xx. 35; Acts xxiv. 3; xxvii. 3, etc., is perhaps in its origin to be explained by the preceding rule; yet we find it also where the whole object is meant. In the same way the earlier Greek authors almost always construe κληρονομέων (inherit, also participate in) with the Genitive (Kypke II. 381), but the later and the N.T. writers connect it with the Accusative of the thing; as, Matt. v. 4; xiv. 29; Gal. v. 21 (Polyb. 15, 22, 3) see Fischer-Well. III. 1. 368; Lob. Phryn. 129; Mthth. 802.

Lambda has the Accusative in Acts i. 17; 2 Pet. i. 1 λοτυμον ἡμῶν λαχοίν πίστιν (where πίστις does not mean faith in an ideal sense, the faith in which every Christian gets a share by his conversion, but the subjective faith of these Christians) Mthth. 801. But in Luke i. 9 the Gen. is used (to obtain by lot); cf. Brunck, Soph. Electr. 364; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 803.

8. In the foregoing examples we already perceive that the notion of proceeding from something slides over into that of participation in something; but the partitive import of the Genitive is still more plainly disclosed in such combinations as μετέχεων τινός, πληροῦν τινός, τηρήμαν τινός. With the Genitive are construed,

a. Words that express the notion of having a share, partaking, wanting (wishing to partake) Mthth. 797; as, κοινωνεῖ Heb. ii. 14, κοινωνός 1 Cor. x. 18; 1 Pet. v. 1, συγκοινωνός Rom. xi. 17, μετέχεων 1 Cor. ix. 12; x. 21; Heb. v. 13, μεταλαμβάνεων Heb. vi. 7; xii. 10, μέτοχος Heb. iii. 1, also χρήσεως 2 Matt. vii. 22; 2 Cor. iii. 1, etc., προσδείσασθαι Acts xvii. 25. But κοινωνεῖ also takes — and in the

189 N. T. more commonly — the Dat. of the thing; as, 1 Tim. v. 22 μὴ κοινωνεῖ ἀμαρτίας ἀλλοτρίας, Rom. xv. 27; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 Jno. 11 214 (Wis. vi. 25), and in a transitive acceptance εἰς, Phil. iv. 15 οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκουσώσειν εἰς λόγον δόσεως. Cf. Plat. rep. 5, 453b. δυνατῇ φύσις ἡ θήλεια τῇ τοῦ ἀρρένου γένους κοινωνήσαι εἰς ἀπαντα-tà ἔργα. Act. Apocr. p. 91. The Dat. of the thing with κοινωνεῖ and μετέχεω sometimes occurs in Greek authors (Thuc. 2, 16; Demosth. cor. c. 18) Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 77; and, in respect to κοινωνεῖ, is to be explained probably from the notion of community implied in the word (1 Tim., as above, cannot be resolved into

1 But according to good authorities [Sin. also] τουτοχάνεω has the Acc. in Rom. xi. 7; see Fr.

2 Though in Luke xi. 8 several Codd. have διὰ χρήσεως, neither from this, nor from the construction χρῆσεως τι (Mthth. 834), should it be concluded, as is done by Kähnö, that χρ. is construed with the Acc. also (in the sense of desiring, demanding).
Further, 181 metéchev is once construed with the interposition of ék, 1 Cor. x. 17 ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἁρτοῦ μετέχομεν. I am not aware that a similar instance is to be found in any Greek author.

b. Words of abounding, filling, 1 being empty, wanting (Mttth. 826 ff.); as, Rom. xv. 13 ὁ θεὸς πληρώσαι υμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης, Luke i. 53 πενωπάσαι ἐνπλησεν ἄγαθων, Acts v. 28 πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν (ii. 28 Sept.), Jno. ii. 7 γεμίσατε τὰς ύδριας ὕδατος (vi. 13), Matt. xxii. 10 ἐπλήσθη ὁ γάμος ἀνακειμένων (Acts xix. 29), Jno. i. 14 πλήρης χάριτος, 2 Pet. ii. 14 ὀφθαλμοὶ μεστοὶ μοιχαλίδος, Luke xi. 39 τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρτοπαγίς καὶ πονηρίας, Jas. i. 5 ἐλ τις ἵμων λείπεται σοφίας (Matthiae, Euphr. Hippol. 323), Rom. iii. 23 πάντες ἑστερέονται τῆς δύνασι τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Lob. Phryn. p. 237), see also Acts xiv. 17; xxvii. 38; Luke xv. 17; xxii. 35; Jno. xix. 29; Rom. xv. 14, 24; Rev. xvi. 8. Verbs of fulness are but rarely joined to ἀπό (Luke xv. 16 ἐπεθύμη γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλιὰν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν κερατίων, xvi. 21) or ἐκ (γεμίζει ἐκ Rev. viii. 5; χορτάζει ἐκ Rev. xix. 21, but χορτάζων τινὸς Lam. iii. 15, 29, μεθύειν and μεθύσκεσθαι ἐκ Rev. xvii. 2, 6 cf. Lucian. dial. d. 6, 3). 2 Altogether soecistic is Rev. xvii. 3 γέμον τὰ ὀνόματα cf. 4. [This soecism is probably to be explained by the analogy of πεπληραμένων καρπῶν δικαιος. Phil. i. 11 and the like.] The Dat. after πληροῦν, μεθύσκεσθαι etc. rests on a conception essentially different; see § 31, 7. How 1 Cor. i. 7 ὑπερείσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαράματι must be taken, is obvious; cf. Plat. rep. 6, 484 d.

c. Verbs of touching (Mttth. 308) so far forth as the touching 190 affects only a part of the object; as, Mark v. 80 ἄγαθον τῶν ἰματίων 31 ἑτέρων (vi. 56; Luke xxii. 51; Jno. xx. 17; 2 Cor. vi. 17, etc.), Heb. xii. 20 215 καὶ θηρίων θύγγ τοῦ ὄρου (xi. 28). Under this head comes also Luke xvi. 24 βάπτετε ὕδατος, Bhdy. 168 (βάπτετε εἰς ὁδόρ Plato, Tim. 73 e.; Ael. 14. 39).

d. Verbs of laying hold of, when only a part of the whole is taken hold of; as, Matt. xiv. 31 ἐκεῖνος τὴν κείρα ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ,

---

1 To this head may be referred also πλοῦτος with the Gen. Eurip. Orest. 394. In the N. T., however, the preposition ἐν is always used; as, Eph. ii. 4 πλοῦτος ἐν ἐλεί (rich in mercy), Jas. lii. 5. Cf. πλουτοῦς, πλουτοῦσθαι ἐν τοῖς Tim. vi. 18; 1 Cor. i. 5, etc.
2 On πληθύνειν ἀπὸ Athen. 13, 569 see Schweighauser. add. et corrig. p. 478. In Matt. xxiii. 25 ἀρεταῖς γυμνοῖς (cup and platter) ἐξ ἁρτοῦ καὶ καρπασίας is probably to be rendered: they are filled from plunder, their contents arise from plunder. Luke, on the other hand, transfers the fulness to the Pharisees themselves, and therefore writes: τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἁρτοῦ etc. Likewise ἐκ τῆς ἄμαχης ἐν Jno. xii. 3 ἡ οἷα ἐπελειπθῇ ἐκ τῆς ἄμαχης τοῦ μύρου does not stand for the Genitive, but denotes that whereas the filling of the house came; it was filled from (by) the odor of the ointment (with fragrance).
cf. Theoph. ch. 4 (with his hand he could take hold of Peter, just in the act of sinking, by a part of the body only, perhaps by the arm), Luke ix. 47; in a different application Mark ix. 27 κρατήσας αὐτὸν τῆς χειρός, Acts iii. 7 πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρός (by the hand), cf. Plato, Parm. 126; Xen. A. 1, 6, 10; hence usually with the Genitive of a limb; as, Luke viii. 54 κρατήσας τῆς χειρός αὐτῆς, Acts xxiii. 19 (Isa. xii. 18; xlii. 6; Gen. xix. 16). On the other hand, κρατεῖν or λαμβάνειν, ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τινα always denotes seize, apprehend one, i.e. his whole person; as, Matt. xii. 11; xiv. 3; xvii. 28; Acts ix. 27; xvi. 19; [xviii. 17. Yet it is doubtful whether ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι is ever joined to an Acc. of the person, since (according to the analogy of Luke xiv. 4 ἐπιλαβόμενον ἱππατό aitw) the Acc. in Acts ix. 27 is probably governed by ἰγαγεν, in xvi. 19 by ἐλκυσαν, in xviii. 17 by ἐτυπτον. See also Mey. on Acts ix. 27 (3d ed.), and Bttm. Gramm. des neuest. Sprachgebr. p. 140]. The same distinction is observed in the figurative use of these verbs; as, Genitive, Heb. ii. 16; Luke i. 54; 1 Tim. vi. 2 (Xen. C. 2, 3, 6); Accusative; 2 Thess. ii. 15; Col. ii. 19, etc. But κρατεῖν hold fast Heb. iv. 14 and vi. 18 and ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι lay hold of 1 Tim. vi. 12, 19 (Ael. 14, 27), are construed with the Genitive; in both instances, however, with reference to a good which is destined for many (ὅμολογία, ἠλπις), and which the individual, for his respective part, holds fast or attains. See, in general, Mtth. 803 f. In an ideal sense ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι is construed with a double Genitive; as, Luke xx. 20 ἵνα ἐπιλαβόμεναι αὐτὸν λόγον that they might catch him by a word, 26 ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτὸν ῥήματος (cf. literally Xen. A. 4, 7, 12). Lastly, to this head is to be referred the construction ἔχεσθαι τινος, hold by, adhere to anything (pendere ex), Bleek, Heb. II. II. 220 f.; Mtth. 803, and ἀντέχεσθαι τινος. Both these verbs are thus used in the N. T. only in a figurative sense; as, Heb. vi. 9 τὰ κρεῖςσονα καὶ ἑχόμενα σωτηρίας, Matt. vi. 24 τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καθαφρονήσει, 1 Thess. v. 14 ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἀσθενῶν, Tit. i. 9 ἀντέχομενος τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου. Also ἀντέχεσθαι τινος endure any thing or any one, comes under this head, for it denotes properly to hold to a person or thing (Matt. xviii. 17; Heb. xiii. 22; Eph. iv. 2), cf. Kypke II. 93; likewise ἐνοχὸς (ἕνεχομενὸς) τινος, as Matt. xxvi. 66 ἐνοχὸς θανάτου, or 1 Cor. xi. 27 ἐνοχὸς τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου (Jas. 216 ii. 10), for in all cases a being held by, bound to, something is expressed,—in the first passage, to a punishment which must be 191 suffered, in the second, to a matter for which satisfaction is due. See Fr. Mt. p. 223; Bleek, Hebr. II. I. 340f.; cf. § 31, pp. 210, 213.
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Note 1. The partitive Genitive is sometimes governed by an adverb; as, Heb. ix, 7 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐναυτοῦ once a year, [Matt. xxviii. 1 ὁ υἱὸς οἰκοδόμων], Luke xviii. 12; xvii. 4 (Ptol. geogr. 8, 15, 19; 8, 29, 31; 8, 16, 4, etc.) cf. Mdv. 54.

Note 2. The partitive Genitive occurs not merely in dependence, it also makes its appearance sometimes as subject; as, Xen. A. 3, 5, 16 ὅπως ... ἐπιστάυον καὶ ἐπιμανθαίαν σφόν τε πρὸς ἑκείνους καὶ ἑκατάν πρὸς αὐτούς and (some) of them have intercourse with those; of those, with them, Thuc. 1, 115 (Theophan. I. 77). In the N. T. a similar construction occurs in Acts xxiii. 16 συνήλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν σὺν ἦμα (cf. Pseudarist. p. 120 Haverc. ἐν οἷς καὶ βασιλικοὶ ἤσαν καὶ τῶν τιμωμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως). In such cases, however, the Genitive is regularly accompanied by a preposition; as, Jno. xvi. 17 ἐπὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ etc.

9. Moreover, the Genitive is easily to be recognized as the whence case when joined

a. to verbs of accusing, arraigning (sentencing) as Genitive of the thing (Mith. 848), e.g. Acts xix. 40 κυνυνεύομεν ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως, xxv. 11 οὐδὲν ἐστώ ὅν οὕτω καταγγείλοι μου, Luke xxiii. 14 οὐδὲν εἰρήν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αὐτοῦ διὸν καταγγείλετε κατ' αὐτοῦ (yet we find also περὶ τινος de aliqua re Acts xxiii. 29; xxiv. 13, cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 7, 2, like κρίνεσθαι περὶ τινος Acts xxiii. 6; xxiv. 21); for the offence of which one is accused is that from, out of which 183 the καταγγελεῖ arises, or proceeds. We must not, however, fail to mention that the two preceding verbs are usually in Greek authors construed differently, viz. καταγγελεῖ τινος τι (a construction which can hardly be proved to occur in the N. T. from Mark xv. 8, cf. Lucian. necyom. 19) and ἐγκαλεῖ τινι τι Mith. 849 f.1

b. to κατακαυχάσθαι boast one’s self of a thing (borrow glory from something) Jas. ii. 13. On the other hand, the construction ἔπαινειν τινά τινος (4 Macc. i. 10; iv. 4; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 661) does not occur in the N. T.; for in Luke xvi. 8 τῆς ἀδίκιας is undoubtedly to be joined to οἰκονόμος, and the object of ἔπαινειν is expressed only in the clause ὅτι φρονήσω ἐποίησεν. In general, 217 see on the former construction (Sinentis) in the Leipz. L. Z. 1833, I. 1135. Like ἔπαινειν the verb μοσεῖ has in later Greek the Genitive of the thing (Liban. Oratt. p. 120 d.; Cantacuz. I. 56).

c. to verbs signifying to emit an odor (smell, breathe hard), Mth.

---

1 How καταγγελεῖ (properly, maintain, assert against one) comes by the Genitive of a person (Matt. xii. 10; Luke xxiii. 2, etc.), is obvious; but καταγγελεῖν τινος 1 Jno. iii. 20 f. is construed exactly in the same manner (Mth. 860). Instead of ἐγκαλεῖ τινι (Sir. xvi. 19) we find in Rom. viii. 33 ἐγκαλ. κατά τινος, which is as easily accounted for as καταγγελεῖ εἰς τινα Maitzen, Antiph. 207.
856; for in δὲ ἔξω τῶν the Genitive denotes the substance from which the δὲ ἔξω emanates. In the N. T. this Gen. occurs only in a 192 figurative sense, Acts ix. 1 ἐμπνέων ἄπειλής καὶ φόνου panting with, breathing of, threatening and slaughter, cf. Aristoph. eq. 437 οὖν ἄπνοι κακίας καὶ συνομαθίας πτει Heliod. 1, 2; Ephraem. 2358. Different from this are φόνου πνεύματε Theocr. 22, 82, θυμὸν ἔπνευεν Eurip. Bacch. 620, where the direct object is expressed: breathing murder, courage, the verbs being used as transitive.

10. The Genitive appears to be removed a little farther from its original import, when joined

a. to verbs of feeling, in order to denote the object towards which the feeling is directed; as, σταμαχεσθαι τινος Matt. xviii. 27. But in German also, sich jemandes erbarmen, we find the Genitive construction; and in Greek the object was unquestionably conceived as operating upon the feeling subject, consequently, as the point from which the feeling proceeds, i.e. is generated. Most verbs of this kind, however, are construed with the Acc., conformably to a different conception of the relation; see § 32, 1 and Hartung, S. 20.

b. to verbs of longing and desiring (Mthh. 824 f.), where we commonly say, long for something, hanker after, etc. But the Greek conception of ἐπιθυμεῖν τινός (except in connections where the Gen. can be taken partitively, as ἐπιθυμ. σοφίας, to desire of wisdom) was such that the longing, the desire, proceeds from the good in question,—the good things of themselves entice men to longing. In the N. T. ἐπιθυμεῖν invariably (in Matt. v. 28 alone we find a var.) takes the Genitive; as, Acts xx. 33 Ἀργετίῳ ὁ χρυσός ὁ ἰματισμὸς σοῦ ἐπιθύμησα (1 Tim. iii. 1), so also ὁ ὀργάνωσα 1 Tim. iii. 1 εἰ τις ἐπισκοπής ὀργάζεται, καλὸν ἐργὸν ἐπιθυμεῖ (Isocr. Demon. p. 24 ὀργάζεται τῶν καλῶν ἐργῶν Lucian. Tim. 70), Heb. xi. 16, and ἑμείσθαι 1 Thess. ii. 8. Likewise in the Sept. and the Apocrypha (Wisd. vi. 12; 1 Macc. iv. 17; xi. 11, etc.) we find ἐπιθυμεῖν τινός the rule (ὁργάσθαι does not occur there at all), though the verb already begins to be joined as transitive to the Acc. Exod. xx. 17; Deut. v. 21; vii. 25; Mic. ii. 2; Job xxxix. 20, cf. Wisd. xvi. 3; Ecclus. xvi. 1. The verb ἐπιποθεῖν appears constantly with the Acc. even in the earlier Greek (because the 218 construction was thus resolved in thought: ποιεῖν or πιθὼν ἔξω ἐπι τι, after something, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 81), Plat. legg. 9, 855 e.; Diod. S. 17, 101; cf. 2 Cor. ix. 14; Phil. i. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 2. Likewise πεινήν and διψήν, which in Greek authors regularly take the
Genitive, are joined in the N. T. in a figurative sense (in reference to spiritual blessings) with the Acc. (φιλωσοφίαν δυσ. Epist. Socr. 25 p. 53 Allat.) Matt. v. 6 πεισώντες καὶ διψώντες δικαιοσύνην. ¹ The difference between these two constructions is obvious: δυσ. φιλωσοφίας means to have a thirst for philosophy, while δυσ. φιλωσωφίαν represents philosophy as something indivisible which one wishes to get possession of.

Next to the verbs already mentioned follow, c. those of thinking of, remembering (Mth. 820); as, Luke xvii. 32 μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ [1 Thess. i. 3], Luke i. 72 μνησθῆναι διαθήκης, Acts xi. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 2; Luke xxiii. 42; Heb. xiii. 2; Jude 17; 2 Pet. iii. 2 (also ὑπομνήσκειν τω δερ μεγας 2 Pet. i. 12). We, too, say: einer Sache gedenken, think of a matter, for this process is simply the seizing, laying hold of, a particular with the memory. Correspondingly, in the case of forgetting a thing, Heb. xii. 5 ἔκλησθη τῆς παρακλήσεως, vi. 10 ἐπιλαβέοντας τοῦ ἐργοῦ ὑμῶν, xiii. 2, 16. But ἀναμνησκόμεναι Heb. x. 32; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Mark xiv. 72 and μνημονεύειν Matt. xvi. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xviii. 5 often govern the Accusative (Mth. 820), yet rather in the sense of having present in the mind, holding in remembrance (Bhyd. 177); ἐπιλαυ-θέαον likewise is joined to this case in Phil. iii. 14, so sometimes in the Sept. (Deut. iv. 9; 2 Kings xvii. 38; Isa. lxv. 16; Wisd. ii. 4; Ecclus. iii. 14), and even in Attic (Mth. 821). This double construction rests on a different view of the relation, of which there is a glimpse also in Latin. Verbs of mentioning do not take the Genitive in the N. T.; but we find, instead, μνημον. περὶ Heb. xi. 22 (cf. μνησκόμεναι περὶ Xen. C. 1, 6, 12; Plut. paedag. 9, 27; Tob. iv. 1).

d. Further, the transition is easy to verbs of caring for or neglecting (Mth. 821), Luke x. 34 ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ (1 Tim. iii. 5), 1 Cor. ix. 9 μη τῶν βοῶν μελεί τῷ θεῷ; (Acts xviii. 17; Plut. paedag. 17, 22), Tit. iii. 8 ἵνα φροντίζωσι καλῶν ἐργῶν, 1 Tim. v. 8 τῶν ἱδίων ὑπὸ προσώπου, 1 Tim. iv. 14 μη ἄμελει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρὶματος (Heb. ii. 3), Heb. xii. 5 μη δινόγορε παιδείας κυρίων. Under this head comes also φειδέσθαι (Mth. 822), Acts xx. 29 μη φειδομένοις 185 τοῦ ποιμνίου not sparing the flock, 1 Cor. vii. 28; 2 Pet. ii. 4. etc. ⁶⁶d

¹ In the Sept. this verb is found with the Dat. Ex. xvii. 3 διήρησον δ λαώς διατι (for water). Likewise in Ps. xiii. 2 the Cod. Vat. has διήρησον καὶ (θεός, al. se) ἥψῃς μοῦ.
² In Latin parcere aliti. But in the Greek φειδέσθαι, judging from the construction, lies rather the notion of restraining one's self from, sibi temperare etc. In the Sept., however, this verb also takes the Dative, and is construed with prepositions.
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219 On the other hand, we find μὲλει also with περι in Matt. xxi. 16; Jno. x. 13; xii. 6, etc. (Her. 6, 101; Xen. C. 4, 5, 17; Hiero, 9, 10, etc.; Wisd. xii. 13; 1 Macc. xiv. 43, cf. Strange in Jahn’s Archiv II. 400).

c. Lastly, verbs of ruling (Mtth. 838) take the Genitive as the simple case of dependence (for to this the notion of preceding also reduces itself, Hartung, S. 14): Mark x. 42 οἱ δοκοῦντες ἀρχεῖν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύοντοι αὐτῶν (Rom. xv. 12 LXX.), cf. also κυριεύων Rom. xiv. 9; 2 Cor. i. 24, αὐθεντεῖν 1 Tim. ii. 12, κατακυριεύειν Jas. ii. 6, ἀυθυπατεῖν Acts xviii. 12 etc.—verbs all derived from nouns, and whose construction is to be resolved thus: κυρίον τινός ἐσαι, ἀυθυπατός τινος ἐσαι. On the other hand, βασιλεύων τινός 194 (Her. 1, 206 and Sept.) never occurs in the N. T.; but we find instead, conformably to the Heb. idiom (יִצָּע with verbs of ruling, Ps. xlvii. 9; Prov. xxviii. 15; Neh. v. 15) βασ. ἐπὶ τινὸς Matt. ii. 22; Rev. v. 10, or ἐπὶ τῶν Luke i. 33; xix. 14, 27; Rom. v. 14; cf. Lob. Phryn. 475.

Verbs of buying and selling take the Genitive of the price (Bhdy. 177 f. Mdv. 67 f.); as, Matt. x. 29 οἵ δὲ δύο πρόφυλα διοικοῦσιν πωλοῦται—xxvi. 9 ἰδοῦντο τοῦτο πραβήται παλαιά, xx. 13; Mark xiv. 5; Acts v. 8 (Plato apol. 20 b.) 1 Cor. vi. 20; cf. Rev. vi. 6—Bar. i. 10; iii. 30 (but Matt. xxvii. 7 γεροφασαν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν viz. ἀργυρίων, Acts i. 18). Acts vii. 16 ὁ νῆσαρχος τῆς ἀργυρίων (with ἐκ Palaeph. 46, 3, 4). Also under this head comes Jude 11 ζη πλάνη τοῦ βαλαμμὸν μετὰ θυσίαν ἐξεκυρίσας for ἐξεκυρίσας (Xen. C. 3, 2, 7; Plat. rep. 9, 575 b.). Agreeably to the construction with ἐκ, and still more in view of the fundamental import of the Genitive, this genitivus pretii might be reduced to the notion of proceeding from (cf. Eng. proceeds), as that which is bought for a price comes to us, as it were, out of the price given. But it is probably more correct to refer this construction to the Genitive of exchanging, and to compare such phraseology as ἄλλασσεν τί τινος (Hartung, 15; Mthh. 483); for one buys or sells in exchange for so much money. Hence in Greek ἄντι [cf. Heb. xii. 2, 16] is the preposition of price. (A different view will be found in Hm. Opusc. I. 179; see on the other hand Prüfer de graecae et lat. declinat. 98 sq.) However, the construction ἄλλασσεν. διαλλάσσει τί τινος does not itself occur in the Greek Bible, but in Rom. i. 28 we find the more explicit ἄλλασσεν τινι κακιν as in the Sept. (after the Heb. יִשָּׁע) Ps. cv. 20. Ἀλλασσεν τί τινι comes nearest to this (Her. 7, 152; Sept. Exod. xiii. 13; Lev. xxvii. 10, and frequently). Moreover, words of valuing, estimating, etc. stand on the same footing with verbs of buying, etc., and govern in like manner the Genitive (Krtt. 44); cf. ἔκ τις Matt. iii. 8; x. 10; Rom. i. 32, ἔχων 2 Thess. i. 11; 1 Tim. v. 17; Heb. iii. 3, etc.
11. The Genitive of place and of time is employed without being directly governed by a single word, yet in accordance with the primary import of the case (Hm. Vng. 881; Hartung, 32 ff.) and in obvious connection with the structure of the sentence; as, Aesch. Prom. 714 ξαμάς χειρὸς σιδηροτέκτονες οἰκονομικον Χάλκης on the left hand (Her. 5, 77), Xen. Eph. 5, 13 ἐκεῖνης τῆς ἡμέρας that day, Philostr. her. 9, 3 f. χειμῶνος in winter, 'of a winter,' Thuc. 3, 104 (Mth. 857 f.). The N. T. writers, in this case, almost invariably employ a preposition. Only in certain standing phrases do they use the Genitive alone (which is strictly a partitive Genitive); as, often νυκτός by night, also μέσης νυκτός Matt. xxv. 6, ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός Luke xviii. 7; Acts ix. 24 (Xen. A. 2, 6, 7), χειμῶνος Matt. xxiv. 20 (joined with σαββάτῳ), Luke xxiv. 1 δρόμου βαθέος, v. 19 μὴ εὑρόστε, πολιμ (ὁδοῦ) ἐσπευγκαλων αὐτῶν (by) what way, xix. 4 (ἐκεῖνης sc. ὁδοῦ), Gal. vi. 17 τοῦ λοιποῦ (Thuc. 4. 98) cf. the German des weitem. (But for the very reason that the Genitive of time is confined in the N. T. to simple and current phrases, Acts i. 3 ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα in D must not be translated within forty days (Mth. 858), see above 2, a. Had such been Luke's meaning, he would undoubtedly have employed a preposition.)

Rev. xvi. 7 ἡκονοια τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγοντος is certainly not to be referred to this head (I heard speaking from the altar, cf. Soph. El. 78; Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 142; Bttm. Philoct. 115; Bhyd. 137); but, in accordance with the analogous expressions in verse 5 and vi. 3, 5, it must be translated I heard the altar speaking; see Bengel in loc. This prosopopoeia may be attributed to the strangely mysterious character of these visions, see de Wette. The reading ηκ. ἀλλον ἐκ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λεγ. is a manifest correction. On Τωθεράδος Jno. vi. 1 see above, p. 191.

Note. Genitives absolute, which often occur in the historical style even in the N. T., are not in their original application properly absolute, but come under the Genitive as the case defining time, cf. Hartung, S. 31 (hence they correspond to Ablatives absolute in Latin). Subsequently, however, they are used in a more extended reference, especially to specify the cause and condition (also involved in the Genitive). We have merely to remark here, that they sometimes occur where the nature of the verb following would lead one to expect a different oblique case: Luke xvii. 12 ἐκφοβόμενοι αὐτῶν. . . ἀπήγερσαν αὐτῷ, xxii. 10, 53; xviii. 40 ἑγγίζωντο αὐτῶν ἐπιρώπησαν αὐτῶν, Mark xi. 27; Acts iv. 1; xxi. 17; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Jno. iv. 51. This is usual likewise in Greek authors, partly because at the beginning of the sentence the writer had not yet decided on the principal verb, and partly because the regular construction would often render the expression clumsy, cf. Her. 1, 41; Thuc. 1, 114;
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221 3, 13; Xen. A. 2, 4, 24; Mem. 4, 8, 5; Pol. 4, 49, 1; Xen. Eph. 4, 5; Heliod. 2, 30, 113; Wytenbach, Plut. Mor. II. 21; Schaeff. Apollon. Rh. II. 171 and Dem. II. 202; Poppo, Thuc. I. 2, 119; Siebelis, Pausan. II. 8; Hoffmann, Pr. de casib. absol. p. 1; Likewise 2 Cor. iv. 18 αἰώνιον βάρος 187 δόξης καταργάζεται ἡ μία, μη σκοποῦντων ἡ μίαν τὰ βλέπομενα might have been expressed thus: μη σκοποῦσι τὰ βλέπ. By the former construction, however, the participial clause is brought out with more prominence and force. Cf. Xen. C. 6, 1, 87. Finally, Genitives absolute are exceptionally used when the subject of the principal clause (in the Nominative) is the same as that of the secondary clause; as, Matt. i. 18 μνημείωσις τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, πρὶν ἡ συνελθὼν αὐτοῦ, εὐφέρη ἐν γαστρὶ ἐξούσα, where the writer probably had contemplated another termination of the sentence. So perhaps Rev. xvii. 8. In Greek authors such instances are rare; yet see Her. 5, 81; Plat. rep. 8, 547 b; Pol. 31, 17, 1, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 119 sq.; Wannowski, p. 61 sqq. In the Sept. notice Gen. xlv. 4; 196 Exod. iv. 21; v. 20; xiv. 18; cf. Acta apocr. p. 68, 69; Epiphan. vii. p. 326, 340, 346 (in the 2d vol. of the Works of Epiphan. ed. Colon.); in Latin, Suet. Tib. 31. In all these instances Genitives absolute appear as fixed forms of expression, their grammatical origin being no longer taken into consideration.

§ 31. DATIVE.

In Greek the Dative is the more comprehensive in its import, because it represents the Ablative also, which in Latin is a separate case (cf. Hm. emend. rat. p. 140). Its relation to a sentence is not (in general) close and essential, like that of the Acc. or even the Gen.; but it serves merely to complete and extend, inasmuch as it points out the object (mostly a person) towards which an action tends, to which it has reference, yet on which it does not directly terminate. Hence the Dative frequently accompanies an Acc. of the object; as, 2 Cor. ix. 2 προθυμία ἢν καυχῶμαι Μακεδόνων, Acts xxii. 25 προέτειναν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἰδίοις τῶν (Kuin. in loc.), xxiv. 5; Jno. vi. 13. In a looser application (to things) the Dative denotes what in any way accompanies the action, as motive, power, circumstance (of time and place), etc.

222 1. We shall first consider the Dative as the case of reference (of the more remote object, as it is commonly called) when joined to transitive verbs—as, δἰδώνοις (δωρεάνδρα) τί τινι, γράφειν τί τινι (2 Cor. ii. 8), εἰκαγγελικέοσθαλ τινι τι (Luke ii. 10; 2 Cor. xi. 7),

1 From the Latin compare Ablat. absol. in Cic. Phil. 11, 10; fam. 15, 4, 18; Caes. b. gall. 5, 4; civ. 1, 36; 2, 19; 3, 21.
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its force is more or less distinct,

a. In ἀκολουθεῖν, ἐγγίζειν, κολλάσθαι, στοιχεῖν (Rom. iv. 12 etc.), δεδέσθαι (Rom. vii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 27), ἐντυχεῖν τινί etc., also εὐχεσθαι τινι Acts xxvi. 29.


c. In πιστεύειν, τηροῦναι, ἀποστείλειν, ἀπείρω, ἄποτεῖν, ὡπακούειν, ὕπηκοος, ἀκανθίος, etc.

d. In προκύψειν, λατρεύειν (not Phil. iii. 8), δουλεύν.

e. In ἀφέσεω, ἀρκεῖν Matt. xxv. 9; 2 Cor. xii. 9, ἀρκετός and ἰκανός Matt. vi. 34; 1 Pet. iv. 3; 2 Cor. ii. 6.

f. Further, in ξενίσθαι τινι 1 Pet. iv. 12 (Thuc. 4, 85) be sur-, prised at a thing (the surprise being in reference to the thing), ἀπολογεῖσθαι (2 Cor. xii. 19; Acts xix. 38 cf. 1 Pet. iii. 15) and διαλέγεσθαι τινι (Acts xvii. 2; xviii. 19), διακατελέγεσθαι τινι Acts xviii. 28 (δοματίσειν τινι cf. Col. ii. 20), where the person to whom the conversation, defence, etc. is addressed, is indicated by the Dative. Also ὄμωσιν and ἐξουσιοδοθεῖν τινι (Jas. v. 16), even in the sense of praise (τιτιν) Luke x. 21; Rom. xiv. 11; 197 Heb. xiii. 15, since every act of praise to God is a confession made to him, that we recognize him as the High and Mighty One. So in one instance also αἰνεῖν τινι Rev. xix. 5 according to the best Codd. [Sin. too], cf. Ecclus. li. 12; in this case, too, τιτιν was probably in mind,—unless the construction is ad sensum like εἰπεῖν αἴνεων.

g. In κρίνεσθαι Matt. v. 40, διακρίνεσθαι τινι Jude 9 (Jer. xv. 10) to go to law, to contend with one.

h. In verbs of likeness or similarity,—under another point of view—Matt. xxiii. 27 ὀμοίάζετε τάφος κεκοιμαμένοις, vi. 8; Heb. ii. 17; 2 Cor. x. 12 cf. ὄμωσις, ἰσος τινι Matt. xi. 16; Jno. ix. 9; 1 Jno. iii. 2; Acts xiv. 15; Matt. xx. 12; Phil. ii. 6; cf. Fr. Arist. amic. p. 15 (ὅμωσι) also once with the Genitive, Jno. viii. 55; Mth. 878; cf. § 30, 4), and verbs of participating in; as, 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 18 cf. Luke v. 10; Rom. xv. 27 (these verbs have more frequently the Gen. § 30, 8). Likewise ὀμιλεῖν τινι Acts xxiv. 26.

i. In verbs of using, as χρησθαι Acts xxvii. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 12, 15; 223
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(on the contrary, once 1 Cor. vii. 31 with the Acc. in the best Codd. [also Sin.*], as sometimes in later writers e.g. Malal. p. 5; Theophan. p. 314; Böckh, corp. inscript. II. 405 — not Xen. Ages. 11, 11 — cf. Bornem. Act. p. 222. But in Acts xxvii. 17 the Acc. has little authority).

k. In στίκευν (ἐστηκέναι) tвл, to stand fast for a thing 2 Cor. i. 24; Gal. v. 1 (var.), or a person Rom. xiv. 4.

Προσκύνειν (reverence and worship) invariably governs the Dative in Matt. Mark and Paul (Matt. iv. 10 is a quotation from Deut. vi. 13); while in the other N. T. writers it has sometimes the Dat. (Jno. ix. 38; Acts vii. 43; Heb. i. 6; Rev. iv. 10; vii. 11; xiii. 4, etc.), sometimes the Acc. (Luke iv. 8; xxiv. 72; Jno. iv. 23; Rev. ix. 20; xiv. 11); similarly γονυπετέων τoυ Mark (i. 40) x. 17; Matt. xvii. 14 (and λατρεύων τoυ sometimes, Mth. 886). The Dative after προσκύνειν is peculiar to later Greek alone; Lob. Phryn. p. 563; cf. Bos, ex. phil. p. 1 sqq.; Kypke, obs. I. 7 sq.

Χαίρειν, which in Greek authors is often construed with the Dative (Fr. Rom. III. 78 f.), and sometimes also in the Sept. (Prov. xvii. 19, cf. Bar. iv. 37), is never so used in the N. T. (on Rom. xii. 12 see below, No. 7; in 1 Cor. xiii. 6 the Dat. depends on σών) but for the most part with ἐπὶ over.

The phrases ἀποθανεῖν τῷ ἁμαρτίᾳ, τῷ νόμῳ Rom. vi. 2; Gal. ii. 19, θανατοῦσθαι τῷ νόμῳ Rom. vii. 4, νεκρῶν ἔλειν τῷ ἁμ. vii. 11, in antithesis to ζην τῷ (τῷ θεῷ Rom. vi. 10 cf. 1 Pet. iv. 10) signify: to be dead to (for) sin, the law etc. cf. Rom. vii. 4 εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἔτρεψαν ἀπογενέσθαι τῷ ἁμαρτ. 1 Pet. ii. 24. In the same way, in Rom. vi. 20 ἔλειθυς τῷ δίκαιον is contrasted with δοῦλουσθαι τῇ δίκαιον (verse 18 cf. 19, 20): when ye were slaves to sin, ye were free to (relatively to) righteousness, — so far as righteousness is concerned, freemen.

189 In κατακρίνειν τῷ θανάτῳ Matt. xx. 18 (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 6),¹ an expression unknown to classic Greek, we find a Dative of the thing after a verb of sentencing: to condemn one to death, i.e. by sentence adjudge to death.

The classical Greek construction is κατακρίνειν τίνι θανάτοι or θάνατον (Mth. 850; Heuple, Mr. 285), or κατακρ. τώι θάνατον Her. 6, 85 (to award death). Analogous is καταδίκαζειν τίνι θανάτῳ, Lob. Phryn. p. 475; cf. also δοκεῖ τῷ κρίνει Matt. v. 21 f. amenable to the court (§ 30, 8). Cf. Bleek, Heb. II. I. 340.

2. Closely connected with this is the Dative dependent on ἔλεγε (ιπάρχειν) and γίνεσθαι (not on the predicates joined to them); 224 for ἐστι or γίνεται μοι φόβος can only mean: the φόβον ἔλειν or γίνεσθαι applies, refers, to me. From it result the following uses:

¹ This construction is unknown also in the O. T. Of the parallel passages quoted by Bretsch. one, Sus. 41, is κατακρίνεις αὐτῷ ἀποθάνειν, and the other, vs. 48, is absol. κατακρίνει τῷ θυγατέρα Ισραήλ.
a. Without a predicate, ἐντὸς τινι expresses property (possession), ἔνσεθαλ τινι impartation: Luke ii. 7 οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος they had no room, Acts viii. 21; x. 6; iii. 6; xxi. 23; Matt. xviii. 12; Luke i. 14 ἦσταν χαρά σοι, Matt. xvi. 22 οὐ μὴ ἦσταν σοι τοῦτο this will not befall thee, Acts xx. 3, 16; ii. 48 ἐγένετο πάση ψυχῆ φόβος fear fell upon, Rom. xi. 25. Elliptically 1 Cor. vi. 13; v. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Jno. ii. 4 (Krū. 59).

b. With a predicate (mostly a substantive), ἐντὸς or ἔνσεθαλ τινι denotes what quality for a person a thing has or receives, objectively as well as subjectively (i.e. in his own opinion); as, 1 Cor. viii. 9 μὴ ποιεῖται ἡ ἐξουσία ... πρόκαμμα γίνεται τοῖς ἀσθενείς, i. 18 ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοὺς μὴ ἀπολλυμένους μερία ἐστὶν etc. ix. 2; xiv. 22; Rom. ii. 14; vii. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 3; ix. 3; Phil. i. 28. But become (rebound) to (Krū. 59) is usually expressed in the N. T. by ἐντὸς or ἔνσεθαλ εἰς τι.

3. Substantives derived from verbs governing a Dative sometimes take the same case, instead of the ordinary Genitive; as, 2 Cor. ix. 12 εὐχαριστιάζω τῷ θεῷ (not 11), somewhat like εὐχαί τοῖς θεοῖς Plat. legg. 7, 800 a., see Wytenbach, Plut. Mor. i. 134 Lips.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. 101, and rep. I. 372; Ast, Plat. Polit. 451; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. 374; Fr. Mr. p. 63. Compare besides τὸ εἰώθος αὐτῷ Luke iv. 16; Acts xvii. 2 (Plat. legg. 658 e. τὸ ἤδος ἡμῖν) and τὸ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ 1 Cor. vii. 35. The case is different in Luke vii. 12 ὃς μονογενὴς τῇ μητρί a son who was to his mother an only son (thus not strictly for the Genitive, cf. Tob. iii. 15 μονογενὴς τῷ πατρί, Judg. xi. 34), with which the Dative of relationship—cf. Luke v. 10; Rom. iv. 12 (Bttm. Philoct. p. 102 sq.; Boisson. Nic. p. 271; Ast, Plat. Polit. 451, 519, also legg. p. 9)—is not to be confounded. On Rom. iv. 12 see § 61, 5, p. 555.

Also in Matt. xxvii. 7 ἠγόρασαν τὸν ἄγρον ... ἐς ταφὴν τοῖς ἔσονι for a burying-ground for strangers, the Dative belongs to the substantive; cf. Strabo 17, 807 πρὸς ἐπιθετῖν τοῖς ἔσονι. See Schoem. Isae. p. 264; 199 Krū. 68 f. But in 1 Cor. vii. 28 the Dative may be referred to the verb τῷ κλ. of the sentence. Yet see Bhdy. S. 88.

4. The Dative, without being directly involved in the signification of a verb or noun, expresses the relation of the action to some one: 2 Cor. ii. 12 οὐκ ἐσχήκα ἀνεσιν τῷ πνεύματι μου for my spirit (1 Cor. vii. 28), or Luke xviii. 31 πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ... τῶν νῦν 225 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου which were written for him (that they might receive fulfilment in him), (Matt. xiii. 14; Jude 14). Cf. besides, Matt. xiii. 52; Phil. i. 27; 1 Tim. i. 9; Rev. xxi. 2. Especially deserving of notice are,
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a. The Dative of opinion or decision (cf. above, No. 2); as, Plato, Phaed. 101 d. εἰ σοι ἀλλήλοις ξυμφωνεῖ ἡ διαφωνεῖ; Soph. Oed. C. 1446. So in the expressions Acts vii. 20 ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ, 2 Cor. x. 4 διωντὰ τῷ θεῷ.¹ See also 1 Cor. ix. 2. Cf. Wyttcnb. Plat. Phaed. as above; Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 615; Krü. 61.

b. The Dative of interest, 2 Cor. v. 13 εἰτε ἔξεστημεν, θεῷ εἰτε σωφρονοῦμεν, ἕμων (Rom. xiv. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 22), or, more definitely, the dativeus commodi and incommodi, Jno. iii. 26 ὑμῖν μεμαρτύρηκας, to whom, in favor of whom (Luke iv. 22; Rom. x. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 1; cf. Xen. M. 1, 2, 21). On the other hand, Matt. xxiii. 31 μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ὑπὶ νῷλ ὅστε etc., against yourselves, cf. Jas. v. 3. Cf. besides, Heb. vi. 6; Jude 1; Rom. xiii. 2. On Rev. viii. 3, see Ewald. (But Eph. v. 19 λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς—ἀλλήλοις—ψαλμοῖς, etc., is a simple Dative of direction: speaking to one another, etc.)

5. The preceding illustrations suffice to show that the Dative is as closely related to the prepositions εἰς (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 860)² and πρὸς (cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 558), as the Gen. is to the prepositions εἰ and ἀντο. Hence in many phrases one of the former prepositions is used instead of the Dative. Thus we find, as every one knows, not only λέγει τινι and πρὸς τινα (the latter is in Matt. and Mark the usual indeed almost invariable expression, see Schulz, Parab. v. Verwalt, S. 88)—cf. κράζει τινι Rev. vii. 2; xiv. 15, φωνεῖ τινι Rev. xiv. 18,—but also ἐβασκαΐη θεῷ Acts xxvi. 29 (Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 12; Demosth. Conon. 729 c.; Plut. Coriol. 9; Xen. Eph. 4, 3), and ἐβασκαίη πρὸς θεῶν 2 Cor. xiii. 7 (Xen. M. 1, 3, 2) cf. Phil. iv. 6, βαυν τινι Luke xviii. 7 and β. πρὸς τινα Hos. vii. 14, ψευδοσθαὶ τινι (Acts v. 4; Ps. xvii. 45; lxvii. 36; Jer. v. 12, but not in Greek authors) and ψευδ. πρὸς τινα (to lie against one, to be false towards one) Xen. A. 1, 8, 5, καταλλάττειν τινι and 200 πρὸς τινα Xen. vectig. 6; Joseph. antt. 14, 11, 3, εὐδοκεῖν εἰς τινα ἑαυτῶν. 2 Pet. i. 17 and τινι in Greek writers (Pol. 4, 22, 7; 1 Macc. i. 43), 226 μάχεσθαι τινι Xen. A. 4, 5, 12; Plato, rep. 3, 407 a. and πρὸς τινα Jno. vi. 52; Íliad. 17, 98; Plato, Lach. 191 d.; Lucian. conv. 42, and often (also in Sept.),⁴ δομείων τινι and πρὸς τινα Luke xxiv. 14;

¹ Τοις πτωχοῖς τῷ κόσμῳ, as Lehmn. and Tdf. read Jas. ii. 5, would be similar.
² In modern Greek the Acc. with εἰς serves very commonly as a circumlocution for the Dative, even in its simplest relations; as, λέγει εἰς τὸν φίλον μου δικο ἀμικο μοι, (German, gegen m. Fr.), see v. Läthermann, Lehrb. 90.
³ Col. i. 20 ἀνωκαταλλάς. εἰς would be analogous, if this were not designedly a pregnant construction; see Mey.
⁴ So besides παραβαλλεῖν τι τινι (Her. 4. 198) also τι πρὸς τι occurs (Joseph. Ap. 2. 15). Otherwise Mark iv. 30 εἰ τοις παραβαλή παραβαλλομεν τῷ βασιλεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ, see Fr.; but the reading here varies.
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Xen. M. 4, 8, 2. The construction with a preposition doubtless attracted the N. T. writers, through the influence of the explicit and graphic idiom of their vernacular tongue, and hence where the Dat. commodi or incommodi would have been sufficient for native Greek authors, we find eis: Acts xxiv. 17 ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ξένος μου, Luke vii. 30 τὴν βούλην τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς εαυτοῖς to their own harm (so that eis also signifies contra). On the other hand ἐπιτίθεν ή εὐαγγελίζοντο εἰς, being constantly followed by the Plural of the noun, denotes to make known among, Mark xiii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 25; Luke xxiv. 47 (Paus. 8, 5, 8). In Matt. xx. 1 μεθισθῶν εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα means hire, not for, but into his vineyard. In the same way, the construction is pregnant in Mark viii. 19 τοὺς ἄρτους ἔκλασα eis τοὺς πεντακεκληροδότους (and divided) among the etc. Likewise in Matt. v. 22 ἐνοχος εἰς τὴν γένναν liable into Gehenna, i.e. to go, be cast (on the other hand ἔς κρίσει, τῷ συνεδρίῳ). Also Rom. viii. 18 τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς is an abridged expression (see Fr.) similar to the Hebrew —δεχεται 1 Sam. iii. 7. Lastly, in the phrases ὀφελέμος πρὸς τι 1 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Tim. iii. 16 (with eis Xen. Oec. 5, 11 cf. χρησίμος eis Wisd. xiii. 11), εὐθετος eis τι Luke xiv. 35 (Dion. H. de Thuc. 55, 3, with πρὸς Pol. 26, 5, 6; D. S. 5, 37) the preposition with the Acc. must not be regarded as put for the Dative, since useful, adapted, for, to something is quite an appropriate expression, while the Dative would be more suitable in reference to the Person. Yet cf. Luke ix. 62 var.

The phrase πιστεύων εἰς or ἐν τῷ (Acts ix. 42; xxii. 19) obviously means in Christian phraseology more than πιστεύων τῷ (credere, confideere aliqua), and is to be taken as pregnant: in faith to resign one's self unto any one, to profess one's self a believer on one, fide se ad aliquem applicare. Likewise παραδόσας eis (to deliver up to any one) is not simply equivalent to παρ. τῷ, but rather denotes deliver into the power of, surrender to, Matt. 201 x. 17; hence it is used with θάνατος Matt. x. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 11, θλῖψις Matt. 7th ed. xxiv. 9, ἀκαθαρσία Rom. i. 24 etc.; cf. Xen. Hel. 1, 7, 8. The construction ἐναυτὸς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀνελγείᾳ εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης etc. Eph. iv. 19 requires no explanation.

1 In Luke viii. 43 the text. rec. has eis λατρεῖς προσαναλάγων διὸν τὸν βίον, but the best Codd. [Sin. too] have ἱερεῖς. The latter must be preferred, as the former appears to be a correction. In Greek authors, that is to say, the verb is usually construed with eis. Xcn. Cyrop. 2, 4, 9; Aelian. 14. 32.

2 Πιστεύων εἰς Χριστός is to be understood in the same way, yet this expression cannot be unquestionably established from Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 13; we find, however, in Mark i. 15 πιστεύω εἰς τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, which is not essentially different. Further, ἐν ὑπὸ τῷ πιστεύω, and the like (Schwarz, Comment. p. 1108), do not prove the expression πιστεύων πρὸς εἰς τῷ to be pure Greek.
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Note. The Dat. is related also to μετά. Accordingly, in the N. T. we find πολεμεῖν μετά τοὺς Rev. xii. 7; xiii. 4 for πολεμεῖν τινι, also άρκεσθαι μετά τοὺς 1 Cor. vi. 6 (7). In other relations a circumlocution for the Dat. is formed, a. By means of ἐνώπιον Acts vi. 5 ἔρχεσθαι ἐνώπιον παιδὸς τοῦ πλήθους (Gen. xxxiv. 18; xli. 37; 2 Sam. iii. 36, etc.) cf. 1 Jno. iii. 22, προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke iv. 7; Rev. xv. 4). This, and almost the preposition ἐνώπιον itself (τοῖς), is Hebraistic. b. After περίουθα by ἐν Phil. iii. 3, or ἐν with Dat. Mark x. 24; 2 Cor. i. 9 and with Acc. Matt. xxvii. 43 (1 Macc. x. 77), [or lastly by εἰς, yet only in Gal. v. 10]. c. After ἀκολουθῆναι by ἐκόνω Matt. x. 38; see § 33.

That the Dative can be employed precisely for the local πρὸς or εἰς with the Acc. has been denied by Bornem. (in Rosenm. Repertor. II. 253 and in the neu. krit. Journ. d. theolog. Literat. VI. 146 f., cf. also ad Anab. p. 23), and also by Mey. on Acts ii. 38. It is true, the examples adduced from Greek poets by Fr. (Conject. I. 42) do not establish the rule (for prose), and the N. T. passages may be explained differently: in Acts ii. 33 and v. 31 ὕψον τῇ δεξιᾷ may signify by (his) right hand; in Rev. ii. 16 σοι is simply a Dat. incommodi; even Acts xxi. 16 might be rendered (after Beza and Glass.) adducemus secum, apud quern hospitaremur Mnasemonem, so that Μνᾶσεως dependent on ἄγοντες as Acc. of the object (Μνᾶσων κ.τ.λ.) would be incorporated into the relative clause. But the latter rendering has little probability.¹ Sooner could we, according to Bornem.‘s more recent suggestion (Luke p. 177 sq.), resolve the attraction in the above passage thus: ἄγοντες (ἡμᾶς) 228 παρὰ Μνᾶσονα τινα ... παρ᾽ ἰερισθώμεν (as to άγεν ταρά τινα cf. Her. 1, 86; 3, 15); even this, however, is not the easiest way. The construction άγεν τινι bring to one may indeed be unusual (yet see the Note) in Attic prose, but in later prose authors we find expressions entirely similar, as φοιτήν τινι Philostr. Soph. 2, 1, 14 (Wyttenbach, Platarch. Mor. IV. 389), ἢκεν τινι Platarch. 202 Aem. 16, 1, εἰςφερεῖν τινᾳ τινι Malal. 10, p. 231. On Acts xxi. 16 especially, however, cf. Xen. Eph. 3, 6, p. 68 πότεντο ἰγομέν Ἀβρα-

¹ Not precisely on account of the annexed predicate ἀγεν, μαθηγὶ (Bengel’s n. Archiv III. 179), as that refers to Mnasem to show that Paul could trust him perfectly; but rather because it is not credible that his companions would have brought a host for Paul with them from Caesarea, as there were in Jerusalem so many trustworthy Christians. According to this view one would have to assume that this Mnasem was either accidentally present in Caesarea, or that he had a residence in two places at the same time. By dropping secum, which is not implied in ἄγοντες, the statement would become simpler: they brought (introduced) Mnasem in Jerusalem after their arrival; but then the position of the words would not be suitable.
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In Luke ii. 41 ἐπορεύοντο ... ἐσ ἴσως τῷ ἐπορτῷ is not to the festival (Luth. auf das Ostertfest), but either on account of the f. (see below, 6 c.), or, as a loose expression, at the f. (as we also say: they made a yearly journey at Easter to ... to attend divine service). There would be more reason for referring to the preceding rule Mark xiv. 53 συνέφροντες αὐτῷ convenenat eum, and Jno. xi. 33 τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῷ ἱουδαίον (Fr. Mr. 648). Still, as appears to me, in both these passages the Dative is really governed by σὺν: the second signifying simply, who had come with her; and the first, they came with him, that is, with Jesus (verse 54), see BCrus.

Further, different from the foregoing construction is that of the Dative joined to verbs of coming in an ideal sense; as, Acts xxii. 31 ἀνάβη φῶς τῷ Χριστῷ compare our tidings came to him. A similar usage occurs frequently and indisputably in Greek authors; as, Plutarch. Brut. 27 μελημονεν αὐτῷ διαβαίνειν ... ἕκαν ἀγγελία περὶ τῆς μεταβολῆς, and Pomp. 13 τῷ Σύλλα πρωτῷ μὲν ἠλθεν ἀγγέλια. Cf. ἀνάγεται τῷ τινι to bring a thing before one (notify to), Malal. 3 p. 63; 10 p. 254.

6. In a wider use the Dative of the thing is employed of every thing in reference to which an action or a state comes to pass. Accordingly, it is used

a. To designate the sphere to which a general predicate is to be conceived as confined (cf. Bhdg. 84; Krü. 74); as, 1 Cor. xiv. 20 μὴ παιδια γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσκίας, ἀλλά τῇ κακίᾳ τηρίτεε children in understanding, children in reference to malice (Plat. Alcib. pr. 122 c.), Rom. iv. 20 ἐνενυμαὼθη τῇ πίστει he grew strong in faith, 229 Phil. ii. 8 σχέματι εὐφραίνει ὡς ἀνθρώπος, iii. 5; Matt. v. [3] 8; xi. 29; Acts vii. 51; xiv. 8; xvi. 5; xvii. 2; xx. 22; Rev. iv. 8; 1 Cor. vii. 34; Heb. v. 11; xi. 12; xii. 8; 1 Pet. iii. 18; v. 9 (Pol. 20, 4, 7); Gal. i. 22; Rom. xii. 10 f.; Col. ii. 5; Eph. iv. 18, 23 (Mth. 898; Fr. Rom. III. 68). Such a Dat. is intercalated in Eph. ii. 3 ἦμεν τέκνα φύσει ὄργῆς as respects nature, naturally, children of wrath.

b. Of the rule, or standard, according to which something takes place; as, Acts xv. 1 ἐὰν μὴ περιτέμνῃ τῷ ὥθει Ὑμῶν (on the other hand, xvii. 2 κατὰ τὸ εἰσόδος, and more frequently κατὰ

---

1 Yet ἤγειν τῷ (cf. προδέχεσθαι τῷ § 52, 4, 14.) is not in all these cases used in a purely local or material sense; but rather means introduce to one's acquaintance. Similarly φοιτῶν τῷ (to attend one as teacher), different from φοιτῶν πρὸς τ. Epict. ench. 33, 13.
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ἐθος) cf. Xen. C. 1, 2, 4; Sext. Emp. 2, 6; Strabo 15, 715 (Tob. iii. 8; 2 Macc. vi. 1).

c. Of the occasion or cause (on account of); as, Rom. xi. 20 τῇ 203 ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξελάθησαν because of unbelief (cf. 30 ήπειρητε τῇ τοῦτῳ ἀπεθανεῖ), Gal. vi. 12; Col. i. 21—also of the motive (through, from, etc.) 1 Cor. viii. 7 τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλων ὡς εἰδωλολάτρων ἐσθιον, 2 Cor. i. 15; Rom. iv. 20. See Diog. L. 2, 57; Heliod. 1, 12, 33; Paus. 3, 7, 3; Joseph. antt. 17, 6, 1; cf. Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 392; Goeller, Thuc. p. 157, 184, etc.; Mth. 894 f.; Bhdγ. 102 f.; Krü. 73.

The use of the Dative in Rev. viii. 4 ἀνβη δ κανὸς τῶν θυματών ταῖς προσευχαίς τῶν ἄγιως, etc. is more strange, and has given rise to numerous conjectures. The simplest translation probably is: there went up the smoke of the incense (of the angels) for the prayers, i.e. the ascending smoke availed for the prayers, to attend and render them more acceptable (on the representation see Ewald in loc.). Expositors who supplied σῶν took the same view of the expression. On the other hand the rendering inter preces sanctorum is by no means justifiable. In 2 Cor. vii. 7 the Dat. τῷ πράγματι is certainly allowable, yet harsh for the language of the N.T.; ἐν τῷ πράγματι has good authorities in its favor, and the ἐν was probably omitted, either because it was absorbed by the εἰς or because ἐν παρτί ... was taken with πράγματι.

7. In the uses adduced under 6. the Dative of direction, and consequently (according to Greek views) the Dative proper, is still to be detected more or less clearly; but this case, by a further outward extension of its import to whatever accompanies the action, passes over altogether into the Ablative,

d. When it designates the mode and manner, as casus modalis (Bhdγ. 100 f.), 1 Cor. xi. 5 προσευχαμένη ἀκατακαλύττῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ with the head uncovered, x. 30; Col. ii. 11; Phil. i. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 4 (Jude 6), also Rom. viii. 24 τῇ ἑλπίδι ἐσώθημεν (and Eph. v. 19);—or the instrument (casus instrumentalis Mdv. 45, yet cf. Krü. 72), as 1 Pet. i. 18 ὁ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλπισθητε, Gal. ii. 13 δοκε ... συναπτήθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει (2 Pet. iii. 17 cf. Zosim. 5, 6), Eph. i. 13; Col. ii. 7; Phil. iii. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 7 τίς στρατεύεται 230 ἓδιος ὁφνίου ποτὲ with his own resources, at his own expense, Heb. vi. 17 ἐμεσίτευσεν δρκω, i. 3; Rom. xv. 18, —likewise Acts i. 5 ἐβάπτισεν ἄδατι (xii. 16), Jno. xxi. 8 τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἠλθον, Mark vi. 32 (though elsewhere we find ἐν πλοῖῳ, Matt. xiv. 18; Acts xxviii. 11; D. S. 19, 54), Acts xii. 2; Rom. i. 20; iii. 24; Tit. iii. 7; Eph. v. 19, etc. To this head may also be referred Heb. xii. 18 δρος κεκαυ-
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μὲνον πῦρ ἰγνῖ ardens, burning in, with, fire, (Exod. iii. 2; Deut. iv. 11; ix. 15; cf. Lob. Paralip. p. 523 sq.). In Rom. xii. 12 τῇ ἀντίδει καλοφθεῖς is through (in) hope rejoicing. In reference to δεησει in 2 Cor. ix. 14 I now agree with Mey. We often find ἐν or διὰ (especially of persons) used for the instrumental Dative; as, Rom. xv. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 23, 26 f.

A virtual Ablative will be perceived also in μεθύσκεσθαι ὁ ὕψος Eph. v. 18 (Prov. iv. 17), and in πληρωθήσαι τινι Rom. i. 29; 2 Cor. vii. 4 (Eurip. 204 Herc. fur. 372, cf. πλήρης τινι Eurip. Bacch. 18—oftener with the Gen.—νή ήδη Bhdv. 168, in later writers πληρηθέντες ἀγροί Mal. p. 54). (But in Eph. iii. 19 ἐδ with the Acc. is not used for the Ablative. The preposition expresses rather: filled up to the fulness, etc.)

8. In all these (6 a. et seq.) relations, however, prepositions are not rarely and sometimes even more usually employed, — both in Greek prose, and still more in N. T. Greek, — with or without a modification of the meaning; viz.

For a. ἐν, 1 Pet. iv. 1 ἐν σαρκὶ παθῶν in connection with σαρκὶ παθ., Tit. i. 13 cf. ii. 2; διαφέρειν ἐν τινι 1 Cor. xv. 41 (Soph. Oed. C. 1112; Dion. H. ep. p. 225. Krü.).

For b. κατά, as almost always κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, ἐνθόθos Luke iv. 16; Acts xvii. 2.

For c. διὰ with the Acc. see § 49 c. p. 398 sq.

For d. διὰ or ἐν also μετὰ. Thus we find instead of βαπτίζεσθαι ἐνάτι usually ἐνάντι in water) Matt. iii. 11; Jno. i. 26, 31 (but also ἐν πνεύματι), for βία always μετὰ βίας Acts v. 26; xxiv. 7; for πίστει also διὰ πίστεως, etc. But in Eph. ii. 8 τῇ χάριτι ἐστὶ σευσωμένη διὰ τῆς πίστεως and Rom. iii. 24 the Dat. expresses the motive, διὰ πίστ. the subjective means; and in 2 Pet. iii. 5 διὰ refers to the material means, the Dat. to the immaterial. For παντὶ τρόπῳ Phil. i. 18 we find ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ 2 Thess. iii. 16. On the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 3 the Dat. is used of the means, and ἐν denotes the state (the disposition).

When, however, N. T. expositors took ἐν simply for a nota dativi (cf. 195 Blomfield, Aeschyl. Agam. 1425, and Eurip. Med. p. 628), even where a Dative proper (not an Ablative) is required, they went too far, and their opinion could not find even a remote support in the Hebrew idiom. Most 231 of the passages quoted are plausible only because in such connection else where the Dative of a person is commonly employed (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 11; iii. 1; i. 18), but in reality they are quite irrelevant. In Acts iv. 12 δεδομένῳ ἐν ἀνθρώποις is most certainly: given (promulgated) among men,
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cf. 2 Cor. viii. 1; Gal. i. 16 ἐποκαλύψαι τὸν νῦν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῶν ἵνα τῷ ἐμοὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀλήθειας ἐποίησις, I. I.; 1 Μν. i. 9 ἑπανεκρυπτή ἡ ἡγήσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, the love of God was manifested in (respect to, on) us which differs unquestionably from to us; 1 Cor. xiv. 11 δὲ λαλῶν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἡμῖν, according to me, in my estimation (see, e.g., Jacobs, Athen. p. 183; Dürer, Oed. Col. p. 529; Wex, Soph. Antig. v. 549); 1 Cor. ii. 6 κοσμίων λαλοῦν ἐν τοῖς τελείως means: among or with, before, (or coram see Plat. symp. 175 e., frequently in the orators § 48 a.) them that are perfect, etc. (i.e. when we have to deal with such) cf. Judith vi. 2. Baumgarten has in the main correctly explained 2 Cor. iv. 3 ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶν κεκα-205 λυμένον: is hid in (among, with) them that perish. On ὁμολογεῖν ἐν τοῖς see § 32, 3 b. Acts xiii. 15 and Col. ii. 13 require no explanation, and Eph. ii. 5 νεκροῖς τοῖς παραπτῶμασι is not grammatically parallel to the last passage. In Eph. i. 20 ἐνίγγυσαν ἐν Χριστῷ is quite regular: (power) which he exhibited in Christ (by raising him from the dead). Matt. xvii. 12 ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὡσα ἐθέλησαν (Mark ix. 13 ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ) is: they did, perpetrated on him, cf. Mark xiv. 6; Jno. xiv. 30; Luke xxiii. 31; 1 Cor. ix. 15 (Gen. xi. 14; Judith vii. 24). Likewise correct is the expression 2 Cor. x. 12 μετρῶν ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς: measuring themselves on (with) themselves, though in Greek authors the Dative alone is in use, Aristot. rhet. 2, 12; Herod. 1, 6, 2.

9. Time, as that substratum with which all events are connected, is expressed by the Dative in answer to the question When; whether it denotes, a. A space of time; as, Luke viii. 29 τολλοίδες χρόνοις συνεργάσεις αὐτῶν within (during) a long time, Acts vii. 11; xiii. 20; Rom. xvi. 25; Jno. ii. 20 (not Eph. iii. 5); cf. Joseph. antt. 1, 3, 5 τῷ υἱῷ τῆς ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα δέκα κατεφέρετο, Soph. Trach. 599 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, Aeschin. ep. 1. p. 121 c.; Diod. S. 19, 98.

b. Or (more frequently) a point of time, at which something takes place; — and that, too, in words that directly signify the notion of time or a division of time (with a numeral or Genitive annexed, 196 Krü. 57), as Luke xii. 20 ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί, Mark vi. 21 Ἡρῴδης τοῖς γενεσίως αὐτοῦ δείπνων ἐποίησε, Matt. [xiv. 6 γενεσίως γενομένου according to Lachmann's reading, sustained also by Cod. Sinai.] xx. 19 τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσεται, xxvi. 17; Luke xiii. 16; Acts 282 vii. 8; xii. 21; xxi. 26; xxi. 12; xxvii. 23, or in names of festivals (Wannowski, p. 86) Luke xiii. 14 τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐθεράπευσε (xiv. 1), Matt. xii. 1 τοῖς σάββασι etc. Cf. Plat. conv. 174 a.; Mdv. 48.

1 So also in Diog. L. 1, 105 τι ἄστιν ἐν ἀνθρώπων ἀνθέων τῷ καὶ φαίλων, where, too, the Latin translator has: quidnam esse hominibus hominum etc. Cf. besides, Fabric Pseudepigr. 1. 628 διουλήθησαν ἐν τοῖς ἐυθροί ἀνθίν, Arrian. Epict. 1, 18, 8.
Yet ἐν is inserted, regularly in the last case, and frequently also in the first (especially with ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ or ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως), even in Luke (iii. 1; i. 26), cf. Krü. 57; the expression τῇ ἐστρατῇ or ταῖς ἐστραταῖς without ἐν is rare even in Greek authors (Wannowski, 88).

The Dative of place is not deeply rooted in the N. T. Before names of cities ἐν is always put; as, ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἐν Τύρῳ Acts xvii. 6; xix. 1; Rom. i. 7; 2 Tim. i. 17; iv. 20, etc. But ὅσος occasionally dispenses with the preposition; as, Jas. ii. 25 ἵππος ὅσος ἐκβάλεται (where, however, the preposition was hardly necessary) cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 16, ὅσος πορεύεται 2 Pet. ii. 15; Acts xiv. 16 (trop.) cf. Lucian. Tim. 5 ὅσος βαδίζει (Fr. Rom. III. 140 sq.), στοιχεῖν ταῖς ἲθνεῖ Rom. iv. 12 (βαίνειν ἱθνεῖ Plut. Sol. 30), with which are to be classed also the figurative expressions ἄρα ὁ πόσῳ Acts ix. 31; xiv. 16; Prov. xxviii. 26; 2 Sam. xv. 11; 1 Macc. vi. 23; Bar. i. 18; ii. 10; iv. 13; Tob. i. 2; iv. 5 (interchangeably with ἄρα ἐν 1 Pet. iv. 3, etc.) and even πρωταρτάν ταῖς ἰθνεῖ Acts xxxi. 21; 2 Cor. xii. 18; Gal. v. 16; Rom. xiii. 13. Generally, even in Greek prose, the use of the Dativus 206 localis is very limited; see Mdv. 48; Poppo, Thuc. 1, 143.

10. The Dative (of a person) with Passives instead of ὑπό, παρά, etc. with the Genus, is but seldom employed (and then usually with the Perfect): Luke xxiii. 15 ὅπερ ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπαγμένον αὐτῷ (Isocr. paneg. c. 18). Yet this construction is not entirely the same as that with ἐν ὑπό etc.; it denotes the person not by whom something has been done, but to whom what has been done belongs (Mdv. 45; Krü. 72; Benseler, Isocr. Evag. p. 18). It is used in particular with ἐφικτομέθαι 2 Cor. xii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 14; Rom. x. 20 Sept.; cf. besides Luke xxiv. 35 (Jas. iii. 18) Phil. iv. 5 (Acts xxiv. 14), also 2 Pet. ii. 19 where ὃς τις ἤττησαι means, by what a man is overcome, to what he is inferior, (in classic Greek ἤττησαι τινος). But in Acts xvi. 9 ὃθῃ ὑπό ὑπάρχει τῷ Παῦλῳ means became visible to him (as often elsewhere ὃθῃναι τίνι appear to one). In Jas. iii. 7 τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ means rather by the nature of man (ingenius hominum). In general, the Dative of a thing with Passives (probably also in Rom. xii. 16, see Fr. in loc.) is less surprising, as it coincides with the Dative of the means. In Heb. iv. 2 τῶν ἄρχαρ υσκασον indicates probably the persons with or in whom the μή συγκρ. τῇ πίστει occurred. Lastly, Matt. v. 21 ff. ἐφίθη τῶν ἄρχαρων should be translated: to them of old time; see Tholuck, Berggr. 158 f. The above use of the Dative (of a pers.) after Passives is known likewise in Greek prose, but it is especially frequent after participles; cf. Dem. Olynth. 3, p. 12 c.; 233
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Theocrin. 507 c.; coron. 324 a.; Conon. 781 b.; Diog. L. 8, 6; Philostr. her. 4, 2.

Note 1. The Dative in Col. ii. 14 ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἑμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασι, is noticeable. Some expositors explain it δ ἤν ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν quod constat placitis (mos.), conformably to Eph. ii. 15 τὸν νόμον τῶν ἄντων ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας — an explanation correct doubtless as respects the sense, but at variance with the grammar; for according to it Paul must have written: χειρόγρ. τὸ ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι. Now in the first place as regards Eph. ii. 15 the expression τῶν ἄντων ἐν δόγμασι must undoubtedly be taken as one idea: commandments in (individual) ordinances, cf. § 20, 2. And in Col., all things considered, δόγμασι cannot be taken otherwise than as closely connected with τὸ καθ' ἑμῶν χειρόγραφον: the bond (in force) against us through the ordinances, and Paul perhaps employed the word δόγμασι in this passage to bring out the notion with prominence. Meyer's explanation: what has been written with commandments (Dat. like what has been written with letters), is the more forced, because the word χειρόγραφον has acquired from usage so distinct and independent a meaning that it can scarcely take such a Dative after it, as if equivalent to γεγραμμένον.

Note 2. What Kühnöhl remarks on Matt. viii. 1, viz. that Datives absolute are sometimes put for Genitives absolute, as καταβάντι αὑτῷ for καταβάντος αὑτοῦ, Matt. xxxi. 23 ἄθικον αὑτῷ for ἄθικόν αὑτοῦ, was indeed formerly believed, in general, even by scholars (Fischer, Well. III. a. p. 391; Wytenbach, Plut. Mor. II. 304; Heupel, Mark p. 79). In reality, however, all such Dativos (at least in the better class of authors, Wannowski, p. 207 91 sqq.) may be as easily explained from the nature of the Dative, as the Genitive absolute is from the nature of the Genitive; see Bhdy. 82; Stalb. Plat. Protag. 60; Rost, Gr. 712 f. The remark cannot with the slightest plausibility be applied to the passages quoted above from the N. T., as both καταβάντι and ἄθικον follow the verb ἄκολοθον; at the same time it must be confessed that the author might also have written: καταβάντος αὑτοῦ ἡκολουθησαν αὑτῷ ἀκλος τολλοῖ, cf. Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 2 var. There is only this peculiarity in these constructions, that in all αὑτῷ is repeated (because several other words are inserted between the Dative of the participle and the governing verb). In the passages quoted by Kypke I. 47 from Pausan. and Joseph, either there is simply a pronoun joined to the participle, or the pronoun is directly connected with the verb (Joseph. antt. 8, 13, 4); accordingly, they do not prove the point in question. Even in Acts xxii. 6, 17 the Datives are not properly absolute. In the latter passage μοι ἐποτρέψατε, precisely as in vs. 6, belongs with ἐγένετο.

234 Then follows a quite different construction (with the Genit. absol.): accidit mihi reverso, cum precabam in templo, etc. Cf. Paus. 8, 10, 7 and 25, 8.

Note 3. Two Datives, the one of a person and the other (explaining, more closely defining) of a thing, occur in 2 Cor. xii. 7 ἵππη μοι σκόλοψ
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τῆ σαρκὶ a thorn was given me for (in) the flesh (Exod. iv. 9; Gen. xlvii. 24) cf. in Homer δίδωσιν et ἡμι χερον; Reisig, Soph. Oedip. C. 266; Elsmale, Eurip. Bacch. p. 49, 80, ed. Lips.; Bornem. Xen. conviv. p. 214; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 811; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 278. The two Datives in Eph. iii. 5; Rom. vii. 25; Heb. iv. 2; Rev. iv. 3 are of a different nature, and require no remark.

Note 4. A very singular Dative occurs in 2 Cor. vi. 14 μὴ γίνεσθε ἐτρεπόμενοις ἐπιστολαίς, where some understand σὺν, while others attribute this meaning to the Dative itself. But, though the Dat. is sometimes to be resolved by with (Reitz, Lucian. VI. 599, Bisp.; Mtth. 907; cf. Polyaen. 8, 28), this is an entirely different case. The apostle seems to have expressed himself elliptically, and to have suited the Dative rather to the thought than to the words. He evidently means: μὴ γίνεσθε καὶ οἱ δρομόμενοις (συνομ.) ἐπιστολαίς do not put yourselves into an unsuitable yoke, that is, be not united in the same yoke with unbelievers.
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1. The Accusative is strictly the Objective Case when joined to transitive verbs (active, middle, or deponent); as, κοππεῖν τὴν θύραν, κοππεῖσθαι τ. κεφαλήν, φυλάσσειν τ. κήπον, φυλάσσεσθαι τ. ἔντολας. It must be remarked, however, that,

a. Not only in later and especially in Biblical Greek, many neuter verbs received a transitive (causative) meaning (μαθητεύ- τι ἐν τινά § 38, 1.) but,

b. In general, certain classes of verbal notions which we consider as either entirely or mainly intransitive, were regarded by the Greeks as transitive. Such are,

a. Verbs denoting an affection of the mind; as, ἀλεεῖν Matt. ix. 27; Mark v. 19; Phil. ii. 27, etc. (Plato, symp. 173 c.; Ael. 18, 21) and ἀικτέίρειν Rom. ix. 15, LXX. (Soph. El. 1403; Xen. C. 5, 4, 32; Lucian. abd. 6; Tim. 99; ἐπαυσχύνεσθαι τινά and τι Mark viii. 38; Heb. xi. 16; Rom. i. 16 (Plat. Soph. 247 c.; cf. ἐπαυσχύνεσθαι Soph. 235 Oed. R. 1079; Eurip. Io 1074); the last once takes ἐπί, Rom. vi. 21 cf. Isocr. perm. 778. On the contrary, σπλαγχνίζεσθαι is regularly construed with ἐπί, only once does it govern the Gen. Matt. xviii. 27, sec § 33. Ἐντερέσθαι τινά, to reverence one, Matt. xxi. 37; Luke xvii. 2; Heb. xii. 9, is a later construction, from the time of Plut.; earlier authors said ἐπτερί τινι.

b. Verbs denoting to treat one well or ill (harm, benefit), or to speak well or ill of one: ἀδίκειν, ἠδάπτειν, ἠφελεῖν, λυμαίνεσθαι, ἠσπιζεῖν τινά (Xen. Hell. 2, 4, 17; Lucian. pisc. 6); ἐπηρεάζειν
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τινὰ (with Dat. pers. Xen. M. 1, 2, 31), λοιδορεῖν τινα Jno. ix. 28; Mtth. 871, βλασφημεῖν τινα Matt. xxvii. 39; Acts xix. 37; Rev. xiii. 6, etc., yet also εἰς τινα Luke xii. 10; cf. Demosth. cor. nav. p. 715 c.; Diod. S. 2, 18 and LXX. hist. Drac. 9 (like the Greek όνειδίζειν εἰς τινα and ύβριζειν εἰς τινα Lucian. Tim. 31) and ἐν τινι 2 Pet. ii. 12 (in Greek authors also περὶ τινος Isocr. permut. 786), όνειδίζειν τινα Matt. v. 11 (LXX. cf. Rom. xv. 3) Schaeff. Plutarch. V. 847 (earlier writers say όνειδίζειν τινα or εἰς τινα), κακος ἐρεῖν τινα Acts xxiii. 5 (Plat. Euthyd. 284 e.; D. S. Vat. p. 66), also καταράζονται τινα Matt. v. 44; Jas. iii. 9 (Wisd. xii. 11; Ecclus. iv. 5, etc., with Dative Xen. Α. 7, 7, 48). All these constructions are finally grounded on the simple λέγειν or εἰπεῖν τινα, Jno. i. 15; viii. 27; Phil. iii. 18, etc. (Jud. vii. 4); cf. Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 1404; Mtth. II. 929. On the other hand, we find καλὸς ποιεῖν with the Dative of a person, Luke vi. 27 (Acts xvi. 28 μηδὲν πράξεις σεαυτῷ κακὸν is of another kind, and this, with similar expressions, is frequent in Greek writers, Lys. accus. Agor. 41; Xen. C. 5, 4, 11; 5, 5, 14; 8, 7, 24), and also εἰς ποιεῖν Mark xiv. 7. In Greek prose the Acc. is here always preferred, see Biblioth. Brem. nova I. 277. Yet cf. Odys. 14, 289 δι εὔ οὐλὰ κὰκ ἀνθρώπους ἐώρησε. But ποιεῖν τινα τί to do something to one occurs also in the N. T. Matt. xxvii. 22; Mark xv. 12. Cf. Aristoph. nub. 258 sq.

γ. Ὄμνυειν τινα Jas. v. 12 (σοφανών) swear by, cf. Hos. iv. 15; Xen. C. 5, 4, 31; Herod. 2, 10, 3.

Yet in the N. T. these verbs are not invariably connected with the obj. Acc.; many still vary, as in Greek authors, between a transitive and a neuter construction: κλαίειν with Acc. Matt. ii. 18 Sept., but ἐπὶ τινα Luke xix. 41; xxiii. 28; πενθεῖν τινα 2 Cor. xii. 21, but ἐπὶ τινι Rev. xviii. 11; κόπτεσθαι τινα Luke viii. 52 (Eurip. Troad. 628; 1 Macc. ii. 70) and ἐπὶ τινα Rev. i. 7; xviii. 9; εὐδοκεῖν τινα Heb. x. 6, 8 Sept. (Lev. xxvi. 34; Ps. li. 18), usually ἐν τινι. Ὄμνυειν is mostly treated as neuter, and construed with κατὰ τινος, Heb. vi. 13, 16 (Amos viii. 14; Zeph. i. 5; Isa. xliv. 23; 236 Schaeff. Long. p. 353) or ἐν τινι Matt. v. 34 ff.; Rev. Χ. 6 (Jer. v. 2, 7; Ps. lxiii. 12). But in 2 Cor. i. 11 εὐχαρ. (τινι) τί occurs for εὐχαριστεῖν (τινι) ἐπὶ τινι (in a Passive acceptation); and in 2 Cor. ix. 2; xi. 30 we find καυχάσθαι with the Acc. of the thing.

With Jude 15 τῶν ἐργῶν ἀσβεστῶν αὐτῶν ὅ (ὁ) ἑρτῆσαν compare Zeph. iii. 11 τῶν ἐπιτυγχανόντων σου ὅτι ἑρτῆσας εἰς ἡμᾶς (ἀσβεστει Plato, legg. 12, 941 a. is of another description, Mtth. 929).

'Ισαύρειτε, Ἰραίζεσθαι and ἀπορησθεῖσθαι are real transitives, and as ἀερ.
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\( \thetaυσίαν \) is a proper expression (Palsaeph. 5, 3 cf. Acta apocr. 113), so το \( \epsilon\alphaγγελον \) Rom. xv. 16 in a figurative sense, is quite correct. \( \\epsilon\μπορεύον \) has not only an Acc. of the merchandise but an Acc. of a person, ἐμ. τω Ἑζεκ. xxvii. 21; this in 2 Pet. ii. 3 means: make merchandise (gain) of you. Lastly, with Rev. xviii. 17 δοκε τὴν ἀλασσαν ἑργάζοντα compare Appian. Pun. 2; Boisson. Philostr. p. 452. Similar is γὰρ ἑργαζ.

Paus. 6, 10, 1.

Εὐαγγελίσθαι (of Christian preaching) is employed in the N. T. quite like a transitive with the Acc. of a person; as, Luke iii. 18; Acts viii. 25; xiv. 21; compare especially εὐαγγ. τω τι Acts xiii. 32. Yet εὐαγγ. των also occurs Luke iv. 18; Rom. i. 15; Gal. iv. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 6.

Βασκαίνειν fascinare also is construed with the Acc. Gal. iii. 1. In the signification invisible it has the Dat. (Philostr. epp. 13) Lob. 463. Yet the ancient grammarians are not agreed among themselves on the distinction between the constructions, see Wetsten. II. 221 sq.

Παραπάν, which in Gr. writers usually governs the Dat. of a person (Aesch. dial. 2, 13; Pol. 5, 4, 7), has the Acc. in Acts xxvii. 22. On the other hand, we find in Rev. ii. 14 διδόσκον τιν (var.), as in some later writers; see Schaefer. Plut. V. 22.

Φυλάσσοντα, to beware of, likewise governs the Acc. in Acts xxi. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 15 (as frequently in Greek authors, Xen. M. 2, 2, 14; Lucian. asin. 4; D. S. 20, 26), as if to observe, keep a watch on, some one for one's self; on the other hand, in Luke xii. 15 ἀπω follows it—a construction not unknown also to the Greeks (Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9).

In a similar way, φοβεῖσθαι to be afraid in reference to something, to 200 fear something (for one's self) is usually construed with the Acc., but sometimes has ἀπο (to be afraid of, sibi ab al. timere); as, Matt. x. 28 μή φοβεῖσθαι ἀπο τῶν ἀποκτηνόντων τὸ σῶμα ... φοβηθῇ δι μᾶλλον τῶν δυνάμεων, etc. Greek authors say φοβ. ἀπο των or τιν (yet compare φόβος ἀπο των; Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 53; 6, 3, 27). Φοβεῖσθαι ἀπο is an imitation of the Hebrew יָרָה (or נָרָה) הָא (Jer. i. 8). According to this analogy are construed also θέλειν ἀπο (praeguonter) Mark viii. 15; xii. 38, and προσέχειν ἀπο Matt. xvi. 6. On the other hand, Phil. iii. 2 ἔλθετε τὴν κατατομήν etc. observe, keep your eye on (βλέπειν τι as signifying to beware of, could receive no confirmation from φυλάσσονται τι, since the Mid. voice here is 210 essential). To beware is here but a derivative meaning.

Φεύγειν governs the Acc. in a figurative sense in 1 Cor. vi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 22 (to flee a vice, i.e. to shun); but once it has ἀπο, 1 Cor. x. 14 φεύγειν ἀπο τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας. This last construction is otherwise very usual in the N. T. (as in the Sept.), and φεύγειν ἀπο των means either to flee from one in various senses (Jno. x. 5; Rev. ix. 6; Mark xiv. 52; Jas. iv. 7), or (including the result of fleeing) to escape Matt. xxiii. 33. In Greek authors, φεύγειν ἀπο occurs only in a strictly local sense, Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 4; Mem. 2, 6, 31; Plato, Phaed. 62 d.; Pol. 26, 5, 2.

On χρόστιαι τι see § 31, 1, i. p. 209 sq.
The Acc. of *the place to which*, after verbs of motion, was confined in the classics, after the full use of prepositions had been introduced, mostly to poetry (Mtth. 747). From the character of the language of the N.T., one would expect only a preposition in such a case. Even Acts xxvii. 2 μελλοντι πλειων των κατα την Ἀσιαν τοτους (where, however, in several good Codd. [Sin. also] εις is inserted) forms no exception; it must be rendered: *sail the places along the Asiatic coast.* In this signification πλειω is used by the best authors (as a strictly transitive verb) with the Acc. (also of places on the coast), cf. Poppo, Thuc. 6, 36.

2. Neuter verbs expressing a feeling or act, frequently take an Acc. of a noun which is either from the same root or from one of kindred signification. Such nouns, inasmuch as they merely denote substantively the notion of the verb, are virtually implied in it. They are never annexed, except when the meaning of the verb has to be extended (Hm. Soph. Philoct. 281; Eurip. Androm. 220 sq.; Krü. 16 f.) either by an (Objective) Genitive, as 1 Pet. iii. 14 των φόβων αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθήτε (Isa. viii. 12), Col. ii. 19 αἰδει τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ (Plat. legg. 10, 910d. ἀσεβείων ἀνδρῶν ἀσέβημα, 1 Mac. ii. 58 φιλούσαν γίγαν νόμον, Judith ix. 4); or by means of an Adjective, as Matt. ii. 10 ἐκάρπναν χαρὰ τινα μεγάλην σφόδρα, Ἰησ. vii. 24 τὴν δικαιαν κρίσιν κρίνετε, 1 Tim. i. 18 ἦν στρατεύς τὴν 201 καλὴν στρατεύαν (Plutarch. Pomp. 41), Mark iv. 41 ἐφοβηθησαν τοις φόβων μέγαν, 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7; Rev. xvii. 6; 1 Pet. iii. 6 (LXX. Gen. xxvii. 33; Zech. i. 15; Jon. i. 10; iv. 1, 6; Wisd. ix. 3).

This, too, is very common in Greek authors, see Fischer, Well. III. I. 422sq.; Bhdy. 106f.; Ast, Plat. Polit. 316; Weber, Dem. 471, 238 especially Lob. Paralip. 501 sqq. (Mtth. 744f., 910f., 941) cf. Plato, Protag. 360 b. αἰοχρός φόβος φοβοῦται, Xen. M. 1, 5, 6 δουλευον 211 δουλειαν οὐδεμᾶς ἢττον αἰοχράν, Her. 5, 119 μάχην ἐμαχέσαντο τιμιὰν ἰσχυρίν (magnam pugnavimus pugnam Terent. Adelph. 5, 3, 57) Plat. Apol. 28 b. τοιοῦτον ἐπιτίθεσαι ἐπιτίθεσαι, p. 36 c. ἐνεργετείν ἀν μεγαλην ἐνεργείαν, Alciphr. 2, 3 δεΐται μου πάσας, δεήσεως Lysias 1; Theomneste. 27 πολλούς δὲ καὶ ἄλλους κυνίνων μὲθ ὑμῶν ἐκκυνόντες (Plato, conv. 208c.), Demosth. Neaer. 517 b.; ep. p.121 b.; Aristot. polit. 3, 10; rhet. 2, 5, 4; Long. 4, 3; Aeschin. ep. 1, 121 b.; Lucian.asin. 11; Philostr. Apoll. 2, 32. Further see Georgi, Vind. 199 sqq.; Wetst. II. 821 (Gesen. Lg. 810). This

1 Wahl's parallels from Xen. Hell. 4, 8, 6; Pol. 3, 4, 10 only confirm the phrase πλείω τῇ δικαίας, τὰ πελάγη, of which instances already existed in 1 Mac.xiii 39; Ecclus. xliii. 24.
construction occurs with the passive in Rev. xvi. 9 ἐκαυματίσθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι καίμα μέγα (Plato, Euthyd. 275 e. ἐφελέται τὴν μεγίστην ὄφελειαν, Plutarch. Caes. 55 a.).

We find the same construction in a relative clause in Jno. xviii. 26 ἢ ἐγάπη ἢ ἡγάπησα με, Eph. ii. 4; Mark x. 38 τὸ βάπτισμα ὁ γὰρ βαπτίζωσαι βαπτισθηκαί.

From this must be distinguished the case in which the kindred noun denotes the objective result of the action, consequently a concrete idea, as διαβίσκην διατίθεσαι (Judg. ii. 2), μαρτυρίαν μαρτυρεῖν, πλούτων πλουτεῖν (Dan. xi. 2), ψήφισμα ψηφίζεσθαι, ἀμαρτάνειν ἀμαρτίαν (1 Jno. v. 16), meaning, make a covenant, bear a testimony, etc., Ewald, Gr. 595. For here the noun does not necessarily require the support of an adjective, etc. (as αἰσχρὰν ἀμαρτ. ἀμαρτάνειν Soph. Phil. 1249; Plato, Phaed. 113 e.; Lucian. Tim. 112; Dio Chr. 32, 361) cf. Eph. iv. 8 (Sept.) ἱχμαλῶσειν αἰχμαλωσίαν (Judg. v. 12; 2 Chron. xxviii. 17; Demosth. Steph. 2, 621 b.). Yet constructions of this sort occur, for the most part, only through the interposition of a relative clause; as, Jno. v. 32 ἢ μαρτυρία, ἢν μαρτυρεῖν περὶ ἐμοῦ, 1 Jno. v. 10; Heb. viii. 10 αὐτή ἢ διαβίσκη, ἢν διαβήσομαι (x. 16, but viii. 9 διαβίσκην ποιεῖν), Acts iii. 25; Luke i. 73; 1 Jno. ii. 25; Mark iii. 28; cf. Isocr. Aegin. 936; Lucian. paras. 5. That such Hebrew and Greek expressions, however, possess greater fulness and vividness than our general phrases, make a covenant, bear testimony, there can be no doubt.

Finally, to be separated altogether from the preceding combinations are those in which the substantive denotes something objective and material which exists independently of the action of the verb; as, φυλάσσειν φυλακάς (posts) Xen. A. 2, 6, 10; φόρον φέρειν Aristoph. av. 191; Aristot. pol. 2, 8; Lucian. paras. 48. Compare from the N. T. Luke ii. 8 φυλάσσοντες φυλακᾶς τῆς νυκτός, viii. 5 τοῦ στρατοῦ τοῦ στρόφων αὐτοῦ, Matt. xiii. 30 δησατε δεσμάς πρὸς τὸ 239 κατακάυσαν bind bundles, Matt. vii. 24 διὰ τὸ κατακόμβησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, Luke vi. 48 cf. also 1 Pet. iv. 2 (ἀκοήν ἀκοίνων Obad. 1). In these cases sometimes no different expression can be used (cf. ἄπο-202 στόλους ἀποστέλλειν, legatos legare Cic. Vatin. 15, γράμμασι γρά-φειν Dem. Polycl. 710 b.), and the connection of the noun and the verb is purely etymological and historical. On the whole phrase-212 ology under this head, which is far more diversified in classic Greek, see Wunder on Lobeck’s Sophocl. Aj. S. 37 ff.
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Akin to this construction is ὃρκον ὄμνιν Luke i. 73 (Demosth. Apat. 579 c.), βοῶν χρόνον 1 Pet. iv. 2 (τῆν βίον D. S. exc. Vat. p. 49), ἀφεὶν (πληγάς) παλλάς, ἄλγας, which further takes an Acc. of a person (cf. Luke xii. 47). Cf. Wunder, as above, 86. On Luke ii. 44 ἥλθον ἡμέρας οὖν they went a day’s journey, or Acts viii. 39 ἔφορεύετο τὴν οὖν αὐτοῦ (cf. ὁδὸν βαδίζεων Plut. Coriol. 9; LXX. 1 Sam. vi. 9; Num. xxii. 33; Exod. xiii. 17), scarcely any remark is necessary; yet see Wunder, 41 ff.

Analogous is the construction with the Dative; as, φωνεῖν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Acts xvi. 28, and βοῶν or κράζων φωνῇ μεγ. Mark xv. 34; Matt. xxvii. 50; Acts vii. 60, ὄρκῳ ὄμνιν Acts ii. 30, χαρᾷ χαίρει 1 Thess. iii. 9 (ἀγαλλιάζονταi χαρῇ ἄνεκλαλήτων 1 Pet. i. 8), κρίνοντες φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Rev. v. 2 [text. recept.]; also ποιός θανάτῳ ἠμελεῖ ἀποθνῄσκων Ἰνν. xii. 33; xviii. 32. Cf. Aristot. pol. 3, 9; Plut. Coriol. 3 (Jonah i. 16; Acta apocr. 4) Krt. 17 (Bengel, Apoc. xvii. 2) cf. § 54, 3, p. 466.

3. Instead of the Accusative of the object, in many cases a preposition, ἐν (ἡ), is said to be used, according to the Hebrew construction; but the passages adduced, when more closely examined, soon show the admissibility of the preposition in its proper import:

a. In Acts xv. 7 ὁ θεῶς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο διὰ τοῦ στόματος μου ἀκούσαι τὰ ἐθνη etc.; ἐπὶ ημῶν is not to be referred to, but ἐν ἡμῖν signifies among us (the Apostles); for, in the first place, the singular μου is immediately used of Peter, and again, notice is to be taken of τὰ ἑθνη (as the apostolic field of labor): God made choice among us, that the heathen should be instructed through me. See also Olshausen in loc. On the Hebrew הֵּֽעֵ֝ו, which in the Sept. is sometimes rendered ἐκλέγω. ἐν (1 Sam. xvi. 9; 1 Kings viii. 16; 1 Chron. xxviii. 4; Neh. ix. 7), but which Gesenius has not even deemed it necessary to explain; see Ewald, Gr. 605.

b. Ὀμολογεῖν ἐν Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8 to make confession in one, i.e. (according to another construction) about one. Bengel otherwise. The Hebrew expression בָּאִים Ps. xxxii. 5 has not quite the same meaning.

4. Two Accusatives are used,

240 a. One of a person and the other of a thing (Mth. 930, 932), uniformly after verbs of clothing and unclothing Ἰνν. xix. 2; Matt. xxvii. 28, 31; Mark xv. 17; Rev. xvii. 4, of (feeding and) giving to drink Mark ix. 41; 1 Cor. iii. 2, of anointing Rev. iii. 18 (Heb. i. 9), of loading Luke xi. 46, of adjuring (by) Acts xix. 13; 1 Thess. v. 27, of reminding (ἀναμμῆνοι) 1 Cor. iv. 17 (Xen. C. 3, 3,

1 To this class belongs also ὕμῳς Num. xi. 4; Dent. viii. 16; Wisd. xvi. 20, for which we find in Jambl. Pyth. ὕμῳς τῶν τῶν. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. xiii. 3 ὕμῳς πάντα τὰ βαρέσσια means to sell out all my goods, bestow in food.
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87; Her. 6, 140; but ἀναμ. τινα των Xen. C. 6, 4, 18), of teaching Jno. xiv. 26, of asking and inquiring Matt. vii. 9; Jno. xvi. 23; 203 1 Pet. iii. 15 (αιτεῖν), Matt. xxi. 24 (Lob. Paralip. 522), Mark iv. 10 (ἐρωτᾶν). On the other hand, εὐφυλλεύσθαι is construed only in Acts xiii. 32 with two Accusatives, cf. Heliod. 2, 10; Alciphr. 3, 12; Euseb. H. E. 3, 4, var. For κρύπτειν τινα τι (Mth. 937) the construction κρύπτειν τι ἀπό των is invariably used, Col. i. 26; Luke xviii. 34; xix. 42, or at least indicated. Διδάσκειν is once joined, but according to a somewhat uncertain reading, to ἐν των of the person, Rev. ii. 14 (as if instructing at a person). Other and better Codd. have ἔδιδασκε τῷ Βαλακ, cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 656 (ἢ ἡμᾶς Job xxi. 22). Besides αἰτεῖν τινα τι, we find αἰτεῖν τι παρά or ἀπό των Acts iii. 2; ix. 2; Matt. xx. 20 (Xen. A. 1, 3, 16). Further, χρείαν τινα with the Dative of the material occurs Acts x. 38, as ἀλείφειν uniformly, Mark vi. 13; Jno. xi. 2, etc.; ὑπομε- μνήσθαι τινα περὶ των 2 Pet. i. 12, also περιβαλλεθαι ἐν Rev. iii. 5; iv. 4, ἡμφεσμένος ἐν Matt. xi. 8; Luke vii. 25 (Dat. in Plat. Protag. 321 a.). For ἀφαίρεσθαι τινα τι we find ἀφαίρεσθαι ἐν των Luke viii. 3.

Heb. ii. 17 ὡδόσκεσθαι τῶν ἀμαρίας (cf. Ecclus. xxviii. 5; Dan. ix. 24 Theodot.) expiare peccata is perhaps to be explained by supposing that the expression ὡδόσκεσθαι τῶν θεον τῶν ἀμαρίας had begun to be used. In 1 Sam. iii. 14 ἐξιλασθήσεται δύσκα όικου 'Ηλί, the verb is strictly passive.

The same view essentially may be taken (Mth. 927, 989; Rost 497 f. 503) of the Accusative of a pronoun (τι, τῷ αὑτῷ, τάττα) or neuter adjective (μέγα, etc.), which is joined to many verbs along with the Acc. or Gen. of a person (as, βλάπτειν Luke iv. 35, ὠφελεῖν Gal. v. 2 cf. Lucian. Tim. 119, 241 δικέων Acts xxv. 10; Gal. iv. 12; Philem. 18, μυροθήκαι 1 Cor. xi. 2); there is however this difference, that in these instances the use of two Accusatives was arrested, as it were, in the first stage. So we Germans say: jem. etwas, viel u.s.w. fragen, but not on this account: jem. eine Nachricht fragen. Hither I refer also Matt. xxvii. 44. Instances of intransitive verbs which are construed with such Accusatives of a thing and have thus become (to a limited extent) transitives, it is scarcely necessary to adduce; yet see 1 Cor. ix. 25 πάντα ἐκπαιδεύεται, xi. 2; Phil. i. 6; ii. 18; 2 Cor. vii. 14 (cf., however, 1 above) Matt. ix. 14; Rev. v. 4, etc. Fr. explains in the same way also Rom. vi. 10 δέπθασθαι and Gal. ii. 20 δὲν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, see above, § 24, note 3, p. 168.

1 This construction cannot be certainly established in reference to the Hebrew by 2 Chron.xvii. 9, γεννᾶται ζῶως as this probably means teach in Judah. In Acts vii. 22 ἐπιδεόθη πᾶν σοφία is not put for πᾶν σοφίαν (cf. Diod. S. 1, 91); but the Dative is employed to denote the means of training, whereas ἐπιδεύω πᾶν σοφίαν would be edactus est (institutus ad) sapientiam. The true reading of the passage, however, is probably ἐν τῳ σοφίᾳ, cf. Plat. Crito 50 d.
b. An Acc. of the Subject and of the Predicate (Mth. 934 f.);
as, Jno. vi. 15 ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν βασιλέα, Luke xix. 46 ὑμεῖς
αὐτὸν (οἴκου) ἐποίησατε σπήλαιοι λῃστῶν, Heb. i. 2 δεν θήκε κληρονόμου
(i. 13), Jas. x. 10 οὐδεμισμα λάβετε τῆς κακοπαθείας . . . τοὺς
214 προφήτας, Heb. xii. 9 τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς πατέρας εἰχόμεν παιδευτάς,
Phil. iii. 7 ταῦτα (κέρδη) ἤγγικεν ζημίαν, 2 Pet iii. 15 τήν τοῦ κυρίου
ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἤγείροθε, Luke i. 59 εἰκόλαυν αὐτῷ . . .
Ταξιαριαν, vs. 53 (Pol. 15, 2, 4). So, in particular, with verbs of
204 making, naming (appointing), constituting, viewing as, etc., Matt.
iv. 19; xxii. 43; Jno. v. 11; x. 33; xix. 7; Acts v. 81; vii. 10;
xx. 28; Luke xii. 14; Rom. iii. 25; vi. 11; viii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 9;
ix. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Eph. ii. 14; Phil. ii. 29; Tit. ii. 7; Heb. vii. 28;
xi. 26; Jas. ii. 5; Rev. xxi. 5; 2 Sam. ii. 5, 13; iii. 15.

The Acc. of the Predicate (of destination) is, however, sometimes
annexed with the preposition eis, — Acts xiii. 22 ἥγειρεν αὐτοῖς τὸν
Δαυὶδ εἰς βασιλέα, vii. 21 ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἐαυτῇ εἰς νιόν, for,
as, a son, xiii. 47 (cf. also the Passive λογιζομαι εἰς τι Acts xix.
27; Rom. ii. 26; ix. 28, § 29, 8. Note), — or with ὅς, as 2 Thess. iii. 15
καλ ὃς ἐκβόλην (τοῦτον 14) ἥγεισθε (ὑπὲρ). This is a Hebraistic
construction (Ewald, Gr. 603), and is frequently imitated in the
Sept., Isa. lxxix. 6; 2 Kings iv. 1; Judith iii. 8; v. 11; Gen. xii. 2;
xliii. 17; 1 Sam. xv. 11; Esth. ii. 7; iv. 4. What has been ad-
duced from classic Greek as parallel to the construction with eis
is different from it, as the eis of destination in Her. 1, 34 πάντες
τοῖς χρεόνων εἰς πόλεμῳ, or Eurip. Troad. 1201 οὐ γὰρ εἰς κάλλος
τίχας δαίμων διδώσοι, or Alciphr. 3, 28. On the other hand, real
parallels occur in later writers, e.g. Niceph. Constant. p. 51, ed.
Bonn.: ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἡπας δῆμος . . . ἀναγείρουσιν εἰς βασιλείαν
242 Ἀρτέμιον, p. 18 εἰς γυναίκα διδώμει σοι αὐτῇν, Geo. Pachym. I. 349
τὴν ἐκείνου ἐγκυόνοι λαβῶν εἰς γυναίκα, Theophan. contin. p. 223
κεχρησμένος εἰς βασιλεία. See, in general, the Index to Pachym.,
Leo Grammat. and Theophan. in the Bonn edition; Acta apocr.
p. 71. To the latter mode of expression may also be referred Heb.
xi. 8 ἀμβών, εἰς κληρονομίαν, and perhaps Acts vii. 53 ἐλάβετε τὸν
νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἁγγελῶν ye received the law for ordinances
of angels, i.e. as ordinances of angels, see Bengal in loc.; yet eis
here may be more easily explained by Matt. xii. 41. In Phil. iv. 16,
however, the construction eis τὴν χρείαν μοι ἐπέμψατε is obviously
a different thought from τὴν χρείαν μ. ἐπ., and so does not belong
here.

1 On the other hand, cf. Xen. Anab. 4, 5, 24 πάλιν εἰς δασὺν βασιλεία τρεφομένους,
whereas Arrian, Alex. 1, 26, 5 τοῦτο οὖν, οὐ δασὺν βασιλεία ἑρεθο, see Ellendt, in loc.
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Essentially the same as the preceding constructions are Luke ix. 14 κατακλίνατε αὐτοὺς κλασάς ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα (in rows of 50), Mark vi. 39 ἔτεραν αὐτοὺς ἀνακλίνας πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια (in separate parties). These Accusatives are most simply understood as predicative. See § 59.

5. Verbs which in the Active voice govern the Acc. both of a person and of a thing, retain as is well known the latter in the Passive; 215 as, 2 Thess. ii. 15 παραδόσεις ἵδε διδάχθητε, Luke xvi. 19 ἐνεδίδοσκετο πορφύραν, Heb. vi. 9; cf. Phil. iii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 13 (without εἰς!). So also in the constructions considered under 2: Luke xii. 48 δαρήσεται ὀλίγας (cf. δέρειν τινα πληγάς), Mark x. 38 τὸ βάπτισμα, δ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτίζωναι, Rev. xvi. 9 (cf. Lucian. Tox. 61; Dion. Hal. IV. 2162, 8). On the other hand, the Predicate Acc. passes over into a Nominative: Heb. v. 10 προσαγωγεῖες 205 ... ἀρχιερεῖς, Matt. v. 9 αὐτοὶ νιόν θεοῦ κληθόνται, Jas. iv. 4 ἐχθρὸς θεοῦ καθίσται.

Further, the Accusative of the thing is retained by such verbs as, in the Active, govern a Dative of the person along with the Accusative of a thing,—they being treated when put in the Passive altogether like causal verbs; as, Gal. ii. 7 πεπίστευμαι τὸ εἰσαγγέλων (from πιστεύω τινι τι, in the Passive πιστεύομαι τι), 1 Cor. ix. 17; Rom. iii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 11;¹ see Fischer, Well. III. I. 437; Mth. 946. The same analogy is followed by περίκεμαι Acts xxviii. 20 τὴν ἅλυσιν ταύτην περίκεμαι (from ἅλυσις περίκεματα μοι) Heb. v. 2 (d’Orvill. Charit. p. 240; Mth. 947). Accordingly, in general, the Accusative with Passives indicates the more remote object, particularly that part of the Subject where the quality denoted by the verb resides; as, 1 Tim. vi. 5 διεσθαρμένοι τῶν νοῶν (as if from διαφθείρω τινα τῶν νοῶν), 2 Tim. iii. 8; 1 Jo. xi. 44 δεδεμένος τῶν 243 πόδων καὶ τὰς χείρας, Phil. i. 11 πεπληρωμένοι καρπῶν δικαιος., 2 Cor. iii. 18 τὴν αὐτήν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα, Heb. x. 22 f. on which cf. Valcken. ad Herod. 7. 39; Hartung, Casus 61.

Whether Matt. xi. 5 πτωχοὶ εἰσαγγελίζονται, Heb. iv. 2 διόμεν εἰσαγγελισμόνι (verse 6) cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 31; Joel ii. 32 also come under this rule or should be referred to εἰσαγγελίζονται τινα τι, remains doubtful; yet see § 39, 1.

6. The Accusative employed to denote a material object only in a mediate or remote way was by degrees more and more extended, and gave rise to elliptical constructions of various sorts, which we must resolve by prepositions and the like. This phraseology is but slightly used in the N.T. It is mainly in specifications of

¹ On the other hand, e.g. 1 Cor. xiv. 34 οὐκ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, Acts xxvi. 1.
time and place that the Acc. as an Objective case is still perceptible to us; as, Luke xxi. 41 ἀπεστάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡς λίθος βωλήν he withdrew from them a stone's cast (as if by his withdrawing he made the distance from a stone's cast), Jno. vi. 19 ἁγιακότες ὡς σταδίους εἶκοι πέντε (Mtth. 9:50), 1 Pet. iv. 2 τὸν ἐπίλουσαν ἐν σαρκὶ βιῶσαι χρόνον, Jno. ii. 12 ἐκείνη ἤμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας, Luke i. 75; ii. 41; xv. 29; xx. 9; Jno. i. 40; v. 5; xi. 6; Matt. ix. 20; Acts xiii. 21; Heb. xi. 23; iii. 17; Mdv. 33 f. The Acc. is thus in the N.T. commonly employed to denote the duration of time (but in Jno. v. 5 ἡ is governed by ἔχουν, see Mey.) — sometimes also the 216 (approximate) point of time, as Jno. iv. 52 ἔχθες ὅραν ἐβδομήν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῶν ὁ πυρετός, Acts x. 8; Rev. iii. 3 (where more frequently ἑρπὲ with the Acc. is used) Krü. 18 f.

When the Acc., annexed as a detached word or phrase to other words, gives a closer specification as respects sort, number, degree, sphere — as Jno. vi. 10 ἀνίστασαν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς πεντακισχίλιον (in number), cf. Isocr. big. 842; Aristot. pol. 2, 8; Ptol. 4, 6, 34 (many others in Lob. Phryn. p. 364 sq. and Paralip. 528), Jude 7 τὸν ομοιὸν τοῖς τρόπον ἑκατονευσάσας, Matt. xxiii. 37 ὅταν τρόπων δρόμων ἐπισυνάγει, 2 Tim. iii. 8 (Plat. rep. 7, 517 c.; 206 Plut. educ. 4, 4; 9, 18), Acts xviii. 3 σκηνοποιῶς τὴν τέχνην (Lucian. asin. 48; Agath. 2, 46; Acta apocr. p. 61) — it resembles most nearly the Passive construction under 5. This accusative, however, is very rare in the N.T.; even in Acts xviii. 3 the best Codd. [Sin. also] have τῇ τέχνῃ, cf. § 31. On the other hand, a number of strictly adverbial Accusatives, which were probably very current in the language of conversation, have found their way into the 244 N.T.; as, μακράν (afar), μάτην (in cassum), ἀκμήν (this moment) γετ, τὴν ἀρχήν (Jno. viii. 25), δωρεάν, τὸ τέλος (1 Pet. iii. 8), cf. § 54, 1. See, in general, Hm. Vig. p. 882 sq. To the same class of constructions belong also parenthetical phrases, such as Rom. xii. 18 εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἔξ ὑμῶν, μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρημένοντες, ix. 5 (i. 15) Heb. ii. 17; v. 1; Rom. xv. 17; Mtth. 734; Mdv. 36 f.

How the Acc. of quality coincides with the Dative has already been noticed. Thus τῷ ἄριστῳ is used for τῶν ἄριστων. Usually, however, we find the Acc. in classic Greek where in the N.T. the Dative is employed; e.g. τὸ γένος (natione) Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 2; Herod. 1, 8, 2; D. S. 1, 4; Arrian. Al. 1, 27, 8 and τῷ γόνι Mark vii. 26; Acts iv. 36 (Palaeph. 6, 2; 11, 2), ἐκλύσατο τῇ ψυχῇ Heb. xii. 3 and τὴν ψυχὴν Diod. S. 20, 1, βραδέως τῇ καρδίᾳ Luke xxiv. 25, but βραδέως τὸν νοῦν Dion. H. de Lys. p. 243 Lips.

1 On the Hebrew cf. Ewald 591 f.
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See Krü. 15; Lob. Paralip. 528 (Wettst. N.T. I. 826). In Demosth. ep. 4 p. 118 b. we find θαρεός τῷ βίῳ and μη τολέτης τῷ νῦν φύσει side by side. For τούτου τὸν τρόπον even Greek prose authors more frequently employ κατὰ τούτου τὸν τρόπον.

Very extraordinary is the expression ὅδεν θαλάσσης in Matt. iv. 15 (from Isaiah) which is rendered by the way. Passages such as 1 Sam. vii. 9 εἰ ὅδεν ἄρων αὐτῆς πορεύεται (Wunder on Lob. Sophocl. Aj. 41 f.) Num. xxii. 33; Exod. xiii. 17 (cf. Luke ii. 44), do not authenticate that Acc. without government (by a verb), in an address containing Vocatives. Such a construction would quite exceed the limits of prose composition (Bhd. 114 f.). What Thiersch p. 145 sq. remarks, is not decisive. Should we perhaps read εἰ ὅδεν θαλάσσης (οἰκονύμες), with the Sept.? It is difficult to maintain with Mey. that ὅδε in verse 16 is the governing verb. The topographical difficulties of the usual interpretation are not invincible; only we must not, as in the prophet, take πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου as an in-217 dependent clause, as that would not apply to this passage in Matthew. ἀκαταγορασμένος.

7. In some passages the Accusative is said to be used absolutely, when on closer examination the grammatical reason for the Acc. can be discovered in the structure of the sentence. Thus in Rom. viii. 3 τῷ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου ... ὁ θεὸς τοῦ ἐκατον τῶν πέμψας ... κατέκρινε τὴν ἀμαρτίαν is properly equivalent to τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς, πέμψας ... καὶ κατακρίνων etc. (where ἀδύνατον does not require to be taken in a passive sense); this, however, may also be a Nominative put at the commencement (cf. Wisd. xvi. 17). In Acts xxvi. 3 the Acc. γυνώσκειν ἄντα is undoubtedly to be explained as an anacoluthon, which, when 207 participles are annexed, is of frequent occurrence; see § 63, I. 2a. Schaper, de sola ec. p. 94 sq., has adduced nothing altogether of the 245 same kind. In Luke xxiv. 46 f. ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν ... καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν ... ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ, the Acc. (in the construction of the Acc. with the Infinitive) is in itself grammatically clear; only the reference of ἀρξάμενον is loose: beginning (viz. the κηρύσσων), or, impersonally, that it should be begun; cf. Her. 3, 91. See besides Kypke I. 344 sq. In Rev. i. 20 the Accs. depend on γράφον verse 19, as has long been admitted. Lastly, in Rev. xxi. 17 ἐμέτρησε τὸ τείχος τῆς πόλεως ἐκατον τεσσαρ. περὶ, μέτρον ἀνθρώπου etc., the last words are a loose apposition to the clause ἐμέτρησε τὸ τείχος etc.; cf. Mth. 916. Further, cf. Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 501; Hartung, S. 54; Wannowski, Syntax. anom. p. 128 sqq. On an Acc. in apposition to a whole clause, as Rom. xii. 1, see § 59, 9.
§ 33. CONNECTION OF A VERB (NEUTER) WITH ITS DEPENDENT NOUN BY MEANS OF PREPOSITIONS.

A considerable number of verbs, particularly such as denote an affection or a tendency of the mind, are connected with their predicate by means of a preposition. In this respect the diction of the N. T. sometimes accords with classic usage, and sometimes displays more of a Hebrew and Oriental tinge. We arrange the verbs in question as follows:

a. Verbs of rejoicing or grieving, which in Greek authors are frequently construed with the Dative alone (Fr. Rom. III. 78 sq.), take for the most part the preposition ἐπί with the Dat. (cf. Wurm, Dinarch. p. 40 sq.), as χαίρειν Matt. xviii. 13; Luke i. 14; Acts xv. 31; 1 Cor. xiii. 6; Rev. xi. 10 (cf. Xen. C. 8, 4, 12; D. S. 19, 55; Isocr. permu. 738; Arrian. Ind. 35, 8), ἐφραίνεσθαι Rev. xviii. 20 (Ecclus. xvi. 1; 1 Macc. xi. 44; Xen. conv. 7, 5), συλλυπεῖσθαι Mark iii. 5 (Xen. Mem. 3, 9, 8; cf. χαλεπῶς φέρειν ἐπὶ 218 τινι Xen. H. 7, 4, 21); but sometimes also ἐν (λυπεῖν ἐν Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 814), as χαίρειν Luke x. 20; Phil. i. 18 (Col. i. 24; cf. Soph. Trach. 1119), ἐφραίνεσθαι Acts vii. 41, ἀγαλλιάσθαι 1 Pet. i. 6 (but ἀγάλλεσθαι ἐπὶ Xen. Mem. 2, 6, 35; 3, 5, 16).

Of verbs of being angry, ἄγνακτεῖν is construed with περὶ (to be 246 angry on account of some one) Matt. xx. 24; Mark x. 41; but (like ἄγνακτεῖν ἐπὶ Lucian. abdic. 9; Aphthon. progynm. c. 9 p. 267) ὀργίζεσθαι ἐπὶ τινι Rev. xii. 17; cf. Joseph. boll. jud. 3, 9, 8 (in the Sept. even ὀργίζεσθαι ἐν τινι Judg. ii. 14, in later Greek writers ὀργίζεσθαι κατά τινος as Malal. p. 43, 102, 165, etc.). The opposite, εὐδοκεῖν, is construed, in imitation of the Hebrew אָמַר and after the example of the Sept., with ἐν (to have pleasure in), whether used in reference to persons Matt. iii. 17; Luke iii. 22; 1 Cor. x. 5 or things 2 Cor. xii. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 12 (βέλεων ἐν Col. ii. 18 cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 22 ?); in classic Greek the Dative alone would be sufficient. 208 Ἀρκεῖσθαι, which usually takes a Dative (Luke iii. 14; Heb. xiii. 5), is once, 3 Jno. 10, construed with ἐπὶ.

b. Verbs denoting wonder, amazement, take ἐπί with the Dative; so θαυμάζειν Mark xii. 17; Luke xx. 26, ἐκπλήσσεσθαι Matt. xxii. 83; Mark i. 22; xi. 18; Luke iv. 32; Acts xiii. 12, which is also very common in Greek authors. Θαυμάζειν περὶ τινος Luke ii. 18 (Isaeus 3, 28 cf. Schoenm. ad Isaeum p. 244) or even διά τι on account of something Mark vi. 6, as Aelian. 12, 6; 14, 36 θαυμάζειν τινὰ διά τι. But θαυμάζειν ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν Luke i. 21 may mean
during his tarrying; yet cf. Sir. xi. 21. On ἔσκεσθαι τιν see above, § 31, 1, f. p. 209.

c. Of verbs signifying to pity, σπλαγχνίζεσθαι usually takes ἐν either with the Acc., Matt. xv. 32; Mark vi. 34; viii. 2; ix. 22, or with the Dat., Luke vii. 13; Matt. xiv. 14, only once Matt. ix. 36 it takes περὶ; but ἐδεισθαι is used as a transitive, see § 32, 1, b, a.

d. Verbs of relying on, trusting, hoping, boasting, are construed with ἐν, ἐν, ἐν; as, πέποιθα ἐν τιν Mark x. 24; Luke xi. 22; 2 Cor. i. 9 (Agath. 209, 5; 306, 20), ἐπὶ τῷ οἷνa Matt. xxvii. 43; 2 Thess. iii. 4, with ἐν Phil. iii. 3; πιστεῦω ἐπὶ τιν Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 6 Sept. (on πιστεύω ἐν or ἐπὶ τῶν believe on one, see above, § 31, 5), ἐπιζεῖν ἔπι with Dat. Rom. xv. 12; Phil. iv. 10 (Pol. 1, 82, 6) and with Acc. 1 Tim. v. 5; 1 Macc. ii. 61, ἐν Jno. v. 45; 2 Cor. i. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 5; Ecclsius. ii. 9 (Herod. 7, 10, 1; Joseph. bell. jud. 6, 2, 1, ἐν τῶιε ἐν ἐν Plut. Galba c.19)., ἐν 1 Cor. xv. 19 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 25; Mem. 4, 2, 28; Pol. 1, 59, 2 ἐνπίθα ἐγεν ἐν τ.), καννακεῖν ἔπι τιν Rom. v. 2 (Ps. xviii. 7; Ecclsius. xxx. 2; D. S. 16, 70, similarly σεμνόνεσθαι Diog. L. 2, 71; Isocr. big. p. 840 and φιλοσοφεῖ Diog. L. 6, 24), more frequently ἐν Rom. ii. 17, 23; v. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 21; Gal. vi. 13 (Ps. cxlii. 5; Jer. ix. 23), but not κατὰ 2 Cor. xi. 18 see Mey. in loc., also not ἐπερι 2 Cor. vii. 14 cf. ix. 2.

e. Of verbs of sinning, offending against, ἀμαρτάνεω is connected by ἐν with the object sinned against, Matt. xvii. 21; Luke xvii. 4; 219 1 Cor. vi. 18 etc., cf. Soph. Oed. C. 972; Her. 1, 138; Isocr. panath. p. 644; permut. p. 750 and Aegin. p. 920,934; Mr. Anton. 7, 26; Wetsten. I. 443; on the other hand, ἀμαρτάν. πρὸς τῶν Joseph. antt. 14, 15, 2, περὶ τῶα Isocr. permut. 754 (ἀμαρτ. τῷ 1 Sam. xiv. 33; 1 Kings viii. 31, 33; Judg. x. 10).

f. The verbs ἀρέσκεω please, and φανηρας appear (so and so), instead of the Dative of the person to whom something gives pleasure or appears (in such or such a light), are connected with the noun by the Hellenistic preposition ἐνοπιον; as, Acts vi. 5 ἐρεσεν δο λόγον ἐνοπιον παντός του πλήθους (Deut. i. 23), Luke xxiv. 11 ἐφάνησαν ἐνοπιον αὐτῶν ὃς εἶνα τὸ ἡμετα. In the Sept. ἀρέσκεω occurs also with ἐνωπίων τῶος Num. xxxvi. 6; Gen. xxxiv. 18; 1 Macc. vi. 60.

g. Of verbs of seeing, βλέπεω is often construed with ἐν (intueri) Jno. xiii. 22; Acts iii. 4, which is not unknown to classic Greek also; see Wahl.

There is properly speaking a redundancy when verbs of following are
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construed with the preposition μερά or σίν (cf. comitari cum aliquo in Latin inscriptions), Rev. vi. 8; xiv. 13; see Wetst. N. T. I. 717; Lob. Phryn. p. 354; Schaeff. Dem. V. 590; Hm. Lucian. p. 178; Krü. 63. The phrase ἀκολούθω δι' ἵσω τινός (ὡς) Matt. x. 38 (Isa. xlv. 14) is Hebraistic.

Substantives derived from such verbs are in the same way connected with the object by means of prepositions; as, νίκης ἐν Χρυσῷ Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 15 etc., παροιμία πρὸς ὑμῶν Phil. i. 26, θάλημα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν Eph. iii. 13, ζηλον ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν 2 Cor. vii. 7, see Fr. Rom. I. 195, 365 sq.

§ 34. ADJECTIVES.

1. Although the two sorts of nouns, substantive and adjective, are distinct from each other in thought, yet the latter (including participles) enter the sphere of substantives far more abundantly in Greek than, for instance, in Latin. This they do whether they have or have not the Article, and in every gender; sometimes owing to an original ellipsis, and sometimes without an ellipsis, 248 by virtue of the Gender, whether masculine or neuter, peculiar to them (Krü. 2 f.); as, ἡ ἔρημος (γῆ), τῇ ἐπιμονῇ (ἡμέρᾳ), διοπτερίς (ἄγαλμα) Acts xix. 35, τὸ αὐρίκου (ὑφασμα ?) Rev. xviii. 12, ὁ σοφός, ὁ κλέπτων Eph. iv. 28, βασιλικός, ὁ ἄρχων, ἀλλότριοι strangers, κακοτικοὶ evil-doers, τὸ ἀγαθὸν (τὸ πνευματικὸν, γυμνὸν 1 Cor. xv. 46 ?).

On adjectives which have become substantives by an ellipsis, see § 64. Among expressions relating to persons, as σοφός, ὁ σοφός, the following are characteristic of the N. T.: ὁ πιστὸς the believer, πιστοί believers, ἄγιος, ἓκλεκτος, ἀμαρτωλός Rom. xv. 31; xvi. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 15; 1 Tim. i. 15; v. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Heb. xii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 22; so even with an attributive Adjective, Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2 κληροῦ αγίου, or with a 220 Gen. Rom. viii. 33 ἓκλεκτοι θεοῦ. In all these cases persons are indicated to whom the quality in question belongs; and there is no necessity for supplying ἄνθρωπος (or ἄνδροι). Likewise where ὁ ἀληθινός 1 Jno. v. 20 is used of God, or ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ Luke iv. 34 of Christ, or ὁ παρθένος of the devil, there is no ellipsis of those substantives, but the notion is grammatically complete: the True, the Holy One of God; and what individual is distinctively so called in Biblical diction, must be ascertained from other sources.

2. Especially frequent and diversified are Neuters used substantively (Krü. 3). Many of these even regularly take the place of a substantive derivable (but not always actually existing) from the root; and this, not only in reference to things sensible, μέσον, ἐσχατον, μικρόν, βραχύν, ἀλόγον, φανερόν, κρυπτόν, ἐλάττων, ἀρσεν, etc., especially with a preposition (εἰς τὸ μέσον Mark iii. 8; Jno. xx. 19,
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metà μικρὸν Matt. xxvi. 73, ἐν ὀλύγῳ Acts xxvi. 29, ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Matt. vi. 4, εἰς φανερὸν Mark iv. 22), but also mental and abstract, particularly with a Gen. annexed, as Rom. ii. 4 τὸ χριστὸν τ. θεοῦ (ἡ χριστότης), Heb. vi. 17 τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς θουλίας, Rom. viii. 3; ix. 22; 1 Cor. i. 25; 2 Cor. iv. 17; Phil. iii. 8 τὸ ἐπιρέχον τῆς γνώσεως, iv. 5 τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὕμων. Instead of the Gen. another construction is selected in Rom. i. 15 τὸ κατ’ ἐμὲ πρόδιδον (τὸ πρόδιδον 210 purpose Eur. Iphig. 983). The Plurals of adjectives are regularly 3. sub concretes, and denote whole classes of things (persons); as, τὰ ἄρσα κ. ἄρσατα Col. i. 16, ἐπουράνια and ἐπίγεια Jno. iii. 12; Phil. ii. 10, τὰ βασίλεια Rev. ii. 24, ἀρχαία 2 Cor. v. 17. Such adjectives, moreover, are sometimes made more specific by the context: thus, ἐπουράνια Jno. as above heavenly truths, Phil. ii. 10 heavenly beings, Eph. ii. 6; iii. 10 heavenly places (i.q. οὐρανοί, cf. var. Eph. i. 20) etc. In Rom. i. 20 τὰ ἄρσατα τοῦ θεοῦ the Plural refers to the partition that follows, ἦ τε ἄρσις δύναμις καὶ θειότης, and Philippi has 249 explained the word more correctly than Fr. (On Eph. vi. 12 πνευματικὰ τῆς πνεύματος, see Note 3.)

The expression τὸ δοκίμαν τῆς πίστεως in 1 Pet. i. 7 does not come under this head, as δοκίμαν of itself is a substantive, (no adjective δοκίμαν exists); further, compare on this passage and on Jas. i. 3, Fr. Prælim. S. 44. In Rom. i. 19, too, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is not simply i.q. ἡ γνώσις τ. θ., otherwise it would not be easy to see why Paul did not employ ἡ γνώσις, so usual to him; but the meaning is either what is known (to mankind) of God, or what is knowable (may be known) of (about) God. (In reference to the latter meaning of γνωστός, which Thol. questioned, see Soph. Oed. R. 362; Hm. Plat. rep. 7, 517 b.; Arrian. Epict. 2, 20, 4, cf. Schultess, theol. Annal. 1829, S. 976.) I prefer the former as the simpler. Paul is speaking of the objective knowledge, of the sum of that which is known of God (from what source see verse 20). This objective γνωστόν becomes subjective, in as far as φανερὸν ἀκούν ἐν αὐτοῖς. This shows, too, why Paul did not use ἡ γνώσις here.

The preceding mode of expression, which flows quite simply from the 221 nature of the Neuter, is not unknown to the Greeks. The later prose authors in particular adopted it from the technical language of philosophy. At the same time, the examples collected by Georgi (Hierocrit. I. 39) must be carefully sifted. The following may serve as unquestionable parallels: Demosth. Phil. 1. p. 20 a. το τῶν θεῶν εἰμικότες, and de fals. leg. p. 213 a. τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτῆς, Thuc. 1, 68 το πῖστιν τῆς πολιτείας. 2, 71 τὸ ἀνθρώπων τῆς γνώσης, Galen. protrept. 2 το τῆς τέχνης ἀκούν τον, and το τῆς βάσεως εἰμικότος, Heliod. 2, 15, 88 το ἀντιβάλλον τῆς λύπης, Plat. Phaedr. 240 a.; Strabo 3, 168; Philochr. Ap. 7, 12; D. S. 19, 55; Diog.
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3. On the other hand, 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. Yet the N. T. is by no means poor in adjectives; it can show a considerable number which do not occur in the (early) Greek authors, and some of which have been formed by the apostles themselves (ἐπισυνάω, σαρ-κίος, πνευματικός, παρείσακτος, πόρμος, ἀκατάκριτος, ἀκρογνωμάτος, ἀνεπαλάχυντος, αὐτοκατάκριτος, ἀχειροποίητος, βροκόνος, ἐπιποθητος, εἰσπεριστατος, ἵσαγγελος, κατειδολος, κυριακός, ταπεινόφρον etc.).

This substitution of a substantive for an adjective takes place,

a. In such a way that the substantive which is the principal word stands in the Genitive: 1 Tim. vi. 17 μὴ ἰδίκεαν ἐτί πλοῦτον ἀδηλόττητι not to trust in the uncertainty of riches i.e. in riches which are uncertain, Rom. vi. 4 ἦν ἡμεῖς ἐν καυνότετι ζωῆς πεπατώσαμεν, vii. 6.

This form of expression, however, is not arbitrary, but is designed to give greater prominence to the main idea, which if expressed by an adjective would recede more into the background. It is rhetorical, therefore, not grammatical. Cf. Zumpt, Lat. Gramm. S. 554 and examples from Greek authors in Held, Plut. Timol. p. 368.

Properly only those passages come under this head in which, to the substantive that is followed by a Genitive, a verb is joined which from the nature of the case suits rather the substantive in the Genitive, and consequently points it out as the principal noun (as, ingemuit corvi stupor, or the above ἓπισυνάω, ἐτί πλοῦτον ἀδηλόττητι). On the other hand, such passages as the following are to be decidedly excluded from this class: 2 Col. ii. 5 βλάπτων τὸ στερέωμα τῆς πίστεως, 2 Cor. iv. 7 ἦν ἡ ἐπιβολή τῆς ὁμάτων 222 ἦ τοῦ θεοῦ, Gal. ii. 14 ὄρθοποδεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἐλέειναν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ii. 5, also 2 These. ii. 11 πέμπει ἐνέργειαν πλάνης. In Heb. ix. 2 ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρων

---

1 On the case in which an adjective as a predicate is expressed by means of a substantive for rhetorical reasons, as in 2 Cor. iii. 9 καὶ διακονᾶ τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξας, see § 58.
2 Fr. Rom. I. 367 sq. has objected to this separation, which however he appears to have misunderstood. In passages of the second kind the statement is merely logical, in those of the first it is rhetorical. When it is said, live according to the truth of the Gospel, we are to understand the words in their proper and natural meaning (the truth of the Gospel is the rule of life); but when it is said, corvi stupor ingemuit, the statement is figurative, like, his blood called for vengeance. Cic. N. D. 2, 50, 127 belongs to the second class, and foedo odore would be the less exact expression.
signifies: the setting before, exposition, of the bread; and in 1 Pet. i. 2 ἄγγελος πνεύματος, as a glance at the context will show, is not synonymous with πνεῦμα ἄγνω. Lastly, the phrase λαμβάνει τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος in Acts ii. 33; Gal. iii. 14 means: obtain the promise of the Spirit, which happens when the promised blessing itself is received (κομίζεται τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν), when the promise becomes fulfilment.

b. Far more frequently so that the noun which expresses a quality (mostly moral) stands in the Genitive: Luke iv. 22 λόγοι τῆς χάριτος, xvi. 8 οἰκονόμος τῆς ἁδικίας, xviii. 6 κρίτης τῆς ἁδικίας, Col. i. 13 μός τῆς ἁγίατος, Rev. xiii. 3 ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου mortal wound, Rom. i. 26 πάθος ἄτμιας, 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jas. i. 25; Heb. i. 3. This, in prose, is a Hebraistic mode of expression, (and is to be 251 attributed not merely to the want of adjectives in Hebrew, Ewald 212 572, but to the peculiar vividness of the Oriental languages). In the more elevated style, however, there are instances of the same construction even in Greek authors, see Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 226, cf. Pfochen, diatr. p. 29; but the examples in Georgi, Vind. p. 214 sqq. are nearly all useless. In later writers it intrudes into plain prose, Eustath. Gramm. p. 478.

If in such expressions a Gen. of a personal pronoun be annexed, it is rendered as belonging to the entire idea: as, Heb. i. 3 τῆς ἐκκλησίας δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ by his mighty word, Col. i. 13; Rev. iii. 10; xiii. 3. It is common to go still further, and to assert (e.g. Vorst, Hebraism. p. 570 sq.; Storr, observ. p. 234 sq.) that when two nouns combined denote one principal notion, the demonstrative pronoun also, according to the Hebrew idiom (?), agrees grammatically with the governed noun: as, Acts v. 20 τῆς ἀγίατος 223 τοῦ ταύτης τούτοις for ταύτα these words of life, xiii. 26 ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας τούτης this doctrine of salvation, Rom. vii. 24 ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτον, cf. the Peschito. But this rule (which even Bengel has adopted) is imaginary. In Rom. vii. τούτου may have been construed with σώματος by Paul himself; but it is not without ap-

1 But 2 Thess. i. 7 ἄγγελος δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ are angels of his power, i.e. who serve his power.
2 The Genitive of material does not come under this head. The expression λίθου kudos e.g. was to the Greeks like our ram of stone, and it is only the Latin idiom that would require the use of the adjective here. Likewise δομικὸς θεών Phil. iv. 18 (cf. Aristot. rhct. 1, 11, 9) is probably fragrance of sweet odor, and not quite equivalent to εὐφῶς. That 1 Cor. x. 16 τοῦ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας and Rom. i. 4 πνεῦμα ἀγγέλων are not to be explained by the above rule, is now admitted by the best expositors. For still more unsatisfactory examples, see Glass. I, 26 sq.
3 Some attempt to prove this to be a Hebraism by Ezra ix. 14 בְּשָׁם הַבְּשָׁם bakhbakh, where, however, there is no necessity whatever for construing הַבְּשָׁם with the second substantive.
propriate sense, if connected with θανάτου. As the apostle had already said much of θανάτος (verse 10 ff.), he might naturally refer to it; see de Wette in loc. Likewise in Acts xiii. σωτήρ Ἰσραήλ had already been expressed in verse 23, and accordingly δ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης means: the word of this (through Christ effected) salvation. In Acts v. the pronoun refers to the salvation which the apostles were then engaged in preaching. Even the Hebrew construction, as יְהוָה יְהֹוָה Isa. ii. 20 or יְהוָה יְהֹוָה Ps. lxxix. 21, which, though according to the rule, is at the same time much more natural as both words are properly one, has not been literally translated so in the Sept. Cf. Isa. as above, τα βασιλείματα αὐτοῦ τα ἄργαρα, 252 Deut. i. 41 τὰ σκεῖν τὰ πολεμικὰ αὐτοῦ, Ps. as above, ἐν ἐλαιώ ἐγώμ. In fact it is not easy to perceive, how Luke and Paul, in statements so simple, came to employ such an irregular construction. What Georgi, Vind. p. 204 sqq., and Munthe, obs. Acts v. 20, quote from Greek authors, loses all plausibility when closely examined (Fr. Exc. 1. ad Mr. p. 771 sqq.).

Note 1. The Hebraism (Gesen. Lehrgeb. S. 661; Vorst, Heb. 282 sq.) according to which the Neuter of an adjective is expressed by its Feminine, is said to occur in Luke xi. 33 εἰς κρυπτὴν τίθης. Absurd! κρυπτή had already become a substantive, signifying a covered place or passage, a subterraneous receptacle, vault (Athen. 5, 205); and this meaning is quite appropriate in the passage. On the other hand, Matt. xxii. 42 (Mark xii. 11) παρὰ κυρίῳ ἐγένετο αὐτῇ (τῶν), καὶ ἐστι θαυμαστὴ (θαυμαστῶν) is a quotation from Ps. cxvii. 23; even the Sept., however, may have referred the Feminine to κεφαλὴ γονίας (Wolf, cur. ad h. l.).

Note 2. We must here mention another Hebraistic (Vorst, Hebraism. 467 sqq.) circumlocution (as it is called) for certain concrete adjectives when employed as substantives, viz. by the use of νος or τέκνον followed by a Genitive of the abstract; as, νος ἀπεθάνεσι Eph. ii. 2 i.e. the disobedient, νος φωτός Luke xvi. 8; Jno. xii. 36, τέκνα φωτός Eph. v. 8, τέκνα ἁρχής ii. 3, τέκνα ἐπάκοις 1 Pet. i. 14, τέκνα κατάρας 2 Pet. ii. 14, δ νος τῆς ἀπωλείας 2 Thess. ii. 3. Every one must feel that these expressions are not mere circumlocutions, but phrases which bring out the meaning with greater vividness and force. This phraseology is traceable to the vivid imagination of Orientals, which even in the realm of ideas represents the most intimate 224 relationship (derivation or dependence) under the image of son or child (Eccles. iv. 11). Children of disobedience, therefore, are those who belong to ἀπεθάνεσι as a child to its mother — those in whom disobedience has become predominant and a second nature (compare in Hebrew, Deut. iii. 18; xxv. 2; 3 Sam. xii. 5; Ps. lxxix. 23). (The expressions ταιες λατρῶν, διατήρων — especially in Lucian — Schaeff. Dion. 313, grammatically rather resemble νος τῶν ἀθρόων. Παις or τέκνον joined to an abstract noun, as in the preceding quotations, neither Schwarz nor Georgi has been able to vindicate by any passage from Greek prose. For an instance from ecclesiastical authors, see Epiphan. Opp. I. 380 b. of νος τῆς ἀληθογ
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πλείως. Strictly similar phraseology is not to be expected in modern European languages; child of death, for instance, is derived from the diction of the Bible. In the more elevated style, however, a few such expressions are used: every one is the offspring of his age. See, in general, Steiger on 1 Pet. as above; Gurlitt in Stud. u. Kritik. 1829, S. 728 f. Of a different nature is 2 Thess. ii. 3 δὲ ἁθροισὶν τῆς δαμαρίας—not i.q. δὲ δαμαρίων—*the man of sin*, that is, he who peculiarly belongs to sin, the representative of sin, its personification. 

Note 3. In Eph. vi. 12 the expression τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας is peculiar. The Greek idiom to which expositors here refer (see Koppe in loc.; Fischer, Weller. III. i. 295), παρθενικὸς for παρθένοι (Lob. Paralip. 305 sq.), was in the better period merely poetical, and is not quite analogous. In the Byzantines, however, we find e.g. ἦν ἤσπερ γιὰ τὸ ἵππος (Ducas, p. 18); and (τὰ) δαμόνα, which was originally an adjective but which in later Greek is used substantively along with δαμόνες, affords in the main a proper analogy. A Genitive joined to it e.g. τὰ δαμόνα τοῦ ἄρων would present no difficulty. But in the above passage of Eph. the abstract appears to have been purposely chosen as a contrast to ποὺ αἷμα καὶ σάρκα: your struggle is not against outward but against spiritual adversaries. If, however, any one is unwilling to take πνευματικά for πνεῦμα, it can only be regarded as a collective Plural, like τὰ λῃστράκια in Polyena. 5th ed. 5, 14 (robber-hordes, from τὰ λῃστράκια the robber class or profession) Lob. Phryn. 242, and rendered: the spiritualities of wickedness, wicked spiritual powers; see Mey. in loc.

§ 35. COMPARATIVE.¹

1. Degrees of Comparison are expressed exactly as in classical Greek; that is, by means of the appropriate form of the adjective, that with which the comparison is made being subjoined in the Genitive, or, especially when it is a whole clause,² connected by ἢ: 225 Jno. iv. 12 μὴ σὺ μείζων ἐλ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν; i. 51; xiii. 16; Mark xii. 31; 1 Cor. i. 25; 1 Tim. v. 8; Heb. xi. 26; Jno. iv. 1 πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ ἢ Ἰωάννης, 1 Cor. xiv. 5; 1 Jno. iv. 4; Rom. xiii. 11 ἐγγὺσερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία ἢ δὲ ἐπιστείασαμεν, 2 Pet. ii. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 15; Klotz, Devar. 588. After πλείον or ἐλάττων before a numeral, ἢ is often omitted (Mthl. 1019); so in Acts xxiv. 11 οὐ πλείου εἰσὶν μοι ἡμέραι δεκαδύο, iv. 22; xxiii. 18; xxv. 6; cf. Ter. Ad. 2, 1, 46 plus quingentes colaphos infriget mihi. See Lob. Phryn. 410 sq.; Held, Plut. Aem. p. 261. The contrary in Luke ix. 18.

¹ Cf. in general G. W. Nietzsche de comparativis graecae linguae modis, in his edition of Plat. Ion. Lips. 1822, 8vo.

² In such a case we find in the Sept. the Genitive of the Infinitive also, Gen. iv. 13.
§ 35. COMPARATIVE.

It is sometimes doubtful whether the Genitive following a Comparative contains the second member of the comparison, or is altogether independent of the comparison. In Heb. iii. 3 πλείονα τιμήν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου etc., it is probably most correct to take οἶκον in the former way; but 1 Cor. xiii. 13 μείζων τιτbearer ἡ ἐγκαταθήματος may be rendered: (greater) the greatest (of) among these is love; see No. 3. Cf. besides, 1 Cor. xii. 23; Luke vii. 42 (Lucian. fug. 6).

The Comparative is strengthened by annexing μᾶλλον, 2 Cor. vii. 18 περισσότερος μᾶλλον (Plato, legg. 6, 781 a.), Phil. i. 23 πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρέσμων (much more better), and in reference to another comparison, Mark vii. 36 ὁς αὐτῶς διεστάλλετο, αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσαν, see Fr. in loc.; also by ἤς Ηεβ. vii. 15 περισσότερον ἐκ κατάδηλον (still more evident), Phil. i. 9; lastly, by πολὺ, as 2 Cor. viii. 22 πολὺ σπουδαίοτέρον. All these are very common in Greek authors (Kru. 79): on μᾶλλον see Wytenh. Plut. 215 I. 238; Ast. Plat. Phaedr. p. 395; legg. p. 44; Boisson. Aristaen. p. 430 sqq. (in Lat. cf. Cic. Pis. 14 mihi ... quaevis fuga potius quam ualla provincia esset optatior); as to ἤς cf. Plat. pol. 298 e.; Xen. M. 1, 5, 6; Cyr. 5, 4, 20; Anab. 1, 9, 10, and as to πολὺ Xen. M. 2, 10, 2; Lucian. Tim. 50. In Greek authors sometimes ἤς πολὺ are conjoined: Xen. M. 2, 1, 27; C. 1, 6, 17; Anab. 7, 5, 15.

Also when prepositions are employed after the Comparative they are designed to give it additional force; as, Luke xvi. 8 φρονμότερον ἡ πέρ τοῦ νεότος τοῦ φωτός, Heb. iv. 12; Judg. xi. 25; xv. 2; xviii. 26; Heb. ix. 23 καίτοις θυσίαις παρὰ ταύταις, i. 4; iii. 3; xi. 4; xii. 24; Luke iii. 13. Compare, in reference to παρὰ, Thuc. 1. 23 πυκνότερον παρὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν χρόνον μετανοῆμα, Dio C. 38, 97. See Hm. Vig. 862.

2. Instead of the Comparative form, the Positive is used,

a. With μᾶλλον, partly when the Comparative form seemed uncouth, partly when more emphasis was required (Kru. 78), Acts xx. 35 μακάριον ἡττο μᾶλλον διδόντι ἡ λαμβάνειν, 1 Cor. xii. 22; Gal. iv. 27.

b. With a preposition following which contains the notion of comparison; as, Philostr. Apol. iii. 19 παρὰ πάντας Ἀχαίοις μέγας. So Luke xiii. 2 ἀμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλατιανοὺς (though ἀμαρ., to be sure, has no comparative), Heb. iii. 3. In the Sept. παρά and ἐντέρ are often thus used: Exod. xviii. 11; Num. xii. 3; Hagg. ii. 9; Eccl. iv. 9; ix. 4; 1 Sam. i. 8.

c. With ἣ following; as, Aristot. probl. 29, 6 παρακαταθήκην

1 μᾶλλον is not joined to the Superlative, and in 2 Cor. xii. 9 ἡσύχατα ὅτι μᾶλλον καυχόσθημαι ἐν τῶι ἀσθενείᾳ μου, the word μᾶλλον belongs to the whole expression ἡσύχατα καυχ., rather, then, will I glory most gladly, etc., i.e. then, repining, beseech God to remove the ἀσθειν. (verse 8 f.). The word ἡσύχατα indicates the degree of καυχόσθημι, while μᾶλλον forms the antithesis to what precedes.
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αισχρόν ἀποστερήσω μικρὸν ἐὰν πολὺ δανειώσαμεν (Held, Plut. Timol. 317 sq.). This, on the whole, is of rare occurrence; but the analogous βούλωμα or θέλω ἦ, μάλλο, became a current phrase, 255 IIer. 3. 40; Polyb. 13, 5, 8; Plut. Alex. 7; Sulla 3. This usage may be most simply explained by supposing that ἦ (owing to the Comparative construction) had come to be regarded as a proportional particle, presupposing, or to a certain extent directly expressing, a comparison; 1 cf. Plaut. rud. 4, 4, 70 tacita bona est mulier semper quam loquens, Tac. ann. 3, 17.

Now, in the N. T. we find not merely θέλω ἦ 1 Cor. xiv. 19 and λυστελεῖ ἡ σαίει est quam Luke xvii. 2 (Tob. iii. 6), but, as in Greek authors (Lys. affect. tyr. 1), this use of ἦ is extended to other connections; as, Luke xv. 7 γαρ ἐσται ἐπὶ ἐν άμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἑνεκνοτανενία διαλόγου; greater joy than etc., cf. Num. xxii. 6 λαχνεῖ οὐ ποτέ ἡ ἁμείς. With adjectives we find only a single example, but in both relations, Matt. xviii. 8 καλῶν σοὶ ἐστιν εἰσελθείν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν καλόν ή κυλλόν, ή διό χεῖρας ... ἔχωντα βληθήναι etc. Mark ix. 43, 45. On the other hand, this construction is of frequent occurrence in the Sept., Gen. xlix. 12; Hos. ii. 7; Jon. iv. 3, 8; Lam. iv. 9; Tob. xii. 8; Ecclus. xxii. 15, and there it was suggested by the Hebrew, which also makes the comparison follow the adjective in the preposition τῷ. In Greek authors compare with Luke xvii. (above) ἢ ἐν ἀταράχως συμφέρει ἢ τῷ τρυφάν μοι etc. Aesop. 121 de Fur. (Tob. vi. 13), in Adjunct. and Adv. Thuc. 6, 21 αἰσχρὸν βιασθέντας ἀπελθεῖν ἡ δυστερον ἐπιμεταπήμπησαν, Plut. Polop. 4 τούτων ἀν ὁρθώς κ. δικαιῶς προσαρχούσεις συνάρχοντας ἡ ἐκείνως, Aesop. 134 de Fur. See d’Orville, Char. p. 588; Boisson. Marin. Procl. p. 78; Kypke I. 89; II. 228 and Nitsch l. c. p. 71.

Luke xviii. 14 with the reading κατέβη οὖν δεδικασμένος ... ἡ ἐκείνος, would according to the preceding idiom be free from difficulty; cf. Gen. xxxviii. 26 δεδικασμέναι Θαμαρ ἡ γυν. (only a comparison is not quite suitable here). All the better Codd., however, read γάρ (see also Matthäi, small ed., in loc.), which is without a parallel. Yet on Hermann’s theory (followed also by Bornem. in loc.) the passage may be perhaps resolved thus: this one went away justified ... or (went) then the other etc.? The γάρ must have been annexed, as elsewhere to interrogative words (also to ἦ, e.g. Xen. C. 8, 3, 40; Soph. Electr. 1212 f.), for emphasis. Probably 227 the reading in some Codd. ἐπερ (which in Jno. xii. 43 does not differ from ἦ) 7th ed.
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256 is rather a correction of ἡ γάρ than the origin of it. Lehm., Tdf. in his first edition, and Mey. read παρ' εἰκόνον [so too Cod. Sin.], which would be quite free from difficulty (justified beyond i.e. to the neglect of the other).

3. The Comparative places over against the object compared but one thing as comparable, whether this one thing be an individual or a complex whole; as, Jno. xiii. 16 οὐκ ἔστι δούλος μείζων τού κυρίου, v. 20 μείζων τούτων δεῖξει αὐτῷ ἐργα, x. 29. If the Genitive annexed denotes all things of the same kind, as Mark iv. 31 μικρότερος πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, verse 32; Luke xxi. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 19; Eph. iii. 8, it is to be understood of course with the exception of the thing compared: smaller than all (other) seeds; and the Comparative may be rendered also by the Superlative: the smallest of all seeds. This mode of expression occurs also in Greek authors: Demosth. falsa leg. 246 b. πάντων τῶν ἄλλων χείρω πολίτην, Athen. 3, 247 πάντων καρπῶν ὄψεται, Dio Chr. 3, 39 ἀπάντων πιθανότερος, see Jacobs, Anthol. III. 247.

In 1 Cor. xiii. 13 μείζων τούτων ἡ ἐγνώσθη the Comparative is not put for the Superlative; but the meaning is: the greater of (among) these is love, and the Comparative is employed because the other two graces were regarded as forming but a single class in contrast with love.

4. The Comparative is not unfrequently used when the object of comparison is not expressly mentioned; Reiz, de accent. inclin. p. 54; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 418, 538; Stallb. Phileb. p. 120 and rep. 1, 238; Mth. 1021 f.; Krü. 77.

In such cases this may ordinarily be gathered easily from the context, Jno. xix. 11; Acts xviii. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 38 (cf. vs. 36 f.) xii. 31; Heb. ii. 1; vi. 16; ix. 11; Jas. iii. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 7; or the expression has become a current phrase, as oi πλείονες the majority 217 (in an assembly), Acts xix. 32; xxvii. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 19, etc. But sometimes the peculiar force of the Comparative recedes still farther from view; in such passages earlier expositors regarded the Comparative as put for the Positive or Superlative: 2 Tim. i. 18 βέλτιον σὺ γνώσκεις thou knowest better, sc. than I (Lucian. pisc. 20 ἀμεμον σὺ ολοθα ταῦτα); Acts xxv. 10 ὡς καὶ σὺ κάλλων ἐπιγνώσκεις, better than thou art willing to appear to know it 257 (according to the supposition in verse 9 of his being guilty); 2 Cor. viii. 17 τὴν μὲν παρὰκλησιν ἐδέξατο, σπουδαιότερος δὲ ἐπάρχων more

1 In Greek authors also the Comparative is not used for the Positive in sentences like Lucian. epp. Sat. 3, 32 τὸ ἱδιατὸν καὶ συμπαθητέρωτερον καὶ λαογμα, etc., or 11 ὡς καὶ μεγαλομοιότερος αὐτῷ ἢ καὶ ἐπαινότερος, Her. 2, 46 etc. (Heusing. Plut. educ. p. 3). Cf. also Heinichen, Euseb. H. E. I. 210 sq.; Herm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 284.
eager sc. than to require an exhortation; vii. 7 ὥστε μὲ μᾶλλον καρδίας more sc. than for the (mere) arrival of Titus (verse 6), 228 cf. verse 13; Acts xxvii. 13 ἀσον παρελέγοντο τὴν Κρήτην nearer 7th ed. sc. than (verse 8) it had been possible; Phil. ii. 28 σπουδαστέρος ἐπεμψα αὐτῶν sc. than I should have done, had you not been made uneasy by the news of his illness (verse 26); i. 12 τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ μᾶλλον εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήμφθην more (rather) for the advancement sc. than, as we feared, for the hinderance; Jno. xiii. 27 ὁ πουὶς ποιήσων τάξιον more quickly than thou seemest disposed to do, hasten the execution, see Lücke in loc. (Senec. Agann. 905 citius interea mihi edissere, ubi sit gnatus, cf. oiosis Virg. Aen. 8, 554). In 1 Tim. iii. 14 τάξιον (ἐκπίλον ἐλθειν πρὸς σὲ τάξιον) is generally rendered as the Positive (ἐν τάξιει Lehm. is a correction), while some take it as equivalent to ὁς τάξιστα. The meaning is: I write this to thee, hoping (though I hope) to come to thee more quickly, sooner i.e. than thou wilt need these instructions. The reason of his writing notwithstanding, is contained in ἐὰν δὲ δραίων etc., cf. verse 15. Heb. xiii. 19 that I may be restored to you sooner (than would be the case without your prayers); 1 xiii. 23 if he come sooner (than the date of my departure); Rom. xv. 15 τολμηρότερον ἐγραψα ὁμῶν more boldly (frankly) sc. than, from your Christian attainment (verse 14), was necessary. On Mark ix. 42 see Fr. in loc. Acts xviii. 26 does not require explanation. In 1 Cor. vii. 38 the relation between the Positive καλῶς ποιεῖ and the Comparative κερισσον ποιεῖ is plain from verse 36 f. Likewise περισσοτέρωs, so much used by Paul, never occurs without a comparison. Its comparative force is obvious in 2 Cor. i. 12; ii. 4; vii. 13; xi. 23; Phil. i. 14; Gal. i. 14; Heb. ii. 1; vi. 17; but in 1 Thess. ii. 17 περισσῶs ἐσπουδάσαμεν τὸ πρόωσον ὠμῶν ἰδεῖν etc., the ground of the comparison lies probably in the clause: ἀπορφανωθέντες ἀφ' ὠμῶν πρὸς καρδίαν ὀρας. The being deprived of their personal intercourse for a time (which Paul calls being bereaved), had made his desire stronger than it would have been had he sustained no such relation to them. In 2 Pet. i. 19 the comparative 218 force of βεβαιότερον can be determined only on hermeneutical grounds; but the discordance even of the most recent expositors, shows how occult the reference here is. On the other hand, there can be little doubt that in 2 Pet. ii. 11 after μελῶνes "than those 258 τολμηταῖ αἰθάδεσν" ought to be supplied. On Eph. iv. 9 see Mey.

1 Böhme, who expresses the meaning of the passage correctly in his translation, affirms nevertheless in his comments: non est comparat. stricte intelligendus.
Acts xvii. 21 λέγειν τι καὶ δικούν κανότερον is peculiarly characteristic. The Comparative indicates that they desired to hear something newer (than even what was deemed new), and is well fitted to portray the thirst of the Athenians after news. Generally, however, the Greeks employed the Comparative (usually νεώτερον) in asking the news; thus denoting not merely something new (Positive), but something still more fresh than what 229 had, up to that moment, been news; Her. 1, 27; Eurip. Orest. 1327; Aristoph. av. 254; Theophr. ch. 8, 1; Lucian. asin. 41; D. Sic. Exc. Vat. p. 24; Plat. Protag. 310 b. and Euthyphr. c. 1, see Stallb. in loc.

In Matt. xviii. 1 (Mark ix. 34; Luke ix. 46; xii. 24) τῶν ἄλλων at once suggests itself as the ellipsis (μεγίστος would have implied three grades of four even among the Twelve; Ramshorn, lat. Gr. 316). In the same way, in Matt. xi. 11 ὁ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ όρφ., that is, ὁ μικρότερος (τῶν) ἄλλων (the Comparative appears to be chosen here as corresponding to the preceding μικρῶν), cf. Diog. L. 6, 5 ἀρχηγοὶ τί μα καρτίωτερον ἐν ἄθροισις, ἐφ. εὐνοῦχῳ ἀποθανόν, Bauer, glossar. Theod. 455; Boisson. Philostr. 491. Other expositors after μικρότερος understand Ἰωάννου τοῦ βασιλικοῦ; see, in general, Mey. Likewise in Acts xvii. 22 κατὰ πάντα ὅς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς εἶπεν ὅτι he word ποιμῆν he particle ὅς does not appear to belong to the Comparative as an intensive, but the passage must be rendered: In all respects (at every step, as it were) I behold you as more religious people (than others are, sc. ἄλλων; the Athenians as is well known were reputed to be such; see the expositors in loc.). The word ποιμῆν was designedly chosen, compare verse 23; and ποιμῶν ὅς, though unusual, can hardly be considered as improper.

Note 1. When it is asserted that πρῶτος is used for the Comparative (πρότερος) where only two are spoken of e.g. Rev. xxi. 1 εἰδον σφαλῶν κατῶν ... ὁ γάρ πρῶτος οφρανός etc. prius coelum, Heb. x. 9 θανατοῦ ἐν τῷ πρῶτον, ἢν τὸ δευτέρον σήμερον, Matt. xxi. 36 ἀποστειλεῖν ἄλλους δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρῶτων, Acts i. 1; 1 Cor. xiv. 30, the assertion is true only from a Latin point of view, for the Greeks are accustomed, even when there is a distinct reference to two only, to employ πρῶτος, δευτέρος, not πρότερος, ὑστερος (cf. Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 38), just as with us the former, the latter belong rather to the language of books than to that of the people. Likewise πρῶτος with the Genitive, as in Ἰν. i. 15, 30 πρῶτος μου (cf. Ael. anim. 8, 12), and the Adverb xv. 18 πρῶτον ὑμῶν, is properly not prior me, prius vosibis; but the Superlative merely includes the Comparative, as is remarked by Hm. on Eurip. Med. ed. Elmsley, p. 343: Graecos igitur superlativum pro compar. dicere, ubi haec duo simul indicare volunt, et maius quid esse alio et omnino maximum. Cf. also Fr. Rom. II. 421, not. It is an entire mistake when in Luke ii. 2 αὐτὴ ἡ ἀγωγὴ πρώτη ἤγενετο 259 ἤγεμονοικός τῆς Πανα Κυρηνίου, even recent expositors take πρώτη for πρώτα and make the Genitive ἤγεμων. etc. dependent on this Comparative: took place before Q. was governor. On this view Luke's language is not
only ambiguous (for the rendering: this took place as the first under the administration of Q, presents itself as the most obvious and natural), but also awkward if not ungrammatical. And Huschke (über d. zur Zeit d. Geburt J. Chr. gehalt. Census. Breal. 1840, 8vo.) has not succeeded in adducing a really similar construction; he merely proves (what everybody admits) that πῶς is followed by the Genitive of a noun. The error of Tholuck (Glaubwürdigt. d. evang. Geschichte, S. 184) in regarding Jer. 230 xxix. 2 in the Sept. as parallel, has been exposed by Fr., as above.

Note 2. Two Comparatives which are correlative, as in Rom. ix. 12 ὅ τε μείζων δουλεύει τῷ ἀλάσσον (Sept.), cf. 1 Cor. xii. 22; 2 Cor. xii. 15; Phil. i. 23 sq., or joined with a word expressing proportion, as in Heb. i. 4 τοσοῦτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος διὰ διαφορώτερον κεκληρονόμηκεν όνομα (x. 25), require no explanation. Cf. Xen. C. 7, 5, 7; Mem. 1, 4, 10; Plato, Apol. 39 d.

In the N. T. no instance occurs of two Comparatives connected by ἃ (Krū. 77). On the other hand, we find Positives with μᾶλλον in 2 Tim. iii. 4 φιλόδονον μᾶλλον ἡ φιλόθεον.

5. Sometimes, in comparative sentences, a part is compared not with the corresponding part but with the whole (Bhdy. 432); as, Jno. v. 36 μαρτυρίαν μείζων τοῦ Ἰωάννου, witness greater than John, that is, greater than that of John; so Her. 2, 184 πυραμίδα καὶ σῶς ἀπελεύπτει πολλὰν ἀλάσσω τοῦ πατρός, i.e. than that of his father; and Lucian. salt. 78 τὰ δὲ ὀμμάτων φαινόμενα πιστότερα εἶναι τῶν ὀστῶν δοκεῖ. There is here no proper ellipsis (as the earlier philologists supposed); for had the speaker’s thought coincided exactly with ours, he would have said τῆς τοῦ Ἰ., τῆς τοῦ πατρός, etc. Rather must we regard the construction in question as a condensed form of expression quite in accordance with the genius of the Greek language, and of frequent occurrence, not merely with strict Comparatives (Hm. Vig. 717; Schaef. Melet. 127; Mth. 1016), but also in other comparative sentences; Franke, Demosth. p. 90; Weber, Demosth. p. 399; Fr. Conjectan. I. 1 sqq. and Mr. p. 147, see § 63. In Latin, cf. Juven. 3, 74 sermo promptus et Isisae torrentior, Cic. ad Brut. 1, 12; Orat. 1, 44, and in Hebrew, 260 Isa. lvi. 5 (1 Esdr. iii. 5). Matt. v. 20 ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ἡμῶν ἢ δικαιοσύνη πλείου τὸν γραμματέων etc. may also be explained in this way without violence; (Jesus could speak of a δικαιοσ. γραμμ., for their conduct assumed for itself this title of honor, and was looked up to and esteemed by the people as προχ). On the other hand, 1 Cor. i. 25 τὸ μικρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ σοφότερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, is

1 Only when several such parallel clauses follow each other is the Article omitted in the last; as, Plat. Gorg. 455 ε. τῶν ἑμῶν κατασκευή εἰ τῆς Θεομακλίδου ἴμπουλιν γήγες, τὰ δὲ εἰ τῆς Περικλίδου, ἄλλα οὐκ εἰ τῶν δημοσίων. Cf. Siebelis, Pausan. IV. 291.
220 easily accounted for without the usual (but forced) solution (Pott, Heydenreich, Flatt, in loc.): the foolishness of God is wiser than men (are); that is, what appears foolishness in God’s arrangements is not only wisdom, but is even wiser than men, outshines all the wisdom of men.
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§ 36. SUPERLATIVE.

1. Instead of the Superlative, we find, in elevated style, one instance of the Positive accompanied by a generic substantive: Luke i. 42 εὐλογημένη σὺ εἶ γυναιξίν, blessed (art) thou among women. This is primarily a Hebrew idiom (Gesen. Lg. 692) which strictly means: Among women thou art the (only) one that can be called blessed, the blessedness of others cannot be compared to thine; hence, with rhetorical emphasis, highly blessed. This is not without parallel in Greek poetry (though the passages adduced by Kühnöl are not appropriate); as, Eurip. Alcest. 473 ὁ φίλα γυναικῶν (ὁ φιλτάτα) see Monk in loc., Aristoph. ran. 1081 ὁ σχέτλις ἄνδρων, still more Find. Nem. 3, 80 (140) αἰετὸς ὦκις ἐν πετανοῖς, cf. also Himer. orat. 15, 4 ὁ γενναῖος τῶν πόνων, and Jacobs, Ael. anim. II. 400. The case is different in Matt. xxii. 36 πολὰ ἐντολὴ μεγάλῃ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; which kind of commandment is great in the law? so that others seem insignificant in comparison,—not precisely the greatest, see BCrus. in loc. Likewise in Luke x. 42 τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἔξελέξατο, the Positive is not put for the Superlative; the meaning is: She has chosen the good part (in reference to the kingdom of heaven; that which alone truly deserves this name); Fr. Conject. I. 19 is in error. Matt. v. 19 δὲ δὲν ποιήσῃ ... οὔτος μέγας κληρικὴται will be called great, a great one, not expressly the greatest (opposed to ἐλάχιστος which precedes.) Cf. Hm. Aeschyl. p. 214.

2. Of the well-known Hebrew mode of expressing the Superlative, כַּלֵּי הָיָה, כָּלֵי הָיָה, only the following examples occur in the N. T.: Heb. ix. 3 ἡ (λεγομένη) ἡγία ἡγίαν the most holy place (which, however, as it had already assumed the character of a standing designation, scarcely comes under this head), Rev. xix. 16 βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, κύριος κυρίων, the highest king, lord, 1 Tim. vi. 15. But none of these expressions is a pure Hebraism; in the Greek poets also we find such a doubling of adjectives (used substantively): Soph. Electr. 849 δειλάλα δειλάλων, Oed. R. 466 ἀρρητόν ἀρρητῶν, Soph. Phil. 65, καρὰ καρὼν Soph. Oed. C. 1238, see
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Bhdy. 154; Wex, Antig. I. 316. The phrase βασιλεύς βασιλέων too, is very simple, and more emphatic than ὁ μέγιστος βασιλεύς; cf. Aeschyl. suppl. 524 ἀναξ ἀνάκτων, and, even as a technical designation, Theophan. contin. 127, 387 ὁ ἄρχων τῶν ἄρχοντων. See also Hm. Aesch. p. 230; Georgi, vind. 327 and Nova Biblioth. Lubec. II. 111 sq. In reference to the kindred expression οἱ αἰῶνες τῶν αἰῶνων, see the passages in the concordance.

3. What were formerly adduced as Hebraistic circumlocutions for the Superlative, are for the most part either,

a. Figurative expressions which appear in all languages (and the explanation of which in the present comes under the department of N. T. Rhetoric); e.g. Heb. iv. 12 ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ τομάτης ἐν πάσαν μάχαιραν διότι ΜωΜωτ. Matt. xvii. 20 ἐὰν ἔχειτε τις τὸν ἱκανόν αὐτῶν τινας οὐκ ἔπεισαν the least faith, iv. 16 καθισμένος ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου in the darkest shadow. Cf. Matt. xxviii. 3; Rev. i. 14; xviii. 5. Or,

b. Constructions which have nothing to do with the Superlative; as, Col. ii. 19 αἰχμοσ τοῦ θεοῦ not a divine, i.e. extraordinary, increase, but God's increase, i.e. not merely acceptable to God, but produced by God (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 6); 2 Cor. i. 12 ἐν ἀπλότητι καὶ εἰλικρνείᾳ θεοῦ not perfect sincerity, but sincerity which God effects, produces; Jas. v. 11 τίδος κυρίον not glorious end, but the end which the Lord reserved (for Job); Rev. xxi. 11 πόλες ἔχουσα τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ not great glory, but simply and strictly the glory (splendor) of God; see Ewald in loc.; 1 Thess. iv. 16 σάλπιγξ θεοῦ not great or far-sounding trumpet (σάλπιγξ φωνής μεγάλης Matt. xxiv. 31), but trumpet of God, i.e. trumpet which sounds at God's command, or less restrictedly (as it is without the Article) a trumpet as used in the service of God (in heaven); so also Rev. xv. 2 κιθάραι τοῦ θεοῦ harps of God, as they sound in heaven (to the praise of God), cf. 1 Chron. xvi. 42.

In Rom. i. 16 δύναμις θεοῦ means, as expositors have long been agreed, the power of God (power in which God works); and there

1 See, especially, Passow, Grammat. p. 298 sq. The Hebrew mode of expression בֵּית הַיָּהָּם is used likewise by the later Greek poets; see Boisson. Nic. Eugen. p. 134, 383. Cf. Sept. σφόδρα σφόδρα Exod. i. 12; Judith iv. 2. On the Rosetta inscription we find μέγας καὶ μέγας. Essentially the same is the expression (μικρός) δεσον δεσον Heb. x. 37 a very little while (Hm. Vit. 726), literally, little how very, how very! In Greek authors it occurs with a substantive appended, as in Aristoph. vesp. 213 δεσον δεσον στάμναν as big (that is, as small) as a drop; hence it is used precisely like quantilium. The simple δεσον occurs also with a limiting genitive in Arrian. Indic. 29, 15 σειράπων δεσον τῆς χάρου. The passages adduced by Westl. and Lösser as parallel do not establish δεσον δεσον, but merely the simple μικρός δεσον. On the other hand, cf. Isa. xxvi. 20.
is no ground for charging Bengel with having intended by his "magna et gloria" to countenance the Hebraism in question. He merely gives prominence, in his way, to two qualities which a *virtus dei* will exhibit,—referring to 2 Cor. x. 4. Lastly, *αστείος τῷ θεῷ* Acts vii. 20, used in reference to Moses, does not express the Superlative, so much as intensity rather; it is to be translated *fair for* (before, in the judgment of) *God*, that is, to be sure, admodum formosus (cf. 2 Cor. x. 4 and Sturz, Zonarac glossae sacrae P. II. Grimmae, 1820, 4to. p. 12 sqq.). In Hebrew נָבָקָם and לָחָם are used in precisely the same manner (Gesen. Lg. 238 695), cf. Gen. x. 9; Jon. iii. 3 (Sept. πόλεις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ). See n'th ed. Fischer, proluss. 231 sqq.; Wolle, de usu et abusu αὐξήσεως nominum divinor. sacrae, in his comment. de parenthesi sacra, p.143 sqq.; but the use of the *Dative* is not, in itself, to be esteemed a Hebraism, cf. Heind. Plat. Soph. 336; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 479 a.

Haab (S. 162) is quite mistaken in maintaining that even the word Χρωτός, annexed to a substantive, merely gives intensity to its signification, e.g. Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 10 ἀλήθεια Χρωτός, ἐν Χρωτῷ the most unquestionable truth. So other expositors would understand Col. ii. 18 θηροκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων as cultus perfectissimus; cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 20 *σοφία ἀγγέλου*.


§ 37. NUMERALS.

1. In expressing the day of the week, εἰς is always used for the ordinal numeral πρῶτος, as Matt. xxviii. 1 εἰς μίαν τῶν σαββάτων, Mark xvi. 2 πρῶτ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων, Luke xxiv. 1; Jno. xx. 1, 19; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2. The passages which have been quoted as analogous from Greek authors, merely prove that εἰς is used of the first member in divisions and enumerations (Weber, Demosth. p. 161), when δεύτερος or ἄλλος, or the like, follows; as, Her. 4, 161; Thuc. 4, 115; Herod. 6, 5, 2 sqq. (Georgi, vindic. 54 sqq.). In this case εἰς no more stands for πρῶτος than in Latin unus, when followed by alter, tertius, etc., stands for primus (cf. also Rev. ix. 12 with xi. 14 and Gal. iv. 24). In the quotation from Her. 7, 11, 8 εἰς retains its proper signification, unus, and probably also in Paus. 7, 20, 1, where Sylb. renders it by una.

1 Also *Foerstsch*, observ. in Lysiam p. 37, has been able to adduce only passages of this kind. On Diog. L. 8, 20 see *Lobeck*, Aglaopham. p. 429.
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The preceding use of the numeral is Hebraistic (Ewald, krit. Gr. 496; on the Talmud, see Wetsten. I. 544; in the Sept. cf. Exod. xl. 2; Num. i. 1, 18; Ezra x. 16 f.; 2 Macc. xv. 36) and has in classical Greek a parallel in compound numerals; as, ἐς καὶ τριήκοντάς (Her. 5, 89) one and thirtieth. We, too, use in like manner the cardinal numeral in giving the year, page, etc. mainly for brevity's sake, as in the year eighteen, page forty, etc.

For the cardinal one the Singular of a substantive is sometimes used alone; as, Acts xviii. 11 ἐκάθεν ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνα ἔς (Joseph. antiq. 15, 2, 3), Rev. xii. 14 τρίφτειν ἰκαὶ καυρὸν (but Jas. iv. 18). This, how-223 ever, is not an ellipsis (cf. § 26, 1), as the number one is implied in the first Singular. A similar usage is found in all languages.

2. In 2 Pet. ii. 5 we find an abbreviated use of the ordinal: 223 διώδουν Ναὸς ... ἐφώλαξε Ναος as eighth, i.e. with seven others. In the same way Plut. legg. 8. 695 c. λαβῶν τὴν ἄρχην ἐβδόμος, Plutarch. Pelop. c. 13 εἰς οἰκίαν δωδέκατος κατελθὼν, Appian. Pun. p. 12 (2 Macc. v. 27), cf. also Schaef. Plutarch. V. 57 and Demosth. I. 812. Greek authors usually add αὐτὸς; see Kypke 264 II. 442; Mtth. 1037.

3. Cardinals when repeated assume a distributive signification; as, Mark vi. 7 δύο δύο ἡμέρας ἀποστέλλειν, δίνος misit, in pairs, two and two. Instead of this the Greeks say κατὰ or ἀνὰ δύο (Krüis 75); the latter occurs, for instance, in Luke x. 1, and in Mark as above in Cod. D as a correction. This repetition is properly Hebraistic (see Gesen. Lg. 708; cf. Gen. vii. 3, 9, and thence Leo, Gramm. p. 11), and the simplest form of expressing distribution, cf. Lob. pathol. p. 184. Yet solitary instances of a similar usage occur in Greek (poetry), e.g. Aeschyl. Pers. 981 μυρία μυρία, i.e. κατὰ μυρίας; and the combination in Mark vi. 39, 40 ἐπέτειξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλίναι πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ... ἀνέπεσον πράσιαλ πρασιαλ is analogous.

The following expressions are singular: ἀνὰ ἐς ἐκατὸς Rev. xxi. 21 and ἐς καθ' ἐς (or καθεὶς) Mark xiv. 19; Jno. viii. 9 (like ἐν καθ' ἐν), ἐς καθ' ἐς Rom. xii. 5 (3 Macc. v. 34), for which Greek authors, preserving the regimen, use καθ' ἐνa (1 Cor. xiv. 31; Eph. v. 33). Yet compare ἀνὰ τίσσαρες Prut. Aem. 32 (see, however, Held). ἐς καθεὶς (Bekker writes καθεὶς) Cedren. II. 698, 723, ἐς παρ' ἐς Leo, Tact. 7, 83 and simply καθεὶς Theophan. contin. p. 39 and 101, and other quotations from late writers in

1 For this ἀνὰ the Syriac version always employs the repeated numeral, e.g. Mark vi.

40 ἀνὰ ἐκατὸν ||| ἐκατὰ ||| ἐκατὸν ἐκατὸν. On the other hand, we find in Act. apocryph. 92 ἀνὰ δύο δύο.
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Wetst. I. 627, also Intpt. ad Lucian. Soloec. 9. In these phrases the preposition serves merely as an adverb; Hm. de partic. ἀν p. 5 sq. A different view is taken by Döderlein, Pr. de brachylogia serm. gr. et lat. (Erlang. 1831, 4to.) p. 10.

4. The well-known rule, that in combinations of numbers καὶ is commonly inserted when the smaller number precedes, but omitted when the greater precedes (Mth. 339; cf. the Inscription in Chishull, antiqu. asiatic. p. 69 sq.) cf. 1 Cor. x. 8; Jno. vi. 19; Acts i. 15; vii. 14; xxi. 37; Rev. iv. 4; xix. 4,1 ought not, particularly the latter part of it (Schoem. ad Isaeum 332; Krü. 74), to be taken too strictly; for there are exceptions to it everywhere, in the N. T. at least several undoubted ones: Jno. ii. 20 ἑσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἑτεσῶν (without var.), v. 5 τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἑτῆ (according to preponderating authority), Gal. iii. 17; Luke xiii. 11, 16; Acts xiii. 20; Rev. xi. 2. Similar instances again and again occur in Greek authors; as, Her. 8, 1 εἴκοσι καὶ ἑπτά, Thuc. 1, 29 ἐβδομή- 224 κοντα καὶ πέντε, Dion. Hal. IV. 2090 ὑγδοῖκοντα καὶ τρεῖς. In Sept. cf. 1 Kings ix. 28; xv. 10, 33; xvi. 23, 28; Gen. xi. 13 (in Judg. 265 x. 4 Tdf. has given in one verse, τριάκοντα καὶ δύο νιῶν and τριά- κοντα δύο πῶλου).

5. When ἐπάνω is joined to a cardinal to denote above, more than, the cardinal does not stand in the Genitive after ἐπάνω, but is put in the case which the verb of the sentence requires; as, Mark xiv. 5 πραθήναι ἐπάνω τριακοσίων δηναρίων, 1 Cor. xv. 6 ὅφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίων ἅδελφων. Precisely so (without a case) the Greeks use ἔλαττον Plato, legg. 9, 856 d. μη ἔλαττον δέκα ἑτη γεγονότας (Thuc. 6, 95), πλέον (Paus. 8, 21, 1), περί (Zosim. 2, 30), εἷς or εἷς (Appian. civil. 2, 96, but compare Sturz, Lex. Xen. II. 68), μέχρι (Aeschin. fals. leg. 37 ed. Bremi), ῥπήρ (Plut. virt. mul. 208, Lips.; Jos. antt. 18, 1, 5); see Lob. Phryn. 410 sq.; Gieseler in Rosenmüller's Repert. II. 139 ff.; Sommer in the allg. Schulzeit. 1881, S. 963. Latin constructions such as occasis ad hominum millibus quattuor, Caes. b. gall. 2, 33, from the historians, are well enough known.

Note 1. That the Neuters δεύτερον, τρίτον, etc., signify also the second time, the third time, etc., it is superfluous to remark. They are sometimes accompanied by τούτο, as τρίτον τούτο ἔρχομαι 2 Cor. xiii. 1 this is the third time I come, or, now I am coming for the third time, cf. Her. 5, 76 τέταρτον τούτο.

Note 2. For the numeral adverb ἐπτάκις we find the cardinal in Matt.

1 Three numerals are sometimes found thus combined; as, Rev. vii. 4 ἑκατὸς τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες xiv. 3; xxi. 17; Jno. xxi. 11 ἐκ. πεντήκοντα τρεῖς.
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xviii. 22 in the formula Ἰδόμηντος ἐπτά ἑβδομαδάς ἐπτά seventy times seven (times), compare in Sept. Gen. iv. 24 and ἔνθη Πα. cxix. 164 (for ἔνθη Πα.) Ewald 498. Taken strictly it means: seventy times (and) seven, that is, seventy-seven times; but this would not suit the passage. Moreover, that ἔνθη is not to be joined to ἐπτά but to Ἰδόμην, appears from the preceding Ἐος ἐπτάς. (How variously numeral adverbs are expressed in the Sept. may be seen from the following passages: Exod. xxxiv. 23; Deut. xvi. 16; 2 Kings vi. 10; Neh. vi. 4; 2 Sam. xix. 43.)

CHAPTER IV.

THE VERB.

§ 88. ACTIVE AND MIDDLE VOICES.

1. As on the one hand the Active voice of transitive verbs not infrequently assumes also an intransitive (apparently reflexive) signification, so on the other many intransitive verbs have become transitives (causatives);

Sometimes in consequence of composition, as διαβάσεις Heb. xi. 29, παρέχεσθαι Luke xi. 42; and sometimes by simple adaptation, as μαθητεύειν τινά 1 Matt. xxviii. 19 (θραμβεύειν τινά 2 Cor. ii. 14 ?), βασιλεύειν τινά 1 Sam. viii. 22; 1 Kings i. 48; Isa. vii. 6; 1 Macc. viii. 13 (Lob. Soph. Aj. 385). See § 32, 1, pp. 221 sqq.

Those transitive verbs which are frequently or even generally employed as intransitive, are restricted to certain classes of meanings that may be easily gathered from the following examples: ἄγει (ἄγομεν let us go), παράγει Matt. xx. 30; 1 Cor. vii. 31, περιάγει Acts xiii. 11, βαλλει Acts xxvii. 14 (precipitate itself, rush), ἐπιβάλλει Mark iv. 37 (beat into), ἀποβλέπτω Acts xxvii. 43 (throw themselves off), κλίνει Luke ix. 12 (incline itself, decline), ἐκκλίνει Rom. xvi. 17, ἀνατέλλει, βλαστάνει, αὐξάνει (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 89 sq. 382 sqq.), στρέφει Acts vii. 42, ἀναστρέφει Acts v. 22 (return), and especially ἐπιστρέφει; ἐκτρέπει, παραδίδοναι Mark iv. 29; 1 Pet. ii. 23 (commit, consign one's self), ἀπέχει be at a distance, ἐπέχει Acts xix. 22 (hold one's self back, i.e. stay), ὑπερέχει, σπεύδει. In the N.T. ἀνακάμπτειν, προκόπτει are only intransitive. In all these cases (which are

1 Here belongs also προσάρτειν τινα to commission one, Acts apocr. p. 172.
for the most part verbs of motion) the Greeks considered nothing as omitted (not even ἑαυτόν), but the verb denotes the action absolutely: ἡ ψάλλει, Germ. stürzt, *into the sea,* he turns; where, however, as no object is mentioned, the reader can only refer the action back to the subject. See, in general, Bos, Ellips. p. 127 sqq.; Mthh. 1100 ff.; Bhdv. 339 f.; Krü. 134 f.; Poppo, Thuc. I. 186; Fr. Mr. p. 138. On διδόναι and its compounds in particular, see Jacobs, Philostr. p. 363, and on παρέχειν Ast, Plat. polit. p. 470; Wytenb. Plut. mor. 1, 405.

267 Jno. xiii. 2 τοῦ διαβόλου βεβηληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν must not be referred to this head, whether the received reading or that adopted by Lehm. and Tdf. be followed; βαλλεῖν has in any case an Active signification; see Kypke.

237 Many verbs have some of their tenses transitive (causative), and some intransitive. So ἱστήμεναι with its compounds (Bttn. II. 207), of which it is sufficient to remark, that the 1st Aor. Pass. σταθήμεναι Mark iii. 24 and the 1st. Fut. σταθήσομαι Matt. xii. 25, 46 share the intransitive meaning stand, and that in Acts xxvii. 28 the 1st Aor. διαστήματε [after which σαῦ or ἑαυτόν is not with Bttn. (Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 41.) to be supplied] signifies stood off; (cf. Malal. 2 p. 35 στήσας for σταύρος). In Heb. xii. 15 Sept. φεύγει even in the Pres. is intransitive (Iliad. 6, 149).

In 1 Pet. ii. 6 περιέχειν ἐν τῷ γραφῇ is contained (stands) in the Scripture, περιέχει appears to have rather a passive than an intransitive signification; cf. Joseph. antt. 11, 4, 7; Malal. 9, 206; 18, 449; see Krebs, observ. 198.

On the impersonal use of certain verbs (in 3d pers. Sing.), as βρῶται, λέγει, φησί, see § 58, 9, p. 522.

226 2. The Middle Voice (of transitive verbs)\(^1\) refers back the action to the acting subject, either

\(^1\) See L. Küster, de vero usu verborum medior. ap. Graecos, and J. Clerici, diss. de verbis Graecor. mediis, both reprinted in the work of Dresig, to which we refer below. Hm. emend. rat. p. 178; Bhdv. 342 ff.; Rost, 562 ff.; Krü. 140 ff. are more philosophic. Especially cf. Poppo, Progr. de Graecor. verbis mediis, passivis, deponentibus rite discernendis. Pref. a. V. 1827, 4to., and Melchorn's critique on it in Jahn's Jahrb. 1831, I. 14 ff.; Sommer in Jahn's Jahrb. 1831, II. 36 ff.; J. H. Kistemaker, de origine ac vi verbor. deponent. et medior. gr. ling. in the Classical Journal No. 44 (Dec. 1829), No. 45 (March 1821). A monograph on this subject in reference to the N. T. is, S. F. Dresigii commentar. de verbis med. N. T. nunc prim. editus cura J. F. Fischeri. Lips. (1755) 1762, 8vo. On the whole, however, scholars have hitherto represented too many verbs as middle; a great many such verbs, on account of the constant use of their Aorist Passive, may be fairly regarded as passive, since in Greek as well as in Latin the passive may be used as reflexive. Thus in κύωνα, ἤγοναμα, ἱκανονοῦσα, ᾿αγησάτω, ἅδησανα, ἅδησάνα, ἅδησάνα (Col. ii. 20), ἄτυχεσάνα Fr. (Rom. i. 72), συγκυριακεσάνα, the thought is undoubtedly passive, not middle, as moveri etc. in Latin. Under this head come still more appropriately ἀπείρατο (appetitum ferri), ἀποκόρουσα πασχ., etc.; also ἀπεκτάναι. Compare, in general, Rost's preface to the third edition of his Greek Dictionary, p. 9 sq. and his Gramm. p. 270. Sommer, as above.
\section*{Active and Middle Voices.}

§ 38. Active and Middle Voices.

a. Simply as the immediate object, as λοίμασι I wash myself, κρύπτομαι I conceal myself Jno. viii. 59, ἀπώγγλομαι I hang myself Matt. xxvii. 5, παρασκευάζομαι 1 Cor. xiv. 8; or,

b. Medially, in case the action is done to or in any way for the subject; as, ἐξαγοράζομαι I buy for myself, προέχομαι I hold before myself (Fr. Rom. I. 171), νίπτομαι τὰς χειρὰς I wash for myself the hands, my hands Mark viii. 3, σπάομαι τὴν μάχαιραν xiv. 47, ἐισκαλύμαι Acts x. 23 I call in to myself, ἀπωθέωμαι I push away for myself (from me). Compare besides περιποιεῖσθαι, κομίζεσθαι, καταρτίζεσθαι, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι (θεόν) Fr. Rom. II. 403, and the following passages: Matt. vi. 17; Luke vi. 7; x. 11; Acts v. 2 f.; ix. 89; xviii. 18; xix. 24; xxv. 11; Gal. iv. 10; 1 Pet. v. 5; 2 Thess. iii. 14; Heb. x. 5.

Sometimes a verb is used in the Active voice of material, and in the Middle of mental objects; as, καταλαμβάνειν to seize, καταλαμβάνεσθαι to comprehend, ἀνατίθεσθαι put up, ἀνατίθεσθαι to propound; probably also διαβεβαιώσθαι 1 Tim. i. 7; Tit. iii. 8; cf. Aristot. rhet. 2, 13. On προβλέπεσθαι see below, 6, p. 258.

At other times a new signification grows out of the Middle, as πειθομαι I persuade myself i.e. obey, ἀπολύομαι solvo me i.e. discedo, παύομαι I cease, φυλάσσομαι tua I guard one in reference to myself i.e. I beware of him; thoroughly transitive are παραπομαι τι (I deprecate something in my own behalf) I decline, αἰρομαι I 227 take for myself, I choose, ἀπευπάμην τι I renounced 2 Cor. iv. 2, ἐκτράπομαι τι 1 Tim. vi. 20, ἀποδίδομαι τι (I give away something from myself) I sell something, ἀποκρίνομαι (I give out a decision from myself) I answer, ἐπικαλομαι καλάρα Acts xxv. 11 (I call upon the emperor in my behalf) I appeal to. So λατρῶ in properly

---

1 What verbs regularly express this reflexive meaning by the Middle must be learned from observation. In many (we should rather say in most, see Rotl 563), the reflexive sense is never expressed by the Middle, but by the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτὸν etc. subjoined, see Bttm. 122, 2. Thus in Matt. viii. 4 θεωρεῖν τὸν ἑαυτὸν is used to denote show himself, cf. Her. 3, 119; ἀνατίθεσθαι τὸν ἑαυτὸν is always employed to express kill himself (Jno. viii. 22); cf. further, Jno. xxi. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 4; 1 Jno. i. 8 (in contrast with a passive Matt. xxiii. 12; 1 Cor. xi. 31, or an active Luke ix. 25; xxiii. 35), see Küster, de verb. med. p. 56. Lexicographers should no longer defer an accurate investigation of the subject. See also Poppo. as above, p. 2, note; Krit. 146.

2 Φυλάσσομαι as a Middle means also sibi (aliquid) custodire (Hein. Plat. Gorg. p. 323), and was used of that one which one retains in his mind, by Hesiod. op. 263, 561. On the other hand, in the sense of (legem) sibi observare, as in Luke xviii. 21 according to the reading of several Codd. (ναῖτα πάντα ἐφολείναι καὶ νεώτητος), it probably does not occur in classical Greek, but frequently in the Sept. Yet in Luke xviii. 21 the better reading [sustained by Cod. Sin. also] is ἔφελαγα.
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means I liberate, acting as master; but ἀντροῶμαι I liberate for myself another's captive, Luke xxiv. 21.

When such Middle verb is construed with the accusative of any thing or quality belonging to the subject, the pronoun is sometimes in the N. T. added to the substantive; as, Matt. xv. 2 οὗ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν, Rom. ix. 17 ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμιν μου (in Greek authors ἑνδείκνυμαι is often so used, Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 9; Schoem. ad 239 Plutarch. Agid. p. 144), Acts vii. 58 ἀπέθανεν τὰ ίματα αὐτῶν (where Tdf. without sufficient authority omits the pronoun), Heb. vi. 17; Eph. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 19. In such instances the pronoun is redundant, and Greek authors usually dispense with it, which the N. T. writers also frequently do, as in Acts ix. 39; Mark vii. 8; xiv. 47.

By the usage under b. is likewise 2 Cor. iii. 18 ἡμεῖς πάντες ... τὴν δέξαν κυρίων καταστρέψομεν to be explained: as it were sibi intueri, beholding (for ourselves) the glory of the Lord (as in a mirror), like Philo II. 107. In Rom. iii. 25 ἐν προθετεύω δ θεός etc., recent expositors have likewise taken notice of the Middle; yet Philippi seems to have reached the true exposition more nearly than Fr.

3. Finally, c. the Middle frequently denotes an action that takes place by order or with the permission of the subject,—a relation 239 expressed in German by the auxiliary verb (sich) lassen, and in Latin usually by curare (cf. Sommer in Seebode, krit. Biblioth. 1828, II. 733); as, ἀδυκεῖσθαι to allow one's self to be wronged, and ἀποστειρεῖσθαι to allow one's self to be robbed (both in 1 Cor. vi. 7), ἀπογράφεσθαι to allow one's self to be registered, get enrolled Luke ii. 1. Cf. further βαπτίζεσθαι, γαμεῖσθαι, and many others. Examples of Middle verbs that in this case, too, assume a new and independent transitive signification, are: δανεῖσαι pecuniam mutuo dandum sibi curare i.e. mutuum sumere Matt. v. 42, μισθοῦ-μαι allow something to be hired out to one's self i.e. hire Matt. xx. 1.

In some Middle verbs the reciprocal meaning is combined with the reflexive (Kru. 143); as, ἐγκύνεσθαι to consult with one another Jno. xii. 10, ὁμοιοῦσθαι to settle, agree, among themselves Jno. ix. 22, κρίνεσθαι be at law, have a lawsuit 1 Cor. vi. 1 (in the quotation from the O. T. in Rom. iii. 4 also ?).

4. Although the import of the Middle is sharply defined and peculiar, yet in practice, even among the best Greek authors, the forms of the Middle often blend with those of the Passive;—not merely,

a. That those tenses which have no separate form in the Middle are borrowed from the Passive (the Present, Imperf., Perf., Pluperf.,
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see Bttm. I. 368), and that the 1st Aor. Passive in several verbs serves at the same time as 1st Aor. Middle, as in φοβεῖσθαι, κομπάσθαι, πορεύεσθαι, ἀγνίζεσθαι (Acts xxii. 24, 26; cf. also § 39, 2); but


This usage, it has been thought, occurs in the N. T.: Gal. v. 12 ἰδεῖν καὶ ἀποκόψωνται οἱ ἀναστατούντες ὑμᾶς, yet here the Middle affords a very good sense (see my Com. in loc.); 1 Cor. x. 2 καὶ πάντες ἔβαπτισαντο, which, however, (see Mey.) may be very suitably rendered: *they all allowed themselves to be baptized* (the reading ἐβαπτίσαντον, which is found in very good Codd. [Sin. also], is probably an emendation); the same applies to 1 Cor. vii. 11 ἁπελοῦσανθ. In Acts xv. 22 ἐκλέξαμένους, even if it were to be joined to ἀνδρασ, would not be equivalent to ἐκλέξθεντας (see Kühnöl in loc.; Schwarz, Comm. p. 499), but would retain the Middle signification: *who suffered* themselves to be chosen, who voluntarily accepted the mission; (ἐκλέξθεντας would mean: *who were chosen, even without their consent*). 2 But it is more probable that ἐκλέξαμένους should be referred to ἀπόστολοι and πρεσβύτεροι, and translated: *after they had chosen from among themselves persons*; see Elsner, observ. I. 429. Cf. § 63, I. 1, p. 567.

5. The Active is sometimes employed in Greek authors where the Middle form might have been expected, (Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 185; Locella, Xen. Eph. p. 233; Bttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 161; Siebelis, Pausan. I. 5; Weber, Demosth. 252 sq.). From the N. T., however, the following passage has been erroneously referred to this head: 2 Cor. xi. 20 ἐν τῷ ὑμᾶς καταδοῦσιν if one brings you into bondage unto himself (sibi) (Gal. ii. 4, Middle as a var.). The Apostle wished to say generally: *if he brings you into bondage, makes you slaves. He speaks merely of enslavement; to whom and how,

---

1 According to Sommer, as above, the Fut. Middle was itself, perhaps, originally Passive, and afterwards, on account of its more convenient form, preferred to the Fut. Pass. Cf. Rost, 561 f.

2 So perhaps Plutarch, orator. vit. 7 (V. 149, Lips.) πιστευόμενος τῷ διδαχὲν τῶν χρημάτων.
must be gathered from the context. Likewise, in Luke xii. 20
the Active is used with strict propriety: ἀπαίτοντι ἀπὸ σου they
require of thee (where only the taking away of the ψυχή was to
be expressed). On the other hand we sometimes find, at least in
the text. recept., ποιεῖν, where classic Greek authors would have
employed ποιεῖται (Küster, p. 37 sqq. 67 sqq.; Dresig, p. 401 sqq.;
Kru. 141), e.g. συννυσσιαν ποιεῖν Acts xxiii. 13 (Polyb. 1, 70, 6;
Herod. 7, 4, 7), μονὴν ποιεῖν Jno. xiv. 23 (Thuc. 1, 181 and Poppo),
πρόθεσεν ποιεῖν Eph. iii. 11; 2 but in the first two passages Lchm.
has restored the Middle. Likewise εὑρίσκειν is used in the meaning
of conseqüi for εὑρίσκεσθαι, see Fr. Mt. p. 390.3

Occasionally the Middle and Active are used interchangeably,4
as Luke xv. 6 συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους, vs. 9 συγκαλεῖται τὰς φίλας etc.
according to Lchm. (Tdf. has the Active here also); 5 it depended
here on the writer (Franke, Demosth. p. 95), whether he would
say, called together to himself, or generally, called together,—the
latter being perfectly intelligible. Compare also Jas. iv. 2 f. αἰ-
τείτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτείσθε, 1 Jno. iii. 22; cf. v.

1 In Mark ii. 23 δῶσεν ποιεῖν (where Codd. vary) is probably not put for δῶσεν ποιεῖται
Her. 7, 42 (according to ποριλᾶν ποιεῖται Luke xiii. 22), as the meaning make a journey
is here rather unsuitable. The translation must be quite literal: they made by plucking
ears a pathway in the field. Lchm. in accordance with his theory has printed ὅσον ποιεῖν,
after B.

2 The Middle of ποιεῖν seldom occurs in the N. T. (almost exclusively in the Acts
and Paul’s Epistles), but then it always clearly exhibits a Middle signification.
As the lexicons do not usually distinguish the Middle and Active, we shall here annex the
phrases in which the Middle occurs: Acts i. 1 ὁ πρώτος λόγον ἐπικαθέναι; viii. 2 ἐκ
τῇ ἐντολῇ καθίσαι, xxv. 17 ἀναβλήθη ποιεῖσθαι, xxviii. 18 ἐβλήθη ποιεῖσθαι, Rom. i. 9; Eph.
i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 2; Phil. 4. 3 μείζων τινὸς ποιεῖται; 2 Pet. i. 15 μείζων τινὸς ποιεῖται;
i. 10 ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖται; 1 Jno. 3 στοχαὶν ποιεῖται; Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1 διὰ ποιεῖσθαι,
Rom. xv. 26 καίνεισθαι ποιεῖται; Eph. iv. 16 τὸ σῶμα τὴν ἀθετεῖ ποιεῖται, Heb.
ii. 3 βίον καθορισμὸν ποιεῖσθαι τῶν ἀναρτῶν. To illustrate Greek usage much
has been collected by Dresig, p. 422 sqq.; see also V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. i. 538 sq.
The distinction between the Act. and the Mid. has been stated by Blume, ad Lycurg.
p. 55, thus: Est poeïn, quotiescunque accusativus substantivī abstractī accedit, aliquid
effecerō, parare, faciendum curare, cause, bring to pass, institute, poeïāv ipsum facere cum
substantivīa junctum peripherin facit verbi, quod ant notatione aut certa notione
nomini apposito conveniat. (On λόγον ποιεῖν and ποιεῖται, see Weber, Demosth.
p. 295.)

3 In Jno. v. 5 ἦν ἐσθήσατο ... τρίῳ. καὶ ἀκτίν ἔχειν ἐν τῷ ἀσθενεῖ it cannot be
said that ἔχειν is put for ἔχεισθαι. Rather might ἔχειν ἐν ἀσθενεῖ be considered as
equivalent to ἔχον ἀσθενῶς (κακῶς). But according to verse 6 ἔχειν is probably to be
joined as transitive to ἔγαρ.

4 The distinction between the Active and the Middle is forcibly marked e.g. in Dion.
H. IV. 2088 τὸν τε ἀκτίν ἐν δεσμῷ δεῖ, καὶ τὸν στρατοπεδαρχὸν ἐκεῖνον.

5 In the same way along with καταλαμβάνειν τόλμη, etc. (to capture, take possession of),
kataλαμβάνειν τόλμη is also used; cf. Schweighäuser, Lexic. Polyb. p. 330.
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In such cases as Matt. xxvi. 65 διεφθάναι τα ιμάτια αδρού, Acts xiv. 14, the expression διεφθάναι τα ιμάτια might also have been used in Greek, see above; yet the former is not an anomaly, Bhdv. 348. The distinction between παρέδωκα and παρέδωσα (Rost. 564; Kru. 141; cf. Küster, No. 49) is not uniformly observed even by the Greeks; yet the suitableness of the Middle will be easily recognized in Acts xix. 24: Col. iv. 1; Tit. ii. 7, and in Acts xvi. 16 ἔφησαν πολλῶν παρέσχετε τοῖς κυρίοις αὔτης μαντευόμενη the Active is more appropriate than the Middle, as the writer is speaking of a gain which the damsel procured actually only, not designedly.

6. On the other hand, the Middle occurs with ἐαυτῷ Jno. xix. 24 242 δειμερίσαντο ἐαυτῶν (for which we find in Matt. xxvii. 35 δειμερίσαυτο ἑαυτῷ alone), cf. Xen. C. 1, 4, 13; 2, 1, 30; Lycurg. 11, 8; 17, 3, and with ἐαυτόν, instead of the Active with ἐαυτόν (Plat. Protag. p. 349a.; Blume, Lycurg. p. 90). In Tit. ii. 7 σεαυτόν παρεχόμενος τοῦτον the use of the Middle in the sense of prove one's self (in any mental or moral quality) was so established, that the writer employed it even where σεαυτόν (on account of τοῦτον) had to be distinctly expressed; cf. Xen. C. 8, 1, 89 παράδειγμα ... τούτων εαυτῶν παρεδώκετο. For other examples of the Middle with ἐαυτῷ, ἐαυτόν, see Schaefer, Dion. Hal. p. 88; Bornem. Xen. Anab. 76 sq.; Bhdv. 347;
Mehlhorn, as above, 36; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 189; cf. also Epiphani. I. 380 ὁπλισμένος ἔστων. In Tit. i. 5 ἐπιδιορθώσῃ, according to the received text (where, however, better Codd. have ἐπιδιορθώσῃ), would be exactly equivalent to the Active. As little can a Middle signification be recognized in ἀπεκδύσθαι Col. ii. 15, ἀμώνεσθαι Acts vii. 24 (cf. Dion. H. I. 548), ἀμώοζεσθαι 2 Cor. xi. 2 (Lösner, Observ. p. 320 sq.). Perhaps also προέχεσθαι Rom. iii. 9 is used for the Active. Similar instances occur in later writers, Schaef. Plutarch. V. 101; Meineke, Index ad Cinnam. 244. 1 To this head are referred also Eph. v. 13 πᾶν τὸ φανεροῦμενον φῶς ἐστι, and i. 23 τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρομένου. But in the first passage φανεροῦσθαι occurs immediately before as a Passive, and the apostle continuing his argument connects φανεροῦμενον with φανεροῦσθαι; the former, therefore, must be taken in the same sense with the latter, as Harless and Mey. in loc. have explained: all things when reproved are made manifest by the light, for everything that is made manifest is light. In i. 23 πληρομ. might also be taken in a Passive sense (as has been done by Holzhausen); but then, as Harless has well shown, τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι would create difficulty. I take πληροῦσθαι, therefore, as Middle (Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 56; 6, 2, 14; Demosth. Polyel. 707 b.), the fulness of him who filleth all, where the Middle signification is not entirely lost: from himself, with himself, he filleth all. Likewise in Heb. xi. 40 the Middle προβλέποσθαι is employed correctly: προβλέπων would be the bodily act of seeing beforehand; the Middle expresses the act of mental providing. (Similar is the distinction in Greek authors between προορᾶσθαι and προϊδέσθαι.)

A distinction between the use of the Act. and Mid. appears in the verb ἐνεργεῖν, the Active of which is used by Paul of personal action (1 Cor. xii. 6; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. i. 11, etc.), and the Middle of non-personal (Rom. vii. 5; Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. ii. 7, etc.). Hence in 1 Thess. ii. 13 διὰ must not be referred to ἔνεντος but to λόγος.

7. From Middle verbs are to be carefully distinguished Deponent. These, under a Passive (or Middle) form, have a transitive or a neuter signification; and their Active forms either do not occur at all (in prose), or have, by usage, exactly the same meaning (Rost 267.); 2 as, δίωσθαι, δωρεῖσθαι, γινεῖσθαι, βιώσθαι, ἐνεῖλ-  

1 In the passages selected by Schweighäuser, Lexic. Herod. II. 185, the distinctive import of the Middle Voice can be for the most part detected.  

2 Only in later authors do we find e.g. the Active of λυμαίνεσθαι, see Passow. On the other hand, the Active of δωρεῖσθαι occurs even in Pindar, Olymp. 6, 131. In the N. T. we find even ἐνεργεῖται, as frequently in the Sept.
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λέοσαι, ἐγχεσαί, ἐνθυμεῖσθαι, ἐργάζεσθαι, εὑραμεῖον, μάχεσθαι, μέμφεσθαι, ἐφεδροῦσθαι, ἀσπάζεσθαι, ἔρχεσθαι, ἤγειρον, ἰάσθαι, λογιζεσθαι, προαίτιάζεσθαι, and many others. With regard to Deponents 274 it must be remarked that,

a. Though most of them have in the Aorist the Middle form (Middle Deponents, as αἰτιάζοι, ἀσπάζοι, ἔργαζοι, προαίτιαζοι), yet not a few have in that tense the Passive (Passive Deponents), as θεοίσθαι, δύνασθαι, ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, εὑραμεῖσθαι, σπλαγχνίζεσθαι, μωμᾶσθαι, etc.

b. Others combine both forms, though then (in prose) either the one form or the other predominates. Among these is ἄρνεσθαι, on which (in opposition to Bttm.) see Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 209. In the N. T. only its Aor. Mid. ἔρνησάμην occurs, which in Greek prose authors is precisely the rarer form. On the other hand, διαλέγεσθαι has always the Passive Aor. in biblical Greek.

c. Sometimes in Middle Deponents, along with the Aor. (or Perf.) Mid. (with an Active signification), the Aor. or the Perf. Pass. with a Passive signification is in use; as, ἔθεαθνε Matt. vi. 1; Mark xvi. 11 (Thuc. 3, 88) cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 594 sq., along with ἔθεασαμην I sau; ιάθνε Matt. viii. 13; Luke vi. 17 (Isa. liii. 5; Plat. legg. 6, 758 d.) and ιαμαι Mark v. 29 (on the other hand, 232 ἵασάμην Active); ἠλογίσθην often (cf. Xen. C. 3, 1, 33), ἀπεδέχθησαν ζωήν Acts xv. 4 (Aor. Mid. Luke viii. 40; Acts xvii. 27) cf. 2 Mac. iii. 9, παρητμένου Luke xiv. 19 (Aor. Mid. Heb. xii. 19, 25), ἔφησθην 2 Tim. iv. 17 (Aor. Mid. Col. i. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 7, etc.), ἐχαρίσθην 1 Cor. ii. 12; Phil. i. 29 (Pluperfect, Her. 8, 5; Aor. Mid. often in N. T., see, in general, Rost, p. 566).


e. The Perf. Pass. εἰργάσομαι is sometimes used actively 2 Jno. 8 (Demosth. Conon. 728a. Xen. M. 2, 6, 6; Lucian. fugit. 2), and sometimes passively Jno. iii. 21 (Xen. M. 3, 10, 9; Plat. rep. 8, 566 a.) Rost, as above. On the other hand, ἔρνημαι 1 Tim. v. 8, ἐντεταλματι Acts xiii. 47 (Herod. 1, 9, 28; Pol. 17, 2, 1; 1 Sam. xxii. 2; Tob. v. 1, etc.), and δεδεγνατι Acts viii. 14, have only an Active meaning. See, in general, Bttm. II. 51; Bhdy. 341, but especially Poppo in the programme mentioned above, and Rost, Gramm. S. 266 ff.
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That among verbs usually called Deponent there are many to be regarded as Middle, has been noticed by Rost, Gramm. S. 268 ff. and 5th ed. Mehlhorn, as above, S. 39. With regard to παλαισθαι this is already admitted. But κτάμαι I acquire for myself, ἀγωγῶμαι (Rost 268), βάλεσθαι, μεγαλαυχέωμαι, and perhaps δέχόμαι, ἀπόλεπμαι (according to Passow a Deponent Middle), should be also considered as Middle, as in all of them a reflexive meaning is more or less apparent. Πληροφορεῖν Εφ. i. 23 is by Mey. [in 1st and 2d ed.; not so in 3d] called a Deponent, but improperly. Υἱοπετεῖν occurs only in the N. T. as synonymous with the Active. Lastly, μαίνομαι as well as ηττάμαι must, as among the Greeks, be taken Passively; Sommer, as above, p. 36.

§ 39. THE PASSIVE.

1. When a verb governing the Gen. or Dat. of a person, as πιστεύειν τωι, καθηγορεῖν τινος, is construed in the Passive, the Greeks generally make the noun denoting the person the Subject (Krū. 187); as,

a. Gal. ii. 7 πεπιστευσατο το εὐαγγέλιον i.e. πεπιστευμένον Ἐχω το εὐαγγ. (Actively πιστεύειν τωι τι), Rom. iii. 2 ἐπιστεύθησαν (the Jews vs. 1) τα λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Cor. ix. 17 οἰκονομιάν πεπιστευμαι cf. Diog. L. 7, 34 πιστευθέντες τὴν ἐν Περγάμῳ βιβλιοθήκην, Pol. 3, 69, 1 πεπιστευμένος τὴν πόλιν παρὰ Ρωμαίων, 31, 26, 7; Herod. 7, 9, 7; Demosth. Theocr. 507 c.; Appian. civ. 2, 136; Strabo 4, 197; 17, 797, and often. Likewise, in the signification to believe some one (πιστεύειν τινι), the Passive πιστεύειν signifies I am believed, e.g. Xen. A. 7, 6, 33; Isocr. Trapez. p. 874; Demosth. Callip. 720 a., βασιλεύομαι Aristot. Nic. 8, 11. It is otherwise in 1 Tim. iii. 16 ἐπιστεύθη (Χριστός) ἐν κόσμῳ, which cannot be referred to πιστεύειν Χριστῷ, but presupposes the phrase πιστεύειν Χριστόν, as in 2 Thess. i. 10 ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν is referable to πιστεύειν τι, 1 Jno. iv. 16. Under this head come also the following passages: Acts xxi. 3 ἀναφανέντες τὴν Κύπρον when it appeared in sight, i.e. ἀναφάνεσθαι ἐχοντες τὴν Κ., Heb. xi. 2 ἐν ταύτῃ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι (μαρτυρεῖν τιν), Acts xvi. 2 etc., Heb. xiii. 16 εὐαφροσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ (Bleek in loc.), likewise viii. 5 καθὼς κεχρηματίστοι Μωίσης (Matt. ii. 12, 22; Joseph. antt. 3, 8, 8) and Matt. xi. 5 (Luke vii. 22) πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται, Heb. iv. 2 — the latter passages because the construction εὐαγγελίζομαι τινι (see 276 Fr. Mtth. p. 395) and χρηματίζειν τινι (Joseph. antt. 10, 1, 3; 11, 1 The reverse ἀναφανεῖται Wisd. xii. 17.
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8, 4) is the usual one; probably also Col. ii. 20 τι ὡς γίνεται ἐν κόσμῳ δογματιζόμεν (δογματίζεων τινι 2 Macc. x. 8) see Mey. In 3 Jno. 12 the Passive μαρτυρεῖται is construed also with the Dative of a person.

b. Of verbs governing the Genitive, only the Passive κατηγοροῦμαι occurs, Matt. xxvii. 12 ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖται αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁρχιερέων, 245 Acts xxii. 30 τὸ τί κατηγορεῖται ὑπὸ (παρὰ) τῶν Ἰουδαίων (2 Macc. 11 ed. x. 13). On the other hand, I can find no sufficient reason for taking κεχάρισμαι 2 Cor. ii. 10 passively, as Mey. does [yet in the 4th ed. he has it correctly].

In Rom. vi. 17 ὑπηκούσατε . . . εἰς δὲ παρερέθηκε τοῦτον διδάχησι, this construction is perhaps combined with an attraction (for ὑπήκουσαν εἰς τοῦτον διδάχησιν, δὲ παρερέθηκε, i.e. παραδοθέντα ἔγερσι); yet see above, § 24, 2, p. 164.

Heb. vii. 11 δὲ λαὸς ἐν αὐτῷ (ἱερωσύνη) νομοθετήτης may probably be referred to νομοθετῶν τῶν: the people have received the law (founded) on the priesthood, cf. viii. 6. On the other hand, the passages quoted from the Sept. as parallel to νομοθετῶν τῶν (τι) do not belong here, as in that construction the verb always signifies: guide some one in accordance with law, e.g. Ps. cxviii. 33 νομοθέτησαν μὲ τὴν ὕδων τῶν δικαιώματος σου, xxiv. 8 νομοθετήσῃ ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐν ὕδω. But the Byzantine writers use νομοθετῶν τῶν in reference to a country or people, Malal. p. 72, 194. The regular construction of the Passive occurs in Deut. xvii. 10 ὁσα δὲ νομοθετῆσῃ σοι.

2. In the N. T. many verbs which in the Middle signification have uniformly in classical Greek the 1st Aor. Middle, take instead of that the 1st Aor. Passive (cf. § 38, 4), as: ἀπεκρίθη ἐν (the prevailing form), especially in the Partic. ἀποκριθείς (Aor. Middle ἀπεκρίνατο Mark xiv. 61; Luke iii. 16; xxiii. 9; Jno. v. 19; xii. 23; Acts iii. 12, and frequently in var. as Jno. i. 26; xii. 34; xviii. 34), cf. Sturz, dial. alex. p. 148 sq.; Lob. Phryn. 148 sq.; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 305. In like manner διεκρίθη, Matt. xxi. 21; Mark xi. 23; Rom. iv. 20 (but ἔκριθη in a Passive sense in Acts xxvii. 1). In other passages Aorists still regarded as Aor. Pass. for 234 Middle, viz. προσεκλιθῆ Acts v. 36, ἐνεργουμένη Rom. iv. 20, παρε. ἐν δόθητε vi. 17, ταπεινώθητε 1 Pet. v. 6; Jas. iv. 10, are really according to classic (and even N. T.) usage Passive Aorists; just as in Latin servari, delectari, are used for (taking German as the standard) servare se, delectare se, cf. Rost 568. The same remark 277

1 Yet we find the form ἀπεκρίθη in the MSS. of Xen. A. 2, 1, 22. On Plato Alc. 2 p. 149 b. see Phryn. as above. In authors after the age of Alexander it occurs frequently.
2 From which we find the Fut. ἀπεκριθοῦμαι Matt. xxv. 37, 45 and in the Sept.
3 The Aor. Mid. of such verbs is usually employed only with the Acc. in the reflexive construction mentioned § 38, 2. Thus ἐσάθην means me servavi (servatus sum): but one says ἐσώθην τὸ σῶμα corpus meum (mihi) servavi.
applies to the 2d Aor. καταλαγήσω 1 Cor. vii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 20 (cf. Rom. v. 10), and to the Fut. (προφοροφόρησεν Matt. xix. 5 (Eph. v. 31).

Eph. i. 11 ἐκληρώθημεν (see Harl. in loc.) and Acts xvii. 4 προσκεκληρωθήσαν are obviously to be taken Passively.

3. That the Perfect (Mtth. 1097) and the Plup. Passive have also a Middle signification is admitted on all hands since the old-fashioned Perf. and Plup. Middle disappeared from the grammars; Bttm. I. 362. In the N. T. compare Acts xiii. 2 (εἰς ἐν προσκέκλησαι αὐτοῖς whereunto I have called them for myself, xvii. 10 προσκεκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς the Lord has called us for himself etc. (cf. Exod. iii. 18; v. 3), xxv. 12 καίσαρα ἐπικεκλησαι thou hast called for thyself upon Cæsar (appealed to him), Rom. iv. 21 ἐπιτηγγελται, δυνατός ἐστι καί ποιήσαι (ὁ θεός), Heb. xii. 26; Jno. ix. 22 εὐνετέθεμον ὁ Ἰουδαῖος, 1 Pet. iv. 3 πεπορευμένοις ἐν ἀσέλγειαις (1 Sam. xiv. 17; 2 Kings v. 25; Job xxx. 28; Zeph. iii. 15; Demosth. Nicostr. 723 c. etc.). (On the Perf. Passive of Deponents, see § 38, 7, p. 259.)

On the other hand, in 1 Pet. iv. 1 πέπαντι ἀμαρτίας (which is usually rendered peccare desit, cf. Xen. C. 3, 1, 18) may be also taken as Passive: he has rest from sin, is preserved from it, see Kypke in loc. Phil. iii. 12, however, in no event comes under this head. Πολεμεώμα (Acts xxiii. 1) may according to Poppo's theory be considered as a Deponent (since the Active in an intransitive sense is to be found); yet see above, p. 260. In Rom. xiv. 23 κατακέκλησαι was undoubtedly employed by the apostle in a Passive sense.

The Perf. Passive is said to be used for the Perf. Active in Acts xx. 13 οὕτω γὰρ ἦν (ὁ Παῦλος διακονισάμενος, and 2 Pet. i. 3 τὴς θείας δύναμεως ... τὰ πρὸς ᾽ζων διεσωρημένης (cf. Jensii lect. Lucian. p. 247). But in the first passage, διακ. is Middle (as in Polyaen. 6, 1, 5; Joseph. antt. 4, 2, 1 and elsewhere) : so had he appointed; and in 2 Pet. i. 3 the Perf. comes from the Deponent 1 διεσωρεύμα. Further, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 179 sqq.

235 Note 1. The Fut. Pass. is used in a very singular manner in Acts xxvi. 16 6th ed. εἰς τούτο ὀφθην σοι, προανασάθαι σε ὑπηρέτην καί μάρτυρα, εἰς τε εἴδες, εἰς 278 τε ὀφθησόμαι σοι. Agreeably to the parallelism the passage might be trans-

1 Markland (explicat. vett. aliquot locor. in the Leipsic reprint of his edition of Eurip. supplic. p. 324 sq.) refers to this head also the passage, famous in the Predestination controversy, Acts xiii. 48, which he punctuates καί ἐσιτειναί, διαὶ διὰ ταὐταμοιν, εἰς τοὺς εἰσίν, and translates: et fidem professi sunt, quotquot (tempus, diem) constituerant, in vitam aeternam. This interpretation, however, should find with unpresumptuous expositors as little approval as most of those which come from English philologists, (who at any rate give more attention to the N. T. than the German).
l. what thou hast seen, and what I will cause thee to see, ἐφθάσῃς being taken in a causative sense (see Doederl. Soph. Oedip. C. p. 492; Bornem. in Rosenm. Rep. II. 289). The other interpretation, followed in general by Schott, Kühnöl, Heinrichs, Mey., de Wette: de quibus (in reference to which) or quorum causa est tibi porro apparebo, would on the whole be more suited to the context, and is certainly simpler than the former. As to ὡς for ἃ by attraction, see § 24, 2, p. 165 sq.

Note 2. As in the Hellenistic language many verbs which in classic Greek are neuter are used transitively (see above, p. 251), expositors affirm that the Passive also, conformably to this causal signification, is occasionally to be taken just like the Hebrew Hophal. But of this there is no certain or even probable instance. In Gal. iv. 9 γνώστες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ἐν' αἰτῶ even the anathesis requires the passage to be rendered: knowing God, or rather known (recognized) by God, see my Comment. in loc. 1 Cor. viii. 3 εἶ τις ἄγαν τιν θεόν, οὗτος ἐγνωσάντα ἐν' αἰτῶ should not be translated, as by Erasm., Beza, Nösselt, Pott, Heydenreich, et al.: is veram inteligentiam consequutus est; but the meaning is: whoever imagines he knows anything (that is where a γνώσω φυσιοῦσα exists) has not yet known as one ought to know, but if any one loves God (cf. the preceding words ἡ γαίη ἡ ὀικοδομή), he (has not only known as he ought to know, but) is known by Him (God), (is himself an object of the highest and truest, that is of divine, knowledge). In 1 Cor. xiii. 12 ἀγαπή γνῶσις ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐγνωσόμεα καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσεθη, the latter undoubtedly refers to the knowledge of God, and Nösselt has correctly rendered the passage: there we shall know all perfectly (not ἐκ μέρους, not as if ἐν αἰτώματι), even as perfectly as God knows us. It has not yet been shown from Biblical Greek that γνώσεως denotes cognoscere facere, edocere; and probably Pott was not satisfied himself when he quoted Jno. v. 42; Rom. ii. 18. This meaning, however, meets us in a passage adduced by Stephanus in his Thesaurus from Demosth. cor. (p. 345 c.): ὡμολογήσεις γιν' ἵματι ὑπάρχειν ἐγνωσόμενοι ἵματι μὲν λέγειν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος, αὕτω δ' ὑπέρ Φιλίππου; but it disappears if we read ἵματι, as Dissen does, on the authority of a Cod., nos esse cognitos (i.e. de nobis constare), me quidem verba facere pro patria, etc.

Note 3. Frequently it has seemed doubtful whether a particular verbal form is Middle or Passive. The decision is grammatical only in so far as it can be shown that the verb in question was never used either in the Passive or in the Middle, or that in the Middle it had an Active signification. Hence in Rom. i. 24 ἐστιν ἐκμάθησα ὅσα is properly regarded as Passive; so too οἰκοδομεῖσθαι 1 Cor. viii. 10, παρεσταί 1 Pet. iv. 1, ἀνανεωθαί Eph. iv. 23. On the other hand, 1 Cor. i. 2 τίς ἐπικαλοῦμαι τὸ ἴδιον τοῦ κυρίου can only be Middle. In other passages either the context must decide, — as in

1 A similar antithesis of the Active and Passive occurs in Phil. iii. 12 f. Cf. Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 8 δύναται τις ὑπεληθῇ καὶ δύνατος ἵππος ἀνίχνει ὑπεληθημένος; Liban. cp. 2.
§ 40. THE TENSES.

2 Cor. ii. 10 where κεφάλαιου (Mey. to the contrary [in his earlier edd.]) is to be regarded as Middle, and Rom. iii. 9 where προέχεσθαι clearly cannot be Passive; or the known usage of the writer elsewhere, as in Eph. vi. 10 in respect to ἐσωματώθη.

§ 40. THE TENSES.

1. With regard to the Tenses of the verb, N. T. grammarians and expositors 1 have been guilty of the greatest mistakes. 2 In general, the tenses 3 are employed in the N. T. exactly in the same manner as in Greek authors, 4 viz. the Aorist marks simply the past (merely occurrence at some former time—viewed τό as momentary), and is the tense usually employed in narration; the Imperfect and Pluperfect always have reference to secondary events connected in respect to time with the principal event (as relative tenses); the Perfect brings the past into connection with the present, representing an action in reference to the present as concluded. No one of these tenses strictly and properly taken can stand for another, as com-

"In the use of the tenses, it is well known that the N. T. writers pay very little regard to the rules of grammar."

Occasioned in part by parallel passages which it was thought must be considered as exactly alike grammatically. The abuse of parallelism in exposition ought some-
time to be exhibited separately.

The three principal tenses with the Greeks were the Present, the Perfect, and the Future: Plut. Isid. c. 9 ἐνετείλα τὸ γεγονός καὶ ὥσι καὶ ἐσόμενον, cf. Odys. 16, 437.

Cf., besides the well known grammatical works (especially Hm. emend. rat. p. 180 sqq.; Schneider, Vorles. über griech. Gramm. I. 289 ff.; Krüt. 147 ff.), L. G. Dissen, de temporibus et modis verbi graeci. Gött. 1808. 4to.; H. Schmidt, doctrinae tempor. verbi gr. et lat. expositio histor. Hal. 1836–1842. 4 Abthl. 4to. An earlier dissertation by G. W. Oeder, Chronol. grammat. Gött. 1743 (in Pott, Syllogc VII. 133 sqq.) is of little use. On the other hand, the enall. temp. was combated in A. zum Felde, de enall. præs. temp. in S. S. usu. Kil. 1711. 4to., and in Woeck's work, mentioned above (p. 8, Note 1); cf. also the views of Aristides in Georgi, Vind. 252.

The arbitrary interchange of tenses (enallage temporum) is accounted a Hebraism, as it is imagined that in Hebrew the Preterite is indiscriminately used for the Future, and vice versa. But the incorrectness of this opinion has been already shown by Gesenius (Lehrgeb. S. 760 sqq.), and still more thoroughly by Ewald (Krit. Gr. 523 ff.).
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(Krü. 158 f.). The latter occurs chiefly in the interchange (or combination) of those tenses which, like the Proterites, denote one and the same principal relation of time.

2. Accordingly the Present tense, which expresses present time in all its relations (particularly in rules, maxims, and principles of permanent validity, cf. Jno. vii. 52), is used

a. Only in appearance for the Future (exactly as in Latin, German, etc.) when an action still future is to be designated as as good as already present, either because it is already firmly resolved upon or because it follows according to some unalterable law; as, Matt. xxvi. 2 οἶδας; ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται (is the Passover) καὶ ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι (is delivered, an event which as a divine decree is fixed), Jno. xiv. 8 ἐὰν πορευθῶ 

...πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήψομαι (xxi. 23), Matt. xvii. 11 Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται (a point of Jewish Christology) καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα τὰ ἐκ νόμου (cf. Jno. vii. 42, Luko xii. 54 οὐκ ἦπτε τὴν νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, εὐθεῖας λέγετε· ὁμορρος ἐρχεται (in reference to a meteorological principle founded on experience), Col. iii. 6 διὰ Γαλατησὶς ἡ ἧφη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν νυμφῶν τῆς ἀπεθανασης (according to a law of God’s moral government), Heb. iv. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 13; xv. 2; Eph. v. 5. Hence the expression ἔρχεται ὅρα ὅν, used by Jesus, Jno. iv. 21; xvi. 2, and the Jewish designation ὁ ἔρχομενος (κριτικός) for the Messiah. The phrase in John ὅπου εἰμί ἐγώ followed by the Fut., Jno. xii. 26; xiv. 3; xvii. 24, may be also brought under this head, if we do not prefer the interpretation where I am, where I have my home. It would be a mistake in translating these passages to substitute the Future for the Present preferred by the writer. Cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 158; Krü. 149, and as to Latin, Ramshorn p. 401. In other passages the Present is employed to denote what is just about to take place, what one is on the point of doing, that for which he is already making preparation (Hm. Vig. 746 and Soph. 281 Oed. C. 91; Bekker, specim. Philostr. p. 73 sq.; Schom. ad Isaeum p. 202); as, Jno. x. 32 διὰ τούτων αἴτων ἐργον λιθάζετε με (they had already taken up stones), Jno. xiii. 6 κύριε, σὺ μου νίπτεις τῶν πόδας; (he had already prepared to wash them), xiii. 27; xvi. 17 238 (ἰππάγος), xvii. 11; xxi. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 31; 2 Cor. xiii. 1; Rom. xv. 25. See, in general, Held, Plutarch. Tim. p. 835 sq.

1 οὐ ποιεῖς, τολμῶν τάχειον quod (iam) facis, quo jam occupatus es, id (fac) peresse ocios; cf. Arrian. Epict. 4, 9, 18 ωμία δ' ὁ ποιεῖς, 3, 23, 1, and Senec. benef. 2, 5 fac, si quid facis; see Wetstein. I. 931. The command or recommendation here is not conveyed in the verb, but in the adverb annexed.
Many other passages have been referred to this head with still less plausibility. In Jno. iii. 36 the thought is weakened, if εἴκει be taken for ζημία. The notion which John attached to ζωή not only admits, but almost requires, the Present. And apart from this, the expression εἴκειν ζωήν αἰώνιον might very well be used of one who indeed is not yet in the enjoyment of eternal life, but who in the certainty of his hope already as it were possesses it.1 So also Jno. v. 26; Matt. v. 46 have been correctly explained by Fr. On the other hand, we must not with him regard Matt. iii. 10 as a general maxim: every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down (is wont to be hewn down). These words are connected with οὐν with ἡ ἄξον πρὸς τὴν μίαν τῶν δέντρων καιραῖ, and require to be rendered with a special reference to the preceding δέντρα: the axe is already lying at the root of the trees; accordingly every tree etc. is, (will be) to a certainty, hewn down; i.e. from the fact of the axe’s being already applied, it may be inferred what fate awaits the bad trees. 1 Cor. xv. 35 τὸς θείοντας οἱ νεκροὶ treats of the resurrection of the dead, not as a fact (of the future), but as a doctrine: in what manner does the resurrection of the dead (according to thy teaching) take place? cf. vs. 42. In the same way we can say: Christ is the Judge; the punishments of the damned are eternal etc. In like manner Matt. ii. 4 πῶς ὁ Χριστὸς γεννήθαι (i.e. where is the birthplace of the Messiah?) and Jno. vii. 52. In 2 Cor. v. 1 οὕτως, ὅτι, έν ἡ ἑπόγευς ἡμῶν οἷον οὐκ οὐκέτι καταλύθη, οὐκοδομήν ἐκ θεοῦ έχομεν, the Future έχομεν would have been inexact; the instantaneous entrance into a new habitation, the moment the καταλύσθαι takes place, is intended to be expressed. In Matt. vii. 8 the Present (of what usually occurs, Krü. 148) is connected, in a statement of universal application, with the Future, cf. Rom. vi. 16; Gal. ii. 16. On the other hand, in Matt. iii. 11 the Present and the Future (of one about to come) are intentionally distinguished: the Present refers to the predicted, permanent (and already present) personality; the Future, βασιλεία, to a particular function which he is to execute. Lastly, in the parallel passages Matt. xxiv. 40 and Luke xvii. 34 we find in the former the Present, δ ἐστὶν παραλαμβάνεται, but in the latter the Future, ἐστίν παραλαμβάνεται: in the one passage the fact introduced by the Fut. (ἐσται) is by a vivid conception regarded as present (see what follows); in the other, it is depicted in all its parts as future. Cf. besides, Jno. xvi. 14, 15; Heb. i. 11.

b. For the Aorist as a historical tense, only when the narrator wishes to represent the past vividly, as though it were just taking place (Longin. c. 25; Mith. 1135f.; cf. Zumpt, lat. Gramm. S. 481.);

Jno. i. 29 τῇ επαύριον βλέπει ... καὶ λέγει (vs. 32 καὶ εὐαρτυρμένων), i. 44 ευφράκεις Φίλιππον καὶ λέγει (ἔθελας just before)

1 In what immediately follows, οὐν διάδειν ζωήν, the Apostle very accurately distinguishes the Future from the Present.
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cf. 46, xiii. 4 f.; Matt. xxvi. 40 ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ εἰρίσκει 239 αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας. Such a Present is often introduced abruptly between Aorists, Jno. ix. 13; xviii. 28; xix. 9; Acts x. 11; Mark v. 15; or Present and Aorist are combined in the same verse, as Mark vi. 1; ix. 2; xi. 15; Jno. xx. 6, 19. In the first three Gospels one Evangelist uses the Present, while in the corresponding narrative another employs the Aorist; with Matt. xxi. 13 cf. Mark xi. 17 f., and with Matt. xxii. 23 cf. Mark xii. 18. This Present occurs also in the Apocalyptic visions; as, Rev. xi. 9; xii. 2. As 251 to the Sept., in which this usage is extremely rare, see Thiersch p. 187. Suddenness in a series of past events is indicated with striking effect by the Present in Matt. ii. 13 ἀναχωρησάντων αὐτῶν ἵδιν ἄγγελος κυρίον φαίνεται κατ᾽ ἄναρ, etc.

Similar instances occur in Xen. Hell. 2, 1, 15; Cyr. 4, 6, 4; 10; 5, 4, 3; Ages. 2, 19–20; Thuc. 1, 48; 2, 68; Paus. 1, 17, 4; 9, 6, 1; Arrian. Al. 7, 17, 5; Dion. H. IV. 2113; Achill. Tat. 4, 4, p. 85; Jacobs, Xen. Ephes. 5, 12, p. 113; cf. Abresch, Aristaen. p. 11 sq.; Ast, Plat. Phaedr. p. 335; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 68.

c. Sometimes the Present includes also a past tense (Mdv. 108), viz. when the verb expresses a state which commenced at an earlier period but still continues,—a state in its duration; as, Jno. xv. 27 ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς μετ᾿ ἐμοῦ ἐστε, viii. 58 πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί (cf. Jer. i. 5 πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ, ἐπισταμαί σε, Ps. lxxxix. 2), 2 Pet. iii. 4; 1 Jno. iii. 8. To this head may be referred likewise Acts xxv. 11 εἰ μὲν ἀδικῶ καὶ ἄξιον θανάτου πέπραξα τι (cf. Xen. C. 5, 2, 24); ἄδικῶ, however, denotes a quality existing in reference to 283 the judge, ἄδικως εἰμί, see Bhdy. 370; Mthh. 1137. In Jno. viii. 14 there is first an Aorist and then a Present: οἴδα πόθεν ἥλθον... ὡς δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε, πόθεν ἐρχομάι.

In 1 Jno. iii. 5 the sinlessness of Jesus is considered as still present to faith (see Lücke); but in Acts xxvi. 31 οἴδαν θανάτου ἄξιον ἢ δεσμῶν πρᾶσσει does not refer to Paul's past life, but to his conduct in general: this man (so simple an enthusiast) does nothing bad; see Bengel in loc. (Kühnöl is wrong); cf. Jno. vii. 51. Recent expositors have admitted that in Heb. ii. 16 ἐπιλαμβάνει is not to be taken as a past tense (Georgi, Vind. 25; Palair. 479); likewise εἰσαραγῇ in ix. 6 is a pure Pres. In 1 Cor. xi. 30 κομψάτων is properly translated by Bengel obdormiunt (later critics have all either rendered it as a past tense, or taken no notice of it; yet even in Byzantine writers κομψάθαι signifies only to fall asleep, expire, and not to be dead). On παράγεται in 1 Jno. ii. 8 see Lücke. In Jno. v. 2 no expositor of any judgment will admit the possibility even that ἔστι stands for ἦν. On the other hand, the use of the Present does not necessarily
prove that the locality was still in the same condition when the author wrote; cf. Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 135 sqq.

The Present in dependent clauses may appear to stand for the Imperfect; as, Jno. ii. 9 οὐκ ἦδε, πώς ἦστιν, iv. 1 ἠκούσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ὅτι ἤριστον ... 240 ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει, Mark v. 14 έχριθην ἵδιαν, τί ἔστι τὸ γεγονός, xii. 41; xv. 47; Acts ix. 4; v. 13; vi. 5, 24, 64; Luke vii. 37; xix. 3; Acts iv. 13; ix. 26; x. 18; xii. 3; Heb. xi. 8, 13 — (the Preterite, found in most of these passages according to a greater or smaller number of Codd., is a manifest correction.) But the use of the Present in such cases is a pure Greek construction (see Vig. p. 214 sqq.; cf. below § 41 b. 5), founded properly in a mingling of the oratio recta and oratio obliqua (Porson, Eurip. Orest. p. 36 Lips.), cf. Pol. 5, 26, 6; 8, 22, 2 and 4; Ael. 2, 13 ext.; Long. past. 1, 10 and 13. In these passages the Imperf. or the Aor. might have intimated that what was inquired about or heard was already past at the time when the inquiry or the hearing took place; cf. Jno. ix. 8 οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον, ὅτι τυφλὸς ἦν, Luke viii. 53; Matt. xxvii. 18; Acts iv. 13.

3. The Imperfect, as in Greek prose authors (Blody. 372 f.; Krü. 149 ff.), is used

a. When a past action is to be designated in relation to another simultaneous action as then going on (Bremi, Demosth. p. 19); as, Jno. iv. 31 εν τῷ μεταξὺ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν (viii. 6, 8), vi. 21; Luke 284 xiv. 7 ἐλεγε ... ἔπειχον, πώς τὰς πρωτοκλισίας ἔξελέγοντο λου they (then) were choosing out, xxiv. 32 ἡ καρδιὰ ἡμῶν καιμενή ἦν εν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν εν τῇ ὁδῷ, Acts viii. 36 ὡς ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, ἤλθον ἐπὶ τῇ ὁδῷ, x. 17; xvi. 4; xxii. 11; Luke vi. 19; Jno. xvi. 16; xii. 6.

b. To denote a continuous or stately extended past action (Mth. 1117, 1133; Schoem. ad Plut. Agid. p. 137; Held, Plutarch. Aem. P. p. 267); as, Jno. iii. 22 ἐκεῖ διέτριβε μετὰ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐβαινεῖν, Rom. xv. 22 ἐνεκπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ διαθείμ, 1 Cor. x. 4 ἐπιστον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματ. ἀκολουθοῦσης τέτρας (where ἐπιστον denotes simply the past and completed action; but ἐπιστον the continuation of it during the journey through the wilderness), xiii. 11 ὅτε ἡμῖν νήπιος, ὡς νήπιοι ἐλάλουν, Acts xiii. 11 περιέγον ἐξῆτε κεραυνογοὺς, Matt. xiii. 34 χαρίς παραβολῆς οὐκ ἔλαλε (during his ministry), cf. Luke v. 15; vi. 23; viii. 41, 52; xvii. 28; xxiv. 14, 27; Matt. iii. 5; xxvii. 39; Mark i. 7, 31; Jno. v. 18; vii. 1; xi. 5; xiii. 22 f.; xii. 2; xxi. 18; Acts vi. 1, 7 (Thuc. 1, 29); ix. 20; xi. 20; xvii. 25; xxvi. 1, 11; xxvii. 6; Rev. i. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 10;

1 On the still more extended use of the Present in parenthetical clauses for a Preterite, see Bttm. Gr. § 124, Note 6, and ad Philoct. p. 129.
Col. iii. 7, etc. So Xen. A. 1, 2, 18; 4, 5, 18; 5, 4, 24; 6, 3, 3; Mem. 1, 1, 5; Apol. Socr. 14. Accordingly the Imperfect denotes a custom or habit; as, Mark xv. 6 κατὰ ἐορτὴν ἀπέλυεν αὐτὸν ἓνα δέσμιον, xiv. 12 (Demosth. Phil. 2. 27 b.); cf. Hm. Vig. 746.

c. To express an action commenced in time past but not completed 1 (Schaef. Demosth. I. 337 and Plutarch. IV. 398; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 646; Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 282; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 220; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 178); as, Luke i. 59 ἐκώλυσεν αὐτὸ... Ζαχαρίαν (the mother objects, and he is called John), Matt. 241 iii. 14 ὅτε Ἰωάννης δικαίωσαν αὐτόν cf. vs. 15, Acts vii. 26 σωματικῶς εἰς ἑρήμου (Moses) cf. vs. 27 (according to good 253 Codd. [Sin. too], see Fritzsche de crit. conformat. p. 81). Similar 264 instances occur in Eurip. Iph. T. 360; Herc. f. 487; Her. 1, 68; Thuc. 2, 5; Demosth. Mid. 896 b.; Xenoph. A. 4, 5, 19; Mem. 1, 2, 29; Paus. 4, 9, 4; cf. Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 337, note. On the other hand, Heb. xi. 17. (προσέφερεν) does not come under this head; but Gal. i. 13 probably would, if πορθῆσθαι were rendered destroy; yet see my Com. in loc.

d. Sometimes also in narration apparently for the Aorist, when events are described at which the narrator was present; as, Luke x. 18 ἐθεώρουν τῶν σατανῶν ὡς ἀστρατήν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα. The narrative thus becomes more graphic and animated than it 285 would be with the Aorist, which simply reports and confines within a single point of time; cf. also Acts xvi. 22 ἐκέλευσαν ἑαυτῶν παθῆσθαι (cf. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 620) they gave orders (while I was present) etc. (Mtth. 1117). Accordingly this may be referred to No. 1. Cf. Hm. Soph. Oed. C. p. 76; Soph. Aj. p. 139; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 155; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 225; Schoem. Plut. Agid. p. 84, 142; Mtth. 1138; Bhdv. 373. In no case is it necessary to take this tense for the Pluperfect; (yet see Poppo, as above; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 5; Krüger, Dion. H. p. 304). In Acts iv. 13 ἐθαυμάσων ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτῶν, ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ Ἰουαν must be closely taken together: they marvelled and recognized (roused by their very wonder to more attentive observation) that, etc. Kühnöl is wrong, following Raphael, annot. II. 37.

In many passages Codd. vary between the Imperfect and the Aorist, e.g. Mark vi. 12; xiv. 70 (see Fr. in loc.), Acts vii. 31; viii. 17, as in Greek authors also the forms of these two tenses are often interchanged (cf.

1 Hm. Soph. Aj. 1106: in eo, quod quis voluit facere, nec tamen perfect, quod aptius adhiberi tempus potest, quam quod ab ea ipsa ratione nomen habet, imperfectum? Cf. Mtd. 112.
Boisson. Eunap. p. 431 and Philostr. her. p. 530), and sometimes differ very little in meaning (Schaef. Plutarch. IV. 346; Siebelis, Pausan. IV. 290). It often depends on the writer whether he will regard the action as momentary or as continued,—as a point or a period in time, Kühner II. 74 (Matt. xxvi. 59 ἕρτονεν ψευδομαρτυρίαν ... καὶ οὐχ ἐρον, but Mark xiv. 55 καὶ οὖν ἑρίκεν, cf. Matt. xix. 13 with Mark x. 13); and thus, particularly in (later) Greek writers, the Imperfect of verbs of saying, going, sending is not unfrequently used where the Aorist appeared to be requisite, Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 570 sq.; Held, Plutarch. Tim. p. 484 sq.; cf. Mark ii. 27; iv. 10; v. 18; vii. 17; x. 17; Luke iii. 7; vii. 36; viii. 9, 41; x. 2; Acts iii. 3; ix. 21.

The Imperfect and the Aorist are connected with appropriate distinction in Luke viii. 23 κατέβη λαλαύ ... καὶ συνεπληρώστω καὶ ἑκατέρεψεν, xv. 28; Mark vii. 35; xii. 18; Jos. ii. 22; Matt. xxxi. 8 f.; Jno. vii. 14; xii. 13, 17; xx. 3; Acts xi. 6 f.; xxi. 3 (Jno. i. 5); Phil. 13, 14; 1 Cor. xii. 23 (in the same way the Imperfect and Perfect in 1 Cor. xiii. 11) cf. Thuc. 7, 20, 254 44; Xen. A. 3, 4, 31; 5, 4, 24; Plutarch. Agis 19; Arrian. Al. 2, 20, 3;¹ Reisig, Soph. Oed. C. p. 254 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 29; Elleudt, Arrian. 242 Al. II. 67 sq.

The Imperfect might appear to be put for the Present (yet see Mehlhorn, Anacr. p. 235 sq.; cf. Fuhr, Dicearch. p. 156 sq.) in Col. iii. 18 ἵπτονασθεὶς τοὺς ἄνδρας, ὡς ἀνήκεν, ἐν κυρίῳ, ut par est, and in Eph. v. 4 (μὴ ὁμοαξίοθω ἐν ὑμῖν) αἰσχρότης ἡ μικρολογία ἡ ἐντραπέλια, ὡς οὖν ἀνήκεν (immediately before, καθὼς πρέπει) var. But it must be rendered: ut oportebat, ut par erat, as was fit, ought to be (already hitherto), see Mtt. 1138; Bornem. Schol. p. 181; for every such exhortation, strictly speaking, involves the assumption that what is enjoined has not hitherto been observed² (Krü. 150). Cf. § 41 a. 2. On Eph. as above, see ibid. In Matt. xxvii. 54 ἥδε refers to one now dead: he was God’s Son.

4. The Perfect is employed in strict accordance with its proper import, whenever the past is to be put into relation with the present; that is, when something past is intended to be represented as something just now (in the present) completed: I have com-

¹ The following passage is particularly instructive: Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 25, 9 sqq. ὅρροιοι μετετράκτησαν ὡς ἡ Ελλάδος τοὺς ἐκ σοφία προτεύοντας ... μετετράκτητο δὲ καὶ Ζόλωνα, etc. Cf. also Plat. Parmen. 126c. τοὺς εἰσόντας ἐβαθύνομεν καὶ καταλάβαμεν τὴν ἑστραφήτητα etc., and from the LXX. Num. xxxiii. 38 f. ἀνῆκεν Ἅρμαν καὶ ἄνθετον ... Ἀρὰν ὡς τριῶν καὶ εἰκοσι ἡμείῶν ὡς ἑκατών ἡμέρης.

² To take ἀνήκεν, as Huther does, for a Perfect with the meaning of the Present, is as unnecessary as it is grammatically inadmissible. Should καθὸς, προτεύει also be regarded as Perfects? Must then the Perfect ἥδε, elsewhere rare, have established itself just in these forms even in Attic? Besides, no passage can be adduced in which these words necessarily have the meaning of a Present,—provided only a reader acquires the power of keeping the German mode of thought subordinate to the Greek.
manded, my command is at present one previously given).¹ Here
the result of the action is usually, but not necessarily (Krü. 151),
conceived as permanent. The following instances are especially
instructive: Luke xiii. 2 δοκείτε, δὲ τι οἱ Γαλαταῖοι οὗτοι ἀμαρτωλοὶ
παρὰ πάντας . . . ἐγένοντο, δὲ τοιαῦτα πεπόνθασιν that these
Galileans were sinners because they have suffered, i.e. suffered not
merely once or in time past (that would be the Aor.), but that they
stand recorded among the historical examples of those who have
been cut off by (a violent) death; iv. 6 δὲ εἴμι παραδείσοται
(ἡ ἔξονσι) i.e. I am in possession of it, after having received it,
commisam habeo potestatem (the Aorist would denote it was
delivered to me, which would leave it uncertain whether the pos-
session of it still continued); v. 32 οὐκ ἐληλυθα καλέσα τιναυς
I am not here (on earth) in order to, etc. (in Matt. ix. 13 in nar-
rative style: οὐκ ἦθαν Ἰ came not, was not sent), cf. vii. 20, 50;²
Rom. vii. 2 ἡ ὑπανάγος γυνὴ τὸ ζωντι ἀνοιξί δέστοι νόμοις οὐ δερε
(accordingly belongs to), Gal. ii. 7 πεπίστευμα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον con-
credicitum mili habeo, etc. (his apostolic functions continue, he is
still in the exercise of them), likewise 1 Thess. ii. 4 καθός δεδοκι
μᾶς μεθα ἵπτο τοῦ θεοῦ πιστευθήματι τὸ εὐαγγείλην, 1 Cor. xi. 15 ἡ
κόμη ἀντὶ περισβολάι τινας (γνωκι) οὐκ ἔχει (by a fixed arrange-
ment of nature) hair for, etc., Heb. x. 14 μᾶ προσφορὰς τετελείωκεν
eis to διπλεκεσ τοὺς ἀγαθομένους (where the contrast μᾶ . . . τετε-
λειωκεν must not be overlooked), Jno. xix. 22 δ γέγραφα, γέγραφα,
Mark x. 40; xi. 21; xvi. 4; Luke xiii. 12; Jno. vii. 19, 22; viii.
33; xiii. 12;³ xv. 24; xix. 30; xx. 21; Acts viii. 14; Rom. iii. 21;
v. 2; ix. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 11; iv. 4; viii. 14 f.; 2 Cor. iii. 10; vi. 11;
Col. ii. 14; iii. 3; Heb. i. 4; iii. 3; vii. 6, 14; viii. 6, 18; ix. 18,
26; xii. 2; 1 Jno. v. 9 f.; 3 Jno. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 1; Rev. iii. 17.
Hence in quotations from the O. T. prophecies the very frequent
use of γέγραπται, or κεχρηματισται Heb. viii. 5, or εἴρηκε Heb. i. 18;
iv. 4, etc.⁴

¹ Hm. emend. rat. p. 186: γέγραφα tempus signifcat praeteritum terminatum pra-
scendi tempore ita, ut res, quae perfecto exprimitur, nunc peracta dicatur, illudque jam,
peractam rem esse, praecessit. Poppe in his Progr. Emendanda et suppleenda ad
Matthiaeis gramm. gr. (Frkf. on the Oder, 1832) p. 6, thus defines the nature of the Perfect:
actionem plane praetritam, quae ant nunc ipsum sem modo finita est ant per effectus
suos durat, notat.

³ Παναμετε, τι πεπόνθα δριαί: where the finished action (γέγραφα) is represented,
according to its symbolic import, as continuing its influence down to the present.
Cf. xv. 18.

⁴ Likewise in 2 Cor. xii. 9 εἴρηκε μοι· ἄρκει οὖς ἡ χάρις μοι the Perfect refers to a
statement (of the Lord’s) which was to be expressed as not merely having been made,
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We find the Perfect and Aorist joined together (cf. Weber, Demosth. 480) in Luke iv. 18 ἔχρισε με εὐαγγελισάσθαι, ἀπέσταλκε με κηρύξαι he anointed me ... and hath sent me (the former viewed as what took place once; the latter, as still present in its effects), Mark xv. 44 Πιλάτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἦν τέθνηκε· καὶ ... ἐπηρώθησεν αὐτῶν, εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανε (the latter referring to the event, the act of dying; the former, to the effect, the being dead), Heb. ii. 14 ἐπεὶ τὰ παιδία κεκοιμώμενης σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, καὶ αὐτὸς μετέσχε (at his incarnation) τῶν αὐτῶν, 1 Cor. xv. 4 δότι ἐτάφη (an event that once took place, long past) καὶ δότι ἐγήγερται τῷ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (continues in its effects in the new life of Jesus), 2 Cor. i. 19; ix. 2; Acts xxii. 28; Jno. viii. 40; iv. 38; xiii. 3; 1 Jno. i. 1. 1 Characteristic are the following passages also: Col. i. 16 δότι εὗρος ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (the act of creation) ... τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτῶν ἐκτίσταται (doctrinal view of the completed and now existing creation), Jno. xvii. 14; xx. 28 (Mey); 1 Cor. xv. 27; Col. iii. 3.

The Perfect simply for the Aorist in narration occurs in Rev. v. 7 ἠλθε καὶ εἴληψε (τὸ βιβλίον) without var., viii. 5. The Perfect is thus used purely with the signification of an Aorist particularly in later writers (especially the Scholiasts, Poppo, Thuc. 256 III. II. 763), Schaefer. Demosth. I. 468; Wytenbach, Plut. Mor. I. 742 sq. (Lips.); Lehrs, quaest. epic. p. 274; Index to Petr. 244 Patric. in the Bonn edition, p. 647; Bhdy. 379. Less remarkable is 2 Cor. xi. 25 ... ἔλαβον, ἔφραβδιεσθη ... ἔλθασθην ... ἐνανώγησα, 288 νυκτὸς ἠμέραν ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πετούλικα, Heb. xi. 28 πίστει πετούλικε τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος (nothing but Aorists precede and follow) cf. also verse 17. In such enumerations of detached facts, it was a matter of indifference whether the Aorist or the Perfect should be employed, they are both alike suitable (I was stoned, I suffered shipwreck, I have spent a day, etc.). In Mark iii. 26 nobody will take μεμέρισται after ἀνέβη for an Aorist because in vs. 25 the Aor. μερισθῇ occurs.

The Perfect is used for the Present,

a. Only in so far as the Perfect denotes an action or state whose commencement and occasion were completed in time past (Hm. Vig. 748); as, Jno. xx. 29 δότι ἐδρακός με, πεπίστευκας, where the origin of his (still existing faith) is intended to be indicated, iii. 18; but as still in force (he has given me an answer, and I must rest satisfied with it). I do not see what Rückert could here find strange. Meyer is now right.

1 Cf. Lucian. dial. d. 19, ἡφαίστευμα αἰθέρα καὶ μολιημάς.
xi. 27; v. 45 Μονοσής, εἰς δὲ ἣλπικατε, in whom you have (placed your hope) hoped, and still hope (in quo repositam habetis spem vestram). Similar instances are, 2 Cor. i. 10 εἰς δὲ ἣπικαμεν, 1 Tim. vi. 17; Jude 6. As to ἔωρακα Jno. ix. 37, etc., see note further on. 2 Tim. iv. 8 ἡγησικότες τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ who have loved, and therefore now love. The Pluperf. of such verbs has naturally the signification of the Imperfect, Luke xvi. 20. To this head we must by no means refer Jno. i. 34 καὶ γὰρ ἔωρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα, where the latter Perfect appears to denote that the testimony concerning Christ given by John at the baptism stands complete, continues firm and valid: I have seen and have testified. Essentially the same explanation applies to the Perfects in Heb. vii. 6 (9), where it is manifest that more than a mere fact is intended to be related.

b. After clauses which convey a supposition (εἰ, εἰὼν with a Fut. or Aor., seldom with a Particip.) to express an action still future, but viewed in this event as (occurring forthwith and so) wholly completed; 1 as, Eurip. El. 686 εἰ παλαισθεῖς πτῶμα θανάσιμον πεσεί, τέθυηκα ἕγω, Soph. Philoct. 75 and Liv. 21, 43 si eundem animum habueritis, vicimus, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 156; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 470; Hm. Aristoph. nub. p. 175 sq.; Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 512 and Gr. 1125 f.; Kri. 152. In the N. T. see Rom. xiv. 23 δὶ διακρινόμενος, εἰὼν φάγγα, κατακέκριται is condemned, the sentence of condemnation has been (at the same moment) and remains pronounced against him, he lies under condemnation, 1st ed. iv. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 19, 20, and with a Participle Jno. iii. 18 δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἡδὲ κέκριται, Rom. xiii. 8. On the other hand, the Perfect is not used for the Fut. in Jno. v. 24 μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου ἐκ τὴν ζωὴν; the passage has no reference at all to a future event, but to something that has already occurred 245 (ξει ζωῆν αἰῶνων), cf. 1 Jno. iii. 14; Lücke, Comment. II. 52. 6th ed. Further, in Jno. xvii. 10 Christ uses the word δεδοξασμαι proleptically in reference to the disciples, who already believe, cf. xvi. 11; but in xiv. 7 καὶ ἀπὸ ἀρχής γενόσκετε αὐτῶν καὶ ἐωράκατε αὐτῶν must be rendered: from henceforth ye know him and have seen him, not with Kühnöl: eum mox accuratius cognosceatis et quasi oculus videbitis, cf. Demosth. Laocr. 597 a. ἀνθρώπῳ, δὲ ἤμεισε οὗτε γινώ σκομεν οὕς ἐωράκαμεν πώποτε. See, further, Lücke in loc.

1 The N. T. does not contain a clear instance of the Hebrew prophetic Perfect (Genes. Lg. 764), which in the Sept. is usually rendered by a Future. Akin to it is the usage of the Greek aorists, who begin with the Fut. but continue in the Aorist, Iliad. 4, 158 sqq.; Pind. Pyth. 4, 56; Isthm. 5, 51, see Bückh not. crit. p. 462.
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In Jas. v. 2 διό τε οὕτως ὄμων σέσηπε, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια διόνων συνῆψεται γέγονεν the Perf. is not put for the Pres. or Fut.; but the case indicated by the Apostle in ταλαιπωρ. ὄμων τ. ἐπερχόμα is viewed as already present, and consequently the σήμερον of the riches as already completed. In Jno. xvii. 22 δεδωκα does not signify tribuat; Christ contemplates his life as terminated, his disciples have already assumed his place. In Luke x. 19 δεδωκα and δεδωκαμ would be equally appropriate; Tdf. justly prefers the former.

That the Perf. is used also for the Pluperf. (which is not impossible), Haab p. 95 erroneously attempts to prove by Jno. xii. 7 εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐναντίονου τετυπηκέναι αὐτῷ; for here τετυπηκέναι is to be regarded as strictly a Perfect (she has kept it, and accordingly uses it now), since Jesus means figuratively to represent this anointing as that which prepares him for the grave. The reading, however, is doubtful.

That the Perfects (and Aorists) of many verbs have inherently, and according to established usage, the signification of the Present, is well known; and is explained by the (inchoative) primary meaning of these verbs (Fr. Rom. I. 254; Bengel on Rom. iii. 23); as, κάνετεμαι I possess;[1] 290 from κτάομαι I acquire; κεκούμαι (I have fallen asleep) I am asleep, from κούμαομαι fall asleep; ὅτα I know, from ἔδω I see; ἔστηκα I stand, from ἔστης place, properly, I have placed myself (hence also 2 Thess. ii. 2 ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Χρ. cf. Palair. in loc., Rom. ix. 19 τος ἀνέστηκεν who resists him? cf. xiii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 6 ἐφέστηκε); likewise ἔστακα Jas. i. 6, 23.

The Plup. of such verbs then naturally becomes equivalent to an Imperfect, 258 as εἰστήκεσαν Matt. xii. 46, ἦσαν Jno. ii. 9; xx. 9, etc. Also κάραγα from κράζεων has the meaning of a Present (Jno. i. 15), see Bttm. II. 57; Bhd. 279, and ἔφασα sometimes signifies: I (have got a sight, and) see Jno. ix. 37; 1 Jno. iv. 20. But in Phil. iii. 7 ἔγνωμαι (Mth. 1139) is to be taken as properly a Preterite antithetical to ἔγνωμαι verse 8.

246 On the other hand the Present ἔγαμπ means, I have come, I am here (Mth. 1136) Jno. ii. 4; iv. 47; 1 Jno. v. 20, and so ἔσω is sometimes rendered by ausisse 1 Cor. xi. 18 (Xen. A. 5, 5, 8; Mem. 3, 5, 9; Plat. Gorg. 503 c.; Philostr. Apoll. 2, 8; see Lucian. fug. 7; Ast. Plat. legg. p. 9 sq.; Franke, Demosth. p. 62). This, however, is the case only when the hearing (in effect) continues; as we too say: I hear thou art sick, cf. 2 Thess. iii. 11 and Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 246. To denote the act of hear-

1 In the N. T. this verb, in other tenses besides the Perfect, is occasionally translated incorrectly by possess. Luke xviii. 12 should be rendered, of all I acquire, quae mihi redempt; and xx. 19 by perseverance acquire, or you will acquire, your souls; they will then for the first time become your true property, not to be taken away. Schott now explains the passage rightly. As to 1 Thess. iv. 4, see de Wette. Yet κτέμα appears to signify possido in Aesop. 142, 2. As to κούμαται 1 Cor. xi. 30, which also is usually considered as equivalent to κεκούμαται, see above, 2 c. p. 267.

2 Just so νωθήδωμαι I understand, Demosth. Calipp. p. 719 c. etc.
ing completed in time past, a Greek must say ἀκέμον. Ἀκέμον, in the same way, may be translated by acceptisse, Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16; Phil. iv. 18, it is properly, however, like weghaben in German (have already, or in full, received), Wytenbach, Plutarch. Mor. II. 124; Palair. p. 25.

5. The Αοριστ (E. A. Fritsch, de aoristi vi ac potest. Fr. 1837. 4to.; H. Schmidt, der griechn. Aorist in s. Verhältnissen zu d. übrigen Zeitformen. Halle, 1845. 8vo.) is used,


   a. in subordinate clauses specifying time; as, Acts v. 24 ὅς ἦκουσαν τ. λόγους ... διηπόρουν, Luke vii. 1 ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν τὰ μήματα ... εἰκέθλευ (ii. 39; xxii. 66; Jno. vi. 16; ix. 18; xiii. 12; xxi. 9; Acts xxi. 26), cf. Thuc. 1, 102 οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ... ἐπειδὴ ἀνεχώρησαν ... ἔσφαλμαί ἐγένοντο, Aesch. ep. 1. p. 121 c.; Mdv. 118 f.

   B. in relative clauses; as, Acts i. 2 ἐντελέμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις οὗ ἔξελέξατο, ix. 35 [Matt. ii. 9 ἐδον, xxvii. 55 αἱτεῖται ἡκολούθησαν] Jno. xi. 30; iv. 45, 46; Luke xix. 15; xxiv. 1; Mdv. 114. Thus probably are the Aorists to be rendered also in a clause with ἐτε, Jno. vi. 22; see the expositors. The reason of this usage is, that the Greeks (who in such cases seldom or never employ the Pluperfect, Bhdv. 380) viewed the occurrence merely as past, not in relation to another occurrence also past. The Aor. is thus used in independent clauses, when they contain supplementary remarks, 291 Matt. xiv. 3 f. Whether this also applies to Jno. xviii. 24, cannot be decided on grammatical grounds. In Matt. xxvi. 48 ἐσκόκεν is probably not to be rendered as a Pluperf. (Fr.), see BCrus. and Mey. On the contrary, the Pluperf. is regularly employed in such clauses even in the N. T.: Jno. xi. 19, 57; viii. 20; Acts ix. 21; Mark xiv. 44; Matt. vii. 25.

   With very great want of judgment Haab S. 95 (cf. also Pasor S. 235) refers to this head a number of other passages, in which either the Aor. 259 retains its original import, or is owing to a somewhat different account of the one Evangelist which must not be arbitrarily harmonized with the others’ narrative; as, Jno. xviii. 12 συνέλαβον τὸν Ἰησοῦν. According to the other Evangelists (Matt. xxvi. 50 f.; Mark xiv. 46) the seizing and binding preceded Peter’s striking with his sword. John, however, may wish to imply that Peter interposed with his sword at the moment when the guard were laying hands on Jesus. On Matt. xxvii. 37 καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν αἵλαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην de Wette very appropriately remarks: “This, as respects the matter of fact, is to be considered as a 247 Plup. — (though we must admit it to be possible that the narrator of this, 6th ed.
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not himself an eye-witness, may have supposed that the affixing of this superscription did not take place until this time), but according to the language it is a simple preterite. *The narrator here does not observe the order of time.* That the Evangelist does not exactly follow the order of time is obvious besides from this, that after he has made the soldiers sit down to watch Jesus, he proceeds vs. 38 to introduce the crucifixion of the two robbers: τὸτε σταυρωθησαν, κ.τ.λ. *Should this also be regarded as a Plup.?* In Mark iii. 16 εἰσῆλθε τῷ Σιμώνι Σιμωνί Πέτρον is not to be translated by imposuerat; for Mark had not yet recorded the circumstance, and it must not be thus as a matter of course supplied from John (i. 43). Also in Acts vii. 5 δοθηκε is not to be taken as a Plup.; this is manifest from the antithesis: he gave not . . . but promised. It seems equally unnecessary to take the Aor. as Plup. in Acts iv. 8; viii. 2; xx. 12.1 As to Mark xvi. 1 compared with Luke xxiii. 56, see Fr.

That the Aorist stands for the Perfect cannot be shown with certainty from any passage. Luke i. 1 εὐαγγέλισα πολλοί επιχείρησαν . . . θεοὶ καθισμένοι must be taken in the narrative style: as many undertook . . . I too determined, etc. So also ii. 48 τέκναν, τί επιχείρησα . . . οἷς προσώπων σα. More plausible instances are the following: xiv. 18 ἀγρόν ἤγορασα, 19 ζεύγη βοῶν ἤγορασα etc., Phil. iii. 12 οὐχ ὅτι ήσν ἡδονή ή δύναται τετελείωμαι, Jno. xvii. 4 ἐγώ σε ἔδωκα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸ ἐργόν τετελείωσα, etc. But in all these the action is exhibited merely as come to pass, as occupying a single point of time past, simply as gone by, (in Luke, as above, in contrast with a present action) I bought a field, a yoke of oxen, etc. In Phil. as above in particular, ἡλασάω seems to denote merely the attaining of the goal as an honorable achievement, while τετελ. denotes its consequences. Likewise in Rom. xiv. 9; Rev. ii. 8 the Aorists are simply narrative, and in reference to the death of Christ the Perfect could not even be used here. In Mark xi. 17 the Perf. is now in the text; but the Aorist also would be appropriate, see Fr. As to Greek usage, cf. Böckh, Pind. III. 185; Schaeff. Eurip. Phoen. p. 15; Mth. 1118. It often depends on the writer which of the two tenses he will use, as the difference between them is sometimes very slight, cf. Xen. Mem. 1, 6, 14; Dion. H. IV. 2320; Alciphrr. 3, 46. (The Codd. occasionally vary — as well those of the Greek authors, see e.g. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 434, 566, as those of the N. T. — between the Aorist and the Perfect, e.g. Jno. vi. 32; 1 Cor. ix. 15).2

1 Markland (explicatt. vett. aliq. loc. in the Leipzig reprint of his edition of Eurip. Suppl. p. 326) erroneously refers to this head Matt. xxviii. 17 ὅτι δὲ ἐδιαταγοῦν also, on which see Valcken. annot. crit. p. 350.

2 If in Matt. xxi. 20 τοίς be taken as an exclamation (quam), ἔθραψαν might have been expected instead of ἔκραψα, as in Mark xi. 21 according to good Codd. But the latter passage is not entirely parallel, and Matt. xxi. 20 is probably to be rendered: *how did the fig-tree wither suddenly?* They desire an explanation of what (according to this Evangelist’s narrative) had taken place before their eyes. The disciples therefore allude to the fact of ἔθραψαν, and not to the consequences.
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b. It is only in appearance that the Aorist is used for the Future 248 (Hm. Vig. p. 747. cf. above 4. b.), e.g. Jno. xv. 6 ἐὰν μὴ τις μελητῇ ἐν ἑμοί, ἐβληθῇ ἢ ἐξῆν ὡς τὸ κλῆμα in such case (should that have happened) he (was) is cast away, not he will be cast away (the not abiding has this as its instantaneous consequence: whoever has severed himself from Christ, resembles a branch broken off and thrown away. With this βληθῇ the Presents ἐκνάγουσιν etc. are connected). Cf. as to this passage Hm. de emend. p. 192 sq. and Vig. as above. Rev. x. 7 οταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελέσθῃ τὸ μυστήριον, in the mouth of the angel describing the future: then is finished the mystery, 1 Cor. vii. 28. Cf. Eurip. Med. 78 ἀπωλόµενος ἐδρ᾽ ἐκακὸν προσώπους νέον παλαιός, Plat. Gorg. 484 α. The Aor. never occurs in this sense without an antecedent clause. In Jno. xvii. 18 ἀπέστειλα is I sent them forth (which took place when the apostles were chosen). In xiii. 31 Jesus says: νῦν ἐδοξάσθη δ ὑος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the traitor Judas having gone away and as it were already completed his treason. In Mark iii. 21 ἐξέστη has the force of the Present insanit, cf. vs. 22. Jude 14 is a verbatim quotation from the (Greek) book of Enoch, and the Aor. represents the coming of Christ as having already taken place. In Rom. viii. 30 ἐδόξασε is used, because he in reference to whom God has completed the δικαίων has also already obtained from God the 293 δῷξασθαι, (though the δόξα as an actual possession will not be imparted to him until later).

1. Nowhere in the N. T. does the Aorist express what is wont to be done (Schaef. Demoeth. I. 247; Wex, Antig. I. 326; Mdv. 110). In Luke i. 51 God's μεγαλεία (vs. 49) are spoken of as already accomplished, only the respective parallel members must not be taken too rigidly in a historical sense. In Jno. viii. 29 ὁ δὲ ἀφηκὼς µὲν µόνον ὁ παρήκ means the Father left me not alone (on the earth), that is, he granted me, besides having sent me (πέσας), also (hitherto) his unceasing aid. In 1 Jno. ii. 27 it is equally unnecessary to take ἐδοξάζει as denoting wont to teach; Lücke in his 2d ed. has correctly explained the passage. As to Rom. viii. 30 see above. Heb. x. 5, 6 is a verbatim quotation from Ps. xl. applied to the fact of 261 Christ's εἰσερχεῖ εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Heb. i. 9 (Sept.) ἡγάπησεν δικαιότητα etc. ἔστιν contains the reason for the annexed διὰ τοῦτο ἐξωρίζετε σι σι θεός, and the former is as strict an Aorist as the latter. Sooner might Jas. i. 11 ἀνέτειλεν δ ἔλεος σιν τῷ καιρῷ καὶ ἐξήρανε τὸν χόρτον etc. be referred to this head (cf. 1 Pet. i. 24), as has already been done by Piscator; but

1 In 1 Cor. xv. 49 ἐφορθίωμεν might seem to stand for the Fut. Perf.; but Paul places himself in the point of view of the Parousia, and speaks in the narrative style of the life passed on earth.
the Aorists are narrative (representing the fact as having taken place), and taken together indicate the rapid succession of the events: *the sun rose, and (immediately) withered etc.* (Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 53), — scarcely was the sun risen, when it withered. Moreover, passages such as Eph. v. 29 form the transition to this use of the Aorist, which can be easily traced to the primary import of the tense (Hm. de emend. rat. 249 187). In Jas. i. 24 κατευθύνεται ζωντι καὶ ἀπελέλυθε καὶ εὐθῶς ἐπλάθη ὁ θνοῦς ἐπὶ neither the Aorist nor the Perfect is put for the Present, but the case supposed for illustration in vs. 23 is assumed as matter of fact, and the Apostle falls into the strain of narration.

2. Quite unnecessarily Pott maintains that in 1 Cor. ix. 20 ἔγενομεν τοῖς Ἰουδαίωσ ὡς Ἰουδαῖος the Aor. is used for the Present. The Apostle states how he has hitherto acted. Heumann on 1 Cor. iv. 18, and many expositors on Jas. ii. 6 ἡγαμάσατε (which even Gebser renders by the Present), have made the same mistake. Tholuck’s present view of Jno. xv. 8 ἐξοξάσθη is more correct than his former opinion; the Aorist is proleptic, as in Eph. ii. 6; Rom. viii. 30. In Matt. iii. 17 (xii. 18; xvii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 17) Sept. the Aorist ἐκδόσασα may be taken naturally: my good pleasure fixed upon him, I took him into favor; see Mey. Hm. Vig. 746, No. 209, treats merely of poetic usage, and his remarks have with great discrimination been rendered still more clear and precise by Moller in the Zeitschrift f. Alterthr.-Wiss. 1846, No. 134–136.

In epistles ἔγραψα, as is well known, is used for γράφω, like scripia in Latin, in reference to the epistle which is just being written. In the same way ἔπεμψα μισί is used, out of regard for the fact that to the receiver of the epistle the πέμψω has become an ἔπεμψα. As to the latter, compare in the N. T. Acts xxiii. 30; Phil. ii. 28, ἀνέπεμψα Phil. 11, probably also συνεπέμψαμεν 2 Cor. viii. 18 (Demosth. ep. 3; Alciphr. 3, 30 and 41); as similar, ἑβουλεύθην 2 Jno. 12. On the other hand, not even ἔγραψα in 1 Cor. v. 11 can be quoted as an instance of that use. This Aorist, rather, refers in all cases either to a previous epistle (1 Cor. v. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 3, 4, 9; vii. 12; 3 Jno. 9), or to an epistle already brought to its conclusion (Rom. xv. 15; Phil. 19; Gal. vi. 11; 1 Pet. v. 12), or even to a series of verses just finished (1 Cor. ix. 15; 1 Jno. ii. 21, 26; v. 18). For an epistle in course of being written γράφω is more usual, 1 Jno. ii. 12, 13; 1 Cor. iv. 14; xiv. 37; 2 Cor. xiii. 10, etc. As to 1 Jno. ii. 13 f. see Lücke. In the Greek writers also this use of the Aor. (or Perf.) for the Pres. is not carefully observed; cf. Diog. L. 7, 9. See Wyttébach, Plut. Moral. I. 231 sq. Lips.

3. Lastly, the Aor. is not employed de conatu¹ (Kühnöll) in Mark ix. 17 τοῦ ἴημεν τῶν νεοῖν μου. These words denote: I brought my son to thee (and I present him now to thee). That ἵημεν Jno. xi. 44 need not be thus
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explained, has been perceived by Kühnöhl himself; and Tholuck very properly takes no notice of such an interpretation. On Matt. xxv. 1 see Mey.

6. The Future ¹ does not always denote pure and actual futurity, but sometimes what is possible (as futurity and possibility are closely related) and in fact what may or should take place (ethical possibility), Hm. Vig. p. 747; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 184; Krü. 156. This is particularly the case in questions. Owing, however, to the great resemblance between the Future and the Aor. Subjunctive and the variations in MSS., the passages in question are not all established. Luke xxii. 49 φρέ, ει πατάξομεν ει μαχαίρα are we to smile, etc.? (strictly, shall we— with thy permission—smite, wilt thou allow us to smite? cf. Eurip. Io 771 εὑρωμεν ἢ συγώμεν; ἢ τι δράσομεν;), Rom. x. 14 πώς ὁν ἐπικάλεσατο, εἰς δ' ὁν ἐπιστενθαν; how can they call, etc.? iii. 6 ἐπει πώς κρυπει ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον; Jno. vi. 68; Matt. xii. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 5; 1 Cor. xiv. 16 (Plat. Lys. 218 c. τι ὁν δὴ χρησίμοθεα, Lucian. Tox. 47 πώς ὁν … χρησίμοθεα τοῖς παροντι). On the other hand, in Matt. vii. 24 ὁμοιῶσω retains the simple force of the Fut., as does τολμήσω in Rom. xv. 18. In Rom. v. 7 something is expressed which is never likely to take place. 1 Cor. viii. 8 is similar. In Rom. vi. 1 and 15 the Subjunctive is 295 the preferable reading, as also in Luke iii. 10; Jno. vi. 5; but in Rom. vi. 2 the authority for ξύσομεν predominates, and the Future here forms a distinct contrast to the Aor. ἀπεθάνομεν. Mark iv. 13 and 1 Cor. xiv. 7 are strict Futures. In Matt. vii. 16 ἐπιγνώσεθε does not contain a precept (ya, shall), but a simple reference to what time itself will show: by their fruits ye will know them (as ye observe them, in the course of your observations). In Rom. vi. 14 the Fut. expresses an assurance and is essentially connected with the Apostle’s reasoning. 1 Cor. xv. 29 ἐπει τι ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ἵππερ τῶν νεκρῶν is probably to be rendered: else (if Christ is not risen) what will they do (what are they about to do, what do they purpose) who get themselves baptized over the dead (are therefore in such case deluded)? The Pres. ποιούσων is manifestly a correction. The phrase τι οὖν ἐρωτήσεται always means quid dici-mus? not quid dicamus. 1 Cor. xiv. 15 προςεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, προςεύξομαι δὲ καὶ νότ expresses not a resolution (προςεύξομαι is 263 probably only a correction), but a Christian maxim which the be-

¹ The 3d Fut. Pass. παρατίθημα occurring once (Luke xix. 40) in not a few Codex.

stands for the 1st Fut., which in this verb is not in use, and has not the meaning which this form has in other cases (Mth. 1118 f.; Mdv. 114; Janson, de græci srm. paulo post futuro. Rastenburg, 1844. 4to.).
liever intends to follow, and is more decided than the Subjunctive. In 2 Cor. iii. 8 ἐσταὶ refers to future δόξα. (As to such phrases as θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν and τί αἱρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω, where the Subjunctive also would be suitable, see § 41 a. 4, p. 285 and b. 4, p. 299.)

In the phrase ἔρει τις dicat aliquid 1 Cor. xv. 35; Jas. ii. 18, the Fut. denotes a merely supposable case. But the Greek idiom is here more precise than the Latin: some one will say, I foresee it, I expect nothing else. So ἔρεις οὖν dices igitur Rom. ix. 19; xi. 19. Heb. xi. 32 ἐπιλείφει ὑμῖν διεγγούμενον ὁ χρόνος is decidedly to be taken as a Future: time (I foresee) will fail me (deficient me tempus, Philostr. her. p. 686 ἐπιλείφεις με ἡ φανή; cf. also longum est narrow rare for the German-Latin idiom longum esset etc.).

Also in Luke xi. 5 τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐξε ἐπιλείψεις καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὸν μετοπικτίον the Fut. is appropriately used; take away the interrogative form and the ordinary Future remains: none of you will go to his friend at midnight, such importunity will never take place. Lastly, in Matt. v. 39, 41; xxiii. 12 the notion of possibility is connected rather with ἔστης than with the Fut.; and in Jas. ii. 10 the best Codd. [Sin. also] have the Subjunctive. (It would be altogether incongruous to take the Future as indicating nothing more than a wish in Rom. xvi. 20; Phil. iii. 15; iv. 7, 9, 19; Matt. xvi. 22.)

On the use of the Fut. for the Imperative; see § 43, 5, p. 315.

296 Some interpreters have preposterously asserted that the Fut. is used for the Preterite in Rev. iv. 9 ἦν δόξα γενομενον τὰ ζων δόξαν τῷ καθημένῳ τίνι τοῦ θρόνου ... πέσονται οἱ ἐκκοσμοῖ τάσσοντες προσβρέποντα, etc.; but the passage must be rendered: when (as often as) the beasts shall give glory ... shall fall down. On the other hand, the Fut., in expressing general truths, sometimes very nearly assumes the import of the Present; as, Gal. ii. 16 ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμον οὐ δικαίωσεται πάσα σάρκι; Rom. iii. 20: this is a rule which (since the introduction of Christianity) will hold true in the world. Substantially so also in Rom. iii. 30 ἐπείρατε ἐὰς ὁ θεός, ὡς δικαίωσει περισσότερον ἐκ πίστεως, etc., where δικαίων is regarded as an act of God which in the Christian method of salvation will be constantly thus realized. In Luke i. 27 ἐνυμνησθήσεται is used, in an allusion to the O. T., of that which belongs to no particular time, but will always hold true (Theocr. 27, 9; see Hm. emend. rat. p. 197), cf. Rom. vii. 8. But in Matt. iv. 4 ἔσται after Deut. viii. 3 denotes rather a rule established by God: shall live.

Note 1. The connection of different tenses by καὶ (Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 274 sqq.; Reisig, Oed. Col. 419; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 700; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 59 a.), which has already been illustrated incidentally in the

1 The case is different when the thought is expressed in the Optative with ἄρ, as in Dion. H. 10, 2086 ἐπιλείποι ἐν με ὁ τίς ἡμέρας χρόνος.
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above examples, is partly to be accounted for by the fact that when an author is writing without rigorous exactness any one of several tenses may be employed without difference in the sense; and is partly intentional (Heb. ii. 14; 1 Cor. x. 4; xv. 4; Jas. i. 24; Jno. iii. 16; Phil. iii. 7 sq.; 1 Pet. iv. 6, etc.). The former, perhaps, is the case in Rev., as iii. 3; xi. 10; xii. 4; xvi. 21, etc. In none of these passages are the tenses used incorrect; and should any one discover something altogether extraordinary in such combinations (as e.g. Eichhorn, Einl. ins N. T. II. 378), he would only betray his defective knowledge of the Greek language. See my exeget. Studien I. 147 f.

Note 2. The tenses are used in the significations above elucidated for the most part only in the Indicative (and Participle) (Hm. emend. p. 189). In the other moods, particularly the Subjunctive, Optative, Imperative, the Aorist rarely denotes past time (1 Pet. iv. 67), but generally retains, in distinction from the Present, only the notion of transientness or instantaneousness (cf. Pres. and Aor. Jno. iii. 16) Hm. Vig. 748, without reference to any definite time, Rost 587; Mdv. 109.

§ 41. THE INDICATIVE, SUBJUNCTIVE, AND OPTATIVE MOODS.†

1. According to Hermann, these moods are distinguished from each other as follows: The Indicative denotes what is actual, the Subjunctive and Optative what is possible merely: — the Subjunctive, what is objectively possible (the realization of which depends on circumstances); the Optative, what is subjectively possible (simply conceived of, as e.g. a wish), Hm. emend. rat. I. 205 sqq.; ad Vig. 901 sqq., more fully de particula ἀν p. 76 sqq.; cf. also Schneider, Vorles. I. 230 ff. With Klotz, ad Devar., we have adhered to

† Cf. K. H. A. Lipsius, comm. de modorum usu in N. T. P. I. Lips. 1827. 8vo.

‡ "In conjunctivo sumitur res experientia comprobanda . . .; conjunctivus est debere quid fieri intelligentis ac propteræa expectantia quid eveniat" Hm. partic. ἀν p. 77.

8 Klotz, Devar. II. 104: Optativus modus per se non tam optionis vim in se continet, quam cogitationis omnino, unde proficiscitur etiam omnis optatio. Hm. partic. ἀν p. 77: Optativus est cogitationis quid fieri, neque an fiat neque an possit fieri quasertis.

4 P. 77: Apertum est, in indicativo veritatem facti ut exploratam respici, in conjunctivo rem sumi experientia comprobandum, in optativo veritatis rationem haberi nullam, sed cogitationem tantummodo indicari. How Kühner combines this distinction between the Subjunctive and Optative with an original temporal import of both cannot be here explained in detail (Griech. Gr. II. 87 f.).

this theory, as nothing in all respects better seems yet to have been propounded; — least of all by Madvig.

In the N. T. these moods in their main distinctions, are employed with strict propriety (Hwiid to the contrary; — whom Kühnöl ad Acta p. 777 quotes with approval). Only it is noticeable that the Optative, as in the later Greek authors who do not aim at classic refinement, is partially set aside (more still than in Josephus), and in certain constructions is superseded by the Subjunctive.¹

2. The use of the Indicative in independent propositions is very simple even in classic Greek. In reference to the N. T., accordingly, we have on this head but two remarks to make:

a. The Imperfect Indicative is sometimes employed, as in Latin (Zumpt, S. 446), where we should use the Subjunctive; as, 2 Cor. xii. 11 ἐγὼ ἀφείλον· ὥστε ἤμων συνιστασθαι deebam commendari I ought to have been commended, Matt. xxv. 27 ἐδει σε βαλεῖν thou oughtest to have put etc. (2 Cor. ii. 8; Acts xxiv. 19; xxvii. 21), Matt. xxvi. 9 Ἰδώνατο τοίτο πραθήκατι etc., xxvi. 24 καλὸν ἢν αἴτω 
εἰ οὐκ ἐγέννηθη it were good for him (would have been), satius erat, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρείττον ἢν αἴτιος μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὡδὰν τῆς δικαιοσύνης (Aristoph. nub. 1215; Xen. Anab. 7, 7, 40; Philostr. Apoll. 7, 30; Lucian. dial. mort. 27, 9; Diog. L. 1, 64); Acts xxii. 22 οὔ γὰρ καθῆκεν αἴτων τὸν he should not have lived (i.e. he ought to have been put to death long ago), non debebat or debuerat vivere, cf. Mtth. 1188 f.; Stallb. Plat. Symp. p. 74. The Greeks and Latins here merely state what, independently of circumstances, was proper, what should or should not have taken place; and the reader, by combining this statement with the actual fact, infers the disapproval of the latter. The Germans (and English) start from the present state of the matter, and by the Subjunctive express disapproval of its origin. Both moods therefore are correct in thought. It must not, however, be supposed that in such Greek constructions there is an omission of ἀν; for such expressions to the mind of a Greek exclude all thought of a condition under which something would have been good or must have happened; see Hm. partic. ἀν § 12.


¹ Modern Greek has, as is well known, wholly given up the Optative; and it is still a question how far it was used in the popular speech of the ancient Greeks. It is often the case that certain forms and constructions embodying refinements of the literary diction are persistently shunned by the people.
Εβουλόμην etc. vellem, (without έν), is to be explained somewhat differently, e.g. Acts xxi. 22 ἑβουλόμην καὶ αὐτός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἄνοιγος Κ I too should wish to hear the man (the account of him having awakened my curiosity), Aristoph. ran. 866; Aeschin. Ctesiph. 274 b.; Arrian. Epict. 1, 19, 18; Lucian. dial. mort. 20, 4; abdic. 1; Char. 6, etc. There is expressed here, not a desire which has been active at some former time merely (under different circumstances) voletam, but a wish still felt by the speaker. This, however, is not stated directly (volō), for this can be done only when the performance is viewed as dependent solely on the will (1 Tim. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xvi. 7; Rom. xvi. 19, etc.); nor by means of ἑβουλόμην έν, for this would imply the counterpart but Κ I will not, Hm. partic. έν p. 66 sq., nor yet by the much weaker θεουλίμην έν (Xen. Oec. 299 6, 12; Krü. 163), velim, Κ I could wish; but definitely: Κ I was wishing, wished, that is, if it were proper, if thou wouldst permit it (and wish accordingly on this assumption), Bhdy. S. 374; Kühner II. 68, (a conditional clause, therefore, being understood). 1 So also Rom. ix. 3 η ρχόμην γάρ αὐτός ἐγώ ἀνίθμημα έλναι ἀπό τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπέρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου οπταρεμ έγο etc., and Gal. iv. 20, see my Comment. in loc. (It is otherwise in 2 Cor. i. 15; Phil. 18, 14, where the Aorists express what actually took place, and in 254 2 Jno. 12 ηθεουλίθημι.)

In Jno. iv. 4 etc. έκκα is to be taken as a genuine Imperf. Indicative, denoting a real fact. On the contrary, in Heb. ix. 26 έκκά έδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθὼν the particle έκ might have been expected, as something is expressed that according to a certain supposition must have taken place. The Codd., however, do not give it, and it can be omitted,—just as we say: for (otherwise), if that were the design, he must have often suffered (cf. Hm. Eurip. Bacch. p. 152; Bhdy. 390, see § 42, 2). In Rom. xi. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 14; v. 10, the Indicatives Pres. after έκκά (otherwise, aloquin) are usually rendered as Subjunctives. The meaning, however, of the first two passages is simply this: then (in that case i.e. if έξ έργων) grace is no longer grace; then (in case the husband is not sanctified in the wife) are your children unclean. But in 1 Cor. v. 10 nearly all the better Codd. [Sin. also] read υπειθερα. See, further, Ast, Plat. legg. p. 162 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 57.

In 1 Cor. vii. 7 θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους έλναι έσ καί έμαυτόν the Indic.

1 Schoemann ad Isaecum p. 435 takes a different view: Addita particula έν voluntatem significamus a conditione suspensam: vellem, st liceret: omissa autem particula etiam conditionis notio nulla subintelligitur, sed hoc potius indicatur, vere non illud voluisse, etiamsi omittenda fuerit voluntas, scilicet quod frustra nos velle cognovimus. This nice distinction, however, might not be applicable to all passages.
θλω is not used, as Pott maintains, for θλομι or θηλον. Paul actually entertained this wish, directing his attention meantime merely to the advantage that would thus accrue to men (Christians), and not to the obstacles. Had he referred to the latter he must have said: I could wish, or I could have wished, velim or vellem. Baumgarten has understood the passage correctly. In the same way we must explain 1 Cor. vii. 28, where φιλομαι is likewise explained by Pott as equivalent to φιλομαι ἂν. All recent expositors have correctly explained 2 Cor. xii. 9 ἀρκεῖ τοι ἡ χάρις μου, which Luther inaccurately renders: be satisfied with my grace. The force of the Indicative has been exaggerated in another way in 1 Cor. v. 7: καθὼς ἐστε ἐξαιμοι esse debetis; incorrectly, see Mey.

3. The Indicative Pres. sometimes occurs also b. in direct questions where in Latin the Subjunctive (in German the auxiliary verb sollen) would be used; as, Jno. xi. 47 τί ποιούμεν; ὅτι οὕτως ὁ ἀνθρώπος πος πολλά σημεία τοιεί, quid faciamus? what are we to do? Lucian, pisc. 10; asin. 25. The Ind., however, here strictly denotes that something must undoubtedly be done (forthwith); so we say, what are we doing? more resolute and emphatic than what shall we do? Τι ποιούμεν is the question of one who invites to deliberation (cf. Acts iv. 16); τι ποιούμεν, on the contrary, is the language of one who on behalf of those concerned assumes the determination not only in general to do something, but also to do something definite, and desires simply to draw out a declaration of the specific thing. [That this distinction is not artificial, as Bttm. Gramm. d. N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 180 asserts, has been justly acknowledged by Mey., also, in loc.] On this (rhetorical) Ind. Pres., which mainly occurs in conversation, see Heind. Plat. Gorg. p. 109 and Theaet. p. 449; Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 141; Bhdy. 396.

The Greeks go still further, and even say πίνομεν we drink i.e. we are to drink, when they mean to proceed to drink forthwith, when the cup has been already lifted up (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 559). Gal. vi. 10 however, ἐργαζόμεθα το ἁγαθόν, which is the reading in good Codd. viz. AB and which Lchm. has printed [but only in his stereotyp. ed.] can hardly serve as an instance of this usage; see Mey. As to Jno. xxi. 3, cf. § 40, 2, p. 265.

The meaning of 1 Cor. x. 22 ἡ παραμετομὴ τῶν κυρίων; which Schott still renders by the Subjunctive, is probably: or do we provoke God? is that the meaning of our conduct, to awaken God’s wrath? παραλ. expresses, not what is still to take place (as Rück. takes it [and recently even Bttm. Gramm. d. N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 181 considers as not inappropriate]), but what is already actually taking place. Rom. viii. 24 δο βλέπεις τις, τί καὶ ἐπιτίμοι; is not (Schott) quare insuper speret? for dropping the question
the passage means, not: he may no longer hope for; but: he no longer hopes for. On the Ind. Fut. for the Subjunctive, see § 40, 6, p. 279.

The Indicatives in Jas. v. 13 κακοσιάτει τις εν θυμίῳ .... ἀδιάφενει τις εν θυμίῳ, denoting a case represented as real, are attended with no difficulty: some one is afflicted among you, ... some one is sick among you, etc.

Demosth. cor. 351 c. (where a point of interrogation is not necessary, 269 Krü. 160). In Greek authors, even a Preterite is used in this way, 6th d. Mth. 1155.

4. The Subjunctive is used in independent propositions

a. When an invitation or resolution (conjunct. adhortativus) is expressed (Mth. 1169); as, Jno. xiv. 31 ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντείθεν, xix. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 32 φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὕριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν, Phil. iii. 15 δοσοί ὄντες τελειοί, τούτο φρονῶμεν, 1 Thess. v. 6 γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήψομεν, Luke viii. 22. The Codd. occasionally vary between the Subjunct. and the Fut. Heb. vi. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; Jas. iv. 13, but in the first two passages there is preponderating evidence in favor of the Subjunctive.

b. In undetermined questions (conjunct. deliberativus, Mth. 1170; Bhdy. 396; Kühner II. 102 f.); as, Mark xii. 14 δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν; shall we give or not give? Rom. vi. 1 ἐπιμένομεν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ; 1 Cor. xi. 22; also in the 3d and 2d Pers., as Luke xxiii. 31 εἰ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ 801 ξύλῳ ταύτα ποιοῦσιν, εἰ τῷ ξύλῳ τῇ γέννησι; and Matt. xxvi. 54 πῶς πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί; how shall the Scriptures be fulfilled? xxiii. 33 πῶς φύγητε (Jno. v. 47 var.). Under this head comes the Subjunctive in certain set phrases; as, Luke ix. 54 θέλεις εὑτομεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀλυμποῦ; (Hm. de ellips. p. 183) will thou that we, are we to bid etc., Matt. xiii. 28; xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 9. Cf. Eurip. Phoen. 722 θοῦλες τράπωμαι δῆθεν δύνασθαι τινὰς; Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 1 θοῦλες σκοπῶμεν; Aesch. Ctesiph. 297 c.; Lucian. dial. m. 20, 3. See also Matt. vii. 4 ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος etc. 1 Cor. iv. 21. It is a mistake to supply in such cases ἡν or ὅνως (Lehmann, Lucian. III. 466). There is no ellipsis, any more than, for example, in the German es scheint sie kommen, it seems they are coming. In some passages, Codd. have the Fut., which, in these phrases, Greek authors do employ (Lucian. navig. 26), though not very frequently; see Lob. Phryn. p. 734, and Fr. Matt. p. 465, 761 (from the Sept. see Heb. viii. 5) cf. e.g. Exod. xxv. 40 ὃρα ποιήσεις κατὰ τὸν τύπον etc.

In questions, the Future instead of the Conjunct. deliberativus of the 256 3d Pers. is, according to the testimony of the Codd., more frequent in the N.T., see above, § 40, 6, and is to be retained even in Rom. x. 14f.;
§ 41a. INDICATIVE, SUBJUNCTIVE, AND OPTATIVE.

although in Greek authors the Subjunctive, in this person also, not unfrequently occurs (Stallb. Plat. Men. p. 103; Krü. 161); Soph. Aj. 403 ποι τις φύγῃ; Oed. Col. 170 ποι τις φροντίδος δάθυ; (1st Pers. vs. 311); Plato, Soph. 225a.; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 96. In Luke xi. 5 the Fut. Ind. and the Subjunctive are connected, τίς έξ ομίων έξει φίλον καὶ πορευέσται πρὸς αὐτόν ... καὶ εἶπη αὐτῷ; see Mth. 1171; Hm. partic. ἂν p. 87; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 26 and Phaed. p. 202; Bornem. Luc. p. 147; Bmln. p. 182.

Respecting Jas. iv. 15 ἃν δι κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ ξήσωμεν (ξήσομεν) καὶ ποιήσωμεν (ποιήσομεν) τούτο ἢ ἕκειν a learned controversy has been carried on between Fritzsche (Leipz. Literatur-Zeit. 1824. S. 2816 and n. crit. Journ. V. S. 3 ff.) and Bornem. (n. crit. Journ. VI. S. 130 ff.). The former would make the conclusion begin at καὶ ποιήσομεν (adopting this as the preferable reading); the latter would make it begin at καὶ ξήσωμεν (re-taining also ποιήσομεν). Fritzsche renders the passage: if the Lord will and we live, we shall also do this or that; Bornem.: if it please the Lord, let us seek our support, let us do this or that. Every one must feel that there is something incongruous in the expression if God will, we will live; and B. himself has perceived this, as he translates ξήσομεν we will use life! But this explanation appears forced, and not warranted by biblical usage. There is nothing remarkable in the occurrence of καὶ at the beginning of the apodosis (2 Cor. xi. 12). With regard to this, therefore, I must agree with Fr. But he should not have asserted that ποιήσομεν is far better attested than ξήσομεν. The critical authorities are nearly equal. Only from Cod. Meerm. (by Dermout) ποιήσομεν (but not ξήσομεν) has been adduced; [and Cod. Sin. has ποιήσομεν together with ξήσομεν]. Considering the ease with which a mistake in transcribing might occur, we should probably adopt as the most suitable reading: ἃν δι κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ ξήσωμεν, καὶ ποιήσομεν etc. (vs. 13).

5. The OPTATIVE is used in independent propositions when a wish is expressed; as, Acts viii. 20 τὸ ἄργυριον σου σὺν σοι εἶνας ἑκάστου, Rom. xv. 5; Philem. 20 ἐγώ σου ὅναλμην, 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 11 f.; v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 5; (in 2 Cor. ix. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 7 the Futures are to be restored, as is the Imperat. λαβέτω in Acts i. 20). As to the Sept. see some remarks in Thiersch p. 101. Cf. 1 Kings viii. 57; Ps. xl. 3; Tob. v. 14; x. 12; xi. 16.

Instead of the Optative, the Hebrew frequently employs a question to denote a wish; as, 2 Sam. xv. 4 τίς με καταστήσῃ κρατήν utinam quis me constituat! This construction, however, occurs also in Greek poets, Fr. Rom. II. 70. Yet it is on insufficient grounds that Rom. vii. 24 τίς με δίσεται etc. has been taken as a wish expressed in the form of a question. A question expressive of perplexity and conscious helplessness is here peculiarly appropriate, and requires no μετάβασις et al. γένος.
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1. The particles of design IEW and δῶσ (both which, however, strictly signify quod modo, ut;—respecting μή see below, § 56), are quite naturally construed with the Subjunctive and Optative (according to the distinction above pointed out between the two moods), as every design refers to the future, and, consequently, to something still to be carried into effect. The Indicative they can take—so long as the writer thinks correctly—only in the Future tense.¹

In the N. T. these particles are usually followed by

a. The Subjunctive, and then a. not only after the Present, as Matt. vi. 2 ποιοσ ... δῶσ δοξασθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 2 Tim. ii. 4 οὖδεις στρατευόμενος ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματείαις, ἵνα τῷ στρατολογήσατι ἄρεσῃ, 10 πάντα ὑπομένει διὰ τ. ἐκλέκτους, 270 ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ σωτηρίας τύχωσιν (Mark iv. 21; Luke viii. 12; Rom. xi. 25; 1 Jno. i. 3; Heb. ix. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 29; Gal. vi. 13; the Subjunctive here denoting—Hm. Vig. 850—what was regarded as a consequence actually about to take place, what was in fact and immediately designed, consequently what is objectively possible), and after the Imperat. and the Fut., as 1 Tim. iv. 15 ἐν τούτως 308 ἵνα, ἵνα σοι ἡ προκοπή φανερὰ ὑπὲρ, Matt. ii. 8 ἀπαγγείλατε μοι, δῶσες κύριω δαρκυνήσου αὐτῷ, v. 16; xiv. 15; Acts viii. 19; xxiii. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 18; 1 Jno. ii. 28; Jno. v. 20 μείζονα τούτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα, ἵνα ἰμέις θαυμάσῃ, Phil. i. 26, also after the Conjunct. adhort. or deliber., as in Rom. iii. 8; Luke xx. 14; Jno. vi. 5, etc.,—all in accordance with the preceding remarks, and quite regular (Hm. Vig. 850);—but also β. after the Preterite, when the latter denotes a really past time² (cf. Gayler, de partic. gr. sermon. negat. p. 176 sqq.), and there occasionally can be perceived a reason for selecting this mood instead of the Optative (Hm. Vig. 791; Krü. 166).³ Accordingly, in the following passages the Subjunctive may denote an action still continuing either in itself or in its results, or one frequently recurring (Hm. Vig. 850 and ad Eurip. Hecub. p. 7; Heind. Plat. Protag. § 29; Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 103;

¹ See, in general, Franke in the Darmstädter Schulzeit. 1839. S. 1236 ff.; Klotz, Devar. II. 615 sqq.

² For where a Perfect has the sense of a Present, IEW or δῶσ with the Subjunctive cannot be surprising, Jno. vi. 38; Luke xvi. 26; Acts ix. 17; 1 Jno. v. 20.

³ Many other distinctions have been laid down by Wex in the epist. crit. ad Gesenium (Lips. 1831. 4to.) p. 22 sqq. The question arises, however, whether such nice distinctions are consistent with the character of a living language.
Ast, Plat. legg. p. 93; Klotz, Devar. II. 618): 1 Tim. i. 16 ἥλεθν, ἵνα ἐν ἑμοὶ πρῶτῳ ἐνδείξηται Ι. Χριστὸς τὴν πάσαν μακροθυμίαν, vs. 20 οδὴ παράδοκα τῷ σατανᾷ, ἵνα παιδευθῶσι μὴ βλασφημεῖν, Tit. i. 5 κατέλυτον σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδοθῶσι ημῖν, ii. 14 διὸ ἐδοκεῖν ἑαυτὸν περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρωθῇ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, Rom. vi. 4 συνυπήρχετον αὐτῷ, ἵνα... καὶ ἡμῖν ἐν κανόντι τῷ ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν, 1 Jno. iii. 5 ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἢμερημοί, 258 vs. 8 ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τού διαβόλου, τοῦ 13 ταιτρα ἐγγαρεύω ἤμων, ἵνα εἰδῆτε; cf. Luke i. 4 (Plat. Crit. 48 b.; rep. 9, 472 c.; legg. 2, 653 d.; Xen. Mem. 1, 1, 8; Aelian. 12, 30). In other passages, e.g. Acts v. 26 ἠγαγὼν αὐτοὺς... ἵνα μὴ λιθασθῶσιν, Acts ix. 21 εἰς τότε ἐλπιζον, ἵνα... ἀγάπη, the Subjunctive may denote an intended result of the occurrence of which the speaker entertained no doubt whatever; cf. Mark viii. 6 εἴδον τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραβαλῶσιν (that they might... which they could not refuse to do), xii. 2; Acts xxv. 26 προῆγαγον αὐτῶν ἐφ' ὑμῶν, ὅπως τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενόμενης σχῆ τῇ γράφῳ. (The Optative would express a design of uncertain result, Mtth. 1182, 1184.) Lastly, the construction in Matt. xix. 13 προσέκεισθαι αὐτῷ τὰ παιδία, ἵνα τὰς χειρὰς ἐπιθῇ 271 αὐτοῖς; Mark x. 18 προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα ἁγιασθῇ αὐτῶν is perhaps to be explained by the fact that the Greeks in narration sometimes introduce the opinions of another in direct discourse, or at least as though he himself were still present, and consequently employ the same moods which he would have used (Heind. Plat. Protag. p. 502, 504; Poppo, Xen. Cyrop. p. 189 sq. and Thuc. I. I. 141 sq.); so here: that he may lay his hands upon them, instead of might lay (Optative). The reader is thus more vividly made as it were a beholder of the scene described (Klotz, as above, pp. 618 sq. 682); cf. Jno. xviii. 28; Matt. xii. 14. As, however, the Optative never occurs in the N. T. in this (B.) very common construction, we are by no means warranted in ascribing to the sacred writers this nice distinction. They seem, rather, to have unconsciously avoided the Optative—a mood which becomes more and more rare in the later language, and in the popular speech perhaps never conformed to the rules of literary Attic—even where a more cultivated taste in such matters would have certainly given it the preference (e.g. Jno. iv. 8; vii. 32; Luke vi. 7; xix. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 6; Heb. ii. 14; xi. 35; Phil. ii. 27, etc.). Even Plutarch, in the above construction, usually employs the Subjunctive,1

1 Even in the earlier authors particles of design are more frequently construed with the Subjunctive after a Preterite than was formerly admitted. See Bremi, Lys. exc. i. p. 435 sqq.
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and in the Hellenistic language it is everywhere the predominant mood, as may be seen from every page of the Sept., Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, etc. (Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 47).

b. The Indicative Future (after a Pres. and Perf. cf. Hm. Vig. 851); as, Rev. xxii. 14 μακάριοι οἱ πιστοὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἔσται ἡ ἐκκοιλία αὐτῶν etc. (the Subjunctive immediately follows), iii. 9; vi. 11; xiv. 18 (var.); Jno. xvii. 2 ἀνέκδοκεν αὐτῷ ἐκκοιλία ... ἵνα ... δόξῃ αὐτῶς (al. δώσῃ), 1 Pet. iii. 1; 1 Cor. xiii. 3 (var); Gal. ii. 4 (var.). Compare, further, the variants in Rev. viii. 3; ix. 20; xiii. 16; xiv. 18, (on the other hand, in the O. T. quotation Eph. vi. 3 the construction is continued in the oratio directa at ἡμᾶς, which accordingly must not be supposed to depend on ἵνα. In the same way may be explained also the var. ἐγεναστήσει and καθίσεοςθε in Mark xii. 19 and Luke xxii. 30). The Fut. with ὅποιος never occurs in the N. T. (for ὅποιος ... ἡμᾶς Mark v. 23 has little authority); but this is a construction not unfrequent in 259 Greek authors, as Xen. A. 8, 1, 18; Theophr. char. 22; Isocr. perm. 746; Dem. Mid. 398 b.; Soph. Philoct. 55; cf. Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 498; Klotz as above, p. 688 sq.; Gayler de partic. negat. p. 211, 321; Rost 647 f., and the Fut. then usually denotes a continuing state, while the Aor. Subjunct. is used of something quickly passing by. This construction with ἵνα also appears correct to Elmsley, Eurip. Bacch. p. 164; see, on the other hand, 305 Hm. Soph. Oed. Col. 155, and de partic. ἄν p. 134; Klotz, Devar. II. 630— (in all the passages referred to this head ἵνα may be 272 conveniently rendered by ubi or where). Instances of this construc- tion actually occur in the later writers (Cedren. II. 136), the Fathers (Epiph. II. 382 b.), and the Apocrypha (Evang. apocr. p. 437; Thilo, apocr. 682); cf. Schaesf. Demosth. IV. 275. In the N. T. this mood, according to the above passages, is pretty well established, though owing to Itacism the forms of the Ind. and of the Subj. might easily have been interchanged.

c. Lastly, the use of ἵνα in connection with the Present Ind.,\(^1\) of which two instances occur almost without var. — 1 Cor. iv. 6 ἵνα μᾶθητε ... ἵνα μὴ φυσιούσθε, and Gal. iv. 17 ἰηλούσιν ἱμᾶς ... ἵνα αὐτοὺς ἰηλούσθε,—is very surprising; for the Pres. Ind. after a particle of design seems illogical. Hence Fr. Matt. p. 836 sq. asserted that in both passages ἵνα is not the Conjunction, but the Adverb ubi; and this opinion, after Fr. had exchanged it as respects the

\(^1\) Valkenae's note on 1 Cor. confounds the Indic. Preterite, Future, and Present, and is consequently useless.
first passage for another (Fritzschior. Opusc. p. 186 sqq.), 1 Mey. has taken up again: *under which circumstances you (then) are not puffed up, — where (in which case) you are zealous in regard to them.* But, apart from the fact that in the whole Greek Bible ἵνα never once occurs as an Adverb of place, the Pres. in both passages would be surprising, and also in the first passage οὗ would rather be expected. Moreover in both passages, as Mey. himself admits, ἵνα denoting design is far more in accordance with the Apostle’s meaning. I think, therefore, that this use of ἵνα with the Ind. Pres. must be regarded as an imprropriety of later Greek, 2 — although the passage from Acta Ignat. ed. Ittig. p. 538 does not furnish satisfactory proof, as ἀπολύοντα might be taken for the Attic Fut. if necessary, and in Geopon. 10, 48, 3; Himer. 15, 3 the Ind. may have arisen easily from the Subjunct. by a mistake of the scribe. On the other hand, in later works ἵνα with the Ind. Pres. occurs so frequently as to preclude the supposition that every instance is a mistake of transcribers; see Malal. 10, p. 264 ἐπιτρέψας ἵνα πάντες ... βαστάζονται, 12, p. 300 ἐποίησε κέλευσιν ἵνα ... χρηματίζοντι, Acta Pauli et Petri 7 προδέχεται, ἵνα μία πόλις ἀπόλλυται, 20 ἐδίδαξε 806 ἵνα τῇ τιμῇ ἄλληλους προσγονύται, Acta Pauli et Thecl. p. 45 ἵνα 260 γάμου μὴ γίνονται ἄλλα οὕτως μένουσιν, Evangel. apocr. p. 447. 3 And this construction has further forced its way even into the N. T., 273 good Codd. having in Ἰω. xvii. 3 ἵνα ... γυνώσκοι. [Cf. besides, Gal. vi. 12 ἵνα μὴ διώκονται, Tit. ii. 4 ἵνα σωφρονίζοντις, Rev. xiii. 17 ἵνα μὴ τις δύναται in Tischendorf’s text, and 2 Pet. i. 10 ἵνα ποιεῖσθε in Lachmann’s.] Either, therefore, Paul actually wrote thus (yet see Bengel on 1 Cor. iv.), or the forms were introduced in these passages by transcribers at an early date. It is worthy of remark, however the case may be, that in both instances the verb ends in οὐο. When the Optative (after a Pres.) follows ἵνα, as in Eph. iii. 16 καμάτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ... ἵνα δύνη ὑμῖν etc. (where, however, very good Codd. [Sin. too] have ἔδησ] i. 17, ἵνα is not strictly a particle of design; but the clause which it commences expresses the object of the wish and prayer (that he may give), and the Opt., as modus optandi, is selected on this very account; see Harless on Eph. i. 17. Yet the Opt. is used even after ἵνα or δώσω in order that, when it depends on a clause

---

1 He adopts the emendation ἵνα μὴ ... φωσιοῦθαι (for ἵνα μὴ ... φωσιοῦθε); but against this see Meyer.
2 Modern Greek, e.g. in the Confess. Orthod., usually puts the Ind. Present after ὡς or ὡς ὡς.
3 Xen. Athen. 1, 11 ἵνα λαμβάνων μὴ πράττει (which Steins still adduces in his Lexic. Xenoph.) was long ago changed into λαμβάνων μὴ πράττει. See Schneider in loc.
expressive of a wish, Soph. Philoct. 325 and Aj. 1200; see Hm. on the latter passage, and Wex, epist. crit. p. 33. (In Eph. as above, it is unnecessary, with Lchm. and Fr. Rom. III. 230, to read ςον, an Ionic form of the Subjunctive which is not sufficiently established in the N. T.)

2. In hypothetical sentences four kinds of construction occur (Hm. Vig. 834, 902):

a. Pure condition: *if thy friend comes, give him my regards* (the case is put as real). Here the Indicative is used with *ei*; "quae particula per se nihil significat praeter conditionem," Klotz, Devar. 455, cf. p. 487.

b. Condition with assumption of objective possibility (where experience will decide whether or not it is real): *if thy friend come* (I do not know whether he will come, but the result will show). Here ἐλαύ (ei ἐλαύ see Hm. partic. ἐλαύ p. 95 sqq.) with the Subjunctive is used.

c. Condition with assumption of subjective possibility, the condition existing merely in thought: *if thy friend should come* (the case being conceivable and credible) *I should be pleased to present my respects to him*. Here *ei* with the Optative is used.

d. Condition believed to be contrary to the fact: *were there a God, he would govern* (but there is not). *Had God existed from eternity, he would have prevented evil* (but he has not existed). Here *ei* with the Indicative is used,— the Imperf. in the first case, the Aor. or (much more rarely) the Plup. in the second (Krü. 170); in the conclusion likewise one of these two tenses. Why a Preterite is used has been explained by Hm. Vig. 821, compare with this Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 51 sq. In general, see Klotz, Devar. p. 450 sqq.

For *ἐλαύ* we sometimes find, as in Jno. xii. 32; xvi. 33; xx. 23; Luke 274 iv. 7 (where, however, Tdf. has made no remark), in good Codd. (as B) ἐλάβε, respecting which cf. Hm. Vig. 812, 822. It is also by no means rare in Greek authors, even in Attic, though these prefer ἔλαυ, which does not occur in the N. T.

---

1 See also ad Soph. Antig. 706; ad Soph. Oed. C. 1445; ad Eur. Bacch. 200. *Klosmann*, de ratione et usu enuntiatur. hypothet. linguæ gr. Vratisl. 1830. *Kiesling*, 2 Programm. de enunciatis hypothet. in lingua gr. et lat. Cizeaie, 1835. 45. 4to. *Recknagel*, zur Lehre von den hypothetischen Sätzen mit Rücksicht auf die Grundformen derselben in der griech. Sprache. Nürnberg, 1843 ff. III. 4to. Besides, it can easily be conceived that, in many sentences, either *ei* or *ἐλαύ* might be used with equal propriety, the selection depending on the writer. The later writers are not careful to discriminate between them. It may be worthy of remark, that Euclid almost always uses *ἐλαύ* with the Subjunctive of a case in Mathematics (respecting which no future experience is needed to decide).
The diction of the N. T. will be found entirely in accordance with the preceding rules; e.g.

a. a. Matt. xix. 10 e'i ótoto's e'ostin 'h aitia tòu anvroupou ... ou'sumferei gamhsai, 1 Cor. vi. 2; ix. 17; Rom. viii. 25; Col. ii. 5 (Pres. followed by Pres.); Matt. xix. 17 ei thleis eisheisein eis tin zoiyn, tipheri tás evtolas, viii. 31; xxvii. 40; Jno. vii. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 9 (Pres. followed by Imperat.); Rom. viii. 11 ei to' pneuma to'gefeirontos Ioseoun ... oikei en un'is, o'gefeiras ... zosopoihsei kai to' thnata somyata, 'omwn, Matt. xvii. 4; Acts xix. 89; Jno. v. 47 (Pres. followed by Fut.); 1 Cor. xv. 16 ei nekrol ouk geferontai, ou'de Xristo's eghygeirai if the dead do not rise (I assume the case), then is Christ also not risen, xiii. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 20 (Rom. iv. 14) (Pres. followed by Perf.) cf. Demosth. ep. 3, p. 114 b.; Matt. xii. 26 ei o' sathnais ton satanavn ekballei, e'phi aautou emerisotai, cf. vs. 28; Luke xi. 20 (Pres. followed by Aor.) cf. Orig. de die domin. p. 3 Jani: ei de tov' ergon apostei, eis tin ekklisiai de ouk eisichai, ou'den ekberhavas.  

b. Acts xvi. 15 ei kekrikate me pistant to' kuri' evnai, eisheisontes ... meivate (Pres. followed by Imperat.); 2 Cor. v. 16 ei kai enwokamen kata' sarka Xristou, alla vino oukete 'gnwskomen (Pres. followed by Pres.; cf. Demosth. c. Boeot. p. 639 a.); Jno. xi. 12 ei kekoiymenai, sowhyssetai (Pres. followed by Fut.); Rom. vi. 5; 2 Cor. ii. 5 ei tis leluptheke, ouc em' leluptheke (Pres. followed by Perf.); vii. 14 ei ti aitw uper' ismou kekainymai, ou kathroxhthen (Pres. followed by Aor.);  

γ. Rom. xv. 27 ei tois pneumatikouis auton 308 ekounympavan ta' ethnik, ophileousi etc., 1 Jno. iv. 11 (Aor. followed by Pres.); Jno. xviii. 23 ei kakous elakheta, martrypseta peri to' kakou, Rom. xi. 17, 18; Col. iii. 1; Philem. 18 (Aor. followed by Imperat.); Jno. xiii. 32 ei o' theos eidothes en aitou, kai o' theos doziasei auton en 262 eautou, xv. 20 1 (Aor. followed by Fut.).  

δ. Matt. xxvi. 33 ei  

1 In this passage: ei eimai dhilevan, kai brakcoi dhizevoi; ei twn 'logon mou ethrhipwn, kai twn biteron thxhswai; the translation if they persecuted me, they will persecute you also, etc. is the only correct one. The words appear to me to be simply a special application of the preceding thought, ouc eosi doxous me'reos tou' kuriou aitou: your lot will be like mine; there is but a single alternative: persecution or acceptance. The words themselves leave it for the moment undecided which of the two has befallen Jesus. What follows, however, shows how Jesus wished to be understood. Only it must not be overlooked that Jesus speaks of the conduct of the Jews in general, without reference to individual exceptions. According to a new exposition put forth by rector Lehmann in the Prog. lucrabrationum sacrar. et profan. Pt. I. (Lübben, 1828. 4to.) a vis proportionalis is to be attributed to ei: quemadmodum me persecuti sunt, ita et vos sequentur; quemadmodum (prount) mean doctrinam amplexi observavant, ita et vestram, etc. But this import of the particle should have been established by decisive examples (in Jno. xiii. 14, 32 such force it obviously has not). The writer seems to have confounded the simple comparative ut ... ita (the parallel antithesis of two clauses standing in necessary correlation) with the proportional prout, accordingly as. There is a difference between
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πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοι, ἐγὼ οἰδέτοι σκανδαλισθήσομαι 275 (Fut. followed by Fut. like Isocr. Archid. p. 280; Porphyrr. abstin. 11 ις 1, 24); yet in Jas. ii. 11, where according to the received text the Fut. is followed by the Perf., probably the true reading would give Present tenses in the protasis. Such construction with the Fut. would approximate most nearly to that with ἔλαυ (Krü. 171); but if all shall be offended in thee is a more decided statement than if all should be offended. In the latter, it is still altogether uncertain whether they will be offended; in the former, this is assumed as a future fact (Christ has distinctly assured his disciples of this), cf. Hm. Vig. p. 900.

b. 'Ελαυ if an objective possibility with the expectation of a decision is to be expressed, always therefore in reference to something future (Hm. Vig. 834); as, Jno. vii. 17 ἔλαυ τις θελὴ τὸ θελημα αὐτῶν ποιεῖν, γινόσται etc., Matt. xxviii. 14 ἔλαυ ἀκούσῃ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱγμένους, ἥμεις πελάργους αὐτῶν. Hence the consequent clause usually contains a Fut. (Matt. v. 13; Rom. ii. 26; 1 Cor. viii. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 15; or, what is equivalent, an Aor. with οὐ μὴ Acts xiii. 41; Jno. viii. 51 f.) or an Imperat. (Jno. vii. 37; Matt. x. 13; xviii. 17; Rom. xii. 20; xiii. 4), more rarely a Pres., and then either in the sense of a Fut. (Xen. A. 3, 2, 20) or denoting something permanent, Matt. xviii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 1, or a general truth, Mark iii. 27; 1 Cor. ix. 16; Jno. viii. 16, 54; Acts xv. 1 (Diog. Laert. 6, 44; 10, 152). Perfects in the conclusion become equivalent in sense to Presents, 309 Rom. ii. 25; vii. 2; Jno. xx. 23 (on Rom. xiv. 23 and Jno. xv. 6 see § 40, 4 b. 5 b.). The Aor. in the conclusion occurs in 1 Cor. vii. 23 ἔλαυ δὲ καὶ γῆμης, οὐχ ἠμαρτες θου οἱ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οUCH HAMARTEΣ THOU HAST NOT SINNED, THOU ART NOT IN THIS CASE A SINNER. Cf. Mtth. 1203; Klotz, Devar. II. 451 sq. The Subjunctive depending on ἔλαυ may be a Subj. Pres. or a Subj. Aor. The latter (on the whole the more usual) is, for the most part, rendered in Latin by the Future Perfect.

That ἔλαυ 1 Cor. vii. 11, as Rück. maintains, refers to an event (possibly) already past, is a mistake, cf. Mey. In 2 Cor. x. 8 also Mey. has corrected Rückert's concessive acceptation of ἔλαυ.

c. El with the Optat. to denote subjective possibility (Hm. partic. ἔλαυ p. 97); and, a. When a condition is regarded as frequently recurring (Klotz p. 492; Krü. 172), as 1 Pet. iii. 14 εἴ καὶ πάσας χορε

the two: In a free translation the first may be put for εἴ, but the latter is not comprehended in the import of εἴ or ὅτι; and every one must perceive that in the passage in question L. really takes εἴ in two senses, first simply as ὅτι and then as proατ. See also Lücke in loc.
indicative, subjunctive, and optative.
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diā δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι even if ye should suffer. Πάσχειν is designated here not as something occurring in the future, but merely as something that may very probably occur, regarded without any reference to definite time (and in general as often as it may occur). Elsewhere only in parenthetical clauses, but with the same reference; as, 1 Cor. xv. 37 στερεῖς ... γυμνὸν κόκκον, εἰ τὸ χοίρ (if it should so chance), σίτου (Dem. Aristocr. 436 c.; Lucian. navig. 44; amor. 42; Toxar. 4, see Jacob on the last passage, and Wetzst. on 1 Cor. xv.), 1 Pet. iii. 17 κρείττον ἀγαθοποιοῦντας, εἰ θέλαι τὸ λήμμα τοῦ θεοῦ, πάσχειν, cf. Isocr. Nicocl. p. 52. Β. After a Preterite when the condition is represented as the subjective purpose of the agent; as, Acts xxvii. 39 κόλπον τινὰ κατειποῦν ἔχοντα αἰγιαλὸν εἰς δὴ βουλεύοντο, εἰ δύναιντο, ἐξακολούθη τὸ πλαῖον, also Acts xxiv. 19 οὗ ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν, εἰ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς με ὑδη they had anything against me (in their minds), Krü. 171. In Acts xx. 16 the Optat. might, in the same way, be expected; yet even in Greek authors sometimes (and that not merely in standing phrases, as εἰ δυνατόν ἔστι above) in orat. obliqu. the Ind. is used; as, Ael. 12, 40 ἐκπρύγηθη τῷ στρατηγῷ, εἰ τῷ ἔξαι ὑδορ ἐκ τοῦ Χαόσπου, ἦν δὲ βασιλεῖ πιεῖν. cf. Engelhardt, Plat. apol. p. 156. Further, see no. 5 below.

(After ἐν in orat. obliqu. nobody will expect the Opt. in the N. T. Acts ix. 2; Jno. ix. 22; xi. 57, Bttm. § 126, 8; yet cf. Hm. Vig. 822.)

For examples to d. see § 42.

310 The exceptions to these rules in the N. T. text are but very few, and occur for the most part only in particular Codd. They are the following:

- a) ὅ is used with the Subjunctive in 1 Cor. ix. 11 ὅ ἡμείς ὅ ὁν τὰ σφραγικὰ θερίζωμεν (according to good Codd.), xiv. 5 ἐκτὸς ὅ μὴ διαφημίζῃ (al. διαφημίζω) except (in case that) he interpret, Rev. xi. 5 var. (Sir. xxii. 26). The use of this mood after ὅ by Attic authors was long denied, but it is now admitted to occur even in prose; see Hm. Soph. Aj. 491 and de partic. ἀν p. 96; Poppo, Cyrop. p. 209 and Emend. ad Mth. Gramm. (Frkfr. on the Oder, 1832) p. 17; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 463; Klotz, Devar. IL 500 sqq. The distinction between ὅ with the Subjunctive and ὅν or

1 Luke ix. 13 probably means: unless perhaps we are to buy some, and the mood does not depend on ὅ, — as elsewhere after the phrase ἔστη ὅ καὶ Mth. 1205. Plat. Cratyl. 425d. ἐν μὴ ὅ ἡδὸν ... καὶ ἡμεῖς ... ἀλλαλάγημεν would be similar; but others read ἀλλαλάγημεν.

2 In 1 Thess. v. 10 the text. rec. with all the better Codd. [Sin. also], has ὅν, εἰτε γρηγορῶμεν εἶτε καθοδίωμεν, ἣμα σῶν αὐτῷ γιοῦμεν, where (after a Pret. in the principal clause) a more exact writer would have used the Opt. in both passages; cf. Xen. A. 2, 1, 14. Yet ὅν with the Subj. is here used according to ὅ, 1, and the Subj. in the secondary clause is accommodated to this.
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is thus defined by Hm. (de partic. ἵν p. 97 and ad Soph. Oed. R. p. 52 sq. cf. Klotz as above 501): ἵν puts the condition simply, but when used with the Subjunctive represents it as depending on the result; ἵν also does the latter, but less decisively, inasmuch as the ἵν represents the condition as dependent on accidental circumstances, if anyhow or perhaps. This will suit both the passages above quoted: ἵνοις εἰ μὴ διατρεβετοί nisi si interpretetur, on which the result will decide, referunt ad certam spem atque opinionem, futurum id esse (vel non esse). On the other hand, ἵν 264 would make the matter doubtful: unless he perhaps, which may be the case, interpret. This would be manifestly unsuitable, as the gift of interpreting did exist, and was frequently exercised, vs. 26 f. In later prose this Subjunctive became more and more frequent (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 681 and Athen. p. 146; Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 183; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 53; Jacobitz, Index p. 473; Schaef. Ind. ad Aesop. p. 131), particularly in Byzantine authors (Index to Malalas and Theophanes), also in the Hellenistic writings (Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 23), and almost uniformly in the Canon. Apost. and the Basilic. (in the Sept. cf. Gen. xliii. 3, 4). In these writers a fixed distinction between ἵν with the Subj. and the same particle with the Ind., cannot be traced, (many doubt whether such a distinction existed even in Attic, Rost S. 632; cf. Mtth. 1210 f.); consequently it is uncertain whether Paul had in view the nice discrimination specified above.

b) ἵν is followed by the Indicative (Klotz p. 468), and not only — a. by the Ind. Present (Sept. Lev. i. 14; Acta aopcr. 259) according to good Codd. in Rom. xiv. 8 ἵν ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποθν., a general truth: cum morimur (without reference to the fact that time will decide whether we die or not), 1 Thess. iii. 8 (in Gal. i. 8 the Ind. has little authority), or 311 Future, Jno. viii. 36 ἵν ὁ ψός ὑμᾶς ἄφες ἀπεφέσο. Acts viii. 31 (where, however, there is preponderant authority for the Subj.), Luke xi. 12 ἵν αἰρήσαι ἓν according to many uncial Codd. cum petet, not petierit, vi. 34; see Klotz pp. 470, 472 sq. The same (cf. Fabric. Pseudoepigr. I. 678, 687) occurs several times, as in Exod. viii. 21 (Lev. iv. 3), Malalas 5, p. 136; Cantacuz. 1, 6, p. 30; 1, 54, p. 273 (Basilic. I. 175; Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 23; Schaef. ind. ad Aesop. p. 131), in which passages, to be sure, forms so slightly distinguished from each other hardly permit a positive decision; — but also, β. by the Ind. Preterite, as in 1 Jno. v. 15 ἵν ἐδοκέω without var. cf. Ephraemi 6298 (even when the Pret. is strictly Pret. in signification, as in Job xxii. 3; Theodoret. III. 267; Malalas 4, p. 71 ἵν καὶ ὁ βούλευε, Nili ep. 3, 56 ἵν ἔδοξα, Ephraem. 5251), see Jacobs, Act. Monac. I. 147; cf. Hase, Leon. Dion. p. 143; Schaef. ad Bastii ep. crit. p. 26; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 313 and III. II. 172.2

1 In all these passages the form might easily have arisen from a mistake in transcribing (Fr. Rom. III. 179); Klotz p. 471 sqq. has, however, adduced examples from good writers to which this would not apply.

2 Editors of early writers have usually corrected such passages (see also Ebd. Dionys.
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Sometimes ἐάν and εἰ are connected in two parallel clauses; as, Acts v. 38, 39 ἐάν ἢ ἡ ἀνθρώπων ἡ βουλὴ αὐτῇ ἢ τοῦ ἔργου τουτοῦ, καταλύθηται (should it be from, and this the result will show), εἰ δὲ ἐν θεοὶ ἔτως, οὐ δύνασθε καταλύται αὐτῷ (if it is of God,—a case I assume), Luke xiii. 9 278 καὶ μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν ... εἰ δὲ μήγε ... ἐκκόψεις si fructus tulerit; ... sin minus (si non fert) etc. (Plat. rep. 7, 540 d.), Gal. i. 8 f.; see Hm. Vig. 834; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 143; Weber, Dem. p. 473. Cf. Her. 3, 36; Xen. 265 C. 4, 1, 15; Plat. Phaed. 93 b.; Isocr. Evag. p. 462; Lucian. dial. m. 6, 3; Dio Ch. 69, 621. In most cases of this nature εἰ or ἐάν repeated might be used with equal propriety, though the choice of the one conjunction or the other would obviously proceed from a different conception of the relation; see Fr. Conject. i. 25. In two mutually subordinate clauses εἰ and ἐάν are distinguished from each other in Jno. xiii. 17 εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοι λογε, ἐάν ποιήσητε αὐτῷ, ἣν εἰκονίζετο, ὅταν γὰρ ποιήσητε εἰς ἀληθήναι τὸν παθήνον αὐτοῦ νομίζει, ὅταν γὰρ ἐπιράκη μοι, etc. Rev. ii. 5; cf. Krü. 172.

3. Particles of time (Krü. 175) which 1) in narration denote a definite past event (when, while, etc.) are naturally constricted with the Indicative Pret. or historical Pres. ; as ὅτε Matt. vii. 28; ix. 25; Mark xi. 1; xiv. 12; Luke iv. 25; 1 Cor. xiii. 11; ὅτε Matt. 812 xxviii. 9; Luke i. 28; vii. 12; Jno. iv. 40; Acts xvi. 4, etc., ὅποτε Luke vi. 3, ἐπισκέπτομαι 2 Cor. iii. 15 (Lchm. and Tdf.) cf. Klotz p. 613. So likewise ἔως and ἔως οὖν 1 Matt. i. 25; ii. 9; Jno. ix. 18; Acts xxi. 26, etc.; Mth. 1197 f. Those which 2) denote a future event (when, as soon as, until) likewise govern, a) if they refer to a distinctly conceived event, the Indicative (Fut.); as, Jno. iv. 21 ἐρχεται ὃ ρα, ὅτε ... πρὸς κυνήσετε τῷ πατρί, Luke xvii. 22 ἐλύονται ἡμεῖς, ὅτε ἐπιθυμησετε, xiii. 35; Jno. v. 25; xvi. 25; see Hm. Vig. 915. After ἔως the Pres. Ind. is in a few instances used for the Fut. (§ 40, 2); as, Jno. xxi. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 13 ἔως ἔρχομαι (like ἔως ἐπάνωσιν Plut. Lycurg. c. 29). 2 The Pres. Ind. after ὅτε p. 851), sometimes without MS. authority (Arist. an. 7, 4 p. 210 Sylb.). On the other hand, we find in Dinarch. c. Philocl. 2, even in Bekker’s edition, ἐὰν ... ἀλλὰ, which, according to Klotz’s remarks, is not to be altered.

This phrase (equivalent to our until) is not peculiar to later prose, except when used without ἔως. Even in Her. 2, 143 we find ἔως ὅ ἐστι διδασκαλο,, and in Xen. A. 1, 7, 6; 5, 4, 16 etc., μέχρις οὖ, so frequently in Plutarch., more fully μέχρι τοῦτο, ἔως ὅ Παλæph. 4, 2.

In the sense of as long as, ἔως denoting something actual is used as naturally with the Ind. Jno. ix. 4 (xii. 35 var.; Plat. Phaed. 89 c.; Xen. C. 1, 6, 9; 7, 2, 22; Plutarch. edue. 9, 27 etc.; Klotz, Devar. II. 565). The same mood is used after the Imperat. in Matt. v. 25 ὅτι ἐνίοτε τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δοκεῖν ταύτα, ἔως ὅτου ἐν τῷ ὅπῃ μετὰ αὐτοῦ, where the Subjunctive might have been expected, as a merely possible case is indicated. This statement, however, contains a general truth, in which the case in question is represented
differs from this. That is employed in general truths; as, Jno. ix. 4 ἔρχεται νῦν ὅτε (i.e. ἐν ἧ) οὐδείς δύναται ἐργαζεῖσθαι, Heb. ix. 17 οὖσιν μὴ πιστεύειν διαθήκης, ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθημένος, see Hm. as above, 915.  b) If, however, the future event is only (objectively) possible, though viewed as under certain circumstances sure to take place, the Subjunctive with a particle of time compounded with ἄν (ὅταν, ἄφαν, ἳνα ἄν) is usually employed, see § 42. The same construction is used, when the particle of time indicates a duration or a future repetition (ὅταν, ὡσάκις ἄν), or a point of time till which something is to continue (ὁσ ἄν) Mtth. 1199. In the latter case, however, the Subjunctive alone with ἔως, ἔως ὃν, ἄφρο, πρὶν, etc. often occurs, particularly in the later authors; as, Mark 266 xiv. 32 καθιστεῖς αὐτήν, ἔως προσέχομεν until I shall have prayed, 2 Pet. i. 19 καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ... ἔως ὁ ἡμείρα διανεύσῃ, Luke xiii. 8 ἄφες αὐτήν καὶ τρίτο τό ἔτος, ἔως ὅτου σκάφῳ περί αὐτήν, xii. 50 ; xv. 4 ; xxi. 24 ; xxi. 16 ; xxiv. 49 (Heb. x. 13) ; 2 Thess. ii. 7 ; 1 Cor. xi. 26 ; xv. 25 ; Gal. iii. 19 ; Eph. iv. 13 ; Luke ii. 26 μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, πρὶν ἦ ἴδῃ τὸν Χριστόν.  
See Plutarch. Cat. min. 59 άφρος ὁ τὴν ἐσχάτην τύχην τῆς πατρίδος ἐξελέγχωμεν, Caes. 7 μέχρις ὁ καταπολεμηθῇ Κατιλίνας, Plato, Eryx 392 c. ; Æsch. dial. 2, 1 ; Lob. Phryn. p. 14 sq. ; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 61 sq. ; Held, 318 Plutarch. Timol. p. 369 sq. ; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 668. The lucid distinction which Hm. lays down, part. ἄν p. 109 sq. (restricting it, however, immediately, p. 111) cf. Klotz, Devar. 568, however easily it finds support in the preceding passages, would vanish again as respects the N. T. on a comparison of the passages with ἔως ἄν § 42, 5. In Rev. xx. 5 οἱ λοιποὶ ... οὐκ ἐξήχουν, ἔως τελεσθῆ τὰ χίλια ἑτῆ does not mean, till they were completed (narratively), but is a concise expression: they remained (and remain) dead, till the thousand years shall be completed.  3) The Opt. (without ἄν) occurs but once in the N. T. after a particle of time in orat. oblique. Acts xxv. 16 οὐκ ἔστω τοις ἱπποις ἡμᾶς ἀπελευσθήναι τω ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀπόστολον, πρὶν ἦ ὁ κατηγορόμενος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἐχότα τοῦ κατηγόρου, τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι etc. See Klotz p. 727. In other places, where this mood might be expected, we find the Subjunctive, as in Matt. xiv. 22; Acts xxiii. 12, 14, 21; Mark ix. 9; Luke ii. 26; Rev. vi. 11; this may be in part accounted for by a blending of the orat. recta and obliqua, see below, no. 5. With as real. On the other hand, in Luke xvii. 8 διακοσίων μας, ἔως φέγγων καὶ τίνω (ἄν is omitted in the better Codd. [Smin. also]) the Subjunctive is employed in reference to an uncertain limit in the future.
Matt. as above, cf. Thuc. 1, 137 τὴν ἀσφάλειαν εἶναι μηδένα ἐκβῆναι ἐκ τῆς νεώς, μέχρι πλοῦς γενηταί. Alciplhr. 8, 64; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 142; Krü. 177. Once indeed in such a case, Mark vi. 45 (which Fr. has left wholly unnoticed), the Indicative even is fully established, which is to be accounted for in a similar way; see Mey.

In Luke xiii. 35 ἦν ἡ ζωή, δὲ εἰπητε the Subjunctive is joined also with δὲ, a construction that could hardly be vindicated by Attic prose (Klotz 688); but (de eventu) it is not incorrect: quando dixeritis. The Iud. Fut. would be more suitable in the mouth of Christ, and would correspond better to ζωή (Diod. S. Exc. Vat. 103, 31 Lips.). Besides, compare as to δὲ with the Subjunctive, Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 100 and in Act. Monac. I. II. 147.

4. INTERROGATIVES in indirect questions are construed,

267 a. With the Indicative, when the question refers to a matter of fact i.e. to the existence of something, (is it? is it not?) or to the condition of something existing (how? where? wherefore? etc.), whether the principal clause contain a Pres. or a Pret. (Plut. Arist. 7; Xen. A. 2, 6, 4; Plat. Phil. 22 a.; rep. 1, 380 e.; conv. 194 e.; Diog. L. 2, 69; Klotz, Devar. 508); as, Mark xv. 44 ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν, εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν, Matt. xxvi. 68; Jno. i. 40 εἶδον τὸν μένει, Mark v. 16 διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς, πῶς ἐγένετο τὸ διαμοιζόμενο, Acts xx. 18 ἐπίστασθο... τῶς μεθ' ὕμων ἐγενό μῆν (he had actually 314 been with them), 1 Thess. i. 9 ἀπαργίζεταινς, ὅποιαν εἰσόδου εἰς κομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Jno. ix. 21 πῶς νῦν βλέπει, οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ver. 15; x. 6 οὐκ ἐγνωσαν τίνα ἦν ἐκάλει what it was (meant), iii. 8; vii. 27; xx. 13; Acts v. 8; xii. 18; xv. 36; xix. 2; Luke xxiii. 6; Col. iv. 6; Eph. i. 18; 1 Cor. i. 16; iii. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 15, also Jno. ix. 25 (where ἀμαρτωλὸν εἶναι had been asserted): whether he is a sinner or not. In such instances the Latin language, as is well known, taking a different view of the case employs the Subjunctive. The tense of the direct question is introduced into an indirect question in Acts x. 18 ἐπηρώτανο, εἰ Σίμων ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται, Heb. xi. 8; cf. Plat. apol. 21 b. ἡπόρον, τί ποτε λέγει, Plutarch. Opp. II. 208 b., 220 f., 221 c., 230 f., 231 c. etc.; Polyb. 1, 60, 6; 4, 69, 3; Diog. L. 6, 42; 2, 69, and, in general, very frequently, not to say uniformly, in Greek authors.

b. With the Subjunctive, when something objectively possible, something which may or should take place, is to be expressed (Klotz,
Devar. 511); as, Matt. viii. 20 ὁ δὲ ὁ ποντὸν ἀνθρώπου. oὐκ ἔχεῑ. ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ where he may lay, ubi repouat, Krü. 166; Rom. viii. 26 τί προσευχήμαθα καθό δεῖ, οὐκ οἶδαμεν what we should pray for (as to the var. προσευχήμαθα, see Fr. in loc.), Matt. vi. 25; x. 19; Mark xiii. 11; Luke xii. 5, 11; Heb. viii. 3; 1 Pet. v. 8; cf. Stallb. Plat. Plaed. p. 202 and rep. I. 72; Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 21; Cyr. 1, 4, 13; Anab. 1, 7, 7; 2, 4, 19; Isocr. paneg. c. 41; Plat. rep. 368 b. Likewise after a Pret., as in Acts iv. 21 μηδεῖν εἰρήσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσωνται αὐτοῖς, Luke xix. 48; xxii. 2; Mark iii. 6 συμβούλων ἐποίων ... ὅπως αὐτῶν ἄπολεξασσετη σι, xi. 18; xiv. 1, 40., where the Opt. might be used (Lucian. dial. d. 17, 1; 25, 1 etc., Kühner II. 103; Hm. Vig. 741), but the Subjunctive is used inasmuch as there is a reference to the direct question they put to each other: τῶς αὐτῶν ἄπολεξασσεν (deliberative Subjunct. cf. Thuc. 2, 52.)

In such cases the Fut. Ind. also may be used for the Subjunctive (owing to the affinity between these two forms\(^1\)); as, Phil. i. 22 τί αἱρήσομαι 281 (without var.), εἶ μην γνωρίζω what I am to choose, Mark ix. 6, see Demosth. 34 el funebri. 152 b.; Thuc. 7, 14; Herod. 5, 4, 16; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. 151. 315 On the other hand, there is the testimony of the most distinguished Codd. [Sin. also] for ἄροι in 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33, 34. But in Mark iii. 2 παρετηρον αὐτῶν, εἰ ... θετασσομαι means: whether he will (would) heal, and the Fut. is necessary, as in 1 Cor. vii. 16. See Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 249.

c. The Optative is used to denote subjective possibility — a mere conception; hence in narration after a Pret. if a person is introduced with a question referring simply to his idea alone; as Luke xxii. 23 ἤρξατο σὺνταξεὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοῖς, τὸ τίς ἠρέμε ἐγὼ ἐξ αὐτῶν who he might 268 ἐκεῖ i.e. whom they should regard as, i. 29 (2 Macc. iii. 37); iii. 15; 6th ed. viii. 9; xv. 26; xviii. 36; Acts xvii. 11 ἐδέξατο τὸν λόγον ... ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφάς, εἰ ἦν ἐπι ταύτα αὐτῶς whether these things were so, xxv. 20; cf. Her. 1, 46; 3, 28, 64; Xen. A. 1, 8, 15; 2, 1, 15; C. 1, 4, 6, and Hm. as above, 742. See, further, Acts xvii. 27 ἐποίησε ... τὰν ἐθνὸς ... ζυγητῶν τῶν θεῶν, εἰ ἔργε ὕπναρφησεν if happily they might feel after etc., Acts xxvii. 12 (Thuc. ii. 77) see Mtth. 1213; Klotz p. 509.

Acts xxi. 33 ἐκπευάσαντο, τίς ἄν ἐγὼ καὶ τί ὅτι. πεποιήκωσκε throws especial light on the distinctive import of the moods in dependent clauses after τίς etc. That the prisoner had committed some offence was certain, or was assumed by the centurion as certain, and τί ὅτι π. inquires after the

matter of fact of the περιπέθαιον; but ὃς the prisoner might be was a point on which the centurion wished then for the first time to form an idea. Cf. Xen. Eph. 5, 12 ἑπεθαμάκει, τίνες τε ἦσαν καὶ τί βούλοιντα, Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 107; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. 139. See also Dio Chr. 35, 429; 41, 499; Heliod. 1, 25, 46; 2, 15, 81.

In the phrase οὐδεὶς ἦσαν ὥστε or τίς ἦσαν ὥστε (of similar import), even followed by the Fut., the Indicative is always and properly used; as, Matt. x. 26 οὐδέν ἦστι κεκαλυμμένον, δὲ οὐκ ἄποκαλυφθήσαται there is nothing covered, which shall not be revealed (though the Romans would have said: nihil est, quod non manifestum futurum sit), xxiv. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 5; Phil. ii. 20; Acts xii. 35; Heb. xii. 7 (Judith viii. 28; Tob. xiii. 2); cf. Vig. p. 196 sq.; Bhd. 390. The Subjunctive occurs only once in connection with the Ind.: Luke viii. 17 οὐ γὰρ ἦστι κρυπτὸν, δὲ οὐ φανερὸν γένηται, οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον, δὲ οὐ γνωσθήσεται καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἡ θή (BL [Sin.] have δὲ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἡ θή). See below, § 42, 3 b. The passage adduced by Lob. Phryn. 736 from Joseph. Antt. 13, 6 is also not fully established. As to the import of this Subjunctive, see below, § 42, 3 b, p. 307.

In Jno. vii. 35 the Fut. Indic. is quite according to rule: ποῦ οὖσα μὲλεὶ πορεύεσθαι (λέγων), δι' ἡμῖν οὖς εὑρήσομεν αὐτόν; whither will this man go, that (according to his statement, vs. 34) we shall not find him? In οὖς 316 εὑρήσατε the words uttered by him (vs. 34) are repeated in the tense and mood of direct discourse. Acts vii. 40 (a quotation from the O. T.) is also 282 quite correct: τοιούτοι τίνι θεοῖς, οἳ προπορεύονται οἵμων qui anteecedant ἡμῖν. (see Mtth. 1145), Phil. ii. 20; 1 Cor. ii. 16; cf. Demosth. Polycl. 711 b.; Plat. Gorg. 513 etc.; Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 2; Aristot. Nic. 9, 11.

The use of the Indic. Fut. after et or e ἂρα, also, is worthy of notice in cases such as Acts vii. 22 δειξθείς τοῦ θεοῦ, e ἂρα ἀφεθήσεται σοι ἡ ζώινα τῆς καρδίας σου, Mark xi. 13 ἥλθεν, e ἂρα εὑρήσει τιν ἐν αὐτῷ he came, if happily he might find etc. (in Latin, si forte ... inveniret). The words are here expressed in the mood which the speaker himself would employ: I will go and see, whether I shall find, etc. The Ind. Fut. after εἰτος Rom. i. 10 is of a different description, but equally well established.

In Eph. v. 15 if the sense had been: take heed how you may (can) walk 279 exactly the Subjunctive or Fut. Indicative must have been employed. With the Indic. Pres. the question refers to the manner in which the ἀκριβῶς περιπατάται, as a Christian duty, is carried into effect; see how you realize the ἀκριβ. περιπατ., how you set about living accurately. Cf. Fritzsch. Opusc. p. 209. 1 Cor. iii. 10 ἐκαστὸς μεθετέω τῶν ἐπουκοδομεῖ is not exactly similar to the preceding, inasmuch as in this passage after ἀλλος ἐπουκοδομεῖ there can be no doubt that reference is made to a matter of fact.

5. The Optative in the oratio obliqua (Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 18) but rarely appears: Acts xxv. 16 πρὸς οὖς ἀπεκρίθην ὅτι οὐκ ἦστιν ἔθος Ἡρωμαῖος χαρίζομαι τών ἤθρωπον, πρὶν ἥ ὁ κατηγοροῦμενος
katâ próσωπon éxovi toûs katagrárous tôn toû te ápolologiás láboi etc.; and indeed the instances in which the words of another are indirectly quoted are rare in the N.T. When such instances occur the Indicative is commonly used; either because the intermediate clause where the Optative might have been expected is uttered in the person of the narrator (Blnn. 270) Luke viii. 47; Matt. xviii. 25; Mark ix. 9; Acts xxii. 24, or because by a mingling of two constructions the mood of the oratio recta is used for that of the oratio obliqua (which was perhaps in special accordance with colloquial usage); as, Acts xv. 5 ἔξανεστησάν τινι τῶν... Φαρίσαων, λέγοντες ὅτι δει περιτέμενων etc., Luke xviii. 9 εἴπε καὶ πρὸς τινι τῶν πεποιθώτας ἐφ' ἐαυτῶς, ὅτι εἰς δικαίοι (on the contrary, Mthh. 1222), Acts xii. 18 ἦν τάραχος οὐκ ἀλήγος... τι ἢρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο, ix. 27; xxiii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 15. Something similar occurs in Attic authors (though for the most part in lengthened sentences) Isocr. Trapez. 860; Demosth. Phorm. 586 and Polycol. 710, 711; Lys. caed. Eratosth. 19; Xen. Cyrop. 2, 4, 3, 2, 27; 4, 5, 36; Hell. 2, 1, 24, and later writers Aelian. 11, 9; Diog. L. 2, 32, 74; Pausan. 6, 8, 1. See Heindorf, Plat. Soph. 317 p. 439 sq.; Mthh. 1224 sq.; Bhdly. 389.

Note 1. The consecutive particle διήκε is usually construed with the Infin. (as the simple Infin. may be employed in a consecutive sense), cf. § 44. Yet the Finite verb is used, not only where διήκε begins a new clause (in the sense of quære, itaque),—sometimes in the Indic. as in 283 Matt. xii. 12; xix. 6; xiii. 31; Rom. vii. 4; xiii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 27; xiv. 22; 7th ed. 2 Cor. iv. 12; v. 16; Gal. iii. 9; iv. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 18; 1 Pet. iv. 19, etc. (Gayler de partic. negot. p. 218 sq.), and sometimes in the Conjunct. exhort. as in 1 Cor. v. 8 and the Imperat. as in 1 Cor. iii. 21; x. 12; Phil. ii. 12; iv. 1; Jas. i. 19, etc. (Soph. El. 1163; Plutarch. Them. c. 27),—but also where the clause with διήκε forms a necessary complement to the preceding clause, as in Jno. iii. 16 οὕτως ἡγάπησεν ὁ θεός τὸν κόσμον, διήκε... ἡμέραν, Gal. ii. 13 (but in Acts xiv. 1 οὕτως διήκε with Inf.). This construction is very common also in Greek authors. Thus διήκε occurs with a Finite verb after οὕτω in Isocr. Areopag. p. 343, 354; de big. p. 838; Aegin. p. 922; Evag. 476; Lysias pro Mantith. 2, and pro mil. 17; Xen. C. 1. 4, 15; 2, 2, 10; Diog. L. 9, 68, after εἰς τοσοῦτον in Isocr. de big. p. 836; Soph. Oed. R. 533; see Gayler as above, 221 sq. Cf. Schaeuf. Plutarch. V. 248. The distinction at least in the better authors seems to be this: διήκε with the Indic. presents the facts in succession purely externally as ante-cedent and consequent; while with the Inf. it brings them into closer connection as issuing one from the other, Klotz 772; cf. Blnn. 88.

Note 2. Ὅφελον (ἀφελον) is in the N.T. (as in later Greek) treated
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quite as a particle, and construed with the Indic.; a. Of the Preterite, 1 Cor. iv. 8 ὃφελον ἔβαςιλεύσατε would that ye did reign, Imperf. 2 Cor. xi. 1 ὃφελον ἄνεκχαθε μον μικρὸν would that ye had patience with me for a little; b. Of the Fut. Gal. v. 12. With this construction of ὃφελον cf. Arrian. Epictet. 2, 18, 15 ὃφελον τις μετὰ ταύτης ἐκοιμήθη, Gregor. orat. 28 (Exod. xvi. 3; Num. xiv. 2; xx. 3). When ὃφελον had once come to be regarded as a particle, the former construction was just as correct in thought as the Imperf. or Aor. Indic. after εἴθε, Mthh. 1161; Klotz, Devar. 516 (aor. de re, de qua, quom non facta sit olim, nunc nobis gratum fore significamus, si facta esset illo tempore); the Fut., however, took the place of the Opt. In Rev. iii. 15 some Codd. have ὃφελον ψυχὸς εἰης, others ἡσ. Both readings make equally good sense.

§ 42. THE CONJUNCTION 'AN WITH THE THREE MOODS.¹

1. The particle ἀν, which in general imparts to the expression the impress of being dependent on circumstances (a fortuita quaedam conditione), and accordingly conditional and fortuitous (Hm. 284 Vig. 903, 820; de partic. ἀν p. 10 sq.), fort.e, si res ita ferat, perhaps, perchance (should the case occur),² is used with one of the three moods either in an independent or a dependent clause. Yet its use in the N. T. (as in general in later Greek) is far less copious and diversified than in classic (Attic) writers;³ in particular, it is never found joined with a participle. In independent and simple clauses ἀν occurs in the N. T.,

¹ Compare, as to the use of this particle, the following monographs: Poppo, Pr. de usu partic. ἀν apud Graecos. Pref. ad Vial. 1816. 4to. (also in Seebode's Miscell. crit. I. 1), Reisig de vi et usu ἀν particulae in his edit. of Aristoph. nub. (Lips. 1820. 8vo.) p. 97-140. I have mainly followed the theory of Hermann, from which the views of Buttman, and still more those of Thiersch (Acta Monac. II. 101 sqq.), partly differ. It is most fully expounded in lib. 4 de particula ἀν, which are printed in the London edition of Stephanus's Thessaurus, as well as in Hermann's Opuscul. Tom. IV., and which were also published separately in Leipsic, 1831. 8vo. With Hermann on all the main points Klotz Devar. II. 99 agrees, while Hertung Partik. II. 218 ff. widely dissents from both. The opinion hitherto accepted respecting the import of ἀν has been completely reversed by B. Matthise in his Lecix. Eurip. I. 189 sqq.; he pronounces it to be rather a corrobating and affirming particle, and gives us to understand that his view is a divina et quid nihil unquam verius exudit descriptio. Further, compare Bäumlein on the Greek Moods (see above p. 281) and Moller in Schneidewin, Philolog. VI. 719 ff.

² Perhaps the halt of the South of Germany may also be compared with it.

³ In the Sept. ἀν does not occur more seldom than in the N. T. (Bretschneider. Lexic. p. 22 says: multo rarius). It occurs in hypothetical clauses, where it is required. It is also sometimes construed with the Optative, as in Gen. xix. 8; xxxiiii. 10; xlv. 8, and with the Participle in 2 Macc. i. 11; 3 Macc. iv. 1. It occurs on almost every page. As to ἀν in the Apocrypha, see Wahl, Clav. apocr. p. 34 sqq.
a. With the Aorist Indic. to indicate that something on a certain condition would have taken place (in which use a hypothetical proposition is implied in the context) Mtth. 1154 f.; Rost 606 f.; as, Luke xix. 23 διὰ τι οὐκ ἐδωκας τὸ ἄργυριον μου ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν; καὶ ἐγὼ ἐδώκαν σὺν τόκῳ ἀν ἐπραξα αὐτὸ, I should (had the διδώναι τὸ ἄργυρ· ἐπὶ τὴν τράπ. occurred) have collected it with interest. Here the omitted protasis may be easily gathered from the question διὰ τι ... τράπεζαν. The same remark applies to the parallel passage in Matt. xxv. 27 ἔδει σε βαλεῖν τὸ ἄργυριον μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις, καὶ ἐδώκαν ἐγὼ ἐκομισμένη ἄν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ, and Heb. x. 2 καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἐπαινεύτου προσφερόμεναι, where we may supply from vs. 1: if these sacrifices had perfected forever the offerers,—completely cleansed them from sin (Xen. A. 4, 2, 10; Thuc. 1, 11; 319 Plat. symp. 175 d.; rep. 8, 554 b.; Aristot. rhet. 2, 2, 11; Diog. L. 2, 75). Cf. Sept. Gen. xxvi. 10; Job iii. 10, 13 (Pluperf. 2 Sam. xviii. 11).

b. With the Optative, when subjective possibility is attached to condition (opinio de eo, quod ex aliqua conditione pendet, Hm. partic. ἂν 164 sqq.), Acts xxvi. 29 εὐξαίμην ἄν τῷ θεῷ (I could willingly pray God, i.e. were I to be guided by what I feel — were I to follow the wish of my heart). This phrase (corresponding to βουλοῦμαι ἄν) occurs in Dio C. 36, 10, and εὐξαίμην τὸ τις in Xen. hippar. 8, 6, ὡς ἃν ἐγὼ εὐξαίμην Diog. L. 2, 76. We find a similar phrase, ἄγωσαίμαι ἄν, in Liban. oratt. p. 200 b. In direct questions: Acts ii. 12 λέγοντες τί ἄν θέλω τούτῳ εἶναι; what may this perhaps mean? (I assume it must mean something), xvii. 18 ἃτι ἄν θέλοι οἱ στερμολόγοι οὕτος λέγειν; (it being assumed that his words have some meaning or other), Luke vi. 11; Gen.xiii. 15; Deut. xxviii. 67; Job xix. 23; xxv. 4; xxxi. 2; xxxii. 31; Ecclus. xxv. 8. Cf. Od. 21, 259; Xen. C. 1, 4, 12; Diog. L. 2, 5; Krü. 163.

Acts viii. 31 is equivalent to a hypothetical construction: τῶς ἂν δυναῖμαι, ἢν μὴ τίς δοκήσῃ με; for without a question it would run: οὐκ ἂν δυναῖμαι, cf. Xen. Apol. 6 ἃν αἰσθάνομαι χείρων γεγράμενος ... τῶς ἂν ... ἐγὼ ἢς ἂν ἴδως βιστεύσῃ;

We find ἂν (according to most Codd. [Sin. included]) without a mood (Hm. partic. ἂν, p. 187) in 1 Cor. vii. 5 μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἄλλους, εἰ μὴ τί ἂν ἐκ συμφώνου, except perhaps in case of mutual consent.

2. After conditional clauses with εἰ we find ἂν in the apodosis

1 Klotz p. 104: Adjecta ad optativum ista particula hoc dictatur: nos rem ita animo cogitare, si quando fiat, i.e. rem, si fiat, ita fieri oportere ex cogitatione quidem nostra. Cf. Mdv. 148 f.
with the Indicative to denote hypothetical reality (Rost 627; Mtth. 1147 f.), and then,

a. With the Imperf. (usually), when I would do it is to be expressed, a. After an Imperf. in the antecedent clause, as in Luke vii. 39 οἴτως εἰ ἦν προφήτης, εἶχονος κατέπαυσαν ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθεύειν αὐτοῖς. Where he a prophet, 272 he would know, xvii. 6; Matt. xxiii. 30 (Fr.); Jno. v. 46; (viii. 19); viii. 42; ix. 41; xv. 19; xviii. 36; Gal. i. 10; Heb. viii. 4, 7; 1 Cor. xi. 31; Acts xviii. 14; cf. 2 Macc. iv. 47; Valckenaer ad Luc. xvii. 6. β. After an Aor. in the antecedent clause, as in Heb. iv. 8 εἰ γὰρ αὐτοῦ 'Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσαν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἀληθ. ἔλαλει ἐφ' Ἰ. had given them rest, he would not speak etc. (in the words pre-320 viously quoted vs. 5) cf. in vs. 7 the Pres. ἐπλήγη; Gal. iii. 21 (cf. Jer. xxiii. 22; Baruch iii. 18).

b. With the Aor., when I would have done it is to be expressed (Hm. Vig. 813), Matt. xi. 21 εἰ ἔγραψαν ... πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν if ... had been done, they would have repented long ago, 1 Cor. ii. 8; Rom. ix. 29; Sept. Gen. xxx. 27; xxxi. 27, 42; xliii. 9; Judg. xiii. 23; xiv. 18; Isa. i. 9; xlviii. 18; Ps. l. 18; liv. 13; Judith xi. 2, etc. (in the conditional clause also the Aor. is used); Jno. xiv. 28 εἰ ἐγκομίσθη με, ἐξάραθε ἂν εἴδης ἂν ye loved me, ye would have rejoiced, xviii. 30; Acts xviii. 14 (the Imperf. in the conditional clause, Bar. iii. 13); Matt. xii. 7 εἰ ἐγκομίσθη ... οὐκ ἂν κατεξεκαίσατε had ye known, ye would not have condemned (the Pluperf. in the conditional clause, cf. Demosth. Pantaen. p. 624 b.; Liban. oratt. p. 117 c.); Judg. viii. 19; Job iv. 12. In this case the Plup. also is used instead of the Aor. with ἂν, as in 1 Jno. ii. 19 εἰ ἦσαν εἰς ἡμῶν, μεμενήκεσαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν manessent (atque adeo manerent), Jno. xi. 21 (vs. 32 Aor.) xiv. 7 (Soph. Oed. R. 984; Aesch. Ctes. 310 a.; Demosth. cor. 324 a.; Plat. Phaed. 106 c.; Diog. L 3, 39; Aesop. 31, 1; Lucian. fugit. 1; cf. Hm. partic. ἂν p. 50). See in general Hm. partic. ἂν I. cap. 10. The translators of the N. T. have sometimes been ignorant of this distinction of tenses, and sometimes have passed it over without notice. (The consequent clause with ἂν is absorbed by an interrogative clause in 286 1 Cor. xii. 19 εἰ ἦν τὰ πάντα ἐν μελός, ποῦ τὸ σῶμα; Heb. vii. 11 εἰ τελείωσις διὰ τῆς ... ἠρωσομένης ἐστὶν τὰ χρεία etc.) As to ἂν in the interrogatory apodosis, see Wisd. xi. 26 πῶς ἔρευνεν ἂν τι, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἤθελης; On Acts viii. 31 see above.)

In Mark xiii. 20 εἰ μὴ κύριος ἀναλύσωσε ... οὖν ἂν ἔσοδον πᾶσα σάρξ neither of the Aorists is put for the Imperf., but the sense is: had not the Lord shortened those days (in his decree), all flesh would have perished.
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(might be regarded as already perished). In Heb. xi. 15 𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃𐤃遨 of the Imperf. is used in the principal clause probably because it refers to a continued (past) action (Mth. 1147; Med. 117); in Latin also the Imperf. is used in the same way (Zumpt, Gramm. 454) haberent: had they in mind ... they had opportunity (during their life) to return (and would not therefore, at the end of their life vs. 18, have made this profession). The Aor. would have represented the ἔχον καυρόν as something occurring once, and quickly passing by. Another view of the Imperf. in hypothetical clauses (Franke, Demosth. p. 59, 74) is not to the purpose.

In the consequent clause ἀν may be omitted also, particularly with the Imperf. (Hm. Eurip. Hec. 1087; Soph. Elect. p. 132, and 321 partic. ἀν p. 70 sqq.; Bremi, exc. 4 ad Lys. p. 439 sqq.; Mth. 1152), 273 and in later Greek was more and more frequently omitted, without an designing in all cases to express the emphasis (the positiveness) originally included in this construction without ἀν (Küllner II. 556). The several examples may be arranged as follows:

a.) Imperf. in the condition, Imperf. in the conclusion; as, Jno. ix. 33 ει μη ἦν οὐτος παρὰ θεου, οὐκ ἦδοντα τοις ὀφθαλμοῖς ὄφειν οὐδὲν were he not from God, he could do nothing, Diog. Laert. 2, 24; Lycurg. orat. 8, 4; Plat. symp. 198 c.; Gorg. 514 c. In Jno. viii. 39 the Codd. are about equally divided as to the omission or insertion of ἀν; if it was used by the writer, it may have been merged by transcribers in the νῦν which immediately follows.

b.) Aorist in the conclusion, with the omission of ἦν in the condition; as, Gal. iv. 15 εἰ δυνατόν τοῖς οφθαλμοῖς ὄμων ἔκφυγαντες ἐδώκατε μοι, where there is not much authority for ἀν.

c.) Aorist in the condition, Imperf. in the conclusion; as, Jno. xv. 22 εἰ μὴ ἦλθον ... ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχουν if I had not come, they would not have sin, cf. Diog. Laert. 2, 21.

d.) Pluperf. in the conditional clause (Judg. viii. 19), Imperf. in the principal clause; as, Jno. xix. 11 οὐκ ἔχει ἐξοντωθαν οὐδεμίαν κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἀνοδέν thou wouldst not have ... if it had not been given thee, Acts xxvi. 32; Rom. vii. 7 non cognoram ... nisi diceret; also, in the immediately preceding τῆν ἀμαρτίαν etc., where έγνωτο is to be repeated with εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου.

This omission of ἀν occurs especially with καλὸν ἦν, ἔδει, ἔχρην 287 etc. Med. 119; Bmln. 140 f.; cf. Matt. xxvi. 24 καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἦν ἡ ἐγνωσθῇ etc., see above, § 41 a. 2. a, p. 282.

1 Similar are such sentences in Latin as Flor. 4, 2, 19 peractum erat bellum sine sanguine, si Pompeium oppresseret (Caesar) potissim, Horat. Od. 2, 17, 27; Liv. 34, 29; Cic. fam. 12, 24, 2; Tac. annal. 3, 14; Sen. consol. ad Marc. I. See Zumpt, Gr. S. 447.
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2 Cor. xi. 4 εἶ δὲ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κυρίος· εἰ... καλῶς ἀνίχνευθα is rendered: if he... preached, ye would bear with etc. (Cod. B alone has ἀνίχνευθε, and it has been so printed by Lchm.). Here one would certainly expect ἐκρήγοσεν, but as several words intervene the writer might easily have fallen into such an anacoluthon (if... preaches another Jesus... ye would bear with it ἀνίχ., as if he had written ἐκρήγοσεν. As, however, he had used κυρίος·, consistency required ἀνίχνευθε), or in order not to hurt the Corinthians he designedly changes the harsh ἀνίχνευθα into the hypothetical and consequently softer ἀνίχ.; in which case, to be sure, one would so much the more have expected ἄν, as the antecedent clause does not correspond with a hypothetical period (cf. also Klotz, Devar. 487 sq.). We find something similar in Diog. L. 2, 69 εἰ τούτο φαίλων ἵστηκα, οὐκ ἄν ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἥραμα ξύλετο. The passage in Demost. Neaer. 815 a. is of another kind. (That in Rom. iv. 2 ἐχει καύχημα is not put for ἐξεν ἄν, as Rück. maintained, is apparent to one who attends to Paul's reasoning, and has been correctly shown by Köllner among recent expositors.)

274 3. In relative clauses after ὅς, ὅτις, ὅσος, ὅποιος etc., ἄν is used,

a. With the Indicative when some matter of fact, something certain therefore, is spoken of, "sed cujus vel pars aliqua, vel ratio et modus dubitationem admittunt" (Hm. Vig. 819) 1; as, Mark vi. 56 δόσω ἄν εἰσέπεσε ὅπου ἦ προτοῦ αὐτὸν as many as at any time touched him; καθώς ἄν Acts ii. 45; iv. 35, ὡς ἄν 1 Cor. xii. 2. In all these instances with a Pret., as in Gen. ii. 19; xxx. 42; Isa. lv. 11; 2 Sam. xiv. 26; Ezek. i. 20; x. 11; Esth. viii. 17; 1 Macc. xiii. 20, and also in Greek authors, as Lucian. dial. m. 9, 2, and Demon. 10; Demosth. I. Steph. p. 610 b. (Agath. 32, 12; 117, 12; 287, 13; Malal. 14, 36). On the other hand, the Present Ind. (which Klotz p. 109 sqq., in opposition to Hm., declares to be inadmissible) in the N. T. in Luke viii. 18; x. 8; Jno. v. 19 has not any great external evidence in its favor, and in Mark xi. 24 the Ind. without ἄν is to be restored, from Codd. [Sin. also], as by Lchm. In the Sept. the Present often occurs, as in Ps. ci. 3; Prov. i. 22; Lev. xxv. 16.

In Matt. xiv. 36 we find δόσω ὕπαντο, ἰνωθηρον, instead of the parallel in Mark vi. 56 δόσω ἄν ἕπταντο, ἰνωθοτο. Both constructions are proper, according as the writer regarded the fact as in every respect definite or not. The first must be rendered: all who (as many as) touched him, of

1 Klotz p. 145: In his locis quum res ipsa, quae facta esse dicatur, certa sit, pertinent illud, quod habet in se particula & incerti, magis ad notionem relativam, sive pronomen, sive particula est.
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the persons then surrounding him, vs. 35. Mark does not limit the nar-ration to any particular place (as ἐσιν ἄν εἰσερχόμενο shows), but says ἄν generally: all who at any time touched him. Cf. Hm. de part. ἄν p. 26.

b. With the Subjunctive, when the statement relates to something objectively possible, that is, regarded as only conditionally liable to occur, and then a. In the Aorist (most frequently), of what may perhaps occur at a future time,—where in Latin the Fut. Perf. would be used; as, Matt. x. 11 εἰς ἣν ἦν τὸν πόλιν ἥ κόμην 328 εἰσέλθησε into whatever city ye may have entered, in quamunque urbem, si quam in urbem, xxi. 22 δοxa ἄν αἰτήσητε quaescunque petieritis, xiii. 32; Mark ix. 18; xiv. 9; Luke x. 35; Acts ii. 39; iii. 22, 23; viii. 19; Rom. x. 13; xvi. 2; Jas. iv. 4; 1 Jno. iv. 15; Rev. xiii. 15, etc. For examples from Greek authors, see Bornem. ad Luc. p. 65. From the Sept. cf. Gen. xxi. 6, 12; xxi. 2; xxiv. 14; xxvi. 2; xxviii. 15; xlv. 9 f.; Exod. i. 22; ix. 19; x. 28; Lev. v. 8, 15, 17; xi. 32; xx. 6, 9, 16 ff.; Num. v. 10; vi. 2; Deut. xvii. 9; Isa. xi. 11. The Fut. for the Subjunctive occurs in Deut. v. 27; Jer. xlix. 4; Judg. x. 18; xi. 24 (Malch. hist. p. 238; Cinnamin. I. 6, ed. Bonn.); Mth. 1220. B. In the Present, in reference to what may have already taken place or usually takes place, or is to be represented as continuous; as, Gal. v. 17 ἤν ὡ, δ ἄν θέλητε, ταῦτα ποιήσε (what you may happen to desire), Col. iii. 17 πᾶν δὲ ἄν ποιήσε, 1 Thess. ii. 7 ὅς ἄν τροφὸς θάλατη etc., Luke ix. 57; Jno. ii. 5; v. 19; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Jas. iii.i 4; Col. iii. 23. 275 See, in general, Hm. part. ἄν p. 118 sqq.; Vieg. 819. In the Sept. cf. Gen. vi. 17; xi. 6; 1 Sam. xiv. 7; Lev. xv. 19; Exod. xxii. 9; (much more rare than the Aor.).

In 2 Cor. viii. 12 a double construction occurs: εἴ ἡ προσθυμία πρόκειται, καθό ἄν ἐκ τοῦ, εἰ πρόκειται, ὅποι καθό ὑπέκειται. The distinction is obvious: the positive ἐκ in the proportion specified (καθό) may still be viewed as various, according to what he may (perchance) have; the negative ὑπέκεισθαι is simple and definite. Cf. Lev. xxiv. 20; xxv. 16; xxvii. 12; ix. 34 πᾶν βρώμα, δ ἵνα θεταί, εἰς δ ἄν εἴπερθαν ὅσα. In Attic prose ἄν is commonly employed where relatives are construed with the Subjunctive; yet there are well-established passages in which ἄν is omitted (Rost 660 f.), and Hm. partic. ἄν p. 113 has shown when it must be omitted; cf. Schaeff. Demosth. I 657; Poppo, observ. p. 143 sqq.; Jen. Lit.-Zeit. 1816, April, no. 69, and ad Cyrop. p. 129, 209, but see Bmln. 212 ff. In the N. T. we find according to good Codd. [Sin. also] in Luke viii. 17 οὐ γάρ ἄν ... ἀπόκρυφον, δ ὅποι γνωσθῇ (al. γνωσθήσεται) καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἄλλῃ, which is to be rendered: which may not become known and come to light. The relative here points to a perfectly definite con-
ception, and not to anything whatever, quodcunque. On the other hand, one might have expected ἄν in Jas. ii. 10 δει τοῦ τὸν νόμον προσγορίζῃ, πταλωθῇ 289 δὲ ἄν ἐν, yet it is not necessary, inasmuch as the writer conceives the case ἃ ἐστί altogether definite: qui (si quis) ... custodierit. So also in Matt. x. 33. On the other hand, in Matt. xvi. 4 Lchm. has already adopted the Fut.

4. In indirect questions ἄν is used with the Optative (after a Pret. 324 or histor. Pres.) ; as, Luke i. 62 ἐνενένου τῷ πατρί, τί τι ἄν θέλω ἔνδειξαν αὐτόν how he may perhaps wish him to be called (assumed that he has a wish in the case; τί θέλω etc. would be, how he would wish him to be called), Acts v. 24; x. 17; xxi. 33 (see above § 41, b. 5), Luke vi. 11 διελάπου πρὸς ἄλληνον, τί ἄν ποιήσω ἵνα Ἰησοῦ what they might do to Jesus, quid forte faciendum videretur (pondering in doubtful mood the different possibilities), ix. 46; Jno. xiii. 24 according to the reading νεεῖ τοῦτο Σιμών πιθέσθαι τίς ὁ ἐν μη περὶ οὗ λέγει (who it might be, whom they should perhaps regard). The better reading, however, is νεεῖ ... καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ τίς ἵνα περὶ οὗ λέγει. See Klotz p. 509; cf. Esth. iii. 13.

5. After the particles of time ἄν followed by a Subjunctive (Mtth. 1194 f.) is used if an (objectively possible) action is to be expressed, — a case which can or will occur, but in regard to which there is no certainty when (how often) it will occur (Hm. partic. ἄν p. 95 sqq.). Thus, a. ὅταν i.e. ὅταν, Matt. xv. 2 νιπτόνται τὰς χεῖρας, ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσον when (i.e. as often as) they eat, Jno. viii. 44; 1 Cor. iii. 4; Luke xi. 36; xvii. 10 ὅταν ποιήσῃτε πάντα, λέγετε when ye shall have done, Matt. xxi. 40 ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος ... τί ποιήσει 276 quando venerit. So usually with the Aorist Subjunctive for the Lat. Fut. exact., as in Mark viii. 38; Jno. iv. 25; xvi. 18; Rom. xi. 27; Acts xxiii. 35; 1 Cor. xv. 27; xvi. 3; 1 Jno. ii. 28, also Heb. i. 6 (as Böhme and Wahl have already pointed out), while the Subj. Present for the most part denotes a frequently repeated action not limited to any particular time (Mtth. 1195), or exhibits something in itself future simply as a fact, 1 Cor xv. 24 (along with the Subj. Aor.). Similar to this are ἡμέρα ἄν 2 Cor. iii. 16 (when ... it shall have turned), ὅραμα ἄν (as often as) 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26 (Pres.), ὡς ἄν as soon as Rom. xv. 24; 1 Cor. xi. 34; Phil. ii. 23.

b. The conjunction until that, as ἐσόμεν, 1 in Matt. x. 11 ἐκεί μείνατε, ἐσόμεν ἐξελθήτε, Jas. v. 7; Luke ix. 27, ἀπῆρεν φθάνῃ ἄν in Rev. ii. 25 (Gen. xxiv. 14, 19; Josh. ii. 16; xx. 6, 9; Exod. xv. 16; Isa. vi. 11; xxvi. 20; xxx. 17; Tob. vii. 11, and often); cf. Soph.

1 We find in parallel clauses in Exod. xv. 16; Jer. xxiii. 20 ἐσόμεν with the Subj. and ἄν ἄν, according to the common text.
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Oed. R. 334; Xen. C. 3, 3, 18 and 46; An. 5, 1, 11; Plat. Phaed. 59 e. etc., and usually in Attic prose, Rost 617. Further cf. § 41 b. 3, 2) b). Προν ἂν does not occur in the N. T.

The Fut. after ἦν in Rev. 4, 9 ἦν δόξα ὑμῶν τὰ ζωὴ δόξαν ... πεποίηθαι οἱ ἕκαστον τέσσαρας etc., occurs according to a well-established reading for the Subjunctive quando dederint, as in Iliad. 20, 335 ἀλλ’ ἀναχάρισα, δὲ εἰς 825 κεν ἐμβληθοῦν αὐτῷ. Other Codd. have ἦν or δόξαν. In Luke xi. 2; 290 xiii. 28; Matt. x. 19 there is preponderant authority for the Subjunctive. In Rom. ii. 14 the Ind. Pres. ποιήσατε after δόξα is very doubtful (or rather a transcriber’s mistake for ποιήσασ), and we should read with Lchm. and Tdf. ποιήσατε. On the other hand, in Mark xi. 25 οτι' οὖν is supported by good Codd., and the Ind. can be as well tolerated (since it is intended to express a specification of time only externally: cum statis precantes) according to Klotz, Devar. 475 sq., as it is attested by Codd. in Lycurg. 28, 3.¹ In this case the Ind. Pres. or Fut. after ἦν sometimes occurs even in early authors, see Klotz as above, and pp. 477 sq. 690,² where formerly critics would not tolerate it, (Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 61; Achill. Tat. 452; Mthh. 1197); in later authors (cf. e.g. Exod. i. 16; Act. Apocr. 126) it frequently occurs (Jacobs in Act. Monac. I. 146; Schaef. ind. Aesop. 149).

More singular appears, in Mark iii. 11, ἦν with an Indicative Preter. (Imperf.) in narration: τὰ πνεύματα ... ἦν αὐτῶν ἦσαν ἡ ἀρχὴ, προσέπτων whenever they saw him (quandocunque), without var.; in Rev. viii. 1 with var. A Greek would probably have here employed ἐρε, ἐξήταρα with the Optative, Ημ. Vig. 792;³ yet in the former passage the Ind. can be accounted for as easily as in ἦν ἄν ἀπάντησα, see above, 3 a. Cf. Gen. xxxviii. 9; Exod. xvii. 11; Num. xi. 9; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; Ps. cxix. 7; Thieresch p. 100 (and ἡμικύρα ἄν Gen. xxx. 42; Exod. xxxixii. 8; xxxiv. 34; 277 xl. 36, ἐξήταρα ταῦ Tob. vii. 11, τὰν Judg. vi. 3, where likewise a repeated past act is expressed), also Polyb. 4, 32, 5; 13, 7, 10 (see Schweigh. on the last passage); Aristid. Lept. § 3, 6; cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 313.⁴ In the Byzantine authors, ἦν even in the sense of when (in reference to an individual fact in time past) is construed with the Ind. Aor., as in Ephraem. 7119, 5386, 5732; Theoph. p. 499, 503. Cf. also Tdf. in the Verhandel. p. 142.

6. The particle of ..design ἦσαν with ἂν denotes a purpose the accomplishment of which is still doubtful, or is regarded as depending on circumstances, ut sit, si sit (see Hm. Eurip. Bacch. 593, 1232;

¹ Becker has conjectured ἦν. Others read ἐρε ἄν, and Blume says distinctly: indicativus per grammaticas leges h.1. ferri nequit.
² The passages adduced by Güyler de partic. negat. p. 193 sq. may be regarded for the most part as uncertain.
³ Fr. Mr. p. 801 insists on writing ἐρε ἄν, in order to show that ἂν here belongs to the verb in the sense of always. Cf. Schaef. Demosth. III. 192. Yet see Klotz, Dev. 688 sq.
⁴ In the Sept. even ἂν ἄν occurs with the Ind. Pret. where a definite past action is spoken of, as in Gen. vi. 4; xxvii. 30 ἂν ἄν ἐξῆλθεν ἵκαρ, etc.
partic. ἄν p. 120 sq.) ut, si fieri posit, ut forte (cf. Bengal, Acts iii. 19; Rom. iii. 4) Isocrr. ep. 8, p. 1016; Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 21; Plat. Gorg. 481 a.; conv. 187 e.; legg. 5, 788 d. etc.; Demosth. Halon. 32 c.; see Stallb. ad Plat. Lach. p. 24; Krü. 167. This applies 291 well to the two N. T. passages which come under this head (Acts 19. c. xv. 17; Rom. iii. 4 are quotations from the O. T.; and in Matt. vi. 5 326 ἄν is expunged on the authority of many Codd.) Acts iii. 19 ἐποιεῖται ἄν ἐνθοσικῷ καρό ἀναφυζέως ut forte (si esse admonitioni metaνοΗσατε καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε parueritis) veniant tempora etc., Luke ii. 35. In both the quotations from the Sept. too, particularly in Acts xv., the meaning is plain. Besides cf. Gen. xii. 13; xviii. 19; l. 20; Exod. xx. 20, 26; xxxiii. 13; Num. xv. 40; xvi. 40; xxvii. 20; Deut. viii. 2; xvii. 20; 2 Sam. xvii. 14; Ps. lix. 7; Hos. ii. 3; Jer. xlii. 7; Dan. ii. 18; 1 Macc. x. 32.

"Ἀν after conjunctions and relatives never occurs with the Optative in the N. T. (but in Sept. Gen. xix. 8 — cf., however, xvi. 6 — xxxiii. 10; 2 Macc. xv. 21); but once with the Inf. 2 Cor. x. 9 ἵνα μὴ δοξ ὡς ἄν ἐκπομεν ἵματι that I may not seem to terrify you; which in oratio recta (Hm. de partic. ἄν p. 179; Krü. 311) would run: ὡς ἄν ἐκπομεν ἵματι tamquam qui velim vos terrere.

According to the best and most numerous authorities ἄν frequently occurs for ἄν in the N. T. text after relatives (as in the Sept. and Apocryph. see Wahl, clav. apocryph. p. 137 sq.; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 8, occasionally in the Byzantines, e.g. Malalas 5. p. 94, 144); as, Matt. v. 19 (not vii. 9); viii. 19; x. 42; xi. 27; Jno. xv. 7; Luke xvii. 33; 1 Cor. vi. 18; xvi. 8; Gal. vi. 7; Eph. vi. 8, etc., and not unfrequently in the Codd. of Greek authors, even Attic. Recent scholars (in opposition to Schneider, Xen. Mem. 3, 10, 12) uniformly write ἄν for ἄν (see Schaeff. Julian. p. V; Hm. Vig. 835; Bremi, Lys. p. 126; Boissonade, Aen. Gaz. p. 269; Stallb. Plat. Lach. p. 57; a more moderate judgment is given by Jacobs, Athen. p. 88; yet see the same author in Lession. Stob. p. 45 and on Achill. Tat. p. 831 sq., cf. also Valckenrae ad 1 Cor. vi. 18). The editors of the N. T. 278 have not yet ventured to do this; and there may really be in ἄν for ἄν a peculiarity of the later (if not even of the earlier) popular language much like the Germ. etwem in relative clauses: was etwem geschehen solle (when something occurs as it should be). Cf. Luke x. 8.

§ 43. THE IMPERATIVE.

1. The Imperative usually denotes an exhortation or command, but sometimes mere permission (permissivus) or leave (Krü.
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163) 1, as in 1 Cor. vii. 15 εἴ δὲ ἄπιστος κακώστας, κακώσσω he may depart (on the part of the Christian partner it cannot and ought not to be hindered), xiv. 38 εἴ τις ἄρνει, ἄρνειτο (renunciation of further effective instruction). Where, however, this acceptance 292 is necessary, must be determined on hermeneutical, not on grammatical, grounds; and neither in Matt. viii. 32, on account of the parallel passage Luke viii. 32, nor in Jno. xiii. 27 or 1 Cor. xi. 6, can the Imperative be taken as simply permissive. On the former passage cf. BCrus.; in the latter κακώσθω like κατακαλυπτέωθω is to be understood of logical necessity (the one requires the other). On the other hand, Matt. xxvi. 45 καθεύθετε τὸ λαυτὸν καὶ ἀμαρτάνεθε was probably uttered permissively by Jesus in the tranquil, gentle, resigned mood resulting from the prayer: sleep on then and take your rest. The notion of irony is incompatible with the grave earnestness of the moment. Perhaps, however, there may be something of that in Matt. xxiii. 32, and the tone of the discourse loses in force by a permissive interpretation. In Rev. xxii. 11 all is exhortation: let every one by adhering to his present course grow ripe for Christ’s approaching judgment; the fate of all is, as it were, already determined.

2. When two Imperatives are connected by καὶ, the first contains sometimes the condition (supposition) under which the action denoted by the second will take place, or the second expresses an infallible result (Mthh. 1159) 2; as, Bar. i. 21 κλίνατε τὸν ὄμον ἕμων ἐργάσασθαι τῷ βασιλεί . . . καὶ καθίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, Epiph. II. 388 ἔχε τοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγους κατὰ ψυχὴν σου καὶ χρειαν μὴ ἔχε 'Επιφανίου. In the N. T. this explanation has been applied to Eph. iv. 26. (from Ps. iv. 5.) ὧριζοσθε καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε be angry and sin not i.e. if ye be angry ye do not sin (Rü.), Jno. vii. 52 ἔρευνησον καὶ ἰδεῖς search, and thou wilt see (Kü.), cf. divide et impera. In Hebrew, constructions of this sort are certainly frequent; Ewald,

---

1 According to Moller (Schneiderin, Philolog. VI. 124 ff) the Imper. Pres. only should be so used. This, it is true, is found in the above passages of the N. T.; but the question in reference to the N. T. will not be regarded as thereby decided.

2 What Bornem. on Luke xxiv. 39 adds from Greek authors, is of a different nature. This mode of expression, however, cannot be considered as thereby a Hebrewism; see Gesen. Lgb. S. 776 (where, however, some passages are quoted which remain doubtful, as Ps. xxxvii. 27, or which at any rate ought to have been separated from the others Gen. xlii. 18; Isa. viii. 9). With Eph. iv. 26 (p. 312) those passages have no analogy, otherwise the words of Paul must mean: if ye are angry, yet do not sin, or even: if ye would not sin, then be angry. It is therefore surprising that, notwithstanding this, Zyro (Stud. u. Krit. 1841. 3 Heft S. 685) has had recourse again to this alleged Hebrewism.
krit. Gramm. 653. But in Jno. vii. the expression is more forcible than καὶ ὅψει (Lucian. indoct. 29) would have been. The result of the search is so certain, that the exhortation to search is at the same time an exhortation to see. We find the regular construction 328 in Luke x. 28. In the passage from Eph. Paul’s meaning is unquestionably this: we should not let anger lead us into sin, cf. vs. 27 (see Bengel and BCrus. in loc.); vs. 31 cannot be urged against this. It is only the grammatical acceptation of the expression that is doubtful. It is either logically a single proposition ὄργιζομενοι μὴ ἀμαρτ. divided into two grammatically, or ὄργίζεσθε must be taken permissively (cf. the similar passage Jer. x. 24). For, the assertion (Mey.) that of two closely connected Imperatives the 293 one cannot denote a permission and the other a command, is incorrect; we may say with perfect propriety: Well, then, go (I give you leave), but do not stay out above an hour.

1 Tim. vi. 12 δύνασθαι τὸν καλὸν ἀγώνα τῆς πίστεως, ἐνλαβᾶσθαι τῆς αληθείας ζωῆς (where the asyndeton is not without special force) must be rendered simply: fight the good fight of faith, lay hold of (in and by that fight) eternal life; cf. Mark iv. 39, see Fr. Ἐπιλαμβ. τῆς ζωῆς is not here exhibited (though it might have been) as the result, but as the very essence, of the contest; and ἐνλαμβ. does not signify attain, receive. In 1 Cor. xv. 34 ἔκκειται δικαίως καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνεις are obviously two exhortations, one of which (Aor.) is to be carried into effect at once, while the other (Pres.) requires continuous effort.

Constructions like Jno. ii. 19 λύσαι τὸν ναὸν τούτον, καὶ ἐν τρόπῳ ἡμέραις ἔχειν αὐτόν, Jas. iv. 7 ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύγεται ἀφ’ ὧν (vs. 8), Eph. v. 14 (Sept.) ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφανεῖ σοι ὁ Χριστός, may be resolved like two Imperatives connected by καὶ: if ye resist the devil, he will, etc. But this, grammatically, requires no remark, as the Imperative has here its ordinary import (hortatory), and the structure of these sentences can, indeed must (as incomparably more forceful), be retained in the translation also. Cf. Lucian. indoct. 29 τοὺς κορίτσις τούτους ἐπίσκεψαι καὶ ὅψει, dial. d. 2, 2 εἰσθημα βαίνει καὶ ὅψη, Plato, Theaet. 149 b.; rep. 5, 467 c.; see Fr. Mt. as above. Even recent expositors quite erroneously take the Imperative in Jno. ii. 19; xx. 22 for the Fut., supporting their view by a reference to the Heb. in such passages as Gen. xx. 7; xlv.18 (Glass. Philol. sacr. I. 286). Inasmuch as every command extends into future time, the Fut. tense, as a general expression of futurity, may be used for the Imperative (see no. 5); but the special form (the Imperative) cannot, in turn, be employed for the more general (Fut.). Such 280 a substitution would occasion a confusion of tongues, and the observation above alluded to, like so many others, is the offspring of the closet, not of attention to the phasemomena of living speech. Olshausen has correctly
opposed Tholuck (and Kühnöl) on Jno. xx. 22, and Tholuck has rectified his error. In Luke xxii. 19 the Fut. is the better reading; see Meyer.

3. In the N.T. the distinction between the Aorist Imperative and Present Imperative is in general maintained (Hm. emend. rat. p. 219 and Vig. 748, cf. H. Schmid de imperativi temporiib. in ling. graec. Viteb. 1833, 4to. and especially Bmln. 169 ff., and in reference to the latter, Moller in Schneidewin Philologus VI. 115 ff.). For

a. The Aorist Imperat. (cf. § 40 note 2.) denotes an action that is either transient and instantaneous (Ast, Plat. polit. p. 518; Schaeff. Demosth. IV. 488), or to be undertaken but once; as, Mark i. 44 σεαυτόν δείξων τῷ ἱερεῖ, iii. 5 ἔκτενον τὴν χείρα σου, vi. 11 ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν, Jno. ii. 7 γεμίσατε τὰς ύδρας ὑδάτως etc., xi. 44 λύσατε αὐτὸν (Δάζαρ.) κ. ἀφετε αὐτῶν ὑπάγειν, 1 Cor. v. 13 ἐξάρατε τὸν θεωρον ἐξ οὐράνων αὐτῶν, Acts xxiii. 23 ἑτομάσασθαι στρατιώτας διακο. σιούς forthwith make ready to march. Besides these, see Mark ix. 22, 43; x. 21; xiii. 28; xiv. 15, 44; xv. 30; Luke xx. 24; Jno. ii. 8; iv. 35; vi. 10; xi. 39; xiii. 29; xviii. 11; xxi. 6; Acts iii. 4; vii. 33; ix. 11; xvi. 9; xxi. 39; xxii. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; Eph. vi. 13, 17; Col. iii. 5; Tit. iii. 13; Phil. 3; Jas. iii. 13; iv. 8, 9; 1 Pet. iv. 1; 2 Pet. i. 5, 10. When something to be carried into effect at once is expressed, sometimes νῦν or νυνι is added to the Aorist Imperat.; as, Acts x. 5; xxiii. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 11. The Aorist Imperat. is used also when δέ strengthens the injunction, as in Acts xiii. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 20 (Judith v. 3; vii. 9; Bar. iii. 4; Xen. C. 1, 8, 9; Soph. El. 524; Klotz, Devar. 395).

b. The Present Imperat. denotes an action already begun and to be continued (Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 742), or one that is permanent and frequently recurring. Hence it is commonly employed in the measured and dispassionate language of laws and moral precepts, e.g. Rom. xi. 20 μὴ ἐν πλῆθος ἡμᾶς (as thou now art), xii. 20 ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου, ψωμίζε αὐτὸν (constantly in such case), xiii. 3 βέβαια μὴ ποιείσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ ἄγαθον ποίει, Jas. ii. 12 αὐτῳ λαλεῖτε καὶ αὐτῳ ποιεῖτε, ὅπως διὰ νόμου ἐκείνου etc., 1 Tim. iv. 7 τοὺς βεβηλίζους καὶ γαρώδεις μῦθους παρατω, cf. Jas. iv. 11; v. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 11, 13; v. 7, 19; vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 8, 14; Tit. i. 18; iii. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 13; x. 14, 25; xvi. 13; Phil. ii. 12; iv. 3, 9; Eph. ii. 11; iv. 25, 26, 28; vi. 4; Jno. i. 44; xxi. 16; Mark viii. 15; ix. 7, 39; xiii. 11; xiv. 38. Hence in ordinary discourse the Present Imperat. conveys more softness and reserve of expression, and frequently denotes merely advice (Moller as above, 123 f.). 330

Accordingly the Present and the Aorist Imperat. are sometimes
used together, to denote respectively the distinctions above specified; as, 

as, Jno. ii. 16 ἄρατε τὰ ταῦτα ἐνεκέθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου οἶκον ἔμποριού, 1 Cor. xv. 84 ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ μαρτύνετε, Acts xii. 8 περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιον σου κ. ἀκολούθει μου, Rom. vi. 13 μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μὲν ἴματά ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας, Mark ii. 9; Jno. v. 8, 11; ii. 8; cf. Plato, rep. 9, 572 d. 

θές τοίνυν πάλιν ... νέων νίκα ἐν τοῖς τούτων αὐτῇ ἡθεσε τεθραμμένον. 


4. Occasionally this distinction may seem to be disregarded (1 Pet. ii. 17), and the Aorist Imp. in particular appear to be employed where the Present Imp. would have been strictly required (Bhdy. 398). It must be remembered, however, that in many cases it depends on the writer whether or not he will represent the action as occurring in a point of time and momentary, or as only commencing, or likewise continuing. Neither must it be overlooked that the Aorist Imp. is in general more forcible and stringent than the Present Imp. (see no. 3), and the strengthening of discourse 205 is mainly a subjective matter; cf. Schoem. ad Isaäum p. 285.1

In accordance with these principles we must judge of the following passages: μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί Jno. xv. 4 etc. (also μένετε Luke ix. 4; 1 Jno. ii. 28, μένε 2 Tim. iii. 14, μενέτω 1 Cor. vii. 24 etc.), 1 Jno. v. 21 φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων (similarly 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 14., on the other hand 2 Pet. iii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 15), Heb. iii. 1 κατανοοῖσατε τόν ἄποστολον καὶ ἄρχεσθαι τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, Mark xvi. 15 πορευθέντες εἰς τόν κόσμον ἀπαντα κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Jno. xiv. 15 τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμᾶς τηρήσατε, Jas. v. 7 μακροθυμήσατε ἐκ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου, cf. Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Tim. i. 8; ii. 3; iv. 2; 1 Pet. i. 13; ii. 2; v. 2. The Aorist Imp. will be found quite suitable in all these passages. In Rom. xv. 11 (Sept.) Jno. vii. 24 the Present Imp. and the Aorist Imp. even of the same verb are thus connected together. In many passages 381 the reading varies e.g. Acts xvi. 15; Rom. xvi. 17; as also in the Codd. of Greek authors these two forms are often interchanged.

1 In opposition to Schoef. Demosth. III. 185 he remarks: tenuissimum discrimen esse apparent, ut saepenumero pro lubitu aut affectu loquentis variari oratio possit. Nam quid mirum, qui modo lenius iussaret: σκοπεῖται (Demosth. Lept. 483), cum statim eum majore quadem vi et quasi intentius sagitante addere: λόγους. Et plerumque, si non semper, apud pedestres audem scripторes, in tali diversorum temporum conjunctione praes. imperativus antecedit, sequitur aoristus.
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Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 99, 222, especially where they differ only in a single letter. Sometimes also one of these two Imperatives has become obsolete,—thus λάβε is constantly employed, not λάμβανε; or one of the forms predominates, as in the N. T. φέρε over ἐνεγκε. See Bmln. 172.

Respecting the Imperat. (Pres.) after μή, see § 56, 1, p. 501 sq.

The Perf. Imp. is used when an action, complete in itself, is represented as to continue in its effects, as in Mark iv. 39 in Christ’s address to the troubled sea: πεθέμων εἶ (and remain) still! Cf. also ἐκφέρω, ἐκφέρωθε 232 Acts xxiii. 30; xv. 29. See Hm. emend. rat. p. 218; Mth. 1126 f.; cf. Bmln. 174. Cf. Xen. M. 4, 2, 19; Thuc. 1, 71; Plato, Euthyd. 278 d. and rep. 8, 558 a.

5. The Imperative may also be superseded by other forms of expression:

a. By the phrase—originally elliptical—(my command is, or see) that thou do not tarry. We find ὅπως ἔπεξες τῷ μαρφέο Dem. Mid. 414 c. (ὅπως with Fut. Indic. Mdv. 126), Eurip. Cycl. 595; Aristoph. nub. 828, (less frequently with the Subjunctive, Xen. C. 1, 8, 18; Lucian. dial. d. 20, 2). In the N. T. (the weakened § 44,8 ἵνα is thus used with the Subjunctive in Mark v. 23 ἵνα ἐλθῶν ἐπιθῇ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ, also in 2 Cor. viii. 7 (but not in 1 Cor. v. 2; 1 Tim. i. 8); and in the 3d Pers. in Eph. v 38 ἣ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβηθῇ τὸν ἄνδρα (an Imperative precedes). In the Greek poets, however, ἵνα occurs in the same connection (Sophr. Oed. C. 155), and also in later prose; as, Epict. 23 ἀν πεποιήθη ὑποκρίνεσθαι σε 296 θελή (ὁ διδάσκαλος), ἵνα καὶ τούτων εισφέρω ὑποκρίνη, Arrian. Epict. ἡ ἡ 4, 1, 41; and in the Byzantines even with the Ind. Pres., Malal. 13 p. 334, 16 p. 404. In Latin cf. Cic. fam. 14, 20: ibi ut sint omnia parata.

b. By a negative question with the Future (Hm. Vig. 740; Rost 678): wilt thou not come immediately? Aristoph. nub. 1296 οὐκ ἀποδώξεις σειατὼν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας; Xen. Cyr. 2, 8, 22. Cf. Acts xiii. 10 οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφειν τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου; 4 Macc. v. 10 οὐκ ἐξυπνώωσες; This construction, however, is for the most part more forcible than the Imperative.

c. In categorical sentences by the Future (especially in the negative form): thou shalt not touch it, Matt. vi. 5 οὐκ ἔσῃ ὡς ὑποκριταλ, v. 48 (Lev. xi. 44). In Greek authors this mode of expression passes as milder than the Imperative, Mth. 1122; Bldty. 378; Sintenis, Plut. Themist. 175 sqq.; Stallb. Plato, rep. II. 295; Weber, Demosth. p. 369 sq.; (as to the Latin, see Ramsh. S. 421) 332
But in Hebrew it has established itself in the emphatic diction of legislation (Ewald, krit. Gr. 531); hence in quotations from the Old T.: Matt. v. 21, 27, 33 οὕτως εἰσέρχεσθε, οὕτως οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε, Luke iv. 12; Acts xxi. 5; Rom. vii. 7; xiii. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 9 (Heb. xii. 20 Sept.). Only the fifth commandment τίμα τὸν πατέρα etc. (from Sept.) Matt. xv. 4; xix. 19; Eph. vi. 2, etc. is expressed in the Imperat. In Rom. vi. 14 the Fut. expresses simple expectation. This form of expression may be in itself either stern or mild;—depending on the tone with which it is uttered.

d. By the Infinitive: to proceed! This, not to mention antique and epic diction, occurs in Greek prose, and not only when a command is uttered with excitement or imperious brevity (Hm. Soph. Oed. R. 1057; Schaeff. Demosth. III. 580; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 146; Bhdy. 538), but also in requests, wishes, and prayers (Bremi, Dem. 230; Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 388; Fr. Rom. III. 86; Mdv. 155. Compare the ancient form of salutation χαλπεω Acts xvi. 23; Jas. 288 i. 1). Expositors have often been over-ready to discover this usage in the N. T. (Georgi, Hierocr. I. I. 58); altogether incorrectly in 1 Thess. iii. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 17; iii. 5, where as the accent shows Imperatives occur. In other passages the change of construction, in sentences of some length, has been overlooked: in Luke ix. 3 we find μήτε μάθητε ... ἐξευα, as if μηδὲν αἴρεεν had been employed in the preceding part of the sentence; both constructions might have followed εἰπεν πρὸς αὐτός, and the writer certainly thought of ἐσχεν as an Infinitive depending on εἰπεν. In the parallel passage Mark vi. 8 f. we find another change of structure. Cf. Arrian. Al. 4, 20, 5 σὺ νῦν φύλαξον τὴν ἀρχήν· εἰ δὲ ... σὺ δὲ ... παραδώγαια. Similarly Rom. xii. 15, see § 63. In other passages also the regular grammatical connection has been misunderstood: in Rev. x. 9 δοῦναι undoubtedly must be joined with λέγεια; in Col. iv. 6 εἰδέναι 297 is an Inf. elucidating the preceding predicates of λόγος. Only in Phil. iii. 16 πλήν ... τὸ αὐτὸ οὐκ οὐκεῖαν is the Inf. most easily taken for the Imperat.; it points out here with peculiar effect the unchanging law of progress for the Christian life. Cf. Stallb. ad Plat. Gorg. 447 b.

To the imperative ἵνα under a. Gieseler in Rosenm. Repert. II. 145 refers the use of a ἵνα in John etc., as in Jno. i. 8 ὅπε ἦν θεῖος τὸ φῶς ἄλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ but he was to bear witness; ix. 3; xiii. 18. But the 388 construction can only have this meaning when ἵνα signifies in order that;

1 Thus in laws and moral rules in Hesiod. opp. et dd., in Theogulis, in Hippocrates, in Marc. Anton. See Gayler, partic. negantt. p. 80 sq.
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and then an ellipsis, at least of a general kind, as γέγονεν τοῦτο,1 underlies the usage, though John himself in consequence of frequent use regarded it in particular passages as nothing more than but in order that, cf. Fr. Mt. 840 sq. An expositor, on the contrary, if he wishes to do his duty, can and must in every case give naturally the special ellipsis from the context; as, Jno. i. 8 he himself was not the light of the world, but he came (ἰλάθεν vs. 7) that he might bear witness; ix. 3 neither hath this man sinned nor his parents, but he was born blind that . . . might be made manifest (cf. 1 Jno. ii. 19). In xiii. 18 there is probably an aposiopesis, which may be easily explained psychologically: I speak not of you all, I know those whom I have chosen, but (I have made this choice) that . . . might be fulfilled etc.; see BCrus. (if we do not prefer to suppose that Jesus, instead of giving utterance to the painful fact in his own language, continues in the words of the Psalmist, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9). In Jno. xv. 25 ἐμὲ ἤμετρον με δωρεάν in the quotation shows that μεμερισθήσεται must be repeated before ἵνα. In Mark xiv. 49 the coming forth of the Jews against Jesus, in the manner described in vs. 48, is understood as predicted. Lastly, in Rev. xiv. 13 from ἀποθνῄσκοντες the word ἀποθνῄσκοντι may be supplied before ἵνα etc.

Note. In the N. T. text it is occasionally doubtful, whether a verbal form that answers equally for the Imperat. and (the 2d person of) the Indic. is to be taken for the former or the latter; e.g. Heb. xii. 17 ἵστε. 6th d. ὁ δὲ καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομήσω τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀνεδοκιμάσθη, [xiii. 23] 1 Cor. vi. 4 βιωτικὰ μὲν οὖν κριτήρια ἔχατε, τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τούτους καθ' ἐξετάσει, i. 26; xi. 26; Rom. xiii. 6; Eph. ii. 22; Phil. ii. 15, 22; Jno. xiv. 1; 1 Pet. i. 6; ii. 5. In all such cases the decision must depend on the context; and the question belongs not to Grammar but to Hermeneutics.

§ 44. THE INFINITIVE.2

1. The Infinitive, inasmuch as it expresses the idea of the verb purely and simply i.e. without reference to a subject, is least qualified of all the verbal forms to figure as a part of speech in a grammatical sentence. It is so used, a. in expressing a concise, hurried command (§ 43, 5 d.); or, b. when introduced adverbially; or, c. subjoined absolutely. Under b. comes only the phrase ὁς ἐκτὸς εἰπέων Heb. vii. 9 (Krü. 178). To c. may be referred (Krü. 179) Phil. iv. 10 ἀνεθάλετε τὸ ἵπτερ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν as to your regard

1 To say that there is nothing to be supplied (as de Wette does), is not satisfactory; at any rate it must be shown how and by what means ἵνα assumes that import.

for me, though another construction also is possible here. But an Inf. which is added to a clause as its complement (infinit. exepgeticus), generally to express design (Rost 687), is related to the last use, or rather coincides with it essentially, Matt. ii. 2 ἡλθομεν προσκυνήσας αὐτῷ (in order) to worship him (after ἔρχομαι Matt. xi. 7; xx. 28; Heb. ix. 24; Rev. xxii. 12; Jno. iv. 15; Luke i. 17, and πέμπω or ἀποστέλλω Mark iii. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17; xvi. 8, and, besides, Acts v. 31; Rom. x. 7; 1 Cor. x. 7); 2 Cor. xi. 2 ἡμοσάμην ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἄνδρι παρθένων ἄγνην παραστήσας τῷ Χριστῷ, Col. i. 22; 2 Cor. ix. 5; x. 13, 16; Jno. xiii. 24 νεὺς τοῦτο πυθέσθαι (cf. Diod. S. 20, 69), Rev. xvi. 9 οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι αὐτῷ δόξαν, 2 Pet. iii. 2 (1 Sam. xvi. 1) Phil. iv. 12. In other passages it denotes the result (as, in the early language, design and result were not yet distinguished, Bmln. S. 339) Col. iv. 6 ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ... ἱλατε ἠρτυμένος ... εἰδέναι πῶς etc. seasoned with salt, to know (so that ye may know), Heb. v. 5; or the mode of carrying into effect, as in Acts xv. 10 τὴν περάξετε τῶν θεῶν ἐπιθείναι γιον ἔπι τῶν τρύχηλων τῶν μαθητῶν ἑποντέν ἦγε, Heb. v. 5 (1 Pet. iv. 8). Lastly, in Eph. iii. 6 the Inf. clause gives the substance of the μυστήριον vs. 4; cf. also Eph. iv. 22. In Greek authors this lax use of the Inf. is carried much farther, Schaeff. Soph. II. 324; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. 116; Held, Plut. Aem. P. 185 sq. The Inf. of design is particularly frequent (Soph. Oed. C. 12; Thuc. 1, 50; 4, 8; Her. 7, 208; Plut. Cim. 5; Arrian. Al. 1, 16, 10; 4, 16, 4) 285 Mth. 1234; Krü. 186 (though the Greeks, after verbs of going or sending, still more frequently employ the Participle, cf. Acts viii. 27; xxiv. 11).

Such relations are more distinctly denoted sometimes by ἐπελθεῖν before the Inf., as in Luke ix. 52; Matt. xxvii. 1. On the above passage in Matt. 299 where the explanation of Fr. is very far-fetched cf. Strab. 6, 324; Schaeff. ad Bos. ellips. p. 784, and Soph. Oed. Col. p. 525; Mth. 1232. In the Byzantine writers ἐπελθεῖν with the Inf. instead of the Inf. alone is peculiarly common, e.g. Malal. p. 385 δουλεύσατο ἐπελθεῖν ἐκβληθήναι τὴν πεθέραν, p. 434. Cf. also Heinichen, ind. ad Euseb. III. 545. A parallel to Luke, as above, occurs in Euseb. H. E. 3, 28, 3: εἰσελθὼν ποτε ἐν βαλανεῖ ἐπελθεῖν λούσασθαι. 385 This extended use of the particle in the later language it is better to recognize in the N. T. also, than to consent to forced interpretations. Ὅσ before the Inf. occurs only in Acts xx. 24 ὀφενός λόγον ποιοῦμαι, οὔτε ἐξο τὴν ψυχήν μον τιμᾶν ἐμαρτ., ὃς τελείωσαι τὸν δρόμον μον μετὰ χαρᾶ in order to finish my course etc., see Bornem. Schol. p. 174 sq.

Other forms of the Infinit. exepgetic. are more naturally annexed
to a proposition or a clause, and assume the form of a grammatically governed word, which they were considered to be in part by earlier grammarians: 1 a. Mark vii. 4 πολλὰ & παρέλαβον κρατεῖν (observanda acceperunt), Matt. xxvii. 34 ἐδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν δίκοι, Eph. iii. 16 (Thuc. 2, 27; 4, 36; Lucian. asin. 43; Diog. L. 2, 51). b. 1 Cor. ix. 5 ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν γυναῖκα περαίνειν, ix. 4; Luke viii. 8 ὁ ἔχων ὑπὰ ἅκοντιν ἡκούντως, ii. 1; Acts xiv. 5; Eph. iii. 8; Heb. xi. 15 καρός ἀνακάμψας, iv. 1 (Plato, Tim. 38 b.; Aesch. dial. 3, 2) Mth. 1235. In this construction a subject even may be added to the Inf., as in Rom. xiii. 11; cf. Schoem. Plut. Cleom. 187.

The Inf. is construed with Adjectives in 2 Tim. i. 12 δυνατὸς τὴν παραβήκτην μου φυλάξαι (Thuc. 1, 139.), Heb. xi. 6; vi. 10 οὐκ ἄδικος ὁ θεός ἐπιλαθέσθαι etc., 1 Pet. iv. 8; 1 Cor. vii. 39; Mark i. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 5; Luke xv. 19; Acts xiii. 25; Heb. v. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Luke xxii. 33. Cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 117; Stalib. Plat. Euthyd. 204; Weber, Demosth. 261; Bhd. 361.

2. But the Inf. may also enter into the construction of a sentence as an integral part of it; and then its nature as a noun more or less clearly appears. In such cases it is used sometimes as the subject and sometimes as the object. It serves as subject (Mth. 1239) in sentences such as Matt. xii. 10 εἰ ἔχετι τοῦς σάββατας θεραπεύειν is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day (is healing etc. lawful)? xv. 26 οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων, 1 Thess. iv. 3 28ο τούτῳ ἐστὶν βέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἀπέχεσθαι ... ἀπὸ τῆς πορείας (where ὁ ὄγιασμος ὑμῶν precedes, which also might have been expressed by an Inf.), Acts xx. 16 ὅποις μὴ γενήται αὐτῷ χρυσοτριβήσας (Weber, 386 Dem. 213), Matt. xix. 10; Eph. v. 12; Phil. i. 7; Gal. vi. 14; Jas. 300 i. 27; Rom. xiii. 5; 1 Cor. xi. 20; Heb. vi. 6; ix. 27; 1 Pet. ii. 15. 7th ed. If in such cases the Infinitive itself has a subject, whether a substantive, adjective, or participle, this is usually connected grammatically with the Inf. and put in the Accusative; as, Matt. xvii. 4 καλῶν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὡδε εἶναι, xix. 24; Jno. xviii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 15; Acts xxv. 27; Luke ix. 33; xvii. 25. Cf. Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 526; Schwarz, de soloecc. discip. Ch. p. 88 sq. When the subject is subjoined to the leading clause (Phil. i. 7 ἐκαὶ εἰμὶ 1Likewise by those who thought that in the example adduced under b. ἔχομεν ἐξονέαν περαίνειν, a τοῦ is omitted before the Inf. (Haitinger in Act. Monac. III. 301): this is put when the Inf. is regarded definitely as a Gen. (noun); without τοῦ it is the Inf. epexeget. The two constructions are somewhat differently conceived, Mth. 1235. So in Latin, Cic. Tusc. 1, 41: tempus est abire (cf. Rams horn S. 423), in other passages abeundi. See in general Stalib. Plat. Phil. p. 213 and Euthyphr. p. 107. (As in Luke i. 9 we find ἰδαντι τοῦ θυμοῦ, so in Demosth. Neer. 577 c. ἱδεῖ καὶ βουλεῖν.)
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to to φρονεῖν etc.), the adjectives construed with the Infinit. stand either in the Acc. (Matt. xviii. 8 καλὸν σοι ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν χαλάν ἢ κυλάν), or in the case of the subject, according to an attraction common in Greek authors; as, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρείττον ἢν αὐτοῖς, μή ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ἐπιστρέψαι, Acts xv. 25 (var.) cf. Thuc. 2, 87; Demosth. funebr. 158 a., 156 a.; Xen. Hier. 10, 2; Bhdyy. 359; Krü. 180 (Zumpt 505). In Heb. ii. 10 both constructions are united: ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ ... ἀγαγόντα ... τελείωσαι cf. Mark ix. 47; Matt. xviii. 8 (Plut. Coriol. 14).

It is further to be remarked that

a. The Inf. in this case sometimes has the Article: viz. where it serves directly as a verbal noun, which takes place not only in sentences such as Rom. vii. 18 τὸ θέλειν παράκειται μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεται τὸ καλὸν οὖ, 2 Cor. vii. 11 αὐτὸ τὸ τάρα τὰν λυτηθήναι πάσην κατεργάσατο ὑμῖν σπονδήν, Phil. i. 21, where the finite verb with its adjuncts forms a complete predicate; but also in the impersonal phrases καλὸν, ἀδερφὸν ἵπτετι etc. (Rost 681), if special force is intended to be given to the notion expressed by the Inf. e.g. 1 Cor. vii. 26 καλὸν ἄθροισθη τὸ οὕτως εἶναι, Gal. iv. 18 καλὸν τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε, Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. xi. 6. In the former case the Article could hardly be omitted; but in the latter καλὸν ἄθροισθη οὕτως εἶναι it is good for a man so to be (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 1; xiv. 35) would have been less forcible in expression.¹ Phil. i. 29 may also be reckoned in the second class; in 1 Thess. iv. 6 one such Inf. with the Article is followed by another without it (cf. Plat. Gorg. 467 d.; Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 76); but in Rom. iv. 13 the Inf. τὸ κληρονόμον εἶναι appears as a species of apposition to ἄνεγγελται. In Greek authors compare with the above, Plat. Phaed. 62 d.; Gorg. 475 b.; Xen. M. 1, 2, 1; Diod. S. 1, 93.

b. Instead of the Inf., especially when its subject is to be expressed with special force, a complete clause also is used with τῶν, τὸ, τῷ (according to the import); as, Mark xiv. 21 καλὸν ἥν αὐτῷ, τὸ ζηλοῦσθη, 1 Cor. vii. 8 καλὸν αὐτοῖς ἵπτον, τῶν μείνων ὡς κἀγὼ, Jno. xvi. 7 συμφέρει ὑμῖν, τῷ ἕγω ἀπλάθω. Respecting τῶν, see below, no. 8. This is in part a general peculiarity of the (later) popular language, which prefers circumstantiality; in part it is to be referred to the Hellenistic tinge of the N. T. diction. Yet something similar occurs in Greek authors, as in Isocr. Nicocl. p. 40, 46.

Likewise, when the Inf. is joined with δοτι in the sense of it is lawful, or it is possible etc. to ..., the Inf. is itself the subject; as, Heb. ix. 5 (Ast, lexic. Plat. I. 622 a.). But 1 Cor. xi. 20 may (in opposition to Wahl and

¹ A difference in meaning between an Inf. with the Art. and without it is certainly not to be assumed. In German, too, none such exists between das Deten ist segensreich and deten ist segensreich. Yet the Inf. becomes more forcible when used as a substantive with the Article.
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Mey.) be further rendered: when ye come together, it is (means) not to eat the Lord’s Supper. Toōro in resumption of the Gen. abs. is not required.

3. The Inf. denotes the object (predicate) in all cases when it is requisite to complete the meaning of a verb, not only after θέλεω, δύνασθαι, τολμάω, ἐπικεφαλίζειν, σπουδάζειν, ἔτηεῖν, etc., but also after verbs of believing, hoping (I hope to come, etc.), saying, asserting. The regular usage need not be proved from the N. T., and therefore we have merely to remark,

a. If, in such case, the Inf. has its own subject different from that of the principal verb, such subject with all its attributives is put in the accusative (Acc. with Infin.); as, 1 Tim. ii. 8 βούλομαι προσέχειν τοὺς ἁδρας, 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Heb. vi. 11 ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ἐκαστὸν ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδεικνυθαι σπουδὴν etc., 2 Pet. i. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 10; Acts xiv. 19 νομίζοντες αὐτὸν τεθνάναι, 2 Cor. xi. 16 μὴ τίς με δόξῃς ἀφοῦνα εἶναι; Rom. xv. 5 ὁ θεὸς διῆκεν ὑμᾶς τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, 2 Tim. i. 18. Yet, more frequently we find a complete clause with ἵνα after verbs of entreat, commanding, etc. (see no. 8), with ὅτι after verbs of saying, believing (Matt. xx. 10; Acts xix. 26; xxii. 29; Rom. iv. 9; viii. 18; Gal. v. 10), and always in the N. T. after ἐλπίζω. If, on the other hand, the Inf. and the principal verb have one and the same subject, the qualifying words, if such there be, are subjoined in the Nominative; as, Rom. xv. 24 ἐλπίζω διαπερνόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς, 2 Cor. x. 2 δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρήσαι (Philostr. Apoll. 2, 23), Rom. i. 22; Phil. iv. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 14; Jude 3 (Luke i. 9?); which is a kind of attraction; cf. Krüger, gramm. Untersuch. III. 328 ff. The subject itself is then not repeated; as, Jas. ii. 14; 1 Cor. vii. 36. 338 Even in this construction, however, the Accusative (with Inf.) may be used, yet only when the subject is repeated in the form of a pronoun (Hm. Vig. 743), though this does not often occur; as, ἦτοι. Rom. ii. 19 πέπουθας σεαυτὸν ὅθεν ὕπνα τιμῆλαι, Phil. iii. 13 ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατεληφέναι, Luke xx. 20 ἐποκρινομένους, εἰμοῦ δικαίος ἡμῖν, Acts xxxvi. 2; Rev. ii. 2, 9, perhaps also Eph. 28. iv. 22 (where, as appears to me, ἀποδίδοναι ἤμας depends on ἐνδίκαια.

1 In opposition to Bornem. Schol. p. 40 see Fr. Rom. II. 376; cf. Blume, Lycurg. p 151.
2 If the governed substantive to which the Inf. refers be in the Dative, the noun accompanying the Infin. may also be in the Dative, as in Acts xxvii. 3 ... τῷ Πάλαμ χρησάμενοι ἐπιτρεπὼν πρὸς τὸν φίλου τοποθετήσας ἐπιθελείς τοιχών, unless the Dative here is a correction; see Bornem. On the other hand, we find in Luke i. 76 τοῦ δοῦνα ἤμας ἀφόθας ἐκ θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου μυαλίνας αὐτῷ ἀπεκδίκειας αὐτῷ etc.
3 So also in 1 Tim. i. 3 προσευκάμενος belongs to παρεκδίκεσα. If connected with προσευκάμενα it would necessarily, in such proximity, appear in the Accusative.
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χθητε) cf. Her. 2, 2; Xen. C. 5, 1, 21 νομίζωμι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν ἐσκέψας etc., 1, 4, 4 (where see Poppo); Anab. 7, 1, 30; Mem. 2, 6, 35; Diod. S. 1, 50; Exc. Vat. p. 57; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 12; see Krüger as above, S. 390. Yet in the former passages this construction was preferred probably for the sake of antithesis (see Plat. symp. c. 3, and Stallb. in loc., cf. Krüger as above, S. 386 f.) or of perspicuity: I deem not that I myself have already etc. For the same reason, also, ὑμᾶς, in Eph. as above, appears to be employed, since in vs. 21 another subject, Jesus, has intervened. Later writers, however, use this construction even when no antithesis is intended, cf. Heinichen, Euseb. H. E. I. 118.

b. After verbs of saying, (asserting), believing, the Inf. is sometimes used when the assertion etc. refers not to something that really is, but to something that should be (such verbs containing rather the notion of advice, claim, or command; see also Elmsley, Soph. Oed. T. p. 80; Mth. 1230); as, Acts xxii. 21 λέγον, μὴ περιτέμνειν αἱτίως τὰ τέκνα he said they ought not to circumcise their children (he commanded them not to circumcise etc.) xv. 24? Tit. ii. 2; Acts xxii. 4 τῷ Παύλῳ ἔλεγον μὴ ἀναβάνειν εἰς 'Ιεροσ. they said to Paul that he should not go up (advised him not to go) etc. cf. Eurip. Troad. 724. In all these cases if the statement were resolved into direct address the Imperative would be used: μὴ περιτέμνετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν. Compare on this Inf. (which even recent writers still explain by supposing the omission of δεῖν, see in opposition Hm. Vig. 745) Lob. Phryn. p. 753 sqq.; Bttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 131; Eugellhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 81; Jen. Lit. Zeit. 1816, No. 231; Bhdy. 371. Too many passages, however, of the N. T. have been referred to this head. Rom. xiv. 2 β; μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα means: one man has confidence to eat, and the may be already implied in πιστεύειν. In xv. 9 δοξάσαι denotes, not what the Gentiles should do, but what they actually do; see Fr. In ii. 21 f. and Eph. iv. 22 f. (see above) the verbs to make known and to be instructed, on which the Infinitives depend, inherently denote as well what is (and must be believed) as what ought to be (should be done); and, in the same way, we can say: they preached to them not to steal; ye have been taught to lay aside. In Acts x. 22 καλεῖσθαι occurs, which is almost uniformly employed to denote the direction of an oracle, a divine injunction. Finally, when after verbs of beseeching the Inf. must be rendered by may, such import is comprehended in the meaning of those verbs in the 3rd of context in question, as in 2 Cor. x. 2 δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι
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τὸ πεποιθήσει, as if, I beseech you in reference to my not being bold, that is, to see that I be not bold.¹

c. The Article is put before the Inf. when it is the object, to make it a substantive, and thus give it greater prominence (Rost 289, 682) Rom. xiii. 8; xiv. 13 (Lk vii. 21 var.); 1 Cor. iv. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 1; viii. 10; Phil. iv. 10; cf. above, 1 (Hm. Soph. Aj. 114); especially at the beginning of the sentence (Thuc. 2, 53; Χενοφ. M. 4, 3, 1), 1 Cor. xiv. 39 τὸ λαλεῖν γλώσσας μὴ κωλύσει (cf. Soph. Phil. 1241 ὥσι σε κωλύσει τὸ δράτας). In Phil. ii. 6 ὅπλα ἀρπαγμῶν ἄγνωστο τὸ εἶναι ίςα θεος, the Inf. with the Article is the immediate object of ἄγνωστο, and ἀρπαγμῶ is predicate, cf. Thuc. 2, 87 ὅπλα δικαλεῖ ἐκεί τέκμαρσον τὸ ἐκφοβήσα, and Bhdv. 316.

Especially deserving of attention is the use (in Luke peculiarly frequent) of the Inf. with the Acc. after ἔγνεστο, as in Mark ii. 23 ἔγνεστο παραπομπέοντο αὐτῶν accidit, ut transiret, Acts xvi. 16 ἔγνεστο παραδίκεσαν τινὰ ... ἀπατήσῃς ἡμῖν, xix. 1 ἔγνεστο Παύλου διελθέτα ... ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἑφεσον, iv. 5; ix. 3, 32, 37, 43; xi. 26; xiv. 1; xxi. 1, 5; xxii. 6; xxvii. 44; xxviii. 8, 17; Luke iii. 21 f.; vi. 1, 6; xvi. 22 et al.² Here the Infinitive clause is to be considered as the (extended) subject of ἔγνεστο, just as after συνέβη (see just below), and in Latin after aequum est, apertum est, etc. (Zumpt, Gr. 505): Jesus’ passing by came to pass, etc. The construction is good Greek, though the frequent use of ἔγνεστο with the Inf., instead of the historical tense of the particular verb, is primarily an imitation of the Hebrew נָתַן. In Greek we find a grammatical parallel in συνέβη τὴν τόλμη ... εἶναι πορεύεσθαι Diod. S. 1, 50; 3, 22, 39; Plat. legg. 1, 635 a.; Demosth. Polycl. 709 e.; Dion. H. IV. 2089, and frequently, particularly in Polybius (also 2 Macc. iii. 2), which occurs also once in Acts xxi. 35. 340 The germ of the former construction may be seen in Theogn. 639 πολλάκι ... γένεσται εἰρήνης ἐργῇ ἀνδρῶν, with which Matt. xviii. 13 agrees most closely. It appears in its full form in Plat. Phaedr. 242b. τὸ δειμὼν τι καὶ τὸ εἰσάγων σημαίνων μοι γένεσθαι ἔγνεστο; and especially in later writers, e.g. Codin. p. 138 ἔγνεστο τὸν βασιλέα ἀνεμεῖν, Epiphani. Monach. ed. Dressel p. 16 ἔγνεστο αὐτῶν δραβήσηται εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.

The use of the Acc. with the Inf., as has been already remarked, is elsewhere in the N.T. comparatively rare. A clause with ἔτι is more

¹ In 2 Cor. ii. 7 ἔτι ... χαρίσασθαι καὶ παρακαλέσαι the two Infinitives in the same way denote what should be, and not what actually takes place. Yet even here δέ is not to be supplied, but the clause with λαμβάνει extends its influence to these Infinitives: The reproach is sufficient,—that you may now, on the contrary, forgive him etc.

² The same construction is followed in Acts xxi. 17 ἔγνεστο μοι ὑποστρέφωντι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ ... γενέσθαι μοι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, where the Infinn. might have been joined directly to μοι ὑποστράφων (accidit mihi), and perhaps would have been joined to it had not the writer been led to depart from this construction by the intervention of the Gen. abs. καὶ προ- κουσκούσαν μοι ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ.
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304 common, quite after the manner of the later (popular) language, which resolves condensed constructions, and prefers the more circumstantial and perspicuous. Hence in Latin e.g. ut where the more ancient language employed the Acc. with the Inf.; hence, especially, the quod after verbs dicendi and sentiendi which in the period of declining Latin (particularly in the extra-Italian provinces) becomes more and more frequent. In German the concise construction, "He said I had come too late," is resolved in the speech of the people into "He said that I." etc. Moreover, it must not be overlooked that after verbs dicendi the N.T. likes to introduce what is said in the oratio recta, according to the graphic idiom of Oriental tongues.

4. The Inf. rendered an unmistakable substantive by means of the Article is also employed in the oblique cases. When so used it appears in the N. T. most frequently (far more so than in Greek authors) in the Genitive. Sometimes,

a. it depends on nouns or verbs which elsewhere also govern the Genitive: 1 Cor. ix. 6 oikous oikousan tou μη ἐργάζεσθαι; 1 Pet. iv. 17 οι καυροι τοι άρξασθαι το Κρίμα etc., Acts xiv. 9 πλωτω έχει το οσιωναι, xx. 3 έγνετο γνωμη τον υποστρέφειν, Luke xxiv. 25 ορδείς τη καρδία του πιστεύειν, Acts xxiii. 15 έτοιμοι του ανελεύν (Sept. Ezek. xxi. 11; 1 Macc. v. 39); Luke i. 9 ελαχε του θυμίασαι (1 Sam. xiv. 47); 2 Cor. i. 8 άποτε εναποκηρυσσημαι ήμας καλ του ζην, 1 Cor. xvi. 4 έδώ ή εξαν του καμε πορεύεσθαι if it be worthy of my going also. Cf. also 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Cor. viii. 11; Luke xxii. 6; Phil. iii. 21; Rom. vii. 3; xv. 23; Heb. v. 12; Rev. ix. 10 (Sept. Gen. xix. 20; Ruth ii. 10; Neh. x. 29; Judith ix. 14, etc.). Sometimes the Codd. vary between the Inf. with του and without it, as in Rev. xiv. 15 (in other passages we find, in parallel phrases, sometimes the one and sometimes the other, Heb. v. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 9). For passages from Greek authors, see Georgi, vind. 325 sq.; Mtth. 1256. (In these, several words frequently intervene between the Article and the Inf.; but this does not occur in the N.T., owing to the simplicity of its diction. See Demosth. funerbr. 153 a., 154 c.; Aristocr. 431 a.)

Under this head come also Luke i. 57 οπλησθη δ χρόνος του τεκειν αοτηρ, ii. 21, cf. Sept. Gen. xxv. 24; xlvii. 29, as in writing Greek the author regarded the Gen. as depending immediately on χρόνος. In Hebrew the construction is somewhat different, the Inf. with ח being used; see Ewald 621.

Sometimes, b. it is construed with entire clauses, to express design (see Valcken. Eurip. Hippol. 48; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 56;
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Schaef. Demosth. II. 161; V. 363; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 338; Mtth. 1256 f.), where the earlier philologists supplied ἐνεκα (cf. Dem. funebr. 156 b.) or χάριν, as Luke xxiv. 29 εἰσήλθεν τοῦ μείναι σὺν αὐτῶς, Matt. xxiv. 45 ὅπως κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δούναι αὐτῷ τὴν τροφήν, iii. 13 παραγίνετα ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰορδάνη τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, xiii. 3; Luke ii. 27; v. 7; xxi. 22; xxi. 31; Acts iii. 2; xxvi. 18; 1 Cor. x. 13; Heb. x. 7; Gal. iii. 10; with 305 a negative in Acts xxi. 12 παρεκαλοῦμεν ... τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαλεῖν αὐτὸν eis 'Ierousaλήμ, Jas. v. 17; Heb. xi. 5. This construction is especially peculiar to Luke (and Paul). But in Greek prose, particularly after the time of Demosthenes, parallel instances occur; and this use of the Genitive results so surely from the primary import of the case itself (Bhdy. 174 f.), that no one should venture to find in it either an ellipsis or a Hebraism. Cf. Xen. C. 1, 6, 40 τοῦ δὲ μηδ’ ἐντεῦθεν διαφεύγεται, σκοτάοι τοῦ γηγομένου καθίστη. Plat. Gorg. 457 e. φοβοῦμαι οὖν διελέγχει σε, μὴ με ἑπολάβης οὐ πρὸς τὸ πρόγυμα φιλονεκοῦντα λέγειν, τοῦ καταφανεῖς γενέσθαι etc. Strabo 15, 717; Demosth. Phorm. 608 b.; Isocr. Aegin. 932; Thuc. 291 1, 23; 2, 22; Heliod. 2, 8, 85; 1, 24, 46; Dion. H. IV. 2109; Arrian. Al. 2, 21, 13; 3, 25, 4 and 28, 12. An Inf. with, and another without τοῦ, are connected in the same principal clause in Luke ii. 22 f. If a subject is expressed in this construction it is put in the Acc. Luke v. 7.

In Phil. iii. 10 also this Inf. denotes design, where τοῦ γρῶμα is connected with vs. 8 and resumes the thought there expressed. (In the Sept. this Inf. occurs on every page, cf. Gen. i. 14; xxiv. 21; xxxviii. 9; xliii. 17; Judg. v. 16; ix. 15, 52; x. 1; xi. 12; xv. 12; xvi. 5; xix. 3; xx. 4; Ruth i. 1; 7; ii. 15; iv. 10; Neh. i. 6; 1 Sam. ix. 13, 14; xv. 27; 2 Sam. vi. 2; xix. 11; Jonah i. 3; Joel iii. 12; Judith xv. 8; 1 Macc. iii. 20, 39, 52; v. 9, 20, 48; vi. 15, 26.)

Different from this, and more closely connected with the notion of the Genitive — hence to be referred to a. — is the use of the Inf. with τοῦ after verbs signifying to be distant from, to restrain or debar from, to prevent from; for these verbs contain the inherent power of directly governing the Gen., and accordingly are uniformly followed by the Gen. of a noun, as Rom. xv. 22 ἀνεκοστόμην ... τοῦ ἄλογον, Luke iv. 42 καὶ κατέχαν αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ προείσθαι (cf. Isocr. ep. 7, 1012 ἀτέχνων τοῦ τινος ἀτοκτένων, Xen. M. 2, 1, 16; A. 3, 5, 11), with a pleonastic negative 342 (§ 65) Acts xiv. 18 μόνον κατέστησαν τοὺς δώλους τοῦ μὴ θίνων αὐτῶν (cf. ταύνων των τῶν καὶ ταύνωσθαι followed by Inf. with τοῦ Diod. S. 3, 33; Phalar. ep. 35, also ἄνυπνας τοῦ τωνιν Malalas 17, p. 417), xx. 27 σῖχ ἐπιστευμένη τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγελά τύμιον πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. vs. 20),
1 Pet. iii. 10 παρασκευή τῆς γλώσσας αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χείλη αὐτοῦ τοῦ μὴ λαλήσαι δόλων, Luke xxiv. 16 οἵ δὲ θεοι δικαιοσύνη τοῦ μὴ ἐγνώσαι αὐτῶν (Xen. Laced. 4, 6); Rom. vi. 6; Acts x. 47 (Sus. 9; 3 Esr. ii. 24; v. 69, 70; Gen. xvi. 2; Act. Thom. § 19; Protev. Jac. 2 etc.). Perhaps also φεύγων and ἐκφεύγων τοῦ ποιήσαι is best explained in this way (as φεύγων τῶν is used), Xen. A. 1, 3, 2. Cf. Bhdv. 356; Bttm. exc. II. ad Demosth. Mid. p. 143.

In Rom. i. 24 παραδείκνυαι αὐτοῦ... δ θεοῦ... εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ θυμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν δαυνώις the Inf. depends directly on the noun ἀκαθαρσία, 306 and there is nothing strange in the omission of τῆν before ἀκαθ. (xiv. 23; ἦκαν 1 Cor. ix. 6). The Gen. indicates in what this ἀκαθ. consisted: commisit impuritati, quæ cerebatur in etc. Fr. with more detail says: virgula post ἀκαθαρσία collocata ante τοῦ mente repete ἀκαθαρσίαν. The need of this I cannot perceive, as ἀκαθαρσία and θυμάζεσθαι stand close together, and the Gen. may naturally be understood of the sphere of the ἀκαθαρσία. In the same way, too, in Rom. viii. 12 the Inf. τοῦ κατὰ σέρκα ζῆν is to be understood as depending on ὑπελήθη, in conformity to the regular phrase ὑπελήθην εἰςαλ τῶν; see Fr. Matt. p. 844. Finally, in Luke i. 73 τοῦ δοῦναι in the same way is most naturally connected with δοκεῖν, cf. Jer. xi. 5.

It soon became usual, however, to employ this construction more loosely, not only a) After verbs involving the idea of (entreaty)1 292 command,2 determination, and thus indirectly of design, Acts xv. 20 καί ἐπιστεύλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι to send them the direction to abstain, Luke iv. 10 (from the Sept.) τοῖς ἀνγέλους αὐτῶν ἐντελεῖν περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι, Acts xxvii. 1 (where it would be forced to connect τοῦ ἀντοπέλειν with the following παρεδιδο) cf. Ruth ii. 9; 1 Kings i. 35; 1 Macc. i. 62; iii. 31; v. 2; ix. 69; Malal. Chron. 18, 458; Ducas p. 201, 217, 389, a.; Fabric. Pseudopigr. i. 707; Vit. Epiph. p. 346;—but also, b) For epegeesis, where an Inf. with or without ὑπερε might have been used, and the import of the Gen. is lost by blending result and design. Very freely so in the Sept.; (ὁ with the Inf. denotes both design and result; as to εἰς with the Inf. see afterwards). In the N. T. compare Acts vii. 19 ὁτοι κυτασοφισάμενοι... ἐκάκωσε τοῖς πατέρας ἡμῶν τοῦ παιδίου ἐκθέται τὰ βρέφη etc., so that they cast out (cf. Thuc. 2, 42, and Poppo in loc.), and what is still harsher iii. 12 ὡς πεποιηκόσι τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτῶν (1 Kings xvi. 19). In both

1 Cf. Malalas 14, 357 ἔθεσαν ἢ Ἀθηναία τὰς Βασιλεία, τοῦ κατελθεῖν εἰς τοῦ ἄγνους τόνος, 17, 492 πεποιηκαν εἰς τούτων ἀνακρίσεως τοὺς παρηκμασίας τοῦ φρουτεσθῇ; τῆς πόλεως, 18, 440 κελέσας τοῦ δοθήκα τοις χάριν προϊδες ἢ χρυσῶν λιπρῶν εἴκοσι etc. 18, 461.

2 A construction parallel to κελέσαν ἢν.
these passages Fr.’s exposition (Matt. p. 846) is undoubtedly to be rejected; otherwise, many passages of the Sept. would either be inexplicable, or would admit of but a very forced interpretation. Cf. in particular Josh. xxii. 26 εἵπαμεν ποιήσαι οὗτον τοῦ αἰκουδομῆσαι, 1 Kings xiii. 16 οὖ μῆ δύνωμαι τοῦ ἐπιτρέψαι (1 Macc. vi. 27), xvi. 19 ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ, ἄν ἐποίησε τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρόν etc., Judith xiii. 20 ποιῆσαι σοι αὐτὰ δ ὁ θεὸς εἰς ὅψιν αἰώνιον τοῦ ἐπικέφασθαι σε ἐν ἀγαθοῖς, 1 Macc. vi. 59 στήσωμεν αὐτὸν; τοῦ πορεύεσθαι τοῖς νυμίμοις, Joel ii. 21 ἐμεγάλυνε κύριος τοῦ ποιῆσαι.

How diversified the use of the Inf. with τοῦ in the Sept. is, may be seen from the following passages (which can easily be classified and which exhibit more or less distinctly the relation denoted by the Genitive): Gen. xxxi. 20; xxxiv. 17; xxxvii. 18; xxxix. 10; Exod. ii. 18; vii. 14; 307 viii. 29; ix. 17; xiv. 5; Josh. xxi. 13; Judg. ii. 17, 21, 22; viii. 1; ix. 24, 7th st. 37; xii. 6; xvi. 6; xviii. 9; xxi. 3, 7, 1; 1 Sam. vii. 8; xii. 23; xvii. 34; xvi. 26; 1 Kings ii. 3; iii. 11; xii. 24; xv. 21; xvi. 7, 31; Ps. xxxix. 14; Jonah i. 4; iii. 4; Mal. ii. 10; 3 Esdr. i. 33; iv. 41; v. 67; Judith ii. 13; v. 4; vii. 13; Ruth i. 12, 16, 18; iii. 3; iv. 4, 7, 15. See also Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 20; Tdf. in the Verhandeling. p. 141. Cf. Acta apocr. p. 68, 85, 124, 127, etc. This Inf. is by no means unfrequent in Byzantine authors; as, Malal. 18, 452; 18, 491; cf. Index to Lucas p. 639, where p. 320 even ἐλ βουλεύτα τοῦ ἵνα φάνερος occurs, cf. p. 189, and p. 203 δύναται τοῦ διακορμέθηνα. This use of τοῦ must be recognized as an extravagance of declining (Hellenistic) Greek, unless forced interpretations be preferred. In Hellenistic writers this construction appears to have become the counterpart of the Inf. with ὑπερ in its manifold relations; and, as generally 298 takes place in established phrases, they no longer thought of the original ἐλ Genitive force. Analogous to this, moreover, is the Byzantine usage of inserting οὗτος before the Inf. after such verbs as βουλεύσας, δοκεῖν etc.; see Index to Malalas, Bonn ed., cf. above, no. 3.

In Rev. xii. 7 ἑγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οἴρῳ, δ διὰ τοῦ δυναμός αὐτῶν 344 τοῦ πολέμησα (where the received text has the correction ἐπολέμησα) a construction occurs which I am unable to explain (Lucke, too, in his Einleitung. in die Offenerbar. Joh. 2. Anfl. S. 454 f., was unable), unless we may consider δ διὰ τοῦ αὐτῶν as a parenthesis — awkward to be sure — which compelled the writer to resume then the ἑγένετο πόλεμος in the construction τοῦ πολέμου. Fr.’s exposition (Matt. p. 844) appears to me artificial. It would, however, be still more inadmissible to take τοῦ

1 In Aesop. 172 de Fur. we find ἵππες αὐτὸς τοῦ καταθέσας τὰ δορὰ, where Schäf. thinking solely of the above use of the Genitive Inf. (no. 4 b.) would reject the τοῦ.

2 Even native Greeks could consider this Inf. after such verbs as δύναμαι, θέλει etc. as a sort of Genitive, inasmuch as the action expressed by the Inf. always depends on the principal verb as a part depends on the whole.
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πολεμ. for an imitation of the (later) Hebrew וְלִשֵּׁבַן pugnandum iis erat, as Ewald and Zullig do. For even in the Sept. that construction is in no passage rendered so strangely. If ἐγένετο τοῦ πολεμήσαι alone were the reading, there would be a parallel in Acts x. 25 (see just below), and the construction would be tolerably explicable. Perhaps, however, the passage contains an ancient gloss, or something fell out of the text, at an early period, before τοῦ πολ. would be to make John chargeable with a strange latitude in the use of words. Acts x. 25 ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθῆναι τῶν Πέτρων, where τοῦ is critically established, cannot be compared to the usage mentioned by Gesen. 308 Lehrgeb. S. 786 f., for according to this it must have run: ἐγέν. ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ εἰσελθῆναι; it is an extravagant use of the Inf. with τοῦ 1 which in Luke certainly must be very surprising. Bornem. considers the whole clause as spurious, —but the reader is referred to B. himself for the manner in which he thinks the text should be made up. Likewise in Luke xvii. 1 ἀνέδεκτον ἦσαν τοῦ μὴ ὑδατὸν τὰ σκάνδαλα some Codd. omit the τοῦ. If it is genuine (both Lehm. and Tdf. have retained it), the Genitive is owing probably to the notion of distance or exclusion implied in ἀνέδεκτον, cf. above, no. 4 b. The view of Mey. is different.

5. The Dative of the Inf. denotes the cause, according to the 294 inherent import of that case, see § 31, 6 c. (Mtth. 1258; Schaef. Demosth. II. 163; Stallb. Plat. Tim. p. 203), 2 Cor. ii. 13 οὐκ ἐσχήμα ἀνέσαν τῷ πνεύματι μου τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν Τίτον because I found not etc.; cf. Xen. C. 4, 5, 9; Demosth. pac. 21 c., funer. 156 b., ep. 4 p. 119 b.; Achill. Tat. 5, 24; Lucian. abdic. 5; Diog. L. 10, 27; Liban. ep. 8; Athen. 9, 375; Joseph. antt. 14, 10, 1; Simplic. in Epict. enchir. c. 38, p. 385; Schweigh. Agath. 5, 16. This Inf. is understood by some as denoting design in 1 Thess. iii. 3 τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι ἐν 345 ταῖς θλίψεωι in order that no one be shaken etc., as it were ‘for the not being shaken’ (Schott. in loc.), a thought which is subordinate to the εἰκ τὸ στηρίζαν, and therefore was not expressed by a repetition of this form. No such Dat. Infin., however, occurs in Greek; and we must read with good Codd. [Sin. included] τὸ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι, which has now been received into the text. See above, 1. Remark.

6. The Infinitive in an oblique case is often joined to a preposition, particularly in narration, and almost more frequently in the N. T. than in Greek authors. The Article is then never omitted (Hm.

1 Cf. Acts aoper. p. 68 ὁτὶ ἐγένετο τοῦ τελεσθῆναι αὐτῶν διδασκαλίας etc. Under this head would come also Acts ii. 1 if the reading were καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις τοῦ συμπληρωθῆναι.
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Vig. 702; Krü. 94), though several words may be inserted between the Article and the Inf. (Acts viii. 11; Heb. xi. 3; 1 Pet. iv. 2); as, Matt. xiii. 25 ἐν τῷ καθεύθεν τούς ἀνθρώπους while men slept, Gal. iv. 18; Luke i. 8; Acts viii. 6 (Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 5; Hiero 1, 6); iii. 26 εὑρωποῦντα ὡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀποστέφεων etc. by turning away, in that he turns away (Heb. iii. 12); Phil. i. 28 ἐπιθυμιὰν ἔχουν εἰς τὸ ἀναλύσαι desire towards departing (to depart), Jas. i. 19 βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι slow to speak, 1 Cor. x. 6 εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγνατος 309 ὡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν to the end that ye be not etc., ix. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4; vii. 3; Matt. xxvi. 2; Luke iv. 29; Acts vii. 19 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 5; An. 7, 8, 20) Rom. iv. 18 (see Philippi), 1 Thess. ii. 16; 2 Cor. viii. 6 εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ὡμᾶς Titon so that we besought Titus (lit., unto the beseeching etc.), Rom. vii. 5; Heb. xi. 3; Heb. ii. 15 διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν (through) all their life-time, Phil. i. 7 διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὡμᾶς because I have you etc., Acts viii. 11; xviii. 2; Heb. vii. 23; x. 2; Luke ii. 4; Mark v. 4 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 5; Mem. 2, 1, 15; Aristot. rhet. 2, 13; Pol. 2, 5, 2); Jas. iv. 15 ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὡμᾶς instead of your saying (Xen. Apol. 8; Plat. 295 rep. 1, 343 a.); Matt. vi. 8 πρὸ τοῦ ὡμᾶς αἰτησάμενος before your asking, Luke ii. 21; xxii. 15; Acts xxiii. 15 (Zeph. ii. 2; Plato, Crit. 48d.); Matt. vi. 1 πρὸ τὸ θεάθηναι ἀντὶ τοῦ ὡμᾶς in order to be seen of them, 2 Cor. iii. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Luke xviii. 1 θέλειν παραβολὴν πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντως προσεύχεσθαι in reference to etc.; Matt. xxvi. 32 μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθημαί με after my resurrection, when I 346 shall have been raised, Luke xiiii. 5; Mark i. 14; Acts vii. 4; xv. 13 (Herod. 2, 9, 6; 3, 5, 10); 2 Cor. vii. 12 εἴνε κεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τῷ σπουδήν ὡμῶν (Demosth. fun. 516 a. b.; Plato, Sis. 390 b.; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 39. Also inscript. Rosett. 11).

Paul with peculiar frequency expresses purpose by the Infinitive with εἰς or πρὸς, while in such cases the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews prefers a derivative noun; see Schulz, Hebräerb. S. 146 ff. But cf. also 1 Cor. vii. 35.

1 On the other hand, cf. Theodoret. III. 424 ἵκα κυβερνής τὸ βρόμα, IV. 851 παρὰ συγγελάθεσθαι, Psalt. Sal. 4. 9. Similar constructions sometimes occur in Greek prose (Baly. 354; Kühner II. 352), but it is uncertain.

2 Yet not so many, and not entire clauses even, as frequently in Greek authors (Xen. Oec. 13, 6; Cyr. 4, 5, 9; 7, 5, 42 etc.). The adjacent, too, are uniformly put after the Inf. An Inf. with ἐρχόμαι or μέχρι never occurs; with ἐρχόμαι only once.

3 The rendering of the Inf. with εἰς by so that is unobjectionable, as εἰς is elsewhere employed to express alike either aim or result; cf. Eurip. Bacth. 1161.

4 Against the other exposition, according to which ὡμᾶς is taken as the subject, see van Hengel in loc. Even where the subject is placed after the Infinitive the proper construction is always to be determined by the context, e.g. Simplic. enchr. 13 p. 90 διὰ τὸ πολλὰς μισεῖν τοὺς θυγγυμναστέας. Cf. Ἰνο. i. 49.
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If in this construction of the Inf. with a prep. a subject be annexed, it is put in the Acc. even when it is one and the same with the subject of the principal clause; as, Heb. vii. 24 ὅ δὲ διὰ τὸ μένων αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἴῶνα ... ἔχει, Luke ii. 4. Predicates also stand then in the Acc.; as, Luke xi. 8 δῶσαι αὐτῷ διὰ τὸ εἶλα αὐτοῦ φίλον; but cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 3 διὰ τὸ φίλομα τῆς ἀγάπης εἶλα ... αὐτὸς ἀνήμην, Mtth. 1284. Yet the attraction, which properly accounts for the Nominative, is also in other circumstances omitted in Greek authors.

The Inf. (without the Article) after πρῶ or πρῶ ἡ (Reitz, Lucian. IV. 501 ed. Lehm.), may be considered as Inf. nominascens; e.g. Jno. iv. 49 κατὰ βηῆ ἡ ἑνῶν ἀποδεικνύει τὸ παιδίον μου is equivalent to πρὸ τοῦ ἀποθ. etc. The Inf. with this particle is employed not only in connection with a Fut. or Imperf. in reference to a still impending fact (Mtth. 1200) Matt. xxvi. 34 ἀλ. (Acts ii. 20); but also in reference to past events (Xen. C. 3, 3, 60; An. 1, 4, 13; Herod. 1, 10, 15) in connection with Preterites, Matt. i. 18; Acts vii. 2; Jno. viii. 58. As to πρῶ ἡ cf. Her. 2, 2; 4, 167.

7. The well-known distinction between the Inf. Pres. and Inf. Aor., as well as between the Inf. Aor. and Inf. Fut. (Hm. Vig. p. 773), is for the most part very clearly observed in the N. T. The Inf. Aorist is employed,

a. In narration after a Preterite on which it depends (in accordance with that parity of tenses carefully observed in Greek, see Schaeff. Demosth. III. 432; Stalb. Phileb. p. 86 and Phaed. p. 32); as, Mark ii. 4 μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσαι αὐτῷ ... ἀπεστέγασαν, xii. 296 12 ἐκίνησαν αὐτῶν κρατήρας, ν. 3 οὐδὲς ἡδύνατο αὐτῶν δῆσαι, Luke viii. 13 οὐκ ἦθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὁφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔπαρε, Jno. 347 vi. 21; vii. 44; Matt. i. 19; viii. 29; xiv. 28; xvii. 23; xxvi. 87; xxvi. 40; xxvii. 34; Mark vi. 19, 48; Luke vi. 48; x. 24; xv. 28; xix. 10; Acts x. 17; xvii. 3; xxv. 7; Col. i. 27; Gal. iv. 20; Philem. 14; Jude 3. This is quite regular, and requires no proof from Greek authors, Mdv. 188. (Sometimes, however, we find the Inf. Pres., as in Jno. xvi. 19; Acts xix. 33; Luke vi. 19, and in parallel passages the Inf. Pres. is used in Matt. xxiii. 37, while in Luke xiii. 34 the Inf. Aor.) Likewise the Inf. Aor. is uniformly connected with the Imp. Aor.; as, Matt. viii. 22 ἔφη τοὺς νεκροῖς θάψα τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκροῖς, xiv. 28; Mark vii. 27.

1 Stalb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 140: Aoristus (Infín.) qua nullam facit significationem perpetuities et continuationis, prouti vel initium vel progressus vel finis actionis verbo expressae spectatur, ita solut usurpari, ut dicatur vel de eo, quod statim et e vestigio fit iodeque etiam certo futurum est, vel de re semel tantum evicentia, quae diuturnitatis et perpetuitatis cogitationem aut non fert aut certe non requirit, vel denique de re brevi et uno veluti temporis istu peracta.
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b. After any tense, when an action (rapidly) passing, completed at once, or instantly to begin, is to be expressed (Hm. Vig. as above); as, Mark xiv. 31 εὕρη μὲν δὲν συναποθανεῖν σοι, x. 31 ἐαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι, Matt. xix. 3 εἰ ἔξεστιν ἄνθρωπος ἀπολύσαι τὴν γυναίκα, 1 Cor. xv. 53 δεῖ τὸ φθαρτόν τούτο ἐνδυνάσθαι ἀφθαρσίαν. Cf. Jno. iii. 4; v. 10; ix. 27; xii. 21; Acts iv. 16; Rev. ii. 21; 2 Cor. x. 12; xii. 4; 1 Thess. ii. 8; Eph. iii. 18. Under this head comes also Jno. v. 44 (πιστεύει signifies to exercise faith, to become a believer).

c. In particular, after verbs of hoping, promising, commanding, wishing, and many others, the Greeks frequently employ the Inf. Aor. (Lob. Phryn. p. 751 sq.; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 153; Ast, Theophr. char. p. 50 sq.; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 525, 719; Weber, Demosth. 343, especially Schlosser, vindic. N. T. locor. adv. Marcand. Hamb. 1742, 4to. p. 20 sqq.), viz. where the action is to be designated merely as brought to pass ("ab omni temporis definiti conditione libera et immunis," Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 140; Weber, Dem. as above); 1 whereas the Inf. Pres. has reference to 311 the continuance of the action, or represents it as just now occurring, in al and the Inf. Fut. (after verbs of hoping, promising) represents it as not to occur till some future time of indefinite remoteness (Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 215 sq.; cf. Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 138; Pflugk, Eur. Heracl. p. 54 sq.). In the N. T. ἐλπίζω is uniformly followed by the Inf. Aor. [since only in Acts xxvi. 7 is the Infm. Future found as the solitary variant of Cod. B], and none of the examples will occasion any difficulty, especially as it often depends upon the writer how he will view the action; as, Luke vi. 34 παρ' ὦν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν, Phil. ii. 23 τοῦτον ἐλπίζω πέμψαι, ὡς ἃν ἀπίδω π. vs. 19; 2 Jno. 12 ἐλπίζω γενέσθαι πρὸς υἱόν, 3 Jno. 14; Acts xxvi. 7; Rom. xv. 24; 1 Tim. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xvi. 7; 2 Cor. x. 15. 2 Likewise ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι is usually construed with the Inf. Aor.; as, 297 Mark xiv. 11 ἐπηγγέλθατο αὐτῷ δοῦναι, Acts iii. 18; vii. 5; similarly 348 δμημοι, Acts ii. 30 ὅρκῳ ὄμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ἀσφάλεις αὐτοῦ καθίσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου; on the other hand, see Inf. Fut. in

---

1 It is less probable that the Inf. Aor. is intended to designate the action as rapidly passing (Ilm. Soph. Aj. p. 160; Krüö. Dion. II. p. 101, and others); this element hardly comes to view in the case of a hope or a command.

2 For an Inf. Perf. after ἔλπιζω see 2 Cor. v. 11 ἔλπιζω καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναποθανέσθαι ὑμῶν πεφαρμόσθαι that I have been made manifest, where ἔλπιζω is not exactly equivalent to νομίζω, but indicates an impression still requiring confirmation; but the Inf. Perf. after the preceding πεφαρμόσθα needs no explanation. Cf. llad. 15, 110 ἄφη νῦν ἐπερωτή ἔρη τὸς πῦρ τοῦ ἁθανατοῦ, appropriately quoted by Mey. Further, cf. below (no. 7, end).
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Heb. iii. 18; Weber, Demosth. 830. After ἐκλεύειν the Inf. Aor. is more frequent than the Inf. Pres., the latter being used for the most part in reference to a continued action; as, Acts xvi. 22 ἐκλευον ῥαβδίζειν, xxiii. 35 ἐκλευος αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ πραϊτωρίῳ φιλάσσεσαί, xxiii. 5; xxv. 21 etc. Παρακαλέων has the Inf. Aor. in Rom. xii. 1; xv. 30; 2 Cor. ii. 8; Eph. iv. 1, etc.; but the Inf. Pres. in Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 1.

This explains also the use of the Inf. Aor. after ἔτοιμος and ἐν ἔτοιμῳ ἔχειν (in reference to the future), as in 2 Cor. x. 6; xii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 5; Acts xxii. 13, which is more frequent than the Inf. Pres. The former is on the whole rare in Greek authors; yet cf. Dion. H. III. 1536 (Joseph. antt. 12, 4, 2; 6, 9, 2). In the N.T. πρὶν also is uniformly used with the Inf. Aor.; and when πρὶν refers to the future, the Inf. Aor. has the meaning of the Fut. exact. See Hm. Eurip. Med. p. 343.

Whether in the N.T. the Inf. Aor. ever has the force of a Preterite, except in the use considered in 7 a., is questionable. In Rom. xv. 9 τὰ ἑκατεροί ἑλον δὲ ἐξ ἐκείνῳ τῶν θεῶν this might seem at first to be the case, as the Inf. depends on λέγω vs. 8 (Mdv. S. 187) and corresponds to a Perfect γεγυνήσθαι, while Paul would certainly have expressed continuous glorifying by a Present. Probably, however, he merely wished to express the act of glorifying without reference to time at all. Likewise in 2 Cor. vi. 1 it is not necessary to take δέησαν as a Preterite, as even Mey. does [yet not in the later editions], though the connection which Fr. Rom. III. 241 suggests between vi. 1 and v. 20 is somewhat far-fetched. Probably in later Greek the Inf. Perf. quite superseded the Inf. Aor. in such cases, as being more expressive; see p. 384 below, no. 7, end.

The Inf. Present is generally employed to express an action just taking place, or (in itself or its results) continuing, or frequently repeated; as, Jno. ix. 4 ἐμὲ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἐργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με, vii. 17 εάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θελήμα αὐτῶν ποιεῖν, xvi. 12 οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἅρπ., iii. 30; Acts xvi. 21; xix. 33; Gal. vi. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 25; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Tit. i. 11; Phil. i. 12. Hence it is used in general maxims; as, Luke xvi. 13 οὐδεὶς οἰκεῖς δύναται δουλεύειν, Mark ii. 19; Acts v. 29; Matt. xii. 2, 10; Jas. iii. 10, etc. Verbs of believing, are construed with the Inf. Pres. to express something which already exists or at least has already commenced (IIm. Soph. Oed. C. 91); as in 1 Cor. vii. 36; Phil. i. 17 (16). See Ast, Plat. legg. p. 204. As to ἐκλευεῖν with the Inf. Pres. see above.

If this distinction is not always rigorously observed where it might be expected, this may be explained by the circumstance that in many cases it depends entirely on the writer whether he
will represent an action as continuing, or as transient and occupying only a point of the past (cf. Luke xix. 5; Matt. xxii. 17); and by the fact that some writers are negligent in such matters. Hence in parallel passages we sometimes find the Inf. Aor. and Inf. Pres. employed in the same relation; as, Matt. xxiv. 24 cf. Mark xiii. 22; Matt. xiii. 3 cf. Luke viii. 5, also Jude 3. The like occurs even in the better Greek authors; as, Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 1 ἐλ τῷ βασιλέως δέοντο, τοὺς παίδας ἐκέλευν τοῦ Κύρου δείσας διαπράξασθαι αφίη: ὁ δὲ Κύρος, εἰ δέοντο αὐτῷ οἱ παίδες, περὶ παντὸς ἐποιεῖτο διαπράττεσθαι, 6, 1, 45 ὥν ἐμὲ ἐσάρχα πέμψαι, 46 ἐκέλευσεν πέμπτειν, 2, 4, 10 ὅσι τις βουλήται ἁγαθοίς συνεργοῖς ποιεῖσθαι ... οὐ δὲ δὴ τῶν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἔργας ποιήσασθαι τις βουλήτου συνεργοῖς προθῆκον (cf. Poppo in loc.), Demosth. Timoc. 466 a. μὴ ἔξειναι λύσασι μηδένα (νόμον), ἐὰν μὴ ἐν νομοθεταῖς, τότε δὲ ἔξειναι τῷ βουλημένῳ ... λύειν. Cf. also Arrian. Al. 5, 2, 6. We find a perceptible distinction, however, between the Inf. Pres. and the Inf. Aor. in parallel clauses e.g. in Xen. C. 5, 1, 2, 3; Mem. 1, 1, 14; Her. 6, 177 etc., see Mth. 944; Weber, Demosth. 195, 402. In the N. T. cf. Matt. xiv. 22 ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῶν χαίρεται ἐμβηκαί εἰς τὸ πλοῖον (quickly passing action) καὶ προάγειν (continued) αὐτῶν etc. Luke xiv. 30; Phil. i. 21. See in general Mactzner, 313 Antiphon p. 153 sq.

It appears, on the whole, that where the Inf. Pres. and Inf. Aor. may be used indiscriminately, the latter is the more common (as being the less definite), particularly after ἵνα possitum (Hm. Eur. suppl. p. 12 praeuf.), δώσατε, δυνατός εἰμι, θέλω, etc. In the Codd. of Greek authors the Inf. Pres. and Inf. Aor. are not unfrequently interchanged, see Xen. C. 2, 2, 13; Arrian. Al. 4, 6, 1; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 904, 941, etc. So likewise in the N. T., cf. Jno. x. 21; Acts xvi. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 35; 1 Thess. ii. 12.

The preceding remarks will also account for the use of the Inf. Aor. after hypothetical clauses, as in Jno. xxi. 25 ἀνα, ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἐν, oǐδε αὐτῶν οἴμαι τὸν κόσμον χαίρεσον non comprehensurum esse, where some unnecess. 350 sarily would insert ἦν; cf. Isocr. Trapez. 862; Demosth. Timoth. 702 a.; Thuc. 7, 28; Plat. Protag. 316 c. (in some of which cases, it is true, ἦν with the Opt. precedes). The expression is more confident (without ἦν), see Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 43; cf. Lössner, obs. p. 162 sq. The Inf. Fut. (that is, also without ἦν, cf. Hm. partic. ἦν p. 187) is not singular in such constructions, Isocr. ep. 3 p. 984.

As to the construction of ἀλλα, in particular, with the Inf., that verb in Greek authors is most frequently used with the Inf. Fut. (cf. also Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 206 sq.), more rarely with the Inf. Pres. (cf. Dion. H. IV. 2226, 8; Arrian. Al. 1, 20, 13; 5, 21, 1, and Krüger, Dion. p. 498).
This, however, is not very surprising as the notion of futurity is already implied in μέλλων, and the construction is analogous to that of ἔχειν. It is still more rarely used with the Inf. Aor. (Plat. apol. 30 b.; Isocr. Callim. p. 908; Thuc. 5, 98; Paus. 8, 28, 8; Ael. 3, 27). This last construction, indeed, some ancient grammarians (e.g. Phrynich. p. 336) pronounce to be un-Greek, or rather un-Attic; but they have been thoroughly confuted with a considerable number of undoubted examples by Böckh.

The Perfect Inf. is frequently employed, especially in narration, to denote a past event in its relation to present time; as, Acts xvi. 27 έμελλαν εἰαυτόν ἀναρέων, νομίζειν ἐκτεθεισάναι τοῖς δεσμίοις had fied, and accordingly were away, xxvii. 13 δοξάνσεις τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι they had (already) obtained their purpose (and were thus in possession of the advantages), viii. 11; xxvii. 9; xxvi. 32; Heb. xi. 3; Rom. iv. 1; xv. 8, 19; Mark v. 4; Jno. 314 xii. 18, 29; 2 Tim. ii. 18 (1 Pet. iv. 3) 2 Pet. ii. 21. In several of these passages, after verbs of saying, supposing, thinking, a Greek author would perhaps have considered the Inf. Aorist as sufficient, Mdv. 187. On these see p. 331 note 2; as to 1 Tim. vi. 17 see § 40, 4 a. p. 273.

8. That the N. T. writers sometimes (see below, p. 338 sq.) use ἦνα where, according to the syntax of (the written) Greek prose, simply the Inf. (Pres. or Aor., not the Perf.) should be expected, was correctly admitted by the earlier biblical philologists, but has been resolutely denied by Fr. (exc. I. ad Matt., yet see Rom. III. 230), whom Mey., and almost nobody else hitherto, has followed. In such phrases as the following, Matt. iv. 3 εἰπέ, ἦνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτος ἄρτοι γένωνται, xvi. 20 διεστειλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἦνα μηδενε εὑπωσιν etc., and particularly Mark v. 10 παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ, ἦνα μὴ αὐτοὺς ἀποστείλῃ etc., the original meaning of ἦνα might indeed be retained, and the phrases rendered: speak (a word of power), to the

1 On the other hand, Tittmann, Synon. II. 46 sq., Wohl (also in the Clar. apocryph. p. 273), and Bretschneider agree with me in the view for which I contend. Besides, compare Robinson, a Greek and English Lexicon of the N. T. (New York, 1850. 8vo.) p. 352 sq.
end that these stones become bread; he charged his disciples, to the end that they should tell no man; he besought him much, to the end that he would not send them away. Still, it would be strange, in the first place, that in so many passages, instead of the object of the entreaty or of the command, which was to be expected, the design should be stated, which in such connections usually merges itself in the object. Again, the possibility of the foregoing interpretation shows merely how close the affinity is in such a case between the design and the object, and how easily therefore ἵνα might have come to be employed to denote the latter. It is accordingly much simpler to believe that the later language, in accordance with its genius, resolved the more condensed construction with the Inf. into a separate clause and to some extent weakened the import of ἵνα, just as the Romans employed their ut after impero, persuadeo, rogo, inasmuch as the object of the command, request etc. is always something to be accomplished, and therefore the purpose of the person commanding or beseeching. Traces of this use of ἵνα already occur in writers of the κοινή. That is to say, in these writers, ἵνα after verbs of desiring and beseeching already begins to pass over into a that of the objective clause; as in Dion. II. I. 215 δεύσασθαι τής θυγατρός τής σής ἐμέλλων, ἵνα με πρὸς αὐτήν ἀγάγοι,II. 352 666 sq. κραυγῆ ... ἐγένετο καὶ δεύθως ... ἵνα μένῃ etc., Charit. 3, 1 ταρεκάλει Καλλιφόρνη ἵνα αὐτῷ προσέλθῃ, Arrian. Epict. 8, 28, 27 (see Schaeff. Melet. p. 121). In the Hellenistic writers this use is quite common; as, 2 Macc. ii. 8; Sir. xxxvii. 15; xxxviii. 14; 3 Esr. iv. 46; Joseph. antt. 12, 3, 2; 14, 9, 4; Ignat. Philad. p. 379; Cod. pseud epigr. I. 548, 671, 678, 780; II. 705; Act. Thom. 10, 24, 26; Acta apocr. p. 36. As to ἵνα after verbs of commanding

1 Weakened, because originally ἵνα was employed only where a direct design was to be expressed: I come, in order to help thee. Even worthy to be kept the earlier writers express not by ἵνα (Matt. viii. 8; Jno. i. 27; vi. 7, etc.), but by the Inf., perhaps with ἦσσε (Mth. 1238). But it does not follow that the weakened ἵνα yet coincides altogether with ἦσσε. It appears rather to be for the most part still recognizable as an extension of ek consilio ut. Hence there is no inconsistency in maintaining the above rule on one page, and on the next denying that ἵνα is to be considered as equivalent to ἦσσε (see § 53, 10).

2 Those who vehemently combat this view should at least confess that the use of ἵνα in the cases mentioned is not in accordance with the (older) prose diction of the Greeks. This is the least requirement of grammatical fairness.

3 A solitary instance in the earlier authors (Demosth. cor. 335 b.) is ἄδειον ἵνα.

4 In the Acts Luke has never employed this construction, but after ὅπως and παρακαλεῖν always uses the Inf., see viii. 31; xi. 23; xvi. 39; xix. 31; xxvii. 33. In the Gospel also he has in v. 3 the Inf. with ἔποιησε, which occurs also in Jno. iv. 40; 1 Thess. v. 12. Matthew usually connects παρακαλεῖν with the direct words of the individual entreatings.
and directing, \(^1\) see Hm. Orph. p. 814; cf. Leo Philos. (in epigrammat. gr. libb. 7, Frcf. 1600, fol. p. 3) εἰτέ καστιγνῆτη κρατεροῖς ἦνα βῆρας ἐγείρη, Malal. 3 p. 64; Basilic. I. 147, κελεύειν and θεωτείειν ἦνα (3 Esr. vi. 31; Malal. 10 p. 264), ἐπιτρέπειν ἦνα Malal. 10 p. 264, διδάσκειν ἦνα Acta Petri et Pauli 7.\(^2\) Accordingly in the N. T. also we may cease to insist on the strict force of ἦνα, and may render it in the following passages simply by that, just as in Latin praecipsum, rogavit, imploravit ut etc.: Luke x. 40 εἰπὼν αὐτῷ ἦνα μοι συναντι- λάβηται (iv. 3; Mark iii. 9; Jno. xi. 57; xiii. 34; xv. 17), 2 Cor. xii. 8 τόν κύριον παρεκάλεσα ἦνα ἀποστῆ ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ (Mark v. 18; viii. 22; Luke viii. 31; 1 Cor. i. 10; xvi. 12; 2 Cor. ix. 5), Mark xii. vii. 26 ἡρώτα αὐτοῦ ἦνα τὸ δαμ. ἐκβάλη (Jno. iv. 47; xvii. 15; Luke xvi. vii. 36), Luke ix. 40 ἐδέσθην τῶν μαθητῶν σου ἦνα ἐκβάλωσιν (xxii. 32), Phil. i. 9 προσεύχομαι ἦνα ἡ ωρᾶτη ὑμῶν ... προσευχή, b. Moreover, θέλειν ἦνα also simply means: will (wish) that,\(^3\) cf. 816 Arrian. Ep.1, 18, 14; Macar. hom. 32, 11; Cod. pseudopigr. I. 704; Thilo, Apocr. I. 546, 684, 706; Tdf. in the Verhandel. p. 141. If Matt. vii. 12 δος ἄν θέλητε ἦνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν means, wish with the design that they do, one cannot understand why θέλειν ἦνα did not become a common construction in the language, since θέλειν may 353 be always so taken. And ought Mark vi. 25 θέλω ἦνα μοι δόξ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου to be rendered: I will in order that thou give me? What is the proper object of choice here? Is it not the obtaining of John’s head? Why then that circumlocation? And how affected it would be to render Mark ix. 30 οὐκ ἦθελεν ἦνα τις γρφ. he would not, in order that any one should know! That nobody should know was precisely his object of choice. Cf. also Acts xxvii. 42 βουλῇ ἐγένετο, ἦνα τῶν δεσμῶτων ἀποκτείνωσι, Jno. ix. 22 συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἦνα ... ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται, xii. 10

1 In the N. T. κελεύειν is never construed with ἦνα.

2 An analogous construction is the Inf. with τὸν after verbs of beseeching, exhorting, commanding, as in Malal. 17, 422 πεπαγὰ ὑγραφα τοῖς αὐτοῖς πατρικῶι τοῦ φροντισθέντω τὴν πάλαι, 18, 440 κελεύει τοῦ δεσμῶκεν αὐτοῖς χάριν προεσκα παλα χρυσόν λειών εἰκος etc., 461 βῆτε τὸς βήμα τοῦ ἀτελῆς πάνθημον, p. 172. Index to Ducas in the Bonn ed. p. 639 sq.

3 Hence the modern Greek circumlocation for the Inf.: θέλω καὶ γράφω καὶ γράφω, for γράφειν, γράφω. In general how far modern Greek goes in its application of the particle καὶ — which occurs even in the Byzantine writers, e.g. Cananus (cf. also Bois- soneade, Anced. IV. 367) — a few passages from the Orthodox Confession will show: p. 20 (ed. Norman) πράτει, καὶ πατείτωμεν (p. 24, 30), p. 36 λέγεται καὶ καταιτί, p. 43 ἑσαυτοῦ καὶ διουλέστη (scrupled cf. Matt. i. 20), p. 113 ήμιστερεί καὶ δεχομεν, p. 211 ήθελε, ἀκούσας καὶ ἀνοικτὴσα, p. 235 ἔχουζε γρῆνα καὶ συνετέθηντο, p. 244 ἑιμνεσθαν χρυσοί εἰς ὅπωραν. In the above passages, therefore, the modern Greek translator has almost always retained the ἦνα in the form καὶ.
(Sir. xliv. 18), and, as an isolated instance of the commencement of such construction among the Greeks, Teles in Stob. serm. 95 p. 524, 40 ἵνα Ζεὺς γένηται ἐπιθυμήσει. Under this head comes also ποιεῖν ἵνα in Jno. xi. 37; Col. iv. 16; Rev. iii. 9 (analogous to ποιεῖν τὸ with Inf., see above, no. 4) and δίδοναι ἵνα in Mark x. 37; see Krebs in loc. Lastly,
c. In Matt. x. 25 ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ, ἵνα γένηται ὦς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, does the interpretation satis sit discipulo non superare magistrum, ut ei possit par esse redditus seem easy and agreeable? Cf. Jno. i. 27; vi. 7; Matt. viii. 8 (Inf. Matt. iii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 9; Luke xv. 19, etc.). In John iv. 34 ἐμὸν βρῶμα ἔστω, ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με does the use of ἵνα seem to be completely justified by the translation meus victus hoc continetur studio, ut Dei satisfaciam voluntati? In that case στουδάξεω ἵνα must have been the ordinary and most natural construction. That in Jno. xv. 8 the clause with ἵνα cannot express the design with which God glorifies himself (Mey.), has already been shown by Lücke; cf. also xvii. 3. To resolve also Matt. xviii. 6 συμφέρει αὐτῷ, ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὕμνος ... καὶ καταποντισθῇ etc. into συμ. αὐτῷ κρεμασθήναι μύλον ὑμ. ... ἵνα καταποντ. etc. (by an attraction), would, I greatly fear, be generally thought very forced. And Meyer's opinion is too manifestly a shift. See also Luke xvii. 2; 302 Jno. xi. 50; xvi. 7; 1 Cor. iv. 2, 3; Phil. ii. 2; likewise Luke i. 43 πόθεν μοι τούτο, ἵνα ἐλθῇ ἡ μητήρ τοῦ κυρίου etc., on which passage Hm. partic. ἐν p. 135 remarks: fuit haec labantis linguae quaedam incuria, ut pro infinitivo ista constructione utetur. In fact, in all these phrases every unprejudiced scholar must perceive that the clause with ἵνα contains what, in classical Greek, would have been expressed by the simple Inf. (Mth. 1235), just as in Latin (especially of the silver age) aequum est ut, mos est ut, expedit ut was employed, where the mere Inf. (as subject) would have been sufficient, see Zumpt S. 522. Sometimes the construction 317 with ἵνα and that with the Inf. are found connected, as in 1 Cor. ix. 15 καλὸν γὰρ μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν, ἢ τὸ καϋχημα μου ἵνα τινες κενῶση, where it is easy to perceive what led the apostle to alter the construction; yet in this passage the ἵνα is not fully established. Thus the traces of the ancient function of the particle of design still exhibited in the examples adduced under a., and even under b. also, have entirely disappeared in the passages last illus-

1 Analogous is Arr. Epictet. 1, 10, 8 πρῶτον ἔστω, ἵνα ἐγὼ κοιμηθῶ. Cf. besides, Acts apocr. p. 8, 15, 29.
trated. And so we see how modern Greek, gradually extending the usage, forms every Infin. by means of να. How far popular Greek had already declined in the second century, appears from many parts of Phryn., and in particular p. 15 sq. Lobeck's ed.

What Wytenbach, Plutarch. Mor. I. 409 Lips. (p. 517 Oxon.), has adduced from Greek authors to prove the alleged lax use of ἵνα for ὅτε, is not all to the point. In πείθειν ἵνα (Plut. apophth. 183 a.) the verb is not regarded as supplemented by the clause with ἵνα (by persuasion to effect that), but as independent: to speak persuasively in order that. Τί μοι τουόντο συνέγραψα, ἵνα τοιεύον ὁ λοκακεῖος ἱδονάς (Plut. fort. Alex. p. 333 a.) means: what hast thou discerned in me of the kind in order to flatter? that is, concisely: what could lead you to flatter me? In Adv. Colot. p. 1115 a. (240 ed. Tauchn.) ποῦ τῆς δοκίμου το βιβλίων ἔγραφεν, ἵνα ... μὴ τοῖς εἰκόνων συντάγμασιν ἄντιχρης, what was truly proper but result is attributed to the writer as design; so we too say: In what desert then did he write his book, to keep you from obtaining it? In Liban. decl. 17 p 472 οἴδηκεν ἵνα κρυφήτας πονηρός, ἵνα κρυφή τῆς Μακεδόνων δουλείας ἄξιος no slave is bad, in order to be judged worthy, — ἵνα is not used for ἵνα after an intensive (so bad as to be), but denotes the design which the slaves' πονηρία might have occasioned see § 53, 10, p. 461. These passages are not exactly parallel to the above constructions from the N.T., but they exhibit the gradual transition to them. The phrase ὅποι ὅπου does not come under this head, and the ὅτε also after verbs of beseeching, commanding, etc. (Matt. viii. 34; ix. 38; Luke vii. 3; x. 2; xi. 37; Acts xxv. 3; Phil. 6, etc.), which is not uncommon in Greek authors (Schaef. Demosth. III. 416; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 439; Holwerda, emendatt. Flav. p. 96 sq.), is usually otherwise explained, Mthh. 1231; Rost S. 648. Yet see Titt.-Th. mann, Synon. II. 59.

Further, John's use of ἵνα (cf. Lucke I. 603, II. 632 ff., 667 ff.) deserves special attention; in particular where ἵνα refers complementally to a demonstrative pronoun. Two cases are to be distinguished:

855 a. 1 Jno. iii. 11 αὕτη ἐστίν ἡ ἀγγελία, ἵνα ἀγαπήσων that we should love, vs. 23, cf. vi. 40. Here the telic force of ἵνα is clearly discernible (in the manner stated above p. 334 sq.), as in iv. 34 ἐρῶν βρῶμα ἐστίν ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμπαντος that I may do (strive to do), vi. 29. In these passages nobody will consider ἵνα as equivalent to ὅτε. On the other hand, b. Jno. xv. 8 ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατὴρ μου, ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρῃ is certainly equivalent to the construction with the Inf. (ἐν τῷ καρπῶν πολὺν 318 φέρειν ὑμᾶς). The same applies to xvii. 3 αὕτη ἐστίν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, ἵνα ἵνα ἐγνώσων etc., xv. 13; 1 Jno. iv. 17; 3 Jno. 4; like Luke i. 43 τόθεν μοι τούτῳ, ἵνα ἀδικήσῃ τῷ ἀληθείᾳ. To these may be added the

1 Schweigh. is wrong in adducing in his Lexic. Epictet. p. 356 the passage from Arrian. Epict. 2, 1, 1 as an instance of this construction.
phrase χρείαν ἔχειν ἵνα Jno. ii. 25; xvi. 30; 1 Jno. ii. 27 (Ev. apocr. p. 111) as well as Jno. xviii. 39. On the other hand, viii. 56 ἡγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ὑψι not he rejoiced in order to see; yet still less is it that (ὅτι) he saw, but that he should see; — a thought which, although ἵνα implies the idea of purpose (design), could hardly have been expressed in Greek by means of ὑπ' alone. In Jno. xi. 15 ὑπ' is simply a particle of design.

Finally, the construction ἔρχεται or ἑλπίζων ἢ ὅρα, ἵνα δοξασθῇ xii. 23; xiii. 1; xvi. 2, 32 means: the time is come in order to, that is, the time appointed for the purpose, that etc. True, in a Greek author in the same sense the Inf. ἐλθ. ἢ ὅρα (τοῦ) δοξασθήσαι, perhaps ὅτι ὅτι, would have been employed. Cf. Ev. apocr. p. 127.

As to Rom. ix. 6 όχι ὅποιον ὅτι ἔποντωσεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, where a clause with ὅτι seems to be used as a periphrasis for the Inf., see § 64, I. 6.

Note 1. It sometimes appears as if the Inf. Act. were used for the Inf. Pass. (d’Orville, Charit. p. 526) e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 9 περὶ τῆς φιλαδελφίας σὺ χρείαν ἔχεις γράφειν ψιν (Heb. v. 12), but v. 1 σὺ χρείαν ἔχεις ψιν γράψεις; cf. also Heb. vi. 6. Both constructions, however, are equally proper, (Active, ye have no need to write to you, that is, that I (one) write to you; as if: ye have no need of one’s writing etc.) In such connections the Inf. Act. is perhaps even more frequent in classical Greek; see Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. p. 151 Lips.; Jacobs, Philostr. Imag. 620, also as respects χρή and δόθ. In particular, Weber, Demosth. 306. Cf. especially Theodoret. II. 1528; IV. 566.

Note 2. ὅτι occurs with the Inf. in Acts xxvii. 10 θεορῶν ὅτι μετὰ πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον τ. φορτίων καί τ. πλοίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν μιλλαν ἐσώθαι τῶν πλοίων (cf. Xen. Hell. 2, 2, 2 ἀείως, ὅτι, ἄρα δὲ πλοίον συνηλησίων 304 ἐς τὸ ἀστὺ, βατοῦ τῶν ἑπτήδεων ἐνδεικνύων ἐσώθαι, Cyr. 1, 6, 18; 2, 4, 15; ταῦτα Αν. 3, 1, 9; Plato, Phaed. 63 c.; Thuc. 4, 87), which is a blending of two 356 constructions (Plin. Vig. 500): μιλλαν ἐσώθαι τῶν πλοίων and ὅτι μιλλα ἐσώθαι ὁ πλοῖος. So especially after verbs sentiendi and dicendi, Schaef. ad Bast. ep. crit. p. 36; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 479; Wyttenuh. Plutarch. Moral. I. 54; Boissonade, Philostr. 284 and Aen. Gaz. p. 230; Fritzche, quaest. Lucian. p. 172 sq. This so frequently occurs in the best authors (even in short sentences, Arrian. Al. 6, 26, 10), that it almost ceased to be felt by the Greeks as an anacoluthon, and to the ὅτι may be attributed merely a vis monstrandi, as when it introduces the oratio directa, cf. Klotz, Devar. 319 p. 692. (Similarly ἵνα with the Inf. 3 Esr. vi. 31.)

Note 3. A trace of the Hebrew Inf. Absol. presents itself from the Sept. in Matt. xv. 4 θανάτῳ τελευτάω (Exod. xix. 12; Num. xxvi. 65), and in the diction of the N. T. itself in Rev. ii. 23 ἐποκτενῶ ἐν θανάτῳ (cf. ταύτῃ τιν), and Luke xxi. 15 ἐπιθύμησα ἐκθέσθαι etc. So frequently in the

1 The Subjunctive excludes the possibility of taking ἵνα in these cases for when (Hoeye. part. I. 525 sq.); as, otherwise, it would be necessary to regard the Subj. Aor. as exactly equivalent to the Fut. (Lab. Phryn. 723). Yet see Tittmann, Synon. II. 49 sq.
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Sept. the Inf. Absol. is expressed by the Ablative of a nomen conjugat. annexed to a verb, in a manner not altogether foreign to the Greek idiom (§ 54, 3), as in Gen. xli. 15; xliii. 2; i. 24; Exod. iii. 16; xi. 1; xviii. 18; xxi. 20; xxii. 16; xxi. 24; Lev. xix. 20; Num. xxii. 80; Deut. xxiv. 15; Zeph. i. 2; Ruth ii. 11; Judith vi. 4 (test. patr. p. 634). See, in general, Thiersch p. 169 sq. How in still other passages the Sept. expresses the Inf. Absol., see below, § 45, 8, p. 364.

Note 4. There is nothing singular in a concurrence of several Infinitives in a single sentence, one depending on another, somewhat as in 2 Pet. i. 15 σπουδάσω εκάστοτε ἵξειν ὑμᾶς ... τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι. In Greek authors three Infinitives not unfrequently occur thus in immediate succession; Weber, Demosth. 351.

§ 45. THE PARTICIPLE.

1. The verbal character of the Participle appears, partly in its directly governing the same case as its verb (Luke ix. 16 λαβῶν τοὺς ἄρτους, 1 Cor. xv. 57 τῇ διδότι ἡμῖν τὸ νῦκος, Luke viii. 3 εκ τῶν ἱππαρχόντων αὐτῶν, 2 Cor. i. 23 φειδόμενος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἤθικον, 1 Cor. vii. 31; Heb. ii. 3; Luke xxii. 4; ix. 32, etc.); partly in its regularly retaining the element of time, which can be done more completely in Greek than in Latin and German on account of its copiousness in participial forms. The temporal force of the participles corresponds, moreover, to the observations made in § 40 upon the separate tenses.

The simple and ordinary use of the Participle is exemplified,

a. of the Present, in Acts xx. 23 τὸ πνεῦμα διαμαρτύρεται μοι λέγον etc., Rom. viii. 24 ἐλπὶς βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπὶς, 1 Thess. ii. 4 θεοί τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας, 1 Pet. i. 7 χρυσίου τοῦ ὑπολλυμένου, Heb. vii. 8 — something now present or uniformly occurring at all times (Schoem. Plut. Agid. p. 158; Schaeff. Plut. V. 211 sq.).

b. of the Aorist, in Col. ii. 12 τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος Χριστῶν 305 εκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Rom. v. 16 δὲ ἐνος ἀμαρτήσαντος (something that occurred once by itself), Acts ix. 21.

c. of the Perfect, in Acts xxi. 3 ἀνὴρ γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ (past facts still operative), Jno. xix. 35 ὁ ἐφορακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν, Matt. xxvii. 37 ἐπέθηκαν ... τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην, Acts xxiii. 3; 1 Pet. i. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 6; Jno. v. 10; vii. 15; Eph. iii. 18.

d. of the Future (rare in the N. T.) in 1 Cor. xv. 37 οὐ τὸ σῶμα 320 τὸ γεννησόμενον στείρεις, viewed from the past, Heb. iii. 5 Μωίσης θαύμα.
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πιστῶς ... ὡς θεράπων εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων of those things which were to be spoken (revealed); cf. Acts viii. 27; xxiv. 11; Luke xxii. 49.

Moreover, the Present Participle is used a) for the Imperf. in connection with a past tense; as, Acts xxv. 3 παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν αὐτοῦ μενειν χάριν, Rev. xv. 1 εἶδον ἄγγελον ἐπτά εἶχοτας πληγάς, Heb. xi. 21 Ἡσαΐας ἀποθνῄσκον ... ἡνιῶτηνεν, Acts vii. 26 ὀφθή αὐτοῖς μαχομένως, xviii. 5; xx. 9; xxi. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 28; 2 Cor. iii. 7 (Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 264); also of a continued state of things, Acts xix. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 5. b) of that which will immediately or infallibly occur; as, Matt. xxvi. 28 τὸ αἷμα τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυτόμενον, vi. 30 τὸν χόρτον αὐρίων εἰς κλάβανον βαλλόμενον, 1 Cor. xv. 57; Jas. v. 1. Accordingly, ὃ ἐρχόμενος used of the Messiah, κριτικός, is not venturus, but he that cometh (the coming one), he of whom it is firmly believed that he is coming, Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19, etc.

Likewise ὅν, joined to a Preterite or an adverb of time, is not infrequently an Imperfect Participle; as, Jno. i. 49; v. 13; xi. 31, 49; xxi. 11; Acts vii. 2; xi. 1; xviii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 28; 2 C. viii. 9; Eph. ii. 13 ὦ νῦν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμᾶς οἱ ποτε δύνατες etc. Col. i. 21; 1 Tim. i. 13 μὴ τὸ πρότερον ὄντα βλασφημον. Cf. Aristot. rhet. 2, 10, 13, πρὸ τοὺς μυριστῶν ὄντας, Lucian. dial. mar. 13, 2 ὃς ἐγλεούσας ὑπέρποτης πρὸτερον 358 ὅν. But in Jno. iii. 13 ὅν (see Lücke and BCruis. in loc.) means : who (essentially) is in heaven, who belongs to heaven.1 The same applies to i. 18. But ix. 25 ἃν τυφλὸς ὅν ἀπὶ βλέπως is probably: I being blind (from my infancy), a blind man: only in so far as a reference to a previous condition is included in ἀπί, can it perhaps also be translated, whereas I was. An undoubted Present occurs in 1 Cor. ix. 19 ἠλεύθερος ὅν ἐκ πάντων πᾶσιν ἐλαυνον ἐδούλωσα being free (though I am free), I made myself servant (the Apostle's ἠλεύθερα was something permanent). On the other hand, in Rev. vii. 2 εἶδον ... ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα (which Eichhorn strangely enough declared to be a solecism) I saw him ascend (while he was ascending) an Imperf. Part. is quite appropriate, as denoting something not at the moment completed. But in xiv. 13 ἀναβαίνοντες can only be the Present Part.

In many passages formerly the Present Part. was improperly taken for the Future, in most of which the force of the Present is quite sufficient: 306 in connection,

1 'Ο ὅν ἐν τῷ ὦμ., in the signification of qui erat in coelo, would nearly coincide in sense with ὃ ἐκ τοῦ ὄπερ καταβᾶς. It must here, however, denote something special and more emphatic, and a climax in these predicates is not to be overlooked. Yet ὃ ὅν does not form a third predicate co-ordinate with the two others, but is, as Lücke correctly observes, explanatory of the predicate ὃ ὃς τοῦ ἀφρ. 
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a. with a Pres. or Imperat., as Rom. xv. 25 τορεύομαι διακονών τοὺς ἀγίους (the διακονών begins simultaneously with the journey), 1 Pet. i. 9 ἐγκαλλαίσθη ... κομιζόμενοι as receiv ing (they are so already in the assurance of faith), Jas. ii. 9. As to 2 Pet. ii. 9 see Huther.

b. with an Aor. (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 234), as 2 Pet. ii. 4 παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τρωμάτων as those who are kept (contemplated from a present point of view), Acts xxii. 2 εὕροντες πλοῦν διακριστὸν εἰς Φωκίαν on her passage to, bound for (Xen. Eph. 3, 6 in.), Luke ii. 45 ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερού. ἀνά·ζητοντες αὐτὸν seeking him (which began already on the way back), Mark viii. 11; x. 2 (Fut. Part. in reference to an action only purposed, Acts xxiv. 17; xxv. 13).

c. with a Perf., as Acts xv. 27 ἀπεστάλκαμεν Ἰουδαῖον καὶ Σιλαν... ἀπαγγέλλοντας ταῖς αὐτῶν announcing, with the announcement (they assumed the character of announcers simultaneously with their entrance on their journey), 1 Cor. ii. 1; Demosth. Dionys. 739 c.; Pol. 28, 10, 7. In 2 Pet. iii. 11 τοῖς πάντως λυμέρων means, since all these things are dissolving, that is, are by their nature destined for dissolution; the doom of dissolution is already as it were inherent in them. Λυμερομένων would express only mere futurity: as their dissolution will at some time take place. The Apostolic (Pauline) terms οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, οἱ σωζόμενοι (subst.) denote: those who are perishing, those who are becoming saved etc., not merely at some future time but already, inasmuch as they refused to believe and therefore are the prey of eternal death. As to Acts xxi. 3, see no. 5.

d. with a Conjunct.exhortat., as Heb. xiii. 13 ἐξηράμεθα ... τὸν ὑνεκαριόν αὐτοῦ φέροντες, where the bearing etc. is annexed directly to the ἐξηρά-, whereas the Fut. Part. would have removed it to some indefinite and distant time. Cf. also 1 Cor. iv. 14.

Still less can the Pres. Part. take the place of the Aorist. In 2 Cor. x. 14 οὐ γὰρ ὡς μὴ ἐφικνοῦμεν εἰς ὑμᾶς ὑπερεκτείνομεν εἰπτὸς means: as though we reached not unto you (which, however, is the case). In 2 Pet. ii. 18 ἀποφεύγοντος, which Lchm. has already adopted, denotes that the escaping has only just begun; such persons are most likely to be misled. As to Eph. ii. 21 and iv. 22, see Meyer.

The Aorist Part., in the course of a narration, expresses either a simultaneous action (Krü. 155), Acts i. 24 προσευχάμενοι εἰπτὸν praying they said (the prayer follows), Rom. iv. 20; Eph. i. 9; Col. ii. 13; Phil. ii. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 5; or a previously past action, where we should expect the Plup., Matt. xxii. 25 ὁ πρῶτος γαμήσας ἐτελεύτησε, Acts v. 10; xiii. 51; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Eph. i. 4 f.; ii. 10. If the principal verb refers to something future, the Aor. Part. is equivalent to the Latin Fut. exact.; as, 1 Pet. ii. 12 ὡς ... ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύσαντες δοξάσωσι τῶν θεῶν, iii. 2; Eph. iv. 25 ἀποδέμενοι τῷ ψεüδος λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν, Mark xiii. 13; Acts xxiv. 25;
Rom. xv. 28; Heb. iv. 8; Hm. Vig. 774. Likewise the Perf. Part.
has sometimes in narration the sense of a Plup.; as, Jno. ii. 9 i' 
διάκονοι ἤδειαν ὦ ἡμεληκότες, Acts xviii. 2 εὐρὼν Ἰουδαίον ... προ-
φάτως ἐξηλιθῆτα ἀπὸ τ. Ἰταλίας, Heb. ii. 9; Rev. ix. 1.

The Aor. Part. never stands for the Fut. Part.:—not in Jno. xi. 2
(where the Evangelist alludes to an event long past, which he narrates
for the first time in chap. xii.); also not in Heb. ii. 10, where ἀγαγόντα 307
refers to Christ sojourning in the flesh, who even while on earth led many 8th ed.
to glory (a work which began with his very appearance). As to Heb. 322
ix. 12 see below, 6. It is a misuse of parallel passages to translate Mark
xvi. 2 ἀνατελέντως τοῦ ἥλιου: as the sun rose (so Ebrard still), because
Jno. xx. 1, cf. Luke xxiv. 1, has σκοτιάν ἐκ οὐσιά. Such minute discrep-
ancies in the gospels one must have the courage to tolerate. As to Jno.
vi. 33, 50 ἄρτος δὲ καταβαίνων εἰ τοῦ ὄφανος, compared with ἄρτος δὲ καταβάς
εἰ τοῦ ὄφανος in verses 41, 51, see Lücke. Neither is the Aor. Part. used
for the Perf. Part. in 1 Pet. i. 13.

The Perf. Pass. Part. κατεγωγόμενος in Gal. ii. 11 is erroneously rendered 360
reprehendendus. According to grammar and the context it means blamed,
see Mey. Likewise in Rev. xxx. 8 ἵππειν γυμνὸς is abominated. On the
other hand, in Heb. xii. 18 the Pres. Part. ψηλαφομένον denotes touchable,
for what is touched has the property of touchableness, as τὰ βλεψόμενα

Aor. and Perf. Participles are connected and the distinction between
them maintained: 2 Cor. xii. 21 τῶν προπαραγωγῶν κ. μη μετανοησάτων,
1 Pet. ii. 10 οί οὐκ ἡλευδοῦσιν διὰ ἀληθείας (Sept.) — the former denoting
a state, the latter a fact. As to 1 Jno. v. 18 see Lücken; cf. Ellendorf, Arrian.
Al. i. 129. The connection of the Pres. Part. and the Aor., as in Jno.
xxi. 24; Heb. vi. 7, 10, or of the Perf. Part. and the Pres., as in Col. ii. 7,
in a single proposition, hardly requires to be mentioned.

2. As respects grammatical construction, the Participle is used
either a. as a complement to the principal clause, as in Matt.
xix. 22 ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος (Rost 701); or b. it forms for the
sake of periodic compactness a secondary clause, and can be re-
olved by a relative or by a conjunction (Rost 708; Mth. 1311 ff.),
Jno. xv. 2 πῶν κλήμα μη φέρον καρπῶν which does not bear fruit,
Rom. xvi. 1 συνιστήμη Φοίβην, οὔσαν διάκονον, Luke xvi. 14 etc.;
Rom. ii. 27 ἢ άκροβυστία τῶν νόμων τελείος ἢ ταύτα παρέχειν ἢ ἢ (thereby, that it)
suffice, Acts v. 4 οὐκέλευθος σοι ἑμενε; when it remained (unsold),
did it not remain thine? Rom. vii. 3; 2 Pet. i. 4; 1 Tim. iv. 4
(Xen. M. 1, 4, 14; 2, 3, 9; Plat. Symp. 208 d.; Schaeff. Melet.
p. 57; Mth. 1314), Acts iv. 21 ἀπέλυσαν αὐτῶν μηδὲν εὐρίσκομεν;
etc. because they found nothing, 1 Cor. xi. 29; Heb. vi. 6 (Jude 5;
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Jas. ii. 25), Xen. M. 1, 2, 22; Lucian. dial. m. 27, 8; Rom. i. 32 οὕτως τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγρύντες οὐ μόνον etc. though they knew etc. (had become well aware), 1 Cor. ix. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 6; Jas. iii. 4 etc.; cf. Xen. M. 3, 10, 13; Philostr. Apoll. 2, 25; Lucian. dial. m. 26, 1. Most frequently in narration the Participle is to be resolved by a particle of time; as, 2 Pet. ii. 5 δύονον Νῶε ... ἐφύλαξεν, κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἐπάγας, as (when) he brought upon the world, Luke ii. 45 μὴ εὑρότες ὑπέστρεψαν after they had not found, Phil. ii. 19; Acts iv. 18 καλέσαντες αὐτοῦς παρῆγγειλαν, Matt. ii. 3; Acts xxi. 28 ἐπέβαλον ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τὰς χειρὰς κράζοντες while they cried etc., Rom. iv. 20 ἐνεδυνάμωθη τῇ πίστει δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ etc.

361 When Particiles are used limitatively (although), this import is often 308 indicated by καίτοι or καίτερ prefixed, as in Philh. iii. 4; Heb. iv. 3; v. 8; 6th ed. vii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 12; cf. Xen. C. 4, 5, 32; Plat. Protag. 318 b.; Diod. S. 323 3, 7; 17, 39. Sometimes this meaning is made prominent by an antithetical ὁμος (Krti. 202), 1 Cor. xiv. 7 ὅμοι τὰ ἀφυα φωνὴν διόντα ... ἐκ διαστολῆ ὁ δὲ, τῶς γνωσθῆσατο τὸ αὐλοῖμον etc. things without life, although giving out sound, will nevertheless not be understood, unless etc.

3. The connecting of two or more Particiles in different relations (co-ordinate or subordinate one to another) without the copula καί with one and the same principal verb, is particularly frequent in the narrative style. This takes place not only,

a. When one Particile precedes, and another follows, the finite verb, as Luke iv. 35 πέθανεν αὐτὸ τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς μέσον ἐξήλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, μήδεν βλάψαν αὐτὸν throwing him down (after he had thrown him down), the evil spirit came out of him without doing him any harm, x. 30; Acts xiv. 19; xv. 24; xvi. 28; Mark vi. 2; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Tit. ii. 12 f.; Heb. vi. 6; x. 12 f.; 2 Pet. ii. 19 (Lucian. Philops. 24, and Peregr. 25); but more frequently,

b. When the Particiles immediately follow one another without a copula, as Matt. xxviii. 2 ἀγγέλως κυρίον καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλιε τὸν λίθον etc., Acts v. 5 ἀκούων Ἀνανίας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, πεσὼν ἐξέφυμε, Luke ix. 16 λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ... ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν, 1 Cor. xi. 4 πάς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων κατὰ κεφαλὴς ἔχων, κατασχύνει etc. every man that prayeth or prophesieth with his head covered etc., Luke vii. 37 f.; xvi. 23; xxiii. 48; Acts xiv. 14; xxi. 2; xxv. 6; Mark i. 41; v. 25-27; viii. 6; Col. i. 3 f. εὐχαριστοῦμεν ... προσευχό- μενοι ... ἀκούαμεν while we pray, ... since (after) we heard, 1 Thess. i. 2 f.; Heb. i. 3; xi. 7; xii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 58; Jno. xiii. 1 f.; Col.
ii. 13; Phil. ii. 7; Philem. 4; Jude 20, etc. Nothing is more frequent in Greek authors, cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 6, 8; Cyr. 4, 6, 4; Plato, rep. 2, 366 a.; Goerg. 471 b.; Strabo 3, 165; Lucian. asin. 18; Alex. 19; Xen. Eph. 3, 5; Alciphr. 3, 43 in.; Arrian. Al. 3, 30, 7; see Heindorf, Plat. Protag. p. 562; Hm. Eurip. Io p. 842; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. § 32, and Plat. Euthyphr. p. 27; Apol. p. 46 sq.; Boiss. Aristænæt. p. 257; Jacob ad Lucian. Tox. p. 48; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 322, etc. (In several passages sometimes a smaller and sometimes a greater number of Codd. have the copula καὶ, as in Acts ix. 40; Mark xiv. 22, etc."

The Particles stand otherwise related to each other in Luke ii. 12 εἰσῆκεν βρέφος ἵππαργαγωγάν εἰς φάτνῃ γε ἰσταινίαν 362 swaddled, lying in a manger, where the first Part. takes the place of an adjective.

4. When the Participle is employed merely as a complement or predicate, it fills sometimes the office discharged in Latin and German by the Inf. (Rost 694 ff.), viz. in the well-known phrases:

a. Acts v. 42 οὐκ ἔταυντο διδάσκοντες (xiii. 10; Heb. x. 2; Rev. iv. 8), Acts xii. 16 ἔτημενε κροίων, Luke vii. 45 (2 Macc. v. 27), 2 Pet. i. 19 ὁ καλῶς προεύθεντες, Acts x. 38; xv. 29; Phil. iv. 14; 3 Jno. 6 (Plato, symp. 174 e.; Phaed. 60 c.; Her. 5, 24, 26), 309 2 Pet. ii. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 13; b. Mark xvi. 5 εἰδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον, Acts ii. 11 ἠκούσαντο λαλοῦντων αὐτῶν, vii. 12; Mark xiv. 58. Logically, the Participle is in these instances as appropriate, at least, as the Infinitive; the Greeks used the former to mark a nice distinction which other nations failed to note. Οὐκ ἔταυντο διδάσκοντες is, teaching (or, as teachers) they did not cease; εἰδον καθήμενον they saw him (as one) sitting. The Part. denotes an action or a state already existing, not first occasioned or produced by the principal verb; see, in general, Mtth. 1228; Krü. 191 ff. ²

We further specify the following instances as of less frequent occurrence: Under a. 1 Cor. xiv. 18 εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ πάντων ἰμῶν μᾶλλον γῆς σωματικῶς λαλῶν (rec.) 8 that I speak (as one . . .

² Lchrm. and Tdf. on the authority of many uncial Codd. [Sin. also] give λαλῶ; then we have two unconnected clauses side by side: I thank God, I speak more than you all (for that I speak more than you all), cf. Bornæm. Xen. conv. p. 71. The Cod. Alex. omits both λαλῶ and λαλῶ.
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speaking), cf. Her. 9, 79; Acts xvi. 34 ἔγγαλλώσατο πεπιστευκὼς τῷ θεῷ ( Eurip. Hipp. 8; Soph. Phil. 882; Lucian. paras. 3; fug. 12; Dion. H. IV. 2238); but Rom. vii. 13 does not come under this head, see Rück. cf. Heusing. Plut. paedag. p. 19; Under b. Luke viii. 46 ἐγὼ ἐγροῦν δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθεῖν (Thuc. 1, 25 γνώντες ... οὐδεμίαν σφίσων ἀπὸ Κερκύρας τιμωρίαν οὖσαν, Xen. C. 1, 4, 7, see Monk, Eurip. Hipp. 304 and Alcest. 152), 1 Heb. 363 xiii. 23 γνώσκετε τὸν ἀδέλφον Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον ἵνα θεω that ... is set at liberty, Acts xxiv. 10 εἰ πολλῶν ἐτῶν δύτα σε κριτῷ τῷ ἐθνεί τούτῳ ἐπιστάμενος, cf. Demosth. ep. 4 p. 128 et al. (but in Luke iv. 41 ἴδεις τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, where also in Greek prose the Participle would probably have been employed, cf. Mehlhorn in Allg. L. Z. 1883, no. 110, yet see Eimsley, Eurip. Med. 580), 2 Τιμ. 7 οἱ μὴ ὄρμολογοντες Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, 1 Τιμ. iv. 2 τινεῦμα δ’ ὄρμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐνθυμήσεται. 2 As to verbs dicendi with a Part. see Mtt. 1289; 310 Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 109. In Greek prose the verb αἰσχύνεσθαι also is especially so used, e.g. Xen. C. 3, 2, 16 αἰσχυνομέθ’ ἐν σοι 325 μὴ ἀπὸδιδόντες, 5, 1, 21 αἰσχύνομαι λέγον, Mem. 2, 6, 39; Dioz. L. 6, 8; Liban. oratt. p. 525 b. Yet just here we see with what propriety the Participle is chosen in the cases just noted. For this verb is also construed in Greek authors with the Inf. But there is an essential difference between the two constructions; see Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 286 sq. 8 The Part is used only when a person is now doing (or has done) something of which he (at the moment of acting) is ashamed; but the Inf., when shame in view of something to be done (but not yet actually performed) is to be expressed (cf. e.g. Isocr. ad Philipp. p. 224, and big. p. 842; Xen. M. 3, 7, 5). Luke, observing this distinction, has written correctly xvi. 8 ἐπιτείνα αἰσχύνομαι to beg I am ashamed (Sir. iv. 26; Sus. 11); had the speaker already begun to beg, ἐπιτείνων αἰσχύνομαι must have been used. Ἀρχηγαῖ is uniformly in the N. T., and commonly in Greek authors, construed with the Infin., as he began speaking is less appropriate than he continued speaking. Yet see Rost 698.

1 Eph. iii. 19 γνῶν τὴν ἐπερβάλλουσαν τὴν γνώσεις ἐκπέμπῃ τοῦ Χριστοῦ cannot be referred to this head, as many expositors refer it; for the Part., by its position between the article and substantive, is too clearly marked as an adjective. For another reason, also, Phil. ii. 28 ἐν ἑαυτῶν εἰς τὸν πάλιν χαιρεῖτε must not be referred to the above construction. The sense is: that ye, beholding him, may again rejoice.

2 The passage of Isocr. Pancg. c. 8, usually adduced as a parallel (even still by Mth. 1299), was corrected by Pier. Wolf, cf. Baiter in loc. Weber, Demosth. p. 278, discusses another matter.

8 With τυπάδεναι both constructions coincide; see Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 145.
§ 45. The Participle.

 Ἀκούων, which also is occasionally construed with a predicative Part.,
and that not merely in the literal sense of immediate hearing as in Rev.
v. 13; Acts ii. 11, but also in that of learning, being informed (through
others) as in Luke iv. 23; Acts vii. 12; 2 Thess. iii. 11 ἀκούομαι τῶν
περιπατοῦντας etc., 3 Jno. 4 (Xen. C. 2, 4, 12),¹ is in the latter sense fre-
quently construed with ἵµαρτε, once [by Paul] with the Acc. with the Inf.,
1 Cor. xi. 18 ἀκοίνος σχῆματα ἐν ὑµῖν ἱπάρχων (ὑπάρχοντα), [once also by
John, xii. 18 ἰκουσαν τῷ τοῦτο αὐτῶν πεποιηκέναι τῷ σημείον]; cf. Xen. C. 1,
3, 1; 4, 16. The construction is different in Eph. iv. 22 if ἀκοίνοις
ὑµᾶς ... τὸν παλαιὸν ἄθροισιν depends on ἰκουσαν or ἰκουσάθητε in vs. 21
(that ye must put off); see § 44, 3, p. 322.

The use of the Part. examined in this section is in Greek authors, even
prose writers, much more diversified than in the N. T. (see Jacobs, Anthol.
Hec. p. 31). The construction of παρεσκευαί with the Inf. is disapproved
even by ancient grammarians, though erroneously, see Schaeff. Apoll. Rhod.
II. 223; Ast, Theophr. char. p. 223 sq.

Also in 1 Tim. v. 13 ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀργαὶ μαθήματος περιερχόμενοι: the
Part. is by nearly all recent expositors thought to be used for the Inf.: 
they learn (accustom themselves) (to be) going about idle etc. This gives
a suitable meaning. But in all cases where the Part. joined to μαθήματων
refers to the subject, that verb signifies to perceive, comprehend, observe,
remark something which is already existing, as in Her. 3, 1 διαβεβλημένος
ὑπὸ Ἀμάσιος ὃν μαθήματος (see Vaickien. in loc.), Soph. Antig. 532; Aesch.
Prom. 62; Thuc. 6, 39; Plut. paed. 8, 12; Dion. II. IV. 2238; Lucian.
326 dial. d. 16, 2; ² but in the sense of learn it is used with the Inf., Phil. iv. 11
also 1 Tim. v. 4; ³ Mth. 1228. The preceding construction, then, must
have been incorrectly extended beyond the proper bounds. Perhaps,
however, μαθ. is to be connected with ἀργαί, and περιερχόμενοι to be taken
as a proper Part. (they learn idleness, going about etc.). Ἀργαί μ. would
then be a concise expression, like what sometimes occurs elsewhere also
with an adjective (Plat. Euthyd. 276 b. ὁ ἄλοχος ἄρα σοφοὶ μαθήματος,
and more frequently διδάκτων τοῖα σοφῶν), which does not like the Part.
include the notion of tense or mood.⁴ This exposition, which Deza,
Piscator, and others adopted and which Luther has recently approved, is
supported by this, that in the sequel ἀργαί is repeated as the leading word,
and to the climax φλιάσον καὶ περιέργος a Part. is likewise annexed, λαλοῦσαι
τὰ μὴ διώνα.

¹ Cf. Rosé, in his griech. Wörterb. I. 143.
² In Xen. C. 6, 2, 29 ἔστω ἐν μάθημαν ἐφοδοτάται γεγομένοι (a passage which would not
be altogether decisive), λαλοῦσα was long ago substituted for μάθημαν.
³ Matthies has passed over the grammatical difficulty in silence. Leo, after Casebon.
ad Athen. p. 453, would render μαθήματος by solent; but he has not observed that this
meaning belongs only to the Preterite.
⁴ Under this head comes also Dio Chr. 55, 558 ἰσόρροπης ὃτι μὴν τὰ ἵμαρτε ἀλοχὸς
ὅτι τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς τέχνην, ἀπόκτησεν (Socrates learned as stone-cutter etc.).
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A verb of the kind specified under a. is once construed with an Adjective—which cannot be thought strange, Acts xxvii. 33 τεσσαρεσκαδέκατην

Some erroneously think the Part. used for the Inf. in 1 Tim. i. 12 πιστῶν
με γῆσατο θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν. The meaning is: he counted me faith-
ful, in that he appointed me to the ministry (by that very act showing that
he counted me faithful). In another sense, indeed, θέσθαι εἰς διακονίαν
might also have been employed.

5. Present participles are frequently used (in the narrative
style) with the verb εἶναι, and in particular with ἦν or ἦσαν (yet
also with the Fut.):—sometimes, as it seems, simply for the cor-
responding person of their finite verb (Aristot. metaphor. 4, 7;
Blidly. 334), as in Mark xiii. 25 οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐσονται
πιντοντες (where immediately follows, as a parallel clause, καὶ
ἀι δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται,—Matt. has πεσοῦνται),
Ias. i. 17 πάν δώρημα τέλειον ἀνωθέν ἔστι καταβαίνων etc., Luke v. 1;
Acts ii. 2; sometimes, and indeed more frequently, to express con-
tinuance (rather than an act), which might also be indicated,
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dial. mar. 6, 2), v. 5, 11 (Hm. Soph. Philoct. p. 219) ii. 6; Luke 366 ii. 8; xxiv. 58; Mark xiv. 4 ἥσαν τινες ἄρανακτοὺς there were some (present) who had indignation; or the Part. has assumed rather the nature of an adjective, as in Matt. xix. 22 ἣν ἔχων κτήματα he was possessed of property, ix. 36; Luke i. 20 (cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 34). Perhaps also the verbal idea was sometimes dissected into a Part. and Subst. verb in order to give it in the form of a noun more prominence (Mdv. 204), 2 Cor. v. 19 (see Mey.), 1 Cor. xiv. 9; Col. ii. 23. In Luke vii. 8 ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ἵπτε ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος the Part. appears to be not directly dependent on εἶναι, but an epithet belonging to a substantive. In Jno. i. 9 ἢν ... ἐρχόμενον are not to be taken together, but ἐρχόμενον belongs as an attributive to ἄνθρωπον, see Meyer. Moreover, this use of the Pres. Part. is not uncommon in Greek authors; and they (particularly Herodot.) employ thus the other Participles also besides the Pres., cf. Eurip. Herc. fur. 312 sq. εἰ μὲν οἴνον τῶν ἐμῶν βραχίων ἢν τὺς ὑβριδίων, Her. 3, 99 ἀπαρ νεόμενός ἐστιν, Xen. An. 2, 2, 13 ἢν ἡ στατηγία οὐδὲν ἄλλο δυνάμενη, Herod. 1, 3, 12 κρατήσας ἢν τοῖς δυσλοις (where προσηγόμενο precedes), Lucian. cunuch. 2 δικασταὶ ἁγιοφορεῖτες ἃς ὁι ἄριστοι. See Reiz, Lucian. VI. 537 Lehm.; Couriers, Lucian. asin. p. 219; Jacob, quae. Lucian. p. 12; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 597; Boisson. Philosr. 660, and Nicet. p. 81; Mtth. 1302. In later writers (e.g. Agath. 126, 7; 135, 5; 175, 14; 279, 7 etc., Ephraem. see Index under εἶναι) and in the Sept. it occurs much more frequently, though in the Sept. the Hebrew seldom gave occasion to this construction. On the other hand, the circumlocution of the Part. and to be for the finite verb became established, as is well known, in Aramaean; and so in Palestinian authors a national predilection 328 for the above construction may have prevailed.

Acts xxi. 3 ἐκαίσε ἢν τὸ πλοῖον ἀποφορτίζομεν τὸν γόμον cannot be rendered, with Grothius, Valckenae and others: eo navis merces expositura erat, but means: thither the vessel was unloading its cargo i.e. in the narrative style: thither it was going in order to unload, (to take ἐκαίσε for ἐκαί—cf. Bornm. Schol. p. 176—is unnecessary). That the phrase ἢν ἄροφ. refers to what the ship was just then freighted with is not to be 313 overlooked.

In Luke iii. 23 ἢν ... ἐρχόμενος are not to be joined together, but ἢν ἄκουσα forms the principal predicate, and ἐρχόμενος is annexed as a closer limitation. The idiom mentioned in Vig. p. 355 is not similar. Of one who is entering on his thirtieth year it cannot be said: he is beginning thirty years; he is, rather, on the point of terminating thirty years.
367 In Jas. iii. 15 οίκ ἐστιν αὐτῇ ἡ σοφία ἀνωθεν κατερχόμενη ἄλλα ἐπιγενος, ψυχική etc. the Part. is employed adjectively, and ἐστιν belongs likewise to the adjectives following; cf. Franke, Demosth. p. 42.

Ὑπάρχειν with the Part. in Acts viii. 16 μοῦν βεβαστυμενόν ὑπάρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, is not a mere circumlocution for the finite verb, for βεβαστυμενόν ὑπάρχον would be the regular expression, there being no other form for the Plup. In Jas. ii. 15 λειτήμενοι is annexed as a predicate to γενομένοι ὑπάρχομεν. In part, however, Luke xxiii. 12 προϋπάρχον ἐν εἰδῷ δότες might be referred to this head, for which πρότερον ἐν εἰδῷ δότας might have been used. See as to these combinations of ὑπάρχειν with the Part. ὅν, Bornem. Schol. p. 143.

Γίνομαι also (in the sense of εἰσὶ) is never in the N. T. employed with a Part. (Heind. Plat. Soph. 273 sq. ; Lob. Soph. Aj. v. 588) to form a periphrasis of this sort. In Heb. v. 12 γεγόνατε χρείαν ξοουτε signifies: ye have come to have need. In Mark ix. 3 τὰ ἵματα αὐτοῦ γένοσαν σταθοῦσα means: became shining. In the same way are to be explained Luke xxiv. 37; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Rev. xvi. 10; but in Mark i. 4 εὑρέθη Ἰωάννης (exstitit Joannes) is to be taken by itself, and the Participles that follow are added as explanatory. Just so Jno. i. 6.

The construction in the following passages cannot by any means be taken as a circumlocution for a finite verb: θεός ἐστιν ὁ ενεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν etc. Phil. ii. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 4, etc. (usually with the omission of the copula, Rom. viii. 33; Heb. iii. 4, etc.) it is God that worketh etc., cf. Fr. Rom. II. 212 sq.; Ktj. 191.

6. Greek prose authors seldom take the liberty of omitting the Subs. verb in such constructions, so as to make the Part. stand exactly for a finite verb;¹ and then it is done only in simple tense and mood forms (see Hm. Vig. 776; Mth. 1303; Siebelis, Pausan. III. 106; Wannowski, synt. anom. 202 sq.).² Expositors, disregarding the corrections of Greek philologers (Hm. Vig. 770, 776 sq.; Bremer in the Philol. Beitr. a. d. Schweiz. 1. 172 ff.; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 146 and Schol. in Luc. p. 183; Döderlein, Soph. Oed. Col. p. 593 sq.; Blhdy. 470), have often and unhesitatingly assumed such a usage in the N. T. But in nearly all the passages so explained, a finite verb either precedes or follows, to which the Part. is to be joined (and then merely the usual punctuation of the text must not be minded); or there is an anacoluthon, owing to the writer's

¹ Cf. Fr. Rom. i. 289. As to the Byzantine use of Participles simply for finite verbs, see Index to Malalas, in the Bonn ed. p. 797. (We are not speaking here of the poets; see e.g. Hm. review of Müller's Eumenid. S. 23.)

² The restriction under which Mehlhorn in the Allg. Lit. Z. 1833. no. 76 maintains this ellipsis, can neither be fully justified on philosophic grounds, nor can instances be found, especially in later authors, to support it.
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having lost sight of the construction with which he began (Poppo, Thuc. III. III. 138). Several such passages have been correctly explained by Ostermann in Crenii exercitatt. II. 522 sq.

a. In 2 Cor. iv. 13 ἔχοντες must be joined to the πιστεύομεν following: as we have ... we also believe. In 2 Pet. ii. 1 both ἀρνούμενοι and ἐπάγοντες are to be connected with παρευκαζοῦσιν; they are not, however, co-ordinate with each other, but ἐπάγοντες is annexed to the clause οίτις ... ἀρνούμενοι. In Rom. v. 11 ἀλλὰ καὶ κανεχώμενοι has not so close a correspondence to σωθησόμεθα, that κανεχώμεθα (var.) was to have been expected; but the meaning appears to be but not only shall we be saved (simply and actually), but while we, so that we etc. (expressive of the joyous consciousness of the saved). In 2 Cor. viii. 20 στελλόμενοι is to be connected, as to the sense, with συνετέχομαι in vs. 18. In Heb. vi. 8 ἐκφέρωσα does not stand for ἐκφέρει, but this Part. corresponds to πιστεύσα and τίκτονα in vs. 7, and by δέ is placed in opposition to both; but an ἔστι is to be supplied with ἀδόκιμος and κατάρας ἐγνύ. In 2 Pet. iii. 5 συνεστώσα is a proper Part. (attributive), and the preceding ἵκαν avails also for ἢ γῆ. In Heb. vii. 2 ἐρμηνευόμενος must be joined to Μελχισ. in vs. 1., as ὁ συναντ. and δ ἐμεύσων are parenthetical clauses, and the principal verb in the sentence follows all the predicates in vs. 3 μενε ἱερεύς etc. In Eph. v. 21 ὑποτασασόμενοι, like the other Participles in vss. 19, 20, certainly belongs with the principal verb πληροῦσθε ἐν πν., and is not to be taken for an Imperative, as has been done by Koppe, Flatt, and others; the αἱ γυναῖκες etc. in vs. 22 is then joined, without a special verb (for ὑποτασεωςθε is undoubtedly a gloss), to ὑποτασσόμενοι, as a further illustration. Likewise in 1 Pet. v. 7 the Participles are connected with the foregoing Imperative in vs. 6; and 1 Pet. iii. 1 refers back to ii. 18, where the Part. is to be joined to the Imperat. in vs. 17. In the same way in 2 Thess. iii. 8 ἐργαζόμενοι is to be joined to ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ, and this again corresponds to δωρεάν as an adjunct to the verb ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν. In Heb. x. 8 λέγων belongs to the verb following in vs. 9, εἰρηκεν. 330 In x. 16 διδοῦσι may very well be connected with διαθήσομαι. Rom. vii. 13 has long since been correctly explained. 1 Pet. iv. 8 needs no explanation.

b. Acts xxiv. 5 begins with the Part. εὐθύνεστο τοῦ ἄνδρα, and vs. 6 should have continued ἐκρατήσαμεν αὐτόν etc. Instead of this the writer annexes this principal verb to the interpolated relative clause δς καὶ ... ἐπέφρασε. In 2 Pet. i. 17 λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ
etc. the structure is interrupted by the parenthetical clauses φωνής ... εἰσδόκησα; and the apostle continues in vs. 18 with καὶ ταύτην 869 τὴν φωνὴν ἡμείς ἡκούσαμεν, instead of saying, as he intended, ἡμᾶς εἶχε ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἀκούσαντας, or something similar (Fr. diss. 815 in 2 Cor. II. 44). 1 In 2 Cor. v. 6 θαρροῦστε, after several intermediate clauses, is resumed in θαρροῦμεν δὲ vs. 8. In vii. 5 οὐδεμίαν ἔσχεν ἄνευν ἡ σάρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλίβομεν, ἔσχεν μᾶχαι etc., ἡμεθα (from ἡ σάρξ ἡ μῶν) may be supplied (Hm. Vig. p. 770); but an anacoluthon may also be assumed (Fr. as above, p. 49), as if Paul had written in the previous part of the sentence οὐδεμίαν ἄνευν ἔσχεσαμεν τῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν. In v. 12 ἀφορμὴν διδόντες must be taken as a Part., but the foregoing clause must be understood as if it had run οü γὰρ γράφομεν ταύτα πάλιν ἐκατος συνιστάμεντες, or what comes to the same thing, the more general λέγομεν, γράφομεν, be deduced from συνιστάμενοι; see Mey. in loc. In 1 Pet. ii. 11 ἀπέκεχεθε is the reading now adopted, with which in vs. 12 ἔχοντες is regularly connected; and in Acts xxvi. 20 ἀπηγγέλθη was long ago substituted for ἀπαγγέλθην. As to Rom. xii. 6 ff.; Heb. viii. 10, and 1 Pet. iii. 1, 7 see § 63. (In Rev. x. 2 ἔχων is subjoined independently and ἐστι can be supplied.)

In Rom. iii. 23 τῶν ... ὑπερούνται τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ θεοῦ, δικαιομένων δωρεάν etc., the Part. cannot stand for a finite verb (even Ostermann explains it ὑπερούνται καὶ δικαιομένων), but the Apostle as his words show conceived the connection thus: and come short of the glory of God, in that (since) they are justified freely; the latter is proof of the former.

In 1 Cor. iii. 19 ὁ δραστόμενος τοῦ σοφοῦ ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν, a quotation from the Old Test., does not form a complete sentence, but contains merely the words suited to the Apostle's purpose, cf. Heb. i. 7. What the Apostle quotes incompletely we ought not to wish to complete by annexing an ἐστι. As to 1 Pet. i. 14, see Fr. Conject. i. 41 sq.; the Part. ἐν συνχρηματιζομένωι may be taken as depending on ἀπίστα, or, as 331 I prefer, may be connected with γεννήθητε vs. 15 as parallel to κατὰ τῶν καλῶν etc. As little reason is there in proverbs, such as 2 Pet. ii. 22 καί ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τῷ θωματισμῷ and ὑποκαταστάθη εὐγένεια, to change the Part. into the finite verb. The words run: a dog, that turns to his own vomit, as if spoken διακρινόμενος in reference to a case under observation; just as we say in German e.g. ein ründiges Schaf! ('a black sheep,' Eng.) when a bad man makes himself conspicuous among the good.

In another way a Part. was taken for a finite verb, when the Part.

1 Yet it may also be assumed that Peter wished to say: receiving from God honor and glory — he was declared to be the beloved Son of God, but interrupts the construction with the direct quotation of the words uttered by the voice from heaven.
seemed to express an action following that denoted by the finite verb (Bähr in Creuzer Melet. III. 50 sq.). In the N. T., however, there is no single established instance of this usage. In Luke iv. 15 ἐδωκαν... 370 δοξάζομεν ὑπὸ πάνω means: he taught being glorified of all,—while he was glorified of all (during his teaching). Jas. ii. 9 εἰ δὲ προσωποληπτότες, 316 ἀμαρτίαν ἤφαγεν οὐκ ἔλεγχόμενο ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου etc. is: ye commit sin, while ... (since) ye are convicted, being convicted (as προσωποληπτότες); Gebser is wrong. In Heb. xi. 35 ἔχειν ἀπολύτρωσιν οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν not accepting the deliverance (offered them), προσδεξ. denotes something preceding rather than following the τιμωμῖς; cf. Heb. ix. 12. Acts xix. 29, too, does not contain the use of the Aor. Part. in narration mentioned by Hm. Vig. 774; as ἀμφισβαίνετε δὲ δοκίμασθε εἰς τὸ διαταγ. συναρ- πάζοντες γάιον καὶ Ἀρισταρχον means either, after they had seized along with themselves (from their quarters) or, while they seized along with them. In Luke i. 9 δαχνοῖς τοῦ θυμίασας εἰςειλθὼν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κυρίου, the Part. probably belongs to the Inf. (as the Vulgate takes it): entering into the temple to burn incense; Mey. is artificial. As to Rom. iii. 23, see above, p. 352. Rom. ii. 4 requires no elucidation. Likewise the peculiarity occasionally found in Greek authors, according to which the principal notion is expressed by a Part. and the secondary by a finite verb (Mth. 1295 f.; Hm. Soph. Aj. 172; Stalib. Plat. Gorg. p. 136), has by some been unwarrantably forced upon the N. T.; such critics having quite forgotten that the usage in question could not occur independently of any limitation involved in the nature of the ideas to be expressed. To explain 2 Cor. v. 2 στενάζομεν... ἐπιθυμοῦμεν as put for ἐπιθυμοῦμεν στενάζομεν is eminently felicitous; the Part. must be regarded as subjoined to the verb, and explained σας as causal-like στενάζομεν βαροῦμαι in vs. 4.

7. The Present Part. (with the Article) is often used substantively, and then, as a noun, excludes all indication of time. In Eph. iv. 28 ὁ κλέπτων μικρὰς κλεπτεῖν is not for ὁ κλέφτας (as some Codd. have); but, let the stealer i.e. the thief steal no more, Heb. xi. 28. So also when it is accompanied with an Acc. of the Object, or other adjuncts; as, Gal. i. 23 ὁ διακόνων ἡμᾶς ποτέ οὐρ former persecutor, Matt. xxvii. 40 ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν the destroyer of the temple (in his imagination), Rev. xv. 2 οἱ νικῶντες ἐκ τοῦ θριόν (which Eichhorn, Einl. N. T. II. 378, mentions as singular!), xx. 10; Gal. ii. 2 (οἱ κοινωνεῖς see Kypke II. 274; cf. also Pachym. 332 I. 117, 138, etc.); 1 Thess. i. 10; v. 24; 1 Pet. i. 17; Rom. v. 17; 1 Th. Jno. xii. 20 (xiii. 11); cf. Soph. Antig. 239 οὐτ᾽ ἐθὼν δύον ἢν ὁ δρᾶν, Paus. 9, 25, 5 ὅποιά ἐστιν αὐτώς καὶ τῇ μητρὶ τὰ δρόμας, Diog. L. 1, 87 βραδείως ἔγχειρε τοὺς πραπτομένους (faciendis), Soph. Electr. 200 ὁ ταύτα πράσσων, Plat. Cratyl. 416 b. ὁ τὰ ὄνομα τίδεις, Demosth. Theocrin. 508 b. and frequently in the orators
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ο τῶν νόμων τιθέεις (legislator), ὁ γράφων τῆς μαρτυρίαν (Bremi, Demosth. p. 72) Strabo 15, 718; Arrian. Al. 5, 7, 12; Poppo, Thuc. 871 I. I. 152; Schaeff. Eurip. Orest. p. 70; Demosth. V. 120, 127; poet. gnom. 228 sq., and Plutarch. V. 211 sq.; Weber, Demosth. 180; Bornem. Schol. p. 10; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 22; Maetzner ad Antiphont. p. 182. Likewise in Acts iii. 2 οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι is used substantively, those entering; one cannot regard it with Kühnl 317 (Matt. p. 324), on the ground that μελέτοντας εἰσίναι occurs in vs. 3, as the Present Part. used for the Fut. The more precise expression is quite appropriate in vs. 3, as the person addressing the two apostles detained them a short time during their εἰσίναι.

In other passages, when there is a distinct reference to past time, the Aorist Part. is used substantively; as, Jno. v. 29; Acts ix. 21; 2 Cor. vii. 12, etc., cf. ὁ έκείνου τεκόντων Eurip. Electr. 335, οἱ τῶν ιστορικῶν τεκόντες Aeschyl. Pers. 245,— Aristoph. eccl. 1126 ἡ ἓμη κεκτημένη, Lucian. Tim. 56.)

Such Present Participles with the Article show themselves to be complete substantives when a Genitive is joined to them, as in 1 Cor. vii. 35 πρὸς τὸ ὑμᾶν αὐτῶν συμφέρειν (Demosth. cor. 316 c. τὰ μικρὰ συμφέροντα τῆς τάξεως); see Lob. Soph. Aj. 238 sq.; Held, Plut. Aem. p. 252.

8. In quotations from the Old Test. a Part. is occasionally connected with some person of the same verb (and placed before it); as, Acts vii. 34 ὡδὼν εἶδον from Exod. iii. 7 (cf. Lucian. dial. mar. 4, 3), Heb. vi. 14 εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνώ σε (from Gen. xxii. 17), Matt. xiii. 14 βλέποντες βλέψετε (from Isa. vi. 9). This construction is extremely frequent in the Sept., as Judges i. 28; iv. 9; vii. 19; xi. 25; xv. 16; Gen. xxvi. 28; xxxvii. 8, 10; xliii. 6; Exod. iii. 7; 1 Sam. i. 10; iii. 21; xiv. 28; 1 Kings xi. 11; Job vi. 2; Ruth ii. 16; 1 Macc. v. 40; Judith ii. 13 (see Thiersch p. 164 sqq.), and is a Hellenizing of the Hebrew Inf. Absolute (Ewald, krit. Gr. 560 ff.), though the LXX, once accustomed to the construction, sometimes employ it even where the Hebrew contains no Inf. Absol., as in Exod. xxiii. 26. This mode of expression, however, was judiciously chosen, although in Greek prose, with the exception of that isolated ὡδὼν εἶδον in Lucian, no perfectly satisfactory parallels can be shown (Georgi, vind. p. 196 sq. has mixed together things dissimilar);¹ for in the instances

¹ Some passages have been quoted according to erroneous readings. Plat. Tim. 30c. runs thus: τίνι τῶν ζωών αὐτῶν εἰς ἡμετέρα βέβαια ἡ ἡμιστροφή τοῦ κόσμου. Likewise Plat. Lach. 185 d. συνελογοίμενοι συνελογούμεν is questioned by recent critics, and Myth. 1301 proposes to read: συνελογούμεν & συνελογούμεν. Yet the singularity here consists more in the connection of the Middle and Active.
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apparently corresponding the Part. carries its own idea, as in Her. 833 5, 95 φεύγων ἐκφεύγει fuga evadit (Diod. Sic. 17, 83), and still more in Xen. Cyr. 8, 4, 9 ἰπακούον σχολὴ ἵπτεντα, Lucian. 372 parasit. 43 φεύγων ἐκεῖθεν ... εἰς τ. Ταυρέων παλαιστραν κατέφυγε, see Gataker de stylo c. 9; Lob. paralip. p. 522. The later writers are the first to imitate this construction, as Anna Alex. 3, 80; Euseb. H. E. 6, 45. Originally this Participle implied an emphasis, though subsequently it may have become weakened. In the three 318 passages quoted above, this emphasis is perceptible. We express it by the voice and the position of the words, or by a corresponding abverb, etc.: well have I seen,—surely (richly ?) will I bless thee,—with your own eyes shall ye see, etc. Acts xiii. 45 is a construction of another sort: οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀντέλεγον τοῖς ἰπτὼ τοῦ Παῦλου λεγομένως, ἀντιλέγοντες καὶ βλασφημοῦντες, where ἀντέλεγον is taken up again in the Part. and strengthened by βλασφ.

Eph. v. 5 τούτῳ ἵστε γινώσκοντες probably does not come under this head, but ἵστε refers to what is stated in vs. 3 f., and γινώσκει is construed with ὅτι: this, however, ye know, aware (considering) that, etc. That 1 Pet. i. 10, 12; Acts v. 4 do not come under this rule, is obvious to every one. Finally, it passes comprehension that Kühnöl should adduce Heb. x. 37 ὁ ἐφέμενος ἦσα (he omits, it is true, the Article) as an instance of the above usage.

Note 1. On Participles used absolutely, see § 59. Such is also τυχέν, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, which is inserted in the clause as an abverb, Xen. A. 6, 1, 20; Plato, Alcib. 2, 140, etc.

Note 2. Sometimes two finite verbs are so closely connected by καὶ that the first has, logically, the force of a Part., e.g. Matt. xviii. 21 ποιῶς διάρρησα εἰς ἐμὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος μου καὶ ἀπῆλθον αὐτῷ, i.e. διάρρησαν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ. This distribution of a single (logical) clause into two grammatical clauses is a peculiarity of Oriental diction, and is of frequent occurrence; see § 66, 7.

Note 3. Luke and Paul (still more, however, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews) are peculiarly fond of participial constructions. Paul accumulates Part. on Part.; cf. 1 Thess. ii. 15 f.; Tit. ii. 12, 13; 2 Cor. iv. 8–10. In narration, however, the use of Participles appears on the whole less frequent and less diversified in the N. T. than in Greek historical authors. The historical discourse of the N. T. runs on in simple

1 It is hardly necessary to remark that the phrase ἴδων ἀδιά (scio me vidisse) Athen. δ, 226; Arrian. Ind. 4, 15 does not come under this head. Cf. also ἄκοπος ἄρα Lucian. dial. mort. 28, 1.

2 This author has rightly set aside the passage from Aeschyl. Prom. 447. But he found himself finally compelled to let the instance from Lucian. dial. mar. stand. Accordingly, viewed linguistically, it approximates the Hebrew mode of expression, a fact which Thiersch should not have questioned.
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334 clauses (which are joined together especially by the oft-recurring καὶ) ἢ καὶ and disdains the periodic structure in which the Greeks were so expert.

CHAPTER V.

THE PARTICLES.

§ 46. THE PARTICLES IN GENERAL.

1. Although propositions and periods can be formed by means of those inflections of the noun and verb whose syntax has been discussed in the preceding pages— (propositions, in particular, by means of Cases, the use of which is so varied in Greek; periods, by means of Infinitives, Participles, etc.)—yet those inflections alone do not suffice for the great diversity of relations which give origin to propositions and periods. Hence language possesses besides a vast stock of so-called particles, by whose aid it becomes possible to construct all conceivable propositions and all their conceivable combinations. Particles are divided, as is well-known, into Prepositions, Adverbs, and Conjunctions (Rost S. 717); though respecting the boundary-lines which separate these three species from each other, grammarians have not yet been able to agree. Cf., in particular, Hm. emend. rat. p. 149 ff.

Interjections are not words, but sounds; and lie quite beyond the limits of Syntax, and indeed of Grammar.

2. Without attempting to settle the dispute among grammarians respecting the boundaries of these three classes of particles, we see at once as much as this:

1) That the classification must be made not on the basis of the words but of their signification; as it has long been acknowledged that prepositions e.g. often assume the nature of adverbs, and vice versâ (Hm. as above, p. 161), — in fact, that the prepositions are adverbs originally.

2) That all particles either serve merely to complete the structure of a simple proposition and confine their import within its limits, or are designed to join one proposition to another. The latter are properly called Conjunctions; and if the grammarian
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pays regard to the language (expressed thought) rather than to the (pure) thought, he may reckon among them the comparative particle ὥς (ὡς), the particles of time (ἤπειρον, ἤτοι, ὡτότε, etc.), the negative particle of design μη etc., so far forth as they are also connectives; so that these particles, according to their import, may be classed either as adverbs or as conjunctions. The power of adverbs and prepositions, however, is confined to the limits of a simple proposition; the structure of this they serve to complete. Prepositions denote only relations (of substantives); adverbs, inherent attributes (of terms of quality or condition, and consequently of adjectives and verbs, inasmuch as the latter are compounded of the copula and a term of quality or condition). See, especially, Hm., as above, 152 ff.


3. The great copiousness of the Greek language in particles, as developed in the elegant literary Attic, is shared by the N. T. to a limited extent; for not only was the (later) popular language of the Greeks in general more frugal in the use of particles, but the N. T. authors also, as they imparted a Jewish tinge to their presentations of thought, did not feel impelled to employ the niceties of Greek composition in the structure of periods. From the nature of the case, however, while they could easily dispense with the great variety of conjunctions, they could least dispense with the prepositions. In treating of particles, N. T. Grammar, if it will avoid encroaching on the department of Lexicography, should not take up the particles separately and explain in detail all their various significations, but should endeavor rather, primarily to give only a clear and discriminating delineation of the various modifications of thought which the particles are employed to designate; and then in every instance to point out how far these varieties of meaning have been expressed by the N. T. writers through the use of the abundant store of particles which the Greek language supplied. At the same time, however, it will take pains to exhibit in its leading traits, so far as the exist-
ing state of N. T. Lexicography and Interpretation may permit, the mutual dependence of the significations of the principal parti-
375 cles, and emphatically to protest against the arbitrariness of what
is called *enallage particularum*.

The general subject of the Greek particles had never been in any
considerable degree exhaustively treated even down to quite recent times,
either as respects the facts (especially in reference to the various periods
386 of the language) or still less as respects their philosophy. The works of
Mt. Devarius (Reussmann's edition, Lips. 1793. 8vo.) and H. Hoogeveen
(Amsterd. 1769. II. 4to. condensed by Schütz, Lips. 1806. 8vo.) are no
longer satisfactory, especially as they entirely omit the prepositions. On
1832 f. II. 8vo. merits recognition. Still more helpful are the acute re-
searches with which R. Klotz has enriched his edition of Devarius (Lips.
1835. 1842. II. 8vo.); [cf. also W. Bäumlein, Untersuchung üb. griech.
Partikeln. Stuttg. 1861. 8vo.]. Schraut, on the other hand, die griech.
Partikeln im Zusammenhange mit den ältesten Stämmen der Sprache
(Neuss, 1848), is too fanciful. A comparative treatment is given by E. A.
For the biblical particles a Lexicon. Particularum to the Sept. and the
Apocrypha is a desideratum, as the concordances and Schleusner also in
his Thesaur. Philol. have entirely omitted these words. (Bruder, as is
well known, has carefully inserted the particles in his N. T. Concordance.)
Tittmann's treatise on N. T. Particles (de usu particular. N. T. Cap. 1, 2,
Lips. 1831. II. 4to., also in his Synonym. N. T. II. 42 sqq.) is not thoroughly
to be commended; moreover it was interrupted by the death of the acute
and learned author, who however did not pay due attention to the actual
usage of the language.

321 § 47. THE PREPOSITIONS IN GENERAL,¹ AND SUCH AS GOVERN
THE GENITIVE IN PARTICULAR.

1. The prepositions correspond to the cases; hence each accord-
ing to its signification is connected with a particular case, viz.
with that case whose primary meaning accords with the primary
meaning of the preposition. Prepositions are employed where the
cases are insufficient to indicate a relation (for these relations are
extremely diversified), and sometimes also where a case would
376 have sufficed indeed, but on account of the variety of its uses did

¹ Cf. Hm. de emend. rat. p. 161 sqq.; B. G. Weißeke, de praeposition. gr. comment.
Gorlic. 1809 f.; K. G. Schmidt, question. gramm. de praeposition. gr. Berol. 1829. 8vo.;
Döderlein, Reden u. Aufs. II. nr. 3; Bhdy. S. 195 ff.; Schneider, Vorles. S. 181 ff.
not appear to the speaker to be definite enough for his purpose. They are relatively more numerous in the N. T. than in Greek prose, because the apostles had not such an inherent sense as cultivated native Greeks of the extended application of the cases; besides, the Oriental prefers the more vivid expression; and moreover, the Hebrew-Aramaic language indicates by means of prepositions nearly all those relations which are designated in Greek by cases alone.

2. In treating of prepositions it is necessary, in the first place, to seize with clearness and precision the true primary meaning of each from which all its applications emanate as from a common centre, and to trace back to this all the various shades of meaning the preposition may have assumed,—i.e. to show how the transition to every such application was effected in the mind of the speaker or writer; and secondly, to take cognizance of the case, and the necessity for it, which is joined to a given preposition, either in general or in a particular range of significations (Bernhardi, allg. Sprachl. I. 164 f.), and in turn to make use of this knowledge in fixing the limits of the signification of the prepositions themselves. The former, viz. the determination of the primary meaning of the prepositions as exhibited now in their construction with the Gen. now with the Dat. etc., will set in its true light the mutual interchange of prepositions, which in the N. T. has been thought to be wholly unlimited. The latter must be performed without a passion for over-strained refinements, and with a recognition at the outset of the fact that, according to the special, and according to the more or less precise, perception of a relation to be expressed (particularly if mental), one and the same preposition may be construed with several different cases (cf. Hm. emend. rat. 163).

In treating of prepositions in the N. T., it is only necessary to add first, a notice of how far later Greek, and in particular the popular language, extended the use and import of prepositions, obliterated their nicer distinctions, and was led probably even into improperities in employing them; further, to pay constant regard to the Hebrew-Aramaic, which delights in the use of prepositions and presents numerous relations under aspects different from the Greek (cf. e.g. ὅμωσαι ἐν τῷ, ἀποκτείνων ἐν ἰδικοῖς); and finally, not to leave out of sight the distinctively Christian view which underlies the use of many prepositions (e.g. ἐν Χριστῷ or κυρίῳ).

The maltreatment of the prepositions until a few decades ago on the
part of N. T. philologists in Lexicous and Commentaries (e.g. Koppe's N. T.) was really horrible; but it found precedent and support in the purely empirical treatment of the Hebrew prepositions current until Ewald's time, see my exeget. Stud. I. 27 ff. Wahl was the first to pursue a better course; and almost everybody now has begun to be ashamed of the license just described.

As respects in particular the comparative predominance of the Greek element and of the Hebrew-Aramaic in the use of the prepositions, it must not be overlooked, 1) that many constructions which the N. T. writers adopted through the influence of their mother tongue, occur also in Greek poets and later prose writers, so diversified is the use of the Greek prepositions; 2) that though in the more Hebraistic portions of the N. T. (particularly in the Revelation) the exposition from the Hebrew suggests itself, yet we must not on that account explain the Greek prepositions in all the books indiscriminately by a reference to the Hebrew; for simultaneously with the Greek prepositions a multitude of special linguistic relations had been communicated to the Apostles, and close observation shows that as respects the relations expressed by prepositions the Apostles had already become accustomed to think in Greek; 3) that, especially in Paul (and John), the un-Hellenic application of several prepositions (e.g. ἐκ) is closely connected with doctrinal phraseology, and belongs to the Apostolic (Christian) element in N. T. diction.

3. The proper and the metaphorical significations of each preposition must be accurately distinguished. The former always refer primarily to local relations (Bernhardi I. 290); and if these are conceived in great multiplicity by a nation, a corresponding multiplicity of prepositions is the result. The simple relations of place are but two,—that of rest and that of motion (or even merely of direction, which is viewed as more or less a motion). The latter, however, comprises motion towards and motion from. The notion of rest is denoted by the Dative; that of motion towards, by the Accusative; that of motion from, by the Genitive.

Local designations to which single prepositions correspond are,

a) of rest: in ἐκ, by the side of παρά, upon ἐπί, over ἐπέρ, under (ἐπέρ), amid (with) μετά, before πρό, behind μετά, on (up on) ἀνά, about ἀμφί, around περί, over against ἀντί; b) of (direction) motion towards a point: into εἰς, towards κατά, to πρός, upon ἐπί, to beside παρά, under ἐπί; c) of (direction) motion from: out of ἐκ, from ἀπό, from under ἐπί, down from κατά, from beside παρά. To the last division may be referred through relating to space (διά)

1 Tittmann, de scriptor. N. T. diligentia gramm. p. 12 (Synon. I. 207): nulla est, ne repugnans quidem significatio, quin quaecunque præpositio cam in N. T. habere dicatur.
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(cf. Progr. de verbor. cum praeposs. compositor. in N. T. usu V. p. 3), for which the Hebrew uses יָבָא, and the German sometimes aus (e.g. aus dem Thore gehen).

4. Language deals at first with the ideas of time by taking local relations as the pattern; hence temporal senses also are put upon most of the prepositions. Not till later does the transition ensue to immaterial, purely ideal relations, which every nation conceives under forms more or less material. 'This produces a corresponding diversity in national modes of expression. A Greek, for instance, says, λέγειν περὶ τινός; a Roman, dicere de aliqua re; a Hebrew, יֹאָר; a German, über etwas sprechen. The first views the object as a central point which the speaker as it were encom- 339 passes (to speak about a thing); the Roman, as a whole of which the speaker imparts something to the hearer (de as it were to speak off something from the object);¹ the Hebrew, as the ground on which the speaker stands (to speak on something); the German, as something lying before the speaker over which his discourse extends (for über governs in this connection the Accusative).

The notion of origin, and consequently of cause, is most naturally implied in the prepositions from, out of (ἀπό, εἰς, παρά, ἐκ); that of occasion, and consequently also of motive, in πρὸς, εἰς (e.g. on the report), ἐπὶ with the Dat. and διά with the Acc. (on account of). Here ἐπὶ refers to the basis on which something rests; hence we also use the word ground for reason. Design and aim expressed by to are denoted by ἐπὶ with the Dat., or by εἰς or πρὸς with the Acc. Condition is expressed by ἐπὶ with the Dat., just as we say by a 379 similar metaphor: auf. Lohn Recht sprechen. The object which underlies an emotion is indicated by ἐπὶ with the Gen., as in German sich freuen über (rejoice over), stolz sein auf (pride one’s self on). To speak in reference to an object is λέγειν περὶ τινός (see above). The rule, or standard, is expressed either by after (πρὸς, κατά) or by from (ἐκ); in the former construction, the rule is conceived as something after, according to, which a thing is to shape itself; in the latter, as that from which the thing regulated is derived. Lastly, the means finds natural expression in διά with the Gen., 324 sometimes in ἐπὶ.

5. One preposition may sometimes, no doubt, be employed for another; but we must deduct from instances of this class all those in which an immaterial relation may be expressed with equal pro-

¹ As to the primary import of the Latin de, see Heidmann in the Zeitschr. f. Alterth. Wiss. 1846. no. 109 f.
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priety by several different prepositions,¹ (loqui de re and super re, ἦν ἐκ and ἀπὸ τιμος, ἀφελείσθαι ἀπὸ and ἐκ τ. Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 34; Mem. 2, 4, 1, also ἐπὶ τιμ, ἀποτελείσθαι ἀπὸ and ἐκ τιμος Rev. ix. 18, ἀποδυνάσκειν ἐκ τιμος Rev. viii. 11 and ὑπὸ τ., ἀποδυνάσκειν ὑπὲρ and peri τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν, ἄγωνισθαι peri and ὑπὲρ τιμος, ἐκλέγεσθαι ἀπὸ 340 and ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν).² This cannot be called enallage of prepositions. On the other hand, particularly in expressing local relations, the more comprehensive preposition may be used for the more restricted, (as Luke xxiv. 2 ἀποκυλλέων τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, but Mark xvi. 3 ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; the latter agrees better with the precise facts of the case: out of the door — cut into the rock). This is sometimes attributable to the fact that it does not seem to be everywhere necessary to speak with entire precision, sometimes the author may through negligence have used the more indefinite term for the more definite. The interchange of prepositions is only apparent when any of them is employed praequantiter, i.e. when it includes also a second relation, the antecedent or con-
sequent of that which it strictly expresses, as κατοικεῖν εἰς τὴν τοῦν, εἶναι ὑπὸ νόμον; or in case of an attraction, as αἰρεῖν τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκῆς Matt. xxiv. 17, ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον Luke ix. 61.

An arbitrary interchange of prepositions — (of which the earlier N. T. commentaries are full, and which was upheld in part by an abuse of parallel passages, especially in the gospels) — would never have entered the imagination of critics, had they been accustomed to consider language as a living instrument of social intercourse. It is really preposterous to suppose that any one could have said, ‘he is travelling to Egypt’ for ‘he is travelling in Egypt’ (εἰς for ἐν); or, ‘all is for him’ instead of ‘all is from him.’ In expressing by, for instance, διὰ and ἐν are not thoroughly equivalent to each other, particularly διὰ Ἰ. Χρυστοῦ and ἐν Ἰ. Χρυστῷ. In Latin, also, per (before names of persons) and the Ablative (of things) are usually distinguished. Close observation shows in general how correctly the N. T. writers discriminate between those prepositions even which

¹ Thus Paul sometimes employs different prepositions in parallel clauses, to give variety to his discourse; as, Rom. iii. 30 ἐκ δυνάμεως περιστομῆν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀφελείσθαι διὰ τῆς πίστεως, Eph. iii. 8 f.

² Sometimes in different languages the same relation, because viewed under different aspects, is expressed by prepositions of exactly opposite significations. Thus Germans say, sur Rechten; the Romans, Greeks, and Hebrews, a dextra etc. Even one and the same language may express a relation, especially if ideal, by opposite prepositions. We say on the condition and under the condition. In South Germany they say, relation or friend to (zu) one; in Saxon, relation or friend of (von) one. How ridiculous it would be to infer from such instances, that of (von) is sometimes equivalent to to (zu), and on to under!
are closely allied (e.g. Rom. xiii. 1 oiv ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ et μὴ ἀπὸ θεοῦ, at δὲ ἀποστ. ἐν ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τιταγμέναι εἰς). And we ought to honor them and 325
ourselves by recognizing everywhere their scrupulous care.

Where either of two prepositions might be employed with equal propriety, a preference for one in the N. T. is perhaps to be attributed to the Hellenistic tinge of its diction; this, at least, the critic must take into consideration as a possibility. Planch, however (articuli nonnulli Lex. nov. in N. T. Goett. 1824. 4to. p. 14), is mistaken in supposing that ἄγαθος πρὸς τι (Eph. iv. 29) is less correct Greek than εἰς τι. The former construction is of frequent occurrence, e.g. Theophr. hist. plant. 4, 3, 1 and 7; 9, 13, 3; Xen. Mem. 4, 6, 10, etc.; see Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 278.

With such prepositions as in different significations govern different cases, it is sometimes possible, when immaterial relations are to be ex-341 pressed, to use either of two cases with equal correctness (as ἐν with ἤν τι Gen. or Acc.). Sometimes the Codd. vary between the two; see Rom. viii. 11. In the N. T. this has been erroneously said to hold frequently in reference to διὰ; see below, § 47, i, d. p. 381, cf. § 49 c. Purely external relations, on the contrary, sustain no such interchange in careful writers; only very late, especially the Byzantine, authors indulge in it, and confound e.g. μετὰ with the Gen. and with the Acc.; see the word in the Index to Malalas in the Bonn ed., cf. Schaef. Ind. ad Aesop. p. 136; Boisson. 381 Anecd. IV. 487; V. 84. Indeed the later writers have already become so devoid of an appreciation of the cases as to begin to connect prepositions even with cases altogether foreign to them,—ἀπό, for instance, with Acc. and Dat., κατὰ with Dat., σὺν with Gen.; see Index to Leo Gramm. and Theophan.

The attempt, recently revived, to explain this alleged interchange of cases in the N. T. by the circumstance that Hebrew has no cases, is to be rejected, if for no other reason, because apart from a very small number of doubtful exceptions the N. T. writers exhibit a correct perception of the differences between the cases.

The position of prepositions is more simple in the N. T. than in the classics, Mtth. II. 1899 f. They are uniformly placed immediately before the noun, and only those conjunctions which never stand at the beginning of a clause intervene between preposition and substantive; as, δὲ Matt. xi. 12; xxii. 31; xxiv. 22, 36; Acts v. 12, γάρ Jno. iv. 37; v. 46; Acts viii. 23; Rom. iii. 20, τι Acts x. 39; xxv. 24, γε Luke xi. 8; xviii. 5, μεν and μεν γάρ Rom. xi. 22; Acts xxviii. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 4.

1 Hence I cannot admit what Lücke, Apokal. II. 458, says about an irregular and inconsistent use of prepositions in the N. T.

2 In close succession μετὰ signifying with takes the Acc. and then the Gen. in Acta apocryph. p. 257.

3 The case is different with ἐν followed by the Acc.; see Schaef. Dion. comp. p. 305; Ross, inscriptt. gr. I. 37.
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a. 'Antι (Lat. ante), of which the local meaning is (directly) before, in front of, over-against, denotes figuratively barter, exchange (Plato, conv. 218 e.), in which one thing is given for, instead of, another (tooth for tooth, Matt. v. 38), and in consequence assumes its place. It governs the Genitive, that being the case of (issuing from and) exchange (see above, p. 206), e.g. 1 Cor. xi. 15 ἡ κομή ἀντί περιβολαίου δέδοται (τῇ γυναικί) her hair for, instead of, a covering (to serve her as a covering, cf. Lucian. philops. 22; Liban. ep. 350), Heb. xii. 16 δι' ἀντί βρώσεως μιᾶς ἀπέδοτο τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτοῦ, vs. 2 ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς ὑπέμενε σταυρόν (for the joy that was set before him, against this setting death on the cross), Matt. xx. 28 δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρου ἁντὶ πολλῶν, xvii. 27 ἐκείνου (στατῆρα) λαβὼν δὸς αὐτοῖς ἀντὶ ἔμοι καὶ σοῦ, ii. 22 'Ἀρχέλαος βασιλεὺς ἀντὶ Ἡρώδου in place of Herod, cf. 344 Her. 1, 108; Xen. A. 1, 1, 4; 1 Kings xi. 44. Hence ἀντὶ is the preposition chiefly used to denote the price for, in exchange for, which one gives or receives an article of merchandise (Heb. 382 xii. 16); then, to denote requital (Lev. xxiv. 20) and reward (bordering on the causal sense, like the Germ. ob) e.g. ἀνθ' ἄν (as a recompense) for this (that), i.e. because, Luke i. 20; xix. 44; Plat. Menex. 244; Xen. A. 5, 5, 14; 1 Kings xi. 11; Joel iii. 5; or on which account (wherefore) Luke xii. 8; ἀντὶ τούτου Eph. v. 31 (Sept.) therefore, for this, cf. Pausan. 10, 38, 5. 'Ἀντὶ is used in Jno. i. 16 διὰ σοµεν... χαρῶν ἁντὶ χάριτος in a peculiar application, referable, however, to its primary import: grace over, upon, grace (Theogn. sent. 344 ἁντὶ ἀνίσων ἄνισας), strictly grace against, for, grace, grace in the place of that which preceded, therefore grace uninterrupted, unceasingly renewed.

b. ἀνό, ἐκ, παρά, and ἐντό, all denote issuing, proceeding from —the generic import of the Genitive— but with some diversity as respects the previous mutual relation of the objects in question. Beyond doubt ἐκ indicates the closest connection; ἐντό, one less close; παρά (de chez moi, νές), and especially ἀνό,¹ one still more distant. Accordingly, these prepositions may be ranged in

¹ The distinction between ἀνό and ἐκ is perceptible in Luke ii. 4 (cf. also Acts xxii. 34); but in Jno. xi. 1 (see Luke in loc.) and Rev. ix. 18 ἀνό and ἐκ are employed as synonymous. Cf. also Luke xxii. 18 with Acts xxvii. 34. On the other hand, in the parallel passages Mark xvi. 3 and Luke xxiv. 2 ἀνό and ἐκ are respectively used, —out of the door, the more precise (and suitable) expression, and (away) from the sepulchre, the more loose; see p. 382.
the following order, proceeding from the most intimate connection to the more remote: ἐκ, ἐπὶ, παρὰ, ἀπό. Further, if merely the idea of proceeding from is to be expressed, ἀπό is used. If the proceeding is definitely thought of as from a person, παρὰ or ἐπὶ is required. If the person is to be indicated only in a general way as the point of departure, παρὰ is used; if represented strictly as the efficient, producing cause, ἐπὶ is selected, and hence is the regular preposition after passives. Finally, the idea of distance and separation attaches itself to ἀπό; so that both ἀπό and ἐκ express disjoining and removal, while these notions are not directly implied by παρὰ and ἐπὶ.

Παρὰ is used properly in reference to objects proceeding from one's vicinity or sphere of power (παρὰ with Gen. used antithetically to πρὸς with Acc. in Lucian. Tim. 58), e.g. Mark xiv. 43 παραγίνεται ἡ χλός τοῦ... παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων from the chief priests (near whom, about whom, they served; cf. Lucian. philops. 5; Demosth. Polycl. 710 b.), xii. 2 ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ part of the produce which was in the hands of the husbandmen; Jno. xvi. 27 δι' ἑνὸ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξήλθον (cf. i. 1 ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν), v. 41 (Plat. rep. 10, 612 d.); xv. 26; 343 Eph. vi. 8; Luke ii. 1; 2 Pet. i. 17. Accordingly, it is joined to verbs of inquiring and asking Matt. ii. 4, 16; Mark viii. 11; Jno. 383 iv. 9, of learning 2 Tim. iii. 14; Acts xxiv. 8 (Xen. C. 2, 2, 6; Plat. Euth. 12 e.), the matter to be learned etc. being viewed as in some one's (mental) possession (ἐπὶ Mark xv. 45; Gal. iii. 2 expressing this more indefinitely; ἐκ τινός Xen. Occ. 13, 6 with greater precision). It is only in later writers that παρὰ is used after Passive verbs as exactly equivalent to ἐπὶ (Bast. ep. crit. p. 156, 235; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. II. 172). In Acts xxii. 30 τὴν κατηγορεῖται παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Luke could hardly have said ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων (they had as yet laid no formal charge, had not yet taken measures for a regular prosecution), the meaning is: of what he is accused on the part of the Jews. Matt. xxxi. 42 παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὐτῇ (Sept.) means: this is from the Lord (divinitus, through means under God's control); and Jno. i. 6 ἐγένετο ἀνθρώπων, ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ: he made his appearance, sent from God, cf. vs. 1 ὁ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

In no passage of the N.T. do we find παρὰ with Gen. used for παρὰ with Dat., as is sometimes assumed in Greek authors (Schaef. Dion. comp. p. 118 sq.; Held, Plut. Tim. p. 427). In 2 Tim. i. 18 ἐφικτέω implies the notion of procuring; (otherwise in Luke i. 30 ἐφρᾶσε χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ
with God.) Mark v. 26 is to be explained by attraction; probably, however, in iii. 21 of παρ’ αὐτῷ are his kindred (those descended from him, those belonging to him), see Fr. in loc. cf. Susann. 33. As to παρά in a circumlocution for the Gen. see § 30, 3, note 5. That τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν Phil. iv. 18, and τὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν Luke x. 7, are not strictly equivalent to τὰ ὑμῶν (ὑμεῖς), αὐτῶν, is obvious; in both passages the phrase is accompanied by a verb of receiving (having received the things sent from you i.e. your presents; eating what is set before you from (by) them).

'Εκ originally denotes issuing from within (the compass. sphere, of) something (antithetic to εἰς Luke x. 7; xvii. 24; Herod. 4, 15, 10; Aesch. dial. 8, 11), e.g. Luke vi. 42 ἐκβάλε τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ (it was ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ), Matt. viii. 28 ἐκ τῶν μνημείων 328 ἔρχομαι, Acts ix. 3 περιήστατον αὐτὸν φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Matt. i. 16 ἐξ Ἰς (Μαρίας) ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς, vs. 3; 1 Pet. i. 23. Concisely in Luke v. 3 ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου out of the ship (speaking from on board) cf. ii. 35. Allied to this is the use of ἐκ to denote the material out of which a thing is made, Matt. xxvii. 29; Rom. ix. 21; cf. Herod. 8, 4, 27; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 150; then, the mass or store out of which a thing is taken, Jno. 384 vi. 50 φαγεῖν ἐξ ἐρτοῦ, Luke viii. 3; 1 Jno. iv. 13 ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ἐκ, hath given us of his Spirit; further, the class to which one belongs, (out) of which one is, Jno. vii. 48 μὴ τίς εἰς τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐπιτευχείς; iii. 1 ἀνθρώπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, xvi. 17 εἶπον ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν (τινὸς), 2 Tim. iii. 6; 2 Jno. 4; Rev. ii. 10, 344 or the country from which one derived his origin, Acts xxiii. 34, the progenitor from whom one is descended, Ἔβραιος ἐξ Ἔβραιων (Plato, Phaedr. 246 a., cf. δουλέχοις D.S. exc. Vat. p. 31), cf. Heb. ii. 11; lastly, the situation, state out of which one comes, Rev. ix. 20, or (by brachylogy) out of which he undertakes something, 2 Cor. ii. 4 ἐκ πολλῆς θλίψεως ... ἐγραψα ὑμῖν. Sometimes ἐκ is used in a local sense, like the Latin ex for de (down from), Acts xxviii. 4 κρεμώνεν τὸ θρῆνον ἐκ τῆς χειρός (Judith viii. 24; xiv. 11; Odyssey 8, 67; Her. 4, 10; Xen. M. 3, 10, 13), Acts xxvii. 29, or, with less precision, Heb. xiii. 10 φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ θυσιαστήριου from the altar (what was laid as an offering upon the altar); 2

1 Mark xvi. 3 does not come under this head: see above, no. 5, p. 362. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the same relation may be conceived somewhat differently in different languages, and yet with equal propriety: e.g. Rom. xiii. 11 ἐγραφημεν ἐξ θνοῦ, (aufstehen von Schlaf) arise out of, from, sleep. In Rev. vi. 14 ἐκ is probably used designedly, as the mountains are rooted in the earth. It is certainly so used in Jno. xx. 1.

2 In the N. T. καταβάλων ἐκ τοῦ ἱροῦ is unique, Matt. xvii. 9 (Exod. xix. 14;
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sometimes it denotes mere direction, from, Matt. xx. 21 ἵνα καθισσω... ἐς ἐκ δεξιῶν etc., Heb.i. 13 (Bleek in loc.), where the Germ. says on (to) the right, zur Rechten, the Lat. a dextra, the Hebr. גַּם. In making such specifications it is a matter of indifference whether the mind proceeds from the object to be located (towards itself), or from itself towards the object. The former conception the Greeks have adopted (ἐκ δεξιάς), the latter, the Germans; cf. Goeller, Thuc. 8, 33. For analogous expressions see Thuc. 1. 64; 8, 51, and Her. 8, 101 οἰκέουσι πρὸς νότου ἀνέμου. When used of time, ἐκ denotes the point of departure of a temporal series since which something continues to exist, Acts xxiv. 10 ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν ὑπαρχεῖσακεν ἐκρίθην etc. Jno. vi. 66; ix. 1; Acts ix. 33; Gal. i. 15, ἐξ ἐκάνετο Luke xxiii. 8 (like ἐκ πολλῶν).1 Here the Greek says out of, viewing the time specified, not as we do as a point from which something is reckoned, but by a more vivid conception as an expanse out of which something extends (as ἔξῳ ἡμέρας. ἐξ ἔτους etc.).

Figuratively, this preposition denotes every source and cause out of which something issues (hence ἐκ and διά are related, Franke, Dem. p. 8; Held, Plut. Tim. 331, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 332), and is applied either to things or persons, Acts xix. 25; Rom. x. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 2; iii. 5. Under this head the following applications of ἐκ deserve attention: Rev. viii. 11 ἀποθνῄσκειν ἐκ τῶν ὀδότων (ix. 18; Dio C. p. 289, 27, cf. Iliad. 18, 107), Rev. xv. 2 μετὰ ἐκ τίνος (victoriam ferre ex aliq. Liv. 8, 8 extr.), 1 Cor. ix. 14 345 ἐκ τοῦ ἐυαγγελίου ἧυν (Luke xii. 15 cf. with ἀπὸ Aristot. pol. 3, 8, 3 ἐκ ex rapto vivere Ovid. Met. 1, 144), Luke xvi. 9 πονησάτε ἐαυτοῖς φίλον ἐκ τοῦ μαμάν τῆς ἄδικας, Rom. i. 4 ὑποθέτοισιν νοῦθεν ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν (source out of which convincing evidence flows, cf. Jas. ii. 18). Its use in reference to persons 8 is especially fre-

xxxii. 1), for which in other passages we find καταβάς. ἄνδρα τοῦ ἄνθρωπος, Matt. viii. 1; Mark ix. 9; Luke ix. 37.

1 The N. T. passages formerly adduced to show that ἐκ means statim post do not establish the assertion. Luke xi. 6 signifies come in from a journey; xii. 36 return from the wedding; Jno. iv. 6 fatigued from (by) the journey; 2 Cor. iv. 6 out of darkness, light etc. In many of these passages to render ἐκ immediately after would be altogether unsuitable; in others it would obtrude a specification of time where the writer thought primarily only of the condition from, out of which, etc. Least of all can ἐκ be translated immediately after in Heb. xi. 35.

8 Ζήτησάτε ἐκ τοῦ ἄνθρωπος Demosth. Enbal. 540 b., which Wahl quotes in his Clavis, does not come under this head.

8 This use is very extended, particularly in Herodot., see Schweighauser. Lex. Herod. p. 192. Further, cf. e.g. Diog. L. 1, 54; Philostr. Soph. 2, 12 etc. and Sturz, Lexic. Xen. II. 88.
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quent and diversified; compare beside, Jno. iii. 25 ἐγένετο ἔτησιν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου (Plato, Theaet. 171 a.), Matt. i. 18 ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ὄγιον, Jno. vii. 22 οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Μωυσέως ἐστὶν (ἡ περιτομή), Rom. xiii. 3 ἐξευτελεόμενον ἐξ αὐτῆς (ἐξουσίας), Jno. x. 32 τολμᾶ καὶ ἔργα ἐδείξα ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, vi. 65 (Her. 8, 114), xviii. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 7; 2 Cor. ii. 2; Rom. v. 16 (Fr. inaccurately translates it by per); most of all in reference to sovereigns, rulers, magistrates, Xen. An. 1, 1, 6; Cyr. 8, 6, 9; Her. 1, 69. 121; 2, 151; Polyb. 15, 4, 7. 'Εκ is especially employed to express the mental state, the disposition out of which something springs, 1 Tim. i. 5 (Rom. vi. 17), Mark xii. 30; Phil. i. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 3 (Plato, Phil. 22 b.; Xen. An. 7, 7, 48 ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς φίλος ἦν, Arrian. Ep. 3, 22, 18; Aristoph. nub. 86); then the occasion, Rev. xvi. 21 ἐβλασφημησαν τῶν θεῶν ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς (but not, as Meyer thinks [yet no longer, 4th ed.], in 1 Cor. x. 17) and the ground (ratio), Rev. viii. 13 — for each is the source of its consequence (Lucian. asin. 46; Demosth. Con. 727 b.); 1 the basis of a judgment (from which a judgment is deduced), Matt. xii. (33) 37 see Kypke in loc., Rev. xx. 12; Xen. C. 2, 2, 21 and 3, 6; Aesop. 93, 4 (by a different metaphor we say judge according to, on, cf. ἐν 1 Jno. iii. 19; v. 2), and consequently the standard, 2 Cor. viii. 11. 'Εκ, moreover, sometimes denotes the price of a thing, Matt. xxvii. 7 ἐπέρασαν ἐξ αὐτῶν (ἀργυρίων) ἀργύριον (Palaeph. 46, 3), inasmuch as the property is viewed as accruing to us out of the money (given for it), cf. Matt. xx. 2 (where the expression is abbreviated). As to ἐξ ἐργων εἰλα and similar phrases in Gal. iii. 10; Rom. iii. 26; iv. 14, 16; Phil. i. 17; Tit. i. 10, see my Comment. on the first passage. In general, the phrase εἰλα ἐξ 330 τῶν partakes of all the diversified significations of the preposition, cf. e.g. 1 Cor. xii. 15 ὅτι οὔκ εἰμὶ χειρ, οὔκ εἰμὶ επὶ τοῦ σώματος; by an opposite conception we say belong to the body.

That ἐκ never stands for ἐν (as has been assumed even in Greek authors 346 occasionally, see Poppo, Thuc. 2, 7; 8, 62) is beyond question. As to the attraction in Matt. xxiv. 17 αὕρων τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας see § 66, cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 493.

'Τττά signifies from under, out from under (τῷτῷ) e.g. Hesiod. theog. 669 Zeus ... ὑπὸ χθονὸς ἦκε etc. Plato, Phaedr. 230 b.

1 Other passages adduced (e.g. by Bretsch.) to prove that ἐκ means on account of, are to be excluded. Rom. v. 16 is easily referrible to the idea of source. Acts xxviii. 3 may be rendered, gliding forth out of the heat; recent editors, however, read ἀπέ.
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It commonly accompanies Passive verbs— in order to designate the subject from whom the action proceeds, who had the power, therefore, to do or to omit it, — and Neuter verbs also which can be used as Passives; as, 1 Cor. x. 9 ἵνα τῶν ὑψίστων ἀπώλεσθαι, Matt. xvii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 24; cf. Demosth. Olynth. 3, p. 10 c.; Lucian. Peregr. 19; Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 45; An. 7, 2, 22; Lysias in Theomnest. 4; Pausan. 9, 7, 2; Plat. apol. 17 a. and conv. 222 e.; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 28; Polyaen. 5, 2, 15, and Porson, Eur. Med. p. 97; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 880. In these instances the forces which have produced death, destruction, etc., are regarded as efficient causes, killing, destroying, etc.; if, on the contrary, ἀπό had been used (cf. παθεῖν ἀπό Matt. xvi. 21), they would have been 387 designated merely as that from which a result ensued (occasional causes). In the former case, the Active construction, the serpents destroyed, etc. might have been directly substituted; in the latter, it would be inaccurate. Cf. the difference between βλάπτεσθαι ἀπό τὸν και ὑπό τῶν in Xen. C. 1, 3, 30; Aeschin. dial. 2, 11. See, in general, Engelhardt, Plat. Apol. p. 174 sq.; Lehmann, Lucian. VIII. 450; II. 23; Schulz vom Abendm. S. 218. Further, ὑπό is applied not merely to persons or animate beings, but also to inanimate agencies, 1 Cor. vi. 12; Col. ii. 18; Jas. i. 14, etc.

The meaning of 2 Pet. i. 17 φωνῆς ἐνθολής αὐτῷ τοῦ ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῖς δόξης is simply: when such a voice was borne to him by the exalted Majesty. All other expositions are arbitrary.

Ἀπό means, locally, from in the widest sense— whether what has come from anything, may have been previously on, with, at, or beside (even in) the object in question,— principally, therefore, 331 the opposite of ἐπὶ with the Acc. Diog. L. 1, 24; as, Luke xxiv. 2 ἐν ὑπὸ τῶν λιθῶν ἀπὸ δικαστηρίων αὐτῶν τοῦ μνημείου, Matt. xiv. 29 καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου coming down from the ship (he was on the ship), iii. 16 ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱδατος up from the water (not out of the water), xv. 27 τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης (they were on the table), Acts xxv. 1 ἀνέβης εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ ἀπὸ 347 ἁλισθάντων.

1 2 Pet. ii. 7 ἐν τῇ τῶν ἀδικίων ἀναστροφῇ ἐβραίοντο would be an instance of the transition if the words were taken as they stand (out of the power of the conduct of the lawless, under the influence of which Lot had been left) cf. IIiad. 9, 248 ἐρωτόθην ὅποι Τρῆμεν ὄρμαγον, 23, 86. See, in general, Hm. Eurip. Hec. p. 11. But the usual mode of connecting ἐν ὑπὸ with καταδρομέων is to be preferred. Moreover, in Luke viii. 14 also, ἐν ὑπὸ after a Passive is to be recognized (Active Matt. xiii. 22 and Mark iv. 19), where Bornem. has proposed another, but not a satisfactory (construction and exposition, in which, however, Mey. concurs. 47
Kausapēias from (not out of) Caesarea. In its developed application (whether in the realm of matter or of mind) ἀπό specially indicates,

a) Separating, letting go, deserting, Matt. vii. 28 ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, Luke xxiv. 31 ἀφαντὸς ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν, Heb. iv. 4 κατέπαυσεν ἁπ' πάνων τῶν ἔργων, Rev. xviii. 14 (cf. also ἀποκρίπτειν, παρακαλύπτειν ἁπ' Matt. xi. 25; Luke ix. 45, and the pregnant phrases in Col. ii. 20; Rom. ix. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 2; Acts viii. 22; 2 Cor. xi. 3 and the like), and consequently, remoteness, Jno. xxi. 8 (Rev. xii. 14; cf. Xen. An. 3, 3, 9; Soph. Oed. Col. 900).

Far more frequently,

b) Proceeding from, in any respect, — especially temporal origin and commencement from . . . forward, since Matt. ix. 22; xxv. 34; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Acts iii. 24, or the commencement of a series Matt. ii. 16; Luke xxiv. 27; Jude 14 (ἀπὸ . . . ἐστὶ Matt. i. 17; xi. 12; Acts viii. 10, ἀπὸ . . . εἰς 2 Cor. iii. 18); hence the source, material, or mass, from which anything comes, Matt. iii. 4 (Lucian. 388 dial. deor. 7, 4; Her. 7, 65), Acts ii. 17 (Sept.) ἐκχεῖ ἁπ' τοῦ πνεύματος μου, Luke vi. 13; xv. 16; Jno. xxi. 10; Matt. vii. 16. Further, ἀπὸ expresses derivation under manifold aspects Jude 28, descent (from a people or country), hence place of abode, sect Matt. xxii. 11; xxvii. 57; Jno. xi. 1; xii. 21; Acts ii. 5; xv. 5; Heb. vii. 13 (Polyb. 5, 70, 8; Plut. Brut. c. 2; Her. 8, 114); especially does it indicate, concretely, the personal point of departure of an efficiency (viewed merely as such, — not as a conscious and self-moved power, to denote which παραῖ is used with Neuter verbs Schulz, Abdm. S. 215 ff.,1 and ἐντὸς2 with Passives, in the N. T. as

1 After verbs of receiving, borrowing, etc. ἀπὸ merely designates simply and in general the whence: Matt. xvii. 25 ἄνω τίνων λαμβάνοντο τίλη; it is kings who are the λαμβάνοντες; παρὰ would have indicated the immediate source, and would have been employed in this passage had the tax-gatherers been the λαμβάνοντες. In the expression λαμβάνον παρὰ τίνως, the τίς is always viewed as active (as giving or tendering); in λαμβάνειν ἁπ' τίνως, merely as the proprietor. In 3 Jno. 7 the apostle would have used παρὰ and not ἁπ' (τῶν ἱδίων) if the meaning had been that the Gentiles had actually rendered a gratuity. In Col. iii. 24 ἁπ' τοῦ κυρίου ἀποκαλύφθη τὸν ἀντιστοιχον the reward is indicated as proceeding from the Lord; παρὰ κυρίου, which Paul might have employed here, would have denoted the Lord's direct communicating of the reward. On the other hand, Christ says in Jno. x. 18 with precision, τοῦτον τὴν μεταλαμβάνῃ παρὰ τοῦ παπρός. Paul likewise, in 1 Cor. xii. 23, writes παρελαμβάνῃ ἁπ' τοῦ κυρίου I received from the Lord, not: the Lord himself has (directly, personally, in an ἀποκάλυψις) communicated it to me; παρὰ, which some uncial Codd. give, is undoubtedly a correction; see Schuls, as above, 215 ff.; cf. N. theol. Annal. 1818. II. 820 ff.

2 The Codd. occasionally vary between ἐντὸς and ἐντῷ, as in Mark viii. 31; Rom. xiii. 1, which is frequently the case in those of Greek authors also, Schauf. Melet. p. 22, 83 sq.
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well as in Greek authors\(^1\) e.g. Acts xiii. 21 τὴν ἀπό σου ἐπαγγε-λιαν (see above, § 30, 3, note 5), Rom. xiii. 1 οὗ γάρ ἐστιν ἐξουσία ἐνου ἐπὶ θεοῦ (immediately followed by αἱ δέ σοια ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμένας εἰς), Matt. xvi. 21 παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (Lucian. dial. deor. 6, 5; Plat. Phaed. 83 b.), Mark xv. 45 γραφῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος, Matt. xii. 38 θέλομεν ἀπὸ σου σημεῖον ἰδεῖν, Acts ix. 13; Gal. i. 1; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 13; 1 Jno. ii. 20; iv. 21; Col. iii. 24; 2 Thess. i. 9,—and, abstractly, the efficient power itself, and may therefore be rendered through, Acts xx. 9 κατενεχθείς ἀπὸ τοῦ θυνοῦ, Rev. ix. 18. Further, it signifies the occasion, Acts xi. 19 (Poppo, Thuc. III. i. 128, 598; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 180), and the motive, Matt. xiv. 26 ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἐκπλήκτων for fear, xiii. 44; Luke xxi. 26; xxii. 45; xxiv. 41; Acts xii. 14; Plutarch. Lysand. 23; Vig. p. 581,—the (objective) cause, propter, Matt. xviii. 7 (according to some Heb. v. 7 also; see Bleek), or præae (in negative expressions), Acts xxii. 11 οὐκ ἐνέβλησον ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φαντος on account of (for) the splendor (his not seeing arose from the splendor), Luke xix. 3; Jno. xxi. 6, se e Kypke in loc. (Acts xxviii. 8 var.), cf. Held, Plut. Tim. 814 (Judith

Schweighaeuser, Lexie. Polyb. p. 69, and others. Further, we find ἀπὸ for ἄναβ after Passives in later writers more and more frequently (especially in the Byzantines; see e.g. Index to Malalas in the Bonn edit.) in earlier authors this interchange is on the whole rare, yet see Poppo ad Thuc. III. i. 158; Bhdly. 224.

\(^1\) In Jas. i. 13 ἀπὸ θεοῦ περὶ ζωματικῶν means simply, I am tempted (through influences proceeding) from God, and is a more vague expression than ἐν θεῷ περὶ ζωματικῶν which would be identical with ἐν θεῷ περὶ ζωής. The words that follow, περὶ ζωῆς ωδεία, merely show that the apostle has also in mind a direct temptation by God (cf. Hm. Soph. Oed. Col. 1531; Schormann, Plutarch. Cleom. p. 237); the phrase ἀπὸ θεοῦ is very frequently a sort of Adverb, divinitus. In Luke vi. 18 the words περὶ ζωῆς signify the malady itself; had the expression been e.g. ἔχολομενοι ἐν χρόνοισ, it would have presented no difficulty. In Luke ix. 22; xvii. 25, ἀνθυποκειόμενοι ἀπὸ is simply: to be rejected on the part of the elders. That in Acts xii. 20 ἀπὸ τὸ ἐφεσεαί αὐτῶν τῆς χάρας ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας (Arist. Pol. 4, 6) ἀπὸ is not used instead of ἐν θεῷ, is quite obvious. Schneckenburger, ad Jas. i. 13, who asserts that it is, has in general not discriminated with sufficient care. As to Matt. xi. 19 see Fr. in loc. and Lehmann, Lucian. VI. 544; 2 Cor. vii. 13 does not at all come under this head; ἀπὸ there means from (through influence proceeding from). In Acts x. 17 (text. rec.) ἀπὸ ἀναστάσεως ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορελείου (Arrian Epict. 3, 22, 23) is simply: those sent from C., the deputation from C.; whereas ἀναστ. ἄναβ (which some Codd. [Sin. also] give as a correction) would be more definite: those whom he (in person) had sent; cf. 1 Thess. iii. 6 ἐθεωροῦν Τιμοθίου τοῖς ἡμῖν ἀπὸ ἐμῶν (they had not sent him). In 1 Cor. i. 30 ἐν ἐγκυείᾳ σφάλα ἡμῶν ἀπὸ ἀπὸ ἄναβ ὃς became to us wisdom from God, ἄναβ is not necessary, cf. Her. 5, 125 (see also Stallb. Plat. rep. 103). Finally, in Jas. v. 4 δὲ μεθα' ἀπὸ ἀναστηρημένον ἀπὸ ἑμῶν, probably ἀπὸ was used designedly: on your part, by you (though not solely or directly). (Both prepositions occur together in significations obviously different in Luke v. 15 according to some Codd. and in Rom. xiii. 1, cf. Euseb. H. E. 2, 6, p. 115, Heinichen.)
ii. 20; Gen. xxxvi. 7 etc.; Her. 2, 64). Acts xvi. 33 is a pregnant construction: ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν he washed and cleansed them from their stripes, i.e. from the blood with which they were covered in consequence of the blows. Matt. vii. 16 is evidently, from their fruits (objectively) will the knowledge be derived (Arrian. Epict. 4, 8, 10), — (the case is different in Luke xxi. 30 ἀφ’ ἐαυτῶν γνώσετε, 2 Cor. x. 7, where the subjective power whence the knowledge comes is indicated; ἀφ’ ἐαυτοῦ, indeed, often signifying sponte).

Schleusner and Kühnöl maintain that ἀπό denotes also 1) in, Acts 338 xv. 38 τῶν ἀποστάτων ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Παμφυλίας who had left them in ἀπό τῆς Παμφυλίας. But the obvious meaning is: who had left them (as they 390 were proceeding) out of Pamphylia. This is quite different from ἐν Ἀ., 349 which might have implied that Marcus remained in P. but separated from ἐν τῆς Paul, cf. xiii. 13. 2) de, Acts xvii. 2 διελέγετο αὐτοῖς ἀπό τῶν γραμφῶν; but this means: starting (in his discourses) from the Scriptures, or drawing his arguments from the Scriptures (cf. Epiphan. Opp. II. 340 d.); cf. Acts xxviii. 23. Nor is the signification de supported by Her. 4, 53. 195 (Schweighæuser, Lexic. Herod. I. 77). 3) per, Acts xi. 19 διασπαράται ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως, which however means owing to the persecution, the persecution being the occasion or incidental cause. 4) modo, instar, 2 Tim. i. 3 ἀπὸ προγόνων, see also Flatt in loc. The phrase signifies, from my forefathers (Polyb. 5, 55, 9), with the sentiments inherited from them. On such passages as Jno. xi. 18; Rev. xiv. 20 see § 61, 5 remark p. 557.

c. Ἀμφί does not occur in the N. T.

d. Ἰπό before (in a wider sense than ἀντι), locally in Acts v. 23; Jas. v. 9, also Acts xiv. 13, cf. Helioud. 1, 11, 30; Boeckh, Corp. inscript. II. 605. It is more frequently used temporally, either with nouns of time, 2 Tim. iv. 21 πρὸ χειμῶνος, Jno. xiii. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 2; Matt. viii. 29, and the Inf. of verbs, Matt. vi. 8; Jno. i. 49, or with personal pronouns and names of persons, Jno. v. 7 πρὸ ἐμοί, x. 8; Rom. xvi. 7. It is used figuratively in Jas. v. 12 πρὸ πάντων ante omnia, 1 Pet. iv. 8 (Xen. M. 2, 5, 3; Herod. 5, 4, 2). As to the original use of this preposition, explaining its construction with the Gen., see Blhdy. p. 231.

e. Ἡπέρ. The fundamental meaning of this preposition may be discerned in its construction with the Dative. With that case it denotes encircling, shutting in, on several or on all sides (closely related to ἀμφί, which signifies shutting in on both sides). Hence it is different from παρά, which merely indicates that one object is near to, beside another. Ἡπέρ with the Gen. is used in prose
almost exclusively in a figurative sense (yet cf. Odys. 5, 68),\(^1\) to designate an object as the centre of activity, around which the activity is conceived as moving,—e.g. contending, drawing lots, caring, about anything, Matt. vi. 28; Mark xiii. 32; Jno. x. 13; xix. 24;\(^2\) and then quite usually deciding, knowing, hearing, speaking, about, concerning (de, super), see above, p. 361. At other times it is to be rendered by for (as pray for one), Jno. 334 xvi. 26; Acts viii. 15; Heb. xiii. 18; Luke xix. 37; 1 Thess. i. 2;\(^3\) or on account of, Jno. xv. 22; Acts xv. 2; xxv. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 18 (although many traces of about are to be discerned in these cases), 350 or in reference to, Matt. iv. 6; Rom. xv. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 1; Jno. vii. 17; Demosth. Ol. i, § 11. In the last sense perpi with its substantive is put at the beginning of a sentence in appearance absolutely, as an exponendum (Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 157 and Tim. p. 97), 1 Cor. xvi. 1 perpi τής λογίας etc. quod ad pecunias attinet, although these words are grammatically connected with οὕτως διέταξα; and still more perceptibly in 1 Cor. xvi. 12 perpi Ἄπωλείω, πολλά παρεκάλεσα αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔλθῃ πρὸς ἵμας etc. (cf. Papyri Taur. 1, 6, 31; de is similarly used e.g. in Cic. fam. 3, 12). Sometimes perpi appears to signify superiority, over and above, prae, as in the Homeric perpi πάντων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων (Blody. 260).\(^3\) Some (Beza) have taken it in this sense in 3 Jno. 2 perpi πάντων εὑχομαι σε etc. above all (Schott); Lücke, in support of this explanation, quotes a passage from Dion. H. II. 1412 (where, however, perpi ἄπαντων means in reference to etc.). Still, it seems to me that the impossibility of connecting perpi πάντων with the Infinitives which follow (Bengel and BCrus. in loc.) has not yet been shown.

f. Πρὸς. The meaning from (something) hitherwards, which accords with the primary force of the Genitive, flows from its local

---

\(^1\) That the local sense around is not without example in (later) prose writers, has been shown by Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 269; cf. Schaefer. Dion. comp. 351. Accordingly, in Acts xxv. 18 perpi σι of might be joined with στατήρες (as is done by Mey.), cf. vs. 7 περὶ στατήρων of ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ καταβαθμίζετε Ἰκουδαίου.

\(^2\) Verbs of caring for, etc. are construed also with ἐπί, see ἐπί, below. As to the distinction between the two constructions, Weber, Demosth. p. 130 says:  ἐπί solam mentis circumspicutionem vel respectum rei, ἐπί simul animi propensionem etc. signifi- cat. Verbs of contending (about or for anything) have the same double construction. Hence in one and the same passage perpi and ἐπί are sometimes contrasted, Franke, Demosth. p. 6 sq.

\(^3\) Even here, however, as the construction was originally viewed the preposition undoubtedly bears the signification around. Surpassing around all is he who by his superiority so encircles, as it were, all, that no one can emerge from the mass. Before all marks the relation only on one side;  ἐπί, on all sides.
use, Hm. Vig. p. 863, and is evident also from examples like τὸ ποιεῖμενόν πρὸς τῶν Δακεδαμονίων Her. 7, 209, πάσχομεν πρὸς αὐτῆς Alciphr. 1, 20 (Blidy. 264) and ἐναυ πρὸς τῶν to be on one’s side, cf. ad Herenn. 2, 27 ab eo re facere. Hence πρὸς ἑμοῦ, like ere nostras, to my advantage, according to my interest, Lob. Phryn. 20; Ellendt, Arrian. I. 265. Ἄνω in this sense gives way in the N. T. to ἄν and ἐκ; it is used only once, Acts xxvii. 34 τῶν (taking nourishment) πρὸς τῆς ἰμητέρας σωτηρίας ἵππας ἰπάρχει is for (conducive to) your deliverance, strictly, is on the side, as it were, of your deliverance. A similar expression occurs in Thuc. 3, 59 οὐ πρὸς τῆς ἰμητέρας δόξης non cedet vobis in gloriam.

932 g. ἔτι. The primary import of ἔτι, which might justify its being used with the Gen., has almost disappeared, unless we choose to translate e.g. Luke iv. 29 ἔρσιν, ἐφ’ οὖν ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν ἡκοδόμητο up from which (on which upwards) was built (D. Sic. 3, 47; Polyb. 10, 10, 5). Usually ἔτι indicates the being upon, above, a place (point or level), whether the object is regarded as at rest or in motion,1 Matt. x. 27 κηρύξατε ἔτι τῶν δωμάτων, xxiv. 30 ἐρχόμενον ἐτι τῶν νεφελῶν, ix. 2, 6; Acts v. 15; viii. 28; Rev. xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 10; Luke xxii. 21, especially ἔτι τῆς γῆς (opposed to ἐν τῷ 351 οὐρανῷ) cf. Xen. An. 3, 2, 19; Arrian. Al. 1, 18, 15. Applied to waters, it may refer not merely to their surface, Rev. v. 13 ἔτι τῇ ἀλάσσῃ;2 but also to their coasts or banks (cf. Arrian. Al. 1, 18, 10) Jno. xxi. 1 ἔτι τῆς ἀλάσσῃ by the sea, on the sea-shore (Polyb. 1, 44, 4; Xen. An. 4, 3, 28; 2 Kings ii. 7, cf. the Hebrew בַּי). It is further applied to elevated objects (up) on which something is placed e.g. on the cross Acts v. 30; Jno. xix. 19. On the other hand, the local sense of beside, near,3 alleged in N. T. Lexicons,

1 Wittmann, de natura et potest. prep. ἐν. Schweinf. 1846. 4to. In most cases the Latin language employs ēs for it. The German auf, which is applied both to heights and to plains, corresponds to the Greek word in many respects. Mark viii. 4 ēs ἐρμῖας entirely resembles the German auf dem Felde, though we do not employ auf in that particular phrase. Cf. Matt. iv. 1 ἀνὰ χθόνι on the ήμων.

2 Here belongs also Jno. vi. 19 (it seems that in Matt. xiv. 25 ἦν τῆς θαλασσᾶς to walk on the sea, cf. Lucian. philoeras. 13 βαθὺς ἐφ’ ὀποῖος, veris hist. 2, 4 ἔτι τῶν πρᾶγμασ βαθυτέρες (Job ix. 8). By itself ἔτι τῇ θαλ. might indeed also be translated on the edge of the sea. This assuredly Fr. Mt. p. 502 did not mean to deny.

3 Even in the case of things on the same level, the Greek, by a conventional or ethical conception which we not seldom share, speaks of an above. Above the door (Her. 5, 92) might, for instance, be applied to a person who stands near the door inside the room; on the other hand, under the door to one outside, at the door. Cf. as to the kindred ἐν τῷ Blidy. S. 263. The relation is conceived very differently in different languages.
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cannot be certainly established. In Luke xxii. 40 τὸπος refers to a hill (though we also say on the spot); in Matt. xxi. 19 ἐπὶ τῆς δόσου means on the way; in Acts xx. 9 ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος is upon the window; in Jno. vi. 21 τὸ πλοίον ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is used of the landing of a vessel, and ἐπὶ refers to the rising shore; yet see what has been said before.

The figurative meanings of ἐπί are quite plain. It is used,

a) Of authority and superintendence over etc.; as, Matt. ii. 22 βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ 'Ἰουδαίας, Rev. xi. 6; Acts viii. 27 εἰναι ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς, vi. 3; xii. 20; Rom. ix. 5 εἰναι ἐπὶ πᾶντων, Eph. iv. 6; 393 cf. Polyb. 1, 34, 1; 2, 65, 9; Arrian. Al. 3, 5, 4; Reitz, Lucian. VI. 448 Bip.; Schaef. Demosth. II. 172; Held, Plutarch. Timol. 388.

b) Of the subject, the ground-work as it were, of an action; as, Jno. vi. 2 σημεῖα ἐκ τῶν ἀσθενοῦντων which he wrought on the sick (cf. Mtth. 1368); particularly of speaking, Gal. iii. 16 οὐ λέγει ... ἄν ἐπὶ πολλῶν as of (upon) many (speaking of many), cf. scribere, disserere super re, and Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 2, 24; 6, 25; Epict. ench. 3; Heind. Plat. Charm. 62; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 114; Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 76; Ellendt, Arrian. I. 436.

c) Of presence, before (coram), particularly before judges, magistrates, etc. (in the phrase bring up before), Matt. xxviii. 14; [Mark xiii. 9]; Acts xxiii. 30; xxiv. 20; xxv. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 13 (cf. Ael. 8, 2; Lucian. catapl. 16; Dio. C. p. 825; Schoem. Isa. 293); and then in general, 1 Tim. v. 19 ἐπὶ μαρτύρων before (with) witnesses (Xen. Hell. 6, 5, 38; vectig. 3, 14; Lucian. philops. 22; Mätzner, Antiph. p. 165); also 2 Cor. vii. 14 (before, i.e. in presence of, Titus), see Wetst. I. 443, 562; Schaef. Melet. p. 105. 336

d) In a related sense, with names of persons, of the reign, Acts xi. 28 ἐπὶ Κλαύδιον under Claudius, Mark ii. 26 (Raphael and Fr. in loc.), Luke iii. 2 (Her. 1, 15; Aeschin. dial. 3, 4; Xen. C. 8, 4, 5, etc.; Bremi, Demosth. p. 165; Schweigh. Lexic. Herod. I. 243; Sturz, Lexic. Dion. Cass. p. 148); likewise simply of the lifetime (ἐπὶ ἐμὸν in my time), especially of prominent characters, Luke iv. 27 ἐπὶ Ἐλευσίαν (Xen. C. 1, 6, 31; Plat. rep. 10, 599 e.; Crit. 112 a.; Alciphr. 1, 5 ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων, Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 27); also with words denoting conditions and events (Xen. C. 8, 7, 1; Herod. 2, 9, 7) Matt. i. 11 ἐπὶ τῆς μετουκεσίας Βαβ. at the time of the exile; lastly, directly of time, Heb. i. 1 ἐπὶ ἐσχάτου

1 The phrase in full would be, ἐπὶ στύματος ὧδα μαρτύρων etc. Matt. xviii. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 1 (after the Hebrew "ם"ב"א). Even here, strictly, ἐπὶ means simply with: with (on) the testimony of... witnesses.
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τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦτων in these last days, 1 Pet. i. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 3, cf. Num. xxiv. 14; Gen. xlix. 1 (ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων Aristot. polit. 3, 10; Polyb. 1, 15, 12; Isocr. paneg. c. 44); and in general, of that with which something else is connected, Rom. i. 10 ἐπὶ τῶν προσεχῶν μου at (in) my prayers, 1 Thess. i. 2; Eph. i. 16. The import of ἐπὶ is not quite the same in Mark xii. 26 ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου at the bush, i.e. concisely, at the passage relating to the bush.

Sometimes ἐπὶ in a local sense is also used with verbs of direction, and even with verbs of motion (Bhd. 246) ἐπὶ, towards, forth upon; as, Matt. xxvi. 12 βαλοῦσα τὸ μῦρον ἐπὶ τοῦ σῶματος on (over) my body, Acts x. 11 σκεύος τι ... καθιέμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς let down on (to) the earth, Mark xiv. 35 εἶπεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς upon the earth, Heb. vi. 7. So very frequently in Greek authors, Her. 1, 164; 2, 73, 75, 119; 4, 14; 5, 38; Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 1, and Hellen. 1, 6, 20; 3, 4, 12; 5, 8, 6; 7, 1, 28 etc.; Sturz, Lexic. Xen. ii. 258; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. i. 339; Wittmann, de natura et potestate praepositionis ἐπὶ. Schweinfurt, 1846. 4to. In this application ἐπὶ originally includes the notion of remaining on, upon, see Rost 553 (somewhat differently explained in Krü. 302). ¹ Such passages as Rev. x. 2; Luke viii. 16; Jno. xix. 19; Acts v. 15 (τιθέναι ἐπὶ τοῦ etc.) are traceable, like poner in loco, to a different view of the action.

h. Ἐπάρκεια properly signifies among, amidst (μέσος), Luke xxiv. 5 τίς ἐφείτε τῶν ἐπάρκεια μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν; Mark i. 13. Hence it denotes with (together with), Luke v. 80 μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν ἐσθίετε, Jno. xx. 7; and that in reference to personal association, Jno. iii. 22; xviii. 2; Acts ix. 39; Matt. xii. 42; Heb. xi. 9, ² and alternate action, Jno. iv. 27 λαλεῖν μετὰ τινος, vi. 43 γογγυζεῖν μετ' ἀλλήλων, Matt. xviii. 23 συναίρειν λόγον μετὰ τινος, cf. Rev. ii. 16, 22; Luke 353 xii. 13; especially if intellectual or moral, Matt. xx. 2 συμφωνεῖν μετὰ τινος, ii. 3; Luke xxiii. 12; Acts vii. 9; Rom. xii. 15; 1 Jno. i. 6 (ἐίπα μετὰ τινος Matt. xii. 30, cf. Xen. C. 2, 4, 7); sometimes 337 where we should employ on or towards, erga, as Luke x. 37 ὁ ποιήσας ὑμᾶς εἰς ἐλεόν μετ' ἐμοῦ, i. 72 (eμοτ; probably not Acts xiv. 27), for we regard the individual towards whom kindness is shown as the object, not as the partner, of the act. But μετά is applied also to things, Luke xiii. 1 δῶ μετὰ αἷμα ἐμφιεῖν μετὰ τῶν θυσίων αὐτῶν, Matt.

¹ This distinction was perceived by so early a writer as Bengel (on Heb. vi. 7).
² Under this head comes also the Hebraistic πληρώσω με συφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσέκουσαι του Acts ii. 28 Sept. (τῶν τῶν), which must not be taken in a merely local signification.
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xxvii. 34, especially to express equipment, accompaniment, environment, Luke xxiii. 52 ἐξειληθάτε μετὰ μαχαίρων, Jno. xviii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 31 (Dem. Pantaen. p. 628 c.; Herod. 5, 6, 19); then of accompanying actions and circumstances, particularly states of mind (Bhdy. 255), Heb. xii. 17 μετὰ δακρύων ἐκχύτησα (Herod. 1, 16, 10), 1 Tim. iv. 14; Matt. xiv. 7; Mark x. 30; Acts v. 26; xvii. 11 ἐδέξασθο τὸν λόγον μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας, Matt. xiii. 20; xxviii. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 15 (Eurip. Hippol. 205; Soph. Oed. C. 1636; Alciphr. 3, 88; Arist. magn. Mor. 2, 6; Hérod. 1, 5, 19); lastly, 895 of the inward connection of spiritual objects, Eph. vi. 23 ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως. In good prose μετά never designates the instrument as such (Kypke I. 143), — in 1 Tim. iv. 14 μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν is with, amid, the laying on of hands (simultaneously with the act of imposition), Matt. xiv. 7 μεθ' ὀρκου interposito jurejurando (Heb. vii. 21) — yet it borders on this signification in Luke xvii. 15 μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης δοξάζων (essentially equivalent to φωνῇ μεγάλῃ or ἐν φωνῇ μ.), and perhaps in Acts xiii. 17; cf. Polyb. 1, 49, 9 ἥθροιζε μετὰ κηρύγματος, Lucian. philops. 8 βονθεῖν τινι μετὰ τῆς τέχνης, as σῶν is used in other writers, at least in poets, Bhdy. S. 214). As to Matt. xxvii. 66, however, see Fr. It never signifies after; in Mark x. 30 μετὰ διωγμῶν is, amid persecutions, as μετὰ κινδύνων is amid dangers, Thuc. 1, 18 a. Kühnöl and BCrus. erroneously render μετά with the Gen. in Matt. xii. 41 by contra; the meaning is: the men of Nineveh will appear at the judgment with this generation, i.e. when this generation appears before the judgment-seat, the Ninevites will appear also; for what purpose (against) we are first told by the words that follow. (The use of the Gen. with μετά is accounted for by the fact that whatever attends or surrounds any one bears to him a certain relation of dependence.)

i. Διά. Its primary meaning is through, 1 Cor. xiii. 12 (Plat. Phaed. 109 c.); but with the idea of going through is connected always, in the local sense, that of going forth or out from (thus in Heb. and Arabic ṣa is the only preposition for the local through; cf. also Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 191 ἐκφεύγειν δέ αἰώνος, Matt iv. 4

1 The meaning of μετὰ λόγων Fabric. Pseudepigr. II. 143 is: with a light, i.e. furnished with a light, carrying it with him, cum lumine, not lumine. On the other hand, cf. Leo Gramm. p. 260 μαχαίρων ἐκφέρεται βουλήμενος ἀναλείματι σα μετὰ αὖτος, p. 275 etc.

2 Yet μετά here is probably to be understood of the accompaniment: with upraised arm, as he held up his arm over them (to protect them).

3 Fabric. Pseudepigr. II. 599 μετὰ τοῦ ἱλασθεῖν is undoubtedly an error in transcribing, for τὸ ἱλασθεῖν. Further, the passages collected by Raphael. Mr. 1.c. prove nothing.
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ἐκπορεύεσθαι διά from Deut. viii. 3, and διεξέρχεσθαι Plat. rep. 328b 10, 621 a.) 1 hence διά governs the Genitive. It is applied to space in simple expressions, Luke iv. 30 αὐτὸς διεξάγει διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο (Herod. 2, 1, 3), 1 Cor. iii. 15 σωθήσεται . . . ὡς διὰ πυρός, Rom. xv. 28 ἀπελεύσομαι δι’ ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν i.e. through your city (Thuc. 5, 4; Plut. virt. mul. p. 192 Lips.), Acts xiii. 49 διεφέρετο ὁ λόγος δι’ ἀληθ χωρίς from one extremity to the other 396 (throughout, Odys. 12, 335; Plat. symp. p. 220 b.), 2 Cor. viii. 18 οὖ δὲ ἐπαινοῦ . . . διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

From this local through, in Greek as in all languages, the transition is easy to the instrument (whether animate or inanimate), as that through which the effect as it were passes (cf. in particular 1 Pet. i. 7), that which intervenes between the volition and the deed, e.g. 8 Jno. 13 οὖ θάλα διὰ μέλανο καὶ καλάμου γράφει, 2 Jno. 12 (Plut. vit. Solon. p. 87 e.), 2 Cor. vi. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 2 διὰ λόγου, δι’ ἐπιστολάς, by word of mouth, by letter, Heb. xiii. 22 διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν ραυκίς scripsi vobis, see § 64; thence it is applied to immaterial objects, as in 1 Cor. vi. 14 ὡς ἐξεγερεὶ διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, Rom. iii. 25 διὸ προέθετο διαστήμων διὰ τῆς πίστεως, Rom. ii. 12; Jas. ii. 12 κρίνεσθαι διὰ νόμον; to persons, as in Acts iii. 16 ἡ πίστις ἢ δι’ αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor. iii. 5 διάκονοι, δι’ ὑμᾶς ἐπιστεύσατε, Heb. iii. 16 οἱ ἐξελθόντες εἰς Ἀγρίππαν διὰ Μωσ. Thus in particular in the expression διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of the (mediatorial) agency of Christ in all its manifestations, Rom. ii. 16; v. 1; 2 Cor. i. 5; Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 5; Phil. i. 11; Tit. iii. 6 etc. 2 as also in διὰ πνεύματος (ἀγίου) Rom. v. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 8; Eph. iii. 16. To this (instrumental) use may be referred likewise 2 Tim. ii. 2 διὰ τολῆς μαρτύρων intervenientibus multis testibus, through the interposition i.e. here in the presence of many witnesses, Heb. vii. 9 διὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Λευὶ διδακτώτατα through Abraham (that is, in the person of Abraham as representative of the whole Israelitish people, when Abraham was tithed Levi also was tithed). Διά but rarely indicates the causa principalis, 3 1 Cor.

---

1 Cf. Kühner II. 281 and my 5th Progr. de verbis composit. p. 3.
2 This expression comes essentially under the same head when it is joined to praising, thanking, etc. Rom. i. 8; vii. 25; xvi. 27; Col. iii. 17. Not merely the benefits for which thanks are offered are procured through Christ, but even the thanksgiving itself is offered (if so as to be acceptable to God) through Christ who lives with God and continues the work of mediation for his people. The Christian does not give thanks in his proper person, but through Christ, whom he regards as the mediator of his prayer as well as of salvation. Philippi on Rom. i. 8 is unsatisfactory; Bengel on the same passage is better.
3 As to the Latin per for a, see Hand, Tursell. IV. 436 sq. The wrong done through
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i. 9 (Gal. iv. 7 var.), in other words but rarely seems to be equivalent to ἐν οίκῳ or παρὰ; but even in such cases it does not designate the author as such, i.e. as the one from whom something proceeds, but rather as the person through whose effort, or kindness etc., something accrues to one cf. Gal. i. 1 (without specifying whether it flows from him directly or indirectly).¹ We may add with Fr. (Rom. I. 15): est autem hic usus ὁδι τανταμ admisus, ubi nullam sententiae ambiguïtem crearet; thus in Gal. i. 1, after the discriminating use of ἀπὸ and διὰ, διὰ alone is employed in summing up, and employed too of God. Many passages, however, have been erroneously referred to this class: in Jno. i. 3, 17 the doctrine of the Logos justifies the per of mediate agency, cf. Origen in loc. (Tom. I. 108 Lommatsch); in Rom. i. 5 δι' ὄν is explained from xv. 15; Rom. xi. 36, owing to the prepositions εκ and εἰς, admits no other interpretation; on Gal. iii. 19 see my Comment.; in Rom. v. 2 nobody will be misled by Fr.'s remarks; in Heb. ii. 3 Christ is viewed as commissioned by God to proclaim salvation; as to 1 Pet. ii. 14 see Steiger in loc.²

To the idea of instrumentality διὰ can also be referred when used of the state of mind in which one does something, e.g. δι' ἱστο-μονῆς ἀπεκδέχεσθαι, τρέχειν Rom. viii. 25; Heb. xii. 1; Plut. educ. 5, 3;³ probably also 2 Cor. v. 7 διὰ πίστεως περιπατούμεν. Hence διὰ serves as a circumlocution for an adjective, 2 Cor. iii. 11 εἰ τὸ καταργοῦμεν (ἐστι) διὰ δόξης (i.e. ἐνδοξοῦ) Mtth. II. 1358. Διὰ is more loosely used of one's equipment, and of the circumstances

¹ and the wrong done by me, may on the whole express quite the same thing; yet the wrong-doer is viewed in these expressions under two different aspects. Probably διὰ is employed purposely in Matt. xxvi. 24 τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δι' ὁδι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδόθη (the betrayer was merely an instrument, cf. Rom. viii. 32) and in Acts ii. 43 καὶ τῆς καὶ σημεία διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο, as the efficient cause was God himself (Acts ii. 22; xv. 12), cf. διὰ χειρῶν v. 12; xiv. 3. That this more precise mode of expression is not observed everywhere and by all writers does not invalidate this exposition.

² Nearly to the same effect is the remark of Bremi on Corn. Nep. 10, 1, 4. Even conceded that διὰ and ἐν διά are wholly identical, it would not follow that Gal. iii. 19 (ὁμοίως) διαντεραὶ δι' ἀγγέλων represents the angels as authors of the Mosaic Law (as Schultess persisted in asserting). To justify any departure from the plain meaning—ordained through angels—far other and more solid reasons must be assigned than those urged by Schultess.

³ At first sight τίνας παραγγελίας ἵδωσαν ὁμῶς διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Ἰ. These. iv. 2 appears strange. But as the Apostle was not acting in his private capacity, but as moved by Christ, the charges he issued were properly charges given through Christ.

⁴ Xen. C. 4, 6, 6 is of a different sort. Also in 2 Cor. ii. 4 ἔγραψα διὰ τολμᾶν διὰρόων is, properly, through many tears. Amid many tears is an expression somewhat similar; see above, μετὰ p. 376 sq.
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and relations under which he does something, e.g. 1 Jno. v. 6 ἔδωκαν δὲ ἦσαν καὶ ἀμφοτεροίς came by means of water and blood, Heb. ix. 12 (yet see Bleek in loc.), Rom. ii. 27 σὲ τὸν δὲ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάσεις ὤνα with letter and circumcision, i.e. notwithstanding that thou wast in possession of a written law etc.,

356 iv. 11; xiv. 20 δὲ προσκόμιματος ἔσβην he who eateth with offence (giving offence), (Markland, Lys. V. 329 Reisk.).

Applied to time, διὰ denotes, a) During (i.e. within a space of time), Heb. ii. 15 διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζητοῦ (Xen. Cyr. 2, 1, 19; Mem. 340 1, 2, 61; Plat. conv. 203 d.); even though the action takes place but once or occasionally within the period mentioned, as in Acts v. 19; xvi. 9 etc. (of which laxer use no instances are to be found in literary Greek, Fr. in Fritzschior. Opusc. p. 164 sq.).

b) After, as δὲ ἐπὶ πλείονον Acts xxiv. 17, properly interjectis pluribus annis, many years intervening, i.e. after the lapse of many years (see Perizon. Aelian. p. 921 ed. Gronov.; Blomfield, Aesch. Pers. 1006; Wetst. I. 525, 558), and Gal. ii. 1, cf. Her. 6, 118; Plat. legg. 8, 834 e.; Arist. anim. 8, 15; Polyb. 22, 26, 22; Geopon. 14, 26, 2; Plutarch. Agis 10; Lucian. Icar. 24, also Sept. Deut. ix. 11. Lastly, Mark ii. 1 δὲ ἡμερῶν after (some) days (Theophr. plant. 4, 4 δὲ ἡμερῶν τινων), cf. διὰ χρόνου Plat. Euthyd. 273 b.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 28 (Raphael, Kypke, and Fr. in loc.).

The following significations have been erroneously attributed to διὰ:

a. Into (in with the Acc.): 1 Cor. xiii. 12 βλέπομεν δὲ ἔκτροπον is said agreeably to a popular notion; the look passes through the mirror, inasmuch as the form appears to be standing behind the mirror.

b. Cum: 1 Cor. xvi. 3 δὲ ἑπτακόλων τοῦτον πέμψω ἀνενεκαίν etc. is to be rendered, by means of letters, so as to recommend them by letters (Syriac |<c.t.>). To be sure, the Apostle means at the same time

---

1 No one will deny this signification who is not trying to find in the above passage of Gal. confirmation of his own previous decision respecting the chronology of Paul's travels. That the preposition can have this meaning becomes plain, whether, with Mth. 1352, we derive it from the notion of distance which διὰ in a local sense denotes, or from the notion of passing through a succession of points of time (which are thereby indicated as travelled through, gone over), Hm. Vig. 856. The assertion that διὰ is thus applied only to a period of time after which something occurs as its result, is a subtlety which has no foundation in usage, and a misapplication of the notion of means (itself figurative) to explain a temporal use of the preposition, — a use always most closely connected with its local and primary import. Even, however, were the alleged restriction to be admitted, it would not be impossible to apply the expression διὰ διὰτρα. ἐτῶν in Gal. ii. 1 to a journey the necessity of which Paul felt in consequence of an active ministry of fourteen years. At least, καὶ ἀπόστασιν in vs. 2 could not be urged as a decisive argument on the other side.
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that they themselves should take the letters with them; but still the import of the Preposition is strictly preserved.

c. Ad: 2 Pet. i. 3 καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς is not ad relig. Christ. adduxit eo consilio, ut consequeremini felicitatem etc., but called us by (means of) glory and might, so that in this call God's power and 299 majesty were exhibited (vs. 4, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9). Some Codd. [Sin. also] give δόξη καὶ ἀρετῆ.

d. On account of, for διὰ with the Acc. (only thus in very late writers, e.g. Acta apocr. p. 252): In 2 Cor. i. 13 διὰ denotes rather the occasion which gives rise to the δοξάζων; whereas what follows, ἵππες ἑπταγενή, ἓν ἅλιν, means, for i.e. on account of the obedience. In 1 Cor. i. 21 ὅπως ἐν κόσμῳ διὰ τῆς σοφίας τῶν θεοῦ may very well be rendered: by means of their (boasted vs. 20) wisdom (it did not conduct them to this result); though the interpretation of others, in consequence of (sheer) wisdom, if taken thus: by the possession of wisdom (see above), is grammatically 341 admissible. But διὰ τῆς μορφῆς which immediately follows is decisive in favor of the former explanation. Rom. vii. 4 ἵδανατο ἐμπρος τῆς νόμου διὰ τοῦ σωματος Χριστοῦ is elucidated by verses 1–3: Ye were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; with the death of the body of Christ (which had reference to the law) ye are made dead (slain) to the law. That in 1 Cor. xi. 12 διὰ τῆς γνωσίας is not used for διὰ τῆς γνώσεως (which would introduce here an extraneous thought) is the more clear from the circumstance that it is manifestly to be taken as corresponding to ἐκ τοῦ ἀναπόστ; the distinction between ἐκ and διὰ is obvious. In 2 Cor. viii. 8 (Schott) διὰ τῆς ἑλπιδὸς ἡσυχίας is to be joined to δοκίμαζο, see Bengel. Heb. xi. 39 (Schott) πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως εἰς, who through the faith have obtained a good report. Likewise the rendering per (Schott) in exhortations and adurations (by), Rom. xii. 1; xv. 30; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. x. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 12, is entirely unfounded. To exhort or adjure one through the mercies of God, through the name of Christ. means: referring to, reminding of etc.; διὰ indicates the consideration held out to strengthen the exhortation.

k. Κατά. Its primary import is down, de (down upon, down from), cf. κάτω (Xen. A. 4, 2, 17 ἀλλόμενοι κατὰ τῆς πέτρας, 1, 5, 8 τρέχειν κατὰ πρανοῦς γηλόφου, Her. 8, 58): Matt. viii. 32 ὅρισεν πάσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνῶν (Galen. protrept. 2 κατά κρημνῶν, Dio Chr. 7, 99; Porphyr. abstin. 4, 15; Aelian. 7, 14; Pausan. 10, 2, 2), 1 Cor. xi. 4 ἀνήρ κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων having (a veil hanging) down from his head; cf. also, in a tropical use, 2 Cor. viii. 2 ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεῖα poverty reaching down to the depth.1 It

1 To the same head is to be referred also Acts xxvii. 14 ἦβαλε κατ' αὐτής ἀνέμου τυφώνεις. The tempestuous wind rushed (from above) down upon the island. In Mark xiv. 3 κατέχειν ἀπό τῆς κεφαλῆς (holding the flask of ointment over his
400 passes from this to denote the level over (through) which something extends; and thus differs essentially from the local εν (with which by late writers it is often confounded, cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 355), as in Luke iv. 14 ἐξήλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου, Acts ix. 31, 42; x. 37, cf. Arrian. Alex. 5, 7, 1, and Indic. 13, 6.

Figuratively, it is applied to hostile movement directed against something, as in Matt. x. 35; xxvii. 1; Acts vi. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 6; xv. 15; Rom. viii. 33 (the opposite of ὑπὲρ Rom. xi. 2; cf. viii. 34; 2 Cor. xiii. 8); and is the preposition usually employed to express this relation. Yet primarily it seems, like the German gegen, to denote merely thitherwards; while ἀνά, like contra, includes the notion of hostility in its local signification even. In oaths and adjurations, as in Matt. xxvi. 63; Heb. vi. 13, 16, κατὰ θεόν (Schaef. Long. p. 353 sq.; Bhdy. 238) probably means down from God, calling God down, so to speak, as witness or avenger (Krü. 294).

Kühner II. 284 takes a different view.

342 1. ὑπέρ, in its local signification, denotes the being above (over) a place (properly without immediate contact, Xen. M. 3, 8, 9 ἡμῶν τοῦ θέρους ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν στεγῶν πορευόμενος, Herod. 2, 6, 19); hence in geographical diction the expression situated above a place, imminere urbi, Xen. A. 1, 10, 12; Thuc. 1, 137 (Dissen, Pind. p. 431). In the N. T. it is used only in a figurative sense: 1 and 1) most nearly approaching its local import in 1 Cor. iv. 6 ἦν μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνός φυσιόνοιτε, if rendered: that one be not puffed up above the other (so that he fancy himself raised above the other); still related also to the local sense, 2) to the advantage of, for the benefit of, for (the opposite of κατὰ Mark ix. 40; Rom. viii. 31) any one (die, suffer, pray, care, exert one’s self, etc., see 401 Benseler, Isoor. Areopag. p. 164 sq.) Jno. x. 15; xi. 50; Rom. v. 6; ix. 3 (cf. Xen. A. 7, 4, 9; Diod. Sic. 17, 15; Strabo 8, 165; Eurip. Alcest. 700, 711), Luke xxii. 19; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iv. 10; Heb. v. 1; vii. 25; xiii. 17; Col. i. 7, 24, probably also 1 Cor. xv. 29, — originally as if bending over one to protect and defend him (cf. head) good Codd. [Sin. also] omit the preposition. As to κατὰκόσμον κατὰ τοὺς, see Plat. rep. 3, 398 a.; Apollod. 2, 7, 6.

1 Unless 1 Cor. xv. 29 βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν be rendered: cause themselves to be baptized over the dead. The passage can only be elucidated by antiquarian research. It is strange, however, that Mey. should declare the above explanation inadmissible because ὑπὲρ occurs nowhere else in the N. T. in a local sense. Might not the preposition be used in this most simple local sense in a single passage only? The comment of van Hengel, Cor. p. 186, is worthy of attention, though it, too, contains an arbitrary restriction.
§ 47. PREPOSITIONS WITH THE GENITIVE.

μάκεσθαι ἵπτερ τινός Xen. C. 2, 1; 21; Isocr. paneg. 14); ¹ also εἶναι ἵπτερ τινός to be for one, Mark ix. 40; Rom. viii. 31; x. 1; Blume, Lycurg. p. 151. In most cases one who acts in behalf of another takes his place, 1 Tim. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 15; hence ἵπτερ is sometimes nearly equivalent to ἀνρί instead, loco (see, especially, Eurip. Alcest. 700) Philem. 13 (Thuc. 1, 141; Polyb. 66, 7, 7). ² 8) ἤτερον denotes the subject on (over) which one speaks, writes, decides, etc., Rom. ix. 27; Phil. i. 7; 2 Cor. viii. 23 (see Joel i. 8; Plutarch. Brut. 1; Mar. 8; Plat. Apol. 39 e.; legg. 6, 776; Demosth. 3-9 1. phil. p. 20 a.; Arrian. Al. 8, 3, 11; 6, 2, 6; Arrian. Epict. 1, 7th ed. 19, 26; Polyb. 1, 14, 1; Dion. H. V. 625; Aeschin. dial. 1, 8; Aelian. anim. 11, 20 and often), or for, in reference to, which one gives thanks, praise, Eph. i. 16; v. 20; Rom. xv. 9, on which one prides one's self, 2 Cor. vii. 4; ix. 2; xii. 5; 2 Thess. i. 4 (cf. in Latin super, in Hebrew עזר; the phrase de aliqua re loqui, too, is akin, see under περί); ³ hence in general, with regard to a matter, 343 e.g. 2 Cor. i. 6, 8; 2 Thess. ii. 1 ἡμῶν ἤπτερ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου (cf. Xen. C. 7, 1, 17 ἤπτερ τινός ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ to have full confidence in reference to one). Akin to this is the causal designation on account of, for the sake of, 2 Cor. xii. 8 (Hebrew עזר, yet cf. Latin gratia, and Xen. C. 2, 2, 11, and even the German für, which often suits such passages and presents the same meaning under different aspects) Rom. xv. 8 ἤπτερ ἀλήθειας θεοῦ (Philostr. Apoll. 1, 35; Xen. A. 1, 7, 3, etc.), under which head come also Jno. xi. 4 ἤπτερ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ for the glory of God, gloriae divinae illustrandae causa, 2 Cor. xii. 19 ἤπτερ τῆς ἱμάτων οἰκοδομῆς for your 402 edification, Rom. i. 5; 8 Jno. 7 and, with a difference of application, Phil. ii. 13 θεος ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ... ἤπτερ τῆς εὐδοκίας because of his benevolence, in order to satisfy his benevolence. In 2 Cor. v. 20 ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ προσβείον ... δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, probably

¹ Hence properly different from περί, which simply means, on account of one, viewed as the object, the cause of the death, the prayer, etc.; see Schaeff. Demosth. I. 189 sq.; cf. Reitz, Lucian. VI. 642; VII. 403 sq. ed. Lehm.; Schoefer. Isae. p. 234; Franks, Demosth. p. 6 sq. In the Codd. of the N. T., however, as in Greek authors, the two prepositions are frequently interchanged, see on Gal. i. 4, Rom. i. 8, and the writers themselves do not adhere to the distinction. The two prepositions are appropriately used together in 1 Pet. iii. 18 (Eph. vi. 18). Cf. Thuc. 6, 78.

² Still, in doctrinal passages relating to Christ's death (Gal. iii. 13; Rom. v. 6, 8; xiv. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 18, etc.) it is not justifiable to render ἵπτερ ἡμῶν and the like rigorously by instead of on account of such parallel passages as Matt. xx. 28 (Fr. Rom. I. 267). 'Ἀνρί is the more definite of the two prepositions. 'Ἐτερον signifies merely for men, for their deliverance; and leaves undetermined the precise sense in which Christ died for them.

³ So with ἀλήθειας, ἐγεράστως, etc. Stalib. Plat. Enthyd. p. 119.
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ίτρεπ means both times (see de Wette in opposition to Mey.) for Christ i.e. in his name and behalf (consequently, in his stead), cf. Xen. C. 3, 8, 14; Plato Gorg. 515 c.; Polyb. 21, 14, 9; Marle floril. p. 169 sq., see above, no. 2) at the end. Others take the second ιτρεπ as in solemn asseverations (Bhdy. 244, whose explanation of this use, however, is assuredly erroneous) by Christ, per Christum. In Eph. vi. 20 the phrase προςβεδευμ ιτρεπ is used in reference to a thing: to act as an ambassador for the gospel (in the cause of the gospel), cf. Dion. H. IV. 2044; Lucian. Toxar. 34.
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a ἐν 1) In its local signification (see Spohn, Niceph. Blemmid. p. 29 sqq.), this preposition refers to an expanse within the bounds of which anything exists. Hence, according to different conceptions of the relation, it signifies

860. a) First of all ἐν or (when applied to surfaces, heights, etc.) on, Matt. xxiv. 40 ἐν τῷ ὁρῷ, xx. 3 ἐν τῷ ὁρῷ, Luke xix. 36; Rev. iii. 21; Jno. iv. 20; 2 Cor. iii. 3. The same relation is frequently expressed by ἐπί with greater precision.

b) Then (of many) among, Matt. xi. 11; Acts ii. 29; iv. 34; xx. 25; Rom. i. 5; 1 Cor. v. 1; 1 Pet. v. 1; ii. 12. With this is connected ἐν denoting retinue, Luke xiv. 31 ἐν δεκα χιλιάσιω 403 ἀπωτῆσας, Jude 14 (Neh. xiii. 2; 1 Sam. i. 24; 1 Macc. i. 17); as well as clothing (and armor, cf. Eph. vi. 16; Krebs, Obs. 26)

344 Matt. vii. 15; Mark xii. 38; Jno. xx. 12 (Aelian. 9, 34; Her. 2, 169; Callim. Dian. 241; Mthl. II. 1340). In a more general use ἐν is applied to that with which one is furnished, which he brings with him, Heb. ix. 25 εἰσέρχεται ἐν αἵματι, 1 Cor. iv. 21; v. 8; 2 Cor. x. 14; Rom. xv. 29 (Xen. C. 2, 3, 14).

c) Less strictly ἐν, at, sometimes of direct cohesion, Jno. xv. 4 κλήμα ἐὰν μὴ μείνῃ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, sometimes of mere proximity (by, παρά), καθίζειν (εἶναι) ἐν ἐξήθ θεῷ at (on) the right hand, Heb. i. 8; viii. 1; Eph. i. 20; Plutarch. Lysand. 436 b.; Dio C. 216, 50

1 ἐν is used (apparently) with the Gen. in Heb. xi. 26, according to the reading admitted into the text by Lchm. from A and other Codd., τῶν ἐν Ἁγίστου τιθεασάν. Such constructions, by no means rare in Greek authors, must, as is well known, be considered as elliptical: ἐν γῇ Ἁγίστου. Usually, however, only such words as λύς, ἐσθρ, ὡς are omitted; and in the passage in question there is a predominance of authority for τῶν Ἁγίστου τιθεασάν; [so Sin. also]. As to the most ancient use of this preposition (in Homer), see Giuse in Schneidewin's Philolog. VII 77 ff.
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(much more frequently thus used in Greek authors, Xen. C. 7, 1, 45; Isocr. panath. p. 646 and Philipp. p. 216; Plat. Charm. 153 b.; Diod. S. 4, 78; 17, 10, cf. comm. on Lucian. VI. 640 Lehm.; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 123). On the other hand, it signifies in in Jno. x. 23 and Luke ii. 7, probably also in Jno. viii. 20, where ῥαξοφυλάκιος denotes the treasury as an apartment (or locality), and Luke xiii. 4, as it was usual to say in Siloam, because the fountain was surrounded with buildings; perhaps also Matt. xxvii. 5, see Mey. in loc. That in forms of quoting, as ἐν δαινός Heb. iv. 7; Rom. ix. 25 (in Cic. or. 71; Quint. 9, 4, 8) and even Rom. xi. 2 ἐν Ἡλία (see van Marle and Fr. in loc. cf. Diog. L. 6, 104), ἐν should be rendered by in, is obvious.

d) Before, apud, coram (Isocr. Archid. p. 276; Lysias pro mil. 11; Arrian. Epictet. 8, 22, 8; Ast. Plat. legg. 285)—a rendering, however, which is unnecessary in 1 Tim. iv. 15 (where, besides, πάσων must be read without ἐν). This meaning, however, it bears in 1 Cor. ii. 6 (xiv. 11), see above, § 31, 8 (cf. Demosth. Boeot. p. 636 a.; Polyb. 17, 6, 1; 5, 29, 6; Appian. civ. 2, 187), also 1 Cor. vi. 2 ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται ὅ κόσμος (in the orators ἐν ὑμῖν is often used thus for apud vos, judices, see Kypke in loc.), as well as ἐν ὑπάλληλοις των before one’s eyes (ante oc.), see Palair. and 361 Elsner on Matt. xxi. 42—a phrase used in this passage of the Sept. 74 ad figuratively.

2) By an easy transition ἐν is employed to denote temporal 404 relations, where we use sometimes in, sometimes on (e.g. of festivals) Matt. xii. 2; Jno. ii. 23, sometimes at (with a substantive denoting an event) Matt. xxii. 28; 1 Pet. i. 7, also 1 Cor. xv. 52 ἐν τῇ ἑκάστῃ σαλπηρίᾳ at the last trumpet (as soon as it sounds), 1 Thess. iv. 16; Heb. iii. 8, and with the Inf. of verbs, Matt. xiii. 25; Luke ix. 36; xvii. 11. Where it signifies within (Wex, Soph. Antig. p. 167) Jno. ii. 19 it may also be rendered by in (Hor. 2, 29), and differs then obviously from διά; for ἐν τρισίν ἥμερας (Plato

---

1 To render ἐν ἃ in Heb. ix. 4 by juxta quam, would be to favor archaeology at the expense of grammar. Where ἐν is in a local sense is joined to personal names (in the Plat.), it signifies not so much with as among, in the midst of, (a number, a company, etc.). As to 1 Pet. v. 2 ἐν ὑμῖν κοινωνία, Potts’s rendering is quite admissible: the flock existing in the countries where you reside (cf. 8d Rom. xv. 28). Grammatically it would be possible also to join ἐν ὑμῖν to συμμετείχεσθε (quantum in vobis est, as much as in you lies), or, which would undoubtedly be far-fetched, to render ἐν ὑμῖν κοινωνία the flock entrusted to you, as ἐλεύθερα. ἐν τινι means, to rely on, depend on, one.

2 In explaining 1 Cor. as above, Rücker pronounces ἐν ὑμῖν exactly the same as ὑμῖν—one of those superficial remarks which, so nackedly stated, one could hardly have expected from a scholar at the present day.
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345 Menex. 240 b.) does not mean that three whole days are to be spent on something, but only that something is to take place within that space of time, consequently before its expiration. Cf. besides, ἐν τῷ white, during the time that, Jno. v. 7; Mark ii. 19; Thuc. 6, 55; Plato Theat. 190 e.; Soph. Trach. 925 (ἐν τοῦτῳ interea Xen. C. 1, 8, 17; 3, 2, 12), ἐν ὑπὸ during which Luke. xii. 1. Closely related to the temporal signification is the ἐν of subsistence (i.e. positive and continued existence) Heb. vi. 18 ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον γεν- σασθαι θεόν whereupon, these two assurances being matters of fact, etc., Rom. ii. 12 ἐν νόμῳ ἦμαρτον under (during the existence, while in possession, of) the law; — also of condition, Luke viii. 43 γυνῆ οὗτα ἐν ὑπὸ αἵματος, Rom. iv. 10; Phil. iv. 11 (see Elnser in loc.; Kühner II. 274), and that, too, inward, Luke iv. 36; Tit. i. 6, particularly of the state of mind or feeling, 1 Tim. ii. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 1; viii. 2; Luke i. 44, 75; Eph. i. 4 (Heb. xi. 2); 2 Pet. ii. 3; lastly, — the ἐν of occupation, 1 Tim. iv. 15 ἐν τούτῳ ἵσταται, Col. iv. 2 cf. Eph. vi. 20 (Mey. in loc.), neut. ἐν οἷς Acts xxvi. 12. Cf. Xen. C. 3, 1, 1; 5, 2, 17; Soph. Oed. R. 570; Plato Phaed. 59 a. and Stallb. in loc.

3) The figurative use of ἐν, to which we have already made some incidental reference, is extremely diversified, perceptibly exhibiting the progressive deterioration of the language as well as a Hebrew coloring. For ἐν is used to indicate not merely that in which something else is (ideally) contained, consists, appears 1 Pet. iii. 4; Eph. iv. 3 (ii. 15), 2 Thess. ii. 9 (1 Cor. xi. 25), Phil. i. 9, but also, with great variety of application,

a) The basis on which, or the sphere (range, personal or impersonal) in which, some power acts, 1 Cor. ix. 15 ἡμα oὖν (vs. 13 f.) γεννηται ἐν ἑαυτῷ that it should be so done on me (in my case), iv. 2, 405 6 ἐν ἰδίῳ μάθητε learn in us, Jno. xiii. 35 ἐν τούτῳ γνώσονται, Xen. C. 1, 6, 41 (Luke xxiv. 85; 1 Jno. iii. 19), Rom. xiv. 22 ὅ μὴ κρίνων ἐν φόνο (ἐν τούτῳ δ) δοκίμαζει, 1 Thess. v. 12 κοπιῶντες ἐν ἰδίᾳ who labor upon you, Rom. i. 9 λατρεύειν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (1 Thess. iii. 2 συνεργός ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ var.), 1 Cor. vii. 15; to denote an ethical relation, 2 Cor. iv. 2 περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ (Eph. ii. 3, 362 10; v. 2), Rom. vii. 2 ζην ἐν ἀμαρτίᾳ (Fr. in loc.), Col. iii. 7 (Cic. fam. 9, 26), cf. 1 Cor. vi. 20; 2 Thess. i. 10; 1 Jno. ii. 8; in a more extended sense, of the object in (on, at) which one rejoices, glories etc., χαίρειν, καυχάσθαι, ἐν see § 33 p. 232.

b) The measure or standard (Thuc. 1. 77; 8, 89) in, according to, which something is executed, Eph. iv. 16 (Heb. iv. 11), cf. the
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Hebrew. Many understand it so in Heb. x. 10 ἐν φθαρματι ἡμασμένοι εἰσεῖν according, in conformity, to which will. Here, however, ἐν is more precise than εἰς: It is founded in the will of God, that we are sanctified through Christ’s sacrificial death. In no other passage does the meaning secundum occur, although even the most recent N.T. Lexicons give copious examples in support of it. Ἐν ἑων according to my judgment, 1 Cor. xiv. 11, is properly: to me (in my conception) cf. Wex, Antig. p. 187. In Rom. i. 24; viii. 15; xi. 25 (var.); Phil. ii. 7 ἐν denotes condition. 1 Thess. iv. 15 may be translated: this I say unto you in a word of the Lord, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 7; xiv. 6. In περιποιηθεὶν ἐν σοφίᾳ and similar phrases, σοφία is not represented as a rule according to which, but as an ideal possession, or even a sphere within which to walk (see above). To understand ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν κυρίῳ, as meaning according to the will or example of Christ, would be to take a flat view of the apostle’s conception. Lastly, 1 Tim. i. 18 ἐν στρατεύῃ ἐν αὐταῖς (ταῖς προφητείαις) τὴν καθὴν στρατείαν is probably to be interpreted, conformably to the figure, in prophesyings, equipped with them so to speak (as the actual warrior is in arms).

c) The (external) occasion, Acts vii. 29 ἐγγυς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦτο at (on) this saying, Xen. equestr. 9, 11; hence sometimes the ground, cause, Matt. vi. 7 ἐν τῷ τολμοῦντι αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκούσθησαι on account of their much speaking (properly on their etc.), cf. Aelian. anim. 11, 31; Dio C. 25, 5, and ἐν τοῦτω Ἰν. xvi. 80 therefore,1 probably also 1 Cor. iv. 4 (cf. Plutarch. glor. Athen. c. 7 ἐν τούτοις); ἐν φίλῳ (for ἐν τοῦτῳ φίλῳ because Rom. viii. 8 see Fr. In 406 many languages, however, a concomitant is assigned thus as a cause: in Latin, propter strictly means near; and the German weil (because) is properly a particle of time (during). Ἐν in

1 In Heb. xi. 2 ἐν τάξει (τῷ πίστει) denotes not the ground, but the (ideal) possession: in hac (constituit), cf. 1 Tim. v. 10 (Ἰν. viii. 21). In Heb. ii. 18 ἐν φθαρματι is undoubtedly to be resolved by ἐν τοῖς δόμοις in eo quod, see above p. 159. This same meaning occurs in 1 Pet. ii. 12. In Heb. vi. 17 ἐν φίλῳ may be referred to δόμοι preceding, though (as sometimes δόμοι φίλῳ) the rendering quaer opropter, quare, would not be inappropriate. In Rom. ii. 1 ἐν φίλῳ may be rendered dum, or better, with the Vulgate, in quo (in qua re) judicas etc., which gives a sense quite in point, cf. Fr. In Luke x. 20 ἐν τάξει ... φίλῳ means, at this (rejoice that) that, cf. Phil. i. 18. I am not aware of there being in any Greek author an unquestionable instance of ἐν τάξει, ἐν φίλῳ, in the sense of therefore, because. The passages adduced in Stkrz, Lexic. Xenoph. II. 162, admit of another meaning. Xen. A. 1, 3, 1—a passage which Kypke, II. 194, refers to this head — has in the best editions ἐν τάξει. Likewise Plat. rep. 5, 455 b, where Ast explains ἐν φίλῳ by propter quod, is susceptible of another exposition; see Stallb. in loc.
the sense of propter is never joined to names of persons (see my
Comment. ad Gal. i. 24, cf. Exod. xiv. 4); and in general too many
passages have been referred to this head, as Eph. iii. 13; Jno.
viii. 21; Jas. i. 25; 2 Cor. vi. 12; Heb. iv. 11.

d) The instrument and means (principally in the Rev.), not
merely (as in the better Greek prose authors, see Bttm. Philoct.
p. 69; Boeckh, Pind. III. 487; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 195, and the
uncritical collections in Schwarz, Comment. p. 476; Georgi, Vind.
153 sq.) where the German in also (or auf) is admissible, as kaien

347 ev προπλ Rev. xvii. 16 (1 Cor. iii. 18), cf. 1 Macc. v. 44; vi. 31
(δῆσαι εν πέδαις Xen. A. 4, 8, 8; cf. Judg. xv. 13; xvi. 7; Sir.
11, 15), μετείχαι εν μέτρῳ Matt. vii. 2, ἀληθευεν εν ἀλατι Matt. v. 13;
Rev. vii. 14; Jas. iii. 9; Heb. ix. 22, but also, through the influence
of the Hebrew מז, in circumstances quite different from this, where
in Greek authors the Dative would be employed alone as the casus
instrumentalis, as Luke xxii. 49 παταστειν εν μαχαιρᾳ, Rev. vi. 8
ἀποκτείναι εν ῥομφαίᾳ, xiii. 10; xiv. 15 κράζειν εν μεγάλῃ φωνῇ (2 Pet.
ii. 16); Matt. vii. 6 καταπατεῖν εν τοῖς ποσίν, Luke i. 51; Mark

407 xiv. 1; Rom. xv. 6, especially in the Rev. (cf. Judg. iv. 16; xv. 15;
xx. 16, 48; 1 Kings xii. 18; Josh. x. 35; Exod. xiv. 21; xvi. 3;
xxvii. 5, 13; xix. 18; Gen. xxxii. 20; xli. 36; xliviiii. 22; Neh. i. 10;
1 Macc. iv. 15; Judith ii. 19; v. 9; vi. 4, 12, etc.). Yet such
constructions occasionally occur even in Greek authors; as, Himer.
eclog. 4, 16 εν ἑξῆς, Hippocr. aphor. 2, 36 εν φαρμάκεσι καθαλ-
364 πειθαι, Malal. 2 p. 50. Ἐν is so used with personal designations,

1 In 2 Cor. xiii. 4 ἀδεικνομεν εν ἀδρι, as frequently εν Χριστῷ (so variously un-
stood by expositors), denotes fellowship with Christ, the relation of εἰρήν εν Χριστῷ
(see below, p. 389). The apostle is not weak for Christ's sake (out of regard as it were
for the interest of Christ, to prevent the possible falling away of the Corinthians); but
weak in Christ, i.e. in and conformably to (apostolic) fellowship with Christ (who
likewise was in a certain sense ἄδεικνυσθαι; see what precedes). The phrase designates
concisely a state which results from being in Christ; just as the εἰρήν and διακοινεῖν εἰρήν
are referred to fellowship with Christ (cf. above). Just as little does Eph. iv. 16 δεικνομεν εν κυρίου
mean the prisoner for Christ's sake. Somewhat more remote is Phil. i. 8 ὅτι ἐποιηθεν τὰς
διδασκαλίας ἐν σωλήνας ἐκκλησίας Χριστῷ 'I., see Bengel.

2 It would be a mistake to suppose that in Eph. ii. 15 (§ 31, note 1, p. 220) and vi. 4 εἰ
denotes the instrument. In the latter passage ποιεῖται καὶ νουθεσία κυπλοῦσθαι is the sphere
in which the children are trained, cf. Polyb. 1, 65, 7. Even in the expression ἀλατοφθαλμοῖς
τῆς εἰρήν Rom. i. 23, I cannot with Fr. adopt the meaning per, nor do I think that the
Hebrew מז with מְזָרִית is to be so understood. To change something in gold is either an
abbreviated expression, or gold is conceived as that in which the exchange is effected.
The εἰ of price is similar; see above and p. 390.

3 Many passages that might be adduced under this head from Greek authors, are to
be otherwise explained, as ὤμων ἐν ἀνθρώπων Lucian. Phalar. 1, 5, ἐν ἀνθρώπων ὑποβλέπων Lucian. amor. 28 (cf. Weir, Antig. I. 270), Porphyry. de antro Nymphar. p. 261 ἄμφορεῖς, ἐν ἀδί ... ἄρνεθα, Lucian. asin. 44 ἐν τῇ ἁλμήσῃ ἐν τῇ ἁλμήσῃ (under the blows), Plat. Tim. 81 c. τεθραμμένης ἐν γάλακτι brought up on milk (cf. Jacob, Athen. p. 57). In Lucian. conscr. hist. 12 for ἐν ἀκαρπίᾳ φανέρων recent editors on the authority of MSS. give ἐν ἀκαρπίᾳ. φ. ; on the other hand, in Lucian. dial. mort. 23, 3 all the Codd. but one have καθώς ἐν τῇ ἀρόβιῳ (not so Adv. 6, 6), yet Lehmann considers the preposition even in this passage as suspicious (cf. Lucian. Lapith. c. 26). See, besides, Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 261; Dissen, Pind. p. 487.

1 In Jno. xvii. 10 ἄνωθεν κατὰ ἄνωθεν undoubtedly signifies more than ἀνωθεν. He would have been glorified through them, if they had merely accomplished some external achievement conducive to the glory of Christ; he is glorified in them, in so far as they in their own persons, in themselves, glorify Christ. In the same way to live and have one’s being in God, appears to express man’s subsistence, his being rooted as it were, in the divine power, with greater precision than could be done by ἄνωθεν. When ἐν and ἄνωθεν are joined together in one and the same sentence, ἄνωθεν expresses thus the external means, while ἐν points to what was wrought in or on one’s person, and as it were cleaves to him, Eph. i. 7 ἐν (Christo) ἐκχυμεν τῇ ἀπολύσεις ἀνωθεν τοῦ ἀναβολοῦ (where Meg. is wrong), iii. 6. Even when things, and not persons, are in question, the distinction between ἐν (referring to mental states or powers) and ἄνωθεν (of the means) is perceptible; as, 1 Pet. i. 5 τοῦ ἐν δύναμει θεοῦ ἑρωτομοῦσας ἵνα πιστεύετε, see Steiger in loc., i. 22 ἐγκυμότητος ἐν τῇ ἁρκεσίᾳ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκ πνεύματος, Heb. x. 10. Lastly, passages in which ἐν and ἄνωθεν in reference to things are interchanged in the same proposition, Col. i. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 4 ff. 8; 1 Cor. xiv. 19, merely show that both prepositions are identical as respects the sense. Even ἐν in Matt. iv. 4 ἐν πνεύματι φήματι does not appear to be exactly equivalent to ἐνεργεῖν ἐν ἄνωθεν; but the latter (ἐνεργεῖ) denotes the basis, ἐν the (spiritual) element, of life. At all events, through or by means of would be an inaccurate translation.
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viated way, to the being in Christ *ἐν Χριστῷ* (1 Thess. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 1; xvi. 11; 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. i. 22), and Luther's "barbarous" translation (Fr. II. 85) 1 is to be retained. So likewise in 1 Cor. xii. 3 *ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλῶν* is to be rendered quite literally, *speaking in the Spirit of God*, the element in which the speaker lives (Rom. ix. 1; xiv. 17; Col. i. 8).

e) The price, after the analogy of the Hebrew, Rev. v. 9 ἀγοράζων *ἐν τῷ αἵματι* (1 Chron. xxi. 24). The value of the thing purchased is contained in the price (to which the ἐκ of the price then corresponds).

Even in the most recent Lexicons the significations of this preposition have been unwarrantably multiplied or its real significations incorrectly applied to passages of the N.T. The interpretations which have been given to the phrase *ἐν ὀνόματι τινος* in particular are Protean. The *ἐν* here causes no difficulty, for it simply means *in*. And something takes place "in a person's name" when it is comprehended or embraced in his name, is to be set down to his personal activity, cf. Acts iv. 7 (not to his who is the nearest, the immediate, subject, cf. Jno. v. 43). Only the various verbs which are limited by *ἐν ὀνόματι* require the expositors' attention, in order that the various senses may be traced back severally in the simplest manner to the literal meaning of the phrase. This task has not yet been performed satisfactorily (yet better by Harless, Eph. S. 484, than by van Hengel, Philip. p. 161 sq.), not even by Mey. Phil. ii. 10 seems to require separate treatment: ὀνόμα here refers to ὀνόμα in vs. 9, and *ἐν ὀνόματι* denotes the name upon which those that bow the knee unite, on which united all (πᾶν γόνυ) worship. The name which Jesus has received moves all to united adoration. In Tit. iii. 5 *ἐν* does not indicate the *finitis* or *consilium*; but ἔργα τὰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ mean, works performed in the spirit of a δικαιοσύνη; as to Luke i. 17; 1 Cor. vii. 15 see below. In Mark ix. 50 ἄρπαζεν ἐν ἀλλήλοις, the rendering *erga* is not necessary; we, too,

---

1 In so far as the Christian abides (by faith) in living (inward, hence ἐν) fellowship with Christ, he will do everything in the consciousness of this fellowship, and through the strength which this fellowship confers, i.e. *in Christ, in the Lord*; as a Christian, in a Christian spirit, etc., as the words are frequently rendered, expresses much less than the pregnant phrase in Christ. So in Rom. xvi. 12 who labor in the Lord, conscious of their fellowship with the Lord (unworldly κοινωνία is meant), 1 Cor. xv. 18 who fell asleep in Christ, in conscious, steadfast fellowship with Christ (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 16; Rev. xiv. 13), Rom. ix. 1 (a passage which even Bengel misunderstood) speak the truth in Christ (as one living in Christ), xiv. 14 persuaded in the Lord (of a truth of which one in living union with Christ is assured). As to 1 Cor. iv. 15 see Mey. In the same way σπλαγχνίζω ἐν Χρ. Phil. iii. 9 is to be explained. See besides, Rom. xv. 17; xvi. 2, 22; 1 Cor. vii. 39; Phil. iv. 1 (Eph. vi. 1), 1 Pet. v. 10. Fr. Rom. II. 82 sqq. is essentially right, though his remarks are not free from misapprehensions nor from unnecessary matter. See, besides, v. Hengel, Cor. p. 81.
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say: among (one another) yourselves. The following interpretations appear still more inadmissible:

a. ex; Heb. xiii. 9 εν εἷς οίκοις ὁμονομένοις καὶ περιμετίσματε ὑπὲρ (Schott) nihil commodi perceperunt (cf. ὁμολογεῖ άνόι Aeschin. dial. 2, 11). If in 349 εἷς is to be joined to ὁμονομένοις, the preposition indicates the profit that would be made by being there in or attached thereto, Xen. Athen. rep. 1, 3; Demosth. Pantaen. 631 a.; but εἷς belongs to περιμετίσματε. Matt. i.20 τῷ εν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν means, that which has been begotten in her (in ejus utero).

b. pro, loco, Rom. xi. 17 (Schott) ἐκκατορίσθης εν αὐτοῖς (κλάδος) means: 366 grafted on the branches (of which some had been cut off).

c. with. In Acts xx. 32 εν τοῖς θεομακαίοις signifies, among (with) the sanctified. Acts vii.14 μετεκαλύσαν τόν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ἱακώβ ... εν ψυχαὶς ἔβδομ. means, (consisting) in seventy souls; χ is used in the same way in Deut. x. 22; I do not, however, know of an instance in a Greek author. Fr.'s explanation of these words (ad Mr. p. 604) appears to me too far-fetched, and it has been rejected by Wahl also. In Eph. vi. 2 ἃς ἐστὶν ἐν πάλιν ἑκάστη εν εἰκασίᾳ undoubtedly means not merely, annexe, addita promissionem, but the first in promise, i.e. in point of promise (not εν τάξει Chrysost.). So also Mey.

d. by (of). In Eph. iv. 21 εγενετε εν αὐτῷ ἐξεύρητη εἰς γεωργίαν εἰς κεραυνοὺς εἰς καταλήψιι, εἰς υπάρχειν undoubtly means not merely, annexe, addita promissionem, but the first in promise, i.e. in point of promise (not εν τάξει Chrysost.). As to εν for εἰς, see § 50, no. 4, p. 413 sq.

b. Σύν with as distinguished from μετά indicates a more intimate union; as, among persons, partnership in calling, faith, fortune, etc. Acts ii. 14; xiv. 4, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 32. Hence it is generally used in reference to spiritual fellowship, as that of believers with Christ, Rom. vi. 8; Col. ii. 13, 20; iii. 3; 1 Thess. iv. 17; v. 10; or that of believers with Abraham, Gal. iii. 9 (σύν denoting in all these cases not mere resemblance, but actual association). Then in reference to things it denotes powers combining and co-operating with a person, 1 Cor. v. 4; xvi. 10. It would be extended to a less intimate connection in 2 Cor. viii. 19 with the collection; yet here εν seems the preferable reading. On 410 the other hand, cf. Luke xxiv. 21 σὺν τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἔγεις σήμερον along with all this, i.e. joined to all this is the additional fact that etc. (Neh. v. 18; cf. Joseph. antt. 17, 6, 5).

1 Fischer, Weller. p. 141, adopts this meaning even for τινές εν ἄγγελοις, γραφή etc. (Isocr. paneg. c. 30; Diog. L. 1, 104, bibere in ossibus Flor. 3, 4, 2). With equal reason might it be asserted that in German auf is the same as von because we say auf silbernen Tellern essen, which, according to the analogy of aus silbernen Bechern trinken, is equivalent to von silbernen Tellern.

2 Krit. 287 "σύν τοις denotes rather coherence; μετά τοις, rather co-existence."
c. ἐπὶ. The primary, local, import is upon, above, (applied both to heights and plains): ¹ Matt. xiv. 11 ἱναντία ἢ κεφαλὴ ἐπὶ πίνακι, Mark i. 45 ἐπ’ ἐρήμους τῶν οὐκ (see above, ἐπὶ with Gen.; cf. ἀνάγειν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον Matt. iv. 1), vi. 39; Luke xxii. 6; Rev. xix. 14, also Jno. iv. 6 ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ ὅν (at) the well (the rim of the well rises above the well itself), Rev. ix. 14 (Xen. An. 1, 2, 350 8; 5, 3, 2; Cyr. 7, 5, 11; Isocr. paneg. c. 40; Dio C. 177, 80; see above, § 47 g.). ² Sometimes it signifies at (on) Jno. v. 2 ἐπὶ τῇ 367 προβατικῇ at the sheep-gate, Acts iii. 10, 11; Matt. xxiv. 33 ἐπὶ 7th α. δύρας (Xen. C. 8, 1, 33, yet see note ⁸ p. 374); it is applied also in this sense to persons, Acts v. 35 πράσσειν τι ἐπὶ των inflict something on one (do something to), cf. δρᾶν τι ἐπὶ των θηρ. 3, 14; Ael. anim. 11, 11. Lastly, it signifies (continuity) at, with either in reference to place (apud) Acts xxviii. 14 ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ἐπημείνα, or to time Heb. ix. 26 ἐπὶ συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων sub finem mundi; and so Phil. i. 3 εὐχαριστῶ τῷ δεό ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μείζῃ ῥήμα on every remembrance of you, Mark vi. 52 οὗ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, 2 Cor. ix. 6 στείρεων, θερίζου ἐπ’ εὐλογίαι with blessings, so that blessings attend; and in another application in Heb. ix. 15 τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων with (under) the first covenant (during the existence of the first covenant). In this sense it is applied also to persons, Heb. x. 28 (Sept.) ἐπὶ τριῶν μάρτυριν with (before) three witnesses, adhibitis testibus. It likewise indicates what is closely connected (in time), what follows on some event, Xen. C. 2, 3, 7 ἀνείστη ἐπ’ αὐτῷ Φεραίλας directly after (Appian. civ. 5, 3; Paus. 7, 25, 6; Dio C. 325, 89, and 519, 99; cf. Wurm, Dinarch. p. 39 sq.; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 30). Some explain in this way Acts xi. 19 ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ (see Alberti in loc.); but ἐπὶ there means rather upon (on account of) or against (Matthäi in loc.), cf. Schaef. Plutarch. V. 17; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 288.

411 Figuratively ἐπὶ denotes, in general, the foundation on which an action or state rests, Phil. iii. 9; so in Matt. iv. 37 ἐπὶ ἄρτω Sept. (corresponding to ἐν ῥήματι) after the Hebrew ἐν τῇ Deut.

¹ According to Kr. 303 ἐπὶ with Gen. indicates rather an accidental and more loose connection; ἐπὶ with Dat., the notion of belonging to.

² The signification upon is perceptible also in Luke xii. 53 στιν ... ταυτὰ ἐπὶ νῦν καὶ υἱς ἐπὶ πατρὶ the father will be upon him, that is, as a load, oppressing; agreeably to the vulgar idiom; cf. the German, Vater und Sohn liegen sich auf dem Halse. Against, however, here expresses the meaning correctly. I cannot, however, decide with Wöhl to apply the same meaning to Luke xxiii. 38. Rom. x. 19 is of quite a different sort.
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viii. 3 (though it is thus used also in Greek authors, Plato Alcib. 1, 105 c.; Alciph. 3, 7; cf. sustentare vitam). Here belongs also ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι τινος (Lucian. pisc. 15; cf. Schoem. Isae. p. 468 sq.) to do something upon the name of some one, i.e. in doing it to rely upon, or have reference to, the name of some one. The expression has various applications in the N. T.: ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησ. Xp. to teach upon (in) the name of Christ (Luke xxiv. 47; Acts iv. 17; v. 28, 40), i.e. by referring to him as the source of doctrine and authority; to cast out demons upon (in) the name of Christ, Luke ix. 49, i.e. making the efficacy of the exorcising depend on his name (uttered on the occasion as a solemn form); baptism upon (in) the name of Christ is baptism founded on the acknowledgment of his name, Acts ii. 38; to receive any one upon (in) the name of Christ, Matt. xviii. 5, i.e. because he bears his name, confesses him, etc.

Special senses of ἐπὶ are


b) Over, to, of addition to something already existing, Luke iii. 20 προκείμενε καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσι, Matt. xxv. 20 ἀλλὰ πίντε τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς in addition to those five talents (if ἐπὶ 351 αὐτοῖς is genuine), Luke xvi. 26 ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις besides, over and above, all this, Lucian. conscr. hist. 31; Aristoph. plut. 628 (cf. Wetsten. and Kypke in loc.). Phil. ii. 17; Col. iii. 14; Eph. vi. 16 (cf. Polyb. 6, 28, 12). Hence in Jno. iv. 27 ἐπὶ τοῦτῳ ἥθανοι οἱ 368 μαθηταῖς upon this, as Jesus spoke thus with etc., came the disciples. It is used somewhat differently in 2 Cor. vii. 13 ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει περισσοτέρως, μᾶλλον ἐκχάρισμα besides my consolation, I rejoiced, etc.

c) Over, of the object after verbs denoting an emotion, as θαυμάζεων, ὑγαλλόν, πενθεῖν, λυπεῖσθαι, ὑργίζεσθαι, [μακροθυμεῖν], μετανοεῖν, Luke i. 47; xviii. 7; Mark iii. 5; xii. 17; Matt. vii. 28; Rom. x. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Rev. xii. 17; xviii. 11 (Plat. symp. 217 a. and 206 b.; Isocr. paneg. 22; Lucian. philops. 14; Aristot. rhet. 2, 10, 1; Palaeph. 1, 8; Joseph. antt. 5, 1, 26 a.). With εὐχαριστεῖν it signifies to give thanks over (for), 1 Cor. i. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 15; Phil. i. 3 sq.; Polyb. 18, 26, 4. It is also employed with verbs of speaking, Rev. x. 11 προφητεύσας ἐπὶ λαοῖς (xxii. 16 var.), Jno. xii. 16 ταύτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα (Her. 1, 66; Paus. 3, 13, 3; 412 cf. Schoemann, Plutt. Agis p. 71).
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d) On, of a supposition or condition (Xen. symp. 1, 5; Diod. S. 2, 24; Lucian. conscr. hist. 38; Aesop, 21, 1): ἐπὶ ἐπιθεί ὑπὸ (in) hope, 1 Cor. ix. 10 (Plat. Alcib. 1, 105 b.; ἐπὶ ἐπιθεὶς Dio Chr. 1003, 21; Herod. 3, 12, 20), Heb. ix. 17 ἐπὶ νεκρῶς (on one's death) after men are dead, when death has taken place. It is used also of motive, Luke v. 5 ἐπὶ τῷ ἰματὶ σου χαλάσω τὸ δίκτυον ὑπὸ thy word, induced by thy word, Acts iii. 16 ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει on account of the faith, xxvi. 6; Matt. xix. 9 (1 Cor. viii. 11 var.); cf. Xen. Mem. 3, 14, 2; Cyr. 1, 3, 16; 1, 4, 24; 4, 5, 14; Her. 1, 137; Lucian. Hermot. 80; Isoc. areop. 336; Dio Chr. 29, 293. Hence ἐφ' ὅ wherefore, on which account, Diod. S. 19, 98 (ἐφ' ὅπερ Dio C. 48, 95, etc.), and because 2 Cor. v. 4; Rom. v. 12; probably also Phil. iii. 12 (on this account that, for ἐπὶ τοῦ ὅτι see Fr. Rom. I. 299 sq.), so quod.

e) To, for, of aim and issue, 1 Thess. iv. 7 οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ to uncleanness, Gal. v. 13 (like καλεῖν ἐπὶ ἕνιαλ Xen. An. 7, 6, 3, and the like; see Sintenis, Plutarch. Them. p. 147), 2 Tim. ii. 14; Eph. ii. 10, cf. Xen. An. 5, 7, 34; Mem. 2, 3, 19; Plat. rep. 8, 389 b.; Diod. S. 2, 24; Arrian. Alex. 1, 26, 4; 2, 18, 9; Diog. L. 1, 7, 2; cf. Index to Dio C. ed. Sturz p. 148 sq., according to some ἐφ' ὅ Phil. iii. 12 unto which (for which).

f) After, of the rule, model, Luke i. 59 καλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὅνομας after the name (Neh. vii. 63). To this head, probably, belongs 352 also Rom. v. 14 ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοίωματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ ad (Vulg. ἐπὶ ὅ) similitudinem peccati Ad.; for other explanations, see Meyer. 369 2 Cor. ix. 6, however, we cannot with Philippi (Röm.-Br. S. 172) understand together in the same way; see above, p. 392.

When ἐπὶ with Dat. in a local sense is joined to a verb of direction or motion (Matt. ix. 16; Jno. viii. 7, not Matt. xvi. 18; Acts iii. 11), the phrase 413 includes together with the idea of motion that of tarrying and resting also.

d. Παπά beside i.e. properly near, at the side of, used of place, with the Dative of the thing only in Jno. xix. 25 (Soph. Oed. C.

1 Yet several of these passages may be referred to the more general signification at, with (see above), as is done by Fr. Rom. I. 315.
2 'Ἀποκλείεται ἐπὶ ἀποκλείειν ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῇ οἰ γνώσει (where, however, good authorities [Sin also] read ἐπὶ) is, properly, perishes on thy knowledge i.e. because thy knowledge is urged,—briefly, through thy knowledge. But ἐπὶ does not therefore, as Græcius Rom. v. 12 maintains, strictly mean through.
3 The Greeks usually employ the Plural, ἐφ' ois (but ἐπὶ τῶν Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 211). Rothe (Versuch über Röm. v. 12 ff. p. 17 ff.) has recently asserted that in the N. T. this ἐφ' ὅ should be uniformly rendered on the supposition, on the understanding, on condition, that, in as far as. There is no passage, however, in which this would not be artificial and forced; cf. Rückert, Comment. zu Röm. 2 Aufl. I. 262.
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1160; Plato Ion 536 b.), elsewhere with the Dat. of the person (Krü. 299); sometimes denoting

a) What is externally near, by, with, Luke ix. 47, or what is in one’s vicinity, province, custody, 2 Tim. iv. 13 φελόνυν ἀπελιπον παρὰ Κάρπῳ, 1 Cor. xvi. 2 (Aristot. pol. 1, 7), Luke xix. 7 (where παρὰ ἄμαρτι belongs to καταλύσας), Col. iv. 16; Rev. ii. 13; Acts x. 6; xviii. 3. Sometimes, and more frequently,

b) In reference to what is ideally near one, in one’s possession, power, capacity, etc. (penes); as, Matt. xix. 26 παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τούτῳ ἀδύνατον ἔστιν, παρὰ δὲ θεοὶ πάντα δυνατά, Rom. ii. 11 οὖ γὰρ ἐστὶ προσωποληψία παρὰ θεοί, ix. 14; Luke i. 37 (παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ is a clerical mistake) cf. Demosth. cor. 352 a. ei ἐστι παρ’ ἐμὸν τις ἑπεμβήλα, Jas. i. 17; 2 Cor. i. 17, especially of the judgment, Acts xxvi. 8 τι ἀπιστῶν κρίνειν παρ’ ὑμῖν etc. (apud vos), Rom. xiii. 16 μὴ γίνεσθαι φρόνιμοι παρ’ έαντοῖς (Prov. iii. 7) before yourselves (as judges), in your own estimation, in your own eyes, 1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 8 (Her. 1, 32; Plato Theaet. 170 d.; Soph. Trach. 586; Eurip. Bacch. 399, and Electr. 737; Bhdv. 257). So likewise 2 Pet. ii. 11 οὖ φέροναι κατ’ αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίῳ (before the Lord as Judge) βλάσφημον κρίσιν were the words π. κυρ. genuine, and, substantially, 1 Cor. vii. 24 ἑκατὸς ἐν δὲ ἐκληθή, ἐν τούτῳ μενέτω παρὰ θεῷ with, before God, on the plane of God’s judgment. That παρὰ with the Dat. denotes strictly direction towards, cannot be established (Wahl in his Clav.) by Luke ix. 47, still less by Luke xix. 7 (see a) above).

e. Πρός has the same primary import as παρά, but is used in the N. T. only in its local sense: at, by, in the (immediate) vicinity of; as, Jno. xviii. 16 πρός τῇ βύρᾳ, xx. 11, 12; Mark v. 11 (to 414 adduce instances of the same use of πρός from Greek authors would be superfluous; for the assertion of Münter, Symbol. ad intpat. ev. Joa. p. 31, is untrue). So likewise Rev. i. 13 περιε-ζωσμάνος πρός τοὺς μαστοὺς ζώνην girded about at the breasts with a girdle (Xen. C. 7, 1, 33). In Luke xix. 37 ἐγγίζοντος ἤδη πρός τῇ καταβώσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν is to be rendered: as he was 370 already close to etc. (In the Sept. πρός with the Dative occurs much more frequently than in the N. T.)

f. Περί and ἐντό are never used in the N. T. with the Dative.

1 If παρά with the Dat. is employed with a verb of motion, the same attraction must be acknowledged which occurs when ἐν is so used. But in Xen. A. 2, 5, 27, which Kübler adduces as the only instance, recent editors on the authority of Codd. give παρὰ Τιγσαφίρην. On the other hand, see Plutarch. Themist. c. 5 and Sinentis in loc. It cannot, however, be denied that in the Dative itself the notion of whither is originally contained (p. 214). Cf. Hartung über d. Casus. S. 81.
§ 49. PREPOSITIONS WITH THE ACCUSATIVE.

353

a. Eἰς (the opposite of ἐκ Rom. i. 17; v. 16).

a) In the local sense it denotes not merely into, in among (Luke x. 36; Acts iv. 17, likewise Mark xiii. 14 εἰς τὰ δρΗι as we say, into the mountaines), or (of countries and cities) to (into) Matt. xxviii. 16; Acts x. 5; xii. 19, etc., but also (of levels) on Mark xi. 8 ἐστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὥδην, Acts xxvi. 14; Rev. ix. 3, and even simply to (ad), thitherward (of motion or direction) Mark iii. 7 (Polyb. 2, 23, 1), Matt. xxi. 1; Jno. xi. 38 ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον cometh to the tomb, cf. vs. 41; iv. 5 cf. vs. 28; xx. 1 cf. vs. 11; Acts ix. 2; Luke vi. 20 ἐπάρας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς towards his disciples, Rev. x. 5 (εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν) Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 11; Aeschin. dial. 2, 2. In reference to persons it hardly signifies to (πρὸς or ὧς Mdv. 33; Bhdv. 215), but among, inter, Acts xx. 29; xxii. 21; Luke xi. 49; Rom. v. 12; xvi. 26; Plato Prot. 349 a.; Gorg. 526 b. (when it occasionally approaches the import of the Dative, Luke xxiv. 47, see above, § 31, 5); 1 in one passage, into a person's house, Acts xvi. 40 εἰς τὴν Αὐγιάν (according to many [minuscule] Codd.) see Valcken. in loc. cf. Lys. orat. 2 in. Strabo 17, 796; Fischer, Well. III. II. p. 150; Schoem. Isae. 363, and Plutarch. Agis p. 124, (but the better Codd. [Sin. also] give πρὸς).

415 b) Applied to time, εἰς signifies sometimes a point, limit for, at which Acts iv. 8 (Herod. 3, 5, 2), or up to, till which, Jno. xiii. 1; 2 Tim. i. 12; 2 sometimes a period (for, during, like εἰς) Luke xii. 19 εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη (Xen. M. 3, 6, 18).

C) Used tropically, of ideal relations, it denotes any aim or end; as, Acts xxviii. 6 μὴ δὲν ἄτομον εἰς αὐτὸν γνώμενον unto, towards (on) him, cf. Plut. Moral. p. 786 c.; hence, a. the measure, amount (Bhdv. 218) which something reaches, 2 Cor. x. 13 εἰς τὰ ἀμετρα κανάκασθαι, iv. 17 (Lucian. dial. mort. 27, 7), cf. also the well-known εἰς μᾶλιστα and εἰς τρῆς. β. the condition into which something is brought, Acts ii. 20; Rev. xi. 6; Heb. vi. 6; cf. like-

371 wise Eph. ii. 21 f. γ. the result, Rom. x. 10 (xiii. 14); 1 Cor. xi. 17 εἰς τὸ κρείττον συνέρξεσθε. δ. the direction of the feelings

1 Likewise in 1 Cor. xiv. 36; 2 Cor. x. 14 εἰς is more appropriate than πρὸς, inasmuch as in all these passages ideal reaching to one (his knowledge or intercourse with him) is spoken of.

2 (The more expressive) ἵσα (or μέχρι) is oftener used in this sense; and many passages added in Lexicons under the signification usque ad are not purely temporal, but include the εἰς of purpose, aim, Gal. iii. 17, 23; Eph. iv. 30.
views, etc. and the deportment towards (erga and contra), 1 Pet. iv. 9 φιλοξενον εἰς ἀλλήλους, Rom. viii. 7 (Her. 6, 65), xii. 16; Matt. xxvi. 10; 3 Jno. 5; Col. iii. 9; 2 Cor. viii. 24; x. 1; Luke xii. 10, to which sense likewise Col. i. 20 ἀποκαταλάττετε τί εἰς αὐτὸν may be referred (cf. ἀπαλάττετε πρὸς τινα Demosth. ep. 3, 354 p. 114; Thuc. 4, 59 etc.); further, the direction both of the thoughts, Acts ii. 25 Δαυιδ ἱέγει εἰς αὐτὸν aiming at (referring to) him (dicere in aliquem, cf. Kypke in loc.), Eph. i. 10; v. 32; Heb. vii. 14; cf. Acts xxvi. 6, and of the desires (after something) Phil. i. 23 and of the will in general; and then, the occasion Matt. xii. 41 εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ at the preaching; the purpose and end in view (Bhdy. 219) Luke v. 4 χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιαν for a draught (to catch), 2 Cor. ii. 12 ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα εἰς τὸ εἰσαγγέλιον for the gospel i.e. in order to publish it, Acts ii. 38; vii. 5; Rom. v. 21; vi. 19; viii. 15; ix. 21; xiii. 14; xvi. 19; Heb. x. 24; xii. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 12; 2 Cor. ii. 16; vii. 9; Gal. ii. 8; Phil. i. 25 (εἰς δ ὑπὲρ which Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. i. 11; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 8, εἰς τί Matt. xxvi. 8). In this way are explained also the phrases ἐπιτίκευεν, πιστεύειν εἰς τινα, as well as the passages in which εἰς relating to persons signifies for, Rom. x. 12 πλούτων εἰς πάντας, Luke xii. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 1 etc. (and thus borders on the Dat. see a) above), and lastly, the looser connections where εἰς is rendered in reference to, as respects, with regard to (Bhdy. 416 220; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 484) Acts xxv. 20; 2 Pet. i. 8; Rom. iv. 20; xv. 2 (of things, Xen. Mem. 3, 5, 1; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 16), 2 Cor. xi. 10; Eph. iii. 16; iv. 15; Rom. xvi. 5 (of persons). Sometimes subjective and objective purpose, aim and effect, cannot be separated, Heb iv. 16; Luke ii. 34; Rom. xiv. 1; Jude 21. The German zu, for, to, includes both. Further, cf. § 29, 3 note.

The following alleged significations of εἰς are to be rejected: Sub (Rom. xi. 32 cf. Gal. iii. 22); εἰς here retains the signification of in, as we can say included in just as well as under; With (of the instrument), in Acts xix. 3 εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βαπτισμα (ἐβαπτίσθησεν) is a direct answer to the question εἰς τί ὄνω ἐβαπτίσθη; strictly the answer should have been, unto that unto which John baptized. The expression is abbreviated there-

---

1 It is not necessary to consider this phrase pregnant, as Fr. Rom I. 278 does. It is obviously founded on the same conception as the expression preferred by Greek authors διαλαττετεν προς τινα.

2 Likewise ἀφύνει εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα Matt. v. 35 is substantially to be referred to this signification; see Fr. in loc.

3 But in Jno. iv. 14 ἀλλοιωνον εἰς τον αἰώνον is probably to be rend. red into, though BCrusius is of a different opinion.
fore, or rather, inexact. Nor can εἰς be strictly rendered before, coram in Acts xxii. 30 (see Kühnöl), cf. Heind. Plat. Protag. 471; Stallb. Plat. 372 symp. p. 43 sq.; but ἐπεροθανόν (αὐτῶν) εἰς αὐτούς is: introduced (placed) him among them, in the midst (εἰς μέσον). In 2 Cor. xi. 6 εν παντὶ φανερωβιντες εἰς ὑπάσ verse is very nearly: towards you (εργα), as elsewhere πρὸς is used. That εἰς is ever equivalent to διὰ with Gen. is a fiction; and εἰς διακεράτων ἀγγέλων Acts vii. 53 is most simply rendered upon the injunctions of angels (which, indeed, as respects sense amounts to in consequence of such injunctions), unless the interpretation proposed § 32, 4 b. p. 228 be preferred. As to εἰς for εἰν see § 50, 4, p. 414 sq.

355 b. Ἄνα upon, up along (Bldy. 233 f.), occurs in the N. T. chiefly in the phrase ἅνα μέσον with Gen. of place, through the midst of, (in) between, Mark vii. 31; Matt. xiii. 25, and figuratively with Gen. of a person, 1 Cor. vi. 5 διακεραίων ἃνα μέσον τού ἀδέλφου. Then, with numerals, in a distributive sense; as, Jno. ii. 6 ἱδραίς χωροῦνται ἃνα μετρητὰς δίο ὡ τρεῖς containing two or three metretae apiece, [Matt. xx. 9], Luke ix. 3; x. 1; Mark vi. 40 (where Lchm. [and Tdf.] following Codd. B. [Sin.] give κατά); so frequently in Greek authors. The preposition thus gradually assumes the nature of an adverb (Bldy. 234). This distributive signification probably grew out of such phrases as ἅνα πάν ἔτος every year, year by year.

417 Hug, in the Freiburger Zeitschr. VI. 41 f., proposed to render the above passage from John: containing about two or three metretæ; but he has not succeeded in establishing such a use. In Polyb. 2, 10, 3 and Dio Cass. 59, 2 ἅνα manifestly signifies each, apiece. In Polyb. 1, 16, 2 nobody will believe that the writer intended to state the strength of the Roman legion indefinitely, as merely ‘about’ 4000 foot and 300 cavalry. In Her. 7, 184 ἅνα δικρωσίως ἄνδρας λοιπομένους ἐν ἐκάστῃ νηθ is a pleonastic expression, similar to others of frequent occurrence—200 apiece ... in each ship, (at the rate of etc.). Rev. iv. 8 εν καθ ἐν αἰώνων ἐὰν ἅνα πτέρυγας ἂν is similar. Moreover, the Greeks use ἂν with the Acc. to express about, for, a numerical amount.

c. Ἄνα with the Acc. indicates the ground (ratio), not the design (not even in 1 Cor. vii. 2), and signifies on account of (even in

1 Hm. de partic. εἰ p. 5: Primum ac proprium usum habet in iis, quae in al. rei superficie ab imo ad summum eundo conspiciuntur: motus enim significationem ei adeaeiret omm ex eo intelligitur, quod non est apta visa quae cum verbo εἶνα componeretur, tum docet usus ejus adversabilia, ut ἄνα ἄνα εἰς ἐπαρισαίον. Further, cf. Spitzner de vi et usu praepositis. ἄνα et κατά. Vitub. 1831.

2 That is to say, it is only per consequent that the notion of design is implied in διὰ τὰς σεξαπλέσ: on account of fornications let every man have his own wife. Fornications are
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Jno. vii. 43; x. 19; xv. 3 etc.), or, when the motive of an action is meant, out of, from, Matt. xxvii. 18 διὰ φθόνον out of (from) envy, Eph. ii. 4 διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἁγάπην (Diod. S. 19, 54 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἥτταχοκότας ἔλεον, Aristot. rhet. 2, 13; Demosth. Conon. 730 c.). As to Rom. iii. 25, which even Reiche has misunder-373 stood, see Bengel. In Heb. v. 12 διὰ τῶν χρόνων is, on account of the time, considering the time (you have enjoyed Christian instruction; 1 not, as Schulz renders it, after so long a time).

Sometimes διὰ with Acc. denotes apparently the means (ground or motive and means are very closely connected, cf. Demosth. cor. 354 a.; Xen. M. 3, 3, 15; Liv. 8, 53; and in the poets διὰ is sometimes used with the Acc. even in a local sense, see Bhyd. 236): Jno. vi. 57 καὶ διὰ τῶν πατέρα τὸν ἥρων με με με 353 δι' ἐμέ, just as in Long. pastor. 2 p. 62 Schaaf. διὰ τῆς νύμφας διὰ τῆς

ζητεῖ, Plut. Alex. 668 e. But the passage strictly means, I live by reason of the Father, that is, because the Father lives, cf. Plat. conv. 283 e.; Fr. Rom. I. 197, who adduces as parallel Cic. Rosc. Am. 22, 63 ut, propter quos hanc suavissimam lucem adspererit, eos indignissime luce prívaret. Passages more or less similar are Demosth. Zenoth. 576 a.; Aristoph. Plut. 470; Aeschin. dial. 1, 2; 418 Dion. H. III. 1579; cf. Wyttenb. Plut. Mor. II. p. 2 Lips.; Sintenis, Plutarch. Themist. 121; Thuc. ed. Poppo III. II. 517. But Heb. v. 14; vi. 7 by no means belong here, nor (as de Wette and Ewald still maintain) Rev. xii. 11 ἐνίκησαν διὰ τὸ αἷμα, cf. vii. 14 and what immediately follows, καὶ οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν etc. As to Rom. viii. 11 (where the reading, indeed, varies) see Fr., and as to Jno. xv. 3 Mey. in loc. In 2 Cor. iv. 5; Heb. ii. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 2 (where Schott still renders it by per, which gives a false sense even; Bengel otherwise) Rev. iv. 11, διὰ is quite appropriately translated for the sake of. So too in Rom. viii. 20 2 (where Schott has per again). But in Rom. xv. 15 διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι

the ground of this regulation, inasmuch as they are to be prevented. In Greek authors also design sometimes in the same way attaches itself to διὰ; see the annotators on Thuc. 4, 40 and 102.

1 The phrase is used thus, essentially, in Polyb. 2, 21, 2 and elsewhere, see Heck on the above passage. Schulz insists in applying the temporal sense of διὰ to Heb. ii. 9 likewise. But διὰ τὸ τάσημα τοῦ δανέων means, on account of the suffering of death, and is elucidated from the well-known connection, recognized by the apostolic writers, between the sufferings and the exaltation of Christ.

2 Here διὰ τὴν δυνατήσεων constitutes an antithesis to ὅπως ἐνεώσα, not voluntarily, but by reason of his that subjected,—by the will and command of God. Probably Paul intentionally avoided saying διὰ τὸ δυνατήσων, equivalent to δ θέω νικαῖ αὐτόπ. Adam's sin was the proper and direct cause of the ματαιότης.
the preposition must not, in consideration of xii. 3 διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι, be understood in this sense; both expressions are proper. 1 Jno. ii. 12 is correctly rendered by Lücke. 2 Pet. ii. 2 needs no comment. In 2 Pet. iii. 12 δι' ἡν may be referred to ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρα, and translated on account of; yet if referred to παρονία, as is done by Bengel, it gives sense. Lastly, in Gal. iv. 13 δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός is probably not to be understood (Schott) of the state, condition (δι' ἀσθενείας), but means: on account of weakness, owing to a weakness; see Mey.

d. Κατά. The local (primary) meaning is,

a) down upon (down along, cf. Aeschin. dial. 3, 19), passing on, through, over (Xen. C. 6, 2, 22); as, Luke viii. 39 ἀπῆλθε καθ' ἐν τῇ πόλιν κηρύσσων, xvi. 14 λιμὸς κατὰ τὴν χώραν throughout the country, all over the country, Acts viii. 1 (2 Macc. iii. 14; Strabo 3, 168); Acts v. 15 ἐκφέρων κατὰ τὸς πλατείας through the streets, along the streets, viii. 36 (Xen. An. 4, 6, 11), Luke ix. 6; xiii. 22; Acts xi. 1; xxvii. 2 (Xen. C. 8, 1, 6, Raphel. in loc.). Uniformly of horizontal extension. So even in Acts xxvi. 3 τὰ 419 κατὰ τοὺς Ιουδαίους ἔθη καὶ ἐνετήματα the customs etc. extending throughout the Jews (common among the Jews).

b) on to, towards, Phil. iii. 14 (κατὰ σκοτοῦν towards the mark), Acts viii. 26; xvi. 7; Luke x. 32 (Aesop. 88, 4; Xen. C. 8, 5, 17); likewise merely of the direction (geographical position, versus), Acts ii. 10 τῆς Διβότης τῆς κατὰ Κυρίην, xxvii. 12 λιμένα βλέπουσα κατὰ λίβα (Xen. An. 7, 2, 1). Accordingly, κατὰ πρόσωπον τινος signifies to one’s face i.e. before one’s eyes, Luke ii. 31; Acts iii. 18; so also κατ’ ὀφθαλμοὺς Gal. iii. 1 (Xen. Hist. 1, 14 like κατ’ ὄμμα Eurip. Androm. 1064, κατ’ ὄμματα Soph. Ant. 756). Likewise in Rom. viii. 27 κατὰ θεόν ἐνυγχάνειν does not mean (in a local sense) apud deum, but, properly, towards God, before God.

1 Κατά in its local signification is not properly synonymous with ἐν (as even Kühnöl on Acts xi. 1 asserts). Κατὰ τὴν πόλιν means, throughout the city; καθ’ ἐν τὸν ἐλέυθερον, where the primary meaning recedes farthest from view, is used to express a different conception from ἐν ἐλευθερον (as τοῦ Ηαυστ, at home) is different from τοῦ Ηαυστ, in the house). Besides, κατά has established itself in many phrases where probably ἐν might have been used.

2 Hence comes the meaning with, among, as of κατ’ ὄμμα τονταλ Acts xvii. 28, cf. xiii. 1 and other passages; see above, p. 193. Κατά with a personal pronoun is employed thus, especially in later authors, as merely a circumlocution for a possessive pronoun; see Hase, Leo Diac. p. 230.

3 Against this explanation, adopted also by Fr. Kreß and others, various objections have recently been raised, particularly by Mey. and Philipp. The most unimportant of all is that then κατ’ ἀπόθεν would be used. The emphasis implied in the substantive
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Closely connected with this is the temporal use of the preposition, sometimes as in Acts xvi. 25 κατὰ τὸ μεσονύκτιον towards midnight, and sometimes as in Matt. xxvii. 15 καθ' εορτὴν during the festival, i. 20 καθ' οναπ during a dream, secundum quietem (Herod. 2, 7, 6, κατὰ φῶς by daylight Xen. C. 3, 3, 25, κατὰ βίον Plato, Gorg. 488 a.), Heb. ix. 9 also iii. 8 (Sept.) κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ in the day etc., and κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ at the same time Acts xiv. 1.

Hence it is employed of both place and time in a distributive sense, first with plural nouns, as κατὰ φυλὰς by tribes, Matt. xxiv. 7 κατὰ τόπους, Acts xxii. 19, κατὰ δύο in pairs 1 Cor. xiv. 27 (Plato, ep. 6, 323 c.), Mark vi. 40 var.; afterwards frequently with singular nouns, as in Acts xv. 21 κατὰ πόλιν from city to city (Diod. S. 19, 77; Plutarch. Cleom. 25; Dio Chr. 16, 461; Palaeph. 52, 7), κατ' ἐναυτόν yearly Heb. ix. 25 (Plato, pol. 298 e.; Xen. C. 8, 6, 375 16, κατὰ μῆνα Xen. An. 1, 9, 17; Dio C. 750, 74), καθ' ἡμέραν τὸ ἀν d at daily Acts ii. 46; 1 Cor. xvi. 2 (Hm. Vig. 860).

Used figuratively κατὰ is the preposition of reference and direction to something: either generally, as in Eph. vi. 21 τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ quae ad me pertinent, Acts xxv. 14, or in limitation of a general expression (Her. 1, 49; Soph. Trach. 102 and 379) Eph. vi. 5 οἱ κατὰ σάρκα κύριοι as respects the flesh, so far as concerns the flesh, Rom.ix. 5 εἴ δὲν (Ἰουδαίων ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (1 Pet.iv.14), Acts iii. 22; Rom. vii. 22 also xi. 28 and xvi. 25; or especially

a) the measure, the standard, according to, in conformity to, as in Eph. iv. 7; Matt. xxv. 15; Jno. ii. 6; Luke ii. 22 κατὰ νόμον, Heb. ix. 19 (Xen. Cyr. 5, 5, 6), Acts xxvi. 5; Rom. xi. 21 κατὰ 358 φύσιν, Matt. ix. 29 κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὕμων according to your faith, as it deserves, 2 Cor. iv. 13; Rom. ii. 2 κατὰ λάθειαν, Matt. ii. 16 κατὰ χρόνον according to the time. Hence it denotes similarity, sort (pattern), Heb. viii. 8 εἰς συντελέσια . . . διαθήκην κακών, οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἦν ἐποίησα etc. (1 Kings xi. 10), Acts xviii. 14. Likewise with names of persons κατὰ τινα usually signifies according to some one’s opinion Col. ii. 8 (Eph. ii. 2); 2 Cor. xi. 17, or will Rom. xv. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 8; cf. Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 91, or

is easily felt, and is indicated visibly, too, by the position of κατὰ τεθρ., though the point of principal moment lies in ὑπὲρ διήν. The translation, according to God, introduces an entirely unnecessary idea into the passage, since of the Spirit no different intercession can be thought of.

1 Also καθ' εαυτόν for one’s self is usually referred to this use (see e.g. Passow), but erroneously, as the phrase is not distributive. Καθ' εαυτόν, and the like, properly means in reference to one’s self, whereby something is restricted to a single subject; hence for one’s self; adv. seorsum. As to εἰς τὸ εαυτόν, see Fr. Rom. III. 212.
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according to some one’s pattern and example, as in Gal. iv. 28 κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ in the same way as Isaac, ad exemplum Isaaci, 1 Pet. i. 15; Eph. iv. 24 (Plato, Parm. 126 c.; Lucian. pisc. 6, 12; eunuch. 18; Dio C. 376, 59; cf. Kypke and Wetst. on Gal. as above, Marle, floril. p. 64 sq.). It is used of authors: τὸ κατὰ Μαθαίου εὐαγγέλιαν the gospel (the evangelic history) as recorded by Matthew (according to Matthew’s understanding and exposition of it). As to εἰμι κατὰ σῶρκα, κατὰ πνεύμα Rom. viii. 5, see the expositors.

In the (Pauline) phrase κατ’ ἀνθρώπου after the manner of man, in (ordinary) human fashion, (with contexts of various descriptions), κατὰ is used more generally: Rom. iii. 5; Gal. i. 11; iii. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 6 (see Wiesing. in loc.), see Fr. Rom. I. 159 sq.¹ Cf. in connection with the same use of κατὰ, 421 Rom. iv. 4 κατὰ χάριν by way of grace, 1 Cor. ii. 1 καθ’ ὑπεροχήν 876 λόγου, Phil. iii. 6; Eph. vi. 6; Rom. xiv. 15; Acts xxv. 23 ἀνδρασὶν τοῖς κατ’ ἐξοχήν τῆς πολέμως.

b) the occasion (and the motive), a sense closely allied to the preceding (hence in Rom. iv. 4 κατὰ χάριν may be rendered also, of (out of) grace), Matt. xix. 8 ἀπολύσας τὴν γυναῖκα κατὰ πάσαν αἰτίαν for every cause, on every ground (Kypke in loc., cf. Paus. 5, 10, 2; 6, 18; 2, 7), Rom. ii. 5; Acts iii. 17 κατὰ ἀγνοίαν ἐπράξετε in consequence of ignorance (Raphel. in loc.), Phil. iv. 11 όλοι δόται καθ’ ὑστέρησιν λέγω from (in consequence of suffering) want, Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 3 κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἐλεός;² Eph. i. 5; Her. 9, 17 (κατὰ τὸ ἔχθος) etc. cf. Diog. L. 6, 10; Arrian. Al. 1, 17, 13. Also in Heb. xi. 7 ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη the righteousness which proceeds from faith.

c) the intention, purpose, for, to (Jno. ii. 6), 2 Tim. i. 1;³ Tit. i. 1 (cf. Rom. i. 5 εἰς), and the (necessary) result, 2 Cor. xi. 21

¹ In 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10 λυπήσας κατὰ θεόν and λόγης κ. ὧν is not sorrow produced by God (Kypke in loc.), but, as Bengel aptly says, animi Deum spectantis et sequentis, to sorrow according to God i.e. after the mind and will of God. In the passage that follows Paul might in the same way have written ἡ κατὰ τὸν κόσμον λόγη. But ἡ πρὸ καθομιν λόγη has a meaning somewhat different: the sorrow of the world, i.e. as the world (those who belong to the world) possesses and experiences it (of course about the things of the κόσμος). Bengel in like manner has duly appreciated the difference between these two expressions. In 1 Pet. iv. 6 κατὰ ἀνθρώπου means after the manner of men, and is more closely defined by the annexed σαρκι; just so κατὰ θεόν means after the manner of God, which is more closely defined by πνεύματι (for God is πνεύμα).

² Accordingly κατὰ sometimes stands parallel to the Dat. (instrum.), as in Arrian. Al. 5, 21, 4 κατ’ ἔχος τὸ Πᾶρον μᾶλλον ἢ φίλια τῇ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. See Fr. Rom. I. 99.

³ Matthes gives an artificial exposition with the remark that it cannot be shown that κατὰ expresses object. This import, however, is very naturally involved in the original meaning of this preposition. Moreover, see Matth. 1356, 1359.
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κατ’ ἀτμίαν λέγω to (as a, by way of) reproach (Her. 2, 152; Thuc. 5, 7; 6, 81). The signification cum must be rejected, though κατά may sometimes be translated with. In Rom x. 2 359 ἄγιος θεοῦ ἄλλ’ οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσι is zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, i.e. not as zeal resulting from knowledge manifests itself (cf. above, κατ’ ἐγνώμα), 1 Pet. iii. 7. In Heb. xi. 13 κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον etc. means: they died in (according to) faith, without having received etc.; it was in accordance with faith (with the nature of πίστις) that they died having seen only from afar the fulfilment of the promises. The idea of κατὰ πίστιν is contained in the second participial clause.

e. Τετερ with Acc. signifies beyond, away-over (Her. 4, 188; Plato, Crit. 108 e.; Plut. virt. mul. p. 281 Lips.). In the N. T. it never occurs in reference to place, but is always used figuratively, beyond, over and above in number, rank, quality; as, Acts xxvi. 13 φῶς περιλάμψαν ... ἑπέρ τὴν λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου, Matt. x. 24 οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ἑπέρ τῶν διδάσκαλων, Philm. 16; Matt. x. 37 ὁ φίλων πατέρα ἑπέρ ἐμέ (Aesch. dial. 3, 6), 2 Cor. i. 8 (Epict. 31, 37); Gal. i. 14, also 2 Cor. xii. 13 τί γὰρ ἐστιν, δ ἡττήσθητε ἑπέρ τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας inferior beyond the other churches (gradation 422 downwards). Concerning ἑπέρ after comparatives, see § 35, 1.

f. Μετά denotes motion into the midst of something, Iliad 2, 376. Then it signifies motion after, behind, something; in prose, however, it more frequently means behind, after (post) of a state of rest, Heb. ix. 3 μετὰ το δευτερον καταπέτασμα (Paus. 3, 1, 1). In all other passages of the N. T. where it occurs it signifies after in regard to time, (the opposite of πρὸ), even in Matt. xxvii. 63 — where the popular expression presents no difficulty, see Krebs, obs. p. 87 sq. — and 1 Cor. xi. 25 μετὰ το δευτέρῳ, which must 377 not, in consideration of Matt. xxvi. 26 (ἐσθιώντων αὐτῶν), be rendered by during; on the other hand, cf. Luke xxii. 20. So too, the familiar expression μεθ’ ἡμέραν ἐνερδίου (Ellendt, Arrian. Al. 4, 13, 10) properly denotes post lucem, after daybreak.

g. Παρά. The primary import is beside, along, of a line or extended space, Matt. iv. 18 περιπατῶν παρὰ τὴν ψάλας ἐπεκ etc. walking along the sea-side (Xen. C. 5, 4, 4 1; A. 4, 6, 4; 6, 2, 1; Plato Gorg. 511 e.), xiii. 4 ἐπεκε παρὰ τὴν ὀδών fell (along) by the wayside. Then it is used also of a point of space,—belonging, however, to an extended object; as, ἐρχέσθαι παρὰ τὴν ψάλασαν to the sea-side Matt. xv. 29; Acts xvi. 13, πάντες or τιθέναι παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τ. to beside the feet Matt. xv. 80; Acts
§ 49. PREPOSITIONS WITH THE ACCUSATIVE.

iv. 35; cf. Held, Plutarch. Timol. 356. It is used only thus also with verbs of rest,¹ as of sitting, standing, lying, (being situated) παρά τῷ θάλασσαν or τῷ λίμνην or παρά τῷ ὕδων (propter mare, viam) Matt. xx. 30; Luke v. 1 sq.; xviii. 35; Heb. xi. 11; Acts x. 6 ὃ ἐστιν οἰκία παρά θάλασσαν (vs. 32), cf. Xen. A. 3, 5, 1; 7, 2, 11; Paus. 1, 38, 9; Aesop. 44, 1; Hartung d. Casus S. 88.

Further, παρά means beside the mark or aim, and consequently (as the context may determine), sometimes above, as in Rom. xii. 3 (to which Fr. compares Plutarch. Mor. 83 f. θαυμασταί παρ' ὑπὲρ), sometimes below, as in 2 Cor. xi. 24 πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν δισάχος (with the omission of one) less one, Joseph. antt. 4, 8, 1 (cf. Heb. ii. 7 Sept.), Bhdy. 258. In the former sense it is used figuratively,

a) in comparisons, as in Luke xiii. 2 ἀμαρτωλὸς παρὰ πάντας above all (more than all, see ἰπέρ, cf. § 35, 2 b.), iii. 13; Heb. i. 9 (Sept.); iii. 3 (Dio Cass. 152, 16; analogous to which is ἀλλός παρά 1 Cor. iii. 11 other than, equivalent to the ordinary ἄλλος ἂ, cf. Stallb. Phileb. 51); Rom. xiv. 5 κρίνειν ἢμεραν παρ' ἢμεραν to judge (esteem) one day above another, i.e. to prefer one day to another.

b) against: Acts xviii. 13 παρὰ νόμου (Xen. M. 1, 1, 18; Lucian. Demon. 49); Rom. i. 26 παρὰ φύσιν (praeter naturam Plat. rep. 5, 466 d.; Plut. educ. 4, 9); iv. 18 παρ' ἐλπίδα (praeter speram, Plato pol. 295 d.); xvi. 17; Heb. xi. 11 (Thuc. 3, 54; Xen. A. 2, 5, 41; 5, 8, 17; 6, 4, 28; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 38); compare the expressions overstep, transgress, the law. The opposite would be: κατὰ φύσιν etc., cf. Xen. M. as above, Plut. educ. 4, 9.

c) in Rom. i. 25 παρά τῶν κτισμάτων with the omission of the Creator (consequently, instead of the Creator). In one passage παρά indicates the ground or reason: 1 Cor. xii. 15 [16] παρά τοῦτο therefore, strictly with (beside) this, since this is so, Weber, Demosth. p. 521 (Plut. Camill. 28; Dio C. 171, 96; Lucian. paras. 378 12 and often). In Latin, as is well-known, propter (from prope, cf. propter flumen) became the ordinary causal preposition, (Vig. p. 862; Vkm. Fritzsche, quaestion. Lucian. p. 124 sq.; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 182).

l. Πρός to, towards, with verbs of motion or mere direction (Acts iv. 24; Eph. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 12 πρόσωπον πρός πρόσωπον

¹ Such expressions as Polyb. 1, 55, 7 ἐν τῇ παρὰ τῆς Ἰταλίας κειμένη πλευρά τῆς Σικελίας situated (extending) towards, alongside of, Italy, constitute the transition to this use of the preposition.
face turned to face). Sometimes the force of the Acc. seems to disappear and πρὸς means with, particularly before names of persons, as in Matt. xiii. 56; Jno. i. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 6 (Demosth. Apat. 579 a.); even here, however, πρὸς denotes (ideal) annexation. But the appropriateness of the Acc. is still perceptible in Mark iv. 1 ὁ δὲ χλως πρὸς τὴν θαλάσσαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆς ἐν on the land towards the sea (by the sea-side), ii. 2; still more in Acts v. 10; xiii. 31; Phil. iv. 6; see Fr. Mr. p. 201 sq., cf. Schoem. Isaæ. p. 244. The Latin ad, as is well-known, has both significations.

The temporal applications πρὸς καυρὸν for a time Luke viii. 13; Jno. v. 35; Heb. xii. 10 f., and πρὸς ἐστῶραπ towards evening Luke xxiv. 29 (Wetst. I. 826), are seen at a glance to be warranted; (cf. above, ἐπὶ § 47, g, d) p. 375, and § 48, c. p. 392).

Figuratively, πρὸς denotes the end towards which something is directed, and consequently the result, issue, as 2 Pet. iii. 16 ο... στρεβλασθα... πρὸς τὴν ἱδίαν αἰτῶν ἀπώλειαν, Heb. v. 14; ix. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 7 (Simplic. in Epict. 18 p. 146), Jno. xi. 4; but especially the direction of the mind towards something, e.g. Heb. i. 7 424 πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει in reference to (speaking with regard to) them, Luke xx. 19; Rom. x. 21 (not Heb. xi. 18), like dicere in aliquem; cf. Plutarch. de ei ap. Delph. c. 21; Xen. M. 4, 2, 15;—in particular

a) disposition towards one, erga and contra,1 as in Luke xxiii. 12; 361 1 Thess. v. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 2; vii. 12; Acts vi. 1; Heb. xii. 4; Col. ii. iv. 5; Rev. xiii. 6.

b) design (direction of the will) and object (purpose, behalf), as in 1 Cor. x. 11; xii. 7; Matt. vi. 1; Heb. vii. 11; Acts xxvii. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 12. Hence πρὸς τὸ wherefore (quo consilio) Jno. xiii. 28; cf. Soph. Aj. 40.

c) consideration for something, Matt. xix. 8 ὁ ὥσπερ πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὡμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν etc. out of regard to, on account of, the hardness of your hearts (Polyb. 5, 27, 4; 38, 3, 10).

d) the rule after, according to, which one is guided, Luke xii. 47; Gal. ii. 14; 2 Cor. v. 10; Lucian. conser. hist. 38; Plat. apol. 40 e.; Aeschin. dial. 3, 17; and hence the standard according to which a comparison is instituted, as in Rom. viii. 18 οὐκ ἡξία τὰ παθήματα ταύ τινι καυρόν πρὸς τὴν μὲν τουσαν δίξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι compared to, as if applied to a standard of comparison, Bar. iii. 36 (Thuc.

1 Thus used but seldom except in verbs already containing the notion of hostility, as in Sext. Empir. 3, 2 (Dio C. 250, 92). This remark is necessary to qualify the statement in my Observatt. in. epist. Jac. p. 16.
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6, 81; Plat. Gorg. 471 e.; Hipp. maj. 281 d.; Isocr. big. p. 842; Aristot. pol. 2, 9, 1; Demosth. ep. 4, 119 a; cf. Wolf, Leptin. p. 251; Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 340.

379 That in such expressions as διατίθεσθαι διαθήκην πρὸς τινα, διακρίνεσθαι ἰν οἱ πρὸς τινα, εἰρήνην ἔχειν πρὸς τινα (Rom. v. 1), κοινοία πρὸς τι 2 Cor. vi. 14 (cf. Philo ad Caium 1007; Himer. eclog. 18, 3) etc. (see Alberti, observ. p. 303; Fr. Rom. I. 252) the preposition drops the meaning cum,¹ and signifies simply towards, has already been acknowledged by Bretsch. and Wahl. Also in Heb. iv. 13 πρὸς δν ἡμῶν δ λόγος, the preposition denotes direction; and Kühnöl might have reserved his remark, 'πρὸς signifies cum' (cf. Elsner in loc.). Schleusner's rendering of the phrase εἰρήνης τοις πρὸς θεῶν by precari a deo, deserves to be mentioned only as a striking instance of unlimited empiricism.

i. Peri about, around. Primarily of place, as in Acts xxii. 6 περιστράψαι φῶς περι ἐμὲ a light shone round about me, Luke 425 xiii. 8; also with verbs of rest, as in Mark iii. 34 οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν καθίμενοι, Matt. iii. 4 εἰχε γίνεσθαι περὶ τὴν ὁσφύν about his loins. Then of time, as in Mark vi. 48 περὶ τητάρτην φυλακὴν about the fourth watch (circa in Latin), Matt. xx. 3 (Aeschin. ep. 1, 121 b.); Acts xxii. 6. Lastly, of the object around which an action or a state revolves, as it were, as in Acts xix. 25 οἱ περὶ τὰ τοιατὰ ἐφαγάται (Xen. Vectig. 4, 28); Luke x. 40 (Lucian. indoct. 6); 1 Tim. vi. 4 νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεως (Plat. Phaed. 228 e.). Hence it is sometimes equivalent to in reference to, as in Tit. ii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 19; 2 Tim. iii. 8 (Xen. Mem. 4, 3, 2; Isocr. Evag. 4; errorem circa literas habuit, and similar expressions, occur in Quintil. and Sueton.). Cf. above, § 30, 3, note 5 p. 192, and Ast, Plat. legg. p. 37; but especially Glossar. Theodoret. p. 317 sqq. Worthy of notice, further, is the phrase οἱ περὶ τῶν Παῦλου Paul and his companions 362 Acts xiii. 13,² like οἱ περὶ Εὐανδρίαν Xen. An. 7, 4, 16, οἱ περὶ τῆς Κέκροπα Xen. Mem. 3, 5, 10, an expression which in later authors denotes the leader alone, Hm. Vig. 700. So probably in Jno. xi. 19

¹ Merē in such phrases is used also by Greek authors, though this use seems to become more common in the later language, Malal. 2, 52 ἐκπλήθεσθαι μετ' ἄλλαξιν, 13 p. 317, 337; 18 p. 457.
² Greek writers, as is well known, employ ἀμφότεροι likewise in this circumlocation; but in simple prose peri is in general far more frequent. That the expression οἱ περὶ τῶν Παῦλου means not only the 'surroundings' (followers, companions, etc.) of Paul, but also includes Paul himself, arises probably from the pictorial nature of the preposition, which denotes what encompasses, and thus Paul's company. An expression somewhat analogous to this is used in German, e.g. Müllers (genit.) i.e. Müller and his household. (In Franconia they say, die Müllerschen, the Müllers, also including the head of the family.)
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ai peri Mάρθαν kai Mαρίαν is to be interpreted; for the αὑτας
following can only refer to the two sisters. Examples (but without precise discrimination) are adduced also by Wetst. L. 915 sq.; Schwarz, Comment. p. 1074; Schweigh. Lexic. Polyb. p. 463. See also Bhdv. 263.

k. 'Τρό originally denotes local motion, underneath, Matt. viii. 8 ον μον ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθης, Luke xiii. 34 ἐπισωμάζας τὴν νοσσίαν ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας (Xen. C. 5, 4, 43; Plutarch. Thes. 3); also rest, τὰ ἦν i.e. the being (extending) under a surface, as in Acts ii. 5 οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν οἴραν, Luke xvii. 24 (Plat. ep. 7, 326 c.), 1 Cor. x. 1 (Her. 2, 127; Plat. Themist. 26; Aesop. 36, 3), also in Rom. iii. 13 (Sept.) ἰδου ἀστιθὼν ὑπὸ τὰ χείλη αὐτῶν under their lips (cf. Her. 1, 12 κατακράπτειν ὑπὸ τὴν θύραν). Then figuratively (Bhdv. 267; Boissonade, Nic. p. 56), Rom. vii. 14 πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν sold under sin, into the power of sin, Matt. viii. 9 ἔχων ὑπὸ ἐμαυτῶν στρατιῶτας (Xen. C. 8, 8, 5) under me i.e. subject to my power, 1 Pet. v. 6; often in the phrase ἐλατο or γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ το θει to be under, 426 given up to, something, Matt. viii. 9; Rom. iii. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 1; Gal. iii. 10; iv. 2, 21 (Lucian. abdic. 23). It is applied to time in Acts v. 21 ὑπὸ τῶν δρόμων (Lucian. amor. 1) close upon, towards (like the local expression ὑπὸ τὸ τεῖχος). Similar instances are of frequent occurrence in Greek authors; as, ὑπὸ νόκτα, ὑπὸ τὴν ἐο etc. (see Alberti, observ. p. 224; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 146; Schweigh. Lexic. Polyb. p. 633). The Romans, too, use sub in the same way.

1. 'Επί 1) Of place: motion upon (over a level surface) Matt. xxvii. 45 σκότος ἐγενετο ἐπι πάσαν τὴν γῆν, xiv. 19 ἀνακλῖθην ἐπι τοις χώροις, Acts vii. 11 (xxvii. 26); on or to, coming from above or below, accordingly down upon Matt. x. 29 ἐπι τὴν, Acts iv. 33, up upon Acts x. 9 ἀνέβη ἐπι τὸ δόμα, Matt. xxiv. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 24 (Xen. C. 3, 1, 4), also on (upon) Jno. xiii. 25 ἐνπιπτεῖν ἐπι τὸ στῆθος on the breast (Jno. xxi. 20); up before (a high court) Matt. x. 18; Luke xii. 11; in general, of the end towards, after, at (which one advances, strivest, arrives, etc.) Luke xv. 4; xxii. 52; Acts viii. 36; Phil. iii. 14 (var.) Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 39; Ἀν. Ν. 6, 2, 2; Kypke in loc., rarely merely to (of persons) Mark v. 21; Acts i. 21.3 363

From this primary import we may easily explain the application θαδ.

1 Accordingly Eurip. Acest. 307 λέγω τα φίλαν των ἐν θαδ γαῖας, which Monk changed into ἐν θαδ γαῖας, may probably be tolerated. Cf. Matthiae, Eurip. Hec. 144. The phrase is certainly not peculiar to later Greek (Palseph. 10, 1).

2 From such passages must be distinguished Luke x. 9 ἔφηκεν ἐπι ομοί ἐπι βασιλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ. Here a heavenly gift is spoken of which comes down on men; cf. Acts i. 8.
of the preposition in Acts x. 10 ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ αὐτὸν ἐκτασιν (v. 5), i. 26 ἐπεσεν ὁ κλήρος ἐπὶ Ματθαίων, v. 28 ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐπὶ τινὰ τὸ αἷμα ἀνθρώπου τινός, Jno. i. 38 and elsewhere. The German auf, almost universally applicable as it is, is very similar (only, in rendering Matt. xxvii. 29 ἐπέθηκαν κάλαμον ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν, a German would say, in die rechte Hand; better Codd., however, [Sin. also] give ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ, and the common reading cannot be defended by Rev. xx. 1). It is only in appearance that ἐπὶ with the Acc. is joined to verbs of rest; as in Matt. xiii. 2 ὁ δσιος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγαλον εἰσέηκε, stood (had placed themselves) upon the shore, cf. Odyssey. 11, 577; Diod. S. 20, 7. In Matt. xix. 28 καθίσεσθε ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους (Paus. 1, 35, 2), 12 Cor. iii. 15 κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν κεφαλῆς, Acts x. 17; 381 xi. 11, the same remark applies to the use of ἐπὶ as to that of ἐς in similar circumstances; see § 50, 4 b.; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. II. 91.1

27 2) Of the time over which something extends; as, Luke iv. 25 ἐπὶ ἐτη τριά for, during, three years; Acts xiii. 31; xix. 10; Hob. xi. 30; cf. Her. 3, 59; 6, 101; Thuc. 2, 25; Xen. C. 6, 2, 34: Plat. legg. 12, 945 b.; Strabo 9, 401. Hence ἐφ’ ὀσον Matt. ix. 15; 2 Pet. i. 13 (Polyaen. 6, 22) as long as. More rarely of the point of time towards which, at which, something takes place, Acts iii. 1 see Alberti in loc.

3) Figuratively: a) of the number and degree to which something amounts, as in Rev. xxii. 16 ἐπὶ σταδίους δώδεκα χιλιάδων — where we use up to (Her. 4, 198; Xeu. C. 7, 5, 8; Polyb. 4, 39, 4) Rom. xi. 13 ἐφ’ ὀσον in quantum i.e. quatenus. b) of superin-

1 Jas. v. 14 προσευχάρησαν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν may mean let them pray over (upon) him (folding their hands over him in prayer, cf. Acts xix. 13), or pray down upon him, or even over him, for ἐπὶ is very often used with Acc. where the Dat. or Gen. might have been expected. A recent expositor should not have rejected this exposition so lightly. In Luke v. 25 ἐφ’ ὅν κατέστη (as the best Codd. [Sin. also] read) may be explained either according to the preceding remark, or thus: upon (over) which (a level) he lay. Moreover what is said above seems sufficient to justify the reading, furnished by good authority [also by Cod. Sin.] and already adopted by Lchm., in Jno. xxxi 4 ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγαλόν (cf. Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 68, see above in the text), which Matthai erroneously calls a semigraecam correctionem. Elsewhere certainly the difference between ἐπὶ with Acc. and ἐπὶ with Gen. or Dat. is sometimes inconsiderable. When it is supposed, however, that in Mark xv. 24 (we also say über die Kleidung loosen) Phil. i. 27 (sorrow upon sorrow — so that one sorrow comes upon another already present) the Acc. stands for the Gen. or Dat., a closer examination of the passages shows at once the incorrectness of the supposition. But in Luke xxviii. 28; Rev. xviii. 11 the Dat. also might certainly have been employed, cf. Luke xix. 41; Rev. xviii. 20, and in Rev. v. 1 the Acc. would have been even more correct. These two constructions, though, are based on somewhat different views of the matter. We also say über eine Sache freuen (to rejoice over a thing).
tendence and power over, Rev. xiii. 7 ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἔξωσια ἐπὶ πάσαιν φυλὰ, Heb. iii. 6; x. 21 (Xen. C. 4, 5, 58), cf. Luke ii. 8; xii. 14, βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ τύχα Luke i. 38; Rom. v. 14; cf. Malal. 5 p. 143. c) of the heart’s direction, the disposition, hence towards (Franke, Dem. 127), erga and contra, Matt. x. 21; Luke vi. 35; 2 Cor. x. 2; 364 Rom. ix. 23 (not 1 Pet. iii. 12), Sturz, ind. to Dio C. p. 151; hence to trust, hope, upon Matt. xxvii. 43; 2 Cor. ii. 3; 1 Tim. v. 5; 1 Pet. i. 18, but also σπλαγχνίζεσθαι ἐπὶ των, to have compassion on (towards) one, Matt. xv. 32; Mark viii. 2. d) of the direction of thought or discourse, Mark ix. 12; Heb. vii. 13 (Rom. iv. 9), or the will, and consequently of the intention and aim, Luke xxiii. 48 (Plat. Crit. 52 b.), Matt. iii. 7 (Xen. M. 2, 3, 13; Cyr. 7, 2, 14; Fischer, ind. ad Palaeph. under ἐπι), Matt. xxvi. 50 ἐφ’ δ’ (Plato, Gorg. 447 b.), also when aim and result coincide, Heb. xii. 10. Lastly, it is used in a very general sense: in reference to, as Matt. xxv. 40, 45 (as to Rom. xi. 13 see a)). On 428 πιστὸς ἐπὶ τι Matt. xxv. 21, see Fr. in loc.

§ 50. INTERCHANGE, ACCUMULATION, AND REPETITION OF
PREPOSITIONS.

1. The same preposition is employed in the same sentence or in parallel passages (especially of the first three Evangelists) with different cases to denote different relations; as, Heb. ii. 10 δι’ δυ τὰ πάντα καὶ δι’ ὅν τὰ πάντα, Rev. v. 1; xi. 10; xiv. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 9, 12 ὅπως ἄνηρ διὰ τὴν γυναίκα,—ἄνηρ διὰ τῆς γυναικὸς. Cf. Demosth. Philipp. 2 p. 25 c. To this more remotely may be referred Heb. xi. 29 διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν βάλασαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς, where the Acc. is governed by the compound διαβαίνειν, after which, however, διὰ itself governs the Genitive (cf. Josh. xxiv. 17 ὅσα παρῆλθομεν δι’ αὐτῶν, Wisd. x. 18). The distinction between such different cases, in itself delicate, sometimes almost wholly disappears in practice; as, Matt. xix. 28 ὅταν καθιση... ἐπὶ θρόνων δόξας αὐτῶν, καθίσασθε καὶ ἵμετε ἐπὶ δῶδεκα θρόνους, xxiv. 2 οὖ ὑφή λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, Mark xiii. 2 οὖ ὑφή λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον (cf. Josh. v. 15 in one and the same clause ἐφ’ φόνου ἐστικας ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ, Gen. xxxix. 5; xlix. 26; Exod. viii. 3; xii. 7; Jon. iv. 10), Rev. v. 1, 13; vi. 2, 16; vii. 1; xiii. 16. In the same way Greek authors employ ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἤππους and ἐπὶ τῶν ἤππων (Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 272) the one as often
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as the other (Sept. even ἄναβαλεν ἐπὶ ταῖς οἰκίαις Joel. ii. 9). In
Rev. xiv. 9 we find λαμβάνει τὸ χάραγμα ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου αὐτοῦ
ἡ ἐπὶ τὴν χειρὰ αὐτοῦ, xiii. 1. Cf. also Diog. L. 2, 77 ... ἐπὶ τὸ
ἡκοῦ; ἐphasis ἐπὶ τῷ μεταδώσεως etc., Pol. 6, 7, 2 τραφέντας ἕντο
τοιούτοις, but 10, 25, 1 τραφεῖς καὶ παιδευθεῖς ἕντο Κλέανδρον.
In general, see Jacobs, Anthol. III. 194, 286; Bldy. 200 f. Such
apparent indifference as respects case occurs most frequently with
ἐπὶ (Schneider, Plat. civ. I. 74), cf. ἐπιτίζεως ἐπὶ τυμι and τυμι
1 Tim. iv. 10; ν. 5, ἡποιδέναι ἐπὶ τυμι and τυμι 2 Cor. i. 9; ii. 8,
καταστήσας ἐπὶ τινος and τιν Luke xii. 42, 44 (κοπτεσθαί ἐπὶ τυμι
Rev. i. 7 and ἐπὶ τυμι xviii. 9 var.), ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ κοσμῶνς Acts xii.
Moreover, see as to ἐπὶ used of aim with Gen. Bremi, Aesch. p. 412,
with Dat. and Acc. Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 59, as to ἐφε' εαυτόν and
ἐφ' εαυτῷ Schoem. Isa. p. 349, as to παρά with Gen. instead of
Dat. Schaeft. Dion. p. 118 sq. Hence in detached instances, where
an exact parallel may not be found in Greek authors (Luke i. 59
καλεῖν ἐπὶ τυμι cf. Ezra ii. 61; Neh. vii. 63 etc.), we are not
authorized to pronounce the construction un-Greek, particularly if
something analogous can be adduced (Mth. 1374), or if the case
employed can be easily conceived as connected with the preposition
in question. On the other hand, the N. T. writers never use ἐπὶ
Κλαυδίων or Κλαυδίου for ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου, nor construe ἐπὶ of con-
dition (stipulation) with the Gen. or Acc. It was not till a later
period that different cases, which though construed with the
same preposition conveyed different significations, began to be
confounded in the written language of the Greeks, so that e.g.
μετὰ with Gen. and μετά with Acc. came to be used in the same
sense, see above, p. 368.

That in the same sentence the same preposition with the same case
should be used in different relations and senses cannot be considered any
more strange in Greek than in any other language, e.g. Luke xi. 50 ἵνα
ἐκτεθῇ τῷ αἵμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν ... ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως ταύτης ἀπὸ τοῦ
αἵματος Ἀβγαλ etc., Rom. xv. 13 εἰς τὸ περισσότερον ὡμαῖ ἐν τῇ ἅλοι ἐν
δυνάμει πνεύματος ἅγιον, Jno. ii. 23 ἵν ἐν τῇ Ἰεροσολύμων ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν
tῇ ἱερατῇ, 2 Cor. vii. 16 ψαλῳ ἐπὶ ἐν ταύτῃ θαρρῶ ἐν ὡμί, xii. 12; 1 Cor.
th. 18; Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 3, 14; ii. 3, 7; iv. 22; vi. 18; Phil. i. 26;
ii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Thess. i. 4; Col. i. 29; ii. 2; iv. 2; Heb. v. 8;
ix. 11 f.; Jno. iv. 45 (xxvi. 15); Acts xvii. 31; 2 Pet. i. 4 (Philostr. her.
4, 1; Arrian. Epict. 4, 13, 1).

2. The two different prepositions in the same sentence in Philhem.
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5 ἀκούων σοι τὴν ἄγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν, ἥν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἄγιους are usually explained by referring, in regard to the sense, the words πρὸς τὸν κύριον to πίστιν, and εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἄγιους to ἄγαπην; — a chiasticus in which there would be nothing inherently surprising, cf. Plat. legg. 9, 868 b. (see Ast, animadv. p. 16), Horat. Serm. 1, 8, 51 and the expositors in loc. It is simpler, however, to take πίστις in the sense of fidelity, and to let both πρὸς τ. κ. and εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἄγιους depend upon it alike, without making any distinction between the prepositions; see Meyer. Though some Codd. give εἰς in the former 430 clause, this is only a correction, occasioned by the endeavor to make the phraseology uniform and by the circumstance that elsewhere faith in Christ is always called πίστις ἡ εἰς Χριστὸν. Yet the expression πίστις ἔχεις πρὸς τινα is quite unobjectionable, and occurs at least in Epiph. Opp. II. 335 d. As to Luke v. 15; Jno. vii. 42; 2 Cor. x. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 3; Rom. iv. 18; x. 17; Eph. iv. 12; 1 Jno. iii. 24; 1 Thess. iv. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 12, no remark is required. On 1 Cor. iv. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 17; iii. 5; xiii. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 8 see the more recent expositors. On the other hand, in 1 Thess. ii. 6 οὕτω ξυτοῦντες εἴ άνθρώπουν δόξαν, οὕτε άφρύ άμον οὕτε άπ' ἄλλων the two prepositions are quite synonymous, as also in Jno. xi. 1; Acts xxiii. 34. In Rom. iii. 30 Paul certainly does not have in view any difference of meaning (between ἐκ πίστεως and διὰ τῆς πίστεως), as doctrinally considered πίστις may with equal propriety be conceived of either as the source or as the means of blessedness (Gal. iii. 8; Eph. ii. 8). Cf. from Greek authors Paus. 7, 7, 1 aι ἐκ πολέμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς νόσου συμφοραί, Isocr. permut. 738; Arrian. Al. 2, 18, 9; Diod. S. 5, 30; Schaeff. Gnom. p. 203 366 and Soph. I. 248; Bornem. Xen. Mem. p. 45. As little difference is there between the two prepositions in 2 Jno. 2 τὴν ἀληθείαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐστι, and in Exod. vi. 4 εν γῇ (γῇ) καὶ παρακαταστάνει ἐν' αὐτής, Jno. iv. 10. Lastly, in 2 Cor. iii. 11 the distinction urged by Billroth between διὰ δόξης and ἐν δόξῃ will 384 hardly stand the test of usage, see above, p. 386. As to διὰ of the condition (state), see p. 379 sq. On the other hand, the difference of import between κατά and ἐπὶ in 1 Cor. xi. 4, 10 and between ἐκ and διὰ in 1 Pet. i. 23 is manifest.

3. Prepositions of kindred signification are substituted for each other in parallel passages in the Gospels and elsewhere; as, Matt. xxvi. 28 (Mark xiv. 24) ἀλλα ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, on the contrary, Luko xxii. 20 ἐπὶ πολλ. ἐκχ. ; Matt. vii. 16 μῆτε
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συλλέγοντων α’ πο’ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλίων, on the contrary, Luke vi. 44 οὐκ ἐξ ἀκανθ. συλλέγοντας σῦκα; Matt. xxiv. 16 φευγότων ε’πι τὰ δρή (up to) cf. Palaeph. 1, 10, but Mark xiii. 14 φευγ. ε’ἰς τὰ δρή (indo); Jno. x. 32 δἰ αὐτῶν αὐτῶν ἔργων λειβάζετε με; vs. 33 περὶ καλοῦ ἄργου οὐ λειβάζομεν σε; Heb. vii. 2 φ καὶ δεκάτην α’ πο’ πάντων ἐμέρωτεν Ἀβραάμ, vs. 4 φ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβρ. ἐδώκειν ε’κ τῶν ἀκροβυσίων; Rom. iii. 25 ε’ἰς ἄκωζεν τῆς δικαιουσίας αὐτοῦ, on the contrary, vs. 26 πρὸς τὴν ἐνδείξιν τ. δικ. αὐτοῦ. Cf. Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 43 πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ τείχος προσήγαγον ... οὐκ ἐθέλω ἵππ’ αὐτὰ τὰ τείχη ἀγείν. Here belongs also Heb. xi. 2 ε’ν τιτὶ (τῦ πίστει) ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, vs. 39 πάντες μαρτυροῦντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως (through faith, i.e. ut instructi fide); here the phrases εἰςεσθαί, προεἰσεθαί, εἰσαριστεῖν, δέχονται περὶ οὐ ἰππ’ τινος (Rom. x. 1; 2 Cor. i. 11; Eph. vi. 18; Col. i. 3, 9; 1 Cor. i. 4; Eph. i. 16; cf. Acts apocr. p. 58); here too the expression suffer or die περὶ or ἰππ’ ἀμαρτίαν (the former signifying on account of, the latter for, sins) 1 Cor. xv. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18. Sometimes even the good Codd. vary between ἰππ’ and περὶ, as in Gal. i. 4, as these prepositions were often interchanged by the transcribers. Cf. Weber, Dem. 129. (Recent editors have proposed, assuredly without sufficient reason, to correct the reading in Eurip. Alcest. 180, where οὐ δυνάσθην π’ ἐρ’ occurs instead of the elsewhere more usual ἰππ’, see Monk in loc.)

Sometimes we find in parallel phrases a preposition now inserted and now omitted; as, 1 Pet. iv. 1 παθόντως ἰππ’ ἡμῶν σαρκί, and immediately afterwards δ’ παθὼν ἐν σαρκί, Luke iii. 16; Acts i. 5; xi. 16 βαπτίζων ζδατί, but βαπτ. ἐν ζδατί Matt. iii. 11; Jno. i. 26, 33. This difference in phraseology does not affect the sense, but each form of expression arose from a different conception: πάσχων ἐν σαρκί means, suffer in the flesh (body); πάσχων σαρκί means, suffer according to (as respects) the flesh (§ 31, 6). Bαπτίζων ἐν ζδατί signifies, baptize in water (immersing); βαπτίζων ζδαι, baptize with water. Here, and in most other passages, the identity of the two expressions in sense is manifest; yet we must not 6th ed. consider one as put for the other. Cf. besides, Eph. ii. 1 νεκροὶ τοὺς παρα- 385 δόμασι but Col. ii. 13 νεκροὶ ἐν τοῖς παραπτ., 2 Cor. iv. 7 ἢ ἐνερβιβαλ- 1 Jno. iii. 18.

4. It was formerly supposed (Glassii Philol. sacr. ed. Dathe

1 But invariably only βαπτιζ’ ἐν παρθανατι.
2 So in Arist. anim. 4, 10, p. 111 Syll. λαμβάνοντες παρθανατι is, caught with a trident (like τ’ χειρι with the hand); but λαμβάνειν ἐν τ’ ἔρεμον, immediately following, is caught on the trident. Schneider and Bekker, however, read in the latter passage λαμβάνειν ἐν.
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I. 412 sq.) that in the N. T. the prepositions εν and εἰς especially were used indiscriminately for each other (see also Sturz, Lexicon. Xen. II. 68, 166). The former, it was said, was employed agreeably to the Hebrew idiom with verbs of motion or direction to denote into, as Matt. x. 16 εγὼ ἀποστέλλω οὐκάς ός πρόβατα εν μέσῳ λύκων, Jno. v. 4 ἄγγελος κατέβανεν εν τῇ κολυμβηθρα. Luke vii. 17 432 ἐξῆθεν ὁ λόγος εν δόξῃ τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ, Mark v. 30 εν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἐπιστρα- 

φείς, Rom. v. 5 ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται εν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, Luke v. 16; Jno. viii. 37; 1 Cor. xi. 18, etc. (in Rev. xi. 11 the reading is very uncertain, and Mark i. 16; 1 Tim. iii. 16 do not come under this head). The latter, it was imagined, was used with verbs of rest to signify in, as Acts vii. 4 (ἡ γη) εἰς ἥν ύμεῖς 

νῦν κατοικεῖτε, Mark ii. 1 εἰς οἷον ἐστι, Jno. i. 18 ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ix. 7 νῦσαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβηθραν etc.¹

a. Now first in reference to εν: the Greeks also, particularly Homer, sometimes use εν with verbs of motion to indicate at the same time the result of the motion, that is, rest.² This they do from a love of terseness peculiar to the Greek race. It is only in later writers, however, that such use of εν appears in prose (for Thuc. 4, 42; 7, 17; Xen. H. 7, 5, 10 have now been emended on MS. authority, Mth. 1843), e.g. Aelian. 4, 18 κατῆλθε Πλάτων εν Σικυῶν i.e. he came (and dwelt) in Sicily, Paus. 6, 20, 4 αὐτοὶ 


v. 4, especially if these words are a later addition; for the other

¹ The above observation must be confined to the two cases specified; for when εν and εἰς might according to different conceptions be used with equal propriety, it could not be said that one is put for the other, e.g. τοῦτο ἐγένετο μοι, or τοῦτο ἐγένετο εἰς μοι.

² The same remark applies to the Hebrew הָיָה when it appears to be joined to verbs of motion, see my exeg. Studien I. 49 ff. Further, cf. Kotha, schol. 78 f. — ἐκείνος εν does not come under this head (Lucian. paras. 34; cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. III. 891). Neither can Perfects or Perfects with εν, as κατατεφυτεῖτο εν τῷ Πατρί Plat. Soph. 260 c.; Thuc. 4, 14, etc., be considered as parallel with the above examples. They show, however, the origin of this usage, cf. Bedy. 208; and in good writers the usage is generally confined to such cases only, Krü. S. 286. Finally, the (not infrequent) construction ἤρχεσθαν εν Luke ix. 46; xxiii. 42; Rev. xi. 11, etc. is perhaps to be also excepted when it denotes come (arise) in.

³ The fact that εἰσῆρχεσθαν εν appears to be an imitation of the Hebrew הָיָה makes no difference, as this Hebrew expression is undoubtedly to be explained in the same way.
exposition, went down in the pool (into the depths, to produce the 386 ῥαπαχή, see Lücke), is opposed by the consideration, that then in
μέ android, so circumstantial a narrative a descent of the angel from heaven
433 would first of all have been mentioned. In all other passages
the substitution of ἐν for εἰς is merely apparent: Luke vii. 17
means went forth (spread) in all Judea; Mark v. 30 ἐπιστραφέω
ἐν τῷ δύχω turned him about (turned around) in the crowd, Luke
v. 16 ἦν ἐντοχωρών ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμωσι continued retired in the solitary
places. If the reading is genuine in Matt. xiv. 8, ἔθετο ἐν φυλακῇ
exactly corresponds to the Latin ponere in loco (for which we,
according to a different but equally correct conception, say put
into); similar is Jno. iii. 35 πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῷ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, 2 Cor.
viii. 16 (IIiad. 1, 441; 5, 574; cf. also Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I.
598). In the same way, Matt. xxvi. 23 ὁ ἔμβαψας ἐν τῷ τρυπήλῳ
is, he that dipped in the dish, an expression as correct as the Ger-
man in die Schüssel eintauchte, dipped into the dish (cf. Aesop.
124, 1). In 1 Cor. xi. 18 σωφρ. ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ means, meet in an
assembly (as we say, meet in the market-place, in company, etc.).
In Phil. iv. 16 διὰ καὶ ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ ... εἰς τὴν χρείαν μου ἐπέστρεψε;
the expression is abbreviated: ye sent to me (when I was) in Thes-
salonica (cf. Thuc. 4, 27 and Poppo, in loc.). As to Jno. viii. 37
there may be doubt how ἐν ἴμιν is to be taken, see Lücke; but
there can be no doubt that ἐν is not put for εἰς. As to Jas. v. 5
see de Wette. In Matt. xxvii. 5 ἐν τῷ ναῷ is, in the temple. In
Rom. v. 5 the use of the Perfect was sufficient to indicate the
correct interpretation (cf. Poppo, Thuc. 4, 14).  

b. More surprising still are the passages adduced in support of
the assertion that εἰς is used for ἐν. Even in Greek authors εἰς is
not unfrequently construed with verbs of rest; and then the idea of
motion (preceding or accompanying) was originally included,
agreeably to the principle of breviloquentia mentioned above (Heind.
Aj. 80; Jacobs, Ael. anim. p. 406, and, as to Latin, Hartung on the
Cases S. 68 ff.), as Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 4 νόμῳ εἰς τὰς ἐντύνων χώρας
ἐκαστοι τούτων πάρεσιν, Aelian. 7, 8 Ἡματίσεων εἰς Ἐκβάτανα
ἀπέθανε, Isaeus 5, 46 (cf. Acts xxi. 13).  

1 Passages of Greek authors in which some have erroneously thought ἐν is put for
εἰς, have been more correctly explained by Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 247. As to εἰς for
ἐν, see ibid. II. 91. As to Latin phrases in which in with Ablat. appeared to be used
for in with Acc, see Krits, Sallust. II. 31 sq.

2 Eis χωρίων τῆς 'Αρακλάς ὑδάτων Steph. Byz. p. 495 Mein. is to be explained in a
different manner.
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*eis tás výsous* Paus. 7, 4, 3. (The use of *eis* with such verbs as 434 Ἐμν, καθέσθαι — καθοθαι — Mark xiii. 8, cf. Eurip. Iph. T. 620, is of a somewhat different nature, see Bttm. Dem. Mid. p. 175; 369 Schweigh. Lexic. Herod. I. p. 282; Valcken. Herod. 8, 71 etc.; 387 Poppo, Thuc. III. I. p. 659; Fr. Mr. p. 558.) In this way are to be explained the following passages: Mark ii. 1, where we say in German also *er ist ins Haus*, i.e. he has gone into the house and is now there (Her. 1, 21; Arrian. Al. 4, 22, 3; Paus. 8, 10, 4 and Siebelis in loc.; Liv. 37, 18? Curt. 3, 5, 10; Vechnor, helenol. p. 258 sq.) cf. xiii. 16; Luke xi. 7; Acts viii. 40 Φιλάππος εὑρέθη *eis 'Aξιον* Philip was found conducted to Azotus (cf. vs. 39 πνεύμα κυρίου ἣρπασε τὸν Φιλ., see Wesseling. Diod. Sic. II. 581; cf. Esth. i. 5; Evang. apocr. p. 447); Acts vii. 4 εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε (Xen. A. 1, 2, 24; Xen. Eph. 2, 12; Theodoret. Opp. I. 594), Mark x. 10 (where the position of the words is to be noted); probably also Acts xviii. 21 δέι με τὴν ἐορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς 'Ἰερός., but the genuineness of these words is suspected and the more recent editors have omitted them, [they are wanting, too, in Cod. Sin.]; Jno. xx. 7 ἑπταυλεγένον εἰς ἑνα τότων wrapt together (and put) into one place. On the other hand, in Acts xii. 19 εἰς Καισάρειαν belongs grammatically to κατελθὼν. In Acts xx. 14 εἰς signifies to. In Acts xix. 22 ἐπεσχέξε κρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν, probably εἰς is not used simply in a local sense: *he remained in Asia*; but, he remained for Asia, in order to labor there longer. The only admissible interpretation of Acts iv. 5 συναχθόμενοι αὐτῶν τῶν ἀρχιστάς . . . εἰς 'Ἰερός. is that of Beza; yet the good Codd. [Sin. excepted] give ἐν. In Acts ii. 39 the *oi μακρῶν* are those dwelling at a distance,—afar off. In Jno. i. 18 ὁ ὅν εἰς τὸν κόσμον (though here said in reference to God) is probably to be referred to the primary (external and local) import: who is (laid) *upon* (unto) the bosom. In Jno. ix. 7 εἰς τὴν κολυμμαθραν is as respects sense to be connected also with ὄπαγε, cf. vs. 11: *go into the pool and wash thyself* (cf. Luke xxi. 37) see Lücke, though νεπτεσθαι εἰς ὅσωρ by itself is as correct as in Cato R. R. 156, 5 in aquam macerare, or *sich in ein Becken waschen* (Arrian. Epict. 435

1 Cf. with this as analogous in auren, oculum dormire Terent. Heaut. 2, 2, 101; Plin. ep. 4, 32; Plaut. Pseud. 1, 1, 121. De Wette rejects the above explanation, "as here at least quite inadmissible." But why should not such figurative expressions, transferred from human relations to God, be taken in the sense which primarily belongs to them, the sense in which they had their origin? The phrase is in existence; when transferred to immaterial relations it is taken just as it stands, without further thought respecting the physical relation in which it originated.
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Still more easy of explanation is Mark i. 9 ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνη. In Luke viii. 34 ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν etc. means, they carried the news into the city (for which we find a more circumstantial statement in Matt. viii. 33: ἀπελθοῦντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα etc.). Not unlike this is Mark i. 39; cf. Jno. viii. 26. In Mark xiii. 9 καὶ εἰς συναγωγάς δαρήσεσθε, where ἐν though it has some slight MSS. support is clearly a correction, the words εἰς συναγωγάς cannot well (Mey.) be joined to the preceding παραδώσουν without quite destroying the parallelism. The most literal rendering, ye shall be beaten into the synagogues, presents no archaeological difficulty; still, one would have sooner expected the beating in the synagogues. The pregnant construction, however: brought into the synagogues, ye shall be beaten, is harsh for Mark. Luke iv. 23 δόσῃ ἡκούσαν γενόμενα εἰς Καπερναοῦ may be rendered: done (towards) unto Capernaum, cf. Acts xxviii. 6; and ἐν, which some good Codd. give, is undoubtedly a correction. See, generally, Beyer de praeposs. ἐν et εἰς in N. T. permutatione. Lips. 1824. 4to.

5. If we turn now, further, to several passages of the N. T. Epistles where these prepositions (particularly ἐν for εἰς) are supposed to be interchanged when used in an ideal sense (cf. also Rück. Gal. i. 6), probably nobody will find any difficulty with 2 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. iii. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 13;— quite as little with Eph. i. 17; vi. 15. In Phil. i. 9 ἵνα ἀγάπη ... πεμπόσει ἐν ἐπιγνώσει means ἐν knowledge; the purpose, on the other hand, is first expressed by εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν vs. 10. So too in Phil. vi. ὅταν ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως σου ἐνεργηθην ἐν ἐπιγνώσει. In Jas. v. 5 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σφαγῆς means — as is plain from its parallelism with ἔθναισάντες ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις vs. 3 — in the day of slaughter, which also makes good sense, see Theile in loc. In Eph. ii. 16

1 Jer. xii. (xlviii.) 7 ἔδρα ὁ ἄρης θάνατα συνέχει ἐστώ ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος (and cast) them into the pit. Cf. i Macc. vii. 19.
2 Soph. Aj. 80 ὅμοι ἐρχέται τῶν ποιητῶν ἐπὶ δόμους μὴν can no longer be adduced; as Lobeck’s edition has shown. See also Lobeck in Wunder’s edit. S. 92 f. As to Xen. C. 2, 1, 9, however, see Bornem. in the Index, under εἰς. Also Lycurg. 20, 3 διακρατεῖν εἰς τὴν παράβασα is not: they were steadfast in their country.
3 Originally ἐν and εἰς (εἰς) may have been one and the same preposition, as in Pindar we find agreeably to the Aecolic dialect ἐν with Acc. for εἰς; see Pindar ed. Böckh, I. p. 294, 378, etc. As little, however, can be argued from this in support of an interchange of these two prepositions in the cultivated written language of the Greeks with its established forms, as that in German at the present day vor and für may be arbitrarily interchanged, because in the earlier language they were properly only one and the same word.
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ἐν ἐνί σώματι points to εἰς ἑνα καύσων ἀνθρωπου; accordingly, he 436 reconciles to God ἐν ἐνί σώματι those κτισθέντας εἰς ἑνα ἀνθρ. In Rom. i. 24 εἰς ἄκαθαρσις is to be joined directly to παρέδομαι, and ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθ. is in their lusts, cf. vs. 27 ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν. In 1 Cor. i. 8 ἐν τῇ ἦμ. is construed with ἄνεγκλήτους, and this is in apposition to ἦμας. In the same way, in 1 Thess. iii. 13, ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ, which is parallel to ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ, depends directly on ἀμέμπτους. In 2 Thess. ii. 13 εἰλατο ἦμας ὁ θεὸς . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος etc. means, chosen to salvation in sanctification of the Spirit; ἁγιασμός. πν. is the spiritual state in which the being chosen to salvation is realized. 1 Jno. iv. 9 is simply: in this was manifested the love of God on (as respects) us. On the other hand, in Rom. ii. 5 θησαυρίζεσαι σεαυτῷ ὁργήν ἐν ἡμέρα ὀργῆς is an abbreviated expression: thou art treasuring up to thyself wrath (which will break forth) on the day of wrath. And 1 Thess. iv. 7 οὐκ ἐκάλεσαν ἦμας ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἀλλὰ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ is put for ὡστε εἶναι 389 (ἡμᾶς) ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. 1 Cor. vii. 15 and Eph. iv. 4 may also be explained in the same way; others, however, understand ἐν to refer to the ethical nature of the κληρον, see, especially, Harless on the latter passage. Moreover, in 1 Cor. the Perfect is not to be overlooked. As to διδόναι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις 2 Cor. i. 22 and the 371 like (Rom. v. 5) no remark is necessary after what has been said above, p. 414. Finally, εἰς is not put for ἐν in Rom. vi. 22 ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμὸν; the εἰς manifestly designates the moral goal. Similar is Rom. xiii. 14. In Eph. iii. 16 κραταιοῦντες εἰς τὸν ἑαυτῷ ἀνθρωπον means, to become strong in regard to the inward man. In general, it is inherently improbable that in clearly conceived doctrinal statements the apostles should have perplexed the reader by employing ἐν for εἰς or εἰς for ἐν. At least, they could have written εἰς with as much ease, certainly, as the expositors who are trying to smuggle it in.

The alleged usage of indiscriminately interchanging these prepositions is not sustained by an appeal to Suidas and the Fathers;¹ nor by the fact that sometimes in parallel passages εἰς and ἐν exchange places, as Matt. xxii. 8 ἀπεθανατ γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ δόξῃ, but Mark xi. 8 εἰς τὴν δόξαν; Matt. xxiv. 18 ὁ ἐν τῇ ἁγιασμῷ μητρὶ πασχαλιναῖς, Mark xiii. 16 ὁ εἰς τῶν ἄγγελον etc.; Mark i. 16 ἀμφισβάλλοντες ἀμφιβλητῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, Matt. iv. 18 βαλλ. 437

¹ The words of 2 Cor. xii. 2 ἀπαγένεται εἰς τρίτῳ θερμανοῦ are quoted by Clem. Alex. paedag. I. p. 44 Syllh. thus: ἐν τῷ ἐρταθεὶς θερμανοῦ; on the other hand, those of Prov. xvii. 3 δοκιμάζεται ἐν καύσων ἀγνοοῦ etc. are quoted by him in Strom. II. p. 172 as follows: δοκιμ. . . . εἰς κάμινον.
§ 50. INTERCHANGE, ETC. OF PREPOSITIONS.

ἄμφιβλ. εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν—the former means, they cast the net about (waved it about) in the sea; the latter, they cast it into the sea; different stages and acts of their business are indicated. In Rom. v. 21 ἴσαρσεν ἣ ἀμφίθη ἐν τῇ θανάτῳ in death, which is actually present; but ἣν ἥ χάριν βασιλείας διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνων υπὸ τῆς ζωῆς, as the end to be attained; probably, however, εἰς τῇ αἰών. depends directly on βλ. see Fr.; cf. besides 2 Cor. xiii. 3. It must, however, be admitted that the limitation according to which εἰς is construed with verbs of rest and ἐν on the other hand with verbs of motion, is overlooked by writers of the later period, especially by the Scholiasts and Byzantines, and so ἐν and ἐς are employed without distinction, and ἐν even begins to predominate with verbs of motion, see Leo Diac. ed. Hase p. XII.; Blume, Lycurg. p. 56; Niebuhr, ind. to Agath., also the indices to Theophan. and to Menandri hist. in the Bonn ed. The modern Greeks, in fact, have retained but one of these prepositions. Cf. further, Argum. ad Demosth. Androt. § 17; Theodoret. Opp. II. 466, 804; III. 869; Epiph. haer. 46, 5; Pseudoepiph. vit. proph. pp. 241, 248, 332, 334, 340, 341; Basilic. I. 150; III. 496, also the Sept. 390 the Apocr. and the Pseudoepigr. in many passages. Yet in the N. T. there is at least no instance more anomalous than those which occur in the earlier writers of the koinē.

6. It is especially characteristic of Paul to use several prepositions referring to one and the same substantive, in order that together they may define his idea on all sides, e.g. Gal. i. 1 Παῦλος ἀνάρτωλος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρός etc. i.e. an apostle sent forth in no respect by human authority (not from men, as the ultimate authority; not through any man, as intermediate authority); Rom. iii. 22 (πεφανέρωται) δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας, i.e. is most completely imparted to all believers (is manifested unto all and over (upon) all), Syriac 

(English) (Bengel in loc. is arbitrary, following the ancient expositors; Rück. helpless); xi. 36 εἰς αὐτοῦ (θεοῦ) καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα, i.e. the world bears every possible dependent relation to God,—it is from (out of) him, inasmuch as he 438 created it (the First Cause); through him, inasmuch as he is

1 Compare Hm. on Böckh's Behndl. d. Inschrift. S. 181 f.
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(continuously) efficient upon it; to him, inasmuch as he is the ultimate End to which all things are directed; Col. i. 16 εν αὐτῷ (Χριστῷ) ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ... τὰ πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτίστατο, i.e. the universe stands in necessary and complete relation to Christ; first, historically (Aor.): in him was the world created, inasmuch as he, the divine λόγος, was the personal ground of the divine creative act (just as in Christ God redeemed the world); then of the world as subsisting (Perf.): all things have been created through (by) him (as mediate person), and to (for) him (as κύριος πάντων in the most comprehensive sense); in vs. 17 πρὸ πάντων refers back to δι’ αὐτοῦ, and εἰς αὐτὸν συμεστηκεν is explanatory of εἰς αὐτόν. Eph. iv. 6 εἰς θεός καὶ πατὴρ πάντων ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ εἰς πᾶσιν ἡμῖν, i.e. God is the God and Father of all in every conceivable relation, (ruling) over all, (working) through all, (dwelling) in all (filling them with his Spirit). 2 Pet. iii. 5 γῆ εἰς θεότος καὶ δι’ θεότος συνεστῶσα τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ out of water (as the material in which it lay contained) and through water, i.e. through the action of the water; which partly retired to the low places, and partly formed the clouds in the sky. In the parallel clauses in 1 Cor. xii. 8 f. spiritual gifts are referred, by the use of διὰ, κατά, εἰς, to the πνεῦμα from which they all origi- nate: διὰ designates the Spirit as mediate agent; κατά, as dispose (vs. 11); εἰς, as container. The antithesis between εἰς (or ἀπό) and εἰς (the point from and the point towards) is easily perceived, Rom. i. 17; 2 Cor. iii. 18 (cf. in a local reference Matt. xxiii. 34). (In 1 Cor. viii. 6, where the corresponding prepositions refer to different subjects — θεός εἰς οὗ and κύριος Ἰ. Χρ. δι’ οὗ — there cannot be a moment’s doubt respecting the propriety and import of the prepositions.)

The following instances in Greek authors deserve notice as parallel: 373


7. When two or more substantives dependent on the same prep- 489 osition immediately follow one another joined together by a copula,

1 Theodorot has thus explained the passage: αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα πνεύματα, αὐτῷ τὰ γεγονότα διατελεί κυβερνῶν ... εἰς αὐτὸν ἄφοραν ἐπιστεῖται προσήκει ὡς πρὸς τῶν ἐπιράματος χρώμαν ἐμαυλογοῦνται, αὐτῶντας δὲ τὸν ἑκείνα προσήκειαν, αὐτῷ δὲ χρῆ καὶ τὴν προσήκειαν ἀνατέμεταν ἐμαυλογοῦν.
the preposition is most naturally repeated, if the substantives in question denote things which are to be conceived as distinct and independent, Weber, Demosth. p. 189 (as to Latin, see Kritz, Sallust. I. 226; Zumpt, Gr. S. 601 f.); but not repeated, if the substantives fall under a single category, or (if proper names) under one common class:

a. Luke xxiv. 27 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν (Acts xv. 4); 1 Thess. i. 5 ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ, Jno. xx. 2;¹ 2 Tim. iii. 11; Acts xxviii. 2; Mark vi. 4; x. 29; xii. 33; Rev. vi. 9. Hence it is almost always repeated when two nouns are connected together by καὶ...καὶ (Bremi, Lys. p. 3 sq.) or τε...καὶ, as in Acts xxvi. 29 καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ (the two are incompatible with each other), Luke xxi. 38; 1 Cor. ii. 3; Philem. 16; Acts xvii. 9; cf. Xen. Hier. i, 5 (but Soph. Trach. 379); Phil. i. 7 ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ, Acts xxv. 23 etc. (cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 16; Thuc. 8, 97; Diod. S. 19, 86; 20, 15; Paus. 4, 8, 2).²

b. Jno. iv. 23 ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (two aspects of one comprehensive notion) see Lücke, Luke xxii. 26 ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων (essentially one state of mind), Eph. i. 21; 1 Thess. i. 8; Acts xvi. 2; xvii. 15 (cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 7; Arist. Eth. Nic. 7, 11 in.; Thuc. 3, 72; 2, 88; Paus. 10, 20, 2), also when the substantives are connected by τε...καὶ, as in Acts xxviii. 23 ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, i. 8; xxvi. 20 (Franke, Demosth. p. 65), Paus. 10, 37, 2; 25, 23; Xen. Hell. 1, 1, 8; Herod. 6, 3, 2. For instances with proper names, see Acts vi. 9 τῶν ἀπὸ Κύλλιακα καὶ Λομπίακα, xiv. 21 ὑπετρεπαν εἰς τὴν Διόστραν καὶ Ἰκάνιον καὶ Ἀντίοχειαν, xvi. 2; ix. 31; Matt. iv. 25.

392 If the substantives are connected disjunctively or antithetically, the preposition is in the former case usually, and in the latter always, repeated, Col. iii. 17 ὁ τι ἐὰν ποιήτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, ii. 16; Matt. vii. 16; xvii. 25; Luke xx. 4; Jno. vii. 48; Acts iv. 7; viii. 34; Rom. iv. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 3, 21; xiv. 6; Rev. xiii. 16; cf. Paus. 7, 10, 1 (the contrary only in Heb. x. 28 ἐπὶ δυσών ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν, 1 Tim. v. 19); Rom. iv. 10 οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν 440 ἀκροβυσσίᾳ, vi. 15; viii. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 5; xi. 17; 2 Cor. i. 12; iii. 3;

¹ On this passage Bengel remarks: ex praepos. repetita colligi potest, non una fuisse utrumque disciplum.

² As to the various cases in which Greek prose writers repeat a preposition after τε καὶ, see Sommer in the Jahrb. f. Philol. 1831. S. 408 f.; cf. Stallb. Philol. p. 156; Weber, Dem. 189.
Eph. i. 21; vi. 12; Jno. vii. 22; xvii. 9, etc. (Alciphr. 1, 31). Lastly, in comparisons the preposition is always repeated, Acts xi. 18; Rom. v. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 2 Thess. ii. 2; Heb. iv. 10 (as to Greek authors, see Schaef. Julian. p. 19 sq.; Held, Plut. Aem. 124; Krüg. 284). In general, there is a greater tendency to repeat the preposition in the N. T. than in Greek prose (Bhdy. 201; Krüg. 284 f.; Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 229), which frequently or usually omits the preposition, not only before a noun simply connected with one preceding (Bornem. Xen. conv. 159), but also after ἀλλὰ or ἦ (Schaef. Dem. V. 569, 760; Plutarch. IV. 291; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 493; Weber, Dem. 889; Franke, Dem. 6) before words in apposition (Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 112, 247; cf. Bornem. Schol. p. 173) and in answers (Stallb. Plat. sympos. p. 104 sq.; Gorg. p. 38; rep. I. 287). On the other hand, the following passages are singular even in the N. T.: Acts xxvi. 18 ἐπιστρέψας ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατάνα ἐπὶ τῶν θεῶν, vii. 38; 1 Cor. x. 28; Heb. vii. 27, but cf. Aristot. Eth. Nicom. 10, 9, 1 περὶ τε τούτων καὶ τῶν ἁρετῶν, ἐτί δὲ καὶ φίλας etc. (see Zell, Aristot. Eth. p. 442); Lysias 1, in Theomnest. 7; Dion. H. IV. 2223, 1; Diog. L. proemem. 6; Strabo 16, 778; Diod. Sic. 5, 31; Plutarch. Sol. c. 3.

In Jude 1 κυν is not to be repeated from the preceding clause before Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as that would be harsh; but Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς is the dativus commodi: kept for Christ. Before a noun in apposition the preposition is regularly not repeated, Luke xxiii. 51; Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 4; it is only in cases of epexegetical apposition that the repetition can take place, Rom. ii. 28 ὑπὸ τοῦ φανεροῦ ἐν τῷ σαρκί περιτομῆς, Jno. xi. 54, (in 1 Jno. v. 20 there is no apposition). So also in the classics, though usually only when the word in apposition is separated from the principal substantive, Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 127; Mth. 1402.

The repetition of the preposition before each of a series of nouns succeeding one another without connectives, as in Eph. vi. 12 ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τῶν κοσμοκρατορῶν...πρὸς τὰ πνεύματα etc., Jno. xvi. 8 (cf. Arist. rhet. 2, 10, 2), is of a rhetorical nature or serves to give greater prominence to the several particulars, see Dissen, 393 Find. p. 519.

The preposition with which the antecedent is construed, is usually in Greek authors not repeated before the relative, as Plat. legg. 10, 909 d. ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἦς δὲ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῶν ὁ φύλος τοῦ δόκην, 12, 955 b. ἐν ἑρώις — 441 ὁς ἐν ἠδήνῃ, 2, 659 b. ἐν ταύτω στόματος, ὀπέρ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπικαλέσατο etc.

1 But in such antitheses the preposition is not repeated before an adjective, as 1 Pet. i. 23 οἴκι ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου.
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Plat. Phaed. 21; Gorg. 453 e.; Lach. 192 b.; Thuc. 1, 28; Xen. conv. 4, 1; An. 5, 7, 17; Hiero 1, 11; Aristot. probl. 26, 4 and 16; Paus. 9, 39, 4; cf. Brebi, Lysa. p. 201; Schaf. Soph. III. 817; Dion. comp. p. 325; Melet. p. 124; Demosth. II. 200; Heller, Soph. Oed. C. p. 420; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 108; Wurm, Dinarch. p. 33; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 291; Bhdv. 203 f.

So, in the N. T., Acts xiii. 39 ἀπὸ πάνω, ἐν οἷς ἔδωκαὶ... ἡ διακωσία, ὡς καὶ δικαοῦτα, xiii. 2 ἀφορίζετε... ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ, δ' ἀποκάλιψαι αὐτοῖς, Luke i. 25; xii. 46; Matt. xxiv. 50; Rev. ii. 13 (not 1 Cor. vii. 20); on the contrary, Jno. iv. 53 ἐν καθαρᾷ τῇ ὕσσε. ἐν οἷς ἐδόθην, Acts vii. 4; xx. 18 (Jon. iv. 10) cf. Demosth. Timoth. 703 b. ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις, ἐν οἷς γέγραπται τὴν τιμίν τῶν φιλῶν ὑφείλων, Aristot. anim. 5, 30; Plat. Soph. 257 d.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 4; Diog. L. 8, 68; Heinich. Euseb. II. 252. As to the Lat. see Ramshorn S. 378; Beier, Cic. offic. I. 128. The Greek authors, also, readily repeat the preposition when the relative is separated by several words from the antecedent, Her. 1, 47; Xen. vectig. 4, 13; Lucian. necyom. 9; Dio Chr. 17, 247.

In Greek authors, and especially in the poets, a preposition belonging to two successive nouns is sometimes, as is well known, expressed only once and that before the second noun, Hm. Vig. p. 854; Lob. Soph. Aj. v. 397 sq., the comment. on Anacr. 9, 22; Kühner II. 320 etc. Such an instance has been supposed to occur in Phil. ii. 22 (Heinich. Euseb. II. 252) ὅταν, ὡς παρεῖ τέκνοι, σὸν ἵματι διουλοῦσθε etc. But the passage contains rather a variatio structurae. Paul uses σοιν ἵματι, bethinking himself that he cannot well say ἵματι διουλοῦσθε: he has, as a child serves his father, served with me, etc. See, in general, the opposite remarks of Bhdv. p. 202; cf. however, Franke, Dem. p. 30.

Note 1. It is a peculiarity of later Greek, in particular, to combine a preposition with an adverb, especially of place or time (Krt. 266 f.),—either so as to make the preposition modify the meaning of the adverb, as in ἀπὸ προὶ Acts xxviii. 23, ἀπὸ πέραν 2 Cor. vii. 10; ix. 2, ἀπὸ ἀκρα Matt. xxvi. 29, ἀπὸ τοῦτοMatt. iv. 17 [xvi. 21] xxvi. 16 [Luke xvi. 16], ἐκκαίως 2 Pet. ii. 3, ὑπερλάβων 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11 (cf. ὑπερέφε Xen. Hiero 6, 9); or so as to blend with an expressive adverb a preposition that seemed weakened by diversified usage (cf. in German: oben auf dem Dache), as ὑποκάτω, ὑπεράνω, κατέναντι. Sometimes also an adverb is strengthened by the preposition, as ταπαυίκα. To this class belong likewise such numerals as ἅπαξ Rom. vi. 10 etc. (Dio Cass. 1091, 91; 1156, 13, analogous to ἄπαξ Franke, Demosth. p. 30, πρὸς ἀπαξ Malal. 7, p. 178), οἰκὶ πρὸς Acts x. 16; xi. 10 (among the examples adduced by Kypke II. 48 is the 93 analogous εἰς πρός, which occurs in Her. 1, 86; Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 4; cf. Hm. Vig. p. 857). Many of these compounds are to be found only in writers 442 that flourished after the time of Alexander, some only in Scholiasts, Lob.

1 Yet ἐς ἀκέ, ἐς ἁπειρόμενον, and the like, occur even in Thuc. 1, 129, 130; 4, 63; 8, 23. As to ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, and the like, see § 65, 2, p. 603.
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Phryn. p. 46 sqq.; cf., however, Kühner II. 315; several, such as ἀνὰ πρὸς, (for which προτέρως or ἀντέρως), are not to be met with even there. Further, cf. Sept. ἀνὰ ἄνωθεν (ἦν ἐν) 1 Sam. xii. 20 and Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 25. (Consistency in the mode of writing these compounds, whether connected Krüt. 266 or separated, has not been observed even by the most recent editors of the N. T.)

Note 2. The antique usage of employing (simple) prepositions without a case for adverbs, has been retained, with certain restrictions, in the prose style of all periods, Bhdyl. 196. In the N. T. we find but a single example of this: 2 Cor. xi. 23 διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσίν; ἐν ἄναμορφωθήμεν ἐγὼ I more. The instances which Kypke adduces in loc. are not all similar. Usually in prose such prepositions are supported by a δι or γε (μετά δι is especially frequent) Bhdyl. 198. Πρός in addition, besides, may be best compared with the above passage, e.g. Dem. 1 Aphob. 556 a.; Franke, Demosth. p. 94. The form in with the accent thrown back for εἰ (έ), including the substantive verb, occurs several times, see p. 80; Bornem. (Stud. u. Krit. 1843. S. 108 f.) attempted, but on insufficient grounds, to introduce ἀνὰ far from (Bttm. II. 378) in Matt. xxiv. 1.

§ 51. USE OF PREPOSITIONS IN CIRCUMLOCUTIONS.

1. When a preposition with a noun forms a circumlocution for an adverb or (mostly with the aid of the article) for an adjective, the propriety of such a use of the preposition must be shown by a reference to its fundamental signification;¹ a merely empirical treatment might lead to erroneous conclusions. Note, then,

a. Ἀπό; e.g. ἀνὰ μέρος Rom. xi. 25; 2 Cor. i. 14 in part (from a part hitherwards), ἀνὰ μιᾶς (γεώργης) Luke xiv. 18 unanimously (proceeding from one determination), with one mind.

b. Ἀνὰ with the Genitive usually denotes a mental state viewed as something mediate, a means: in Heb. xii. 1 δι' ὑπομονῆς may 443 be rendered, with (through) patience, patiently, assidue (similarly Rom. viii. 25 δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα etc., cf. δι' ἀφροσύνης imprudenter Xen. C. 8, 1, 18, δι' εὐραβελῶς timide Dion. H. III. 395 1360, see Pflugk, Eur. Hel. p. 41), cf. also e.g. δι' ἀφαλέιας Thuc. 7a e 1, 17. Of a different nature is Heb. xiii. 22 διὰ βραχέων ἐπεκτείνα ὑμῖν breviter—properly by means of few (words), paucis—cf. διὰ βραχυτάτων Dem. Pant. 624 c., and below, § 64, 5. Used adjectively

¹ This is not altogether without difficulty, chiefly because in different languages different views of the same relation predominate, e.g. ἀνὰ μέρος zum Theil, in part, ἐν διεξέρατα zur Rechten, en, at, to the right, ab oriente gegen Osten, on, to, towards the East. Many phrases, too, arise from abbreviation.
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2 Cor. iii. 11 εἰ τὸ καταργοῦμενον διὰ δόξας etc. (above, p. 379), it denotes a quality with which something is invested.

c. Εἰς expresses a degree (unto) which something reaches, Luke xiii. 11 εἰς τὸ παντελὲς completely (perfectly) wholly (Aelian. 7, 2, εἰς κάλλιστον Plat. Euthyd. 275 b., εἰς τὸ ἄκριβές Thuc. 6, 82); this, however, can hardly be called a periphrasis for the adverb.

d. 'Εκ, e.g. εἰς μέρον 1 Cor. xii. 27 εἰς παρτε (forth from a part).

'Eκ is used especially of the standard (secundum), as in εἰς τῶν νόμων secundum leges, legibus convenienter (rule of conduct drawn as it were out of the laws); hence εἰς ισότητος according to equality, equally 2 Cor. viii. 13, εἰς μέτρον by measure, moderately Jno. iii. 34; cf. εἰς ἄδικου injuste Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 18, εἰς θύσαν Her. 7, 135; Plato, rep. 8, 561 b., εἰς προσκύνημα Thuc. 8, 67; see Ast, Plat. legg. p. 267; Bhd. 230. It also denotes the source: εἰς ἀνάγκης Heb. vii. 12; cf. Thuc. 3, 40; 7, 27; Dio C. 858, 98 (springing out of necessity i.e. necessarily); the same explanation applies to εἰς συμφάσιον 1 Cor. vii. 5 εἰς κομπόσιο, which, however, under a different aspect (in consequence of an agreement), nearly comes under the first use. In the phrases οἱ εἰς πίστεως Gal. iii. 7, οἱ εἰς περιτοµής Acts x. 45, οἱ εἰς εὐαντίας Tit. ii. 8, οἱ εἰς εὐπρεπίς Rom. ii. 8, and the like, εἰς designates party (dependence on), and consequently belonging to: those of the faith, who belong to the faith; who, as it were, side with faith. Cf. Polyb. 10, 16, 6; Thuc. 8, 92.

A relation altogether material is expressed in Mark xi. 20 εἰς ριζών (out) from the roots, radicitus. The temporal εἰς τρόπον Matt. xxvi. 44 (1 Macc. ix. 1; Babr. 95, 97; 107, 16; Evang. apocr. p. 439; cf. εἰς ιστορήμαν Her. 1, 108) and the like (where the German, on the other hand, says sum Dritten) for the third time, is doubtless most simply, out of the third, (commencing) from the third; in later authors we find likewise εἰς πρώτης Babr. 71, 2, εἰς δευτέρης 114, 5.

444  ε. 'Εν. Instances in which εν with a substantive may be taken adverbially, as εν ἀληθείᾳ, εν ἑκτενείᾳ, εν δικαιοσύνῃ Matt. xxi. 16; Mark xiv. 1; Col. iv. 5; Acts xvii. 31 (εν δίκῃ Plat. Crat. p. 419 d., εν τάχει Thuc. 1, 90), need explanation the less, because we too can employ εν with the corresponding substantive. The substantives usually denote abstract ideas, particularly qualities or dispositions in which one does something. The use of this preposition

1 But in Jno. iv. 23, the words εν πνεύματι καὶ ἄλληθρῳ, dependent on προσκυνήσωσιν, must not be resolved and degraded into the adverbs πνευματικῶς καὶ ἄλληθρως; but εν denotes the sphere in which the προσκυνήσω is exercised.
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with a substantive for an adjective is equally plain, as ἐργα τὰ ἐν 396 ὅμοιουμη, τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ (ἑστι) 2 Cor. iii. 11, and the like.

2. f. ἐπὶ is frequently construed with the Gen. of abstract nouns which denote either a quality with which a person acts in a given way (ἐπὶ ἀδελαίας with fearlessness), or an objective notion with the actual existence of which something accords, as in Mark xii. 32 ἐπὶ ἀληθείας in accordance with truth, truly (Dio C. 699, 65; 727, 82). With the Dat. ἐπὶ indicates, as it were, the ground on which something rests, Acts ii. 26 ἢ σάρξ μου κατασκευάσει ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι with, in hope, confidence (in God); hence securely, tranquilly. The phrases ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ, ἐφ᾽ ὅσον, ἐπὶ πολὺ present no difficulty.

g. Κατά. The expression ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχελα 2 Cor. viii. 2 is probably to be rendered, poverty extending to the lowest level, the deepest poverty (cf. Strabo 9, 419); Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 5 is not parallel to this, δ κατὰ γῆς means: terra conditus. Probably the adverbial phrase καθ᾽ ὅλων properly signifies throughout (in universum), in general, as κατὰ with the Gen. has sometimes this meaning. The use of κατὰ with the Acc. of a substantive in circumlocutions for adverbs, as κατ᾽ ἐξουσιαν, κατ᾽ ἐξοχῆν, κατὰ 378 ἑνῶν, requires no explanation, see Schaeff. Long. p. 330 (cf. κατὰ τάχος Dio. C. 84, 40; 310, 98, κατὰ τὸ ἵσχυρον Her. 1, 76, καθ᾽ ὀρμήν Soph. Philoct. 562, κατὰ τὸ ἀνεπιστήμων Aeschin. dial. 3, 16, κατὰ τὸ ὀρθὸν Her. 7, 143), see Bhdy. 241. As to ἡ κατ᾽ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις Rom. ix. 11, οἱ κατὰ φῶσιν κλάδοι Χι. 21, see § 30, 3, note 5.

h. Πρὸς with the Acc., e.g. Jas. iv. 5 πρὸς φθόνον invidioso, cf. πρὸς ὄργην Soph. El. 369 (properly, according to envy, according to anger); besides, πρὸς ἀκριβείαν Sext. Emp. hypot. 1, 126 for ἀκριβῆς.

As to the use of the prepositions ἐν, κατὰ etc. in circumlocutions for 445 certain cases, especially the Genitive, see § 30, 3, note 5 p. 192 sq.

§ 52. CONSTRUCTION OF VERBS COMPOUNDED WITH PREPOSITIONS.

1. Our attention here will naturally be confined to those compound verbs in which the preposition preserves its peculiar and independent force, and so directly governs a noun different from that governed by the transitive verb; as, ἐξβάλλεω to cast out from, ἀναφέρεω to bring up upon, etc. Accordingly, we do not speak
of those in which the signification of the preposition is either obscured (e.g. ἀποδίκεσθαι, ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἀποθνῄσκειν), or blended with that of the verb into one general idea (e.g. μεταδόσον αἰματικ, προάγειν τινα praetere aliquem, precede some one, ἀποδεκατοῦν τι to tithe something, συμπλεῖεν τι ensconce something), or, approximating to the nature of an adverb, serves to give intensity to the verb (e.g. εἰπεῖτείν, διατελεῖν, διακαθαρίζειν, συντελεῖν, perpugnare).

The full import of the compound verbs of the N. T., and how far they may be employed for simple verbs, has not yet been investigated thoroughly and on rational principles; cf., however, C. F. Fritzsche: Fischer's and Paulus's Observations on the precise Import of the Prepositions in Greek Compound Verbs, etc. Lips. 1809. 8vo.; Tittmann de vi praepositionum in verbis compos. in N. T. recte diiudicandis, Lips. 1814. 4to. (also in Synonym. N. T. I. 218 sqq.); J. v. Voorst de usu verbor. c. praeposs. compositor. in N. T. Leid. 1818. 2 Spec. 8vo.; Theol. Annal. 1809. II. 474 ff. (Brunck, Aristoph. nub. 987; Zell, Aristotel. ethic. p. 383; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 154). Till very lately translators and expositors of the N. T. appeared to vie with each other in disregarding the exact import of compound verbs (cf. e.g. Seyffarth de indele ep. ad Hebr. p. 92). With a view to check such recklessness I have commenced a new inquiry into the subject: De verbor. c. praeposs. compositor. in N. T. usu, Lips. 1834 ff. 4to.; hitherto five articles have appeared. (As to Greek authors in general, cf. Cattier, Gazophylac. sec. 10, p. 60 sqq. ed. Abresch; C. F. 446 Hachenberg, de significat. praepositionum graec. in compositis. Traj. ad Rh. 1771. 8vo.)

2. Compound verbs in which the preposition retains its distinctive force may have one or another of the three following constructions:

a. The preposition may be repeated before the noun, as Matt. vii. 23 ἀπογραφεῖτε ἀν’ ἐμοί, Heb. iii. 16 οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, see Born. Xen. conv. p. 219 and my second Progr. de verb. compmp. p. 7 sqq.; or

b. Another preposition of substantially the same import may be used before the noun, as Matt. xiv. 19 ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, Mark xv. 46 προσεκύλισε λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν; or

c. The compound verb may, without the intervention of a preposition, directly govern a case such as its import requires, and such at the same time as the preposition also commonly governs; as, Mark iii. 10 εὐπρήστευεν αὐτῷ, Luke xv. 2 συνεσθείς αὐτῶι, etc. Accordingly, verbs compounded with ἀπό, κατά (against), ἐπί, take the Gen.; those compounded with περί (Matt. iv. 23 περιόγευς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, Acts ix. 3), the Acc.
3. Which of these modes of construction is the regular one, must be learned from usage. Sometimes two of them, or all three together, occur (cf. ἐνβάλλει, likewise parallel passages such as Matt. xxvii. 60 and Mark xv. 46; Jno. ix. 6 and vs. 11; Acts xv. 28 and vs. 29). Yet it must not be overlooked that even in this case usage has often established a distinction. Thus no one will regard it as an indifferent matter whether verbs compounded with εἰς be construed with a noun by the insertion of the preposition εἰς (πρὸς), or with a case alone without a preposition. For instance, ἴστε ἰτειν in its proper sense takes εἰς; but when used figuratively (like spe excidere), it governs the Gen. (Gal. v. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 17; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 36; yet see Diod. S. 17, 47). So προσφέρειν των of persons means, offerre aliqui (aliquid); but προσφέρειν ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς to bring before the synagogue (authorities), Luke xxii. 14. Cf. also προσέρχεσθαι των adire aliquem and προσέχω. πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν 1 Pet. ii. 4; ἐφικτάναι των (of persons) Acts iv. 1, and ἐφικτάναι ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν xi. 11. See, in general, my second Progr. de verb. comp. pp. 10 sqq.

4. The usage of the N. T. is more particularly as follows:
1) After verbs compounded with ἀπό,
a) for the most part ἀπό is repeated (cf., in general, Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. p. 225): so after ἀπέρχεσθαι (followed by a personal noun) Mark i. 42; Luke i. 88; ii. 15; Rev. xvii. 14 (Lucian. 388 salt. 81), after ἀποπίπτειν Acts ix. 18 (in a material sense, cf. ἔπειθεν Her. 3, 130; Polyb. 11, 21, 3; in a figurative sense it does not occur in the N. T.), ἐφικτάναι desistere a, or to withdraw from a person, Acts v. 38; Luke ii. 37; xiii. 27; 2 Cor. xii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 5 etc. (Polyb. 1, 16, 3) but 1 Tim. iv. 1, see below, ἀποφανζεσθαι 1 Thess. ii. 17, ἀποστάσθαι Luke xxii. 41; Acts xxi. 1 (Polyb. i, 84, 1; Dion. H. judic. Thuc. 28, 5), after ἀφορίζων Matt. xxv. 32, ἀποθανεῖν Luke v. 2 (Polyb. 23, 11, 4, etc.), ἀποδωρεῖν Matt. vii. 23; Luke ix. 39, ἀπαίρεσθαι Luke x. 42; xvi. 3 (Lucian. Tim. 45), ἀπαίρεσθαι Matt. ix. 15, ἀπαλλάττεσθαι Luke xii. 58;

---

1 So ἀναφερόμαι deficere with ἄπειρο in Xen. C. 5, 4, 1 and with the Gen. alone in 4, 5, 11.
2 In prose εἰς ἐνθερμαμεν ἀπειρεσθαι εἰς is usually employed in a local sense, e.g. εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν; but with τίνι or των (like incessere aliquem) in reference to desires, thoughts, etc. Demosth. Aristocr. 446 b.; Herod. 8, 8, 4, etc. Yet see Vuck. Eurip. Phoen. 1099. As to ἀπειρεσθαι in particular, see my second Progr. de verb. comp. pp. 11 sq.
3 In Greek authors ἀπείρωσθαι obstinere usually takes the Gen.; but in the N. T. it is sometimes followed by ἄπειρο, Acts xv. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 3; v. 22.
4 Cf. τῶν τοῖς ἱστοῖς προσβλιθεῖν προσέρχεσθαι Polyb. 8, 8, 5; 3, 46, 8, but (fig.) 9, 5, 5 προσερχάτων ἐπολά τω νῆς τὴν στρατηγίαν.
Acts xix. 12, ἀποκρύπτειν Matt. xi. 25, ἀποστρέφειν Rom. xi. 26 Sept., once also after the figurative ἀποθνῄσκειν Col. ii. 20 (cf. Porphyrr. abstin. 1, 41), which elsewhere, in the composite sense of dying to, is construed with the Dat. (see immediately below).

b) after ἀπολαμβάνειν, παρά is used (with personal nouns), Luke vi. 34; cf. Diod. S. 13, 31; Lucian. pisc. 7 (.FILL, when the verb signifies to take away by force, Polyb. 22, 26, 8).

c) the Genitive follows ἀποφεύγειν 2 Pet. i. 4 (but not in 2 Pet. ii. 20), ἀπαλλαττοριν Eph. ii. 12; iv. 18 (Polyb. 3, 77, 7), ἀφιστάναι (deficere a) 1 Tim. iv. 1 (Polyb. 2, 39, 7; 14, 12, 8), ἀποστερεῖσθαι (fig.) 1 Tim. vi. 5.

d) the Dat. is used after ἀποθνῄσκειν to die to a thing, Gal. ii. 19; Rom. vi. 2, (in Rom. vi. 10 the Dat. is to be taken differently); similar is ἀπογίνεσθαι ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις 1 Pet. ii. 24.

2) Verbs compounded with ἄνα in the local sense of up (to), are construed with,

a) εἰς, when the place to which the motion is directed is indicated, e.g. ἀναβαίνειν to go (travel) up to Luke xix. 28; Mark 448 x. 32 (Her. 9, 113), or go up (upon a mountain, into heaven etc.) Matt. v. 1; xiv. 23; Mark iii. 13 (Herod. 1, 12, 16; Plat. Alcib. 1, 117 b.; Dio C. 89, 97), ἀναβλέπειν Matt. xiv. 19 (Mark vii. 34; Luke ix. 16) Acts xxii. 13, ἀνάγων Matt. iv. 1; Luke ii. 22; Acts xx. 3 (Herod. 7, 10, 15), ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι Mark xvi. 19, ἀναπίπτων Luke xiv. 10, ἀναφέρειν Matt. xvii. 1; Luke xxiv. 51, ἀναχωρεῖν Matt. ii. 14; iv. 12 etc., ἀνάρχεσθαι Jno. vi. 3; Gal. i. 18.

b) τρός, principally when the point at which the motion terminates is a person; as, ἀναβαίνειν πρός τόν πατέρα Jno. xx. 17, ἀνακάμπτειν Matt. ii. 12, ἀναπέμπειν Luke xxiii. 7 (ἀναβλέπ. πρός των Plat. Phaed. 116 d.; Arrian. Epict. 2, 16, 41), yet ἐπὶ των is also used in such cases Luke x. 6 (ἀνακάμπτειν cf. Diod. S. 3, 17), or the Dat. Luke xxiii. 11 ἀναπέμπειν των.

c) ἐπὶ, when the goal of the action is to be designated definitely as an eminence or as a surface on which the motion terminates, (Polyb. 8, 31, 1 ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τήν ἀγοράν (up) to the market, on the other hand ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τήν οἰκίαν like the Latin ascendere Polyb. 10, 4, 6, ἀναβάλλειν ἐπὶ δικαστήριον frequently in Greek authors). Thus we find ἀναβιβάζειν ἐπὶ τῶν αἰγαλῶν Matt. xiii. 48 (Xen. C. 4, 2, 28; Polyb. 7, 17, 9), ἐπὶ τό κτήριον Luke x. 34 (Palaeph. 1, 9; Xen. C. 4, 5, 16; cf. 7, 1, 38), ἀνακλίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν χώρτων Matt. xiv. 19, ἀναπίπτειν ἐπὶ τῆν γῆν Matt. xv. 35 or ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς Mark viii. 6, ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὸ δώμα Luke v. 19, ἐπὶ
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συκομορέαν xii. 4 (cf. Xen. C. 4, 1, 7; 6, 4, 4; Her. 4, 22; Plut. educ. 7, 13; Arrian. Epict. 3, 24, 33; Lys. 1; Alcib. 10; Paus. 6, 381 4, 6), ἀναφέρεντο ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον upon the wood (cross) 1 Pet. ii. 24, 

3) Verbs compounded with ἀντι (against) are regularly followed by the Dat., as Matt. vii. 2; Luke xiii. 17; Jno. xix. 12; Rom. xiii. 2 etc.; yet see Heb. xii. 4 ἀνταγωνιζομαι πρὸς τι (cf. vs. 3 ἦ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογία), similar to which is ἀντικεῖσθαι πρὸς Polyb. 2, 66, 3; Dio C. p. 204 and 777.

4) Verbs compounded with ἐκ are sometimes followed by that preposition (i.e. when out of is to be expressed), and sometimes merely by ἀπὸ or παρὰ (i.e. when merely direction from or from the vicinity of is indicated): thus ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ Matt. xiii. 52; Jno. ii. 15; 3 Jno. 10, etc. (Plat. Gorg. 468 d.) and ἀπὸ Matt. vii. 4, ἐκκλίνειν ἀπὸ 1 Pet. iii. 11; Rom. xvi. 17, ἐκκόπτειν ἐκ Rom. xi. 24 (Diod. S. 16, 24), ἐκκόπτειν ἐκ Acts xii. 7 (Arrian. Ind. 30, 3), 449 ἐκκέντοσθαι ἐκ Jno. xv. 19 (Plat. legg. 7 p. 811 a.), ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐκ Matt. xv. 11, 18; Rev. ix. 18 (Polyb. 6, 55, 4) and ἀπὸ Mark vii. 15 400 (var., not Matt. xxiv. 1) or παρὰ Jno. xv. 20, ἐκφεύγειν ἐκ Acts vii. 16, ἐξαιρεῖν and ἐξαιρεῖν ἐκ 1 Cor. v. 2; Acts xxvi. 17, ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ Matt. ii. 6; Acts vii. 8 etc. (Her. 9, 12) or παρὰ Luke ii. 1. On the other hand these verbs are but rarely construed with the Genitive, never when used in a local sense except ἐξέρχεσθαι Matt. x. 14 (and even there not quite indubitably, see the variants; yet cf. ἐκβαλόειν τῶν Jacobs, Philostr. p. 718); when used figuratively, however, the Gen. is constant with ἐκκόπτειν (like τῷ excidere) Gal. v. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 17; Plat. rep. 6, 496 c.; Lucian. contempl. 14 (yet with ἐκ Her. 8, 14; Dio C. p. 1054, 57), and ἑκκέρμασθαι Luke xix. 48. Lastly, ἐκφεύγειν even in a physical sense takes the Acc. (of the force): 2 Cor. xi. 23 ἐκφεύγειν τὰς χείρας τῶν (Sus. 22), cf. Her. 6, 40 and frequently; ἐκ occurs after this verb merely to denote locality in Acts xix. 16 ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου, cf. Sir. xxvii. 20.

5) The construction of verbs compounded with ἐν is very simple: when they signify direction to (towards) something, they are followed by εἰς; when they denote rest in, or on, a place, they are followed by ἐν, e.g. ἐμβαίνειν εἰς Matt. viii. 23; xiv. 22; Jno. vi. 17 (Her. 2, 29; Plat. Crat. 397 a.), ἐμβάλλειν εἰς Luke xii. 5 (Dio C. p. 288, 79; Plat. Tim. 91 c.; Lucian. Tim. 21), ἐκκόπτειν εἰς Mark xiv. 20 (but with ἐν Matt. xxvi. 23 dip in the dish),

1 With the Acc. alone we find ἀναβάλλειν ἵναν, Dion. H. 2252, 7; Pausan. 10, 19, 6.
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ἐμβλέπειν εἰς Matt. vi. 26; Acts i. 11, ἐπιπτοῦειν εἰς Luke x. 36 (Her. 7, 43; Plat. Tim. 84 c.; Lucian. Hermot. 59) 1 Tim. iii. 6, ἐπιπτοῦειν εἰς Matt. xxvi. 67; xxvii. 30, but ἐνδημεῖν ἐν 2 Cor. v. 6, ἐνοικεῖν ἐν 2 Cor. vi. 16; Col. iii. 16 (with Acc. Her. 2, 178), ἐφεργεῖν ἐν Phil. ii. 13; Eph. i. 20 etc., ἐγγράφειν ἐν 2 Cor. iii. 2 (like ἐγγύ-θεω ἐν Her. 2, 4), ἐμμενεῖν ἐν (τῇ διαθήκῃ) Heb. viii. 9. At the same time, in both significations the construction with the Dat. occurs not unfrequently, cf. ἐμβλέπειν τινὶ (of a person) Mark x. 21, 27; Luke xxii. 61; Jno. i. 36, 43 (Plat. rep. 10, 609 d.; Polyb. 15, 28, 8), ἐπιπτοῦειν τινὶ Mark x. 34; xiv. 65; xv. 19, ἐμμένειν τινὶ (πίστει) Acts xiv. 22 (Xen. Mem. 4, 4, 4; Lycurg. 19, 4; 882 Lucian. Tim. 102). Ἐπηρεασθὰ to revel in something is construed in Greek authors with the Dat. alone (e.g. Diod. S. 19, 71); on the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 13 ἐν is repeated. In Rom. xi. 24 ἐγκεντριζεῖν is construed first with ἐν and then with the Dat.

6) Still more simple is the construction of verbs compounded with εἰς, such as εἰςἀγεῖν, εἰςπορεύεσθαι, εἰςφέρειν, εἰςέρχεσθαι; viz. 450 uniformly repeat εἰς, cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 210; yet see Hm. Eurip. Ion p. 98, and my second Progr. de Verb. comp. p. 13.

7) Of the verbs compounded with ἐπὶ, some are construed with that preposition (more rarely with εἰς), and some with the Dative alone; yet many take either construction indifferently: ἐπιβάλλειν εἰς (into) or ἐπὶ τι (upon Plat. Prot. 334 b.) Mark iv. 37; Luke v. 30; ix. 62, also with the Dat. of the person 1 Cor. vii. 35; Mark 401 xi. 7; Acts iv. 3 (Polyb. 3, 2, 8; 3, 5, 5), ἐπιβαίνειν ἐπὶ or εἰς

Acts xxi. 6; xx. 18 (Matt. xxi. 5), also with a local Dat. Acts xxvii. 2 (Polyb. 1, 5, 2; Diod. S. 16, 66), ἐπιβλέπειν ἐπὶ Luke i. 48; Jas. ii. 3; Plut. educ. 4, 9 (with εἰς Plat. Phaedr. 63 a.), ἐπικεπεθαι ἐπὶ τινὶ Jno. xi. 38, also with the Dat. of the person 1 Cor. ix. 10, ἐπιφάνεσθαι ἐπὶ τι Mark iv. 12; Acts x. 10, or ἐπὶ των Acts viii. 16, or with the Dat. of the person Mark iii. 10; Acts xx. 10 (Polyb. 1, 24, 4), ἐπιφροπεῖν ἐπὶ τι 1 Pet. v. 7, ἐπιειδεῖαι ἐπὶ τι Mark iv. 21; Matt. xxi. 4; Acts ix. 17 etc., or with the Dative, mostly of the person Luke xxiii. 26; Mark vii. 32; Acts ix. 12; 1 Tim. v. 22 etc., rarely of the thing Jno. xix. 2 (Lucian. Tim. 41, 122), ἐπιρήχεσθαι ἐπὶ τι Luke i. 35; Acts viii. 24; xiii. 40 or with the Dative of the thing Luke xxvi. 26, ἐπαιρεῖν ἐπὶ or εἰς τι Jno. xiii. 18; Luke xviii. 13, ἐπομοδοεῖν ἐπὶ τι 1 Cor. iii. 12 or

1 On ἐπιβάλλειν τῷ χερὶ ἐπὶ τινα and τινὶ (Lucian. Tim. 10) in particular, see Fr. Mr. p. 637. We find in a material sense in Polyaen. 5, 2, 12 πολε πέλει βούλαστο ἐπιπλέουσαι.
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Των Eph. ii. 20, but also ἐν Col. ii. 7, ἐπιδεῖχνεται τι τι Acts iv. 29, ἐπιφέρεται with the Dat. of the thing Phil. i. 17, ἐφυκομένως εἰς τινα 2 Cor. x. 14, ἐφάλλωσαν ἐπὶ τινα Acts xix. 16 (1 Sam. x. 6; xi. 6). On the other hand, ἐπιγράφεω is construed with ἐν, 2 Cor. iii. 2 cf. Plat. de lucri cupid. p. 229 etc.; Palaeph. 47, 5 (differently in Num. xvii. 2; Prov. vii. 3). Ἐπιστεύεται Phil. iii. 14 (stretch one’sself out after) and, when joined to names of persons, ἐπιφάλλωσαν and ἐπιφαίνει take the Dative alone, Eph. v. 14; Luke i. 79 (cf. Gen. xxxv. 7); so also does ἐπιφέρεται in the sense of adding something to something, Phil. i. 17. Ἐπισκιάζεις has sometimes the Dative of the person, as in Acts v. 15 and probably in Mark ix. 7 (to make a sheltering shade for one, cf. Ps. xc. 4), and sometimes the Acc. Matt. xvii. 5; Luke ix. 34 (overshadow, envelope, as transitive). In the Sept. we find also ἐπισκιάζεις ἐπὶ τινα Ps. cxxxix. 8; Exod. xl. 29.

8) Of the verbs compounded with διά, there are but few in which the preposition is particularly prominent: cf. in the N. T. διαπορεύομαι διὰ στόρμων Luke vi. 1, cf. D. S. exc. Vat. p. 30 (but we find also διαπορεύομαι πόλεμος, yet in the sense of obire, Acts xvi. 4), διέρχεσθαι διὰ Matt. xii. 43; 2 Cor. i. 16 to pass through (and consequently out of) something, cf. Strabo 8, 332, and the pregnant διασώκειν δἰ ὅσιος 1 Pet. iii. 20. Most of them are construed like transitives, with the Acc., e.g. διαπλεῖν ταῦτα 388 through Acts xxvii. 5, likewise διέρχομαι when it signifies pass through Luke xix. 1; Acts xv. 3, διαβάζομαι Heb. xi. 29 etc.

9) Verbs compounded with κατά which denote an action descending upon a local point, take ἀπό or ἐκ when the terminus ad quem is to be expressed, e.g. καταβαίνειν ἀπό τοῦ οὖραν Luke ix. 54; 1 Thess. iv. 16, καταβ. ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. Jno. iii. 13; vi. 41; when the terminus ad quem is to be indicated (Dio C. 108, 28; 741, 96) they take ἐπὶ, εἰς, or πρὸς, according to the respective nature of the point in view, Luke xxii. 44; Mark xiii. 15; Acts xiv. 11, perhaps the Dative alone in Acts xx. 9 καταφέρεσθαι ὑπν. On the other hand, καταβάλλει, καθίζειν, κατασπάνει ἐν τίνι signify 402 to set down on some place, etc. Κατηγορεῖν to accuse, in as far as the notion of κατά is retained, is usually construed with the Gen. of the person; κατηγορεῖν τι κατὰ τίνος occurs once, Luke xxiii. 14, and similarly ἐγκαλεῖν κατὰ τίνος Rom. viii. 38; cf. Soph. Philoct. 328. Analogous to κατηγορεῖν with the Gen. is Rom.

1 As we find elsewhere καταφέρεσθαι εἰς τὸν νόον or ἐφ’ ὑμῖν, see Ἀποκ. in loc. Otherwise ἐννυρ might also be taken as Ablative.
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xi. 18 κατακανανθασθαι τινος boast against something cf. Jas. ii. 13, and καταμαρτυρεῖν τινος Matt. xxvi. 62; xxvii. 13; but κατακανανθασθαι τινος Jas. iii. 14.

10) Verbs compounded with μετά in which this preposition signifies trans, as μεταβάνειν, μεταμορφοῦν, μετασχήματίζειν, μετανοεῖν, μετοικίζειν etc., naturally take εἰς to denote passing over into, cf. Vig. p. 639.

11) Verbs compounded with παρά, are followed by ἀπό or παρά (yet see § 47 pp. 365, 369 ff.) when the place whence is to be expressed, e.g. Acts i. 25 ἄφες ἦς (ὕποστολής) παρέβη (Deut. xvii. 20; Josh. xi. 15, etc.), according to others ἐκ ἦς (Deut. ix. 12, 16); παραλαμβάνειν ἀπό τίνος 1 Cor. xi. 23 and παρά τ. 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 6, παραφέρειν ἀπό τ. Mark xiv. 36; Luke xxii. 42, παρέχεσθαι ἀπό τ. Matt. v. 18; Mark xiv. 85.

12) Most verbs compounded with περί have become regular transitives, and accordingly govern the Acc.; as, περιέρχεσθαι 1 Tim. v. 13 (obire), περιζωνύμαι Eph. vi. 14, περιστάναι Acts xxv. 7. In a material sense, with περί repeated, we find once 452 περιαστράπτειν Acts xxii. 6 (in the parallel passage Acts ix. 3 it is used as transitive), περιβάλλοντα εἰς Rev. xv. 6 (περί τὰ στήθη), περικείονται Mark ix. 42; Luke xvii. 2 (περισπᾶναι Luke x. 40), but with Dat. περιπλέοντες (Ἀρσαῖος, πειρασμοῖς) Luke x. 30; Jas. i. 2 (Thuc. 2, 54; Polyb. 3, 53, 6; Lycurg. 19, 1) and περικείονται Heb. xii. 1.

13) Of verbs compounded with πρό, only προσπορεύομαι Luke i. 76 repeats the preposition: προσπορεύοντα πρὸ προσώπων κυρίου (Deut. ix. 3); in the Sept. ἐνώπιον is also used Ps. lxxxiv. 14; xcvi. 3 and ἐμπροσθέν Gen. xxxiii. 16. Isaiah lvi. 8. So in Luke i. 17 προσελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (but in xxii. 47 προηρχετό αὐτοῖς). Further, see above, No. 2.

14) Verbs compounded with πρὸς repeat that preposition when towards in a local sense is to be indicated, e.g. προσπορεύοντες πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τινος Mark vii. 25; cf. Dio C. 932, 82; 1275, 53 (but προσπορεύοντα tois γυναικι Dial. S. 17, 18), προστίθεσθαι πρὸς τοῦς 384 πατέρας Acts xiii. 36; also προσκολλάσθαι πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα cleave to his wife Mark x. 7; Eph. v. 31. On the other hand, with ἐπί in Matt. vi. 27 προστίθεναι ἐπί τὴν ἡμικίαι. More rarely the Dat. alone is used, e.g. προσερχόμαι ἐπὶ Ἑβ. xii. 22, προσπορεύοντας ὀπίσθεν Matt. vii. 25 (Xen. eq. 7, 6; Philostr. Apol. v. 21), and of direction, προσφωνεῖν τινι call to Matt. xi. 16; Acts xxii. 2, cf. Diod. S. 4, 48 (but προσφωνεῖν τινι call one hither Luke vi. 13). On the other
hand, the Dat. alone is almost invariably used when the object ap-
proached is a person, e.g. προσπήπτειν τινί (to fall down before
one) Mark iii. 11; v. 33; Acts xvi. 29, προσθέτειν τινί (Philostr.
Apol. v. 22), προσφέρεσθαι τινί to draw near to one, or when
the approaching is itself to be taken figuratively, e.g. προσάγειν
τῷ θεῷ to bring to God 1 Pet. iii. 18 (in Sept. προσόντειν τῷ
κυρίῳ frequently), προσκλίνεσθαι τινί to attach one's self to
Acts v. 36 cf. προσέχειν τινί Heb. viii. 13; Acts xvi. 14, προσκέχεσθαι
τινι Matt. vi. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 13, προστίθεναι λάγου τινί Heb. xii. 19, προστίθεσθαι
τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ Acts ii. 41. If the verb implies rest (πρός τινι), it is
construed either thus with the Dat. alone, as προσμένειν τινί Acts
xi. 23; 1 Tim. v. 5, προσδερέειν 1 Cor. ix. 13 (Polyb. 8, 9, 11; 38,
5, 9), προσκαρτερεῖν Mark iii. 9; Col. iv. 2; Rom. xii. 12; cf. Polyb.
1, 55, 4; 1, 59, 12; Diod. S. 20, 48 etc., or (in strictly local rela-
tions) with ἐν, e.g. προσμένειν ἐν Ἑφέσῳ 1 Tim. i. 3.

15) Verbs compounded with σὺν but rarely repeat that prepo-
tion Col. ii. 18 (συνάντειν), or take instead of it μετά (Weber,
Demosth. 210) Matt. xxv. 19 (συναλήτηειν), 2 Cor. viii. 18 (συμπέ-
τειν), Matt. xx. 2 (συμφωνεῖν), xvii. 3 (συνλαλεῖν), Mark xiv. 54; 453
they are most frequently construed with the Dat. alone, instances
of which occur on nearly every page of the N. T. (also in 1 Cor.
xiii. 6; Jas. ii. 22, not in Rom. vii. 22). In classical Greek this
construction is almost the only one used. Acts i. 26 συγκαταπή-
τησθαι μετὰ τῶν ἐνδεκα ἀποστόλων is a pregnant expression.

16) Of the verbs compounded with ὑπό none repeat the prepo-
sition; but when they denote direction towards (ὑπάγειν, ὑποστέ-
θειν etc.) they take εἰς or πρός, and when the ὑπό means under,
as in ὑποπλεῖν, they are used as transitives.

17) Verbs compounded with ἰπέρ are for the most part used
absolutely. Only ἰπερευνυχάειν repeats ἰπέρ Rom. viii. 26 (var.),
cf. Judith v. 21; Sir. xxxvi. 27; and ἰπέφρονεῖν is construed with
παρά in Rom. xii. 3. Ἰπερβαλεῖν in 1 Thess. iv. 6 and ἰπερβαίνειν
in Acts xvii. 30 are used transitively in a figurative sense.

Note. The N. T. contains no decided instance of the usage, not very
rare in Greek authors, to which the preposition of a compound
verb influences also a second verb (Franke, Dem. p. 80).

§ 53. CONJUNCTIONS.

1. Conjunctions, particles designed to connect words and sen-
tences, classify themselves according to the various species of
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connection, which are the same in all cultivated languages and are 385 eight in number (Krü. 308); cf. O. Jahn, grammaticor. gr. de conjunctionibus doctrina Gryph. 1847.

The primitive conjunctions are monosyllabic: καὶ, τοι, τε, δὲ, μὲν, 404 οὖν. Many are obviously derived from pronouns or adjectives: τι, ὁ, ὁς, τοι, ἀλλα etc. Others are compound: εἰ (ei ἔν), εἰπε, ὁστε, γὰρ (γε ἄρα), τοῖνυν etc. Some are construed with a 454 particular mood according to their signification (εἰ, ἐὰν, ἢνα, ὅπως, ὅτα etc.). See, in general, Hm. emend. p. 164 sqq.

The principal conjunctions (of all the various classes) used in Greek prose are employed in the N. T., and in their legitimate senses.1 But τοι, μὴν (by themselves) do not occur; many compounds also, the more refined niceties of expression (e.g. γοῦν), were unnecessary in the style of the N. T.

It is further to be specially remarked, that causal conjunctions (as τοι, εἰπε, εἰποῦν) originally designated for the most part something present, either tangible or temporal; — a connection of ideas observable also in the case of prepositions (p. 360 sq.), and which occurs likewise in Latin and German (quod, quoniam, quando, quandoquidem, weil).

2. The most simple and most general connection of words and sentences, the mere coupling of contiguous words and sentences, is formed by καὶ and τε (et and que), the latter of which occurs oftenest in Luke, particularly in the Acts, and then in the Epistle to the Hebrews: Matt. ii. 13 παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ φείγει εἰς Ἀγιοπτόν, Acts π. 22 ἀνήρ φοβούμενος τ. θεόν, μαρτυρούμενος τε ἐπὶ δολο τοῦ ἔθνος, iv. 13 θεωροῦντες ... ἑταύμα-ζον, ἐπεγίνωσκον τε αὐτοὺς etc. The distinction between καὶ and τε is this: καὶ is conjunctive (of something co-ordinate), τε is adjunctive (of something accessory). Says Hermann, καὶ conjungit, τε adjungit; with which cf. Klotz, Devar. II. 744.2 Hence τε denotes rather an internal (logical) relation; καὶ, rather an external.

Observation shows that in the N. T. also τε 3 designates something

1 Schleiermacher, Hermen. S. 66 goes too far; on S. 130 his opinion is more correct. It is only in reference to the position of certain conjunctions that the language of the N. T. departs from the earlier prose.


3 As to the Latin que, see Zumpt, Gr. § 333; Hand, Tursellin. II. 467 sqq.; cf. Bauermeister, über die Copulativpartikeln im Latein. Luckau, 1853. 4to.
additional, supplementary, explanatory, flowing from what precedes, or even its details (Rost 722 f.), Jno. vi. 18; Acts ii. 33, 37; iv. 33; v. 42; vi. 7; viii. 13, 28, 31; x. 28, 48; xi. 21; xii. 6; xv. 4, 39; xix. 12; xx. 7; xxi. 18; Rom. xvi. 26;—hence usually something of inferior importance, Jno. iv. 42; Acts xvi. 34. Sometimes, however, τε has the effect to give 455 prominence: in Heb. ix. 1 εἴς ἐάν τε ἐρωτήσῃ (διαθήκης) δικαιώματα λατρείας τό τε ἄγνοι κοιμηθεὶς, the last particular is subjoined by τε as something specific and implied in δικαιώματα λατρείας; but when the author in vs. 2 sqq. speaks 405 of the sanctuary in detail, he takes this specification as his leading idea. There is nothing strange in this; for that which is not co-ordinate (καί) 386 with what precedes but is merely annexed to it, may just as well, according to circumstances, be more important as less; cf., further, Heb. xii. 2. Indeed, it may be remarked generally (Klotz l. c.), that the private views of the writer often have much to do in deciding him to choose τε; and that τε and δὲ were early interchanged in the N. T. by transcribers (Acts vii. 26; viii. 6; ix. 24; xi. 13; xii. 8, 12; xiii. 44; xxvi. 20, etc.).

3. In the N. T., as in the Biblical style generally, the simple connection by means of καί1 is often chosen, even where in a more artificial diction some more specific conjunction would have been employed. This circumstance led the earlier biblical philologists to the erroneous assumption, that in the N. T. καί, like the Hebrew γ, was a sort of conjunction-general, combining in itself the significations of all conjunctions whatever, and of many adverbs besides (see still Schleusner's lexicon under the word).

But in the N. T., as in Greek authors (Klotz, Devar. II. 635), καί has only two significations: and and also.2 These significations, however, comprehend several shades of meaning, which we express by special words: thus also is intensified into even, vel, adeo (Fr. Rom. I. 270; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 50). In many passages, however, this is not the case, but καί as a simple copula was chosen by the writer either in accordance with the simplicity of Biblico-Oriental thought, or designedly on rhetorical grounds; sometimes both causes concur. A translator should not efface the coloring of the style by employing more specific conjunctions.

1 The and uniting separate clauses deserves perhaps special mention only in the case, often overlooked, where a writer tacks on one O. T. quotation to another e.g. Acts i. 20 γενέσθαι ἐὰν πρωτάκεια... ὑπὸ αὐτόν (Ps. ix.)., καί τὴν ἐνεργή... ἐτρέφει (Ps. cix.); Heb. i. 9 f. (see Bleek); Rom. ix. 33.

2 Klotz, as above: In omnibus locis, ubiqueunque habetur καί particula, aut simpliciter copulat duas res, aut ipsa ponitur ut praeter alias res, quae aut re vera positae sunt aut facile cogitatione supplere possunt, hanc vel illam rem esse aut fieri significet, et in proriore causa et reddi solet, in posteriore etiam, quaeque, vel, sicuti res ac ratio in singulis locis requirit.
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456 In the narrative style, especially of the first three Gospels, the several facts are usually strung together in simple succession by καί; whereas the use of δέ or οὖν, μετά τοῦτο, ἕτοι, etc. instead would give more variety, and participial and relative constructions would distinguish with greater clearness principal from subordinate matters: Matt. i. 24 f. παρέλαβεν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ σῆκεν ἑγώνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἐως οὗ ἔτεκεν νέον, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, iv. 24 f.; vii. 25, 27; Luke v. 17, see § 60. The case in which a specification of time is given and then the event attached to it by καί, deserves particular attention; as, Mark xv. 25 ὅπα τρίη καὶ ἑσταίρωσαν αὐτόν (a supplementary statement, as it were, to vs. 24) it was the third hour and (when) they crucified him;—where δέ was early substituted as a correction. From this we must distinguish Luke xxiii. 44 οὔτε οὖν ὃρα ἐκτῆ καὶ σκότος ἑγένετο, where if δέ were used the time would be brought out as the principal matter, and the event regarded as subordinate; both, however, are to be represented as co-ordinate,—hence καί.

This structure of a sentence is found also in Greek authors (Mthh. 1481; Mdv. 214), e.g. Plat. symp. 220 c. ἔδη τοῦ μεσημβρία καὶ ἐκθαρσούντο πριθίνατο, Arrian. Al. 6, 9, 8 ἔδη πρὸς τῇ ἐπάλει ἦν καὶ . . . ὧνε, Thuc. 1, 50; Xen. A.1,1,8. Still more unlike is the case when, in prophetic announcements, the time is first specified and then a clause annexed with καί,—a construction which imparts greater solemnity to the discourse: Luke xix. 48; Heb. viii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 52. In exhortations also, like αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθῆσαι ἐμῖν, Luke x. 28 τοῦτο ποιεῖ καὶ ἄντος, the co-ordination of the two verbs is more forcible than such a construction as τοῦτο ποιῶν ἄντος (Frake, Demosth. p. 61). Cf. Demosth. olynth. 3, 11 c. ὅπατε ταῦθ' ὄτως ὄτως . . . καὶ δυνήσεσθε ἐξεῖναι καὶ μισθὸν ἔχετε.

In such sentences as 1 Cor. v. 2 . . . and ye are puffed up, Matt. iii. 14 I have need to be baptized by thee, and comest thou to me, Jno. vi. 70 have I not chosen you . . .? and one of you is a traitor, xi. 8; xiv. 30; Heb. iii. 9, surprise or sorrow is more eloquently expressed by the simple and than by the more sonorous however, nevertheless, notwithstanding; in the mere contraposition of the clauses the contrast speaks as it were for itself. On the other hand, in Matt. xxvi. 53 ἦ δοκεῖς, ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι ἄρτι παρακαλέσαι τ. πατέρα μου καὶ παραστῆσαι μοι πλείον δωδέκα λειμωνίαν ἄγγέλων; Heb. xii. 9 οὗ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγχόμεθα τῷ πατρί τ. πνειμάτων καὶ ἔστησαν; Jas. v. 18; Rev. xi. 3, that which was the object or aim of the first act, and might have been so represented (ὅνα . . .), is by means of the consecutive καί raised to independence as a result, since the writer wished to impart to it the greatest possible emphasis. A Greek author to produce such effect would probably have laid out the sentence from the outset as follows: οὗ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγχέται τῷ πατρί . . . ἔστησαν; See, further, Rom. xi. 35; Mark i. 27; Matt. v. 15; cf. Ewald 653 (Sept. Ruth i. 11; Jonah i. 11). From later Greek may be quoted Malal. 2. p. 39 ἐκεῖνος καὶ ἐκάθη ἦ μιστερά κεφαλή τῆς Γοργώνος.
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As to the other uses of καί, inasmuch as they are referrible to the significations and and also, we have only to note:

a. Kai before interrogatives, Mark x. 26 καί τίς δόματα σωθηναί; Luke x. 29; Jno. ix. 36; 1 Pet. iii. 13; 2 Cor. ii. 2 (familiar enough from the Greek authors, Plat. Theaet. 188 d.; Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 13; 6, 3, 22; Lucian. Herm. 84; Diog. L. 6, 93; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 30; the Latin et, too, is so used), comes under the significations and. We also say, Und was that er? And what did he do?— in an abrupt, hurried question, barring further discussion. On the other hand, καί never occurs in the N. T. before the Imperative to imply urgency (Hoogeveen, doctr. partic. I. 538 sqq.; Hartung I. 148). All the instances formerly alleged in support of this usage are of a different nature. In Matt. xxiii. 32 the καί is consecutive: ye profess to be sons etc., fill ye up then etc. In Luke xii. 29 καί denotes also or and (consequently). In Mark xi. 29 καί is and; in 1 Cor. xi. 6 also. The strengthening καί after interrogatives, as in Rom. viii. 24 δέ γὰρ 40τι βλέπεται τι, τι καί έλπίζει; why doth he yet hope for? is reducible to the nath sense of also.

b. Kai never occurs strictly as adversative. In the first place, passages in which καί εἶ, καί μή (Fr. Mr. p. 31), καί οὔτες, etc. occurs—Matt. xi. 17; 388 xii. 39; xxvi. 60; Mark i. 22; vii. 24; ix. 18; Jno. iii. 11, 32; vii. 30 έδ. (on the contrary, vs. 44); x. 25; xiv. 30; Acts xii. 19; Col. ii. 8, etc. must be set aside, as in these the contrast lies in the negation, and is neither strengthened by δέ nor weakened by a simple καί (Schaef. Dem. I. 645). Even in such sentences as Mark xii. 12 τίς τούτου αύτών κρατήσαι κ. έφοβήστηκαν τού δόξαν, 1 Thess. ii. 18 ήθελήσαμεν ελθέντες πρὸς ύμᾶς καί ένέκοψεν ύμᾶς δ σώρατος, Jno. vii. 28; 1 Jno. v. 19, the writer probably viewed the two particulars as co-existing side by side, though we are more inclined to emphasize the opposition. And in Acts x. 28; Matt. xx. 10 (the first supposed that they would receive more; and they also received every man a denarius) we also employ and to give prominence to an unexpected result, see above. No one now will think it strange that in 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6 δέ and καί are used alternately. Lastly, in 1 Cor. xvi. 9 two circumstances (one favorable and one unfavorable) detaining Paul in Ephesus are united; καί therefore is the simple copula.1

c. The epexegetical, more closely defining, καί namely (Hm. Philoct. 458 1408; Bremini, Demosth. p. 179; cf. Vc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 9; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 33 sq.; Weber, Demosth. p. 458) is primarily only and (and indeed), Jno. i. 16 out of his fulness have we all received, namely (that is) grace for grace, 1 Cor. iii. 5; xv. 38; Eph. vi. 18; Gal. vi. 16; Heb. xi. 17; Acts xxiii. 6. But this force has been attributed to καί in too many passages: in Matt. xiii. 41; xvii. 2; xxi. 5 καί is simply and.

1 So early a scholar as Hoogeveen perceived that but (however) is not the proper meaning of καί: sciant non ex se sed ex oppositorum membror. natura hanc (notionem) nactam esse καί particulam (doctr. particul. I. 533).
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In Mark xi. 28 the true reading [sustained also by Cod. Sin.] is probably Ἰ. In Matt. iii. 5 to render καὶ ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου by namely the country about the Jordan, would be to join an incongruous adjunct to ἡ Ἰονδαία, as the two geographical notions do not exactly coincide nor is the former comprehended in the latter. The phraseology resembles, All Hesse and the Rhine-region; all Baden and Breisgau, cf. Krü. 318. In the expression δὲς καὶ παρήρ the meaning of καὶ is simply and (at the same time), not namely, that is.

d. It may be doubted whether καὶ ever signifies especially (Bornem. Luc. 78; Fr. Mr. p. 11) when to a general term one that is special and strictly speaking already included in the former is added: in Mark i. 5 ἐξορθενεύ̣ντα τάσα ἡ Ἰονδαία χώρα καὶ ἡ Ἱεροσολυμῖται πάντες, xvi. 7 the specification is made prominent by its very position, but καὶ simply signifies and. Cf. Heb. vi. 10. On the other hand, when a special term precedes, καὶ is sometimes put immediately before the general expression which includes the former, as in Matt. xxvi. 59 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρωσσιτέροι 408 καὶ τὸ συνεδρίον δολον and (in one word, to sum up) the whole sanhe. ὄλη drim, see Fr. Mt. 786; Mr. 652; cf. Vc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 67, Stabb. Plat. Gorg. p. 83 and rep. II. 212. Καὶ stands at the close of an entire exposition (before the final result) in Heb. iii. 19 (and according to some Codd. in 1 Cor. v. 13).

e. Where καὶ signifies also (which is not the case e.g. in Eph. v. 2),

it 389 may be sometimes translated by precisely, just, very (eben, ja) (Hm. Vlg. 837; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 419): Heb. vii. 26 τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἢμῶν καὶ ἐπεκεῖν ἀρχιερεῖς, δόσος etc. for such a high priest just became us, vii. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 8 (Jno. viii. 25), Col. iii. 15; 2 Cor. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 12. Elsewhere it might be rendered by vicissim 1 Cor. i. 8; Phil. ii. 9; but also is quite sufficient.

f. When καὶ occurs in the consequent clause after a particle of time (ὅτε, ὥστε), as in Luke ii. 21 ὅτε ἐπλήθησαν ἡμῖν ὡστε τοὺς περιεμένις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκλίθη τὸ δόμα αὐτοῦ Ἡρῴου, or vii. 12 ὡς ἤγγισε τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἠδοὺ ἔκκομιζε τεθηκὼς, Acts i. 10; x. 17, the proper construction 459 would be: ἐπλήθη ὥστε ... καὶ ἐκλίθη, ἤγγισε τῇ πύλῃ ... καὶ ἔκκομι. On the other hand, in Jno. i. 19 we must not (as even BCrus. does) join ὥστε ἐπεκεῖνα ... καὶ ὄμωλύγγε, but ὥστε ἐπεκεῖνα etc. is to be connected with τὴν ἐκτὸν ἡ μαρτυρία etc., see Lücke in loc. On καὶ commencing a parenthesis, e.g. Rom. i. 13 (Fr. in loc.), see § 62, 1. On καὶ γάρ see no. 8 p. 448; and on καὶ δέ, no. 7 p. 448. In Luke xix. 42 and Acts ii. 18 we find καὶ γε et quidem, and that without a word intervening, a usage that does not occur in the earlier written language. As to later authors, see Klotz, Devar. II. 818.

1 As to καὶ also after relatives (Heb. i. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 23, etc.), see Klotz, Devar. II. 636; but, in general, Krül. 319. The exact meaning of the also, even, must always be gathered from the context. Καὶ is repeated several times in succession by way of climaxes in 1 Cor. xv. 1 f.
4. Connection in the form of correlation takes place, when two words or clauses are joined as corresponding to each other, by means of καὶ ... καὶ (τε ... τε Acts xxvi. 16) or τε ... καὶ. The first formula (καὶ ... καὶ) is used when the writer from the very first conceives both members as co-ordinate, et ... et (both ... and, as well ... as); the latter, when he appends to the first member a second (et ... que, not only ... but also) Klotz, Devar. II. 740; Matt. x. 28 ο δυνάμενος καὶ ζυγῷ κ. σώμα ἁπλοῦσα, 1 Cor. x. 32 ἀπρόσκοπος καὶ Ἰουδαίως κ."Ελληνικῷ καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, Phil. iii. 10; iv. 3; Acts xxii. 12 παρεκαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οί ἐντόπιοι, Luke ii. 16 ἀνεύρου τὴν τε Μαρία καὶ τ. Ἰωσήφ καὶ τὸ βρέφος etc., Krü. 327. In the former case, the members are combined as into one whole (or compact group); in the latter, the second member is to be viewed as something added to the first, while the respective importance of each is not thereby pronounced upon (Rost 134, 5 c.); cf. Acts iv. 27; v. 24; Rom. i. 14; Heb. xi. 32 etc. In the course of lengthened enumerations, groups (pairs) are thus formed by 409 τε ... καὶ ( ... καὶ), as in Heb. xi. 32 Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψών κ. ἦδ. Ἰσθμ. ᾿Αδνῆ, Δανίκ με κ. Σαμουήλ κ. τῶν προφητῶν, 1 Cor. i. 30; Heb. vi. 2; Acts ii. 9, 10; Phil. i. 7.

καὶ ... καὶ connect not merely things similar but also things contrasted, as in Jno. vi. 36 καὶ ἐφόρακαθε καὶ ό παρείνετε the seeing and the not believing both occur, in xv. 24, probably also in xvii. 25. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. vii. 38 the co-ordination of the contraries is disturbed in the second member by a comparison. On the correspondence between τε and δὲ, according to which the latter particle denotes, along with connection, some opposition (lenis oppositio Klotz, Devar. II. 741) as in Acts 390 xxii. 28 and the chief captain answered ... but Paul said, xix. 3, see Stallb. Plat. Philoeb. p. 36, and rep. II. 350; Ἡμ. Eur. Med. p. 362 sq.; Klotz l.c. τε and καὶ are placed either immediately together between the two 460 words thus formed into a group, as in Luke xxii. 11 φόβητρα τε καὶ σημεῖα, Acts ix. 18, or are separated by one or two of the connected words, as in Luke xxiii. 12 ὥ τε ἑλθετορ. καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης, Jno. ii. 15; Acts ii. 43 παλλά τε τίρατα καὶ σημεῖα, x. 39 ἐν τε τῇ χώρᾳ τ. Ἰουδαίων καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ, Rom. ii. 20; Acts xxviii. 23 etc., in which case the article, preposition, or adjective serves also for the second member. Otherwise in Phil. i. 7 ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ etc. (In Acts xix. 27; xxii. 28 we find τε καὶ in one and the same clause, que etiam, a combination rare in Greek authors, though not to be rejected.)

1 Such passages as Mark ii. 26 καὶ Ἰωβεαν καὶ τοῖς συν ἀδερφοῖς, Jno. v. 27, where καὶ ... καὶ are not parallel to each other but the second signifies also, do not come under this head, cf. Soph. Philoct. 274.
5. Correlation is brought out with greatest precision in the form of comparison: ως (διστερ, καθως) ... ουτως; frequently καλ is sub-
joined to the latter to increase its force, as in Jas. ii. 26 διστερ
to σωμα χωρις πνευματος νεκρων εστιν, ουτως καλ η πιεσις χωρις των
εργων νεκρω εστιν, Jno. v. 21; Rom. v. 18, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 2 Cor.
i. 7; Eph. v. 24; Heb. v. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 12. Sometimes, in fact, καλ in the second member actually takes the place of the comparativa,
particle, as in Matt. vi. 10 γενηθητω το θελημα σου ως εν
ουρανω καλ επι γης, Jno. vi. 57; x. 15; xii. 33; xvii. 18; Acts
vii. 51; see Bornem. Luke 71.

The popular style likes to introduce καλ elsewhere into comparisons,
though also is already implied in the comparative particle; as, 1 Cor. vii. 7
θελω παντας ανθρωπους ελαιν ος καλ ηματιν, Luke xi. 1; Acts vii. 51; xv. 8;
xxvi. 29. Accordingly καλ is repeated in both members in Rom. i. 13
ηα τω καιρων σχο καλ εν ημω καθως καλ εν τοις λοιποις θεσμων, Matt.
xxiii. 33; Col. iii. 13; Rom. xi. 30 (var.), Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 372; Klotz,
Devar. II. 635; Fr. Rom. I. 39; II. 588 sq.

6. Disjunction comes next under consideration. Simple dis-
junction is effected by η (which is often repeated, especially in
impassioned discourse, Rom. viii. 35) and by καλ or even (Matt.
vii. 10; Luke xviii. 11; Rom. ii. 15; xiv. 10; 1 Cor. xvi._6; cf.
Fr. Rom. I. 122). Correlative disjunction, on the other hand, is
expressed by η ... η, ελτε ... ελτε, εινε ... εινε, whether single
410 words or entire clauses are contrasted, Matt. vi. 24; 1 Cor. xiv. 6
(ητοι ... η Rom. vi. 16), Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 13; 1 Pet.
iv. 15, etc.

In the N. T. η is never put for καλ, nor καλ for η, Marle, floril. 124, 195;
461 cf. Schaeft. Demosth. IV. 33. There are cases, however, in which both
391 particles, each agreeably to its import, may be used with equal correctness
(Παππος, θυρ. III. II. 146), e.g. 1 Cor. xiii. 1 and 2 Cor. xiii. 1 (cf. Matt.
xviii. 16), also Heraclid. as quoted by Marle. When δισσυμιλα are joined
together by καλ (Col. iii. 11), they are merely placed in connection as
individual objects, and not exhibited expressly as different or opposite.

1 According to the nature of the thoughts, the second clause, annexed by means of
η καλ, is either to be considered as supplementary (Bengel on Rom. ii. 15) and is of less
importance than the first, or καλ involves an enhancement as in 1 Cor. (Klotz, Devar.
II. 592).

2 As to aut for ει, see Hand. Tursell. I. 540. On the other hand, disjunction by η
may in a manner include union by καλ. When we say: Whoever murders father or
mother is guilty of the most heinous crime, we mean of course at the same time that
whoever murders both his parents is not less guilty. The minus includes the majus.

3 On καλ ... καλ vel ... vel, see Schoem. Isae. p. 307.
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In Matt. vii. 10 by καὶ εἶνα a second case is introduced to which the speaker proceeds (further); but the better reading [supported too by Cod. Sin.] is probably γὰς καὶ. In Luke xii. 2 we must supply καὶ οὖν κρυπτῶν. In Matt. xii. 27 Schott has correctly rendered καὶ by porro. In a sentence constructed like Matt. xii. 37 or would be quite inappropriate; no less so in Rom. xiv. 7. It has been urged by Protestants, on controversial grounds, that γὰς is used for καὶ in 1 Cor. xi. 27 δὲ ἂν ἐστιν τὸν ἄρτον τούτων γὰς πινῇ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου. But, not to mention that in this passage several good Codd. give καὶ (as in vss. 26, 28, 29), γὰς may be explained from the mode then current of partaking of the Lord’s Supper, without giving countenance to the Catholic dogma of the communion in one kind, see Bengel and Baumgart. in loc.¹ Should any one insist, however, that γὰς proves a real distinction in the administration of the sacrament, even more would follow (looking at the matter philologically) than the Catholic interpreters could consent to take, viz. that the cup alone might be sufficient in the communion. In Acts i. 7 (x. 14); xi. 8; xvii. 29; xxiv. 12; Rom. iv. 13; ix. 11; Eph. v. 3 γὰς is employed in negative clauses (Thuc. i, 122; Aelian. anim. 16, 39; Sext. Empir. hypot. 1, 69; Fr. Rom. III. 191 sq.; Jacobs, Philostr. imag. p. 374 and Aelian. anim. p. 457), where in Latin also aut is used for et (Cic. Tusc. 5, 17; Catil. 1, 6, 15; Tac. Annal. 3, 54 etc.; Hand, Turs. I. 534), and in οὖτι εἰμὶ εἰστὶν γένεια χρόνος καὶ καρπὸς the negation applies equally to γένεια χρόνος and γένεια καρποῦ (the attention may be directed to the one or the other), so that the sense is exactly equivalent to γένεια χρόνος καὶ καρποῦ. When, lastly, καὶ and γὰς occur in parallel passages (Matt. xxi. 23; Luke xx. 2), the relation was differently 411 conceived by the different writers. It would be a manifest abuse of second parallelism to attempt to prove from this that the two particles are synonymous. Besides, these two particles have been not infrequently interchanged by transcribers (Jno. viii. 14; Acts x. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 1 etc.; 462 Maetzner, Antiph. p. 97). Cf. also Fr. Mr. 275 sq.; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 11; whereas Tholuck, Bergpred. S. 132 f., reaches no very clear result.

7. Antithesis is expressed sometimes by the simple adversatives (δὲ, ἀλλά), sometimes by a concessive construction (μέντοι, ἐμοὶ, ἀλλά γε). A mutual relation of contrast, and consequently a combination of antithetical clauses, was originally indicated by μὲν . . . δὲ (1 Pet. iii. 18; iv. 6); but this relation was ultimately weakened into mere correspondence (Rom. viii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 23), and 392 became logically even inferior to parallelism by means of καὶ . . . δὲ.

The particles ἀλλά and δὲ differ in general like sed and autem (vero), see

¹ Even according to our mode of communing it is conceivable that one may receive the bread devoutly, but the cup with sensuous (perhaps sinful) distinction. Accordingly we, too, could say, Whoever receiveth bread or cup unworthily.
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Hand, Tursellin. I. 559, cf. 425: The former (the Neut. Plur. of ἄλλος with a different accent, Klotz, Devar. II. 1 sq.), which may often be translated by yet, nevertheless, imo, expresses proper and strict opposition (cancelling a previous statement or indicating that it is to be disregarded); the latter (weakened from δέ Klotz, l. c. p. 355) connects while it contrasts, i.e. adds another particular different from what precedes (Schneider, Vorles. I. 220). When a negation precedes, we find οὔκ ... ἄλλα not ... but, and also οὔ (μή) ... δέ not ... but (but rather), e.g. Acts xii. 9, 14; Heb. iv. 13; vi. 12; Jas. v. 12; Rom. iii. 4, οὖν ... δέ Heb. ii. 8 (Thuc. 4, 86; Xen. C. 4, 3, 13; cf. Hartung, Partik. I. 171; Klotz, Devar. II. 360). On ἄλλα and δέ we remark specially that,

a) ἄλλα is used when a train of thought is broken off or interrupted, whether by an objection (Rom. x. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 35; Jno. vii. 27; Klotz, Devar. II. 11; cf. Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 9; 4, 2, 16; Cyr. 1, 6, 9), or by a correction (Mark xiv. 36; 2 Cor. xi. 1), or by a question (Heb. iii. 16; cf. Xen. C. 1, 3, 11; Klotz II. 13), or by an encouragement, command, request (Acts x. 20; xxi. 16; Matt. ix. 18; Mark ix. 22; Luke vii. 7; Jno. xii. 27; cf. Xen. C. 1, 5, 18; 2, 4, 5, 5, 24; Arrian. Al. 5, 26, 3; see Palairot p. 298; Krebs p. 208; Klotz, Devar. II. 5); for in all these instances something different is added over what precedes. Cf. also Jno. viii. 26 and Lücke in loc. In a consequent clause (after conditional particles) ἄλλα, like the Latin at, gives it an adversative emphasis, and so strengthens it: 1 Cor. iv. 15 εἰ τινὶς παράκογγος ἐξῆνεν ἐν Χριστῷ, ἄλλα οὗ πολλοὶ πατέρας (yet not, still), 2 Cor. iv. 16; xi. 6; xiii. 4; Col. ii. 5 (cf. Her. 4, 120; Xen. C. 8, 6, 18; Lucian. pisc. 24; Aelian. anim. 11, 81; see Kypke II. 197; Niebuhr ind. ad Agath. p. 409; Klotz, Devar. II. 98). (The case is different in Rom. vi. 5 εἰ σύμφωνον γεγόναμεν τῷ δομοῦματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἄλλα καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἠγομεθα ἵνα ... surely we shall be also etc., see Fr. in loc.) The use of ἄλλα, when 463 after a negative question it absorbs the answer no, as in Matt. xi. 8 τι ἐξήλθατε θεᾶσασθαι; κάλαμον ὅπο ἀνέμου σαῦρομενον; ἄλλα τι ἐξήλθατε σει; and 1 Cor. vi. 6; x. 20; Jno. vii. 48 sq., requires no explanation (see Schweigh. Arrian. Epict. II. 839; Raphel ad 1 Cor. as above). In Phil. iii. 8 ἄλλα μὲν οὖν signifies at sace quidem; ἄλλα opposing the Pres. ἕγονοιμας as a correction to the Perf. ἐγονοίμας.1 In Rom. v. 14, 15 ἄλλα occurs 993 twice in succession, in different relations; in 1 Cor. vi. 11 it is repeated ὥστε several times, emphatically, in one and the same relation.

1 'Ἄλλα' § after a direct or indirect negation, which occurs (occasionally in the Sept. e.g. Job vi. 5 and) three times in the N. T. (Luke xii. 51; 2 Cor. i. 13 and 1 Cor. iii. 5,— but in the last passage is probably spurious), must according to the careful investigation of Klotz, Devar. p. 31 sqq., who followed Krüger (de formulae ἄλλα § et affinitm particular. post negation. vel negat. sententias usurpar. natura et usum. Brunsvic. 1834. 410.), be referred to ἄλλα and not to ἄλλα. (In Luke as above I am not come on earth to bring — anfht but division.) It is no valid objection to this exposition, that in 2 Cor., as above, ἄλλα itself precedes, cf. Plat. Phaed. 81 b.; see Klotz p. 36.
§ 53. CONJUNCTIONS.

b) δέ is frequently employed when merely something new is subjoined, something other and different from what precedes, though not strictly something contrasted (Herm. Vig. 845); this occurs in 2 Cor. vi. 15 sq.; 1 Cor. iv. 7; xv. 35 even in a succession of questions (Hartung I. 169; Klotz, Devar. II. 356). Hence, in the first three Gospels kai and δέ are sometimes found respectively in parallel passages; in 2 Cor., however, as above, a clause commencing with ή is inserted in a series of clauses containing δέ.1 Like the German aber, δέ is used in particular where an explanation is annexed,—whether as an integral part of a sentence, as in 1 Cor. ii. 6 σοφίαν λαλομέν τοῖς τελείως, σοφίαν δέ ὑπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, iii. 15; Rom. iii. 22; ix. 30; Phil. ii. 8, or as a complete sentence in itself, as in Jno. vi. 10; ix. 14; xi. 5; xxi. 1; Gal. ii. 2; Eph. v. 32; Jas. i. 6—and where, after a parenthesis or digression, the train of thought is resumed (Hm. Vig. 846 sq.; Klotz II. 876; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 141 sq.); 2 Cor. x. 2; ii. 12; v. 8; Eph. ii. 4; cf. Plat. Phaed. p. 80 d.; Xen. An. 7, 2, 18; Paus. 3, 14, 1 (autem Cic. off. 1, 43; Liv. 6, 1, 10). In an explanation which is at the same time a correction, such as 1 Cor. i. 16, the adversative force of the particle is still perceptible. Sometimes δέ introduces a climax, as in Heb. xii. 6, or indicates successive steps in the discourse, as in 2 Pet. i. 5–7. As to δέ in the apodosis [Acts xi. 17], see Weber, Demosth. p. 387, particularly after participles (supplying the place of the protasis) as in Col. i. 21 (Klotz II. 374), see Jacobs, Aelian. anim. I. 26 praef. Δέ used several times in succession in didactic discourse must be interpreted according to the requirements of each particular case, as in 1 Pet. iii. 14 sqq. (the third δέ, however, is dropped by Lechm.) see Wiesinger. In narration often several clauses are connected together simply by δέ, as in Acts viii. 1–3, 7–9.

καί...δέ (in one and the same clause), as often in the best authors (Weber, 418 Demosth. p. 220), is equivalent to et ... vero, atque etiam, and also (Krü. 319 “καί means also; δέ, and”); Hartung I. 187 f. maintains the reverse), 484 Matt. xvi. 18; Heb. ix. 21; Jno. vi. 51; xv. 27; 1 Jno. i. 3; Acts xxii. 29; 2 Pet. i. 5; Schaef. Long. p. 349 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 154; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 137. The opposite phrase δε καί (2 Pet. ii. 1) means but also.

As to μέν (weakened from μέν ἀπ' τοῦ), there is nothing peculiar in N.T. usage, for μέν ... δέ ... δέ in Jude 8 (not in 2 Cor. viii. 17) requires no explanation. Where, however, μέν ... διάλα correpond, as in Rom. xiv. 20 etc. (cf. Iliad 1, 22 sqq.; Xen. C. 7, 1, 16), the second clause is made more strongly prominent, Klotz, Devar. II. 3. Further, when μέν ... καί correspond, as in Acts xxvii. 21 f., there exists an unmistakable anacolouthon, Hm. Vig. 841; Maetzner, Antiph. 257. As to μέν without δέ following, see § 63, I. 2, e. p. 575. Finally, on the unauthorized insertion of μέν before δέ (Wahl, Clav. p. 307), see Fr. Rom. II. 423, cf. Rost 731.

1 In Greek authors, also, δέ occurs frequently, as is well known, in narration.
2 This occurs in the N.T. only in the pure Greek combination δέ μέν ἀπ' τοῦ (Heb. vi. 14 (and even there not without var.), used to introduce an oath (Hartung, II. 376, 388).
Antithesis expressed by means of *yet, however*, is of very rare occurrence in the N.T. John uses μέντοι most frequently where others would have employed a simple δέ. He once strengthens μέντοι by prefixing ὅμως (xii. 42). Elsewhere ὅμως is used but twice,—by Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 7; Gal. iii. 15. We find καίτοις in Acts xiv. 17, referring to something that precedes, and meaning *although, quamquam* [cf. also Jno. iv. 2]. In the N.T. there is nothing peculiar in the use of ἀλλά γάς (Luke xxiv. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 2 etc.) but *yet, but certainly*, Klotz, Devar. II. 24 sq., except that both particles are placed in immediate succession, which could scarcely occur in classic authors, Klotz, as above, p. 15. The correlation *though...yet*, is expressed by εἰ καί...ἀλλά in Col. ii. 5 εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπεμψε, ἀλλά τῷ πνεύματι οἶνον ὑμῖν εἴμη, and by εἰ καί...γάς in Luke xviii. 4. In general, εἰ καί means *if also, si etiam, quamquam* (designating something as matter of fact); but καί εἰ even *if, etiam si* (putting something merely as a case supposed), cf. Hm. Vig. 882; Klotz, Devar. II. 519 sq.

8. The temporal relation of clauses is expressed by ὡς, δότε (δόταν), ἐπεὶ, or by ἦν, μέχρι, πρῶτον (§ 41 b. 8, p. 296 sq. and § 60). An inference is indicated by ὅν, τοίνυν, δότε (μενοῦν), and more sharply by ἅρπα, διό (δεθαυ), τοιγαροῦ, (ὁυκοῦν only in Jno. xviii. 37). The causal relation is denoted by διε, γὰρ (διώτι, ἐπεὶ), while ὡς, καθὼς, καθότι (subjoining a clause) are rather explanatory than argumentative. Lastly, a condition is expressed by εἰ (ἐκεῖνε, ἐπερ), εἰν, § 41 b. 2, p. 291 sq.

a. The most usual and most strictly syllogistic of the illative particles is ὅν, [Val. Chr. Fr. Rost üb. Ableitung, Bedeutung u. Gebrauch der Partikel ὅν. Gött. 1859. 4to.]. Its reference can be discovered with more or less facility from the context in each instance, e.g. Matt. iii. 8, 10; 465 xii. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 11 (see Mey. in loc.); Matt. xxvii. 22; Acts i. 21; Rom. vi. 4. But like the German *nun* (Eng. then, now), it is very often used to indicate the mere continuance of a narration (when what follows depends upon what precedes chronologically merely), Jno. iv. 5, 28; xiii. 6; cf. Schaef. Plutarch. IV. 425. Moreover, like the German also (therefore, thus) or nun (now), it is used especially after a digression to resume the train of thought (Heind. Plat. Lys. p. 52; Bornem. Xen. Mem. p. 285; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 42; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 418; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 738) 1 Cor. viii. 4; xi. 20, or when a writer proceeds to explain, (even by examples) as in Rom. xii. 20. *Hāρa accordingly, quae cum ita sint, rebus ita comparatis, serves, no doubt, primarily to introduce leviorem conclusionem, as it is used principally in conversation and the language of ordinary intercourse (Klotz, Devar. II. 167, 717); but in later Greek the use of this particle was extended, and individual writers, at least, employ it to indicate even a strictly logical inference. It inclines towards
its primary import when used in the apodosis (after a conditional clause) (Matt. xii. 28; 2 Cor. v. 15; Gal. iii. 29; Heb. xii. 8; cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 2; 8, 4, 7); so also when it expresses an inference from some singular averment (cf. 1 Cor. v. 10; xv. 15, where it may be rendered by indeed, that is, Klotz 169; cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 92; Hoogeveen, doctrina particul. I. 109 sq.) or proceeding (Luke xi. 48). In the N.T. Paul employs this particle most frequently, especially when analyzing the import of a quotation from the O. T., Rom. x. 17; Gal. iii. 7 (cf. Heb. iv. 9), or summing up a discussion, Rom. viii. 1 (Gal. iv. 31 var.); though in these cases he as often uses ὅσον. In questions ἀρα refers either to an assertion or fact previously mentioned, Matt. xix. 25; Luke viii. 25; xxii. 23; Acts xii. 18; 2 Cor. i. 17, or to some thought existing in the mind of the questioner Matt. xviii. 1, and which suggests itself more or less distinctly to the reader. It then signifies, such being the case, under these circumstances, ὥστε. rebus ita comparatis, and sometimes, of course, obviously, Klotz II. 176. Likewise et ἀρα si forte Mark xi. 13; Acts vii. 22 and ἔτι ἄρα 1 Cor. vii. 14 may be referred to this signification (Klotz, as above, 178). Ἀρα ὅσον combined, and that as the first words of a sentence (see, on the other hand, Hm. Vlg. 823), so then, hence ergo (where ἀρα is illative and ὅσον continuative, cf. Hoogeveen, doctr. part. I. 129 sq.; II. 1002), is a favorite expression of Paul's, Rom. v. 18; vii. 3; viii. 12; ix. 16, etc. I know of no instances of this combination in Greek authors: in Plat. rep. 5, p. 462 a. the recent texts read (in the question) ἄρα ὅσον, cf. Schneider in loc.; Klotz, Devar. II. 180. Paul and Luke employ διά (δι' ὅ) most frequently. Τὸδιν assuredly now, therefore, and τοῦτον (strengthened τοῦτον, Klotz II. 738) wherefore then, are rare. As to ἀρα and its construction, see p. 301.

b. ὅτι refers in general to some matter of fact under consideration, and hence signifies both that and because, quod; in the latter case, it is some 466 times rendered still more forcible by a preceding διά τοῦτο (propterea quod). 415 Occasionally it is used elliptically, Luke xi. 18 if Satan also is divided ἦν ὅτι against himself, how will his kingdom stand? (I ask this) because ye say, by Beelzebub etc.; i. 25; Mark iii. 30 (Acta Apocr. p. 57); Bornem. Luc. p. 6. Likewise in Jno. ii. 18, where it amounts to the same thing to translate it in consideration of the fact that (seeing that), Fr. Mt. p. 248 sq. But in Matt. v. 45 ἂν simply means because. (Sometimes it seems doubtful whether ἂν means because or that; the decision then rests on hermeneutical grounds.) The compound διὰτι (chiefly found in later Greek) for this reason that, or simply because, Fr. Rom. I. 57 sq., is used most frequently by Paul and Luke.

Τὰρ is in cultivated prose the most common causal particle, and corresponds to our for. Originally (it is contracted from γὰρ and ἄρα, ἄρα), it expresses in general a corroboration or assent (γὰρ) in reference to what precedes (ἄρα) (see Hartung I. 457 ff.; Schneider, Vorles. I. 219; Klotz,
Devar. II. 232 f. 1: *sane igitur, certe igitur, sane pro rebus comparatis* (enim in its primary import), and from this fundamental signification arose its causal force. In consequence of its original signification γάρ serves—passing over what is familiar—first of all and very naturally

a) to introduce explanatory clauses, whether they appear in the form of supplementary statements (sometimes of digressions) Mark v. 42; xvi. 4; 1 Cor. xvi. 5; Rom. vii. 1, or blend with the current of the discourse 2 Cor. iv. 11; Rom. vii. 2; Jas. i. 24; ii. 2; Heb. ix. 2; Gal. ii. 12. Γάρ is then to be rendered by *that is*, Klotz 234 sq. Explanatory in a wide sense every confirmation or proof (even Heb. ii. 8) may be said to be which we introduce by *for* (though the German *ja* comes nearer than *denn* to the primary import of γάρ) Hartung I. 463 ff.: Matt. ii. 20 *go into the land of Israel: for they are dead etc.* This is especially the case in those passages where it was supposed that something is to be supplied before γάρ *for,*

396 Matt. ii. 2: where is the born king of the Jews? (he that is born king of the Jews?) for we have seen his star, xxi. 28; 1 Cor. iv. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 5; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 5. Hence what Klotz says p. 240 is in point: Nihil suppleendum est aunte enuntiationem eam, quae infertur per partic. γάρ, sed ut omnis constet oratio, *postea demum* aliquis tacita cogitatione adsumendum erit, sed nihil tamen alieni, verum id ipsum, quod ea sententia quae praecedet γάρ particulae enuntiavit (for we have seen his star,—he must have been born, therefore, somewhere). Likewise,

467 b) in replies and rejoinders (Klotz p. 240 sq.) the original import of γάρ is prominent; for in Jno. ix. 30 *ἐν γάρ τοῖς θαυμαστοῖς ἔτινε* etc. the reply refers primarily to the statement of the Pharisees in vs. 29 (άρα), and then subjoins an affirmation (γε): *sane quidem mirum est etc.* *in this at least, it is assuredly wonderful.* So also in 1 Cor. viii. 11; ix. 9, 10; xiv. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 20, in all which cases nothing is to be supplied before γάρ. 3 Equally unnecessary is it to supply anything in *exhortations* (Klotz 242) Jas. i. 7: *for let not that man think etc.;* here άρα refers back to δι γάρ δικαιωμένοις etc., and γε combines a corroboration with the inference. On the other hand,

1 Si sequimur originem ipsam ac naturam particulae γάρ, hoc dicitur conjunctis ipsis particulis: *Sane pro rebus comparatis,* ac primum adfirmatur res pro potestate particulae γε, deinde refertur cadem ad antecedentia per vim particulae άρα.

2 This practice of something has been carried to an extent quite pedantic, e.g. Matt. iv. 18; xxvi. 11; Mark iv. 25; v. 42; 2 Cor. ix. 7. If it were maintained that between the propositions, "He makes clothes, for he is a tailor," we must supply, "One need not wonder at this," every body would regard it as ridiculous. As to the Latin nam, see Hand, Tursell. IV. 12 sqq.

3 In Acts xvi. 37 Παύλος άρα: δειδαρτε ἡμᾶς ημοία ἄκατακτους, ἀθρόους Παύλους ὄπροχος ἐβαλον εἰς φυλάκιον, καὶ ἐν λάθρῃ ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλουσιν; Paul immediately answers the question himself, *οὗ γάρ, ἀλλὰ ... αὐτοὶ ἡμᾶς ἔχαγανέων*: non sane pro rebus comparatis. The άρα contained in γάρ glances back at the circumstances previously described; while the γε founds upon them a corroboration: continet (as Klotz says p. 242) cum adfirmatione conclusionem, quae ex rebus ita comparatis facienda sit.
c) in *questions* ὡς seems to deviate farthest from its original import. And in fact the origin of this use may have been afterwards forgotten, and ὡς have been regarded as the sign of a question¹ urgent because justified by the connection (Klotz 247). However, the essentially inferential force of ὡς (ἔρω!) is still perceptible in many passages: igitur rebus its comparatis, adeo. In Matt. xxvii. 23 Pilate's question τί ὡς καὶ νοεῖς ἐκάκον; refers to the demand of the Jews σταυρωθήτω in vs. 22. From this Pilate infers the opinion which he in the question imputes to the Jews: quid igitur (since you demand his crucifixion) putatis eum mali fecisse? So in Jno. vii. 41 (surely you do not think then that the Messiah comes out of Galilee? num igitur putatis, Messiam etc.?) The reference of this ὡς to something preceding is in all cases plain;—even in Acts xix. 35; viii. 31. It is usual in this case also to supply something before the question, even though only a nescio or miror, Hm. Vig. 829 and ad Aristoph. nub. 192; Wahl, Clav. 79 sq. See in opposition, Klotz 234, 247. Lastly, Klotz 236, 238 appears to be right in contradicting the 897 current assertion, that even in prose authors (such as Her. see Kühner καὶ. II. 453) it is not unusual, in the lively movement of thought, to put ὡς with the causal clause before the clause it is intended to substantiate (see Matthiae, Eurip. Phoen. p. 371; Stabb. Plat. Phaed. p. 207; Rost, Gr. 738*); in reference to the N. T. (Fr. 2 diss. in 2 Cor. p. 18 sq.; Tholuck 468 on Jno. iv. 44 and Heb. ii. 8) this observation was in fact unnecessary. Meyer has, beyond doubt, correctly explained Jno. iv. 44. In Heb. ii. 8 the words ἦν ὡς τῆς ἐπορείας τὰ πάντα contain the proof of there being nothing which was not put in subjection to him according to God's purpose, 417 indirectly therefore of vs. 5 that the world to come also is put in subjection to him; while νῦν δὲ σὺναγ. etc. shows that this subjection has at least begun to be carried into effect. The Scriptural promise must be distinguished from its actual fulfilment, which, however, has already commenced. 2 Cor. ix. 1 stands in obvious connection with viii. 24. 1 Cor. iv. 4 οὐ δὲ ἐπωτεύεν ἀνακρίνε: οὐδὲ ὡς ἐπωτεύ εὐνοεῖ καὶ σὴν ἐν τούτῳ δεδιδακτόμαι is to be translated: *I am conscious, to be sure, to myself of nothing, yet etc.*

d) ὡς occurs several times in succession with change of reference: Rom. ii. 11–14; iv. 13–15; v. 6, 7; viii. 5 f.; x. 2–5; xvi. 18 f.; Jas. i. 6, 7; ii. 10; iv. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 3–5; ix. 16 f.; Heb. vii. 12–14 (Lucyrg. 24, 1; 32, 3) see Engelhardt, Plat. Apol. p. 225; Fritzscbe, quaest. Lucian. 183 sq. In such passages ὡς often gives the ground of a series of separate thoughts subordinate one to another (Jas. i. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 8; Rom. viii. 5 ff.),

¹ The energy which resides in such questions with ὡς proceeds from their being prompted by the very words of the other party, or by the circumstances; a right being thus conferred to demand an answer, e.g. 1 Cor. xi. 22.
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see Fr. Rom. II. 111. Sometimes, however, the same words are repeated with γὰρ in order to introduce some addition to what has been said, Rom. xv. 27 (not 2 Cor. v. 4).

Καὶ γὰρ is equivalent either to etenim (merely connecting) or nam etiam (giving prominence) Klotz, Devar. II. 642 sq. This latter signification has frequently been overlooked by expositors, even those of the N. T. (Weber, Demosth. p. 271; Fr. Rom. II. p. 433). Thus in Jno. iv. 23; Acts xix. 40; Rom. xi. 1; xv. 3; xvi. 2; 1 Cor. v. 7; 2 Cor. ii. 10, etc.; in several of these passages even Wahl renders καὶ γὰρ by etenim. Te γὰρ in Rom. vii. 7 means for also, or for indeed, Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 176; Schaeff. Dem. II. 579 and Plutarch. IV. 324; Klotz, Devar. II. 749 sqq.; but in Heb. ii. 11 (Rom. i. 26) ὥστε and καὶ correspond, and in 2 Cor. x. 8 there is probably an anacolouthon, Klotz loc. cit. 749.

Ἐνείλη passed from a particle of time into a causal particle, like our since and the Latin quando. Ἐνείλη answers entirely to quoniam (from quom—quum—jam). Ἐνείλη ὅπως since indeed (Hm. Vig. 786) occurs only in Rom. iii. 30 (yet not without var.), see Fr. in loc. [Ἐνείλη ὅπως forasmuch as, since now (Aristot. Phys. 8, 5; Dion. Hal. 2, 72; Philo ad Caj. § 25 and used by the best Greek authors, see Hartung, Partikell. I. S. 342 sq.) occurs in the N. T. only in Luke i. 1.]

Καθὼς and ὅσα, in appended clauses, denote explanation rather than strict confirmation, and resemble the Latin (quoniam) quippe, siquidem, and the antiquated (Germ.) simental. On ὅσα (in 2 Tim. i. 3; Gal. vi. 10; Matt. vi. 12 it means as) cf. Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 336; Stallb. Plat. sympos. p. 135; Lehmann, Lucian. I. 457; III. 425 etc.

986 As to ἐφ’ ὅ on this account that, see p. 394.

469 c. ἐν has the compound forms εἰσε if that is since, quandoquidem (when no doubt exists) and εἰσέπ αἴτω if indeed (when no decision is implied), Hm. Vig. p. 834; cf. Klotz. Devar. II. 308, 528, which occur almost exclusively in Paul. The distinction pointed out is obvious in most passages; as to Eph. iii. 2, see Mey. 1 Pet. ii. 3, and probably also 2 Thess. i. 6, appears to be of a rhetorical nature. On these passages, as well as Rom. viii. 9; Col. i. 28, see Fr. Prælimin. S. 67 f. Εἰ itself retains the signification if, even where in point of meaning it stands for ἐνείλη since (Acts iv. 9; Rom. xi. 21; 1 Jno. iv. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 4, etc.); the sentence is in form conditional: if (as is actually the case), and the categoric force for the moment does not come into view. Sometimes there is a rhetorical reason for this usage (Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 195; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 101). So also in expressions in which it may be rendered by that, see § 60, 6. Εἰ denoting a wish, if only, O that, for which Greek authors usually employ ἢθε or ὑπὲ γὰρ (Klotz, Devar. II. 516), occurs, according to the punctuation adopted by recent editors, in Luke xii. 49 καὶ τι θέλω; ἐποίησα δινόθη and what do I wish? (answer) if it were (only) already kindled; see Mey. [in his earlier eds.] in loc. With regard to the Aorist, see Klotz loc.: si de aliqua
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re sermo est, de qua, quum non facta sit olim, nunc nobis gratum fore significamus, si facta esset illo tempore. Such a question, however, seems rather artificial in the mouth of Jesus. Of the objections which Mey. brings against the common exposition, How I wish that it were already kindled! the second, so far as usage goes, is less forcible than the first. [But Mey. now (4th ed.) acknowledges the common interpretation to be correct.]

9. Final clauses are expressed by means of the conjunctions ἡνα, ἓπνος (ὡς). Objective clauses, which as they express the object of the principal clause in the form of a perception or judgment merely unfold its predicate, and consequently assume the place of the Objective case in a simple sentence (Thiersch, gr. Grammat. S. 605), I see that this is good, I say that he is rich, are introduced by ὅτι or ὡς. Yet conjunctions are the less indispensable for both kinds of clauses as both may be conveniently expressed by means of the Infinitive, § 44.

Ὅτι is the proper objective particle, like quod and that. It is used in this sense e.g. also after solemn asseverations, as in 2 Cor. x. 10 ἵνα διήλθῃ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐμοί, Gal. i. 20 ἵνα ἔχων τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Cor. i. 18 πρὸς ὅ τι θεός, Rom. xiv. 11, for these include the idea I aver, cf. Fr. Rom. II. 242 sqq. In this way, too, is ὅτι to be taken when it introduces direct discourse, Mdv. p. 222; cf. Weber, Demosth. p. 346.

Ὡς (Adv. from the pronoun ὡς Klotz, Devar. II. 757) likewise signifies, after verbs of knowing, saying etc., how, ut (Klotz p. 765) Acts x. 28 470 ἐπιταχθεὶ, ὡς ἀδεμυτὼν ἐστιν ἄνδρι ἱνδος εἰς γνω, how (that) it is unlawful for a Jew. Thus the two conjunctions ὅτι and ὡς, when used in objective 399 sentences, proceed from different conceptions of the object, but coincide 4th ed. in sense.

Ὡς, like ut (quo), besides being an adverb (how, ὡς Klotz, Devar. II. 681, cf. Luke xxiv. 20), has become a conjunction. ἡνα was originally 419 a relative adverb, where, whither (Klotz, as above, p. 616). From local 4th ed. direction it was transferred to direction of the will (design), and thus resembles the Latin quo. In the N. T. ὡς expressing design (Klotz p. 760) occurs only in the well-known phrase ὡς ἐστιν εἰρείν, Heb. vii. 9; cf. Mth. 1265, which, however, recent grammarians are inclined to explain otherwise, Klotz II. 765; Madv. 164. (How ἡνα in the N. T. is used also instead of the simple Inf., see p. 334 sqq.)

10. The regular use of all these conjunctions, framed as they were to express the several relations of clauses, would be quite annulled, had the N. T. writers actually employed one conjunction

1 Weller, über Subjects ... und Objectsätze etc. Meining. 1845. 4to.
§ 53. CONJUNCTIONS.

for another — if with them δὲ often were equivalent to γάρ, γάρ to οὖν, ἢν to ὥστε, etc.¹ — as expositors, following indeed the scholiasts (Fischer ad Palaeph. p. 6) and earlier philologists, long assumed (Pott, Heinrichs, Flatt, Künnöl, Schott, even D. Schulz), and as the Hermeneutics of the time (Keil, Hermen. S. 67) taught.

471 But such interchange is in every instance only apparent. It rests in part on the circumstance, that the relation of two sentences to each other may be conceived sometimes in several ways ²; and thus the particular logical connection in a given passage may depend on the conception of the individual (or nation, see below on ὥστε), one which is unfamiliar to the reader; and in part on a conciseness of expression foreign to the genius of our language. Wherever the apostles use a δὲ they have always thought somehow of a but; and it is the expositor’s duty to reproduce for himself in like manner the connection of thought, and not for convenience’ sake to imagine an interchange of conjunctions perhaps of opposite import. For how absurd to suppose that the apostles actually used for when they intended to say but, or but when they should have written for! Any child can distinguish such relations. And how stupid they must have been to think of employing instead of for its opposite therefore! None but expositors who had never accustomed themselves to view language as living speech, or who shrank from the labor of precise thought, could have indulged such an

¹ Even the better expositors are not free from this arbitrariness: thus Beza in 1 Cor. viii. 7 takes ἀλλὰ for itaque. See in opposition to such interpretation my Progr. Conjunctionum in N. T. accurarius explicandar. causae et exempla. Erlang. 1826. 4to. It is really strange to see how the commentators (till within a few decades) undertake again and again to dictate to the apostles, and force upon them almost always some other conjunction than that actually employed in the text. Were we to reckon up the passages, there would certainly remain e.g. in Paul’s epistles not more than six or eight in which the apostle has selected the right particle, and not required the subsequent aid of an expositor. This has made the interpretation of the N. T. very arbitrary. Are we not to believe that Paul and Luke knew more Greek than many of their domineering expositors? No one in this matter can appeal to the Hebrew who has not a most irrational idea of that language. Such arbitrary substitutions of one thing for another are impossible in any human speech. Besides, the arbitrariness of the interpreters was the more manifest, because different expositors often attributed to a conjunction senses entirely different in the same passage: (in 2 Cor. viii. 7 e.g διὰ as according to some is put for ἀλλὰ according to others, for ὥστε etc.; in Heb. v. 11 καὶ according to some is put for διὰ, but according to others means licet. In Heb. iii. 10 Künnöl leaves it optional whether δὲ is taken for καὶ or in the sense of nam). Thus purely private opinion has here the freest range. Moreover, the translators of the books of the N. T. (even the excellent Schulz in the Epistle to the Hebrews) deserve censure for rendering the conjunctions most capriciously.

² Cf., as to such a case, Kiitz II. p. 5, and the remarks made below (after explaining οὖν), p. 455 sq.
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imagination; and it is no honor to biblical exegesis that such principles so long found approval. In human thought connected ideas are always related ideas. Whenever, therefore, a conjunction is used in a sense apparently foreign to it, the very first endeavor must be to show the process by which the writer's mind passed from the primary to the unusual signification. But this was not thought of; had serious thought been given to it, the delusion of which we have been speaking would have vanished in a moment.

As the unlimited interchange of conjunctions is a pure fiction, so too is the notion that they are weakened; according to which even the more forcible particles, as for, but, are represented as being quite superfluous or mere particles of transition (see e.g. no. 3 below). Recent exegetes, indeed, have abandoned this arbitrary but convenient rule of interpretation. We will therefore single out only a few especially specious passages, in which the conjunctions employed were for a long time not acquiesced in, or where even the better expositors are not agreed about the connection of thought.

1. Ἀλλά does not stand

a) for σὺν: In 2 Cor. viii. 7 ἄλλα simply means but, at: from Titus, to whom he had given instructions, Paul turns to exhort his readers on their part to do what was desired; for the clause with ἵνα is to be taken imperatively. Eph. v. 24 is not an inference from vs. 23; but the statement in vs. 22, that wives should be subject to their husbands ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, is proved in vss. 22, 24 first from the position of Christ and of the husband, both being κεφαλαί, but secondly—and this is the main argument—from the claim (to be obeyed) which, as for Christ so for the husband, flows from this position. And vs. 24, so far from being a mere repetition of what is stated in vs. 22, concludes the argument, and explains ἵππος τοῦ ἀνδρ. ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ. The expressive apposition also, ἀπὸς σωτήρ, etc., does not interrupt the train of thought; whereas the exposition of Mey., who regards these words as an independent sentence, introduces a statement that obstructs the line of argument. As to Acts x. 20 (Elsner in loc.), see above, no. 7, p. 442.

b) for εἰ: In Mark ix. 8 οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον, ἄλλα τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον 421 means, they no longer saw any one (of those that they had previously seen, vs. 4), but (they saw) Jesus alone. In Matt. xx. 23 (Raphel and Alberti in loc.) δοθήσεται, borrowed from δοῦναι, is to be repeated after ἄλλα, and the conjunction signifies but.

c) for sane, profecto: neither in Jno. viii. 26 see no. 7 p. 442, nor in xvi. 2, where it denotes ἵνα or at as in Acts xix. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 6. Rom. vi. 5, where ἄλλα (καί) occurs in the apodosis, does not come under this head.
2. Δέ never means:

a) therefore, then: In 1 Cor. xi. 28 it signifies but, in antithesis to vs. 27 ἀνακτῶν τιθεῖν, but let a man examine himself (in order to avoid bringing on himself such guilt). In 1 Cor. vii. 9 a practical restriction, in the form of an admonition, is annexed to the general principle laid down in vs. 8: but see to it that this liberty do not become etc. In Rom. vii. 8, if Paul had intended to present θέψε ἄρεσα οὗ δίναρα as an inference from what precedes he might have continued therefore (as Rück. explains δέ); but he passes from ἐξάρα εἰς θεῶν to the other aspect of the matter θέψε ἄρεσα οὗ δίναρα, — a transition which would have surprised no one had 473 there been no parenthetical clause. In Jas. ii. 15 δέ, if genuine, means jam vero, atqui.

b) for (Poppo, Thuc. II. 291; Ind. ad Xen. Cyr., and Bornem. ind. ad Xen. Anab.; see, on the other hand, Hm. Vig. 846; Schaefl. Demosth. II. 128 sq.; V. 541; Lehm. Lucian. I. 197; Wex, Antig. I. 300 sq.):

In Mark xvi. 8 εἰς δέ is merely explanatory; the cause of this τρόμος καὶ ἐκκορίας is stated in the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ; some good Codd., however, which Lehm. follows, [Sin. also] have γάρ in the first passage. In Jno. vi. 10 the words Ἰν δὲ χρῖτος etc. are also a supplementary explanation; see above. In 1 Thess. ii. 16 ἐκδικάζει δέ forms a contrast to the intention of the Jews ἁνακτηρ. αἰτῶν τ. ἀμαρτ.: but (as, in fact, they would have it so) the punishment for this is come on them. In Matt. xxiii. 5 πλατύνουσιν. δέ etc. are special illustrations of πάντα τὰ ἔργα αἰτῶν προῖς τὸ θεαθήναι; the γάρ, adopted by the more recent editors, probably owes its origin to scribes who were troubled by δέ. In 1 Tim. iii. 5 εἰ δέ τις etc. means, but if one etc.; the sentence, as will be seen by referring to vs. 6, is a parenthetical antithesis to τοῦ διὸν οἰκον προϊσταμένον. In 1 Cor. iv. 7 who distinguisheth thee (declares thee pre-eminent)? but what hast thou, that thou didst not receive? i.e. but if thou appealest to the pre-eminence which thou possessest, I ask thee, hast thou not received it? In 1 Cor. vii. 7 (Flatt, Schott) δέ signifies potius. In 1 Cor. x. 11 ἐγκαθίστης δέ, as even the leading position of the verb indicates, forms an antithesis to the statement that precedes: all these things happened etc.; but they were written etc. In 1 Cor. xv. 13 δέ is a genuine adversative: if Christ is 422 risen, then the resurrection of the dead is a reality; but if the resurrection θέασι of the dead is not a reality, then (by converse reasoning) neither is Christ risen. Verse 14 contains a further inference: but if Christ is not risen, 402 then etc. The one statement of necessity establishes or invalidates the other. In 2 Pet. i. 13 δέ forms the antithesis to the words καὶ ἔρ οἴνους etc. On Phil. iv. 18 see Mey.

1 In the sense of namely, that is, both conjunctions coincide: by means of δέ a new clause is annexed which is part of the statement; while by means of γάρ a clause is presented as a confirmatory illustration of what precedes. The latter mode of expression is often in substance equivalent to the former, see Hm. Vig. p. 845.
c) Nor does it ever serve as a mere copula or particle of transition: Matt. xxi. 3 (Schott) say, the Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them, i.e. these words will not be without effect; but, on the contrary, he will straightway etc. In Acts xxiv. 17 the narration proceeds by means of τέ to another event. In 1 Cor. xiv. 1 δέ means but: but the διακεχει ρήμα διάφωνον must not prevent you from ζηλοίν τά πνεύματα. On 2 Cor. ii. 12 Meyer's opinion is more correct than de Wette's; Paul refers to vs. 4. In 1 Cor. xi. 2 it would be a mistake to regard, as Rück. does, δέ as indicating merely the advance to a new topic (Luther has not translated it at all, while Schott renders it by quidem); the words connect themselves (directly) with the exhortation immediately preceding, μυριά λου γίνωσκε: 474 yet (while I thus urge you, I do not mean to blame you) Ιπραύειν etc. Likewise in Rom. iv. 3 Luther and many other translators have neglected δέ (at the beginning of a quotation where the Sept. has καί); but Paul is probably as little chargeable as James (ii. 23) with having used the adversative particle wantonly or without meaning. It renders ἐπίστευον more forcible, not to say almost antithetic.

3. Γάρ is incorrectly taken

a) for the adversative but (Markland, Eur. suppl. vs. 8; Elmaley, Eur. Med. 121; see, on the other hand, Hm. Vig. 846; Bremi in the n. krit. Journ. IX. 533): In 2 Cor. xii. 20 I say all that for your edification; for I fear etc. (this is the very reason that I say it). In Rom. iv. 13 the clause with γάρ confirms the last words of the preceding verse, ἐν ἀρεσκευή λαοῦ πίστεως τοῦ παρόδος etc. In Rom. v. 6 f. the first γάρ simply refers to the fact which attested the love of God (vs. 5), — Christ's dying for the ungodly; the second γάρ explains, a contrario, how death (of the innocent) for the guilty evinces transcendent love; the third γάρ substantiates the remark μοί σε ναπλών etc. 1 Cor. v. 3 means: and ye, have ye not felt yourselves compelled to exclude the man? for I (for my part), absent in body, ... have already decided etc. It was, therefore, surely to be expected that ye, who have him before your eyes, would have applied the (milder) punishment of exclusion. Pott understands γάρ here in the sense of alias! As to 1 Cor. iv. 9 see above, p. 446 a). 2 Cor. xii. 6 is: of myself I will not boast; for if I should desire to boast, I shall not be a fool (therefore, I might do so). In Phil. iii. 20 ἐμῶν γάρ etc. stands in closest relation to οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρον. they that mind earthly things! (a summary of vs. 19), for our conversation is in heaven (on this very account I warn you against them, vs. 18 f.). In Rom. viii. 6 the clause with γάρ states the reason why οἱ κατὰ πνεύμα (vs. 4) τοῖς πνεύματων φρονούσων, which is, that the φρονεῖν τῆς σωφροσύνης leads to death, but the φρονεῖν τοῖς πνεύματων to life; vs. 5, 423 however, is confirmatory of vs. 4. In Col. ii. 1 Bengel had already indicated the correct interpretation. Heb. vii. 12 (Kihnlō: autem) appends the reason for vs. 11: for change in the priestly succession and abolition of the law necessarily go together, see Bleek in loc. 2 Pet. iii. 5 explains
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(Pott) how such men can come forward with such frivolous assertions as 408 in vss. 3, 4. Heb. xii. 8 enforces the preceding resolution τρέχεσθε etc., by the reference to the example of Christ.

b) for therefore, then: Bengel's remark throws light on Luke xii. 58: γάρ saepe ponitur, ubi propositionem excitip tractatio. 1 Cor. xi. 26 elucidates the expression ἐκ τῶν ἑμῶν ἀνάμμων vs. 25. In Rom. ii. 28 the connection is this: the uncircumcised, who lives agreeably to the law, may convict thee, who, though circumcised, transgressest the law; for it is not what is external (like circumcision) that constitutes the real Jew. On Heb. ii. 8 see above, p. 447.

c) for although: as in Jno.iv. 44 (see Kühnél); but γάρ is simply for; ἀρρήτος can only mean Galilee, vs. 43.

d) for on the contrary: 2 Pet. i. 9 (Augusti). Αἱ might have been used, if the apostle had intended to say: but he, on the contrary, who lacks these (virtues) etc. With γάρ, the sentence confirms (illustrates) the foregoing οὐκ ἔρχεται ... Χριστοῦ ἐκτίμησιν a contrario (μη): for he that lacks these, is blind. This interpretation supplies, too, a more forcible reason for the exhortation in vs. 10.

e) for δόλῳ δὲμω nevertheless: 2 Cor. xii. 1 (where indeed the reading is extremely uncertain; yet the common reading δὴ is not so decidedly incorrect as Mey. insists) to boast (xi. 22 ff.) is not expedient for me surely; for I will (I will, that is to say, Klotz, Dever. II. 235) now come to visions and revelations of the Lord. Paul in this passage contrasts (cf. vs. 5) boasting of himself (of his own merits) with boasting of the divine marks of distinction accorded him. Of these last he will boast, vs. 5. Accordingly, the meaning is: yet glorying in self is not expedient; for now will I come to a subject for glorying that excludes all self-glorification and renders it superfluous.

f) for the mere copula: In Rom. iii. 2 πρῶτον μὲν γάρ commences the proof of the statement πολὺ καὶρὰ πάντα πρῶτον. Acts ix. 11 inquire in the house of Judas for Saul of Tarsus; for, behold, he prayeth (thou wilt therefore find him there), and he hath seen a vision (which has prepared him to receive thee), cf. Bengal in loc. In Acts xvii. 28 τοῦ γὰρ γένος etc. is a verse quoted verbatim from Aratus, where, moreover, γάρ may be taken as confirmatory of ἐν αὐτῷ ἡμῶν καὶ κυνόμεθα καὶ άσμην. In Acts iv. 12 the clause ὁδεῖ γάρ ὁνομά ἰσωτερικὴν etc. serves to unfold, and thus to establish, the statement ἐν ἀλλη ὁδεῖ ἡ σωτηρία; and what the second clause adds to the first the attentive reader will easily perceive. In Acts xiii. 27 we may, with Bengal, Meyer, and others, restore the connection thus: to you, ye (foreign) Jews etc. is this word of salvation addressed; for those at Jerusalem have despised this Saviour. It is more probable, however, that Paul intended to proceed thus: for he is proved to be the Messiah foretold to our fathers, cf. vss. 29, 32 ff. The recital of the facts in which the prophecies were fulfilled, impairs, however, the formal com-
pactness of the reasoning. At all events γάρ is not a mere particle of transition, as Kühnöl asserts. In 2 Cor. iii. 9 it appears to me that the words εί γάρ ἡ διακ. etc. go so far towards establishing the apostle’s thought as διακοιν. τῆς διακοινοῦσης expresses something more definite than διακοιν. 476 τοῦ πνεύματος: if the ministration of death was glorious, ... how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be much more glorious? Fr.’s exposition, in his diss. Corinth. I. p. 18 sq., seems to me artificial. In Matt. i. 18 404 (Schott), after the words τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Ἰμ. ἡ γένεσις οὖν ἢ, the details θέος Δὲ αὐτοῦ commence as is not unusual with γάρ namely.

4. οὖν is falsely taken

a) for but : Acts ii. 30 (Kühnöl) προφ. οὖν οὖν ὑπάρχει is simply an inference from the sentence that precedes: David died and was buried. He therefore, in his character of prophet, referred to Christ’s resurrection in the words which he used apparently in reference to himself. Acts xxvi. 22 is not antithetic to vs. 21; but Paul, reviewing his apostolic life up to this imprisonment, concludes: by the help of God, therefore, I continue until this day, etc. Even Kühnöl, in his Comment. p. 805, accurately renders οὖν by igitur; but in the index οὖν is represented as here denoting sed, tamen! In Matt. xxvii. 22 τι οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν ἐστι: what then shall I do with Jesus (since you have decided in favor of Barabbas)?

b) for for. In Matt. x. 32 πᾶς οὖν δῦνας οὖν is not confirmatory of the clause πολλὰν στροφὴν διαφέρεται ἡμῖν, but resumes and continues the main thought vs. 27 κηρύσσει εἰς καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε. Fr. is of a different opinion. In the parallel passage, Luke xii. 8 λέγω δὲ οὐκ ἔπαι δὲ ἐν ὑπολογίασθαι εἰς, the δὲ is substantially the same in sense but more expressive. In 1 Cor. iii. 5 τίς οὖν οἰνοῦς ... Ἄπολλων; who, then (to follow out your party-strifes), is ... Apollo? In 1 Cor. vii. 26 οὖν introduces the γνώμη which the apostle proposes in vs. 25 to give.

c) for a mere copula, or as wholly superfluous: Rom. xv. 17 (Köllner) becomes at once plain by a reference to vs. 15, 16 (δὲ τὴν χάριν etc). The οὖν in Matt. v. 23 is entirely overlooked even by Schott; but it unquestionably introduces, however, a practical inference (admonition) from vs. 22 (the punishableness of anger etc.). It is more difficult to determine the connection in Matt. vii. 12, and even the more recent expositors differ widely from each other. Tholuck’s exposition is probably correct, though his review of the various interpretations is far from complete. In Jno. viii. 38 καὶ ἡμῖν οὖν καὶ ἦκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ποιήτε ὁ οὖν is far from being redundant; it contrasts with sad irony the conduct of the Jews (you also, therefore) with the conduct of Jesus, representing both as following the same principle.

Of the preceding four conjunctions δέ and οὖν are the most closely allied; and hence there are passages where either might have been employed with equal propriety (e.g. Matt. xviii. 31), though even in the mere continuance of discourse (in narration) they are not strictly equiv-
477 alent. Instead of: Jesus found two fishermen, who ... And (but) he said 425 to them etc., I can also say: Jesus found ... So (then) he said to them.

The change does not greatly affect the sense, but still there is a difference of conception between the two. In the first case, to the coming and finding them the speaking is annexed as something new and different; in the last, the thought is this: he said then (availing himself of the opportunity) to them. If in such an instance the narrator employs δὲ, it cannot be asserted that he ought to have used οὖν; or vice versa. Τὰς and δὲ, also, can sometimes be used with equal propriety (see 10, 2, b) p. 452): In Jno. vi. 10 the evangelist wrote: Jesus said, make the people recline; now (but) there was much grass in the place. He might also have written: for there was much grass, etc. In the latter case he represents the circum-
stance as the incidental cause of the direction; in the former, it is given as merely explanatory; see Klotz II. 362; cf. Hm. Vig. 845 sq. Here also then there is a difference of conception in the two cases. Consequently we may not adduce parallel passages, such as Luke xiii. 35, cf. Matt. xxiii. 39, as proof of the perfect equality of δὲ and γάρ. Even, however, if in such cases δὲ and οὖν, δὲ and γάρ, are pretty nearly equivalent, it does not follow that they are interchangeable in all, even their more precise, significations. On the other hand, γάρ and ἀλλά are particles of far too definitive a nature to admit of their being used for each other at will, or even being unimportant. Finally, even in the most ancient Codd. (and versions 1) numerous variations are found, in respect to the conjunctions δὲ and γάρ Matt. xxiii. 5; Mark v. 42; xii. 2; xiv. 2; Luke x. 42; xii. 30; xx. 40; Jno. ix. 11; xi. 30, etc.; Rom. iv. 15 (Fr. Rom. II. 476), δὲ and οὖν Luke x. 37; xiii. 18; xv. 28; Jno. vi. 3; ix. 26; x. 20; xii. 44; xix. 16; Acts xxviii. 9 etc., οὖν and γάρ Acts xxv. 11; Rom. iii. 28.

5. ὅτι is not equivalent 478
a) to διὰ wherefore (as the Hebrew γας, but likewise erroneously, is sometimes rendered; see my Simonis under the word, yet see Passow under διὰ): In Luke vii. 47 nothing but a blind hostility to the Catholics (see Grotius and Calov. in loc.) could misinterpret ὅτι, see Mey. in loc. As to 2 Cor. xi. 10 see above, no. 9 p. 449.

Nor is this particle used for διὰ τί in direct question (Palairot, observ. 125; Alberti, observ. 151; Krebs, observ. 50; Griesbach, commentar. crit. II. 138; Schweigh. lexic. Herod. II. 161 [Bttm. Gramm. des N. T.

1 These latter, therefore, where conjunctions are concerned, ought not to be cited in a critical apparatus as authorities without great caution. Yet in general, nothing has been treated so negligently by the earlier critics as the ancient versions; even the better known and most accessible are, ten to one, brought forward incorrectly, — when, that is to say, either from the nature of the language or the principles on which they were executed they can be made to furnish no evidence respecting a various reading. But it is to be regretted that even in the most recent editions this part of the critical apparatus still appears unsifted.
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Sprachgebr. S. 218]) in Mark ix. 11; even de Wette so understands it, and in support of his opinion refers to the passages which Krebs adduces from Josephus, not considering that there ὅ τι (ὅ τι, as Lchm. printed it) is used as a pronoun in an indirect question,—a usage that assuredly does not require proofs from Josephus (Kypke I. 178). But as to this passage, 426 see above, p. 167. Fr. was disposed on very slight authority to read τι ὅτι ἐνέφερ (from Matt.), which is undoubtedly a correction. In Mark ix. 28 the best Codd. (even the Alex. [but not Sin.]) give διὰ τι, as in Matt. xvii. 19. In Mark ii. 16 Cod. D at least gives the same [likewise Cod. Sin.], yet Lachm. reads τι ὅτι. But ὅτι, though admitted as the true reading, would not necessarily be an interrogative. As to Jno. viii. 25 (Lücke), see § 54, 1 p. 464.

b) to quanquam: Kühnel renders Luke xi. 48 though they killed them, yet ye etc. Beza had already given the right exposition of the passage. In Matt. xi. 25 Kühnel has himself, in the fourth edition, given up this interpretation; and in his third edition also explains correctly Jno. viii. 45.

c) to ὅτι. As to 1 Jno. iii. 14, see BCrus. In 1 Cor. iii. 13 (Pott) ὅτι obviously specifies why ἰδοὺ ἔργα δηλώσει etc. Everybody is aware that ὅτι and ὅτι have often been interchanged by the transcribers (cf. Jno. xii. 41; 1 Cor. xii. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 20, etc.); see Schaeff. Greg. Cor. p. 491; Schneider, Plat. rep. I. 393; Siebelis, ind. Pausan. p. 259. Accordingly in the Sept. wherever ὅτι appears to have the meaning of when or as, we must unhesitatingly read ὅτι (even in 1 Kings viii. 37), as the recent editions give commonly on good manuscript authority in all the passages quoted by Pott on 1 Cor. as above.

d) to profecto: In Matt. xxvi. 74 ὅτι is recitative; on the other hand, in 2 Cor. xi. 10 it means that (as after solemn oaths), see above, no. 9 p. 449. In Rom. xiv. 11 (from Isa. xliv. 23) the sense is: I swear by my life, that etc.

Lastly, for a refutation of the assertion that ὅτι is equivalent to ὅτι, as according to some is the case in Matt. v. 45, see Fr. in loc. Vs. 45 declares that by ἄγαρ τοῖς ἑκδόσοις etc. they will become children of their Father in heaven, and proves this from that Father's treatment of the πνευμόνῃ.

6. ἵνα to the end that, in order that (sometimes preceded by a preparatory εἰς τὸν, Jno. xviii. 37; Acts ix. 21; Rom. xiv. 9, etc.), is said to be 479 frequently employed in the N. T. εἰς τὸν to denote the actual consequence (Glass. ed. Dathe I. 539 sqq.), as it has sometimes been taken in Greek authors also, see Hoogeveen, doctr. particul. I. 524 sq., the annotations on Lucian. Nigr. 30; Weisake, Xen. Anab. 7, 3, 28; cf. also Ewald, Apocal. p. 233. Now even if this were possible as a general principle, inasmuch as the Latin ut denotes both design and result (though the gradual weakening of ἵνα in later Greek see § 44, 8 is no proof of it), yet no one will
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deny that expositors have made most immoderate use of this principle and are chargeable with great exaggeration.¹ The alleged use, wholly unknown e.g. to Devar., was denied by Lehmann, Lucian. Tom. I. 71, and afterwards by Fr. Matt. exc. 1, and by Beyer in the n. krit. Journ. IV. 418 ff.; yet cf. also Lücke, Comment. on Jo. II. 371 f.; Mey. on Matt. i. 22. Beyer's view was combated by Steudel in Bengel's n. Archiv IV. 504 f.; and Tittmann, Synon. II. 35 sqq., has also declared himself in favor of ἵνα ἐκβάτικιν.² Others, as Olshausen, bibl. Comment. II. 250 and Bleek, Heb. ἵνα καὶ II. I. 283, are for admitting the ecbatic sense at least in single passages; [Bittm., too, (Gramm. des N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 206) asserts that there are passages of the N. T. where ἵνα has more of the ecbatic sense than of the final, and where we shall come nearer the author's thought if we translate it by so that (i.e. ἐκτε with Inf.).] In the first place, most expositors have hitherto overlooked the fact that their judgment of the use of ἵνα is often to be shaped in accordance with Hebrew teleology, which interchanges historic results with divine designs and decrees, or rather represents every (important, and especially every surprising) event as ordered and designed by God (cf. e.g. Exod. xi. 9; Isa. vi. 10, Knobel in loc.; cf. Rom. xi. 11; see BCrus. bibl. Theol. S. 272; Tholuck, Ausleg. d. Br. a. d. Röm. 3 Aufl. S. 395 ff.),³ and that on this account ἵνα may oftentimes be used in the biblical dialect where we, agreeably to our conception of the divine government of the world, should have employed ὥστε. Other passages have not been examined attentively enough; else it would have become evident that even according to the ordinary modes of thought ἵνα is employed there correctly. In still other passages it has escaped observation that sometimes the expression to, in order to, is employed for rhetorical reasons, by a sort of hyperbole (e.g. so then I must go there in order to get sick! cf. Isa. xxxvi. 12; Ps. li. 6; Liv. 3, 10; Plin. Paneg. 6, 4; I have, then, built a house in order to see it burn down!); or lastly, that ἵνα merely expresses (what in the regular course

¹ If indeed with KühnöI (Hebr. p. 204) we lay it down as a principle that ἵνα denotes consilium only accurpium, we shall easily make up our minds to take the conjunction ἐκβάτικιν.

² He thinks that even in Attic poets he has found instances of the kind. But Aristoph. nub. 58 ἰδίωτα ἵνα ἑλέοι is obviously not one; and Aristoph. vesp. 318 receives its explanation in the remark soon to be made above. Likewise in Mr. Anton. 7, 25 ἵνα is undoubtedly τελεκοῦς. How unceremoniously Tittmann disposes of the N. T. in order to make out his theory is apparent from his treatment (p. 45) of Jno. i. 7, where in fact no unprejudiced expositor will take the second ἵνα as ἐκβάτικιν. Even KühnöI has not done so.

³ To assert that the Israelites uniformly confounded design and result (Unger de parabol. p. 173), would be saying too much. This took place only in their religious views of events (in devout speech, BCrus. Jo. I. 198). When these did not influence them the sharp distinction between in order that and so that must certainly have made itself felt by the Israelites. Their having in their language a special expression for so that shows that they had a correct notion of the distinction.
of nature and life is) the necessary result, one which is therefore so to speak unconsciously intended by the person that does some given act (cf. Lücke, Jo. I. 603; Fr. Rom. viii. 17), see below on Jno. ix. 2.

Passing over those examples which will be readily understood by the attentive reader (as 1 Pet. i. 7, where Pott from mere habit as it were takes ἵνα for ὥστε), we select the following, in which ἵνα is supposed even by good expositors to be used de eventu:

In Luke ix. 45 (the divine) purpose is indicated by ἵνα (cf. Matt. xi. 25): that they might not at that time perceive it (otherwise, they would have been perplexed with regard to Jesus). In Luke xiv. 10 ἵνα corresponds to μῇτος vs. 8, and very clearly expresses design (not without reference to the application of the parable): be humble, in order that thou mayest be deemed worthy of his heavenly kingdom; the result is indicated wholly in τῷρε ἔργα etc. As to Mark iv. 12 (Schott) see Fr. and Olsch. and below, 428 p. 461. Cf. also Luke xi. 50; Matt. xxiii. 34 f. In Jno. iv. 36 the sense ἵνα is: this is so ordered in order that etc. In Jno. vii. 23 (Steudel) the words ἵνα μῇ λιθῇ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως express the design underlying the custom περιτωμῆν λαμβάνει ἠρεπόσον ἐν σαββάτῳ. Jno. ix. 2 is to be explained by the Jewish theory of final causes, which in its national exaggeration the disciples shared. Severe, inexplicable, bodily afflictions must be divinely ordained penalties for sin: who then by his sin has moved the penal justice of God to cause this man to be born blind? The necessary consequence (though undesignedly induced) of ἀμαρτάνω is meant, see Lücke in loc. In Jno. xi. 15 ἵνα πνεύματε is added to ὅτι ἵματι by way of explanation: I rejoice on your account (that I was not there), to the end that ye may believe, i.e. now ye cannot but believe. In Jno. xix. 28 ἵνα means in order that, whether with Luther we join ἵνα τελ. ἣ γραφή to πάντα ἡγὴ τεσσά. (so Mey.), or with Lücke and de Wette to the following λέγει; in the latter case ἵνα denotes a purpose attributed by John to Jesus. As to Jno. xvi. 24 see Lücke. In Rom. xi. 31 ἵνα does not indicate the design of the ἀπαθούντες, but God's decree which linked itself to this unbelief cf. vs. 32, to bring them salvation (not as merited, but) out of mercy. In connection with the divine plan, then, unbelief is designed etc., cf. also vs. 11. In the 408 same way is v. 20 f. to be explained, and probably also 2 Cor. i. 9. The 481 same teleological view clearly finds place in Jno. xii. 40 in a quotation from the O. T. Rom. ix. 11 only requires attention to be plain; and it is fairly surprising that Reiche should still take ἵνα as ecstatic. The meaning 481 of 2 Cor. v. 4 is obvious; and it passes comprehension even Schott could render ἵνα by ita ut. In 1 Cor. v. 5 eis ὀλεθρον τῆς σαρκός shows how an intention of promoting the good of the πνεύμα is connected with the apostolic παραδοοντι τῷ Σατανᾷ: beyond contradiction, therefore, ἵνα denotes in order that. In 1 Cor. vii. 29 the words ἵνα καί οἱ ἔρωτε etc. indicate the (divine) purpose of ὅ καρδίς συνεσταλμένος etc. The same applies to Eph. ii. 9. In Eph. iii. 10 ἵνα γνωρίσῃ etc. is probably de-
pendent grammatically on τοῦ ἀποκαρφυμένου in vs. 9, see Mey. In Eph. iv. 14 ἰνα etc. expresses the negative design of what had been stated in vs. 11–13.

As to Gal. v. 17 (Usteri, BCrus.) see Mey. 1 Cor. xiv. 13 ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ προσευχόντος, ἵνα διερμηνεύη means: let him pray (not in order to make a display of his χάρισμα τῶν γλωσσῶν, but) with the intention, for the purpose, of interpreting (the prayer). 1 Jno. iii. 1 behold, how great love the Father has shown us (with the intention) that we should be called children of God; see Lücke; BCrus. is not decided. In Rev. viii. 12 ἰνα expresses the object contemplated in the πλήρεσθαι of the sun etc.; for πλήρη. does not denote, as many suppose, the actual darkening of the heavenly bodies, but is the O. T. πληρ. used in reference to the wrath of God, see Ewald in loc. In Rev. ix. 20 the intention of μετάνοην is expressed in ἰνα μὴ: they did not amend, in order no longer to serve demons etc. The discernment of the fact that the objects of their worship were 429 mere demons and wooden idols, should have led them to μετάνοην, in order ἵνα ἀπελευθερωθήντωσιν to emancipate themselves from so degrading a worship. In 1 Thess. v. 4 (Schott, BCrus.) ἰνα denotes design on the part of God, see Lünemann. Under the telic sense comes also John’s expression ἐλθεῖς ἐδέσμα ἵνα ἦν ἵνα Ἰνα Jno. xii. 23: the hour is (by God’s decree) come (consequently is present in order) that I etc., cf. xiii. 1; xvi. 2, 32. Inaccurate expositors took ἰνα in these passages as in 1 Cor. iv. 3; vii. 29 for ἵνα or ἵνα. 2 Cor. vii. 9 (Rück., Schott) ye were brought into sorrow, in order that (God’s purpose) ye might be spared a more severe chastisement. Ye did not rather mourn, in order that ... might be expelled? Here, it is true, ἵνα might also be used if αὐτῶν were regarded as the natural result of παρείσαυν. Paul, however, conceives of it as the end: ye should have mourned with this end in view, to expel him. In 2 Cor. xiii. 7 the double ἰνα indicates the aim of Paul’s prayer: first negatively, then positively. The correct exposition of Rom. iii. 19 is probably now to be regarded as settled; see also Philippi. Only BCrus. still hesitates. As to Rom. viii. 17 see p. 459. In 2 Cor. i. 17, however, ἰνα preserves its meaning, whether we explain the passage: what I resolve, do I resolve according to the flesh, that (with 482 the intent that) the yea with me may be (unalterably) yea, and the nay nay (i.e. merely to show my own consistency)? or thus: in order that with me there should be (found) yea yea, and nay nay (that both should be found with me at the same time, that I should afterwards deny what I had 409 affirmed). In 2 Cor. iv. 7 ἰνα γε ἐπερβολῇ etc. refers to God’s purpose in the fact that ἐξομεν τῶν θησαυρῶν τῶν ἐν ὑποτακτίαν σκείσαν. In Heb. xi. 35 the words ἵνα κρείττοις ἀναστάτως τίγχως indicate the purpose with which those persons refused the ἀπολύτρωσιν. On Heb. xii. 27 see Bleek and de Wette. In Rev. xiv. 13 (Schott) probably ἀποθνησκόμενοι (from ἀποθνησκόμενος) is to be repeated before ἵνα ἀναστάσωναι. Ewald and de Wette are of a different opinion, cf. above, § 43, 5, p. 317.
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That the expression ἴνα (ὅτις) πληρωθῇ τὸ ἑρθέν in Matt. or ή γραφή, δ λόγος in John, which was for some time reduced to a mere ita ut, has in the mouth (of Jewish teachers and so) of Jesus and the apostles (when used in reference to an event which has already occurred) the more precise sense of in order that it might be fulfilled, cannot be doubted; cf. also Olsh. and Mey. on Matt. i. 22. But it certainly was not meant by this that God had caused an event to occur, or impelled men inevitably to act in a certain manner, for the very purpose of fulfilling the prophecies (Tittm. Synon. II. 44); the expression is very far from implying any sort of fatalism, Lücke Jo. II. 536.1 With this expression, moreover, is Mark iv. 12 also to be classified: all things are done to them in parables, in order that they may see and yet not perceive etc., for: in order that the declaration (in Isa. vi. 10) may be fulfilled: they will see and yet not etc. We too are accustomed to interweave such quotations with our discourse, when they may be presumed to be well known. Jesus cannot intend to assert the general impossibility of understanding such parables (for then it would have been strange indeed to speak in parables at all); but means that to persons who do not comprehend parables so very plain might be applied the saying of the prophet: he sees and understands not; and that there would be such men had been expressly predicted.

In the defective diction of the Apocalypse ἴνα is apparently used once, xiii. 13, for ἵνα or ὅτα, after an adjective including the notion of intensity: magnæ miracula, i.e. tam magna, ut etc. This would be as admissible at least as ἵνα after an intensive, cf. Ducas p. 34, 28, p. 182; Theophan. cont. p. 663; Cedren. II. 47; Canan. p. 465; Theod. H. E. 2, 6, p. 847 ed. Hal., and my Erlang. Pflangstprogr. 1830, p. 11. Yet see p. 338. It is otherwise in 1 Jno. i. 9 (a passage misconstrued even by de Wette and Schott): he is faithful and just, in order to forgive us (with a view to forgive, that he may forgive); cf. in German: er ist scharfsinnig, um einzusehen. This expressed thus: er ist scharfsinnig, so dass er einsieht, conveys in substance the same meaning, yet exhibits the thought under an aspect somewhat different. Here belong also the passages quoted by Tittmann (Synon. II. 39) from Mr. Anton. 11, 3; Justin. M. p. 504. Bengel’s remark on Rev. as above: ἴνα frequens Joanni particula; in omnibus suis libris non nisi semel, cap. 3, 16 ev., ἵνα posuit etc. is indeed 410 correct, yet is not to be understood as if John used ἴνα indiscriminately for ἵνα. The reason why ἵνα so seldom occurs in John is partly owing to the doctrinal turn of his writings, and partly to the fact that he expresses result by other constructions.

1 Bengel, on Matt. i. 22, says, in the doctrinal phraseology of his time yet in the main correctly, ubicunque haec locutio occurs, gravitatem evangelistarum tuert debemus et, quamvis hebeti visu nostro, credere ab illis notari eventum non modo talem, qui formulae cuipiam veteri respondeat, sed plane talem, qui propter veritatem divinam non potuerit non subsequi ineunte N. T.
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Some insist that ἵνα is used for ὅτι in Mark ix. 12 γέφυρασα ἐπὶ τὸν ὕδωρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πολλὰ πάθη καὶ ἱκουσίωσῃ. But the words probably mean, in order that he suffer; this must be understood as an answer to the question, and ἵκομαι or ἱκουσίωσῃ supplied before it. Nobody will be misled by the passage which Palairot (obs. 127) has quoted from Soph. Aj. 383 οὐχ ὁρᾶσ, ἵν' ἐλ κακοῦ; where ἵνα is an adverb. (Some take ἵνα for ὅτι, ὅς in Xen. C. 3, 3, 20; 8, 7, 20, see Poppo in loc.)

Many render also ἵνα in order that erroneously by ita ut (Kühnöl, Act. 129; Tittm. Synon. II. 55, 58). In Luke ii. 35 (BCrus.?) it is hardly necessary to refer to the Hebrew teleology to discover the meaning of the conjunction. Acts iii. 19 is plain if ἵνα ἀποκτείη τὸν Χρ. vs. 20 be understood of the opening of the kingdom of heaven, as vs. 21 requires. What was remarked in reference to ἵνα p. 457 sq. elucidates Matt. xxiii. 35. Philem. 6 is connected with vs. 4: I make mention of thee in my prayers, in order that etc. Meyer's objections to this reference are groundless. In Heb. ii. 9 (Kühnöl) the clause with ἵνα receives so much light from 431 vs. 10 that scarcely any expositor is now likely to render the ἵνα by ita ut. On ἵνα πληρωθῇ see above, p. 461.

'Ως as a particle of comparison always means in the N. T. as, not so (for οὕτως), as in 1 Pet. iii. 6 Pott might have learnt even from Bengal. Nowhere also in the N. T. is there a reason for writing ὅς—a form, moreover, very rare (Heind. and Stallb. Plat. Protag. c. 15) in prose writers (with the exception of the Ionic). In Heb. iii. 11; iv. 3 (Sept.) ὅς may be rendered by that, so that; in which sense it is sometimes used with the Indicative even in good Greek authors (Her. 1, 168; 2, 135). On Mark xiii. 34 and similar passages, see Fr.; to assume there with Mey. an anaclouthen is quite unnecessary.
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1. Adverbs are so indispensable in defining closely relations of quality, that we can easily understand how it is that the N. T. writers, though inferior to the Greek prose authors as respects the use of conjunctions, have yet mastered pretty well the resources of the Greek tongue in adverbs, considered extensively; it is only when it is viewed intensively, i.e. as respects the finer shades of thought conveyed by several of the simple adverbs (e.g. ἀν) and by adverbial compounds, that their usage betrays them to be foreigners who did not feel the need of such refinements.

Derivative (adjectival) adverbs are the more numerous in the N. T., because the later Greek had derived from many adjectives adverbial forms previously unknown, and had adopted into ordinary prose other words of the class which had hitherto been used
only in poetry. Cf. ἀκάλως (Sir. xxxii. 4), ἀναφίω (2 Macc. xiv. 42), ἀνόμος (2 Macc. viii. 17), ἀποτόμως (since Polyb.), ἑκτενῶς (likewise; Lob. Phryn. 311), ἀπεριπάττως (likewise; Lob. 415), ἑτοίμως (for which the Attic language at least used έξ έτοίμου), εἰδώμως (since Polyb.), ἐσχάτως (cf. Lob. 389), εἰ- αρέάτως (Arrian. Epict. 1, 12, 21), κενῶς (Arrian. Epict. 2, 17, 6 (εἰς κενών), προσφάτως, τελείως, πολυτρόπως and πολυμερῶς, ἤτοι, ἑκνικως in the biblical sense.

Among the remaining adverbs also some belong to later prose, and give offence to the grammarians; e.g. ἵπερκειμα see Thom. M. 336, οὐρανίδεν, πανδιώδεν, μακρόθεν Lob. 93 sq.

The use of the adjective (or partic.) Neut.¹ for the corresponding adverb, which became more and more common in later Greek, does not exceed in the N.T. the limits observed in the earlier 492 prose: cf. πρότον, διότερον, πρότερον and το πρότερον, πλησίον, τυγχάνω, ἐπαρτήν, πολύ, το νῦν ἱκών Acts xxiv. 25 for the present (Vig. p. 9, cf. Hm. p. 888), ποιναντίον, λοιπόν and το λοιπόν (Hm. Vig. 706), ταχύ, πικνά, ἴσα, μακρά, πολλά (often, σφόδρα) and τά πολλά (for the most part), for most of which no adverbial forms existed.

In general, there is nothing peculiar in the N.T. diction in regard to the use of adjectives, with or without prepositions (elliptically or not), for adverbs: cf. e.g. τοῦ λοιποῦ (Hm. as above; 485 van Marle, floril. p. 232 sq.), περί, πάντη, καταμόνας, κατ’ ἱδίαν, ἱδία, καθόλου, εἰς κενῶν, and the Lexicons under the words. Instead of κατὰ ἐκώσιον Philem. 14 (Num. xv. 8) ἐκώσιος, ἐκώσια or ἐξ ἐκώσια is more common in Greek. It is not necessary to speak of genuine Greek compounds, such as παραχρήμα; on the other hand, in conformity with the genius of the Hebrew-Aramaic tongue, abstract substantives with prepositions, instead of adverbial forms actually existing, are more frequent than in Greek authors: e.g. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ Matt. xxii. 16, ἐπ’ ἀληθείας Luke xxii. 59 (for ἀληθῶς), ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ Acts xvii. 31 for δικαίως, see above, § 51. In 2 Cor. iv. 16 ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα, as a circumlocution for the adverb daily (καθ’ ἡμέραν or το καθ’ ἡμέραν, common in the N.T.), would be without example in the N.T. cf. το διήν, see Vorst, Hebr. 307 sq.; Ewald, kr. Gr. 638.² Probably, however, Paul designedly used the expression day by day, to indicate the progress of ἀνακαίνοωθαί; whereas καθ’ (ἐκάστῃ) ἡμέραν ἀνακαίνονται might be taken also in another sense. Further, we find an analogous con-

¹ However, what Hm. Eurip. Hcl. p. 30 sq. says in elucidation of this use of neutrals, deserves consideration.
struction (though only in a local sense) in Mark vii. 39 ἔτεταξεν ἀνακλίναι πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ετεταχθέντες, cf. Exod. viii. 14, vs. 40 ἀνέπεσον πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ αἰεταλιμ, see § 57, 8. These words are strictly in apposition, cf. Luke ix. 14. What Georgi in his Vindic. p. 340 has collected is of another sort.

412 When a simple accusative of a noun (substantive) is used adverbially, the construction is decided by a simple preposition, see as in Matt. xv. 16; see Lob. Phryn. 123 sq.

Adverbs may be joined not only to verbs, but also to nouns, as in 1 Cor. 433 xii. 31 καθ’ ἑνεβολὴν ὅπως ὑμῖν δείκνυμι, see no. 2, and 1 Cor. vii. 35 πρὸς ἡκεῖν τῷ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπεριπάτως.

2. The adverbial notion is sometimes expressed concretely as adjectival, and subjoined to the substantive (Mth. 1001; Kühner 486 II. 382). This takes place not only when it is to the substantive (not to the verb) that a predicate (logically) belongs (though in German an adverb is used), but also where such reference to the substantive appears to be more favorable to perspicuity: Acts xiv. 10 ἀνάστηθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου ὅπῃ ὁ ἄρχων, Mark iv. 28 ἀυτομᾶτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, Acts xii. 10 (Iliad. 5, 749), Rom. x. 19 πρὸ τῶν Μωσοῦς λέγει (as the first), 1 Tim. ii. 13; Jno. xx. 4 etc.; Luke 1 So Jno. iv. 18 τοῦτο ἀληθῆς εἶπες this hast thou spoken as (something) true, hoc verum dixisti. On the other hand, τ. ἀληθῶς εἶπ. (which Kühnol demands) would be ambiguous. Cf. Xen. vectig. 1, 2 ἐπεὶ γεγυμνήθη, ὅτι ἀληθῆς τούτο λέγω, Demosth. Halon. 34 b. τοῦτο γε ἀληθῆ λέγοντα.

2 Cf. especially Bretl, Exc. 2, ad Lys. 449 sq., Meikborn, de adjectivor. pro abverbio positior. ratione et usu. Glogav. 1828. See also Veckner, Hellenol. 215 sq.; Zumpt, lat. Gramm. §§ 682, 686; Kritz, Sall. I. 125; II. 131, 216. In Latin this form of expression is in general still more prevalent. Eichhorn (Einleit. ins N. T. II. 261) makes an erroneous application of the rule in supposing that Jno. xiii. 34 ἐντολὴν καὶ ἑρμήνευσις καὶ διδασκαλία can signify, anew καὶ διδασκαλία will I give you the commandment. But in that case John must at least have written τῇ ἐντολῇ καὶ ἑρμήνευσις διδασκαλία. Even the position of the words precludes taking μένου adverbially in Jno. v. 44; see Lücke.

3 Ordinal adjectives are used for adverbs only when first, second, etc. refer to the person; that is, when something is expressed which the person did before all other persons (was the first to do); but when the person is represented as doing a first act, in distinction from other subsequent acts of the same person, the adverb must be used. Cf. also Kritz, Sallust. II. 174.
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XXI. 34 μήποτε ἐπιστῇ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς αἰφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη (var. αἰφνίδιος), Acts xxviii. 13 δευτεραίοις ἡλιθομεν εἰς Ποτιδαύν, 1 Cor. ix. 17 εἰ γὰρ ἐκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω... εἰ δὲ ἐκὼν etc. Cf. also Luke v. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 6, etc. With these adjectives the construction described is frequent, not to say predominant, in Greek authors (cf. in regard to αὐτόματος Her. 2, 66; Lucian. necyom. 1; Xen. An. 5, 7, 8; 4, 8, 8; Cyr. 1, 4, 13; Hell. 5, 1, 14; Dion. H. 1, 139; Wetst. I. 569, in regard to πρῶτος Xen. An. 2, 3, 19; Cyr. 1, 4, 2; Paus. 6, 4, 2; Charit. 2, 2, as to δευτερ. Her. 6, 106; Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 2, Arrian. Al. 5, 22, 4; Wetst. II. 654, as to αἰφνίδιος Thuc. 6, 49; 8, 28, subitus irrigut Tac. hist. 3, 47); yet with other 413 adjectives not uncommon: Xen. Cyr. 5, 8, 55 αὐτὸς παρελαύνων τὸν ἵππον... ἡσυχος κατεθάτο etc. 6, 1, 45 εἰ οὖδε, ὅτι ἀρμένος δὲν πρὸς ἄνδρα... ἀπαλαγησθαί (Demosth. Zenoth. 576b.; 2 Macc. x. 32); Pflugk, Eurip. Hel. p. 48; see, on the other hand, Acts xxi. 17), 7, 49 εἰ ταῦτα πρὸθυμος σου συλλάβομεν (var.), 4, 2, 11 εἰρενούσος ἑξίωντες, Dio Chr. 40, 495 τινοι βαδιζοντες, Isocr. ep. 8 τελευτῶν (at last, finally) ἑπισκόμεν, cf. Palair. 214; Valcken. Her. 8, 130; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. 1. 156; Krü. 210 f.

How far it is correct to say that adjectives are used instead of adverbs 434 is obvious from the preceding observations. To suppose, also, that adverbs are used instead of adjectives is a mistake (Ast. 1 Plat. polit. p. 271), as 487 in Matt. i. 18 ἢ γάνατος οὖν ἢν, xix. 10 εἰ οὖν ἔστιν ἢ αἰτία τοῦ ἄνθρωπον (LXX. Rom. iv. 18) 1 Pet. ii. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 10 ὡς οὖν κ. δικαίος καὶ δικάμπτως ἡμῖν ἐγενήθημεν, vs. 13; Rom. ix. 20 τι με ἐπισκόπεσε οὖν; In the first of these passages εἶναι is not the simple copula (as in αὐτῷ or τοιοῦτο ὅτι), but denotes to be of a certain condition or character, stand, comparatum esse. 3 In Rom. ix. 20 οὖν denotes the manner of τοιοῦτο, the consequence of which is his being now the person that he is. Cf. Bremi, Aesch. Ctesiph. p. 278; Bhdyl. S. 337 f.; Hm. Soph. Antig. 633; Wex, Antig. I. 206; Mehllhorn in the allg. Lit.-Zeit. 1833. Ergzbl. no. 108; Lob. Paralip. p. 151; as to Lat. Kritz, Sallust. Cat. p. 306 sq. Likewise in 1 Cor. vii. 7 ἐκαστὸς οὖν ἔχει χάραμα, δὲ μὲν οὖν, δὲ δὲ οὖν the adverbs are in place: each has his own (peculiar) gift, one after this manner, another after that.

A closer approximation to adjectives is found

a. In certain local adverbs, such as ἡγοιτε εἶναι, χαρές τινος εἶναι Eph. ii. 12, πόρρω εἶναι Luke xiv. 32 (Krü. 244).

1 His article in the Landshuter Zeitschr. f. Wissensch. und Kunst III. 2. 133 ff. I have not had an opportunity of comparing.

2 In Jno. vi. 55 there is a variant. Recent editors have preferred ἀληθές, see Lücke; who, however, ably combats at the same time the opinion that ἀληθές and ἀληθής are synonymous.
b. In adverbs of degree annexed to substantives (ὡς being understood); as, μᾶλα στρατηγός Xen. Hell. 6, 2, 39, see Bhd. 338. Usually they are placed before the noun, but sometimes after it. Even ancient expositors thus understood 1 Cor. xii. 31 καὶ ἐὰν καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν δὲν ὑμῖν δεῖκνυμι: a super-eminent (more excellent) way. Such an adverbial adjunct is placed after the noun in 1 Cor. viii. 7 τῇ συνεδρίᾳ ὡς ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδῶλου, Phil. i. 26; 2 Pet. ii. 3, probably also in 2 Cor. xi. 23; see Mey.

3. The adverbial notion of intensity is not Un frequently expressed by joining to a verb a participle of the same verb (see § 45, 8), or a cognate noun in the Dative (ablative): Luke xxii. 15 ἐπιθυμεῖ ἐπεθύμησα I have earnestly desired, Jno. iii. 29 χαρᾷ χαίρει impende laetatur, Acts iv. 17 ἄπειλη ἄπειλησεμένα let us straitly threaten, v. 28 παραγγέλω παραγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν, xxiii. 14 ἀναθέματι 414 ἄνθεματα μεν we have bound ourselves under a great curse, Isa. vi. 17, from Sept. Matt. xiii. 14 (Isa. vi. 9); Matt. xv. 4 θανάτῳ τελευτάτῳ (Exod. xxii. 15). This form of expression is of frequent occurrence in the Sept. and the Apoc., and is there an imitation of the Hebrew infinitive absolute, cf. Isa. xxx. 19; lxvi. 10; Deut. 488 vii. 26; Exod. xxi. 20; Josh. xxiv. 10; 1 Sam. xii. 25; xiv. 39; Sir. xlvii. 11; Judith vi. 4 (Vorst, Hebr. p. 624 sq.); yet it is sometimes found in Greek authors also (Schaeff Soph. II. 313; 435 Ast, Plat. Epin. 586; Lob. Paralip. 524) e.g. Plat. symp. 195 b.

4. Of a different nature are those passages in which the Dative of the noun is accompanied by an adjective (or any other adjunct); as, τὰς μέγεθους τιμαὶς ἐτύμησαν, ζημιωτῶ τῇ νομισμᾶτι ζημία (Schwarz as above). These coincide with the mode of expression explained in § 32, 2; cf. Xen. A. 4, 5, 33; Plut. Coriol. 3; Aristoph. Plut. 592; Aeschyl. Prom. 392; Hom. hymn. in Merc. 572. From the N. T. see 1 Pet. i. 8 ἄγαλλατον χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ etc. Even the expression γάμῳ γεγαμηκός in Demosth. Boeot. 639 a. has no connection with the construction in question; it means, as it were, having espoused by marriage i.e. living in lawful wedlock, as γαμεῖσθαι alone is applied also to concubinage. Even Xen. An. 4, 6, 25 οὶ τελεσταί δρόμῳ ἵθεον I would except, as δρόμος denotes a particular sort of rapid advance: at a run, on the trot. As to Soph. Oed. C. 1625 (1621), see Hm. in loc.

1 Lob., as above, shows that in Greek authors this form of expression is used only in a figurative sense, not in a physical, as in Jer. (xxvi.) xlvi. 5. Moreover, in Latin the well-known occidione occidere is analogous to this construction.
4. Certain adverbial notions the Greeks were accustomed to regard as verbal; accordingly, the verb which was to have been qualified by one of these notions, they made, in the form of an Infinitive or Participle, to depend on it as principal verb (Mtth. 1279 ff.; cf. Kritz, Sallust. 1, 89): Heb. xiii. 2 ἐλαθὼν των ἐφισαντες they (escaped—their own—notice as entertaining) entertained unconsciously, unawares (Wetst. in loc.; cf. also Joseph. bell. jud. 3, 7, 3; Tob. xii. 13), Acts xii. 16 ἐπέμενε κρούνων he knocked persistently (Jno. viii. 7) cf. Lösner, obs. 208; Mark xiv. 8 προελαβε μνησαοι antevertit ungere, she anointed beforehand (Kypke in loc.; φθάνω also is sometimes used with the Inf. see Wytenbach, Juliani orat. p. 181; cf. raper occurrence Horat. Od. 2, 12, 28), Matt. vi. 5 φιλοσοφοι προσεῖχον they love to pray (cf. Ael. 14, 37 φιλο λα τα ἀγάλματα ... ὅραν) Wetst. and Fr. in loc., Luke xxiii. 12, see Bornem. Whether θελω also (ἐθελω? Hm. 489 Soph. Philoct. p. 238) is used as a finite verb to denote the adverbial notion gladly, with pleasure, cheerfully (sponte), has lately been questioned, (that the Partic. of θελω is so used is well known, cf. Mey. on Col. ii. 18). And in fact Jno. viii. 44 τὰς ἐπιθυμιας 415 τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλεντε ποιεῖν must be rendered: the lusts of your father ye will (are resolved and inclined to) do (carry into effect), either in general (your hearts impel you to follow the will of Satan) or because ye go about to kill me (vs. 40). The Plural here, which troubles de Wette, has already been explained by Lücke. In Jno. vi. 21, also, the interpretation given by Kühnöl and others is necessary only in case an attempt (for which there is no authority is made to harmonize the narrative of this evangelist with that of Matt. and Mark. At the same time this must be admitted, that ἐθελον ποιησαι they purposed, were inclined, to do (Arist. polit. 6, 8) when from the context it is obvious that the sense is not confined to the mere act of will, may signify they did it designedly, spontaneously, gladly, e.g. Isocr. Callim. 914 οἱ δυστυχησάντες τῆς πόλεως προκυκνινεύων ὑμῶν ἡ θέλησαν who were willing to expose

1 Yet in Ael. 1, 7 οὕτως ὑπαντών λαθόντες δοκιμών φάγων, we find the construction which corresponds to German usage. The Inf. instead of the Part. after λαθόντες occurs in Leo, Chronogr. p. 19.

2 In 2 Pet. iii. 5 λαθέων τοῦτο θέλοντας I prefer the rendering latet eos hoc (what follows) volentes, i.e. volentes ignorant, to the other: latet eos (what follows), hoc (what precedes) volentes, i.e. contendentes; since the former brings out more clearly the guilt of the mockers. In Col. ii. 18 also θέλων is not to be taken as an adverb.

3 In Jno. vi. 21 the matter appears according to John’s account not to have gone beyond a mere act of the will.
themselves to danger for you (and have proved their willingness by their deeds), who cheerfully encountered dangers in your cause (Xen. Cyr. 1, 1, 3). The phrase ἔθελοντι ποιεῖν, however, when it does not indicate a mere act of the will, signifies according to the nature of the case: they do willingly, cheerfully (Demosth. Ol. 2 p. 6 a. ὅταν μὲν ἵν’ εὖνοιας τὰ πράγματα συντηρεῖ καὶ πᾶσιν ταὐτὰ συμφέρει… καὶ συμπονεῖ καὶ φέρειν τὰς συμφοράς καὶ μᾶνεν ἐθέλοντα συν οἷον ἀνθρωποί), or they do it of their own accord, spontaneously (Xen. Hier. 7, 9 ὅταν ἄνθρωποι ἄνδρα ἡγοσάμενοι… ἰκανῶν… στεφανίσω… καὶ δώρεσθαι ἐθέλωσε). 1 Cf. besides Stallb. Plat. symp. p. 56, and Gorg. p. 36; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 28. According to this, Mark xii. 38; Luke xx. 46 τῶν θελοντῶν περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς οἱ who wish to go about i.e. who love to go about, would not be bad Greek (though τῶν φιλοντων περ. would be preferable); yet this expression is perhaps to be referred primarily to the Hebraistic θέλειν τι δελεταρι τε, as in Mark θέλειν is immediately followed by the Accusative ἀστασμοῦς as its object.

5. In Hebrew, adverbial notions are to a still greater extent regarded as verbal; since in that language they not only are grammatically construed with the verb (which shows that the two are essentially connected), as in הָעַבְרָנָה הִשְׂחָד i.e. he sent again, which is imitated in Luke xx. 11 f. προσέθετο τίμναι (but in Mark xii. 4 we find καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν), Acts xii. 3 προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον besides he apprehended Peter also, Mark xiv. 25 var. (thus frequently in Sept. προστίθεναι and Mid. προστίθεθαθαι Gen. iv. 2; xi. 6; Exod. x. 28; xiv. 13; Deut. iii. 26; xviii. 16; Josh. vii. 12, etc., likewise with Inf. Pass. Judges xiii. 21), but also both are used as finite verbs and joined together by and: he does much and weeps (Ewald 631). 2 This last construction has been retained in particular phrases through all periods of the language; whereas in other cases this mode of expression (as it were, a ἐν διὰ δυνοῦ with verbs) passes over perceptibly into the other, which becomes predominant. In the N. T. also it was thought that instances of that former and more simple construction were to be

1 Cf. also Orig. c. Marcion. p. 35 Wett. τὰ διακόσια ἐν ταῖς γραφαίσι εἰρημένα βοηθεῖς νοεῖν τὸν αὐτόν inclined to understand, understandest designedly.

2 The Sept. reproduce verbatim only a few of these Hebrew constructions, e.g. Judg. xiii. 10 ἐπάτωσεν ἣ γνωρίζω τῷ εἰρήματι, 1 Sam. xxv. 42; Ps. cv. 13; Dan. x. 18; Hose. i. 6. Cf. on the other hand, Gen. xxvi. 18; xxx. 31; Job xix. 3; Ps. xxxii. 3. The phrase ἐπάνω is also rendered in the Sept. by the Part.: Gen. xxxviii. 5 προσέθεντο ἐὰν τινὶ τινι ὑπὸν ἐκ τῶν etc., xxv. 1 προσθίουσιν ἀβράαμ ἔλαβε γυναῖκα, Job xxi. 1; xxxvi. 1. It occurs once also in Luke xix. 11. Besides, cf. Thiersch de Pentat. alex. p. 177.
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found, as Rom. x. 20 ἀποτολμᾶ καὶ λέγει speaks out boldly, Luke vi. 48 ἐσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε he dug deep (Schott), Col. ii. 5 χαίρων καὶ βλέπων seeing with joy (Beng. and Schott) etc. But in many passages referred to this head this explanation is quite inadmissible,—as in 2 Cor. ix. 9 ἐσκόρπισεν, ἐδωκε τοὺς πέντεν which must be rendered: he dispersed abroad, he gave to the poor (Ps. cxii. 9),—in others it is unnecessary, as in Luke vi. 48 he dug and deepened (crescit oratio, Beza); I no. viii. 59 ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (B Cruc.) means: he hid himself and went forth i.e. either withdrew from their sight, rendered himself invisible (according to which a miraculous ἀπαντήσεως of Christ is narrated), or he concealed himself and went (soon after) away (Lücke, Mey.). The narrator might easily from his point of view combine thus, and connect by καὶ, two events not precisely simultaneous, yet following one another in rapid succession. Perhaps we should prefer, with Bengel, the first of the two explanations given, as 491 the one more in accordance with the character of this evangelist, and in fact established if the words ἔμελθαν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν are genuine. In Acts xv. 16 the word ἀναστρέψω has nothing corresponding to it either in the Sept. or in the Hebrew (Amos ix. 11); probably to the apostle as he makes the quotation it means, (to him) I will turn (myself) again (as also וה in many passages of the O. T. must by itself be rendered, e.g. Jer. xii. 15 יְאשִׁירֵנִי וְאָרְחֶנִי I will return—to them, antithetic to Jehovah’s turning away from them—and have mercy on them; Sept. ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἔλεησον αὐτῶν), as iterum is already contained in the compounds ἀνουκόδομός, ἀνορθώσω. Likewise in Matt. xviii. 3 εἶναι στραφήτε καὶ γένητε etc. and Acts vii. 42 ἐστρεψεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ παρέδωκε this verb appears independently: to turn i.e. according to the connection, respectively turn about, repent, and turn away. In Luke i. 68 the absolute construction of ἐπεσκέπασε (ἢς) 438 is obvious. The above passage from Rom. is more like the Latin audet dicere; in which construction the idea of the first verb is not conceived of as subordinate. Render: he makes bold and says; ἀποτολ. indicates the frame of mind, λέγειw its result, the utterance of the mental state in the bold saying. In Col. as above Paul probably means to say two things:² in spirit I am present

¹ Every discriminating reader will perceive that the constructions from Xen., Plant., and Persius, which Kühn on Luke vi. 48 has adduced as analogous, are of a different nature.

² In the quotation by Wetst. from Joseph. bell. jud. 3, 10, 2 the Codd. read χαιρε καὶ βλέπω or simply βλέπω.
with you, rejoicing (over you, σὺν ήμῶν) and beholding your order etc. To the general statement is annexed one that is special. It is also possible that in βλέπων etc. the ground of the joy is subjoined, and καὶ is to be rendered namely, that is. As, however, the rejoicing is something caused by βλέπων, the adverbial notion expressed independently by a finite verb could in no event precede the principal notion;¹ nor could such a form of expression be supported, on careful consideration, by Hebrew analogy.² Jas. iv. 2 φονεῖτε καὶ ζηλοῦτε does not mean: ye envy even to the death (Schott), mortally,³ but as Stolz renders it, ye kill and envy; see Kern in loc. In Rev. iii. 19 the two verbal notions can easily be taken each by itself. Others, even Züllig, find here a hysteronproteron; Hengstenberg on the passage is right.

Against the rendering of Mark x. 21 ἠγάπησεν αὐτῶν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἐλέας eum compellavit (also Schott), see Mey. in loc. ⁴

6. As prepositions without a case are sometimes used as adverbs (see § 50, note 2, p. 423), so on the other hand, and still more frequently, adverbs (especially of place and time) are connected with cases: as ἀμα (even in Her. 6, 118 ἀμα τῷ στρατῷ) which in later Greek became almost a preposition (ἀμα αὐτοῖς Matt. xiii. 29 equivalent to σὺν αὐτοῖς, cf. Lucian. Asin. 41, 45; Polyb. 4, 48, 6 etc. see Klotz, Devar. II. 97 sq.), ἐς of time and space (Klotz II. 564, cf. ἐς τοίνυν — for which the Greeks use ἐγρη, μέχρι, or in a

¹ Where the adverbial idea is promoted grammatically to an independence which does not logically belong to it, it can maintain such independence only by following the principal verb; cf. Plut. Cleom. 18 εἰσελθὼν καὶ βιωμένος equivalent to ξην εἰσελθὼν.

² The Hebrew verbs which when placed before other finite verbs are taken adverbially, express either an idea considered independently, as Job xix. 3 ye are not ashamed and ye desien me, or a general idea which is more precisely defined by one more special, as: he made haste and ran to meet the Philistines; he turned back and dug etc. In like manner 1 Sam. ii. 3; which poetic passage, however, cannot be used in explaining the prose of the N. T.

³ Gebner gains nothing by appealing to Jas. i. 11 and iii. 14 in support of this interpretation. In i. 11 ἀνέστην ὁ θεὸς ... καὶ εἴπαρε expresses the rapid scorning of the herbage more aptly than ἀνέστην εἴπαρε, cf. veni vidi vici, not veniens vidi, or veni videns vici. To rise and to scorched is one act; not, ‘after he is risen, he sets about scorching.’ It is precisely by expressing each of the moments by a finite verb that their rapid succession is more graphically represented. The second passage, iii. 14 μὴ κατακαυχάσθαι καὶ φεύγεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, I render (and Wiesinger concurs with me) do not glory and lie against the truth; κατὰ τὴν ἀλ. belongs properly to κατα-

⁴ κακακαυχάσθαι (Rom. xi. 18). But the apostle to explain κατακαυχάσθαι thruts in with a stronger expression. By resolving it into μὴ κατακαυχάσθαι καὶ φεύγεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθ., we gain only the antitypology κατὰ τ. ἀλ. φεύγεσθαι, while the κατὰ in κατακαυχάσθαι is wholly neglected.
7. Adverbs of place, even when not in relative clauses (§ 23, 2), are (originally by force of an attraction, Hm. Vig. 790, ad Soph. Antig. 517; Wex, Antig. I. 107; Weber, Demosth. p. 446; Krüger, grammata. Untersuchungen III. 306 ff.) interchanged by good prose writers; particularly adverbs of rest are joined to verbs of motion when at the same time continuance in a place is to be expressed, Hm. as above, Bhdy. 350 (see above, on ἐν, § 50, 4) cf. Matt. ii. 22 ἐφοβθήσατε ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν, xvii. 20; xxviii. 16. So in the later writers ἐκεῖ came to be used freely for ἐκείνῃ, τοῦ and ὅπου for τοῦ and ὅπου, ὅ with for whither. They are thus used in the Sept. and even in the N. T. (where e.g. ὅπου never occurs); as, 440 Jno. xviii. 3 ὁ Ἰουδασ... ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ μετὰ φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων.
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419 (Arrian. Epict. 24, 113),1 Rom. xv. 24 ἵστε ἵμων προσεμφόνως ἐκεῖ (to Spain), Jno. vii. 35; iii. 8 (πόθεν ἐρχεσθαι καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει), viii. 14; xi. 8; Luke xxiv. 28; Jas. iii. 4; Rev. xiv. 4, etc. This is an abuse easily to be explained in the language of conversation (in οὐδὲ and ἐνθαδε, ἐνταῦθοι, the meanings hic and huc coalesced still earlier, Krü. 268), and which ought not to be denied in the written language of the N. T.2

With respect to other adverbs of place, not only does ἐσώ stand 494 for within (ἐνδον does not occur in the N. T.) Jno. xx. 26; Acts v. 23 (Ezek. ix. 6; Lev. x. 18), but also ἐκεῖσε for ἐκεῖ Acts xxii. 5 ἀξιων καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖσε δύνασ (see Wets. in loc., cf. especially ὁ ἐκεῖσε οἰκέωντες Hippocr. vict. san. 2, 2 p. 35, and the Index to Agathias, to Menander, and to Malal. ed. Bonn.). On the other hand, Acts xiv. 26 ἰδεν ἡσαυ παραδεδομένοι τῇ χάρτῃ, as even Luther saw, is quite regular, cf. Mey. (and the emendation by Hemsterhuis, ἡσαυ, inadmissible in any case); and in Acts xxi. 3 ἐκεῖσε retains its meaning, as does ὅτου in Luke xii. 17. The adverbs ἐξωθεν, ἐσωθεν, κατω, in prose usage, as is well known, represent both relations, from without and without, downwards and beneath, etc.


That adverbs of place (relat.) are also used with reference to persons is well known, cf. Rev. ii. 13 παρ' ὕμων, ὅτου ὁ σαταν. 4

1 Her. 1, 121 ἔλαβον ἐκεῖ plainly signifies: having arrived there (cf. the preceding τοὺς χαρπαν ἐς Πέφρασαι), and so might ἐρχεσθαι in Jno. xviii. 3 perhaps be rendered. Heb. vi. 20 ἂν οὐ πρόθρομος εἰρήδεις may mean, where entered; see Böhme, whom Block has not understood.

2 Many passages, to be sure, have been referred to this head which are of another sort, e.g. Matt. xxvi. 36; Luke xii. 17, 18. Here ἐκεῖ and ὅτι certainly mean: there, where. Not so Luke x. 1, where Höldemann's translation ubi iter facere in animo erat is false because ἐρχεσθαι does not mean iter facere. Cf. Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 106.

3 It is, indeed, not to be overlooked that forms such as τοῖς, τοῖς, also ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖναι, might be easily exchanged by transcribers, as actually happens often in MSS. of Greek authors (Schaaf. Eurip. Hec. 1062). Nevertheless, in the case of the N. T. the number of such variations noted is extremely small. Also corrections, as Acts xxii. 5 ἐκεῖ, very rarely occur, since the readers were too much accustomed to such use of these adverbs to take offence at it. Besides, the old (Homeric) language coincides with the later prose in the interchange of local adverbs, while Attic prose keeps the forms more distinct.
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The Greek language has, as is well known, two orders of negatives, οὐ, οὐτε, οὐκέτι (οὐδέοις) etc., and μη, μήτε, μηκέτι (μηδείς) etc. The distinction between the two has been most fully unfolded by Hermann (ad Vig. p. 804 ff.; cf. Mtth. II. 1437 ff.; Mdv. 235 ff.). Οὐ, for instance, is used when something is denied in plain terms and directly (as a matter of fact); μη, where something is denied as mere matter of thought (according to supposition, and under conditions): the former is the objective, the latter the subjective negation.¹ And this distinction is in substance observed also in the N. T.;² as will be clear first of all,

¹ Cf. besides, L. Richter, de usu et discrim. particul. οὐ et μη. Crossen, 1831–1834, Commenttt. 4to.; F. Franke, de particulis negotiib. linguae gr. Rintel. 1892–1893, Comment. 4to. (reviewed by Benfey, in n. Jahrh. f. Philol. XII. 147 ff.); Baumlein, in d. Zeitschr. f. Alterthumswiss. 1847. nr. 97–99, and remarks, highly instructive on the general subject also, concerning particular uses of both forms of negation in Hlm. Soph. Oed. R. 568; Ajac. 76; Philoct. 706; Eurip. Androm. 379; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 155 Lips.; Schaeff. Demoeth. I. 225, 465, 587, 591; II. 266, 327, 431, 492, 568; III. 288, 299; IV. 258; V. 730; Statlb. Plat. Phaed. p. 43, 144. The theory of Hermann is combated on the ground of Thiersch's principles by Hartung, Lehre von den griech. Partik. II. 73 ff., and he is followed by Rost, Gramm. 743; in the main, however, ho at last agrees with Herm., and the doubt through which he was led to his views has been solved by Klotz, Devar. II. 666. G. F. Gayler's essay, particular. gr. sermonis negantium accurata disputatio, Tubing. 1836. 8vo., is an industrious collection of examples, but is deficient in clearness.) On the difference between non and haud in Latin see Franke I. 7 sq., the review in Hall. L. Z. 1834. no. 145, and Hand, Tursell. III. 16 ff. (who at the same time explains οὐ as the qualitative, μη as the modal negation). The comparison of the Heb. ḫ with μη (Ewald, 530) can be less perfectly carried through; precisely in the more delicate relations the correspondence fails.

² That the N. T. authors observed almost invariably this in itself delicate difference, is due not to their theoretical knowledge, but to the sense of propriety they acquired by much intercourse with those who spoke Greek; precisely as we also learn the sometimes conventional difference between the synonyms of our mother tongue. In particular instances, however, a foreigner might well be expected to err, since even Plutarch (Schaef. Demosth. III. 289; Plutarch. V. 6, 142, 475), Lucian (Schaef. Demosth. I. 529; Schoennans, Plutarch. Agis p. 93; Fritzsche, quaestio. Lucian. p. 44), Pausan. (Franke, I. 14), Adrian (Jacobs, Acl. anim. p. 187), cf. Mdv. 245; Mtth. 1444, are, said to have sometimes interchanged the two negatives. Cf. also on δὲ μη for δὲ οὐ Ellendt, praef. ad Arrian. I. 24 sq. I would not, however, assert that in these passages grammatical acuteness might not repeatedly be able to discover the reason for οὐ or μη;
§ 55. NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

a. From the examination of a few passages in which the two negatives occur together. Jno. iii. 18 οἱ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται, 442 οἱ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἦδὲ κέρκιται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν etc. (cf. Hm. as above 805); κρίνεται is denied as matter of fact by οὐ, i.e. it is asserted that in fact a judgment does not take place. The second πιστεύων, however, is negated by the particle μὴ merely as a supposed case, for οἱ μὴ πιστ. means, who (ever) does not believe, if one does not believe (οἱ οὐ πιστεύων would indicate a definite individual who does not believe); hence follows also ὅτι μὴ πεπίστ., since a case is merely supposed (quod non crediderit). This usage is not contradicted by 1 Jno. v. 10 οἱ μὴ πιστεύων τῷ θεῷ φεύστην πεποίηκεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν etc. Here the apostle in the last words passes suddenly from the mere supposition (ὁ μὴ πιστ.) to the matter of fact: the μὴ πιστεύων had already begun, and John pictures to himself now an actual unbeliever.

Mark xii. 14 ἠκούσιν . . . δούναι ὃ οὐ; δώμεν, ἢ μὴ δώμεν; where, in the first instance, inquiry is made as to the objective reason for paying tribute; in the second, a subjective principle is expressed: are (ought) we to give etc. Cf. Hm. Vig. 806, on Aristoph. Thesmoph. Plat. rep. II. 270.

Eph. v. 15 βλέπετε πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε, μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἅλλ' ὡς σοφοί; the μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι etc. is the direct explanation of πῶς, and like that dependent on βλέπετε,—hence the subjective negation.

2 Cor. x. 14 οὖ γὰρ, ὡς μὴ ἐφικνοῦμεν εἰς ἐμᾶς, ὑπερεκτείνουμεν εαυτοὺς we do not overstretch ourselves (objectively negated), as though we had not reached to you, a mere supposition; in point of fact it is not so. Cf., on the other hand, 1 Cor. ix. 26.

Rom. xi. 21 εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μηποὺς οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται if God spared not (matter of fact, he has in reality not spared them), so (it is to be feared) lest he also spare not thee. Here the apostle might have uttered the sentence categorically, so will he also not spare thee; but he prefers to give it a milder turn by using μηποὺς: lest perhaps οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται become true; and every apprehension is subjective (Rev. ix. 4). Cf. Plat. Phaed. 76 b. φοβοῦμαι, μὴ αὑριον τευματίας οὐκέτι ἤ υἱοθρωμπῶν οὐδεὶς άξιός οἶδος τε τούτο ποιήσαι, p. 84 b. οὐδὲν δειμών, μὴ φοβηθῆ, ὅπως μὴ . . . οὐδὲν ἔτι οὐδαμοῦ ἦ, Thuc. 2, 76; see Gayler pp. 427, 430.

while we must never forget that sometimes there is no stringent reason in favor of οὐ or μὴ, but either negative may be used according to the author's view of the case, Hm. Vig. 806.
§ 55. NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

1 Jno. v. 16 ἐὰν τις ἔδη τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτάνωντα ἀμαρτάναν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον ... τὰς αὐτὰ ἀμαρτίας ἐστὶ καὶ ἐστὶν ἀμαρτία τοῦ πρὸς θάνατον (in the former clause μὴ is used as following up a subjective observation and dependent on ἐὰν ἔδη, in the latter οὐ, since an objectively valid principle is asserted, an idea dogmatically real is laid down).

Jno. vi. 64 εἰσὶν εὖ ὁμών τινες, οἷον πιστεύοντες; ἦδει γὰρ ... ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες, the former clause conveying a matter of fact, the second a supposition, who they were that would not believe, qui essent, qui non crederent. Cf. besides Rom. v. 13; 497 Jno. v. 28; xiv. 24; xv. 24; Acts iv. 20; x. 14; xxv. 17 f.; 1 Jno. iv. 8; v. 12; 3 Jno. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 10; Gal. iv. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 13; 448 Heb. iv. 2, 15.1

b. But the same result which these passages give follows also 422 from those in which μὴ occurs alone: Matt. xxii. 25 μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα ἀφήκε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, where μὴ ἔχων is used with reference to the law that made this provision (ἐὰν τις ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων etc. vs. 24): not having, he left behind etc., as one not having in the sense of the law, he left etc. (οὐκ ἔχων would exhibit the not having as if narrating something purely a matter of fact); in Mark xii. 20 we find in the narrative form οὐκ ἀφήκε σπέρμα. Col. i. 23 εἰγε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει ... καὶ μὴ μετακινοῦμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος, where the not being moved away (in a proposition beginning with εἰγε) is put as a condition, consequently as something only supposed. 2 Thess. i. 8 διδόντως ἐκδικήσων τοὺς μὴ εἰδότας θεὸν καὶ τοὺς μὴ ἰδακονουσί τῷ εὐαγγ.; the statement here is general: such as know not God, whoever they are, wherever such are to be found (consequently a supposition), cf. ii. 12. Rom. xiv. 21 καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα (the not eating as something supposed: ἵνα ἕνα εἰτὸν οὐκ; τὸ οὐ φαγεῖν would represent the not

1 Passages from Greek authors in which οὐ and μὴ appear together in the same main proposition, with more or less obvious difference, are e.g. Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 1, 3, 68 ταῦτα οὐκ ἀναλογούμενον ἢ, ἀλλὰ κακώς ἐπιστηροῦσιν κακὰ καὶ μηκέτι μετρίως, ἀλλὰ ἄρθιν ἐπιστηροῦμεν τὰς ἀπολογίας, 2, 60 λεκτέαν, ὅσ' εἰ μὴ ἓν ὦτι διτυπρικής τέλεως, οὐκ ἑν ὥστε διτυπρικῇ (2, 107), 2, 110; hypotyp. 3, 1, 2; Lucian. catalog. 15 ἐγὼ δὲ μὴ ἐχὼν ἔχων ἐνέχυρον εἰς τὴν βίαν, οὐκ ἐγὼν, οὐ πνευμάτως, οὐ χωριστόν εἰς. Soph. Antig. 686 οὐ γὰρ ἐν δυνάμει, μὴ τε ἐπιστηροῦμεν λέγειν, Philoct. 1048; Demosth. Call. 756 b.; pac. 23 a.; Phorm. 604 a.; Xen. C. 2, 4, 27; Aristot. polit. 6, 8; rhet. 1, 11, 31; 2, 2, and 15; Lucian. dial. mort. 16, 2; adv. indoct. 5; Strabo 3, 138; 15, 712; Himer. oratt. 23, 18; Plutarch. Pompej. 23; apophth. p. 183 f.; Aelian. anim. 5, 28; Joseph. Antt. 16, 9, 3. Cf. besides, Gayler p. 291. From the Fathers, cf. Orig. c. Marc. p. 26 Wetst. ; from the apocrypha, Acta apocr. p. 107. Particularly noteworthy is Agath. 2, 23 ὅρ' ἐγὼ δὲ σώματι μηθατασταίον οἱ δρινεῖς οἱ οὖν οὐκ αὐτίκα ἐκποιοῦσιν οἰκοπαράξιον εἰςἀπαράξιον εἰς.
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eating as something objective,—an actually existing practice it may be). Rom. x.v. 1 ὀφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς ... καὶ μὴ ἱαυτοῖς ἀφέσκειν (vs. 3 narratively: καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἣρεσεν). Hence, naturally, with the Optative when a mere wish is expressed (Franke I. 27), Mark xi. 14 μηκέτε ἐκ σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰώνα μηδεὶς καρπὸν φύγοι (yet some Codd. read here φάγει), 2 Tim. iv. 16; and in Imperative sentences, Rom. xiv. 1 τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προσ-498 λαμβάνεσθε, μή εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν (xii. 11); Phil. ii. 12, where some erroneously refer the words μὴ ὡς ἐν τῇ παρονίᾳ etc. to ἑπικούσατε, in which case οὐ would have been indispensable.

In accordance with the difference above defined, μή in general will express the weaker (cf. also Hm. Philoct. 706), and οὐ, as categorical, the stronger negation. Nevertheless μή is also at times more emphatic than οὐ (Hm. Soph. Antig. 691), inasmuch as, if 444 (even) the supposition is denied, more is expressed than if the actual existence of a thing (as a fact) is denied. See under no. 5. In like manner is the Latin haud sometimes the stronger, sometimes the weaker negation, Franke I. 7; cf. Hand, Tursell. III. 20.

Where οὐ belongs to a single word (verb) to which in the language there is a negative directly antagonistic, it coalesces with that word and expresses this exactly contrary idea, as οὐκ ἔστω to prevent Acts xvi. 7, οὐ 423 θέλω nolle 1 Cor. x. 1. See Franke I. 9 sq., cf. under no. 6. Οὐ combined with nouns into one idea obliterates their meaning altogether: Rom. x. 19 παραχίζεσθε ὑμᾶς εἰπ' οὐκ ἐδίναν ὑμῖν ἔνα πολιτείαν, ix. 25 καλῶς τὸν οὐ λαὸν μοῦ λαῶν μοῦ καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἡγαμήλην ἡγαμήλην, 1 Pet. ii. 10 — (all quotations from O. T.); cf. Thuc. 1, 187 ὑ τὸ διάλυσης the not breaking (the bridge had not been broken), 5, 50 ὑ ὡς ἐξονία, Eurip. Hippol. 196 οὐκ ἀπόδειξε, see Monk in loc.; Sturz, ind. ad Dion. Cass. p. 245; Fr. Rom. II. 424. How this combination differs from that with μή (ἢ μὴ διάλυσις), see Franke, as above, I. 9. Numerous examples of both in Gayler p. 16 sqq.

The simple, accented, οὐκ ὡσ (Matt. v. 37; Jas. v. 12; 2 Cor. i. 17 f.) occurs in answer to a question only in Matt. xiii. 29; Jno. i. 21, (for instances from Greek writers, see Gayler p. 161); the fuller form οὐκ ἔγωγε would have been more usual.

2. Let us consider now those cases, the most frequent of all, in which a negation is expressed by μή; this takes place:

a. In (wishes) commands, resolutions, encouragements, and that not only with verbs of the sort, that is to say Imperatives and Subjunctives, Matt. vii. 1 μὴ κρίνετε, Gal. v. 26 μὴ γυνώσκετε κενό-δοκον, 2 Thess. iii. 10, see § 56, 1, but also with words which are
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considered as integral parts of the command, etc., 1 Pet. v. 2 τομάσατε ... μὴ ἀναγκαστός, 1 Pet. i. 13 f.; 1 Tim. v. 9; Luke vi. 35; 1 Cor. v. 8; Rom. xiii. 13; Phil. ii. 4, 12; Heb. x. 25; Acts x. 20.

b. In telic clauses, with ἐν Matt. vii. 1; xvi. 20; Rom. xi. 25; Eph. ii. 9; Heb. xii. 3; Mark v. 43; 2 Cor. v. 15; vii. 9; Eph. 499 iv. 14, or ὅτι Luke xvi. 26; 1 Cor. i. 29; Matt. vi. 18; Acts viii. 24; xx. 16. So also with single words of such clauses, Rom. viii. 4; Eph. ii. 12 [?]; Phil. i. 27 f.; iii. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 12; Heb. xii. 27.

c. In conditional sentences (Hm. Vig. 805), with εἰ Jno. xv. 22 εἰ μὴ ἡλθον, ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐξοσάν, xviii. 30 εἰ μὴ ήν οὕτως κακῶν ποιῶν, οὐκ ἂν σοί παρεδόκαμεν, Matt. xxiv. 22; Acts xxvi. 32; Rom. vii. 7; Jno. ix. 33, and with εὰν Matt. v. 20; xii. 29; Rom. x. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 5, not only with reference to the whole proposition, but also with single words which are considered as conditional, 1 Tim. v. 21; Tit. i. 6 εἰ τις ἐστιν ἀνέγκλητος ... μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας, ii. 8; Jas. i. 4, 26.

In all these cases the necessity of the subjective negation is clear; for every condition, design, purpose, command, falls within the province of what is merely conceived of.

In conditional sentences οὐ occurs not infrequently; in the N.T. 445 pretty often, in the older writers with logical necessity only where but a single word of the conditional sentence (hardly the verb merely Kru. 271) is negated, so that the negation coalesces with this word into a single idea, Hm. Vig. 833; Eurip. Med. p. 344; Soph. Oed. C. 596; Schaaf. Plut. IV. 396; Mehilhorn, Anacr. p. 139; Bremsi, Lys. p. 111; Schoemann, Isae. p. 324 sq.; e.g. 424 Soph. Aj. 1181 εἰ τοῦ θανόντος οὐκ εἰς δαίμων εἰ διδός hinderest (Iliad. 4, 55), Lys. Agor. 62 εἰ μὲν οὐ πολλοί (i.e. δλέγων) ἔσαν, Thuc. 3, 55 εἰ ἀποστάσει Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἰδολομαίες, Her. 6, 9. Cf. Gayl. p. 99 sqq.; Mtth. 1440; Kru. 271. (On the analogous ὅτα οὐ see Held, Plut. Timol. 857.) According to this there is nothing strange in Matt. xxvi. 42; Luke xvi. 31; Jno. v. 47; Rom. viii. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 10, 14; 1 Tim. iii. 5; v. 8; Rev. xx. 15, etc., and as little in 2 Cor. xii. 11 εἰ καὶ οὐδέν εἰμι.

On the other hand, Lipsius (de moror. in N. T. usu p. 26 sqq.) has adduced a number of other passages, which contradict the

1 Schaaf. Demosth. III. 288: οὐ poni licet, quando negatio refertur ad sequentem vocem cum eaque sic coalescit, unam ut ambae notionem efficient; μὴ ponitur, quando negatio pertinet ad particulam conditionalem. Cf. Rost, Gr. S. 745.
above canon, or appear to do so; since, indeed, generally in the N. T. *if not* is expressed more frequently by *ei ou* than by *ei μή*, which latter phrase most commonly signifies *except*. We divide these passages into four classes:

a) Such as have nothing to do with the question: Luke xii. 26 *ei ou'de eláxistōn dínāsōte, tī peri tōn λουτρών μεριμνάτε;* for *ei* here is conditional only in appearance; in reality it is equivalent to *ἐτέι*, Krū. 271. Translate *if* (as is clear from the alleged cases), i.e. *since you cannot do even the least etc.* (hence always *θαυμάζω ei ou* cf. Kühner II. 406). So also Rom. xi. 21; Jno. iii. 12; v. 47; x. 35; 2 Pet. ii. 4; cf. Soph. Oed. Col. 596 *ei thēlonτάς γ' ou'de soi phεύγειν καλόν ei, quum te volunt recipere, ne tibi quidem decorum est exsulem esse*, and Aeschin. ep. 8 *ei δὲ ou'de sīn έκείνῳ δίεγγομας έξίναι etc.*, Sext. Empir. Math. 7, 434 *ei ou'd' aiτό toútō ήδεi etc*. Xenoph. A. 7, 1, 29; Aesop. 28, 2, see Bhdy. 386; Franke, Demosth. p. 202; Gayl. 118; Hm. Aeschyl. II. 148.

b) Such as, when viewed more closely, are in unison with the above canon: not only 1 Cor. xi. 6 *ei γάρ ou' kατακαλύπτεται γυνή, kal κεφάλασθω if a woman is unveiled, she ought also to be shorn*, 2 Thess. iii. 10, but also Jno. x. 37 *ei ou ποιώ τὰ έργα τού πατρός μου, μή πιστεύετε μοι; ei δὲ ποιώ, κάν ἐμοί μὴ πιστεύητε, τοὺς έργους πιστεύσατε if I omit the works of my Father (and thus withhold from you the proofs of my divine mission) etc.; but if I do them etc., Jno. iii. 12; Rom. viii. 9; Rev. xx. 15; cf. Lys. accus. Agor. 446 76 *εἰν μὲν οὖν φάσκη Φρύνιχον ἀποκείμαι, τούτων μέμνησθε . . . εἰν δ' οὖν φάσκη, ερεσθε αὐτῶν etc. but if he denies it, Sext. Empir. Math. 2, 111 *εἰ μὲν λήμματα τῶν ἔχει . . . εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔχει etc. but if he is destitute of them, 9, 176 *εἰ οὖκ ἔχει, φαῦλον ἔστι τὸ θείον . . . εἰ δὲ ἔχει, ἔσται τι τοῦ θεοῦ κρίτερον, hypotyp. 2, 5, 160. 175; Lucian. paras. 12; Galen. temper. 1, 8; Mr. Anton. 11, 18 p. 193 Mor. (cf. also Euseb. de die dom. p. 9 Jani). Nor is there anything to object against 1 Cor. xv. 13: *ei ἀνάσταςις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστι if the resurrection of the dead is a chimera, etc.; cf. in the preceding context τῶν λέγουσι τινες ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστω; On vs. 16 cf. Philostr. Apoll. 4, 16, p. 154.

c) Cases in which the proposition with *ei ou* merely negatives the idea which is expressed affirmatively in a corresponding proposition, without the *ou* coalescing with the negativated word into a

---

1 *ei ou* and *ei μή* are well distinguished in a single sentence in Acta Thom. p. 57 ed. Thilo.
single opposed idea: 1 Cor. ix. 2 ei ἄλλοις οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν εἰμὶ, si aliis non sum apostolus, vobis certe sum. Luke xi. 8, cf. xviii. 4. But even in such oppositions later writers use ei οὐ, e.g. Sext. Empir. Math. 11, 5 ei μὲν ἄγαθόν ἐστιν, ἐν τῶν τριῶν γενήσεσαι, ei δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄγαθόν, ἦτοι κακόν ἐστιν, ἢ οὔτε κακόν ἐστιν οὔτε ἄγαθόν ἐστιν, Diog. L. 2, 36 ei μὲν γὰρ τί τῶν προσόντων λέξεων, διορθώσωσιν, ei δὲ οὐ, οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, where the sense is 501 not: if, however, they be silent about it, but, if they do not say something useful,1 cf. Judg. ix. 20; Judith v. 21; Demosth. ep. p. 125 a.; Basilic. II. 525, and Poppo Xen. Anab. p. 358.

d) Cases in which οὐ likewise antithetically denies, without, however, an express affirmative proposition preceding: Jas. ii. 11 ei οὐ παρακεχώρης (with reference to the preceding μὴ παρακεχώρης), φονεύσεσι δὲ, γένοντας παραβάτης νόμον εἴ τι δεῖ πολλάκις δικαστήριον, yet εἴ τι δεῖ πολλάκις δικαστήριον, ἦτοι ἄνδραμα (where the rendering, εἴ σαν ἔμεινεν the Lord, would probably not represent the apostle's meaning); 2 Jno. 10 εἴ τις ἐρχεται πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ ταῦτῃ τῷ διδαχῆν οὐ φέρει, Luke xiv. 26.

For the later prose writers, then, who in general use ei οὐ (as the stronger and more expressive form) much oftener than the older writers (who were rather frugal in its use), we may state the rule thus (cf. also Anton, Pr.gr. de discrim. particul. οὐ et ἦμ, Gorlic. 1823, 4to. p. 9): where not in a conditional proposition is emphatic,2 ei οὐ (as in Latin si non) is used; but where εἰ not stands without emphasis on the negation, εἰ μὴ (as in Latin nisi): 447 e.g. if thou dost not commit adultery (with reference to the pre-
ceeding μὴ μοιχ.,) if any man loveth not the Lord (as he ought), if I am not an apostle unto others, Jno. i. 25 if thou art not the Christ, cf. vs. 20. The emphasis is brought out by an antithesis, either open (1 Cor. ix. 2) or concealed (1 Cor. xvi. 22). It lies, however, in the nature of the case that οὐ then negatives only a part of the conditional proposition, not the proposition itself.

1 Macar. homil. 1, 10. Cf. also 1Diog. L. 1, 105 εἰ τῶν τούτων τοῦτον οὐ χρύς, γέρων γενόμενος θανάτος οὐσιν.
3 Meklhorn, as above, gives the rule: ubi simpliciter negatio affirmationi ita opponatur, ut negandī part. vocē sit ascuda, semper οὐ poni, ubi contra verbum vocē inprimis, notandum μὴ esse debere. Cf. also Poppo on Xen. Anab. as above.
4 Cf. also e.g. Aesop. 7, 4 ei οὐ καὶ τοῦτο προσβήσεις, οὐκ δὲ γῆς αὐτῷ συνεβολέων if it were not useful to thee, thou wouldst not advise us to it.
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"ὅτε" (Krt. p. 272 f.) of a consequence even when represented as mere matter of fact is used in the N.T. always with "μὴ" and the Infinitive, Matt. viii. 28; Mark i. 45; ii. 2; iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 7; 1 Thess. i. 8. Only in 2 Cor. iii. 7 is there a logical ground for it in the conditional proposition; Engelhardt, Plat. apol. p. 219.

426 After "ὅτε" and "ὅτι" because (in direct discourse) of follows regularly, Jno. viii. 20, 37; Rom. xi. 6; Luke i. 34; Bäumlein S. 773; "ὅτι μῇ" in conditional discourse occurs in Jno. iii. 18. On the contrary, we have in Heb. ix. 17, in direct discourse, "διαθήκη ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπὶ μῇ ποτὲ ἡγίστε, ὅτε ζῆτο διαθέματος, which Böhme explains thus: "μῇποτε" seems here to negative even the idea of "ἡγίστε"; consequently in general to deny more strongly than "οὐποτε". Yet Böhme's rendering of "μῇποτε" by "nondum" is erroneous; it means, never, never at all (Heliod. 2, 19). And perhaps the author gave the preference to "μῇποτε" on this account also, because he is speaking in general terms and not of any particular testament. However, in later authors the subjective negation frequently occurs in connection with "ὅτι" ("ὅτι" quandoquidem, not only where something is clearly designated as a subjective reason (as is perceptible even in Aelian. 12, 63; cf. besides, Philostr. Apoll. 7, 16; Lucian. Hermot. 47), but also where an objectively valid reason is assigned (Gayl. 183 sqq.; Mdv. p. 245; on Lucian and Arrian in particular, Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. præfet. p. 23 sqq., cf. also Ptol. geogr. 8, 1, 3), in so far as the reason falls back at last on a supposition. Others (Bengel, Lchm.) take "μῇποτε" in Heb., as above, as an interrogative, as indeed "ὅτι" often introduces a question, Rom. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; xv. 29; Klotz, Devar. p. 543. This seems to me, however, to be too rhetorical for the style.

3. e. In relative clauses with "ἄν" (ἐὰν), Luke viii. 18 διὰ ἄν μὴ ἔχω, Acts iii. 23 (Sept.) πᾶσα ψυχή, ἣτις ἐὰν μὴ ἄκουσῃ, Rev. xiii. 15 δοει ἄν μὴ προσκυνήσωσι, Luke ix. 5. In all these cases nothing is denied as a matter of fact of particular subjects, but the language is only conditional and supposed: whoever hath not (may not have). Relative clauses without "ἄν" have regularly "οὐ", Jno. iv. 22 προσκυνεῖτε δ' οὐκ οἰδατε, Luke xiv. 27 δετις οὐ βαστάζει, Rom. x. 14; 1 Cor. v. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 10; 1 Jno. iv. 6, etc., so far forth as they deny something as matter of fact; on the other hand, "μὴ" occurs sometimes in such cases when the negation refers only to a supposition (assumption, condition) (Hm. Vig. 805; Krt. 271), 2 Pet. i. 9 θ' μὴ πάρεστι παύτα, τυφλός ἐστιν whoso lacketh, if any man lacketh, etc. In 1 Tim. v. 13; Tit. i. 11 τὰ μὴ δέουτα and δι μὴ δεῖ (cf. Rom. i. 28; Soph. Phil. 588) express merely a moral conception: quae, si quae non sunt honesta; whereas δι οὐ δεῖ would denote positively inhonesta, the kind of unseemly things objectively present, cf. Gayl. 240 f. In Col. ii. 18 μὴ before
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ἔφρακεν is expunged by the more recent critics; only Tisch. in the 2d [and 7th] Leipzig ed. restores it, and undoubtedly it has 503 the greatest amount of external authority on its side (Mey. states the authorities imperfectly). If the negation [which is wanting, moreover, in Cod. Sin.*] be genuine (some authorities have οὐ), μὴ must be used because even the relative clause is viewed by 427 Paul subjectively, as μηδεὶς ὑμ. καταβραβευτῶ.2

Frequently ὅς is followed by οὗ, where, since apparently a mere supposition is uttered, some have expected μὴ (Lipsius de modis p. 14), as in Matt. xxiv. 2 οὗ μὴ ἄφθασ pdf λίδος ἐκεί λίθον, ὅς οὗ καταλυθῆσεται (but here μὴ is not indispensable, inasmuch as the words deny a matter of fact); and also where in Latin the Subjunctive would stand, and therefore μὴ would have been expected, Matt. x. 26 οὗδεν ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον, δὲ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθῆσεται, Luke viii. 17; xii. 2; Matt. xxiv. 2; cf. 1 Kings viii. 46. For instances from Greek authors (Hm. Vig. p. 709) see Eur. Hel. 509 sq. ἀνὴρ γὰρ οὗδεις ἔδει ... ὅς ... οὗ δῶσει ἔρωταν, Lucian. sacrific. 1 οὗκ οὐδα, εἰ τις οὕτω κατηφορέστη ἐστι, ὅτιος οὗ γελάσηται, Soph. Oed. R. 374 οὗδεις ὅς οὗ χί τάνυ ὁνειδεῖ τάχα. In all these cases the relative clause is considered as a definite, objective predicate, as if it were said ἀνὴρ οὗδεις ἔδει οὗ δῶσει ἔρωταν, even in construction with the Optative, Isocr. Evagor. p. 452 οὗκ ἔστων, ὅτι οὗκ ἐν Ἀλκάδος προκρίνειεν, also p. 199; Plut. apophth. p. 196 c. Closely allied to this is the phrase τής ἐστώ, ὅς οὗ followed by the Pres. indic. Acts xix. 35; Heb. xii. 7; cf. Dion. comp. 11 ed. Schaeff. p. 120, which in sense is equivalent to οὗδεις ἔστω, ὅς οὗ (for which Strabo 6, 286 has οὗδεν μέρος αὐτῆς ἔστω, ὅ μὴ τυχάνει); on the other hand, οὗδεις ἔστω, ὅς οὗ with the Preterite, is beyond the range of those cases in which one would expect μὴ. Xen. An. 4, 5, 31; Thuc. 3, 81; Lucian. Tox. 22; asin. 49; cf. Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 233; Weber, Demosth. 356 sq. See also Gayl. p. 257 sqq., who, it must be confessed, has not discriminated sufficiently.

4. f. With Infinitives (Mth. 1442; Kri. 278), not only such as depend on a verb of thinking, speaking, commanding, wishing (of 449 course also in the construction of the Accusative with the Infini-
tive) Matt. ii. 12; v. 34, 39; Luke ii. 26; v. 14; xx. 7; xxi. 14; Acts iv. 17 f. 20; v. 28; x. 28; xv. 19, 38; xix. 31; xxi. 4; xxiii. 8; xxvii. 21; Rom. ii. 21 f.; xii. 3; xiii. 3; 1 Cor. v. 9, 11;

1 Cf. Philostr. Apoll. 7, 27 διελέγετο δὲ μὴ ἓκεινον προβαίνει quae 3illi hand prodestent. From the Sept. may be adduced Exod. ix. 21 δὲ μὴ προσέλθη τή διανοία eis τὴ βημα κυρίου in opposition to δ ἴμοδομινος τῆ βῆμα κυρίου vs. 20; thus just like εἰ ἃ μὴ in antithesis. οὗ and μὴ after relat. in parallel propositions, see Arrian. Epicr. 2, 2, 4.

2 In propositions with particles of time (Gayl, p. 185 sqq.) μὴ does not happen to occur in the N. T.; several times οὗ is quite regularly joined to the Indicative of time, Jno. ix. 4; xvi. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Acts xxii. 11.
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2 Cor. ii. 1; x. 2; Heb. ix. 8, etc., or by which a design is expressed 2 Cor. iv. 4 ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοηματὰ ... εἰς τὸ μή αἰγύσαι, 1 Thess. ii. 9 ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρήσαι, Acts xx. 27 οὐχ ἑπεστειλάμην τοῦ μὴ ἅγαγεται, 1 Pet. iv. 2,—but also where the Infinitive is the subject of a proposition, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρείττων ἵνα αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι, Luke xvii. 1, or, being joined to a proposition, is resolvable into a finite verb with οὐ, Jas. iv. 2 οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς (ὅτι οὐκ ἀιτεῖσθε ὑμεῖς), Luke viii. 6; Acts xxviii. 18; Heb. x. 2. But in that first case ἐπεγνωκ. is denied only as a supposition (in fact they had known), and in the second the cause is represented not objectively, but as primarily, the thought of the speaker. Precedents from the classics for all this, see in Gayler 294 sqq.; cf. Rost 750; Bäumlein nr. 99, S. 788 f. Also those parts of speech which belong essentially to the Infinitive clause are negated by μὴ, e.g. 2 Cor. x. 2.

The cases in the Infinitive construction in which οὐ is, and can or must be, used have been pointed out by Rost 747 f.; Krü. 274; Bäumlein S. 778. In Jno. xxi. 25 εἰς γράφηται καθ’ ἐν, οὐδ’ αὐτῶν οἷμαι τῶν κόσμων χαρῆσαι τὰ γραφ. βιβλία the negation belongs to οἷμαι, cf. Xen. M. 2, 2, 10 ἐγὼ μὲν οἷμαι, εἰ τοιαύτην μὴ δύνασαι φέρειν μητέρα, ἀγαθὰ σε οὐ δύνασθαι φέρειν. In Heb. vii. 11 τὸς ἐτί χρεία κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδ. ἔτερον ἀνίστασαι ἰερὰ καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν 'Ααρών λέγεσθαι the negation does not belong to the Infinitive, but negatives the words κατὰ τ. τάξιν. Οὐ is often in dependent clauses joined thus to a single word, Krü. S. 270.

When after a verb of understanding or saying, in direct discourse etc., the assertion, observation etc. is expressed in a clause with δὴ, the negation is made by οὐ, Luke xiv. 24 λέγω ὑμῖν, δὴ οὐδεὶς τῶν ἄνδρων ... γείσται τοῦ δείκτου, xviii. 29; Jno. v. 42 ἔρνωκα ὑμᾶς δὴ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε etc., viii. 55; Acts ii. 31 etc. The proposition with δὴ stands here as a pure objective proposition just as in indirect question (§ 41, 4), as if it were οὐδεὶς ... γείσται, τότε ὑμῖν λέγω, while the Infinitive construction brings it into immediate connection with, and consequently dependence on, λέγω, δρῶ etc. Cf. Krü. 253, 270; Mdv. 235.

5. g. With Participles (Gayl. 274 sqq.; Krü. 274 f.) μὴ is used not only when they belong to a proposition which, as expressing command, design, condition, etc., requires the subjective negation (see no. 2), Eph. v. 27; Phil. i. 28; ii. 4; iii. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 12; Heb. vi. 1; Jas. i. 5; Tit. ii. 9 f.; Rom. viii. 4; xiv. 3; Matt. xxii. 24; Acts xv. 38; Luke iii. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 21; cf. Soph. Oed.
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C. 1155, 980; Plato, rep. 2, 370 e.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 26; Krü. 275, 450
— but also under other circumstances:

a. when they refer, not to particular persons, but to a supposed 505
genus: Matt. xii. 30 ὅ μὴ δὲν μετ’ ἐμοῦ κατ’ ἐμοῦ ἐστίν he who is not with me i.e. whoever belongs to this class of men that I have in mind, *si quis non stet a meis partibus*, Hn. Vig. 805; Mthh. 1441 sq.; Krü. 174 (ὁ οὐκ δὲν μετ’ ἐμοὺ would mean a particular individual who actually was not with him), Matt. xxv. 29; Luke vi. 49; Jno. x. 1; xii. 48; xx. 24 [?]; Rom. iv. 5; xiv. 22; Jas. ii. 18;
iv. 17; 1 Jno. ii. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 37; hence with πᾶς Matt. xiii. 19;
Jno. xv. 2. Also 2 Jno. 7 πολλοὶ πλάνοι εἰδὴλθουν εἰς τὸν κόσμον οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χρ. etc. belongs here; the words do not mean many deceivers — namely, those who do not confess (οἱ οὐχ ὁμ.); — but, many deceivers, all those who do not confess, quicunque non profitetur.

B. when they apply to particular persons indeed, but ascribe to them a quality only conditionally or in thought: Luke xi. 24 ὅταν ... ἐξῆλθα ... διέρχεσαι ἐδ' ἀνύδρου τῶν χιτῶν ἀνάπανος, καὶ μὴ εὑρίσκων λέγει i.e. he finds it not, in case he does not etc., Rom.
ii. 14; Gal. vi. 9 θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλύόμενοι, Luke xii. 47 ἐκεῖνος ὁ δούλος (vs. 45 f.) ὁ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας μηδέ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα δαρήσεται (this is propounded as one of two possible cases); 1 Cor.
x. 33 πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω, μὴ χιτῶν τὸ ἐμαντὸν συμφέρον I seek to please all, (supposition) as one who, inasmuch as I etc., ix. 21;
2 Cor. vi. 3; Rom. xv. 23; 1 Thess. iii. 1, 5 (against Rückert see Lünemann in loc.); Jno. vii. 15 πῶς ὅτι ηράματα οἶδε μὴ μεμαθηκώς; since he can't have learned (since we, surely, know him to be such a one as has never learned? cf. Philostr. Apoll.
3, 22 ὁ καὶ γράφει μὴ μαθὼν ηράματα). Luke vii. 33 ἔθηκαν Ἰωάννης μὴ ἐσθίων ἄρτων μὴ θάνων ὅτι ἔσθαν without having eaten ... drunken (spoken from the position of those who, observing this, are introduced as saying so); οὐτὲ ἐσθίων οὐτὲ πίνων would express the predicates as pure matters of fact. In Luke iv. 85 τὸ δαμόνων ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μὴδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν, by the last words the author does not mean to relate a mere matter of fact (οὐδὲν βλάψῃ. αὐτόν and did not harm him), but to exclude merely the thought that the evil spirit had in any way injured the possessed: he had not (as one might perhaps have thought) injured him.

Thus μὴ is very often to be understood: Acts v. 7; xx. 22;
Heb. iv. 15; xi. 8; Matt. xxii. 12. Cf. what Klotz says, Devar.
p. 666: quibus in locis omnibus propterea μὴ positum est, non οὐ,
quod ille, qui loquitur, non rem ipsam spectat sed potius cogitationem rei, quam vult ex animo audientis amovere (Plut. Pompej. 506 c. 64); Hm. Vig. 806. In Matt. xviii. 25 μὴ ἔχουσος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκείνουν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ πραξῆναι etc. the first words express a fact, indeed, as he had not; but in this construction they are put in close relation with ἐκεῖνος: he commanded, because that man had not, because he knew that the man had not, etc. So also Acts xxi. 34; Luke ii. 45; xxiv. 23; Acts ix. 26; xiii. 28; xvii. 6; xxvii. 7, 20; 1 Pet. iv. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9; cf. Plut. Pompej. c. 23 and Alex. 51; Polyb. 17, 7, 5; 5, 80, 5. On Rom. ix. 11 see Fr. Acts xx. 29 οἵεν διὰ εἰσελεύσοντα ... λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς υἱὰς, μηθ' οἰκειομενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου is, as the Future shows, to be taken altogether as an ideal picture. Also Heb. ix. 9 μὴ δύναμαι κατὰ συνελεύσεις τελείωσαι etc. is spoken in the view of the writer; had it been οὐ δύναμαι, an actual inherent property would have been signified (not being able), but such offerings Israelites would not have presented. 1 Cor. i. 28 ἔξελέξατο τὸ υἱόν τὰ μὴ προσέτα, ὥστε τὰ πρῶτα κατατέθησαι; where τὰ οὐκ πρῶτα would signify (Hm. Vig. 889) the non-existing (as a single negative idea), but τὰ μὴ πρῶτα must mean which were reckoned as things that did not exist; the πρῶτα is negated as a supposition, not spoken actually of nonentities. In 2 Cor. iv. 18 (even in the second proposition, which is categorical) τὰ βλέπομενα stands opposed τὰ μὴ βλέποντα, not τὰ οὐ βλέπ. (Heb. xi. 1). This last would denote what actually is not seen (τὰ ἀδάρσα), but τὰ μὴ βλέπ. expresses, in conjunction with μὴ σκοποῦσαν ἡμῶν, the subjective view of the believer, cf. Heb. xi. 7. Also in 2 Cor. v. 21 τῶν μὴ γνώσατε ἀμαρτίαν ἐνέπνευσεν, the μὴ γνώσατε carries us back to the conception of him who makes him ἀμαρτία; τὸν οὐ γνώσατο would be objective and equivalent to τὸν ἀγνώσαα,2 Isae. 1, 11 and Schoem. in loc. 2 Cor. vi. 3 does not read οὐδεμιὰς ἐν οὐδενι διδοῦσας προσκοπῆν, because this would exhibit merely an actually existing characteristic, but μὴ θεμιὰς ἐν μηθεί διδ. τρ. because the characteristic is regarded, in connection with παρακαλοῦμεν vs. 1, as subjectively adhered to and continually striven after. Cf. besides, Luke vii. 50; Jno. vii. 49; 1 Cor. ix. 20 f. So with ὡς in subjective speech, 1 Cor. iv. 7 τί καυχᾶσαι ὡς μὴ λαβόν; iv. 18; vii. 29; 2 Cor. x. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 16; Gayler 278 sq. (otherwise 1 Cor. ix. 26, see below).

1 Μὴ πρῶτα and οὐκ πρῶτα are united in Xen. An. 4, 4, 15.
2 The remark of Rückert on this passage, that in Greek ὡς never stands between the article and participle but always μηθ, is wholly empirical, and false besides, and has been properly refuted by Mey.
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On the other hand, ὁ with participles (and adjectives) — with which it occurs far less frequently — negatives actually and without qualification (Gayl. 287 sq.; Mtth. 1442), and hence stands especially with predicates which are denied of definite persons:¹ Phil. iii. 8 ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν ἡ περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι θεῷ λατρεύοντες ... 452 καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποίθοτες (the ἡμεῖς, since they actually are πνεύμ. θεῷ λατρ., are denied to be ἐν σαρκὶ πεποίθοτες); 1 Pet. ii. 10 ὡμεῖς ... οἱ οὐκ ἐλεημόνει, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες, Rom. ix. 25 (LXX.); Heb. xi. 35 ἐλάβω γυναῖκες ... ἀλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν οὖ προσδέξαμεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν (not accepting, i.e. disdaining); Col. ii. 19 εἰς εὐθυμίες ... καὶ οὐ κρατῶν, although the sentence is imperative (vs. 18 μηδείς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετο and δ μη ἐφόρακεν etc.), yet with οὐ κρατ. the apostle passes over to a predicate actually existing, Acts xvii. 27; Luke vi. 42; 1 Cor. ix. 26 ἔγω οὗτω πνεύμων, ὡς οὐκ ἄερα δέρων (οὐκ ἄερα δέρ. a concrete predicate which Paul attributes to himself, ὃς is qualitative; ὃς μη δ. δ. would be as if I would not beat the air), Gal. iv. 27 (LXX) εὐφράνθησε στείρα ὡς τύπουσα etc. thou that bearest not! of a historic person; see besides 1 Cor. iv. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 8 f.; Acts xxvi. 22; xxviii. 17; Heb. xi. 1, (adjectives with οὐ Rom. viii. 20; Heb. ix. 11); cf. Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 6; Her. 9, 88; Plato, Phaed. 80 e.; Demosth. Zenothem. p. 576 b.; Strabo 17, 796 and 822; Diod. S. 19, 97; Philostr. Apol. 7, 32; Aelian. 10, 11; Lucian. Philops. 5; peregr. 34.

In 1 Pet. i. 8 both the negatives are used together: δν οὐκ εἴδοτες ἀγαπάτε, εἰς δν ἄρτι μη ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιάσθε etc.; the οὐκ εἴδ. expresses the negative idea (personally) unknown as a matter of fact; the μη ὁρ. means, although ye see not, referring to the conception of the persons addressed: believing, ye rejoice in him, and the thought that ye see him not does not restrain you from rejoicing. (In like manner οὐ and μη are construed with participles in one and the same sentence in Lucian. indoct. 5 καὶ ὁ κυβερνᾷν οὐκ εἰδὼς καὶ ἐπιπείνειν μη μεμελετηκὸς etc., cf. also Lycurg. 11, 9 and Blume in loc.). In Rom. i. 28 431 we find παρέδοκεν αὐτοῦ φῶς τὸς θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μη καθήκοντα, but in Eph. v. 3 f. πορνεία καὶ πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία ... ¹ The difference between οὐ and μη with participles is well illustrated by Plat. Phaed. 63 b. ἡδίκουν δν οὐκ ἐγαμακτ ἦν οὖσα ἂρα injuste facerem egeo, qui non indignor; on the other hand, ἤδ. δν μη ἄγων. (according to Olympiod.) injuste facerem si non indignarier. Cf. also Soph. antt. 16, 7, 5 ο δὲ θεός εἰς μέσων ἀπείλητο, μὴ δὲν ἐσφακὸν εἰς ἀναλογίαν ἴσαρ ... ἀκώσαι δν οὖ πιστεύομαι. 62 c. d.
The latter (in apposition) is to be resolved, which are unseemly things (which a Christian is bound to shun), actions which are not seemly (as indeed some Codd. [so too Cod. Sin.] have: δ' οὖκ ἄνικεν). Gal. iv. 8 τότε οὖκ εἰδότες θεόν ἐδουλεύσατε etc. is a glance at a past historic fact, and οὖκ εἰδ. form a single idea: ignorantes deum, ἀθεοί; on the contrary, 1 Thess. iv. 5 τὰ ἐστὶν 508 τὰ μή εἰδότα τῶν θεών, and 2 Thess. i. 8 τοὺς μή εἰδόσα τιθέν, in dependent construction.

Sometimes, however, μή would appear to stand for οὐ, but Rom. iv. 19 καὶ μὴ ἀπεθάνησας τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἵππον σῶμα etc. means, he regarded not his body, quippe qui non esset imbecillus; κατενόησε expresses a fact, but the being weak in faith only a supposition, which is to be denied (οὐκ ἀπεθάνησα would mean, strong in faith). According to another construction, it might, also, have run thus: οὐκ ἐπεθρήσαν... ἦστε 453 κατανόησαν etc., cf. Plut. reg. apophth. p. 81 Tauchn. On the other hand, Heb. vii. 6 ὅ δὲ μη γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν δεδεκάτωκε τῶν Ἀβραάμ is probably to be explained on the principle, that in antitheses (cf. vs. 5), where a peculiarly strong negation is intended (and the negative is accent), the Greeks use μὴ (by which even the supposition is denied). See above, no. 1 and Hm. Soph. Antig. 691, which will be quoted presently. In Luke i. 20 ἦστι σωστῶν καὶ μη δινάμενος λαλήσαι the subjective negation is so much the more fitting, as a particular condition is designated as but just announced, and consequently existing but in thought (ἦστι). So also Acts xiii. 11. The connection of the subjective and objective negatives appears strangest in Acts ix. 9 ἐὰν ἡμέρας τρεις μὴ βλέπων καὶ οὐκ ἐφαγεν οἴδα ἐπιαν (cf. Epiphani. Opp. II. 368 etc. ἦν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς μὴ δινάμενος λαλήσαι). But here the not eating and not drinking are related as matters of fact; whereas the βλέπων, which from vs. 8 one might have supposed to be returning, is as a supposition denied antithetically. The remark of Hm. Soph. Antig. 691 is applicable here: μὴ fortius est, quia ad oppositum refertur: nam οὐκ ἐὰν simpliciter est prohibere, μὴ ἐὰν autem dicitur, quum, quem credas siturum, non sinit. Accordingly οὐ βλέπων there would have meant blind outright; μὴ βλέπων affirms not seeing of one who had had his sight and might be supposed to have it again. Cf. also Jno. vii. 49 ὁ δὲ χλόος οὗτος, ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον, where the χλόος is denied an attribute which it could and should have had; μὴ γινώσκει. conveys a censure, οὐ γινώσκει. would be a simple predicate: unaquainted with the law. See besides, Luke xiii. 11; Mark v. 26; Acts ix. 7 (cf. vs. 3).

Although, then, it may be quite true as Schaeff. says, Demosth. III. 495: in scriptis cadentis graecitatis vix credas, quotes participialis constructio (especially that of the Genit. absol.) non οὐ etc., ut oportebat, sed μὴ etc. adsciscat, cf. also Plut. V. 6; Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 28, and above, p. 473
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note 2, yet it is indispensable to scrutinize sharply every passage even from
the writers of the κοινον, before asserting that μὴ stands for ὥστε (Fr. Rom. 432
II. 295); in particular, as has been already remarked, it should not be 9th ed.
overlooked that often much depends, especially in the construction of
negatives with participles, on the mode in which the author conceives of
his subject, Hm. Vig. 804, 806; Mth. 1437, 1441. On the general subject 509
cf. also Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 244; Bähr in Creuzer, Melet. III. 20;

6. Continued negation is, as is well known, expressed by the 454
compound negatives οὔτε, μηδὲ, and οὔτε, μήτε.2 The difference
between the two words has often been discussed in modern philo-
logy, but has not yet been developed in all its relations and with
complete unanimity; see especially Hm. Eurip. Med. 380 sqq.
(also in his Opusc. III. 143 sqq.) and ad Philoctet. p. 140, then
Franke, comm. II. 5 sqq.; Wex, Antig. II. 156 sqq.; Klotz, Devar.
II. 706 sqq.3

Undoubtedly οὔτε and οὔτε run parallel with the conjunctions
δὲ and τε, and must be explained primarily from their meaning;
accordingly we may say with Herm. that οὔτε, μήτε are adjunctive,
οὔτε, μηδὲ disjunctive (δὲ is properly but, and denotes an opposition,
Franke II. 5), i.e. the latter add negation to negation, the
former divide a single negation into parts (which last of course are
mutually exclusive).4 For instance, Matt. vii. 6 μὴ δῶτε τὸ
ἀγαυν τοῖς κυρι.; μηδὲ βᾶλτε τοὺς μαραγράτας etc. give not —
and cast not (two different actions are equally denied, i.e. interdicted);
Matt. vi. 26 οὐ στειροῦσιν οὔτε βῆποῦσιν οὔτε συνάγουσιν etc.
say not, and they reap not, and they gather not. On the other

1 On Aelian. 3, 2 δὲ μηδὲ διαρακδές εἰπεν, 14, 33 δὲ οὔτε διαρακδές εἰπεν,
see Fr. Rom. II. 295. Elsewhere ὡστε is taken for μὴ with particip. sometimes in Plut.,
see Held, Plutarch. Tim. p. 457 sq., also in Aelian, see Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 187.
In like manner ὡστε seems to me to stand for μὴ in Basilic. I. 150 ταῦταν ὁ ὁδύτων σι
filii non existunt. As it stands it means, since children are not in existence. (Polyb. 7, 9,
12 τῶν θεῶν ὡς δότως θεῶς καὶ θεῶν which Gayer quotes, p. 591, is merely a conjectural
reading of Cassiobon.) In Lucian. saltat. 75, on the contrary, the transition from μὴτε
into ὡστε is owing to an anacoluthon. Lastly, ὡστε and μὴ are differently construed with
participles in Aelian. anim. 5, 28; see Jacobs in loc.

2 Where οὔτε does not refer to a preceding negation, it denotes, as is well known,
also not, or not even (Klotz, Devar. 707). On the latter meaning see Franke II. 11.

3 Cf. Hand, de partic. τε dissert. 2 p. 9 sqq.; Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 69 sq.; Stalb.

4 Benfey in the new Jahrh. f. Philol. XII. 155: "As τε . . . τε connects only ideas or
propositions which are mutually complementary and combine into one whole, so οὔτε . . .
οὔτε can connect only such. This higher unity or complex whole is divided by the
negated complementary parts; in these neither the negation of the one nor of the
other is a whole, but each must be supplemented."
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hand, Matt. xii. 32 οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὐτὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὐτὲ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι forgiveness will not be imparted, neither in this 438 world, nor in that which is to come (the single negation οὐκ ἀφεθ.

is distributed into two parts on the basis of time); Luke ix. 3 510 μηδὲν αἱρετε εἰς τὴν ὄδον μὴτε ῥάβδου μὴτε πηραν μὴτε ἄρτου μὴτε ἀργύρουν.

In this acceptance, then, the following particles are usually correlative:

a. Οὐ ... οὐδὲ Matt. vi. 28; vii. 18; Luke vi. 44; Jno. xiii. 16; xiv. 17; Acts ix. 9; Rom. ii. 28, μη ... μηδὲ Matt. vi. 25; x. 14; xiii. 9 f.; Mark xiii. 15; Luke xvii. 23; Jno. iv. 15; Acts iv. 18; Rom. vi. 12 f.; 2 Cor. iv. 2; 1 Tim. i. 3 f., οὐ ... οὐδὲ ... οὐδὲ Matt. xii. 19; Jno. i. 13, 25,1 μη ... μηδὲ ... μηδὲ Rom. xiv. 21; Col. ii. 21; Luke xiv. 12 (not ... nor ... nor);

b. Οὐ ... οὐτὲ ... οὐτὲ Matt. xii. 32, μη ... μητε ... μητε 1 Tim. i. 7, μη ... μητε ... μητε ... μητε Jas. v. 12 (μητε three times), Matt. v. 34 ff. (μητε four times) not ... neither ... nor etc.; but 455 still more frequently without a simple negation preceding, Jno. ix. 37 οὐτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκηκόατε πῶς τε οὐτε εἶλος αὐτοῦ ἐωράκατε, Matt. vi. 20; xxii. 30; Luke xiv. 35; Jno. viii. 19; ix. 3; Acts xv. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 5 f.; Rom. viii. 38 (ten times), Matt. xi. 18 ἢλθε Ἰωάννης μητε έσθλον μητε πίνων, Acts xxvii. 20; Heb. vii. 3 neither ... nor etc. Accordingly, οὐτε and μητε regularly refer to another οὐτε and μητε (or τε or καλ) — just as τε ... τε (τε ... καλ) correspond to each other; but οὐδὲ and μηδὲ connect themselves with a preceding οὐ or μη, as in fact δέ always refers to something that precedes. Hence it may be laid down as a principle (resulting from the respective import of τε and δέ), that οὐτε ... οὐτε denote a more intimate connection than οὐ ... οὐδὲ. Klotz, Devar. 707 sq.4 In this correlation, however, it is a

1 In Judges i. 27 we find οὐ followed by οὐδὲ fourteen times.

2 1 Cor. vi. 10 οὐτε ... οὐτе ... οὐτε ... οὐτе ... οὐτε ...
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matter of indifference whether the things denied are individual words (conceptions) merely, or entire sentences; and entire sentences are with as much propriety rendered negative by ὡστε ... ὡστε Acts xxviii. 21 (Plato, rep. 10, 597 c.; Phaedr. 260 c.), as individual words are by οὐ ... οὐδὲ. In the latter case, it is true, the verb serves for all the negative members. Matt. x. 9 μὴ 511 ἀπόστηθε χρυσόν μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκόν, 2 Pet. i. 8 οὐκ ἁργοὺς οὐδὲ ἁκάρπους καβοτρησιν etc., Matt. xxii. 29; xxiv. 20; xxv. 13; 1 Jno. iii. 18. In Matt. x. 9 the other form of negation might have been employed, if the evangelist had said μηδὲν ετήσιο. μήτε χρυσόν μήτε ἄργυρον etc., cf. Franke II. 8. Further, Matt. vi. 20, and 434 Matt. x. 9 compared with Luke ix. 3, throw especial light on the ἐκθέσιον distinction between οὐδέ and ὡστε.

The succession ὡστε ... ὡστε σα ὁ Ἰν. v. 37 f., as the interpretation which latterly become usual connects the clauses, would be no more liable to grammatical objection than ὡστε ... τε σά ὁ Ἰμ. Soph. Antig. 759; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. p. 68; yet the clause with σα ... σά does not sustain quite the same relation as if ὡστε were employed. I consider it, therefore, preferable not to comprehend σα ... σά in the partition. See Mey. in loc.

From what has been said it follows further,

a) οὐδέ ... οὐδὲ, μηδὲ ... μηδέ, in the sense of neither ... nor (when a single negation does not precede), cannot be correlative 456 (on Thuc. 1, 142 see Poppo in loc., and on Xen. Anab. 3, 1, 27 ὡστε. the same author’s Index to the Anab. p. 535); but where one negation is annexed to another, or where a series of negations occurs, the first is expressed by οὐ or μη, and only in this way is a foundation laid for the antithetical disjunctive δέ. Mark viii. 26 λέγων, μηδέ εἰς τὴν κόμην εὐεξής μηδέ εὔπρος τῳ etc. cannot signify neque ... neque; but the first μηδέ denotes ne ... quidem, and the second also not (nor), see Mey. in loc. Cf. Eurip. Hippol. 1052 and Klotz, Devar. 708. The case is different when the first οὐδέ connects the clause to what precedes, as e.g. in the case of οὐδὲ γὰρ in Gal. i. 12 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἄνθρ. παρέλαθον αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ἐδιδάχθην, yet on this passage see below, p. 492.

b) as ὡστε and μήτε always introduce co-ordinate members of a partition, μήτε is incongruous in Mark iii. 20 ὡστε μὴ δύνασθαι μήτε ἀρτον φαγεῖν, for μὴ φαγ. here is dependent on δύνασθαι.

1 Hence Mith. 1444 does not express himself with accuracy.
2 On οὐδέ and μηδέ after an affirmative sentence, see Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 64 sq.; Franke, p. 6, 8 sq.
3 That even in the latest edition of Griesbach’s N. T. μήτε should remain unchanged,
As the text now stands it can only mean: that they neither had power, nor ate (the first μὴ being used for μητε). The sense, however, obviously is: that they were not able (not even [so much as] to eat; accordingly, μητε must be restored on the authority of the better Codd. (see Fr. in loc.), which has been done by Lchm. and Tdf., but not by Scholz. In the same way we must read in Mark v. 3 οὔτε Ἀλώτης, in Luke xii. 26 οὔτε Ἐλαχίστον δύνασθε, in vii. 9 οὔτε εἶν τῷ Ἰσραήλ,¹ and in Luke xx. 36, where οὔτε γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἐπὶ δύναται (as good Codd. read) is not parallel to the preceding sentence οὔτε ... οὔτε, but the confirmation of it: neque enim.² Cf. also Matt. v. 36. In these passages also Scholz reprinted the old mistakes.

c) as οὔτε ... οὔτε introduce negative members of a partition, and these mutually exclude each other (Hm. Med. p. 332), the reading of some Codd. [Sin. also] οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε οἵονται (which Lchm. and Tdf. [2d ed., not so 7th] have received into the text) in Mark xiv. 68 cannot be supported: neque novi neque scio can hardly be said,—the verbs being nearly identical in sense. Cf. Franke II. 13; Schaefer. Demosth. III. 449; Fr. in loc. Griesb. has received into the text οὐκ οἶδα οὔτε οἵονται; cf. Cic. Rose. Am. 43 (not neque) novi neque scio, which according to the meaning of the two verbs is very suitable.³

d) οὔτε may indeed follow οὐ, so far forth as οὐ as respects sense is to be taken for οὔτε, see Hm. as above, p. 333 sqq. 401 and Soph. Antig. p. 110, in opposition to Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 4, 5 and Soph. Oed. T. 817; cf. Franke II. 27 sq.; Maetzner, Antiphon p. 195 sqq.; Elleundt, Lexic. Soph. II. 444; Klotz, as above, 709 sq.⁴ Accord-

is remarkable. What is still more strange, however, is, that Griesbach and Schulz have not even noted the var. μητε given by approved Codd. See, on the other hand, Scholz in loc.

¹ On the same ground οἶδα should be printed also in Act. apocr. p. 168. Yet Döderlein, Progr. de brachylogia sern. gr. p. 17, considers οὔτε correct in such case, maintaining that inasmuch as τε like καὶ may denote etiam this negation also may be used in the sense of ne quidem. See in opposition Franke II. 11.

² Bornem. insists on construing οὔτε with the following καὶ (see no. 7 below, p. 494), but the clause καὶ οὐλο etc. goes with λέγεται γὰρ.

³ When οὔτε ... οὔτε is used, it is true "the two notions are regarded as forming one compound thought" (Mey.); but this supposes that there actually are two notions, which may be connected affirmatively by as well ... as.

⁴ "In rare cases, and in virtue of a rhetorical figure, it is allowable to drop the complementary particle of the one οὐ, and so impart to the member thus stripped of its complementary symbol greater apparent independence, and consequently greater rhetorical force; just as we may say in poetry Not father nor mother, instead of Neither father nor mother," etc. Benfey, as above, 155. Cf. Hm. l.c. 335, 401 and Franke (who differs somewhat) II. 27, (also Döderlein, Progr. de brachylogia p. 6).
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ingly, ὠθεὶ in Rev. ix. 21 is unassailable, Mthh. 1448; though the usage in question passes as poetical, Franke II. 28. The same 513 correlation is to be recognized in Rev. v. 4 οὐδεὶς δὲι ως εὐρέθῃ ἀνοιξαὶ τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε βλέπεις αὐτὸ (as Tdf. also reads), cf. Klotz, Devar. II. 709 sq. and the passage adduced there from Aristot. polit. 1, 3, though the writer might also have said: οὐδεὶς δὲ. εὐρέθῃ οὔτε ἀνοιξαὶ τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε βλα. But μη ... μήτε cannot be tolerated in Eph. iv. 27, where the best MSS. [also Sin.] unite in giving μηδὲ, which Lehm. has admitted into the text. This usage is a sort of anacoluthon; in employing οὗ the writer had not yet the subsequent parallel member in view. Sometimes it may even have been adopted purposely, in order to give prominence to the first word. In Rev. xii. 8 also οὐδὲ appears to me the more correct expression, and it has been adopted by Knapp. On the other hand, in Jnvi. i. 25 εἰ ἐν οὐκ ἐλ ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτε Ἡλίας οὖτε ὁ προφήτης linguistic propriety does not require that οὐδὲ should be employed (cf. Hm. Soph. Philoct. p. 140), yet the better Codd. [Sin. also] give it. Likewise in Rev. v. 3 οὐδεὶς ἡδύνατο ἐν τῷ 436 οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, οὐδὲ ἱππόκατο τῆς γῆς ἀνοιξαὶ τὸ βιβλίον οὐδὲ βλέπεις αὐτὸ the relation of the negations is appropriate: no one ... nor on the earth, nor ... to open ... nor (not even) to look upon it.

e) as to οὔτε (several times) ... οὐδὲ Acts xxiv. 12 f. according to Lehm. and Bornem. from Codd. B [and Sin.] see Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 229; Franke II. 14 sqq.; Klotz, Devar. II. 714. The οὐδὲ is not correlative to οὔτε, but commences a new sentence: they neither found me in the temple ... nor in the synagogues, ... nor can they (and they can not) etc. Most of the Codd., however, 458 give οὔτε vs. 13. Then οὔτε ... εὑρόν μὲ ... οὔτε παραστῆσαι ἐκ δινανταί are regular correlates, and to the first proposition belong οὔτε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς οὔτε κατὰ πόλιν as subordinate members. On Luke xx. 36, see p. 490.

That in negative sentences the subordinate members are introduced by ἦ, has already been stated, § 53, 6. On the other hand, in Acts xvii. 29, according to the reading (adopted by Bornem.) of Cod. D οὐκ ὠφελομέν νομίζειν οὔτε χρυσῷ ἡ ἄργυρῳ etc., the ἦ is co-ordinate with οὔτε, a usage of which another example could hardly be found, Mthh. Eurip. VII. 178.

1 οὐ μετενέχθης ἐκ τῶν φόνων οὔτων, οὔτε ἐκ τῶν ... οὔτε ἐκ τῆς ... οὔτε ἐκ τῶν etc. (instead of the regular οὐ μετεν.) οὔτε ἐκ τῶν φόνων οὔτε etc.) is as allowable as Odys. 9, 136 ff. τιν οὐ χρείαν πελέματο ἦττα, στὶν εὖ καὶ ταῦτα βαλλει, οὔτε προμήχι σκότας, or Odys. 4, 566, see Klotz, Devar. 710. A var. in Rev. as above has not been noted.
However, as τα...ἡ is used (Klotz, Devar. II. 742 sq.), οὗτε...ἡ may also be allowable. But the other authorities omit οὗτε in this passage.

It is more difficult to say whether or not μητε, οὗτε can be used after μηδὲ, οὗδε. Almost all recent philologists decide in the negative, see Mtth. II. 1446 (Engelhardt, as above, p. 70; Lehmann, Lucian. III. 615 sq.; Franke II. 18, and others), on the ground that when the stronger expression οὗδε (Mtth. 1444, 1446) precedes, the weaker οὗτε cannot follow, cf. also Fr. Mr. p. 158.¹ Yet in the various editions of Greek authors there occur many passages in which οὗδε is followed by an οὗτε (Thuc. 3, 48; see Poppo in loc.; Lucian. dial. mort. 26, 2; catapl. 15; Plat. Charm. 171 b.; Aristot. physiogn. 6, p. 148 Franz); they are usually emended, however, commonly with more or less MS. authority. That οὗτε and μητε cannot be strictly parallel with οὗδε and μηδὲ, may hold as a general rule (though the reason alleged does not appear to me decisive); yet, when these particles have nothing to do with οὗδε (or μηδὲ) as a conjunction, οὗτε (μητε) may follow οὗδε (μηδὲ) in the two following cases (cf. also Döderlein in Passow’s Lexicon under οὗδε):

a) When οὗδε means ne...quidem (Klotz, Devar. 711; cf. 2 Macc. v. 10) or neither (also not), or connects the negative clause to which δέ points with a preceding clause.² In Gal. i. 12 437 οὗδε γὰρ ἐγὼ...παρέλαβον αὐτὸ oὗτε έδιδάξαθην the common reading is to be retained, if the passage is rendered: for neither did I receive it,—nor was I taught it, or neque enim ego (for οὐ γάρ) accepi didicique (-ve), cf. Hoogeveen, doctr. particul. II. 980 sq. See Plat. Charm. 171 b.; Hom. in Cercer. 22 (Hm. emend. p. 39); Lysias orat. 19 p. 157 Steph. The οὗδε of good Codd. [even Sin.] for οὗτε is probably a correction.

b) When the οὗτε (μητε) following οὗδε (μηδὲ) is not co-ordinate with the latter, but is subordinate to it, e.g. I harbor no enmity and I do not counterwork the plans of others nor their undertakings, Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 11 μηδὲ ἐπεσθαί μηδὲ πείθοιθα μητε στρατηγὸ "μητε ἀλλο ἄρχοντι (where, however, the first two words are suspicious), Cyrop. 8, 7, 22 μητησ’ ἀσεβὲς μηδὲν μηδὲν ἀνόσον μητε ποιήσῃ μητε βουλεύσῃ, Plato, ligg. 11, 916 e. The negation

¹ Oὗτε after οὗδε is upheld by Bornem. Xen. A. p. 26; Hand, as above, p. 13.
² Hand, as above: intelligitur, nuxum, quem nonnulli grammatici inter οὗδε et oﬅe intercedere dixerunt, nullum esse, nisi quod οὗ in voc. οὗδε cum οὗτε cohaeret. Nam si in aliquibus Hom. locis ista vocem. hoc quidem ordine nexas videntur exhiberi, in his δέ pertinet ad superiora conjungenda. Cf. Hartung I. 301; Klotz p. 711.
μοίδε is here divided into two members (μήτε ... μήτε) Dem. Callipp. 718 ε.; Judith viii. 18; cf. Held, Plut. Timol. p. 483 sq.; Mth. 14:45; Kühner II. 440. Accordingly Acts xxiii. 8 μη εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, μηδὲ ἀγγελον (μηδὲ εἶναι μήτε ἄγγ.) μήτε πνεύμα would be admissible, and would find additional support in τὰ 515 ἀμφότερα immediately following. ¹ Tdf. has so printed the text in his 2d [and 7th] Leipsic edition. The sentence would be simpler, indeed, with μηδὲ πν., or, as the better Codd. [Sin. also] have it, μητὲ ἄγγ. μήτε πν.; and this last has been preferred by Lehml. and Bornem. The more usual reading, however, might easily have been introduced as a correction for the more unusual. In 1 Thess. ii. 3, owing to the notions connected, οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ appears to me more suitable (the better Codd. too [Sin. also] have this reading, and Lehml. has so printed); and in general, I think that in this case accurate writers would for the sake of perspicuity use ἦ instead of οὔτε, see § 53, 6, p. 440 sq.

In 1 Cor. iii. 2 the best Codd. [Sin. also], instead of the transcriber’s error οὔτε as in the received text, give ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἐτὶ νῦν δύνασθε νε nunc quidem (cf. Acts xix. 2; Lucian. Hiermot. 7; conscr. hist. 33 and Fr. Mr. p. 157.), so in 2 Thess. ii. 2 εἰς τὸ μὴ παντὸς σαλευθήσαι ... μὴ δὲ διερεῖσαι μὴτε διὰ πνεύματος etc. (Lehml. and Tdf.). In 2 Thess. iii. 8 οὐδὲ is the only correct reading. In Luke vii. 9; xii. 27; Acts xvi. 21 Griesb. properly adopted οὐδὲ, which should be adopted too in Acts iv. 12. In Jas. iii. 12 recent editors (Lehml. and Tdf. also) give οὐτε ἄλωκον γλυκὸ πνεύματα οὐδὲ. This reading can only be supported on the assumption that James had in mind as the antecedent member οὐτε δύναται συνεχής διάλογον πνεύματα etc. — harsh on any view it must be confessed —; otherwise we must read οὐδὲ which some Codd. give. [So Cod. Sin. also, but with οὔτως preceding.]

Passages like Luke x. 4 μὴ βαστάσεις βαλλάντιον, μὴ πίραν, μηδὲ ἐπὶ- 438 δήματα (not ... nor ... neither), Matt. x. 9 μὴ κτήσῃς ἄκουσον μηδὲ ἂν ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν, μὴ πίραν εἰς ὄνομ, μηδὲ δύο ἄνωτάς, μηδὲ ἐποδήματα etc., present nothing that is singular.

It may be incidentally remarked further, that the distinction between 460 οὐδὲ, μηδὲ, and καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή, which is explained by Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. 116 ad. p. 65, and still more aptly by Franke II. 8 sq. (καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή after affirmative sentences and not, yet not, et non, ac non), as it appears to have a

¹ See Hoogeveen, doctr. particul. I. 751. Kühnel insists on rendering τὰ ἀμφότερα τρια τίτα, but by no means vindicates that rendering by Odys. 15, 78 ἀμφότερον κιδῖς τὲ καὶ ἄγγελὴς καὶ δωρέας, since the first two words here, united by τὲ καὶ, are regarded as a single notion. In Acts, as above, were we to read μηδὲ, ἀμφότερα still could not mean τρία; but the writer regards ἄγγ. and πνεύμα, agreeably to their logical import, as one leading conception.
logical foundation, is observable likewise in the N. T., cf. καὶ οὗ Ἰν. ν. 48; vi. 17; vii. 36; Acts xvi. 7; 2 Cor. xiii. 10, καὶ μὴ Ἰάκ. i. 5; iv. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 16; iii. 6; Heb. xiii. 17.

516 For passages in Greek authors which especially illustrate the difference between οὖτε and οὔτε, see Isocr. Areop. p. 345 οὐκ ἀνωμάλως οὐδὲ ἀτάκτως οὔτε ἰθεράπευον οὔτε ὀφρύζον etc., permut. p. 750 οὔτε μηδένα μοι πώστε μὴ δὲν ὠλυγαρχίᾳ μὴ δὲν ὑποκρίτικα μὴ τε ὄβεν μὴ τε ἀδικίαν ἔγκαλος, Her. 6, 9; Isocr. ep. 8, p. 1016; Xen. Ages. 1, 4; Demosth. Timocr. 481 b. Cf. Mtth. p. 1445.

7. In two parallel propositions, sometimes οὔτε (μήτε) is followed, not by another negative, but by a simple copula (καί or τε), e.g. Ἰν. iv. 11 οὔτε ἀντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ, as in Latin nec hastrum habeat et puleus etc. (Hand, Tursccl. IV. 133 sqq.), 3 Ἰν. 10, cf. Arrian. Al. 4, 7, 6 ἐγὼ οὔτε τὴν ἅγιαν ταύτην τιμορίαν Βῆσον ἐπανώ ... καὶ ὑπαξηναὶ Ἀλέξανδρον ἕμφημα etc., Paus. 1, 6, 5 Δημίτριος οὔτε παυτάπασιν ἤξειστίκες Πτολεμαῖος τῆς χροσάς, καὶ τινὰς τῶν Ἀιγυπτίων λοχύσας διέθειερ, Lucian. dial. mar. 14, 1; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 20 (τε is the more frequent, Jacobit, Lucian. Tox. c. 25; Weber, Demosth. p. 402 sq.) see Hartung, Partik. I. 198; Klotz, Devar. p. 713, 740; Götting. Δινεος. 1831, S. 1188. On the other hand, in Ἰν. iii. 14 the negation is omitted the second time, or rather affects also the annexed clause: μὴ κατακαυχάσθε καὶ μὴ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας. So also in 2 Cor. xii. 21; Matt. xiii. 15; Mark iv. 12; Ἰν. xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 27; cf. Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 2, 20; Diod. S. 2, 48; Aelian. anim. 5, 21; Gataker, Advers. miscell. 2, 2, p. 268; Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 182; Boissonade, Nicet. p. 890. The converse construction many expositors have asserted is found in Eph. iv. 26 ὀφρύζοντε καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε για μὴ ὄργ. καὶ (μὴ) ἀμαρτ. So in Greek authors (even prose) οὐδὲ and οὔτε are frequently used in the second member of a sentence, and have to be supplied in the first, see Schaeff. Bos, ellipsa. p. 777; Hm. Soph. Aj. 289, 616; Döderlein, brachylog. p. 5 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 841. This construction, however, which would be extremely harsh for the prose of the N. T., is not necessary in the preceding passage (especially as it does not run μὴτε ἀμαρτ.), see § 43, 2, p. 311 sq. On the other hand, in Luke xviii. 7, according to the accredited reading ὁ θεός οὗ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ ... 439 καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς, especially if the latter verb means delay, the negative particle would be omitted in the second clause, and merely the interrogative μὴ τοῦ would have to be repeated.

Bornem. in the sächs. bibl. Studien I. 69.
§ 55. NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

Oως ... δε Heb. ix. 12 hardly needs a remark, as oυ ... δε is of so very frequent occurrence.

8. It has frequently been laid down as a rule, that sentences 517 which contain a single negation followed by ἀλλά (δε), or in which oυ (μυ) forms an antithesis to a preceding affirmative sentence (Matt. ix. 18 Sept.; Heb. xiii. 9; Luke x. 20), are not always (as e.g. Mark v. 39 το ταυδίον oυι αυτέθανεν ἀλλ’ καθεύθεν, where the latter thought exactly overturns the first, Matt. ix. 12; x. 34; xv. 11; 2 Cor. xiii. 7) to be understood as purely negative, but (in consequence of a construction which, though Hebraistic, occurs also in Greek prose) must be rendered: not so much ... as (non tam ... quam, oυ τοσοῦτον ... δεον Heliod. 10, 3; Xen. Eph. 5, 11, oιχ oυτως ... oις Dio. Chr. 8, 130, oυ μαλλον ἡ Xen. Hell. 7, 1, 2), or: not only ... but also, non solum ... sed etiam,1 cf. Blackwell, auct. class. sacr. p. 62; Glass. I. 418 sqq.; Wetst. and Kypke ad Matt. ix. 13; Heumann on 1 Cor. x. 23 f.; Kuinoel, Acta p. 177; Haab, Gr. 145 ff.; Bos, ellips. p. 772 sq., and others (Valcken. Opusc. II. 190; ad Dion. H. IV. 2121, 10; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. p. lxix.); e.g. Acts v. 4 oυκ ἐψευσκό ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλ’ θεον not so much to men (the apostle Peter), as to God etc.; 1 Cor. xv. 10 oυκ ἐγώ δε (ἐκορισσα), ἀλλ’ ἡ χάρις τού θεου ἡ σὺν ἐμοι, Augustine: non ego solus, sed gratia Dei mecum (Jno. v. 30); 2 Luke x. 20 μη χαιρετε στι ... χαιρετε δε στι etc. nolite tam propterea laetari ... quam potius.

But in the passages from the N. T. referred to this head, when more closely considered, either

1 The first sense, non tam ... quam, is the one by far most commonly assumed in the N. T., as the examples which follow show; and an apparent warrant for it might be found in the fact, that in N. T. Greek the relative negation non solum ... sed is frequently expressed, but non tam ... quam in point of fact never.

2 No wonder expositors have been partial to such a weakening of the preceding idiom, since even philologists supposed it necessary to soften a strong expression in passages of the ancients where there was not the slightest occasion. Thus Dion. H. IV. 2111 δει το ανθρωπον επιθυμουν oυκ αληθεια is still translated by Reiske: te fortitudinis studium esse opinione magis quam re ipsa. For a similar impropriety, see Alberti, obscr. p. 71. As to the misapprehension of Palairet (obs. p. 236) in reference to Macrobi. Saturn. I, 22, see my grammatische Excurs S. 155. Cic. off. 2, 8, 27 also is easily disposed of according to the preceding remarks. Moreover, any one may see in Glass. as above, p. 421, how the older Biblical interpreters allowed themselves to be influenced even by doctrinal considerations in explaining this idiom. In 1 Pet. i. 12 the weakening of oυ ... δε into non tam ... quam (see Schott even in the latest edition) arises from misunderstanding δεικνυται. Flatt in 1 Cor. vii. 4 wanted to have even the simple oυ restricted by a μην. On 1 Cor. ix. 9 the passage of Philo quoted by expositors throws sufficient light.
§ 55. NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

a. an unconditional negation is plainly intended, as may be gathered from a careful examination of the context: Matt. ix. 13

δεν δέω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, where Christ, using the words of the prophet (Hos. vi. 6), really wishes to have mercy (a state of heart) put in the place of sacrifices (mere symbols), cf. what follows: οὐ γὰρ ἢδον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλ' ἀμαρτωλοὺς; Jno. vii. 16 ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχὴ οὐκ ἐστιν ἐμή, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τῷ πέμψαντός με, where Jesus speaks of the origin of his doctrine (vss. 15, 17, 18): my doctrine (which ye consider mine, cf. vs. 15) belongs not to me, but to God,—has for its author not me, but God, (Christ calls it ἡ ἐμὴ διδασκαλία). In reference to the opinion of the Jews, who in the words πῶς οὖν γράμματα οἶδε, μὴ μεμαθηκός; assumed it to be something acquired by means of study), cf. Jno. v. 30; xii. 44; Jno. vi. 27 ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρόχων τὴν ἀπολλύμενην, ἀλλὰ τὴν βρώσων τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰών., ἤν οὐδὲς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μὴν δῶσει, where Jesus censures the conduct of the people who had come to him as the Messiah, and the thought: not so much for ordinary food as for heavenly (Kühnhol) would be absurd. As to vs. 26 see Lücke. In 1 Cor. vii. 10 Paul makes a distinction between the Lord’s injunctions and his own, as he does in vs. 12, inverting the order; for he alludes there to Christ’s declaration Matt. v. 32. Recent expositors are right. As to 1 Cor. xiv. 22 cf. 23 no doubt can exist; cf. besides, 1 Cor. x. 24 (Schott) and Mey. in loc., Eph. vi. 12; Heb. xiii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 17 and Mey. in loc. Likewise in 2 Cor. vii. 9 χαίρω οὐχ ὅτι ἐλπίθητε ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐλπίθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν in the first clause λυπηθήμενος is denied in itself (the thought so far as contained in λυπηθ.) and absolutely, but to be taken up again in the second clause with an added limitation εἰς μετάνοιαν. So in non bonus sed optimus (see the note below), non cancels good (in the positive) (good he is not), in order straightforward to put in its place the only correct term optimus, (which of course comprehends the bonus also). Or,

b. in other passages, the absolute negation is on rhetorical

---

1 Bengel: non est mens, non ullo modo descendit labore parta.
2 Similar to this would be to say e.g. of a biblical expositor abounding in ancient quotations, Thy learning is not thy learning, but Wetstein’s. The first thy learning is put only problematically; and to infer from it that the speaker means actually to ascribe to the party concerned (that) learning in some degree or in a certain respect, is an inference purely grammatical not logical. Hm. Eurip. Alcest. p. 29 had already glanced at non bonus sed optimus (Fr. diss. in 2 Cor. ii. p. 162). Of a similar kind are the passages cited by Heumann as above: Cic. Arch. 4, 8 se non interfuisse sed egisse, and Vell. Pat. 2, 13 vir non saeclui sui sed omnis sevi optimus. Cf. also 2 Cor. vii. 9.
grounds employed instead of a conditional (relative), not for the purpose of logically cancelling the first conception, but in order to direct undivided attention to the second, so that the first 519 may comparatively disappear (cf. Mey. on Acts v. 4): 1 Thess. iv. 8 (Schott) rejecteth not man, but God. Of course he rejects 468 the apostle also, who announces the divine truth; but the inten-
tion was to present to the mind with full force the fact, that it is 441 properly God, as the real author of the truth announced, who is rejected. The force of the thought is immediately impaired if rendered: he rejects not so much man as God. To give such a translation would be like diluting e.g. an asyndeton (the nature of which also is rhetorical) by subjoining a copula. Therefore it appears to me that ơν̣̣̣ ... ἀλλά, when it logically means non tam ... quam, is always a part of the rhetorical coloring of the composition, and for that reason is to be preserved in the translation (as is done by all good translators). The speaker has chosen this negative designedly, and the expression is not to be judged of grammatically merely. Whether, however, such is actually the case, is to be determined not according to the impressions of the interpreter, but by the context and the nature of the connected thoughts. In this way the following passages are to be treated:

Matt. x. 20 (Schott) ơν̣̣̣ υμεῖς ἔστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, Mark ix. 37 (Schott) δι ἐὰν ἐμὲ δέχηται, ơν̣̣̣ ἐμὲ δέχεται, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλατά με, 1 Cor. xv. 10 περισσότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκοπλάσα: ơν̣̣̣ ἐγώ δέ, ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί, Jno. xii. 44 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ πιστεύει εἰς ἐμὲ, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με, Acts v. 4 (cf. Plutarch. apophth. Lac. 41; see Duker, Thuc. 4, 92); Luke x. 20 (where many MSS. insert a μᾶλλον after δέ); 2 Cor. ii. 5 (Schott). As to Luke xiv. 12 f. see Bornem. and de Wette in loc.²

---

1 Cf. Demosth. Euerg. 684 b. ἡγγασμένη δήρισθαι οὐκ ἐμέ (but he had been abused actually) ἀλλ' ἐαυτὴν (τὸν Βολίτη) καὶ τὸν δήμον τὸν ψυχεύμενον etc., Aesop. 148, 2 οὐ σὺ με λοιδορεῖς, ἀλλ' ὁ πύργος, ἐν ὦ ἠταλαί. Klotz, Devar. p. 9: ơν̣̣̣ ἐκυκλώσεις, ἀλλ' ἐστάτως est: non pericilitas sed passus est, quibus verbis hoc significatur: non dico iustum pericilitatum esse sed passum, ut ut, cum ille dicatur passus esse, jam ne cogitetur quidem de eo, quod priore membro dictum est.

² Against this view, propounded in the first edition of this work in accordance with the remarks of de Wette (A. L-Z. 1816 nr. 41 S. 321) and those of a critic in the Theol. Annal. 1816 S. 473, Fr. dissert. in 2 Cor. II. 162 sq. declared himself. His objections were examined by Beyer in the n. krit. Journ. d. Theol. 3 B. 1 St.; but Fr. discussed the subject anew in his 2d excursus on Mr. p. 773 sq. I had written the above in substance before I received this excursus, and it agrees essentially with the opinion expressed in the second edition of this Grammar S. 177, and in my gramm. Excurs. S. 155.
When (οὐ) μὴ ... ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐστιν are correlative, as in Phil. ii. 4 μὴ τὰ ἐκατὼν ἔκαστον σκοποῦντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐγέρων ἐκατον, the original plan of the sentence intended οὐ ... ἀλλὰ, and καὶ was introduced because the writer on reaching the second member determined to soften and qualify the thought. Passages of a similar sort are not unfrequent in Greek authors, see Fr. Exc. 2 ad Mr. p. 788; cf. Thuc. ed. Poppo III. III. 300, (on the Latin non ... sed etiam or quoque, see Ramhorn S. 535 f.; Kritz, Vell. Pat. p. 157 f.). The converse is οὐ μὸνον ... ἀλλὰ (without καὶ, see Lehmann, Lucian. II. 551), when the writer drops μὸνον, and, instead of a thought parallel to the first, subjoins one that is stronger (which usually includes the former), see Stallb. Plat. symp. p. 115; Fr. as above, 786 ff. and Klotz, Devar. p. 9 sq. So Acts xix. 26 ὅτι οὐ μὸνον Ἑφέσον, ἀλλὰ σαχῶν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας ὁ Παύλος οὐδεὶς πείσας μετέκτησεν ἰσαμόν ὄχλον that he not only at Ephesus, but in all Asia etc., where strict propriety required: but also in other places, cf. 1 Jno. v. 6 οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὑδάτι μὸνον, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ τῷ αἵματι. On the Lat. non solum (modo) ... sed, see Hand, Tursell. IV. 282 sqq.; Kritz, Sallust. Cat. p. 80. The second member is heightened in a different way in Phil. ii. 12; in 1 Tim. v. 23 μηκέτι ὄντος ὁδοποιτεί, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ὅλης χρῶ is to be rendered, Be no longer a water-drinker (ὕδοποιτείων cf. Her. 1, 71; Athen. 1. 168), but use a little wine; ὄντος ὁδοποιτείων differs from ὅπως πίνων, and signifies to be a water-drinker i.e. to drink water usually and exclusively. One who uses a little wine ceases of course to be a water-drinker in this sense, and it is quite unnecessary here to supply μὸνον. Matthies in loc. is not accurate.

9. Two negatives employed together in one principal clause

(a) Produce an affirmation, Acts iv. 20 οὐ δυνάμεθα ἡμεῖς, & εἴσομεν καὶ ἡκούσαμεν, μὴ λαλεῖν, non possimus ... non dicere, i.e. we must declare (cf. Aristoph. ran. 42 αὕτοι μα τὴν Δήμητρα δύναμαι μὴ γελάν), 1 Cor. xii. 15 οὐ παρά τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστων ἐκ τοῦ σώματος it is still, for all that, of the body (belongs to it). In the first passage the particles of negation belong to different verbs (δυνάμεθα is first denied and then λαλεῖν), in Syriac مكرطلا Moyer and B. Cruzius have decidedly agreed with me in the various passages adduced above; but I take especial pleasure in the remarks of my acute colleague Klotz ad Devar. p. 9 sq. in support of my view. As to non ... sed, cf. Kritz, Sallust. Jurg. p. 533; Hand, Tur. IV. 271.

1 The two negatives equivalent to an affirmative in Rom. xv. 18, which occur in two different clauses blended by attraction, require no special notice.
tive clause in Demosth. Androt. 420 c.; Aelian. 12, 86). See 521 besides, Matt. xcv. 9 text. rec. Cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 711; Mtth. II. 1449. Or,

b. They both produce but a single negation (which is the more frequent case), and serve (originally) only to make the principal negation which would have sufficed alone more distinct and forci-

ble, and to impart to the sentence a negative character through-

14 ed. out: 1 Jno. xv. 5 χάρις ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε τοιεῦ οὐ δένειν non potentis facere quidquam, i.e. nihil pot. fac. (Dem. Callip. 718 c.), 2 Cor. xi. 8 παρὼν ... οὐ κατενάρκησα οὐδενός, Acts xxv. 24 ἐπιβδόμητε μὴ δεῖν αὐτῶν ζῆν μηκέτι, Mark xi. 14 μηκέτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἢ σοῦ μηδὲν καρπὸν φάγῃ, 1 Cor. i. 7 ὡς ἴμας ὡς ὑπερείσθαι εἰς μηδὲν χαρισμάτι, Matt. xxii. 16; Mark i. 44; v. 37; vii. 12; ix. 8; xii. 34; xv. 4 f.; Matt. xxiv. 21; Luke iv. 2; viii. 43 (51 var.); x. 19; xx. 40; xxii. 16; Jno. iii. 27; v. 30; vi. 63; ix. 33; xvii. 23 f.; xix. 41; Acts viii. 16, 39; Rom. xiii. 8; 1 Cor. viii. 2 (var.); 2 Cor. vi. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 6; 1 Jno. i. 5; Rev. xviii. 4, 11, 14, etc. 2 So in particular where the notion every, always, every time, everywhere, is added to the negative clause for its necessary or rhetorical amplification (Böckh, nott. Pind. p. 418 sq.), 3 or where the negation is decomposed, Matt. xii. 32 οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὐ τε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὐ τε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι. 4 In this way a single sentence may contain a series of negatives: Luke xxviii. 53 οὐ οὐκ ἦν οὐδέπω οὐδελείς κείμενος, Mark v. 3 (cf. Aelian. anim. 11, 31 ὡς οὐδεπότετε οὐδένα οὐδὲν ἀδικήσας, Plat. Parmen. 166 a. ὅτε τάλλα τῶν μὴ δυνάων οὐδενὶ οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς οὐδεμίαν κοιμώνιαν ἔχει, Phaed. 78 d.; Her. 2, 39 οὐδὲ ἄλλων οὐδενὸς ἐμψύχου κεφαλῆς γεύσεται Αἴγυπτων οὐδεὶς, Lysias pro Mantith. 10; Xenoph. A. 2, 4, 23; Plat. Phil. 29 b. and soph. 249 b.; Lucian. chronol. 13; Dio C. 635, 40; 402, 35; 422, 24); see Wytenb. Plat. Phaed. p. 199; Ast, Plat. polit. p. 541; Boisson. Philostr. Her. p. 446 and Nicet. p. 243, especially also Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 13;

1 As in popular German; yet the accumulation of negatives is genuine German, and has been expelled from the language of the educated only through the influence of the Latin, which so thoroughly pervades our literary culture. As to Latin, see Jani, Ars poët. lat. p. 236 sq.

2 In the Sept. cf. Gen. xlv. 1; Num. xvi. 15; Exod. x. 23; Deut. xxxiv. 6; Josh. ii. 11; 1 Sam. xii. 4, especially Hos. iv. 4 δώσω μηδές μήτε διακαίεται μήτε ἔλεγχοι μηδές. Transcribers have in such sentences sometimes omitted a negative, see Fr. Mr. p. 107.

3 But this mode of expression is not always employed, cf. Acts x. 14 οὐδέποτε ἱφαγόν τῶν κοινῶν καὶ ἀδικῶν (without var.), 1 Jno. iv. 12.

4 Klotz, Devar. II. 698: in hac enuntiatisa est repetita est negatio, quod unumquodque orationis membrum, quia co amplificabatur sententia, quasi per se stare videbatur.
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523 Gayl. p. 382 sq. When οὐδὲ ne . . . quidem is employed, it is usual in Greek to prefix another negative to the verb (cf. Stalib. Plat. rep. I. 279; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 460). So Luke xviii. 13 οὐκ ἥθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔπαρα.

In 1 Cor. vi. 10, after several antecedent partitive clauses (οὐτε, οὔτε, οὐ, οὐ), the negative is once more repeated for the sake of perspicuity with 466 the predicate βασιλείαν θεοῦ ὁ κληρονομήσοντα. The best Codd., however, [Sin. also] omit it, and Lehm. has expunged it. In Rev. xxii. 4 οὖν ἦνατος οὐκ ἦταν ἦταν οὐκ ἦταν, οὐκ τέλθος οὐκ κραυγῇ οὐκ πάνος οὐκ ἦταν ἦταν, the writer might also without hesitation have dispensed with the second οὐ.

444 What comes nearest, however, is Aesch. Ctesiph. 285 b. οὐδὲ γε ὁ πατήρ ὁ οὐκ ἀν ψηφεῖν δημοσίῳ χρηστός, see Bremi in loc. (c. 77), cf. also Plat. rep. 4, 426 b. and Hm. Soph. Antig. as above. On the other hand, οὐκ ἦταν ἦταν οὐκ τέλθος etc. would be quite according to rule. In Acts xxvi. 26 the text rec. gives λανθάνων αὐτῶν τι τοιτῶν οὐ πεθομα οὐ δεν; but the better Codd. omit either οὐδὲν or τι. [Yet οὐδὲν with τι is found in Cod. Sin.*]

On the pleonasm of μὴ after verbs in which the idea of negation is already contained, see § 65, 2, p. 604.

Note. A peculiar kind of negation is formed with έλ in oaths by virtue of an apophasis of the apodosis; as, Mark viii. 12 δείην λέγω δείην, έλ δοθήσετε τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτης σημείων i.e. no sign will be given; Heb. iii. 11; iv. 3 Sept. ὡμοσα, έλ εἰσελεύσονται έλ τῷ κατάπαυσιν μου. This is an imitation of the Hebrew וֹ (cf. Gen. xiv. 23; Deut. i. 35; 1 Kings i. 51; ii. 8; 2 Kings iii. 14, etc.), and a form of imprecation must always be supplied as the apodosis: in the last passage, then will Νοt live, not be Jehovah; in passages where the speaker is a man, so may God punish me (cf. 1 Sam. iii. 17; 2 Sam. iii. 35), then will not live, and the like; Ewald krit. Gr. 661, (cf. Aristoph. equit. 698 f. έλ μὴ σ' ἐκφάγω . . . οὐδέποτε βιώσωμαι, Cic. fam. 9, 15, 7 moriar, si habeo). 'Εάν is thus used in Neh. xiii. 25; Song of Sol. ii. 7; iii. 5 Sept. Of the opposite, δειν μη ορ έλ μη (affirmatively), no instance occurs in the N. T. (cf. Ezek. xvii. 19), for most unwarrantably has Haab. S. 226 referred to this head Mark x. 30; 2 Thess. ii. 3.
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1. The (subjective) negative μὴ ne (with its compounds) is used in independent sentences to express a negative wish or a warning, and is construed

523 a. With the Optative (Aor.) — the mood which would be used also without the negation — when a negative wish is expressed (Franke I. 27), e.g. in the frequently recurring μὴ γένοιτο Luke xx. 16; Rom. iii. 6; ix. 14; Gal. ii. 17 (Sturz, dial. Alex. 204 sq.),
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and in μὴ αὖτος λογοθέτης 2 Tim. iv. 16 (Plat. legg. 11, 918 d.). So also μηκέτι, according to the text. rec., Mark xi. 14 μηκετί ἐκ
σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μηδεὶς κακῶς φάγοι μἐν one ever again etc.
The Subjunctive φάγη, however, would here be more appropriate
in the mouth of Christ,—if it only had more external authority
in its favor. Besides, see Gayler p. 76 sqq. 82.

b. When a warning is expressed, it is construed a) sometimes
with the Imperative Present, usually where something permanent
and which a person is already doing is to be indicated (Hm. Vig. 467
809); Matt. vi. 19 μὴ θεσσαρίζετε ἡμᾶς, vii. 1 μὴ κρίνετε, Jno. v. 14
μηκέτι ἀμάρταναι, cf. Matt. xxiv. 6, 17; Jno. xiv. 1; xix. 21; Mark
xiii. 7, 11; Rom. xi. 18; Eph. iv. 28; 1 Tim. v. 23; 1 Pet. iv. 12; 445
β) sometimes with the Subjunctive Aorist, when something trans-
sient, which should not be begun at all, is to be expressed (Hm.
as above), Luke vi. 29 ἄπο τοῦ αἰροῦντος σου τὸ ἰμάτιον καὶ τὸν
χειτώνα μὴ κωλύσῃς, Matt. x. 34 μὴ νομίσητε (do not conceive), ὅτι
ἐλαθον etc., vi. 13; Luke xviii. 28; Acts xvi. 28. So in legislative
prohibitions, Matt. vi. 7; Mark x. 19; Col. ii. 21, where not the
repetition or continuation, but the action itself (though done but
once) is interdicted, and absolutely. The Aor. Imperat., which
specially has this signification, and is not at all rare in later writers
(Gayl. p. 64), does not occur in the N. T. (and is doubtful in the
Sept. also). On the other hand, the Pres. Imperat. also is often
used in reference to what should not be begun at all (Hm. as
above, Franke I. 30); cf. Matt. ix. 30; Eph. v. 6; 1 Tim. v. 22;
1 Jno. iii. 7. In general, see Hm. de praeceptis Atticistar. p. 4 sqq.
(Opusc. I. 270 sqq.); cf. Soph. Aj. p. 163; Bhd. 393 f.; Franke
I. 28 sqq. The Imperat. and Subjunctive are both employed in
one sentence in Luke x. 4.

The Pres. Imperat. is also construed with μὴ in Rom. xiii. 8 μηδὲν
μὴ δὲν ὑπειλετε; for owing to the subjective negatives ὑπελ. cannot be
taken as an Indicative. Reiche’s observations on the other side are a
strange mixture of obscurity and half-truth. And if he means to say that
the subjective negatives are used in the same way in some of the passages
524 adduced by Wetstein, he is very much mistaken; for in these passages
the Inf. or Participle is employed, both of which regularly take μὴ.

As to ὅθε with the Fut. Indic., partly in passages from the O. T. law, as

1 There must here be καταρρίτωμα after ἄμα, as H. Stephanus correctly remarked in the preface to his edition of the N. T. of 1576. If ἄμα ἑκ to be immediately connected,
θροήθες must be substituted for θροήθες. Tdf. [in his 2d ed.] has not attended to
this. [In his 1st ed. and 7th ed. he has it correctly.]
Matt. v. 21 ou phovówes, xix. 18; Acts xxiii. 5; Rom. xiii. 9, and partly in the N. T. style itself, Matt. vi. 5 oúk ἴσαντες ἐπέστρεψαν, where μή with the Subjunctive might have been expected, cf. § 48, 5. Not unlike this is Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 34; see Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 204; Franke I. 24. (On μή with the Fut. Indic. in a mildly prohibitive sense, see Weber, Demosth. p. 369.)

When μή in a prohibitive sense is joined with the third Person (as frequently in laws, see Franke, as above, p. 32), the Imperat. is used (always in the N. T.), not the Subjunctive (Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 163): the Present Imper. when what is forbidden has already commenced, and the Aorist Imper. when something which has not yet commenced is to be avoided (in future also); as, Rom. vi. 12 μὴ ὅπως σάψεται ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θυμῷ ὑμῶν σώματι, xiv. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 12, 18; Col. ii. 16; 1 Tim. vi. 2; Jas. i. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 8; on the other hand Matt. vi. 3 μὴ γυναῖκα ἡ ἀνευρέτα σου etc., xxiv. 18 μὴ ἐπιστρεφόμεν ὁπίσω, Mark xiii. 15 μὴ καταβάτω εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν (probably also in Matt. xxiv. 17 according to good Codd. [Sin. also], where the text. rec. has καταβαίνων). Cf. Xen. C. 7, 5, 73; 8, 7, 26; Aeschin. Ctes. 282 c.; Mith. II. 1157; Kühner II. 113. (Instances from the Sept., therefore, are not needed here; otherwise, besides Deut. xxxiii. 6 and 1 Sam. xvii. 32, many could be found, as Josh. vii. 3; 1 Sam. xxv. 25; 2 Sam. i. 21; Judges vi. 39.)

If a dehortation in the 1st Pers. (Plur.) is to be expressed, μή takes the Subjunctive, and either the Pres. or the Aor. according to the distinction indicated above (Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 162), e.g. Jno. xix. 24 μὴ σιχλοσωμεν, but 1 Jno. iii. 18 μὴ ἀγαπώμεν λόγῳ (as some were doing), Gal. vi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 6; Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. x. 8. In Gal. v. 26 the Codd. vary, some having μὴ γενόμεθα κενόδοξοι (text. rec.), others γενόμεθα. The better [Sin. also] favor the former, (and Lchm. and Tdf. have so printed). The apostle may mean to reprove a failing already existing in the churches, as seems probable also from what precedes. Mey. takes a different view. From Greek authors, see evidence for the use of the 1st Pers. Plur. Subj. in Gayler 72 sq.

2. In dependent clauses μή (μῆπος, μῆποτε etc.) is used,

a. In the sense of in order that not (for which ἵνα μή is more commonly employed), with the Subjunctive after Pres. and Imperf. 1 Cor. ix. 27 ὑπωτιάξω μου τὸ σῶμα . . . μῆπος . . . ἀδόκιμος γένομαι, 2 Cor. ii. 7; xii. 6; Matt. v. 25; xv. 32; Luke xii. 58 and frequently; with the Optative after a Preterite, Acts xxvii. 42 τῶν.
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οστρατωτων βουλη ἐγένετο, ἵνα τοὺς δεσμώτας ἀποκτείνωσι, μὴ τις ἐκκολυμβήσας διαφύγοι, but good Codd. [Sin. also] have here διαφύγη, which Lchm. and Tdf. have adopted (Bhdy. 401; Krü. 168). The latter reading, however, may be a correction or an error of transcribers. The Subj. is also used in the O. T. quotation Matt. xiii. 15; Acts xxviii. 27, where, however, as a permanent result is meant, it is less questionable. The Indic. Fut. (along with a Subj. Aor.) Mark iv. 12 Sept. μὴποτε ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἀφεθήσεται (according to good Codd.) [as also the Fut. βληθήσῃ Matt. v. 25] it is not necessary to regard as likewise dependent on μὴποτε, though even then the Fut. would be quite proper, see Fr. This applies to ιάσομαι Acts xxviii. 27 (Born. ιάσωμαι) cf. Luke xiv. 8 f. In Matt. vii. 6 Lchm. and Tdf. read μὴποτε καταπαθήσωσιν, where Griesb. and Scholz have not noted any var.

b. In the sense of that not, lest, after δρα, βλέπε or φοβοῦμαι, and the like (Hm. Vig. 797; Rost, Gr. 650 f.). In this connection the particle is followed

a) by the Indicative, when the suspicion (apprehension) that something is, will be, or has been, a matter of fact, is also expressed: Present Indic. Luke xi. 35 σκόπεσαι, μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν (Hm. Soph. Aj. 272 μὴ ἐστὶν verentis quidem est ne quid nunc sit, sed indicantis simul, putare se ita esse, ut velutur, 469 cf. Gayl. 317 sq.) ; Proterv. Jacobi 141; Future Indic. Col. ii. 8 ἦν αἱ βλέπετε, μὴ τις ἐσται ὑμᾶς ὁ συλαγωγῶν ne futurus sit, ne existat, qui etc. Heb. iii. 12; Mark xiv. 2; Her. 3, 36; Plat. Cratyl. 393 c.; Achill. Tat. 6, 2 (p. 887 Jac.); Xen. C. 4, 1, 18 etc. (cf. Stallb. 447 Plat. rep. I. 336); Preterite Indic. after a Pres. Gal. iv. 11 φοβοῦμαι ἔρθῃ διὸ ὑμᾶς, μήποτε εἰκῆ κεκαπτακα (may have labored), see Hm. Eurip. Med. p. 356; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 135; Stallb. Plat. Menon p. 98 sqq.; 526 cf. Thuc. 3, 58; Plato, Lys. 218 d.; Diog. L. 6, 5; Lucian. Piscat. 15 (Job i. 5), see Gayl. 317, 320.

β) by the Subjunctive (Gayl. 323 sqq.), when the object of a

1 We cannot with de Wette pronounce this acceptation inappropiate on the ground that "simply a general warning is here expressed." That is just the question. An injunction to examine carefully lest such might be the case, Jesus might certainly give to his contemporaries, according to the assumption elsewhere made in the N. T. respecting their predominant religious character; and this injunction is in reality general. Let every one take care lest the second of the cases mentioned in vs. 34 should apply to him. The apprehension that Jesus would thus be countenancing the doctrine of the complete depravation of man's reason is groundless; and Niemeyer (Hall. Pred. Journ. 1852. Nov.) should not have been induced by such apprehension to take the Indicative for the Subjunctive,— an interpretation which he supports, moreover, by passages of a totally different nature.
mere apprehension, which may perhaps prove groundless, is indicated: by the Present Subj. Heb. xii. 15 Sept. ἐπισκοποῦτες ... μὴ τις μῖα πικρίας ... ἐνοχλή (Hm. Soph. Aj. 272 μὴ ἃ verentis est, ne quid nunc sit, simulque nescire se utrum sit nec ne significantis); usually by the Aorist Subj. in reference to something still future, Matt. xxiv. 4 βλέπετε, μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ, 2 Cor. xi. 3 φοβοῦμαι, μὴ παραφὸς τὰ νόηματα ὑμῶν, xii. 20; Luke xxi. 8; Acts xiii. 40; 1 Cor. viii. 9; x. 12. The same mood is employed in narration after a Pret. Acts xxiii. 10 εἰλαβηθεὶς μὴ δὲ αὐτὸς αὐτὸς ἡ γὰρ ... ἐκέλευσε, xxvii. 17, 29, as after words of fearing (where the fear appears to be well founded, Rost S. 650) even in the best Greek prose authors, Xen. A. 1, 8, 24 Κύρος δείχασαι, μὴ ὑπιστευν γενόμενος κατακόψῃ τὸ Ἐλληνικόν, Cyr. 4, 5, 48 τοῖς φόβοιν ἡμῖν παρεῖχετε, μὴ τι πάθητε, Lysias caed. Eratosth. 44 δὲ ἐγὼ δεδίως μὴ τις πυθότατε ἐπεθύμου αὐτὸν ἀπολέσασαι, cf. also Thuc. 2, 101; Plato, Euthyd. 288 b.; Herod. 4, 1, 3; 6, 1, 11; see Mtth. II. 1189; Bornem. Xen. sympos. p. 70; Gayl. 324 f. The Indic. Fut. and Subjunct. are connected in 2 Cor. xii. 20 f. φοβοῦμαι, μὴ ποτὲ οἷς οἶνος θελὼμεν εὐρῶ ὑμᾶς κόψῃ καὶ εὐρεμέω ὑμῖν ... μὴ πάλιν εἴλθυς τὸ ἐπεινωσέμει με ὑ αἰῶν ἐτοκικαί.
tolic activity, still continued. And the Pret. Indic. ἔγραμεν would be justified by the assumption that Paul gave to the whole sentence the same turn of expression that he would have employed, had he uttered the words in a direct form: in order that I run not or have run (for might run, or might have run), cf. above, p. 288. Still simpler, however, is the interpretation now adopted by Fr., who takes the Preterite in a hypothetical sense, cf. Mth. II. 1185; Him. de partic. àv p. 54: ne forte frustra cucurrisse (which might easily have been the case, had I not propounded my doctrine in Jerusalem). But of course, it is not allowable to refer ἀνεθίμην (as Fr. does) to an intention of Paul to instruct himself (for not the mere exposition of his views could have secured him from having run in vain, but only the assent of the apostles); on the contrary, Paul must have been satisfied in his own mind that his views were correct, and only have designed to obtain the very important declaration of the apostles in his favor, without which his apostolic labors for the present and the past would have been fruitless, see de Wette in loc.

In 1 Thess. iii. 5 μὴ πῶς is construed with both Indic. and Subjunct.: ἔπεμψα εἰς τὸ γρόνω τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν, μὴ πῶς ἐπιρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πεπρᾶξον καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόσμος ὑμῶν I sent to ascertain your faith, (fearing) lest haply the tempter have tempted you, and my labor be fruitless. The different moods here are obviously justifiable. The temptation (to waver in faith) might have already taken place; but whether the apostle's labor had been rendered fruitless by it depended on the result of the temptation, as yet not known to him, and might be dreaded as impending. Fr.'s interpretation (Opusc. Fritzschior. p. 176): ut ... cognoscerem, an forte Satanas vos tentasset et ne forte labores mei irriti essent, appears to me harsh, as μὴ πῶς would thus be taken in two senses. And I can by no means admit that according to my interpretation the Fut. γενήσεται would be required instead of γένηται. On the contrary, the Fut. denoting an apprehension which cannot be verified, and in any event will not be verified at some definite future time, would be far too explicit. See also Him. Soph. Aj. p. 48 and partic. àv p. 126 sq.; Mth. II. 1186.

Note. Verbs of fearing are regularly followed by the simple μὴ, μὴ πῶς, etc. not by ἵνα μὴ: hence in Acts v. 26 ἵνα μὴ λαβασθῶσιν must not be connected with ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν, as is done by most expositors (even Mey.); but it is dependent, rather, on ἡγαγεν αὐτοῖς ὦ μετὰ βίας, and the 449 words ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν are to be considered as parenthetical.

3. The intensive οὐ μὴ (in reference to what in no wise will 528 or should take place)1 is construed sometimes, and indeed most follows; forgetting that two different moods, according to different conceptions, may be and sometimes are connected with one and the same particle. (See the passage to be quoted immediately: 1 Thess. iii. 5.)

1 Thus οὐ μὴ regularly refers to the future (Matt. xxiv. 21 οὐ μὴ γένονται ... οὐ οὐ μὴ γένονται). Moreover, it is now the prevalent opinion of scholars, that this idiom
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frequently, with the Subjunct. Aorist, sometimes with the Subjunct. Present (Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 51, see below), and sometimes also with the Indic. Fut. (Bengel on Matt. v. 18 is mistaken), see Ast, Plat. polit. p. 365; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 36 sq.; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 409 sqq.; Gayl. p. 480 sqq. The difference between the Subj. Aor. and the Fut. Indic. (which alone occur in the N. T.) is defined by Hm. Soph. Oed. Col. ver. 853 thus: Con junctivo Aor. locus est aut in eo, quod jam actum est (see, however, Ellendt as above, p. 411 sq.), aut in re incerti temporis, sed semel vel brevi

472 temporis momento agenda; Futuri vero usus, quem ipsa verbi forma nonnisi in rebus futuris versari ostendit, ad ea pertinet, quae aut diuturniora aliquando eventura indicare volumus aut non aliquo quocunque, sed remotiore aliquo tempore dicimus futura esse. The inquiry whether this distinction is observed in the N. T., is rendered difficult by the variations of MSS., of which, in many passages, some have the Indic. Fut., and some the Aor. Subj. So far as can be ascertained by the present apparatus of various readings, the Subj. is established in Matt. v. 18, 20, 26; x. 23; xviii. 3; xxiii. 39; Mark xiii. 2, 19, 30; Luke vi. 37; xii. 59; xiii. 35; xviii. 17, 30; xxii. 18; Jno. viii. 51; x. 28; xi. 26, 56; 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. viii. 13; 2 Pet. i. 10; Rev. ii. 11; iii. 8, 12; xviii. 7, 21 f.; xxi. 25, 27. There is a preponderance of evidence for the Subj. in Matt. xvi. 28; xxii. 35; Mark ix. 41; xvi. 18; Luke i. 15; ix. 27; xviii. 7, 30; xxii. 68; Jno. vi. 35; viii. 12, 52; xiii. 8; Rom. iv. 8; Gal. v. 16; 1 Thess. v. 3. There is at least as much evidence for the Subj. as for the Fut. in Mark xiv. 31; Luke xxi. 33; Matt. xv. 5; xxiv. 35; Gal. iv. 30; Heb. x. 17; Rev. ix. 6 (xviii. 14).¹ The authorities decidedly favor

is to be considered as elliptical: oβ μη πατήρ for oβ δέσμων or oβ φόβος, oβ δίος εστί (there is no fear) μη πατήρ. see Ast, Plat. polit. p. 365; Matthiae, Eurip. Hippol. p. 24; Sprachl. II. 1174; Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 1028; Hartung II. 156. This involves, indeed, the assumption that the Greeks lost sight of the origin of the expression; for in many passages "there is no fear that" is not appropriate, (in the N. T. Matt. v. 20; xviii. 3; Luke xxii. 16; Jno. iv. 48). Earlier Hm. (Eurip. Med. p. 390 sqq.) had explained the phrase differently, cf. also Gayl. p. 402. The connective oβδέλ μη (καὶ oβ μη) occurs in the N. T. only in Rev. vii. 16 (var.), but frequently in the Sept. e.g. Exod. xxii. 21; xxiii. 13; Josh. xxiii. 7; and oβδέλ μη in Wisd. i. 8. Generally, oβ μη is of very frequent occurrence in the Sept., and its prevalence may probably be referred to that effort after expressiveness, characteristic of the later language. The instances have been collected by Gayl. p. 441 sqq. It is not the fact, however, that in the N. T. (Hitzig, Joh. Marc. S. 106) Mark and the Revelation display a predilection for oβ μη. A concordance will prove the contrary.

¹ It must not be overlooked that sometimes the Future form may be occasioned in MSS. by a preceding or following Future, as in Jno. viii. 12 oβ μη πατήρας . . . ἀλλ' ἐστίν.
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the Fut. in Luke x. 19 ; xxii. 34 ; Jno. iv. 14 ; x. 5. The Fut. is 450 established (without var.) in Matt. xvi. 22 οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τὸντο δή. (absit) ne tibi accidat hoc. Accordingly the Subj. is indisputably predominant in the N. T. (cf. Lob. Phryn. p. 722 sq.), and this is no less the case in Greek authors, see Hartung, Partik. II. 156 f. Hermann's rule on the whole does not apply to the N. T.; for although several passages might be interpreted in accordance with it, yet others in turn are at variance with it, and the Aor. is employed where the Fut. should have been used, as e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 15 ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῴτες οἱ περιλειτομένοι εἰς τὴν παροιμίαν τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τούς κομμηθέντας, where the point of time is very definitely in mind viz. on the day of Christ's second coming; and Heb. viii. 11, where in οὐ μὴ διδάξωμεν there is reference to a precise time (the Messianic period, vs. 10), and duration also is indicated, cf. Rev. xxii. 25. In fact, the Subj. Aor. in the sense of the Future had become usual in later Greek, cf. Lob. as above, p. 723 ; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 57. Mdv. also S. 127 discovers no perceptible difference between the Fut. and the Aor. in this construction. (Gayl. 440 sqq. has catalogued all the passages in the Sept. where οὐ μὴ occurs.)

The statement of Dawes, however, which recognizes no difference of meaning between the Aor. and Fut. in this construction, but as respects the former allows only the 2d Aor. Act. (and Mid.) in Greek texts, has been almost universally rejected (see Mth. II. 1175 f.; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 343; on the other hand, Bhdy. 402 f.), and cannot be applied to the N. T., where the 1st Aor. is as frequent as the 2d Aor. even in verbs that have a 2d Aor. in common use, (var. see Rev. xviii. 14).

Sometimes οὐ μὴ is followed, according to a few Codd., by a Present Indic., viz. in Jno. iv. 48 ἵδιν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ὠφθη, οὐ μὴ πιστεύετε, and Heb. xiii. 5 Sept. οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω; indeed, one Cod. (quoted by Griesb.) has in Rev. iii. 12 the Optative, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθω. The last is undoubtedly only a mistake of a translator, misled by the ear (the case is different in the orat. obliqu. in Soph. Philoct. 611, Schaeff. loc. ; cf. also the same on Demosth. II. 321), and the Subjunctive was long ago restored. Likewise in Heb. as above, ἐγκαταλίπω is undoubtedly the true reading. But in Jno. iv. 48 perhaps the reading ought to be πιστεύετε, as the Subj. 530 Present is so used in Greek authors also, as in Soph. Oed. Col. 1024 οὐ, οὐ μὴ τοις χῶρας φυγόντες τῆς ἐπεύχωνταί θεοῖς (according to Hm. and others), Xen. C. 8, 1, 5; An. 2, 2, 12 (see Hm. Eurip. Med. Elmsl. p. 390; Stallb. Plat. polit. p. 51; Ast, Plat. pol. p. 365), and, as in the passage from John, after a conditional clause with ἵδιν in Xen. Hier. 11, 15 ἵδιν τοὺς φίλους κρατῆς εὖ ποιών, οὐ μὴ σοι δύνασαι ἀντέχειν οἱ πολέμιοι, and
frequently in Demosth. (Gayl. p. 437). In John, however, there is preponderant MS. authority [to which Sin. must be added] for πεντελικορεί, which Lchm. and Tdf. have adopted. What Hm. Iphig. Taur. p. 102 says of an Indic. Pres. after οὗ μή, the received text would hardly substantiate. As to Luke xviii. 7 see § 57, 3 and p. 494.

This intensive οὗ μή is used also in dependent clauses: not merely in relative clauses Matt. xvi. 28; Luke xviii. 30; Acts xiii. 41, but also in objective clauses with διὰ Luke xiii. 35; xxii. 16; Matt. xxiv. 34; Jno. xi. 36 τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν, διὰ οὗ μὴ διδόῃ αἰτίαν ὑμῖν; what think ye? that he will not come to the feast? Likewise in direct question with τίς, Rev. xv. 4 τίς οὗ μὴ φοβηθεῖ; Cf. with the former passages, Xen. C. 8, 1, 5 οὐκ ὡμ. αἰτία οὗ εἴδεναι χρή, διὰ οὗ μὴ δίνῃται Κύριος εἰρεῖν etc. Thuc. 5, 69; and with the latter, Neh. ii. 3 διὰ τί οὗ μὴ γένηται ποιμέν etc. On οὗ μή in an interrogative clause, without an interrogative pronoun, construed with a Subjunctive or a Future (Ruth iii. 1), see § 57, 3, p. 511 sq.

Note. Not ..., no one ..., nothing ..., except, is commonly expressed by οὗ ..., οὐδείς ..., οὐδὲν ..., εἴ μή, as in Matt. xi. 27; xxii. 19; Luke iv. 26; Jno. xvii. 12, etc. (Klotz, Devar. p. 524). More rarely the negation is followed by πλήρως, as in Acts xx. 23; xxvii. 22; ἢ is found only in Jno. xiii. 10 text. rec. : οὗ λεγομένου οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν ἢ τοῦς πόδας νύκτος. Most Codd. have εἴ μή, and this Lchm. has adopted. The latter, however, may be a correction of the rarer ἢ, which yet occasionally occurs, Xen. C. 7, 5, 41.

§ 57. INTERROGATIVE PARTICLES.

1. In the N. T., interrogative sentences (cf. Krü. 250 f.) which commence neither with an interrogative pronoun, nor with a special interrogative adverb (πῶς, ποῦ etc.),

a. if direct, have usually no interrogative particle (Jno. vii. 23; xiii. 6; xix. 10; Acts xx. 37; Luke xiii. 2; 1 Cor. v. 2; Rom. ii. 21; Gal. iii. 21, etc.). Sometimes, however, contrary to the usage of the written language of the Greeks, εἴ is employed before a question in which the inquirer merely discloses his uncertainty, without intimating that he expects a reply (see no. 2).

b. if indirect, they are introduced by εἴ (which is here, too, the conditional conjunction).

1 Hence it is sometimes matter of dispute among commentators whether a particular sentence is to be taken as interrogative or not, e.g. Jno. xvi. 31; Rom. viii. 33; xiv. 22; 1 Cor. i. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 1; xii. 19; Heb. x. 2; Jas. ii. 4; or how many words are comprehended in an interrogation, e.g. Jno. vii. 19; Rom. iv. 1. On this, Grammar can ordinarily give no decision.

2 How εἴ acquires the general force of an interrogative particle, see Hartung, Partik. II. 201 ff.; cf. Klotz, Devar. 508.
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In direct double questions πότερον ... ἢ is used only once, Jno. vii. 17; elsewhere the first question is without an interrogative particle, Luke xx. 4; Gal. i. 10; iii. 2; Rom. ii. 3, etc., and only the second has ἢ,—if negative, ἢ οὐ Matt. xxii. 17; Luke xx. 22, or ἢ μὴ Mark xii. 14; cf. Bos, Ellips. p. 759; Klotz, Devar. 576 sq. Sometimes, moreover, ἢ is used in an interrogative sentence which refers to a preceding categorical sentence (like the Latin an, see Hand, Tursell. I. 349) 2 Cor. xi. 7 εἰ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει ... ὃ ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησα ἐμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν; or did I commit an offence? Rom. vi. 3 (Dio C. 282, 20) etc. cf. Lehmann, Lucian. II. 331 sq.

2. The following are instances of the singular use of ei in direct questions (especially in Luke): Acts i. 6 ἐπηρῴων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· κύριε, εἰ ... ἀποκαθιστάνει τὴν βασιλείαν; Luke xxii. 49 εἰπον ... 452 κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαῖρᾳ; Matt. xiii. 10; xix. 3; Luke xiii. 23; οὐκ εἰ Acts xix. 2; xxi. 37; xxii. 25; Mark viii. 23 (on Matt. xx. 15 see Mey.); cf. Sept. Gen. xvii. 17; xliii. 6; 1 Sam. x. 24; 2 Sam. ii. 1; xx. 17; 1 Kings xiii. 14; xxii. 6; Jon. iv. 4, 9; Joel i. 2; Tob. v. 5; 2 Macc. vii. 7; Ruth i. 19. Perhaps this use originated in an ellipsis: I should like to know (Mey. on Matt. xii. 10); cf. the indirect inquiry in German, ob das wahr ist? But at the period of which we are treating ei had attained to all the rights of a direct interrogative (cf. Schneider, Plat. civ. I. 417), like the Lat. an which later writers also use in direct question; and it would be affectation to insist on taking ei as equivalent to the indirect an (Fr. Mt. p. 425; Mr. p. 327). The ei by which this 532 ei is rendered in the Vulgate has become in the same way a direct, from an indirect (Liv. 39, 50), interrogative particle. That even in Greek authors ei is sometimes used in direct questions (Hoogeve. doctr. partic. I. 327) was asserted again by Stallb. Phileb. p. 117, but denied correctly in regard to Attic prose by Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 39 sq., and Stallb. recalled his statement, Plat. Alcib. I. 231; cf., further, Herm. Lucian. conser. hist. p. 221; Fr. Mr. p. 328, and Klotz, Devar. 511. In the passage, Odyss. 1, 158, ad. 475 duced by Zeune, Vig. p. 506, ei was long ago corrected into ἢ; in Plato rep. 5, 478 d. all good Codd. have ἐντὸς for ei, and in Aristoph. nub. 483 (Palairot, observatt. p. 60) ei does not mean num, but an in an indirect question. So also in Demosth. Callicl. p. 735 b. On the other hand, Dio Chr. 30, 299 ei τι ἄλλο ύμιν προσέταξεν, ἐπέστειλεν ἢ διελέξθη; where follows the answer: πολλὰ καὶ δαμόνια — is probably corrupted (Reiske proposes ἢ τι ἄλλο),
or it is to be taken as an indirect question: but if he gave you any other injunction? (may be asked, some one will perhaps ask). Schneider, even in Plat. civ. 4, 440 e., retains on manuscript authority ei, which recent editors had changed into (ἄλλα) ἢ; but he explains this use of the particle in (only apparently) a direct question by an ellipsis, and has expunged the mark of interrogation. (Some have wanted to take ἵπτε also as a direct interrogative in the N. T., but without sufficient reason, see § 53, 10, 5 p. 456 sq.).

The interrogative ἢπα is originally  ἢπα strengthened, and in an interrogative sentence, distinguished as such by the voice, denotes the conclusion from something preceding, whether a negative answer is expected (where ἢπα is equivalent to num igitur), or an affirmative (ergone) Klotz, Devar. 180 sqq.1 The former is the more usual in prose (Hm. Vig. 823), and occurs in the N. T. Luke xviii. 8 ἢπα εἰρήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; will he then find faith on the earth? and ἢπας Acts viii. 30, cf. Xen. Mem. 3, 8, 3 ἢπαγε, ἔφη, ἔρωπας με, εἴ τι ἵπτα παρευρέω ἄγαθον; οὐκ ἔγωγεν, ἐφη. On the other hand, in Gal. ii. 17 ἢπα might be rendered by ergone: Christ is therefore a minister of sin? (cf. Schaef. Melet. p. 89; Stalh. Plat. rep. 438 II. 223; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 415). Others read ἢπα without a question; 6th ed. this is opposed, however, by the fact that Paul invariably makes a question precede μὴ γένορο, see Mey. in loc.

To the interrogative particles, πῶς, πότε, πότις, etc., which are appropriated 533 to direct questions, correspond, as is well known, in indirect questions (and discourse) the relative forms ὅπως, ὅποτε, ὅπου, etc. (Bttm. II. 277). Even Attic authors, however, do not always observe the distinction (see Kühner II. 583; Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 80; Poppo, ind. ad Xenoph. Cyrop. under πῶς and πότι), and later writers neglect it frequently. In the N. T. the interrogative forms are predominant even in indirect discourse (παραθηκ Jno. vii. 27, πότα Matt. viii. 20; Jno. iii. 8; on πῶς see Wahl, Clav. 439).

"Ὅταν in the N. T. is employed rather as a strict relative.

3. In negative interrogative sentences,

a. ὡς where an affirmative answer is expected (Hartung, Partik. 476 II. 88) is commonly equivalent to nonne, as in Matt. vii. 22 οὐ ὡς τῶν σφόν ὁμολιτευόμεθα, προεφητεύσαμε; have we not? etc. xiii. 27; Luke xii. 6; xvii. 17; Jas. ii. 5; Heb. iii. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xiv. 23. Sometimes, when the speaker himself assumes a negative answer, ὡς is used with an expression of indignation and reproach, Acts xiii. 10 οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφον τᾶς ὁδοὺς κυρίον τᾶς εἰθελε; will thou not cease etc.? The tone employed indicates, as with us, the par-

1 A different view is taken by Leidenroth, de vera vocab origine ac vi per linguari. comparationem investiganda (Lipa. 1830. 8vo.) p. 59 sqq. Further, see on ἢπα and ἢπα Sheppard in the Classical Museum, no. 18.
ticular cast of the question: Wilt thou not cease? (i.e. thou wilt cease wilt thou not?) is nonne desines? but, wilt thou not cease? (i.e. wilt thou persist?) is non desines? The o one here negatives the verb (non desinere i. q. pergere), see Franke I. 15. Cf. Plut. Lucull. c. 40 o ο ζωη σς πολυτων μεν ως Κράσσος, ζων δ' ως Δού- κουλλος, λέγων δε ως Κάτωυ; So also Luke xvii. 18; Mark xiv. 60. — Oυκ δρα in Acts xxii. 38 means non igitur, thou art not therefore (as I supposed, but as I now see denied) etc. Klotz, Devar. 186, (nonne, as the Vulgate renders it, would rather be, in connection with nevertheless, δρ' oυ or ουκουν, see Hm. Vig. 795, 824).

b. Μή (μητις) is used, when a negative answer is presumed or expected (Franke as above, 18).1 Jno. vii. 31 μή πλεονα σμεια πονηρε; surely he will not do more signs will he? (that is not conceivable), xxi. 5; Rom. iii. 5 (Philippi is incorrect), ix. 20; xi. 1; Matt. vii. 16; Mark iv. 21; Acts x. 47, etc. Both interrogatives are (in accordance with the above distinction) used consecutively in Luke vi. 39 μητις διναται τυφλος τυφλον δηγειν; ου χει αμφοτεροι εις βοθυνον πεισουναι; The assertion of Hm. (Vig. 789), that μή sometimes anticipates an affirmative answer, has been contested by Franke I. c. and others; some interpreters, however, have wanted to take it so sometimes in the N. T. (Lücke, Joh. I. 602; cf. Fr. Mtth. p. 432). But the speaker always has his eye on a negative answer, and would not be surprised if he received such: Jno. iv. 33 has any one brought him anything to 554 eat? (I can’t believe it, especially here in the country of the Samaritans!), viii. 22: will he kill himself? (yet we cannot believe that of him), cf. Matt. xii. 23; Jno. iv. 29; vii. 26, 35. Occasion- sionally there exists an inclination to believe what is asked; but inasmuch as the question is put negatively, the speaker assumes the appearance, at least, of wishing a negative reply. Some have taken μη in the sense of nonne likewise in Jas. iii. 14 ει ζηλων πικρων εχετε ... μη κατακαυχασθε και γευζεθε κατα της αλθειας — but incorrectly. The sentence is categorical: do not boast (of your Christian knowledge, vs. 18) against the truth. When μή oυ occurs in a question, oυ belongs to the verb of the sentence, and μή alone is interrogatory, as in Rom. x. 18 μη αικηκουναι; did they fail to hear? (i.e. it can’t be that they did not hear, can it?) vs. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5; xi. 22 (Judg. vi. 13; xiv. 8; Jer. viii. 4; Xen. Mem. 4, 2, 12; Plat. Meno p. 89 c. and Lysias 213 d.; Acta Apocr. p. 79). On the other hand, oυ μη is merely a strengthened 477

1 As to the Latin num, see Hand, Tursell. p. 320.
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form of a simple negation which may stand either interrogatively or not: Jno. xviii. 11 ὃν μὴ πῶς αἰτῶ; shall I not drink it? Arrian. Epictet. 3, 22, 33, see § 56, 8, 505 sq.

Acts vii. 42 μὴ σφάγα καὶ θυσίας προσφέρεγκατε μοι ἐν τῇ τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; (from Amos): did ye offer to me ... in the wilderness? (ye did not, did ye?); the narrative then proceeds with καὶ ἀνελάβετε, because the question implies: ye brought me no offerings for forty years and ye (even) took up etc. A different view is given by Fr. Mr. p. 66. On the other hand, see Mey. The passage in Amos has not yet been itself duly explained. Perhaps the prophet follows a different tradition from that contained in the Pentateuch. As to Luke xviii. 7 see above, p. 494.

In Matt. vii. 9 τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὧν ἀνθρωπος, ὃς ὅπως αἰτιοὶ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθῳ ἐπιδίωκει αἰτητόν; two questions are blended: who is there among you that ... would give? and, would one if asked for ... give ... (surely he would not give, would he)? Cf. Luke xi. 11 and Bornem. in loc.

Note. As to Jno. xviii. 37 see, in particular, Hm. Vig. 794. Οὐκοῦν is non (nonne) ergo with or without a question, οὐκοῦν ergo (the negation being dropped). Now if we read the above passage interrogatively οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς ἐστίν; it will mean, art thou then not a king? nonne ergo (Hm. Vig. 795) rex es? and the speaker thinks of an affirmative answer (after the words of Jesus ἐγώ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία ἡ εἰρήνη etc.), see no. 3. But οὐκοῦν (as editors have it) βασιλεὺς ἐστίν is simpler: thou art a king then, ergo 585 rex es (perhaps with a touch of irony, see Bremi, Demosth. p. 238) with or without a question (Xen. Cyr. 2, 4, 15; 5, 2, 26. 29; Aristot. rhet. 3, 18, 14, etc.). Οὐκοῦν gets the meaning of therefore, then, accordingly because originally οὐκοῦν also was regarded as interrogative, thou art a king then? (is it not so? is that not true?), see Hm. Vig. p. 794 sq.; cf. Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. 432 sq.1 A question appears to me more suitable to the speaker as a magistrate, and Lücke has expressed the same opinion. At all events, οὐκοῦν cannot signify non igitur, as Kühnöl and Bretschneider maintain; in that case it would require to be written separately οὐκ ὁμ.  

455 B. STRUCTURE OF PROPOSITIONS AND THEIR COMBINATION INTO PERIODS.
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7th ed. § 58. THE PROPOSITION AND ITS COMPONENT PARTS, IN GENERAL.

1. The necessary parts of a simple sentence are Subject, Predicate, and Copula. As, however, the Subject and the Predicate may be supplemented and enlarged in a variety of ways by means

---

1 Rost 742 and Gayl. p. 149 are opposed to distinguishing the words by means of accentuation.
§ 58. THE PROPOSITION AND ITS PARTS.

of adjuncts; so again the Predicate is frequently, and the Subject sometimes, blended with the Copula. The limits of the Copula are never doubtful; but it may sometimes be uncertain which and how many words constitute the Subject or the Predicate, as in Rom. i. 17; 2 Cor. i. 17; xi. 13; xiii. 7. In this event we encounter not a grammatical but a hermeneutical inquiry.

The Infinitive (by itself), when it stands for the Imperative (Phil. iii. 16), see § 43, 5 p. 316, is not a complete sentence, because every grammatical indication of the subject is wanting, which in other moods is given by the person of the verb.

2. The Subject and the Predicate are regularly nouns (including Infinitives used as substantives, Phil. i. 22, 29; 1 Thess. iv. 3); but sometimes whole clauses take their place: Luke xxii. 37 τὸ γεγραμμένον δεὶ τελεσθήναι ἐν ἑμοί, τὸ καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογισθη, 1 Thess. iv. 1 παρελάβετε παρ′ ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δεὶ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν, Matt. xv. 26 οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τεκνῶν etc. The 536 case of the Subject (in independent sentences) is, as everybody knows, the Nominative, (in dependent the Accusative,Acc. with Inf.) yet the Partitive Genitive also may elliptically stand as the Subject, Acts xxii. 16 see § 30, 8, note 2. On the other hand, the alleged use of ἐν as nota nominativi, in imitation of the Hebrew עַל essentiae, does not merit a moment's consideration, and the latter itself is a grammatical figure; see § 29, note, p. 184.

Deserving of distinct mention is the Predicate which consists of a Participle with the Article, as in Matt. x. 20 οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, Jno. v. 32; xiv. 28; Phil. ii. 13; Rom. viii. 33; Gal. i. 7, etc.; this is to be carefully distinguished from the participle without the article, cf. Mth. 717; Fr. Rom. II. 212 sq.

3. The Copula, as is well known, regularly agrees with the Subject in number, the Predicate in number and gender; except that when the Predicate consists of a substantive it may differ in gender and number from the Subject, e.g. 2 Cor. i. 14 καὶ Χριστὸς ὑμῶν ἐσμέν, 1 Thess. ii. 20 ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ Δόξα ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά, Jno. 479 xi. 25 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή, viii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 2; Rom. vii. 13; Eph. i. 23 ήτις (ἡ ἐκκλησία) ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (see § 24, 3); 1 Cor. xi. 7; Col. iv. 11; Luke xxii. 20.¹ Yet deviations 456 from the preceding rule occur, even in prose, when the writer pays more regard to the meaning of the subject than to its grammatical

¹ Instances in which the Nenter has a depreciatory force, as in 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτα τῶν ἁρτῷ, grammatically considered, come likewise under this head.
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Form. This takes place more frequently in Greek than in Latin. Consequently

a. A Singular Predicate (Copula) is joined to a Neuter Plural, mostly when the Subject is lifeless, and may be regarded as a mass (Bhdv. 418; Mtth. 761); as, Ἰησοῦς 25 τὰ ἔργα ... μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἑμοῦ, 2 Pet. ii. 20 γένοεσθε αὐτοῖς τὰ ἑσχάτα χείρων τῶν πρῶτων, Acts i. 18; xxvi. 24; Ἰησοῦς ix. 3; x. 21; iii. 23; xix. 31; Rev. viii. 3. But

a) when prominence is to be given to the plurality and diversity of the objects (Weber, Demosth. p. 529), the Pred. is put in the Plural, as Ἰησοῦς xix. 31 ἦν κατεαγώγησεν αὐτῶν (of the three persons crucified) τὰ σκέλη (previously ἦν μὴ μείνῃ τὰ σώματα is used, cf. also vi. 13; Rev. xxi. 12; xx. 7; Xen. An. 1, 7, 17); seldom otherwise, 1 Tim. v. 25 τὰ ἄλλα ἔχουσα (ἔργα) κρυβήναι οὐ δύνανται, Rev. i. 19 ἄ εἰδες καὶ ἂ εἰσίν (but immediately afterwards ἄ μέλλει γίνεσθαι), Luke xxiv. 11 (not Rom. iii. 2, see § 39, 1 a). In 2 Pet. iii. 10 Sing. and Plur. are united. Likewise

587 in Greek authors (Rost 475; Kühner II. 50) the Plural of the verb is not unfrequently used, especially when instead of the Neut. another substantive, Masculine or Feminine, may be in the mind (Hm. Soph. Elect. p. 67; Poppo, Thucyd. I. I. 97 f. and Cyrop. p. 116; yet see Schneider, Plat. civ. I. 98); yet in other cases also, cf. Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 2; Ἀναβ. 1, 4, 4; Hippiarch. 8, 10; Thuc. 6, 62; Ael. anim. 11, 37; Plat. rep. 1, 353 c.

b) neuters, however, which denote or refer to animate objects, especially persons, are almost always construed with a Plural Pred.; as, Matt. x. 21 ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτῶν, Jas. ii. 19 τὰ δαμόνια πιστεύοντες καὶ φρίσσουσιν, Ἰησ. x. 8 οὐκ ἠκούσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα, Mark iii. 11; v. 13; vii. 28; Matt. vi. 26; xii. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 17; Rev. iii. 2, 4; xii. 13, 18; xvi. 14; xix. 21 (Matt. xxvii. 52 πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἄγιων ἡγέρθησαν, Rev. xi. 13). In other passages the Codd. vary remarkably, and there is a preponderance of authority for the Sing. in Mark iv. 4; Luke iv. 41; viii. 38; xiii. 19; Ἰησ. x. 12; 1 Ἰησ. iv. 1; Rev. xviii. 3; indeed, in Luke viii. 2 is found without var. ὁφ' ἵνα δαμόνια ἑπτα ἐξελησθείη, vs. 30 εἰσῆλθεν δαμόνια πολλα, and in 1 Ἰησ. iii. 10 φανερὰ ἐστὶν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τοῦ διαβόλου. Cf. also Eph. iv. 17 and Rom. ix. 8. The Sing. and Plur. are connected in Ἰησ. x. 4 τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῶ {ἀκολουθοῦν, ὁτι 480 σεαυτὶν τὴν φωνήν αὐτῶν, 27 τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκοῦει ἔνδει, καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν, Rev. xvi. 14; cf. 1 Sam. ix. 12. Lastly
in Rev. xvii. 12 τὰ δέκα κέρατα δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσὶν the Plur. of the verb is more appropriate, on account of the Predicate noun, cf. 1 Cor. x. 11. The use of the Plural Pred. with animate Subjects is the rule in Greek authors also, cf. Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9 τὰ ζώα ἐπιστανται, Plat. Lach. 180 ε. τὰ μειράκια ἐπιμέμνηται, Thuc. 1, 58; 4, 88; 7, 57; Eur. Bacch. 677 f.; Arrian. Alex. 3, 28, 11; 5, 17, 12; see Hm. Vig. 739.

In general, the construction of Neuters with Plural verbs is more frequent in Greek prose authors than is usually supposed (though the 457 Codd. vary noticeably), Reitz, Lucian. VII. 483 Bip.; Ast, Plat. legg. 60 εἰς p. 46; Zell, Aristot. Ethic. Nicom. p. 4 and 209; Bremi, exc. 10 ad Lys. p. 448 sq.; Held, Plutarch. Aem. Paull. p. 280; Ellendt, praef. ad Arrian. I. 21 sq.; Bornem. Xen. Cyrop. p. 173, but chiefly in later writers, and that without any distinction (Agath. 4, 5; 9, 15; 26, 9; 28, 1; 32, 6; 39, 10; 42, 6, etc.; Thilo, Apocr. I. 182; Boisson. Psoll. p. 257 sq.; Dresser, ind. to Epiph. monach. p. 136). The proposal of Jacobs (Athen. p. 228, cf. also Heind. Cratyl. p. 137) to substitute the Singular in all such passages was apparently retracted subsequently by that scholar himself (cf. Jacobs, Philol. imag. p. 236), though where Codd. offer the Singular 538 we may, with Boisson. Eunap. p. 420, 601, give it the preference.

What was said of the Singular of the Pred. after Neuters applies only to the form of the verb; if the Predicate consists of εἰναι or γίνεσθαι with an adjective, the latter is put in the Plur. while the verb is Sing., as in Gal. v. 19 φανερὰ ὅτιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς, 1 Cor. xiv. 25 τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν φανερὰ γίνεται.

4. b. Collectives denoting animate objects are construed with a Plural Pred.: Matt. xxi. 8 ὁ πλείστος ὁχλος ἐστρωσαν ἐκατον τὰ ἰμάτια (Mark ix. 15; Luke vi. 19; xxiii. 1), 1 Cor. xvi. 15 οἰδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ, ὅτι ... εἰς διακοινῶν τοὺς ἁγίους ἐταξιν ἐκατον, Rev. xviii. 4 ἔξελθετε ἐξ αὐτῆς, ὁ λαὸς μου (Hesiod. scut. 327), also ix. 18 ἀπεκτάνθησαν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, viii. 9 (but Sing. viii. 8 f., 11); Luke viii. 37; Acts xxv. 24. Elsewhere the Plur. and the Sing. of the verb or Pred. occur in connection, as in Jno. vi. 2 ἤκολούθει αὐτῷ ὁχλος πολὺς, ὅτι ἐώρων (xii. 9 f., 18), Luke i. 21 ἣν ὁ λαὸς προσδοκοῦν καὶ ἡθαύμαζον, Acts xv. 12 (1 Cor. xvi. 15). The Plural, in reference to a Collective, occurs in Luke ix. 12 ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὁχλόν, ἵνα ἅπελθοντες ... καταλύσωσι etc. When the Pred. consists of an adjective with εἰναι, the adjective is of course not only Plur. but also in the gender of the persons, as in Jno. vii. 49 ὁ ὁχλος οὐτος ... ἐπάρατοι εἰσίν. On the other hand, attributives in such constructions may stand either in the Plur. or the Sing.; — in the Sing. when they precede
the Substantive, as Mark ix. 15 πᾶς ὁ δύρχος ἰδόντες ... εξεθαμβήθη θησαυρός (Luke xix. 37; Acts v. 16; xx. 36; xxv. 24), Luke xxiii. 1 ἀναστὰ ἀπαντάνει τὸ πλῆθος ἰδιομοιοῦσαι. Yet in the N. T. the regular construction of Collectives with a Sing. Pred. is the more usual. The Plural construction often occurs in the Sept. also, as in Judg. ii. 10; Ruth iv. 11; 1 Sam. xii. 18 f.; 1 Kings iii. 2; viii. 66; xii. 12; Isa. li. 4; Judith vi. 18 (λαὸς is almost invariably construed with a Plural verb), and it does not mean rare in Greek authors; as, Her. 9, 23 ὃς σφι τὸ πλῆθος ἐπεβοήθησαν, Philostr. her. p. 709 ὁ στρατὸς ἀδυσμοὶ ἰδουα, Thuc. i, 20; 4, 128; Xen. Mem. 4, 3, 10; Aelian. anim. 5, 54; Plutarch. Mar. p. 418 c.; Pausan. 7, 9, 8; see Reitz, Lucian. VI. 538 Lehm; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 446; Krüger, Dion. H. p. 234; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 529 sq.; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 105.

458 Here belongs in the main also 1 Tim. ii. 15 συνήκασται δὲ (ἡ γυνῆ) διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, ἡν μείνωσιν (αι γυναῖκες) εν πίστει, for ἡ γυνῆ which is to be supplied is to be understood of the whole sex. But in Jno. xvi. 32 ὡσκοποιθῆ ἦταν ἵκαστος ἐν ἐνδιαφορά. Rev. xx. 13 (v. 8) 1 Pet. iv. 10; Acts xi. 29; see Hes. scut. 283; Aelian. anim. 15, 5; Var. Hist. 14, 46; Wesseling, Diod. Sic. II. 105; Brunck, Aristoph. Plut. 784; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 622. Similar to this is Acts ii. 12 and 1 Cor. iv. 6 ὡς μη ἀπερ αὐτῶν ἰδοὺς φυσιούσθη κατὰ τοῦ ἐκκλήσας. On the other hand, in Acts ii. 3 a suggestion of the Singular subject for ἵκαστος (for ἵκαστον is obviously a correction, to conform to ἰδοὺθησαν) is contained in ἐφ' ἐν ἵκαστον αὐτῶν. Other instances of a transition from the Plur. of a verb to the Sing. have been collected by Heind. Plat. Protag. p. 499; Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 100.

Collectives have influenced only the gender of the Pred. in Luke x. 13 εἶναι τωριᾷ καὶ Σιδώνισι ἰδειγμηθήσαν αἱ δυνάμεις ... παλαι ἀν ἐν σάκκῳ καθ' ἡμενοὶ (the inhabitants) μετανόησαν.

Note 1. Some have thought that a preceding Sing. verb construed with a (Masc. or Fem.) Plural Subject (the schema Pindaricum, Mth. 766; Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 86) occurs in Luke ix. 28 ἔγενος ... ὡς ἤμερα ὅκτω. But ἔγενος is to be taken by itself, and ὡς ἦμερα ὅκτω as a detached expression of time inserted parenthetically, see § 62, 2. On the other hand, in Luke ix. 13 εἰσὶν is not construed with πλῶν, but the latter is an unconnected insertion (cf. Xen. Anab. 1, 2, 11), and εἰσὶν belongs to ἅρπτω. That the Imperat. ἀγιο, which is nearly a pure interjection, is connected with a Plural subject without disturbing the construction, in Jas. iv. 13 ἀγιοίν ὅλην λέγοντες and v. 1 ἁγιοίν ὅλην πλοῦσιον, is obvious. This usage is frequent in Greek prose authors, e.g. Xen. Cyr. 4, 2, 47; 5, 3, 4;
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Note 2. Here may be introduced also a remark, in passing, on the usage according to which a Plural verb and pronoun are employed by an 482 individual speaker in reference to himself (Glass. I. 320 sqq.). The 1st el. communicative force is still manifest in Mark iv. 30 πώς ὁ μοι ὕσσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ εν τινι αὐτήν παραβολῆ θυμεν; Jno. iii. 11. It occurs much more frequently in the Epistles (as among the Romans scrip-simus, misimus), where the author speaks in his apostolic character, as in Rom. i. 5; cf. vs. 6 (otherwise explained by van Hengel, Rom. p. 52), Col. iv. 3 cf. the immediately following δεδεμαι, Heb. xiii. 18 cf. vs. 19; Gal. i. 8. Only it is necessary to distinguish from this usage the case in which the writer really includes other persons, though it may be difficult in particular instances to specify when and what persons he means besides himself, and at any rate that cannot be determined on grammatical grounds. 540 In Eph. i. 3 ff. and 1 Cor. iv. 9 the Plural proper is undoubtedly used. 459 As to Jno. xxi. 24 see Mey. (In 1 Cor. xv. 31 according to the reading θαὶ ἡμῖν ἀποθνῄσκω, νῇ τὴν ἡμετέραν καυχησον, ἡ ἐκ, the Sing. and the Plur. would be used together; but ἡμετέραν [which also Cod. Sin. gives] is here unquestionably to be preferred.)

5. Such sentences as the following are not to be regarded as instances of grammatical discord between the Subj. and Pred.: Matt. vi. 34 ἀρκετόν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ καλὰ αὐτῆς, 2 Cor. ii. 6 ἴκανον τῷ τοιούτῳ ἡ ἐπιτυμία αὐτῆ. The Neuters here are used as substantives: a sufficiency for such a one is, like triste lupus stabulis (Virg. ecl. 3, 80) a sad thing for the folds, (Ast, Plat. polit. p. 413; Hm. Vig. p. 699). Instances in Greek authors are: Her. 3, 36 σοφὸν ἡ προμηθεία, Xen. Hi. 6, 9 ὁ πόλεμος φοβερὸν, Diog. L. 1, 98 καλὸν ἡμοχία, Xen. M. 2, 3, 1; Plat. legg. 4, 707 a.; Plut. paedag. 4, 3; Lucian. philops. 7; Isocr. Demon. p. 8; Plat. couviv. p. 176 d.; Aristot. rhet. 2, 2, 46 and eth. Nic. 8, 1, 3; Lucian. fug. 13; Plut. mul. virt. p. 225 Tauchn.; Aelian. anim. 2, 10; Dio Chr. 40. 494; Sext. Emp. math. 11, 96. Cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 51; Wetsten. I. 337; Kypke, obs. I. 40; Fischer, Well. III. a. p. 310 sq.; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 237, ed. Lips.; Held, Plat. Timol. p. 367 sq.; Kühner, Gr. II. 45; Waitz, Aristot. categ. p. 292. In Lat. cf. Ovid. amor. 1, 9, 4; Cic. off. 1, 4; famil. 6, 21; Virg. eclog. 3, 82; Aen. 4, 569; Stat. Theb. 2, 899; Vechnner, Hellenol. p. 247 sqq. (As to the rhetorical emphasis sometimes involved in the use of the Neuter, see Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 396.)
§ 58. THE PROPOSITION AND ITS PARTS.

Of a different sort, but also deserving of notice, is the construction in 1 Pet. ii. 19 τούτο γὰρ χάρες; cf. τοῦτο ἄστιν ἀνάμνησις Demoeth. and upon it Schaefer appar. V. 289; Herm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 305.

6. If the Subject, or the Pedicate, or both, be compound (Mtth. 760), the grammatical form of the Predicate is determined according to the following rules:

a. If the Subject is composed of the 1st Person and 3d, the verb is put in the 1st Pers. Plur., as Ἰνο. x. 30 εγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐσ μεν, 1 Cor. ix. 6 ἡ μόνος εγὼ καὶ Βαρνάβας οὖκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαις etc. (1 Cor. xv. 11); Matt. ix. 14; Luke ii. 48 (Eurip. Med. 1020); but in Gal. i. 8 we find εὰν ἡμεῖς ἡ ἀγγελος εξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται, the latter Subject being regarded as the more exalted, Isae. 11, 10. When, on the other hand, to the 2d Pers. is annexed a 3d, the former receives the preference as the more important, and the verb (which precedes) is put in the 2d Pers., as in Acts xvi. 31 σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκος σου xi. 14.

b. When the several Subjects Sing. are of the 3d Person, or are impersonal objects,

a) the Pred., if it follows, is regularly put in the Plural, as in Acts iii. 1 Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀνέβαινον, iv. 19; xii. 25; xiii. 46; xiv. 14; xv. 35; xvi. 25; xxv. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Jas. ii. 15; and its Gender is Masculine when there is a Masc. among the Subjects, 2 Pet. iii. 7. An adjective belonging to them all agrees sometimes only with the first or the principal Subject, as in Acts v. 29 ἀποκριθεὶς Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐπαν; in the opposite case, Acts iv. 19, the Adj. is in the Masculine when the nouns are of different sex, as Acts xxv. 13 Ἀγνίττας καὶ Βερνίκη κατήρπησαν... ἀσπασάμενοι τῶν Φησιτῶν, Jas. ii. 15. When the disjunctive ἦ is used, a Singular Pred. also follows several Subjects, as in Matt. v. 18; xii. 25; xviii. 8; Eph. v. 5.

β) if the Pred. precedes, it is put either in the Plural, in case the author had in mind a plurality of Subjects, Mark x. 35 προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης, Ἰνο. xxi. 2, hence with καὶ... καὶ or τε... καὶ Luke xxiii. 12 ἐγένετο φίλος ὁ τε Πιλᾶτος καὶ ὁ Ἰρώδης (Acts i. 13; iv. 27; v. 24; xviii. 5), Tit. i. 16 μεμιᾶναι αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ νόμος καὶ ἡ συνείδησις; or in the Singular, if the Subjects are to be conceived separately, 1 Tim. vi. 4 ἐξ ὑμῶν γίνεται φθόνος, ἐρωτ, βλασφημίας etc. Rev. ix. 17 (Thuc. 1, 47; Plat. Gorg. 508 ε.; 517 d.; Lucian. dial. mort. 26, 1; Quint. inst. 9, 4, 22); 1 Cor. xiv. 24 ἐὰν εἰσέλθῃ τις ἀπίστος ἡ ἴδιώτης (so commonly when there is a disjunction by ἦ 1 Cor. vii. 15; 1 Pet.
iv. 15) [?]; Acts v. 38; xx. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 34; or only the first Subject, usually as the principal one, is specially taken into consideration, Jno. ii. 2 ἐκλήθη (καὶ) ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, iv. 53; viii. 52; xviii. 15; xx. 3; Acts xxvi. 30; Luke xxii. 14; Matt. xii. 8; Phil. 23; Rev. i. 3; xii. 7, etc.; Plat. Theag. 124 c.; Paus. 9, 13, 3; 9, 36, 1; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 25; Mdv. S. 3 f. In such case a predicate participle or adjective is put in the Plural, as in Luke ii. 33 ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζουντες, Rev. viii. 7. Cf., in general, Herm. Vig. p. 194; d’Orville, Charit. 497; Schoem. Isae. 462. When the Subjects are connected by ἦ Greek authors usually employ the Plural of the verb, cf. Porson, Eurip. Hecub. p. 12, Lips.; Schaeff. Melet. p. 24; Schoem. Isae. p. 295 (exactly as after ἄλλος ἄλλω and the like, see Jacobs, Philostr. p. 377). The distinction which Matth. Eurip. Hec. 84; Sprachl. II. 768 set up, is not perceptible, at least in the N. T. (The Sing. 542 is used quite regularly in the following arrangement, εἶ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐδάλῃσεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἀγγελός ... Acts xxiii. 9.)

By means of this construction very decided prominence is imparted to 484 one subject out of several in Jno. ii. 12 κατῆθη ἐς Καφαρναοῦμ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, iv. 12, 53; Luke vi. 3; vii. 22; Acts vii. 15, and the propriety of using the Singular Pred. here is obvious. This mode of expression is of frequent occurrence in Hebrew (Gesen. Lehrg. 722), and (even in the form αὐτὸς τε καὶ or καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ Ruth i. 8, 6) is not rare in Greek authors, Matth. Eurip. Iphig. A. 875; Weber, Demosth. 261; Fr. Mr. p. 70, 420; cf. Demosth. Euer. 688 a. εἰ διαμεῖν ἐς Παλαιᾶς αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ τὰ παιδία etc. Alciph. 1, 24 ὡς ἐν ἔχωμι σῶζοναι αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ τὰ παιδία.

7. When several Subjects or Predicates are united in a single proposition, the copulative particle is, according to the most simple construction, put before the last; whereas the disjunctive ἦ must stand before each of the successive words, as in Matt. vi. 31 τῇ φάγωμεν ἢ τῇ πίεσθω ἢ τῇ περιβάλωμεθα; Luke xviii. 29 δὲ ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἁδελφοὶς ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα. Even the copulative is sometimes used in this manner, as in Rom. ii. 7 τοῖς δοξαν καὶ τυμίῳ καὶ ἀφθαρσίᾳ ἡτοῦν, xi. 33; xii. 2 (Lucian. Nigr. 17), see Fr. Rom. II. 558. When such a series of words is introduced by ὡς, this particle is used but once, at the beginning; in 1 Pet. iv. 15, on the other hand, the repetition of ὡς before ἀλλοτριοποίηκατο σeparates this predicate from those that precede, and gives it independent prominence. The connecting particle is thus not unfrequently repeated before each word of a whole series (pολυσυνδετον), ές.
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A usage which is partly to be considered as merely an imitation of the Hebrew mode of expression (Ewald, krit. Gr. 650) Matt. xxiii. 23; Rev. xvii. 15; xviii. 12; xxi. 8, and partly seems to arise from an effort to secure due attention to the import of each word, as in Rom. vii. 12 ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή, ix. 4 ὁν ἡ νοοθεσία καὶ ἡ δίκαια καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νοομοσεία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, Luke xiv. 21 τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ ἀναπηροὺς καὶ τυφλοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς εἰσάγαγε, 1 Pet. i. 4; iii. 8; Jno. xvi. 8; Acts xv. 20, 29; xxi. 25; Phil. iv. 12; Rev. ii. 19; v. 12; vii. 9, 12; viii. 5; Philostr. Apoll. 6, 24; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 32. So in particular with proper names, Acts i. 13; xiii. 1; xx. 4; Matt. iv. 25; Jno. xxii. 2. On the other hand, the connective of the different parts of a single sentence is entirely omitted (ασυνδετον).

a. In enumerations, 2 Tim. iii. 2 ἐστοὺς οἱ ἄνθρωποι φίλανθοι, φιλάργυροι, ἀλάξιοι, υπερήφανοι, βλασφήμοι etc., 1 Cor. iii. 12 ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον χρυσόν, ἀργυρον, λιθοὺς τιμίους, ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην, 1 Pet. iv. 8; Heb. xi. 37; 1 Tim. i. 10; iv. 13, 15 (Cic. fam. 2, 5; Attic. 13, 13); Rom. i. 29 ff.; ii. 19; Phil. iii. 5; Jno. v. 3; 1 Cor. xiii. 4–8; xiv. 26; 2 Cor. iv. 8 f.; Jas. v. 6; 543 1 Pet. ii. 9; Matt. xv. 19 (Col. iii. 11 is peculiar). Similar are Demosth. Phil. 4 p. 54 a. and Pantaen. p. 626 a.; Plat. Gorg. p. 508 e.; 517 d.; rep. 10 p. 598 c.; Lycurg. 36, 2; Lucian. dial. mort. 26, 2; Heliod. 1, 5.

b. In parallelisms and antitheses, which thus receive additional prominence, 2 Tim. iv. 2 ἐπίστηθι εἰκαίρως ἀκαίρως (like nolens volens, honesta turpia, digni indigni, ἄνω κάτω, Aristoph. ran. 157 ἄνδρων γυναικῶν, Beier, Cic. off. I. 135; Kritz, Sull. I. 55; II. § 23), 1 Cor. iii. 2 γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐποτίσα, οὐ βρῶμα, vii 12; Jno. x. 16; Jas. i. 19. Yet asyndeton in such cases is not necessary, Col. ii. 8; 1 Cor. x. 20; cf. Fr. Mr. p. 31 sq. who, however, has drawn a distinction between the two modes of expression which seems to me too subtle.

When some of the Subjects are in the Plural, the verb following is put in the Plural, Acts v. 17, 29. This, however, seems not to be indispensable, Diod. S. 20, 72 δάκρυα καὶ δείκτες καὶ βρήχος ἐγένετο συμφορητός, Xen. rep. Ath. 1, 2.

Note. When several substantives either in the Subject or the Predicate are connected by καὶ, the first sometimes denotes an individual comprehended in the second as its genus, as Ζεὺς καὶ θεός. After the second, therefore, λοιπὸν was supplied; but the intention of the expression is to give prominence to the individual as the principal subject, as in Acts v. 29
§ 58. THE PROPOSITION AND ITS PARTS. 521

δ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι (Theodoret. III. 223; see Schaeff. Sophocl. II. 314, 335), i. 14; Mark xvi. 7; Matt. xvi. 14 (yet see Mey. in loc.) cf. Mark x. 41.

This schema καὶ ἔδωκα (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 221) is an established idiom in Greek authors, cf. Plat. Protag. p. 310 d. ἂν καὶ θεοὶ (Plaut. capt. 5, 1, 1; Jovi dissique ago gratias), Iliad. 19, 63 Ἕκτωρ καὶ Ἰομή, Aeschin. Timarch. p. 171 c. Σαλὼν ἐκέινος, δὶς θαλάς νομοθέτης, καὶ δὶς Δράκων καὶ οἱ κατὰ τοὺς χρῶνες ἐκέινους νομοθέται, Aristoph. nub. 412 (Chrysippus et Stoici Cic. Tusc. 4, 5, 9), see Ast, Theophr. char. p. 120; Stallb. Plat. 462 Protag. p. 25. On Eurip. Med. 1141, which Elmsley adduced in support of this idiom, see Hm. Med. p. 392 ed. Lips., besides Locella Xen. Ephes. p. 208. (Of a different yet kindred nature is the Latin phrase exercitus equitatusque, Caes. b. gall. 2, 11.)

8. If two predicative verbs have a common object, and both verbs govern the same case, the object is expressed only once, as in Luke xiv. 4 ἰάσατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσεν, Matt. iv. 11. In Greek authors, too, the object is regularly but once expressed even when the verbs govern different cases, Krü. 227. In the N. T., when the verbs govern different cases, the object is usually repeated in the form of a pronoun, as in Luke xvi. 2 φονήσας αὐτὸν ἔτειν εἰς τὸν, yet cf. Acts xiii. 3 ἐπιθέετο τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἀπέλυσαν, Eph. v. 11 544 μὴ συγκοινώνετε τοῖς ἐργοῖς τοῖς ἁκάρποις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐλέγχετε, 2 Thess. iii. 15; 1 Tim. vi. 2, see § 22, 1 p. 143.

9. Of the three constituent parts of a proposition, the subject and the predicate are indispensable; but the simple copula is implied in the mere juxtaposition of the subject and predicate: ὁ θεὸς σοφὸς (which in Greek can only mean, God is wise). The same holds also when the subject and the predicate are extended, as in Heb. v. 13 πᾶς ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος ἀπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor. i. 21; Rom. xi. 15; see § 64, 2. But as the predicate is usually blended with the copula, so the subject may be implied in the 486 copula, or in the blended copula and predicate. This takes place, independently of any special context,

a. When the verb is in the 1st or 2d Pers. (where the subjects are conceived as present, Mdv. p. 6) usually, as in Jno. xix. 22 ἔγραφα, γέγραφα, Rom. viii. 15 οὐκ ἔλαβετε πνεύμα δουλείας, as here even the pronouns ἐγὼ, σὺ are expressed only when emphasis is intended, see § 22, 6. If now the name of the subject be annexed to the pronoun of the 1st or 2d Pers., as in Gal. v. 2 ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ἤμων (Eph. iii. 1; Rom. xvi. 22; 2 Cor. x. 1; Phil. 19; Rev. i. 9; xxii. 8, etc.), Gal. ii. 15 ἡμεῖς φίλει Ιουδαίοι ...
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eis Xριστ. Ἰησ. ἐπιστεῦσαμεν (2 Cor. iv. 11) Luke xi. 39, the adjunct is in apposition.

b. When the verb is in the 3d Pers. (impersonally), and then
   a) a Plur. Active is used, if merely (acting) subjects generally are meant (Mdv. S. 7); Matt. vii. 16 μὴ τι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἁκανθῶν σταφυλίματα; do they (people) gather etc., does one gather etc. Jno. xv. 6; xx. 2; Mark x. 13; Acts iii. 2; Luke xvii. 23; Rev. xii. 6. See Fischer, Weller. III. I. 347; Duker, Thucyd. 7, 69; Bornem. Schol. p. 84.

   β) a Sing. Active, when no definite subject is meant (Mdv. S. 7) of which the verb is predicative, but only the action or condition is designated as a fact: ὅρα, βροντὰ (Jno. xii. 29 βροντῆς γίνεται) it rains, etc. (cf. Germ. es lünet), 1 Cor. xv. 52 σαλπίζει there will be a sound of trumpets, also 2 Cor. x. 10 αἱ ἑπιστολάς, φησὶ, βαρηῖαν, it is said (Wisd. xv. 12). Yet, according to the concrete conception of the Greeks, this idiom may, strictly, be elliptical: ὅρα, βροντὰ Ζεῦς (Xen. H. 4, 7, 4), σαλπίζει ο σαλπηρίτης, like the ἀναγρώσεται of the orators, see § 64, 8. On (the parenthetical) φησί, not infrequent in Greek authors, see Wolf, Demosth. Lept. p. 288; Wytenbach, Plut. mor. II. 105; Boissoneau. Eunap. p. 418, (in Latin inquit, ait is similar, see Heindorf, Horat. 6th ed. sat. p. 146; Ramshorn, Gramm. S. 383).

545 γ) More frequently, however, in such impersonal sense a Sing. Passive is used (Mdv. S. 8), as in 1 Cor. xv. 42 στείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ (see v. Hongel in loc.), 1 Pet. iv. 6 εἰς τοῦτο καὶ νεκροίς εἰς ἐνεργείαν etc., Matt. vii. 2, 7; v. 21, etc. This form is connected with the 3d Pers. Plur. Active in a parallelism in Luke xii. 48 ὁ ἐδόθη πολύ, πολύ, ζητήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ παρέθευτο πολύ, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτοῦ.¹

The forms of quotation, λέγει 2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16; Eph. iv. 8 etc., φησί 1 Cor. vi. 16; Heb. viii. 5, εἴρηκε Heb. iv. 4 (cf. the rabbinic נאָצַק, see Surenhus. βῆθα, καταλ. p. 11), μαρτυρεῖ Heb. vii. 17 (ἐπὶ 1 Cor. xv. 27), were probably never intended by the N. T. writers to be taken impersonally; but for the most part the Subject (ὁ θεός) is directly or indirectly contained in the context. In 1 Cor. vi. 16 and Matt. xix. 5, however, in connection with φησί and ἐπεξεργασίᾳ there is an apostolic ellipsis (of ὁ θεός). Lastly, in Heb. vii. the best authorities [Sin. also] give μαρτυρεῖαν.

There is nothing at all impersonal in Jno. xii. 40 (one acquainted with

¹ It cannot, however, be inferred from this that the 3d Plural Active strictly has a Passive sense (as in Chald., see my Gram. § 49), for even in Luke xii. 26 ἀναπτούνσθω may be taken concretely; see Bornem. in loc.
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the Scriptures easily supplies δ θεός), 1 Cor. xv. 25 (θι σοιλικτ Χριστός from αὐτῶν), Rom. iv. 3, 22 ἐκστίστων Ἀβρ. τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαοσύνην sc. τὸ πιστεύειν from ἐκστίστων., Jno. vii. 51 ἐὰν μὴ ἀκοῦσῃ where δ νόμος is to be repeated, which is personified as a judge; in 1 Jno. v. 16 from αὕτη the word αὐτοῖμον (θεός) might be supplied as the Subject of δόσει (Lücke) more suitably than αὐτῶν; lastly, in Heb. x. 38 ἐὰν ὑποστήληση it would perhaps be most simple to educe the general term ἀνθρώπος from δ δικαος.

The Predicate is involved in εἶναι when it signifies existere, Matt. xxiii. 31 εἰ ἦμεθα εἰ ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων etc., Jno. viii. 58; Rev. xxii. 1 ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστεν ἔτη. In this sense adverbs are then annexed for closer specification in 1 Cor. vii. 26 καλῶν ἀνθρώπως τῷ οἴνῳ εἶναι.

§ 59. EXTENSION OF A SIMPLE SENTENCE IN ITS SUBJECT AND Predicate: ATTRIBUTIVES, APPPOSITION.

1. The Subject and the Predicate of a proposition may be extended in a great variety of ways by adjuncts: And first of all attributively, most commonly by means of adjectives, see no. 2. Personal nouns in particular which denote office, character, etc., receive, with little extension of significatio, general personal 546 attributives in the substantives ἀνθρώπως, ἀνήρ, γυνή etc. (Mtth. 967) Matt. xviii. 28 ἐμοιούθη ... ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλείᾳ, xiii. 45; xx. 1; xxi. 33 (Iliad. 16, 263 ἀνθρώπως ὀδίτης, Xen. Cyr. 8, 7, 14; Plato, Gorg. 518 c.); Acts iii. 14 ἔτησασθε ἄνδρα φωνα χαρισθήναι ὅμι, i. 16; Luke xxiv. 19 (Piat. Ion. p. 540 d. ἀνήρ στρατηγός, Thuc. 464 1, 74; Palaeph. 28, 2 ἀνήρ ἀλμείος, 38, 2; Plat. rep. 10, 620 b.; Xen. 60 c. Hi. 11, 1; see Fischer ind. ad Palaeph. sub ἀνήρ, Vechner, Hellenol. p. 188. Cf. on the Hebrew idiom, my Simonis p. 54.). On the other hand, in 1 Cor. ix. 5 γυναῖκι is to be taken predicatively; it would be wrong, also, to refer to this head passages in which the attributive is strictly an adjective, as in Acts i. 11; xvii. 12; xxi. 9 (Nep. 25, 9); Jno. iv. 9. In the addresses ἄνδρες Ἰσραήλιται Acts ii. 22, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι xvii. 22; xix. 35 the emphasis lies on ἄνδρες, and renders the address one of respect (cf. Xen. An. 3, 2, 2). Similar forms of address are frequent in the Greek orators.

2. Adjectives (and participles) annexed to substantives attributively to supplement their meaning regularly stand after them, Luke ix. 37 συνήντησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλον καὶ πολίς, Rev. xvi. 2 ἔγγεντο ἄλος 488 καὶ πονηρόν, Matt. iii. 4; Jno. ii. 6; 2 Tim. iv. 7 τὸν ἄγωνα τῶν καλῶν ἡγώνισμα, Luke v. 36 ff.; Phil. iv. 1; Rev. vi. 12, 13, since the thing itself presents itself to the mind before its Predi-
cate. When, however, the adjective is to receive any degree of prominence, as directly or indirectly antithetical, it is put before the substantive; and this is peculiarly frequent in the didactic style: Matt. xiii. 24 ὁμοίωθ' ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνδρόν αὐτῷ σπείρανε καλὸν σπέρμα (vs. 25 ἐσπειρεῖν ὕζωμα), Luke viii. 15 τὸ (πειρόν) ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ (vss. 12, 13, 14); Jno. ii. 10 πρῶτον τῶν καλῶν οἶκων τίθησιν, καὶ ὕστερον μεθοδοῦσιν, τότε τὸν ἐλάσσον (Rom. i. 23; xiii. 3; Mark i. 45; Matt. xiii. 35); 1 Cor. v. 6 διὸ κυρία ζύμη ὅλω τῷ φύραμα ζυμοῦ (Jas. iii. 5); 1 Pet. iv. 10 ἐκαστὸς καθὼς ἐλάβεν χάρισμα εἰς ἑαυτὸς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλὸν οἰκονόμοι (the καθὼς ὃς not do so), Heb. x. 29 (cf. vs. 28); viii. 6; Rom. vi. 12 ἡ βασιλευμένη ή ἀμαρτία ἐν τῷ θυσιῶν ὑμῶν σώματι (just because the σώμα is θυσίαν, it would be absurd to allow such dominion), 2 Pet. i. 4; Mark xiv. 6; Heb. ix. 11, 12; 1 Tim. i. 19; 1 Cor. v. 7; 2 Cor. v. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10, 19. Hence in the apostolic diction καὶ κίνος, καὶ δίκαιος, and for the most part ἢ καῦμα διαθήκη. But even the adjective put after the substantive may be emphatic when made prominent by the article, Jno. iv. 11 τὸ ἔχεις τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἱερὸν; x. 11 ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς, or when placed at the end of the sentence, as in Mark ii. 21 οὐδεὶς ἐπηράπτετε ἐπὶ ἵματόν παλαιῶν, Jno. xix. 41; Mark xvi. 17 ἔκλεισαν 547 καὶ ἤλειπον καῦμα. In one and the same verse we find an adjective preceding and another following the substantive, Tit. iii. 9 μωρᾶς διηνέχεις ... μάχας νομικάς. In general, it must not be forgotten that it often depends on the writer whether he will emphasize the adjective or not. Thus in Jno. xiii. 34; 1 Jno. ii. 7, 8 καὶ ὑπὸ ἐντολὴν might have been put in distinct antithesis to the old commandments, but the Apostle says ἐντολὴν καῦμα, a commandment which is new. In Rev. iii. 12 we find τῇ καὐμαὶ Ιερουσ. but xxi. 2 Ιερουσ. καῦμα; and in 2 Pet. iii. 13 καὶ οὐρανοὶ καὶ γῆ καῦμα, it was sufficient to emphasize the adjective by position merely the first time. In Acts vii. 36; Heb. xi. 29 we find ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα, but in the Sept. frequently θάλασσα ἐρυθρὰ. When two or more adjectives connected by καὶ belong to one substantive, they are put before or after it, in accordance with the preceding distinctive arrangements, as in 1 Tim. ii. 2 ἡ ἱδρυμα καὶ ἡ πρόκλησις ὑπὸ διάγωμαν, Matt. xxv. 21 διὸ διὰ σῶμα καὶ πνεύμα, Luke xxiii. 50 ἰδρύμα καὶ δύναμις, Acts xi. 24; Rev. iii. 14; xvi. 2. Such arrangements of words as in Matt. xxiv. 45 ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ πρόκλητος, Heb. x. 34, are to be accounted for by the circumstance, that the writer afterwards introduces a second adjective to complete the sense, or has reserved it for the end of the sentence for the sake of force.
3. Two or more adjectives regularly are connected by καὶ and
joined to their substantives, 1 Pet. i. 4 εἰς κληρονομίαν ἀφθαρτον
καὶ ἁμαρτων, καὶ ἁμαρτων, vs. 19; 2 Pet. ii. 14 etc. When the
copula is omitted, it is either because the intention of the writer 489
is to enumerate single qualities separately deserving of attention
(§ 58, 6) 1 Tim. iii. 2 ff. δεὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπιληπτὸν εἴλαι,
νηρῆλα, σόφρα, κόσμου etc. Tit. i. 6; ii. 4 f.; Phil. ii. 2; Rev.
v. 1 (Job i. 8) see § 58, 7, perhaps with climax Luke vi. 38 (Mthh.
998); or because one of the adjectives is more closely related to
the substantive, and forms with it as it were one notion, 1 Pet.
i. 18 ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ύμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου, Jno. xii. 3
μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου, where νάρδου πιστικῆ designates,
commercially as it were, a certain sort of spikenard, which is
then declared to be πολύτιμος, Jno. xvii. 3 ἣν γνῶσκοςοι σὲ τὸν
μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, Gal. i. 4; 1 Cor. x. 4; Rev. i. 16; ii. 12; xii. 3;
xxv. 6; xx. 11, (which is sometimes obvious from the mere position
of the words, as in Jno. vii. 37 ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ
tῆς ἔρημος, Heb. ix. 11). Cf. Her. 7, 23 σῖτος πολλὸς ἐφοίτα ἐκ
tῆς Ἀσίας ἀλληλεσμένος, Dion. H. IV. 2097 συναγαγόντες ἰδιωτικὸν
συνέδριον πατρικῶν, see Mthh. 998; Dissen, Pindar. ed. Goth. 308 sq.; 548
Cyr. p. 71; cf. (Nep. 25, 9, 14; Cic. parad. 5, 2) Kritz, Sallust.
Jug. 172. (When the second Predicate is a real participle, a
connecting καὶ is of course not to be expected, Acts xxvii. 6
eἰρῶν πλοῖον Ἀλεξανδρίνον πλέων εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, Mark xiv. 14;
Rev. x. 1.)

When πολύς is annexed to a substantive that already has an adjective,
it will either be construed according to the preceding rule, as in Jno. x. 32
πολλὰ καὶ ἐγγά ἐδωκα, 1 Tim. vi. 9, or written as in Acts xxv. 7 πολλά
τι καὶ βαριὰ αἰτώματα, where the word expressing the quality is made
prominent: many and (that, too,) heavy etc. Cf. Her. 4, 167; 8, 61; Xen.
Mem. 2, 9, 6; Lys. 26, 1, see Mthh. 998. Under this are come also
Jno. xx. 30 πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα (but xxii. 25 ἄλλα πολλά), and Luke
iii. 18 πολλὰ καὶ ἔγνω (which is not unknown also in Greek authors, see
Kypke on the first passage) many and other, for which we say many other.

4. From the natural rule, that an adjective must agree with its
substantive in gender and number, there is sometimes a deviation,
when the writer allows regard for the thought to prevail over that
for the grammatical form. That is

a. Neuter or Feminine substantives that signify persons have
Masculine adjectives joined to them (Hm. Vig. p. 715), Rev.
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xix. 14 τὰ στρατεύματα ... ἡκολούθει αὐτῷ ... ἐνδεδυμένοι
βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρόν, v. 6; Eph. iv. 17, 18; 1 Cor. xii. 2; Mark
ix. 26 (Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 3 αἱ πόλεις ... ως παιόντες, Cyrl. 1, 2,
466 12; 7, 3, 8; Joseph. antt. 6, 11, 6; cf. Liv. 7, 2; still more bold
is Aristid. I. 267 extr. Jebb. ἀμίλλα καὶ σπουδὴ τῶν ἐκατέρωθεν
μεγίστων πόλεων, καλούντων τι ως αὐτούς, Rev. xi. 15 ἐγένετο
φωναὶ μεγάλαι ... λέγοντες (v. 13 f.); iv. 8 τὰ τέσσαρα θω, ἐν
καθ' ἐν αὐτῶν ἤχων ἀνά πτέρυγας ἤξ ... καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν οὐκ ἤχουν
ήμερας καὶ νυκτὸς λέγοντες.

In Eph. iv. 18 ἵστοτιμαῖοι does not belong to the subordinate clause
490 καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη, but to ὡμᾶς; and 2 Jno. 4 εὕρηκα ἐκ τῶν τεκνῶν σου
τῷ εἰπερίπατοντας only borders upon the above usage.

b. Collectives (cf. § 58, 4) in the Sing. sometimes have adjectives
after them in the Plural, as in Acts v. 16 ὑπηκόρετο τὸ
πλῆθος τῶν πέριξ πόλεων Ἱερ. φέροντες ἀσθενεῖς etc. (xxi. 36; Luke
xix. 37; cf. Diod. S. 5, 43; Xen. Ephl. 1, 3; Palairet, observ.
p. 201); iii. 11 συνέδραμεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ... ἐκθαμβοῦν, Jno. xii. 12;
Rev. vii. 9; xix. 1 (Philostr. Apoll. 2, 12); Luke ii. 13 τὰ πλῆθος
549 στρατιῶν ὕπαρχον αἰνοῦντων τῶν θεῶν etc. On the other hand,
in Rev. iii. 9 τῶν λεγόντων is not an epithet of συναγωγῆς, but to
be taken partitively. The Sing. and Plural connected, occur in
Mark viii. 1 παπύρων ἐχολοῦν δυτος καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων, τι φάγωσι,
Acts xxi. 36; cf. Diod. S. 14, 78 τῶν πληθοῦσα συντρέχοντος ... καὶ
τῶν μοθοῦν πρότερον ἀπαντοῦντων, Virg. Aen. 2, 64 undique visendi
studio Trojana juventus circumfusa ruit certantque illudere capto.
Further, see Poppo Thuc. I. 102 sq.; Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 36;
Anab. p. 354; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 811; Hm. Lucian. conscr.
hist. p. 301; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 103 sq.; Mth. 976 f.

Noteworthy is the connection of two genders in Rev. xiv. 19 ἵδαιμα εἰς
τὴν ληφόν τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν μέγαν, as even Tdfl. reads, (ληφός is some-
undoubtedly wrote ληφόν μεγάλην ... ἠτίς, see Bornem. in loc. In Phil.
ii. 1 all recent editors [with the exception of Lchm. and Tdfl. 7th ed.] have
substituted εἰ τοῦ for εἰ τις σπλάγχνα.

5. When an adjective refers to two or more substantives of
different genders or numbers, it is

a. Usually repeated with each substantive, as in Mark xiii. 1 Πέ

1 Lucke (Apokal. II. 464) wants either to read with a single Codex τοῦ μεγάλου
(which is probably a correction), or to assume a constructio ad sensum, the writer in
using τοῦ μέγαν having thought only of θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Lucke himself confesses that
the latter assumption is pretty violent and harsh. See also Matthai's small edition, p. 63.
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ποιαὶ λίθῳ καὶ ποιαὶ παράλληλοι, Jas. i. 17 πάσα δόσις ἀγαθή καὶ πάν ὁρμημα τέλειον, Rev. xxi. 1 οὐρανὸν καινόν καὶ γῆν καινήν, Jno. xi. 33; Acts iv. 7; 1 Cor. xiii. 2; Eph. i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 13 (3 Esr. iii. 5); cf. Aristot. Nicom. 7, 9, 1; Demosth. pac. 23 b. Or

b. Used only once: preceding, in the gender and number of the first substantive, Luke x. 1 εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον, 1 Thess. v. 23; Rev. xiii. 7; vi. 14; vii. 9; cf. Diod. S. 1, 4 μετὰ πολλῆς κακοπάθειας καὶ κυδόνων, Dem. Con. 728 a.; Plutarch. mor. 993 a.; on the other hand, when placed after the substantives, it is sometimes in the Plur. and sometimes in the Sing., and its gender is that of the nearest or principal substantive, as in Heb. ix. 9 δόρα 467 τε καὶ θυσίαν προσφέροντα μὴ δυνάμενα etc. iii. 6 ἑὰν τὴν παράδοσιν συν. εἰς καὶ τὸ καύχημα μέχρι τέλους βεβαιών κατάσχομεν (var.), Rev. viii. 5. 550 Cf. Iliad. 2, 136 sq. αἱ ἡμέτερα τ' ἄλοχοι καὶ νήπια τέκνα εἰστ' εἰνὶ 491 μεγάρους ποτιδέγμεναι, Thuc. 8, 63 πυθόμενος ... καὶ τὸν Στρωμβι-χέδη καὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀπεληλυθότα, Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 60. If the substantives are of the same gender, or if the adjective employed has not different forms to express different genders, it is usually expressed but once; — with the first substantive as in Acts ii. 43; Matt. iv. 24; Mark ii. 15; Eph. i. 21; 1 Cor. xi. 30 (2 Pet. i. 10); Rev. vi. 15, or with the second as in 2 Cor. 6.

The Plural of an adjective which belongs to two substantives may appear to be used in 1 Pet. i. 18 σοι φθαρτοῖς ἄργωρης ἡ χρυσὶς ἀληθῆτα; but φθαρτ. must be regarded as a substantive, and ἄργ. and χρ. as explanatory specifications in apposition to it: not with corruptible things, silver or gold etc.

6. Predicative amplifications, which we introduce by as or for, to, are very frequent: 1 Tim. ii. 7 εἰς δ' ἐπεθυμή ἐγὼ κηρύξ; 1 Cor. x. 6 ταῦτα τῶν ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, vs. 11; xv. 26; Matt. i. 18; Jno. iii. 2; xii. 46; 2 Tim. i. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 5 αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ἔχουν αἰνοδομεῖσθε ὅκος πνευματικός, 1 Cor. ix. 5 ἅδελφην γυναίκα περιά-γειν, Rom. iii. 25 ὑπ' ἐπιθύμησιν ὅ θεὸς ἀλατήριος, Jas. v. 10 ὑποθέσας λάβετε ... τοὺς προφήτας, Acts vii. 10; xix. 19; xx. 28; xxv. 14; xxvi. 5; Luke xx. 43; 1 Cor. xv. 20, 28; 2 Cor. iii. 6; 1 Jno. iv. 10, 14 (2 Thess. ii. 13 according to the reading ἀπαρχήν) Heb. i. 2; xii. 9; 2 Pet. iii. 1; Rev. xiv. 4. Sometimes such a Predic- cate is made prominent by the comparative particle ὡς, as in 2 Cor. x. 2 λογισμένοις ἡμᾶς ὡς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατῶμεν, 1 Cor. iv. 1; cf. 2 Thess. iii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 1 f.; or the Hebraistic construction with εἰς is adopted, as in Acts xiii. 22 ἥγεσιν τὸν Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς
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βασιλέα, vs. 47; vii. 21; see p. 228. On making the Predicate precede, see § 61.

The Predicate is sometimes an adjective, as in Heb. vii. 24 ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱεροσόλυμα, Mark viii. 17; Heb. v. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 22; Matt. xii. 13 ἁπεκατεστάθη (ἢ χειρ) ὑγίες, Acts xiv. 10; xxvii. 43; xxviii. 13; Rom. x. 19; 1 Cor. iv. 9; ix. 17; Mark iv. 28; or a pronoun, as in Rom. ix. 24 οὖν (σκέπη ἐλκον) καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς, Jno. iv. 23; Heb. x. 20. On the other hand, a Predicate is sometimes annexed to a pronoun, as in 1 Pet. iii. 21 δὲ (ὁδὶρ) καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σωζέται.

Such Predicates are sometimes to be taken proleptically (Bornem. Luc. p. 39; Krü. 210), as in Matt. xii. 13 ἁπεκατεστάθη ὑγίες ἢ ἂντε γενόσθαι ἡγιστη (Luke xiii. 35 var.) Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. i. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 13.

551 7. Especially diversified are the appositive adjuncts,1 which, annexed syntactically, are intended mainly to define more closely one nominal (or pronominal) notion by another. But apposition is,

468 492 a. Synthetic, in the case of proper names which are distinguished by the species or genus, or, if they belong in common to a plurality of persons or of objects, by a distinctive quality: Matt. iii. 6 ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, Heb. xii. 22 προσελθόντας Σίων δρει, Acts x. 32 οἰκία Σίμωνος βυρσίδων, Heb. vii. 4 δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἐδωκεν ... οἱ πατριάρχες, Acts xxii. 39; Rev. ii. 24.

b. Partitive (Rost 844): 1 Cor. vii. 7 ἐκατος Ἰδου ἔχει χρίσιμα, ὁ μὲν ὀφείλες, ὁ δὲ ὀφείλες, Matt. xxii. 5; Acts xvii. 32; xxvii. 44, more simply in Acts ii. 6 ἡκονον εἰς ἐκατος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ etc., Eph. iv. 25.

c. Parathetic, when some characteristic of a person or thing is expressed: Luke xxiii. 50 Ἰωσῆφ, ἄνηρ ἄγαθος καὶ δίκαιος, Jno. xiii. 14 εἶ ἐγὼ ἐνυψα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος, viii. 40; Heb. ix. 24; Acts xxii. 12; Jas. i. 8; Matt. xiv. 20; Rom. vii. 19; cf. 1 Pet. v. 1, etc.

d. Exegegetic, when a more precise expression is added, which we should introduce by namely, that is to say: Eph. i. 7 ἐν φ’ ἑκομεν (vs. 10) τὴν ἁπάλατροσιν ... τὸν ἀφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων, 1 Pet. v. 8 ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν, διάβολος, Eph. i. 13; ii. 15; iv. 18; Phil. iv. 18; 1 Cor. v. 7; 2 Cor. v. 1; vii. 6; Rom. viii. 23; Jno. vi. 27; vii. 2; Mark xii. 44; Acts viii. 38; 1 Jno. v. 20; Jude 4; Rev. xii. 1, etc. So also after pronouns, as in Jno. ix. 13

---

1 Well-considered views are contained in J. D. Weickert's Progr. on Apposition in German, Lübben, 1839. 4to. Further, cf. Mehhorn de Appositione in Graeca ling. Glog. 1838 (Sommer in the Zeitschr. für Alterthumswiss. 1839. nr. 125 f.), Rost, Gramm. 482 f.
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ἀγονον αὐτὸν ... τῶν ποτὲ τυφλῶν, 1 Thess. iv. 3 τοῦτο ἐστι θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἀγαμσός ὑμῶν (Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 15; Plat. rep. 9, 583 d.; Gorg. 478 c.); 2 Cor. ii. 1 ἐκεῖνα ἔμαυτό τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ ... ἐξεῖσθαι (Rost 486); Eph. i. 19 εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας, Rom. xiv. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 9; Phil. iii. 3; Jas. i. 27; 1 Pet. i. 21; ii. 7 (2 Pet. iii. 2); 1 Jno. ii. 16; iii. 241 etc. (Bornem. Luc. p. 114 sq.); 1 Cor. xvi. 21 ὃ ἀναστασιμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παῦλου i.e. τῇ χειρὶ μου Π. (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 74; Krü. 213 f.; Rost 483; cf. Cic. parad. 4, 8; Fam.5,12; Liv. 4,2; 7,40). Appositive adjuncts occur even after adverbs, as in Luke iv. 23 ὦ ἔν τῇ πατρίδι σου (Aeschyl. Choeph. 654); Jas. iv. 1 πόθεν πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι; οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν, ἐκ τῶν ἱδωνων etc. Mark viii. 4; Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 7, 15. 552

Several words may be joined by apposition to one and the same subject, Rev. xii. 9; xiii. 16; and so sometimes an apposition consists of several parts, 2 Thess. ii. 3 sq. On the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 18 we are not (with Lchm. and Tdf.) to find in τοῖς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένως an apposition to τοῖς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγονται, but that second Accusative depends on ἀποφεύγω. [see Huther and Wiesinger in loc.].

An apposition occurs also in Mark viii. 8 ὁρὰν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων 498 ἐπὶ τῶṇ ἀπρόδητας they took up remnants, seven baskets; and in Matt. xvi. 13, μελ. according to the reading τῶν με λέγουσιν οἱ ἀδρωμοὶ ζῶν, τὸν οἶνον τοῦ ἄνθρωπος; the last words would be an apposition, see Bornem. Luc. p. LII. To reject μὲ on the sole authority of Cod. B [and Cod. Sin.] (for versions cannot be counted here) with Fr. [Tdf.] and others [Lchm. puts it in brackets] I consider rash. Μὲ here may be cumbersome, but I cannot regard it as inadmissible: who do people say that I, the Son of Man, am? He himself had always styled himself the Son of Man, and now desires to hear what idea the people have of him as the Son of Man. As to other passages, in which the Dutch critics in particular have taken offence at such appositions and made hasty alterations in the text, see Bornem. diss. de glossem. N. T. cap. 5 prefixed to his Scholia on Luke.

We must likewise refer to the head of Apposition the well-known use of ἄλλοι before a substantive, which occurs not only in Homer, e.g. Odys. ἄλλοι 2, 412 μήτε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι οἱ ἄλλα δημοῖ τοῖς ἄλλοις πολιτὶς καὶ τοῖς

1 The personal pronoun included in a verb takes an apposition in 1 Pet. v. 1 παρακαλῶ (ἔχε) ὅ συμμετέχοντος καὶ μάρτυρς etc. cf. Lucian. d. deor. 24, 2; Thuc. i. 1, 137; Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 42. To this head may be referred also 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταύτα γενέω ἢ (ἡμῖν, τοῖς σου, i.e. some).
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ἀλλων ξένων and the rest (namely) foreigners, Xen. An. 5. 4, 25 οι πολέμους ἐν δή πάντες γενόμενοι ἡμάχοντο καὶ ἐξεκοντεύοντο τοὺς παλτοὺς καὶ ἄλλα δόρατα ἔχοντες, 1, 5, 5; cf. Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 128 sq. Lips.; Jacobs, Athen. p. 22 sq.; Krüger, Dion. p. 139; Poppo, Cyrop. p. 186; Vio. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 54 sq.; Zell, Aristot. ethic. p. 62. This is probably not to be applied to Jno. xiv. 16 καὶ ἄλλον παράληπτον δωτέ ὑμῖν; but the analogous ἔτεροι does appear to be so used in Luke xxiii. 32 ἡγομένοι δὲ καὶ ἔτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι σύν αὐτῷ ἀναρεθήσαται, where from the expression Jesus also seems to be called κακοῦργος (cf. x. 1 ἀνδρευόμενος καὶ ἕκκλησις ἡμᾶς καὶ ἔτερος ἡ δοξολογία δύο). See Thuc. 4. 67; Antiph. 6. 24.

Abbreviation combined with apposition occurs in 2 Cor. vi. 13: τὴν αὐτὴν ἀντιμεθέναι παραληθείς καὶ ἔμαχος, instead of τῷ αὐτῶ, ὥστε ἀντιμεθεία, see Fr. dss. in 2 Cor. II. 113 sqq.

Epegegical apposition may likewise be introduced by τοῦτ' ἐστιν, as in Rom. vii. 18 ἐν οἷοι τοῦτον ἐστιν ἐν τῷ σαρκί μου, Acts xix. 4; Mark vii. 2; Heb. ix. 11; xi. 16; xiii. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 20; Philem. 12. An apposition is annexed with emphasis by αὐτός in Eph. v. 23 ὦ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς ωτήρ τοῦ σώματος.

An apposition appears to be incorporated into a relative clause in 1 Jno. ii. 25 αὐτὴν ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἡν αὐτῶς ἐπηγεγεῖτο ἡμῖν τῷ τῷ ζωῆν τῷ αἰῶνιον, probably also in Phil. iii. 18 and 2 Cor. x. 13, see Mey. in loc., cf. Plat. Phaed. 66 c. τότε ... ἡμῖν ἐσται οἱ ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ... φρονήσωμεν, Hipp. maj. 281 c. οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐκέκοιν; ών ὄνομα μεγάλα λέγηται ... Πιτακοῦ καὶ Βαντοῦ ... φαίνονται ἐπεχώμενοι, rep. 3, 402 c.; 7, 583 c.; Apol. p. 41 a.; Lucian. Eunuch. 4.

8. That words in apposition, being co-ordinated with their principals, agree with them in case is the well-known rule. It does not extend to gender or number (Ramshorn, S. 294); since, in particular, a neuter (abstract) may be put in apposition with a personal noun, a plural with a collective singular, a singular with a plural, as Phil. iv. 1 ἀδελφοὶ μου ἄγαπητοι ... χαρᾷ καὶ στεφανῶς μοῦ, 1 Cor. iv. 13; xv. 20; Col. iii. 4; Phil. iv. 18; Rev. i. 6; xvi. 3 (Soph. Oed. C. 472; Eurip. Troad. 432; Plin. epp. 9, 26 Demosthenes, ulla norma oratoris et regula, Liv. 1, 20, 3 virgines Vestac, Alba oriundum sacerdotium, 1, 27, 3; 8, 32, 5), 1 Cor. i. 2 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡγομένους ἐν Ἰρών. τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, 1 Jno. v. 16 δώσει αὐτῷ ἡμῖν, τοῖς ἀμαρτάνοισιν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, cf. 1 Kings xii. 10; Xen. Mem. 2, 3, 2; Hi. 3, 4. Cf. Vig. p. 41.

1 Bornemann's exposition (bibl. Studien der sächs. Geistl. I. 71), according to which αὐτῷ is referred to him that asks, and τοῖς ἀμαρτάνοισι is taken for a Dativ. commodi (he will give him life for them etc.), appears to me artificial. Αὐτῷ cannot well be referred to ἀδελφοῖς ἀμαρτάνοις ἀμαρτανοῦν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, as αἰρέω here manifestly denotes intercession.
Even greater discordance occurs in the apposition contained in Col. iii. 5 νεκροσάτε τὰ μέλη ... πορνελαύν, ἀκαθαρσίαν etc., where the vices are placed beside the members employed in the indulgence of them, the results beside the instruments. See Matth. 974. But even from the agreement of the apposition with the noun in case (apart from what has been established above by 1 Cor. xvi. 21), there are exceptions:

a. It is a very common grammatical usage to annex the apposition in the genitive to the noun on which it depends (Bengel on Jno. ii. 21), as in 2 Pet. ii. 6 πόλεως Σοδόμων καὶ Γομορράς (Odysse. 1, 2; Thuc. 4, 46; Krü. 97, like urbs Romae, flumen Rheni in Latin, cf. also Hoffmann, Grammat. Syr. p. 298), Luke xxii. 1 ἡ ἔορτη τῶν ἄξιων (2 Macc. vi. 7 Διονυσίων ἔορτη), ii. 41; Jno. xiii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 5 τὸν ἄφραβωνα τοῦ πνεύματος the earnest of the Spirit (consisting in the Spirit), the Spirit as an earnest (Eph. i. 14), Rom. iv. 11 σημεῖον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς (where some authorities give περιτομήν as an emendation), Jno. ii. 21; xi. 13; Acts ii. 33; iv. 22; Rom. viii. 21; xv. 16; 1 Cor. v. 8; 2 Cor. v. 1; Eph. ii. 14; vi. 14, 16 f.; Col. iii. 24; Heb. vi. 1; xii. 11; Jas. i. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 8, etc. Under this head comes also Eph. iv. 9 κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα (μέρη) τῆς γῆς (γῆς γιγάντων) to the lower parts i.e. the earth, or which constitute the earth (similar is Isa. xxxviii. 14 εἰς τὸ ὑψὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, cf. Acts ii. 19 εἰς τὸ 554 οὐρανὸν ἄνω ... ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κατάω). The Apostle infers from ἀνέβη a κατέβη: now Christ strictly and properly came down on earth (and from it ascended again); this, contrasted with heaven, which is here called ὑψὸς, is spoken of as a deep or lower region. Christ’s descent into Hades (to which the expression is referred in Evang.) Apoc. p. 445) as an isolated fact cannot here be taken into consideration; it would be too restricted to refer the expression αἰχμαλωτεύειν αἰχμαλωσίαν to that. Finally, in Rom. viii. 23 also the interpretation of ἀπαρχῇ τοῦ πνεύματος the Spirit as first-fruits, that is, of God’s gracious gifts, has not yet been conclusively disproved, even by Mey. and Philipp. The main argument against it, that the Genitive after ἀπαρχῇ is always (in biblical diction? yet cf. Exod. xxvi. 21; Deut. xii. 11, 17) partitive, is merely mechanical. According to this, we could never say: my first-fruits, first-fruits of the Pentecost etc. Living languages cannot be pent up within so narrow bounds, cf. Fr. Rom. II. 175. The Spirit is unquestionably a divine gift, as well as σωτηρία or κηρύκοντα, and may with perfect propriety be regarded as the first-
fruits of the gifts of God; and this view is favored by the phrase ἄραβας τοῦ πνεύματος more than Philippi is ready to admit. On the other hand, πνεύμα to signify the fulness of heavenly gifts hereafter is not current in biblical usage. As for the rest, the Genitivus apositionis is easily explicable from the nature of the Genitive (the sign of circumcision, the Genitive of the closer specification of a general notion), and is not unfrequent in the Oriental idiom (Gesen. Lehrg. 677; Ewald 579), while in Greek it appears to be confined to the above geographical expression (and even this is on the whole rare). Not one of the instances adduced from Thuc. by Bauer, Philol. Thuc. Paull. p. 31 sqq., is entirely certain. In Latin, however, cf. besides the expressions, quite usual in ancient languages but unnoticed by the moderns, verbum scribendi, vocabulum silentii, Cic. off. 2, 5 collectis ceteris causis, eluvionis, pestilentiae, vastitatis rel. (i.e. quae consistunt in eluv., pestilentia, etc.).

b. Sometimes we find the Nominative where the structure of the sentence would lead us to expect a different case, as in Jas. iii. 8 τὴν γλώσσαν οúdeις διώνυσα διάμακα· ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεσθή λοῦ. The last words are to be regarded as a sort of exclamation, and, therefore, annexed in an independent construction, cf. Mark xii. 40; Phil. iii. 18 f. So also might Rev. i. 5 ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς be taken. In Luke xx. 27 προσελθόντες τινὲς τῶν Ἀδδουκαλῶν, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι etc., τῶν ἀντιλέγοντων would have been more precise, and nothing is gained by a reference to Bhdv. S. 68 (Mey.). Moreover, the passage (Thuc. 1, 110) adduced by Bornem. in loc. is not entirely analogous. There is, however, some similarity in Corn. Nep. 2, 7 illorum urbem ut propugnaculum oppositum esse barbaris, where the gender (as in the above instance the case) is conformed to that, not of the substantive to which it in sense belongs, but of a subordinate substantive. Further, a parallel construction in the N. T. would be Mark vii. 19 according to the reading καθαρίζων. On the other hand, Demosth. Aristocrat. 458 a. ἄρα ... τῆς πόλεως οἰκοδομήματα καὶ κατασκευάσματα τῆς καταβαίνει τούτῳ, όστε ... προπόλεμα ταύτα, νεώσουκοι, στοαῖ etc. appears to be an intentional

---

1 It would be a great mistake to consider as an apposition the second Genitive in Col. ii. 17 & ἵστε σκία τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The words are undoubtedly to be so explained as to make Χριστοῦ a part of the predicate, and dependent on τοῖς: but the body is of Christ, belongs to Christ, is in, with, Christ.

2 In the passages adduced by Mey. on Eph., as above, [1st. and 2d edns.] from Erfurdt's Soph. Antig. 355 and Schaeff. Apollon. Rhod. schol. p. 235, there is nothing connected with the Gen. appositis.
anacoluthon. And it is in general quite intelligible how even a word in apposition, if it is to be introduced as independent, is put in the Nominative without regard to the construction,—a sort of detached insertion.

In 2 Cor. xi. 28 ἡ ἐπιστολαίς μου etc. is not an abnormal apposition to χωρίς τῶν παρεκτός—such a solecism is not to be credited to Paul,—but Subject Nominative, and as such rendered prominent.

The apposition to a Vocative stands in the Nominative in Rom. ii. 1 ὁ ἀνθρωπε πάς ὁ κρίνων, Rev. xi. 17; xvi. 7; cf. Bar. ii. 12; Acta apocr. p. 51, 60; the exegesis in these cases is not construed with the Vocative, but introduced independently. Cf. Bhd. S. 67. In Matt. vi. 9 the adjunct ἐν τοῖς οἰκονομαῖς could not have been annexed to πάτερ by means of the article in any other manner than it is, since the article has no Voc. form.

9. An apposition sometimes refers, not merely to single words, but also to whole clauses (Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 602; Monk, Eurip. Alcest. 7; Matth. Eurip. Phoen. 223; Sprachl. II. 970 f.; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 228; Krü. 215); and the nouns of which it consists, in the Nom. or Acc. according to the form of the sentence, may then frequently be resolved into an independent proposition (Wannowski, syntax. anom. p. 47 sqq. 197 sq.):

a. Substantives in the Acc. (cf. also Lob. paralip. p. 519), as in Rom. xii. 1 παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς, παραστήσας τὰ σῶματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν, ὁγιάν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τῇ λογικῇ λατρείᾳ, i.e. ἦτας ἐστὶ λογ. λατρ. qui est cultus etc., 1 Tim. ii. 6 ὁ δοῦς ἐαυτὸν ἀντιλυτρὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων, τῷ μαρτύρῳ καρπῷ δίδοις; — and in the Nominative, as in 2 Thess. i. 4 ὅστε ἦμᾶς αὐτοῖς ἐν ὑμῖν καυχῶμαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως ἐν 556 πάσι τοῖς διογμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς ὁλίγσεις, αὐτοῖς ἀνέχεσθε, ἐνδειγμα τῆς δικαιας κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ etc. (cf. Sucton. Calig. 16 decretum est, ut dies ... Parilia vocarctur, velit argumentum rursus conditae urbis, Curt. 4, 7, 13 repente obductae coelo nubes condidere solem, ingens asteu fatigatis auxilium, Cic. Tusc. 1, 43, 102; Hor. sat. 1, 4, 110; Flor. 3, 21). See Eurip. Orest. 1105; Herc. fur. 59; 497 Electr. 281; Plat. Gorg. 507 d.; as to Latin, Ramshorn 296. 7th ed. Bengel incorrectly applies this usage to Eph. i. 23 ἐν πλήρωμα etc. where occurs a perfectly simple appositive relation (to σῶμα αὐτοῦ).

b. A Neuter adjective or participle refers to the whole clause in 2 Tim. ii. 14 διαμαρτηρ. ἐνόπτων τοῦ κυρίου μὴ λογομαχεῖν, εἰς οὐδὲν χρήσιμον, Mark vii. 19 καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρώνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζον πάντα τὰ βρώματα which (namely ἐκπορ. εἰς τ. ἀφ.) purges all sorts of food; yet see above, 8 b. cf. § 66, 3 g. (On the other hand,
we must not with Mey. take ἀνακαλυπτόμενον in 2 Cor. iii. 14 for such an impersonal apposition; it is an attributive to κάλυμμα.

In Rev. xxi. 17 μέτρον αὐθρώπου is annexed as a loose apposition to ομέτρησε τὸ τέχνος etc. A construction similar, but not exactly the same, is adduced by Mdv. S. 23.

10. The word in apposition naturally follows the main substantive, but for the sake of emphasis is sometimes separated from it by several intervening words; as, 1 Cor. v. 7 τὸ πᾶσα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη, Χριστός, Rom. viii. 28; 2 Cor. vii. 6; Heb. vii. 4; Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 144; Weber, Demosth. p. 152; Jas. i. 7 f. μὴ οἴσθω δι' ἀνθρώπου ἐκεῖνος, ὃς λήγεται τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἀνὴρ δύναντος, ἀκατάστατος etc. we say he, a double-minded man. Rom. vii. 21 does not belong here; and as to 2 Cor. xi. 2 see Mey. against Fr. The apposition precedes, for an obvious reason, in 1 Pet. iii. 7 οἱ ἀνδρεῖς συνικούντες ... ὃς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκέιει τῷ γνωστεῖ. But of a different nature is, for example, Tit. i. 8 κατ' ἐπιταγήν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ. Here the Predicate σωτῆρ ἡμῶν is the principal noun, but is explained exegetically (since elsewhere Christ is so called) by the appositive θεοῦ. So also in Rom. iv. 12; 1 Tim. ii. 3; 2 Tim. i. 10; Acts xxiv. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 15; v. 8; 2 Pet. i. 11; ii. 20 (iii. 7); Rev. ix. 11; Jno. vi. 27; Luke ii. 1; Jude 4; Heb. ii. 9; cf. Aeschin. ep. 6, p. 124 b.; Paus. 1, 10, 5; Alciphr. 3, 41; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 60. Frequently also in Latin, as in Cic. orat. 1, 18; Liv. 1, 14; 10, 85; 27, 1; Caes. b. gall. 4, 1, 10; afr. 98; Suet. Tib. 2; Galb. 4; Otho 1; Nep. 20, 1; 22, 3.

557 Under this head come also adjectives or substantives placed at the beginning of a sentence, when corresponding to exegetical apposition they herald the contents of the sentence (Krü. 215 f; Mdv. 229): Heb. viii. 1 κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις τοιούτων ἅξομαι ἀρχαιά (Lycurg. orat. 17, 6), where it is not necessary to supply ἐτοί. Cf. Rom. viii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 8.

11. In conclusion, we must advert to the irregularities (solecisms) of government and apposition which occur in the Revelation (especially in the descriptions of visions), and which, from their number and nature, give the style the impress of considerable harshness; see, besides the well-known works of Stolberg and 498 Schwarz (see above, p. 8), my exeg. Stud. I. 164 ff. They are 1 What Hitzig (on Joh. Marcus. Zürich, 1843. 8vo. S. 65 ff.) has collected respecting the language of the Revelation, serves a special critical purpose, and too much is put down to the account of the Hebrew element. A more moderate view is taken by Lücke, Apokal. II. 448 ff., who, however, in this particular sets too high a value on Hitzig's merits.
partly intended, and partly traceable to the writer's negligence. From a Greek point of view they may be explained as instances of anaclitoun, blending of two constructions, constructio ad sensum, variatio structurae, as should always have been done, instead of attributing them to the ignorance of the author, or pronouncing them to be mere Hebraisms, since most of them would be anomalies even in Hebrew, and in producing many of them Hebrew could have had only an indirect and incidental influence. But with all his simplicity and Oriental tone of diction, the author understands and observes very well the rules of Greek syntax, and even in imitating Hebrew expressions proceeds judiciously (Lücke S. 447). Besides, examples analogous to many of these irregularities occur in the Sept., and even in Greek authors; though certainly not in such thick succession as in the Revelation. In reference to particulars we remark:

Rev. ii. 20 is probably to be construed thus: ὃτι ἀφεῖς τὴν γυναῖκα σου Ἰεζαβέλ. ἡ λέγουσα ἐαυτὴν προφήτην καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ etc. who, while she pretends to be a prophetess, teaches and seduces etc. The blending of two constructions explains vii. 9 ἑδον, καὶ ἱδοῦ δύος πολὺς ... ἐστῶτες ἐκόπτων τοῦ θρόνου ... περιβεβλημένους (where the writer, in using the Nom. had ἱδοῦ, and in using the Acc. περιβ. had ἑδον, in his mind, and blended both constructions together, cf. iv. 4; xiv. 14; Judith x. 7; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 32).1 In Rev. v. 11 ἡ κοιναὶ φωνὴ ἀγγέλων 558 ... καὶ ἢν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν μυριάδες μυριάδων ... λέγοντες, the last word does not refer to μυριάδες but to ἀγγέλω (as the words καὶ ἢν ... μυρ. are to be considered parenthetical), as if the writer had commenced φωνὴν ἐπήραν ἀγγέλων etc. (Similar are Thuc. 7, 42 τὸ κεῖ ἵππους ἵππους ... κατάπληξεν οὐκ ἀλήθει ἐγένετο ... ὅρωντες, Achill. Tat. 6, 18 περιτήριον ταῦτα εἶναι σοὶ δοκεῖ ... ἀνδραί των ἄλοισα, Plat. Phaed. p. 81 a. οὐκοίνοι οὕτω μὲν 474 ἔχουσα εἰς τὸ ὄμοιον αὐτῆς τῷ ἀνέρχεται τῷ θείῳ τε ... οἱ θεοὶ ἀφικμένη ὑπάρχειν αὐτῇ εὐδιαίμονε εἶναι, πλανῆς ... ἀπηλλαγμένη, ὅπερ δὲ λέγεται κατὰ τῶν μεμνημένων, ὡς ἀληθῶς τῶν λοιπῶν χρόνων μετὰ θεῶν διάγουσα, instead of διαγοῦσα.) Elsewhere we find λέγοντας, λέγοντες iv. 1; ix. 13 sq.; xi. 15 with φωνῇ, φωνηί etc., the 2nd. reference being to the speakers themselves. Λέγον is even used

1 In Rev. xiv. 14 ἑδον, καὶ ἱδοῦ ψηφιλη λαυνε καὶ ἢν τὴν ψηφιλη καθήμενην ὄμοιον ὑπάρχοντι, ἁψων etc., probably καθήμενοι is not the Acc. Masc., but the Neuter used substantively: on the cloud something like unto a human being etc. Afterwards the construction immediately passes into the Masculine.
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quite absolutely xi. 1; xiv. 7; xix. 6, as in the Sept. corresponding to ἡς Gen. xv. 1; xxi. 20; xxxviii. 13; xiv. 16; xlvii. 2; Exod. v. 14; Josh. x. 17; Judges xvi. 2; 1 Sam. xv. 12; 1 Kings xii. 10, (and even Rev. v. 12 might be so taken). The anomalous apposition (§ 59, 8 b.) in Rev. iii. 12 appears more strange: τὸ δύομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μου, τῆς καινῆς Ἰερ., ἡ καταβαίνουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . . καὶ τὸ δύομα μου τὸ καινὸν (where, however, ἡ καταβαίνουσα etc., as it cannot well be taken for a Nominat. tituli, interrupts the structure as a significant parenthesis, as if for αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ κατ.); and that also in xiv. 12 ὁ δὲ ὑπομονῇ τῶν ἁγίων ἐστὶν· oί τῆς ἡμεροῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς etc. (i. 5), where there is an abrupt transition to a new sentence, somewhat as in Jas. iii. 8 τὴν γλῶσσαν οὐ δεῖς δύνασαι ἀνθρώπων δαμάσαι, ἀκατάσχετον κακόν, μεστὴ Ἰου θανατηφόρον. Likewise in Rev. viii. 9 ἀπέθανεν τὸ τρίτον τῶν κτισμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ βαλάσσῃ, τὰ ἔχουσα ψυχάς, ix. 14; xvi. 3 probably the apposition is purposely inserted in an independent form; see besides xx. 2. In Rev. xxi. 11 f. there is a repeated change of construction: first we find καταβαίνουσαν regularly construed with τὴν πόλιν vs. 10; then follows ὁ φωστήρ etc., as an independent parenthetic clause; vs. 12 reverts to πόλας, but the attributive forms part of a new sentence, ἔχουσα etc. Cf. Cic. Brut. 35 Q. Catulus non antiquo more sed hoc nostro . . . eruditus; multae literae, summa . . . comitas etc. On the combination of two constructions, each of which is allowable, in xviii. 12 f.; xix. 12, see § 63 II. 1. That in xvii. 14 (?) is less harsh. In i. 5 f. τῷ ὑγιαστεί etc. is connected with αὕτῳ ἡ δόξα etc.; the author, however, instead of writing καὶ ὑγιαστεί etc., inserts this thought as an independent clause. The connection of two genders in xiv. 19 we noticed above, no. 4 b. Still more singular is the construction in xi. 4 αὕτω εἰσών αἱ δύο ἐκλαῖαι καὶ αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου ἐστώτες (for ἐστῶσαι is manifestly a correction), v. 6 559 (iv. 8; xiv. 1 var.); the attributives, however, are construed ad sensum, since the substantives denote living creatures of the masculine gender. As to i. 4 see p. 68.

(Inaccuracies of a different kind have been occasionally noticed in the previous part of this Grammar. With διδάσκειν τώι p. 227, may be classed xix. 5 αἰνεῖν τῷ θεῷ. The conjunction ἵνα is frequently in good Codd. — p. 289 sq. — construed with the Indic. Present, xiii. 17; xx. 8.)
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1. In continued discourse, connection between propositions is the rule; want of connection (asyndeton), the exception. The latter is sometimes grammatical, and sometimes rhetorical.

a. Absence of grammatical connection occurs not only with sentences which begin anew (i.e. the larger) sections, the commencement of which the want of connection is intended to indicate, as in Rom. ix. 1; x. 1; xiii. 1; Gal. iii. 1; iv. 21; vi. 1; Eph. vi. 1, 5, 10; Phil. iv. 1, 4; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 14; v. 1; vi. 1, 8; 2 Tim. ii. 14; iv. 1; 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 1; 1 Jno. ii. 1; iv. 1 f.; but also in uninterrupted discourse in the case of individual sentences, sometimes in narration where mere sequence passes for chronological connection, sometimes in the didactic style, particularly with conjunctions, maxims and the like, which, although running on one common thread of discourse, yet present themselves as individually independent. The former class are of most frequent occurrence in John, and constitute one of the peculiarities of that writer's style, cf. the oft-recurring λέγει or εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ i. 38, 40, 42, 44, 46 f. 49, 52; ii. 4 f. 7, 8; iii. 8; iv. 7, 11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 25, 26, 34, 50; i. 26, 49 f.; ii. 19; iii. 3, 5, 9, 10, iv. 13, 17; though it is not to be denied that by asyndeton (cf. xx. 26; xxi. 3), especially where it runs through several verses, the narration gains much in liveliness and impressiveness (as it is often accompanied with the praesens historicus), Jno. iii. 3–5; iv. 9–11, 15–17; v. 6–8; xx. 14–18, and the grammatical asyndeton is combined with the rhetorical.

Didactic asyndeton occurs in the sermon on the mount, Matt. v. vi. and vii., also in James, but most frequently in John (in Christ's discourses and in the 1st Epistle). The discourse incessantly begins anew, as it were; and in translating, it is unjustifiable to insert a connecting particle. Cf. Jno. ii. 7; iii. 30–33; v. 43, 45; vii. 17, 18; x. 3, 4, 17 f.; xv. 2–24; 1 Jno. i. 6, 8–10; ii. 4, 6, 9 f. 15, 18 f.; iii. 1 f. 4–10, 18–20; iv. 4–10, 12; v. 1 f. 5 f. 9 f. 12, 16–19; Jas. i. 16–18; iv. 7–10; v. 1–6, 8–10; Rom. xii. 9, 14, 16, 21; 1 Tim. iv. 11–16; v. 14, 22–24; Matt. x. 8.

2. b. Rhetorical asyndeton, of which even Longinus 19; Gregor. Cor. in Walz rhet. graeci VII. II. 1211; Quintil. institut. 9, 3, 50 sq. treat, and which is correctly classed among rhetorical figures

¹ Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik, B. 116 f.
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(Glassii philol. sacra I. 512 sq.; Bauer, rhetor. Paull. II. 591 sqq.; 501 cf. Hand, lat. Styl p. 302), is naturally found more frequently in the epistles than in the historical books of the N. T., but has not always been considered by expositors from the right point of view. Since it produces in general a sharp and rapid advance in the discourse, it gives to the style liveliness and force. The following 476 different sorts of rhetorical asyndeton (Bludy. S. 448; Kühner II. 459 f.) between sentences (for as to asyndeton within a sentence, see § 58, 7) may be distinguished. The connecting particles are omitted,

a) When in impassioned discourse a series of parallel clauses are annexed to each other; particularly in a climax (Reiz and Lehmann on Lucian v. hist. 2 § 35), where the repetition of the connective would make the discourse drag. Mark iv. 39 σῶμα, πεφύμωσο, 1 Cor. iv. 8 ἡδη κεκερασμένον ἐστέ, ἡδη ἐπλούτισατε, χωρὶς ἠμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε, xiii. 4–8; xiv. 26; 1 Thess. v. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 17; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vii. 2; Jas. v. 6; 1 Pet. v. 10 etc. Similar is Demosth. Phil. 4, p. 54 a.; Pantaen. 626 a.; Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 38; Weber, Demosth. p. 363.

b) In antitheses, where the force of the contrast is made to strike the reader more pointedly: 1 Cor. xv. 43 f. οὐσίερεται ἐν ἀτμία, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ, οὐσίερεται ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δυνάμει, οὐσίερεται ἐν ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται ἐν πνευματικόν, Jas. i. 19 πᾶς ἀνθρώπος ταχύς εἰς τὸ ἀκούσαι, βραδύς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, cf. further, Mark xvi. 6; Jno. iv. 22; vi. 63; viii. 41, Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 144 and Plat. Protag. p. 52. So, in general, in the counterpoising of sentences, as Acts xxv. 12 καίσαρα ἐπικέκλησαι, ἐπὶ καίσαρα πορεύσῃ, cf. Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 464.

c) Especially when a reason or explanation is subjoined to a statement (Krü. p. 228), or an application or exhortation is deduced from what has been said (Stallb. Plat. Alcib. 2 p. 319), Rev. xxii. 10 μὴ σφαιρίσης τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· ὁ καρδίς ἐγγὺς ἐστιν, Jno. iv. 24; viii. 18; xvii. 17; Rom. vi. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 4, 15; 2 Cor. xii. 11; Rev. xvi. 6, 15; 1 Pet. v. 8; 2 Pet. ii. 16 (Rev. xiv. 5 var.); Heb. iii. 12 βλέπετε (cf. vss. 7–11) μὴ ποτὲ ἐσταί ἐν τοῖς ῥυμῶι καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας, 1 Cor. vi. 18; v. 7, 18; vii. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 30 (see Mey.); Jno. xii. 35.

1 See Dissen 2 excurs. to the Gotha ed. of Pindar; also Hm. in Jahn’s Jahrbb. I. 54 ff.; further Nägelebach’s Notes on the Iliad, p. 266 ff. As to Latin, cf. Ramshorn, S. 514 f. For the Hebrew, many examples (which, indeed, require sifting) are given by Nolde, Concordant. particul. p. 318 sqq.
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As a distinct species of asyndeton that construction deserves notice, which, after a declaration, appends a discussion of it by repeating the substantive without καί, as in Jno. x. 11 ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς· ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν φυσιν αὐτῶν τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβατῶν, xv. 18; 1 Cor. viii. 2. In such passages we need only supply in thought a ὅτε (γάρ) or οὖν (ὅτε), in order to feel how the expression would thus be weakened, cf. Lys. in Nicomach. 23; Aesch. Ctesiph. 48 (Kritz, Sallust. I. 184). Lastly, the amplification of a thought is not unfrequently introduced asyndetically, as ἦν ἐν Heb. xi. 3.

Clauses appended ἄνωθεν, the expositors, in accordance with a prevalent impropriety, are fond of bringing into connection with what precedes by the insertion of particles, and thus the rhetorical effect of the omission of the conjunction is entirely overlooked, e.g. 1 Cor. iii. 17; vii. 23; Jas. v. 3, see Pott in loc. With similar impropriety the copyists have often inserted a connective.

3. Sentences are connected with each other most simply by the copulative particles καί and τέ (negatively by οὔτε), which denote nothing beyond mere annexation (see § 53). Hence in historical style, according to Oriental simplicity, the transition from one fact to another is often made by them,—by καί in the Gospels and the Acts, τέ (Mdv. S. 212) being used almost exclusively in Acts; cf. 477 καί Matt. iv. 23–25; vii. 25; viii. 23–25; ix. 1–4; xiii. 53–58; 4th ed. Mark i. 13; ii. 1 f.; Jno. ii. 7 f. 13–16; iii. 22; iv. 27; v. 9; Acts ii. 1–4; xii. 7–9, 24–26; τέ Acts xii. 6, 12, 17; xiii. 4, 46, 50, 52; xiv. 11–13, 21; xv. 4, 6; xvi. 23, 34; xvii. 26; xviii. 4, 26; xix. 2 f. 6, 11; xx. 3, 7; xxv. 2; xxvii. 3, 8, 29; xxviii. 2.¹ In particular, after a specification of time in an independent clause the event is annexed by καί, as in Mark xv. 25 ἦν ὃρα τρίτη καί ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτῶν, Jno. xi. 55 ἦν ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα καί ἀνέβησαν πολλοί, iv. 35 etc. (cf. § 58, 3). With the Greeks this became an established form when the specification of time was to be made prominent, see Mdv. 213 f.

Narration is continued, however, still more regularly by means of the well-defined connecting particles δὲ and οὖν (see § 53). 562 These, since the first adds something other, different, new, and the second indicates the sequence, are in a loose application peculiarly adapted to the historical style. Hence the N. T. writers, by an

¹ What Rost, S. 723 f., says of this τέ connecting clauses in Attic prose scarcely finds corroboration in Luke.
interchange of καί, δέ, οὖν, imparted to their narration a certain variety, which even in the Gospels veiled the Hebraistic complexion. Cf. Jno. ii. 1 (καί twice); 2 (δέ); 3 (καί); 8 (καί), 8 f. (δέ); iv. 4 (δέ); 5 (οὖν); 6 (δέ and oùν); 39 (δέ); 40 (oùν); 41 (καί); 42 (τε); Acts xii. 1–3 (δέ four times); 5 (oùν and δέ); 6 (δέ); 7 (καί twice and δέ); 8 (δέ twice and καί); 9 (καί twice and δέ); 10 (καί twice and δέ); 11 (καί); 12 (τε); 13 (δέ); 14 (καί and δέ); 15 (δέ three times); 16 (δέ twice); 17 (δέ, τε, and καί); 18 (δέ); 19 (δέ and καί); 20 (δέ twice); 21, 22 (δέ); 23 (δέ and καί); 24 f. (δέ); xxv. 1 (oùν); 2 (τε); 4, 5 (oùν); 6, 7 (δέ), etc.

Not much more characteristic, yet aiming at greater diversity, is the 503 connection, in the historical style, effected by τότε (especially in Matt), τότε μετά τούτου or ταύτα (especially in John and Luke), έν ἡκίασε ταῖς ἡμέραις etc. (in isolated cases ἀνα).

The polysyndeton between clauses not purely narrative is designed to give them prominence as individual portions of a compound sentence, e.g. Jno. x. 3 τούτῳ ο θυρωρός ἀνοίγει καί τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἄκουε καί τὰ ἰδία πρόβατα φωνεῖ καί τὸν ἄνωμα καί ἔχαγεν αὐτά vss. 9, 12; cf. Acts xiii. 36; xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff.

4. The connection of sentences is more close when it is based on a contrast: either in general, when two sentences are joined together, like an arsis and thesis, by μέν ... δέ (Mdv. 215) or καί ... καί (Mdv. 212), negatively by οὔτε ... οὔτε, as Acts xxii. 9 τὸ μὲν φῶς θεότησαν, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν, xxiii. 8; xxv. 11; i. 5 (cf. § 58, 7); Mark ix. 13 καὶ Ἡλίας ἐλήμυνε καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ δόσα ἣδελον, Jno. ix. 37 see § 58, 4; or when an affirmative sentence is opposed to a negative, or vice versa, as Jno. iii. 17 οὐκ ἀπέτειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οἶνον αὐτοῦ ἕνα κρίμα τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἕνα 478 σωθῆ ὁ κόσμος, Rom. ix. 1 ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὗ ψευδομαί, 6th ed. cf. § 55, 8.

To this form of expression (antithesis) are likewise to be referred,

a. Comparative sentences, as Matt. xii. 40 ὁ ἐπιστέφων ἦν Ἰωάννας ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τούς κήτους τρεις ἡμέρας κ. τρεῖς νύκτας, οὔτως ἔσται ο νίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τ. γῆς, Matt. v. 48 ἐσεθηκέν ὡμείς τέλειον, ὡς ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν τέλειον ἐστιν, Jno. iii. 14 καὶ θάνατος Μωυσῆς ὄψεσθε ... οὔτως ὄψωθήσεται δεῖ, Luke vi. 31 καὶ ὅς βέλετο, ἶνα ποιῶσιν ὡμι οἱ ἀνθρωποί ... καὶ ὡμεῖς ποιείτε αὐτῶς ὄμωλοι.

b. Temporal sentences (see § 58, 8), as Luke i. 23 ὃς ἐπιλήθησαν αἰ ἡμέρας ... ἀπῆλθεν, Acts xxvii. 1; Jno. iv. 1; Matt. xviii. 25 δὲ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ... προεφθασέν, vi. 2 ὅταν οὖν τοὺς ἐλεημοσύνην, μὴ σαλπήτρης ἐμπροσθέν σου, etc.
c. Even conditional sentences (§ 53, 8) 1 Cor. ix. 17 εἰ ἐκὼν τούτο πράσσω, μοσθῶν ἔχω, Luke vii. 39 εἰ ἐν προφήτης, ἐγνώσθην ἄν, Jno. vii. 17 εἰν τῷ θέλη τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖ, γρωσταί etc. That these also are properly to be referred to this head, is apparent from the structure, elsewhere examined, that occurs in Jas. v. 13 κακοπαθεὶς τις ἐν ὑμῖν, προσευχήσομαι, where the conditional clause makes its appearance as independent: some one among you is afflicted (I suppose the case), let him pray; 1 Cor. vii. 21 δούλος ἐκλήθης, μὴ σοι μελέτω, cf. Jas. ii. 19 f.; Mdv. 224. Here εἰ has by some been unwarrantably supplied; and it is equally inadmissible to regard the first clause as interrogative, see above, p. 285; cf. Bhdy. 385; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 284 sq. So in Latin Terent. Eunuch. 2, 2, 21 negat quis, nego; ait, ajo. Heind. Horat. sermon. 1, 1, 45; Kritz, Sall. II. 349.

5. In the cases just adduced a.—c. (as well as in causal sentences) a protasis and apodosis are contrasted (Luke i. 1; v. 4; Matt. iv. 3; v. 13; Heb. ii. 14, etc.), though the beginning of the latter is not in most cases specially marked, as it is in German by so (hence sometimes it is doubtful where the apodosis begins, as in Jas. iii. 3 f.; iv. 15, etc.); for when οὕτως seems to be employed for this purpose, or when ἐκτα, τότε, and in hypothetical constructions ἀλλά, δέ (Jacobs, Ael. anim. p. 27 sq. praeef.), ἀρα (οὖν? see § 63), is put before the apodosis, as in Mark xiii. 14; Matt. xii. 28; Jno. vii. 10; xi. 6; xii. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23; xv. 54; xvi. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; 1 Thess. v. 3, etc., it is intended to give prominence to the apodosis,—by οὕτως in particular to refer again to the circumstances expressed in the protasis.

It is only in comparative sentences that a. A οὕτως or καί before the apodosis corresponds often to the ὡς, ὡσπερ, καθὼς of the protasis, Rom. v. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 7; Matt. xii. 40; Jno. v. 21; xv. 4, 9; xx. 21 (οὕτως is the most regular correlate of ὡσπερ). Οὕτως after a conditional clause was formerly thought to be purely pleonastic. But in Rev. xi. 5 οὕτως means hoc modo (see the sentence preceding), and in 1 Thess. iv. 14 it refers to the similarity of the lot of believers to that of Christ (ἀπεθάνασα καὶ ἀνέστη); and these instances have no resemblance to those adduced by Mth. 1457. (Still less is οὕτως 564 redundant after participles in Jno. iv. 6; Acts xx. 11; see § 65, 9.) 479 In the case of grouping of protasis and apodosis, the protasis is usually repeated in a distinct form after the apodosis, so as to produce apparently a double apodosis, as in Rev. ii. 5 μετανοήσου.
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ei δὲ μὴ (μετανοεῖς), ἔρχομαι σοι ταχύ ... εἰς μὴ μετανοήσῃς, where the length of the sentence occasioned the repetition. This, however, is probably not the case in Matt. v. 18, see § 65, 6, p. 612.

6. Objective, consecutive, final, and causal sentences are conceived as distinctly dependent on, and consequently subordinate to, a leading clause, and are accordingly presented in the form of dependent sentences introduced respectively by ὅτι, ὡς, by ὅστε, ὡς (not ἕνα, see § 58, 10, 6 p. 457 sq.) also οὖν, ἄρα, by ἵνα or ἐποίησε, by γάρ, ὅτι etc. see § 58 (where the relation of grammatical dependence is sometimes expressed also by the indirect moods of the verb). Causal are akin to objective sentences; hence both are introduced by ὅτι (quod), signifying either because or that. Ei (like the Latin si) is so used apparently in one class of cases, after verbs denoting an affection of the mind, where the objective ὅτι might have been expected (Hoogoveen, doctr. partic. ed. Schütz, p. 228 sq.; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 52; Mdv. 225), e.g. Mark xv. 44 ἐθαυμάσας ei ἤδη τέθηκεν miratus est si jam mortuus fuerit, 1 Jno. iii. 18 μὴ θαυμᾶτε, ei μισεῖ υμᾶς ὁ κόσμος cf. Fr. Marc. p. 702. But ὅτι is employed when the occasion of surprise (grief etc.) is a positive matter of fact, ei when it hovers before the speaker’s mind as merely a possibility, seems to him doubtful, or at least is to be represented as doubtful: marvel not, if the world hate you (Weber, Demosth. p. 585; Mtth. 1474 f.; Rost 622). Similar is Acts xxvi. 8. Sometimes modesty or diffidence has led to the selection of this latter form of expression, just as we sometimes hear: he begged him if he would not promise (Germ. er bat ihn, ob u.s.w.). Cf. with this Acts viii. 22.

The affinity of objective and relative sentences is illustrated in Acts xiv. 27 ἀνὴγγέλλων, ὅσι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός μετ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν etc.

7. a. Relative sentences still more distinctly assume a dependent character when they are of an appositive nature, whether more or less requisite to complete the sentence; as, Matt. ii. 9 ὃ ἀστήρ, ὅν εἶδον, προῆγεν αὐτοὺς, Rom. v. 14 Ἀδάμ, δὲ ὅτι τύπος τοῦ μελλοντος, 1 Cor. i. 30 Χριστόφ, δὲ ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν etc., Acts i. 2; xv. 10. But the form of a relative clause is adopted in two other cases: a. when the discourse, particularly a narration, is continued by δὲ and that is resolvable into καί ὅτι, as in Acts xiii. 43 ἧκολοθρήσαν πολλοὶ ... τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ, οἵτινες προσλαμβάνετε ἐπειδὸν αὐτούς etc., Acts xvi. 24 ἐβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν 565 παραγγεῖλαντες τῷ δεσμοφυλακεί ... δὲ παραγγελ λαῖ τοιαύτην etc.
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Luke x. 30; Acts iii. 3; xiii. 31; xiv. 9; xvi. 14, 16; xvii. 10; xix. 25; xxxi. 4; xxiii. 4; xxiii. 14; xxviii. 28; β. when the Subject or Predicate is a relative sentence, e.g. Acts xiii. 25 ἐρχεται, οὐ 480 οὐκ εἰμι ἄξιος τῷ ὑπόθημα λῦσαι, vs. 48 επίτευσαν, δοῦν ἢσαν ἔτεκα-μένων εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, vs. 37; Jno. xi. 3 ὃν φιλεῖς, ἀσθενεῖ, Matt. x. 27; xxiii. 12; Jno. i. 46; iii. 34; xv. 7; 1 Jno. ii. 5; iv. 6; Acts xiii. 37; Rom. viii. 25. In this case the relative clause is often placed before the principal, as in Jno. iii. 34; xiii. 7; 1 Jno. iii. 17; Acts x. 15; Rom. viii. 25, or there is a reference from the relative clause to the relative clause by means of a demonstrative, as in Matt. v. 19; Luke ix. 26; Jno. v. 19; 1 Jno. ii. 5.

Not unfrequently several relative clauses are combined, as in 1 Pet. iii. 19-22,—either as co-ordinate, as in Acts xiv. 15 f.; i. 2 f.; iii. 2 f.; xxvii. 23; xxiv. 6, 8 (Tdf.), or as subordinate one to another, as in Acts xiii. 31 (Ἰησοῦς) δέ ἐφθαν τοῖς συναναβάσαν αὐτῷ...οίτινες νῦν εἰσιν μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ etc. xxv. 15 f.; xxvi. 7; Rom. i. 2, 5, 6.

b. Indirect interrogative sentences (which in classic Greek were marked by the special form of the interrogatives δέτις, ὅποιος, ὅπόσος etc.), as Jno. vi. 64 ἢδει τίνες εἰσίν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες, Matt. x. 11 ἐξετάσατε τίς ἄξιος ἐστιν, Jno. iii. 8 οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται κ. τοῦ ὑπάγει, Acts x. 18 ἐπιθύμησεν οὗ Σῖμων ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται, Luke xxii. 23 ἠρέμωτο συνήτειν πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ τῷ τίς ἀρα εἰς ἐβ αὐτῶν ὁ τουτο μέλλων πράσσειν, Acts xxv. 20 ἀποροίμενος ἔγω...ἐλέγον, εἰ βούλωσίν πορεύεσθαι etc. Cf. on this Schleiermacher, Hermen. S. 131.

8. We have thus far spoken of the connection of sentences with each other by certain single connective words, among which, speaking somewhat loosely, the relatives also may be reckoned; but connection may also be effected by means of forms of inflection, especially the Infinitive and the Participle, in such a manner as to render grammatically the subordinate clauses constituent parts of the principal clause:

a. 1 Cor. xvi. 3 τούτους πέμψω ἀπενεγκεῖν τὴν χάριν (ὡν ἀπενέγκω), Mark iv. 3 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπέρων τοῦ σπειραί, Acts xxvi. 16 εἰς τούτῳ ὁφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαι σε, Phil. i. 7 διὰ τὸ ξέειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς (ὅτι ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ κ. ἐχω), Acts xviii. 2; xxvii. 9; xix. 1 ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ τῶν Ἀπολλών εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ, xx. 1 μετὰ τὸ παιδοφασθαι τῶν θρύβον...ὁ Παῦλος ἐξῆλθεν. Especially do Infinitives with prepositions serve to give compactness and roundness to sentences, and so too the Acc. with the Inf. which
§ 60. CONNECTION OF SENTENCES.

usually represents an objective clause; as, Heb. vi. 11 ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ἐκαστὸν ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυοντοι σπουδὴν, 1 Tim. ii. 8 Βούλουμαι προσεύχομαι ἄνδρας etc. § 44, 8, p. 321.

566 b. 2 Cor. vii. 1 ταῦτας ἡχοῦσες ἐπαγγελίας καθαρίσωμεν εἰαυτοῦ, Luke iv. 35; Acts xxv. 13 κατήνθησαν ἀπασόμενοι τῶν Φήστων, Acts xxv. 1 Φήστος ἐπιβάς τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ . . . ἀνέβη, Luke iv. 2 ἤγετο ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ πειραζόμενος, Acts xii. 16 ἐπέμεινε κρούών (§ 45, 4). Particularly are participles in the Gen. abs. employed thus to denote accessory circumstances, local or temporal (§ 30 note, p. 207), e.g. Acts xxv. 13 ἡμερῶν διαγενομένων τῶν 'Αγρίππας καὶ Βερνίκης κατήνθησαν, καὶ Ἡρώδης τῇ πόλει ἐγγιζόντων ἀνέβη Πέτρος, Luke iv. 40 δύοντος τοῦ ἡλίου πάντες . . . ἤγαγον, ix. 42 ἐτί προσερχομένων αὐτοῦ ἐρήμην αὐτὸν τὸ δαμόμουν, Mark xiv. 3 καὶ ἂν αὐτῶν ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σιμώνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, κτάκειμένου αὐτῶν, ἠλπίην γυνή etc. And this gradually became so usual a mode of expression, that it was employed even when the subject was the same as that of the principal clause, see p. 208. Besides, one and the same principal sentence frequently contains several participial constructions co-ordinate or subordinate one to another, by which means the structure of the sentence is rendered more organic, e.g. Acts xii. 25 Βαρνάβας καὶ Σαῦλος ὑπέστρεψαν ἐξ 'Ιερουσαλήμ, πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες καὶ Ἰωάννην, xvi. 27 ἐξευτελίσας γενόμενος ὁ δεσμοφυλακὴς καὶ ἰδὼν ἀνεφιγμένας τὰς θύρας τῆς φιλαρχίας, σπασάμενος μᾶχαιρὰν ἠμέλλειν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναρεῖν, νομίζων ἐκπεφευγέας τοὺς δεσμούς, xxiii. 27 τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλλημφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ μέλλοντα ἀναρείσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐπιτατ' σὺν τῷ στρατευ- ματί ἐξειλάμην αὐτῶν, καὶ θόν etc. Acts xiv. 19; xviii. 22f.; xxv. 6f.; 2 Tim. i. 4; Tit. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xi. 4; Luke vii. 37 f.

Hence in general it must be noticed, that in this manner compound sentences receive not merely greater variety, but also a greater degree of periodic compactness. This latter result is effected still more decidedly by the blending of two independent propositions into one, Attraction (§ 66), for which purpose relatives possess very extensive aptitude (§ 24). Attraction, too, is itself very diversified, and occurs even in the N. T. in many forms, from 507 the simple (as in Luke v. 9 ἐπὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ τῶν ἱερῶν, ὡς συνέλαβον, Acts iv. 13 ἐπεγίνωσκον αὐτοὺς ὡς σὺν τῷ Ἱησοῦ ἤσαν) to the complex, as in Rom. iii. 8 τί ἐτί κἀγα κρίνεται κρίνως; καὶ μὴ, καθὼς βλασφημοῦμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασίς τινες ἡμᾶς λέγεις, δὲ τοι ἔσομεν κακά, ἦν δὲ τὸ ἀγαθά;
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Note. In contrast with this intertwining of clauses stands the practice of forming a proposition where a simple Infinitive would have sufficed; as, Mark xiv. 21 καλῶν αὐτῷ ἐσώρουσον ἵνα ἐγένητο δ ἀνθρώπος ἑκάστος, 1 Jno. v. 2 ἐν τούτῳ ἐγγίκαμεν, ὅτι... ἐν γὰρ τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπῶν (ii. 3), Acts xxvii. 42 τῶν στρατιωτῶν βουλὴ ἐγένετο, ἵνα τοὺς δικαίωσης ἀποκτείνωσιν (on the other 567 hand, vs. 12), Rev. xix. 8. This mode of expression is not always adopted from a love of amplification (a peculiarity of the later language), but is employed sometimes to give more forcible prominence, and sometimes to attain a more flexible construction.

9. By these various means of connection, the style of the N. T. is shaped into an organic structure which is by no means destitute of variety, though it is inferior in this respect to the style of Greek authors. In this way are constructed periods even of considerable length, particularly in Luke (and especially in the Acts), e.g. Luke i. 1-3; Acts xii. 13 f.; xv. 24-26; xvii. 24 f.; xx. 9, 20 f.; xxiii. 10; xxvi. 10-14, 16-18; Rom. i. 1-7; 1 Pet. iii. 18-22; Heb. ii. 2-4; 2 Pet. i. 2-7. At the same time it must be admitted that, after the beginning of a long period has been made, the thread of the arrangement is frequently broken, and the sentence terminates in some kind of anacoluthon or remains quite unfinished Rom. iii. 8; xii. 6-8; xvi. 25 f. 27; Mark vii. 8 f.; Gal. ii. 4 f.; 2 Pet. ii. 4-8; 2 Thess. ii. 3 f.; see § 68, or at least is commenced anew 2 Pet. ii. 5 sq.; Eph. v. 27; Jno. viii. 53; Rev. ii. 2, 9. The N. T. writers, further, have hesitated from one mode of constructing ramified sentences, in that they regularly do not incorporate quotations, though but of small extent, in an indirect form, but express them directly, and without introducing them always by ἀλλὰ as an external connective or by λέγων, as in Matt. ix. 18; xxvi. 72; Mark xi. 32; Luke v. 12; Jno. i. 20; xxi. 17; Gal. i. 23; Acts iii. 22; v. 23, etc. They often, even when they begin with an indirect quotation of others' words, pass over very soon into the oratio directa, as in Luke v. 14; Acts i. 4; xxiii. 22; see § 68. The same takes place in particular after verbs of requesting; in which case instead of subjoining the request indirectly, by means of an Inf. or a clause with ἵνα (§ 44, 8), the precise words of the petitioner are stated, as in Luke xiv. 18 ἔρωτω σε, εἰς με παραγγελέων, vs. 19; ν. 12; Jno. iv. 31; ix. 2; Phil. iv. 3; Acts ii. 40; xvi. 15; xxi. 39; Matt. viii. 31; xviii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 16. However, what the style loses thus in compactness, it gains on the other hand in animation and vividness. Further, see Schleiermacher, Herm. 131.

Note. It is interesting to notice, in parallel sections, especially in the
first three gospels, the variety as respects the structure and connection of sentences. Luke will be found by such comparison invariably the most expert writer, and more careful than the others also in the selection of his words; (he prefers, for instance, idiomatic expressions, verba composita and decomposita). This subject, however, belongs to N. T. Stylistics.

§ 61. POSITION OF WORDS AND CLAUSES, ESPECIALLY WHEN IRREGULAR (HYPERBATON).

1. The arrangement of the individual words of a sentence is, in general, determined by the order in which the conceptions are formed, and by the specific relation which the different parts of the sentence (as groups of words) bear to each other. This relation requires, for instance, that the adjective should regularly be placed in immediate contact with its substantive, the adverb with its verb or adjective, the Genitive with its governing noun, the preposition with its case, and one member of an antithesis with the other. In particulars, however, the connection of a clause with what precedes (cf. Heb. xi. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 6; Col. ii. 9; Phil. iv. 10), the greater (rhetorical) emphasis to be given to a word, even to a greater or less degree the requirements of euphony, regulate the respective position of the words. Sometimes, however, the arrangement depends on the nature or the conventional importance of the ideas (e.g. terra marique, etc.). It is not necessary that the word to be emphasized should be placed at the commencement of the clause; it may even stand at the end (see e.g. Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 74), and in any case in that position which from the nature of the sentence gives it the most striking prominence. For example, intentional connection with what precedes causes a relative pronoun, even in an oblique case, usually to begin the clause etc. The position of words is determined therefore, by the laws of the succession of thought and by rhetorical aims (Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 181). And although these leave great latitude to the spontaneous mental movements of the writer, and are never felt by the practised author as trammels; yet just because the arrangement of words decidedly serves logical and rhetorical purposes, only a small part of it usually becomes so habitual with an individual writer that it can be considered as a prominent characteristic of his style.¹

¹ No very thorough treatise is known to me on the arrangement of words in Greek. Kühlner's attempt, however, to vindicate for this subject (under the name of Topik) its
2. The arrangement of words in the N. T. is in the main determined by the same principles as in the Greek prose authors, for these principles are but to a very small extent confined to any particular nation. It must be remarked, however, that

a. The arrangement of words is bolder and more diversified in the didactic writings, particularly those of Paul, than in the historical books; since in the former the rhetorical element is more influential, while in the (synoptical) gospels the Hebraistic type of arrangement predominates.

b. Especially in the narrative style, a wide separation of the two principal parts of a sentence, the Subject and the verb (Predicate), is avoided; and, in accordance with the Hebrew mode of expression, sometimes the verb is advanced nearer to the Subject, sometimes, when the Subject is complex, only the principal Subject precedes the verb, and the others follow (see § 58, 6), lest the attention should be kept too long in suspense. Relative clauses, too, are if possible so placed as to be introduced only after the full enunciation of the principal clause. On the whole, the arrangement of words in the N. T. is simple and free from all affectation, as well as from stiffness or monotony. Gersdorf, in his well-known work, has professed to point out numerous peculiarities of individual N. T. writers; but on strict examination it will be found that a) he has not duly investigated the several particulars on which the arrangement of words is in every case dependent; and b) under the impression that it might become the invariable usage of a writer to place e.g. the adverb before or after the verb, he has propounded and partly executed a species of critical inquiry that merits the charge of prejudgment. A philosophical work on this subject would be a great acquisition to verbal criticism.

It is not a matter of indifference whether a writer employs ἤτευμα τοῦ θεοῦ or ἤτευμα τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. § 20, 1), or, without the articles, ἤτευμα θεοῦ or θεοῦ ἤτευμα. Every individual passage of the N. T. must be elucidated according to its respective stylistic conformation. To lose sight

due place in grammar deserves thanks (ii. 622 ff.). Medv. also has collected some observations on the subject (Syntax, S. 258 ff.). In regard to Latin, special inquiries were previously instituted in connection with the doctrine of sound, and the subject is ably handled by Zumpt, Grammat. S. 626 ff.; cf. also Hand, Lehrb. des lat. Stils S. 307 ff.; Gernhand, commentatt. gramm. P. 8 (Jen. 1828. 4to.). On the ancient languages in general, see H. Weil, de l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes etc. Paris, 1844. 8vo. As respects the habitue of individual writers in the arrangement of words, Taschirmer, for instance, who strove after a prose rhythm, could not fail to be recognized in any one of his writings.
of this, neglecting the Codd. (as well as the ancient versions, and the more or less free quotations in the Fathers), and invariably to attribute to a writer one and the same arrangement of words, is empirical pedantry. If the adjective is usually placed thus: φόβος μέγας, ἕργον ἀγαθόν, or the 570 adverb in reference to its adjective thus: χάλεντος λαός, μεγάλη σφόδρα 510 (Strabo 17, 801), the arrangement is very natural. The opposite arrangement either aims at giving prominence to the adjectival or adverbial notion, which with many writers may be caused by an antithesis habitual to them (καλὰ ἔργα is used for the most part by Paul); or the (antithetical) nature of a particular adjectival notion may require that it should precede, like ἄλλος, ἄσ, ἄτοις, etc. That ὅ ἀνθρώπος ὁ ἄνθρωπος is likewise not surprising. The latter arrangement implies an emphasis on the pronoun (this man, no other), which is in place only when one is speaking δεικτικῶς or intensively. The predominance of the latter arrangement in John (Gersdorf 444 f.) is, in the first place, by no means decided, and secondly, the reason for such arrangement may be easily perceived in all the passages in which it occurs. Ταῦτα πάντα Luke xii. 30 and πάντα ταῦτα Matt. vi. 32 are not exactly of the same import (Gersd. 447 f.): the former means these things all together; the latter, all these. In the first expression, πάντα is a closer specification of ταῦτα; in the second, πάντα is pointed out demonstratively by means of ταῦτα. Πάντα ταῦτα is undoubtedly the more rare, much like omnia haec in Latin, yet in Matt. xxiii. 36; xxiv. 33 f.; Luke vii. 18 it is the better established reading, cf. Bengel on Matt. xxiv. 33. That the narrators when they subjoin something chronologically say ἐν ἐκείνως ταῖς ἡμέραις and the like, will not be considered by any observant reader as an arbitrary deviation from the usual sequence: ὅ τόλμε ἐκείνη. To what purpose are remarks such as: πάλιν, ἐκείνεν etc. are placed sometimes before and sometimes after? Finally, I cannot imagine how Gersdorf (S. 335) could so misjudge the place of the adjective in Matt. xiii. 27; xv. 20 as even to be inclined to correct the text. When we find in Matt. xv. 34 πόσων ἄρους ἔχετα; or δε ἢπον ἤπαττα καὶ ὅλγα ἰχθύδια but in Mark viii. 7 καὶ ἠχον ἰχθύδια ἀλλαγα, the antithesis with ἤπατα required that ἀλλαγα should precede; whilst in the latter passage bread and fish are contrasted: they had also in fish a small provision. That Paul writes in 1 Tim. v. 23 ὁ ὅλγα ὅλγῳ and James iii. 5 ὅλγον (var. ἡλίκον) πῦρ, nobody probably will think strange who studies language with attention. In Jno. v. 22 τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκε τῷ νῷ, πᾶσαν is very appropriately 485 placed immediately before δέδωκε, as it belongs to it (he gave it to him not in part, but wholly, 1 Cor. xii. 12), cf. also Matt. ix. 35; Rom. iii. 9; xii. 4;
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Acts xvi. 26; xvii. 21; 1 Cor. x. 1 (Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 40; Thuc. 7, 60 etc.). Along with the arrangement πᾶσα η πόλις occurs also ο πᾶς νόμος Gal. v. 14; τῶν πάντων χρόνον Acts xx. 18; 1 Tim. i. 16 (Thuc. 4, 61; Isocr. Dem. 571 p. 1; Herod. 1, 14, 10; Stalib. Phil. 48). On the simple precedence of an emphatic word (Jno. vi. 57; viii. 25; ix. 81; xiii. 6; Rom. vii. 23; xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 4; xiv. 2; xv. 44; Luke ix. 20; xii. 30; xvi. 11; Heb. x. 30; Jas. iii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Pet. i. 21), no remark is necessary. Yet see under 3. The order in the apostolic benediction χάρες 511 ἐν καὶ εἰρήνη, uniformly adhered to as it is (in 1st and 2d Pet. also), is not certainly intended to point out χάρες as the principal and more comprehensive idea, to which εἰρήνη is added as a consequent. The Vocative, with or without ἢ, either precedes the sentence,—that is, when it expresses a cry Mark xiv. 37, or as an address is intended to rouse the attention for what follows Matt. viii. 2; xv. 28; xviii. 32; xxv. 26; Mark ix. 19; Luke viii. 48; xxiv. 25; Jno. vi. 68; xiii. 6; xxi. 15 sqq.; Acts i. 11; ii. 29; v. 35; vii. 59; ix. 13; xiii. 10; xxv. 24; Rom. ix. 20; Gal. iii. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 20,—is or is intercalated into the sentence, when, that is, the attention of the person addressed is assumed, and what follows is to be referred solely to him Matt. ix. 22; xvi. 17; xx. 31; Jno. xii. 15; Acts i. 1; xxvi. 19, 24, 27; Gal. i. 11; Phil. i. 12; iii. 17; Philem. 20; 2 Pet. i. 10; Rev. xv. 4. The Vocative in this case stands after one word or several, according as they are or are not connected in sense Matt. xvi. 17; Jno. xii. 15; Rev. xv. 4, etc.; sometimes, when supplementary, it stands at the end of the sentence Luke v. 8; Jno. xiv. 9; Acts xxvi. 7.

3. The grounds of every unusual arrangement (transposition) of words, when it originates in the writer’s free choice, may with greater or less distinctness be ascertained. The following cases are to be distinguished:

a. When the unusual position of the words is occasioned by rhetorical causes, and is consequently intentional, as in 1 Pet. ii. 7 the appositive (Weber, Demosth. p. 152) τῶι πιστεύοντοι is reserved for the conclusion, because the condition as believers, if we believe, thus obtains greater prominence, particularly as it is brought so close to the antithetical ἀπειθοῦντες.1 Cf. 1 Jno. v. 13, 16; Jno. xiii. 14; Rom. xi. 13; Heb. vi. 18 (Stalib. Plat. Euthyd. p. 144), also Heb. vii. 4 δ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἐδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροβιων, ὁ πατριάρχης unto whom Abr. gave even a tenth, the patriarch, x. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 4. Other instances of the same sort are Heb. vi. 19 ἢν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἐξομν. τ. ψυχῆς ἀσφαλή ἕτε καὶ βεβαιαν καὶ εἰσφραξίμενης etc. x. 34; 1 Pet. i. 23; 1 Cor. xiii. 1 ἐὰν ταῖς γλῶσ-

1 Cf. with this Demosth. fals. leg. 204c. εἰμί τοίνυν ὃ κατηγορῶν εἰς ἄρχῃς ἄρθρο τοῦτον, τεθέναι δ ὅπειρες ἰμαῖ.
§ 61. POSITION OF WORDS AND CLAUSES.

σας τον ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τὸν ἁγίαλων, Acts xxiv. 17; xxvi. 22. The Genitive in particular is put last, 1 Thess. i. 6; Jno. vii. 38; 1 Tim. iii. 6, etc. In giving a word precedence (see above, no. 2), antithesis is manifest in 1 Cor. x. 11 ταῦτα τύποι συνέβαινον ἐκεῖνοι, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς etc. Luke xvi. 12; xxiii. 31; Jno. ix. 17; xxi. 21, likewise in 2 Cor. ii. 4 οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθήτε, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁγίατὴν ἵνα γνώτε, xii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 15; Acts xix. 4; Rom. xi. 31; Col. iv. 16; Gal. ii. 10 (Cic. div. 1, 40; Mil. 2 fin.; Krü. 286), as well as in 1 Cor. vi. 4 βιωτικὰ μὲν οὖν κριτήρια εἰσὶν ἔχον (such postposition of εἰσὶν is frequent in Demosth., see Klotz, Devar. p. 484); Rom. xii. 3 ἐκάστῳ ὥς ἐμέρισεν μέτρου πιστεὼς, 1 Cor. iii. 5; viii. 7; 512 Jno. xiii. 34 (Cic. off. 2, 21, 72); 2 Thess. ii. 7 μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἥρτο ἐὼς ἐκ μέσου γένηται, finally in Rom. viii. 18 οὐκ ἀξία τὰ παθήματα τοῦ καιροῦ πρῶς τ. μέλλοναν ἀν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθήναι, Gal. iii. 23; Heb. x. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 22.

b. At other times we find a closer specification, which only occurred to the writer after the sentence had been arranged, 572 brought in afterwards; as, Acts xxii. 9 τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθεᾶσαντο, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι, iv. 33 μεγάλη δυνάμει ἀπεβίοντο τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, Heb. xii. 11; Jno. iv. 39; vi. 66; xii. 11; 1 Cor. 486 x. 27; Luke xix. 47; 1 Pet. i. 13; 2 Pet. iii. 2 (Acts xix. 27); cf. Arrian. Al. 3, 28, 1 τοῦ ἅπαντας ἐν τῇ διάσει τῆς στρατιᾶς. To this head should probably be referred also Rev. vii. 17. In 2 Pet. iii. 1 ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινή διάνοιαν the words spaced out are thrust into the current of the sentence as a subjoined closer specification of διεγείρω.

c. Words which are to be joined together in sense, are placed near each other; as, Rom. ix. 21 ἔχει ἔξωσιαν ὁ κεραμεύς τ. πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποίησις etc., 1 Pet. ii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 11. In Eph. ii. 3 φύσει belongs to τέκνα, and accordingly has the most suitable place.

d. Sometimes the transposition is unavoidable; as, Heb. xi. 32 ἐπιλεύσεις γὰρ με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεών, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψίων etc. where, since a long series of names follows with which in vs. 33 a relative clause is to be connected, no other arrangement was possible, vi. 1, 2; 1 Cor. i. 80.

e. An effort to keep unimportant words in the background, is manifest in Heb. iv. 11 ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ etc. v. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 19; Acts xxvi. 24. So perhaps in 1 Cor. v. 1 διὸ τινας τοῦ πατρὸς ἐχεῖν (that the wife one has of his
father), Luke xviii. 18. See Weber, Demosth. pp. 139, 251. Likewise in Heb. ix. 16 δι' ὑμᾶς, θανάτου ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διάθεμένου, the main thought θανάτου ἀνάγκη would have been weakened if the last word had been placed anywhere else. Occasionally in the more dexterous N. T. writers the aurium judicium even, on which Cicero laid so much stress, may have exerted an influence, and produced a more flowing and rhythmical arrangement.

On the collocation of the same or similar words, as κακὸς κακοῦς ἀπολέσω, see § 68, 1; cf. Kühner II. 628.

The antecedent position of the Predicate (e.g. in Jno. i. 1, 49 cf. vs. 47; iv. 19, 24; vi. 60; Rom. xiii. 11; 2 Pet. i. 10, 14, 19; Phil. iii. 20; ii. 11; 1 Jno. i. 10; Rev. ii. 9) is everywhere to be judged of according to the principles stated above. It is quite natural also, that, particularly in sentences having an exclamatory character, as well as in macarisms, the predicate should be placed at the beginning (the omission of the substantive verb being in such sentences the predominant usage), e.g. Matt. xxi. 9 εὐλογημένος δ' ἔρχομαι ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, xxiii. 39; Luke i. 42, 68; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 11[?]; 1 Pet. i. 3; Matt. v. 3 μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί τῷ πνεύματι, 4–11; xxiv. 46. So also regularly in forms of praise in the O. T. (Ἰέρες, 513 νῦν) Gen. ix. 26; 1 Sam. xxvi. 25; 2 Sam. xviii. 28; Ps. cvi. 48, etc. But only an empirical expositor could regard this position as an unalterable rule; for, when the subject constitutes the principal notion, especially when it is antithetical to another subject, the predicate may and must be placed after it, cf. Ps. lxvii. 20 Sept. And so in Rom. ix. 5, if the words δ' ἐν ἐν πάντων θεῶν εὐλογητός etc. are referred to God, the position of the words is quite appropriate, and even indispensable,—which, with many others, Harless on Eph. i. 3 has failed to see.

As to placing in particular the Genitive before the governing noun, see § 80, 3, note 4, p. 192. Careful writers avoid such arrangement if misapprehension could arise from it. Hence in Heb. vi. 2 βαπτισμῶν δίδαξις is not instead of δίδαξις, βαπτ., especially as in the other groups the position of the Genitive is in accordance with the rule. In the passages adduced by Tholuck from Thuc. and Plut. ambiguity is impossible.

4. Formerly, attention to the arrangement of words in the N. T. was restricted to those cases in which parts of sentences are found separated from those words with which they belong logically (1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 7; Rom. xi. 13; Heb. ii. 9), which was denominated Trajection. Such restriction was not so much

1 See on such trajectories in Greek, Abreoch, Aristaenet. p. 218; Wolf, Demosth. Lept. p. 300; Reitz, Lucian. VII. 448 Bip.; Krüger, Dion. Hal. p. 139, 318; Engelhardt, Euthyphr. p. 123 sq.
to be censured, as the almost entire neglect to inquire into the reasons which, in each particular case, gave occasion to the so-called trajection. By such (rather instinctive) reasons the N.T. writers were invariably guided. Very seldom indeed have they transposed words, either when the nature of the ideas (Quintil. instit. 9. 4, 24) suggested the arrangement of the words (Matt. vii. 7; Jno. vii. 34; Rev. xxii. 6, 17; Matt. viii. 11; Heb. xi. 8), or in phrases where according to the nature or importance of the ideas (sometimes not without regard to ease of utterance) the order of words had been fixed conventionally. Thus: ἀνδρεὶς καὶ γυναῖκες Acts viii. 3; ix. 2, γυναῖκες καὶ παιδία or τέκνα Matt. xiv. 21; xv. 38; Acts xx. 5, ξόντες κ. νεκροὶ Acts x. 42; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 5, νύκτα κ. ἡμέραν Acts xx. 31; xxvi. 7, νυκτὸς κ. ἡμέραν 1 Thess. ii. 9; iii. 10, σάρξ κ. αἷμα Matt. xvi. 17; Gal. i. 16; Jno. vi. 54, 56, ἐσθιεῖν (τρώγειν) κ. πίνειν Matt. xi. 18; Luke vii. 34; xii. 45; 1 Cor. xi. 22, 29, βρόχος κ. τόξος Rom. xiv. 17; 574 Col. ii. 16, ἐργαὶ κ. λόγοι Luke xxiv. 19 (Fr. Rom. III. 268), ὁ σῶμαν καὶ ἡ γῆ Matt. v. 18; xi. 25; xxiv. 35; Acts iv. 24, etc. ὁ ἡλιός κ. ἡ σελήνη Luke xxi. 25; Rev. xxi. 28, ἡ γῆ κ. ἡ θάλασσα Acts iv. 24; xiv. 15; Rev. vii. 1, 3; xiv. 7, etc., right ... left Matt. 514 xx. 21; xxv. 33; Mark x. 40; Luke xxiii. 33; 2 Cor. vi. 7; Rev. x. 2, δοῦλοι ... ἐλεύθεροι 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Eph. vi. 8, 'Ιουδαίοι κ. 'Ελληνες Acts xviii. 4; xix. 10; Rom. iii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 24 (cf. Rom. ii. 9 f.) and the like. Deviations from this order occur but sparingly (cases, indeed, may be conceived in which the reverse order corresponds better with the truth, cf. Rom. xiv. 9; Hesusin, Plut. educ. 2, 5); and if there is exclusive or predominant MS. authority for the opposite, it must be unhesitatingly adhered to, e.g. Eph. vi. 12 αἷμα κ. σάρξ, Heb. ii. 14; Matt. xxiii. 15 ἡ θάλασσα κ. ἡ ξηρά, Acts ix. 24 ἡμέρας κ. νυκτὸς Luke xviii. 7; Rom. xv. 18 λόγοι κ. ἐργαὶ (Diod. S. exc. Vat. p. 23), Col. iii. 11 Ἐλλην κ. Ἰουδαίοι. (Cod. D has in Matt. xiv. 21; xv. 38 [and in the latter passage Cod. Sin. also] παιδία καὶ γυναῖκες, cf. Caes. b. gall. 2, 28; 4, 14.) In the N.T. the order οἱ πῶδες καὶ αἱ χεῖρες seems to predominate, as in Matt. xxi. 12; Jno. xi. 44; xiii. 9; Acts xxii. 11. Only in Luke xxiv. 39 f. we find the opposite τὰς χεῖρας μον καὶ τοὺς πῶδες (perhaps with reference to the fact that only the hands of persons crucified were pierced, and were therefore considered principal parts, just as Jno. mentions only the hands). In Rom. xiv. 9 the order νεκροὶ καὶ ξόντες is determined by the preceding ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἐζησεν.
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The arrangement of words in the N. T. is more unrestrained, when a series of ideas is framed. For then general and special conceptions etc. are not grouped together, but the words follow one another according to some loose association of ideas, or even a resemblance in sound, Rom. i. 29, 31; Col. iii. 5. See, in general, Lob. paralip. p. 62 sqq.

It is necessary to be cautious in applying to such abnormal arrangements the name of hysteron proteron (cf. Odysseus 12, 134 τὰς μὲν ἄρα θέρασα τεκοῦτα τε, Thuc. 8, 66; Nitzsch on the Odyssey I. 251 f.). We remark in passing, that on Jno. i. 52 ἐγγίζεις θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας Λύκει has stated the right view of the matter; and that vi. 69 εἰρωτεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν (cf. x. 38) must not on account of 1 Jno. iv. 16 εγνώκαμεν καὶ πεποιθεύκαμεν (Jno. xviii. 8) be considered as an inversion of thought, see BCrus. in loc. Likewise, in other passages of the N. T. it would be a mistake to suppose there is a hysteron proteron: In 1 Tim. ii. 4 πάντας ἄνθρωποι θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγγειον ἄλληθεια ἔλθειν the comprehensive ultimate end is first mentioned, and then the immediate (as the means of attaining the former), — (καί and therefore). In Acts xiv. 10, however, ἐπάνω καὶ περιπατεῖ is quite as possible as a matter of fact, as in iii. 8 πεποιθών καὶ ἔλθειν. In 2 Pet. i. 9 μεταπάτων is subjoined as a more exact definition. The hysteron proteron which Bornem. Acts xvi. 18 has adopted from Cod. D, rests on too little authority. Further, see Wilke. Rhetor. 226.

5. f. Sometimes, however, single words were misplaced through inadvertency, or still more, because the ancients, expecting none but intelligent readers, were released from the necessity of minute accuracy. Such irregularity occurred not unfrequently in prose writers in the use of certain adverbs (Stallbl. Plat. Phaed. p. 123), to which, from the sense, every reader could at once assign the proper position, even though the author's arrangement might not be the most logical. This applies to ἀεὶ in Isocr. Paneg. 14 διετέλεσαν κοινὴν τὴν πόλιν παρέχοντες καὶ τοῖς ἰδικομενοῖς ἐστὶ τῶν Ἐλλήνων ἑπαμύνουσαν, Xen. Oec. 19, 19; Thuc. 2, 43, etc. (see Krüger, Dion. p. 252; Schaeff. Demosth. II. 234); also to τοῦτοις Stallbl. Plat. rep. I. 98; to ἐτί Rom. v. 6 ἐτί Χριστὸς ἀνέθην ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν (instead of ἐτί διν. ἕμ. ἀνθ.) cf. vs. 8; Plato, rep. 2, 368 d.; Achill. Tat. 5, 18 and Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 300 sqq.; lastly, to ὡμοῖος 1 Cor. xiv. 7 ὡμοὶς τὰ ἀγνωμοί φωνὴν διδόντα ... ἐὰν διαστολὴν τοὺς φθόνοις μὴ δῷ, πῶς ἴσχυσθησεται τὸ αὐτούμενον etc. instead of τὰ ἀγνωμοί, (καλτερ) φων. διδ., ὡμοῖος, ἐὰν μὴ etc., and Gal. iii. 15 ὡμοῖος ἄνθρωπον κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀβετεὶ instead of ὡμ. οὐδεὶς ἀβετεὶ (see Bengel, and my Comment. in loc.), cf. Plato, Phaed.
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91 c. φοβεῖται μή ἡ γυνὴ δῆμος καὶ θεωτέρον καὶ κάλλιον ὅν τὸν σώματος προσφολλήται, see Hm. and Lob. Soph. Aj. 15; Doederlein, Soph. Oed. C. p. 396; Pflugk, Eurip. Androm. p. 10 and Hel. p. 76.²

489 Likewise the transposition of a negative is not altogether rare in Greek authors (especially the poets, see Hm. Eurip. Hec. vs. 12). Then, however, there is either a suppressed antithesis, e.g. Plat. Crit. 47 d. πειθόμενοι μὴ τῇ τῶν ἐπαινοῦντων δόξᾳ, legg. 12, 943 a.; Xen. M. 3, 9, 6; cf. Kühner II. 628;³ or the negative, instead of being joined to the word denied, is prefixed to the whole sentence, as in Plato, Apol. 35 d. & μήτε ἤγογμαι καλὰ εἶναι μήτε δίκαιᾳ, Xen. Eph. 8, 8 ὅτι μὴ τὸ φάρμακον θανάσιμον ἦν; so also in Acts vii. 48 ἄλλα οὐχ ὅ ὑψιστὸς εἰς χειροποιήτους κατοικεῖ. Further, many expositors⁴ think they find a misplaced negative also in Rom. iii. 9 τι οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως, i.e. by no means 516 (πάντως οὐ 1 Cor. xvi. 12). This interpretation is unavoidable, whether we translate προεχόμεθα have we an advantage? or have we a pretext? The linguistic admissibility of this signification is proved from Theogn. 305 (250 f.)⁴ and Epiphani. haer. 38, 6, as well as by analogies such as οὐδὲν πάντως. Herod. 5, 34, 65;⁵ only a transposition, strictly speaking, is not to be thought of. The phrase is rather to be understood thus: no, assuredly; no, by no means; and the difference between οὐ πάντως when it meant not

---

¹ We must not, however, with Fr. Mr. p. 19, refer to this head εὐβίως (εὐβός). In Mark ii. 8; v. 30 it belongs to the participle beside which it stands. Elsewhere, Mark i. 10; ix. 15, it is put at the beginning of the sentence (see above in the text), and is easily to be construed with the principal verb. Also τάλω in 2 Cor. xii. 21 is not transposed, but made to precede the whole sentence: lest again, when I come, God humble me. So, probably, also σχέδει in Heb. ix. 28 (as if, and almost) applies to the sentence: all things are purged with blood. Cf. Galen. pro trept. c. 1 τά μὲν ἄλλα ζῶον σχέδει αὕτη νάρθη βοῦν. Aristot. polit. 2, 8; Lys. ed. Auger I. p. 204.

² What Vaickenaer, schol. N. T. II. 574, has adduced, is not all well selected. As to other passages, in which even recent scholars assert erroneously the existence of a trajectory of the negation (e.g. Thuc. 1, 5; 3, 57), see Sintenis, Plut. Themist. p. 2.

³ I do not understand on what grounds some of these expositors assert that Grotius's rendering: not in all points, is unwarranted. As little do I understand how οὐ πάντως omnino non is called a Hebraism. ἄλλα οὐδὲν too in immediate connection means non omnis; οὐ πάντως for οὐδείς is always so separated that the verb is negated by the οὐ, see § 26, 1. οὐδὲν, however, with the omission of the verb, which Koppe quotes in loc., I do not remember to have found in the O. T.

⁴ οὐ λέγω οὐ πάντως λέγω ὅ γαρ ὅπαθεν γεγονότος, ἄλλα ἄνθρωπος κακός συνέθηκεν φιλήν.

⁵ But οὐ πάντως (μή πάντως) means everywhere, not particularly. It is sometimes mild as to the expression, but strong as to the sense, a sort of litotes, see Weber, Demosth. p. 340; Franke, Demosth. p. 62. In Rom., as above, the context and tone of the passage prevent us from rendering οὐ πάντως in the same way, by a species of litotes (earnest or ironical), not entirely.
entirely and when it denoted entirely not, was probably indicated by the mode of utterance. Hence it was without reason that van Hengel despaired of giving a satisfactory exposition of the passage, and concluded that there must be an unnoted corruption of the text. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. v. 9 f. ἔγραψα ὑμίν ... μὴ συναναμάγνυσθαι πόρνους, οὐ πάντως τοῖς πόρνους τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, the expression οὐ πάντως signifies non omnino (Sext. Emp. Mathem. 11, 18), and the last words are a corrective explanation of μὴ συναναμ. πόρνους: to have no intercourse with fornicators, not absolutely with the fornicators of this world, for then must ye needs go out of the world (but, strictly, with impure members of the church). So Luther. Likewise Heb. xi. 3 εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαυνομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονότα is erroneously supposed to contain a transposed negation. It is, however, correctly rendered by Schulz: so that things which may be seen have not come of things visible; cf. also Bengel in loc. That which is denied is, ἐκ φαυνομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονότα, and to this sentence the 577 negative is prefixed quite according to rule. The instance to which appeal is made of a transposition of a negation in 2 Macc. vii. 28 δὲν εἶον ἐὰν δύναται ἐποίησαν αυτὰ ὦ θεὸς is uncertain, as only Cod. Alex. has that reading. Tdf. has printed ἐξ εἰναὶ δύνατων. Lastly, 2 Cor. iii. 4 f. πεπολθησαν ... ἔχομεν, οἷς ὅτι ικανοὶ ἐσμὲν etc. must not be explained thus: ὅτι οἷς (μὴ) etc. Rather is it to be rendered: this confidence have we ...; not (referring to 2 Cor. i. 24) that we are sufficient through ourselves, but our sufficiency is from God. In 2 Cor. xiii. 7 Paul states the aim of εὐχόμεθα ... μηδὲν in the words οἷς Ἰησοῦς ἡμεῖς δόκιμοι φανόμεν, first negatively: not that I (if ye abstain from evil) may appear approved (as your teacher). In 1 Jno. iv. 10 the propriety of the arrangement οἷς ὅτι is obvious. In Rom. iv. 12 the negation is not misplaced, but the singularity consists in the repetition of the article before στοιχεῖων; — a negligence of style which Fr. has tried to conceal by an artificial exposition, but which Philippi freely admits. In 517 regard to 1 Cor. xv. 51 πάντες (μὲν) οὐ κομηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ τῷ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, even after the remarks of Fr. de conformatione text. Lachm. p. 38 sq. and of van Hengel Cor. p. 216 sqq., I can only agree with Mey. That is to say, vs. 52 shows that ἀλλάττεσθαι is not applied in the wider sense (to the risen also), but in the narrower, as opposed to ἐγείρεσθαι. The passage can only be rendered: we shall all (the generation whom Paul addressed) — not fall asleep,— but all be changed. Had Paul supposed that
some of the πάντες might die, they would then belong to the οὐκεῖος, vs. 52, and ήμεις would be an inexact antithesis. Any doubt respecting Paul's having been able to foreshadow a thing of this sort cannot induce me to assign to ἀλλᾶτι, in vs. 51 a signification different from what it has in vs. 52. Mey. has answered all other objections. That in Rom. xiii. 14 τῆς σαρκὸς πρόθοιμος μὴ ποιείςθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας is not put for μὴ εἰς ἐπιθ., is doubtless on any supposition clear, see Fr. in loc. Translators, including Luther, have taken the liberty to make a transposition in 2 Cor. xii. 20; but the arrangement in Greek is perfectly regular.

In Rom. xv. 20 οὐχ ὅτιν, according to Bengel is used instead of ὅτιν οἷς for greater force, and according to BCrus. it is a milder, more modest, form of expression; whereas it is simply the only correct expression: οὖν, 578 οὐχ ὅτιν...ἀλλά etc. In Rom. viii. 12 οὐ τῇ σαρκὶ suggests without help the antithesis ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι. To the (appropriate) variation in the position of the negative in Rom. ii. 14 ἐκ τὰ μὴ νόμου ἐχοντα and νόμου μὴ ἔχοντες Bengel had already directed attention, see also Mey. in loc.

Some critics have thought that there is a hyperbaton in 2 Tim. ii. 6 τῶν κοπιῶντα γεωργόν διὰ πρωτόν τῶν καρπῶν μεταλαμβάναν. The Apostle according to vs. 5 appears to mean to say: the husbandman that first laboreth, must be partaker of the fruits, i.e. the husbandman must first labor, before he be partaker of the fruits; so that πρωτόν belongs to κοπιάν, and the sentence should run accordingly, cf. Xen. C. 1, 3, 18 ὁ σὸς πρώτος πανῆτε τεταγμένα ποιά, i.e. ὁ σὸς πανῆτε πρώτος τετ. τ. To get rid of the hyperbaton, Grotius makes πρώτον signify demum, which is inadmissible. Later expositors, laying the emphasis on κοπιά, as purposely placed first, explain the passage thus: the laboring (not the idle) husbandman has the first right to partake of the fruits, see, especially, Wiesinger in loc. Similar and even more remarkable hyperbatae are not unfrequent in Greek prose; see Plat. rep. 7, 524 a.; Xen. Cyr. 2, 1, 5; cf. Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 21; Franke, Demosth. p. 33.

In Greek authors one or more words of a relative sentence are sometimes put before the relative (Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 109), for the sake of emphasis, see above, no. 3. Several expositors have attributed this idiom to Acts i. 2, and punctuated the passage thus: τοὶς ἀποστόλοις, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οίς ἔπληκται; but with little probability, as ἐντόλλ. διὰ πνεύμ. ἁγ. was here (in reference to the sequel of the Acts) the only point of importance in Luke's mind; while ἔπληκτος ἀπὸ τοῦ πν. fell within the range of the pre-518vious history of the Gospel, and did not need to be stated here for the first time. The general reference contained in οἵς ἔπληκτος, by which primarily the apostles are indicated, is not superfluous, as it was by that previous election that they had been prepared to receive the directions διὰ τοῦ πν., see Valcken. in loc. There would be more ground for such
punctuation in Acts ν. 35 προσέχετε διαυτώς, ἕτει τοῖς ἄνθρωποι τούτους τι μέλλετε πράσσειν (see Bornem. in loc.), although the usual mode of connecting the words gives a suitable meaning: take heed to yourselves in regard to these men, what ye intend to do.

On the other hand, it is inconceivable that Luke could have written in Acts xxvii. 39 κόλπον τωλὰ κατανύσσων ἔχοντα αἰγιαλὸν γι' αἰγ. ἔχοντα κόλπον τωλὰ. Grotius long ago remarked: non frustra hoc additur, sunt enim sinus quidam maris, qui litus non habent, sed praeruptis rupibus cinguntur; see also Bengel. Moreover, αἰγ. ἔχοντα must be regarded as directly joined to the relative clause εἰς δὲν etc.: which had a beach, on which they determined to land, i.e. a beach of such a description as may have induced them to attempt a landing. It would be equally harsh to construe, as some do, Rom. vii. 21 εὑρίσκω ἄμα τὸν νόμον τῷ θελοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ καύν παράκαται thus: τῷ θελοντι ἐμοὶ τὸν νόμον ποιεῖν, τὸ καλὸν. 579 It has always appeared to me most natural to take the words thus: εὑρ. ἄμα τὸν νόμον, τῷ θέλα. . . . οτι ἐμοὶ τὸ καύν παράκαται invenio hanc legem (normam) volentis mihi honestum facere, ut mihi etc. See also Philippi in loc.

Many also find a trajectory, sanctioned by long usage and even affecting the case (Mtth. 867), in Jno. xii. 1 πρὸ τοῖς ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα πέντε days before the Passover, and xi. 18 ἣν ἡ Ββραίνα ἐγγύος τῶν Ἰερουσαλήμων ὡς απὸ σταδίων δεκαέπτων about fifteen furlongs off, cf. xxi. 8; Rev. xiv. 20. That is, it is thought that if the prepositions stood in the right place the language would run τοῖς ἡμέραις πρὸ τοῦ π., and ὡς σταδίων δεκ. απὸ Ἰερουσ. (Luke 492 xxiv. 13). But probably in local specifications Greek phraseology proceeded from a different view of the matter, απὸ σταδίων δεκ. (properly: situated at a distance of fifteen furlongs i.e. where the fifteen furlongs terminated, at the end of fifteen furlongs), as in Latin e.g. Liv. 24, 46 Fabius cum a quingentiis fere passeibus castra posuissest; Ramshorn S. 273. If now it were necessary to specify besides the speaker’s position, it was added to the phrase in the Genitive. The same applies to specifications of time. As it was usual to say πρὸ τοῖς ἡμερῶν vor sechs Tagen, before (the last past) six days, the form of expression was retained when it was necessary to indicate the point of time from which the period in question was counted, as πρὸ τοῖς ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (cf. Evang. apocr. p. 436 f.). But whatever explanation we may give of the construction, both these forms of expression (the temporal and the local) were of frequent occurrence in later Greek, cf. Ael. anim. 11, 19 πρὸ πάντων ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἀφανοῦσαν την Ἑλλην. Xen. Eph. 3, 3; Lucian. Cronos 14; Geopon. 12, 31, 2; Achill. Tat. 7, 14 (and Jacobs in loc.); Epiph. Opp. II. 248 a.; Strabo 10, 483; 15, 715 καταλαβέων ἁνδρας πεντεκακεικα ἀπὸ σταδίων εἰκοσι τῆς πόλεως, 519 Plutarch. Philop. 4 ὁ ἄγρος αὐτῷ καλὸς ἀπὸ σταδίων εἰκοσι τῆς πόλεως, Diod. ίτα λ.

1 Polyain. 3, 35 τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐκλεµένων ἀπὸ βραχίων διαστήματος ὑπερηφανίκιο. Is also illustrative.
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S. 2, 7; Acta apocr. p. 39, 61; see Reiske, Const. Porphyrog. II. 20 ed. Bonn; Schaeff. Long. p. 129. Kühnel directs attention to the following passages of the Sept.: Amos i. 1 πρὸ δυὸ έτων τοῦ σεσαμοῦ; iv. 7 πρὸ τριών μηνῶν τοῦ θρυγητοῦ, with Sing. πρὸ μᾶς άμερας τῆς Μαρδακαίης άμερας, 2 Macc. xv. 36 (Joseph. antt. 15, 11, 4; Plut. sympl. 8, 1, 1). Such phrases (in a temporal sense) are also composed with μετά, as in Plut. Coriol. 11 μετά άμερας δόλας τῆς του πατρὸς τελευτῆς, Malal. 4, p. 88 μετὰ μῆς έτη τοῦ τελευτησαί τῆς Πασιφάνης, Anon. cron. (before Malal. ed. Bonn.) p. 10 μετὰ δύο έτη τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, see Schaeff. ad Bos, ellips. p. 553 sq.

6. The position of certain particles and enclitic pronouns is 580 fixed with greater or less precision in Greek, according to their importance in the sentence. For instance, μέν (μενούνγε, μέντοι), οὖν, δέ, γάρ, γε, τοινώ, ἀρα, ought not to begin a sentence (ἀρα also ought not to begin an apodosis, Xen. C. 1, 3, 2; 8, 4, 7). With regard to most of these this rule is observed likewise in the N. T.;* and δέ, γάρ, οὖν, have sometimes the 2d, sometimes the 3d, sometimes even the 4th place (though the Cod. do not everywhere agree). They occupy the 3d or 4th place, particularly, when it is necessary to avoid separating words that are intimately connected [especially prepositional phrases], as in Gal. iii. 23 πρὸ τοῦ δέ ελθέων, [Heb. i. 13 πρὸς τίνα δέ τῶν ἀγγέλων], Mark i. 38 εἰς τούτο γάρ ἐξεληλυθά, Luke vi. 23; xv. 17; 2 Cor. i. 19 ὅ τοῦ 493 θεοῦ γάρ νῦν, Acts xxvii. 14 μετέ οὖν πολὺ δὲ ἔβαλε etc., Jno. viii. 16 καὶ ἔδω κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ, 1 Jno. ii. 2 οὐ περί τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον, 1 Cor. viii. 1 περί τῆς βρόσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθυτῶν, 2 Cor. x. 1 δὲ κατὰ πρόσωπον μὲν ταπεινός, Jno. xvi. 22; Acts iii. 21. Cf. on δέ (Her. 8, 68; Aelian. anim. 7, 27; Xen. M. 2, 1, 16; 5, 4, 18; Diod. S. 11, 11; Thuc. 1, 6, 70; Arrian. Al. 2, 2, 2; Xen. eq. 11, 8; Lucian. eunuch. 4; dial. mort. 5, 1; Sext. Emp. math. 7, 65; Strabo 17, 808) Hm. Orph. p. 820; Boisson. Aristaenet. p. 687; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 302; III. I. 71; Stallb. Philos. p. 90; Franke, Demosth. p. 208; ποίησε Σχαέφ. melet. crit. p. 76; V. Fritzzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 100; ποίησε ἰμ. Orph. as above, Bornem. Xenoph. conv. p. 61; Weber, Demosth. 402. On the other hand, ἁρα (see Hm. Soph. Antig. 628) is frequently, contrary to Greek usage, placed first, as in Luke xi. 48; Rom. x. 17; 2 Cor. v. 15; Gal. ii. 21; v. 11 etc.; so also ἁρα οὖν in Rom. v. 18; vii. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 15; Eph. ii. 19, etc. Likewise μενούνγε begins a period

---

*Εφη, inserted in the direct discourse of a third party, occurs only in Acts xxviii. 35; but φηλ in Matt. xiv. 8; Acts xxv. 5, 22; xxvi. 25, etc. Usually we find in the N. T. ὁ Παίδως οὗ, ὁ δὲ έφη, before the oratio recta, which in Greek authors is the more rare usage, Ἀδω. S. 260.
in Luke xi. 28; Rom. ix. 20; x. 18; see Lob. Phryn. p. 342; so also τοῖνν in Heb. xiii. 13. The latter very seldom begins a 520 sentence in the better authors; for instances in later writers, see Lob. Phryn. l.c. They are especially frequent in Sæxt. Emp., as in Math. 1, 11, 14, 25, 140, 152, 155, 217, etc. Among the Byzantines, cf. Cinnam. p. 125, 136, ed. Bourn.¹

Whether the indefinite τις can stand as the first word of a clause has been doubted, Mthth. Eurip. suppl. 1187 and Sprachl. 1081. Though from the nature of the case it may rarely begin a sentence, yet approved critics 581 have with high probability established its claim to the first place in Soph. Trach. 365, and Oed. R. 1471 (cf. vs. 1475), Aeschyl. Choeph. 640 (Hm.). In prose cf. Plat. Theaet. 147 c.; Plat. tranq. c. 13. In the N. T. τις beginning a sentence is established in Matt. xxvii. 47; Luke vi. 2; Jno. xiii. 29; 1 Tim. v. 24; Phil. i. 15.

Αλλά γε yet at least are, in the more ancient authors, always separated by a word (though it be but a particle), Klotz, Devar. p. 15 sq. This rule is not observed in Luke xxiv. 21 ἀλλά γε σῶν πάσιν τούτων τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἁγιά, see Bornem. in loc.

Moreover, μέν is regularly placed after the word to which according to the sense it belongs.² There are, however, some exceptions to this rule: Acts xxii. 3 ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμὶ ἄρχο Ιουδαῖος, γεγέννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κυλικᾶς, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτη (for ἐγὼ ἐ. ἐ./ Ι. γεγένν. μὲν etc.), Tit. i. 15 πάντα μὲν καθαρά τοῖς καθαροῖς, τοῖς δὲ μιμοσειμοῦσι καὶ αἱ ἀπίστους οὐδὲν καθαρόν for τοῖς μὲν καθαρ. πάντα καθ. etc. or πάντα μὲν καθ. ... οὐδὲν δὲ 494 καθ. τ. μέν, 1 Cor. ii. 15. Cf. Xen. M. 2, 1, 6; 3, 9, 8; Ael. anim. 2, 31; Diog. L. 6, 60, see Hm. Soph. Oed. R. 436; Hartung, Partik. II. 415 f. Yet good Codd. have omitted μέν in the above three passages of the N. T. [Cod. Sin. also in the first two; yet in the second, corrector C has added μέν], and recent editors have accepted their authority. Might it not have been expunged because it was displeasing?

The proper position of τε is after the word which stands parallel to another, as in Acts xiv. 1 Ἰουδαίον τε καὶ Ἑλληνὸν πολὺ πλήθος, ix. 2; xx. 21; xxvi. 3. It is, however, not unfrequently inserted with more license, as in Acts xxvi. 22 (Emsley, Eurip. Herac. 622, yet cf. Schoem. Isae. p. 325); and, in particular, it stands immediately after a preposition or article, as in Acts x. 39; ii. 33; xxviii. 23; Jno. ii. 15, etc., in which

¹ But μέντοι always stands after some other word that commences the sentence. It is otherwise in later writers, see Boissonade, Anecd. II. 27.

² When several words have a grammatical connection, as article and noun, preposition and noun, μέν may be placed immediately after the first, e.g. Luke x. 2 δ μένθερμεθα, Heb. xii. 11 πάσα μέν το παρόν, Acts i. 1; viii. 4 etc. (Demosth. Lacrit. 595 a.). So also μέν δ ὑπεν in Lysias pecun. publ. 3 ἐν μὲν ὑπεν τῷ πολέμῳ. Cf. Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 61. This holds also of other conjunctions, see above, p. 363. Also the names of a single person are separated by such conjunctions, Jno. xviii. 10 Ἰησοῦν ὑπὸ Πέτρος.
case it sometimes emphasizes them as belonging to the two parallel mem-
bers alike, as in Acts xxiv. 23 στιν τε χιλιάρχοις καὶ ἀνδράσιν, xiv. 5; x. 39;
cf. Plat. legg. 7, 796 d, εἰς τε ποιλεῖαν καὶ ἰδίους οἴκους, Thuc. 4, 13 and
the examples collected by Elmsley as above (also Joseph. antt. 17, 6, 2)
and Ellendt, lexic. Soph. II. 796. See, in general, Sommer in Jahn's
Archiv I. 401 ff. In the same way γε is placed after an article or mono-
syllabic particle in Rom. viii. 32; 2 Cor. v. 3; Eph. iii. 2, cf. Xen. M. 1,
2, 27; 3, 12, 7; 4, 2, 22; Diod. S. 5, 40; see Matthiae, Eurip. Iphig. Aul.
498; Ellendt, as above, I. 344.

582 Many expositors, e.g. Schott, find a trasjaction of the καί (even) in Heb.
vii. 4 καὶ δεκάτην 'Αβραὰμ ἑδωκεν, for καὶ δεκάτην καὶ 'Αβρ. ἑδ. But the
emphasis in this passage lies in the giving of a tenth, and Schulz has
correctly translated it.

7. Violent transpositions of clauses1 have been thought to occur
a. Acts xxiv. 22, where Beza, Grotius, and others, in explaining
the words ἐν Φηλεξ, ἀκριβεστερον εἰδώς τα περὶ τῆς ὁδού, εἴσας, διὰν
Ἀνιλας καταβῆ, διαγινώσκομαι etc., include εἰδώς in the clause εἴσας
e tc. and render thus: Felix, quando accuratius ... cognovero,
inquit, et Lysias hic venerit etc. But the arrangement here is
quite regular, as later expositors have perceived. Cf. Bornem. in
Rosenm. Repert. II. 281 f.

b. 2 Cor. viii. 10 οὕτως οὐ μάνον τὸ ποιήσαι ἄλλα καὶ τὸ θέλεω
προέρθασθε ἀπὸ πέρυντι, where an inversion has been assumed: non velle solum sed facere incepistis (Grotius, Schott, Stolz, and
others),2 on account of vs. 11 ἡ προθυμία τοῦ θέλειν. This is
wrong. The willing strictly indicates merely the decision (to collect), and if προέρθασθε is spoken comparatively, that is with a
reference to the Macedonian Christians, may be put before ποιῆσαι,
as expressing a point of more importance: Not only in execution,
but even in intention, ye were before the Macedonians. So much
495 the more fitting is it now, that the collection be quite completed.3

6th ed. It might have been quite possible for the Corinthians to have been
first prompted by the decision of the Macedonians to a similar
decision. Mey. in loc. (1st ed.) subtilizes and finally arrives at the

---

1 On this subject see W. Kahler, satira duplex de veris et fictis textus sacri traject.
ionib. ex Evangg. et Actis Apost. collect. Lemgov. 1728. 4to., and E. Wassenbergk, de
transposit. salub. in sanandis vett. scriptor. remedio. Franceq. 1786. 4to. (also reprinted

2 Syriac ܠܩܐ ܢܘܚܐ ܚܟܒܐ ܚܡܚܡܐ: ܐܠ ܒܦܢܝܢܐ ܠܩܐ

3 I cannot admit that in this sense vs. 11 must have run, καὶ ἐπετελέσατε τὸ ποιήσαι: the θέλειν, was, of course, completed long ago, but it is necessary to complete the
ποιήσαι also.
exposition propounded by Fritzsche (diss. in Cor. II. 9), which de Wette ably combats. This last critic has recently reproduced the above explanation [which Mey. also has adopted in his 2d, 3d, and 4th eds.], and I recall the view that I formerly upheld. As to Jno. xi. 15, see above, § 53, 10, 6, p. 459. (In Mark xii. 12 there is nothing whatever of the nature of a trajectory. To the double clause is annexed, after its conclusion, the ground of the first member, and then in καὶ ἄφεντες etc. the result is expressed. Similar is Mark xvi. 3. In Phil. i. 16 f. the two clauses should, on the best testimony [Sin. also], be thus arranged: οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀγάπης . . . οἱ δὲ εἰς ἐρμηθεῖας, thus in converse relation to vs. 15; 583 this can perplex no reader.)

When, in the arrangement of individual clauses, the dependent are placed before the principal, e.g. telic clauses, as in Matt. xvii. 27; Acts xxiv. 4; Jno. i. 31; xix. 28, 31; 2 Cor. xii. 7; Rom. ix. 11 (see Fr. Rom. II. 297), relative clauses, as in Mark xi. 23; Jno. iii. 11; Rom. viii. 29 etc., conditional clauses, as in 1 Cor. vi. 4; xiv. 9, the grounds of such arrangement are obvious to every attentive reader, cf. Kühner II. 626. Here belongs, probably, also 1 Cor. xv. 2 τίνι λόγῳ εἰσκεραυομένη ὕμων εἰ κατέχετε; see Mey. in loc.

§ 62. INTERRUPTED STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; PARENTHETICALS.

1. Interrupted sentences are those whose grammatical flow is obstructed by the insertion of a clause complete in itself; 1 as, Acts xiii. 8 ἀνθιστατο αὐτῶς Ἐλώμας ὁ μάγος — oὕτως γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ δύομα αὐτῶ — ἠττῶν διαστρέφονται etc., Rom. i. 13 οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγαπεῖν σὺν πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐμβείν πρὸς ὑμᾶς — καὶ ἐκάλυθην ἄχρι τοῦ λεύρο — οὐτα τινὰ καρπὸν σχετικόν καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν. The clause thus inserted is denominated a parenthesis; 2 and is usually separated visibly from the rest of the period by the well-known parenthetical marks. 3 According to the preceding definition the 496 6th ed.

1 The definition given in Ruddimann's Institut. II. 396, ed. Stallb. is not amiss: parenthesis est sententia sermoni, antequam absolvtur, interjecta. Wilke's definition (Rheto. S. 296) is too comprehensive.


3 To throw away all external marks of a (true) parenthesis, and yet retain inter-
name of *parentheses* cannot be applied, in the first place, to inserted subordinate clauses, even though of considerable length, if they are connected in construction with the principal clause by a relative or as Gen. absol. (Rom. xvi. 4; ix. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 6; 1 Cor. v. 4; Luke i. 70; ii. 23; Eph. vi. 2; Acts iv. 36), still less to clauses in apposition, such as Jno. xiv. 22; xv. 26; 1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Jno. 1; Acts ix. 17; Mark vii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 21, or to clauses annexed by way of explanation or reason to a concluded sentence, such as Jno. iv. 6, 8, 10; xi. 2, 51 f.; xiii. 11; xviii. 5; xix. 23; Mark vii. 3 f. 26; Matt. i. 22 f.; Luko i. 55; Acts i. 15; viii. 16; Rom. viii. 36; 1 Cor. ii. 8; xv. 41; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. ii. 8; Heb. v. 13; viii. 5; vii. 11; Rev. xxi. 25, or lastly, to those with which the continuation of the discourse, beyond the alleged parenthesis, is grammatically connected, as 1 Cor. xvi. 5 ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐκαθορίσω τὸν καθορίσμον παραμενῶ, where, indeed, ἐκαθορίσω and ὑμᾶς, διάρκεια and παράμ. stand obviously in mutual relation, Gal. iv. 24; Heb. iii. 4; Jno. xxi. 8; Rom. ix. 11; Mark v. 13; vii. 26. Parentheses are introduced either asyndetically or by kal- (Fr. Rom. I. 35) de or γάρ Rom. i. 13; vii. 1; Eph. v. 9; Heb. vii. 11; Jno. [xvii. 10] xix. 31; 1 Tim. ii. 7; Acts xxi. 3; xiii. 8; 1 Jno. i. 2, and after them the construction either proceeds regularly, or is resumed (sometimes with some alteration) by the repetition of a word from the principal clause, with or without a conjunction, as in 2 Cor. v. 8; 1 Jno. i. 3. It does not, however, follow from the latter circumstance, that a series of words may be regarded as a parenthesis, as Eph. i. 13 ἐν ἐν μαρτυρεῖ, ἵνα μαρτυρεῖ τὸν κόσμον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν, ἐν ἐν καὶ πιστεύετε ἐσφραγίσθητε etc. ii. 11 ff.; 1 Cor. viii. 1 (see Mey.); 2 Cor. v. 6 ff.; Jno. xxi. 21; so too, where the construction which had been commenced is not grammatically resumed, but the thread of discourse is continued in a new and independent form, the structure is not parenthetic, but anacoluthic (§ 63), e.g. Rom. v. 12 ff.

2. The number of parentheses in the N. T. is not small, but not so large as earlier expositors and editors (even Knapp) assumed. Besides the insertion of single words, which is common also in Greek and Latin authors (cf. nudiūs tertius), as in 2 Cor. vii. 3 κατὰ δύναμιν, μαρτυρῶ, κ. παρὰ δύναμιν αὐθαίρετοι, Heb. x. 29 πόσφ,
§ 62. INTERRUPTED STRUCTURE; PARENTHESSES.

Sometimes the narrator interrupts with such an explanation the direct discourse of another: Mark vii. 11 εὐπ άνθρωπος κορβᾶν, δ ἐστιν δῶρον, δ ἐὰν εἴς ἐμοὶ ὤφελήσῃ, Jno. i. 39 οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ ῥαββί, δ λέγεται ἐρμηνεύομεν διδασκαλε, ποῦ μένεις; Sometimes an exhortation is thrust in in the same way, as Matt. xxiv. 15 f. ὅταν ἔτοιμο θεοδεσμά ... ἐστοι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, δ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ etc.

3. There is no parenthesis in Jno. xi. 30: vs. 30 is so far connected with vs. 29 as it was necessary to place the mention of which Mary went; and after the narrator has completed the account of her going out, he passes in vs. 31 to her attendants.

1 Aristoph. Acharn. 12 πῶς τοῦτο λεγεῖται μου, δοκεῖτε, τὴν καρδίαν; Villois. anecd. II. 24 πᾶσιν, οὐσίαι, θυγατέρας ... εἴδοσιν;

2 The Greek idiom to which this has been compared by Kühnel and others (the so-called schema Pindaricum, see Fischer, Weller. III. 345 sq.; Vieg. p. 192 sq.; Hm. Soph., Trach. 817; Boeckh, Findar. II. 684 sq.; J. V. Brögel, diss. in loc. Luc. ix. 26, Jen. 1739. 4to) lies too remote, being almost exclusively poetic (Kühner II. 50 f.), and its application is not favored by εἴεναι, usually employed absolutely (nowhere εἴεναι ἡμέραν δικά etc.). Further, Matt. xv. 32 also is to be explained in the same way as Luke ix. 28: δὴ ἡ ἡμέρα τρεῖς, προσέβησοι μοι according to the best Codd., where Fr., overlooking the loose manner in which such specifications of time are introduced, has printed (from D): ἡ ἡμέρα τρεῖς εἰσὶ καὶ προσέβησον, etc., which is a manifest correction. On Mark viii. 2, however, he has admitted the correctness of the common text. See also his letter Ueber die Verdienste Tholuck's S. 17. Also Luke xiii. 16 ἢς ἔδωξαν δ σωτάρι, οὕτω διδάσκαλον διδάσκαλον εἰς τῇ ἐκκλ. I have no hesitation in taking, with Bengel, in the same way.

3 Different from this is the case in which the writer subjoins incidentally such an explanation to the words of another, and then proceeds in his own person, Jno. ix. 7 ἦσαν οἱ λεύκαι εἰς τ. κολυμβήθρα τοῦ Παλαμά, δ ἐμπνευστήκατα διασταλάμην. διάλειθων οὖν etc., I. 42, 44; Matt. i. 22 f.; xxii. 4 f. In all these cases there is no trace of a parenthesis. Matt. ix. 6 is not so much a parenthesis as a blending of the oratio directa and indir. ; and in Heb. x. 8 the author introduces, indeed, his own words in the midst of the quotation, but he does this by means of a relative clause.
who went out also. In Jno. xix. 5 the narrative proceeds quite regularly, for the change of subject does not render a parenthesis necessary. In Matt. xvi. 26 also parenthetical marks appear to be unnecessary (though Schulz has retained them); for vs. 26 adds to την δὲ ψυχήν ςημωθῇ an illustration of the value of the ψυχή. In vs. 27 the reference is to vss. 25 and 26 inclusively; no interruption of the construction can be perceived. In xxii. 4 f. a remark is added by the narrator; but in vs. 6 the simple narrative continues. Similar is Jno. vi. 6. In Jno. i. 14 probably the words καὶ θεσαυρόν . . . πατρὸς were not regarded by the author as an insertion; but, after the completion of the complex sentence, the summary πληρησα χάρ. κ. ἀληθ. is added in grammatical independence, somewhat as in Phil. iii. 19 or Mark xii. 40. Luke vii. 29 f. contain no parenthesis (Lchm.), but words of Christ, who previously, and again in vs. 31, is speaking. In Mark iii. 17 the assumption of a parenthesis is not sufficient to explain the construction, but vss. 16–19 are expressed in oratio variata, see 525 § 63 II. 1. There is no parenthesis in Jno. vi. 23; it is connected with τὸ in vs. 22. The proposal of Ziegler (in Gabler's Journ. für theolog. Lit. I. 155) to include in a parenthesis the words καὶ ἠσαν . . . γυναικῶν Acts v. 12 ff. has, very properly, found no favor with editors (except Schott); and those critics also who have suspected something spurious in vss. 12–15 (Eichhorn, Beck, Kühnöl) have been too precipitate. The words ὁστε κατὰ τὰς πλατείας ἐκφέρειν τῶν ἀσθενείς etc. are very aptly connected with vs. 14; the two facts, that the people held the apostles in high estimation, and that the number of believers increased, readily explain why the sick were brought out into the streets. The words, indeed, connect themselves with vs. 14 far more neatly than with vs. 12. Are we to understand by πολλὰ σημεία καὶ τέρατα (ἐν τῷ λαῷ) merely the preceding events, the effect of which was ὁστε ἐκφέρειν etc.? To assume this would be to sacrifice the perspicuity of the narrative. For what else could those πολλὰ σημεία have been but miracles of healing? Thus in the words ὁστε κατὰ etc. what had been only briefly indicated in vs. 12 recurs in another connection to be narrated more in detail (vs. 15 f.). Accordingly, I cannot bring myself to make with Lchm. vs. 14 a parenthesis. On the other hand, in Acts x. 36 τὸν λόγου is probably to be connected with vs. 37, and the words οὕτως etc., which as a complete sentence express a leading thought that Peter could not well annex by a relative, form a parenthesis; and in vs. 37
the speaker, after this interruption, proceeds by an amplification of the thought.

4. In the Epistles also parentheses, especially short ones, occur, which contain sometimes a limitation, 1 Cor. vii. 11, sometimes a corroboration, 1 Tim. ii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 5, sometimes a reason or more precise explanation, Rom. vii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 7; vi. 2; x. 4; xii. 2; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. ii. 5; v. 9; Jas. iv. 14; 2 Thess. i. 10; 1 Jno. i. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 5, or any thought whatever that obtruded itself upon the writer (Col. iv. 10; Rom. i. 13). But we find in the Epistles some parentheses also of greater length, as in Heb. vii. 20 f. ο ι μὲν γάρ ... εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, since καθ’ ὅσον ὦ χωρίς ὀρκωμοσίας vs. 20 is obviously connected with vs. 22 κατὰ τοσοῦτο κρείττονος etc.; and in Rom. ii. 13–15, since vs. 16 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρυφεῖ etc. is after all most appropriately connected with κρυφόνται vs. 12, for κρυφεῖ glances back at κρυφόνται. Vss. 13–15, however, constitute an independent group of thoughts, appended to vs. 12 as explanatory: it is the doing, not the hearing, of the law which is required, vs. 13; but the righteous heathen even are doers of the law, vss. 14, 15. But many lengthened insertions are not parentheses but digressions, inasmuch as they check merely the progress of thought and not the sequence of construction. So in 1 Cor. viii. 1–3 Paul, after grammatically concluding the clause περὶ δὲ ... ἔχομεν, allows himself, from ἡ γρώσις to ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, to digress on γρώσις in relation to ἀγάπη, and, resuming the thread of the discourse, returns in vs. 4 περὶ τῆς βρόσεως ὁμ etc. to vs. 1. Similar digressions occur in 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10 and 2 Cor. iii. 14–18 (iv. 1 is connected with iii. 12). In Rom. xiii. 9 f. by καὶ τῶτο εἰδότες Paul returns to μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφειλέτε, which is to be mentally repeated. Finally, in most of the passages usually adduced as parentheses, there is neither parenthesis nor digression: In Tit. i. 1 ff. κατὰ πίστιν is connected with ἀπόστολος, and the destination of Paul’s apostleship is fully brought out in the clause κ. πίστ. ... αἰωνίου, while to ζωὴς αἰων. is appended the relative clause ἦν as far as θεοῦ. Likewise in Rom. i. 1–7, where even Schott in his last edition assumes two parentheses, the whole passage flows with one unbroken thread, only the main conceptions in vss. 3 f. 5, 6 are amplified by relative clauses. So also in Col. iii. 12–14, where ἄνεχόμενοι (corresponding to ἐνδύσασθε) is a modal specification of μακροθυμίαν (perhaps also of πράστημα), but is itself re-enforced by καθὼς etc. Only οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς may appear to interrupt the structure, as the thought is already expressed.
through καθός in the connection of the preceding clause; but if χαριζόμενοι be there supplied, the construction becomes regular. In Heb. xii. there is the less ground for regarding vss. 20, 21 as 588 a parenthesis (Lchm.), since in vs. 22 προσελκύωμετε is repeated from vs. 18; so that a new sentence begins, an affirmative opposed to the negative group of sentences vss. 18–21. In 1 Cor. i. 8 δὲ refers to Χριστός vs. 7, and vss. 5 and 6 contain no parenthesis. In Rom. xvi. 4 the two connected relative clauses occasion no real break in the structure and cannot be regarded as parenthetic. In 1 Pet. iii. 6 ἀγαθοποιοῦσα is connected with ἐγενήθη, and the words ὡς . . . τέκνα are not parenthetic. In Eph. iii. 5 δὲ ἑτέρας etc. is joined to εὖ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χ. vs. 4; and in 2 Pet. i. 5 (Schott) αὐτῷ τὸῦ δὲ σπ. παρεισέκαυτε stands parallel to ὡς πάντα . . . δεδωρημένης etc., and vs. 4 is an explanatory relative clause to the words διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς. On 1 Jno. iv. 17 ff.; Eph. i. 21 hardly any remark is required. In Eph. ii. 11 ὃς λεγ. . . . χειροπ. is an apposition to τά ἐθνη ἐν σαρκί, and the repetition of εἰπε in vs. 12 cannot convert what precedes into a parenthesis. Lastly, anacolutha occur in Col. iii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 4–8 (in the latter passage occasioned by vs. 8, see § 63, I. 1 p. 569) and 1 Tim. i. 3 ff.

In Eph. iii. 1 ff. the Predicate is not δὲ δεσμος, for then, if the meaning were ego Paulus vinculis detineor, the article would be omitted; and the sense I am the prisoner of Christ (καὶ ἐν Χρίστῳ), does not recommend itself. The simplest mode of explaining the passage is, after Theodoret, to recogize in τούτων χάρων vs. 14 the resumption of the thought interrupted in vs. 1; especially as the intercession vs. 14 sqq. finds its appropriate occasion in the very fact that Paul had been by his imprisonment withdrawn from his personal labors, and τούτων χάρω also in vs. 1 receives its natural import. With far less probability others join iv. 1 to iii. 1, since there δὲ δεσμος seems to refer to ἕως δὲ δεσμος. Cf. Cramer, translation of Eph. p. 71 ff., who quotes and tests other conjectures, and Harless.

§ 63. BROKEN AND HETEROGENEOUS STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; ANACOLONTHON, ORATIO VARIATA.

I. 1. Anacoluthon occurs when the construction with which a

---

sentence began is not grammatically pursued;—either because the writer is wholly diverted from the structure adopted at the beginning by something intervening (especially by parentheses, see Beier, Cic. off. II. 365), or because for the sake of a preferable mode of expression (Weber, Demosth. 588) he frames the close of his sentence otherwise than the commencement required. Hence anacolutha are sometimes involuntary, sometimes intentional. To the latter class belong also those which have a rhetorical ground (Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 221), or which originate, as Hm. Vig. 895 expresses it, a motu animi vel ab arte oratoris vim aliquam captantae. In writers of great mental vivacity and activity, more taken up with the thought than with the expression, anacolutha are most frequently to be expected. Hence they are especially numerous in the epistolary style of the Apostle Paul. We specially point out the following: Acts xv. 22 ἐδοξέω τοῖς ἀποστολοῖς ... ἐκλεξαμένους ἀνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι ... ὑγάναντες διὰ χειρός αὐτῶν (Lys. in Eratosth. 7 ἐδοξέω αὐτοῖς ... ὡσπέρ ... πεποιηκότες, Antiphon. p. 613 Reisk. ἐδοξέω αὐτῇ βουλομένη βελτιων εἶναι μετὰ δεῖπνον δούναι, ταῖς Κλαταμιανήστρας τῆς τούτων μυθρὸς ὑποθήκαις ἀμα διακοψόνα, vice versa Plat. legg. 3, 868 d. ἄποβλέψας πρὸς τούτων τὸν στόλον, ὥσπερ διαλεγόμεθα, ἐδοξέω μοι πάγκαλος εἶναι—as, in general, often with ἐδοξέω—, Plat. Apol. 501 21c.; Xen. Cyr. 6, 1, 31; Lucian. Astrol. 3; Schwarz, soloeism. p. 86 sq.); Acts xx. 3 ποιήσας μήν τρεῖς, γενομένης αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλής ... μελλοντι ἀνάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν Συριαν, ἐγένετο γυνώμη, etc. In Rom. xvi. 25–27 τῷ δυναμένῳ ... μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἡσαῦ Χρ., ψ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, Paul is led away from the intended construction by his extended statement respecting God in vss. 25, 26, and, instead of immediately annexing ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, forms a relative clause out of the contents of the doxology, as if the Dative θεῷ concluded a sentence. Similar is Acts xxiv. 5, where ἐκρατησαμεν vs. 6 should without anything further have been added to the participle εὑρόντες τὸν ἄνδρα τούτων; Luke, however, led astray 590 by the relative clause δε καὶ etc. has made it, too, a part of the relative sentence: διν καὶ ἐκρατ. More remarkable are the anacolutha in periods of smaller extent: as in Acts xix. 34 ἐπνυγόντες,

1 Accordingly, in 1 Jno. 1 ff. there is no anacolouthon, as vs. 3, by a grammatically regular repetition of the words of the first verse after the intermediate clause vs. 2, is connected strictly with the beginning of the sentence.

2 In Latin cf. Hirt. bell. afric. 25 dum haec ita ferenet, rex Juda, cognitis ..., non est vixim, etc. Plin. ep. 10, 34.

8 One of the most singular is perhaps that added by Kypēs II. 104: Hippocr. morb
§ 63. BROKEN AND HETEROGENEOUS STRUCTURE.

ὅστε Ἰουδαίος ἐστί, φωνὴ ἐγένετο μιὰ ἐκ πάντων (instead of ἔφωνησαν ἄπαντες), Mark ix. 20 ἰδὼν (ὁ παῖς) αὐτῶν, τὸ πνεῦμα εἰθὺς ἐσπάραξεν αὐτῶν (instead of ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐσπαράξῃ), to which Fr. compares Anthol. pal. 11, 488 (?) καῦχω δ' αὐτῶν ἰδὼν, τὸ στόμα μου δέδεται, see also Plat. legg. 6, 769 c. Further, in Luke xi. 11 τίνα ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσει ὁ νῖος ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; the question, will he give? pre-supposes a protasis: a father when asked for bread by his son, or, a father whom his son asks for bread (Matt. vii. 9). So too in Acts xxiii. 30 μηνυθείσης μοι ἐπιβουλής εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα μέλλειν ἑσεθαι, where the construction should have continued μελλοῦσα ἑσεθαι; whereas μέλειν might have been employed, had the clause been introduced somehow thus: μηνυσάντων ἐπιβουλήν, etc. Cf. § 45, 6. Probably the construction was intentionally altered in 1 Cor. xii. 28 ὅς μὲν ἐθετο ὁ θεός ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους etc., where Paul at first meant to write ὅς μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀποστ., ὅς δὲ προφ. etc.; but instead of employing mere juxtaposition, he preferred an arrangement according to rank, so that now ὅς μὲν stands quite isolated, and the subsequent abstracts also, ἑπτατα δυνάμεις, are appended to the simple ἐθετό, which alone the writer still had in his mind. Likewise in Tit. i. 3 the Apostle, by the introduction of τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ in connection with ἐφανέρωσε δὲ etc., seizes on a more suitable turn of expression. Cf. besides 2 Cor. vii. 5 (1 Cor. vii. 26). Still more incoherent are the composite parts of an anacoluthic period in Jno. vi. 22 τῷ ἐπαύριῳ ὁ δράκος . . . ἰδὼν, ὅτι . . . (Ἀλα δὲ ἤθελε πλούσια . . .), δς τὸν εἶδεν 529 ὁ δράκος etc., where εἶδεν in consequence of the words inserted ἐπὶ ὅς has acquired a more comprehensive object than belonged to ἰδὼν. In Gal. ii. 6 ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων εἶναι τι—ὅπως ποτέ ἦσαν, εἶδεν 502 μοι διαφέρει—ἐμοι γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσευθεῖντο, where the Apostle should have continued in the Passive, but is so disturbed by the parenthetical clause that he frames a new sentence with γάρ.1

vulg. 5, 1 ἐν Ἠλίδι ἡ τοῦ κῆπου γυνὴ πυρέτῳ εἶχεν αὐτὴν ἴσως ἤκουσε καὶ φέρμακα πίνουσα οὖν ἐφέλετο. Cf. also Bar. 1, 9 μετὰ τὸ ἀκούσαν Ναβουχοδονώσορ τῶν Ἰερονίμων . . . καὶ θεραπεύεσαν, etc. Act. apoc. p. 69.

1 In sense Herm.'s explanation (Procr. de locis ep. ad Gal. p. 7) agrees with this. He assumes, however, an aposiopesis after ἄνδρας ἰδὼν δὲ ὅ . . . τι. See in opposition, Fritzschle, 2d Progr. p. 13. (Fritschier. Opusc. 211 sq.) The latter considers the words ἄνδρας δὲ . . . τι, with which as he thinks vs. 5. should conclude, as parallel to διὰ τοῦ παρεδώκατον ὑμῖν, and renders: propter irrepitios autem et falsos sodales (so circumci didi non passus est), quippe qui . . . quibus . . . ut . . . a viris autem, qui auctoritate valerent (circumcisionis necessitatem sibi imponi non sivit). See, on the other hand, Meyer. I have found no reason to give up my view of the passage.
So in vs. 4 f. διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους ... οίς οὐδὲ 591 πρὸς ὀραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ἱπτομαχῇ etc., the parenthetical insertion in vs. 4 occasioned the anacoluthon. The Apostle might either have said: on account of the false brethren (to please them) ... we did not cause Titus to be circumcised; or, we could by no means (in this respect) give way to the false brethren. The two constructions are here blended.¹ In Rom. ii. 17 ff., vss. 17–20 constitute the protasis, and vs. 21 begins the apodosis. Paul, having continued through several clauses the thought which he brought out as protasis, loses sight of εἰ vs. 17, and in appending the apodosis vs. 21 falls into another construction by means of οὖν, which particle indicates an anacoluthon. The explanation differs but little, if οὖν be taken for a conjunction employed to resume and sum up the protasis (Klotz, Devar. II. 718 sq.), as it very frequently in Greek authors begins the apodosis. For the words ὁ διδάσκαλος etc. ὁ κηρύσσων etc., whether they be taken as a question or as a reproachful assertion, alter the natural course of the sentence. That is to say, after the protasis εἰ δὲ etc. the sentence would simply run: thou shouldst carry into effect this knowledge of the law by a corresponding conduct (cf. vs. 23). That the construction selected by Paul is more forcible is obvious.² The anacoluthon in the following passages is harsher: In 2 Pet. ii. 4 the protasis εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφελθητο etc. has no grammatical apodosis. The Apostle meant to say: neither (much less) will he spare these 530 false teachers. But as one instance of divine punishment suggested itself to his mind after another (vss. 4–8), he first in vs. 9 592 reverts with an altered construction to the thought (generalizing it also) which was to form the apodosis. In Rom. v. 12, to the 6th ed. words ὀπέρ δὲ ἔνως ἀνθρώπων ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε one might have expected the apodosis: οὗτος δὲ ἔνως ἀνθρώπων (Χριστοῦ) δικαιοσύνη καὶ διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡ ᾿Ιω. But, by the

¹ To repeat, with Fr. (Progr. I. in ep. ad Gal. p. 24, Opusc. p. 178 sq.), after διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδ., the words οίς ἡμαρισματὶ περιγυμ. (ὁ Τίτος) is no easier at all. Paul, unless we regard him as an inexpert writer, could only omit these words in case the appended relative clauses had made him lose sight of the commencement of the period. But in this way the explanations of the sentence, which is at any rate irregular, amount pretty much to the same thing. Besides, there would be no singularity of style in the statement: but not even Titus ... was compelled to be circumcised. And because of the false brethren stealthily brought in, he did not allow himself to be compelled (to be circumcised).

² In a grammatical point of view cf. Xen. C. 6, 2, 9, where the commencement εἴρη δὲ ... Ἐλθον etc. § 12 is resumed in the words ὧς αὖ ταύτα ἥκουσεν ὃ στράτες τοῦ Κύρου, and the apodosis connected with it.
explanation annexed in vss. 12–14 to εἰσήλθεν ἡ ἀμαρτία καὶ ὁ 
θάνατος, the regular construction is broken off (though in ὃς ἐστι 
tύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος an intimation of the antithesis is given); and 
besides, the Apostle recollects that not merely a simple parallel 
between Adam and Christ might be drawn (ὅσπερ ... ὁτάος), but 
that something greater and more pervasive has proceeded from 
Christ than from Adam. Hence the epanorthosis πολλῷ μᾶλλον, 
which was noticed by so early an expositor as Calvin. The con-
nection is resumed in the words ἀλλ' οἷχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα etc. 
vs. 15, which logically absorb the apodosis, and in εἰ γὰρ ... ἀπέθανον 
the substance of the protasis vs. 12 is briefly recapitulated. After 
this Paul combines vs. 18 the twofold parallel (likeness and un-
likeness) in one final result. In a similar way must be explained 
1 Tim. i. 3 ff. Καθὼς παρεκάλεσα entirely wants an apodosis, 
which escaped the attention of Paul while he was introducing 
directly into the protasis the object of παρεκάλεσιν. The apodosis 
should run thus: σῶτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ, ἵνα παραγεῖτης etc. 
To consider vs. 5–17 as a parenthesis, as even Bengel does, is 
wholly unnatural; it is still more absurd, however, to take καθὼς 
for an untranslatable particle of transition (Heydenreich). Many 
ancient and modern expositors regard Rom. ix. 22 ff. as a very 
singular and in part double anacoluthon; see the different views 
in Reiche. But it is probably simpler to join καὶ ἵνα vs. 22 to 
ἤγερεν, and at the end of vs. 23 to conceive the apodosis as 
suppressed: If God, determined to show forth his wrath, bore with 
all long-suffering the vessels of his wrath, ... also in order to 
make known the riches etc.... what then? what shall we say? 
(must not, then, all censure be silent?). The bearing of the σκέψιν 
δρόγγις is not merely regarded as a proof of his μακροθ., but, at the 
same time, as occasioned by the purpose of bringing to view the 
riches of his glory which he destined for the σκέψιν ἔλεος. The 
instant destruction of the σκέψιν δρόγγις (in this case the unbelieving 
Jews) would have been perfectly just; but God endured them 
with long-suffering (thus tempering his justice with kindness), 
both the aim and the result of this being the more striking display 
593 (by the contrast) of the greatness of his grace towards the σκέψιν 
531 ἔλεος. The δὲ in vs. 22 is not οὖν, and hence the continuation of 
the thought expressed in vss. 20, 21 is not probable. That God 
is perfectly free in bestowing the tokens of his grace, had been 
sufficiently stated. The creature cannot contend with the Creator. 
— that is enough. But, resumes Paul, God is not so rigorous as
he might be, and have no fear of the censure of men. [It is probably still simpler, without supplying an apodosis, to take ei ... ἣνεγκέν as the condition, and καὶ (sc. ἣνεγκέν) ἵνα vs. 23 as the conclusion: if God ... endured ..., he endured them also or at the same time to the end that, etc.] As to Acts x. 36 see above, § 62, 3 p. 564. On Rom. xii. 6 ff. see below, II. 1 p. 578. Col. i. 21 is in any event an anakoluthon, whether we read with Lchm. ἀποκατηλλάγγητε, or with the text. rec. ἀποκατήλλαξεν. On 2 Pet. i. 17 see § 45, 6 b. p. 351, and on 1 Cor. xii. 2 Meyer.

In several other passages where expositors have thought they found an anakoluthon, I can discover nothing of the sort. Rom. vii. 21 εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θελοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακόν παράκειται, where according to Fr. (Conject. p. 50) there is a blending of two constructions, has by this scholar been subsequently explained otherwise, that is, in accordance with Knapp's view; see above, § 61, 5 p. 557. Likewise, in Heb. viii. 9 there is no blending of two constructions (Fr. Conject. p. 34). The quotation from the Sept. τῶν ἑµέρᾳ ἐτπλαβοµένου µον τῆς χειρός αὐτῶν may be an unusual expression, but it is not incorrect. The form of the expression was unquestionably occasioned by the Hebrew (for it is a quotation from Jer. xxxi. 32) מֹּעָר יְבִיָּה הַמַּעֲר. The participle is used instead of the Infinit., as in Jer. xxix. 2; cf. Bar. ii. 28. In 1 Pet. ii. 7 ἀπεθάνον ὑπερ' 6ε grammatically connected with the words of the quotation, οὗτος ἕγενθη etc. In Rom. i. 26, 27 a decision is difficult because the reading varies between ὁµοίως δὲ καί and ὁµοίως τε καί. The former appears to have more external evidence in its support; and Bornem. (neues theolog. Journ. VI. 145) has preferred it (as well as Lchm.), and endeavored to vindicate it by the frequent recurrence of the expression in the N. T. Matt. xxvi. 35; xxvii. 41 (Mark xv. 31); Luke v. 10; x. 32; 1 Cor. vii. 3 f.; Jas. ii. 25, and also in Greek authors, as Diod. Sic. 17, 111. But as none of these passages is preceded by τε, they are inadequate; cf., however, the passage quoted by Fr. from Plat. symp. 186 e. τε ὅν λατρεύων ... ὡς αὐτῶς δὲ καί γυµναστική. Grammatically, therefore, the reading supported by the most authoritative Codd. may be defended, and would even be very appropriate, as the Apostle obviously wishes to give the greater prominence to what was done by the ἄφρενες (he dwells on it in vs. 27, severely condemning the wickedness). Now comes the question whether either or both of these two readings causes an anakoluthon? With the reading ὁµ. τε καί [Cod. Sin.] there is no more an anakoluthon than in the Latin nam et feminae ... et similiter etiam mares. On the other hand, if we read ὁµ. 6ε καί the natural sequence is broken, exactly as in Latin et feminae ... similiter vero etiam mares. Klotz, Devar. II. 532 740. In Heb. iii. 15 we must probably seek for the apodosis in vs. 16 τὸν ἄντε γὰρ quinam etc., as Bleek, Tholuck, and others have done. In 2 Cor.
viii. 3 ἀπάφατον is connected with ἶαυτος ἔσκαψ vs. 5. In 1 Cor. v. 11, in the words τῇ τούτῳ μνήμη καταλύειν we ought not with Erasmus to find an anacoluthon, but an intensive repetition of συναναθήμων. In Jas. ii. 2 ff. the anacoluthon disappears, if vs. 4 καί οὐ etc. be taken interrogatively, as is done now by most critics, and also by Lchm. Ino. xiii. 1 contains no grammatical anacoluthon; the difficulty must be disposed of hermeneutically. 1 Cor. ix. 15, if ἦν before τὸς is spurious (Tlf. has restored it), would be not so much an anacoluthon as an aposiopesis, see Mey. Lastly, in Eph. iii. 18 the participles are probably to be connected with the clause ἦν ἐξωκόσιτε etc., see Mey. in loc.

2. The anacolutha hitherto elucidated are of such a nature that they might occur in any language. But in Greek certain peculiar species of anacoluthon became established by usage, which must now be mentioned:

a. If a sentence is continued by means of participles, these, when at a distance from the governing verb, not unfrequently assume an abnormal case (see Vig. p. 337 sqq.; Rost 704), e.g. Eph. iv. 2 f. παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ... περιπατήσαι ... ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ, σπουδάζοντες etc. (as if the exhortation were direct: περιπατήσατε), also i. 18 (where Meyer makes unnecessary difficulties); Col. iii. 16 ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοκεῖτο ἐν ὑμῖν πλοῦσιν, ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδασκοντες καὶ νοοθετούντες ἰαυτοὺς etc.; ii. 2 ἦν παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ etc. (as if παρακαλεῖσθαι were referred to the persons themselves), Col. ii. 10[?] ; 2 Cor. ix. 10 f. ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν ... χαρηγήσαι καὶ πληθύναι τὸν σπόρον ὑμῶν ... ὑμῶν, ἐν παντὶ πλούτῳ μενον etc.; vs. 12 f. ἡ διακοινία (ἐστι) περισσεύωσα διὰ πολλῶν εἰχαριστῶν, διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τ. διακοινίας ταύτης δοξάζοντος τὸν θεόν (as if ὁ πολλὸς εἰχαριστοῦσα had preceded) cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 26. See also 2 Cor. i. 7; vii. 5; Phil. i. 29 f.; iii. 10; 2 Pet. iii. 3; Jude 16. Cf. in general, Markland, Lys. p. 364, Reiske Vol. V.; Buttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 110; Seidler, Eurip. Iphig. T. 1072; Kühner II. 377 f.; Schwarz, soiociism. p. 89, also Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 135 sq. and sympos. p. 33. Some of the anacolutha of this sort may be considered as intentional. The 595 thoughts when expressed by the Nom. of participles receive greater prominence; whereas the oblique cases merge them rather in the sentence as a whole (singularly so in Jude 16), and are marked as accessory. But most of them are occasioned by the author’s having intended, in the preceding part of the sentence, to employ a different substantive, kindred in sense. Besides, cf. Evang. apocr. pp. 169, 445.
§ 63. BROKEN AND HETEROGENEOUS STRUCTURE.

Of another sort are Mark xii. 40; Phil. iii. 18 f., on which see § 59, 8 b. 533 p. 532. In Rom. xiii. 11 καὶ τὸν ἐδότης is connected with ὀφείλετε vs. 8; 1st ed. and 1 Pet. ii. 16 connects itself, as the ideas suggest, with the Imperative ἔποιήσατε in vs. 13.

b. Frequently after a participle the construction passes over into a finite verb, which is apt to be accompanied by δὲ; as, Col. i. 26 πληρόσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀπὸ κεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ... μὲν δὲ ἐφανέρωθη θεοῦ in stead of μοι δὲ φανερωθέν (cf. Her. 6, 25; Thuc. 1, 67), 1 Cor. vii. 37 δὲ ἔστηκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην, ἔξουσιαν δὲ ἔχει (instead of ἔχον). We must 506 not, with Meyer, refer to this head 1 Cor. iv. 14; nor Eph. ii. 3, 5th ed. where ἡμεν is parallel to ἀνεστάφημεν. This transition occurs without δὲ in Eph. i. 20 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν ... ἦν ἐνέργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐγείρας αὐτῶν ... καὶ ἐκάθεσεν, 2 Cor. vi. 9; Jno. v. 44; Col. i. 6 (Paus. 10, 9, 1). As to 2 Jno. 2 see below, II. 1 p. 578. An effort to attain a more simple structure, or to give prominence to the second thought (particularly in 2 Cor. vi. 9; cf. Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 29), is not unfrequently the cause of such an anacoluthon. Heb. viii. 10 (from the O. T.) is to be explained thus: αὐτὴ ἡ διαβήσει, ἢν διαβήσφαίμαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ ... διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπί καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγραφὸς αὐτοῦ. To render καὶ before ἔστημι by etiam, as some (Böhme, for instance) do, is forced, and far from being favored by x. 16. As to Jno. i. 32 τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαίνον ... καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐν’ αὐτῶν (cf. vs. 33 ἐφ’ ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαίνον καὶ μένον ἐν’ αὐτῶν), the correct explanation has already been indicated by BCrus. Cf. also Schaef. Dion. H. p. 31 and Demosth. II. 75; V. 487, 578, also Plutarch. IV. 323; Blume, Lycurg. p. 147; Mth. S. 1527 f. In the Codd. in such passages the participle is sometimes found as a correction, e.g. in Eph. as above, where Lchm. nevertheless has adopted καθίσας as genuine. A kindred sort of anacoluthon occurs in 2 Cor. v. 6 ff. θαρροῦντες σὺν πάντοτε ... θαρροῦμεν δὲ καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν, where Paul, after several intermediate clauses, repeats θαρροῦντες, which he intended to construe with εὐδοκ., in 506 the form of the finite verb.

c. A clause, which had begun with δὲ, concludes with the (Acc. and) Infin., as if that particle had not been employed at all; as, Acts xxvii. 10 θεωρῶ, δὲ τε μετὰ ὅβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας ... μέλλειν ἐσεσθαι τῶν πλοίων cf. Plat. Gorg. 458 b. ἐγὼ γὰρ εὖ

1 The case examined by Hm. Soph. El. p. 153, and Buttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 149, is different.
§ 68. BROKEN AND HETEROGENEOUS STRUCTURE.

Thus ὅτι, ὡς ἐμαθὼν πειθῶ, εἰτερ... καὶ ἐμὲ εἶναι τούτων ἕνα, see above, § 44, note 2, p. 339. On the other hand, in Aelian. 12, 39 the construction ἐγὼ Ὁμήρων is founded on an Acc. with the 3 Inf., but is followed by μέγα ἐφράξω, as if ὅτι had preceded. Similar is Plaut. Trucul. 2, 2, 62. With this may be compared also Jno. viii. 54 δι' ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐστι (where θεόν ὑμῶν εἶναι might have been used). This, however, is rather to be considered as Attraction; see below.

d. The principal verb in the sentence does not regularly correspond to the Nominative or Acc. placed at the beginning of the sentence (casus pendentes, Wannowski, Syntax. anomal. p. 54 sq.; see, however, H. L.-Z. 1836. I. 388); as, 1 Jno. ii. 24 ὑμεῖς, δὲ ἦκούσατε ἀπ' ἄρχῃ, ἐν ὑμῖν μενέτω, and vs. 27 καὶ ὑμεῖς, τὸ χρίσμα δὲ λάβετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένεις and you, the anointing, which... abides in you. In both passages, ὑμεῖς, if placed in the relative clause (Lchm.), would in that position of precedence be too emphatic. Luke xxi. 6 ταῦτα δὲ θεωρεῖτε, ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, ἐν αἷς οὖν ἀφεθήσονται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ etc. these things which ye behold,—there will come days in which (even to the last stone they will be destroyed) not a stone (of them) will be left on another. So also in Jno. vi. 39; vii. 38; xxv. 2; Matt. vii. 24; xii. 36; Rev. ii. 26; iii. 12, 21; vi. 8. Cf. Exod. ix. 7; Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 5; Oec. 1, 14; Ael. 7, 1. 2 Cor. xii. 17 μὴ τινα δεν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δ' αὐτοῦ ἐπελευκτήσα ὑμᾶς; for, have I sent to you any one of those etc. in order to deprave you? Rom. viii. 3 τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ὑπ' ἠθένει... ὅ θεός τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ νόον πέμψας... κατέκρυψε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν ὑπ' σαρκὶ, what to the law was impossible... God condemned, sending his Son, sin in the flesh, for, that God did, and condemned etc. Here, however, τὸ ἀδύν. may also be regarded as a predicate placed before a proposition complete in itself, and may be resolved δὲ ἀδύνατον ἐστι, like Heb. viii. 1 κεφαλαίον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τοιοῦτον ἐχομεν ἀρχιερεά etc. see § 32, p. 231; cf. Kühner II. 156.

Several critics, Olsh. among them, have supposed that there is an Accus. absol. (?) in Acts x. 36 τὸν λόγον δὲ ἀπέσταλε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ etc. the 597 word, which (or which word) he sent first to the children of Israel (namely, the word vs. 35 ἐν πατρὶ εἶναι etc.). Yet see § 62, 3 p. 564.

An anacoluthon peculiar to the N. T. sometimes occurs, where the writer proceeds in the words of an O. T. statement instead of in his own, e.g. Rom. xv. 3 καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς σὺν ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν, ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραται, οἱ ὄνειδαμοι τῶν ὄνειδαμῶν σε ἐπέπεσαν εἰ' ἵμα (instead of— but, to please
God, he submitted to the cruelest reproaches) vs. 21; ix. 7; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9; iii. 21; Heb. iii. 7. Yet see below, § 64, 7 p. 598.

e. Under the head of acharoluthon comes also the use of μὲν without a subsequent parallel clause (made prominent by δέ), Hm. Vig. 841 sq. In this case either

a) the parallel member is easily to be supplied from the clause with μὲν, being in a manner included in it, as in Heb. vi. 16 ἀνθρωποι μὲν γάρ κατὰ τοῦ μελώνος ὄμνύουσι men swear by the greater, but God can swear only by himself, cf. vs. 13 (Plat. Protag. 334 a.), 535 yet this μὲν is doubtful [and wanting also in Cod. Sin.]; Col. ii. 23 ἀπινά ἐστι λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν θεολογοποιεῖ γαί οときは which, indeed, have an appearance of wisdom, but in fact are not (Xen. An. 1, 2, 1), Rom. x. 1, where perhaps Paul purposely avoided the painful antithesis (which is brought out in vs. 3 but softened by a compliment), see further 1 Cor. v. 8. Cf. Xen. Hier. 1, 7; 7, 4; Mem. 3, 12, 1; Plat. Phaed. 58 a.; Aristoph. pax 13; see Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 105; Held, Plutarch. A. Paull. p. 123. Or

β) the antithetic member is evidently added, but in another construction; as, Rom. xi. 13 f. ἐφ’ δὲνον μὲν οὖν εἰμί ἐγώ έβὼν ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω, εἴπως παρακλητώς μου τὴν σάρκα etc. Here the clause with δέ lies wrapt up in εἴπως παρακλῆ. Instead of Paul’s writing regularly: inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I glorify mine office (preaching zealously to the Gentiles), but I have in this the benefit of the Jews in view (I will thus render the Jews emulous), I am, indeed, in fact an apostle to the Gentiles, but at the same time in purpose an apostle to the Jews. Or

γ) the construction is entirely broken off, and the parallel clause must be gathered by the reader from the sequel, e.g. Acts i. 1 τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐπιησάμην περὶ πάντων ... ἀνελήφθη. Now the writer ought to proceed: and the history from this point of time (the Ascension) I will narrate now in the second part of my work; but by the mention of the apostles vs. 3 he is led to refer to Christ’s appearance after his resurrection, and connects immediately with this the continuation of the narrative. Rom. vii. 12 διὸ τό μὲν νόμος 598 ἄγνοιον καὶ ἡ ἐντολή ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἡγαθή the law, indeed, is holy, and the commandment is holy etc. but ἀμαρτία, made active in the σάρξ, misuses it (in the way indicated vs. 8). This thought the Apostle brings out in vs. 13 by a different turn of expression. Cf. further, Rom. i. 8; iii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 18 (in all these cases πρῶτον μὲν, see below), Heb. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 12 (see Rück. in loc.), Acts
iii. 13; xix. 4 (in the last passage μέν is not fully established), xxvi. 4. Instances in Greek writers are, Eurip. Orest. 8; Xen. C. 2, 1, 4; 4, 5, 50; Mem. 1, 2, 2; 2, 6, 3; Plato, Apol. 21 d.; Reisig, Soph. Oed. Col. p. 398; Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 225 and many others. In Luke viii. 5 ff.; Jno. xi. 6; xix. 32; Jas. iii. 17 the correlative particle is not entirely omitted, only for δὲ we find sometimes ἐπετα (Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 133; Schaeft. melet. p. 61), sometimes καὶ; and that even in Greek authors μὲν ... ἐπετα, μὲν ... καὶ (Thuc. 5, 60 and 71), μὲν ... τε are used correlative, is well known, and not strange, cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 230; Matthiae, Eurip. Orest. 24; Baiter, ind. ad Isocr. paneg. p. 183; Weber, Demosth. 257; Maetzner, Antiph. pp. 209, 257. Sometimes the clause with δὲ is somewhat remote, as in 2 Cor. ix. 1, 3 (Thuc. 2, 536 74), probably also in 1 Cor. xi. 18 (see just below); or as respects expression is not completely parallel, as in Gal. iv. 24, 26.

Rom. i. 8 πρῶτον μὲν εἰς χριστόν etc. is unquestionably an anacoluthon. The Apostle when he used this phrase had in mind a δεύτερον or δυτικά, which, however, in consequence of a change in the thought does not follow. The remark of Wytenbach (Plut. Mor. I. 47, ed. Lips.) is applicable here: si solum posuisset πρῶτον, poterat accipi pro maximé, ante omnia (so it is rendered by nearly all expositors); nunc quum μὲν addidit, videtur voluisse alia subjungere, tum sui oblivus esse. Cf. also Isocr. Areopag. p. 344; Xen. M. 1, 1, 2; Schaeft. Demosth. IV. 142; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 191. In 1 Cor. xi. 18 πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ συνεργομένων ὑμῶν etc., ἐπετα δὲ is probably implied in vs. 20 ff.; and Paul properly meant to write: In the first place, I hear that when ye come together there are divisions among you, and further, that irregularities occur at the Lord's Supper. Paul conceives the latter from a different point of view than the divisions. Rom. iii. 2 Tholuck has already correctly explained.

Likewise in Matt. viii. 21 ἐπιτρέψαντι μοι πρῶτον ἄπελθεν καὶ θάφας etc.

ευ9 there is nothing corresponding to πρῶτον; yet we, too, say: let me first ἐπετα etc. (in the first place) go and bury,—whereupon every one readily supplies according to the context: I will then return (and follow thee, vs. 19, 22). When in the combination τε ... καὶ a πρῶτον is inserted after τε, as in Rom. i. 16; ii. 9 ff., it means primarily, chiefly. In 2 Cor. viii. 5, too, πρῶτον ... καὶ does not stand for πρῶτον ... ἐπετα; see Mey.

An anacoluthon similar to that with μὲν occurs sometimes with καὶ where it ought to have been repeated (as well ... as also). Thus in 1 Cor. vii. 38 ὡς καὶ ὁ ἐγκαμήλιον καὶ λόγος τοιε, ὡς καὶ μὴ ἐγκαμήλιον κρείσσων ποιεῖ the sentence is strictly speaking so laid out that καὶ δὲ ... καὶ λόγος τοιε ought to follow. But Paul, while intending to express himself thus, corrects himself and employs the comparative, and then the adversative particle appears more appropriate. There is, however, weighty evidence against δὲ; and
it may have been introduced by transcribers for the reason just mentioned, instead of the original καλ.

II. 1. Different from anacoluthon is the oratio variata (Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 22; Jacobs, Aelian. p. 6; Bremi, Aeschin. II. 7; Mtth. 1530 ff.). It takes place when, in parallel sentences and members of sentences, two (synonymous) constructions have been adopted, each of which is complete in itself—heterogeneous structure. It occurs in accurate writers particularly when the continuance of the previous construction would have been heavy, obscure, or not quite suited to the thought (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. 254; Beier, Cic. off. II. 38); sometimes, also, regard for variety of expression has had influence.

We subjoin, in the first place, some instances of a simple description: 1 Jno. ii. 2 λασμός περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτίων ἡμῶν, ὡς περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ διὸν τοῦ κόσμου (where, either instead of the last words the writer might have used περὶ τῶν διὸν τοῦ κόσμου, or instead of the first, περὶ ἡμῶν), similar 537 are Heb. ix. 7; Acts xx. 34 (1 Kings iii. 1; iv. 30; Lucian. parasit. 11th ed. 20); Eph. v. 33 καὶ ίμεῖς οἱ καθ’ ἐνα διακοσμοῦ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπᾶτο ὡς ἐαυτόν, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβηται τὸν ἄνδρα (cf. § 43, 5, and Jno. xiii. 29); Eph. v. 27 ἵνα παραστήσῃ ἐαυτῷ δόξαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἤκουσαν σπίλων ... ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἡ (ἡ ἐκκλησία) ἀγιά κ. ἠμωμος,1 cf. Acta apocr. p. 179; Phil. ii. 22 δια, ὡς πατρὶ τέκνου, σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐδόθησαν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγελίον that, as a child a father, he served (me in my apostolic calling, more appositely) with me etc., Rom. iv. 12 (Ael. an. 2, 42); Luke ix. 1; i. 73 f. 2; Rom. i. 12; cf. Mtth. 1529 f.; Schwarz, soloc. p. 89 sq.; 1 Cor. xiv. 1 ἵαλοντε τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε (where Paul might have written τὸ προφητεύειν), cf. vs. 5 and vs. 11; Rev. iii. 18; 600 Acts xxii. 17.

The following are bolder: Mark xiii. 33 f. τῶν θελώντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς (ἀσπασθαί) ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς etc.; 510 Jno. viii. 53 μή σὺ μελζων εἰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, ὅτις ἀπέθανε; καὶ οἱ προφηταὶ ἀπέθανον, where the regular construction required the continuation of the interrogative form: καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, οὕτως ἀπέθ.; 1 Cor. vii. 13 γυνῆ, ὧν ἐχει ἄνδρα

---

1 Jno. xi. 52 (ἡμᾶς ἀποθηκεύειν) ὡς ἵνα τοῦ θεοῦ μόνον, ἀλλ’ ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα ... ἑυφηγή εἰς ἵνα does not come under this head. There was here no more convenient mode of expression for the second clause.

2 On the other hand, in Luke i. 55 the words τῷ Ἀβραὰμ etc. belong to μηθηκαίν υἱών, especially on account of εἰς τῶν αἵματ.
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ἀπιστον καὶ οἰδως συνευδοκεῖ (καὶ συνευδοκούντα) οἰκεῖν μετ’ αὐτῆς, μὴ ἄφιετο αὐτῶν, see above, p. 150; cf. similar instances in Luke xvii. 31 and Jno. xv. 5. In Rom. xii. 6 sq. ἔχουσε δὲ χαρίαματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν ... εἰτε προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, εἰτε διακοινήν εἰς τῇ διακοινίᾳ, εἰτε ὁ δὲ διά σοι καὶ εἰς τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, εἰτε ὁ παρακάλων εἰς τῇ παρακλήσει the construction (Acc. governed by ἔχουσε) is kept up only as far as ἐν τῇ διακ., then commences a new construction with concretes, for which Paul might have written εἰτε διδασκαλίαν ... παρακλήσομεν etc. In 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff. Paul enumerates the sufferings attendant on the apostolic calling, by which he had proved himself to be the servant of Christ, and that in no ordinary degree. First, ἐν κόποις περισσοτ. etc. is simply appended, each particular is enhanced by an adverb of degree, then follow narrative Aorists and Perfects vs. 24 f.; Paul then returns to substantives with the instrumental Dative and the instrumental ἐν by turns, vss. 26, 27. See, further, Jno. v. 44; Phil. i. 23 f.; 1 Jno. iii. 24.

The alteration in the construction is manifestly intentional; namely, for the purpose of bringing out the thought more forcibly than would have been done by a uniform structure, in 2 Jno. 2 διὰ τὴν ἀληθείαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἑμῖν, καὶ μεθ’ ἑμῶν ἦσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Also in Rom. ii. 9 sq. the first time (in reference to 588 misery) ἐν τάσαν ψυχῆς is used, the second time (in reference to salvation) the more appropriate personal Dative. The oratio variata occurs in connection with an ellipsis, in 2 Cor. viii. 23; Rom. ii. 8; xi. 22 and Mark vi. 8 παρῆγγελεν αὐτῶι, ἵνα μηδὲν αὔρωσιν εἰς δόνου ... ἀλλ’ ὑποδειγμένοις σανδάλια (sc. πορεύθηκεν 601 εσθαί) καὶ μὴ ἐν δύσασθαι (here ἐνδύσασθε is the better reading) δύο χιτώνας, see Fr. in loc. In Rom. xii. 2 we should probably read the Inf. συνχρηματίζοναι, and not the Imperat. συνχρηματίζοι.
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From Greek authors many similar instances might be adduced. Thus Paus. 1, 19, 5 τοῦ Νίσου λέγεται ὑγιατέρα ἔρασθημαι Μίνω καὶ ὡς ἀπέκειρε τὰς τρίχας τοῦ πατρός, 5, 1, 2; 8, 24, 4 Πεισανδρος δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Καμρείκης ἀποκτείνα τὰς ὁμοθασ ὦ φησιν, ἀλλὰ ὡς φόροι κροτάλων ἐκδιώξειν αὐτὸς. Thuc. 8, 78; Xen. M. 2, 7, 8; Hell. 2, 3, 19; Anab. 2, 5, 5; Aelian. anim. 10, 13. As to Mark xii. 38 f. cf. especially Lys. caed. Eratosth. 21. From the Sept. may be quoted Gen. xxxi. 38; Judg. xvi. 24; 3 Esdras iv. 48; viii. 22, 80; 511 Neh. x. 30. In Mark iii. 14 ff., with the principal words ἐποίησεν ἔδωκεν ὅνωμα τῷ Σίμωνι etc. in reference to the chief apostle, then follow in vs. 17–19 the names of the rest in direct dependence on ἐποίησεν, and only in vs. 17 is subjoined a similar statement, which no more breaks the flow of the discourse than in vs. 19 δὲ καὶ παρέδωκεν etc. does. The whole structure would be regular had Mark said in vs. 16 Σίμωνα, ὃ ἐπέθηκεν ὅνωμα etc.

Under this head comes also the transition from a relative construction to a personal, as in 1 Cor. viii. 6 εἰς θέου ... ἐξ ὧν τὰ πάντα καὶ ὡμέν εἰς αὐτὸν, 2 Pet. ii. 3 οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκταλαί οὐδὲ ἄργει καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάλει, Rev. ii. 18, see above, p. 149; Weber, Demosth. p. 355 sq. Essentially similar is Luke x. 8 εἰς ἣν ἐν πόλιν ἐσίρχησε, καὶ δείχνοι (οἱ πολίται) ὡμέν etc.

On Rev. vii. 9 εἰδὼν καὶ ἔδωκεν δῶρον ... ἐκτείνετο ... περιβεβλημένος, cf. xiv. 14, see above, § 59, 11 p. 535. Both passages contain a blending of two constructions, as in Rev. xviii. 12 f., where are appended to τῶν γόμων first appositive Genitives, then an Acc. (τῶν ἵλων), afterwards (κ. ἰππών etc.) Genitives again, lastly (φυκὰς ἀνθρ.) another Acc. On the 539 other hand, in ii. 17, in accordance with the proper distinction of cases, ὃτι first a Gen. and then an Acc. are made to depend on δῶσω.
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οὐκ ἔπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; ἀλλ' ἐπηρεμέν' ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν (where the narrator proceeds in his own words). With Acts i. 4 cf. Lysias in Diogit. 12 ἐπείδη δὲ συνῆλθομεν, ἥρετο αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ, τίνα ποτὲ ψυχὴν ἔχον ἄξιοι περὶ τῶν παιδών τουαίτη γνώμη χρήσθαι, ἅδελφος μὲν ὄν τοῦ πατρός, πατὴρ δὲ ἐμός etc. (Geopol. 1, 12, 6). See also Jno. xiii. 29; Acts xvii. 8; on the other hand, in Matt. ix. 6 the narrator intercalates τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ among the words of Christ, cf. Mark ii. 10; Luke v. 24. This explanation is the simplest. Meyer is artificial. 1

512 A transition from the Sing. to the Plur., and vice versa, occurs in Rom. iii. 7 f.; xii. 16 ff. 20; 1 Cor. iv. (2) 6 f. (Aelian. 5, 8); 2 Cor. xi. 6; Jas. ii. 16; Gal. iv. 6 f. (vi. 1); Schweigh. Arrian. Epict. II. I. 94, 278; Matthiae, Eurip. Orest. 111; Schaeff. Demosth. IV. 106; Schwarz, soloec. 107. Likewise Rom. ii. 15 ἐν τ. καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυροῦσα αὐτῶν τῇ συνειδήσεως may be referred to this head. The transition from the Sing. to the Plur. in Luke v. 4 is intentional, see Bornem. in loc. As to the Plur. in apposition with a Sing. in 1 Jno. v. 16 see § 59, 8 p. 530.

A heterogeneous appositive construction occurs in Rev. i. 6 ἔποιησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖαν λειπεῖς τῷ θεῷ, see § 59, 8. So also in other constructions the Greek authors sometimes place concretes and abstracts in juxtaposition, see Brempi, Aeschin. Ctesiph. § 25; Weber, Demosth. 260. Cf. also Cæs. civ. 3, 32 erat plena lictorum et imperiorum provinciæ.

§ 64. DEFECTIVE STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; ELLIPSIS. 2

I. The erroneous and variable notions about Ellipsis (and Pleonasm) current until very recently, and derived from the uncritical compilations of L. Bos 3 and his followers (cf. Haab p. 276 ff.), and of N. T. philologists in particular, were first cor-

---

1 Matt. xvi. 11 ὥσον ὁ ποιεῖτα, ὅτι ὅπερ ἄρτως εἰσήκου ἤμων· προσέχετε δὲ καὶ τῆς ζύμης τῶν θαρσάνων etc. is of a different sort, as here only the direct words of Jesus, used in vs. 6, are as such repeated. Likewise Jno. x. 36 contains nothing remarkable.


rected, and sound views established, by Herm. de ellipsi et pleonasmo in Wolf and Buttmann's Mus. antiqu. studior. Vol. I. fasc. I. pp. 97–235, and in Herm. Opusc. I. 148–244, and especially in his notes on Vig. 869 sqq.\textsuperscript{1} We shall mainly follow him in this discussion, which, however, is primarily intended merely to lay down the various classes of ellipses, since Glassius and Haab have already accumulated examples in great abundance.\textsuperscript{2}

1. Ellipsis (not including Aposiopesis, to be treated under No. II) consists in the omission of a word the meaning of which must be supplied in thought (in order to complete the sentence).\textsuperscript{3} The omission of such a word (whether out of convenience or an effort to be concise)\textsuperscript{4} is allowable only when, in what is uttered, an indubitable intimation of the omitted word is given (Hm. opusc. p. 218), either by means of the particular structure of the sentence or by virtue of a conventional usage.\textsuperscript{5} In accordance with the three constituent parts of every simple sentence, such omissions may be arranged under the three main classes of Ellipses of the Subject, of the Predicate, and of the Copula (Hm. Vig. 870 sq.). A real i.e. entire ellipsis of the predicate, however, does not, and probably cannot, occur (Hm. Vig. 872), since the possible predicates are too various for the speaker to leave this part of his sentence to be supplied by the reader. Accordingly there remain but the other two sorts of ellipses, and those of the subject are naturally the more limited.

The case in which a word or phrase of a preceding clause must be repeated in a subsequent connected clause, either unchanged or altered to suit the construction (Glass. I. 632 sqq.), cannot be called an ellipsis, there being here no actual omission of the word (Hm. Vig. 869; Opusc. 151 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 282).\textsuperscript{6} Examples:

\textsuperscript{1} Ellipsis in Latin is discussed by J. W. Schlickeisen, de formis linguae latinae ellipticis. Mühlhausen, 1830 and 43. two Pr. 4to. An earlier work of J. G. Lindner on Latin Ellipses (Frkft. a. M. 1780. 8vo.) is of little value even as a collection of examples.

\textsuperscript{2} How much the books of Scripture have been compelled to suffer from expositors in the matter of Ellipsis Hm. Opusc. p. 217 intimates, when he terms these books, cæros facti quorundam artibus.

\textsuperscript{3} Hm. opusc. p. 153: ellipseo propria est ratio grammatica, quae posita est in eo, ut oratio, etiam aliquid omissum sit, integra esse sensatut, quia id, quod omissum est, necessario tamen intelligi debat, ut quo non intellecto sententia nulla futura sit.

\textsuperscript{4} The omission of a word may also sometimes arise entirely or partly from a rhetorical cause. See below, no. 3.

\textsuperscript{5} Neither of these can, for instance, be shown by those expositors who, to get over the historical difficulty in Jno. xviii. 31, would supply hoc die (festo) in connection with ἣμιν ὅπερ ὑποτεύχει μόνον αὐτοῖς.

\textsuperscript{6} It must not be overlooked that this mode of expression gives style greater periodic
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a. 2 Cor. i. 6 εἰτε θλίβομεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁμοίως συντηριάς sc. θλίβομεθα (v. 13; vii. 12); Luke xxii. 36 ὁ Ἰησοῦς βαλλάντων, ἀρατω... ὁ μύη Ἰησοῦς sc. βαλλάντων (κ. τίραν); Jas. ii. 10; Jno. iv. 26; xiii. 28 δύσαων σου τὸ ὅνωμα... καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω sc. τὸ ὅνωμα μου. Cf. also Rom. iii. 27; vii. 4; xi. 6; xiii. 1 (αἱ δὲ οὖν sc. ἐξουσία, which but few authorities add). 1 Jno. iv. 53; Acts xxxiii. 34; 1 Cor. vii. 3 f.; xi. 25 (cf. vs. 23); xv. 27; 2 Cor. xi. 11; Rev. ii. 9. So especially in answers: Jno. xviii. 5 τίνα ζητεῖται... 514 ἤκουσον τὸν Ναζαραῖον, vs. 7; Luke xx. 24 τῶν ἤχει εἶκον καὶ ἐπηγαγόν; 1 Th. ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον Καίσαρος, vii. 43; Matt. xxvii. 21; Heb. v. 4 οὖς ἐκτίμη τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν, ἀλλὰ καλούμενο ὑπὸ τ. θεοῦ sc. λαμβάνει τ. τιμ. (but λαμβ. in the sense of receive).

b. Mark xiv. 29 εἶ πάντες σκανδαλωθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὖν εἰς... (σκανδαλωθήσομαι, cf. Matt. xxvi. 38); Eph. v. 24 ἐξερήμεν ἣ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτω... αἱ γυναῖκες τοὺς ἀνδράσιν (ὑποτασσόντως). 2 Tim. i. 5 ἦτο ἄντισκον ἐν τῇ μάχῃ σου... πέφυκεν δὲ, ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοὶ (ἀνωτέρω); Rom. xi. 16 εἰ ἤπαρχε ἡ ἐνίκησιν, καὶ τὸ φύραμα (ἀγων); Heb. v. 5 ὁ Χρ. ὀφείλει δύσασι... ἀλλ' ἐλαλήσασι πρὸς αὐτῶν... (ἁδόξ. αὐτῶν); 1 Cor. xi. 1 μετατρείποντα 542 μου γίνεσθαι, καθὼς κἀγαμος Χριστοῦ (μυθικής εἴμων; xiv. 27 εἰς γλώσσα τις ἔλαληκ, κατὰ δῦνον η ὁ πλείων τρεῖς (λαλεῖσθαι), cf. 1 Pet. iv. 11; Luke xxiii. 41 ἐν τῷ αὐτῶν κρίματι εἰ... καὶ ἰδοὺ μὲν δικαίως (ἐκμέν σε. ἐν τῷ κρίματι τούτῳ); 1 Cor. ix. 12, 25; xi. 16; 2 Cor. iii. 13 καὶ οὐ καθιστήρ Μωυσῆς ἐπίθεται καλομάκα ἐπί τὸ πρόποιτον ἄνωτον (τίθεμεν καλ. ἐπί το πρ. ἡμῶν); 5 cf. besides Matt. xx. 23; xxvi. 5; Jno. xiii. 9; xv. 4, 5; xvii. 22; xviii. 40; Rom. i. 21; ix. 32; xiv. 23; Phil. ii. 5; iii. 4; Heb. (ii. 13) v. 5; x. 25; xii. 25; Rev. xix. 10; Matt. xxv. 9. Under this head comes also 1 Cor. vii. 21 διόλοθεν ἐκλήθης, μὴ σου μελέτης, ἢ ἐπεξερομένη, cf.是 most natural, τῆς δουλείας be supplied (Lob. paralip. p. 314); see Meyer, who has overlooked the fact that even in my fifth edition I made this suggestion. The greatest accumulation of such indispensable repetitions occurs in Rom. xii. 6 ff.

c. Neither is there any real ellipsis when an affirmative word is to be supplied from a foregoing negative,—a case of frequent occurrence in Greek authors (e.g. Thuc. 2, 98, 3 πορευομένῳ αὐτῷ ἀπεγίγνητο μὲν οὖν compactness; whereas the repetition of the same or a similar expression would in most cases be very heavy.

1 1 Jno. iii. 20 also would, according to Lücke's exposition, come under this head, as ὑπὲρ τῆς συντηρίας (σκανδαλωθήσεται) is supplied before the second ἂν, vs. 19. I confess, however, that to me this explanation seems very forced. Why might not a transcriber have added, from inadvertence, a second ἂν? Lehm. has with A rejected the second ἂν. But it may just as well have been omitted because it was not understood. Or why may not the author himself have repeated the ἂν, as in Eph. ii. 11 f.? see Fr. Progr. ad Gal. p. 5 (Fritzscheorum opusc. p. 236). The passage has never yet been satisfactorily explained.

2 This case, in which the verb is construed, not with the principal subject, but with the subject of the secondary clause, may be regarded as a sort of attraction, see Krümml, gramm. Unterruch. III. 72, who at the same time adduces many similar examples, as Xen. C. 4, 1, 3; Thuc. 1, 82; 3, 67.
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tou στρατοῦ el μή τι νοσφ, προσεγιγνετο δέ, see Stahlb. Plat. apol. p. 78; sympos. p. 80, and Euthyd. p. 158; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 176, on the Lat. cf. Brems, Nep. p. 345; Kritz, Sallust. II. 573); as, 1 Cor. vii. 19 ἢ περιπολή οὐδὲν ἦστι, ἀλλά τίρασθα ἐντόλων θεοῦ (ὅτι τι οὐ τὰ πάντα ἦστι), iii. 7; 1 Cor. x. 24 μηδείς τὸ λαυτοῦ ζητεῖται, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἄτρου sc. ἐκαστος. Otherwise in Eph. iv. 29; 1 Cor. iii. 1. Frugality of expression is carried still farther in Mark xii. 5 καὶ τολλοῦ ἄλλους, τοῖς μὲν δέροις, τοῖς δὲ ἀποκεφαλώσεις, where from these two Participles a finite verb is to be borrowed that combines both verbal notions,—such as maltreat (cf. Fr. in loc.). Also in Rom. xiv. 21 καὶ τὸ μή φαγεῖν κρέας μηδὲ πιεῖν ὦνν, μηδὲ ἐν ὧ δ ἄδελφος σου προσέκυπτε etc., after the second μηδὲ, the general word ποιῶν (Aristot. Nicom. 8, 13, 6), or such an expression as make use of, is probably to be supplied. As to Phil. ii. 3 see below, p. 587 (Lob. paralip. p. 382). In Heb. x. 6, ἀλοκαντώματα καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας ὥστε εὐδόκησαι the general notion θυσίας is to be educed from ἀλοκ. for περὶ ἀμ., as in Heb. x. 38 the general term ἀνθρωπος is to be gathered from δίκαιος (cf. Kühner II. 37). In Rev. vi. 4 we must abstract from λαβ. τ. εἰρ. ἐκ τῆς γῆς the concrete of κατοικουμένης ἐκ αἰώνιος as a subject for σφάζων. Yet here, too, the omission is but partial. (For examples of all the 515 preceding cases from Latin, see Lindner, lat. Ellips. S. 240 ff.) At the same time, in all these cases the incompleteness of the sentence (viewed grammatically and logically) renders it obviously necessary to supply 606 something. This is not the case in Jno. viii. 15 ὡμοίως κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνει, ἐγὼ οὖ κρίνω οἰδίνα, where on the contrary the second clause is so concluded by οἴδανα that nothing whatever requires to be supplied: ye judge according to the flesh, but I judge no one (not merely, no one according to the flesh, but absolutely no one). To supply κατὰ τὴν σάρκα 548 from the foregoing clause could only be justified by incongruity in the ἀνωθεν sense without such addition. This, however, I am as unable to discover as Olshausen and Lücke. On the meaning, see especially BCrus. in loc.

After el δὲ μή or el δὲ μή γε (Matt. vi. 1; Luke x. 6; xiii. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 16 etc.; cf. Plat. Gorg. 503 c.; Phaed. 63 c.; Hoogeveen, partic. gr. I. 345 sq.), and after the expression (current with Paul) οὐ μόνον δὲ ( ... ἀλλὰ καί), it is peculiarly common to supply a preceding word or phrase; as, Rom. v. 3 οὐ μόνον δὲ (sc. καυχόμεθα ἐπὶ ἑπεξ ὑπὸς δὸς δόξης vs. 2), ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχόμεθα etc., v. 11 καταλαγώντες σωθησόμεθα ... οὐ μόνον δέ (καταλαγώντες σωθησ.), ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχόμεθα, viii. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 19. In Rom. ix. 10 οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἄρβελακα etc. something to be gathered from a more distant part of the context appears to be wanting. It is easiest to supply it from vs. 9; cf. vs. 12: and (not only) Sarah received a divine promise respecting her son, but also Rebecca, who was yet the mother of two legitimate sons, etc. In Greek cf. Diog. L. 9, 39 πεντακοσίως τάλατον τιμήθησα, μή μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ γαλάκτως εἰκόν. Lucian. vit. auct. 7 οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἣν θυρωφεῖν αὐτὸν ἐπιτήσης, τολὶ
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πιστοτέρως χρήση τῶν κυνών, Toxar. 1 (Kypke, obs. Π. 165; Hoogeween, partic. Π. 956). Analogous is the expression οὗ μόνον γε... ἄλλα used by earlier authors, e.g. Plat. Phaed. 107 b. οὗ μόνον γε, ἐφ' ὁ Σωκράτης (sc. ἀπωτιαίν σε δει ἔχων περὶ τῶν ἐφημένων), ἄλλα ταῦτα τε εἰ λέγεις etc., Meno 71 b.; legg. 6, 752 etc., see Heind. and Stallb. Plat. Phaed. as above. The clause after οὗ μόνον δέ is (by repetition) expressed in 2 Cor. vii. 7. Also the use of καί, in the sense of vel certe (Vig. 527; Boisson. Philostr. epp. p. 97), is referable to an omission, e.g. Mark vi. 56 ἵνα καῖ τοῦ κρασπέδου... ἀφωνται (properly ἤν ἀφωνται αὐτοῖς, καί τοῦ κρασπέδου ἀφωνται), 2 Cor. xi. 16, as also εἴ καί in 2 Cor. vii. 8 cf. Bengel in loc.

Still less is it to be considered as an ellipsis when, in one and the same principal clause, a word used only once is to be supplied twice (in different phrases): Acts xvii. 2 κατὰ τὸ εἰσόδος τῷ Παύλῳ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτούς (Παύλος), xiii. 3 ἐπεθύνετο τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν (αὐτοῖς). In Rom. ii. 26 οἴχ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουναίου ἐστιν οὐδέ ἢ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ περιτομῇ the predicative Ἰουναίου and περιτομῇ must be supplied also to the subject δ ἐν τῷ φαν.

Cf. further Acts viii. 7.

607 Note. It may sometimes happen that a word is to be supplied in the preceding from the subsequent context (Hm. opusc. 151; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 109; Lindner, lat. Ellips. S. 251 ff.), cf. 1 Cor. vii. 39. But in Rom. v. 16 to supply παραπτώματος after ἐξ ἑνὸς from ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν παραπτώματων may now be regarded as out of date, see Philippi in loc. And in 2 Cor. viii. 5 ἐδωκαν serves, as usual, also for the clause beginning with καί οhic, only with the latter it must be taken absolutely: and they did not give as (in extent) we hoped, but their own selves gave they etc. Only in Mark xv. 8 ἢπατο αἰτεῖται καθὼς ἐδε τοῦτο αὐτοῖς it may seem as if it were necessary to supply τούτων after αἰτεῖται, from τοῦτο; but the words properly run: to entreat according as he always did for them, from which the object of request may be gathered, but not grammatically supplied. As to Eph.iv. 26, however, where some would supply μῇ from the second member also in the first, see p. 311.

2. The most frequent real omission is that of the simple copula ἐναι:

a. In the form ἐστὶ, more rarely in the form ἔ (yet cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 183), because it is obviously suggested by the juxtaposition of subject and predicate (Rost 473 f.; Krü. 240 f.; cf. Wannowski, syntax. anom. p. 210 sq.) Heb. v. 13 πάσας ὁ μετέχουσιν γάλακτος ἀπειροῦ (ἐστὶ) λόγου δικαιοσύνης, ix. 16; x. 4, 18; xi. 19; Mark xiv. 36; Rom. xi. 16; xiv. 21; 2 Cor. i. 21; Phil. iv. 3; Eph. i. 18; iv. 4; v. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 17, particularly in questions Luke iv. 36; Acts x. 21; Rom. iii. 1; viii. 27, 31; 2 Cor. ii. 16; vi. 14; Rev. xiii. 4; Heb. vi. 8 (cf. Kritz, Sallust. I. 251) and exclamations Acts xix. 28, 34 μεγάλη ἢ "Ἀρτέμις
'Ἐφεσίων, but especially in certain set forms of expression Jas. i. 12 μακάριος ἄνιψ, ὅς etc. (Matt. v. 3, 5-10; xiii. 16; Luke i. 45; Rom. iv. 8; xiv. 22; Rev. xvi. 15; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 14), δῆλον ὅτι 1 Cor. xv. 27; 1 Tim. vi. 7, ἀνάγκη with Infin. Heb. ix. 16, 23; Rom. xiii. 5, πιστὸς ὁ θεός 1 Cor. i. 9; x. 13; 2 Cor. i. 18 or πιστὸς ὁ λόγος 1 Tim. i. 15; iii. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 11, ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς Phil. iv. 5, ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τ. τροφῆς Matt. x. 10; 1 Tim. v. 18 cf. Rev. v. 2, ἐὰν μικρὸν Ἰνο. xiv. 19, μικρὸν δουλὸν δουλῇ Heb. x. 37, εἰ δυνατὸν Matt. xxiv. 24; Rom. xii. 18; Gal. iv. 15, ὥρα with Infin. Rom. xiii. 11 (Plat. ap. p. 42), τῇ γὰρ Phil. i. 18; Rom. iii. 9, τῇ ὑπὲρ Rom. iii. 9; vi. 15, τῇ ἐμοί κ. σοί Mark v. 7; i. 24; Luke viii. 28; Ἰν. ii. 4 (Her. 5, 83; Demosth. aphob. 564 b.; Arrian. Epict. 1, 1, 16; 2, 19, 16), τῇ το δόξας 1 Cor. xv. 32; Jas. ii. 14, 16, φ. δόξα or δύναμι aitô, where the name follows, Luke ii. 25; Ἰν. i. 6; iii. 1, etc. (Demosth. Zenoth. p. 576 b.), cf. besides Acts xiii. 11; ii. 29. In the latter, as in the former, brevity and compactness are in place, cf. Víg. p. 236.¹ The Subjunctive ὅ is to 608 be supplied after ἦνα in (Rom. iv. 16) 2 Cor. viii. 11, 18.

b. More rarely is the substantive verb omitted in other forms: as εἰμι 2 Cor. xi. 6 εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ ὄλον ἐν τῇ γνώσει (Ἀντιλόμοι μηδὲν ὑστερημέναι τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων precedes),² εἰμί Rom. iv. 14; xi. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 8; i. 26 (see Mey.); Rev. xxxii. 15; Heb. ii. 11 (Schaef. melet. p. 43 sq.), εἰμῖν Rom. viii. 17; 517 2 Cor. x. 7; Phil. iii. 15 (Plin. epp. 6, 16), εἰ Rev. xv. 4 (Plat. Gorg. 487 d.), εἰσερχω Rom. xii. 9; Col. iv. 6; Heb. xiii. 4, 5 (Fr. Rom. III. 65) also after χάρις τῷ θεῷ Rom. vi. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 16; ix. 15 (Xen. A. 3, 3, 14), εἴη in wishes Rom. i. 7; xv. 33; Ἰν. xx. 19, 21, 26; Matt. xxxi. 9; Luke i. 28; Tit. iii. 15. Two different forms of this verb are omitted at the same time in Ἰν. xiv. 11 ὅτι ἔγγον εἰ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ εἰ ἔμοι, xvii. 23. In 545 narration the Aorist also is suppressed, e.g. 1 Cor. xvi. 9 (Xen. Ἰν. An. 1, 2, 18; Cyr. 1, 6, 6; Thuc. 1, 138, etc.). On the Future see p. 586. In all cases in the simple diction of the N. T. it is easy (in Greek authors it is frequently more difficult, see Schaef. melet. p. 48 sq. 114) to perceive from the connection what words are to be supplied. Hitherto, however, expositors have been very lavish of their ellipses of the substantive verb, and have in par-

¹ Under this head comes also the phrase εἰ (δῶρ) ἰνε Mark ii. 16; Acts v. 4 (Bar. iii. 10); Fr. Mr. p. 60.
ticular transformed in this way a multitude of Participle into
finite verbs, cf. § 45, 6 p. 350.

Likewise the Imperative plural ἔστη is, according to the whole tone
of the sentence, omitted in passages such as Rom. xii. 9 (1 Pet. iii. 8);
and to explain the Participle ἀποτεταγμένες by an anacoluthon is unnece-
sary. With εἰλογητος ὅ θεος etc. Rom. ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3
we must supply, not ἔστη (Fr. Rom. I. 75), but (cf. 1 Kings x. 9; Job i. 21)
ἐϊν or ἐστω.

Likewise, where ἔστη etc. is more than a mere copula, where it denotes
existence, permanence, it is sometimes wanting (Rost 474) 1 Cor. xv. 21
και ἀνθρώπων ὅ θάνατος (exists) vs. 40; Rom. iv. 13.

It is thus sufficient to supply εἶναι or γίνεσθαι even in most of those
passages where an oblique case or a preposition seems to
require a more definite verb; as, 1 Cor. vi. 18 τὰ βρώματα τῇ
κοιλίᾳ καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῦ βρώματος, Acts x. 15 φωνῇ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου
609 πρὸς αὐτόν (ἐγένετο, cf. vs. 13), Matt. iii. 17 (Jno. xii. 28 ἡλέων
φωνῆς), 1 Cor. iv. 20 οὐκ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐν
dυνάμει (cf. ii. 5), Rom. x. 1; xi. 11; 2 Cor. iv. 15; viii. 13 (Mey.),
1 Pet. iii. 12; Heb. vii. 20. The preposition or case suggests the
particular verbal notion to be supplied: (whose final doom) leads
to burning, is destined for, results in, etc. As in the last passage
ἐγένετο is obviously sufficient, so in the first and second, in accordance
with the simplicity of the style, nothing more than ἔστη is to be
supplied. The same applies to 1 Cor. v. 12 τί γάρ μοι καὶ τοὺς
518 εἴσοδοι κρίνειν; (Arrian. Epict. 2, 17, 14 τί μοι νῦν τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους
μάχην παραφέρειν; 4, 6, 33) and Jno. xxii. 22 τί πρὸς σε; (see
Hm. opusc. p. 157 sq. 169; Bos, ellips. p. 598; cf. the Latin hoc
nihil ad me, quid hoc ad me, Kritz, Pallust. II. 146). Also in
546 Jno. xxii. 21 οὕτως δὲ τί; ἔσται (γενήσεται) is sufficient. The
connection points to a Future. Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 17. Lastly, under
this head comes the expression ἦν τί sc. γενηται or γένοιτο, Hm.
Vig. 849.

1 Mey. thinks that ἔστη is to be supplied also in Eph. i. 13 after ὅ. But this ἔστη seems rather to be taken up again after the clause ἀκούσατε etc. in the second ὅ. For εἶναι ὅ Χριστός can hardly be introduced between ἀκούσατε and γενήσεται.

2 What is suppressed is always that which is the most simple; and although here and there in a phrase elsewhere elliptical a writer inserts a specific verb, it does not follow that this very verb is the verb to be supplied. Thus Antipater, in the Greek Anthology, says: εἶ τί τοι ἐν ἔρεειν ἡ λέσιν ἐφώνεσον. Yet we must not on that account, with Palaeist p. 415, supply ἔστη in the phrase τί μοι τὸ δείπνον, but merely the simple ἔστη. In the same way, in Lucian. merc. cond. 25 we find τί κοινὶν λοχαὶ καὶ βους; but it does not follow from this that κοινὶν must be supplied in the phrase τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοι; see Fr. Mr. p. 33.
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Verbs which express the predicate (or a part of it) as well as the copula (Hm. p. 156 sq.) can be suppressed only when some intimation of them is given in the structure of the sentence (Bar. iv. 1). Cf. the familiar phrases *Twelve for a dollar, manum de tabula, haec hactenus, etc.* Thus in Acts ix. 6 rec. ό κύριος προς αὐτῶν it is easy to supply *esse* (vs. 15), which is suggested in προς αὐτῶν, as in ii. 38; xxv. 22 (Aelian. 1, 16 var.).¹ In Rom. iv. 9 ό μακαρισμὸς οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀκροβυσσίαν; the meaning is obviously: does it have reference to etc.; yet we must supply, not πιέσας with Theophylact, but rather λέγεται (Fr. in loc.), cf. vs. 6 (λέγειν εἰς τῶν Eurip. Iphig. T. 1180). Acts xviii. 6 τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν, Matt. xxvii. 25 τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς (2 Sam. i. 16; Plato, Euthyd. 283 e.) sc. ἐλθὼν cf. Matt. xxiii. 35 (though ἐλθόν is sufficient).² In Rom. v. 18 ὡς δὲ ἐν εἰς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα supply ἀπέβη impersonal: reus cessit, abit in etc., and in the following οὖτω καὶ δέ ἐν ἐν κακωματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς 610 δικαίωσιν ὑμᾶς, (according to vs. 19) ἀποβῆσαται (Fr.), or rather ἀπέβη also (Mey.). In 2 Cor. ix. 7 ἐκατος, καθὼς προερηκα τῇ καρδίᾳ, μὴ ἐκ λύπης, supply δότω, suggested by the whole context. In Luke xxii. 26 ὑμεῖς δὲ δι’ οὖν οὖν, the word ποιήσετε, inferred from κυριεύοντων etc., is most naturally to be supplied; perhaps even ἐσσεθε might suffice. But in Phil. ii. 3 with μηδὲν κατὰ ἐρίθεαιν it is enough to repeat φρονούντες. In Gal. ii. 9 δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβας κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἐμεῖς μὲν εἰς τὰ ἑδυν, αὐτὸ δὲ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν, since the passage relates to preachers of the gospel, we may readily supply εὐσεβείας ἡμᾶς, εὐσεβείας τοὺς (2 Cor. x. 16, like κηρύττειν εἰς τῶν 1 Thess. ii. 9), and not with Fr. and Mey. the less significant πορευθῶμεν, πορευθῶσιν etc. In Rev. vi. 6 the complement of the cry, χοινξ αὐτοῦ δηναρίου καὶ τρεῖς χοῖνκας κριθῶν δηναρίου a measure of wheat for a denarius! is as obviously suggested by the Genitive of price (p. 206), as in similar forms of expression with us. As to the epistolary forms of salutation in Rev. i. 4 Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἐπὶ ἐκκλησίας ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, Phil. i. 1 Παῦλος πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις . . . τοῖς οὕσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις 519 E inf.

¹ This ellipsis has a wide range in Greek and Latin, e.g. Charit. 6, 1 τῶν μὲν σεν ὧν αἰὼν ἢ δρές, Val. Flacc. 5, 254 εἰς ea. Cf. also Cic. N. D. 2, 4, 11 augures rem ad Senatum, and many similar instances especially in the epistolary style, Cic. fam. 4, 8; 7, 9; Attic. 15, 8 and 17; 16, 9, particularly ad Attic.

² In Greek authors also, when similar imprecactions occur, e.g. δὲ κεφαλὴν σοι Aristoph. pac. 1063, τραπέζων is usually supplied (see Bos p. 657 sq.), agreeably to Mosch. 4, 123; Phalar. ep. 128.
In the proverb 2 Pet. ii. 22 ἓς λοιπαμένη ἐς κύλιμα βορβόρων, the requisite verb is implied in ἐς, and ἐπιστρέφασα may easily be supplied, conformably to what precedes. But it is precisely in proverbs, where brevity of expression is necessary, that specific verbs are (by conventional usage) suppressed, cf. γλαύκ' ἐς Αθήνας, fortuna fortes, and Bhdy. p. 351. Grotend. ausf. lat. Gramm. II. 397 f.; Zumpt, lat. Gramm. p. 610.

3. The subject is wholly wanting (Krü. 232) only,

a. When it is self-evident; because the predicate, owing to the nature of the case or to conventional usage, can refer to but one (definite) subject, e.g. βροντά (ὁ Ζεύς), σαλπίζει (ὁ σαλπνικτής), ἄναγκωσεται (Demosth. Mid. 386 b.) sc. scriba, see above, § 58, 9 p. 521 sq. From Jewish phraseology may be included under this the formulas of quotation λέγει Heb. i. 7, εἴρηκε iv. 4, φησίν viii. 5 (vii. 17 rec. μαρτυρεῖ), see above, § 58, 9 p. 522. As to Heb. xiii. 5 see Bleeck.

b. When an expression is introduced the subject of which is at once supplied by every reader’s knowledge or memory; as, Jno. vi. 31 ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν sc. ὁ θεός, 2 Cor. ix. 9 (Ps. cxii. 9); 1 Cor. xv. 27 (but in vs. 25 the subject is Χριστός), Col. i. 19; Jno. xii. 40; xv. 25; Rom. ix. 18 f.; see v. Hengel, Cor. p. 120 sq. As to Jno. vii. 51 see p. 523. On 1 Tim. iii. 16 see a few lines below; and as to Matt. v. 38 see below, no. 6 Remark, p. 598.

Nothing is omitted when the third person Plur. is used impersonally, as in Jno. xx. 2 ἢραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου (cf. § 58, 9 p. 522); for the general subject, people or men, is properly speaking already contained in the person. See also Luke xii. 20 and Bornem. in loc. The same applies to the Gen. Absolute, as in Luke viii. 20 διδούσι ναὐπίλα θεοί οὕτως u.e. they saying, cf. 1 Kings xii. 9; 1 Chron. xvii. 24; Thuc. 1, 3; Xen. C. 3, 3, 54; Diog. L. 6, 32; Doederlein, Soph. Oedip. Col. p. 393; Valcken. Herod. p. 414; Schaef. Demosth. V. 301.

In 1 Tim. iii. 16, according to the reading δικρινόμενα the subject to the relative clauses that follow would be wanting, unless, with recent editors, we begin the apodosis with ἐκεινον. But that is unadvisable on account of the parallelism. It is more likely that all these members are co-ordinate, and that the apostle took them from some hymn (as such were in use even in the

Sometimes when the subject is omitted a rhetorical reason has influence, inasmuch as it is concealed out of disappointment and vexation. To this might perhaps be referred Rom. ix. 19 and 2 Pet. iii. 4 (see Gerhard).
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apostolic church), and suppressed the subject, familiar to every one, all the more readily because he was concerned here only with those predicates which involved the μνημον. (As to the simple αὐτός in reference to a well-known subject, see § 22, 3 p. 146.) On 1 Cor. vii. 36, see § 67, 1. Under a. come also Heb. xi. 12 δῶ καὶ ἄφι ἐνός ἐγεννήθηναι, where the 520 term children (descendants) is readily supplied, and indeed is already implied in γεννᾶθαι (cf. Gen. x. 21); and Rom. ix. 11 μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων μηδὲ πραξίνων, where, moreover, the notion of τέκνων or uων is sufficiently intimated in Ἐπεξεκα ἐς ἐνὸς κοίτην ἐχενοσα etc. vs. 10. In Luke xvi. 4 the subject is the debtor, cf. vs. 5.

When the subject is not omitted, but has to be repeated from the context (not Heb. viii. 4), there is room sometimes for a difference of opinion, as in Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 25 (Heb. ix. 1). The decision in such cases is not grammatical, but hermeneutical.

4. On the other hand, often but a part of the subject or of the predicate (if it consists of something besides the copula, see above, no. 2) is expressed, and the portion omitted is to be supplied from what is expressed in accordance with conventional usage; as, Acts xxii. 16 συνήθθουν καὶ τὸν μαθητῶν there came also at the same time (some, τινός) of the disciples; with ἐκ or ἀπό in Luke xi. 49 ἐς αὐτῶν ἀποκεννοῦσι (τινάς), xxi. 16; Jno. xvi. 17; xxi. 10; vi. 39; 612 Rev. ii. 10 (v. 9); xi. 9,1 cf. p. 203; Heindorf, Plat. Gorg. p. 148; Vlc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. 201; Jno. iv. 35 δι’ ἑτ τετράμηνος ἐστὶ (χρόνος), Xen. Hell. 2, 8, 9; Luke xii. 47 f. ἐκεῖνος ὁ δοῦλος ... δαρήσεται πολλάς ... ἀλίγας cf. 2 Cor. xi. 24. The notion of stripes is implied in δερῶν; accordingly πληγάς is readily suggested (and this elliptical phrase is of frequent occurrence in Greek authors, Xen. A. 5, 8, 12 τοῦτον ἀνέκραγον ὡς ἀλίγας παλασευ, Aelian. anim. 10, 21 μαστίνυσι πολλᾶς, Aristoph. nub. 971; Schol. ad Thuc. 2, 39 (οἱ πλείονον ἐνεγκόντες), cf. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 737; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 438; Valcken. ad Luc. l.c., and something similar in Bos under αῖκαμα, (cf. also the German: er zählte ihm zwanzig auf, he counted him out twenty).

The ellipsis is carried still further in 2 Cor. vii. 15 ὁ τὸ πολὺ οὐκ ἐπελέωσε, καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀνόματον οὐκ ἠλλημόνθη (from Exod. xvi. 18 cf. vs. 17), where ἔχομ may be supplied. Later writers employ this idiom (the Article with an Accusative) in various forms, e.g. Lucian. Catapl. 4 ὁ τὸ ἔρων, Bis Acc. 9 ὁ τὴν σύρρυγα, dial. m. 10, 4 (Bhdy. 119), and it has been as fully sanctioned by usage in their case as in the case of the phrases specified above. See

1 Some have infelicitously applied this ellipsis to Jno. iii. 25.
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Bos, ellips. p. 166. Some expositors infelicitously apply it to Matt. iv. 15. In Rom. xiii. 7 ἀπόδοτε πάσιν τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τῶν φόρων, τῶν φόρων etc. the most natural ellipsis is ἀποδίδοντας κελεύοντι i.e. ἀπαιτοῦντι. In 1 Cor. iv. 6 ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἡγέραται, if we reject φρονεῖν as spurious, an Infin. is wanting (per ellipsis, not as Mey. maintains [in his earlier eds.; but not so in the 4th.] per aposiopesis); it will be sufficient to supply the general expression: to go beyond what etc., to exalt yourselves. 1

On the other hand, in 1 Cor. x. 13 ὑπὲρ δὲ δύνασθε nothing is to be supplied; the verb is used absolutely, as posse often is in Latin. Luther correctly renders the passage: über euer Vermögen, (above that ye are able).

521 In 1 Pet. ii. 23 παρεδίδον τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίον some supply κράζov from κρίνοντι, which in itself is not impossible; yet παρεδίδον probably is here, as often, to be taken reflexively: he committed himself (his cause) to him that judgeth righteously. There is no ellipsis whatever in Matt. xxiii. 9 πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ; call not (any man) your father on the earth, i.e. do not employ on the earth, i.e. among and of men, the appellation “our father;” and 1 Tim. v. 9 χήρα καταλεγόμεθα μὴ ἀστην εἰρήνα ἐξόφισαν γεγονοῦν etc. is: as a widow let no one be enrolled who is less than 618 sixty years of age; widows entered on the list are, according to vs. 16, those who received support from the funds of the church.

5. It is common, in particular, to omit substantives in certain fixed phrases or in special contexts, and to express their adjectives merely, which latter of themselves conduct the mind to the substantives, cf. Bhdv. 183 ff. Examples:

ἡμέρα (Bos under the word) in the expressions, ἡ ἐβδόμη Heb. iv. 4 (of the Sabbath), ἢς or μέχρι τῆς σήμερον Matt. xxvii. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 15 (2 Chron. xxxv. 25; Malal. 12, 309, generally in the Sept. and the N. T. ἡμέρας is added), ἡ αὐραν Jas. iv. 14; Matt. vi. 84; Acts iv. 8, 5 (8 Macc. v. 38), ἡ ἐκατοκοῦ Acts xxi. 1; Luke vii. 11, τῇ ἐξομένῃ Luke xiii. 33; Acts xx. 15, τῇ ἐπίουσῃ Acts xvi. 11, τῇ ἐτέρᾳ (postridie) Acts xx. 15, τῇ τρίτῃ Luke xiii. 32 (Xen. C. 5, 3, 27; Plut. paeadig. 9, 26 τὴν μέσην τέμνετω). 1


---

1 In Acts xix. 38 ἐγράφων ἐγγραφή (Strab. 13, 629) most expositors supply ἡμέρα, which is quite appropriate.
2 The local meaning of the Gen. that way (cf. Germ. des Wegs) is questioned by Bornem. Luc. p. 37, 118, who wants to read in the two passages volg. ταύτῃ; yet Ἰμ.
iii. ἵστατι τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείας etc. (where, however, in the second member ὅσοις follows) cf. Lucian. dial. m. 10, 13 εὐθείαν ἐκεῖνα προϊόντες, Paus. 8, 23, 2, Lat. compendiariā ducere Senec. ep. 119, rectā ire.¹

δῶρο (Bos p. 501 sqq.): Matt. x. 42 δὲ ἐὰν ποτίσῃ ... ποτήριον 550 ψυχρὸν, Jas. iii. 11; Epict. ench. 29, 2; Arrian. Epict. 3, 12, 17 522 ἅτιν; and 15, 3.; Lucian. mors Peregr. 44, just as we say: a glass of port, a bottle of sherry, etc. We find also θερμὸν sc. δῶρ ω Aristoph. 614 nub. 1040; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 71, etc. So in Latin frigida Plin. ep. 6, 16, calida Tac. Germ. 22, gelida Hor. serm. 2, 7, 91.

ἰμάτιον (Bos p. 204 sqq.): Jno. xx. 12 θεωρεῖ δύο ὄργανον ἐν λευκοῖς καθεξωμένοις in white garments, Matt. xi. 8; Rev. xviii. 12, 16; cf. Sept. Exod. xxxiii. 4; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 10 ἐν κοκκίνοις περιπάτων and Wetst. I. 381, 958; Bos p. 204.

γλῶσσα: Rev. ix. 11 ἐν τῇ ἐλληνικῇ.


χώρα (Bos p. 560 sqq.): ἐξ ἐναυσίας ex adverso Mark xv. 39, which is used likewise in a figurative sense Tit. ii. 8. The same word is usually supplied in Luke xvii. 24 Ἡ ἀστρατηγὴ ἡ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπ’ οὕρανον εἰς τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανοῦ λάμπει (Sept. Job xviii. 4; Prov. viii. 28). Ἡ ὑπερή Luke i. 39 early became a substantive, the highlands, the hill country, Xen. Cyr. 1, 8, 8; Ptol. Geogr. 5, 17, 3; 6, 9, 4.

ὁρᾶ time, is regarded as omitted in the phrase ἀφ’ ἦς 2 Pet.

Vig. p. 381 found no fault with this local Gen. which became established in the Pro-nominal adverbs ὁ, ποῦ. And many instances of this very phrase τὴν (ἀπὸ τῆς ὅδε (cf. Bhdg. 138) are cited, and that not merely from poets (Krū. Sprachl. II. 2. S. 157); cf. in particular, Thuc. 4, 47, 2 and Krū. on the passage, and Thuc. 4, 33, 3. If any one wishes to bring this local Gen. nearer to the primary import of the Gen. (§ 30, 1), he may take it perhaps thus: out or forth from that (way). But probably it connects itself more simply with the use mentioned in § 30, 11 p. 207.

¹ Many adverbial expressions arose from an ellipse of ὅδε (Bttm. anzf. Sprachl. II. 341) or χώρα (Bos p. 561), such as Ἰλία, κατ’ Ἰλίαν, δημοτικ. Acts xvi. 37 etc., which no longer suggest to the mind their origin, Bhdg. 185 f. Such an adverbial expression also is ἄνω μᾶς Luke xiv. 18, which cannot be discovered in the literary language of the Greeks, but was probably current in the language of conversation. It is equivalent to with one mind (ἐκ μᾶς ψυχῆς Dion. H. II. 1058) or with one voice (μοι ὁ δὲ ὁμοτύχησις herod. 1. 4, 21). Wahl, clav. p. 45, after Cameraer, is too artificial. It is possible, moreover, that the Greek did not understand any substantive at all originally, but employed the Feminine (as an abstract, Ewald, Heb. Gr. 645), just as independently as the Neuter, see Schoef. Bos p. 43 and the Review in the L. Lit. Zeit. 1825. no. 179; this, however, Helm. opusc. p. 162 will not admit.
iii. 4; Luke vii. 45; Acts xxiv. 11, which, indeed, had already become completely an adverb (cf. however, Matt. xv. 28). The same applies to ἐξ αὐτῆς Mark vi. 25; Acts x. 33 etc., which many write as one word, ἐξαυτῆς.


γῆ: Matt. xxiii. 15 ἡ γῆ (opposed to ἡ θάλασσα) the continent, dry land (Kypke in loc.). The same substantive would have to be supplied in Heb. xi. 26 oi ἐν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρὸν (Lchm.). Cf. Her. 8, 3; Diod. S. 12, 84. But the reading oi ἐν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρὸν [which Cod. Sin. also gives] is better supported.

χειρ in ἡ δεξία, ἡ ἀριστερά Matt. vi. 3 etc., δεξίαν δεδόναι Gal. ii. 9 (Xen. A. 1, 6, 6; 2, 5, 3), ἐν δεξίᾳ, ἐπὶ τῆν δεξίαν Eph. i. 20; Matt. xxvii. 29.

δραχμῆ: Acts xix. 19 εδραχμὼν ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε, as we say: he is worth ten thousand. Cf. Lucian. eun. 3 and 8; Achill. T. 5, 17. So also the names of measures are omitted Ruth iii. 15. ὑετός: Jas. v. 7 μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ (καρπῷ), ἦσε λάβῃ πρώιμον καὶ δύσμον.

The ellipsis in all these expressions has been sanctioned by long usage, and for that very reason is plain, especially in particular contexts, to all who are familiar with the language (cf. he put 615 down red, he sat on the right, he came in a coach and six). Other omissions are more special (peculiar to the usus loquendi of a city or community), e.g. προβατική (πῦλη Neh. iii. 1) Jno. v. 2 (just as they say in Leipsic, to go out at the Grimma), yet see Bos under the word πῦλη. Such also are oi ὀδόικα, oi ἐπτά (διάκονοι) Acts xxii. 8; cf. in Greek oi τριάκοντα (τριάκοντα).

523 To this head have been referred incorrectly many expressions and phrases in which an adjectival or neuter pronoun is used independently without any ellipsis (Krü. S. 3), e.g. τὸ ιερόν (which at an early period had become a substantive) the temple, τὸ διοπτερὲς Acts xix. 35, τὸ στρυκὸν Rev. xviii. 12, in biblical diction τὸ ἄγνω the holy place (in the tabernacle and the temple), τὸ ἑλαστήριον etc., τὰ ἑδια one's own (possession) Jno. i. 11, τὰ σὰ what is thine Luke vi. 30, τὰ κατάφερα τῆς γῆς Eph. iv. 9 (where, however, good Codd. [Sin. also] add μέρη), τὸ τρίτον τῶν κτημάτων Rev. viii. 9 etc., and the adverbial expressions ἐν παντὶ, εἰς κενὸν, τῷ λοιπῷ (§ 54, 1). Likewise in Heb. xiii. 22 λόγων is not to be supplied after βραχεῖν, any more than verbis or the like is to be understood after paucis, or (in quotations) τόπῳ after ἐν τοῖς Acts xiii. 35; Heb. v. 6. Also in 1 Cor. xv. 46 τὸ πνευματικόν and τὸ φυσικόν are used as substantives, and σῶμα is not to be understood. Lastly, with ἐν τῷ μεταζύ Jno. iv. 31 χρόνῳ is not to be supplied, but τῷ
Even the Gen. of *kindred*, such as Σωτάρτος Πύθρου Acts xx. 4, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, Ἑμάρ τοῦ Συχήμ (§ 30, 3), is not elliptical, but the Gen. expresses the general notion of *belonging to*, just as we say: *Prussia's Blücher* (Hm. opusc. p. 120; Kühner II. 118 f.). For instances from Greek and Roman authors, see Vechner, Hellenol. p. 122 sq.; Jani, ars poet. p. 187 sq. But even were ὑός, ὀδυλός, and the like, actually omitted in such expressions, it would still be a complete perversion to supply ὑός before the Genitive in Gal. iii. 20 ἀ γεῖ μητής ἑνὸς οὐκ ἑστω, (Kaiser de apologet. ev. Joa. consiliiis II. 8). A word can be omitted only when the notion it expresses is conveyed by the context, or may be presumed to be known to the reader. But when it is said: the mediator is not of *one*, the expression does not even remotely intimate that precisely the word *son* is to be supplied. The sentence by itself merely means: *does not appertain to a single individual*. And that he appertains to him as *son* (instead of what surely must be regarded as most obvious, in his very function of mediator) is left wholly to conjecture!

On the other hand, a number of (transitive) verbs have, in a similar way, rid themselves in the course of time of the case of the noun in union with which they formed a current phrase, and are now used alone to express the same meaning, e.g. διάγεω to *live* (in an ethical sense) Tit. iii. 8, strictly, to spend sc. τὸν βίον 552 1 Tim. ii. 2. So frequently in Greek authors, Xen. C. 1, 2, 2; Ἡμ. 8, 3, 50; Diod. S. 1, 8. Similarly, διατρῆσω *sojourn* in a place 616 Jno. iii. 22, strictly, spend sc. τὸν χρόνον, see Kühnl in loc. Cf. in Latin *agere, degere* (Vechner, Hellenol. p. 126 f.). Συμβάλλεων τοῖ or πρὸς τοῖν Acts iv. 15; xvii. 18 to *confer, consult with one*, originally συμβάλλεων λόγου sermonem conferre Ceb. 33; by the older Greeks chiefly in the Mid. συμβάλλεσθαι. Προσέχεων τοῖ *pay attention to etc., sc. τὸν νοῦν*, cf. in Latin *advertere, attendere*. Similar is ἐνέχεω Luke xiv. 7; Acts iii. 5. So perhaps also ἐνέχεω Mark vi. 19; Luke xi. 53, where, however, it is sometimes explained to *be angry*, supplying χόλον (Her. 1, 118; 6, 119); but no instance can be found of the suppression of this Acc. Ἐπι- 524 τιθέων τοῖ (τὰς χείρας) Acts xviii. 10; cf. Xen. M. 2, 1, 15; Cyr. 6th ed. 6, 3, 6. Συλλαμβάνεων, concipere, to *become pregnant* Luke i. 31. Many verbs when used thus by themselves have become technical terms, as e.g. διακονεῖν Jno. xii. 2 to *serve at table, προσφέρεων* Heb. v. 3 to *offer, προσκαλεῖν* to *worship* Jno. xii. 20; Acts viii. 27, λατρεῖας Phil. iii. 3; Luke ii. 37; Acts xxvi. 7, καλεῖν *invite* 1 Cor. x. 27 (Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 23; 8, 4, 1), κρούειν *knock* (at a door) Matt. vii. 7 etc., προβάλλεων to *put forth* (of trees), a
horticultural term, Luke xxi. 30. Nautical terms are *aiphev weigh*
sc. ῥᾶς ὀγκύρας Acts xxvii. 18 (Bos p. 15) Thuc. 2, 23, like the
Latin *solvere* Caes. gall. 4, 28, and *katέχεω εἰς* Acts xxvii. 40, see
Wahl under the word.

We must, however, be careful not to refer to this head such
verbs as either contain in themselves a complete notion, or in a
given context are intended to express nothing more than the
action which they denote, and are used absolutely, as *ἐν γαστρί*
*ἐχεῖν to be pregnant, διαφύσεων to break through, to break in* Matt.
vi. 19, *στρωνύειν εαυτῷ sibi sternere* Acts ix. 34 to make one’s bed,
*ἀποστέλλειν to send* (personally or by letter) Luke vii. 19; Acts
xix. 31 (Vechner, Hellenol. p. 126), *μὴ ἐχεῖν to be poor* 1 Cor. xi.
22; Boisson. Philostr. epp. p. 128 (habere Jani, ars poët. p. 189),
*ἀγοράζειν καὶ πωλεῖν* Rev. xiii. 17. [Just so in ἀποκτενεῖτε etc.
Matt. xxiii. 34 the actions expressed are conceived absolutely;
see Mey. ad loc.] For examples of verbs used abstractly, see e.g.
1 Cor. iii. 1; x. 18; Heb. xii. 25; Col. ii. 21; Phil. ii. 12; Jas.
iv. 2f. As to *πάσχειν* in particular, see Wahl, clav. p. 387; cf.
is probably to be rendered: to prepare for him, what? appears
from the context, and ἕφιαν from Philem. 22 is not to be supplied.
In the same way the verbs are used in 1 Cor. xi. 4 κατὰ κεφαλῆς
*ἐχων* (cf. 2 Cor. v. 12) and Rev. xxii. 19 εὰν τις ἀφέλη ἀπὸ τῶν
λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου, where to supply τι betrays an utter want of
philological discernment. Lastly δινασθαι, used absolutely, sig-
nifies to be able, have power, and does not require an Infin. to
complete its sense, not even in 1 Cor. x. 13 (where δίων. ἵππειν
follows immediately) cf. Rom. viii. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

553 (Substantives with the Article are also used thus technically in
theiclad doctrinal terminology, and with them a Gen. of the Person —
617 θεοῦ — has been looked for; as, ἡ ὀργή Rom. iii. 5; v. 9; xii. 19;
1 Thess. i. 10; ii. 16, τὸ θέλημα Rom. ii. 18.)

Adjectives used attributively with substantives can be omitted only in
very rare instances. It is quite conceivable, for example, that in the
phrase λαλεῖν ἐράμας or κανᾶς γλωσσαῖς the adjective was dropped through
frequent use, and that γλωσσαῖς λαλεῖν alone became a technical expression
(de Wette on Acts, S. 33). But beyond the range of local and individual
usage (somewhat like *libri*, namely Sibyllini, or *bishop in partibus* in
part. *infidelium*) nothing of this sort occurs; since, owing to the diversity
of epithets that may be joined to a substantive, it would not do to leave
the reader to guess the precise one to be supplied. In 2 Pet. ii. 10 οὕτω
σαρκὸς πορεύονται does not need to be completed by ἐράμα from Jude 7;
the phrase is intelligible as it stands. In 1 Cor. vi. 20 ἡγοράσθης τιμής the epithet μεγάλης is not omitted, but the words mean simply: ye have been bought with a price; the emphasis lies upon the verb bought, not obtained for nothing. In Matt. xii. 32 &c. ἔτη λόγων κατὰ τοῦ οὐκ ἰδεύων we must not supply βλάψρημον; to speak a word against one, is a phrase complete in itself. In Rev. ii. 6, also, the rendering hoc (laudable) habes does not assume the omission of some similar word in the Greek. A more plausible instance would be Acts v. 29 ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἄπόστολοι, i.e. οἱ ἄλλοι or λοιποὶ δὲ and the like; yet on this see above, § 58, 7 note, p. 520 sq.

It would be preposterous also to supply, for instance, ένα in Matt. xv. 23 525 οὐκ ἀνεκρίθη αὐτὴ λόγων or ένι in Luke vii. 7 εἰπε λόγῳ, or των in Mark ii. 1 δε ἡμέρων (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 440), or even πολὺν in Luke xviii. 4 εἰπε χρῶνον. The notion of one is contained in the Singular, and that of several in the Plural. Cf. Lucian. Herm. ταλάντου for one talent, and cun. 6 ἡμέραν unum diem (in Latin, ut verbo dicam), Lucian. Alex. 15 ἡμέρας οἱκοι ξαμεν, Xen. Eph. 5, 2; Charit. 5, 9. With Luke xviii. in particular, cf. the well-known χρῶνα Schoenm. Isae. p. 444.

Note. It would be the most absurd of all to admit the existence of an ellipsis of adverbs or conjunctions; and yet this has been done in a variety of cases by N.T. expositors. Of such interpreters Hm. opusc. p. 204 says: qui si cogitassent, adverbia conjunctionesque proprietatibus quisbusdam et sententiarum inter se consociationibus ac dissociationibus indicandis inservire, quae nisi discretum verbi expressae vel propter eam intelligi nequeant, quod, si ellipsis loci esset, etiam aliena intelligi possent: nuncquam adeo absonam opinionem essent amplexi, ut voculas, quorum omissio longe aliter quam adjectio sententias conformat, per ellipsis negligent potuisse crederent. But ignorance of the nature of the moods is in part at the bottom of this opinion. Thus with θέλεις εἰπεμυν Luke ix. 54; Heb. viii. 5, etc. some have wanted to supply a ένα or ένώς, (see in opposition Hm. p. 207, cf. § 41, 4 b. p. 285); so also εἰ or εἴν in sentences like 1 Cor. vii. 21 554 δοῦλος ἕκληθης, μὴ σοι μελέτω (Hm. p. 205; cf. § 60, 4 c. p. 541); so εἶν τίδι (Schwarz, soloc. p. 125) in Jno. xv. 22 εἰ μὴ ἡλθον ... ἀειριτάν οὐκ εἴχον 618 and similar sentences (Hm. p. 205, see § 42, 2 p. 305 sq.); and so μόνον frequently in the expression οὐκ ... ἀλλά cf. § 55, 8 p. 495 sq. or 1 Cor. ix. 9. I It was likewise thought that ή was omitted after the comparative in Jno. xv. 18; 3 Jno. 4 (BCrus.), but the clauses with ένα in both passages

1 Mi τῶν βοῶν μαλει τῷ θεῷ: Paul takes into view here only the spiritual sense of the law, and considers it from the same point as Philo, who says: οἱ γὰρ θεῷ τῶν ἄλλων δὲ νόμος ἄλλο θεῷ τῶν νῦν καὶ λόγον ἐρωτάων, see Mey. The παρασδικευττ following ought to have deterred from such a weakening of the statement. In Rom. iv. 9, before ή καὶ αν τιτιμ, a μόνον is not required; and in iii. 28 μόνον, in the juxtaposition of πίστει and χαρίς εγρήγορος νόμον (since in Paul's view πίστει and εγρήγορος are mutually exclusive antitheses), would be quite superfluous, and would render the sentence cumbersome. On Rom. iv. 14, see Fr. in loc.
are added by way of explanation to the demonstrative pronoun, the Genitive of which is dependent on the comparative. Likewise in instances such as Acts iv. 22 ἐνῷ ἦν πλείων τοις παράκοιτος, xxiii. 13, 21; xxiv. 11; xxv. 6; Matt. xxvi. 53 ἦ is not to be supplied (though it is elsewhere used in such a construction). The Greeks had become accustomed to abbreviate the phrase in this manner, and probably did not regard the word πλείων here as a comparative (more than), but as an annexed specification, just as elsewhere the neuter (adv.) πλέον is inserted even without government, see Lob. Phryn. p. 410 sq.; cf. Mtth. S. 1019. Lastly, some wanted (Pott still) in 2 Pet. iii. 4 ἄφι ἥσ ol πατέρεσ ἐκκομήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἐν ἀρχής κίνησε to supply ὦς before the last words, which would give an appropriate meaning indeed, but would be entirely arbitrary. Two termini a quo are united here in a single sentence, one closer and one more remote, in so far, that is, as ol πατέρεσ is understood of those very fathers (see in particular Semler) who had received the promise of the παρονσία. (There would be a half ellipsis in a particle, if ὦ stood for οὗτω, cf. especially Withof, opusc. Ling. 1778. 8vo. p. 32 sqq. But in Jno. vi. 17 an οὗτω after the preceding ἔδω is to say the least unnecessary: it had already become dark, and Jesus had not come. In Jno. vii. 8 οὗτω is in fact only a correction; if we read οὗ, we cannot remove the ethical difficulty of the passage by introducing a grammatical one in its place, (see also Boisson. Philostr. her. p. 502; Jacobs, Philostr. imagg. 357, and Aelian. anim. II. 250). It does not follow that οὗ is used for οὗτω in Mark vii. 18 because οὗτω occurs in Matt. xv. 17; but in the latter passage also οὗ is the better supported reading. In Mark xi. 13 not is completely sufficient. Against the admission of another sort of half ellipsis, that is, of verba simplicia for composita, see my program de verbor. simpl. pro compositis in N. T. usu et causis. L. 1833. 4to.)

6. Sometimes a partial ellipsis of both the subject and the predicate occurs in one and the same sentence. Gal. v. 13 μόνον 619 μὴ τὴν ἑλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί (κατέχητε, τρέψητε, Occum. 555 ἀποχρῆσθε). The subject as in the second person is obvious from the preceding ἐκλήθητε; and that part of the predicate which forms the copula (κατέχομεν, etc., ἔπει, Hm. Vig. 872) is easily gathered from εἰς ἀφορμὴν (cf. Jacobs, Philostr. p. 525). Matt. xxvi. 5 (Mark xiv. 2) μὴ ἐν τῇ ἐορτῇ sc. τοὐτο γενέσθω or τοὐτο ποιῶμεν, unless we prefer repeating from vs. 4 the two verbs κρατήσῃ. κ. ἀποκρτείν. These words, and Gal. as above, are no more an aposiopesis (Mey. on Gal. [in the earlier eds.] than the German: aber nur nicht am Feate (not on the feast day). On the partial ellipsis in sentences with μὴ, see Klotz, Devar. II. 669. In 2 Cor. ix. 6 probably with τοὐτο δὲ is to be supplied λέγω (Gal. iii. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 15) or φημι (1 Cor. vii. 29; xv. 50) Bos
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p. 632 sq.; Franke, Demosth. 83; cf. Hm. Aeschyl. II. 302, or even λογίζεσθε, (for Meyer's previous connection of this τούτο δέ with ὦ σπείρων following produces a limping construction, as he himself has felt; and his present view, that τούτο δέ is an Acc. Abs., is far-fetched). So too in the phrase οἶχ οἴτι (... ἀλλα), designed to prevent a misapprehension, I say, I mean, was originally understood before οἴτι (Schaef. Bos 775; Hm. Vig. 804), Jno. vii. 22 οἶχ οἴτι ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἔστιν (ἡ περιποιή), ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν πατέρων, vi. 46; 2 Cor. i. 24; iii. 5; Phil. iv. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 9. The phrase, however, became so established by use that its origin was no longer thought of, and so Paul could write in Phil. iv. 11: οἶχ οἴτι καθ' ὑστέρησιν λέγω. By the side of this οἶχ οἴτι might be placed οἶχ οἶνος οἴτι: Rom. ix. 6 οἶχ οἶνον δὲ οἴτι ἐκπέπτοκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, i.e. οὐ τοῖον δὲ λέγω, οἶνον οἴτι non tale (dico), qualem (hoc est) excidisse etc. And the οἶνος οἴτι of the later writers (Schaef. Gregor. Cor. p. 105) might then be compared, and as respects circumstance of expression the phrases adduced by Lob. Phryn. p. 427 ὡς οἶνον, οἶνον ὡστερ. Moreover, 527 two explanations of that Pauline phrase have been propounded:

a. It has been rendered: but it is impossible that; for the τε usually attached to οἶνος in this sense is in the first place not essential, and secondly it is wanting in the passage adduced by Wetst. from Gorgias Leont. σοὶ οἶκ ἦν οἶνος μένον μάρτυρας ... εὑρέω, cf. also Kayser, Philostr. Soph. p. 348,1 and in the third place probably also οὐχ οἶνος τε δέ might be read (Aelian. 4, 17), and the construction with the Inf. ἐκπέπτοκεν τῶν λόγων had been resolved by οἴτι, after the fashion of the later language (cf. in Latin dico quod)2; de Wette's objection falls to the ground, if we take λόγος θεοῦ as Fr. does. b. Some, with Fr., consider οὐχ οἶνος, as it is often used in later writers, a negative adverb: by no means, no such thing (properly οὐ τούτον ἔστω οἴτι the thing is not such that), Polyb. 3, 82, 5; 18, 18, 11. To be sure, the finite verb then always follows without οἴτι; but Paul may either have employed οἴτι pleonastically (like ὡς οἴτι), or have used and construed the phrase in the sense of multum abest ut, far from being the case that. Meyer's solution is in no respect more plausible.

---

1 Examples of the personal ὡς ἐστι, such as Mey. adduces from Polybius, have no connection with the idiom here examined. Cf. Weber, Demosth. p. 469.
2 On the relation of the Infinitive construction to a clause with οἴτι, see Krü. 253.
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In Rom. ix. 16 ἀφ’ ὧν ὁ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ πρέποντος etc., where it is enough to supply ἵπτε, the subject of the impersonal sentence (therefore it is not of him that willeth, does not depend on the will; see, on ἐδαι νως, above, p. 195) is to be gathered from the context: viz. the attainment of Divine mercy, vs. 15. Similar is Rom. iv. 16 διὰ τοῦτο ἵκ πίστεως (ἵπτε), ἵνα κατὰ χάριν (ἡ), therefore from faith proceeds that of which I speak, namely (primarily gathered from vs. 14) ἡ εἰρηνομία. As to Rom. v. 18 see above, no. 2 p. 587.

In Matt. v. 38 ὅφθαλμόν ἀντὶ ὁφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὄδοιτα ἀντὶ ὄδοντος, the subject and part of the predicate are likewise omitted; although an indication of the latter is contained in ἀντὶ. The words, however, are borrowed from Exod. xxi. 24, where ὀφθαλμος precedes. In such well-known expressions as the familiar and almost proverbial passages of the law, even a verb may have been suppressed that could not elsewhere have been omitted without ambiguity; see under 3, b. p. 588.1

7. Even whole propositions are sometimes omitted by ellipsis (Hm. opusc. p. 159; Vig. 872):

a. Rom. xi. 21 εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφελότατο, μῆπτως οὐδὲ σοῦ φέλεσαι sc. δεδοκια or ὑπῆρε, which, however, is suggested in μῆπτως. In Matt. xxv. 9 the text. rec. [and Cod. Sin.] has μῆπτοτε οὐκ, but there is a preponderance of authority † for the reading μῆπτοτε ὦ μή, according to which μῆπτοτε would be taken by itself (as dehortatory) by no means! sc. δῶμεν vs. 8 or γενέσθω τοῦτο, cf. Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9; Exod. x. 11. In Luke xvi. 8 there is not so much an omission of φησιν or ἕπη as rather an annexation in oratio recta of the further discourse of him to whom the expression ὅτι φθονίμας ἐποίησεν belongs. Similar to this is v. 14. In Greek prose ἕπη, or the like, is suppressed only either where αὐτοὶ δε, oi δε indicates the speaker (Aelian. 9, 29; anim. 1, 6), or where the mere structure of the sentence indicates that some one (else) speaks, as frequently in dialogues. Van Hengel (annotatt. p. 8 sqq.) is wrong in thinking that this ellipsis occurs in Matt. xxiii. 34; see, on the other hand, Fr. Bengel’s remark on 1 Cor. ix. 24 is a mistake. In Matt. xvi. 7 διελογίζοντο ἐν εαυτοῖς λέγοντες: ὅτι ἐρτους οὐκ ἐλάβωμεν it is far more suitable to supply before ὅτι the simple sentence ταύτα λέγει

1 Akin to this Acc. in a passage of the law is that employed in all languages in demands, e.g. παρ’ ἱερόν, see Rec. p. 601.

† The contrary statement is made on p. 504. ὃς μή, although supported by B C D and by the majority of the less important authorities, recommended by Grsb., and adopted by Lchm., Tisch. 2d and 7th, Alf., Treg., de Wette, Mey. et al., has been abandoned by Tisch. 8th ed. for ὁμιλάκτω, which is supported by (besides Ἁ) A L Z 33 etc. — J. H. T.
and render ὅτι by because, than to take ὅτι for the particle introducing the oratio recta. In Jno. v. 6, 7, the answer ἀνδρωτοῦν 557 οὐκ ἔχω, ἵνα ... βάλῃ με εἰς τὴν κολομβήδραν does not seem to correspond directly to the question θέλεις ἵµής γενέσθαι; so that a simple yes, certainly, may be supposed to be omitted. But the sick man does not stop at this simple affirmation, but immediately proceeds to state the obstacle which has hitherto opposed his wish. On passages such as Jno. i. 8 οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἦν μαρτυρήση, ix. 3, see p. 316 sq.

b. Sometimes a long protasis is followed by no apodosis, e.g. 2 Thess. ii. 3 f. ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον ... ὅτι ἔστω θεός, it is necessary to understand from vs. 1: the parousia τοῦ κυρίου does not arrive. The long protasis 1 involves this omission. So, in particular, the apodosis is wanting to a protasis with ἀστερ in Matt. xxv. 14; Rom. v. 12; ix. 22 ff. see § 63, I. 1 p. 569 sq.

Likewise, in quotations from the O. T. there sometimes seems to be an ellipsis of an entire sentence, as in 1 Cor. i. 31 ἵνα, καθὼς γέγραπται, ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω. After ἵνα a γένηται or πληρωθῇ may be understood. The apostle, however, unconcerned about the grammatical sequence, attached the words of Scripture directly to his own as integral parts of the statement, just as in Rom. xv. 3 he introduces in direct discourse the words of Christ from Ps. lxix., cf. xv. 21. In 1 Cor. ii. 9 f., however, we must not with Mey. [eds. 1st and 2d] take vs. 10 for the apodosis to ἄδικαλμὸς etc.; but Paul, instead of saying, in continuity with ἀλλά, τοῦτο ἴµῖν etc., annexes the antithesis directly to the words of the quotation, so that ἀλλά remains without grammatical sequence.

II. Aposiopesis, or the suppression of a sentence or part of a sentence in consequence of emotion (of anger, cf. Stalib. Plat. Apol. p. 35, 4 sorrow, fear, etc., cf. Quintil. 9, 2, 54; Tiberius and Alexander de figuris in Walz, rhetor. graec. VIII. 536, 450), in 529 which case the gestures of the speaker supply what is wanting (Hm. p. 153), occurs, not merely in forms of oaths (§ 55, note 622 p. 500) in which it became usual, but also after conditional clauses in the following passages: Luke xix. 42 ei ἐγώς καὶ σύ, καίγε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτῃ, τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου, if thou also hadst known what concerns thy peace! sc. how fortunate that would have been

1 To this some refer also Jas. iii. 3 (according to what is undoubtedly the true reading [supported also by Cod. Sin.] ei eti). But the apodosis is probably contained in the words καὶ δόλω το ὁμα. See the careful discussion by Weisgerber in loc.

2 Like the well-known quois ego —! or the German: waste, ick will dich —! Eng. mind, or I"ll —! The aposis may occur even in the form of a question, e.g. Num. xiv. 27 ἵνα τίνος τὴν συναγωγήν τὴν ποιητάν ταύτην; cf. Acts xxiii. 9 Lchm.
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(for thee); xxii. 42 πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρενεγκεῖν τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ· πλήν etc. In both passages sorrow has suppressed the apodosis. Acts xxiii. 9 οὐδὲν κακὸν εὐρίσκομεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ· εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος . . . we find nothing evil in this man; but if a spirit has spoken to him or an angel—

(which the Pharisees utter with gestures expressive of reserve), sc. the matter is significant, or requires caution. Others take the words interrogatively (Lehm.): if, however, . . . has spoken? how then? what is to be done in that case? Sec, in general, Fr. Conject. I. 30 sq. The addition μὴ θεωράχωμεν found in some Codd. is a gloss. Bornem. has quietly retracted his earlier conjecture. Moreover, it may be doubted whether in the preceding passage an aposiopesis really occurs, or merely a break in the discourse at vs. 10. In Jno. vi. 62 the apodosis, suggested readily by vs. 61, is omitted with an air of triumph: how strange will that appear to you! In Mark vii. 11 ὑμεῖς λέγετε· εὰν εἶπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ· κορβᾶν . . . δ εἶν εξ ἐμοῦ ὕφελθης· καὶ οὐκέτι ἁφίετε etc. the apodosis is to be supplied from vs. 10: then he does right in keeping his vow, and consequently ye release him in this case from the obligation τιμᾶν τὸν πατέρα etc., see Krebs in loc.¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff. is an anacolouthon, and not an aposiopesis. Lastly, in Phil. i. 22 the assumption of an aposiopesis (Rilliet) is quite inadmissible. An aposiopesis is in Greek authors² also most frequent after conditional clauses (Plat. sympos. 220 d.). Indeed when two conditional clauses correspond to each other it is quite common to suppress the apodosis after the first (Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 256; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 197), the speaker hastening on to the second clause as the more important, as in Plat. Protag. 325 d. εἶν μὲν ἓκων πειθήσαι· εἰ δὲ μὴ—εὐθυνοῦσιν ἀπειλᾶσι καὶ πληγᾶσι, 623 rep. 9, 575 d. οὐκόν εἶν μὲν ἓκωτες ὑπείκωσιν· εἶν δὲ μὴ etc. Thuc. 3, 3. So Luke xiii. 9 κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν· εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, 580 εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐκκόψεις αὐτὴν if it bear fruit, well (let it remain); but if not, then cut it down (though here ἐφε αὐτὴν may be

¹ Many expositors find an aposiopesis (?) also in the parallel passage Matt. xv. 5 δε δι ἐν εἰπῃ τῷ πατρὶ· ή τῇ μητρὶ· δόρων· δε· εἶν εξ ἐμοῦ ὑφελθήσι· καὶ αὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ τὴν πατέρα αὐτοῦ —that is, he acts properly (in conformity to the law). But perhaps [yet see Meyer’s objections] we should, with Croesus and Bengel, regard the apodosis as commencing with καὶ αὐ μὴ: whoever says to his parents . . . he is not obliged also (in such case) to honor his parents, he is thereby also (in that case) released from the commandment τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα. The καὶ then would not be pleonastic.

² From the O. T. cf. Exod. xxxii. 32; Dan. iii. 15; Zech. vi. 15; see Köster, Erläuter. der heil. Schrift, S. 97.
supplied from what precedes). (On the omission after eι δὲ μὴ or eι δὲ μὴ γε of the entire conditional clause, to be supplied from the context preceding, see above, p. 583.)

As an aposiopesis ὁ ὕμῃ might also be regarded in Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9, with which may be compared the forms of dehortation or deprecation, frequent in the tragedians, μὴ ταῦτα Eurip. Io 1335, μὴ σὺ γε etc. Yet see above, p. 583 sq.

In Rom. vii. 25 to the complaint τίς με ῥύομαι έκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἤν αὐτόν τοῦ; is annexed, in an overpowering burst of joy, a brief thanks ἵνα καὶ ἡμῖν be to God! — also a species of aposiopesis. In unimpassioned style, Paul would have said: thanks to God that he has already liberated me, etc.

Also in 2 Cor. vii. 12 ὁ ὕμῃ καὶ ἔγραψα ὅμως some have assumed a reservation, where Billroth still wants to supply χαλάρων τε. Paul would thus have purposely omitted the word, because the affair still gave him pain. But ἔγραψα is of itself complete.

§ 65. REDUNDANT STRUCTURE; PLEONASM (SUPERFLUITY),

1 DIFFUSENESS.

1. A Pleonasm² is the opposite of an ellipsis, as redundancy is the opposite of deficiency. A pleonasm, accordingly, would be exemplified in the addition of a word that is not intened to add anything to the meaning of the sentence (Hm. opusc. I. 217, 222). 624 In point of fact the earlier philologists not only believed in the existence of superfluous words, especially particles (Hm. opusc. p. 226), but Kühnöö on Matt. v. 1 (cf. Weiske, pleon. p. 34) goes so far as to maintain that τό ὁ ὅρος may be used for ὁ ὅρος. But as this (pleonasm of the definite article) is a downright absurdity, so is the existence of expletives in the Greek literary language a figment. In general, pleonasm, which takes place chiefly in pred-

¹ See Fischer, Weller. III. I. 269 sqq.; B. Weiske, Pleonasmi graeci s. commentar. de vocib., quae in sermone Graeco abundare dicuntur. Lips. 1807. 8vo.; Poppe. Thucyd. I. I. 197 sqq.; in reference to the N. T. Glass. Phil. sacra I. 641 sqq. (it relates, however, more to the O. T., and is on the whole meagre); Bauer, Philol. Thucyd. Paull. p. 202 sqq.; Tschechuck, de sermon. J. Chr. p. 270 sqq.; Haab S. 324 ff.; J. II. Maii dis. de pleonasmis ling. graec. in N. T. Giess. 1728. (10 sheets). This writer had intended to write a work on Pleonasms in general; see his observat. in libr. sacr. I. 52. Another work, by M. Nascou, announced in a Prodromus (Havn. 1787. 8vo.), failed, in like manner, to make its appearance.

² Glassius, as above, has sensible remarks on the definition of a pleonasm; cf. also Flacii clavis script. sacr. II. 4, 224, and my 1st Progr. de verbis composit. p. 7 sq. Quintil. instil. 8, 3, 53 gives a simple, but, rightly understood, adequate definition: pleonasmus vitium, cum supravacuis verbis oratio oneratur.
icates (Hm. as above, p. 219), consists in ingrafting into a sentence 531 words the full import of which has been already conveyed in another part of the same sentence (or period), either by the same or by an equivalent expression. Even this, however, is done intelligently only when,

a. From carelessness, or from want of confidence in the reader’s attention, the same thing is (particularly in extended sentences) repeated: nonne tibi ad me venienti nonne dixi? Here nonne is intended in reality to be thought but once. So Col. ii. 13 καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς δύνασ ὑπὸ τοῦ παραπτώματα . . . συνεξωπολήσεσιν ὑμᾶς τὸ σὺν αὐτῷ, Matt. viii. 1; Eph. ii. 11 f.; Phil. iv. 15 var. [Matt. iv. 16] (Vechner, Hellenol. p. 177 sq.), Mark vii. 25 γυνή, ἡς εἶχεν τὸ θυγατρὶον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, Rev. vii. 2, see § 22, 4 p. 147 sq. (Demosth. Euerg. 688 b. οὐτοὶ όντο εἰμὶ, εἰ πολλά μου λάβοιεν ἐνέχυρα, ἀδεμνον ἄφήσεις με τοὺς μάρτυρας), 1 Cor. vii. 26 νομίζω τούτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν . . . οτι καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ, Rev. xii. 9 (?). cf. V. Fritzsch, quaest. Lucian. 14 sq.; 2 Tim. iv. 9 σπουδάσων ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με ταχέως, 2 Cor. viii. 24 τὴν ἐνδείξεν τ. ἁγάπης . . . ἐνδείκνυμεν (yet see § 32, 2 p. 224) cf. Plato, legg. 12, 966 b. τῇ ἐνδείξει τῷ λόγῳ ἀδυνατεῖν ἐνδείκνυσθαι (Xen. Cyr. 8, 2, 5). To this head may be referred also Rom. ix. 29 Sept. ὃς Τόμορρα ἃν ὁμοιόθημεν (in the parallel member ὃς . . . ἃν ἐγενῆθημεν), as well as λογιζεῖσθαι or ἀργεῖσθαι τινα ὃς 2 Cor. x. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 15; Lucian. Peregr. 11 (instead of the Acc. alone, cf. ἡ βιβλ. Job xix. 11), as even in Greek authors we find νομίζειν ὃς (yet see Stalhb. Plat. Philib. p. 180) and the like. Different are Luke xx. 2 εἰπον πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Mark xii. 26 πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων, Acts xxviii. 25 τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν . . . λέγον etc. In all these passages the Participle serves to introduce (as frequently in the Sept.) the direct discourse (cf. the well-known ἐφη λέγων Döderlein, Synon. IV. 13), which might assuredly be annexed immediately to εἰπον, εἶπε. Different from this, again, are Matt. xxii. 1; Luke xii. 16, and still more Luke xiv. 7; xvi. 2; xviii. 2, etc.

Another mode of introducing the direct discourse, Luke xxii. 61 ἐπεμνησθη τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κυρίου ὃς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Acts xi. 16 ἐμνησθην τοῦ ἐχειρισμοῦ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃς ἔλεγεν, is to be referred to circumstantiality (see below, no. 4 p. 606 sq.), like the usage of even Attic authors, Xen. Cyr. 8, 2, 14 λόγος αὐτοῦ ἀπομνημονεύσατα, ὃς λέγοι, see Bornem. schol. p. 141, and is not to be deemed a pleonasm.

2. Or when b. one of the synonymous expressions has, from

To this head are to be referred the established schemata:

a. that καὶ is used after particles of comparison, Acts xi. 17 626 εἰ τῷ ὦτον δωρεάν ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν, 1 Cor. vii. 7 θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εὕρει ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτὸν (see above, p. 440); for the also is already implied in the comparison, which makes this very declaration that something takes place also in the case of a second object.

1 From the department of Etymology may be adduced, as instances of the same nature, the double comparatives μείζονες etc., see § 11, 2 p. 69. In German, cf. mehrere, for which pedantic purists would substitute, both in writing and speaking, mehr.


3 Οἰκοδομοῦν οἶκον Luke vi. 48 is no more a pleonasm than aedicicare domum, as both verbs acquired at a very early period, from usage, the signification of to build (generally). See other instances of the sort in Lobeck, paralip. p. 501 sq.
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β. that an additional negative is annexed to a verb of negation in a clause dependent on that verb and supplementing it, 1 Jno. ii. 22 ὁ ἀρνούμενος, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστω ὁ Χριστός, Luke xx. 27 ἀντιλέγοντες, μὴ ἔλαιν ἀνὰβασιν (Xen. C. 2, 2, 20; An. 2, 5, 29; Isocr. Trapez. 360; Dem. Phorm. 585; Thuc. 1, 77), Heb. xii. 19 οἱ ἁκούσαντες παρατίθεντο μὴ προστεθήσαι αὐτοῖς λόγου (Thuc. 5, 63), Gal. v. 7 τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πειθοῦσα (Eurip. Hec. 860). Cf. further Luke iv. 42; Acts xx. 27; 1 Pet. iii. 10 (Thuc. 5, 25; 7, 53; Plat. Phaed. 117 c.; Demosth. Phaenipp. 654 b.; see Vig. pp. 459, 811; Alberti, observ. p. 470 sq.; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 10; Bttm. exc. 2 in Mid. p. 142 sqq.; Mtth. 1242 f.).

The German employs a similar construction in the conversational style; and this usage in Greek may be accounted for by the circumstantiality peculiar to familiar discourse, since in these verbs the force of the negation gradually became less sensible, and thus was expressly renewed in the dependent clause, cf. Mdv. S. 248. Recent writers, indeed, maintain that this mode of expression is not to be considered as pleonastic (Hm. opusc. p. 232; Klotz, Devar. p. 668 1); yet logically one of the negatives is undeniably superfluous. (But even in the N. T. the negation is not always subjoined, e.g. after verbs of hindering Luke xxiii. 2; Acts viii. 36 [1 Thess. ii. 16]; Rom. xv. 22; cf. Mtth. 1248; Mdv. 248; Klotz, Devar. p. 668.)

On the other hand, the following constructions are different from the preceding: Acts x. 15 πάνω εἰς δεύτερον (cf. Jno. iv. 54); Jno. xxi. 16 πάνω δεύτερον (Plut. Phil. c. 15), Gal. iv. 9 πάνω Ἀνωθέν (Isocr. Areopag. p. 338 πάνω ἐξ ἀρχῆς), rursus denuo (Hand, Tursell. II. 279); in all which passages a more definite word is added as explanatory. Still greater difference is there in Acts v. 23 according to the reading τοῖς φύλακας ἀνωθεν ἐστώτας πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν (Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 23); also in Luke ii. 36 αἰτή ἦν προβεβηκτικα ἐν ἡμέρας πολλαί ἡ (cf. i. 7, 18), for the meaning is: she was far advanced (Lucian. Peregrin. 27 πορρωμάτω γύρων προβεβηκτικώς); Rev. ix. 7 τὰ δομιώματα τῶν ἀκρῶν δομεία ἤπειρον, γιὰ δομιώματα signifies 627 forms, cf. Ezek. x. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 17 εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ si placuerit voluntati divinae, since θέλημα means the will itself and θέλων the operation of the will (like the stream streams etc.) cf. Jas. iii. 4. In Jno. xx. 4, however, προέδραμεν ταχέως τοῦ Πέτρου is to be taken thus: he ran on before, faster than Peter (closer specification). In 2 Pet. iii. 6 ἑαυτοὶ would not be superfluous even if ἑαυτῶν were supplied with δι' ἑαυτοῦ.

1 Non otiosam esse negationem in ejusmodi locis, sed ita poni infinitivum, ut non res, quae prohibenda videatur, intelligatur, sed qua vi ac potestate istius prohibitionis jam non fiat.
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It would designate water as an element, whereas ὧσα εἰπά (cf. Gen. vii. 11) would signify the concrete (separate) bodies of water. Cf. further, Jude 4. As to Heb. vi. 6 see my 3d Progr. de verb. compos. p. 10. That Luke xx. 43 ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου (Heb. i. 13) footstool of thy feet, Gen. xvii. 13 ὁ ὠκογενής τῆς οικίας σου (Deut. vii. 13) are not, on account of the Gen. annexed, entirely similar to the preceding examples, is obvious. Lastly, such passages as Mark viii. 4 ὡς ἐπὶ ἤρπασας, xiii. 29 ἐγγὺς ἐκεῖ, 2 Tim. ii. 10 do not properly fall under the notion of pleonasm (Heinichen, Euseb. II. 186), but of apposition. Likewise Mark xii. 23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει, ὅταν ἀναστῶσι can hardly be called diffuseness, as the last clause here is an application of the general ἐν τῇ ἀναστ. to the brothers mentioned in vs. 20 ff. See Lob. paralip. p. 534. As a half pleonasm might ὁσμῆ εἴδωλας Eph. v. 2 (both derivatives of ὁσμὰ) be regarded, and compared perhaps to παῦτον ἁπάσις (Eurip. Androm. 613; Hm. opusc. p. 221). But it signifies an odor of sweet smell; ὁσμῆ is the smell as inhaled, εἴδωλα its quality.

3. c. Lastly, many redundancies are attributable to a blending of two constructions, Hm. opusc. p. 224; Vig. p. 887; as, Luke ii. 21 ὅτε ἐπιλήφθησαν ἡμέρα ὅππω . . . καὶ ἔκλειψε τῷ ὄνομα (instead of ἔπλησθο. δὲ ἡμ. . . . καὶ, or ὅτε ἐπλ. . . . ἐκλήθη), vii. 12 ὡς ἤγγυσε 563 τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἐδοὺ ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκός, Acts x. 17. To ἥδι this head might be referred also Rom. ix. 29 (see under a.) and it is even possible that ὅτε before the oratio recta originated in this way (Rost, Gr. 641). With more assurance may we explain thus the pleonastic negation in the phrase ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ (Devar. 1, 74) : 1 Cor. xiv. 5 μεῖξον ὁ προφητεύον ἡ ὁ λαλῶν ἡλώσσαι, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύῃ except he interpret, xv. 2; 1 Tim. v. 19. The 584 Germans in colloquial speech often employ a similar mode of expression: alle waren zugegen, ausgenommen du nicht; ich komme nicht, bevor du nicht gesagt hast etc. In the preceding quotation, either ἐκτὸς εἰ διερμηνεύῃ or εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύῃ might have been used. On that and other similar phrases (such as πλην εἰ μὴ) much has been collected by Lob. Phryn. p. 459; cf. also Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 869; Doederlein, Oed. Col. p. 882 sqq. On the other hand, in the expression εἰ δέ μὴ γε, when it seems to mean, but if not, otherwise (after a negative clause) Matt. vi. 1; ix. 17; 2 Cor. xi. 16, the negation cannot be considered as pleonastic according to the original import of the phrase; see Fr. 628 Mt. p. 255.

4. The greater part of what has been called pleonasm in the N. T. (and out of it) is circumstantiality or more frequently fullness of expression (Hm. opusc. p. 222 sqq. and Vig. 887;
Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 204 sqq.); the former of which arises from the writer's endeavor to be rightly understood, and the latter is designed to give vividness, force (solemnity), sonorousness to style. It must also be remembered that the N. T. diction is to a great extent conversational, or akin to it; and that the above-mentioned peculiarities are pre-eminently characteristic of Oriental expression. Such phraseology differs from pleonasm in this, that every word and part of a word in a sentence contains something intended to add to the general meaning, though it may not be absolutely necessary for the logical completeness of the thought, e.g. Mark i. 17 ποιησω υμᾶς γενέσθαι άλλεις άνθρωπών, for which Matt. iv. 19 has ποιησω υμᾶς άλλεις άνθρωπών. The opposite is not ellipsis, but conciseness.

In the first place, as respects circumstantiality the following cases are to be distinguished:

a. A word, only required once to complete the thought, is repeated in every parallel member where it might have been simply understood: 1 Heb. ii. 16 οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλων ἐπὶ λαμμενεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος 'Αβραμ. ἐπὶ λαμμενεται, Jno. xii. 3 ἕλεψεν τούς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξεμάζει ταῖς θρεῖσιν αὐτῆς τούς πόδας αὐτοῦ, Rev. xiv. 2 ἡ κοινοσα λίγον ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ ἰ φωνή, ἰν ἡ κοινοσα, ix. 21; xvi. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 12; xv. 54; Phil. ii. 16; 564 iv. 17; Jno. x. 10; Rev. ix. 1 f.; Mark i. 40; Matt. xviii. 32, cf. in Greek authors, Xen. Mem. 2, 10, 3; Demosth. Zenos. 576 c.; Long. 2, 3; Lucian. Cynic. 9; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. 117; Poppo, Thuc. III. Π. 23; in Latin the expressions, especially frequent in Jul. Caesar, in ea loca, quibus in locis; dies, quo die etc. Such repetitions ensure perspicuity, particularly when several words intervene. Sometimes repetitions have a rhetorical aspect, see no. 5.

b. The usual or indispensable instrument (e.g. a human limb) is expressly mentioned along with the action in point: Acts 535 xv. 23 γράφαντες δία χειρός αὐτῶν (they were to deliver it), xi. 30 (2 Cor. xi. 38); xix. 11; iii. 18 προκατήγγειλε δία στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, xv. 7; Luke i. 70 etc. Cf. from the poets, Eurip. Ion 1187 χερσίν ἐκέχεων σπόνδας (var.), Hec. 526 f.; Theocr. 7, 153 ποστὶ χερεύσαι, see Lob. Aj. p. 222 f. (Wunder, Recens. p. 17 sq.). But in Rom. x. 15 (Sept.) ὡς ὄρατοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζόμενων

---

1 We must judge differently many of the repetitions used by the orators who had in view the delivery before the people of what they had written; cf. Foertech, de locis Lysiae, p. 29. Of a different nature also is the repetition of the same word in Plat. Charm. 168 a.
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εἰρήνην the notion of arrival, implied in πώδες, is very far from being superfluous; and in 1 Jno. i. 1 δέ ἐσωκάμεν τοῖς ὄφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν (Luke ii. 30) an emphasis is obviously intended in the last words, like: to see with one’s own eyes (Hesiod. theog. 701; Thuc. 2, 11; Aristot. mirab. 160; Heliod. 4, 19; see Bremi, Aesch. i. 124; cf. Jani ars poet. p. 220 sq.). And in Mark vi. 2; Acts v. 12 it is to be considered that the miracles in question were wrought by the laying on of hands. But analogous to this (circumstantial) form of expression is Luke i. 76 προσπορεύσῃ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου, ix. 52 (ἀπέραντα τοῦ προσώπου τῆς σκηνῆς, Ps. xxxiv. 6 κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀνέμου).

c. An action which according to the nature of the case precedes another, is also expressed separately, and generally by a participle: Matt. xxvi. 51 ἐκείνας τὴν χείρα ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχα τινι αὐτοῦ, ii. 8 ὅπως καγὼ ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ (xiv. 33), Jno. vi. 5 ἐπάρασ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ θεασάμενος etc., Matt. xiii. 31 ὅμως κῶκος σωμάτως, δὲ λαβὼν ἀνθρωπος ἐστεφέν etc. vs. 33; Acts xvi. 3 (Xen. Eph. 3, 4 ὅ δὲ αὐτὸν λαβὼν ἄγει πρὸς τὸν Ἀνθίαν, see Locella p. 141), Jno. vi. 15 γυνὴς ὅτι μελλοῦσιν ἐρχεσθαί καὶ ἀρπάξειν αὐτὸν, Matt. xix. 21. Likewise in 1 Cor. ii. 1 καγὼ ἐλθὼν πρὸς υμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἐπὶ οὐ etc. the participle was not necessary. What Bornem. Cyrop. 5, 3, 2 has adduced is of a different nature, as in his passages the participle is separated by several words from its verb. On the other hand, in Luke i. 31 συναντήσῃ εἰς γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ νιόν etc. no one will find a mere redundancy of language; the momentous nature of the favor vouchsafed—her is expressed by specifying its several particulars. In Luke xxiv. 50 ἐπάρασ τὰς χείρας αὐτοῦ εὐλογήσειν αὐτοὺς the participle denotes the symbolical gesture of the person blessing. In Eph. ii. 17 ἐλθὼν marks a particular both important and demanding distinct consideration; so too in Luke xii. 37. Likewise in Jno. xxi. 13 ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς 563 καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, every separate act of the wonderful occurrence is designedly specified, and, as it were, placed before the eyes. In Jno. xi. 48 ἔλευσονται οἱ Ῥωμαίοι 630 refers to the approach of the Roman armies. See, further, Matt. viii. 3, 7; ix. 18; xxvii. 48; Luke vi. 20 (Ael. 12, 22); Jno. xv. 16; Rev. xvi. 1, 2. And in Acts viii. 35 ἀνοίξεις ὁ Φιλίππος τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταῦτας εὐηγγελίσετο etc. prob-
ably ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα etc. serves for the (solemn) introduction of an important discourse; as undoubtedly is the case in Matt. v. 2 (see Fr. in loc.). Cf. in general, Fischer, de vitis lexic. p. 223 sqq.; Pflugk, Eurip. Hel. p. 184.

d. A word which we are accustomed to think is implied in another is also explicitly stated: Acts iii. 3 ἥρωτα ἐλεημοσύνην λαβεῖν (see Wetsst. in loc. and Boisson. Eunap. p. 459; cf. Vir. Aen. 5, 262 loricam ... donat habere viro), Mark i. 17 ποιήσω ἵματι γενέσθαι ἄλειψις ἀνθρώπων, see above, p. 606; cf. Exod. xxiii. 15; Demosth. ep. 3, p. 114 b. ἦ καὶ τὸς ἀνασθήτους ἀνέκτον̂ς ποιεῖν δοκεῖ γίνεσθαι.

e. In the course of a narration the HEBRAISTIC καὶ ἐγένετο is prefixed to particular occurrences: Matt. vii. 28 καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε συνετέλεσεν ... ἔξεπλήσσοντο, for which a Greek author would say simply, καὶ ὅτε ὅτε δὲ συνέργειον, etc. On the other hand, in Jno. xi. 11 ταῦτα ἐπεν, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει αὐτοῖς, neither ταῦτα ἐπεν nor μετὰ τοῦτο is superfluous; the latter indicates a pause.

To c. might be referred also the use of the participle ἀναστάς, as in Matt. ix. 9 ἀναστάσες ἡκολουθήσας αὐτῶν, Mark ii. 14; vii. 24; Luke i. 39 (similar to the Hebrew יָאָשׁ). But although here ἀναστάς was not necessary, yet this participle is by no means redundant in other passages which expositors bring under the same rule. Thus in Matt. xxvi. 62 ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπεν αὐτῷ means obviously: he stood up from indignation, he rose (from his seat); similar is Acts v. 17; Mark i. 35 προῖ ἀνυψω ἔρχεται ἀναστάς ἐξῆλθε rising in the morning, while it was still very dark, etc.; Luke xv. 18 ἀναστάτας πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατίρα μου (I will arise and go) I will forthwith, etc. In general, too many participles in the N.T. have been represented as redundant; and though the decision 631 may occasionally be doubtful, yet very many of them express notions which were they not expressed would be missed. Thus in 1 Cor. vi. 15 ἀραὶ οὖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἅγιον ποιήσω πόρνης μελη; (see Bengel in loc. 566 Aristoph. eq. 1130; Soph. O. R. 1270), 1 Pet. iii. 19 τοῖς ἐν φυλάκι βοηθεῖσι πορευθέντες κήρυξεν. In Luke xii. 37 παρελθὼν διακονήσει αὐτοῖς drawing near, he will serve them, even tested by our Western notions, is more striking and vivid than if παρελθὼν had been omitted, (παρελθὼν in Lœl. 2, 30 likewise, does not seem to me redundant). Cf. in general, Schaeff.

1 This always occurs when an additional specification of time precedes the principal clause, and the principal verb is then appended either by καὶ (see on this Fr. Mt. p. 341), as in Matt. ix. 10; Luke v. 1, 12; ix. 51, or more frequently without a copula, as in Matt. xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1; Mark iv. 4; Luke i. 8, 41; ii. 1 etc. This usage is most frequent in Luke's Gospel. To render this καὶ by also, even, is far from a happy thought, Born. Schol. p. 25. Besides, this ἐγένετο is pleonastic, as the specification of time might be directly joined to the principal verb.
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Sop. I. 253, 278; II. 314; Demosth. IV. 628; Pflugk, Eurip. Hel. p. 134; Mtth. 1300 f.

Further, with Acts iii. 3 under d. may be compared Acts xi. 22 ἐξατε- στελεῖν Βαρνάβαν διὰ εἰκότων ξωὸς Ἀντωνιάς (where the ancient versions drop the Inf. as superfluous, though it undoubtedly existed in the text), which, however, properly signifies: they sent him out with the commission to go etc. Similar is Acts xx. 1 ἐξῆλθεν πορευθήναι εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐκάθισεν τοῖς τυχεῖν Luke xx. 35. The τυχεῖν denotes something not strictly implied in καταδεσθαι preceding, and is required to render the expression complete and perspicuous. Cf. Demosth. cor. p. 328 b. κατ' αὐτὸ τούτῳ ἐξίσος εἰμι ἐπαίνοις τυχεῖν, and Bos, exercit. p. 48; Bornem. schol. p. 125.

Such idioms as Mark xi. 5 τι ποιεῖτε λίωντες τὸν πᾶλον, Acts xxi. 13 τι ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες καὶ συνθρησκοῦντες μοὺ τὴν καρδίαν, in comparison with the usual τι λίεται, κλαιεῖτε, appear to be, in like manner, circumstantial. But what do ye loosen properly denotes: what is your intention in loosing, quid hoc sibi vult? ποιών, therefore, has not here the general meaning of do, which is already contained in every special verb; and the phrase τι λίεται (for) what loose ye? may with more probability be regarded as abbreviated, than the preceding phrase as redundant.

5. Fulness of expression, by which the writer aims sometimes at didactic or rhetorical force (solemnity), sometimes at graphic vividness, occurs generally in one of the following forms:

a. The same word is once and again repeated in parallel members (Xen. An. 3, 4, 45): Eph. ii. 17 εὐγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακράν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἁγιοῖς, ἱνα νῦν ἐστιν καὶ ἐστίν, Col. i. 28 νοτοτούντες πάντα ἀνθρωπον καὶ διδάκτοντες πάντα ἀνθρωπον, Rom. i. 10; ix. 5; xiv. 26, 27; xv. 19; xix. 10; Matt. xii. 37; Rom. v. 12; xiv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 24, 27; xiii. 11; 2 Cor. xi. 26; Rom. (iii. 31) viii. 15 όν τὸν ἐλάβετε πνεύμα δωκείας ... ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεύμα νικηφορίας (in Heb. xii. 18, 22 the repetition was essential to perspicuity); 632 1 Cor. x. 1 f. τι πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἤσαν καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διῆλθον, καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωυσῆν ἐβαπτίζαντο καὶ πάντες ... καὶ πάντες etc. (Caes. bell. gall. 1, 31), Phil. iii. 2; iv. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 2; 1 Cor. xiv. 24; Rev. viii. 7, 12; 1 Cor. vi. 11 ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε, i. 20; iv. 8; 1 Tim. v. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 2 ἤδειν νῦν καιρὸν εὐπρόδεκτος, ἤδειν νῦν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας (Arrian. Epict. 567 8, 23, 20); Eph. vi. 12, 17; v. 10; 1 Jno. i. 1; Rev. xiv. 8; 7th ed. 77
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xviii. 2 (likewise the polysyndeton in Rev. vii. 12; Rom. ii. 17 f.; 1 Cor. xiii. 2 may be referred to this head). So often in earnest addresses; as, Matt. xxv. 11 κύριε, κύριε, ἀνοιξον ἡμῖν, xiii. 37; Luke viii. 24; x. 41; xxii. 31; Acts ix. 4, and demands Jno. xix. 6; Krüg. Dion. p. 11. In all these cases it was not to be left to the reader to repeat in thought a word employed once, but as often as it is to be understood the writer expresses it, in order to render its importance perceptible (especially ἐκ παραλληλου Rom. xi. 32; 1 Cor. xv. 21).

b. Especially often (particularly by John) is a thought, intended to be brought out with great precision, expressed affirmatively in one member of a sentence and negatively in another (parallelismus antitheticus, see Hm. opusc. p. 228): Jno. i. 20 ὠμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἰηρύσατο, Eph. v. 15 μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί, vs. 17; Jno. i. 3; iii. 16; x. 5 (xviii. 20); xx. 27; 1 Jno. i. 6; ii. 4. 27; Luke i. 20; Acts xviii. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 7; Jas. i. 5, 23; 1 Pet. i. 23; v. 2; 538 Heb. vii. 21; x. 37 (Sept.); xii. 8; Rev. ii. 13; iii. 9 (Deut. xxviii. 13; Isa. iii. 9; xxxviii. 1; Ezek. xviii. 21; Hos. v. 8); cf. Eurip. El. 1057 φημι κοίνα ἄπαρνοῦμαι, Ael. an. 2, 48 οὐκ ἄρνουνται οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀλλ' ὀμολογοῦσι, especially in the orators, Dem. fals. leg. p. 200 c. φράσω καὶ οὐκ ἄποκρίνομαι, see Maii. observ. sacr. II. 77 sqq.; Kypke I. 350 sq.; Poppo, Thucyd. I. I. 204; Hm. Med. ed. Elmsley p. 361 and Soph. Oed. Col. p. 41; Philoct. p. 44; Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 19; Weber, Demosth. p. 314; Boissone. Eunap. p. 164 sqq.; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 157.

c. In the following combinations graphic effect is aimed at: Acts xxvii. 20 περιηγεῖτο ἅγιος τὰ σα ῥομ. viii. 22 πασα ἡ κτίσις συνσταθείσαι καὶ συνυδεθείς, Matt. ix. 35; cf. Diod. S. IV. 41 περιηγήμενος τὸ σῶμα πᾶν, Strabo 11, 500 πολλαῖς σὺνπαληφομένος πηγαί, Lucian. paras. 12; Long. 4. 15; Cie. sen. 18 consurrexisse omnes, Liv. 33, 29 cum omnia terre et fuga complessent, see my 2d Progr. de verb. compos. p. 21 sq.

d. Likewise the forms in address in Acts i. 11 ἄνδρες Γαλιλαίοι, 633 iii. 12 ἄνδρες Ἰσραήλίται, ii. 14; v. 35; xiii. 16 have the same (courteous) force (men of Israel!) as the well-known ἄνδρες Ἀθηναίοι, which itself occurs in Acts xvii. 22, or ἄνδρες δικαισταί. See § 59, 1 p. 523.

Every single word was indispensable in 2 Cor. ii. 16 οὐ μὲν δομὴ δομάτου εἰς ἱδανόν, οὐ δὲ δομὴ ὀφης εἰς ὀφην. A savor of death unto death, a savor of life unto life, means: an odor of death which, from its nature, can bring nothing else than death, etc.
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Redundancy of expression is often erroneously supposed to exist in passages where synonymes are found connected in order to express (as frequently in Demosth.) a single main idea, see Schaeff. Demosth. I. 209, 320, 756; Plutarch. IV. 387; V. 106; Weber, Demosth. p. 376; Franke, Demosth. p. 12; Bremi, Aeschin. I. 79; Lucian. Alex. ed. Jacob p. 24; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 619; Schoem. Plut. Agia 171; cf. Lob. paralip. 61 sq. But Paul, from whom the examples in question have mostly been taken, 568 is not in the habit of combining in one sentence really synonymous expres-
sions,—(not even in Eph. i. 5, 19; ii. 1; iv. 23; 1 Cor. i. 10; ii. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1; v. 5; cf. Jas. iii. 13; Jno. xii. 49; 1 Pet. i. 4; iv. 9; 1 Jno. i. 1, etc.; Fr. Rom. II. 372). A more careful study of Greek, but especially of apostolic diction, precludes a supposition according to which e.g. the apostolic salutation χάρις, ἀλος καὶ εἰρήνη, would become extremely flat. Likewise there is nothing pleonastic in the combinations θυμὸς ὤργη Rev. xvi. 19, πέλαγος τῆς θαλάσσης Matt. xviii. 6, ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παροιμίας 2 Thess. ii. 8, σπλάγχνα θλίσσω or ὀλτημοῦ Luke i. 78; Col. iii. 12. The second of these was correctly rendered aequor maris by so early a critic as Wetstein; πέλαγος, that is, denotes the expanse (of the sea), and is thus applied to the surface of a river also, see Schwarz, commentar. p. 1067. And σπλάγχνα is a comprehensive expression which is more closely defined by the Genitive. The parallelismus membrorum, which occasionally 539 occurs in the N.T. (see § 68, 3), has nothing to do with pleonasm. As 6th ed. to the parallel distribution of doctrinal particulars in Rom. iv. 25; x. 10, see de Wette on the first passage.

6. The pleonasm of entire sentences is inconceivable. When a sentence is expressed a second time with but slight alteration, the writer’s object always is to give to a thought peculiar force, or to exhibit it under different points of view. This occurs in 2 Cor. xii. 7 τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραιρώμαι, ἐδώθη 634 μοι σκόλοφ ... ἵνα με κολαφίζῃ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραιρώμαι (where the last words are omitted, it is true, in good Codd. [also Sin.™], but surely only because they seemed superfluous), Rev. ii. 5 μετανοήσον καὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἔργα ποιήσον· εἰ δὲ μὴ (μετανοεῖς), ἐρχομαί σοι ταχὺ καὶ κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς, ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσης (cf. Plat. Gorg. 514 a. ἡμῖν ἐπιχειρητέου ἐστὶ ... θεραπεύων, ὡς βελτίστους αὐτοῖς τοῦ πολίτας ποιοῦντας.

1 Schäfer’s remark, Demosth. I. 320, “usus (synonymorum) duplex, gravior alter, ut vim concilient orationi, alter levior, ut vel aures expleant vel numeros reddant jucundiores,” has reference primarily only to the orators.

2 The investigation of N.T. synonymes (begun not infelicitiously by Bengel) has lately been prosecuted, rather on the principle of free combination than historically, by Tittmann (de synonymis N.T. lib. I. Lipsiae 1829. 8vo.). Further, cf. also the collections and remarks in Bornemann’s diss. de glossem. N. T. p. 29 sqq.
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ἀνευ γὰρ ἡ τούτων, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν εὐρόσκομεν, οὐδὲν ὑφελοι ... ἐὰν μὴ καλὴ κἀγαθὴ ἡ διάνοια τῶν μελλόντων etc. Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 28). On 1 Cor. xiv. 6 see Mey. On 1 Cor. vii. 26, see above, no. 1 p. 602. On the other hand, in 1 Jno. ii. 27 ὥσ τὸ αὐτὸ χρίσμα διδάσκει ύμᾶς ... καὶ, καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς, μενειτε ἐν αὐτῷ the resumptive phrase καθὼς etc. is so far from being a pleonasm, that it could hardly have been dispensed with. Similar is Rev. x. 3, 4. Cf. as to such expressions Hm. 569 Eurip. Bacch. 1060 and Soph. Antig. 691; Philoct. 269, 454; Reisig, conjec. Aristoph. p. 314 sq.; Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 52 and Cic. nat. d. 1, 16; Schaeff. Demosth. V. 726; Mtth. 1541 f. Of a different nature is Rev. ii. 13 οἶδα ποῦ κατοικεῖς· ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ σατανᾶ, where ὅπου ὁ θρόνος etc. is immediately annexed to explain (as if in answer to) ποῦ κατοικεῖς. So might also Mark ii. 24 be taken; but τί here is probably why? On the other hand, 2 Cor. vii. 8; Jno. xiii. 17 do not come under this head; and in 1 Cor. i. 22 the clause ἐπειδὴ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι ... μοριάν is manifestly not a mere repetition of ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ... τῶν θεῶν vs. 21, any more than ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν etc. vs. 28 is a mere echo of the words in vs. 21 εἰδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς etc. And in Rom. vi. 16 οὐκ ὦδατε, ὅτι ὅ παριστάνετε ἐαυτοὺς δουλοὺς εἰς ἱπατοῖς, δουλοὶ ἔστε ὡς ἵππακούετε would not have been a mere uttering of idem per idem, even had ἤτοι ἀμαρτίας εἰς θανάτον ἢ ἱπατοῖς εἰς δικαιοσύνην not been straightforward annexed to δοῦλοι as a closer specification. As little do the two members of the sentence Rom. vi. 6 ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκετί δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ completely coincide in sense; the latter is the aim, concretely expressed, of what, designated generally, is the καταργηθήναι of the σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 1 Pet. ii. 16, however, does not remotely come under this head; 2 Pet. iii. 4 also is of a different nature. On Matt. 540 v. 18 there may be a difference of opinion, inasmuch as πάντα in the last clause may be either referred to the law (Olsh., Mey.), or explained with Fr. universally: donec omnia (qua mente fingere queas) evenerint. The latter, however, is not very plausible.

7. We subjoin now several other passages in which, although from of old N. T. expositors have been accustomed to assume the 635 existence of pleonasms, neither pleonasm nor redundancy of any sort occurs. And first of all, there is a statement to which currency has been given even by recent commentators, and which is propped up with misunderstood parallels from Greek authors, that in the N. T. many verbs, viz. ἀρχεσθαι, δοκεῖν, θηλεῖν, τολμᾶν,
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δινασθαι, when joined with an Infus., are often used pleonastically; Kühnöl on Luke i. 1 represents even επιχείρειν to be one of them; cf. Weiske, pleon. under the words. The whole rule is founded in error. In the first place

a. With regard to Luke i. 1 επιχείρειν in the clause επειδήτερ ρολλοι επεχειρησαν ανατάξασθαι διήγησαν etc., is no more used without special meaning than is the Latin aggredi in aggressus sum scribere (though even philologers share that view, see Herbst, Xen. mem. p. 38, and on the other side, Heind. Plat. soph. p. 450). Luther well renders it: sintemal es sich viele unterwunden haben (whereas many have taken it upon them) etc. So in all the passages from the classics adduced by Kühnöl.

b. So also τολμάν (Weiske p. 121 sq.), to undertake something, always implies some matter of difficulty or importance, sustinere, to bring one's self to (Blume, Lycurg. p. 89), Rom. v. 7; 1 Cor. vi. 1. In Jno. xxi. 12, however, it simply means audere, make bold to; and it is only respecting the ground of their not venturing to interrogate Jesus that doubt may be entertained. The assertion 570 of Markland, Lys. p. 159 ed. Taylor, ought not to have misled him any expositor.

c. As to δοκεῖν cf. Fr. Matt. iii. 9 and the earlier critic J. D. Michaelis in the Nov. Miscell. Lips. IV. 45. In 1 Cor. x. 12 ὁ δοκῶν ἐστάναι is obviously, he that thinketh he standeth, cf. Gal. vi. 8. In Mark x. 42 οἱ δοκοῦντες ἀρχεῖν τῶν ἐθνῶν means, they who pass for the rulers of the nations, are recognized as such (similar are Gal. ii. 9; Susann. 5; Joseph. antt. 19, 6, 3. The parallel passage Matt. xx. 25 has merely οἱ ἀρχοντες). Luke xxii. 24 τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μελέτων quis videatur habere (habiturus esse) principatum, who was to be judged to have the pre-eminence (over the rest); the matter is still future and so merely an object of conjectural judgment. 1 Cor. xi. 16 εἶ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνευος εἶναι ἵνα any one thinks (it allowable) to be contentious, or (Mey. and de Wette) ἵνα any one seems to be contentious, is an urbane expression. Luke viii. 18 ὁ δοκεῖ ἵνα what he thinks he has. On 1 Cor. iii. 18; vii. 40; viii. 2; xiv. 37; Heb. iv. 1 (where Böhme regards δοκεῖ as used elegantius, while Kühnöl and Bleek judge more correctly) no remark is required. Cf. in general, Bornem. 635 schol. p. 52 sq.

d. Most of the passages in the Gospels where critics have considered ἀρχεσθαι as pleonastic (cf. too Valcken. Selecta I. 87), have been correctly explained by Fr. Mthh. p. 539 sq. cf. p. 766.
In regard to Luke iii. 8 Bengel hints at the truth: omnem excusationis etiam conatum praecidit. In particular, it is quite absurd to regard this verb as redundant in Luke xii. 45; xxi. 28; 2 Cor. iii. 1. In Jno. xiii. 5 ἥρφασεν indicates the commencement of the action whose completion is related in vs. 12. Acts xxvii. 35 is explained by vs. 36: Paul's ἀρχεσθαι ἐσθίειν was an invitation to the rest to do the same. In Acts xi. 15 Kühnöl adduces as a reason why ἀρχεσθαι λαλεῖν must be equivalent to λαλεῖν: ex x. 43 patet, Petrum jam multa de rel. chr. disseruisse etc. But ἀρχεσθαι λαλ. primarily designates only the commencement of the discourse, which for that very reason has not yet been completed (Peter intended to continue to speak, x. 44 ἐτι λαλοῦντος τοῦ Π.). But why this commencement is to be referred solely to the first six or eight words is not apparent. Moreover, it must not be overlooked that ἐν τῷ ἄρχεσθαι με λαλεῖν in an address, Acts xi., is stronger, as if: scarcely had I uttered a few words, when etc. In Acts xviii. 26 ἥρφασον is to be connected with ἄκοψαντες δὲ αἴτου etc. following. On Acts ii. 4 see Meyer. Likewise in Acts xxiv. 2 the discourse of Tertullus, which to judge from the introduction vs. 3 was undoubtedly intended to be of greater length, probably was interrupted by the corroboration of the Jews vs. 9, and Paul himself broke in immediately after; or vs. 2 is to be taken thus: as soon as he was called, Tertullus began etc. (began his discourse forthwith).

e. In regard to θέλειν (Gataker, Mr. Ant. 10, 8) in Jno. v. 35, see Lücke’s careful examination of the subject. More plausible 571 is 2 Tim. iii. 12 πάντες οἱ θέλοντες εὐσεβῶς γίνεται. But the meaning of these words is: all who determine, who are minded, to live piously etc. In Heb. xiii. 18 the import of θέλοντες is obvious. Jno. vii. 17 was correctly understood by Kühnöl. And in Jno. vi. 21 that expositor has rejected Bolten’s arbitrary explanation; a difference between it and Mark vi. 51 will have to be acknowledged. In 1 Cor. x. 27 καὶ θέλετε πορεύεσθαι is: and you are willing, decide, to go (instead of declining the invitation). On 1 Pet. iii. 10 see Huther.

f. In opposition to Kühnöl, who considers δύνασθαι in Matt. ix. 15 as pleonastic, see Fr. By BCrus. it is erroneously made 637 to signify be allowed or desire. Still less should the authoritative word redundat mislead us in Luke xvi. 2 and Jno. vii. 7. In the latter passage, in particular, there is obviously an intended difference between δύνασθαι μοιεῖν and μοεῖ.
Among nouns erroneously supposed to be sometimes used pleonastically, must be specially mentioned ἡγον when followed by a Genitive (Boisson. Nicet. p. 59) e.g. Rom. ii. 15 ἡγον νόμου, Eph. iv. 12; 1 Thess. i. 3 (see Koppe); see in opposition Fr. on Rom. as above. In 1 Thess., as above, the very parallelism of ἡγον τῆς πίστεως with κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης forbids our taking ἡγον as a pleonasm; see de Wette in loc. The correct view of Eph., as above, has already been given by Flatt. From the Greek authors, also, no instance of ἡγον as a pleonasm can be adduced. In Polyacen. 1, 17 ἡγον τοῦ λόγου undoubtedly means the matter of the oracle, the deed foretold in the oracle. In Diog. L. prooem. 1 το τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἡγον is the occupation of philosophizing, the cultivation of philosophy, cf. 542 just afterwards ἀρχαὶ φιλοσοφίας (in Latin cf. virtutis opus Curt. 8, 14, 37; probationis opus Petr. fragm. 28, 5), not precisely the fabric, system, of philosophy. Χρημα is different from ἡγον, and even χρημα with a Genitive is not properly a pleonasm, see Passow under the word. As to ὑνωμα (very frequently regarded as pleonastic, see Kühnöl on Jno. p. 138) Wahl has already given the true view (cf. v. Hengel, Philipp. p. 160), see also my Simon. lexic. Hebr. under ὑνωμα; yet this word certainly requires a more precise handling than it has yet received in N. T. Lexicons. (As to a periphrastic use of ὑνωμα in Greek poets, see Mth. 965.) In Col. ii. 16 ἐν μερει ἡγον τῆς νομίμου ἡ σαββατών is no more pleonastic than in respect (or in the matter) of holidays, new moons, etc. Lastly, in Rom. vi. 6 σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας is a single composite idea, the body of sin, i.e. the (human) body; respecting the relation of which to sin no reader of Paul's epistles can be at any loss. See above, p. 188.

8. Nearly all the earlier expositors asserted, that by a sort of half pleonasm καλείοθαι is used for εἶναι (Graev. lection. Hesiod. p. 22; Porson, Eurip. Hippol. v. 2; Blomfield, Aesch. Pers. p. 128; on the other hand, Ellendt, lexic. Soph. I. 912), in which use at the same time there was thought to be a Hebraism (καλείθη, esse). But Bretsch. lex. man. p. 209 sets the matter right by saying: sum videlicet ex aliorum sententia. Cf. van Hengel, Cor. p. 53 sq. 572. As to καλείθη see my Simon. lex. p. 867. In the N. T. καλείοθαι always signifies to be named, to be called, Jas. ii. 23; Matt. v. 19; xxi. 13, especially in reference to names of honor, which denote the possession of a certain dignity, Matt. v. 9; Luke i. 76; 1 Jno. iii. 1; Rom. ix. 26. It is used even as antithetical to εἶναι (to be), 638 1 Cor. xv. 9 (even so much as to bear the name of an apostle), Luke xv. 19. Nor can ὑνωμάζεσθαι Rom. xv. 20 (1 Cor. v. 1); Eph. i. 21; iii. 15; v. 3 be weakened down to a mere esse; (it is even emphatic, as μηδέ in the last passage shows).¹

¹ The passages adduced by Schwarz, Comment. p. 719 sq., from Greek authors to
utter perversion when many expositors render even Heb. xi. 18 ἐν Ἰσαάκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα: existet tibi posteritas; (Schulz, too, very inaccurately translates it: thou wilt receive offspring).

Εὑρίσκεσθαι also is said (see Pott on 1 Cor. iv. 2; cf. the annotators on Plut. educ. 13, 5), like ἀνήκ (cf. on the other hand my Simonis p. 575), often to be used instead of εἶναι. But these two verbs are always distinguished from each other by this, that εἶναι denotes the quality of a thing in itself, while εὑρίσκεσθαι denotes that quality as found, discovered, recognized, in the subject. Matt. i. 18 εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχονσα it proved (it appeared) that she was with child (ἡ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα might have been previously said), Luke xvii. 18 εὐθείᾳ εὐρήσαν ἐποστρέψαντες δόγμα δόξαν τῷ θεῷ εἰ μὴ ἄλλογενής οὖντος; were none found (as it were, did none show themselves) who returned? Acts viii. 40 Ὅλος τός εὑρήθη εἰς Ἀχαῖαν Φίλιππος was found (cf. πνεύμα κυρίον ἠπάνε τῶν Φιλ. vs. 39) at Ashdod (properly, transported to Ashdod, by the πνεύμα κύριον that carried him away), Rom. vii. 10 εὑρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἐν εἰς ζωὴν αὐτῆς εἰς ἦν εἰς θάνατον it proved, appeared, appeared (from Paul's personal experience vss. 8–10) that the commandment for life had become to me a commandment for death, Gal. ii. 17 εἰ δὲ ... εὑρήθησαν καὶ ἀνθρώπων: if we ourselves were found sinners (before God and man), 1 Cor. iv. 2; 2 Cor. v. 3; Phil. iii. 9; Rev. xii. 8 οὔτε τῶν εὐρήθη αὐτῶν ἦς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ neither was their place any more found (any more to be seen) in heaven, as we say: every trace of them was blotted out (cf. Rev. xvi. 20; xviii. 21; xx. 11), 1 Pet. ii. 22 οὔτε εὑρήθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ nor was guile found in his mouth, no guile could be detected in his words (Rev. xiv. 5). Phil. ii. 7 was correctly rendered by Luther. The Greek passages adduced as parallel, by Kyprke I. 2; Palairet p. 198; Schwarz et al., prove nothing. In Mr. Anton. 9, 9 τῷ συναγωγῷ ἐν τῷ κρείττονι ἐπιτευγμένον εὑρίσκετο etc. 578 εὑρίσκομαι retains its proper meaning: was found. Hierocl. in ἐν τῷ βιβλ. Pythag. p. 88 ed. Lond. ἀρχὴ μὲν τῶν ἀρετῶν ἡ φόνης εὑρίσκεται is: prudentia virtutum principium esse deprehenditur, 639 εἰς. it is found by the considerate that etc.; Eurip. Iph. Taur. 777 (766) ποῦ ποτ’ ἐνθ’ εὑρήμεθα; ubi tandem esse deprehendimus (deprehensi sumus)? whither does it turn out that we have wandered? In Joseph. antt. 17 (not 7), 5, 8 εὑρίσκει. refers to those very persons in whose opinion Herod wished to avoid standing

prove that καλεῖται or ἵνα μόνον is used for εἶναι, dispose of themselves for an attentive reader. The attempt to take nominari for esse in Cic. Flacc. 27 is truly ridiculous.
unfavorably. Cf. also Soph. Trach. 410; Aj. 1114 (1111); Diod. Sic. 3, 39; 19, 94; Athen. I. 381; Schweig. Philostr. Apoll. 7, 11; Alciphr. 1, 30. In Ignat. ad Rom. 3 οὐκέσθαι χριστιανόν and εὑρίσκεσθαι χριστιανόν are contrasted.¹

9. Among the particles, ὡς in particular has frequently been regarded as pleonastic, as in 2 Pet. i. 3 ὡς πάντα ἡμῶν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ ... δεισιομένης. But ὡς combined with the participle in the construction of the Gen. absol. imparts to the verbal notion the impress of subjectiveness, of a persuasion or purpose. Hence the preceding passage, taken in connection with vs. 5, must be rendered: persuaded (reflecting) that the divine power has bestowed on us all things, ... earnestly endeavor etc., ἡγούμενοι, ὡς ή θεία δύναμις ... δεισιομένη (1 Cor. iv. 18), cf. Xen. C. 3, 3, 4 ὡς εἰρήνης οὖσας on the understanding of there being peace, 3, 1, 9 ὡς τάλαθος ἐρώτος assured that I am telling the truth, cf. 6, 1, 37; Mem. 1, 6, 5; Strabo 9, 401; Xen. Eph. 4, 2; Dion. Hal. III. 1925; 544 see Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 320; Loesner, obs. p. 483; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 203; Fr. Rom. II. 360. (In Greek authors this particle is thus connected also with the Acc. absol., e.g. Xen. C. 1, 4, 21; An. 7, 1, 40.) Ἡ οὔ is likewise, with the same import, put before a Dative governed by a verb, Acts iii. 12 Ἡ ἡμῶν τῇ ἀτενίξετε ὡς ἴδη δύναμες ... πεποιηκόσιν etc. In Rom. xv. 15 ὡς ἐπανακμηνήσκων, the particle ὡς means as (of the characteristic): as one who reminds you according to the grace of God.

In Rom. ix. 32 ὡς σοι ἐπίστευσεν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐς ἐργον νόμον, the expression ἐς πίστευς denotes the objective standard; ὡς ἐς ἐργον, the purely imaginary. 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Jno. vii. 10; Philem. 14 also are to be traced back to a comparison. And Matt. vii. 29 ἐν διδάσκων ὃς ἐξονωμεν ἐκομμένων, Jno. i. 14 δοξαν ὡς μονογενον παρὰ πατρός, mean simply: as one having authority, as of the only begotten etc., and even in these instances the particle does not of itself indicate what exists revera, though, if we regard the sense, 640 this idea is implied in the comparison (exactly as, altogether as, like, i.e. the true, perfect glory of the Son of God, etc.).

In reference to ὡς ἐπί Acts xvii. 14 we have to remark, that ὡς joined to a preposition of direction (ἐπί, πρός, εἰς) expresses either the actual 574 purpose of taking a certain direction, or even the mere pretense or assumed appearance of doing so, Kühner II. 280. In the preceding passage, Beza, Grotius, and others have understood it in the latter sense;

¹ The same applies to the Latin invenire (e.g. Cic. Lael. 12, 42), which Schwarz in the like clumsy way represents as equivalent to esse. Even in Malalas ὄπλασθεν, in most passages, still retains clearly the significance of inveniri, e.g. 14 p. 372. So also in Theophan.; see the Index in the Bonn edition.
the former interpretation, however, is simpler and more suited to the context. As parallel instances, cf. Thuc. 5, 3; 6, 61; Xen. An. 1, 9, 23; 7, 7, 55; Diod. S. 14, 102; Polyb. 5, 70, 3; Arrian. Al. 2, 17, 2; 3, 18, 14. See besides, Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 1004. Also in ὡς ὅτι, in immediate succession¹ (as it were, as that), ὡς properly indicates that the statement introduced by ὅτι is a mere report, an alien or even pretended opinion, Isocr. Busir. argum. p. 520 κατηγόρου στό ὅτι ὅτι κανές δειμόνα εἰσφέρει. So also 2 Thess. ii. 2 εἰς τὸ μῆνιν σαλαβθάναι ὑμᾶς ... μήτε διὰ λόγου μητὲ δὲ ἐπιστολῆς ... ὡς ὅτι ἐνάτυχεν ἢ ἤμερα τοῦ κυρίου. In 2 Cor. xi. 21, likewise, this import of ὡς is perceptible (see Mey. in loc.), and in 2 Cor. v. 19, if the statement be regarded as the substance of the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς conferred. In the earlier authors, too, ὡς ὅτι is thus used Xen. H. 3, 2, 14; Dion. H. III. 1776.² Among the later (Theodore. epq. p. 1294) see Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 10 sqq. and Lehr. de Aristarch. p. 34. Similar, but decidedly pleonastic, is ὡς ἢν in Byzantine writers, as in Duc. 8. p. 31, 127; Jo. Canan. p. 467, 470 f. Still more strange is ἢν ὅτως Constant. Man. p. 62; Geo. Acropol. p. 62. (As to the earlier ὡς ἢν, see Bast, ep. crit. p. 48; Hm. opusc. I. 219 sq.)

10. A half pleonasm of a particle is found by Palairret p. 305, after Glassius, in Acts xiii. 34 μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, where μηκέτι is supposed to stand for the simple μή (as Christ had never gone to corruption). But the phrase εἰς διαφθοράν ὑποστρέφ. denotes, as so early a critic as Bengal per-sed, simply to (die and) be buried. The quotation from Aelian. 12, 52 is of no force; μηκέτι there signifies: no longer (as hitherto), just like ὠνκέτι in Jno. xxi. 6. Many used to teach a half pleo-nastic use of ὠνκέτι also; but likewise erroneously. In Rom. vii. 17 ἐνὶ δὲ ὠνκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ, ἀλλὰ ἢ ... ἁμάρτια ἐστί: 575 now, however, after having made this observation vs. 14 sqq., it is no longer I that do the evil, i.e. I can no longer consider myself the primary cause of it, cf. vs. 20. Rom. xi. 6 εἰ δὲ χάριτι, ὠνκέτι

¹ In Aristot. Pol. 3, 7 ὅτι is used differently; that is, ὅτι corresponds to an an-tecedent ὡς.
² For separated, so that ὅτι in the course of the sentence resumes ὅτι, both particles were used at an early period, Schoen. Isae. p. 294; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 566.
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εἰ ἔργον is: *if by grace, then (it is) no more (further) of works*, i.e. the latter thought is annihilated by the former, it can no longer exist. Rom. xiv. 13, 15; 2 Cor. i. 23; Gal. ii. 20; iii. 18 are plain. In Jno. iv. 42 οὐκέτι derives elucidation from vs. 41, where διὰ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ is antithetical to διὰ τῶν λόγων τῆς γυναικὸς vs. 39; two motives for πιστεύειν are distinguished, an earlier and a later. As to Jno. xv. 15 see Lücke. Moreover, Xen. A. 1, 10, 12 cannot be adduced in support of such a use of οὐκέτι, and still less (μηκέτι) Xen. Eph. 1, 13 (in Paus. 8, 28, 2 recent editors give οὐκ ἐστι, yet see Siebelis in loc.). Cf. also Lucian. Parasit. 12; Sext. Emp. Math. 2, 47; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 86. Likewise on Aelian. Anim. 4, 3 Jacobs admits that οὐκέτι is used for the simple negation paullo majore cum vi.

§ 66. CONDENSED AND EXPANDED STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES (BREVIOQUENCE, CONSTRUCTIO PRAEGNANS, ATTRACTION, ETC.).

1. The inherent predilection of the Greeks for terseness and compactness of discourse exhibits itself even in prose in various modes of expression, some of which are to be found in the N. T. They all, however, agree in this, that an intermediate member not absolutely essential to the sense is omitted, and the other parts of the sentence are drawn together into one compound whole. Cf. Mtth. 1538 ff.; Doedelein, de brachylogia sfrm. gr. et lat. 546 Erlang. 1831. 4to. This breviloquence is akin to ellipsis, yet different from it, inasmuch as in an elliptical sentence the grammatical structure always indicates the omission of a definite individual word, while in breviloquence the break is always covered up by the structure.

To breviloquence belong the following cases:

a. To a protasis is joined an apodosis without a direct connection: Rom. xi. 18 εἰ δὲ κατακαυχάσασθαι, οὐ σὺ τὴν ἰδίαν βαστάζεις, ἀλλὰ ἡ ἰδία σε but if thou ... then know or reflect that, not thou, etc. 1 Cor. xi. 16. The full structure would be: ἵσθι (διανοοῖ), ὅτι οὐ σὺ etc.; cf. Clem. ad Cor. I. 55. The sentence could not be called elliptical unless it ran thus: εἰ δὲ κατακ., ὅτι οὐ σὺ etc.; then ὅτι would point to an actually omitted word, such as, know or consider. In like manner, in Latin, scito is often suppressed between the protasis and the apodosis, Cic. or. 2, 12, 51. Cf. also 1 Jno. v. 9 εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνομεν, ἡ μαρτυρία.
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576 τοῦ θεοῦ μεκανὸν ἐστὶν, we must consider that the testimony of God etc., or, we must much more receive the testimony of God, which etc.; 1 Cor. ix. 17. (In Rom. ii. 14, however (Fr.), the protasis and the apodosis are connected without any difficulty.) In Matt. ix. 6 ἦν δὲ εἰδήτε, ὅτι ἔξωσιν ἔχει ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ... (τοῦτο λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ) ἔγερθε δὲ ἐν τῇ χλίνῃ, where the words inserted by the Evangelist do not belong to the structure of the sentence: that ye may know ... stand thou up and take etc., i.e. the paralytic shall at my command immediately rise up, I command the paralytic: Stand up etc. (analogous to this are the constructions so frequent in the orators, such as Dem. cor. 329 c. ἦν τοίνυν εἰδήτε, ὅτι αὐτὸς μοι μαρτυρεῖ ... λαβῶν ἀνάγμωθι τῇ ψυφίσμα διον, see Kypke and Fr. in loc.). Jno. ix. 36 καὶ τὰς ἑστὶν, κύριε, ἦν πιστεῦσον εἰς αὐτὸν; sc. I wish to know, in order that etc., cf. i. 22.

A breviloquence similar to that in sentences with ἦν takes place when through ἀλλ' ἦν an event is referred to a prophetic prediction, as in Jno. xv. 25; xiii. 18; Mark xiv. 49; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9. Yet in such passages what is wanting before ἦν may usually be supplied from the preceding context, see Fr. exc. i. 1 ad Matt. p. 841.

b. To a general predicate, the appropriate verb of which is omitted, a special verb (with its predicate) is directly annexed: Phil. iii. 13 f. ἐγὼ ἐγερμένον ὦ λογίσμωι κατειληφέναι, ἐν δὲ, τὰ μὲν ὅπισώ ἐπιλαμβανόμενος, τοὺς δὲ ... κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω etc. for ἐν δὲ ποιῶ, κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω, cf. Liv. 35, 11 in eos se impetum facturum et nihil prius (facturum), quam flammam tectis injecturum. 2 Cor. vi. 13 τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ... πλατύνθητε καὶ ἔμειν, ἕτο τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ ἐστὶν ἀντιμισθία etc. see Fr. diss. in 2 Cor. II. 115; as to the Acc., however, cf. Hm. opusc. I. 168 sq. Similar is Jude 5 δι' ὧν κύριος λαοί ἐκ γῆς Ἀιγύπτου χώσας τὸ δεύτερον 613 τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπόλεσεν. Here the verb to be connected 547 with τὸ δεύτ. would properly have been οὐκ ἐσώσε (ἀλλὰ etc.):: the Lord, after having delivered them, did, on a second occasion (when they were in need of his helping grace), refuse them his delivering grace and destroy them etc. Cf. further Rom. xi. 23 δύνατος ἐστὶν ὁ θεος πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτοῖς. The αὐτοῖ are those that grew upon the stock κατὰ φύσιν; they therefore cannot be ingrafted on the stock again. In strictness the language ought to run: again to unite them to the stock, viz. by ingrafting.

On the other hand, Col. iii. 25 ὡς κομμέναι δ ἀνθρώποι could hardly in accordance with the genius of the Greek language be regarded as
brachylogical. It denotes (according to the signification of κομίζομαι) pretty nearly: he *will* 
*rep* the wrong; not that he will suffer the same 
wrong which he has committed, but its fruits, the reward of it, the wrong 
in the form of penalty. Cf. Eph. vi. 8. Similar to this are Jno. xii. 5 
διὰ τινὰ τὸ τοῦ μισαν οὐκ ἐπράβη ... καὶ ἰδίη τωχοῖς; — and (the proceeds) 577 
given to the poor (strictly, and in the form of money arising from the sale 1st al 
given to the poor), and 1 Cor. xv. 37.

c. Acts i. 1 δὲ ἤρθοτο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν ἀρχῆ ἥ 
κατέργασι; etc., i.e. *what* Jesus began, and consequently continued, 
to do and to teach until the day etc. (vs. 22 ?) ; much like Luke 
xxiii. 5 διδάσκων καθ’ ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρξόμενος ἀπὸ τῆς 
Γαλααίας ἐως ὁδεις ἀρχαιολογίας, and continuing to this place, 
and Matt. xx. 8 ; Jno. viii. 9 ; Strabo 12, 541. The construction 
proposed for these last passages by Fr.: διδάσκων ἐως ὁδε, ἀρξόμ. 
ἀπὸ τ. Γαλα. (Lucian. somn. 15), is too artificial. The assertion 
of Valckenaer, however, and Kühnlô, that in Acts i. 1 ἀρχεσθαι is 
pleonastic, seems to be a mere makeshift.

2. Brachylogy appears with especial frequency, and was noticed 
by the ancient grammarians,

d. in what is called constructio praegnans (which connects a 
preposition with a verb that includes another as consecutive); as, 
2 Tim. iv. 18 σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν will save me into his kingdom, 
i.e. save me, translating me into etc. Acts xxiii. 24 ; 1 Pet. iii. 20 
(Her. 7, 230 ; Xen. A. 2, 3, 11 ; Polyb. 8, 11, 1 ; Lucian. 
asin. 56 etc., cf. my 5th comment. de verb. compos. p. 9), 2 Tim. ii. 26 
ἀνανύφωσον εἰς τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος, Matt. v. 22 ἐνακόσιος ἑστα 
eis την γένναν (§ 31, p. 213), Rom. viii. 21 ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ 
tῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης etc. (see Fr. 
in loc.), Acts v. 37 ἀπέστησε λαὸν ἰκανῶν ὡπὶ οὗτοι, xx. 30 ; 
2 Cor. xi. 3 μῆτα ... φθορῆ τὰ νοήματα ὁμοιωμένων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλοτητοῦ, 
Acts viii. 40 Φιλ. εὐφρενί τε εἰς Ἀξίων (Rom. vii. 10). See, further, 
Acts xxiii. 11 ; Luke iv. 38 ; xviii. 3 ; Gal. v. 4 ; Rom. v. 2 ; 
i. 3 (xv. 28) ; xvi. 20 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13 ; xv. 54 ; 2 Cor. x. 5 ; Heb. 644 
3 ; x. 22 ; Eph. ii. 15 ; 1 Tim. v. 15 ; 1 Pet. iii. 10. According 
to some, Heb. v. 7 also comes under this head, see Bleek in loc. 
(Ps. xxii. 22 Hebr.; Ps. cxvii. 5 Sept.) ; with more certainty 
Mark vii. 4 does. This species of conciseness occurs frequently

1 The passage must be rendered: (on returning) from the market (like Arrian. Epict. 
3, 19, 5 ὁ μὴ ἐπικαίρων φαγεῖν ἐκ Βαλαμαίου), if they have not washed themselves, they 
eat not. To refer βαστισθομεν to the food (as Kühnlô does), would be opposed not so 
much by the usus loquendi (for βαστισθομεν, derived from βαστις, is in vs. 4 obviously
548 in Greek prose, cf. Markland, Eurip. suppl. 1205; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 60; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 292 sq.; on the Hebr., however, see Ewald S. 620. Expressions such as κρύπτειν or κλείειν τι ἀπὸ τινος (1 Jno. iii. 17), μετανοεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας (Acts viii. 22) 578 or ἐκ τῶν ἔργων etc. (Rev. ix. 20 f.; xvi. 11), ἀποβλέπειν and ἄφοράν εἰς Heb. xi. 26; xii. 2, παραλαμβάνειν εἰς Matt. iv. 5, άσφαλίζεσθαι τοὺς πόδας εἰς τὸ ξύλων (Acts xvi. 24), συγκλείειν τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπελευθέρων (Rom. xi. 32), originate in like manner from a constructio praegnans, though by us it is scarcely felt. On βασιλεῖας τινὰ εἰς τινα, see Fr. Rom. I. 859. In general, cf. further Fr. Mr. p. 322, also § 50, 4 p. 413 sq.

e. in what is called Zeugma (synizesis), when two nouns are construed with a single verb, though only one of them, the first, directly suits it (cf. Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 429 sq.): 1 Cor. iii. 2 γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρώμα, where ἐπότισα suits γάλα only, and for βρώμα we must educe from this verb the idea to feed, cf. Acta apocr. p. 60; Luke i. 64 ἀνεύξθη τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ... καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ, where properly ἀλήθη (cf. Mark vii. 35) must be understood for γλῶσσα (and a few authorities have it), see Raphel in loc.¹
In 1 Tim. iv. 3 κωλύοντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρομάτων, the word κωλύοντων (or with the Scholiast in Matthaei εἰσγρομένων) must be deduced from κωλ. (i.q. κελέω, μή) for the latter Inf.; [in the same way in 1 Thess. ii. 8 the simple verb δοῦναι from the foregoing compound μεταδούναι must be supplied with ἄλλα καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχὰς]. And lastly, 1 Cor. xiv. 34. Cf. Soph. Oed. R. 242; Eurip. Phoenix. 1223; Plat. rep. 2, 374 b. (yet see Stallb. in loc.)
645 Protag. p. 327 c.; Demosth. cor. § 55, see Dissen in loc.; Arrian. Al. 7, 15, 5. In Greek authors, sometimes from the first verb must be deduced one of exactly the opposite import for the second member of the sentence, Kühner II. 604; Stallb. Plat. Cratyl. p. 169. This was applied to Jas. i. 9, 10, where it was thought ταπεινούσθω (or αἰσχυνέσθω)² to be understood with ὀ δὲ applied to things), or by the Mid. voice, for this might signify wash for themselves, as by the circumstance that in this way a very ordinary thought, and an unexpected one in the connection, is introduced. For, the washing of articles of food brought from the market was not a mere precept of Pharisaism, but a proceeding required by the nature of the case and by the spirit of the Mosaic laws concerning purification.

¹ That ἀνεύξθη γλῶσσα could be employed in plain prose is not proved by what has been adduced by Segar in loc. We may remark also, in passing, that the zeugma usually quoted from Her. 4, 106 disappears in the edition by Schweighäusen, in which the text is: ἐσθήτα δὲ φορέως ... γλῶσσας δὲ ἱππὸ ἱχυσακ. As, however, there is no MS. authority for ἱχυσακ, later editors have with reason declined to follow him.
² The passage quoted by Hottinger in loc. from Plat. rep. 2, 367 d. runs as follows,
But this is unnecessary; and the thought is finer if καυχώσω is made to apply also to the second member, see my Observ. in ep. Jac. p. 6. On 1 Cor. vii. 19 see above, § 64, 1 p. 583. For examples of Greek and Latin zeugmata, see d'Orville, Charit. p. 440 sq.; Wytenb. Plut. moral. I. 189 sq. ed. Lips.; Schaef. Dion. p. 103; Engelhardt, Plat. apol. p. 221; Bremi, exc. 3 ad Lys.; Vlc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 132; Funkhaenel, Demosth. Androt. p. 70; Hand, lat. Styl. p. 424 f.

f. in comparisons (Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 63, 494; Achill. 549 Tat. p. 747; Fr. Mr. p. 147), i.e. with the Comparative (cf. § 85, 5 p. 245) and in constructions with adjectives of resemblance, e.g. Rev. xiii. 11 εἰς χέρατα διό δομοία ἁρμίφ (properly ἁρνίον 579 κέρατο),1 as in Iliad. 17, 51 κόμαι Χάριηεσσον δομοία, Wisd. ii. 15; 11 ed. vii. 3; 2 Pet. i. 1 τοις ισότιμοι ἡμῖν λαχοῦδοι πλοτίων (for ισότ. τῇ ἡμῶν πλοτεί), Jude 7. Cf. also Xen. Cyr. 5, 1, 8 δομοία ταῖς δουλαίς εἰς τὴν ἐσθήτα, 6, 1, 50 ἁρματα ἐκ τοῦ ἰππικοῦ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ δομοί ἐκείνω (i.e. τοῖς ἑκείνου), Iliad. 1, 163 οὐ μὲν σοὶ ποτε ἵσον ἔχω γέρας (i.e. ἵσον τῷ σῷ), Arrian. Epict. 1, 14, 11; Mth. 1016. This breviloquence in comparisons is, however, in the Greek authors much more diversified still, see Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 6; 2, 1, 15; Hier. 1, 88; Isocr. Evag. c. 14; Diod. S. 3, 18; Ael. anim. 4, 21; Dion. H.I. 111; see Wytenb. Plut. Mor. I. 480 sq.; Schaef. Apollon. Rhod. II. 164; melet. p. 57; Demosth. III. 468; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 153; rep. I. 134, also Heinichen, Euseb. II. 154. In the N. T. under this head come also 1 Jno. iii. 11 f. αὐτή ἡ ἀγγελία ἦν ἥκοισατε ἀπ’ ἁρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους· οὐ καθ’ ὑμᾶς Κάιν ἐκ τοῦ ποιηροῦ ἦν etc. Strictly, there is nothing to be supplied (δομοί or ποιηροῖ would not suit οὗ), but the comparison is expressed carelessly, and the reader easily sets it to rights for himself: that we love each other, not as Cain was of the wicked one 648 etc. will, or should, it be with us.2

Luke xiii. 1 ἐν τῷ αἵμα Πιλᾶτος ἦμερε μετὰ τῶν θυσίων αὐτῶν (for μετὰ

1 Rev. ix. 10 probably does not come under this head. The comparing of tails to scorpions is nearly in the style of the poet, and is sustained by other passages, see vs. 19 and cf. Züllig in loc.

2 Cf. Demosth. Mid. p. 415 a. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ πολιτικῆς αἰτίας, οὐδὲ ἐπερ Ἀριστοφάνης ἀποδείκνυται στράτου οἰκεῖος ἦν τὴν προβολήν not on account of a political offence, and did not like A. ... quash the proceeding, i.e. nor acting in the way by which A. quashed the impeachment. In opposition to Reiske, who would here insert δι, see Spalding in loc.
3. g. It may be considered as breviloquence also, when a word which should have a clause of its own is directly appended (or even prefixed) to a clause as an apposition; e.g. 2 Tim. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 3 etc. (see § 59, 9 p. 533) and (according to the usual reading) Mark vii. 19 εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρόνα ἐκτοπευται, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα. Akin to this is the proleptic use of adjectiva effectus (in a sort of apposition), as in Soph. Oed. Col. 1202 τῶν σῶν ἀδερκῶν ὄμματων τιτώμενος for ὧστε γένεσθαι ἀδερκτα. This usage is not merely poetic and oratorical, Schaeff. Demosth. I. 239; V. 641; Erfurdt, Soph. Antig. 786; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 278; Heller, Soph. Oed. Col. p. 522 sqq., — but is used also in prose, Ast, Plat. legg. p. 150 sqq.; Plat. polit. p. 592; Vlc. Fritzsche, quaestion. Lucian. p. 39, 57; Weber, Demosth. 497. See, in general, Meyer de epithet. ornantt. p. 24 and Ahlemeyer Pr. on the poetic prolepsis of the Adject. Paderborn 1827. 4to. From the N. T. might be referred to this head, Matt. xii. 13 (ἡ χείρ) ἀπεκατεστάθη υγιής (Bornem. schol. p. 39; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 76; my Simonis p. 262), Rom. i. 21 ἑκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία, 2 Cor. iv. 4 θεὸς ἐτύφλωσε τα νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, 1 Thess. iii. 13 στηρίξαι τὰς καρδιὰς ύμῶν ἀμέριπτους etc., Phil. iii. 21 μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα ... ἡμῶν σὺ μορφοῦ τῷ σώματι etc. (where some Codd. subjoin after ἡμῶν: εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ), 1 Cor. i. 8. This construction, however, is hardly admissible, at least in respect to Rom. i. and 2 Cor. iv. In the former passage the import of ἀσύνετος (having reference to ἐματαιώθησαν preceding) is less strong than that of σκοτίζεσθαι (as Flatt perceived), and in 2 Cor. Paul probably conceives of enlightenment as proceeding from a general faith in Christ. Because they did not turn to Christ, but at once rejected him, they did not obtain enlightenment.

With the instances first adduced must be classed also Luke xxiv. 47 ἐδει παθεῖν Χριστὸν ... καὶ ἀναστήσει ... καὶ κηρυχθήσει ἐπὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ 647 μετάνοιαν, ... ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ Ἴρενωσαλῆ, where the participle (as frequently ἔζων, παρὰν Vig. p. 329) is used absolutely and impersonally: whilst (so that) it was begun, cf. Her. 3, 91 ἀπὸ δὲ Ποσειδίου πόλεως ... ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ ταῦτα μέχρι Αἰγύπτου ... πανηκοτα καὶ τρικόσια τάλαντα φόρος ἄρ, see J. L. Schlosser, vindicat. N. T. locor., quor. integritatem J. Marcland. suspectam redere non dubitavit (Hamb. 1732. 4to.) p. 18 sqq. This English critic (ad Lysias p. 653, Reiske VI.) wanted to read ἀρξάμενον.

A sort of breviloquence occurs in Acts i. 21 ἐν παρα κρόνῳ, (ἐν) ὁ ἀκ-
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ηλθε και ἔξηλθεν τῷ ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς for εἰσήλθε τῷ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἔξηλθε ἀφ’ ἡμῶν. But such diffuseness would have been intolerable to every classic author also, cf. Eurip. Phoen. 536 ἐς οίκους εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἔξηλθ’ (where to be sure the arrangement is more simple) and Valcken. in loc. See also Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 289.

Note. In Acts x. 39 there would in like manner be a brachylogy in the words καὶ ἡμῖν μάρτυρες τῶν ἐν ποιόσον . . . δν καὶ (the reading according to the best authorities [Cod. Sin. also]) ἀνέλαυν κρεμάσαντες εἰς ξίλων, if the meaning were: we are witnesses of all that he did, also of this, that they put him to death. But this acceptation is not necessary. Besides, whatever opinion others may hold, καὶ here means nothing else than etiam (adex), and the rendering tamen (Kühnöl) is in this connection very doubtful. Likewise Luke xxiv. 21 τρέχει ταύτῃ ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον, cf. 2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1, could only be regarded as a brachylogy by taking German as the standard. In Greek the numeral was considered simply as a predicative adjunct, cf. Achill. Tat. 7, 11 ιετὐ ταύτῃ ἡμέραν γέγονεν ἄφαντης, Dion. Hal. IV. 2055 τρικοστὸν τῶς τούτο ἀνεχόμεθα etc. see Bornem. Luc. p. 161 and on analogous cases Krü. 297. Further, there is no brachylogy in 1 Cor. i. 12 οὐκαίτο ἡμῶν λέγειν ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλών, ἐγὼ δὲ Κητᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ. In these four statements Paul intended to comprehend all the declarations current in the church respecting religious partisanship; each uses one of the following expressions. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 26. Lastly, 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτα τῶν ἡμᾶς, rightly understood, contains no brachylogy, see § 58, 3 p. 518.

4. But the Greek language has a method of blending sentences and parts of sentences so as to give discourse still greater compactness and conciseness, viz. by means of what is called Attraction (Btttm. Gr. § 538, 1), which can be termed a species of brachylogy only under one point of view. The name of Attraction, as is well known, has been given by modern grammarians to that mode of expression by means of which two portions of discourse (especially clauses), logically (in sense) connected, are also grammatically (formally) blended. A word (or assemblage of words), which properly belongs to but one of these portions (clauses), is gram. 648 matically extended to the other, and so applies to both at once (to the one clause, logically, and to the other, grammatically), as urbem, quam statuo, vestra est; where urbē properly belongs to vestra est (for there are two propositions: urbē vestra est, and quam statuo), but is attracted by the relative clause and incorporated into it, so as now to belong to both clauses, logically to vestra est, and grammatically to quam statuo. See Hm. Vig. p. 891 sqq.,1

1 Hm. as above: Est attractio in eo posita, si quid eo, quod simul ad duas orationes partes referatur, ad quorum alteram non recte referatur, ambas in unam conjungit. Cf.
in particular G. T. A. Krüger, gramm. Untersuch. 3 Theil. The copious diversity of this mode of expression encountered in Greek authors, does not, indeed, occur in the N. T.; yet even there we find not a few instances of attraction which were not recognized as such by the earlier expositors, and which, to say the least, created no small difficulty in interpretation (see e.g. W. Bowyer, Conjectur. I. 147).

5. Attraction in general, so far as it affects the connection of sentences or clauses, may be reduced to three principal sorts: Either, 1. something is attracted from the dependent by the principal clause; or, 2. the principal clause transfers something to the dependent (accessory) clause; or, 3. two clauses, predicated of one and the same subject, are blended into one.

The 1st sort comprehends such constructions as the following:

a. 1 Cor. xvi. 15 οἶδα τὴν οἴκην Στεφάνα διὰ ἐστίν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαλας, Acts ix. 20 ἐκήρυσσεν τὸν Ἱησοῦν δι᾽ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ. This is very frequent, when objective clauses follow a verb of observing, knowing, showing, or declaring, as Mark xi. 32; xii. 34; Acts iii. 10; iv. 13; xiii. 32; xv. 36; xvi. 3; xxvi. 5; 1 Cor. iii. 20; xiv. 37; 2 Cor. xii. 3 f.; 1 Thess. ii. 1; 2 Thess. 582 ii. 4; Jno. iv. 35; v. 42; vii. 27; viii. 54 (Arrian. Al. 7, 15, 7); xi. 31; Rev. xvii. 8 (Gen. i. 4; 1 Macc. xiii. 53; 2 Macc. ii. 1; 1 Kings v. 3; xi. 28, etc.). Also when interrogative clauses follow, 552 as Luke iv. 34 οἴδα σε, τίς εί, Mark i. 24 (see Heupel and Fr. in loc.; Boissonade, Philostr. epp. p. 143), Luke xix. 3 οἶδα τὸν Ἰησοῦν, τίς ἐστιν, cf. Schaef. ind. Aesop. p. 127; Jno. vii. 27 τὸν τόν οἴδαμεν, πώς ἐστίν (Kypke in loc.), Acts xv. 36 ἐπισκεψάμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ... τῶν ἐκουσα, 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Jno. xiii. 28 (Achill. Tat. 1, 19; Theophr. char. 21; Philostr. ep. 64). And the same form of anticipation occurs from clauses with ἢν, μή etc.

649 Col. iv. 17 ἐλέπε τὴν διακονίαν, ἢν αὐτὴν πληροῖς, Rev. iii. 9 ποιήσω αὐτοῦς, ἢν ἤξουσι, Gal. vi. 1 σκοτῶν σεαυτῶν, μὴ καὶ σὺ περασθῇ, iv. 11 φοβοῦμαι ύμᾶς, μήτωμεν εἰκῇ κεκοπιάκα εἰς ύμᾶς (cf. Diod. S. 4, 40 τὸν ἀδελφὸν εὐλαβεῖσθαι, μὴποτε ... ἐπίθησα τῇ βασιλείᾳ, Soph. Oed. R. 760 δέδωκεν ἐμαυτὸν ... μὴ πολλ' ἄγαν εἰρημέν' ἢ μοι, Thuc. 3, 58; Ignat. ad Rom. I. φοβοῦμαι τὴν ύμῶν ἄγατην, μὴ αὐτῆ μὲ ἀδικήσῃ, Varro R. R. 3, 10, 6; Caes. b. gall. 1, 39; cf. Krü. S. 164 f.). In the Passive 1 Cor. xv. 12 Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται


1 1 Cor. xv. 2 does not come under this head, see § 61, 7 p. 561.
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b. Rom. i. 22 φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμφάνισαν, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρείττων ἢν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπερωτάτω... ἡ ἐπιγνώσειν ἐπιμερὴς etc. § 44, 2 p. 320; Kühner II. 355. This sort of attraction has not been adopted in Acts xv. 22, 25 (Elsner, obs. I. 428 sq.); xxvi. 20; Heb. ii. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 8; Luke i. 74; cf. Bremi, Aeschin. fals. leg. p. 196.

c. Acts xvi. 34 ἡγαλλάσατο πεπιστευκὼς τῷ θεῷ, 1 Cor. xiv. 18 εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλῶσσαις λαλῶν (var.), see § 45, 4 p. 345.

d. The most simple attraction, but one of very frequent occurrence, is that in which a relative, instead of being put in the case (Acc.) required by the verb of the relative clause, is made to correspond to the verb of the principal clause, and consequently is put in the case governed by it: Jno. ii. 22 ἐπίστευσαν τῷ λόγῳ ὁ εἶπεν (for ὅν), see § 24, 1 p. 163.

e. Lastly, under this head would come 1 Pet. iv. 3 ἀρκετὸς ὁ παρελημμένος χρόνος τῷ βουλήμα τῶν ἑθῶν κατειργάθη, if, with Wahl, we were to resolve it thus: ἀρκετὸν ἐστὶν ἡμῖν, τῶν χρόνων... κατείργη. cf. Bttm. § 138, 1, 7. But there is no need of such nicety.

On the other hand it should not be said that in Phil. i. 7 δίκαιον ἐμοὶ τοῦτο φρονεῖν etc. attraction is neglected (Δικαίος εἰμὶ τ. φρόν.) Mth. 756, for the Greeks also use δίκαιον ἐστὶ with the Infin. impersonally; only they are less accustomed to connect with it the Dat. of the person, than to connect the personal word with the Infin. and put it in the Acc. Her. 1, 39. The former is the more simple and natural construction.

2) The simplest form in which a subordinate clause exerts an attraction on the principal clause is when the relative pronoun, which should agree in number and gender with the noun of the principal clause, agrees in these respects with the noun of the subordinate clause; as, 1 Tim. iii. 15 ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ, ἤτις ἐστὶν ἐκείνη, Rom. ix. 24 (σκεύη δέλεως) ὅς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς. In the following cases the attraction is carried still farther:

1 Anticipation is properly to be admitted only when the author applied beforehand to the subject the subsequent predication in the accessory clause. On the contrary, particularly when parenthetic clauses intervene, e.g. Acts xv. 36 the construction ἐνακραφάμεθα τοὺς ἄδελφους may at first have been alone intended, and τῶν ἄχουσιν subjoined merely for further explanation.
§ 66. CONDENSED AND EXPANDED STRUCTURE.

650 a. 1 Cor. x. 16 τὸν ἀρτόν ὃν κλώμεν οὐχὶ κοινωνίᾳ τοῦ σῶματος etc. Jno. vi. 29 ἵνα πιστεύσητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκείνος, see § 24, 2 a. pp. 164, 166, or Mark vi. 16 ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, αὐτὸς ἔστιν, see § 24, 2 b. p. 164, cf. Matt. vii. 9.

b. 1 Jno. ii. 25 αὐτὴ ἔστιν ἡ ἐπανγελία, ἡν αὐτὸς ἐπανελθασεν ἡμῖν τῇ ζωῇ τῇ αἰώνιοι for ζωή in apposition to ἐπανγελία 558 (see § 59, i. p. 580), Philem. 10 f.; Rom. iv. 24 ἀλλὰ καὶ δι᾽ ἡμᾶς, ὁλαὶ μέλλει να λογιζεῖθαι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν etc. (Rev. xvii. 8 var. ?). Luther understood Phil. iii. 18 also thus. Cf. further, Fr. Mr. 828; Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 216; II. 146; Kühn. II. 515.

c. Matt. x. 25 ἀρκετῶν τῷ μαθητῇ, ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ for καὶ τῷ δοῦλῳ (ἵνα γέν.) ὡς ὁ κύρ. etc.

d. Rom. iii. 8 τῇ ἐπὶ ἐγώ ὃς ἀμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; καὶ μῆ, καθὼς βλασφημοῦμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασὶ των ἡμῶν λέγειν, δι το θεόν ουμεν τὰ κακά, ἵνα etc., where the apostle ought to have made ποιεῖν κακά etc. dependent on καὶ μή, but, misled by the parenthesis, appends it to λέγειν in oratio recta. The same construction occurs not unfrequently in Greek authors, particularly in connection with a relative clause, see Hm. Vig. 743; Krüg. Unters. 457 ff.; Dissen, Dem. cor. 177, and on the Latin usage, Beier, Cic. off. I. 50 sq.; Grotefend, ausf. Gr. 462 f.

3) Two interrogative clauses following one another as predicates of one and the same subject are blended into one; as, Acts xi. 17 ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν ἡμῶν δυνατὸς κατέσκοψα τὸν θεόν; but I, who was I? had I power to withstand God? Cf. Cic. N. D. 1, 27, 78 quid censes, si ratio esset in belluis, non suo quasque generi plurimum tributuram fuisse? Luke xix. 15 τίς τί διεπραματευσάτο; Mark xv. 24 τίς τι ἄρη; see Hm. Soph. Aj. 1164; Eurip. Io 807; Lob. Soph. Aj. 454 sq.; Ellendt, lexic. Soph. II. 824; Weber, Demosth. p. 348 (as to Latin, Grotefend, ausf. Gram. II. 96; Kritz, Sallust. I. 211). For other modes of blending interrogative clauses by attraction, see Kühner II. 588 f. An interrogative and a relative clause are blended in Luke xvi. 2 τι τοῦτο ἄκοιν περὶ σου; quid est quod de to audio, see Bornem. in loc. Similar is Acts xiv. 15 τι ταύτα ποιεῖτε;

Luke i. 73 also I consider as an attraction: μυθοθῆκα διαθήκης ἀγίας αὐτοῦ, ὅρκον (for ὅρκον) δὲ ὅμως etc. Others, as Kühnöl, find here a double construction of μυθοθῆκα, which in the Sept. is also construed with the Acc. Gen. ix. 16; Exod. xx. 8,—a view previously adopted by an anonymous writer in the Alt. und Neu. for 1735. S. 836 f. 2 Pet. ii. 12
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οὐς ἰδοὺ; μαθηματικὸς, is probably to be resolved: ἐν τούτῳ, § 584 ἰδοὺ, μαθηματικὸς. A similar construction, μαθηματικὸς, εἰς τῷ, is of frequent occurrence (§ 32, 1 p. 222), cf. α) τρίτη 2 Sam. xxiii. 9, β) τὴν Isa. viii. 21 (to which perhaps may be compared also μνημονεύειν ἐν τῷ 3 Esr. i. 49; see, on the other hand, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16), though ἰδοὺ ἐν τῷ also is not without example in later writers; see Fabricii Pseudepigraph. II. 717.

6. But attraction is also confined to a single clause. In this case it is especially noticeable that two local prepositions are blended into one, and thus the clause gains in terseness (Hm. Vig. 893), Luke xi. 13 ὁ πατήρ ὁ οὗ ὄφραν δῷς πνεῦμα ἄγιον for ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐν ὄφραν δώσει οὗ ὄφραν ἄγιον. [Matt. xxiv. 17 τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ for τὰ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας.] Col. iv. 16 ἐκ Λαόδεικες ἐπιστολήν ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναργυρτε (not the letter written from Laodicea, but) the letter written to Laodicea and sent again from Laodicea.1 Cf. besides, Luke ix. 61 (Mark v. 26). 554 So too with adverbs of place, as an instance of which may be considered Luke xvi. 26 οἱ ἐκείθεν (Franke, Demosth. p. 13). With passages of the former class may also be numbered Heb. xiii. 24 ἀποκάλυψαι ὑμᾶς οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ (i.e. οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ); yet it might be also rendered: those from Italy, the Italian Christians (who were with the writer of the letter). A critical argument concerning the place where the letter was written should never have been found in these words. On the other hand 2 Cor. ix. 2 and Phil. iv. 22 are also intelligible without assuming an attraction. Such condensed expression is very frequent in Greek authors, cf. Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 5 ἀρπαγομενοὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων, Thuc. 2, 80 ἀδινάτων διτῶν ἔμβοηθεῖν τῶν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης Ἀκαρνάνων, Demosth. Phil. III. 46 etc. τῶν ἐκ Σερέλλου τείχους... στρατωτῶν ἐξίβαλεν, Paus. 4, 18, 1 ἀποφρίσαι τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης, Demosth. Timocr. 483 b.; Xen. An. 1, 2, 18; Plat. apol. p. 32 b.; Thuc. 3, 5; 7, 70; Lucian. eunuch. 12; Theophr. char. 2; Xen. Eph. 1, 10; Isocr. ep. 7 p. 1012 (Judith viii. 17; Sus. 26). See Fischer, Plat. Phaed. p. 318 sq.; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 119; Hm. Soph. Electr. 135 and Aeschyl. Agam. vs. 516; Ast, Theophr. char. p. 61; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 176 sq.; III. II. 889; Weber, Demosth. 191, 446.

7. On the other hand, sometimes a clause is grammatically resolved into two, which are connected by καί: Rom. vi. 17 χάρις

1 Ignorance of the frequency of this usage has determined several expositors, in spite of the context, to adhere to the translation the epistle (written by Paul) from Laodicea.
Corresponding to this idiom, only more limited, would be the figure of speech εν διά δοῦν (hendiadys), by which instead of one substantive with an adjective or Genitive (of quality) two substantives are used, the quality of the thing being thus for the sake of emphasis raised to a grammatical equality with the thing itself: pateris libamus et auro, i.e. pateris aureis. This is substantially an appositive relation: pateris et quidem auro, pat. h. e. auro, see Fr. exc. 4 ad Mt.; Teipel in the Archiv f. d. Stud. d. neunern Sprachen 10 Bd. 1 Heft. For a more exact view of the subject, see C. F. Müller in Schneidewin, Philol. VII. 297 ff. Expositors have in fact asserted the existence of this figure in the N. T. (Glass. philol. sacra I. 18 sq.), and some of them in the most unmeasured and injudicious terms (Heinrichs), e.g. Matt. iii. 11; Acts xiv. 13; Jno. i. 14; iii. 5; Heb. vi. 10. But even a sifted collection of examples (Wilke, Rhet. S. 149) does not furnish one that is unquestionable. Either the two notions connected together are really distinct, as in 2 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Pet. i. 16; or the second

1 Others, as finally Fr. also, lay the stress on the Preterite ἔστη, that ye were (that this is past); and this exposition may urge the position of ἔστη in its favor. But on this interpretation Paul would at any rate have expressed himself somewhat artificially, since ἔστη primarily designates their state only as having formerly existed, not from the present point of view as terminated, (ye were servants, not ye have been).
§ 67. ABNORMAL RELATION OF INDIVIDUAL WORDS.

Substantive is epexegetical (consequently, supplementary), as in (Rom. 6:5) Acts i. 25; xxiii. 6; Eph. vi. 18, cf. also 2 Cor. viii. 4 (καὶ and indeed, namely p. 437 c.), — a construction which, even though of the same genus with hendiadys, is of a different species. (Interpreters have wholly erred in wanting to find a hendiadys in the verb also, e.g. Phil. iv. 18.)

§ 67. ABNORMAL RELATION OF INDIVIDUAL WORDS IN A SENTENCE (HYPALLAGE).

1. Occasionally an irregularity may be noticed in the relation of individual words in a sentence. This occurs sometimes as constructio ad sensum (very frequent in Greek authors), — an irregularity which, to the reader who attentively observes the connection, cannot render the meaning either difficult or doubtful; at other times it may be characterized as an inadvertence on the part of the writer, who, busied with his thoughts, disregards accuracy of expression.

We notice,

a. The constructio ad sensum (πρὸς τὸ σημανώμενον or κατὰ σύνεσιν), examples of which have already been adduced in connection with the predicate and attributive § 58, and in connection with the pronouns § 21 (cf. also Rev. iii. 4).

b. The subject is omitted, and has to be indirectly supplied from the preceding context: 1 Cor. vii. 36 γαμεῖτωσαν viz. the two young persons who have associated together; as inferred from the preceding mention of a marriageable daughter. In Gal. i. 23 μόνον ἄκοινοις ἡσαν the notion of church members is to be gathered from ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις vs. 22 (cf. Caes. gall. 4, 14). There would be a similar instance in 1 Tim. ii. 15, if in ἐὰν μείνουσιν ἐν πλατεί the word τέκνα were to be supplied from τεκνογονίας preceding. This is grammatically admissible, cf. Plat. legg. 10 p. 886 d., where γενόμενοι is referred to θεογονία, as if the expression θέων γένεως had been employed, see Zell, Aristot. ethic. p. 209; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 29, 160; Küster (Reisig) Xen. Oecon. p. 247 sq., yet see above, § 58, 4 p. 516. In 1 Tim. v. 4 probably 556 for μανθανέτωσαν the subject χήρας is to be deduced from the collective τῆς χήρας, see Huther in loc., as a Plur. often refers to 654 τῆς (Rev. xiv. 11), see Herbst, Xen. mem. p. 50. On the other hand, in Rom. xiii. 6 λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ εἰσίν refers to οἱ ἄρχοντες vs. 3.

c. Sometimes there is a sudden change of subject: Ἰνο. xix. 4 f. ἐξῆλθεν δὲν πάλιν ὁ Πιλάτος καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: Ἡ δὲ ἀγω γῆν
§ 67. ABNORMAL RELATION OF INDIVIDUAL WORDS.

αὐτοῦ ἔξω ... ἐξήλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω ... καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς viz. Pilate, cf. xix. 38; Luke xix. 4 προδραμῶν ... ἀνέβη ἐπὶ συκομορέαν (Σακχαῖος), ἵνα ἔδῃ αὐτὸν ('Ἰησοῦν), ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἦμελλε ('Ἰησοῦς) διέρχεσθαι, cf. xiv. 5; xv. 15; xvii. 2; Mark ix. 20; Acts vi. 6; x. 4; Rom. x. 14 f.; Judith v. 8. On 1 Jno. v. 16, see § 58, 9 p. 523. In Greek prose authors this transition from one subject to another is not uncommon: Her. 6, 30 ὁ δὲ (Histiaeus) οὐτ' ἂν ἔπαθε κακῶν οὐδὲν, δοκεῖς ἡμοι, ἀπήκει (Darius) τ' ἂν αὐτῷ τ' ἄντα (Demosth. c. Phorm. p. 587 a. δς οὐκ ἐφασκεν οὔτε τὰ χρήματα ἐπεθείαθαι τοῦτον (Phormion), οὔτε τὸ χρυσόν ἀπειληφέναι (Lampis), 587 Plutarch. Poplic. compar. 5 ... προσέλαβεν (Popicola) δόσα δόντα ἀγαπητῷ ἡν νυκήσαι· καὶ γὰρ τὸν πύλημα διέλυνε (Porcosa) etc., vit. Lysand. 24 ἄλλο δ' οὐδὲν ἐχρήσατο (Agesil.) αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν πύλημα· ἄλλα τοῦ Χρόνου διελθόντος ἀπέπλευσεν (Lysand.) εἰς τὴν Σπάρτην etc., Ages. 40 τὴν βασιλεῖαν Ἀρχίδαμος ... παρελαβε, καὶ (sc. αὐτῷ) διέμεινε τῷ ἄγνει, Artax. 15 τοῦ κρατόφου τυχῶν κατέβαλον τὸν ἀνδρα, καὶ τέθηκεν (ουτος) etc., Lysias caed. Eratosth. 10 ἣν τὸν τυτθῆν αὐτῷ (παιδώ) διδῷ καὶ μη βοᾷ (τὸ παιδ.). Cf. Poppo, observ. in Thuc. p. 189; Schaeuf. Demosth. IV. 214 and Plutarch. IV. 281, 381; V. 86, 295; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. 215; Maetzner, Antiphon 145; Schoem. Is. 294. As to Hebrew usage, see Gesen. Lgb. 803.

d. Words referring to something antecedent are used in a loose reference. On αὐτός see § 22, 3 p. 145 sq. So in Gal. ii. 2 αὐτοῖς refers to 'Ἰερουσαλήμ vs. 1, but the inhabitants are meant. Similarly in Acts xvii. 16; 2 Pet. iii. 4 αὐτοῦ is to be understood of Christ, who has not been expressly named, but is intimated in παρουσία. In Jno. xv. 6 αὐτά refers to the Sing. τὸ κλήμα, which is in apposition to εἰς. In Acts iv. 7 αὐτοῖς; in a different way, refers, not to αὐτῶν vs. 5, but to vss. 1 and 2. In Acts x. 7 αὐτῷ refers, not to Simon vs. 6, but to Cornelius vss. 1–5, as is indicated even by some MSS., which read τῷ Κορνηλίῳ, a manifest gloss. In Acts vii. 24 πατάξας τῶν Ἀιγυπτίων, no Egyptian had been previously mentioned; the ἄδικων is merely hinted in ἄδικομενον, and that he was an Egyptian is assumed as known from the connection. Lastly, in 2 Jno. 7 ὄστος refers to πολλοὶ πλάνοι, and sums up in one person the plurality. Vice versa, in 1 Jno. iv. 4 αὐτοῖς refers to ἀντιχριστοῦ vs. 3. The reference of αὐτοῦ in Jno. 655 xx. 7, of αὐτῶν vs. 15, and of ἐκεῖνοι Jno. vii. 45 to the nearest subject, is more simple, see p. 157. It is an inaccuracy of construction also when a pronoun, especially a relative, serves in a
single form for two cases 1 Cor. ii. 9 à ὁβθαλμῶς οὐκ ἔλεγεν καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἠκούσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρ. οὐκ ἀνέβη Sept. Fundamentally this falls under the class of constructions treated of in § 64, I. 1 p. 581 sqq. The like occurs frequently in Latin also, Kritz, Sallust. I. p. 67; II. p. 295 sq.

e. Of two parallel members of a sentence, the first is sometimes expressed in such terms as to appear to comprehend the second, though from the nature of the case that is impossible: Acts xxvii. 22 ἀποβαλάθη 557 ζωγῆς οἰδείμα ποταὶ μὴ πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου would literally mean: there shall be no loss of life except of the ship; instead of which should have been said: there shall be no loss of life, only the loss of the ship. Similar is Gal. i. 19 ἵνα τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ ἔδωκαν, εἰ μή Ἰάκωβον τῶν ἀδελφῶν τοῦ κυρίου, if, with Fr. Matt. p. 482, we choose to render it: aliüm apostolum non vidi, sed vidi Jacobum etc., that is, so that it would be necessary 588 merely to repeat ἔδωκαν with Ἰάκ.; yet see my Comment. and Mey. in loc. Nearly the same use of εἰ μή occurs in Rev. xxi. 27 σοὶ μή εἰσέλθῃ ... τῶν κοινῶν καὶ δοσολογεῖ μελέτην μητρί τιμῆς οἰκεῖν, where the γεγραμμένων are not to be counted under τῶν κοινῶν. The meaning is rather: nothing profane shall enter; only they who are written etc. shall enter, ix. 4. Cf. 1 Kings iii. 18 οὐκ ἦταν οὐδεὶς μετὰ ἡμῶν παρεῖ ἐμφατέρων ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ.

2. The very structure of the sentence has been disturbed by the inadvertence of the writer in Luke xxiv. 27 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διηρμήνευεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ. Here it can hardly be assumed that to Moses and the prophets are opposed certain other books of the O. T. to which Jesus passed, nor, with Kühnöl, that Jesus first quoted the statements of the prophets, then, as a separate proceeding, began to interpret them (see van Hengel, annot. p. 104); but probably Luke meant to say: Jesus, beginning from (with) Moses, went through all the prophets; see also BCrus. in loc. Instead of this, having ἀπὸ in mind, he annexes πάντες προφηταὶ in the Genitive. Meyer’s device is unsatisfactory. In connection with this passage may be taken Acts iii. 24 πάντες οἱ προφηταὶ ἀπὸ Σαμουήλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς ὅσοι διάληκαν καὶ κατηγορεῖαν etc. Luke might have said, all the prophets, Samuel (as the first) and all his successors (in order) etc., or, all the prophets from Samuel downwards, as many of them etc. As the words now stand, they

1 In Heb. xii. 25 εἰ ἦκενοι οὐκ ἠφείσαν ... οὐλὸ μᾶλλον ἡμῖν εἰς those who (Kühnöl also) render τολμᾶν μᾶλλον by multo minus repeat for the apodosis ἠφείσαν alone. But the phrase retains its signification multo magis, and the entire negative notion οὐκ ἠφείσαν is to be repeated after it. Cf. Cæs. gall. 1, 47.
contain an unmistakable tautology. For even the division, pro-
posed by Casaubon and adopted by a host of expositors (including
Valckenaer), τῶν καθ. ὧνοι ἐδικ. does not help the passage
essentially. Still we have all the prophets from Samuel on, and
then, as if not already included in the foregoing, the whole succes-
sion that followed Samuel and prophesied. The expedient that
van Hengel (as above, p. 103) suggests, supplying ἔως Ἰωάννου
(Matt. xi. 18), is arbitrary, and gives only the equally inappropri-
ate sense: from Samuel and the succeeding prophets . . . to John,
whilst it was to be expected that two boundaries of this series
would be mentioned. Hengel thus gains at last merely Luke's
brachylogy (already explained p. 621): ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ . . . ἔως.

3. Formerly critics went much farther in discovering such inac-
curacies resulting from inadvertence. Namely,

a. A false reference of the attributive to the substantive, affecting
the grammatical form of the former, was thought to exist not
only in Acts v. 20 τὰ βήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταῖτης (for ταίτη), Rom.
vi. 24 see above, p. 237 sq., but also (Bengel on Luke xxii. 20;
τῆς ξοικείας τοῦ ἀριστο, τοῦ πνεύματος etc. instead of τὸ πνεῦμα,
iii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 7; Luke viii. 32; xxii. 20; and this supposed
species of hypallage was supported by examples from ancient
authors. In a sentence of some length, containing a variety of
relations, such inaccuracy, especially on the part of an unpractised
writer, would be quite possible. In the poets also passages might
be pointed out, which without some such assumption admit of
only a forced interpretation, cf. Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 73 sq.; Hm.
Vig. 891 and Soph. Philoct. p. 202 and Eurip. Hel. p. 7; Krüger,
grammat. Untersuch. III. 37 f. But in prose such instances are
p. 206; Heinichen, Euseb. II. 175); in the N. T. there is not a
single one that is unquestionable, see F. Woken, pietas crit. in
As to Eph. iii. 2, see my Progr. de Hypallage et Hendiadyi in N. T.
libris. Erlang. 1824. 4to. p. 15 and Harless in loc. In Eph. ii. 2,
where the apostle might most easily have strayed from the correct
construction, πνεῦμα is that spirit which pervades and rules men
of the world, and of which Satan is regarded as the lord and
master, see Mey. in loc. Heinichen, Euseb. II. 99, insists on the

 Cf. Gloss. philol. sacr. I. 652 sqq.; Jani, ara poet. lat. p. 258 sqq. On the other
hand, cf. Elster, de Hypallage. Helmst. 1845. 4to.
existence of hypallage. In 2 Cor. iii. 7 εἰ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θεαντοῦ ἐν γράμμασιν ἐν τετυπωμένη ἐν λίθοις, Paul might in contrast with διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος have said with greater simplicity: ἡ διακονία τοῦ γράμματος ἐν τετυπωμένου ἐν λίθοις. But the present connection of the words is not incorrect. Moses' ministry of death was in so far itself ἐν λίθοις ἐν τετυπωμένη, as it consisted in communicating laws threatening and inflicting death, and in administering them among the people. The letter of the law contained the ministry which Moses had to execute. Moreover, there is a grammatical resemblance between this passage and Tac. annal. 14, 16 quod species ipsa carminum docet, non impetu et instinctis nec ore uno βιους. In Heb. ix. 10 ἐπικείμενα is certainly not construed with δικαιώματα instead of ἐπικείμενοι, but δικαιώματα is in apposition to ἐπὶ βρώμασιν etc., and ἐπικείμενα corresponds to μὴ δυνάμενα, the neuter being selected because both, δόμα καὶ θυσία, are here included. According to the other reading, δικαιώματα, which is well supported [by Cod. Sin. also], 559 ἐπικείμενα can be referred to that appositive word quite regularly. 560 ἐπί. There is more appearance of irregular reference in Luke xxii. 20, where τὸ ὑπὲρ ὕμων ἐκχυνόμενον might have been construed with ἐν τῷ αἵματι. But it is not probable that in so short a sentence Luke should have employed ἐκχυνόμενον from inadvertence. It is more likely that, as he had connected δεδομένων with σῶμα, he joined ἐκχυν. to ποτήριον, meaning the contents of the cup, and this metonymy is easier still than the other, τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καυνὴ διαβήκη. This anomaly is obviously not of a grammatical, but of a logical kind, (although to pour out a cup may be said with entire correctness). Yet Schultmess (on the Lord's Supper, S. 155 f.) need not have grown so warm over the matter. In Heb. vi. 1 even Kühnöl has rejected the hypallage, alleged by Palaret and others. On Jno. i. 14 πληρῆς χάριτος etc. see § 62, 3 p. 564, and on 2 Cor. xi. 28 and Rev. i. 5, § 59, 8 pp. 532, 533. In 2 Cor. iv. 17 αἰώνιον βάρος δόξας cannot be taken for αἰώνιον βαρ. δόξας, for the reason that this would destroy the harmonious arrangement at which the apostle manifestly aimed (παραιτικά, αἰώνιον, ἐλαφρόν, βάρος, ὑλής, δόξα). On 1 Cor. iv. 3 see Meyer against Billroth and Rückert. In Acts xi. 5 εἶδον καταβαίνου σκεῦος τι, ὥς ὃδόνη μεγάλην, τέσσαραν ἀρχαίς καθιεμένην etc. must not be regarded as an hypallage, on being compared with x. 11 (καθιεμένον); the participles may be referred with equal propriety to σκεῦος or to ὃδόνη. It is difficult to decide on 2 Cor. xii. 21 μὴ ... πενθήσω
§ 68. REGARD TO SOUND, ETC.

We naturally ask, why not all impenitent sinners? Did Paul intend to say: τοὺς μὴ μετανοησάντας? As, however, in vs. 21 a different class of sins is named from that in vs. 20, we may, with Mey., conclude that the προμαρτυρία is more closely characterized by μὴ μετανοησάντ. as those that have remained impenitent only in reference to sins of sensuality, mentioned immediately after.

b. Akin to hypallage is antiptosis, which some (including Kühnöö) find in Heb. ix. 2 πράθεσις ἄρτων, as if for ἄρτοι πράθεσις (cf. as to this remarkable figure Hm. Vig. p. 890; Soph. Electr. p. 8; Blomfield, Æschyl. Agamemn. 148, 1360; Wytenb. Plat. Phaed. p. 232), nearly as the following passages have been understood: Plutin. Enn. 2, 1 p. 97 g. πρὸς τὸ βουλήμα τοῦ ἀποτελέσματος ὑπάρχει προσήκει for πρὸς τὸ βουλήμα ἀποτελεσμα, or Thuc. 1, 6 οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν εὐδαιμ.νῶν for οἱ εὐδαιμόνες τῶν πρεσβ. (see Scholiasts). But that N. T. passage is to be rendered quite simply: the exposition of loaves (the sacred usage of laying out loaves). Valcken. even wants to take ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόβ. ἄρτ. for ἡ τράπ. τῶν ἄρτων τῆς πρόβ. Lastly, it is altogether wrong to take, as do some (including Bengel), διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης in Rom. ix. 31 for δικαιοσύνην νόμον, see Fr. in loc. In reference to other alleged incongruities of this description, cf. the instructive 1st Exc. of Fr. on Mark, p. 759 sqq.

560 § 68. REGARD TO SOUND IN THE STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; PARONOMASIA AND PLAY UPON WORDS (ANNOMINATIO), PARRHESEIS, VERSE.

1. The general euphony of the N. T. style (in which cacophony but rarely appears, 1 Cor. xii. 2, cf. Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 105 and paralip. p. 58 sq.) was not for the most part the result of design. Only, in regard to paronomasia and nominatio, many instances may have been intentional. Paronomasia, which as is well known consists in the combination of words of similar sound, and is one of the favorite fancies of Oriental writers, is peculiarly frequent in the Epistles of Paul, partly, it should seem, accidentally, and partly studied by the writer in his desire to impart genial liveliness

---


2 See Verschür, dissertat. philol. exeget. p. 172 sqq.
to the expression, or greater emphasis to the thought; as, Luke xxi. 11 καὶ λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται (cf. the German Hunger und Kummer), Hesiod. opp. 226; Plutarch. Coriol. c. 13, see Valcken. in loc.; Acts xvii. 25 ζωήν καὶ πνεύμα (cf. the German leben und wehen, Hülle und Fülle, Saus und Braus, rüden und ändern, Varr. R. R. 3, 2, 13 utrum propter oves, an propter oves, see Baiter, Isocr. Paneg. p. 117); Heb. v. 8 ἐμαθεν ἄφ' ἀω ἐπαθεν (seine Leiden leiteten ihn zum Gehorsam, cf. Her. 1, 207), see Wetst. and Valcken. in loc.; Rom. xi. 17 τινὲς τῶν κλάδων ἔκκλασθησαν. Thus, in a series of words, the paronomastic are placed next to each other, as in Rom. i. 29, 31 (πορεία, πονηρία) φθόνον, φόνον ... ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνήθους (Wetst. in loc.). In other passages words of similar derivation are placed together; as, 1 Cor. ii. 13 ἐν διδακτοίς πνεύματος, πνευματικοὶ πνευματικὰ συγκερίνωτες, 2 Cor. viii. 22 ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις σπουδαῖοι, ix. 8 ἐν παντὶ πάντοτε πάσαν αὐτάρκειαν, Acts xxiv. 3; 2 Cor. x. 12 αὕτου ἐν ἐαυτοῖς ἐαυτοὺς μετροῦντες, Rom. viii. 23 αὕτοι ἐν ἐαυτοῖς στενάζομεν. Phil. i. 4 ( Xen. mem. 3, 12, 6 δυναστεία καὶ μανία πολλακίς πολλαῖς ... ἔμπιπτος, 4, 4, 4 πολλαῖς ὑπὸ τῶν δικαιῶν ἀφιεμένων, An. 2, 4, 10 αὐτοὶ ἐφ' ἐαυτῶν ἐκόρων, 2, 5, 7 πάντη γὰρ πάντα τοῖς θείοις ὑποχα καὶ πανταχὺ πάντων ἵνα οἱ θεοὶ κρατοῦσι, Polyb. 6, 18, 6; Athen. 8, 352; Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 22; Synes. prov. 2, p. 116 b. πάντα πανταχοῦ πάντων κακῶν ἐμπλε ἵν, see Krü. Xen. An. 1, 9, 2; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 138, 380; Boisson. Nicet. 243; Beier, Cie. off. 592 I. 128; Jahn, Archiv II. 402). Matt. xxi. 41 κακοὶς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὕτοις ἵνα will miserably destroy those miserable fellows (Demosth. Mid. 413 b. έτα βανμάζεις, ei κακος κακώς ἀπολύ, adv. Zenothl. 575 c.; Aristophan. Plat. 65, 418; Diog. L. 2, 76; Alciph. 3, 10; cf. also Aeschyl. Pers. 1041; Plaut. Aulular. 1, 1, 3 sq. and Schaeff. Soph. Electr. 742; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 471 and 561 paralip. 8, 56 sqq.; Foertsch, de locis Lysiae p. 44).1

Writers occasionally use strange or uncommon words, or forms, for the purpose of producing a paronomasia (Gesenius LG. S. 858) e.g. Gal. v. 7 πειθοῦς ... ἣ πεισμοὶ (see my Comment. in loc.), cf. die Bisthümer sind verwandelt in Wüsthümer, die Abteien

---

1 See also Doederlein, Progr. de brachylogia p. 8 sq. Especially a large collection of such paronomastic combinations will be found in E. A. Diller, Progr. de consensu notionum qualis est in vocibus ejusd. originis diversitate formarum copulatis. Misen. 1842. 4to.
660 sind nun — Raubsteinen (Schiller in Wallenstein’s Lager), Verbeserungen nicht Verbesserungen.\(^1\)

2. Annominatio is akin to paronomasia, but differs from it in this: that it adds to a regard for the sound of words, a regard to their meaning also (as, in German: Träume sind Schläume); consequently for the most part it consists of antitheses, e.g. Matt. xvi. 18 συν δὲ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρῃ οἰκοδομήσω ετοι., Rom. v. 19 διὸ καὶ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοὶ, καὶ καὶ τῆς ὑποκοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται, i. 20 τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ... καθορᾶται, Phil. iii. 2 f. θλέπτετε τὴν κατανομὴν, ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἔσμεν ἡ περιτομή (Diog. L. 6, 24 τὴν Ἐυκλείδου σχολὴν ἔλεγε χολὴν, τὴν δὲ Πλάτωνος διαφθέρην κατατρίβην), ii. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 8 ἀπορούμενοι, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔξαπορούμενοι, 2 Thess. iii. 11 μηδὲν ἐργαζόμενοι, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζόμενοι (cf. Seidler, Eurip. Trag. p. 11), 2 Cor. v. 4 ἐφ’ ὅν θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐκπενθύσασθαι, Actviii. 30 ἀράγε γινώσκεις, ἀναγινώσκεις; 1 Jno. ii. 23 f. πολλοὶ ἐπιστευοντο εἰς τὸ δύναμιν αὐτοῦ... αὐτος δὲ Ιησοῦς ἕξαμεν ἐπιστευοντες ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ, Rom. i. 28; iii. 3; xi. 17; xii. 3; xvi. 2; Eph. i. 23; iii. 14, 19; Gal. iv. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 17; vi. 2; xi. 29, 31; xiv. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 2; v. 21; x. 3; 1 Tim. i. 8 f.; 2 Tim. iii. 4; iv. 7; 3 Jno. 7 f.; Rev. xxii. 18 f. [Matt. vi. 16].

In Philem. 20 the allusion in ὀνάθλων to the name of the slave Ὀμηρίmonkey\(^2\) is less obvious. Moreover, the same remark made above respecting strange words may be repeated here, and is perhaps applicable to Gal. v. 12; cf. my Comment. in loc., and also 6th ed.

---

1 In the Agenda of Duke Henry of Saxony, 1589, it is said in the preface respecting the Pòlish parson: sein Sorge ist nicht Seworge, sondern Medsorge.

2 An annominatio in which regard is had solely to the meaning occurs in Philem. 11 Ὑπῆρχον τὸ τοῦ ἐκχρηστον, καὶ δὲ σοι καὶ μοι ἐκχρηστον etc. Still more latent would be the annominatio in 1 Cor. i. 23: κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἑπταμένων, ἰσοπαλικὸς ἐκ κακοῦ κακοῖς... σοφῶς, where Phil is said to have had in view the words ἔξω κακίᾳ chal. Chris., ἴσος γὰρ σκάνδαλον, ἵστορι μὲν στίτισσε, and ἴστορι sapientia (Glossii philol. I. 1339). I am not aware, however, of such a word as ἴστορι in Chaldaic; and it is only in Ethiopic that ἵστορι signifies cross. The whole statement is an instance of learned trifling. Equally improbable is Jerome’s conjecture on Gal. i. 6, that in metatithēse the apostle makes an allusion to the Oriental etymology of the name Galadrai (from ἐλαφος or ἐλαφει), see my Comment. in loc. and Boettcher as above, S. 74 sq. In the discourses of Jesus, which were delivered in Syro-Chaldaic, many verbal allusions may have disappeared in the process of translating into Greek, cf. Gloss. l.c. p. 1339. But the attempt of modern critics to restore some of them, as in Matt. viii. 21 (Eichhorn, Einl. ins N. T. I. 504 f.) and Jno. xiii. 1 (μεταθέσθω, ἔστη, ἔστη), must be pronounced decidedly infelicitous.
Terent. Hecyr. prol. 1, 2 orator ad vos venio ornatu prologi, sinite 661 exorator sim.


3. Parallelismus membrorum, the well-known peculiarity of 594 Hebræan poetry, occurs also in the N. T. when the style rises to 6th d. the elevation of rhythm. This parallelism is sometimes synonymous, as in Matt. x. 23; Jno. i. 17; vi. 35; xiv. 27; Rom. ix. 2; xi. 12, 33; 1 Cor. xv. 54; 2 Thess. ii. 8; Heb. xi. 17; Jas. iv. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 3, etc., and sometimes antithetic, as in Rom. ii. 7; Jno. iii. 6, 20 f.; 1 Pet. iv. 6; 1 Jno. ii. 10, 17, etc. See, in particular, the hymn in Luke i. 46 ff.; cf. § 65, 5 p. 611 (E. G. Rhessa, de parallelismo sententiar. poet. in libris N. T. Regiom. 1811. II. 4; J. J. Snouk Hurgronje, de parallel. membror. in J. Chr. dictis observando, Utr. 1836. 8vo.). Sometimes dogmatical statements which might be expressed in a single proposition are divided in this way into 563 parallel members, Rom. iv. 25; x. 10. Likewise 1 Tim. iii. 16, 6th ed. where parallelism is accompanied with entire similarity of the 662
clauses, appears to be a quotation from one of the hymns of the apostolic church.

4. The Greek verses or parts of verses\(^1\) found in the N. T. are of two sorts: they either belong to Greek poets and are quoted as theirs; or they make their appearance suddenly and without any sign of quotation,—whether because they were current poetic utterances of unknown authorship, or, as is more frequently the case, were let fall by the writer unconsciously, which sometimes occurs even in good prose writers, but was pronounced a blemish by the ancient teachers of rhetoric.\(^2\) The apostle Paul alone has inwoven poetic quotations into his discourses, and in three passages (J. Hoffmann de Paulo apost. scripturas profanas ter allegante. Tubing. 1770. 4to.):

a. In Tit. i. 12 there occurs an entire hexameter, from Epimenides of Crete (διὸς αὐτῶν προφήτης cf. vs. 5):

\[
\text{Κρητες α[ει]ψευσται, κακα | θηρια | γαστερες | αργα.}
\]

tov γαρ | και γενος | εσμεν,

595 cf. Arat. Phaenom. 5, where the conclusion of the verse runs thus: 76 ὁ δὲ ἤπιος ἀνθρώπως (δεξιὰ σημαίνει), so that a spondee occurs in the fifth foot, as frequently happens, particularly in Aratus 10, 12, 32, 33.

b. Acts xvii. 28 contains the half of an hexameter:

\[
\text{φθειρου ςιμ ηθη χρησθ | ομιλαι | κακαι,}
\]

where, as often takes place, spondees are used in the odd feet 1 and 3 (Hm. doctr. metr. p. 74\(^3\)). The quotation is from the well-known comic poet Menander, and, according to H. Stephanus, from his Thais (see Menandri Fragm. ed. Meineke p. 75, and Fragm.

---

\(^1\) Loefler, de versibus qui in soluta N. T. oratione habentur. L. 1718. 4to.; Kosegarten, de poetarum effatis graec. in N. T., also his Dissertatt. acad. ed. Münche p. 135 sqq.

\(^2\) Cf. Cic. orat. 56, 189 (a passage erroneously quoted by Weber, Demosth. p. 208), Quintil. Inst. 9, 4, 52. 72 sqq.; Fabric. biblioth. latin. ed. Ernesti II. 389; Noltem, Antibrar. under the word versus; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 52 sq.; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 315; Franke, Demosth. p. 6, likewise the Classical Journ. no. 45, p. 40 sqq. I have never seen the dissertation of Loefler (Moeller) de versu inopinato in prosa. L. 1668. That condemnation of poetic insertions in prose, has been qualified and corrected by Hm. opusc. L. 12! sqq.

\(^3\) In Hm. doctr. metr. p. 139 impori sede is probably a misprint for pari.
comic gr ed. Meineke vol. 4 p. 182). However, the best Codd. 663 of the N. T. [Sin. also] give χρηστά without elision.

5. To the second of the above-mentioned classes¹ belong 564 a. The hexameter in Jas. i. 17, which even the old commentators had recognized:

πασα δοσις αγαθη και παν δωρημα τελειον

(where, in the second foot in the arsis, σις might be used as long); see the commentators in loc. Schulthess tried to arrange the rest of the passage into two metrical verses; but the rhythm is harsh, and the use of poetic words does not in James warrant us in inferring the presence of verses and restoring them by means of violent alterations and transpositions.

On the other hand b. an unmistakable hexameter occurs in Heb. xii. 13 in the words

και τροχας ορθας ποιησατε τους ποιουν ιμων:

And c. in Acts xxiii. 5 the words quoted from the Sept. may be scanned as an Iamb. trimet. acatac.: 596

ἄρχον τα του λαου σου ουκ ερεις κακος,

but, owing to the thrice occurring spoudē in the 1st, 3d, and 4th feet, it would be offensive to a Greek ear.

Lastly, in Jno. iv. 35 the words τετράμηνος ... ἔρχεται have the rhythm of a trimeter catalectic, if read thus:

tetramunos esti χωθεριμον ἔρχεται.

The first foot is an anapaest (Hm. doctr. metr. p. 119 sq.). As to χω for καλ ὃ, see Bttm. I. 122.

¹ Hunting for such verse is so much the more a matter of idle curiosity, as prosaic rhythm is different from poetic and sometimes does not permit these passages to appear as verse; Hm. as above, p. 124; Thiersch in the Munich gel. Anzeigen 1849. Bd. 28 nr. 118. We have adduced such passages only as by themselves furnish a complete thought. For half or incomplete sentences containing a rhythm, see the Classical Journal, as above, p. 46 sq. Also in 2 Pet. ii. 22 some have, by combining the two proverbs, framed Iambic verses, see Bengel.
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Passo G. 5.'

Passive the, with the dat. 219; with the acc. 229, 260; 1st aor. used for the
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classic 1st aor. mid. 261; perf. and pluperf. in mid. sense 262; perf. supposed to be used for perf. act. 263; fut., singular use of 262 sq.; is it ever used like the Hebr. Hopal ? 263; forms, how to be distinguished from the same in the middle voice 263.

Paul his knowledge of Greek 21; his doctrinal system as a guide to his language 98, 130; his use of the art. with Χριστός 118; his multiplication of relatives 167; his use of the gen. of more remote internal relations 188; his separation of the gen. from its noun 191; his use of the infin. with εἰς or ἐπί 329; fond of participial constructions 355; his doctrinal use of prepositions 360; his accumulation of prepositions 418; his bold arrangement of words 547; his use of parentheses 565 sq.; and anacolutha 567 sq.; fond of paronomasia 636.

Perception verbs of, with the gen. 199.

Perfect the, pass. for mid. 262; pass. said to be used for act. 262; its import and use 270 sq.; in connection with the aor. 272; for the aor. in narration 272; how far used for the pres. 272 sq.; prophetic 273; supposed use of for pluperf. 274; in sense of pres. 274.

Periodic Structure in the N. T. 545.

Personal Pronouns multiplied in N. T. 143; occasionally omitted 143; occasional use of nouns for 144; loose reference of 145 sq.; repetition of 147 sq.; in nom. always emphatic 152; position of 155; dat. apparently superfluous 155; ἵδε ὑμᾶς μοῦ etc. in circumlocution for 156.

Persons rare forms of, in regular verbs 75 sqq.

Ptochen Seb. 13.

Place gen. of 207; dat. of 219; acc. of after verbs of motion 224; as a specification 230.

Plenasm 601 sqq.; causes of 602; for the most part circumstantiality or fulness 605 sq.; supposed instances of examined 612 sqq.

Pluperfect augment of omitted 72; pass. in mid. sense 262; of certain verbs. equiv. to imperf. 274; when expressed by the aor. 275.

Plural the, of category 175; of certain nouns used for the sing. 176; of names of countries and cities 176; of nouns denoting a feeling etc. 176; Hebr. plur. maj. or excellentes 177; for the dual 177; neut. used of a person 178; used of himself by the speaker 517.

Polysyndeton 519, 540.

Position of words and clauses 546 sqq.; how determined 546; works on 546 sq.; in N. T. simple 547; in the apostolic benediction 549; of the vocative 549; causes of unusual 549; of the predicate 551; of the gen. before its noun 155, 192, 551; trajectory 551 sq.; hysteron proteron 553; irregular, of single words, particularly certain adverbs and negatives 553 sq.; of ἐπειδή, ἂν ὥστε etc. in specifications of place and time 557 sq.; of particles and enclitic pronouns 558; supposed transposition of clauses 560; as affected by a regard to sound 536 sq. Cf. Adjectives, Apposition etc.

Positive the, with μᾶλλον a prep. or § instead of the compar. 240; for the superl. 246.

Possessive Pronouns 143 sqq.; sometimes to be taken objectively 153; ἐν ὑμῖν used for 153 sq.; circumlocutions for 154 sq.

Predicate the art. with 114; its connection with the subj. 512 sqq.; a clause as 513; consisting of a part. with the art. 513; grammat. discord between pred. (or copula) and subj. 513 sqq.; grammat. form of compound 518; several, how connected 519; several with a common object 521; indispensable 521; extended by adjuncts 523 sqq.; 527; when placed first 551.

Prepositions predilection for in N. T. 32, 38, 180; compound 102; connecting a (neut.) verb with its dependent noun 232 sq.; for adverbs 250, 423; general remarks on 358 sqq.; the proper sense of to be distinguished from the metaphorical 360; interchange of 361 sq. 411 sq.; interchange
of cases with 363; position of 363; with the gen. 364 sqq.; with the dat. 384 sqq.; with the acc. 396 sqq.; the same in the same sentence used to denote different relations 409; different in the same sentence 410 sqq.; kindred substituted for each other in parallel passages 411 sqq.; əv and əs not used indiscriminately 413 sqq.; accumulation of by Paul 418; repetition of 419 sqq.; omitted before the relative 421 sqq.; combined with adverbs 422; in circumlocutions 154, 192, 423; after compound verbs 425 sqq.; two blended into one 629.

Present the, its force 265; only in appearance for the fut. 265; for the aor. in narration 266 sqq.; conjoined with the aor. 267; may include also a past tense 267; in dependent clauses apparently for the imperf. 268; perf. and aor. equiv. to 274; with force of perf. 274. Cf. Aorist, Future, Perfect.

Prophetic Perfect the Heb. 273.

Pronouns enclitic 54; indef. expressed sometimes by əf 117; use of in N. T. 140 sqq.; differing in gen. or num. from their noun 141; in supposed reference to a following noun 142; neuter used adverbially 142; personal and possessive 143 sqq.; repetition of 147 sqq.; demonstrative 157 sqq.; relative 163 sqq.; interrogative and indefinite 168 sqq.; Hebraisms in connection with 171 sqq.; in loose reference 632 sqq. Cf. Demonstrative, Personal etc.

Proper Names throw back the accent 51; contracted forms of 102; with the art. 112 sqq.

Proposition see Clause and Structure.


Proseusagma of the demonstr. pron. 162.

Punctuation of the N. T. 55 sqq.

Purists the, history of 12 sqq.; a criticism of their efforts 16.

Questions rel. pron. put for interrog. in direct 167; the subjunct. in undetermined 285; indirect 298 sqq. 308, 543; negative 510 sqq.; with the fut. for the imperat. 315; brachylogy in 628. Cf. Interrogative.

Quotation peculiar biblical formula of 522.

Redundant Structure 601 sqq.

Reduplication 72 sqq.; of verbs in 74 sqq.

 Reflexive Pronoun used in reference to the 1st and 2d pers. 150 sqq.; with the middle voice 257.

Relative Pronouns thought to refer sometimes to the more remote noun 157; include the demonstrative 158; attraction with 163 sqq.; agree sometimes with following noun 166; for interrogative 167; multiplied by Paul 167; before whole clauses 168; not used for demonstrative 168.

Relative Clauses position of 167; use of 542 sqq.

Revelation book of, its irregularities of style 534.

Rhetoric (stylistics) of N. T. 1 sqq.

Ruling verbs of, with the gen. 206.

Schema κατ’ ἐξοχήν 520.

Sentence see Clause, and Structure.

Septuagint its Greek style 31 sqq. 37 sqq.

Singular (the distributive) for the plural 174.

Smelling verbs of, with the gen. 203.

Structure of Sentences: of a simple 512 sqq.; of compound 518 sqq.; by extension of subj. or pred. 523 sqq.; their connection 537 sqq.; asyndeton 537; polysyndeton 519, 540; position of words and clauses in 546 sqq.; interrupted (parenthetic) structure 561 sqq.; broken and heterogeneous (anacoluthon 566, oratio variata 577) 566 sqq.; defective (ellipsis 580, aposeiopsis 599) 580 sqq.; redundant (pleonasm 601, blended 605, circumstantiality 605, fulness 609) 601 sqq.; condensed and expanded (breviloquence 619, constructio praegnans 621, attraction 625, hendiadys 630) 619 sqq.; irregularities of relating to single words (hypallage) 631 sqq.; regard to sound in (parono-
masia 638, nominativus 638, paral-lelism 639, verse 640) 636 sqq. Cf. Clauses, Asyndeton, Attraction, Position, etc.

**Style** (stilistics) in N. T. 1 sq. 31, 33, 35, 37 sq.; of individual writers 4, 29, 33, 39, 118, 546 sq. Cf. Paul etc.

**Subject** the, in relation to the art. 115; gen. of 186; relation to the sentence 512 sqq.; a partitive gen. may be used for 203, 513; relation of copula and predicate to 513 sqq.; compound 518; one rendered prominent 519, 520; may be implied 521 sq.; extension of 522 sqq.; wanting 588, 631; sudden change of 631 sq.

**Subjunctive** the future 75, 86; distinguished from the indic. and the optat. 281; in independent propositions 285 sqq.; in dependent propositions 287 sqq.; in hypothetical sentences 291 sqq.; after particles of time compounded with ἄν 297, 308; after interrogatives 298; after ὥσπερ 301; in relative clauses with ἤ 307; with ἔως for the imperat. 315; with ἔως for the infin. 334 sqq.

**Substantives** see Nouns.

**Superlative** the, circumlocution for 246; Hebr. modes of expressing 246 sq.; strengthened by ὡκερος 248.

**Synecdoche** 622.

**Synonymes** 611.

**Syntax** peculiarities of, few in later and N. T. Greek 27; 36 sqq.

**Technical Terms** religious in N. T. 85.

**Tenses** rare forms in 73 sqq.; how far interchanged 264; import and use of the pres. 265 sq.; imperfect 268 sq.; perfect 270 sq.; aorist 275 sq.; forces of in the moods 281; future 279 sq.; different connected 280 sq. Cf. Aorist etc.

**Thinking** of verbs expressing take the gen. 205.

**Time** gen. of 207; dat. of 318; acc. of 229 sq.; particles of, how construed 296 sq., with ἂν 308.

**Touching** laying hold of, verbs of take the gen. 201.

**Trajectio** (transposition) of words 513 sqq.; of clauses 560.

**Transition** from a participial constr. to a finite verb 573; from ἐν to the (acc. with) infin. 573; from a relative constr. to a personal 579; from oratio obliqu. to rect. and vice versa 579; from the sing. to the plur. and the reverse 580. Cf. Structure of sentences.

**Verbs** augm. and redupl. of 70 sqq.; rare forms in tenses and persons of regular 73 sqq.; in verbs in μα and irregular verbs 78 sqq.; list of defective 82 sqq.; later forms of not always used in N. T. 90; same forms may come from different 91; derivative 91; compound 100; decomposite 109; intransitives with acc. of thing 227; neut. used transitively 251, 263; compounded with prepositions, how construed 425 sqq.; with ἄρει 427; with ἄρε 428; with ἄρει 429; with ἄρε 429; with ἄρει 429; with ἄρε 429; with ἄρει 430; with ἄρε 430; with ἄρει 431; with ἄρε 431; with ἄρει 432; with ἄρε 432; with ἄρει 432; with ἄρε 432; with ἄρε 433; with ἄρει 433; in circumlocutions for adverbs 467 sq. Cf. Active etc.; Tenses etc.

**Verbal** substantives 93 sqq. (cf. nouns); adjectives 96 sqq.

**Verses** found in N. T. 640 sq.

**Vocative** use of nom. for 182; most frequently without ἦ; 183; position of 549.

**Voices** see Active, Middle, Passive.

**Vorst** J. 14.

**Words** see Derivation, Position, Pannonomasia etc.

**Wyss Caspar** 5.

**Zeugma** 622.
II. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND FORMS.

The Figures refer to Pages.

- a, -α in the gen. 60.
a in forms of 2d aor. 73.
δ for δι δ 142.
*Αλσόν 67.
*Ανίδ accent 52.
άγαθοργεῖν 25.
άγαθοσμενεῖν 25.
άγαθός πρὸς τι and εἰς τι 383.
άγαθοργεῖν 25, 101.
άγαθοσμενεῖν 25.
άγαθοσμενεῖν 25.
άγαθοσμενεῖν 25.
άγαθοσμενεῖν constr. of 232.
άγαθοσμενεῖν without art. 120; θεοῦ or Χριστοῦ 185.
*Αγαρ, τὸ 179.
άγγελαμ forms of 82.
άγγελοι art. with 124; ἄγγελοι and ὁ ἄγγελος 124.
άγγελος without art. 124.
άγγελος without art. 124.
άγγελος without art. 124.
άγγελος without art. 124.
άγγελος with plur. subject 516; ἰγ. τιν 215; ἰγιμεν 251.
άγγελοιμα 250.
άγαρφει supposed ellipsis of 593.
άγγελωθεα 254.
άγγελους 52 sq.
ἀδι position of 558.
ἀδετος 22.

ἄζημα 176.
-ας verbs in 92.
ἀδέως ἄντι τ. 180, 197.
Ἀγγελοτος never has art. 112.
αἵμα 30; αἵμα ἡχεῖν 33; ἀἵματα 177.
ἀἵματεκχωτα 25, 28, 99.
ἀ>iνείν with dat. 536.
-ας aor. of verbs in 75; verbs in 92.
ἀλαίρως art. τὰς ἀλαίρας 594.
ἀλαίρως 26.
ἀλαίρω forms of 82; ἀλαίρωι 253.
ἀλαίριζομαι with part. and with infin. 346.
ἀλαίρω constr. of 227.
ἀληθέα 24.
ἀλλαματείνως 25.
ἀλλαματείνως 25.
ἀλλατείνως 176; ὁ αἰών. τῶν αἰών. 247.
ἀλλατείνως 69.
ἀλλατείς 463.
ἀλλατείς 236.
ἀλλατείς 464.
ἀλλατείς 214, 234.
ἀλλατείζω 26.
ἀλλατείς forms of 82; constr. of 199 sq. 347; signify. of 274.
ἀλλατείς, ἀλλατείστα 24, 99.
ἀλλατείνως 235.
ἀλλάτης 23, 97.
ἀλλατειν constr. of 227.
ἀλλατεία 25.
αλλατεία 23.
*Αλέξας 25.
αλλάθειν 22.

ἄλλα distinguished from ἄλ 441 sq.; in abrupt transitions 442; ἀκ ... ἄλλα 442; ἄλλα γάρ 442; not used for ἀκόν 451; nor for ἐλ μή 451; nor for same 451; after a single neg. 495; before apod. 541; ἄλλα γε 559; ἄλλα ἴνα 620.
ἀλλατείνως constr. of 206.
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ἀλλομα forms of 82.
ἀλλος in opposition 599; position of 548; omitted 595.
ἀλλοστροφικαστος 25, 99.
ἀμα 470.
ἀμαρτά, ἀμαρτέ forms of 82; constr. of 233.
ἀμαρτία without art. 120.
ἀφι does not occur in N. T. 372.
ἀφι for ἃν in perf. 76; ἃν in infin. omits subj. 47.
ἀφι force and use of 302 sqq.; omission of 282, 305 sqq. 307, 333, 595; for ἃν 291; in relative clauses 306; in indirect question 308.
ἀζθ with the acc. 398; constr. of verbs compounded with 428.
ἀζθα 79.
ἀζθγκ 30.
ἀζθδεμα 24, 32.
ἀζθδεματε 33.
ἀζθκανδ 26.
ἀζθκάμητες 251.
ἀζθκίονθα 23.
ἀζθκλεις 23.
ἀζθκόσθα 263.
ἀζθκίος 463.
ἀζθκες 74.
ἀζθκίστες 23.
ἀζθκέρφωσ 251, 469.
ἀζθκος κερω 188.
ἀζθκεμα 24.
ἀζθκέλλεις 251.
ἀζθκθμα 253.
ἀζθκολαλ 175.
ἀζθλα 100.
ἀζθκλεκτος 236.
ἀζθλευ 471.
ἀζθχομα augm. of 72; forms of 83.
ἀζθρ (φωνεῖ etc.) 30; without art. 122; ἀθρ in addresses 610.
ἀμαρτάνειν ἀμαρτάνει 225.
ἀμαρτάνειν 25.
ἀματια στέρματι 83; ἀματια 79; ἀματας redundant? 608.
ἀμαρθαι augm. of 72; forms of 83; ἀμαρθαι 622.
ἀμαρθείς 463.
ἀμαρθανταί ending of patronym. nouns 95.
ἀμαρθάδεμα 25.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 25.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι with gen. 206; with the gen. 864; constr. of verbs compounded with 429.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 42.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 25.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 108.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 93.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι contr. of 205, 226 sq.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 25.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι contr. of 206.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 253.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 96.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι contr. of 83.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 24.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 25.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 24.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 97.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 24.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 463.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 275; ἂτκεσθα constr. of 427.
ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι contr. of 193; with verbs of eating, taking etc. 199; with verbs of fulness 201; meaning of etc. 364 sq. 369 sq.; distinguished from ἀμαρθαντικάσταθι 364; distinguished from ἀπό 369; distinguished from ἀπό with passives 370; with verbs of receiving etc. 370; constr. of verbs compounded with 427 sq.; proof of with the gen. of place? 557; ἂτκεσθα 603; ἂτκεσθα 422; ἂτκεσθα 422; ἂτκεσθα 422; ἂτκεσθα 422; ἂτκεσθα 603; ἂτκεσθα 423; ἂτκεσθα 423, 591; ἂτκεσθα 18.
ἀμαρθνθτικάσταθι 622.
ἀμαρθνθτικάσταθι 254.
ἀμαρθνθτικάσταθι 253.
ἀμαρθνθτικάσταθι contr. of 210, 226, 227, 428.
ἀμαρθνθτικάσταθι augm. of 72.
ἀμαρθνθτικάσταθι 25.
ἀμαρθνθτικάσταθι 253, 255, 261.
ἀματια forms of 83; signif. of 253.
ἀματας 83.
ἀματας 88.
ἀμαται 83.
ἀμαται contr. of 428.
ἀμαται forms of 83.
ἀμαται 62, 102.
ἀμαται 258.
ἀμαται contr. of 427.
ἀμαται 251.
ἀμαται 24.
ἀμαται 594.
ἀμαται 196; signif. of 254.
GREEK INDEX.

ἀποτέλεσμα 463.
ἀπώπωτος 97.
ἀπόκατο 90.
ἀρα meaning and use of 444 sq.; before apod. 541, 542; position of 558; ἀρα ἄνευ 445, 558.
ἀρα interrog. 510.
ἀργός, -ή, -αν, 24, 68.
ἀργορία 176.
ἀρθοκεν constr. of 238.
ἀρχεταλ accent 51.
τὰ ἀριστερὰ 176.
ἀρχιερεῖα constr. of 232.
ἀρχιευθα 259.
ἀρχοτάν 24.
ἀρχαῖοι forms of 83.
ἀρχαν 66.
ἀρχή 22.
ἀρτεμιάς 102.
ἀρτέμων inflec. 64.
ἀρτυχ φαγίν 33.
ἀρχή without art. 124; τὴν ἀρχήν allocutio 464.
-ἀρχής 61.
-ἀρχες 61 sq.
ἀρχομαι constr. of 346; alleged pleonasm of 612 sq.; peculiar use of 633.
Ἀσία art. with 112.
ἀστείομαι 259, 260.
ἀστείον 66.
ἀστυχοῖς with gen. 196.
ἀσφαλήν 66, 69.
ἀσφαλεῖσθαι τοὺς νῦν δῆλα ς τοίχους etc. 622.
ἀστείων 24, 100.
ἀστείων θεά 252, 263.
ἀσιστῶν 23.
ἀδίκωμαι forms of 83, 251.
ἀδρα ellipsis of 591.
ἀδεικτὰρχεῖσα 236.
ἀδρές in loose reference 145 sq. 632; subjoined to the subject 147 sq. 519; subjoined to the relative 148; repeated 149; so ἀδρές for ἄδρες 149; unemphatic 150; ἀδρές 112; with dat. 150; ἀδρές ἄγαν 153; ἀδρέω or ἀδρόω? 151 sq.; ἀδρόω before the governing subet. 155; in apposition 530; ἀδρόω τοῦτο adv. 142.
ἀδρόω 95.
ἀδρόω 45.
ἀδρόω, ἀδρέω, ἀδρέω 81.
ἀδικνυν constr. of 427.
ἀδικνυ εἰς 622.
ἀδύνατον 26.
Ἀχάλ art. with 112.
ἀχροποιήτω 236.
ἀχρις or ἄχρις? 42; constr. of 297, 471.
Βδάλ, ἂ 179.
βαθμός 22.
βαθεί forms of 79.
βαθτόνων form of 43.
βάλλειν 251 sq.
βαντίζε constr. of 216, 217, 412; mid. 254 255, 621; βαντίζε τινὰ εἰς τινὰ 622.
βαντίσεμα 25, 35, 93.
βαντισμός 621.
βαρέω 24; forms of 83.
βασιλείων constr. of 180, 206.
βασιλεύσα 24, 95.
βασιλείων forms of 83; constr. of 223.
βάτος, ῥ 36; ῥ 63.
βαβάλα 69.
βαβάλλει 22.
βαβαρά decl. 61.
βαβαράν indcl. 61.
βαβαράν 52; indcl. 61.
βαβαρίζων 24, 96.
βαβώματα forms of 84; χρόνον 296.
βαβώματε constr. of 227.
βαβώματα forms of 84; 251.
βαβώματες constr. of 222, 629.
βαβώματα ἀνό 39; τι 223; εἰς 233.
βαβώματα constr. of 212.
βαβώματα 252.
βαμίλλεθα 254.
βαμίλλεθα aug. of 70; βαμίλλεθε without ἔν 283.
βανός 22.
βαράτωχα 52 sq.
βρέχω 28.
Γαλαλεία art. with 112.
γαμέλοι forms of 84; mid. 254.
γαμήσω 92.
γαμίσω 176.
γὰρ origin and signification of 445 sq.; in explanations 446, and going before 447; in rejoinders 446; in questions 447; repeated 447 sq.; not to be taken for but 453; nor for therefore 454; nor for although 454; nor for on the contrary 454; nor for nevertheless 454; nor as a mere copula 454; sometimes equiv. to ὅ 452, 456; position of 558; introducing parenth. 562.
GREEK INDEX.

γενεματι construction 52.
γελάω forms of 84.
γενέσθαι and τῇ γένοι 120.
γεννάω 24, 176.
γεννήματα 23, 33.
γενέθσαι constr. of 36, 198; θανάσσα 33.
γῇ without art. 120; ellipsis of 599.
γοδάπεδο 92.
γὴρ dat. 64.
γήγνωμαι forms of 84; construed with el.
183 sq.; with gen. 195 sq.; with dat. 210 sq.; ἐγένετο with acc. and inf. 323; never used periphrastically 350; with pred. adj. 515; ellipsis of 586; kal ἐγένετο pleonastically 608.
γορδέσσαι significa. 263; ἄθρα 18.
γλώσσα 32; ellipsis of 591; γλωσσάεις λα-
λεον 594.
γλωσσάεις 24, 94.
γλήσσος infec. 69.
γράγγα 22.
γραφεῖν τυχ 210.
Γρογδῆδα indecl. 61.
νὰ ἵπτῃ γράφῃ ματα 177.
νὰ γραφῇ 177.
γράφω in the pret. 278.
γραπτό 26, 92.
γραμματέω 25.
γραμματίας 96.
γραφή ellipsis of 190.
γράφω, γραμμάνα 23, 239.
γράφη spelling of 44.
δι meaning and use of 441, 443; distin-
guished from ἀλλ ἀλα 441 sq.; μὲν ... ἔδ
441, 443; οἷ (μῆ) ... ἔδ 442; οἷου ... ἔδ 442; kal ... ἔς 443; ... kal 443;
never means therefore 452; nor for 452; nor is it a mere particle of transition
453; as related to γέρ 456; after a single neg. 495, 539 sq.; position of
558; introducing parenth. 562.
δειγματίζεων 25, 26.
δείκνυ, δείκνυο 65.
δεκάτην 24.
δείκνωd without art. 122; τὰ δείκνωd 176.
δεξιάλαβεω 102.
δεξιοδίδω 101.
δεόμαι constr. of 198.
δεσμάω 26.
δεσμώ plural forms of 63.
δευτερόπφω 100.
δῆ with imperat. 313.
δήμας 103.
δῦ with gen. 377 sq. 423 sq.; with verbs of
praising etc. 378; denoting the causes
principalis? 378; used of time 380;
with acc. 396 sq.; in circumlocutions
423; construction of verbs compounded
with 431.
διαβεβαιω 253.
διαβολα without art. 124.
διάγευμα κ. τῆς βλέψ 593.
διάθεσι 177.
διαθέσαι διαθέσαι 225.
διακειμεν 593.
διαλύσει constr. of 206.
διαπατρίβη 102.
διπλαν with acc. 431.
διπλανέω 23.
διπλανεσθαι constr. of 431.
διπλανοτίζεω 25.
διπλάζεως κ. τῆς χρόνου 593.
διδασκευ τοῦ 223; ὅ 227.
dίδομαι forms of 78, 79, 84; constr. of 180,
197, 198.
διεγερώ 102.
διερχεσθαι with acc. and with δῦ 431.
διακοριτσία 25, 99.
διάκοιτο διάπτωμα 136.
διακοσμήτω 32; etc. 35; without art. 190;
θεὶ 186; πιέζω 186.
δὶ 445.
διότι 445.
διότρωσθαι 594.
διών τ. etc. 17, 77; with acc. 204 sq.
δίκαιον 30; forms of 84.
δίκαιον 84.
διείστω alleged peleonasm of 612 sq.
διευθήσε 26.
διείστω ellipsis of 592.
διά 32; ἃ 108.
διηρύθσ ellipsis of 592.
διώναμα aug. of 70; forms of 76, 84; with
infin. 321, 327, 333; used absolutely
590, 594; alleged peleonasm of 613.
dιιμάς 32.
διομά 26.
δίπόρ 76.
δίον infec. 64; with plur. 177; δίον δίον 249.
δίον 64.
διώματ 176.
δίωμα, δίωμα forms of 84.
195 sq.; with dat. 210; with pred. adj. 515; ēvī with infin. 320.
-conn adjectives in 99.
eis forms of 85; fut. 279, 280; ērēsae
sc. ē ὑπὸ 522; ēp in direct discourse
558; ellipsis of 598; ēis 22, accent
51.
eisop 448.
eis with ind. fut. 300.
eisphēn Thoû 186.
-ēs plural ending 64.
es never in p 58; in supposed circumlocation
for the nom. 183; as a sign of the dat. 219; of the acc. 228, 527; in cir-
cumlocations 228, 424, 527; with infin.
how rendered 329; with acc. 396 sq.;
used for ὑγιεία 414; with ἐστιν, καθίστατο
etc. 415; es τῆς 422; constr. of verbs
compounded with 430.
es and ἡ es 116; es as an indef. art. (ὑπὸ) 117;
for πῶς 32, 248; es and ἡ 249; ἡ ... ὑπὸ 172; ἡ ... καὶ ἡ 173;
position of 548.
esphēnēta constr. of 427; ἡ τῶν κόσμων 18.
estath 52.
este 540; before apod. 541.
esta ... esth 440.
es in circumlocations 193, 424; use of with
gen. 366 sq.; distinguished from ἥ
364; with verbs of fullness 201; never
put for ὑγία 368; constr. of verbs com-
ponded with 429; in local attraction
629.

σκαντός always without art. 111; with plur.
pred. 516.

σκανταρχός 61.

σκίδαλλος Ὕδε 603.

σκυμμιζόν 102.

for ἐνείρησε 471.

ἐνεών with noun and art. 110; referring
to the nearest subject 157; position
of 157, 169; repeated 160.

for ἐνείρησε 472.

ἐβυθίσθη 87.

ἐβακεῖν 25.

ἐβλησθα without art. 122.

ἐκάθισεν ἐν τῷ 226.

ὁ ἐκκατέριθ 35, 234.

ἐκκαταρτίζον 25.

ἐκαλαί 24, 422.

ἐκβάλετε constr. of 427.

εκβάλεται constr. of 232.
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83

οἷά 87.

οἶκος 88.

εἰκών 25.

εἰκών 25, 463.

εἰσός εἰ μὴ 605.

ἐπερεύονται 251, 429.

ἐκχέω forms of 85; ἐκχεῖ fut. 77.

ἐπέμβασι 88.

ἐλαχιστότερος 69.

ἐλέος 85.

ἐλευθέρως 99.

ἐλέος forms of 85; constr. of 233.

ἐλέος gend. 66.

ἐλευθεροί constr. of 196, 197.

ἐλεύθερος 86.

ἐλέω forms of 86.

ἐλληνίζω, ἐλληνιστής 28, 94.

ἐλπίζω constr. of 233, 321, 331, 410.

ἐμέ is used objectively 153.

ἐμπερευόμεθα constr. of 222, 429.

ἐμπορίζων 471.

ἐν and Ἐν ἀκέραιοι 184, 513; hebraistically
for acc. of object ? 226; in alleged
circumloc. for gen. 193; alleged sign
of the dat. 217; ἐν Χριστῷ 359, 360,
388, 390; with dat. in local use 384;
temporal 385; fig. uses 386 sq.; ap-
parently with gen. 384; ἐν ὧδε, ἐν τούτῳ
387; distinguished from ἐν ἧδε 389; ἐν
ἀνάμιστο τιμος 390; used for ἐν 413 sq.
415; originally identical with ἐν 416;
in adverbial and other circumlocu-
tions 424; construction of verbs com-
pounded with 429.

ἐποτος 43.

ἐπίσκοπος Ἡρώδων 30.

ἐπίγας 90.

ἐπίκεια forms of 43; with infin. 329.

ἐπίστατα 88.

ἐπιγραφίς 258, 430.

ἐπίχειμα sc. χέλαν 593.

ἐπί 80, 423.

ἐπενήχειον 43.

ἐπέδας or ἐπεδάς 44.

ἐπεχοσ constr. of 180, 202, 210, 218.

ἐπάτωμα 25.

ἐπετείθον looking forwards 161.

ἐπερεύονσι constr. of 221, 429.

ἐπερηφάν constr. of 430.

ἐφάντασων 214; τοῖς ὑστ. 32.

ἐφιστήσθην 33.

ἐφίσμεν ἔξω 603.

ἐφιστάλλεν 102.

ἐφίσμενα 24.

ἐφηκάστευ 102.

ἐφηκέμενο 87.

ἐφοβοῦντο 91.

ἐφήρχοντα εἰ τις δοφός τιμος 83.

ἐφ ο εἰς ἱνεκές 141 sq.

ἐφισμαλογεύσθη 102; constr. of 30, 32, 209.

ἐφον ἡμᾶς 24.

ἐφορευέω 102.

ἐφορεύων 26.

ἐφορεύοντος 25.

ἐφορεύοντος 24.

ἐφω ἐξο 471.

ἐπιτίθεον 90.

ἐπικά 274.

ἐπιγαλάζω 177.

ἐπιγαλάζοντας with infin. 331.

ἐπιστάμεθα 88.

ἐπιστέφω forms of 86; constr. of 203.

ἐπιστέω 98.

ἐπιστεύομαι augm. of 73; constr. of 291.

ἐπίς 297.

ἐπίς 102, 250.

ἐπικάρας 103.

ἐπέλευ 448; with indic. pres. 283.

ἐπέλευ ἀπα 445.

ἐπέδιδθε 448.

ἐπέδιδησε 448.

ἐπέλθε 448.

ἐπέλθε 448.

ἐπετείθα μετὰ τούτῳ 608.

ἐπίκει α accent 52.

ἐπίκεισθαι constr. of 431.

ἐπιπέδοια equiv. to πέπειν 278.

ἐπιθέτης 25.

ἐπίχειμα 593.

ἐπιστήδευσι constr. of 221.

ἐπί with gen. 374; with dat. 392; ἐφ’ ἐς
394; ἐπί τῷ ἄνεθο τιμος 393; with acc.
407 sq.; with different cases in the
same sentence 409; ἐπί τῆς 422; in
circumlocations with gen. and dat. of
abstracts 425; constr. of verbs com-
pounded with 430.

ἐπίγαμβράζεων 26.

ἐπιδημείων constr. of 204, 430.

ἐπικαλοῦμαι 253, 263, 430.

ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι constr. of 202, 430 sq.
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έπιστέμων 98.

έπιστερίων forms of 86.

έπιστολος 97, 236.

έπιστολήν constr. of 204, 490.

έπιστολήν 236.

έπιστολήν constr. of 431.

έπιστολαί 23.

έπιστολαί of a single ep. 176.

έπιστολάρχον 26, 251.

έπιστολοφος 26.

έπιστόμα accent 52.

έπιστολάς των άτω χήρας 593.

έπιστράτοι 89.

έπιστράτοι 90.

έπιστράτευσι constr. of 431.

έπιστράτευσι pleonastic ? 613.

έπιστράτευσι, τά 235.

έπιστρατεύει 72, 222, 259.

έπιστρατος as a pleonasm ? 615.

έπιστρατεύοντα 23.

έπιστρατος accent 52 ; inflection 69 ; 4 106.

έπιστρατος, έπιστρατεία 51, 94.

έπιστρατεύοντα 65.

έπιστροφή 103.

έπιστροφήν, έπιστροφήν 85.

έρχομαι forms of 86 ; έρχομαι άπα, ένα 339 ;

ό έρχόμενος 341.

έρχομαι 22, 30, 32, 335.

έρχομαι 23.

έρχομαι forms of 86 ; constr. of 190, 198 sq.

έσθω 28, 86.

έστι 78.

έστι 

έστι 78.

έστι not έστω 52 ; 471, 472.

έστι 69.

έστι in appos. 530 ; έστημι, έν 592.

έστημι in comparison 241 ; position of 553.

έστωμος accent 52 ; with aor. infin. 332.

έστωμος 463.

έστωμος forms of verbs beginning with 71.

έστιν έκμετάλλησα 24, 35 ; aug. of 71 ; constr. of

180, 213, 223, 227, 229, 260.

έστιν ούτως τού Χριστοῦ 186.

έστιν έσπερίστατος 463.

έστιν έσπερίστατος 25, 101, 212, 222, 222.

έστιν position of 554.

έστιν 463.

έστιν έστιν 236.

έστιν έστιν 92.

έστιν 86.

έστιν 86.

έστιν 26; constr. of 219 ; εφιέ-

σκευθα for έστι 9 616.

έστιν 23.

έστιν έστιν accent 51.

έστιν έστιν 23, 222.

έστιν έστιν 71 ; 212, 259.

έστιν έστιν 92.

έστιν 423

έστιν 588 ; omitted 598.

έστιν 40.

έστιν 45.

έστιν έστιν constr. of 427.

έστιν 24, 45 ; cf. 48.

έστιν with gen. 203 ; with infin. 333 ; έστι

έστιν έστιν 594 ; μή έστιν 594.

έστιν 77.

έστιν έστιν as in the fut. 77.

έστιν έστιν 70.

έστιν έστιν έστιn constr. 396 ; έστιn έστιn 308 ;

έστιn έστιn 470 ; έστιn έστιn, ένδεικτε etc.

471.

έστιn forms of 86 ; constr. of 226, 227.

έστιn, τά 65.

έστιn έστιn 102.

έστιn 86.

έστιn έστιn 33.

έστιn έστιn 133.

έστιn in comparisons 240 sq. ; έστιn έστιn 440 ;

never for kal 440, yet cf. 441 ; co-

ordinate with έτη 491 sq. ; after neg.

509 ; in questions 509 ; repeated 519 ;

supposed ellipsis of 595 sq.

έστιn έστιn 602.

έστιn έστιn 24.

έστιn έστιn 87.

έστιn έστιn 87, 274.

έστιn έστιn anharmonious 119 sq.

έστιn έστιn 82.

έστιn έστιn 80.

έστιn never unemphatic 153.

έστιn έστιn 70.

έστιn έστιn ellipsis of 590 ; έστιn έστιn έστιn 463.

έστιn, έστιn, έστι 65.

έστιn ellipsis of 64.

έστιn έστιn constr. of 296 ; έστιn έστιn 297.

έστιn έστι 87.

έστιn έστιn 70.

έστιn έστιn 96.

έστιn έστιn 86.

έστιn έστιn 95.

έστιn έστι 80.

έστιn έστι 440.

έστιn έστι 260.

έστι 79.
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δόειν 81.
δόεις, τε 65.

έλανον without art. 121.
έλλαω 87.
έλυφος, gen. έλυφου 66.
επερέθανος 101.
έδώρας 29; without art. 122.
εγκεφών constr. of 232.
εγκατστάω 259.
εγκατεστάω 25, 26.
εκπέφαντος 96.

έλαω with inf. 37, 321, 327, 333; έλαω ἢ
malle 241; not for ἔθελα 284; followed
by subjunc. 285, 595; ένα 336 sq.; used
adverbially! 467; pleonastic? 612 sq.
έδώς, έδώ vocative 63; without art. 121 sq.;
ellipsis of 522, 598.
εκπαγγέλτης 23; accent 53.
εκδότης 103.
έλεγκτος 50.
έρημος accent 50.
ερατιθέντων 23, 251.
ἐρώς ἱρών 611.
έφη without art. 123; in plur. 176.
έφεδρος 23.
-ῶν verbs in 92.

-αν nouns in 95.
έδομαι 259.
ἐδέ and ἐδέ 49.

Ποιος for poss. pron. 153 sq.; added to a
pers. pron. 154; position of 548; ἤλθη,
κατ’ ἔθνα 591; τε ἔθνα 592.

ἐξορίσα 24.

Τερετός 67.
εἰρημένα 25.
εἰρημένων constr. of 222.

Τερνεττάμη form and inflec. 67 sq.; use of
art. with 112; plur. 176.
-ίσα fut. of verbs in 75; deriv. of verbs in
91 sq.

-ῶς forms of 80.

Τερνούσι inffection 66.
εἰσελέγει 24.

Εὐκαθαρίσθω constr. of 227.

Εὐκαθαρίσθων 96, 592.

Εὐγρεω 22.

εὐπορία 176; ellipsis of 591.

εὐπορία 26.

εὐπρεπθανίτο 101; constr. of 204.

ἐν 449; with ind. pres. 36; constr. of
287 sq.; with subjunc. for imperat. 315;

weakened 36, and for infin. 334 sqq.;
John's use of 338 sq. 461; is it used
δεσποτεύει; 457 sq.; ἐν πληρωθεί 461;
apparently for ἔτως or ἐς after adjec.
461; for ἐν 462; supposed ellipsis
of 285, 595; in breviloquence 620,
ἄν ἐν 620; ἐν τι ἃσαντο 169, sc.
γάρ. 586.

-νος adjectives in 99.

τερνούσι art. with 112.

τερνούσι art. with 112.

ἐνa used adverbially 177.

ἐνκατστάω 236.

ἐνα accent 52; ἐν adv. 177; constr. of 209.

ἐστώ 87.

ἐστώ 78.

ἐστών forms of 78, 79, 87; signif. of 253;
perf. 274.

ἐστιά art. with 112.

ἐστάτης infception 66.

καθάντω 257.

καθαρίσθωn constr. of 197.

καθαρίσθω constr. of 197.

καθ' εἰς 249.

καθ' 81.

καθάματα forms of 81; constr. of 431.

καθαρίσθωμαι 26.

καθαρίσθω constr. of 415, 431.

καθαρίσθω 81.

καθ' εἰς 26; καθαρίσθω ... ὑζέφε λατω 440.

καθ' εἰς 434 sqq.; connecting numera 250;
connecting diff. tenses 280; at the
beginning of an apodosis 286, 438;
connecting imperatives 311; distingui-
shed from τε 434; uses of 435 sq.;
with interrogatives 437; adverbative
437; expository 437; meaning especi-
ally! 438; after a particle of time
438; καθ' ... καθ' 439; in comparisons
440, 603; never for ὁ 440; καθ' ... ἢ 443;
καθ' ei distinguished from ei καθ'
444; καθ' ἐκ 448; καθ' ἐκ ὑμῖν 493;
in schema καθ' ἐκχθεί 520 sq. 539 sq.
transposed 560; introducing parenth.
562; anacoluthic use of one for two
575; καθ' ἐν εὐθεία Hebraistically 608.

κατάθετω without art. 124.

κατόρθω art. with 112.

κατόρθω, κατέρθω with part. 344; κατόρθω
444.

κατάθετω without art. 190.
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καλεῖν, ἐν τῷ 410, 593; καλεῖσθαί for εἶναι! 615; καλέσω fut. 77.
καλοποιεῖν 25, 26; constr. of 222.
καμπύλες 24.
κᾶ ν τελ.certe 584.
Καῦς accent 52; indecl. 61.
καπραδοκεῖν 101.
καρδία as a circumlocution for the pers. pron. 156; εἰδόσθα 32.
καρπῶς κουλλᾶν 33; ἄθοφος 38; χιλέως 33.
κατά with acc. of pers. pron. equiv. to poss. pron. 154; in circum. for gen. 193; with gen. 381 sq.; with acc. 400 sq.; in local sense 400; in temporal 401; in distributive 401; figuratively 401 sq.; καθ’ ἑαυτόν 401; in circumlocutions 425; καθ’ δόνα 425; constr. of verbs compounded with 431.
κατάβα 79.
κατάγγειμι aug. of 70.
κατακαθίσομαι 87.
κατακαλώ 87.
κατακυκλώσαμε constr. of 203, 432.
κατακρίνων constr. of 210.
καταλαμβάνω 253.
κατάλειπομί 87.
καταληφθὲν 102.
κατάλημα 25, 93.
κατάνυξις 94.
κατακολύτωσιν 24.
καταστολή 23.
καταστάτω 70.
κατάξαν 70.
κατατάσσω 236.
κατάθενται 102.
κατεργάστην 102.
κατέχειν els 594.
κατηγορεῖν constr. of 190, 203, 260, 431.
κατόρθωμα 25.
κατάγερος 69.
καυχάοντας constr. of 222, 233.
κείρεμ 257.
κεκίρασμα 87.
κεκτημάτω 274.
κελέων with Infinit. 339, 386.
εἰς κενὸν 592; κενὸς 463.
κεραμάδω 99.
κερανόμι 87.
κεφάλης 23.
κῆρας inflection 65.
κερξάνω 87.
κῆρυξ or κῆρυξ! 50.
καθόραμι 252.
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Λαφρέως 583.
Λέγων constr. of 212; ellipsis of 587; λέγων
sc. δ θεός 522, 588; λέγων used absol.
535 sq.; pleonastically 602.
Λευτ or Λευν's inflection 66.
Λιβαδείαν 25, 26, 109.
Λυμα, η 22, 36, 63.
Λυγία 25.
Λυγίσαθα eis 228.
Λυγίσαθαί 259; οί 602.
Λυμή 23.
Λαστόν, τὸ 592.
Λουσίων ἄρθ 197; λαοθεῖα 253.
Λουκᾶς 103.
Λυχωία 24.
Λόδδα inflection 61.
Λέων 22; constr. of 197.
Λυτρῶν constr. of 197; act. and mid.
253.

-μα substantive in 25, 93.
μαθητέσων 23; constr. of 221, 251.
Μακεδονία art. with 112.
Μακρά 230.
Μακρόν 463.
μάλλον in comparison 240, 603; παλλ
μάλλον 633.
μάρμον 25.
Μαρασία inflection 67.
Μαρτλία with infin. and part. 347.
Μαρτυροί μαρτυριῶν 225.
Μάρταιος inflection 68.
Μάρτιον 230.
Μαρχήρι 62.
Μεγαλοχώλον 30.
Μεγαλοςκάθων 26.
Μεθοδεύσαθα constr. of 201, 217, 252.
Μέθυσον 23.
Μεθύσατος 27, 69.
Μέλε constr. of 205.
Μελευς 24.
Μέλλων with inf. 37, 334; ang. of 70.
Μελομαθοῦν 88.
Μέν 443; position of 558, 559; without 84
575 sq.; μὲν ... ἀλλά 443; μὲν ... 84
540; μὲν ... Πετάτα 576; μὲν ... Καλ 576.
Μένεται 558.
Μέντοι 444, 558, 559.
Μεσομερία without art. 121.
Μεσοπτέρων 25.
Μένων without art. 123, 131; μένων as an
adv. 471.
Μετά with gen. 376; distinguished from σώ
391; with acc. 408; constr. of verbs
compounded with 432; μετά τοῦτο or τοῖτα 540.
Μετακινοῦμαι ἀνθ' or ἐν 622.
Μετακτό, ἐν τῷ 592.
Μεταστᾶσα with gen. 196.
Μετέχω constr. of 180, 201.
Μετωπίων 24.
Μετατίθεον ἐν 218.
Μετροτάθησαι 101.
Μέχρι and μέχρις 471.
Μῆθα etc. distinguished from οὗ 473 sq.; use
of 476 sq.; with imperat. 476; in
conditional clauses 477 sq.; in relative
clauses 480 sq.; with infinit. 481, with
participles 482 sq.; apparently for οὗ
486 sq.; in continued negation 487 sq.; in
anarth. 495 sq.; in independ. prop.
500 sq.; in prohibitions 502; in de-
pend. prop. 502 sq.; after ἄρα, ἐποίηθε etc.
503, 601; after verbs of fearing 505;
in questions 511; ellipsis with 596;
redundant 604; in 61 μ 633; in λέγω
ἐλ μή 605; in ἐλ ἔμ μή γε 605; μή ... ἄλλα 595; μῆ ... ἄλλα καὶ 498; μῆ ὁ
511; μῆ ... μᾶς for μηθεῖς 171.
Μῆθό 487 sq.; must be preceded by μῆ
489; distinguished from καὶ μῆ 498;
μῆ ... μῆτε 492.
Μῆθέν 44.
Μηθύκε supeposed use of for μῆ 618.
Μῆρα 434, 443.
Μήτραι 480.
Μῆτρω μεθον γαρ 504 sq.; with both
indic. and subjunct. 505.
Μῆτρα 487 sq.; used after μῆθει? 492.
Μῆτρα without art. 122; omitted 190.
Μέλος 88.
Μεσοματαῖος with gen. or acc. 180, 628.
Μεσοπόλεως 24.
Μεσοτάξια 51.
Μεσομαθιῶν constr. of 205.
Μεσοχάλας 24.

-μον substantive in 93.
Μονοθείλομεν 24.
Μόνως without art. 131; supposed ellipsis
of 495, 595.
-μος substantive in 93.
Μοσχάντωις 96.
Μοσχηρίζομαι ἐν 629.
Μόρια, μορίον 53.
Μορύς accent 52.
Μεσοφως spelling 44; inflection 66.
v in the accusative 66.
ν ἤρεμθυματικαί 41.
νεκροί without art. 123.
νεμίζεω 92.
νίκας 24.
νίκτης 88.
νοεῖ, νοεῖς 62.
νομαθείνων 261.
νόμος without art. 123.
νοσεῖ 24.
νοσεῖμα 24.
νοσθεία 24.
νοσφώτης 62.
νοσθεία infection 62.
Νομανδής 102.
νομανδής 92.
νομί 32; with imperat. 313.
νομίζωμεν 25.
νόθητος δι' and τὸ 63.

διαλογιζομαι constr. of 209.
διαλογισθάμετρος 25.
διπλά, ἡ 18, 592.
διπλώμα 23.
διπλώμα 24.

δ with participle derisively 135; with an acc. elliptically 589; δ μὴ ... δ ἔσται 104; δ ἔσται without δ μὴν 104; δ ἔσται κ.δ. ἔσται 63.
δ for δ' δ' 142; before a clause 168.
δε apparently equiv. to δ δέ 162.
δέδος 32; ellipsis of 590; δὲδὸν ἐπεθύμησα 231.

ἐκδικαστείν 25.
ἐκδικαστήριον 25.
ἐκδικεῖσθαι 30; angm. of 71; pass. 263; claus. 600.
ἐκδικοῦμαι 24, etc. 35.
ἐκτέρεμα 88.
ἐκτυπώσα 176.
ἐλιγμός without art. 131.
ἐλεγέω, ἐλεγεῖ 92.
ἐλεφθέρωμι 33.
ἐλεφθερίας 25.
ἐλεύθερος without art. 131.

Ὀλύμπος 103.
ὁμολογεῖται or ὁμολογεῖσθαι 101.
ὁμολογεῖ constr. of 212.
ὁμολογεῖ 89; constr. of 222.
ὁμολογῶμεν 25.
ὁμοιός accent 52; inflec. 68; constr. of 180, 195, 209.
ὁμοιόμαι ἐν 602.
of time 161; position of 162, 548; ταῦτα 163; ταῦτα πάντα 548.

στρωμικα and στρωμα 41; repeated 160; looking forwards 161; for στρωμα 465; before apod. 541; after condit. clauses 541; with part. 541; in anaphora 618.

φαίλομα 32; φαίλοματα φιαίλων 30, 33. φαιλον constr. of 301 sq.

δήμων 23.

δήμων 471.

δήμων 88.

δήμων 24.

δήμων 23; να 176.'

ναι verbs in 91.

ταὐτός 97.

ταὐτόν 96.

ταὐτον 22.

ταὐτόν 26, 463.

τάκειο 88.

τάκειο 30.

τάκειο position of 548, 554; διάταξαν εἰς τον αυτόν 604; ἄνωθεν 604.

τακείος 25.

τάκειον 26, 44.

τάκεια ταῦτα and ταῦτα πάντα 548.

τάκτη, τάκτη 47.

τάκτων with the compar. 242; with the superl. 248.

τάκτων 26.

τάκτων in comparisons 240; distinguished from ἀπε 364 sq.; after passives 365; with gen. 365 sq.; with dat. 394; with acc. 403; constr. of verbs compounded with 432.

τακτήν 26.

τακτήν 93.

τακτήτθη 102.

τακτήτθης 435. τακτήθης 102. τακτήθη constr. of 223.

τακτέων 22; with infin. 332; constr. with 335.

τακτέων 63 622.

τακτελησιον 471. τακτελησιον 253. τακτέλης 24.

τακτώλης 22.

τακτώς, τακτελησιον 257. Παρεμβαίνεις 103.

τακτομεία 33.

τὰς art. with 111; τὰς ... σο (μή) 172; ταύτη καὶ τάντα 47; παῦτα καὶ τάντα 47; παῦτα καὶ τά
πάντα 116; πάντως with the compar. 242; with the superl. 248; πάντα πάνω and ταύτα πάντα 548; πάρτι, ἀν 592.
πάντα 68.
πάντως 35, 594; constr. of 412.
πάντως without art. 129; ellipsis of 190.
παράδρακα 26.
Παύλος use of art. with 113.
παύλεσθαι with gen. 196, 263; παύσεται mid. 253, 263.
παῦλον 18.
παῦλον βα 338.
παῦλον 253.
παῦλος 24, 96.
παῦλον etc. 77; constr. of 204 sq.
παῦσα 91.
παῦσων 38 sq.
παῦσον τῆς θάλασσης 611.
παῦστα 26.
πάνω in the preterite 278.
παντοκράτηρ 26.
παντοκράτωρ 91.
παντοκράτεια constr. of 214, 233, 410.
παντοκράτορα 25.
παντοκράτεια τῆς γῆς 30.
παντοκράτεια in circumlocutions ? 192 sq.; with gen. 372; distinguished from ἐν τῷ 373, 411 sq.; with acc. 406; constr. of verbs compounded with 432.
παντοκράτειον 257.
παντοκράτειοι constr. of 239.
παντοκράτωρ 32.
πανταχοῦσα 23.
πανταχοῦσα εἰς τὸν 70, 243.
παντάκοιμα 24.
παντάκοιμη 88.
παντάκοιμερ 65.
παντίζω 22.
παντίσα 88.
παντίσχω 88.
Παύλος accent 52; use of art. with 113.
πάνω 88; fut. πᾶμα 90.
πάνω 89.
πάντων constr. of 213, 229, 233, 260.
πάντως 97.
πάντως etc. 35; without art. 120.
παντίσκων τὴν καρδίαν 30.
πάνω with acc. 224.
πάνω 596.
πάνωσθαι without art. 120.
πάνω εἰς ellipsis of 589.
πάνω 508.
πανοράμα, πανοράσθαι 180, 201, 217, 260.
πανοράματα 25.
πανοραμά, ὁ 24, 130, 471.
πανοράματι 94.
πάνως 62.
πάνωσις constr. of 201.
πάνωσις genit. 65; πάνωσις παντοτε 225.
πανεύμα etc. without art. 122; τὸ πνεύματος 592.
πανά 22.
πανεύμα, πανεύματι 256; not pleonastic 609;
πανεύματα μετά τ. 33; πανεύμαta 337.
παναμιακός accent 52.
παναμιακοῦ τ. 180, 214.
παναμιακράσθα 262.
πανάμιάκες position of 553.
παναμικός 463.
πανάμικος with other adj. 525, e.g. πανάμικα καλά καλλια and καλλια παλλα 525; παλλαί and
οἱ παλλαί 110; παλαί in comparison 240;
παλαί μᾶλλον 633; πλέαν 596.
παλαιράκες 463.
παλαιοφορά δέσμα 30.
παλαιόφων εἰναι 465.
παλαιόθες 24.
παλαιός for ἀρχαί 510.
παλαιοτέρων ... ἀλ 509.
παλαιότερον 32.
παλαῖ 471, 508, 510.
παλαῖ accent 50.
παλέσει 47.
παλεῖ, παλέσθα 45.
παλεῖ 22.
παλεῖ with subjunct. 297; with infin. 330, 332.
παλεῖ 372; with gen. of time 557; constr. of verbs compounded with 432.
παλεῖλαλε 593.
παλεῖλαλεσθα 592.
παλεῖλεσθα, παλεῖλεσθαι 258.
παλεῖσθαι 254.
παλεῖστεσθαι 251.
παλέσθε for the simple dat. ? 212, 214; with gen. 373; with dat. 395; with acc. 404 sq.; in circum. 425; verbs com-
pounded with 432.
παλεῖσχεστα 427, 432.
παλεῖσθαι εἰς τ. τόν 593.
παλεῖστεσθα 24, 26, 97.
παλεῖστα στασιστα δευτ. τ. 36, 210, 593.
παλεῖστῶν adverbial constr. of 468.
παλεῖσθα 25.
παλεῖστα 463.
παλεῖστα στασιστα δευτ. 427, 432, 593.
παλεῖστα στασιστα with dat 36; and acc. 180.
προσπολητητέων 33, 48, 101.
προσπολητήτης 101.
προσποληπτίκης 48, 101.
πρόσωπων without art. 122, cf. 174; Hebr.
use of 607; πρόσωπον λαμβάνει 30, 33.
προφητεύειν aigm. of 71.
πρόμα 22.
προφ 47.
προφύσ 26.
πρόφυσις 62.
πρότερος for πρότερος 244; for αις 248 sq.
πρύθν. 24.
πτώμα 23.
πώλη ellipsis of 592.
πώς 508, 510.

ρ past tenses of verbs beginning with 74.
Ραμά indecl. 61.
βαρτίζειν 24, 74.
βάσιμα 25.
βαθίς 25.
βίο 89.
βίω 89.
βίμα without art. 123.
βίος 22.
βίοσθαι constr. of 197.
βίτη 22, 23.
Ρήμα use of art. with 112.

σ and τ 41 sq.
σάββατον infec. 63; τα σάβ. 177.
σαλτίζω 89; σαλτίζει τσ. δ σαλτ. 522.
Σαμωρία art. with 112.
σάρκως and σαρκικός 98.
πάνα σάρξ 33.
παρά 24.
περίζεσθαι 23.
περιστρέφει 89.
περιστέρα 26.
Χίλοι 103.
συνάδες 26, 92.
συναιστήκα 26, 92.
συναίστησαι 98.
συναίστησαι 25.
συνειδεσθαι 254.
Σουρία art. with 112.
Συροφωνία, Συροφωνία 95.
σχολή 23.
σάξω constr. of 197.
Σέιαταρος 103.
τάμιων 24, 94.
τανειμοσφοτή 26, 99.
τανειμοσφοτή 236.
ταρταρούν 25.
ταῦτα referring to a single object 162;
τάτα τάτα and τάτα τάτα 548.
ταχός comparison of 69.
t distinguished from καί 434; τα... τα
439; τα... τα 439; τα γαρ
448, 539 sq.; position of 559; with
πρώτον 576.
τεκνία accent 52.
t with gen. of abstractions 238.
tέλεσ fut. 77.
τέρας 65.
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τέσσερες etc. 43.
τέτευχε 89.
-της, -στης substantives in 94.
τίθημι forms of 78.
Τίμων accent 51.
τις, τι in indirect quest. and for the relat. 168 sq.; for τέσσερες 169; τις ἄτον ἄτον with indic. 300, and of 481; τι used adverbially 142; in exclamations 142; τι δέ 585.
τις, τι (indef.) not used for of τις 169; with substs. and advs. 170 sq.; position of 170, 559; τι aliquid (magni) 170; τι, τι not used in N. T. 171; τι as acc. with verbs 227.
Τίτων and Τίτων 52; never has art. 118.
τό before entire clauses 109; before a word as a sound 109, 179; before the infin. 320; τό εἰς ὅμως and the like 230.
τόν 434.
τοιγαροίν 445.
τοιγαροίν 445, 559.
τούντων use of art. with 111.
τούλμαν alleged plonasm of 612 sq.
-τος verbs in 96 sq.
τότε as a connective 540; before apod. 541.
τότε used adverbially 142; τότε μέν ... τότε δέ so used 142; τότε, τότε exegetical 530.
τρέχω 250.
Τρέπωμε accent 51.
τρεχός accent 54.
Τρεύως use of art. with 113.
τυχέω 89; constr. of 200; supposed to be plonastic 609.
τυχέω 355.
-τιων in imperat. 76 sq.

Βάλος 22.
βλέπων with the acc. 64.
βλέπω accusative 64.
βλέπω ellipsis of 591.
βλέπω ellipsis of 592.
uvw θεᾶτρου 33; uvδ with abstr. gen. 238; supposed to be omitted 190, 593; δ uvδ τοις ἀπερατοῖς not equiv. to ἔγνοι 144.
"Τίμωνος accent 51.
-νος verbs in 92.
θανατέων εἷς 165.
προφέρω with part. 350.
πρέπει with gen. 382 sq.; distinguished from πρέπει 383; with acc. 403; as an adverb 423; constr. of verbs compounded with 433.
θαράσσεω 422.
θαράσσεω 463.
θαράσσεω 423.
θαράσσεω 96.
uvw with gen. 364, 368 sq.; confounded, with ἀπερατοίς 370 sq.; with acc. 407; constr. of verbs compounded with 433.
θαυμάζω 422.
θαυμαζόμενος constr. of 227.
θαυμάζω for ἔκπληξις 43.
θαυμάζω 26.
θαυμάζω 43.
θαυμάζω 196, 260.
θάφεος τῇ δια. 215.

θαγγὼ 89; constr. of 198 sq.
θαγγω 89.
θαγγω accent 51.
θαλω 89; θαλασσέω constr. of 233.
θαλασσέω 90.
θαλασσέω constr. of 180, 205.
θαλασσέω 99.
θαλάσση 96.
θαλώς 90.
θαλεύω constr. of 223.
θάλεις accent 52.
θαλεύω sc. θαλάς 522, 588; in direct discourse 558; ellipsis of, or of θαλάς 598.
θάλευσ 23, 90.
θαλά 22.
θαλάσσεω constr. of 223.
θαλάσσο(with) 75.
θαλάσσεω fut. 77 sq.
θαλάσσον 24.
θαλίς 90.
θαλακτόν 26.
θαλακτόν constr. 226.
θαλάσσεων νήμα 30; φολάκας 225; φολάκας constr. of 223; signification of 253.
θαυμάζω 34.
θαυμάζω intrans. 22, 252; forms of 90.
θαυμάζω ψωφί 236.
χαίρω sc. ὅμως 549.
χαίρω 90; constr. of 210, 232; χαίρω in salutation 316.
χαρίσματα 90.
χαρίζωμαι 90, 261, 264.
χαρίζωμαι 90.
χαίρω 18, 30, 32.
ψομίζειν 23; with the acc. 226 note.
—σε in the acc. 62.
ἀδίκιν 65.
ἀθέων 90.
ἀν as an imperf. part. 341.
ἀντιγλυκός aug. of 70, 90.
ἀνασάμην 70, 90.
ἀντίφασι 24, 96.
ἐπε without acc. 124; ellipsis of 591 sq.
ἀφάνεια 88.
ἀς (not ἄς 462) constr. of 296, 448, 449; with infin. 318; always as (not ἄς) 462; before a series 519; before a pred. 527; supposed pleonastic 617; force of, particularly before gen. abs. 617; with a prep. of direction 617 sq.; ἀς . . . καλεῖ 440; ἀς ἠρξι 618; ἀς (ἄστυ) . . . ὀφεῖ 440; ἄς ἀς 308, 309 note; ἄς ἀς ἐπιτείχω 317, 449.
ἀσάμην 71.
ἄστυ in prot. without apod. 599.
ἀπε constr. of 301, 318, 337; with a negative 480.
ἄτειν 25.
ἀφελεῖσι constr. of 227.
ἀφέλειμα constr. of 213.
## III. INDEX OF PASSAGES IN THE N.T. EXPLAINED OR CITED.

The Figures refer to Pages; those followed by an Asterisk indicate passages not merely referred to or quoted, but commented upon.

<p>| Matt. i. 1 | 125 | Matt. iii. 5 | 68, 268, 438* |
| Matt. i. 3 | 366 | Matt. iii. 6 | 528 |
| Matt. i. 6 | 67, 190 | Matt. iii. 7 | 409 |
| Matt. i. 10 | 67 | Matt. iii. 8 | 206, 444 |
| Matt. i. 11 | 187*, 375* | Matt. iii. 9 | 151 |
| Matt. i. 12 | 187* | Matt. iii. 10 | 110, 266*, 444 |
| Matt. i. 16 | 366 | Matt. iii. 11 | 75, 217, 266*, 337, 412*, 630 |
| Matt. i. 17 | 110*, 370 | Matt. iii. 12 | 75, 149* |
| Matt. i. 18 | 113, 192, 206*, 330, 368, 455* | Matt. iii. 13 | 325 |
| | 465*, 527, 616* | Matt. iii. 14 | 269, 436* |
| | 330 | Matt. iii. 15 | 269 |
| Matt. i. 20 | 391*, 401* | Matt. iii. 16 | 147*, 151*, 369* |
| Matt. i. 21 | 141, 150, 182 | Matt. iii. 17 | 132, 232, 278*, 586 |
| Matt. i. 22 | 461, 562, 563 | Matt. iv. 1 | 106*, 374, 392, 428 |
| Matt. i. 24 | 436 | Matt. iv. 3 | 334*, 541 |
| Matt. i. 25 | 107, 182, 296, 436 | Matt. iv. 4 | 87, 280*, 377, 389*, 392 |
| Matt. ii. 1 | 113, 139 | Matt. iv. 5 | 622 |
| Matt. ii. 2 | 55, 155, 316*, 446* | Matt. iv. 6 | 373 |
| Matt. ii. 3 | 68, 111*, 113, 344, 376 | Matt. iv. 10 | 210 |
| Matt. ii. 4 | 75, 110, 266*, 365 | Matt. iv. 11 | 521 |
| Matt. ii. 6 | 114, 429 | Matt. iv. 12 | 428 |
| Matt. ii. 7 | 105 | Matt. iv. 15 | 121, 187*, 231*, 590 |
| Matt. ii. 8 | 287, 607 | Matt. iv. 16 | 147, 247, 602 |
| Matt. ii. 9 | 104, 275, 296, 473, 542 | Matt. iv. 17 | 422 |
| Matt. ii. 10 | 66, 224 | Matt. iv. 18 | 177, 403*, 417*, 446 |
| Matt. ii. 12 | 260, 423, 481 | Matt. iv. 19 | 228, 606 |
| Matt. ii. 13 | 79, 267, 434 | Matt. iv. 21 | 113, 132, 190 |
| Matt. ii. 14 | 104, 428 | Matt. iv. 23 | 131, 132, 145, 156, 496, 539 |
| Matt. ii. 16 | 365, 370, 401* | Matt. iv. 24 | 110, 436, 527, 539 |
| Matt. ii. 17 | 51 | Matt. iv. 25 | 67, 420, 520, 539 |
| Matt. ii. 18 | 222 | Matt. v. 1 | 115, 428 |
| Matt. ii. 20 | 175, 446* | Matt. v. 2 | 608 |
| Matt. iii. 3 | 61 | Matt. v. 4 | 200, 551 |
| Matt. iii. 4 | 106, 370, 406*, 523 | Matt. v. 5 | 551, 585 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.T. INDEX.</th>
<th>669</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 6</td>
<td>205*, 551, 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 7</td>
<td>551, 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 8</td>
<td>215, 551, 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 9</td>
<td>122, 299, 551, 585, 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 10</td>
<td>120, 551, 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 11</td>
<td>223, 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 12</td>
<td>114, 293, 585, 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 13</td>
<td>78, 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 14</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 15</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 16</td>
<td>172, 432, 506, 518, 542, 552, 613*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 19</td>
<td>160, 246*, 310, 543, 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 20</td>
<td>245*, 477, 506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 21</td>
<td>265, 502, 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 22</td>
<td>228, 250*, 215*, 455, 621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 26</td>
<td>79, 296*, 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 27</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 28</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 29</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 31</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 32</td>
<td>56, 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 33</td>
<td>85, 86, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 34</td>
<td>222, 389*, 481, 488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 35</td>
<td>397*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 36</td>
<td>76, 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 38</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 39</td>
<td>288, 598*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 40</td>
<td>168, 280*, 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 41</td>
<td>147, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 42</td>
<td>280*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 43</td>
<td>254*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 44</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 45</td>
<td>445*, 457*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 46</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 47</td>
<td>315, 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 50</td>
<td>311, 121, 259, 399*, 405, 583, 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 51</td>
<td>725*, 287, 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 52</td>
<td>502, 592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 53</td>
<td>148, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 54</td>
<td>275*, 310, 315, 467*, 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 55</td>
<td>44, 122, 433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 56</td>
<td>387*, 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 57</td>
<td>209, 329*, 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 58</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 59</td>
<td>121, 533*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 60</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 61</td>
<td>97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 62</td>
<td>81, 152, 448*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 63</td>
<td>197, 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 64</td>
<td>56, 275*, 638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 65</td>
<td>143, 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. v. 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 21</td>
<td>576*, 638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 23</td>
<td>499, 539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 24</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 25</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 28</td>
<td>220, 366, 480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 29</td>
<td>87, 124, 330, 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 30</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 31</td>
<td>292, 545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 32</td>
<td>311*, 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 33</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. viii. 34</td>
<td>110, 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 1</td>
<td>184, 539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 2</td>
<td>80, 374, 539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 3</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 4</td>
<td>169, 539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 5</td>
<td>80, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 6</td>
<td>47, 374, 563°, 580°, 620°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 8</td>
<td>111, 175°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 9</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 10</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 12</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 13</td>
<td>66, 271°, 495, 496°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 14</td>
<td>227, 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 15</td>
<td>408°, 437, 614°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 16</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt. ix. 17</td>
<td>605</td>
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