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Divinity School.
I trust it will not be imagined that in writing on certain tenses of the Greek verb I am proposing to run amuck among all scholars—English and German, American and French—of the present and the past as to the sense and use of these tenses, or that I am undertaking to show that in some considerable degree the Greek verb has been misunderstood. Nothing of the kind. Even if I am able to add a handful or two to the granary already well stored with wheat by the labour and industry of earlier students, it is but a handful or two after all: that these tenses are in the main perfectly understood by scholars is not, and cannot be, questioned. What may be questioned is whether they are always satisfactorily rendered into English. In short we have before us a problem of Comparative Grammar which I venture to think has not yet been adequately discussed, and towards an adequate discussion my wish is to offer now some contribution.

For it is much too commonly believed and taught that the Greek Aorist Indicative (for my remarks will deal chiefly with the Indicative mood) is equivalent to the Simple Past Tense in English (I wrote, I loved, I brought), and the Greek Perfect to the English Perfect (I have written, &c.), with only occasional exceptions scarcely worthy of serious notice.*

* Thus the late eminently learned Bishop of Durham uses the same names as applicable to both languages, when he deplors "the confusion of the aorist and the perfect" in the A.V., and adds: "It is not meant to assert that the aorist can always be rendered by an aorist and the perfect by a perfect in English." (On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament, p. 82.)
This is much as if any one knowing that the Iberian Peninsula is of about the same extent as France, and that they are both tolerably compact in shape, should conclude that if maps of these countries drawn to the same scale be compared by superposition (as we prove the equality of certain pairs of triangles or segments of circles in some of the familiar propositions of Euclid), they will at least very nearly coincide. Let him try the experiment, and he will find that here France will largely overlap, there the Peninsula, and if the maps are correctly drawn, by no ingenuity can one be made to fit with any approach to exactness upon the other. Correctly drawn: dropping the figure I affirm that the English Past, used according to the true English idiom, will largely fail to coincide with the Aorist of the Greek verb; and so of the two Perfects.

Moreover I do not propose to subject these tenses to complete and exhaustive treatment, and to go once more over all the ground that the labours of so many able and eminent grammarians have covered.

I. In the first place, as to entire and absolute similarity of use, is it reasonable to expect it? Take the very simplest words that are in use—nouns, for example, which are the names of the commonest objects; do pairs of such words ever coincide in any two languages? And if not words, and such words, how can we expect inflexions entirely to agree?

1. To illustrate this point. Compare the Greek χεῖρ with the English hand. In their prevailing use these words are perhaps equivalent: if I hold a thing ἐν τῇ χειρί, I hold it in my hand. But are the “hands” of a mill or of ironworks χεῖρες? Would a horse sixteen “hands” high have in Greek ἐκκαῖδεκα χεῖρας? I have not seen in any Modern Greek paper how “an old Parliamentary hand” has been hellenized, but παλαιὰ βουλευτικὴ χεῖρ seems doubtful; and altering the first two words (or either of them) to γεραιά and the not altogether inapplicable ἐκκλησιαστικὴ does not give a true Thucydidean ring after all. And when we find in a Dialogue
of Lucian (not given in the common editions) the Shade of Porsonus, after enjoying an evening chat with Socrates and old Museus, breaking it off—and breaking off certain old habits of his also—with the words, which he instinctively throws into metre—

"ἀλλ’ ὥδε γὰρ τοι κλεψύδραν μικράν τινα
ἀνυδρον ἔχω τρόχια τε καὶ χεῖρας δύο
ἐξουσαν, ἡ δ’ ἐτυφεν ἅρτι τὰς δέκα·
ἐς λέκτρον εἴμι’"—

how the Athenian sage lifts his two hands! We are not surprised that he exclaims (especially as he is just a little reminded of some of the worst lines of that Euripides whom he detests but whom Porsonus loves), "Φεῦ τῆς ἄνοιας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τί ποτ’ ἐλεξεν;"

2. And as hand is not always χεῖρ, neither is χεῖρ always translatable by hand. At least occasionally in Homer (as in II. 11. 252,

νύξε δὲ μν κατὰ χεῖρα μέσην, ἀγκώνος ἐνερθεν),

in Hesiod (Theog. 150), Herodotus, Xenophon, Euripides (Iph. in Tauris I. 1404, where see Paley’s note), and always in Hippocrates and other medical writers it means not hand but arm. "Ακρὴ χεῖρ is the fore-arm (Littré, Hipp. vol. III., p. 283), and ἡ δλη χεῖρ in Theoph. Protosp. De Corp. Hum. Fabrica includes the βραχίων and the πήχυς (Greenhill’s edition, pp. 25 and 37). Accordingly arm would be the preferable rendering for χεῖρ in some places (as Heb. xii. 12) in N. T. Moreover χειραγωγέω (Acts ix. 8 and xxii. 11) is rather to lead by the (lower) arm than by the hand, if we accept the authority of Greek vases on which we see one person leading another, grasping him round the lower arm just above the wrist. And in Xen. Anab. I. 5. 8 ψέλλα ἐπὶ ταῖς χεραῖ is obviously “bracelets on their wrists.”

3. In like manner horse is not always ἐπιστός (towel-horse for instance), nor board πίναξ or σανίς—fancy an ἐπιστάτης τῆς σχολαστικῆς πίνακος!—nor tub (on the Cherwell) πῦξ, nor queen (queen-bee) βασίλισσα, nor would it be safe for an
aspirant to the honour of being A.B., T.C.D., to begin translating "a power of potatoes" with δύναμις, whatever encouragement the Latin "vis frumenti" might give him in that direction. And just so the Spanish suposición besides meaning supposition is also imposition and social eminence; sermón means not only sermon, but also language (like the Latin sermo) and censure; and constipación includes the idea of a so-called cold in the head. Indeed examples similar to these might be quoted by the thousand.

4. If then the mind or fancy or fashion of different nations so differently apprehends or so variously combines or modifies even the simplest notions, and the most solid and substantial elements of speech are liable to such vagaries—and what has been just shown in the case of nouns is equally true of adjectives, verbs, and other parts of speech*—how is it likely that such light and gaseous elements as forms and inflexions should not be vastly more changeable and fitful and flitting? If horse and ὑπνός, with whatever certainty they may originally have been names for the same species of animal, yet came to diverge so widely in the later meanings into which they branched off, assuredly we may reckon with confidence that σ and Δ, even if (which it would not be easy to prove) they did originally indicate in ἔγγαίησα and loved precisely the same modification of the verbal idea, would nevertheless in course of time assume additions and variations of meaning differing in different languages.

II. Again: while in English as compared with Greek it is so firmly believed that our Past is the equivalent of the Aorist that by many it is reckoned altogether inexact and unscholarly to render, except very rarely, ἔγγαίησα by I have loved, and the like, it seems to have escaped observation that nobody dreams of applying such a rule to the past tenses of verbs in any other pair of languages.

1. How was Jerome to distinguish the Greek Perfect and

---

* As to two of the particles see Appendix A (on Γάρ), and Appendix B (on Οὖν)
Aorist when translating into the Latin of the Vulgate, as his version is called? They are both represented by one tense in Latin. And just so, there being in Latin no Present Participle Passive, he is compelled to use the Perfect Participle in its place, as in *translato sacerdotio* for *μετατηρεμένης τῆς ἱερωσύνης*, Heb. vii. 12. The Greek and Latin tenses obviously do not coincide.

2. Compare Greek or Latin with Hebrew, and the difference is most marked. Hebrew has only one Past, and that is very often a Future. Thus נַעַל is *fuit* (or *erat* or *fuerat*): prefix רַ, *and*, and נַעַל is now כָּל כָּטַש, *et cærit*.

3. Compare Greek or any Romance or Teutonic language with Sanskrit. Here I can scarcely do better than to quote from Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar, § 532, where he states that the tenses of the Sanskrit verb "here distinguished (in accordance with prevailing usage) as Imperfect, Perfect, Pluperfect, and Aorist receive those names from their correspondence in mode of formation with tenses so called in other languages of the family, especially in Greek, and not at all from differences of time designated by them. In no period of the Sanskrit language is there any expression of imperfect or pluperfect time—nor of perfect time; except in the older language, where the 'Aorist' has this value; later, Imperfect Perfect, and Aorist (of rare use) are so many undiscriminated past tenses."

4. Compare French with Latin: *il chanta* and *il a chanté* are both *cantavit*, just as *il avoit chanté*, *il eut chanté*, and *il a eu chanté* *are all cantaverat*.

5. Compare French with Italian: "Nè i Greci combattendo per tanto tempo contro il Gran Re *usarono* la lingua de' barbari, nè i Romani la greca;" in French we should find not *usèrent* but *usahaient*.

6. Compare French with German: *er sang* is both *il chanta* and *il chantait*.

7. Compare English with German, and we find similar

---

*Quand j'ai eu racheté ma liberté, j'ai voulu, etc. Le Chevalier de Cerny (Jules Noriac), p. 251.*
differences of usage though the languages are so closely akin. "Die Felder lagen ungebaut," "The fields were lying uncultivated." "Yesterday I was at church," "Ich bin gestern in der Kirche gewesen." "How long have you been in England?" "Wie lange sind Sie schon in England?"

8. Compare English with Italian: "I sang" is either "Io cantava" or "Io cantai," and "Io cantava" is either "I sang" or "I was singing." "I have brought the hat I bought yesterday," "Ho portato il cappello que io ho comprato ieri." "Sono oramai quarant' anni che io semino 'l grano nel mio podere," "It is forty years that I have been sowing wheat in my farm."

9. English and Spanish: "Mientras preparaba su comida, dióse á . . . .," "While she was preparing her dinner, she set about, &c." The Imperfect however can be expressed in a periphrastic form as in English: "Estaba entregando la carta á las áscuas del fogón, cuando la campanilla anunció á Caballero," "She was committing the letter to the flames, when the door-bell announced Caballero." And while in this same example the Simple Past "announced" answers to the Spanish Preterite "anunció," every page of a Spanish book will show examples where the same English tense is required for the Spanish Imperfect. Also we find the Present for the English Perfect: "Ya estoy seis años en España," "I have now been six years in Spain." If I were speaking of a former residence in Spain, he estando would be preferred.

10. Instances such as the above of the different uses of tenses in various languages it would be easy to multiply indefinitely; but as bearing on the mode of rendering the Greek Aorist and Perfect it is especially noteworthy how frequently our Simple Past becomes in French, German, Italian, and other languages the Compound of the Present—what in French is called the Preterite Indefinite. For instance: "When I went out this morning, I met your cousin," "Quand je suis sorti ce matin, j'ai rencontré votre cousin." And it is yet further remarkable that within the limits of one and the same language usage differs on this point. The French sentence just given is Parisian French, and accords with the
rule for the tenses observed throughout the greater part of France. But, if I am rightly informed, in the South of France (where also they still often employ the Imperfect of the Subjunctive, which has fallen into desuetude elsewhere) precisely the same thought would be expressed, "Quand je sortis ce matin, je rencontrai votre cousin."

11. Add to all the above the many cases where the use of tenses is found to differ in different stages of the same language; Greek for example. On this, however, it is unnecessary to enlarge.

12. Facts such as these seem to indicate with considerable emphasis that the ideas of time which are conveyed by the past tenses of verbs are apt to be differently distributed in different languages, so that it is a priori improbable in a high degree that the past tenses in Greek and in English should be found at all exactly to correspond.

III. Besides, the other tenses of the Greek verb and the English verb do not coincide: why should the past tenses be expected to do so?

1. First, look at the English Present, to which we so readily at times give the force of a Future: "We start to-morrow," "The king comes here to-night." This usage, though rare, is not unknown in classical Greek, and in the N. T. there appears to be one instance (not dealt with by Winer) where, just as in "We start to-morrow," and with the same effect of more vivid presentation of the idea to be conveyed, we read Μακεδονιαν γὰρ διέρχομαι, I Cor. xvi. 5, the verb being equivalent to μέλλω διελεύσεσθαι. Alford explains this Present as implying the Apostle's "now matured plan," which is precisely the sense conveyed by "We start to-morrow."

2. But it is wonderful that in no Grammar—none at least that I am acquainted with—is there any mention of one very notable use of the Present (with of course a corresponding use of the Imperfect) where, there being also some adverb or adverbial phrase expressive of "time how long," past and present time are both included, as in the familiar Latin jampridem cupio, and as above shown in French, Spanish, &c.
In English we have no such sense of the Present, at least east of the Irish Sea, but say, "I have long desired" or "been desiring." In Homer we find examples, as in II. 14. 206 and 305,

ηδη γαρ δηρον χρονον αλλαλον απεχονται,

"For now for many a year they've lived apart." Homer also thus employs the Perfect, but not in precisely the same sense as the Present. Δηρον εγω πολεμω πεπαυμαι (II. 18. 125) is not "I have long left off war," referring to the act of retiring from the φυλοτις αινη, but "I have long been at rest from war," referring, as the Perfect always does in Greek, to the state resulting from the act. Compare παλαι τά καλά ἀνθρώπων εξεύρηται, Her. 1. 8 ad fin., which does not mean simply "what is right has long been discovered" ("invented," Blakesley) "by men," but "has long been counted among things ascertained and recognized:" not merely this knowledge has been acquired, but it has formed a part of our treasure of settled and abiding knowledge. In Soph. Aj. 601 we have 'Εγω δ' ο τλάμων παλαιος αφ ου χρόνος . . . . μιμω, "But as for me, unhappy being that I am, 'tis a long time that I have abode:" "depuis longtemps je continue" is the French equivalent.—In Soph. Trach. 44 we read

χρόνον γαρ ουχι βαιον, άλλη ηδη δέκα
μήνας προς άλλοις πεντ' ἀκηρυκτος μενει,

"For it is not a short time, but fifteen weary months, that no tidings have come from him." See again παλαι θαυμάζω, "I have long been wondering," Plat. Crito, c. 1; εμε ἀνέχεσθαι τοσαῦτα ηδη ἔτη, "That now for so many years I have been allowing," Plat. Apol. c. 18; άδικει πολιν ηδη χρόνον, Dem. Phil. II., 70, 5; ουκουν παλαι δήπον λέγω; Aristoph. Plut. 261; παλαι φράζει, Aristoph. Av. 50.

3. But without adducing further examples from the Classics, we may point out a few out of many in the N. T.: οδησα, Mk. v. 25; προσμένουσιν, Mk. viii. 2; ἐρχομαι, Lu. xiii. 7; ἐχουσα, Lu. xiii. 11; δουλεύω, Lu. xv. 29; ήν θέλων, Lu.
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xxiii. 8; ἔχων and ἔχει, John v. 5, 6; εἰμί, John xiv. 9; κατακείμενον, Acts ix. 33; διατελεῖτε, Acts xxvii. 33; ἐπιποθίαν ἔχων, Rom. xv. 23.—In the LXX. the same usage is found: τρέφων, Gen. xlviii. 15; κατουκεῖν, Deut. i. 6; πενθοῦσα, 2 Ki. (Sam.) xiv. 2; ἐσμέν, Ezr. viii. 73 (ix. 7).*

This is surely evidence enough that the Present tense is not used alike in Greek and in English; while there is yet this to be added, that our verb, so wealthy in tenses, has three Presents (I write, I am writing, I do write) to one in the Greek.

4. Again, the Greek Imperfect is often inaccurately rendered in English translations. Translators seem to forget how wealthy in tenses (as I have just remarked) our English verb is; and to convey the true sense of the original and bring out all its force, the natural resources of our own language ought to be remembered and employed. The fact is that such forms as “I have been writing” and “I had been writing” are for the most part left out of sight. Yet these are often the correct English representatives of the Greek Imperfect. And so the Imperfect Passive, which needs to be turned into the Active in English: διαδοχαῖς ὁ Ἐρυνύων ἡλιανυμέσθα φύγαδες, “Fury after Fury has been driving me about in exile,” Eur. Iph. T. 80.

* In some of these passages our English Versions give the true English idiom; in the majority, dominated by the Greek Syntax, they do not. In two places (Mk. viii. 2, Acts xxvii. 33) where A.V. is right, the Revisers, whose ways are sometimes profoundly inscrutable, have altered the correct rendering and given the Greek idiom in English words in a manner for which Macaulay’s schoolboy—methinks I can hear his χαμαργή!—

That this use of the Present has escaped observation can easily be accounted for when we remember that all the older Greek grammars, from the anonymous primer published at Erfurt in 1501 down to our own times, were written in Latin, the Greek and Latin idiom being the same in this particular. And nothing could be more natural than that it should be unnoticed by scholars, commentators, translators, to whom France, Italy, Spain, Holland, Germany have given birth, when in all their languages the Present is similarly used. But it is less excusable that English scholars with their eyes open to jampridem cupid should close them to πάλαι δεινός.

[A friend however has pointed out to me, since the above was written, that this use of the Present is mentioned, with three examples quoted, by Professor Goodwin of Harv. Univ. in his Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb.]
5. Examples might be collected by the score: I will quote a few. Hector was just leaving the place where "he had been talking" (Paley) with his wife, δάριξε, Hom. II. 6. 516; Hephæstus put away in the tool-box the tools "with which he had been working," τοὺς ἐπονεῖτο, II. 18. 413; ἐναυμάχεον, Her. 8. 42, "had been fighting;"

τολῦν, τολῦν με, δαρόν τε δή κατείχετ' ἀμφὶ Τροίαν χρόνον,

"A long, long, weary time have ye been detaining me here before Troy," Soph. Aj. 416 (the Imperfect here taking the place of the more common Present, because the weary detention is supposed now to have reached its close); βασιλέων ὀργὰς ἀφέρουν, "I have been warding off the anger of the royal house," Eur. Med. 455; "this is now evident which I have been telling you," ἔλεγου, Plat. Apol. c. 14; "whom now I have been keeping in check," κατείχου, ibid. c. 30; "twenty-five ships with which he had been blockading Miletus," ἐπολιόρκει, Xen. Anab. I. 4. 2; τὰ γὰρ τῶν πολεμίων ἑδαπανάτε, "for you have been living at the enemy's expense," ibid. VII. 6. 31; κρέα ἀνέβραττεν ὄρνθεια, καὶ τραγήματα ἐφρυγεν, κφόνον ἀνεκεράννυ, "she has been stewing chickens and toasting sweets and mixing wine," Ar. Ran. 510, 1; ὦ δὲ τοῦτο ἐκ πάντος τοῦ χρόνου μάλιστα ἐπραγματεύετο, "this (delay) was just what he had been contriving all the time," Dem. de Cor. p. 234, 3 (Whiston); ἐπραγματεύει καὶ διεξῆ, "has been tragically detailing," De Cor. 229, 18; ἥκουν τίνων, "people have been telling me," Dem. Olynth. I. 15, 19.*

6. New Testament examples are—ἐξητούμεν σε, "we have been seeking thee," Lu. ii. 48; ἀρας ἑφ' ὑ κατέκειτο, "taking up the bed on which he had been lying," Lu. v. 25; ἐκείνο, John xx. 12; εἰχέτε (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), "ye have been holding," 1 John ii. 7; καθὼς ἔλεγου, "as I have been saying," 2 Cor. ix. 3. And similarly the force of the passive ἐνεκοπτόμην in Rom. xv. 22 is best given by "I have been hindered;" and ἔμελλον ἀποθανεῖν, Apoc. iii. 2, "have been on the point of death."

* And so the participle in Thuc. vi. 93, διανοούμενοι, "who had been intending."
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7. And there is yet another use of the Imperfect, as in 
&omicron;χρον ἦν, "it would have been disgraceful," Thuc. iii. 63.

8. It is thus plain that the Greek Imperfect does not follow
the same rules as the English Imperfect, not to dwell on the
familiar fact that ἔτυμτον, besides meaning "I was striking,"
is also frequently "I used to strike," "I kept on striking,"
"I tried to strike"—so ἐδεδουν and οὐκ ἐκών regularly,—"I
began to strike," and perhaps most commonly of all, "I
struck."

9. Of the Future it is sufficient to remind the reader that
it appears in similes in Hom. (as in II. 4. 131), and that
βουλήσομαι, ἐθελήσω, προθυμήσομαι sometimes correspond to
the English Present.

If then the Present, the Imperfect, and the Future are
so differently used in the two languages, how is it reasonable
to expect that other tenses shall not exhibit similar differ-
ences?

IV. One source of error, it seems to me, is the following.
It is not noticed—at least I have failed to find any hint of it
in any grammar—that the use of the tenses relatively in the
two languages differs in a considerable degree according to
the nature of the composition, as being, or not being, simple
narrative. However overlooked hitherto, the distinction is
one of prime importance.

1. As to the Greek, I have carefully compared many
chapters of the narrative and the non-narrative parts both of
Thucydides and Herodotus to ascertain the frequency of use
of the several tenses, and will state the results in tabular
form. The figures indicate percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thuc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1'5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32'5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1'5</td>
<td>7'5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuc.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Present in the narrative portions of these authors...
would be represented by lower figures but for including occasional geographical descriptions. The non-narrative portions are the speeches, those of Thucydides however containing just a little of the narrative element.

2. Now no one questions that in principal clauses the Aorist of narrative is almost invariably translatable by our Simple Past (that it is sometimes the English Pluperfect is shown below), as it is by the Preterite Definite in French, Spanish, Italian, &c.: "Ο Φήστος τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον, A.V., "Festus declared Paul’s cause unto the king"; R.V., "Festus laid Paul’s case before the king"; Segond, "Festus exposa au roi l’affaire de Paul"; de Valera, "Festo declaró la causa de Pablo al rey"; Diodati, "Festo raccontò al re l’affare di Paolo."

3. But outside the limits of narrative we find instances in great numbers in which Greek takes the Aorist, but the English idiom refuses to admit the Simple Past.

For example, if we speak of any incident as mentioned by some author we regularly use the Present, sometimes the Perfect: "The Chronicle states ——," "Clarendon records ——," "Gibbon informs us ——," "Macaulay has noticed ——." We never say, "The Chronicle stated——," and so on. But in Her. i. 12 ad fin. we have τὸ καὶ Ἀρχιλόχος ὁ Πάριος . . . . ἐν ἰάμβῳ τριμέτρῳ ἐπεμνήσθη.

4. And so in conversation or debate. Creesus for instance speaking to Solon (Her. i. 30) compliments him on his extensive travels as well as his fame as a philosopher, and adds, νῦν ὁν ἵμερος ἐπείρεσθαι μοι ἐπήλθε, εἰ τινὰ ἡδη πάντων εἶδες ὁλιγώτατον, which may be literally rendered "now therefore a curiosity has sprung up within me to know whether you have now seen any one who is the happiest of all men." Who would dream of saying "a desire sprang up . . . . you saw"?

A little lower down we read (c. 32 init.) the indignant question of Creesus, "But is my happiness, Athenian stranger, so set at naught (ἄπερρυπτα το ὁ μηδὲν) by you that you have not deemed (ἐπολυσας) me worthy of comparison even with private persons?"

In Her. 7. 8 med. Xerxes is addressing the council of
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Persian nobles prior to the invasion of Greece: διὸ ὑμέας νῦν ἐγὼ συνέλεξα, “for this cause have I now called you together.” In his flattering reply (c. 9) Mardonius declares, “All that you have said is most admirable and true,” λέγων ἐπίκεισθη. And lower down he boasts, “And I myself have already had experience of these men, for I have led an expedition against them,” ἐπειρήθην.

So in Demosth. Symm. pp. 181, 182: πάνω πολλὰ πράγματα ἐσχὼν, “I have taken exceeding pains;” ἰδαὶ τῶποθ’ ἀπαντεῖ ἴππολύθητε, “whenever you have had a common wish;” οἴδειν πῶποθ’ ὑμᾶς ἐξέφυγεν, “nothing has ever escaped you;” οἴδειν πῶποτε ὑμίν ἐγένετο, “none of your designs have been executed.” (These are C. R. Kennedy’s renderings.)

These examples taken from a few chapters in Herodotus and a few lines in Demosthenses will suffice.

5. If now we turn to the N. T. we may reasonably expect to find a similar usage, especially as pure narrative constitutes so small a part of the volume. More than one-third of the whole is made up of the Epistles, and of the remaining two-thirds a large fraction consists of conversations, parables, sermons, and other discourses either of our Lord or His Apostles. It may be desirable therefore to quote a few passages where this non-equivalence of the Aorist to the English Simple Past is so far admitted that both in A. V. and R.V. it is rendered by the English Perfect. Matt. v. 21, 27, &c., ἰκούσατε, “Ye have heard;”* Mark x. 20, ἐφυλαξάμην, “I have observed;” x. 28, ἀφίκαμεν, “we have left,” and so ἀφῆκεν, “hath left” in ver. 29; xii. 26, οὐκ ἄνεγγετε; “have ye not read?” xiv. 6, ἵργάσατο, “she hath wrought;” xiv. 8, 9, ἐπολύσεων δὲς, “hath done;” Eph. ii. 13, ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς, “ye are made† nigh;” iii. 5, ἀπεκαλύφθη, is revealed” (A. V.), “hath been revealed” (R. V.); Apoc. xiv. 8, ἐπεσευ, “is fallen.”

6. It may be asked then why, if the necessity for such

* And so the same word in Jas. v. 11, where Dr. J. B. Mayor remarks, “The aor. here must be translated, as in many other instances, by the Engl. perf.”

† It is scarcely necessary to observe that these forms, like “I am come,” “Ils sont tombés,” are Perfects; just as “The house is built at last” would require in Latin not a d i f i c a t u r, but a d i f i c a t a e s t.
rendering is thus admitted by the Revisers, is it necessary to write this protest. The answer is, because the propriety of such rendering is by no means sufficiently admitted, and the Perfects in the passages just quoted seem to have been adopted almost by mere instinct, not guided or controlled by any grammatical principle. I hope to establish a principle, and to prove that such renderings are in accordance with it, and not in reality exceptional as commonly supposed.

V. The Revisers write as follows: "There are numerous cases, especially in connexion with particles ordinarily expressive of present time, in which the use of the indefinite past tense in Greek and English is altogether different; and in such instances we have not attempted to violate the idiom of our language by forms of expression which it could not bear" (Pref. to N. T., III. 2). But this passage suggests an important enquiry. Is the Simple Past in English an "indefinite past tense"? It is a fact that in most English grammars the tense bears that name; and apparently the mere name has guided our Revisers. But is the name justly applied?

1. As to "aorist," probably no reader of these pages needs to be informed that aorist means indefinite, and we must bow to the authority of the Greek grammarians who held that name to be a suitable one to describe the tense of ἔλεξα or εἶπον. And manifestly suitable it is, if the tense (as in Ἰμερός μου ἔπηλθε) is employed to mark an event that occurred in its completeness in some time prior to the present, without defining either expressly or by implication precisely when that time was, however far off or however near. The Aorist, as we well know, was also used when the time was defined, as in narrative; and in narrative, as the above table shows, just one third of the verbs are in that tense. It must not however be imagined that the Aorist in narrative differs as to its own proper meaning from the Aorist elsewhere. It is altogether indefinite still, and the definiteness is supplied by the notes of time that appear somewhere in the context. But our present business is the comparison of the two languages, and for the purpose of comparison we may set the Aorist of narrative
aside as a case in which its correspondence to our Simple Past is admitted.

2. It may indeed seem at first hardly credible that in a Time-Word (as the Germans call the Verb) the time-idea should be so nearly dispensed with altogether, so nearly non-existent. But let me recall the reader's attention to the passage above quoted (§ II. 3) from Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar. Or, without travelling quite so far in either time or space as Ancient India, let us see whether we do not possess a tense equally indeterminate in our own present language of every day life.

3. For instance suppose we desire to state in English a fact or event (not as protracted or continuous, but looked at in its entirety as a whole) that took place in some time prior to the present, without defining either expressly or by implication when that time was; what tense do we employ? The event, we will suppose, is my brother's travelling in Russia: what Englishman, speaking in simple and natural English, would express himself in any other tense than the Perfect, "My brother has travelled in Russia"? A soldier alludes to battles of his earlier days, a sailor to his voyages, an engineer to his construction of bridges, a land-owner to his planting of trees, a builder to his erection of houses, a physician to his treating some particular disease, a scholar to his acquisition of languages, an author to his writing certain works, all without giving any hint as to the time, except only that the event or act was somewhere or other in past time, and what is the form of expression? "Many a battle have I fought;" "I have often sailed in those seas;" "I have built bridges of all kinds;" "I have planted hundreds of acres of Scotch firs;" "I have built more than two thousand houses;" "I have treated several cases of that kind;" "German I have learnt, but not Polish;" "I have written advocating those views." This is the form we choose in all such cases. On this I insist as on a plain and indisputable fact in our language, and this form therefore is our true Past Indefinite; and this is the tense which, unless the Greek grammarians were intolerably ignorant of their own language, is the normal equivalent of the Greek Aorist.
4. On the other hand—and this again is a plain and indisputable fact—when we define the time as in narrative, whether with little exactness or with much, speaking of the action or event as a whole, we always use the Simple Past tense: “I fought in three battles in that campaign;” “I built two bridges in the course of that summer;” “I erected scores of houses before I was forty;” “I learnt Polish once, but soon forgot it;” “I brought out that work in 1886.” This therefore is the Past Definite, though in this paper I have preferred to call it the Simple Past.

5. And the French grammarians en masse take the same view. *Je parlai, je reçus, je vins* is the Prétérit (or Passé) Défini in (I believe) all French grammars, and *j'ai parlé, j'ai reçu, je suis venu* is the Prétérit (or Passé) Indéfini—the French Aorist.

6. But may it not be said of this Simple Past, as just now of the Aorist of narration, that it owes its definiteness to the context? No, for we never use it without some at least implied note of time,* but the Aorist may be so used. Definiteness is therefore of the essence of the tense. If some old General says, “I fought in three battles,” either the year or campaign referred to has been previously mentioned by the same or by another speaker, or we feel that the sentence is unfinished. But when without any note of time the angel exclaims (Apoc. xiv. 8), Ἐπεσεν, ἐπεσεν Βασιλέων, in English there is a felt necessity for rendering the Greek indefinite tense by our own true indefinite tense, the Perfect: “Fallen, fallen is Babylon.”

VI. Now it has been above pointed out (§ III.) that the Greek and English uses differ both of the Present, and of the Imperfect, and of the Future; and partly this has been

---

* Of this tense (which he calls the Preterite) Professor Agar Beet writes: “We cannot use it unless we have in mind some definite [past] time, definitely separated from the present” (Expositor, first series, vol. XI., pp. 191, &c.). I had not the advantage of seeing Professor Beet’s three papers in the Expositor on the use of the Aorist in the Greek Testament till the present article was completely finished, but it was a pleasure to find that on all leading points we had arrived at the same conclusions.
shown of the Aorist also. But in the Aorist such variety can be exhibited yet more fully, as well as in the Greek Perfect (and therefore in the Pluperfect), and in English in the Simple Past and in the Perfect.

1. One use of the Aorist not mentioned above is this, where we might have expected the Perfect; for instance, ἠδόθη, "has been given," Matt. xxviii. 18, which is perhaps equivalent to ἤδοται.

2. Another is in clauses, mostly dependent, where it states some fact or event that is prior, and is intended to be understood as prior, to some other past fact or event. It then corresponds to, and should be translated by, the English Pluperfect.* To give just one example from the Classics, in Her. 8. 21 we find, Ἐκομιζοντο δὲ ὡς ἐκαστοι ἐτάχθησαν, Κορίνθιοι πρῶτοι ὑστατοι δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι, "But they [the Greek fleet] retired in the order in which the several divisions had been stationed, the Corinthians leading, the Athenians bringing up the rear." And in the N. T., Matt. i. 24, ὡς προσέταξεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος, "as the angel had bidden him;" xi. 1, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν, "when He had made an end;" xxvii. 31, ὅτε ἐνεταξάν αὐτῷ, "when they had mocked Him;" xxvi. 19, ὃς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "as Jesus had appointed them;" Mark i. 32, ὅτε ἐδοξασεν ὁ ἠλισθ, "when the sun had set [and the Sabbath was over];" and it is, as so frequently, the Greek rather than the English idiom that both A.V. and R.V. give us in Matt. ii. 9, "the star which they saw (εἶδον) in the east went before them." Luther translates "der Stern den sie im Morgenlande gesehen hatten;" Diodati, "la stella che aveano veduta in Oriente;" de Valera, "la estrella que habían visto en el oriente;" Segond, "l’étoile qu’ils avaient vue en Orient;" so also Lasserre and Stapfer; and going back to earlier dates, the Vulgate (both Clementine and Amiatine), and later Beza, render "stella quam viderant in Oriente."

3. Such clauses I have said are mostly dependent, as in all the examples just given. In Matt. xiv. 3 however ἠδοσεν and ἀπέθετο seem to be principal verbs, and possibly ἀπέστειλεν

* Observe, the English Pluperfect: see below, § VII. 3, note.
in John xviii. 24 should be so understood. But these may be simply Hebraisms.

4. The Aorist too is often used where our idiom demands the Present, as in the similes of Homer and Theocritus, and as in the 'vaìs ë'θæøv ëση ð' αθòs of Euripides; but this Gnomic Aorist (as in Jas. i. 11, "for the sun rises, &c.") and the Epistolary Aorist (2 Cor. viii. 18, "we send with him the brother, &c.") need not here be enlarged upon.

5. The Aorist Participle in a Future Perfect sense, though overlooked in the grammars, is worth notice. Examples (a few will suffice) are—νυκήσαντι, Hom. II. 3. 138; νοστήσαντα, II. 13. 38; συναντήσαντα, Eur. Ion 534; κυρήσας, Eur. Phœn. 490; and in N.T., πονίσας, Rom. x. 5; κοιμηθέντας, 1 Thess. iv. 14; πιστεύσασαν, 2 Thess. i. 10. And so the Indicative (in a relative clause) in Rom. ii. 12.

6. Again, the Aorist cannot be translated by the Simple Past, when, being the Aorist of an intransitive verb that signifies state or condition, it marks the entrance on that state or condition; such being often* the force of the tense in verbs of that class. One example is, "for now is your salvation nearer than when ye first believed" (Rom. xiii. 11), where the "first" ought not to be printed, as in R.V., as though it were not in the Greek; it is in the Greek, fully implied by the tense. Compare δπως σχαδ, Acts xxv. 26, "that I may find," or "get;" ἐπτάχευσεν, 2 Cor. viii. 9; ζησωμεν, 1 Thess. v. 10, and 1 John iv. 9; πλουτήσης, Apos. iii. 18; ἐβασιλευσεν, Apos. xix. 6.† Sometimes the passive Aorist has a similar force, as

---

* Not always; for while Hellen and his sons are said by Thucydides (I. 3) to have "grown powerful (λεχωσώνων) in Phthiotis," in Luke vi. 48 we find the same verb in the same tense signifying the possession of strength in past time looked at as a whole, not merely in the incipient stage—"the wind could not shake the house." And so elsewhere, but always, I think, with a negative or μελε.

† When Bishop Lightfoot wrote, what is undoubtedly true, that "the Aorist of πιστεύω is used very commonly, not of the continuous state of belief, but of the definite act of accepting the faith" (On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament, p. 86), one may confidently affirm that he did not mean that this verb stands alone in being so modified in sense in the Aorist. Indeed there is one Aorist which rarely (but see Ἐσχ. Pers. 785, Eur. Ion 251) has any other meaning than this inchoative one—ἐλεφ. From Homer downwards in all the Greek authors this word hardly ever signifies I had (which is ἔλεξω), but
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περισθέντες, "when first enlightened," Heb. x. 32. So in the Classics, ἐπηνευον, "I approve your action," Soph. Aj. 536; ἀπεττυον αὐτήν ἦτις κτλ., "I loathe the woman who &c.," Eur. Tro. 662; ἡρυθρασας, "you are blushing," ἑδάκρυσας, "you are weeping," lit., "you have began to blush" or "to weep;" and see Kühner's note on βουλεύσας, "senator factus," Xen. Mem. I. i. 18.

7. And there is also at least one passage where an Aorist is apparently used by a Hebraism (see above, II. 2) for the Future, namely καὶ ἔτελεσθη, "then shall be consummated," Apoc. x. 7; for the Apocalypse is brim-full of Hebraisms. Compare Num. xx. 19, "then I will pay," Heb. וְתִתֶּנָּה, lit., "and I paid"; Is. xlix. 21, "then shalt thou say," Heb. וְתִיתְנָה, lit., "and thou saidst;" Jer. li. 48, "then . . . shall sing," Heb. וְתִיתְנָה, lit., "and they sang."

8. Compare now our Simple Past. It is never employed as certain Aorists are, as shown in the four preceding paragraphs. ἔβασιλευσε or ἐτυράννησε may mean "he reigned," but also, and more commonly, "he came to the throne" (see 1 Cor. iv. 8); but "he reigned" never bears this latter sense.

9. It can be used however, at least in colloquial English, for the Pluperfect; as, "He gave her the apple he knocked down from the tree." This usage survives from Anglo-Saxon times, as, "And ἦδί ζά he fæste feowertige daga," "And when he fasted" (that is "had fasted") "forty days."

10. It often signifies that which used to take place at some past time, as, "His sons went and feasted in their houses, every one his day, and sent and called for their three sisters to eat and to drink with them" (Job i. 4). But this would be the Imperfect in Greek, not the Aorist. In this passage in the LXX., vv. 4-6, there are six principal finite verbs, all Imperfects.

11. Again it may signify that which happened or was done during a period more or less prolonged simultaneously with

I got, I acquired, I began to possess, I began to hold. It is not the holding alone, but the thrusting forward and then holding, of spear and orb be shield that we see in II. 5. 300 and 17. 7. And so almost always.
some other event or action or course of action, as, "I wrote while they painted," where the same idea may be expressed by saying, "I was writing, while they were painting." This sense also, like the last mentioned, would require, not the Aorist in Greek, but the Imperfect; and not only in Greek, but in Anglo-Saxon also, French, Spanish, and Italian.

12. In short the one and only use in which our Simple Past is equivalent to the Aorist is its use in narrative as a Past Definite (§ V. 4); but of course this includes the brief and fragmentary narrative that constitutes an important element in ordinary conversation. Still there remain innumerable cases in which the Aorist is not our Past, nor our Past the Aorist.

VII. Let us now turn to the Greek Perfect, which is commonly assumed to be equivalent to the English Perfect. That it may, not only in many cases but in most, be translated by our Perfect is quite true; but it does not follow that the two are equivalent.

1. Their equivalence is at once disproved by the fact (see §§ IV. and XII.) that our Perfect is so often the fitting and only true representative of the Aorist. But there is more to be said.

2. In Smith and Hall's English Grammar it is affirmed: "The statement, 'I have lived in London seven years,' implies that the speaker is still living in London, and the period of time referred to reaches up to the moment of speaking." And it is because this is the common view that in so many modern grammars this tense is called the Present Complete. But the assertion is not true. The words do not at all of necessity imply "that the speaker is still living in London, &c." He may be now living, and may have lived for years, in New York or Madagascar or Tonquin, and may yet be able to state, referring to an earlier period of his life, "I have lived in London seven years." (See above, § II. 9). Undoubtedly the expression may be used in the sense those writers attribute to it, being then equivalent to the Present in German, French, Italian, &c.; but it may also be used without
implying any connexion with present time, nothing but mere priority, being then equivalent to the Preterite Indefinite in German, French, Italian, &c. In other words this form “I have lived” is sometimes a Present Complete, while also it is sometimes, though perhaps less frequently, a Past Indefinite.

3. But what of the Greek Perfect? This is a Present Complete, I think always: I doubt whether it is ever a Past Indefinite. In its prevailing use it differs from the Aorist in this: the Aorist predicates—definitely (by aid of the context, as above pointed out) as to time in narrative, indefinitely in its other uses—a past event or act, looked at as a completed whole; the Perfect predicates the present state resulting from that event or act. So the Pluperfect predicates a past state resulting from a prior act; and the Future Perfect, a future state that will result from a prior act.* The state is commonly that of the object in active transitive verbs, that of the subject in intransitive and passive verbs.

4. The following are examples. Transitives: ἔγραφα;

* Such is Matthiae’s view of the Perfect tenses, as he most clearly shows in his remarks (§ 497, Obs.) on the use of the Aorist where we might have expected the Perfect or Pluperfect. “It is often optional,” he writes, “whether a writer will or will not express the continuance of the state produced by a past action, because this may be self-evident, or it may have been his design to direct attention chiefly to the action itself.”

With this Madvig agrees in the main. The example however which he adduces is not felicitous, for it is hard to see how the Greek Pluperfect could be used there at all. It is this: [Οἱ Πελοπόννησοι] ἔγραψαν μὲν χρώμαν ὑπέμεναν, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐτράποντο ἐς τὸν Πάνορμον, δὴν περ ἄνηγάγοντο, Thuc. II. 92. Now if I were going-over an English man-of-war, and, picking up a small piece of rope, were to untwist it a little and discover a red thread running through it, I should at once say, “This rope came from Devonport,” or “was made at Devonport,” a sentence which in Greek would undoubtedly have the verb in the Perfect: the very make of the rope affords permanent evidence of the past fact. But as to that Peloponnesian fleet, what Panormian characteristic would distinguish it? What mark or sign of any kind could it carry with it showing that it had in the morning put to sea from Panormus?

A good example of the two tenses in juxtaposition, each of them equivalent to the English Pluperfect, while only one is the Greek Pluperfect, is found in Thuc. I. 75, τίνων καὶ ἥδη ἀποστάτων κατεστραμμένων, “when some of them had already revolted and been reduced to submission.” Here the Aorist indicates the act which had been done, undone, and avenged: the Pluperfect, the state that resulted.
γέγραφα, and there it remains written; δέδωκα, and the gift remains theirs; your faith σέσωκέν σε, and you are now in perfect health; νευκήκατε τὸν Πονηρόν, and he is now a beaten foe. Intransitives: μεμαρτύρηκε, and he is a standing witness to the truth; τεπίστευκα, and that belief abides; προγεγονότα ἀμαρτήματα, sins whose place is in the category of things past; τέθηκεν, “he is dead,” describing the present condition, while ἀπέθανεν (Rom. vi. 7) marks the act, “he has died”—a distinction that cannot be made in Latin or French, nor in various other languages, but which in English is both possible and important;—κεκρίκει (Acts. xx. 16), the intention being then fully formed in St. Paul’s mind; ἔληλυθεν, was fresh from a visit (to Jerusalem), Acts viii. 27. Passives: ἡ ὁμάτια τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελείωται, his love to God has reached maturity and is perfect; μεμηγμένοι ὁίνοι, the wine mixed with gall was already prepared—St. Matthew would have written μιξάντες ἠδοκαν, had he intended to suggest to his readers the act of mixing; the assembly ἢν συγκεκ τιμήθη, was in a state of confusion. The Future Perfect does not, I believe, occur in the N.T., but its force is easily discernible when we compare κληθήσεται (Matt. ii. 23), “shall receive the name,” with κεκληθήσεται (Æsch. Pr. V. 859), “shall bear the name.” Of course, when the Future Perfect dropped out of use (as it has quite disappeared from Modern Greek), the Simple Future had to do duty in its place.* Matthiæ, § 498, remarks of this Future Perfect (or Third Future, or Paulo Post Future) that it expresses “not so much the simple future passive, a future transient action, as a future permanent condition, which will have arisen from a transient action.”

5. But it is fitting to invite attention to two specially instructive examples of the Perfect. Every kind of inferior nature, St. James reminds us (iii. 7) δαμάζεται καὶ δεδαμασται by mankind. The δαμάζεται of course does not signify that men actually do tame every kind of animal, but that such a

* So in Hebrew, where there is no Fut. Perf., the Simple Future is at times used as one: see Is. liii. 10, “When thou shalt make” (דָּשַׁתָּנָךָ) signifying “When thou shalt have made”: LXX., τὰν δῶτε (with a v. l. δῶται); Vulg., “si posuerit.”
conquest is effected now and then—can be effected. The Perfect δεδάμαστας marks the result of the taming. The passage means therefore that every animal “can be tamed and kept tame” by man. The other is in Rom. xvi. 25, 26, where we have the Perfect, or rather Pluperfect, Participle σεανηγμένου in immediate conjunction with the Aorist Participle φανερωθέντος. The latter predicates an act, the former a state. If the throwing of the veil of silence had been spoken of, and the being first hidden by it, we should have had the Aorist συγκέποτος: the Perfect indicates the remaining under the veil. “Which was kept secret” is the excellent rendering of A.V.; and φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν should be translated “but has now been laid open to view.”

6. The Greek Perfect, however, of a transitive verb does not always indicate the resulting and permanent state of the object: occasionally it is that of the subject. Thus ἑωρακότες the miracles of Christ (John iv. 45), “having been eye-witnesses of them, and being therefore still under the abiding impression produced by them:” all this is implied in the ἑωρακότες.

7. As to permanence of result, compare the passive ἐσταυρωμένος. The primary meaning is “in the condition resulting from the act of crucifying,” in other words, “on the cross.” And this is apparently the sense intended in Gal. iii. 1: “before whose very eyes Jesus Christ was [in my preaching] painted as on the cross.” But in 1 Cor. i. 23 the thought is different: “We proclaim Christ as One who may to endless ages be described as having endured the agony of the Cross.”

“Crucified! we Thee adore.”

Similar to this is the ἀπέσταλκεν of 1 John iv. 9. Jesus abides for ever the Ἀπόστολος (Heb. iii. 1) whom we confess, the Sent Redeemer of mankind.

8. But there are passages where it is not easy to see any permanent result as having followed the action, there being some Old Testament narrative either quoted or alluded to, and the Perfect being so used as to bear a certain resemblance to the Historical Present. See Heb.
vii. 4-10. Melchizedek meets Abraham returning from the κοπή of the kings; and now we see he "has received a tithe" (δεδεκάτωκεν) from the Patriarch and "has blessed" (εὐλογηκεν) him, and Levi too "has paid tithe" (δεδεκάτωται). So in Heb. viii. 5 the book of Exodus is quoted: we refer and see that Moses "has been divinely instructed" (κεχρηματίστωται) concerning the building of the Tabernacle. In like manner, Heb. xi. 17, we read in Genesis how Abraham in intention "has offered Isaac." In translating into English the Historical Present may be used, as in R.V. of Heb. viii. 5; but the Simple Past is sometimes preferable, as adopted by the Revisers in Heb. xi. 17. The English Perfect, as in R.V. of Heb. vii. 6, 9, even if we take it as a Past Indefinite, seems strangely out of place; as also in Acts vii. 35, where ἀπέσταλκεν, which is to be similarly accounted for, must be simply "sent," not "hath sent."*

9. Yet other places there are where the English Perfect cannot be employed as the equivalent of the Greek Perfect.† It is utterly amazing that in Rom. xvi. 7 οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ is rendered in R.V. "who also have been in Christ before me." The English idiom here is simply outraged. What officer in our Navy or Army would not stare at the βάρβαρος who should say of a senior officer, "He has been in the Service before me?" "He was in the Navy (or Army) before me" is the only correct English form according to the norma loquendi on which usage has set its

* One wonders how the Revisers would render the following: "Anselme Popinot était petit, pied-bot, infirmité que le hasard a donné à lord Byron, à Walter Scott, à monsieur de Talleyrand, pour ne pas discourager ceux qui en sont affligés." For Byron, Scott, Talleyrand were all dead when Balzac wrote that sentence.

† I do not propose to discuss every Perfect in the Greek Test., but one small exceptional class may be just alluded to. The Perfects ἔσχηκα, ἐληφσα, and ἔρηκα are sometimes used apparently in a purely aoristic sense. The Perfect perhaps admits of explanation as such in every case except where ἐληφσα and ἔρηκα occur in the Apoc., ἐληφσα five times (ii. 27, iii. 3, v. 7, viii. 5, xi. 17) and ἔρηκα twice (vii. 14, xix. 3). The aoristic force (which indeed is not necessarily assigned in all these passages) is, I suspect, to be attributed to simple error, the Perfects being mistaken for Aorists through their resemblance to ἔθηκα, ἠρεύκα, &c.
seal. And this is perfectly intelligible. The English mind fastens on the idea of time defined (though loosely) by “before me,” and therefore uses the Simple Past, which, as above pointed out, is our Past Definite. The Greek Perfect is correctly employed, because it is intended to convey, and does convey, the idea that they are still in Christ, while the English “have been” suggests precisely the contrary. “I have been in Spain” implies that I am not there now; “I have long been in Spain” implies that I am there now; but this would not need the Perfect but the Present in Greek. With Rom xvi. 7 we may compare John ix. 29, Ἡ τοῦ Ἡρῴου, “God spoke [what we still have on record] to Moses;” and vi. 25, πότε ὁ ἔγονας; “when camest thou hither [where thou now art]?” Also 1 Cor. xi. 15, ἡ κόρη ἀντὶ περιβολαλου ἐδόται αὐτῇ, “was given to her as [what it still is] a covering;” xiii. 11, ὁ ἐγένομα ἄνηρ, “when I became, [what I am], a man;” * xv. 4, καὶ ὁ ἔγινεται, “and that He rose” [as He still is a risen Saviour]. “Has risen,” of the act, would be the nearest English representative not of ἔγινεται, but of ἔγερθη.

10. With this use of the Perfect compare the μθώσω of Luc. Dial. Mort. 11. 2: “What was the end then? I should much like to know?” “They both died [and they are now here among us] on the same day.” And τεθανατοῖ in Xen. Hell. II. 4. 19, coming in the very midst of the description of a battle, must in English be rendered “was buried,” the word further implying “Where he still lies.”

11. In short while such a sentence as “One of the A.S. Kings has established Trial by Jury” or “King John has signed Magna Charta” is quite contrary to usage in English,

*I am inclined to think that similar to this is the true explanation also of the ἐγένεσα in Matt. i. 22, xxii. 4, xxvi. 56, “all this came to pass [and remains what it is—an accomplished fact].” Bishops Lightfoot and Wordsworth prefer to account for the Perfect on the ground that “St. Matthew writes as one who lived near the fact, and speaks of it as just done.” This “just done,” however, is inaccurate. There is nothing in the Greek Perfect that indicates recent action. But any way the tense implies that the thing abides as done, the meaning being in this respect fuller than that of the English Perfect. Alford and Plumptre pass over the difficulty.
notwithstanding the continued existence of Trial by Jury as one of our institutions and of Magna Charta as part of the law of the land, in Greek on the contrary the verb might correctly be in the Perfect; and this again constitutes a marked distinction between the Greek Perfect and the English Perfect.

VIII. A further and double proof remains that the Greek and English Perfects are not equivalent. For what more familiar modes of expression have we than these—"I have never written to him," "I have often written to him"? Yet here we should normally have the Aorist in Greek, not the Perfect.

1. As to never of past time. In the N.T. (see Bruder) we find 23 such passages, in only 6 of which (all containing πώ) is the Perfect used, while in all the remaining 17 the Aorist appears, with οὐδέποτε or οὐδεὶς πώποτε or οὐδεὶς οὔπω or οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς or the simple οὐκ as equivalent to never (Mark xiv. 21, Luke xxiii. 29). As in this last case in the N.T., so in half a dozen passages which I have succeeded in finding in the O.T., the LXX. uses οὐκ where A.V. has never—there is in Hebrew no one word for never,—and in only one of these (Daniel xii. 1) is it followed by a Perfect. Turning to the classical authors, I have with some difficulty found in Sophocles, Aristophanes, Plato, and Demosthenes, 34 passages in which the force of never is conveyed (by οὐδέπω, οὐδετέρωποτε, οὐ . . . ποτε, οὐτε . . . ποτε) of past time, but the verb in 29 of the 34 is in the Aorist. In many of these in English also we should employ the Simple Past, but by no means so commonly as the Aorist is used in Greek.*

2. In the case of πολλάκις, though its employment with a past tense is by no means frequent, the Aorist is almost exclusively found as the equivalent of our Perfect. Thus in Hom. Il. 1. 396, "For oft have I heard (ἐκούομαι) thee say in my father's house;" ib. 3. 232, "Oft has Menelaus entertained

---

* "The indefiniteness of the Aorist is very conspicuous in negative sentences. For in these it is quite clear that it covers the entire past up to the present moment." Dr. Agar Beet.
(ξείνοσεν) him in our house;” Soph. El. 62, “For oft before now have I seen (εἶδον);” Plat. Crito 1, “I have often thought you happy (ευδαιμόνια);” ib. 10, “As we have often agreed (ὁμολογήθη) before now;” Xen. Mem. I. 1. 1, “I have often wondered (ἐθαύμασα);” Luc. Dial. De. 11. 1, “I have often threatened (ὑπείλησα), if he will not desist from doing such mischief, I will break his arrows;” and similarly, ib. 19. 2, “You have hit him with many an arrow (πολλὰ ἐτόξευσας).” Occasionally indeed πολλάκις takes the Perfect, as πολλάκις τεθαύμακα, Xen. Mem. III. 13. 3, but not in precisely the same sense: with the Aorist the meaning is “I have often been led to wonder” (or “admire”), with the Perfect, “I have often been in a state of wonder” (or “admiration”). But when we find Homer’s lines (Il. 9. 490, 1)

πολλάκι μοι κατέδευσας ἐπὶ στηθεσί διτῶνα
οίνου ἀποβλύζων ἐν νηπιϊ ἀλεγείνη,

translated by Newman

“— oft in infantine annoyance
Didst thou the wine-draught gurgle out and wet my bosom’s vesture;”

or by Cordery,

“Yes, I remember, oft a fretful child
Thou ’dst spill the wine and soil the garb upon me;”

as to tense these are inaccurate renderings, representing not the Aorist, but the Imperfect of the Greek. Compare Hom. II. 17. 408, πολλάκι . . . ἐπείδετο, Soph. Cyd. Tyr. 1275, πολλάκις ἠρασε βλέφαρα, Xen. Mem. I. 2. 50, πολλάκις ἐσκόπει. Here the oft-repeated enquiry, striking, discussion, took place in definite past time: and this is what the Simple Past in English expresses. Πολλάκις ἔγραφον is “I often wrote;” πολλάκις ἔγραψα, “I have often written;” and the much rarer πολλάκις γέγραφα, “I have often had my completed writing before me.”

3. So in N.T. πολλάκις ἐβαλε, Mark ix. 22, “has often thrown;” πολλάκις προεθέμην ἀλθεῖν, Rom. i. 13, “I have often intended to come;” ἐδοκιμάσαμεν πολλάκις, 2 Cor. viii. 22, “we have found by frequent experience;” πολλάκις με ἀνέψυξεν, 2 Tim. i. 16, “has often cheered my spirit:” no time being
defined, these are the only correct renderings. Similarly πολλάκις συνήχθη, John xviii. 2, "he had often resorted." In Mark v. 4 the full force of πολλάκις δεδέσθαι is not merely "that he has often been secured," but "made fast and left (as was supposed) secure." The Imperfect with πολλάκις in Rom. xiv. 22 and Phil. iii. 18 refers to repeated action within a definite past period, and therefore the English Simple Past may be used: "I was hindered on those" (not "these") "many occasions (ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλά in the best MSS.);" and "I many times told you," namely, while present with you.

IX. The persistent rendering of the Greek Aorist by the English Simple Past in the R.V. of the N.T. has one very undesirable effect—that the translation is not English.

This un-English tone is felt in the numerous Hebrew and Greek idioms that seriously mar the R.V. of the N.T. I will not digress to deal with Hebraisms, but will adduce just one example of a Greek idiom, one out of many: "a man which had his hand withered." We do indeed say "the man who had his arm broken" or "scalded" or "cut off;" but there the act—that is, his endurance of the act—of breaking or scalding or cutting off is suggested; but no one can imagine that the act of withering, whether God's act or one performed by some human process unknown to modern science, is referred to in the ἐξαραμμένη (not ἔλαφρατεσάν) of Mark iii. 1. State, not act, is indicated by the Perfect Participle. As to "had his hand withered," we should as soon say "The elephant has his hide thick," or "The girl has her hair red;" excellent as Greek, intolerable as English.

2. So it is with respect to the use of the tenses in R.V.; and it is possible to adduce a somewhat striking proof of the recalcitrance of our native tongue on this bed of Procrustes on which the Revisers—I still speak only of the N.T.—have forced it to lie.

3. I have examined numerous chapters of the Epistles—the English R.V.—and classified all the indicative verbs in them to a total of 650. I have similarly examined non-narrative writings—dedications, prefaces, dialogues, but mainly letters—
of several of our classical English authors, classifying the verbs to a total of 2,000. It would not have done justice to the experiment not to appeal to a variety of authors on a variety of subjects. The letters &c. were those of Pope, Gay, Kirke White, Byron, Coleridge, Southey, Charles Lamb, W. S. Landor, Trench, Mrs. Browning, and especially (but eschewing narrative) Macaulay. The following table shows the percentages of results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pope, &amp;c.</td>
<td>57'55</td>
<td>'2</td>
<td>16'95</td>
<td>14'25</td>
<td>1'95</td>
<td>9'1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul in R.V.</td>
<td>52'92</td>
<td>'15</td>
<td>26'46</td>
<td>10'92</td>
<td>4'6</td>
<td>9'1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do. A.V.</td>
<td>50'15</td>
<td>'15</td>
<td>19'69</td>
<td>16'77</td>
<td>6'1</td>
<td>12'61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course such expressions as Pope's "That gentleman is become," Kirke White's "Your time is nearly expired," "My Essay is printed," Coleridge's "Their fame is established," Macaulay's "I am fully resolved," and in R.V. "Ye are made nigh," "Your faith is gone forth," "It is written"—are not reckoned as Presents, but what they really are, Perfects. None of them would be in the Present either in Latin or Greek.

4. Now when we look at this table we see at a glance that the Future is used with exactly the same proportionate frequency in the R.V. of the Epistles as in our English classics, while all the other tenses, especially the Perfect and Pluperfect, are thrust into the background to enhance the honour of the Simple Past. In Pope's and Gay's letters the Perfect is used just as frequently as the Past, by Coleridge and Mrs. Browning even more frequently in the writings that I examined; while the average is about as 7 to 8: in R.V. the ratio is about 2 to 5, and this in spite of the fact that some of these Perfects (as shown in § VII. 9) are such by an illicit process. Would it be possible to adduce evidence more conclusive that the Revisers showed too little consideration for the genius of the English language?

5. Let us now turn from R.V. to A.V. The figures (the percentages reduced from the same total of 650) are given in
the same table. It is unfortunate that I did not keep an
exact list of the passages from R.V. that I examined, so that
I lighted on places where there were more Futures but fewer
Presents. But in respect to the two tenses now chiefly under
consideration, it is truly remarkable how accurately the relative
use of the Simple Past and of the Perfect by the Translators
of 1611 coincides with that of our best writers in the same
class of composition. If instead of 1677 we had 1655 the
proportion would be exact, for


How is it then to be accounted for that the N.T. Revisers
of 1881 have so far departed from the model of our best
writers? Because—untaught by the very name of the
α-ὅριστος—they imagined it to be the special function of the
Aorist to predicate a past event in definite past time, over-
looking the wide difference (§ IV.) between narrative and non-
narrative Greek; and rightly feeling, in spite of the inexact
and misleading nomenclature of the English grammars, that
the Simple Past is the Definite Past in our language, they
came to the erroneous though honest conclusion that they
were bound to translate the Aorist by the Simple Past—with
a few inexplicable exceptions.

X.—Attention has already been called (§ III. 3, 4) to the
wealth of tenses of our English verb. Nevertheless it is
deficient in one tense, the Simple Imperfect. Such a tense is
found in Greek, Latin, French, Italian, &c., but there is none
in English.

1. What then do we substitute for it? Frequently, as
above pointed out (§ III. 8), we adopt some periphrasis, “I was
writing,” “I kept on writing,” and so on; but most commonly,
whether we are translating Thucydides or St. Luke, we employ
the Simple Past: ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἔπολει, Mark iii. 8, “What
great things He did,” A.V. and R.V. Obviously we might
render the ἔπολει by “He was doing” or “He had been
doing;” but our Simple Past is often used of (1) prolonged
or (2) repeated or (3) habitual action, where the Imperfect
would be used in the languages that are provided with that
tense. Examples, though perhaps scarcely necessary, are (1) "He utterly distrusted the baron," (2) "An actress who night after night played the Belle Arsène, and whom the pit hissed," (3) "She always thought of his troubles;" where in French we should find "se défiait," "jouait . . . . sifflait," "pensait." Now this suggests two remarks.

2. First, if our Simple Past bears this sense, and so frequently, as every reader of Greek knows, corresponds to the Imperfect as well as the Aorist, is there not obvious danger, while avoiding confusion of the Aorist with the Perfect, of confounding it with the Imperfect? a danger of steering away from Scylla into Charybdis? Hence in many places were the R.V. retranslated into Greek by any scholar who was keenly alive to the distinction of tenses, the English Past would be rendered by the Greek Imperfect. To give one example of many that might be adduced: Jesus upbraided certain towns "because they repented not" (Matt. xi. 20) must convey to the mind the sense "because they were not penitent" or "repenting." But this would be the Imperfect, while the Greek has the Aorist. The true rendering is "because they had not repented"—the English Pluperfect.

3. In any translation some seeming confusion of the tenses of the original is absolutely unavoidable, because, as above shown, none of our tenses correspond exactly—nay, they are far from corresponding—with those of the Greek verb; but it does seem strange that translators have been so apprehensive of confounding the Greek Aorist and Perfect (or Pluperfect) under one tense in English, while yet continually compelled to confound the Greek Aorist and Imperfect under another. There will be least clashing of the two tenses if we shift the ground of the Aorist itself, restoring it to its just rights as an indefinite tense, and accordingly often rendering it by the English Perfect or Pluperfect. This necessity the Revisers fully recognize when they write: "In the great majority of cases we have been obliged to retain the English preterite [= Simple Past], and to rely either on slight changes in the order of the words, or on prominence given to the accompanying temporal particles, for the indication of the
meaning which in the Greek the imperfect tense was designed to convey.” (Pref. to N. T. III. 2.) But why should one regard this necessity as *valde defienda*?

4. Second: in translating from any modern language we do not painfully trouble ourselves about either Scylla or Charybdis. Our one aim is to give an exact and adequate reproduction of the writer’s meaning, as accurate as our idiom admits, in pure and natural English; and more than this cannot be done except by adding explanatory notes. In Spanish the Past Definite is often used, just like the Aorist, where we prefer the Perfect, and even at times in principal clauses. Thus Pérez Galdós writes: “Dios te *hizo* tan sosa que le dejarás escapar,” “God *has made* you such a fool that you will let the man escape from you;” “Esa vida *se acabó,*” “That kind of life *has come to an end.*” But who would dream of translating otherwise, although they are simple tenses in the Spanish?

5. Moreover the Simple Past when equivalent to a Latin or Greek, French or Spanish, Imperfect, still always refers to *definite* past time in or within which the action, prolonged or repeated or habitual, took place. The reader can test this for himself. Read page after page of Plautus or Livy, Sophocles or Thucydides or the Greek Testament, of Dumas (père ou fils), Balzac, Victor Hugo, or Cervantes or Pérez Galdós, and this will be found true.

XI. This fact that our Simple Past, whether it represents in translation an Aorist or an Imperfect, is always definite, is one on which I must strenuously insist.

1. The English Perfect may be, and often is, so employed that the circumstances, or a gesture, or other words in the sentence may indicate—as the Greek Perfect always does—a connexion with present time, though this is by no means always the case. In “I have written these letters” there is a true Present Complete. In “I have written dozens of letters on gilt-edged paper” there is no indication of time whatever—one specified, none implied; only the writing was in some past time. This is a Past Indefinite. But in “I wrote dozens
of letters’’ some time is definitely alluded to, or has been already mentioned, at or within which the letters were written. This is a Past Definite.

2. Occasionally a Simple Past is apparently indefinite, but only apparently. For instance, let a contractor say, “I built those houses,” what he really means is, “At the time when those houses were built, I was the builder.” The true predicate is I: “the builder was—I ;” and time is definitely implied. Or some extension of the predicate may be in sense the predicate, as “I built those houses of the best Suffolk stocks ;” still the time is definite. So in Rom. i. 5, δι’ οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν is preferably to be rendered “by whom we have received, &c. ;” but “by whom we received” is intelligible, if we understand the Apostle as saying that “when we received grace and apostleship, these came through Him.” In that case the true predicate is the οὗ; “the giver was—He ;” but the time is definitely implied. And there are a few other similar passages.

3. But there are many which will not admit of such an explanation, and in which the rendering of the Aorist by our Simple Past imports an idea of definite time which is not in the original; and the introduction of any thought not in the original no one would attempt to justify. In Rom. xvi. 17, “the doctrine which ye learned ;” at any special time? Surely not.—2 John 6, “as ye heard from the beginning :” “as ye heard in the beginning” would be intelligible; but as it stands the expression points to a period wholly past that started “from the beginning,” and what such period was there, and when did it terminate?—Very similar is 1 John ii. 27, “even as it [the anointing] taught you :” but this cannot have been limited to one definite past time, for the very same verse says, “His anointing teacheth you,” so that the teaching still goes on. (I hesitate to accept Bishop Westcott’s interpretation of this verse, for it seems to me that in order to justify the importation of one extraneous idea he introduces another, that of the “germ” of truth.)—In Matt. xi. 25, what pretext is there for supposing that on one particular occasion God “hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them to babes”?
4. Other examples are the following. Certain persons are alluded to in 1 Tim. i. 19, 20 as having made shipwreck concerning the faith, and Hymenæus and Alexander as having been by St. Paul delivered to Satan. A.V. states these things indefinitely as having happened: R.V. alludes to some particular time not mentioned. With what advantage?—"Demas forsook me," says R.V., 2 Tim. iv. 10; "brethren who bare witness," 3 John 6; and "thou didst leave thy first love," Apoc. ii. 4; but no definite time is stated or implied in the Greek in any of these cases, and it is not only unnecessary but unwarrantable to foist in that idea.—"Those who . . . . fell away," Heb. vi. 4-6: this R.V. rendering limits the awful warning to certain persons who so sinned at a certain time. "Each part of the picture," says Bishop Westcott, "is presented in its past completeness," an interpretation which I venture to think not only inexact, but perilously misleading.—In Rom. iii. 7 even Alford renders, "If the truth of God hath abounded by means of my falsehood, &c.;" and what is gained by fixing, with R.V., "my lie" to a certain date?—And again, two verses below, even Alford renders "we have before proved, &c." R.V. gives, "we before laid to the charge both of Jews and Greeks, &c." Well, when? If in this same Epistle, which seems clearly the meaning, assuredly "we have above laid, &c." is imperatively demanded by the "usus" of English speech.—In Col. iii. i, 3, even if "the allusion is to a definite time, your baptism" (Alf.), the time not being mentioned, our idiom prefers "ye have been raised with Christ" and "ye have died," the latter as in Rom. vi. 7.

5. In all these cases the "have" needs not a word of apology, or to be spoken with "whispering humbleness:" there is nothing unscholarly in its use; it supplies the only correct form to exhibit adequately the true sense of the original—the true English Past Indefinite for the Greek Past Indefinite.

XII. Since writing thus far I have for my own satisfaction tested the soundness of the view of the Aorist here maintained by a careful reading of Lucian's Deorum Dialogi,
selecting these because they contain but little narrative. The result is interesting.

1. In those Dialogues there are in all, if I have correctly counted, 154 Aorists Indicative. Of this total 83 are in narrative passages, such as describe the offence and the punishment of Prometheus, the death of Hyacinthus, the fate of Phaethon, &c.; 4 refer to a definite time just past ("Why do you ask me that?" "I asked for no particular reason"); 12 may be translated indifferently by the English Simple Past or Perfect ("Io is no longer a girl, but a heifer." "Marvellous! but how has she been," or "was she," "changed?"—"I carried off the infant to Nysa and gave it," or "have given it," "to the nymphs to bring up under the name of Dionysus"); while one (ἐγέλασα) may best be rendered by the Present ("You make me laugh"). The remaining 54 seem to me all to require, or at least to prefer, the Perfect in English. For instance, Eros entreating Zeus to release him pleads, "But if I have done anything wrong (ἡμαρτον), forgive me."—"Hera has put a herdsman in charge (ἐπέστησεν) of Io, and he sees to the heifer's grazing."—"He is unworthy . . ." "What outrage then has he committed (ὑβρισε) ?"—"Why are you laughing, Hermes?" "Because I have seen, &c."—"He has on his face the scars of the punishment he has received (ἐλαβεν) in boxing."—"I am obliged to you for" (lit., "you have obliged, ὄνησε, me by") "telling me how to distinguish them."

2. It is not necessary to quote all the 54. Let the reader examine these Dialogues for himself, carefully separating the narrative portion—even short fragments—from that which is not narrative, and let him deal with the various Aorists Indicative that occur, considering with what tenses they ought to be rendered according to the true, natural, and familiar English idiom. Next let him read a few chapters of Herodotus or Thucydides or Xenophon, distinguishing speeches, and then decide whether my contention is justified that while the Aorist in narrative is (by virtue of the context) definite as to time, and corresponds to our Simple Past, or occasionally our Pluperfect, the non-narrative Aorist is wholly
indefinite in time, and that its true representative is what we ought to call our Past Indefinite, namely the Perfect. If so, while it is strictly accurate to render δευτεραίοι ἠλθόμεν εἰς Ποτιόλους by “On the second day we reached Puteoli,” it is not a whit less accurate to render τὴν ἀγάπην σοι τὴν πρώτην ἀφήκες by “Thou hast left thy first love,” Apoc. ii. 4: “thou leftest” (or “didst leave,” R.V.) is inaccurate and wrong.

3. It is profoundly to be regretted that our N.T. Revisers so insufficiently studied our English tenses. Thousands there were of their Bible-loving countrymen who year after year from the inception of the Revision to its completion were always on the look-out for every morsel or crumb of information as to the progress of the work, and who, when it appeared, discovered with interest and delight its many real and high excellences; but to such it has been matter of sincere lamentation to find these excellences so seriously marred and countervailed by faults and blemishes that impair the surface, and more than the surface, of the work. And in particular the reader far too often feels that he is not reading English; so he lays the volume aside, or at most regards it as useful merely for occasional reference. In short the disappointing and deplorable result is this—the public rejects the book. The cause κατ’ ἔξοχήν I believe to be the erroneous treatment of the English verb with which these pages have dealt.
APPENDIX A.

ON ΓΑΡ.

1. It is generally admitted that γάρ stands for γ' ἀρ. The first element, γε, is commonly the same in sense as our yea, with which also in the modern pronunciation it is almost identical: whether it is actually the same word, it would be out of place to discuss here. The second element is plainly akin to the verb ἀρω, and marks a logical connexion between the ideas conveyed by the two sentences which it unites.

2. Γάρ therefore so far resembles the simple ἀρ (or ἀρω), and the equivalent adverbs ὅτι, τοινυν, &c., that it confirms the statement already made, while it adds another.

"They might not choose the Lowland road,
For the Merse foragers were abroad."

The statement that these lawless bands were scouring the Lowlands confirms the other statement that Marmion and his handful of followers took another way. The propositions themselves will still bear the same relation of confirmans and confirmata if we connect them by therefore; only the therefore will be prefixed to the confirmata. In other words, therefore introduces a conclusion, while for supplies a reason, or, in logical phraseology, a premiss. Herein lies the distinction between therefore and for, between ἀρω and γάρ. That γάρ ever possesses a conclusive force—"its primary and original conclusive force" (Thayer's Grimm's Lex., s. v., I.) I venture to deny.

3. Sometimes γάρ introduces the major premiss, or principle. For example, Matt. xxvi. 52 may be thrown into the syllogistic form thus:—
Maj. Pr., Whoever takes arms is in danger of being killed;
[Min. Pr., You are taking arms;]
Concl., You will do well to sheathe your sword.
Similarly Gibbon (ch. x.) has the sentence: "He partook of the
booty; for the Goths had learned sufficient policy to reward the
traitor whom they detested." As a syllogism this would read:—

Maj. Pr., The Goths rewarded all useful traitors;
[Min. Pr., This man was a traitor whom they found useful;]
Concl., They allowed him to share the spoil.

4. Far more commonly it is the minor premiss that is stated with
γὰρ or for, the major being understood. Thus in 2 Pet. i. 15, 16:—

[Maj. Pr., The statements of eye-witnesses may be accepted;]
Min. Pr., We were eye-witnesses;
Concl., The evidence we give ought to be impressed on
your memory.

In like manner when Mill writes: "The advice was to give his
decision boldly, for it would probably be right; but never to venture
on assigning reasons, for they would almost infallibly be wrong."
Here the major premiss is implied: "All decisions arrived at by plain
common sense are probably right." And in Dryden's dictum: "To
move both pity and terror is certainly a good rule, but not perpetually
to be observed; for that were to make all tragedies too much
alike"; the major is understood—"Whatever rules would cast all
tragedies into the same mould are of questionable value."

And there are few instances of the use of γὰρ or for which
(whatever disguised in form) are not in substance of this character.

5. But occasionally both premises are stated, each beginning
with γὰρ, as in John iii. 19, 20:—

Maj. Pr., Every evil-doer hates the light;
Min. Pr., These men were evil-doers;
Concl., They loved darkness rather than light.

Also at times, by way of premiss, γὰρ offers only a partial proof,
just one step (and possibly not more than one) in an induction,
where our expression is for example. Thus in Rom. vii. 2, after the
general statement (ver. 1) that "the Law governs a man as long as
he lives," the Apostle adds, "a woman for example (γὰρ), whose
husband is living, is bound to him by the Law; but if he dies, &c."
Other instances are given in Thayer's Grimm, s. v. γάρ, II. 2; but it would be difficult to find in our English literature a case parallel to these where the conjunction for would do such duty.

6. Is γάρ, however, never used to introduce a conclusion, like therefore, or the weaker illatives then, thus, so, &c.? Never. Such at least is never its true sense, even if a translator, in passages where the English idiom does not fit on the Greek, takes the liberty—and very properly takes it—of rendering (for example) τί γάρ; by "What then?" (See Phil. i. 18, Ellicott and R.V.) See below § 9.

7. Nothing is more certain than that "it very often happens that the sentence whereof γάρ gives the premiss is suppressed, and must be supplied by the mind." (Jelf, Grk. Gr. § 786. 1. Obs. 1.)

The example quoted by Jelf is from Plat. Symp. p. 194 A, καλώς γὰρ αὐτὸς ἡγώνυσαι (sc. οὐ μὲν δύνασαι θαρρεῖν), where Rückert explains, "[Te quidem bono animo esse nihil mirum,] ipse enim bene decertasti." Similarly we have in Arist. Nic. Eth. p. 1097 b. 33, τί οὖν δὴ τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη ποτέ; τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζην κοινὸν εἶναι φαίνεται καὶ τοῖς φυτοῖς, which Dr. Welldon translates, "What then can this function be? It is not life; for life is apparently something which man shares with the plants."

Similar also are the many cases where in dialogue γάρ demands to be rendered by "Yes, for," or "No, for"; such as Aristoph. Nub. 331, οὐ γὰρ μὰ Δί' οἴσθα κτλ., "Yes, for you do not know, &c."; Plat. Theat. p. 188 C, τέρας γὰρ ἔστω, "No, for that would be monstrous"; and Ἀσχ. Pr. V. 983 (1004), σὲ γὰρ προσήδων οὐκ ἄν, ὅνθ᾽ ἵππηρετον, where Hermes has flung the gibe, "Thou art not yet absolute wisdom," and Prometheus replies, "No, for I should not then be speaking to a minion like thee."

So enim stands for "No, for" in Cic. Tusc. Disp. II. 24, "Imperantem enim patriam Lacedaemoniis relinquebat, etc."

It is obvious that the yes or the no in these cases really stands for a sentence, which is the conclusion based on the premiss that begins with for.

But I venture to think that in many, perhaps in most, such cases the suppressed clause was not consciously supplied even by the mind of the Greek speaker. The for explained a smile, a frown, a shrug, a lifted hand, or any other gesture or look or manifestation whatever of pleasure, of pain, of disappointment, of satisfaction, of anger,
astonishment, or of any other feeling that had been excited. Nevertheless, if pressed to explain himself, the Greek might state in words the proposition that he had in reserve. "[I am terrified], for . . . ."; "[I am delighted], for . . . ."; "[I laugh], for . . . ."; "[I am indignant], for . . . ."; "[My hands are thrown up], for . . . ."; "[My nostrils curl], for . . . ."; and so on.

8. We have, however, in English an expression almost precisely parallel. "Why [am I acting in this way?]"; "Why [do I say that?]"; "Why [am I angry?]"; "Why [do I laugh?]";—questions such as these being the evident source of the multifarious applications of the unemphatic why, which for distinction's sake is commonly written or printed followed by a comma. And this is not infrequently the true representative of γὰρ. A few examples are the following.

(a, b, c.) In Matt. xxvii. 23, and in the corresponding places in Mark and Luke we have, τι γὰρ καὶν ἐποίησεν; "Why, what evil has he done?" (It is surprising to hear these words of Pilate's sometimes read even by educated men as, "Why? What evil has he done?" making two separate questions. Yet the word as used without emphasis or interrogation is no stranger in our language at least as long ago as the time when Shakespeare's Henry V. was written, containing [ii. 2, 127-131] the King’s impeachment of Scroop:—

"Show men dutiful?

Why, so didst thou: seem they grave and learned?
Why, so didst thou: come they of noble family?
Why, so didst thou: seem they religious?
Why, so didst thou."

(d.) John ix. 30, Ἑν τούτῳ γὰρ τὸ θαυμαστὸν ἦστιν, "Why, herein is the marvel." (R.V.)

(e, f.) And so the γὰρ might best be rendered in John vii. 41, "Why, doth the Christ come out of Galilee?" and i Cor. xi. 22, "Why, have ye no houses to eat and to drink in?" in both of which R.V. has "What?"

(g, h.) In Acts viii. 31 and xix. 35 the γὰρ is omitted. Yet the rendering of the conjunction here contended for would add life and force to the speaker's words. Asked by the Evangelist whether he understood what he was reading, the Eunuch replied, "Why, how could I unless some teacher were to instruct me?" q.d., ["Of course
not: your question astonishes me,] for, &c." And after the riotous uproar at Ephesus, the Town Clerk awes the people into silence by his appeal, "Why, who of all mankind does not know, &c.?" q.d., "[I am amazed at your folly,] for, &c."

(i.) When Paul, a Roman citizen, has been unjustly and illegally beaten with rods and imprisoned, and the lictors come next morning with a message from the Prætors to the gaoler to let Paul and his companion go, the Οἱ γάρ (c. xvi. 37) in which the Apostle vents his indignation, refusing to leave till an apology has been offered by the Prætors personally, is not ill represented by "Nay, verily"; and perhaps this is more dignified than the "Why, no!" which was equally at the translator's disposal.

(j.) In 1 Cor. viii. 11, ἀπόλλυται γάρ is the reading almost universally accepted. Principal Edwards explains, "Built up, did I say? Nay, he is perishing!" This is certainly allowable, though it is perhaps still better to render, "Why, through your knowledge the weak brother perishes—your brother for whom Christ died!" Here why is equivalent to, ["I am shocked at your thoughtlessness,] for, &c."

(k.) In 1 Cor. ix. 10, the "no doubt" of A.V. and the "yea" of R.V. are both inexact. Better far thus: "Why, it is for our sakes that was written, because, &c."

9. A host of similar examples might easily be adduced from the classical writers. Let one suffice:—

τί γάρ πέργρωται Ζηνί, πλήν ἀεὶ κρατεῖν;

"Why, what fate hangs o'er Zeus, but aye to rule?" Æsch. Pr. V. 519 (527).

And exactly so the τί γάρ of Phil. i. 8 may be explained: "Why, what [are we to say?]," or with some such ellipse of the verb.

10. But besides the class of cases hitherto dealt with, in which our unemphatic why is available, there are others where for may stand, and yet the conclusion, of which it furnishes the reason, is suppressed. In Mark xvi. 4, it is implied that the women's seeing the stone already removed was a great relief, for, &c. In Acts xxiii. 5, Paul's meaning plainly is, "If I had known it was the High Priest, I would not have exclaimed, for, &c. In Phil. ii. 29, the Apostle seems to say, "And Timothy is the best man I have to send, for, &c." And in 1 Pet. iv. 15, "I speak only of suffering for Christ's sake, for none of
you must be punished for actual crime”; all of which would probably be compressed by an English writer into a but.

11. The use of γάρ in co-ordinate clauses (strangely denied by Meyer) our idiom refuses to imitate in the use of for: and or but must be substituted. Here are examples.

(a.) 1 Pet. ii. 18-21 may be thus exhibited in syllogistic form:—

[Maj. Pr., Whatever pleases God is a duty;]

Min. Pr., i. To endure grievances for conscience’ sake towards God pleases Him (ver. 19);

2. and To suffer for doing right pleases Him;

3. and You were called by God expressly to imitate Christ (ver. 21), who did always what pleased Him;

Concl., therefore servants must obey even bad masters (ver. 18).

Here, as elsewhere, the conclusion comes first, and is followed by the reasons with γάρ, γάρ, γάρ, which our idiom changes into for, and, and.

(b) 2 Pet. i. 5-9. Let your Christian character exhibit all virtues; for (ver. 8) thus you will be fruitful; but (ver. 9) without these you will be half-blind believers.

(c) Ibid. 10, 11. Make sure of your salvation; for with such faith, virtue, knowledge, &c., you cannot fail, and, on the same conditions, you will receive the freest admission into the Kingdom.

(d) Matt. vi. 31, 32. Be not crushed under a load of anxiety; for that is a characteristic of the Gentiles, but as to you your Father knows your needs. (Though here the πάντα . . . ἐπιζητοῦν may be taken as parenthetical.)

(e) Mark viii. 34-38. My followers must be prepared for suffering (ver. 34); for (ver. 35) thus they will save their souls, and (ver. 36) all earthly gains are as nothing to the loss of the soul—an irreparable loss (ver. 37, parenthetical),—and he who disowns me, him I will disown.

12. But regard for English idiom will take us one step further.

In §§ 7 and 8 it has been shown how for can often be accounted for by the supposition of an ellipse, and that our unemphatic why exactly meets the requirements of such a case. But there are numerous other places where neither does the γάρ introduce a reason
for a conclusion stated in the preceding sentence, nor does there seem to be any such clause understood as those suggested in § 7, so that why would be suitable.

(a.) Turn for instance to 1 Thess. ii. 1, "For you yourselves know, brethren, how we came among you, &c." Is either this knowledge or the success that attended the Apostle’s visit a reason why wrath is coming, as mentioned in the clause immediately preceding? or why—see other preceding clauses—Jesus rescues us from destruction? or God raised Him from the dead? or we await His return from Heaven? None of these: it refers back to words earlier still (chap. i. 9); and it is, to say the least, very rare in English to find for so used. I venture on this assertion as the result of careful and prolonged search in a great variety of our best English authors. The Apostle here is dropping the subjects to which he has just alluded, for he has others with which he desires to deal, or rather he wishes to resume an earlier line of thought.

Now have we no way of expressing this resumption in English? Assuredly we have: we employ the conjunction however. (Originally an adverb, in this use it has become a conjunction.) Whether Hartung is right in calling this γάρ “argumentativ-explicativ” may well be questioned: it is resumptive rather. But at any rate in English, not for, but however, is the word that corresponds.

I do not for a moment deny that in every instance the original sense of the γάρ as = for can be discovered; but what is here aimed at is to ascertain the best rendering into English. A translator into English from Greek or any other language has not merely to render words, if possible, by exactly corresponding English words—nay, that is very often what he must by no means do—but to represent forms of thought by English forms of thought, and modes of connecting thoughts by English modes of connecting.

(b.) In 2 Cor. ix. 1, after the Apostle has devoted nine verses to a panegyric on the brethren who were helping him to make the collection and were about to accompany him to Jerusalem, he returns to enforce, with admittedly (almost) superfluous earnestness of exhortation, the recognized duty of liberal contribution. The sentences would naturally in English be connected by however, or even by but—not the strongly adversative conjunction, but but as “merely expressing disconnexion”: (see Murray’s Dict. s.v. But, 25.)

(c.) In Rom. vi. 18 the writer teaches us that believers, freed
from bondage to sin, have entered into bondage to righteousness. Then in the first clause of ver. 19 he apologizes for the boldness of the figure, but at once returns to it: "As, however, you allowed yourselves to become the slaves of impurity and lawlessness, so now must you become the slaves of righteousness." The Greek conjunction here and elsewhere is called by grammarians "the resumptive \( \gamma \alpha \rho \)"; be it so, but this resumptive sense is far better conveyed in English by however or but than by for, even if it can be proved that for is ever so employed in our best authors, in writings other than translations, which I gravely doubt.

(d.) In like manner in the difficult passage where we have five successive \( \gamma \alpha \rho \)s, 1 Cor. ix. 14-17, and another in ver. 19, I venture to connect as follows: "It is the Lord's command that preachers of the Good News should receive pecuniary support. But I have not done so, nor do I now write with that object in my own case; for I would rather die than that any one should make this an empty boast of mine. Why, if I preach the Good News, it is nothing for me to boast of, for the necessity is imposed upon me, and alas for me if I fail to preach it! And if I am doing so willingly, I receive my wages, but if against my will, it is a stewardship that is entrusted to me. What are my wages then? The very fact that the Good News I preach will cost nothing to the hearers, so that I cannot be charged with abuse of my privilege. Although, however, I am free from all human control, I have made myself the slave of all, &c." The last \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) here seems to be equivalent to saying, "But I pass from this distasteful subject of payment, for I have this also to say"; all of which is condensed into our however.*

Other examples of the use of \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) where our idiom seems to prefer however or but are—Rom. iii. 7, 2 Cor. xii. 6 and 13, Gal. ii. 6 and v. 13, Heb. iii. 3, iv. 8, v. 1, vii. 13, and viii. 3. There are, I believe, none except in the Epistles of Paul and (a fact not without significance) the Epistle to the Hebrews.

13. Now it will naturally be asked, Do any either of the classical authors or of the Greek Fathers make a like use of \( \gamma \alpha \rho \)? None an exactly similar use, so far as I can find; but that in all Greek there may be a clause understood before \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) is a fact so unquestion-

* Compare with this passage Acts ix. 23-26, where \( \delta \) occurs five times. Neither A.V. nor R.V. translates with five buts, nor probably would anybody do so, while the \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \) that immediately follows is far better but (with A.V.) than and.
able that we may justly suppose Paul to have been unconscious of any deviation from usage, even where the omitted clause is such as to necessitate a less common mode of rendering into another language. Yet that his γάρ sometimes differs not widely from our but may explain the change of an apparently original γάρ into δε in later copies, as in Rom. xv. 8, 1 Cor. x. 1, &c.

14. But can this use of γάρ by Paul be any way accounted for? Possibly thus—that there was a similar exceptional usage in Hebrew by which he was at times unconsciously influenced. The Hebrew ו, which is the ordinary word for our for or because, bears sometimes an adversative sense. For example, Gen. xxiv. 4, “But thou shalt go unto my country, &c.”; Gen. xix. 2, “But we will abide, &c.” Also compare A.V. with R.V. of Job xiv. 16; and see Ps. xiv. 6, R.V. marg. Other instances are given by Gesenius. Moreover if the O. T. Revisers are justified in their marginal rendering of ו in Ps. xlix. 10, giving “Yea, he shall see it” for “For he seeth,” this yea manifestly approaches somewhat closely in sense the unemphatic why above discussed.

Were not the other N. T. writers, however, or at least most of them, as familiar with Hebrew as Paul was? and yet they never so employed γάρ. Quite true; but who will undertake to track all the vagaries of human nature as to modes both of thought and of expression. Many a word or phrase or form of speech is familiar on the lips of one man and rarely or never used by many other people. Where almost everybody else says “not the least” (title, endeavour, necessity), Mr. Gladstone habitually employs the more dignified “not the smallest.” And probably every reader of Pearson on the Creed has at first been puzzled by the Bishop’s being in the sense of since or inasmuch as. According to Murray’s Dictionary (s. v. Be, B. I. 3) this is an “archaic or dialectal”* use of the word. It is undoubtedly rare elsewhere, but of frequent occurrence on Pearson’s pages; and just so Paul seems to have had this γάρ = however or but—whether “dialectal” or not, whether a Hebraism or not, whether he felt it to be elliptical or not—as a common and familiar part of his vocabulary.

* Dr. Murray’s coadjutor in his great work, Mr. Henry Bradley, tells me that to this day being as so is thus used in the South of Yorkshire. For instance, “I was much interested, being as so I had never seen the place before.”
APPENDIX B.

ON OYN.

That oðv commonly is our therefore can no more be questioned than that commonly γὰρ is our for. In Euclid indeed it is not usually oðv that is employed to usher in a conclusion drawn from premises just previously established: ἀπα has that duty to discharge. It is occasionally so used, but more frequently (and yet not often) it accompanies ἀπα, the latter signifying sequitur ut, while the oðv, in accordance with its apparent derivation, is quae quum ita sint.

I venture, though not without hesitation, to consider Euclid’s authority as decisively adverse to Bishop Ellicott’s opinion (see his note on Gal. vi. 10) that ἀπα possesses a “weaker ratiocinative force” than oðv; and whether in the Elements or in St. Paul’s Epistles, where alone in the N. T. this combination is found, I take ἀρ’ oðv to mean “it follows then that,” with oðv = “then.” In Aristotle also the emphatic therefore, or it follows, or the consequence is, is ἀπα or διὸ περ’ or ὀὖν, while oðv rather points in the direction of the conclusion than positively introduces it.

Nevertheless oðv has as a general rule some illative force, sometimes strong, though more usually weak.

2. But there are passages where it seems to have lost its illative force; nay more, it is employed at times in a manner that strongly contrasts with the drawing of an inference. Therefore, consequently, so, the unemphatic then, &c., introduce clauses which not only harmonize with, but in some way follow from, those which immediately precede. But oðv sometimes heads a clause that is altogether distinct from, or even adversative to, the sentence preceding. In such cases it obviously claims to be rendered by but, yet, however, or some such word.
To prove this, the *argumentum ad auctoritatem* will be most satisfactory, and the following few instances out of many that I have noted may be adduced.

(a.) George Burges was one of our best Greek scholars, learned and acute, in the first half of this century, and it was my pleasure to know him when he was old and I was young. Here, out of many such, is one of his renderings: Plat. *Leg.* IV. p. 711 E, τοῦν' ὁδόν ἐπὶ μὲν Τρολας κτλ., "But this, as they say, took place in the times of Troy, &c."

(b.) In Plat. *Phæd.* 80 C we read, ἵννοεῖς οὖν, which Cary translates, "you perceive, however." And so in many other places.

(c.) Her. VII. 18, οὖκ δὲν ἀμφότερην οὐκ ἐχώρησεν, "still success did not attend them in both arms, i.e. by land and sea." (Blakesley.)

(d.) Her. VII. 106, οὖτοι δὲν πάντες ἐξηρέθησαν, "but these persons were all driven out." (Rawlinson.)

(e.) Dem. Phil. III., p. 120, l. 11, τί οὖν αἴτιον τούτοι; "but what has caused the mischief?" (C. R. Kennedy.)

(f.) Acts xxv. 4, "but Festus answered." (A.V.)

(g.) ibid., "howbeit Festus answered." (R.V.) And so in Acts xxviii. 5, "howbeit he shook off the beast into the fire." (R.V.)

These seven authorities sufficiently prove that οὖν is at times used where no direct inference exists; nay, even an opposition of thought.

3. Somewhat different from the above are these cases.

Dem. Ol. I., p. 9, l. 11, δὲ μὲν οὖν . . . . . καρδός: this Whiston renders, "well then the present crisis," and adds, "here οὖν is scarcely an inferential particle; it rather marks the opening of the subject matter of theorton, as igitur in Sall. Cat. c. I." And just so οὖν is used by St. Paul at the beginning of his speech before Herod Agrippa, Acts xxvi. 4.

Now is this use difficult to account for? By no means: the exordium, whether short or long, has been long enough, therefore the speaker passes on; or (in introducing a new subject, see examples below in § 5), this point has been sufficiently dwelt on, therefore τοσοῦτα εἰρήσθω. For οὖν, like γάρ, is very frequently used elliptically.

But it may be objected that it is not the simple οὖν, but μὲν οὖν, that commonly appears in such cases. Quite true, but the μὲν has its own function to perform altogether irrespective of the οὖν. The μὲν points onwards to a δὲ following. It is familiarly known that in
the Classics μέν is not infrequently found without the correlative δέ, and so nine times in the N.T. of the 39 places in all where μέν is accompanied by oὖν, there is no δέ following; nevertheless this omission is exceptional and anomalous, and as a rule μέν is only a premonition of a coming δέ. But whether there is a δέ or not, this does not affect the oὖν, which bears its own proper force.

4. But how ought the oὖν to be rendered in English, when it thus introduces a speech or a fresh topic in a speech or narrative? What is the usage in our language?

Most commonly we omit the conjunction altogether. Let the reader look through a few pages of any English author, and he will soon satisfy himself on that point. Every tyro in Greek is aware that the idiom of the Hellenes requires many more particles than we employ in English, and the illative particles are no exception. Accordingly our best translators omit very freely. Here are a few details.

In looking through Thuc. VI., I have found 23 oὖνs. Ten of these Jowett renders by a word of illative force (therefore, then, so, whereupon, accordingly, consequently), while thirteen are simply left out.

In Thomson’s edition of Plato’s Phædrus 10 passages in all (unless some have escaped my eye) containing oὖν are translated in the notes. In 8 some illative force is attributed to it, the rendering being by thus, hence, therefore (once only), thus we see that, &c.; in one now is used, in one the conjunction is omitted.

In the Phædo I have noted 107 oὖνs with which Cary in his translation deals as follows: he uses therefore 10 times; then 54 times; hereupon, upon this, however, but, or now, 9 times; in 34 places he omits the conjunction.

In Plat. Leg. IV. I have noted oὖν 31 times, not including oὐκοὖν (or oὐκοὐν). Of these 31 Burges translates 16 by some illative, the remaining 15 he omits.

In Rawlinson’s Herod. VII. of 25 oὖνs 9 are omitted.

Donaldson in his translation of Soph. Ant. omits oὖν in 11 places out of 14, renders it twice by well, once by then. (There may be here or elsewhere other instances of oὖν which I have overlooked. I mention those that have caught my eye.)

Asyndeton is much less common in Jebb’s Soph. Æd. Tyr., and.
of 21 oôv only two are omitted. Therefore, so, or then is used in 10 places, and elsewhere now, nay, even (after ei'), at least (after de), and.

In Kennedy's translation of the Olynthiacs and Philippiics of Demosth. I have noted in 62 passages his treatment of oôv. In 20 of these he uses therefore, then, or so; in 6, and, but, well, or however; in 36 the oôv is left untranslated.

In Arist. Nic. Eth. I have noted oôv in 74 places. In Welldon's translation 50 of these exhibit therefore, then, accordingly, thus, it follows, &c., but in the other 24 the oôv is omitted.

5. But if for any reason a translator prefers not to disregard the oôv at the beginning of a speech or argument, have we no word capable of representing it? In St. Paul's speech before Agrippa above referred to, the oôv (Acts xxvi. 4) is, I venture to think, best treated in A.V., where it is left untranslated: in R.V. we read, "My manner of life then . . . know all the Jews." I presume the meaning of this rendering to be—and the true meaning too,—with then as a feeble kind of therefore, "[I am obliged to make a defence, and further preface is needless,] therefore I defend myself by saying, &c."

But the genuine English idiom, if it inserts any particle at all, prefers now. Thus where Creon in Soph. Æd. Tyr. 587 makes a speech of some 30 lines, after 4 lines of exordium, he proceeds, "Now I, for one, (ἐγώ μὲν oôv oôv' αὐτός, κτλ.) have no yearning in my nature to be a king rather than to do kinglike deeds, &c." Such is Professor Jebb's rendering.

And so in transition to a new subject of discourse. The opening lines of Arist. Nic. Eth. II. 4 are these:—"We have next to consider the nature of virtue. Now, as (ἐπεῖ oôv) the qualities of the soul are three, &c." So Mr. Welldon translates.

But for such transition from one topic to another however is more common in English than now. In Demosth. Phil. I., p. 43, l. 23, we read in Kennedy's admirable translation, "However, as to the importance of a general zeal in the discharge of duty, believing you are convinced and satisfied, I say no more." Here the Greek is, ὃς μὲν oôv ἐεὶ τὰ προσήκοντα ποιεῖν κτλ.

Compare—"These matters are worth consideration, one would think; however, allons!—it is no business of Tom Cringle's." So Tom turns to another subject.
6. Now if our English idiom in these cases is really such as is above affirmed, assuredly it is much to be regretted that in the R.V. the authority of idiom is so grievously disregarded. About 530 times is οὖν met with in the N.T., yet only 5 times (so far as I have noticed) is it rendered by now, twice by verily (Acts xxvi. 9, Phil. iii. 8), once by nay (1 Cor. vi. 7), once by and (John viii. 38, καὶ ἐμεῖς οὖν, "and ye also"). I have examined every passage where οὖν occurs in the Gospels, and a large number in other parts of the N.T., and I find the percentages as follow: therefore, A.V. 48, R.V. 77; then, A.V. (often obviously not illative, but an adverb of time) 43, R.V. 13; so, A.V. 3, R.V. 10; other renderings, such as so then, and, but, now, verily, nay, howbeit, in A.V. 6, in R.V. less than 1.

Howbeit is of course equivalent to however, which in our modern speech, when used to mark transition to a different topic, is plainly elliptical: "however [that may be], let us pass to the next point."

7. But our however, not content with introducing a different thought, often brings in an opposite one: in other words it becomes, as so used, more or less decisively adversative. Originally an adverb, it is now a conjunction, distinctly and fully equivalent to but. Here are examples.

"For my part I generally took the author's meaning to be as you have explained it, yet their authority . . . overruled me. However, Sir, you may be confident I think you in the right, because you happen to be of my opinion." (Pope.)

"I wish that there were no necessity of . . . tracing the meanders of his [Dryden's] mind through the whole series of his dramatic performances; it will be fit, however, to enumerate them, and &c." (Johnson.)

"On the 21st of August he wrote that ' . . . with the most trifling impulse a revolution would be certain.' Events, however, so far had not borne out his expectations." (Froude.)

But it is needless to multiply instances of a use that is now perfectly familiar. Let me rather ask, if our however has undergone this modification of meaning, why may not οὖν have done the same, at least in one dialect of Greek, that in which the N.T. is written?

8. The question, however, which is of paramount importance is, supposing that in any instance therefore seems unsuitable as a rendering of οὖν, can however be with advantage substituted for it? and is
that at all frequently the case? I make bold to answer both questions in the affirmative, and adduce in support of that view the following passages.

(a.) Matt. v. 48. Here therefore, according to its ordinary English use, would naturally point to a conclusion drawn from the clause (or possibly clauses) immediately preceding. Let the reader carefully consider verses 46, 47, and 48, and judge for himself. Is such love on the part of publicans and Gentiles really the reason why Christ's followers are to be perfect as their Father is? It simply constitutes a pattern totally unworthy of their imitation. The expressed ἵππος seems to show clearly a comparison between the persons addressed and the ἵππος, and that comparison can only be that of contrast. They are undoubtedly imperfect; you are not to be content with attaining their standard. "You, however, are to be perfect," seems to me to exhibit the true connexion of thought.

(b.) Matt. vi. 8. "The Gentiles expect their prayers to be heard because of their multiplicity of words. Do not imitate them, however; for &c." Therefore is quite out of place. The true reason for not imitating them is found, not in the preceding clause, but in that which follows.

(c.) Matt. x. 26. Christ's disciples must expect worse treatment than hostile words, worse than merely to be called devils: is that a reason why they are not to fear their persecutors? Quite the contrary. "Fear them not, however," makes perfect sense.

(d.) Luke xi. 36. Our Lord has just warned His disciples to see to it lest within them the very light should be darkness: "If, however, your body is full [not of darkness, but] of light, &c."

(e.) Luke xxi. 14. The prediction of persecution is followed up by our Lord's instruction, "Do not, however, premeditate the defence you shall make in the courts, for I, &c." The reason follows, it does not precede; therefore cannot truly represent the ὅτι.

(f.) John* vi. 19. "When therefore they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they behold Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the boat: and they were afraid." So R.V. Is it possible that ὅτι here can really mean therefore? Does it signify that the darkness and the sudden and violent squall were the reason why they had rowed? That would be sheer nonsense. Or

---

* In John's Gospel ὅτι occurs about 180 times in all.
are these the reason why they saw? Equally impossible. Or the reason why Jesus came thus preternaturally to their rescue? The plain English reader could scarcely so understand the passage, where the principal participles and verbs all refer to their action, not to His. Besides, however true it may be, and happily is, that amidst darkness and storm and the felt absence of Jesus—whether the tempest and the gloom are spiritual or intellectual or even physical—He often condescends to intervene for his people’s consolation and deliverance, it is hard to believe that that is the primary meaning here. Render, “When, however, they had rowed, &c.,” and all difficulty disappears.

(_g._) John ix. 18. A.V. is right in giving but here rather than therefore. Considering the extreme simplicity of this Apostle's style, it is difficult to be content with a rendering which to the English reader seems to say that because the man who had been blind said of Jesus, “He is a prophet,” therefore the Jews did not believe he had been blind.

(_h._) Rom. x. 14. In this, as in many similar questions, the oōv is indeed illative, but the verb of the conclusion is suppressed: “such and such a state of things presents a difficulty, therefore [I ask you] how, &c.”; all of which we commonly compress into “but how, &c.? ”

In short there are numerous passages in which the strongly illative therefore misrepresents the meaning of the writer to the English reader, and where a translator, in order to conform to our idiom, ought either (_a._) to omit the conjunction; or (_b._) to employ one of the less emphatic illatives, then, so, accordingly, &c.; or to use (_c._) the now that marks a transition—a bend in the road—of thought, or (_d._) even the adversative however or but.

The general argument on the rendering of the Aorist might be illustrated not only, as above, by γὰρ and oōv, but by means of probably every particle in every language and the equivalent words or modes of speech by which that particle would be represented in any other language. Here is just one illustration with one reference in each case to both A.V. and R.V., unless otherwise specified.

The Hebrew ה, besides its normal rendering by and, is also both (Num. ix. 14), also (Ps. lxxv. 8), but (Gen. xxxix. 8), now (Gen. xxxvii.
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3), so (Gen. xxxvii. 14), thus (Neh. xiii. 30), then, as correlative to a preceding when (Ps. lxxviii. 34), if (Job xxxi. 14), though (Job xiii. 28, R.V.), yet (Job xix. 26), for (Job xix. 25, A.V. and R.V. marg.), when as yet (Ps. cxxxix. 16), when [nevertheless] (Jud. xvi. 15), again (Job xii. 15, R.V.), yea (Job v. 19), as for, emphasizing a pronoun (Ps. xxx. 6, R.V.), who (Gen. xliv. 25), as (Job v. 7), even (Job vi. 9), lest (Ps. cxliii. 7), therefore (Ps. ii. 10), wherefore (Ezek. xviii. 32), that, = in order that (Isa. xiii. 2), &c., &c.
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