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PREFACE.

It has long been an acknowledged fact, among all who are well versed in the critical study of the New Testament, that there are in it some peculiarities in respect to the forms, the use, and the construction of words, which make it in some measure to differ from the Greek of profane authors. On this account, those who endeavour to acquire an accurate philological knowledge of the New Testament in its original language, need some other assistance than that which the common Greek grammars afford; all of which are adapted, almost exclusively, to aid in the study of native Greek writers. In particular, every student in theology, who turns his attention to the interpretation of the New Testament, needs a grammar of it, which is adapted to promote, more especially, his exegetical knowledge. The peculiarities of its idiom and syntax are to him an important subject of study; since an accurate acquaintance with these is essential to his obtaining well grounded views of the meaning of many of the phrases and forms of expression that occur.

The design of the following publication is to furnish him with such an aid. Dr Winzer,* the author of the present treatise, was professor extraordinarius at Leipsic when he published it; but has since been made professor ordinarius of theology at Erlangen in Bavaria. The work has had an extensive circulation in Germany; and it has been thought sufficiently important to deserve an introduction to the theological schools, and to the colleges of our country. The primary object in translating it has been, to furnish our own students with one of the requisite helps to a correct study of the language of the New Testament; particularly so, as a good and

* Pronounced Füener.
appropriate grammatical help for this purpose is wanting in our language.

The labour of translating has been equally divided; the first half of the work, as far as to the syntax of verbs, having been done by the senior, and the remaining part, by the junior translator. The translators have now and then made additions, which are included in brackets, and marked with the initials of their names, when of any considerable length; and they have inserted nothing which is not thus marked, except occasionally, when there was a reference to an elementary work in German, they have added one to the corresponding work in English. They would gladly have made some further additions, but have been prevented by the pressure of other avocations. The whole work has been revised; the references to the New Testament have all been verified; and some oversights have been corrected. The labour of doing this has been double to that of translating. Very many of the references were found to be inaccurate, either through haste in the composition, or neglect of due correction in the printing. The translators were unwilling to give the book to the public in such a state; and they indulge the hope, that in its present state few of the references, at least of those to the New Testament, will be found to be erroneous.

It is not to be supposed that an attempt of this nature would, at the outset, accomplish every thing which the nature of the subject requires. There have been grammars of the New Testament published before, but they have been on a very different plan, in many respects, from the present; so that this work may be called new in its kind. It is not the apprehension of the translators, that the subject is exhausted; or that, in every respect, the author has fully succeeded in what he has undertaken. In particular, that part of the syntax which respects the prepositions, is regarded by them as rather ingenious than solid; as more savouring of a priori theory, than of sound practical experience. The manner in which the preposi-
tions are exhibited in Wahl's lexicon, is much more judicious and satisfactory.

But there is, on the whole, so much which is good and useful in the work, that it will be found a help to the young interpreter of no small importance, in respect to the attainment of a discriminating knowledge of the New Testament dictio. It may serve, at least, to turn the attention of the rising generation of the clergy and others to a subject, respecting which there is yet but little accurate knowledge in our country. If it should pave the way (as it not improbably will) to a more successful effort of the same kind, hereafter, among ourselves, it will not be in vain that it has been published. Every thing connected with the study of the Bible is important; and every thing which tends to promote an accurate knowledge of its language, is worthy the patronage of an enlightened and religious public.

When the Lexicon of Wahl, which is now in the course of publication by the junior translator of the present work, shall have been completed, the students of our country will have in their own language, dictionaries and grammars of the Old and New Testaments, which will make access to sacred philology less difficult and less expensive than it has heretofore been. Wahl and Winer have both studied with great diligence, and with no small success, the latest and best sources of Greek philology. They have adopted, for the most part, similar principles, in regard to this subject; and although the lexicon must be considered as a work of a higher character than the present, yet the two works will cast mutual light upon each other, and harmonize well together. The lexicon, it is expected, will be published in the course of the ensuing summer.

In the view of the translators, some abatement is to be made from the censures which Winer occasionally casts upon Schleusner, in the present work. They have softened some of his expressions; and some they would have suppressed, except that they did not
feel themselves to be responsible for them. It is no doubt true that Schleusner has failed, in very many cases, with respect to an accurate knowledge of Greek philology, not having made himself familiar with the most recent authors in that department. But one man cannot do every thing. What he has done entitles him to the thanks of all who study the New Testament in its original language; and it has prepared the way for higher and more successful efforts, in the department of sacred lexicography.

If the present work shall, in any measure, serve to increase the knowledge of the sacred writings of the New Testament, and excite to an accurate critical study of them, it will accomplish the ends for which it is published, and compensate for all the labour which has been bestowed upon it.

M. STUART.

E. ROBINSON.

Andover, Theol. Seminary,
Jan. 24, 1825.
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INTRODUCTION.

ON THE DESIGN, METHOD OF TREATING, AND HISTORY OF THE GRAMMAR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. The idiom of the New Testament, like every other, may be scientifically investigated in two respects. The words which constitute a continued discourse may be considered, either as they are in themselves, in respect to their origin and signification; or, with reference to their regular connexion in sentences and periods. The first belongs to the department of lexicography; the second to that of grammar. The latter must be carefully distinguished from the rhetoric of the New Testament.

The lexicography of the New Testament has hitherto been conducted only in a practical way. A theory of this science, however, may be formed; which one might designate by the term lexicology, a word that has recently come into use. That this theory is yet in an imperfect state need not seem strange; since even the classic languages are still wanting in this respect; and our exegetical theology also has yet formed no theory of higher and lower criticism upon the Bible. The want of a proper theory, however, has had a prejudicial influence upon lexicography; as is evident from a close examination of the works in that department, which have hitherto been composed upon the New Testament.

A treatise on the rhetoric of the New Testament (an appellation used by Glass and Bauer) should unfold the peculiarities of each writer in his modes of description and representation, which are independent
of established grammatical rules, and sometimes supersede them. In respect to this, much remains to be done; although Schulze and Bauer have published excellent preparatory works, in this department.* In respect to the discourses of Jesus and the letters of the apostles, one might, in a sketch of biblical rhetoric, most properly treat of the method of argumentation, after the manner of the old rhetoricians. This would avoid the dividing of New Testament exegesis into too many distinct sciences; which is the more desirable, inasmuch as many parts of it cast mutual light upon each other. Comp. Gersdorff’s Beiträge zur Sprachcharacteristik des N. Testaments, s. 7. Kell, Hermeneut. p. 28. C. J. Kellmann, Diss. de usu rhetorices hermeneutico, 1766. It may be remarked by the way, that in our systematic treatises, even the latest ones, the representations of exegetical theology are quite defective.

II. A grammar of the New Testament presupposes a general grammar of the Greek language. Consequently the fundamental laws of the Greek language, with the philosophical and historical proof of them, are here omitted. Hence this grammar limits itself, first, to the nicer and more uncommon grammatical phenomena; particularly to such as are usually regarded as exceptions to the common rules: and secondly, to the peculiarities of the New Testament diction, and of the several writers in particular. In respect to this last head, it points out, by appropriate comparisons, the Hebrew-Aramean origin of some of those anomalies which now and then occur.

The grammar of the New Testament, as a science, ought not to be limited to the grammatical peculiarities of the New Test. diction; as has hitherto been done by Hebrew-Greek grammarians, in consequence

* J. D. Schulze, Der schriftstellerische Werth und Charakter des Johannese, 1803. Also Der schrift. Werth und Char. des Petrus, Judas, und Jacobus, 1802. Also—des Markus, in Kell und Tschirner’s Analektten 2 B. 2 st. s. 104 und 151. 3 st. s. 60—132. 3 B. 1 st. s. 88—137. C. L. Bauer, Rhetorica Paullina, 2 vols. 1782. Also Philologia Thueyd. Paullina, 1773. See also Tschirner’s Observ. vatt. Pauli apost. episc. scriptoris ingenium concernentes, 1800.
of imperfect and obscure perceptions respecting the subject. For, if
we except the merely apparent Hebraisms, such peculiarities are
comparatively few; and the learner would obtain neither a complete
view of the grammatical character of the style of the New Testament,
nor any adequate assistance for the interpretation of its language.
Equally erroneous would it be to repeat here all the minute rules of
the Greek language; and to establish them by examples cited from
the New Testament. No doubt, the judgment of men may be vari-
ous, as to what ought to be inserted in this grammar, and what exclud-
ed from it; and I freely concede, that in respect to this subject, I
have simply followed my own views of propriety. In the mean time
I would hope that not much which is superfluous will be found in it;
nor much that is necessary be omitted.

It appeared sufficient, in respect to every rule of the Greek which
may be proved by examples out of their national writers, to refer
merely to the comprehensive works of Fischer, Hermann, Matthiae, and
Buttmann. When however unusual constructions occur, the interpret-
ers of particular books, and passages from the Greek classics, are ac-
ually cited; because I could not suppose that every reader would
have such philological works at hand.

In times past, the peculiarities of the New Testament, as pertaining
either to the grammar or the lexicon, have been the subject of but
little attention; although the consideration of them is so undeniably
connected with correct interpretation and the successful application of
higher and lower criticism. Among the older literati who have paid
any attention to this subject, are M. Flacius, in his Clav. Scrip. Sacr. II.
and A. Blackwall in his Sacred Classics, tom. II. pt. i. More of this nature
is comprised in the writings named in no. I. On the other hand, Gers-
dorf, in his Beiträge zur Sprach characteristic der Schriftsteller des N.
Testament—a work grounded on the most laborious investigations—has
commenced in a most happy manner, the compensation of these palpa-
table defects.

III. Although the investigation of the New Testa-
ment diction is indispensable to all correct interpretation, yet biblical philologists have, until quite recently, almost excluded the grammar of the New Testament from the circle of their scientifical investigations. Their
repeated inquiries have been principally limited to the department of the lexicon; while, at most, they have touched on that of grammar merely as it stood connected with the doctrine of N. Testament Hebraisms. Only C. Wyss (1650) and G. Pasor (1655) seem to have more fully comprehended the proper idea of N. Testament grammar; yet without being able to get this to be acknowledged as a part of exegetical discipline particularly important. For the space of one hundred and sixty years after them, Haab (1815) was the first who treated of the N. Testament diction, in a work appropriated to this subject. But, apart from the consideration that he confined himself solely to what is Hebraistic, his work was so very uncritical, that it seems rather adapted to check than to forward the progress of knowledge. The observations, moreover, on several grammatical topics, which are found partly in commentaries at large on the New Testament, and partly in monographs or comments on particular passages or subjects, are of very inferior worth; especially since the fundamental investigations of the present day, which have given a new form to Greek grammar.

The first writer, who in any considerable degree collected together and explained the peculiarities of the New Testament diction, was the celebrated Gries (ob. 1650) in his Philologia Sacra; the third book of which is entitled Grammatica Sacra; and the fourth, Appendix Gram. Sacrae.* But as he everywhere touches only upon Hebraisms, and treats of the New Testament idiom only so far as it is connected with these; so his essay (not to mention its deficiencies) can be regarded only as a feeble effort in the province of N. Testament grammar. But there are two men, the mention of whom ought not to be omitted, whose names are extensively known, but whose in-

* In the edition of Dathe, these are arranged in B. I.
Boors in this department; have been nearly forgotten; so much so, that works of theological literature, and even extensive libraries, altogether omit them.

The one is Caspar Wyss, professor of Greek at the gymnasium in Zurich, who wrote *Dialectologia Sacra*, in *qua quicquid per universum Novi Testamenti contextum in apostolica et voce et phrasae, a communi legis et grammaticae analogia discrepat, methodo congrua dispositione accurata digestus, et omnium sacri contextus exemplorum inductions illustratus*, 1650. The peculiarities of the New Testament diction, in general, are arranged in this book under the following heads, viz. Dialectus Attica, Ionica, Dorica, Aeolica, Boeotica, Poetica; et Hebraica. This is very inconvenient; in this way, many things of a like kind will be separated, and often treated of in four different places. Moreover, the author shows that his knowledge of Greek did not extend beyond what was common at his time; as the mention of a poetical dialect evinces, and as an examination of what he calls Attic will render still more evident. But as a collection of examples, which in many parts is perfectly complete, the book is very useful. In reference, also, to the Hebraism of the New Testament, the author shews a moderation, which deserved to be imitated by his contemporaries.

George Fasor, professor of the Greek language at Franeker (ob. 1687), known by his small lexicon of the New Testament which has passed through several editions (the last by J. F. Fischer), left behind him, among his papers, a grammar of the New Testament, which was edited by his son, Matthias Fasor, professor of Theology at Groningen (ob. 1688), with additions and corrections of his own. Its title is *G. Fasori Gram. Graec. Sacra N. Testamenti, in tres libros distributa*, 1655. This work is now a literary rarity; although it is far better adapted to perpetuate the author’s fame, than his lexicon of the New Testament. Among the modern writers, Georgi, so far as I know, is the only one who made use of it in his investigations of the Greek language. The whole is divided, as the title shows, into three books; the first of which treats of the forms of words; the second, of the syntax; and the third contains seven appendixes, respecting nouns, verbs, anomalous verbs, dialects, and accents of the New Testament; together with a grammatical praxis, and an account of Greek numbers. The second book is the most valuable; and in the third, that part which respects the dialects of the New Testament. The first book and most
of the appendices, are occupied with the subjects that belong to Greek grammar in general, and exhibit complete paradigms of nouns and verbs; which surely is superfluous. The syntax is compiled with great accuracy, and is copious even to the exhaustion of the subject. Parallels out of the Greek national writers are seldom adduced. In fact, the syntax of this excellent writer exceeds any thing of the kind that has hitherto been compiled; and leaves Haab's inadequate performance very far behind it. The book is without a complete index.

During the period of time between Pasor and Haab, the grammar of the New Testament was treated of only in a cursory way, in writings which had respect to the style of the New Testament; e.g. by Leusden De dialectis N. Test. and Olearius De stylo Nov. Test. p. 257—271. But these authors confined themselves merely to Hebraisms; and comprised among these much that is pure Greek, which only served to perplex the whole investigation. Georgi was the first who shewed many phrases to be pure Greek, which had often been treated as Hebraisms; although he was not free from party bias.

The interpreters of the New Testament relied upon what had been produced as Hebraisms, and often asserted to be such by those writers, without again subjecting them to the test of investigation; e.g. they adopted many erroneous observations, or at least such as were only partially true, respecting the use of the article, the tenses, modes, prepositions, etc. This could not fail to produce an unhappy influence on the interpretation of the New Testament.

In the mean time, philologists had devoted their attention to Greek study, in such a way that important consequences followed from it. Greek grammar, in the course of a few years, assumed a shape quite different from its former one, in consequence of such works as Hermann De emend. ratione Graec. grammaticae, 1801; and Vigerus De pre-eip. Graec. dictionis idiotismis, ed. Hermann, 1813, with important additions and corrections; Buttmann Griechische Grammatik, 1820; and his Ausführliche Grammatik, 1819; Matthiae Ausführl. Grammatik, 1807,* and other investigations. See also Fischer, Animadversiones ad Welle-ri-Gram. Graec. 1798; and the admirable work of Lobeck, in which so much is done to promote the knowledge of the later Greek, viz. Phrynici Eclogae nominum et verborum Atticorum, cum notis Nunaeii, Hoeschelii, Scaligeri, et de Paum, edidit et explicit C. A. Lobeck, 1820.

* Translated into English by the late Rev. E. V. Blomfield, and published in 2 vols. 1819. Tr.
These works made a great disparity between the grammatical views of Greek philologists, and those of New Testament interpreters; as the latter had, with remarkable constancy, adhered to the older grammars, and made Zeune’s edition of Vigerus the principal source of their grammatical knowledge. No wonder, then, that theologians in this way became a subject of derision to the philologists; and that their knowledge of Greek became almost a by-word.*

Under such circumstances, Ph. H. Haab (of Schweigern in Wurtemburg) came before the public, with his Hebrew-Greek grammar of the New Testament, prefaced by F. G. Süsskind, Tubingen, 1815. Overlooking all the pure Greek part of the New Testament diction, he directed his attention solely to grammatical Hebraisms. In the arrangement of his work, he followed the favourite work of Storr, Observation ad analogiam et syntaxin Heb. and Weckherlin’s Gram. Hebraea. If one may credit the reviewer of this work in Bengel’s Archiv (1 B. p. 406 ff.) “the author has accomplished his task with a diligence, a soundness of judgment, an accuracy, and a nice and comprehensive knowledge of language, which must ensure the approbation of all the friends of the well-grounded exegesis of the New Testament.” Very different from this, and opposite to it, is the decision of two learned men, who must be regarded as competent and impartial judges in this department of literature. See Schulthess, in the Theol. Annal. 1816. 2 B. p. 859—879; and De Wette, in A. Lit. Zeitung 1816. n. 39—41. p. 305—326.

After long and various use of the book, I must declare my agreement with them, as to every point of importance. The principal fault of the author is, that he does not distinguish with any nicety between what is pure Greek and what is Hebraistic; and consequently he treats as Hebraism, much that is common to all cultivated languages, or what very frequently occurs in Greek. He has, moreover, erroneously explained a multitude of passages as Hebraisms, from his great partiality to Storr’s work. In consequence of this, every thing is thrown together; the order is exceedingly arbitrary; and the whole begins with a section on tropes! a thing entirely foreign to a grammar.

* A very honourable, but alas! the only exception to these remarks among the lexicographers of the New Testament, is Wahl, whose lexicon everywhere affords evidence of the most diligent use of all the late investigations into the nature of the Greek language.
There is no injustice done, therefore, when the second of the above named critics concludes his review with the following words; "Seldom has the reviewer met with a work, which is so very unfortunate as this, and against the use of which he should feel himself obliged to give a more decided warning."
PART I.

CHARACTER OF THE DICTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.


The character of the New Testament diction, although it is pretty definitely marked, was for a long time mistaken, or was only imperfectly and partially understood, by biblical philologists. The reason of this was, a want of acquaintance with the character of the Greek language in its later periods, joined with polemical considerations, which always render men of clear understanding in respect to other things, slow to discern what is correct in respect to a controverted subject. From the time of Henry Stephens (1576) down to the middle of the past century, two parties existed among the interpreters of the New Testament; the one of which laboured to shew, that the diction of the New Testament is in all respects conformed to the style of the Greek (Attic) writers; while the other maintained, on the contrary, and supposed themselves able to prove from every verse, that the style was altogether mixed with Hebraisms, and came very far short of the ancient classic Greek, in respect to purity.
Although in latter times, the former of these assertions has been shewn to be inadmissible; yet it was not until quite lately, that the imperfect conceptions of those who maintained the latter position began to be felt, and the spirit of the New Testament diction to be more deeply investigated. It is proper to introduce a grammar of the New Testament by prefixing to it the result of such an investigation; particularly so, because the subject is still misapprehended or overlooked, by some interpreters of considerable reputation.

This is not the place to enter into a minute detail respecting the contest about the style of the New Testament, which was carried on with so much party spirit, and for the most part with a neglect of the true principles of criticism; see Morus' *Herm.* by Eichstäd, I. p. 216 ff. Planck *Einleit. in die Theol. Wiss.* 2 thl. s. 43 ff. My design is only to call the attention of the reader to the principal points, or (if I may be allowed the expression) epochs of this contest.

The first excitement to it arose from Henry Stephens; who in the preface to his edition of the New Testament (1576) asserted the purity of the New Testament diction, rather than did any thing to demonstrate it. A discussion, however, in which the learned took a part, and which was long continued by renewed attack and defence, was occasioned, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, by Stephen Pfochen, when he published his *Diatribe de linguae Graec. N. Test. puritate* (1629. ed. sec. 1633.) in which he laboured to prove (§ 81 —129) by many examples, that profane Greek authors had made use of the same words and phrases as the writers of the New Testament (§ 29). In Germany, J. Junge (1639), Dan. Wufser (1640), and the celebrated Musaeus (1641), opposed themselves to the sentiments of Pfochen. The latter did not attempt to answer them. But Jac. Gross (1640—42) took the field of combat, and by opprobrious epithets and invicious insinuations, rather than by any valid arguments, reduced these three learned men to silence. In Holland, the essay of Pfochen was opposed by D. Heinsius (1643), a very dexterous assailant. But scarcely had Heinsius' book made its appearance, when Cl. Salmasius of France entered the lists with three works in favour of Pfochen's position. The reputation of this celebrated author, and perhaps the
term in which he conducted the controversy, was the reason why no opposition was speedily made against his assaults. After some years, however, writers of some note in England, Holland, and Germany, appeared in favour of the sentiment defended by Heinsius. These were Thomas Gataker in England (1648); John Vorst in Holland (1662), who was not reduced to silence by the opposition made to him in an essay of Horace Vitringa; and John Olearius in Germany. With these were soon united Sam. Werenfels of Switzerland (1698), and John Leusden in Holland. The contest appeared to be now at an end, and the differences of opinion to be laid aside, in favour of those who maintained the Hebraistic style of the New Testament. This was particularly the case, when J. H. Michaelis (1707), and A. Blackwall (1737), endeavoured to shew, that although the diction of the New Testament writers is not free from Hebraisms, still it has all the essential qualities of a good style, and in this respect comes nothing short of classic purity. "We are so far from denying," says the latter of these writers, "that there are Hebraisms in the New Testament, that we esteem it a great advantage and beauty to that sacred book, that it abounds with them." It is thus that Blackwall begins his work on the sacred classics, a book enriched with valuable remarks.

In the year 1732, C. S. Georgi, in his *Vindicatus N. Test. ab Ebraismo*, leaned to the opposite opinion; and in 1733, he endeavoured to corroborate it by a new work entitled *Hierocriticus Sacer*. Yet even Georgi was not the last opposer of New Testament Hebraisms. In 1752, Elias Palairet undertook the same task, in his *Observat. philol. crit. in N. Testamentum*. Most of the older writers on this controversy may be found collected, in Van Honert's *Syntagma Dissert. de Stylo N. Test. Graeco*, Amst. 1703; and also in J. Rhenferd's *Dissert. philol. theol. de stylo Novi Test. Syntagma*, Leov. 1702.

Let us now endeavour briefly to characterize the efforts of those who maintained the classical purity of the New Testament diction. In general these efforts were directed to the collection of passages out of the national Greek authors, in which the same words and phrases occurred as were found in the New Testament, and which were asserted to be Hebraisms. In so doing they overlooked several considerations, which will now be specified.

1. Many expressions and phrases, and especially those which are figurative, on account of their simplicity and conformity to nature are the common property of all languages, and so can neither be called Graecisms nor Hebraisms.
A difference must be made between prose and poetry; and if, in a book of mere prose, like that of the New Testament, expressions may be found like those used by Pindar, Aeschyus, Euripides, etc. or even if they repeatedly occur, this by no means establishes the classic purity of the New Testament Greek. [See the next page.]

5. When a phrase may be found both in Hebrew and Greek, the manner in which the apostles and writers of the New Testament were educated, renders it more probable that they followed the Hebrew idiom than that they borrowed it from the refined language of the classics.

These critical collectors of phrases have gleaned many passages out of Greek authors, where to be sure the same word occurs, but not in the same sense. (March's Michaelis, I. p. 142, ed. of 1802.)

5. They have passed over, and were compelled to pass over, many phrases in silence, because they are undeniably Hebraisms. Their proof, then, was partly incomplete, and partly irrelevant and aside from its design.

Finally, they limited themselves, in a particular manner, to the department of the lexicon; while Georgi only has copiously treated of the grammatical department.

As a proof of what has now been said, I shall subjoin a few examples. (Comp. Momms. Herm. p. 222.)

By illustrate consideration 1. Matt. 6: 6 πεντενε μη διενορευετη διαν θεου. Parallel are adduced out of Xenophon, Aeschyus, Lucian, and Artemidorus, to prove that διενορευετη, in pure Greek, may have such a tropical meaning, as in Matthew. But, in fact, it is used in this manner in all languages, and particularly in Latin; and this cannot therefore be regarded as Graecism. It is really ridiculous, when Matt. 10: 27 οπρουσετε εν των δοματιοι, is compared with the following passage in Aesop, εις των εννοος δοματος ιερως. Such superfluous remarks frequently occur in the essay of Plochen.

To illustrate consideration 2. That ψυχη may mean life, is shown out of Homer Il. XXIII. 325. Eurip. Hec. 176. Alcest. 300. That ψυχη may mean to be dead, is proved out of L. XI. 241 (comp. Georgi, Findisice, p. 122 &c.) That σειρα may signify offering among the Greeks, is shown from Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 584. Iphig. Taur. 983; 659. Hecub. 254 (Georgi, p. 87 &c.) And that τευχη may mean slaughter, is also shown from Eurip. Hippol. 1450. Iphig. Taur. 78; 924. Alcest. 186, etc. Comp. also ψυχηνειν to govern.
[The principle which Winer endeavours here to establish, and which is recognised by Ernesti and many of the late interpreters, is not perhaps so clear as he would seem to think it; at least not as a general principle to be applied to the New Testament. That prose should be compared with prose, and poetry with poetry, in order to find opposite analogies of language and expression, is a good general rule: But it is a rule which is applicable rather to rhetoric—to figurative language—to the costume in which a writer invests his thoughts—than to mere style simply considered. This very rule, too, so far from excluding altogether the comparison of the diction employed by the Greek poets with that of the New Testament, would serve to shew that such a comparison may, to a considerable extent, be judiciously instituted. The diction of the New Testament, as all admit, takes its colouring from that of the Heb. Scriptures. Now one half, or more, of these Scriptures is poetry; and by far the greater part of the Old Testament which is quoted in the New, and on which the thoughts of the New Testament writers were habitually employed, (in reference to the prophecies respecting the Messiah,) belongs to the poetic class of compositions. Besides, all the prophecies in the New Testament, the book of Revelation, the predictions of our Saviour, of Paul, etc. the sermon on the mount, the song in Luke 1, and most of the discourses of the apostles, plainly develop many of the characteristics of Hebrew poetry, both in structure and diction. Why then should a comparison of Greek poetry be excluded, according to the principles of the general rule?

It is moreover quite certain, that the Greek poets, and in particular the tragedians, with all their sublime and elegant diction, have intermingled much more of the language and forms of the colloquial Greek and that of common life, than the Greek historians have done. No one, for example, can read Sophocles, and Xenophon or Thucydides, without being convinced of this fact. The dialogue of the tragedians necessarily led to this result. The Greek of common intercourse shows in constant tendency to abridged and apothegmatic forms of speech, which every one knows abound in the Greek tragedians. Compare also our best poets in English. Have not Shakspeare, and Pope, and Cowper, very much more of the language of conversation in their works, than Hume, and Robertson, and Gibbon? Poetic-license so called, is nearly all an approximation to this language of common life, and cannot be indulged in by grave historians.

Now as the style of the New Testament is that of the Greek of
common conversation, intermixed with a strong colouring derived from a familiar acquaintance with the Hebrew Scriptures; and as Greek poetry exhibits more of the colloquial familiarities, apothegms, etc. than Greek history; while at the same time it exhibits, with this, many more resemblances to the Hebrew poetry; I am unable to see why the poets, and in particular the tragedians who have exhibited dialogues, and the lyric poets who often have resemblances to the Hebrew lyrics, may not, and must not, be drawn into a fair comparison with the New Testament writers, as to many points of their diction. It requires, indeed, sound judgment to determine where a comparison may be made legitimately and with force. But this is also required, though it is far from having been always exhibited, in all comparisons with the Greek historians.

If the principle now stated be correct, it is demonstrably certain, that almost everything which has been called Hebraism in the New Testament, has its parallel in Greek. There are scarcely any peculiarities in the Hebrew syntax, which do not find analogies in Sophocles, Euripides, and Pindar. [S.]

To illustrate consideration 3. Certainly it would not be an error, if one should derive the phrase γυναικείος τον ανδρα immediately from the Hebrew. וָאֱרֹן, and regard it as Hebraism in the New Testament; although it is not foreign to the Greeks. So the phrase ανάμιγην, and others of a similar character, are an imitation of the Hebrew, and cannot be proved to be pure Greek by parallel phrases deduced from Herodotus, Xenophon, and Aelian.

To illustrate consideration 4. Ptolemaeus endeavours to prove that among the Greeks, as well as in the New Testament, denotes the instrumental case; e.g. πλεων εν ταις ναυσι, Xen. and ηδε—εν την μελανη, Hesiod. So Georgi (Vindiciae p. 116) endeavours to shew that ευφρασν χαριν is good Greek, from Demosthenes, who uses the expression ευφρασν την ειρηνην, την δυναμεαν; as if this mode of phraseology was not rather to be attributed to the Hebrew language. In like manner are most of the passages irrelevant, by which Georgi (Hierocrit. p. 36 ff. p. 187) attempts to prove, that the best Greek writers commute the prepositions εν and εν for each other, in the same way as the New Testament writers. The same objections may be made to Palairot's Observationes.

Sturtz, in his essay De dialecto Alexandrinis (Lips. 1784. ed. 2. 1809.) led the way to a right estimation of the style of the New Testament

In the age which succeeded Alexander the Great, the Greek language underwent an internal change of a double nature. In part, a prosaic language of books was formed, ἣ κοινὴ διάλεκτος, which was built on the Attic dialect, but was intermixed with not a few provincialisms; and partly a language of popular intercourse was formed, in which the various dialects of the different Grecian tribes, heretofore separate, were more or less mingled together; while the Macedonian dialect was peculiarly prominent. (Sturtz De dialecto Mace-don. et Alex. p. 26 ff.) The latter language constitutes the basis of the diction employed by the Seventy, the writers of the Apocrypha, and of the New Testament. The peculiarities of these may be ranked under two heads; viz. those which pertain to the department of the lexicon, and of the grammar.

The older writers on the Greek dialects, particularly on the κοινὴ διάλεκτος, are at present nearly useless. This subject is briefly but well treated of by Matthiae § 1—8; still more forcibly, however, by Buttmann, Ausführ. Griech. Sprachlehre, p. 1—9; but best of all by Planck, loc. cit. p. 13—23.

* Translated into English by Prof. Patton, and published as an appendix to his translation of Thiersch’s Greek Tables. Tn.
The Egyptian Jews learned the Greek, first of all, by intercourse with those who spoke this language, and not from books;* for they had in the time of Christ a decided aversion to Greek culture and literature; see Ernesti De odio Jud. advers. hui. Graec. in Opusc. philol. crit. p. 408 seq.† When they appeared as authors, they did not adopt the style of writing employed by the learned, but made use of the popular dialect, which they had been accustomed to speak. The character of this dialect, however, can be only imperfectly known; as the Septuagint, the New Testament, and some of the fathers of the Church, exhibit the only monuments of it; and these are not altogether pure. Since, however, much which belonged to it was peculiar to the later Greek writings; so writers in the κοινή διάλεκτος, particularly Polybius, Plutarch, Artemidorus, Appian, etc. and more especially the Byzantine historians, may be used as secondary sources. See Planck l.c. p. 21 ff.

I now proceed to bring the peculiarities of the later Greek idiom, pertaining either to the lexicon or the grammar, under general inspection; and to establish them by adducing the necessary examples. In doing this, however, I build upon the investigations already made by Sturtz, Planck, and Lobeck, to whom the following citations or examples are referred. I shall mark with an asterisk whatever appears to be exclusively the popular Greek, and which is not to be found in any profane Greek author.

I. Peculiarities pertaining to the Lexicon.

a) The dialect of the later Greek comprised words and forms of words, belonging without distinction to all the Greek dialects. E. g. the Attic; υαλός, ο' σκοτός, τα δέσμα, αλόπειν (Lob. p. 151). The Doric; πιαζω, πλεθανος, η λειμος, αλεκτωρ, σκοτει. The Ionic; βαθμος, ευραω, γογγυζω (Lob. p. 358), φησις, επτρωμα, σκορπιζων.

b) To words used in the ancient language, it gave new significa-

* That the Jews, in the time of Christ, formed their Greek style, or power of expression in Greek, by reading the Septuagint, naturally makes here no essential difference.

† That a learned Greek education cannot be ascribed to the apostle Paul, seems now to be generally acknowledged. A greater versatility in Greek expression than the other apostles, he certainly possessed. This, however, he might well have acquired in Asia Minor, where he had so much intercourse with Greeks, some of whom were men of learning and rank.
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tions. E.g. παρακάλειν to beseech, παίξευειν to chastise, αμητος* sprung from a mother of unknown fame (Philo de Temul. p. 248), ανα-
πλέειν, αναπίπτειν to recline at table, αποκριθήναι to answer (Lob. p.
108), αποκατασσεθαι to renounce, to take leave of (Lob. p. 23 ff.), δια-
πονέυομαι* to be indignant, αναστροφή life, γαμος* marriage feast,
σφάνειον wages (Sturtz l. c. p. 187.)

c) Words which were seldom used in the old Greek, or only by the
poets, were employed in this dialect as common or favourite ones.
E.g. βρέχειν to water (Lob. p. 291.)

d) Many words received a different, and commonly a lengthened form.
E.g. μετοικεῖαι, ἱεὐσα, καυγησίς, αναθέμα (αναθήμα), γενεσία (γενε-
θεία Lob. p. 104), γλωσσοκόμων (γλωσσοκόμων Lob. p. 98, 99), εκ-
παλαι (παλαι Lob. p. 45 ff.), αἰτήμα (αἰτήμα), πρόεμα (προέμα),
βασιλεία (βασίλεια), εκχύλειν (εκχύλειν), ελευθερός (ελευθ. Lob. p.
87), αργός-η-ον (αργός-ον with two endings, Lob. p. 105.)

e) Words altogether new were formed, mostly by composition. E.g.
αλλοτριοποιεῖς* ανθρωποφάρσκος (Lob. p. 821), αἰχμαλωτικεῖς
(Lob. p. 442), ἱδυπαθεῖα, ἀντιλυτρον* ἐκκυκλητίζεις*, ἀλεκτροφω-
νων (Lob. p. 229), αποχαλεῖς (Lob. p. 341), αγαθουργεῖς, δια-
σκοπικεῖς (Lob. p. 228), εὐκρατεύομαι* (Lob. p. 442), οἰκοδεσποτής
(Lob. p. 373), πανδοχεῖον (Lob. p. 307), ἐξωδοχεῖον (Lob. p. 307), ὄνθ-
γειν (Lob. p. 429), καμμενίν (καταμενίν Sturtz. p. 123.)

The later dialect was peculiarly rich in substantives ending in μα.
E.g. καταλλημα, ανταπόδομα (Pasor Gram. N. T. p. 571–574). Al-
so in adjectives ending in ὕνος; e.g. ορθόνος (Sturtz. p. 186), ομι-
νος, πρωνος, καθήνειν. In verbs ending in οω and ιοω; e.g.
ἀνακαίνων, αφύνων, δεκατων*, εὐοδεῖνω, ὀθενον, ορθομοι*, δια-
ματικον. Compare also παντοτε (διαπαντος, ἐκαστοτε). See Sturtz
De dialect. ἀλεξ. p. 187 ff.†

† It was natural that the popular Greek should receive and incorporate
many foreign words (appellatives), borrowed with little variation from the lan-
guages of the several provinces abroad, where Greek was spoken in connec-
tion with a foreign language. This, however, does not concern the above in-
vestigation. For Egyptian words in the Sept. and elsewhere, see Sturtz De
dialect. ἀλεξ. p. 34 ff. Latin and Persian words are also found in the New
p. 247 ff. II. passim. For Latinisms, see Marsh’s Michaelis, vol. I. p. 162,
ed. 1802.
II. Grammatical peculiarities.

The peculiarities of the New Testament diction which pertain to the department of grammar, are limited almost entirely to the manner of declining nouns and verbs; and are exhibited in certain forms, which, in the earlier Greek, were either altogether unknown, or not at all used in particular words, or at least were foreign to the Attic dialect; for the mingling of the dialects which were formerly separated, developed itself also in this respect. In reference to syntax, the later idiom has very little that is peculiar. For example, few verbs in it are construed with cases different from those which the earlier dialects are accustomed to employ. Whatever pertains to this topic, will find a more appropriate place under § 4.

That the later dialect which we are considering had peculiarities of its own, in several provinces, is quite probable; as the ancient grammarians, who have written upon the Alexandrine dialect, have asserted, e.g. Irenaeus and Demetrius Ixion; see Sturtz De dialect. Maced. et Alex. p. 24, note 4, comp. p. 19. Accordingly, some find Cilicians in the writings of Paul, e.g. Jerotie Ad Algesiam quest. 10, tom. IV. edit. Martiniay, p. 204. Still, however, the four examples which this father produces are not decisive; see Marsh's Mich. I. p. 152. As we can now have access to no source of evidence respecting Cilicisms, we must dismiss this investigation, rather than build on empty hypotheses. Comp. Stolberg De Cilicismis a Paulo usurpatis, in his Exercitatt. Ling. Graecas.

§ 3. Hebrew-Aramaean complexion of the N. Test. diction.

The popular Greek dialect was not spoken and written by the Jews, without some intermixtures of a foreign kind. Particularly did they intermix many idioms and the general complexion of their vernacular language. Hence arose a Judaizing Greek dialect; which was in some good measure unintelligible to the native Greeks, and became an object of their contempt.* All

* For example; a native Greek could understand the phrase ἄρεξ ἡμῶν τα ὁφειλήματα ἡμῶν Matt. 6:12, only as having respect to a debt of a fine (Demosth. adv. Timoc. p. 468 A), and ἀμφοτερκα ᾧςειναι Mark 4:12, he would regard as meaning merely to permit an error or
the idioms of the vernacular language of the Jews, which have been transferred to the Septuagint and the New Testament, have been ranked under the general appellation of *Hebraisms*; to which, however, many phrases have been assigned, that more properly should be named *Aramaecisms*, or which belonged to the popular Greek.

All the nations, who after Alexander's death came under Greek rulers, and gradually adopted the language of their conquerors, in the common intercourse of life, particularly the Syrians and Hebrews, spoke the Greek less purely than the native Grecians, and enstamped upon it more or less of the characteristics of their respective vernacular tongues. Since now all the Jews who spoke the Greek language, are commonly called *Hellenists* (whether rightly, see Morus' *Hermen.* P. I. p. 227 ff.) so the dialect used by them has obtained the appellation of Hellenistic; see Buttman *Ausfuhr. Gram.* p. 7, and in Patton's translation, note 12. On this account, the New Testament diction has been called Hellenistic. It was not Drusius, however, (Comm. on Acts 6:6) who first employed this appellation, but Joseph Scaliger.

The Hebraisms of the New Testament have often been collected together, and with a copiousness that deserves commendation. Verstius, Lusden, Olearius (De stylo Nov. Test. p. 232 ff), and Hartmann (Linguist. Einleit. in das Studium des A. Test. p. 382 ff) have done this best. Still, this matter should have been executed with more regard to the principles of criticism. Almost all the writers on this subject, are liable to the imputation of several errors, viz.

1. They did not bestow sufficient attention on the Aramaecisms of the New Testament diction.* It is well known, that the Syro-Chaldaic,

---

* Many idioms of the New Testament may be regarded as either Hebraisms or Aramaecisms. E.g. *ἐξ* used as the definite article; and the frequent
and as the old Hebrew, was spoken by the Jews of Palestine in the time of our Saviour. On this account, many of the current expressions in that language must have been introduced into the Greek which was spoken by the Jews. Among the older writers, however, Olearius has a section De Chaldaeo-Syrisimis N. Test. p. 345 ff (comp. Georgi Hierocrit. I. p. 187 seq.) In later times, much that pertains to these idioms has been collected by Boysen (Krit. Erläuterungen des Grundtexts des N. Test. aus der Syr. Uebersetz. 1761); Agrell (Orat. de dictione N. Test. 1798; and Otiola Syriaca, 1816. p. 53—58); and Hartmann, (ut supra. 382 ff.) In like manner, several earlier interpreters have now and then adverted to this subject; see Marsh’s Michaelis, vol. I. p. 135 ff. and Bertholdt’s Einleit. I Th. p. 158. Here, finally, belong the Rabbinisms; see Olear. ut sup. p. 360 ff. Georgi ut sup. p. 221 ff. For the explanation of these, much useful matter may be found in Schoetgen’s Hor. Hebraicae.

2. The dissimilarity of style among the New Testament writers was almost wholly neglected by the authors in question. Consequently, from their collections it would appear as if all parts of the New Test. equally abounded in Hebraisms. But in respect to this, there is no small dissimilarity; for Matthew, Luke, John, Paul, and James, can by no means be ranked together, in regard to the frequency of Hebraisms in their writings. Moreover the authors above cited did not show the relation of the New Testament diction to the style of the Septuagint; although, with all its similarities, it also exhibits many discrepancies. Generally, the style of the Septuagint is more Hebraistic than that of the New Testament.

3. These writers also ranked much under the appellation of Hebraisms, which was not unusual among the Greek prose writers; and generally they appear not to have had clear and definite ideas of what was to be regarded as Hebraism; see De Wette in der A. L. Zeitung no. 39. p. 306. For example, they employed this word in a three-fold sense; viz.

(a) To denote such words, phrases, and constructions, as belonged use of εὐαγγελία with a participle, instead of a verb in a definite tense. But we ought rather to regard these, and such like peculiarities, as Aramaeisms, because they are more frequent in the Aramaean language, and are found in Hebrew almost exclusively in the later authors, who lean to Aramaeam. Finally, what has been said in respect to this topic, is applicable only to the New Testament; in the Septuagint we do not meet with Aramaeisms.
exclusively to the Hebrew-Aramaean language, and correspondent to which nothing could be found in the Greek prose writers: E. g. ἀφετηρία, προσώπου λαμπαδη, μαρτυρίων in the sense of doc-

trine, etc.

b) To denote words, phrases, and constructions, which now and then occur among the Greeks, but which are derived immediately from the vernacular language of the writers of the New Testament. E. g. ἀλήθεια probus (Demosth. 113. 17); ἀναγκὴ distress, troublre, (comp. Diod. Sic. IV. 29) corresponding to the Hebrew יִשָּׂע, יֵרְשָׁא, יֶשֶׁב, יָרְשָׁא. So εἰς ἀναγκαῖα like יִשָּׂע (comp. Diod. Sic. XVIII. 59; Polyb. V. 28); ἀποφρεσσοῦσα to commence discourse, like the Hebrew יִשָּׂע (Arist. Hart. I. 22. Lucian. Demon. 26); ἀνεπέμφτω, ἀποκρισίς Gk. 677 (Aristot. Rhet. III. 3.) comp. Prov. 22:8; εὐθεῖα to destroy, to ex-
terminate, (Max. Tyr. 38.) comp. יַשָּׂע.

c) To denote such words, phrases, and constructions, as are equally common both in Hebrew and Greek, and respecting which it must be doubtful whether they are to be regarded as constituent parts of the popular Greek spoken by the Jews, or as derived from their own vernacular idiom. E. g. θυσίας vοικον, αἵμα αεας, αὐτό with an appellative e. g. αὐτό φοινα. This last observation applies to many grammatical phenomena, which Haeb has brought forward in his Hebrew-Greek grammar; e. g. in respect to the demonstrative meaning of the article; in respect to the so-called genitivus of the object, etc.

From what has already been said, it is plain that there are two kinds of Hebrewism in the New Testament, which ought to be distinguished. The one we may call perfect; the other, imperfect. By the former we understand such words, phrases, and constructions, as exclusively belong to the Hebrew (Aramaean) language; and therefore must have been derived from it, and introduced into the language of the New Testament. By the latter, we understand all words, phrases, and constructions, which although they may be found in the Greek prose writers, yet probably were derived from the Hebrew (Aramaean) language. This we may argue from the fact, that the latter dialect was more familiar to the New Testament writers than the Greek written language, and that such words, phrases, and constructions, were more frequent in their vernacular language than in the Greek. The difference here made between Hebrewisms, seems to have been felt by De Wette, and expressed in words (ut supra. p. 319) as follows;

"There is certainly an essential difference whether a phrase ... be not
Greek at all, or whether it has some point of union in the Greek, to which it could attach itself?"

This is not the place to exhibit a full catalogue of all which I deem to be Hebraisms in the New Testament. I shall content myself with simply designating the classes into which they may be divided, and adding a few examples to support such a division.*

The Hebraisms of the New Testament which pertain to the lexicon consist of the following classes of words; viz.

a) Of words which were formed by the Jews, after the analogy of certain Hebrew words. E.g. σπλαγχνιζόμαι, which stands in the same relation to σπλαγχνα, as κύρος to κύριον; ευοικειόμαι† equivalent to γαρμήν; δεκαδυό (δεκαδεκα) like δέκα πενήντα Ex. 26:21. Acts 19:7. Whether γεροτόμω is to be classed with these is doubtful; as this word may be a production of the later Greek, like many others in our.

b) Of words which, besides a usual Greek signification, have also another meaning common to correspondent words in the Hebrew. E.g. δικαιοσύνη alma, liberality, i. q. ἴδιος; μαρτυρίων precept, i. q. ταξις, ἡ στέρεως; ἀνεμοι region of the heavens, i. q. ναοί; ονά thing, something, i. q. ονάς; εὐμολογεῖσθαι to praise, to applaud, i. q. ἐλευθάρη; ἀποκρινεῖσθαι to begin discourse, i. q. προτότοκος. Compare also in Wahl, εἰρηνή, ἀντίθετον, αναγγέλται, αντιστήμα, εἰσαγωγοι, εἴλεγον, αἰώνες. So also ἀναθημα belongs to this class of words; since among the later Greeks it signifies the same as ἀναθημα, i.e. an offering consecrated to the Divinity, and in this respect it compares well with דתות; but in the Sept. and New Testament, it bears the signification of something devoted to destruction, something that should be destroyed. From this noun is formed the verb ἀναπτείσθαι, which is analogous to סימן.—ARAMAIGNS of this class are δυναμικ miracle, i. q. κρίσις; εἰςδεκαζητεῖν to cohabit, i. q. ἡ ἐκδοσις; λέγειν to command, i. q. ναός; δεκαδυό to hear, to follow, i. q. δάκτυλος; κοιμασθαι to die, i. q. πτωτός.

c) Of whole phrases which imitate the Hebrew; and although they

* Among the lexicographers of the New Testament, none has separated the Hebraistic part from the pure Greek with more care and skill, than WAHL in his Lexicon. To him I refer in a particular manner.

† Vostius, Fischer (Proleg. de vidis Lex. N. T. p. 693), and Sturts (De dialect. Lex. p. 166), hold this word to be a production of the Alexandrine Greek idiom. Their reasons, however, do not seem to be satisfactory.

may severally be found in Greek, yet the connexion of them in such a manner is altogether oriental. E. g. προσωπον λαμβάνειν, I. q. οὖν δύναται; αἷμα εκχέειν, I. q. γινεῖν ἕκτυ; ζητεῖν ψυχῆς, I. q. ὕπο μητίστερ; ἀπερχομένεις π. αφολούθειν οποίου, I. q. ἄρα τοὺς ἥλιος; διωθεῖν τον αγαπητὸν τ. δικαίωσεν, I. q. Ὄμος; φρονήσεως πονηρος, I. q. τίς τούτοις. Armaeisms of this kind, or Rabbinisms, are οφειλήμα τιμωρεῖται, I. q. ἀρχηγὸς βραβεύει; σωτὲ καὶ αἷμα instead of αὐθεντος.*

Many Greek words, moreover, are used by the New Testament writers in a kind of technical way, i. e. to express the peculiarities of the Christian religion; so that a third class of words pertaining to the New Testament diction grows out of this circumstance, and may be termed peculiarly Christian; see εὐγα, πιστες, δικαίωσθαι, πληρουθεισα, etc. But as complaints are found in the Talmud of the use of such words, it would perhaps be difficult to shew that the apostles have introduced any words altogether new.

The grammatical Hebraisms may be found in the following section.


In respect to the grammatical character of the New Testament diction, both the elements above described, as forming a part of the language, may in general be distinguished in it, (§ 2. ii. § 3.) The basis of it consists of the peculiarities of the later Greek language, which however develop themselves in modes of declining, rather than in syntactical construction. In the use of all the parts of speech, the Hebrew idioms and modes of construction combine with these; yet still, so as that the grammatical Hebraisms of the New Testament are much fewer than those which belong to the lexicon. In this respect, therefore, the diction of the New Testament, as to purity, is greatly superior to that of the Septuagint.

* The Jewish Greek in a peculiar manner uses δαμουνον in the sense of evil spirit, devil. This was connected with the idea which the Jews entertained of the heathen gods, believing them to have once been devils incarnate.
The history of language in general teaches us, that changes made by the progress of time are much greater in the department of the lexicon than in that of the grammar; i.e. the meaning of words changes more than their forms. This is true as applied to the Greek language. Only a few grammatical changes appear in the later Greek; and these consist principally in a greater copiousness of forms. For example, we find several modes of declining nouns and verbs, which either were not used by the earlier Greeks, and were formed in later times by abridging or prolonging the original forms; or which belonged only to the peculiarities of particular dialects. Of the latter kind are such inflections as the following, viz.

a) Attic; e.g. ἐθέσας, ἡβουληθήν, ἡμέλλε, βουλεύ (βουλή), οὐεί.

b) Doric; e.g. ἦσσο (ἑσσω), αφενναε (αφενναε).

c) Aeolic; aorist opt. in εἰς; although this mode of declining early passed into the Attic dialect.

d) Ionic; e.g. ἑρεί, ἑπτα 1 aorist.

As forms unknown to the ancient language may be added, dat. νολ', imper. καθού, perf. εγγουκάν (ορεγγουκάσι), aor. 2 and imperf. like κα- τελεσσαν, εδολιασσαν, aor. 2 as ειδαμέν, εφυγαν. In particular, many tenses belong here, which in other respects have a regular inflection, but for which the ancient language used different tenses. E.g. εγγενησσα (εγγενησαιμιν), εβλαστησσα (εβλαστων), κλευσσω (κλευσσαι), κερ- δησσω (κερδησσω), and many others; see §§ 6—11. Finally, the catalogue of later inflections by Greek grammarians, might be enlarged out of the New Testament. See below, πισσα, φαγεσαι, § 9. 1. d.

Very few syntactical peculiarities are found in the later Greek dialect. These are developed mostly by a negligent use of the modes of verbs with particles. In the New Testament we may rank under this head, ὄταν with the indic. (§ 35. 9); ἵνα with ind. pres. (§ 35. 5. a); γενεσθαι with the acc. (§ 23. 5. a); προκειμεν with the dat. § 24. 1. a. (Lobeck p. 463); and after μελλεν, θέλεν, etc. follows more often the inf. aor. (Lobeck. p. 747.)

The grammatical Hebraisms of the New Testament, which have been so multiplied by biblical philologists, particularly by Haub, I shall divide into two classes. (§ 3. p. 29, 30.)

I. Perfect Hebraisms. For example, οῦ πας for οὐδεσ (§ 20. 1); the predicate expression of the nominative by εἰς, in such forms as σκέφτεσθαι, γενέσθαι κατ' εἰς (§ 22. 3); the fem. adj. instead of the neut. gender (§ 26. 2. b, note 2); such connexions as τα προτα της αισχυνης (§ 27. c),
and τα δηματὰ τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης instead of ταυτα (§ 26.2. b, n. 1); periphrastic expressions of the superlative, as εὐλογημένη ἐν γνώσει (§ 29. 1. n. 1), ἀγία ἀγίων (§ 29. 2); the designation of distributives by the doubling of numerals, as δου δου instead of αυτά δου (§ 30. 2); the form of oaths, as εἰ δοθησάνται (§ 48. 2); imitations of the Heb. inf. absolute, as αἰτεῖν αἰτεῖσθαι (§ 47. 1); constructions such as ὁμολογεῖν εἰς τινί (Aramaean, see Peshito in Acts 23: 8. 1John 1: 9. Mich. Syr. Christom. p. 28); εἰσείν από τοῦ ψυχοῦ, διδάσκειν εἰς τινί, ἀποκρύπτειν από τινος (§ 23. § 25); προειδοθεῖαι πεμψα (§ 47. 2); the designation of the dative by εν and εἰς, etc. see Wahl on these words.

II. IMPERFECT HEBRAISMS. These may be divided into two kinds; viz.

a) Such constructions as are more frequent in Hebrew than in Greek prose; and which may be regarded as very nearly like the perfect Hebraisms. E. g. τῷ γνωστῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ for γνώσις τοῦ Θεοῦ (§ 28. 1); παρεα and ὑπερ for a periphrasis of the comparative (§ 28); the positive for the superlative (§ 29. 1); εἰς for πρωτος (§ 30. 1); a participle with εἰς as for a finite verb (§ 39. 2); the participle passive of the prater for the participle in δει (§ 39. 6 note 1); nouns for adjectives and adverbs (§ 26. 2. § 47.)

b) Such constructions as are equally common to Greek and Hebrew; in regard to which we can merely say that the New Testament writers more probably borrowed such idioms from their vernacular language. E. g. the use of the nom. for the voc. (§ 22. 2); the nominative absolute (§ 22. 1); the elliptical construction of the comparative, as μαρτυριῶν μετ' (sc. μαρτυριαν) ἰωάννου (§ 28. 4); zeugma et constructio praegnans (§ 31. 3); the imperative in a permissive sense (§ 37. 1); the omission of the personal pronoun after active verbs (§ 16. 1.)

Imaginary Hebraisms are the pluralis excellenitae, so called (§ 21.3. n.1); and such connexions as σαλπνγος τοῦ Θεοῦ (§ 29. 3), which have been erroneously regarded as a periphrasis for the superlative.

A comparison of the Sept. will soon show, that the language of it is, in a grammatical respect, much more Hebraistic than that of the New Testament, even in those books which are not closely translated; a circumstance which hitherto has been but little regarded. Haeb, for example, attributes Hebraism to the New Testament, in a number of

† J. C. Schwartz’s Observatt. quadam de Stylo Sept. (in his edition of Olcor. De Stylo N. Test. p. 294—345) contain many valuable things; but they rather hint at the principal object, than give a comprehensive view of it.

In characterizing the language of the New Testament, it must not be forgotten, that to several writers belong peculiarities which are found only or particularly in them. The individual character of the apostles as writers, exhibits itself particularly in the departments of rhet-
monic or the lexicon; still there are not wanting constructions and phras-
eses, which appear as favourite ones in one writer, although they seldom
or never occur in another. This is peculiarly the case with the relative
position of words, as Gersdorf has fully shewn. It may be added here,
that the diction of Paul bears a near relation to that of Luke. Finally,
the author of the Apocalypse, as is remarked by others, has many
grammatical peculiarities, or to speak more definitely, anomalies, par-
ticularly in the use of cases and tenses; although the manuscripts do
not accord in all the instances. In the mean time it may suffice here
to refer, for the proof of what has been now said, to those sections
of this work, in which such individual characteristics in the writings
of the apostles are brought to view and explained. Comp. § 12: 1 note
7, 3. § 18. 6 note. § 18. 3. n. 1. § 23. 7. § 27 note 2. § 38. 3. n. 2. § 39. 1
note. § 49. § 50.

Lastly, it is plain, that in all our investigations respecting the gram-
matical character of the New Testament diction, the variety of the
readings must be diligently investigated. On the other hand, it is also
clear, that criticism on the words of the New Testament writers can
never be successfully managed, without a fundamental knowledge of
their peculiarities, both as it respects the lexicon and the grammar.
PART II.

FORMS OF WORDS.

§ 5. Apostrophe, contraction, crisis.

The concurrence of two vowels, which was so carefully avoided by the Greeks, (and particularly by the Attics,) as producing harshness of sound, is not at all uncommon in the New Testament.

1. An apostrophe at the end of words which terminate in a short vowel, is not unfrequently neglected.

Examples of this kind are very numerous. The following are selected merely from the Gospels. Matt. 2: 1 ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ. 8: 9 ὑπὸ ἀντιστασία. Mark 2: 17 ἀλλὰ ἀρνητόλογος. 7: 5 επέβαλεν ἐπεφηνώσῳ. 11: 33 ὄνομα ἐμα. Luke 19: 42 καὶ ἐξ. John 1: 3 οὐδὲ ἐμ. 5: 14 ναρκάς ἀνήλικος. In manuscripts this mode of writing is often found, where the common text does not exhibit it; e. g. Acts 26: 25 ἀλλὰ κατέθεσέν τινα in 2 Vienna manuscripts and Cod. Diez. 2 Cor. 12: 14 ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ οὗ τῆς λέξεως in Cod. Diez. etc. In other manuscripts the omission of the apostrophe is corrected; e. g. 2 John 5 ἀλλὰ ἐν in Cod. Diez. and thus in several other cases.

That a neglect of the apostrophe was common among the Ionic writers, is well known. On this account, the older biblical philologists have named such neglect in the New Testament, Ionismus. It should however be mentioned here, that the Attic prose writers also not unfrequently neglected the apostrophe; although the examples of this, produced by Georgi in his Hierocrit. Sacer (I. p. 143), are not all to be relied upon. See Buhlmann Ausführ. Gram. p. 124 f.
§ 5. APOSTROPE, CONTRACTION, CRASIS.

In respect to the forms οὐτῶς and οὐράς, there is a great want of uniformity in the manuscripts, some having exclusively one form only, (e. g. Cod. Diez. nearly always οὐτῶς). The same is true of the ν εἰσλαμβάνων, which, in many manuscripts, stands almost everywhere after a verb ending in ε or ρ, contrary to good usage. So Cod. Diez. in Acts 9: 4. 24: 7. al. See Buttmann l. c. p. 92 ff. In respect to οὐκος and οἶκος, see Lobeck ad Phrynicum p. 14.

The ε in οὐχι, as is well known, is not omitted by apostrophe; e. g. 1 Cor. 6: 1. Rom. 3: 27. al. In regard to χρηστά (i. e. χρηστά) ὀμιλεῖ 1 Cor. 15: 33, respecting which some have doubted, see Georgi p. 186.

2. Contractions which are common elsewhere, are sometimes omitted; although this is rather unfrequent, and takes place only in respect to certain forms of nouns.


4. According to Sturtz (De dialect. Alex. p. 116 ff.) the Alexandrians had their peculiar orthography, which not only exchanged letters for each other, e. g. ας and ε, ε and η, ι and ε, ι and π, but also added superfluous ones, e. g. εγρήσε, βασιλεῖα, νυκτα, φθάνεια, and omitted those which were necessary, e. g. γενημα, δοξοφορον, ομονοία. They also neglected the methods of avoiding harsh sounds, practised by other Greeks (Buttmann p. 24 ff. Ev. trans.) writing, for example, γενήμα-
§ 6. Nouns; unusual inflections in the first and second declensions.

1. Proper names of the first declension ending in ας, make the genitive throughout in α.


2. The dative of the second declension is sometimes in ω.


3. The accusative of the second declension is sometimes in ω.

E. g. Απολλων (from Απολλως) Acts 19:1. 1 Cor. 4:6 instead of Απολλωνι, compare Acts 18:24. (The gen. is regularly Απολλωνι Cor. 3:4. 16:12.) The Attics are accustomed to omit the ν in the accusative, comp. Xen. Cyrop. I. 6. 19. Lucian tom. V. p. 77. As to the name Απολλων, see Plat. Cratyl. p. 728 A. Respublic. 3. p. 618 Β. comp. Georgi p. 97. Matthiae § 70. 1. According to some manuscripts του Κοσμος Acts 21:11 belongs here (Matthiae ut supra); but others have the
common form του ἄρνημα as has Cod. Diez. Both of these endings in the accusative occur in common Greek; see Schol. ad Iliad. XIV. 255.

§ 7. Nouns; unusual inflections in the third declension.

1. In the third declension the following peculiarities occur in the cases of the singular.


(b) The dat. γνησεί (Ionic). instead of γνησεί, Luke 1: 36; for which however the vulgar text has γνησα. Comp. Ecclus. 8: 50. 1 K. 11: 4. and see Matthiae § 64 note 4.


2. In the plural the following forms occur, viz.


(b) The accusative ends in εις from nouns whose nominative is in εις. E. g. γόνεις Matt. 10: 21. Luc. 2: 27. γαρματεις Matt. 23: 54, etc. So also among the Attics; see Matthiae § 82. 5. Fischer Proclus. p. 663. although the ancient grammarians reject this form; see Buttman § 47. 1.

(c) In respect to the uncontracted forms, οστεα, οστεων, etc. see above § 5. 2.

(d) In one instance occurs the contraction of the neuter ἡμιση used substantively, Luke 19: 8; concerning which the same may be said as was above remarked in respect to ἡμισως. The common form is ἡμισσαι, without contraction. Comp. Flsch. Proclus. p. 667. Buttman § 48 note 5. p. 96.

Note. From κλεις, the common form κλείδα occurs Rev. 20: 1; and also the unusual one κλεῖς Rev. 3: 7, although many manuscripts read here κλείδα. In the plural, we find τὰς κλεῖς Matt. 16: 19. Rev. 1: 18. It is usually κλείδας without contraction; see Buttman § 50, article κλεῖς.
§ 8. **Nouns; inflection of foreign and indeclinable words.**

1. For some oriental names, imitating the Greek, the Septuagint and New Testament writers have introduced a simple method of inflection; in which the genitive, dative, and vocative have one form, and the accusative a final.


2. Many Hebrew proper names, which might be inflected after the third declension, are treated in the Septuagint and the New Testament as indeclinable.


In Rev. 1:4, a whole phrase is treated as indeclinable; e.g. ἄνευ ὁ οὐ, ἔσται ὁ θανάτος. See other examples of omission as to declension in the Apocalypse, below in § 27 note 2.

* So viewς, view, view, come from viewς, which, however, is obsolete; see Lebekk ad Phryg. p. 68 ff.

† So in the fathers; see Suicer Thesaurus II. p. 607. Ephiphanius declines the plural τα πασχα, Haer. 11. p. 19.
§ 9. Verbs; unusual inflections, etc.

1. In respect to the inflections of the tenses.

(a) The praeter and aorists sometimes receive the temporal augment instead of the syllabic.


(b) The perfect has sometimes a reduplicate form.


(c) The Attic form εἰληκα is used instead of λεισνα.


(a) Tenses, formed in other respects after the analogy of the second aorist, assume, in the Septuagint, the ending of the first aorist.

E. g. εἰδαμεν 1 Sam. 10: 14 (Acts 4: 20 in Cod. Alex.) εἰδαν (see Sturtz Dial. Alex. p. 61.) εἰρμαν 2 Sam. 10: 14. εἰρμαν 2 Sam. 17: 29. εἰρμασεν 19: 42. etc. In the New Testament, compare εἰδομας Μαθ. 9: 12. In other passages this form is omitted by transcribers; but it ought, according to good manuscripts*, to be restored in the following places, viz. Matt. 25: 36 κανακε. Luke 7: 24 εκηθησε. 11: 52 κακηθησε. Acts 7: 10 and 12: 12 εκελαρο. 7: 21 ακελαρο. 22: 7 επεκα (Eurip. Troad. 293); compare Matthiae § 188 note 7. Of the same character are πεκας, φαισας, Luke 17: 8 (compare Wetstein's New Test. I. p. 773 ff.) which forms Matthiae, Buttmann, and Lobeck do not exhibit; see below in no. 2. 5.

(e) The pluperfect often omits the augment.


* See Hugi's Einleit. I. p. 257 ff. on the manuscripts which have this form.
§ 9. VERBS; UNUSUAL INFLECTIONS, ETC.

(§) The future of verbs in εἰσιν is often contracted.

James 4: 8. Heb. 9: 14. 10: 37. This is common among the Attics;

(γ) The imperative εἰσίν is used instead of εἶνε. 


(a) The verb αναγεννέω sometimes has a double augment.

E. g. ηνεγκημένω Rev. 10: 8, otherwise αναγεννέων Rev. 19: 11.

2. In respect to the inflection of the persons.

(a) The second person singular of the present and future, both passive and middle, has ει instead of η.

John 11: 40. In the two verbs ὠπομαι and σουλομαι, this form is
C. Arrian. dia. Epictr. I. 29. II. 5. In respect to other verbs it occurs but seldom; and almost exclusively in the poets. Compare
Georgi p. 34. Matthiae § 197. 1.

(b) In the same person occurs the original uncontracted form.

[Here also more properly belong the forms πιέσαι, φαγεσαι, Luke 17: 8, from the common futures πιέσαι, φαγομαι. So Wetstein in loc.]
(c) The perfect 3 pers. plur. sometimes has αὐτ instead of αὐτ, imitating the 1 aorist.


(d) The 1 aorist optative has the original ἀσικ: ending αὐτ, αὔτε, αὐτ, instead of the usual ending αὐτ, αὔτ, αὐτ.


3. In the contract verbs are found the following uncommon forms.

(a) In the imperfect 3 person plural occurs the termination οὐσιν for οὐ.

E. g. ἐθολιωσαν contr. for ἐθολιωσιν Rom. 3: 13. This form occurs as 3 pers. plur. both of the imperf. and 2 aor. in the Septaigint, and in the Byzantine historians; e. g. οὐλδοσαι Ps. 79: 1. κατηλιωσαι Ex. 16: 24. ἐκυνώσεν 18: 23. So Niceph. Greg. VI. 5. p. 113 ἐκ-

(b) The future sometimes follows the analogy of verbs in λ, μ, ν, ρ.


(c) The first aorist εγγησα occurs.

E. g. Mark 6: 17; comp. 2 Macc. 14: 25. The ancient Greeks ab*

*In manuscripts, we find also ἔσαρχαι Luke 9: 36. μεγάλη Rom. 10: 7 (Cod. Vat.) 2 Cor. 5: 17 (Cod. Beor.) etc.
§ 10. UNUSUAL INFLECTIONS OF VERBS IN \( \mu \), ETC.

(\( \text{δώνω, wrote δώνω, as in Luke 14: 20. 1 Cor. 7: 33. See Georgi p. 20. Matthiae} \) \( \text{§ 237. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 742.} \)

(\( d \)) In the New Testament are found the forms \( \text{δι-γαρ} \) and \( \text{δι-φα} \), instead of the usual \( \text{δι-ψην} \) and \( \text{δι-ψη} \).

E. g. Rom. 12: 20. John 7: 37. These forms occur only in the later Greek writers (Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 61); while the infinitives \( \text{δι-ψην}, \) \( \text{δι-ψη} \), and the indicatives \( \text{δι-ψης}, \) \( \text{δι-ψη} \), etc. are common in the Attic written language. See Buttmann p. 263.

§ 10: VERBS; UNUSUAL INFLATIONS OF VERBS IN \( \mu \), AND OF IRREGULAR VERBS.

1. Unusual forms of verbs in \( \mu \) are the following, viz.

(a) Pluperf. act. \( \text{εστηκός} \) for \( \text{εστηκείν} \) Rev. 7: 11; comp. however Thucyd. I. 15.

(b) Present third pers. plur. E. g. \( \text{τιθέως} \) for \( \text{τιθέως} \), Matt. 5: 15. 23: 4. Mark 15: 17. This form is Attic; comp. Thucyd. II. 34. Aristoph. Vesp. 562. Plat. Repub. I. p. 579 E. See also Georgi p. 146 ff. who adduces many examples; and Matthiae \( \text{§ 205.} \)


(d) Inf. perf. active. E. g. \( \text{εστανε} \) 1 Cor. 10: 12; comp. Thucyd. III. 15. Demoeth. in Mid. p. 388 C. Soph. Antiq. 651. See Georgi p. 182 seq. Matthiae \( \text{§ 205.} \)


(f) Pluperf. active. E. g. \( \text{δέδωκες} \) for \( \text{καταστημένω} \) Mark 14: 44. \( \text{πα-} \) \( \text{φηδωκε} \) Mark 15: 10; see above \( \text{§ 9.} \) 1. e.

(g) From \( \text{βίω}, \) \( \text{βίω} \), we have in the compounds the imperative \( \text{κατα-} \) \( \text{καθίστη} \) Rev. 4: 1. \( \text{καταίσ} \) Mark 15: 20. So Eurip. Phoen. 203.
§ 10. **Unusual Inflections of Verbs in ειμι, Etc.**


Note: The form δωση, otherwise δωσει, John 17: 2. Rev. 8: 3. which Theocritus uses (XXVI. 2), and which according to some is Doric for δωσ, Fischer holds with probability to be an error of transcribers (ad Weller. p. 174 ff), as does also Matthiae § 203. 5. Comp. Ast ad Theophr. Char. p. 130 seq.

2. Unusual forms from ειμι are the following, viz.


(b) For ετω imper. we have ησω 1 Cor. 16: 22. James 5: 12. So p. 104: 31. So once in Plat. Repub. II. p. 215. See Matthiae § 211. 2. According to Heraclides, this inflection is Doric; Euath. p. 1411. 22.


3. Unusual forms from the root ιημι are the following, viz.


(b) The form ηπει Mark 1: 34. 11: 16, from απεικη with an augment attached to the preposition. So Phil. Leg. ad Calp. p. 1023. See Fischer ad Weller. II. 480. Buttman p. 165.

4. The verb πασημαι makes in the imperative πασευ.
§ 11. Verbs; of the defective verbs.

From a number of verbs, there occur tenses and moods in the New Testament, which are found in none of the Greek writers, at least in none but the later ones; and which are noted as being spurious, by the old grammarians.* These are exhibited below.


* See Planck De indole orat. Graec. N. Test. p. 34 seq.

Eπιθείσω, fut. επιθέσεως instead of επιθυμομαι 1 Cor. 11: 22.


Καταλείπω, aor. 1 καταλείπει Acts 6: 2, which according to Lobeck is very rare; ad Phryn. p. 714.

Κερδανω, fut. κερδησω instead of κερδανου 1 Cor. 9: 19. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 740.


Πανον, fut. πανομοίω instead of πανομοσμαι 1 Cor. 13: 8. See Moer. p. 293.


On the well known inscription at Rosetta, εσταν occurs at the end of the eighteenth line. In short, it is perhaps more proper to regard this form as Alexandrine for the aor. 2. See above § 9.1: d.
§ 11. VERBS DEFECTIVE.


PART III.

SYNTAX.

SYNTAX OF THE ARTICLE.

§ 12. Of the definite article.

1. The Greek article ὁ, η, το, stands before a noun, when a definite object is designated, or is distinguished from all other similar objects. This usage may be classed under two heads.

   (a) The noun itself, to which the article is prefixed, designates a particular definite object. Here the article appears properly to be superfluous.

   Examples of this use of the article are the following, viz.
   (1) Proper names of persons, countries, towns, etc. e. g. ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἡ Μακεδονία, ἡ Θρᾴκη.
   (2) Nouns which designate single unanimated objects; e. g. ἦ γῆ, ἦ αἰγές, το ἄγαθον virtue.
   (3) Nouns connected with demonstrative pronouns; e. g. οὕτως ὁ ἀνθρώπος, εἰκίνη ἤ ἡμέρα.

   Note 1. Before proper names, the article is often omitted by the best Greek writers; but not before nouns of the second and third species above mentioned; compare Matthiae § 267. The German lan-

§ 12. OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE.

óγησε omits the article in the first and third cases. [The English also; and in many cases belonging to the second; e. g. we say truth, virtue, etc. S.]

Note 2. The following examples will serve to exhibit the more definite limitations respecting the use of the article before proper names, in the New Testament.

(a) The article is often omitted before proper names, because, as names of individuals, they are in their nature altogether definite; and so do not need the article. E. g. Acts 8: 1 Σαυλος, comp. 9: 8 ὁ Σαυλος. 8: 5 Φιλιππος, comp. 8: 35 ὁ Φιλιππος. Particularly is the article omitted in the nominative; e. g. Acts 8: 20, 29, 34, 39, 40. al. or when an appellation of honour, of office, etc. precedes or follows, e. g. Acts 18: 8, 17. 21: 8 Φιλιππου τον ευγγελιστον. Matt. 4: 21. John 20: 1. Acts 13: 1. 19: 24. compare Matthiae § 273; or when ονοματε precedes, e. g. Acts 9: 11, 12; or when a proper name is in the gen. and connected with another noun, e. g. Matt. 23: 2 ἐπί τῆς Μωσής καθεδρας. Acts 19: 3 εἰς τὸ ἱωάννου βαπτιστήμα; or finally when the proper name designates a tribe or family, e. g. Acts 13: 21 ἦ γυλη Ἰουνίας.


In inscriptions to letters, the article is omitted; e. g. 1 Mac. 15: 2 βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Σιμωνί τετείη μεγάλος, etc. 1 Mac. 15: 16 Αὐτόν ὑπατος Ῥωμαιων Πολεμαρι βασιλει, χαμεν. But compare Acts 23: 26, [where it is omitted before the proper name, but inserted before the name of office.]


(c) Before names of towns and places, the article is more frequently omitted. In Matthew it is used but once, viz. 4: 15 καταλαίπων την Ναζαρη. In Mark, not at all; see 3: 8 where ἀπο ἱεροσολύμων is used between two names of countries that have the article. In Luke only thrice; e. g. 4: 16 εἰς την Ναζαρη. 19: 1 την Ἰεριχω. 21: 20
§ 12. OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE.

τὸν Ἰορνυσαλήμ, 4: 23 is a doubtful reading. In John four times; e.g., 4: 46 εἰς τὴν Κανα. 10: 22 εἰς τοὺς ἱεροσολυμοὺς. 11: 18 η Ἰερουσα-λήμ—τῶν ἱεροσολυμῶν. In Acts, not at all before the name Jerusalem, although before the names of other towns it is both inserted and omitted. In Paul’s epistles it is inserted only once, e.g., 2 Cor. 2: 12; but omitted Rom. 9: 29. 15: 19. 1 Cor. 1: 2. 16: 8. 2 Cor. 1: 1, 23. Gal. 1: 17, 18. Phil. 1: 1. 4: 16. Col. 1: 1. al.

Note 3. In regard to nouns accompanied by the demonstrative pronouns, which of course, take the article (no. 3 supra) Gerhardi has shown, the following facts (p. 434), viz.

(a) That οὗτος, with few, and some of these doubtful exceptions, in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul, stands before the noun.

(b) That τοῦτος, on the contrary, is placed after the noun with which it is connected. Rarely is it placed before the noun, except in cases where prepositions occur. (p. 431.)

(c) That the article is regularly omitted in such phrases as οὗτος πάντες, ταῦτα πάντα, Rom. 8: 37. Luke 7: 18. Mark 10: 20, etc. See Gerhardi p. 447.

(b) The noun to which the article is prefixed is rendered definite by the article. Here the article is essential, and is never omitted by correct writers.

This case is by far the most common, and may be distributed under the following heads.

(i) The article is applied, when of numerous objects of the same kind which the noun designates, only one is intended to be pointed out as well known.

E.g., John 6: 10 ὁν δὲ χορὸς πολὺς εἰς τῷ τοπῷ, and Matt. 2: 11 εἴδοντες εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, where, in the preceding context, the discourse had respect to a particular τοπῷ and οἰκία. So 1 Cor. 5: 9 εγραψα ὑμῖν εἰς τὴν επιστολήν. 2 Cor. 7: 11 καὶ ἐπιστέπαστε ἑαυτοὺς ὁμοίως εἰς τὴν πραγματικήν. John 21: 20 ὅς καὶ ἐκπέμπεσεν εἰς τῷ δησipo, ἀκος εἰς τὸν υφὲς τῆς ὄνομα ὅνως. 1 Cor. 10: 1 οτ περὶ τῶν ὑπὲς τὴν νυφὲς ὑπὸ τοῦ νεανίσκου ὡς διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρου ἀντίκρητος. John 20: 1 βλέπετε εἰς ὅνα ἑτοῖμον. In all these passages a knowledge of the particular objects designated, although they are not named in the preceding context, might well be presupposed, in respect to hearers or readers; as τὴν επιστολήν which ye received from me; τὴν πραγματικήν which ye well recollect; at τῷ δησιπο, of the Saviour with his disciples, viz., the last
§ 12. OF THE ARTICLES.

passo catching etc. Hence such phrases as ὃς προφητεύει, ὃς ἀρχιμενος, respecting the generally expected Messiah. So the article is placed before a noun, where it is immediately repeated; e.g. Luke 9: 13, ομι εἴσων ἵμνον ήπινεν ἡ πνεύμα αρτοὺς καὶ ἔρευνς δύο, and then 9: 16, λαβὼν τοὺς πνεύμα αρτοὺς καὶ τοὺς δύο εὐθὺν.

(2) The article is employed when the noun stands as a collective designation, and points out a distinct totality or whole genus.


Note 1. From this rule there are exceptions, even where the genuineness of the reading is without any grounds of suspicion; e.g. Heb. 6: 16 μετάθεσις ἀπεκδόσεως ἀνθρώπου. [as in German and English, men swear etc.] where that is immediately affirmed only of a part, which, agreeably to the views of the writer, applies to the whole. Rom. 11: 13 ἀποστολος εἰσιν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑτελεῖον.

Note 2. In respect to πᾶς, the following circumstances are to be noted, viz.

(a) Connected with a noun singular, and used in the sense of all, totality, πᾶς requires the article; e.g. πᾶσα ἡ πόλις Matt. 21: 10. 6: 29. Mark 4: 1. Luke 2: 1 etc. see Gersdorf p. 380 ff. On the contrary, when πᾶς means every one, any one, the article is omitted, as also among the Greeks; e.g. πᾶν δεινόν, πᾶς αὐθροιος, πᾶσα πόλις, Matt. 3: 10. 13: 47. Luke 3: 5. Acts 3: 23. etc. See Gersdorf p. 374 ff.


The few exceptions to this are generally suspected readings (see Gersdorf p. 386 ff.) for only Rom. 5: 12. 1 Tim. 2: 4. and Tit. 3: 2 πᾶντες αὐθροιοι, can be well established. The distinction which the Greek grammarians make between πᾶντες οἱ and πᾶντες simply (Matthiae § 264. 2), is confirmed by examples of the New Testament; e.g. Matt. 2: 4 πᾶντες τοὺς ἀρχιμενοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς, i.e. the members of Sanhedrin. 2: 16 πᾶντες τοὺς παῦδας, i.e. the children in Bethlehem. 13: 23 πᾶντες οἱ ὀχλοι, i.e. the multitude referred to in the preceding narrative, etc.

Note 3. Respecting the appropriate meaning of ἀλλος and αὐτος with the article, in the New Testament, nothing needs to be particularly remarked. Comp. Matthiae § 268. See Matt. 5: 39 τὴν αἰλίνην. 18: 19 ὁ ἡλείας. John 20: 2 ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής, an usage contrary to
which occurs Matt. 4:21. So John 20:25 of αλλος. 21:3, and elsewhere. As to υἱος, we have Matt. 5:46 το αυτο. Mark 14:39 τον αυτον λογον, etc. In the New Testament, of πολλος denotes either a collective totality, as Rom. 5:15 where it is exchanged for παρεξε 5:18; or it signifies many in a definite sense, e.g. 2-Cor. 2:17 οι τω πολλος θηται, viz. known to you. 1 Cor. 10:17 εν σωμα οι πολλοι εσπεν ως, i.e. the Christian church, the multitude of believers, are one body.

2. Adjectives joined with nouns which have the article, and placed as if in apposition with them, also take the article. Particularly do adjectives and participles take the article, when they are put for definite nouns.

E.g. 1 Thess. 3:5 ο περαξων. Rom. 1:19 ο γνωστον. 2:4 ο γνωστον, etc.

3. The article frequently stands where no noun is expressed, but only implied.

(a) With adverbs.


(b) Before prepositions followed by their appropriate cases.

E.g. Matt. 6:9 ο εν τοις ουρανοις. Phil. 4:22 οι εν της Χαιρετας, ομας. Heb. 2:17 τα ροσ των θων. By this kind of circumlocution, Paul in particular often expresses an adjective meaning; e.g. Rom. 4:14 οι εν νομων. Rom. 2:8 των δε εξ ερημων. John 21:2 ο απο Κανα. (§ 46.)

(c) The neuter article is used before prepositions with their cases, when they have an adverbial significance.


Note. In particular, the phrase οι περι deserves to be noticed. It denotes in the New Testament, the companions, dependents, etc. of any
The article is often used in this way, before nouns in the genitive.

(1) Before the genitive of proper names.

E. g. Matt. 4: 21 Ἰωσὴβον τοῦ τούτο Ζεβεδαίων. 1: 6 τῆς τοῦ Ουσίου, the wife of Uriah. John 21: 2 τοῦ τούτο Ζεβεδαίων. Acts 13: 22 τοῦ τοῦ Ἰωσίου. In all these cases παῖς, or νέος, or γυνή are to be supplied; the latter in John 19: 25; see Matt. 27: 56. Probably ἀδελφός. Luke 6: 16, comp. Jude 1. 1 Cor. 1: 11 τοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the word ἐκκλησία is implied after the article; as also in Acts 16: 33. Rom. 16: 10, 11.

(2) The neuter article occurs, both in the singular and plural, before the genitive of an appellative noun, in order to denote possession, property, etc.


4. The neuter article stands before all propositions, which are cited as proverbs, or maxims, or which on account of their importance require to be made distinctly prominent. (Matthiae § 279.)


5. When two or three definite nouns follow each other, of like number and gender, usually the first only has the article.
Note 1. If by the above remarks, the position is confirmed that, as a general rule, the Greek article stands exclusively before such words only as are altogether definite; then we may judge by this respecting the correctness of the rule, that the subject of a proposition must have the article prefixed, and may be known by this circumstance. In profane writers, it is true, the subject of a sentence usually has the article; but merely because it is usually of a definite nature. But, on the other hand, the predicate may have a definite article, when a definite object is expressed by it; e. g. Matt. 6: 26 τὸ ἄρρητον τοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτῶν ὁ ἀρχάγγελος. 1 John 3: 4 ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν νήμα αὐτοῦ. Matt. 6: 13 ἐν τῷ ἐμῶν ὑπαίτιον ἐστιν Ῥωμ. 1: 5 τοῦ τεσσάρων. 2 Cor. 3: 17 τὸ ἀληθινὸν. For or, the article may be omitted before either subject or predicate, when they are indefinite; e. g. Rom. 6: 21 τὸ ἔργον τῆς θανατοῦ. Rom. 8: 6 τὸ γὰρ φρονήμα τῆς σάρκος, θανάτου, τοῦ γὰρ φρονήμα τῶν πνευμάτων, σώματι καὶ εἰρήνῃ. Matt. 20: 16 πολλῷ γὰρ εἰσὶν κήποι, ὅλους δὲ ἐκλέγεται, comp. Matt. 22: 14. Of course, it follows that the above rule is useless, because it is destitute of any good support. Glass and Rambach in his Instit. Hermet. p. 446, have made the same remark.

Note 2. The insertion or omission of the article, in some cases, marks the individual character of an apostolical writer. Gersdorf has shewn (p. 38, 272 ff.) that the four evangelists always write οἱ Χριστοῦ; but Paul and Peter usually Χριστὸς, as this appellation had, in their time, become a proper name. But even here, Χριστὸς commonly has the article, if it is in construction with a preceding noun that has it; e. g. 2 Thess. 3: 5 εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ; and also in the common phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. See also 2 Cor 4: 4. Col. 4: 3. Rom. 7: 4. 1 Cor. 1: 17. The article is also used by Paul and Peter, when Χριστὸς is followed by a pronom which has reference to it; e. g. Eph. 1: 12, 13, also 1: 10, 11. [It is used, moreover, when οἱ Χριστοῦ, on account of a preceding mention of it, or an equivalent of it, means that Christ, the Christ mentioned, see Gerard. p. 277, 278 ff. 8.] Paul commonly uses Κυρίος to denote God, and οὐ Κυρίος Christ; but there are examples in him of different usage, e. g. Κυρίος for
Christ 1 Cor, 7: 22. 10: 21. 2 Cor. 3: 16; and so εν Κυριῳ frequently. So ὁ Κυριος is used for God, 1 Cor. 3: 5. 10: 26. See Gabler Neu. theolog. Journal, 4 B. p. 11—24.

[6. The neuter article is prefixed to the infinitive mood; so that this mood is used as an indeclinable noun in all cases except the vocative.]

(a) In the nominative case; e. g. Phil. 1: 21 το ζην Χριστους, και το άποθάνειν κερδος.

(b) In the genitive case; e. g. (1) Matt. 13: 3 εξηλθεν ο σπευρον του σπευρου. Heb. 11: 5 μετεπεθη, του μη ἰδεν τον Θανατου, the two in such cases answering to the Latin ut, and του μη to ne or ut non, with the subjunctive; see Rom. 1: 24.—(2) The genitive stands also with the same meaning as the simple infinitive; e. g. Acts 21: 12 παρακαλω, μεν—του μη αναβαινειν, the same as μη αναβαινειν. Comp. James 5: 17. Acts 3: 12. See below in § 38. 3 note 3.

(c) In the dative case; e. g. absolutely, as 1 Thess. 3: 3 το μηδενα σαινεσθαι that no one may disquiet himself, (§ 38. 5 note.) It is often construed in the dative with εν; see Wahl on the word εν.

(d) In the accusative case; e. g. absolutely, Rom. 14: 13 τον θεν κρεναι ηλλον, to μη κρεναι προσκομια. So with prepositions preceding, e. g. δια, or εις, or προς; see these prepositions in Wahl's lexicon. S.]

Note. Manuscripts vary much as to the article, in cases where the insertion or omission of it is a matter of indifference. Criticism here must have regard to the value and authority of the manuscript, rather than be guided by any observations respecting individualities of style, which are often and for the most part not to be depended on. E. g. in Matt. 4: 4, some manuscripts read ουν επι αφεν μουν ζησεται ο ανθρωπος; others read ανθρωπος. Both are right. The last means, as in German, that no man lives by bread only. [So in English; while the former reading would mean, mankind do not live by bread only; see above in no. 1. b. 2. S.] Comp. Mark 3: 28 βλασφημαι, better αι βλασφημαι. 6: 17 εν φυλακη, better εν τη φυλακη. 9: 38 ιωαννης, better than ο ιωαννης. 10: 2 Φαρισαιου. 10: 46 νιος. 11: 4 παιλον. 12: 33 θυσιων. 14: 33 λακωβον. 14: 60 εις μεσον.
§ 15. The article used as a pronoun.

1. It is well known, that among the poets, the article ὁ, ὧ, το, is, used throughout as a demonstrative pronoun, for οὗτος or ὁδε. Such is the case too among later Greek prose-writers. Of this, only one instance occurs in the New Testament.

   This occurs in a quotation from Aratus, Phaen. 5 τοῦ γαρ καὶ γενος ἑσμεν, Acts 17: 28. Compare Matthiae § 286.

2. The use of the article as a demonstrative pronoun, in order to denote distribution, is quite common in prose.

   E. g. ὁ μέν—ὁ δε, οἱ μέν—οἱ δε, Phil. 1: 16; see Matthiae § 288. For the latter, sometimes occurs ὁς μέν—ὁ δε, as Rom. 14: 2; comp. Polyb. p. 316. Aelian. V. Hist. XIII. 46. Sometimes it is ὁς μέν—ὁς δε, 1 Cor. 11: 21; so Aelian V. Hist. VI. 1 οὐς μέν ἀπεκτενοῦν, οὐς δε ἀπεκτενοῦν. Sometimes οἱ δε stands alone for οὓς δε, Matt. 2: 5. § 20. al.

3. Among the Greeks, particularly the Ionians and Attics, the article stands for the relative, (Matthiae § 291.) In the New Testament, some have thought they found the same usage; e. g. Acts 13: 9 Σωτῆρος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, see Schles. in verbo; but their conclusion is erroneous. Ὁ καὶ Παῦλος is equivalent to ὁ καὶ καλουμενὸς Παῦλος; see Schaeser ad Bos. Ellips. p. 213; so that the article retains here its usual signification.

   How Schlesser could reckon such instances as ὁ γὰρ τοῦ Luke 11: 10. το τοῦ δεν, etc. under this head, is difficult to see, and would seem sufficiently strange, if one did not find so much that is strange in his lexicon, even the latest edition.

   [But what is the real grammatical use of the article, in πατερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοις οὐφανοῖς, in οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ απὸ ἱεροσολύμον, in τὸ εἰκηθηρῶν το εἴ οὐφανοῦ, etc. if it be not equivalent to ὁς? S.]
§ 14. Of the indefinite article.

It is sufficiently known, that the Greeks have no indefinite article; and that when they wish to designate an individual in a manner undefined, they make use of €κ. This usage is fully adopted in the New Testament.

It has been remarked, as a peculiarity of the New Testament, that sometimes the article €κ, €γ, €ν, is used as being indefinite. Analogies for this have been found, as was believed, in profane Greek authors (Hodgson and Zane ad Vigter. p. 19, 20); as also in the Septuagint and Hebrew. That the Hebrew article €γ has in fact sometimes the meaning of the English indefinite article a or an, cannot well be denied (Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 665; Stuart § 163. 4); and in conformity with this usage, the Greek article might sometimes be so employed in the New Testament. But the examples from Greek authors of such a usage, are capable, if one is not misled by the first appearance of them, of another explanation. See Matthiae § 266, Bittmer § 110. 2. No examples, after all, from the New Testament, in which €κ, €γ, €ν is used indefinitely, can be placed beyond all ground of doubt; and most of them are very uncertain.

E. g. Matt. 12: 2 εἰτε αὐτον εἰς το πλοῖον ἐμβάντα παρθένοις, i. e. the boat which he had with him; compare Mark 3: 9. 4. i Mark 3: 24 ιεπολείων εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, i. e. the house where he was accustomed to reside. Matt. 12: 29 εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ σαμώλον τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ, i. e. any strong man, a collective designation, or general idea; see above § 12. 1. 6. 2.—John 7: 24 τὴν δικαιαν προς την κράταν, i. e. the right judgment in opposition to the wrong; as in one case only one judgment can be given. John 18: 18 καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής, i. e. the other disciple distinguished by Jesus. Mark 3: 13 καὶ πέτασε εἰς το ορος, i. e. the hill near Capernaum; compare John 6: 3 and Luke 9: 26. John 10: 11 διδοὺς πόνοις, i. e. the good shepherd, a definite idea. (Xen. Oecon. XV. 7.) So Luke 8: 5 ὁ στρεφόν; and in a similar way, in all fables, allegories, apocrypha, etc. Luke 5: 21 διὶ γιατί μακάρις οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν, i. e. εἰς την
καθομνων, i.e. man collectively, any man with whom he had to do. Acts 11: 15 είδε τον αγγελον, viz. the angel of whom Luke had spoken in 10: 3, 22. Acts 17: 1 ουτως η η των λαοις ουδενων, i.e. the sanctuary of the country, as the towns which lay around had only oratories. Gal. 3: 20 ο μεσος του δεσμου, a generic appellation, mediocris. Heb. 11: 26 ο αδειαντος the destroyer, i.e. the angel of destruction mentioned by Moses in Exodus; compare 1 Cor. 10: 10; Rev. 12: 14 του αυτου του μεγαλου, a generic term. 1 Thess. 4: 6 εις το πραγματε ι. e. as we say in business, a generic term. 1 Cor. 16: 8 εις περας του εκποματος, i.e. to me as the after-born, viz. among the apostles; see Schultess on the passage, in Theol. Anz. vol. also p. 168. Matt. 12: 35 ε αγαθος ανθρωπος — εναλλες τα αγαθα, και σωτηριον άνθρωπος — ομοιως; both modes of expression are correct; the good man produces τα αγαθα (generic); the evil man — bad things (unlimited).

There remains then not a single passage, in which a reason cannot be given why the definite article is used. The name is the case, with the examples taken from the Septuagint, as De Wette has shown, at least in respect to some of them. (A. L. Zeit. se. 40. p. 315.)

Note 1. When Haab (p. 81 note 2) attributes to εκεινος the meaning of the indefinite article, he is evidently mistaken; as De Wette has shown in A. L. Zeit. p. 316. In Acts 10: 10 εκεινος παρασκευαζονται relates to people of the house, well known to the apostle and the narrator. Mark 13: 24 εν εκεινοις τοις ημεραις conveys the idea of a definite future time. Luke 18: 43 ο δοεος εκεινος is the servant spoken of v. 42; only, as De Wette justly remarks, the predicates ζωον and φρονησις are applied to him in v. 42, merely in reference to the first supposed case of deceiver.

[Note 2. That much remains yet to be done, in order to give a full and satisfactory account of the Greek article, will be evident to any one who will take the pains to investigate for himself, in any national Greek author, or in the New Testament. Middleton has devoted a large book to this purpose; which, in some important respects, fails to give satisfaction to the critical investigator. Proceeding upon principles established by a priori considerations, he has often overlooked the difficulties that lie in his way from the actual survey of the use of the article in the New Testament, and often cut the knot, without satisfying it. Wahl has a very valuable dissertation on the use of the article, in his lexicon, under the word ο, νη; το. Winzer has many good things, in
the preceding account of the article; but neither these, nor any other
writers with which I am acquainted, have given a complete view of it,
as used in the New Testament. Not a few principles are laid down,
in the very best writers on this subject, as applying without limitation,
which one finds to be only partially true.

E. g. Wahl says, that "nouns in apposition with proper names take
the article," meaning such nouns as indicate office, station, employ-
ment, descent, etc. and to this principle he states no objection. He
may say other writers; and such is more commonly the case. But as the
opposite of such a rule, see Acts 6: 5 Νεκρολαον, προσηλυτον. Acts
13: 1 Μακεδον—συντροφος; 13: 21 τον Σαουλ, νιον Κίς, ανδρα δι' ου-
λην Βεναδίμπα, which also contradicts the principle, that when the
proper name has an adjunct noun in apposition it necessarily omits
the article: Acts 19: 5 Καρπαθαύς—οι ομογενείς, etc. It is very evident,
that there is yet wanting a simple, well-arranged account of the actual
use of the article through the whole New Testament, with proper
reference to the various readings and manuscripts; and that, instead of
reasoning a priori, or laying down a universal rule from a few instan-
ces, general rules and conclusions, should be drawn only from induc-
tion, made with reference to all the particulars.

Wahl supposes that there are cases where the article is used
and omitted in the New Testament, contrary to the usual custom of
the Greeks. Why may not this well be the case, when it is certain
that the use of the Hebrew article does not by any means correspond
with that of the Greek; and when the New Testament writers com-
monly use the popular colloquial Greek, which cannot reasonably be
supposed to observe all the grammatical niceties of Plato and Xen-
ophon. However this may be, the whole subject needs yet a different
kind of investigation from what it has received; and this is a desidera-
tatum in the department of the critical study of the Scriptures. S.
§ 15. Use of the Pronouns.

1. Pronouns both personal and relative frequently occur, the gender of which is different from that of the noun to which they relate. In such cases the idea conveyed by the noun is regarded, rather than its grammatical gender. This is called *constructio ad sensum*.


2. In a similar way, pronouns which relate to a noun singular are put in the plural, when that noun has a collective sense, or the abstract is put for the concrete.


On the contrary, some have supposed a pronoun singular to relate to a noun plural, in Phil. 3: 20, *ἐν οὐρανοῖς, εἰς οὐν*. But εἰς οὖν, by usage, became a kind of adverb, meaning *wide*. Matthiae § 434. 2. b. Gesen. p. 715. Stuart § 181. 2. a.

3. Pronouns sometimes relate to nouns not expressed in the preceding context, but implied in it, or in some verb or noun.


According to some interpreters, e.g. Kuinoel, pronouns sometimes relate to a noun which is expressed in the succeeding context. E.g. Matt. 17: 18, *ἐπιθυμήσει αὐτῷ* οἰς *τῷ δικαίωμα*. Acts 12: 21, *εἴη τῷ-
§ 16. Use of the personal pronouns.

1. The personal pronoun after verbs is often omitted; particularly when it immediately preceded, or must be again repeated, in the same sentence. In such cases, the pronoun must be supplied from the connexion.


Not the omission of the pronoun is most frequent, in cases where it would occur the second time, in the same predicament. E.g. Matt. 27:14. Acts 17:27. 1 Tim. 1:12. John 20:22.

2. The proper name of the person himself, or of his official rank, is sometimes inserted instead of a pronoun which would usually be employed. This is done to give intensity to the expression
to
3. Sentences sometimes exhibit a change in discourse, from one person to another.


4. The pronoun autós is used in various constructions, viz.

(a) Sometimes in a reflexive sense, for εαυτον, αὐτον. E.g. John 4:47 ἵνα εαυτον αὐτουλο θεμελ. Matt. 21:45 ὥσπερ αὐτον λέγει. This is a mode of speech which may be deduced from the Hebrew (as Luther's German put, "ihn, ihn, for sich," but which may also be deduced from pure Greek writers. See Arist. Ethic. 1.2. 16. Eth. Inst. III. 2. Theocyd. VII. 5. Comp. Georg. p. 162. Matthiae § 467. Most passages, however, which are referred to this head, such as Eph. 1:9, Acts 15:26, Rom. 14:14, Luke 14:26, have also εαυτον, αὐτον, etc. in some of the manuscripts.

(b) It is used pleonastically, when between a noun and its verb there is inserted a clause or several words. E.g. John 15:2 παν ἀνήρ -εις -ας αὐτο: Mark 5:2 καὶ ἐγέρθοντες αὐτοῦ -αυτ. Rev. 6:4 το εὐθνητος -αυτ. This usage is very common in respect to the relative pronoun; e.g. Acts 15:17 επι εἰσι -εν εαυτοὺς. Mark 7:25 γυνή, ὅπερ το θυγατριον αυτη. Examples of the like kind, in abundance, are given by Matthiae (§ 467. 2) out of the national Greek writers. Comp. Schaeff. ad Bos Ellip. p. 23. Still the New Testament writers may have borrowed this idiom from their own vernacular language, [where it is more frequent. Gesen. p. 734, Stuart § 210.

(c) It occurs in the sense of sua sponente, suopite ingenio, John 18:27.

Note. ὁ αὐτός the same, has in the New Testament the nature of the poison after it, when it is employed in the meaning of the same with. E.g. 1 Cor. 11:5. comp. Matthiae § 366, 1.
§ 17. DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS.

5. The pronoun ἑαυτοῦ, which is properly of the third person, is often used in reference to the first or second person.

(a) For the first person plural. E. g. Rom. 8: 23 ἡμεῖς αὐτοῦ εν ἑαυτοῖς στεναχὸ μὲν. 1 Cor. 11: 31. 2 Cor. 1: 9. 10: 12. al.


(c) For the second person singular. E. g. John 18: 34 αὐτῶν σοι τοῦτο λέγεις. Rom. 13: 9 in a quotation from the Septuagint.

Note. This usage is also found among the Greeks. See Buttman § 69. 2. Matthiae § 148. Viger. p. 165 ff. Wahl Lex. In regard to its use in the sense of mutually, among each other, see Schleusner and Wahl on the word.

6. The pronoun ἡμεῖς frequently stands for εἴςω, particularly in the writings of Paul.

E. g. Rom. 3: 8. 2 Cor. 1: 10.

Note 1. Respecting a periphrasis for the possessive pronoun, by means of the prepositions κατὰ, πέρι, εἰς, etc. see below in § 46.


§ 17. Use of the demonstrative pronoun.

1. The pronoun οὗτος sometimes relates to a remote noun which is to be regarded as the principal subject, instead of the nearest one.

Comp. Gesen. p. 741. Stuart § 165. 2 note. Glass. p. 156:

E. g. Acts 4: 11 οὗτος (ἡσυχας Χριστοῦ ν. 10) εστὶν ὁ λαθος. Acts 7: 19. 1 John 5: 20 οὗτος εστὶν ὁ αληθινος θεος, viz. ὁ θεος εστιν, not ὁ Χριστος, as the older theologians supposed, from doctrinal views; for first, αληθινος θεος is a constant and exclusive epithet of the Fa-
ther; and secondly, a warning follows against the worship of idols, which are always placed in opposition to the true God. [But where, in the writings of John, is the Father called ζωος αιωνιως? The same who is here called the true God, is called eternal life, an epithet always applied by John to the Saviour. Add to this, as Χριστος is the nearest antecedent, there is the stronger grammatical reason for applying ουτος to Χριστος, as well as the fact that the usus loquendi is in favour of it. As the evidence then preponderates so plainly in favour of such an application, may it not be that the younger theologians, out of doctrinal views, have decided against such an application? S.] The place in Acts 8:26 αυτη εστιν ερημος, is doubtful. Some supply here Πατα, the nearest subject; others οδος. See Kuinoel in loc. Winer's bibl. Realwörterb. p.235. Wahl's Lex, art. Πατα. Novat. The same is the case with the relative pronoun, Heb. 9:2. 5: 7. 1 Cor. 1:8. Eph. 3: 5. al.

2. The demonstrative pronoun is often omitted before the relative pronoun.


3. Sometimes ουτος stands before a short sentence, where we should expect ος.


§ 18. Use of the relative pronoun.

1. According to a well known usage of the Greek tongue, the relative pronoun is regularly put in the same case with its antecedent. This is called attraction; and occurs frequently in the New Testament. See Hermann ad Viger. p.892 ff. Matthiae §473. Bultmann p. 543. See below in §50.
§ 19. Use of the interrogative pronoun τις.

1. The pronoun τις is sometimes put for the relative; as in German wer for welcher. So in Latin, qui and quis are often used in the same manner, [and in English, who is both relative and interrogative.]

§ 20. Hebraisms in respect to some pronouns.

1. Instead of ὁδες, μηδας, for which the Hebrews have no corresponding pronouns, we find sometimes in the New Testament, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom, ov πας.


Note. The idea of thing, something, is in some cases expressed by ἃμα, like the Hebrew ָּ. Thus Luke 1: 37 ουκ ἀδυνατησει παρα θεο παν ἄμα; which however is taken from the Septuagint, Gen. 18: 14.

2. The pronouns any one, every one, are sometimes expressed in the Hebrew manner, by ανθρωπος.

(a) E. g. Matt. 19: 6 ανθρωπος μη χωριζεται.
(b) E. g. 1 Cor. 4: 1 ουτως ομας λογιζεσθω ανθρωπος. 11: 28 δυκαμαζεται ανθρωπος σεαυτον. Compare Septuagint Prov. 24: 12, where Hebrew בֵּן.
§ 21. Nouns; singular and plural.

Note 1. This also but seldom happens; for among the passages cited by Schleusner as examples, several do not belong here. So Matt. 9:9 εἰςν αὐθρόπον καθήμενον is, as in all languages, he saw a man sitting. Luke 6:31 καθὼς δεῖτε ἵνα ποιῶν ὅμως οἱ αὐθρόποι, as we say, as ye would that men, etc. On John 8:25, see above p. 58 ult.

Note 2. In the sense α, we find also αὐριό. E. g. Prov. 6:27. Ecc. 6:3. Luke 9:38; although in most passages referred to this head αὐριό may be translated a man, and in the plural, people; but in the same sense as one might use the pronoun. See Luke 5:10. Acts 10:5. Before the relative, we may translate αὐριό by the demonstrative pronoun, in place of which ὁ ὁδὲ occurs in like cases in Hebrew. E. g. Rom. 4:8 and Ps. 32:2 μακαρίως αὐριό, ὥς οὐ μὴ λογίας παρίστη την ἐμφάνιαν. Compare Rom. 11:4 and 1 K. 19:18. James 1:12. Such examples, however, are found only in quotations from the Old Testament, with the exception of the one last cited, which is an imitation of the Hebrew phrase שַׁמְיָה יְרוּם. In respect to the connexion of αὐριό and αὐθρόποι with other nouns expressive of office, dignity, character, etc. e. g. αὐριό φωνεύω, see Schleusner and Wahl, on the words.

For the periphrasis of every by repeating a noun, e. g. ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα, see below in § 47. 5 note.

SYNTAX OF NOUNS.

§ 21. Nouns; peculiar use of the singular and plural.

1. A noun singular is frequently used in a collective or generic sense, respecting things or persons.


E. g. Gal. 5:10 ὁ ταραπασσόν, i. e. all who occasion unchristian maxims or opinions. James 5:6 εφονευσάτε τον δικαίον. 1 Pet. 4:18. 1 Cor. 6:5. A plural verb is often connected with such nouns in the singular; see below in § 40. 2.

2. When a writer wishes to express himself in a general way, the plural is not frequently used, where what is predicated belongs only to one subject.
E. g. Matt. 27: 44 τίς ἰδεῖται—εἰσελθὼν ἐν αὐτῷ, i. e. one of the thieves railed at him, comp. Luke 23: 39, unless we admit a discrepancy in the narrations. Comp. Matt. 9: 8. i. John 5: 9. (John 5: 34, 36.) Some reckon here 1 Cor. 15: 29 οἱ ἑπτάκοσινα ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, and by νεκρῶν understand Christ; which, to be sure, the text loquendi permits. On the other hand, Matt. 22: 20 τις ἐν Κήθους—οἱ ζητοῦντες, does not belong here (as Wyss in his Diæktol. p. 106 makes it), for the words are taken from Exodus 4: 19. Somewhat different, and rather from the neglect of particularity in the mode of expression, are such cases as Mark 1: 2 and Acts 13: 40 καὶ τῶν ἄγγελων τῶν προφητῶν, i. e. 'in one of the prophets of the Old Testament. Matt. 24: 28 ἐν τούτω (τούτῳ ὁ Χριστὸς) καὶ τῶν τεσσαράς i. e. in a τεσσαράς. See Gesen. p. 663. Stuart § 167. 3.

3. Some nouns which denote but one object, have usually the plural form, because that object consists of many parts.

E. g. Heb. 9: 3, 12 τα ἁγια τὴν θεότητα, which had three parts. 1: 2 οἱ πατέρες the world, the universe; comp. ναοὺς. Matt. 8: 11 ἀνατολάς καὶ δυτικὰs the east and west countries. Heb. 2: 23 οἱ οὐρανοὶ the heavens, since the Jews made several heavens, one above the other; see Wetstein on 2 Cor. 12: 2. So τὰ ἑδέσια Matt. 26: 64. Acts 2: 25. al. i. e. the whole right side of the body, not merely the right hand. Here belong also some appellations of feast; e. g. εὐχαρίστας, γενέσια, etc. as also some names of towns, as Αἰγινας, Παταγώς, Φιλιππος, etc.

The plural συμβάται for συμβατικά is perhaps a mere imitation of the Aramaean form סימב. Respecting the signification week, see Schleusner and Wahl on the word.

Note. 1. It is without any ground, that some find a pluralis excellensiae vel majestaticus in the New Testament, as do Glass. p. 59. Haeb p. 59 ff. E. g. in Heb. 9: 23 καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, spoken respecting the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. John 9: 3 ορᾶσθαι a most important work of God. Heb. 7: 5 εἰς ἐνεργείας the important promise. 2 Cor. 12: 1, ἡ ἀποκάλυψις an excited revelation. For, first, this usage is limited in Hebrew, which the above is said to imitate, to the idea of God, Lord, etc. Gesen. p. 663 ff. Stuart § 167. 2. At least, examples of a different kind are very doubtful, (Storr Observatt. p. 97 ff.) And secondly, the plural in all these passages agrees well with the supposition, that the writers mean to express themselves in a general way.

Note 2. In respect to Phil. 2: 6 το ἐναυσάς ὁ Θεός, compare Greek
usage, in Hom. l. I. 187. XV. 519 τον γυν. ουα θεον α. Αelian. V. H. VIII. 38. etc. and see Schleusner and Wahl art. οιον. It seems to me that οιον is used in this passage simply in an adverbial sense; as in the passages quoted by Elsner in his Observat. Sacr. II. 245. e. g. Odys. XI. 303 τιμην λεγογενην οιον θεοσι. Pausan. Carinath: οιον θεον θεβος, etc. When, moreover, from doctrinal views, some of the older interpreters, as Cocceius, would make a difference between οιον θεον ειναι and οιον θεον ειναι, the attempt seems to be hardly worth a refutation.

For the plural ημείς for εχει, see above in § 16. 6.

Note 3. To express generality, i. e. all, every, etc., the Hebrew sometimes use both the masculine and feminine forms of the same word together; see Gesen. p. 670. An example of this kind may be found in 1 Cor. 7: 15 ου διδαχομεν ο αδελφος η εις αδηλη εν τοις ημουτας, i. e. no Christian is in bondage, etc.

§ 22. Nouns; use of the nominative.

1. The nominative absolute is sometimes found, i.e., a nominative with which no verb is connected.


2. Very frequently among the Greeks and Hebrews, the nominative with the article is used instead of the vocative. Of this usage there are many examples in the New Testament.

§ 23. Nouns; use of the genitive.

στοιχεῖον. Some make the nominative to stand here for the accusative.

Note. A seeming example of the nominative for the accusative is found in Rom. 1:22 χειριστέος εἰς[ε]νομοί. See on this Graecism, Matthiae § 368, and comp. below in § 38. 4 note 2.

3. Altogether Hebraistic is the periphrasis of the nominative by εἰς with an accusative, connected with the verbs εἰσαί and γραφεῖν.


For the use of the nominative case in participles that are employed as adjective nouns, as in Acts 15: 22; 23 ἀποτολούς — γραμματεῖς, etc. see below in § 51. 3 note 1.

§ 23. Nouns; use of the genitive.

1. The genitive, after nouns which indicate feeling, speech, or action in respect to anything, is sometimes to be understood as indicating the relation which that feeling, speech, or action has toward that thing.


Note 1. That the genitive is often employed to denote the place where, is so well known as to need no examples from the New Testament to establish it; see Matthiae § 379. The passage in Rev. 16: 7 ξυποκοπή τοῦ ὑποδημίου λέγων: does give particular mention; the meaning is, I heard from the altar one saying, etc. see Walke art. ὑποκοπήν.

Note 2. Instead of the genitive, the nominative is placed after ἁπάντας, as if it were in apposition; e. g. Rev. 7: 6. 14: 3.
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§ 23. Nouns; use of the genitive.

Note 3. I cannot confidently reckon Rom. 7:2 τον νομον του ανθρωπον as belonging to the kind of genitive in question; for this may also mean the law which proceeds from man. Whether we are to understand εὐαγγελιον του χριστου in the sense of the gospel preached by Christ, or the gospel concerning Christ, may be doubtful. I prefer the latter sense, however, because we have the full phrase in Rom. 1:1 2, 3 εὐαγγελιον θεου—περι του νου αυτου; of which the other phrase appears to be an abridgement. The phrase Rom. 2:16 εὐαγγελιον μου, i.e. the gospel preached by me, is peculiar to the apostle Paul.

2. In many other passages of Paul and John, the genitive is used in a way so brief and comprehensive, that it must be resolved into a whole sentence.

E.g. Col. 1:20 του αληθους του σωθου, i.e. the blood shed upon the cross. 1:23 ελπιδος του ευαγγελιου, i.e. the hope which the gospel inspires. Phil. 4:9 θεος της ειρηνης, i.e. God who gives peace. Eph. 4:18 της ζωης του θεου, i.e. the happiness which God bestows. John 5:29 αναστασις ζωης θεου, i.e. resurrection to life or condemnation. Comp. Phil. 1:22. John 7:35. Col. 1:14. Rev. 15:2. In Hebrew this is very frequent; see Gesen. p.676. Stuart § 171. But examples of the same kind may be found in classic Greek; see Matthiae § 313. Comp. also 2 Cor. 11:26 κυνδυνοι ποταμων, κυνδυνοι ληστων, perils by water, perils by (or on account of) robbers.


3. The genitive has several peculiar constructions with adjectives, viz.

(a) It gives limitation to their meaning, and is to be resolved by the preposition respecting, in regard to, etc.

E.g. James 2:5 τον πειρατου του κοσμου, i.e. πoor in respect to worldly goods; see Pott in loc. Philem. 1:9 δευτερου χριστου, i.e. is captive for the sake of Christ. Here belongs also 2 Pet. 3:9 ου βραδυς κυριος της επαγγελιας, inasmuch as βραδυς is equivalent to βραδυς εστι; see Wahl's Lex. art. βραδυς.

Note. Instead of the genitive, the dative in such cases is not un
§ 23. Nouns; Use of the Genitive.

frequently used; e. g. πετωχοι τω πνευματι Matt. 5: 3. or the preposition εν, e. g. δεσμος εν κυριε Eph. 4: 1. or peri, e. g. αδημοι peri την πιστην 2 Tim. 3: 8. Peculiar is Luke 24: 25 βραδες τη ναρδος του πνευματος ταδη απο credendum.

(b) A different case from this, is when the genitive is connected with a participle or verbal adjective, derived from a verb which governs the accusative. It is then to be resolved through the insertion of by, of, etc.


Note: Even in this case, a preposition is sometimes inserted, e. g. 1 Thess. 1: 4 γηραιμενοι υπο θεου.

(c) That adjectives significant of learning, partaking of, fulness, etc. should govern the genitive, is a common principle of the Greek language, which holds good also in the New Testament.


4. The connection of the genitive with verbs is very various. Passing by the common and well known classes, I notice, in particular, the following as construed with a genitive of the thing.


Sometimes, however, such verbs are construed with απο; e. g. Luke 15: 16 επεθυμε γεμισα την κοιλαιν αυτου απο των πειρατων.


(c) Verbs signifying dominion. Rom. 14: 9 κυριεύω; compare Did. Sic. p. 27. 1 Tim. 2: 12 εὐδοκεῖται. 1 Tim. 3: 4, 12 πρεσβύτητας, COMP. 1 Mac. 6: 10. Also Matt. 16: 18 αιτιογίειον. See Mattheias § 337.


(a) To these may be added καταγγέλω 2 Cor. 11: 8. 12: 13, 14; COMP. Mattheias § 376. ἀνέγκυσθαι Matt. 17: 17. 2 Tim. 4: 3. Heb. 13: 22; also 2 Cor. 11: 1 where της αφόσινής means, in respect to my folly.

(x) Verbs of buying and selling, which in common Greek govern the genitive, take in the New Testament not only the genitive after them, but also en with the genitive. E. g. Matt. 20: 2 συγκωπηθάναι—en δυνατόν. 25: 7 γυροὶς εἰς ματων (ἀργοίν). Acts 1: 18. COMP. 1


Note 2. Verbs of departing and removing, which among the Greeks often govern the genitive (Matthiae § 331), sometimes also take the genitive in the New Testament. E.g. Mark 2: 21 αφες το αηθεριον τον πανον του παλαιου. Luke 18: 4. In some other examples they are construed with apo; e.g. 1 Cor 7: 10.

5. It is a well known principle of the Greek language, that the genitive stands after transitive verbs, when the action which they denote does not affect the whole object, but only a part of it; the genitive being generally the case of partition.

E.g. μεταδιδονας τινι τινος, εσθιειν τινος, λαμβανειν χειρος, Matthiae §§ 356, 367.

In the New Testament there are many departenas from this usage, viz.

(a) Verbs of eating, taking, or giving of any thing. E.g. Luke 24: 42 επιδεωκαν αυτω apo μελισσου χηρου. Matt. 15: 27. Mark 7: 28 τα κυνορια εσθιει apo των φθυιων των παιδιων (comp. 2 Ν 73) Acts 5: 2 πως ἐπονησατο apo της τημης. John 21: 10 ενεμανατο apo των ωμων. — The passage in Heb. 13: 10 φαγειν εις υπο (θεος σιγατηρου) does not belong here, as the meaning is to was (live) by the altar (not victim), i. e. to eat the flesh-offerings. In common Greek, only ἀπολαβειν takes apo and ek after it; in such cases. Matthiae § 361.


(b) Verbs signifying to obtain and to acquire, take the accus. after


6. The construction of the verb ἐπιστρέφειν with the genitive is deserving of notice. (a) It signifies to be on one’s side or of his party, 1 Cor. 1: 12: 3: 4. (b) With abstract nouns, it denotes state or condition, e. g. Heb. 10: 39 εἰπον ὑποστάλης; so 12: 11. Comp. Bos Ellips. p. 33.

7. Not unfrequently, particularly in the writings of Paul, two or more genitives are connected, of which the one governs the others. In this case, the genitive next to the governing noun is commonly employed as an adjective. E. g. 2 Cor. 4: 4 τον φανερον του εὐαγγελιον της δοξης του Χριστου. Col. 2: 2 πλούτων της πληροφορίας της σωτηρίας. Eph. 1: 6 εις επαινον δοξης της χαριτος αυτου. Col. 1: 13. 2: 12. Eph. 1: 19. 4: 13.

Note 1. Peculiar, but not altogether unknown to the Greeks, is the construction 2 Pet. 2: 14 καρδιαν γεγυμνασμενην πλεονεξιας (so read in many good manuscripts instead of πλεονεξιας), animus servitut exserciatus. Comp. Philost. p. 688, 708. and see Pott in loc.

Note 2. The genitive, in Paul’s epistles, is often separated from the noun which governs it by intervening words. E. g. 1 Thess. 2: 13 λογος αυτος παρ’ ημων του θεου. Phil. 2: 10 ινα παν γην καρπη εκουσαναι και ειδοναι και παταχθοναι. Eph. 2: 3 οτι και φυλον αγγει ανθρωπου.

Note 3. Two genitives, having a different relation, are sometimes, though seldom, connected with one noun. E. g. Acts 5: 32 ημεσεμεν αυτου (Χριστου) μαρτυρει των θησαυρων τουτων.

Note 4. Nouns very rarely govern the same case as the verbs from which they are derived. An example is 2 Cor. 9: 12 δια πολλων ευχαριστιων τον θεον. Viger. p. 54.
§ 24. Nouns; use of the dative.

1. In respect to verbs, which among Greek writers are construed with the dative (Matthiae § 381—385), there is no peculiarity in the New Testament. It is necessary only to mark the following particulars.


(b) The phrase καλεῖν ποιεῖν, which is usually connected with the accusative (Matthiae § 409), is regularly in the New Testament connected with the dative; e.g. Luke 6: 27. Matt. 5: 44.


2. The dative is connected with verbs of a transitive or intransitive meaning, when the condition or action which the verb expresses, is for the advantage or honour of any person or thing, (dativus commodi); sometimes when it is for the disadvantage or dishonour of any person or thing, (dativus commodi).


3. The rule above is part of the general rule, that the dative is connected with verbs and adjectives, where the question arises, as to what? or, in what respect?


I might also put here Rom. 6: 20 ἐλευθεροτ. τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ free in respect to virtue, i. e. free from the service of virtue. In other places, free from any thing has apo or εκ. after ελευθεροιν. So also Gal. 4: 16 ανθυρετον ὑμην conducting uprightly(in my instructions) in respect to you.

4. After verbs signifying to send, to go, to come, the dative is sometimes put, instead of the preposition προς or εἰς.

E.g. Luke 2:44: εξορθόντα—τῇ η εις τὸν παρθένο. Rev. 2:16 ερμομα χαμ ταχύς, i.e. I will come upon thee suddenly; compare, Judges 11:18 ἐν τῇ λόγῳ ταύτῃ.

5. As among Greek writers, so in the New Testament, passive verbs are frequently construed with the dative, instead of the prepositions ὑπὸ, πάρε, etc.

E.g. Matt. 5:21 ἤκουσας, ὥσπερ ἔστη τοὺς ἀρχαίος. Acts 16:9 ὑπομακαρία—οἰκία ἡ τῆς Παύλου. 1 Tim. 3:16 εὐεργείας ἀγγέλων. Luke 24:36 εἰσεβλέπων αὐτοῖς, etc. In Heb. 12:5 ἡ τίς ἐστιν αὐτός διαλέγεται, is not (with Haab) to be translated, speaks concerning you, but speaks to you. In Acts 20:9 καταφέρομεν ὑπὸν βαθεῖς means also sopore oppressus, and belongs to a somewhat different construction. See Matthew § 403.

6. Instead of the dative, however, in most of the above cases a preposition is sometimes put to govern the noun, after the Hebrew manner of expression.

(a) For the dative of advantage or disadvantage; e.g. Luke 9:13 βυθίσαται εἰς λαον. 7:30 Φαρισαῖοι τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀδελφὸν εἰς εαυτοῦ i.e. to their disadvantage, against them; see Kunoed in loc.

Compare 1 Thess 1:5. 2 Cor. 4:3.


(c) After such adjectives as εὐδεῖον Luke 14:35. ἀφελείματος 1 Tim. 4:8. So after χρησιμός Wisd. 13:11.

(d) After verbs signifying to give over, construed with εἰς Matt. 10:17, compare 5:25. to announce, with εἰς Luke 24:47. 1 Thess. 2:9. to please, with εὐποιον Acts 6:5.

On the other hand, in 2 Cor. 8:1 εἰς τὰς εὐθυμίας; and in Acts 4:12 φολεσ—ἐκ διδακμον εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώποις, the preposition εἰς means among.

Notz. 1. As further examples of the above principle may be addu-
§ 25. Nouns; use of the accusative.

1. The accusative stands after transitive verbs, to designate the immediate and proper object of an action. In Greek, however, many verbs are construed as transitive, which in Latin or German [and also in English] are construed with other cases.
§ 25. NOUNS; USE-OF-THE ACCUSATIVE.

because the idea conveyed by the verb, is regarded as having a somewhat different relation to the object.

E. g. ἄδικεν, ὑβριζειν, ευρηκεῖσθαι, ἀγαθοποιεῖσθαι, ευποιεῖσθαι, καλοῖσθαι, ὀφεῖσθαι; see Matthiae § 409. So εὐλογεῖσθαι, βλασφημεῖσθαι, κακολογεῖσθαι, καταργεῖσθαι, πέσεσθαι; see Matthiae § 410. In all these verbs, the construction ποιεῖσθαι v. λεγεῖσθαι lies at the basis.

Note 1. Instead of the accusative, the preposition en with the dative is put after εὐλογεῖσθαι Acts 17: 2; comp. יְדוּעָה Neh. 9: 7. So after ὁμολογεῖσθαι Matt. 10: 32; compare יֶרְחָה Job 40: 14. See an instance of a contrary kind, John 9: 22.


Note 3. Of the verbs which signify an affection of mind, as to feel shame, compassion, etc. εἰλησθαί and επαισχυνεῖσθαι Rom. 1: 16, are connected with the accusative, as also in common Greek, Matthiae § 408. Αἰσχυνεῖσθαι has once the preposition en after it, Phil. 1: 20. Σπλαγχνιζεῖσθαι governs the genitive Matt. 18: 27, but sometimes it is followed by the preposition peri, Matt. 9: 36. or en, Mark 6: 34. Matt. 15: 32.

2. Verbs which govern two accusatives are the following, viz.

(a) Verbs which signify to put on or off; e. g. περιβάλλειν John, 19: 2. Luke 23: 11. εὐθυεῖν Mark 15: 20. εὐθεῖν Mark 15: 17, 20.


(c) Various verbs; e. g. διδασκεῖν John 14: 26, (but a different usage occurs according to some copies, e. g. διδασκεῖν ἐν τοῖς Rev. 2: 14, compare יְלִדוּ כִּיֵּדֶנָה Chron. 17: 9, and see Wahl’s lexicon sub voce.) ἐκρατεῖν 2 Cor. 3: 6. πειθεῖν Acts 28: 23. ἀδικεῖται Gal. 4: 12, (so ἀλεθεύ- πῃς σοι Phil. 18 should be so, see Griesbach on the passage.) ποι-
§ 25. NOUNS; USE OF THE ACCUSATIVE.


Note 2. When such verbs as govern two accusatives are put in the passive, they retain the accusative of the thing. E.g. Acts 21:3 ανασφανες την Κυριον; from the active construction ανασφανες την τινα τι. Comp. Matthiae § 421. Buttmann § 121. 7. Wahl's lexicon art. ανασφαν-νοι.

Note 3. In Hebrew, verbs of telling govern two accusatives. Corresponding with this, is Col. 1:9 ἵνα πληρωθητε την εἰπγοναι, the passive retaining the accusative.

3. An accusative of the thing is frequently connected with passives, viz.

(a) In the sense of in respect to, or in relation to; e.g. Eph. 6:14 πεπληρωμενοι την σοφιν εν υλησια, comp. Rev. 1:13. Eph. 6:18 ὑποδημασεν των ποδων. 1 Tim. 6:5 διεθαρακεν τον τοιχ. 2 Tim. 3:8 κατεθαρακεν τον νους. 4:3 κηθομεν την εκονιν. 1 Pet. 1:13 ανασφανες των σοφων. Mark 16:5 εισυνεπνον περικεφαλη- μενον στολιν λευκην. 2 Cor. 3:12 την αυτην εικονα μεταμορφομεθα απο δοξης εις δοξαν. Acts 18:25.—Acts 18:3 is peculiar, ησαυ σκηνο- ποιοι την τεχνην.

(b) Instead of the genitive or dative, which the active governs; e.g. Phil. 1:11 πεπληρωμενοι καρπον δικαιοσυνης (some copies read και- πων). Col. 1:9 ἵνα πληρωθητε την εἰπγοναι, comp. note 3 above. The common usage is πεπληρωμενοι πασης γνωσεως Rom. 15:14. or, πεπλη- ρωμαι τη παρακλησε. 2 Cor. 7:4. So also πεποιητεμαι τι, i.e. something was entrusted to me; e.g. Gal. 2:7 πεποιητεμαι τω ευαγγελιον των ακ- ροντης. Rom. 3:2 ειποτεμας τα λογια του Θεου. 1 Cor. 9:17 δικαιοσυνη πεποιητεμαι, etc. Compare Matthiae § 490. 420 α.
The subject of a sentence is sometimes put in the accusative, when a relative intimately connected with it immediately follows.


SYNTAX OF ADJECTIVES.

§ 26. Use of adjectives.

1. A neuter adjective in the singular, and sometimes (though not often) in the plural, supplies the place of a noun, when followed by a noun in the genitive; particularly where the language has no substantive corresponding to such adjective.


Note 1. On 1 Pet. 1:7 το δοκιμον της πιστεως, which some assign to the above place, see Hottinger Ep. Jac. et Pet. c. comm. p. 101. In James 1:3, the same phrase is to be rendered, the trial of your belief.

Note 2. The Greeks also used this mode of expression; but the examples by Georgi (Hierocrit. p. 39) must be carefully examined. Actual parallels are Demosth. Phil. I. p. 20. A το του θεου ευμενες. id. de fals. legat. p. 213. A το ασφαλες αυτης.
2. A noun not unfrequently supplies the place of an adjective. This happens in the following cases, viz.

(a) When the noun which is the principal word, i.e. which the other is to qualify, is put in the genitive.


Strictly considered, only those passages belong here in which the verb attaches by its sense to the second noun, and shews that this is designed to be the principal one. Such passages, therefore, cannot be reckoned to belong here, as Col. 2: 5 θλεπων το στερεωμα της εις Χριστον πιστεως υιων. Eph. 4: 17 μηκετι υιως πεπιστευτην εν μα τιστητι του νους ανεων. Also Heb. 9: 2 η προσθεσις των αρτων may be translated, the setting forth of the (shew) bread. The passages of similar construction from the Greek writers, adduced by Pfoc- chen (p. 29 ff.) are almost all of a different character.

(b) When the substantive to be taken as an adjective, stands in the genitive.


Note 1. When in such cases a pronoun is added, it stands after the noun in the genitive, and agrees with it in gender. Acts 5: 20 τω ση- ματα της ζωης ταυτης these words of life. Rev. 3: 10 λογος της υπο- μονης μου my precepts of patience. Comp. Rom. 7: 24. Judith 9: 10. This is Hebrew usage, see Gesen. p. 732 ff. Stuart § 185. 1.

Note 2. Only one case occurs in the New Testament where the neuter adjective, according to the Hebrew custom, is expressed by the feminine. Matt. 21: 42 and Mark 12: 11 παρα κυριου εγενετο αυτη (sc. τουτο) και εστε θαυμαση (θαυμαστον.) In the Septuagint this is frequent. 1 Sam. 4: 7. 11: 2. Ps. 27: 4.
§ 27. Adjectives: connexion of adjectives with nouns.

From the rule that adjectives agree with the nouns which they qualify in gender and number, there are, as is well known, many exceptions in the best Greek writers. In respect to the New Testament, the following circumstances may be noted, viz.

(a) Adjectives either masculine or feminine may be connected with nouns of the neuter gender, when these nouns designate any being which is masculine or feminine. In such a case, the construction is regulated by the sense, rather than by the forms of words.

E.g. Rev. 4: 8 τεσσερα ζωα—λεγοντες, compare verse 1. Eph. 2: 11 τα ισχυ σ εις σοι, αι λεγομενοι ακροβατια. Indirectly, 2 John 4 εχαρην ότι ευρηκα εκ των τεκνων σου περιπατουντας εν αληθεια.

(b) A plural adjective is often joined with collective nouns in the singular.


(c) An adjective sometimes qualifies a noun, which is put in the genitive after it.

E.g. 2 Cor. 4: 2 τα κρυπται της αισχυνης. Phil. 3: 8 το υπερεχουν της γνωσεως δι' αγαπης υπερεχουσα. 1 Pet. 1: 7 το δοκιμον της πιστεως. Compare 2 K. 19: 23. 1 Sam. 2: 28. 2 Macc. 3: 16.

Note 1. This method of expression has a near affinity with that which is noticed in § 26. 1, but still it is not the same. Attention to the connexion will, in most instances, soon determine to which of these two cases any particular instance belongs, and whether the author means, or does not mean, to represent the quality which the adjective expresses as the principal idea, as in § 26. 1. The above construction may be compared with § 26. 2, since τα κρυπτα, το υπερεχον, etc. have the grammatical value of a noun.
Note 2. In the book of Revelation, there are striking anomalies of
gender, or case, or of both, in respect to the connection of adjectives
with nouns. E. g. 2:20 την γυναίκα—ἡ λεγον. 3:12 της πολεως—ἡ
παναβαστάσθη. 7:9 οἶχος πολὺς—ἐσωσίας—περιβεβλημένους. 14:14
τῷ αγγέλῳ—ὁ εἶχεν την σαλαμίγγα. 14:12 ὑπομονή τῶν ἁγίων—οἱ της
ποιμνεῖς ἐς εὐτολα. Transcribers have endeavoured, in almost all
such passages, to amend the text.

§ 28. Adjectives; comparative degree.

1. Instead of the comparative degree, the positive
is sometimes used, followed by the particle of compar-
ison.

E. g. Matt. 18:8 καλὸν σου εἰσὶν εὑσέλθειν—γαλῶν η σ.τ.λ. Compare
εσίνως; compare Tob. 3:6. Sometimes this takes place in Greek writ-
ters. Matthiae § 457 note 1. Compare Soph. Ajax 981 εμοὶ πιθὺς τε-
θήκετο καὶ ποινος γλυκος.

Note 1. The cases where μᾶλλον is used do not seem to belong here;
e. g. Mark 9:42 καλόν εἰσι μᾶλλον (Matthiae § 458); because the gra-
dation is not here omitted, but expressed by the adverb. Also Matt.
26:26 καλὸν ην αὐτῷ, τι οὖν εὐεργηθῇ does not properly belong here;
for it may be rendered, οὗτος ἦν μᾶλλον ὑπερθέρμαν, etc.

Note 2. On the other hand, θελω followed by η makes a case alto-
gether analogous. E. g. 1 Cor. 14:19 πεντε λόγους λαλησαν θελω, η
μακραις λόγοις, etc. compare L. L. 117. So Luke 17:2 λογοστελε αὐτῷ
—η τι ἦν ὑπερθέρμαν, etc. Compare Tob. 6:12 οὐ καθηκε λα-
βεῖν, η πρῶτον ἀνθρωπον. The grammarians supply μᾶλλον in such
cases.

2. Sometimes the positive with παρὰ stands before the word which is the object of comparison.

E. g. Luke 13:2 εὐμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πισταὶ τοὺς Γαλιλαίους; the word
εὐμαρτωλος, however, has no comparative form. This is an imitation,
of the Hebrew comparison by the use of γε. See Ex. 18:11. Judith
13:18.

The particle παρὰ stands also after the comparative in Luka 3:13
3. The comparative sometimes stands for the other degrees of comparison, viz:

(a) For the positive. In the New Testament, this is the case with only περίπποντες, 2 Cor. 2:8. In Acts 17:21 ἄγνώστου, kai apotelōn παντοτέον, the comparative is altogether opposite to express that they were constantly desirous of hearing something more new, i.e. one novelty after another. Comp. Theophr. Char. VIII. 1. Eurip. Orest. 1321. In Acts 25:18 οίς αὐτὸν ἐπερευνωσεν μέμνεσιν, thou knowest better than I can tell thee.


Some passages, where παντοτέον is connected with the comparative, seem hardly to belong here; e. g. Matt. 13:22 ο μικρότερον εἴτε παντοτέον τῶν σπερμάτων. Mark 4:32 παντοτέον τῶν σπερμάτων μεγίστον. John 10:29 ο πατὴρ μου μεγίστον παντοτέον εἰστι. 1 Cor. 15:19 ελευθεροφορά παντοτέον ανθρώπων. In these passages the comparative has its proper signification, and the genitive παντοτέον seems to be the cause of a superlative meaning.

§ 29. Adjectives; superlative degree.

4. Where the thing compared, and that with which it is compared, are one and the same, the repetition of the noun which designates it is commonly omitted.


§ 29. Adjectives; superlative degree.

1. The positive is sometimes used in the place of the superlative, either with or without the article.

E. g. Matt. 22: 36 ποια εντολή μεγαλή εν τη νομι. Luke 10: 42 Μαριά την αγαθήν μερίδα εξελέβατο the best part. Matt. 5: 19 ουτος μεγας πληθωμεναι, where the antithesis is ελαχιστος. Similar examples may be found in the Greek writers; see Kuinoel on Matt. 5: 19. The usage, however is more prevalent among the Hebrews, Gesen. p. 691 ff. Stuart § 178.

Note 1. To the positive used as a superlative, a generic noun is added in Luke 1: 28, ευλογουμενη σοι εν γυναικίν. This is Hebrew; see Gesen. p. 691 ff. Stuart § 178. What Kuinoel here adduces from the Greek classics is not sufficiently analogous, as in Odys. I. 219 the superlative itself (апονματος) is connected with the genitive.

Note 2. The passage in 1 Cor. 6: 4 τους εξουθενημενους εν τη εκκλησια τουτους καθιστετε, appears to belong here; which must be translated as advice given by the apostle, viz. rather make the most despised among the Christians, judges, etc. Comp. v. 1 επι των αδικων χασουν επι των άγιων.

2. In respect to the Hebrew superlatives, such as קְרֵבָה בְּרֵי, קְרֵבָה בְּרֵי, only the following examples are found in the New Testament.

E. g. Heb. 9: 3 άγια άγιων the most holy. Rev. 19: 16 βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, κυριος κυριων, comp. 1 Tim. 6: 15; and also Lev. 23: 32 σαββατα σαββατων.
§ 30. **Numeral adjectives.**

6: 3. Other cases which have been adduced as instances of the superlative may be classed as follows, viz.: (a) Figurative expressions, such as occur in all languages. E. g. Heb. 4: 12 ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ εστὶν τομωτέρος ὑπὸ πάσην μαχαιρίν διατόμων. Matt. 17: 20 εἰνεκῆς πίστειν ὡς κόκκων σκαλπεῖσθαι, i. e. the least belief. Comp. Matt. 28: 3. Rev. 1: 14. 18: 5.

(b) Cases of mere intensity of expression. E. g. Matt. 2: 18 θυρινὸς καὶ πλάνθομος καὶ ὀδυρμός πόλις. Luke 1: 14 χαρὰ καὶ ἀγαλλίασις. Rom. 2: 8 θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή. 1 Thess. 2: 9 τὸν κοπόν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μυχὸν, etc.

(c) Cases which do not belong here. E. g. Luke 1: 15 μεγας ἐνώμοις κυρίῳ (ἡμῖν ἡμῖν). Col. 2: 19 αὐξήσεις τοῦ θεοῦ; not the greatest increase, but increase caused by God, or in respect to God. 2 Cor. 1: 12 εἰ ποιήσετε καὶ εἰληφθείσετε θεοῦ, not perfect uprightness and sincerity, but that which is pleasing to God. Even Acts 7: 20 αὐτοφος τής θεοῦ, spoken of Moses, expresses more proper intensity, than the superlative, i. e. formosus judice Deo, exceedingly fair.


The Syriac explanation of this idiom by יְהֹוָה יְהוָה pleasing to God, which is adopted by several of the fathers (Oecumen. ἀληθινὸς, Θεοφίλης), and by some late interpreters, is contrary to the analogy of the Greek tongue, as Fischer has shewn. The conjecture of Hammond and Junius, that αὐτοφος τής θεοῦ fair in appearance, is the true reading, is built on a want of knowledge of the Hebrew idiom.

Note 2. Altogether erroneous is the principle laid down by Haeb (p. 163) that even the word ἔριστος serves only to denote intensity, where it is combined with another word; e. g. 2 Cor. 11: 10. Rom. 9: 1 ἀληθεία ἔριστος v. eν ἔριστο, undoubted truth. A miserable interpretation!

§ 30. **Numeral adjectives.**

1. For the ordinal πρωτὸς, the cardinal εἰς is sometimes used.

E. g. Matt. 28: 1 εἰς μιᾶν τῶν σαββατῶν. Mark 16: 2 πρῶτοι τῆς μυ-
§ 30. NUMERAL ADJECTIVES.


Note. The cardinal word ἐπτα stands once for the numeral adverb ἑπτάχις, Matt. 18: 22, in the formula ἐβδομηκοντα ἐπτα σεβηντεις seven times, like the Septuagint Gen. 4: 24. So the Heb. יָבִ֣עַ שָׁוָ֥ה Ps. 119: 164, instead of יָבִ֣עַ שָוָ֥ה שָׁוָ֥ה שָׁוָ֥ה seven times; Gesen. p. 703. Stuart § 176. 10.

2. When the cardinal numbers are doubled, they denote distribution.

E. g. Mark 6: 7 δύο δύο ηκάστος αποστέλλειν two and two be sent forth. The Greeks say και δύο, which occurs in Luke 10: 1. The first mode of expression is Hebraistic; and accordingly, the Syriac translates such expressions as καὶ δύο by merely repeating the numeral, e. g. Mark 6: 40 καὶ καὶ ἵκατον ||κο||κο. See Gesen. p. 703. Stuart § 176. 9.

3. After the cardinal numbers in Hebrew, the name of measures or coins is often omitted; Gesen. p. 700. Stuart § 176. 6. In the New Testament there is but one example of this kind, viz. Acts 19: 19 συνεπήνων τας τιμας αυτων και εύρον αργυριον μυριάδας πέντε, where δραχμων must be supplied. See Kuinoel in locum.

§ 31. General remarks upon the use of verbs.

1. It is sometimes the case, that verbs are not to be understood in the full extent of their signification, but are to be taken with certain limitations.

Compare Glass Philol. sacr. ed. Dathe, 1. p. 188 ff.

(a) As denoting merely a desire, purpose, endeavour, to do what the verb usually expresses, i. e. as spoken de conatu.

E. g. Mark 14: 51 καὶ προσφέρετο αὐτὸν οἱ νεκροὶ, i. e. they attempted to lay hold of him, made as if they would lay hold on him. Matt. 5: 23 εν προσφέρετο θαυμάζειν, i. e. when thou art about to offer, etc. compare v. 24 ελθὼν προσφέρειν. 2 Cor. 13: 1 τριτον τούτο ερχόμενοι προς ἡμᾶς, i. e. this third time have I determined to come, etc. Gal. 1: 13 επορθοῦν αὐτὴν, i. e. I sought to destroy it. 5: 4 οἴρων δικαίωσθε, i. e. who seek to be justified, etc. So ἀρεσκέων to seek to please, 1 Thess. 2: 4. 1 Cor. 10: 33; compare Gal. 1: 10 where it is ζητῶν ἀρεσκέων. So οὐ γινώσκειν to be unwilling to know, John 8: 27. 10: 6. 14: 17.

(b) As denoting merely the commencement of the action.

E. g. Luke 1: 6 διερχόμενοι το δικτύων αὐτῶν, i. e. their net began or threatened to break. Matt. 4: 2 επεύησεν, i. e. he began to be hungry.

Note. On the other hand, ἀρχομαι when construed with another verb, is not unfrequently to be understood as denoting, not the commencement of the action expressed by that verb, but the action itself; e. g. Gen. 2: 3. Acts 11: 15. See Schleusner and Wahl on the word.

(c) As denoting capacity or ability to do that which the verb usually expresses.

E. g. John 5: 21 ὥσπερ ὁ πάτερ ἐγέρον τοὺς νεκροὺς, i. e. is able to raise up. Rom. 1: 21 γνῶνει τὸν Θεὸν, i. e. capable of knowing God.
(d) As declarative of that which the verb usually expresses.

E. g. Acts 10: 15 α' ό θεος ἐκαθαρίσε, i. e. what God has declared to be pure, i. q. Syr. Pael. Gal. 3: 22 συνεκλείσεν η γραφή τα παντα υπο αἵματαν, i. e. has declared all to be included, etc. see Winer's Comm. in loc.—The following passages do not belong here, John 15: 8 καὶ γενοσέθεν εμοί μαθηταί, which is to be rendered, 'and that ye should be my true disciples.' So John 12: 40 τευφλοκε—καὶ πέπορωκεν αὐτῶν τὴν κορδίαν sc. ὁ θεὸς, where the verbs are to be understood with peculiar reference to the early religious opinions of the Hebrews; see Rom. 9: 16 ff.

(e) As denoting the continuance of the action of the verb.

E. g. John 7: 1 καὶ περεμπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τή Γαλιλαϊ, i. e. he continued to traverse Galilee. John 13: 19 λεγω υμῖν—ἰνα πιστεύσητε, i. e. that your belief and confidence may become still stronger. John 2: 11 καὶ επιστευθάν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ.

2. On the other hand, verbs sometimes designate more than the simple action which they usually express, viz.

(a) They sometimes denote customary or often repeated action.

E. g. Mark 15: 6 κατὰ ἑόρην ἀπελευ, αυτοῦ εἶνα δεσµὸν, i. e. he was accustomed to release; comp. Matt. 27: 15 where it is εἰωθεὶς ἀπολέσει. Syr. מָצָה מַחֲסַד; see Kuinoel in loc. Mark 14: 12 οτὲ το πασχα εὐνο. This signification, however, in both these examples, may be said to lie in the use of the imperfect tense; see Buttmann p. 508. Or we may also consider the latter passage at least, as a mere explanatory circumstance, viz. as they were offering the passover.

(b) They sometimes denote intensity of action.

E. g. Matt. 6: 25 μη μεριμνήσητε, i. e. be not anxiously solicitous; Syr. מַחֲסַד מַחֲסַד.

(c) They sometimes imply successful action.
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E. g. 1 Cor. 7: 5 ἵνα μὴ πείραζῃ ὁ Σατάνας, i. e. that Satan may not tempt you with success. So Gal. 6: 1. 1 Thess. 3: 5.

3. In connexion with a verb expressed, another verb must sometimes be understood, in order to complete the full sense. This happens in the following cases, viz.

(a) When a verb stands grammatically connected with two subjects or predicates, but is connected as to sense with only one of them. This is called zeugma. See Gesen. p. 853. Stuart § 214. Kuinoel on Luke 1: 64.

E. g. 1 Cor. 3: 2 γαλά ὕμας ἐποτίσα, ou βρωμα, where ἐποτίσα can be predicated only of γαλά; Syr. Δεδέσα ἑποτίσα. 1 Tim. 4: 3 καλινωτόν γαμεν, απεχθεθα βρωματον, where we may supply καλινωτόν before the latter clause.—On the contrary, James 1: 9, 10 καυχάσθω ὁ αδελφὸς τατείνως εἰς τὸν νῦμεν αὐτοῦ, ὁ δὲ πλούσιος εἰς τὴν τατείνωσιν αὐτοῦ, which some refer here and translate, ‘let the poor man rejoice—let the rich man mourn,’ etc. does not belong here, because the sense of καυχάσθω is suitable to both parts of the expression; see Pott in loc.

(b) When a verb is construed with a preposition and noun, with which it cannot properly be connected in sense. This is termed constructio praegnans.


E. g. 2 Tim. 2: 26 καὶ αναγνώσαν εἰς τὴν διαβόλου παγίδος, i. e. bonam frugem redeant, liberati, expediti laqueis diaboli. Acts 23: 24 ἵνα τὸν Παύλου διασωσθῆναι πρὸς Φηλίκα, i. e. that they may conduct him in safety; comp. Xen. Anab. II. 3. 11 αποσοῦσαι εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα. Polyb. VI. 58. 5 σῳθηρεῖ πρὸς τοὺς αναγνώσους καὶ τῆς διαβολῆς. Acts 20: 30 τοὺς αποτείνη τοὺς μαθητὰς ὅπως αὐτοῖς, i. e. to draw away persons from the doctrine of Jesus and make them followers of themselves; comp. Acts 27: 43.

Some interpreters refer to this head many other passages (see Haab p. 312 f.) in which, when rightly explained, the constructio praegnans
cannot properly be said to have place. E.g. Mark 7: 4 μακρὰ τῶν ἀγώνων, which is not to be translated, as even Schott has done, neque e foro reversi—nisi se abluerint, etc. but, they eat not of the market (i.e. of provisions purchased in the market), unless it be first washed; see Kuinoel in loc. Wahl's lex. art. ἀγώνα. The passage Heb. 5: 7 εὐκακώσθητι απὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, is at least doubtful, since it may be translated not merely, he was heard and delivered from his anguish (comp. Ps. 22: 22); but also, he was heard on account of his pious resignation; see the commentators in loc. In 2 Cor. 10: 5 αἰχμαλωτε-ζότης τον νομαν εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν, there lies no constructio praegnans at bottom; it means simply to lead into the captivity of obedience, i.e. to bring into subjection.

§ 31 b. Verbs; use of the active voice.

1. The declarative sense of verbs (§ 31. 1. d.) corresponds to one of the significations of the Hebrew conjugation Hiphil; some of the other senses of which the Seventy have also not unfrequently expressed by verbs in the active voice.

E.g. the causative sense; as Gen. 47: 6 κατοικίσων τον πατέρα σου, Heb. φυγε-γε ψαλη. 1 Sam. 15: 35 κυρίος μετεμελήθη ὅτι εβασμέ-λευς τον Σαουλ ἐπὶ Ισραήλ. Comp. 8: 22. 2 K. 14: 21. Ez. 17: 24. Is. 16: 5. Ps. 119: 50. al.*—The same idiom has passed into the Apocryphal books of the O. Test. (although 2 Macc. 7: 37 and Tob. 8: 20 do not belong here,) and also in some degree into the N. Testament; though the examples adduced by Glass (I. p. 252 ff.) and Haab (p. 112 ff.) need to be carefully examined. Nor must it be forgotten that among the best Greek writers, many neuter verbs assume also a transitive signification.

In the New Testament we may properly assign here the following passages.

E.g. Matt. 5: 45 ὁ θεός τὸν ἥλιον ανατελέει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἄγαθοὺς; Syr. מִלָּהִמְךָ. 1 Cor. 2: 16 ὁ σωματικός αὐτοὶ. Luke 12:

*The Sept. often translates Hiphil by a periphrasis with πωτερίως; see p. 34.
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37 περικωπεῖν καὶ ἀνακάλυψιν αὐτοῦ. 2 Cor. 2: 14 τοῦ παντοτε ἀνακαλύπτοντος ἡμᾶς. Phil. 4: 10 αὐθεντεῖν τοῦ ἐκεῖ ἐμαυθανεῖν. But that most of these verbs, in classic usage also, connect a transitive with their neuter signification, has long since been shown by writers on this subject; comp. ἀνακάλυψις Diod. Sic. XVII. 7. ἀνακάλυψις Polyb. XXXI. 4. 5. See Lebeck ad Phryn. p. 216.*

Note 1. In 2 Pet. 3: 12 εἰ ὡς ἀνακαλύπτοντος καὶ σκεύοντος τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμᾶς, which passage Haeb refers to this place, the verb σκεύομαι means esse desiderio expectare, as it often does in Greek writers; though this meaning comes ultimately from the signification accelerare; see Pott in loc. The Syriac after the same interpretation, 

Note 2. That, in analogy with the above observations, the passive form sometimes expresses the signification of Hophal, is asserted by Glass (I. p. 253) and Haeb (p. 114); who appeal to 1 Cor. 8: 3. 13:12. Gal.4: 9. But in the latter passage μαθέων ἐκ γνώσεως ὕπο θεοῦ, the sense is, known i. e. approved of God; see Winer Comm. in Ep. ad Gal. p. 64. In 1 Cor. 13: 12, those Interpreters who render ἐπεννοεῖν by edoctus fuero, concede that ναὶ after καθὼς is thus entirely disregarded. We ought therefore to translate, as we also are known sc. of God; and the whole phrase implies that we shall have exact and comprehensive knowledge; see Jaspis in loc. The other passage, 1 Cor. 8: 3 εἰ τὸν θεόν οὐτός εγνώσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, has been considered as an undoubted instance of the Hophal signification, on account of the preceding oudeν εγνώσθη; and Erasmus, Beza, Schulz, Nösselt, Krause, etc. have actually translated it veram intelligentiam consequet us est. But the version by is Deo probatur is also allowable, and is perfectly well suited to the context; for the apostle had asserted that an enlightened understanding without love is of little value in the sight of God, and then he adjoins in v. 3, that love only can render us worthy of the approbation of God; see Grotius and Jaspis in loc.

2. After active verbs of a transitive signification, the reflexive pronoun εαυτὸν, εαυτοῦ, is sometimes omitted.

*The verb αὐθεντεῖν does not rank with this class, because it was probably transitive in its original signification (comp. Lat. augeo,) and is frequently so used in Greek writers; see Wahl on the word.
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E. g. Acts 27: 43 ἀπορρίπτανες (εἰς θαλάσσαν), i. e. casting themselves into the sea; comp. Kunoel in loc. Mark 4: 37 τα κυματα εἰσ-βάλλειν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, i. e. poured themselves into the vessel. Here also may be referred Mark 4: 29 ἕταν ποιμαζόν τὸ καρπὸς γεμισμένον (se) transdierit (quasi messoribus).* Acts 9: 19 ἱλασθεὶς τυφήν ἐναχυσθεὶς, confirm- mábat, refecit (se).


Note 1. John 13: 2 does not belong here, viz. τὸν διαβολοῦ βεβλη-στος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, where βάλλειν signifies to instil, to suggest; see Kypke in loc. Zeune ad Viger. p. 181.

Note 2. In such verbs the transition was very easy from the reflexive to a passive signification; see Matthiae § 496. 3, 4. To this head we may refer 1 Pet. 2: 6 περιέχει εὖ τῇ γραφῇ, i. e. continetur; see Pott in loc. Syr. [ startActivity] ἐν τῷ ἔδρα. Comp. Joseph. Antiq. I. 11 εἰς στηλὴν ἄλον μετέβαλεν, sc. Lot’s wife.

3. Verbs in the active voice sometimes receive a neuter or impersonal signification, through a species of ellipsis.

E. g. ὦν it rains, βροντῇ it thunders, where in common Greek ὁ Ζεὺς is properly to be supplied. To a like idiom we may refer 1 Cor. 15: 52 σαλπίζει γαρ, i. e. for it (ἡ σαλπίζει) shall blow or sound; like the Germ. es lautet. See Hermann ad Viger. p. 871.

*The Syr. has freely translated this passage, Ἐδέσθη ὡς ἐστήκει i. e. quan- do pinguis factus fuerit fructus.—To me, the double ellipsis of se and messoribus seems harsh, and in prose hardly tolerable. Perhaps we might better supply the accusative of καρπὸς, or of θερισμὸς from the succeeding clause; comp. Arat. in Cic. Div. I. 9 (lentiscus) iria tempora monstrat arandi.
§ 32. Verbs ; use of the middle voice.

The subject of the middle voice, which had been treated of by the earlier grammarians,* has been in a manner exhausted by the later ones, and its peculiar signification accurately unfolded; see Hermann De emend. ratione, etc. p. 178. Matthiae § 491 ff. Buttmann § 122 ff. [p. 232 in Everett's translation.]

The proper use of the middle voice consists in this, that it represents the action of the verb as returning and terminating either directly or indirectly upon the subject; or, to use a common grammatical term, its meaning is reflexive. This reflexive signification, however, is subject to a threefold modification, which will now be exhibited.

1. The first, the most simple, and probably the original form, in which the reflexive signification appears, is when the subject of a transitive verb is also the direct, immediate, and proper object of the action which the verb designates.


In this way the middle voice often assumes the appearance of having a new simple intransitive meaning, which may be expressed in Latin, German, and English, by a distinct and appropriate verb.

E. g. παυω to put into a state of rest; παυομαι to put one's self into

* See particularly L. Küster De vero usu verborum mediorum apud Graecos; and J. Clerici Diss. de verbis Graecorum mediis, both printed together with the work quoted in the next note.

† See S. F. Dresigii Comm. de verbis med. in N. T. cura J. Fischeri, 1765.
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A state of rest, i. e. to cease, Luke 5: 4. al. στελλω to send, στελλομαι to send one’s self; i. e. to go; to journey, Soph. Oed. Tyr. 434. αναστα-μαι and εγειρομαι excito me ipsum, i. e. to arise, Mark 9: 31. Matt. 26: 46. απολυομαι dimitto me ipsum, i. e. to depart, Acts 28: 25, comp. απαλλαττεσθαι Acts 19: 12. οργιζομαι ad iram me provoc, i. e. to be angry, Matt. 5: 22. αποστερομαι to turn one’s self away from, i. e. to reject, to contemn, Heb. 12: 25. αυξανομαι se ipsum augere, i. e. to increase, to grow, 2 Cor. 10: 15. βοσκομαι to feed one’s self, i. e. to be feeding, spoken of a herd, Matt. 8: 30. επαιρομαι se extollere, i. e. su- pierbire, 2 Cor. 10: 5. πειθομαι to persuade one’s self, i. e. to believe, to have confidence, Acts 26: 26. etc.

Sometimes, though not often, this new signification is transitive; e. g. φοβομαι to terrify one’s self, i. e. to fear, Matt. 21: 28 φοβομαι τον οχλον. Mark 6: 20 εφοβοτο ουν ιωαννην.

[Note. In the above instances, the middle verb has the direct and proper reflexive meaning. In those that follow, it can only be said to be indirectly reflexive. R.]

2. The middle voice is also used to denote a return of the action of the verb upon the subject considered as the remote object, and thus to express the idea of the active verb in connexion with the dative of the subject (έαντος). Hence, when the verb in the active governs an accusative, the middle retains it without change.

E. g. αιτεω τι to ask for any thing, αιτομαι τι to ask for any thing for one’s self, i. q. αιτεω τι εμαυτον, Mark 6: 23, 24. αποκτενομαι to cut off for themselves, sc. the part circumcised, Gal. 5: 12, (but see below in no. 5, and Wahl’s lex.) έξαγοραζομαι to redeem for one’s self, Eph. 5: 16. περιποιομαι to acquire for one’s self, Acts 20: 28, comp. 1 Tim. 3: 13 where εαντος is expressed. κοιμομαι mini reporto 1 Pet. 1: 9.

Here also the middle signification may sometimes be expressed in other languages, by a distinct and appropriate verb.

E. g. φωλαττομαι to watch or observe any one for one’s own advantage, i. e. to be on one’s guard before any one, 2 Tim. 4: 15. αιτεωμαι to take for one’s self, i. e. to choose, to select, Heb. 11: 25.
3. In its third modification, the middle voice designates an action which takes place, either by the order or with the permission or sufferance of the subject. This idea is usually expressed in Latin by the help of the verb *curare*; in German, by the verb *lassen*; and in English by prefixing the verb *to cause* or some similar word.

E. g. *αδικευομαι* to suffer injustice to be done to one's self, 1 Cor. 6: 7. *απαγγαβασθαι* to cause one's self to be enrolled, Luke 2: 5; comp. *παρηγερτευμενεσθαι*, 1 Cor. 7: 18.

In this case also the middle signification passes over into a new one, which may be expressed by an appropriate verb.

E. g. *δανειζομαι* to cause money to be loaned to one's self, i. e. to borrow, Matt. 5: 42. *μισθομαι* to cause to let to one's self, i. e. to hire, Matt. 20: 1. *λυτρομαι* to cause to release for a ransom, i. e. to redeem, to deliver, Luke 24: 21.

4. With the reflexive meaning there is sometimes connected, in some middle verbs, a reciprocal signification, including the idea of two or more parties.

E. g. *βουλευομαι* to consult with one another, John 12: 20. *μαχησθαι* to contend with one another, 2 Tim. 2: 24, where the subject is to be taken collectively; (comp. *στρατευομαι* 1 Cor. 9: 7. *αγωνιζομαι* 1 Cor. 9: 25. *καταγωνιζομαι* Heb. 11: 33. etc.) *παρακαλεισθαι* to give mutual consolation, 2 Cor. 13: 11. *συντιθεομαι* to make an agreement with one another, John 9: 22. Luke 22: 5.

Note. All the significations assigned above to the middle voice, belong also to the Hebrew Hithpael; see Gesen. p. 247, 248. Stuart § 80. 3. The proper reflexive and reciprocal meanings are also found in Niphal; Gesen. p. 238, 239. Stuart § 77.

5. Although the signification of the middle voice is definite and altogether peculiar, yet in practice, even among the best Greek writers, the forms of the middle
are sometimes used instead of the passive and with a passive meaning.

This takes place not only in those tenses for which the middle has no distinct form, (i.e. pres. imperf. perf. and pluperf. Buttmann Gr. Gram. p. 175.) but also in other tenses, particularly the aor. 2 and future; see Matthiae § 496. 8.

E.g. Here belongs, according to some interpreters, the passage Gal. 5:12 ὁρείσαν καὶ ἀποκρυφόντας οἱ ἀναστατούντες ἵμας, i.e. I should think they were cut off, destroyed, etc. see Winer Comm. in loc.—So in aor. 1, καὶ πάντες ἐβαπτίζοντο, 1 Cor. 10: 2. (Georgi l. c.) The passage Acts 15: 22 can hardly be considered as belonging here, since ἐκλέχτειν expresses a different idea from ἐκλεξθεῖν (Kuinoel in loc.) and retains the signification of the middle, i.e. they suffered themselves to be chosen, they undertook the mission willingly; an idea which ἐκλεξθεῖευ does not convey.

Note. Pasor in his Gram. Sacr. p. 150 ff. reckons here several other examples still, in which, however, the middle signification is very apparent; e.g. ἀπογραψαθαι Luke 2: 5. κειρωθαί 1 Cor. 11: 6. ὀπλισσαθαι 1 Pet. 4: 1. etc.

6. In some instances, the active stands where we might expect the middle, and is then followed by a possessive pronoun.


For the use of the passive forms in a middle sense, see § 33. 2.

[Note. The author has omitted to state, that in some verbs the forms of the middle voice are used without any reference to its peculiar signification, and simply in the sense of the active. E.g. ἀναταγάσθαι Luke 1: 1. παρεγέσθαι Acts 19: 24. Col. 4: 1. Tit. 2: 7; comp. Acts 16: 16 where the active is employed in precisely the same sense and construction. ἐναγγελισθαι Luke 1: 19. al. ἀπειλήσασθαι Acts 4: 17, 21. etc.—In the future active especially, many verbs have no appropriate form, but use the forms of the future middle; e.g. βαινειν, γενομαι, λαμβανειν, τικτε, etc. R.]
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1. When a verb, which in the active voice governs a genitive or dative of person, is put in the passive construction, it is generally the case that the noun which designates person is made the subject of the passive verb; while the other adjuncts remain as with the active.


2. The perfect of the passive is sometimes used in the sense of the active or middle.

E. g. Acts 20: 13 οὐτοι γὰρ την (ὁ Παύλος) διαταγμένος ἵνα λαβῃ Paul directed; see Fischer ad Wall. III. pt. II. p. 62 ff. Matthiae § 482. § 496. 6.

3. Among the Greek writers, the aorist of the passive not unfrequently takes the signification of the middle; see Buttmann Gr. Gram. p. 501. Matthiae § 493. a. In the Apocrypha this usage occurs Ecclus. 18: 21 ταπεινωθήτε. On the other hand, no instances of this kind in the New Testament have occurred to me; for in respect to the examples which Haab has brought (p. 117), it is necessary only to glance at them to see that in order to support the rule, he has subjected them to a false interpretation. [In the word φοβερομαι, however, to which the author justly assigns the sense of the middle voice (§ 32. 1), and which occurs in such constructions as μη φοβηθητε εις αυτους Matt. 10: 26. εφοβηθη τον αγιον Matt. 14: 5. 21: 46. al. is not the form of the aorist passive used in a middle sense? So in John 8: 59, where the author himself assigns εκρυθη to the middle (§ 32. 1), the form is that of the aor. 2 passive. Comp. Eph. 1: 11 ευλογηθημεν; see Wahl on the word. R.]
§ 34. Verbs; use of the tenses.*

1. In respect to the tenses, the grammarians and interpreters of the New Testament, even the latest ones, have committed great mistakes. In general, the tenses are used in the New Testament in the same manner as in the Greek writers; viz. the aorist marks simply past time, and is the usual tense of narration; the imperfect and pluperfect are always used in reference to a secondary or subsidiary action or event, which is past, but which stands connected in respect to time with the main action or event;† while the perfect expresses past time in connexion with the present.

None of these tenses, properly and strictly taken, can be substituted for another, as commentators would have us believe; but where an exchange of this kind appears to have taken place (Georgi Hierocr. p. 58 ff.) it is either merely appearance; or else there may generally be discovered in the circumstances of the action, a sufficient reason why that particular tense and no other should be used; or, finally, it must be put to the account of the characteristic remissness of popular diction.

Nota 1. The arbitrary exchange of the tenses, enallage temporum, is commonly reckoned among the Hebraisms of the New Testament; because it is taken for granted that in the Hebrew language, the prac-

* See, besides the common grammatical works, J. Primisser Gedanken über das vom Prof. Trendelenburg vorgeschlagene Syst. der griech. Conj. 1788.
L. G. Dissen De temporibus et modis verbi Graeci, 1808.

† "The pluperfect shows an action which is past, but which still continued, either by itself or in its following or accompanying circumstances, during another action which is past."—"The imperfect expresses an action continuing during another action which is past, or the accompanying circumstances of an action or situation in past time, whether the main action be expressly stated or be inferred from the context. It differs from the aorist in this, that the aorist marks an action past and gone by; the imperfect, an action past, but at that time continuing." Matthiae 4 497. Comp. Buttmann p. 504 ff. R.]
ter and future are used promiscuously for each other. But that this supposition is groundless, is sufficiently shewn by Gesenius, p. 760 ff. Stuart § 191 ff. Comp. also Vigerus p. 209 ff. — From the remarks made above, however, must be excepted the book of Revelation, in which the tenses are thrown together without any rule; e. g. 2 ζώον εξε ον και εβαστασας. 3 ζε ειληφας και ηκουας. 12; 4 η ουρα αυτοι το τριτον των αστερων και εβαλεν αυτους εις την γην. 11: 10 οι κατοικοντες επι της γης χαιρουνια—και ευφοραθησονται—και πεμουσιν. 17: 16 και τα δεκα πεντα τις μπονοιν την πορνην, και κηρουμενην ποιησουσιν αυτην—και τας σαρνας αυτης φαγετωσι. etc.

[Note 2. The above assertion of the author, that the tenses are always employed in the New Testament in conformity with Greek usage, is not correct, at least not so, in the extent which he would assign to it. There is nothing more evident, than that the use of the tenses by the New Testament writers takes a colouring from the Hebrew, their vernacular tongue; and that the exchange or confusion of tenses which they exhibit, is therefore properly to be ranked with Hebraisms. In respect to the interchange of the praeter and future in Hebrew, Gesenius (l. c.) has shown only that it is not arbitrary in particular circumstances; while any one who has attentively read the Hebrew Scriptures, or at least the poetical parts of them, will want no further evidence that the two tenses are often used for each other promiscuously. In order, moreover, to maintain his assertion, the author has been compelled to except the book of Revelation from the application of his principle; although the anomalies which occur in it, if more frequent, are not more striking than are to be found in almost every other part of the New Testament. E. g. Matt. 3: 3 and Mark 1: 3 ξωμασα- τε την οδον κυριου, ευθειας ποιετε τας τρεις αυτου. Luke 1: 47 μεγαλυνε η ψυχη μου—και γηλιασε το πνευμα μου. John 1: 15 Ιωαννης μαρτυρει—και κεκαγμενε. 3: 32 και ο ειρωκε και ηκουε. Acts 22: 15 οιν ειρωκας και ηκουας. 1 John 1: 1 ο ακησουμεν, ο ειρωκα- μεν, ο εθεασαμεθα και αι γεριες ημων ευθυλαφησαν. 2: 7 ην ειχετε απι αρχης—οιν ηκουσατε απ αρχης. etc. These, and many more instances which might be quoted, are at least as striking as those which Winer has brought from the Apocalypse, and go to show that his principle can be fully applied to the other parts of the New Testament, with no more propriety than to that particular book. Other examples to the same purpose are adduced below in no. 4. a, note 2: R.]
2. The present is sometimes used for other tenses in the following manner, viz.

(a) For the future, when the writer would express some future action or event as being altogether certain. This occurs in Latin, German, English, etc. chiefly in colloquial discourse.


(b) For the aorist, as the historic tense, in animated narration or description, especially in John.


Here belong most of the examples which Pasor (p. 232) adduces to prove an emallage of the present for the imperfect and perfect, as he incorrectly expresses it.

(c) Sometimes the present includes in itself the idea of the perfect or imperfect, viz. when the verb is used to express a continued state or condition, uninterrupt-ed duration, etc.


Notz. In Acts 4:13 the form ἤσσαν of the imperfect, manifestly stands
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for the pluperfect, i.e., fuérent. But we can hardly draw from this instance any general rule, because it occurs in a verb which has no distinct form of the pluperfect. Other examples in the same verb, are 1 John 2:19 et γαρ ησαν. Matt. 23:30 et ημεθα ε_buckets; fuéssimus; see Buttmann p. 292.

3. The perfect sometimes stands for the following tenses, viz.

(a) For the present, when an action or state is designated, which commenced in past time, but extends also into the present.

E.g. John 20:29 ὅτι ἐσώφακας με, πεπιστευεῖ· στεφάνα, ἔσσε κατά, is whom ye trust, i.e. in whom ye have placed your trust; 2 Cor. 1:10 εἰς οὖν ἡπισκαμέν; comp. Hom. Il. XX. 186 εὐλπια. — So the Greek writers often in verbs of fearing; see Hoogeveen and Hermann ad Vig. p. 212, 748. — John 5:42 οὐκ εὔροκα υἱάς, ὅτι—οὐκ ἔχετε κ.τ.λ. 8:52 οὐκ εὐροκαμεν. John 8:29 οὐκ αφηκα με μονον ο θεός may be rendered, my Father is not accustomed to forsake me, i.e. he never has forsaken, and he never will forsake me.—It is doubtful whether John 1:34 καὶ γόνον ἐσώφακα καὶ μεμαρτύρων, belongs here; for John would seem to be speaking as of a past transaction, since he also uses the perfect τεθεαμην, and also γένε, v. 32, 33. That he still continued his testimony at that time, is doubtless true, but it does not necessarily follow from the words of this passage. See Matthiae § 503. 2.

(b) For the future, when the action is yet to take place, but the writer for the moment has it so vividly in his thoughts, as to look upon it as already past.

E.g. John 4:38 ἀλλος πεποιηκας, και υἱος—εἰς εἰς ηλιον Θατερ εν John 5:24 μετατεθηκεν εν τον θνωτόν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν, where the certainty of this μεταταξις is indicated.—In the same manner the Hebrews often use their praeter; see Gesen. p. 764. Stuart § 192. 5. a. Nor is this mode of expression unusual among the Greeks and Romans; comp. Liv. si. tales animos habebitis, vicimus; quoted by Hoogeveen ad Viger. p. 214.
This passage in John 14:7 was interpreted by some as ἐσάρξησεν αὐτὸν, is to be rendered with Schott, jam nec (Beauz) cognoscetis ac videatis; or with Stolz, henceforth ἐγὼ οὖν οὗτος ἐστίν: rather than with Kuinoel, cum non accuratius cognoscetis et quasi semel videbitis.

Note. That the perfect stands also sometimes for the pluperfect; (which certainly is not impossible,) Haab attempts to shew (p. 95) from John 13:7 εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τετηρημένον αὐτό. This is inconclusive; because Jesus would represent even this anointing, as an emblematical preparation of his body for the tomb. [In other examples, however, the perfect is incontestably used for the pluperfect; e. g. Luke 1:22 καὶ ἐπεργεῖσαι, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνον ἐν τῇ παρ. 24:23 ἠλέθων, λέγοντες καὶ ὑπηκοόν αὐγελον ἐφ᾽ ὅσιους να. John 20:18 ἐρχεται Μαριάμ—συναγγέλου—ὅτι ἐστὶν οὐδὲν να. This cannot be said to arise from the want of a distinct form of the pluperfect in this verb, for in Acts 7:44 occurs the regular pluperfect ἐσάρξησεν. For other characteristics of the perfect, see below in no. 4. a, note 2. R.]

4. The aorist sometimes stands for other tenses, as follows, viz.

(a) For the pluperfect in narrations, when, through a neglect of the order of time, an earlier circumstance is introduced afterwards.

E. g. John 18:24 ἀπεστείλε αὐτὸν ὁ Ἄννας πρὸς Καίαραν; comp. v. 14, and Kuinoel in loc. Matt. 26: 46 ὁ δὲ παραδίδωσιν αὐτὸν εἶδον αὐτὸς σημείον, where however it may perhaps be translated he gave them a token, sc. as they came in sight of Jesus. [So also where no neglect of the proper order can be attributed to the writer; e. g. John 4: 1 οἷς οὖν ἐγώ ὁ κυριος, ὅτι η ἡ κοινοτεύνον οἱ Δαφνίσιοι, ὅτι κ.τ.λ. R.]

In a manner the most uncritical, Haab has adduced here many other examples (p. 95, comp. Pasor p. 235.) in which either the aorist is to be taken in its appropriate sense, or else some apparent discrepancy in the narration of the different evangelists, lies at the bottom. E. g. John 18: 12 συνέλαβον τον Ἰησοῦν; where the other evangelists (Matt. 26: 50 ff. Mark 14: 46.) place the seizure and binding of Jesus before the stroke of Peter's sword; but John (according to Haab) would represent it as if Peter, at the moment when the guard were laying hold
of Jesus, had struck in between them with his sword! On Matt. 27: 37: ουδεὶς κατέλαβε τινα των κυριαρχῶν των αυτῶν αὑτοῦ γραμματέων, which Hebraic readers, they had affixed, De Wette very well remarks (A. L. Z. l. c.) "If we look at the order of events, this is properly a pluperfect; but if we regard only the words, it denotes simply a past. The writer here has not regarded the order in which the events succeeded each other. That he does not aim at accuracy in this respect appears also from this, that after he has represented the soldiers (v. 36) as sitting down to keep watch over Jesus, he then goes on (v. 38) to introduce the crucifixion of the two malefactors, τοιαύτα τα σταυρωματα κ.τ.λ. Shall we translate this also as a pluperfect?" In Mark 3: 16 ενεδρυκε το Σιμωνος αυτος Ηερον, it is not improbability for Mark had not previously noticed this fact, and we are not at liberty so inconsiderately to supply it out of John 1: 43.

Note 1. That the aorist ever stands for the perfect, can be shown with certainty by no example in the New Testament; for Luke 1: 1 ενεδρυκας παλαις παγχρησταις—εδειξε ειρηνη, is to be taken in the true aorist or historical sense, since many understood—I also thought it best, etc. So Luke 2: 48 τεκνον, ει εποιησας—εζητουμεν σε κ.τ.λ. With how much propriety and conformity to the rules of prosaic language, the writers of the New Testament have employed the perfect, may be seen by comparing the following passages, viz. Luke 4: 43; 5: 32. 7: 20, 12, 7, 13: 2, 16: 26, 21: 5, 22: 52.

[Note 2. The above remarks on the passages in Luke would seem not to be well grounded; for if there is any fact in regard to the use of the tenses in the New Testament, which is susceptible of demonstration, it is this, viz. that the aorist and perfect are often used for each other, and often in connexion and in the same sense. E. g. Luke 1: 25 comp. 1: 49, where πεποιηκας and εποιησα are used in precisely the same sense. So Luke 1: 19 απεσταλαν and 4: 43 απεσταλμαί. Luke 4: 18 εχριδε με—απεσταλκε με. John 3: 19 το φως ειληθην εις κοιμον, και αγαπησαν οι ανθρωποι το σκοτος. 5: 22 δεδωκε και ν. 27 εδωκε, 5: 36 εδωκε—απεσταλκε και ν. 36 απεστειλεν. 6: 57 απεστειλε και 20: 21 απεσταλκε. Acts 22: 15 οι εωρακας και ηκουσας; see also above in no. 1 note 2. In all these instances the aorist, as compared with the perfect, most evidently takes the sense of the perfect, i. e. It expresses past time as connected with the present. Other examples, where it subserves the same purpose, when not connected with a per-
fest are the following; viz. Matt. 5: 21, 27, 33, 48. 1 John 2: 7, 24 and 3: 11, comp. 2: 14.—On the other hand, in the following instances, the perfect takes the sense of the aorist; e. g. John 6: 32 ἐδώκεν and v. 31 εὐωκεν. 5: 33 ὑμεῖς απεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην καὶ μεμαρτύρηκε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, comp. 1: 20 where the fact of their sending is related. John 7: 19, 22 Μωϋσῆς ἐδώκεν ὑμῖν τὴν περιτομήν. 17: 2 καθὼς ἐδωκα—ινα παν’ ὁ ἐδωκας. R.]

[Nota 3. The aorist, moreover, is often used in the sense of the present, a use which Winer has neglected to notice. E. g. when connected with a present, Matt. 3: 3 and Mark 1: 3 ἐτομμάσατε—ποιεῖτε. Luke 1: 47 μεγαλυκε ἡ ψυχή μου—ηγελλάσσε το πνεύμα μου. 1 John 2: 14, 21, 26 εὔφημα, comp. v. 13 where it is γραφον. In other passages its use resembles that of the perfect for the present (supra no. 3. α), and it expresses an action commencing in past time but extending into the present; e. g. Matt. 3: 17 and Mark 1: 11 εν ὦ ἐκδοκησα. Matt. 23: 2 επ’ τῆς Μωϋσεως καθέδρας εκδιδον οἱ γραμματεῖς, i. e. have seated themselves. John 7: 26 μηποτε ἀληθῶς εγνωσαν οἱ αρχινωτες. R.]

(b) For the future, in the same manner as the perfect (supra no. 3. b), and as denoting the certainty of an action or event which is yet to take place.

E. g. John 15: 6 ειν μὴ τις μετὴν εν εμοί, εβληθή εξοί το κλημα he will be cast out, etc. which, in respect to the divine counsels, is as if he were already cast out. Rev. 10: 7 ετελεσθη τὸ μυστήριον, i. q. τελεσθησατε.—On the other hand, in Mark 3: 21 εξεστη retains its proper signification, extra se raptus, insania correpit est; and 2 Thess. 1: 10 belongs not here as Haab would have it, p. 105. [In Luke 1: 68, 69, the aorist is manifestly used for the future, in a manner corresponding to the use of the Hebrew praeter in prophecies, protestations, etc. Gesen. p. 764. Stuart § 192. 5. a. R.]

[Nota. From all the preceding observations it results, that the general use of the aorist in the New Testament corresponds to that of the Hebrew praeter; see Gesen. p. 160 a. E. Stuart § 191. R.]

5. The future is sometimes employed in the following significations, viz.

(a) To express the idea which the Latins convey by the present of the subjunctive, and the English by the
potential mood; both of which in their nature are closely related to the general idea of the future.

E. g. Rom. 15: 18 ou τολμησον λαλειν non audire dicere, I should not (or would not) dare to speak. Matt. 7: 24 ὅμοιοσον αὐτοῦ assimilem, assimilaverim. So after the particle εἰπώς, Rom. 11: 14. Phil. 3: 11. Comp. Herm. ad Vig. p. 927.

(b) To express the possibility of an action, etc. this signification, being intimately connected with the preceding one.


On the use of the future for the imperative, see in § 37. 3.

Note. That the future is also used for the present is affirmed by Zeune (ad Viger. p. 212), who adduces in proof of his assertion, Rom. 3: 30 εἰς ὁ θεὸς ὁδικαιωθής εἰς πιστεύειν κ.τ.λ. and in the same way do Jaspis and Stolz translate the passage, Syriac وَفَزَرْنَ. This, however, is unnecessary; for this τὸ δικαιωθής is also represented in other places as something still to take place, since the bliss of the divine kingdom is yet future; e. g. Rom. 2: 13 οἵ πιστεύει τὸν νομὸν δικαιωθησώνται. Gal. 2: 16 ou δικαιωθησόμεθα εἰς κύριον νόμον πάσα σαρκί.

§ 35. Verbs; use of the indicative, subjunctive, and optative moods, in dependent clauses.

1. In respect to the indicative, subjunctive, and optative moods, it is necessary to treat here only of their use in dependent propositions, or subsidiary clauses, etc. which may be connected with the main proposition by interrogatives, by the relative, or by conjunctions or other particles.

In all other cases, these moods present no difficulty, and exhibit no peculiarity of usage in the New Testament; comp. Acts 1: 20. 8: 20. etc:
2. After interrogatives and the relative, the Greeks employ the indicative in dependent propositions, where other languages, especially the Latin, would use the subjunctive; viz. when any thing is to be represented as actually existing or occurring, and not as merely possible or desirable. This also holds in the New Testament, whether the inquiry be direct or indirect.


3. In similar cases, where any thing is to be represented merely as possible, but existing as yet only in thought or purpose, the Greeks put after interrogatives and the relative, either the subjunctive or optative, viz.

(a) The subjunctive, when the possibility refers to the object of the verb.

E. g. Luke 19: 48 καὶ οὖν εὑρίσκων το, τι ποιήσωσιν, i.e. they found not what they might do; the optative would have signified, 'what they could do.' Mark 6: 36 οὐ τι γαρ φαγώσων, οὐκ εξουσίων, i.e. they were unable to eat, merely because they had no food. Matt. 8: 20 οὐ γίνο. τὸν αὐθροαίνον οὐκ εχείν ὅπου τὸν κεφαλήν κλω. —Acts 4: 21. Rom. 8: 26. Matt. 10: 19.

Note. Instead of the subjunctive, we sometimes find in such cases the future, which is intimately connected in signification with the subjunctive. E. g. Phil. 1: 22 τε αἰρήσομαι, οὐ γνωρίζω. 2: 20 οὐδενα. εχω—ὅτες τα περὶ ὑμῶν μερεισμησε. 1 Cor. 7: 34. Mark 3: 2. See Hermann ad Vig. p. 747 no. 164. p. 351.

(b) The optative, when the possibility refers to the subject of the verb.
§ 35. Verbs; Use of the Three Moods, Etc.

4. The other particles, with which these three moods stand in connexion in the New Testament, are of three kinds, viz. those which mark the end or object of an action, those which express condition, and those which refer to time.

5. Of particles which mark the end or object of an action, only ἵνα and ὅπως occur in the New Testament. The first is construed among the Greeks with all three of the moods; the latter, only with the subjunctive and optative. In the New Testament, ἵνα only is found with the indicative in a few places; with the subjunctive both ἵνα and ὅπως occur, the first much the most frequently; while, of their use with the optative, not a trace appears.

How far the writers of the New Testament, in their use of these particles, coincide with the usage of pure Greek, will appear from the following illustrations.

(a) The indicative is put after ἵνα in the following tenses, viz.

(1) In the present. E.g. 1 Cor. 4: 6 ἵνα μαθητεῖ—ἵνα μη ἐρωτευσότε, where transcribers have sometimes written ἐρωτευσότε, and sometimes ἐρωτευσότε; see Griesbach in loc. Gal. 4: 17 ἵνα λογίζεται ὅμως—ἵνα αὐτοὺς ἤλογίζετε.—On the other hand the present of the indicative is never found after ἵνα among the Greeks; and the passages which some interpreters have adduced to prove such a usage, are shown by Hermann (I. c. p. 852) to be inadequate; e.g. Hom. Ili. 1.363 ἵνα ἐκδοθήν, where ἐκδοθήν is for ἐκδοθεῖν.

(2) In the future. Rev. 22: 14 ἵνα πᾶσας ὅλας πάντως τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα εσται ἡ ἐγκαταστασις τῶν, where there follows immediately
§ 35. VERBS; USE OF THE THREE MOODS, ETC.

καὶ (ινα) εἰσέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν πολίν. 1 Cor. 9: 18 τις μοι εστὶν μυθός; ινα—αδάπανον Θ η σω το ευαγγέλιον. Comp. also Rev. 13: 16. 1 Cor. 13: 3. 1 Pet. 3: 1. where the readings vary. This construction is perhaps the less doubtful, inasmuch as the future, being in its nature related to the subjunctive, elsewhere also takes its place. Comp. Herm. ad Vig. p. 851. Buttmann p. 515. Wahl art. ina no. l. 1. b.

(b) The subjunctive appears after ina and onai in the following circumstances, viz.

(1) After the present. E. g. Matt. 6: 2 ποιουσιν—ὅπως δοξασθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ανθρώπων. 2 Tim. 2: 4 οὐδεὶς στρατευμένος εμπληκτεί ταῖς τοῦ θεοῦ πράγματεις, ινα τὸν στρατολογησάντα αρεσθῇ. v. 9 παντα ὑπομενο—ινα καὶ αυτοὶ σωτηρίας τυγχῶσιν. Comp. 1 Tim. 1: 18. 5: 21. Mark 4: 21. Phil. 1: 9. Rom. 3: 19. 11: 25. 1 John 1: 3. This is in accordance with Greek usage; and the subjunctive here expresses a consequence which is considered as altogether certain; see Hermann ad Vig. p. 850.

(2) After an aorist or perfect. E. g. 1 Tim. 1: 16 ἡλεθνη—ινα εν εμοι πρωτον ενδειχθαι ήσους Χριστὸς τὴν πασαν μακροθυμιαν. v. 20 οὐς παρεδωκα το Σατανα, ινα παιδεαθοίς μη βλασφημείν. Tit. 1: 5 κατελειπω σε εν Κρητη, ινα τα λειτουργα ενδιαφέρωσις. 2: 14 ος εδόκει το αυτον περι ήμων, ινα λυπηρωθηται ήμας. Rom. 6: 4 συνεκαρπη-μεν αυτω, ινα—καὶ ήμεις εν καινοτητι ζωης περιπατουμεν. 1 John 3: 5 εφανερωθη, ινα τας ἀμαρτιας ήμων αφη. v. 8 εφανερωθη, ινα λυση τα εργα του διαβολου. 5: 13 ταυτα εγραψα υμιν, ινα ειδητε. 5: 20 ο νοος του Θεου ήμει και δεδωκεν ήμιν διανοιαν, ινα γνωσκου-μεν τον εληθνον. Comp. Luke 1: 3. John 15: 11. 17: 2. 1 Cor. 4: 6. Here the subjunctive every where expresses an action, which, either in itself or in its consequences, is continued. The, Greeks also in this case use the subjunctive; see Herm. ad Vig. p. 850.—It is otherwise, however, in passages like the following, viz. Acts 5: 26 ηγαγεν αυτους—ινα μη λιθασθωσιν. 9: 21 εις τουτο εληλυθει, ινα—σαρητ. Mark 6: 41. 8: 6. 12: 2. 13. Here the subjunctive expresses a consequence, which the person speaking or acting etc. considers as altogether certain; comp. above in (1.) The Greek usage is similar; and especially that of Thucydides; see Matthiae § 519. Herm. ad Vig. p. 851.—Finally, such passages as Matt. 19: 13 Προσγειαθη αυτω τα παιδια, ινα εας μερας επιθυμη αυτως, and Mark 10: 13 Προσερεπουν αυ-
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χει παριστα, ἵνα ἁμερον αὐτῶν, are undoubtedly to be accounted for by the fact, that the Greeks in narrations often quote the words of a person directly, and even in the tense in which he may be supposed to have spoken them. So here, *they brought them in order*, as they would say, *that he may lay his hands upon them*, instead of *might*. Comp. John 18: 28.


6. The *conditional* particles in the New Testament are εἰ and εἰσ.

The former of these particles, among the Greeks, is regularly construed only with the indicative and optative; though it occurs with the subjunctive sometimes among the Attics, and often among the poets. It is construed with the indicative in a past tense, in reference to a *condition*, on the occurrence of which something else was dependent, but which in fact has not taken place; and in any other tense, when it is left indeterminate, whether the *condition* can or will take place. It is construed with the optative, as denoting merely that an action etc. is possible. See Herm. ad Vig. p. 834.

7. In the New Testament the particle εἰ is often construed with the indicative, and seldom with the optative. In every instance, however, it appears to be employed in accordance with the Greek usage as exhibited above.

(a) With the *indicative* in different tenses; viz.

(1) With the present. E. g. 1 Cor. 7: 9 εἰ δὲ εὐγενευονται, γυναικιαν-τουςαν, i. e. supposing the case should happen, etc. So 7: 12 εἰ τει—γυναικα εχει απιστον, and v. 15 εἰ εν ἀπιστος γυναιται, where had the apostle written εἰ—εχοι, εν γυναιται, it would have signified, if it were possible or I can suppose it possible, etc. Matt. 4: 3 and 6 εἰ υδος ει του θου.
(2) With a past tense. E. g. John 15: 22 ει μη πεθανε και ελεησεν αυτου, αμαρτιαι αυτοι ειχαν, i. e. but I have come—the condition had not taken place, and they are therefore guilty. Matt. 26: 24 καλον την αυταν, ει δυνητη η απεννηθη. Here belongs John 15: 20 ει τον λογον μου εξηρησαν, και τον νησαν επησονουν, i. e. but they have not kept mine, therefore they will not keep yours. In this construction the apodosis often takes αν; see § 36. 1.

(b) With the optative.* E. g. Acts 24: 19 ει τε εχων εχει με, i. e. if they, as is very possible in the present state of feeling towards me (Paul) among the Jews, have any thing against me. 1 Pet. 3: 14 ει και καθημενι δια θρασυνοις, εναχταιμοι. Acts 27: 39 εις δε εβαλεν, εις γυνακει, εχουσας, εις πλοιον, 17: 11 καθ εσον ανακορι- 

Note. The subjunctive is put with ει in the received text in Rev. 1: 5 bis ει τες αυτους θελη αδελφης, where Griesbach on the authority of manuscripts reads Φιλες.

6. The particle εινα is construed with the subjunctive, and denotes possibility in reference to something which is external in respect to the principal subject of discourse.

The apodosis here takes a tense of the indicative, and particularly the future; see Matthiae § 523. 1. Herm. ad Vig. p. 915. E. g. Matt. 22 εινα μονον άνοικε του υμαν τουτοι αυτου, ωδησωσαν. 4: 9: 3: 18. John 15: 7. 1 Cor. 6: 4 βιωτικα προτηρε είαν εγχεις, τους εχων υπαρ- 

Note: This particle is once construed with the indicative, 1 John 5: 15 εινα ορισμεν.

9. Particles which refer to time are construed with the indicative or the subjunctive, viz.

* Wahl has noticed this construction in his lexicon, art. ει ονo 1. 1. c. but has produced only two examples.
(a) With the indicative, when they refer to an action altogether definite, which may be either future or past, viz.

(1) Future; e.g. John 4: 21 ἐρχεται ὁ θάνατος, ὅτε—προσκυνήσετε τῷ πα- τρί. Luke 17: 22 ελευσόνται αἱ ἡμέραι, ὅτε ἐπιθυμήσετε. John 5: 25 ἐρχεται ὁ δόχος καὶ τὸν ἐστίν, ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ακούσωσι τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ζωοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. 9: 4. 16: 25. See Herm. ad Vig. p. 915 ff. This usage however, is found only with ὅτε.

(2) Past, where they may be rendered, as, while, etc. E.g. Matt. 7: 23 εγενήτο ὃτε οὐκετελεῖτο ὁ Ἰσαάκ. 9: 25 ὃτε ἔξελθε τῷ ὄχλῳ. 11: 1. Mark 2: 25. al. So ὅτε ὦκε Luke 8: 3.

(b) With the subjunctive, in two significations, viz.

(1) As denoting duration of time, I.e. while, as long as, etc. E.g. with ὅταν, John 9: 5 ὃταν ἐν κοσμῷ ὦ, Matt. 6: 2. With ὑμεῖς, I Cor. 11: 25. In this signification, ὅτε stands with the indicative John 17: 12. Heb. 9: 17.

(2) As referring to a future foreseen action or event, etc. Matt. 5: 11 μακαριοὶ ὦστε ὅταν ονειδισθοσιν ὑμᾶς. Mark 13: 11 ὅταν ἀγγέλων ὑμῖν παραδόσετε. 14:7 ὅταν ἦλθετε, δουκαδε αὐτοὺς αὐτοῖς ποιήσασθε. John 5: 7 ἵνα ὅταν περαχθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ, βολὴ με εἰς τὸν κολομβηθρὸν. Matt. 2: 8 μπαίναν εἰσήκουσε. Luke 13: 35 ὃς ἂν ἕξῃ, ὅτε εἰσήκυ. 2 Cor. 3: 16 γεν- κα καὶ καταθλίψῃ πρὸς κυρίον. This construction occurs very often with ὅταν, where the futurum exactum is to be expressed; in respect to some certain action or event; inasmuch as the subjunctive has a very close affinity with the future. E.g. John 7: 27. 8: 28. 13: 19. 14: 20. 15: 28. Mark 12: 23. 13: 7. 1 John 2: 28. al. — This is altogether accordant with the Greek usage; see Matthiae § 521.

Note 1. In the New Testament ὅτε, ὅταν, and ὅταν, are never found with the optative, as is the case in Greek writers; see Herm. ad Vig. p. 792.

Note 2. The particle ὅταν in the sense of as often as, is followed by the indicative in Mark 3: 11. This construction is unknown to the early Greek writers, and occurs only in those of a later age, e.g. the Scholiasts; see Herm. ad Vig. p. 792; and comp. on the other hand Matthiae § 521 note 1 ult. Comp. moreover Evag. Aegypt. (in Clem. Rom. Ep. 2 ad Corinth. p. 116 ed. Ntlg) ὅταν ὅται τῷ τῶν ὥν. In the sense of while, ὅταν takes the subjunctive 1 Cor. 15: 27.
§ 36. Verbs; use of the particle ἀν with the three moods.

The particle ἀν is used with the indicative, subjunctive, and optative moods.*

1. With the indicative, it is employed in different constructions, viz.

a) When it is preceded by a conditional proposition with εἰ, expressed or implied, it serves to indicate that the action of the verb would have taken place under certain circumstances, but has not taken place, because those circumstances have not occurred, viz.

(1) With the imperfect it is to be rendered "I would or should do," etc. E.g. Acts 18: 14 εἰ—ην κατασκοτικὴ—ἀν εἰσέβαλων ἕμαν, i.e. I would bear with and hear you. Gal. 3: 21 εἰ—ποιεῖν τομος ὁ δυναμενος ἑξεπλησσας, οὖσαν ἐν εἰς τομον ην ἡ δικαιωσυνη, i.e. would have come by or from the law. Luke 7: 39. John 5: 46. 15: 19.—In this sense ἀν would seem to be omitted in John 8: 39; see however Griesbach in loc. and Wahl art. ἄν no. I. 1. b. See note below.

(2) With the aorist it is to be rendered, I would or should have done, etc. (Buttmann p. 519.) E.g. Matt. 11: 21 εἰ εγενότα—παλαις αυτοις τενοπησαν πα—εμειναν, i.e. they would have repeated, etc. Luke 19: 23 εἰδον αν ευν τοπη εραξατ αυτο, coming, i.e. if I had come, I should have received back, etc. John 4: 10 εἰ ηδος—αν ευσης αυτον, i.e. thou wouldst (already) have asked, etc. Schott inaccurately translates, precibus sum adres. Matt. 12: 7 εἰ εγενότα—ο紊εν αν κατεδιανεγου. Matt. 24: 43. Luke 10: 13. John 11: 32.

Note. With the two preceding rules, the following passages seem at first to be in contradiction, viz. Heb. 4: 8 εἰ — καταπαυασεν, ο紊εν αν ποιε αληθεια ει λαι ει μετα ταυτα ἡμερας, God would not have spoken, etc. but it may also be translated, God would not speak, etc. i.e. in the words there quoted from the Old Testament. — John 8: 42 εἰ ο’ θεος

When not preceded by a conditional sentence, either direct or indirect, the particle *αὐ* with the indicative serves to mark uncertainty or indefiniteness in respect to the subject of discourse.

E. g. Mark 6: 56 ὁ δὲιξεν ἢπεταυτοῦ αὐτὸν ὡς many as touched, ἔτη, however great the number. Acts 4: 35 διεδίδοτο ἐκαστῷ, καὶ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ χρεὼν ἐχειν according as one might need. Here had the writer said *ὡς ὁς τοῦ χρεὼν ἐχειν*, the sense would have been, *as every one needed,* i. e. it would have implied that the necessities of each individual had been definitely ascertained. See Herm. ad Vig. p. 319. Byttmann p. 516, 517.

2. With the subjunctive also, *αὐ* is used in different constructions, viz.:

(a) After the relative pronouns *ὁς, ὅς, ὅς, ὅς,* and the relative particles *ὅποι, ὅποι,* it corresponds to the Latin *si quis,* or to the termination *cunque* or to *cuere, coever,* annexed to pronouns and particles, and expresses *indefiniteness* in regard to the subject of discourse.

E. g. Rom. 16: 2 ἐν ὃι αὐτὸν γρηγορὶ ἄντι i. e. *in whatever thing she may perhaps need your assistance.* Mark 14: 9 ὁπου ἢπεταυτοῦ ἐκαστῷ συναγγελεῖν wherever the gospel may or shall be preached. 1 Thess. 2: 7 ὠς ὁ δὲιξεν γενεαὶ ἐκαστῇ π. τ. ἀν a nurse always, at all times whatever. Mark 8: 35, 38. Rom. 9: 15.

(b) With the aorist after particles denoting *time,* viz. *ἐκεῖσ, ἐνεκα, ὅς, ὅποι,* and designating the *futurum exactum.*

E. g. Matt. 22: 44. 2 Cor. 3: 16. Phil. 2: 23. The action here is not actual, but future and certain. See Herm. ad Vig. p. 943 f.

(c) With the particle *ὅποι,* which marks the end or purpose of the action.
§ 37. Verbs of the Imperative


Note. The passage 2 Cor. 10:9 ἵνα μὴ δοκῇ ὦς ἂν εὑροθεῖν τίματι may properly be referred to a above; and then it would signify, that I may not appear to be one, who would in any way terrify you, ὦς ἂν εὑροθεῖν τίματι. Comp. Wahl. art. ἄν no. II.

3. With the optative the particle ἄν occurs in the New Testament only after interrogative words, whether the interrogation be direct or indirect, and indicates possibility, indefiniteness, indecision, etc., in regard to the subject of the verb.


Note. Instead of ἄν we often find in the New Testament the particle εἰς, especially after relative words; e.g. Matt. 5:32. 8:19. 11:6. 14:7. al. See Hermann ad Vig. p. 835. Wahl art. εἰς no. 2.

§ 37. Verbs; use of the imperative.

1. The imperative is sometimes to be taken in a permissive sense.

E.g. Matt. 28:32 εἰς πληροφορεῖτε τοῖς μετροῖς τῶν παντῶν ὑμῶν fill ye up, i.e. ye are permitted to fill up the measure, etc. John 13:27. Matt. 3:31, 32. In Eph. 4:26 ὑπερευθείτε καὶ μὴ ὁμαρτανέτες, quoted from Ps. 4:4, the first imperative is permissive, i.e. ye are permitted to be angry, if ye be without sin.—Whether Matt. 26:45 καθευδε ὑμῖν, belongs here, is doubtful. At least I should prefer to translate with Koppe, Krebs, Knapp, etc. are ye even yet asleep? since to suppose any approach to irony is contradictory to the frame of mind in which Jesus then was; and moreover the permissive sense would be opposed to the words in v. 46 εὑροθεῖν, εὑρομεν, which Kuinoel quite arbitrarily considers as not having been spoken till sometime afterwards. See, however, Wahl art. ὑμῖν no. 3.

2. When two imperatives are connected by the copula καὶ, the first often expresses a condition on which
the action of the second depends; and then the second is put for the future.

E.g. Baruch 2:21 κλινατε των αμων και εργασοντε τω βασιλει και καθιατε επι την γην. So in New Testament John 7:52 εργασον και οδε σε αρχην and see 1. e. if thou wilt search, thou wilt see, etc. This is Hebraism, see Gees. p. 776. Stuart § 194 1. Sometimes also the copula is omitted; e.g. 1 Tim. 6:12 εγγυευοι επιλαβον.—In Luke 10:28: τουρ θησει και επεζης; the actual future is put instead of the second imperative.

Note 1. The passages 1 Cor. 15:34, Gal. 5:16, do not belong here; because in each, the two imperatives merely express the same idea by synonymous words, and are therefore to be taken in their appropriate sense.

Note 2. We find constructions like the following, viz. John 2:19 λιπατε των ναιν των ουν και εν τρισι υμειοις εγερω αυτον. James 4:7 αντιστητε χρι διαβολο και φυεται αφι νιμων. Eph. 5:14 αναιχθηνε και επισημανει αυτω την χριστο. In these cases, to be sure, we might explain the imperative as conditional, (comp. Luke 10:28 above); i.e. when or if ye resist the devil, he will flee, etc. But this hardly requires notice in a grammar, since the imperative is here employed altogether in the usual manner, and the loose connexion of the two parts of the proposition may be, and is retained, when such phrases are translated into our own language.

3. Instead of the imperative, the future is often used; especially in negative sentences with μη or ou.


For the infinitive as used instead of the imperative, see § 39.

Note. In respect to the use of the tenses of the imperative, viz. the present and aorist, the same difference obtains in the New Testament as in Greek writers; [i.e. the aorist denotes an action passing by or transient, and fixes the attention only on its completion, while the present indicates continued action, or one of which the commencement-
§ 38. Verbs; use of the infinitive.

1. After verbs which imply the expression of volition in regard to any action, e.g. verbs signifying to command, to forbid, to permit, to persuade, to entreat, to exhort, to resolve, to dissuade, to prevent, etc. the action in regard to which the volition is expressed, is often put in the infinitive; which is usually to be rendered in Latin and in our language by **ut**, **that**, with a finite verb.


Here belongs also διδομένος signifying to permit, to grant, etc. E. g. Matt. 13: 11 ὅπως δοθῶσιν γυναι. Acts 14: 3 κυρίωσι—διδομένος οὖσαν καὶ τερατά γινεθσιν δίκαιον τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ. 2 Tim. 1: 16 διὰ κυρίου ὕμνον ἔφεσον ἔλεος.

Here too may be referred 2 Cor. 10: 13 οὐ εμείσαιν ὕμνον ὁ θεός μετρον, εφεκτὸς αὐτῷ καὶ ὕμνον, since in metron meriζεων there is an implication of command.

**Note 1.** After most of these verbs we often find either **ivm**, as 1 Cor. 1: 10. Matt. 24: 21. or the accusative with an infinitive, as Eph. 3: 16. 17 ἵνα δοθῆ—κατακρίνως τὸν Χριστὸν. 4: 17 ματριφυσομεν μυθιμεν ὕμνον. This latter construction is the common one after καλέων, ...So also we find τοῦ before the infin. Acts 21: 12 παρακαλοὺ
2. In a similar manner, the infinitive is put after nouns and adjectives signifying power, capability, adaptability, worth, etc.


Note: A different case is Luke 2:1 εγενετο δογμα — (το) ἀπογραφθαι πασαν την οἰκουμενην, where the latter clause is in apposition with δογμα. — Sometimes also in the above construction, the article του occurs before the infinitive in such a way as properly to convert it into a noun in the genitive; e.g. Phil. 3:21 κατα την ενεργησιν του δυνασται. (§ 12. 6. b.)

3. After verbs which express motion of any sort, choice, desire, and the like, the infinitive is employed to express the design or object, in reference to which the action of the preceding verb is exerted; and is put either with or without του before it.

(a) With του. E.g. Luke 5:1 εγενετο εν τοι τον οχλον επικενσαθαι αυτοι τον ακουειν τον λόγον. 24:29 εισηλθε του μεναι σου αυτοις. 4:42 και τε ουν αυτοι του μη πορευεσθαι απ' αυτον. Acts 20:30 και σημειοναι αερας ολοντες δεσπομενη του αποσπασθην ποις μαθητες ουτωι αυτων. 3:2 ων εμεθυν προς την θυραν του λεγου — του αι-
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Note 1. Sometimes an accusative stands with the infinitive after these verbs; e. g. Eph. 1: 4 καθος εξελεξατο ημας—ειται ημας αγιοις. So also with τοῦ; e. g. Luke 2: 27 εν τη εισεγαγεν τους γονεας το παιδιον, του ποιησαι αυτοις κατα το εισιμενον.

Note 2. This use of the infinitive, with or without τοῦ, is exhibited by Luke and Paul in a still wider extent, and occurs after other verbs in the sense of so that, in order that, in such a manner that. E. g. Luke 24: 16 οι δε αφθαλων αυτον εκβαλουντο, του με επιγνωναι αντρυν. 21: 22 ομηραι εκδικησωσαι αυται εσι, του πληθυναι παντα τη γεγραμενα. Rom. 1: 24 παρεδουκεν αυτους ο θεος—εις ακαθαρσιαν, του αιτιμαζοσαι τα σωματα αυτων εν έκαται.—Here also belongs Col. 4: 6, though it may be considered as peculiar, ο λογος ύμων παντοτε εν χαιρει—ειδεναι, πως δει ύμας ενι εκαστην αποκρινεσθαι, i. e. so that ye may consider or know; [where perhaps we may more properly supply εητε; see no. 6. b. R.]

[Note 3. The above use of τοῦ before the infinitive, seems to be in some respects sui generis. Instances somewhat similar occur, however, in the Greek writers; e. g. Thuc. I. 23 του μη τινας ζητησαι τονε πα δε quin abhincando requirat. II. 4 et 22. Xen. Cyr. I. 3. 9. V. 1. 25. Sophoc. Philoct. 197. Dionys. Hal. Ant. I. p. 41. These are usually resolved by supposing ενεκα or some like word to be omitted, which in other cases is expressed; e. g. Thuc. I. 45 του μη λυνεν ενεκα και for dura fragrent. Xen. Hiero IV. 3 ύπερ του—αποθυσκεν. Isocr. Areop. p. 152 D. See Bos Ellips. Gr. p. 708 ed. Schaefer. Matthiae § 539. In this way Michaelis would solve the construction in Matt. 13: 3 εγηλθεν ο σπειρων (ενεκα) του σπειρειν; see Bos p. 709. The principle might apply in this and perhaps most instances; comp. 2 Cor. 7: 12. E.g. these are other cases where it is totally inapplicable; e. g.
4. Verbs which imply oral expression, as verbs signifying to say, to affirm, to mention, to deny, etc. and also verbs signifying to hope or expect, to consider, to regard, to hold for any thing, take after them exclusively either ὅτε or the infinitive with an accusative. (Matthews § 533.)


Of verbs of fearing, etc. only κινδυνεῖν is construed with the infinitive; the others taking after them the subjunctive with a negative. E. g. Acts 19: 27 κινδυνεῖται ἧμιν ὃς μερος ἐγὼ ἀπελέγχειν εἶδον. 19: 40 κινδυνεύομεν ερμαίαν ὑπάρχουσιν ἀπεισαίεσθαι. On the other hand, Acts 27: 17 φοβοῦμεν ὑμᾶς—ἐπιστούνειν. 27: 29. 2 Cor. 11: 3. 12: 20. Gal. 4: 11.

Note 1. Seldom or never does τοῦ occur before the infinitive in this construction. In 1 Cor. 2: 2 some read ὅτι γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ εὐθεῖα τε, while others omit τοῦ.

Note 2. Examples of the nominative before the infinitive in this construction, in sentences where the subject of the main and dependent

The infinitive is often preceded by the article and a preposition, and is then to be translated by an appropriate particle, and finite verb. This is common to the Greeks and Hebrews.


(b) With προς, Heb. προς, that, so that, Matt. 5: 28. 6: 1. That, in order that, 2 Cor. 3: 13. So προς το μη, that not, lest, 1 Thess. 2: 9.


(e) With εις, that, so that, 2 Cor. 7: 3. 8: 6. That, in order that, 1 Cor. 10: 6. Phil. 1: 9.

(f) With dia, because, on account of, Phil. 1: 7. Acts 8: 11.

Note. Instead of εις with the infinitive we find once the dative τῷ, 1 Thess. 3: 3 τῷ μηδενα σαρασθαι, where two preceding infinitives have εις; see however Griesbach in loc.—So in 2 Cor. 2: 12 we find τῷ before the infinitive in the sense of dia above, i.e. because, on account of; see § 12. 6. c.

6. The infinitive stands also after the particles προς and ὥστε.


Note. Both these particles are also construed with finite moods, viz.

(a) Ὑπερ, with the subjunctive, Luke 2: 26 τον ευτυχεσσαρουντον, μη εἰδεν θαμαται προς η ημι τον Χριστουν. 22: 34 ου μη χρησιαται αλεξωρ, προς τη απαρανην μη ειδεναι με.—With the optative, Acts 25: 16 ουκ εστιν εδος Ρωμαιους χαριςδαι ειναι ανθρωπον εις απολειαν, προς η η κατηγοριουντος.—εχει τους κατηγορους; see Vigerus p. 442, where Hermann adjoins, 'si res narratur, ut cogitatio aliendarum.'

(b) 'Ὅστε with a past tense of the indicative, Gal. 2: 13 ὥστε Βαρ-
The infinitive sometimes stands for the imperative, as it also does among the Greek writers, especially the poets, and sometimes also in Hebrew. (Matthiae § 544.)

E. g. Luke 9: 3 κείτων ἐκεῖν, where the preceding clause has εἰσε-πε. 2 Cor. 9: 10 ἐφευρεύσας καὶ πληθυναὶ τὸν σπόρον ύμων—καὶ αὐθε-ναί. Rom. 12: 15 καὶ μείνα—κλαίειν, where εἰσέρχεσθαι precedes. In all these cases, however, we may perhaps supply δει, which is often omitted, e. g. Xen. Venat. V. 15. This is undoubtedly the case in Phil. 3: 16 τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν κανονὶ. Wahl also refers here (Lex. art. καλεῖν) the passage in Acts 23: 22 παραγγείλας μηδενι εκλαίησαι, which I should rather assign to no. 1 above.

Note 1. It would sometimes appear as if the infinitive active was put for the infinitive passive; e. g. 1 Thess. 4: 9 περὶ τῆς φιλαδελφί-ας οὐ κρείτεν ἐχετε γραφέων ύμῖν, comp. 5: 1 where it is οὐ κρείτεν ἐχετε ύμῖν γραφεσθαι; but in the former case the phrase is elliptical, for ὑμᾶς γραφεῖν or the like. Here also may be referred Heb. 5: 11: 6-6.

Note 2. Instead of the infinitive, we sometimes find a verbal noun with εἰς or προς, especially in the writings of Paul. E. g. Eph. 4: 12 προς τὸν καταφέρον τῶν ἁγίων εἰς εργον διακονιας. 2 Cor. 4: 6 προς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δοξῆς τοῦ θεοῦ. Heb. 11: 11 εἰς κα-ταβολὴν σπερματος, comp. Wahl art. καταβολὴ.

Note 3. A construction corresponding to the Hebrew infinitive absolute occurs Rev. 2: 23 αποκείμεθα εὖ θανατῷ; comp. πατρὶ γιν. Other modes in which the Seventy express the same idea see above p. 34. and below § 39. 3.

8. In all the constructions where the infinitive is dependent on a verb or noun, it is put sometimes in the aorist and sometimes in the present; but always in ac-
cordance with a well defined distinction in the nature of these tenses.

(a) The aorist of the infinitive is employed in the following cases, viz.

(1) In narrations, after a past tense on which it is dependent. E.g.: Mark 2: 4 μὴ δυναμενοι προσεγγισαι αυτο — απεστεγασαν. 5: 3 ουδεις ηνυνατο αυτον δησαι. Luke 18: 13 ουκ ηθελεν ουδε τους οφθαλμους εις τον ουρανον επαρει. John 6: 21 ηθελεν λαβειν αυτον εις το πλοιον. 1 Thess. 2: 2. al. In this construction there is nothing anomalous; comp. Thuc. V. 25 απεφρόντη μη επε την ειματερον χωραν στρατευσαι.


(3) Where an action is in itself continued, but the writer does not fix the attention on it as such, but merely on the fact of its occurrence. E.g. John 10: 16 καπεινα (προβατα) με δεις αγαγειν. Matt. 5: 14 ου δυναται πολες προβηναι επανοιρησαι ορος περιπεμενη, where the act of concealing is designated, not the remaining so. Luke 17: 25 δει αυτον πολλα παθειν. 19: 5 δεις με μειναι, where merely the fact of his taking up his residence for the day, is denoted. 14: 28 Θελων πυρον οικοδομησαι. 20: 22 εξετο Καισαρι φορον δουναι. John 5: 44 πως δυνασθε ιμας πιστευσαι, i.e. how can ye yield belief; see John 14: 17.

§ 39. Verbs; use of participles.

(δ) The present of the infinitive is used as follows, viz.

(1) To denote an action, which either in itself or in its consequences, is continued. E. g. John 9: 4 μεν δει εργαζεσθαι τα εργα του πεμφαν-

τος με. 7: 17 ει τις θελη το θελημα αυτου ποιειν. 16: 12 ων δυνα-

οθε βασταζειν αρσε. Luke 16: 13 ουδεις οικετης δυνατως δυσι κυρι-


(2) Where an action in itself is momentary or transient, but this cir-

cumstance is not the object of notice; the attention being fixed simply


[Note 1. By comparing the cases in which the aorist or present of

the infinitive is used, as above laid down, by Winer, it will be seen that

in some instances the only assignable difference lies in the mode of ex-

pressing the rule, rather than in the thing itself; comp. a. 3. and b. 2. R]

Note 2. Afer μελεων the infinitive is found not only in the aorist

and present, but also in the future; e. g. Acts 24: 15 αναστασιν μελ-


Plat. Rep. VI. p. 78. VIII. 231. Apol. 6.—The use of the infinitive

aorist after μελεων is rejected by some of the ancient grammarians, as

contrary to good Greek usage. So Phrynicus p. 336 αυριοτηρ χρονο-

το ε μελεων ου συναπτουσιν οι Αθηναοι, αλλ ητοι ενεπειται η

μελουμε; but see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 745 ff. where he produces ma-


143 μελουμεν η η σαι μεχρι της συνελευς του αιωνος, τοσε μελω-

ουν απο σαληναι παρα Θεου.

§ 39. Verbs; use of participles.

1. After many verbs, the object of which includes

the idea of action that might be designated by a verb,

this latter action is expressed by a participle instead

of the infinitive mood. This idiom is very general.

E. g. In the Greek writers, Xen. Mem. II. 4. 1 ημοσσα δε ποτε αυ-

τον—διαλεγομενον. II. 2. 1 αισθομενος δε ποτε Λαμπραρια προς

την μητερα χαλεπαινοντα. See Matthiae § 547 ff.
In the New Testament, besides verbs of sense, this construction occurs with the following verbs, viz.

\textit{Apologeten.} Luke 7: 45 ευ οι διελε παταρίλουσα μοι τας ποδας.


\textit{Κύριοοίννει.} Matt. 1: 15 ευρήκη εν γατες εσχοια.

\textit{Αμαθανείς.} Heb. 13: 2 ελαθον εινες ξενιατες; see below in § 47. 2.


\textit{Θείεν.} Matt. 11: 1 ησ εις εγεν ο ημιος διατασαν.

\textit{Θερειν.} 2 Pet. 2: 10 ου τροφον τουτος βλασφημουντες.

In a similar construction we also find \textit{μαθανείν}, 1 Tim. 5: 13 \textit{μαθανουσε} περιστομενα τας οικειας.

See on the whole subject, Matthiae § 547 ff.

2. Participles are often construed with some tense of the verb \textit{εισαι}, and then form with it a periphrasis for the same tense of their own verbs. This also often occurs in Hebrew and classic Greek; but still more frequently in the Aramaean dialect.


Note. We must not refer here all the cases where a participle is connected with \textit{εισαι}; for sometimes the idea of \textit{εισαι} is to be taken independently, and then the participle stands for an adjective; e. g. Luke 7: 8 εις ανθρωπος ειμι—τασσομενος. 9: 45 \eta παρακεκλημενον απ αυτων. Mark 5: 5. 14: 49 κατ ημεραν ημιν προι υμας—διδασκων \textit{I was daily with you}—teaching.

3. A participle in some instances stands in connexion with a finite tense of its own verb; and is then sometimes intensive, and sometimes not. In this con-
struction it corresponds to the Hebrew infinitive absolute.

E. g. Heb. 6: 14 εὐλογον εὐλογησαν σε, καὶ πληθυναν πληθυνω σε. Acts 7: 34 ιδον ιδον. This construction occurs elsewhere only in the Septuagint, from which the preceding examples are direct quotations; see Gen. 22: 17. Ex. 3: 7.

Another mode of expressing the Heb. inf. absol. see above in § 38. 7 note 3.

4. Sometimes participles are connected with verbs from which they differ in signification, and of course are to be rendered independently of them.

E. g. Col. 1: 3 ευχαριστουμεν—προευχαριστούμενοι—απόστασες, i. e. we bless God in our prayers for you, because we have heard, etc. Luke 5: 12, 19. 10: 30.

5. The writers of the New Testament often carry forward a construction by means of participles, where finite verbs might more regularly be employed; especially when the idea expressed by the participle is collateral with that of the preceding verb.

E. g. Rom. 5: 11 σωθησομεθα—ον μονον δε, αλλα και καυχημενοι i. e. καυχημεθα. 2 Pet. 2: 1 οινιες παρεισαγουσα—αρνομενοι—επαγοντες έαντοις ταχυνην απωλειαν. 2 Cor. 4: 13, 14.—In Mark 12: 5 και πολλους αλλος, τους μεν δεροτες, τους δε αποπεποιιντες, I should prefer to supply απεπεπηνων after πολλους αλλος, and then the following participles would retain their appropriate character. For other modes of interpretation, see Kuinoel in loc.

Note 1. This mode of construction is a favourite one with Luke and Paul; and the latter especially often arranges participle after participle; e. g. 1 Thess. 2: 14 ff. 2 Tim. 1: 9, 10. Tit. 2: 12, 13. 2 Cor. 4: 7—10.

Note 2. On the other hand, two finite verbs are sometimes so connected, that the first one is to be taken as a participle; e. g. Matt. 16: 21 δικαιος άμαρτησε εις εμε δε αδηλος μου, και αφησας αυτον, i. e. άμαρτησας αδηλω. 17: 20 ερετε τον ορει τουτο—και μεταβησε.
§ 89. VERBS: USE OF PARTICIPLES:

6. It has been asserted by most grammarians and interpreters, that in the New Testament and Septuagint the participle of the present tense is used at pleasure for that of any other tense, and often expresses either a past or a future action; see Haab p. 86. Such is indeed the case with the Hebrew participle, which is employed indiscriminately for all tenses; see Gesen. p. 790. Stuart § 203. But in respect to the present participle of the New Testament, the above assertion must not be received without great limitation. The examples usually quoted in support of it are, partly, altogether inapposite, the participle being used simply in a present sense, or (in a narration) in the sense of the imperfect; and, partly, they are the result of neglecting nice distinctions in regard to tense, a fact which is common in all languages, and is therefore by no means to be classed as a Hebraism. In support of these positions I adduce the following examples, viz.

(a) The present participle has the proper sense of the present, E.g. James 5: 11 μακραγιζομεν τους ὑπομνοντας, i.e. not, who have endured, but those who still endure. Rom. 4: 4 τω εργαζομενω δ μεθοδοιον λογιζεται κατα χαριν, i.e. one who fulfils all the ἐργον required by the law. Gal. 6: 13 οι πεπραγμενοι, i.e. those who practise circumcision. Eph. 4: 28 ο μελετων he who steals, a thief. Heb. 11: 21 ομοιωθεναι αποθνησκων, i.e. the dying Jacob. James 3: 6 φλογιζομενη ὑπο της γεννης is itself kindled from hell.

(b) It takes in narrations the sense of the imperfect. E.g. Acts 21: 16 συνηλθον—αγοντες. Matt. 14: 21 οι συναγωνισται ησαν ανδρες. Rev. 15: 1, 6, ενον αγγελους ἐπεκεκληται, εχοντας πληγας, where the succeeding clause in v. 7 εδυναμως ἐπεκα αγγελους, limits the time to the past.

(c) It is sometimes used for the future, as in all languages, [and then may properly be referred to the principle stated in § 34. 2. a.] E.g. Acts 21: 3 ην—αποφοριζόμενον, i.e. we sailed to Tyre, for there the ship was about to discharge her cargo, which in relation to the sailing to Tyre, was yet future. 2 Pet. 3: 11 τουτων παντων λυομενων since dissolution awaits all things. 2: 4 παρεδωκεν εις κρισιν τηρουμενων ἐχθρίων futuro usuervandos. v. 9. Acts 15: 27 απεσταλμένοι λουθαν μεν Δικαιωματι—απογελουται nunciaturus, i.e. in order to declare, alega- 

[Further text continues with natural representation of the content.]
§ 40. Verbs; construction of the predicate, etc.

verbs. Similar constructions frequently occur in the Greek writers; see Zeune ad Viger. p. 344.—To this head we might also refer the following passages, viz. Matt. 26: 29 αἶμα εκχυμομενον. Luke 22: 19 διδομενον. 1 Cor. 11: 24 σῶμα—κλωμενον. Here, however, the participles would seem to signify not so properly effundendum, frangendum, etc. as effusum, fractum, etc. in a past sense; since they refer rather to the bread and wine, which are the emblems of and imply the body of Jesus already broken and his blood already shed; and the partaking of them carried the disciples forward, in anticipation, to a time subsequent to the death of Jesus.

Note 1. This indefinite use of the present participle occurs frequently in the case of ὁν from εἶναι, which often stands in place of ὅς ἦν; e. g. John 1: 18. 3: 13. 9: 25. It must not be forgotten, however, that εἶναι has no past participle.

Note 2. A construction altogether different from the above, is that of the perfect participle in the sense of the Latin participle in duc; e. g. Gal. 2: 11 κατεχωμενος ἦν, visuperandus, reprehensione digans. Rev. 21: 8 ἐξελευμένος abominandi, detestandi. This is Hebraism; Gesen. p. 791. Stuart § 203. 3 note 2. though the Greek is not wholly wanting in similar examples. To this rule Haab (p. 90) most strangely refers the substantive νεκρος, Eph. 2: 1.

Note 3. I might here notice the singular error which Haab has committed (p. 86) in extending the above canon, which at most is but partially true, even to the use of nouns! Thus, he would translate Matt. 10: 3 γελανεν the former collector. Eph. 6: 12 ἐπουρανους formerly celestial. Luke 9: 60 τους νεκρους those who are to die, who are mortal. This, however, has been already sufficiently reprehended by Schulz, Theol. Annal. 1816. p. 869 ff. and by De Wette, A. L. Zeit. 1816. no. 40. p. 317.

§ 40. Verbs; construction of the predicate with the subject.

1. From the general rule, which is current in all languages, that the predicate must agree with the subject in number and gender, there are some exceptions which constantly occur even in the best Greek writers. In the New Testament, the following instances are of this character.
2. In respect to number, collective and abstract nouns of the singular, often have the predicate in the plural.


Here also properly belongs 1 Tim. 2: 15 σῳδηστασ. (γυνῆ) διὰ τὴς τεκνοφορίας, καὶ μεγαλοφ. εἰς πίστει καὶ αγάπῃ, see Heilrichs Wegscheider, and Stolz in loc. Others, as Schott, would incorrectly refer μεγαλοφ. to a nominative τεκνα, which must then be supplied out of the word τεκνοφορίας.

3. In respect to gender, a noun in the masculine or feminine has sometimes connected with it in the predicate, an adjective in the neuter gender; in which case the adjective includes the idea of thing, something, etc.


4. Where a predicate is connected with two or more subjects, it is construed as follows, viz.

(a) If the predicate be placed first, and the nearest subject be in the singular, the predicate is put in the singular.


(b) When the predicate follows the subjects, it is put in the plural.

(a) When the subjects are of different genders, i.e. masculine and feminine, the predicate is put in the masculine.


Note. From the general rule that a neuter plural takes a verb in the singular, there are in the New Testament several exceptions; e. g. Matt. 12: 21. Luke 24: 11. John 10: 8. Rev. 11: 18. 16: 20. See also John 10: 27, 28. 2 Pet. 3: 10, where a neuter plural is construed with verbs both singular and plural. Moreover, in some of these examples, (Luke 24: 11. 2 Pet. 3: 10. Rev. 16: 20.) there is a neglect of the rule which Porson has laid down, viz. that the verb, in such cases, is put in the plural, only when the noun implies things which have life. See Porson, Addenda ad Eurip. Hec. 1149. Comp. Herm. ad Vig. p. 739. Fischer ad Well. III. pt. I. p. 342 ff. Matthiae § 299, Segar ad Luc. p. 243.

§ 41. Verbs; impersonal verbs.

1. Impersonal verbs, or rather verbs with indefinite nominatives, are often expressed in the New Testament, by the third person plural.


2. The use of the third person singular may, perhaps, sometimes be referred in the New Testament to the same idiom; which is also common in Hebrew and Aramaean.

E. g. [The frequent use of ἐστιν εἰσερέθη in the beginning of a sentence, etc. is always impersonal, and corresponds to the Heb. ידוע. R.] As instances of verbs with an indefinite nominative, we have John 7: 51 μὴ δὲ νομος πρίνει τον ανέθρωπον, εαν μὴ ακούσῃ πάρ αυτον προτερον κ.τ.λ. before one has heard, i.e. before he has been heard, etc. 2 Cor. 10: 10 ὅτι αἱ μεν εἰσερέθησαν, γὰρ σὺ, βασιλέα, κ.τ.λ. one says, i.e. it is said. Comp. Gesen. p. 797. Stuart § 190. 2.
On the other hand, the passage in 1 John 5:16, αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἴσην ὄντως ὁ θεός ὁ θεὸς does not belong here, since it should be translated 

<he> shall ask and he (God) will give him life; God being here the principal subject, see v. 14, 15. Or it may be rendered, with Schott and Stok, he shall ask and shall thereby obtain for himself life, etc. So the forms of quotation, e. g. λέγει Heb. 1:7. 2 Cor. 6:2. Gal. 3:16 at. γὰρ Heb. 8:5. μαρτυρεῖ Heb. 7:17. seem to me to be mere cases of ellipse, for λέγει o' θεος, το πνευμα, η γραφη, etc. as in 1 Tim. 5:18; see in δ. 53. 3. The passages in Rom. 7:1. 15. 10. Mark 15:36. which Haab (p. 288 ff.) would bring under this rule, are entirely of a different character.

Note. As connected with this subject of indefinite nominatives some have supposed that constructions occur in the New Testament, corresponding to the Hebrew. Both essentiae, or πάντα before the subject or predicate of a verb; see Gesen. p. 838. Stuart δ. 210. 5. E.g. Mark 5:25 γυνὴ τεκνοφόρη ἐν φύτει, αἰματος, and Rev. 1:10 ηγεμόνι ἐν παραβασιν ἐν τῷ εὐφρατει ἡμῖν. Glass, I. p. 31. Eph. 5:9 ὁ κρυπτὸν τιν οὖσα ἐν πατρὶ ἐξουσιωδον. Hartmann Linguist. Einl. p. 384. John 9:30 ἐν τούτῳ διανοαστε ἐστιν; Schleusner art. ἐστιν. But in the first example, ἐστιν ἐν φύσεω is simply to be in a certain state; and in the second, γνωσθαι ὑπεραμπαρετι is to be present any where in spirit or mentally, [or rather spiritus abrumen esse, see Jaspis in loc. R.] and the third, (οὐκεπτο) ἐστιν means contains, potest esse in; while the last, ἐν παραβασι may surely be rendered herein, in respect to this; see Wahl art. ἐστιν no. 4. b. It is doubtful, moreover, whether this construction ever occurs in Greek or Latin writers, as Gesenius would seem to suppose; since in the passages which he quotes from Euripides and Cic., etc. viz., ἐστιν ἐν σοφος and ἐν μεγάει viris habendum esse, the connexion is altogether natural and common, and expresses simply to belong to the number of, etc. In order that in these cases ἐστιν and ἐστιν should really correspond to the Beth essentiae, it should be ἐν σοφος, i. e. αὐτός ἡμῶν, as in Ex. 32:22 ὁ λαὸς ἡ λαῷ they are evil. Hos. 13:9 ἐστιν for ἐστιν. Ps. 68:5 τὸ ἐστιν Ἰηβωθ ἐν τὸ ἐστιν; Jehovah is his name; for it is such cases only that belong to this construction; since in passages like Ps. 118:7 ἐστιν Ἰηβωθ ἐστιν, there is merely a resemblance to it.

After these remarks, the instances which Haab (p. 337 ff.) adduces, are evidently inadmissible; for in 1 Tim. 2:14 γυνὴ παραβάσις ἐν παραβασισιν, οὐκοῦμ, can we say that ἐν παραβασισιν is equivalent to παραβασισιν? So in Matt. 5:37. το παραβάσισιν ἐν τον παραβασιν ἐστιν, the ex
can surely not be reckoned as corresponding to the Heb. 2; but the phrase εκ του πονηρου is to be taken as the common periphrasis for an adjective, i.e. πονηρος (§ 46. 3. Wahl in εκ no. 4.) since the neuter το πονηρο is here a substantive, i.e. το πανος, i.e. evil in general; though so far as the sense is concerned, it might also have been written εκ πονηρου without the article.

§ 42. Verbs; construction of composite verbs.

In respect to verbs compounded with prepositions, we can here properly treat only of those, in which the signification of the preposition is neither lost nor amalgamated with that of the verb, so as to form with it one general idea. Where the preposition thus retains a kind of independent meaning, besides the case of the object which the simple verb governs (if transitive), another noun is often connected with such verbs, and governed by the same preposition that is compounded with the verb, or by a similar one. In such cases we find three modes of construction, viz.

1. The preposition which is prefixed to the verb, is repeated before the following noun.

E.g. Matt. 7: 23 αποχωρετε απ' εμων. Heb. 3: 16 οι εξελθοντες εξ Αδωνιπου. This occurs most frequently with verbs compounded with απο, εις, εκ, επι, προς; compare απερχεσθαι, απεχεν, αποκρυπτειν, αποκαλον, αποστρεφειν, αποκριθειν, αφαιρειν, αφωνηται, αφωνειν, εισερχοθαι, εισπεριν, εισπορευεσθαι, εισφερειν, εκπορευεσθαι, εκ-χωριζειν, εξαγειν, εξαφανειν, εξερχοθαι, επιβαλλειν, επιβιβαζειν, επι-πετειν, επιστρεφειν, προπορευειν, προποτειν, etc. Less frequently does it occur with compounds from εν, see ενοικειν; or with δια, see διαπορευεσθαι.

2. Instead of repeating the same preposition, another one of a similar signification is sometimes employed.

E.g. After verbs compounded with ανα we find εις; see αναβλε-πειν, ανακριπτειν, αναγειν, αναφερειν, ανασπον. After compounds with προς we find εις, see προσκυλειν; and vice versa, after εις we find προς, see εισπορευεσθαι; both of these occur very seldom. [So after εκ we sometimes find πος, see εκβαλλειν Matt. 7: 4; and after
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ṣυν we find μετα, see συλλαβω. Matt. 17:3. οὐκεπεμψάω 2 Cor. 8. 18. R.

3. Sometimes the noun is connected with the verb without the intervention of another preposition; and is then put in that case, which in its nature corresponds to the signification of the compound verb.

E. g. The dative is put after verbs compounded with ἐν, πρὸς, and συν, which is in accordance with the common rule. The genitive is put after verbs compounded with αὐτό, e. g. ἀπολύειν, ἀποκαλέω, etc.

Note. Which of these constructions, in the case of particular verbs, is the most regular, can be learned only by attention to the usage of language. In some verbs are found two, or even all three of the above constructions; comp. above and see ἐπιβάλλων. It must not, however, be overlooked, that with different verbs, particular constructions sometimes become fixed idioms. Thus no one would regard it as indifferent whether in the compounds with ἐν, the following noun should be construed with ἐν or πρὸς. [But we find in Acts 17:2 ἐγνάθε πρὸς αὐτοὺς. The almost universal construction, however, is with ἐν. R.] So ἐπιπέτω, both in its proper and metaphorical sense, usually takes a simple genitive; e. g. Acts 12:7. Gal. 5:4. 2 Pet. 3:17. For ἀποτρεπθῶς ἀπὸ τινὸς v. τινα, see § 25. 3. c.*

* Something relative to this subject may be found in the following work, viz. C. F. Fritzsche. Fischers und Paulus Bemerk. über das Bedeutungswerte der griech. Präp. in den daraus zusammengesetzten Verben nebeneinander gestellt und bewiesen, Lpz. 1819.
SYNTAX OF PARTICLES.

§ 43. Of the prepositions in general.*

1. Prepositions may be properly termed particles of relation; since they serve to express the relation which exists between the idea of one verb or noun, and that of another noun. Hence they govern the cases of nouns, etc. and always require that case, of which the fundamental signification accords with that of the preposition.

Thus the Greeks said εν της πόλεως, because the genitive is used to express that from which any thing proceeds or emanates; which in this instance is still more definitely marked by the preposition εν. So on the other hand, they said προς το ονόμα, because the accusative implies that towards which anything approaches or tends, which is here rendered, as it were, still more palpable by the preposition προς.

2. The Greek prepositions, according as their significations are more or less extensive and varied, are connected, some with only one case, viz. αντι, απο, εκ, προ, εν, συν, εις; others with two cases, viz. ανα, δια, παρα, προς, ενεργ.; and others with three cases, viz. αμφι, επι, μετα, παρα, περι, προς, υπο.

* For general remarks on the subject of the Greek prepositions, see Hermann De emend. rat. gram. Graec. p. 161—163. B. G. Weiske De præposit. Graec. Commentat. 1809. The view which Matthiae (i 572 ff.) has given of the prepositions, is not free from the charge of being too superficial and unphilosophical. It cannot be expected that I should here exhaust a subject so extensive. My object is merely to present a sketch; while the detail falls to the province of the lexicon. [Wahl has also quite recently published, as a supplement to his lexicon, a work on the use of the prepositions in the New Testament, which however has not yet reached this country. Tr.]
§ 43 b. Prepositions with the Genitive.

It will be our object to ascertain, with constant reference to the New Testament, the original and fundamental meaning of each preposition; and, as connected with this, the reason why it is employed with this or that particular case. We are the more induced to this course, because the latter topic has hitherto been touched by no biblical philologist; while the former has been treated of by the lexicographers of the New Testament, and even by those of the greatest note, without any regard to method or system.*

§ 43 b. Prepositions governing the genitive.

1. *Ante* denotes that one object is exchanged for another, is given instead of it, comes in its place, etc. Consequently it takes the genitive, because this case expresses the idea of removal out of a place, abstraction, etc. E. g. Heb. 12: 16 ὃς ἀντὶ βρωσεν μιας απεδω τὸ τὰ πρωτοτοκία αὐτὸν. Matt. 5: 38 οφθαλμός ἀντὶ οφθαλμον. 20: 28 τοῦ διώκει τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ λυτρον ἀντὶ πολλον. 2: 22 Ἀρχάγγελος βασιλεὺς ἀντὶ Ἡρωδου. So also John 1: 16 ἐλαβομεν—χαριν ἀντὶ χαρας φαβων ὑπὸ φαβορ; literally favour in the place of favour, i.e. one favour after another, uninterrupted grace; comp. Theogn. Sent. 344 ἀντὶ αἰῶνοι αἰῶνας.

2. ἀπὸ, ἐκ, παρὰ, and ὑπὸ, all express the same general idea as the genitive, viz. that of one object proceeding or emanating from another object. There however exists among them a well grounded distinction, inasmuch as the connexion which may be conceived to have before existed between the two objects, may be nearer or more remote, intimate or general. The most intimate previous connexion is un-

* It has long been matter of loud complaint, that the particles are exhibited in the lexicon of Schleusner, in a manner so entirely unphilosophical. The remark applies with particular force to the prepositions, whose significations Schleusner has multiplied without measure or limit; e. g. ἀπὸ is exhibited as having 19 different meanings; ἐπὶ with 25 in all; ἐν with 52 in all, which involuntarily reminds one of Noldit Concordant. part. Heb. In part, also, the meanings which Schlesner assigns are false and contradictory; e. g. he makes ἀπὸ to signify in; ἐκ, ad; ἐν, ex; πρὸς with the accus. in.—On the other hand, it is deserving of particular notice and acknowledgement, that Wahl in his lexicon has bestowed on the particles an attention so discriminating, and so highly successful in its results.—Among the lexicographers of the Greek language at large, Passow has distinguished himself in this department.
doubtlessly indicated by *ἐκ*; a less intimate one by *υπὸ* and *ἐπί*; and a more remote one by, *παρὰ*. That these prepositions, at least *ἀνω* and *ἐκ*, and also *ἐπί*, *υπὸ*, *παρὰ*, should be interchanged with one another, arises from the fact, that this previous connexion is, in different circumstances, an object of a more or less distinct perception. We will now consider each in particular.

(a) *Παρὰ* is properly used in reference to an object which comes from the near vicinity, neighbourhood, etc. of another. E.g. Mark 14: 43 *λογίας παραγινέται καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ οἶχος πολὺς—παρὰ τῶν ἀρτοτροφίων*, i.e. from the place where the chief priests were. 12: 2 *ινα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λαβῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ that he might receive a portion of the produce of the vineyard from the keepers, viz. which the keepers of the vineyard had in their charge. In connexion with this, is the case where *παρὰ* stands after verbs of *searching for*, *investigating*, *inquiring*, etc. Matt. 2: 4, 7. Mark 8: 11. Acts 24: 8.—Not unfrequently, also, *παρὰ* indicates the *source* or *efficient cause* of any thing; e.g. Acts 22: 30 *καθηγορεῖται παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*; but that in such cases it marks only the *action*, and does not imply *design*, *purpose*, etc. cannot be shewn, at least from any example in the New Testament. See below in *ὑπὸ*.

Note. That *παρὰ* in prose is usually connected only with words which imply animated existence, is a remark which is generally true, and receives confirmation also from the New Testament. Comp. Matthiae § 588. Vigerus p. 580.

(b) *Ἐκ* in its original meaning is employed only in reference to such objects as proceed from the interior of another object, or from the most intimate connexion with it. E.g. Rom. 7: 24 *τις μὲ ἐγνεκτικὸν ἐκ τοῦ σωμάτως τοῦ θανατοῦ τουτού*. Matt. 8: 28 *ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἐξερχομένων*. Luke 11: 49 *ἐκ αὐτῶν ἀποκεννοῦσιν*.—It is used in a less accurate sense, when it marks the *source*, *origin*, *cause*, *material*, etc. E.g. John 6: 65 *ἐὰν μὴ ὁ δεδομένων αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μου*. Matt. 1: 18 *ἐν γαστρὶ εξοσάκει ἐκ πνεύματος ὁγίου*, though there is here an imitation of the expression *ἐν γαστρὶ ἐγείρει ἐκ αὐτοῦ*, *ἐν αὐτοίς*, where *ἐκ* is used in its proper sense. So also when it is used in reference to a period of time; e.g. Acts 9: 33 *ἀνθρώπων—ἐξ ἐτῶν ὑπὸ κατακεκλημένων ἐπὶ κρασβασι-σῴρ*. Matt. 19: 12. Acts 24: 10.—The significations *ad*, *in*, *cum*, which Schleusner assigns to this preposition, are entirely inadmissible. In support of the first he adduces Matt. 20: 21 *ἰνα καθιστώσιν—ἐῖς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου*, i.e. as he says *ad dextram*; but the Latin expression is
also "under", and correctly: since in a designation, like this, of relative place, the mind may pass from one object to the other in either direction. In 2 Cor. 2:4 en κάθες θλίψεως ἐκκίνησε ἡμᾶς, which Schleusner translates in multa afflictiones constitutas, he is undoubtedly right as to the mere sense; but does en therefore mean in? The language implies simply that the apostle wrote to them out of the state of deep distress, etc. in which he was placed, [as the English version has correctly rendered it.] Syr. Δ διὰ πάντων ἐρμηνεύεται ἄπειρως. As to Luke 14:13, where also Schleusner would make εἰς the same as er by comparing Matt. 7:11, the attentive reader will need no further illustration. Finally, where εἰς is translated by own, as 1 Tim. 1:5 εὑραμένων εἰς ἄνθρωπος παράδειγμα, the sense evidently is, love (proceeding) out of a pure heart.

(c) "Thro is used in its original meaning, in reference to an object which comes from the unter part of another object; E. g. Hesiod. Theog. 669 Ζεὺς — ὑπὸ γαθονος ἦς κ. ἡ. In its common use it is connected with passive verbs, in order to mark the subject from which the action proceeds, or in whose power it was that the action should or should not take place; e. g. Matt. 1:22. 2:16 Rom. 13:1. — It is evident that ὑπὸ implies more than παρά, or even ἀπό, since it always expresses efficiency in connexion with design, purpose, etc. while with παρά it often remains undetermined whether or not the action is the result of design, etc. There is a difference of meaning in the phrases διδακεσθαι παρὰ τινὸς and διδακεσθαι ὑπὸ τινὸς.

(d) ἀπὸ is properly used in reference to an object which before was on, with, at, another (not in, nor merely in the near vicinity of another,) from which it is now separated. E. g. Matt. 28:2. ἀπεκδίδωσεν τοῦ λειποῦν ἀπὸ τῆς θυρᾶς. 14:29 κακασθαν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλούσου, i. e. as we say from on board of the ship. Luke 24:31. Matt. 3:16. Very seldom and with less accuracy is it spoken of an object which before was in another; e. g. Luke 8:2 ἀπὸ τῆς — εἰκότης. — It also marks the source, origin, cause, etc. e. g. Matt. 16:21 πολλὰ παθεῖς ἀπὸ τῶν προσβετηρίων. Luke 21:30 ἀπὸ τῶν γνωστῶν, i. e. your knowledge shall proceed from your own selves. Matt. 14:26 ἀπὸ τοῦ φοβοῦ ἐκραξάν from fear, i. e. fear extorted their outcry. Connected with this also, is the notion of the commencement of any thing which ἀπὸ is also used to express; e. g. Matt. 25:34 ἀπὸ κατασκολοφ. 2
Theo. 2: 13.—Schleusner assigns also to ἐκ the significations in and
day and in Acts 16: 38: ἔνω. οὐστατέτα ἐκ' οὐσίας ἐν ἐκ Παμφιλίᾳ;
he translates who departed from them in Pamphylia; but most evident-
ly the meaning here is, who left them and departed from Pamphylia.
This is certainly a different idea from what would be expressed by ἐκ
Παμφιλίᾳ; which would signify that Mark, although separated from
Paul, still remained in the province. It is quite intolerable, when Schleus-
nner refers here such expressions as ἐκ' αἰρῆς, ἐκ' οὐσίας, etc. He
finds the meaning de, in Acts 17: 2 διαλεγόμενοι ἐπεστάλησαν ἐκ τού 
γλαύκων; which surely is not equivalent to ἐνε ἐκ τού γλαύκων, but means sim-
ply that [as the English version has it] he reasoned with them out of the
Scriptures, i.e. borrowing from the Scriptures his arguments and
proofs. Syr.  *

3. ἐκ' does not occur in the New Testament.

3. ἐκ', before, is spoken commonly of place, and then also of time,
John 10: 8. It simply connects the idea of precedence or priority with
the usual signification of the genitive, and presents no difficulty.

5. ἐκ'. The original signification of this preposition is apparent
from its use in connexion with the dative. It serves to express the
idea of surrounding or inclining on all sides; and consequently differs
from παρά, which merely denotes previous proximity, e.g. on one
side. When construed with the genitive it is commonly to be trans-
lated by de, von, of; all of which, in their primitive signification, are
properly used in relation to any thing ensuing or proceeding from one
object towards another. Since now four languages are here in acc-
cordance, the question may be asked, How far, in such expressions as
legate ν. διαλεγόμενοι περὶ πνεύμ., is the fundamental idea of the geni-
tive to be considered as belonging to the preposition περὶ? In such
cases, the person speaking conceives himself as being at or around the
object; inasmuch as he has brought it within the compass of his knowl-
edge, and made it his own; either by actual inspection or contempla-
tion, and then what he says comes, as it were, from the object; or
in some other way. In the four languages above referred to, there is
this difference, viz. that the Greek expresses the thing the most strik-
ingly, since the person speaking has, as it were, thrown his mind around
the object and holds it in his knowledge (animo complectitur; the Ger-
man and English mode of expression is altogether indefinite; while the
Latin may be said to hold a middle course, since the phrase de a qua
re. logos indicates that the person is, as it were, on or over the thing; and takes a general survey of it.—In the signification de, above assigned to προς, there is included the more general one of in respect to, concerning, about, etc. E. g. Luke 2: 38 προς συν ουκ ενεργησαι. Matt. 4: 6 τοις αγγέλους αντον ενεπαναληθει τιμωρ. Here belong all those passages in which Schleusner would find the meanings contra and erga. [The English preposition about has the same latitude and meaning as προς, and is equally expressive and philosophical; if such a name may be applied to Winer’s speculation concerning προς, which is too far fetched to be entitled to much regard. S.]

6. Προς, in its original signification, which also accords with that of the genitive, is spoken of that from which anything proceeds or emanates towards one’s self; as in Herodot. VII. 209 το ποιουμενον προς Αιγαλεωθεντες done by the Lacedaemonians; and so 1. 124 εισας προς τινα σταιρον αληθω, to be on one’s side, i. e. to hang upon (from) any one. In the New Testament it occurs with the genitive only in Acts 27: 34 τουτο γαρ προς την ημετερας σωτηριας ὑπαρξεις this is for our advantage, i. e. as it were, this is on our side, stans a nostris partibus.

7. Μετα takes the genitive in the same sense, as it would appear, in which συν takes the dative; and one might hence be led to doubt whether the principle which we have stated above will hold throughout. But meta in its original sense is distinguished from συν, in that the latter always expresses a nearer and more intimate union; the former, a looser connexion. Whatever is with, in company with any person or thing, in a strict sense depends on or from that person or thing, e. g. Matt. 12: 3. 16: 27. John 3: 2. Luke 22: 28. So μετα χαρας, etc. Matt. 13: 20. Acts 5: 26. Where συν is used, it implies that the object is an integral part of another, something inherent in it; and therefore it takes the dative, as expressing that in or on which any thing rests.—In the popular dialect of the New Testament, however, these two prepositions are constantly interchanged.

8. Ακος in its original meaning is through; and that in this sense it should take the genitive is easily apparent; since, at least in the local sense, the idea of passing through includes in itself also that of passing out or proceeding from, etc. E. g. John 4: 4 δια της πολεως. Luke 4: 30 αυτος διελθων δια μεσου αυτου, επορευτο. 1 Cor. 3: 15 σωθησων εις διαπανως. From this primitive meaning, as in all languages, the transition is easy to that in which it marks the instrument; since that through which the thing done, passes, as it were, to its accomplishment,
lies in the midst between the volition and the action, [and is said to be the medium of its accomplishment.] E. g. 1 Cor. 3: 5 διακονιοί, δι' αὐτῶν
ἐνστυφόνται. 1 Cor. 6: 14 ἡμᾶς εἰσεβάζει διὰ τῆς δυναμεως αὐτοῦ. In
John 1: 3 πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ εγενέτο, the expression is peculiar, though it
is still to be referred here, viz. God created all things through the Logos;
and διὰ is not to be taken as denoting the principal or efficient
cause, as Schleusner has done. [But why not? In Rom. 11: 35 we
have δι' εἰς αὐτού (Θεού), καί δι' αὐτοῦ, καί εἰς αὐτοῦ τα πάντα.
Is διὰ here also to be taken as denoting merely the instrumental
cause? So in Gal. 1: 1 Παύλου, ἀποστόλος ὑμῶν—δι' αὐτοῦ παρατηρῶν,
αλλ' οἱ Εὐαγγελιστες Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς. See also Wahl's lex. art.
dea no. II. 1. c. Moreover, the phrase πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ εγενέτο is quite
different from that in Heb. 1: 2 δι' οὗ τους κυρίους ἐποιήσαν (δ' θεοῦ),
with which Winer would probably compare it; since the former advert
to only one agent, while the latter declares that God made the world by
his Son; which, whatever the meaning may be, must be allowed to
differ in expression from John 1: 2. Tr.]}—Schleusner has improperly
assigned to this preposition the following significations, viz. (1) Lat.
in.with the accus. Acts 3: 16 πιστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ, which surely, merely
because πιστις εἰς αὐτοῦ occurs elsewhere, is not to be rendered
here in the same sense. Yet Schleusner has rendered it in suffi-
ciently bad Latin, ἡδονία in ipsum posita. Schott translates correctly,
σπερμα σεφικτικα (in nobis) effecta. In Heb. 9: 11 διὰ τοῦ 
μεγάλου και τι
κεντρωτας κυρίων, Schleusner translates, intravit praestantissimum—tenet
... and to Syr. | Ἀ | But it simply means intravit per,
sc. εἰς τα ἀγα μ. 12; see Stolz and Schott.—(2) Cum, with. 1. Cor.,
16: 3 οἳ ἀν δοκίμασε, δί εἰσπόλω τουτοις πεμψε απερχεσθαι
π.τ.λ. where however δί εἰσπόλω is to be rendered through, by means
of letters, i. e. letters of introduction and recommendation; Syrisc
Log. The apostle meant, indeed, that they should take these
letters with them; but still, the proper meaning of the preposition is
fully retained.—(3) Ad, to. 2 Pet. 1: 3 καλεσαντος ὑμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ
αρέτης, Schleusner translates, quis vos ad rel. Christ. adduxit in cannibus, ut
consequerentur felicitatem, etc. Schott and Jaspis rightly, pro commune be-
nignitate, etc. see Pott in loc. and Wahl art. αρέτη.
9. Κατά signifies, in its original sense, down, down from one object
towards another; comp. κατω. E. g. Matt. 8: 32 αἵρεσαν κατά ἡ 
αγί
κατα τον κρωπον. Mark 14: 3 κατέθεεν, αὐτον κατα της κηδαλοπ
§ 44. PREPOSITIONS WITH THE DATIVE.

i. e. while she held the flask of ointment above or over his head. Sometimes it is to be translated against, as indicating hostility, etc. e. g. Matt. 12: 30 σαρ’ εμου εστιν. This, as is evident, easily connects itself with the original signification.

§ 44. Prepositions governing the dative.

[The dative in Greek is the case which expresses that in, on, or with which any thing rests, remains, etc. see p. 142. 7. It is therefore construed with the following prepositions.]

1. ἐπ. The principal significations of this preposition present no difficulty. But besides these, it exhibits in the New Testament some meanings, which are to be referred to the Hebrew-Greek idiom, viz. (a) It is used with the dative, instead of ἐπι with the accusative; e. g. Mark 6: 30 ἐπεστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὕλαμ. See in b. (b) In the sense of through, spoken of the instrument, Matt. 17: 21. Acts 11: 14. Mark 14: 1. Both this and the preceding signification are expressed in Hebrew by מ; and although in is sometimes found in the same senses in Greek writers (Schleusner no. 2. Wahl no. 8. Fischer ad Well. III. pt. II. p. 141 Μ. Matthiae § 577. 4.) yet this belongs rather to the peculiarities of individual writers; and in the New Testament, therefore, is properly to be derived from the Hebrew. (c) In the sense of with. Heb. 9: 25 εν αἰματε ἀλλοχριστ. Jude 14. The other examples which Schleusner brings, do not belong here; and also Xen. Mem. III. 9. 2 εν πέλταις, has another meaning; see Matthiae § 577. 2.

Of the twenty-six significations which Schleusner has assigned to this preposition, many are altogether inadmissible, viz. (1) ἐπ. Luke 2: 27 ἠλθεν εν πνεύματε. Luke 4: 1 ηγετο εν τῷ πνεύματε; i. e. in both cases, in the Spirit, in a state of inspiration, in which he was under the special influence of the Spirit. Acts 20: 19 τῶν συμμαχων μου εν ταῖς εκκλησίαις τῶν ουδαμών, i. e. among or through the plots of the Jews. 1 Cor. 4: 6 ἐν αἷς Ἰησοῦ Ἰακώβε, in us, i. e. by or through our example. Phil. 2: 24 πεποίητα εν πνεῷ θεοῦ χριστίαν πεποιηθεν. (2) ἐπικεφάλαζο; but in Acts 2: 29. 23: 6, εν signifies among; and in Acts 12: 11 it retains its original meaning, although it might in translating be expressed by ἐπικεφαλαζο. (3) ἐπικεφαλαζο. Matt. 22: 37 εν ὕλῃ τής πάρθενου. John 13: 35 εν τούτῳ γνώσωνται, i. e. herein, hereby, shall they know. Heb
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13: 9 en ois soux ophelghtasen, i. e. that which is profitable does not lie in the choice of food, etc.—(4) Per, spoken of place; Matt. 9: 31 diaphmiasonten en olh te yf, and Luke 7: 17 eziktethen o logos en olh te loudias! [In English, however, the word through, or throughout, expresses the idea perfectly. R.] —(5) Post; Matt. 3: 1 en tas ymoraic eixeinas, i. e. in, at, about, that time, in the usual indefinite manner of Hebrew dates. Mark 13: 24 en eixeinas tas ymoraic meta te ylpean at that time after the tribulation, etc. the word ymoraic being spoken not merely of the duration of y ylpe. Acts 8: 33 en te tappoueies autou y krwic autou yphic during, in the midst of his sorrows; quoted from Is. 53: 8. In Luke 12: 1 en ois belongs to eisunachesteisun ton mpreades, i. e. the multitudes having meanwhile collected.—(6) Pro, loco, i. e. instead of; Rom. 11: 17 eisunachesteis en autou (aikadoic) graptas into or upon the branches, part of which had been pruned off.—(7) Pro, i. e. in commodum; 1 Thess. 5: 12 ton kouvontes en ymiv i. e. who labour among you, sc. for your instruction and improvement.—(8) Proper; Matt. 6: 7. James 1: 25. al. Here en every where retains its proper meaning; and in these particular cases, it indicates the circumstances in which one is heard, or receives enjoyment.—(9) Quod attinet ad; Rom. 1: 9 en ton eunygelw in tradenda doctrina divina. Matt. 23: 30 kouvoneis en aiyates partakes in, a Hebraistic construction for ton aiyates; comp. Acts 8: 21. John 4: 37 en touto in this case, in this instance. Rom. 2: 20 eyouna te morphiw—allethes en ton nomo, i. e. having in (or by) the law the whole form or system of true knowledge, etc.

2. Evv presents no difficulty; see in § 43 b. 7.

3. Epi. The original signification is over, on, at, spoken of place; e. g. Mark 2: 4. 6: 39. John 5: 2. Matt. 24: 35. al. Hence it is used to designate the ground on which anything rests; in its widest sense; e. g. Matt. 18: 13 xaireis en aiyor. Mark 3: 5 solupouemenos en te paroises, where also we say over. Acts 14: 3 parageonaxomoneis en to

* This signification Fischer has also assigned to en (ad Well. III. pt. II. p. 141) on account of the expressions pivein en arphus on xwro, etc. (like bibere in oemius Flor. III. 4.) In a similar manner one might assert, that in English on means from; for we speak of eating on silver plates, which from analogy to the phrase to drink out of silver cups, should mean, to eat from silver, etc. To assert, however, that on therefore means from, would be anything rather than enlightened criticism.
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κυρίω. Luke 4: 4 ουκ επ’ αρπή μονάς ἡστει α’ καθισμος; comp. Athen. Χ. 13 Μανιος Κουριος επε γογγυλως διέβειω. Especially is it used to express a condition, stipulation, as Rom. 8: 20; or the object or purpose of an action, inasmuch as we may conceive an action not only as being directed towards an object, but also as resting upon it; e.g. Matt. 26: 50 εφ’ οι παρε. 1 Thess. 4: 7 εκαλεσεν ημας — επ’ ακαθάρσια.

4. Παρά properly signifies with, i.e. near, by the side of. Hence it is also used more generally, with or without reference to a local relation; e.g. Matt. 22: 25 ησαν παρ’ ήμιν αδελφοι. Rom. 2: 11 ου γαρ εστι προσοπολήμα παρά θεό. To this head we may reduce all the examples which Schleusner has brought, under nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.—With the dative, παρά never means α, ο, as Schleusner would have it, for in 2 Pet. 2: 11 ου περισσευνεν κατ’ αυτων παρά πυριν βλασφημιων κρισάν, the sense is coram domino.

5. Προς has the same original meaning as παρά, but more commonly means, in the immediate vicinity of; e.g. John 18: 16. 20: 12. So Rev. 1: 13 περιεζομενος προς τοις ματίοις ουνήν, i.e. girded at or about the breast, etc. The passage in Luke 19: 37 εγγεζοντες ηση προς τη καταβοσι του ορους των ελατων, is to be translated as he drew near and was already at, etc.

6. Περί and οπα do not occur in the New Testament, in construction with the dative.

§ 46. Prepositions governing the accusative.

[The accusative in Greek is the case which expresses that towards which any thing approaches or tends, etc. see p. 137. 1. It therefore takes with it the following prepositions.]

1. Eis. Besides its usual local signification, εἰς also marks a period of future time, as Luke 12: 19. Acts 4: 3. or the object of an action, as Mark 1: 38. Matt. 27: 7. or it is used of persons who constitute the aim or limit of an action, as Matt. 18: 15. 26: 10. 1 Cor. 16: 1. In this latter case it is used especially after verbs of speaking; e.g. Acis 2: 25. Ἀναβιβαζεν; εἰς αυτον. Eph. 5: 32. Heb. 7: 14; where also it may be translated into Latin by in, i.e. de. Finally, it serves to express the occasion of any thing, etc. Matt. 12: 41. μετενεσσεν εἰς το ηδυμα Ιωνα, ad, at, etc. i.e. the proclamation of Jonah was the occasion, etc.
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It also stands by Hebrewism for εν; e.g. Mark 1:9. 2:1 εἰς αὐτον. Acts 3:23; comp. Fischer ad Well. III. pt. II. p. 165 s. It may also be translated in reference to, in relation to, etc. Eph. 3:16. (comp. Xen. Anab. I. 9. 10.) but Gal. 4:11 does not belong here.—On the other hand, the meanings cum and sub which Schleusner assigns to it, are to be utterly rejected; for in Acts 7:53 εἰς διαταγὴν is for εν διαταγήν, (see Kuinoel in loc. and Wahl in διαταγὴ no. 2.) and in Rom. 11:32 εἰς retains its appropriate signification, since the construction συγκλει-

σεν εἰς is just as proper as συγκλεισεν ὑπὸ in Gal. 3:22.

2. ἄνα occurs in the New Testament with an accusative, only in the phrases ἄνα μεῖον, ἄνα μείος, and presents no difficulty.

3. Διὰ with the accusative properly signifies on account of, i.e. for the sake of, and marks the direction of an action upon a definite object: But as the object and the ground (i.e. occasion, cause) of an action are nearly related, the object being in one sense the occasion, hence διὰ with an accusative is often to be translated through; e.g. Matt. 27:18 διὰ φθονόν παρεδόθην αὐτον through envy, i.e. on account of, because of envy.—Other significations which Schleusner brings are inadmissible; e.g. πρὸ, Mark 2:4. quod attinet ad, Rom. 3:24. post, Heb. 2:9. In all these instances διὰ is simply equivalent to proper.

4. Κατὰ. The proper signification of κατὰ is local, indicating direction from one place through another, throughout. Luke 8:39 αἰσθήσει κατ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν. Acts 5:15 εἰσέβαλεν κατὰ τὰς πλατείας throughout the streets, i.e. into all the streets, etc. Luke 10:4 κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν throughout the way, i.e. along the way, by the way. Acts 11:1 κατὰ τὴν λουθιαν. With this is connected the use of κατὰ to mark duration of time; e.g. Matt. 1:20 κατὰ ονομα, in a dream. John 5:4. Luke 2:41 κατὰ έτος throughout every year, i.e. year in and year out, from year to year, every year. From these significations, the transition is easy to the notion of correspondence, similarity, which κατὰ also expresses; e.g. Luke 2:22 κατὰ τὸν νομὸν Μωϋσῆς. Rom. 8:1 κατὰ σωφρινον περιπάτειν. Gal. 4:23 κατὰ δικαίων. Matt. 2:16. So also in the inscriptions to the gospels, as κατὰ Ματθαῖον according to Matthew, i.e. according to the representation of Matthew. Here belong also John 2:6 κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν λουθιῶν according to the custom of purification, etc. where Schleusner unnecessarily introduces the meaning proper. Tit. 3:5. 2 Tim. 1:9. Often also κατὰ may be rendered in reference to, in consideration of, in respect to; as in John
6. quoted above, κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου may mean with reference to the custom of purification, etc. Rom. 11: 26: 9: &c. — The meaning, εἰς, which Schleusner brings, cannot be supported; for in 1 Pet. 4: 14 κατὰ means in respect to, as to, (see Hottinger in loc.) and in Gal. 1: 11 οὐκ εἰς κατὰ ἀνθρώπου is to be translated the gospel has no relation to man, as to its origin. So also the meaning εἰς, which he brings, is to be rejected;* for Luke 1: 18 κατὰ τι γνωσματι του, is whereby, wherein; and in Acts 3: 17 κατὰ σιαρκον, and Tit. 3: 5 κατὰ τοῦ δελω, and 1 Tim. 5: 21 κατὰ προσκλησιν, it is in accordance with, etc. while in Luke 5: 12 κατὰ πάλιν is spoken in reference to place, just as κατὰ εἰς is in respect to time, i. e. from city to city; which as to the sense, may indeed be rendered out of every city.

5. Μέτα with the accusative properly indicates local direction, out above, every, beyond any thing; but occurs in the New Testament only in a particular sense; e. g. Acts 26: 13 γενος περιλαμψαν — ὑπερ την λαμπροτητα του. Matt. 10: 24 οὕτω εἰς μαθητης ὑπο τον διδασκαλον. etc.—in 2 Cor. 12: 13 τε γεν ουτι, ὁ ἡττηθες ὑπερ τως λουπων ενεκλεισιας, this preposition signifies intra in appearance only; for the direction is here considered as if inverted, and tending downwards, etc.

6. Μέτα with the accusative indicates direction behind, after, in the rear of any thing. It is so used partly of place, and partly of time, Matt. 17: 1; since events which succeed each other in time, constitute a series of objects following after each other.

7. Παρὰ properly signifies towards, to or by the side or near vicinity of any thing; e. g. πλος ο Παρὰ γην along the shore, Plut. II. p. 621 D.—Mark 2: 13 εξηλθεν παρὰ την θαλασσαν he went out (from Capernaum) to, along, the seashore. Matt. 4: 18. 13: 1. Derived significations are the following, viz.

(a) Praeter, i. e. by the side of, besides, 1 Cor. 3: 11.
(b) Propter, which also signifies near by, as propter aquam. 1 Cor. 12: 15 ου παρὰ σου ουν εστιν εκ του σωματος, i. e. Is it therefore not of the body? Μπροτερ, the side of, together with this circumstance, etc.
(c) Plus quam. Rom. 1: 25 ελατρευαν παρὰ τον κτησινα, i. e. prop-

* Kuinoel also adopts this signification, on account of the expressions κατα την ενσωμη, κατα νομον, κατα νου, etc. Comp. Fischer ad Well. III: pt. II. p. 180.
erly, with a passing by of the Creator. Luke 13: 2 ἀπετράπαντες ἡμᾶς ἁμαρτάνοντες, i. e. they, as it were, passed by all others in sin, left all others behind.

(d) Contra. Acts 18: 13 παρὰ τοῦ νομοῦ, i. e. passing by the law, disregarding it.

8. Πρὸς indicates direction from any thing to, towards, another. Retaining this primitive meaning, it may also be translated, according as the verb or the context may require, either by contra, Acts 6: 1, or by cum (which also includes all the examples where Schlesmer renders it inter,) Luke 24: 14. Acts 11: 2, or by erga, Gal. 5: 10, or by in with an accus. Luke 12: 3. It retains also the same original meaning in such phrases as the following, viz. Luke 14: 32 ὅπερ εἰρηνήν which lead to peace. John 4: 35 λευκὰς ἑκάστος πρὸς θεόν, are white unto, i. e. near to the harvest. John 11: 4 αὐθεν τοῦ πρὸς τάφον, i. e. a sickness which leads to death. Luke 24: 29 πρὸς ἑωράσωσιν σοι, i. e. the day towards evening. Luke 12: 47 ποιμνια πρὸς τὸ δυτικόν, i. e. following the will of any one. With this is connected the signification at, by, with, ad (which also in Latin indicates direction,) in cases where the attention may be supposed not to fix itself on the direction simply, but on the limit or bound of that direction; e. g. Matt. 26: 55. Mark 2: 2. Acts 13: 31. 2 Cor. 4: 2. Hence, in particular cases it may also be translated by in, before, etc.—The following significations assigned by Schlesmer are untenable, viz. (1) α, ab; 2 Cor. 13: 7 εὐχαριστοῦν πρὸς θεόν, i. e. I pray to God; so Xen. Mem. 1. 3. 2.—(2) De; Rom. 8: 31 τι ερωτεύον πρὸς ταύτα, i. e. thereto. Heb. 4: 13 and Luke 20: 19, where it is in reference to, in respect to.—(3) Ex; Eph. 3: 4 οὐ πρὸς τὸ δύναμις—νομισματικόν in relation to which.


10. ὅπως with the accusative properly expresses local direction towards the under part of any thing, under, etc. Matt. 5: 15 τινος ὑπὸ τοῦ μαθητῆς. Hence it is also used in a more general sense; e. g. Rom. 7: 14 παρακαλόντας ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας; and also with εἰς το ρέον to be under, Matt. 8: 9. Gal. 4: 2. It also denotes time when, as Acts 5: 21 ὑπὸ τοῦ ὁμοθέτου, i. e. near, as is common with the Greeks, and as the Latins also use sub.

11. ἐπὶ properly designates local direction upon any thing; e. g.
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Matt. 18: 12 εἰς τα ὀργ· περευθεσί. 14: 19 αναπλήθηναι επί τούς χορ- τας. 14: 26 περιπατεῖν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. 2 Thess. 2: 4. Then also it is spoken of time upon or over which any thing extends itself; e.g. Luke 4: 25. Acts 13: 31. Finally, it marks the limit or object upon which any action is directed; e.g. Mark 3: 7 εἰς το βαπτισμα, i. e. in order to be baptized. Luke 23: 48. Matt. 10: 21 επαναστησθαι— εἰς γονεῖς to rise up upon i. e. against parents. Matt. 14: 14 εἰπε ἐκεῖνοι, i. e. over them. Mark 9: 12 μεγαπαττοι εἰς τον υἱόν του ανθρωπου.—The signification apud, which Schleussner assigns, must be restricted to cases where εἰς merely indicates rest on such a place as is higher than something else in the vicinity, as the shore of a lake, sea, etc. Matt. 13: 2. Rev. 15: 2.

Note 1. In regard to the prepositions in general, we find them, in particular instances, connected with cases different from those which the idiom of the purest Greek writers would require or allow; e.g. εἰς with a dative after verbs of speaking, John 12: 16. Acts 4: 17. and after verbs of naming, Luke 1: 59, where the Greeks would put the genitive. The detail, however, belongs rather to the lexicon; and the subject may, with the more propriety, be left uninvestigated here, since Wahl in his lexicon has treated it with so much care and diligence.

Note 2. In a general view, we sometimes find a preposition connected with different cases in the same construction and sense; e.g. Matt. 24: 2 ου μη αφεθῇ λειδος εἰς λειδον, comp. Mark 13: 2 ου μη αφεθῇ λειδος εἰς λειδο. Both are grammatically correct.

§ 46. Prepositions in circumlocutions.

1. Several of the prepositions with the nouns which they govern, form circumlocutions for other parts of speech, viz.

(a) For adverbs. Here belong the following, viz. (a) Ex with numerals, as εκ δευτερου, εκ τριτου, Matt. 26: 42, 44. or with other nouns, as 2 Cor. 8: 13 εκ εσοπτός. Heb. 7: 12 εκ αναγιν.—(β) Ex; e.g. Matt. 22: 16 εν αληθεια. Mark 14: 1 εν δολω. John 7: 10 εν πρωτη. Col. 4: 5 εν σοφία. Rev. 19: 2 εν ερυθι.—(γ) Exs; e.g. Mark 12: 14; 32 εν ερυθιας. Acts 10: 34, comp. 13: 11 where it is αληθως; το Ιω. 37: 18. Acts 28: 6 εν πολυ.—(δ) Κατα; e.g. Rom. 7:
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13 καθ' ύπεροχην. 1 Pet. 3: 7 κατα γνωσιν. Acts 19: 20 κατα κρατος.—(e) Exs; e.g. 1 Thess. 3: 5 εις κενον, i.e. κενος. — Other examples see in 47. 5.

To these may perhaps be added James 4: 5 προς φθονον, in the sense of invidiose; as the Greeks say προς φρυγην, προς εχθραν, and the like; see Hottinger in loc. Pott gives a different sense; see also Wahl art. επισοθεως.

(b) For adjectives or participles, viz. (a) Ex preceded by the article; e.g. Gal. 3: 7 οι εκ πιστεως, 1. e. οι πιστευοντες. Acts 10: 45 οι εκ περετουμης. Tit. 2: 8 οι εξ εναντιως, i.e. adverse, hostile.—(β) Ev; e.g. Luke 4: 36 λογος εν εξουσια. 1 Cor. 2: 7 σοφια εν μυστηριω. Tit. 3: 5 εφα γεν εν δικαιουσην, etc.—(γ) Κατα; e.g. 2 Cor. 8: 2 η κατα δωσον πιστεως. Rom. 11: 21 οι κατα φυσιν ιδανου. Rom. 9: 11 η κατε εκλογην προθεσις.

(c) For possessive pronouns; e.g. Eph. 1: 15 την καθ' ύμας πιστον. 2 Tim. 1: 3 την περι σου μνειαν. 2 Cor. 8: 7 τη εξ υμων αγαπην. 2 Cor. 8: 2.

2. The preposition εις with its noun stands by Hebrewism for the nominative, and also for the dative; see above in § 22. 3. § 24. 6. So εν with its dative is put for other cases; see in § 24. 6. See also Wahl on εις and εν.

All the cases of circumlocution above given, except those in no. 2, are entirely conformed to the idiom of pure Greek; as will appear from the following illustrations, viz.

§ 47. Adverbs.

The idea of an adverb is sometimes expressed, not by the appropriate adverbial form, but by a circumlocution, or particular construction, viz.

1. Adverbs of intensity are expressed by a circumlocution, in which there is connected with the verb a corresponding substantive derived from the same root, and which is put either in the dative or accusative.


Note 1. The same Hebrew idiom is expressed in the Septuagint, and also in the New Testament, by a participle of the same verb; see above § 39. 3. Peculiar, but similar in signification, is Matt. 15: 4 and Mark 7: 10 ἄραν ψυχὴ τελευταῖος, i.e. he shall surely be put to death, quoted from Ex. 21: 15.

Note 2. To this head do not belong passages like John 5: 32 μαρτυρεῖν μαρτυρεῖτε. Mark 3: 28 διασφημοῖς διασφημήσατε. 1 Tim. 6: 12 ὀρολογεῖν τὴν ὀρολογίαν. Heb. 8: 10 διαθήκην διατίθεναι. etc. In these cases the connexion of the verb with the corresponding noun is
not emphatical, but the verb stands instead of another verb which would express a more general idea; e. g. to bear witness, testimonium exhibere; to make an arrangement, covenant, etc.

Note 3. Just as little are those constructions to be referred to the above rule, where the verb takes the corresponding noun with the adjectives πολὺς, μεγας, etc. e. g. Mark 4: 41 εφοβηθησαν φοβον μεγαν. 5: 42 εξεστησαν έκστασει μεγάλη, etc. Here the adverbial idea of intensity is contained in the adjective, while the substantive, strictly considered, is pleonastic.

2. When a finite verb is followed by another verb in the infinitive, the former is sometimes to be rendered as an adverb, viz.:

(a) The adverb willingly, gladly, is expressed by the following verbs, viz. (a) By γιλεω; e. g. Matt. 6: 5 γιλεω προευχεσθαι; so Is. 56: 5. Ecclus. 6: 33. comp. Aelian. V. H. X. IV. 37 φιλω τα αγαλμα—δορν. In other passages, on the contrary, γιλεω signifies to be wont, solere.—(β) By θελω v. εθελω; e. g. John 6: 21 θελον λαβειν αυτον. 8: 44 τας επιθυμιας του πατρος υμων θελετε ποιειν. The passages which Schleusner, Kuinoel, and others, quote as parallel to this usage, viz. Aeschyl. Choeph. 791 θελον αμεγησει, and Lysias Orat. 18. 2 θελοντες αποδεχεσθαι, are not of the same kind, since the participle, θελον, θελοντες, is here to be translated by willing, volentes, and is to be construed merely as an adjective connected with the verb.

(β) The adverb again, once more, is expressed by προστηθεναι; e. g. Luke 20: 11 προσεθετο πεμψαι, comp. Mark 12: 4 where it is και παλεις εμπυραι. So Ecclus. 19: 23. Gen. 18: 29. al. This is undeniably Hebraism; see Gesen. p. 823. Stuart § 205.

Note. Similar to the above is the construction in Heb. 13: 2 ελαθον τινες ξενειαντες unconsciously have entertained, etc. see above § 39. 1. Viger. p. 259.—With less propriety can we refer here the passage in Tit. 3: 12 σπουδασον ελθειν, which we may literally translate hasten to come. So Mark 14: 8 προελαβε μυρωσα μου το σωμα antecrert unge- re, i. e. she has anticipated the anointing of my body, etc. With more reason may we assign to this rule 1 Thess. 2: 2 επαρφησαςωμεθα εν τω θεω υμων καληαι, i. e. we spoke boldly, or perhaps more properly, we were emboldened to speak.

3. Sometimes the idea of an adverb is designated by
a verb, i.e. where there are two verbs in connexion; either with or without a copula, one of them is sometimes to be rendered as an adverb.

This is Hebraism; see Glass I. p. 272. Gesen. p. 823. Stuart § 205.

E.g. Rom. 10: 20 ἀποτολμᾶς καὶ λέγει, i.e. he speaks out boldly. John 8: 59 ἔσωσεν εκρυβή καὶ ἐξηλάθεν εἰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, i.e. he withdrew secretly. Acts 15: 16 ἀναστερέω καὶ ανακοδομήσω i.e. ἔτεινε ἐξήφων, quoted from Amos 9: 11. 2 Cor. 9: 9 ἐσκοποῦσαν, εὗρεν τινὲς γεννήσαι, i.e. he has given abundantly, quoted from Ps. 112: 9. Col. 2: 5 χειρὶ καὶ βλεπὼν ὑμῶν τὴν ταξίν i.e. joyfully beholding, etc.

Note. The passage in Matt. 18: 3 εἰς μὴ στραφήτε καὶ γεννήση ὁ τα παιδεια, does not necessarily belong here, since we may translate it, nisi rederis (ad bonam frugem) et—faci critis; see Kuinoel in loc. Phil. 4: 18 is to be pointed as follows, viz. ἀπεκρ. ὑμ. πάντα, καὶ περισσεύων τελεσσωμεν κ.ε.λ.

4. An adverbial sense is sometimes expressed by adjectives and participles.

E.g. Acts 29: 13 δευτεραίον ἡλθομεν, i.e. on the second day, postidie; comp. Xen. Cyr. V. 2. 1. Diod. Sic. XVI. 68. — Acts 18: 26 ἀποβιβασαντον αυτω εξηλάθεν την του θεου ὁδον. Luke 19: 11 προσέθεναι εἰς παραβολήν, i.e. porro. 22: 32 εἰς ἀποστασεψαι στηριξον. 1 Thess. 3: 5 εἰς κενον, i.e. κενως; see in § 46. 1. ε.

5. An adverbial sense is often expressed by a periphrasis, viz. by a substantive and the preposition which governs it, although the appropriate adverbial form may at the same time exist in the language.

This is common among the Greek writers; though the writers of the New Testament may have derived it from the Hebrew, it is prevalent; see Gesen. p. 625. Stuart § 156. 3. This mode of expression, however, is allowable, and is not unfrequently employed, in all languages.

E.g. Matt. 22: 16 εἰς ἀληθείαν, i.e. as we say in truth, for truly. Luke 22: 59 εἰς ἀληθείας of a truth, truly, comp. Mark 26: 73 where it is ἀληθῶς. Acts 17: 31 εἰς δικαιοσύνην, i.e. δικαιος. Eph. 6: 24 εὑρίσκωμαι. Phil. 3: 6 κατὰ τῇνον, etc. Other examples see in § 46. 1.

—An instance where merely the accusative, without a preposition, is
§ 48. PARTICLES OF NEGATION.

1. The simplest negation, as is well known, is expressed in Greek by the particles *ou* and *μη*.

The difference between these two particles has been fully developed by Hermann ad Viger. p. 804. no. 267. comp. Matthiae § 600. Buttmann § 135. The particle *ou* is employed, where any thing is immediately and directly denied; the particle *μη* is used, where that which is denied is a mere matter of supposition or cogitation. This distinction holds also in the New Testament, as will appear from a few examples, viz. John 3:18 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν, *ou* κρίνεται ὁ ἐκ μη πιστεύων, ἢ ἡ κεκριται, ὡς μη πιστεύειν. Here it is *ou* κρίνεται, because it is simply and fully denied that the believer is ever subject to condemnation; but it is *μη* πιστεύειν, as expressing negation in a supposed case, and *ὁ μη πιστεύων* is equivalent to *should there be any one who does not believe*, etc. while the phrase *ou* πιστεύων would imply some definite individual who actually does not believe. So it is ὅτε μη πιστεύειν, i. e. because, by supposition, *he has not believed*. Col. 1: 23 εἴη επιμενέτε τῇ πιστε—καὶ μή μετακινομένοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος, where the *not being moved* is put (in a sentence beginning with *εἴη*) as a condition, and consequently is a matter of supposition. 1 Thess. 2: 9 and 2 Thess. 3: 8 ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μη εἰπαργήσας ύμον εἰπον εκπυξαμεν, where the being burdensome is not denied as a fact, for the apostle might involuntarily have been to them a burden; but as a thing not intended nor desired by the apostle. 2 Thess. 1: 8 ἐνδοτος εἰκεικήσετι τοῖς μη εἰδοὺς θεον καὶ τοῖς μη ὑπακοοῦσιν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, where the case is supposed, that there should be such un-
belief, etc. Rom. 7: 3 εἰς εἰς τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι μονο-γαλίδα. 8: 4 ἐν τῷ δικαιωμα—πληρωθῇ εν ἡμῖν, τοὺς μὴ κατὰ σαφῆνει περιπατήσωιν, i. e. on the supposition that we do not, etc. 13: 3 θέ-λεις μὴ φοβερυσαι την εξουσίαν. 14: 21 καλον το μὴ φοβερυσαι, i. e. it is well, if one never eats meat, etc. 15: 1 οφειλώμεν θελείς—καὶ μὴ έχοντες αρέσκειν, comp. v. 3 καὶ γαρ ὁ Χριστός οὐ νέαν ηρεμε-σει. 1 Cor. 7: 1 καλον ανθρωπον, γυναικος μὴ ἀπέστησαι.

The particular constructions in which μὴ is found, may be classed as follows, viz.

(a) After ὁς, ὁς, ὁς, ὁς σε (σαρ); e. g. Matt. 11: 6. Mark 6: 11. al.
(b) After conditional particles, as εἰ, εἰς; or those which express the end or object of an action, as ἐν, ἐνόμος, ἐντε; e. g. Rom. 7: 11: 15. 16: 20. 1 Cor. 1: 17. 2: 5, 11. 4: 6. 2 Cor. 2: 3, 5. 3: 7. 4: 7. al.
(d) After participles, when they are to be taken generally, and as corresponding either to quinque, signis (Herm. ad Vig. p. 805), as Matt. 9: 36. 25: 29. John 5: 23. Rom. 14: 3. 1 Cor. 7: 30. or to quamquae, signis, as 1 Cor. 10: 33 αρέσκει μὴ ζητεῖν το εμαυτον συμμερεσθο. Phil. 3: 9 εύρεθαι εν αὐτῷ μὴ εχων εμνὴ δικαιοσύνην την εκ νομου. 1 Cor. 7: 37. or where they may be rendered in connexion with though, although, as John 7: 15. 1 Pet. 1: 8.
(e) In the signification ne, lest, before the imperative or subjunctive; see below in no. 5.
(f) As a sign of interrogation, is it so then? etc. Rom. 9: 14. 10: 19. 2 Cor. 1: 17. See Herm. ad Vig. p. 789.

After all, it would appear as if, in some peculiar circumstances, the particle μὴ was employed in the place of ou. This appearance it is so much more the duty of grammarians to endeavour to explain, because the use of the negative particles has so many delicate shades, as to have presented some embarrassment to grammarians and commentators even among the Greeks themselves.—Thus in 1 Cor. 9: 21 εγενόμην τοῖς αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς αὐτοίς, μη αὐτοὶ αὐτοῖς θερ αὖ τοῖς εἶναι Ἑρωτημένης. But here the participle with μὴ is to be rendered quamvis non sim, though I might not be, etc. Rom. 10: 20 εύρεθαι τοῖς εἰς μὴ ζητουσί, i. e. generally, all, whoever they may be, who, etc. while τοῖς εἰς ζητουσί would imply some particular nation, etc. 1 Cor. 1: 28 εἶ-
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ελέγαν ὁ θεὸς τα μῆνα οὐτα ἵνα τα οὐτα καταργησῇ, where τα οὐτα would signify things not in existence; while τα μῆνα implies merely that they are to be considered, estimated, as not existing.—In respect to the examples which follow, it is to be premised, that where the Greeks wish to express a very definite and emphatic negation, as in an antithesis, they often employ μη; because οὐ on the other hand is incapable of designating any degree of intensity,* e. g. 2 Cor. 5 : 21 τον γαρ μη γνω ὡν ἄμαρτην υπερ ἡμῶν ἀμάρτην εποιησε. Here τον οὐ γνωτα would merely imply the same as τον εγνωντα, i. e. simply a state of ignorance; for the meaning of οὐ like that of a privative, flows together and amalgamates with that of the verb with which it is connected, as in οὐ φημε i. q. nego. The apostle, however, would express the idea with the strongest emphasis, and therefore makes the negation particularly prominent, he knew not in all, not in the least possible degree; comp. Wahl art. μη 1. 3.—2 Cor. 4: 18 μη σκοπουντον ήμον τα βλεπομενα, αλλα τα μη βλεπομενα, is to be rendered as the definite antithesis requires. So 2 Cor. 6: 9 οὐ παθεωμενον και μη θανατουμενον. 2 Cor. 3: 14 αχρι της σημερον το αυτο καλυμμα—μενει, μη ανακαλυπτομενον.

Note: Since οὐ, when connected with verbs, etc. serves simply to invert their meaning from a positive to a negative sense, as οὐ φημε is i. q. nego; so also when joined with nouns it sometimes, like a privative gives them the opposite signification; e.g. Lam. 1: 7 ευ ουκ εισχυ; i. e. in weakness; comp. in New Testament, Rom. 9: 25 ου λαυν, Germ. Nichtswohl, [for which there is no equivalent word in English. This is Hebraism; comp. ἦν-ν>, ἦ-ν>, etc. Gesen. p. 832. Stuart § 206. 5 note. R.]

2. In oaths and affirmations, the conjunction ει is sometimes to be taken as a negative.

E. g. Mark 8: 12 αμην λεγω ύμεν, ει δοθησεται—σημεον, i. e. there shall no sign he given. Heb. 3: 11 ομοσα, ει εισελυσονται εις την καταπαυσιν μου. This is in imitation of the Hebrew דע; see Gesen. p. 884. Wahl art. ει no. 7. ειν no. 3.

* An instance of a similar, though not precisely the same construction, occurs in Latin, when haud is put in antithesis with sed; e. g. Liv. XXI. 1 haud signosas belli artes inter se, sed expertas—conscrebant Romani et Carthag. i. e. not indeed unknown, but known, i. e. perfectly known. Comp. also Sallust. Catil. 3.
Note 1. In respect to the opposite of this, viz. εαυτον μη as an affirmation, surely, certainly, etc. Ez. 17: 19, there is no example of it in the New Testament; for it is with the greatest inconsideration that Haab (p. 228) has referred here such passages as Mark 10: 30. 2 Thess. 2: 3.

Note 2. With the above idiom Wahl also classes Mark 4: 22 ου γερ εστι προτιον, ο εαυτον μη πανερυσθη, and supposes that εαυτον stands here instead of ου, as is undeniably the case in the Septuagint, Judg. 5: 9. 2 K. 3: 14. Prov. 27: 24; see Wahl art. εαυτον no. 3. comp. Gesen. p. 844. But this is not necessary; for ο εαυτον μη is quod non aliqua ratione, which shall not in some way or other be made manifest, etc. Generally speaking, Hebraisms are not to be attributed to the writers of the New Testament without some proof or explanation.

Note 3. In Hebrew and in the Septuagint, when two verbs are connected, both of which are used in a negative sense, the particle of negation is often expressed only before the first verb, and is to be supplied before the second; see Gesen. p. 832. Stuart § 211. 11. The only examples of this idiom in the New Testament are in passages quoted from the Septuagint, e. g. Matt. 13: 15. Mark 4: 12. John 13: 40.

3. It has often been stated as a general rule, that in sentences which contain a negative followed by αλλα, the negation is not to be taken as absolute, but only in a qualified sense; and is to be translated by non tam—quam, not so much—as; or by non solum—sed, not only—but, etc. see Glass I. p. 418 ff. Haab p. 145 ff. comp. Bos Ellips. p. 772 ff. Valken. Opusc. II. p. 190. ad Dion. Hal. IV. 2121. 10.—E. g. Acts 5: 4 ουκ εμενον ανθρωποις, αλλα θεου, not so much unto man (sc. Peter) as unto God. 1 Thess. 4: 8 ουκ ανθρωποιν αθετει, αλλα τον θεον, he rejects not merely man (sc. Paul) but also God. But in these and all similar passages, the negative particle retains its full force; e. g. in 1 Thess. I. c. while the apostle speaks of the divine teaching, his own individuality shrinks into nothing and vanishes; so in Acts I. c. and comp. John 12: 44. Mark 9: 37. In a similar construction also with και, Matt. 9: 13 ειςοι δελα και ου θυσιας, quoted from Hos. 6: 16, both the prophet and Christ would represent the disposition or sentiment of compassion as really coming in place of the external offering, which was merely symbolical; for that the prophets of the Old Testament had already formed a just estimate of the nature and comparative value of sacrificial offerings, is obvious to every attentive reader of the
Old Testament, and especially of Isaiah. 1 Cor. 1: 17 οὐκ ἀπεστάλη μὲ Χριστὸν βαπτιζόμενοι ἂν εὐαγγελιζόμεθα, i. e. baptism could as well be administered by others, and it was accidental that Paul had baptized any in Corinth; instruction was his peculiar province; and the particular business for which he was commissioned. John 6: 27 ἐργάζεσθαι μὴ τὴν βρωσιν τὴν ἀπαλλαγμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν βρωσίν τὴν μενοῦσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνίων; here the object is to render the affirmative clause emphatically prominent through the antithesis of the negative clause; and for the moment Jesus would fix the attention only upon the βρωσίν ἡ μενοῦσα, and the sentiment is enebed when ou is translated by non tam. Matt. 10: 20 οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦσες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ παρος ὑμῶν, refers not to the physical act of speaking, but to the sentiment uttered; which was to be really imparted to the apostles by the Holy Spirit.—With such cases in view, I cannot convince myself, that the construction ou—ἀλλὰ is to be taken in only a qualified sense. The above rule has also been at least partially called in question by De Wette and Schulthess; see A. L. Z. 1816. no. 41. p. 321. Theol. Annal. 1816. p. 873.

4. The general rule of the Greek language is, that two negatives only strengthen the negation; See Viger. p. 451 ff. That this, however, is far from being always the case, is fully shewn by Buttman, p. 564. comp. Matthiae § 601 ult. Viger. p. 452. In accordance with this exception, only one example occurs in the New Testament; viz. Acts 4: 20 οὐ δυνάμεθα ἡμεῖς, αὖ εἰδομεν καὶ θησαυροῦμεν, μὴ λαλῶμεν, i.e. what we see and hear, we must promulgate. The negative particles here belong to different verbs, the first giving a negative sense to δυνάμθαι, the other to λαλῶν. Syr. صِحِبِسُ پْسُ | پْسُ صِحِبِسُ بِمُمْدَدْ صِحِبِسُ بِمُمْدَدْ بِمُمْدَدْ بُغْبُ بُغْبُ بُغْبُ بُغْبُ صِحِبِسُ بِمُمْدَدْ بُغْبُ بُغْبُ بُغْبُ بُغْبُ بُغْبُ

Note 1. Two negatives properly serve to strengthen the negation in Greek, only when one of them is annexed to a sentence which is already complete without it; e. g. John 15: 5 χαρίς ὑμῶν οὐ δυνάσθε ποιεῖν οὐδὲν, where οὐδὲν οὐ δυνάσθε ποιεῖν would mean nihil non, i. e. omnia. 1 Cor. 6: 10 οὐ λαῖδοροι οὐχ ἄρπαγες βασιλεῖαν ὦσιν οὐ κηρυνομησοῦντος, where the negative is merely again repeated before the verb. 2 Cor. 11: 8 παρον—οὐ κατεναρκησαν οὐδένος. So Plato Apol. 19 οὐ γὰρ εστιν ὅτις ἀνθρώπος σωθησεται, οὔτε ὑμῖν, οὔτε ἀλλ᾽, κ.τ.λ.
§ 48. PARTICLES OF NEGATION.


5. The negative particle μη often stands in a negative wish, entreaty, etc. viz.

(a) In a negative wish, it is construed with the optative; e.g. in the often recurring phrase, μη γενοιτο, Luke 20: 16. Rom. 9: 14. Gal. 2: 17. al.

(b) In a negative entreaty, etc. it is construed as follows, viz.


(5) With the subjunctive of the aorist, where the action is to be expressed as transient, or only once occurring; e.g. Luke 6: 29 απο του αιροντος σου τον ιματιων, και του χιτωνα μη κωλυρεις. Matt. 10: 34 μη νομισητε, οτι πλαθον κ.τ.λ. i.e. do not for a moment suppose, etc. So in prohibitions, Mark 10: 19. Matt. 6: 7; where it is not the repetition or continuance of the action, but the action itself as occurring at all, that is forbidden. Comp. Rom. 3: 8. Acts 23: 9.

(3) With the imperative of the aorist in a similar sense, Matt. 6: 3. 24: 18.

(4) With an infinitive, after προσευχθανε, Luke 22: 40 προσευχθαν μη εισελθειν εις πειμαρον; and also after κηρυσσεν, Rom. 2: 21 κηρυσσον μη κλεπτειν. Both these verbs imply a negative; see Matthiae § 533 note 3.

For the construction of μη with verbs generally, see Viger. p. 458, and Wahl on the word.

Note 1. The double negative ου μη occurs with the subjunctive in Matt. 5: 18. 15: 5. Luke 21: 33. see Buttmann p. 564. It occurs also with the future of the indicative (which has a near relation to the subjunctive), Matt. 26: 35. Mark 14: 31. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 755 ff.

Note 2. The particle ου sometimes occurs alone in prohibitions,
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before the future.indicative; e. g. Matt. 5: 21 οὐ φονευείς, comp. 19: 18. Acts 23: 5 αρρενᾶτο καὶ λευκὸν καὶ λευκὸς αὐτομ. Rom. 13: 9 οὐ μοιχεύεις. al. But there are all quotations from the Septuagint, where the translators have often imitated the Hebrew אָּ֫בָּד before the imperative and future, instead of בָּד. The writers of the New Testament, where they use their own language, have never exhibited this anomaly.

FIGURES OF SYNTAX AND RHETORIC.

§ 49. Paronomasia.

1. Paronomasia is a favourite figure among the Hebrews, and occurs also in the New Testament, especially in the writings of Paul, where it seems to be sometimes unpremeditated, and sometimes to be the result of design on the part of the writer. It may be divided into two kinds, viz.

(a) Where words of a like sound are employed in the same sentence, without regard to their sense.


Note. In order to form a paronomasia of this kind, unusual words or forms of words are sometimes employed; e. g. Gal. 5: 7 πεπεσόντας —η πεσόμον; see Winer’s Comm. in Ep. ad Gal. p. 75.

(b) Where the words are not only the same in sound, but there is also a resemblance or antithesis in the sense.

E. g. Gal. 4: 17 ζηλουσιν ύμας — ην αυτους ζηλουσε. Rom. 5: 19 ούπερ δια της παρακολουθίας του ένος ανθρωπον αμαρτωλοι καταστάθησαν οι παλαί αυτω και δια της παρακολουθίας του ένος θεω τα παρασκευάζωσαται. Phil. 3: 2, 3 βλεπετε την κατατομην, ὑμεῖς γαρ 21
§ 50. Attraction.

1. The name of attraction is given to that mode of construction, by which two sentences or clauses that have a logical connexion, are in a grammatical view entangled, as it were, in each other. Two species of
this construction are of common occurrence in the New Testament.


(a) The relative is put in the case which is governed by the verb of the preceding clause.

E. g. John 2: 22 εἰπεν σοι τῷ λόγῳ, οφι εἴπεν ο Ἰησοῦς, instead of ὁν εἴπεν. For other examples of this kind of attraction, and also of the neglect of it, see above in § 18.

(b) After verbs followed by ὁν or ἐν with another clause, the noun which would properly be the subject of the latter clause, is put as the object of the preceding verb, and in the case which that verb governs.


Note. The construction in 1 Cor. 10: 16 τον αρτὸν ὃν κλόωμεν, ou-γε κοινωνα τον σωματος του Χριστου εἰτε, which has been already noticed in § 25. 4, may also be properly brought within the general idea of attraction. So 1 Pet. 2: 7. See Fischer ad Well. III. pt. I. p. 339 ff.

§ 51. Parenthesis and Anacoluthon.

1. Sometimes the construction with which a sentence begins, is afterwards interrupted, especially in the writings of Paul. This is done in two ways, viz. the writer after a longer or shorter digression, again resumes the same construction; or else abandoning the former, he introduces a new construction, leaving
the first one incomplete. The former of these is *parenthesis*; the latter *anacoluthon*.

2. Parentheses, by which the grammatical connexion of a sentence is for a time interrupted, occur in every part of the New Testament, but in no writer so frequently as in Paul. They are generally introduced as follows, viz.:

(a) Where the parenthesis is short, it is inserted without hesitation between two clauses which are grammatically connected, and then after the conclusion of the parenthesis, the latter clause proceeds as if no interruption had taken place.

E. g. Acts 1:15 *Πετρός—ειπεν* (ἡν τε οὖς ὄνοματσαν επί το αυτό ὡς ἐκατον εἰκοσιν) ανδρέας αδελφος, ἐδει κ.τ.λ. 1 Cor. 15:52 ὑπὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ἁλαλλόγον (καλεῖς γὰρ ἀλλαγής ὁμοθετῆς) δεῖ γὰρ το φῶς τον κ.τ.λ. 2 Cor. 6:2. 10:3, 4. Gal. 2:8. A parenthesis of considerable length is in this way inserted in Rom. 2:13—16.

In cases of this kind the parenthesis is commonly indicated by the particles ὅτε, τε, γαρ, etc. at its commencement; see the above examples, and Rom. 1:20. 15:3. Heb. 7:20. al.

(b) When the parenthesis is longer, the principal word or words of the preceding clause are repeated, with or without variation, after the parenthesis.

E. g. 1 Cor. 8:1—4 *περὶ τῶν εἰς ὅλον ὅντων οἱ δαμεῖς* ὑπὶ αὐτόν (ὅτι πάντες γνωσὶν ἔχομεν—ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ) περὶ τῆς βροχος ὅν τῶν εἰς ἔνοπλον ὅντων ὁ δαμεῖς ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ. Eph. 2:1—5 ὃν τοῖς ἐν κρίσιν τοῖς παρατιθέμενοι καὶ τοῖς άμάρτοις, (ἐν αἷς ποιεῖται—ὑπὸ γνωσμοῦ ἡμῶν) καὶ οὑτα πᾶσαι ἡμῶν ἐν κρίσιν τοῖς πάσης ἀπόφασις κ.τ.λ. 1 John 1:1 ὃς ἡν ἐκαστοίμην,

The anacoluthon,† or sentence which contains two different constructions, such that the beginning of the sentence is not in grammatical connexion with the close, occurs not infrequently in the epistolary style of Paul.

* E.g. Gal 2: 6 από 8υ των δοκουντων ειναι τι οντως πατε ησαυ, ουδεν μοι διαφερεται (προσωπον θεου ανθρωπου ου, λαμβανει) ενος και αυτων επονομαι προσκεκεντο, where grammatical regularity would require απο 8υ των δοκουντων—ουδεν μοι προσκεκενη. Gal. 2: 4, 5 δια 8υ των παρεσκεπτων ψευδαδελφους—οις ουδε προς αιραν

* On this passage Theodoret remarks: βουλετας μεν ευποροιν, οτι ταυτην ημον την κλησιν λεγωσ και ακριβως επιστημονος—δειμαι και εκενων των ονων θεου κ.τ.λ. τεθεικε δε πλειοντα δια με ησο ν, παλιν της ενεργειας σημαινειν τα μεγεθος.

parenthesis is occasioned by the parenthesis inserted in v. 4. The apostle might say, either that he did not cause Titus to be circumsized on account of (i.e. to please) false brethren; or, that in this respect he did not at all yield to their wishes, etc. As it stands, he has intermixed both constructions; see Winer Comm. in loc. —Rom. 2:17, 8 τοις—ητουσιν, τι ημι αι ων ων νοειν (παρεκκλησετε), τως δε εγερθαι—εν μοι και ὑγιή. 2 Cor. 12:17 ηε τε μνα, εν παρα
calασις προς υμας, δι' αυτων επελεικτησα υμας. 1 Pet. 2:7 ουν
tος εγεννηθη εις φαιναν γονιας και λαος προσκυνητας. On Rom. 8:3 ff. to γαρ αναφερον παρεκκλησιν νεοτων παρεκκλησεις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις. The construction may be most easily resolved by supplying ηθος or εγεννηθη in connexion with αυ
toις; see Grotius and Schultze in loc. Others give a different solu
tion; e.g. Bauer l. c. p. 277. —In Heb. 3:15 the writer goes on in the words of the Old Testament, μη σχηματιζε της πατριας υμων πατριας υμων πατριας υμων πατριας υμων. There is no parenthesis. A different opinion is held by Storr, in his Pauli Br. ad die Heb. p. 57.

A departure from the construction with which a sentence begins, is also found in 2 Cor. 11:28 χωρει των παρεκκλησων, η επι τω σταυρωσις—η με φιλανα. Less striking, perhaps, are the following, viz. Rom. 12, 1, 2 παρακαλων υμας—παραστησεις και μη συνβαθμιζεσθε—μει
tαμαρσωσθε. Eph. 1:20 ου ενθυμηθεν εν τω Χριστω, εγερθες ευνων εκ νεκρων και εν θανη εν δειξι αυτου. Col. 2:14 εγα
cλησας—μη αυτοι ηκεν. 1 Cor. 14:5 δελο παντας υμας λαλη
gενωσας, μαλλων δε iva προσκυνητες. Rom. 12:14 et εν λογιστη αυ
tω—χαρετε (γαρ) ρονωντες εσ. 2 Cor. 8:23 εκει ενερ 
χρισου—εει αδελφοι (υπερ αδελφων). Eph. 5:27 παραστησε την 

Note 1. It happens very often, that when a construction is carried on by participles, these being separated from the principal verb or word, are put in a different case from that which the grammatical con
struction would require; e.g. Mark 12:40 oι κατεσθοντες τα ωικε
ας, which refers back to βλεπον επω των γραμματων των θε
λοντων παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλησις παρεκκλη
tων των θελοντων και νουθετητων ευα
tης. 2 Cor. 9:10, 11 υμων—en πατε πλουτους ευα


§ 52. Peculiar Arrangement of Words.

1. Anomalies in the arrangement of words in a sentence also occur in the New Testament, by which the natural order of the words is more or less disturbed, and a difficult construction introduced; so that a kind of harshness is sometimes imparted to the sentence in which they occur.


§ 82. PECULIAR ARRANGEMENT OF WORDS.

Note 1. That the genitive of nouns and pronouns, especially, is often separated from the noun which governs it, has already been shewn above, p. 76 note 2. See in addition, Luke 13:11. 20:36. 7:36. 1 Cor. 10:27.

Note 2. In Heb. 11:3 εις το μη εκ φανωμενον τα βλεπομενα γεγονεναι, which some would refer here as being put for εκ μη φανωμενων, the negative properly belongs to γεγονεναι, and the sense is correctly given by Schulz, so that the things which are now seen did not originate from things which were before visible; see his Bearbeit. der Br. an die Heb. p. 230, and compare Storr in loc. The example of the inverted position of the negative, on which others rest, viz. 2 Macc. 7:28 ουτε ουκ εις πτωμον εποιησε αυτα ο δεος, is not certain, because only the Cod. Alex. has this reading, while other manuscripts read εις ουκ πτωμον. — So also in 2 Cor. 3:4, 5 πεποθησεν εγομεν—ουχ ουτε ικανου εσμεν, we are not to explain the sentence by ου δι' ουχ (μη) etc. It is much better to translate it, we have this confidence, not because we are sufficient—but because, etc.—Finally, in 2 Cor. 13:7 ουκ εις ημεσ δοκιμαι φανωμεν, αλλ' εις ημεσ το καλον ποιησε, I would not, with Schott, translate it, ημεσ δοκιμαι (Iesu legatur) comprobatis sed ut, etc. as if the negative belonged to φανωμεν. The apostle would rather say, my only desire is that ye do good, exhibit virtuous conduct; not that thus I may be δοκιμας, but simply that ye may indeed ποιησαι το καλον and thus be δοκιμαι, even though I myself should be ους αδοκιμας. In this mode of explanation, there is no inversion of the negative.

(b) More violent disruptions of the parts of a sentence have been found by some in the following examples; e.g. Acts 24:22, where Beza, Grotius, Rosenmüller, etc. suppose ακριβεστερον ειδωσ to belong after ειπων and οταν and to constitute part of the language of Felix, quando cognovero—et Lyrae huc venerit, etc. But this is wholly unnecessary, and therefore inadmissible; see Kulmnel in loc. In 2 Cor. 8:10 οικεσ ου μονον το ποιησαι, αλλα και το Θελειν προενηξασθη αυτο περιος, some interpreters, as Grotius, Schulz, Schott, Stoiz, etc. suppose an inversion for ου μονον το Θελειν αλλα και το ποιησαι προενηξασθη.* They are incorrectly led to this, on account of the

* Syr.
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phrase ἡ προθύμια τοῦ ὑλείν in v. 11. For ὑλείν in v. 10, is really more than ποιεῖ; it signifies to do i.e. to give freely, gladly; comp. v. 3 and John 6:21. In v. 11 the whole emphasis lies on ἐπιτελεῖν, as if the apostle would say a beginning, yea even beginning with ardour (ἡ προθύμια τοῦ ὑλείν) is not all that is necessary; there must be a carrying through, a completion, of the good deed. He therefore twice uses (ποιησαὶ) ἐπιτελεῖν in v. 11, and not ποιεῖν which would be the antithesis to ὑλείν taken merely in the sense of to will. The supposed inversion would be more than harsh, and would be hardly tolerable even in Paul. Besides, if to ὑλείν means here merely to will, the phrase to ὑλείν προετρέπασθε ye began to will, exhibits no suitable sense. The above mode of explanation is, in general, in accordance with Beza, Hermann, and Bauer (Log. Paul. p. 334.)

2. There is occasionally an appearance of neglecting the nicer rules of grammar in regard to the use of certain words, especially the pronouns; which, however, occasions no difficulty to the attentive reader, and imparts no obscurity or uncertainty to the sense.

E. g. Acts 10:7 where αὐτῷ refers not to Σίμων v. 6, but to Κορηνήσω in v. 1 ff. and hence some manuscripts read τῷ Κορηνήσῳ in v. 7, which is evidently a mere gloss.—Acts 15:11 where καθενων is connected in sense with τὰ ἑδνη in v. 7.—Luke 14:15 των υἱῶν ὅνος η βούς εἰς φρέαρ ἐμπεσούσαι, καὶ ὁι εὐθείας αναπαυσείσε, where the subject is changed without its being expressly indicated. So Luke 15:14, 15 εγενετο λαμπας ἱμαρος—καὶ αὐτος ὅ νεοτερος ἕξετο νικηφόρως καὶ—ἐκκλησθη ἐπὶ τῶν πολιτῶν—καὶ εἴπεμψεν αὐτοὺς, where the subject is changed twice. This occurs in Hebrew very frequently; see Gesen. p. 803. comp. 2 Sam. 11:13.

For the connexion of the demonstrative pronoun with a remote subject, see above in § 17.

Note. In regard to the arrangement and relative position of words, the different writers of the New Testament have many peculiarities. This, however, is not the place to enter into detail on the subject, since it has only a remote connexion with the department of grammar; and such a course is the more unnecessary, inasmuch as Gersdorff has devoted a separate work to the investigation of the whole sub-
ject—a work too, which, in the part already published, exhibits many results which are well worthy of attention. See his Beiträge zur Sprachcharakteristik der Schriftsteller des N. Testaments.

§ 53. Ellipsis.*

The notions of ellipsis, (and also of pleonasm,) which were generally current until a very recent date, were extremely indefinite and incorrect. They were principally introduced and fostered by the uncritical collections of Bos and his successors, and especially by philologists who have treated of the New Testament; see Haab p. 276 ff. The first attempt to rectify and settle these notions, has been made with acuteness and sagacity by Hermann, in Wolf’s Mus. antiq. studior. I. Fasc. I. p. 97—235, and ad Viger. p. 389 ff. We shall chiefly follow him in the exhibition now to be made, which, however, is intended only to point out the different classes of ellipsis; since Glass and Haab have already accumulated examples in great abundance.

1. Ellipsis consists in the omission of a word, the idea of which, although it is not actually expressed, must still be supplied in the mind of the reader.† In correspondence with the three essential constituents of a sentence, these omissions might also be arranged under three classes, viz. ellipsis of the subject, of the predicate, and of the copula.

An ellipsis of the predicate, however, never occurs, and cannot well

---


‡ This definition does not include the figure apopiosis which belongs properly to rhetoric.
Yet Haeb finds such an one in Rom. 28. ογ γαρ ὁ ἐν φανερῷ οὐδαιος ἐστιν (οὐδαιος); but here is no ellipsis, for the sentence is to be pointed as follows, viz. ογ γαρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ οὐδαιος ἐστιν.

Note. After the above remarks, it is apparent, that those instances in which a word or a form of a word is to be supplied out of the preceding or following part of a sentence, cannot well be brought within the notion of ellipsis; because in these the word is not entirely omitted, but is only covertly expressed; see Herm. l. c. p. 869. E. g. John 5: 36 μαρτυρι αυτῇ τῆς μαρτυρίας τοῦ Ἰωάννου. Eph. 5: 24 ὡστε ἡ εὐκλησία ὑποτασσεῖται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτω—αἱ γυναικεῖς τοῖς ἀνδρασιν (ὑποτασσόμεθα). 2 Tim. 1: 5 ἵνα εὐφέρῃ ἐν τῇ μαμή σου—πεπεισμαί δε, ὅτι καὶ εν δυο (εὐσεβεί). 2 Cor. 2: 10 οἴ δὲ τι χαριτοδότη καὶ εγὼ (χαριτοδοτί); see Winer's Comm. in Eph. ad Gal. p. 65. 1 Cor. 7: 19 περιτύμην οὐδεν ἐστιν καὶ ἡ ακροβυσσία οὐδεν ἐστιν, ἀλλα τρεις εὐτούν ὅζουν (εστι τι).—So also in respect to the construction praegnans, andzeugma; for which see above in § 31. 3. Just as little also is attraction (§ 50) to be considered as an elliptical construction.

2. An ellipsis of the copula is very frequent.

In respect to εἰναι and also γίνεσθαι, the ellipsis is so common as hardly to need exemplification; comp. Acts 10: 15. Heb. 5: 13. 12. 15. Rev. 15: 4. Other verbs, the idea of which may be gathered from the comparison of the subject and predicate, are also omitted; e. g. Gal. 5: 13 μονον μη τιν ελευθερίαν εις αφοριμν τη σαρκα (ωτηγεαν θ. παραλαβετε); see Winer Comm. in loc. Rom. 4: 9 ο μακαρισμός—επι την περιτομην η επι την ακροβυσσιναν; i. e. does it relate to, etc. Schoettgen supplies here πεπει, ad Bos Ellips. p. 646. 1 Cor. 6: 13 τα βρωματα τη κοιλια καὶ η κοιλια των βρωματων, i. e. is destined for, etc. Bos supplies προφημει.

3. An ellipsis of the subject often takes place, but only in the following circumstances, viz.

(a) Where the subject is necessarily understood, because the predicate in the nature of things can be affirmed of only one definite subject.

E. g. βροντη, σαλτπύρα, 1 Cor. 15: 52. See above, p. 96. 3.
(b) When the subject is implied in the article:

σημερων, see Bose p. 174 ff. So ὁ του Ζεβεδαιου sc. ιος. ἡ Κλωτα 
sc. γυνη; see above, p. 54. d.

Note. To the case α above, we may refer the often repeated modes 
of quotation; e. g. λεγει sc. ἡ γραφη Heb. 1: 7. αλ. χρη Ηeb. 8: 5. 
al. ματηρες Heb. 7: 17. The construction elsewhere occurs in full; 
e. g. John 7: 38, 42. 9: 17. Rom. 10: 11. 1 Tim. 5: 18. This ellipsis, 
which is properly an imitation of the Rabbinic mode of quotation, has 
passed from the New Testament into the writings of the Fathers; see 
Bose p. 92.

4. The host of ellipses which have been fabricated 
for the New Testament, is immeasurably great. The 
chief source of them has been an unacquaintance with 
the nature of particular parts of speech, and with the 
fundamental signification of the cases.

Of these feigned ellipses we can here exhibit only a specimen; 
since the preceding remarks, or those which are immediately to be 
made, will render it not difficult to form a just estimate of the whole 
stock that has been collected by Glass, Bauer, Haab, Wolf, etc. They 
have usually been divided into ellipses of nouns, of verbs, and of particles. But as I have already spoken of the omission of the verb, and 
as this part is by far the least copious, I shall confine myself here to the 
two remaining divisions.

(c) The ellipsis of nouns they made to comprise the followig cases, viz.: 
(i) With every adjective standing alone, as ἀγαπητος, ἐρημος, στ 
μυθεος, το εσσον, etc. and also with a pronoun or with the neuter 
article, as τα του θεου, το εσοθεν, το και εμε, they supplied some substantive, such as ἡ, δουλος, δομα, μηνη, προγμα, etc. see Bose Ellips. 
p. 276 ff. 460 ff. They overlooked the circumstance, that an adjective may really occupy the place of a noun (Herm. ad Vig. p. 871.) and 
that the neuter article το, τα, etc. which was originally a pronoun, is 
used for the very purpose of expressing an abstract generality. This 
may be illustrated from the Latin; where the phrases hoc est laudabile, 
nullum difficit, cannot be said to be elliptical, because the language
contains no word (like προελέγχει) which can be supplied; for to conceive that the word negoiam is omitted or can be supplied, is manifestly absurd.

(2) After verbs like γενέσθαι, ανακαμπτεῖν, κρούειν, καυγεῖν, προσέχειν, etc. they suppose the case of the object to be omitted, e.g. of βρῶμα, βρῶμος, ὄνειρα, νους, etc. see Bos p. 70, 120, 197, 323. Haeb p. 291 ff. But since these nouns are already implied in the notion of the verbs, e.g. food in the idea of tasting, a door in the idea of knocking, etc. the omission is merely apparent; see Herm. ad Viger. p. 883.

(3) Before verbs which are used impersonally in the 3. pers. plural, they would supply the participle of the same verb, as a nominative, e.g. συλλέγωνες sc. συλλέγοντες; βλέπονες sc. βλέποντες; see Haeb p. 285 ff. On an absurdity like this it is unnecessary to waste a word.

(4) In regard to the ellipsis of particles, Hermann (L. c. p. 877) makes the following just observation: "nulla in re magis plusque εἰς αὐτό quum in ellpsai particularum volet." It is almost inconceivable, how much unacquaintance with the fundamental principles of philosophical grammar has been manifested, not only by biblical critics, but by all the old philologists. The following examples may suffice.

(1) In respect to prepositions, they would supply as follows, viz. ἀπό after verbs of buying and selling; as Acts 7: 16. Matt. 10: 29.—And after verbs of freeing, abstaining, etc. as Luke 13: 12. 2 Pet. 1: 4. —dia with nouns of time, as John 18: 13; and also with τῆς in the sense of cur, quare, as Mark 12: 15.—Etc after verbs of going or coming to a place, and also with the infinitive of purpose, etc.—Ex with verbs of plenty, fullness, etc. as John 2: 7. Matt. 22: 10; and also with the genitive taken partitively.—Ev with nouns of time, as Matt. 12: 1. Rom. 16: 25; or of place, as Luke 9: 12; or of the instrument, etc. as Mark 6: 32.—Eis with verbs of governing, etc. as Rom. 6: 14; and with the gen. absol. as Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν. —Κατὰ with many accusatives, which do not designate the immediate object, after verbs and nouns; and also generally in every other instance where they could not account for the use of the simple accusative.—Πρός with verbs of remembering, forgetting, caring for, etc. as Matt. 18: 27. 1 Cor. 9: 9. etc. etc. That in all these instances, the simple case of the noun already has the signification which they would assign only to an implied preposition, is now generally acknowledged by all the best grammarians; see Hermann in Mus. Antiq. stud. l. c. p. 136 ff. et ad Viger. p. 877 ff.
(2) In respect to conjunctions and adverbs. Before ἡ they would supply μᾶλλον, in cases like 1 Cor. 14:19 ἰδοὺ πεντε λόγοις λαλίσσοι—ἡ μεταίχθη λόγοις ἐν γλώσσῃ; but here ἡ is properly an forte, and such sentences are to be taken interrogatively, i.e. I would gladly speak five words—but will I utter a thousand in an unknown tongue? etc. see Herm. I. c. p. 884. Wahl art. ῦ no. 1.—In cases like Matt. 20:32 ἦ εἶς θεὸς πάντων ἦμα, they would supply ἵνα; but the ground of this is rather the intermixture of two different constructions; as if one began to say ὥστε θεὸς πάντων ἦμα, but the construction is abruptly broken off and the idea more briefly expressed ἦ εἶς θεὸς πάντων ἦμα; see Herm. I. c. p. 884.—So in Matt. 6:10 ὥστε ἐν συμφωνίᾳ ἑκάστου γίνεται there is no omission of υἱὸς, because the idea is conveyed by the copulative ἔν τις. Wahl art. ως no. H. 9.—Scarcely does it deserve reflection, when they undertake to supply words in cases like the following, viz ἦς in the direct interrogation, as Matt. 11:3. 1 Cor. 11:13. ἐν ἑκάστῳ in sentences like Mark 6:26 ἐγείροντο γενομένος ὁ βισιλεύς θαυμάζοντας ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ ἐγείροντας—οὐκ ἀνείλησον κ.κ.λ. and μοῦν. as in 1 Tim. 5:23 ἀνείλησον ἐκεῖ, ἀλλ. ὁ ἐγείροντας, where surely no ellipsis can be supposed.

§ 54. Pleonasm.*

1. Pleonasm, in opposition to ellipsis, is the insertion of a word which expresses an idea not requisite for the completeness of a sentence. This occurs most frequently in respect to the predicate; and of this kind of pleonasm, Hermann distinguishes two sources, viz. " unus, quum loquitio multo usu aliquid de vi sua amisit ideoque etiam ibi usurpatur, ubi, nisi ex parte iners sit, aliena est; altera, in iteratione ejusdem notionis,

quae, 'ad vim orationis augendam inventa, frequenti usu eam vim deposuit.'

E. g. (a) εδοξος αιλιν prominent above others. (b) σωφρολαξ δο-μαν. I. X. 365 απ' ουρανοθεν.

In the New Testament we have examples like the following, viz. Acts 18: 21 παλιν ανακαμπτειν. Heb. 6: 6 παλιν ανακαμπτειν (see Weishe Pleson. p. 142 ff. and comp. Demosth. Philip. I. 3 παλιν αναληψασθε.) Matt. 26: 58 απ' μακροθεν. Here also belong the following, viz. Rom. 9: 29 ως Γημορα αιμοφθημεν. Matt. 10: 38 and Mark 8: 34 όστις θαλει ομοι τον ανιλουθεν. 2 Cor. 3: 24 την ενδεξια της αγαπης—ενδεξασθε. To this place also is to be referred the construction of composite verbs by means of the same preposition with which they are compounded; see in § 42. [All these instances seem to arise from the second source above pointed out by Hermann.]

Note. It is doubtful whether we are to refer here Rom. 8: 19 α πο-καρα δοκει α της κτισεως την αποκαλυψιν των γιου του θεου απεκδικηται, which indeed signifies merely that η κτισις ταται with ardent expectation, etc. since the word αποκαραδοκεια implies the adverbial idea of ardently, with longing, etc.

2. By far the greater part of the examples adduced by the earlier biblical philologists as instances of pleonasm, are not really such, but may be referred to some one of the classes assigned by Hermann (I. c. p. § 87.) viz.

(a) To fullness or redundancy of expression (verbositas,) circumstantiality (explicatio), or periphrasis (circumscriptio.)

E. g. When the immediate instrument is mentioned, as Acts 11: 30 δια χειρος Βαρναβα. Or when an action is particularly expressed, which in the nature of things, must necessarily precede another, as Matt. 5: χανοεξαιτο στο μα αυτου εθειαθηναι. Matt. 26: 51 εις των μετα ηπου εεχει νας την χειρα απεσασε την μαχαλαν. (Matt. 9: 13 and 17: 8 and Luke 1: 39 do not belong here.) Or when the dative of the reciprocal pronoun is appended to verbs, as Heb. 10: 34 μιμωποκνες εχει εαυτως πρεσιτων επαρθεν εν ουρανοις. Or when words which already stand in the preceding part of a sentence, and
would necessarily be implied, are yet again introduced, as 1 Cor. 14: 26. Mark 12: 30.

(b) In the expression of strong emotion, words are often repeated for the sake of emphasis, or else synonymous words are accumulated, especially by Paul.


(c) For the sake of explanation, [or rather of emphasis] a proposition is sometimes expressed both affirmatively and negatively. This is called parallelismus antitheticus.


(d) Some passages must be referred to the intermixture of two different constructions.

E. g. Luke 2: 21 ὅτε επιλησθησαν ἡμεῖς οκτω—καὶ εκληθή το ονομα, instead of επιλησθησαν—καὶ εκληθή, or ὅτε επιλησθησαν—εκληθή. Luke 2: 27 εν τῷ εισαγαγεῖν—καὶ αὐτὸς εδέξατο. Rev. 14: 9, 10 εἰ τίς—καὶ αὐτὸς πιέται. 10: 7 ὅταν μελλή σαλπιζέων, καὶ ετελεσθή το μυστήριον του θεου. al. [But in all these instances, καὶ properly includes the idea of time, as is often the case with the Heb. יָ, and is equivalent to τοτε, τον, etc. see Wahl art. καὶ II. 10. R.]

Here belongs also the use of ὅτα in quoting the exact words of another, Matt. 13: 11. Luke 19. 7, 9. Acts 5: 25. al. freq. Vigerus p. 548. [In such cases ὅτα, in its general use, is to be taken as a mere sign of quotation, and in translating may be considered only as equivalent to our inverted commas. R.]

FINIS.