
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

ON A PASSAGE IN MATTHEW XXVI. 50.

BY THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, LATELY PRESIDENT OF YALE COLLEGE.

THE expression which I propose to discuss is, *ἐφ' ὃ πάρει*. I shall say no more of *ἑταῖρε* than to refer to chapters xx. 13; xxii. 12, and shall assume that *ἐφ' ὅ* is the unquestionably true reading, and not *ἐφ' ᾧ*. That *ἐπί* with the Accusative can denote the aim or object, answering to our *for* or *after*, may be shown by many examples from the best authors; so that it is no Hellenistic usage, as Bloomfield strangely imagined. Compare Herodot. vii. 32 *ἀπεπέμπετε ἐπὶ γῆς αἴτησιν*, Soph. Trachin. 503 *ἐπὶ τάνδε ἄκοιτιν . . . τίνες κατέβαν;* Philoct. 591 *ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἄνδρε τώδε . . . πλέουσι*, Eurip. Bacch. 454 *ἐφ' ὅπερ ἐς Θήβας πάρει*, Aristoph. Lysistr. 1101 *ἐπὶ τί πάρεστε δεῦρο;* Nubes 266 *ἐπὶ τί στέφανον* i.e. *λάβω;* Plat. Gorg. 447 B. *ἐπ' αὐτό γέ τοι τοῦτο πάρεσμεν*, where it is noticeable that one MS. has the Dative. The same phrase occurs in Euthydem. 274 A., cited by Stallb., who also adduces from Theages 122 A. *νῦν οὖν ἥκεις ἐπ' αὐτὰ ταῦτα.*

The meaning of *ἐφ' ὃ πάρει* is what we desire to discuss more at length. There are four interpretations of it, all of which have their advocates at the present day.

The first of these which I shall name, after having fallen out of notice for a very long time, has again been brought forward in the present day, and has received the votes of some of the most distinguished commentators. It regards the sentence as having the relative form, and explains the sense by an aposiopesis: "that for which thou art come,— do." This may be called the interpretation of Euthymius Zigabenus (cent. xii.); but it will be made to appear that he was by no means alone, among the ancient interpreters,

in his view of the passage. He is followed, in modern times, by Meyer (H. A. W.), Ewald, Lightfoot, Alford in his last editions, by Lange, Steinmeyer (in his Leidensgesch. des Herrn, Berlin, 1868), and the Dutch Bible Company (1868), in their alternative rendering.[1]

The second explanation, which regards ἐφ' ὅ as interrogative, has the vast majority of voices in its favor. It appears in some MSS. of the Old Latin, and is the received rendering of the Vulgate, which the later Latin ecclesiastical writers naturally followed; it is adopted by some Greek interpreters, as perhaps by Origen and Chrysostom, and without doubt by Theophylact; the greater part of the Protestant commentators, as Calvin, Grotius, Casaubon, and more recently, Kuinoel, DeWette, Wordsworth, Alford in his earlier editions, know of no other; and the same is true of the lexicographers, as E. Robinson and Grimm; of grammarians, such as Winer; and of all the principal editors of the sacred text.

The third opinion, which regards the passage as exclamatory, was known to earlier interpreters, but was made prominent in later times by Fritzsche, who does not, in his very able comment on the passage, seem to be aware that he had been anticipated in his judgment. He is followed by Noyes in his translation, Alexander Buttmann in his Grammar, and Holtzmann in the Bibelwerk of Bunsen (viii. 212).

The fourth interpretation proceeds on the supposition of an ellipsis; the sentence being interrogative, but the relative force of ὅ being preserved: "*Was it this* for which thou art come?" This mode of explanation was followed by the Peshito, and in modern times by Bengel, but has had very few advocates besides.

A question preliminary to all others is, whether the relative ὅς can be used in interrogation. To the consideration of this point we invite our readers, regretting that it cannot be despatched in a few words, but hoping that in a monograph

[1] To whom I add, on information received from Professor Abbot, of Harvard, Rilliet, formerly Professor in Geneva, in his French translation of the New Testament (1860), Volkmar (with some hesitation) in die Evangelien (Leipsig, 1870), and Burger in a recent Commentary.

like this a certain fulness of discussion will not be found to be out of place. The method adopted in these remarks will be, first to consider the grammatical point just mentioned, and then to enter somewhat fully into the history of the interpretation of the clause, and the claims of the several explanations of it to our acceptance.

1. As it regards the use of relatives exclusive of ὅς and interrogatives in indirect questions, Lobeck's doctrine is (in a note on Phrynichus, p. 57, Leipz., 1820), that they are used indiscriminately, and often in the same sentence. His words follow the citation of a passage from Demosthenes, in which ὅποι, ὅ τι, and τίς, ποδαπόν, and ἐκ πόσου occur in the same sentence and construction, and where Reiske edited from a MS. ὁποδαπόν.[1] Lobeck then adds: "Consulto autem hunc locum commemoravi ut pateret tironibus Graecos data opera in interrogationibus obliquis pronomina ἀναφορικά et ἐρωτηματικά effugiendae repetitionis causa commiscuisse." He then cites several examples, partly from earlier, partly from later authors. Stallbaum, on Plat. Gorg. 448, remarks: "Relativa post interrogativa in eodem verborum ambitu frequenter inferri docuimus ad Critonem" (48 A., pp. 141, 142, where a great number of examples are cited). But the restriction "post interrogativa" will not stand. The compound relatives, in the received texts, sometimes come first.[2] Thus, in Republ. iii. 414 D., we have οὐκ οἶδα ὁποίᾳ τόλμῃ ἢ ποίοις λόγοις,—where Stallbaum himself defends ὁποίᾳ against the reading ποίᾳ; and in Charmid. 160 D. we have ἐννοήσας ὁποῖόν τινα ... καὶ ποῖα τις οὖσα. There is no rule of succession as yet discovered, known to the writer; and hiatus, as well as dislike of repetition, must have had much to do with the usage. The frequent various readings, as of the shorter forms of ποῖος for the longer of ὁποῖος, seem to show that the Greeks themselves confounded the two sets of pronouns.

2. Are the relatives exclusive of ὅς used in direct interroga-

[1] Reiske says that he is ignorant whether ὁποδαπός is to be met with elsewhere. But it is found in Herodotus at least three times, vi. 18; vii. 218; ix. 16.

[2] Kühner, larger Grammar (1st ed. § 837), contents himself with saying that the relative forms rarely come first.

tion? Lobeck says again, in the same note, that what Brunck says on Aristoph. Plut. 392, that "ὁποῖος, ὅπως, ὡς, ὅστις centies apud Atticos poetas occurrere in interrogatione [directa], idem valet de scriptoribus cujusvis generis et in relativis omnibus." The passages are all but two from later Greek writers. One of these is from Eurip. Rhes. 702:

τις, πόθεν ἦ ποίας πάτρας;
ὁποῖον εὔχεται τὸν ὕπατον θεόν;

Where, however, the modern critics read:

τίς ἦν πόθεν; ποίας πάτρας;
ποῖον ἐπεύχεται τὸν ὕπατον θεῶν;

Here measure and sense are satisfied, the last line in both strophe and antistrophe consisting of two exactly similar dochmii.

The other passage is from Demosth. c. Timoth. p. 1199, ὁπόσον τινὰ καὶ ποδαπὸν καὶ πόθεν γενόμενον τὸν χαλκὸν τοῦτον. On this Schaefer (apparat. in Demosth. v. 285), says: "Scribe πόσον. Nec me movet, quanquam gravis, auctoritas Lobeckii ὁπόσον tuentis..... Vulgatam textui affricuisse videtur labes Graecitatis citerioris; idemque, opinor, tenendum aut de omnibus aut de pluribus classicorum scriptorum locis ubi relativa vice funguntur interrogativorum."[1]

Here Schaefer admits that in lower Greek the relatives (i.e. especially the correlative ones) have found their way into interrogative sentences. Prof. Sophocles, in his Lexicon of later Greek, gives examples of such use of ὅστις from Pseudo-Justin, Julian (frag.), Cyrill, Theodoret, Theodor. Studites. A passage in Plato (Meno 74 D.) contains ὅ τι so used, but in so involved a sentence that the author may have forgotten the construction with which he set out. But there are other passages where this class of relatives is used in direct questions by the best authors. Here we do not refer to cases, such as a number to be found in Aristophanes, where the interrogative of a question is repeated in the answer by the

[1] Dindorf has received Schaefer's πόσον without MS. authority into his Oxford edition of Demosth. 1849.

corresponding relative. Thus (Acharn. 594, 595), *ἀλλὰ τίς γὰρ εἶ;* i.e. "but who are you though?" *ὅστις;* "who I am," sc. do you ask? Equites, 128, Nicias asks *καὶ πῶς;* Demosthenes replies *ὅπως;* i.e. "how"? do you ask. Nubes 214, "But Lacedaemon is where?" *ποῦ 'στιν;* to which the reply is *ὅπου 'στιν;* "where is it?" do you ask. Nearest to such cases come others like Plat. Euthydem. init., where Crito had asked Socrates who a certain person was with whom he had been talking the day before — *τίς ἦν;* The reply is *ὁπότερον καὶ ἐρῶτας;* "which of the two do you ask about?" But in Plat. Lys. 212 C. *ὁπότερος ποτέρου φίλος ἐστίν;* there is no such reason to be found for the relative forms. Still, Stallbaum tries to explain the usage in several parts of his edition of Plato by supplying something like "*scire velim*," or "*quaerere licet?*" But this is not satisfactory to me. Kühner also, in his larger Grammar (§ 587, p. 1017, 2d ed. 1872, which edition I had not seen until these remarks were written), denies that this usage was allowable in good Greek. "That the words of indirect inquiry," says he, "were used in direct questions, can hardly be admitted. This confusion of them seems to belong to the later Greek." And he adds, that where it seems to occur in earlier writers, we must suppose a word like λέξον or εἰπέ to have floated in the writer's mind. Moreover these forms are easily interchanged in the manuscripts.

3. We inquire in the next place, whether ὅς can be used in interrogative sentences. Matthiae laid down the rule that it could thus occur, but only in *dependent* propositions (§ 485). His examples are such as these: "he sends to Cyrus" *εἰπὼν ὃς ἦν*, Xen. Cyr. vi. 1. 46; *περὶ ἀρετῆς, ὃ ἐστίν, ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ οἶδα*, Plat. Men. 80 C.; "he tells the shipmaster" *ὅστις ἐστί*, Thucyd. i. 137; *ὧν τοὔργον Ἅιδης χοἱ κάτω ξυνίστορες*, Soph. Antig. 542 "Who did it Hades knows and those below."—Plumptre's trans.; Plat. Rep. 8, 559 A. *παράδειγμα ἑκατέρων αἳ εἰσίν*. So also Soph. Oed. T. 1068; Herodot. iii. 5; iv. 131; vi. 37; viii. 37. The explanation of this class of cases, as given by Stallbaum on the passage in

Meno, seems to be satisfactory: *περὶ ἀρετῆς, ὃ ἐστίν* = *π. ἀ., τοῦθ' ὃ ἐστίν*. Or, might we not say, "concerning virtue, i.e. concerning that which it is"? So "Hades knows those who did it." "He told him who he was."[1]

We may say then, that in dependent clauses after words of knowing, finding out, doubting, inquiring, wondering, ὅς can occur in places where ὅστις, and even τίς, might be used. As some sentences unite both the relative and the interrogative force, it is not strange that this should be common ground for the three. An interesting example, besides what we have given, occurs in Herodot. ix. 71: *γενομένης λέσχης ὃς γένοιτο αὐτῶν ἄριστος*, where the noun, denoting conversation or discussion, implies asking. "When a discussion took place, who of them had shown himself the bravest." Kühner, in the second edition of his large Grammar published last year (§ 562, p. 942, Vol. ii.), denies that ὅς, οἷος, ὅσος are ever used for ὅστις or τίς, or ὁποῖος for ποῖος, even in indirect questions. As perhaps the latest utterance of a grammarian of high standing, almost writing anew his old work after the lapse of more than thirty-five years, it deserves respectful consideration. That one of his main positions is true, that in such sentences as that from Aeschines cited a little above, the relative preserves a relative force, seems to me unquestionable. That, however, ὅς in dependent or indirect question must have the force of οἷος, rather than of ὅστις, does not seem to me to be true. For instance, in the passage from Herodot. ix. 71, just now cited, *γενομένης λέσχης ὃς γένοιτο ἄριστος*, this rule breaks down. We must say then, I think, that ὅς in such places stands where ὅστις, or even τίς, might stand, but has a relative force. In the passage just cited, we explain the relative "as to him who," etc. *Τίς* is used in such places from the tendency to bring the forms of direct into indirect inquiry.

It is only a seemingly interrogative use of ὅς, which occurs

[1] In Aesch. c. Ctes. § 95, *ὃν δὲ τρόπον καὶ δι' οἷων κακουργημάτων, ταῦτα ἤδη ἄξιόν ἐστιν ἀκοῦσαι*, ὅς and οἷος have a purely relative force. "It is worth while to hear the way in which, and the knaveries by means of which," etc.

in such forms of the dramatic poets, as *οἶσθ' οὖν ὃ δράσον*. This may be resolved into "do, do you know what"? But Kühner (larger Gram. 1st ed. § 470) is no doubt right in explaining it as if it grew out of *οἶσθ' οὖν ὃ δράσω*, or *ὃ δράσεις*, "Do you know what I am going to do?" or "what you must do?" It is a passing over from indirect to direct discourse. Similar is *οἶσθα νῦν ἃ μοι γενέσθω*.

We may lay it down with confidence that *ὅς* is not used in classical Greek in *direct* interrogation. This is, we believe, admitted by all the grammarians. Lobeck says *u.s.* "sed pronomen *ὅς* pro interrogativo *τίς* usurpari falsa est Hoogeveeni opinio ad Viger. v. 14, alienissimo Demosthenis loco (Or. pr. c. Aristog. p. 779) abutentis." Professor Hadley says (Gram. § 682) that, "The interrogatives are used in both kinds of questions, but in dependent questions the indefinite relatives are more common; in direct questions they are never found." Kühner says that, "*ὁποῖος* and its class never occur in direct question for *ποῖος*, etc., or only apparently, since a governing principal clause must be supplied" (1st ed. § 837, Anm. 2). We have seen what Matthiae's opinion is. Krüger makes a similar remark (Gram. p. 130). Much less, then, could they grant that *ὅς* could find place in interrogation.

The grammarians of the New Testament, however, Winer and Alexander Buttmann, contend that *ὅς* is interrogatively used in direct inquiry in Matt. xxvi. 50. Winer admits that this is unknown in classical prose, but thinks that it was an impropriety of declining Hellenism, which cannot be thought very surprising when the affinity between *qui* and *quis* is considered. He gives no examples of this unhellenic usage, and the affinity between *quis* and *qui* was about as great in early Latin as afterward. Alexander Buttmann (in the German Gram. p. 217, under § 139, 59; in Professor Thayer's recently published trans. p. 253) says that, "We reach the natural and only congruous interpretation of the passage by the assumption of the faulty use of *ὅ* in the sense of an interrogatory exclamation." He thus agrees with Fritzsche, and supports his view by the use of *ἥλικος* in James iii. 5. The

relatives, indeed, οἷος, ὅσος and ὡς occur in exclamation, but are to be distinguished from the interrogatives, ποῖος, πόσος, πῶς (Comp. Hadley, § 815). Thus, ὡς ἡδὺς εἶ = Oh, the way in which you are pleasant! But ὅς could scarcely be used in exclamation, because it denotes bare relation, while it is quality, quantity, and the like, that provoke wonder. No one probably would think of translating our passage "Oh! that for which thou art come!" It would be a very feeble expression for ἐφ' οἷον πάρει, if any one should be disposed to give it such an explanation.

It remains then to inquire whether in later Greek there are any examples of ὅς as a direct interrogative. I know of but four alleged examples, all of which are cited by Professor Sophocles in his Lexicon of later Greek; they are Justin M. cohort. (Otto's ed. iii. § 5 end), Epictet. diss. iv. 1, 95, 120 and Methodius (165 C. of Migne's Greek Patrol. vol. xviii). The two first of these had been cited before, Justin's passage by Grotius (ad loc. Op. Theol. iii., ed. Basil., 1683), the two first by Dr. Edward Robinson in his Lexicon (*v.* ὅς), and these, with the two last, by Professor Sophocles in the second edition of his above-mentioned work. I am able to adduce from Methodius still another; and also one from a writer quoted by Eusebius (Praepar. Evang. vi. 7), to which Viger makes reference.

The passages from the dissertations of Epictetus can be easily managed. The first is corrupt; in the second ὅς is not interrogative. The first (§ 95) is as follows: "But what if my fellow-traveller himself should turn upon me, and prove to be a robber? What shall I do? I will be the emperor's friend. No one will wrong me, if I am his companion. In the first place, in order that I may become illustrious, what things I must endure and suffer; how often and by how many must I be robbed! Then, if I become his friend, he too is mortal." ἵνα γένωμαι λαμπρός, ἃ με δεῖ τλῆναι καὶ παθεῖν; ποσάκις καὶ ὑπὸ πόσων ληστευθῆναι; etc. Here πόσα must be read instead of ἃ, which is weak in the company of πόσα and ποσάκις, and we can easily account for the

dropping out of *πόσα* by a kind of homoeoteleuton (*ΛΑΜΠΡΟΣΠΟΣΑ* was read as if *ΛΑΜΠΡΟΣΑ*).

The other example (in § 120) is *καὶ τίς ἡ ζημία τῷ δήσαντι τὸν αὐτοῦ δοῦλον; ἣν δοκεῖς; τὸ δῆσαι τοῦτο· ὃ καὶ σὺ ὁμολογήσεις, ἂν θέλῃς σώζειν, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔστι θηρίον, ἀλλ' ἥμερον ζῷον.* If *ἣν δοκεῖς* is to be taken interrogatively, and the pointing is right, the sense must be, "And what is the loss for him who has put his slave in chains? what do you think it is? It is this act of putting him in chains; which you too will admit, if you are willing to keep in mind that a man is not a wild beast, but a tame animal." With this rendering *ἣν δοκεῖς* is idle, being contained in the previous question; and there is no answer from the person so addressed, but the author answers for himself, and then adds *ὃ καὶ σὺ ὁμολογήσεις*, etc. If we join *ἣν δοκεῖς* to the clause preceding, and put no interrogation after *δοῦλον*, we have better sense: "And what is the loss for him who puts into bonds his slave, which you think there is?" Or we may point *ἣν δοκεῖς, τὸ δῆσαι τοῦτο*, as was done in old editions, and render, "that which you think there is, viz. this act of putting into bonds," where the words are somewhat sarcastic; since the imaginary person thought putting into bonds a *ζημία* for the slave, but not for the master. This passage has given difficulty to the editors. See Schweighäuser's note. Wolf wanted to read *οἷον δοκεῖς*. Upton remarks that *ἣν δοκεῖς, τὸ δῆσαι τοῦτο*, etc., was the old pointing; and the pointing we have given comes from him. Schw. follows him, for want of something better, confessing that *ἣν δοκεῖς;* for *τίνα δοκεῖς;* "insolentius dictum esse videtur," and saying that Upton's Latin version, *illud ipsum in vincula conjicere*, would answer better to *αὐτὸ τὸ δῆσαι τοῦτο*.

The passages in Justin Martyr and Methodius are more difficult for one who denies that *ὅς* can be used in direct interrogation. Justin's words are: *πῶς οὖν οὐκ εἰκότως ὁ Θαλῆς πρὸς αὐτόν φησι·* (or *φήσει*, with the Strasburg MS.; see Otto.) *Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, ὦ Ἀριστότελες, τὰς μὲν Πλάτωνος ἀναιρεῖν ἐθέλων δόξας, ὡς ἀληθεύοντι προσέχεις Ὁμήρῳ, ἡμῶν*

δὲ τὴν ἐναντίαν ἀποφηνάμενος δόξαν οὐκ ἀληθεύειν Ὁμηρον οἴει; "How then will not Thales say to him with justice, 'For what reason, O Aristotle, when you wish to overthrow the opinions of Plato, do you adhere to Homer as saying what is true, but when you express the opinion contrary to ours, think that Homer does not say what is true?'" The passage in Methodius of Patara (ob. cent. iv., near the beginning), from the Sympos. Virg. viii. § 15, is as follows: εἰ κρεῖττον ἦν τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν γένεσιν εἶναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὦ σχέτλιοι, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ αὐτόθεν ἀφ' οὗπερ ἔφυ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένεσις ἦν; That is, in the translation belonging to Clark's series, "If it were better, O wretched ones, that man should be subject to [the star of his birth] than that he should not be, why was not his generation and birth from the very time when the race of man began to be?"

Another example of δι' ἣν αἰτίαν occurs in interrogation in a passage of the same author (de Creatis, cap. 5, Migne Patrol. Graec. xviii. 337), ἐροίμην γὰρ σφᾶς δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀγέννητον αὐτὸν φάτε, etc., "for I can ask them 'for what reason do you say that he is unbegotten?'" This may remind one of the expression in Acts xxii. 24, ἵνα ἐπιγνῷ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὕτως ἐπεφώνουν αὐτῷ, where, however, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν can be resolved into τὴν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν, as in the passage on p. 319, note. There is yet another clear example of ὅς used in direct question, in an extract from Oenomaus, a cynic philosopher of the second century of our era. It is preserved by Eusebius (Praep. Evang. vi. 7, ed. Heinich. i. 269), Ὧν δὲ ἕνεκα ταῦτα προὐτήνεγκα τῷ λόγῳ; Ὅτι σε ἐκπέφευγεν, ὦ μάντι; where see the editor's note.

These four passages, if the text is right, are undoubted instances of such interrogative use of ὅς in direct questions. Their very rarity, however, and the need of explanations of the meaning of our passage in Matthew, which called, as will soon appear, for such glosses as those of Hesychius and Suidas, will, I think, subject them to suspicion.

If, then, there is no sufficient authority for allowing ὅς to make a direct inquiry, is not the presumption greatly against

treating this clause as a question? This presumption will grow in our minds, when we consider in what way many of the old Greek and Latin expositors of the Gospels dealt with this passage. If the relative ὅς could be used interrogatively in a direct sentence, this, from the nature of the case, must have been an idiom not infrequent, and well understood; but many of them treat the passage as if it needed a gloss, or they resort to other than the interrogative meaning in such a number of instances as to show that it gave them trouble.[1]

1. Here we will briefly mention, first, the Greek explanations

[1] The intrusion into another field was committed rather by the interrogative τίς than by the relatives. In the New Testament ὅ τι occurs but once, Acts ix. 6, and there the received text with a number of MSS. has τί. In the classical writers there are traces of this use of τίς for ὅστις, as in Soph. Electr. 316 ὅς νῦν ἀπόντος ἱστορεῖ τί σοι φίλον, where see Schneidewin's note. In the same drama, v. 1176, τί δ' ἴσχες ἄλγος πρὸς τί τοῦτ' εἰκὼν κυρεῖς; the present writer, in his edition of 1857, wrote τί δ' ἴσχες ἄλγος; etc., on the ground that two short questions are better suited to the exalted feeling in the scene. In two exactly similar passages, Soph. Oed. Tyr. 1144, and Trachin. 339, Schneidewin has done the same. In an old oracle quoted by the same critic from Diog. Laert. i. 28, occur the words τίς σοφίᾳ πάντων πρῶτος τούτου τρίποδ' αὐδῶ; The earlier and the correct pointing was πρῶτος; "who is foremost of all in wisdom? his I pronounce the tripod." Otherwise τίς would here be strictly a relative, but the interrogative form cannot be found fault with. In an epigram of Callimachus (No. 30, or in Meineke's ed. 28) we have

ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ
χαίρω, τίς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει,

where τίς takes the place of ὅστις. The bald and suspicious second line is corrected by Meineke (*u. s.* in a diatribe on the epigram) so as to read ὅτις for τίς, which is here feminine, and λαούς. The Schol. on Soph. Oed. Col. 3, quoted by Bentley, absurdly makes the τίς there relative, and supports it by another passage from Callim., ὑπὲρ ἅλα ἐνάσθη | Ἀλκάθοόν τις ἄπυστος. The sense, giving a relative force to τίς and reading Ἀλκαθόου would be "he must have dwelt beyond the sea, who never heard of Alkathous." But this, too, can establish nothing. The same Schol. cites an epigram from Nossis (310 B.C.) for the same use of τίς for ὅστις. But Bentley thinks the citation corrupt, and would read τὸν (τήν) for τίνα, undoubtedly with good reason. In Eccl. v. 9, — a unique example, I believe, in the Sept. for τίς as a relative in direct discourse, — the text and translation are out of joint. Probably τίς never took on the strictly relative sense. It ought to be added, however, that Jacobs in the Anthol. Pal., and Kühner (2d ed., § 587, p. 1018), do not object to the reading τίνα. — Here, it may be added, as a curiosity of language, that the modern Greek has lost the relative ὅς, substituting for it ὁ ὁποῖος and ὁποῦ (or, as a monosyllable, ποῦ).

that have fallen under our notice. Origen *seems* to give the passage an interrogative turn. His remarks are not extant in the original, but may be found in the Latin selections from his Commentary on Matthew (in Lommatsch's ed. iv. 447), "Dicit autem ei, improperans simulationem amicitiae ejus, 'Amice ad quid venisti?' Hoc enim nomine [i.e. *ἑταῖρος*] neminem bonorum in scripturis cognoscimus appellatum. Ad malum enim et non indutum nuptialibus vestimentis dicit: amice quid huc venisti," etc. Here "ad quid venisti" may be the translator's version, following his reading of the Vulgate, without any comment on Origen's part. All the other parts of the passage are employed upon the shade of meaning in *amice*. Nor is it improbable that Hilary of Poitiers may have borrowed from Origen his translation of the passage.

Chrysostom's comment is (ed. Montf. ii. 723 A.), if the Homily is genuine, *ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει; πλήρωσον τὰς κακὰς συνθήκας ἃς πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους πεποίηκας· συντέλεσον τὸν γραμματεῖον τῆς πράσεως*, etc. Here he *seems* to have understood the words as if they denoted "that for which thou art present — do; complete the wicked covenant you have made with the Pharisees," etc. For the pointing the editor is responsible. In his eighty-fourth homily on Matthew, Chrysostom has no remarks on *ἐφ' ᾧ* (sic). But in the Symbol. Crit. Patr. in Matth. (Toulouse, 1646), Chrysostom is quoted as explaining *ἐφ' ᾧ* by *ἐπὶ ποίᾳ αἰτίᾳ*; etc.

Basil of Seleucia (A.D. 450, publ. with Greg. Thaumat. Paris. 1622, Orat. xxxi. p. 169), takes the same view of the sentence: "Thou sawest his coming up with soldiers, with arms and staves, and saidst not 'get thee behind me Satan'; not with words didst thou turn him aside, not with deeds didst thou terrify him, but didst urge him upon the attempt: *Ἑταῖρε ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει; ἔχου τοῦ ἔργου, μὴ ἀναβάλλου τὴν τολμάν, κύρωσον τῇ πράξει τὴν πράσιν.*" The interrogation here is out of place.

Theophylact (A.D. 1070–1112, Comment. in 4 Evang. Paris. 1635, p. 162) has come clearly upon the interrogative ground.

He says, *τὸ δὲ ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ ποίῳ σκοπῷ πάρει ἐνταῦθα*, etc.

Euthymius Zigabenus or Zygadenus (cent. xii. first part), is more clear and decided than any of the Greek expositors (ed. Matthaei, i. 1055). After saying that *ἑταῖρον ὠνόμασε τὸν ἔχθιστον*, he adds, *τὸ δὲ, ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει, οὐκ ἐρωτηματικῶς ἀναγνωστέον· ἐγίνωσκε γὰρ ἐφ' ᾧ παρεγένετο· ἀλλ' ἀποφαντικῶς. δηλοῖ δὲ, ὅτι δι' ὃ παραγέγονας, ἤγουν, τὸ κατὰ σκοπὸν πράττε, τοῦ προσχήματος ἀφέμενος*. He errs with Theophylact in reading *ἐφ' ᾧ*; he errs in the contrary direction in finding pity in *ἑταῖρε*, in which Theophylact sees derision (*κωμῳδῶν καὶ διασύρων*); and his argument is not good, that because our Lord knew why he had come, he could not ask him why he had come; but he shows, here and elsewhere, much of the instinct of an able expositor.

Hesychius, the lexicographer (Alberti's ed.), gives the interrogative sense under the phrase *ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει· ἐπὶ ποίῳ σκοπῷ πάρει καὶ παραγέγονας ἐνταῦθα*, in which words the author of the gloss and Theophylact agree.

Suidas has also a gloss on *ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει* in these words *καὶ Χριστὸς πρὸς τὸν Ἰούδαν, ἑταῖρε ἐφ' ᾧ πάρει ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τίνι παραγέγονας;* where the interrogative sense is clearly given. But it is remarkable that in the MS. of Brussels, called E by Bernhardy,—who regards it as *infimi ordinis*, and thinks that Gaisford rated it higher than it deserves,—the beginning of the gloss is omitted, and after *παραγέγονας* is added *ἐρωτηματικῶς, οἱ δὲ κατ' ἀντίπτωσιν λέγουσι, οἷον οὗ χάριν παραγέγονας ποίησον*, where not Euthymius, probably, but some other expositor is copied.

These gloss-collectors would have passed by this phrase in the book of all others most commonly read, unless it had been a strange expression; and the different views are significant, as showing that the later Greeks could not satisfy themselves with believing that ὅς could find place in direct inquiry.

It is quite remarkable that the explanation of these words by an *aposiopesis* passed into or originated in the Latin

church, and was current there for ages, notwithstanding the translation *ad quid venisti* of the Vulgate. It is certain that the hint of this came from the Old Latin version. While part of the manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Codd. Colbert., Corbeiens. 2, have *ad quid*, the Veron., Vercell, Clarom., Corbeiens. 1, two Sangerman., and the Cantab. or cod. Bezae, contain the reading *ad quod*. And so the codd. Forojul., Amiat., Fuld., and Maj. Mon. of the Vulg. have the same reading. The cod. S. Gatiani, according to Sabatier, has the version *amice ad quod venisti fac.*[1]

Now that a relative meaning assigned to *ad quod* was very ancient, and stood its ground long in the Latin church, will be made evident by the following citations, arranged, as far as we are able, in chronological order.

Juvencus (under Constantine the great), in the fourth book of his Hist. Evangelic. (col. 515, ed. of George Fabricius, Basil, 1562, where the lines are not numbered), has the following verses:

> "Ille ibi dissimulans blanda cum voce salutat,
> Attigit et labiis justi miserabilis ora.
> Continuo Christus: totum complere licebit
> Huc venisse tuo quaecunque est causa paratu."

Here the last line appears to be equivalent to *that for which thou art come*, and the third answers to *do*, = the *fac*, *perfice*, of others.

Hilary of Poitiers, in his comment. on Matt. (ed. of 1730, Verona, i. col. 804), after the words "osculum enim ejus non respuit," adds, "quod autem ait Judae, *fac quod facis*, traditionis suae potestatem sub verbi hujus conditione permittit." ..... "Dat igitur in se potestatem dicendo *fac quod facis;* scilicet, quia voluntatis crimen pro facti pensatur invidia, re perageret quod voluntate jam faceret."[2]

Christian Druthmar of Aquitaine, called "Grammaticus,"

[1] The Cod. Brix., also, as Dr. Abbot informs me, an Evangelistary at Harvard of cent. viii., and another also deposited there, have the reading *quod* full or abbreviated.

[2] "In pluribus manuscr.," says the editor, "fecerat, rectius in aliis libris quod faceret."

a monk at Corvey and Stablo (cent. ix., middle), has, in his exposition of Matt., "amice ..... ad quid venisti perfice," where he must have written *quod* (max. Biblioth. patr. xv. 167 B.).

Paschasius Ratbertus, abbot of Corvey (ob. about 865) in his comment. on Matt. (ibid. xiv. 677 D.), takes the same view in a somewhat confused way: "increpantis voce dicit, amice ad quid venisti? Ac si diceret, ad quod venisti cur aliud agere ostendis? Osculum quidem porrigis, sed signum est traditionis. Rem aliam agis, cum me oscularis ..... unde fac ad quod venisti, et perfice coepta, ne immoreris circa oscula," etc.

Remigius of Auxerre (cent. ix.), as quoted by T. Aquinas (Opera iv. 459, ed. Ven.), gives the interrogative rendering and adds: "sive *hoc fac* subintelligitur."

In the Commentary of Jerome himself *ad quid venisti* appears; but no remarks are made on this part of the verse, but only on ἑταῖρε. But there is enough made out by the interpretations already mentioned, to show that the relative force of ὅ was distinctly recognized by the renderings of Latin writers, from the third century onward; and this, taken in connection with the similar Greek explanations, is a strong argument in its favor, as well as a proof of its antiquity.

Probably this interpretation was felt to be difficult on account of the aposiopesis which it requires. But we can take away something of the abruptness of the aposiopesis, on the supposition that the sense was assisted by a motion of the hand. I must confess that without this to supply ποίει or ποίησον would to me seem too harsh.[1]

Here the purpose of the words, according to this interpretation, calls for our notice. Meyer explains it by the words: "Damit weist Christus das geschehene verrätherische

[1] It may, perhaps, be conceived of as possible, that the interpreters reached this meaning by supplying several intermediate thoughts, that might follow an interrogative ἐφ' ὅ. As, e.g., "For what art thou come? Is it to give me a kiss of friendship, or to betray me? Do your work then." But the distinct statement that ὅ does not ask a question, shows, I think, that they could not have got at their paraphrases in the way mentioned.

Küssen von sich." There is more of indignation and less of pity in this explanation, than seems to suit the speaker and the occasion. But to me, this sense of the words harmonizes well with Luke's account (xxii. 47, 48): "Judas ..... drew near to Jesus in order to kiss him. But Jesus said unto him, Judas, art thou betraying the Son of man with a kiss?" This account leaves it untold whether Jesus repelled the kiss, or whether Judas, as Matthew says, actually gave the concerted sign. But, if we suppose that ἐφ' ὃ πάρει, in the sense here spoken of, followed what Luke records, there seems to be a certain unforced harmony between the passages.[1] "Judas, art thou betraying the Son of man with a kiss? That for which thou art come, do." Something so, Ewald, cited by Meyer (ed. 5), although he expresses the sense in rather a tame way: "Deines Kusses bedarf ich nicht, und weiss dass es mit diesem dir kein Ernst ist! Thue vielmehr was deines Amtes jetzt ist!" By joining the two passages together, as thus explained, we have in the first pity and horror at the act, in the second indignation at the hypocritical kiss, and in all honor is done to the Son of God. Professor Lightfoot (Fresh Revis. p. 128, Engl. ed.; p. 114, Amer. ed.) lends his high authority to this interpretation, but seems to find in it an echo of the words spoken by our Lord in John xiii. 27, at the last supper, "What thou doest, do quickly."

2. The interrogative force given to the words in question by most critics and expositors must be rejected on grammatical grounds, as we have already seen. It only remains to inquire whether such a sense is demanded by the context, or is inconsistent with the situation. The objection of Euthymius, that Christ knew why Judas had come and needed not to put the question, amounts to nothing; for such a question might with reason be put to an evil-doer to arouse his sense of guilt. Still less force have Fritzsche's remarks in his valuable note on this place: "Ejusmodi interrogatio

[1] After writing this I found in Maldonatus, the Catholic Expositor, the same idea.

in hunc locum minime quadrat. Haec enim ejus foret, qui praesenti periculo consternatus, animi intrepidi et recte factorum conscientiae simulatione adversarium confundere conaretur hoc modo: amice (= homo pessime, vid. xx. 13), edissere consilium quo huc accederes." There is in favor of this interpretation a rather remote resemblance to Luke xxii. 48: "For what art thou come?"="Art thou come to betray me?" Still it has no advantages over the others in regard to suitableness to the context.

3. The third explanation, or that of Fritzsche, is that the words contain an exclamation. "For what," that is, "for what a crime art thou here!" This thought suggested itself to several expositors before Fritzsche. Albertus Magnus (cent. xiii.) has, "Ad qnid venisti: hoc est, de statu apostoli in quam vilem foveam proditoris cecidisti!" So Sa (Bibl. Max. Comment. literal. Paris, 1643) says, "Vox facinus admirantis"; and Harduin, in his Comm., "Cum admiratione dictum, ut sit sententia, Ad quale facinus perpetrandum venisti!" Fritzsche says that he would accept the view taken by Euthymius, "nisi pateret et simplicior ratio et aptior. Nimirum post πάρει exclamationis signo in locum interrogationis suffecto, ita explicandum, ut Jesus, quo nihil magis eum decet, discipulum ad tradendum summo facinore magistrum advenisse doleat, hac ratione: vetus sodalis, ad qualem rem perpetrandam ades!" Here we find no fault with the meaning given to the words; but just the same objection of being ungrammatical lies against an exclamatory, as against an interrogative, turn given to the sentence. Exclamation goes with interrogation, and grows out of it. Moreover, ὅ is too bald and generic for exclamation; we should expect a word like οἷον, denoting quality. And this difficulty Fritzsche does not appear to me to meet by the remark that "ὅ et τοῦτο saepe ad genus referri, ut sit idem quod οἷον et τοιοῦτο." But the *quality* of the act needs to be made emphatic here, if the relative could be so used. Alexander Buttmann, as we have said before, has accepted this solution.

4. The remaining interpretation, "is it this for which thou

art come?" is unobjectionable, as far as the sense and situation are concerned. "Is it to betray me" (or to betray me by a kiss) "that thou art here?" The Syriac (the Peshito) takes this view of the passage, "Ob id venisti?" as given in Walton's Polyglott; "Is it for this thou hast come?" in Dr. James Murdock's transl. of the Peshito (New York, 1851). Ludovicus de Dieu, in his exposition of the passage (Animad. in Quat. Evangel., Lugd. Bat., 1631), refers to this translation, and prefers to give the sense of "hast thou come for this" to the Syriac words, rather than "is it this for which," etc. Several commentators refer to de Dieu's remarks. But I know of no one who accepts this interpretation until we come down to Bengel, whose note is, "locutio elliptica i.e. hoccine illud est cujus causa ades?" Then he barely quotes (as an alternative?) the gloss of Hesychius, already spoken of. Fritzsche reviews this explanation, in his excellent note, and makes this just objection, which we had felt before being supported by his opinion: "Summi ponderis vocabula, *ἐκεῖνο ἄρα ἦν* aut similia, per ellipsin omitti non poterant." The weight of the sentence, in fact, lies in the omitted words; and there is no reason, as there is in aposiopesis proper, why they should be omitted. Nothing suggests them; no gesture helps them; and they would be more readily supplied in a remark like "*this is* what you have come for," than in a question.

I conclude with saying that the view of the words taken by Euthymius, Meyer — *ὁ μακαρίτης*, Lightfoot, and a number of scholars in recent times, seems to me to be preferable to the other explanations.

The results which have been reached in this Article are principally the following:

1. That *ὅς* is never used in direct inquiry by the classical authors, and is so seldom found in later Greek — so far as we can discover — as to make the texts doubtful which support this usage. In most of these cases, singularly enough, a case of *αἰτία* is employed in the questions.

2. That the infrequency of such use is shown by the ne-

cessity which the glossarists and lexicographers felt of explaining ἐφ' ὃ πάρει.

3. That the Syriac took ὅ here to be a relative, and that most probably the original reading of the Old Latin version was *ad quod venisti*.

4. That this *ad quod venisti* was explained by a series of authorities in the Latin church as if it denoted *id ad quod venisti fac*.

5. That the same interpretation appears in the Greek church from the time of Basil of Seleucia down to Euthymius.

6. That this interpretation harmonizes well with Luke xxii. 48, and suits the occasion when the words were uttered.

7. That for grammatical reasons we must reject the interrogative turn generally given to the sentence, and that the exclamatory turn given by Fritzsche is objectionable on the same ground. Neither of these is necessary for the sense.

8. That the violent ellipsis required by the rendering, *is it this for which*, etc., condemns this translation of the early Syriac and of a few others.

Should it be thought that there is any value in this Essay, much of that value is to be ascribed to my friend Professor Thayer, of Andover, who has most kindly supplied me with quite a number of passages from the older Greek and Latin commentators, which, so far as I know, had not been collected before, and who has rendered to me other important assistance. I am also indebted to Professor Abbot, of Harvard, for valuable suggestions and information. It is due, however, to both of these eminent biblical scholars that I should say that they are not responsible for the views advocated in this article.