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

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

ARTICLE V.

PREDICATIVE PARTICIPLES WITH VERBS IN THE AORIST.[1]

BY PROF. WM. G. BALLANTINE, OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

HAVING been unable to find in any one of the New Testament or classic Greek grammars, or in any commentary, a concise and comprehensive statement and adequate illustration of the principles which guide Greek writers in the use of predicative participles *when the leading verb is in the aorist*, we offer here the results of a somewhat protracted and painstaking original investigation:[2]

RULE 1. When a writer wishes to assert by a participle, in addition to the leading action, *another action synchronous* with it, he always uses a *present* participle; e.g. John ix. 7, "and came seeing (ἦλθε βλέπων)"; Mark ii. 14, "and as he passed by (παράγων), he saw (εἶδε) Levi the son of Alphaeus."

RULE 2. When a writer wishes to assert by a participle, in addition to the leading action, *another* action which, by even the shortest interval, *preceded* it, he always uses the *aorist* participle; e.g. Matt. viii. 3, "And he stretched forth (ἐκτείνας) his hand, and touched (ἥψατο) him"; Matt. xxii. 25, "and the first married and deceased (γαμήσας ἐτελεύτησε)."

It is needless to multiply illustrations of these idioms, as they abound on every page of the New Testament, and are undisputed.

RULE 3. But very frequently a writer wishes to make by

[1] [The valuable Note on the Translation of the Aorist Tense in the Indicative Mood, which appeared in our April Number (p. 386 seq) was by an inadvertence inserted without the name of the author, Professor F. B. Denio, of Bangor Theological Seminary. — EDS.].

[2] We omit in this discussion the future and perfect participles as sufficiently well explained in the grammars.

a participle an additional assertion, not of a contemporaneous or precedent act, but *of the same act;* having asserted the effect or nature of the action he wishes to add its outward form, or the converse. In every such case the *aorist* participle is used; e.g. Matt. iv. 4, "but he answered and said (*ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε*)." Christ did not "say" *while* answering, nor *after* answering; *in* saying he answered. There were not two acts, but one.

In our own reading, as well as in a careful study of the numerous examples brought together in the grammars from the whole range of Attic literature, we have found very few, even apparent, exceptions to these three rules. The New Testament writers follow them always, as if by an unerring instinct.

With these three rules in mind let us examine a number of New Testament passages:

Luke vii. 29, "And all the people when they heard (*ἀκούσας*). and the publicans, justified (*ἐδικαίωσαν*) God, being baptized (*βαπτισθέντες*) with the baptism of John." This is a case under Rule 2. The "hearing" preceded the "justifying," and so did the "being baptized." Meyer, curiously enough, says: "*βαπτισθέντες* is *contemporaneous.*" But it was not *while receiving baptism* that they justified God.

Acts x. 33, "and thou hast well done (*ἐποίησας*) that thou art come (*παραγενόμενος*)." This is a case under Rule 3. The "coming" and the "well-doing" are not two contemporaneous acts, but are the same act viewed in two aspects—its outward form and its moral nature.

Acts x. 39, "Whom also they slew (*ἀνεῖλον*), hanging him (*κρεμάσαντες*) on a tree." This is a case under Rule 3. They did not slay Jesus *while* crucifying him nor *after* crucifying him, but by the act of crucifixion slew him. There were not two acts, but one.

Acts xiii. 27, "For they that dwell in Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not (*ἀγνοήσαντες*), nor the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath, fulfilled them (*ἐπλήρωσαν*) by condemning him (*κρίναντες*)." The

first of these participles falls, we think, under Rule 2; the failure to recognize preceded the "fulfilling." The second participle falls under Rule 3; the act of "condemning" *was* the act of "fulfilling."

Acts xxv. 13, "Now when certain days were passed, Agrippa the king and Bernice arrived (*κατήντησαν*) at Caesarea, and saluted [margin: Or, *having saluted*] (*ἀσπασάμενοι*) Festus." In the Textus Receptus we used to read *ἀσπασόμενοι*, but the critics now give us the aorist instead. Some of the Revisers seem to have been able to make nothing of the aorist here, and even such a scholar as Dr. Hort helplessly confesses: "The authority for *-άμενοι* is absolutely overwhelming, and as a matter of transmission *-όμενοι* can be only a correction. Yet it is difficult to remain satisfied that there is no prior corruption of some kind."[1] But the aorist tense of the participle simply indicates that the whole visit was an act of salutation. It was not *before* coming nor *while* coming nor *after* coming that they saluted, but in and by the act of coming.

Rom. iv. 20, "But waxed strong (*ἐνεδυναμώθη*) through faith, giving (*δούς*) glory to God." Abraham is asserted to have glorified God by "waxing strong." Meyer says: "The aorist participle puts the *διδόναι δόξαν κ. τ. λ.* not as preceding the *ἐνεδυναμώθη*, or as presupposed in it, but as completed simultaneously with it." Godet says: "Wherein, in this case, did the homage consist? The apostle tells us in verse 21: in the firm conviction which he cherished of God's faithfulness to his word and of his power to fulfil it."

Eph. i. 4, 5, "even as he chose (*ἐξελέξατο*) us in him before the foundation of the world,..... having foreordained (*προορίσας*) us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, etc." On this Meyer says: "Homberg has indeed conceived the relation of time of *προορίσας* to *ἐξελέξατο* as: '*postquam nos praedestinavit adoptandos, elegit etiam nos, ut simus sancti*'; but the usual view correctly conceives

[1] The New Testament in the Original Greek (Harper's ed.), Vol. **, Appendix, p. 100.

προορίσας as coincident in point of time and accomplished simultaneously with ἐξελέξατο, so that it is regarded as the *modus* of the latter." In other words, it is a case under Rule 3.

Eph. i. 8, 9, "which he made to abound (ἐπερίσσευσεν) toward us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known (γνωρίσας) unto us the mystery of his will." Meyer says: "The aorist participle signifies an action coincident and completed at the same time with ἐπερίσσευσεν." Here the Revisers of 1881 miss one of the nicer distinctions of Greek syntax. It was in and by "making known" that he "abounded," not after "having made known."

Eph. iv. 8, "When he ascended (ἀναβάς) on high he led captivity captive (ᾐχμαλώτευσεν)." This passage is cited by Moulton as perhaps intended, in a misprinted reference, by Winer (p. 430) as an example of an aorist participle expressing a simultaneous action. It would be easily enough explained as a case under Rule 3, for by his resurrection Christ justified us (Rom. iv. 25), but, being in a quotation from the LXX, it was probably written originally under the principle of Rule 2, and quoted by Paul unchanged.

Phil. ii. 7, "but emptied (ἐκένωσε) himself, taking (λαβών) the form of a servant." Meyer says: "The aorist participle denotes not what was previous, but contemporaneous with the ἑαυτ. ἐκέν. So also do the two following participles, which are, however, subordinated to μορφὴν δούλου λαβών as definitions of manner." It was simply "*by* taking the form" that he "emptied himself." The two acts were numerically one. We do not agree in making the two following participles subordinate to λαβών. The first (γενόμενος) is an appositive to it — a repetition of the same thought in other language. The second (εὑρεθείς) is a case under Rule 2. The expression "being found in fashion as a man" corresponds to the expression "being in the form of God." Two steps in humiliation are affirmed: the first, from unincarnate Deity to manhood; the second, after the assumption of humanity, to death. We have again, in γενόμενος κ.τ.λ., in verse 8,

a case under Rule 3: in becoming obedient, etc., he humbled himself.

Col. ii. 11, 12, "in whom ye were also circumcised (*περιετμήθητε*) with a circumcision not made with hands, ... having been buried (*συνταφέντες*) with him in baptism." Meyer says: "*συνταφέντες* is synchronous with *περιετμήθητε*, and represents substantially the same thing, 'in that ye became buried with him in baptism.'"

1 Tim. i. 12, "I thank him ..... that he counted (*ἡγήσατο*) me faithful, appointing (*θέμενος*) me to his service." On this passage Winer says (Moulton's ed., p. 437): "Some have wrongly supposed that the participle stands for the infinitive. The meaning is, *He counted me faithful, in that he appointed me for the ministry;* by this very act he gave proof that he considered me faithful."

Heb. ii. 10, "For it became him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing (*ἀγαγόντα*) [margin: Or, *having brought*] many sons unto glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect (*τελειῶσαι*) through sufferings." The aorist participle here indicates, according to Rule 3, that the writer views the "bringing" and the "making perfect through sufferings" as numerically one act; Christ on the cross reconciled us to God. Lünemann says: "According to Tholuck, who is followed by Moll, 'the participle aorist indicates, as nearer defining of the infinitive aorist *τελειῶσαι*, the specific character of the same without respect to the relation of time.' But only the infinitive, not the participle aorist, is used non-temporally; and the 'specific character' of *τελειῶσαι* cannot be expressed by *ἀγαγόντα*, for the reason that the personal objects of *ἀγαγόντα* and *τελειῶσαι* are different. *Ἀγαγόντα* can have no other meaning than 'since he led,' and is the indication of the cause from the standpoint of the writer. The aorist participle has its justification in the fact that from the moment Christ appeared upon earth as a Redeemer, and found faith among men, God in reality was leading *εἰς δόξαν*, those who believed." Dr. A. C. Kendrick (in his additions to Moll's Notes on Hebrews

in Lange's Commentary, p. 52), makes many valuable remarks upon the uses of the aorist participle, and comes very near stating the true law, but seems unable to satisfy himself, says: "The knot of the difficulty of the aorist participle *ἀγαγόντα* is scarcely yet untied," and closes with the confession, "Were there even any slight external authority for *ἄγοντα* or *ἄξοντα*, on internal grounds I should hardly hesitate to adopt it." But it is manifest from our rules that on *internal grounds* *ἀγαγόντα* is most suitable.

We might pursue the discussion of particular cases, but the foregoing will suffice. In amplification of the rules the following observations may be made:

OBS. A. The aorist participle *never* can be used, with a leading verb in the aorist, to assert a properly synchronous act, that is, an act numerically distinct.

In a sentence like Acts iii. 8, "And he entered (*εἰσῆλθε*) with them into the temple, walking (*περιπατῶν*), and leaping (*ἁλλόμενος*), and praising (*αἰνῶν*) God," aorist participles could not have been used. These participles assert the manner of entering, but the actions asserted are not the same as the act of entering. This is true even of *περιπατῶν*. The man did much superfluous walking on his restored feet, beside the mere entering. So in John ix. 7, "and came seeing (*ἦλθε βλέπων*)," an aorist participle would have been a solecism.

OBS. B. As the converse of the preceding proposition we may say that the aorist participle, when used to assert an action distinct from the leading action, *always* asserts it as precedent.

Matt. ii. 10, "And when they saw (*ἰδόντες*) the star they rejoiced (*ἐχάρησαν*)." The aorist participle indicates that the "seeing" preceded (and so caused) the "rejoicing." It is futile for Dr. Kendrick to say (*l.c.*), "Logically the seeing preceded the rejoicing; chronologically they were simultaneous." There was no joy until the act of seeing was complete.

And so it will be found in all cases where the aorist parti-

ciple is affirmed to assert a distinct contemporary act. For example, in Plato's Phaedo, 101, B. γελάσας ἡσυχῇ ἔφη, "He laughed and said," the aorist participle indicates distinctly that the laugh *preceded* the saying. So in Phaedo, 89, B. "and then he smoothed (καταψήσας) my head, and pressed (ξυμπιέσας) my hair upon my neck, and said (ἔφη)." By the dramatic touch of the aorist participle, we understand that there was a moment of silence as Socrates stroked Phaedo's hair, and *then* he spoke.

In 2 Tim. i. 17, "But when he was (γενόμενος) in Rome, he sought (ἐζήτησε) me diligently," the precise meaning is, "after he got to Rome." See Ellicott on the passage.

Where the aorist participle is adverbially used, there will be found, on consideration, a temporal reason why it is used rather than the present; e.g. διαλιπών having (first) left an interval; κατατείνας, earnestly, i.e. having bent all one's powers.

There remains but one exceptional usage in which the aorist participle asserts a distinct act, and yet one not past with reference to that of the leading verb. This is in those cases in which the participle is used for an infinitive. (Goodwin's Greek Moods and Tenses, § 113.) Acts x. 3, "He saw (εἶδεν) in a vision ..... an angel of God coming in (εἰσελθόντα) unto him, and saying (εἰπόντα) to him, Cornelius." Acts xi. 13, "and he told us how he had seen (εἶδε) the angel standing (σταθέντα) in his house, and saying (εἰπόντα), Send to Joppa." In these passages the aorist participles are used to avoid precisely what the Revisers of 1881 have taken pains to secure, namely, a reference to the *continuity* of the actions. The writer's purpose is purely narrative, not dramatic. Cornelius saw an angel "enter and say," not "entering and saying." He saw him "stand and say," not "standing and saying." 2 Pet. i. 18, "and this voice we ourselves heard (ἠκούσαμεν) come [margin: Gr. *brought*] (ἐνεχθεῖσαν) out of heaven." Here the Revisers of 1881 catch the significance of the idiom and render correctly. The meaning is not, as S. G. Green thinks (Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek

Testament, § 231), "the voice *as it* was borne." Green appears to think that if an aorist participle is *predicative*, its meaning is therefore the same as that of a present participle. The principles which regulate the tenses of infinitives affect often those of participles in connection with τυγχάνω and some other verbs of "modified existence."

Obs. C. The aorist predicative participle asserting the same act is used with all of the modes of the aorist. We have seen it with the infinitive in Heb. ii. 10. Eph. ii. 16, "and might reconcile (ἀποκαταλλάξῃ) them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain (ἀποκτείνας) the enmity thereby." We cannot agree with Meyer in rendering here, "after he shall have slain." The reconciliation is affected in the act of slaying the enmity. Eph. v. 26, "that he might sanctify (ἁγιάσῃ) it, having cleansed (καθαρίσας) it by the washing of water with the word." Here Meyer says: "The aorist participle could express that which is coincident in point of time." We have no hesitation in classifying this as a case under Rule 3.

Obs. D. In some cases the *present* participle seems to assert the same act as the leading verb, but such cases are otherwise explicable; e.g. Matt. xxii. 35, "And one of them, a lawyer, asked (ἐπηρώτησεν) him a question, tempting (πειράζων) him." We think that in this case, by the use of the present participle, the evangelist suggests that the question occurred *in the course* of a continued effort to test our Lord.

There is one glaring exception to our rules, namely, the use of the present participle λέγων, which occurs on almost every page of narrative in the New Testament with leading verbs of saying in the aorist; e.g. Matt. xxii. 1, "And Jesus answered (ἀποκριθείς) and spake (εἶπεν) again in parables unto them, saying (λέγων)." The association of the present participle with the aorist participle in the same sentence, and predicating the same action, is striking. It appears probable that the *signification* of this word "saying," emphasizing as it does the progress and continuity of utterance, led to an

idiomatic gerundive usage of the present participle like that of the Hebrew infinitive בְּ.

In the light of the foregoing discussion let us examine what some of the leading grammars have to say upon the subject:

Winer: "The aorist participle in the course of a narrative sometimes expresses a simultaneous action, as in Acts i. 24, *προσευξάμενοι εἶπον, praying they said*, Rom. iv. 20; Col. ii. 13; Phil. ii. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 5; sometimes an action which had previously taken place," etc.[1] Acts i. 24 is a plain case under Rule 3. Col. ii. 13. If *χαρισάμενος* does not denote a previous act, it may well be viewed as the same act as *συνεζωοποίησεν*. Phil. ii. 7, we have discussed above. 2 Pet. ii. 5, "but preserved (*ἐφύλαξε*) Noah ..... when he brought (*ἐπάξας*) a flood." The act of *bringing* the flood Peter represents as precedent to, and so furnishing the occasion of, God's preserving Noah.

Buttmann: "The use of the participles, however, is in so far more precise, that with the present participle to the idea of continuance that of incompleteness or of contemporaneousness (with other predicates) must necessarily be added, and with the aorist participle, that of completed (real or imaginary) past has sovereign control, whether the action be momentary or fill the duration of an entire period."[2] This excellent grammar strangely contains nothing more definite than this general remark upon so important a question. This may be because the New Testament usage is precisely the same as the classic.

Webster: "When a participle and a verb are combined together, both in the past tense, we can only determine by the sense whether the action described by the participle is antecedent to that of the verb or is coincident with it. In the following it seems to be coincident: Rom. vii. 8; Mark xv. 37; Acts vii. 36."[3] But a little reflection will convince

[1] Grammar of the New Testament Greek (Moulton's Trans.), p. 430.

[2] Grammar of New Testament Greek (Thayer's Trans.), p. 201.

[3] Syntax and Synonyms of the Greek Testament (London, 1864), p. 113.

the reader that each of these is a plain case under Rule 2. Rom. vii. 8, "but sin, finding (λαβοῦσα) occasion, wrought (κατειργάσατο) in me through the commandment all manner of coveting." It was certainly *after* finding the occasion, and not *while* finding it, that sin wrought. Mark xv. 37, "And Jesus uttered (ἀφείς) a loud voice, and gave up (ἐξέπνευσε) the ghost." The cry was uttered first. Acts vii. 36, "This man led them forth (ἐξήγαγεν), having wrought (ποιήσας) wonders and signs in Egypt, and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness forty years." It was *after* working the wonders in Egypt that Moses led Israel forth; this fixes the tense of ποιήσας, the other phrases are loosely added. As cases in which the action denoted by the participle is antecedent to the action described by the verb, Webster cites Mark xv. 43, Luke xi. 8, Acts v. 30, x. 39, v. 5, xvi. 34, 37, xv. 22, Gal. iv. 15. Some of these look far more like cases of coincident action than those which he cites as such; but, with the exception of Acts v. 30 and x. 39, which belong under Rule 3, are rightly adduced. The first — Mark xv. 43, "he boldly went in (τολμήσας εἰσῆλθε)" — is a case of adverbial use of the participle, and the aorist is chosen because one must "screw up his courage" *before* action. Webster thus fails to support his statement that the time of an aorist participle may coincide with that of the leading verb by examples, and wholly overlooks the usage upon which we base Rule 3.

S. G. Green[1] says only, that as a temporal adjunct the present participle denotes a contemporaneous, and the aorist a preceding, fact.

Jelf: "The aorist participle is used in its past force when it is wished to represent the action of the participle as antecedent to that of the principal verb; but it is also used in its primary sense to express the simple verbal notion almost in a present sense; as, Plat., Phaedo 60. C. εὖ γ' ἐποίησας ἀναμνήσας με, *you did well in reminding me;* and the aorist and present are used in the same sentence; Thuc. V. 22, πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ξυμμαχίαν ἐποιοῦντο νομίζοντες (*thinking this at*

[1] Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament, p. 363

the time, and acting upon it); and shortly after νομίσαντες expressing their abstract opinion without reference to that or any other time." [1] The sentence from the Phaedo is a fine example under our Rule 3. Of the other example cited, Dr. Arnold says: "Few sentences in Thucydides exhibit a more extraordinary specimen of anacoluthon than this." It is not really a case of an aorist and present participle in the same sentence; the author, having begun his sentence with the purpose of affirming the contemporary thought of the actors, broke off, and began again with their previous thought.

Sophocles: "The aorist of the indicative and participle express finished past action without reference to the time required for its completion; it simply narrates what happened." [2]

Madvig: "Sometimes after a verb in the aorist or historical present an aorist participle stands as apposition to the subject, not to denote an earlier, but a contemporary (single and momentary) action (*in that, by —, and*) so that the past is specially denoted in the action of the participle, just as it would be in a *verbum finitum* with *and*, etc. Phaedo 60. C. εὖ ἐποίησας ἀναμνήσας με." [3] This comes near to our statement of Rule 3. But Madvig fails to observe that the so-called contemporary acts are not two, but the same. The use of the terms "single" and "momentary" has been abandoned by the best grammarians. It cannot be too strongly condemned.

Koch: "The idea of previousness [*des Vorher*] lies not in the aorist participle, but arises because the action in being thought of as a point, not as continuing, becomes immediately past to the principal action. There are also abundant examples where the idea of previousness is so imperceptible that the actions almost coincide. Such are the cases in which the subordinate action stands not in a temporal, but a causal relation to the leading action, and where consequently the aorist participle is to be resolved by *by* [*dadurch dass*]. An. iv. 8, 25, παῖδα κατέκτανε ξυήλῃ πατάξας (by a

[1] Greek Grammar (Oxford, 1861), § 405, 5.

[2] Greek Grammar (Revised ed. 1872), p. 264.

[3] Greek Syntax (Arnold's 2d ed. London, 1873), § 183. Rem. 2.

dagger thrust)."[1] Koch is misled by the exploded notion that the aorist "represents a momentary action." The example which he gives is a good one of Rule 3. Koch also says: "The aorist participle can (like the Latin participle perfect of deponents) have also an ingressive meaning, so that only the beginning [*Eintrittspunkt*] of the subordinate action falls before the leading action while in continuance they are contemporary; Cyr. 1. 6. 27, *Κῦρος ἐπιγελάσας εἶπεν* (he laughed, and said while laughing)."[2] This is an arbitrary assertion. Xenophon says that Cyrus laughed and said. He does not say that he began laughing, and continued to laugh while speaking.

Hadley has a notion like this of Koch's. "Properly the aorist participle represents the action only as introduced (brought to pass) before that of the principal verb: in its continuance the former may coincide with the latter; Hom. *δείσας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἆλτο καὶ ἴαχε*, *and* (having become afraid) *in fear he sprang from his throne and cried.* Thus the aorist participle when joined to a principal verb in the aorist may denote the *means* or *manner*."[3] The cases referred to in the last sentence fall under our Rule 3. That the aorist participle represents the action merely as first *introduced* is an arbitrary assertion which cannot be proved. We learn nothing from the tense of *δείσας* as to the continuance of the action. So far as the affirmation goes, the fear may have been seen to be baseless the next moment, and may have instantaneously ceased. The act of fear took place and prompted the spring, that is all that Homer says. But we would not in every instance claim for Homer the same discrimination in the use of tenses that we find in the Attic and the New Testament writers.

Goodwin: "The tenses of the participle generally express the same time as those of the indicative; but they are present, past, or future relatively to the time of the verb with which they are connected." "The aorist participle in certain constructions does not denote time past with reference to the leading verb, but expresses a *simple occurrence* without regard to time (like the aorist infinitive in

[1] Griechische Schulgrammatik (Leipzig, 1881), § 101. Anm. 1.
[2] Ibid., § 101. Anm. 2.
[3] Greek Grammar, § 717 a.

§ 202). This is so in the following examples: *ἔτυχεν ἐλθών, he happened to come*; *ἔλαθεν ἐλθών, he came secretly*; *ἔφθη ἐλθών, he came first* (see § 279, 4); *περιδεῖν τὴν γῆν τμηθεῖσαν, to allow the land to be ravaged* (*to see it ravaged*) (see § 279, 3). So sometimes when the participle denotes that in which the action of the verb consists (§ 277); as *εὖ γ' ἐποίησας ἀναμνήσας με, you did well in reminding me.*"[1] It will be seen that the last remark is an inadequate statement of Rule 3. The other cases in which the participle is used like an infinitive are admirably treated under the sections referred to. Professor Goodwin in the last edition of his grammar wholly avoids the confusing words "single" and "momentary" in discussing the aorist, and in other ways improves upon the definitions of his "Moods and Tenses." But he does not clearly state and insist upon the fact that the aorist participle is used with the timelessness of the infinitive *only* with a few well ascertained verbs of peculiar meaning, and that in the mass of cases it is not grammatically admissible to assume that the aorist participle is used in its "primary timeless sense." The number and variety of cases in which the aorist participle asserts the same action as the leading verb also escapes him.

K. W. Krüger: "Joined to an aorist the aorist participle at times indicates an act so far contemporary as it expresses the outward form of the action of the leading verb [*wodurch, worin eben die Handlung des Aorists sich aüssert*]."[2] This is well said, but entirely too narrow to cover all instances, e.g. *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε*. The relation of the participle to the leading verb may be just the converse of that stated by Krüger; e.g. Demos. Phil. *Γ*, § 62, *ἀπέσφαξεν ἑαυτόν, ἔργῳ μαρτυρήσας ὅτι καὶ δικαίως καὶ καθαρῶς ὑπὲρ τῶν πολιτῶν ἀνθειστήκει Φιλίππῳ*, "he slew himself, showing in deed," etc.

But we will not continue these citations from the grammarians. Enough have been given to show a good deal of confusion and inadequacy of statement. We cannot help believing that our three rules furnish a true key to Greek usage.

[1] Greek Grammar (Revised ed. 1880), p. 252.

[2] Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen (Leipzig, 1875), § 53. 6. An. 8.