
A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

VI.

It will not be necessary to attempt here any exhaustive survey of the cases in detail: too full a treatment here will reduce the space available for other fields of grammar which are more important. There are a few noteworthy uses of the *nominative*, which, as we have seen, has a certain tendency to be residuary legatee of case-relations not obviously appropriated by the other cases. We have the use of the nominative as the name-case, unaltered by the construction of the sentence, in Revelation ix. 11: the fact that this has classical parallels is perhaps only accidental, for we have already seen that the Apocalypse has a tendency to use ungrammatical nominatives, and the general New Testament usage is certainly assimilation (Matt. i. 21; Mark iii. 16; Acts xxvii. 1). If ἐλαιών is the right accentuation in Luke xix. 29, xxi. 37, we have a nominative which in a writer like St. Luke may well be illustrated by the classical passages supplied by Blass, p. 85. WH., the Revisers, and Blass treat it as ἐλαιῶν, gen. pl. I have already remarked (Expositor, December, 1903, p. 429) on the conclusive evidence which compels us to regard the noun Ἐλαιών, *olivetum*, as a word current in the Κοινή. WH. (*App.* 158) regard the presence of Ἐλαιῶνος in Acts i. 12 as corroborating the argument drawn from the unambiguous τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν. Tertullian's *in elaeonem secedebat*, the prevalence of *olivetum* in the Latin versions, and the new fact (unknown to WH.) that ἐλαιών is a word abundantly occurring in the vernacular, may together perhaps incline us rather to the other view, with Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Weiss (cf. Dr. Moulton's note in WM. p. 227). Certainly if we were forced to emend on conjecture, to substitute ἐλαιῶνα in Luke *ll.cc.* —in one of which places the initial ἀ following makes it especially easy—would cause much less disturbance than

to follow Blass's ἐλαιῶν in Acts and Josephus. See Deissmann's careful discussion, *B.S.* 208–212.

The parenthetic nominative in expressions of time is well seen in Matthew xv. 32, and Mark viii. 2, a construction which begins in popular Attic as far back as the 5th century B.C.[1] Whether Acts v. 7 belongs to this category, as well as the similar Luke ix. 28, I have already discussed briefly (EXPOSITOR for January, p. 74); but perhaps it is not quite as decisive a consideration as I then thought, that the adoption of this means an isolated return to the construction of ἐγένετο, which St. Luke used in his Gospel, but then abandoned. The use of parenthetic nominatives appears in the papyri most abundantly in the phrases with οὐλή and with γείτονες. Thus a description will run "to A., long-faced, straight-nosed, a scar on his right wrist"; and a piece of land or a house is inventoried with "belonging to A., its neighbours on the south the open street, on the west the house of B."—all nominatives without construction. We compare such examples as John i. 6.

There is a very marked increase in the use of the articular nominative in address. Nearly sixty examples of it are found in the New Testament. There seems no sufficient reason for assigning any influence to the coincident Hebrew use, for classical Greek shows it well established. The rough and peremptory tone which characterizes most of the other examples seems to have disappeared. Contrast the Aristophanic ὁ παῖς ἀκολούθει, "you there! the lad I mean" (Blass), with the tender ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε in Luke viii. 54, where, however, we may recognize a survival of the *decisiveness* of the older use. *Descriptiveness*, however, is rather the note of the articular nominative of address in

[1] See Meisterhans, *Gram. d. att. Inschr.*[3] 203. Deissmann (in *Theol. Literaturz.* 1898, p. 629) notes an example from *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, the papyrus text. So also a British Museum papyrus, as read by Crönert in *Cl. Rev.* xvii. 197: ἐπειδὴ ἀσχολῶ ἐλθὶν πρὸς σὲν αὐτὲ ἡμέρε (=αὐταὶ ἡμέραι, "his diebus").

the New Testament : so Luke xii. 32, John xix. 3, where we may represent the *nuance* by "Fear not, you little flock!"—"Hail, you 'King'!" In the latter passage we can easily feel the inappropriateness of the βασιλεῦ found in ℵ, which would admit the royal right, as in Acts xxvi. 7. The anarthrous nominative should probably be regarded as a mere substitute for the vocative, which begins from the earliest times to be supplanted by the nominative. In modern Greek the vocatives in -ε are practically the only separate forms surviving. Hellenistic has little more, retaining some in -α and -εῦ, with the isolated γύναι, πάτερ, and θύγατερ; but the nominative is beginning to assert itself even here, for πατήρ and θυγάτηρ are well attested (see the evidence in Blass, p. 86 n.). The vocative itself need not detain us, the presence or absence of ὦ being the only feature calling for comment. In the Lucan writings only is the interjection used in the classical manner without emphasis. Elsewhere it is mostly used as we use *O*, except that it is with us appropriate in prayer, from which it is markedly absent in the New Testament, though not entirely in the LXX. where there is a Hebrew original. The progressive omission of ὦ is not wholly easy to explain, for the classical examples (see Gerth's Kühner § 357. 4) show that the simple vocative has normally a touch of sharp or peremptory tone. In the New Testament this would suit the presence of ὦ rather than its absence; but there is no reason to explain the development with Buttmann as a Latinism.

Common to nominative and accusative is the use of εἰς with acc. to replace a predicate, in phrases like γίνεσθαι εἰς and ἐγείρειν εἰς (Acts xiii. 22). This use cannot fairly be described as a Hebraism, for the vernacular shows a similar extension of the old use of εἰς expressing destination: cf. for example a papyrus (2nd cent.) from Karanis—ἔσχον παρ' ὑμῶν εἰς δά(νειον) σπέρματα, a recurrent formula. It

is obvious that "I received it *as* a loan" and "*for* a loan" do not differ except in grammar. The fact that this εἰς is mainly found in translation falls into line with other phenomena already discussed. A correct locution is overdone in passages based on a Semitic original, simply because it has the advantage of literally rendering a corresponding phraseology in the Hebrew.

We may pass over the accusative, as little remains to be said of it except on points of detail. On the genitive, readers of Winer will perhaps hardly need reminding nowadays that to call the case "unquestionably the *whence-case*" is an utterly obsolete procedure. We have already seen that the ablative, the only case which answers to Winer's "case of *proceeding from* or *out of*," is responsible for a part of the uses of the genitive with which it united of itself. Most of the ordinary divisions of the case we find still in extensive use. The objective genitive is very prominent, and exegesis has often to discuss the application of this or the subjective label to a particular phrase. It is as well to remember that in Greek the question is entirely one of exegesis, not of grammar. There is no approximation to the development by which we have restricted the inflexional genitive in our language almost entirely to the subjective use. The partitive genitive is largely replaced by the ablative with ἀπό or ἐκ, but is still used freely, sometimes in peculiar phrases. If ὀψὲ σαββάτων in Matthew xxviii. 1 is rightly interpreted by Blass, Zahn, and others, as "late on the sabbath," that is "after the sabbath," we must allow that the partitive genitive was capable of almost indefinite stretching; but the meaning *after* for ὀψέ, for which three passages are quoted from Plutarch and Philostratus, would probably come better from the ablative, "late *from*."[1]

[1] For the other rendering (R.V. etc.) I may quote a papyrus from Tebtunis (2nd cent. B.C., no. 230), τῇι προκειμένηι ια ὀψίτερον τῆς ὥρας, where

The question of Hebraism is raised again by the genitive of definition. Some of the "long series of phrases" coming under this head "obviously take their origin from Hebrew," says Blass, p. 98. The poetical examples collected in Jebb's note on Sophocles, *Antigone* 114 (or more fully in Kühner-Gerth, p. 264), include some which are quite as remarkable as the "Hebraisms" quotable from the New Testament. Thus *καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας* (Heb. iii. 12) will pair off well with *τόσονδε τόλμης πρόσωπον* (*Oed. Tyr.* 533). That many of these phrases really are literal translations from the Hebrew need not be questioned, and if an existing usage was adapted for the purpose, we can understand its being overstrained. Our only concern is with passages where no Semitic original is admissible. In these it seems fair to assume that the poetical phraseology of the Attic period had come down into the market-place, as happened also in St. James's *ἀπείραστος κακῶν*, for example.

The rapid extension of the Genitive Absolute is a very obvious feature of the later Greek. In the papyri it may be sometimes seen forming a string of statements, without a finite verb for several lines. In the New Testament we have it freely used in reference to a noun standing in the sentence, without any effort to assimilate the cases. We also find there, as more frequently in the papyri, examples of a participle standing by itself in genitive absolute construction, without noun or pronoun in agreement. The old accusative absolute, from impersonal verbs, has been swallowed up by the genitive in Hellenistic. Cf. the frequent *ἐξόντος* in papyri.

the partitive meaning is undeniable. There remains the old Latin and Vulgate *vespere sabbati*, supported by the Lewis Syriac. So Weiss, Wright, etc.: *ὀψέ* being used very much like an indecl. noun (cf. the late exx. in E. A. Sophocles's *Lexicon*), this seems a natural development, but the question is very difficult to decide. (Blass in his second edition abandons the attempt to get "after" out of "late on," falling back on the evidence for *ὀψέ*=after.)

Finally we may speak of one dative use, that of which ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε will serve as a type. In giving a list of these phrases, Blass (p. 119—unchanged in ed. 2) remarks that "the usage is an imitation of the Hebrew infinitive absolute like מוֹת יָמוּת, and is consequently found already in the LXX."; also that "the analogous classical phrases, such as γάμῳ γαμεῖν ('in true wedlock'), φυγῇ φυγεῖν ('to flee with all speed'), are only accidentally similar to these." There are two points here on which I should venture to state the case rather differently. It may of course be freely allowed that this construction, and that with the participle (βλέποντες βλέψετε) are examples of "translation Greek." But in what sense are they *imitations* of the Hebrew? It seems to me that such a description would need something much nearer and more literal, such as ἀκούειν ἀκούσετε. Is it then mere accident that we find the Hebrew locution represented by Greek which recalls respectively the γάμῳ γαμεῖν and φυγῇ φυγεῖν quoted by Blass, and the well known Aeschylean—

οἳ πρῶτα μὲν βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην,
κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον?

The Greek translator, endeavouring to be as literal as he could, nevertheless took care to use Greek that was possible, however unidiomatic. Those who have had to do much in the way of marking classical examination papers, know very well that "possible, but unidiomatic" is a very good general description of the kind of language used by translators who have attained the conscientious accuracy, but not the sure-footed freedom of the mature scholar.

We pass on to the Prepositions, about which, however, there is not much to be said in a general survey like the present, beyond what has come out already. We note the extension of the "Improper" Prepositions, all (except ἐγγύς) with genitive only. "Hebraism" is much to the

fore in this field. Hebrew was supposed to be responsible for the very coining of *ἐνώπιον*, till Deissmann proved it good vernacular.[1] The compound preposition, *ἀνὰ μέσον*, looked the same way, but has turned up abundantly in papyri.[2] The disappearance of *ἀμφί* as a separate word, and the virtual extinction of *ἀνά*, alike pursue a little further what is more than incipient in Attic. We have already seen that the instrumental use of *ἐν* is really on the lines of pure Greek development, and the same may be said of nearly all its other uses in which the Hebrew ב was supposed to be the active factor. Passing over the encroachments of *εἰς* (p. 464 above), we note the enlargement of the sphere of *ἀπό*, which encroaches upon *ἐκ*, *ὑπό*, and *παρά*. The title of the modern vernacular Gospels, "*μεταφρασμένη ἀπὸ τὸν Ἀλεξ. Πάλλη*," reminds us that *ἀπό* has advanced further in the interval. The use of prepositions, where classical Greek would have been content with a simple case, such as for partitive sense, and to express material (as Matt. xxvii. 21, iii. 4), enables *ἐκ* to outnumber *ἀπό* still, though obsolete to-day.

peculiar uses of these prepositions must be neglected here. *Πρό* in John xii. 1, 2 Corinthians xii. 2, raises the possibility of a Latinism, *ante diem tertium kalendas*, as in John xi. 18, *ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε* resembles *a millibus passuum duobus* (see Blass, pp. 126, 95). The question of the recognition of Latinism must be reserved, but I may quote here[3] three examples of this construction from the second century A.D., which show that it was a thoroughly naturalized idiom. One of these, parallels for which may be seen in Viereck's *Sermo Graecus* in the dates affixed to translated decrees, runs *πρὸ ιε̄ καλανδῶν Αὐγούστων*. Since

[1] *Bible Studies*, p. 213. Cf. EXPOSITOR, February, 1903, p. 113. The word will now be found also in O.P. 658 (250 A.D.), in the formula of a *libellus*.

[2] Not, however, in any use which would help 1 Corinthians vi. 5, where it is almost impossible to believe that the text is sound.

[3] References given in *Cl. Rev.* xviii. 152 (April, 1904).

this clear imitation is found three or four centuries earlier in inscriptions, it is not difficult to conceive the official phraseology being extended. But the construction must have been very much at home to produce *μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα τῆς τελευτῆς μου* and the illiterate *πρὼ δύο ἡμερῶν ἀγόρασον τὰ ὀρνιθάρια τῆς εἱορτῆς* ("buy the fowls two days before the feast"). I strongly suspect that the roots of this usage lay as much in the vernacular itself as in the Latin formula which is assumed to have produced it.[1]

We are back among "Hebraisms" when we look at the compound prepositions which are made so freely with *πρόσωπον*, *χείρ* and *στόμα* (Blass, 129 f.). They started of course in literal translation, and held their ground, like all other locutions to which the name of Hebraism may properly be given, by the conscious use of Biblical phrases, such as may be abundantly paralleled in the style of Englishmen whose minds are saturated with Bible language.

Of the prepositions with two cases, *διά* and *μετά* show no signs of weakening their hold on both; but *κατά* c. gen. and *περί*, *ὑπέρ* and *ὑπό* c. acc. are distinctly falling behind. *Κατά*, like *ἀνά*, is used as an adverb distributively. The distinction between *περί* and *ὑπέρ* c. gen. is growing dull, and in the passages where these prepositions are used to describe the relation of the Redeemer to man, or man's sins, it would probably be prudent not to rest much theology on the distinction. With three cases *ἐπί* alone remains entirely at home, and here there is a great deal of confusion. *Πρός* c. gen. and dat. is all but obsolete, and *παρά* c. dat. is being undermined.

There is little to say under the head of Adjectives, except on the important "Duality" question raised by the phenomena of comparison. The question touches the use of dual pronouns of the *ἕτερος* class, as well as the relation

[1] I have just noticed in Herodotus (vi. 46) *δευτέρῳ ἔτει τούτων*, which is essentally the same.

between comparative and superlative: it is really one with the tendency which destroyed the dual. The abolition of a distinction between duality and plurality is almost inevitable sooner or later in language history. English affords us instructive parallels. The simplicity and convenience of our suffixes *-er* and *-est* have preserved in common speech the old degrees of comparison. But how often does the man in the street say "the better of the two"? I should not like to say offhand how far in this matter modern literature is impeccable on Lindley Murray standards; but I fancy that in conversation the most correct of us may be caught tripping, and even when the comparative is used we are almost conscious of a kind of pedantic accuracy. That "the best of the two" is the English of the future is a fairly safe assertion. "Whether," adjectivally, is as obsolete as πότερος:[1] when we translate τίνα ἀπὸ τῶν δύο (Matt. xxvii. 21) by the archaism "whether of the twain," we are only advertising the fact that the original was normal speech and our translation artificial. We have not yet arrived at "either of the three," but we can say "either A. or B. or C." without a qualm. Of course the first step was taken ages ago in the extinction of the dual, the original existence of which in Germanic may be seen from Wulfila's Gothic. Other modern languages tell the same tale. In the New Testament the obsolescence of the superlative, except in the *elative* sense, is most marked. It is mere chance that only one example of the -τατος superlative has survived,[2] for there are scores of them in the papyri. In the genuine superlative sense, however, the examples there are very rare; practically we may say that in the vernacular documents the superlative forms are used to express the sense of our "very." The confusion of

[1] I have eleven papyrus collections by me, with *one* occurrence of πότερος in the indices, and that is nearly illegible and (to me, at least) quite unintelligible (*Amh. Pap.* 135, second cent.).

[2] Acts xxvi. 5, in true superlative sense; the speech is much affected by literary style.

comparative and superlative is well seen in some illiterate papyri, where phrases like *τὸ μέγιστον καὶ γνησιώτερον* occur. One or two typical examples of irregular comparatives may be cited—the references may be found with other examples in *Class. Rev.* xv. 439 and xviii. 154. Specially instructive is the papyrus of the astronomer Eudoxus, written in the second century B.C. There we have *καθ' ὃν ὁ ἥλιος φερόμενος τὴν μὲν ἡμέραν βραχυτέραν ποιεῖ τὴν δὲ νύκτα μακροτέραν.* The sense demands superlative, and Blass no doubt rightly assumes that the fourth century author wrote *βραχυτάτην* and *μακροτάτην.* In that case the scribe's alteration is very significant. He has in the same way altered *μεγίστῃ* to *μειζόνει* in another place, and he writes *ἐν ἑκατέρωι τῶν ζωιδίων* for "in *each* of the (twelve) signs." A Ptolemaic papyrus has *ἐν μείζονι ἀξιώματι,* an elative comparative. The phrase *σοῦ πρῶτός εἰμι* (second or third cent.) shows that in this word it was the superlative which ousted the comparative, and not *vice versâ* as elsewhere. It is reasonable to argue from all the new evidence that the R.V. marginal note should be dispensed with in John i. 15, 1 Corinthians xiii. 13, Matthew xviii. 1, and the like. And in Acts i. 1 we must allow that the mere use of *πρῶτος* can prove very little when we ask whether St. Luke meant to write a third treatise. *Πρότερος* is very rare in the papyri, though not extinct. Ramsay himself admits (*Paul the Traveller*, p. 28) that the absence of the word from Lucan writings precludes certainty for his point. The case is not quite so strong for the pronouns. There are plenty of places where *ἕτερος, ἑκάτερος, ὁπότερος,* etc., are used of more than two, and *ἄλλος* of two only; but also places where they are used carefully according to classical precedent. It seems to me a fair assumption that these words were in much the same condition as was described just now for our own comparative and superlative in phrases like "the better (best) of two." Educated men would know the distinction and observe it unless off their guard.

In these cases we must let the context decide, paying due attention to the degree of grammatical precision usually attained by each several author.

A difficulty under this head is raised by Acts xix. 16, which I briefly discussed in the EXPOSITOR for last December (viii. 426). The probability that ἀμφότεροι may be used for πάντες in a second century document, and two clear examples of it from the fourth, with the undeniable Byzantine use, form a strong temptation where the relief would be so great. I cannot but think that Ramsay is quite right in saying (*Paul the Traveller*, p. 272), "The seven sons in *v.* 14 change in an unintelligible way to two in *v.* 16 (except in the Bezan text)." St. Luke must have been a very slovenly writer if he really meant this, and the Bezan reading of *v.* 14 does not help us to understand how the more difficult "neutral text" arose if it really was secondary. On the other hand, St. Luke is the very last New Testament writer whom we should expect to yield to a colloquialism of which there is no certain example for another three centuries. If we are to defend these verses from Ramsay's criticisms—and in a purely grammatical discussion I must not deal with them except on this side—must we not assume that the original text of *v.* 14 is lost? If it contained a fuller statement, the abruptness of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρόν in *v.* 14, and of our ἀμφοτέρων, might be removed without sacrificing the characteristic ἑπτά. (It might also give us a more satisfactory statement as to Sceva's office.) The alternative is to suppose the verses an interpolation from a less educated source, imperfectly assimilated to St. Luke's style. It should be observed that the Sahidic and the later Syriac understood ἀμφοτέρων to mean "all," as also the Roman Ethiopic. But we must not trespass on the preserves of the critics, whether higher or lower; we only ask them to untie between them a knot the difficulty of which has hardly been adequately recognized.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.