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

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

VII.

WE pass on to the Pronominal Adjectives and Numerals. The use of εἷς as an ordinal is "undoubtedly a Hebrew idiom" (Blass, p. 144). By this time I am afraid I shall be regarded as a hopeless "Purist"—if a Purist could be imagined taking under his wing the post-classical Greek— but even at this risk I must express my doubts here. Blass is, of course, right in saying that the Attic εἷς καὶ εἰκοστός, like *unus et vicesimus* or our *one and twentieth*, is essentially different. But what of τῇ μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι (in a Berlin papyrus of 2nd or 3rd century)? We have many examples of ἐνάτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι and the like, but in this example there is no ordinal in the whole phrase.[1] If Hebrew usage caused this, why was it restricted to the first numeral? Regarded as vernacular Greek, the reason of the restriction is obvious : πρῶτος is the only ordinal which in form altogether differs from the cardinal.[2] As Winer remarks, we ourselves use cardinal for ordinal in phrases like *page forty*.

There is a further use of εἷς which calls for remark, its development into an indefinite article, like *ein* in German, *un* in French, or our own *an*. The fact that εἷς progressively ousted τις in popular speech, and that even in classical Greek there was a use which only needed a little

---

[1] εἰκάς, like τριάς, δεκάς, τριακάς, etc., was originally either "the number 20" or "a set of 20," though used only for the 20th of the month. Cf. τριάς in Philo="3rd day" (L. & S.).

[2] δεύτερος is not derived from δύο, but popular etymology would naturally connect it. In Byzantine Greek the cardinals beyond 4 began to take the place of the ordinals, which they have now entirely ousted: see Dieterich, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 187 f.

diluting to make it essentially the same,[1] is surely enough
to prove that the development was entirely within the
Greek language, and owed no more to Hebrew than it did
to popular Latin. We cannot, I fear, listen to Meyer (on
Matt. viii. 19), denying that εἰς is ever used in the New
Testament in the sense of τις : to import subtleties into
the meaning, against the development history of the com-
mon Greek, is a risky procedure. The use of ὁ εἷς in
Mark xiv. 10 is, as noted in EXPOSITOR VI. vii. 111,
paralleled in early papyri. In Blass's second edition we
find a virtual surrender of the Hebraism in δύο δύο, συμπό-
σια συμπόσια, δεσμάς δεσμάς (a highly probable reading in
Matt. xiii. 30) : he remarks on μίαν μίαν in Sophocles that
" Atticists had evidently complained of it as vulgar, and it
was not only Jewish Greek." It might be said that
Jewish Greek has no more to do with it than English has.
The note in Thumb's *Hellenismus* (p. 128) gives modern
Greek parallels, and Deissmann (*Theol. Literaturz.* 1898,
p. 631) cites τρία τρία from a third century papyrus. Thumb
is undeniably right in calling the coincidence with Hebrew
a mere accident.

Two single passages claim a word before we pass on
from the numerals. Ὄγδοον Νῶε ἐφύλαξεν in 2 Peter ii. 5
presents us with a classical idiom which can be shown to
survive at any rate in literary Common Greek : see examples
in Winer, p. 312, and in Schaefer's Demosthenes *l.c.* I
have not noticed any occurrences in the papyri, and in
2 Peter we rather expect bookish phrases. The A.V. of
this passage is an instructive illustration for our inquiries
as to Hebraisms. " Noah the eighth person " is not Eng-
lish, for all its appearing in a work which we are taught to
regard as the impeccable standard of classic purity. It is a

---

[1] It is difficult to see any difference between εἷς and τις in Aristophanes,
Av. 1292 :—

πέρδιξ μὲν εἷς κάπηλος ὠνομάζετο
χωλός, Μενίππῳ δ' ἦν χελιδὼν τοὔνομα, κ.τ.λ.

piece of "translation English," and fairly unintelligible too, one may well suppose, to a great many of its less educated readers. Now if this specimen of Homeric nodding had made its way into the language—like the misprint "strain *at* a gnat "—we should have had a fair parallel for " Hebraism " as hitherto understood. As it stands, a phrase which no one has ever thought of imitating, it serves to illustrate the over-literal translations which appear very frequently in the LXX. and in the New Testament, where a Semitic original underlies the Greek text.

Last in this division comes a note on Matthew xviii. 22. Blass ignores entirely the rendering "seventy-seven times " (R.V. margin), in spite of the fact that this meaning is unmistakable in Genesis iv. 24 (LXX.). It will surely be felt that Dr. Moulton (note on Winer, p. 314) was right in regarding that passage as decisive. A definite *allusion* to the Genesis story is highly probable : Jesus pointedly sets against the natural man's craving for seventy-sevenfold revenge the spiritual man's ambition to exercise the privilege of seventy-sevenfold forgiveness. For a partial grammatical parallel I might quote *Iliad* xxii. 349, δεκάκις [τε] καὶ εἴκοσι, " tenfold and twenty-fold," if the passage is sound.

We pass on to the Article, on which there is not very much to say, since in all essentials its use is in agreement with Attic. It might indeed be asserted that the New Testament is in this respect remarkably " correct " when compared with the papyri. It shows no trace of the use of the article as a relative, which is found in classical Greek outside Attic, in the later papyri,[1] and to some extent in Modern Greek. The papyri likewise exhibit some examples of the article as demonstrative, apart from connexion with μέν or δέ,[1] whereas the New Testament has nothing beyond the poetical quotation in Acts xvii. 28. Further, we have nothing answering to the vernacular idiom by

---

[1] See Völker, *Der Artikel*, pp. 5, 6 (*Syntax d. gr. Papyri*, I.).

which the article may be omitted in the articular infinitive. In family or business accounts among the papyri we find with significant frequency an item of so much εἰς πεῖν, with the dative of the persons for whom this thoughtful provision is made. There are three passages in Herodotus where ἀντί behaves thus: see vi. 32, ἀντὶ εἶναι, with Strachan's note, and Goodwin, *M.T.* § 803. In these three points we may possibly recognize Ionic influence showing itself in a limited part of the vernacular; it is at least noteworthy that Herodotus will supply parallels for them all. The Ionic elements in the Κοινή were briefly alluded to above (EXPOSITOR, April, p. 318), where other evidence may be noted for the sporadic character of these elements, and their tendency to enlarge their borders in the later development of the Common Greek.

We are not much troubled with Hebraism under the article. Blass (p. 151) regards as " thoroughly Hebraic " such phrases as πρὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς : κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν, however, " is a regular phrase and perhaps not a Hebraism." Where Semitic originals are clearly behind our Greek, there need be little objection ; but the mere admission that κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν is Greek shows how slightly these phrases diverge from the spirit of the translator's language. Phrases like τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ, διὰ χειρὸς ἐξ οἴκου, etc., are recurrent in the papyri, and the extension, such as it is, lies in the addition of a dependent genitive. The principle of " correlation " (on which see the note in Winer-Moulton, p. 175) here supports the strong tendency to drop the article after a preposition. This is seen working in the papyri : cf. Völker, *op. cit.* pp. 15–17. Without laying down a law that the noun is naturally anarthrous when attached to a preposition, we may certainly say that the usage is so predominant that no refinements of interpretation are justifiable. Obviously ἐν οἴκῳ (Mark ii. 1) is not " in *a* house," nor ἐν ἀγορᾷ (Luke vii. 32)

"in *a* market-place," nor ἐν ἀγυιᾷ, in the current papyrus formula, "in *a* street." We say "down town," "on 'Change," "in bed," "from start to finish." If we substitute "in my bed," "from the beginning to the end," we are, I take it, more pictorial; we point, as it were, to the objects in question. There is nothing *indefinite* about the anarthrous noun there; but for some reason the qualitative aspect of a noun, rather than the deictic, is appropriate to a prepositional phrase, unless we have special reason to point to it the finger of emphatic particularity. As far as I can see, there is much the same nuance in Greek, where, however, the anarthrous use with prepositions is much more predominant than in English. Pursuing further the classes of words in which we insert *the* in translation, we have the anarthrous use "in sentences having the nature of headings" (Hort on 1 Peter, p. 15*b*). Hort assigns to this cause the dropped articles before θεοῦ, πνεύματος and αἵματος in 1 Peter i. 2; Winer cites the opening words of Matthew, Mark, and Revelation. The lists of words which specially affect a dropped article will, of course, need careful examination for the individual cases. Thus when Winer includes πατήρ in his list, and quotes John i. 14 and Hebrews xii. 7, we must feel that in both passages the qualitative force is very apparent—"what son is there whom his father, *as a father*, does not chasten?" (On the former passage see R.V. margin, and the note in Winer-Moulton, p. 151.) For exegesis there are few of the finer points of Greek which need more constant attention than this omission of the article in order to lay stress on the quality or character of the object. Even the R.V. misses this badly sometimes, as in John vi. 68.[1]

With proper names we are not much nearer than we

---

[1] The marginal reading stood in the text in the First Revision. It is one among very many places where a conservative minority damaged the work by the operation of the two-thirds rule.

were to a satisfactory account of the shade of meaning con-
veyed by the article. Deissmann has attempted to define
the papyrus usage in the Berlin *Philolog. Wochenschrift*,
1902, p. 1467. He shows how the classical use is still
followed in the repetition with article of a proper name
which on its first introduction was anarthrous. When a
man's father's or mother's name is appended in the geni-
tive it is normally with the article. There are very many
cases where irregularities occur for which we have no ex-
planation. See also Völker, p. 9, who notes the curious
fact that the names of slaves and animals receive the article
when mentioned the first time, where personalities that
counted are named without the article. The innumerable
papyrus parallels to Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος may just be alluded
to before we pass from this subject : see Deissmann, *Bible
Studies*, 313 ff.

The position of the article is naturally much affected by
the colloquial character of the language. In written style
the ambiguous position of εἰς τὸν θάνατον, Rom. vi. 4,
would have been cleared up by the insertion of τοῦ, if the
meaning was " by this baptism into his death." Generally
speaking there is no doubt whether the prepositional
phrase belongs to the neighbouring noun. A very curious
misplacement of the article occurs in the ὁ ὄχλος πολύς of
John xii. 9. As Jebb notes on Sophocles, *O.T.* 1199 f.,
the noun and adjective may be fused as a composite
idea; but Jebb's examples (like 1 Pet. i. 18 and the cases
cited in Dr. Moulton's note WM. p. 166) apply only to the
adding of a *second* adjective after the group article-adjective-
noun (cf. *Ox. Pap.* 99, τῆς ὑπαρχούσης αὐτῷ μητρικῆς οἰκίας
τριστέγου). I cannot discuss here the problem of Titus
ii. 13, for we must as grammarians leave the matter
open : see WM. 162, 156 note. But I might add to the
Christian commentaries upon the passage the Berlin
papyri 366, 367, 368, 371, 395, which give seventh century

attestation for the translation "our great God and Saviour." The formula runs ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ τῆς δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου, κ.τ.λ. Needless to say, these documents are just as valuable for the exegesis of this passage as they are for proving the deity of Mary, but it may be worth while to cite them. A curious echo is found in the Ptolemaic formula applied ‖to the deified kings : thus Grenfell-Hunt, II. 15 (139 B.C.), τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ εὐεργέτου καὶ σωτῆρος [ἐπιφανοῦς] εὐχαρίστου. The phrase here is, of course, applied to one person.[1]

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

---

[1] I find I cited this in my first paper (EXPOSITOR, vi. iii. 279).