

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

most serious error is the insertion of "Col. i. 3" among the passages affected by the suggestion headed "XIII." A change of text, accepted by the revisers (omitting *καί* before *πατρί*, with Westcott and Hort), throws this instance outside the application of the principle. Our lamented Prof. Abbot, who prepared this note, followed Tischendorf's reading, to which the principle is applicable. He himself suggested many minor corrections in the American Appendix after it appeared in the Revised Version.

Μή interrogative.

BY REV. W. H. COBB.

It is well established that *μή* in questions expects the answer *no*; but how to derive this fact from the general use of *μή* as a *subjective* as well as negative particle is not commonly explained. I find that *μή* interrogative occurs in the N.T. only in *conversation*, actual or implied; but not in reflective or rhetorical questions, where "Shall I?" would stand in English (John xix. 15; 1 Cor. vi. 15), nor in questions as to matters of fact merely.

The subjective force it conveys belongs almost always to the other party, not to the speaker. Some such phrase as *τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν (σοι)*; may be understood before it, and what follows is supposed to be *not* (*μή*) the thought of the person or persons addressed. Instead of dropping the negative in translation, we may express it by the words "you do not think, suppose, claim," etc. *E.g.* in John iv. 12, the A.V. and R.V. render "Art thou greater than our father Jacob?" as though *μή* were absent. Were we to preserve the negative thus: "You are not greater than our father Jacob?" the question would still be objective. So in the redundant form employed in such cases by Winer and others, "You are not greater than our father Jacob, are you?" there is no clear mark of subjectivity. I call this redundant, because the speaker's tone gives the question sufficiently, both in Greek and in English. The true meaning I take to be, "You do not think you are greater than our father Jacob?" as though she had said, "What do you claim? *Not* — you are greater than Jacob?" *μή σὺ μείζων εἶ Ἰακώβ*; In the similar passage, John viii. 53, the Jews say to Jesus, "You do not think you are greater than Abraham?... *whom do you make yourself?*" In chap. iv. 33, the disciples are in conversation (*ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους*), one saying to another, "You

don't suppose any one brought him food?" A similar note of mutual questioning (*εἶπον πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς*) occurs at chap. vii. 35, where the Jews say among themselves, "You don't think he is about to go to the Dispersion?" This seventh chapter of John contains several other examples. Verse 26 (see Meyer), "Perhaps the rulers do not really know that this is the Christ?" where the subjectivity inheres in *ἔγνωσαν*. Verse 31, many of the multitude *were saying*, "When the Christ cometh, you do not suppose he will do more signs?" Verse 41, "Why, you don't think the Christ is coming out of Galilee?" (*οὐ γάρ* would be, "No, for cometh the Christ out of Galilee?"). Verses 47, 48, "You too haven't been deceived [in your mind]? You don't suppose any one of the rulers believes on him?" Verse 51, "You wouldn't claim that our law judges a man without hearing?" Verse 52, "You too don't hail from Galilee?" In Paul's epistles a question is sometimes expressed before *μή* interrogative; in other cases it must be mentally supplied. Rom. iii. 5, "What shall we say? *Not* — God is unrighteous?" So ix. 14. Chap. iii. 3, "For what is the case? *Not* that their want of faith," etc. When *μή* is followed by *οὐ*, the latter negatives the verb only (so Winer), while *μή* still retains its subjective force. 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5, "You do not claim that we have no right to eat and drink, to lead about a wife that is a believer?" 1 Cor. xi. 22, "Why, you do not mean to say you have no houses for eating and drinking?" The double form of the question here and at chap. ix. 8, 9, is no valid objection. See Meyer on these passages.

The only clear case where *μή* refers to the speaker's own impression is John xxi. 5, "Children, ye have no meat, I suppose?" Sometimes the subjectivity is in the sphere of volition or feeling rather than thought. John vi. 67, "You too do not mean to go away?" Luke xxii. 35, "You did not feel the lack of anything?" Acts vii. 28, "You do not intend to kill me?" (from LXX).

The difference between the subjective and objective negation is well seen at Luke vi. 39, where both occur: "You do not suppose a blind man can lead a blind man? will they not (*οὐχί*, as matter of fact) both fall into a ditch?"