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No man can be a theologian who is not a philologian. He who is no grammarian is no divine.-- A.M.Fairbairn

If any apologia be needed for a thesis of this nature it may be found.I think, in Renan's remark." La Verité consiste dans les nuances". We are concerned with minutiae,but singular:ly important minutiae. Any really scientific $\mathbb{N}$. T.exegesis must take full account of the prepositions. I venture to claim this as the first attempt on any considerable scale to illustrate and expound the prepositions of the Greek N.T. in the light of contemporary Fapyri usage. Moulton and Milligan have already pioneered some of the way in their lexical notes. But this thesis which is quite independent of the latter work, aspires to be not only an attempt to illustrate from the Fapyri but also a full treatment of the N.T. prepositions to boot.

The thesis falls into three parts:(1) An introduction on the importance of the prepositions of the N.T. (2) A general consideration of the N.T. representatives in the light of ancient and modern Greek. (3) A detailed exposition with illust:rations from the Papyri. The last and by far the largest section embodies the results of my own researches except where sometimes I have drawn upon the dissertations of hossberg and Kuhring who used collections to which I had not access. The middle section is perhaps the least original; but even there I hope it leaves the impression of having gone through my own mill.

I have tried to acknowledge all my borrowings as they occur.
t Some of fiess ullustrationis are undalied, hnt are morkly Ptolemaic. A.M.H.
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"THE PREPOSITIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WITH SOME
illustrations from the papyri."

PROIEGOMENA: THE IMPORTANCE OF GREEK PREPOSITIONS.

1. The study of Greer prepositions does not, on a casual thought, commend itself as an enthralling pursuit. The versatilities of $\dot{\epsilon} \mathrm{V}$ or K $\alpha \tau \alpha$, or the subtle soteriological differences between ávri and únćp do not suggest themselves as any more exciting than the problems which engaged Browning's Grammarian -

> "He settled "Hoti's" business - let it be! Properly based" OuN" Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic "De", Dead from the waist down."

What boots "this lust of the linguistic", may the uninitiated quite innocently ask, who has never thrilled to the discovery of a new 'nuance' of meaning in an old preposition?

And yet of all the parts of speech there is scarcely any more important than the preposition. We have the excellent authority of Luther for declaring that there is a divinity in prepositions. On the correct understanding and translation of one of these little words depends not seldom the correct exegesis of many a notable passage of New Testament Scripture; without that prepositional
key the door to the exposition of many a great text would never properly open. "Am I wrong in saying", writes Westcott on Rom.6:13, "that he who has mastered the meaning of these two prepositions, now truly rendered - 'into the name', 'in Christ' - has found the central truth of Christianity? Certainly I would gladly have given the ten years of my life spent on the Revision to bring only these two phrases of the New Testament to the heart of the Englishman. ${ }^{*}$ *

But, even after all these centuries, who dare say that he can plumb all the depths of meaning latent in the great Pauline év Xerorî ? Who shall dogmatise where a Schweitzer and a Deissmann disagree? Here, indeed, no mere grammatical surgery can hope to lay bare the deepest content of the phrase. "These are", as Simicox remarks, "extra-grammatical points".**
2. The interest and value of Greek prepositions in the New Testament touches a multitude of important beliefs and problems, from the Baptismal formula to the mysticism of St. Paul and the Sem.itisms of the Apocalypse. What theological battles have been waged round the interpretation of a particular preposition! What theories have been built on a single prepositional phrase! To take

[^0] (p.83). ** Language of the New Testament. (p.144).
one instance only, what is the meaning of the phrase Kגта̀ sáék in 2 Cor.5:16? Scholars like Johannes Weiss and James Hope Moulton, building on this phrase, have seriously suggested that Paul had once actually seen Jesus in the flesh.

No scholar or exegete, then, who would discover the full riches of a 'logion' of Jesus or an argumentation of Paul, can afford to ignore such apparent 'minutiae' as the prepositions. The Greek prepositions are instinct with life and meaning. Here the man who reads the New Testament only in the English Authorised Version is often liable to miss the full significance of a sentence or saying. I confess that, before I came to read Greek, I never fully understood the point of the Authorised Version's (Matt.23:24), "strain AT a gnat and swallow a camel." But the original Greek is pellucidly clear: "Strain OUT (Sıulí ̧oviesk....) a gnat." Only then I grasped the humorous hyperbole, so beloved of the Oriental teacher, with all its absurdity and truth: before that I had the wrong mental picture.

A similar example may be cited from Westcott: John

 houdaíous, 'Eג̀v ípeis r.T.入.

Authorised
Version, "Many believed on Him ........ to those Jews
which believed on Him", destroying the intended distinction between TIGTE'UGV G's c. acc. and Tioteúciv with the dative. miortúciv c.dat. marks intellectual belief, tioreúen fis personal trust. It is our English difference between "believing a man" and "believing in him". "Some believed in Christ", comments Westcott, "and they were safe in their readiness to follow Him, wherever He might lead them. Some Jews believed Him and, while they admitted His claims, would have made Him the Messiah of their own hearts. In such a state lay the possibility of the fatal issues of the chapter." (Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament, p.64).
3. A man reveals himself as much in his prepositions as in his books. Of the writers of the New Testament this is eminently true. Each book has its prepositional idiosyncrasies. Luke uses his prepositions differently from John. Matthew is more correct in differentiating $\epsilon$ 's from $\epsilon_{v} v$ than Mark. But of all the writers, Paul is undoubtedly the most adept in his handing of the prepositions. $\delta / \alpha^{\prime}$, ratá, év, we may say of him, but the greatest of these is év. And, on occasion, he can paint a picture by a deft use of these little words. The classic example of this is Gal.3:13, where three prepositions describe Paul's interpretation of the significance
of Jesus' death. Úró gives the first idea: (v. $\mathcal{O}$ ) "As many as are under ( cinó) a curse from the works of the Law." The Law is a sword of Damocles hanging over every man who seeks salvation in works of Law. He is 'under' a 'curse'. But, says Paul (v.l3), Christ became a curse 'over' ( $\cup$ 'réc ) us, i.e. 'for' us. The sword of Damocles fell on Him instead of us. Christ stood 'over' us, and between us and the curse of the Law 'under' which we lived. And, thirdly, Christ bought us out (色nyócarev) from under the curse of the Law. We were delivered from under the curse of the Law when Christ became a curse in our stead.

Prepositions, indeed, are pictographic for those who have eyes to see them.
4. But the prepositions have other values and worths. Sometimes an argument for the common authorship or, at least, common 'provenance' of two New Testament books, may be buttressed by an appeal to prepositions. We do not attempt to maintain the common authorship of all the 'Johannine' writings, but the conservative scholar may find an incidental argument for his case in the fact that únó c.gen., so common, for example, in Luke and Paul, is used only twice in the Fourth Gospel, once in the Johannine epistles, and twice in the Apocalypse. Conversely, a study of the prepositions may militate against
traditional views. What are we to make of the fact that the epistles attributed to St. Peter contain no instances of Semitic prepositional periphrases, so natural and inevitable in the writing of a man whose mother tongue was Aramaic? Or of the fact that $\vec{e} \boldsymbol{m}_{\prime}^{\prime}$ acc. with the sense of "with regard to" (a good Platonic idiom) occurs six times in the brief Pastoral Epistles, and only once in all the rest of the admittedly Pauline letters? Is this mere linguistic coincidence? Is it not rather that a man's prepositions no less than his dialect, "bewray" him, suggesting that the Pastorals are by another hand?
5. Further, the prepositions of the Greek New Testament are a valuable aid in placing the New Testament Koine in its proper chronological position in the bistorical evolution of the Greek language. We shall recur to this point later; here a sentence from M. P.F.Regard's excellent monograph on the New Testament prepositions may suffice. It summarises a careful linguistic investigation into the relations of the New Testament prepositional system with the Greek of the classical period on the one hand, and the language of the modern Greek vernacular on the other. "En résumé, dans la Hoine representée par les textes du Nouveau Testament, le système ancien apparait modifié souvent, atteint parfois,
mais non ruiné; le système moderne n'est pas constitué, mais on aperçoit comment il va s'établir. La langue du Nouveau Testament est du grec ancien, mais on $y$ voit poindre le grec moderne." (Contribution, etc. p.688).

## PLAN OF THESIS.

These random prolegomena will serve to suggest the interest and importance of the prepositions in the Greek New Testament. In the succeeding pages our aims will be (1) To appraise the New Testament Koine prepositional system in its relations with classical Greek and with the modern spoken language. (2) To characterise, in broad outline, the New Testament prepositions, adding chapters on (a) the great increase of prepositions in the New Testament Koine, (b) the encroachments of various prepositions on each other, (c) the interchange of eis and $\dot{\epsilon}_{v}$, and (d) Semitiesms among the New Testament prepositions. (3) To set forth the New Testament prepositions in some detail, illustrating them from the papyri wherever possible.

## GENERAI RBMARKS.

We shall not waste much time in discussing prepositions in general: this is not a treatise in comparative philology. Suffice it here to make a few introductory remarks.

It is of course obvious that the term "preposition" is not always correct. In early times it was often a "postposition", placed after the noun. But for the purpose of the Greek New Testament the name is accurate enough.

Nor, again, is it quite correct to speak of prepositions "governing" certain cases. The boot is really on the other foot. The cases do the "governing" largely. At first the meaning resided in the case itself. Only when the case-suffix began to lose its primitive force, was the help of place-adverbs enlisted to help out the meaning, and to give it exactness. So, as language developed, the prepositions began to master the cases. "As the horse in the fable called in the man to help him against the stag", says Mr. H.P.V. Nunn with pictorial pptness, "and allowed him to get on his back, and then found that he himself had lost his liberty, so the cases called in the help of the prepositions, and then found themselves weakened and finally destroyed." (Syntax of New Testament Greek, p.24). This consummation reached
in modern Greek, Italian, French and English almost completely, has not yet occurred in the New Testament Koine, though there are no uncertain foreshadowings of it. Perhaps, therefore, we ought to adopt M.Regard's way of describing the relation of the prepositions to the cases, and say that they "accompany" them (accompagner).

We have said the prepositions were originally placeadverbs. Giles' definition (Manual p.341) is admirable. "The preposition is only an adverb specialised to define a case-usage." This includes what are called "improper" prepositions. In this thesis we shall be chiefly concerned with the seventeen "proper" ones (eighteen in classical Greek, which still has ${ }^{\prime} \mu \phi^{\prime}$ ). The only real difference, however, between the proper and the improper prepositions (which in the New Testament number over forty) is that the former, being older, are compounded with verbs, while the latter are not.

One last word. The grammarians never tire of telling the novice that the proper way to study the Greek prepositions is first to discover the meaning of the case (true genitive or ablative - genitive, true dative or instrumental or locative), then to add to it the rootmeaning of the preposition, and, finally, to weigh the context. This, excellent though it is in theory, is often a counsel of perfection. For in the Koine the
cases, like Heraclitus' cosmogony, are in a state of flux. We have to reckon with an evanescent dative and a progressive accusative; nor can the savants themselves always say surely whether the case accompanying a particular preposition is an ablative or a genitive, a pure dative, a locative, or an instrumental (e.g. l Cor.6:2, e' év úpiu reiveral ó kóofos ). For érí the rule cited above is almost useless. In the New Testament $\epsilon \boldsymbol{m}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ is found with an accusative in one verse, and with a genitive in the next with no discernible difference of meaning.* In such cases Farrar's rule that $\epsilon$ 'rí c.dative denotes absolute superposition, with the genitive only partial superposition, with the accusative motion with a view to superposition, is of little practical use. ("Greek Syntax", Farrar, p.102. Farrar is quoting Donaldson).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Cf. also Matt.19:28. }
\end{aligned}
$$

## THE ROOT-MEANINGS OF THE PREPOSITIONS.

The seventeen proper prepositions with their rootmeanings, so far as can be ascertained, are:-

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { àvá }^{\prime} & \text { : 'upwards' } \\
\mathcal{\alpha}_{\nu \tau i} & : \text { 'in front of', 'overagainst', so 'in place of ' } \\
\dot{\alpha} \pi o ́ & : \text { off, so 'away from' }
\end{array}
$$



The reader may incline to question some of the rootmeanings assigned to the various prepositions above. Let him do so. We dare not dogmatise where Brugmann and Delbrlhck dissent. K K Ta is a case in point. The original meaning is not certain; but Brugmann thinks the earliest use of the word was 'along' something, so as to remain in contact with the object.

A sentence or two on the others. The idea of 'aurí (a locative case of $\alpha^{\prime \prime} v+\alpha$ ) is 'in front of' or 'at the end of'. "Suppose", says A.T.Robertson (Grammar, p,572), "two men at each end of a log facing each other. That
gives the etymological picture, 'face to face'."
8/á, too, interests etymologically. Delbruck (Vergl.Synt. I, p.579) says, "Of the origin of 8/a' I know nothing to say." Despite this modest agnosticism of the great scholar, there is no doubt that 8io' is akin to Súo, dis etc. It is 'by-twain', 'be-tween', and originally has the idea of interval between. The word Síadoyos suggests its basal force.

Remark the prepositions we have bracketed together. 'Ev of course, is simply the older form of $\epsilon$ 's ( $\vec{E}_{V}=\vec{c}^{\prime} \cup s$ $=\epsilon ' s=\epsilon \prime S$ ). Some grammarians take the same view of meo and reo's : the relation is not proven. Incidentally, let us protest against the common view that roós means 'to'. 'Near' or 'face-to-face' seems to have been the original significance. As for imés and inó : inó is simply the positive of cinée.

These root-meanings are of capital importance in appraising the meaning of any prepositional phrase. In actual use, many of them appear so close in meaning that it seems mere refinement to differentiate between or among them.

That there is a measure of confusion and encroachment in the New Testament Koine is undoubted. But that is no ground for 'lumping' like prepositions together, and no excuse for failing to discriminate between them.
reo's, $\epsilon \Pi I^{\prime}$ and Eis are not mere synonyms after verbs of motion. mpo's generally connotes personal relations, while $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}$ and $\epsilon$ 's differ in that $\epsilon$ 'ri' marks the ter-
 significantly different. ふ́mó marks the point of departure; $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ suggests that one has been within the place or circle before departing (so e.g. the common New Testament phrase E'K vekpîv which should always be given its full force 'out of the dead'); while tapo' is more intimate: it indicates that one is beside the place or person whence he starts: 'from the side of', 'from the presence of'.

Once again, incée, 'aurí, and nté' have some ground in common. They are all used at different times to describe Christ's death. But they approach the subject from different angles, and must be delicately distinguished. (Unfortunately our English 'for', often employed to translate all three, is not exact enough: it is too vague, it is of ten ambiguous).

The vexed question of cis and $\dot{\epsilon \prime} \cup$ and our mode of translation must be left here until later: it is too important a problem to solve in any categorical fashion. Lastly, $\epsilon \vec{v}$ and 8/a must be carefully distinguished (vide 1 Cor.12:7 ff. 8 (á ....karó ....év). "The student will find the variation of the prepositions a suggestive
lesson in the laws of revelation." (Westcott: Lessons of the Revised Version, p.64).

We shall probably require to recant some of this doctrine later in the light of the papyri. What we really wish to arraign here, is the careless, undiscriminating translation of various prepositions as though they were all absolutely synonymous. The Koine does not, to be sure, use its prepositions with the precision and accuracy of the best Attic rhetoricians. A vernacular speech could not, and would not. But the writers of the New Testament, and of all save the most illiterate papyri, did know one preposition from another, and with the exception of an 'occasional and partial' blending of tis and $\in \vec{v}, \pi \in C^{\prime}$ and $\dot{u} \pi \mathcal{K}^{\prime}, 8_{1 a}$ and únó, (the latter is very, very occasional), used them idiomatically and properly. Coarse vulgarisms such as oúv c.genitive are quite absent. Even apparent solecisms like Rev.1:4, àno ó ơv are admitted by Charles to be premeditated. "Our author knows perfectly the case that should follow ánó, but he refuses to inflect the divine Name" (The Revelation of St. John, p.cliii). In fine, if there is not classical exactness, there is general fidelity to the laws of grammar as they stood at that time.

## LINGUISTIC HISTORY OF GREEK PREPOSITIONS.

And now let us plunge 'in medias res'. Let us take a brief glance at the linguistic history of the Greek prepositions. Let us see the exact place the prepositions of the Greek New Testament occupy in the evolution of the Greek language. A comparison of the Koine usage of the first century A.D. with Attic Greek on the one hand, and modern Greek on the other, will give us an excellent synoptic view of the whole process, and an excellent idea of where and how the New Testament representatives stand. Indeed, our prepositional criterion will shew us, in one important particular, the precise place the New Testament Koine as a whole occupies in the history of the Greek language.

Broadly speaking, we may say that the ancient system has been modified in certain directions in the New Testament language; but though modified and somewhat impaired, it remains substantially. It is not so much that certain prepositions have disappeared, as that there is a tendency towards the increased use of some to the disuse of others. It is the record, in a sense, of 'the survival of the fittest'. We see prepositions very much 'on the make', and prepositions quite as clearly on the decline.

We append tables with relevant remarks:-
I. PREPOSITIONS WITH ONE CASE.
A. Classical Greek.

Genitive.


## New Testament Koine.

## Genitive.

áuri

$$
\alpha^{\prime} \text { 'то' }
$$

$\epsilon^{\prime} \xi$
roó

Remarks: In the New Testament, as in the Koine generally, $\alpha^{\alpha} \pi o^{\prime}$ and $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} k$ ( $\epsilon \prime \xi$ ) have extended their provinces very markedly. व'uri' and Tró are on the road which ' $\alpha \mu \phi \prime^{\prime}$ has already traversed. There are only twelve examples of 'aua' in the New Testament (Rev. 21:21 is an adverbial use) and twenty-two of $\alpha^{\prime} v i l^{\prime}$ (five of which are the stereotyped phrase ' $\alpha v \theta$ 'ī̀ ). ávrí's decline is due in some measure to the encroachment of U'ח'ৎ. Teó has also lost its substitutionary force.
B. Dative.

$$
\vec{E}^{2} v
$$

súv

Dative.
év
oúv

Remarks: 'Ev is the commonest of all the New Testament prepositions. It occurs very often where classical Greek was content with the simple dative. In Moulton's phrase, Ev $\epsilon_{v} 6031$ times in Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon,
and 17,130 times in twelve voluminous historians of the post-classical age. But these figures are scarcely more than half of those which Helbing assigns to cis in the twelve post-classical writers. The New Testament almost reverses the numbers. E's occurs 1743 times; Év 2698 times. (vide Moulton: The Christian Religion in the Study and in the Street, p.130).

Eúv, thanks to its stronger rival $\mu \in T \alpha^{\prime}$, never became really common. The New Testament and the Papyri have it much oftener than the classical writers. (Xenophon is the exception, but then he is a precursor of the Koine). It is the 'aristocrat' among the New Testament prepositions, though Dr. Luke did not scruple to make it work. (Cf. 127 instances of Gúv in the New Testament; I count 80 in the Lukan writings).

## II. PREPOSITIONS WITH SEVERAL CASES.

A. With Two Cases.

Genitive \& Accusative (cl). Genitive \& Accusative (N.T)

| $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ | - |
| :---: | :---: |
| 81 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 8120 |
| k $\alpha$ ¢ $\alpha$ | като' |
| $\mu \in T \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ | $\mu \in T \alpha$ |
| (see next table) | $\pi \in \mathcal{C l}^{\prime}$ |
| Unté | $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon^{\prime}($ |
| (see next table) | ̇̇о' |

Remarks: Classical $\alpha^{\prime} \mu \phi \prime^{\prime}$ has disappeared in the New Testament documents. rec' made it superfluous in a language that did not nicely differentiate the basic ideas of 'around' and 'on both sides'. The cl. use of TEP' c. dative has vanished by New Testament times. For the relative frequency of the others, see the New Testament statistics.
B. With Three Cases (Acc. Gen. and Dative).

| rocea' | Tacá |
| :---: | :---: |
| TEE' | (see Remarks under II,A) |
| meos | rreos |
| író | (see II, A) |

Remarks: 'Eri' in both New Testament and classical Greek is found frequently with all three cases. Topá c. dative is rarer. rcos only gets into this category of prepositions with three cases in virtue of a semiliterary and solitary occurrence with the genitive in Acts. únó c. dative, found in classical Greek, is replaced by író c. accusative in the New Testament and in the papyri.

Before we proceed to discuss the modern Greek situation, let us insert the statistics for the relative
frequency of the prepositions in the New Testament and in the papyri. Moulton's computation is worth reproducing here* : he takes ${ }^{*} V$ as representing unity and finds the others ranging thus: 'ava' .0045; ávrí .008;

 sưv.048; unép.054; íлó .08.

That is, $\epsilon \vec{\epsilon}, \epsilon$ 's, and $\overrightarrow{\epsilon K}$ are the commonest, with $\epsilon^{\prime} \Pi^{\prime}$ hard on the heels of $\in \mathcal{K}$. Tropa', $\pi \in \mathcal{C O}^{\prime}$, reó, Góv, cimép and úró, and especially davá and dourí are suffering swift eclipse.

The actual figures are also worth stating. They can be compared with the secular witness of the papyri.
Accusative
Genitive
Dative.

| $\alpha^{2} v \alpha^{\prime}$ | 12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ávrí |  | 22 |
| áró |  | c. 655-660 |
| 8/a' | 279 | 382 |
| Gis | 1743 |  |
| E'M G'v |  | c.920 (163 times in 'Jahn') |
| eni' | 464 | 216176 |
| K<tó | 391 | 73 |
| $\mu \in T \alpha$ | 100 | 361 |
| $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha^{\prime}$ | 60 | 78 |


|  | Accusative | Genitive | Dative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pi \in \rho \rho^{\prime}$ | 38 | 291 |  |
| тeó |  | 48 |  |
| neos | 679 | 1 | 6 |
| sưv |  |  | c. 130 ( 80 in Luke and Acts) |
| urtée | 19 | 126 | and Acts) |
| ¿nó | 50 | 165 |  |

Some of these figures are of my own counting. They are approximate because of MSS. variants.

## ROSSBERG'S FIGURES.

Rossberg has made a similar calculation for the papyri collections which he has examined:-
Accusative. Genitive. Dative. Aggregate.

| $\alpha^{\prime} \times \alpha^{\prime}$ | 652 |  |  | 652 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| arvi |  | 89 |  | 89 |
| áró' |  | 920 |  | 920 |
| diá | 206 | 508 |  | 714 |
| Eis | 1765 |  |  | 1765 |
| G'K |  | 903 |  | 903 |
| Ev |  |  | 2245 | 2245 |
| ERi | 313 | 579 | 126 | 1018 |
| ratá | 793 | 64 |  | 857 |
| $\mu \in \alpha^{\prime}$ | 81 | 130 |  | 211 |
| $\pi \alpha \rho^{\alpha}$ | 89 | 907 | 40 | $1036{ }^{+}$ |


|  | Acousetive. | Genitive. | Dative. | Aggregete. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| negi | 256 | 376 |  | 631 |
| apá |  | 44 |  | 44 |
| rors | 622 |  | 262 | 784 |
| caí |  |  | 234 | 134 |
| úrás | 23 | 270 |  | 283 |
| cimis | 53 | 302 | 9 | 364 |
| Total: | 4843 | 5091 | 2716 |  |

Romarks: Thene etatiotion tell aubetantially the same etory an the Vow Testament. The difforent nature of the documents acoounts for most of the dieparities, e.g., 12 times in the New Testament, but 652 timen in the papyri. The very frequent commercial use of avo' in the papyri is the explanation. The papyri again have Tapa c. genitive 907 times against the New Testament's 78. This is largeIy due to the frequent formula, 'I have from so-and-so' (in receipts) where $\pi \mathcal{C}^{\alpha} \alpha^{\prime}$ is commonly used. The frequency of tref' c. accusative in the papyri is due to its local use 'in the area of' in official documents. With these exceptions, the two sets of figures shew a close correspondence. One remark further:- Rossberg finds no examples of reo's c. genitive, and Radermacher says the usage does not occur in the papyri. But I have myself counted at least four bona fide’ examples of it (vide sub teós Part II, ).

## THE MODERN GREEK SITUATION.

We come now to compare the New Testament prepositions with their counterparts in modern Greek. The new situation is surprising to anyone who has not studied the processes at work in the time of the New Testament. But where one remembers the doom that was rapidly overtaking the dative case, and the growing encroachment of the more powerful and generally useful prepositions on their less utilitarian fellows, even in the first century A.D., the resultant position in modern Greek is not so startling. A shrewd student of linguistic evolution, with the New Testament prepositional statistics before him and no knowledge of modern Greek, might tolerably well predict how the prepositions would fare in the sequel. For, in Regard's striking figures, "le grec (of the New Testament) est souvent plus ou moins semblable a une maison out les nouveaux locataires s'installeraient avant le départ des anciens." (op.cit. p.686).

It is, of course, not the $k \alpha \theta \alpha \rho$ Gúourd , the Atticizing learned language of the present day, but the modern vernacular which concerns us here. It alone is the true descendant of the ancient language. Occasionally obsolete prepositions occur in vernacular texts (e.g. reó) through borrowing from the literary jargon. But it is the prepositions which remain alive in the spoken tongue
which are important for our purpose.
Two features strike us at once. (1) with the exception of a few set phrases, all the proper prepositions 'accompany' the accusative case. The dative is dead, the genitive appears only in a few fixed formulae. (2) The number of proper prepositions has sensibly diminished. 'EU after its 'crowded hour of glorious life' has paid the penalty of its popularity and vanished. Indeed, the only commonly used prepositions are cis, àmó, $\mu$ '
 (and in dialects ob $X$, ross ) are found less frequently. (Thumb: Handbook, p.98).

Only seven, therefore, of the eighteen Attic, and seventeen New Testament proper prepositions have come through the testing struggle for existence.

But there are other changes and developments. Ais in the form $\sigma \epsilon$ ( $\epsilon \prime \sigma \epsilon^{\prime}$ ) has now become ' the maid of all work'. It suppliants the dative: there are hints of this tendency in the New Testament. It serves, of course, for év. It has usurped reós: again the New Testament foreshadows quite certainly this development.
'Aró is hardly less versatile. It means 'of', 'from', 'out of', 'ago'. It occurs in such phrases as ${ }^{\prime} \times \omega^{\prime} c, \sigma t o s$ ब'ró ', 'separable from', and фuláyopar àmò to karo
'I guard against evil' and 'Gokiá ̧ovtav arno twos 8pákous 'he was afraid of the draki' - all of which recall New Testament expressions which at one time seemed palpably Semitic. It denotes agent, as okorwonke व $\pi^{\prime}$ tour Toúgkous (again the New Testament has parallels), material, ànò $\mu a ́ c \mu \alpha c o . ' o f ~ m a r b l e ', ~ c a u s e, ~$ (yiveral ami áváyky : Luke has similar usages, egg. ' arno 申' ${ }^{\prime}$ nov Luke 21:26) and, of course, has a partitive sense, e.g. ravers $\alpha \pi 0$ sous $\phi^{\prime}$ thous and $\delta \in i \pi v a i \omega$ a hmo Kwa 'I eat (of) earth'.

Merak, in the apocopate form $\mu \epsilon^{\prime}$, has vanquished Guv.. Though it no longer means 'after', it is very frequent
 such phrases as no $\quad \underset{\epsilon}{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon$ 'I fight with' and $\mu \boldsymbol{\lambda} \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon^{\prime}$ 'I speak with' (cf. similar New Testament combinations) appear. Cf. Rev.2:16; 12:7; 13:4; 17:14.
$\Delta \alpha^{\prime}$ disguised as y/a', besides preserving the usage of $8 / \alpha$ c. accusative, "has acquired the function partly of the old dative and partly those of $\epsilon \epsilon^{\prime}, \pi \in C^{\prime}$, órée $\alpha^{2} v{ }^{\prime} i^{\prime} . " \quad(T h u m b$ gives examples ad hoc.).

Kara preserves its common New Testament meaning of 'according to'. The old senses of 'down' and 'against' are gone. But it has often the sense of 'towards', and shares with $\epsilon$ 's the simpler uses of the lost moo's.

$$
\text { In } \alpha_{0} \alpha^{\prime} \text { has one interesting development, though its }
$$

uses are far more limited than formerly. The New Testament (Rom.1:25) had contained $\vec{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$ pevodu $\vec{i}$ kTíGe, rapà tot Kтíquuta - Modern Greek corroborates this comparative force in Tapá. Katútepa fiàs "occas
 hour of liberty than forty years of slavery.'

Some further remarks on the preposition usage of modern Greek must be made:- Though ten of the New Testa-
 Guv, ír'́e, ínó, ) have disappeared to all intents and purposes, there are odd relics and reminiscences of some. 'Ard survives in Ávafétafo 'between' (cf. I Cor.
 the Epirot ob $X$ and ' $X$, r $\rho \rho^{\prime}$ and $\epsilon$ ' $\pi i$ in adverbial phrases as Neo re $\alpha$ ans 'at the head of the table' and mioroma 'on the mouth', etc.

If the proper prepositions have decreased, the 'impproper' ones have prospered. They are usually formed with $\sigma \epsilon$, ' $n=0$, and $\mu \epsilon$ prefixed, and denote mostly spatial relations. And, as shewn in the table above,
 rank of proper prepositions.

The New Testament shews prepositions followed by adverbs such as árò pakcóvtu , ánò tóte, eons róte The modern vernacular says $\dot{\alpha}^{\prime r} r^{\prime}$ ergs , $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \dot{\circ}$ rote (s), cos rórtetc.

The New Testament provides occasional examples of $\epsilon$ íva, combined with reós, $\epsilon$ 's, etc. This usage is altogether regular in the modern Koine.

Lastly, the New Testament $\kappa_{\alpha} \theta^{\prime} \epsilon_{i s}^{\prime i s}$ is perpetuated in the modern Greek wa $\theta$ 'is.

So we sum up. Changes there have been, and a great reduction in the prepositional system since the time of the New Testament. Yet the tendencies - the ruin of the dative, the advance of the accusative, the decrease of proper and the increase of improper prepositions, the use of prepositions with adverbs, etc. - were all latent in the language which Mark and Luke and Paul wrote in the first century A.D.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT PREPOSITIONS.

The four most striking characteristics of the New Testament prepositional system are: (I) the greatly increased use of them as compared with classical Greek. (2) The decadence of some prepositions, and the growing ascendency of others. (3) A measure of confusion and encroachment among certain prepositions. (4) A marked tendency towards the use of a one-case preposition as in modern Greek.

We shall devote short chapters to (1) and (3). and (4) have already been, to some degree, discussed.

A few remarks on the prepositions in detail at this stage may not be irrelevant.
'Avo', used with dative and accusative in Attic, now barely survives in the accusative in virtue of two idioms, (1) 'Ava' used distributively, and (2) the phrase dra' $\mu$ GOOV.
'Avti in both New restament and papyri, is suffering from the vogue of $\dot{\iota} \pi \epsilon^{\prime} e^{\prime}$. The phrase áv $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\omega} v$ is to be noted.
'Ano' is very much 'on the make'. It strives with E'K for possession of the old genitive. It is used partitively. It appears frequently in such combinations
 and even with $\dot{U}$ тó of agent.
$\Delta \alpha^{\prime}$ c. genitive denoting intermediate author is increasingly common. $\Delta \alpha^{\prime}$ c. accusative, besides its old functions, is often used like $\epsilon_{\text {Cl }}$ UK d . Occasionally $\mathcal{O}_{1} \alpha^{\prime}$ c. accusative approaches very near to the idea of ins trument.
$E^{\prime}$ 's is second only to $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ in popularity. It is interchanged partially with $\epsilon^{\prime} v$. It often means no more than 'to'. It occasionally replaces the dative. It has an extended predicative use in the New Testament. 'En though 'feeling' the popularity of ${ }^{\prime} \pi o^{\prime}$, is still very much alive. Its partitive use is very ferequant, especially in the Fourth Gospel.
'Eu, 'the maid of all work', has too many uses to allow full comment here. 'Av of Instrument is perhaps its most striking usage.
'Fri' is the only preposition still used freely with three cases: except for certain idioms ( $\alpha^{2} y \in / v \hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} \pi r_{1} \tau / \sim \alpha$, $\vec{\epsilon} \phi$ lécews , $\epsilon \bar{\pi} i$ roirors etc.), it is difficult to distinguish between the three cases.

Katá c. genitive competes with rcós c. accusative and $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi \prime^{\prime}$ c. accusative in the sense 'against'. With the accusative it is extraordinarily versatile, and has as many applications as our 'with regard to'.

Meta has lost its connexion with the dative. It is freely used with the genitive where the classics would
have employed a dative of Manner.
Ilaca' is used with three cases, but there are signs of decrepitude in its association with the dative. Trap' c. accusative often occurs where we might expect napa' c. dative. Such a phrase as oi Tap 'aंर्थि (for of mac $\alpha$ 人

II $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ has lost its connexion with the dative. With the genitive it sometimes is equivalent to $\dot{U} \pi \epsilon^{\prime}(\mathrm{C}$ c. genitive.

Keos is used chiefly of Time. Neo Trántur of Pereference is a common phrase. Its use $=$ 'for' like unté has gone.

II Co's c. genitive is literary (once in the New Testament). With the dative it is rare. With the accusative tee's is very common and varied in its use.

Eúu remains alive (Xenophon gave it a new lease of life) but is making little headway against $\mu \in \tau \alpha^{\prime}$ c.genitive.
'Y$Y_{\pi \in \mathcal{C}} \quad$ c. genitive has aggrandised itself at the expence of 'puri' and recí. With the accusative it has sometimes a comparative force like rap' c. accusative.
'Yró c. accusative occurs for úró c. dative after a verb of rest. But $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma^{\prime}, 8, \alpha$, , even rapó have encroached on its use with the genitive expressing Agent.

## (1) INCREASE IN USE OF PREPOSITIONS.

We must now discuss the great increase in the number of prepositions compared with Classical usage. Something has already been said of the reasons for this prepositional abundance. The cases, and above all the dative, were becoming blurred. Prepositions were being called in to help out meanings once adequately expressed by the case-endings. The proper prepositions were getting more and more to do; and besides them there was springing up a host of improper prepositions. This increasing use of prepositions was, in fine, a practice which in the course of the history of the language, became more and more adopted in opposition to the employment of the simple case." (Blass: Grammar of New Testament Greek, p.121). Rossberg begins his dissertation on the prepositions in the papyri thus, "As compared with classical usage, the Ptolemaic period shews a great increase in the use of prepositions." And after discussing the dominance of prepositional expression in the laws and institutes of Ptolemaic times he continues: "But this style of speech greatly increased in those writings which give us the everyday language of the people." Flinders Petrie Pap.III 43 recto 12 sqq. is a fine example of this method of heaping-up prepositions. "As the force of the cases weakens, men try to set forth ideas in as few words as
possible and to avoid the more difficult constructions. They use prepositions to set forth what could be expressed by substantives, adjectives, participles or the simple case alone dependent on some verb." If these words are true of the papyri, they are equally true of the kindred speech of the New Testament. In a sentence, it may be said that as a language passes from the synthetic to the analytic stage, the need for prepositions inevitably increases.

Some rough statistics may help to shew how considerably the 'proper' prepositions had extended their dominion in later Greek compared with classical. The "Apology" of Plato contains approximately 9000 words of which 284 are prepositions: that is, approximately, 3.1 prepositions in every 100 words. By a similar calculation I reckon the prepositional percentage of Bk.I of Xenophon's Anabasis to be a fraction over 5\%. (Xenophon, it should be noted, is in many ways a precursor of the Koine and not least evidently in his prepositions). Now take a book of the New Testament, say Philippians, and compare the percentage. Philippians contains approximately 1650 words, and of these 164 are prepositions: that is the percentage is a tiny fraction under 10\%. Philemon's percentage is 11 , 1 Thessalonians $10 \%, 2$ Thessalonians $9 \%$, Ephesians $11 \%$, Hebrews $12 \%$, and so forth.

Of course statistics are 'kittle' things, and such a comparison, to have real scientific value, would have to be carried very much further. Moreover, different circumstances and different kinds of narrative may call for a greater or less use of prepositions. Some men have a greater predilection for using prepositions than others. According to Suetonius, the Emperor Augustus was one such: he used prepositions freely in an endeavour after clearer expression (quod quo facilius exprimeret) (Farrar, Syntax, p.75).

Yet these rough figures are significant. The Koine uses prepositions in far greater abundance than classical Greek. Paul uses three times as many prepositions as Plato.

To prove that in this matter the New Testament was no different from the Koine of the papyri, we have counted the prepositions in ten documents* dating at or shortly after the beginning of the Christian era. The result confirmed our conclusion. Despite the fact that a considerable part of these short letters is occupied with the address where no prepositions occur, the average worked out at $9 \%$, not much behind the New Testament figures cited above.

The influence of Hebrew and Aramaic was the old explanation of the New Testament's prepositional wealth. Doubtless the Hebrew ? was responsible for much of frequency in the IXX and therefore had indirect repercussions on the speech and idiom of the New Testament writers. The use of $\epsilon^{\prime} \dot{v}$ followed by the infinitive, equivalent to an 'as' or 'when' temporal clause, seems to be such a case. But the evidence of the papyri proves Kandisputably that the prepositional abundance of the New Testament was no mere Semitic phenomenon garbed in a Greek mode, but rather a pazmary characteristic of the vernacular Koine of the centuries immediately before and after Christ.

In what ways and circumstances do the prepositions manifest their new abundance in the Koine? This is a very big question. We content ourselves here with outlining a few of the more striking.

Prepositions are much used in the New Testament and in the papyri to underline the exact relationship between one noun dependent on another, where the weakening of the case-forms might leave the meaning inchoate and unclear. One sees this especially in the use of a preposition with the partitive genitive, where in earlier Greek the simple case would have been adequate. There are, to be sure, a number of instances in the New Testament where the old
partitive genitive survives. (egg. Matt.6:29, eau toútuv, Acts 7:52 tina tûv reофитî̀v, Rev.11:13 tò Séwatav ins nótews etc.). But the more usual New Testament practice is to sharpen the partitive relation by means of $\epsilon^{\prime} \dot{x}$ or $\alpha^{\alpha} \mathrm{m}_{0}$ (followed by an ablatival genitive). Eng.

 etc. etc. Matt.27:21 Jiva $\theta^{\prime}$ ' $\lambda \in \tau \epsilon$ ảnò Tiv S'ío etc. 'Eu
 But ${ }^{\alpha} \pi \sigma^{\prime}$, once getting a foothold, so consolidated her position that modern Greek says SW人 'give me some of that' (Dr. Rouse: vide Prolegomena, p.245). Kuhring (p .ll ff., 20) gives a detailed study of the propositions in the papyri replacing the simple genitive.* Here two examples of our own finding must serve to illustrate this prepositional-partitive genitive. P.Petr.II xi (1) ${ }^{5}$ 1ii/BC audio voúras to fificu 'the half of this'. Proxy

 of which please give to your children.' N.B.: This partitive genitive is specially common in the New Testament
 Mivev, etc, etc. 'John' in particular is extremely

* Gk with genitive of price found in both New Testament and papyri., Cf. Matt.20:2 with Oxy IV 745

fond of ck with this usage (Radermacher: New Testament Grammatik, p. ). Allied to this partitive use is what A.T. Robertson styles the 'partisan' usage of $\epsilon^{\prime k}$ :Rom.4:14 of č' toí vópau . Acts.11:2 of ék tins $\pi \in C^{\prime}$ touns etc.

Another striking way in which the prepositions find greater employment in the Koine, is their use with the articular infinitive to express purpose, cause, time, etc. This is really a very neat idiom. The prepositions combined with the articular infinitive, according to my reckoning, number 198. They are $\alpha^{\alpha} v \tau_{i}^{\prime}$ (1), Gis (72),
 of course, is a classical idiom. Thucydides and Xenophon make use of it. Among the later writers Polybius is fond of it. But there are several things to be noted about the New Testament usage. Neither the classics nor the Koine papyri use év c. articular infinitive in the way the New Testament does. In the New Testament the phrase is combined with either aorist or present infinitive with the meaning 'after' and 'as' respectively. And three-quarters of the examples occur in Luke. When we know that the LXX has 455 instances, we must allow that there is definite Semitic influence here.

Notice, too, that fis to c. infinitive seems to be one of Paul's personal mannerisms of style. Fifty of
the New Testament examples are his. The papyri have
 But, on the whole, this seems a

Parallels to the other prepositions c. articular infinitive can be found in the papyri, if not in great abundance.

This use of the prepositions and infinitive, then, to replace subordinate clauses of purpose, consequence, time, cause, etc. is not new. But it has developed very sensibly in the New Testament. Indeed, it is one of the factors which helped to compass the ruin of the infinitive. Outworn by a too frequent use, the infinitive failed to survive in modern Greek.

What Regard calls 'la recherche de l'expression' was undoubtedly another reason for the increase of prepositions in the Koine. The genius of the Greek tongue feeling the decrepitude of the cases, was ever questing after fresh modes of expression. This is the 'raisin d'etre' of the new republic of 'improper' or adverbial prepositions, It is
also the reason for the evolution of such combinations as
 E'ws Er' (Acts 17:14), and of the composite prepositional
 Kara $\mu$ 'prov, (did $\mu$ 'sou?) which we meet in the pages of the

New Testament. In the same category fall the Semitic combinations with nóówtrov, $\chi$ tic , etc. though, it must

 the stigma of Semitic origin).

Besides all this, there was an increasing use of prepositions after verbs and adjectives where earlier Greek found the cases adequate. Where Xenophon, for example's sake, used the simple genitive after '̀ кoúw


 $\phi_{\text {eovếs }}$ ). Akin to this development, is the increasing tendency to repeat the preposition after a verb compounded with it. The classical idiom, for example, is to follow
 tais suvenirais wait tais ortousais. . The
 (vide Robertson: Grammar, p. 559 for a full discussion of the prepositions repeated after the verbs) t. Cf. $\pi$ ancon G'K (John 12:3) etc.

As for prepositions after adjectives, two examples must suffice here. kotasòs, = 'clear of' was generally followed in Attic Greek by the genitive. E.g. Plato:
 If In luke eterne are nofewer it an ex. 'verses 16, 21, 22,25, 26, 39,42, ,55)
 ai ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ arcs Tóurwv - an idiom indeed regarded as a Hebraism until the papyri produced hundreds of examples and gave it a good vernacular pedigree." In 5:22 we have "volos cis in yé val though the previous verse had containe the usual classical dative with that adjective.

But it is time to d raw these random remarks on the increase of prepositions to a close. Let us reiterate our conclusion: when all other considerations have been given their full weight, the capital reason for the great increase in prepositions in the Koine is undoubtedly that which originally created the need for them - the weakening of the oblique cases, particularly the dative. And, second, this frequency is no mere result of Semitic influences, but a palpable characteristic of the vernacular Greek.



## (2) ENCROACHMENT BY VARIOUS PREPOSITIONS.

Another important feature of the New Testament prepositions is the encroachment of some of them upon the domain of others. Certain prepositions are enlarging their sphere at the expense of their less popular brethren. There is also some confusing interchange. (We shall see the latter process at work in the case of cis and $\in \mathcal{G}$ ). A number of prepositions have quite patently overstepped the limits that obtained in classical Greek, and begun to usurp the functions of kindred but not synonymous others - and that, too, without the excuse of a common etymological origin. This was inevitable in a widely-diffused speech like the Koine, whose growth no 'Académie' of Purists could control. A language spoken by the common people always uses its prepositions with more or less looseness. Even in English and among men of culture it is impossible always to employ 'la préposition juste'. Who dare boast that he has never used 'between' when 'among' was the proper preposition? Or who so pedantically correct that he has never said 'oblivious to' or 'averse from' or 'tinker with', where the King's English (see Fowler's book of that name, p. 161 f) demands 'of' and 'to' and 'at'?

So in the Koine it is altogether natural that arro' should often be found where classical nicety ordained $\epsilon^{\prime} K$
or $\pi \alpha_{0} \alpha^{\prime}$. A capital example is l Cor.11:23, 'Eyí yah
 raise any exegetical superstructure on Paul's use of 'बтró instead of the expected $\pi \alpha \alpha^{\alpha} \alpha^{\prime}$. We see this same ant denoting the sender of letters in the papyri where taco would seem more exact. Brose, who has examined the
 1898, pp.351-360) concludes that in daily speech these prepositions were used without exact distinction.

The encroachments in the New Testament prepositions (and of course in the contemporaneous papyri) are various and often difficult to determine. E's , for example, besides annexing some of its kinsman $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime}$ 's territory, has also made inroads on mos c. accusative and $\epsilon^{\prime} \prime^{\prime}$ c. ascusactive. It is often, in the New Testament, no more than
 is no explicit idea of 'Anteriority'.
' $\alpha \pi o ́$ is becoming interchangeable with ck (egg. I Thess.
 our' $\alpha^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime \prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ where the variation seems only to be due to a desire for variety). ' Arno' is also being used occastonally for ito c. genitive of agent (Acts 20:9 ratereXocis ánò rū̃ únvou, James 1:13 àmò Ofoû $\pi$ e'cáSopar, Matt. 16:21, etc).

THe f after certain verbs does the work of ene, (Rom.8:3

1 Pet.3:18 cf. Gal.1:4). And, vice versa, íméc , means sometimes no more than 'concerning', 'with regard to'. (Romans 9:27, 'Hoarías $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ kcáhti úrico toū \% ocant. 2 Cor.5:12, 1 Cor.4:6, etc.).

In all this the new light from Oxyrhynchus and elsewhere has been a very ${ }^{\epsilon} \mathcal{C} \mathcal{Y} \mu \alpha o v$ to the modern commentator and a voo círinfa $^{\prime}$ to the exegete of the older school who persists in finding deliberate and delicate distinctions between (or rather 'among!) prepositions of similar meaning like $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \sigma^{\prime}, \epsilon^{\prime} k$ and $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$.
(N.B. We ought, perhaps, to say that these encroachments and interchanges were not absolutely without parallel in classical Greek. Dladéytodal uníe truos is good Attic; but no better than kivjuvéueiv $\pi \in \rho^{\prime} \prime^{\prime}$ tivos .)

There is one instance of encroachment that is of paramount importance - that of ír'̣ on àvtí. If we dwell on it at some length, it is because the encroachment has no small significance for a correct understanding of Paul's view of Jesus' death, and its atoning value. Jesus Himself had used ávri' to describe the meaning and purpose
 ' ${ }^{〔} \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \mathcal{C}$ in soteriological passages.

Why? The older commentators believed the reason was that Paul used írég in order to avoid committing
himself to the substitutionary view of the Atonement which 'ava' was thought to entail. Even so, modern a commentary as that edited by Bishop Gore contains this assertion (p.418). "The idea of Substitution is not found in St. Paul's writings: his language is that Christ died 'for us', not that He died 'instead of us'." This is much too dogmatic. We do not aver that Paul taught a substitutionary doctrine of Christ's death. We do aver that $\dot{c} \pi \epsilon \in \mathcal{C} \cap \dot{n} \mu \bar{\omega} v$ can mean 'instead of us' just as well as àvтí ňpū.

As $\alpha^{2} \pi \sigma^{\prime}$ encroached on the functions of $\epsilon$ 'K (the vaguer upon the more definite) so utre'c in the Koine encroached on $\alpha^{2} \nu \tau \prime^{\prime}$. Nor did this phenomenon first appear in the Koine. Attic has some excellent parallels. A good one is found in the "Clouds" of Aristophanes. L. 796 has $\pi \in \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \pi \in N$ E'Keivov ávri sauroù pau*ávelv. A few
 Or take the Alcestis of Euripides, where the central theme is the substitutionary death of Alcestis for her husband. Here ÚTÉS is used seven times in this connexion, whereas $\alpha^{\prime} v T_{i}^{\prime}$ and reó together have fewer uses. There are other examples (vide L. and S. sub verbo) in Thucydides I 141, Xenophon Anabasis 7, 4, 9, and Plato's Gorgias ( 515 C.). Coming down to New Testament times, we have found two good patriftic instances: The Ep. ad Diognetum has 入uppor
inter $\eta_{\mu} \bar{\omega} u$ of Christ's death, and Irenaeus Hair. V.I., the

 avi tiv j̀merépor o人prív, where the identity in meaning of the two prepositions seems hardly questionable. All of these passages merely confirm the usage of the papyri. Here in countless documents we meet the formula. "So-and-so wrote this for (erré ) So-and-so who is flitirate."

The meaning here isstrictly 'as the representative of'. But as Wines (Winer-Thayer, p.382) very sensibly remarks, "One who acts for (or represents) another generally takes his place." We cannot, then, assert that Paul in writing of Jesus death, deliberately tried to avoid saying that Jesus died 'in our stead'. Indeed, in Gal.3:13 (to which we referred earlier in this thesis) it is impossible to avoid the suggestion of substitution.

 in its vicarious emphasis.

The extended use of $\dot{U} \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \mathcal{O}$ is the whole explanation. 'బvrí in the New Testament occurs 22 times against írée 's 126 instances. But the papyri shew us even better how greatly ómée had developed in both meaning and use. (Rossberg finds it 270 times against ảvrí's 89). In the
first century of the Christian era it no longer meant 'in the interest of only. It meant anything from a colourless 'about' or a commercial 'to' (see Prolegomena p.105) down to 'as representing' and 'instead of'. I. Tim. 2:6 ávriגuteav ítićc rávrav shews us that the writer felt the vagueness of simple úné $^{\prime}$ and, to make his meaning unmistakably clear, used $\alpha_{\alpha} v r^{\prime}$ in combination with dúreov. On the other hand, in such a context as l. Cor. 15:29 of Fanti hófevol úrés tiv vekpī̀v, the obvious meaning (though repugnant to some commentators who cannot conceive of Paul acquiescing in such a superstition) is that there was a practice of vicarious baptism of the living for the unbaptised dead.

To sum up this section. Partial confusion and encroachment undoubtedly exists among the prepositions of the New Testament. As yet, however, it has not reached a very advanced stage. The exegete who would know how much stress he may lay upon such-and-such a preposilion in a particular context, must guide himself by the light of contemporary vernacular usage in the papyri and inscriptions.
 See Field's parallel (ad hoc.).

## (3) INTERCHANGE OF EIS AND EN.

A short chapter must be devoted to the most remarkable preposition phenomenon which the student, versed in Attic, meets when he opens the Gospels in Greek for the first time - to wit, the substitution of $\in \mathcal{A} S_{\text {for }}$ fo and, more rarely, $\in \mathcal{V}$ for $\epsilon^{\prime}$. The important question is, How far does this interchange extend in the New Testament? What is the extent of the mixing? When ought we to translate $\epsilon$ 's by 'into', when by 'in'? For it is observable that is often occurs after a verb which contains no apparint idea of motion. Moreover, the exact meaning of such important passages as Matt. 28:19 ( Bat tígovtes his to óvopa k.t.A.) and Rom.6:3f. (Antis Xeiviotóv and cis tiv Óvarov) is on debate. And, to complicate the issue further, it is remarked that not all the New Testament writers seem to be guilty of this 'mixing'. Nor is this a peculiarity of New Testament Greek. Contemporaneous papyri reveal the same tendency. Here is an excellent example culled from P.Tebt. II $416^{3-6}$

3 Yeivórriv oe Ofitw oar EyE-
4 váunv EV 'Alȩ̧avdctió.

$6 \lambda \omega$ pévev sis 'Avtivóou. Eye.

8 [可urnoal.
'I wish you to know that I have reached Alexandria. Do not (believe?) that I intend to remain at Antinoe. I came to Alexandria to pray.'

This example alone will shew how far the Koine is from the exactness of Attic, and how dangerous it is, in the fashion of older commentators, to press a distinction always between $\epsilon i s$ and $\dot{\epsilon} V$ in the interests of a marticular exegesis. The classic example of this in the New Testament is John 1:18, of civ cis hov Kólnov which Westcott, lacking the new light from the papyri, described as denoting the combination .... of rest and motion, of a continuous relation with a realisation of it." If the papyri had done nothing more than to dismiss this kind of over-refining subtlety from the domain of scientific excgesis, their study would have been worth while. No modern commentator dare glibly label such New Testament
 on Els prov áypoín, Luke 11:7, cis riv koínv civil, Acts


 nantes'.

It will be noticed how many of these examples are Lucan. Luke indeed, both in his Gospel and in Acts, commonly uses $\epsilon$ 's for $\dot{\epsilon}_{V}$. Mark does the same. But Matthew and,
oddly enough, the book of Revelation, are singularly free from this trait. The Pauline Epistles too, so far as purely local usage goes, seem to avoid this misuse of $\epsilon$ is and $\epsilon \vec{v}$, though, as we shall see, Paul uses $\vec{e} v$ where we should expect $\epsilon$ 's.

But, because the papyri parallel this New Testament peculiarity, we must not jump to the rash conclusion that it is almost immaterial whether a writer uses eis or év in the New Testament. That is very far from the truth. True it is that $\epsilon$ 's and $\epsilon \boldsymbol{v}$ are etymologically the same word. True it is that eis has in modern Greek completely driven $\overrightarrow{E V}$ from the field, and that in the first century A.D. this tendency was already begun in certain parts of the Greek-speaking world. But, if we may anticipate our final conclusion, this substitution of $\epsilon$ 's for civ (and also of $\epsilon \dot{v}$ for $\epsilon$ 's ) is in New Testament times neither general nor obligatory, but only occasional, provincial, and partial.

The only accurate way to arrive at the truth is to sift the New Testament examples and to see how far the tendency had advanced.

This study will shew, I think, two results: The examples in the New Testament are numerous enough (especially in the most literate of the New Testament writers Luke) to demonstrate that in the time of the authors, the
dative had so far decayed that the original force of
 felt. In the second place, the instances are suficiently rare (and that too in the least literate of the New Testament writers such as the author of the Apocalapse) to prove that every person who undertook to write then, still ordinarily and generally distinguished between Gi c. dative and $\epsilon$ is c. accusative.

The only way to reach a truly accurate knowledge of the extent of the confusion between $\epsilon$ 's and civ would be to search all the New Testament writings in turn and compile statistical tables. The compass of this thesis will not permit that. What we shall now attempt is to pass in review some typical instances, and to examine the factors which combined to cause this confusion - factors we say, using the plural advisedly, for no linguistic change or development is due to any isolated cause: it is the product of the combination of various causes.
I. There are, firstly, examples where the interchange between $\epsilon$ 's and $\bar{\prime} v$ seems complete. Els is simply put for $\epsilon \mathcal{U}$. Such are: Mark 13:16, on this rova'yoiv uris
 passages have $\epsilon \boldsymbol{v}$.
 his tor oíróv you.
t Regasal has done this for custom boito. I ave miacblia to lime feet souse good examples.

There are also clean-cut examples of $\epsilon$ 's for $\epsilon \dot{U}$ combimed with $\epsilon^{\bar{\prime} v a l}:-$


(we shall illustrate fully from the papyri later).
John 1:18, of inv cis to kòncov fou nato's (already discussed). Compare John 3:13, oo iou civ pis oúpavij (omitted in W.H. but found in A.F. $\Delta$ etc.).

Acts 7:12, ákrougas dep '/anis $\beta$ örra nitid cis A'yontov.
 gits év A'vóntry.

And there are numerous examples of cis for év combinged with various verbs:
 Kit. $\lambda_{\text {, }}$ with which may be compared the examples in
Tebt II $416^{3-6} \mathrm{cited}$ earlier in this chapter.

Luke 7:50, To çúou ais cichivnv ; but Acts 16:36 has mocéver $\theta$ e tiv cicríny.

 34-36 where both $\in$ 's and civ are found after ob $\mu$ vó tiv ;



## 'EQ FORTIS.

II. Our second class of examples are those where $\epsilon \dot{v}$ is put for li's. The instances are not so numerous nor, perbaps, so convincing. A good one is Rom.1:25 oitues رetnillaçav
 there is a good contrast in the next verse (26), $\alpha^{\prime \prime} \prime T \in$


 compared with Matthew's correction, 26:10, E'C'you yào


 o $\Theta \in$ os. .








Vide also John 3:35 ( $\delta . \delta \omega \mu$ ii $)$, Rom.1:24, 2 Cor.8: 16, etc.

Papyri examples, if not abundant, are adequate. Here are two meantime: see $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ in Part II for others. P.Ryl II
 'threw the box empty into my house'. J.E.A. p. 61,"
 you may not be annoyed at coming to K.' Even Epictetus could write (I, 11, 32) dove coNn civ PLúpy ;

## INTERMEDIATE CATEGORIES.

III. Between these two extreme types, (i) where cis is put for $\epsilon ' v$ and $\epsilon \in v$ is put for $\epsilon$ 's and (ii) where $\epsilon \prime \prime$ Gov are sharply and correctly differentiated (Luke 2:34 is such an one), there is a whole range of intermediate examples, which are hard to classify. In some cases we may either suppose interchange or suggest another interpretation. In John 8:26 taûta ratio cis toil kóopov the preposition e's may merely be for $\hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} v$, or it may replace the dative til kor pes (or roots tau kórkou) as Goo ( sis tóv) does in modern Greek.
 $E \mathcal{L}$ may be for tic 'into thy kingdom' (as Authorised Version) ; or, and this is a very possible exegesis, it may mean 'when thou comest in (the power of) thy kingdom'. (N.B. B.I. read t's here). Matt.16:28 has c'eXópevou


There are numerous other examples where the verb is the 'crux interpretum'. We may prefer to dwell on
the movement exerted to attain an object，or we may lay stress on the immobility of the object attained．In the former case we shall expect $\epsilon$＇is，in the latter $\hat{\epsilon} v$ ．Rev． 3：21 is a case in point，óvikūv，Sw＇sw au＇rió，kaOíval
 Kero rout tareós pau iv ruiz Opóvs aúroù．

 tau éxaiño ．

The same problem presents itself in Luke 23：19，$\beta \lambda_{2} \theta \in i s$ Th i фu入aky



（Here Bias and A．T．Robertson disagree．Bias cites Mark 1：9 as an example of G＇s put for $\epsilon_{V}$ ．Robertson dwells rather on the idea of motion inherent in Bartígeiv and finds els altogether suitable．ibid．p．592）．

Finally，there are examples where the prepositions are used carelessly enough．They are mixed usages and

 nü入ígtro Cis tò öpos к．T．入．，etc．etc．Luke 9：46，


So much by way of illustration．We must now ask，

What were the causes of this mixing?
One is the etymological identity of $\epsilon \prime$ and $\epsilon \dot{U}$. It is because we have all been trained in Attic that we are apt to draw a hard and fast line of demarcation between $\epsilon$ 's and $\in ́ v$. Colloquial language does not differentiate nicely between the two. Vernacular English says "Come in the house", "He fell in the river". And certainly vernacular Greek, as the papyri prove, laid less stress on the distinction between $\epsilon$ 's and $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ than the literary did.

The capital cause of the use of $\in \mathbb{\prime}$ for $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{G}}$ is the senescence of the dative. (This, of course, is also the reason for the Koine's use of reós, unó etc. with the accusative where we naturally expect a dative. So we find John 1:1, ó dóyos ūv ncòs tò Өeóv and John 1:48,
 itions do we see this tendency: equally good witnesses
 reorkuvéw, which tend more and more to forsake the dative for the accusative. Not that the dative was by any means dead in the first century A.D. Indeed, thanks largely to ${ }^{\text {M }}$ ubiquitous preposition $\epsilon V^{\prime}$, it was still very far from being 'une forme morte'. But it was used so frequently that its fine syntactical edges became dulled: it ceased to be useful and died, in Moulton's expressive figure,
'of fatty degeneration'. E's, taking advantage of E'v's unhealthy popularity in the centuries before and after Christ, began quite visibly to encroach on its rival's vast but insecure dominions. It is probable that the third century A.D., a sad period of economic ruin and political chaos which sealed the doom of the old culture, saw the decisive decline of the dative case and therefore of the preposition $\epsilon^{\prime} V$. Thereafter the preposition $\epsilon$ 's proceeded to establish itself in the impregnable position it occupies in modern Greek.

But even in classical Greek we find uses of Gis which must have facilitated the later interchange of $\epsilon$ is and $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon}$.
 racéatac wai is yurin is Éfin Eis koiron, to quote only one instance, inevitably prepared the way for such a Koine use as Luke's use tis siv woínu with tival(u:y). From that it is a short transition to the figurative use of John 1:18 ó i̛v tis tờ kódtov toú margós.

The reasons for the occurrence of $\hat{E} V$ where $\epsilon$ is would seem more natural, are not far to seek. One is the amazing versatility of $\mathcal{E} \mathcal{V}$ in the first century A.D. The other is of course the vernacular tendency to revive and intensify the old identity of $\epsilon$ is and $\epsilon i$.

## SUMMARY.

To summarise. The etymological oneness of tis and $\dot{\in} v$, the decay of the dative case, the growing indefiniteness of $\epsilon V$ as a consequence of its great popularity, and the existence already even in classical literature of types symptomatic of the later development - all combined to cause the interchange of $\epsilon$ 's and $\epsilon \dot{V}$ in the New Testament language which - and this is perhaps as important a cause as any - is, we must never forget, a vernacular speech.

The general conclusion must, however, be reiterated. In neither the papyri nor the New Testament is this interchange wholesale and complete. It is occasional and partial. We cannot follow A.T.Robertson when be says: "It is quite immaterial whether one uses $\epsilon$; óvond as in Matthew 10:41-42 and 12:41 or E'V óvófarc as in Matthew 21:9, Mark 9:49." Hence we find either 'baptised Év the name of Jesus Christ' (Acts 2:38) or 'baptising G's the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit' (Matthew 28:19)." (Minister and his Greek New Testament, p.51). "It is splitting a hair to insist on 'into' the name because of the use of $\epsilon$ is."

It is true that there is no absolute line of cleavage between $\epsilon$ 's and $\epsilon \dot{\prime}$ in the New Testament language. But the practice and general culture of the author must be
taken into consideration in each case. Mat thew generally distinguishes between $\epsilon$ 's and $\bar{\epsilon} v$ : indeed he occasionally corrects cis into $\in v$ where he borrows fumm Mark. For that reason and for others ${ }^{\dagger}$ we believe the translation of the Baptismal formula (Matt.28:29) should be." Baptising them into...". But it may fairly be retorted that the verse is none of the Evangelist's!

It is a good rule for the New Testament as a whole to make the distinction between $\epsilon$ is and $\epsilon^{\prime} v$. except where the
interchange is palpable and incontovertible.And these cases are relatively quite few. Between the old way of discriminating rigorously between the the two prepositions and a modern tendency to abolish any distinction , we must steer a middle course : as in other things.' in medio veritas.'
$\dagger$ Vide B.S.p 147. Deissmann cites C.I.G. ii No 4963, e (begin-
 kinkatóvals $\in$ is tou $\theta \in o u ̀$ óvopa
-a first-class parallel.to the N.T. uses. Kinparáns is the nominal purchaser who represents the real purchaser.i.e. the deity. "Just as to ' buy into the name of the god' means to 'buy so that the article belongs to the god'so also the underlying e.8. the expressions 'to baptise into the name of the Lord' or to believe into the name of the Lords is that baptism or faith constitutes the BELONGING to God or to the Son of God."

## (4) SEMITISMS AMONG THE NEW TESTAMENT PREPOSITIONALIA.

Our last task in appraising the New Testament prepositions is our hardest. We approach it with no small trepidation, for it is the vexed question of the extent of the Semitic influence on the speech of the writers. We would gladly have avoided a problem on which the best scholarship is so divided. But face it we must, however briefly and inadequately, because the prepositions and their usage figure so prominently in the discussion. The influence of the Hebrew ? on $\epsilon \dot{?}$, of $?$ strange New Testament uses of $\alpha{ }^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime}$ and $\mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$, to name only a few instances, raise questions for which we are quite inadequately equipped. Indeed, few men are. Only men like Wellhausen can be allowed to dogmatise here. For the matter demands for its solution that rare phenomenon, a scholar equally at home in Semitics and Hellenistic, and with no definite bias in favour of either. Only he can really speak 'ex cathedra'.

Most scholars feel (vide Milligan, Selections: Introduction p.xxixf.) that 'the most pertinent criticism' that can be directed against Dr. J.H. Moulton's Prolegomena is his tendency to minimise the number of Hebraisms in the New Testament. Dr. Moulton was too prone to imagine that because he could parallel a New Testament Hebraism with a relatively similar usage from the papyri, he had
a SEMiTIC - if stigina undead it be.
purged it from at he, stigma, (pace Herr Adolf Hitler!).
A handful of Ptolemaic instances of $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} V=$ 'armed with' (from the Ferturis Papyri) does not rescue instrumental $\in \cdot v$ in the New Testament from the category of 'Hebraisms'. Nor are we quite sure that $B G U 1079$ ( 41 As.) $\beta \lambda$ enc orion ब'ṅ t wv \%oosainv contains an idiom "which the Hebraist will hardly dare to claim now" (Proleg. p.107). Two arguments may be urged against this view. (I) "The Egyptian language is essentially Semitic both from a lexicographical as well as from a grammatical point of view." (This sentence is from Aaron Ember's "Egypto-Semitic Studies' ed. by Miss Frida Behuk: vide Expository Times, Oct.1931, for a review by Professor J.E. Macfadyen).
 though of Egyptian origin. (2) It has always seemed to me that the writer of this papyrus letter, who bids his friend "beware of the Jews" (so numerous in Egypt, specdally at Ale andria), is probably using (mockingly) a Semitic turn of phrase in his warning. When we wish (playfully) to warn a friend against the blandishments of widows, do we not often resort to the 'ipsissima verbs' of Samuel Weller, "Samivel, my boy, beware of vidders!"

But if the papyri usage is no irrefragable argument against the Semitic colouring of a New Testament prepositional phrase, there is another - that of Thumb - which
seems sounder, viz. that a usage native in modern Greek is, 'ipso facto', no Semitism. This argument has been used
 $\chi$ גíases Tou'(kous of. Rev.12:7 al.) from the charge of Hebraism. I think we may also in the same way vindi-
 Tò K K Kó ) and $\lambda \alpha \lambda \in i v \mu \in T \alpha ́$ (Thumb, p. $103 \mu \lambda \bar{\omega} \mu \epsilon '^{\prime}$ 'I speak with').

But, ere we go further, it will be well to have before us a summary list of the Semitic elements in the prepositional use of the New Testament. Thayer's list will serve our purpose admirably. (H.D.B. Vol.III, p.39). That article stands midway between the old and the new epochs in New Testament linguistic research. It owes much to Buttmann and Winer; but it is later than the publication of Bibel-studien, though it is six years before the appearance of the "Prolegomena". Thayer's list is not exhaustive, bat it comprises the main poinis. Under the heading 'Grammatical Hebraisms', he cites the following Semitic prepositionalia;- "An extended use of prepositions: for instance $\hat{\epsilon} V$ (cf. $\frac{\mathcal{Y}}{\dot{!}): ~ n o t ~ o n l y ~ i n ~ c o n s t r u c t i o n ~ w i t h ~ v e r b s, ~}$
 strumental force, as keá $\rfloor \in \in \in \dot{v}$
 expansions of prepositions:- by the use of $o^{\prime} \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu$ o's


 John 10:39, Gal.3:19, Acts 2:23, 7:35.

 cis megitounv (Ro.2:26); and, in general its insertion before the second accusative after verbs signifying "make


 $\mu \in y a d o ́ v e i v$, troreiv $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \lambda$ cos $\mu \in T \alpha$ etc (he 1:58, 42).
old, will still, with a few additions and criticisms, command the approval of the sober critic who desires to recognise both the Semitic and the Koine elements in the Hew Testament. The extension in the use of prepositions We have seen to be a feature of the Koine requiring no general Semitic explanation. ' $E v$ is a partial exception to this affirmation - especially instrumental $\in \mathcal{E}$. This latter usage is really rare in the papyri. Its more irequant use in the New Testament is undoubtedly due to the influence through the LXX of the Hebrew $\frac{7}{:}$. The uses of $\mathrm{E} V$
 $\sigma K \alpha v \delta \alpha \lambda_{i}^{\prime} \rho \in \sigma \theta_{\alpha} c$ are palpably conformed to Semitic models: nothing like the semblance of a parallel is traceable in the papyri.

1 Cor. $4: 21 \epsilon^{\prime} v \rho^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime} \beta \delta \omega \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \lambda \theta \omega$ seems explicable by the context (ie. it is made to conform to the following cv aby an already in the writer's thought).
 of $E^{\prime} v \mu \alpha \chi_{\alpha \prime} \rho \eta$ go to prove that it was quite good Koine Greek. But it must be confessed that Luke 14:31 $\epsilon \mathcal{U} \delta_{\mathcal{K}_{k}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$
 (with $\epsilon^{\prime} \delta \epsilon^{\prime}\left(X_{0} \mu a r\right)$ where $\epsilon \dot{U}$ is a species of comitative instrumental usage ( $=\mu \in T \alpha$ or $\sigma u^{\prime} v$ ) wear a suspiciously Semitic aspect.
 though it may be due to $\mathbb{N}$
 $\therefore \dot{\forall} \delta \in \sigma \mu \bar{y}$ Shoal where $\in v$ locates the action, and shows the thinness of the dividing line between locative and instrumental. $\dagger$ But the IXX's énáto slav wórov civ raxa'co (2) П ユ) suggests a Semitism in Luke 22:49. The general Hebraic tincture in the style of Revelation seems present
 parallel from P.Par. $28^{13}$ Siaduómevac cv $7 \dot{i}$ dim is



 they may conceivably be instances of what Kuhring styles 'intrusive ćv'. 'Eu with the articular infinitive in a temporal signification, so common in Luke, we have already pronounced a Hebraism because of its failure to secure good Koine authentication.

E＇s after yeve 276
Greek．P．Fay 111 （A．D．100）yields $I_{V \alpha}^{\prime \prime}$ 仿 cis $\psi \omega^{\prime} \mu$ riv Yévnral ！But Semitic prototypes undoubtedly gave this use a distinct fillip among the New Testament writers． Moulton thought the extension of $\epsilon$ is expressing destin－ ation a good enough explanation．He cites K．P． 46 ii／a．D．

 yrnoide viór］． cf．Matt．21：46－without feel－ ing convinced we have explained away a Semitism．Yet Moulton＇s own words would be difficult to criticise．＂This idiom is，therefore，simply the overdoing of a correct locu－ tion in passages based on a Semitic original，simply be－ cause it has the advantage of being a literal rendering＂ （Proleg．p．72）．Indeed，the fact that it is so common in the translation passages，and that the LXX abounds in it as a translation of ？justifies us in saying that it is formed on a Hebrew pattern，though it is not un－Greek． Before we leave t＇s，let us notice noption（innate）t＇s GiCrín（Matt．5：34，Luke 7：50，8：48）：＂it is due to the

＇Arno comes next in Thayer＇s list．But surely фєúytiv బंतó（Matt．3：7，John 10：3）would not cause the most fast－ dious Atticism to raise an eyebrow．Xen．Mem II 6，31 has
 $t$ Theogn． 162 has oils to karo Sokcóov yrýverac e＇is $\alpha y \alpha \theta o i v$－an eraelent parallel to Jo 16：20 in turn spiv cis Xx our yeungerale．
 ing to Dr. Mackinlay (Moulton-Howard, p.460), is found in mediaeval and modern Greek. The anti-Semitic case for $\phi 0 \beta_{t i s} \theta_{a l} \alpha \alpha_{n o ́}$ is not so clear.



 Sow arno tout okuxpoû this ósoû 'owing to the fatigue of the journey'). It is so natural a development that one wonders it was ever suspected of Semitic extraction.

 Xiofod in modern Greek. P.Hib.I $52^{i, 2}$ B.C.245, though scarcely an exact parallel, may be cited: half veveruikaoiv

 vindication in the papyri, which use $\beta \in \beta$ airs $\alpha^{\prime} \pi o^{\prime}$ and even a'nó simplex ( $=\alpha^{\prime \prime} v e u$ ) similarly.
 fleets the Hebrew $3 \underline{y}$. So does $e^{\prime} \pi i$ oróparos (Matt.18:16).
 is good enough Greek: ex en' c.dative 'on the basis of is

 sta remeaypévol.
 is almost indisputably due to Hebrew influence, egg. II


 class parallel. Merámerely = 'in connexion with'. The simple Toifiv $\mu \in \tau \alpha \dot{\prime}$ of Acts $14: 27,15: 4$ seems easier to defend. Besides P.Amh. $135^{15}$ (ii/A.D.) and BGU $798^{6 \%}($
 a' Ėדóngev $\mu \in T \alpha$ tiu Soúxwv aúrîss we can add P.
 $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha} f a r \quad$ 'to do any lawless action to them'. l. John
 Brooke( ICC: ad.loc.) of being an Aramaism. May it not simply mean 'amongst us', the primitive force of the areposition which can still be seen in some New Testament examples (egg. Luke 24:5)?

Thayer's list of periphrastic expansions of the pro-
 can be dismissed as translitterated Semiticisms with the following reservations. (1) The anarthrous $\epsilon \dot{v}$ od $\theta \alpha \mu$ ais (Matt.21:42, Mark 12:11) is a frequent phrase in classical
 (2) Kara reórwnov is found in the papyri. E.g. P.FH.IIIi, 8


 'as you were urged in person by me'.

Before we close this subject, we add notes on moa c.accusative with comparative force (with or without a comparative adjective) and the use of roo's c. accusative of person, both of which are not free from Semitic surpicion.

Il $\alpha \rho^{\prime}$ 'c. accusative = 'more than', can be seen, Luke 13:2 ápaptrotoi mapà raítas rois 「a入itaíous; Heb.1:9, Heb.1: 4
 Is $\boldsymbol{j}^{\mathfrak{y}}$ responsible?

In Hebrews 1:9 $=\psi 45: 7$ we find trapan for the Heb. preposition, to take a single example. Thackeray (Gr. p.23) says the frequency of this $\pi \alpha \rho^{\alpha} \alpha^{\prime}$ in the IXX is due to such phrases in the Hebrew as $j^{0}$ bin . Eellhausen considers the positive use like the Aramaic (Einleitung in die drei ersten Evang. p.28).

But, for all this, the usage is good Greek. The classics have it. 'A feivoves rapà riv Eáurcù фúán occurs in Herod 7:103. Thucydides 4:6 has $\mu \neq 1$ Ssw racon. Zen. Meme, 4, 14 shews rad ed thus without a comparative ad-



ment of the meaning 'beyond' as in Heb.12:11 napa kapoiv jj $\lambda / k i \alpha s$, and of adios Tapá ( 1 Cor.3:11), ËTヶpos rapá which are classical. It is, therefore, one of these locutions which both accurately render the Hebrew and are also tolerable Greek.

Ipo's c. accusative of person after a verb of rest
 appears about a score of times in the New Testament. Burney declares it Aramaic. We do not think it necessary to throw this usage to the Semitising wolves.

For (I) Teós c. dative, the case we should have expetted, is a moribund usage in the New Testament. It occurs six times and not once with a dative of person. The papyri tell the same tale.
(II) Tlapó c. dative, which we might have thought more appropriate, is evidently being superseded by reós c.



(III) The root-meaning of roo's seems to be 'over against', 'face-to-face with', cf. German 'gegen'. Cf. Matt.3:10 ross cígau keitac ( and even as far back as Homer Odyss XIII 240 váćv reơs ht r'nє́tióv te ). Surely it is a short transition from these to the New Testament

 was face-to-face with God": absolute intimacy of communion).
 when we remember the decay of the dative.
(IV) As yet the papyri have not yielded altogether satisfactory parallels. The best we can do is P.Cairo
 'I expect we shall soon be with you'. There are also $\mathrm{Syll}^{3}$
到/v which is excellent, and Sharp's example from Epic-
 course, is frequent in the papyri, with roo's $c$. accusative

 'T. who will also be responsible for the taxes on the boy.'

We submit that this usage of roofs needs no Semitic explanation, and await the discovery of more plentiful parallels.

A few general remarks from Thayer (H.D.B. vol. III, p.40) may fitly conclude these rambling biter dicta' on Semiicisms among the prepositions. "We must not forget the uncertainty arising from our present defective knowledge. We must not interpret the fact of prior occurrence into clear proof either of primary origin on the one hand or direct derivation on the other. We must not overlook the
truth that coincidences of popular expression are to be found in many widely separatedand unrelated tongues (e.g. $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ comparative above) But not withstanding all uncertainties and abatements the general influence of the ILXX upon New Testament Greek was undisputably great." Tory, Burney, and Charles, even if all their theories be not established, have done much in recent years to reemphasise the Semitic element in the New Testament which at one time seemed collapsing before the brilliant attack of Deissmann and Moulton.
" How are we to understand the passages , so important from the point of view of religious history, in which St Paul and others employ the prepositions, unless we pay attention to the 'profane' uses ? " Leissmann, Light etc p.120.

Avá is found as a preposition in the Koine only with the accusative. The use with the dative = 'on' in epic and lyric poetry has vanished. In modern Greek $\dot{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime}$ survives only in the literary tongue.

The Papyri have ' $\alpha{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ much of tener than the New Testament. Rossberg counts 652 instances of ${ }^{x} v \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ against the dozen examples in the New Testament. The very frequent use of ${ }_{\alpha} v_{\alpha}^{\prime}$ in accounts, receipts, etc. meaning 'at the rate of' is the reason.
'Ava' is, therefore, the 'rara avis' of the New Testament prepositions. W.H. show 12 examples in all, of which 4 occur in the composite preposition $\alpha$ वर्व férov 'between', 7 in the distributive usage, and one in the idiom $\dot{\alpha} \alpha^{\alpha} \mu \notin ́ \rho o s \quad$ 'alternatively'.
I. Place: The only local use of $\alpha \vee \alpha^{\prime}$ in the New Testament is in the phrase $\dot{\alpha} \nu \grave{\alpha} \mu \notin \sigma o v$ 'in the midst of', 'between'.

Mt.13:25 $\alpha^{\alpha} \dot{\alpha}$ нérov tou Jítou 'in the midst of the wheat.'


A figurative use occurs in 1 Cor. 6:5 Siakpival àvà
 possible to believe the text sound' (Proleg., p.99). Perhaps the second person involved in the 'judgment' is
meant to be mentally supplied (by a species of ellipsis). ${ }^{\dagger}$


 'attacked us between P. and T.'
 between the eyebrows.' Generally, however, àvà p' $\quad$ 'nov is used adverbially (without a following genitive) as,
 'with a blind alley in between'. P.Oxy IX, $1200{ }^{168 .} \mathrm{EVV}$ tais
 of the village'.
P. RyE. II, $154^{15}$ (A.D. 66), ó...kiņpos àv̀̀ $\mu \in \dot{\sigma} o u$ öuros Kovoí ispaywyou iou Tотíhetal 'the holding searated by a common water-channel by which it is irrigated', etc. etc.

It will be clear then that $\alpha^{\prime} v \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma v$ is not a Hebraism, as was once supposed. Modern Greek retains the expression in the form $\dot{\alpha}^{\prime} v \alpha \mu \in \sigma \alpha$.
II. The distributive use keeps $\alpha^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime}$ alive in the New Testament and papyri. The sense is 'apiece' or 'at the rate of'.

Lu. 10:1 àté'́teItev बútoùs au ra סúo.
f Ma. gr. has '̀vaMe'ra豸y 'ectiven' in this sense.



Papyri examples are numerous:

 bundles each'.

 chickpeas bought at 5 artabae each'.
F.0xy III $499^{18}$ (A.D.121), фopóou Euáoms

'at a rent for each aroura, of 36 drachmee of silver.' P.Fay $101 \mathrm{col} \mathrm{ii}^{\prime 2}$; F.Oxy XIV $1685^{\prime \prime}$ (A.D.158), etc.

Notes: (1). Rev.21:21 has $\alpha^{\prime} \nu \alpha$ tis Énaotos twiv mułúvav . Blass styles it a 'valgarism'. Is àvá adverbial here, or is $\epsilon \hat{i}$ s an indeclinable numeral? Regard's view ( p .66 ) seems reasonable: "Les nombres cardinaux de 5 à 100 n'étaient pas fléchis du tout, et, a l'époque du Nouvequ Testament, fis ne l'était plus necessairement; en pareil cas la préposition devait pour ainsi dire fatalement reprendre une position adverbiale indépendante, il y a lieu de comparer a cette tournure celles du grec modern qui lui resemblent sans
 richer quail était, il est devenu un mendiant', $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{o}^{\circ}$
 situation et les former modernes $k \alpha \theta^{\prime}$ cis et $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \in \alpha \alpha s$; il n'y a aucune raisin de chercher la solution en dehors du gree."
 tracoćroc.]
(2) We have not paralleled d'và $\mu$ 'foo of 1 Cor. 14:27 in the papyri. But the phrase is classical, and the papyri have the very common ${ }^{\circ} \nu{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ dóyov 'proportionally' 'reasonably', egg. P.Ryl II, $154^{32}$ (A.D.66); P.Oxy/ $1405^{23}$ (3/A.D.).
(3) Miscellaneous: 'A va' = 'by' of multiplication, occurs often in the papyri, egg. P.Brit.Mus. $372^{4}$. Radermacher (p.16) cites $\alpha^{\prime} v \alpha$ in medical prescriptions denoting the dose. In P.Oxy XIV $1743^{9}$ (A.D.221-2) ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{v} \dot{\alpha}$ XEico $=8 ふ$ Xetpós 'by hand'. P.Ryl II 88'(A.D.156) ham oưłè dep
 is owing me for the current period'. Cf. P.Ryl II $99^{7}{ }^{\top} \hat{y}$
 ing'.
${ }^{*} C f$. English ' on hand'.
'Avrí : The primitive meaning of this preposition must be kept in view. It is 'in front of', 'opposite' (German, 'gegenłber'). Often this original sense comes out very vividly in composition with verbs. Thus Acts

 Priest and the Levite passed on the other side of the road, facing ( ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} v \tau-$ ) the wounded man.' Cf. also Rom.
 Robertson (Grammar, p.573) elucidates the prepositional picture: 'The Holy Spirit lays hold of our weakness along with ( Guv- ) us, and carries his part of the burden facing us (-र्थvil-), as if two men were carrying a log, one at each end.'

In New Testament times ávrí has lost considerable ground to STEEp. The New Testament has àvtí 22 times, and Rossberg counts 89 examples in the Ptolemaic papyri he has searched. Yet $\dot{\alpha} v+i(s)$ survives in Modern Greek

I. The New Testament contains no instance of $\dot{\alpha} v{ }^{\prime} i ́ i n$ a purely local sense, as e.g. in Xen.Anab. IV, 7,6. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} v \tau i$

 $\dot{x}_{V T i}{ }^{\prime \prime} \psi \in \omega s \bar{\eta} \mu_{\mu} \hat{\prime} V$.' before our eyes'.
II. The common meaning of $\alpha^{\prime} v i i^{\prime}$ in both New Testament and the papyri is 'in place of' (two objects 'opposite' each other suggest the idea of equivalence and interchange) and so 'in exchange for', 'in return for'. Twelve of the New Testament's 22 uses of ' $\dot{\sim} \operatorname{ci}^{\prime}$ are in this category.

Mt. 5:38 o' $\phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu$ òv $\alpha$ Uni oj $\phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu o u ̀$

Rom.12:17 unsevi kakìv ávit kakồ ar áodidóvtes.
I Pet.3:9 $\lambda 0, \delta_{0 \text { cia }}$ avi toisopias.
Twice the notion is rather 'in succession to'.


In the latter case commentators have made a great pother over a very simple usage. 'New grace for (ie. in succession to) old' is all that is meant, as in the very apt parallel from Philo, De Poster. Caini, 145 ctéfas (Xápoross)



Papyri: P.Hib.I, 170 (B.C.267), iv $\mu$ in $^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime} v \tau_{i} \phi i \lambda i \alpha s$
 ship'. P.Tebt. III $759^{9}$ (B.C.226) бко́ttel úntote $\alpha^{2} \cup t t_{1}$
 don't come to quarrel with you instead of being on good

$\alpha \quad$ avi $\mu \bar{\alpha} s$ ，＇an equivalent（allowance）being made to him＇，


 the faulty measure＇，Etc．

The sense of＇in succession to＇can be seen in P．On
 nominate other persons in succession to them．＇PrOxy XIV $1642^{4}$（A．D．289），自 ayopavomial＇I appoint you as my successor in the office of agoranomus＇．
 cause＇，occurs 5 times in the New Testament．The phrase is classical，and in the LXX translates the Hebrew －Luke claims 4 of the examples，and，as the usage is rare in the Papyri，I venture to suggest it is semi－1itit like reós c．gen．




Also Lu．12：3，19：44．
 $\theta \in o i u^{\prime} y^{\prime} \in / \alpha v$ ，＇because the gods have granted hill health＇．P．Leid．D．I，21，oi 立 yévoito dove＇uivivi
óriws Siákelodc，＇because you are well－disposed towards the deity＇．

Note：Eph．5：31 has ג́vti Toútou＇for this reason＇，


IV．Abri c．artic．inf．has a single example in the
 Cf．P．Iebt．T， $27^{103}$（）avi toì toüto moiñal．
 is＇for＇，＇as＇，without any sense of substitution．＇To serve as a hood＇，not＇as a substitute for a headdress＇ is Paul＇s meaning．This sense of $\dot{\alpha} u{ }^{\prime} i^{\prime}$ is common enough in the Papyri：PrOxy VIII $1156^{76}$（iii／A．D．），Soüval［TI］ $4 \alpha i \alpha \alpha^{\alpha} v i$

＇to give him something and to take from him the trodden grapes as the price of it＇．PrOxy XIV， 1627 （A．D．342）， mri ions ar ál於s＇as an equal recompense＇．

N．B：English＇for＇has the same double significance， （1）＇new lamps for old＇，（2）＇he took it for a joke＇（as）．

 behalf of＇．（And sometimes indeed we find circe where＇$\alpha v t c^{\prime}$ might be expected．，E．g．，the Ep．ad．Diogn．／quotes the
 Mt．17：27 is brachylogical，i．e．the tax due from Christ
and Peter is the real correspondence to E'KEivov (the statēr).

Closely related to this passage is, we believe, the famous phrase used by Jesus to describe the purpose of the advent of the Son of Man. Mt.20:28 (Mk. 10:45).
 basic meaning is that Christ places the purchase-money which is His life, 'over-against' the lives of the many. Though the preposition of itself does not necessarily entail substitution, the context demands the idea.* When Christ 'gave His life (or rather, Himself) as a Purchasemoney to buy the many', it is merely indubitable that He conceived of Himself as doing something for the many which they could not do for themselves. The question of to whom the purchase-money was paid, and why it was paid, is a matter for the theologians. But let them remember that our Lord was a poet, and that the word-pictures of religion such as this. one, were never meant to be hardened into dogma. If any clue to the saying is to be found in Christ's own words we think Mt.17:27 supplies it (see A.B. Bruce, E.G.T. ad loc). "That word began the strik-
*Josephus, Antiq., 14,107 supplies the best linguistic

 tainly indicates substitution. The gold beam is in place of the whole remaining temple of gold.
ing course of instruction in humility as this one (20:28) ends it. The 8igcaxpov was a dúŗov (cf. Ex. 30:12 where the phrasing suggests Jesus' words are an unconscious echo of the Old Testament) as the life of the Son of Man is represented to be." The tax was paid $\partial_{v}+i$ émoù kबi roù. : the Life is to be given $\alpha_{v r i} n o \lambda \lambda \bar{\omega} v$ Is it far-fetched to conjecture that the Capernaum incident was in Christ's mind when He spoke His Ransom-saying, and that in the first saying lies the clue "to the psychological history of the term $\lambda$ úreov "?
'Amé : Well does Rossberg preface his remarks on $\alpha^{\prime} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ in the papyri thus: "Aró praepositionis usps multus et varius in papyri occurrit" (p.19). The New Testament confirms this description. It is found about 655 times in the New Testament (MSS. variants make this total approximate), and Rossberg counts 920 instances in the Ptolemaic papyri. Yet mere statistics cannot reveal how virile and versatile is this preposition in the Koine. Wherever the ablative case is natural in Greek, wherever there is any notion of separation or quittance or source there $\vec{x} \pi o^{\prime}$ may appear to clarify the case-idea. Paul
 (Col.2: 20 ) and $\phi \theta \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \in \mathrm{c}$ ( 2 Cor.11:3), and such a phrase as $\alpha^{\prime} \vee \alpha \theta \in \mu \alpha$ rival (Rom.9:3). The New Testament shows a very diversified range of verbs followed by $\alpha \pi o ́$. A seminal mind like Paul's, writing with his nerves "in a kind of blaze" and with the subconscious remembrance of IXX usages where $\alpha^{\prime \pi \prime}$ was compelled to translate the Hebrew ${ }^{p}$, sometimes wrests language into strange collopcations to express his thought. But the papyri, too, reveal the "varied and abundant" use of ' $\alpha \pi o ́$. 'Aró is found in both New Testament and Papyri, not only after $\alpha^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime}$ - compounds like $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha c, \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \pi \alpha / \tau \in \pi \quad$ and $\dot{\alpha} \phi, \delta \tau \alpha \sigma \theta_{\alpha c}$,

frequently after compounds of $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ (like $\epsilon^{\prime} \xi \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \neq \sigma \theta_{\alpha c}$ ), and
 and phrases like $k \alpha \theta_{\alpha} \operatorname{lo's}^{\prime}$ Évac. We might be tempted
 (Iu.5:29,34), till we meet such a phrase as ciyaiveiv
 Metavoeル ג̇াó (e.g. Acts 8:22) seems to English eyes a strange combination; but is really no more remarkable

2. A Aró in the Koine has encroached on $\in \mathcal{K}$, $\pi \alpha \rho^{\alpha}$ and ப́ró. (a) For àró where we might expect $\in$, k , cf. Jo.1:44; Acts 12:1; Mt.3:4. (b) For $\alpha^{\prime} \mathrm{mo}^{\prime}$ where rapá is expected, cf. Acts 9:13; 1 Cor.11:23; and I Jo.1:5. (c) For aró
 etc.

It is no surprise to learn that in modern Greek $\alpha \pi o^{\prime}$

 $\pi \alpha$ т́ра цои 'I received a letter from my father' (for $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ ).

 after the Vatican MS. by Alex. Pallis' (for irró.).
I. Local: 'Aró , as distinct fromék which emphasises the 'within-ness', marks the point of Departure or Separ-
ation, with or without the idea of Motion:

Mk. 8:11 Enjeíov àmò toú oúpavoù.
Ac. 20: 9 'Eteबtev d́rò tau tciotéyou.
Phil. 4:15 'Egñi You ánò Make Sovias
Rev.21:13 'Arò Boepâ mutŵves regis, arno Nótou tuláves tpeis ánò Sưpíar mutáves regis.

And generally after verbs of departing and removing, coming and going, beginning and being distant.
 t'reivou oikias é $\xi \in \lambda_{n} \lambda u ́ \theta c c$ but it was from his house that he came out' (note $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ and ánó). P.Ryl II $81^{7}$ (c. 104.
 almost clear off the water' (sc. 'the water-gates'). P.


With Rev. $21: 13 \mathrm{cf}$. P.Fl. III, l, Col. ii ${ }^{9}$ oils yeíroves $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{o}$

 combination in both New Testament and Papyri. Cf.e.g.

 your tower to the boundaries'.
II. Temporal ${ }^{\alpha} \pi o^{\prime}$ is also very common in the Koine, denoting the starting-point of a period. Phrases like $\alpha^{\prime} \mathrm{mo}^{\prime}$







Iu. 12:52 द́б́outal yàp àmì toù vüv.


2 Cor. 8:10 reoevn'j̧ $\alpha \sigma \theta_{\epsilon} \alpha^{2} \pi o^{\prime}$ rtépors. 'a yearago'.
 'since Iubi of last year'. P.0xy IV $725^{12}$ (183 A.D.) ${ }^{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime}$

 $\alpha^{3} \pi o_{o}$ roú vöv 'from now on', 'henceforth' (often). P.H@b.
 1682 (iv/A.D.) $\alpha^{\prime} \phi$ ' $0 \bar{i} \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \pi t \in u \sigma \alpha s$ 'since you sailed'. P.Oxy vii.

 the 13th of the month P.' P.Oxy I, 33 col.iii ${ }^{9}$ (ii/A.D.) $x^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}$ aicuros . Etc.
 third hour of the night': compare the use of $\alpha^{\prime} \pi_{0}^{\prime}$ in
invitations to marriages，etc．P．Oxy III， $523^{4}$（ii／A．D．） $\alpha^{\alpha} \pi i o{ }^{c}{ }^{\prime} \rho \alpha=$（＇A．invites you to dine with him）at $90^{\prime}$－ clock＇．

III．Figurative：（a）separation，etc．Where classical Gr used the simple genitive of Separation after such verbs
 inserts $\alpha^{\prime} \pi 0^{\prime}$ ．But $\alpha^{2} \pi o^{\prime}$ is also used in such verbs as
 speak of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \in \notin \in I V, \beta \lambda \in \pi \in I V$, tupi etc． （See discussion of $\phi 0 \beta \in i \sigma \theta_{\mu} \alpha^{2} \pi o^{\prime}$ etc．under＇Semitisms＇ in Part I）．We have already mentioned Paul＇s bold use


doúeiv ar áóo, It is unwise to style any
of these uses dogmatically as Hebraisms：$\alpha^{\prime r} \mathrm{o}^{\prime}$ in modern
Greek has so many similar usages，and ever and anon fresh discoveries in the Papyri prove a suspected Semitism to have a good vernacular origin．


1 Cor．7：27 入е́入urar ふ’mò yuvaino＇s





 $0^{\prime \prime} \mu \beta$ fou, 'he has recovered from the wet'. P.Oxy VI, $924^{2}$
 'protect A. from ague by day'. P.Iebt II, $420^{4}$ (iii/A.D.)
 B入єíte Gator dino tun loodxicov 'beware of the Jews'. Kuhr-
 Kedałaiou, from 'Charts Argentorat.' (Archive. III p. $415 \$$ ).


 Mt. 27:24). But it is needless to cite further. This 'mixed bag' from the Papyri will show that the New Testament had no monopoly of these uses of $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \sigma^{\prime}{ }^{\dagger}$
(b) Source, Origin, Material: The following examples from the New Testament will illustrate this comprehensive heading:- (For such phrases as of $\alpha \pi 0^{i n j s} / T \alpha \lambda_{i}^{\prime} \alpha S$ see special note at end).






 (ac t116:33) see Bicisaname 8.5. p2.6 and p.224.
 'you will have profit from them' (books). PrOxy
 'concerning the inviolability legally belonging
 Óvopátwr, (the collection) 'was based on old lists
 to u пеа́ущатоs ; 'shall I gain from the business?'
 tuXeiv, 'praying to obtain your aid'. B.G.U. ${ }^{1676^{7}}$ (ii/A.D.)
 tors having heard from your opponents'. For auto of mat-



 of a living persea-tree'.
(c) Cause: 'A $\quad$ (to is sometimes found where $\delta_{1 \alpha}$ c. acc. might be expected. 'From' easily becomes 'in consequence of'.






 'owing to a splinter'. P.FI.III, $35 b^{4}$ épefipac yap kakûs S,aktínevos え̇t' GK eívou (from Rossberg,p.22, who classifies it as 'qua causâ quid fiat').

Akin to this causal use is ' $\alpha \pi o^{\prime}$ of Instrument used after a passive verb. The Lucan writings have it often. It is the usual way of expressing 'by' in modern Greek.

 बúriss, (a'crux interpretum': this seems the best way of taking $\alpha^{\prime} \pi o^{\prime}$. See Macneile, ad.loc).


 tween र̇то́ and úrtó).

Papyri: P.Oxy VI, $891^{14}\left(294\right.$ ADD.) ${ }^{\prime \prime} \delta 0 \xi \in U . .$. w' ort $^{\prime \prime} \alpha^{\prime}$
 'it was decided that the expenses should be paid by the whole body of those belonging to the order'. P.Oxy VII,


which he hoped that my execution might be prevented'. (Instrumental Source might be a fitter designation). P.

'we were limited by the furlough'. P. Fay $97^{\prime 3}$

(drachmae)'bequeathed by his dead father'. "In chartis autein perpauca exstant exempla, id quod co magis mirandum est, cum in recentibus scriptorium libris tala saepissime occurrant." (Kuhring, p.36).
(d) We have already touched on partitive $\alpha^{\prime} \pi c^{\prime}$ in Part I. It is merely indubitable that the frequent use of this idiom after verbs like $\vec{E}_{\sigma} \theta_{1}^{\prime} \in v, ~ T V \in N$ etc. was inspired by the Hebrew $j^{p}$. The examples of $\alpha^{\prime} \pi o^{\prime}$ partitive, common enough in the papyri, do not parallel the usage.

Mt. 27:21 Jiva ג下̇io tiv Súo




N.B: These partitive usages of $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ no $^{\prime}$ though reminiscent of Semitic antecedents are not altogether dissonant with the late Greek use of the ablative clarified by means of a preposition.
 pause before we label them pure Semitisms.

Papyri: P.Oxy III, $482^{7}$ (109 A.D.) provides us with


' the third share which belongs to me, of 2 shares out of 4 shares out of 5 shares'. In P.Oxy III, $503^{\circ}$


 designated only two of the three eutheniarchs'. P.Petr.
 this'.

Miscellaneous:
(i) With Mk.5:7 etc. $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \grave{o} \mu^{\alpha} \alpha^{\prime} \beta o \theta \in v ~ ' f r o m ~ a ~ d i s t a n c e ' . ~$

 (Rom.11:25, 15:15,24, 2 Cor.1:14, 2:5). Cf. P.Iebt $402^{2}$ (172 A.D.) , P. $0 x y / 1681^{9}$ (iii/A.D.), P.Ryl II, $133^{\prime 7}$ (A.D.33).
(ii) Blass seems right against Moulton in regarding Jo.11:18 cos ánò orasicu Seuantévte (also Jo.11:18, 21:8 and Rev. 14:20) as a Latinism. Significantly enough, all the parallels cited (e.g. Strabo, Diodorus, Plutarch) are late. Josephus: War I, 3,5 furnishes a good parallel: touro
 stades from here'.
(iii) One example for several in the New Testament.

clue in the Epistle as to who the addressees were, and, unfortunately, it is ambiguous. Was the writer staying with a church in Italy, or with Italian Christians exiled somewhere, who join with him (or 'her') in sending their salutations.

The preposition, 'per se', does not settle the issue. In the New Testament $\alpha^{\prime} \pi o^{\prime}$ so used generally denotes a man's country as $\epsilon$ 'K denotes his town. (Sometimes ánó is very like the German 'von' and French 'de' (cf. Jo. 1:44, 19:38)). In the papyri ג̇̃ó is a very common phrase to denote the inhabitants of a town, e.g. Oxyrhynchus. But it does not fix the present whereabouts of the persons it describes. It means 'hailing from', 'natives of' only.

It is probable that we shall never finally settle whence and whither Hebrews was written. But we believe
 tians for the following reasons:
(I) Had the writer been resident in Italy (probably in Rome) would he have designated his place of residence so vaguely? Would oi ti Pwjun not have been more natural?
(2) May not the writer be saying, "Those hailing from Italy send their greetings" much as a Scot domiciled in Canada might write home thus "All hailing from Scotland send their regards."?
(3) If Priscilla was the authoress' is not this usage of גंतo' wistfully appropriate? She writes from Corinth of Ephesus to Rome to her old fellow-Christians and adds a greeting from old Italian friends now sundered from their homes by the seas and Claudius' decree?

Deissmann, Milligan etc. have argued that the papyri usage of apo' warrants us in supposing that the phrase denotes "those who were in Italy" at the time. Cf. Acts
 The context in both these places suggests that 'the bretfen from Joppa' and 'the Jews from Thessalonica' were actually in Joppa and Thessalonica at the time. On the other hand (as Lake and Cadbury argue ad.loc) the writer perhaps views the episodes from the Caesarean and Beroean ends respectively. $F$

For New Testament uses of $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ to describe country, domicile, etc. vide Mk.15:43; Jo.1:44,45; Jo.7:41; Iu.2:4; Acts 24:18. A Am' also, like $\dot{\epsilon_{4}}$ (Acts 10:45) is


> II
 'all parties inhabitants of 0.' P.Iebt.II, $389^{7}$ (98 A.D.)
 inhabitant of $\mathrm{T}^{\prime}$. P.Ryl. II, $77^{33}$ (192 A.D.)
$t$ Harnack. Moulton, J.A. Robertson etc. * L.A.E. p209. Notes.


 cried out'. Pap.Wessely, p.113, L. 3 ( 250 A.D.) K $\alpha_{\mu}^{\prime} / \mathrm{s}$

i.e. native of, but not presently staying in Philagris.

With Acts $12: 1$ cf. P.FI. III, 144 col.iii ${ }^{22}\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { áves } \\ \text { of }\end{array}\right.$ x"ŋ̀̀ roù yurvariou veavíokol . P. Ryl II, $102^{8}$ (ii/A.D.)
(where see note on oí a'rò toù yu⿰urdiou ). P.Tebt I, $33^{6}$ (112 B.C.) 'Pupaios $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \grave{o}$ бuykintou, 'a Roman senator'.
$\Delta \alpha^{\prime}$ : It is clear that etymologically $8 / \alpha$ is related to S's, Sumo , etc. Such words as fia'loyos and S/á日nun suggest the primitive meaning of the preposition. 'Two' becomes 'by-twain', and the consequent notion of 'interval between' glimmers through many of the later developments and usages.
$\Delta \alpha^{\prime} c$. genitive denotes 'through' whether of space, time or means.
I. Local: 'Through', 'throughout', as -

Mt. 7:13 8/ג ais reins rúlns
Mk. 10:25 Sid reumatios iodíSos
Rom.15:28 $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ úбopxc $\delta_{1}^{\prime}$ úmaiv $\epsilon$ is Emaviav.
'through your midst'

Papyri: P.0xy I, $69^{7}$ (190 A.D.) Bia His aùtis Qucídos

 Boped teiXos, 'undermined by way of the beershop etc'. P. Lond $1164(h)^{7}$ ( 212 A.D.) Thoiov Exthiviroiv ... $\sigma \in \sigma \alpha v i d(4) \mu$ évov 8/ג veii's oùv iotî , 'the Greek boat ... decked

II. Temporal: $\Delta \alpha^{\prime}$ of Time has three distinct nuances: (a) 'after (an interval of)'; (b) 'throughout' of duration;
（c）＇by＇as in 8 à vuktós．



 $\theta_{t \alpha} \sigma_{a \sigma} \theta \alpha c$ ，＇the sight of them after a year＇s intefval＇． P．Oxy XIV $1694^{\prime \prime}\left(280\right.$ A．D．） $81^{\prime} \epsilon^{c} \xi \alpha \mu \eta^{\prime}$ vou，＇at the end of a six－month＇．This idiom，which is classical，is not very common in the Koine．
（b） $8, \alpha^{\prime}=$＇throughout＇has usually $\pi \alpha \hat{s}$ or ${ }^{c}$＇tos add－ ed to make the meaning emphatic．

Heb．2：15 8ià тautò̀ toü Sウ̃レ．
Mt．18：10 Slà лavtòs $\beta$ 白 Dià Tauro＇s occurs also Mk．5：15
and Heb．9：6：it replaces the obsolescent ${ }^{\alpha} \in I^{\prime}$ ．
Papyri：P．0xy XII， $1481{ }^{2}$（ii／A．D．）dia＇rovoútou Xeóvou

 from Inscriptions of Prieie：112， 98 and 99 （i／B．C．）．P．

 release for good＇．Rev．Eg．1919，p． $204^{10}$（ii／A．D．）tойто $\mu$ о yaju tủktéol éotiv sià rautós，＇for your welfare is what
 Ss' $\theta \in$ ¢́ous $\epsilon u$ wиotatov, 'very cheap during the summer'.
 of the Xystus for life'.
(c) In the phrase fica vukiós the 'throughout-ness' is not stressed: it means simply 'by night'.

also Acts 16:9, 17:10, 23:31.
P.Oxy XVII, $2153^{2 \prime}$ (iii/A.D.) 81ג vunto's ódeúdavtes

 he had leapt, etc.'. P.Iebt. III, $706^{14}(171$ B.C.?) Sid

 oiko 8ouñow, the meaning seems to be 'within'. The parallels Mt.27:40, Jo.2:19 have Év. $^{\prime}$
(ii) What does Acts $1: 3$ mean? ( Bi jॅuєçv
 fashion of interpreting the phrase as 'appearing at intervals during forty days'. So Bengel: "non perpetus ied per intervalla". Bias also adopts this view. But the Greek of itself gives no definite support to this view. ÓnTגvópevos is now conclusively shewn to be not frequentative; it is a late Greek verb simply meaning 'appear'. (See Lake and Cadbury on Acts, ad.loc.). The natural
translation therefore is 'appearing during forty days'. The length of the period, not the transitory and sporadic character of the appearances, seems to be all that the Greek expresses. Acts 13:31 os $\omega^{\prime \prime} \phi \theta \eta \epsilon_{n}^{\prime} \Pi_{i} \eta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \alpha s \pi t \in i o u s$ supports this sense of 'during'.

Yet, despite the foregoing argument, might not the meaning be 'appearing on forty separate days'? Cf. B.G.U.


 visit I. every month regularly on 4 separate days bringing the child to be inspected by her' (Edd.).
III. Figurative: Classification here is no easy task. The Modal use of $8 / \alpha^{\prime}$ is little different from instrumentail $8 / \alpha$, and the latter shades into a quasi-causal significande. Yet this threefold subdivision seems necessary for clarity's sake.
(a) Modal: $\Delta \alpha^{\prime}$ is frequently employed in the Koine to express the Manner or the Accompanying Circumstances of an action. "By" "W ir" etc.,

Lu. 8: 4 Sig тор $\alpha \beta$ 人ोर今s 'by parable'.
Jo. 19.23 É










 'in a note'. Ibid $293^{5}(27$ A.D.) oưte sià y yartoû
oúre $\delta \lesssim$ onféśou 'neither by letter nor message'.
 'punishment by scourging' (attendant circumstances). P.
 ' $\alpha_{T} \in \sigma \notin \in S^{\prime}$ 'send me word at once you have received it'. P.

 Hib.I, $66^{\sigma}$ (228 B.C.) Sid Kevn̄s 'to no purpose'. P, Par. $26^{9}$ (163-2 B.C.) 8, 'oxi'mV ...' $\notin X \theta \in i v a c ~ ' t o ~ s e t ~ f o r t h ~$ in a few words'.
(b) Instrumental: $\Delta / \alpha^{\prime}$ denotes 'by the instrumentality of', 'through', 'by means of'. It is found with a genitive of person or of thing.
(i) Instrumental Cause:

Mk. .6:2 Sian tã̃ Xeipav áró̀ yıvoméval

Jo. 17:20 गtepi tiou tioteuóvtav fià toù doyou aútion.




Tit. 3: 5 fia tourpoù raxluyeverias
Papyri: Si人 $X \in \rho$ ós is, of course, a very frequent formula in the Papyri meaning 'from hand to hand', 'directly', e.g. P.Oxy.II, $268^{7}$ (enos).P.Goodspeed $5^{3}$ (ii/B.C.)
 through your efforts'. Ep.pr $48^{15}$ 度 y $\left(\rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha^{\prime} \tau \omega v\right.$

 tou's kwh vopeious dia twiv reo enkerféunv tportaypa'twv. Here perhaps may be cited S' óvcu 'on donkeys' (P.Ryl II, $135^{\prime \prime}, 34$ A.D.) and P.Oxy XVII $2153^{\prime 4}\left(\right.$ iii/A.D.) $\dot{\alpha}^{\prime} v \in \lambda \theta \in i v$ ... d/2 tiov $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} j^{\mu} \mu \pi$ kTnvīv,' to come up on the animals here'.

But (ii) oftener $\delta_{1} \alpha^{\prime}$ c. gen. denotes the mediate author or agent. This usage is very widespread in the Koine.

Mt. 1:22 tò én $\theta$ èv únò Kupíou sıà toû reфф́ntou.
Jo. 1:17 ó vofés Sià Mwuréws édóvn.

Rom.I: 2 ó тएо Є̈пŋууєixato sí twù теофитйv аútoù
Gal.3:19 Sidrayeis SI áyyétav.

Here also are to be placed phrases like $\delta / \alpha$ fou
 Si aúoú and Sià Xeiotoú，$\delta$＇aùroú ，etc．＊

I am inclined to think that the use of y $\rho^{\alpha} \phi \in \in$ not $\pi \in \mu \pi \in ル$ ，suggests Silvanus was the amanuensis in 1 Pet 5：12． If this be so，the palmary objection to the authenticity of the Epistle，viz．that a Galilean fisherman was not capable of writing such Greek，is removed．But we may
 and yea $\phi \in ル 8 / \alpha^{\prime}$ occur very commonly in the Papyri，it is never easy to say whether the personal noun in the gen－ itive denotes messenger or amanuensis or both together．
 i．e．by a professional letter－writer with P．Oxy XI势， $1737^{19}$ （ii／A．D．）．Ypá $\psi$ Uv for értrorodinv dian roù ávasisóvtos $\sigma 01$ $\pi \in 巴 \epsilon i$ His $\dot{i} y / \hat{\alpha} s$ ru，＇write me a letter by the man who delivers note to you about your health＇．Cf．P．Oxy XVII，
 For the general use of $8 / \alpha$ denoting agent in the Papyri compare the following：P．Oxy I， $51^{6}$（173 A．D．）．
 vekeól＇I have been instructed by you through H．your


[^1]$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha y y \in \lambda \mu \alpha$ rois ai means of giving the men the order'. P.Ryl II, 123 $3^{22}(28-9$
 'he had them conveyed home, by his unmarried daughter'.
 $\mu \in 1$ gov, 'send me the child by one of the guards'. P.Ryl II, $234^{9}$ (ii/A.D.) $\alpha v \sigma \phi v_{n} \theta v_{j} \sigma \in T \alpha c$ gid riv GTeatriyus,' the answer will be delivered through the strategi', etc. $\Delta / \alpha^{\prime}$ occurs in innumerable receipts connoting the agent through whom payment is made.
(c) There are some cases in the New Testament where $(i) \delta^{\ell}, \alpha$ c. gen. is causal rather than instrumental, ie. 8/ $\alpha$ c. gen. of thing means 'in consequence of' etc., rather than 'through', (ii) $f / \alpha$ c. gen. of person $=$ 'by', and is even applied to the First Cause - God.



(ii) ex of persons, $=" B y "$

Mk. 14:21 SI où óviós tout adv
Acts 24: 2 Todiñs tienúus tuyXávoutes sid fou


or even of God, the 'cause principalis',


I Cor. 1: 9 8íoù ékhń one cis kommviav t. víoù aúroû.

Papyri: Rossberg has noted that in the Papyri $\delta_{1 \alpha}$ c. gen. means simply 'by': "saepius a function író c. gen. coniuncti non differt" (p.38). $0 r .56_{(i i / n c}^{45} \sigma u \mu \beta^{\prime} \in \beta_{n} k \in v \quad \delta_{1 \alpha}$
 iepâv yea $\mu \mu \alpha$ тéwn étos eivac. P. Ryl II, $141^{17}$ ( 37 A.D.) útị́
 roo ß $\alpha$ т uv
'damages for grazing by their flocks'.

Miscellaneous:
 S' 'exutõ, is found in the Papyri. PrOxy XII, $1483^{56}$ (ii/iii A.D.) $\bar{\omega} v S_{\alpha} \alpha \in \alpha u t o \bar{u} \xi \xi \omega \delta_{i \alpha}^{\prime} \sigma \alpha s$ 'of the things you spent yourself'. Also P.0xy II, $273^{2 \prime}\left(95\right.$ A.D.) $\delta_{1}^{\prime} \notin \alpha u$ そ̂s 'by herself'.
 (Also Rom.15:30 and 2 Cor.10:1) shews Sid with the sense of the Latin 'per' after verbs of praying, swearing, etc. It may be a Latinism. The Attic usage is to's tivos.
 Ska Mauréws; ; R.V. 'by Moses'. Should it not rather be 'under'? Iebt.I, $888_{(\beta C / 15-4)}^{5}$ Zountiou k ai kpokositotadiou
 36b, $i^{3}$ twi $\delta_{1}$ aứtoú $\pi$ hoíwv - 'the boats under his charge'.
 Saepius locutio oi fiá tivos occurrit, qua indicantur qui alicuioboediunt, imprimis qui sub signis aliciūius militalnt. Idem usus ad res spectat significans rei aliquest praeesse ant rem alicuius esse. (Rossberg, p.38) .
(iv) The phrase $\delta_{1} \alpha X_{\text {Cotou }}, \delta_{1}$ 人ưroù , is used in the New Testament to denote Christ as God's instrument in the Creation (Jo.1:3, 1 Cor.8:6, Col.1:16), the Divine Channel of Grace, Redemption, Reconciliation (Jo.l:17, 3:17, Acts 10:36, 2 Cor.5:18, Col.1:20), of Judgment (Rom.2:16), and Salvation (Rom.5:9, Titus 3:6, etc). Christ mediates God's Will and Purpose to man. On the other hand, in such passages as Jo.10:9, 14:6, Heb.7:25

 "vermittler menschlichen Handelus Gott gegenßber". Oephe well summarises the usual meaning of the phrase, "vielmehr liegt Hberall die Voraussetzung zugrunde, dass Gott durch sein Handeln in Christus den Weg gebahnt und damit jede menschliche Leistung entbehrlich gemacht, jede Mittelinstanz ausgeschaltet hat."
(Oepre: Kittel's Theol.Ẅrterbuch: Band II s.66, where Schettler's view in。Die Paulinische Formel "Durch Christus" is discussed).
(v) Note how frequent $\delta, \alpha$ is in Romans (69) and Hebrews (29).
$\Delta 1 \alpha$ c. acc. occurs 279 times in the New Testament as against 382 instances with the genitive. Out of 714 usages in the Papyri, Rossberg counts only 206 with the acc.
$\Delta_{1} \alpha^{\prime}$ c. acc. is found with nouns of Person and of Thing. Primarily retrospective, it may also be prospective in its significance. It may denote Cause or Motive; on the other hand, it often indicates End or Aim, and arrogates to itself in some degree the functions of $\underset{\in V \in U \alpha}{ }$.

Regard says (p.134), "Il n'y a pas de rapport entre S/ $\alpha^{\prime}$ avec le génetif et $\delta^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime}$ avec $l^{\prime}$ accusatif; ce sont au fond deux prépositions distinctes." That may be true in some sense; but both the New Testament and the Papyri reveal examples where the line of division between $\delta / \alpha$ c. acc.

 If they were clean 'because of the word', must they not have been cleansed 'through it'? Cf. P. Fay $119^{34}$ (c. 100 A.D.) єiva usi eis $\psi \omega \mu$ iv yeuntar sià 70 ứswe 'that it may not be dissolved by the water' (Edd). Nor is there any fundamental difference of meaning between $\delta^{\prime} o^{\dot{u}}$ to


 ed us to make application to your brotherliness by this present letter'. (Edd.).

Moulton (Proleg.p.105) cites M.P. 16 and 20 (iii/B.C.) iva 8, $\alpha$ oè $\beta \alpha \sigma i t \in \bar{u}$ toù Sikaióu rúłw where $\delta, \alpha$ c. acc. is subtly and delicately different from for c. gen. "If the humble petitioner had meant 'through you', he would have addressed the king as a mere medium of favour: refaring to a sovereign power, the ordinary meaning because of you is more appropriate. This applies exactly
 too útorágauta )." This seems convincing, but why, we may ask, did Tertullus (in Acts 24:2) not use fin $\sigma \epsilon^{\prime}$ to Felix?*

Moulton has already (op.cit, p. $\wedge^{106}$ ) cited rOxy I, $41^{8} ?$
 may add the following: P.Iebt. II, 409 " ( 5 A.D.) Gi $8 \omega \bar{s}$
 Si $\sigma \in e^{\prime}$, and I shall have fine animals without blemish, etc. with your help' (Edd.). P.Iebt. III, $780^{23}$ (171 B.C.) тoúrou
 done I shall obtain help by your means'.
I. $\Delta_{1}^{\alpha}$ local occurs once in the New Testament, viz.

 Yéuntac $\delta 12$ sou!
ing it may be said（i）that $\delta / \alpha^{\prime}$ c．acc．local is as old as Homer，$\dagger$ and（ii）there is a growing use of the acc．in the vernacular with all prepositions．Against it we may urge（I）the Papyri，so far，have revealed no contemporary parallels．（2） 8 人 $\mu \in \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma 0 u$ has very fair quthentication in other MSS．The question must be left open．Oepke suggests that the meaning is：＂Durch das Grenzgebiet von Samarien und Galiläa（nach Peräa）．＂ （Theol．WOrterbuch：Kittel，Band II，Lief．2，p．68）．

II．$\Delta i \alpha$ of cause etc．springs naturally from the basal
 27：18）．＇Envy＇is the reason that inspired the betrayal and came in＇between＇and caused the act．

The ordinary meaning＇on account of＇，＇because of＇， is very common with a noun of Thing；expressing Cause or Motive：

Mk．2： 4 8，$\alpha^{\prime}$ tov̀ व́xtov
Acts 28：20 S1a＇таutnv thiv גitióv

Papyri illustrations are too numerous to quote in extenso：－P．Oxy II， $261^{12}(55$ A．D．）8ふ yuvaikeiav $\alpha \sigma \theta_{\text {éveíal＇owing to womanly weakness＇．Cf．Gal．4：13 }}$ where there is no need to read（with Blass）the genitive； †e．g．Sl． 11,118 そ̈＇$\xi \in$ 8iの 8cupà．．．каi útnv
 ＇on account of your innate kindness＇；P．OXy XII $1469^{9}$ （298 A．D．） $8 \lesssim \lambda 今 \mu \mu \alpha$＇for gain＇（Motive）；P．Oxy XIV，
 your clemency to us＇．P．Oxy XVII $2130^{26}$（ 267 A．D．）Tiv airiav 8，＇ヴvkrl．＇the reason why＇．P．Ryl II， $238^{4}(262$ A．D．） $8 / \alpha$ mol ${ }^{2} \alpha^{\prime} X_{e} \epsilon i \alpha s$＇for various needs＇．P．Ryl II，
 pressed because of the lack of water＇，etc．

With personal nouns：－
New Testament：Jo．12：11 ro入入oi $8_{1}$ aúrov̀ ún ñyou．
12：42 8，à tours $\Phi$ apetalous oúl cópotóyour．
Papyri：P．Flor． $127^{12}$（256 A．D．）roo dé［máutwv Xor pí8rov
 those who are with us＇．P．S．I， $299^{9}$（iii／A．D．）of 枵 $\pi \alpha$ rip
 account，though sick myself，I have stayed on＇．
$\Delta \alpha$ toũo， 8 i $\alpha$ rûrd are frequent in the New Pes－ tament，especially in the four Gospels．Here probably the influence of the Hebrew $\lceil$ ？by，translated in the IXX by fid roûto，has been felt．The Papyri，of course， have it，but not nearly so abundantly．P，Oxy XIV 1676

you have disdained us'. yàe aúròv 8, ' $\alpha \dot{u} \tau \dot{\alpha}$ raúra, 'for this very reason', etc.

Often in the New Testament $81 \alpha^{\prime}$ c. acc. has the sense of $\in \dot{c} \in K \alpha$ 'for the sake of' (with both Persons and Things) .



Heb. 6:7 $\mathcal{E}$, ours k ai yewpyeital.
Of THINGS:-




In most of these examples $\delta / \alpha^{\prime}$ denotes the fid in view: it is prospective 8 ; ; it looks forward. But sometimes it is not easy to separate motive from aim, cause from end, e.g. Rom. 4:25 os $\pi \alpha \rho \in \delta_{0}^{\prime} \theta_{n} 81 \alpha$ To $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$
 S. and H.(ad.loc.) remark: "Inasmuch as the idea or motive precedes the execution, $\delta, \alpha$ may be retrospective in regard to the idea, but prospective with reference to the execution. Here $\delta / \alpha \tau \alpha \pi$ may be retrospective or prospective (ice. in order to atone for them), $\delta i \alpha$ riv $\delta / k \alpha i \omega \sigma \omega$ is prospective, "with a view to our justification".

Examples of $\delta / \alpha=$ 'for the sake of' from the Papyri:

 well as mine please return to the city'. P.Iebt. I, $22^{5}$
 $\Delta / \alpha$ c. artic.infin. often does duty for a ${ }^{\circ \prime T}$ clause, expressing Cause. The New Testament has 33 instances ( 18 times in Luke and Acts) and the Papyri have abundant examples. A classical idiom, it was frequent in Xenophon and Thucydides. Sometimes it is found cheek by jowl with ot or 810'r1. Egg. Jo.2:24 Bia rò аütoù




Lu. 9:7 8/人 to $\lambda \in ́ y \in \sigma \theta_{\alpha c}$ útó tivaiv.
Acts 18:3 81人 to ó óóteYvov rival.


is that the smith is a long way from us'. P. Fay $123^{7}$
 'owing to having been molested, I wasn't able to come



 cause he said we should proceed to $C^{\prime}$. Plebe $59^{\prime \circ}$ (B C99) 8/2 to


Remarks: Though $8 / \alpha^{\prime}$ c. genitive has vanished in modern Greek, $8 / \alpha$ c. a causative has, like $\epsilon$ ' ${ }^{\prime}$, extended its province considerably. $\phi \in u ̛ y \in 1$ yid xiv Eúpúr $\eta$, Er $\phi u y \in$

 he was gone three years, it is for you that $I$ am doing it, I rejoice in your good fortune, he spoke to me about you' (cited Regard, p.136).
$\Delta i \alpha$ tísurvives in modern Greek as y/גtí.

Eis : On the etymology we need not dwell. Eis is really $\epsilon^{\prime} \cup-S$. Solmsen (Inser.Graecae, p.46) cites $\neq v s$ 'AOavaidv. E's is merely the form of $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ which became stereotyped with the accusative case, and acquired the resultant meaning of 'into'.

In the New Testament and in the Papyri $\in$ is yields aly to $\epsilon_{V}^{2}$ in point of frequency. ( 1743 examples against 2698 of $\epsilon^{\prime} v ;$ cf. Rossberg's figures for the Papyri: 1765 against 2245). But in the enormous popularity of $\varepsilon^{\prime} v$ lay the potency of decay: the case of $\epsilon$ 's was otherwise; "elle n'a rien de maladif", says M.Regard (p.226). Modern Greek marks the culmination of processes discernible in New Testament times. 'Ev has gone under in the shipwreck of the dative case, and $\in$ is has largely absorbed the functions of both.

Besides its occasional substitution for $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ (see Part I), $\epsilon$ 's in the New Testament has encroached on the provinces of such prepositions as meós and E'Ti' with the accusative. And, though grammarians heretofore have been slow to realise it, there are frequent cases even in the first century A.D. where tis (cf. reós c. accusative) does duty for the dative of earlier times.
I. Local: It is found after all kinds of verbs of going, coming, etc., whether the verb itself indicates
direction，or a verb of direction is to be understood． The resultant meaning may be＇into＇，＇unto＇，＇to＇（for reós ）＇among＇，＇against＇，according to the context．Eis is employed with the names of persons and pronouns（tho＇ reós is more usual）as well as of places．

Mt．2：1 $\pi \alpha \rho \in у$＇́vorio $\epsilon$＇s leporódura＇to＇ P．Hib．I $55^{2}$（250 B．C．）raleayevou Gis Tadasv n＇$\delta \eta$＇come to $T$ ． at once＇．yiver $\theta \alpha c$ e＇s（Acts 20：16）is common in the Papyri．

Mt．20：18 $\alpha^{3} v \alpha / \beta$ alivopev Eis＇$/ \epsilon \cos \delta \lambda u \mu \alpha$ B．G．U．III $846^{6}$（ii／A．D．）


P．Oxy $1487^{3}$（iv／A．D．）Kadi $\sigma \in \Theta_{\text {ciwv ．．Gis }}^{\text {tois y invites you to }}$ the wedding＇
tou＇s y ápous．
Lu．16：16 $\pi \alpha \dot{s}$ e＇s aúriv ßráserac．
 6is Tヴン oikiav．



P．Oxy IX $1219^{4}$ ropevóperos eis rinu Nairiou．＇to the $\underset{N}{ }$ ，city of
Rev．1：11 Y（eá4ov eis $\beta$＇$\beta$ iriov
Hib．I， $29^{9}$（c． 265 B．C．）yca＇qas tis＇upon a white teórcw／$\alpha$ ．notice－board＇

Other vergs used with $\theta$ is and common to the New Testament and Papyri include：$\pi \in \mu \pi \in I v, ~ \mu \sigma r \alpha \pi \in \mu \pi \in \sigma \theta \alpha$

and $\dot{Z}^{\prime}$ (GN (and their compounds). Bis is also used metaphorically in the same way:

With Lu; li, cf. P.Oxy II, 158 ( $86-7$ AdD.?)
 of thirteen'.

With Acts $17: 20$ cf. P.Oxy I, $129^{4}$ (Vi/A.D.) $\epsilon^{2} \pi \epsilon \delta_{\eta}^{\prime}$ t's à̉od's Gilds $\hat{u}^{5} \lambda \theta \in v$, 'since it has come to my ears.'

With Lu. 22:44 cf. P.Tebt II, $423^{14}$ (iii/A.D.) w's cis


With 1 Pet. 3:20, 2 Tim. $4: 18$, cf. Or. 56 (Rossberg) To $\alpha^{2} y \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha r \alpha$... $\alpha^{\prime} \cup \in^{\prime} \sigma \omega \sigma \in V$ ais A'iyurtov.

With Lu. $21: 12$ etc. cf. P.Oxy XVII $2125^{25}$ (220-1 A.D.)


With Spacráveveis (Mt.18:21 etc) cf. P.Eleph.1 ${ }^{9}$


With $\beta \lambda \in \notin \epsilon \in \in \epsilon^{\prime}$ of the New Testament, cf. P.Oxy XIV $1680^{\prime \prime}$ (iii/iv A.D.) $\beta \lambda \in$ firn $\epsilon$ is rò áqúvratov, 'having regard to the insecurity'.
(b) E's often indicates the part of the body 'on' which something is done. It is very common in the Papyri in the description of assaults.

New Testament Examples:
2 Cor.11:20 úभàs metis mpórwirav SÉpti.
Mk. 8:23
пrub́os cis ra' on mara

Mt. 27:30 Étumton kist riv ke申xiñv बüroù.
Papyri: P.Ryl II, $124^{23}$ (i/A.D.) Er 8 prov ... Ainyàs TiE!ous is mow $\mu$ épos fou ow $\mu$ eros, 'blows on every part of the body'. P.Iebt.III, 798'(ii/B.C.) tartionutes ais riv roidiav, 'having kicked me in the stomach', etc.
II. El's for $\epsilon_{v}^{\mathbf{v}}$. We have already devoted a chapter to this interchange in Part I. All that is necessary here is to add a few examples from the Papyri. The use of ti's for $\epsilon \dot{v}$ in the Koine is by no means so widespread as some imagine.
P.Hib. $39^{4}(25$ B.C. ) Cis Kovrwrtá 'on the state-
 то'גוル $\lambda$ eiroucyias, 'of their present service at Alabastropolis'. P.Fay $111^{\prime 2}(95-6$ A.D.) EEvéteidáppju $\sigma 01$ E's पiofuvi]áda rival, 'I enjoined you to stay at D'. B.G.U.
 (ii/A.D.) rivsuveúбavios $\leqslant$ is $\theta \alpha \dot{\lambda} \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha y$, 'when $I$ was in danger at sea'. FOXy X $1259^{\prime 2}$ (211-2 A.D.) arno sußoówv

 cis tor mpokeípquov $\theta$ nowucóv, 'at the above granary'. P.
 oivon elis to telóviv, ' do not allow the boat to be
taxed at the custom－house＇．P．Oxy 1874 （vi／A．D．）ヶarakiwoc
 to behold you among them in Paradise＇，etc．

III．E＇s Temporal denotes（1）＇for＇（like G＇तi＇c． accusative）duration．（2）＇until＇，i．e．end of a period． （3）Apparently $=\vec{\epsilon}$ ：point of time．
（1）Iu．12：19 Keípeva eis e＇ry motiá Lu．1：50 Єis yeveàs rai yeueás＇for＇ Heb．7： 3 eis rò Jinveke＇s＇continually＇
and the common New Testament phrase tis rov גi心ua（Mt．21：9 etc．）．

Fapyri：P．0xy VIII， 1129 （ 183 A．D．）＇EM＇$\sigma \theta \omega \sigma \in V .$. fis én résoapa＇for four years＇．P．Oxy XVII $2133^{28}$ tis à $\epsilon i$ ＇evermore＇．P．0xy I，40＂（iii／iv A．D．）A้ you tis fòv दै̂̂va＇Lords Augusti for ever＇．For tis rò 8invekés see Deissmann，B．S．p．251．He cites I．M．Ae． $786^{16}$ （Rhodes，Imperial period）teter $\mu \eta \mu$ fivos $\epsilon$ is rò bievekés．
（2）＇Until＇，＇up to＇，＇unto＇．

Phil．1：10 e＇s $\eta^{e} \mu e^{\prime}$ couv Xpiftoù．
I Th． $4: 15$ тegidertópeval Eis тウレ rapousiav．

 Sook＇́ ，＇let Iucia wait until the year＇．P．Oxy

XIV $1764^{9}$（iii／A．D．）خ̈v érép $\theta \in T O$ onjuteou eis Tivv
 the arrival of K．＇．F．Oslo $6^{3}$（ 150 A．D．）$\Phi \alpha \mu(E v i) \theta i \bar{\epsilon}$ tis is＇Phamenoth l5th to l6th＇．
 2 Cor．13：2 єis tò rádıv＇again＇，cf．el．fis $\alpha \hat{u} \theta$ is． Lu．13：9 Eis ro＇$\mu$ éttov＇thenceforth＇，（but Weymouth，evidently founding on Field（q． V ．），translates ＇next year＇）．In Iu．1：20，Mt．21：41， 2 Th．2：6，e＇s $=\epsilon^{\prime} v$

Papyri：F．Tebt． 328 （191－2 A．D．）Mクui Meroeク̀ Gis भ゙v ÉTo＇yXavor＇on which＇．P．Oxy I， 36 col. iii $^{3}$（ii／iii A．D．）
 be liable to false accusations subsequently＇．

With the New Testament e＇s Tédos＇to＇，or＇at the end＇（Mt．10：22，Mk．13：13，Lu．18：5，Jo．13：1）compare
 G＇s rétos E＇gétefev which is curiously reminiscent of Peter＇s treatment of Malchus＇right－ear in Gethsemane （J0．18：10）．
 With this odd note of Time compare P．Ryl II， $127^{6}$（ 29 A．D．）
 ＇on the night before the 17 th of the present month Sebas－ tus＇．Also P．Iebt．II， 332 （ 176 A．D．）8id Tヴs Gis rヴン＊$\beta$ roí örros puno＇s＇A⿴囗⿰丿㇄心e vukrós＇on the night before the 22nd
of the present month＇．The idea of＇leading unto＇has been varied into that of＇dawning into＇in Matthew．

IV．Figurative：（1）Of the figurative uses of tis the final sense $=$＇for＇expressing purpose or result，is the commonest，（as in the phrases fis $\mu x$ prúpiov，tis Jógavetc）．

Lu．2：32 фws Eis àrouáduчıv
Jо．13：29 àyocáSヒル cis riv Éoctŋ́v
Eph．2：22 $\sigma$ uvainosopeíge tis katoiktń́ciov．

 make up the money＇．P．Fay $115^{3}$（ 101 A．D．）$\alpha^{3}$ yócaoov írpiv S＇sw $\sigma u y \in \eta$ Xocisia Gis reoфniveis íxou，＇buy us two pigs of a little to keep at the house＇．P．Iebt．II， $104^{42}$（92 B．C．）$\pi \in ́ \pi(T \omega k \in v) \in \prime^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ arayp（aфn＇v）＇deposited for regis－ tration＇．P．Ie ét．II， 406 （c． 266 A．D．）L． 19 Goísiov tís
 $\lambda$ ivcur＇a leaden kettle for dyeing linen．P．OXy XVII $2139^{2}$（ii／iiii A．D．）So＇s tis rapáotaou oreatriyou ópve日（as）$\delta$ ＇give for the visit of the strategus five fowls＇． With Mt．27：7 Eis roфnv rois $\xi$ Évois and Mk．14：8 Eis
 ＇for the burial of $A$＇．

With Eph．I：5 Gis vioveriav cf．P．Oxy IX $1206^{\text {（4）}} 335$
A.D.) Sig to $\alpha \pi \alpha \xi \alpha \pi \lambda \bar{\omega} s$ ais ie [ O 01 ajutóv 'because we have once for all given him to you $f$ or adoption'.

With Titus 3:14 Els Tàs ayaynaias Xetías, of.
 With Heb.9:26 cis $\dot{\alpha} \theta_{\text {éryoun th's } \alpha \text { apaptias , of. }}$
 be annulled and cancelled.t

A similar use in the New Testament after verbs like
 where $\epsilon$ is is Predicative, used to be styled a Semitism.
 to the usage in Biblical writers; but it is the ferequency, not the idiom itself, I should say, that is really Semitic. See, for example:-

Acts 13:22, 19:27. Rom.2:26, Heb.11:8, and compare: b.G.u. $1103^{\prime \prime}(13$ biC.) $\delta$ eixov cis deeváerov 'what he received for dowry'. Proxy IX $1206^{2 \prime}$ ( 335 A.D.) से सoyedtoral
 my own son'. Cf. Acts 7:21 $\alpha^{2} v \in \theta_{c}$ étuato बúròv Éauty̆ t's


arourae in all of bad land for the god's portion'.
Gif to $c$. infinitive with a telic force (sometimes I One of sural vistanaes where Me legal formulae of
sub－telic，ie．of Tendency or Result）occurs 72 times in the New Testament，mostly in Paul．




（where cis to c．at．inf．is simply explanatory）．
Papyri：P．Ryl II， $77^{31}$（192 A．D，）E is To Tそうv Tód儿



＇try to obtain a pair of oxen for irrigating the vine－

 recover the barley＇．P．Oxy VI， $898^{34}$（123 A．D．）ti io
 able of proceeding against her＇．
（ii）Relation：A wide rubric．（a）sometimes E is（as in the classics occasionally）has the force of＇in regard to＇，＇quod attinet ad＇．

Lu．16：8 фpovirítepol cis riv yeveáv．


cf．Rom．4：20， 2 Cor．10：13，etc．


 who is good and capable in regard to his affairs'. Ep.pr
 érautòr é $\pi$ IISISóval.
(b) Deissmann (B.S., p.117) has already compared such
 <́yious, . Acts 24:17, 2 Cor.8:4, 2 Cor.9:1, 2 Cor. 9:13, Rom.15:26, Mk.8:19, with the Papyri use of tis to specify the various purposes of the items in accounts, etc. He cites also P.Par. $5^{\prime}$ (114 B.C.) Tòv tis Táynv oikov Cunodounfévov, where tis replaces a Dativus Commodi. We add P.Tebt.II, $398^{\prime 2}\left(142\right.$ A.D.) Tepi ìv $\delta \in \mathcal{L}^{\prime} y \rho \alpha \psi \in V$ ó Maricuv
 ing the drachmae paid by Pasion, as he states, to the public bank to the credit of H.'. Also P.Iebt.II $352^{8}$ ( 158 A.D.) E's Taop $\sigma \in V O \hat{u} \phi / V$, 'to the credit of T.', where the Edd. remark that e's has sometimes the force of 'to the credit of ${ }^{\prime}$ in accounts. Cf. P.Fay $83^{6}$ ( 163 A.D.) etc. We may call this Destinating $\in$ is, and in the New Testament cases translate 'for the benefit of', 'in favour of'.

How far tis as a preposition in the New Testament has come to replace the dative - a 'fait accompli' in modern Greek - is not so easy to decide. But there are clear
instances, as where tis is used after such verbs as E'yyífeiv, knpúbotiv , etc.*

Iu. 24:28 ग’ýyıo人v tis tiv kúpŋv. (Lu 22:47 has sumple datūve.)
Lu. 15:22 Sóte Saktútev eis tiv Xeipa autau.

With Rom. 5:8 $\alpha y^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime} \pi \eta v$ t's cf. P. Oxy XIV $1766^{3}$ (iii/A.D.)
 affection for you'. But cf. P.Iebt $16^{9}$ (ii/B.C.) oú Anyourts in̄́ [Gis] aútoùs $\alpha u ̛ \partial \alpha S_{i}^{\prime} \alpha \quad$ 'where Gi's actually stands for the possessive genetive' (Moulton, Proleg., p.246). P.Oxy III, $512^{9}$ (173 A.D.) ákodoúOws Th tis $\sigma \dot{\epsilon}$ $\mu / \sigma \theta \omega \sigma$, 'in accordance with the terms of your lease'. P. Par. 5, ii (114 B.C.) (cited by Moulton) has Xúpis tou eis aüriv oíkov 'her house'. I do not think we need look further for an explanation of 1 Peter l:11, Tג tis $X$ (viotòv $\pi \alpha \theta \eta^{\prime} \mu \alpha T \alpha$, 'the sufferings of Carist', as both the Authorised Version and the Revised Version translate.

## Miscellaneous:

(1) The question of the difference between Tioteúciv c.dat. and $\pi / \sigma T \epsilon \dot{u} \in I V$ fis c. acc. has been admirably

* Here probably ought to be placed Gal.3:14, iva tis rà
 be a figurative use of the extremely common Koine phrase yive $\sigma \theta a l$ - t's 'reach' as, e.g. B.G.U. $1680^{3}$

dealt with by Moulton (Proleg., p.67f). "To be unable to distinguish ideas so vitally different in the scheme of Christianity would certainly have been a serious matter for the New Testament writers." Here the Papyri afford us no help. The distinction between the two constructions seems to have been due to the needs of the Christian believers, who desired to differentiate between mere belief (c.dative) and personal trust ( $\epsilon$ 's c. accusative). There were Hebrew antecedents ( but "le developpement des différentes constructions ex-
 isme." (Regard, p.225).

For BartíSeiv, TIJteúeiv eis tò óvoud see Part I, (p.56). Cf. P.Hib.I, $74^{3}$ (c. 250 B.C.) Eis Tò óvo~a $K \lambda \in O \mu \alpha X_{o u}$, and make receipts for them, one in the name of C.', etc. P.Iebt.I, $30^{19}$ (115 B.C.) shows us $\epsilon$ is with
 'register the holding under the name of P.'. Cf. 1 Cor. 10:2. The 'name' generally stands for the person in the Hebrew and New Testament usage, as Mt.10:41-2,ó $\delta \in X O^{\prime} \mu \in v o s$ reoфn'rnv $\epsilon$ is ơvoud reоф'ntou, where Moffatt well translates 'because he is a prophet'. In such a case it seems hairsplitting to insist here on 'into' because GI's is used,

入óyou Sórews Mai $\lambda n^{\prime} \psi \in \omega s$, Cf. PrOxy X $1273^{33-34}$ (260 A.D.)
 TE O $\alpha \rho \alpha$ 'kout $\alpha$, 'the husband shall give her on account of the expenses of the birth 40 drachmas'. P.Oxy XVII $2133^{\text {/t }}$
 ing given nothing by way of dowry'. PrOxy $1275^{21}$ (iii/
 earnest money', etc.

 suffered a loss of 15 talents'. (The succeeding text in Mk. is doubtful).
${ }^{2}$ EK in the New Testament in respect of frequency ranks third to $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ and $\epsilon$ is . Occurring about 920 times, it still more than holds its own with its powerful and aggressive competitor, बं $\pi o ́$ (c. 655-660 instances). In Rossberg's statistics, however, $\alpha$ 'ró slightly outnumbers $\epsilon^{\prime k}$ (920 against 903). The fact that $\epsilon \dot{k}$ outnumbers $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \sigma^{\prime}$ in the New Testament and not in the Papyri, may have a Semitic explanation. It is very significant that the Fourth Gospel and Revelation between them account for about a third of all the New Testament examples. (Fourth Gospel 163; Epp.37; Rev.135). In modern Greek $\alpha$ 'Tó has almost completely vanquished $\epsilon^{\prime} k$.

The proper significance of $\epsilon$ ' $k$ is 'out of', 'from within'; as such it is sometimes contrasted with Eis. Wherever possible, $\epsilon$ 'K should receive its full force of 'out of', but sometimes it is not possible to accent the idea of 'within-ness'. The notion of origin explains many New Testament examples which we have not classified here. A wide range of verbs is found with $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ (from owifelv to vikà Cf. Rev.15:2, Vルর̂v $\epsilon^{\prime} k$, probably a Latinism, i.e. modelled on 'victoriain ferre ex'.)
I. Local: 'Out of', 'from', after verbs of motion or of rest, etc. (We select only New Testament examples, which can be closely illustrated from the Papyri). Mt.



 ' $\epsilon \lambda 2 v$ 'gathered from the fruits a quantity of olives'.


 Or. $74^{3}$ 万 $\omega \theta_{\text {Cis }} \in \dot{k} \pi \pi \in \lambda^{\prime} y$ yous 'saved from the deep'. ${ }^{\dagger}$
(b) 'EK can also signify direction after verbs of rest: Greek says 'from', where we say 'at', 'on', etc.



 'a scar on the right side of the forehead'. P.Ryl II, $144^{15}(38$ a.D.) os $\delta e ́$ ck toù évavtiou ä́toyou ain Sian poi
 opposing me', etc. With P.Oxy XII $14699^{5}$ ( 298 ADD.) X $\bar{\omega} \mu \alpha$ o ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{V}$
 public dyke on the south of our village', cf. Rev.21:13 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \bar{o}$ votou turtâves their.
II. Time: Temporal $\overrightarrow{E k} k$ marks the point of departure: $\left.(f) \vec{a} \pi o^{\prime}\right)$ 'from', 'since'.
 B.S. p248.

Mk. 9:21 $\in \epsilon^{\prime} k \pi \alpha^{\prime} \delta_{o}^{\prime} \theta \in V \quad$ (classical $\epsilon^{\prime} k \pi \alpha^{\prime} \delta \omega v$ )*
Lu. 23: 8 Ecg íkavãv X Xóvav.

Acts 9:33 Є'
 $\mu$ 'XXl Tins évertworns írcépas, 'from past time down to the
 $\mu \in X$ Xe Th's àrosórews tókous 'the interest on it from the beginning up to the time of repayment'. (several
 व́d入otcióthros. 'A too tote is frequent in the Gospels, (Mt $4: 17 \mathrm{etc}$ ), cf. Ck Tótt PrOxy $95^{17}$ (129 A.D.).

Sometimes $\epsilon^{\prime} K$ expresses the idea of succession:
Mt.26:44 E'K т̧'rou 'a third time':
Jo. 9:24 E'K Seur'pou

2 Pet.2:8 $\eta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \rho^{\alpha} \alpha$ '̇ $^{\xi} \xi \eta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \alpha s$. 'day after day'.
Papyri: P.Iebt. 297 (c. 123 A.D.) Ely Seutépou 'a second time'.
III. Figurative: (a) $\vec{\epsilon} K$ denotes Origin. This is a wide rubric, including $\epsilon$ ' $K$ of Nativity, of Extraction, and of Material, besides Source.

 is natural to man from childhood.


Jo．1：13 $\in$＇K $\theta \in o u ̈ ~ \in y \in u v \eta^{\prime} \theta n \sigma \alpha \cup$ ．
 4：7 youj $\epsilon$ 立 Th＇s Eapactías．

Jo．2：15 moinoas фeayétiou eik oxorvicul
Rev．18：12 $\quad$ кkē̃os $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ Gúdou tipıura＇tou
 youaikos，＇to bear children by another woman＇．
 $\theta \in o u ́$, god and son of a god＇．Cf．O．G．I．S． $90^{10}$（Rosetta Stone）．P．Oxy $1206^{\prime \prime}(335$ A．D．）S心 tò Gúyeuñ aúòv Eivajl
 born and of well－born and free parents＇． P．S．T． $1016^{23}$（129 B．C．）$E \in u v o u ̂ \theta i s ~ " ~ \Omega \rho o u ~ T i ̄ ̀ v ~ t ' K ~ t i ̄ ̀ v ~$ Meruvoveicu；＇s．daughter of $H$ ．from Memnonea＇（a village）． Hib．I， $56^{6}$（249 B．C．）Nikóote 2 Tov $\epsilon^{\prime} K K_{o}^{\prime} \beta \alpha$ ，＇Nicostratus of Koba＇．

 ok入noou גíGou＇a statue of rough stone＇．（i／BC）．
（b）Ek is employed to sharpen the partitive genitive in the Koine．The writer of the Fourth Gospel in par－ ticular，has a great fondness for partitive $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ ．


Jo．4：13 Tル＇ルV $\in \mathfrak{k}$ tout c＇ci 8 dos
Jo．17：12 Dúdeis $\epsilon \in \xi$ aúvív．

 Twi ófoimv é＇夭Xev Ouyaté as 8úo，＇married one of his own rank and had two daughters＇（direct object unexpress－ ed：this ellipsis common in the New Testament；vide Lu．
 ＇one of you＇．

Note：The frequent use of partitive $\epsilon \mathcal{K}$ after verbs like $\epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \theta^{\prime} \epsilon \mathcal{N}, \pi i v \in I V$ etc．in the New Testament is pro－ bably due to Hebraistic influence，though the phrase it－ self is not un－Greek；no one would call partitive $\epsilon k$ after $\mu \in T E X \in N$ a Semitism．

Here we may also place the frequent New Testament phrase $\epsilon^{\top} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{al}} \epsilon_{k}^{\prime} k$ ，＇to be out of＇，i．e．＇to belong to＇． It is commonly used to denote membership of a sect or com－ many．

Mt．26：73 rail où＇́ $\xi$ aútĩ́v $\epsilon_{i}^{\prime}$.


Rom．2：18 oft Eek This Excl $\theta$ ids．
Phil．4：22 of ci k $^{k}$ Til Kגídpos oikias．＇Ye members of Caesars household＇．

Papyri: P.Oxy XVII $2110 \mathrm{col.i}{ }^{25}(370$ A.D.) tETs ti tiv $K \delta$ Makpobios, 'M. being one of the 24'. P.Iebt.I, $40^{\prime \prime}$ (117 B.C.) reOQupoúfevos rival Eck this oikias 'being eager to be a member of your house'. P.Ryl. II, $65^{3}$ ( 67
 belonging to the association'. P.Par.26 (163-2 B.C.) Kali
 'and others connected with the Serapeum and others connected with the Asclepeum'.
(c) EK can denote Cause or Occasion with the meaning 'as a result of', 'in consequence of'.

Jo. 4: 6 KeKorlakìs ÉK Tins ósoritocias



Ho. 6:66, 19:12, etc. Є'र тоútou, 'consequently' Papyri: B.G.U. II, $423^{17}$ (ii/A.D.), ofT' $\mu \in \in \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha_{\prime}^{\prime} \delta \in u \sigma \alpha S$


 cessive rising of the most sacred Nile'. P.Ryl II, $68^{10}$
 dispute struck me'. P.Iond $1915^{19}\left(330-340\right.$ A.D.) ai $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ Toúrou óykou ápyupiou save
sequently borrowed a large sum of money'. P.Oxy XII


Sometimes Cause shades into Instrument or Author:

Lu. 16:9 moińбате tavtoís ф'toos tee tout $\mu \alpha \mu \bar{\omega} v a$



Papyri: P.Hib.I $51^{6}(245$ BC. $)$ Toroûro ràe Éukeitac Ely Baбixikoú, 'for that is the rate published by the govern-
 So日évid !two petitions presented by X'. P.Grenf. ii, $76^{3}$ (245 B.C.) E $\dot{K}$ tivos mounpoû saípovos ouvé $\beta$ n aútoùs $\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \zeta \in \hat{u} X \theta_{\alpha L} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda n \prime \lambda \omega V$ 'through some evil spirit it has come about that we have separated from one another'.

Note: The New Testament shows one example of $\epsilon^{\prime} K c$. art. infinitive denoting cause viz. 2 Cor.8:1l. Cf. P.Oxy I, 68 (131 A.D.) E'K toil moho Xeóviov rival 'owing to the lapse of time'.
(d) 'Ak denotes Price, occasionally in the New Testamont and quite frequently in the Papyri:

Mt. 20:2 $\sigma 0 \mu \phi \omega v n^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \epsilon^{\prime} k$ 位vaciou 'at the rate of'.


Papyri: P. Fay $111^{15}(95-6$ A.D.) $\lambda \in ́ y o u \sigma c ~ t i v a l ~ t i ́ ~$

入'́tivov ... $\epsilon^{\prime} y\left(\delta_{C} \alpha x \mu \hat{\omega v}\right)$ ' $\eta$ 'they say lotus is to be had at 18 drachmae'. P.Fay $131^{5}$ (iii/iv A.D.) moindov $\alpha$ 'uTふ̀s maOnval $\in \dot{x}(8 \rho a x \mu i v)$ i $\delta$ 'get them sold at 14 drachmae'.
 'interest at the rate of 2 drachmae'. P.Oxy IV $745^{2}$ (c. I A.D.) .

## IV. Miscellaneous:

(i) Sometimes the attraction of the context substitutes $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ for $\epsilon^{\prime} v$.


Lu. 11:13 ó Tating ó $\epsilon$ ' oùpavoù * 'Facher-in-steaven' Col. 4: 6 Thiv $\in k$ Sas dikeias.
 'burns up the things in the earth'.
(ii) There ise any number of adverbial phrases made from E'K: E'K K'́ pous 'in part' ( 1 Cor.13:9, 10, etc) is quite abundant in the Papyri. E.g. P.0xy II, $242^{15}$ ( 77 A.D.) Totimu e'k $\mu \in$ '̧oous męiteixiouévav 'partly walled round'. 'Ek suk $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathrm{w} v o u}(1$ Cor.7:5) 'by mutual consent', cf. P.Oxy XII $1473^{29}$ (201 A.D.).
*W.H. bracket ó before è $\xi$.

Other phrases occurring in the Papyri include $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ $\mu \in \sigma \sigma 0^{*}$ ( 1 Cor.5:2) E' $\xi$ úyioùs kail ext ảdn $\theta$ ias 'honestly

 the contrary', $\in \mathcal{K} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda o y \circ \sigma \mu o u ̂ ~ ' f a l s e l y ', ~ ' \epsilon \xi ~ i ́ \sigma o u ~ ' i n ~$ equal instalments' (cf. 2 Cor.8:13 $\epsilon^{\prime} \xi$ ' ${ }^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime} T_{n} t o s ~ ' b y ~ e q u a l-~$ ity'), etc.

²Ev : In the Koine as represented by the New Testament and the Papyri this preposition has enormously enlarged its sphere of influence. For this extension there were two cardinal causes. (1) The growing lack of clearness in the dative case: (2) the influence of the $L X X$ where the frequency of $\hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} V$ is undoubtedly due in part to the Hebrew $\because$ •* It is 'facile princeps' among the New Testament prepositions, occurring in all 2968 times (Rossberg counts 2245 instances in the Ptolemaic Papyri he has read). Or, to state the figures otherwise: $\mathcal{E} V$ accounts for $26 \frac{1}{2} \%$ of all the New Testament prepositional usages, and $18 \%$ of the Papyri occurrences. Heilmann, (Reform. Kirchenzeit, 1896, p.413) has calculated that in Colossians ${ }^{\in} V$ represents $48 \%$ of the collective prepositional total, in 2 Peter a still larger percentage, in 1 John $45 \%$, and in Ephesians 44 $\frac{1}{2} \%$. Small wonder that Moulton described this preposition as "a maid of all work". Indeed, the basal simplicity of the idea of $E v$ allowed it to appear in almost any conceivable circumstance, local, temporal, or figurative; and the only way to arrive at the resultant meaning of it is to study carefully the context. Where classification is hard and capable of almost indefinite extension, we

[^2]have judged it best to include all the usages under the four broad categories of Place，Time，Circumstance（or State）and Instrument，adding a fifth comprising miscel－ laneous uses．

M．Regard well writes the epitaph of $\in \mathcal{V}$ which no longer survives in modern Greek．＂Après one extraordin－ aires survie dons la Koine antique，où ale avait déjà perdu une part sensible de sa solidité，la préposition a sombre dens le naufrage du datif．＂（p．323）．

I．Local：Strictly $\epsilon_{V}$ means＇within＇，＇inside＇a certain place，sphere or limit，egg．Mt．3：6，E vv T $\hat{\imath}$ lop ’ávn

 sultant meaning is often＇on＇，or＇among＇．Mt．5：25＇$V$ v
 etc．So too when used metaphorically，as Mt．5：28 $\epsilon \vec{v}$ Ty


Papyri：P．Hib．I $72^{18}$（ 241 BC．）$\epsilon \hat{v}$ tai ádútuc＇in the sanctuary＇．P．Fay $112^{17}(99$ A．D．）ar $\mu \hat{v}$ av $u$ úâs $\epsilon \hat{V}$ tois isiors．．．rival＇it is better for you to be in your houses＇．Cf．Jo．l：ll，ais Tali sid．P．Ryl II 130（31 A．D．） cv 解 ywvíx＇in the corner＇，cf．Acts 26：26．P．Ryl II



With Lu.2:49 cf. PrOxy III $523^{3}$ (ii/A.D.) tiv tais Klaus iou) Eaparico(los) 'in the house of C.S.'. With
 $\epsilon^{\prime} v \theta_{n}\left[\sigma^{\prime} \cup \rho_{\imath} \hat{\iota}\right]$ 'stored at the granary'. With Jo.20:30,
 $\epsilon_{V}$ tais $\beta u \beta$ lions 'I do not find the entry in the books'.
 rev $\alpha$ ' $\mu$ nov, 'in the fifth month when $I$ was with child'.

As an example of the metaphorical use, cf. PrOxy XN
 'the youth carries you in their hearts'

For the anarthrous $\in^{2} v$ oik of Mk.2:1, I Cor.11:34 etc. where there is nothing indefinite about the phrase,
 have it made for you at home'. Cf. also the frequent $\epsilon \dot{V}$ 'ayu'd $_{1}$ 'in the street' Eeg. PrOxy X $1282^{\prime 4}$ ( 83 A.D.), indicating that an agreement was made before a public notary.
(b) The New Testament uses $\bar{\epsilon} V$ after such verbs as $i \sigma^{\prime} \alpha \nu \alpha c$
 far to say that $\epsilon^{\prime} V$ is put for $\epsilon^{\prime}$; the stress is not so much on the movement as on the ultimate resting-place.



 'lodge ... an image in each temple'. Iebt. I $61 b^{220} \theta \in \operatorname{cival}$
 the Papyri, e.g. P.Ryl II $105^{19}$ ( 136 A.D.).
 On the other hand, $\epsilon$ is is just as natural after such verbs.eg.jol3:3.
 them in a safe place'.

But there are cases where $\in^{\prime} v$ is quite clearly equivalent to $\in$ 'S after verbs of Motion, although this interchange is not nearly so common as the reverse one. The essential identify of $\epsilon$ 's and $\epsilon^{\prime} v$, and the vernacular charaster of the speech, are the causes of this mixing.

Lu. 8: 7 ExT


(For metaphorical uses see Rem.1:25 etc, Part I, p. 50).
 oikí $\mu$, 'came into my house'. J.E.A._p. 61 (c. 293

 'A $\lambda \in \xi \alpha \cup \delta_{\rho \sec i \alpha}^{\alpha}$ ' on my arrival in A.'. PrOxy I $65^{5}$ (iii or

have brought down to our village'.
Note: P.Oxy VII $1068^{5}$ (iii/A.D.) $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \alpha$
 is found with the accusative in some ancient Greek dianlects (Thessalian, Boeotian, etc.) as well as in modern Cypriot.
I. III. In a figurative significance $\vec{G} v$ denotes Situation, Circumstance, State, Condition, Manner, etc. Only a few examples can be seledted:



 heard) of your protracted illness'.
2 Cor. 1:4 av $\pi \alpha \dot{\sigma} y$ $\theta \lambda^{\prime} \psi \in$
PrOxy $939^{\prime 3}$ (iv/A.D.) $\epsilon \cup \theta \lambda_{i} \psi \in \prime$ ( $\epsilon \overline{\mathrm{I}} \alpha_{c}$ ) 'be in affliction'.
2 Tim. 2:2 ThU Eu útep ok in óvtav
P.Tebt.III $734{ }^{24}$ (fragment) (141-79 B.C.) rivas Tiv $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$
 able inhabitants of A.'.
Acts 26:12 $\epsilon \hat{v}$ ois kail ropevófevos 'in these circumstances'

 'be absent' (P.Iebt. II $319^{3} 248$ A.D.) ; $\epsilon \dot{v} \in \dot{\epsilon} \pi \circ \chi_{\hat{n}}$ 'in
 land handed over' in a dry condition'. (P. Jebt 378, ${ }^{\prime 3} 265$ A.D.) iv Xtwoois : of land 'with greenstuffs' (Foxy XIV 1646 ${ }^{9}$, 268-9 A.D.). EúX
mpokomais 'I pray that I may see you in further advancemont' (F.Ryl II $233^{15}$ ii/A.D.).

New Testament examples of $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ denoting Manner include Lu. 18:8 $\in \dot{v} \tau \alpha ́ \chi \in L \quad ' q u i c k l y '$
Rom.12:8 $\epsilon \mathrm{V}$ бmous $\hat{l}$ 'hastily'
Col.2:15 $\epsilon \hat{u}$ racenoía 'boldly'

 'to supply speedily'. P.Hib. I 27 col.iii (301-240 B.C.)
 briefly and accurately as I could'. With Cv rios фavepã
 'publicly' (Add.).

Akin is the use of $\epsilon \mathcal{\prime} v$ to denote Clothing, Equipment, etc.

Mk. 12:38 Eve otolais TEPITRTEIN
Jas.2:2 $\alpha^{2} v \grave{n} C$ X(

In P.Oxy III 472 col iv $^{96}(\mathrm{ii} / \mathrm{A} . \mathrm{D}$.$) there is a remark-$ ably good parallel to the latter New Testament example: Tíuns duh $\theta$ justros $\epsilon \dot{u}$ Eúretésiv íuatiols, 'a poor man wearing

Here I would place the $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ of Accompanying Object, or Person, as in -

Lu. 14:31 $\epsilon v^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon_{\alpha}$ Xidiáolv ú $\pi \alpha v i n j \alpha l$.
1 Cor.4:21 $\in \dot{v} e^{\alpha \prime} \alpha \beta \delta \omega \quad{ }_{\imath}^{\prime} \lambda \theta \omega_{j}$
Heb. 9:25 $\in \dot{v}$ аїдат

 which are all excellent illustrations of the meaning 'equipped with', but are not really first-class examples of the Instrumental év. The three above New Testament examples are reminiscent of LXX phrases. E.g. I Kings
 the Papyri it is perhaps best to say that at this point the Hebrew idiom touches hands with the Greek.


Under this rubric we place what we may call the Mystic $\epsilon^{\prime} v$, as in the great Pauline $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ Xelotù . Here the Papyri are of no assistance, except that we find the formula $\in i$ Kucio etc in Caristian letters of the fourth or fifth century.

The old way of explaining the Pauline phrase $\epsilon^{\prime} v \times$ Corty E'v Kucin etc. was to find the key in such a word as
 possessed by the god. New Testament affinities outside
of Paul were sought in such places as Mk. 5:2 'av $\theta_{\text {patios }} E^{\prime} v$

 Paul to be 'in Christ' was not a spasmodic experience, but the normal state of the Christian who "no longer lives but Christ, the Spirit, lives in him")!

In his classic monograph "Die Neut Testament Formed in Christo": Marburg (1892) Deissmann investigated the whole phrase thoroughly. He thought the general meaning of 'in Christ' was that of 'dwelling in a pneuma-element which may be compared to the air', as animals live in air, fish in water, and plants in earth. 'Iv Xporic̀ Inonu (invariably that order) relates always to the glorified Christ regarded as $\pi v \in \bar{u} \mu d$, not to the historical Christ. The correlative phrase Xciotòs Av tiu he explained by the same analogy. Not only is an animal IN THE AIR, but the air is IN THE ANIMAU.

Schweitzer in "The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle" (1931) trenchantly criticised Deissmann's view. Rejecting Deissmann's Jewish-Hellenistic explanation of Paul's mysticism, Schweitzer finds the key to the whole problem in Jewish eschatology. Deissmann had written "In the Damascus experience Paul attained to the conviction not only that Jews was the expected Messiah, but also to い
the 'in Christ' and 'Christ in me'. That for Schweitzer
$t$ Deismanu (B.S. 1186 ) will wot allow that these are good parallels. Transactions

is explaining the 'obscure by the more obscure' (op.cit. p.35). For him the 'being-in-Christ' is a partaking in the heavenly corporeity of Christ, the sharing by the elect in the mystical body of Christ which is not a pictorial expression, but an actual entity. 'In Christ' is not the original phrase and oùv Xeioriu a derivative one. They find a common denominator in the idea of partaking with Christ in a special way in the corporeity which is capable of resurrection. Indeed the frequency of $\epsilon \vec{v}$ Xelotã is due to the fact that it forms easy antitheses with analogous Pauline expressions like 'in the body', 'in the flesh', 'in the Spirit', 'in the Law'. (See p.122f).

Who shall decide where doctors disagree? Suffice it here to say that Schweitzer's view seems better to accord with New Testament facts. Whether Paul created the phrase and the conception, or whether it is traceable to Christ Himself (see Jo. $6: 56$ etc), is a question on which we cannot dogmatise.
III. Time: The Temporal use furnishes yet another instance of how the ubiquitous $\vec{\in} v$ came in with the dative that scarcely aeeded it. It seems in some cases almost immaterial whether the simple dative or $\epsilon \vec{\cup}$ with the dative. is used to express Point of Time. In John 6:44 we have

in 6:40 the MSS. vary. On the other hand, there is truth in Blass-Debrinner's assertion (p.120): "Da der Dat. nur den Zeitpunkt bezeichnet, $\in \stackrel{v}{ }$ dagegen Zeitpunkt und Zeit\#raum, so ist für "bei Tage, bei Nacht" (Zeitraum) wohl $\in \vec{V}(T \hat{y}) \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \rho^{\alpha}, ~ \in \hat{v}(\tau \hat{y})$ vuкरí möglich (Jo.11: 9,10; Acts 18:9; 1 Th.5:2)." It is significant that
 24:7,46, Acts 10:40) never has $\epsilon^{\prime} v$. (Incidentally cf. Field's note on Mt.l6:2l proving it is impossible for the Resurrection to have occurred on the fourth day).
(a) Point of Time:- 'In', 'at', 'on', but not so emphatically definite as the simple dative.
 12:2 Tофєĩ $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha ́ \tau \omega$


Jo.1:1 evे बंटरहु
11:24 Ev Th $\alpha v \alpha \sigma T \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \in 1$
Acts 1:6 $\epsilon \vec{v}$ cireive rì X cóvic

1 Cor. 15:23 $\in \hat{u}$ Tỳ Tapouбía aùtoù.
N.B.: The Hebrew $\frac{7}{?}$ may have accelerated this usage
 ( $n i^{\wedge}$ 그) .

Papyri：P．Oxy I $121^{5}$（iii／A．D．）$\in \vec{v} T \hat{y}$ $\sigma \eta^{\prime} \notin \in \rho o v \quad \pi \in \rho \in 1-$ －opoyńtwo人v，＇Ie them be dug round today＇．P．Oxy XIV $1684^{2 /}$

 the visit of the dux＇．Cf．the New Testament $\in \hat{U}$ Ti j Tapovoia．

P．Ryl II 153（136－61 A．D．）Av tro入入ois＇on many occas－ ions＇．Or． $56^{55^{\prime}}$（Rossberg）$\in \vec{v}$ Lें tee（ $\mu$ xvi）ki no＇H入íou
 Tu E＇vátwl ÉTEI．
（b）Much more commonly $\in \mathcal{V}$ denotes＇within＇，＇during＇， ＇in the course of＇．In Acts 27：7 U ＇ Beadur dooúvtes，＇sailing slowly for many days＇（Lake and Cadbury）we might have expected inavàs inf épas．

 14： $2 \mu \dot{\prime} \in \dot{U}$ ヒ́opTy＇not during the feast＇．
Jo． $4: 31$ Єنे $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \mu \in T \alpha \xi u ́$
Acts 26： $28 \in \dot{V}$ òdiyw $\mu \in \pi \in i \theta \in i S$（see Notes below）




ふंrodw four months＇．P．OXy XIV $1671^{9}$（iii／A．D．）$\epsilon v+y \alpha^{\prime} \alpha \alpha \beta \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \in \iota$ $\dot{\epsilon}_{v \in \beta \alpha \lambda o ́ \mu \in \theta_{\alpha}}$＇we did the lading during the journey up＇．
P.Oxy X 1252 (verso) col.ii ${ }^{34} \epsilon \hat{v} \tau \hat{i} \mu \in T \alpha \xi u ̀ ~ \alpha ̇ \pi o 8 o u ́ v \alpha c, ~$ 'discharge in the meantime'. Cf. Jo.4:31 (supra). P. Fay $112^{\prime 7}$ (99 A.D.) diwgov גंutoù tw̄v бкафŋitewn ev duбi $\eta_{\mu} \mu \epsilon^{\prime}(\alpha<) S$ 'carry on the digging during two daym'. Or.
 $\mu \epsilon y^{\prime} \alpha \lambda^{\prime} S$ ravnyúpeav 'during the great assemblies'. Notes: (i) When Jesus says (Jo.2:19) he will rise E $\dot{V}$. TCơiv júfés, He means the Resurrection will occur WITHIN three days. (ii) In Acts $26: 28$ the meaning may be 'by a short argument', sc. tóyw cf. Eph.3:3, but the more usual meaning of $\in \vec{v}$ oेxiyc is 'in a short time'. Cf. Plato: Apology, 22B.
(c) For $\epsilon \vec{v} \quad$ c. aft.infinitive see Part I, p. $36 f$. For New Testament examples see Mt.13:4, 13:25, 27:12; Mk.4:4; Lu.1:8, 2:6,43, 5:1, etc. All the New Testament examples have a temporal force (with pres.inf. = $\epsilon^{\circ} \omega$
 and Heb.8:13.

The only examples $I$ have found in the Papyri are
 Guvtufeiv 'Amod入civ( $\omega$ ) ('on the boundary between temporal and causal meaning'. Mayser, I主, p.329). P.Par. $13=$ Petr. III Einl p. 26, 94 (164 B.C.) Tís oútws É̛Tiv d'vádntos



None of these is unequivocally temporal. As there are 500 examples of this idiom in the LXX, it seems best frankly to recognise it as a Hebraism (pace Moulton). It is suspiciously paradoxical that the big majority of the New Testament examples should occur in the writings of the only Gentile among the Kew Testament authors.
IV. Instrument: A great deal of grammarians' ink has been spilt over the genesis of instrumental $\in \mathcal{V}$ in the New Testament. Some instances undoubtedly have good enough Greek antecedents; but there are others that no amount of Deissmannism will purge of their Semitic pedigree. "In what shall it be salted?" (Mt.5:13) is intelligible enough to Greek ears; not so natural is "they shall perish in the sword" (Mt.26:52). Let us e xamine the New Testament usages in some detail. Instrumental év
is found -

1) with $\alpha$ tionteivelv, $\pi \alpha T \alpha \sigma \sigma \in \operatorname{liv}^{\prime}$ etc. as,
 Lu.22:49, Rev.2:16, 6:8, 19:21. Revelation shows thid $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ often. (Simple dative Rev.12:2, Lu.21:24).
 9:49, (bis), simple dative).
 Also Rev.l6:8, 14:10. (Simple dative in Rev.8:8,

21:8, Mt.3:12, etc.).

 Mk.l:8, etc. (But simple dative Lu.3: 16).
 Rom.5:9, etc. (Simple dative in Rom.3:28).

 13:1 $\left.\mu \cdot \mu \in \tau_{\alpha}^{\prime}\right)$.
 Lu.6:38 has simple dative).
 Rev.18:2. (Simple dative in Mk.1:26, Rev.19:17 etc.).

There are also examples like Mt.9:34 $\epsilon \vec{\nu}$ tiv atp outs tam

 BeaXiôvlaúroù, I Cor.6:2 Gi úfiv k кivetal ó nóquos ; which do not easily lend themselves to classification.

The question is: How far are these uses of $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ traceable to the direct or indirect influence of Hebrew ? How many are mere locatives and therefore perfectly good Greek? How many can be paralleled from the Papyri?
(i) I should say that there is Hebrew influence ertainly behind (1) the use of $\epsilon \mathcal{v}$ with $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ roureivelv etc;
 ßeaxiour (Lu.1:51) and possibly $\mu \in T$ tiv $\in \dot{v}$.
(ii) K Ki civ $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ is good Greek. There is nothing inevitably Semitic about àdíServ cv, $\beta$ atríseiv civ, Sınaroüv $\epsilon \hat{V}$ ('in the sphere of'), $\mu$ 'yo úval e'v . A rocafive explanation is possible in all these cases.

In Mt.9:34 $\in \mathcal{V}$ has the sense 'in the power of','inspire by', a usage not so unlike $\epsilon^{\prime}$ X Xerorio as Leismann thinks. In Acts 17:31 $\epsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}=$ 'in the person of', and in 1 Cor.6:2 $\in \dot{v}$ univ $=$ 'in consessu vestro'.*
(iii) What use of the instrumental $\epsilon \prime v$ is to be found in the Papyri? It must be frankly admitted that it is extremely rare, and that there are few, if any, examples which may not be explained as locatives. The only good example is the oft-quoted P.Par. $28^{13}$ d/atuór oral $\epsilon \hat{v} T_{i}$ $\lambda_{1} \mu \hat{\omega}$; for P. Par. $27^{14}$ has $\tau \hat{\omega} \lambda_{i \mu} \hat{\omega}$ and $26^{9}$ imo $\pi \bar{i} \lambda_{1 \mu} \hat{\omega}$. Others we have found, include:
 $\lambda$ iroucyías 'since I am weighed down by my official

 (the God Sarapis) for the good hopes that are held by mankind'.


 Univ wis var. 'I put it to you that....'
with your own neck and not with mine'.

## V. Miscellaneous:

(I) With Mk.4:8 $\epsilon$ vj rlákourd and Acts 7:14 Eu 廿uxais ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta 80 \mu n^{\prime}$ rout $\pi \epsilon \in t \in$ where $=$ 'amounting to', 'to the number of', compare P.Oxy 724 ( 155 A.D.) ${ }^{\prime} \in \xi$ w iv $\notin \sigma X \in S$ riv
 a first instalment amounting to 40 drachmas'. B.G.U. $1103^{\prime 2}(13$ B.C. ) íparidia eva acyupoiju Spaxpais 'clothes to the value of 120 drachmas'. Cf.P.Grenf.ii, $77^{6}$ (iii

 fee for transporting the body, being 340 drachmas'.
(2) Not unlike is Eph. 2:15 fou vópov ran Éutotcuv tv sóypari Cf. P.Iebt.II 319 ( 248 A.D.) Eu Sufi бфৎaytior a'poupar Ezra' 'seven arourae in two parcels'. So.P.Oxy XII 1454 ( 116 A.D.) Eu teri dó $\sigma \in \sigma \iota$ 'in three portions'.

 'in kind or in money or in bodily labour'.
(3) Predicative $\epsilon_{v} v$ is common in the Papyri. We have


 ' concessional land '.
'Err' : Though this preposition is still well represented in all three cases in the New Testament, the statistics betray the trend towards the accusative (Gen. 216, dative 176, accusative 464).
"Il fact noter un certain flottement dens I'emploi desc cas - on troupe parfois desc cas différents avec émí pour exprimer le même sens exactement - et le developpement caractéristique de l'accusatif." (Regard, p.464). From a careful study of crit in the New Testament I have reached the same conclusion, viz. that except where an idiom has become stereotyped and made a particular case its own, it is almost immaterial whether genitive, dative,




 Tरे Єंगो +र्यs yर्ns, etc.

The Papyri show the same fluctuation: P.Oxy IX






Among the New Testament books one may instance
Revelation as showing the greatest fluctuation in its use

 See 4:2 (accusative), 14:16 (genitive), 21:5 (dative).
'Eníc. genitive:
I. Local: (a) The root-meaning 'upon' is common, but (b) sometimes in the New Testament and often in the Papyri $\notin \pi l^{\prime}$ means 'at' or 'in'.

Mk. 6:48 $\pi \in \rho, \pi \alpha \tau \bar{\omega} v ~ \epsilon ' \pi i ̀ ~ t \bar{\eta} s$ $\theta \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \eta s . ~$

Acts 5:30 kperaб́ravies $\epsilon \pi i$ gútou.
(b) Mk. 8: 4 єт' 'épŋrias 'in'


Here we place Mk.12:26 Є' ri tout $\beta \dot{\alpha}$ fou 'at (the passage about) the bush'.

Papyri: (a) P.Oxy I $33 \mathrm{col.iii}{ }^{6}\left(\mathrm{ii} / \mathrm{A} . \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ to бтрофєiov

a magical incantation uttered 'over his head'. Cf.
 $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi i{ }^{\prime}$ w' $^{\prime} \mu$ avos 'on the embankment'. P.Ryl II $87^{6}$ (ii i/A.D.)

 Barilinns so dou 'on the royal road'.
(b) P.0xy I $83^{9}$ ( 327 A.D.) E' Titis àyopa人s 'in the market-place'. P.Oxy XIV 1724 (iii/A.D.) $\epsilon^{\prime} 内{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha}_{\mu} \mu \phi_{0} 80 u$
 the West '. P.Ryl II $127^{9}$ ( 29 A.D.) koprwhévou you émi tits $\theta$ úcas 'while $I$ was sleeping at the door'. With Acts
 'in court'. 'Emit tóriov occurs often in the Papyri meaning 'on the spot'.

Notes: (1) In Mt.21:19, Jo.21:1, vicinity, not actual 'upon-ness' is all that is meant. Cf. e.g. P. Lond $1164(h)^{\prime 7}\left(212\right.$ A.D.) $\epsilon^{\prime} \phi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ op pa 'Avtivóou 'at the port of A.'.
(2) The Attic idiom where $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi i^{\prime}$ c. genitive
 Enki Ba bu $\lambda \hat{\omega} v o s$ 'leading to Babylon') is not extinct in



II．＇Err＇meaning＇before＇，＇in the presence of＇（Lat． ＇corami＇）is frequent in New Testament and Papyri： usually in forensic usages．



1 Tim．6：13 є＇गi $\Pi$ avion $\Pi \epsilon / \lambda \alpha_{\text {to u }}$ ．
就 sou aúprov，＇I swear by the Emperor ．．．I will speak before you tomorrow＇．P． $0 x y$ XIV $1709^{4}$（ 224 AdD．
 A．D．）éntopionos this［दं ］ri you 8ikdio 8ótou＇a petty pleader at the court of the dicaeodotes＇．P．Ryl $77^{48}$（192 A．D．）
 to become exegeses＇．So a Iso，probably，P．FI．p． $20^{39}$ che $_{0}$ nous $\lambda \alpha \beta \in \pi \bar{v} . . . \epsilon \epsilon_{i} i \operatorname{riv} \theta_{\epsilon \hat{\omega} v}$ ．

Note：In Acts 25：10 $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi \prime^{\prime}$ in the phrase $\left.\epsilon^{\prime \pi}\right)^{\prime}$ to is Brr $\alpha$ mos means＇before＇，while in $V .17$ the meaning is ＇upon＇．

III．＇Enif Time：denotes＇in the time of＇，generally with a personal noun following：


Lu．4：27 Éri＇Exiбaiou toù mpoфи́rou

 itefímv kail kavnфogíav tã̀ övtar kay oúoùv . Proxy y

 'in the consulship of the present consuls'. F. Fay $21^{5}$
 'which occurred during my office'. P.Tebt. III $774^{4}$ (c. 187 B.C.) éni fou $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \pi$ tiu roo $\left\langle\alpha \sigma_{i}^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}\right.$ in the reign of'.

The New Testament also has temporal ' ${ }^{\prime} \pi_{i}^{\prime}$ as in Heb.


 $\pi$ 恓位v $\tau \in\left(\mu \mu^{\prime} v\right)$, 'the highest current price at the time'. P. Fay $112^{2 \prime}$ (99 A.D.) Éni tout tapóvios 'at present' (often). P.Tebt. II 303 (176-80 A.D.) uni fou éntoù, 'at the specified time'.
IV. (i) The idea of Basis comes out clearly in some of the figurative uses:


 people received the law' (Weymouth).
 * 'the true value'. P.0xy $255^{16}$ ( 48 A.D.), P.Oxy III $480^{9}$
(132 A.D.) etc. Hib. I $27^{24}(301-240$ B.C.) Éni roù Є̈pyou ÉKikvé 'illustrated it on the basis of practice'.

 'this seems to me fair in the case of those who resign their property'. P. Oxy $/ 725^{14}(183$ A.D.) wis Érit twu of ólwv $\mu \alpha \theta_{n}+\hat{\omega} v$ 'as in the case of other such apprentices'.
 the case of the deified personges', etc.
(ii) Eri' signifying 'over', 'in charge of', is quite common in the Koine.

Mt. 24:45 Ờ Katéstngev ò Kúpios Ėti tīs oikereías aúroú.
Acts 12:20 toù Eiti toú koitûvos toü ßafitews
Rom. 9: 5 ó civ éri rávtwv.

 'Hipparch over men'. P.Oxy IV 658 '(250 A.D.) [Decian per-

 dents of irrigation'. P.Hib. I $39^{5}(265$ B.C. $) \epsilon^{\prime} \phi$ 'oì vákinpos каi kußepuníns גütòs ' $\Omega$ gos 'of which (barge) the master and pilot is the said Horus'.

Remarks: (i) In Rom.1:10, Eph.1:16, 1 Th.1:2,

cisely this use occurs in P.Oxy X 1252 col. ii ${ }^{26 /}(288-95$
 your memoranda you read a letter'. The meaning in both cases appears to be 'in the course of't
(ii) 'Eli otópatos is modelled on the Hebrew. See 'Semitisms', Part I.
(2) 'Eric. dative, while not so frequent in the New Testament with local force as $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi i^{\prime}$ c.genitive or $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi \prime^{\prime}$ c. accusative, has an extremely varied figurative range.
I. Local: 'Emit c.dative of Place expresses (a) 'upon', like $\in \pi i ́ c$ c. genitive. (b) Contiguity (cf.genitive) 'near', 'at'.








Papyri: (a) P.Tebt II $362^{3}$ (ii/iii A.D.) $\epsilon^{J} \pi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime} \omega$ ion a donkey'. Cf. Mt.21:5-Eतi ơvov. P.FI. III 1 col.ii ${ }^{3}$ oủdj



Examples are rare in the Papyri. (b) F.Tebt I $\sigma_{a}^{27(B C / 40-39)}$



 their presence'.
II. 'Eríc. dative of Time is rare: Heb.9:26 Eri Goutextia tiov diwuwv, 'at the close'. Here also are probably to be placed: Jo.4:27 Є'ri Toútw 'upon this' i.e.
 $\operatorname{si\alpha } \theta$ nkns, 'during the reading of the Old Testament', and perhaps 1 Cor 14:16, Eph.4:28.
 ótou Xévou, 'at the close of the whole period'. P.Oxy
 the end of each year'. (this phrase several times). For the sense 'during' compare P. $\operatorname{RyI} \frac{\pi}{\frac{\pi}{2}} 77^{36}$ (192 A.D.) Ti' t'oúk
 'during'the delightful prefecture of I. M.'. P.Fay $131^{\text {C }}$
 them a long time'.
III. Figurative: If we remember that $\in \boldsymbol{m}^{\prime}$ c. dative generally suggests the idea of BASIS, we have a key to
the interpretation of practically all the figurative
 $\epsilon^{\prime} \boldsymbol{T}^{\prime} \dot{e} \lambda \pi \mu^{\prime} \delta_{1}$, 'my flesh will pitch its tent upon the fourdation of hope' (here the Greek ' $\epsilon \pi \prime \prime$ admirably translates the Hebrew by).
(a) Basis: Examples occur passim:



'based on greater promises'.

Under this head fall the numerous instances of $\overline{\epsilon \pi \prime \prime}$
 and the frequent phrase $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi i$ th óvópati k.t.入.
 $\delta 1 a \theta_{n}^{\prime} k y$ teגEuTnow, 'if I die on the basis of this will', ie. 'with it unchanged' (as of ten). PrOxy XVII
 the security of the 4 arourae' (the same doc.I. 14 has
 $\epsilon^{\prime}$ 'i tais reokime'volls 'to lease on the terms aforesaid'.
(b) Occasion is sometimes the resultant notion of $\epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \prime^{\prime}$ although the idea of $b$ asis remains.


 $\hat{\epsilon} \xi \in T \in \lambda \in \sigma \alpha$ 'I did all that was fitting on the occasion
 fou iou aúrof ' on the occasion of the crowning of his son'.

Extremely abundant is the use of $\vec{E} \pi i^{\prime}$ after verbs of Emotion to denote ground or Cause: 'at', 'for', etc.





Other verbs so used with ' $\begin{aligned} & \text { ri' }\end{aligned}$ in the New Testament

 $\pi \in v \theta \in i v$.



'for the fact that you are well, I straight-
way thanked the gods, but about your coming home .... I
 Eujoípul 'I wept over the blessed one'. P.0xy $1600^{7}$
 grieved at your absence from among us'. P.Giess.bibl.
 beats me' (Ed.).

Other verbs I have found with sri, in the Papyri in-


(c) 'Err' c. dative sometimes expresses Aim or Consequince: 'with a view to', etc.




 'to the detriment of A.'. P.Eleph $1^{6}$ ( 311 B.C.) tidy
 'to the disgracing of her husband'; ibid. L.8, has $\epsilon^{\prime} \phi^{\prime} u^{\prime} \beta p^{\prime} \in 1$ 'in insult of'. P.Ryl II $75 \mathrm{col} . i^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{ii} /$ A.D. $)$ tiro,
 done anything to defraud their creditors'. P.Oxy XVII $2105^{4}(147-8$ A.D.) $\epsilon \grave{\pi} i \quad$ tifñ $\theta \in \bar{\omega} v$ 'in honour of the deities'. PrOxy II 237 col.vi L. 21 ( 186 A.D.) kккогро́mos ki éri ऐ́dioupyíal 'with malice prepense'. A frequent phrase is $\epsilon \pi \pi^{\prime} \alpha^{2} y a \theta$ is meaning 'auspiciously' (quod bonum felix faustumque sit?) e.g. PrOxy III $531^{6}$ (ii/A.D.) Є̈ws $\epsilon \pi^{\prime} \alpha \alpha_{\alpha} \theta \dot{\omega}$ rрòs $\sigma t$ rapayévopal e P.Ryl II $233^{2}(1 i / A . D$.$) ottar$
 ate issue'.

## Miscellaneous:


 that of building upon a basis, i.e. 'on top of', as in Col.3:14 'on top of all these (put on) love'.
(2) Sometimes the resultant force of $\epsilon$ ' $\pi$ ' is 'against', as Lu.12:52, sometimes 'over' as Lu.12:44. It can even mean 'concerning', Jo.12:16, Rev. 10;11.
(3) In Lu.1:59 Kadeiv Eiti Th óvófati (cf. Rom.5:14) Eni' seems to recall the Hebrew by. E.g. Neh.7:63, e'rxh' ${ }^{\prime}$ noav

(4) The New Testament has no example of $\epsilon^{\prime} \phi^{\prime} i \hat{i}=$ 'an condition that' as in classical Greek. The Papyri shew it often; as also $\epsilon^{\prime \pi} i^{\prime} c$. articular infinitive. In Rom. 5:12 and 2 Cor.5:4 the meaning 'in view of the fact that' does not differ greatly from the classical usage. (vide Moulton: Proleg., p.60).
(5) Moulton's note on Tiereúviv $\vec{\epsilon}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ with the accompanying table (on p.68, Prolegomena), is excellent. 'Enitiorevét Eni describes the reposing of one's trust on God or Christ. 'Eni'c.dative suggests more of the State, ' $^{\prime} \boldsymbol{i}^{\prime} \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{accus-}$ ative more of the initial act of faith.
'Eric' c. accusative is abundantly found in the New Testament, so abundantly that one wonders how much of the abundance is due to the influence of the Hebrew $3 \underline{y}$. But the root-meaning 'upon' shines through all the usages.
I. Local: Besides meaning 'upon', Є̇í can also mean simply 'to', indicating the terminus. In other contexts 'as far as', 'against', 'at' may be the resultant force. 'Enl' c.accusative is used after verbs of movement; but it is common where there is no idea of motion, and there is no need to label such usages 'constructions praegnantes', as the older concordances and grammars did. A few examples will show the various nuances:






$46 \pi$ пеобекúdiocv lígov Éni mu Oópav 'up to'
This local usage is also common in a metaphorical sense.
Lu. 1:12 $\phi 0$ 'os $\epsilon \pi \in ' \pi \in \sigma \in V \quad \in \epsilon^{\prime}$ 人ữouv.

 'Eradpóstirov 'we came to E'. P.Oxy X $1287^{5}$ (iii/A.D.)

 it at the tent'. P.Ryl II $153^{5}(138-61$ A.D.) cis tòv ta fou Hov Eli Hiv áruov, 'to my tomb in the sand'. P.FI.



 ixOuv kofíowor 'send also to the fisherman to bring us
 Papyri, as P. Flor 127 ( 256 A.D.) TEe $\mu \psi$ av Éri , riv Xóprov
 'goes in quest of the lost'.

Among metaphorical uses of local Gíí, notice -
 Snpooiar 'I lodged in the public bank'; cf. Lu. 19:23 auk

II. Temporal: 'Ert' of Time denotes (a) 'for', 'during' ie. filling out the idea of the accusative (Extension);
(b) more definitely 'at', 'on' (quite unclassical).
 18: 4 oủk グ $\theta \in \lambda \in \sigma$ er $\pi i$ Xpóvov.

Acts 13:31 ${ }^{\prime} \phi \phi \theta_{\eta}$ tiTi ńpépas $\pi \lambda \in i o u s$

 The phrase é ${ }^{\prime}$ 'órov (Xpóvov) occurs several times: 'as long as'.

 2 Pet.1:13.
 'for all time'. P.Oxy XIV 1674 ' $^{13}$ (iii/A.D.) miXes
 been able to have many days enjoyment with him'. P. Fay $95^{6}$ (ii/A.D.) $\epsilon^{\prime} \phi^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime \prime} t \eta \delta$. 'for four years'. P.S.I. $299^{4}$
 illness for a long time'.
'while he survives'. P.Oxy XIV 1648 col. iii ${ }^{53}$ (ii/A.D.) '́ $\phi^{\prime}$ čsov $\zeta_{i} \bar{l}$, 'for his lifetime'. P.Oxy I 33 (ii/A.D.)
 desire you to speak'.

Note: This usage which is very frequent in the Koine occurs in the New Testament oftenest in Acts and Paul. This is only one example of many where Luke and Paul, especially Luke, wrote a good Koine style, in a way that,
say, the author of the Fourth Gospel or the writer of Hebrews did not.

Acts 3:1 Émi tiv w'pav this mporeuxins
This use of $\epsilon^{\prime} \Pi \prime^{\prime}$, where Attic would employ a dative, I have not been able to trace in the Papyri. Nor does Rossberg adduce any examples.
III. Figurative: ' Emit' used figuratively may denote (a) 'over', 'at the head of': (b) Purpose, 'for', 'with a view to': (c) Degree as in éri $\pi \lambda \in \hat{i o v}$.



This usage is not in the Papyri: it seems to be due to the influence of the Hebrew $3 \underline{y} 3_{\underset{\sim}{p} \underset{\sim}{p}}$.
 Wherefore art chan come?' $t$ 26:50 Є' $\phi^{\prime}$ or $^{\prime} \quad \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \in 1$;
'cary Ant ion'



'for a personal inspection'. P.Tebt I $33^{6}$ (112
B.C.) Enki mu $\theta$ Ewciav 'to see the sights'. Or. $82^{6}$ 人moorateis

(c) Adverbial locutions expressing degree occur in the
 The use of the relative o's as an interrogative is by us uneans tare in late Greet. For paraliels se Denssmam, hight, 10.126 ).
 se évKótitw
 Ibid．3：9，3：13 є́тi to X Xipou．

Papyri：PrOxy VI 935 （iii／A．D．）ic àse入фй éri to коцч＇терои＇́＇Та＇пn，＇has taken a turn for the better＇．
 he make a less favourable decision＇．P．Ryl II 65 ${ }^{15}$（67 B．C．）$\in ⿱ ⺌ 兀 寸 i ~ \pi \lambda \in I ̇ V . . . \pi E e^{i} \in \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \mu$＇os，＇still further dis－ tracked＇．

V．Judicial Éni＇c．accusative $=$＇before＇common in Acts，finds illustration in the Papyri．


Acts 16：19 ciltruodv cis tiv áyo（àv emil toùs d＇eXoutas．
 E＇Ti $\sigma \in$＇request that they be brought before you＇．Teat
 stearnyou＇I have previously taken this man before the strategus＇．Etc．

Notes：（1）$\vec{E} \pi i$ to $\alpha$ unto occurs often in the New Testament $=$＇together＇，generally local．The figurative
 wi cinatov tikoor，＇altogether about a hundred and
twenty", occurs passim in the Papyri in the totallingup of accounts. See P. Fay 102 (c. 105 A.D.) which is full of expressions like yivorral mini to े aútò krA. B.G.U. E.

(2) For the rest, $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi i^{\prime}$ c. accusative is used like $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi i^{\prime}$
 $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \Pi^{\prime} \alpha$ Ürn'v 'he burst into tears over it'. Sometimes 'upon' becomes 'about' (just as in English 'he discoursed upon Art') eeg. Mk.9:12 Tits yéyoartar titi fou vióv fou

 Finally, E $\pi i^{*}$ c.accusative is found after verbs (or nouns)
 someone. (See $\epsilon \pi i^{\prime}$ c. dative).

K $\alpha$ ' $\alpha$ : Its radical sense is 'down', 'down along'. With the genitive it is found 73 times, with the accusative 391 times. Rossberg's figures correspond: 64 against 793. Save in its sense of 'against' (like older $\epsilon_{\epsilon \pi \prime \prime} \mathrm{c}$ accusative) K $\alpha \mathrm{T}^{\prime} \mathrm{c}$ c.genitive is moribund. K $\mathrm{K} \mathrm{T}^{\prime} \mathrm{c}$ c. accusative is very much alive in New Testament times, and is found in a bewildering number of applications. In modern Greek vernacular $K_{\alpha} T \alpha^{\prime}\left(K_{\alpha}^{\prime}\right)$ is confined to the notions of 'toward' and 'according to', having lost the ideas of 'against' and 'down' (Thumb: Handbook, p.105f).
I. K $\alpha$ ó c.genitive. Local: There are 11 examples in the New Testament, but 6 of these are found in the peculiarly Lucan use of そató c. genitive with ó olos = 'throughout', i.e. equivalent to local K $K \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$ c. accusative. E.g.
 Acts 9:31,42, 10:37, 49). The usage seems literary; for though Polybius (III 19,7 ) and other Hellenistic writers have it, it has so far not been traceable in the Koine. The remaining local uses are quite in the classical idiom.
 5:13 and Lu.8:33).
 p. 606 points out that this is an ablative case 'down from it': $\alpha^{\prime} u$ rйs refers to Crete).
 the head'. Here also may be inserted the figurative


Papyri: I cannot add to Rossberg's solitary example from the Papyri of Kara c. genitive local, viz. P.FI. III $23^{b / 5}$ étrाneaẁv '́vontev dúroì katà tout reaxhiou : (down) 'on the neck', unless P.Ryl II $93^{14}$ (33-30 B.C.) $\alpha^{2}$ (poo $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha s}$ Pelion Giro tàs ketiòj $\sigma$ rópou 'the 17 sown arurae'), be an
 ka $\theta$ ' ś8dтоS 'a hollow under water'.
II. Figurative: (I) $K \alpha \tau \alpha$ c.genitive means 'against' after verbs of saying, accusing, taking council, etc. This is its commonest use: sometimes it is contrasted with Uitée (Mt.12:30).

Lu. 23:14 wive Katnyogeite kat aútoú.
Acts 6:12 $\lambda \alpha \lambda \bar{\omega} v ~ \kappa \alpha т \alpha ̀ ~ t o u ̀ ~ t o ́ n o u ~ t o u ̂ ~ \alpha ̌ y i o ́ o ~$




 $81 \alpha \lambda \times \beta \in \pi \quad k \alpha r^{\prime} \alpha \dot{u} r o \tilde{~}$ 'I therefore beg you to proceed against him'. PrOxy III $472 \mathrm{col} \mathrm{ii}^{22}(\mathrm{c} .130 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{D}$.
 is no argument against the master'. PrOxy X $1272^{\prime 3}$ (144
 a suspicion against my neighbour'. P. Fay $12^{8}$ (c. 103 A.D.)
 made the customary charges against him'. P.Hib. I $57^{2}$
 brought me a petition against E'.
 and Acts 19:26 (i $\sigma$ Xútuv kard 'prevail over') cf. P. rOxy
 no authority over her'. P.0xy I $105^{2}$ (117-137 A.D.)

 I alienate any of my rights over it'.
(2) K $K \tau \alpha$ ' c.genitive is used of the object sworn by after verbs of swearing, adjuring, witnessing. The idea may be perhaps that of laying the hand 'down on' the object by which one swears. This construction is classical: eeg. Dem 852, 18 Kara térrwv ópuóval. Lysias 210.9 Єテ̈rockeiv katà riv raísov.

New Testament:




Also Heb. 6:13, 16.
Papyri: P.Par 574 (iii/A.D.) '̧́ockigo $\sigma \epsilon, \delta \alpha i \mu o v$, watà tou'to toù $\theta_{\text {eou }} \sum$. . ' adjure thee, demon, by the God S.'. P.F1. III p. 20, 39 ócrous $\lambda$ (Beiv pis frovov
 Rossberg appends a footnote which seems refuted by the New Testament usage: "Hic cognosci potest, quantopere Kard́ praepositionis ingenuina notio praevaleat. Karà vēv
 homines vel res, per quos iuratur, decidere pertabatur." (p.35).

K $\alpha$ T $\alpha^{\prime}$ c. accusative. The sersatility of Kat $\alpha^{\prime} c$. accusative is well illustrated by this excerpt from
 $\mu$ 'éeós twù úmacóvouv aütñs, ópoíms kai twiv tins pentcós $\mu$ LIdu 'Elévns ratà roùs vómous rai tà kekpiréva vitó te

 meo' $\sigma \omega \pi n=$, I registered the half of the property accruing to me, and likewise the half of my mother Helene's property according to the laws and judgments of successive procurators and prefects requiring that the division of property should be made according to households, and not individuals.' In this sentence we find $k \alpha T \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ with four different nuances.

In the New Testament K KT ' c accusative is common in Romans (37 instances) and Hebrews (39). But it is
 No fewer than 76 instances of it are found in Moulton and Geden.

Farrar's explanation of the difference between K $K T \alpha$ c.genitive and K KT $\alpha^{\prime}$ c. accusative is both sound and helpful in explaining the astonishingly varied uses of this preposition. (Greek Syntax, p.100). K 1 ( $\alpha^{\prime}$ c.genitive is 'down from' (ablative) or 'down on' (true genitive), whereas K $K$ ' $\alpha^{\prime}$. accusative is 'down on', suggesting the
idea of a horizontal plane. So Paul says (Phil.3:14)
 goal to s ecure the prize' - a vivid prepositional pictare in itself.

Where classification is exceedingly difficult, we think it well to use the three broad categories,
(1) Local. (2) Temporal. (3) Figurative, and to gather up the numerous idioms and phrases in a miscellansous note:
I. Local: "It is extremely hard to render (local) $K \alpha \sigma$ '. It scarcely means 'in' and is more often equivalent to 'in the direction', but sometimes it is difficult to see any difference between a $K \alpha \alpha<-p h r a s e$ and an adjectival or simple genitive." (Lake and Cadbury on Acts 27:2). Selected examples will suggest its various senses:
 10: 4 un $\delta^{\prime} c^{\prime} \alpha \alpha \alpha+\alpha$ riv ósov $\alpha \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} n \sigma \theta \in$ 'on the way'
 declivity)
Acts 2:10 Tג’ $\mu$ 们





Papyri: : Hib. I $27^{167}$ (301-240 A.D.) dúxuous háouol karà Thv X' ${ }^{\prime} \rho \alpha \nu$, 'they burn lamps throughout the country'. P.0xy VII $1068^{24}$ (iii/A.D.) Giva pusis évoxtriol dưtois $k_{x} \theta^{\prime}$ 'ósov 'on the road' (Lu. 10:4 etc.). P.Oxy VIII 1106 ${ }^{4}$ (vi/A.D.) yevoù kałà niv e'enfévinv kió $\mu n v$, 'go to the
 Mévelv, 'to remain at home'. P.S.I. 1016 (129 B.C.) eù toís katà toìs riov Meproveíuv tá $\phi$ ors 'among those tombs opposite those of Memnonea'. P.S.I. ${ }^{299^{\prime 8}}$ (iii/ A.D.) Evórnoav $\delta$ è távtes of kxtà niv oikíav, 'everyone in the house was ill', cf. Rom.6:5 Thu Kat' oikiav aiorion
 tórters (cf. Acts 27:2). Tebt III $793 \mathrm{col} . \mathrm{xi}^{13}(183 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$.)
 $\Delta w \rho^{\prime} \omega v$ 'when I had arrived at the Bubastis-shrine, D. attacked me'.

Note: How near $K \alpha \tau \alpha$ may come to $\epsilon_{v}^{\prime} v$ in meaning is seen in Acts 14:12 TIoreúnv rब̄б Toís Kard̀ tov vópov Wai toís ei tais meофйтаıs yeyeapнévols.
II. Temporal: K $\alpha$ 的 of Time is commonest in Acts, though it occurs elsewhere. It means 'about', as in K ג' E'Keivov tò Kalcóv (Acts 12:1), or simply 'at', 'on' (Rom.5:6 Kata ralgoiv 'at the fitting time' $=\in \dot{V}$ Kareü). (The question arises whether such notes of
time as Acts $12: 1$ are only paragraph marks or whether they are genuine synchronisms. K.I. Schmidt (Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, p.192) discusses the pericopes in the Gospels which often begin similarly. In Acts, at least, such $K \alpha T^{\alpha} \alpha$-phrases would seem to indicate general synchronisms. In Acts 12:I, for example, this would seem true. The famine of Acts 11:27f. and the death of Herod (Acts 12) appear to have been roughly synchronous).
 Acts 13:27 kat à $\pi \hat{\alpha}_{v} \sigma \alpha{ }^{\beta} \beta \beta a t o v$

1 Cor. 16:2 k $\alpha+\alpha$ Miav $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha$ 'tiv 'on the first day of
Heb. 1:10 к ar' $\alpha^{\prime} x^{\alpha} \alpha^{\prime} s$ 'in the beginning'


 $\psi \alpha+\alpha$ to $\mu$ кrovúktiov 'about midnight'. P.Tebt III $769^{15}$ (237-6 B.C.) K r $^{\prime}$ 'KKEivous toùs karcoóls . P. Par.
 first (originally) went up'.

* Orients graeci inscriptiones selectae: Dittenberger (1903).

Kat＇ci kalpón＇about which time＇．
K $\alpha$ d is very common in temporal distributive uses
 そ̌uג＇par＇every day＇．B．G．U． $1107^{25}(13$ B．C．）ta Kんな人 $\mu$ ard reoфfia＇the monthly wages＇，etc．

III．Figurative：（a）$O f$ Standard or Rule of Measure， by far its commonest figurative use．The usual meaning is＇in accordance with＇，but often it shades into＇in relation to＇，＇in response to＇，etc．



Jo．8：15 úrtis kara＇mi $\sigma$＇pk кр＇VETE，＇according to appear


2 Cor．10：13 Кат to $\mu \in$＇TPov tow kavóvos，cf．Eph．4：7



 $\epsilon^{\prime}$ Our $\quad$（Libellus from the Decian persecution）．Ibid．
 To gíkaiov＇please therefore further him in this matter as is just＇．P．Oxy VIII $1132^{14}$ кatà X teóycoфov
'in accordance with a note of hand', cf. Col.2:14. P.


 Twv épywv 'according to the progress of operations'.
 of astpotoyol, 'the Iunar days'. P.Columbia

 by order of the god'. (Kar' émitayńv, occurs 5 times in the New Testament). P.Eleph $1^{12}(311$ B.C. $) \eta^{c} \delta_{\epsilon}$ тpágs
 legally decided action'. P.Ryl II $75 \operatorname{col} i^{8}$ (ii/A.D.) TÚTos E'बTiv KaӨ'ö E'kpiva roll\&kis 'there is a principle according to which $I$ have often judged.' Cf. Heb.8:5
 $\theta \in 1 \alpha s \delta_{1} \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \xi \in 1 s$ 'according to the imperial ordinances'.t

Among many other examples we may here cite the very frequent expression K $\kappa \pi \alpha$ रóyou 'according to reason',
 úpũv, 'I might reasonably have listened to you' (Wegrouth). In the Papyri it also means 'proportionately', 'Satisfactorily', etc. Vide e.g. P.Columbia 270 col.i' (256 B.C.). P.Cairo Zen $59426^{2}\left(260-250\right.$ B.C.). P.Eleph $13^{\prime}$ (222 B.C.)
(b) Often figurative Kat' denotes Manner, etc. Here may be grouped also the numerous adverbial phrases formed with Kor od:


Acts 19:20 ката' кра́тоs .... グű̧avev 'mightily' (class)
 2 Cor 1:8 $K \alpha \theta^{\prime}$ UTE $\beta 0 \lambda \eta^{\prime} v(5$ times in Paul) 'exceedingly'


Papyri: P.Oxy VI. $923^{9}$ (ii/iii A.D.) E'rei k $k r^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime} y v o i ́ \alpha v$ two ф covtíiov aúriv m’eyd́ato. 'in ignorance'.
 $\mu \epsilon$. The phrase is not therefore bad Greek, as Simcox (language of New Testament, p.146) suspects. P.Tebt I ( $B C 113$ )
 $\beta \in \beta \alpha$ (eలumévolin which is Paul's phrase in 2 Cor .1:8. DaRyl II. $231^{13}(40$ A.D.) 4 $4 T \alpha \prime$ JTousriv $\delta \in ́ \sigma 01$ E'Ypa4a 'I have written you hurriedly'. P.Oxy VIII $1119^{17}(254$ A.D.) rata
 of my heart I nursed her'.

Among miscellaneous phrases we find some good New Testament parallels: with the Pauline kara $\alpha^{\prime} \cup \theta \rho$ prov
 yivnral P.Oxy XIV $1630^{7}$ (222 A.D.) gus Éyí


KんTג' Toे $\phi \alpha v \in$ póv ' $^{\prime}$ publicly' (P. Tebt III $786^{31} \mathrm{c} .138$



 92 B.C.) К 112 A.D.) кגな̀ $\mu$ épos 'in detail' (P.Oxy I 69'190 A.D.) all have New Testament equivalents.
(c) K $\alpha$ ' ${ }^{\prime}$ Distributive is very frequent in the Koine. It is used of (1) Place; (2) Time; (3) Numbers.
 Acts 2:46 кतथute's te kat oíkov äptov "

Iu. I:41 étopévouto of yoveis גútoù hat' '̇tos "



Papyri: Census papers $K \alpha{ }_{r}$ oikíau vindicating the historicity of Lu. $2: 3$ are frequent: e.g. P.Ryl II $103^{\prime 2}$
 every village'.
 treat him every day'. P.Tebt II 311 ( 186 A.D.) kx $\theta^{\prime}$ éros 'yearly'. P.Ryl II $168^{\prime 2}\left(120\right.$ A.D.) K $12+\alpha{ }^{\prime}$ tò $y^{\prime \prime \mu} 1 \delta 0$
'by halves'.
P.Oxy $886^{\text {¹ }}$ (iii/A.D.) ${ }^{\mathcal{E}} \rho \in$ rard Súo 8óo 'lift them up two by two' cf. Iu.10:1 (W.H.). Kat'óvofa 'by name' 'individually' is exceedingly common in epistolary greetings ${ }^{n}$ e.g. P.Oxy VIII $1160^{7}$ (iii/iv A.D.) $\alpha \dot{\sigma} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \in \theta_{\epsilon}$
 $i i^{4 \prime}(238$ A.D.).
 found in Jo. 5: 4 (omitted by W.H.) cf P.Fay $27^{13}$ (151-2 A.D.)
 house-tothouse censuses'. For the Lucan distributive to кх $\theta^{\prime}$ ѝ $^{c} \notin \rho \alpha$ (Iu.11:3, 19:47, Acts 17:11) cf. P.Oxy $1220^{4}$

 account of our expenditure for your information'. Kara $\mu$ Ģos 'by instalments' F.Fay $91^{26}(99$ A.D.) and Kata Míkpov (P.Petr.II XI (1) ${ }^{7}$ (iii/B.C.) 'in small instalments' complete the list.

IV Miscellaneous: (i) In Acts 14:1 Katà tò גúró may (I) be a Lucan variant for cं,it tò аútó 'together'; or

 'that we should be together'.

（also Acts 21：19，Rev．4：8）cf．p．0xy XIV $1637^{16}$（257－9
 P．Oxy XVII $2110^{38}\left(370\right.$ A．D．）Koルท̂̀ $T \in K \alpha i k \alpha \theta^{\prime} \in V$ ，＇collective－ ly and individually＇．Really a distributive use．

In Rom．12：5 tò $\delta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} k a \theta^{\prime}$ cis and Mk．14：19 cis ka 日＇cis etc．，ais is probably indeclinable．Cf．modern Greek $K \alpha \theta \in i ́ s$ and see remarks on＇$u \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ ．
（iii）P．Oxy I $63^{8}$（ii or iii／A．D．）tours Serymatoá（JTגs
 P．Tebt III $774^{24}$（c． 187 B．C．）～ov́os Bu（ $3 \alpha^{\prime} \sigma$ ton $\alpha$ úriv к $\alpha \theta^{\prime}$ $\alpha \mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{G}} \eta^{\prime} v$ ，（I was sole sitologus）＂of Bubastus by itself＂．

（iv）Phrases with $K \alpha \alpha_{\alpha}$ forming alperiphrasis for the genitive are a marked feature of Hellenistid preposition－ al usage：we have already mentioned Acts 17：28 Twi $k \alpha \theta^{\prime}$
 ＇your faith＇．P．Tebt 28 is a good parallel：ins ka 日＇íhās $\alpha^{3} \sigma$ Xolías＇of our labour＇．But both New Testament and Papyri are full of the neat idiom exemplified in Acts 25：14 Tג kat ג tov II $\alpha \hat{u} \lambda o v, ~ ' P a u l ' s ~ c a s e ' . ~$

N．T．Acts 24：22 Tरे $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \hat{u}^{\prime \mu} \bar{\alpha}$＇your case＇

Eph．6：21 Tà Kat＇$\epsilon^{\prime} \mu \epsilon^{\prime}$ ．Phil．1：12


Papyri: P.Tebt $397^{\prime \prime}$ (198 A.D.) tò иат' aútoùs $\mu$ (ү́̃os
 ( 5 B.C.) Toùs ka $\theta^{\prime}$ Gowroùs motafoús 'the rivers in their

 P.Oxy I $120^{\prime 4}$ (iv/A.D.) $\pi i \grave{s}$ Tà k $k r^{\prime} \alpha i \mu \alpha i ~ \alpha ̀ \pi o r i \theta \alpha / t \alpha e, ~$ 'how my affairs are placed'. P.Ryl II $68^{20}(89$ B.C.) $\mu \in \notin X e$.

 $\alpha i \sigma \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta_{\alpha}+\alpha$ 位 $k \alpha+\sigma \epsilon$ 'it was a pleasure to me to hear your news'. P.Tebt III 760 ${ }^{\prime 8}(215-4$ B.C.) ákoúras S'̀ rà
 case of P.!.

Robertson ( $p .608$ ) calls such uses of $k \alpha T \alpha$ as Acts 17:28, 18:15, 26:3 marks of Luke's literary style. The Papyri prove abundantly that it is good vernacular. Its frequency may be due to the fact that it is a substitute in the Koine for the obsolescent possessive pronouns.

M $C T \alpha$ : (For statistics in the New Testament and in the Papyri see Part I). The root-meaning 'midst'
 $\mu \in T-$ éwpos 'in midair') is still apparent in some New Testament uses. Lu. 24:5 $\mu \in \nless \downarrow$ tiv vekpisv 'amongst the dead'.

 Mt.27:34 oivov $\mu \in な \alpha$ Xoגñs $\mu \in \mu$ yúývov.

 makes it clear that 'in your midst' is the sense.

There are traces of this primal force of $\mu \in T \alpha$ in the Papyri also: P.Ryl II $102^{40}$ (ii/A.D.) $\mu \in \tau^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime \prime} \lambda(\lambda \omega v)$ $y($ (uralkīv) TEeGov 'amongst other women his wife Tereus (Edda.).

 to mix what belongs to the man from the Oasis among the rest'.
 the apocalyptic phrase $\epsilon^{\prime} \subset X_{o ́ \mu} \in \operatorname{vov} \mu \in T \bar{\alpha}$ tiv $v \in \phi \in \lambda \bar{\omega} v$ tout oúcavoü (Mk.14:62, etc. \%.
II. The usual meaning 'with', 'in company with', has a wide use:

Mt. 26:38 Y(\#Yoceite $\mu \in \tau^{\prime}$ E aNON.

Gal. 2: $4 \quad \alpha_{v \in \prime}{ }^{\prime} \beta n \mu \in T \alpha ̀ \quad B \alpha \rho v^{\prime} \alpha \beta a ̃$.
Papyri: P.Oxy I $119^{2}$ (ii/iii A.D.) (the famous
 'you didn't take me in your company to town'.
 $\mu \in T \alpha$ two $\alpha^{\alpha} v \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega v$, 'if you wish me to remain here with the men'.
J.E.A. xiii p. 61 L. 28 (c. 293 A.D.) $\mu \in T \alpha े ~ \dot{\alpha} \cup \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega v$


With Mt.12:30 oc fins $\sigma$ uráywu fer er $\mu$ où cf. P.Oxy III $527^{3}$ (ii/iii A.D.) oi $\quad$ ouvepyalórevos $\mu \in T \alpha \Phi \Phi, t \in ́ O U$.

Cf. also Lu. 23:12 Ey'v́ourosé ф'́tor ... $\mu \in T^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda_{2}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \omega v$
 we may remain on good terme with one another'.

MET is used with a great diversity of verbs in the Koine. Compounds of $\sigma u v$-are frequent. E.g. $\sigma u \alpha_{i}^{\rho} \in \in$
 $\mu \in T \alpha$ etc. Other verbs range from $\lambda x \lambda \in \pi \mu$. to $\pi o \lambda \in \mu \in \pi \mu$. (hostile sense, often in Rev.) both of which have been suspected of Semitism, but are used in modern Greek. ${ }^{+}$

The use of rival with $\mu \mathcal{E}+\alpha^{\prime}$ ('to be an associate of someone') and the phrase of $\mu \in T^{\prime}$ duro ('his companions' or 'partisans'), are common in the New Testament and find some corroboration in the Papyri. Cf. of oui, oi $\pi$ Rec! etc.

Mt. 26:69 k ai $\sigma \hat{i} \eta^{\top} \sigma \theta \alpha \quad \mu \in T \alpha ' / n \sigma o u$.



 $\pi$ cáorovtes. B.G.U. $27^{\prime 5}$ (ii or iii/A.D.) L̈ore éws onfrepov

 0xy III $531^{4}$ (11/A.D.) $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \rho_{0} \mu \in \theta \alpha$ Taútes oi ci oik in rail
 O, $\mu \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha}^{\alpha}$ tivos significat omnes quid aliquo mode cum aliquo coniuncti sunt, et propinquos (Kuhring, p.16).

The kindred idea of 'in conjunction with', 'in association with' occurs very often in legal formulae among the papyri in the phrase of 8 ब iva $\mu \in \pi \bar{\alpha}$ kupiou toú Servos 'So-and-so with his guardian'. This usage is very like what Simcox styles "the religious sense" (p.150) of $\mu \in+\alpha^{\prime}$, and regards as Semitic.
 It is the same use which occurs in the New Testament
 $\mu \in \Theta^{\prime}$ 'suciv etc. 'The grace of the Lord Jesus (cooperate) with you'. The prototypes may be Semitic; the usage itself is tolerable Greek.
III. The notion of Accompaniment is also common with Things. Hellenistic Greek is very fond of describing Manner or Accompanying Circumstances by $\mu \in \tau \alpha ́ c . g e n i t i v e . ~$ New Testament examples are: $\mu \in T \alpha X \times \rho \bar{\alpha} s(M t .13: 20) \mu \in な 亠$

 (17:15), $\mu \in T \grave{\alpha} \phi \alpha v \omega \hat{v}$ kail $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \dot{\delta} \omega v$ (Jo.18:3), $\mu \in T \alpha ̀$ tapcnoías
 $\mu \in T \alpha ’$ naóns meoburías (17:11) $\mu \in T \alpha$ rollins фauraoías (25:
 фópoi tai reómou, The Papyri are equally prolific in illustrations: $\mu \in T \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \pi \alpha^{\prime} \operatorname{aop} s$ guv $\alpha \mu \in \omega s$ ( $0 x y$ II 292) ,




 Ki skol $\mu \hat{0}$ (Tebt III 790) $\mu \in \theta^{\prime}$ fyi as (P. Hab. 85), $\mu \in T \alpha ̀$ Kótou (Dy 1482), etc.

Some of the New Testament examples cited above are
quasi-instrumental, e.g. Mk.14:43, 17:15, Jo.18:3, Acts 13:17. It is true that the influence of the Hebrew $D y, \pi$ (rendered by $\mu$ (rod in the LXX) may be responsible for such a sentence as Acts 2:28 $\pi \lambda$ ク信 wrtis $\mu \in$
 must be very cautious in labelling an unusual $\mu \in T \alpha^{\prime}$ Semitic, for the preposition is astonishingly versatile in the Koine. Instrumental usages occur in the Papyri as often as in the New Testament. B.G.U. III 909 (351


 304 (167-8 A.D.) w'ठTє $\mu \in \tau \alpha$ gútuv iorn $8 \hat{n} \sigma \alpha c$ 'rush in with staves'. The dividing line between $\mu \in T \alpha=$ 'equipped with' and $\mu \in+\alpha=$ 'with' (instrumental) was narrow. In modern Greek it has vanished and $\mu \in \tau \alpha(\mu \in)$ regularly denotes instrument.
(For a discussion of supposedly Hebraistic uses of $\mu \in \mathcal{T}^{\prime}$ in the New Testament see Chap. on Semitisms, , Part I).
IV. There are one or two topics still to be treated. (I) METג K Kí. A pleonastic $k \alpha i^{\prime \prime}$ is found with $\mu \in T \alpha \dot{\prime}$ (Phil 4:3) $\mu \in+\alpha$ K $\alpha$ i K $\lambda^{\prime} \mu \in u T 0 s$. To Deissmann's scanty examples (p. 265 B.S.) we can add:
P.Oxy IX $1193^{3}(i v / A . D). ~ \mu \in T \alpha ' ~ k \alpha i ~ e ̂ v o ̀ s ~ \phi u ́ t a k o s ~$

XII $1588^{\circ}$ (iv/A.D.) $\mu \in \tau \alpha ̀$ кגi stuatíntou.
P.Ryl II $110^{9}$ (259 A.D.) feTa ai ais yeaфйs.
 PrOXy III $531^{6}$ (ii/A.D.) $\mu \in T \alpha$ mai Toul ơvwv.
(2) MGTん́ often is merely a sort of copula:Mt. 2:11 biSon tot maisiov MeT ג Macias

 Compare the following Papyri uses:
P.Oxy XVIII $1158^{3,4}\left(\right.$ iii /A.D.) EủXó $\mu \alpha \theta_{\alpha} \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \alpha$ oे̀oktn(jєi furs' fou ólkou dou c'ljou 'we pray for your prosperity and that of your whole house'. P.Oxy XIV $1758^{3 f}$ (11/A.D.) Eur opal

and so often in the closing greetings of letters.
(3) It is alike futile and unscientific to elaborate a distinction between $\mu \in T \alpha^{\prime}$ and $\sigma u^{\prime}$ in vernacular Greek. They are often used interchangeably (see remarks on $\left.\sigma_{U}^{\prime} v\right)$. We find either $\mu \in T \alpha^{\prime}$ or $\sigma u^{\prime} v$ linking up persons in a salutation. We find $\mu \in \theta^{\prime} \eta^{\prime} \mu$ odis or out ${ }^{\wedge} \mu \mu \operatorname{co\lambda }{ }^{\prime} \alpha$ 'increased by a half' in the Papyri. We find $\mu \in T \alpha$ and $\sigma \sigma^{\prime} v$ used with no sensible difference of meaning in the same sentence. (e.g. P.Oxy III 531 ii/A.D.). The old view therefore that $\sigma u ́ v$ expressed a more intimate association
than $\mu \in T \alpha$, , cannot safely be pressed. $\sum u ́ v$ is commoner than $\mu \in T \alpha$ in composition with verbs. But, as a greposition, $\mu \in T_{\alpha}^{\prime}$ is much the more versatile and varied. Eventually, as modern Greek shows, it proved too strong for $\sigma u$ iv whose functions were absorbed by $\mu \epsilon$.

## M $\in T \alpha ́ c$. Accusative:

I. Place: There is a solitary instance in the New Testament of $\mu \in T \alpha$ with a local sense = 'beyond', 'behind'. Heb. $9: 3 \mu \in T \alpha$ to $\delta \in u ́ r z \rho o v ~ k \alpha T \alpha \pi \in T \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$ 'beyond the second veil'. The idea may be of passing through the 'midst' of the veil and so coming 'beyond' it. Rossberg finds no Papyri parallels. We have found a few: PrOxy VI 918 ii $^{\prime 3}(i i / A . D.) \delta i \omega p\left(u \xi \mu \in \theta^{\prime}\right.$ inv of obs 'beyond which there is a road' (several examples in this document where $\mu \in T \alpha^{\prime}$ seems to be contrasted with $\alpha^{\prime} \nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu$ ' $\sigma o v$ 'between').
 Dion Tayopias, 'a public street beyond which is the house of D.' etc. Cf. also P.Oxy XII $1475^{8}$ ( 267 A.D.) Guv $\hat{y}$
 the date'. P.Oxy XVII $2106^{27}$ (iv/A.D.) $\mu \in \theta^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime}{ }^{c} P_{\omega \mu} \mu / k \alpha^{\prime}$, 'followed by Latin'.
II. All the other New Testament uses of $\mu \in T \alpha$ ' c. accuseative are Temporal. M $\mathcal{T} \alpha$ tx out $\alpha$ as a formula of transition, abounds. (See the Fourth Gospel, Acts, and Revelation especially). A.T. Robertson thinks the meaning 'after' comes from passing through the midst of an event till you reach a point where you look back on the whole (p.612).

Lu. 15:13 $\mu \in T^{\prime}$ oú mod入às ai $\mu \in C^{\prime} \alpha \sigma$.



Papyri* Teat I $60^{71(\beta C 118)} \mu \in T \alpha$ тò $\sigma \pi \rho^{\prime} \rho \circ v$. P.Tebt I 6 Ib ${ }^{97(B C / 18-7)}$
 بerà tiv Xeóvov racabióow. P.Oxy VIII $1103^{\prime}$ ( 360 A.D.) MET


 cf. P.Ryl. II $77^{4 \prime}\left(192\right.$ A.D.) $\mu \in \mathcal{T}^{\prime}$ ód'yov 'after a little'.

MEな To with infinitive occurs 15 times in the New Testament and makes a neat substitute for a $\alpha^{\prime} T \epsilon$ clause.

Mt. 26:32 $\mu \in T \alpha ̀ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ t o ̀ ~ \epsilon ' y \in \rho ~ \theta n ̃ ّ a ́ ~ \mu \epsilon ~$

Lu. 22:40 $\mu \in T \alpha$ to delervñal

(Not in any of the Johannine writings. But the 'argumentum ex absentia' cannot be pressed. Paul has it but once, $\mu \in T \alpha$ to $\delta \in \operatorname{li} u \bar{n} \sigma \alpha(1$ Cor .11:25) exactly as Lu. 22:40).
 $\hat{\delta} \delta \in \dot{u} \sigma \epsilon(=\sigma \alpha 1)$ $\tau \alpha \bar{u} \tau \alpha$ 'after these things went off' (Bd.).



Notes: $M \in T \alpha$ 'in the Papyri sometimes means 'besides',
 $\mu \in T \dot{\alpha}$ roûrov 'no zealous man besides this one'. $P$. Grenf ii $77^{22}$ (iii or iv/A.D.) L 程 vekcotá $\phi_{L}$ ais to ópos
 digger for the desert journey besides the above-mentioned fee one chou of wine", etc. $M \in \theta^{\prime \prime} \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha=$ 'etc' (Oxy XIV $1637^{28} 257-9$ A.D.). So $\mu \in \theta^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} T \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha}$ (P.Ryl II $75^{i \prime \prime}{ }^{4}$ ii/A.D.) This sense of 'besides' is probably the right one in Lu.12:4 and Jo.21:1 (where $\mu \in \tau \bar{\alpha} \tau \alpha \hat{u} \tau \alpha$, 'besides the events narrated...' would suit the idea of an Appendix).

Th $\rho \alpha$ c. genitive occurs 78 times in the New Testament. It means 'from the side of', 'from the presence of', 'from', and is more intimate than $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime}$.

New Testament examples:
In. 2: $1 \epsilon^{\prime} \xi \hat{n} \lambda \theta \in v$ Sóyma mapà Kaíбароs Au’yu'sтои
8:49 épXetaí tis mapò tout ar eXiouvaywyou

It is common in both New Testament and Papyri after verbs of asking and receiving, hearing and learning, buying and sending.

with P. Fay $121^{14}$ (c. 100 A.D.) aitnoov ra [[Jj roil] kuerai


 Tapas '/wávou with B.G.U. III $846^{14}$ (ii/A.D.) ${ }^{14}$ 'provo $\alpha$





 $\pi \alpha \rho \bar{\alpha}$ Өeoú, with P.Oxy $1872^{6}$ (v/vi A.D.)

II. The last example of roo $\alpha^{\prime}$ shows that preposition practically equivalent to ciró of agent after a passive verb. Though in the 5 th or 6 th centuries A.D. $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha^{\prime}$ did become a substitute for ínó $^{\prime}$, as the Papyri show, we cannot assert that it is simply equivalent to im in the New Testament.
 Kupiou, Blass* points out the correctness of the use. "God did not speak Himself, but only His commissioned angel." So too in Mt.18:19 yevñetal aúrois rapà roí rareós mou toù év oúpavois, rapá simply describes the performance of the request as a quasi-concrete thing proceeding from God. The emphasis is on the Divine Source rather than the Divine Agency. Cf. Jo.1:6.

Most of the genuine examples of $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$ (Agent) belong to the 5 th and 6 th centuries A.D.
 àmo Tepúdecos 'when I was injured by the inhabitants of T.'.

Earlier examples do, however, exist:
 Onceúelv kai áypiधútiv, 'I desire to be granted a a permit by you for hunting etc.'.


III. Mk.3:2l of rגр' גúroù, deserves separate treatment. The context will not allow the general meaning of the phrase in the Papyri, viz. "The agents, assigns:, or employees of some person". It demands the meaning 'relatives' or 'friends'. And the Papyri use the phrase thus:

 greet my mother and Apollon and all our family individually'. Also P.Oxy II $298^{51}$ (i/A.D.).
P.Cairo Zen. $59426^{4}$ (260-250 B.C.) triv Táбav Ériméteiav
 ing the utmost care that no one troubles your people'.

 (i.e. family) were asleep in their chambers with the door shut'.
 ouvtelâv, 'heaping insults on my dependants'.

Revillout, Mélanges, p. $295^{7}$ (130 B.C.) Katîs morícis
 self and our dependants to take courage'.

The meaning of of $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} \alpha$ 'urou in Mk. $3: 21$ is then 'his family' or 'his dependants' (Josepy being dead and Jesus, the eldest, the Head of the house).




'and contribute it from your own funds'.
 $\epsilon_{i}^{\top} \mu \in \mu \pi T o s$, if you attend to your business, you are not to be blamed'.
[Teat I $24^{15}$ Gill $\phi \in v$ T $\alpha^{\prime}$ mas os sou
Teat I $38^{2}$ な人 rap ${ }^{2}$ nov Ociov J

Notes: Sometimes $\alpha^{\prime n} \mathbf{n o}^{\prime}$ replaces map al : egg. Acts 9:13 n'kou


 in 1 Cor.11:23' (Moulton: Proleg.p.246).

Th $\alpha$ 人 c. dative is found 50 times in the New Testament. Only once is it found after a verb of motion (Lu.9:47); only once with a dative of Thing (Jo.19:25). Its commeanest use is with a dative of Person, usually a personal pronoun. The phrase rap à $\theta_{i}^{i}$ occurs 15 times.



Papyri: P.Ryl II $174^{7}$ (112 A.D.) фakòs Tapà peri $\vec{\epsilon} \xi$ x́protepũ 'a mole at the left side of her nose'. Cf.
 post', and P.0xy VIII 1101 (367-70 A.D.) Kekwìlutal trap od tais vórols toüto.
II. The ordinary use of trap' c. dative 'by', 'besides' needs little comment.

2 Tim.4:13 ờ a'réteinov Av Tewa'sl rapà Kápris
More interesting is the use of Ta $\alpha \alpha^{\prime}$ (generally with a personal pronoun) to signify 'at the house of' (Lat. 'apud', French 'chez', Germ.'bei').






 (above). B.G.U. $1107^{6}$ ( 3 B.C.) Ontá大tiv $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \xi \omega \quad \pi \alpha \rho \in \alpha[\tau n c]$ 'To suckle outside at her own home'. P. Cornell $9^{6}$ (206

III. The figurative use generally has the meaning
'in the judgment of', 'in the eyes of'. So moa $\theta \in \bar{c}, \pi, \pi \rho \alpha '$ "argil, tapas Kupíw etc.




Papyri: P.Flor $338^{18}$ (iii/A.D.) єfraivonv yah rap à nर्वol, 'for I was besmirched in the eyes of all men'. $P$.
 'that you may not become wearisome to them'.

In illustration of $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \theta$ tic etc. we may adduce the very frequent prayer-formula in letters. P. Fay $127^{4}$ (ii/iii A.D.) to reorkúvngá dou roil rąà rio kupíc Exp ámi81, though mac $\alpha$ is almost local here. P.Oxy X



Class. Phil xxii, p. $243^{4}$ (ii/A.D.) Váyù Nủròs céytaivu kai


Notes: "EXENV Tap' éautĭ 'have by one' is found often in the Papyri, e.g. P.Fay $121^{9}$ (c. 160 A.D.). Notice P. Oxy $1220^{9}$ (iii/A.D.) oúseiv ß hémo qā̃tov $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{Ol}$ ', 'I see nothing bad in my behaviour (Edd.). It is a fair


T知 $\alpha^{\prime}$ c．accusative occurs 60 times in the New Testament．This small total may reflect the compel－ inion of reós．Curiously enough，the Johannine writ－ ings contain no examples of the preposition with this case，although the Fourth Gospel uses $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ c．genitive oftener than any other New Testament document．Nor do the Catholic Epistles have it．

I．Local：$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ c．accusative $=$＇beside＇，＇along＇， is used in the New Testament after verbs of Motion and verbs of Rest．It is found with rival where we should expect racác．dative，and it can even stand alone，as oi тара тゥン s̊óv（mk．4：15）．

New Testament examples：




 10：6 $\dot{i} \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \tau i v ~ O i k i \alpha ~ \pi \alpha \beta^{\prime} \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha v . ~$

$x$





 to his home'. P.S.I. $1080^{5}$ (iii/A.D.) Tएiv $\mu \in T \alpha \beta \omega \bar{\omega} \mu \in$ $\pi \alpha \Omega \dot{~ ' ~}{ }^{\prime}$ y $\alpha \theta$ inov.
P.Par $47^{7}$ (c. 152 B.C.) of $\pi \alpha \rho^{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \theta \epsilon 0 i$ 'your gods'. P.0xy XIV $1631^{18}(280$ A.D.) Kai oivou tapà hnvòv kepapíwv
 25
 P.S.I. $1016^{25}(129$ B.C.) oủdr' racà Xadivòv $\delta \in \xi($ óv $)$ etc.
II. (a) The Figurative sense grows naturally out of the Local. To go 'alongside' is often to go 'beyond' and to go 'beyond' is often to go 'against' or 'contrary to'.

Lu. 3:13 unièv théov tach tò siatetaypévov.
Acts 18:13 Tapà toù vóuor.



2 Cor.8:3 тара̀ Súvapiv aú的ic૯то.

trary to the prohibition'. P.Ryl II $105^{29}(36 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{D}.) \operatorname{CaN}^{\prime} \mathrm{V}$ TI roued to Stóv yévn( $\alpha \alpha$ ) 'if any contravention of what is right occurs'. P.Tebt III $726^{5}$ (ii/B.C.) $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma^{\prime}$ Ka日ñkov 'wrongly'. P.Tebt III 756 ${ }^{17}$ (174 B.C.) Tapà фú

Tएब́乡elu, 'unnaturally'. P.Tebt III $785^{\text {'7 }}$ (c. 138

 on me contrary to your intention and the right'. P. Lond $1915^{19}$ (330-40 A.D.) and P.FI. III 146b ${ }^{2}$ tapas Sóvaruv 'beyond one's means'.
(b) Ta@ $\alpha=$ 'beyond' in the sense of 'more than' has already been discussed at some length in Part I of this thesis. It occurs no less than 8 times in Hebrews, where doubtless Semitic influence must be acknowledged. But, as we have shewn earlier, $\pi \propto \rho \alpha^{\prime}$ in this sense (with or without a comparative adjective) has Attic antecedents, exists in the Papyri, and survives in modern Greek.
(c) An interesting usage crops up in II Cor.11:24.

 sjuécas, 'all but thirty days'. Modern Greek
 And the Papyri yield a number of illustrations: P.Oxy

 weaver's cubits all but two palms'. P.Oxy VIII $1131^{5}$ Y (V/A.D.). P.Oxy XIV $1729^{\prime}$ (iv/A.D.). P.Hamb $86^{19}$ (ii/
 $\pi \in \sum^{\prime} X \omega^{\prime} \neq \alpha \alpha^{c} \epsilon^{\prime} \xi$ 'we have sold the grass in the cleruchies
excepting the six basins'. Also P.Grenf ii, 87. B.G.U. $1079^{\prime 5}(41$ A.D.).
(d) In 1 Cor. 12:15 we find raja Toüto in the sense of 'idea'. The idiom is classical, and resembles the use of the Latin proper, which has the local significance 'alongside' (propter flumen) as well as the causal (propter hoc). Farrar (Greek Syntax, p.104) aptly cites the colloquial English 'It's all along of his own neglect'. The Papyri afford some good parallels: P.Oxy
 is not my fault they have not been presented'. P.Ryl
 'if anything occurs because of my neglect'. P.Ryl II
 ing that nothing has occurred through any fault of yours'.

Notes: Ta ${ }^{2} \alpha^{\prime}$ c. accusative of Time is also found in the Papyri. With the New Testament $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \backslash \rho \tilde{n} \mu \alpha$ cf. P.
 $\beta^{*}\left(\beta \lambda^{\prime} \alpha\right.$ 'I immediately presented to you our petition of appeal'. P.OXy III $472 \operatorname{col~in~}^{10}(\mathrm{c} .130 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{D}$.$) has tap à Tòv$ this teovoís Xeóvov 'during the period of his steward-

 'for the animals go up continually'.

Tepic c. genitive occurs 291 times in the New Testament, and with the doubtful exception Acts 25:18 (possibly local) always in a figurative sense. Two points about its New Testament usage should be remarked. TEe f c. genitive is specially common in the Fourth Gosvel: it occurs 70 times. Doubtless the abundant use
 yódpervis the real cause of the preposition's frequency. (2) $\Pi_{\epsilon} l^{\prime}$ c. genitive does not occur in the Apocalypse. Let those who think the same hand wrote both the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, explain that fact away!
I. $\Pi \in \mathscr{O}$ ' = 'concerning', 'about', is found after verbs of 'saying', 'feeling', 'asking', 'caring', 'praying', etc. Indeed $\pi \in e^{\prime}$ ' may occur with almost any verb where the notion of 'about', 'concerning' is natural. We have made a brief list of some verbs found with TEe' common to both New Testament and Papyri: $\alpha^{3} y y^{\prime} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \in i v$, yivwóokelv, yoyyúsev




Here are some typical New Testament uses with Papyri parallels:

 guv ayopartikou.
'I bade you enquire about the purchased corn'.
Mt. 6:28 teri évsúparos ti feepi么vate;

'I was worrying about him'.
Lu. 4:10 tais äyyenols גútoù évtedeitar kepi roup.
 'in accordance with your instructions concerning S.' Jo. 1:15 '/wa'vns faptucei teri aúrou.

Jo. 6:41 éyóyyu̧ou oulu oi You8ato reni aúroù.



Luke and Paul (especially Luke) are fond of the neat




 news of the metropolis'. P.Oxy I $123^{6}$ (iii or iv/A.D.) ia reit mss ótokncias if un, 'news of your welfare'. P.
 tell you my news', etc.
II. Paul sometimes puts reni at the beginning of a complete sentence as a sort of absolute phrase or 'expo-
endum'. It is like our 'à propose of', 'with regard to', 'as to' - a sign of loose sentence-building, which the careful litterateur would eschew.

16:1 TE Ci $\delta$ et in is 入oyías ... Siena. $5 \alpha$
16:12 пधि' SE "A "A
Papyri: PrOxy I $121^{13}$ (iii/A.D.) TECEi twū tá́pov, $\epsilon^{\prime} e^{\prime} \propto \zeta \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \theta \omega v$, 'with regard to the bulls, make them work'.

 $\mu_{0 I} \epsilon \dot{u} T \dot{\alpha} X \in \prime$, 'with regard to the note of your sister, inform me quickly what you wish brought or sent * along'. P.Eleph $13^{5}$ ( 222 B.C.) Tष्टi de tout oivapiou
 has not yet come in from the country'. P.Ryl II $229^{\prime 2}$
 oi Taœayévopal, 'as for the pigs' fodder ... make provision until I come'.
III. Finally, in several passages Heep' = 'for', 'on account of' and so is practically equivalent to $\dot{U} \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \rho$. This is not a surprising interchange. To pray 'concerning' a thing is generally tantamount to praying 'for' it. Sometimes indeed the MSS. vary between i mic and teri. .

In Gal.1:4 W.H. read viné rather than méi ; in Heb.
 example of the practical equivalence of the two prepos-


Compare Mt.26:28 tò reei tohtīv ékXunvópevov with
 tament examples are:




The Papyri shew Tep' thus used:
P.Tebt II $408^{56}$ ( 3 A.D.) Tapakatis $\sigma \in$ Trei vicouv you
 aútois $\mathrm{So日ñal}$.
 seyeías oou.
 $\Theta_{\text {Eij }}$ repi this ódokincias sou kai twiv фitta'twv vou.
Notes: (1) This confusion of resi and ofrép has parallels in classical Greek, which says kivjuveúeル Réí tivos, Ėyk àeiv tivi repí tivos, etc. Jannaris (an Historical Greek Grammar, 1686) describes this interchange as an acknowledged characteristic of the language. Sharp (Epictetus, p.93) cites this excellent
example from Epictetus ii．13．18，where the two pres－ positions are used＂in parallel clauses in the same sense＂．Ti oủv oi fetter reni two àd入orgíwv；．．．Tí oủv
 here compare P．Par $44^{7}$ àywvic̄ yà kepi oo
（2）Torrey thought the frequency of rep＇in the Fourth Gospel（ rEel 70 times，U＇TEX 14 times）due to the translation of the Aramaic by．But Colwell（The Greek of the Fourth Gospel＇，p．84）shews that the＂fre－ quent use of 爪世्ट！＂in＂John＂is not quite as frequent as the use of this preposition in Epictetus and the Papyri，so making it impossible to regard the frequency of $\pi E \rho \prime$ or its interchange with cirép as a Johannine Aramaism．

Kepi (c. accusative 38 times in New Testament) is found in local, temporal and figurative significances. Matthew, Mark, Luke and the Pastorals alone have it more than once. The fact that the Pastorals, brief though they are, have it 6 times, whereas the admittedly genvine let $\epsilon$ four reni tors $\sigma$ TÉ vols .
 nonethele Thrice in the New Testament and frequently in the of the Pastorals' authorship.
I. Local: 'around'.




N.B.: Here once again the accusative has supplanted the dative; for the classical construction is: $\theta \omega^{\prime} \rho \alpha \mu \alpha$ ÉXouol rept tais otépuors

Thrice in the New Testament and frequently in the Papyri TE ${ }^{\prime}$ ' denotes 'in the neighbourhood of' a place or town.

Mk. 3: 8 आе्टi Túpov kail $\sum 18 \hat{\omega} v a$ т $\lambda \hat{h} \theta o s$ modú.



Papyri: P.Tebt I 56 ${ }^{12}$ (130-21 B.C.) Sniñas for teलi
 seeking out in the neight ourhood of your village 5 arouræ for our maintenance'. TEci kwłnu is very frequent.

The phrase of Teटi aútóv (like of oưv tivl of petá
fivos ) occurs several times in the New Testament, denothing a man's associates, followers, ete.

Mk. 4:10 oí Tęi aúròv où toís Swideka.
Lu.22:49 ísoures sè oi nepi aútóv.

T̂̄s yovakòs kai râv itepi aữóv, 'and of his friends'.

'one of your servants'. P.OXy XIV $1631^{8}$ ( 280 A.D. ) yju or $\pi \in e \bar{i}$ tòv (Aúpindiov Ktiotóv) 'we the party of A.K.' Often this usage denotes 'servants' or 'employees':
 'Atodiáviov tov dooknting, 'all four in the service of A. the dioecetes'. So also P.Columbia $270 \mathrm{col} \mathrm{i}^{27}(256$ B.C.) etc.

The classical idiom of repi Inaìtov 'Paul and his friends' is found in Acts 13:13, and is common enough in the Papyri:
P.Grenf I $21^{16}$ (126 B.C.) аi $\pi \in \rho^{\prime}$ A Amadiwviav 'Apollonia and her sisters'. P.Ryl $65^{8}$ ( 67 B.C.?) toìs reßi
 supporters'. P.Tebt II $408^{8}$ (3 A.D.), P. Fay $34^{\prime \prime}$ (161 A.D.), P.Oxy $1275^{10}$ (iii/A.D.) etc.
II. Temporal: 'about', 'towards' (9 times in the New Testament).



Papyri: P.Tebt $15^{2}\left(\right.$ BC $1 / 4$ ) ${ }^{c \prime} \omega^{\prime} \sigma \in 1$ Tस्Ci íspav 'about the lIth hour'. P.OXy VIII, 1114, col i ${ }^{24}(237$ A.D.) tree

III. Figurative Use: If it is possible to elaborate a distinction between $\pi \in \rho^{\prime} c$. accusative and Tepic. genitive $=$ 'concerning', it is that $\pi \in \mathrm{c}^{\prime} \mathrm{c}$. accusative denotes the object of the action or of the pains expended, $\pi \in$ I' $^{\prime}$. genitive the subject of speech or thought. But the Koine writers do not of ten write with this precision.
 P.Tebt I $30^{18}$ has $\pi \in \rho^{\prime} \sigma \pi \omega ́ \mu e v o s ~ \pi \epsilon \rho^{i} \alpha_{\alpha} v a y k a i ́ w v . ~$

With the following New Testament examples -


Acts 19:25 тоӥs reni Tג tolגûta.

6: 4 vorĩv reci らそinídels.
compare these from the Papyri:

 ion of it'. PrOxy I $124^{5}$ (iii/A.D.) $\pi \in C^{i} \operatorname{tov}\left[y^{\prime} \propto \mu . \alpha /\right]$ E8uorúxouv 'were unlucky as to marriage'. P.Oxy VI
 'the method is concerned with the 29 letters'. P.0xy VIII $1121^{16}$ (295 A.D.) ai wis Éroú teed inv ouppocàv oúons, 'while I was occupied with my trouble'.
 reni chic yivoure, 'all the vain talk of the world besets me'.

HECi révtas kndepoviav, 'perceiving your love of equity and care for all'. P.Ryl II $244^{9}$ (ii i/A.D.) ai oủkétı rep toüro yéyova, 'I have done nothing further in the matter'.

 T2 teri sautóv.

Teó occurs in the New Testament 48 times．It is confined to Matthew and John＇s Gospels，the Lucan writ－ ings and the Pauline epistles（12 times）．$\pi \rho \rho_{0}^{\prime}$ does not survive in the modern Greek vernacular．Its New Testa－ ment uses are（1）of Place，（2）of Time，（3）of Super－ iority or Preference．Tè reoóńrou（common in Luke） is a translation Hebraism．There is a curious use of reó in John 12：1，to be discussed in a special note． All these uses－save the translation Hebraism－find illustration in the Papyri．

I．Place：This classical use occurs only 4 times in the New Testament．Acts 12：6，пеळे rins $\theta$ úe $\alpha$ ，Acts
 5：9 तeò tiv $\theta$ upīv．The influx of the improper prepos－
 ，katevíntiov，ÉV谓i，warévavti（all belonging to the Koine）is undoubtedly the reason for the scarcity of local reó．（These improper prepositions were widely used in the LXX as translating more closely the Hebrew ＇ココ」，＇ゝソュ ）．The Papyri afford the following illustrations：

＇let them expose it in front of the agoranomus＇
office＇（？）．
 Tórov 'the owners of the open plot in front of your gate'. O.G.I.S. $50^{12}$ (iii/B.C.) àva $\theta \in \pi \alpha 1$ tpò tou vèे roú Drovú́ou.
II. Time: Temporal roó occurs 26 times in the New
 and is also frequent in the Papyri. Typical New Testa-



 Gal.1:17 roùs reò Ǵqoû átoorótous, Eph.1:4 moò kataßotīs

P.Oxy I $33^{5}$ (ii/A.D.) Toùs $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ e ́ \mu o u ̀ ~ t e \lambda c u t r ́ \sigma a v t a s . ~ . ~$


 'before the appointed time'. P.Oxy X $1269^{\circ}$ (ii/A.D.) rír 40\% бoù ènnyur $\hat{\imath}$ 'your predecessor as exegetes'. P.Oxy
 'to leave $E$. before winter', cf. 2 Tim.4:21. P.Oxy XIV $1685^{\prime 9}(158$ A.D.) Tàs Tpò toù É6ráuÉvas ápoúpas 'the previously sown arourae'. (meà roú is, classical). P.OXy XIV $2113^{23}(316$ A.D. $)$ TROO tou kalcoù toù tétous
'before the end of the time'. P.Hib I $60^{4}$ (c. 245 B.C.) re o énths Lucas . P.Hamb. $86^{7}$ (i i/A.D.) T0ò tout nyefóvos Hacayevoi 'come before the prefect'.

Under this head falls reó c. articular infinitive, a neat idiom 9 times in the New Testament expressing a subordinate clause of antecedent time. Mt.6:8 Too roù




Papyri parallels are not plentiful:
P.Tebt III $755^{9}$ (ii/B.C.) ötros $\sigma 01$ Guuladńow roo roe $\mu \in$ $K \alpha T \alpha \pi \lambda \in \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha$ 'in order that $I$ may have a talk with you before I sail down'.
 someone fetches you'.
III. The New Testament has reó twice of Preference: 'before all'. Jas.5:12 Tएò toútwov $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \alpha^{\prime} \delta \in \lambda \phi 01$ fou fin
 E'KTEVN ${ }^{\prime \prime} \in$ XoVTES . The private letters of the Papyri abound in this formula. We need only quote PrOxy $292^{\prime \prime}$

 the gods that I may receive you in good health'. T po Tavrós, neo row r ólwr are also found.
 cannot be denied that this prepositional phrase，on a casual consideration，looks very like an imitation of the Latin＇ante diem tertium Kalendas＇．This impression seems strengthened when we find the phrase in the Papyri where a Latin original lies behind the Greek，e．g．P．Oxy
 8 th day before the Calends of October＇．（This phrase is a É（巳んnveíd tau $\left.{ }^{〔} P_{\omega \mu} \mu \alpha \kappa \bar{\omega} v\right)$ ．Moulton＇s very able de－ fence of the idiom against the charge of Latinism shows the danger of such snap－judgments．（Prolegomena，p．101）． His parallels from Greek literature when combined with those of Schulze，justify him in saying that＂the hypo－ thesis of Latinism is utterly improbable＂．Cf．Amos 1：I TVO SÚo ĖTūv too $\sigma \in i \sigma \mu O \hat{U}$ ．The explanation of the second genitive given by Moulton seems true：it is an ablative ＂starting from．．．．＂On the other hand，it is probable that Latin influence gave a wider currency to the idiom． Examples，besides these already cited，can be seen P．Tebt II 285 （ 239 A．D．）；P．Oxy VII $1047^{4}$（iv／A．D．）；P．Oxy XIV ${ }^{+} 1645^{\prime}$（ 208 A．D．）；B．G．U． $326^{6}(189-94$ A．D．）．
 further years before＇sounds strange to English ears． But the Germans have it in＂vow finer Woche＂，＇a week ago＇，＂vor vierzehn Jahren＂，etc．Bless cites
$\pi p^{o} \dot{\alpha} \mu \in e \bar{\omega} v$ from the will of Epicteta (Doric, end of iii/B.C. or beginning of ii/B.C., therefore pre-Roman, p. ). Add P.Ozy VIII $1121^{12}$ ( 295 A.D.) (cited supra), P.Oxy VIII 1153 (i/A.D.) Trò тоخ入oū 'some time ago'. P.
 Xeóvou, 'I bought, my lord, a long time ago', etc.

## Additional Note on tro т poowirrou This phrase though

 a translation of the Hebrew 'נ̣? is not altogether alien ( 114 B.c.) to the Greek idiom. In Tebt.F. I, 28, Ia, I8, we find moi o' $\phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \bar{i}$ cf. 2Macc.viii.17.3 Macc.iv.4.

II coos: For statistics see Part I (pp.19, 20). From these it will be seen that moo's is well on the way to becoming a one-case preposition. For the unusual New Testament use of mos c. accusative of Person after see p.66f., Part I.
I. Toss c. genitive is represented in the New Testamont by the solitary example in Acts $27: 24$ tour poss miss ifurépas owtycias . 'This (the taking of food) is in the interests of your health'. (The context shews that owrncia must have this sense of physical well-being.) BIas and Moulton are agreed that this is a literary usage. Certainly $\in$ 'val moos rivas $=$ 'e re nostrâ' is a good classical idiom. Cf. Herodotus I, 75, Thuc.5:59 oi


- The LXX has moos c. genitive 23
 Tpòs Seixys. It was common too in writers like Plutarch and Lucian. But it is untrue to say with Radermacher ? ( $p$. ) that rios c. genitive is not found in the Papyri. (So Rossberg, p.54).

In the collections I have searched, iTo's c.genitive occurs at least $\$$ times. One (P.Tebt 294, 146 A.D.) is probably a mistake for the dative. Another, P.Oxy $138^{34}$ (610-11 A.D.) is the classical idiom moo's roo $\theta$ toil after
a verb of swearing. The remaining examples are all used of origin or descent, 'on the side of' (classical). F.0xy III $487^{7}$ ( 156 A.D.), P. $0 x y$ III $503^{3}$ (118 A.D.), P. Teat II 292 (189-90 A.D.), P.Ryl II 160(a) ${ }^{2}$ (14-37 A.D.),
 Girtopfly $\theta$ tíou rios ratio's 'being wronged by a man whom I can hardly call my paternal uncle'. (Ibid. I. 10 has $\kappa \alpha T \alpha \pi_{\alpha} T^{\prime} C^{\alpha} \theta \in \neq 1{ }^{\prime}$. Indeed, Luke might quite

II. Mo's c. Dative is found 7 times in the New Restament and always in a local sense. The IXX has it about 90 times. Rossberg counts 162 instances in his Papyri. Despite these last figures (most of which are due to the figurative of mos TIU 1) the usage is undoubtedly moribund. Teós c. accusative is winning all along the line. The New Testament examples are:







In all these the etymological meaning 'near' or 'facing' is clear, and Call for no comment. Papyri illus-
trations:-
P.Oxy II $141^{24}\left(c .98\right.$ A.D.) reas ris ' ${ }^{24}$ orping, 'by the temple of Osins'. P.Tebt III $793 \mathrm{col} \mathrm{xi}^{5}(183 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$.$) övra$ reòs iñ $\theta$ ócal . P.Ryl II $77^{32}(192$ A.D.) rpòs tì


 тотащй .

Notes: It is significant that the Papyri, like the New Testament, never use meós local c. dative of Person. The fact that this use has vanished, has a bearing on the New Testament use of mpo's c. accusative with Persons (e.g. Jo.l:1, Mt.26:18, etc) after a verb of rest. This usage appears to be a result of the decay of the dative, and should not be labelled a Hebraism. (See Part I, p.66).

The Papyri use mós c. dative in other senses than the local. The classical reos toíros is found, e.g. $x$ P.Oxy III 488 (ii/iii A.D.) cf. P.Tebt III $762^{17}$ (iii/B.C.) uǹ díar àyfuvin meòs tois doírors, 'that I may not be anxious about this in addition to other things.' Cf. P.Ryl II $245^{6}$ (iii/A.D.) P.Grenf ii $87^{31}$ (602 A.D.). Eival rpo's tivi, 'to be occupied with something' is another idiom. P,Tebt III $757^{9}(186-5 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$.$) neos ti$ ÉHßOAグ outas 'occupied with the lading'. P.Tebt I
$45_{(8 c 13)}^{9}$ duros you meostry meanteceíal] 'occupied with the collection'. Cf. perhaps Lu.2:49 $\epsilon^{\prime} V$ toís toú nareo's ... tivar.
ò reós or of reo's very frequently signifies 'officials in charge of some business. 'Tebt I $30^{\prime 8}$ (115 B.C.) toùs reòs tais artodoyiars - B.G.U. III $915{ }^{9}$ (ii/A.D.) $\circ$ meòs tais Xecídis.
N.B: Moulton after noting (p. 106 Proleg.) the obsodecence of ro's $c$. dative produces an example"as late as 245 A.D." (P. Fay 5 reós ris nuxĩv, ). Add P. $0 x y$ XVII $2136^{4}$ ( 291 A.D.) Teos ta3 Auavecicic, and P.Grenf ii, $87^{31}$ cited above, is dated 601 A.D., though the use is not local.

Keos c. accusative ( 679 times in the New Testament) has such diverse applications that it is extraordinarily hard to classify. Neo's shares with $\epsilon$ 's and Tee' the task of supplanting the disappearing dative.
I. The decay of the dative is evident in the very abundant use of roo's not only after verbs of motion like coming and sending, but after words which contain any notion of direction, and especially after verbs of saying and answering. (The tendency of the language to use prepositions for the old cases, is nowhere better illusprated than in the use of ross aúrov for aữu ). We can only find room for a few typical examples here:


Acts 9:2 émiotołàs moos tais ouvaywyás.
Acts 22:1 ג́rodoyía Tएòs úpàs.
Phil. I: 26 racouoías maidu moos ias.
Acts 25:22 roo's toil Фñou é $\phi$ ク


(where the IXX gen.2:24 has Th yuvaki).
Cf. Acts 7:3 Eirtev roots aútóv with Gen.12:1 eírev tụ̂ 'A乃cár.
Papyri: B.G.J. I-261 ${ }^{5}$ (ii/iii A.D.) $\in u ̛ \neq \alpha^{\prime} \mu \in \theta \alpha \in \lambda \theta \in \hat{V}$
 Tooiswiviov（yiveroac moo＇s very frequent in the Papyri）； POxy XIV $1681^{13}$（iii／A．D．）．

P．Tebt $113^{\prime}$ meòs Métara dóyos（Bcı．4－3）Tebt I $27^{\prime \prime}$ tús meòs
 B．G．U．III $822^{20}$（ii／iii A．D．）íva eüc⿹ Euthyov ñòs aürñ入annon．

With Mk．15：43 Eioñx日e roós Tixatóv＇went into Pilate＇s house＇，and Acts 11：3 meòs áv ${ }_{c o \alpha s}$ annso ßuotiav

 not enter your door＇．Cf．also P．Tebt III 793（183
 ＇as I was returning home at a late hour＇．

II．Tpo＇s c．accusative of Time is not very common． The classical idiom meòs Є́rípar＇towards evening＇is found Lu．24：49．The usual temporal force of reo＇s is ＇for＇a certain time（and no longer）．

Lu．8：13 of reós kaicòv tiotzóouar．＇for a time＇．
むo．5：35 reòs čépar．

12：11 moo＇s tò racoiv＇for the present＇．

Papyri：With Iu．24：49 is to be compared P．Tebt
 'arriving at a late hour' (note ơ $\psi \in$ ' : cf. Mt.28:1).
P.0xy I $76^{10}$ ( 179 A.D.) Tròs kacoov Trapatoyxávwv eis k'junv Nepfépas 'who happens to be for the present time at the village of N.'.

 ,only bergs, example: he thinks the meaning is 'usque ad').
 rpoós ró 'evertos étos 'I voluntarily undertake to lease for the present year (only)'. Also P. Fay $36^{6}$ (IIl-2 A. D.), P.Ryl II $168^{3}$ ( 120 A.D.).
III. The figurative uses of moo's c. accusative are muiltifarious. It may denote hostile or friendly relations when the meaning is either 'against' or 'towards'. It has a wide final or epexegetic application, especially after adjectives: 'for'. It may also mean 'compared with', 'according to', 'with reference to', 'with a view to': the context is the determining factor. The idiom Tג reós tud or rl is fairly frequent. Occasionally has an adverbial force, as in reós $\phi$ oivov. Tcòs tó c. infinitive is used with a final significance.
(a) Hostile and friendly relations. The New Testament
uses such verbs as Guynteiv, fiadoyíSerbal, àyavakten,
 followed by reós (often mos 'a ${ }^{\prime} \lambda_{n}^{\prime}$ nous ) where our translation 'with' may be either friendly or hostile. Other noteworthy phrases which are joined with roo's, include:





The Papyri shew similar combinations: $\sigma u \mu \phi \omega v \in i u$ moos (e.g. P.Oxy XIV $1707^{1} 204$ A.D.), $\sigma u y k \epsilon \bar{\sigma} \theta_{\alpha}$ moods (Fib I

 (P.Ryl II $229^{15} 38$ A.D., as in Mt.18:23 and 25:19) Guviorao ${ }^{1}$ ac

 I, $5^{207}$ ).
 'the person whom you accused, did not attend'. P.Oxy XIV $1680^{\prime 5}$ (iii/iv A.D.) úrovooupal oft traumas rad lv tit tote ce tel moos $\sigma \in \in$, 'I suspect he must have some further claim against you'.


our adversary'. P.0xy IV 743 col ii ( 2 B.C.) \&i tai
 $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} X_{0} \mu \in v$ roòs Éarois $\phi \lambda_{i}^{\prime} \alpha v, \quad$ 'although I have had trouble with others, you must assist him for the sake of the friendship we have with each other'. (This last example shews 'To's used of both hostile and friendfly relations).
(b) Typo's is often used with abstract nouns with the final sense 'for'. Frequently, too, it is epexegetic after certain adjectives.

Jo. 13:28 Teós $\tau i$ ' titter; 'With a ais to what?' 'ce. 'Why'
I Cor.14:26 $\pi \alpha^{\prime} v \tau \alpha$ mos oino8opウ̀v yivérow.


After adjectives denoting fitness, etc.:-

2 Cor.2:16 uni meòs testa His inavo's;
Eph. 4:2 $\alpha$ 'yogis mpōs oikodoriv.
I Tim. 4:8 $\dot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda \mu$ os toss , Tit.1:16 $\alpha$ 'Sókipos mos, Tit. 3:1 étorpos ross
Papyri: The final use of moo's abounds in the Papyri:
（Fay 103），rpòs inv détourav érét $\left.\xi_{0} 80, \hat{V}\right)$（Fay 107），rpòs piv Qurial（Hib．54），reòs pacruciá（Ryl 116）meòs 弓iou rovaviál（B．G．U．1052），meós àopateíal（Oxy 129），Kтevia reòs Ke申axiv Sćo＇ 2 hair－combs＇（Oxy 1142）are only
a few of the many examples．
 tru Xetiav．
（c）Tpo＇s c．articular infinitive is found 12 times in the New Testament：

Mt．6： 1 meòs tò $\theta_{\in \alpha} \theta_{\text {ñulal }}$ dötoís．
5：28 тएós to énilouñioal düñs．

Eph．6：11 meos̀ tì dúvaroal ípàs orival．
 Two examples（Lu．18：1 and Acts 3：19）Moulton thinks （ p .218 ）are hardly final．They mean rather＇with refer－ ence to the duty＇（Winer）．Paul＇s 4 instances express the＇subjective purpose＇in the agent＇s mind．

The idiom is fairly frequent in the Papyri and
always final．
 Kai ảva申аcérmos tival tä̀v tékvuv．＇in order that after their death it might be the secure and in－ alienable possession of their children＇．
 be no hindrance in collecting (the revenue)'.
 $\mu \alpha e^{\text {roçjoai }}$ fol 'so that on his return he may bear witness of it to me'. P,Oxy XIV $1631^{15}\left(280 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ ross to órroù $\delta \in i$ your Xoüv $\beta^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime} t \in \sigma \theta \alpha c$ : En order that earth may be thrown in the proper places'. P.Oxy XVII $2108^{\circ}(259$ A.D. ) \#̈ùs tò
 be displayed in the most conspicuous places of the village'.
(d) General Accord like Hard c. accusative is express-



 Tò Égovirápiv elva moòs roùro roinons, 'I send you the pattern that you may go by that'. So P.Oxy I $113^{6}$ (ii/ A.D.) (of matching a piece of cloth). Keos's often in the Papyri denotes the standard to which the actual measure is equated. P.Hib I $85^{19}(261$ B.C. $)$ Toss rom Xadkoüv. P.Amh. $43^{9}$, etc.

Too much pother has been raised over Rom.8:18 oúk
 The root-meaning of roods should be remembered. Lit. 'the sufferings of the present time are not worth anything
face-to-face with, i.e. confronted with the glory to be revealed'.
(e) With such New Testament phrases as tà reòs toì $\theta$ cóv
 etc. cf. P.Rei $17^{7}$ な人 moos niv yewpyikǹv natarkeuñv. P.Oxy VIII $1121^{4}$ ( 295 A.D.) Tà moós miv knsiáv árins tapó́oxov

 koifuor Biou dikala
(b) Jas.4:5 has meòs $\phi$ Oóvov 'jealously'. Cf. P. Oxy XIV $1462^{29}\left(289\right.$ A.D.) reòs ${ }^{\prime \prime} X \theta_{p \alpha V} \lambda^{\prime} \in \xi \in / s, \quad$ 'spitefully'. P.Fay $12^{23}$ (c. 103 A.D.) Tròs $\alpha \sigma \omega t e^{\prime} \alpha v$ 'incontinently'. P. Fay $118^{\prime \prime}(110$ A.D.) dótrágou roùs ditaôtas oe táutes rpòs
 'partially'.

Note: Very instructive is P.Oxy VII 1069 (iii/A.D.)
 фitoroveiore. Teó is, of course, the original form of roo's as $\epsilon^{\prime} v$ is of t's . The dropping of ' $s$ ' (final) is common from an early period (Mayser, Grammatik I, pp.205-7).

## Súv (older form sưv) is not quite so effete an

'aristocrat' as most grammarians maintain. The following table provides a statistical conspectus of its career compared with $\mu \in T d^{\prime}$ in Attic and the Koine. (The Attic figures are Mounsen's: Entwick. einiger Gesetze
 Thucydides ( 600 pages), $\mu \in T \alpha ́ ~ 400$ times v. oúv 37 times

| Aristotle | " | 300 | " | v. | " | 8 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demosthenes, | " | 346 | " | v. | " | 15 |  |  |
| The New Testament | " | 361 | " | V. |  |  |  | rox) |
| The Papyri (Rossberg) | " | 130 | " | v. |  | 134 |  |  |

From this comparison it will be seen that ouv had awakened somewhat from its Attic sleep. Rossberg finds it even oftener than $\mu \in+\alpha^{\prime}$ in the Ptolemaic Papyri he has searched. (In Xenophon, of course, oóv is more frequent than perd - another case where Xehophon is a precursor of the Koine). Yet ouv never really threatened to supplant its more powerful rival perd'. In the modern vernacular the apocopated form $\mu \epsilon$ of $\mu \in \tau d^{\prime}$ serves for $\sigma$ óv which survives only in the single phrase $\sigma \dot{u} \theta$ tiul.

The New Testament statistics, in detail, are:


| James | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 use |  |
| 2 Peter | 1 |

N.B: Guv not in Pastorals, Hebrews or Revelation.

General Remarks: The root-meaning is 'together with', the case is the comitative-instrumental. Nearly all the New Testament examples have the idea of accompaniment, though in several instances oúv appears to mean no more than a strong Mai'. E.g. Mk.9:4 'Hkíds out Mwüoti, Lu.5:19. наө̂̄kav ourò sou rim kxルisić ; 'bed and all' is the sense, not 'by means of the bed'.

It is idle to look for a distinction between oúv and $\mu \in T \alpha^{\prime}$ in the Koine. The only difference is that $\mu \in \sigma^{\prime}$ is far more versatile. Oxy III $531^{6}$ (ii/A.D.) shews them
 Ounorgive, $\left.\mu \in \boldsymbol{T}_{\alpha} k \alpha\right\rangle$ tī̃ óvav, where the only motive seems a desire for variety. Cf. ibid $527^{3}$ (ii/iii A.D.) $\delta$

 timon $\mu a \theta_{n+\omega} v$. etc. (see also $\mu \in t^{\prime} \alpha$ ).
I. $Z_{u v}^{\prime}=$ 'with', 'together with', with persons and things.

Mk. 15:27. Guv ain orawpoüal súo.
Lu. 2:27 Éyévero oui ni áyyé $\lambda_{i}$


Fapyri parallels are: B.G.U. I $261^{7}$ (ii/iii A.D.)
 P.Fay $126^{3}$ (ivi or iii/A.D.) rep'ratoûvtós fou sùv rỏ rarei n'kourd 'as I was walking about with your father I heard..'

 'as I drafted it with you in the city', etc. etc.

With Things:
Mt.25:27 Éropióqnu à̀ tò Éfòv oùv tókw. Cf.Iu.19:23

 Tò $k \in \phi \alpha^{\prime} A \alpha i o v$ oùv toîs rómpis]. (oùv rókç is quite a common phrase). P.Tebt II $406^{12}$ (c.266 A.D.) 入uxueid rateid
 a cupid and a lamp', etc. P.Oxy VIII $1127^{\circ}$ ( 183 A.D.) TEPIGTECEAVa sö in rou'rou kieipake guxivy, 'a pigeonhouse with its wooden ladder':

The phrase of oúu Tivi (cf. oi Tapá, oírecí, oí $\mu \in T \alpha$, ) occurs about 9 times in the New Testament indicating a person's associates or companions.

Iu. 24:24 tivès tūv oùv גúrì.
Acts 5:21 ó à XX. Kai of Gù dùno

$$
\text { 19:38 } \because \cdot . \quad \text { hai oi suiv aürû rexviral. }
$$

Rom.16:15 roùs oùv kútois náutas
The Papyri shew this expression also, especially in
the sense of Acts 19:38, i.e. those engaged in the same business: qui eodem officio ant munere funguntur, says Kuhring (p.16).

0xy II $242^{33}$ ( 77 A.D.) of oò $\alpha u^{3} \tilde{c}_{i}$ iepeis

'associated contractors'
P.Ryl II 77 ( 192 A.D.) 〈oi〉 oùu aurois noomn+ í', $^{\prime}$,
'fellow-cosmetae'.

EG is often used in both New Testament and Papyri to link up persons in an epistolary salutation:

2 Cor.l:1 Tĥ́ énkinoia.... où toís áyías.
Phil.l:1 tois àyiols ... oùv énióótrois.


II. Eúv, as in the classical où $\alpha$ 'xuy , occasionally denotes Instrument or Means:

1 Cor.5:4 oüv n̂̀ Suvápel toù Kocióo.
This usage seems only to be found among the Papyri in the phrase $\sigma$ ov $\theta_{i} \tilde{c}$ (classical and modern Greek) 'with God's help'.

F.Grenf II $73^{15}$ (ii/i-i-i A.D.) ótav ertori ouv $\theta$ eiv.

More often the meaning of the phrase is rather 'with God's leave', i.e. our 'a.v.'.
P.Cairo Zen $59060^{1}$ (257 B.C.) oùv Sé $\theta$ eois tirtein étrifu k.t.l.
'to speak with the gods' leave, I hope'.
 Ky rएás oé yevórevos, 'God permitting, expect us to pay you a visit on the 23rd'. P.Oxy IX (iii/A.D.) Gàr rapayeing où $\Theta c i u, ~ ' i f ~ y o u ~ c o m e ~ D . V . ' ~$
III. Eúv very occasionally has the meaning 'besides'.
 Cf. Nehemiah 5:18 Kגi oüv routors d́arous mis $\beta$ ías oúk ÉSnín $\sigma \alpha$. Cf.P.Fay $12^{14}(c .103$ A.D.) où tou'tors rai ér'çous ou utapóuras 'others beside themselves being present'.

For an example of oùv kai' (vide Deissmann B.S., p. 265, on $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\prime}$ kai', Phil.4:3) see P. Pay $108^{\prime 3}$ (c. 176 A.D.) E'Snoar $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\alpha} s$ oùv nai rị̂ raybulo申útake ' they bound us and the guard of the watch-tower'.
IV. The New Testament uses oúv with Divine names to denote a mystical union, e.g.

Rom. 6: 8 ג̇सe
2 Cor.13:4 Sn'somev ouv auni.
Col. 3: 3 kékpurtal ouv tio Xpioriz.
Phil. 1:23 kai oïl Xpiomi Gival.

These are extra-grammatical points. Deissmann's classical monograph, Die neut. Former 'in Christo Jesu', discusses $\sigma u v$ Xeortis. He finds the phrase to denote the fellowship of the believer with Christ after death, and in 'Light' ( p .303 ) he cites a 'graffito"* with these words to a deceased person, EüXopar kayì $\epsilon \dot{u}+\alpha \dot{X} u$ guv $\sigma$ oi rival - a truly fine parallel. I pray that I may soon be in fellowship with thee'. U. vo Wilamowitz-Moellendorff points out the striking fact that the graffito already expresses the hope (not current even in the New Testament) of meeting again after death.
V. Lastly notice ${ }^{c \prime} \alpha \mu \alpha$ own twice, in 1 Thess.


This is an emphatic 'together with'. Cf.Eurip.Ion 717.
iva BákXios a'رфi rópous ब'véXwv reúkas


[^3]'Y $\quad$ G' $\mathcal{P}:$ New Testament statistics: cegenitive, 126 instances, c.accusative 19. Rossberg's figures from the Papyri are 270 against 13. The reason for the increased frequency of íté c. genitive in the Papyri is commercial. "Genetivi pretii vicibus funguntur iam Ptolemaerrum temporibus plerumque praepositiones. Inter quas primas partes agit $\dot{u} \pi \mathcal{E}^{\prime}$, quod fines ab Atticis conservatos longe transit." (Kuhring, p.24).

In the Koine Unté has encroached on both $\alpha^{\prime} u r l^{\prime}$ and TEP'. Affinity in sound and sense facilitated the latter interchange. There are several places in the New Testament text where the MSS. vary between UTKé and MESi (e.g. Mk.14:24, Jo.1:30, Acts 12:5, Rom.1:8, Gal.1:4).

In the modern Greek vernacular Unté has faded away before útec $\alpha$ 'vus and $\delta / \alpha(y / \alpha)$.
I. The New Testament provided no example of ćrाéc c. genitive used in a local sense (imless l Cor.15:29 is to be construed as baptism 'over' the dead). Nor can we supplement Rossberg's two examples of local usage from the Papyri. P.Paris I 145 rò $\mu \in i$ útrier yùs , iau $\theta^{\prime}$ úrò yñs Ibid. 235, 1, 253.
II. The root-meaning 'over' easily develops into the meaning 'on behalf of', 'in the interest of', 'for the sake of', by far its commonest use.




Sometimes it is opposed to $k \alpha+\alpha$.


Papyri: 0xy I $33^{13}(\mathrm{ii} / \mathrm{A} . \mathrm{D}$.$) K入є́os$ бoí Ǵativ ute This y خokutátns sou aबreídos redeutñol 'pro patrica mari'.
 $\sigma o u$, 'D. labours on your behalf'.
 inerneiar tioopévn.
'On behalf of' shades into 'as the representative of' - a very common meaning in the Papyri. One sees the same meaning in the New Testament. That is the force of

 dative Death. So also Heb.2:9 ómus Xápiti Aton citron
 death as the Representative of every man, just ad the earthly high-priest is appointed the representative of
 offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins'.

A person who represents another, invariably takes his place. So UHré , if the context demand it, can have the meaning 'instead of'. For a fuller discussion see Part I of this thesis (chapter on "The Encroachment of various Prepositions"). Here we may add a few examples from the Papyri: Business documents by the score close with the refrain of P.Fay $91^{4 / 4}(99$ A.D.) $\Lambda$ tovras y y yead $\alpha$


Leontas, have written for Thenethouis also, as she is illiterate', though the wording of the formula sometimes
 to $\mu \hat{n}$ raptival aúrou . P.Columbia 270, col $\mathrm{i}^{2 \prime}$ (256 B. Q.)
 Z. or his representative shall have the right of exeqution'. So also in legal proceedings: P.Ryl II $272^{5}$

II. Just as reaí was sometimes found where we expected ÚTÉP, so UUK'é is often no more than a colourless 'about'. Paul has it several times, but the idiom is as old as

 Yeyovótos tourovi' reáyparos) and is common in Aristotle.
(Sometimes, however, 'on behalf of' yields quite as good sense as 'concerning'.)


 introducing an 'exponendum' or absolute clause).

2 Thess.2:1 Útiè tins racouoĺas tout kupiou.
See also 2 Cor.l2:8, Phil.1:7, 4:10.
This use is practically confined to Paul: but then vire in any sense, is not common in the New Testament outside of his writings. The fact that the IXX has a tendency to use ćrép for repí after verbs of saying and writing, where the Hebrew has $\underline{y}$, has led some scholars to pronounce this Pauline use of úcé a Hebraism. But the Papyri have it so abundantly as to negative this theory:

PrOxy I 33 col vI. 16 (ii/A.D.) $\alpha \hat{\lambda} \lambda^{\prime}$ íTÈC ins éfautoù

 $\mu \mathrm{ol}$, 'write to me about anything you want'.

'I ask you to take cognisance of the matter'.


[^4] mpòs of $\Gamma$ गגukiau, 'as regards the things we wished ...' P.Tebt III $750^{3}$ (187 B.C.) oi rerílos] Tएobevñ́vekTaí fol TTroderegios uTter tits Kofyías. ' P has shewn me no moderation about the collection'.

Notes: infer abounds in commercial documents meaning 'on account of' 'by way of', 'to', etc., e.g. P.Oxy XIV $1626^{3}$

 XIV $1753^{4}$ ( 390 A.D.) uiTÈट Tins $\mu \in \hat{\lambda} /$ TOS 'as the price of honey', etc. These Kuhring has very carefully classified (p.24f).
${ }^{c}$ Yrép c. accusative is found 19 times in the New Testament. Rossberg's table shews only 13 instances. Plainly Úréc is on the way to becoming a one-case proposition.

Nor do the New Testament writings furnish a single example of útié c. accusative in a local sense. The Papyri shew this usage is not quite dead.
 ougiav úté riv oknuily oưoũv 'the Syrian cloths being above the cabin'. P. Ry II $74^{3}$ (133-5 A.D.) $\left[E^{3} 300 \jmath^{\prime} \mu n v \mu \dot{\mu} v\right.$
 regions beyond Coptus'. P.Ryl II $119^{2}(54-67$ A.D.) úNì) Mérфiv 'above Memphis'. P.Ryl II $153^{48}$ (138-61 A.D.) фakòs útrij ódpeuv áplorepáv, 'a mole above the left eyebrow', etc.
II. The figurative meaning of $\dot{\operatorname{lrf}}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{C}=$ 'beyond', 'above', accounts for all the New Testament uses.



Phil.2:9 tò óvopa tot útrè trâr óvopa.
A comparative force is easily derived from the meaning 'beyond'.

2 Cor 12:13 Útré Tais toind̀s ÉkK入hoias.

And sometimes a comparative adjective precedes ciTES :
Lu. 16:9 \$ covirwitepol citèe toul vioús.

This figurative use of vire The relative frequency in the New Testament is undoubtedly due to the influence of the IXX which translated the Heb. $\prod^{0}$ by ciTE (sometimes by $\Pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ c. accusative), (Hebrew lacking a comparative adjective). The idiom is 'per se' not un-Greek. There are traces of it in classical Greek and some examples in the Koine.
 add P.Tebt III $781^{\prime \prime}$ (c. 164 B.C.) Ta's doris LOJúas oúods until Tads $\rho 1$ 'the remaining doors to the number of more than 110.'

For the comparative adjective preceding "crrép we may cite P.Ryl II $119^{2}$ (54-67 A.D.) $\pi \lambda \in i ́ v \omega v$ ex úté to girtoũ fou keqalaiou, 'rents exceeding twice the capital sum'.

For the ordinary meaning 'beyond':
 ai ப́mèc $\delta^{\prime} u v \alpha \mu N$, 'I provided for her in a manner that exceeded my resources'.

 alone beyond the point of safety'.

$$
t \text { Proleg. p. } 234
$$

 etc. and seems to have meant originally 'from under', 'upwards' (perhaps our English 'up').

The New Testament has no instances of ciró c. dative, although the Papyri shew it has not quite disappeared. With the genitive the New Testament has 165 instances against 50 with the accusative. (Rossberg: 302 against 53). Of these Luke and Acts between them furnish more than half the examples.

A curious fact is that the Fourth Gospel contains only one instance of firó c. genitive, and all the Johannine writings together but five. What are we to infer? Is it an incidental argument for unity of authorship? Or is an Aramaic original the cause? Abbott (Joh. Gr. p.279) suggests that 'John' preferred to represent the agent as performing the act and so eschewed ívo'. If so, he was a good stylist (cf. Quillercouch "On the Art of Writing", p.121) in this particular.

The relative infrequency of ciró in the whole of the New Testament is due in some measure to the encroachments of $\dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \pi o^{\prime}$ and $8 \alpha^{\prime}$ and, in lesser degree, of $\epsilon^{\prime} k$ and $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha^{\prime}$.
I. (a) Úто́ c. genitive denotes Agent, after a passive cerb and is to be distinguished from $8 / \alpha$ which indicates
mediate authorship.

Mk. I: 5 è ßantíSovto ín' аútoú.


It does also denote Efficient Cause.
Mt.11:7 Káxaرov ப́тò d̀vérou oatevórevov.



Papyri: P.Oxy II $284^{5}$ (c. 50 A.D.) $81 \alpha \sigma \in i \sigma 0 n v$ irò 'Arrodto $\phi \alpha{ }^{\prime} v o u s$ 'I suffered extortion at the hands of A.'
 Érncétou 'we were commissioned by you through H'. Hib

 तोavópevol citò two $\theta \in \tilde{\sim} v$, 'misled by the gods'.
P.Oxy III $532^{22}$ (ii/A.D.) oủk àvé $\mu \in i v a s$ írò kakoù suveifotos Kate $X_{o}^{\prime} \mu \in u_{0}$, 'oppressed by an evil conscience'. Ibid.

$\checkmark$ 'swept away by the river'. P.Par $26^{8}$ (163-2 B.C.) गंvaykáoore $\theta^{\prime}$
 under pressure of necessity'. P.FI III 44(2) verso I,
 of the water'.

Note: Sometimes úñó almost $=8 / \alpha$ c. accusative.
 ipicopíar únò miss áoXúrns, 'never again can I hold up my head for shame'. PrOxy VIII $1101^{7}$ (367-70 A.D.) E'íte miro
 or perversity of judgment.' P.Amh. II $78^{4}$ ( $184 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{D}$. ) úrò This $\dot{\alpha} \theta u \mu i \alpha s \quad \mu \in T \dot{\eta} \lambda \lambda \alpha \chi \in v$ tòv 乃óv.
(b) Both New Testament and Papyri use úró also after verbs like $\pi_{\alpha \sigma ́ X} \neq \|, ~ y i v \in \sigma \theta \alpha l$ etc.








The Papyri shew an equally varied assortment of verbs and phrases followed by úmó:-

 mont from pitiless and godless men'. PrOxy II $239^{\prime 0}$ (66.

 done by us'. P.Ryl II $136^{19}(34 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{D}$.$) úrovoūl oùv to rorocín$ Yeyovéval úrrò täl Katayivopévou éu tñc Anvãl deyopévy.
'I suspect that this has been done by the inhabitants of the so-called Winepress'. P.Tebt III 793 col x , ${ }^{25}$ ( 183 B.C.) ouve'ß


 transport of the sheaves will be seen to at once by my father'. P, Par $26^{39}$ (163-2 B.C.) Míav '́'
 the assistance that lies in your power'.

Remarks: (I) ÚTó c. genitive in a local sense as in the classical of ciro X Xovo's does not occur in the
 New Testament) replaces it. I have found no Papyri example of ćró c. genitive $=$ 'under'.
(2) In modern Greek д’пó has supplanted úró .
II. Unó c. dative does not occur in the New Testament. Moulton cites two examples from the Papyri (p.63) O.G.I.S. 54 (iii/B.C.) and P.Oxy 708 (as late as 11/A.D.). Add
 ed with sand'; P.Oxy XII $1425^{6}$ ( 318 A.D., i.e. iv/A.D.).
${ }^{c}$ Yod c. accusative is found in the New Testament after verbs of both Motion and Rest. "The old local use of vino tivos and úrd tiv has become merged in ito TI.". This is not quite true of the Papyri where cero c. dative still survives. Cf. P.Oxy XIV $2120^{4}$ (221 A.
 rove inyouperidu sol. 'I have acted as assistant in the collection of corn-revenues of the nome under you to Apollonius your chief officer'. Here dative and accusative are placed in juxtaposition.
I. Local: 'Under' after verbs of Motion.

Mt. 8:8 iva $\mu$ au unto tiv string eioetioñs
 or Verbs of Rest -


 Grod'v, 'under the East colonnade'. P.FI III $2^{6}$ oùnj $\mu$ eriontac imo ref $\quad$ 'scar on the forehead under the hair'.
Lugd. G. 14 twi oínò too oúpavov Xwpãv cf. Acts 2:5. P.Tebt II $397^{4}$ (198 A.D.) Xeŋrationãv úq'óv ÉGtiv kail to
 which is the request presented by her'.
*. Bias: Grannie. p. 135 .
II. The New Testament furnishes one example of 'i no' c. accusative of Time: 'about'. Acts 5:21 lino ròv ole $\theta$ eon 'about daybreak'. Latin: sub vesperum'.
 'about the time of the first measuring'. P. Fay $108^{10}$
 'about dawn some thieves attacked us'.
III. The Figurative use of irc', 'under', 'under the authority of' is its commonest New Testament use. ciño vópor occurs no less than 10 times.




Gal.3:10 धitò katacoù Gíviv.

Papyri: P.Ryl II $238^{10}$ (262 A.D.) kTnuúdeiov $8 \grave{\epsilon}$ aúroís
 spirited donkey from those under your charge'. PrOxy X $1261^{7}$ (345 A.D.) бтаariutiov into Eeounciavóv, 'soldiers


 C.) úmì rウ̀v'/ாnárou ok énnk] 'under the protection of H'.

Notes: (I) The Papyri use vino c. accusative of animals meaning 'laden with', e.g. P.Tebt II $423^{\prime 8}$ (iii/
 the animals laden with corn to Heron'. Cf. I Tim 6:I óvol Eisiv into Gíyov. 'laden with the yoke'.
「ñv 'Ithiov kat' Eứvolav kail dido otocyial doùtà fou oúpata.
'I set free under sanction of Zeus, Earth, and Sun for their goodwill and affection towards me', etc. One example for many. Cf. Latin 'sub corona vendere', and
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[^0]:    * Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament,

[^1]:    ＊See note（iv）at end of this section．

[^2]:    *We should perhaps add a third cause, viz: the enrichment of the figurative use under the influence of Christian concepts, as, e.g. in the phrase $\in V \times$ piorū

[^3]:    Probably Imperial Period, and not a Christian document.

[^4]:    'having brought news of your release'.

