

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

MISREADINGS AND MISRENDERINGS IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

III.

B. ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION (*continued*).

IN my preceding or second article,¹ speaking of the Greek Infinitive, as exhibited in the literary and therefore artificial style of classical literature, I stated that even professional writers of that period often resorted to the expedient of resolving the Infinitive into a finite subordinate verb introduced either by *ἵνα* (also by *ὅπως* and *ὡς*), or by *ὅτι* (also by *ὡς*, then later on by *διότι*, *ὡς ὅτι* or *ὡσὸτι*, and *πῶς*). The former case, that is the "*Ἰνα*-analysis, which we called the prospective or final, was then historically investigated and its consequences and effects upon New Testament Greek traced and duly emphasized.

We now proceed to consider the alternative case, when the Infinitive was resolved into *ὅτι* and *ὡς* with their later and amplified by-forms *διότι*, *ὡς ὅτι*, and *πῶς*. As already intimated in the said inquiry, this "*Οτι*-analysis was limited to the comparatively small number of cases in which the Infinitive depended on such verbs or expressions as indicated a Saying, Thinking, Perceiving, Swearing, and the like,—terms which sometimes go by the collective and technical name of *verba dicendi* (or *declarandi*) *et sentiendi*. It will be convenient to call this Infinitive as well as its "*Οτι*-analysis the *Recitative*, or rather *Declarative*.

The Declarative Infinitive then, which from the outset had a limited usage, began to retreat before its "*Οτι*-analysis as early as classical antiquity and considerably earlier than the Prospective Infinitive already discussed. Now in this

¹ See the EXPOSITOR for April last, p. 298 ff.

Declarative analysis the particles resorted to were first and chiefest of all *ὅτι*, then *ὥς*, later on *διότι* (= *ὅτι*), and still later *ὥς ὅτι* (*ὥσότηι*) and *πῶς*, all of which were identical in their function and meaning, viz. *that* (German *dass*, French *que*). As regards their history, *ὅτι* has had an unbroken record from Homer down to the present day, *ὥς* and *διότι* played a rather limited and varied part, whereas *ὥς ὅτι* (*ὥσότηι*) and *πῶς* (= *ὅτι*) cropped up as colloquial terms in early Græco-Roman times and had a considerable run; as a matter of fact *πῶς* has ever since been in constant use with a steadily increasing popularity; so that in the colloquial speech of to-day it is the regular representative of ancient declarative *ὅτι* and *ὥς* or their equivalent Declarative Infinitive.

To illustrate the preceding exposition, let us take the sentence: *They said THAT he was a good man.* This clause in *classical* literary style would be expressed either by the declarative Infinitive: *οὗτοι ἔλεγον ἀγαθὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι*, or by its declarative analysis through *ὅτι* or *ὥς*, namely: *οὗτοι ἔλεγον ὅτι* (or *ὥς*) *ἀγαθὸς εἶη* or *ἐστίν*. This construction then gradually made room for the post-classical—especially Græco-Roman—*popular* form:

οὗτοι ἔλεγον ὅτι (or *ὥς*, also *διότι*) *ἀγαθὸς ἐστίν* or *ἐνι*,

then for the form:

οὗτοι ἔλεγον (or *ἔλεγαν*) *ὅτι*—also *ὥς ὅτι* or *πῶς*—*ἀγαθὸς ἐστίν* or *ἐνι*.

Accordingly modest or untrained writers who cared not for style but for substance and facts, are now breaking with the hitherto conventional style and largely adopt the *artless, plain*, and DIRECT mode of expression. This plain and direct style is eminently illustrated in the New Testament compositions, inasmuch as direct speech or *oratio recta* largely preponderates over indirect speech or *oratio*

obliqua. Consequently an unconventional scribe of the Græco-Roman period either used one of the above indirect forms of expression, or rather proceeded indirectly and then suddenly changed indirect to direct speech; so that the above typical sentence assumed the form:

οὗτοι ἔλεγον (ὅτι)· “Ἀγαθός ἐστιν ἢ ἔνι” (cf. John 7, 12);
then: αὐτοὶ ἔλεγον (οὐ-γὰρ) πῶς· “Αὐτὸς ἀγαθός ἐστιν ἢ ἔνι.”

Now if the above particles *ὅτι*, *ὡς*, *διότι*, *ὡς ὅτι*, *πῶς* were in every case synonymous, always meaning *that*, there would be no mistake about them in compound or connected sentences. But as each of them has other meanings besides, their contextual function in very many instances becomes ambiguous. Thus *πῶς* may stand for the adverb *πῶς*, ‘how,’ and for the conjunction ‘that’; *διότι* for ‘because’ and for ‘that’; *ὡς* for ‘that,’ for ‘because,’ for ‘how,’ and for ‘how much’;—while *ὅτι* may do duty for ‘that’ or for ‘because,’ or it may be a misreading of *ὅ,τι* (*ὅ τι*) and so mean ‘that which’; nay, it may even stand for the interrogative *τί*, and thus mean ‘what’ or ‘why,’ as we shall show in our next paper.

In order to obtain a clear idea of the particular function of these particles in each case and their direct bearing upon New Testament Greek, it will be expedient first to premise a few broad remarks on the use of the particles in general and then to consider the above representatives in their historical development with especial reference to the New Testament language.

If any particular section of Greek grammar were taken as a specimen to illustrate the historical evolution of the Greek language, no better representative could be selected for the purpose than the chapter dealing with the particles. For this class of words shows pre-eminently how those among them which were associated with each other in one or more points gradually resulted in a complete identification or differentiation, each losing its secondary notion;

and how they successively retreated before, or coalesced into, the most expressive or most familiar representative among them. Thus:—

Classical *ἐν*, *εἰς*, and *πρός* have led in modern Greek to *εἰς*; *μετά* and *σύν* to *μετά* (now *μέ*); *ἀπό*, *ἐξ*, *ὑπό* and *παρά*, to *ἀπό*; *ὡς* and *ὅτι* to *ὅτι*; *ὅπως* and *ἵνα* to *ἵνα* (now *νά*).

Such a study further shows how, in many cases, the resultant representative, having once established itself, again began to wear off into a commonplace and weak particle and thus had either to retreat in its turn before some new substitute, or to seek to recover its former force by combining itself with some other synonym. Thus:—

$\acute{\omega}\varsigma + \delta\tau\iota = \acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\tau\iota$ or rather $\acute{\omega}\sigma\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$;
 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma + \acute{\iota}\nu\alpha = \acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$,, $\acute{\omega}\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$.

The natural consequence of the above process was that on the one hand the number of particles used anciently has diminished considerably, and on the other those particles which eventually prevailed over their associates and competitors have increased in frequency. In the case of the conjunctions this was also to be expected, seeing that, ever since classical antiquity, the infinitival and participial construction began, as already explained,¹ to make room for finite dependent clauses introduced by the appropriate conjunctions.

The process above delineated may be roughly illustrated by the following particles taken as representative specimens:—

¹ See EXPOSITOR of April last, p. 300.

ASSOCIATED PARTICLES

In Classical Antiquity used concurrently	In Græco-Roman Times reduced to	In Modern Greek reduced to
ἐξ (ἐκ), ἀπό, ὑπό	ἀπό, ἐξ	ἀπό
ἐν, εἰς, πρὸς	εἰς, ἐν	εἰς
μετά, σὺν	μετά	(μετά), μέ
εἰ, ἐάν, ἄν, ἦν	εἰ, ἐάν, ἄν	ἄν
ἕως, ἕς, ἕστε	ἕως, ὥς ¹	ὥς, ὥστε (from ὥς ὄτε)
ὅπῃ, ὅποι, ὅπου	ὅπου	ὅπου
ὅτι, ὡς, infin.	ὅτι (ὡς, πῶς)	(ὄτι), πῶς
” ” ”	ὡς ὄτι	πῶς ὄτι, ὄτι πῶς
ὡς, ἵνα, ὅπως, inf. part.	ἵνα	νά
” ” ” ” ”	ὡς ἵνα	διὰ νά, ὡς διανά

Now to return to the *declarative* particles or conjunctions ὅτι, ὡς, διότι, ὡς ὄτι, with which we are concerned here, they had, as I have already indicated, a varied and more or less individual history since classical times. In these circumstances, it may prove of interest and use to consider them here separately and as briefly as possible.

1. ΟΤΙ: *that* (German *dass*, French *que*).

This particle is far too common and familiar to students to require illustrations here.

2. ΩΣ (= ὄτι), *that*.

As already observed, ὡς was an old associate of declarative ὄτι. Though far less common than ὄτι, it was fondly used by certain writers, especially by Thucydides and—what is more significant for us—by Polybios. However, in the course of post-classical times it began to lose ground before its associate and formidable rival ὄτι, and eventually—towards the close of the Græco-Roman period—disappeared

¹ This form ὥς (misaccented ὡς), from and for ἕως, occurs already in the New Testament, as: John (9, 4); 12, 35 ὥς (not ὡς) τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, *as long as* (or *while*) *ye have the light*. Gal. 6, 10 ὥς καιρὸν ἔχομεν, *while we have time*. So too Ignat. ad Smyr. 9, 1 ὥς (ubi male ὡς) ἔτι καιρὸν ἔχομεν.

altogether from the living language. It follows from this that at the time of the New Testament writers, *ὡς* as a declarative particle had not become extinct, as is commonly but erroneously assumed. Thus in Luke 23, 55 *ἑθεάσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ ὡς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ*, *i.e.* "they saw the tomb and *that* (not 'how') his body had been laid."

Luke 24, 6 *μνησθήτε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ ὃν λέγων*, *i.e.* "do remember *that* (not 'how') he had preached unto you while he was yet in Galilee saying."

Luke 24, 35 *καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐξηγούντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ ὡς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου*, *i.e.* "and they narrated what had occurred on the way and *that* (not 'how') it had become known unto them on the occasion of the breaking of the bread."

Acts 10, 28 *ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὡς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι*, *i.e.* "ye know yourselves that (surely not 'how,' as the R.V. has it) it is unlawful to associate oneself with a Jew."

Romans 1, 9 *μάρτυς γάρ μου ὁ θεὸς . . . ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνεῖαν ὑμῶν ποιούμαι*, *i.e.* "for God is my witness . . . *that* I constantly remember you in my prayers."

3. ΔΙΟΤΙ (= declarative *ὄτι*): *that*.

This particle, which represents an amplified by-form of *ὄτι*, is very common in post-classical Greek from the third century B.C. onwards down to Byzantine times. However, as it does not seem to occur in the New Testament compositions, we need not discuss its history and usage here.¹

4. ΩΣ ΟΤΙ or ΩΣΟΤΙ (= declarative *ὄτι*): *that*.

As already indicated, *ὡς ὄτι* is an amplified or strengthened form of declarative *ὄτι* (just like later *ὡσίνα* = *ίνα*), and

¹ Readers interested in this particle and its associates are referred to my *Hist. Greek Grammar*, §§ 1753 f., then Appendix vi. 12 f.; for *ὡς* §§ 1751 ff., 2086, then Appendix vi. 7, 12.

should be written *ὥσόντι*, seeing that it is never disjoined into *ὥς* and *ὅτι* by the insertion of some other word between the two component parts, but always forms a single word, like *δι-ότι*, *καθ-ότι*, *ἐπει-δή*, *οὐκ-έτι*, *οὐ-πω*, *μέν-τοι*, *εἶ-τε*, *καί-περ*, *εὖ-γε*, *ᾧσ-περ*, *οὐκ-οὖν*, *ὄτ-αν*, *ἐπειδ-άν*, etc. Be it as it may, *ὥσόντι* made its appearance in the compositions of early Græco-Roman ages, and had a fairly wide run down to Byzantine times. Like declarative *ὅτι*, it depends upon a *verbum dicendi* or *sentiendi* or some kindred term, and introduces a definite statement: *that*, often also an explanatory statement: *namely that*,—but never a reason, either objective (*because*)¹ or subjective (*as if*, *as though*). In view of these facts, Winer's opinion (*Grammar*, 771 f.), followed by other critics, that *ὥσόντι* (*ὥς ὅτι*) has the meaning of German *als ob* (*as though*) and that it forms an ellipsis in which *ὥς* represents a whole subjective clause suppressed before the objective *ὅτι*-clause, though ingenious and prepossessing, is artificial and untenable; as a matter of fact, it does not suit the sense in the passages where it occurs.

The following typical instances may serve as illustrations of the real function and usage of the particle in question.²

Diod. Frg. ii. 536, 51 λέγων ὥσόντι (*that*) Θρᾷκες ποτέ, κτλ. Dion. Hal. Ant. 9, 14 ἐπιγνούς ὥσόντι (*that*) ἐν ἐσχάτοις εἰσὶν οἱ κατακλεισθέντες ἐν τοῖς λόφοις. Strabo 15, 57 τὸ ὑπὸ Τιμαγένους λεχθὲν, ὥσόντι (*namely that*) χαλκὸς ἔοιτο. Jos. Apion. 1, 11 (1, 5 Niese) ἰκανῶς δὲ φανερόν, ὥς οἶμαι, πεποικῶς ὥσόντι πατριός ἐστιν ἢ περὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀναγραφῇ τοῖς βαρβάρους μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν, βούλομαι μικρὰ πρότερον διαλεχθῆναι. Anth. Pal. 9, 531 Ὁ οὐκ ἐθέλουσα Τύχη σε προήγαγεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα δείξῃ ὥσόντι (*that*)

¹ The passage LXX. Esth. 4, 14 ὥς ὅτι ἐὰν παρακούσης, will be considered in my 4th article.

² Such instances as Xen. Hell. 3, 2, 14 εἰπὼν τῷ Φάρακι ὥσόντι ἄνολη, and Isocr. Bousiris 520 κατηγοροῦν αὐτοῦ ὥσόντι καὶ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρει, are apparently chargeable to their Byzantine copiers.

πάντα ποιεῖν δύναται. Clem. Rom. Hom. 1, 7 ἵνα ἴδω εἰ ταῦθ' οὗτος λέγων ἀληθεύει, ὥσόντι (*namely that*) υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐπιδηδήμηκεν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ. Orig. i. 752C τὸ μέγιστον περι τῆς συστάσεως τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κεφάλαιον, ὥσόντι (*namely that*) προεφητεύθη ὑπὸ τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίους προφητῶν. Athan. i. 312A οὐκ ἠγνοῦμεν ἀλλὰ καὶ φανερόν ἡμῖν ἦν ὥσόντι (*that*) οἱ τῆς δυσωνύμου τῶν Ἀρειανῶν προστάται πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ ἐμηχανῶντο. Schol. in Ar. Pac. 507 ἀναφέρων ὥσόντι . . . ἐθαλασσοκράτουν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. Schol. in Aeschin. et Isocr. (ed. G. Dindorf) p. 6, 14 φασὶ γὰρ ὥσόντι (*that*) οὐδὲν τοῦ χαρακτήρος τοῦ Πλάτωνος σφίξει. So too 24, 10. Then 59, 32 θέλομεν εἰπεῖν ὥσόντι, κτλ. 67, 8 ἔχει τις εἰπεῖν ὥσόντι αὐτὸς μόνος ὁ Φάλαικος ἠγνόει τὴν Φιλίππου γνώμην. 83, 30 εἶπεν ὥσόντι οἱ δῆμοι, κτλ. So further 92, 30. 93, 11. 105, 1. 105, 3 εἶπομεν ὥσόντι ζηλωτῆς ἐγένετο τοῦ Γοργίου,—and so on passim. Schol. II. B 78 φάσκων ὥσόντι πολλαὶ πόλεις ὁμοφωνοῦσι προσηγορικοῖς. Γ 280. I 6 προσθεῖναι ἐκεῖνο ὥσόντι (*namely that*), κτλ. Cyrill. Scyth. V. S. 311C λέγειν ὥσόντι, κτλ. Vita Epiph. 104A ἔγραψεν ὥσόντι Ἰωάννης τὰ Ἰνριγένους φρονεῖ. Leont. Neap. V. S. 1677A προβαλλόμενος μάρτυρα ὥσόντι οὐδὲν, κτλ. Chron. Pasch. 731, 13 ἐδεξάμεθα ἀπόκρισιν ὥσόντι μέγαν χειμῶνα εὔρον.¹

So also then in the New Testament compositions, where it occurs thrice. The first passage is 2 Corinthians 5, 19 τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ (Rec. Ἰησοῦ) Χριστοῦ καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς, ὥσόντι Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ. Here ὥσόντι is correctly rendered "to wit that" by both the A. and R. versions, despite the contrary comments of modern critics.

On the other hand, in 2 Corinthians 11, 20, 21 ἀνέχεσθε γὰρ εἴ τις ὑμᾶς καταδουλοῦ, εἴ τις κατεσθίει, εἴ τις λαμβάνει, εἴ τις ἐπαίρεται [ἐπαράται?], εἴ τις εἰς πρόσωπον ὑμᾶς δέρει

¹ For more particulars see my *Hist. Greek Grammar* §§ 1753 ff.

κατὰ ἀτιμίαν. λέγω ὡσότι ἡμεῖς ἡσθενήκαμεν,—not only ὡσότι, but other parts of the passage are misunderstood. I mean that the adverbial expression κατὰ ἀτιμίαν does not refer to Paul, but to the Jews (τις); hence it belongs not to λέγω, but to the preceding δέρει. The whole passage therefore should, in my opinion, be rendered thus:

“For ye bear with one if one reduceth you to bondage, if one ruineth you, if one layeth hold of you, if one exalteth oneself [accurseth you?], if one smiteth you on the face to your disgrace. I say (*that*) I have been weak.”

Similarly in the rather obscure passage, 2 Thessalonians 2, 1 f. ὡσότι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, the current rendering of ὡσότι by “as that,” if this means anything (= as though?), should make room for “*namely that* the day of the Lord is present.”

5. ΠΩΣ (= declarative ὅτι), *that*.

Regarding πῶς, as an equivalent of declarative ὅτι, *that* it made its appearance in, or rather found its way into, the literary compositions of the Græco-Roman period, and soon met with increasing popularity which it maintained ever since. As a matter of fact, this particle—formerly an adverb of manner exclusively and now a declarative *conjunction* as well—in its latter function eventually (*i.e.* since the Middle Ages) has practically ousted ὅτι from ordinary speech, so that in the vernacular Greek of to-day πῶς is by far commoner than ὅτι. Now that this πῶς, when it acts as a declarative conjunction (*that*), bears no stress is manifest from the nature of its function. Its relation to the interrogative adverb πῶς is somewhat like that of English declarative *that* (in: I mean ‘that’ man is mortal) to demonstrative *that* (in: I mean *that* man). Hence declarative πῶς bears no stress and had perhaps be better written πῶς if not even πως.

And now let us come to actual illustrations, first from

secular and extra-canonical texts, then from the New Testament compositions.

Pap. Berol. 6884 (= Griechische Urkunden zu Berlin no. 37; dated 51 A.D.) οἶδας πῶς αὐτοῦ (i.e. τοῦ Στοτόητος) ἐκάστης ὥρας χρήζω, "ye know *that* (not 'how') I need him every moment." Epict. Diss. 1, 18, 1 γνώση πῶς ἀπάνθρωπόν ἐστιν ὃ λέγεις καὶ ὅτι ἐκείνῳ ὅμοιον, "that it is cruel and like him." 2, 1, 17 ἰδοὺ πῶς οὐ δάκνει, "ye see *that* he does not bite (surely not 'how he does not bite'!)." So too *ib.* 34 and 35; then 2, 19, 15 δεικνυε πῶς εἴωθας ἐν πλοίῳ χειμάζεσθαι, "show *that* you are accustom-ed." Clem. R. ad Cor. 19, 3 νοήσωμεν πῶς ἀόργητος ὑπάρχει πρὸς πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν αὐτοῦ. 21, 3 ἴδωμεν πῶς ἐγγύς ἐστιν καὶ ὅτι οὐδὲν λέληθεν αὐτόν. 34, 5 κατανοήσωμεν τὸ πᾶν πλήθος τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ πῶς τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ λειτουργοῦσι παρεστῶτες. So too 37, 2; 56, 16. Ignat. ad Smyrn. 6, 2 καταμάθετε τοὺς ἑτεροδοξοῦντας πῶς ἐναντίοι εἰσὶ τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ θεοῦ. Barn. 14, 6 γέγραπται γὰρ πῶς αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ ἐντέλλεται. 16, 1 ἐρῶ ὑμῖν πῶς ἤλπισαν. Acta Xanthip. 59, 11 ὄρας, ἀδελφέ, τὰ ξόανα τῶν δαιμόνων ταραττόμενα, πῶς οὐ φέρουσι τοῦ λόγου τὴν δύναμιν; 80, 34 ἰδὼν πῶς ἡ μέριμνα αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἦν εἰς τοὺς πτωχοῦς. 82, 27 νῦν ἔγνων ἀκριβῶς πῶς φθονεῖ ὁ διάβολος τῇ παρθενίᾳ. 85, 23 ὄρας πῶς διὰ πολλῶν προφάσεων σφίζει ὁ θεός. Acta Pilati ii. 1, 2 γογγύζουσι κατ' αὐτοῦ πῶς τοσαύτης τιμῆς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἠξίωσεν. *ib.* ἰδὼν Ἰούδας πῶς ἤγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐνώπιον Πιλάτου. 16, 3 ὁ οὖν Ἰωσήφ ὡμολόγει ὅτι ἐκήδευσεν καὶ ἔθαψεν αὐτὸν μετὰ τοῦ Νικοδήμου καὶ πῶς ἐστὶν ἀληθὲς ὅτι ἠγέρθη. Narratio Josephi 3, 3 θεωρῶ πῶς ὁ διάβολος χαίρων τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λαμβάνει. Apophthegm. Patrum 249B οὐ βλέπεις τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς πῶς εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι εἰς τὴν σύναξιν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; Doroth. 1629A λέγω πῶς αἱ ἐντολαὶ πᾶσι τοῖς χριστιανοῖς ἐδόθησαν. 1832B λέγω ὑμῖν πῶς ἡ ψυχὴ τριμερὴς ἐστίν. Leont. Neap. Vita Joh. 5, 21 εἰπόντος πρὸς αὐτὸν πῶς Διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ὠφέλησόν με. Io. Moschos 2992C

ἀρέσκει σοι πῶς ἢ ἀδελφὴ αὐτῆ ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος ἀδικεῖται καὶ ἀσχημονεῖ,—and so on down to present speech.

That this declarative or recitative πῶς (= ὅτι) occurs in the New Testament compositions is a fact evidenced by many instances, e.g. Matt. 12, 4 (also Luke 6, 4). Mark 9, 12. 12, 26 and 41. Luke 8, 36. Acts 11, 13. 20, 18. Rev. 3, 3. As a matter of course in all these cases πῶς is mistaken for the familiar adverb πῶς, *how*, either interrogative or exclamatory. But a close inspection of the respective passages, coupled with the occasional alternative reading ὡς (= ὅτι, as: Mark 12, 26. Luke 6, 4), and the parallel usage in secular and extra-canonical texts decide the question beyond doubt. Thus Matt. 12, 14 οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησε Δαβὶδ ὅτε ἐπέινασε καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ; πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν κτλ., “*that* he entered,” not “*how* he entered,” since Jesus refers to the *fact* not to the manner in which David entered and ate the shewbread. So too Luke 6, 4, unless we read with the best MSS. ὡς εἰσῆλθεν, “*that* (not ‘*how*’ or when’) he entered.”

Mark 9, 12 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς: Ἠλίας μὲν ἔλθων πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστᾶ πάντα καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κτλ.¹

“And he said unto them, Indeed when Elijah has first come, he restoreth all things; and *that* it is written of the Son of man,” etc.

Mark 12, 26 περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν ὅτι ἐγείρονται (= περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐγέρσεως τῶν νεκρῶν) οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωσέως ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός, “*that* God spake unto him” (not ‘*how*’).

Mark 12, 41 καὶ καθίσας κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου ἐθεώρει πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον,

¹ Compare John 3, 28 αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς μοι μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον “Ὁσὶ εἰμι ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός,” ἀλλ’ ὅτι “Ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμι ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου.”

“ *that* (*i.e.* the fact that, not the manner in which) people was casting coppers into the treasury.”

Acts 11, 13 ἀπήγγειλε δὲ ἡμῖν πῶς εἶδεν τὸν ἄγγελον, *i.e.* (the fact) “that he had seen the angel” (not how he had seen).

Acts 12, 17 διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πῶς ὁ κύριος αὐτὸν ἐξήγαγεν ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς, “declared unto them *that* the Lord had brought him out of the prison” (not how, *i.e.* not the manner, since this would imply a previous knowledge of the fact).

Acts 20, 18 ἐπίστασθε . . . πῶς μεθ’ ὑμῶν τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἐγενόμην, “ye know *that* (not ‘after what manner’) I spent all that time with you.”

Rev. 3, 3 μνημόνευε πῶς εἴληφας καὶ ἤκουσας, *i.e.* “remember *that* (not ‘how’) thou hast received and heard.”

A. N. JANNARIS.