MISREADINGS AND MISRENDERINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

III.

B. ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION (continued).

In my preceding or second article, 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 ἔνα (also by ὑπως and ὑς), or by ὦτι (also by ὤς, then later on by ὦτι, ὡς ὦτι or ὡσότι, and πώς). The former case, that is the ἔνα-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 ὦτι and ὡς with their later and amplified by-forms ἔσωτι, ὡς ὦτι, and πώς. As already intimated in the said inquiry, this ὦτι-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 ὦτι-analysis the Recitative, or rather Declarative.

The Declarative Infinitive then, which from the outset had a limited usage, began to retreat before its ὦτι-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 ὅ, later on διότι (= ὅ), and still later ὅ; διότι (ὁ σῶτι) and πῶς, all of which were identical in their function and meaning, viz. that (German dass, French que). As regards their history, ὅ has had an unbroken record from Homer down to the present day, ὅ and διότι played a rather limited and varied part, whereas ὅ; διότι (ὁ σῶτι) and πῶς (= ὅ) cropped up as colloquial terms in early Graeco-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 ὅ and ὅ; 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 ἠλέγον ἀγαθὸν αὐτὸν ἐστιν, or by its declarative analysis through ὅ; or ὅ; namely: οὗτοι ἠλέγον ὅ (or ὅ;) ἀγαθὸς ἐστιν or ἐστιν. This construction then gradually made room for the post-classical—especially Graeco-Roman—popular form:

οὗτοι ἠλέγον ἦ (or ὅ, also διότι) ἀγαθὸς ἐστιν or ἐστιν,

then for the form:

οὗτοι ἠλέγον (or ἠλέγαν) ἦ—also ὅ; ἦ or πῶς—ἀγαθὸς ἐστιν or ἐστιν.

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 Graeco-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:

οὐτοὶ ἠλέγον (ὅτι): "Ἄγαθός ἐστιν οὐ έν" (cf. John 7, 12); then: αὐτοὶ ἠλέγον (or -γαν) πῶς: "Αὐτὸς ἀγαθὸς ἐστιν οὐ έν."

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 ὅτι 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 ὅτι (ὅτι) and so mean 'that which'; nay, it may even stand for the interrogative τι, 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 *πρὸς* have led in modern Greek to *εἰς*; *μετά* and *σὺν* to *μετά* (now *μέ*); *ἀπό*, *ἐξ*, *ὑπό* and *παρά*, to *ἀπό*; *ὡς* and *ὅτι* to *ὅτι*; *ὁπώς* 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:

\[ ὡς + ὅτι = ὡς ὅτι \text{ or rather } ὡσότι; \]
\[ ὡς + ἵνα = ὡς ἵνα \text{ ,, } ὡσίνα. \]

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:

\[^{1}\text{See Expositor of April last, p. 300.}\]
**Associated Particles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Classical Antiquity used concurrently</th>
<th>In Greco-Roman Times reduced to</th>
<th>In Modern Greek reduced to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εξ (εκ), ἀρό, ὑπό</td>
<td>ἀπό, εξ</td>
<td>ἀπό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν, εἰς, πρός</td>
<td>εἰς, ἐν</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μετά, σὺν</td>
<td>μετά</td>
<td>(μετά), μέ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰ, εάν, ἄν, ἦν</td>
<td>εἰ, εάν, ἄν</td>
<td>ἄν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔως, ἐς, ἐστε</td>
<td>ἔως, ἔως</td>
<td>ἔ σ, ἐστε (from ἔδ, ἐτέ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅπερ, ὅποι, ὅπου</td>
<td>ὅπου</td>
<td>ὅπου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅτι, ὅς, ἴν</td>
<td>ὅτι (ὁς, πῶς)</td>
<td>(ὅτι), πῶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅς ὅτι</td>
<td>πῶς ὅτι, ὅτι πῶς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔως, ἰνα, ὅπως, inf. part.</td>
<td>ἰνα</td>
<td>νά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔα, ἴνα, ὅπως, inf. part.</td>
<td>ἰνα</td>
<td>νά</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now to return to the declarative particles or conjunctions ὅτι, ὅς, διῶτι, ὅς ὅτι, 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. **ὍΤΙ**: *that* (German dass, French que).

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

2. **ǾΣ** (= ὅτι), *that*.

As already observed, ὅς was an old associate of declarative ὅτι. Though far less common than ὅτι, 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 ὅτι, and eventually—towards the close of the Graeco-Roman period—disappeared.

1 This form ὅς (misaccented ὅι), from and for ἔως, occurs already in the New Testament, as: John (9, 4); 12, 35 ὅς (not ὅι) τὸ φῶς ἐχεῖτε, as long as (or while) ye have the light. Gal. 6, 10 ὅς καὶ δὴ ἔχομεν, while we have time. So too Ignat. ad Smyr. 9, 1 ὅι (ubi male ὅς) ὅτι καὶ δὴ 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 ἔθεασαντο 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 μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἐτι ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ ὧν 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 ἔξηγοῦντο 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 ἀθέμιτον 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 γὰρ μοῦ ὁ θεὸς . . . ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνεῖαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι, i.e. “for God is my witness . . . that I constantly remember you in my prayers.”

3. ΔΙΟΤΙ (=declarative ὅτι): that.

This particle, which represents an amplified by-form of ὅτι, 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 ὅτι): that.

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

¹ Readers interested in this particle and its associates are referred to my Hist. Greek Grammar, §§ 1753 ff., then Appendix vi. 12 f.; for ὡς §§ 1751 ff., 2086, then Appendix vi. 7, 12.
should be written ωσότι, seeing that it is never disjoined into ως and δτι by the insertion of some other word between the two component parts, but always forms a single word, like δι-δτι, καθ-δτι, ἐπει-δή, οὐκ-ἐτι, οὒ-πω, μέν-τοι, εἰ-τε, καὶ-περ, εὖ-γε, ὁς-περ, οὐκ-οὖν, ὄτ-αν, ἐπειδ-άν, etc. Be it as it may, ωσότι made its appearance in the compositions of early Graeco-Roman ages, and had a fairly wide run down to Byzantine times. Like declarative δτι, 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 ωσότι (ος δτι) has the meaning of German als ob (as though) and that it forms an ellipsis in which ως represents a whole subjective clause suppressed before the objective δτι-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 ωσότι (that) Θράκες ποτέ, κτλ. Dion. Hal. Ant. 9, 14 ἔπνυνος ωσότι (that) ἐν ἐσχάτοις εἰσίν οἱ κατακλεισθέντες ἐν τοῖς λόφοις. Strabo 15, 57 τὸ ὑπὸ Τιμαγένους λεχθὲν, ωσότι (namely that) χαλκὸς υποτ. Jos. Apion. 1, 11 (1, 5 Νiese) ἰκανὸς δὲ φανερόν, ως οἵμα, πεποιηκός ωσότι πάτριός ἐστιν ἡ περί τῶν παλαιῶν ἄναγραφή τοῖς βαρβάροις μᾶλλον ἡ τοῖς Ἐλλησσίων, βούλομαι μικρὰ πρότερον διαλεχθῆναι. Anth. Pal. 9, 531 'Ὁ οὖκ ἐθέλουσα Τύχη σε προῆγγεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα δείξῃ ωσότι (that)

\(^1\) The passage LXX. Esth. 4, 14 ως δτι εἶν παρακώσις, will be considered in my 4th article.

\(^2\) Such instances as Xen. Hall. 3, 2, 14 εἰπὼν τῷ Φάρακι ωσότι ὅκροι, and Isocr. Bousiris 520 κατηγόρῳ αὐτοῦ ωσότι καὶ διὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφερεῖ, are apparently chargeable to their Byzantine copiers.
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.


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 ἦμιν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς, ὡςτι Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ. Here ὡςτι 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 εἰ τις ὑμᾶς καταδουλοῖ, εἰ τις κατεσθεῖε, εἰ τις λαμβάνει, εἰ τις ἐπαίρεται [ἐπαρᾶται?], εἰ τις εἰς πρόσωπον ὑμᾶς δέρει

¹ For more particulars see my Hist. Greek Grammar §§ 1753 ff.
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κατὰ ἀτυμίαν. λέγω ὡσῶτι ἡμεῖς ἡσθενήκαμεν,—not only ὡσῶτι, but other parts of the passage are misunderstood. I mean that the adverbial expression κατὰ ἀτυμίαν does not refer to Paul, but to the Jews (τις); hence it belongs not to λέγω, but to the preceding ἐδει. 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. ὡσῶτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, the current rendering of ὡσῶτι by "as that," if this means anything (= as though?), should make room for "namely that the day of the Lord is present."

5. ΠΟΣ (= 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 πῶς.

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.) οίδας τῶς αὐτοῦ (i.e. τοῦ Στοτότης) ἐκώστης ὥρας χρηζω, “ye know that (not ‘how’) I need him every moment.” Epict. Diss. 1, 18, 1 γνῶσῃ πῶς ἀπάνθρωπον ἐστὶν ὁ λέγεις καὶ ὃτι ἐκεῖνῳ ὁμοιον, “that it is cruel and like him.” 2, 1, 17 ἵδιον πῶς οὔ δὰκνει, “ye see that he does not bite (surely not ‘how he does not bite’!).” So too ib. 34 and 35; then 2, 19, 15 δείκνυε πῶς εἴωθας ἐν πλοίῳ χειμάξεσθαι, “show that you are accustomed.” Clem. R. ad Cor. 19, 3 νοήσωμεν πῶς ἀόργητος ὑπάρχει πρὸς πάσαν τὴν κτίσιν αὐτοῦ. 21, 3 ἵδωμεν πῶς ἐγγὺς ἐστιν καὶ ὃτι οὔδεν λέληθεν αὐτοῦ. 34, 5 κατανόησωμεν τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ πῶς τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ λειτουργοῦσι παρεστῶτες. So too 37, 2; 56, 16. Ignat. ad Smyrn. 6, 2 καταμάθετε τοὺς ἐτεροδοξοῦντας πῶς ἑναντίοι εἰσὶ τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ θεοῦ. Barn. 14, 6 γέγραπται γὰρ πῶς αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ ἐντέλλεται. 16, 1 ἐρῶ ὕμιν πῶς ἠλπίσαν. Acta Xanthip. 59, 11 ὅρας, ἀδελφέ, τὰ ξοάνα τῶν δαιμόνων ταραττόμενα, πῶς οὐ φέρουσι τοῦ λόγου τὴν δύναμιν; 80, 34 ἵδων πῶς ἡ μέριμνα αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἦν εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς. 82, 27 νῦν ἔγνων ἀκριβῶς πῶς φθονεῖ ὁ διάβολος τῇ παρθενίᾳ. 85, 23 ὅρας πῶς διὰ πολλῶν προφάσεων σφεξε ὁ θεός. Acta Pilati ii. 1, 2 γογγύζουσι κατ' αὐτοῦ πῶς τοσαύτης τιμῆς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἡξίωσεν. ib. ἵδων Ἰουδᾶς πῶς ἤγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐνώπιον Πιλάτου. 16, 3 ὁ οὖν Ἰωάννης ὡμολογεῖ ὅτι ἐκκήδευε καὶ ἐθαψεν αὐτὸν μετὰ τοῦ Νικοδήμου καὶ πῶς ἐστὶν ἀλήθες ὃτι ἡγέρθη. Narratio Josephi 3, 3 θεωρῶ πῶς ὁ διάβολος χαίρων τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λαμβάνει. Apophthegm. Patrum 249b οὐ βλέπεις τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς πῶς εἰσιν ὡς ἀγγελοὶ εἰς τὴν σύναξιν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; Doroth. 1629a λέγω πῶς αἱ ἐντολαὶ πᾶσι τοὺς χριστιανοὺς ἐδόθησαν. 1832b λέγω ὡμίν πῶς ἡ ψυχὴ τριμερῆς ἐστιν. Leont. Neap. Vita Joh. 5, 21 εἰπόντος πρὸς αὐτῶν πῶς· Διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ὅφελησόν με. Io. Moschos 2992c
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That this declarative or recitative πῶς (=δι) 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 (=δι, 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 ἀνέγνωσε τί ἐποίησε Δαβίδ ὅτε ἐπέλατο καὶ οἱ μὲν 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 ἐφή αὐτοῖς: Ἡλίας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστᾶ πάντα καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν νῦν 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 ἐγείρεσις τῶν νεκρῶν) οὐκ ἀνέγνωσε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωσέως ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ θεός, “that God spake unto him” (not ‘how’).

Mark 12, 41 καὶ καθίσας κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλάκιον ἐθεώρη τῶς ὁ άχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον,

1 Compare John 3, 28 αὐτοὶ ἰμεῖς μοι μαρτυρεῖτε δι’ εἰπον ὁ Χριστὸς,” ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ “Ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἐμπροσθέν 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 ἐπιστάσθη . . . 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 ήκονσας, i.e. "remember that (not 'how') thou hast received and heard."
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