

# *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/robbadshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

# JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

VOLUME XLIV

1925

## PARTS III AND IV

THE TENTH CHAPTER OF GENESIS . . . . .	A. H. SAYCE	193
SOME NOTES ON ZECHARIAH 11:4-17 . . . . .	S. FEIGIN	203
LEXICAL NOTES ON LUKE-ACTS. I . . . . .	H. J. CADBURY	214
THE LUCAN ACCOUNT OF THE LAST SUPPER . . .	G. G. MONKS	228
ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT . . .	J. V. MADISON	261
THE HEXAPLARIC STRATA IN THE GREEK TEXTS OF DANIEL . . . . .	J. A. MONTGOMERY	289
COLLATION OF HOLMES-PARSONS 23(VENETUS)-62-147 IN DANIEL FROM PHOTOGRAPHIC COPIES . . . . .	C. D. BENJAMIN	303
THE "POLYGLOT" ARABIC TEXT OF DANIEL AND ITS AFFINITIES . . . . .	H. S. GEHMAN	327
ON THE NAME YAHWEH . . . . .	F. C. BURKITT	358
BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS		
A. Philological Note On Mark 16:8 . . . . .	C. H. KRAELING	357
The Reverend Professor John Skinner, D. D. . . . .		358
BOOKS RECEIVED . . . . .		359
PROCEEDINGS, DECEMBER 1924 . . . . .		i
LIST OF MEMBERS . . . . .		vii
LIST OF SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES AND EXCHANGES . . . . .		xviii
CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS . . . . .		xxii

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL  
LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

Drawer 8, Yale Station

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

\$5.00 A YEAR

SINGLE NUMBERS, \$1.25

## LEXICAL NOTES ON LUKE-ACTS. I.

HENRY J. CADBURY  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THERE can be no doubt that the present time is an auspicious one in the history of New Testament lexicography. Five Greek dictionaries of importance are in process of publication. There is Walter Bauer's greatly enriched edition of † Preuschen's *Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des N.T.* (Giessen, 1925—), which in its explicit references both to ancient parallels and to modern commentators will apparently surpass any New Testament lexicon. There are two general unabridged dictionaries of the Greek language,—W. Crönert's revision of Passow (Göttingen, 1912—) and H. Stuart Jones' revision of Liddell and Scott (Oxford, 1925—). All these three have at the moment not progressed beyond the letter *α*. They take account of the Greek papyri, but not so fully as two special works, one a general dictionary to the Greek Papyri by † Fr. Preisigke (Heidelberg and Berlin, 1924—); and the other a special study of the *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Nonliterary Sources* by † J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, London and New York (1914—). At the present writing (June, 1925) these two works have been published as far down the alphabet as *έχω* and *όψινος* respectively.

These works, together with others in preparation, should stimulate an interest in lexical research, but it may not be out of place to offer from time to time detached and unsystematic notes parallel to those larger collections. Certain New Testament words deserve more special study. Furthermore, there

are ways in which the *ἰδιώτης* can somewhat supplement the regular lexicographer. In the first place, the papyri already published deserve repeated search and new papyri are constantly becoming available. What gleanings have been missed we have had lately indicated in the case of the word *ἐπιούσιος*. This word, appearing as it does in no less important and familiar a passage than the Lord's Prayer (both Matthew and Luke), uncertain in meaning, and absolutely unknown in any Greek passage of non-Christian origin, is a word whose discovery in any secular writing would naturally excite the interest of all scholars. A papyrus containing the word was published in 1889, but it apparently was not included in any dictionary or brought to the attention of New Testament scholars until just recently<sup>1</sup>—thirty-five years later!

In the second place, light on New Testament semantics is afforded by thorough study of the Hellenistic writers. Some of these have recently become more accessible, and those that have always been known yield something to the diligent student. The new Wettstein that is projected will doubtless recover and arrange much valuable information of this sort, but no generation can quite exhaust the possibilities, and our generation has much to do if our sympathy with the nuances of contemporary Greek is to match even that of the Eighteenth Century scholarship which produced the *Observationes* literature. In this field, also, any independent worker may perchance find gleanings which the reapers have left.

In the third place, the New Testament text itself offers suggestions of new insight into its meaning to one who acquaints

<sup>1</sup> See A. Debrunner in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, March 7, 1925, col. 119, citing Preisigke *Wörterbuch*, Fasc. 2, 1924, col. 567. The papyrus was originally published by Sayce in Flinders Petrie *Hawara, Biahmu, and Arsinoe* (London, 1889), p. 34, as No. 245, and was republished by Preisigke in his *Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten I* (Strassburg, 1915), as No. 5224. Unfortunately the passage—an entry in a memorandum of expenses of a half obol paid for *ἐπιούσια*—gives little clue to its meaning. Moulton and Milligan evidently examined for New Testament parallels, without noticing this, the collection in which the papyrus was originally published. I must confess to having overlooked the word in the same way.

himself with the whole spirit and character, interests and modes of expression, of the several authors. There are certain habits of language which both in individuals and in human speech generally are easily overlooked until attention is drawn to them, as, for example, the fading of the etymological meaning, to mention but one of them.

In the fourth place, detached notes afford opportunity for fuller discussion of the connotation, literary quality and usage of the word than is possible in the restricted space of even the most elaborate lexicon or is appropriate in the continuous exposition of a commentary. Such selected word studies give the author the comfort of ample space for more or less relevant observations on usage and in some cases, as for example in F. Field's *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, can make a permanent contribution to the work of both lexicographer and commentator.

The following notes are intended to suggest rather than to supply the lexical supplementation that is possible along such lines. I confine myself to a single writer of the New Testament and begin with that part of the alphabet which the most advanced of the newer lexica has just reached.

### δυνθυμαδόν.

There has been considerable debate whether this word still means "with one accord" in Acts, or simply "together." E. Hatch in his *Essays in Biblical Greek*, 1889, pp. 63 f. makes it plain that in the Septuagint "a) it is used to translate Hebrew words which mean simply 'together,' b) it is interchanged with other Greek words or phrases which mean simply 'together,' c) it occurs in contexts in which the strict etymological meaning is impossible," and he declares that in none of the N.T. passages is there any reason for assuming that the word has any other meaning than that which it has in the Greek versions of the O.T., viz., 'together.' In reply T. K. Abbott in his *Essays*, p. 96, and Moulton and Milligan *s. v.* in *Lexical Notes from the Papyri* and in their *Vocabulary* attempt to place the burden of proof on those who deny the etymological force of the word. It is doubtful, however, whether it is fair

to give either the Septuagint or etymology any strong advantage in the discovery of Luke's meaning. The alternatives are not quite so extreme.

The ten passages in Acts are not decisive from their context. None of them has an impersonal subject, yet there is none of them that demands the stronger meaning of 'with one mind,' or 'with one purpose.' There is rather association of place, time and action. The word represents what is done 'simultaneously' or 'alike,' or the being (5 12 *ἥσταν*; 15 25 *γενομένους*) or moving (12 20 *παρῆσταν*) of persons 'together.' It could scarcely be used of unanimity of persons separated in time or place. In 2 46 (*cf.* 5 42) being together in the temple (*όμοιθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*) may be contrasted with distribution to their homes (*κατ' οἶκον*). Probably no one English word or phrase expresses its exact meaning. It strengthens other words in its context. Hence it is found associated with *πάντες* in Acts (1 14; 2 46) as in other writers, but never with such phrases as *ὑπὸ μιᾶν φωνήν* (Aristeas 178), *ἐκ μιᾶς γνωμῆς* (Demos. 147 1), *ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι* (Romans 15 6). In Luke's own vocabulary it appears to have what is almost if not quite a synonym in *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* (Acts 2 1 with *όμοῦ*, T. R. *όμοιθυμαδόν*; 2 44 &c.), rather than in *ἀπὸ μιᾶς* (Luke 14 18) or the more definite *ἢν καρδίᾳ καὶ ψυχὴν μία* (Acts 4 32). It is doubtful, moreover, whether in the more classical writers the etymological emphasis on internal feeling had not given place at least in Hellenistic times to external action. Translators are often misled by etymology in languages in which they are not perfectly at home. Thus the Vulgate translates (except 15 25 *in unum*) by *unanimiter* or *uno animo*, but we may prefer to follow the old bilingual lexicon which reads: *όμοιθυμαδὸν universi, una pariter, gregatim, simul.* The LXX certainly had no reason to use it for **רַבָּי** or **רַבָּתִי** unless it meant in the *kōnī* 'together.' These Hebrew words are elsewhere in the LXX rendered by *אָmu* or *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.*

Convincing evidence that in Acts or elsewhere the word had lost its psychological reference is naturally difficult to secure since, as has been said, the etymological force is never absolutely impossible. References to riots, however, in Acts 7 57; 18 12; 19 29 do not imply regulated purpose. A passage

in the papyri mentioned by Moulton and Milligan without full citation appears on examination (the reading is not absolutely certain) to bear unmistakable evidence of the absence in ὁμοθυμαδόν of consent or accord. In P Par 63, 93 (B. C. 164) (= P Petr. III p. 26) complaint is made that a group of people not liable for taxes had been dunnged for them, "as though the tax determined by decree had been assessed on all the persons in the country without exception" (*ὡς τοῦ διὰ τοῦ προστάγματος ωρισμένου κεφαλαίου πᾶσι τοῖς κατὴν (sic) χώραν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπιγεγραμμένον*). Here the subject of the sentence is quite impersonal. Further, it is a subject on which Egyptians acted by necessity rather than with one accord—the payment of taxes! The passage calls for a translation such as "alike."

No doubt the author of Acts believed there was harmony in the early church, but his use of ὁμοθυμαδόν is not the best evidence of it.<sup>2</sup>

### ὅπτανομαι.

Moulton and Milligan show that this word (Acts 1 3) can no longer be called Biblical, and they refer to Knowling as indicating that the word is not limited to unreal visions as distinguished from actual sight. That it can be used of super-human appearances is not merely suggested by Luke's own noun ὅπτασία in Luke 24 23 (*ἀγγέλων*), Acts 26 19 (*οὐράνιος*), but is proved by its use in Tobit 12 19 of Raphael πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ὥπτανόμην ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγον οὐδὲ ἔπιον, ἀλλὰ ὅρασιν ὑμεῖς ἔθεωρεῖτε, and in the magical P Par 574, 3033 ὄρκίζω σε τὸν ὅπτανθέντα τῷ Οσραὴλ ἐν στύλῳ φωτινῷ καὶ νεφέλῃ ἡμερίῃ. Its use in 3 Kingdoms 8 8, "the ends of the staves of the ark were seen in the holy place, but they were not seen outside

<sup>2</sup> The impressive 'with one accord in one place' of the King James version in Acts 2 1 had already disappeared since the revisers followed the better MSS in reading ὁμοῦ for ὁμοθυμαδὸν with ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ. We may perhaps set it down as a rule of Hellenistic Greek that short words tend to give up their meaning to longer words which look or sound something like them but originally had quite a different meaning. Beside ὁμοθυμαδόν for ὁμοῦ we seem to have in the NT. πληροφορέω for πληρῶω, ἔριθετα for ἔρις, &c.

the tabernacle" (*οὐκ ὤπτάνοντο ἔξω*), and in the papyri of the non-appearance of a boy (P Par 49, 33) or other persons (or things?) (P Tebt I 24, 5) that were "wanted," suggest that its distinctive meaning is 'to be visible.'<sup>3</sup> Acts 13, then, means not merely that Jesus was seen but that he was to be seen. Its opposite is the equally idiomatic *ἀφαντος ἐγένετο* of Luke 24.31: "he was not to be seen." Secular writers also use the latter of persons who disappear in a sudden manner. The parallel to Acts 13 in Acts 10.40 is instructive, *ἐμφανῆς γενέσθαι*. It is a good synonym of *όπτάνομαι* also in all its other known occurrences. The English 'being visible' may sound strange in Acts 13, but is probably a better translation than 'appearing,' which suggests distinct occasions and appearances at the initiative of Jesus. That there were repeated occasions is not impossible and was maintained by Chrysostom. The author of Acts may have thought of Jesus as becoming visible from time to time during the forty days. But if we could leave out of our minds the gospels and 1 Corinthians, Acts would most naturally be understood as implying continuous visibility for forty days concluded by a definite ascension, and of course followed by later visions of Jesus to Stephen, Paul, &c. Neither the word itself nor the context of Acts 13 seems to me to indicate what degree of reality there was in the appearances, or, to use Luke's own expression (Luke 24.37 ff.), to show whether or not they "saw a spirit."

### *ὅροθεσία.*

Acts 17 is a chapter containing several words formerly supposed to be unknown to secular or earlier writers but now found in papyri and inscriptions. *ὅροθεσία* is one of these (*cf.* *ἀναστατώω*, *καταγγελένς*, *πολιτάρχης*). From each group of non-literary sources it has been attested as belonging to the common vocabulary. It occurs not only in the inscription from Priene mentioned by Moulton and Milligan but also unmistak-

<sup>3</sup> Krenkel, *Josephus und Lucas*, p. 147 is apparently in error in attributing the verb to Josephus. It occurs in Hermes Trismegistus 31, 15 Parthaea, and is a fairly well attested variant in Numbers 14.14.

ably in B G U III 889, 17 (151 A. D.). The context of this passage is, unfortunately, missing. In the Priene inscription, which is of earlier date, the word in its two occurrences (Hiller von Gaertringen, *Inschriften von Priene*, 42 lines 8 and 12) evidently means the fixing of a boundaryline (*cf.* ὁροθετεῖν in LXX). The nearest parallel previously known was a different word τὸ ὁροθέσιον and was found in Hesychius. There is now no longer any reason for Blass's conjectured reading τὰ ὁροθέσια here. But nothing prevents our finding the same feminine word as in Acts, the inscription and the papyrus in Galen *Definitiones medicae* II (XIX, 349 Kühn), ὁρισμὸς δὲ λέγεται ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ἐν τοῖς χωρίοις ὁροθεσιῶν, though the editors accent ὁροθεσίων. Did the sharp eyes of Hobart overlook this evidence of 'medical language'?

The new evidence, unfortunately, throws little light on the meaning of the Acts passage. The latter is well discussed in Wendt (Meyer<sup>6</sup>), *ad loc.*, and I should be inclined to agree that ὁρίσας προστεταγμένους καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν is, like 14.17, an appeal to the evidence of God in the experience of man. I have, however, the suspicion that, instead of the first part being temporal and the second geographical (*cf.* LXX Deut. 32.8 ὁρία), as is usually supposed, ὁροθεσία κατοικίας may be temporal also, applying to the "fixation of the term of residence" of each nation (*πᾶν ἔθνος*). The following considerations may be urged:

1. There is the wellknown tendency of Semitic thought, in contrast with Greek, to use categories of time rather than those of space (*cf.* Dobschütz, *Zeit und Raum in Denken des Urchristentums* in *JBL* XLI [1922], 212 ff.).

2. Luke deals with history and revelation in terms of periods fulfilled or junctures arrived at. This appears throughout,—in his treatment of Hebrew history in the speeches of Acts (*e. g.*, 7), in his outlook on the future (*e. g.*, Luke 21.24 ἄχρι πληρώθωσι καιροὶ ἔθνῶν), and elsewhere. A few verses later in Acts 17 there is reference to χρόνοι τῆς ἀγνοίας and to the fixing of a day for the judgment.

3. It is a distinct habit in Luke to join with *καὶ* two synonymous or similar terms. In this passage we have ζωὴν καὶ πνοήν, τέχνης

καὶ ἐνθυμήσεως. With *προστεταγμένους καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ὄροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν understood as two expressions of time compare Acts 1 3 χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἔξονσίᾳ (cf. 3 19–21). Even in the phrase of Acts 14 17 ὑετοὺς καὶ καιροὺς καρποφόρους the first word is probably to be understood not as rains in the modern sense but as rainy seasons correlative to harvest seasons.*

### ὅρος, δρ(ε)ινή.

Western readers of the Bible are not accustomed to consider mountain and desert as synonyms. We think, for example, of Egyptian deserts as sand without mountains and Palestinian wildernesses as mountains without sand. The papyri (see Moulton and Milligan, *s. v.*) give interesting evidence that in Egypt ὅρος and ὄρεινός referred to the desert (*ἔρημος*). The latter occurs regularly without its noun and usually in the spelling ἡ ὄρωνή (*sc. διῶρυξ*) of the desert canal.

This fact throws some light on the occasional equation in the gospels of ὅρος and ἔρημος (cf. my *Style and Literary Method of Luke*, p. 118, note 1). Thus Mark 6 31 places the feeding of the five thousand in a desert place, John 6 3 in the mountain. Luke especially seems to equate desert with mountain. When Mark 5 5 refers to the demoniac as living in the tombs and in the mountains, Luke 8 27, 29 says he was in the tombs and was driven by the spirit into the deserts. Matthew and Luke, following Mark (or Q), both place Jesus' temptations in the desert, but Matthew 4 5 locates one of them on an exceedingly high mountain while Luke 4 5, by omitting all reference to place and changing the order, gives the impression that it was still in the desert. In the parable of the lost sheep Matthew 18 12 says ἀφεῖς (*v. l.*) τὰ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρη πορευθεὶς, Luke 15 1 καταλείπει τὰ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα ἐν τῇ ἔρημῳ καὶ πορεύεται. This difference in the place is sometimes regarded as one of the principal variants in these parallels, but evidently we have here as elsewhere in Q the use of nearly synonymous terms. They are scarcely evidence of the use of different sources as Streeter, for example, thinks.

Nor within Luke's writings are we to draw much distinction

between them. For example, there are Jesus' prayers. In the sequel to the feeding of five thousand "in the desert" (so all the evangelists) Mark (6 45) adds ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὅρος προσένξασθαι. Luke (9 18), as at the temptation, gives no change of scene but continues καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας. In Luke 5 16 following Mark 1 35 there is reference to Jesus praying ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις. But at 6 12 and 9 28 Luke gives Jesus as praying in τὸ ὅρος where Mark's ὅρος is without mention of prayer. On the night of the betrayal all three evangelists represent Jesus as going (Luke 22 39 adds "according to his custom") to the mount of Olives and praying.

So, too, with the early career of John. Luke 1 65 uses of his birthplace ἡ ὄρεινὴ τῆς Ἰουδαίας (*cf.* 1 39); he says in 1 80 John was ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις until the day of his manifestation to Israel; in 3 2 he says the word of God came to John ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Probably in these several passages he intends no difference of locality.

I may conclude this note with a suggestion about the familiar crux in the parallel passages called, respectively, Matthew's 'Sermon on the Mount' and Luke's 'Sermon on the Plain.' Unless one of the evangelists is following an indication of locality found in the common source (Q), I think we must explain the place references as due to the different passage or combination of passages in Mark to which each of the later evangelists attached the insertion. In Mark 3 7–19 Jesus first withdraws to the sea and heals a multitude, then goes up into the mountain and chooses the twelve; Luke 6 12–19 reverses these events, substituting for "the sea" (which he avoids) the level place, so that the "sermon" which follows without new allusion to place appears to have the latter location. Matthew, on the other hand, does not follow Mark's outline so faithfully and combines and repeats Mark's general references to Jesus' work and its locations; but I think his introduction to the sermon on the mount, 5 1, "And seeing the multitude he went up into the mountain, and when he was seated his disciples came to him" may be derived from the references to Jesus in the desert place(s) in Mark 1 35 and 45, especially the former where Jesus, avoiding the multitude which seek him (*cf.* Luke 4 42),

goes out into the desert place and is overtaken by Simon and those with him. It will be recalled that other sections of Mark 1 are used in the context by Matthew, Mark 1 16-20 and 1 39 before the Sermon on the Mount, and Mark 1 21 b-22 and 1 40-44 immediately after it. This would constitute another synoptic parallel between desert and mountain. Of course the mountain of Matt. 5 1 may be that evangelist's own addition to Mark, as it seems to be in the similar addition to Mark 7 31 in 15 29 *καὶ ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ*. For a different explanation of the pair of parallels last mentioned, together with Matt. 5 1 and John 6 3, see Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 1924, pp. 412-414.

### οὕτως.

In Blass-Debrunner § 425, 6 we read: "Die klass. Freiheit, οὕτως zur Zusammenfassung des Inhalts einer vorangegangenen Partizipialkonstruktion zu verwenden, findet sich im NT nur in den Acta." The passages are Acts 20 11 ἀναβὰς δὲ καὶ κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον καὶ γευσάμενος, ἐφ' ἵκανόν τε ὁμιλήσας ἄχρις αὐγῆς, οὕτως ἔξηλθεν; Acts 27 17 φοβούμενοί τε μὴ εἰς τὴν Σύρτιν ἐκπέσωσι, χαλάσαντες τὸ σκεῦος, οὕτως ἐφέροντο. Similarly, though not following a participle, we find in Acts 17 33 οὕτως ὁ Παῦλος ἔξηλθεν ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν.

We may accept the view that this use is limited in the N.T. to Acts (see, however, John 4 6; Rev. 3 5), but its occurrence in the papyri shows that it is no mark of classical culture. In the absence of illustrations in Moulton and Milligan I may add a few. P Lond I. 106, 19 (iii/B. C.), in a complaint of assault ἐμοῦ δὲ οὐκ ἐκχωροῦντος ἀλλ' ἐπιμαρτυρομένου τοὺς παρόντας καὶ συνδραμόντων πλειόνων καὶ ἐπιτιμώντων αὐτῷ οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη; P Grenf II. 77, 9 (about 300 A. D.) ἀλόγως ἀπέστητε μὴ ἄραντες τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ὑμῶν ἀλλὰ συνλέξαντες ὅσα εἶχεν καὶ οὕτως ἀπέστητε; P Strass II 100, 14 (ii/B. C.) κάμοῦ τὸν ψόφον ἀκούσαντος καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκάλουν βοηθοὺς οὕτως εἰς φυγὴν ὥρμησαν (the sentence is scarcely classical!).

### πάντως.

πάντως occurs three times<sup>4</sup> in Luke-Acts:

<sup>4</sup> The T. R. reads with D, &c., in Acts 18 21 δει με πάντως τὴν ἐօρτην

Luke 4 23 πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, οἱτρέ θεράπευσον σεαυτόν.

Acts 21 22 τί οὖν ἔστι; πάντως [δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν] ἀκούσονται [γὰρ] ὅτι ἐλήλυθας.

Acts 28 4 πάντως φονεύς ἔστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ὃν διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ δίκη ζῆν οὐκ εἴασεν.

In all these instances the adverb occurs at the beginning of a sentence and therefore applies to the whole statement rather than to a single word. It is used in dialogue, not in narrative, and of matters which were not of the nature of facts already known. The word is normally translated "certainly" or "assuredly,"<sup>5</sup> and such a meaning is possible, but it has seemed to me from the context of the passages that a weaker word is more natural. They demand no strong asseveration. The inference or expectation is expressed and is accepted by the speaker as true, as in each case the sequel shows, but to translate the adverb 'probably' or even 'possibly' would suit the context as well if not better.

I must at once admit that I have no 'authority' for this lexical conjecture. I can adduce no unmistakable instance of πάντως = 'perhaps.' I may however give some circumstantial evidence.

Such a change of meaning is in accord with the general laws of language. Like other currencies, words have a tendency to depreciation. Words meaning 'immediately' come to mean 'soon,' words meaning 'excessively' come to mean 'somewhat.' It would be natural for 'certainly' to become 'probably' or

τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, but A B omit. In this passage as in the longer form of Acts 21 22 the πάντως with δεῖ has presumably its regular meaning of "by all means."

<sup>5</sup> There is an adversative element often in such normal usage, though the dictionaries and commentaries do not always note it. Not "by all means" but "at any rate" is the English equivalent (German *jedenfalls*, French *en tout cas*). Even the less normal meaning proposed herewith does not exclude the retention of that idea. Thus in Luke 4 23 the concessive clause is represented by the favorable reception and wonder which his hearers first gave Jesus; in Acts 28 4 it is though Paul had been saved from the sea. In Diodorus Siculus I. 77, 3 it seems to strengthen γε.

even ‘possibly.’ In French philology such *kenosis* is common; *absolument* is said to have a much weaker colloquial sense. In English ‘quite’ does not always mean ‘entirely,’ and ‘doubtless’ has a sense of ‘peradventure’ even when used not in sarcasm. These word-biographies are fairly near the proposed degeneration of meaning in *πάντως*. Perhaps similar slipping down the scale from superlatives is seen in ‘generally’ and ‘on the whole,’ which do not mean ‘universally,’ and in the curious ‘almost.’ See M. Bréal, *Essai de Sémantique*, pp. 256—8 [Eng. trans. 230—2].

Paul is the other New Testament writer to use the word. In Romans 3 9 v. l. he has the dialogue negative *οὐ πάντως* (*cf.* 1 Cor. 5 4); but in 1 Corinthians a less positive meaning is appropriate:

9 9f. *μὴ τῶν βωῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ ἢ δὶ' ἡμᾶς πάντως λέγει;* *δὲ' ἡμᾶς γάρ ἐγράφη κτλ.*

9 22 *τοῖς πᾶσι γέγονα πάντα, ἵνα πάντως τινὰς σώσω.*

16 12 *καὶ πάντως οὐκ ἦν θέλημα ἵνα νῦν ἔλθῃ, ἐλεύσεται δὲ ὅταν εὐκαιρήσῃ.*

Without a fresh rehearsal of some ancient difficulties involved in these passages the reader will see that a milder word than ‘certainly’ is quite appropriate in them, even if it is not necessary or even preferable. In 9 10 Paul is asking whether perhaps scripture was written for our sakes; in 9 22 had it not been for his word play on forms of *πᾶς*, *πώς* would have been as suitable as *πάντως*. In 16 12 if *θέλημα* means the divine will, and even if it means Apollos’ will, there was little reason for Paul to assert emphatically that Apollos’ coming now was ‘in every way’ or ‘assuredly’ not in accordance with the wish of God (or of Apollos). He may be saying resignedly or politely, “Perhaps it was not God’s will for him to come now, but he will come when he has a good opportunity.”

That *πάντως* does not imply always strong certainty is shown by the fact that Justin Martyr uses it in sentences following the verbs *ὑπονοέω* and *ὑπολαμβάνω* (*Dialogue* 103, 3; 140, 2) and in the expression of his wish (*ibid.* 142, 3). The New Testament versions, Latin and Syriac, show a remarkable willingness to omit the word entirely, *e. g.*, the Vulgate in

Acts 18 21; 1 Cor. 9 22: the Peshitta in every Pauline passage except one (see below). If the word was colorless enough to omit, it must not have seemed so emphatic to ancient translators as to modern ones.<sup>6</sup>

In the two Lucan passages where the weaker sense seemed to me most likely (Luke 4 23; Acts 28 4) I found quite unexpectedly that the Peshitta gave me full support. In both cases it renders initial πάντως by initial unction, which can only mean under the circumstances 'perhaps.' In Luke 4 23 we have the additional support of the Old Syriac for the same rendering. The same Syriac rendering of πάντως occurs in 1 Cor. 16 12. There the Sahidic and Ethiopic agree.

For parallels to the dialogue style of the New Testament one naturally looks to the *Shepherd of Hermas* rather than to the more cultivated *Dialogue with Trypho*.<sup>7</sup> Of instances of πάντως there, three seem on first sight to admit the rendering 'probably,' 'possibly,' quite as well as the usual one, *viz.*, Mand. 9, 7; Sim. 7, 4; 9, 4, 4.<sup>8</sup> Here again early translators concur in this equivalence. There are two Latin versions of Hermas and both in all three cases render the word as 'perhaps' (usually *forsitan*). In Sim. 7, 4 Dibelius (*Der Hirt des Hermas*, Tübingen, 1923) translates "vielleicht(?)" and gives this note:

"so ist nach lt<sup>1</sup> *forsitan*, lt<sup>2</sup> *fortasse* wohl zu deuten; statt πάντως unction ist dann ποτε (kaum mit Hollenberg unction)

<sup>6</sup> E. g., Plummer (*I. C. C.* on Luke 4 23): "πάντως is used in strong affirmations." G. G. Findlay (*E. G. T.* on 1 Cor. 9 22) says more wisely that it "varies in sense according to its position and context."

<sup>7</sup> A probable illustration in dialogue of the weakened πάντως is PSI 281, 47 (ii/A. D.) εἰχέ τι πάντως ἡ Φιλομένη πρός σε δίκαιων. διὰ τοῦτο ζώσαν αὐτὴν οὐκ ἀπέγνωσα.

<sup>8</sup> The reading of the last passage is not quite certain, as it is not included in the extant parts of either the Codex Sinaiticus or the Michigan Codex (see *Harvard Theological Review* xviii [1925], p. 115), while the reading of the Athos MS is very obscure (see note in Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, *ad loc.*, and also his *Facsimiles of the Athos Fragments of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 1907); but the Latin translation seems to me to confirm the older reading πάντως rather than Lake's πάντας(?).

zu konjizieren: die Lesart  $\pi\acute{a}v\tau\omega\varsigma$  erklärt sich aus dem Einfluss des folgenden  $\sigma$  sowie desselben Wortes im nächsten Satz."

Such heroic measures with the Greek text are entirely unnecessary if we may add to our lexicon *s. v.*  $\pi\acute{a}v\tau\omega\varsigma$  an entry like this:

In colloquial and Hellenistic usage, according to a common weakening of language, *perhaps, probably*, Luke 4 23; in tentative explanation of divine purpose Acts 28 4; 1 Cor. 16 12(?); Hermas, Mand. 9, 7; Sim. 7, 4; 9, 4, 4; of the meaning of scripture 1 Cor. 9 10; Justin *Dial.* 57, 2; with indefinite pronoun (=  $\pi\omega\varsigma$ ) 1 Cor. 9 22; *cf.* in Eusebius  $\pi\acute{a}v\tau\omega\varsigma \pi\o u\varsigma$ .