A FEW years ago the Teubner Press published a critical edition of the Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum. It was perhaps natural that to one who had occupied his mind with the fallacies of the arguments for medical language in Luke and Acts this event should suggest a somewhat fanciful idea. The new publication might offer an opportunity for a delightful reductio ad absurdum. If the twenty volumes of Kühn's Corpus Medicorum Graecorum could be made to yield a linguistic argument so imposing as Hobart's book on the Medical Language of St. Luke, was it not likely that these two volumes from the Greek mulomedici would show in proportion some equally interesting contacts with Luke's style? And then there passed through the mind the several allusions in the evangelist's writings to the subjects that would interest an ancient veterinary. From the manger at the beginning of the Gospel to the proverb near the close of Acts about kicking against the goads,—there was doubtless as much internal evidence to prove that the author was ἵππωνα ἄρτος as ἰατρός, if only tradition had connected him with the former term, or if Colossians 4 14 were so interpreted. Was Luke also among the horsedoctors?

It would be folly to pursue such a fancy, though it is instructive.

2 Dublin, 1882. I shall not repeat or even refer specifically to my discussion of Hobart and his followers in my Style and Literary Method of Luke.
to suggest it. The newly published materials in any case were not so satisfactory as those used by Hobart. They are not complete original treatises but excerpts from a succession of writers in a series of Byzantine collections. Not only in extent are the *hippiatri* far below the *medici* but their remains are more repetitious and monotonous, with less narrative. They are also later in date, deriving from the Fourth or Fifth Century, at least two centuries later than Galen and Aretaeus. It was sufficient therefore to satisfy oneself that, considering these differences, just as striking evidence of Luke's veterinary language was forthcoming as any evidence of medical language. Doubtless in antiquity the two were much alike. Were Hobart's examples really of value, it would be worth noting all of them that recur in the *Corpus Hippiatricorum*. For example of 415 terms in Hobart's index I found at least 130 in the 250 pages that form the body of Volume II of the *Corpus*.

The only real value in Hobart's work was the collection of parallels of expression to Luke-Acts. To be sure most of the words discussed were common and needed no such illustration, but when the more unusual words or locutions in the New Testament could be illustrated from the doctors the parallels were worth notice, not as evidence of Luke’s profession but as general evidence of the accordance of his idiom with Greek style. The fact that the doctors are mainly a century later than Luke and that the horse-doctors are two more centuries later is no objection. There is no reason to suspect either group of dependence upon the Lucan writings. It is true that the Corpus contains a few Christian allusions but in its main part it is evidently as secular as though it were pre-Christian in date. The following parallels may be accepted therefore merely like the old *Observationes* literature as illustrations of Lucan style from an ancient body of literature that has not been previously read for this purpose and is not likely to be so read again. I shall omit many of the commonest phrases, selecting only a few of special interest.

At its very beginning the *Corpus Hippiatricorum* yielded material to my purpose. The collection opens with the excellent Berlin MS of the Ninth Century and this begins with the preface
of Apsyrtus. Recalling that an early argument for Luke’s medical language was the likeness of his preface to one of Dioscorides (Lagarde’s *Mittheilungen*, iii. 355f.), though similarities among prefaces are in the nature of the case to be expected, I observed some verbal likeness. The passage (I.1) begins: στρατευσάμενος ἐν τοῖς τάγμασι τοῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰστροῦ ποταμοῦ ἔγνων τὰ συμβαίνοντα τοῖς ἵπποις, ἐν ὦς καὶ διαφωνοῦσιν. ἀ ν α τ ξάμενος ὦν ταῦτα καὶ τὰ πρὸς αὐτὰ βοηθήματα προσφέρω σοι, φύλλατε Ἀσκληπιαδή, τοῦτο τὸ βιβλιον, ὡντι μοι πολίτη καὶ ἰατρῷ μεγίστῳ, ἐν ὦς μὴ ἐπιζητήσῃ λογοτήτα, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς πείρας ψυχικὰν ἐμπειρίαν ἐπίγνωσα τι. 

Λέγω δὲ πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ πυρρίττοντος, ὡς ἐπίγνωσα τι ἡ σταυροῦ ποταμοῦ. ἤπεταξάμενος καὶ ταῦτα τὰ σημεία, ὡς ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων προσφέρω τῷ σοι σημεῖον τοῖς τοιούτων σημείων ἐπιζητήσῃ παῖδα εὐχέρως γνωσκόμενος καὶ μὴ ἀσκότας καὶ ἀγνώστως λέγων ἐκ τῶν ἀριβῶς ἐπισταμένων καταγελά, διὰ τοῦτο ὦν χρῆ ταῦτα ὑπὸ παντὸς ἰπποίσκαιροι λαῳ γνωσκέσθαι.

Of the words spaced as recurring also in Luke 1:1–4 the most significant is ἀνατάξαμενος, for which the inferior Paris MS has written the commoner ἀναλεξάμενος. The verb ἀνατάσσω is not common. Blass was able to cite only two instances beside Luke. In my commentary on Luke’s preface I was able to add few others. Recently Jos. Mansion, writing “Sur le sens d’un mot grec: ἀνατάσσω,”5 is able to add only examples from the Byzantine period, of which only two, Etymol. Magn. 152, 28 ἀνατάσσεται τόνον, and Psellus, Synops. Leg. 960 (Migne, P.G. cxxii), are not dependent on Luke. The verb was, however, certainly more usual than these few instances suggest, and the impression I had that Luke was using it quite naturally and idiomatically in his preface is confirmed by discovering it in a preface of the hordoscor Apsyrtus.

3 This reference to the campaign of 332—334 A.D. supplies the chief date for fixing the time of Apsyrtus.


5 In Serta Leodiensia ad celebrandam patriae libertatem iam centesimum annum recuperatum composuerunt philologi Leodiensis (= Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l’Université de Liège. Fasc. xliv), Liège, 1930, pp. 261—267.
The additional instance does not help us determine for the word any special meaning. Mansion is probably right in supposing that it had various meanings and that neither its etymology nor its use in a given passage, e.g. of the rehearsal of tricks by elephants, must be pressed. In both prefaces it probably meant little more than ‘write’, as indeed Ulfilas translated it. A. Severyns in a footnote (p. 267) to Mansion’s article calls attention to two nouns in inscriptions older than Luke who is the first writer known to use the verb, in which the meaning list or estimate, ἀνάταξις (Dittenberger, Sylloge², 577 21), or assessors, ἀνατάκται (ibid., and OGIS. 213) appears.

ἀνωτερικός

One of the very few of Hobart’s examples which were really nearly confined to Luke and the doctors was the word ἀνωτερικός. The hinterland of Asia Minor is called in Acts xix. 1 τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη. According to Hobart “it is a very rare word, and in medical language was applied to the upper part of the body—medicines which acted there—emetics.” It is used, however, in an anonymous veterinary description (I. 69 22) of an eye trouble where certain surface infusions spread over the eyes, certain membraneous bodies (ἀνωτερικά τινες ἐπιχύσεις ἐπιφερόμεναι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, σώματά των ὑμενώδη) depriving them of sight as a cloud covers a star.

ἀνακαθίζω

Another word said by Hobart, p. 11, to be confined in its intransitive use, with few exceptions, to medical writers is ἀνακαθίζω. They employ it of patients sitting up in bed. Luke twice (Luke 7 14; Acts 9 40) uses the same verb of the sitting up on their bier of dead persons restored to life. Quite analogous is its application to sitting animals as when Apsyrtus (I. 177 21; followed as for the verb by Hierocles, 181 17; contrast 186 15 ἀνακάθηται, ὡς περ ἑκὼν) describes a horse as unable to rise again with its back legs, but it sits up like a dog with its front legs (ἀναπεσῶν δὲ ἐγείρεσθαι πάλιν τοῖς ὀπίσθιοις ἀδυνατεὶ ἀλλ' ἀνακαθίζει ὡς κύων τοῖς ἐμπροσθίοις).

6 The passage is Plutarch, De sollert. anim. 12 (Moralia 968), with which should be compared Pliny, N.H. viii 3 (3) § 6 where the verb used is meditantem.
Even to the multiplying examples of the unusual proper name Barnabas, the *Corpus Hippiatricon* unexpectedly contributed an addition. It is not probably due to Christian influence in spite of the "Abraham" that follows. It is a prescription, or more nearly, a charm for duo-oupla (II. 36 ff.): Βάρναβας καὶ περίπτετε θεί-κλησιν ἑπικαλούμενος βαρναβαϊδόθθ καὶ σεχθαβαγγγα. ἑπικαλοῦ-μαι καὶ θεόν Ἀβραὰμ μμμ. λύσον φλέβας τὴν δυσοιρία καὶ βεῦσον ως ὁ Νεῖλος ποταμὸς ὑπὸ μηδενὸς κατεχόμενος.

**βελόνη**

Hobart and his followers have laid much stress on the fact that for "needle" Luke 18:25 uses βελόνη instead of ραφίς in the parallels of Matt. 19:24 and Mark 10:25. He has evidently changed the word in his source. His motive may, however, have been literary taste rather than technical language. Certainly βελόνη is recommended by Atticists, though ραφίς is not avoided entirely either by men of culture (Cadbury, *Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 180, note 26) or, as Hobart (p. 61) implies, by medical writers. With the gospel parallels may be compared the descriptions of an operation on the horse's testicle by Apsyrtus and Hierocles (I. 223 f.). Apsyrtus writes ραφίδι λεπτῇ ἁκροθιγῶς κεντοῦντες τὸ παρὰ τὸν καυλὸν δέρμα, ὄξος δρμῷ προσραϊμεν τοῖς κεντήμασι... καὶ ἡ ἔδρα δὲ καὶ τὸ ὑποταύριον κεντούμενα τῇ ραφίδι καθιστάσαν εἰς τὴν χώ-ραν. Hierocles, mentioning Apsyrtus by name, writes: βελόνη λεπτῇ ἁκροθιγῶς κεντεῖ τὸ περὶ τὸν καυλὸν δέρμα, καὶ ὄξος προσραϊμεν δρμῷ τοῖς κεντήμασι... καὶ ἡ ἔδρα καὶ τὸ ὑποταύ-ριον κεντούμενα τῇ ραφίδι καθιστάσαν αὐτὸ εἰς τὴν χώραν. The later writer, whose interest in style is, as usual, best disclosed in his learned preface with its literary allusions (I. 3—6; contrast Apsyrtus' preface already quoted), in paraphrasing his source here has changed ραφίς to βελόνη, but the change, like many similar

---

changes of Mark made by Luke, is not carried out to the second occurrence of ᾲῤῥής.

(δια)λακάω

For the word ἐλάκησεν, used in Acts 1:18 of Judas’ death, parallels whether simple or compound are worth noting as the verb is infrequent. Two instances are in passages probably dependent on Acts, viz. Acta Thomae 33: ὃ δὲ δράκων φυσηθεὶς ἐλάκησεν (Tischendorf, p. 219), and Acta Pilati B (Tischendorf, Evangelia Apocrypha², p. 290 with itacistic spelling: ἐλάκησεν ἐπηλίσθη). A. D. Knox in the Journal of Theological Studies, xv. 289 calls attention to the vernacular expression in Hierocles, Philogelos 194: ἔγω <ἐντός> τοῦ ἐνοικίου μον ἐλάκησα, and mentions also Geoponica xiii. 15. The expression there is: λακησαὶ τὰς ψυλλας (the fleas) ποιήσεις. If it occurs in Geoponica we might expect to find it in the horse doctors. The compound in δια- is used there of blisters (φλύκταιναι) bursting, in the following passage (I. 423 16ff.): πρὸς δρακοντίαν, δρακοντίαν οὖτω νοῆσεις, φλύκταιναι γι- νονται εἰς ὅλον τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ διαλακάςων, ὀπερ θεραπεύσεις οὖτως κτλ. The same compound in the form διαλακήσασα occurs already in Aristophanes, Nub. 410.

But what deserves attention is the spelling διαλακῶσων. The verb is usually given as (δια)λακέω and is sometimes described as a Doric and later Greek form of λάκεω (Liddell and Scott⁹, Part 6, 1932, p. 1044; Blass on Acts 1:18, and Grammar; Moulton-Howard, Grammar of N.T. Greek, ii. 246) or connected with λάσκω, aorist ἐλακόν, first (or weak) aorist ἐλάκησα. But all writers assume contraction in -eos. The veterinary passage uses διαλακῶσων, which, in the indicative, can be nothing except from διαλακῶ, though the new Liddell and Scott puts it down for διαλακέω. The passage in Acts as indeed all the other passages quoted, are ambiguous. They can be derived from either -aw or -eos. The underlying vowel of the stem must be determined from passages that are decisive, and the newly brought example is decisive for -aw. It does not however stand alone. There is in the great Paris magical papyrus (P. Mag. Par. 3074) σίδηρος λακά. I would propose, therefore, that hereafter New Testament and Hellenistic
lexica should index not \( \lambda\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\omega \) nor even, like the new Liddell and Scott, both \( \lambda\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\omega \) and \( \lambda\alpha\kappa\alpha\omega \), but simply \( \lambda\alpha\kappa\alpha\omega \).\(^8\)

\[ \sigma
\nu
\theta\rho
\u
\pi
\tau\omega \]

Luke’s compound \( \sigma\nu\nu\theta\rho\u\pi\tau\omega \) is a very rare verb though one would not suspect it as one reads in translation the simple and familiar complaint of Paul, “What mean ye weeping and breaking my heart?” (Acts 21 13 \( \tau\i\ \pi\omega\i\i\i\i\te\ \kla\i\o\i\o\te\se\ \kai\ \sigma\nu\nu\theta\rho\u\pi\tau\o\nu\o\te\se\ \mu\o\o\n\ \tau\i\n\n \kappa\a\r\i\d\i\a\i\n\)) Hobart can only illustrate the uncompounded \( \theta\rho\u\pi\tau\omega \). He admits that “this seems to be the only passage in the Greek authors in which this particular compound occurs.” For parallels other lexica have had to rely only on Byzantine authors. Unless they have overlooked other instances as well as this one the next oldest occurrence to Acts is a Greek translation of Pelagonius when, after the ingredients are described of a potion useful for a great variety of internal complaints, the instructions follow (Π. 106 4f.): \( \tau\a\i\t\a\ \tau\a\i\t\a\ \k\a\t\a\r\a\a\s\ \kai\ \sigma\nu\nu\theta\rho\u\pi\psi\e\as\ \e\se\i\ \e\n\ \u\d\a\i\t\i\ \a\p\o\ \k\i\s\t\i\r\e\r\n\a\s\). Even here the manuscript tradition is not unanimous but the variant \( \sigma\nu\nu\theta\pi\psi\e\as\ \) is recorded.

\( \phi\a\tau\nu\n\)

Of the meaning of \( \phi\a\tau\nu\n\) in Luke 2 I have nothing to add to what I said before in these notes (Journal of Bibl. Lit. xlv., 1926, pp. 316ff.). The word occurs naturally with great frequency in the writings of the veterinaries, e. g. I. 290 12 \( \tau\o\i\n\ \w\o\u\z\i\ \tau\u\pi\te\i\ \tau\i\n\ \phi\a\tau\nu\n\ ) where I suppose either stall or manger could be meant. So Π. 222 14 \( \e\a\u\i\t\o\n\ \e\i\l\i\ \tau\o\i\n\ \k\o\i\ \k\i\ \tau\h\i\ \phi\a\tau\nu\n\ \a\p\a\r\o\se\i\e\ ) (cf. I. 208 20). But a few lines further down (34f.) \( \pi\ro\i\ \tau\a\ \w\i\ \l\a\k\i\t\i\z\e\w\ \z\e\a\ \a\l\l\a\li\l\o\n\ ) \( \e\n\ \tau\h\i\ \phi\a\tau\nu\n\ ) it can only mean stall. The anarthrous prepositional phrase in I. 42 1f. \( \k\a\ \t\a\ \s\i\t\i\a\ \k\a\t\a\l\e\i\p\e\i\ \d\i\a\m\a\s\o\w\e\n\os\ ) \( \e\n\ \phi\a\tau\nu\n\ ) suggests that even at its first occurrences in Luke 2 7, 12 \( \e\n\ \phi\a\tau\nu\n\ ) could be rendered “in the manger or the

---

8 Since this paragraph was written Professor W. F. Howard, of Handsworth College, has called to my attention a remark of W. Bauer in Theologische Literaturzeitung, liv. (1929), col. 102, in which, on the basis of the same two passages, he derives the verb in Acts, loc. cit. from \( \lambda\a\k\a\o\o \). rejoicing to have been anticipated in the same opinion, I allow what I have written to remain.
stable" instead of "in a manger or a stable." In Luke's verse 16 év τὴν φάτνη the article refers to the object as something already mentioned, in accordance with Greek idiom.

A very large amount of the text of the Corpus is occupied with prescriptions. The pharmacopoea is not large. The same drugs recur often, and accessible articles are naturally favorites. In view of Luke 10 34 κατέδησεν τὰ τραίματα αὐτῶν ἐπίχεων ἐλαιον καὶ οἶνον it is worth mentioning again that this is a very common combination for internal and also for external use. The wine is usually mentioned first (e. g. I. 9 4, 26 24ff., in both cases with ἐπίχεω, and II. 126 7 et al.) as in the much commoner compound ὀψελαίον (I. 39 23 et al.). Luke's adjectives for wine (Luke 5 39) are also usual, παλαιός (I. 26 24) and χρυστός (II. 66 16). αὐτητήρος, used of persons in Luke 19 21f. (contrast Matt. 25 24 σκληρός), is also used of wine and vinegar. The garden vegetables connected in Luke 11 42 τὸ ἡδύσμον καὶ τὸ πήγανον occur together also in recipes (I. 12 15 ἡδύσμον καὶ πηγάνου) but so do Matthew's anise and cummin (Matt. 23 23 τὸ ἡδύσμον καὶ τὸ ἀνηθὸν καὶ τὸ κύμινον; II. 164 13 πήγανον, κύμινον, κόνιζαν, ἀνηθον) and of course each of them separately. The horse-doctors distinguish cummin, as they do many other substances, by a variety of geographical names, e. g. κύμινον Αἰθιοπικόν (I. 140 25), Ἀλεξανδρίνον (I. 289 15), 'Ελληνικόν (II. 135 21), 'Ιταλικόν (II. 210 8); and although the problem of νάρδος πιστική (Mark 14 3, John 12 3) belongs to the vocabulary of other evangelists, in view of the use in the Corpus of νάρδος Ἰνδική or Κελτική or Κρητική or Συριακή (II., Index, p. 349) I cannot but think that Jannaris was on the right track when he suggested (Class. Review, xvi. 460) for πιστικός an adjective of place. Both the Lucan terms συκάμινον and συκομορέα (II. 165 15) occur in the Corpus, the former repeatedly (I. 9 1, 102 16, 144 1 et al.).

Of the Lucan terms for diseases the spelling δυσεντερίου probably should be retained in Acts 28 8 though Hobart and the horse-doctors provide only examples of the earlier and more correct δυσεντερία. Dropical, a condition discussed by the latter (I. 201ff., II. 164ff.) in close proximity to dysentery, is expressed by Luke 14 2 by an adjective ὕδρωπικός, which occurs also in the
veterinary writings (I. 201 5, 203 7, II. 164 25, 165 11) alongside of the more regular ἰδέρος. It has been claimed that παραλυτικός when used by Mark was avoided by Luke as a word rejected by the doctors. To other evidence of good medical use of παραλυτικός (Journal of Bibl. Lit., xlv., 1926, pp. 204 f., note 45) may be added Corp. Hipp. Gr. I. 433 6.

It has been said that Luke has a rich vocabulary for conception and childbirth. In illustration such terms are cited as occur also in Corp. Hipp. Gr. II. 141 13ff. when as a spell the writing of Psalm 47 as far as the words ἐκεῖ ὁ ὁδείν ὅς πνευμόνης ἐς τὸ στήριζον; cf. 81 συλλαβεῖν στείραν ἰππον; cf. 84 ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα.

Of more general words for disease or symptoms other parallels may be cited. There are in Luke 16 ἔλκος, ἔλκων, words common in the Corpus. As it is said of Lazarus that the dogs licked his sores (21 οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἔλκη αὐτοῦ), so reference is made to a horse under treatment (I. 251 19 ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ γλώσσῃ περιστείχων τὰ ἔλκη) licking its sores with the tongue. ἀσιτία is an often mentioned symptom of diseased animals (I. 54 10, II. 240 13) and the continuance of it required various expression. Beside parallels from other authors for Acts 27 21 παραλῦσαι arretfa and 33 ἀστεῖοι διαστέλεται we may add from the Corpus I. 3 7 ἀσιτίας μενοῦσης, 180 7 μένει ἀσίτος.

The passage Acts 3 8 has been claimed as medical for many years, particularly for the words σφύρα, βάσις, στερεῶ. The first of these is too common in all literature to need citations about “ankles” of horses. For στερεῶ of cures of feet we may compare I. 324 12 ὁ στερεοπούς as a description of a horse, II. 82 1 ἐστε­reiωσθαί of the strengthening of a horse’s feet, 263 ὁ στερεοποίει τοῦτο πόδας.

Luke’s general terms used for illness are often as easily illustrated from the Corpus Hippiatricorum as from the Corpus Medicorum. συνέχομαι in the sense “be affected” (Hobart, p. 3) occurs often. There is for example the case with curious assonance (I. 155 10): ὅταν συνέχηται ἰππος τῷ πάθει τούτῳ, συνεχέστερον ἀναπνει. Luke twice uses the verb with fever (Luke 4 38, Acts 28 8). Hiero­cles’ preface is followed by a discussion of fever beginning (I. 6 23): ἰππος εἰ συνέχοιτο πυρετό. Inflammation is expressed in Acts
28 in the doctors (Hobart, p. 50), and in the horse doctors (e.g. I. 157, II. 109) by πιμπραμαί. The verbs ὀχλέω and ἐνοχλέω are abundant in the Corpus (cf. Hobart, p. 7).

For recovery or cure the horse doctors use ἀπαλλάσσω, διάλυω (e.g. I. 33 11) and ἀνάληψις (e.g. I. 398 22, II. 268 8), but more as do the doctors (see Hobart 47, 204, 124) than in accord with Luke's usage. Of stanching blood likewise the doctors of both sorts use ἵστημι transitively rather than, like Luke 8 44, in transitively. While βοήθημα is very common as an expedient used in cure I found only one instance of βοήθεια (II. 185 15; cf. I. 183 1) comparable to the usage of that word which I would recommend for explaining Acts 27 17 (see Commentary, ad loc.). Ramsay's view that θεραπεία (-εύω) is to be distinguished from ἵασις (ιάσω) as meaning treatment and cure respectively is not supported by such occurrences of θεραπεία as I. 351 12, 316 23, II. 64 23. On the other hand the phrase of Acts 27 3 ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν can be exactly duplicated from I. 12 5. For rapidity of change Luke's adverbs ἐξιήφως (Hobart 19; I. 74 5, 368 17, II. 286 3), παραχρῆμα (Hobart 96; I. 53 10 al.), συντόμως (Hobart 262: to be translated 'quickly,' rather than 'briefly') and ἀφεῖ (not in Hobart, e.g. Acts 28 8; II. 158 27) are all used.

It is becoming increasingly clear that certain adverbs tend to be used without definite comparative force in the comparative. The Corpus Hippiatricorum illustrates some of the same ones as do Luke's writings.

ἀκριβέστερον Acts 18 26, 23 15, 20, 24 22; I. 5 1.
καλλίων Acts 25 10; I. 99 3.
πυκνότερον Acts 24 26; II. 135 17, 181 26, 263 6.

Other identities of vocabulary between Luke and the horse-doctors include (with no suspicion of medical force)

διαστήσας βραχύ Acts 27 28; I. 388 5.
βοών ζεύγος Luke 14 19; II. 270 3.
περι蓖πτω Luke 22 55; II. 36 9, quoted above, and passim.
πτοέομαι Luke 21 9, 24 37; I. 290 13; II. 249 18, 19.
Hobart and others lay stress on words found in the New Testament only in Luke’s writings. The terms just listed all belong to that category, but none of them is illustrated by Hobart, while of Hobart’s own list of that sort the horse doctors employ such further words as ἀπελπιζω, ἀποθλιβω, ἀπομάσσω, ἀποτυώσσω, διατηρέω, ἐκταράσσω, ἐκτυώσσω, ἐνδέχεται, ἐπινεύω, καθημερινός, καταψυχω, παράδοξον, προσψαίω, συμπίπτω, συστρέφω, συστροφή. ⁹

⁹ Like the doctors, the horses doctors provide some interesting parallels to other New Testament writers than Luke. With Paul’s κυνίνους ποταμών (2 Cor. 11.36) compare II. 234.13 ποταμών κυνίνων and with the σταίνεσθαι of 1 Thess. 3:3 (si vera lectio, see ZNTW, vii. 1906, p. 361; Expos. Times, xviii, p. 479, etc.) II. 81.5 δε εἴθεωσ σπασμοὺς ὑπομένει καὶ σταίνεται, λοιπὸν φοβεῖται τὴν τροφήν κτλ.