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PREFACE.

This study has, indeed, furnished quite a formidable array
of facts in exemplification of the various elements of Broken
Construction which scholars have discovered and defined for us
in the field of historical grammar.

There has been considerable satisfaction too, in the very
effort put forth, on the one hand, in going thru the Greek New
Testament in search of examples of Broken Construction, then
classifying under appropriate headings according to the kinds of
Broken Construction exemplified; and on the other hand, in the
study of each separate case — just to learn things about them
severally.

A further interest has developed along the way because of
certain appreciable results, both in the direction of exempli-
fication and confirmation of the conclusions reached by historical
grammarians, and in the way of giving us a concrete view of the
modes of expression of the New Testament writers and speakers,
the physical facts, so to say, of Apostolic life expression.

It has not indeed, been our purpose to make a defence of the
Apostolic writers against the charge of being "bungling writers
of confused thought" in their use of Anacoluthia, Oratio-Variata,
and Aposiopesis. They need no defence in this particular.
They but keep company with Greek writers of all ages, and it is
not in their poverty of Broken Construction that the writers of
the age suffered in comparison with their predecessors. They
had the most vigorous message of the years, and such a message
in any age is liable to a construction suited to the marvellous
on-rush of world-moving thought. Nor has it been our aim to
study the facts of Broken Construction in the Greek New Testament
just for their own sake, and to find satisfaction therein. We
have endeavored also to learn the significance of the facts, i.e.
to ascertain why the writers (or speakers) made use of Broken Con-
struction; what they gained thereby in variety and vigor, etc.,
and even whether they did not thus mount to heights of grandeur
of thought for life-interpretation not otherwise attainable.
This has led more or less out of the field of historical grammar
into that of the interpreter. It is here, indeed, that the chief
value of the essay should be expected, and here found.
EXPLANATORY WORD:

"Broken Construction", far from being an indication of faltering lips or clumsy pen, as the expression might seem to imply, is a regular method both of Grammar and Rhetoric in the literature of the ages.

Broken Construction is a general expression susceptible of analysis into Anacoluthia, Oratio-Variata, Aposiopesis - to write the most important elements, and inasmuch as a lively interest for the student will attach to each one of these composites, I propose in this dissertation to study them all under the general title given above.

DEFINITION AND COMMENT.

Anacoluthia. From the viewpoint of grammar, Anacoluthia is found when the construction with which the sentence opens has no grammatical continuation, or, to follow the Encyclopaedia Britannica, it "is the lack of grammatical symmetry in a sentence". This lack of symmetry is the result, many times, of the intervention of parenthetical thoughts by the contemplation of which the writer is wholly led away from the construction with which he began, and gives the sentence a conclusion quite different from what the beginning anticipated. Here the Anacoluthia are mainly involuntary.

Rhetorically, Anacoluthia is a figure of speech in which the writer, for the sake of energy, or because a preferable turn of expression presents itself, or the speaker, "seizing another way, from the movement of his thought or from the skill of his oratory", abandons the grammatical form used in the beginning and adopts a construction syntactically irreconcilable to it.

It is in writers of great mental vivacity, more taken up with the thought than with the mode of its expression, that we find Anacoluthia most frequently, and, indeed, it adorns the pages of the great poets and orators of the ancient classics, and likewise in modern literature of many languages in productions of deep emotion.

In the New Testament, they are especially numerous in the style of Paul. And of Georg Niebuhr it is told that his oral lectures, delivered at Bonn University in 1812, consisted almost entirely of anacoluthic constructions.

In the field of Rhetoric, as we should naturally suppose, Anacoluthia is intentional. And here its beauty, its purpose, and its value to interpretation are to be sought. Accordingly Anacoluthia represents that method of writing or speaking in which the construction is undesignedly or designedly broken off or
ORATIO-VARIATA. Whether it is versatility that is sought for, or the niceties of diction, by careful writers (abandoning a construction which, if continued, would become clumsy or obscure, for a smoother and more elegant one), recourse is had to Oratio-Variata, a term applied (1) "where, in parallel sentences, or members of sentences, two different, though synonymous constructions, each complete in itself, are adopted"; and the period becomes heterogeneous in its structure; or (2) where there is a transition from the Oratio-Obliqua to the Oratio-Recta, or vice versa - a change very common in Greek prose.

APOSIOPESIS. This is a figure of speech in which the speaker (or writer) suffers the suppression of a sentence, or a part of a sentence, as, through excited feeling of anger or sorrow or fear, he becomes unable or unwilling to continue. The omitted member may receive representation in a gesture or a look or a sigh. This figure is of common occurrence in formulas of swearing, but in Greek writers, as likewise in the New Testament, Aposiopesis occurs most frequently after conditional clauses.

GENERAL REMARKS.
1. Of the almost one hundred examples of broken construction in the Greek New Testament, more than half are found in the writings of Paul.

2. The majority of cases is manifest in the anaocoluthic exemplification which is characteristic of the Greek language: as when sentences begun by a finite verb are continued by a participial construction, in an abnormal case; or conversely, when a participial construction is changed to a finite form; or, when the \( \sigma \varepsilon \) clause is changed to the accusative and infinitive construction; or, the casus pendentes method; or, the \( \mu \varepsilon \) clause without the corresponding \( \sigma \varepsilon \) complement.

3. Of the several examples of Aposiopesis, four may be attributed to Paul and five to Jesus.

4. There are a few cases of very much involved Anaocoluthia; one or two supposed to be double Anaocoluthia, which bear witness to the marvellous rush of thought of the writer, and render him liable to the charge of being a bungling writer of confused thought. It is the burden of the student of Anaocoluthia to discover if he can whether the charge be true, or, whether the writer through an anaocoluthic method has mounted to heights of grandeur in thought not otherwise attainable. He may thus establish the
value of broken construction in the field of interpretation.

1. EXEMPLIFICATION OF ANACOLOUTHIA.

I will begin with examples in brief periods of general Anacoluthia, which indeed, are less involved in construction, but (and for that reason) the more remarkable in their anacoluthic nature.

1. Acts 19:34. (words of the author)

In unbroken construction the text would read as follows: ἐν ἀγνώμονες δὲ οὖς Ἰουδαίος έστιν ἡ ἑρμηνεία κατὰ χρόνος φωνήν τὴν ὁσεὶ ἐπὶ ἀφάσην ἔστω τέκνα Ἰουλίας ἐοιν ἐκεῖ ἡγεῖται 

Remarks: (1) Anacoluthia is seen in that ἐν ἀγνώμονες anticipates a plural in agreement, subject of the principal verb, which does not occur. (2) It is clear from this example that the anacoluthic expression adds nothing in clearness nor in elegance. Indeed, the American version does not render the anacoluthic text, but, combining the two forms (or disregarding the Anacoluthia entirely) renders the passage: "But when they perceived that he was a Jew, all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians'". (3) But the anacoluthic construction marks a change of emphasis very natural to the situation, calling attention to the dominant feature of the whole procedure - the noise of the cry. To outsiders it was the cry, not the people, which was the matter of interest. When the throng rushed together, "some cried one thing and some another", and the majority did not know the occasion of the assembly, but the Demetrian mob soon gave the slogan, and by the time the Jew was ready to speak, there was one cry: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians". The Anacoluthon suggests this unanimity.

2. Mark 9:20. (words of Mark)

Text: Καὶ ἐξ ἄνω πάντως εἶναι πνεύμα εὕθεσ συνεστάλη ἐν ἄνω, καὶ πεσίνων ἐπί ἡς γῆς ἦς ἐκύλιστο ἀφελόν.

Notes: (1) Anacoluthia is manifest in the fact that (having reference to ἄνω in the preceding sentence, which in turn, has for its antecedent ἄνω further back), while filling the function of a participle of antecedent action, and anticipating agreement with the subject (here unexpressed) of the principal verb, has no such agreement; on the contrary, ἐν πνεύμα
is inserted as the subject of the principal verb, thus cutting off ἐκτὸς from grammatical construction in the sentence. (2) The unanacoluthic form would be about as follows: καὶ εἰρήνα ἀντὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐσχάτως Ὁ. (3) Weiss is probably wrong in suggesting that ἐκτὸς refers to the evil spirit, since ἐκτὸς is masculine while πνεῦμα is neuter and juxtaposed. (4) An additional irregularity in this anacoluthic sentence is found in the use of ἐκτὸς twice, referring to different persons. It seems the picture of an eye-witness. Filled in, the sentence translated would stand: "And (the boy) having seen him (Jesus) straightway the spirit convulsed him (the boy)"). (5) Manifestly, the anacoluthic method here fixes the attention of the reader on the evil spirit as the chief actor in the episode, changing the function of the spirit from that of instrumentality expressed by the passive voice to that of the subject of the action expressed by an active form. It might have been unintentional Anacoluthia, the writer having in mind the picture just drawn by the father of the lad, and repeating it in effect. If designed, the following manifested power of Jesus stands out in stronger relief.

5. Matthew 7:8. (Words of Jesus)

Τεκτον οὖν ἐστὶν ἐυθέως ἀνθρώπος, ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἄντιστος ἐκτὸς ἔρχεται καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐπὶ ἑαυτῷ ἀναμένει, ἀντὶς ἀντὶς.

Notes: (1) This is anacoluthic. The definite interrogative, ὁ ζεύς ἀνθρώπος stands forth as the prominent subject with which the principal verb will, by natural supposition, follow in perfect agreement; but instead of that, when this verb is reached, it, though standing in the interrogative form, rejects the formerly expressed subject and by the very nature of its clause compels its subject to be sought in its personal ending. This will be seen by an attempt to translate the sentence as a regular interrogative: "What man of you .... will not give to him (his son) a stone will he?" (2) The occasion of the Anacoluthon. As the mind of the Master runs along the channel of the interposed relative clause, ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἄντιστος, knowing as the true father also knows, the engrossing love of offspring, He pictures the scene of a son appealing to the father (as a right) ἀνθρώπος for bread, and, accordingly, closes the sentence with a clause which, disregarding the anticipated subject, ζεύς ἀνθρώπος gramatically, but involving its thought, grasp in thought by the personal ending, εἴπε, expresses the equivalent of the strongest possible affirmative statement, "He will not give to him a stone,
will he?" which is equal to, he will surely give him bread.

(5) The unbroken construction of this thought would be: Ἐὰν ἐὰν δὲ ἐὰν ἕνα ὄνομα ἔχῃ, δὸν δὸν δὸν ἔχῃ, δὸν δὸν δὸν ἔχῃ, δὸν δὸν δὸν ἔχῃ, and the difference in form between the two constructions may be observed in the parallel translation of both: (a) Or what man of you, of whom his son shall ask a loaf, will give to him a stone, (unbroken); (b) Or what man of you of whom his son shall ask a loaf - he will not give to him a stone will he? (anacoluthic)

(4) The anacoluthic method here has the advantage in strength which the negative sentence that demands the answer "no" has over the simple interrogative sentence.

N.B. The same illustration is given in Luke 11:11 in a slightly different form as follows: Ἐὰν δὲ ἐὰν δὲ ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕνα ἕ

Notes: (1) Here both sentences are simpler, through the non-use of the relative clause. (2) In the anacoluthic form (a) the δὸν, which would naturally be the subject of both verbs, is caught up in ἕνα as object of the second verb. (b) ἕνα, the natural object of both verbs, is appropriated to become the subject of the second, and is represented in the third singular, etc.

4.1st Cor. 12:28. (words of the author)

Text: Καὶ οὐσὶς εἷς ἐθέτο ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, δεύτερον προφήτας.

Notes: (1) οὐσὶς is grammatically suspended, being displaced by the προφήτας, which follow, and hence anacoluthic, and in the translation should be disregarded. (2) Probable explanations: In this sentence Paul starts out as though he intended a mere enumeration of church officials; but, as he writes, before he reaches the first set of officers, he decides to set down the functionaries according to their rank, and so places προφήτας before Apostles etc. But when he has finished the prominent officials he, in ἐπερεάζω, abandons the titular method and falls into the mere enumeration of abstract offices. (5) The Anacoluthon is intentional, setting forth the order of church functionaries, and distinguishing them from the functions which follow in the list and which might be performed by any official.

5. Titus 1:5. (words of Paul)

On the supposition (1) that the ΕΦΗΕΡΕΑ word belongs to Εὐσέβεια and not to ἀποστόλος, and therefore that Ἰην has
...and not ἀληθείας for its antecedent; (2) that οἱ ἑαυτοῦ and ἐφανερώσεν pieces are coordinate: διὸν λόγον. (a) may be regarded as in apposition with ἐν, really explanatory of ἀληθείας, and there is no Anacoluthon in the passage; or (b) it may be supposed that when the Apostle adds ἐφανερώσεν στὰ καίεις αὐτός... he loses sight of the relative clause and employs the διὸν λόγον clause, breaking up the relative construction, and anacoluthic turn, but still the well-known method of making known the truth, since τὸν λόγον, modified by ἐν καιρῷ, is practically synonymous to the Gospel, and hence giving evidence that ἐφανερώσεν ἀληθείας is yet in mind.

6. Gal. 2:3-5. (words of Paul)

Notes: (1) This passage seems to present a case of double departure with a total loss of the original design; A. verse 5 states the fact that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised in spite of apparent pressure being brought to bear; B. the δὲ... ὥσπερ δὲ... seems about to introduce an explanation, but the two departures (a) the relative qualifier, διὸν λόγον; and (b) the parenthetical regimen, οἷς τε wholly obscure the explanation (unless, indeed, we get a glimpse of it in the οἷς clause) and the construction is entirely broken off. (2) Another explanation somewhat simpler, is to suppose an Aposiopesis after καὶ δόξην λύσεις; but the thread of thought is caught up again in the οἷς clause. And, to be sure, the thought of the wickedness of those Judaizers was sufficient to stir to the depths Paul's righteous indignation—i.e. there is a sufficient reason for an Aposiopesis. (3) But there is still a simpler explanation which will relieve this much-discussed passage of every vestige of Anacoluthia. Indeed the construction is not perfectly perspicuous, yet the difficulty is not in Anacoluthia, but in the δὲ which is in fact the explicative. The naked διὰ... ὥσπερ... in the text naturally looks for a restrictive explanation, and the δὲ introduces this explanation, and the supplying mentally in the διὰ... ὥσπερ... of ὁ καὶ... τῷ... δῷ... borrowing it from the preceding clause, is all that is necessary. Note then the translation of the text thus remedied: "But neither was Titus who was with me, though a Greek, compelled to be circumcised; but, to explain (δὲ) he was not circumcised on account of privately brought in X false brethren, who came in" etc. etc.—without any break to the end of verse 5.

7. Gal. 2:6. (words of Paul):—...
Notes: (1) Anacoluthia is clear from the fact that the prepositional phrase, ἀπὸ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν, has its grammatical relation unsatisfied. The anacoluthic form would be: ἀπὸ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν πιστεύσαν ἐκεῖνον (ἐγὼ) (2) The Anacoluthia may be accounted for by the fact that through the run of thought in the two paraenethetical clauses, ἀπὸ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν, the writer's mind became fixed on the "reputed ones" as actors (as he recalls their part in that notable transaction) so that he disregards the open sentence and forms a new sentence with ἔκαστον as though defending his apostleship as on a par with theirs, though he is not so reputed as they. N.B. ἔκαστον is in emphatic position, and the ὅτε paraenthesis beginning with ἀπὸ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν (without formal conclusion) carries us back through the ἔκαστον to the main clause leaving the ὅτε clause entirely unconnected, yet pointing back by means of ἔκαστον ἐν αὐτῶν, as by a guide post, to that abandoned commencement of the sentence, while the parenthesis is concluded in substance, not in form, by λαμβάνει.

The above are remarkable examples of Anacoluthia in very short periods. We now come to broken construction in longer periods and somewhat more involved.

8. Acts 15:22-35a. (the so-called Jer. decree)

Text: ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν ἀποστόλους — πρεσβύτερον ἐκκλησία ἐκλέγατο
νοῦς ἀνδρῶν — πρεσβύτερον ἐστὶν... Παῦλος καὶ ἄνδρες ἡμεῖς
νοῦς ἐν ἀδελφῶν, ἔχουσαν τὰ πάντα ἔπεσον.

Notes: Two points of Anacoluthia appear in this example,
(1) ἐκλέ&gamma;νος in the accusative case instead of dative to agree with ἀποστόλους, though this may be explained as a case of attraction of the modifiers of the unexpressed subject of an infinitive into the case which that subject would have if expressed; howbeit after ἔδωκεν we should not look for an accusative and infinitive construction, but rather for a complementary infinitive.
(2) Anacoluthia appears in the presence of ἔχουσαν, nominative, instead of ἔχουσαν, dative, to agree with ἀποστόλους, the actors, the nominative being used because the thought of the writer is transferred from the selecting of men (some twenty-one words back) to the execution of their mission — his thought now being: having written so-and-so by them, they sent them away.

Remarks: (a) This seems an involuntary Anacoluthion, growing out of the intervention of extensive explanatory clauses between the limiting participles and the nouns with which they would naturally agree in case. (b) Anacoluthia in case of ἐκλέ&gamma;νος may be avoided by regarding the participle as being used in the
passive voice as an attributive modifier of αὐτὸς, which would then be the object of πέμψας. But this aorist (middle) form has rarely, if indeed ever, in prose the significance which would attach to ἐλέεις.


Observation: This text is corrupted, the authorities being quite evenly balanced between the participle, ἐκοίμη, and the finite form, ἐκοίμητο.

Notes: (1) If, with Westcott and Hort, we accept the finite form, there is no Anacoluthon in this period. (2) But if we prefer the ἐκοίμη authority, we note Anacoluthia in the fact that ἐκοίμη ἐκοίμητο has no grammatical agreement but is cut off by the parenthetical sentence, ἔλεεῖς γαρ τούτῳ κυρίῳ ὑμῖν. The thought, however, is resumed and the preceding temporal participial construction is changed to the regular finite form of temporal construction, ἔσκοιμητέ. Note that this new construction is not a repetition of the former thought, but that the ἐκοίμη has a much more comprehensive object than the participle ἐκοίμητο had, growing out of the additional information which the ἐκοίμη received through the investigation of the intervening clauses.


Text: ποιήσας δὲ μὴν ζεῖσις γενομένης εἰπολῆς, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰουδαίων κελλών, ἀναγκαζόμενος εἰς τὴν Συρίαν ἔγενεν ἡμῶν καὶ ὕστερον εἰς Μακεδονίαν.

Notes: (1) ποιήσας is in the nominative singular masculine in anticipative agreement with the subject of the principal verb, but when this verb is reached, it has an abstract subject expressed, entirely distinct from that of the participle which, therefore, has no "construction", but is anacluthic. (2) This is easily accounted for. The participle is followed by a genitive absolute clause, in which stands the dative εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν; and nothing could be easier than that this dative construction "(to) him about to depart into Syria), should beguile the author from the thought of the participle, and open the way for the harmonious regimen, ἔγενεν ἡμῶν. Thus: "(to) him about to depart into Syria, a decision came to" etc.

11. Romans 16:26-27. (Text not quoted)

Whether there be an Anaoluthon in this splendid doxology depends upon the genuineness of the ο for in verse 27. The Westcott and Hort text discards it, and there is no Anaoluthon. Admitting the ο, Anaoluthon is clear in that συμαντοῦσα and μόνω δεῖ are without agreement, seeing that συμαντοῦσα belongs to ο.
and is added for the purpose of including Christ in the inscription, or it may be undesigned, as follows: under pressure of the intervening thought suggested by the mention of "his gospel", in which he so gloried, he forgets that the ἰδίως δύναμις without government, and when he reaches the resumptive καὶ ἐκαθήσατο, proceeding as though they had received it, ἵνα ὑπὸ δοῦλου (as this expression itself hints), he adds to Him an inscription of praise by means of the relative pronoun. N.B. Godet suggests that Paul's impulse Godward (and he expects all to join him) is so strong that he need not express it in statement, as it is implied in the datives. Thus: (my eyes in closing, turn with yours) "To him who is able etc. .. to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, whose is the glory forever, Amen".


Text: ευευγέρως λέγων ἀνθρωπός καὶ τοῦτο ἐν καὶ ἐκαθήσατο, παρὰ ὧν ἄνθρωπον, τε. Notes: (1) Anacoluthon is seen in the fact that the participle, ἐκαθήσατο, looks forward in vain for a principal verb with which its subject agrees. The lawyer, becoming involved in relative clauses, of which he uses three, loses himself in them, using the main verb in one of these, ἐκαθήσατο. The unbroken form would be: ευευγέρως γὰρ τὸν ἐπίτροπον ἐκαθήσατε. The lawyer, becoming involved in relative clauses, of which he uses three, loses himself in them, using the main verb in one of these, ἐκαθήσατο. The unbroken form would be: ευευγέρως γὰρ τὸν ἐπίτροπον ἐκαθήσατε.

13. Romans 2:17-21. (words of Paul)

Text: εἰ δὲ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζῃ καὶ τοῦτο — πέπονθας τε σεαυτὸν ὑπὸ διώκειν ἐκαθήσατο — ἐξοναίᾳ τὸν κοσμὸν ἀλλὰ σὺν διάκονον ἐλευθεροποιήσας, σεαυτόν ὑπὸ δικαιωμένος; Notes: (1) Anacoluthon is observed in the fact that the εἰ δὲ ἐπονομάζῃ clause, being the protasis of a Particular Present Supposition, finds no complementary grammatical apodosis.

(2) The Apostle elaborating through several clauses the thought which he premises with εἰ δὲ etc. in verse 17, changing in the meantime to the accusative and infinitive construction after a verb of thinking, πέπονθας τε, and finally, as he nears the end of the protasis, falling into a participial form τοῦτον κοσμὸν ἐλευθεροποιήσας, loses sight of the εἰ δὲ of verse 17 and makes use of the participial (suggested perhaps by the supplementary participial clause) and Indicative interrogative apodosis, by the help of the resumptive ὧν, verse 21.

(3) This construction, however, broken as it is, furnishes a parallel in thought to what the apodosis would have been, and is more forceful. Thus the form would have been: "If thou art a Jew, and art skilled in the law as an illuminator and instructor of others, thou shouldst prove thy teaching by thy practice".
But, this new construction particularizes the apodosis, while it catches up the protasis through the resumptive \( \text{oúv} \) and the participle - the \( \text{διδάσκων} \) \( \varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \) being practically equal to "if thou teachest another." And the apodosis thus individualized: "If thou art ..... an instructor of others, ..... thou who teachest not to steal, dost thou steal", is stronger than "If thou art ... an instructor ..... thou shouldst prove thy teaching by thy practice." (4) And so, piling up the elements, characteristic of the average Greek teacher, in every element of which make-up every such teacher would boast - a description quite general, however, because belonging to all - the Apostle through this anacoluthic construction suddenly breaks out on the individual by direct address, and, either by a question, or assertion of reproach, brings home the charge of individual inconsistency and hypocrisy.

14. Col. 1:21. (words of Paul)

Notes: (1) If \( \text{ε\nu\nu\nu\nu} \) verse 21 were followed by \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \), or, if there were no \( \varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \) following the \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \), this verse could with reason be regarded as an unbroken sentence; but as it stands, the \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \) manifestly anticipate some such conclusion as \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \). So the \( \varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \) renders the sentence anacoluthic and all the more so since \( \text{ε\nu\nu\nu\nu} \) is not a nominative followed by a finite verb. (2) If I am not mistaken this verse really represents an Aposiopesis after \( \pi\nu\varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \). Consider as follows: in the past it was the good pleasure of the Father through Him (Jesus) to reconcile all things to himself ..... "and you at that time by being alienated and enemies in your mind by reason of your evil deeds" - then his thoughts wandered to the consideration of the awful condition of the people thus alienated, thus hostile, but finally drifting to Jesus the great Reconciler, he recalls the time when proclaimed salvation to them in Jesus, and so, contrasting the rebellious and saved states, concludes as in the text - \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \) - the purpose now being to emphasize the full concurrence of him who reconciled all in the body of his flesh through death with the Father, in that great work.


Notes: (1) The punctuation of the Westcott and Hort. text, with a period after \( \sigma\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \), verse 7, assumes that verses 5-7 make a complete paragraph. In that case the protasis is found in 5 and 6, and the apodosis in 7. But this the subjunctive, \( \varepsilon\varepsilon\pi\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon \), verse 7, will not allow. (2) The better supposition is that the apodosis begins with verse 8, while verses 5-7 furnish the protasis. In this case there may be two ways of explaining.
the broken construction: (a) it may be urged that the interrogative form continues to \( \piρ\alpha\varepsilon\alpha\rho'\eta\sigma \) verse 6, but that with \( \kappa\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\iota\nu\sigma \) the interrogative is abandoned and the sentence proceeds as if conditional, with \( \varepsilon\lambda\nu \) assumed, in accordance too the apodosis beginning with verse 8 is turned. The Anacoluthon begins with \( \kappa\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\iota\nu\sigma \), being occasioned by the long Oratio-Directa (verses 6 and 6) after which it is not observed that the \( \varepsilon\iota\nu\eta \) verse 5 is independent of \( \varepsilon\lambda\nu \). (b) A better resolution, I think, is to consider that the interrogative form be assumed to continue through verse 7, but that the long dialogue in Oratio-Directa (6b-7) renders the hypothetically \( \varepsilon\iota\nu\eta \) conditional sentence unmanageable, and the Anacoluthon begins at verse 8 with a declarative statement, rendering the apodosis much stronger than it should have been if affixed in the regular form, which in this case would have been a negative apodosis. The difference can be seen in a rendering of what the unbroken form would have been along side of that which is used: (1) "Who of you shall have a friend and shall go to him and say etc. .... and that one answering shall say ... I am not able to give to you," and yet shall not, if not through the other's friendship, still through his own importunity receive as much as he needs—the probable unbroken form. (2) "Who of you shall have ... and shall say etc... and that one answering shall say ... I am not able to give to you—"I say to you etc." verse 8.

SOME EXAMPLES OF VERY MUCH INVOLVED ANACOLOUTHIA.

16. 2nd Peter 2:4-9. (words of Peter)

This is a very significant illustration of how a writer may be led off from his initial form of construction by pursuing one after another thoughts suggested by the way, until he becomes quite involved, and finds it impossible to complete in good form the construction with which he set out. Notes:

Notes: (1) Anacoluthia is noticed here in the fact that the protasis \( \gamma\alpha\varepsilon \delta\varepsilon\oslash\alpha \varepsilon \omega\kappa \varepsilon\nu\kappa \varepsilon\rho\tau\alpha\varepsilon \) has nowhere in the subsequent context a grammatical apodosis. (2) The construction would have been, if completed, \( \gamma\alpha\varepsilon \delta\varepsilon\oslash\alpha \varepsilon \omega\kappa \varepsilon\nu\kappa \varepsilon\rho\tau\alpha\varepsilon \) \( \varepsilon\lambda\nu\,\varepsilon\kappa\varepsilon\omega\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\varepsilon \) \( \varepsilon\nu\kappa \varepsilon\rho\tau\alpha\varepsilon \) \( \varepsilon\lambda\nu \varepsilon\kappa\varepsilon\omega\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\varepsilon \). But one example of God's punishment after another, along with accompanying providential deliverance, is suggested and recounted (the ancient world destroyed and Noah saved; Sodom and Gomorrah overturned, a warning for the ungodly, but Lot preserved, with a parenthetical explanation of how he was vexed), until on arriving at the thought which should form the apodosis, still
having in mind Jehovah's unerring retribution upon the wicked and his intricately providential deliverance of his own, he forms an apodosis eminently harmonious to the immediately preceding thought and remotely so even to the thought with which the paragraph began, but with a very changed construction and a much more general scope, verse 9. N.B. It is verse 6 which opens the way for the Anacoluthon, by substituting the participial for the conditional form of sentence.

17. Romans 5:12-19. (words of Paul)

Notes: (1) To regard verse 12 as a complete parallel, the second member beginning with καὶ διέκρισεν is to disregard the order of these words. καὶ διέκρισεν do not signify "so, also" (cf. 15a, 18b, 19b) but "and so", and this spoils the parallel. Besides, as the whole context shows, it was not the design of the author to compare the mode of death's entrance into the world with its diffusion. The parallel if it had been stated in full, would have been: ὥστε ἐὰν θεώσῃ η̂ ἑλλείπῃ ἐπὶ σώιν Κόσμον ἐν θεώσῃ, καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἐκείνου, ἐνώπιον δὲ ἐὰν θεώσῃ, διὰ καλούση, καὶ διὰ τοῦ δικαιοσύνης τοῦ Ἰουδαίων.

But when Paul is writing the καὶ first member, he thinks of the universality of death, and states it in the καὶ διέκρισεν clause. But then he is called upon to explain how sin was in the world before the law, with its concomitant death, and to state the universality of sin and death both in time and space. And this explanation running through 13 and 14 makes it impossible to add the second half of the comparison syntactically belonging to ὥστε, and so he leaves it broken off midway as to construction, nevertheless at the mention of Adam, verse 14, who is the ἐν θεώσῃ ὥστε καὶ ἐκείνου of verse 12, he suggests the second member of the comparison by the expression ὥστε ἐὰν θεώσῃ καὶ ἐκείνου. (2) But the attempted parallel of verse 12, though "broken off midway", is not wholly neglected, nor in thought left incomplete, and so there is more to say upon this passage. (N.B. The ὥστε ἐὰν θεώσῃ is not a proper apodosis in either form or make-up, it is a sort of "provisional substitute" for an apodosis, but not a grammatical apodosis - Philippi.) The "type of him to come" verse 14 requires immediate definition which is given in 16-17, through which the parallel instituted in verse 12 is three times suggested and the superior greatness of the second Adam both in extent and influence is three times set forth by a logical plus expression, πολὺ ἀπλλοῦν, more of an antithesis than an epanorthosis. But
now in verse 18 Paul, still mindful of his purpose projected in verse 12, finishes that comparison in like form, but more specifically in a grand climax, while verse 10 applies this climax to the "one" and the "many" of verses 15-17, which but for this fact might be regarded as subordinately parenthetic. (3) That this is a fair explanation of the passage, is indicated by the following considerations: (a) The ἐφα is illative like ἐπι γυνε, and probably synonymous to it, especially when we consider (b), that γυνε indicates the resuming of a previously expressed idea which was expressed in verse 12. (c) The comparison of verse 12 between "one" and "all" (which was dropped in the digression for the contrast between the "one" and the "many") reappears in verse 18. (d) The thought of verse 12 is logically concluded in 18 is clear in that 1st, the "as through one fall" reproduces the idea of "as through one man" of verse 12, and 2nd, the "so also by one act of righteousness" is the long-delayed second term of the comparison, and shows us what that second member would have been in thought if it had been expressed.

And so the expression ἐφα ἐστιν μελέταςἀρέτας verse 14, instead of being the principal idea of the paragraph and conclusion of the premise of verse 12, is simply the method of announcing to the reader the second member of the parallel which was to be further prefaced verses 15-17 before being fully enunciated.

18.1st Tim.1:3-5. (words of Paul)

This is an exemplification of a "broken off" construction, but yet not an Aposiopesis. The τελειωμα clause describing the effect of the endless genealogies renders it grammatically inelegant to complete the comparison with which he began. The construction if completed would have been: ἐκδικήσας ἀσέβειαν τελειωμας ἐν τισι, εἰνάν οὐν ταυτακαλῳ. But knowing that such a conclusion would be readily understood by Timothy, he proceeds, without giving it, to the exposition of the important charge.

ANACOLUTHA PECULIAR TO GREEK USAGE.

1st. Where the construction is continued by a participle in an abnormal case far separated from the governing verb.

16. Eph.1:16. (words of Paul)

Text: ἐκείνοις διεσαλᾶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἔτι ἐκείνη ἐκτενέστερα τις ἐφα. There are three possible explanations of this participial construction: (a) It may be regarded as an accusative absolute, agreeing with ὑποθαλῆς. (b) It may be regarded as an accusativical clause after ἐφα in verse 17, the expected ἀκαίρεος omitted to give...
it emphatic appositional effect. (c) It may be regarded as a lax construction, a participle referring to \( \text{\textit{synv}} \) verse 17 and \( \text{\textit{op{\beta}al{\lambda}{\upsilon}os}} \) being an accusative of limiting reference.

Comments: - (on "(a)"): the accusative absolute is found especially in later Greek, but is rare, and should not be resorted to, if the context will lend aid to a different explanation. On "(b)"; (1) Notice that the \( \text{\textit{k}a{\lambda}} \) is absent and in this construction the \( \text{\textit{tau{\omicron}}} \) should follow and not precede the \( \text{\textit{op{\beta}al{\lambda}{\upsilon}os}} \). - ("In order that \( \text{\textit{God}} \) may give you a spirit of wisdom (even) enlightened eyes, viz.; those of your heart"). (2) But this appositional effect is exegetically bad—"That he may give you a spirit of wisdom - (even) the enlightened eyes of your heart"!

On "(c)"; this seems best though involving Anacoluthon viz., the abnormal construction of \( \text{\textit{pe{\rho}o{\omicron}{\alpha}{\omicron}{\omicron}{\nu}{\omicron}{\omicron}{\upsilon}}{\upsilon}os} \), it being an accusative instead of a dative though referring to \( \text{\textit{synv}} \), but this change is accounted for by the following \( \text{\textit{e}}{\omicron}{\omicron} \) clause which expresses the purpose of the illumination to which the Apostle's mind having turned, he deliberately changes the participle from the dative to the accusative to agree with the subject of the infinitive, \( \text{\textit{\upsilon{\omicron}}{\upsilon{\omicron}}} \). Such permutation of case (especially of a participial clause) is not uncommon in the New Testament (Acts 16:22, \( \text{\textit{ek{\lambda}{\upsilon}{\omicron}{\theta}{\omicron}{\omicron}{\omicron}{\upsilon}}{\upsilon}} \)) and not without clear parallel in classical Greek — Jelf, Grammar Sec. 711.

19. Eph. 4:2. (Paul)

Notes: (1) The anacoluthic character is seen first in the nominative of the participle, \( \text{\textit{av{\epsilon}{\omicron}{\omicron}{\theta}{\omicron}{\nu}{\omicron}{\upsilon}{\upsilon}os}} \) instead of the accusative (to agree with \( \text{\textit{\upsilon{\omicron}}{\upsilon{\omicron}}} \)) as though the exhortation had been given in the direct form, \( \text{\textit{\tau}{\omicron}{\epsilon}{\omicron}{\gamma}{\pi}{\alpha}{\omicron}{\nu}{\sigma}{\alpha}{\epsilon}{\varsigma}}{\upsilon}{\upsilon}{\upsilon}os \). The nominative case was probably suggested by the \( \text{\textit{ek{\lambda}{\upsilon}{\theta}{\omicron}{\upsilon}{\omicron}{\upsilon}{\upsilon}e}} \) — a very natural transition to an unintentional Anacoluthon. (2) The Anacoluthon was probably designed, however, the \textit{casus recti} of the participles being used to cause them to stand out in prominence. An oblique case would have held them back in a subordinate, accessory place in the sentence.

20. Col. 3:16. (Paul)

Note: Like the example just given and Phil. 1:29-30 where \( \text{\textit{ek{\lambda}{\upsilon}{\theta}{\omicron}{\upsilon}{\omicron}{\upsilon}{\upsilon}e}} \) (verse 30) has assumed the \textit{casus recti} in order to get into prominence instead of standing in the dative with \( \text{\textit{\upsilon{\omicron}}{\upsilon{\omicron}}} \), this Col. passage is another illustration of the frequent, indeed, now practically becoming in the New Testament an idiomatic occurrence of participial Anacolutha, the participle lapsing into a nominative case — a fact referable to the manifestly weaker
force of the oblique cases of it.

21. 2nd Cor. 9:11-13. (Paul)

Notes: (1) If with the Westcott and Hort text and other commentators we regard verses 9 and 10 as parenthetical, there is no Anacoluthon in verse 11, the participle, 

(2) It is fair to object, however, to placing verse 10 in this parenthesis on the ground (a) that verse 10, beginning with τοῦ, represents a fresh beginning of a portion of the piece; and (b) that it is not parallel with and explains verse 6. 

(3) It is better, therefore, to regard πλοῦτος ἅλλος as anacoluthic, referring to οὕτων (verse 10) but standing in casus recti as if attached to and agreeing with the mentally supplied 

(4) ὁ δὲ ἐπαναφέρει (verse 13) is also anacoluthic, beautifully so: a construction arrived at by the well-known law of suggestion, verse 12, parenthetical and explanatory of the εὐχαριστίαν, of 11, bringing out the fact that this liberality, (11) not only supplied the necessities of the saints, but abounded through many thanksgivings to God. And Paul, letting the mind pass from the thanks to those giving thanks, adds: "Glorify God (as the thanksgivers do) through the proving of this administration, on the basis of the obedience of your confession unto the gospel of Christ"—just as though ὁ δὲ 

22. 2nd Cor. 1:7. (Paul)

Note: ἐκεῖς refers by this idiomatic Anacoluthon to ἐὰν εἰπῃ, of which clause the εἰπῃ is the logical subject. So also, 25, 2nd Cor. 7:6, where Paul uses ὅπως ἄλλος, referring to "our flesh", but written as though ὅπως ἄλλος ἄλλος ἄλλος had proceeded—a result of deep emotions from past memories. The same is true, 24, of 2nd Peter 3:3, where γεωργεῖται is in the nominative case referring to the logical subject of καὶ θεοὶ ἐκίνησαν.

26. Acts 26:3—(Paul)

Note: Here we find δὲ τὸ ὅπως (verse 3) where we would expect ὅπως τοῦτο, in agreement with τοῦτο in verse 2. This is not easy to explain. Buttmann regards the τὸ as accusative absolute, a common construction when the participle is annexed. Meyer thinks it joined in an abnormal case as though ὅπως ὅπως ὅπως had proceeded. Jelf and Green suppose it to be an accusative after ἔρχεται.
understood, as supplied from ἡ Υγίαινα

2nd, In which the construction, leading off with a participle as though anticipating a series of participles, is changed to a finite verb.


Notes: (1) There is a slight corruption of text here as is seen by a comparison: ἦτοι παρὰ τὸν πατέραν τῆς ἱδίας τῆς καθος καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκογενείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἐν τῷ πάτρῳ ὡς ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκογενείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκογενείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου. But that slight difference, together with the difference of punctuation, makes a considerable difference in the construction and sense, for (2) according to the former text, there is an anacoluthon in the participle, καταλαμβάνειν, which after ἐκεῖνος should have been a participle in the genitive case instead of a finite form of the verb, used periphrastically to give prominence to the idea of present continuance, paralleling the pregnant use of the ἐκ above; but the anacoluthic form (a change from the participle to the finite verb) is used to bring into greater prominence the fruit-bearing element of the Gospel. (3) According to the second text (the Westcott and Hort) by the rejection of the καὶ, the anacoluthic form may be escaped, but the καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ is quite superfluous, and indeed the whole sentence seems very weak.

27. Col. 1:26. (Paul)

Notes: (1) Anacoluthon is manifest here in the transition from the participial construction, ἀποκατάλαμβανειν, to a construction with a finite verb, ἐπεξεργάζων. (not ἐπεξεργάζοντας).

(2) This example is like the former text, except that here we have ἐκ for a stronger contrast.

26, 1st Cor. 7:37. (Paul)

Text: ἐὰν δὲ ἔστηκεν ἐν Ἰησού καὶ ἰδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖνος, ἐὰν ἐξεργάζεται ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐποιεῖται καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκείνος. Notes: (1) Observe again the anacoluthic construction in the use of ἐκεῖνος instead of the participle, ἐκεῖνος, which, since the ἐκ shows the clause to be correlative to the former, would have been the regular construction. (2) The superior force of the anacoluthic construction can be seen by the parallel translation: ______

But he who stands steadfast in his heart, not having a necessity
But he who stands steadfast in his heart, not having a necessity,
but having power with respect to his own will. Manifestly force
is gained by the transition to the finite form, though care must
be used though the following clause be construed as coordinate
with this anacoluthic clause, instead of with ἐὰν δὲ ἔστηκεν at the beginning.
29. Eph. 1:20-22. (Paul)

Text: εἰς γάρ αὐτὸν εἰ περικεφαλασίας καὶ καθισμὸς εἰς δικαίας αὐτοῦ — καὶ πάντα ὑπεράγειν ὑπὸ — καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς ὅκενον.

Notes: (1) Here is a sentence starting out with a series of coordinate aorist pra participles, which might have been continued to the end of the sentence, but because the words which follow καθισμὸς εἰς δικαίας open the way for a strong statement with a finite verb, the Apostle, appropriating the thought rather than quoting the words of Psa. 8:7 makes a transition through Anacoluthia to the desired finite verb construction - ἐπείγομένον.

N.B. Psa. 8:7-6 reads πάντα ὑπεράγειν ὑπὸ καθισμὸς εἰς δικαίας αὐτοῦ. (2) And thus verse 22 (not a tautological restatement of 21) is the installation of Christ into the highest Κυρίον, Phil. 2:10, and the emphasis is greatly strengthened by the anacoluthic construction.

30. 2nd Cor. 6:9- (Paul)

Notes: (1) A remarkable fact here is the injecting into a series of participial constructions, through Anacoluthia, a single finite verb ἐπείγομένον, and then resuming the participial construction, and so continuing to the end of the pr paragraph.

(2) Why the anacoluthic form? Was it (a) "to reach a simpler structure?" No, the participial method would have been as simple and as sensible as the preceding corresponding participle. (b) It was to emphasize the second element of the parallel in this special case. Note also the force of ἐπείγομένον, yielding the variation of lively surprise. But the intrinsic difference in signification between the present indicative and the present participle must be recalled, giving a joyful feeling of victory to the persecuted Apostles through the anacoluthic change - "as dying, and behold we are living!"

31. John 5:44- (Jesus)

Text: πᾶς δύνατος ἔχεις πιστεύουσαι, δος γὰρ πας — λαμβάνεις καὶ δεῖν δοθῇ — οὖν μητηρεῖ. (Jesus)

Note: Here, too, the two coordinate elements of the sentence might have been expressed by coordinate participles, but the change to the finite form in the second member is made (1) to give independence to the second clause, as the finite form does; and (2) to lend impressiveness to it, as may be observed from the parallel translation: [glory from one another receiving, and the glory from God not receiving, glory from God you do not receive.

32. Heb. 8:10. (quotation from O.T.)

Notes: (1) There is a corruption of text here: the Vatican
LXX having ἰδοὺς δοθῇ, and the Alexandrine LXX being the same as the Westcott and Hort here; yet the Hebrew text has ἰδοὺ, a simple prophetic perfect. So neither one of the above correctly represents the Hebrew, the Vatican being the strongest possible future. If the Vatican LXX is correct, there is no Anacoluthon. But taking the text as it stands in the Westcott and Hort text: (2) Shall we connect ἰδοὺς with ἵππησον (10a) and place a colon after ὀρῶν, making the following line an independent clause, beginning afresh? This is a possible solution, escaping an Anacoluthon. But (a) this occasions too great a break between the ἵππησον and its antecedent (next line) and its antecedent ὀρῶν (this line). (b) There would be, further, a large break between ἵππησον (second line) and its antecedent, ὀρῶν Ἰερ (10a); while ἵππησον and ἵππησον would seem to refer to the same antecedent. (3) Shall we connect ἰδοὺς with ἐπίμενε following, and render καί "also"? Translation: "While placing my laws into their mind, also upon their hearts will I write them". This too, is possible and quite probable, being grammatically unobjectionable, and would escape a broken construction. An objection to this arrangement is the implication involved (though not necessarily so,) that the first covenant was placed on the mind as well as on stone, and this one is distinguished by being written on the heart also. (4) The last solution, and one free from the above-mentioned objection, is to connect ἰδοὺς with ἵππησον and to regard the construction as anacoluthic - expecting ἐπίμενε, but actually using the future finite form for vividness and emphasis. Thus ἐπίμενε "for this is the covenant which I will make with the House of Israel ... giving my laws into their minds and writing them upon their hearts (upon their hearts will I write them, and I will be)". 

35. John 1:32. (John the Baptist)

Notes: (1) Anacoluthia occurs in the change to the finite form in the second member thus: ἐπίμενε χειρὶ καὶ ἐπίμενε ὡς περὶ ἡμῶν ἐστὶ οὐκ ἑπιστάναι καὶ ἐπὶ ἡμῶν ἐστὶ οὐκ ἑπιστάναι. In the broken construction there would be no comma after ὀρῶν. (2) This change is made to emphasize the fact of remaining, a fact used for a testimony later on (verse 35). Note: ἐπίμενε (and accusative): "It remained directed toward him".

54. 2nd Cor. 5:6. (Paul)

Notes: (1) Verse 8 is not an apodosis of the participial protasis of verse 6, as Hoffman suggests; for in that case there would be no ἦ in verse 8. (2) The verse is anacoluthic, the
construction being quite broken off by verse 7, yet the thought of verse 6 is resumed in verse 8 but in anacoluthic form. Paul intended to write ἐπαλεύεις οὐ παντ' ὧν καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐμὸν, but he was carried away by the parenthesis of verse 7. However he returns to the same thought in verse 8, and could have resumed by ἐπαλεύεις; (repeating after a parenthesis), but he actually uses the finite form ἐπαλεύεις, according to the anacoluthic method now under investigation.

3rd, Another form of Anacoluthia is where a sentence which begins with ὡς concludes with the accusative and infinitive construction, as though ὡς had not been used, and vice versa.


This illustrates the sort of Anacoluthon just described. It is quite common in classical Greek, though we do not find it frequently in the New Testament.

36. John 8:56.

The vice versa of the principle stated is illustrated in John 8:56 where we have ὡς, ἐπεκέκπη ὡς ὁ Ἰσραήλ, instead of ὡς ἐπεκέκπη δέπου.

4th, A fourth kind of Anacoluthia is exemplified in sentences at the head of which stands a nominative or accusative with which the verb of the particular sentence is not made to agree - casus pendentes.

37. 1st John 2:24,27. (words of John)

Notes: (1)These passages are not clear. To join the ὡς of both verses with the relative clause which follow, as the Westcott and Hort text does, seems to give to the pronouns an undue weight of emphasis. It seems better to cut them off with commas regarding them as used Hebraistically, "as for you." (Gen. 17:4,7,37,etc.) (2)So in each case beginning with ὡς, John does not follow it up by ἔτεκε ἐπεκέκπη, but by a ὡς clause (relative) which becomes the new subject of the principle verb.


ἀπόρριψης, a very significant example of a suspended nominative, ἀπόρριψης, a nominative absolute. This is surely very striking as compared with what the regular construction would be: "These things which you see shall in days which shall come not escape being torn down stone from stone".

39. John 6:59. (Jesus)

ἐστιν ἄνελεξοις τί ἔστιν ἄνελεξοις. This is surely a very striking thing which you see in days which shall come not escape being torn down stone from stone".

40. John 6:59. (Jesus)
That is, the πᾶς becomes a suspended nominative, for the verb is not made to agree with it but has a new subject, εἰς (Jesus) understood, and an αὐτῷ, referring to the three πᾶς is actually introduced as object.

40. John 7:38. (Jesus)

The same is true of this passage where we have:

\[ ὁ πρὸς εὐαγγ. — παρακλ. ἐκ ἐνδοθ. γέν. εὐαγγ. \]

41. John 5:3. (Jesus)

Exactly the same principle is illustrated here where we have,"every branch in me not bearing fruit ὅσι ἐν τῷ ἀν.", not ἀπετάσ.

42-44. Essentially, the same is the suspended nominative, πᾶς ἐν Ἰ. in Matthew 12:36, with which the ἀπὸ δυνάμεως does not agree; and in Revelation 2:26, where ὁ νῦν ἐν Ἰ. is followed by δυνάμει with a new subject. See also Revelation 3:12.

45. 2nd Cor. 12:17. (Paul)

Note: Here we have an accusative pendens. For emphasis Paul prefixes absolutely the πᾶς clause as the designed object of the πᾶς principle verb, but afterwards subjoining the qualifying phrase ἀπὸ δυνάμεως, independently of it, he leaves the accusative πᾶς a more emphatic pendent.

46. Romans 8:3. (Paul)

The suggested most simple disposition of the πᾶς λογοὶ in this passage is to regard it as a nominative absolute, in opposition with the designed act which is described in the following verses, especially the (He) "Condemned sin in the flesh" 5b. But this is not the thing which the law could not do, see 7:7, cf. 24. It has been suggested that we regard πᾶς λογοὶ as an accusative and translate "in view of the incompetency of the law". Then πᾶς λογοὶ is here probably supposed to be an accusative of specification, but it is doubtful whether such an accusative should be translated "in view of", unless we may suppose a δακτύλιον to be implied. The solution may be to regard this as unanacoluthic, supplying ἐνδοθ. ἐν μέσῳ, in the sense of "accomplish", before the ὁ δεός τείχος, leaving the context to explain the significance of the πᾶς λογοὶ viz. to justify and understanding a καὶ before κακοκατάγειν. The law had no offering πεπλήρωμα which could save from it as Jesus did. Translate as follows: "for the impossible achievement of the law viz. to bring justification, because it was weak through the flesh, God accomplished, having sent his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh and with respect to sin, and condemned sin in the flesh" etc.
In this passage and in 16:21 and in 9:7 there is a illustrated a sort of Anacoluthia peculiar to the New Testament, in which the writer proceeds not in his own words, but in those of some quotation from the Old Testament, e.g. ἡλία οὐ εἴδοσ — μου ἴνον ἐν τῷ ἴπτερον ἐν ἐμὲ ἔνεν not "Christ pleased not himself, but to please God suffered all manner of abuse".

5th, Another form of Anacoluthias is found in the use of μεν clause, without a subsequent parallel clause marked by a δε.

48. Col. 2:23. (Paul)

Text: λόγον μεν ἐχων ἀποκληθήσεις.

Notes: 1)There is no δε in this second member, but as Paul goes on with the three prepositional phrases, describing the show of μεν wisdom, the reader is prepared for a contrast; and when he reaches the second member he does not use the δε antithesis, but theοινεις ἐν μη, not in contrast ο to λόγον, however, but τοίχεια ἐμθετοροικα etc., from which we may gather in substance what the μεν clause expected.

49. Romans 10:1. (Paul)

γ' μεν ἐτῶσον, but no δε clause anywhere in the antithesis; for in the following verses of departure, in which he describes the Jews perverted "zeal", the Apostle's thought so looks up before him, standing in the relation of direct opposition to his heart-felt desire, that his μ solicitude must remain unfulfilled on account of the perverted striving of the Jews for righteousness, and there is no need of his stating the contrasted member.

50. 1st Cor. 5:3. (Paul)

Notes: (1)The peculiarity of this μεν solitarium is that it looks backward rather than forward, because it represents an independent resolution arrived at by Paul in anticipation of the act of the Corinthians related in the previous verse — a resolution carried out in his own mind at a time when he supposed the church was assembled to put away the evil worker, i.e. he judged the man (in his mind) and put him away, which they μ did not — a sufficient contrast. (2)A sufficient contrast moreover, is seen in the "you boasting is not good" verse 6, especially when compared with the present tense of the verb of verse 2, "you are puffed up", and so verse 6 may be regarded as the contrasting member.
The εἰ ἡν clause is a different turn of expression and probably not even anacoluthic, though it after all expresses the aim of 

κοπ. πάντως εἰ ἡν would regularly follow a verb of "watching" (trying) etc., in Greek here understood, σκοπ. πάντως εἰ ἡν. The regular construction if anacoluthic would have been probably thus: "Inasmuch as I am an Apostle to the Gentiles, I magnify my office; but I do this with a view, through moving my nation by jealousy, to saving some",—with a grand ultimate aim (as verse 16 shows) through the recovering of the Jews, for the largest possible blessing of the Gentiles, his proper charge, which he characterises as a "resurrection from the dead".

52. Acts 1:1. (words of the author)

Here the construction is wholly broken off and the parallel member must be deduced by the reader or from the sequel.

Notes: (1) When Luke wrote οὐκ εἰ ἡν λόγος he purposed to follow with a ό�ε complement about as follows: 'But this ἐκκεντρος λόγος will treat of the work which at his ascension he committed to his ambassadors'. But the mention of the Apostles (verse 2) and their commission, leads him off to the relation of events which happened between the resurrection and the ascension but which were not recorded in the εἰ ἡν, though a necessary preparation for the ἐκκεντρος: concluding with a restatement of the ascension, the conclusion of the former narrative (10-14), or indeed, 10-26: so that the ἐκκεντρος really begins with Acts 2:1. (2) But from his wandering he returns no more to the thought of the οὐκ clause, and the second member is to be supplied by the imagination of the reader.

53. Romans 7:12, 13. (Paul)

οὐκ εἰ ἡν λόγος: But no ὡς clause in form follows.

Notes: (1) In the contexts, 1-6 and 7-11, Paul has shown (a) that the being discharged from the law was a great boon to the Jews, actually or potentially bringing them into liberty, 1-6; and (b) (in answer to the objection that the law must therefore be sin) that while death had been the result of his contact with the law, it was not the law in him but sin in him which wrought the havoc; and now verse 12 is designed to set forth the two in contrast, and fully stated would have been about thus:

οὐκ εἰ ἡν λόγος: ὡς ἐκκεντρος καὶ ἐκεῖ, ἡ γάρ αὐτοκράτορα ἐκκεντρος καὶ ἐκεῖ καὶ κακία.

But the inference against the law which might have been drawn from verse 7 and used against him now crosses his train of thought and he digresses. (2) From this digression he does not return so as to express the thought parallel to the οὐκ clause in a ὡς
form; howbeit the contrast for which the ἐκλειστος clause prepares the way is indeed found in substance in 13b: where, having put that inference drawn from verse 7 in the form of a question, he gives as a refutation of it the substance of what he first intended, but now in a polemical form using the strongest adversative, ἀλλά. (3) The remarkable fact about 13b is that it also becomes anacluthic through the supposition that the intended contrast between the law and sin had been fully stated in 11 and 12: "But (the) sin that it might be shown to be sin by working death in me through that which is good - (became thus unholy and unjust and evil) in order that through the commandment the sin might become inexpressibly sinful". N.B. The repetition of Ἔλεος, the subject of ἐγέρσει, instead of being superfluous, conveys, especially when placed at the close, in climatic parallel the mighty emphasis of its solemn and painful and tragic effect.

54. Romans 1:8. (Paul)
Note: The πειστον ἐκλειστος of this verse never realizes its ἐκλειστος in this member. The Apostle thanks God that their faith is proclaimed throughout the world. And this suggests the emotion towards prayer for them and longing to see and bless them which came to him whenever he heard of them, and, engrossed in the expression of his feelings, he forgets the πειστον ἐκλειστος and absorbs himself in his debt to the Gospel.

55. Romans 3:2. (Paul)
Notes: (1) In this passage the question is suggested whether ἐκλειστος always expects the corresponding ἐκλειστος, or whether the apodosis is, as it were, obliterated, it being determined beforehand by the writer that no ἐκλειστος clause shall follow in certain cases; and that, then, the ἐκλειστος has a force of its own. (Cf. 53, Romans 7:12, where ἐκλειστος may perform both functions and serve, (in addition to what is said above) to guard beforehand the unassailable character of the law, as though signifying, 'that nothing shall invalidate the character of holiness belonging to the law', sufficing to insulate some person or thing and so to exclude everything else from consideration). The ἐκλειστος seems to here have perform some such function in Romans 11:13, 1st Thes. 2:18 and Acts 26:9. Does it have this force in Romans 3:2? (2) Now it may be said that this passage illustrates a characteristic of Paul to get lost in his digressions and forget his ἐκλειστος factors of discourse; thus, Paul begins to illustrate the "much every way" according to individual elements, but just after mentioning the
first, he is led away by crowding thoughts of Israel's experience, and never returns. This may easily be the situation.

(3) But may it not be that this possibly illustrates the usage of **καί** mentioned at the beginning of these notes? That καί was used thus absolutely and determinatively, without any δέ anticipated, is clear especially from Epic and Ionic usage, and not without illustration in Attic Greek. (See illustrations above).

And so with an "obliterated" apodosis i.e. no apodosis intended, the Apostle "insulates" the example mentioned, purposely excluding others. Thus: "While I might mention many of the numerous and varied advantages entwining through all the relations of life, I will confine myself to one which stands in the first rank and from which all the others flow" — remembering the force of "determinative" which is — though this advantage were the only one, it remains unassailable, real. This solution would confirm the scholarship of Paul, and relieve his writings (in this passage and others) from the charge of being illogical in arrangement, and without continuity in texture and elaboration. This is the better solution of Romans 11:13, though it deprives that passage of the much desired Anacoluthia.

56. 1st Cor. 11:18. (Paul)

**καί** ἐν, followed by no second member with δέ.

Notes: (1) Really, the εἰκεῖα δέ would be found in 12:1, but in the discussion of the first part (running through 16 verses,) Paul loses sight of the καί ἐν and uses no εἰκεῖα with the δέ in 12:1. (2) The second member is not to be sought for in verse 20 with ἄνωθεν, for ἄνωθεν is resumptive and does not introduce a second reprehension, but takes up the first which had been interrupted by the καί ἐν ἔκαστος δέ.

57. Heb. 9:1.

**εἰκεῖα** καί ἐν ἄνωθεν εἰκαστος etc., but no δέ.

Note: Led away by the description of the ordinances and the sanctuary of the first covenant, the author does not recur to the antithetical statement εἰκεῖα of the ordinances of the second covenant. Howbeit the δέ regimen, beginning with verse 11, gives full antithesis of the second covenant.

58. 2nd Cor. 12:12. (Paul)

καί καί εἰκεῖα καστος etc., but no δέ.

Note: His Apostleship had been called in question at Corinth, and the Corinthian brethren were wavering. The καί solitary leaves the readers to find the corresponding contrast: 'the signs were there, but you seemed not to have fixed them'.
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Note: There is quite a versatility here, every case conforming to the rules of Greek grammar, yet breaking a strict grammatical construction: (1) μεί is regular after υειετες; (2) ἰπος ἐφαντι, a dative agreeing with μεί and an aorist tense expressing past time; (3) περιεχομενου μια, a genitive absolute expressing time when; a transition from a dative case; (4) γεν- ἐδαπανα, a transition to indirect discourse, instead of infinitive complementary with μια omitted.

65. Mark 12:38-40. (Jesus)

Note: Consider again the Lord's versatility in conversation:
βλέπετε ἀπο λαον τον βαλεντιμων, perfectly regular; (2) απαγορευσα, a noun instead of ἀπαγορευσα, coordinate with περιεχομενου; (3) κατα- δοντες, transitional to a nominative by broken construction for των καταδοντιαν, coordinate with μείκτων εις ναυ.

66. John 8:53. (Jesus)

Note: Here we have και αποτραγον απεδανων instead of μια κατα- δοντες απεδανων, which, indeed, would have been quite clumsy and repetitious. "And the prophets died" drives to the same conclusion by its thought-provoking method, and gains much in brevity.

67. 1st Cor. 7:13. (Paul)

Note: This passage furnishes a rather common preference of the strong demonstrative in place of the simple relative pronoun: και γενι ἐκει και ἀνθρωπος και ανθρωπος, κατο ν ὅτε.

68. John 15:5. (Jesus)

Note: This is quite interesting: the εις εις would be a sufficient subject for εις εις, but the emphatic εις ανθρωπος is well supplied, signifying "this one, no other than he, beareth much fruit". Notice, too, how the εις εις εις. Κληρα (5a) establishes the εις εις of 4b and, the εις εις εις brings in to relief the proceeding εις εις εις especially by the emphatic position of εις εις εις εις.

69. Romans 12:6. (Paul)

We have here an exemplification of varied discourse in that (1) there is a list of abstract accusatives depending on εις εις εις continued to εις εις εις εις; then (2) a new construction, consisting of concrete nouns in the nominative, changing also (if this is a series of concise maxims thrown in elliptically) from first person to third person, and becoming more hortatory, as seen in εις εις εις and the following.

70. Hnd Cor. 11:25-26. (Paul)

Here is a fine illustration of Variata, a catalogue of the varied experiences of the Apostle's life expressed in a variety
of ways e.g. (1) Instrumental: (a) by ἐκ and dative case (b) then by dative alone. (c) by ἐκ again, mixed. (2) The oratorical emphasis upon καὶ ὁ νῦν. (3) An aorist followed by a perfect.

71. John 2. (John)

Text: ἓλθεν δὲ ηῷς ἐκ σαρκὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, καὶ Μάρτυρις ἐστί. θο.

Note: Here is a change to a future finite verb for a participial construction parallel to ἐν σάλο - a change indeed, almost necessary to express the future abiding; for the future participle expresses what is "about to be". Nevertheless the change serves to give prominence to the idea expressed, and indeed that finite verb expresses the imperishable endurance of the fellowship of the truth with the believer.


Text: εἰς ὕπό τι ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐκ νομοῦ ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ ἐκ τῆς Καταρχῆς, ἐπεκείνα Ελ.

Note: Oratio-Varia is noticed here in the change in two coordinate members from the participial construction to a finite verb. They might have said ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐκ νομοῦ ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ ἐκ τῆς Καταρχῆς ἐπεκείνα Ελ., ἐξ ἐναγαίνων but coordinate members usually have the same tense, and the finite form always has the advantage of vigor over the participial form.

73. Romans 2:9. (Paul)

Notes: (1) ὅτι θεός are broken, being in the nominative instead of the accusative after ἀμώμων verse 6§ "which would better follow ὥσπερ ἰδον αὐτοῖς ὁ πατὴρ Ἰσραήλ" (Philippi), and therefore really anacoluthic. (2) There is, too, a sort of appropriateness in changing from the ἐν πάσαν ἔργον, when expressing sorrow (wrath) to the personal dative τῇ ὑπὲρ, when expressing joy.

74. Mark 6:5. (the author)

Text: καὶ παρῄσχεται ἐνα μὴ ἐπὶ ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ ἐπετρεπτόντος σανδάλια.

Note: An interesting Oratio-Varia is found here in that while the writer follows παρῄσχεται ἐκ first with a ἐνα object clause, indirect discourse, and then as though he had changed (and did so in mind) to the obliqua, παρῄσχεται ἐν αὐτῷ παρεσοφάλον against, in fact, according to Westcott and Hort, he uses παρεσοφάλον σανδάλια and finally, by a lively non-periodic method of picturing the scene, he changes once more (if we may take the marginal reading) from obliqua to the directa μὴ ἐποίησον. N.B. This Oratio-Varia is peculiar to Mark, the Matthew and Luke accounts, 10:1-14, 9:1-16 being unchanged.

75. Acts 23:22. (The chiliarch)

Text: ἄρειν οὖν κυρίῳ ἄρειν ἄρειν ἀπελύσεται ἀπὸ ἐναγαίνων οὕτως τὴν ἐκλαθέντα, ἐπὶ εἱδή ἐναγαίνων οὕτως πεσὲν.
-a very striking illustration of the change from obliqua to
directa, both escaping a bunglesome rendering of two third-persons
auxō, ταῦτα ἐγνώμεν ἑξέστην, and confirming the suggestion of
friendliness made in verse 19. It is significant that the
American revision does not use the same versatility in rendering
this passage.


Essentially in the same construction is this passage from
Luke: καὶ αὐτῶς παρὰ οπισθεν αὐτῷ ἐπεβεβλαρών ἀλλὰ ἀπέλυσεν
δὲ ἐκεῖνον ἄλλα τῷ ἐκείνῳ ἐτοιού ἑτέρῳ. etc., where the author wishing to use
the identical words of Jesus, changes to direct discourse.


Text: παρέκκλισεν αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἑτέρῳ ἐτοιού ἑτέρῳ. etc.
Note: The writer resorts to a change here for vividness,
and especially to reproduce the exact words of Jesus,
and for the sake of any who had followed Jesus to recall
the scene and circumstances where Jesus had recently spoken these words.


Text: λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦς Ἰακώβῳ ἐν τῇ ἑτέρῳ ἑτέρῳ τοῦτον ἐπιτίθητι. etc.
This represents a change from direct to indirect discourse
(the converse of the above). The scene represents the supposition
of some of the twelve that, because Judas carried the bag,
"Jesus had said to him 'Buy things of which we have need for
the feast', or, that he should give something to the poor".
The picture is vivid, and gives a touch of human nature. The
things needed for the feast were close to their thoughts, and so
put in directa, the giving something to the poor (expressed in-
directly) was more remote.


Text: παρατείνειν ὀν χ. ἵνα παρελθοῦσα ἐπιτίθητι. Ἰησοῦς Ἰακώβῳ Ἰακώβῳ. etc.
Notes: (1) The Oratio-Varia appears in the second member
being changed to direct as above instead of καὶ ἐν ἐκεῖνος ἑτέρῳ (ἤν)
ὁ χ. ὧν ἐπεβεβλαρών ἑτέρῳ ἑτέρῳ. (2) The change was
made in order to gain the superior vividness of direct address
in presenting a personal Savior. (3) It is true also, and a
matter of interest, that the two elements of the member rendered
indirectly present the historical Messiah, and the direct state-
ment presents a personal living Saviour; the indirect is related
to the direct statement as the general proposition of the Messiah
of the cross is to the concrete manifestation of Jesus as that
Messiah.


I now come to two examples of peculiar construction - not
broken, for the grammar is alright, but varied, changing from soliloquy to direct address. I say soliloquy, because ΙΟΩΨΕΛΗ is not in the vocative as is shown by the nominative case of the qualifying participle ἀποκαίνωσα etc., and the third personal pronoun ἀυτοῦ. Again, it is varied, in that Jesus changes from the singular pronoun ἐγώ to the plural in δίκαιος ὁ- μων in verse 36. I am inclined to place the passage under the title of Apostrophetic soliloquy.


Yet more peculiar is this passage: ἑνά δὲ εἰσῆλθε ἐντὸς οἴκου 

Notes: (1) Shall we say (τὸν λεγέται παντεί, not being parenthetical, nor ἑνά δὲ εἰσῆλθε elliptical) that here is an illustration of the intermixing of speech and narrative, where the simpler construction would be either ἑνά δὲ εἰσῆλθε... ὑπὲρ λέγω τῶν παρερε., or ἑνά δὲ ὑπὲρ ὁλὸν... ὑπὲρ λέγει... το, so that in the text we have the first member of the former construction joined with the second of the latter, and no break at all, such as is indicated in the Westcott and Hort. text? Or (2) receive the text as given by Westcott and Hort, supposing an Aposiopesis at ἀκριάς, and translate thus: "It would have been as easy to say arise and walk as to say thy sins be forgiven, but in order that you may know etc.,... (I said what I did), then addressing the paralytic he said etc.; or (3) 'It was as easy to say thy sins be forgiven as to say arise and walk, and I said the former, but in order that you may know .... sins, (the Aposiopesis being marked by the act of turning to the paralytic) arise and take up thy bed". (4) Still another disposition of this matter is to say that no formal apodosis follows ἀγριάς, but to regard the address to the paralytic as an equivalent. The expression "He said to the paralytic", is a circumstantial simplicity of styl (which would not be found in Greek writers who would have omitted such an expression as an encumbrance, or not have thought it, and left the people to interpret the Aposiopesis by the act of turning to the paralytic, see (3)) characteristic of the author and may be regarded as parenthetical.

III. EXEMPLIFICATION OF APOSIOPESIS.

82. Mark 8:12.

Text: Καὶ ἀναβαλεῖς—λέγεις: Τι ἄγεται—οποῖος;

Notes: The ὡρωσε introduces a form of solemn asseveration, bar-
rowed from Hebrew and perhaps not found in classical Greek, in which there is an implied imprecation, suppressed through Aposiopesis. It corresponds to the so common in oaths in the Old Testament, see Gen.14:23; Deut. 1:35, 1st Kings 1:51, 2:8. What the imprecation would have been is suggested by Old Testament usage: "God do so to me and more also etc."

83. Heb. 3:11, 4:3.

Note: This formula of swearing is especially illustrated in Hebrews 3:11, and here in reference to God. The form of the implied imprecation would differ according to whether it was God or man taking the oath. In these passages the suppressed apodosis would be like this: Οὐ χάρις ἐν ἡ δοξή μου, εἰ δεικνύομαι τὴν ἐνδοξήμονα. But the solemn impressiveness of Aposiopesis is illustrated (and this is common in classical Greek as well) in suppressed apodoses of conditional clauses. Here we have a number of beautiful examples.

84. Luke 18:42

Text: ἐν ὑμέναις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αυτῇ ὑμεῖς ἔχασατε ὧν δέ εἰς Χριστόν ἐλήματον ἀπέστειλας.

Notes: (1) Translation: "If thou hadst known, even thou, the things which have reference to @pace — but" etc. This is a pathetic Aposiopesis pointing to the absolute fruitlessness of the wish. The apodosis is suppressed through the outcry of sorrow. (2) Note that the word here is θλοίν, audible crying, and not δακρύω, silent trickling of tears as at Lazarus's grave. And, well does this example impress the oriental custom expressed by Zigabenus, καί έρασίς, λαίκες έπειτα κατερθήσασθαι διά τία δοσμος λόγους ὑπὸ τῆς πάθους σφόδρῳ διαγος — for those wailing are accustomed to cut short their words through the violence of their suffering.


Since the three passages tell of this suffering I will quote them all: πάντες μοι, εἰ οὗ δυνατόν οὐδὲ παρέμενεν έαν έν αὐτῷ ποιώ, έγερθε θεός, το θελημάτι σου, (Mk); Αββα, εἰ πάντες πάντες δυνατοί οὐ έσείτες, κε διογένεσι οὖν τούτο απέκρισθεν, ἀλλ' οὔ έπεί τι θέλω, ἀλλ' οὗ έσείτες οὖν τούτο, (Mt); τάθεε, Ε'; θολεί παρείτες, έσείτες, κε διογένεσι οὖν τούτο απέκρισθεν, πάντες μοι, το θελημάτι σου αλλ' οὗ έσείτες οὖν.

Notes: (1) My position is that there is here an Aposiopesis after ποιώ, and I have quoted the three accounts for comparison; since we may consider the three as an attempt to express the feelings and words of Jesus, whether afterward told the Apostles by Jesus or revealed to them through the Holy Spirit. (2) An
objection to regarding the Matthew passage as *Aposiopetia* (the others manifestly are not) is that as it stands it is a good example of a more vivid future condition. I answer, (a) that as to form it may be so regarded, though the *imv* is comparatively rare in such an apodosis, especially after a negative, (cf. verse 58). (b) We learn from a combination of the Luke passage, and verse 59, and the Mark passage, that there was an expressed longing on Jesus' part that the cup might pass, with a growing conviction (even through strong appeals) that his longing could not be satisfied, that God's will was different. And so, this passage (which certainly follows the others chronologically) if made a regular conditional sentence loses much of its force; as. though he said, "My Father, if it be not possible for this cup to pass except I drink it. (and I feel that is thy will) let thy will be done." Now this has some force, but not such a force as the next supposition which is ask follows, (c) When Jesus begins this second prayer he is not thinking of his conflict of will, but trying to measure his agony and find alleviation. And as he feels his dark way along. through those awful words (Matthew 26:42), the way impenetrably dark and inexpressibly so when he reaches πέω, and he pauses, why? Let Luke 22:43-44 and Heb. 5:1-5 answer here. And Meyer remarks that "Jesus will expressed in verse 58 is completely silenced here" yes, suppressed by Aposiopesis through strong crying and bloody sweat, but finally recovering he adds, "Let thy will be done."

Text: οὐ δεῦ κακὸν εὖρεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικαίου, αὐτὸν ἡγομένος ἵκνον θάνατον

Notes: (1) It is clear that there is an Aposiopetia after ἵκνον, whether resulting from a feeling of bitter offensiveness against the Sadducees, or of dread and awe from coming in contact with a divine fact, but in either case indicating the critical position in the case supposed. (2) If Paul's device results only in stirring up a party feeling, then we may imagine the Pharisee utters the words with a gesticulatorily treacherous look, and gesture toward the Sadducees to whom they leave the task of supplying in thought an apodosis. (3) Or it might be that just when he pronounced the word ἵκνον, the realization dawned upon him that a divine message was in that case just as binding upon the Pharisees and he became suddenly silent.

Note: This may represent a sentence broken off by an interruption.

Text: ἐνδώ&ρεν υπὸ τῶν σκότων ἠδών ὃν τε Θεοῦ τον καλόν ἀναβαίνοντος γυναῖκας ἄνευ ραντέκρουστ

Notes: (1) I fail to find any exemplification or justification
of the effort to make this εἰκτι an interrogative particle, involving the presence of an interrogative ἢ, as the Standard American version renders this passage, excluding the suggestion of an Aposiopesis. (2) It seems much better to recognize an Aposiopesis, and to regard the apodosis as suppressed in the triumphant tone of the passage, then the reader seeking the apodosis will find it suggested by the ἐστιν ποιεῖν ἠδρόσωμεν of 51, and might supply it in ποιεῖν ἠδρόσωμεν, and translate "If accordingly you shall see the Son ascending where he was before, what then will you do"? (3) Another solution: remembering (a) that this is a more vivid future condition, not a less vivid, as the Revised unjustifiably translates it, and (b) that Jesus now passes from the fact of Messianic death verse 51, to the hitherto unrevealed fact of Messianic exaltation, and having announced it as a Messianic fact, breaks off by Aposiopesis, leaving the apodosis for future events to reveal. Enlarged by translation: Does this my method of setting forth vaguely the giving of my flesh for the life of the world, cause you to stumble, in your faith? If accordingly you shall see the Son Man ascending where he was before" - but let the sequel reveal the effect.

38. Mark 7:11. (Matthew 15:5)

Text: ἐκεῖνος δὲ λέγετε, ἐτέρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκρύπτῃς - Κορβάν.

εἰκεῖν εἰ γειτονὶ ἀφελθῇ δὴς αὐκέεσεν.

Note: There is an Aposiopesis after ἀφελθῇ. The apodosis is suppressed, it being well known by all, what the Pharisees and Scribes taught, but may be conjectured by us and supplied as follows: "But you say, 'if a man shall say to his father a gift is that wherewith you would be profitted from me', he is not bound by the commandment to honor his father, but his obligation is transferred to his Corban'; and "no longer do you permit him etc." W.B. This is much better than to punctuate as the Westcott and Hort text does either (a) thrusting the αὐκέεσεν clause in as an apodosis of the condition, though in different person and number or (b) referring it correctly to ἐκεῖνος δὲ λέγετε, without indicating in any way that the conditional clause has no apodosis.

39. Phil. 1:22. (Paul)

Text: ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ γάρ ἐν σαρκί, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐκεῖνος δὲ τῇ ἀφέσιν σοῦ ὑπερβαίνει.

Notes: (1) Κατόνος is correlative to ἐκεῖνος of verse 21, and signifies in connection with ἐγὼ "emolument", "work fruit".

He has just said, "Living is for me Christ, and dying is gain".
and here, "Living is Christ and dying is gain", is to be insensible to the emotions which surge upon one when contemplating the most solemn moment of one's career. The emotion however, is not one of awe at the contemplation of death, but joy in the anticipation of life. This is confirmed by verse 25 where he accepts the supposition of verse 22 as the Lord's prerogative.
Notes: (1) This is a very difficult passage, and in no text is it punctuated as an Aposiopesis. Some help may be derived from the consideration of the state out of which the expression arose. It is well nigh impossible to believe that Paul utters this cry as a Christian. The state of Paul saved was that of freedom, of overcoming, of life in Christ, and of Christ in him, of a new creature from whom old things have passed away. But Paul often recalls his pre-Christian experience, and conforming himself to all men can easily realize their unsaved state. So it is Paul, transporting himself back to the state of his former career of the bloody deeds of which he has a keen remembrance. Thus transported, while his imagination makes real his former life of struggle in his conflict with sin, he cries "O wretched man that I am who shall deliver, etc."; then suddenly leaping the dark chasm of his Damasus experience, he cries through the overmastering pressure of joy: "Thanks be to God!" (2) Here seems some kind of Aposiopesis, though it is not connected with a protasis of a conditional sentence. But I see no reason why an Aposiopesis might not follow a pathetic interrogation, as well as an emotional condition. So I would write the text thus: 

"O wretched man, I, who shall deliver me from the body of this death! Thanks be to God through our Lord Jesus Christ". 

Notes: (1)An Aposiopesis after ἐθνὸν, that is a suppressed apodosis of a conditional clause, which however, can be gathered by a comparison with the on-rush of thought in the immediately preceding context. It is not accurate to say that this is an interrogative conditional sentence, for the interrogative nature also must be gained from the context. (2) What this Aposiopetic apodosis would be can be arrived at by supplying what this immediate context seems to demand as seen in a translation: "But if God, though minded to manifest his wrath and make known his power, endured with much longsuffering vessels of wrath adjusted
Tor destruction in order that he might make known the riches of his glory on vessels of mercy which he before prepared for glory; whom also he called viz. us not only from the Jews but also from the Gentiles - yes, from the Gentiles also; for this was his design in his promise to Abraham = as also in Hosea he says".

(3)Another view of this suppressed apodosis from the more remote contextual study is "But if God etc. ... but also from the Gentiles" - how shall not thy desire to dispute with God completely depart from thee? Or wilt thou still venture This indeed may be regarded the more logical apodosis for the protasis, but certainly it does not so well fall in with the subsequent context as 2, and comparing Acts 21:22 we see how easy it was for unbelieving Jews to manifest incredulity on the appearance of the Word of God.

95. 1st Cor. 9:15.

Text: καὶ ὑπὲρ μοι ἀποθάνει; συν. "Τὸ καὶ χαίρει μοι οὐδὲν ηευθὸς Καβωτής.

Notes: (1) Another example of Aposiopesis apart from its being the suppressed apodosis of a conditional sentence, cf. 9:1. For some weighty reason which Paul nowhere reveals, and here suffers Aposiopesis rather than reveal it, (that reason probably was, lest the Judaizers get a pretext against him in that money-loving city, Corinth), he had determined upon the principle of self support while preaching the Gospel in Corinth. And the reason for his preaching the Gospel without charge viz. that he might cut off his enemies from a chance to entrap him, was to him a ground of boasting, and left them without excuse. And he robbed other churches for his support while in Corinth, in order not to yield his principle. And he would rather die than to lose his ground of boasting. Just what that handle might have been which the Judaizers sought in Corinth must be a matter of conjecture. Probably it was: "Yes there he is in Corinth preaching his philosophy for big pay! But Paul shuts them off. So the suppressed member would be: "For it is better for me to die than - (that I should yield my principle for Corinth). He afterward acknowledged that by this principle he wronged the Corinthians, 2nd Cor. 12:15. (2) At one time Meyer regarded Paul as making an Aposiopesis at 2, "Breaking off there to explain with triumphant certainty: my no man shall make void!" Splendid! But in his last edition he says: "I now regard this interpretation as too bold, being without analogy in the New Testament in which as in
classical writers the suppression of the apodosis occurs only after conditional clauses. Indeed one would hardly know where to look for the suppression of an apodosis except after a conditional clause. But that is not proving that Aposiopesis may not be found elsewhere. Meyer's present solution is η here cannot mean the "than" of comparison. It means "or otherwise", specifying what will take place if the thing before mentioned does not happen. What Paul says is: "Rather is it good for me to die i.e. rather is death beneficial to me, or otherwise, if this αμβατικός is not to ensue and I therefore am to remain alive, no one is to make my glory void". This "rather is it good for me to die, or otherwise, no one is to make my glorying void" seems to me somewhat void of at least deep significance, and I do not see why Meyer could "glory" in his change. (3) I should like to ask by what principle of translating a foreign tongue into English the Standard American revision renders the οὐδὲν of this passage by "any man". 
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