

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

points where their traditions find themselves most evidently on common ground with the Semitic stories which we find in Genesis." Accordingly, in referring septenary time to the creation, we only put it upon the same footing with other legends, such as the Creation of Man, the Fall, the Edenic Happiness, the Flaming Sword, the Tree of Life, the Deluge, etc., which prevailed so extensively in remote ages, and which are found with such remarkable persistency in their chief characteristics in the traditions and literatures of the East.

ARTICLE VIII.

ATTRIBUTIVE AORIST PARTICIPLES IN PROTASIS, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR W. G. BALLANTINE, D.D., OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

It is a familiar principle of Greek grammar that a participle preceded by the article may be used substantively and is then equivalent to *he who* or *those who* with a finite verb.¹ Accordingly we have *ὁ κλέπτων*, *he who steals*, *ὁ πιστεύων*, *he who believes*, *ὁ ἀγαπᾶν*, *he who loves*, and similar expressions without number. The large majority of such participles are in the present tense, but those of the other tenses are not infrequent. It is the purpose of this inquiry to account for the tense in a certain class of cases when the participle is in the aorist. Incidentally, for the sake of discrimination, it will be necessary to consider somewhat the other uses of the aorist and those of the present.

¹ Goodwin's Greek Grammar, § 276.2; Hadley and Allen's Greek Grammar, § 966.

That an aorist participle connotes generally time antecedent to that of the leading verb is fully recognized on all hands, but the failure of our grammars and commentaries to account satisfactorily for the aorist in those cases where it is unnatural to think of antecedent time has thrown a shade of uncertainty over the whole subject.

After careful study of many instances, we believe the two following rules can be sustained:—

RULE I. The phrase *ο λίσας* generally corresponds to *ὅς ἔλυσε* *he who loosed*. It then expresses time antecedent to that of the leading verb, except when the participle and verb express different aspects of the same act.

RULE II. The phrase *ὁ λίσας* occasionally corresponds to *ὅς ἂν λίσῃ*. It is then equivalent to the protasis of a present general supposition, *whenever looses*, or to that of a future general supposition, *whenever shall loose*.

The fact that a participle may be equivalent to a finite verb of any mood of the same tense is generally recognized. It is explicitly stated in Goodwin's *Greek Moods and Tenses* § 52. 1; but the full application of the principle to cases of the attributive participle such as we are now considering is not there indicated. It is to Professor T. D. Seymour, of Yale, in a paper "On the Use of the Aorist Participle in Greek," published in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 1881, that we owe the first complete exhibition of this second rule. But he makes no reference to the New Testament, and it will not do to assume that what is true of syntax in Homer, or the later classics, is true in Hellenistic Greek.

The standard grammars yield little that is helpful for the point in hand. Jelf³ says: "As the infinitive has of itself a substantival, and the participle an adjectival character, we may illustrate the difference between the forms of the aorist and present by saying that the aorist infinitive comes nearer to the substantive . . . and the aorist

³ *Greek Grammar*, 5th Edition, § 405. 3. obs. 3.

participle to that of the adjective or personal substantive: ὁ φυγών — φυγῶς, inasmuch as there is therein less of the verbal accident of time." In regard to this view, we can only say that not the slightest support for it is afforded by the usage of the New Testament.

The Grammar of Hadley and Allen³ says: "The attributive participle is often used alone, its substantive being omitted: οἱ παρόντες *the persons present*, ὁ τυχών *whosoever happens*." Notice how strikingly this second example confirms our second rule.

Winer⁴ says: "The present participle (with the article) is not unfrequently used substantively, and then, having become a noun, excludes all the indications of time." Unfortunately his first example is Eph. iv. 28, ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω, of which he says: "The present does not stand for the aorist ὁ κλέψας, which is found in some MSS., but the words mean, *let the stealer* (i. e., *the thief*) *steal no more*." Our Authorized and Revised Versions, "*let him that stole,*" show that somehow there has been a wide-spread repugnance to the idea that Paul wished to say just what he did say, namely "*Let him that stealeth* (*habitually*) *no longer continue to steal*." If the theft was a thing of the past why should Paul, as in our versions, command its discontinuance? If it was a thing of the present, why should grammarians deny the usual time indication? Winer's next example is equally unfortunate, namely, Gal. i. 23, ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτέ, *our former persecutor*, where, as ποτέ shows, the imperfect indicative (ὅς ἐδίωκε) is represented. "In other places," adds Winer, "where there is a distinct reference to past time, we find the aorist participle used as a substantive; e. g., John v. 29," οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες, *they that have done good*.

Buttmann⁵ says: "The present participle, in connection with the article, is often used without any temporal reference, merely to present the idea of the verb either in

³ § 966.⁴ Moulton's Edition, p. 444.⁵ p. 296.

the form of a substantive or an adjective." His first example is the same as Winer's, Eph. iv. 28. Each of the others (Matt. xxvii. 40; Rev. xx. 10; 1. Thess. i. 10) can be shown to contain a distinct tense reference. Regarding aorist participles, Buttmann's most distinct utterance is:* "With the aorist participle the idea of the completed (real or imaginary) *past* has sovereign control."

S. G. Green' says: "In some cases the substantivized participle appears to have lost all temporal reference," and like the others fortifies the statement first by a citation of Eph. iv. 28, adding Stier's enigmatical remark that "here *ὁ κλέψας*, *he who stole*, would be too weak, while *ὁ κλέπτῃς* would be too strong," and irrelevantly giving references to Ellicott, who translates, "*he who steals*," and to Alford, who translates, "*he that stealeth*." But Green admits that some of Winer's examples of timelessness refer to present time.

Our contention now is that in the New Testament the attributive participle has always as much, or as little, time reference as belongs to the same tense in the finite mood represented. Thus *ὁ κλέπτων* may be equivalent to *ὃς κλέπτει*, *he who steals*, or to *ὃς ἔκλεπτε*, *he who was used to steal*, or to *ὃς ἂν κλέπτῃ*, *whoever steals*; on the other hand *ὁ κλέψας* may be equivalent to *ἔς ἔκλεψε*, *he who stole*, or to *ὃς ἂν κλέψῃ*, *whoever steals*, or *whoever shall steal*. Theoretically, of course, both participles may stand for the optative, but practically it may be left out of the account. There was no confusion as to the force of the participles in the minds of the New Testament writers. Each is used with nice discrimination and distinct feeling of its appropriateness to the idea intended. Which of the three translations possible to each participle shall be given in a particular instance must be determined by the context.

We are prepared now to examine a number of illustrative passages:—

* p. 201. ' Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament, p. 365.

Acts xvii. 24, "The God that made (ὁ ποιήσας) the world," dwelleth not in temples made with hands." Here ὁ ποιήσας is equivalent to ὃς ἐποίησε, and the time connoted is past relatively to the speaker's present; of course also, though only incidentally, past relatively to the leading verb of the sentence.

John v. 29, "they that have done good (οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες) and they that have done ill (οἱ τὰ φαῦλα πρῆξαντες)." Here the participles connote time past relatively to the leading verb.

Acts ix. 21, "Is not this he that in Jerusalem made havoc (ὁ πορθήσας)?" The aorist participle here plainly represents the aorist indicative (ὃς ἐπόρθησε). The time of it is past to the speaker's present, and also, as always in such instances, to the leading verb, yet only incidentally.

John iii. 33, "He that hath received (ὁ λαβών) his witness hath set his seal to this (ἐσφράγισεν), that God is true." Here the participle is equivalent to ὃς ἔλαβε, it connotes time past to the speaker, but not to the main verb; for the two actions are identical. Speaking of an individual believer, the evangelist would say, λαβὼν ἐσφράγισε, *by receiving he set his seal*. The participle would then fall into the class of aorist participles of identical action discussed by the present writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. xli. page 787. This sentence is equivalent then to a simple past supposition.

2 Cor. vii. 12, "I wrote not for his cause that did the wrong (τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος) nor for his cause that suffered the wrong (τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος)." These participles represent the indicative; their action is prior to that of the main verb, incidentally also to the speaker's present. The Authorized Version read, "for his cause that *had done* the wrong," which seems better than the Revised Version.

Matt. xix. 9, "Whosoever shall put away (ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ) his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry (γαμήσῃ) another, committeth adultery, and he that marieth (ὁ γαμήσας) her when she is put away committeth

adultery." Here it is evident that the aorist participle with its article is interchangeable with the hypothetical relative clause *ὅς ἂν γαμήσῃ* with the aorist subjunctive. The aorist participle here certainly does not connote time previous to that of the leading verb; it is the protasis of a present general supposition. Consequently the change from the Authorized Version "whoso marrieth her that is put away," to the Revised Version "he that marrieth her," was a change for the worse. In the parallel passage in Luke (xvi. 18), the present participle (*γαμῶν*) is used. There likewise the Revisers have changed "whosoever marrieth" of the Authorized Version to "he that marrieth." They treat the aorist and present participles just alike. Evidently they could not account for the use of the aorist participle at all.

Matt. xxi. 44, "And he that falleth (*ὁ πεσών*) on this stone shall be broken to pieces: but on whomsoever it shall fall (*ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ*) it shall scatter him as dust." Meyer translates, "he who shall have fallen." Here evidently *ὁ πεσών* is only another way of saying *ὅς ἂν πέσῃ*. It is the protasis of a general future supposition, and the meaning is "whosoever shall fall," just as the Authorized Version had it, not "he that falleth," as the Revisers have changed it.

Matt. xxiii. 20-22, "He therefore that sweareth (*ὁ ὀμόσας*) by the altar, sweareth by it, and all things thereon. And he that sweareth (*ὁ ὀμόσας*) by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. And he that sweareth (*ὁ ὀμόσας*) by the heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon." Here *ὁ ὀμόσας* is equivalent to *ὅς ἂν ὀμόσῃ*. It is the protasis of a present general supposition, and the rendering of the Authorized Version, "whoso shall swear," should have been changed to "whoso sweareth," not to "he that sweareth," as in the Revised Version. The Revisers again ignore the fact that they have an aorist participle to deal with and treat it precisely as they would treat a

present participle. They also inaccurately retain the rendering "whosoever *shall* swear" for $\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu \acute{\omicron}\mu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\eta$ in verses 16 and 18, in a *present* general supposition. In the English translation of Meyer on Matthew (Funk and Wagnalls, New York, 1884), we find on this passage this remark: "The aorist participle represents the thing as already *in the course of being done*." This surprising remark, with its hopeless misapprehension of the aorist, one could feel sure, even before investigation, must, according to all the principles of higher criticism, be laid to the charge, not of the *magister*, but of some later incompetent "redactor." Meyer's words in the 6th edition, his last, are simply, "Das Part. Aor. druckt *das Eintreten der Handlung aus*;" though this is unsatisfactory enough.

Mat. x. 39, "He that findeth ($\acute{\omicron} \epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$) his life shall lose it; and he that loseth ($\acute{\omicron} \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$) his life for my sake shall find it." The Revisers seem to have been puzzled by the aorist participles, and to have placed mechanically in the margin the alternatives, "Or *found*," "Or *lost*." How the verse could be understood with these renderings does not appear. Meyer is too exact a grammarian to suppose that aorist participles can mean simply "he that findeth," and "he that loseth." He translates, "He who shall have found his soul shall lose it; and he who shall have lost his soul shall find it."* He makes no explanation of the syntactical principle involved and probably regards the participles as simply antecedent in time to the leading verb. Alford takes this view, saying: "The past participles are used proleptically with reference to the day when the loss and gain shall become apparent." It is however much simpler to regard $\acute{\omicron} \epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega\acute{\nu}$ as equivalent to $\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu \epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\rho\eta$, *whosoever shall find*, and $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ as equivalent to $\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\sigma\eta$, *whosoever shall lose*.

John xvi. 2, "Yea, the hour cometh that whosoever kill-

* The Edinburgh Translation (reprinted by Funk and Wagnalls) "traduces" Meyer's words, "Wer seine Seele gefunden haben wird, wird sie verlieren," *Scotice*, "Whoever *will* have found his soul, *will* lose it"!

eth (*πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας*) you shall think that he offereth service unto God." In this verse the participle represents the aorist subjunctive; it is the protasis of a future general supposition, and the exact translation would be, *whosoever shall kill*. In English, however, the present is often idiomatically used for the future, and the Revisers did unaccountably well in retaining the reading of the Authorized Version, "whosoever killeth." Meyer renders, "Every one who shall have put you to death." We infer that he thought of the participle as in a general way indicating antecedent time; yet had he viewed it as standing for the aorist subjunctive he might still have taken it as equivalent to a future perfect.

We have shown that the Revisers saw no special significance in the use of the aorist participle when antecedent time was not to be expressed; we will now add a few words regarding their treatment of present participles. The phrase *ὁ λύων* may represent *ὃς λύει he that looses*, or *ὃς ἔλυε he who was accustomed to loose*, or *ὃς ἂν λύῃ whosoever is loosing* or *whosoever shall loose*. Except in a few cases, where the sense of the imperfect was obviously demanded, the Authorized Version exercised great freedom, we may say capriciousness, as to the choice between the renderings *he that looseth* and *whosoever looseth*. The Revised Version seems uniformly to have changed *whosoever* or *whosoever* in such cases to *he that*; and this must be in general correct. Where, however, the word *πᾶς* precedes the article and participle, the Revisers seem to have felt that a more indefinite idea might be intended. The Authorized Version has here the same capriciousness, rendering "every one that" in about half the instances, and "whosoever" in the others. Of these "whosoever" the Revisers have changed about half into "every one that," without discoverable principle. Once (Matt. v. 22) they have "every one *who*." We still read as in the old version "whosoever believeth," for *πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων*, in John iii. 15 and 16; John xi. 26; John xii. 46; 1 John v. 1;

and Rom. x. 11; probably from a vague feeling that it suits the indefinite freedom of the gospel invitation. In 1 John v. 1, "every one that loveth" ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\omicron} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\omega}\nu$), of the Authorized Version, is changed into "whosoever loveth" through the influence of the adjacent "whosoever believeth"—the only case of a change *to* "whosoever" which we have noticed. On the other hand "whosoever doeth (committeth, maketh)" for $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\omicron} \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\omega}\nu$ in John viii. 34; xix. 12; Luke vi. 47; 1 John iii. 4; and Rev. xxii. 15 has become "every one that doeth (committeth, maketh)." Here is an unexpected difference between *believing* and *doing*—faith and works—of which some of our lay preachers, taking for a text "The *whosoever*s of Scripture," may be expected to make efficient use. In 1 John iv. 7 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\omicron} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\omega}\nu$ is still "every one that loveth" as in the old version. In 1 John iii. 15, we still read "whosoever hateth" for $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\omicron} \mu\iota\sigma\acute{\omega}\nu$; but in Rev. xxii. 15, "whosoever loveth" ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\omicron} \phi\iota\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$) has become "every one that loveth." This cannot be called scientific work.