

## LEXICAL NOTES ON LUKE-ACTS

### V. LUKE AND THE HORSE-DOCTORS

HENRY J. CADBURY  
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

A FEW years ago the Teubner Press published a critical edition of the *Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum*.<sup>1</sup> It was perhaps natural that to one who had occupied his mind with the fallacies of the arguments for medical language in Luke and Acts this event should suggest a somewhat fanciful idea. The new publication might offer an opportunity for a delightful *reductio ad absurdum*. If the twenty volumes of Kühn's *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* could be made to yield a linguistic argument so imposing as Hobart's book on the *Medical Language of St. Luke*,<sup>2</sup> was it not likely that these two volumes from the Greek *mulomedici* would show in proportion some equally interesting contacts with Luke's style? And then there passed through the mind the several allusions in the evangelist's writings to the subjects that would interest an ancient veterinary. From the manger at the beginning of the Gospel to the proverb near the close of Acts about kicking against the goads,—there was doubtless as much internal evidence to prove that the author was *ἰππιατρός* as *ἰατρός*, if only tradition had connected him with the former term, or if Colossians 4 14 were so interpreted. Was Luke also among the horsedoctors?

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

<sup>1</sup> Edited by E. Oder and C. Hoppe. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1924, 1927.

<sup>2</sup> Dublin, 1882. I shall not repeat or even refer specifically to my discussion of Hobart and his followers in my *Style and Literary Method of Luke*.

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

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

#### ἀνατάσσω

At its very beginning the *Corpus Hippiatricorum* yielded material to my purpose. The collection opens with the excellent Berlin MS of the Ninth Century and this begins with the preface

of Apsyrtus. Recalling that an early argument for Luke's medical language was the likeness of his preface to one of Dioscorides (Lagarde's *Mittheilungen*, iii. 355f.), though similarities among prefaces are in the nature of the case to be expected, I observed some verbal likeness. The passage (I. 1) begins: στρατευσάμενος ἐν τοῖς τάγμασι τοῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰστρου<sup>3</sup> ποταμοῦ ἔγνωνα τὰ συμβαίνοντα τοῖς ἵπποις, ἐν οἷς καὶ διαφωνοῦσιν. ἀναταξάμενος οὖν ταῦτα καὶ τὰ πρὸς αὐτὰ βοηθήματα προσφωνῶ σοι, φίλτατε Ἀσκληπιάδη, τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον, ὄντι μοι πολίτη καὶ ἰατρῷ μεγίστῳ. ἐν ᾧ μὴ ἐπιζητήσης λογίότητα, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς πείρας φυσικὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἐπίγνωθι.

λέγω δὲ πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ πυρέττοντος, ὡς ἐπιγνωσθήσεται ἐν τοῖς σημείοις τούτοις. ἐπέταξά σοι ταῦτα τὰ σημεία, ὅπως ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων παραγμάτων ἐν περισσοτέρᾳ ἀσφαλείᾳ τὰ τοῖς ἵπποις ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων σημείων ἐπιγιγνώμενα πάθη εὐχερῶς γινώσκεις καὶ μὴ ἀσκόπως καὶ ἀγνώστως λέγων ἐκ τῶν ἀκριβῶς ἐπισταμένων καταγελά. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν χρῆ ταῦτα ὑπὸ παντὸς ἵπποῖατροῦ λίαν γινώσκεσθαι.

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

<sup>3</sup> This reference to the campaign of 332-334 A.D. supplies the chief date for fixing the time of Apsyrtus.

<sup>4</sup> *The Beginnings of Christianity. Acts* Vol. II, *Prolegomena*, 1921 p. 494. Cf. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, 1898, p. 14.

<sup>5</sup> *In Serta Leodiensia ad celebrandam patriae libertatem iam centesimum annum recuperatam composuerunt philologi Leodiensis* (= Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège. Fasc. xlv), Liège, 1930, pp. 261-267.

The additional instance does not help us determine for the word any special meaning. Mansion is probably right in supposing that it had various meanings and that neither its etymology nor its use in a given passage, e. g. of the rehearsal of tricks by elephants,<sup>6</sup> must be pressed. In both prefaces it probably meant little more than 'write', as indeed Ulfilas translated it. A. Severyns in a footnote (p. 267) to Mansion's article calls attention to two nouns in inscriptions older than Luke who is the first writer known to use the verb, in which the meaning list or estimate, *ἀνάταξις* (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*<sup>3</sup>, 577 21), or assessors, *ἀνατάκται* (*ibid.*, and *OGIS*. 213) appears.

### *ἀνωτερικός*

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

### *ἀνακαθίζω*

Another word said by Hobart, p. 11, to be confined in its intransitive use, with few exceptions, to medical writers is *ἀνακαθίζω*. They employ it of patients sitting up in bed. Luke twice (Luke 7 14; Acts 9 40) uses the same verb of the sitting up on their bier of dead persons restored to life. Quite analogous is its application to sitting animals as when Apsyrtus (I. 177 24; followed as for the verb by Hierocles, 181 17; contrast 186 15 *ἀνακάθηται, ὥσπερ κύων*) describes a horse as unable to rise again with its back legs, but it sits up like a dog with its front legs (*ἀναπεσῶν δὲ ἐγείρεσθαι πάλω τοῖς ὀπισθίοις ἀδυνατεῖ ἀλλ' ἀνακαθίζει ὡς κύων τοῖς ἐμπροσθίοις*).

<sup>6</sup> The passage is Plutarch, *De sollert. anim.* 12 (*Moralia* 968), with which should be compared Pliny, *N.H.* viii 3 (3) § 6 where the verb used is *meditantem*.

## Βαρνάβας

Even to the multiplying examples of the unusual proper name Barnabas<sup>7</sup> the *Corpus Hippiatricorum* unexpectedly contributed an addition. It is not probably due to Christian influence in spite of the "Abraham" that follows. It is a prescription, or more nearly, a charm for *δυσουρία* (II. 36 *ff.*): Γράφε καὶ περίαπτε θεοῦ ἐπίκλησιν ἐπικαλούμενος βαρναβαῶθθθ καὶ σεχθαβαγγγγα. ἐπικαλούμαι καὶ θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ μμμ. λῦσον φλέβας σὺν δυσουρίᾳ καὶ ρεῦσον ὡς ὁ Νεῖλος ποταμὸς ὑπὸ μηδενὸς κατεχόμενος.

## βελόνη

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

<sup>7</sup> See my paper *Semitic Personal Names in Luke-Acts* in the volume of essays published in honor of Rendel Harris entitled *Amicitiae Corolla*, 1933, p. 47. I assume with F. C. Burkitt's, *Church and Gnosis*, 1932, p. 55 that the appended letters in βαρναβαῶθθθ mean nothing as with the final θ in βαρβηλωθ.

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

(δια)λακάω

For the word *ἐλάκησεν*, used in Acts 1 18 of Judas' death, parallels whether simple or compound are worth noting as the verb is infrequent. Two instances are in passages probably dependent on Acts, viz. *Acta Thomae* 33: *ὁ δὲ δράκων φουσηθεὶς ἐλάκησεν* (Tischendorf, p. 219), and *Acta Pilati* B (Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*<sup>2</sup>, p. 290 with itacistic spelling; *ἐλάκισεν ἐπίσθη*). A. D. Knox in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xv. 289 calls attention to the vernacular expression in Hierocles, *Philogelos* 194: *ἐγὼ <ἐντὸς> τοῦ ἐνοικίου μου ἐλάκησα*, and mentions also *Georponica* xiii. 15. The expression there is: *λακῆσαι τὰς ψύλλας* (the fleas) *ποιήσεις*. If it occurs in *Georponica* we might expect to find it in the horse doctors. The compound in *δια-* is used there of blisters (*φλύκταιναι*) bursting, in the following passage (I. 423 16ff.): *πρὸς δρακοντίαν. δρακοντίαν οὕτω νοήσεις. φλύκταιναι γίνονται εἰς ὄλον τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ διαλακῶσιν, ὅπερ θεραπεύσεις οὕτως κτλ.* The same compound in the form *διαλακήσασα* occurs already in Aristophanes, *Nub.* 410.

But what deserves attention is the spelling *διαλακῶσιν*. The verb is usually given as (δια)λακέω and is sometimes described as a Doric and later Greek form of *ληκέω* (Liddell and Scott<sup>9</sup>, Part 6, 1932, p. 1044; Blass on Acts 1 18, and *Grammar*; Moulton-Howard, *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, ii. 246) or connected with *λάσκω*, aorist *ἔλακον*, first (or weak) aorist *ἐλάκησα*. But all writers assume contraction in *-εω*. The veterinary passage uses *διαλακῶσιν*, which, in the indicative, can be nothing except from *διαλακάω*, though the new Liddell and Scott puts it down for *διαλακέω*. The passage in Acts as indeed all the other passages quoted, are ambiguous. They can be derived from either *-αω* or *-εω*. The underlying vowel of the stem must be determined from passages that are decisive, and the newly brought example is decisive for *-αω*. It does not however stand alone. There is in the great Paris magical papyrus (*P. Mag. Par.* 3074) *σίδηρος λακᾶ*. I would propose, therefore, that hereafter New Testament and Hellenistic

lexica should index not *λακέω* nor even, like the new Liddell and Scott, both *λακέω* and *λακάω*, but simply *λακάω*.<sup>8</sup>

### *συνθρύπτω*

Luke's compound *συνθρύπτω* is a very rare verb though one would not suspect it as one reads in translation the simple and familiar complaint of Paul, "What mean ye weeping and breaking my heart?" (Acts 21 13 *τί ποιείτε κλαίοντες καὶ συνθρύπτοντές μου τὴν καρδίαν*;) Hobart can only illustrate the uncompounded *θρύπτω*. He admits that "this seems to be the only passage in the Greek authors in which this particular compound occurs." For parallels other lexica have had to rely only on Byzantine authors. Unless they have overlooked other instances as well as this one the next oldest occurrence to Acts is a Greek translation of Pelagionius when, after the ingredients are described of a potion useful for a great variety of internal complaints, the instructions follow (II. 106 4f.): *ταῦτα πάντα καθάρας καὶ συνθρύψας ἔψει ἐν ὕδατι ἀπὸ κιστέρνας*. Even here the manuscript tradition is not unanimous but the variant *συντριψας* is recorded.

### *φάτνη*

Of the meaning of *φάτνη* in Luke 2 I have nothing to add to what I said before in these notes (*Journal of Bibl. Lit.* xlv., 1926, pp. 316ff.). The word occurs naturally with great frequency in the writings of the veterinaries, e. g. I. 290 12 *τοῖς ὄνυξι τύπτει τὴν φάτνην* where I suppose either stall or manger could be meant. So II. 222 14 *ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ τοίχου καὶ τῆς φάτνης ἀράσσει* (cf. I. 208 20). But a few lines further down (24f.) *πρὸς τὸ μὴ λακτίζειν ζῶα ἀλλήλων ἐν τῇ φάτνη* it can only mean stall. The anarthrous prepositional phrase in I. 42 1f. *καὶ τὰ σιτία καταλείπει διαμασώμενος ἐν φάτνη* suggests that even at its first occurrences in Luke 2 7, 13 *ἐν φάτνη* could be rendered "in the manger or the

<sup>8</sup> Since this paragraph was written Professor W. F. Howard, of Handsworth College, has called to my attention a remark of W. Bauer in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, liv. (1929), col. 102, in which, on the basis of the same two passages, he derives the verb in Acts, *loc. cit.* from *λακάω*. Rejoicing to have been anticipated in the same opinion, I allow what I have written to remain.

stable" instead of "in a manger or a stable." In Luke's verse 16 ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ the article refers to the object as something already mentioned, in accordance with Greek idiom.

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

Of the Lucan terms for diseases the spelling *δυσεντερίον* probably should be retained in Acts 28 8 though Hobart and the horsedoctors provide only examples of the earlier and more correct *δυσεντεριά*. Dropsical, a condition discussed by the latter (I. 201ff., II. 164f.) in close proximity to dysentery, is expressed by Luke 14 2 by an adjective ὑδρωπικός, which occurs also in the



veterinary writings (I. 201 5, 203 7, II. 164 25, 165 11) alongside of the more regular ὕδερως. It has been claimed that παραλυτικός when used by Mark was avoided by Luke as a word rejected by the doctors. To other evidence of good medical use of παραλυτικός (*Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, xlv., 1926, pp. 204f., note 45) may be added *Corp. Hipp. Gr.* I. 433 6.

It has been said that Luke has a rich vocabulary for conception and childbirth. In illustration such terms are cited as occur also in *Corp. Hipp. Gr.* II. 141 13ff. when as a spell the writing of Psalm 47 as far as the words ἐκεῖ ὠδίνες ὡς τικτούσης is recommended; cf. 21 συλλαβεῖν στειραν ἵππον; cf. 84 2 ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα.

Of more general words for disease or symptoms other parallels may be cited. There are in Luke 16 ἔλκος, ἐλκώ, words common in the *Corpus*. As it is said of Lazarus that the dogs licked his sores (21 οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἔλκη αὐτοῦ), so reference is made to a horse under treatment (I. 251 19 ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ γλώσση περιλείχων τὰ ἔλκη) licking its sores with the tongue. ἀσιτία is an often mentioned symptom of diseased animals (I. 54 10, II. 240 15) and the continuance of it required various expression. Beside parallels from other authors for Acts 27 21 πολλῆς ἀσιτίας ὑπαρχούσης and 33 ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε we may add from the *Corpus* I. 3 7 ἀσιτίας μενούσης, 180 7 μένει ἄσιτος.

The passage Acts 3 8 has been claimed as medical for many years, particularly for the words σφύρα, βάσις, στερεώω. The first of these is too common in all literature to need citations about "ankles" of horses. For στερεώω of cures of feet we may compare I. 324 12 ὁ στερεοπούς as a description of a horse, II. 82 1 ἐστερεῶσθαι of the strengthening of a horse's feet, 263 7 στερεοποιεῖ τοὺς πόδας.

Luke's general terms used for illness are often as easily illustrated from the *Corpus Hippiatricorum* as from the *Corpus Medicorum*. συνέχομαι in the sense "be affected" (Hobart, p. 3) occurs often. There is for example the case with curious assonance (I. 155 10): ὅταν συνέχηται ἵππος τῷ πάθει τούτῳ, συνεχέστερον ἀναπνεῖ. Luke twice uses the verb with fever (Luke 4 38, Acts 28 8). Hierocles' preface is followed by a discussion of fever beginning (I. 6 23): ἵππος εἰ συνέχοιτο πυρετῷ. Inflammation is expressed in Acts

28 ε, in the doctors (Hobart, p. 50), and in the horse doctors (e. g. I. 157 γ, II. 109 γ) by *πίμπραμαι*. The verbs *ὀχλέω* and *ἐνοχλέω* are abundant in the *Corpus* (cf. Hobart, p. 7).

For recovery or cure the horsedoctors use *ἀπαλλάσσω*, *διαλύω* (e. g. I. 33 11) and *ἀνάληψις* (e. g. I. 398 22, II. 268 ε), but more as do the doctors (see Hobart 47, 204, 124) than in accord with Luke's usage. Of stanching blood likewise the doctors of both sorts use *ἴσθημι* transitively rather than, like Luke 8 44, intransitively. While *βοήθημα* is very common as an expedient used in cure I found only one instance of *βοήθεια* (II. 185 15; cf. I. 183 1) comparable to the usage of that word which I would recommend for explaining Acts 27 17 (see *Commentary, ad loc.*). Ramsay's view that *θεραπεία* (-εύω) is to be distinguished from *ἴασις* (*ἰάομαι*) as meaning treatment and cure respectively is not supported by such occurrences of *θεραπεία* as I. 251 12, 316 23, II. 64 23. On the other hand the phrase of Acts 27 3 *ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν* can be exactly duplicated from I. 12 5. For rapidity of change Luke's adverbs *ἐξαίφνης* (Hobart 19; I. 74 5, 368 17, II. 286 3), *παραχρῆμα* (Hobart 96; I. 53 10 *al.*), *συντόμως* (Hobart 262: to be translated 'quickly,' rather than 'briefly') and *ἄφνω* (not in Hobart, e. g. Acts 28 ε; II. 158 27) are all used.

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

*ἀκριβέστερον* Acts 18 26, 23 15, 20, 24 22; I. 5 1.

*καλλίον* Acts 25 10; I. 99 3.

*πυκνότερον* Acts 24 26; II. 135 17, 181 26, 263 6.

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

*ἀσώτως* Luke 15 13; II. 109 5.

*διαστήσας βραχύ* Acts 27 23; I. 388 5.

*βοῶν ζεύγος* Luke 14 19; II. 270 3.

*περιάπτω* Luke 22 55; II. 36 9, quoted above, and *passim*.

*πενιχρός* Luke 21 2; I. 138 11.

*πτοέομαι* Luke 21 9, 24 37; I. 290 13; II. 249 18, 19.

Hobart and others lay stress on words found in the New Testament only in Luke's writings. The terms just listed all belong to that category, but none of them is illustrated by Hobart, while of Hobart's own list of that sort the horse doctors employ such further words as ἀπελπίζω, ἀποθλίβω, ἀπομάσσω, ἀποτινάσσω, διατηρέω, ἐκταράσσω, ἐκτινάσσω, ἐνδέχεται, ἐπινεύω, καθημερινός, καταψύχω, παράδοξον, προσψαύω, συμπίπτω, συστρέφω, συστροφή.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Like the doctors, the horsedoctors provide some interesting parallels to other New Testament writers than Luke. With Paul's κινδύνους ποταμῶν (2 Cor. II 26) compare II. 234 13 ποταμῶν κινδύνων and with the σιαινέσθαι of 1 Thess. 3 3 (*si vera lectio*, see *ZNTW*, vii. 1906, p. 361; *Expos. Times*, xviii, p. 479, etc.) II. 81 5 ὅτε εὐθέως σπασμοὺς ὑπομένει καὶ σιαινεται, λοιπὸν φοβείται τὴν τροφήν κτλ.