

hard to put together again. The ethical sacred is itself rational, though it cannot be rationalized and remain either ethical or religious. All values of truth and beauty and goodness are sacred, and that depends on religion as the manifestation of a reality in which we live, and whereby we also have sacred worth. Given that, and logic and aesthetics and ethics can carry on independently their own business, but they cannot do without the sacredness of the true, the beautiful, and the good as absolute reality, or without an estimate of man based on it and responsive to it, and that is the sphere of religion, in accordance with which we can interpret all lower forms as the groping of the creature, hedged in by material conditions and without free ideas, after this higher reality. But Prof. Otto, having once separated the rational from the religious, can do no more than say that they are connected *a priori*, which is not very convincing, if they can be separated in thought and are merely added historically by reflexion on religion and by transference of ideas from other spheres. Nor is it very satisfactory to have to wait for progress in the general sense of truth before we can distinguish between true schematization and false, seeing that no schematization of the holy has been so persistent as the legal idea of reward and punishment. Yet if we are to believe Jesus, the supreme perfection of the Holy One is in sending His rain upon the just and the unjust and our supreme accord with Him in being, like Him, kind to the unthankful and evil. Without emancipation from mere holy awe, should we ever get beyond the idea of the awful judge? Eliphaz was so sure of it that he thought he could argue from his vision of dread backward from Job's suffering to Job's iniquity. Are not what have been called the heroes of religion heroic precisely in being emancipated from mere awe before the tremendous and mysterious, and in entering upon the glorious liberty of God's children?

Yet if this book is not exactly a revelation, most of what it says about primitive religion is right, and it indicates important matters in the history of religion which have been overlooked. Finally, if it does little to satisfy thought, it does a great deal to stimulate inquiry and reflexion.

JOHN OMAN.

THE AORIST PARTICIPLE FOR PURPOSE IN THE *Κοινή*.

I HAVE been much interested in the examples of the aorist participle produced in *The Journal of Theological Studies* for January 1923 by Prof. C. D. Chambers, and in the July issue by Prof. W. F. Howard.

Prof. Chambers cites 2 Macc. xi 36 and 4 Macc. iii 13 as examples

of the aorist participle in the sense of purpose like the future participle and as throwing light on the similar idiom in Acts xii 25 (with the reading *εις*); Acts xxv 13 (reading *ἀσπασάμενοι*); Heb. ix 13. He mentions the fact also that there is manuscript authority for the future rather than the aorist participle in several other passages in 1 and 2 Maccabees. Prof. Howard cites two further examples furnished by Prof. Chambers from the Apocryphal Acts, and also five examples from the papyri which seem to shew the futuristic use of the aorist participle.

The presentation of these examples calls for a fresh study of the subject in the light of the data and the real meaning of the aorist participle. Both Prof. Chambers and Prof. Howard disclaim the advocacy of the so-called subsequent use of the aorist participle.

It should be borne in mind that time in the Greek participle is only relative and is a secondary development. Coincident or simultaneous action was apparently the original use of the participle in Greek. Antecedent action can be suggested even by the present participle, as with *τυφλὸς ὄν* in contrast with *ἄρτι βλέπω* (Jn. ix 25). So also the present participle, while usually coincident in time with the principal verb, may suggest purpose as in Acts iii 26 *ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς*. The antecedent use of the present participle may be articular as in *ὁ διώκων* in Gal. i 23, and the same thing is true of the futuristic present participle as in *ὁ καταλύων καὶ—οικοδομῶν, σώσον* in Matt. xxvii 40.

The articular aorist participle is used with much freedom in the New Testament. Here the absolute timelessness of the aorist participle appears with clearness. So in Matt. x 39 *ὁ εὐρὸν ἀπολέσει*, the principal verb is in the future indicative while the aorist participle is simply punctiliar action coincident with the verb or possibly antecedent by suggestion. In Jn. xi 2 *ἦν δὲ Μαριάμ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν Κύριον* we are not to understand that Mary had previously anointed Jesus before the death of Lazarus, but simply that her act was so well known that she was later known as the one who did this wondrous deed, though at a later time. So also with *ὁ παραδοῖς*, applied to Judas at the time of his appointment as apostle (Matt. x 4).

Hence it is plain that there is nothing in the nature of the aorist participle itself to prevent its use for the idea of purpose, as occasionally is seen in the case of the present participle. It would be merely a development of the simultaneous or coincident use of the aorist participle. The future participle, like the future infinitive, is rare in the New Testament as in the *Κωνή* on the whole. It seems to be a mark of the literary style, as in the Acts of the Apostles.

The examples adduced by Prof. Chambers and Prof. Howard do not make it clear that there was a conscious use of the aorist participle in

the sense of purpose on a par with the future participle. If in the **Κοινή** the use of the future participle for purpose was a literary survival that was disappearing, the writer or speaker in the vernacular would naturally not think of purpose in connexion with it. The notion of purpose would normally be expressed in the vernacular by the infinitive (usually with **τοῦ**) or with **ἵνα** (or **ὅπως**). If the participle is so employed, there is then the simultaneous use of the present participle besides the rare future participle (and the still rarer aorist participle in this sense). The use of the aorist participle in two instances (one articular, one non-articular) in the papyri parallel with the future participle is certainly interesting. The question remains whether the change to the aorist participle is due to a lapse of co-ordination, or to the conscious feeling that the aorist participle carried the same idea as the future. The lack of co-ordination may be due to the vague feeling that one future participle was enough and the others would be coincident with it. The form **ἐποίσαντες** reminds one of the hybrid infinitive **ἐπελεύσασθαι** in the papyri as already **τεύξασθαι** in 2 Macc. xv 7, and **ἐκφείξασθαι** in 2 Macc. ix 22.

The sporadic examples of the aorist participle in a possible future sense thus far adduced do not quite justify a formal syntactical regimen. All the alternatives need to be duly weighed in the light of all the known data.

Least of all do these examples call for any revolutionary interpretation of Acts xxv 13 (**ἀσπασάμενοι**) which makes perfectly good sense as coincident or simultaneous action. As to Acts xii 25, the context forbids the reading **εἰς**. There is an evident allusion to Acts xi 30, and the mention of Mark points to Jerusalem as the place of departure, not of arrival, as is shewn in Acts xiii. So in Heb. ix 12 **εὐράμενος** is apparently not even coincident action with **εἰσῆλθεν**, but antecedent action, referring to Calvary.

The position of the participle after the verb determines nothing as to whether a participle is coincident or antecedent, as I have shewn in my *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* pp. 861, 1113. In Lk. ii 16 **ἦλθαν σπεύσαντες** we have coincident action in the participle following the verb, while in Acts x 29 **ἦλθον μεταπεμφθείς** the action in the participle is antecedent.

Nothing certain can be made out of the fact that the tense of the principal verb is not always aorist. In Acts vii 26 **συνήλασεν εἰπών**, the action is coincident though the verb is imperfect indicative. In Mk. viii 29 **ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει** the main verb is present indicative.

It should be borne in mind also that the aorist participle itself may imply either constative, ingressive, or effective action, as shewn by the meaning of the verb or the context. The effective use of the participle may modify the effective use of the main verb if in the aorist.

For the present the interpreter of the New Testament will be wise not to be too confident that he may accept *eis* in Acts xii 25, or find purpose in *ἀσπασόμενοι* in Acts xxv 13. It is precisely Luke who alone in the New Testament shews any familiarity with the future participle in the sense of purpose.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

THE DEATH OF JUDAS.

ACTS i 18 οὗτος (Judas Iscariot) μὲν ὄν ἐκτίσαστο χωρίον ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας, καὶ πρηγῆς γενόμενος ἐλάκησεν μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ.

The difficulties of this passage are (i) its divergence from other accounts: this we cannot hope to remove. (ii) The asyndeton of sense—we expect καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ πρηγῆς γενόμενος. (iii) The phrase πρηγῆς γενόμενος which, if anything, should be passive—‘thrown on his face’, since one does not ‘become headlong’. (iv) The precise meaning of ἐλάκησεν μέσος. (v) The miraculous story that he should have fallen so that ‘all his bowels gushed out’—a possible effect of a sword thrust but not of a fall, or the equally miraculous story that he burst, if this be the meaning of ἐλάκησε μέσος.

To take these points in another order. (v) Papias has, in his totally different account, τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ ἐκκενωθῆναι, an *evacuatio viscerum*, common in violent deaths, whether the hanging of Matthew (xxvii 5) or the fall of Luke. (vi) ἐλάκησεν means ‘burst’ in two accounts quoted by Blass (see Milligan’s *Dictionary*.s.v.). But these are possibly derivative. However, Luke may have used ἐλάκησεν μέσος = διελάκησεν, as he has elsewhere (for διεσχίσθη) ἐσχίσθη τὸ καταπέτασμα . . . μέσον—where Mark has a longer phrase. διαλακέω is good Greek for ‘burst’, but λακέω is very doubtful as such. A further passage is quoted in *lexica* for the meaning, *Geopon.* xiii 15; but if the chapter be read it will be seen that it only means, apparently, ‘come to a violent end’. How, is uncertain.

Oddly enough no one appears to have noticed a use of ἐλάκησεν, whose appositeness at once leaps to the eye. In Hierocles’s *Philogelos*¹ the book of all others whose vocabulary most closely resembles that of the New Testament, the grumpy man (δύσκολος) in joke number 194 falls downstairs. Some one shouts ‘Who’s in there?’, and he answers ἐγὼ (ἐντός) τοῦ ἐνοικίου μου ἐλάκησα· τί πρὸς σέ; (so the best MS, corrected, as shewn, by Eberhard). Here the sense is clearly ‘have fallen’, or, in modern parlance, ‘have crashed’, ‘come a cropper’.

¹ The meaning ‘burst’ occurs in Joke 176.