Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity   Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1958

A Study of the Anacolutha in the Pauline Corpus

Raymond Carl Schulze
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_schulzer@csl.edu

A STUDY OF THE ANACOLUTHA IN

THE PAULINE CORPUS

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

---

by

Raymond Carl Schulze

June 1958

Approved by: *Edgar M. Krentz*
                                    Advisor

Martin H. Scharlemann
                                    Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem of Anacolutha in the Pauline Corpus

Any writing of great import must subject itself in time to the close scrutiny of the student, even though it may have been intended originally for the interested reader alone. A close look at the Pauline epistles indicates, in many instances at least, grammatical inconsistencies of such a nature that the meaning of the text is obscured to a greater or lesser degree. The anacolutha in the Pauline epistles present such a problem.

This problem is of interest to the student of philology in general as well as to the student of theology. For it is

> in the breach of the rules of concord [that] is seen the widest deviation from classical [Greek] orthodoxy. The evidence which the LXX affords for a relaxation of the rigorous requirements of Attic Greek in this respect is fully borne out by the contemporary papyri.[1]

The problem is further complicated by the fact that it is extremely difficult to establish any scientific principle as a basis for grouping the anacolutha into clear and distinct classes.[2] The confusion of the grammars in their

_____

[1] H. St. John Thackeray, as cited by Henry G. Meecham, Light from Ancient Letters (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923), p. 87.

[2] A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (4th edition, New York: George H. Doran Co., 1923), p. 436.

definitions of what constitutes anacoluthon substantiates this.

The purpose of this paper is to shed a little light in the hitherto musty corners of this subject.

Definition and Limitation of the Scope of the Problem

It is impossible to list, analyze or explain all of the anacolutha in the Pauline corpus. Definitions of the term vary so widely that any grouping and listing on the basis of secondary sources is impossible. To do so on the basis of the primary source is equally impossible since so many of the breaches of concord defy definition.

The study is therefore limited to the secondary sources except in those cases in which it is possible to examine the primary sources on the basis of agreement among the grammarians as to the nature of the problem. There is no attempt to interpret the problematical passages. Rather, examples will be given as to how the reader might go about solving the problems.

The attempt is made to define anacoluthon in general and to define and illustrate its various forms. The next step is to view the anacolutha in the context of the Pauline style, and then to examine his style and his anacoluthic peculiarities in the wider context of literature preceding his own and contemporaneous with it.

No attempt is made to establish or question the genuineness of the epistles traditionally attributed to Paul. We work on the assumption of Pauline authorship of the epistles from Romans to Philemon. The epistle to the Hebrews is excluded.

Major Sources and General Method

The primary sources are the Greek New Testaments of Nestle[3] and Westcott and Hort.[4] Westcott and Hort is the text most frequently cited by the grammars. Most valuable among the secondary sources have been the grammars of Robertson,[5] Blass[6] and Winer.[7] Radermacher[8] has the most complete

---

[3]E. Eberhard Nestle, _Novum Testamentum Graece_ (18th edition; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1948).

[4]Brooke Foss Westcott, and Fenton John Anthony Hort, editors, _The New Testament in the Original Greek_ (Revised American edition; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1889).

[5]Robertson, _op. cit._

[6]Friedrich Blass, _Grammar of New Testament Greek_, translated by Henry St. John Thackeray (2nd revised and enlarged edition; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911). Also _Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch_, edited by Albert Debrunner (9th edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954).

[7]Georg Benedict Winer, _A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament_, edited and translated by J. Henry Thayer (7th edition; Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1869).

[8]Ludwig Radermacher, _Neutestamentliche Grammatik: Das Griechisch des neues Testaments in Zusammenhang mit der Volksprache, in Handbuch zum neuen Testament_, edited by Hans Lietzmann (1st edition; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Verlag, 1911), I, 1-27.

discussion of the Κοινή; Mayser[9] and Meecham[10] of the papyri; Deissmann[11] is helpful in the entire area.

The method is simple. We study the secondary sources first and examine all references to the anacolutha. We check the references with the primary sources and explain our conclusions and definitions by citing examples from the primary sources. Our conclusions and definitions are then considered with respect to the attestation of the secondary sources.

Preliminary Summary of the Findings

The Pauline writings are filled with anacolutha. Most of them can be explained on the basis of Paul's fervid style and active mind. The majority of them do not greatly hinder the apprehension of his message.

Not only do the anacolutha fit into Paul's style, but his style fits into the style of letters of the Κοινή. Anacolutha were more than common in the letters of the papyri.

---

[9] Edwin Mayser, Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der PtolemЁerzeit (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1934), Band II, Book III, 189-208.

[10] Meecham, op. cit.

[11] G. Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies, translated by Alexander Grieve (2nd edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909). Also Light from the Ancient East, translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan (4th revised edition; New York: Harper & Brothers, [1927]).

The most severe of the anacolutha occur in Romans, Galatians, and Second Corinthians, where the circumstances surrounding the composition of the epistles were charged with the electricity of the Church's problem and Paul's anxiety.

CHAPTER II

TOWARD A DEFINITION OF ANACOLUTHON

Robertson says that an anacoluthon is "merely the failure to complete a sentence as intended when it was begun."[1] The difficulty with such a definition is that anacolutha may be either intentional or unintentional. The author may _intend_ to end his construction in a manner different from that in which he began. Robertson realizes this, of course.[2]

The definition of Blass is equally inadequate.

Anacoluthon is due to a failure in carrying out the originally intended structure of the sentence; since the continuation and sequence do not correspond with what has gone before.[3]

A correct and complete definition of an anacoluthon must make allowance for both the intentional and the unintentional on the part of the writer. Winer comes up with the most exact definition of the New Testament grammarians.

---

[1]A. T. Robertson, _A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research_ (4th edition; New York: George H. Doran Co., 1923), p. 435.

[2]_Ibid._

[3]Friedrich Blass, _Grammar of New Testament Greek_, translated by Henry St. John Thackeray (2nd revised and enlarged edition; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911), p. 282. Cf. also _Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch_, edited by Albert Debrunner (9th edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954), pp. 294-295, par. 466. Hereafter Debrunner's edition will be cited as Blass--Debrunner. Blass--Debrunner is more careful with all his definitions, but there is no more adequate _brief_ definition in any of the later German editions. The English edition is not as carefully documented.

Anacoluthon occurs when the construction with which a sentence began is not grammatically pursued;--either because the writer is wholly diverted from the structure adopted at the beginning by something intervening . . . or because for the sake of a preferable mode of expression . . . he frames the close of his sentence otherwise than the commencement required.[4]

It will be possible to define "anacoluthon" more precisely by means of a brief survey of the various types of anacolutha.[5]

Suspended Subject

The suspended subject, which, as Robertson observes, must sometimes be referred to as "suspended object,"[6] is anacoluthic in that "the substantive, pronoun or participle is left by the wayside and the sentence is completed some other way."[7] Into this category would fall such passages as 2 Cor. 12:17.[8]

---

[4]Georg Benedict Winer, A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, edited and translated by J. Henry Thayer (7th edition; Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1889), pp. 566-567. Cf. Herbert Weir Smyth, A Greek Grammar for Colleges (New York: American Book Co., c.1920), pp. 671-672. Smyth uses the terms "natural" and "artificial" where we use "intentional" and "unintentional," and gives examples from the classical authors. His definitions are consistently useful.

[5]Those grammatical, structural irregularities which resemble anacolutha but which are not classed as such will help to define the term further. Cf. infra, chap. III.

[6]Robertson, op. cit., p. 436.

[7]Ibid.

[8]μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς; The question as to whether "suspended subject" is really anacoluthon rather than merely

Digression

Another (and more complicated) type of anacoluthon is
the digression. The digression usually occurs in sentences
of some length,[9] and "mainly in the Epistles of Paul where
his energy of thought and passion of soul overlap all tram-
mels."[10] Digression is the interruption of the original con-
struction by an intervening sentence or clause, with subse-
quent loss of the first construction.[11] Good examples of
digression are Rom. 5:12 and Gal. 2:4-6.[12]

Participial Anacolutha

The term "participial anacolutha" is an artificial one.
We employ it to indicate that many anacolutha are occasioned
in St. Paul's writings by "the free use of the participle,

---

a remnant of the primary function of the nominative (ὀνομασ-
τική) case is confronted by Blass--Debrunner. Cf. Blass--
Debrunner, p. 95, par. 143. But cf. Alex. Buttmann, Gram-
matik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs (Berlin: Ferd.
Dummler's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1859), p. 325. Our point is
that "suspended subject" at least appears to be anacoluthic
to the modern Greek student, and was anacoluthic according
to the grammatical criteria of classical Greek and much of
Hellenistic Greek.

[9]Blass, op. cit., p. 283. Cf. Blass--Debrunner, pp.
296-297, par. 467.

[10]Robertson, op. cit., p. 437.

[11]Digression is not to be confused with parenthesis,
for which see infra, chap. III.

[12]These passages are discussed in full, infra, chap. V.

which he is fond of using, and sometimes in a long series of clauses, instead of a finite verb."[13]

One must be careful not to fault the Pauline epistles too heavily for the extensive occurrence of such anacolutha. Evidence of accepted usage of the interchange of finite verb and participle in the Κοινή is more than abundant.[14] But the fact that this was common usage makes the passages no less difficult to find through, and no less anacoluthic. Illustrations of "participial anacolutha" are 2 Cor. 7:5,[15] Rom. 5:11; 12:6 and 12:9 ff. The latter is an outstanding example.

This will suffice to define anacolutha. Grammarians call them by many different names. The vast majority could be placed into the general classes defined above.[16]

---

[13]Blass, op. cit., p. 284. Blass--Debrunner has made some useful distinctions in this regard, pp. 297-298, par. 468.

[14]Walter Bauer, "Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief," Die Apostolischen Väter, in Ergänzungsband, edited by Hans Lietzmann (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1920), II, 195. "Schon in vorchristlicher Zeit hat die Volkssprache das Partizipium ganz frei als Verbum finitum verwendet." Also Ludwig Radermacher, Neutestamentliche Grammatik, in Handbuch zum neuen Testament, edited by Hans Lietzmann (1st edition; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), I, 167.

[15]See the treatment of this passage infra, chap. V.

[16]Cf. e.g., James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (3rd edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919), I, 58: the famous σχῆμα Πενδαρικόν is "really only a special case of anacoluthon, no more peculiar to Pindar than to Shakespeare." Also ibid., p. 69, "nominativus pendens." Both of these would fit into the first category. But cf. Moulton's note, ibid., p. 234.

CHAPTER III

IRREGULARITIES TO BE DISTINGUISHED FROM ANACOLUTHA

Among the grammatical irregularities of the Pauline Greek which are similar to anacolutha but which do not, strictly speaking, fall into the same category are asyndeton, oratio variata, the $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ . . . $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ inconsistency, aposiopesis, parenthesis and ellipsis.

Asyndeton

Asyndeton is the lack of connection or of connectives between two or more propositions in continued discourse.[1] Blass says that asyndeton

> is on the whole repugnant to the spirit of the Greek language both with regard to sentences and the members which compose them . . . and accordingly in the New Testament also is only used to a limited extent.[2]

---

[1] Georg Benedict Winer, A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, edited and translated by J. Henry Thayer (7th edition; Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1889), pp. 537-538. Cf. also Karl Brugmann, Griechische Grammatik, edited by Albert Thumb, in Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft, edited by Iwan von Müller (4th edition; Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913), Band I, Book II, 551-566.

[2] Friedrich Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek, translated by Henry St. John Thackeray (2nd revised and enlarged edition; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911), p. 276. The German is stronger than this. Cf. Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, edited by Albert Debrunner (9th edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954), p. 210, par. 458. Hereafter Debrunner's edition will be cited as Blass--Debrunner. (But cf. Rom. 12:9, 14, 16, 21; 1 Cor. 4:8; 13:4-8; 14:26; 1 Thess. 5:14, etc.)

Robertson does not agree as to its limited use,[3] although he agrees with Blass as to its repugnance.[4] The fact that Winer finds many cases of asyndeton at points of climax in "impassioned discourse"[5] should warn against its confusion with anacolutha since anacolutha often occur at similar points. Asyndeton really does not interrupt the flow of thought.

Oratio Variata

Oratio variata is simply heterogeneous structure which is really in accord with the Greek idiom. It is a way of describing a lack of parallel in, for example, relative clauses where the relative cannot be repeated for one reason or another.[6] Robertson says that "the line between anacolutha and oratio variata is not very clearly drawn."[7] Winer proceeds to draw the line:

> Different from anacoluthon is the oratio variata . . .
> It takes place when, in parallel sentences and members
> of sentences, two (synonymous) constructions have been
> adopted, each of which is complete in itself--heterogeneous structure.[8]

---

[3]A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (4th edition; New York: George H. Doran Co., 1923), p. 427.

[4]Ibid., p. 428.

[5]Winer, op. cit., p. 538.

[6]Blass, op. cit., p. 286. Robertson, op. cit., pp. 440-442. Winer, op. cit., p. 577.

[7]Robertson, op. cit., p. 440. Also Blass--Debrunner, pp. 298-299, pars. 469-470.

[8]Winer, loc. cit.

One of the most frequent occurrences of <u>oratio variata</u> is in the changing from one form of discourse to another. This occurrence "is not unknown to ancient Greek"[9] but it is particularly within the character of the New Testament and the Pauline style, which is vividly conversational. This is a further reason to distinguish between <u>oratio variata</u> and anacolutha lest Paul be blamed for doing more violence to the Κοινή than he actually did.

The μέν . . . δέ Inconsistency

Both Winer[10] and Blass[11] consider the absence of δέ or ἀλλά to go with the preceding μέν as a sort of anacoluthon. But Robertson[12] demonstrates that the μέν does not absolutely require δέ either by etymology or usage, and he could have used Brugmann[13] more than he did to prove his point. Kühner[14] helps us to agree with Robertson.[15]

---

[9]Robertson, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 442.

[10]Winer, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 573.

[11]Blass, <u>loc. cit.</u>

[12]Robertson, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 1150-1151.

[13]Brugmann, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 544 ff.

[14]Raphael Kühner, <u>Ausfürliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache</u>, edited by Bernhard Gerth (3rd edition; Leipzig: Hansche Buchhandlung, 1904), Band II, Book II, 135.

[15]Robertson has a good section on this whole question in his Chapter XXI, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 1150-1153. Cf. J. D. Denniston, <u>The Greek Particles</u> (2nd edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), pp. 359-386; especially p. 369 and p. 374.

Aposiopesis

> Aposiopesis, or the suppression of a sentence or part
> of a sentence in consequence of emotion . . . in which
> case the gestures of the speaker supply what is wanting
> . . . occurs . . . in forms of oaths . . . and also
> after conditional clauses . . .[16]

Blass denies the existence of aposiopesis in the New
Testament.[17]

Ellipsis

Ellipsis is not anacoluthon but "consists in the omis-
sion of a word the meaning of which must be supplied in
thought (in order to complete the sentence)."[18]

Parenthesis

Occasionally the grammatical flow of a sentence will be
interrupted by the insertion of a clause which stands as an
entity in itself. The inserted clause is called a parenthe-
sis.[19] Parenthesis is common in the New Testament and in
the Pauline corpus. Robertson points out that the term is

---

[16]Winer, op. cit., p. 599. Winer is most clear and
most complete in this (cf. 599-601).

[17]Blass, op. cit., p. 294.

[18]Winer, op. cit., p. 581. See his discussion of this
on pp. 580-599.

[19]Blass, op. cit., pp. 281-282. Winer, op. cit., p. 561
Robertson, op. cit., p. 433.

applied "loosely" to inserted clauses that really do not interrupt the flow of thought.[20]   Hence it cannot be considered anacoluthon.[21]

---

[20]Robertson, loc. cit.

[21]One will notice the wide differences in what is considered to be in parenthesis by Westcott and Hort and by Nestle, for instance, at Mark 3:16, and John 1:15.

CHAPTER IV

THE ANACOLUTHON AND THE PAULINE STYLE

The Nature of Paul's "Epistolary" Style

St. Paul was not only a Hebrew of the Hebrews but a Greek of the Greeks. The style in which he wrote was clearly the style of writings of his day. But the matter that most differentiates the Pauline works from contemporary literature is this that Paul's letters were not written as "literature" but as letters.

Deissmann indicates this facet of Paul's style in his distinction between "epistles" and "letters."[1] This distinction, although not made in ancient times, sets the epistle into the class of the literary, the letter into the class of the personal and the unstudied.

It is this "un-self-conscious" character that best describes the basic quality of Paul's style. Even cursory reading through his letters in translation indicates this. His message was extremely personal and therefore so urgent

---

[1]G. Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies, translated by Alexander Grieve (2nd edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), pp. 3-59. Also Light from the Ancient East, translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan (4th revised edition; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1927), pp. 228-235. Also Otto Roller, Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933), pp. 23-28. Also J. V. Bartlett, "Epistle," A Dictionary of the Bible, edited by James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901, I, 730.

that the finesse of his style became a quite secondary con-
sideration.[2] It is this fact that claims for Paul the title
"genius of style" without the equation that his style is the
"style of genius."[3]

This is not to indicate that Paul's style is at all
void of literary qualities of the highest order. He quotes
the literati[4] and he ranks with them in the literary gran-
deur of many eloquent passages.[5] The arguments for Paul's
terminology and message as being kindred to Stoic literature
may also serve as arguments for his literary facility.[6] But
the claims for outstanding literary style in Paul's letters
must obviously be seen in the light of his overbearing sense
of urgency to get the message across. There are stylistic
parallels in Epictetus and even in the classical writers to
the Pauline material, but the stamp of the "un-literary" in

[2]Georg Benedict Winer, A Grammar of the Idiom of the
New Testament, edited and translated by J. Henry Thayer
(7th edition; Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1889), p. 567.

[3]Farrar, as cited by A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the
Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (4th
edition; New York: George H. Doran Co., 1923), p. 128.

[4]"He used the vernacular $Koιvή$ of the time with some
touch of the literary flavour, though his quotation of three
heathen poets does not show an extended acquaintance with
Greek Literature . . . .Hatch considers Paul to be the fore-
most representative of the Hellenic influence on early
Christianity." Robertson, op. cit., p. 129.

[5]For instance, Rom. 8, 1 Cor. 13, etc.

[6]Eduard Norden, Agnostos Theos (Berlin: B. G. Teubner,
1913), pp. 240-250.

style is impressed everywhere upon both the surface and the innate character of every Pauline letter.[7]

Again it is urged that St. Paul's style, far from being coarse and rugged, is the work of a mind steeped in the literature of the Old Testament and everywhere shows a carefully developed literary pattern.[8] But in the face of every argument it is necessary to understand that the basis and nature of Paul's style is found in the fact that he addressed himself always to an immediate or imminent situation. Paul's letters are "casual in character. They were not written as permanent literature."[9] Whereas the influence of the Septuagint is as undeniable as are parallels to classical and contemporary literature in the Pauline corpus, the overriding fact of the nature of Paul's style is its grammatical looseness of structure, its sacrificing of stylistic beauty for the sake of vividness and force.[10]

---

[7]Winer, loc. cit. Also C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), p. 3. Also George G. Findlay, editor, The Epistles to the Thessalonians, in The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (1st edition; Cambridge: University Press, 1891), XLIV, 32.

[8]Nils Wilhelm Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, c. 1942), pp. 3-29.

[9]Henry G. Meecham, Light from Ancient Letters (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923), p. 166. See also Deissmann, Bible Studies, loc. cit. Also Moule loc. cit.

[10]Meecham, op. cit., p. 106.

An Overview of the Use of Anacolutha in the Κοινή[11]

It is in a style such as Paul's that one would expect to find anacolutha.

> In writers of great mental vivacity and activity, more taken up with the thought than with the expression, anacolutha are most frequently to be expected. Hence they are especially numerous in the epistolary style of the Apostle Paul.[12]

If the stylistic freedom of Paul distinguishes him from the writers of literature, it does not set him apart from the style of writing current to his times. Indeed, some cases of anacolutha can be cited from the great classical authors.[13] The same freedom of style marked the personal letters of Paul's contemporaries as marked his own.[14]

Attempts to demonstrate the Apostle's boorishness or lack of learning on the basis of his style are equally as ridiculous as attempts to establish for him and his fellow apostolic authors a unique "Biblical style." Paul wrote in the style of letters of his day, in the common tongue of his

---

[11]Ludwig Radermacher, Neutestamentliche Grammatik: Das Griechisch des neues Testaments in Zusammenhang mit der Volksprache, in Handbuch zum neuen Testament, edited by Hans Lietzmann (1st edition; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohn Verlag, 1911), I, 1-23.

[12]Winer, loc. cit.

[13]Friedrich Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek, translated by Henry St. John Thackeray (2nd revised and enlarged edition; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911), p. 282.

[14]Meecham, op. cit., pp. 87 ff.

day.[15] Anacolutha were common to the non-literary usage of
the day, and the non-literary papyri supply us with hundreds
of examples.[16] The frequency of occurrence of anacolutha
in the Pauline letters, therefore, proves nothing more than
that Paul was a man with a message, and that matters of gram-
matical purity of a former age were of secondary importance
to him at best. For the Κοινή in general and the style of
letters in particular a phenomenon such as anacoluthon is
considered perfectly "justifiable" and in keeping with cur-
rent grammatical usage.[17]

Grammatically "Justifiable" Anacolutha

An anacoluthon can be considered grammatically "justi-
fiable" as long as it does not interfere with the reader's
understanding of the passage, or as long as it appears to be
intentional. In fact, Kühner feels that anacolutha are
wedded to the spirit of Greek speech.

> Da der Geist der Griechen sich durch eine seltene
> Beweglichkeit, Gewandtheit, und Raschheit des Denkens
> auszeichnete, da sich ihre Sprache aus dem Leben
> selbst hervorgebildet hatte und sich daher auch über-
> all frei bewegen konnte: so lässt es sich wohl leicht

---

[15]Ibid., pp. 96-127.

[16]Edwin Mayser, Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus
der Ptolemäerzeit (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1934),
Band II, Book III, 189-208. Also Meecham, op. cit., pp.
87 ff.

[17]Blass, loc. cit.

begreifen, warum die griechischen Autoren so reich an anakoluthischen Konstruktionen sind.[18]

The very fact that anacolutha may be either intentional or unintentional[19] indicates that their abnormality is largely a judgment of modern grammarians. James Hope Moulton is fond of writing "merely anacoluthon"[20] and indicates that anacolutha are not surprising in the New Testament, even to an exacting grammarian.

Grammatically "Unjustifiable" Anacolutha

If the presence of anacolutha in the Pauline letters were _always_ perfectly acceptable, there would be no problem for the student. But Paul is not always so gracious. In cases of digression particularly the sense of the passage is often so impaired as to render it most difficult to interpret. Rom. 5:12 and Gal. 2:6 offer striking examples. Grammatical "errors" are warranted in the area of anacolutha as long as the sense of the passage is not impaired. Whenever the sense is impaired, the anacoluthon is "unjustifiable" and calls for a special solution on the part of the student with the aid of textual criticism and attendant helps.

---

[18]Raphael Kühner, _Ausfürliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache_, edited by Bernhard Gerth (3rd edition; Leipzig: Hansche Buchhandlung, 1904), Band II, Book II, 589.

[19]Robertson, _op. cit._, p. 435.

[20]James Hope Moulton, _A Grammar of New Testament Greek_ (3rd edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919), I, 225.

The reasons for the occurrence of such anacolutha, in addition to those alluded to above, have been suggested in conjecture by numerous students of Paul. One of the most prominent suggestions is that defective grammar occurred because Paul dictated his letters to a secretary who could hardly have taken verbatim dictation.[21] The secretary would then be entrusted with putting both additions and the Pauline sense into his own words.[22] But assuming that Paul used different secretaries at different times, it would be difficult to imagine how there would be a distinctive Pauline style emerging in his corpus of letters, if, indeed, there is a distinctive style.

A more plausible explanation, assuming the "secretary theory," would be that the secretary wrote rapidly (perhaps in shorthand) what Paul said rapidly, and thereby caught the fervent character of Paul's speech.[23] Even at that, the reason for Paul's not checking the completed manuscript for such "errors" is certainly left unexplained.

Perhaps Renan has a good suggestion.

The epistle was . . . the form . . . perfectly appropriate to the condition of the period, and to the natural aptitudes of Paul . . . . Correspondence, . . . so disagreeable to writers accustomed to set forth

---

[21]J. A. Eschliman, "La Redaction des Epitres Pauliniennes," Revue Biblique, LIII, 2 (April, 1946), 185-196. Cf. also Roller, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

[22]Cf. Rom. 16:22.

[23]Meecham, op. cit., p. 106.

their ideas artistically, was well adapted to his fever-
ish activity, to his need of expressing his impressions
on the spot. . . . The epistolary style of Paul is the
most personal that ever existed.[24]

This is the best justification for the "unjustifiable" anaco-

lutha. Whether or not he wrote the letters himself or with

the help of the secretaries common to his day, the ultimate

form of the letters was a good reproduction of his own per-

sonality and an adequate expression of the urgency with which

he wrote and spoke.

---

[24]Ernest Renan, Saint Paul, translated by Ingersoll
Lockwood (New York: G. W. Carleton, 1869), pp. 154-155.

CHAPTER V

SOLUTIONS FOR SOME OF THE PROBLEMS IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

We shall attempt to demonstrate the method of treating anacolutha in three passages from the Pauline corpus. We have selected Rom. 5:12, 2 Cor. 7:5, and Gal. 2:4-6 for this study.

Romans 5:12

Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον.

Both Robertson[1] and Winer[2] find anacolutha here. Blass does not cite the passage.

Here is a case in which a grammatical structure has been begun but is continued in a manner different from that apparently intended. The protasis (ὥσπερ...) is there, but the apodosis which one would expect is missing.

The point is that after the protasis, ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν,

---

[1]A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (4th edition; New York: George H. Doran Co., 1923), p. 438.

[2]Georg Benedict Winer, A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, edited and translated by J. Henry Thayer (7th edition; Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1889), pp. 569-570. We list it under "digression," supra, p. 8.

in his eagerness to describe sin and death in its connection
with the fall of Adam, Paul fails to give the parallel in
Christ and life through justification which he seems to
have intended by opening the paragraph with ὥσπερ.[3] An
Apodosis which can be suggested is οὕτω δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου
(Χριστοῦ) δικαιοσύνη καὶ διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης
ἡ ζωή .[4]

It is evident that the meaning of the entire passage
is not unclear. It is simply this, that what one would
have expected to be the apodosis is subordinated by Paul to
the thought of his digression. The content of the origin-
ally intended protasis is included later (v. 14) by the
attachment of the relative clause (ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλ-
λοντος) which makes the comparison of Christ and Adam.

Winer finds the connection "resumed in the words ἀλλ'
οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμαetc. vs. 15, which logically absorb the
apodosis."[5] At any rate, the whole matter is cleared up in
v. 18 where the comparison is made and merged into a final
conclusion.

------

[3]William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and
Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in The
International Critical Commentary (11th edition; New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), XXXII, 132.

[4]Winer, op. cit., p. 569.

[5]Ibid., p. 570. Rom. 5:21 shows the form expected.

2 Corinthians 7:5

Καὶ γὰρ ἐλθόντων ἡμῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν οὐδε-
μίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ
θλιβόμενοι· ἔξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι.

Blass,[6] Winer[7] and Robertson[8] cite this as an anacolu-
thon. It would be placed in the class of participial ana-
colutha. Obviously the exegete would have no difficulty
with interpretation.

The problem is that θλιβόμενοι appears without a verb.
The fact that this is common in the New Testament and to
the Κοινή in general has been pointed out above.[9] But it
is still enough of an irregularity to be called anacoluthon.
The solution is to supply a finite verb.[10] Plummer suggests

---

[6]Friedrich Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek, trans-
lated by Henry St. John Thackeray (2nd revised and enlarged
edition; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911), p. 284.

[7]Winer, op. cit., p. 568.

[8]Robertson, op. cit., p. 439.

[9]Cf. supra, pp. 8-9.

[10]We call the supplying of a finite verb a solution to
the problem only because we are illustrating a method for
meeting this type of problem. We are aware of the fact that
the verb is so often suppressed that it may be questioned
that anyone mentally "supplied" it. On this matter cf. espe-
cially Friedrich Blass, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen
Griechisch, edited by Albert Debrunner (9th edition; Göt-
tingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954), p. 297. Hereafter
Debrunner's edition will be cited as Blass--Debrunner. Cf.
also James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek,
(3rd edition; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919), I, 182-83.

that "παρεκλήθημεν might be understood but is not required."[11]

Note the variance in the handling of the passage. Blass
sees it this way:

> Thus 2 C. 7.5 οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι· ἔξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι,
> where one may no doubt supply ἐσμεν in the first clause
> as εἰσίν in the second, though this does not do away
> with the harshness and the want of accurate sequence in
> the passage.[12]

Winer treats it thus:

> In VII. 5 οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν
> ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἔξωθεν μάχαι etc., ἤμελλα
> (from ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν) may be supplied . . . but an ana-
> coluthon may also be assumed . . . as if Paul had writ-
> ten in the previous part of the sentence οὐδεμίαν
> ἄνεσιν ἐσχήκαμεν τῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν .[13]

Galatians 2:6

ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι, — ὁποῖοί ποτε
ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει· πρόσωπον [ὁ] θεὸς ἀνθρώπου
οὐ λαμβάνει — ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο.

Notice that there is a complete change of construction.
The οἱ δοκοῦντες is repeated in the nominative and is followed

---

Cf. also Adolf Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, trans-
lated by Lionel R. M. Strachan (4th revised edition; New York:
Harper & Brothers, 1927), pp. 205 ff.

[11]Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary
on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, in The
International Critical Commentary, edited by Francis Brown
and Alfred Plummer (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915),
XXXIII, 218.

[12]Blass, op. cit., p. 284.

[13]Winer, op. cit., p. 352.

by the middle voice (instead of the active). Even the trans-
lators were mystified at this one.[14] It is clear that the
parenthesis made it difficult for Paul to continue, so he
recapitulated with the οἱ δοκοῦντες and προσανέθεντο.

Burton[15] suggests that, "The apostle doubtless had in
mind when he began the sentence παρέλαβον οὐδέν or some
equivalent expression."

Here is another instance in which the thought of the
writer is clear, but the style is difficult and the grammar
disturbing.

Galatians 2:4-5

Blass is almost guilty of understatement when he writes
about Gal. 2:4 f. that, "It is by no means easy to say what
was the drift of St. Paul's thought."[16]

διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους οἵτινες παρεισ-
ῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ
Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν· οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν
τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

---

[14]Gal. 2:6, "But of these who seemed to be somewhat,
(whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God ac-
cepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat
in conference added nothing to me."

[15]Ernest de Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical
Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, in The Inter-
national Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's
Sons, 1920), XXXIV, 87.

[16]Blass, loc. cit. Blass--Debrunner, p. 296, par. 467.

Simply put, the anacoluthon lies in οἷς . The οἷς
finds no dative to relate itself to in the preceding part
of the sentence. Burton cites no less than seven inter-
pretations of the passage.[17] The easiest way out of the
difficulty is to read the verse without οἷς as do D, Ire-
naeus, and others.[18] But we would be inclined to agree with
Winer,[19] Burton[20] and Robertson[21] against Blass[22] and
others[23] that the manuscript evidence against οἷς οὐδέ
is not strong enough; that it is unlikely that the οἷς
would have been introduced by later editors, since it is
anacoluthic; that anacolutha are common to Paul, especially
in this section of Galatians, and hence may be considered
original.

Winer's solution is that:

the Apostle might either have said: on account of the
false brethren (to please them) . . . we did not cause
Titus to be circumcised; or, we could by no means (in
this respect) give way to the false brethren.[24]

---

[17]Burton, op. cit., pp. 79-82.

[18]Notice that variant readings come to us from the vari-
ous codices and minuscules almost without fail in the face
of anacolutha.

[19]Winer, op. cit., pp. 569-570.

[20]Burton, op. cit., pp. 81-82.

[21]Robertson, op. cit., p. 438.

[22]Blass, loc. cit.

[23]Burton, op. cit., pp. 79-82.

[24]Winer, op. cit., p. 569.

Burton's argument is more convincing.

> Though the request that Paul and those with him should
> yield was not made by, but because of, the false breth-
> ren, he clearly saw that to grant the request would be
> in effect to surrender to the latter. Hence the dative
> here instead of $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}$ $ο\hat{υ}ς$, corresponding to $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}$ $το\grave{υ}ς$
> $\grave{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\varphi ους$.[25]

This argument does not explain the $ο\hat{υ}ς$ away, but uses
it to bring Paul's point home very skilfully. It must be
recognized, however, that the anacoluthon here forces one to
imply the antecedent and thereby renders the passage most
difficult to interpret.

---

[25]Burton, op. cit., p. 84.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Anacolutha are breaks in the grammatical structure of a sentence. They occur as a result of the intervention of another thought which diverts the attention of the writer from the original thought or structure, or they are employed intentionally to heighten the vividness or accent of the subsequent thought.

Although their very irregular nature defies a completely systematic grouping, anacolutha are to be distinguished from other irregularities in grammatical structure which would be differently defined, or which find such grammatical warrant in the Κοινή usage as to be disqualified as bona fide breach of concord.

Occurrences of anacolutha are common to the style of the writers of the mental agility and fervid emotion of the Apostle Paul. Insofar as they were intentional on Paul's part, they serve to give force and vitality to his message. Insofar as they were involuntary, they are to be explained by Paul's primary concern with content rather than form; by his anxiety in moments of stress; by the marks of speech and rhetoric which his letters bore, since many of them were probably dictated; or by errors or inconsistencies on the part of the secretaries to whom he dictated.

The presence of numerous similar anacolutha in the papyri letters indicates that the Pauline anacolutha do not mark Paul as unlearned or coarse but as one who shared with his contemporaries (and with us) the right of mastery over grammar for the sake of forceful language.

The majority of the anacolutha in the Pauline corpus does not affect the understanding or interpretation of the passage involved to any great extent. This does not mean, however, that they are any the less anacolutha nor any the less grammatically inconsistent and therefore grammatically erroneous.

In instances in which anacolutha affect the meaning or understanding of a passage the anacoluthon is not to be changed arbitrarily to remove the harshness of sequence. In fact, there is reason for believing that the presence of a particularly harsh anacoluthon actually helps to verify the passage as genuine. The proper method of treating such a passage is to look to the anacoluthon itself to see if it points to a thought which the writer wished to heighten or emphasize. If such is not the case, the interpreter must determine from the context what the writer "intended" to write.

Any attempt to "explain away" the Pauline anacolutha as unworthy of divine inspiration, and hence spurious, is completely unrealistic. Such an attempt would have to

posit the use of a language different from the Κοινή on the ground that the "vulgar" language of the day was unworthy to be a vehicle for divinely inspired words.

APPENDIX A

A List of the Anacolutha in the Pauline Corpus as Cited by

the Grammars of Blass, Robertson and Winer

Robertson

		page			page
Rom.	5:12 ff.	438	Gal.	2:6	438
Rom.	9:22-25	438	Gal.	6:1	439
?Rom.	12:6	439	Eph.	3:8	439
Rom.	12:9-17	439-440	Eph.	4:2	440
Rom.	16:27	438	?Eph.	5:15-22	440
1 Cor.	7:37	440	Phil.	1:30	439
1 Cor.	9:15	439	Col.	1:22	437
2 Cor.	5:12	439	Col.	1:26	440
?2 Cor.	6:3	440	Col.	2:2	439
2 Cor.	7:5	439	Col.	3:16	440
2 Cor.	8:20	439	Col.	4:6	439
2 Cor.	9:11,13	439	1 Thess.	4:1	439
2 Cor.	12:17	436	2 Thess.	2:3 ff.	1203
Gal.	2:5	438	1 Tim.	1:3-5	439

Blass

Rom.	1:8	267	2 Cor.	9:11	285
Rom.	10:1	267	2 Cor.	9:13	285
Rom.	11:13	267	2 Cor.	11:4	267
Rom.	12:6	285	2 Cor.	12:17	283
Rom.	12:9	285	Gal.	2:6	284
Rom.	16:27	284	Gal.	6:1	286
1 Cor.	7:13	286	Eph.	3:18	285
1 Cor.	7:37	285	Eph.	4:20	285
1 Cor.	11:18	267	Col.	1:26	285
2 Cor.	1:7	285	Col.	2:23	267
2 Cor.	5:12	284	Col.	3:16 f.	285
2 Cor.	6:9	285	1 Thess.	2:18	267
2 Cor.	7:5	284	1 Tim.	1:3 ff.	284
2 Cor.	8:18	284-265	Tit.	1:2 f.	286

Winer

Rom.	1:8	575	Rom.	3:2	575
Rom.	1:26-27	571	Rom.	5:12	569-570
Rom.	2:17-21	569	Rom.	7:12	575

APPENDIX B

A Composite List of the Anacolutha in the Pauline Corpus as
Cited by the Grammars of Blass, Robertson and Winer

Reference		Grammars	Reference		Grammars
Rom.	1:8	B W	2 Cor.	9:10 f.	W
Rom.	1:26-27	W	2 Cor.	9:11,13	B R
Rom.	2:17-21	W	2 Cor.	9:12 f.	W
Rom.	3:2	W	2 Cor.	11:4	B
Rom.	5:12 ff.	R W	2 Cor.	12:12	W
Rom.	7:12	W	2 Cor.	12:17	B R W
Rom.	8:3	W	Gal.	2:5	R
Rom.	9:7	W	Gal.	2:6	B R W
Rom.	9:22-25	R W	Gal.	4:24,26	W
Rom.	10:1	B W	Gal.	6:1	B R
Rom.	11:13 f.	B W	Eph.	1:18	W
Rom.	12:6 ff.	B R W	Eph.	1:20	W
Rom.	12:9-17	B R	Eph.	3:8	R
Rom.	13:11	W	Eph.	3:18	B
Rom.	15:3	W	Eph.	4:2 f.	R W
Rom.	15:21	W	Eph.	4:20	B
Rom.	16:27	B R	?Eph.	5:15-22	R
1 Cor.	2:9	W	Phil.	1:29 f.	W
1 Cor.	3:21	W	Phil.	1:30	R
1 Cor.	5:3	W	Phil.	3:10	W
1 Cor.	7:13	B	Phil.	3:18	W
1 Cor.	7:26	W	Col.	1:6	W
1 Cor.	7:37	B R W	Col.	1:21	W
1 Cor.	7:38	W	Col.	1:22	R
1 Cor.	9:15	R	Col.	1:26	B R W
1 Cor.	11:18	B W	Col.	2:2	R
?1 Cor.	12:2	W	Col.	2:10	W
1 Cor.	12:28	W	Col.	2:23	B W
2 Cor.	1:7	B W	Col.	3:16	B R W
2 Cor.	5:6 ff.	W	Col.	4:6	R
2 Cor.	5:12	B R	1 Thess.	2:18	B
?2 Cor.	6:3	R	1 Thess.	4:1	R
2 Cor.	6:9	B W	2 Thess.	2:3 ff.	R
2 Cor.	7:5	B R W	1 Tim.	1:3-5	B R W
2 Cor.	8:18	B	Tit.	1:2 f.	B
2 Cor.	8:20	R	Tit.	1:3	W
2 Cor.	9:1,3	W			

B--Blass   R--Robertson   W--Winer

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Nestle, E. Eberhard, and D. Erwin Nestle, editors. Novum Testamentum Graece. 18th edition. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1948.

Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort, editors. The New Testament in the Original Greek. Revised American edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1889.

B. Secondary Sources

Abbott, Edwin A. Clue: A Guide through Greek and Hebrew Scripture. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900.

Bartlet, J. V. "Epistle," A Dictionary of the Bible. I. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901. Pp. 729-731.

Bauer, Walter. "Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief," Die Apostolischen Väter. Vol. II in Ergänzungsband. Edited by Hans Lietzmann. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1920. Pp. 195 ff.

Bible, Holy. Authorized Version.

Blass, Friedrich. Grammar of New Testament Greek. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray. 2nd revised and enlarged edition. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1911.

------. Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Edited by Albert Debrunner. 9th edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954.

Brugmann, Karl. Griechische Grammatik. Edited by Albert Thumb. Division I, Band II in Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Edited by Iwan von Müller. 4th edition. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913. Pp. 198, 605 ff.

Burton, Ernest de Witt. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. Vo. XXXIV in The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920. Pp. 77-91.

Buttmann, Alex. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs.* Berlin: Ferd. Dummler's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1859. Pp. 324-331.

Deissmann, G. Adolf. *Bible Studies.* Authorized translation by Alexander Grieve. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.

-----. *Light from the Ancient East.* Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. 4th revised edition. New York: Harper & Brothers 1927.

Denniston, J. D. *The Greek Particles.* 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954. Pp. 359-386.

Eschliman, J. A. "La Redaction des Epitres Pauliniennes," *Revue Biblique,* Vol. LIII, No. 2 (April, 1946), 185-196.

Findlay, George G., editor. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians.* Vol. XLIV in *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.* 1st edition. Cambridge: University Press, 1891.

Kühner, Raphael. *Ausfürliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache.* Edited by Bernhard Gerth. 3rd edition. Band II, Book II. Leipzig: Hansche Buchhandlung, 1904. Pp. 588-592.

Lund, Nils Wilhelm. *Chiasmus in the New Testament.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Caroline Press, c.1942. Pp. 139-225.

Mayser, Edwin. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit.* Band II, Book III. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1934. Pp. 189-208.

Meecham, Henry G. *Light from Ancient Letters.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923.

Morrison, Thomas. *The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul.* 3rd revised edition. London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, n.d.

Moule, D. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek.* Cambridge: University Press, 1953.

Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* I. 3rd edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919.

Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos.* Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. Vol. XXXIII in The International Critical Commentary. Edited by Francis Brown and Alfred Plummer. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.

Radermacher, Ludwig. Neutestamentliche Grammatik: Das Griechisch des neues Testaments in Zusammenhang. Vol. I in Handbuch zum neuen Testament. Edited by Hans Lietzmann. 1st edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Verlag, 1911. Pp. 1-50.

Renan, Ernest. Saint Paul. Translated by Ingersoll Lockwood. New York: G. W. Carleton, 1869.

Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. 4th edition. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1923.

Roller, Otto. Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933.

Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Vol. XXXII in The International Critical Commentary. 11th edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Schwyzer, Eduard. Griechische Grammatik. Edited by Albert Debrunner. Division II, Band II, Vol. I in Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Edited by Walter Otto. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, c.1950.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. A Greek Grammar for Colleges. New York: American Book Company, c.1920.

Winer, Georg Benedict. A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament. 7th edition, enlarged and improved by Gottlieb Lünemann. Revised and authorized translation by J. Henry Thayer. Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1889.

------. Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms: Als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese. 7th edition. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1867.