



Durham E-Theses

Romans 12.11: a textual, lexical and ethical study

North, J.L.

How to cite:

North, J.L. (1988) *Romans 12.11: a textual, lexical and ethical study*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6416/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

Name: J. L. North

Title: Romans 12. 11: a textual, lexical and
ethical study

Name of Degree: Ph. D.

Date of Submission: 30 September 1988

Declaration: I am willing that my work be made available for
consultation by bona fide scholars without
delay and be photocopied by the National
Lending Library.



- 2 NOV 1989

I confirm that no part of the material offered has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or in any other University.

ABSTRACT

This study divides itself into three parts. The opening chapter sets out the textual position. Most of the material here is well known, but additions to it can still be made. Since text, as a selection from a group of variants, and interpretation, as a justification and understanding of that selection, are always associated both in method and in exegesis,¹ the first chapter also presents an attempt to trace the history of the interpretation of Romans 12.11c, particularly in its earlier, less well-known stages and particularly where καίρω is read.

The second chapter, the backbone of the thesis, presents in detail the lexical materials, which show how καίρω often appears in other writers in company with one or other of the words found in the Pauline context (especially σπουδή, ὀκνηρός, πνεῦμα, ἐλπίς, θλίψις and χρεία in vv. 11-13) or with their cognates. My conclusion can be put in this interrogatory form: If this word occurs elsewhere in Greek literature (and with necessary changes in Latin literature) in similar company, should we not reconsider the possibility of its originality in Romans 12.11c?

Chapter three assumes this originality and suggests an exegesis of Romans 12 which gives τῷ καίρῳ εὐλαέοντες its proper weight within its context, especially within chapters 11-15.

1. Even the reading in the earliest extant MS may represent a choice from amongst existing variants or be an emendation, and so itself be an interpretation.



Nihil sub sole novum

Si quem dura manet sententia iudicis olim,
Damnatum aerumnis suppliciisque caput:
Hunc neque fabrili lassent ergastula massa,
Nec rigidas vexent fossa metalla manus.
Lexica contexat, nam caetera quid moror? omnes
Poenarum facies hic labor unus habet.

J. J. Scaliger

I know of no more enjoyable intellectual activity than working on a dictionary. Unlike most research, lexicography rarely sends one in fruitless quests; one does not devote days, months, or even years to testing an hypothesis only to decide that it is not tenable, or to attempting to collect evidence to prove a theory only to have to conclude that sufficient facts are no longer in existence to clinch it. It does not make one's life anxious, nor build up hopes only to have them collapse. Every day one is confronted by new problems, usually small but absorbingly interesting; at the end of the day one feels healthily tired, but content in the thought that one has accomplished something and advanced the whole work towards its completion.

J. R. Hulbert

I send you now by the Carrier Martin, ye papers I promised. I fear I have not only made you stay too long for them, but also made them too long by an addition. For upon ye receipt of your letter, reviewing what I had by me concerning the text of 1 John 5.7, & examining authors a little further about it, I mett with something new concerning that other of 1 Tim. 3.16, wch I thought would be as acceptable to inquisitive men, & might be set down in a little room; but by searching further into authors to find out ye bottom of it is swelled to ye bignesse you see.

I. Newton

CONTENTS

	Page
Personalia	1
Abstract	2
Nihil sub sole novum	3
Preface	6
Abbreviations and other conventions	7
Introduction	10
Chapter One The History of the Problem	17
(a) the MSS	17
(b) Latin writers to c. 450	24
(c) Greek writers to the twelfth century	39
(d) Latin writers from c. 450 to c. 1450	48
Appendix A on 'Bede'	54
(e) Renaissance and Reformation	56
Appendix B on Abbreviations	85
(f) Counter-Reformation to the Present	95
Chapter Two KAIP- in Company	107
with (a) σπουδ-	109
(b) ὀκν-	135
(c) πνεῦμ-	141
(d) ἐλπι-	151
(e) θλιβ-	161
(f) χρεία	163
(g) δουλεύειν etc.	172
Chapter Three τῶ καιρῶ δουλεύοντες	
within the Context of Romans 11-15	179
Bibliography	207

PREFACE

This thesis was many years in the making, having been overtaken and interrupted by changes professional and domestic. Hence my gratitude to the Faculty of Divinity and to the Regulations Committee of the Faculty of Arts in the University of Durham for their patience. I am indebted particularly to Darlington College of Education, sadly now closed, and to the University of Hull for the two periods of study leave that launched this investigation and helped to bring it to port. I am grateful to the Rev. Professor C. K. Barrett for his trust and steady encouragement and to my typists, Miss Anastasia Pallis and Mr. Jannis Panagopoulos who worked on chapter two, and Miss Karen Petch, for their careful work. Above all I am aware of how much I owe to those editors whose concordances have helped so considerably to make chapter two of this study possible. As for chapter one I slowly became aware of the men behind the variants and behind the discussions these provoked. Their errors show only their humanity and are blemishes on giants' work which has laid the foundations for all advanced study of the biblical text.

ABBREVIATIONS AND OTHER CONVENTIONS

AE	See bibliography under Erasmus
art. cit.	In article already cited
BC	Before Christ
Budé	Volume in the series Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé (Paris)
C.	Century or centuries
c.	Circa
CC	Volume in the series Corpus Christianorum, series Latina (Turnhout); reference is to volume and page number
ch. (s.)	Chapter (s)
col. (1.)	Column(s)
CR	Volume in the series Corpus Reformationum (Halle)
CSEL	Volume in the series Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (Vienna); reference is to volume and page number
D-M	See bibliography under Darlow, Moule
ed. (d.)	Editor(s)
esp.	Especially
ET	English translation or Expository Times
etc.	Et cetera
f. (f.)	And following page(s)
ibid.	Ibidem
id.	Idem
in loc.	On the verse in question
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
LB	See bibliography under Erasmus
l. (1.)	Line(s)
LXX	Septuagint
MS(S)	Manuscript (s)

n. (n.)	Note(s)
ns	New series
op. cit.	In work already cited
p. (p.)	Page(s)
PG/PL	Volume in the series Patrologia Graeca/Patrologia Latina, edited by J.-P. Migne (Paris); reference is to volume and column number
PLS	Supplementary volumes to PL, edited by A. Hamman (Paris)
pt.	Part
SC	Volume in the series Sources Chrétiennes (Paris); reference is to volume and page number
sc.	Scilicet
s. v.	Sub voce
Teubner	Volume in the series Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig)
TS	Volume in the series Texts and Studies (Cambridge)
TWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament
v. (v.)	Verse(s)
viz.	Videlicet
v. i.	Variant reading
vol. (s.)	Volume(s)
vol. cit.	In volume already cited
WA	See bibliography under Luther.
W-W	Either J. Wordworth and H. J. White, or their Vulgate Romans (Oxford 1913)
ZNTW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche

Where a date is given in brackets after an author's name, a preceding dagger (†) signifies that it is the year of his death. Years of birth are not generally given since they are less significant, even when

they are known. Dates without the dagger refer to the century or centuries of the author's life, as given in such standard works of reference as *A Greek-English Lexicon*, edd. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie (Oxford 1925-1940), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford 1961-1968), and *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, edd. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (Oxford 1974²). Dates without a following BC are AD.

The abbreviations of book titles in chapter two are those adopted in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, edd. N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard (Oxford 1970²), pp. ix-xxii. The volume, year and page or

column references in periodical literature are given in the form: *JTS* 28 (1927) 98. Supralinear numbers after years of publication refer to editions of books subsequent to the first. As with the word *domino* I have been parsimonious with capital initials, especially in book titles. I have not italicised extensive quotations from Latin authors.

$\kappa \alpha \lambda \rho$ — means the wordgroup of which $\kappa \alpha \lambda \rho \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$ is a member; similarly $\acute{\upsilon} \beta \rho \iota$ — etc..

INTRODUCTION

The text of Paul's letter to the Romans 12.11c is in considerable disarray. A mass of copies in Greek and a dozen other languages, along with several quotations in the works of early Christian writers, supports τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες. A much smaller body of evidence, most of it with Latin affiliation, reads τῷ καρῷ δ. . . At least two MSS pass straight on from ζέοντες to τῇ ἐλπίδι. These, not checked but taken from Tischendorf's apparatus and his sigla modernised, are 1834 and 1912. Was it because of the homoeoteleuton with -οντες, or because of the difficulty of τῷ καρῷ in their exemplars?

What did Paul write at this point? That Christians should serve the Lord or serve the time? On the face of it the latter is the harder reading, but is it so hard that it is impossible?¹ G. B. Caird once said to the writer that it was not only *lectio potior* but *lectio 'potty'*! Yet the evidence for καρῷ is not inconsiderable, though certainly circumscribed, and there is further evidence, of two types, that argues in its favour. It can be shown that in the Mediterranean world of Paul's day time-serving could be encouraged, though its dangers were fully understood (I do not wish to suggest that that necessarily was what Paul had in mind), and secondly it can be shown that many of the words that encircle Romans 12.11c, and their cognates, accompany καρῷ and its cognates in many strands of earlier, contemporary and later Greek.

1. See C. E. B. Cranfield's comment below in the discussion of the reasons for the hardness of καρῷ.

In fact it is the assumption of this thesis that a consideration of the textual data alone cannot resolve this crux, that the evidence is too finely balanced (quantity and geographical distribution over against intrinsic probabilities) and that we must consider other data like the two types mentioned above to aid us in our decision.

But why is it universally admitted that $\kappa\alpha\lambda\rho\hat{\omega}$ is a hard reading and harder than $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$? The only answer that has been given, whether by its critics or by its champions, relates to the ethical implications of $\tau\hat{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\rho\hat{\omega}\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. As we shall see, Athanasius challenged the propriety of such a course of action for the Christian ($\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$); Erasmus, a champion, was aware of its place in pagan ethics; and amongst recent scholars Cranfield, who alleges: ' $\kappa\alpha\lambda\rho\hat{\omega}$ is not only *lectio difficilior* (that it certainly is), but also *lectio impossibilis*', interprets the phrase pejoratively as "opportunism", "accommodating oneself to the circumstances", "time-serving".¹ In 1977 H. Schlier wrote: '... $\kappa\alpha\lambda\rho\hat{\omega}\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\nu$... ist in der Antike eine anstössige Redensart im Sinn von Opportunist sein. Es ist der, welcher der **Z**eit nachläuft und ihr nach dem Munde redet, was ja nicht gerade als Weise der selbstlosen Hingabe betrachtet werden kann. Das Erbarmen Gottes mahnt gewiss nicht dazu, dem Zeitgeist und den Zeitverhältnissen sich anzupassen und ihnen zu verfallen',² and in 1982 U. Wilckens said: '"Der Zeit zu dienen" war eine gängige Redensart in prononciert negativer Bedeutung eines verabscheuungswürdigen Opportunismus'.³

-
1. *A commentary on Romans 12-13* (Edinburgh 1965), p. 44 = *A critical and exegetical commentary on the epistle to the Romans*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh 1979), p. 635.
 2. *Der Römerbrief* (Freiburg etc. 1977), p. 376 f..
 3. *Der Brief an die Römer*, vol. 3 (Zürich etc. 1982), p. 21.

I doubt very much whether τῷ καρῷ δουλεύειν (and *tempori (bus) servire*) was so uniformly pejorative as these last three scholars believe, but it is still ethical considerations which have always controlled the decision. I suggest that there were other reasons which in addition might have predisposed copyists and editors to alter an original καρῷ to κυρίῳ.

Firstly, there is the link with pagan religion and polytheism. In the second century the Greek antiquary Pausanias (5, 14, 9) reported the presence of an altar to Καρὸς at Olympia and the composition of a hymn to Καρὸς by Ion of Chios (4 C. B.C.), in which Καρὸς is represented as the youngest child of Zeus; Himerius (4 C.) wrote that the sculptor Lysippus (4 C. B.C.) 'enrolled Καρὸς among the gods' (Ecl. 14, 1); Palladas (4-5 C.) applauded Menander's (4-3 C. B.C.) description of Καρὸς as a god (AP 10, 52, 1): and even Ausonius (4 C.), a christian poet, in a Latin paraphrase of Posidippus (3 C. B.C.; AP 16, 275), can without scruple make Καρὸς say: *Sum dea quae rara et paucis Occasio nota* (Epigramma 33). But that is exceptional. Monotheists cannot speak of the god Καρὸς with approval. Philo twice refers slightly to this pagan deity and its cult (Post. 121; Q. in Gen. 1, 100), and Christians follow suit, Procopius of Gaza (6 C.) actually quoting the latter of these two passages (PG 87.292C). Other allusions to a pagan god Καρὸς in christian writers include Athenagoras (2 C.; PG 6.937AB), Gregory Nazianzus (4 C.; PG 37.1028A) and Paulinus of Nola, disciple and close friend of Ausonius, mentioned above, (4 C.; PL 61.230B). Had Paul's Romans reading καρῷ or *tempori* fallen into the hands of one or more of these three, correction of the text would have been regarded as a religious duty and would have happened as surely as happened with Jerome when an Old

Latin Romans and/or an Ambrosiaster reading *tempori* was decontaminated and made to read *dominā*; see p. 28f..

Secondly, there is the association of *Καιρός* and astrology, in contexts that sometimes contain Jewish elements, yet an association that would still be antipathetic to christian theology and much christian sentiment. I have observed four places in the ancient sources where *Καιρός* appears in astrological and magical texts, though three of them (2.-4. below) are textually insecure, and *also* two other references, in the secondary literature, where scholars have suggested an astrological understanding of *Καιρός*.

1. In *Les Mages hellénisés* (Paris 1938) J. Bidez and F. Cumont edited a text attributed to the Persian sage Ostanēs, in which *Καιρός* appears as the god of a decan (vol. 1, p. 177f.; vol. 2, p. 273). They suggest that it is the representation of *Καιρός* in Greek art holding a balance, hinting at a connection with Libra, that is the reason for the presence of *Καιρός* here.

2. There is a text attributed to Apollonius of Tyana (1 C.) but probably coming from the fourth century, which may not only employ *Καιρός* in an astrological context but also be a new parallel to the Pauline expression *τῶ̄ καιρῶ̄ δουλεύοντες*.

It was edited twice in successive years by F. Nau and F. Boll.¹ Nau (p. 1385) read: *περὶ τῶν ὀνομασιῶν τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν δουλεύοντων εἰς τοὺς τέσσαρας καιροὺς. αἱ ὀνομασίαι τῶν ἀγγέλων οἱ διοικοῦσι τὸν*

1. Edd. I. Parisot, F. Nau, M. Kmosko, *Patrologia Syriaca*, pt. 1, vol. 2 (Paris 1907), pp. 1363-1392; ed. F. Boll, *Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum*, vol. 7 (Bruxelles 1908), pp. 175-181.

πρώτον καρὸν εἰσὶν αὐταί.

Two comments are appropriate here. The decline of the dative and its replacement by inter alia εἰς + accusative are well known in late Κοινή,¹ so that the final phrase of the first sentence may serve as a new example of the Pauline phrase in Romans 12.11c. Paul himself may offer an example of δουλεύω + εἰς rather than + dative, at Philippians 2.22: ἔδούλευσεν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. The second comment refers to διοικῶσι in the second sentence of the extract. It may suggest that service of the four seasons need not involve the grovelling that some of the champions of κυρίῳ see to be the problem with τῷ καρῷ

δουλεύοντες. Serving, even slaving, does not exclude διοίκησις, administration. However, in his edition published the following year Boll printed τοὺς δικαίους instead of εἰς τοὺς δ' καρούς (p. 180), a reading found in some MSS and recorded in Nau's apparatus. But the context favours καρούς and I would follow Nau's text.

3. Published amongst *Papyri Graecae magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, vol. 2 (Leipzig/Berlin 1931) is a famous Leiden MS, papyrus 13, in which the abbreviation κρος occurs twice (pp. 96, 112, ll. 188f., 508f.). Though A. Dieterich reads this as Κρόνος, in which he was followed somewhat tentatively by R. Reitzenstein,² the editor, K. Preisendanz, followed by

1. Cp. A. T. Robertson, *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research* (London 1919³), p. 535, where other examples are given.
2. A. Dieterich, *Abraxas* (Leipzig 1891), pp. 11, 18; R. Reitzenstein *Die Göttin Psyche in der hellenistischen und frühchristlichen Literatur* (Heidelberg 1917), pp. 30f., 37ff.; id., *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (Stuttgart 1927³), pp. 359, 217.

A.-J. Festugière and very recently by Morton Smith, read *Καιρός*.¹ Few though they be (see below p. 88f.) abbreviations of *Καιρός* are known, of *Κρόνος*, as far as I know, none is found; so again I support the expansion *Καιρός* in these two passages. If this is correct we have an astrological, magical text, dating from the third or fourth century, where *Καιρός* enjoys a very lofty eminence amongst gods and angels. A few lines further on (pp. 91, 114f., ll. 71ff., 583ff.) the magician claims: *δουλεύω ὑπὸ τὸν δὸν κόσμον τῷ σὺ ἀγγέλῳ*. The editor says that the angel here is *Καιρός*. If that is so then we have here another instance of the Pauline phrase in a slightly modified form.

4. Finally, if we can accept the emendation of the editor, we have *Καιρός* incorporated into the barbarous name of a demon in the *Testament of Solomon* 18,9, as *Καιρωζανονδάλον*. This name is mentioned twice and the demon is the one that causes ears to be blocked up!²

As for the secondary literature, A. Bouché-Leclercq described *Καιρός* as 'idée fondamentale de la théorie des *καταρχαί*' (the propitious moments when alone new ventures should be undertaken),³ and in connection with Galatians 4.10: *παρὰ τὴν εἶσθε... καιροῦς* Reitzenstein referred to the late Jewish belief that Michael and

-
1. A.-J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, vol. 1 (Paris 1944), p. 302; Morton Smith in *The Greek magical papyri in translation*, ed. H. D. Betz (Chicago/London 1986), pp. 177, 185. Preisendanz and Reitzenstein disagreed quite explicitly about the more likely way to expand the contraction; cp. the former in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 38 (1917) 1431, in a review of the latter's *Die Göttin Psyche* (coll. 1427-1433), and the latter's response in *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (Bonn 1921), p. 177, n. 3.
 2. Ed. C. C. McCown, *The Testament of Solomon* (Leipzig 1922), p. 52*f..
 3. A. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie Grecque* (Paris 1899), p. 9, n. 2.

Gabriel were the angels of winter and summer, and he appeared to suggest that some such angel worship is presupposed by the Pauline phrase.¹

For all its variety, it seems quite clear that *Καδιδός*, whether as god, angel or demon, enjoyed an important position in popular Greek magic, and any idea of service rendered to such a one would be regarded only as blasphemous by early Christians. Rather than trust Paul and allow his risky expression to stand (even though knowing that whatever he meant, he could never have advised service of demonic forces), some early reader or readers sanitised his text with the unexceptional *Κυριώ*, much the easier reading.

Lastly and most tentatively, it may be, as I shall suggest later (p. 36f.), that the heresiarch Marcion (2 C.) read *tempori* at Romans 12.11c and that it was his support for a phrase already risky and so suspect that finally alienated readers from it. But clearly this view remains only a hypothesis that the present state of the evidence does not allow us to demonstrate.

1. R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (Leipzig 1904), p. 287f., esp. p. 288, n. 1.

CHAPTER ONE

THE HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

(a) The MSS

Though later I shall deal briefly with the earliest evidence for the variant $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ (p. 40, n. 1), I shall concentrate on the variant $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$, describing in greater detail the witnesses supporting it and the interpretations which have been offered. The reasons for this unbalanced treatment are these: where the meaning of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ is clear, that of $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ is not; few would dispute that it is $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ that has to justify itself, because of its ambiguity and weaker attestation, rather than $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$.

There are only four Greek MSS which read $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$, the three Greek-Latin bilingual uncials DFG and the minuscule MS 5. D, codex Claromontanus, is usually dated to the sixth century, but H. J. Frede expresses certainty that it is a fifth century work.¹ On p. 69 of the standard facsimile edition prepared by Tischendorf (Leipzig 1852), the original hand has written, in unbroken uncials:

$\tau\omega\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ *temporiservientes.*

Subsequent correctors have altered both versions to $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ and *domino*, but a sixteenth century corrector restored the Greek side to $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ (see Tischendorf, *op. cit.*, p. 546). It is not clear whether this change was the result of the restorer's being able to recover the erased original or of collation with another MS or a

1. H. J. Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften* (Freiburg 1964), p. 22f., where he follows E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini antiquiores*, vol. 5 (Oxford 1950), § 521. Cp. Tuillier's article mentioned on p. 106.

printed edition like Erasmus's second of 1519.¹

F, codex Augiensis, dated to the ninth century, unlike D, has the Latin on the left side and the Greek on the right side of the page. Only the Greek side supports $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\hat{\omega}$, reading the three words of the phrase with a dot between each, according to Scrivener's facsimile edition, p. 36.² The Latin side (f) reads \overline{dno} (=domino), but over the Greek word $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\hat{\omega}$ the Latin *tempore* (sic) has been written. It is not clear whether this is a translation of $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\hat{\omega}$ because the Latin side offers no help, or the result of collation with G. It is probably the latter.³

G, codex Boernerianus, again dated to the ninth century, presents the Greek and Latin evidence differently from both D and F. Here the Latin (g) is placed over the Greek, rather like an interlinear gloss. Following Reichardt's *Lichtdruck* (Leipzig 1909), p. 16, we have:

1. H. J. Frede, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*, vol. 2 (Freiburg 1974), published a transcription of a Latin Apostolicum from Budapest, written c. 400, copied c. 800, which, he says, agrees with Claromontanus in 86% of its readings. However at Romans 12.11c (p. 81) it reads, unlike Claromontanus, *domino servientes*. The ancient commentary that accompanies the text has no note on the phrase. We shall return to this MS when we examine the evidence of Pelagius. Unfortunately Frede's earlier (re-)discovery, a fragmentary Latin Apostolicum from Monza near Milan, written c. 900, does not contain Romans 12, 11. Its text is said to be entirely Old Latin and akin to Ambrose's text. It is tantalising to speculate whether the great bishop of Milan read *tempori* or *domino*; cp. Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, p. 249. In *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*, ed. K. Aland (Berlin/New York 1972), p. 465, n. 25, Frede reports agreements between Ambrose and this MS at Ephesians 4.8; 16; 18.
2. F. H. Scrivener, *An exact transcript of the codex Augiensis* (Cambridge/London 1859).
3. Scrivener, op. cit., p. xxix. W. B. Smith, 'The Pauline manuscripts F and G. A text-critical study', *The American Journal of Theology* 7 (1903) 452-485, 662-688, does not deal with Romans 12, 11c in his argument that F and G are not immediately dependent on each other.

tempore servientes
ΤΩ. ΚΑΙΡΩ ΔΟΥΛΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ

Before we leave these Greek-Latin bilinguals we should note that the fourth member of the Pauline Greek-Latin bilingual quartet, Ee, codex Sangermanensis, usually considered to be a transcript of D, here does not follow D, but reads *ΚΥΡΙΩ* and, like Frede's Budapest Apostolicum and f, *domino*. So reads Belsheim's edition of E (Christiania 1885, p. 12). Further we should note that Frede has argued that the archetype of these four bilinguals can be dated to about 350.¹ The significance of this will be clearer when we come to the first Latin commentators on Romans.

Before we leave the Latin biblical evidence we must note the witness of the Old Latin capitulation of Romans. According to the Wordsworth-White edition of the Vulgate Romans (p. 56f.; henceforth

1. *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, pp. 94-97. A more recent discussion of the archetype is in N. A. Dahl, '0230 (=PSI 1306) and the fourth century Greek-Latin edition of the letters of Paul', in *Text and interpretation*, edd. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge 1979), pp. 79-98. For Frede's detailed codicological description and assessment of Dd Ee Ff Gg see op. cit., pp. 15-87.

W-W), MSS AF entitle capitulum 42 de tempore serviendo,¹ and MSS OV give the same title to capitulum 49. The retention of an Old Latin capitulum in many Vulgate MSS without any adaptation to the Vulgate's reading is very curious and is another witness to the persistence of Old Latin readings long after the text as a whole had been revised.

The degree of curiosity and the strength of the persistence are heightened when we consider the ages of AF and the circumstances of their preparation. A was copied c. 700 as a presentation copy for the Pope, and F was copied between 541 and 546 for the bishop of Capua. In other words they can be assumed to be carefully written,

1. A (Amiatinus) and F (Fuldensis) were edited by Tischendorf (Leipzig 1850) and Ranke (Marburg/Leipzig 1868) respectively. Tischendorf (p. 256) and Ranke (p. 198) give the reading of the verse (*domino*) and Tischendorf (p. 242) and Ranke (p. 178) the inconsistent capitulum: 42 *de tempore serviendo*. J. B. Lightfoot dealt fully with both A's and F's capitulations in *Journal of Philology* 3 (1871) 193-214, 'The epistle to the Romans', esp. 196-203, where he shows just how many MSS follow A. This article was reprinted in *Biblical Essays* (London 1893), pp. 352-374, esp. pp. 355-362. Lightfoot was expanding a brief mention, which F. J. A. Hort had then criticised; cp. *Journal of Philology* 2 (1869) 266; *ibid.*, 3 (1871) 66f., 80 n. 1 (Hort) = *Biblical Essays*, pp. 289, 337f., 351 n. 1. Lightfoot saw the importance of this for Romans 12, 11c. Another discussion of the capitulations and of their importance for Romans is in P. Corssen, 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes', *ZNTW* 10 (1909) 1-45, esp. 20-31; on p. 27f. Corssen lists examples additional to Romans 12, 11c where the Vulgate text does not agree with the text implied by the capitulation, and on pp. 24-27 demonstrates that Tertullian was familiar with that text. Much more briefly, W-W, p. 43, dealt with the agreements between A and F in their capitulation (capitula I-XXIII (sc. of F) *forsan ad codicem quendam veteris versionis pertinebant*), and thirty years earlier Corssen had said of F: *F per omnes Novi Test. libros tantum proprii et singularis habet, ut non tam Vulgata corrupta quam antiquior quaedam versio ad Vulgatam accommodata videatur esse* (*Epistula ad Galatas* (Berlin 1885), p. 21f.), and B. Fischer draws attention to the mixed character of F's Pauline text in F. Bolgiani's *Vittore di Capua e il 'Diatessaron'* (Turin 1962), pp. 49ff.. The phenomenon of disagreement between Old Latin and Vulgate at Romans 12, 11c was first noticed by Franciscus Lucas of Bruges (†1619) in a book published in 1580; see below, p. 95.

official objets d'art; and yet they can preserve an old reading that formally contradicts and so makes a nonsense of their text! As for MSS OV, they are even further removed in time from Jerome and so their preservation of the Old Latin capitulum|all the more interesting. V is is a ninth century MS and a leading representative of the revision of Jerome's Vulgate attributed to Alcuin (†804).¹ In the case of O² we have an Old Latin Apostolicum which has been partly revised by collation with a Vulgate text; I say 'partly' because it still retains 'many cases' where 'it agrees with *d* almost or quite alone:

1. Cp. S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge* (Paris 1893), pp. 197-203, 413, esp. 202f..
2. Dated by O. Pächt and J. J. G. Alexander, *Illuminated manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford*, vol. 3 (Oxford 1973), p. 2 § 12, to the first third of the ninth century.

e.g. Rom. ii. 14, 16, iii. 22, 26, x. 20, xv. 13, 23, 27, 30'.¹ In the retention of the Old Latin capitulum *de tempore serviendo* we have another example of the connection between O and d, though it is only in d's text; there is no capitulation at all in d e f g (cp. W-W, p. 44).

MS 5, now in Paris, is a medieval minuscule which Hort described

-
1. B. F. Westcott in *A dictionary of the Bible* (London 1863), p. 1696, at 'x2' (= W-W's O). This judgement about O and d was endorsed by H. J. White in the fourth edition of F. H. A. Scrivener's *A plain introduction to the criticism of the New Testament for the use of biblical students*, ed. E. Miller (London 1894), vol. 2, p. 87. Had White already by this time collated O, as he certainly had before 1913 when he assisted Wordsworth in bringing out the *Romans fascicule* (cp. W-W, p. 62)? Wordsworth who had died in 1911 must still be regarded as the chief editor of the *Romans fascicule*, though both White and G. M. Youngman made considerable contributions to it; cp. White in E. W. Watson's *Life of bishop John Wordsworth* (London 1915), p. 154: 'the *Romans* represents a great deal of his (sc. Wordsworth's) work, indeed of his very best work', and p. 402 where *Romans* is included in Wordsworth's bibliography, and p. 143f. for the tribute to Youngman. W-W was reviewed at length by M.-J. Lagrange in *Revue Biblique* ns 13 (1916) 225-239, 'La Vulgate latine de l'épître aux Romains et le texte grec'. Lagrange did not deal with *Romans* 12, 11c in this review though elsewhere he did; see below, p. 936. Strangely W-W was not reviewed in *JTS*. One comment that might have been made was that one or more of the trio of editors dealt unevenly with the new material made available to them by their French collaborator Samuel Berger. In his *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 139, nn. 2-3 Berger had reported four readings from *Romans* from a fragmentary tenth century Monza Apostolicum (8. 38; 9. 25; 15. 30; material à propos 16, 25-27), of which the W-W editor(s) chose to incorporate only two (see W-W, pp. 145a, 150b), under a siglum which is not included or decoded in the *Elenchus Codicum* (p. 62), viz. codd. Modoetin. 1 2/9 or Modoet. 1 2/9. This Apostolicum is of course the one rediscovered by Frede (see above p. 18, n. 1). Berger reported, loc. cit., three other readings from the Apostolicum in the MS, none of which was taken up by the editor(s) of the relevant fascicule, and he gives further details of it, op. cit., p. 395.

as 'a cursive of the first rank'.¹ It reads $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$, and is the only monolingual in any language out of the thousands of MSS that attest Romans so to do. Another witness to $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ which has been very tentatively proposed is the Rockefeller McCormick New Testament, Greek minuscule 2400. At Romans 12,11c it reads $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omega\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$.² In his review of the second volume of the editio princeps (*JTS* 34 (1933) 168) F. C. Burkitt, who had already declared himself an adherent of $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ (*ibid.*, 28 (1927) 98, n. 2), said, 'I do not know any other MS that inserts $\kappa\alpha\iota$ here: it is a pleasing fancy that it may be a relic of $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$, the old Western reading'.

The only Greek evidence for $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ other than the bilinguals and 5 that has ever been quoted in an apparatus criticus was that made available in the very first apparatus to be published. In 1550 Robertus Stephanus published his splendid third edition of the Greek New Testament in Paris, and at Romans 12,11 (part 2 p. 23), against $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ in the text, he has in the inner margin: $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$. $\alpha.\delta.\epsilon.\theta.\iota.\iota\alpha$. By consultation of his introduction one may deduce that there were in his view three other MSS, viz. β, ζ, γ , which support $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ in the text. Attempts to identify Stephanus's sigla have been many, but a consensus seems to be that though it is difficult to establish what all of them refer to (even were they accurate) headway has been made with most. β is universally

-
1. *Journal of Philology* 3 (1871) 70, n. 2 = *Biblical Essays* p. 341, n. 2. For details of this MS see in addition to the handbooks W. H. P. Hatch, *Facsimiles and descriptions of minuscule manuscripts of the New Testament* (Cambridge, Mass., 1951), p. 254f.. Though the non-gospel part of this MS is late (fourteenth or fifteenth century) its text of Paul is 'Western' according to Hatch; as with D Colossians precedes Philippians. Stephanus made use of it.
 2. See vol. 2 (Chicago 1932), p. 73.

equated with codex Bezae, which, of course, is not extant for Romans. Or is β a misprint for δ, which is now 5 (see above), has been in Paris for a long time and so might have been available to Stephanus, and pace Stephanus does read $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tilde{\omega}$? In Gregory-Aland's list is 8 and $\iota\gamma$ is 398. But 8, like codex Bezae, does not include Romans, and 398, which does, reads $\overline{\kappa\omega}$!¹ The fact that it was Stephanus's teenage son who was responsible for the collations may not be irrelevant to all this inaccuracy.²

But even if the solitary witness of 5 were found to be confirmed by some new Greek discovery, the case for $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tilde{\omega}$ would hardly be strengthened in the eyes of those who reject it. It is not primarily on the grounds of the documentary evidence that the case here is won or lost.

(b) Latin writers to c. 450

Since the only non-Greek support for $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tilde{\omega}$ we have so far seen is in Latin, the Latin sides of Claromontanus and Boernerianus (dg), along with Augiensis' (f) glossing $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tilde{\omega}$ with *tempore*

1. I am grateful to the Rev. Dr. W. J. Elliott for checking the reading of 398 in Cambridge University Library.
2. The chief discussions of Stephanus's four editions of the Greek New Testament and of his MSS known to and used by me are: J. Mill, *Novum Testamentum Graecum...* (Oxford 1707), pp. cxvi-cxx, cxxv-cxxvii, with corrections in an appendix separately paginated, p. 46; = (Leipzig 1723²) pp. 117-121, 125-127; J. Bengel, $\eta\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tilde{\omega}\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ (Tübingen 1734), p. 654, = (Tübingen 1763²), p. 334; J. J. Wettstein, $\eta\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tilde{\omega}\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$, vol. 1 (Amsterdam 1751), pp. 142-146; E. Reuss, *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Graeci...* (Braunschweig 1872), pp. 49-54; Scrivener, op. cit.³, p. 435-439, = op. cit.⁴, vol. 2, pp. 188-192; (C. Tischendorf-) C. R. Gregory, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, vol. 3 (Leipzig 1884-1894), p. 212f.; E. Armstrong, *Robert Estienne: royal printer* (Cambridge 1954), pp. 136ff.. Of these Bengel criticised Stephanus's accuracy (we have seen good grounds for this); Mill and Scrivener, the latter followed by Armstrong, attempt to identify the MSS he used.

and the Old Latin capitula in some primary Vulgate MSS, we shall not be surprised to find that as we now move from continuous texts to quotations and allusions in early Christian writers, the evidence for $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{\omega}$ continues to be Latin. That is the only reason for the otherwise mistaken method that I adopt, viz. to deal with the early Latin patristic tradition before the Greek and, particularly, to deal with Rufinus and his version of Origen before Origen himself.

Peter Brown has described the final years of the fourth century so: 'the last decades of the fourth century in the Latin church could well be called "the generation of S. Paul"'.¹ I would not be

surprised if the archetype of the four bilinguals mentioned above, Dd Ee Ff Gg, is another product of this revival of interest in Paul in the West,² but that must remain hypothetical though plausible. What however is clear is that in the seventy years from c. 363 to c. 430 no less than seven men in Italy and North Africa (two of whom incidentally were laymen) produced commentaries on the whole or on part of the Pauline corpus.³

The first was Marius Victorinus, the christian Neoplatonist who wrote commentaries on Galatians, Ephesians and Philippians. He may have written on Romans and he may have been Ambrosiaster's teacher, but the commentary is no longer extant if he did write one and we

-
1. *Augustine of Hippo* (London 1967), p. 151. Cp. B. Lohse, 'Beobachtungen zum Paulus-Kommentar des Marius Victorinus und zur Wiederentdeckung des Paulus in der lateinischen Theologie des vierten Jahrhunderts', in *Kerygma und Logos*, ed. A. M. Ritter (Göttingen 1979), pp. 351-366.
 2. If not its instigator!
 3. In discussing these I shall include mention of those who accept *domino* rather than *tempori*, since the protagonists of each reading were often interacting with their predecessors and opponents.

cannot assess too precisely or fully his influence on Ambrosiaster.¹ But it is still worthwhile outlining Ambrosiaster's setting because it is he who is the first writer certainly to quote Romans 12, 11c in the form of *D* d* F(f) Gg*, the first writer to discuss the textual position and the first writer to offer an explanation of serving the time.

As is well known 'Ambrosiaster' is the name first used by Erasmus for the anonymous Latin commentator on all the Pauline letters, who wrote in Rome between 364 and 375. His general reputation has always been high. Souter called him 'one of the truest Romans of the fourth century', and Jülicher and Harnack spoke of him as the best expositor (of Paul: Jülicher) before the Reformation (in the West: Harnack).² He produced three editions of his commentary on Romans, the only letter to receive this careful reconsideration.

The relevant features of each of the three editions are as follows (I adopt H. J. Vogels' sigla): *recensio* α: *tempori servientes* is to be understood in the light of Ephesians 5.16 and Colossians 4.5-6, where two reasons are given for heeding the injunction to redeem the time: the days are evil, and the need to

-
1. P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus, recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres* (Paris 1971), believes there was such a commentary (p. 287) which he dates '363?' (p. 303). For his influence on Ambrosiaster see P. Séjourné, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, vol. 15/2 (Paris 1950), coll. 2898, 2936, 2950.
 2. Cp. M. Zelzer, 'Zur Sprache des Ambrosiaster', *Wiener Studien*, Neue Folge 4 (1970) 197; A. Souter, 'Reasons for regarding Hilarius (Ambrosiaster) as the author of the Mercati-Turner anecdote', *JTS* 4 (1905) 609; id., *The earliest Latin commentaries on the epistles of St. Paul* (Oxford 1927), p. 44. In this latter book Souter refers to Romans 12, 11c. and Ambrosiaster on p. 63. Other brief references to this verse in this commentator are to be found in H. J. Vogels, *Untersuchungen zum Text paulinischer Briefe bei Rufin und Ambrosiaster* (Bonn 1955), pp. 9, 27; id., *Das Corpus Paulinum des Ambrosiaster* (Bonn 1957), pp. 15, 53; and particularly A. Pollastri, *Ambrosiaster: Commento alla lettera ai Romani: aspetti cristologici* (L'Aquila 1977), n. 96 on pp. 33ff..

know how to respond to a questioner.¹ The reference to evil days introduces a new third reason from Ambrosiaster: he feels that the phrase that Paul has just used, fervent in spirit, might be misunderstood by some unbalanced Christians who could scandalise non-believers by their intemperate championing of Christianity. To head off this possibility, Ambrosiaster says, Paul adds *tempori servientes*: be diplomatic in your advocacy of the faith. In his comment on 12.12 *spe gaudentes*, rejoicing in hope seems to be regarded as compensation for the silence and even for the fear occasioned *propter iniquitatem temporis*; these two reactions appear to be ways of serving the time.

Recensio β adds three features to this very interesting exegesis. Clearly in the interval between recensiones α and β , the church had entered upon a greater measure of peace. One wonders then if recensio α was prepared during Julian's brief reign (361-363) when relations between church and court were more than a little strained, when Marius Victorinus who, as we have noted, may have been Ambrosiaster's teacher, was forced to resign his public position. Recensio β inserts into recensio α two references that imply a transition from harassment to peace. Ambrosiaster's point in β is that even in more settled times non-Christians can be provoked to blasphemy by tactless preaching so easily facilitated by a new tolerance. Secondly, in this interval Ambrosiaster has become aware,

1. This is dealt with much more fully in Ambrosiaster's notes on Ephesians, 5.15-16 and Colossians 4.5-6.

through hearsay (dicitur),¹ that the Greek rendering is τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες, and so he now prefaces his whole comment on Romans 12, 11c by saying that κυρίῳ does not fit the context. The context is full of particular commands; τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες is a general injunction that covers them all. The third addition in recensio^β supports the practice of time-serving by adducing Paul's own example of time-serving: the circumcision of Timothy and his own purification in the Jerusalem temple (Acts 16.3; 21.26). But the addition is clearly an afterthought that has not been satisfactorily incorporated: in saying *nam et ipse servivit tempori, quando quod noluit fecit; invitus enim circumcidit Timotheum* etc., Ambrosiaster introduces a tension into his comment, because recensio α had said that time-serving should be *cum honestate*.

Recensio γ differs little from β , but as only two MSS have the reference to the examples of Paul's time-serving in γ , it is possible that it is not original in γ but a contamination from β and that Ambrosiaster withdrew it after the publication of β . Perhaps he had come to find it too embarrassing.

Before we turn to other representatives of the revival of Pauline studies who wrote commentaries on Romans, we must pause to introduce Jerome into the chronological sequence. In 384 he wrote a letter in Rome to his friend Marcella (ep. 27), complaining about a critic of his recently revised and published Latin gospels. The basis of the complaint was that while his critic clearly preferred the Latin

1. If, as Zelzer concludes (art. cit., p. 213), Latin was not Ambrosiaster's mother-tongue, and if, as we see here, the writer does not seem to command first-hand acquaintance with the Greek tradition (cp. Pollastri, art. cit., p. 35, n. 97), the old thesis that he was a convert from Judaism may be strengthened.

versions, Jerome insisted upon the superiority of the original Greek. It is curious that to prove that superiority he turns for his examples to the Pauline letters. One example is Romans 12.11c. Jerome says: *illi legant: spe gaudentes, tempori servientes, nos legamus, spe gaudentes, domino servientes.* It has been plausibly argued by Vogels¹ that Jerome's critic is Ambrosiaster. He it is who is one of the *homunculi*, the *bipedes aselli*, who dare to criticise the new version put out by the Pope's secretary. This identification would explain Jerome's choice of examples. Since Ambrosiaster's work did not certainly² extend to the gospels, Jerome consults the work his critic has done and exemplifies the principle he is fighting for, the superiority of the original Greek over derivative, self-contradictory Latin, in the part of the New Testament that Ambrosiaster has dared to lay his hands on.³

The third and possibly the greatest of the seven commentators on Paul we are considering is Augustine. Sadly, though he undertook to comment on Romans in two different works, in neither does he deal with Romans 12, 11. In his *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistula ad Romanos.*, written in 394, he jumps from 11.1 to 12.20. In his *Epistulae ad Romanos expositio*, written in 394 or 395, he does not proceed beyond 1.7.

In passing we note that Augustine showed himself familiar with

-
1. 'Ambrosiaster und Hieronymus', *Revue Bénédictine* 66 (1956) 14-19, esp. 17-19.
 2. This statement depends on how we assess A. Souter's claim that Ambrosiaster is the author of a fragmentary commentary on Matthew; cp. Souter, 'Reasons for regarding...'
 3. Jerome's defence of his scholarly methods to Marcella is taken up 500 years later by Florus in his collection of passages from Jerome that illustrate the New Testament; cp. *Revue Bénédictine* 94 (1984) 203 § 56, and p. 49f. below.

Ambrosiaster's work, in 405 calling him *Ambrosius* (CSEL 34. 376)¹ and c. 420 *sanctus Hilarius* (CSEL 60. 528). Assuming that the former name refers to Ambrose of Milan, we gain some idea of the respect in which Augustine held Ambrosiaster and our disappointment that we do not know how Augustine answered 'Ambrosius's' understanding of Romans 12.11c is increased.²

We have already noted (p. 18, n. 1) the fourth commentator on Romans, the man responsible for the text and commentary published by Frede. As with Jerome, Augustine, Rufinus and Pelagius (see below, p. 31), *domino* is preferred.

In 406³ Rufinus finished his translation and adaptation of Origen's Greek commentary on Romans, written c. 160 years earlier. Judging from the opening words of Rufinus's comment, *Domino servientes. Ille Domino servit, qui potest dicere: nobis unus Dominus Jesus Christus, per quem omnia, et nos per ipsum, nec ultra ei aut libido aut avaritia, aut inanis gloria dominatur* (PG 14. 1219C), and judging from the reading in MS 1739,⁴ Origen himself read *κυρίω* at Romans 12, 11c. It is Rufinus⁵ who is responsible for the

-
1. J. H. Baxter, 'Ambrosiaster cited as "Ambrose" in 405', *JTS* 24 (1923) 187.
 2. Augustine quotes Romans 12, 11c with *domino* twice and possibly thrice; cp. CC 41. 297 (v. 1.); CC 32. 147; CSEL 12. 204, in the years 400-405, 426 and 427 respectively.
 3. So C. P. Hammond Bammel, *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung* (Freiburg 1985), p. 104. This is now the fundamental study. Romans 12, 11c is dealt with in various places in this book; see the biblical index. According to p. 495 Rufinus does not quote Romans 12, 11c elsewhere in his works.
 4. O. Bauernfeind, *Der Römerbrieftext des Origenes nach dem Codex von der Goltz* (Leipzig 1923), p. 114. See below (pp. 40f.) for further discussion of Origen.
 5. Cp. B. F. Westcott, in *A dictionary of christian biography*, vol. 4 (London 1887), p. 131: 'The remarks on the variations of Latin MSS. are interesting in themselves but foreign to Origen', and p. 116f..

observation that follows *dominatur*: scio autem in nonnullis Latinorum exemplaribus haberi, tempori servientes, quod non mihi videtur convenienter insertum, nisi si quis forte ita dictum putet, ut in aliis idem Apostolus ait: *Tempus breve est, superest ut qui habent uxores, tanquam non habentes sint*; vel ut illud dictum est: *Redimentes tempus, quoniam dies mali sunt* (op. cit., col. 1220A).

Rufinus's return to the West had (re-)acquainted him with the Old Latin reading *tempori*, but he had elected to follow his original, Origen, and, as it happened, Jerome, and disagree with Ambrosiaster. It is impossible to say whether it was Ambrosiaster's commentary or Jerome's letter to Marcella, or what, that had reminded Rufinus of or

introduced him to the Old Latin reading, but I think that Ambrosiaster is the most likely source. Ambrosiaster had said that it was

κῠρίῳ that did not fit the context (*domino servientes, quod nec loco ipsi conpetit*); now Rufinus says that it was *tempori* that did not fit (*quod non mihi videtur convenienter insertum*).

However Rufinus does not dismiss *tempori* outright. He allows that it might stand if it is understood in the light of 1 Corinthians 7.29 or Ephesians 5.16. Ambrosiaster had used the latter verse in his exegesis of *tempori servientes* but not 1 Corinthians 7.29. This use of parallel passages shows that Rufinus's concern with *tempori* was theological, like Ambrosiaster's, 'What does it mean? What could it mean?', not as with Jerome, historical and linguistic: 'It is

κῠρίῳ that is found in the original'.

Sixthly we have Pelagius, writing shortly after Rufinus's Romans, between 405 and 410, and, it is often said, influenced by it. In his

very brief note on Romans 12, 11c he writes (TS 9/2, p. 97¹), *Domino servientes, Non saeculo nec vitiis, sed omnia propter dominum facientes*. Though his inclusion here is thus not strictly necessary, I wonder whether his phrase *non saeculo* (sc. *servientes*) implies a hostile awareness of *tempori servientes*? But I notice that *saeculum* had already been used twice in his earlier notes on the verse.

Certainly from the way about twenty years later a member of the Pelagian circle (he is my seventh commentator) interpolated his master's commentary on Colossians 4.5, we can see that *tempori servientes* had come to be known in that circle. Immediately after quoting the Pauline lemma *tempus redimentes* (TS 9/3, p. 66) the interpolator bursts in: *ille 'redimit tempus' qui non servit tempori sed tempori dominatur*.² Only then is Pelagius allowed to continue: *de malo tempore bonum tempus vestra prudentia facientes* (TS 9/2, p. 471). It is strange that the interpolator has not indulged his outburst in his comment on the earlier and parallel passage, Ephesians 5.16. Here the Pauline lemma and the Pelagian comment stand first (TS 9/2, p. 375): *Redimentes tempus. Vestra sapientia vel cautela*; then follows the interpolation: *Item: 'Redimere' est dominari tempori* (TS

-
1. TS 9/2 and 9/3 in this paragraph and the next one refer to the second and third fascicules of vol. 9 in the series edited by J. A. Robinson, *Texts and Studies*. Vol. 9, edited by A. Souter, is Pelagius's expositions of thirteen epistles of St. Paul. Fascicule 2 (Cambridge 1925) contains the text and apparatus criticus, 3 (1931) the pseudo-Jerome interpolations.
 2. This is in exact agreement with Frede's Budapest MS; cp. op. cit., p. 279. Does the Pelagian know Cicero, *ad Fam* 9,7,1: *non desino apud istos qui nunc dominantur cenitare. Quid faciam? Tempori serviendum est?*

9/3, p. 57).¹ The interpolator has no comment at all on Romans 12.11c. He jumps from 12.6 to 12.19 (TS 9/3, p. 23f.). Did he annotate Colossians before Ephesians and Romans? But, to summarise, the interpolator certainly, Pelagius probably, are witnesses to *tempori* at Romans 12.11c, but, like Jerome and Rufinus, hostile witnesses.

Thus far the evidence for $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{\omega}$ is D*d* F(f) Gg 5 2400(?); the Old Latin capitulation fossilised in primary and other Vulgate MSS; Ambrosiaster; Latin MSS known to and rejected by Jerome, Rufinus (with qualifications), the Pelagian interpolator and probably Pelagius himself. The reading cannot be definitely traced back before c. 350; though the Old Latin capitulation probably pushes the date further back, how far is not clear.

There is however material which may take back a hundred or a hundred and fifty years the terminus post quem of the evidence for $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{\omega}$. Cyprian has often been regarded as alluding to Romans 12,11c. In his fifth letter, written early in 250, he says: *circa omnia enim mites et humiles, ut servis Dei congruit, temporibus servire et quieti prospicere et plebi providere debemus*. In the famous Oxford edition of the works of Cyprian (1682) John Fell saw the

1. The Budapest MS does not have this; cp. *ibid.*, p. 244 and the textual note. The 'item' of course implies that the interpolator is adding one of Pelagius's own definitions, but I do not find it in the master's work on Paul. However *tempus redimere* is found at TS 9/2, p. 101 in a note on Romans 13,1, and Souter, at TS 9/1 (Cambridge 1922), p. 115, sees in *dominor* + dative a characteristic of Pelagius's vocabulary.

sentence as an allusion to Romans 12, 11c.,¹ as did Hans von Soden and M. A. Fahey in their monographs.² But more recent editors, E. Baluze-P. Maran (Paris 1726), W. Hartel (Vienna 1871) and L. Bayard (Paris 1925 = 1961) have not recognised it even as that.³ It is difficult to decide whether Cyprian is echoing Romans 12, 11c, but as neither Paul nor Romans in general is mentioned in the context and as we have *temporibus* rather than the Old Latin *tempori*, what evidence there is points away from a conscious recollection of Paul. Sadly we have no control over the subconscious possibilities.

In a letter written the following year Cyprian uses rather similar language in a similar pastoral context: *necessitate temporum succubuisse, necessitate succubuit*, again without any perceptible reference to Paul.⁴ However I think one can argue that two later christian writers did think that Cyprian had referred to Paul and Romans 12, 11c, in letter 5. The first is Athanasius, with whom I

-
1. Fell's note (p 2, p. 11 = PL 4. 1193C) also includes mention of Rufinus on Romans 12, 11c, of Ignatius to Polycarp 3, 2 (he is probably following his friend Henry Hammond (†1660), whose commentary, published in 1653, had made much of Ignatius in loc.) and of the abbreviation-solution, from Erasmus or Beza. On all this see below. The English translation of Cyprian, prepared by N. Marshall (London 1717), pt. 2, p. 14, follows Fell.
 2. *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (Leipzig 1909), pp. 57, 591; *Cyprian and the Bible: a study in third-century exegesis* (Tübingen 1971), p. 435.
 3. My copy of Hartel contains the marginalia of a former owner, Père M. Bévénat; he supports a reference to Romans 12, 11c. Letter 5 was first published in 1563; one can only conjecture how Erasmus might have deployed the phrase in a note on Romans 12, 11c (see below).
 4. Ep. 55, 7; 11. May the language be a reminiscence of the *Metamorphoses* by Cyprian's fellow 'Tunisian', Apuleius of Madauros? Cp. 8, 7 *religiosae necessitati subcumbens* and 3, 9 *evictus tandem necessitate succumbo*. Another pagan parallel comes to mind for *temporibus servire ... debemus*: in the anonymous *Laus Pisonis* (first century AD?) 155 we have *temporibus servire decet*. In general cp. Franz Schubert, 'Die pastoralen Grundsätze in Cyprians Hirtenschreiben aus der Decianischen Christenverfolgung', an essay in *Weidenauer Studien*, pp. 255-297, especially pp. 270ff..

shall deal later on (see p. 41f.); the other is Ambrosiaster.¹ In his comments on Romans 12, 11c, already noticed, there are what may be interesting echoes of Cyprian's letter, 5, 2. Using the lineation of Hartel's edition for Cyprian (= C) and Vogels' for Ambrosiaster (= A), we have the following picture:

. enthusiastic Christianity (visiting Christians in prison

in large numbers: C 11. 7-10; tactless evangelism:

A 1. 10f.)

can be misunderstood (*invidia concitetur*: C 1. 11;

scandalum excitarent: A 1. 11f.)

and must be restrained (*cum temperamento*: C 1. 13;

moderate. . aptis et locis et personis apto tempore:

A 1. 13f.)

Christians ought to serve the time(s) (*temporibus servire. .*

debemus: C 1. 18; *tempori servientes*: A 11. 1, 12,

21f.; cp. 11.6, 17)

the result will be better relations with non-Christians

(*minuit invidiam* C 1. 16; *sopiret insaniam* A 1. 20)

Whatever Cyprian had in mind, Paul or Apuleius or neither, it looks as though Ambrosiaster, who had already quoted Cyprian on a textual matter at Romans 5, 14 (Vogels p. 176f.: the status of $\mu\eta'$),² is now paying one of the *veteres* the compliment of accepting his advice, its setting, its method and its results in the exegesis of what he at least took to be Cyprian's basic text, Romans, 12, 11c.

As we have noted, the possibility that Cyprian himself is

-
1. A Souter, *A study of Ambrosiaster* (Cambridge 1905), pp. 212ff. had discussed Ambrosiaster and Cyprian.
 2. Therefore Fahey is misleading when he says: 'He (sc. Cyprian) never refers to Rom 5: 12-21 about which so many of the Latin and especially Greek fathers wrote exegetical comments' (op. cit., p. 429). Cp. Hammond Bammel, op. cit., p. 219f..

alluding to Romans, 12, 11c, whatever Athanasius and Ambrosiaster thought he was doing, is not very likely, but the possibility that behind Cyprian, Cyprian's *magister*, Tertullian, reflects knowledge of $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{\omega}$ at Romans 12, 11c has not been argued, to my knowledge, before. We have already noted Corssen's demonstration that Tertullian was acquainted with the text implied by the capitula of Romans found in certain Vulgate MSS.¹ Now we turn to the evidence that may be implied in the *adversus Marcionem*. As in book 4 Tertullian had deployed Marcion's Euangelion against the heresiarch, showing how even his own defective edition did not support his conclusions, so in book 5 Tertullian turns to Marcion's Apostolicum with the same purpose in mind. He works through the letters of Paul along with Marcion's comments, one by one, and in chapters 13-14 comes to Romans. In chapter 14, 11-13 Tertullian has tackled Romans 12 and quoted vv. 9b; 10a; 12ab; 14b; 16bcd; 17a; 19a;² and 18b (Evans, p. 602). His purpose is still to show that these extracts still contain echoes of the Old Testament repudiated by Marcion. His conclusion is that if the text that Marcion is prepared to keep does echo so much, it is inconsistent with Marcion's principle and so condemns it. My question is: Why does Tertullian not quote Marcion's form of Romans 12, 11c, *domino servientes (ex hypothesi)*? It would have doubly suited

-
1. Cp. 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte...', pp. 24-27, and p. 20, n. 1, above.
 2. Hans von Soden, 'Der lateinische Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian', in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag 26. Januar 1927*, edd. R. Bultmann and H. von Soden (Tübingen 1927), pp. 229-281, shows that v. 19c is a quotation from Tertullian's Old Testament and not from Marcion's Romans (pp. 236, 251, n. 1). In general, Tertullian's text of Romans 12 is displayed, with greater degrees of refinement, in H. Rösch, *Das Neue Testament Tertullian's* (Leipzig 1871), pp. 345ff., 668; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, vol. 2, pt. 2 (Erlangen 1892), p. 518f.; A. Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig 1921), p. 107*, = (ibid. 1924²), p. 109*. As for Marcion, see the bibliographical details in the notes to p. 328f. in B. M. Metzger, *The early versions of the New Testament* (Oxford 1977).

Tertullian's purpose to do this, because he could have easily quoted many Old Testament parallels, as he is doing continually throughout this section (e.g. Exodus 23.25; Deuteronomy 10,12) and so could have convicted Marcion of using of Jesus the word used in the Old Testament of its god. I suggest that Tertullian did not make use of such a polemically valuable text because his copy of Marcion's Apostolicum did not read *domino*, that it therefore read *tempori*, and that he did not use it because there is no parallel to it in the Old Testament.¹

Of course this is an argument from silence, but if it be granted, as I argue it can, then we can push back the knowledge of *tempori* to the early decades of the second century, locate it in Asia Minor and possibly think of it as existing in Greek.

I believe that Priscillian's name can be added to those who support $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{\omega}\nu$ at Romans 12,11c. A set of ninety canons to the Pauline letters is attributed to him; it is an attempt to classify under ninety theological and ethical rubrics the passages in Paul which deal with them, in fact an early topical concordance to one part of the biblical canon. The procedure was to divide the Pauline corpus into short sections which are numbered - and this enumeration is found in the margin of at least seventeen MSS of the Vulgate New Testament - and then these sections are distributed under the appropriate rubric. As W-W p. 57 shows, section 96 in Romans is Romans 12.11c -17a. Romans 96 is categorised under two canons, viz. 41 (W-W p. 25) and 49 (W-W p. 26).² It is canon 41 which is the more

-
1. Tertullian does not seem to have used the expression *tempori(bus) servire* in his extant writings; cp. G. Claesson, *Index Tertullianus* (Paris 1974-76).
 2. Cp. the edition of G. Schepss in CSEL 18. 127, 130f. = PLS 2. 1401, 1403.

significant. It is a mosaic of 1 Corinthians 9.22b; 10.33-11.1; Philippians 2.16; 2 Thessalonians 2.17; 3.7; 9. I realise that Romans 96 covers more than 12,11c, but the only overlapping between any part of the substance of 12,11c to 12,17a and any part of canon 41 is at the point of 12,11c and 1 Corinthians 9,22b, and only when *tempori* and not *domino* is read in the former, i. e. *omnibus omnia fieri = tempori servire*. In his review of H. J. Vogel's edition of Ambrosiaster,¹ H. Chadwick drew attention to several 'curious links between Ambrosiaster and Priscillian'. Their agreement on *tempori* at Romans 12,11c would be one more link.²

1. *JTS* ns 27 (1976) 225f..

2. On the Priscillianist canons see B. Vollman in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband 14 (München 1974), col. 551f., and H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila* (Oxford 1976), pp. (xiii), 58-62.

(c) Greek writers to the twelfth century¹

LF

The picture here is much simpler than in the Latin West. Preachers and commentators either comment on $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ ² or have no comment at all, whether because the transmission of their work is fragmentary or because the annotation is not a continuous verse-by-verse one.

These writers do not comment: Eusebius of Emesa (†c. 359; 86.561C), Acacius of Caesarea (†366), Apollinaris of Laodicea (†c. 390), Diodorus of Tarsus (†before 394), Didymus of Alexandria (†398), Severian of Gabala (†after 408), Theodore of Mopsuestia (†428; 66.862D), Cyril of Alexandria (†444; 74.852B = Pusey's edition of Cyril's St. John, vol. 3, p. 244), Chrysostomica (51.155-208; 59.663-674; 64.1037BD-1038BD) and Photius (†891; 101.1249D; 1252AB).

According to the apparatus criticus of the three editions of the Greek New Testament published by the United Bible Societies (1966, 1968, 1975), the earliest evidence for $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ is Theophilus of Antioch (†after 181). This is a mistake. I was not able to find any use of Romans 12, 11 in the work of Theophilus, and then B. M. Metzger, one of the editors of these editions, kindly confirmed that the assertion is erroneous and suggested that it probably arose out of confusion with Theophylact. So with Theophilus removed from the reckoning, the earliest witnesses for $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ date from c.

1. Apart from Euthymius my information is drawn from PG and from K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Münster 1933 = 1984 reprint). Where no reference is given after the writer's death date the source is Staab. Otherwise it is PG. The two lists are arranged chronologically. Inserted into the second list are the four writers who are not commentators, who quote $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$, viz. Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Basil and Antiochus of Mar Saba.

2. Marcion, we recall, may be the exception, and a witness to $\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\omega$.

200 to c. 245 and are Egyptian: Clement of Alexandria (†after 215; 8.676C) and Origen in his Romans commentary (†c. 254; 14.1219C).¹ After Origen Athanasius (†373; 25.525C) and Basil (†379; 31.813A) quote $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$; thereafter we are in the hands of the commentators: John Chrysostom (†407; 60.605 fin. = p. 365 Field); Theodoret (†c. 466; 82.189CD); Gennadius (†471; not at 85.1720C, but at Staab p. 405). Antiochus of Mar Saba (†after 619) quotes $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ three times in his ethical works: 89.1549B; 1701D; 1760A. Then we return to the commentators: John of Damascus (†c. 749; 95.541CD);² Ps.-Oecumenius (8-10 C.; 118.569B; 572A);³ Arethas of Caesarea (9-10 C.; Staab p. 658); Theophylact (11C.; 124.508B); Euthymius Zigabenus (12 C.; Calogeras (Athens 1887), vol. 1, p. 147).⁴

I wish to make four comments, about Origen, Athanasius, Basil and Ps.-Oecumenius. As we have already seen, our detailed knowledge of Origen on Romans 12 is provided by Rufinus's Latin version. Rufinus in translating also abbreviated his original, and so Origen's comment on 12, 11c at PG 14.1219C may well be a truncated version of his

1. This is confirmed by MS 1739, which in Romans uses the lemmata of Origen's *tomoi* in that letter; cp. Bauernfeind, *Der Römerbrieftext*, p. 114. Papyrus 46, reading $\tau\omega \overline{\kappa\omega}$, is a third witness compatriot and contemporary with Clement and Origen; cp. *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri*, vol. 1 (Berlin/New York 1976), ed. K. Aland, pp. 273-276. Aland assembles the dates that have been suggested: from 'etwa II' (century) to 'III E(nde)'. Of the other important witnesses that are often associated with Egypt, MS B reads $\tau\omega \overline{\kappa\omega}$, and $\chi \tau\omega \overline{\kappa\omega}$, like papyrus 46.
2. M. Geerard in *Clavis patrum Graecorum*, vol. 3 (Brepols-Turnput 1979), catalogues this work amongst John's dubia, p. 524.
3. According to H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München 1959), p. 418, the author is not the Oecumenius of the Apocalypse commentary and is to be dated to the end of the eighth century; cp. Geerard in *Clavis*, vol. 4 (1980), p. 256: 'catena (of Ps.-Oecumenius) *primaeva concinnata s. VIII exeunte ab auctore ignoto, s. IX et X aucta videtur*'. Both Beck and Geerard are dependent on the work of Staab.
4. Wettstein adduces Euthalius but this has not been confirmed from Zacagni; cp. p. 103 β .

interpretation. If there has been abbreviation here, it could well have been to accommodate what follows (1220A), the textual comment about the situation in the Latin MSS, which certainly comes from Rufinus. Another point about Origen: according to the *Biblica Patristica*, vol. 3 (Paris 1980), p. 377,¹ Origen quotes or alludes to Romans 12,11 eleven other times outside his commentary on the letter, but it is usually for the sake of τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες or, twice, for τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί, never for κυρίῳ or καρῷ.²

I have added Athanasius to the list because he is often adduced not only in support of κυρίῳ but also as a witness to καρῷ. I tend to agree with this. These are the facts. Before the Easter of 354 or 355 Athanasius wrote to his friend, the monk Dracontius, who had recently been elected, not yet consecrated, bishop. Athanasius hoped to discourage him from declining the appointment and from remaining in hiding. At one point in his argument (ep. 49,3) Athanasius declares οὐ πρέπει τῷ καρῷ σουλεύειν ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίῳ. I am disposed to think that Athanasius here has Romans 12,11c consciously in mind, not only because he can cite the two variants with the verb in question in 49,3, but for three other reasons.

Before this passage he had already made use of the καρῷ theme to describe Dracontius's hesitation: in 49,1 there are the

-
1. One allusion has slipped through the net of the compilers of this, volume of *Biblica Patristica*, viz., PG 13.1457A, where τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες is found.
 2. In the apparatus criticus to the United Bible Societies' editions 'Origen⁸¹' is alleged in support of κυρίῳ. I do not know what passage is in mind, unless it be MS 1739, which however has already been adduced and so should not be repeated.

phrases τὸν καιρὸν ὀρῶντα and συνορῶντος
τὸν καιρὸν and in 49,3 init. εἰ μὲν οὖν τὸν καιρὸν
ἔφοβήθης . The emphasis on σπουδή that we have
in Romans 12,11a is found frequently in this letter: 49,7 σπεύδε...
μηκέτι βραδύνων ; 49,10 σπεύδε δὲ μᾶλλον;
particularly close is σπουδή... μὴ ὀκνεῖν in 49,4, of
Paul's travel plans.¹ Thirdly, when in 49,4 Athanasius speaks of the
reward of Paul's missionary labours as τοῦ κόπου τὸν
μισθὸν μείζονα ἀπολάβη , and (49,7) describes
Dracontius's faithful ministerial colleagues as τοῦ καμάτου
τὸν μισθὸν προσδοκῶσι , he seems to anticipate
part of John Chrysostom's interpretation of τῷ κυρίῳ
δουλεύοντες thirty or forty years later.² If we could
assume that John borrowed this idea from Athanasius, then we have
another trace of an extended exegesis and application of Romans 12,11
in this letter.

The source of Athanasius's knowledge of καιρῷ is
probably Cyprian. Elsewhere³ I have argued that especially in 49,3
Athanasius is quietly correcting Cyprian ep. 5,2, which we have
discussed above, *circa omnia enim mites et humiles, ut servis Dei
congruit, temporibus servire et quieti prospicere et plebi providere
debemus*, and probably repudiating the Old Latin reading which he
believed Cyprian was relying on for his prudential ethic, *tempori
servientes*. Athanasius is witness to Cyprian's Bible more than to his
own. He probably became familiar with Cyprian's oeuvre during one of

-
1. Cp. 49,10 init., ἐπέιγος καὶ μὴ μέλλε.
 2. Chrysostom's comment is καὶ ὡς αὐτὸς εἶπε
πεπονθῶς, οὕτω σοὶ τὸν μισθὸν λογεῖται.
 3. Cp. *Studia Patristica* 17 (Oxford 1982), ed. E. A. Livingstone,
pp. 1024-1029.

his exiles in the West and cannot be used as a witness to the earlier existence of $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{\omega}\hat{\nu}$ in Egypt.¹

There may be an obstacle to adducing the evidence of Basil. The *Regulae morales*, where $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ is quoted, is a catena of quotations from the New Testament arranged under the heads of different ethical themes. In the prologue to the *Regulae* (PG 31.692A) Basil says that he has identified the relevant New Testament quotations by affixing a number to them that corresponds to numbers in the Testaments available to his readers.² In other words he has not written out the New Testament texts; he has used a reference system that makes that unnecessary. But if he has not transcribed the texts, then the texts we have in Migne are somebody else's, an early scribe's, who supplied the texts referred to. We cannot then be absolutely sure that the texts so supplied reflect in every respect Basil's version.

Since Antiochus also was compiling a catena of biblical passages

1. This does not prejudice the issue about the place of origin of the archetype of the four Pauline bilinguals. Egypt has as much claim as the West; cp. Dahl, art. cit., p. 79f., especially p. 80, n.1, and now A. Wouters' work on a Greek-Latin lexicon to the Pauline letters, written on papyrus by a Greek speaker in Egypt. See his preliminary reports in *Scriptorium* 31 (1977) 240-242, and *Actes du XV^e Congrès international de papyrologie*, edd. J. Bingen and G. Nachtergael, vol. 3 (Bruxelles 1979), pp. 97-107; cp. p. 105: '... the Latin text ... contains ... a high number of readings that are typical of the *Vetus Latina* tradition. The latter is not unexpected if we accept a date for the codex in the IVth century'; as far as its text of Ephesians is concerned, it approaches most nearly that of D and Frede's Budapest MS; cp. art. cit. p. 106.
2. It must then have looked something like the English translation of the *Regulae* as set out by W. K. L. Clarke, *The ascetic works of St. Basil* (London 1925), pp. 101-131 (Romans 12, 11 on p. 120, l. 4). But how can Clarke feel that he is doing a worthwhile job when on pp. 25ff. he collates the Benedictine text against Souter's Greek testament? Cp. J. Duplacy, 'Les *Regulae Morales* de Basile de Césarée et le texte du Nouveau Testament en Asie-Mineure au IV^e siècle', in *Text, Wort, Glaube*, ed. M. Brecht (Berlin/1980), pp. 69-83.

New York

under similar headings, the same caution should apply, though in his case he does not tell us how he worked.

At Romans 12.1-2 Ps.-Oecumenius (PG 118.561D = p. 403 Staab) glosses Paul's $\mu\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \tau\hat{\omega}\ \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\iota\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\omega$ with $\mu\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ (v.l. $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$) $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\iota\varsigma$.¹ But in view of the absence of any reference to $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ in the comment on 12.11, I regard this gloss as irrelevant to 12.11c. In fact had they been asked I suspect that the Greek commentators would have seen the prohibition in 12.2 as making $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ at 12.11 quite impossible!

MS 5 and Athanasius show that $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ was not unknown in the East, but the almost complete silence, unbroken even by an endorsement of Athanasius's disapproval of $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$, is very loud.

Other Greek patristic and even secular evidence for $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ has been alleged, but, desirable though this would be, it does not seem to bear the weight imposed upon it. It concerns Ignatius, Gregory of Nyssa and Palladas. As we have already noted (p. 34, n. 1) and as we shall see again (p. 100), it was Henry Hammond (†1660) who first introduced Ignatius's letter to Polycarp 3,2 into the discussion of Romans 12,11c. Here Polycarp is bidden $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu\ \sigma\pi\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon$.

Hammond noticed the parallelism between $\sigma\pi\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ |\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ in Ignatius and $\sigma\pi\omicron\upsilon\delta\hat{\eta}\ |\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ in Paul, and argued for the originality of $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ on that basis (which exemplifies the approach I shall adopt in chapter

1. The same phrase occurs in Diodorus Siculus 20,64,2, where Libyan troops who might desert their comrades are described $\sigma\upsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$.

two of this thesis). Hammond seems to adduce Ignatius not only as a parallel to Paul but as an adaptation of Paul. On this point I am quite undecided, tempted thought I am by the suggestion. There does not seem to be sufficient evidence and the question may have to be resolved at the level of Ignatius's general knowledge and use of Paul.¹

Wettstein, followed by Griesbach, reported two quotations of Romans 12,11c with **καὶ ρῶ** in Gregory of Nyssa's two encomia of St. Stephen.² These however have not been confirmed. In his commentary on Romans Fritzsche wrote: *locum male laudatum frustra quaesivi* (vol. 3 p. 71 n. *), and Tischendorf: *quod Wtst habet ... ex errore fluxit.*³ I too cannot find them but have a suggestion to make which may explain the origin of this mistake. There are two examples of **καὶ ροῦ δούλος** in the works of Gregory of Nazianzus, the namesake and friend of Gregory of Nyssa.⁴ Has Wettstein or his source confused the two Gregorys and transformed the

1. Cp. the review of the question of Ignatius and Paul in H. Paulsen, *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien* (Göttingen 1978), pp. 32-36, where, apart from 1 Corinthians, scepticism about any considerable specific use appears to be the dominant mood amongst scholars. J. B. Lightfoot, *The apostolic fathers*, pt. 2, vol. 2, section 1 (London 1885), p. 343, says the link 'has not much weight'. W. R. Inge did not include either passage in his treatment of Ignatius and Romans in *The New Testament in the apostolic fathers* (Oxford 1905), p. 69f., and H. Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbrieve* (Berlin 1967), does not appear to refer to them.
2. 'G. Nyssenus H. in Steph. bis, probantibus Erasmo et J. Millio', vol. 2, p. 80. In fact neither Erasmus nor Mill mentions Gregory of Nyssa. The Greek text of these encomia was not published till 1698; cp. PG 44.37B; 35C.
3. Dr. James Brooks, Fort Worth, Texas, USA, who has worked on the New Testament text used by Gregory, has kindly confirmed that he does not quote Romans 12,11c in works so far critically edited. O. Lendle's edition of Gregory's first *Encomium in sanctum Stephanum protomartyrem* (Leiden 1968) does not record any reference to this verse.
4. PG 35.585C (accurately noted by Wettstein); 37.1149A; cp. **δουλεύειν καιρῶ / καιροῖς** at PG 35.625AB; 37.1078A, and **καίροιο ... θεράποντες** at 37.1234A. All five passages are pejorative. Cp. section (g) (i) at the end of ch. 2.

cognate idioms into two quotations from Paul ? A variant of this explanation makes sense of the reference to Stephen. Closely following G. Budaeus's *Commentarii linguae Graecae*,¹ Henricus Stephanus, *Thesaurus linguae Graecae*,² writes: 'Idem Bud. $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$ και $\rho\omicron\upsilon$ *interpr. Servientem statui rerum, in Greg.*'. Then follows the quotation from PG 35.585C. I suggest that someone³ prior to Wettstein had referred to Stephanus's quotation from Gregory as 'Greg. in Steph.', and that Wettstein or his source had misunderstood 'Steph.' to mean St. Stephen, which meant that 'Greg.' must be Gregory of Nyssa since Gregory of Nazianzus had not written anything on St. Stephen whereas Nyssa had (PG 46.701-736)!

As for Palladas, the Alexandrian schoolmaster who towards the end of the fourth century and at the beginning of the fifth penned a large number of cynical and sometimes venomous epigrams, the claim has been made that he makes Heracles allude to Romans 12,11c:

$\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon$ δουλεύειν καὶ θεὸς ὧν ἔμαθον

(Greek Anthology 9,441). Wettstein had quoted the line as a parallel to the phrase in Paul (not, I think, to suggest any imitation), but thirty years ago there was a flurry of interest amongst classicists in the line and in its possible indebtedness to Paul.⁴ Georg Luck said that Heracles's words had 'often been compared with the *textus receptus* of the *epistle to the Romans* 12,11'. He himself remained

-
1. (Cologne 1530), p. 176; the first edition is Paris 1529.
 2. Edd. A. J. Valpy and E. H. Baker (London 1816-1826), col. 4687A; the first edition is Paris 1572.
 3. This was not Bengel who correctly says: $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ και $\rho\omicron\upsilon$ $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$ *dicit Gregorius Naz.*
 4. G. Luck, 'Palladas - Christian or pagan?', *Harvard studies in classical philology* 63 (1958) 459ff.; C. M. Bowra, 'Palladas and Christianity', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 45 (1959) 261; A. Cameron, 'Palladas and Christian polemic', *The Journal of Roman studies* 55 (1965) 17f.; C. M. Bowra, 'Palladas and Christianity', *On Greek margins* (Oxford 1970), p. 259.

doubtful about the likelihood of borrowing. In the next year Maurice Bowra, probably following Luck, wrote: 'it is tempting to think that Palladas makes use of the phrase of St. Paul in Rom. 12,11 $\tau\omega$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ $\epsilon\sigma\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$... Palladas need not necessarily have known St. Paul's words in their original setting, but he may have heard them quoted and turned them to his own purpose here'. Six years later Alan Cameron brought the flurry to a close by claiming that the attestation for $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ by the great Greek uncials, the early versions and the Greek fathers demonstrated its originality, not that of $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$; 'it is scarcely likely, then, that the Alexandrian Palladas should have alluded to a *varia lectio* in the text of *Romans* not to be found in editions accessible in Alexandria'. This may well be correct though it assumes the absence of a Latin Apostolicum in Egypt, something that now seems very unlikely (see above p. 43, n. 1), and Palladas's inability to read it. However when Bowra reissued his essay in 1970 he altered his text at the appropriate point, apparently to accommodate Cameron's textcritical observations, by omitting the sentence 'Palladas ... here ', and substituting 'unfortunately the best manuscripts read not $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ but $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$, and we must take their word'. There the discussion of Palladas and Paul has rested.

We can now repeat for the last time the evidence for $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$
 in Greek: D* F G 5 (2400??) Marcion (??) Athanasius (?)
 in Latin: d* (f) g Tertullian (??) Cyprian (?) Ambrosiaster
 Priscillian (??) Pelagius (?) Pelagian interpolator
 Old Latin capitulation
 Latin MSS known to, quoted and rejected by Jerome
 and Rufinus.

(d) Latin writers from c. 450 to c. 1450

The Latin tradition of exegesis and simple quotation in the millennium between 450 and 1497¹ (when John Colet lectured on Romans) can be analysed under four heads: writers who mention neither *domino* nor *tempori*; those who quote or comment on only *domino*; those who show knowledge of both readings; those who recognise chiefly *tempori*. The first group includes Eucherius (†c. 450; 50.804D),² who jumps from 11,7 to 12,20; Cassiodorus (†583; 70.1329B), who jumps from 12,4 to 13,1; but he may allude to *domino* in his note on 12,4: *Christo Domino debere famulari*;³ Claudius of Turin (†c. 827; 104.925D);⁴ Alulf of Tournai (†1141; 79.1121AB-1122AB = 1304BC), who jumps from 12,3 to 12,16; Lorenzo Valla (†1457), of whom something more must be said. It is not difficult to regard Valla as one of the bridges between the learning of the Middle Ages and the learning of the Renaissance, Reformation and Counter-Reformation. His purpose was to confront contemporary Catholic learning with the 'purer' standards of christian antiquity, and, on biblical matters, to contrast the Latin of the Vulgate with its Greek sources. He compiled two sets of notes on the New Testament. The later set, the work of the years 1453 to 1457, was discovered by Erasmus in a monastery near Louvain in 1504 and edited by him the following year. The earlier set, published by Alessandro Perosa, was prepared in 1443. It is a great pity that

-
1. I am indebted to the Vetus Latina Institut, Beuron, for five of the more arcane references from the earlier part of this period. For the later part, W. Affeldt, 'Verzeichnis der Römerbrief-kommentare der lateinischen Kirche bis zu Nikolaus von Lyra', *Traditio* 13 (1957) 369-406, is still indispensable.
 2. Unless otherwise stated, all references in this section are to PL.
 3. See under Ps.-Primasius below for more Cassiodorean material.
 4. But much of Claudius's work remains unpublished.

neither set shows any knowledge of *tempori*.¹

The second group includes Petrus Chrysologus (†c. 450; CC 24A.723); Salvian (†after 470; SC 220.304); Graecus (c. 500; CC 64.397); Fulgentius (†c. 527; CC 91A.505); Ps.-Ambrose (sixth century; PL 17.562C); Ps.-Primasius (= Cassiodorus, † 583; 68.495A), who repeats Pelagius but replaces *omnia propter Dominum facientes* by *Redemptori*. This may echo the understanding of Colossians 4,5 (cp. on Ephesians 5,16) shown by Pelagius's interpolator: *ille 'redimit tempus' qui non servit tempori sed tempori dominatur*. But the redemption-language is now read back into the basic text in Romans and applied to the Lord. Other members of this group are Sedulius Scottus (†after 860; 103.113C), who repeats Pelagius verbatim;² Florus of Lyon; (†c. 860), the 'Bede' of eighteenth and nineteenth century scholarship on Paul,³ for whom there are three pieces of evidence: at 119.312B at a lemma *spiritu ferventes, domino servientes*, he quotes two passages from Augustine, but neither of them deals specifically with *domino*; in *Revue Bénédictine* 94 (1984) 203 § 56, against the same lemma, Florus quotes almost the whole of Jerome's letter to Marcella, obviously for the

-
1. Cp. vol. 1, p. 859 in the 1962 reprint of the 1540 edition of Valla's works, and p. 190 in the Perosa edition of Valla's *Collatio Novi Testamenti* (Firenze 1970) for the comments on Romans 12. The problems connected with the two sets of notes are outlined in the review of Perosa's work by Maristella de Panizza Lorch in *Renaissance Quarterly* 26 (1973) 44-47. R. Stupperich seems to show no knowledge of Perosa's work; cp. his contribution to *Text=Wort=Glaube*, 'Schriftauslegung und Textkritik bei Laurentius Valla', pp. 220-233. In general see J. H. Bentley, *Humanists and holy writ* (Princeton 1983), pp. 32-69.
 2. It is well known that just as Cassiodorus worked over the Pelagian commentaries on Paul so Sedulius worked from them; cp. H. J. Frede, *Pelagius, der irische Paulustext, Sedulius Scottus* (Freiburg 1961). But Sedulius does not follow Pelagius at Ephesians 5,16 (Frede, p. 146f.) and does not comment at all on Colossians 4,5.
 3. See appendix A for the problems connected with 'Bede'

'discussion' of *domino* and *tempori* which we have already noticed (p. 28); finally, in the same journal, 87 (1977) 358f., we have an extract from Florus's Latin translation of Ephraim Syrus's work on Blessedness of Soul. It contains the injunction *ut efficiamur liberi, servientes domino intente absque ulla distentione, nec concupiscentiis temporalibus vanissimi seculi serviamus ...* (p. 359).¹ Though the structure 'serving a and not serving b' is a fairly obvious one to any moralist, Florus's Latin does remind me of Pelagius and excites the interesting question of possible indebtedness of Pelagius to Ephraim († 373)! Other members of this second group are Haimo of Auxerre († c. 865; 117.474D), who also appears to be in touch with this exegetical

strand: *non divitiis neque vitiis, sive delectationibus. Illi Domino serviunt qui eius praecepta servant;* Luculentius (c. 900 ?; 72.817D), who simply has *eius praeceptis obedientes;* Hatto of Vercelli († 961; 134.253BC), who seems to be answering the criticism of *domino* put by Ambrosiaster: would Paul include a general command amongst particular ones? But this fairly obvious question might have occurred to him independently of Ambrosiaster; his reply - *propter Dei tantum servitutum faciendum* - recalls Pelagius's *omnia propter Dominum facientes;* Lanfranc († 1089; 150.145-146);² Ps.-Bruno (eleventh-twelfth century; 153.103CD); Peter Abelard († 1142; 178.941AB); William of St. Thierry († 1148; 180.674A);³ Herveus of Bourg-Dieu († 1150; 181.770A), who, like Pelagius, juxtaposes service of vice and service of God; Radulph (c. 1150; 155.1741D); Nicholas of Lyra († 1349; (Douai-) Antwerp edition (1617) vol. 6, col. 159), who may be quoted, representing as he does the most important biblical exegesis

-
1. I have not been able to check the accuracy of Florus's Latin against Ephraim's Greek in Assemani.
 2. Cp. M. Gibson, 'Lanfranc's "Commentary on the Pauline epistles"', *JTS* ns 22 (1971) 86-112.
 3. Similarly, in his non-exegetical work, at SC 301.114

of the Middle Ages: *Domino servientes. Ut hoc* (sc., I think, *sollicitudine non pigri*) *principaliter propter Deum: et sic ei exhibetur obsequium.*

In the third group is Rabanus Maurus (†856; 111.1552BC), who records Rufinus's comment and a large part of recensio β of Ambrosiaster's comment; he does not decide between the two, though his lemma is *domino servientes*, and it is Ambrosiaster who is inserted with *notandum quod alia editio habet*. The Glossa Ordinaria, which is composed of a marginal gloss and an interlinear gloss, both to the Vulgate, and is associated with the school that gathered around Anselm of Laon in the first half of the twelfth century, belongs to this group. The Pauline glosses are attributed to Anselm himself (†1117). The importance of the Glossa is reflected in the remark of Samuel Berger: it was 'le pain quotidien des théologiens du moyen âge'.¹ The texts of both glosses to Romans 12.11c do not seem to be securely based. I have consulted three editions, the Strassburg c. 1480, the Lyons 1528 and the (Douai-) Antwerp 1617. First, the marginal gloss: the Strassburg and Lyons have *domino vel tempori servientes*, followed by words from Ambrosiaster, expounding, of course, *tempori*. So eventually does the Antwerp, but not before a quotation in Latin from Theodoret has been introduced, which, as we have seen, reads *κρίσις*. Its absence from the two earlier editions shows that it cannot be an original part of the Glossa. As for the interlinear gloss, the Strassburg and Lyons have over *domino, vel tempori*, and the Antwerp has *in tempore*. Clearly the text of the Glossa Ordinaria is not critically established. I suspect that what Affeldt says is the case elsewhere is true here, that the Glossa Ordinaria tradition has

1. *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 134. The Glossa was printed nearly always with the *Postillae* of Nicholas of Lyra (see above p. 50 f.).

been contaminated by later accretions.¹ But what seems to emerge from this notice of the Glossa is that both *domino* and *tempori* were acknowledged in this seminal work and that *tempori* could not be suppressed. Such was the authority of 'Ambrose', bishop of Milan. Another member of this third group is Thomas Aquinas (†1274), who, lecturing on Romans c. 1270, said:² *tertio quantum ad externis obsequium, cum dicit, domino servientes, scilicet servitute patriae, quae soli Deo debetur. Deut. 6.13: Dominum Deum tuum adorabis, et illi soli servies; Psalm. 2.11: servite Domino in timore. Vel secundum aliam literam, tempori servientes, ut scilicet Dei servitium congruo tempore faciamus. Eccle. 8.6: omni negotio tempus est et* *opportunitas. We observe that tempori servire is still understood within the context of domino servire.*³

To the fourth group belongs Peter Lombard (1160; 191.1501AB), who against a lemma *domino, vel tempori*, first interprets *tempori* by quoting Ambrosiaster and then, much more briefly, deals with *domino* along the lines of Ps.-Bruno (and others): service of neighbour is service of God. Then there is Ps.-Hugh of St. Victor (twelfth century), who has no comment at 175.502D-504D, but at 898D in a final and in his context not entirely relevant comment on the lemma *spiritu ferventes* says: *Verbum Dei passim non est disseminandum, sed tempus*

-
1. Art. cit., p. 373. The Theodoret quotation is one such contamination.
 2. Parma edition, vol. 13 (1862), p. 124, = Turin edition (1953), p. 183.
 3. For bibliographical details about Thomas's work on Paul, where one scholar, Weisheipl (see below), can speak of 'the corrupt state of our printed editions', see E. Gilson, *The Christian philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (London 1957), p. 399 (by I. T. Eschmann), and J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino* (Oxford 1975), p. 372f.. On pp. 247-250 Weisheipl disputes Eschmann's dependence on Mandonnet's chronology of Thomas's commentaries, states his preference for Glorieux's dating of the John and Romans commentaries (1270-1272), bewails the corrupt state of the Thomas text and eulogizes his Romans.

opportunum est observandum. This seems to show an awareness of *tempori servientes* as understood by Ambrosiaster. Finally there is John Colet (†1519) who is important both in his own right and as a man who by his example encouraged Erasmus in his programme of reformation of the church from within by scholarship. He had lectured on Romans in Oxford in 1497 and has left two commentaries on the letter: an *Expositio* which breaks off after ch. 5, and an *Enarratio*, which reads at 12.11c. *observacionem temporis*.¹ As we have just seen, Ps.-Hugh of St. Victor had said *tempus opportunum est observandum*. Is he the origin of Colet's phrasing?

1. P. 194 in the *editio princeps* prepared by J. H. Lupton in 1873. The same editor was responsible for the *Expositio* in 1876. In general cp. the essay by C. A. L. Jarrott, 'Erasmus's Annotations and Colet's Commentaries on Paul: a comparison of some theological themes', pp. 125-144 in *Essays on the works of Erasmus*, ed. R. L. DeMolen (New Haven/London 1978).

Appendix A on 'Bede'

In his edition of the Greek New Testament (1707, p. 450) John Mill reported that Bede referred explicitly to Romans 12.11c. Mill's words are: *Primasius, Sedulius, Beda, (qui probatissimos quosque Gr. Codd. ΚΟΡΙΩ legisse asserit.) Latini omnes, excepto Ambros. inquit Estius.* Bede is mentioned again sixteen lines further on. I have consulted several of the editions of Bede to which Mill could have had access (Paris 1522, Basel 1563, Cologne 1612 and 1688) but I cannot find this statement or indeed any comment on Romans 12.11. It could of course have been made at another passage but that seems unlikely. Amongst earlier commentators only Erasmus mentioned Bede (ad loc. in the third edition (1522) onwards), but in a different connection and quite hypothetically, as the source of the double reading ΚΟΡΙΩ and ΚΑΡΩ in the Glossa Ordinaria (see below under Erasmus). Estius (†1613; see below), to whom Mill refers, does not mention Bede, nor does Lucas of Bruges (†1619; see below), who, however, is the first to mention Primasius and Sedulius. I suspect that Mill has taken Primasius and Sedulius from Lucas, whom he knows and uses, and the mention of Beda and the statement attributed to him rest on a confusion with Beza who similarly spoke (see below ad loc.) of *probatissimis quibusque codicibus!* The only other scholars known to me who adduce Bede, apart from Erasmus and Mill, are Sabatier (†1742; see below) and Bengel (†1752; see below). Sabatier, who knows and uses Mill, does not (p. 641, ad loc.) repeat anything like *qui probatissimos quosque Gr. Codd. ΚΟΡΙΩ legisse asserit*; he reports Bede's reading of *sollicitudine non pigri, spiritu ferventes, domino servientes* (similarly thirty-two lines further on). This, I imagine, is simply Florus (PL 119.312B). Bengel also refers to Bede twice, in support of ΚΟΡΙΩ (p. 334,

1. 4), and showing knowledge of both $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$ and $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\omega}$, along with Peter Lombard and the Glossa Ordinaria (1. 16). I guess that the first reference is based on Mill, his chief source of information; the second is clearly Erasmian.

It is possible, I suppose, that Mill is not quoting a printed Bede (= Florus; see Affeldt, art. cit., p. 378f.) but a genuine Bede in MS. But according to Affeldt's register (p. 375f.) there is no Bede MS on Paul in any British library. This is by no means conclusive but I suspect that the Beza/Beda confusion provides the answer.¹

1. The genuine Bede on Paul remains unpublished (cp. Affeldt, art. cit., p. 375f., and Margaret Gibson, art. cit., 95f.) but its substance, extracts from Augustine, is given in an analysis by I. Fransen in *Revue Bénédictine* 71 (1961) 22-70; p. 34 reveals a jump from 12.2 to 12.16.

(e) Renaissance and Reformation

With Erasmus (†1536) we are not only in a new century but we seem to be in a new age and confronted by a new method. Indebted though he was to Origen and Jerome, to Valla and Colet, it is to Erasmus's credit that out of old materials and perceptions he elaborated something that seems almost contemporary.¹

Although, as we shall see, the years 1516 to 1519 are but the middle of the story as far as Erasmus, Romans and *tempori servire* are concerned, it is there that we must start. In the first edition of his Latin-Greek New Testament,² published in March 1516, at Romans

12.11c Erasmus had read $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\omega}$ κυρίου (in error for $\tau\hat{\omega}$ κυρίῳ)³ and his new Latin translation read *domino*. There was no comment on the phrase - it hardly merited one - in the accompanying annotations. But all Erasmus's subsequent editions (1519, 1522, 1527, 1535) were to read $\tau\hat{\omega}$ και ρῶ and *tempori*, though, curiously, always against the lemma *domino servientes*! Their accompanying annotations in their different forms will be examined shortly, but already in his paraphrase of Romans, written in May-June 1517 and published that November, we see that in little more than a year Erasmus had made his change. The paraphrase runs (LB 7.818F-

-
1. I shall deal at length with the work of Erasmus, Luther, Calvin and Beza because of their huge influence on later debate and textual decisions. Erasmus and Beza are the scholars, Luther and Calvin the exegetes. Apart from later discoveries little escaped them. For Erasmus the best treatment I know is J. H. Bentley, *Humanists and holy writ* (Princeton 1983) pp. 112-193; cp. E. Rummel, *Erasmus as a translator of the classics* (Toronto 1985); id., *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament* (Toronto 1986).
 2. That 'Latin-Greek' is the correct way to speak of Erasmus's intention and work in the years leading up to 1516 we have been taught by the pioneering scholarship of H. J. de Jonge; cp. *JTS* ns 35 (1984) 394-413.
 3. Is this parablepsis due to the first syllable of the next word
 $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$?

819A): Ne reluctemini malis, sed tempori servite, rebus praesentibus vosmetipsos accommodantes, et si quid inciderit incommodorum, vel declinantes, si liceat commode, vel tolerantes, non mo^oesti interim, quod est diffidentium, sed in rebus asperis spe futuri praemii gaudentes et alacres. (Illud interim cogitantes, si quid cui conceditis aut condonatis, id vos Domino condonare, nimirum cum foenore reddituro.) The last sentence, bracketed, was added fifteen years later in the 1532 edition and, again, seems to reflect the sentiments of John Chrysostom ad loc. (see below). The whole passage is expressed quite elegantly: note the wordplay with *accommodantes*, *incommodorum* and *commode*. The second clause, *vosmetipsos accommodantes rebus praesentibus*, appears to echo the opening sentence of *Adagia* 1.1.91 (LB 2.62CD: *servire scenae*): *M. Tullius servire scenae dixit, pro eo, quod est servire tempori, et rebus praesentibus sese accommodare*. This adagium was first published in 1508 and we shall return to it later.

In two letters written at the same time as the publication of the Paraphrase Erasmus alludes to the phrase *tempori servire* and shows his new sensitivity to it and how he applied it to Paul and to himself. In letter 710, which is his preface to the Romans paraphrase, Erasmus explains why Paul only hints in Romans at the mysteries of Christianity: his readers were only recently converted. Erasmus describes this reticence as Paul's time-serving (AE 3.138 init.; this opinion was to embroil Erasmus in controversy with Natalis Beda nine years later; see below p. 66). In letter 740 Erasmus seems to be justifying his scholarly work, whatever the reaction of his friends: *tempori serviendum*. The church's parlous state requires it. The sentiment is ascribed to Paul: *etiam Paulo autore* (AE 3.170).

After the paraphrase and these two letters there was the inevitable introduction of *tempori/καίρῳ* into the second Latin/Greek New Testament, published in March 1519, but completed a year earlier after eighteen months' revision.¹ To justify his change of heart he has a note in the annotations, which, like the *Adagia*, underwent changes in successive editions. I give the final 1535 version as reprinted in LB 6.631F; 632 BC, and then indicate how in the previous sixteen years it grew to its final form. This diachronic analysis will be followed by a synchronic assessment.

Domino servientes.) Origenes aut certe huius interpres, indicat in nonnullis exemplaribus scriptum fuisse, Tempori servientes: et accipi posse, diligenter utendum temporis occasione, quandoquidem breve est. Mihi videtur recte intelligi, boni consulendum, si quid pro tempore inciderit incommodi: nam id, opinor, est servire tempori. cum hoc cohaeret quod sequitur, Spe gaudentes. Si quis exigit tributum, pendere: si quis vectigal, solve: si quis exigit honorem, redde: si quis affligit, patere: nec ea res tristem reddat, sed spes erigat in malis animum.

Item quod praecedit, Spiritu ferventes: fervor enim spiritus contemnit obstacula, et rapit omnem occasionem benefaciendi proximo.

Testatur et Ambrosius sibi narratum fuisse, in Graecorum codicibus haberi, τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες . tempori servientes.

Atque obiter admiror quum Graece sciret, cur non ipse potius consuluerit Graecorum exemplaria.

1. For details of the second edition see AE 2.165; 183f.; 3.387; . A. Bludau, *Die beiden ersten Erasmus-Ausgabe des Neuen Testaments und ihre Gegner* (Freiburg 1902) pp. 23-33.

Quin et Glossa quam vocant ordinariam, admonet duplicis lectionis ex Bedae, opinor, autoritate. Divus Hieronymus in epistola quadam ad Marcellam, praefert hanc lectionem qua vulgo utimur, nec tamen ullam reddit causam cur praeferat.

Sit cuique liberum quod volet sequi. Mihi magis arridet, Tempori servientes. Sed ea sententia, quoniam ethnici philosophi nomine vulgo circumferebatur, et vafriciem quandam praecipere videbatur, offensus aliquis mutavit, in Domino servientes: non satis animadvertens, Domino servientes, cum toto sermonis huius contextu non perinde congruere. Quanquam autem in vocibus Latinis, Tempori et Domino,

nulla est affinitas: tamen in Graecis est nonnulla, *καρῶ* et *κυρίω*,

maxime quum scribae soleant in pingendo, decurtare syllabas.

Chrysostomus et Theophylactus legunt et interpretantur Domino servientes, atque ita connectunt, amantes, honorantes, et adamantes invicem, domino cultum gratissimum exhibebitis:

quod quicquid officii proximo impenditur, ad ipsum dominum pervenit.

Chrysostomus notat emphasis, seu potius epitasim, in singulis verbis quibus hic usus est Paulus. Non enim dixit tantum *μεταδίδοτε*, id est Impartiamini, sed *μετὰ δαψιλείας*, hoc est Largiter et alacriter. neque dixit *προϊστασθε*, id est Providete, sed addit *μετὰ σπουδῆς*. id est Studiose. nec dixit *ἐλεεῖτε*, id est Misereamini, sed *ἀγαπάτε*. id est Diligite, idque sine simulatione. neque dixit *ἀπέχεσθε τῶν κακῶν*, id est Abstinetate a malis, sed *μισεῖτε*. id est Odio habete. neque dictum est *ἔχεσθε τῶν ἀγαθῶν*, id est Adhaerete

bonis, sed *κολλᾶσθε* . id est Adglutinemini. neque tantum ait *φιλεῖτε* , sed addidit *φιλοστόργως* . id est Amico affectu. neque dixit simpliciter *σπουδάζετε* , id est Curate, sed addidit *μὴ ὀκνηρῶς* . id est Non pigre. neque dixit *πνεῦμα ἔχοντες* , id est Spiritum habentes, sed *πνεύματι ζέοντες* , id est Spiritu ferventes.

Diachronically the spaced layout isolates the additions (apparently Erasmus deleted nothing of his earlier work on Romans 12.11c!). The 1519 note extends from the lemma to *κυρίῳ* , without the two sentences *Item-proximo* and *Quin-praeferat* (see below).

The latter was added in 1522 and contains the evidence of the *Glossa Ordinaria*¹ and Jerome.² The 1527 made two additions which together will comprise nearly half the final length in 1535. The first, *Item-proximo*, further embeds *τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες* in its context by showing its connection with what precedes, *τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες* ; the second, *maxime-ferventes*, is the longest addition, claiming that the similarity of *καιρῷ* and

1. Cp. H. J. de Jonge, 'Erasmus und die Glossa Ordinaria zum Neuen Testament', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 56 (1975-76) 51-77. On p. 61 de Jonge mentions 'Origenes und Ambrosius' on Romans 12.11c as well as the *Glossa Ordinaria* but does not refer to Erasmus's opinion about Bede as its source at this point. This addition to the 1522 edition had been signalled two years earlier (AE 4.284, 11. 28ff. and note). Since Bede has been shown above to be something of an *ignis fatuus* in the scholarship on Romans 12.11, it is interesting to note that Erasmus himself seems to have been unable to correlate what the *Glossa* attributed to Bede with his own texts of Bede. He suspected the publisher Badius of abbreviating Bede; cp. de Jonge, op. cit., p. 70f. and n. 61, p. 68, n. 43 for this and for Erasmus's notes on Acts 1.14; 23 in his fourth edition of 1527.
2. In the two editions of Jerome's letters annotated by Erasmus that I have been able to consult (Basel 1524, Lyons 1528), there is no note on epistle 27 with its mention of *tempori servientes* and strongly expressed preference for *domino servientes*. I wonder why. A colleague, Mr. T. S. Pattie, of the British Library, has consulted the Erasmus editions of Jerome published in 1516 and 1534, and confirms that letter 27 does not have a commentary.

κυρίω is even more pronounced when they are both abbreviated, and then adducing the evidence of Theophylact and particularly Chrysostom. The only 1535 addition is to this second long 1527 pendant and represents more from Chrysostom. It is the parallel in the annotations to the addition made to the 1517 paraphrase republished three years before 1535, in 1532, *si quid cui conceditis aut condonatis, id vos Domino condonare* (LB 7.819A).¹

Synchronically, Erasmus's long note is composed of four sections: the evidence for κα. β̄ω and κυρίω ; Erasmus's choice; two reasons for the change to κυρίω ; the evidence of Theophylact and particularly of Chrysostom's study of Paul's rhetoric. In assessing the note one should say immediately that this is the best and longest comment since Ambrosiaster's treatment 1150 years earlier, and superior though Ambrosiaster was to all prior to Erasmus, Erasmus is superior to Ambrosiaster. Erasmus deploys the available patristic and scholastic evidence (Origen-Rufinus, Ambrosiaster, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Glossa Ordinaria, Bede) and on three occasions shows himself aware of the importance of locating a text within its context for understanding it (cp. cohaeret, cum ... contextu ... congruere, connectunt) and he has worked out the possibility of error through an abbreviation wrongly expanded. But there are faults in Erasmus's presentation. There is some inaccuracy: Ambrosiaster is misreported in that he does not say that some Greek codices read 'serving the time'. What Ambrosiaster says is the very opposite: *in Graeco dicitur sic habere; domino servientes*. Where Jerome is said not to give a reason for his preference for *domino*,

1. ὅσα γὰρ ἐν ποιήσεως εἰς τὸν ἀδελφὸν, εἰς τὸν δεσπότην σου διαβάνει (PG 60.605 fin.). The 1527 contains many new references to Chrysostom; cp. on Romans 12.13a; 15a; 16a.

in fact he does, basing himself on the purity of Greek MSS over against the corruption and divergencies of Latin MSS.

This leads us to Erasmus's second weakness. Though he is familiar with patristic exegesis and was ever on the alert for good MSS of his favourite authors, he betrays no knowledge of having consulted a variety of Greek MSS of the epistle to the Romans. He obviously used MSS in the construction of his text,¹ but he does not seem to have cast around for MSS that might support the reading *tempori* to which his Latin sources bore witness. Another omission is his silence about Ambrosiaster's exegesis of *tempori servientes*. He can misreport him (see above), he can quibble because Ambrosiaster had not personally consulted Greek MSS (!), but he tells us nothing about Ambrosiaster's own understanding of the phrase.

Thirdly Erasmus has not organised his materials as well as he might. His own interpretation of *tempori servientes* could have been delayed until he had declared his preference for it; and in giving the two reasons for the change from $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\hat{\omega}$ to $\kappa\upsilon\rho\hat{\iota}\omega$ (the offensiveness and pagan support of $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\hat{\omega}$, and the similarity between $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\hat{\omega}$ and $\kappa\upsilon\rho\hat{\iota}\omega$ when both were abbreviated), Erasmus does not show that only one of these reasons could have originally been operative in that the former explanation is a deliberate one, arising from the conscious recognition that $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\hat{\omega}$ is morally indefensible, and the latter one is not deliberate, in that though $\kappa\omega$ and $\kappa\rho\omega$ are similar the moral feeling would still predispose one consciously to keep $\kappa\omega$ and to avoid $\kappa\rho\omega$. So the change is involuntary and so it does not sit well with the

1. Cp. Bo Reicke, 'Erasmus und die neutestamentliche Textgeschichte', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 22 (1966) 254-265, and AE 2.164ff..

voluntary moral reason.¹ It is one or the other; it cannot be both. A third instance of poor organisation is the position of Chrysostom and Theophylact. Properly they should be alongside Jerome, but Erasmus, who cannot help introducing him where he can, added him at the end and has thus unbalanced his note by including this summary of Chrysostom's view of the intensity of Paul's expression at Romans 12.8-11 that amounts to a third of the whole! He probably did not wish to upset his printer by insisting on a great deal of dislocation of copy.

Whence this large insertion from John Chrysostom in 1527? As I have just noted it is only one of several observed just in the immediate context of Romans 12.11. In the preface to his fourth edition of 1527 Erasmus implies that he has made use of newly acquired commentaries of 'Athanasius' (= Theophylact; cp. AE 3.339 n.8; 6.466ff.) and of Chrysostom, partly because their biblical quotations agreed with his (Erasmus's) text.² (Romans 12.11c is one case where this is not true!) Now Erasmus had already read and used Chrysostom in his 1516 annotations (AE 2.167, 1. 4; 169, 11. 125ff.; 290, 1. 65), but it is not clear whether he was working from Greek MSS or published Latin translations or both. As far as Matthew is concerned, 'both' seems to be the case (LB 9.134C-135A). As far as Chrysostom's Romans in Latin is concerned, it had been available for use since 1503, with later editions in 1504, 1517 and 1522-1525 (AE 9.3f.), but the Greek was not published till June 1529, more than two years after the appearance of the 1527 fourth edition. Erasmus made use of the

-
1. Cp. AE 8.344, 11. 61ff. for another reference to the problems of abbreviations.
 2. AE 6.466, 11. 1ff.. In AE 6.379 Erasmus called Chrysostom's commentaries *Croesi thesauros*. In general cp. AE 10.356, 1. 45: *Graecorum lectio petenda est ex Graecis auctoribus*.

1529 Chrysostom in the 1535 fifth edition as his notes on Romans 14.9; I Corinthians 6.20; 14.33; Colossians 1.2; 12 make clear. However Chrysostom in Greek had been very much in the air as early as 1520. In that year Erasmus complained about the lack of a Chrysostom on Matthew in Greek and the uncertainty of the Latin translation (LB 9.140F; cp. 141C),¹ and in March 1523 Erasmus was urging the house of Aldus in Venice to produce a Greek Chrysostom (AE 5.253 11. 21ff.) and sixteen months later Erasmus himself was urged to do the same (AE 5.491, 11. 152ff.; 7.426, 11. 81ff.; 6.49, 11. 175ff.). From a Greek MS (or MSS) from Italy now in his possession (AE 6.381, 1. 22f.; cp. 466, 1. 1f.; 479, 1. 14f.) he translated and published, as far as the New Testament is concerned, the Greek of Chrysostom's Philippians in 1526 (AE 6.378; suspect: 381. 1. 25f.), and the following year his Galatians (AE 7.95ff.); also in 1527 some of the homilies on Acts, whose authenticity however he suspected (AE 6.186, n.9; 491). In 1530 Erasmus was to publish 2 Corinthians (like the Acts similarly suspect: AE 8.322, 11. 15ff.; 344, 11. 34ff.; 391, 11. 8ff.) and more on Acts,² but never the Romans (AE 8.376, 11. 156ff.) though by 1528 he had had a Romans copied for him (AE 7.79). We need not doubt that it was from this Italian Greek MS (or MSS) that Erasmus could derive the Greek text of his references to and quotations from Chrysostom in his work on the fourth edition which was already under way in July 1524 (AE 1.14, 1. 20f.; 6.68, n. 19).

Erasmus who detested conflict was frequently involved in

-
1. I wonder what Greek MS of Chrysostom's Matthew Margareta, the 'gifted wife' (AE 2.41, n.2) of Conrad Peutinger, was able to consult as early as December 1521 (AE 4.608, 11. 33ff.)? Both the Peutingers wrote to Erasmus about Margareta's problem, but if he replied, his reply is not extant. Erasmus referred to the issue ten years later (AE 9.310, 11. 63-102).
 2. Erasmus's translations of Chrysostom on Acts, 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Philippians are to be found in LB 8.189-326.

combatting his critics. His work on Romans 12.11c, both in his 1519 text and annotation and in his 1517 paraphrase, provoked attack and in turn counterattack.¹ First it was the Englishman Edward Lee (†1544).² Lee was a younger man whose zeal for Greek Erasmus had approved (AE 3.20), though its cause, to confute Erasmus, had not escaped the older man (AE 4.198f.). From a letter to Lee written in 1517 (AE 3.203) we can conclude that Erasmus had been offered some notes on the New Testament by Lee which, Erasmus says, he had been prevented from using. Lee had become an enemy and after some abortive attempts had got his hostile notes on Erasmus's 1516 and 1519 Latin-Greek Testaments published in February 1520. Lee seems to have claimed the credit for drawing Erasmus's attention to Jerome's knowledge of and support (though uncertain) for $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{\omega}\nu$, and that Erasmus had replied that he had now (*iam*) added it to the annotations that would accompany the second edition.³ Lee was clearly hurt that when the second edition came out, in March 1519, Erasmus had not acknowledged his assistant's contribution. Erasmus replied that since he had already come across $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{\omega}\nu$ and informed his public of it (in the Paraphrase, I assume), only Lee's zeal needed to be acknowledged. If Lee had caught Erasmus in a lie, then, Erasmus ironically continues, we would have to be very grateful to Lee (LB 9.216EF). I suspect however that Erasmus did reply *iam addideram*

-
1. Cp. Bludau, op. cit., p. 58: 'Mit der Veröffentlichung des Neuen Testaments begannen zugleich die Streitjahre des Erasmus.'
 2. For further details cp. AE 3.203; 4.108-111; Bludau, op. cit., pp. 86-125; W. K. Ferguson, *Erasmi opuscula* (The Hague 1933), pp. 225-234; *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, vol. 9, pt. 2 (Amsterdam/Oxford 1983), ed. H. J. de Jonge, pp. 10ff..
 3. *Annotationes Edouardi Lee in annotationes novi testamenti Desiderii Erasmi* (Paris 1519), folium 60, annotatio 149; nothing is added in a second set of notes on folia 94, 101, 113. Unfortunately Lee's case immediately collapses because it is Rufinus not Jerome who translated Origen's commentary on Romans; so Jerome's support for *domino* is not divided; he knows *tempori* but firmly rejects it, as we have seen above.

annotationibus meis, but by *iam* meant *already*, i. e. without Lee's notes, not *now*, i. e. as a result of them.

Earlier when Erasmus was classifying Lee's 243 annotations under various opprobrious headings he included annotation 149 under the rubric *fucum facit* (sc. Lee), *gloriam captans*. The whole quarrel was unedifying and neither man emerges untarnished.

Erasmus's second critic was the Frenchman Natalis Beda (†1536 or 1537), who chose the 1517 Paraphrase as the basis of his attack.¹ Beda had disliked Erasmus's reference to Paul's use of hint and suggestion rather than candid exposition when writing to the Romans, in the dedicatory letter to his 1517 Paraphrase of Romans (AE 3.138, a passage we have already noticed), and Beda had published his comments in May 1526. Erasmus replied twice in a series of apologies against Beda. In the *Divinationes ad notata per Beddam*² Erasmus defended his understanding of Paul's motives with references to Jesus's injunctions to the apostles not to divulge his messiahship on their preaching tour, and to Paul's claim to have heard secrets which could not be uttered, his possession of a secret wisdom which only the perfect may hear and to his being all things to all men. This, he says, is to serve time. In another part of his attack on Beda, *Supputationes errorum in censuris Beddae* (so LB 9. 656C-659C),³ Erasmus continues to deal with the general themes of Paul's language and pastoral approach

-
1. Cp. AE 6.65ff.; 258; 286, n. 39 for details.
 2. So LB 9.467AB. This title does not appear in the definitive list of Erasmus's oeuvre in AE 12.29. In his *Bibliotheca Erasmi. Répertoire des oeuvres d'Érasme* (Gand 1893), Ire Serie, p. 178, the editor, F. vander Haeghen, registers *Supputatio calumniarum Natalis Bedae*, whose prologus was published in August 1526, and *Supputationes errorum in censuris N. Bedae*, published in March 1527. The word *Divinationes* first appears in the collected works in 1540 and is repeated hence in LB.
 3. Cp. AE 6.65ff.; 7.7, n. 69.

without specifically using the time-serving idiom, but cp. LB 9.658CD: Sic pro illo tempore decebat Apostolum scribere, me Paraphrasten decet aliter scribere, praesertim hisce temporibus. Non omnia congruunt omnibus ... Tractavit Paulus mysteria, ut tum pro temporum qualitate Spiritus sanctus tractari volebat. We shall return to Beda and another criticism of Erasmus later on.

The third and last critic to fasten on Romans 12.11c was the Franciscan Scripture lecturer Francis Titelmann (†1537).¹ He had lectured on Romans and published his notes in May 1529. Erasmus replied publicly in October, in his *Responsio ad collationes cujusdam juvenis gerontodidascali*.² Like Lee Titelmann was another young man who, as Erasmus's title implies, should have known better than to criticise his elders (and betters!). But Lee had been c. 37 in 1519 - Titelmann was c. 32 in 1529. It seems from Erasmus's reply (col. 1010D) that Titelmann had informed Erasmus that Origen and Ambrose were both familiar with $\kappa\alpha\rho\tilde{\omega}$ as well as $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$. Erasmus replies that he already knew that, and that the source of Titelmann's information was - Erasmus!

Towards the beginning of this section on Erasmus I said that for Erasmus, Romans and *tempori servire*, 1517 and 1519 were but the middle of the story, though clearly the Paraphrase of Romans and the second edition of the New Testament represent the most important chapters in

-
1. Cp. AE 7.69; 8.258; and T. H. L. Parker, *Commentaries on the epistle to the Romans 1532-1542* (Edinburgh 1986), pp. 11-14, 216f., for bibliographical description of his work on the New Testament. I regret that I have not tracked down Titelmann's work on Romans, so my summary is dependent on Erasmus. I feel however that Erasmus can be trusted since he does not misrepresent Lee or Beda. (Erasmus's most considerable opponent in biblical matters, Stunica, does not seem to have assailed Erasmus at this point; cp. de Jonge, op. cit., pp. 174ff..)
 2. So LB 9.967F-1016C.

that story. In concluding this examination of Erasmus I shall illustrate how long before 1517 Erasmus had interested himself in ideas that were to find expression in these two works, and how after 1519 these ideas persisted and how the character that expressed itself in these dangerous ideas appeared to Luther, the next interpreter of Romans in our survey.

A cursory examination shows that from early in his adult career Erasmus was attracted by the idea of *καλῶς* and of Paul as *vafer*, 'sly, cunning, crafty, artful, subtle', according to Lewis and Short, s. v.; early too was his view that *tempori servientes* was correct.

In one of his earliest letters (AE 1.135, 1. 16), from 1494, Erasmus quotes the second line of a famous distich attributed to Cato. The two lines, in the edition of M. Boas (Amsterdam 1952) p. 134, are

Rem tibi quam scieris aptam dimittere noli:

fronte capillata, post haec occasio calva.

This description of a head, hirsute at the front, bald at the back, derives from earlier descriptions of Lysippus's bronze statue of *καλῶς*.¹ It is repeated in the middle of *Adagia* 1.7.70 (Nosce tempus; LB 2.289A-290D), an adagium which contains some of these ancient descriptions, the earliest by Posidippus and one by Ausonius. The whole adagium is important for our understanding of

1. It is necessary not to ignore non-documentary sources, especially when one's author lived at such a fertile time artistically speaking as the Renaissance. For the main features see R. Wittkower, 'Patience and Chance: the story of a political emblem', *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 1 (1937) 171-177, esp. 174 and n. 4; id., 'Chance, Time and Virtue', *ibid.*, 313-321, esp. 313-316; J. Manning-A. Fowler, 'The iconography of Spenser's Occasion', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 39 (1976) 263-266, esp. n. 3.

Erasmus and *καίρῳ* . *καίρῳ* or occasio is hirsute at the front of the head so that it can be grasped as it passed the observer. But once passed, the bald rear makes grasping impossible. This morality Erasmus had taught in another early letter written in 1500 (AE 1.327, 1. 75). He tells his friend Jacobus Battus that he, Erasmus, must act: *nunc maxime mihi videtur καίρῳ ille capillo arripiendus, cum tam honesta offertur ansa.* On the next page (p. 328, 1. 117), he speaks of Battus's misplaced humour as *ἄκαιρῶν*. A month later he quotes (AE 1.335, 1. 12) the Greek proverb *ἄκαιρῳ εὖνοι' οὐδ' ἐν ἔχθρας διαφέρει*, which is also the title and theme of *Adagia* 1.7.69 (LB 2.288D-289A).¹ It was clearly a favourite.

It is found in a letter of 1528 (AE 7.494, 1. 17). In *Adagia* 1.1.91 (LB 2.62CD), which appeared in the *Adagia* for the first time in 1508, we have the phrase *tempori servire*, the only place I have found it in Erasmus's nonbiblical work. The adagium, entitled *Servire scenae*, begins: *M. Tullius servire scenae dixit, pro eo, quod est servire tempori, et rebus praesentibus sese accommodare.* This last phrase we have already noted (p. 56f.) in the 1517 Paraphrase of Romans 12.11c. After dealing with its origin in the theatre and its application, Erasmus quoted the good parallel passage from (Ps.-)Phocylides, *καίρῳ λατρεύειν κτλ* . I do not recall this being quoted again until Wettstein nearly 250 years later. These are the passages I have been able to find (undoubtedly there are more) that show Erasmus's early and unwavering interest in *καίρῳ*.

1. I have not been able to discover when *Adagia* 1.7.69 (*Intempestiva benevolentia nihil a simultate differt*) and 1.7.70 (*Nosce tempus*) were added to the expanding work, nor when 3.9.67 (*Premenda occasio*: LB 2.930EF) was incorporated. 4.10.39 (*Capere crines*: LB 2.1170E) was added in 1517. I am indebted to H. Rüdiger, 'Göttin Gelegenheit: Gestaltwandel einer Allegorie', *Arcadia* 1 (1966) 131, n. 29 for this last reference and date.

The last passage (*Adagia* 1.1.91) with its specific use of *tempori servire* provides a suitable opportunity to say something about Erasmus's earlier biblical work and an early version of Romans 12.11c. In AE 2.182f. Allen traced the beginnings of Erasmus's own Latin translation of the New Testament. The epistles were completed at the latest by the autumn of 1506. The MSS to which Allen referred remained unpublished till 1982 when they were published by H. Gibaud.¹ Like Allen Gibaud accepted at its face value the colophon of the British Library MS containing Erasmus's translation of the epistles, dating the completion of the work to October or November 1506.² Each page of the MS contains two columns. One has Erasmus's new translation and the other Jerome's old Vulgate. The latter is not written out in full, but only those words or phrases which differ from Erasmus's. At Romans 12.11c (Gibaud, p. 341) Erasmus has *tempori servientes*; the Vulgate opposite reads: *temp.) Domino*. It looks as though Erasmus was working with a copy of the Vulgate which contained the Glossa Ordinaria and that the interlinear gloss, properly written superscript, is now adscript.³ But the biggest puzzle is why his first edition (1516) reads *domino/Κυρίου (= -ω)*.

As for the characterisation of Paul as *vafer*, it was in the greatly enlarged 1508 edition of the *Adagia* that, as we have seen,

-
1. *Un inédit d'Érasme: la première version du Nouveau Testament copiée par Pierre Meghen 1506-1509. Contribution à l'établissement d'une édition critique du Novum Testamentum* (Angers 1982).
 2. See Gibaud, p. 531 for the facsimile of the title page, and p. 19* for its transcription.
 3. The palaeographical reexamination of these MSS by A. J. Brown, 'The date of Erasmus' Latin translation of the New Testament', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8 (1984) 351-380, who dates them to 1514, does not affect our case that Erasmus knew of and preferred *tempori servientes* before 1517, even if he is correct. Both John Colet and the *editio princeps* of Ambrosiaster had been available from the 1490s. In private correspondence (15 October 1986) Dr. H. J. de Jonge says he believes that Brown's date can be taken back to 1512.

1.1.91 (*Servire scenae*) is first found. It is also the first of a series in that edition (1.1.91-1.1.95) which seems to be thematically linked. Their titles speak for themselves: *Servire scenae; Uti foro; Polypi mentem obtine; Cothurno versatilior; Magis varius quam hydra*. While they are all relevant to the general theme of these final pages on Erasmus, the need for accommodation, it is to the third and longest (1.1.93: *Polypi¹ mentem obtine*) that I now turn.

In LB 2.63DE Erasmus gives as examples of the mentality of the octopus Alcibiades, Ulysses, Brutus, David and - Paul: *Quin et divus Paulus Apostolus, sancta quadam jactantia gloriatur, hac pia vafricie sese usum esse, atque omnia factum omnibus, ut omnes Christo lucrifaceret*.

It is curious that in his note on these last phrases, obviously taken from 1 Corinthians 9.22, in his Latin-Greek New Testament, Erasmus does not use *vafer* of Paul, nor in the paraphrase on that epistle (LB 6.708f; 7.890D). However in his notes on Romans 1.12 and 12.11 he does (LB 6.561CD; 632B), as well as at Acts 17.23, where (LB 6.501E) years later he got himself into hot water with Natalis Beda (LB 9.715F-716C). In this last passage he defines the meaning of *vafer*: *qui novit simulare ac dissimulare, vafer est*. This is very similar to the dissimulating characters listed twenty years earlier in Adagia 1.1.93. Finally from 1519 comes a letter (AE 3.480-491) which is really Erasmus's preface to the Paraphrase of the Corinthian letters. Lines 364-402 are particularly interesting. Here are two samples. *Cum Paulus noster ubique vafer sit ac lubricus,² in his tamen duabus epistolis sic polypum ac chamaeleontem, sic Proteum ac Vertumnum quendam agit, ut cum Corinthiis plusquam Graecis agens, quodammodo*

-
1. Cp. D'Arcy W. Thompson, *A glossary of Greek fishes* (London 1947), pp. 204-208, esp. 206f.. The Greek line, quoted three times by Plutarch, is **πουλύποδος νόον ἴσχε πολυχρόου;** the last word is the adjective Erasmus translated as *vafri*.
 2. Cp. AE 3.292, 1. 11f.: *Sed Paulus illic (sc. in Romans 7) adeo lubricus est ut nunc huc respiciat, nunc illuc.*

iuxta vetus proverbium πρὸς κρήτα κρητίζειν videatur,
in omnia se vertens quo illos transfiguret in Christum (ll. 364-369);
tanta vafricies, non credas eundem hominem loqui (l. 392f.). *lest*

It is proper to conclude our notice of Erasmus with an irony. Few students of his life will dispute that temperamentally he was personally predisposed to serve time, to accommodate to circumstances. It is not difficult to see this predisposition encouraged by what the classical tradition has taught him about *καρπός*/Occasio and by what the biblical tradition had taught him about Pauline vafricies, and then not difficult to see this predisposition finding expression in his 1506 (or 1514 ?), 1517, 1519 choice of *tempori servientes* at Romans 12.11c, and in everything that Luther called his *amphibolia*. The irony is that his personal motto was CEDO (or CONCEDO) NULLI!¹

But it was not the spirit behind CEDO NULLI that impressed itself on Martin Luther. Two years after his death, Luther summarised his perception of Erasmus in this way: *Erasmi propositio et status fuit serviendum esse tempori.*² As far as I have been able to discover, this is the only time in the *Tischreden* that *tempori servire* is used

-
1. Cp. AE 7.430ff., and for the Renaissance background E. Wind, 'Aenigma Termini', *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 1 (1937) 66-69; E. Panofsky, 'Erasmus and the visual arts', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 32 (1969) 200-227, esp. 214-219; B. C. Bowen, 'Mercury at the crossroads in Renaissance emblems', *ibid.*, 48 (1985) 222-229, esp. 224f.. In *Erasmus in English* 14 (1985-86) 7-10, 'Concedo nulli: Erasmus' motto and the figure of Paul in the Paraphrases', R. D. Sider attempts to use the motto in the interpretation of Paul. He does not refer to Romans 12.
 2. Weimar Ausgabe (henceforth = WA) *Tischreden* § 3963. A German form is slightly fuller: *Erasmi Proposition und furnehmste Lehre ist, man soll sich nach der Zeit richten und den Mantel nach dem Winde hängen, wie man sagt.*

of Erasmus,¹ but there was another probably synonymous wordgroup that Luther regularly used of him. In order to denounce and vilify him Luther rang all the changes on *amphibola*, *amphibolia*, *amphibologia*, *amphibolice*, *amphibologice*, along with their German equivalents (*Tischreden* §§ 446, 699, 811, 821, 1139, 2205a, 3010, 3284, 3302ab, 3327b, 3392ab, 4899; cp. §§ 523 (ambigue), 4905 (bilingues ... et simulatores²), 5487 (ambiguus et cavillator), of Erasmus, and, in general, cp. § 2541ab.³

Luther himself (†1546) can be dealt with much more quickly. He lectured on Romans 12 in the summer of 1516, three or four months after the publication of Erasmus's first edition. A page of his lecture notes must have looked rather similar to a page of Nicholas of Lyra's *Postillae*: a few lines of Latin Vulgate text, especially composed with plenty of room between the lines and in the margins for interlinear and marginal glosses. The difference between the two commentators is that Luther's scholia are much more extensive than Nicholas's and they were taken into the classroom separately to be dictated with the glosses to his students.⁴ At the Vulgate reading *domino servientes* Luther's interlinear gloss was, *non vobis, nec que vestra, querentes*.⁵ The longer scholium is an original note (WA vol.

-
1. Yet elsewhere Luther could, just like Erasmus, use the description of the Lysippus statue of *Καίρῶς* found in the *Disticha Catonis* in a constructive way; see *fronte capillata post haec occasio calva* in WA vol. 43 p. 349 and *Tischreden* §§ 3137ab, 3958, 4801, 4837, and 7050 where the whole is very relevant.
 2. Cp. the Erasmian definition of *vafer*; *qui novit simulare ac dissimulare*. I have not found *vafer* in Luther.
 3. R. H. Bainton, *Erasmus of Christendom* (London 1969), pp. 261, 362, n. 39, both mistranscribes *rex amphibolarum* from *Tischreden* § 3392b and mistranslates it as 'king of Amphibians'!
 4. Cp. *Luther's works*, vol. 25 (Saint Louis 1972), ed. H. C. Oswald, pp. ixff., and WA vol. 56, plate A opposite p. 528.
 5. *Ibid.*, p. 121. WA vol. 57 reprints students' notes of Dr. Luther's lectures; p. 104 shows that someone had been listening: *in his omnibus non vobis servientes neque (que) vestra sunt querentes*. There is no marginal gloss on this verse.

56 p. 464): Hoc non tantum Contra eos, qui Avaritie, seculo aut ventri suo serviunt, Sed multo fortius contra pertinaces in opere bono, Vocante eos alio obedientia. Hii sunt Sicut illi, qui asinum subiugalem habent et non sinunt eum solvi, ut Domino serviat, hoc est, suis studiis se fatigant et ad alia sese avocari nulla pietate Vel causa Dei permittunt. Ideo potius sibi serviunt quam Domino. Quia non sunt parati ad omnem voluntatem Dei nisi a sese electam, hoc scil. sese excusantes: Non est bonum reliquere, quod modo ago, Et illuc operari. Ex horum numero Si principes pertinaces in Ecclesia Aut pontifices in Aula dixerim, forte non mentiar. Ut Fridricus, dux noster, Et officiales, Qui, si querantur, nolunt Inveniri; Vocantur a Deo Et dicunt: hei! oportet me orare et Deo servire, Adeo insipientes, Ut propter obsequium Dei recusent obsequium Dei, Quia nesciunt, Quid sit Domino servire, Scil. indifferentem esse, quocunque Dominus Vocaverit, et in nullo fixe ac pertinaciter stare. Luther sees the command to serve the Lord fulfilled not simply at the obvious levels of self-discipline (*avaritia, seculum, venter*), good works or christian devotions by themselves, but in the service of God only at the place which God ordains. There seems to be some particular contemporary complaint at the back of this exegesis. Luther's own prince and his courtiers are specifically mentioned in an uncomplimentary way. It sounds as though they had kept Luther waiting! ¹

Six years later, translating the New Testament into German from ^h *however* Erasmus's second edition (1519), Luther followed Erasmus's newly adopted $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \rho\acute{\omega}\nu$ and translates or paraphrases it: *Schickt euch ynn*

1. The scholium does not seem to have been noted down. Was the student shocked by his teacher's historicising interpretation that was politically tactless? Was it a piece of heavy-handed humour? Cp. WA vol. 57 p. 222f..

die zeyt (1522), that becomes the familiar *Schicket euch in die zeit* in the 1546 German Bible.¹ (Similarly in his 1529 revision of the Vulgate Luther reads *tempori*.²) This German rendering seems to have endeared itself to Luther, since he came to introduce it into his translations of *ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρὸν* Ephesians 5.16 and Colossians 4.5 as well. In the editions of his German New Testament published between 1522 and 1527 Luther had accurately translated the Greek by *loset* (or, *loeset*) *die zeyt*, no doubt inspired by the earlier German translation, *erloest das zeyt*, that goes back as far as the *editio princeps* of the German Bible published in 1466. But after 1527, from 1530 onwards he adopted inexcusably his rendering of

τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες in Romans 12 at the other two Pauline passages, in the form: *schickt euch jnn die zeit*, which in 1546, the year of his death, became: *schicket euch in die zeit*.³

However, as the German marginal gloss against *boese zeit* in the 1546 edition shows, *loesen* was still in Luther's mind (*ibid.*, p. 205).

Similarly, in a sermon on Ephesians 5. 15ff. preached on 18 October 1545 there is the macaronic phrase: *loset tempus*.⁴

I know of only one place in his voluminous writings where Luther

-
1. Cp. WA *Deutsche Bibel* vol. 7, pp. 68f.; 569; 656 (eight lines from bottom) where Freitag comments on Luther's new rendering and its antecedents.
 2. Cp. WA *Deutsche Bibel* vol. 5, p. 645; on p. XII Eberhard Nestle, as edited by his son Erwin, classified the change from *domino* to *tempori* under the rubric: *Besonders an dogmatisch wichtigen Stellen finden sich Änderungen, meist in Übereinstimmung mit dem Deutschen auf grund des Griechischen*.
 3. Cp. WA *Deutsche Bibel* vol. 7, pp. 204 and note; 205; 234; 235 and note; 596 and 602. The new German translation in Romans not only infiltrated Ephesians and Colossians but influenced other German writers as well; cp. the Grimms' *Deutsches Wörterbuch* vol. 8 (Leipzig 1893), col. 2651f., s.v. *Schicken* 2d), where after the reference to 'Röm. 12,11' the editors add: 'hiernach sprichwörtlich und formelhaft', G. Büchmann, *Geflügelte Worte* (Berlin 1926²⁷), p. 67, and, for further bibliography about Middle High German usage, WA vol. 41 (Revisionsnachtrag, 1974), p. 218, ll. 27-30.
 4. Cp. WA vol. 51, pp. 60-67, esp. p. 65, l. 15, and, for another example, WA vol. 41, p. 448, l. 21: *loset die zeit*, in a sermon preached on 18 October 1535.

comments on the meaning of *schicken euch in die Zeit*.¹ In sermon notes on Romans 12.6-21, prepared for his preachers for delivery in January 1525 (WA vol. 17/2. pp. 32-60), there is an extended note in German on 12.11c (p. 47f.). Luther states the problem about the two readings, says that both make good sense and, like Erasmus six years earlier, leaves the choice to the reader: *ich weys auch noch nicht, wilchs das beste sey..eyn iglicher neme, wilchs yhm gefellet*. After interpreting Κυρίῳ , without any reference to its context in Paul, he declares: *aber ich bleybe bey dem 'schickt euch ynn die zeyt'*, and on the basis of Ecclesiastes 3.3ff. and Psalm 1.3, he paraphrases: *sey frey und an keyne zeyt gebunden, das dū thun mügest, wie und was dyr fur handen kompt*. He applies this against the *Werckheyligen*, whose scrupulous observance of fixed hours for prayer and meals makes help for the needy (who, presumably, come unexpectedly), impossible. Luther adds that even their own preoccupations turn sour on them because the unpredictable timeliness of charity is more important than the prompt and punctual performance of piety. The comment is an interesting parallel to the 1516 scholium about Luther's inability to find his prince and court officials when they were needed and about the excuses they offered. The passage as a whole is much more a comment on *schicken euch in die Zeit* than on $\text{τῷ καρῷ δουλεύοντες}$. One would have supposed that *sey frey und an keyne zeyt gebunden* was just about the opposite of the Greek.²

-
1. In a sermon on Ephesians 5.15ff. preached on 29 October 1536 (WA vol. 41, pp. 704-707) the phrase lies scattered about without much comment or integration into the message; cp. pp. 704, 1.9; 705, 11. 21 (with *raubt zeit!*); 36; 707, 1. 21. Luther appears never to have preached on the parallel in Colossians 4.5.
 2. In what I regard as a retrograde step the modern revision of Luther's Bible has dropped *Zeit* in favour of *Herrn*; cp. E. Gess, 'Conclusion of the revision of the Luther New Testament', *The Bible Translator* 8 (1957) 155-160, esp. p. 157.

Philip Melanchthon (†1560) wrote three works on Romans: a *Dispositio* (1529; CR vol. 15, coll. 443-492), *Commentarii* (1532; *ibid.*, coll. 495-796) and an *Enarratio* (1556; *ibid.*, coll. 797-1052). These followed an early set of *Annotationes* which Luther had published without Melanchthon's knowledge or permission in 1522. But in none of the three approved publications did Melanchthon touch upon Romans 12.11.¹

But Martin Bucer (†1551) did recognise and comment on *καρπῶ*.² In his massive *Metaphrasis et enarrationes ...*, (Strassburg 1536; I have used the Basel 1562 edition) he paraphrases Romans 12.11c: *in occasionem officii intendite* (p. 529) and in the *Expositio* he introduces, I believe, for the first time, a reference to Lysippus's famous bronze of *Καρπός* into the debate (p. 543C-544E).³

John Calvin (†1564) published three editions of a commentary on Romans, in 1540, 1551 and 1556.⁴ As far as Romans 12.11c is concerned,⁵ the first two agree in a short note that combines *Spiritu ferventes* and *tempori servientes* that also takes account of *studio*

-
1. Cp. T. H. L. Parker, *Commentaries*, pp. 1-7.
 2. Cp. *ibid.*, pp. 34-62.
 3. Cp. p. 12 and R. P. Kinsey, 'Was Paul thinking of a statue?', in *Studies presented to David Moore Robinson*, vol. 2 (Saint Louis 1953), p. 1247f.. Kinsey is dealing with *καρπῶς* at Colossians 4.5. The testimonia relating to this statue are collected by J. Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig 1868), pp. 276ff., and discussed by Gerda Schwarz in *Grazer Beiträge* 4 (1975) 243-276. Both however have missed the descriptions in Cyril's commentary on John 7.34 and in Evagrius 3.26 (PG 73.741B; 86.2650B-2652A).
 4. Cp. T. H. L. Parker, *Commentaries*, pp. 71-77; *id.*, 'Calvin the exegete: change and development', in *Calvinus ecclesiae doctor*, ed. W. H. Neuser (Kempfen 1980), pp. 33-46; ed. T. H. L. Parker, *Johannis Calvini commentarius in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* (Leiden 1981).
 5. Cp. *id.*, *Calvin's New Testament commentaries* (London 1971), p. 119; ed. *id.*, *op. cit.*, p. 273f..

non pigri: nam si Spiritu Dei accensi simus, ille nos satis excitabit, ne pigrescamus. Neque ab iis alienum est tertium, ut serviamus tempori. Multum siquidem in ea re positum est momenti, ut noverimus nos tempori accommodare: sic tamen, ut in qualibet inclinatione rectum *Cursum* teneamus. Quod autem alicubi legitur, Domino, id est prorsus extraneum. We observe that Calvin has no time for domino and that compliance without compromise is his understanding of *tempori servientes*. But between 1551 and 1556 the note on the two clauses was completely recast and was expanded in length more than three fold. Quod autem additur, Spiritu ferventes, exprimit quomodo prius illud assequamur. Caro enim instar asini semper torpet, ideoque

stimulis opus habet: solus autem est spiritus fervor qui pigritiam nostram corrigit: ergo benefaciendi sedulitas zelum requirit quem Spiritus Dei in cordibus nostris accenderit. Cur ergo, dicit quispiam, ad hunc fervorem nos Paulus hortatur? Respondeo, quanquam Dei donum est, has tamen partes iniungi fidelibus, ut torpore excusso flammam Divinitus accensam concipiant: sicuti ut plurimum contingit Spiritus impulsus nostra iniuria suffocari et extingui. Eodem pertinet etiam tertium, Ut tempori serviamus. Nam ut breve est vitae curriculum, statim effluit bene agendi opportunitas: quo nos alacrius ad officium properare decet. Sic alibi iubet Paulus redimere tempus, quia dies mali sunt. Potest etiam esse sensus, ut noverimus tempori nos accommodare: qua in re multum momenti positum est. Sed mihi videtur Paulus cessationi opponere quod servire tempori praecipit. Porro quia in multis vetustis exemplaribus legitur *Κυρίω*, licet videri possit primo intuitu extraneum, prorsus relicere non audeo. Quod si lectio illa placet, non dubito quin Paulus quae fratribus praestantur officia, et quicquid alendae charitati servit, referre voluerit ad Dei cultum, quo plus animi adderet fidelibus. We observe Calvin's openness to change in his palpable unwillingness now

to reject *domino* out of hand and in his readiness to offer an interpretation of it (in terms that remind one of John Chrysostom). He still prefers *tempori* however, but not the earlier understanding. In the 1556 edition he has implicated the phrase even more closely with the first two clauses in the verse and sees serving the time as the opposite of laziness: since life is short, time has to be served (and redeemed - he quotes Ephesians 5.16) if good is to be done. I suspect the influence of Rufinus and of Bucer here. Calvin further speaks of *tempori servire* as he goes on to gloss *spe gaudentes*: *Sunt et haec tria inter se coniuncta, ac quodammodo videntur pertinere ad illud, Tempori servientes. Ille enim se tempori optime accommodat, et occasione utitur ad strenue currendum, qui in spe vitae futurae gaudium suum reponit, et tribulationes patienter sustinet.* Here the phrase *et occasione utitur ad strenue currendum* is an addition of the last edition to the earlier two, and agrees with the other 1556 changes in the interpretation of *tempori servientes*, viz. the reference to life as a short distance race and the need for speed.

When Calvin's Romans was translated into French and when, from 1546, Calvin began to revise his cousin P. R. Olivetan's (†1538) French Bible of 1535, the rendering at Romans 12.11c was always *servans au temps*.¹

It is not clear what caused the change in Calvin's mind about *domino*, whether it was renewed reflection on familiar materials or the discovery of new materials or what. What we can isolate however is the fact that between 1548 and 1550 two men made their way to Geneva

1. Cp. CR vol. 85 pt. 1 (Braunschweig 1897), coll. 404, (377f.), and D-M §§ 3710, 3716. Calvin appears never to have preached on Romans; cp. T. H. L. Parker, *The oracles of God* (London 1947) pp. 160-166. Can this be correct?

as refugees from Parisian religious intolerance, men who were in a position to influence Calvin in the period before 1556, viz. Robertus Stephanus (†1559) and Theodore Beza (†1605). One is tempted to see the change in Calvin's estimate of *domino* stemming from one or other of these two new scholar friends. Beza spent a year in Geneva, from October 1548 to November 1549, before being called to Lausanne, less than 50 miles away, where he was professor of Greek for nine years and where he conducted Bible readings on Romans on behalf of his fellow exiles. After publishing his splendid third edition of the Greek New Testament in 1550 in Paris, in the same November Stephanus fled to Geneva where, very probably, he published the fourth and last edition the following year.¹

But both men were not only busy around Calvin with their own work. Both involved themselves with Calvin's commentaries on Paul. From Lausanne Beza wrote a preface to the 1551 edition of the commentaries on the Pauline epistles and Hebrews, and in Geneva the scholar printer Stephanus was the publisher of Calvin's commentaries on the Pauline and Catholic epistles and Hebrews in 1556. So which of the two was it who might have influenced Calvin over *domino*? I propose Stephanus. Stephanus's third edition of 1550 with its rich apparatus criticus in the inner margin was to Calvin's hand; in it Calvin could see the evidence for $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$,² but Beza's work on the New Testament still lay in the future. No doubt his lectures on Romans in Lausanne took note of the text and apparatus of Stephanus's third edition, and, as we shall see, he was always to read $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ /*domino*, yet he published nothing until after Calvin's third edition

-
1. All four editions read $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\rho}\omega$.
 2. As we have seen on p. 23f., Stephanus quotes in support of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ α . (the Complutensian Polyglott), δ . e. i. (three Paris MSS) and θ . i. α . (two MSS from elsewhere).

was published in 1556.¹ Though that does not preclude oral contact and Beza was already² involved in a new annotated Latin translation of the New Testament,³ the evidence strongly favours Stephanus as the (inadvertent) cause of Calvin's improved appreciation of *κυρίῳ*, particularly the support for it explicitly set out in the apparatus of his third edition.

As I have already said, over against his older friends and colleagues Calvin and Stephanus, Beza always read *κυρίῳ / domino* in his numerous editions, large and small, of the Greek New Testament. His long comment is worth careful consideration.⁴ Compared with Erasmus's note, it is set out in a much more orderly way, and, compared with Calvin's, it is a piece of scholarship as well as of exegesis. It runs: *Domino servientes, τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες.*

1. Cp. P.-F. Geisendorf, *Théodore de Bèze* (Geneva 1949), pp. 64, 68 for Beza's preface and the lectures on Romans.
2. It was in the press by July 1555; cp. *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, edd. H. Aubert, F. Aubert, H. Meylan, vol. 1 (Geneva 1960), p. 167.
3. Geisendorf, op. cit., pp. 68-74 and E. Armstrong, *Robert Estienne, royal printer* (Cambridge 1954), p. 232f., discuss this first venture of Beza into New Testament criticism. More generally cp. I. D. Backus, *The reformed roots of the English New Testament. The influence of Theodore Beza on the English New Testament* (Pittsburgh 1980), pp. 1-13 on Beza's New Testament and patristic resources.
4. I work from the first of the four folio editions of his Greek New Testament, the 1565. This particular note is identical with the one that appeared in 1556/57, apart from the absence of the mention of the Vulgate rendering in the 1556/57, which however has a very strongly worded statement towards the end: *denique hanc sententiam vix putarim tam commode posse accipi quin a Christianismo prorsus dissideat*, that is later dropped. The 1556/57 note is identical with the note in the pirated Beza (Greek-)Latin Testament of 1559/60 (Zürich/Basel). Cp. E. Armstrong, op. cit., pp. 239-247, for the complicated printing history of the 1559/60 and its relationship to the 1556/57, and D-M §§ 6140, 4627. I owe my knowledge of the content of the notes in the 1556/57 and 1559/60 editions again to the kindness of Mr. T. S. Pattie. As yet unedited and unpublished are Beza's lectures on Romans delivered in 1565-66; cp. Luc Perrottet, 'Chapter 9 of the epistle to the Hebrews as presented in an unpublished course of lectures by Theodore Beza', *Journal of medieval and Renaissance studies* 14 (1984) 89, n. 1.

Recte hoc subiunxit Apostolus, quo Christianae charitatis praecepta a philosophorum monitis distinguuntur: et ita in probatissimis quibusque codicibus vetustis et Graecis scholiis legitur. Sic quoque convertit Vetus interpres, et ita legunt Chrysostomus et Theophylactus et Basilius in Ethicis, definitione 68, et Clemens. Erasmus tamen interpretatus est, Tempori servientes, id est *καὶ ρῶ δουλεύοντες*. quae lectio annotatur etiam ab Originis interprete, et Glossa ordinaria quam vocant. Explicatur autem tribus modis. Sunt enim qui existiment hoc dicto moneri pios ut si quid incommodi acciderit, boni consulant, ut hoc cohaereat cum eo quod sequitur. Alii vero putant praescribi fidelibus ut pro temporis ratione sese accommodent

fratribus, sicut dicit Apostolus se factum esse omnibus omnia. Alii demum *καὶ ρῶν* accipiunt pro occasione: quod velit Paulus nos studiose omnem iuvandi occasionem captare. quae interpretatio mihi maxime probatur prae ceteris. Sed utcunque accipias, non expresseris significationem verbi *δουλεύειν*, quod plus est quam sese accommodare tempori, aut occasionem captare: neque puto ullum esse locum Scripturae in quo simile dictum occurat. Itaque potius legendum esse puto *τῷ κυρίῳ*, et ab iis corruptum esse locum qui compendium illud scribendi *κῶ* putarunt *καὶ ρῶ* declarare: idque eo verisimilius est quod etiamnum hodie apud Basilium eo loco quem ante citavi, eo compendio literarum scriptum invenitur.

We may note the structure of the comment: 1. a general observation: *domino servientes* is a necessary addition to precepts which without it are hardly distinctively christian;¹ 2. statement

-
1. I presume that the reference to philosophorum monita is made in response to the reason given by Erasmus for the change from the difficult *καὶ ρῶ* to the easier, pious *κυρίῳ*: *ea sententia, quoniam ethnici philosophi nomine vulgo circumferebatur, et vafriciem quandam praecipere videbatur, offensus aliquis mutavit,...*

of evidence: ¹ MSS and patristic material in favour of κυρίω ; writers in favour of καρῶ ; 3. the three ways in which τῶ καρῶ δουλεύοντες might be understood; the first is straight from Erasmus; the second was in Erasmus and was Calvin's preference in 1540 and 1551; the third was Calvin's final choice in 1556. Beza prefers the last of these but finally feels that none of them deals justly with the force of δουλεύειν and that the phrase τῶ καρῶ δουλεύοντες is unscriptural. These are the two reasons for his choice of κυρίω ; καρῶ arose out of a misreading of the abbreviation for κυρίω.

The three later editions of the folio Greek New Testament (1582, 1588-89, 1598) show the aging scholar always at work: as far as Romans 12.11c is concerned, the evidence of the Peshitta (published in 1569) and of Jerome's letter to Marcella (which he could have included in 1556/57 or 1565 from Erasmus's 1522, but probably adopted from Lucas of Bruges who published his notes two years earlier in 1580) - these are added into the scales against καρῶ . Beza becomes more and more convinced that κυρίω is correct: 1565's *potius legendum* becomes *omnino legendum*.² Finally we have a gratuitous anti-Catholic jibe: *quam epistolam* (viz. Jerome's to Marcella) *vide, quaeso, lector, ut qualis fuerit olim tum Ecclesia illa Romana cognoscas.* Did

-
1. These MSS include what he, like Calvin, found in Stephanus's apparatus. In the preface to the second folio edition of 1582 Beza claimed that they had now been supplemented by use of Syriac and Arabic evidence, and by more use of codex Bezae and much use (plurima) of codex Claromontanus. But the latter's reading of καρῶ / *tempori* at Romans 12.11c goes unnoticed. Cp. B. M. Metzger, *Historical and literary studies. pagan, Jewish, Christian* (Leiden 1968), ch. 13, 'Codex Bezae and the Geneva version of the English Bible (1560)', for details about Beza's MSS. See appendix A for the influence of this part of Beza's note on the creation of an erroneous reference in later writers to Bede, and appendix B for the history of the abbreviation hypothesis.
 2. But *omnino* had already been read in the 1556/57 and 1559/60 editions.

Beza mean that in Jerome's day (olim tum, unlike the present) there had been a lively, uninhibited biblical criticism in the Roman church where the superiority of Greek was acknowledged?

Only chauvinism can justify a notice of the textual decisions taken by the early English versions of Romans 12.11c! but they do help to illustrate both the impact of the more recent scholarship, as represented by Erasmus and Beza, on English Protestants and the continuing influence of the old Latin Vulgate. John Wiclif, or his school, had c. 1380 translated 'Lord', after the Vulgate. Following Colet, Erasmus and Luther, William Tyndale (1525 = 1534) had translated 'Applie youre selves to the tyme', and he in turn was followed by Coverdale (1535)¹ and the Great Bible (1539, 1540).² Beza's influence is seen in the Geneva New Testament and Bible (1557, 1560), the Bishops' Bible (1568) and the 'Authorized' version (1611), all reading 'Lord'.³ Rheims (1582) of course followed the Vulgate with the same translation.

-
1. Coverdale's later versions (two in 1537 and the 1550) revert to 'Lord'. In his 1538 Latin-English polyglotts *domino/Lord* are to be found. Cp. J. F. Mozley, *Coverdale and his Bibles* (London 1953), p. 122f..
 2. For the explanation of the symbol of a hand that appears in text and margin of the Great Bible's version of Romans 12.11c, cp. B. F. Westcott, *A general view of the history of the English Bible*, rev. W. A. Wright (London 1905), p. 75 and n. 1. For all this paragraph cp. F. H. A. Scrivener, *The authorized edition of the English Bible (1611), its subsequent reprints and modern representatives* (Cambridge 1884), p. 251.
 3. Not only Beza's Greek and Latin texts but also his note on Romans 12.11c influenced English Bibles. We might expect a Geneva Bible to show sign of this, but varieties of the 'Authorized' version also contain it. A Geneva Bible printed in 1640 in Amsterdam has a marginal note: 'This piece is well put in, for it maketh difference betweene Christian duties and Philosophicall duties'. This is a fair paraphrase of Beza's opening sentence in his annotation of the verse. An 'Authorized' Bible printed in 1683, probably also in Amsterdam, has the same marginal comment. On these Bibles cp. D-M §§ 424, 616.

Appendix B on Abbreviations

Since as we have briefly seen both Erasmus and Beza made use of the phenomenon of the abbreviation¹ of Greek words to account for the problem of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ / $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$, I propose to consider at this point the available data a little more widely. We recall that the final form (1535) of Erasmus's comment is made up of two parts. In 1519 he concluded his first note on Romans 12.11c with the remark: 'although there is no similarity between the Latin words *Tempori* and *Domino*, there is some between the Greek $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ and $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ '. But this was not developed and rather inconsequentially it remained undisturbed through the 1522 revision. But five years later Erasmus added in the fourth edition of 1527 the clause: 'especially when copyists are accustomed to shorten syllables *in pingendo*'. I am not sure what *in pingendo* means. Does Erasmus mean, when scribes paint, i. e. illuminate, the initial of or the compendium for the Greek *nomina sacra*? But this would apply only to $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ (= $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$), and further, as far as I know, only the initial letters of sentences or even of books were so decorated, and then not always. But accepting Erasmus's observation as true, he has still not developed and applied his knowledge of MS decoration technique to the case in point. *ital.*

Thirty years later (1556/57) the view of Beza was that the

-
1. Cp. PL 106.1278CD for a ninth century reference to the phenomenon in Latin. It was of course practised daily in all medieval scriptoria, Greek and Latin. As a matter of interest I note that the contractions *dns* (= *dominus*) and *ds* (= *Deus*) were often confused; cp. W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915), p. 405; cp. p. 399. This will probably explain the presence of *deo* in place of *domino* in some Latin MSS of Romans 12.11c and in some MSS of Ambrosiaster and of the Gothic Breviary in loc. (PL 86.714C).

original $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ (= $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$) 'had been corrupted by those who thought that $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ (sic) represented $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$ '. In other words it was a mistaken expansion of the abbreviation, in one sense not deliberately perpetrated. Beza felt himself confirmed in his analysis because in his copy of Basil's *Ethica*¹ the abbreviation $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ (= $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$) in a quotation from Romans 12.11c was to be found. Though if I understand him correctly this seems to be either a *non sequitur* or a *petitio principii*, at least Beza has attempted an application of a palaeographical datum in defence of his choice between $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$ and $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$.²

How justified were Erasmus and particularly Beza in their views? How do these look in the light of the information available today? The evidence indicates that when it was abbreviated $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ was almost always abbreviated $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$.³ The father of the modern study of the classical *nomina sacra* is Ludwig Traube. His data are derived from 93 documents (papyri, inscriptions and New Testament vellum MSS) and are set out on pp. 56-86 of his famous book, *Nomina sacra* (München 1907). His conclusions for $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ are presented on pp. 91ff.. They are that $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is always abbreviated $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$: 'Wirkliche Varianten hat es nie gegeben. $\overline{\kappa\rho\varsigma}$ auf einer syrischen Inschrift ist nur eine irrtümliche Lesung'. Here he seems to be following

-
1. The first edition of the Greek text of Basil's *Ethica* appeared in Venice in 1535.
 2. Wettstein was to criticise Beza for his recourse to this type of explanation of difficulties in the text of the New Testament, adducing Romans 12.11c amongst others as an example; cp. $\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\eta\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$: *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam 1751), p. 3. *probably*
 3. In this appendix $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ are my shorthand for all cases and both numbers of the noun.

Deissmann's reading of the inscription rather than its first editors',¹ probably correctly. After Traube there is the work of M. Avi-Yonah who published in 1940 a catalogue of 'Abbreviations in Greek inscriptions: the Near East, 200 B.C. - A.D. 1100'.² He was not able to add anything to the evidence known to Traube and Lietzmann over thirty years earlier. His catalogue (p. 78) records only the inscription reported in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (whose reading he seems to accept) and the one adduced by Lietzmann. The interval had thrown up no other instance of $\overline{\kappa\psi}$.

J. O'Callaghan in 1970 and 1971 could adduce no exception to $\overline{\kappa\sigma}$ when $\overline{\kappa\sigma\psi\omicron\sigma}$ is abbreviated in his two surveys of third to eighth century New Testament papyri.³ But in the much more comprehensive survey conducted by A. H. R. E. Paap, which 'includes, in chronological order, all such Christian and related Greek papyrus texts as were published since Traube's book appeared, came to our

1. M. Freiherr von Oppenheim, H. Lucas, 'Griechische und Lateinische Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 14 (1905) 32 § 25; A. Deissmann, 'Verkannte Bibelzitate in syrischen und mesopotamischen Inschriften', *Philologus* 64 (1905) 477. In his review of Traube's book Lietzmann followed Traube in this rereading of the inscription, but does refer to a genuine example (the Jordanian inscription below); cp. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 34 (1909) 334.
2. *The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine*, supplement to vol. 9. It is reprinted in A. N. Oikonomides, *Abbreviations in Greek inscriptions: papyri, manuscripts and early printed books* (Chicago 1974).
3. "Nomina sacra" in papyris Graecis saeculi III neotestamentariis (Rome 1970), pp. 52ff.; "Nominum sacrorum" elenchus in Graecis Novi Testamenti papyris a saeculo IV usque ad VIII', *Studia papyrologica* 10 (1971) 99-122, esp. 113f.. Similarly S. Jankowski, 'I "nomina sacra" nei papyri dei LXX (secoli II e III d. C.)', *ibid.* 16 (1977) 98-104; and K. Aland, *Repertorium der Griechischen christlichen Papyri*, vol. 1 (Berlin/New York 1976), p. 423f., records only one exception - see below.

knowledge and were accessible to us',¹ there are a few exceptions. These are the facts. Of Paap's texts, 421 in all, 247 contain $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ where it occurs, abbreviated or unabbreviated, 'sacral' or 'profane' (cp. p. 5), 2587 times. Of these $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is abbreviated 2431 times, 2423 times as $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$, once as $\boxed{\kappa\varsigma}$ (fourth-fifth century), three times as $\overline{\kappa}$. or $\kappa\cdot$ (fourth (?) century MS of Ps.-Barnabas) and four times as $\overline{\kappa\psi}$ (all in one third century papyrus MS of verses from LXX Exodus 40.5-27).² I shall now concentrate on $\overline{\kappa\psi}$ because this is the abbreviation of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, where the ρ is preserved, which is closest to $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$.³ In addition to Paap's four examples I have discovered four more. From the fifth century there is an example in the recently discovered Mani-codex 18.11, and one on a Jordanian inscription.⁴ From the following century there is an abbreviation in a Christian letter that is probably relevant: $\kappa\rho = \kappa\rho\iota\omega$.⁵ From the ninth century MS of the Pauline epistles, codex Augiensis (F), there is an example at 1 Corinthians 9.1.⁶ This makes eight examples of $\overline{\kappa\psi} = \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in all. Though there are probably many more

1. *Nomina Sacra in the Greek papyri of the first five centuries A.D.: the sources and some deductions* (Leiden 1959), p. 4. In his review (*JTS* ns 11 (1960) 410) C. H. Roberts says that Paap's list 'does not include any biblical or theological text in which no *nomen sacrum* occurs'. This must be based on private information. My statistics are my calculations based upon Paap's materials on p. 79ff. His own discussion is on p. 101f.. Paap's presentation of his materials is clearly based on Traube's.
2. Cp. Aland, op. cit., p. 88, and J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens* (Paris 1976), p. 39f..
3. The origin of the - ρ - form may be by analogy with the second of the two abbreviations of $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, viz. $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$ and $\overline{\chi\psi}$. O'Callaghan, op. cit., (1970), pp. 68ff. and Paap, op. cit., p. 94, provide the data on $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$. But Paap, p. 102, n. 1, says: 'the insertion of the ρ may reflect the influence of the cursive script'.
4. Cp. C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, society and belief in early christian Egypt* (London/Oxford 1979), p. 35, n. 1; H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (Tübingen 1910), in loc..
5. Cp. Paap, op. cit., p. 102, no. 1.
6. Cp. F. H. A. Scrivener, *An exact transcript of the codex Augiensis* (Cambridge/London 1859), p. 72.

instances, even in the important early period, I very much doubt whether they would seriously modify the tentative conclusions I reach below.

As for $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, my sources are Griesbach, Preisendanz (probably) and chiefly Scrivener. Scrivener,¹ who alleges thirteen instances from five Old and New Testaments MSS dating from the fourth (six examples from codex Sinaiticus) to the eighth centuries, shows that $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ could be abbreviated to $\kappa\rho\omicron\varsigma$, just as $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta\nu$ in 2 John 5 was abbreviated in codex Vaticanus to $\kappa\epsilon\nu\eta\nu$. Griesbach² adduced $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \overline{\kappa\rho\omega}$ (= $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\nu$) from a ninth century³ addition in the margin of codex Ephraimi Rescriptus (C), a fifth century palimpsest, at John 5.4. Finally we should probably add the two abbreviations of $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ noted earlier from the Leiden magical papyrus (see p. 14f.).

1. Cp. id., *A plain introduction to the criticism of the New Testament* (Cambridge/London 1883³), p. 16, n. 1 = (London/Cambridge 1894⁴), vol. 1, p. 16, n. 1. I say 'allege' because though the six examples from codex Sinaiticus have been confirmed from the photographic facsimile, I have not been able to consult facsimiles of the other four MSS, even if such exist, and I have reason to doubt whether the pair quoted from codex Rossanensis (Σ) are abbreviations of $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ rather than simply of $\kappa\alpha\iota$; cp. O. von Gebhardt, *Evangeliorum codex Graecus purpureus Rossanensis* (Leipzig 1880), pp. xii, xiv = id., *Die Evangelien des Matthaeus und des Marcus aus dem codex purpureus Rossanensis* (Leipzig 1883), pp. xxi, xxiv. In general, for the serious shortcomings of Scrivener's third edition, see the devastating criticisms collected by E. Abbot, C. R. Gregory, J. R. Harris and B. W. Warfield and edited by J. H. Thayer as a Critical Appendix to *The Andover Review* 3 and published separately (Boston/New York 1885).
2. *Symbolae criticae ad supplendas et corrigendas variarum N. T. lectionum collectiones...*, (Halle 1793), vol. 2, p. 124. This has been confirmed from Tischendorf's edition of C (Leipzig 1843, p. 329). These examples from \mathcal{X} and C will be the basis of Tischendorf's comment at Romans 12.11c: $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ passim iam in edd. uncial. invenitur sic scriptum $\kappa\rho\omega$. Is Lietzmann simply borrowing from Tischendorf when he says in loc.: $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega = \kappa\rho\omega$ ist üblich?
3. This is Tischendorf's dating.

Although $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ could be contracted in another way,¹ we shall concentrate on the data of Griesbach, Scrivener and Preisendanz since they are earlier and preserve the kappa which alone makes the hypothetical confusion with $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ possible; just as we should concentrate on those forms of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ that preserve the rho. Once again, while there must be other examples of $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ abbreviated as $\kappa\rho\omicron\varsigma$, I do not think my conclusions will be significantly altered.

When we juxtapose what best suits the Bezan hypothesis,² $\kappa\rho\omicron\varsigma$ and $\overline{\kappa\rho\varsigma}$ as the forms of the two words most similar to each other and so most exposed to confusion, one feature immediately presents itself, their infrequency. $\kappa\rho\omicron\varsigma$ is attested sixteen times in seven documents, six times in one MS; $\overline{\kappa\rho\varsigma}$ is attested eight times in five documents, four times in one MS. In each case the abbreviation represents an infinitesimally small proportion of the total number of the instances of the word. $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ was only very very rarely abbreviated in any guise; $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ was very often abbreviated when used in what Paap called a 'sacral' sense, but overwhelmingly as $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$. To overlook O'Callaghan's third century New Testament MSS where $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is always $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ in favour of one (admittedly contemporary) LXX MS with its $\overline{\kappa\rho\varsigma}$ is wrongheaded. To base a hypothesis on the conjunction of two extremely rarely occurring forms of abbreviation is in

-
1. Cp. T. W. Allen, *Notes on abbreviations in Greek manuscripts* (Oxford 1889), p. 18, n. 2 and plate V; the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ -syllable in five words in three tenth and eleventh century MSS was abbreviated ς . Neither Avi-Yonah, O'Callaghan (1970; p. 39) nor Paap (p. 14f.) can offer any example of abbreviated $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ in the inscriptions and papyri they have investigated.
 2. By this I mean the view that $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ is somehow, usually palaeographically, derived from $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$. The evidence available does not support the particular conclusion that Beza himself drew, that $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ could have been read as $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$, at least deliberately.

statistical terms highly dubious.¹ Further when we note that the evidence for the two abbreviations is not evenly spread but that of the twenty four examples of $\overline{\kappa\rho\varsigma}$ and $\kappa\rho\varsigma$ ten occur in only two documents, the unlikelihood that the hypothesis is probable becomes almost an impossibility.

I appreciate that I have been trying to argue logically and from evidence in an area where the impossible can happen and where accident (caused e.g. by tiredness or illness or interruption) may be the factor that is at work, accident that is often neither predictable, diagnosable nor quantifiable.² We know that accidents happen and that is all that can be said. But if we choose to cling to the raft of argument from evidence and probabilities, I think we should conclude that either $\overline{\kappa\rho\varsigma}$ is original and $\kappa\rho\varsigma$ has been accidentally but not palaeographically, derived from it (I say accidentally because christian morality would forbid the reverse) or $\kappa\rho\varsigma$ is original and that $\overline{\kappa\rho\varsigma}$ has been deliberately introduced as an obvious, improving and sanitised correction.³

At least three scholars after Beza have seriously addressed the palaeographical possibilities at Romans 12.11c. John Mill (†1707), who accepted $\kappa\rho\omega$, has a long note in loc. on the transcriptional

-
1. To base it, as is very often done, e.g. by B. M. Metzger, *A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London/New York 1971), p. 528, on two less similar forms, not $\overline{\kappa\rho\omega}/\kappa\rho\omega$ but $\overline{\kappa\omega}/\kappa\omega$, makes it that much less likely.
 2. But these are the issues that make textual criticism such fun!
 3. Obiter visa: in the apparatus criticus to the Göttingen LXX text of Deuteronomy 9.20 (1977, p. 152) two Latin MSS of the sixth and seventh centuries (cp. *ibid.*, p. 20) are recorded as having substituted *dominum* for the third $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in the verse. Is this an accidental misreading of κ , (= $\kappa\alpha\iota$) as $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ (= $\overline{\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\upsilon}$)? In the apparatus criticus to the Göttingen Baruch 1.14 (1976², p. 452) the Peshitta implies an alteration of $\kappa\rho\omega$ to $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\upsilon$; cp. E. Nestle in *ET* 10 (1899) 284.

likelihoods based on his own observations about scribal conventions in the MSS. Against Beza who believed in an accidental change from $\kappa\rho\iota\omega$ to $\kappa\alpha\rho\omega$, Mill says that all the MSS he is familiar with use the compendium $\kappa\omega$ (sic) for $\kappa\rho\iota\omega$, and continues: *vocem $\kappa\alpha\rho\omega$, quoties in N. T. occurrit, plene describunt, quod memini, usquam.* This should be augmented with the pertinent sentence from the Prolegomena (p. CXL (1707) = p. 140 § 1321 (1723)): *Fecit non compendiosa quidem scriptura (neque enim $\kappa\alpha\rho\omega$ unquam contracte scriptum puto) sed obscuritas lectionis, ut $\kappa\alpha\rho\omega$ mutaretur in $\kappa\rho\iota\omega$.*

Eighty five years after Mill J. J. Griesbach (†1812), who in the last edition of his Greek New Testament (London 1810, p. 204) was like Mill to read $\kappa\alpha\rho\omega$, included in an earlier work in a long note on the verse a clear exposition of the possibilities and impossibilities of the arguments from abbreviations.¹ After dealing with the variants on the assumption that the change was deliberate (*si consilio mutatus fuit textus*) he proceeds to examine them on the assumption that the change was accidental: *si autem casu orta est lectionis diversitas, vero valde est dissimile, librarium errasse in legendo aut scribendo vocabulo notissimo $\kappa\rho\iota\omega$. Sin denique e scribendi compendio enata est varians lectio, nemo $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ sexcenties in N. T. occurrens confundere potuit cum $\overline{\kappa\rho\omega}$ admodum raro; sed in explicanda sigla parum usitata $\overline{\kappa\rho\omega}$, eo facilius lapsus est librarius, quo planior et melior ei videbatur sensus verborum $\kappa\omega$ δουλευοντες, et quo saepius legere se in sacris litteris meminerat δουλευειν θεω sive Χριστω sive (Act. 20. 19) τω κυριω.* This I believe states the whole position quite admirably.

1. Op. cit., p. 123f..

The third scholar is M.-J. Lagrange (†1938), who seems to have been unable to make up his mind about $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ and $\kappa\upsilon\rho\hat{\iota}\omega$. The doubt is already there in the first edition of his commentary on Romans (Paris 1916). At 12.11 (p. 303) he says of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\hat{\iota}\omega$ and its context: 'la liaison des idées est donc satisfaisante', and a paragraph later: 'le contexte est donc aussi satisfaisant avec cette leçon' (sc. $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$). He goes on, and this may explain in part his unwillingness to decide: 'S. Thomas donne les deux sans se prononcer'! But what is more to the point about the palaeography is that in the introduction to the commentary, in a textual note on 12.11, he says of $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ (and $\mu\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\iota\varsigma$ in 12.13):

's'expliquement probablement ... par une erreur de transcription' (p. lxx). In the last edition of Lagrange's Romans, posthumously published in 1950, but containing a note (p. vi) dated 1930, we find the 1916 notes on pp. lxx and 303 repeated unchanged, but on p. 400 an addendum: $\kappa\upsilon\rho\hat{\iota}\omega$ still makes excellent sense but Lagrange cannot understand the reason for the change to $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$. Now recourse to transcriptional error will not suffice: 'L'idée ne pouvait venir à personne de résoudre une abréviation $\kappa\omega$ en $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ '. So, one suspects, in some desperation Lagrange attempts emendation: $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\hat{\iota}\omega$ οὐ $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ δουλεύοντες.¹ The abandonment of explanations that involve transcriptional error is repeated in the second volume of the second part of his *Introduction à l'étude du Nouveau Testament*, entitled *Critique textuelle: II La critique rationnelle* (Paris 1935², p. 484); over against Lietzmann

1. This may be the place to recall the only other emendations of the clause that I have encountered: Hitzig's $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\omega$, reported in the third edition of Meyer's commentary (Göttingen 1859, p. 434, n.) and Alexander Pallis's $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega}$ $\mu\acute{\eta}$ $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\omicron\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, published amongst other notes on the letter in Liverpool in 1920, p. 139, and translated on p. 184: 'not obsequious to this world'.

(†1942),¹ Lagrange expresses his view that 'un lapsus de copiste' will not explain 'Κδ·ρω pour Κυρ·ω' 'car la confusion n'est pas aussi facile, et il n'est pas tellement aisé de se prononcer sur la vraie leçon'.

1. Lietzmann's name is not used but Lagrange's examples are identical with his; cp. *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe* (Tübingen 1913), p. 15. This pamphlet was prefixed to Lietzmann's *An die Römer* from the second edition onwards.

(f) Counter-Reformation to the Present

After Protestant reformers and English Bibles we return to a co-religionist and fellowcountryman of Erasmus, who, unlike all his predecessors in sixteenth century textual criticism, is underrated today if not virtually unknown. Yet of his importance there should be no doubt. I refer to Franciscus Lucas of Bruges (†1619), who in 1580 published in Antwerp his *Notationes in sacra biblia, quibus variantia discrepantibus exemplaribus loca summo studio discutiuntur*.¹ He has a long note on Romans 12.11c² (even longer than that of Erasmus) in which he makes large additions to the stock of information about the variations in that verse. In addition to Erasmus's evidence (Rufinus, Ambrosiaster, Jerome, the Glossa Ordinaria, Chrysostom and Theophylact) he adduces Theodoret, Oecumenius, Pelagius, Primasius, Sedulius, Haymo and Anselm, but he fails to mention the new evidence from Basil and Clement of Alexandria adduced by Beza in his 1565 edition, or the material from Cyprian's fifth letter available since 1563. But he is familiar with Stephanus's 1550 edition; he says that most Greek New Testaments currently available read $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\hat{\omega}$, but, drawing upon Stephanus's marginalia, reports that the Complutensian Polyglott and five Paris MSS read $\kappa\upsilon\rho\hat{\omega}$, Lucas's most important contribution is the report of his discovery in 'Belgian' libraries of Vulgate MSS that read *domino* in the text but preserve the Old Latin capitulation in ch. 12 which reads *de tempore serviendo*. He does not explicitly state his preference but the general momentum of his comments seems to favour *domino*.

-
1. This is a young man's book, Lucas having been born in 1548 or 1549, but there is evidence that the work had been underway off and on since before 1574. It had been promised for inclusion in a Latin Bible published in that year, but Lucas had misjudged how long his work would take.
 2. Reprinted in *Critici sacri* (London 1660), vol. 9, coll. 3401f..

In 1603 Lucas published a set of very brief notes on biblical verses where Latin MSS varied. The note on Romans 12.11c reads:¹
Domino servientes. Olim, ante Hieronymianam correctionem, Latini libri fere legebant Tempori servientes.

Contemporary with Lucas is Roberto Bellarmino (†1621). Lucas's dedication of the *Notationes* (coll. 3129-3134) to Cardinal Sirleto, of the Society of Jesus, includes a handsome recognition of the co-operation of the Rector of the Jesuit college in Louvain,² an old colleague in work on the Antwerp Polyglott (1569-1572),³ John Harlemius (†1578). But it is perhaps rather strange that there is no mention of another Jesuit, Roberto Bellarmino, a slightly older contemporary of Lucas, who, like Lucas, worked in Louvain, at the Jesuit College from 1569 to 1576, and who, like Lucas, was interested in the textual criticism of the Latin Bible. However, in his *De Verbo Dei*⁴ book 2, after confronting Protestant claims particularly about the status of the so-called Apocrypha, Bellarmino turns to the versions and especially to the Latin Bible. In § 7 (*de editione Graeca Testamenti novi*) he grants that the original language of the New Testament was Greek (Matthew, translated probably and Hebrews possibly from Hebrew, and Mark, possibly from Latin, were exceptions) and he grants the general purity of the Greek text. But its purity is not such that deviations from the Greek in Latin MSS are

-
1. *Romanae correctionis in Latinis bibliis editioni vulgatae, iussu Sixti V. Pont. Max. recognitis, loca insigniora* (Leipzig 1657), p. 50.
 2. Cp. *ibid.*, col. 3441, ll. 51-67, where acknowledgement is made of MSS loaned to Lucas by the College.
 3. Cp. D-M §§ 1422, 6161.
 4. First published in 1586, based on lectures delivered in Rome from 1576; its contents were probably known in Louvain before 1576, the year Bellarmino left there for Rome.

necessarily errors.¹ He repeats Erasmus's misrepresentation of Ambrosiaster (Graeci non habent $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ sed $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$) - this was to implicate Bellarmino in a lot of controversy - and he goes on: *et tamen nostram lectionem esse verissimam, patet tum ex Hieronymo in epistola ad Marcellam ... ubi dicit, in emendatis Graecis codicibus haberi non $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$ sed $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$, tum ex Origine, Chrysostomo, Theophylacto, et aliis Graecis Patribus, qui sic legerunt, et explicaverunt in suis commentariis.* He uses Jerome² and Greek fathers to show that even in the ancient church some Greek MSS required emendation and to show that the Latin is not always at fault.

It is well known that such was Bellarmino's formidable scholarship that university posts were created in Protestant countries in order to resist it. Even James VI and I of England wrote against Bellarmino! So it will be no surprise to learn that at least four scholars had comments to pass on his treatment of Romans 12.11c. Three³ of them agree with his conclusion (that $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ is original), but not with his method of arguing.

In 1609 J. Urbanus criticised Bellarmino for generalising from the particular case that is demonstrably flawed: some Greek MSS do read $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$. In 1618 Daniel Tilenus made a similar point: most ancient Greek MSS read $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$, a few read $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$, through a misunderstanding of the abbreviation $\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}$ (sic). His indebtedness to Beza is further seen in his reference to the abbreviation in Basil and

-
1. *Cp. Quod autem non sint ubique incorrupti, sed aliqui interdum errores irrepserint, saltem negligentia librariorum, et non sit tutum semper Latina ad Graeca corrigere: aliquot exemplis planum fiet* (op. cit., Ingolstadt 1596, col. 106B).
 2. Jerome's importance at this verse is repeated, op. cit., col. 109A.
 3. Glassius is however less certain. Ames does not tackle the point.

in his views about δουλεύειν. The fullest reply was published in Jena by Salomon Glassius in 1623.¹ In the second tractate of book 1 Glassius dealt *de integritate et puritate Graeci N. T. codicis* (pp. 152-234) and in the second section of its second part tackled *Dicta Scripturae N. T. Graecae, quibus corruptelae inesse, vel quibus ipsae N. T. Scripturae corruptae esse videntur* (pp. 184-234). He worked through twenty passages adduced by his opponents, including the seven quoted by Bellarmino. The fourteenth of these twenty is Romans 12.11 (p. 221f.). He follows Urbanus on the logical point, Beza explicitly about κυρίῳ in Greek MSS and fathers. This Greek attestation undercuts Bellarmino's sole reliance upon the Latin Jerome. Other

Latin witnesses do read *tempori* and the Vulgate may be wrong. Finally Glassius suggests that Ambrosiaster makes a good point against *domino*, that he (Glassius) would interpret *tempori* in terms of v. 15 (*gaudere cum gaudentibus, flere cum flentibus*). As an alternative interpretation he quotes the last of the three that Beza had listed. The fourth protagonist was William Ames (†1633). In *Bellarminus enervatus*² Ames comments only on the claim: *Graeci non habent κυρίῳ sed καρῳ*. He protests: *Hoc aperte falsum est, si de omnibus Graecis exemplaribus affirmetur, si de quibusdam tantum, vanum.*

It is not known whether Bellarmino replied to any of his critics.

Two other Catholic teachers addressed themselves to Paul and Romans 12.11c at this time; both commentaries appeared in 1614. Willem Estius (†1613) had his commentary published posthumously at

-
1. *Philologiae sacrae, qua totius sacrosanctae veteris et novi testamenti scripturae, tum stylus et literatura, tum sensus et genuinae interpretationis ratio expenditur*, vol. 1 (Jena 1623).
 2. Oxford 1629³, p. 21 = London 1633⁴, p. 15; first published in 1628.

Douai. At Romans 12.11 there is a lengthy note which gathers together the findings and views of his predecessors (Erasmus, Lucas, Beza). His only original contribution is the reference to the witness of Peter Lombard. Although he finally states his preference for *domino*, Estius shows himself alive to the non-pejorative possibilities of *tempori*. Cornelius a Lapide (†1637), another Dutch Jesuit, has a very much briefer comment that mentions only Ambrosiaster and Erasmus and a couple of interpretations of *tempori*. He silently corrects his great Jesuit colleague Bellarmino (.. *Graeca passim legunt non καφῶ* , sed *κουίω*).¹ His only contribution is the reference to the dictum of Pittacus, one of the Greek seven wise men, *γίνωσκε καίρῳ* ,² though Poole (see below) quotes it from Toletus (†1596), another Jesuit.

Seventeenth century England produced two huge repertoria summarising the biblical scholarship of the previous hundred and fifty years, viz. *Critici sacri* and Poole's *Synopsis*. In *Critici sacri* (London 1660) vols. 7-9 the views of several European scholars on the New Testament are systematically listed. Vol. 9, coll. 3135-3440, reprints the notes on the Bible by Lucas of Bruges that we have already considered. Of the eleven scholars whose comments on Romans 12 are catalogued in vol. 7, coll. 2749-2768, seven simply pass v. 11c by without mention; perhaps Erasmus, who is quoted in full (coll. 2750-

-
1. This was the point that Bellarmino's Protestant critics also most readily fastened on.
 2. As we have noticed, comparative material had already been alleged by Erasmus (Ps.-Phocylides in the *Adagia* is probably the *ethnicus philosophus* of the *Annotationes*) and by Martin Bucer (Lysippus's statue of *Καίρος*). Erasmus had already used this dictum in the *Adagia* without naming Pittacus.

2757), was felt by his successors to have said what needed to be said.¹ But one of these eleven, silent here, did comment on *tempori servire* elsewhere. In vol. 8, col. 1760, J. Drusius (†1616) treats the phrase at Romans 12.11c as a biblical proverb and draws in the Vulgate, the two Glosses, Erasmus and Beza.²

Matthew Poole's *Synopsis criticorum aliorumque s. Scripturae interpretum* (London 1669-1676), a work not produced without some tension with Cornelius Bee, one of the publishers of *Critici sacri*, is the second compendium of earlier biblical scholarship to be prepared in this country. In vol. 4, pt. 2 (1676), col. 273f., there is a pastiche of opinion summarised from commentators from Erasmus to Henry Hammond (†1660).³

As one who has been thought worthy of 'the title of father of English biblical criticism', we shall begin to bring this first part of the investigation to a close by noting the independent observation of Hammond. In 1653 his '*A paraphrase, and annotations upon all the books of the New Testament briefly explaining all the difficult places thereof* (London) appeared. In the paraphrase (p. 526), where the text reads: 'serving the Lord', the margin reads: 'or, serving the season, so other copies read', and the paraphrase itself of the whole

-
1. It is strange that, like Valla, the great classical philologists of the period did not comment on τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες : J. J. Scaliger (†1609), I. Casaubon (†1614), H. Grotius (†1645), D. Heinsius (†1655).
 2. *Proverbiorum classes duae...*, was first published in 1590 in Franeker. We recall that *servire scenae* appeared in another volume of 'wisdom literature', in Erasmus's *Adagia*. Drusius also corrects Bellarmino's statement about κυρίῳ in Greek MSS.
 3. As far as Romans 12.11c is concerned, these two repertoria overlap only in three authors: Erasmus, Lucas and Grotius. That is some measure of their importance in the eyes of their successors. Neither uses Calvin or Bucer. The neglect of the former is particularly strange.

verse runs: 'industrious and nimble to doe any thing that belongs to your calling, and having that earnest affection to God's service, that shall inflame and set you most ardently about it, and accordingly doing those things that in respect of the circumstances of time and place, wherein now you are, may most tend to the honour of God, and building up of the Church'. The words 'the circumstances of time and place, wherein now you are' make one wonder whether Hammond is trying to preserve $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$ alongside $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$! This is confirmed on p. 527 where we have his interesting note which clearly shows his preference for $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$. It is argued solely on the basis of the parallelism between Romans 12.11c and Ignatius's letter to Polycarp 3:

$\sigma\pi\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ γίνου...τούς καιρούς καταμάθανε' is exactly agreeable and parallel to' $\tau\eta\ \sigma\pi\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\eta}\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \acute{\omicron}\kappa\upsilon\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\iota\ \dots$
 $\tau\hat{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}\ \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ 'and may well seem an imitation of it'.¹ Hammond later refers to Romans 12.11c in his note on Ephesians 5.16 (p. 665). He did not express any second thoughts in a volume he published three years later.²

Hammond's *Paraphrase and annotations* proved very popular, and in 1698 Jean le Clerc translated it into Latin and with it published a set of supplementary notes that was translated into English in 1699. At Romans 12.11c he supported Hammond's preference for $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}$ with an argument similar to Ambrosiaster's. Paul is making use of a well-known proverb (Erasmus and Drusius had considered the Latin phrase in this way), and Le Clerc introduces comparative material from Ps.-Phocylides, Cicero and the Laus Pisonis (cp. p. 34, n. 4) to illustrate its currency.

1. Cp. p. 34, n. 1.

2. $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\iota\ \phi\rho\omicron\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$, or, a review of the *Paraphrase and annotations on all the books of the New Testament, with some additions and alterations* (London 1656).



The relationship between this work of Hammond's and another example of the same genre from the very end of the century is not clear. I refer to John Locke (†1704) and his posthumously published *Paraphrases and notes on five Pauline epistles* (London 1705-07). Locke's library included a copy of Hammond (in Latin, Amsterdam 1698) and of Le Clerc's supplement (in English, London 1699),¹ but his own work on Romans 12.11c betrays no idea of what was at stake. Locke's paraphrase of the verse runs: 'not slothful in business; but active and vigorous in mind, directing all the service of Christ and the gospel'. There is no note.

Greater than either Hammond, Le Clerc or Locke was Richard Simon (†1712), 'the father of biblical criticism'. But his unindexed works make use of them almost impossible. But I find a reference to Romans 12.11c in his *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam 1689), p. 270, where his preference for *κυρίῳ* /domino is stated. The basis of his argument is the misreading of an original *ΚΩ*. He appears to have worked from codex Sangermanensis (E) because it was more legible than Claromontanus (D), to which he also had access.

Still at the end of the seventeenth century we have what is, to my knowledge, the only monograph ever devoted to the variants, viz. Andreas Jacobi, *Roman. XII, 11*. *τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες*, *Tempori servientes* (Strassburg 1695). This gives a very full, though disorderly, survey of opinion, concluding that the phrase in the

1. J. Harrison, P. Laslett, *The library of John Locke* (Oxford 1965), §§ 1382, 772; cp. p. 43 on Le Clerc as Locke's 'closest friend when he (sc. Locke) was in exile'.

title is original.¹

Another survey similar to *Critica sacri* and Poole's *Synopsis* is found in J. C. Wolf, *Curae philologicae et criticae* ... (Basel 1741). Wolf is more compact than the former volume and more readable and bibliographically precise than the latter. He too like Jacobi argues for $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$.

I conclude this review by referring to four great collections of material that were prepared in the first half of the eighteenth century. The evidence that is mustered appears in the apparatus

critici of three editions of the Greek New Testament and of an Old Latin Bible. The former are all entitled $\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta\ \delta\iota\delta\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ and were edited by John Mill (†1707) (Oxford 1707), J. A. Bengel (†1752) (Tübingen 1734)² and J. J. Wettstein (†1754) (Amsterdam 1751-52). The fourth is the work of Pierre Sabatier (†1742) and was posthumously published in '1743', really in 1749 in Reims, under the title *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae seu vetus italica*.³

Mill's contribution lies in providing information about the readings of Greek MSS available in Oxford; as we have seen, it appears that it is Mill who is responsible for the $\hat{\beta}$ etise Beda pro Beza, which then muddies the waters for well over a century. Unlike

-
1. This monograph is found in library catalogues and elsewhere under the author's name of Isaac Faustius. But Faustius was the academic promotor not the author, as the full title in the bibliography shows.
 2. The critical notes were reprinted in 1763, augmented by notes from Bengel himself and from others, as *Apparatus criticus ad novum testamentum*. A recent appreciation of Bengel is by K. Aland in *Bericht der Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der neutestamentlichen Textforschung für die Jahre 1985 bis 1987* (Münster 1988), pp. 9-22.
 3. For further details on these four editions see D-M §§ 4725, 4741, 4753, 6263.

Mill Bengel prefers $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$. His new material includes the readings of the Armenian and Coptic versions and of Augustine, Chrysologus and Salvian. Nowadays Wettstein's work is valued chiefly for its huge stock of lexicographical and conceptual parallels.¹ But textcritically his contribution was to adduce the evidence of Gregory of Nyssa (wrongly - see above p. 45f.), Athanasius, Euthalius (though this has not been confirmed) and Antiochus. Like Wettstein Sabatier did not pick up Chrysologus and Salvian from Bengel, and 'Beda' still flourishes unchecked.²

After Griesbach it is neither possible nor particularly fruitful to keep a full record³ of the decisions about $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ and $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ in nineteenth and twentieth century editions of the Greek

-
1. When I began this thesis it was Wettstein's collection that was my first port of call. Wettstein, who was Le Clerc's successor at the Remonstrant College in Amsterdam, did not follow his predecessor in his preference for $\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ nor include his example of *tempori parere* from Cicero.
 2. I do not include the work of the other great eighteenth century critic, J. J. Griesbach (†1812), since I mentioned it earlier in this section; cp. D-M §§ 4763, 4782, 4786.
 3. Not that even the earlier work has been, or could be, fully enumerated and evaluated in this chapter.

1. For these and earlier editions recourse can be had to a very curious, complex and complicated book: *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Graeci cuius editiones ab initio typographiae ad nostram aetatem impressas, quotquot reperiri potuerunt, collegit, digessit, illustravit Eduardus Reuss Argentotarensis* (Braunschweig 1872). This is an analysis of a thousand variant readings, with the purpose of showing how the printed editions belong to different families. **Κυρίω** / **καίρω** is one of the selected variants, and use of Reuss's index (p. 309) will show which editions have which reading. It is clear that it is chiefly editions which have a Lutheran origin that preserve **καίρω** or *tempori*. Cp. F. H. A. Scrivener, *A plain introduction*, vol. 2, p. 175, n. 1; D-M pt. 3, p. 573. Reuss does not clearly show that the editions of Colinaeus (1534) and Edward Harwood (1776) both read **καίρω**. Undoubtedly there were others.
2. Over and above those mentioned in the first chapter and those who are uncommitted or think **καίρω** only possible, the following are the commentators consulted by me who accept it (chronologically arranged): T. Belsham (London 1822), vol. 1, p. 271; H. Olshausen (Königsberg 1835), p. 406 (= ET Edinburgh 1846, p. 392); C. F. A. Fritzsche, vol. 3 (Halle 1843), pp. 71-78; H. A. W. Meyer (Göttingen 1859), p. 434 (= ET Edinburgh 1881, vol. 2, pp. 249f., 265); F. Godet (Paris/Neuchâtel 1879-80: unseen) (= ET vol. 2 (Edinburgh 1881), p. 296); J. T. Beck (Gütersloh 1884); W. G. Rutherford (London 1900), p. 56; T. Zahn (Leipzig 1910: unseen), (= *ibid.* 1925), p. 549f.; E. Kühl (Leipzig 1913); K. Barth (Berne 1918-19: unseen) (= ET (heavily revised) London 1933, pp. 450, 457); but by 1946 he had changed his mind in favour of **Κυρίω**: *Die kirchliche Dogmatik* (Zollikon-Zürich), vol. 2, pt. 2 (1946), pp. 769-818, esp. p. 803: 'als Dienst für den Herrn' (= ET Edinburgh 1957, pp. 713-732, esp. p. 719); *id.*, op. cit., vol. 4, pt. 3/2 (*ibid.* 1959), pp. 691, 1083 (= ET *ibid.* 1962, pp. 603, 942); *id.*, *Kurze Erklärung des Römerbriefes* (München 1956) (= ET London 1959, p. 154): perhaps he smarted under the attack of his old teacher Adolf Jülicher who, in *Die christliche Welt* 34 (1920) 453-457, attacked inter alia some of his pupil's textual decisions, including **καίρω**; A. Pallis (Liverpool 1920), pp. 139 (adding **μή** !), 184; A. Schlatter (Stuttgart 1948), p. 210; *id.* earlier in *Gottes Gerechtigkeit* (Stuttgart 1935), p. 345; H. Asmussen (Stuttgart 1952), pp. 257, 369; G. Dehn, *Vom christlichen Leben* (Neukirchen 1954), p. 49f. (I am indebted to Professor C. K. Barrett for this reference); O. Michel (Göttingen 1955¹), pp. 268(?), 271f.; = (*ibid.* 1978⁵), pp. 381(?), 385; W. Barclay (Edinburgh 1955¹); = (*ibid.* 1975²), pp. 163, 165; like Barth Barclay later changed his mind; F. J. Leenhardt (Neuchâtel/Paris 1957), p. 177 (= ET London 1961, p. 315); H. W. Schmidt (Berlin 1962), pp. 212, 214; O. Etzold (Metzingen 1970), p. 233; E. Käsemann (Tübingen 1973), pp. 327, 330f. (= ET London 1980), pp. 343, 346; J. C. O'Neill (Harmondsworth 1975), p. 202.

but

studies.¹ By 1800 most of the evidence had been uncovered and evaluated, all the arguments for and against the variants proposed and attacked, all the explanations aired. No decisive point had been made. There was an impasse that was not to be cleared at the textcritical level.

-
1. These studies and monographs accept *καρπῶ* (again chronologically arranged): J. Weiss, 'Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik', in *Theologische Studien*, edd. C. R. Gregory et al., (Göttingen 1897), p. 244 (= p. 82 in a Sonderabdruck published in Göttingen in the same year); F. Büchsel, *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh 1926), p. 342; F. C. Burkitt, *JTS* 28 (1927) 98, n. 2; D. Bonhoeffer, *Sanctorum Communio* (Berlin/Frankfurt 1930: unseen); = (München 1960³), pp. 175 and n. 4, 276 (= ET London 1963, pp. 161, 191 (where there is a serious mistranslation), 238. n. 123); G. Delling, *TWNT* vol. 3 (Stuttgart 1938), p. 461; id., *Das Zeitverständnis des Neuen Testaments* (Gütersloh 1940), p. 154, cp. p. 152; O. Cullmann, *Christus und die Zeit* (Zollikon-Zürich 1946), pp. 36, 200 (= French translation, Paris/Neuchâtel 1947, pp. 30, 162), (= ET London 1951, pp. 42, 225); E. Fuchs, *Hermeneutik* (Bad Cannstatt 1954: unseen); = (ibid. 1963³, p. 269); C. Spicq, *Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament*, vol. 2 (Paris 1959), pp. 141-157, esp. pp. 142 and n. 2, 146f., 146, n. 6 and 147, n. 1; id., *Théologie morale du Nouveau Testament*, vols. 1 and 2 (Paris 1965), pp. 58, nn. 1-2, 511, n. 2; cp. pp. 56, nn. 3 and 5, 57, n. 5, 510, n. 5, 511, n. 1, 521, n. 4 (a moment's hesitation!); W. Schrage, *Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese: ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Ethik* (Gütersloh 1961), p. 40 and n. 118; J. Dupont, *Le discours de Milet* (Paris 1962), p. 53, n. 3; I. Rodriguez, 'Del "Kairós" clásico al de San Pablo', *Helmantica* 15 (1964) 107-126, esp. pp. 121-126; A. Feuillet, 'Les fondements de la morale chrétienne d'après l'épître aux Romains', *Revue Thomiste* 70 (1970) 357-386, esp. p. 374f.: 'la lecture servir le *καρπῶς*... jouit aujourd'hui d'une faveur croissante'; V. P. Furnish, *The love command in the New Testament* (London 1973), p. 104f., blows hot and cold; J. Baumgarten, *Paulus und die Apokalyptik* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1975), p. 185, n. 30; A. Tuillier, 'La valeur du *Claromontanus* (Paris. gr. 107) pour le texte du Corpus Paulinien', *Studia Evangelica* vol. 6 (Berlin 1973), ed. E. A. Livingstone, pp. 541-555, esp. p. 550f.: he translates 'servant au bon moment'; F. Festorazzi, 'Originalità della morale cristiana secondo San Pablo', *Dimensions de la vie chrétienne (Rm. 12-13)*, ed. L. de Lorenzi (Rome 1979) pp. 237-259, esp. 246f.; the most recent treatment of the variants known to me is F.-J. Ortkemper, *Leben aus dem Glauben. Christliche Grundhaltungen nach Römer 12-13* (Münster 1980), pp. 93-96, who refers, in addition to my own collection, to K. H. Schelke and K. Kertelge as supporting *καρπῶ*; cp. p. 93, n. 91.

CHAPTER TWO

ΚΑΙΡ- IN COMPANY

This chapter consists of a dossier of over four hundred extracts from all periods of ancient Greek literature, covering nearly two thousand years and 120 authors from Hesiod to Eustathius and extending from a single word to more than a whole page. Its first six sections show how one or other of six words that accompany καίρῳ in Romans 12. 11-13 (σπουδή, ὀκνηρός, πνεῦμα, ἐλπίς, θλίψις, χρεία) accompanies it in these other sources as well. The conclusion is that just as καίρος is found naturally associating with one or more of these words or their cognates elsewhere so their association in Romans 12 suggests the originality of καίρῳ at v. 11c. I cannot say which of the three words preceding καίρῳ triggered it off in Paul's mind, but it was the recurrence of σπουδή (in the most frequently found combination) in extracts I was copying out for another purpose (that later I realised was not relevant to the argument of the thesis) which first alerted me to the value of the approach I now see to be the answer to the textual *cul de sac*.

Further work has shown me that I should have taken much fuller account of another word further removed from vv. 11-13, sc. μέτρον (v. 3), but I have incorporated into ch. three some of the material I belatedly collected.

I have followed a chronological approach in listing the extracts. Because of the indigestible nature of this chapter I have tried not to overcrowd the page and have underlined καιρ- and the relevant word. At the end of the chapter I have provided a summary in tabular

form. In several of the extracts more than one of the six words (or seven with $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho-$) are found alongside $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho-$. These are clearly bonuses for my argument and have also been underlined. I have tried to eliminate repetition but not always successfully.

Section seven records the extracts in which $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{\omega} / \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\hat{o}\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ and *tempori* (bus) *servire* are to be found. The former is the fullest list known to me of Paul's Greek phrase and the latter is the fullest list of the Latin phrase, which, I shall suggest, is the one Paul may be working from.

No doubt knowledge of the prehistory of the Greek language would reveal the reasons for the conceptual links between these seven or eight words (in some cases it is still obvious; cp. $\sigma\pi\omicron\upsilon\delta-$, $\acute{\omicron}\kappa\nu-$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho-$), but in the relatively late stage of the language represented by our texts, even by Hesiod, most links are not easily perceived (cp. $\pi\nu\acute{\epsilon}\hat{\omicron}\mu\alpha$ and $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho-$). The linking is nearly always subconscious. The generation of one word by another is spontaneous. Changes of meanings in the various words do not seem to influence the tendency of a word to generate one or other of its old associates.

(a) ΚΑΙΡΟΣ AND ΣΠΟΥΔΗ

Theognis (6 BC)

401 ff.

μηδὲν ἄγαν σπεύδειν· καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος
ἔργασιν ἀνθρώπων· πολλάκι δ' εἰς ἀρετὴν
σπεύδει ἀνὴρ κέρδος διζήμενος,...

Herodotus (5 BC)

1, 206, 1

ὦ βασιλεῦ Μήδων, παῦσαι σπεύδων τὰ σπεύδεις· οὐ γὰρ ἂν
εἰδείης εἰ τοι ἔς καιρὸν ἔσται ταῦτα τελεόμενα.

Hippocrates (?) (5 BC)

Internal Conditions 28

ἦν γὰρ μεθυσθῆ παρὰ καιρὸν ἢ λαγνέυση ἢ ἄλλο τι ποιήση μὴ
ἐπιτήδειον, τὸ ἦπαρ παραχρῆμα γίνεται σκληρὸν αὐτέω, καὶ
οἰδέει, καὶ σφύζει ὑπὸ τῆς ὀδύνης, καὶ ἦν τι σπεύση, πονέει
ἐξαπίνης τὸ ἦπαρ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἅπαν.

Precepts 9

μετὰ τούτων δὲ πάντων μέγα ἂν τεκμήριον φανείη σὺν τῇ οὐσίῃ
τῆς τέχνης, εἴ τις καλῶς ἰητρεύων προσαγορεύσιος τοιαύτης μὴ
ἀποσταίη, κελεύων τοῖσι νοσέουσι μηδὲν σγλείσθαι κατὰ
διάνοιαν ἐν τῷ σπεύδειν ἀφικέσθαι ἔς καιρὸν σωτηρίας.

Sophocles (5 BC)

Philoctetes 637 ff.

ἦ τοι καίριος σπουδῆ πόγου
λήξαντος ὕπνου κἀνάπαυλαν ἤγαγεν,
οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὰν πνεῦμα τοῦκ πρώρας ἀνῆ,
τότε στελοῦμεν· νῦν γὰρ ἀντιοστατεῖ.

Euripides (5 BC)

Telephus (?) fr. 149

σπεύδειν γὰρ ἐν καιρῷ χρεών.

Thucydides (5 BC)

6. 9. 3

ὡς δὲ οὔτε ἐν καιρῷ σπεύδετε οὔτε ράδιά ἔστι κατασχεῖν ἐφ' ἃ ὤρμησθε, ταῦτα διδάξω.

Aristophanes (5-4 BC)

Plutus 253 ff

ὦ πολλὰ δὴ τῷ δεσπότῃ ταῦτ' ὀν θύμον φαγόντες,
ἄνδρες φίλοι καὶ δημόται καὶ τοῦ πονεῖν ἐρασταί,
ἴτ' ἐγκονεῖτε, σπεύδεθ', ὡς ὁ καιρὸς οὐχί μέλλειν,
ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀκμῆς, ἢ δεῖ παρόντ' ἀμύνειν.

Isocrates (5-4 BC)

Helen 11

ἔστι γὰρ τῶν μὲν τοιούτων συγγραμμάτων μία τις ὁδός, ἣν οὔθ' εὐρεῖν οὔτε μαθεῖν οὔτε μιμῆσθαι δύσκολόν ἐστιν· οἱ δὲ κοινοὶ καὶ πιστοὶ καὶ τούτοις ὅμοιοι τῶν λόγων διὰ πολλῶν ἰδεῶν καὶ καιρῶν δυσκαταμαθητῶν εὐρίσκονται τε καὶ λέγονται, καὶ τοσοῦτῳ χαλεπωτέρῳ ἔχουσι τὴν σύνθεσιν, ὅσω περὶ τὸ σεμνύνεσθαι τοῦ σκώπτειν καὶ τὸ σπουδάζειν τοῦ παίξειν ἐπιπονώτερόν ἐστιν.

Helen 29

αἰσθάνομαι δ' ἑμαυτὸν ἔξω φερόμενον τῶν καιρῶν καὶ δέδοικα μὴ τισι δόξω περὶ τούτου μάλλον σπουδάζειν ἢ περὶ ἧς τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπεθέμην.

Panathenaicus 86

ὦμην δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς χαριεστάτοις τῶν ἀκροατῶν εὐδοκιμήσειν, ἣν φαίνωμαι περὶ ἀρετῆς μὲν τοὺς λόγους ποιούμενος, ὅπως δὲ ταύτης ἀξίως ἐρῶ μάλλον σπουδάζων ἢ περὶ τὴν τοῦ λόγου συμμετρίαν, καὶ ταῦτα σαφῶς εἰδὼς τὴν μὲν περὶ τὸν λόγον ἀκαιρίαν ἀδοξότερον ἐμὲ ποιήσουσαν, τὴν δὲ περὶ τὰς πράξεις εὐβουλίαν αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἐπαινουμένους ὠφελήσουσαν.

ἔσται δ' ὁ λόγος τοῖς μὲν ἡδέως ἂν ἀκούσασι ... οὐτ' ἄκαιρος
ἀλλὰ σύμμετρος ... τοῖς δὲ μὴ χαίρουσι τοῖς μετὰ πολλῆς
σπουδῆς εἰρημένοις...

Demonicus 31

μηδὲ παρὰ τὰ γελοῖα σπουδάζων, μηδὲ παρὰ τὰ σπουδαῖα τοῖς
γελοίοις χαίρων (τὸ γὰρ ἄκαιρον πανταχοῦ λυπηρόν).

Plato (5-4 BC)

Politicus 277a

ἀλλὰ καθάπερ ἀνδριαντοποιοὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἐνιότε σπεύδοντες
πλείω καὶ μείζω τοῦ δέοντος ἕκαστα τῶν ἔργων ἐπεμβαλλόμενοι
βραδύνουσι, καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς, ...

Demosthenes (4 BC)

20. 166

κάν τις ἄρ' ἔλθῃ ποτὲ καιρὸς οὐκ ἀπορήσετε τῶν ἐθελησόντων
ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κινδυνεύειν. ὑπὲρ οὖν τούτων ἀπάντων οἶμαι δεῖν
ὑμᾶς σπουδάζειν καὶ προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν ὅπως μὴ βιασθῆθ'
ἀμαρτεῖν.

23. 182-183

ἦν ὃν ἔχει τόπον ὅστις οἶδεν ὑμῶν, οὐδ' ἐκεῖν' ἀγνοεῖ, τίνος
εἵνεκα καιροῦ περιπεποιήται καὶ διεσπούδασται μὴ λαβεῖν ὑμᾶς.

Alcidamas (4 BC)

Soph. 13

ὅστις οὖν ἐπιθυμεῖ ῥήτωρ γενέσθαι δεινὸς μᾶλλον ἢ ποιητῆς
λόγων ἱκανὸς καὶ βούλεται μᾶλλον τοῖς καιροῖς χρῆσθαι καλῶς ἢ
τοῖς ὀνόμασι λέγειν ἀκριβῶς καὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν τῶν ἀκρωμένων
ἐπικούρου σπουδάζει μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν φθόνον ἀνταγωνιστήν, ...

Aristotle (4 BC)

Politics 1,4,5 (1259 a14)

ἔπειδὴ δ' ὁ καιρὸς ἦκε, πολλῶν ζητουμένων ἅμα καὶ ἐξαίφνης,
ἐκμισθοῦντα δὲν τρόπον ἠβούλετο πολλὰ χρήματα συλλέξαντα,
ἐπίδειξαι ὅτι ῥάδιόν ἐστι πλουτεῖν τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ἢ
βούλωνται, ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ περὶ ὃ σπουδάξουσιν.

Rhetoric B8 1386b 4-5

καὶ μάλιστα τὸ σπουδαίους εἶναι ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις καιροῖς
ὄντας ἔλεεινόν.

LXX (2 BC ?)

Ecclesiasticus

2,1-2

τέκνον, εἰ προσέρχῃ δουλεύειν κυρίῳ,
εἰτοίμασον τὴν ψυχὴν σου εἰς πειρασμόν·
εὐθύνον τὴν καρδίαν σου καὶ καρτέρησον,
καὶ μὴ σπεύσης ἐν καιρῷ ἐπαγωγῆς.

20,18f

ὀλίγημα ἀπὸ ἐδάφους μᾶλλον ἢ ἀπὸ γλώσσης,
οὕτως πτώσις κακῶν κατὰ σπουδὴν ἦξει.
ἄνθρωπος ἄχαρις, μῦθος ἄκαιρος.

36,10

σπεύσον καιρὸν καὶ μνήσθητι ὀρκισμοῦ,
καὶ ἐκδιηγησάσθωσαν τὰ μεγαλεῖά σου.

43,5-6

μέγας κύριος ὁ ποιήσας αὐτόν,
καὶ ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῦ κατέσπευσεν πορείαν·
καὶ ἡ σελήνη ἐν πάσιν εἰς καιρὸν αὐτῆς,
ἀνάδειξεν χρόνων
καὶ σημείου αἰῶνος.

Jeremiah 8, 15

συνήχθημεν εἰς εἰρήνην, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἀγαθὰ εἰς καιρὸν ἰάσεως,
καὶ ἰδοὺ σπουδῆ.

Ezekiel 7, 11-12

καὶ συντρίψει στῆριγμα ἀνόμου, καὶ οὐ μετὰ θορύβου οὐδὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς. ἦκει ο καιρος, ἴδου ἡ ἡμέρα.

3 Maccabees 4,14-15

...στρεβλωθέντας δὲ ταῖς παρηγγελμέναις αἰκίαις τὸ τέλος ἀφανίσαι μιᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ἡμέρας. ἐγένετο μὲν οὖν ἡ τούτων ἀπογραφὴ μετὰ πικρᾶς σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτίμου προσεδρείας...

Aristeas (2 BC?)

4

ἐν (sc. πρεσβείᾳ) δὴ καὶ ἐποιήσαμεθα ἡμεῖς σπουδῆ, λαβόντες καιρὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα...

SIG 700 **1.10**

...σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθεν ἐνλείπων· ἐν δὲ τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ...

748 **1.5**

σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθεν ἐνλίποντες, ὑπὲρ ὧν καὶ παρ' αὐτοὺς τοὺς καιροὺς ἅ πόλις εὐχαριστοῦσα...

OGIS 735

...σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἐν οὐθενὶ καιρῷ παραλείπων οὐθεν·

Polybius (2 BC)

1,44,1

...ἐξαπέστειλαν κατὰ σπουδῆν, ἐντειλάμενοι μὴ καταμελλῆσαι, χρῆσάμενον δὲ σὺν καιρῷ τῇ τόλμῃ...

1,60,9

διόπερ ἔκρινε μὴ παρεῖναι τὸν ἐνεστώτα καιρὸν, συνιδὼν δὲ τὰς τῶν πολεμίων ναῦς ἰστιοδρομούσας, ἀνήγετο μετὰ σπουδῆς.

2,26,1

παρῆν βοηθῶν κατὰ σπουδῆν εὐτυχῶς εἰς δέοντα καιρὸν.

2, 37, 9-10

διὰ τὸ μὴ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας ἕνεκεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς σφετέρας δυναστείας χάριν ἐκάστους ποιεῖσθαι τὴν σπουδὴν, τοιαύτην καὶ τηλικαύτην ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς καιροῖς ἔσχε προκοπὴν καὶ συντέλειαν τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ὥστε...

3, 69, 3-4

...πρὸς τὸ μὴ...ἀπελπίζειν...τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν καιρῶν καταλαμβανομένους, τὸν δὲ προδότην ἐτίμησε μεγαλείως, ἐκκαλέσασθαι σπουδάζων...

3, 82, 7

..., οὗ καιρὸν, οὗ τόπον προορῶμενος, μόνου δὲ σπεύδων συμπεσεῖν τοῖς πολεμίοις,...

3, 86, 3

...Γάιον Κεντήνιον κατὰ σπουδὴν δὸς τετρακισχιλίου ἵππεῖς προεξπέστειλε, βουλόμενος, εἰ δέοιθ' οἱ καιροί, πρὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας τούτους καταταχεῖν.

3, 105, 5

κατὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τούτον Φάβιος, θεωρῶν τὸ γινόμενον καὶ διαγωνιάσας μὴ σφαλῶσι τοῖς ὅλοις, ἐξῆγγε τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ κατὰ σπουδὴν ἐβοήθει τοῖς κινδυνεύουσι.

4, 22, 2

...ὑστερήσας δὲ τοῦ καιροῦ ἀπέστειλε βιβλιαφόρους πρὸς πάντας τοὺς συμμάχους, παρακαλῶν πέμπειν ἐκάστους παρ' αὐτῶν κατὰ σπουδὴν εἰς Κόρινθον τοὺς βουλευσομένους ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῆ συμφερόντων.

4, 30, 4-5

ὅπερ Ἀκαρνᾶνες ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις καιροῖς οὐδενὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἦττον εὐρίσκονται διατετηρηκότες, κάπερ ἀπὸ μικρᾶς ὀρμώμενοι δυνάμει. οἷς οὐκ ὀκνητέον κατὰ τὰς περιστάσεις κοινωνεῖν πραγμάτων, σπευστέον δὲ μάλλον, εἰ καὶ τισιν ἑτέροις τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

5, 4, 1

...χώρας εὐκαίρως κειμένης, ἔσπευδε χειρωσάμενος ὑφ' αὐτὸν ποιήσασθαι τὴν νῆσον.

9, 8, 3

...ὥς τῆς παρατάξεως χάριν σπεύδων εὐκαίρως τινὰς προκαταλαβέσθαι τόπους, ..

9, 8, 10

οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τούτου σπουδάζοντες μετασχεῖν τοῦ πρὸς τοὺς Θηβαίους ἀγῶνος...

21, 20, 7-8

οἱ γὰρ καιροὶ τὴν ἐκ πυρὸς βάσανον ἐμοὶ μάλλον ἢ 'κείνῳ προσήγον. Ἀντιόχου γὰρ σπουδάζοντος ἡμῖν θυγατέρα δοῦναι...

29, 19, 7-8

εἰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων χάριν ἐπρέσβευον, ἐκείνον οἰκειότερον εἶναι τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτε Περσεὺς τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων χώραν ἐπόρθει καὶ τὰς πόλεις, στρατοπεδεύων μὲν ἐν Θετταλίᾳ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ δυ' ἐνιαυτοῦς... τὸ δὲ παρέντας ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν νῦν παρεῖναι σπουδάζοντας διαλύειν τὸν πόλεμον, ὅτε παρεμβεβληκότων τῶν ἡμετέρων στρατοπέδων εἰς Μακεδονίαν συγκεκλεισμένος ὁ Περσεὺς ὀλίγας παντάπασιν ἐλπίδας εἶχε τῆς σωτηρίας,...

Testament of Naphthali (2 BC?)

2, 9ff.

οὕτως οὖν ἔστωσαν τέκνα μου πάντα τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν ... μηδὲ ἔξω καιροῦ αὐτοῦ. ὅτι εἰς τὸν ὄφθαλμόν, ἄκουε, οὐ δύνησεται οὕτως οὐδὲ ἐν σκότει οὔτε δύνασθε ποιεῖν ἔργα φωτός. μὴ οὖν σπουδάσετε ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ διαφθεῖραι τὰς πράξεις ὑμῶν, ..

Philodemus (1 BC)

περὶ οἰκονομίας col. 17, 6ff.

ἔστι γὰρ δὴ τις ἐμπειρία καὶ δύναμις καὶ περὶ χρηματισμόν, ἧς οὐ κοινωνήσει σπουδαῖος ἀνὴρ, οὐδὲ τοὺς καιροὺς παρατηρήσει, μεθ' ὧν κὰν ἡ τοιαύτη δύναμις χρησίμη γίνοιτο.

Julius Caesar (1 BC)

de bello civili 3, 79

His de causis uterque eorum celeritate studebat et suis ut esset auxilio, et ad opprimendos adversarios ne occasione temporis deesset.

5,4,5

τῆς μὲν γὰρ Κόρης τὴν καταγωγὴν ἐποιήσαντο περὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἐν ᾧ τὸν τοῦ σίτου καρπὸν τετελεσιουργῆσθαι συνέβαινε, καὶ ταύτην τὴν θυσίαν καὶ πανήγυριν μετὰ τοσαύτης ἀγνείας καὶ σπουδῆς ἐπιτελοῦσιν,...

11,65,3

διὰ δὲ ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας ἀλλοτρίως διακείμενοι, πάλαι μὲν ἔσπευδον ἄραι τὴν πόλιν, τότε δὲ καιρὸν εὔθετον ἔχειν ἐνόμιζον,...

13,45,4-5

καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν οὓς μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς πύρας ἐπέστησεν, οὓς δ' ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εὐκαίρως ἔταξεν. οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι κατὰ πολλὴν σπουδὴν καταπλεύσαντες...

13,50,3-4

οἱ δὲ Πελοποννήσιοι περιχαρεῖς ὄντες ἠκολούθουν κατὰ σπουδὴν, ὡς νικῶντες. ὁ δὲ Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐπειδὴ τῆς πόλεως αὐτοὺς ἀπέσπασε πορρωτέρω, τὸ σύσημον ἦρεν· οὐ γεννηθέντος, αἶ μετ' Ἀλκιβιάδου τριῆρεις ἐξαίφνης πρὸς ἓνα καιρὸν ἐπέστρεψαν...

13,110,4

οἳ τε γὰρ Σικελιώται διὰ τοῦ πεδίου πορευόμενοι καθυστεροῦν τῶν καιρῶν, οἳ τε μετὰ Διουσίλου μισθοφόροι μῶγῃς διεπορεύοντο τὰς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ὁδοὺς, οὐ δυνάμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν προαίρεσιν ἐπισπεύσαι.

13,111,6

... ἐπειδὴ τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἀλλοτρίους ὁ καιρὸς ἀφηρεῖτο. παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτάτοις συνήλθουν, βλέποντες παρὰ φύσιν ἀναγκαζομένους ἅμα τοῖς ἀκμάζουσιν ἐπισπεύδειν.

14,8,2

εἰώθεισαν γὰρ αἱ πόλεις αὗται κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν τριῆρεις πληροῦν οὐκ ἐλάττους ὀγδοήκοντα. ὥς τότε τοῖς Συρακοσίοις αἱ πόλεις ἀπέστειλαν, σπεύδουσαι συνεπιλαβέσθαι τῆς ἐλευθερίας.

14,52,6-7

... καὶ καταλαβόμενός τινα τόπον εὐκαιρον, παρεδέχετο τοὺς περὶ τὸν Διουσίον. οἱ δὲ Μοτυαῖοι τὸ γεγενημένον αἰσθόμενοι, παραυτίκα μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς παρεβοήθουν καὶ τῶν καιρῶν

ὑστεροῦντες οὐδὲν ἦττον ὑπέστησαν τὸν κίνδυνον.

14, 56, 1

Ἰμίλκων δὲ ... παρεσκευάζετο τὴν στρατιὰν ἀνάγειν ἐπὶ Μεσσηνίας, σπεύδων αὐτῆς κυριεύσαι διὰ τὴν εὐκαιρίαν τῶν τόπων.

14, 72, 4

καταταχοῦμενοι δ' ὑπὸ τῆς ὀξύτητος τοῦ καιροῦ, τὴν ἑαυτῶν σπουδὴν εἶχον ἄπρακτον.

14, 100, 1

... Διονύσιος σπεύδων τὴν κατὰ τὴν νῆσον δυναστείαν καὶ τοὺς κατ' Ἰταλίαν Ἕλληνας προσλαβέσθαι, τὴν μὲν κατ' ἐκείνους κοινὴν στρατείαν εἰς ἕτερον καιρὸν ἀνεβάλετο...

15, 23, 3

~~... πολλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων ἔσπευσαν εἰς τὴν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἡγεμονίαν καταλεχθῆναι. διὸ καὶ κατὰ τούτους τοὺς καιροὺς πλείστον ἴσχυσαν Λακεδαιμόνιοι,...~~

16, 46, 7-8

... διὰ τὸ πρῶτον εἶναι τοῦτο καὶ μάλιστα κείμενον εὐκαιρῶς. ἐφρούρου δὲ τὸ χωρίον στρατιῶται πεντακισχίλιοι, στρατηγούντος Φιλόφρονος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ. οἱ δὲ Θηβαῖοι σπεύδοντες ἄριστοι φανῆναι...

16, 66, 7-67, 1

οὗτος μὲν οὖν κατὰ σπουδὴν ἐτέλει τὸν εἰς Ῥήγιον πλοῦν. Καρχηδόνιοι δὲ βραχὺ πρὸ τούτων τῶν καιρῶν πυθόμενοι...

18, 17, 3

τῶν δὲ καιρῶν κατεπειγόντων ἠναγκάζοντο συγκαταβαίνειν εἰς τὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ὅλων κίνδυνον. ἐκτάξαντες δὲ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ σπεύδοντες διὰ τῶν ἱπέων κρῖναι τὸν πόλεμον, ..

18, 73, 2

... καταταχοῦμενος δ' ὑπὸ τῶν καιρῶν ἀνέξευξεν ἐκ τῆς φοινίκης καὶ διὰ τῆς κοίτης Συρίας προῆγε μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως, σπεύδων τῶν ἄνω λεγομένων σατραπειῶν ἀψασθαι.

19, 53, 1

... σπεύδων Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Πολυπέρχοντος ἐκβαλεῖν ἐκ τῆς Πελοποννήσου· οὗτος γὰρ ἦν λοιπὸς μετὰ δυνάμεως τῶν ἀντιπραττόντων, καὶ κατειλήφει πόλεις τε καὶ τόπους ἐπικαίρους.

20, 82, 1

σπεύδων αὐτοὺς ἀποσπᾶσαι τῆς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἐπιπλοκῆς, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον πρεσβευτὰς ἀπέστειλε καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς Κύπρου διεπολέμει πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον, ..

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1 BC)

Thucydides 45

ἦν δέ γε οὐχ ἡ ... εὗρεσις αὐτῆ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἀξία σπουδῆς, εἰ μὴ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν εἴη προσήκοντα καὶ τοῖς προσώποις καὶ τοῖς καιροῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν.

Demosthenes 42

νῦν δ' ἐξείργομαι, σπεύδων ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα καὶ ἅμα δόξαν ὑφορώμενος ἀκαιρίας.

Strabo (1BC - 1)

17, 3, 17

διατείνει δὲ μέχρι δεῦρο τὰ τῶν ἀμπώτεων πάθη καὶ τῶν πλημμυρίδων, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν τῶν ἰχθύων ἐπιπηδῶσιν οἱ πρόσχωροι κατὰ σπουδὴν θέοντες.

Livy (1BC - 1)

22, 39, 21

Armatus intentusque sis; neque occasione tuae desis neque suam occasionem hosti des. Omnia non properanti clara certaue erunt; festinatio improvida est et caeca.

Memnon (1)

ap. F. Jacoby FGH 3B p.345 1.22

τυγχάνει τῆς σπουδῆς, ἐν ὁμοίοις καιροῖς καὶ χρείαις τὴν ἀμοιβὴν ὑποσχόμενος.

Paul (1)

1 Thessalonians 2,17

ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀδελφοί, ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας
προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ, περισσοτέρως ἐσπουδάσαμεν τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν
ἰδεῖν ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ.

Philo (1)

Leg. 201

οὗτοι παρὰ τῶν ἐπιφοιτῶντων ἀκούοντες, ὅση σπουδῇ κέχρηται
Γάιος περὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκθέωσιν καὶ ὡς ἀλλοτριώτατα διάκειται
πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ Ἰουδαϊκὸν γένος, καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον εἰς ἐπίθεσιν
παραπεπτωκέναι νομίζοντες...

Moses 2,33

ὡς δ' ἦγον, ἐπὶ ξενίᾳ κληθέντες λόγοις ἀστείοις καὶ
σπουδαίοις τὸν ἐστιάτορα εὐώχουν ἀντεφεστιῶντες· ὁ μὲν γὰρ
ἀπεπειράτο τῆς ἐκάστου σοφίας καινὰς ἀλλ' οὐ τὰς ἐν ἔθει
ζητήσεις προτείνων, οἱ δ' εὐστόχως καὶ εὐθυβόλως, οὐκ
ἐπιτρέποντος μακρηγορεῖν τοῦ καιροῦ καθάπερ ἀποφθεγγόμενοι τὰ
προταθέντα διελύοντο.

Spec. L. I 79

... γέρας ἀνδραγαθίας καὶ φιλοθέου σπουδῆς τουτὶ λαβούσα,
καθ' ὃν καιρὸν...

1,186

ὅταν δ' ὁ τρίτος ἐνστῇ καιρὸς ἐν τῷ ἑβδόμῳ μηνὶ κατ' ἰσημερίαν
μετοπωρινήν, ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν ἱερομηνία ἄγεται προσαγορευομένη
σαλπίγγων, περὶ ἧς ἐλέχθη πρότερον, δεκάτη δ' ἡ νηστεία περὶ
ἣν ἐσπουδάκασιν...

2,23

...θαυμάζοντες τὰ μηδεμιᾶς ἀξία σπουδῆς καὶ τὰ φύσει τίμια
γελῶντες· οἷς ὁ ἱερός λόγος ὄρκον ἐν οὐ δέοντι καιρῷ
ποιούμενοις οὐ μετρίως ἐπιτιμᾷ καὶ ὄνειδίζει·

2,64

... Μωυσῆς οὐδένα καιρὸν ἀπράκτους εἶα τοὺς χρωμένους αὐτοῦ
ταῖς ἱεραῖς ὑφηγήσεσιν· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ συνέστημεν ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ
σώματος, ἀπένειμε καὶ τῷ σώματι τὰ οἰκεῖα ἔργα καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ τὰ
ἐπιβάλλοντα καὶ ἐφεδρεύειν τὰ ἕτερα τοῖς ἑτέροις
ἐσπούδασεν,...

... εἰς καιρῶν τῶν ἐτησίων γένεσιν οἷς (c.j.) τὰ πάντα τελεσφορεῖται, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις μυρία ἄλλα θαυμάσια. καὶ περιαθρήσασα κατὰ τε γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν καὶ ἄερα τάδε πάντα τῷ νῷ μετὰ σπουδῆς ἐπεδείξατο.

εἰς γὰρ τὸ ἀναπόδεικτον ἐκάτερος σπεύδειν ἔοικεν, ὃ μὲν ἵνα λάθῃ δούς, ὃ δὲ ἵνα ἀγνοῆται λαβών. ἀοράτῳ δὲ πράγματι πάντως ἀόρατος μεσιτεύει θεός, ὃν εἰκὸς ὑπὲρ ἀμφοῖν μάρτυρα καλεῖσθαι, τοῦ μὲν ὡς ἀποδώσοντας ὅταν ἀπαιτῆται, τοῦ δ' ἐν καιρῷ κομιουμένου.

πολλῶν κατὰ καιροὺς ἐπαναστάντων τῇ χώρᾳ δυναστῶν καὶ φύσει καὶ προαιρέσει χρησαμένων διαφερούσαις - οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸ ἀτίθασον ἀγριότητα θηρίων ἐκνικῆσαι σπουδάσαντες,...

... καὶ εἰ σφόδρα τοῦ πράττειν ἐπέσπευδον οἱ καιροί,...

σπουδαίοις γελοῖα ἀναμιγνύς, διὰ τὸ μὴ πεπαιδεῦσθαι τὸ ἐν καιρῷ κάλλιστον, ἠσυχίαν,...

συντείνων οὖν ἔσπευδε μηδὲν τάχους ἀνιείς, ἕως καιροφυλακῆσας...

... ὅσοι παρρησίαν ἄκαιρον (MSS. ἄπειρον) σπουδάζουσιν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι,...

... ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν σπουδασάντων, ἐπηρεῖα δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος τὴν καίριον ἐπίδειξιν ἀφαιρεθέντων.

πάσῃ σπουδῇ χρωμένους συνέχειν τὸ ἔργον, ὡς γε καιρὸς τούτου ἰδιός ἐστιν.

14,257

ἐπεὶ τὸ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβὲς καὶ ὄσιον ἐν ἅπαντι καιρῷ διὰ σπουδῆς ἔχομεν,...

15,224-5

... κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν εἰσπέμπει διαλεξόμενον. ὁ δὲ πιθανῶς ἅμα καὶ μετὰ σπουδῆς εἰσῆει,...

16,101

... ἤδεσαν, οὐκ εὐσχημονοῦντος οὐδὲ τοῦ κατὰ παρρησίαν λόγου πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν, εἰ μέλλοιεν ἐκ βίας ἀεὶ καὶ κατὰ σπουδῆν ἐλέγχειν πεπλανημένον.

.262

... εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ... σπεύδοντα ...

18,173

... ἀναστροφῆς αὐτοῖς οὐ διδομένης καιρῶν, ἐν οἷς πλήρεις οἱ προειληφότες γενόμενοι ὑποδιδοῖεν τε σπουδῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τῷ λαμβάνειν διὰ τὸ πρὶν ἐν καιρῷ γενέσθαι μεταστῆναι.

19,194

... ἀποσπεύδοντες... εἰς καιρὸν...

20,76

καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον ἐζήτουν δίκην εἰσπράξασθαι σπεύδοντες παρ' αὐτῶν.

Onasander (1)

42,20

... ὥστε... σπεύδειν ἀποτιθέμενον - οἱ γὰρ ὀξεῖς καιροὶ τὴν κοινὴν γνώμην φανεράν οὐκ ἔωσι γίγνεσθαι -

L. A. Seneca (1)

Ep. Mor. 108,24

Qui grammaticus futurus Vergilium scrutatur non hoc animo legit illud egregium Fugit irreparabile tempus: 'Vigilandum est; nisi properamus relinquemur; agit nos agiturque velox dies; inscii rapimur; omnia in futurum disponimus et inter praecipitia lenti sumus.'

Epictetus (1-2)

Ench. 33,10

εἰ δέ ποτε καιρὸς εἴη, μηδενὶ σπουδάζων φαίνου ἢ σεαυτῷ, τοῦτ' ἔστι θέλε γίνεσθαι μόνα τὰ γινόμενα καὶ νικῶν μόνον τὸν νικῶντα·

Diss 1,11,27

...ὥστ' ἐγκαλύπτεσθαι τοῦ ἵππου τρέχοντος ὡς ἐσπουδάκει, εἴτα νικήσαντός ποτε παραλόγως σπόγγων δεῆσαι αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ ἀναληφθῆναι λιποψυχοῦντα. τί οὖν τοῦτό ἐστιν; τὸ μὲν ἀκριβές οὐ τοῦ παρόντος καιροῦ τυχόν·

Dio Chrysostom (1-2)

29,9

δοκεῖ γὰρ ἔμοιγε τῇ ψυχῇ φιλονικῆσαι πρὸς τὸ σῶμα καὶ σπουδάσαι ὅπως ἂν διὰ ταύτην ἐνδοξότερος γένηται. γνοὺς οὖν τῶν πρὸς ἀνδρείαν ἔργων κάλλιστον ἅμα καὶ ἐπιπονώτατον τὴν ἀθλησιν, ἐπὶ ταύτην ἦλθεν. τῶν μὲν γὰρ πολεμικῶν ὅ τε καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν ἢ τε ἄσκησις ἐλαφρότερα.

31(14),7

τοὺς γὰρ σπουδαίους ὄντας περὶ τοὺς εὐεργέτας καὶ τοῖς ἠγαπηκόσι δικαίως χρωμένους πάντες ἠγούνται χάριτος ἀξίους καὶ βούλουτ' ἂν ἕκαστος ὠφελεῖν κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πολλοὺς ἔχειν τοὺς εὐνοοῦντας καὶ συμπράττοντας, ὅταν ἢ καιρὸς, καὶ πόλις πᾶσα καὶ ἰδιώτης ἀσφαλέστερον διάγει.

32(15),75-76

τί σφόδρα οὕτω κυκᾶσθε; τίς ἢ σπουδῆ; τίς ὁ ἀγών; οὐ γὰρ Πέλοψ ἐστὶν ὁ διώκων, οὐδ' Οἰνόμαος οὐδὲ Μυρτίλος, ὁ μὲν δευτέρος ἀπὸ Διὸς γεγονώς, ὁ δὲ Ἑρμοῦ παῖς, οὐδὲ περὶ βασιλείας οὐδὲ γυναικὸς οὐδὲ θανάτου πρόκειται κρίσις, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ ἀγών ἀνδραπόδων ὑπὲρ τοῦ τυχόντος ἀργυρίου, νῦν μὲν ἠττωμένων, νῦν δὲ νικῶντων, ἀεὶ τῶν αὐτῶν. εἰ λέγοι ταῦτα, τί ἐρεῖτε; ἢ δήλον ὅτι οὐδ' ἀκούσεσθε παρ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρόν, οὐδὲ ἂν αὐτὸς ὑμῖν ὁ τοῦ Πέλοπος διαλέγηται πρόγονος;

34,36

τὸν μέντοι γε πολιτευόμενον τῆς εὐνοίας τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ τῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν ἐπιμελείας καὶ σπουδῆς μὴ μὰ Δία καιρόν τινα, ἐξαίρετον εχειν, ..

45,3

ὣν γὰρ νῦν ἐτύχομεν, τότε ἐξῆν ταῦτα ἔχειν καὶ τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ πρὸς ἑτέρας κεχρηῆσθαι δωρεάς. ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν ὑπῆρξε παρὰ τούτου φιλανθρωπία καὶ σπουδή τοσαύτη περὶ ἡμᾶς ὄσσην...

Plutarch (1-2)

Dion 26, I

...αὐτοὶ σπεύδοντες ἀρπάσαι τὸν καιρὸν,

Romulus 8,1

αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν σκάφην κομίζων ἐχώρει πρὸς τὸν Νομήτορα, σπουδῆς καὶ δέους μεστὸς ὣν διὰ τὸν καιρὸν.

Demetrios 42,1

ἡ γὰρ οὐ παρεῖχε καιρὸν ἐντυχεῖν, ἢ χαλεπὸς ἦν καὶ τραχὺς ἐντυγχάνουσι. Ἀθηναίων μὲν γάρ, περὶ οὓς ἐσπουδάκει μάλιστα τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἔτη δύο πρεσβείαν κατέσχεν.

Μοτ: 68CD

ἡ δὲ παρρησία σπουδῆν ἐχέτω καὶ ἦθος. ἂν δ' ὑπὲρ μειζόνων ἦ, καὶ πάθει καὶ σχήματι καὶ τῶν φωνῆς ὁ λόγος ἀξιόπιστος ἔστω καὶ κινητικός. ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ἐν παντὶ μὲν παρεθεὶς μεγάλα βλάπτει, μάλιστα δὲ τῆς παρρησίας διαφθείρει τὸ χρήσιμον.

139F

οὐκοῦν καὶ γυνὴ φαῦλος καὶ ἀκαιρος ἢ παίζειν μὲν ὠρμημένου καὶ φιλοφρονεῖσθαι τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐσκυθρωπακῦα σπουδάζοντος δε παίζουσα καὶ γελῶσα.

147F

οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἀγγεῖον ἡκεὶ κομίζων ἑαυτὸν ἐμπλήσαι πρὸς τὸ δεῖπνον ὁ νοῦν ἔχων, ἀλλὰ καὶ σπουδάσαι τι καὶ παίξαι καὶ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ εἰπεῖν ὡς ὁ καιρὸς παρακαλεῖ τοὺς συνόντας, εἰ μέλλουσι μετ' ἀλλήλων ἠδέως ἔσεσθαι.

804C

Κάτων δέ, περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἠλπιζε πείσειν τῷ προκατέχεσθαι χάρισι καὶ σπουδαῖς τὸν δῆμον ἢ τὴν βουλὴν, ἔλεγε τὴν ἡμέραν ὅλην ἀναστὰς καὶ τὸν καιρὸν οὕτως ἐξεκρουε.

Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta 3,160 (?)

τὸν δὲ σπουδαῖον... ὄντα... εὐκαιρον

Ignatius (2)

Ep. to Polycarp 3,2

πλέον σπουδαῖος γίνου οὐ εἶ. τοὺς καιροὺς καταμάθανε, τὸν ὑπὲρ καιρὸν προσδόκα,...

Isaiah (Aquila (2))

60,22

ἐγὼ κύριος κατὰ καιρὸν ἐπισπεύσω αὐτήν.

Ps. - Barnabas (2)

4,9

...γράφειν ἐσπούδασα, περίψημα ὑμῶν, διὸ προσέχωμεν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. οὐδὲν γὰρ ὠφελήσει ἡμᾶς ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς πλίστεως ἡμῶν, ἐὰν μὴ νῦν ἐν τῷ ἀνόμῳ καιρῷ καὶ τοῖς μέλλουσιν σκανδάλοις, ὡς πρέπει υἱοῖς Θεοῦ, ἀντιστῶμεν,...

Solinus (2) 26,4

Lucinae illis properatius tempus est: quippe uterum trigesimus dies liberat.

Galen (2)

De totius morbi temporibus 7

εἰθ' ἐξῆς ἐκάστου τοὺς ιδίους ἐπίσκεψαι καιροὺς ἀναγκαίους ὑπάρχοντας εἰς τὴν τῶν βοηθημάτων εὔρεσιν, ἧς ἔνεκα ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ὁ δὲ σπουδάζεται.

Ps. - Lucian (? 2)

Amores 33

ἐπειδὴ δὲ αἱ μὲν ἐσπευσμένοι χρεῖαι πέρασ εἶχον, οἱ δὲ τῶν ἐπιγιγνομένων ἀεὶ λογισμοὶ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἀφεθέντες ἠυκαίρου ἐπινοεῖν τι τῶν κρειττόνων, ἐκ τούτου κατ' ὀλίγον ἐπιστήμαι συνηύξοντο.

Lucian (2)

Quomodo historia conscribenda sit 49

καὶ πρὸς πάντα σπεύδεται καὶ ὡς δυνατόν ὁμοχρονεῖτω καὶ μεταπετέσθω ἀπ' Ἀρμενίας μὲν εἰς Μηδίαν, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ῥοιζήματι ἐνὶ εἰς Ἰβηρίαν, εἶτα εἰς Ἰταλίαν, ὡς μηδενὸς καιροῦ ἀπολείποιτο.

De Vera Historia 1,1

ὥσπερ φροντὶς... τῆς κατὰ καιρὸν γινομένης ἀγέσεως -...- οὕτως δὴ καὶ τοῖς περὶ τοὺς λόγους ἐσπουδακόσιν ἡγοῦμαι προσήκειν μετὰ τὴν πολλὴν τῶν σπουδαιότερων ἀνάγνωσιν ἀνιέναι τε τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἔπειτα κάματον ἀκμαιότεραν παρασκευάζειν.

Acts of John (2) 58 (v.1.)

ἀδελφοί, ἤδη με ὁ καιρὸς ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐπανελθεῖν ἐπισπεύδει.

Julius Pollux (2)

1,43

λέγε δὲ περὶ τοῦ μὴ βραδύνοντος, ἔτοιμος, πρόχειρος, πρόθυμος, ἄοκνος, ταχύς, ὄξύς, ἐντονός, ἐνεργός, ἀπροφάσιτος, τῷ καιρῷ χρῶμενος, ἐγρηγορῶς, σπουδαίος, οὐδὲν ὑπερτιθέμενος, οὐδὲν ὑπερβαλλόμενος.

1,112

ὑπαινίττεται δέ τι τοιοῦτον καὶ τὸ Ξενοφώντειον, τὸ σπουδάζοντος τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἄρα τὸ πνεῖν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀνεμον οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὡς εἰς ἀναγωγὴν καιρὸν εἶναι.

Babrius (2)

Fabula 88,11-12

οὕτω καιρός ἐστὶ νῦν φεύγειν·
ὅς γὰρ φίλοις πέποιθεν οὐκ ἄγαν σπεύδει.

Irenaeus (3/5?)

Haer. 3,16,7

Nihil enim incomptum atque intempestivum apud eum, quomodo nec incongruens est apud patrem. Praecognita sunt enim omnia a patre, perficiuntur autem a filio, sicut congruum et consequens est, apto tempore. Propter hoc properante Maria ad admirabile vini signum et ante tempus volente participare compendii poculo, dominus repellens eius intempestivam festinationem dixit:...

Herodian (3)

1,4,2-3

νῦν δὲ καιρὸς εὐκαιρος ἐμοί τε αἰσθῆσθαι μὴ μάτην ἐς ὑμᾶς τοσοῦτου χρόνου τιμὴν τε καὶ σπουδὴν κατατεθείσθαι,...

2,11,1

συντόνῳ δὲ σπουδῇ καὶ γενναίοις πόνοις τὴν ὁδὸν ἐπετάχυνε, μήτε που ἐνδιατρίβων, μήτε διδοὺς καιρὸν ἀναπαύλης,...

P. Flor. 3,338 l.8ff. (3)

ἄλλον γὰρ σπουδαῖον οὐκ ἔχωμεν μετὰ τούτου, ὥστε, ἀδελφέ, σπουδάσον καὶ νῦν τάχα ἢ σὴ σπουδῇ καὶ φιλοστοργείᾳ κατανεικίση τὴν ἐμὴν... ακαίρειαν.

Origen (3)

fr. 19 on Luke

προακούσας ἐράσμιον πρᾶγμα ὁ Ζαχαρίας ἐαυτῷ μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι οὐκ ἔσπευσε πρὸ καιροῦ δραμεῖν πρὸς τὸ δοῦναι ὁδὸν τῇ προφητείᾳ, ...

fr. 500 in Comm. in Matthew

αἱ δὲ ἀμελεῖς μωραί, τὸν προσήκοντα καιρὸν ἀναλώσασαι εἰς τὴν τῶν ματαίων σπουδὴν.

ap. catenam in Ps. 119,30 (SC 189 p. 240)

τὸν στίχον τούτου ἐρεῖ μόνος ὁ καταφρονῶν μὲν τῶν βλεπομένων ὡς προσκαίρων, σκοπῶν δὲ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα ὡς αἰώνια καὶ μόνα κυρίως ἀληθῆ, καὶ ἐπ' ἐκεῖνα σπεύδων.

c. Celsum 3,47

τὰ δὲ μετατιθέντα τὴν ψυχὴν ... διδάσκοντα καταφρονεῖν μὲν ὡς προσκαίρων πάντων τῶν αἰσθητῶν καὶ βλεπομένων σπεύδειν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ἀόρατα καὶ σκοπεῖν τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα,...

Philostratus (3 or 4)

VS 1,21 (LCL p.80)

καὶ τὸν μεθ' ἡμέραν καιρὸν ἤττον ἐσπούδαζεν,...

2,1 (LCL p.160)

ἄξιον δὲ μηδὲ τοῦτο παρελθεῖν λόγου παρὰ τοῖς σπουδαίοις ἀξιούμενον· ἦν μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς φανεροῖς σπουδαῖος ἄνθρωπος οὗτος, Μουσωνίῳ δὲ τῷ Τυρίῳ προσφιλοσοφῆσας εὐσκόπως εἶχε τῶν ἀποκρίσεων καὶ τὸ ἐπίχαρι σὺν καιρῷ ἐπετήδευεν,

2,10 (LCL p.222)

παραδεδωκότος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς γνωρίμοις τὸ μηδὲ τὸν τοῦ πότου καιρὸν ἀνιέναι, ἀλλὰ κάκεῖ τι ἐπισπουδάσειν,...

Aristides Quintilianus (3 or 4)

2,5 (p.58 Winnington-Ingram)

... τὴν θεραπείαν προσάγειν ἔδει χρησίμους ἐν καιρῷ σπουδῆς τοὺς πολίτας ἀπεργαζομένους.

Didymus the Blind (4)

On Genesis 4,25

οὐ τοῦ παρόντος δὲ καιροῦ τὴν δυσσεβὴ τὰύτην διελέγξαι αἵρεσιν, ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος μηκύνεται σ[...]νομεθα δὲ καὶ τὸν λόγον τῆς Εὐας ὡς μαρτυρίαν εἶναι τοῦ τρόπου τοῦ Σήθ. ἀντὶ γὰρ σπουδαίου τοῦ Ἄβελ οὗτος ἐρμηνευόμενος 'ποτισμός'.

4,19-22

τὸ παλαιὸν οὐκ ἔδοκεῖ παράνομον εἶναι οὐδὲ τοῖς σπουδαίοις δύο γυναίκας ἔχειν· τῆς διαδοχῆς γὰρ καὶ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἀνθρώπων καιρὸς ἦν.

Themistius (4)

Oratio 7 (p.128 Schenkl-Downey)

... τοῦ καιροῦ μάλλον τυγχάνειν τῶν λίαν ε̅σπουδακότων.

Gregory of Nazianzus (4)

Oratio 4,79 (SC 309, p. 202)

Τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα τοῖς βουλομένοις ἱστορεῖν τε καὶ γράφειν παρήσω, τοῦ λόγου σπεύδοντος, πολλοῖς δὲ οἶμαι σπουδασθήσεσθαι τοῦ τότε καιροῦ τὴν εἴτε τραγωδίαν ἢ λέγειν εἴτε κωμωδίαν, οἷς μέρος εὐσεβείας δόξει λόγῳ βάλλειν τὸν ἀλιτήριον ὡς καὶ τοῖς ἐπειτα παραδοθῆναι πρᾶγμα τοσοῦτον καὶ ἥκιστα τοῦ λαθεῖν ἄξιον.

27,3 (SC 250, p.76)

Δεῖ γὰρ τῷ ὄντι σχολάσαι, καὶ γινῶναι θεόν, καὶ "ὅταν λάβωμεν καιροῦ, κρίνειν" θεολογίας εὐθύτητα. Τίσι δέ; Οἷς τὸ πρᾶγμα διὰ σπουδῆς, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἐν τι τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τοῦτο φλυαρεῖται ἡδέως, μετὰ τοὺς ἱππικούς, καὶ τὰ θεάτρα, καὶ τὰ ἄσματα, καὶ τὴν γαστέρα, καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γαστέρα.

John Chrysostom (4)

Homily 4,3 in Uzziah (SC 277, p. 154f.)

Ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τὰ χρεᾶ καὶ τὴν καταβολὴν σπεύδωμεν. "Καὶ ἐγένετο τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, οὗ ἀπέθανεν Ὀζίας ὁ βασιλεὺς." Μέλλω λέγειν διὰ τί ὁ προφήτης ἐπισημαίνεται τὸν καιρὸν. ἐζητοῦμεν γὰρ χθές, τί δῆποτε τῶν προφητῶν ἀπάντων τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ζωῆς τῶν βασιλέων εἰωθότων λέγειν, καὶ αὐτοῦ τούτου, ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἔθος ἐλύθη.

Eusebius (4)

HE 5,1,6

οἱ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ὀλίγα ἠγούμενοι ε̅σπευδον πρὸς Χριστόν, ὄντως ἐπιδειχνύμενοι, ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς.

Makarios/Symeon (4)

18,1,5

καὶ πολλοῦ δεῖται καιροῦ καὶ πόνου καὶ ἐργασίας καὶ σπουδῆς
καὶ πίστεως...

Athanasius (4)

Life of Anthony praef.

ἔπειδὴ δὲ γὰρ καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν πλῶϊμων συνέκλειε καὶ ὁ
γραμματοφόρος ἔσπευδε. διὰ τοῦτο ἄπερ αὐτός τε γινώσκω
(πολλάκις γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐώρακα), καὶ ἅ μαθεῖν ἠδυνήθη παρ'
αὐτοῦ, ἀκολουθήσας αὐτῷ χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον, καὶ ἐπιχέων ὕδωρ
κατὰ χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, γράψαι τῇ εὐλαβείᾳ ὑμῶν ἐσπούδασα.

Apollinaris (4)

ap. catenam in Ps. 119.111 (SC 189, p. 370)

ἔπέτεινε τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς περὶ νόμον σπουδῆς, ὅποτε κληρὸν
ἴδιον ἔφη τεθεῖσθαι τὸν νόμον, οὐ πρὸς καιρὸν, ἀλλ' εἰς
ἅπαν,...

Libanius (4)

Epistula 99,3 (T.)

οὐ γὰρ τούτων γε Ὀλύμπιος, ἀλλ', εἴπερ τις, ἀγαθὸς χάριτός τε
ἀπομνημονεῦσαι καὶ τηρῆσαι καιρὸν ἀμοιβῶν καὶ σπεύσαι
λαμπρότερον ἀποδοῦναι.

402,3 (T.)

ἔπειθ' ἐκόντες ἐπανήκαμεν τῆς σπουδῆς, τελευτῶντες δὲ πρὸς
τοῦναντιον χρώμεθα τῇ σπουδῇ καιρὸν εἶναί σοι νομίζοντες κατὰ
χώραν μένειν.

1321,3 (T.)

ἴσως μὲν οὖν ἀπὸ τοιαύτης σπουδῆς γένοιτ' ἂν τι καὶ τέλος
οἶον ἐθέλεις. εἰ δ' οὖν ἰσχυρότερος ὁ δαίμων εἴη - καίτοι
θαυμαστόν εἰ μὴ περιέσῃ τοῦ καιροῦ - εἰ δ' οὖν μείζων ὁ
κλύδων τῆς τέχνης, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς γέ σου τὴν προαίρεσιν
ἀνάγραπτον ἐξομεν.

σὺ δ' ἐν μὲν ὁμοίοις αὐτῷ μὴ βοηθήσῃς καιροῖς, μηδὲ γὰρ γένοιτο καιρὸς παραπλήσιος· τὰς δὲ ἐν τῇ γαλήνῃ τιμὰς οἶδ' ὅτι πάσας τιμήσεις πάλαι ταύτην μεμελετηκῶς μελέτην ἤδεσθαι ταῖς σπουδαῖς αἷς ἂν περὶ τοὺς δεξιούς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐπιδείξῃ.

Julian of Cilicia (4?)

On Job 33,12-13

τοιαῦτα ἐφθέγξω τραχέα ταχῦναι σπουδάζων τὴν ἀπόκρισιν παρ' αὐτοῦ. συγγνοὺς ὅτι καιρὸν αὐτὸς οἶδεν, ..

Basil (4)

Moralia, Reg. 13,2

ὅτι δεῖ πάντα καιρὸν εὐθετον ἡγεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν σπουδὴν τῶν ἀρεσκόντων τῷ θεῷ.

Vegetius (4)

3,6

Si adversariorum imperitia vel dissimulatio occasionem nobis dederit, non oportet omitti sed explorare sollicite...

3,11

hoc ergo tempus est quo tanto magis duces debent esse solliciti...

Asterius of Amasea (4-5)

Homily 10,6

πάντες δὲ καιροὶ κρείττονα τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς δώρων καὶ βλαστημάτων τὰ τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν τοῖς ἐορτάζουσι χαρίζονται διηγήματα. ὡς εἴ τις ἦν σπουδαῖος τῶν μαρτύρων φίλος, ἔθετο δὲ φροντίδα τοῖς τῶν ὄλων πανηγυρίζειν πάθειν, οὐκ ἂν ἡμέραν παρήλθεν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἀνεόρταστον.

10,8

οὐκ ἄμισθον δὲ τὴν εἰς αὐτοὺς σπουδὴν ἐπιδειχνύμεθα, ἀλλὰ τῆς προστασίας αὐτῶν τῆς πρὸς θεὸν ἀπολαύομεν. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐκ

ἀρκεῖ ἢ ἡμετέρα εὐχὴ δυσωπῆσαι θεὸν ἐν καιρῷ ἀνάγκης ἢ συμφορᾶς - ἢ γὰρ δέησις ἡμῶν οὐ παράκλησις ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτημάτων ὑπόμνησις - , διὰ τοῦτο τοῖς ἀγαπωμένοις παρὰ τοῦ δεσπότητος ὁμοδούλοις προσφεύγομεν, ἵν' ἐκεῖνοι ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις κατορθώμασι τὰ ἡμέτερα θεραπεύσωσι πλημμελήματα. ποῖον οὖν ἔγκλημα, ὅτι τιμῶντες μάρτυρας καὶ αὐτοὶ σπουδάζομεν ἀρέσκειν θεῷ ;

12

μικρὸν καρτερίσας κατάλιπε βίον πρόσκαιρον καὶ σπεῦσον πρὸς ζωὴν τὴν αἰδίου καὶ ἀτέλεστον.

Jerome (4-5)

ep. 85,4

ἄκαιροσπουδασταί

Cyriil (4-5)

Comm. in John 5,1

οὐκοῦν ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐν ἡμῖν τὰ ἐκ τῶν καιρῶν μετὰ τοὺς καιρούς, παροῦσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς μὴ ἐπινυστάξωμεν, ἐρηγορῶμεν δὲ μᾶλλον, καὶ μὴ ὅτε τὸ ζητεῖν ἀνωφελές, τὸ θηρᾶσθαι τὸ ὠφελοῦν ἀσυνέτως σπουδάζωμεν.

10,2

ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀποδημεῖ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, τὴν τῶν ἔσεσθαι προσδοκωμένων ἀπαραίτητον ἀφίξιν ἐξηγεῖται χρησίμως καὶ ἐν καιρῷ τῷ πρέποντι. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς τὸ τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦ πρέποντος μὴ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐσπουδασταί, πῶς οὐκ ἂν μᾶλλον ἀρέσαι θεῷ; καιρος οὖν ἄρα σιωπῆς ἦν ἐν ἀρχαῖς, οὐπω τοῦ κρῆναι μαθεῖν ὡς ἐξ ἀνάγκης εἰσβαίνοντος.

Comm. in Haggai 1,2

ἄλλ' οἷον ἐπιμειδιῶν ἀναπίπτουσιν οὐκ ἐν καιρῷ πρὸς τὸ ῥάθυμον καὶ ὧν ἦν εἰκὸς ἐσπουδασμένην ποιεῖσθαι φροντίδα, τούτων αὐτῶν οὐ μετρίως ἠφειδηκόσιν.

Thalassius (?) (5)

Cramer's Catena 1,209

ὁ δὲ σπουδῆν παρεχόμενος εἰς τὸ χρᾶσθαι τῷ τῆς διδασκαλίας χαρίσματι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πλησίου ὠφέλειαν, πλείονα ἐπισπάσεται

καὶ τὴν δωρεάν. ἀκούσωμεν τοίνυν τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων· καὶ ὡς ἔστι καιρός, ἐργασώμεθα τὴν σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν, καὶ λάβωμεν ἔλαιον δαμιλῆς εἰς τὰς λαμπάδας, καὶ εἰς ὅπερ ἐλάβομεν τάλαντον, τουτέστι χάρισμα, ἐπεργασώμεθα, τοὺς πλησίον ἀόκνως παρακαλοῦντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν· καὶ εἰς προστασίαν σπουδαῖοι γινόμενοι· ἂν γὰρ ὀκνήσαντες ἐνταῦθα ἐν ἀργίᾳ διάγωμεν, οὐδεὶς ἡμᾶς ἐλεήσει λοιπὸν ἐκεῖ, κἂν μυρῖα θρηνώμεν.

Hephaestio (5)

Epitoma 1,165,4 (T. vol.2 p.39)

εἰ δὲ σπουδῇ ἐπῆ, μὴ συντρέχουσι δὲ πάντα τὰ προειρημένα, χρηστέον τοῖς πλείοσι καὶ κατὰ καιρὸν δυνατοῖς.

Petrus Chrysologus (5)

Serm. 112,1

Magnum divinae scientiae desiderantibus nosse secretum, noster sermo non sufficit, qui ad praesens festinationi deservit et tempori.

Socrates (5)

HE 3,20

Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ καιροῦ δράξασθαι πάλαι ἐπιθυμοῦντες, ἐν ᾧ τὸ ἱερὸν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὸ θθεῖν ἀνοικοδομηθήσεται, τότε σπουδαῖοι μὲν πρὸς τὸ ἔργον ἐγίνοντο.

Agathias Scholasticus (6)

Anth. Pal. 9,769

δεῖ γὰρ μήτε πονεῖν ἐν ἀθύρμασι, μήτε τι, παίζειν ἐν σπουδῇ· καιρῷ δ' ἴσθι νέμειν τὸ πρέπον.

Anth. Plan. 16,332

ὅς δὲ σοφοῖς μύθοις καὶ πλάσμασι καίρια λέξας, παίζων ἐν σπουδῇ, πείθει ἐχεφρονέειν.

Justinian (6, but this law dates from 473)

Code 4,59,1,1 (p.186 Krueger)

ἢ τοὺς κατὰ καιρὸν περιβλέπτους βεφερενδαρίους ἀπειράτους βασιλικῆς κινήσεως καταλείψομεν, εἰ τοῦ λοιποῦ τοιαύτας τινας προσδέξωνται δεήσεις ἢ τοιούτω τινὶ σπουδῇ συνεισενέγκοιεν ἢ ὑπαγορεύοντες ἢ ὑποσημαίνοντες ἢ συγγεστίουσιν κεχρημένοι ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ ῥοπήν ἢ χρεῖαν συνεισφέροντες.

Antiochus of Mar Saba (7)

Homily 87 (PG 89.1700D)

ἢ κατὰ θεὸν σπουδῇ ἐν πάντι καιρῷ καὶ πράγματι καλὴ ἐστίν.

Photius (9)

Epistula 1,8,105

πολλοὺς ἔβλαψεν εὐτραπελία· ἀπὸ γὰρ γνώμης διεκπεσοῦσα παιζούσης, καιρία πληγὴ γέγονε τοῖς διαπαιχθείσι καὶ βραχεία τέρπει τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων, μεγάλας ἔτεχεν ἔχθρας τῶν σπουδαίων.

Suda (10)

3,84

καιρὸς· Ἀριστοφάνης· καιρὸς γάρ, ὅπερ ἀνδράσι μέγιστος ἔργου παντὸς ἐστ' ἐπιστάτης. ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐφ' ἐκάστου πράγματος τὸ καίριον καὶ χρησιμώτατον ὁ καιρὸς ἐστίν· ὅπου καὶ τὰ σπουδαία παρὰ καιρὸν γινόμενα οὐκ ἀποδέχονται.

Symeon the New Theologian (11)

Theological and Ethical Treatises 12 (SC 129, pp. 388-90)

οὐχὶ οἱ ἐμπορευσάμενοι μὲν τὸν καιρὸν ἐξηγοράσαντο ἐν σπουδῇ, τὰ τῷ καιρῷ πρέποντα ἐργασάμενοι καὶ κέρδος ἐκεῖθεν ἑαυτοῖς περιποίησάμενοι, ὁ δὲ περιεργαζόμενος τὰ ἀλλότρια καὶ μὴ πραγματευσάμενος, εἰ καὶ συνῆν αὐτοῖς, ἐζημιώθη τὸν καιρὸν, μηδὲν ἐκ τοῦ εὐρηθῆναι εἰς τὴν πανήγυριν ὠφεληθεῖς; Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι μὲν αὐθις τῇ προσδοκίᾳ τοῦ κέρδους καὶ ληστῶν ἐφόδου καὶ κόπου ὁδοιπορίας καὶ μακρᾶς ὁδοῦ καταφρονουῖσιν, ὁ δὲ, φόβῳ τούτων βαλλόμενος, κἂν ὑπὸ πάντων παρακαλῆται

συνοδοιπορήσαι αὐτοῖς, καὶ ὑποσχομένους φυλάττειν αὐτὸν ἀκούη
ἀπὸ τῶν προσδοκομένων αὐτῷ κακῶν, οὐ προαιρεῖται ἀκολουθήσαι
αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπελθεῖν πραγματεύσασθαι μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ
πανηγύρει, οὐχι οἱ μὲν καιρὸν ἐξηγοράσαντο, καλῶς
πραγματευσάμενοι καὶ κερδήσαντες, ὁ δὲ τοῦτον ἀφρόνως
ἐζημιώθη, φοβηθεὶς ἐκεῖ φόβον οὐ οὐκ ἦν φόβος;

Οὕτω τοιγαροῦν ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπὶ πάσῃ πράξει καὶ ἐργασίᾳ
πνευματικῇ. Ὅταν γὰρ ἄλλοι ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς πορεύωνται τοῦ
Θεοῦ καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς πᾶσας μετὰ σπουδῆς καὶ θερμῆς ἐργάζωνται,
ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν ἀμελείᾳ καὶ ἀργίᾳ διάγωμεν, ἐκεῖνοι μὲν
ἐξηγοράσαντο τὸν καιρὸν καὶ τὰ μέγιστα ὠφελήθησαν, ἡμεῖς δὲ
καὶ ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἀπώλεσαμεν. Ἄλλα γὰρ ἔτι τὸ νόημα
ἐξετάσωμεν. Τί οὖν φησιν·

Eustathius (12)

Comm. in Iliad 1,258

διδάσκει ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ ἐνταῦθα, ὡς ψεύσεται ποτε κατὰ καιρὸν
ὁ σπουδαῖος, καθάπερ ὁ Νέστωρ ἐνταῦθα.

(b) ΚΑΙΡΟΣ AND ΟΚΝΟΣ

Hippocrates (?) (5 BC)

Precepts 2

μη οκνεῖν δὲ παρὰ ἰδιωτέων ἱστορεῖν, ἢν τι δοκῆ συνοίσειν ἐς καιρὸν θεραπείης.

Sophocles (5 BC)

Electra 21-22

ἴν' οὐκετ' οκνεῖν καιρός, ὡς ἐνταῦθ' ἔμην
ἀλλ' ἔργων ἀκμή.

Hyperides (4 BC)

6,4

... οὔτε ὁ καιρός ἀμόττων τῷ μακρολογεῖν οὔτε ῥάδιον ἔνα
όντα τοσαύτας καὶ τηλικαύτας πράξεις διεξελεῖν καὶ
μνημονεύσαι. ἐπὶ κεφαλαίου δὲ οὐκ οκνήσω εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῆς.

Demosthenes (4 BC)

60, 6

τὰ δ' εἰς ἀνδρείαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν πάντα μὲν κατοκνῶ
λέγειν, φυλαττόμενος μὴ μῆκος ἀκαιρον ἐγγένηται τῷ λόγῳ.

Proem 38, 2

οὐς, ἐὰν ἀκαιρως δυσκολαίνητε, οκνεῖν ἀνίστασθαι ποιήσετε.

Theocritus (?) (3 BC)

1d. 25, 65-67

ἄψ δ' ὄκνω ποτὶ χεῖλος ἐλάμβανε μῦθον ἴοντα,
μὴ τί οἷ οὐ κατὰ καιρὸν ἔπος προτιμυθῆσαι το
σπερχομένου.

Ps. - Plato (3 BC ?)

Definitions 416a 3-6

ὄκνος φυγῆ πόνων δειλία ἀντιληπτικὴ ὀρμῆς. ...
καιρός ἐν ᾧ ἕκαστον ἐπιτήδειον παθεῖν ἢ ποιῆσαι.

Polybius (2 BC)

4.30, 4-5

ὅπερ Ἀκαρνανῆες ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις καιροῖς οὐδενὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἦπτον εὐρίσκονται διατετηρηκότες, καίπερ ἀπὸ μικρᾶς ὀρμώμενοι δυνάμεως. οἷς οὐκ ὀκνητέον ... σπευστέον δὲ ...

Philodemus (1 BC)

περὶ ὀργῆς p. 66f. (Wilke)

ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις καὶ τοῖς ἀναλόγοις καιροῖς γ' ο[ὐκ εἶ]ναι προσφέρεσθαι χω[ρὶς] ὀργῆς, ἢ θαρρεῖν ποιε[ῖν] καὶ πάντα ὄκνον ἀφα[ι]ρεῖται καὶ δειλίαν κα[ὶ] ἀνικῆτως ποιεῖ μέχρ[ι] καὶ θανάτου μένειν.

Ecclesiastes (1 BC?)

10, 17-18

μακαρία σύ, γῆ, ἧς ὁ βασιλεὺς σου υἱὸς ἐλευθέρων,
καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες σου πρὸς καιρὸν φαγονται, ἐν δυνάμει καὶ
οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσονται.
ἐν ὀκνηρίαις ταπεινωθήσεται ἡ δόκωσις,
καὶ ἐν ἀργίᾳ χειρῶν στάξει ἡ οἰκία.

Josephus (1)

BJ 1, 375

ὅτε γὰρ ἐθρασύνεσθε πέρα τοῦ δέοντος καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν παρὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην ἐξωρμήσατε, καιρὸν ἔσχεν ἡ Ἀθηνίωνος ἐνέδρα· νυνὶ δὲ ὁ ὄκνος ὑμῶν καὶ τὸ δοκοῦν ἄθυμον ἀσφάλειαν ἐμοὶ νίκης ἐγγυᾶται.

AJ 19, 70

τοῖς ἀμφὶ τὸν Χαιρέαν ὑπερβολαὶ τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἦσαν ὀκνούντων πολλῶν. οὐ γὰρ Χαιρέας ἐκὼν εἶναι τοῦ πράσσειν ἀναβολὴν ἐποιεῖτο, πάντα καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον τῇ πράξει νομίζων.

Philo (1)

Virt. 16-17

εἰρηκῶς δ' ὅσα καιρος παλιλογεῖν οὐ δικαίῳ. τοὺς μὲντοι μὴ ἀποκνοῦντας ἀλλὰ διὰ σπουδῆς τιθεμένους ἐντυγχάνειν ταῖς πρὸ τούτων βίβλοις δεῖ νοῆσαι, ...

83

καὶ προτρέπει μὴ διὰ τούτ' ἀναδύεσθαι καὶ συμβάλλειν οκνηρότερον, ἀλλ' ἀνειμέναις χερσὶ καὶ γνώμαις μάλιστα μὲν χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς δεομένοις, λογιζομένους ὅτι καὶ ἡ χάρις τρόπον τινὰ δάνειόν ἐστιν, ἀποδοθησόμενον ἐν καιρῷ βελτίονι <ἀνευ> ἀνάγκης ἐκουσίῳ διαθέσει τοῦ λαβόντος, ...

Mos. 1, 321

ὁ δὲ νομίσας αὐτοὺς ἢ προεδρία τὴν διανομὴν τά τε γέρα πρὸ καιροῦ λαμβάνειν ἀξιούν ἢ πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας πολέμους ἀποκνεῖν, ...

Plutarch (1-2)

Mor. 804 A

ὄξεις γὰρ οἱ καιροὶ καὶ πολλὰ φέροντες ἐν ταῖς πολιτείαις αἰφνίδια. διὸ καὶ Δημοσθένης ἠλαττούτο πολλῶν, ὡς φασί, παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἀναδυόμενος καὶ κατοκνῶν.

Dio Chrysostom (1-2)

1 (1), 31

τίς μὲν γὰρ ἀοκνότερος πονεῖν, ὅταν τούτου καιρὸς ᾗ, φίλου;

2 (2), 2

ἐνίοτε μὲν οὖν ταράττουσιν ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ, διὰ τὴν νεότητα καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν φθερχόμενοι πρὸ τοῦ καιροῦ καὶ τὸ θηρίον ἀνιστάντες ἐνίοτέ <γε> μὴν εἶλον αὐτοὶ προπηδήσαντες. τοιαῦτα ἐκεῖνος ἔπασχε τὸ πρῶτον, ὥστε καὶ τῆς ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχης τε καὶ νίκης φασὶν αὐτὸν αἴτιον γενέσθαι, τοῦ πατρὸς οκνοῦντος τὸν κίνδυνον.

44 (27), 10

... ὅταν ᾗ καιρός, οὐκ οκνήσω παρακαλεῖν.

Aelius Aristides (2)

Leuctrikos E (Dindorf 1.698)

ἀλλ' εἰ τῶν ἄλλων οὕτω προνοεῖσθε, ὥστ' εἰ καὶ πολεμεῖν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δεοί μὴ κατοκνεῖν, πῶς οὐχ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν γε αὐτῶν μέχρι τοῦ μὴ κινδυνεύσαι παρὰ καιρὸν προνοήσεσθε;

Julius Pollux (2)

1, 43

λέγε δὲ περὶ τοῦ μὴ βραδύνοντος ἔτοιμος, ... ἄοκνος, ... τῷ καιρῷ χρώμενος, ἐρηγορῶς, σπουδαῖος, ...

1, 178-179

περὶ στρατηγοῦ - ἀγαθοῦ καὶ μὴ τοιούτου: ὀκνηρός ... τοὺς καιροὺς παριείς, ..

Vettius Valens (2)

Anthologiae 7, 3, 53 (Teubner p. 259)

ἀλλ' ὅμως, ἐὰν μετὰ ἀκριβείας τις ζητῇ, οὐ διαφνευθήσεται τῆς δωρεᾶς ἢ καὶ τοιαύτης τιμῆς καταξιωθήσεται ὅσην οἱ τῶν καιροφίλων τις ἐδήλου κατὰ τὴν τῆς γενέσεως ὑπόστασιν. ταῦτα δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔμμαντοῦ πεπειρακῶς ἐδήλωσα ὥστε οὐ δεῖ μέμφεσθαι τοὺς χρόνους οὔτε ἔμμαντῶ οὔτε τῇ προγνώσει, ἀλλὰ καταμαθόντα τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γενέσεως συστρατεύεσθαι τοῖς καιροῖς γενναίως καὶ ἀλύπως (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀνύει μοχθηρῶς διαγων καὶ ἐτέρων τύχαις ἐξισουῖσθαι βουλόμενος ἑαυτόν), ἔχειν δὲ κατὰ νοῦν τὸ τοιούτον·

ἄγου δέ μ' ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ σύ γ' ἡ πεπρωμένη
ἔποι ποθ' ὑμῖν εἶμι διατεταχμένος,
ὡς ἔψομαί γ' ἄοκνος. ἀν δὲ μὴ θέλω,
κακὸς γενόμενος αὐτὸ τοῦτο πείσομαι,

Ps. Lucian (2 ?)

Amores 31-32

ὅμως τὰληθες οὐ προδώσομεν, εἴξαντες, ὀκνω. μόνον ἡμῖν σύ, δαῖμον οὐράνιε, καιρίως παραστήθι φιλίας εὐγνωμων, ...

Ps. Lucian (2 ?)

Demosthenis Encomium 37

ὡς εἰ τοῦτον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὅπλων ἀπέφηναν καὶ νεῶν καὶ στρατοπέδων καὶ καιρῶν καὶ χρημάτων κύριον, ὀκνῶ μὴ περὶ τῆς Μακεδονίας ἂν κατέστησέ μοι τὸν λόγον, ...

Dionysius (3 ?)

Ixeuticon seu De Aucupio 1,6

... ἕτεροι δὲ ἀργότατοι καὶ πρὸς τὰς πτήσεις ὀκνῶδεις, ὥστε τρέφεσθαι παρ' ἑτέρων ἐθέλειν καὶ ὄψε τοῦ καιροῦ πρὸς ἀγρὰν ὀρμᾶν καὶ βατράχοις ἐπιτίθεσθαι μόνοις.

Achilles Tattius (4 ?)

1, 5, 7

σὺ δὲ ὀκνεῖς, καὶ αἰδῆ, καὶ ἀκαίρως σωφρονεῖς; μὴ κρείττων εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ;

Libanius (4)

Epistula 1209, 5 (T.)

... Ἀλέξανδρος νοῦ μὲν ἐπὶ πλείστον ἦκων, θυμῷ δὲ εἰς δέον χρώμενος, ὤπλισμένος δὲ λόγοις, ὀκνου δὲ κρείττων, καιροῦ <δὲ> δεόμενος εἰς ἐπίδειξιν ἀρετῆς.

Cramer's Catena 1, 209 (?)

καὶ ὡς ἐστὶ καιρός, ἐργασώμεθα τὴν σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν, καὶ λάβωμεν ἔλαιον δαψιλεῖς εἰς τὰς λαμπάδας, καὶ εἰς ὅπερ ἐλάβομεν τάλαντον, τουτέστι χάρισμα, ἐπεργασώμεθα, τοὺς πλησίον ἀόκνως παρακαλοῦντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν· καὶ εἰς προστασίαν σπουδαῖοι γινόμενοι· ἂν γὰρ ὀκνήσαντες ἐνταῦθα ἐν ἀργίᾳ διάγωμεν, ...

Cyril (4-5)

On the Trinity 6 (588b)

ὀκνου δὲ ἀμείνους ἡμεῖς, καὶ διερρίφθω μέλλησις, καιροῦ παραθήγοντος εἰς τὸ δεῖν ἐλέσθαι καὶ νῦν τοῖς τῆς ἀληθείας ἡμᾶς συναθλήσαι δόγμασιν.

Wars 7, 15, 5

πέμψαντες τε παρὰ Βέσσαν αὐθις ἠτιῶντο μὲν ὄκνησίν τινα οὐ
δέον αὐτῷ ἐμπεπτωκένοι, ἰσχυριζόμενοι δὲ ὡς ὀλίγω ὕστερον
ἑτέραν ἐπεκδρομὴν ἐς τοὺς πολεμίους ποιήσονται παρεκάλουν καὶ
αὐτὸν ἐς καιρὸν τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐπιθέσθαι δυνάμει τῇ πάσῃ.

(c) ΚΑΙΡΟΣ AND ΠΝΕΥΜΑ

Hippocrates (?) (5 BC)

Epidemics 7, 10

προϊούσης δὲ τῆς ἡμέρης, ἢ τε ἄση πλείων καὶ ἄλυσμός, καὶ πνεῦμα σμικρῶ πυκνότερον· καὶ θρασύτερον καὶ φιλοφρονώτερον τοῦ καιροῦ προσηχόρευε καὶ ἔδεξιούτο.

Illnesses 4, 44, 3

κῆν ἔτι θερμῆς τῆς κοιλίης εὐσῆς θερμότερον τοῦ καιροῦ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ προσγίνηται, οὐ θαῦμά ἐστι τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦτου πνύρετηναι.

Regimen in acute diseases 58

πτύαλου γὰρ ἀναγωγόν ἐστὶν καὶ εὐπνοον. καιροῦς μέντοι τοιοῦσδε ἔχει·

Sophocles (5 BC)

Philoctetes 637 ff.

ἢ τοι καίριος σπουδῇ πόνου
λήξαντος ὄπνον κἀνάπαυλαν ἤγαγεν.
οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴν πνεῦμα τοῦκ πύρας ἀνῆ,
τότε στελοῦμεν· νῦν γὰρ ἀντιοστήατε.

Euripides (5 BC)

Orestes 698 ff.

εἰ δ' ἥσυχως τις αὐτὸν ἐντείνοντι μὲν
χαλῶν ὑπεῖκοι καιρὸν εὐλαβοῦμενος
ἴσως ἂν ἐκπνεύσει.

Demosthenes (4 BC)

18, 308

εἴτ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ ῥήτωρ ἐξαίφνης ἐκ τῆς ἡσυχίας ὡς περ
πνεῦμ' ἐβάνη, καὶ πεφωναστικῶς καὶ συνειλοχῶς ῥήματα καὶ
λόγους, συνείρει τούτους σαφῶς καὶ ἀπνευστί, ...

Aristotle (4 BC)

Meteorologica 1, 4 (341 b 22)

ἔστι γὰρ ἡ φλόξ πνεύματος ξηροῦ ζέσις. ἡ ἂν οὖν μάλιστα
εὐκαιρῶς ἔχη ἢ τοιαύτη σύστασις, ὅταν ὑπὸ τῆς περιφορᾶς
κινηθῆῃ πως, ἐκκάζεται.

1, 7 (344 b 26)

σαφέστερον δ' ἐροῦμεν καὶ περὶ τούτου τοῦ πάθους, ὅταν καὶ
περὶ πνευμάτων λέγειν ἢ καιρός.

Problemata 26, 13 (941 b 25)

διὰ τί ἐπὶ ὤριωνι γίνονται αἰόλοι μάλιστα αἱ ἡμέραι καὶ
ἀκαιρίαι τῶν πνευμάτων;

Politics 7, 14, 7 (1335 a 41)

οἱ τε γὰρ ἰατροὶ τοὺς καιροὺς τῶν σωμάτων ἱκανῶς λέγουσι, καὶ
περὶ τῶν πνευμάτων οἱ φυσικοί, τὰ βόρεια τῶν νοτίων
ἐπαινοῦντες μᾶλλον.

Theophrastus (4-3 BC)

De Ventis 31

ὅτι δὲ συμβαίνει κατὰ τὴν ὥραν τοὺς ἐτησίας ἐπαίρεσθαι καὶ
τὴν τροπαῖαν πνεῖν περὶ Μακεδονίαν ὡς περ σύμπτωμα θετέου.
πανταχοῦ γὰρ τῆς μεσημβρίας ἀπολήγει τὰ πνεύματα διὰ τὸν
ἥλιον ἅμα δὲ τῇ δειλῇ πάλιν αἴρεται. συμβαίνει δὲ κατὰ τὸν
αὐτὸν καιρὸν τὴν τετροπαῖαν πρὸς ταῖς ἀπογείαις αὔραις καὶ
τοὺς ἐτησίας ἐπαίρεσθαι πάλιν.

Polybius (2 BC)

1, 61, 7

εὐτυχῶς καὶ παραδόξως ἐκ μεταβολῆς αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὸν δέοντα
καιρὸν τοῦ πνεύματος συνεργήσαντος.

LXX (2 BC?)

Ecclesiasticus

39, 28

ἔστιν πνεύματα ἃ εἰς ἐκδίκησιν ἔκτισται,
καὶ ἐν θυμῷ αὐτῶν ἐστέρεωσαν μάστιγας αὐτῶν·
καὶ ἐν καιρῷ συντελείας ἰσχύς ἐκχεοῦσιν, ...

Jeremiah

4, 11

ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἐροῦσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ καὶ τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ
Πνεῦμα πλανήσεως ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ...

Diodorus Siculus (1 BC)

3, 40, 7

οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἀκαρεῖ χρόνῳ τὸ πνεῦμα τῇ δούσῃ φύσει πάλιν
ἀπέδωκαν, ...

14, 68, 6

μετὰ δὲ τὴν ναυμαχίαν, μεγάλων πνευμάτων ἐπιγενομένων καὶ τῶν
Καρχηδονίων ἀναγκασθέντων νεωλκῆσαι τὸν στόλον, καιρὸν εἶχε
τοῦ νικᾶν κάλλιστον.

17, 52, 2

... εὐκαιρότατα μὲν κειμένην (sc. Ἀλεξάνδρειαν) πλησίον τοῦ
Φάρου λιμένος, τῇ δ' εὐστοχίᾳ τῆς ῥυμοτομίας ποιήσας
διαπνεῖσθαι τὴν πόλιν τοῖς ἐτησίοις ανεμοῖς καὶ τούτων
πνέοντων μὲν διὰ τοῦ μεγίστου πελάγους, καταψυχόντων δὲ τὸν
κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἄερα, ...

cp. Cicero (1 BC)

In Verrem 1, 3, 8

ut, quoniam criminum vim subterfugere nullo modo poterat,
procellam temporis devitaret.

cp. Strabo (1BC - 1)

5, 1, 12

πρὸς ἅπαντας γὰρ καιροὺς ἄερων ἀντέχει

121

καιρῷ λατρεύειν, μὴ δ' ἀντιπνέειν ἀνέμοισιν.

Philo (1)

Somn. 2, 81

... ὁ ἀστειὸς οἶδεν ὅσον εἴωθε πνεῖν ἀνάγκη, τύχη, καιρός, βία, δυναστεία, καὶ ὅσας ὑποθέσεις καὶ ἡλίκας εὐπραγίας ἀπνευστὶ δραμούσας ἄχρισ οὐρανοῦ κατέσεισαν καὶ κατέρραξαν.

85

ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τῆς ἀκαίρου παρρησίας τὰ ἐπίχειρα, οὐ παρρησίας παρά γε εὐφρονῶσι κριταῖς, ἀλλ' εὐηθείας καὶ φρενοβλαβείας καὶ μελαγχολίας ἀνιάτου γέμοντα. τί λέγεις; χειμῶνά τις ὄρων ἀκμάζοντα καὶ βαρὺ πνεῦμα ἐναντίον ...

Abr. 92

... τοῦ μὲν ποταμοῦ ταῖς πλημμύραις λιμνάσαντος ἐν καιρῷ τὰ πεδία, τῶν δὲ ... πνευμάτων, ...

Jos. 32-33

... καιρῶν καὶ τόπων διαφοραῖς. ὡςπερ γὰρ κυβερνήτης ταῖς τῶν πνευμάτων μεταβολαῖς συμμεταβάλλει ...

In Flacc. 152

... καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ... ἴν' αἱ τότε θεασάμεναι πόλεις αὐτὸν μέγα πνέοντα ...

Post. 113

καθάπερ οὖν ἐξίτηλοι γραφαί, οὐ χρόνου μήκει μόνον [οὐ] διερρῦσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καιρῶν ὀξεύαις μεταβολαῖς ἐκπεπνεύκασιν, εἰσὶ δ' οὓς οἷα χειμάρρου φορὰ πλημμύροντος ἐξαίφνης ἐπικλύσασα ἠφάνισεν.

1 Enoch 16, 1 (?) (Syncecellus's version)

καὶ ἀπὸ ἡμέρας καιροῦ σφαγῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας καὶ θανάτου τῶν γιγάντων ναφηλείμ, οἱ ἰσχυροὶ τῆς γῆς, οἱ μεγάλοι ὀνομαστοί, τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἐκπορευόμενα ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν, ὡς ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσονται, ἀφανίζοντα χωρὶς κρίσεως.

Testament of Solomon (?)

5, 8-12

καὶ προεφήτευσέ μοι τὸ πνεῦμα λέγον· ταῦτα μὲν σὺ, βασιλεῦ Σολομῶν, ποιεῖς ἡμῖν. μετὰ δὲ χρόνον τινὰ ῥαγήσεται σοι ἡ βασιλεία σου, καὶ πάλιν ἐν καιρῷ διαρραγήσεται ὁ ναὸς οὗτος καὶ συνλευσθήσεται πᾶσα Ἱερουσαλήμ ἀπὸ βασιλέως Περσῶν καὶ Μήδων καὶ Χαλδαίων· καὶ τὰ σκευὴ τούτου τρυῖ ναοῦ οὐ σὺ ποιεῖς δουλεύσουσι θεοῖς. μεθ' ὧν ἂν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀγγεῖα ἐν οἷς ἡμᾶς κατακλείεις κλασθήσονται ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τότε ἡμεῖς ἐξελευσόμεθα ἐν πολλῇ δυνάμει ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν καὶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον κατασπαρησόμεθα. καὶ πλανήσομεν πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην μέχρι πολλοῦ καιροῦ ἕως τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ υἱὸς τανυσθῆ ἐπὶ ξύλου· καὶ οὐκέτι γὰρ γίνεται τοιοῦτος βασιλεὺς ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ὁ πάντας ἡμᾶς καταργῶν, οὐ ἡ μήτηρ ἀνδρὶ οὐ μιγήσεται. καὶ τίς λάβη τοιαύτην ἐξουσίαν κατὰ πνευμάτων εἰ μὴ ἐκεῖνος; ὃν ὁ πρῶτος διάβολος πειράσαι ζητήσῃ καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσει πρὸς αὐτόν, οὐ ἡ ψήφος τοῦ ὀνόματος χμδ, ὃ ἐστὶν Ἐμμανουήλ. διὰ τοῦτο, βασιλεῦ Σολομῶν, ὁ καιρὸς σου πονηρὸς καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου μικρὰ καὶ πονηρὰ καὶ τῷ δούλῳ σου δοθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία σου.

17, 1

Καὶ ἐκέλευσα παρῆναι μοι ἕτερον πνεῦμα. καὶ ἦλθε πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου μορφὴν ἔχον σκοτεινὴν καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς λάμποντας. καὶ ἐπηρώτησα αὐτὸν λέγων· σὺ τίς εἶ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη· ἐγὼ εἰμι ὀχεικὸν πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου γίγαντος ἐν σφαγῇ τετελευτηκότος ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῶν γιγάντων.

Paul (1)

Galatians 6, 8-10

... ὁ δὲ σπειρῶν εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν, καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι. ἄρα οὖν ὡς καιροῦ ἔχομεν, ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας,...

Paul (?) (1)

Ephesians 6, 18

... προσευχόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι ...

1 Timothy 4, 1

τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει ὅτι ἐν ὑτέροις καιροῖς ... προσέχοντες πνεύμασιν πλάνοις...

Luke (1)

Gospel 4, 13-14

... ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ. καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

12, 55-56

καὶ ὅταν νότον πνέοντα, λέγετε ὅτι Καύσων ἔσται, καὶ γίνεται. ὑποκριταί, τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τοῦτον πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν;

Peter (?) (1-2 ?)

Letter 1, 11

ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ πόλον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρόμενον ...

Dio Chrysostom (1-2)

17 (67), 19

ἀλλ' ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς, εἰ τῶν τῆς φύσεως μερῶν ἕκαστον ἐθέλοι πλεονεκτεῖν, ἔσθ' ὅπως τὸν βραχύτατον καιρὸν διαμεῖναι δυνασόμεθα; λέγω δὲ οἷον εἰ πλέον τινὶ τοῦ συμμέτρου αἷμα γίγνοιτο, ἢ νῆ Δία τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θερμὸν ὅ,τι δήποτ' ἐν ἡμῖν ἐπιτείνουσι παρὰ τὴν σύμμετρον καὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν, οὐχὶ μεγάλας ἐπίστασθε καὶ χαλεπὰς ἐκ τούτων ἀπαντᾶν νόσους;

33 (16), 5

ἔπειθ' ὑμεῖς ἀκούοντες τὸ μὲν ἐξετάζειν καθ' ἕκαστον ἢ ἀπιστεῖν ἀνδρὶ σοφῷ φαῦλον ἡγεῖσθε καὶ ἀκαιρον, ἄλλως δὲ τῇ ῥώμῃ καὶ τῇ ταχυτήτι τῶν λόγων ἐπαίρεσθε καὶ πάνυ χαίρετε ἀπνευστὶ ξυνείροντος τρῶσούτον ὄχλον ῥημάτων, καὶ πεπόνθατε ὅμοιον τοῖς ὀρώσι τοὺς ἵππους τοὺς ἀπὸ ῥυτήρος θέοντας·

34 (17), 37

νῦν δὲ ὡς περ οἱ τοῖς ἀπογείοις, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γνόφων πνεύμασι πλείοντες, οὕτως φέρεσθε, ἄνδρες Ταρσεῖς, οὔτε τῆς τοιαύτης πολιτείας οὐτ' ἐκείνου τοῦ πλοῦ βέβαιον οὐδ' ἀσφαλὲς ἔχοντος οὐδέν. διαρκέσαι μὲν γὰρ ἄχρι παντός [ἢ διαστήματος] οὐχ οἶαι τέ εἰσιν, αἱ τοιαῦται προσβολαί, πολλάκις δὲ κατέδυσαν ἀκαιρως (c.j.) προσπεσοῦσαι.

Plutarch (1-2)

Mor. 133 F

μέτρον δὲ τοῦ καιροῦ τὸ τῆς τροφῆς καθισταμένης ἀτρέμα καὶ συμπνεούσης τὴν πέψιν ἐγκρατῆ γενέσθαι καὶ ὑπερδέξιον.

Babrius (2)

Fabula 60

Ζωμοῦ χύτρη μὲς ἐμπεσὼν ἀπωμάστω
καὶ τῷ λίπει πνιγόμενος ἐκπνέων τ' ἤδη
βέβρωκα φησί καὶ πέπωκα καὶ πάσης
τρυφῆς πέπλησμαι· καιρός ἐστὶ μοι θνήσκειν.

Julius Pollux (2)

1, 105-106

πλοῦς εὐδῖος, ... αὔρας ἐπιπνεούσης, ... ἀνέμου ... ἐπιπνέοντος
προσπνέοντος, ... ἐπικαίρου, καταβαίνοντος ἐκ γῆς τοῦ πνεύματος,
... ἐκ πρύμνης ἐπιπνέοντος, κατὰ πρύμναν τοῦ πνεύματος
ἐστηκότος ... ὑποπνέων τῇ ὀθόνη ... πεσόντος τοῦ πνεύματος

1, 110-112

ἄνεμος βίαιος, σκληρὸς ... πνεύματος ἀνθεστηκότος, ἀντίου
πνέοντος τοῦ πνεύματος ... ἀκρίτων ὄντων τῶν πνευμάτων,
ἀντιπνεόντων ... λάβρου ὄντος τοῦ πνεύματος ... περιπνέοντος
... καιροῦ μαχομένου ... ὑπαινίττεται δὲ τι τοιοῦτον καὶ τὸ
Ξενοφώντειον, τὸ, σπουδάζοντος τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἄρα τὸ πνεῖν
ἐκ γῆς ἀνεμον οὕτως εἴρηκεν, ὡς εἰς ἀναγωγὴν καιρὸν εἶναι.

Maximus of Tyre (2)

13, 7a (p. 166 Hobein)

σώζει δὲ αὐτὴν οὐ μόνον κυβερνήτου τέχνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ πνευμάτων
καιροί, καὶ ὑπηρεσία ναυτῶν καὶ εὐκολία ὀργάνων, καὶ θαλάττης
φύσις.

Philostratus (2-3)

VS 2, 33 (LCL p. 310)

πολυμαθῆς δὲ ὁ Ἀσπάσιος καὶ πολυήκοος καὶ τὸ μὲν καινοπρεπεῖς ἐπαινῶν, ἐς ἀπειροκαλίαν δὲ οὐδαμοῦ ἐκπίπτων ὑπο τοῦ ἐν καιρῷ χρῆσθαι οἷς γιγνώσκει. τουτὶ δὲ που καὶ ἐν μουσικῇ κράτιστον, οἱ γὰρ καιροὶ τῶν τόνων λύρα τε φωνῆν ἔδωκαν καὶ αὐλῷ καὶ μελῳδίαν ἐπαλδευσαν. ἐπιμεληθεῖς δὲ τοῦ δοκίμως τε καὶ σὺν ἀφελείᾳ ἐρμηνεύειν πνεύματος τε καὶ περιβολῆς ἠμέλησε, ...

Aristides Quintilianus (3 ?)

1, 21 (p 43 Winnington - Ingram)

τῶν γὰρ λοιπῶν ὑγρῶν κατὰ πρόεσιν πνεύματος ἐκφωνουμένων τούτου μόνον ἐμφράττοντες ἡμῶν τοὺς πόρους ἐκφωνεῖν βιαζόμεθα· κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν ἐναντιοπαθοῦν τὸ φωνητικὸν ὄργανον οὐκ ἀπεικότως κολουεῖ τὴν τῆς φωνῆς ὁμαλότητα.

Themistius (4)

Oratio 22 (p. 73 Schenkl - Downey - Norman)

μετάνοια, ἔφη, βραδεία καὶ οὐ σφόδρα εὐκαιρος δαίμων. ὅμως δὲ τινες οὐκ ἔα πάμπαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐρπετῶν ἀπομυζηθῆναι, ἀλλ' ἀνίστησιν ἐτι πνέοντας καὶ οἴκαδε ἀποσώζει.

Gregory of Nazianzus (4)

Carmen de vita sua 708f.

δουλεύομεν καιροῖς τε καὶ λαῶν πόθοις,
ἀεὶ διδόντες τῷ πνέοντι τὸ σκάφος,

Hephaestio (5)

Apotelesmatica 1, 20, 31 (T. vol. 1, p. 50)

ἀποτελεσματικὸς δὲ καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν ἱερατικὸν λόγον καὶ τὰς τῶν θεῶν θρησκείας καὶ τὰς βασιλικὰς προσόδους καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐθίμων ἢ νομίμων κατὰ καιροῦς ἐναλλοιώσεως τῆ πρὸς τοὺς ἐκάστοτε τῶν ἀστέρων συγκράσει, πρὸς δὲ τὸ περιεχόν μᾶλλον ξηρὸς ὢν καὶ εὐκίνητος διὰ δὲ τὴν πρὸς τὸν Ἥλιον ἐγγύτητα καὶ τὸ τάχος τῆς ἀνακυκλήσεως πνευμάτων ἀτάκτων καὶ ὀξέων καὶ εὐμεταβόλων μάλιστα κινητικὸς ὑπάρχει, βροντῶν τε εἰκότως καὶ πρηστήρων καὶ χασμάτων καὶ σεισμῶν καὶ ἀστραπῶν ἀποτελεσματικὸς, ...

1, 21, 3-4 (p. 52)

Τῶν δὲ ἀνέμων οἱ μὲν ἀπ' ἄρκτου πνέοντες ἢ καὶ ἑτέρου μέρους τοῦ ὀρίζοντος ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἐμπύσεως καὶ μονῆς ἐκεῖναις ταῖς χώραις ταπεινῶσιν· σημαίνουσι καθ' ὧν ἐγγυς οὐσῶν πνεύσειαν. ἐν δὲ τῇ καθάρσει τῆς ἐκλείψεως ἄλλοι πνεύσαντες τὰς ὑφ' αὐτοὺς χώρας αὐξήσουσιν, ...

1, 25, 11-13 (p. 78)

λαμπρότεροι μὲν γὰρ καὶ μείζονες ὀρώμενοι παρὰ τὰς συνήθεις φαντασίας οἱ εἰς ὁποιοῦνδήποτε μέρος ὄντες ἀνέμους τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ οἰκείου τόπου διασημαίνουσι, καὶ τῶν αἰδίων δε νεφελοειδῶν συστροφῶν οἶον τῆς φάτνης καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων ἐπὶ αἰθρίας οὐσης αἱ συστάσεις ἀμαυραὶ καὶ ὡσπερ ἀφανεῖς πεπαχυμένοι θεωρῶνται, φοράς ὑδάτων εἰσὶ δηλωτικά, καθαραὶ δὲ καὶ παλλόμεναι συνεχῶς πολλῶν πνευμάτων. ἐπὶ τῶν ἀστέρων τῶν παρ' ἑκάτερα τῆς φάτνης τῶν καλουμένων Ὀνῶν ὁ μὲν βόρειος ἀφανῆς γένηται, βορέαν πνεῦσαι σημαίνει, ἐὰν δὲ ὁ νότιος, τὸν νότον. Καὶ τῶν ἐπιγινομένων δὲ κατὰ καιροῦς ἐν τοῖς μετεώροις αἱ μὲν τῶν κομητῶν συστροφαὶ πάντοτε ἀρχμοῦς καὶ ἀνέμους προσημαίνουσι καὶ τοσοῦτω μείζονας ὅσω ἂν ἐκ πλειόνων καὶ ἐπὶ πολὺ ἢ σύστασις γένηται, αἱ δὲ διαδρομαὶ καὶ οἱ ακοντισμοὶ τῶν ἀστέρων εἰ μὲν ἀπὸ μίας γένοιτο γωνίας, τὸν ἀπ' ἐκείνης ἀνεμον δηλοῦσιν, εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων, ἀκαταστασίαν πνευμάτων, ...

2, 24, 8 (p. 185)

ἐν δὲ τοῖς στερεοῖς διὰ κρημνισμῶν καὶ πνευμάτων, ἐν δὲ τοῖς τροπικοῖς καὶ ἰσημερινοῖς δι' ἔνδειαν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων μετὰ τοῦ νοσεῖν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀνθρωποειδέσι διὰ λησθηρίων καὶ ἐπιβουλῶν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς χερσαίοις διὰ θηρίων ἢ σεισμῶν, Ἑρμοῦ δὲ προσγινόμενου καὶ διὰ κατηγοριῶν, ἔτι δὲ ἔρπετῶν καὶ ἰοβόλων. τὰς δὲ ἐπισημασίας τοῦ <τοῦ> ξενιτεύειν καιροῦ καταστοχαστέον ἐκ τῆς τῶν κατὰ χρόνους ἐπεμβάσεων ποιότητος.

Epitoma 4, 20, 2-7 (Teubner vol. 2, p. 180)

τὰς τε ἀναβάσεις καὶ ἀποβάσεις τῶν ὑδάτων ἐν δέοντι καιρῷ καὶ κατὰ λόγον μηνύει, ὁμοίως τε καὶ τοῦ σπόρον καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ σκοτεινοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἀστέρος ἀνατείλαντος πᾶν τὸ ὑναντίον ἔσται καὶ τὰ γεννήματα ἐν σπᾶνει, καὶ αἱ κύουσαι ἐκτρώσονται. Ἐπιτείλας δὲ ὁ ἀστὴρ μέγας καὶ λαμπρὸς βορέου πνέοντος καὶ τὴν ἀνάβασιν τῶν ὑδάτων κατὰ λόγον καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπὶ συμφέροντι μηνύει ἥτοι σπόρους ἐπιτηδείους καὶ εὐφορίαν, τῷ τε τῆς χώρας βασιλεῖ νίκην κατὰ τῶν ἀντιπάλων· μικρὸς δὲ καὶ στυγνὸς ἀνατείλας βορέου ὁμοίως πνέοντος ἐπιστρατεύσεσθαι τῇ χώρᾳ τοὺς ἐκτὸς καὶ ἀπαλλάξειν οὐ καλῶς, τὴν τε ἀνάβασιν τοῦ Νεῖλου ἔσεσθαι κατὰ λόγον, τὰς δὲ τιμὰς ἐλαττωθῆναι. μέγας δὲ καὶ λαμπρὸς λιβὸς ἢ νότου πνέοντος ἀμιξίας τε καὶ θανάτους, μετρίας τε ἀναβάσεις καὶ λιμὸν μηνύει. ἀνατείλας δὲ μέγας καὶ λαμπρὸς βορέου ἢ ἀπληρώτου πνέοντος τὸν βασιλέα τῆς χώρας καταλείψειν τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀφανῆ γενήσεσθαι

καὶ πόλεμον ἔσεσθαι· μικροῦ δὲ ἀνατείλαντος βορέου καὶ ἀπηλιώτου πνέοντος ἀνάβασιν κατὰ λόγον ἔσεσθαι, κρατηθῆναι δὲ τὴν Αἰθιοπῶν ὑπὸ τίνος δυνατοῦ. μέλας δὲ ἀνατείλας λοιμὸν ποιεῖ, χλωρὸς δὲ νόσους, πυρρὸς δὲ πόλεμον καὶ σφαγὰς.

Cyrl (4-5)

On the Trinity 4

καιροῦς καὶ πρόσωπα βασανίζειν οὐκ ἀνεχόμενοι, ποῖ φέρεσθε, τί δράτε, ὃ παντὶ πνεύματι πονηρῶ παραφόροι καὶ ἀλώσιμοι;

Ignatius Diaconus (9)

Tetrasticha Iambica 1, 45

δρῦν ἦγε ρεῖθρον πνεύμασιν βεβλημένην·
αὕτη δ' ἔλιξι καὶ δόναξι πεύθετο,
πῶς εἰσιν ὀρθοί. "πνεύμασιν δουλούμεθα·
πτῶσις δ' ἐκείνων ἐστὶν ἡμῶν ἢ στάσις."

[βίᾳ καιροῦ μὴ ἀντιτάττεσθαι]

(d) ΚΑΙΡΟΣ AND ΕΛΠΙΣ

Hippocrates (?) (5 BC)

On Fractures 35

ἐν τοῖσιν οὖν τοιούτοις τρώμασι τοὺς μὲν κινδύνους οὐ χρὴ
λήθειν ὁποῖοί τινές εἰσι, καὶ προλεγεῖν χρὴ πρὸς τοὺς
καιρούς. εἰ δὲ ἀναγκάζοιο μὲν ἐμβάλλειν, ἐλπίζοις δὲ
ἐμβάλλειν,...

Aeneas Tacticus (4 BC) 23,3

..., καιρὸν τηρήσαντες καὶ ἐπεξεληθόντες ἐπέθεντο παρ' ἐλπίδα
τοῖς πολεμίοις καὶ κατώρθωσαν.

Demosthenes (4 BC) 15,2

..., ἐν ὑμῖν μόνοις τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας ἔχειν τὰς
ἐλπίδας. ἀξιὸν δ' ἦσθῆναι τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ.

18,298

... ἐμ' οὔτε καιρὸς οὔτε φιλανθρωπία λόγων οὔτ' ἐπαγγελιῶν
μέγεθος οὔτ' ἐλπίς οὔτε φόβος οὔτ' ἄλλ' οὐδὲν ἐπῆρεν ...

57,2

... θαρρεῖν καὶ πολλὰς ἔχειν ἐλπίδας καλῶς ἀγωνιεῖσθαι,
τὸν καιρὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ παρωξύνθαι τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὰς
ἀποψηφίσεις φοβεῖσθαι.

Epicurus (4-3 BC) [66] 10 (Arrighetti)

ὡς γὰρ ἐλπίδος ὁ καιρὸς ἐπιλώθη ...

Polybius (2 BC) 3,67,1

οἱ δὲ συστρατευόμενοι Κελτοὶ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις θεωροῦντες
ἐπικυδεστέρας τὰς τῶν Καρχηδονίων ἐλπίδας, συνταξάμενοι πρὸς
ἀλλήλους, καιρὸν ἐπετήρουν πρὸς ἐπίθεσιν, ...

3, 69, 3-4

... δείγμα βουλόμενος ἐκφέρειν τῆς σφετέρας προαιρέσεως πρὸς τὸ μὴ δεδιότας ἀπελπίζειν τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ σωτηρίαν τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν καιρῶν καταλαμβανομένους, τὸν δὲ προδότην ἐτίμησε μεγαλείως, ἐκκαλέσασθαι σπουδάζων τοὺς ἐπὶ πραγμάτων ταττομένους πρὸς τὰς Καρχηδονίων ἐλπίδας.

4, 51, 3

ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος παραγενομένων τῶν πρέσβευ ἐβουλεύετο μὲν παρακατέχειν τὸν Ἀνδρομαχον, ἐλπίζων αὐτῷ χρήσεσθαι πρὸς καιρὸν ...

5, 75, 7

πλὴν ὁ μὲν Ἀχαιὸς ἦκε πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν, οἱ δὲ Σελγεῖς συμμίξαντες αὐτῷ μεγάλας ἔσχον ἐλπίδας ὡς ὀλοσχεροῦς τινος τευξόμενοι φιλανθρωπίας.

... 5, 104, 7-8

... ἵνα γενόμενος ἔφεδρος ἐμφρων πειραθῇ σὺν καιρῷ τῆς τῶν ὅλων ἀντιποιήσασθαι δυναστείας. εἶναι δὲ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα καιρὸν οὐκ ἀλλότριον τῆς ἐλπίδος ταύτης.

8, 19, 7

... κοινωσάμενος παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν τῇ γυναικὶ καὶ ποιήσας διὰ τὸ παράδοξον τὴν Λαοδίκην ἐκφροῦνα, χρόνον μὲν τινα λιπαρῶν ταύτην καὶ καταπραύνων ταῖς προσδοκωμέναις ἐλπίσι προσεκαρτέρει, ...

9, 8, 6-7

... καὶ τῶν βοηθούτων παραγενομένων εἰς τὸν τῆς καταλήψεως καιρὸν, ταύτης μὲν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀπεσφάλῃ, ...

9, 14, 11

ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὑπερβρας τὸν ὠρισμένον καιρὸν αὐτῆς ἀποτυγχάνει τῆς ἐλπίδος-

16, 22α, 5-6

..., καὶ σχεδὸν ανεπίστου τῆς σωτηρίας ὑπαρχούσης τοῖς ἐναντιουμένοις πρὸς τὴν ὄρμην καὶ βίαν τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου, μόνοι τῶν κατὰ Συρίαν ὑπέστησαν καὶ πάσας ἐξήλεγκαν τὰς ἐλπίδας. τὸ δὲ παραπλήσιον ἐποίησαν καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐνεστῶτας καιρούς. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀπέλειπον τῶν ἐνδεχομένων, σπουδάζοντες διαφυλάξαι τὴν πρὸς τὸν Πτολεμαῖον πίστιν.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1 BC)

Antiquities 3,20,2-3

ταῦτα <δὴ> διανοηθεὶς ὡς εἶχε τάχους ἔφευγε καὶ συνέπεσεν αὐτῷ μὴ διαμαρτεῖν τῆς ἐλπίδος. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἕτερος τῶν Ἰλλυριῶν οὐδέμιαν ἔχων πληγὴν καίριον ἐδίωκεν αὐτὸν ἐκ ποδός, ..

Diodorus Siculus (1 BC) 3,15,7

πάντα γὰρ ἡ χρεία διδάσκει τὴν φύσιν, οἰκείως τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις καιροῖς ἀρμοζομένην πρὸς τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐλπίδος εὐχρηστίαν.

4, 32, 3

... δύναμιν ἀξιόλογον συναγαγεῖν ἐξεκλείσθη διὰ τὴν ὀξύτητα τῶν καιρῶν, ἀθροίσας δ' ὅσους ἐδύνατο, μετὰ τούτων ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς, ἐλπίζων εἰ ταύτας ἐμπρήσειε, τέλος ἐπιθήσειν τῷ πολέμῳ.

Philo (1)

Plant 161

... καὶ εἰ σφόδρα τοῦ πράττειν ἐπέσπευδον οἱ καιροί, πάντως ἀνέμενον οὐκ ἀεὶ τὸ ταχὺ τοῦ βραδέος ἡγούμενοι κρεῖττον· οὗ προμηθὲς μὲν γὰρ τάχος βλαβερόν, βραδυτῆς δὲ μετ' εὐελπιστίας ὠφέλιμον.

Spec. L. 1,78-79

... σώους τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐκάστων παραπέμψοντες· ἐν γὰρ ταῖς νομίμοις ἀπαρχαῖς αἱ τῶν εὐσεβούντων ἐλπίδες εἰσὶν. Φυλαὶ μὲν εἰσι τοῦ ἔθνους δώδεκα, μία δ' ἐκ πασῶν ἀριστίνδην ἐπικριθείσα ἱερᾶται, γέρας ἀνδραγαθίας καὶ φιλοθέου σπουδῆς τουτὶ λαβούσα, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ἔδοξεν ἡ πληθὺς...

Moses 1,32

... τῆς δὲ παππῶας ἀρχῆς ὅσον οὐδέπω γεγωνὸς ἐλπίσι ταῖς ἀπάντων διάδοχος· καὶ τί γὰρ ἄλλ' ἢ ὁ νέος βασιλεὺς προσαγορευόμενος, τὴν συγγενικὴν καὶ προγονικὴν ἐζήλωσε παιδείαν, τὰ μὲν τῶν εἰσποιησαμένων ἀγαθὰ, καὶ εἰ λαμπρότερα καιροῖς, νόθα εἶναι ὑπολαβών, ...

Virt. 30

... οὕτως οἱ περὶ νομίμου γυναικὸς ἢ οἰκίας ἢ χωρίου κτήσεως
πονηθέντες καὶ ὅσον οὕτω τῆ ἐλπίδι νομίζοντες εἰς τὸν ἑκάστου
τῆς χρήσεως ἀφίχθαι καιρόν, ...

75

... ἦσαν ... αἱ πρὸς τὸν παρόντα καιρόν νουθεσίαι καὶ
σωφρονισμοί, παραινέσεις αἱ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα διὰ χρηστῶν
ἐλπίδων, αἷς ἐπακολουθεῖν ἀναγκαῖον αἴσια τέλη.

123

οἱ δὲ μὴ γένει δοῦλοι χρηστῆς ἐλπίδος μὴ εἰς ἅπαν
ἀμοιρείωσαν, ἀλλ' ἴτωσαν ἐπὶ τὴν παλαιὰν ἀδειαν, ἧς διὰ
καιροὺς ἀβουλήτους ἐστέρηντο.

In Flacc. 15-16

ὅτε καὶ τοὺς ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας ὁ καιρὸς ἀπῆλασε καὶ
διέξευξεν. ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν καὶ τοῦτον ἔγνω προσανηρημένον ὁ
Φλάκκος, τὴν λοιπὴν ἐλπίδα κατὰ τὸ παντελὲς ἀπεγνώκει ...

Josephus (1)

BJ 1,4-5

... Ἰουδαίων δὲ τὸ νεωτερίζον τότε τεταραχμένοις ἐπανέστη τοῖς
καιροῖς ἀκμάζον κατὰ τε χεῖρα καὶ χρήμασιν, ὡς δι' ὑπερβολὴν
θορυβῶν τοῖς μὲν ἐν ἐλπίδι κτήσεως τοῖς δ' ἐν ἀφαιρέσεως δέει
γίνεσθαι τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἀνατολήν, .. καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν βασιλείῶν
ὁ καιρὸς ἀνέπειθεν, τὰ στρατιωτικὰ δὲ ἦρα μεταβολῆς ἐλπίδι
λημμάτων.

3,204

'νῦν καιρός', εἰπὼν, 'ἄρχεσθαι μάχης, ὅτι ἐλπίς οὐκ ἔστι
σωτηρίας.'

5,29

κατάπληξις δὲ δεινὴ καὶ δέος ἦν τοῖς γνησίοις, καὶ οὔτε βουλήs
καιρὸς εἰς μεταβολὴν οὔτε συμβάσεως ἐλπίς οὔτε φυγῆs τοῖς
ἐθέλουσιν.

7,76-81

... πολὺ μέρος Γερμανῶν ἐκινήθη πρὸς ἀπόστασιν, οἷs καὶ
Γαλατῶν οἱ πλῆσιον συμφρονήσαντες κοινῇ μεγάλας ἐλπίδας

αὐτοῖς συνέθεσαν ὡς καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀπαλλαξόμενοι δεσποτείας. ἐπῆρε δὲ τοὺς Γερμανοὺς ἀψασθαι τῆς ἀποστάσεως καὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἐξενεγκεῖν πρώτη μὲν ἢ φύσις οὕσα λογισμῶν ἔρημος ἀγαθῶν καὶ μετὰ μικρὰς ἐλπίδος ἐτοίμως βίψοκλινδυνος· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ μίσος τὸ πρὸς τοὺς κρατοῦντας, ἐπεὶ μόνοις ἴσασι Ῥωμαίοις τὸ γένος αὐτῶν δουλεύειν βεβιασμένον. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ μάλιστα γὰρ πάντων ὁ καιρὸς αὐτοῖς θάρσος ἐνεποίησεν· ὀρώντες γὰρ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴν ταῖς συνεχέσι τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων ἀλλαγαῖς ἐν ἑαυτῇ τεταραχμένην, πᾶν τε μέρος τῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῖς οἰκουμένης πυνθανόμενοι μετέωρον εἶναι καὶ κραδαίνεσθαι, τοῦτον σφίσι αὐτοῖς ἄριστον ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκείνων κακοπραγίας καὶ στάσεως καιρὸν ᾗθησαν παραδεδοῦσθαι. ἐνῆγον δὲ τὸ βούλευμα καὶ ταῦταις αὐτοῖς ταῖς ἐλπίσιν ἐτύφουν Κλασσικός τις καὶ Κιουίλιος τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς [ὄντες] ἡγεμόνων, οἳ δῆλον μὲν ὡς ἐκ μακροῦ ταύτης ἐφλεντο τῆς νεωτεροποιίας, ὑπὸ τοῦ καιροῦ δὲ θαρσήσαι προαχθέντες τὴν αὐτῶν γνώμην ἐξέφηναν· ἐμελλον δὲ προθύμως διακειμένοις τὴν πείραν τοῖς πλήθεσι προσφέρειν.

7, 193-194

πεῖρα δὲ πρότερον ἐβούλοντο τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαφεύξεσθαι τὴν πολιορκίαν ἐλπίδας ἐλέγξει. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ προθύμως ἐποιούντο τὰς ἐξόδους ἀνά πᾶσαν ἡμέραν, καὶ τοῖς χούσι συμπλεκόμενοι πολλοὶ μὲν ἔθνησκον, πολλοὺς δὲ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀνηροῦν. αἰεὶ δὲ τοῦ κρατεῖν ὁ καιρὸς ἐβράβευεν ἑκατέροις ...

AJ 2, 211

... δοῦναί τ' ἀπαλλαγὴν αὐτοῖς ὧν παρ' ἐκείνου ἐκακοπάθουν τὸν καιρὸν καὶ τῆς ἐπ' ἀπωλεία τοῦ γένους αὐτῶν ἐλπίδος.

15, 183

... σπεύδων πρὸς Καίσαρα καὶ μηδὲν ἐλπίσαι περὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ πραγμάτων δυνάμενος χρηστὸν ἐκ τῆς γενομένης αὐτῷ πρὸς Ἀντώνιον φιλίας, ὑπόπτον μὲν εἶχε τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρα, μὴ τῷ καιρῷ συνεπιθεμένη τὸ τε πλήθος ἀποστήσῃ καὶ στασιάσῃ τὰ περὶ τὴν βασιλείαν πράγματα,

15, 232

συνθεωρήσασα δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἢ Ἀλεξάνδρα καὶ διότι μικρὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχει μὴ καὶ αὐτῇ τῶν ὁμοίων ἐξ Ἡρώδου τυχεῖν, ...

16, 80-92

... διὸ καὶ καθάπερ ἔφεδρόν τινα τὸν Ἀντίπατρον εἰσήγαγεν, οἰόμενος ὀρθῶς προνοεῖν καὶ κατασταλέντων τῶν μειρακίων ἐξεῖναι εὐκαίρως χρῆσθαι βελτίοσιν. τὸ δ' οὐχ ὡς ἐνόησεν ἀπέβη· τοῖς τε γὰρ παισὶν οὐ μετρίως ἐδόκει κεχρηῆσθαι τῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπηρεΐα, καὶ δεινὸς ὧν τὸν τρόπον Ἀντίπατρος, ἐπειδὴ παρρησίας τινὸς ἐκ τῆς οὐ πρότερον οὔσης ἐλπίδος ἀντεποίησάτο, μίαν ἔσχεν ὑπόθεσιν, κακοῦν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ μὴ παραχωρεῖν τῶν πρωτείων, ἀλλ' ἔχεσθαι τοῦ πατρὸς, ἤδη μὲν ἡλλοτριωμένου ταῖς διαβολαῖς, εὐμεταχειρίστου δ' ὄντος εἰς

ὅπερ ἐσπουδάκει, πολὺ χαλεπώτερον αἰεὶ γενέσθαι τοῖς διαβεβλημένοις. ἦσαν οὖν οὐ παρ' αὐτοῦ μόνου οἱ λόγοι, φυλαττομένου δι' αὐτοῦ δόξαι τὰ τοιαῦτα καταμηνύειν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἐχρήτο συνεργοῖς τοῖς ἀνυπόπτοις καὶ διὰ τὴν εὐνοίαν τὴν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα πιστευθησομένοις αὐτὸ ποιεῖν. ἦδη δὲ πλείους ἐγεχθόνεισαν οἱ κάκεῖνον ἐφ' οἷς ἠλπίζει θεραπεύοντες καὶ τὸν Ἡρώδην ἐκ τοῦ δοκεῖν κατ' εὐνοίαν τὰ τοιαῦτα λέγειν ὑπαχόμενοι. καὶ τούτων πολυπροσώπως καὶ πιστῶς ἀλλήλοις συναγωνιζομένων, ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον αἱ παρὰ τῶν μειρακίων ἀφορμαὶ προσεγίνοντο καὶ γὰρ καὶ δάκρυα πολλάκις ἦν κατ' ἐπήρειαν ὧν ἠτιμάζοντο καὶ τῆς μητρὸς ἀνάκλησις, καὶ τὸν πατέρα φανερώς ἦδη πρὸς τοὺς φίλους οὐ δίκαιον ἐλέγχειν ἐπετήδευον. ἄπερ ἅπαντα κακοήθως ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἀντίπατρον καιροφυλακούμενα καὶ μειζῶνως πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδην ἐξαγγελλόμενα προὔβαινεν οὐ μικρὰν ἀπεργαζόμενα τὴν τῆς οἰκίας στάσιν. ἀχθόμενος γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς ταῖς διαβολαῖς καὶ ταπεινώσαι βουλόμενος τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Μαριάμμης, μείζονα αἰεὶ πῶς τιμὴν Ἀντιπάτρω παρέιχεν, καὶ τέλος ἠτήθεις ἐπεισῆγαγε τὴν ἐκεῖνου μητέρα. Καίσαρι δὲ πολλάκις γράφων ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδίᾳ συνίστη σπουδαιότερον. Ἀγρίππα γε μὴν ἀνιόντος εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην μετὰ τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας δεκαετῆ γεγενημένην, πλεύσας ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ συντυχεάνων μόνον τε τὸν Ἀντίπατρον ἐπηγάγετο καὶ παρέδωκεν εἰς Ῥώμην ἀνάγειν μετὰ πολλῶν δώρων, Καίσαρι φίλου ἐσόμενον, ὥστε ἦδη πάντα δοκεῖν ἐπ' ἐκεῖνῳ καὶ παρεῶσθαι παντάπασιν ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς τὰ μειράκια.

Πρὸς μὲν οὖν τιμὴν καὶ τὸ πρῶτον εἶναι δοκεῖν Ἀντιπάρτρω προὔχρει τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀποδημίαν. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ, πᾶσιν ἐπεσταλκῶτος Ἡρώδου τοῖς φίλοις, διάσημος ἦν· ἠχθετο δὲ τῷ μὴ παρεῖναι μηδὲ εἶχειν ἐξ εὐκαιροῦ διαβάλλειν αἰεὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς, καὶ μᾶλλον ἐδεδοίκει μεταβολὴν τοῦ πατρὸς, εἴ τι καὶ καθ' αὐτὸν ἀξιῶσειεν ἐπιεικέστερον εἰς τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Μαριάμμης φρονεῖν. ταῦτα δὲ δι' ἐννοίας ἔχων οὐκ ἀφίστατο τῆς ἑαυτοῦ προαιρέσεως, ἀλλὰ κάκειθεν, ὅτε ἀνιάσειν τι καὶ παροξυνεῖν ἠλπιζε τὸν πατέρα κατὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, συνεχῶς ἐπέστελλεν, πρόφασιν μὲν ὡς ὑπεραγωνιῶν αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς ἀφ' ἧς εἶχεν φύσει κακοθεΐας τὴν ἐλπίδα μεγάλην καθ' ἑαυτὴν οὔσαν ἐμπορευόμενος, ἕως εἰς τοῦτο προήγαγε τὸν Ἡρώδην ὀργῆς καὶ δυσθυμίας, ὡς ἦδη μὲν εἶχειν δυσμενῶς τοῖς μειρακίοις, ἔτι δὲ κατοκνεῖν εἰς τοιοῦτον ἐμβῆναι πάθος. ὡς δὲ μήτ' ἀμελῶν μήτ' ἐκ προπετείας ἀμαρτάνοι, κρεῖττον ἠγήσατο πλεύσας εἰς Ῥώμην ἐκεῖ τῶν παίδων κατηγορεῖν παρὰ Καίσαρι, καὶ μηδὲν αὐτῷ τοιοῦτον ἐπιτρέπειν, ὃ καὶ διὰ μέγεθος τῆς ἀσεβείας ὑποπτον ἦν. ὡς δὲ ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην, ἐγένετο μὲν μέχρι τῆς Ἀκυληίας πόλεως Καίσαρι συντυχεῖν ἐπειγόμενος, ἐλθὼν δ' εἰς λόγους καὶ καιρὸν αἰτησάμενος ἐπὶ μεγάλοις οἷς ἐδόκει δυστυχεῖν, παρεστήσατο μὲν τοὺς παῖδας, ἠτιάτο δὲ τῆς ἀπονοίας καὶ τῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως, ὡς ἐχθρῶς ἔχουσιν ἅπαντα τρόπον ἐσπουδακότες μισεῖν τὸν ἑαυτῶν πατέρα μεταχειρίσασθαι,

...

Plutarch (1-2)

Μοτ. 804 C

Κάτων δέ, περιὼν οὐκ ἠλπίζε πείσειν τῷ προκατέχεσθαι χάρισι καὶ σπουδαίς τὸν δῆμον ἢ τὴν βουλὴν, ἔλεγε τὴν ἡμέραν ὅλην ἀναστὰς καὶ τὸν καιρὸν οὕτως ἐξέκρουε.

Dio Chrysostom (1-2)

34(17), 4

τί ποτ' οὖν ἐλπίσας καὶ τί βουληθεὶς παρελήλυθα τοιοῦτος ὢν ἐν καιρῷ τοιούτῳ; μανίας γὰρ τοῦτο ἀληθινῆς. ὅτι μηδενὸς αὐτὸς δέομαι παρ' ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας ὠφελείας ἕνεκα ἔσπούδακα.

Herodian (3)

1, 4, 2-3

ἐκ γὰρ ὢν αὐτὸς διακείμαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἀμοιβαίαν εὐνοιαν εἰκότως ἠλπίκα. νῦν δὲ καιρὸς εὐκαιρος ἐμοί τε αἰσθέσθαι μὴ μάτην ἐς ὑμᾶς τοσούτου χρόνου τιμῆν τε καὶ σπουδὴν κατατεθεῖσθαι,...

1, 10, 6

ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Ματέρνω καιρὸς ἐπιτήδειος εἶναι ἐς τὸ τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν λαθεῖν. ἠλπίσε γὰρ...

Aelius Aristides (2)

Sikelikos B (Dindorf 1,587)

καὶ ὅπου νῦν ὤκνησε Νικίας τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν, τί ποθ' ἠγῆσεται πείσεσθαι δευτέρας ἐλπίδος ὑμῶν ἀμαρτόντων; οὕτως ἢ νικῆσοντας πέμπετε, ἢ θάτερον οὐ βούλομαι προσθεῖναι. ἐν οἷς δὲ ἐγὼ λέγω πάντα ἐφ' ὑμῖν μετὰ τοῦ καιροῦ γίγνεται,...

Lucian (2)

Cataplus 11

... ἢ ἐλπίσιν ταῦτα ἔδρων, τῆς ἀρχῆς ὄντες φίλοι καὶ πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν ἀποβλέποντες;...

τούτων γὰρ ἂν μεμνημένον ἐλπίδας ἔχειν τῆς εἰς τὴν νῆσον ἀφίξεως. τότε μὲν οὖν τὰ περὶ τὸν πλοῦν παρεσκευασάμην, καὶ ἐπεὶ καιρὸς ἦν, συνεισιώμην αὐτοῖς.

Vettius Valens (2)

Anthologiae 6,2 (T.p. 233)

ἕτεροι ἐν χαλεπῇ καιροῦ περιστάσει γενόμενοι ἢ καὶ ἀστοχῆσαντες τῷ βίῳ καὶ μηδεμίαν ἀγαθὴν ἐλπίδα προσδοκῆσαντες,...

(T.p. 236)

... καὶ εἰς ἀπόγνωσιν τὰς ἐλπίδας ἀνατυπούμενον διὰ τὴν τῶν καιρῶν κακίαν,...

Dion Cassius (2-3) 13,54,3

καὶ τούτου καὶ τοῖς καιροῖς ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοὺς λόγους καὶ τὰς πράξεις ἐφήρμοζεν, ἅτε καὶ ἐν τῷ ὁμοίῳ τό τε ὑπάρχον καὶ τὸ ἐπιζόμενον ποιούμενος.

21,70,8

ἅτε γὰρ μηδὲν ἀλογίστως μηδὲ ἐξ ὀργῆς ἢ καὶ δέους ποιῶν ἢ καὶ λέγων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ βεβαίου τῶν λογισμῶν πρὸς πάντα τὰ καίρια ἔτοιμος ὢν, καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἱκανῶς ἐκλογιζόμενος, καὶ μῆτε τι ἀνέλπιστον ποιούμενος,...

42,1,4

καὶ διὰ ταῦτ', ἐπειδὴ τάχιστα ἐνίκηθη, δεινῶς ἐξεπλάγη καὶ οὔτε τι βούλευμα καίριον οὐτ' ἐλπίδα βεβαίαν εἰς τὸ ἀνακινδυνεύσαι ἔσχεν.

63,5,1-2

... ἐκβιασάμενος τὸ φρόνημα τῷ τε καιρῷ καὶ τῇ χρείᾳ ἐδούλευσε, μηδὲν φροντίσας εἰ τι ταπεινὸν φθέγγαιτο, πρὸς τὴν ἐλπίδα ὧν τεύξοιτο, εἶπε γὰρ οὕτως, ἐγώ, δεσποτα, ... σὸς δὲ δούλος εἰμι. καὶ ἦλθόν τε πρὸς σὲ τὸν ἐμὸν θεόν, προσκυνήσων σε ὡς καὶ τὸν Μίθραν, καὶ ἔσομαι τοῦτο ὅ τι ἂν σὺ ἐπικλώσῃς. σὺ γὰρ μοι καὶ μοῖρα εἶ καὶ τύχη.

Libanius (4)

Epistula 165,2 (T.)

ἤκει δὴ καιρὸς ἔργων καὶ βεβαίου τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐμοί τε καὶ τούτῳ.

Vegetius (4)

3,11

Hoc ergo tempus est, quo tanto magis duces debent esse solliciti, quanto maior speratur diligentibus gloria et maius periculum comitatur ignavos, in quo momento peritiae usus, pugnandi doctrina consiliumque dominatur.

Paulinus of Nola (4-5)

Epistle 16,4

Unde et Spes, et Nemesis, et Amor, atque etiam Furor in simulacris coluntur, et occipiti calvo sacratur Occasio et tua ista Fortuna lubrico male nixa globo fingitur.

Julian of Cilicia (4?)

in Job 22,23-25

ὅταν οὖν σμικρύνῃς σαυτόν, ἀσφαλεῖς ἔξεις τὰς ἐπὶ τῆς ζωῆς ἐλπίδας ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ πέτρας ἐστηρικμένος καὶ πλησθήσῃ ἀγαθῶν ὡς ὁ χειμάρρους Σουφὴρ ἐν καιρῷ ὑετοῦ...

34, 5-6

πρὸ καιροῦ ἑαυτὸν ἀνακηρύττων καὶ παρὰ τὰ πεπραγμένα αὐτῷ τετιμωρῆσθαι διίσχυριζόμενος καὶ ἀποτετεύχθαι τῶν ἐλπίδων,...

John Chrysostom (4-5)

On the Incomprehensibility of God 3
(SC 28 p. 222f.)

ποιῶν ἔξεις σωτηρίας ἐλπίδα, εἶπέ μοι, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον, ἀγαπητέ;

Homily 10,6

ἔξεστιν δὲ τοῖς ἀπίστοις καὶ περὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν ἀμφιβάλλουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῷδε τῷ βίῳ πραττομένων τῆς ἀγαθῆς προσδοκίας ἡμῶν λαβεῖν βέβαια τὰ ἐνέχυρα. ἰδοὺ γὰρ πεπλήρωται πᾶς τῆς οἰκουμένης κύκλος τῶν ἀθλητῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πᾶς τόπος ἔχει τῶν ἀγίων τὴν μνήμην· πάντες δὲ καιροὶ κρείττονα τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς δῶρων καὶ βλαστημάτων τὰ τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν τοῖς ἑορτάζουσι χαρίζονται διηγήματα.

"Strategemata" (?) (ed. J.A. de Foucault 1949 p.66)

...ἵνα τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἐλπίδι μικρὸν ὑπαναχωρησάντων πολεμίων εὐρωσι καιρὸν εἰσελθεῖν οἷ σύμμαχοι.

Hephaestio (5) ..

Preface to the Epitomes of the Apotelesmatica

(T. vol.2 p. VII)

ἔλθῶν εἰς τοιαύτας ἐλπίδας ῥυθθήσεται. ἐπεὶ δὲ αἱ μὲν ἀπόρροιαί τῶν ἀστέρων τὸν παρωχηκότα καιρὸν, αἱ δὲ συναφαὶ τὸν μέλλοντα δηλοῦσιν, ὁρώμεν τὸν Ἄρην τῆς Ἡλίου ἀπορροίας κρατοῦντα καὶ λέγομεν πρὸ τῆς γενέσεως τῆς παρουσίας ἐξ ἐπαναστάσεών τινων ἢ νόσου ἀρεϊκῆς σφοδρότερον κλιμακτηρισθῆναι τὸν πατέρα, ἐστὶ παχυμερῶς εἰκάσαι πρὸ ἑτῶν τῆς παρουσίας γενέσεως. καὶ ἐπεὶ ὁ Ἥλιος ὁ τὸ πατρικὸν ἐπέχων πρόσωπον πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Ἑρμοῦ ἐπιμαρτυρίαν καὶ κόλλησιν φέρεται, ἐστὶν εὐτυχίας ἐλπίς· μετὰ γὰρ ἔτη ἰγ' πλήρη καὶ ἡμέρας κδ' ὁ τοῦ Διὸς ἐπέρχεται τῷ ἡλιακῷ τόπῳ, καὶ ἐστὶν ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐπερχομένης Ἰνδικτιώνος γ' περὶ τὸν Ὀκτώβριον.

(e) ΚΑΙΡΟΣ AND ΘΛΙΨΙΣ

Aesop (?) 32

ἐπὶ τοῖς θλιβεροῖς ὑπόμενε· πάντα γὰρ καιρῶ ἰδίῳ ἔχει χάριν.

LXX (2 BC?)

Psalm 9, 10-11

βοηθὸς ἐν εὐκαιρίαις ἐν θλίψει
καὶ ἐλπισάτωσαν ἐπὶ σέ οἱ γυνώσκοντες τὸ
ὄνομά σου,

9, 22 (10, 1)

ἐν εὐκαιρίαις ἐν θλίψει

cp. Aquila (2) εἰς καιρὸν θλίψεως

Symmachus (2-3) ἐν καιροῖς θλίψεως

31, 6-7

ὑπὲρ ταύτης προσεύξεται πᾶς ὅσιος πρὸς σέ ἐν καιρῶ
πλὴν ἐν κατακλυσμῷ ὑδάτων πολλῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ
ἔγγιούσιν.
σύ μου εἶ καταφυγὴ ἀπὸ θλίψεως τῆς περιεχούσης με·

Ecclesiasticus

6, 8

ἔστιν γὰρ φίλος ἐν καιρῶ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οὐ μὴ παραμείνη ἐν ἡμέρα θλίψεως σου.

40, 24

ἀδελφοὶ καὶ βοήθεια εἰς καιρὸν θλίψεως

51, 10-11

... μή με ἐγκαταλιπεῖν ἐν ἡμέραις θλίψεως,
ἐν καιρῷ ὑπερηφανιῶν ἀβοηθησίας.

Isaiah 8, 22

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀπορία στενὴ καὶ σκότος, θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ
σκότος ὥστε μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ οὐκ ἀπορηθησεται ὁ ἐν στενοχωρία
ῶν ἕως καιροῦ.

Jeremiah 15, 11

... ἐν καιρῷ τῶν κακῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως αὐτῶν ...

Daniel 12, 1 (Thdt.)

ἔσται καιρὸς θλίψεως, ...

1 Maccabees 13, 5

ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ θλίψεως

Judges 10, 14; Nehemiah 9, 27; Esther 4, 17r; 8,
12 s; Ecclus. 2, 11; 22, 23; 35, 24; 37, 4; Isaiah
33, 2 (all LXX); Jeremiah 14, 8 (Aquila); Ezekiel
35, 5 (Aquila, Theodotion) all use the phrase ἐν καιρῷ
θλίψεως.

SIG (ed. 3 vol. 2 (1917) p. 275) 685 (2 BC)

... θλίβομενοι κατὰ τινὰς καιροῦς ὑπὸ τῶν παρορόντων (sic)
Πραισιῶν ...

Athanasius (4)

Ep. 49, 1

... συνορῶντος τὸν καιρὸν καὶ τὰς ἐπικειμένας θλίψεις τῆ
ἐκκλησίας.

(f) KAIPOΣ AND XPEIA

Aeschines (4 BC)

3, 141

... καιρὸς καὶ φόβος καὶ χρεία συμμαχίας, ἀλλ' οὐ Δημοσθένης.

(cp. 3, 239 καιρὸς καὶ φόβος καὶ χρεία συμμάχων)

Demosthenes (4 BC)

21, 101

... εἰάν του καιρὸς ἢ χρεία παραστή.

47, 30

ὁ δὲ θεόφημος χρόνου ἐγγεγεννημένου, ὅποτε αὐτὸν ἦκων ἀπαιτοίην, ἐμελλε φήσειν ἀποδεδωκέναι, καὶ τούτοις τεκμηρίοις καταχρήσεσθαι ὡς ἀποδεδωκεν, τῷ καιρῷ, τῇ χρεία, ὡς οὐκ ἡλίθιος ἦν οὐδ' αὐτῷ φίλος αὐτῷ γενόμενος οὐδεπώποτε, ὥστ' ἐπισχεῖν.

P. Tebt. 3/1 (1933)

(3 BC) p. 75f.

... καὶ κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς, μὴ μόνον ἀριθμὸν εἶχουσαι (sc. αγοραὶ) ἀλλὰ καὶ δεδοκιμασμέναι καὶ ἐπιτηδειαὶ πρὸς τὰς χρείας. ἐπιπορεύου δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ὑφαντεῖα ἐν οἷς τὰ οἰκονομικά ὑφαίνονται καὶ τὴν πλείστην σπουδὴν ποιούσιν ἵνα πλείστα τῶν ἰστέων ἐνεργᾶ ἦ, ...

Polybius (2 BC)

2, 13, 2

... περὶ ἧς ἡμεῖς εὐφύεστερον καιρὸν λαβόντες ὑποδείξομεν τὴν θέσιν καὶ τὴν χρείων ...

2, 49, 7-10

ἂν μὲν οὖν Αἰτωλοὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς γεγενημένην εὐνοίαν ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Δημήτριον καιροῖς ἐντρεπόμενοι τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν ὑποκρίνονται, καθάπερ καὶ νῦν, πολεμήσειν αὐτοὺς ἔφασαν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς πρὸς τὸν Κλεομένη· καὶ μὲν ἡ τύχη συνεπιλαμβάνηται, μὴ δεῖσθαι χρείας τῶν βοηθησόντων· ἂν δ' ἀντιπίπτῃ τὰ τῆς τύχης, Αἰτωλοὶ δὲ συνεπιτίθωνται, προσέχειν αὐτὸν παρεκάλουν τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἵνα μὴ πρόηται τοὺς καιρούς, ἔτι δὲ δυναμένοις σώζεσθαι Πελοποννησίοις ἐπαρκέσῃ· περὶ δὲ πίστεως καὶ χάριτος ἀποδόσεως ῥαθυμεῖν αὐτὸν ὡντο δεῖν· τῆς γὰρ χρείας ἐπιτελουμένης αὐτὸν εὐρήσειν τὸν Ἄρατον εὐδοκουμένας ἀμφοτέροις ὑπισχνούντο πίστεϊς. ὁμοίως δ' ἔφασαν καὶ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς βοηθείας αὐτὸν ὑποδείξειν.

2, 67, 1

Ἐπειδὴ δ' ὁ μὲν καιρὸς ἦκε τῆς χρείας, ...

3, 101, 11 - 102, 1

εἶχε γὰρ τὰς πλείστας ἐλπίδας τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως ἐν τῷ τῶν ἱππέων τάγματι. Καθ' ὃν δὲ καιρὸν Μάρκος, συνθεωρήσας τὸ πολὺ μέρος τῶν ὑπεναντίων ἐπὶ τὰς προειρημένας χρείας κατὰ τῆς χώρας σκεδαννύμενον, λαβὼν τὸν ἀκμαϊότατον καιρὸν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐξῆγε τὴν δύναμιν, ...

5, 2, 5

πρὸς τε γὰρ τοὺς ἐν γῆ κινδύνους ἐκ παρατάξεως γενναιότατοι πρὸς τε τὰς κατὰ θάλατταν ἐκ τοῦ καιροῦ χρείας ἐτοιμότατοι, ...

5, 2, 8

... ὡστ' ἐκείνους μὲν συμπαρόντας ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν καιρῶν ἐθελοκακεῖν καὶ λυμαίνεσθαι τὰς τοῦ βασιλέως χρείας, ...

5, 75, 6

ὁ δ' ἐστὶ ῥᾶστον μὲν τῶν ὄντων, μεγίστας δὲ παρέχεται χρείας ἐν τοῖς ἐπισφαλέσι καιροῖς, ...

8, 5, 8

... κατὰ δὲ τὸν τῆς χρείας καιρὸν ...

9, 13, 3

... ἀλλ' ὅταν ὁ τῆς ἐκάστου χρείας καιρὸς ἐπαναγκάζῃ.

Diodorus Siculus (1 BC)

3, 15, 7

πάντα γὰρ ἢ χρεία διδάσκει τὴν φύσιν, οἰκείως τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις καιροῖς ἀρμοζόμενην πρὸς τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐλπίδος εὐχρηστίαν.

17, 48, 6

... τὰς ἀρμοζούσας χρείας τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις καιροῖς παρείχοντο.

Cicero (1 BC)

ad Fam. 4, 9, 2

Primum tempori cedere, id est necessitati parere, semper sapientis est habitum.

Ps. - Caesar (1 BC)

de bello Alexandrino 13

Postremo non longam navigationem parabant sed praesentis temporis necessitati serviebant et in ipso portu confligendum videbant.

Strabo (1BC - 1)

2, 1, 30

χρῶμεθα δ' οἰκείως ἑκατέρα τὸν καιρὸν καὶ τὴν χρείαν σκοποῦντες, ...

Memnon (1)

ap. F. Jacoby, FGH 3B, p. 345 1.22

τυγχάνει τῆς σπουδῆς, ἐν ὁμοίοις καιροῖς καὶ χρείαις τὴν ἀμοιβὴν ὑποσχόμενος.

Ps. - Longinus (1 ?)

32, 1

ὁ τῆς χρείας δὲ καιρός, ...

Q. Curtius Rufus (1)

7, 7, 10

Discrimen, inquit, me occupavit meliore hostium quam meo tempore. Sed necessitas ante rationem est, maxime in bello, quo raro permittitur tempora legere (or, eligere).

Philo (1)

Spec. L. 2, 6

... μὴ τόπους εἰ βέβηλοι ἢ ἱεροί, μὴ καιροὺς εἰ ἐπιτήδειοι, μὴ αὐτοὺς εἰ καθαροὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν, μὴ τὰ πράγματα εἰ μεγάλα, μὴ τὰς χρείας εἰ ἀναγκαῖαι προἰξετάσασαντες, ...

112

ἔπειδὴ γὰρ καιροὶ πολλάκις προσπίπτουσιν ἀβούλητοι, δι' οὓς ἀναγκάζονται τινες πιπράσκειν τὰ ἴδια, καὶ τῆς ἐν δέοντι χρείας τούτων προῦνόησε ...

Paul (1)

1 Thessalonians 5, 1

περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν, ἀδελφοί, οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε ὑμῶν γράφεσθαι, ...

Josephus (1)

AJ 4, 293

φέρει καὶ περὶ τούτων βραχέα προσδιατάξωμεν, ὡς ἂν προειδότες ἂν χρῆ ποιεῖν ἐν τῇ χρείᾳ τῶν σωτηρίων εὐπορήτε καὶ μὴ τότε ἂν δεῖ ποιεῖν ἐπιζητούντες ἀπαρασκευάστοι τοῖς καιροῖς περιπέσσητε.

15, 99

... εἴ τις αὐτὸν καιρὸς ἢ χρεία κατάσχοι τοιούτων δεησόμενον.

15, 201

τούτ' αὐτὸν καὶ μάλλον εἰς πίστιν εὐνοίας καὶ προθυμίας ἐπισυνίστη, καὶ πλείστον ἠνέγκατο τῇ χρεία τοῦ καιροῦ τὸ μεγαλόψυχον ἀρμόσας.

Epictetus (1-2)

Diss. 2, 23, 15

πότερον δ' εἰπεῖν ἄμεινον ἢ σιωπῆσαι καὶ οὕτως ἄμεινον ἢ ἐκείνως καὶ τοῦτο πρέπον ἢ οὐ πρέπον, καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκάστου καὶ τὴν χρείαν τίς ἄλλη λέγει ἢ ἡ προαιρετική;

Plutarch (1-2)

Mor. 90F

ἔχθροῦ δὲ καὶ τὸ τιμωρίαν παραλιπεῖν ἐν καιρῷ παρασχόντος ἐπιεικὲς ἐστί. τὸν δὲ καὶ πταίσαντι συμπαθήσαντα καὶ δεηθέντι συλλαβόμενον καὶ παισὶν ἔχθροῦ καὶ οἰκείοις πράγμασιν ἐν χρεία γενομένοις σπουδῆν τινα καὶ προθυμίαν ἐνδειξάμενον, ὅστις οὐκ ἀγαπᾷ τῆς εὐμενείας οὐδ' ἐπαινεῖ τὴν χρησιμότητα, ἐκείνος

ἢ σιδάρου κεχάλκευται ^{ἐξ ἀδάμαντος} μέλαιναν καρδίαν.

454 A

ὅταν ὁ τῆς χρείας ἀφίκηται καιρός ...

Herodian (3)

4, 14, 3

παρέλαβε δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν ὁ Μακρίνος οὐχ οὕτως εὐνοία καὶ πίστει τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὡς ἀνάγκη καὶ χρεία τοῦ παρόντος καιροῦ.

Lucian (2)

de mercede conductis 13

... καὶ τοῦτον ἐν καιρῷ τῆς χρείας ἀπραγμόνως ἀποδίδοσθαι ...

Saturnalia 33

... ἐκείνοις δὲ ἐν καιρῷ τῆς χρείας ἢ δόσις ἀείμνητος.

Clement of Alexandria (2-3)

Paedagogos 2.1, 13, 2

ἀκρασίας γὰρ τῆς μεγίστης συγγεῖν τοὺς καιρούς, ὧν αἱ χρήσεις ἀσύμφωνοι.

Plotinus (3)

Enneads 1, 4, 16

... διδούς μὲν τούτῳ ὅσα πρὸς τὴν χρείαν καὶ δύναται, αὐτὸς δὲ ὧν ἄλλος οὐ κωλύμενος καὶ τούτου ἀφεῖναι, καὶ ἀφήσων δὲ ἐν καιρῷ φύσεως, ...

4, 4, 17

ὅθεν ἄλλο τὸ βούλευμα καὶ πρὸς καιρόν, ὅτε ἡ χρεία πάρεστι καὶ συμβέβηκεν ἔξωθεν τουτί, εἶτα τουτί.

Iamblichus (4)

de vita Pythagorica 181

εἶναι δὲ ποικίλην τινὰ καὶ πολυειδῆ τὴν τοῦ καιροῦ χρείαν.

Achilles Tattius (4 ?)

4, 14, 2

καθ' ἑκάστην διώρυγα χῶμα ἔχουσιν Αἰγύπτιοι, ὡς ἂν μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ τῆς χρείας ὑπερέχων ὁ Νεῖλος τὴν γῆν ἐπικλύση.

Priscillian (4)

Tractate 2 *init.*

... temporis necessitate cogente ...

Libanius (4)

Epistula 586, 2 (T.)

συνέβη δὲ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν διὰ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χειρῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς
ἔλθειν, ἀνδρὸς αὐτοῦ μὲν ἥκιστα παίζειν εἰδότης, σὲ δὲ
νομίζοντος μετὰ τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦτο ποιεῖν. ἀλλὰ νῦν γε οὐ
καιρὸς ἐν ἐπειγούσῃ τῇ χρείᾳ.

Themistius (4)

Oratio 5 (p. 96, Schenkl - Downey)

... ἀκατασκέυαστον χειροτονίαν, ἣν ὁ καιρὸς ἐψηφίζετο, πρὸς
ἣν ἡ χρεία ἐχειραγώγει.

Oratio 8 (p. 170, Schenkl - Downey)

ἥνικα ἐπὶ Σκύθας στρατεύει βασιλεύς, ἥνικα ἐγείρει πόλεμον
ἄκραιφνῆ, καὶ σιτούμενον οὐχ ὠρισμένα, οὐ γὰρ ἀγαπητὸν εἰ μὴ
τῇ χρείᾳ καὶ προσοίσομεν; καὶ γὰρ ἀπίστον, εἰ μὴ τὰς εἰσφορὰς
ἢ κατασχούσα ἀνάγκη διπλασιάσει. νῦν δὲ ἐν καιρῷ περιουσίαν
αἰτοῦντι δαπάνης εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀκρίβειαν ἡμῖς ἐπανάγεις,
...

Oratio 22 (p. 64, Schenkl - Downey - Norman)

ὥστε σοι πανταχόθεν ἀπορριπτέον τὸν ὄκνον καὶ κοιωνητέον
πόνων τε καὶ ἀγρυπνιῶν, κινδύνων τε αὐτῶν καὶ δαπάνης καὶ
ἀτιμίας, οὐ κληθῆναι ἀναμένοντι εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν, ἀλλ'
αὐτομάτῳ θεόντι καὶ προμαντευομένῳ τοῦ καιροῦ πολλάκις καὶ
πειρωμένῳ πρὸς ἐκάστην χρείαν τοῦ φίλου τὸ πρόσωπον οἰκεῖον
μεταλαμβάνειν, ...

John Chrysostom (4)

Panegyrics on St. Paul 5, 11

καὶ τὸ δὴ πάλιν θαυμαστότερον, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἐξεῖπεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ
μέχρι τῆς χρείας ἔστη, οὐ γὰρ ὡς τοῦ καιροῦ παρέχοντος αὐτῷ
πολλὴν τὴν ἀδειαν, ἀμετρῶς πάλιν τῷ πράγματι ἐχρήσατο, ἀλλ'
ἔγνω μέχρι ποῦ προελθεῖν ἔδει.

On the incomprehensibility of God 1 (SC 28 (1970),
p. 100)

εἰς καιρὸν γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα ταῦτα τὴν ἑαυτῶν χρείαν
παρασχόντα ἡμῖν, ...

On Vainglory 69 (SC 188, p. 168f.)

ὅταν μὲν γὰρ τὰς πύλας ἔτι κοσμῶμεν, ἐκείνων τῶν ἀφελεστέρων χρεῖα, ὅταν δὲ εἰσελθόντας τοὺς πολῖτας ῥυθμίζωμεν, καὶ τούτων τῶν ὑψηλοτέρων καιρὸς διηγημάτων.

Vegetius (4)

3, 26

Boni duces publico certamine numquam nisi ex occasione aut nimia necessitate confligunt.

Cyriil (4-5)

On the Trinity 3

... ὡς ἐν καιρῷ τε καὶ χρεῖα καθῆκεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς ἐκούσιον κενῶσιν;

Comm. in Joh. 10, 2

... καιρὸς ἐκάλει καὶ χρεῖα, ...

Procopius (5-6)

epistola 113 (p. 576 Hercher)

οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα πράττειν ὅσα τις βούλεται ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη παρέπεσθαι καὶ δουλεύειν τῇ χρεῖα καὶ πείθεσθαι τῷ καιρῷ, ὃ δὲ δίδωσιν οὐχ ὅσα τις ἐθέλει ἀλλ' ὅσα πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν ἀνάγκη μετρεῖ.

"Strategemata" (?) (ed. J.-A. de Foucault, 1949, p. 115)

... ἐν καιρῷ γὰρ χρεῖας καὶ οὗτοι πολλὰ ὠφελήσουσιν.

"Naumachica" (?) (ed. A. Dain (1943))

p. 21

ἡ γὰρ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν χρεῖα πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀντιμαχομένων πολεμίων δύναμιν, ὡς ἂν ἀπαιτήσῃ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν δρομῶνων.

ρ. 94

... πρὸς τὴν χρείαν τὴν ἀπαιτούσῃ τότε εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ...

(g) (1) τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες (vel sim.) in Greek literature

Cp. Diodorus Siculus (1 BC) 14,67,3

σχεδὸν εἴκομεν τῷ τῆς ἀνάγκης καιρῷ· νῦν δὲ τῶν ὀπλῶν κυριεύοντες καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους ἅμα βοηθοὺς καὶ θεατὰς ἔχοντες τῆς ἀρετῆς, μὴ παραχωρήσωμεν ἀλλὰ ποιήσωμεν φανερόν, ὡς διὰ καιρόν, οὐ δι' ἀνανδρίαν ὑπεμείναμεν δουλεύειν.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1 BC)

Antiquities 11,18,4

... μαθόντες ὅτι οὐ τοῖς πράγμασιν οἱ καιροὶ δουλεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς καιροῖς τὰ πράγματα.

Plutarch (1-2)

Aratus 43,2

ἀλλὰ ὄρων ἀπαραίτητον ἐπικειμένην ἀνάγκην καὶ τὸν καιρόν, ᾧ δουλεύουσιν οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν, ἐχώρει πρὸς τὸ δεινόν.

Dio Cassius (2-3) 63,5,1

ἔπειτα σιωπῆς κηρυχθείσης ἐπεθάρρησέ τε καὶ ἐκβιασάμενος τὸ φρόνημα τῷ τε καιρῷ καὶ τῇ χρείᾳ ἐδούλευσε, μηδὲν φροντίσας εἴ τι ταπεινὸν φθέγγαιτο πρὸς τὴν ἐλπίδα ὧν τεύξειτο.

Ps. - Apollonius of Tyana (4 ?)

Apotelesmata 7

περὶ τῶν ὀνομασιῶν τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν δουλευόντων εἰς τοὺς τέσσαρας καιρούς· αἱ ὀνομασίαι τῶν ἀγγέλων οἱ διοικοῦσι τὸν πρῶτον καιρόν εἰσιν αὐταί·

(This is the reading of F. Nau, who then translated serviunt quatuor (sic) temporibus (anni). F. Boll read δουλευόντων τοὺς δικαίους. V. p. 13f. above for details.)

Athanasius (4)

Epistola 49,3

καὶ μάλιστα, ὅτι οὐ πρέπει τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύειν, ἀλλὰ τῷ
κυρίῳ.

Gregory of Nazianzus (4)

Carmen de vita sua 11. 708f.

δουλεύομεν καιροῖς τε καὶ λαῶν πόθοις,
ἀεὶ διδόντες τῷ πνεύνῳ τὸ σκάφος,

cp. 11. 1719f.

δούλα καιρῷ γάρ φασι
τὰ πάντα.

Orat. 4,93

ἐπειδὴ μέσῃν βαδίζων ὁ τοῦ ἔθνους ἄρχων τοῦ καιροῦ καὶ
τῶν νόμων - τῷ μὲν γὰρ δουλεύειν ὤετο δεῖν, τοὺς δὲ μετρίως
ἡσχύνετο - ...

cp. 65

μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ μέρος οὐκ ἐλάχιστον καὶ ὅσον
εὔρε σαθρὸν καὶ νοσῶδες, τοῦ καιροῦ δούλον καὶ τότε καὶ
πρότερον, οὐ τὸ μὲν δεδούλωτο, τὸ δὲ ἡλιζεν.

Palladas (4-5)

Anth. Pal. 9,441,5-6

νυκτὶ δὲ μειδιῶν με θεὸς προσέειπε παραστάς·
καιρῷ δουλεύειν καὶ θεὸς ὧν ἔμαθον.

Cp. Procopius (5-6)

Epistola 113 (p. 576 Hercher)

οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα πράττειν ὅσα τις βούλεται, ἀλλ'
ἀνάγκη παρέπεσθαι καὶ δουλεύειν τῇ χρείᾳ καὶ πέθεσθαι τῷ
καιρῷ. ὁ δὲ δίδωσιν οὐχ ὅσα τις ἐθέλει, ἀλλ' ὅσα πρὸς τὴν
χρείαν ἀνάγκη μετρεῖ.

(g) (ii) tempori/temporibus servire (vel sim.) in Latin literature

Cicero (1 BC)

In Verrem 2, 3, 199

Imponitis decumas, patiuntur; alteras, *temporibus vestris serviendum* putant; dent emptum praeterea; dabunt, si voletis.

ad Q. fratrem 1, 2, 4

Pertaesum est levitatis, adsentationis, animorum non officiis sed *temporibus servientium*

pro P. Sestio 6, 14

sed agam moderate et huius potius *tempori serviam* quam dolori meo.

pro Caelio 6, 13

Illa vero, iudices, in illo homine admirabilia fuerunt, comprehendere multos amicitia, tueri obsequio, cum omnibus communicare quod habebat, *servire temporibus* suorum omnium pecunia, gratia, labore corporis, scelere etiam, si opus esset, et audacia, versare suam naturam et regere ad tempus atque huc et illuc torquere et flectere, cum tristibus severe, cum remissis iucunde, cum senibus graviter, cum iuventute comiter, cum facinerosis audaciter, cum libidinosis luxuriose vivere.

ad Atticum 8, 3, 6

... cum sit necesse, *servire tempori* et non amittere tempus cum sit datum.

10, 7, 1

Ergo hac in contentione neutrum tibi palam sentiendum et *tempori serviendum est*.

ad Fam. 6. 12. 2

Quod si mihi per me efficiendum fuisset, non me paeniteret pro ratione temporum ita esse molitum. Sed nihil est a me *inservitum temporis* causa, veteres mihi necessitudines cum his omnibus intercedunt.

9, 7, 1

Itaque non desino apud istos qui nunc dominantur cenitare. Quid faciam? *Tempori serviendum est.*

9, 17, 3

Nos enim illi *servimus*, ipse *temporibus*. Ita nec ille quid tempora postulatura sint, nec nos, quid ille cogitet, scire possumus.

10, 3, 3

Scis profecto (nihil enim te fugere potuit) fuisse quoddam tempus cum homines existimarent te nimis *servire temporibus*.

Tusc. Disp. 3, 27, 66

~~Ergo in potestate est abicere dolorem, cum velis, tempori servientem. An est ullum *tempus*, quoniam quidem res in nostra potestate est, cui non ponendae curae et aegritudinis causa *serviamus*?~~

Cornelius Nepos (1 BC)

Life of Alcibiades 1, 3

Cum tempus posceret ... *temporibus callidissime serviens*.

Cp. Ps. -Caesar (1 BC)

de bello Alexandrino 13

Postremo non longam navigationem parabant sed praesentis *temporis necessitati serviebant* et in ipso portu confligendum videbant.

Laus Pisonis (1 ?)

155

Temporibus servire decet

Cp. Irenaeus (3/5 ?)

Haer. 4, 13, 3

... gratiam magis praestantes in proximos quam *necessitate servientes*.

Cyprian (3)

Letter 5, 2

Circa omnia enim mites et humiles, ut servis Dei congruit, *temporibus servire* et quieti prospicere et plebi providere debemus.

Lactantius (3-4)

Divin. Inst. 5, 2, 10

Omnes tamen id arguebant, quod illo potissimum tempore id operis esset adgressus quo furebat odiosa crudelitas. O philosophum adulatorem ac *tempori servientem!*

Osius (4)

PLS 1, 195

Tempori servi.

Petrus Chrysologus (5)

Sermon 112, 1

Ita et magnum divinae scientiae desiderantibus nosse secretum noster sermo non sufficit, qui ad praesens festinationi *deservit et tempori.*

Ps.-Jerome (5)

On Col. 4, 5 (TS 9/3 (Souter) p. 66)

Ille 'redimit tempus' qui non *servit tempori* sed tempori dominatur.

Martianus Capella (5)

9, 967

Numerus est diversorum modorum ordinata connexio, *tempori* pro ratione modulationis *inserviens*, per id quod aut efferenda vox fuerit aut premenda, ...

I conclude with a summary of the whole chapter in a single tabulated form where the letters S O P E T C represent the six Greek words that accompany *Kαί* in sections (a) to (g).

Aesop (?)		T	Testament of			
Theognis	S		Naphthali	S		
Herodotus	S		Philodemus	S O		
Hippocrates (?)	S O P E		Caesar	S		
Sophocles	S O P		Ps.-Caesar			C
Euripides	S P		Cicero		(P)	C
Thucydides	S		Diodorus Siculus	S	P E	C
Aristophanes	S		Dionysius of Hall-			
Isocrates	S		carnassus	S	E	
Plato	S		Strabo	S (P)		C
Aeschines		C	Livy	S		
Hyperides	O		Memnon	S		C
Demosthenes	S O P E	C	Q. Curtius Rufus			C
Alcidamas	S		Ps.-Phocylides		P	
Aeneas Tacticus		E	1 Enoch		P	
Aristotle	S P		Philo	S O P E		C
Theophrastus		P	NT: Paul	S P		C
Epicurus		E	Ps.-Paul (?)		P	
P. Tebt.	S	C	Luke		P	
Ps.-Plato	O		Ps.-Peter (?)		P	
Theocritus (?)	(S)O		Josephus	S O	E	C
LXX: Isaiah		T	Onasander	S		
Jeremiah	S P	T	L. A. Seneca	S		
Ezekiel	S		Epictetus	S		C
Daniel (Th.)		T	Testament of			
Psalms		E T	Solomon		P	
Eccles.	O		Ps.-Longinus			C
Ecclus.	S P	T	Dio Chrysostom	S O P E		
1 Maccabees		T	Plutarch	S O P E		C
3 Maccabees	S		'Stoica'	S		
Aristeas	S		Ignatius	S		
SIG	S	T	Aquila	S		T
OGIS	S		Vettius Valens		O E	
Polybius	S O P E	C	Maximus of Tyre		P	
			Ps.-Barnabas	S		

Galen	S			Priscillian			C
Symmachus			T	Apollinaris	S		
Aelius Aristides	O	E		Libanius	S	O	E C
Solinus	S			Julian of			
Irenaeus	S			Cilicia	S		E
Clement of				Basil	S		
Alexandria			C	Vegetius	S		E C
Lucian	S	E	C	Asterius of			
Ps.-Lucian	S	O	C	Amasea	S		E
Acts of John	S			Jerome	S		
Julius Pollux	S	O	P	Cyril	S	O	P C
Babrius	S	P		Paulinus of Nola			E
Herodian	S	E	C	Thalassius (?)	S	O	
Dio Cassius		E	C	Hephaestio	S	P	E
<hr/>							
Dionysius	O			Petrus Chrysologus	S		
P. Flor.	S			Socrates	S		
Plotinus			C	Agathias Scholasticus	S		
Origen	S			Justinian	S		C
Philostratus	S	P		Procopius of Gaza			C
Aristides Quin-				Procopius of Caesarea	O		
tilianus	S	P		Antiochus of Mar Saba	S		
Didymus the				Photius	S		
Blind	S			'Suda'	S		
Themistius	S	O	P C	Ignatius Diaconus		P	
Gregory of				'Strategemata'			E C
Nazianzus	S	P	E	'Naumachica'			C
Achilles Tatius	O		C	Symeon the New			
Iamblichus			C	Theologian	S		
Eusebius	S			Eustathius	S		
Athanasius	S		T				
Makarios/Symeon	S						
John Chrysostom	S		E C				

* * * * *

This list may also serve as an index to the chapter. Long though it is, the consolation is that it would have been immensely longer if the Christian period could have been more thoroughly combed.

CHAPTER THREE

τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF ROMANS 11-12

I must now try to exhibit the function of τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες at Romans 12.11c within its context. I assume that in spite of the laconic nature of some of the material in ch. 12 and its apparent lack of connection, the frequent asyndeta, the mixture of constructions - imperatival participles, adjectives and infinitives - and the omission of main verbs (e.g. v.6b), there is a train of thought, and I assume that its elements can be bonded into a continuous, coherent exposition.¹ These assumptions are founded on others, concerning Paul's good-will and good-sense.

My understanding of the chapter is based upon vv. 3, 16 with the hardly accidental repetition of the wordgroup φρον-. In v. 3 there are four infinitives: ὑπερφρονεῖν, φρονεῖν (twice), σωφρονεῖν; in v. 16 φρονούντες (twice), φρόνιμοι. Paronomasia with φρον- is very widely

1. Contrast A. Pierson, S. A. Naber, *Verisimilia: laceram conditionem Novi Testamenti exemplis illustrarunt et ab origine repetierunt...*, (Amsterdam/The Hague 1886), who attempt (pp. 166-169) to show just how mangled Romans 12 is: *omnia obscura, quod in capite hic, ut verum fateamur, paraeneticum minime exspectaveris*. Cp. E. Käsemann, *New Testament questions of today* (London 1969), p. 189: 'an exact articulation of the passage [sc. Romans 12] is not easy, and the individual injunctions (at least from v.9 on) are connected not logically, but at best within a framework of juxtaposed fragments of tradition'.

attested in Greek of all periods,¹ and 13.1f. further illustrate Paul's ear for these jingles (ὑποτασσέσθω, τεταγμέναι, ἀντιτασσόμενος, διαταγῆ)² but the clear echoes of v.3 in v.16 and the resumption in both of important elements from ch. 11 and from earlier chs. (see below), suggest something more than a pleasing (?) rhetorical device. I shall argue that φρον— focuses what Paul particularly has in mind in vv.1-2, especially in using νοῦς, and what he exemplifies in 12.4-15 and 12.17-13.7. In particular I consider the contrast between ὑπερφρονεῖν and σωφρονεῖν (12.3) to be central in this part of the letter, and shall argue that behind this contrast is the ancient Greek contrast between ὕβρις (especially in the form of boasting) and σωφροσύνη.

Some of these φρον- cognates have already been used in ch. 11, though in a slightly different context. In explaining how the failure of the Jews as a whole to believe has turned to salvation for the Gentiles, Paul anticipates the tendency of the privileged to pride by warning the Gentile Christians amongst his readers not to 'crow' over the Jews (v.18: κατακαυχᾶσθαι twice), not to 'have ideas above

1. In addition to the five examples collected by Bauer, s. vv. σωφρονέω, ὑπερφρονέω, I have isolated sixteen instances of φρον- clusters, all with ὑπερφρονεῖν, the focus of my search: Aeschylus *Pers.* 820-837; Euripides *Heracl.* 386-388; id. fr. 545; Thucydides 2.62.3-5; 6.16.4; Aristophanes *Nub.* 225-236; Plato *Alc.1*, 103b-104a; Hippocrates [*ep.*] 17 init.; Plutarch *Mor.* 19d; Aelius Aristides 46 (p. 325 Dindorf); Cassius Dio 37.5.3; Aelian *VH* 1.25; Marcus Aurelius *Meditations* 10.8.1; Philostratus *VA* 5.29; id. *Imag.* 2.13.1; Plotinus *Enn.* 2.9.16. These are the cognates to be found with ὑπερφρον- in these passages: φρονεῖν, φρόνημα, φροντίς, φρήν, ἔμφρων, ἀφρων, ἀφρόνως, σωφρονεῖν, σωφρονίζεῖν, σώφρων, σωφρόνως, σύμφρων, καταφρονεῖν, καταφρόνημα, καταφρόνησις, παρὰφρονεῖν, περιφρονεῖν, μέγαφρονεῖν, μεγαλόφρων, μεγαλοφρόνως, μέγαλοφρονέστερον.
2. Cp. 14.22f., κρίνων, διακρινόμενος, κατακέκριται, and 2 Corinthians 10.12-15, ἐγκρίνας, συγκρίνας, συγκρίνοντες; μετροῦντες, ἀμετρα, μέτρον, μέτρον, ἀμετρα

their' religious 'station' (v.20: μὴ ὑψηλο- / ὑψηλὰ φρόνει) for fear their estimate of their religious privilege be based on their own view of the matter (v.25: ἐν ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι) or, Paul might have said, on their own righteousness (cp. 10.3).

Paul attempts to do this in several other ways: to underline the *divine* initiative he speaks of God as the agriculturalist who has full control over the olive tree (vv.17; 20; 21; 23: NB the passives); he emphasises the dependence of Gentile Christians upon the root (v.18); he points to the character of God, which is what is revealed in the conversion of the Gentiles: in that one may observe the χρηστότης and ἀποτομία of God, the latter in not sparing even the privileged Jews (v. 22); also God's unchangeableness (v.29) and pity (v.32); but no-one can hope to plumb them (v.33: ἀνεξερεύνητα, ἀνεξιχνίαστοι) or contribute to them (v.34: τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο) or turn them to one's own advantage (v.35: τίς πρόεδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;). It is God and God alone who is the source and means and goal of creation and salvation (v.36).

Both φρον- and καυχ- have been used even earlier in the letter. In developing his ethical σὰρξ / πνεῦμα antithesis Paul had spoken of the mind or mind-set of the believer and non-believer: in 8.5-7 he had used an old idiom where φρονεῖν τὰ τοῦ δεῖνᾶ means to belong to, be devoted to, be loyal to X, in order to define men's decisions and their results. In 2.17; 23 καυχᾶσαι was used twice of Jewish boasting over God and the Torah, in a passage which criticises the Jews, not for boasting but for the distance between their boasts and their behaviour. But in 3.27 and 4.2 an unspecified but unacceptable boasting is mentioned, though a boasting

based upon some obedience to the law is probably meant. There is too a christian boasting (5.2; 3; 11), acceptable because it is christologically determined (15.17), and this might just include the Gentile christian boasting of 11.18, where the emphatic complex $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\hat{\alpha}\delta\theta\alpha\iota$ is twice used. By itself it is not mistaken, as the Jewish boasting in 2.17; 23 was not; but it can be dangerous because it may tempt one to take the credit for what God has done or to misunderstand it (cp. 2.4: $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\rho\upsilon\epsilon\hat{\iota}\varsigma$).

One more passage remains to be mentioned, viz. 1.30. Though neither $\phi\rho\upsilon\upsilon$ - nor $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi$ - is used, some interesting parallels are. Amongst the twenty-one adjectives or adjectival phrases used to describe the Gentile world, there are $\upsilon\beta\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\upsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\zeta\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha\varsigma$. We should note particularly that these three, along with the whole catalogue, are symptoms of the $\acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\omicron}\kappa\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (v.28) which is the fundamental result of the divine judgment. If these traits are to be tackled, the rebellious, punished $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ must be tackled first.

It would be too much to claim more than this, but this can be claimed: boasting is one of the themes of Romans. Paganism boasts. Judaism, though possessing proper objects for boasting, boasts also and wrongly in its religious achievements. The pagan become Christian (and the Jew become Christian) also has much to be proud of and boast of, but could be tempted to boast of what he may not, how he came to be included within the people of God. Part of Paul's purpose in writing Romans can be seen to be deflating the pride of unbelieving pagans (1.30) and Jews (3.27; 4.2) and even of believers, providing a context for legitimate boasting, for Jewish boasting (2.17; 23), for Gentile christian boasting (11.18) and for all boasting (5.2; 3;

11; 15.17).

The origin of boasting lies in misapprehension, a mistaken analysis of one's status and capacities, a misuse of mind. Some idea of the importance of mind can be obtained from 8.5-7, and if the seat of the problem is there, then the way forward will be in a renewal or re-creation of mind.

In other words, if we look behind 12.3; 16 and examine cognate and related material in the previous chapters, we are already being prepared for 12.1-2, the place where we would expect to find the antecedents of 12.3.

Before we concentrate on ch. 12 (pp.194 ff.) I wish to raise a general question, and raise it at this point because its substance helps to explain the presence of particular items already noticed in the earlier chapters as well as features of chs. 12-13. The substance of my question is this: is not Paul really talking about ὕβρις when he uses words like (κατὰ) καυχᾶσθαι, ὑψηλο- / ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν, ὑπερφρονεῖν? The atmosphere is redolent of ὕβρις, as I shall try to show below. Paul (or his source) has used ὕβριστάς in 1.30, a passage, as we have seen, that introduces an important element in Paul's letter, the godless, fleshly

1. The *Onomasticon* of Julius Pollux regards ὑψηλοφρον- and ὑπερφρον- as synonymous (9.145; 147).

mind (1.28; 8.5-7) and its irresistible capacity for boasting.¹

But more evidence is necessary to establish this claim about ὕβρις than an inner conviction. In fact the evidence is both considerable and, I suggest, cumulative, and can be divided into seven sections.

1. A survey of Greek literature has isolated eighty-five instances of ὑπερφρονεῖν and cognates. In sixteen of these passages I found ὕβρις or one of its cognates.² I shall give four of these. The first and in many ways the most significant is in Aeschylus *Pers.* where we have not only ὑπερφρονεῖν and ὕβρις but also an extended φρον- cluster and a cognate of τιμ- , relating to a point I shall make in a moment. Having spoken prophetically of the Persians' defeat at the battle of Plataea as ὕβρις ἀποινὰ καθέων φρονημάτων (808) Darius goes on (820-831):

ὡς οὐχ ὑπέρφρου θνητὸν οὐτὰ χρὴ φρονεῖν.
ὕβρις γὰρ ἐξανθοῦσ' ἐκάρπωσε στᾶχυν
ἄτης, ὅθεν πάγκλαυτον ἐξέμαθ' ἕρος.

1. But why does he not continue with ὕβρι- in chs. 2-4, 11-15? We have no way of answering with any plausibility questions about a speaker's language patterns; I suggest that Paul prefers ὑπερφρον- because only that word allows the paronomasia that renders elegant (?) and memorable the point he wants to make. Further he may not wish to use such a grave word with Christians whom he does not personally know and whose support he needs in his mission to Spain. There is the possibility that ὑπερφρον- is not irretrievably pejorative, so that its ambiguity makes it a little less offensive than ὕβρις . It is possible to be highminded (see the remarkable passage in Marcus Aurelius *Meditations* 10.8.1); it is only dangerous to be too highminded, i. e. to be ambitious, conceited and hybristic.
2. The whole list is: Aeschylus *Pers.* 821, 825; id. *Sept.* 406, 410; Euripides *Bacch.* 1311, 1325; Thucydides 3.39.4-5; Polybius 6.18.5; 7; Josephus *AJ* 1.194; Dio Chrysostom *or.* 12.36; Plutarch *Mor.* 827A; Maximus of Tyre 18.1c; Philostratus *VA* 4.33; id. *Imag.* 2.13.1; id. *Hero.* 27.10-11; Schol. in Lucian (p. 114 Rabe, 11. 15-16).

τοιαῦθ' ὀρῶντες τῶνδε τὰπιτίμια
 μέμνησθ' Ἀθηνῶν Ἑλλάδος τε, μηδέ τις
 ὑπερφρονήσας τὸν παρὲντα δαίμονα
 ἄλλων ἔρασθεις ὄλβον ἐκχέη μέγαν.
 Ζεὺς τοι κολαστὴς ὑπερκόμπων ἄγαν
 φρονημάτων ἔπεστιν, εὐθύνος βαρῦς.
 πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐκεῖνον, σωφρονεῖν κεχημένον,
 πινύσκει' εὐλόγοισι νοουθετήμασιν,
 λῆζαι θεοβλαβοῦνθ' ὑπερκόμπῳ θράσει.

At AJ 1.194 Josephus is describing the arrogance of the men of Sodom:

πλήθει καὶ μεγέθει χρημάτων ὑπερφρονούντες
 εἰς τε ἀνθρώπους ἦσαν ὑβρισταὶ καὶ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον
 ἰσεβεῖς At or. 12.36 Dio Chrysostom like Aeschylus and

Josephus uses ὑπερφρονεῖν of an attitude towards the deity:

ὑπερφρονούσι τὰ θεῖα, καὶ μίαν ἰδρυσάμενοι
 δαίμονα πονηρὰν καὶ ἄτοπον, τρυφῆν τινα
 ἢ ῥαθυμίαν πολλὴν καὶ ἀνειμένην ὑβριν,
 ἠδονὴν ἐπονομάζοντες, γυναικείαν τῷ ὄντι
 θεόν, προτιμῶσι καὶ θεραπεύουσι....

(The use of another τιμ-

cognate in προτιμῶσι will be noted, in view of τιμῆ in

Romans 12.10). Finally in a fragment on government Plutarch Mor. 827A

again brings ὑβρις and ὑπερφρον- together: ὅταν
 βασιλεία μὲν ὑβριν ἐντέκη καὶ τὸ ἀνυπεύθυνον.
 ὀλιγαρχία δ' ὑπερφροσύνην καὶ τὸ αὐθαρδές.
 δημοκρατία δ' ἀναρχίαν, ἰσότης δ' ἀμετρίαν,
 πᾶσαι δὲ τὸ ἀνόητον.

(In view of μέτρον πίστεως in Romans 12.3 Plutarch's

ἀμετρίαν will also be noted.)

2. Though to my knowledge the fact that ὑπερφρον- and ὑβρι- are virtually synonymous has not been remarked, the fact that σωφρον- and ὑβρι- are classical antonyms has been known for a long time.

σωφρονεῖν is of course actually found at Romans 12.3. A few examples from the collection I have been able to make,¹ in addition to the lines from Aeschylus *Pers.*, already quoted, are these: Xenophon

Cyr. 8.4.14: τὰ μὲν γὰρ ὑβριν τοῖς πολλοῖς, τὰ δὲ σωφροσύνην τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐμποιεῖ;

Philo Spec. L. 2.18: τὴν νοουθεσίαν ὑβριν εἶναι νομίζουσι καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄβροδίαιτον ὠθούμενοι βίον ἀλογοῦσι τῶν σωφρονιστῶν γέλωτα καὶ χλεύην

τιθέμενοι τὰς φρονήσεως καλὰς... λυσιτελεστάτας

Philo Legat. 64: ὁ δὲ πρὸς ὑβρεως τὰς [ὑφηγήσεις.

νοουθεσίας λαμβάνων τῷ πάντων οἶεσθαι

φρονιμώτατος καὶ σωφρονέστατος ἔτι δὲ

ἀνδρείότατος εἶναι καὶ δικαιοτάτος

ἢ χθαίρε μᾶλλον τῶν ὁμολογουμένων

πολεμίων τοὺς διδάσκοντας.

3. One particular aspect of σωφροσύνη should be emphasised here, given the proximity of Romans 12.3 and 11.33-36. Before Pope reminded his readers that the proper study of mankind is man, the Athenian tragedians were pressing a similar restraint upon their audiences and warning them of the folly of the opposite course of

1. Theognis 39-42//1081-1082; 377-380; Aeschylus *Pers.* 821, 829; Sophocles *Aj.* 1258-1259; id. fr. 718; Antiphon *Tetr.* 3.4.2; Plato *Phlb.* 45DE; id. *Leg.* 906AB; Xenophon *Cyr.* 8.1.30; 8.4.14; id. *Apol.* 19; id. *Mem.* 3.10.5; Isocrates *Pax* 119; Philo *Post.* 97-98; *Conf.* 46-47; *Mut.* 196-197; *Jos.* 73-74; *Spec. L.* 2.18; *Praem.* 52; 137-140; *Legat.* 64; Maximus of Tyre 18.1c; Philostratus *Imag.* 2.13.1; Iamblichus *Vita P.* 171; 174; 195; 210; Josephus *AJ* 1.200-201; 2.56; 69; 5.200; 255-256; 15.219; 17.243-247; 277-278; *BJ* 2.416; *Ap.* 2.195 (v.1. in Naber).

action. Quoted by Aristotle *Rh.* 2.21.6 and attributed by Richard Bentley to Epicharmus is the saying *θνητὰ χρὴ τὸν θνητὸν φρονεῖν*, and in two of his plays Sophocles expresses the same thought. In *Aj.* 777 (cp. 761) the hero *οὐ κατ' ἄνθρωπον φρονῶν* and in *Trach.* 473 Lichas expresses approval of Deianeira: *θνητὴν φρονούσαν θνητὰ κοῦκ ἀγνώμονα*. Euripides *Bacch.* 396 has the chorus equate *τότε μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν* with shortness of life,¹ referring back to the mention of Pentheus's *ὑβρις* in 375. One later appearance of this sentiment occurs in 2 Macc.

9.12: *δίκαιον ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῷ θεῷ καὶ μὴ θνητὸν ὄντα ὑπερήφανα φρονεῖν*. One is *σώφρων* when

one realises the limits that humanity, or God, imposes upon men. One is hybristic when like Ajax or Pentheus one refuses divine help (Ajax) or refuses to honour the god (Pentheus), something that Dionysus likes to receive no less than men (319ff., 342). Something like this lies at the back of Romans 11.33-36 where, as we have seen, the sole origin of salvation and all else is ascribed not to man but to God, in a liturgical form which is clearly intended to honour him.²

4. Not only is *ὑβρις* linked with *ὑπερφρονεῖν* and *per contra* with *σωφρονεῖν* and with thinking only human thoughts, but also with boasting, which is, as we have observed, a prominent theme in the earlier chapters and in ch. 12. This association comes through very clearly in Aeschylus *Sept.*. In less than 165 lines *κομπ-*

-
1. If this line runs on without break to 397, *βραχὺς αἰών*. See E. R. Dodds' note in loc.. The sense is not seriously damaged if a stop is read after *φρονεῖν*.
 2. Cp. W. A. Meeks, 'The man from heaven in Johannine sectarianism', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972) 53 and particularly his comparative material in nn. 36 and 37. I suspect that Ps.-Callisthenes, twice quoted by Meeks, has been infiltrated by John 3.12. I cannot find these two passages in the latest edition, by Trumpf (1974).

is used twelve times. After ὑπέρφρον in 387 we have in lines 391, 404, (406: ὕβριν), (410: ὑπέρφρονας), 425, 436, 455, 464, 473, 480, 500, 538, 551, 554 the following cognates of κομπέω , I boast: ὑπερκόμπω, ὑπέρκομπον, ὁ κόμπω δ' οὐ κατ' ἀνθρώπων φρονεῖ, κομπάζοντα, ὑπερκόμπω, μυκτηροκόμπω, κόμπω, κομπάζε, κομπάζεται, ἀκόμπωστος, κομπάσμασιν, ἄκομπωστος. This steady beat, enveloping ὕβρις and ὑπέρφρων , is surely saying something about one of the characteristics of ὕβρις , how it often expresses itself. In Sophocles Ajax and in Euripides Pentheus also boast in their ὕβρις. In *Aj.* 766 the hero's reply is given ὑψικόμπως καφρόνως ; in 770 Ajax τοσόνδ' ἐκόμπει μῦθον. In the *Bacch.* Pentheus is warned against boasting like his cousin Aktaeon (337-340; cp. 340: κομπάσαντ'); he is bidden honour the god (cp. 342: τῷ θεῷ τιμὴν δίδου). This injunction comes at the end of Teiresias's long and Cadmus's short appeals to Pentheus in which a whole cluster of φρον- cognates makes its contribution to the argument; cp. 268, 269, (271: νοῦν), (310: ἀὔχει), 312, 314, 316, 318, (326: μαίνει), (329: τιμῶν), 329, 332, using φρονῶν, φρένες, φρονεῖν, σωφρονεῖν (twice), σῶφρων, σωφρονεῖς, φρονῶν, φρονεῖς. In such a context σωφροσύνη will mean being modest about one's position and achievements, humility, gratitude and showing respect and honour to others.

5. I shall later suggest that φιλαδελφία, τιμὴ and σπουδὴ in Romans 12.10f. are three different facets of ἀγάπη (12.9). φιλαδελφία can readily be seen in this way, but can τιμὴ and σπουδὴ? I shall now argue that σπουδὴ and τιμὴ (especially ἀτιμ-) are introduced because they

are associated with ὕβρις, the concept at the back of the Pauline ὑπερφρονεῖν.

The fundamental passage for ὕβρις and ἀτιμία is Aristotle *Rh.* 2.2.5-6. Having defined anger (ὀργή, *ibid.* 2.2.1) as ὀρεξις μετὰ λύπης τιμωρίας φαινομένης διὰ φαινομένην ὀλιγωρίαν τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἢ τῶν αὐτοῦ, τοῦ ὀλιγωρεῖν μὴ προσήκοντος,

Aristotle adds that anger is with an individual, and that it is not without some pleasure, because of the contemplation of revenge. But

his main concern is to define ὀλιγωρία, which he subdivides into three types: καταφρόνησις, ἐπηρεασμός and ὕβρις.

ὕβρις describes the injurious, annoying actions of those who, feeling superior to their victims, express their superiority only to degrade (ἀίσχυνη) and for no other reason, not even for revenge. It is a wanton display of power for its own sake. (The

exclusion of revenge is strange after the definition of the general concept which included revenge.) Aristotle goes on: ὕβρεως δὲ

ἀτιμία, ὃ δ' ἀτιμάζων ὀλιγωρεῖ. τὸ γὰρ μηδενὸς ἀξίον οὐδεμίαν ἔχει τιμὴν, οὔτ' ἀγαθοῦ οὔτε κακοῦ.

He clinches the connection between ὕβρις and τιμή with two quotations from Homer.

To summarise: one is angry because one has been slighted in public; one form that slighting can take is to have ὕβρις inflicted on one. ὕβρις stems from a sense of superiority and from the wish to display it. Its goal is not revenge but the pleasure of dishonouring and humiliating the victim.

Aristotle is formalizing what had already been expressed in earlier Greek societies. ὕβρι- , τιμ- and ὑπερφρον- are associated in Aeschylus *Pers.* 808, 821, 823, 825; id. *Sept.* 406, 410; Euripides *Bacch.* 1311, 1320, 1325; Thucydides 3.39.4-5; Dio Chrysostom *or.* 12.36. ὕβρι- and τιμ- are combined at Demosthenes 18.205; 21.23; Isocrates *Ad Nic.* 16; Ps.-Plato *Definitions* 415e12, ὕβρις ἀδικία πρὸς ἀτιμίαν φέρουσα; Philo *Fug.* 30; *Dec.* 126; *Spec. L.* 3.168; *QOPL* 55; *Cont.* 42; *In Flacc.* 77; 79; Josephus *AJ* 3.266; 4.136; 9.256-257; 17.46; 18.356-358; *LXX Proverbs* 11.2; 14.2-3; Isaiah 23.9; Wisdom 4.19; Ps. Sol. 2.29-32 (Swete); Testament of Benjamin 6.5, ὕβρεως καὶ τιμῆς; Marcus Aurelius *Meditations* 2.6.

Part of hybristic behaviour is to dishonour, degrade, and so, I shall suggest later, the christian counter is not only to honour, but to go out of one's way to honour (12.10: τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι; cp. 13.7, ἀπόδοτε ... τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν.

6. Similarly I shall argue that the unexpected σπουδή, devotion to another's interests, as in 2 Corinthians 7.12; 8.16, is introduced to counter ὀλιγωρία, belittling of, contempt for, another's interests, which functions in the background of chs. 11-15, and of which ὕβρις is a possible type. Since I shall not deal in detail with the material in chs. 14-15, I note here that in the word ἐξουθενῶ (14.3; 10) we have a κοινή equivalent for ὀλιγωρῶ,¹ and so a continuation of the theme of ὕβρις. In ch. 14 it is the weak brother who feels he may eat

1. ὀλίγη, which is translated ὀλιγωρῶ in Proverbs 3.11, is frequently translated by ἐξουθενῶ or ἐξουθενῶ in LXX; cp. Judges 9.38. In Testament of Benjamin 9.3 we have ἐκεῖ κύριος ὕβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐξουθενωθήσεται.

only vegetables who is in danger of being despised and who is being championed by Paul. In both verses the verb is parallel to κρίνω and we recall the very frequent use of that verb in connection with human judging in this letter (2.1; 3; 14.4; 13), and because the superior judge is tempted to boast, it looks as though one could draw human judgment into Paul's understanding of ὑπερφρονεῖν. I recognise the danger of wishing to see ὕβρις everywhere in Romans and so shall say no more about κρίνειν ! but I propose that τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί is specifically a counter to hybristic ὀλιγωρία .

I wish to draw attention to material that links section 5 (ὕβρις- and (ἄ)τιμ-) and section 6 (Jews who judge). Not only are pagans hybristic (1.30) and so, ironically, dishonour themselves (1.24; 26) but Jews are behaving hybristically when they plunder temples and thus dishonour God (2.22-24), and so they render their claims to be judges that much less plausible. To be able to plunder and desecrate assumes superior strength and plundering is a demonstration of one's complete disregard for the deity and the worshippers within the temple. That would be dishonouring enough, but when to that can be added God's prohibition of such activity, then there is a double ὕβρις , a deliberate flouting of the divine will (cp. Deuteronomy 7.25-26). They are guilty as the Persians were guilty, according to Aeschylus, when in their ὕβρις they

οὐ θεῶν βρέτη
 ἠιδούντο συλᾶν οὐδὲ πιμπράναι νέως.
 βωμοὶ δ' αἰστοὶ δαιμόνων θ' ἰδρύματα

πρόριζα φύδην ἐξάνεστραπται βάρων.

(Pers. 809-812)¹

7. Finally I propose that it is the Τιμωρ— wordgroup, cognate with Τιμῆ , that is behind the whole section 12.17-13.7, so that it is possible to draw this long section within the overall argument that the bulk of Romans 11-15 is directed against ὕβρις in its various manifestations. The earlier chapters of Romans have shown amongst other things how inappropriate it is for human beings, even for enlightened Jews, to sit in judgment upon their neighbours. Their own light is broken and their practice is inconsistent with their preaching. Only God is just and so only he can judge. Man's inadequacy, his flawed perceptions, his eagerness to see himself as the source of wisdom (2.17-20; 12.16) are the reason for the long section that follows 12.16. 12.17-21 deals with retaliation and the Christian's avoidance of this and his better alternative to it. Retaliation even by Christians must be unjust because it must be based on too slight a knowledge of the facts. Only God can deal with evil because only he possesses the whole story. In saying ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις Paul might have said ἐμοὶ τιμωρία,² but the Old Testament lay closer to hand (Deuteronomy 32.35). 13.1-7 is linked with the previous verses in a number of ways. 12.17-21 leaves unanswered the question about the punishment of evil in the

1. Disobedience and hostility towards the gods are also regarded as ὕβρις ; *Hymn to Apollo* 278-279; Euripides *Hipp.* 474-475; id. *Supp.* 495-499; id. *Bacch.* 375; 516; 555; 1297; 1347; Aeschylus *PV* 82; Aristophanes *Nub.* 1506; 1509; cp. 2 Macc. 9.12 quoted in §3 above and Josephus *BJ* 4.150.

2. The closest approximation I find in LXX is Ezekiel 5.15; 17: ἐν τῷ ποιῆσαί με ἐν σοὶ κρίματα ἐν ἐκδικήσει θυμοῦ μου... καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ ἐπὶ σέ λιμὸν καὶ θηρία πονηρὰ καὶ τιμωρήσομαί σε, ... but Josephus *AJ* 14.369 and especially *Phil Det.* 169 treat them almost as synonymous.

interval between the *now* of christian non-retaliation and forgiveness and the *future* when God will avenge evil. The question is, does evil remain unpunished before the *eschaton*? Is it enough for it to be overcome by good (12.21)? Paul's answer is that God's viceregent, the 'state', has this intermediate task to execute, and the Christian's response is to pass private maltreatment to the 'state' for redress. There must be no taking of the law into one's own angry, hasty hands. The 'state' can be trusted to apply the law.¹

In short the 'state' is the divinely instituted organ for retributive justice; without exhausting the divine $\delta\rho\gamma\acute{\eta}$ (12.19) it is its agent in the present. By executing upon disobedience this $\tau\iota\mu\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ God's $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$ as expressed in his laws for the world is recognized and enhanced. The capacity for dishonour in $\acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$ is forestalled. So too is its capacity for disobedience. Perhaps one reason for Paul's setting his remarks about the 'state' as the (only) punisher of wrongdoing (13.3-7) in a general statement about the 'state' and its relationship with God is that in addition to the $\acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$ - $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$ ($\tau\iota\mu\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$) theme there is the $\acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$ - (dis)obedience theme. Greek literature frequently links $\acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$ with civil unrest and disorder. To that Paul opposes, as a feature of $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$, $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\tau\alpha\zeta\acute{\iota}\alpha$; cp. $\delta\iota\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\acute{\eta}$ in 13.2 and the whole $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ -group. Solon fr. 6 says that the people obey their leaders best when there is not too much wealth about to produce $\acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$. Creon in Sophocles *Antigone* describes the heroine in this way (480-483):

$\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\eta$ δ' $\acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\omicron\tau'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\eta\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron$,

1. This link between the two passages is cemented by common words: $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$ (12.17; 21; 13.3-4), $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu$ (12.21; 13.3-4), $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\delta\iota\kappa$ - (12.12; 13.4), $\delta\rho\gamma\acute{\eta}$ (12.19; 13.5) and $\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\iota\delta$ - (12.17; 19; 13.7).

νόμους ὑπερβαίνουσα τοὺς προκειμένους.
ὑβρις δ', ἐπεὶ δέδρακεν, ἦδε δευτέρα,
τούτοις ἐπαυχεῖν καὶ δεδρακυῖαν γέλαεν.

Further we note the expression here of ὑβρις in boastfulness (ἐπαυχεῖν) and we are reminded of Romans 1.32, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράξουσιν.

^In the *Ajax Menelaus* (1052-1090) points out the connection between ὑβρις, the wilful disobedience of the privileged individual and national ruin.¹ Paul then not only counsels ὑποταγή because in this way evil is punished and God's honour preserved but also

because the fabric of 'state' and society is protected from disintegrating ὑβρις.

I now return to ch. 12. If vv. 3; 16 represent the core of what Paul wants to say, what do they mean and how are they connected to vv. 1-2? ὑπερφρονεῖν, which is found only here in the New Testament (never in LXX if we exclude 4 Maccabees) and which therefore is probably used with special intent, means to have an unreal evaluation of one's powers, to accept an assessment that does not correspond to the facts. Its basis is a sense of personal superiority and is akin to ὑβρις. The Pauline hope is for φρονεῖν, even for σωφρονεῖν,² which marks that sober, modest self-assessment that makes arrogance and ambition impossible or maniacal. If so then μέτρον in 12.3, coming immediately after ὑπερφρονεῖν and σωφρονεῖν, almost certainly means limit, with πίστεως being objective: God has placed limits

1. Cp. Theognis 1081-1082: Josephus *AJ* 15.219-220; Plutarch *Mor.* 826F-827A

2. Only here and at 2 Corinthians 5.13 in the undisputed Paul; also only twice in LXX if we can exclude 2 and 4 Maccabees.

on each man's faith.¹ The believer is not a Promethean individualist defying all restraint and capable of anything. He is limited by his faith and faithlessness and further by his humanity, by his belonging to the Body, to a corporate group all of whose other members are equipped, in equally limited but different ways. μέτρον πίστεως is very similar to ἀναλογία τῆν πίστεως (v.6) and, I believe, καρὸς (v.11).²

The link between σωφρον- and μετρ- is an old one in Greek life and literature; compare Plato *Resp.* 399b; *Ps.-Plato Definitions* 411e6f.; 415d8; Euripides fr. 893; Isocrates *Areo.* 4; Aristotle *Eth. Nic.* 1179a9ff.; Josephus *AJ* 2.56; Philostratus *VA* 5.29; 36; Gregory of Nazianzus (PG 37.677A). This can be matched with the contrast between ὑβρι- and μετρ- at Philo *Spec. L.* 2.83; Josephus *AJ* 2.56; 7.172; Plutarch *Mor.* 827A; *PRyl.* 150, 1. 8-9; Philostratus *Hera.* 27.11. μετρ- is found alongside ὑπερφρον- in Plutarch *Mor.* 827A; Philostratus *Hera.* 27.10-11; id. *VA* 5.29; 7.28; Plotinus *Enn.* 2.9.16; Clement of Alexandria *QDS* 1 (med.). μέσος is found with ὑπερφρον- in Aristeas 122.³

1. In Cranfield's analysis of the possibilities it must be option (f), (g) or (h); cp. *New Testament Studies* 8 (1962) 347f. = pp. 23ff. (1965) = pp. 613ff. (1979).
2. The idea of amounts or degrees of faith is found in Mark 11.23; Matthew 8.10; 9.29; 17.20; Romans 14.1-2; 21; 15.1; 1 Corinthians 13.2.
3. I do not wish to introduce καρὸς prematurely and lay myself open to the charge of seeing it, like ὑβρις, everywhere, but I cannot help reporting my observation of the combination in various ways of μετρ-, μέσ- and καρ- in many periods of Greek literature: Hesiod *WD* 694; Pindar *Oi.* 13.47-48; id. *Pyth.* 4.286; Aeschylus *Supp.* 1059-60; Euripides *IT* 419-420; *Med.* 125-128; fr. 893; Isocrates *Ad Nic.* 33; Plato *Pol.* 284e6ff.; Aristotle *Eth. Nic.* 1096a26ff.; Hippocrates *Aer.* 10; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Lys.* 11; Plutarch *Mor.* 989B (+ σωφροσύνη); Anaxarchus in Clement of *Alexandria Strom.* 1.6.36; Menander *Monost.* 273 (Meineke); Polybius 27.20.1. I have gathered more than fifty other examples.

Paul's plea then (v. 1: παρακαλῶ) is for that realism, fellow-feeling and sense of common cause (vv. 15-16a: χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. τὸ αὐτὸ.. φρονούντες) which do not allow pride or flights of religious emotion or fancy (vv. 3; 16: μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν, ὑψηλά) to remove one from where one's brother is, whether in joy or grief.¹ One's rationality and wisdom depend in general on Christ (1 Corinthians 1.30; 4.10) or, as here, even on one's brother and the circumstances of his life, certainly not on oneself (μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς). Though the word is not used here, it is ταπεινοφροσύνη, self-effacement, another φρον- word, that Paul has in mind here (cp. v. 16: τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι; can this mean, share the life-sentence of the humble?).²

If then Paul is concerning himself with the christian φρήν (or φρένες), how the Christian views himself in the light of the new experience of Christ against the backdrop of the church, we shall not be mistaken if we see in the renewed νοῦς of v.2 the word in the opening verses that is particularly relevant for the sequel, and the word that is at the centre of vv. 1-2. φρήν is uncommon in Paul, being found only twice, both times at 1 Corinthians 14.20, where, as in Romans 12, two mentalities are being contrasted, the childish and the adult. The cognate concrete noun, φρόνημα, almost equally uncommon in Paul, is found in Romans 8.6-7 in another contrast, similar to that in Romans 12.1-2. As we have said earlier, in Romans 8.5-7 Paul uses a classical idiom where φρονεῖν τὰ τοῦ δεῖνα

1. Josephus AJ 17.209 contrasts ὑβρις and ὁμόνοια.
2. Contrary to the analysis and advice of Epictetus as reported by Arrian in *Disc.* 3.24.1, οὐ γὰρ συναπαπεινοῦσθαι πέφυκας οὐδὲ συνατυχεῖν ἀλλὰ συνευτυχεῖν. cp. Ps.-Oecumenius at PG 118.564D.

means to belong to X's party, in order to contrast those who support the $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\zeta$ and those who support the $\pi\nu\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$. But in Romans 12.2 for some reason $\phi\rho\acute{\eta}\nu$ or $\phi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\eta\mu\alpha$ is not used. Possibly $\nu\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\varsigma$ is used because it is still fresh in Paul's mind from 11.34 and it is then replaced in v.3ff. by an implied $\phi\rho\acute{\eta}\nu$ / $\phi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ because only that word will allow the alliteration of four cognates in vv.3; 16. But $\nu\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\varsigma$ and $\sigma\acute{\omega}\phi\rho\omega\nu$ were regularly used together in Greek literature,¹ and we have an example of the reverse move in vv.16-17: $\phi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota\mu\omicron\iota \rightarrow \pi\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$.

If then it is a christian rationality and self-assessment that are the key to Romans 11-15 we shall not be surprised to observe other 'mental' or 'cerebral' language in w.1-2, rather than emotional language; e.g. $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega$, $\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\nu$, $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$, $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\nu$, $\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$ are words belonging to the language of argument.² Nor shall we be surprised if Paul wishes to move his readers away from an assessment of themselves and their capacities which focuses attention upon themselves as the origin of their capacities. The basis of his appeal to dedication is the mercies of God, not their own achievements; its goal is the discernment of God's will, not some flight to dizzy experience removed from the brother in need, the $\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, the $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$. The language of sacrifice itself conveys, amongst other things, the implication of the Roman Christians' being at the disposal of God; $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\nu$ implies that

1. Cp. Sophocles *Aj.* 1264; Euripides *Andr.* 231; 235; 237; 4 Maccabees 1.35; 2.16; 18; 3.17. In Plutarch *Mor.* 470D we have another instance if the last two words are defining $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha$: $\delta\ \gamma\epsilon\ \nu\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu\ \sigma\omega\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\delta\ \phi\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha$.
2. Again though I do not wish to introduce $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ prematurely I have noted it in relation with discrimination, judgment and related notions at Pindar *Nem.* 7.58-60; id. *Ol.* 8.23-25; 13.48; id. *Pyth.* 4.286-287; fr. 168; Sophocles *El.* 226-8; Euripides *IT* 419-420; *Alex.* 23.

there is nothing unnatural or coerced about this self-sacrifice - it should have the endorsement of his readers' judgment and will. It is the proper response of thinking people to a legitimate claim that God has upon them. V.2 continues the appeal: the 'world' (*αἰῶν*) which must not determine the form of the readers' faith and practice is the world of disjointed, inflated values. As the Christian's mind is being renewed the whole being is transformed and the will of God in all its facets can be discovered. The repetition of the adjective *εὐάρεστον* also turns the eye away from human achievements to God the judge. The adjectives and the adjectival nouns render the whole discourse completely moral and theistic. In short this

commitment is a voluntary (*παραστήσαι*), thought out (*λογικῆν*) surrender to God, who is merciful (*διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν*, picking up 11.30-32: *ἠλεήθητε ἑλέει, ἠλεηθῶσι, ἠλεήσῃ*),¹ and totalitarian (*θυσίαν, λατρείαν*), and meticulous (*εὐάρεστον, ἀγίαν*). As it is thought out at its beginning, so this dedication continues to be thought through in relationships with christian brothers and with society and 'state'.

Paul's role (vv. 1; 3) is to help them to think correctly. He exhorts them (v.1) and he speaks to them (v.3) only as the grace of God makes it possible for him to speak (cp. 15.15), and only in the recognition that it is God, not Paul nor man, who has initiated the life of faith and thought (*ἐκάστῳ πίστεως*).

-
1. The move from *ἠλε-* to *οἰκτιρμός* is probably to be explained by the fact that *ἠλεος* is rarely used in the plural; never in the New Testament and only twelve times in LXX, out of four columns in Hatch and Redpath's LXX concordance, and it suits Paul's purpose, to emphasise the abundance of the divine pity, to use the plural. *οἰκτιρμός* is used in the plural in thirty-one cases out of thirty-nine examples in LXX.

Paul is speaking quite generally, to all ($\pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\omega$ $\delta\upsilon\tau\iota$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$) and not only to the obviously gifted. God has granted each individual ($\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omega$) faith and spiritual capacities. So God is responsible for the less spectacular gifts and all need to note Paul's plea for realism, since even the meanest gifts can make one arrogant. But the address to each and all is partly in readiness for the simile and its application in vv.4-6a: the body is one entity and has many components and so different functions; so the church has different functions and they all have their origin in God's grace. There can be no room for pride. Vv. 6b-8a list four 'cerebral' gifts in the church, prophecy, 'ministry', teaching and exhortation. Only the second is unclear, but its position amongst three definitely 'cerebral' gifts suggests that here we are dealing with the ministry of the word, though how that might be distinguished from the other three is not clear.

Those who possess a particular *charisma* are instructed to exercise that particular one, and, by implication, no other; to do that would be $\sigma\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\phi\rho\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$.

These four 'cerebral' activities are followed in v.8b-d by three practical and philanthropic ones. One may enquire whether with the move from prophecy, ministry, teaching and exhortation to the next three, there is a momentary slackening of interest in deflating pride and a more general concern with the proper discharging of religious duties and capacities within the church. However if vv.6b-8a are instructing the readers to concentrate on the gifts they do have and not to hanker after what they do not have, v.8b-d may also instruct the readers on the proper way to perform certain duties, which if done will not leave them the time or the energy to envy their neighbour his

gift.¹

Unlike the four 'cerebral' gifts, where hypocrisy is probably more easily detected, the three practical gifts can be exercised for reasons that are less than worthy. The μεταδιδούς can have ulterior motives, the opposite of or different from ἐπιλότης, hidden away in his heart; the προϊστάμενος can do what he has to do² without his heart being in it, the opposite of σπουδή; and the ἐλεῶν can stitch an artificial warmth onto his face, hardly real ἑλαρότης. Hence the appeal that ἀγάπη, the origin of the motive for μεταδίδοναι, προϊστασθαι and ἐλεεῖν be ἀνυπόκριτος, no fiction, the genuine article. It would not be authentic if Christians were those who in their hearts ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ ἀγαθόν, κολλώμενοι τῷ πονηρῷ. If the general principles of hatred of evil and attachment to good are followed, love will be genuine and the particular applications like sharing, committed championing (like Paul's of the ταπεινοί, ἁσθενεῖς ?) and lively compassion will be possible.

In vv. 10-11a, ἀγάπη, introduced in v. 9, is analysed into three of its elements: φιλαδελφία, τιμῆ, σπουδή. If φιλαδελφία after ἀγάπη, means, when ἀγάπη is considered socially, love for fellow-believers as though they were brothers and sisters, (as in fact they are; cp. 8. 15; 23:

1. The three phrases, each introduced by ἐν, formally continue the pattern from vv. 7-8a (ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ etc.), but the discontinuing of the article τῇ and of a word cognate with the participles (μετέδοσις, προστασία and ἔλεος lay to hand) may suggest that materially the three phrases are purely adverbial.
2. The colloquial 'minder' in the English of the 1980s, who looks after by protecting, combines the two meanings of the Greek.

ὕψος), then make sure it is real family affection that is demonstrated. (φιλόστοργος and its root στέργειν are often found in descriptions of family ties.) Where there is that brand of loving within the community, ὕβρις is impossible.

Earlier I suggested that it is Paul's polemic against ὑπερφρονεῖν/
 ὕβρις which has determined his selection of τιμῆ
 and σπουδῆ. τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους ἠ προηγούμενοι

ensures that all feel accepted and respected; that their past (were some Jews?) was not held against them or that their gifts (were they

not very spectacular?) were not despised. Similarly τῇ σπουδῇ

μὴ ὀκνηροί is intended to say to all what v. 8 has said to

particular leaders: do not drag your feet in your commitment to

christian brothers; do not seem to take them for granted or without

proper seriousness. τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες says

positively what the previous injunction has formally said negatively.

ἀγάπη calls for whole-hearted commitment to all members of

1. The unparalleled accusative could be a mistake (Paul's or Tertius's?) because of the preceding ἀλλήλους, or a Latinism, with *antecedere* in mind. It is interesting that there may be more Latinisms in the chapter: διὰ + genitive in v. 1 is sometimes seen as such (cp. *per*); Pallas thought that σπουδῆ in v. 11 could be as specific as study or teaching, and supported this with evidence from Philostratus and I notice in W. Schmid, *Die Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern*, vol. 4 (Stuttgart 1896), p. 424, that σπουδαί = *studia* in Philostratus is regarded as a possible Latinism; to anticipate a little it is possible that τῷ καρπῷ δουλεύοντες is another example; certainly *tempori(bus) servire* is much more common in Latin than the Greek phrase in Greek; cp. M. Dubuisson, *Le Latin de Polybe. Les implications historiques d'un cas de bilinguisme* (Paris 1985), pp. 177f., 227, and pp. 172ff. The evidence might suggest that τῷ καρπῷ δουλεύοντες is a Latinism that Paul has not understood or has deliberately modified, so that καρπός is not taken temporally (as *tempori(bus)* had to be) but in the earlier gnomic sense common in popular Greek ethics, as due measure (see below). In some parts of the early church it was believed that Romans had been written in Latin. Was Paul himself responsible for both a Greek and a Latin version of Romans?

the community, an almost restless enthusiasm that resembles the constantly moving surface of a simmering pan of water.

Yet ἀγάπη in this chapter is subordinate to σωφροσύνη and so the three components of ἀγάπη (τιμῆ, σπουδή, φιλαδελφία)¹ must always be aware of καρῶς, which I do understand to mean the correct amount, the right degree,² and to be themselves they must observe it strictly (δουλεύοντες). The danger is that, careful about not being found ὑποκριτής (v.9), the Christian goes to the other extreme, to such a whole-hearted commitment that might become fanaticism and boasting. In other words τῷ καρῷ δουλεύοντες preserve sanity and balance; they mean 'not going over the top' whenever the emotionally charged injunctions listed in the four previous clauses are obeyed.

It is possible that a passage in an earlier letter of Paul throws light on the meaning of τῷ καρῷ δουλεύοντες. At 2 Corinthians 10.12-18, in addition to formal elements in common (the alliteration in vv.12-15 has already been noted) we have several features shared with Romans 12, e.g. the emphasis on God's measure (vv.12; 13; 15; cp. Romans 12.3) and an explicit emphasis on boasting (vv.13; 15; 16-17) which I have argued is implicit in Romans 12. In particular I wonder whether οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχησόμεθα

1. If σπουδή could be regarded here as specifically as φιλαδελφία and τιμῆ and if μὴ ὀκνηρεῖ could be regarded as a litotes, the third of these four clauses need not be considered less colourful than the others. Might we translate: 'Whenever something requires application, volunteer!?' We have just seen how specific Pallis, a native Greek speaker, thought it could be.
2. Cp. J. R. Wilson, 'KAIROS as "due measure"', *Glotta* 58 (1980) 177-204.

(v. 13; cp. v. 15: οὐκ ... καυχώμενοι) is an application to boasting of the principle expressed by τῷ καρῷ σουλεύοντες.¹

As we have seen there are many passages throughout Greek literature which show that μετρ- , μεδ- and καρ- can be synonymous or belong to the same semantic field, and I suggest that the clauses in 2 Corinthians 10. 13 and 15 and Romans 12. 11c are making the same point, the former exemplifying the principle of the latter. Further I notice that 2 Corinthians 10. 15 and Romans 12. 11c are both followed by a reference to hope (ἐλπίδα δεῖ ἔχοντες, ἐλπίδι χαίροντες). The former is clearly not eschatological and this may suggest that the latter need not be, (as it is often argued to be, so that καρῷ

is then understood temporally, sometimes as the eschatological

καρῷ). Both speak of hope for the development of a particular situation; again 2 Corinthians 10 is more specific, speaking of a hope that there may be opportunity for evangelistic endeavour to the West of Corinth. Moderation (σωφροσύνη, μέτρον, καρῷ) is not a dull, unadventurous virtue; it is open-ended and can be full of hope and possibility.

Before I leave Romans 12. 11 perhaps I should say something about links between καρῷ and ὑβρις , the theme I see as the controlling one in chs. 11-15. Unfortunately so far I have not found many combinations and only one where they are consciously linked. Several Jewish Hellenistic sources show the pair in fairly close proximity but, if this is necessary, without any clear reason for it that I can discern. These sources are: LXX Jeremiah 27 (50). 31-32; Paralipomena Jeremiae 5. 20-21 or 23-24; Ezekiel 7. 10; 12; Philo

1. I do not think that it is coincidental that Pindar can associate these two ideas; cp. Ol. 9. 38-39, τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καρῷ / μανθάνειν ὑποκρέκει . I am grateful to Professor C. K. Barrett for this reference.

Mut. 196; Josephus BJ 4.150; AJ 1.194; 5.231; 12.425; Testament of Judah 16.3;. Outside Jewish material I discovered Schol. in Lucian p. 114 Rabe 11. 10, 15. One is encouraged however to continue to try to discern a link because of the instance in Josephus AJ 15.219 where the two wordgroups are definitely linked.¹ The character of Herod the

Great's wife Mariamme is being discussed, and one of its features is τὸ βασιλεύεσθαι καὶ κρατεῖν ἄλλον αὐτῆς οὐ συγκατα-
λογιζομένη τῷ κατῷ, πολλάκις μὲν ὑβριστικῶς αὐτῷ
προσηνέχθη. The following section goes on to speak about her
διαχλευάζειν and κακῶς λέγειν and στήσεις,
elements not too far removed from the degrading and civil strife we

have observed before in some classical descriptions of ὕβρις .

But to return to the main clauses: Mariamme behaves ὑβριστικῶς
towards Herod because she had not sufficiently (συγ- ... κατῷ)
taken into account the fact that Herod was not only her husband but
her king and master. Had her assessment of her relationship with
Herod taken account of all the facts, all its dimensions, had it been
σὺν κατῷ , she would not, could not, have behaved ὑβριστικῶς
towards him.

The theme of ἀγάπη in its different manifestations
continues in the last two of the thirteen phrases that we have in
vv.9-13: ταῖς χρεΐαις τῶν ἀγίων κοινῶν οὖντες
τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες . The former phrase
particularly would be relevant in a situation where Gentile Christians
were tempted to 'crow' over Jewish Christian saints and bait them with
their poverty. The collection that Paul was organising from Europe

1. Since drafting this I came across Wilson's article already cited, which, pp. 192, 197, quotes this combination at Sophocles OT 873-875; Thucydides 2.65.9.

for the church in Jerusalem would be an admirable chance for Roman Christians to show fellow-feeling and ἀγάπη for their brethren. Even the injunction to pursue hospitality might have improvident Jewish Christian visitors to Rome in mind.

But 12.12 remains a problem if we are trying to see the whole passage as Paul's attempt to preserve the unity of the body by emphasising the necessity of real and realistic love, against the divisiveness caused by ὑβρις and boasting. But I suggest that it is possible to understand the three clauses of v.12, in this way: the pursuit of this sort of love encourages the hope of harmonious life in the body of Christ, and that is why one can and should rejoice; irritations (θλιψις) must occur in any shared experience, so grit your teeth! It is persistent prayer that gets you through.

In v.14 subconscious wordplay factors have clearly operated. θλιψις in v.12 has prepared the ground, but v.13: διώκοντες has provided the language: εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς... μὴ καταράσθε. The theme of non-retaliation is resumed in vv. 17-21. Vv. 15-16 deal with the common mind¹ that forestalls ὑβρις and boasting, and repeat the theme of the whole passage, introduced in ch. 11.20; 25 and 12.3, and prepare the way for 12.17-13.7 where, I have proposed above, ὑβρις, or more exactly, the opposite of ὑβρις, is in mind. If there can be no ὑβρις in the community, then there can be no retaliation² by individuals. Only the

-
1. Aristotle *Rh.* 2.2.9-27 traces anger in part to failure of fellow-feeling; cp. 20 'they are angry with those who rejoice, or in a general way are cheerful when they are unfortunate' (ET in Loeb Classical Library p. 183), and the passage from Josephus, already noted, that contrasts ὑβρις and ἐμόνοια.
 2. Though in one definition of ὑβρις Aristotle himself excludes retaliation.

'state' can act against ὕβρις . This was in accord, consciously or otherwise, with the old Athenian view, that whereas ἀϊκεία, grievous bodily harm, was a private affair for which the individual either sought or did not seek redress (δίκη ἀϊκείας), ὕβρις was an infringement of more than individual honour and it was the 'state' that brought the γραφή ὕβρεως .

Romans 13.8-10 remind us that we are still exploring ἀγάπη though in language again subconsciously supplied by the context (13.7: ὀφειλάς ; 13.8: ὀφείλετε). The eschatological passage 13.11-14 is not likely to have much to do with ὕβρις and therefore the use of καρός (v.11) in a different sense from 12.11c should cause no problem. We have seen that Paul can alter the force of διώκω within three words (12.14-15).

Again I have tried to show that in chs. 14.1-15.13, behind Paul's defence of the weak brother in danger of being judged and despised, there is his apprehension about ὕβρις .

I do not wish to see ὕβρις behind every verse in Romans 11-15. I have however become impressed by the frequency of unsought coincidences between the Pauline material and my (very incomplete) work on ὕβρις , which itself was undertaken when work on the Pauline ὑπερφρονεῖν began to introduce it to me. My hypothesis would be that if it makes more coherent material that on the face of it seems disjointed or unintegrated, ὕβρις should be allowed to bat and face the bowling, with καρῶ as due measure at the other end!

1. Cp. Pierson, Naber and Käsemann's comments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography lists all books and articles referred to in the text and notes of chapter one apart from patristic and medieval works that quote Romans 12.11. The many editions and translations of the New Testament that have been used are given only their number in the Darlow-Moule catalogue. These two limitations are intended to avoid overloading an already lengthy bibliography with the sometimes inflated titles that were once quite fashionable.

Affeldt, W., 'Verzeichnis der Römerbriefkommentare der lateinischen Kirche bis zu Nikolaus von Lyra', *Traditio* 13 (1957) 369-406.

Aland, K., *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin 1963).

do. *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri*, vol. 1 (Berlin/New York 1976).

~~do. 'Johann Albrecht Bengel als Textkritiker', in Bericht der Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der neutestamentlichen Textforschung für die Jahre 1985 bis 1987 (Münster 1988), pp. 9-22.~~

a Lapide, C., *Epistolae divi Pauli* (Antwerp 1614).

Allen, T. W., *Notes on abbreviations in Greek manuscripts* (Oxford 1889).

Ames, W., *Bellarminus enervatus* (Oxford 1629).

Armstrong, E., *Robert Estienne: royal printer* (Cambridge 1954).

Asmussen, H., *Der Römerbrief* (Stuttgart 1952).

Aubert, H., Aubert, F., Meylan, H., *Correspondance de Théodore de Beze*, vol. 1 (Geneva 1960).

'Authorised' Version, D-M §§ 240, 616.

Avi-Yonah, M., 'Abbreviations in Greek inscriptions: the Near East, 200 B.C. - A.D. 1100', *The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine*, supplement to vol. 9 (1940).

Backus, I. D., *The reformed roots of the English New Testament. The influence of Theodore Beza on the English New Testament* (Pittsburgh 1980).

Bainton, R. H., *Erasmus of Christendom* (London 1969).

Baluze, S., Maran, P., *Sancti Caecilii Cypriani...opera...* (Paris 1726).

Barclay, W., *The letter to the Romans* (Edinburgh 1975).

do. *The New Testament; a new translation*, vol. 2 (London 1969).

Barth, K., *Der Römerbrief* (Berne 1918-1919) = ET (London 1969).

- do. *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik* (Zollikon-Zürich), vol. 2, pt. 2 (1946)
 = ET (Edinburgh 1957); op. cit., (ibid.), vol. 4, pt. 3/2 (1959)
 = ET (ibid. 1962).
- do. *Kurze Erklärung des Römerbriefes* (München 1956) = ET (London 1959).
- Bauernfeind, O., *Der Römerbrieftext des Origenes nach dem Codex von der Goltz* (Leipzig 1923).
- Baumgarten, J., *Paulus und die Apocalyptik* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1975).
- Baxter, J. H., 'Ambrosiaster cited as "Ambrose" in 405', *JTS* 24 (1923) 187.
- Bayard, L., *Saint Cyprien. Correspondance*, vol. 1 (Paris 1962²).
- Beck, H.-G., *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München 1959).
- Beck, J. T., *Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer* (Gütersloh 1884).
-
- Bellarmino, R., *Disputationes de controversiis Christianae fidei adversus hujus temporis haereticos* (Ingolstadt 1596).
- Belsham, T., *The epistles of Paul the apostle translated, with an exposition and notes* (London 1822).
- Belsheim, J., *Epistulae Paulinae ante Hieronymum latine translatae ex codice Sangermanensi* (Christiania 1885).
- Bengel, J. A., D-M § 4741.
- do. *Apparatus criticus ad Novum Testamentum* (Tübingen 1763).
- Bentley, J. H., *Humanists and holy writ* (Princeton 1983).
- Berger, S., *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge* (Paris 1893).
- ed. Betz, H. D., *The Greek magical papyri in translation* (Chicago/London 1986).
- Beza, T., D-M §§ 6140, 4627, 4629, 4643, 4650, 4654.
- Biblia Patristica*, vol. 3 (Paris 1980).
- Bidez, J., Cumont, F., *Les Mages Hellénisés* (Paris 1938).
- Bishop's Bible*, D-M § 89.
- Bludau, A., *Die beiden ersten Erasmus-Ausgaben des Neuen Testaments und ihre Gegner* (Freiburg 1902).
- ed. Boas, M., *Disticha Catonis* (Amsterdam 1952).
- Bolgiani, F., *Vittore di Capua e il 'Diatessaron'* (Turin 1962).
- Boll, F., *Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum*, vol. 7 (Bruxelles 1908).

- Bonhoeffer, D., *Sanctorum Communio* (München 1960³) = ET (London 1963).
- Bouché-Leclercq, A., *L'astrologie Grecque* (Paris 1899).
- Bowen, B. C., 'Mercury at the crossroads in Renaissance emblems', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 48 (1985) 222-229.
- Bowra, C. M., 'Palladas and Christianity', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 45 (1959) 255-267 = *On Greek margins* (Oxford 1970), pp. 253-266.
- Brown, A. J., 'The date of Erasmus' Latin translation of the New Testament', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8 (1984) 351-380.
- Brown, P., *Augustine of Hippo* (London 1967).
- Bucer, M., *Metaphrasis et enarrationes perpetuae epistolarum d. Pauli apostoli,...* (Basel 1562).
- ~~Budaeus, G., *Commentarii linguae Graecae* (Cologne 1530).~~
- Büchmann, G., *Geflügelte Worte* (Berlin 1926²⁷).
- Büchsel, F., *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh 1926).
- Burkitt, F. C., (Comments made in passing while reviewing) *JTS* 28 (1927) 98, n. 2 and 34 (1933) 168.
- Cameron, A., 'Palladas and Christian polemic', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 55 (1965) 17-30.
- Chadwick, H., (Comment made in passing while reviewing) *JTS* ns 27 (1976) 225f..
- do. *Priscillian of Avila* (Oxford 1976).
- Claesson, G., *Index Tertullianus* (Paris 1974-76).
- Clarke, W. K. L., *The ascetic works of St. Basil* (London 1925).
- Colet, J., *Enarratio in epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos* (London 1873).
- do. *Epistolae B. Pauli ad Romanos expositio literalis* (London 1876).
- Corssen, P., *Epistula ad Galatas...* (Berlin 1885).
- do. 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes', *ZNTW* 10 (1909) 1-45, 97-102 (Nachtrag).
- Coverdale's Bible*, D-M §§ 6, 13-16, 19-21, 55.
- Cranfield, C. E. B., *A commentary on Romans 12-13* (Edinburgh 1965).
- do. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the epistle to the Romans*, vol 2 (Edinburgh 1979).
- Critici Sacri* (London 1660).

edd. Cross, F. L., Livingstone, E. A., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford 1974²).

Cullmann, O., *Christus und die Zeit* (Zollikon-Zürich 1946) = French translation (Paris/Neuchâtel 1947) = ET (London 1951).

Dahl, N. A., '0230 (=PSI 1306) and the fourth century Greek-Latin edition of the letters of Paul', in *Text and Interpretation*, edd. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge 1979), pp. 79-98.

Darlow, T. H., Moule, H. F., *Historical catalogue of the printed editions of Holy Scripture in the library of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 2 vols. in 4 parts (London 1903, 1911); - D-M.

de Jonge, H. J., 'Novum Testamentum a nobis versum: the essence of Erasmus' edition of the New Testament', *JTS* ns 35 (1984) 394-413.

do. 'Erasmus und die Glossa Ordinaria zum Neuen Testament', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 56 (1975-76) 51-77.

do. *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, vol. 9, pt. 2 (Amsterdam/Oxford 1983), ed.

Dehn, G., *Vom christlichen Leben* (Neukirchen 1954).

Deissmann, A., 'Verkannte Bibelzitate in syrischen und mesopotamischen Inschriften', *Philologus* 64 (1905) 475-478.

Delling, G., s.v. *καρπός* in TWNT vol. 3 (Stuttgart 1938), pp. 456-465 = ET (Grand Rapids 1972), pp. 455-464.

do. *Das Zeitverständnis des Neuen Testaments* (Gütersloh 1940).

Dieterich, A., *Abraxas* (Leipzig 1891).

Drusius, J., *Proverbiorum classes duae*, reprinted in *Critici Sacri*, vol. 8.

Duplacy, J., 'Les Regulae Morales de Basile de Césarée et le texte du Nouveau Testament en Asie-Mineure au IV^e siècle, in *Text. Wort. Glaube. Studien zur Überlieferung, Interpretation und Autorisierung biblischer Texte*, ed. M. Brecht (Berlin/1980), pp. 69-84. / New York

Dupont, J., *Le discours de Milet* (Paris 1962).

Erasmus, D., *Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami opera omnia* (Leiden 1703-06 = Hildesheim 1961-62); = LB.

do. *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami* (Oxford 1906-58), edd. P. S. Allen, H. M. Allen, H. W. Garrod, B. Flower, E. Rosenbaum; = AE.

Eschmann, I. T., see Gilson to whose book he contributed an appendix.

Estius, W., *Commentarii in omnes divi Pauli et catholicas epistolas* (Douai 1614-16).

- Etzold, O., *Der Römerbrief: der Gemeinde neu erschlossen* (Metzingen 1970).
- ed. Evans, E., *Tertullian: adversus Marcionem* (Oxford 1972).
- Fahey, M. A., *Cyprian and the Bible: a study in third-century exegesis* (Tübingen 1971).
- Faustus, I., see Jacobi.
- Fell, J., *Sancti Caecilii Cypriani opera...* (Oxford 1682).
- Ferguson, W. K., *Erasmi Opuscula* (The Hague 1933).
- Festorazzi, F., 'Originalità della morale cristiana secondo San Pablo', in *Dimensions de la vie chrétienne (Rm 12-13)* (Rome 1979), ed. L. de Lorenzi, pp. 237-259.
- Festugière, A.-J., *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, vol. 1 (Paris 1944).
- ~~FaUILLET, A., 'Les fondements de la morale chrétienne d'après l'épître aux Romains', *Revue Thomiste* 70 (1970) 357-386.~~
- Fischer, B., See Bolgiani, to whose book he contributed an appendix.
- Fransen, I., 'Description de la collection de Bède le Vénérable sur l'Apôtre', *Revue Bénédictine* 71 (1961) 22-70.
- do. 'Description de la collection Hiéronymienne de Florus de Lyon sur l'Apôtre', *Revue Bénédictine* 94 (1984) 195-228.
- Frede, H. J., *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften* (Freiburg 1964).
- do. *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*, vol. 2 (Freiburg 1974).
- do. *Pelagius, der irische Paulustext, Sedulius Scottus* (Freiburg 1961).
- do. 'Die Zitate des Neuen Testaments bei den lateinischen Kirchenvätern. Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte', in *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare. Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte*, ed. K. Aland (Berlin/New York 1972), pp. 455-478.
- Freitag, A., 'Anmerkungen und Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament. 1522-1546', in WA (see under Luther) *Deutsche Bibel*, vol. 7 (Weimar 1931), pp. 545-660.
- Fritzsche, C. F. A., *Pauli ad Romanos epistola* (Halle 1836-43).
- Fuchs, E., *Hermeneutik* (Bad Cannstatt 1963³).
- Furnish, V. P., *The love command in the New Testament* (London 1973).
- Geerard, M., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, vols. 3-4 (Brepols-Turnhout 1979-80).

Geisendorf, P.-F., *Théodore de Bèze* (Geneva 1949).

Geneva Bible, D-M §§ 76-77, 424.

Gess, E., 'Conclusion of the revision of the Luther New Testament',
The Bible Translator 8 (1957) 155-160.

Gibaud, H., *Un inédit d'Érasme: la première version du Nouveau Testament copiée par Pierre Meghen 1506-1509. Contribution à l'établissement d'une édition critique du Novum Testamentum* (Angers 1982).

Gibson, M., 'Lanfranc's "Commentary on the Pauline epistles"', *JTS* ns 22 (1971) 86-112.

Gilson, E., *The christian philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (London 1957).

Glassius, S., *Philologiae sacrae*... vol. 1 (Jena 1623).

Godet, F., *Commentaire sur l'épître aux Romains* (Paris/Neuchâtel 1879-80) = ET (Edinburgh 1880-81).

Great Bible, D-M §§ 25, 29-37.

Gregory, C. R., in (C. Tischendorf-) C. R. Gregory, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, vol. 3 (Leipzig 1884-94).

Griesbach, J. J., D-M §§ 4763, 4782.

Grimm, J., Grimm, W., *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, vol. 8 (Leipzig 1893).

Hadot, P., *Marius Victorinus, recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres* (Paris 1971).

Hammond, H., *A paraphrase, and annotations upon all the books of the New Testament briefly explaining all the difficult places thereof* (London 1653).

do. **Δευτέραι φροντίδες**, or, a review of the paraphrase and annotations on all the books of the New Testament, with some additions and alterations (London 1656).

edd. Hammond, N. G. L., Scullard, H. H., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford 1970²).

Hammond Bammel, C. P., *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung* (Freiburg 1985).

Harnack, A., *Marcion: das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig 1921 = *ibid.* 1924²).

Harrison, J., Laslett, P., *The library of John Locke* (Oxford 1965).

Hartel, W., *S. Thasci Caecili Cypriani opera omnia*, vol. 2 (Vienna 1871).

Hatch, W. H. P., *Facsimiles and descriptions of minuscule manuscripts of the New Testament* (Cambridge, Mass. 1951).

Hort, F. J. A., 'On the end of the epistle to the Romans', *Journal of Philology* 3 (1871) 51-80, reprinted in Lightfoot (1893) below, pp. 321-351.

do. *The New Testament in the original Greek* (D-M S 4912), vol. 2 (Cambridge 1907), appendix pp. 110-114.

Jacobi, A., *Exercitatio theologica in monitum Apostoli Rom. XII, II τῶν καθάρων δουλεύοντες. Tempori servientes ... praeside Isaäco Faustio...* (Strassburg 1695).

Jankowski, S., 'I "nomina sacra" nei papyri dei LXX (secoli II e III d.C.)', *Studia Papyrologica* 16 (1977) 81-116.

Jarrott, C. A. L., 'Erasmus's Annotations and Colet's Commentaries on Paul: a comparison of some theological themes', in *Essays on the works of Erasmus*, ed. R. L. DeMolen (New Haven/London 1978), pp. 125-44.

Jülicher, A., *Die Christliche Welt* 34 (1920) 453-457.

do. *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, edd. A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, vol. 1 (Stuttgart 1894), col. 1812.

Käsemann, E., *An die Römer* (Tübingen 1971).

Kinsey, R. S., 'Was Paul thinking of a statue?', in *Studies presented to David Moore Robinson*, vol. 2 (St. Louis 1953), p. 1247f..

Kuhl, E., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer, ausgelegt* (Leipzig 1913).

Lagrange, M.-J., *Introduction a l'étude du Nouveau Testament*, vol. 2: *Critique textuelle: II La critique rationnelle* (Paris 1935²).

do. *Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains* (Paris 1916) = (ibid. 1950).

do. 'La Vulgate latine de l'Épître aux Romains et le texte grec', *Revue Biblique* ns 13 (1916) 225-239.

ed. Lampe, G. W. H., *A patristic Greek lexicon* (Oxford 1961-68).

Le Clerc, J., *A supplement to Dr. Hammonds annotations on the N: T* (London 1699).

Leenhardt, F. J., *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Romains* (Neuchâtel/Paris 1957).

ed. Lendle, O., *Encomium in sanctum Stephanum protomartyrem* (Leiden 1968).

edd. Lewis, C. T., Short, C., *A Latin dictionary* (Oxford 1969).

edd. Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S., McKenzie, R., *A Greek-English lexicon* (Oxford 1925-40).

Lietzmann, H., *An die Römer* (Tübingen 1910).

do. *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe* (Tübingen 1913).

- do. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 34 (1909) 333-334: review of Traube.
- Lightfoot, J. B., 'The epistle to the Romans', *Journal of Philology* 3 (1871) 193-214 = *Biblical Essays* (London 1893), pp. 352-374.
- do. 'M. Renan on the epistle to the Romans', *Journal of Philology* 2 (1869) 264-295 = *Biblical Essays* (London 1893), pp. 287-320.
- do. *The apostolic fathers*, pt. 2, vol. 2, sect. 1 (London 1885).
- Lindsay, W. M., *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915).
- Locke, J., *A paraphrase and notes on the epistle of St. Paul to the Romans* (London 1707).
- Lohse, B., 'Beobachtungen zum Paulus-Kommentar des Marius Victorinus und zur Wiederentdeckung des Paulus in der lateinischen Theologie des vierten Jahrhunderts', in *Kerygma und Logos*, ed. A. M. Ritter (Göttingen 1979), pp. 351-366.
-
- Lorch, Maristella de Panizza, *Renaissance Quarterly* 26 (1973) 44-47: review of Perosa.
- Lowe, E. A., *Codices Latini antiquiores*, vol. 5 (Oxford 1950).
- Lucas, F., *Notationes in sacra biblia, quibus variantia discrepantibus exemplaribus loca summo studio discutiuntur* (Antwerp 1580).
- do. *Romanae correctionis in Latinis bibliis editioni vulgatae, iussu Sixti V. Pont. Max. recognitis, loca insigniora* (Leipzig 1657).
- Luck, G., 'Palladas-Christian or pagan?', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 63 (1958) 455-471.
- ed. Lupton, J. H., *Ioannis Coleti enarratio in epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos: an exposition of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans* (London 1873).
- do. *Ioannis Coleti opuscula quaedam theologica* (London 1876).
- Luther, M., *D. Martin Luthers Werke, kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar 1883--) = WA; quoted by subheading and vol. number.
- McCown, C. C., *The testament of Solomon* (Leipzig 1922).
- Manning, J., Fowler, A., 'The iconography of Spenser's Occasion', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 39 (1976) 263-266.
- Marshall, N., *The genuine works of St. Cyprian... All done into English, from the Oxford edition; ...* (London 1717).
- Melanchthon, P., *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. C. G. Bretschneider in CR vol. 15 (Halle 1848).
- Metzger, B. M., *The early versions of the New Testament* (Oxford 1977)

- do. *Historical and literary studies, pagan, Jewish, Christian* (Leiden 1968).
- do. *A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London/New York 1971).
- Meyer, H. A. W., *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen 1859³) = ET (Edinburgh 1881).
- Michel, O., *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen 1955).
- Mill, J., D-M § 4725.
- Mozley, J. F., *Coverdale and his bibles* (London 1953).
- Nestle, Eberhard, 'A parallel to Rom. xii. 11', ET 10 (1899) 284.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Nestle, Erwin, 'Der Charakter der Vulgata-Revision von 1529', *WA Deutsche Bibel*, vol. 5 (Weimar 1914), pp. xi-xvii.
-
- The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford 1905).
- North, J. L., 'Did Athanasius (letter 49, to Dracontius) know and correct Cyprian (letter 5, Hartel)?', *Studia Patristica*, vol. 17 (Oxford 1982), ed. E. Livingstone, pp. 1024-1029.
- O'Callaghan, J., "*Nomina sacra*" in *papyris Graecis saeculi III neotestamentariis* (Rome 1970).
- do. '"Nominum sacrorum" elenchus in Graecis Novi Testamenti papyris a saeculo IV usque ad VIII', *Studia Papyrologica* 10 (1971) 99-122.
- Oikonomides, A. N., *Abbreviations in Greek inscriptions: papyri, manuscripts and early printed books* (Chicago 1974).
- Olshausen, H., *Der Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Römer* (Königsberg 1835) = ET (Edinburgh 1846).
- O'Neill, J. C., *Paul's letter to the Romans* (London 1975).
- von Oppenheim, M. Freiherr, Lucas, H., 'Griechische und lateinische Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 14 (1905) 1-72.
- Ortkemper, F.-J., *Leben aus dem Glauben. Christliche Grundhaltungen nach Römer 12* (Münster 1980).
- ed. Oswald, H. C., *Luther's works*, vol. 25 (Saint Louis 1972).
- Overbeck, J., *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig 1868).
- Paap, A. H. R. E., *Nomina sacra in the Greek papyri of the first five centuries A.D.: the sources and some deductions* (Leiden 1959).
- Pächt, O., Alexander, J. J. G., *Illuminated manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford*, vol. 3 (Oxford 1973).

- Pallis, A., *To the Romans: a commentary* (Liverpool 1920).
- Panofsky, E., 'Erasmus and the visual arts', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 32 (1969) 200-227.
- Parisot, I., Nau, F., Kmosko, M., *Patrologia Syriaca*, pt. 1, vol. 2 (Paris 1907).
- Parker, T. H. L., 'Calvin the exegete: change and development', in *Calvinus ecclesiae doctor*, ed. W. H. Neuser (Kampen 1980), pp. 33-46.
- do. *Calvin's New Testament commentaries* (London 1971).
- do. *The oracles of God* (London 1947).
- do. *Commentaries on the epistle to the Romans 1532-1542* (Edinburgh 1986).
- do. ed. *Iohannis Calvini commentarius in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* (Leiden 1981).
-
- Paulsen, H., *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien* (Göttingen 1978).
- ed. Perosa, A., *Lorenzo Valla. Collatio Novi Testamenti* (Firenze 1970).
- Perrottet, L., 'Chapter 9 of the epistle to the Hebrews as presented in an unpublished course of lectures by Theodore Beza', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 14 (1984) 89-96.
- Pollastri, A., *Ambrosiaster. Commento alla lettera ai Romani: aspetti cristologici* (L'Aquila 1977).
- Poole, M., *Synopsis criticorum aliorumque S. Scripturae interpretum* (London 1669-1676).
- ed. Preisendanz, K., et al., *Papyri Graecae magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, vol. 2 (Leipzig/Berlin 1931).
- do. Review in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 38 (1917) 1427-1433.
- Ranke, E., *Codex Fuldensis. Novum Testamentum Latine interprete Hieronymo ex manuscripto Victoris Capuani edidit,...* (Marburg/Leipzig 1868) = D-M S 6299.
- Rathke, H., *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe* (Berlin 1967).
- Reichardt, A., *Der Codex Boernerianus der Briefe des Ap. Paulus in Lichtdruck nachgebildet* (Leipzig 1909).
- Reicke, B., 'Erasmus und die neutestamentliche Textgeschichte', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 22 (1966) 254-265.
- Reitzenstein, R., *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (Stuttgart 1927³).
- do. *Poimandres* (Leipzig 1904).

- do. *Die Göttin Psyche in der hellenistischen und frühchristlichen Literatur* (Heidelberg 1917).
- do. *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (Bonn 1921).
- Reuss, E., *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Graeci cuius editiones ab initio typographiae ad nostram aetatem impressas, quotquot reperiri potuerunt, collegit, digessit illustravit...*, (Braunschweig 1872).
- 'Rheims' *New Testament*, D-M § 134.
- Roberts, C. H., *Manuscript, society and belief in early christian Egypt* (London/Oxford 1979).
- do. *JTS* ns 11 (1960) 410-12 (review of Paap).
- Robertson, A. T., *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research* (London 1919³).
- Rodriguez, I., 'Del "Kairós" clásico al de San Pablo', *Helmantica* 15 (1964) 107-126.
-
- Rösch, H., *Das Neue Testament Tertullian's* (Leipzig 1871).
- Rüdiger, H., 'Göttin Gelegenheit: Gestaltwandel einer Allegorie', *Arcadia* 1 (1966) 121-166.
- Rummel, E., *Erasmus as a translator of the classics* (Toronto 1985).
- do. *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament* (Toronto 1986).
- Rutherford, W. G., *St. Paul's epistle to the Romans* (London 1900).
- Sabatier, P., *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae seu vetus italica, ...* (Reims, '1743', 1749) = D-M § 6263.
- Schlatter, A., *Gottes Gerechtigkeit* (Stuttgart 1935).
- Schlier, H., *Der Römerbrief* (Freiburg etc. 1977).
- Schmidt, H. W., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Berlin 1962).
- Schrage, W., *Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese: ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Ethik* (Gütersloh 1961).
- Schubert, F., 'Die pastoralen Grundsätze in Cyprians Hirtenschreiben aus der decianischen Christenverfolgung', *Weidenauer Studien* pp. 255-297.
- Schwarz, G., 'Der lysippische Kairos', *Grazer Beiträge* 4 (1975) 243-267.
- Scrivener, F. H. A., *The Authorized edition of the English Bible (1611), its subsequent reprints and modern representatives* (Cambridge 1884).
- do. *An exact transcript of the codex Augiensis* (Cambridge/London 1859).

- do. *A plain introduction to the criticism of the New Testament for the use of biblical students* (Cambridge/London 1883³) = (London/Cambridge 1894⁴), revised by E. Miller (and others)).
- Séjourné, P., 'Victorinus Afer', *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, vol. 15/2 (Paris 1950), coll. 2887-2954.
- Sider, R. D., 'Concedo nulli: Erasmus' motto and the figure of Paul in the Paraphrases', *Erasmus in English* 14 (1985-86) 7-10.
- Simon, R., *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam 1689).
- Smith, W. B., 'The Pauline manuscripts F and G. A text-critical study', *The American Journal of Theology* 7 (1903) 452-485, 662-688.
- Souter, A., *The earliest Latin commentaries on the epistles of St. Paul* (Oxford 1927).
- do. *A study of Ambrosiaster* (Cambridge 1905).
-
- do. *Pelagius's expositions of thirteen epistles of St. Paul*, fascicules 1-3 (Cambridge 1922-1931).
- do. 'Reasons for regarding Hilarius (Ambrosiaster) as the author of the Mercati-Turner anecdote', *JTS* 4 (1905), 608-621.
- Spicq, C., *Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament*, vol. 2 (Paris 1959).
- do. *Théologie morale du Nouveau Testament*, vols. 1-2 (Paris 1965).
- Staab, K., *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Münster 1933).
- Stephanus, H., *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* (Paris 1572).
- Stephanus, R., D-M §§ 4616, 4620, 4622, 4623.
- Stupperich, R., 'Schriftauslegung und Textkritik bei Laurentius Valla', in *Text-Wort-Glaube*, (see under Duplacy), pp. 220-233.
- ed. Thayer, J. H., *A critical appendix to The Andover Review* 3 and published separately (Boston/New York 1885).
- Thompson, D'Arcy W., *A glossary of Greek fishes* (London 1947).
- ed. Tischendorf, C., *Novum testamentum latine interprete Hieronymo. Ex celeberrimo codice Amiatino...* (Leipzig 1850) = D-M § 6291.
- do. *Codex Claromontanus* (Leipzig 1852).
- do. *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus*, vol. 1 (Leipzig 1843).
- do. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, vol. 2 (Leipzig 1872) = D-M § 4895.
- Traube, L., *Nomina Sacra* (München 1907).

- Tuillier, A., 'La valeur du *Claromontanus* (Paris gr. 107) pour le texte du Corpus Paulinien', *Studia Evangelica*, vol. 6 (Berlin 1973), ed. E. A. Livingstone, pp. 541-555.
- Tyndale's New Testament* D-M §§ 2, 9-12.
- edd. Valpy, A. J., Barker, E. H., *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* (London 1816-1826).
- van der Haeghen, F., *Bibliotheca Erasmiiana. Répertoire des oeuvres d'Érasme* (Gand 1893).
- van Haelst, J., *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens* (Paris 1976).
- Vogels, H. J., 'Ambrosiaster und Hieronymus', *Revue Bénédictine* 66 (1956) 14-19.
- do. *Das Corpus Paulinum des Ambrosiaster* (Bonn 1957).
- do. *Untersuchungen zum Text paulinischer Briefe bei Rufin und Ambrosiaster* (Bonn 1955).
-
- do., ed., *Ambrosiastri qui dicitur commentarius in epistulas Paulinas, pars prima, in epistulam ad Romanos* (Vienna 1966).
- Vollman, B., 'Priscillianus', *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband 14 (München 1974) ed. H. Gärtner, coll. 485-559.
- von Gebhardt, O., *Evangeliorum codex Graecus purpureus Rossanensis* (Leipzig 1880).
- do. *Die Evangelien des Matthaeus und des Marcus aus dem codex purpureus Rossanensis* (Leipzig 1883).
- von Soden, H., *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians* (Leipzig 1909).
- do. 'Der lateinische Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian', in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag 26. Januar 1927* (Tübingen 1927), edd. R. Bultmann and H. von Soden, pp. 229-281.
- Watson, E. W., *Life of bishop John Wordsworth* (London 1915).
- Weisheipl, J. A., *Friar Thomas d'Aquino* (Oxford 1975).
- Weiss, J., 'Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik', in *Theologische Studien*, edd. C. R. Gregory et al. (Göttingen 1897), pp. 165-247.
- Westcott, B. F., 'Vulgate, The', in *A dictionary of the Bible*, ed. W. Smith (London 1863), vol. 3, pp. 1688-1718.
- do. 'Origenes', in *A dictionary of Christian biography*, edd. W. Smith, H. Wace, vol. 4 (London 1887), pp. 96-142.
- do. *A general view of the history of the English Bible*, rev. W. A. Wright (London 1905).

Wettstein, J. J., D-M S 4753.

White, H. J., see Scrivener, *A plain introduction*⁴, vol. 2, ch. 3.

do. see Watson, ch. 7.

do. see Wordsworth.

Wiclif's New Testament, D-M S 777.

Wilckens, U., *Der Brief an die Römer*, vol. 3 (Zürich etc. 1982).

Wind, E., 'Aenigma Termini', *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 1 (1937) 66-69.

Wittkower, R., 'Patience and chance', *ibid.*, 171-177.

do. 'Chance, Time, and Virtue', *ibid.*, 313-321.

Wolf, J. C., *Curae Philologicae et criticae*.. (Basel 1741).

Wordsworth, J., White, H. J., *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine secundum editionem sancti Hieronymi ... partis secundae fasciculus primus, epistula ad Romanos* (Oxford 1913); = W-W; cf. D-M S 6315.

Wouters, A., 'A Greek grammar and a Graeco-Latin lexicon on St. Paul (Rom., 2 Cor., Gal., Eph.)', *Scriptorium* 31 (1977) 240-242.

do. 'An unedited papyrus codex in the Chester Beatty Library Dublin containing a Greek grammar and Graeco-Latin lexicon on four Pauline epistles', in *Actes du XV^e Congrès international de Papyrologie*, edd. J. Bingen, G. Nachtergael, vol. 3 (Bruxelles 1979), pp. 97-107. /a

Zahn, T., *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, vol. 2, pt. 2 (Erlangen 1892).

do. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Leipzig 1925).

Zelzer, M., 'Zur Sprache des Ambrosiaster', *Wiener Studien, Neue Folge* 4 (1970) 196-213.

