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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, 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 \textit{καὶ ὑμῖ} is read.

The second chapter, the backbone of the thesis, presents in detail the lexical materials, which show how \textit{καὴ} often appears in other writers in company with one or other of the words found in the Pauline context (especially \textit{συνεδρία, ὁκνηρός, πνεῦμα, ἐλεήσ, θέλησ} and \textit{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 \textit{τῷ καὶ ὑμῖ σουλεύοντες} 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 suppliciiisque 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
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>See bibliography under Erasmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art. cit.</td>
<td>In article already cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Before Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bude</td>
<td>Volume in the series Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Bude (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Century or centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Volume in the series Corpus Christianorum, series Latina (Turnhout); reference is to volume and page number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch. (s.)</td>
<td>Chapter(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col. (l.)</td>
<td>Column(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Volume in the series Corpus Reformatorum (Halle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEL</td>
<td>Volume in the series Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (Vienna); reference is to volume and page number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-M</td>
<td>See bibliography under Darlow, Moule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed. (d.)</td>
<td>Editor(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esp.</td>
<td>Especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>English translation or Expository Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>Et cetera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. (f.)</td>
<td>And following page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Ibidem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in loc.</td>
<td>On the verse in question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>See bibliography under Erasmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. (l.)</td>
<td>Line(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS (S)</td>
<td>Manuscript(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. (n.)</td>
<td>Note(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ns</td>
<td>New series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op. cit.</td>
<td>In work already cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. (p.)</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG/PL</td>
<td>Volume in the series Patrologia Graeca/Patrologia Latina, edited by J.-P. Migne (Paris); reference is to volume and column number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS</td>
<td>Supplementary volumes to PL, edited by A. Hamman (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt.</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Volume in the series Sources Chretiennes (Paris); reference is to volume and page number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc.</td>
<td>Scilicet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>Sub-voce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teubner</td>
<td>Volume in the series Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Volume in the series Texts and Studies (Cambridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWNT</td>
<td>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. (v.)</td>
<td>Verse(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viz.</td>
<td>Videlicet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.l.</td>
<td>Variant reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol. (s.)</td>
<td>Volume(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol. cit.</td>
<td>In volume already cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>See bibliography under Luther.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-W</td>
<td>Either J. Wordworth and H. J. White, or their Vulgate Romans (Oxford 1913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNTW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 1970\(^2\)), 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.

\[ \text{Κάλπος} \] means the wordgroup of which \[ \text{Κάλπος} \] is a member; similarly \[ \text{Ωβολ} \]— etc.
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 καρπῷ δουλεύοντες. A much smaller body of evidence, most of it with Latin affiliation, reads τῷ καρπῷ. At least two MSS pass straight on from δειοντες to 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 ὠντες, or because of the difficulty of τῷ καρπῷ 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? G. B. Caird once said to the writer that it was not only lectio potior but lectio 'potty'! Yet the evidence for καλώττει 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 καλώττει 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 καλώττει.
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 Καλυφ.timedelta is a hard reading and harder than Κυπέμα? The only answer that has been given, whether by its critics or by its champions, relates to the ethical implications of Καλυφ timedelta δούλευουσίας. As we shall see, Athanasius challenged the propriety of such a course of action for the Christian (Ο Καλυφ timedelta); Erasmus, a champion, was aware of its place in pagan ethics; and amongst recent scholars Cranfield, who alleges: 'Καλυφ timedelta 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". In 1977 H. Schlier wrote: '... Καλυφ timedelta δούλευουσίας ist in der Antike eine anstößige Redensart im Sinn von Opportunist sein. Es ist der, welcher der Zeit 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', and in 1982 U. Wilckens said: "Der Zeit zu dienen" war eine gängige Redensart in prononciert negativer Bedeutung eines verabscheuungswürdigen Opportunismus'.

2. Der Römerbrief (Freiburg etc. 1977), p. 376 f.
I doubt very much whether \( \gamma\kappa\iota\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon \) 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 \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omega \) to \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\nu\epsilon \).

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 \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron \) at Olympia and the composition of a hymn to \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron \) by Ion of Chios (4 C. B.C.), in which \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron \) is represented as the youngest child of Zeus; Himerius (4 C.) wrote that the sculptor Lysippus (4 C. B.C.) 'enrolled \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron \) among the gods' (Ecl. 14, 1); Palladas (4-5 C.) applauded Menander's (4-3 C. B.C.) description of \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron \) 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.; API 16, 275), can without scruple make \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron \) say: Sum dea quae rara et paucis Occasio nota (Epigramma 33). But that is exceptional. Monotheists cannot speak of the god \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron \) 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 \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron \) 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 \( \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\nu \) or \( \upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon \) or \( \upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\omicron \) or \( \upsilon \rho \iota \nu \) or \( \gamma \kappa \iota \upsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \) 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 *domino*; see p. 28f.

Secondly, there is the association of *Kao̱po̱s* 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 *Kao̱po̱s* 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 *Kao̱po̱s*.

1. In *Les Mages hellénisés* (Paris 1938) J. Bidez and F. Cumont edited a text attributed to the Persian sage Ostanes, in which *Kao̱po̱s* appears as the god of a decan (vol. 1, p. 177f.; vol. 2, p. 273). They suggest that it is the representation of *Kao̱po̱s* in Greek art holding a balance, hinting at a connection with Libra, that is the reason for the presence of *Kao̱po̱s* 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 *Kao̱po̱s* in an astrological context but also be a new parallel to the Pauline expression τῶν καιρῶν δουλεύοντες. It was edited twice in successive years by F. Nau and F. Boll.¹ Nau (p. 1385) reads: περὶ τῶν ὄνομασίων τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν δουλεύοντων εἰς τοὺς τέκταρτους καιροὺς. αἱ ὄνομασίαι τῶν ἀγγέλων οἱ διοικοῦσι τὸν

---

Two comments are appropriate here. The decline of the dative and its replacement by inter alia *eis* + accusative are well known in late Koine, 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 + eis* rather than + dative, at Philippians 2.22: *ἐδουλεύσειν eis to eὐαγγέλιον*. The second comment refers to *διοικησις* 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 *καρπω* see to be the problem with *τῷ καρπῷ* *δουλεύσατε*. Serving, even slaving, does not exclude *διοικησις*, administration. However, in his edition published the following year Boll printed *τοὺς δικαίους* instead of *eis toûs ò Karpou* (p. 180), a reading found in some MSS and recorded in Nau's apparatus. But the context favours *Karpou* 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 *Kroes* occurs twice (pp. 96, 112, 11. 188f., 508f.). Though A. Dieterich reads this as *Kroenos*, in which he was followed somewhat tentatively by R. Reitzenstein, the editor, K. Preisendanz, followed by


A.-J. Festugière and very recently by Morton Smith, read Kaiρός. ¹ Few though they be (see below p. 88f.) abbreviations of Kaiρός are known, of Κρόνος, as far as I know, none is found; so again I support the expansion Kaiρός in these two passages. If this is correct we have an astrological, magical text, dating from the third or fourth century, where Kaiρός enjoys a very lofty eminence amongst gods and angels. A few lines further on (pp. 91, 114f., 11. 7ff., 583ff.) the magician claims: δουλεύω ὑπὸ τὸν θὸν κόσμον τῷ σῶ δινέλω. The editor says that the angel here is Kaiρός. 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 Kaiρός incorporated into the barbarous name of a demon in the Testament of Solomon 18, 9, as Kaiρωζανόν οᾶλον. 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. Bouche-Leclercq described Kaiρός as 'idée fondamentale de la théorie des kαταρχαί' (the propitious moments when alone new ventures should be undertaken),³ and in connection with Galatians 4.10: παρατηρεῖτε... Kaiρούς 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.
Gabriel were the angels of winter and summer, and he appeared to suggest that some such angel worship is presupposed by the Pauline phrase.

For all its variety, it seems quite clear that καιρος, 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 κυριε, 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 tempor 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.

CHAPTER ONE
THE HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

(a) The MSS

Though later I shall deal briefly with the earliest evidence for the variant \( \text{Ko} \) (p. 40, n. 1), I shall concentrate on the variant \( \text{K} \), 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 \( \text{K} \) is clear, that of \( \text{K} \) is not; few would dispute that it is \( \text{K} \) that has to justify itself, because of its ambiguity and weaker attestation, rather than \( \text{K} \).

There are only four Greek MSS which read \( \text{K} \), 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. On p. 69 of the standard facsimile edition prepared by Tischendorf (Leipzig 1852), the original hand has written, in unbroken uncials:

\[ \text{τῶν} \text{καλπίων} \text{δουλευόντες} \text{temporiservientes}. \]

Subsequent correctors have altered both versions to \( \text{K} \) and \( \text{domino} \), but a sixteenth century corrector restored the Greek side to \( \text{K} \) (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

---

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 καὶ ὑστερον, 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 dno (= domino), but over the Greek word καὶ ὑστερον the Latin tempore (sic) has been written. It is not clear whether this is a translation of καὶ ὑστερον 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.


tempore servientes

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 Κυρίων 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. 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

---

W-W), MSS AF entitle capitulum 42 de tempore serviendo, 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 a ninth century MS and a leading representative of the revision of Jerome's Vulgate attributed to Alcuin (†804). 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:

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. 67. 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. 93f. 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'. It reads \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \omega \), and is the only monolingual in any language out of the thousands of MSS that attest Romans so to do. Another witness to \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \omega \) which has been very tentatively proposed is the Rockefeller McCormick New Testament, Greek minuscule 2400. At Romans 12,11c it reads \( \kappa \alpha \tau \nu \kappa \nu \pi \iota \omega \sigma \varepsilon \upsilon \upsilon \nu \tau \varepsilon \omega \) in his review of the second volume of the editio princeps (\textit{JTS} 34 (1933) 168) F. C. Burkitt, who had already declared himself an adherent of \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \omega \) (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 \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \omega \), the old Western reading'.

The only Greek evidence for \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \omega \) 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 \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \omega \) in the text, he has in the inner margin: \( \kappa \nu \pi \iota \omega \), \( \alpha . \delta . e . \theta . i . i . a \). By consultation of his introduction one may deduce that there were in his view three other MSS, viz. \( \beta \), \( \delta \), \( \gamma \), which support \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \omega \) 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. \( \beta \) is universally

1. \textit{Journal of Philology} 3 (1871) 70, n. 2 = \textit{Biblical Essays} p. 341, n. 2. For details of this MS see in addition to the handbooks W. H. P. Hatch, \textit{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 \( \beta \) a misprint for \( \delta \), 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 \( \kappa \alpha \iota \rho \omega \tau \). In Gregory-Aland's list \( \xi \) is 8 and \( \iota \gamma \) is 398. But 8, like codex Bezae, does not include Romans, and 398, which does, reads \( \kappa \omega \). The fact that it was Stephanus's teenage son who was responsible for the collations may not be irrelevant to all this inaccuracy.

But even if the solitary witness of 5 were found to be confirmed by some new Greek discovery, the case for \( \kappa \alpha \iota \rho \omega \tau \) 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 \( \kappa \alpha \iota \rho \omega \tau \) we have so far seen is in Latin, the Latin sides of Claromontanus and Boernerianus (dg), along with Augiensis' (f) glossing \( \kappa \alpha \iota \rho \omega \tau \) 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, \( \eta \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \xi \delta \iota \alpha \theta \eta \varsigma \eta \) (Tübingen 1734), p. 654, = (Tübingen 1763²), p. 334; J. J. Wettstein, \( \eta \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \xi \epsilon \alpha \theta \eta \kappa \iota \varsigma \), 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 

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

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 Dd* 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 heedning 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.
know how to respond to a questioner. 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 $\beta$ adds three features to this very interesting exegesis. Clearly in the interval between recensiones $\alpha$ and $\beta$, the church had entered upon a greater measure of peace. One wonders then if recensio $\alpha$ 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 $\beta$ inserts into recensio $\alpha$ two references that imply a transition from harassment to peace. Ambrosiaster's point in $\beta$ 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,
through hearsay (dicitur),¹ that the Greek rendering is ὑπὲρ Κυρίων δουλεύοντες, and so he now prefaces his whole comment on Romans 12.11c by saying that Κυρίων does not fit the context. The context is full of particular commands; ὑπὲρ Κυρίων δουλεύοντες is a general injunction that covers them all. The third addition in recensio 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 servavit 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 Vogels\(^1\) 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 certainly\(^2\) 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

---

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...'.
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 406\(^3\) 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, Domine 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 בְּנוֹן at Romans 12,11c. It is Rufinus\(^5\) who is responsible for the


\(^2\) 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-Ubersetzung (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.

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 aliiis 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 *καύμα* that did not fit the context (*domino servientes, quod nec loco ipsi competit*); 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 *καύμα* 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. 97), Domino
servientes, Non saeculo nec vitis, 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. 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?
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 *καλος* is D*εδι* 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 *καλος*. 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
2. Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians
(Leipzig 1909), pp. 57, 591; Cyprian and the Bible: a study in
3. My copy of Hartel contains the marginalia of a former owner, Pere
M. Bevenot; 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 Leus 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,
shall deal later on (see p. 41f.); the other is Ambrosiaster. 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 μτ), 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

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 \textit{καὶ φυσικῷ} 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. Now we turn to the evidence that may be implied in the \textit{adversus Marcionem}. As in book 4 Tertullian had deployed Marcion's Evangelion 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, 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, \textit{domino servientes (ex hypothesi)}? It would have doubly suited

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 *καλέψω* 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.
The picture here is much simpler than in the Latin West.

Preachers and commentators either comment on \( \text{κυρίως} \) 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 Laodicaea (†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 \( \text{κυρίως} \) 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 \( \text{κυρίως} \) 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 \( \text{κυρίως} \), viz. Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Basil and Antiochus of Mar Saba.

2. Marcion, we recall, may be the exception, and a witness to \( \text{καυρίως} \).
200 to c. 245 and are Egyptian: Clement of Alexandria (†after 215; 8.676C) and Origen in his Romans commentary (†c. 254; 14.1219C). 

After Origen Athanasius (‡373; 25.525C) and Basil (†379; 31.813A) quote \( \kappa \rho \iota \pi \iota \omega \); 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 \( \kappa \rho \iota \pi \iota \omega \) three times in his ethical works: 89.1549B; 1701D; 1760A. Then we return to the commentators: John of Damascus (†c. 749; 95.541CD); Ps. -Oecumenius (8-10 C.; 118.569B; 572A); Arethas of Caesarea (9-10 C.; Staab p. 658); Theophylact (11C.; 124.508B);

Euthymius Zigabenus (12 C.; Calogeras (Athens 1887), vol. 1, p. 147).

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 Römerbrief-text, p. 114. Papyrus 45, reading \( \tau \omega \ \kappa \omega \), 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 \( \tau \omega \ \kappa \omega \), and \( \chi \tau \omega \ \kappa \omega \), like papyrus 46.

2. M. Geerard in Clavis patrum Graecorum, vol. 3 (Brepols-Turnbut 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 concinnae s. VII 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. 103b.
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 the Biblica Patristica, vol. 3 (Paris 1980), p. 377, 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 τις πνεύματι ζεύγτες or, twice, for τὴν σπουδὴν μη ὁμορφοί, never for κυρίως or κατ' ἐκκαθί.

I have added Athanasius to the list because he is often adduced not only in support of κυρίως but also as a witness to κατ' ἐκκαθί. 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 οὖ πρέπει, τῷ κυρίῳ σου λεύεςιν 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 κατ' ἐκκαθί 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 ζεύγτες is found.
2. In the apparatus criticus to the United Bible Societies' editions 'Origen' is alleged in support of κυρίως. 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 καίρον ἀριθματὸς τὸν καίρον and συνοψίμωτος τὸν καίρον and in 49,3 init. εἰ μὲν οὖν τὸν καίρον ἐφοβήθης. The emphasis on σπουδὴ that we have in Romans 12,11a is found frequently in this letter: 49,7 σπεύδε ... μηκέτι βραβύννων; 49,10 σπεύδε δὲ μᾶλλον: particularly close is σπουδὴ ... μὴ ὁκνεῖν 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 κόσμου 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 τῶν καρίων 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 καίρῳ is probably Cyprian. Elsewhere 3 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 œuvre during one of

1. Cp. 49,10 init., ἐπείνου καὶ μὴ μέλλε.  
2. Chrysostom's comment is καὶ ὕστερος εἰς πέπονθος, ὀὕτω δὲ τὸν μισθὸν λογεῖται.  
his exiles in the West and cannot be used as a witness to the earlier existence of Koiv in Egypt.¹

There may be an obstacle to adducing the evidence of Basil. The Regulae morales, where Koiv 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 prejudge 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 XVᵉ Congrès international de papyrologie, edd. J. Bingen and G. Nachtergaeël, 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.

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 μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ with μὴ συμμεταβάλλεσθε (v.l. μεταβάλλεσθε) τοῖς καίροις. But in view of the absence of any reference to καίροις 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 καίροις at 12.11 quite impossible!

MS 5 and Athanasius show that καίροις was not unknown in the East, but the almost complete silence, unbroken even by an endorsement of Athanasius's disapproval of καίροις δούλεύειν, is very loud.

Other Greek patristic and even secular evidence for καίροις 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 πλέον σπουδαίος γίνου οū εἰ. τοῖς καίροις καταμάθονε. Hammond noticed the parallelism between σπουδαίος / καίροις in Ignatius and σπουδῆ / καίροις in Paul, and argued for the originality of καίροις 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 συμμεταβάλλοντες δέι τοῖς καίροις.
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.\footnote{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 Paulusbriefe (Berlin 1967), does not appear to refer to them.}

Wettstein, followed by Griesbach, reported two quotations of Romans 12,11c with \textit{Kaiρος} in Gregory of Nyssa's two encomia of St. Stephen.\footnote{'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.}

These however have not been confirmed. In his commentary on Romans Fritzsche wrote: \textit{locum male laudatum frustra quaesivi} (vol. 3 p. 71 n. 1), and Tischendorf: \textit{quod Wst habet ... ex errore fluxit.}\footnote{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.}

I too cannot find them but have a suggestion to make which may explain the origin of this mistake. There are two examples of \textit{Kaiρος δούλος} in the works of Gregory of Nazianzus, the namesake and friend of Gregory of Nyssa.\footnote{PG 35.585C (accurately noted by Wettstein); 37.1149A; cp. \textit{δουλεῖν Kaiρού ψ/καιροῦ} at PG 35.625AB; 37.1078A, and \textit{καίρος .... θεραπότες} at 37.1234A. All five passages are pejorative. Cp. section (g) (1) at the end of ch. 2.} Has Wettstein or his source confused the two Gregorys and transformed the...
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. Σαλον καὶ ροῶς interpr. Servientem statui rerum, in Greg.' Then follows the quotation from PG 35.585C. I suggest that someone 3 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:

καὶ πῶς σουλεύειν καὶ θεός ὡν ἐμαθεων

(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.
3. This was not Bengel who correctly says: ἔτυκε καὶ φοῦσκε Σοῦλον dicit Gregorius Naz.
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 
\[\text{καταραφων \ εὐθέως}\] ... 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 \(\text{καρφω}\) by the great Greek uncialss, the early versions and the Greek fathers demonstrated its originality, not that of \(\text{καταραφω}\); 'it is scarcely likely, then, that the Alexandrian Palladas should have alluded to a \textit{varia lectio} in the text of \textit{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 \(\text{καταραφω}\) but \(\text{καρφω}\), 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 \(\text{καρφω}\) 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.
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(d) Latin writers from c. 450 to c. 1450

The Latin tradition of exegesis and simple quotation in the millenium between 450 and 1497 (when John Colet lectured on Romans) can be analysed under four heads: writers who mention neither domino nor tempor; those who quote or comment on only domino; those who show knowledge of both readings; those who recognise chiefly tempor. The first group includes Eucherius (†c. 450; 50.804D), 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; Claudius of Turin (†c. 827; 104.925D); 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. Affelt, '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.
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


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 servitutem 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.
3. Similarly, in his non-exegetical work, at SC 301.114
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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'.

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 ἐκπροφή. 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. 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: tertio quantum ad externis obsequium, cum dicit, domino servientes, scilicet servitute latriæ, 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 sevientes, 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.

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.
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. As we have just seen, Ps.-Hugh of St. Victor had said tempus opportunum est observandum. Is he the origin of Colet's phrasing?

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. κυρίως 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 κυρίως and κυπεῖ 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. κυρίως 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 κυρίως (p. 334,
1. 4), and showing knowledge of both καρπὸς and κονίμαι, 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.
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 τὸ δομινοποιεῖν (in error for τῷ κυρίοις)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 τῷ κυρίοις 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 ἐσουλευοῦντες?
619A): Ne reluctemini malis, sed tempori servite, rebus praesentibus vosmetipsos accommodantes, et si quid inciderit incommodorum, vel declinantes, si liceat commode, vel tolerantes, non moestis interim, quod est difficidentium, 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 temporis, 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/Kαυρει into the second Latin/Greek New Testament, published in March 1519, but completed a year earlier after eighteen months’ revision. 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 temporis. cum hoc cohaeret quod sequitur, Spe gaudentes. Si quis exigit tributum, pende: 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 beneficiendi proximo.

Testatur et Ambrosius sibi narratum fuisse, in Graecorum codicibus haberis, τυ χαυρη Σουλευοντες . 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, praeferit hanc lectionem qua vulgo utimur, nec tamen ulla
redit causam cur praeferat.

Sit cuique liberum quod volet sequi. Mihi magis arridet, Tempori
servientes. Sed ea sententia, quoniam ethnici philosophi nomine vulgo
circumferebatur, et vafragiem 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, κατεδότε καὶ
κατά, maxime quam scribæ 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 μετακινοτε, id est Impartiamini, sed μετα δαψιλείς, hoc est Largiter
et alacriter. neque dixit προστασθε, id est Providete, sed addit
μετα σπουδῆς. id est Studiose. nec dixit ἐλεείτε, id est Misereamini, sed ἀγαπᾶτε. id est Diligite, idque
sine simulatione. neque dixit ἀπέχεσθε τῶν κακῶν, id est Abstinete a malis, sed μὴ εἰτε. id est Odio habete.
neque dixit ἔχεσθε τῶν ἀγαθῶν, id est Adhaerete
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bonis, sed κολλάσθε . id est Adglutinemini. neque tantum ait Φίλετε , sed addidit Φιλοστόργως . id est Amico affectu. neque dixit simpliciter σπουδάζετε , id est Curate, sed addidit μή οκνήρως . id est Non pigre. neque dixit πνεῦμα ἔχοντες , id est Spiritum habentes, sed πνεῦματι ζεόντες , 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 κυρίως , 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 and Jerome. The 1527 made two additions which together will comprise nearly half the final length in 1535. The first, Item-proximo, further embeds τῷ καρπῷ δουλεύοντες in its context by showing its connection with what precedes, τῷ πνεύματι ζεόντες ; the second, maxime-ferventes, is the longest addition, claiming that the similarity of καρπῶν 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. 66, 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 temporí 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.
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 *καρίσ* and *καρίς*; Erasmus’s choice; two reasons for the change to *καρισ*; 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. ὥσα γὰρ ἄν ποιήσῃς εἰς τὸν ἄσελφον, εἰς τὸν δέσμην κοῦ εἰδανικέ (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, 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 κατρήσεις to κυρίσεις (the offensiveness and pagan support of κατρήσεις, and the similarity between κατρήσεις and κυρίσεις 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 κατρήσεις is morally indefensible, and the latter one is not deliberate, in that though κυρίσεις and κυρίσεις are similar the moral feeling would still predispose one consciously to keep κυρίσεις and to avoid κατρήσεις. So the change is involuntary and so it does not sit well with the

voluntary moral reason. 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. (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

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), 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, 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. First it was the Englishman Edward Lee
(†1544). 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 \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \rho \omega \), and
that Erasmus had replied that he had now (iam) added it to the
annotations that would accompany the second edition. 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 \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \rho \omega \) 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 \textit{iam addideram}

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, \textit{Erasmi opuscula} (The Hague 1933),
pp. 225-234; \textit{Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami}, vol. 9,
3. \textit{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 \textit{domino} is not divided; he knows \textit{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. 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 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 Bedae (so LB 9. 656C-659C), Erasmus continues to deal with the general themes of Paul's language and pastoral approach.

2. So LB 9.467AB. This title does not appear in the definitive list of Erasmus's œuvre in AE 12.29. In his Bibliotheca Erasmi anae. Répertoire des œuvres d'Érasme (Gand 1893), Ire Serie, p. 178, the editor, F. vander Haeghen, registers Supputationes 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.
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 tempore 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). 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. 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 Κατρώ as well as Κυρίω. 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 *καυλός* 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 *καυλός*. 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 καλρός, καλρός 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 καλρός ille
capillo arripiendus, cum tam honesta offertur ansa. On the next page
(p. 328, 1. 117), he speaks of Battus's misplaced humour as ἄκαλρα.
A month later he quotes (AE 1.335, 1. 12) the Greek proverb ἄκαλρος
εὐνελτεῦεν ἐχάριτα ξιδαφέει, which is also the title and
theme of Adagia 1.7.69 (LB 2.288D-289A). 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 scena,
begins: M. Tullius servire scena dixit, pro eo, quod est servire
tempori, et rebus praesentibus sese accommodare. This last phrase we
have already noted (p. 561)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,
καλρός λατρευεῖν 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 καλρός.

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
occasione 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. 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. 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 adscrip.* But the biggest puzzle is why his first edition (1516) reads *domino/Κυρίου (=-ματ).*

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

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: Polypi 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 lucifaceret.

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, in his tamen duabus epistolis sic polypum ac chamaeleontem, sic Proteum ac Vertumnun quendam agit, ut cum Corinthis 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 πολυχρόνος νόην της γενος το πολυχρόνος; the last word is the adjective Erasmus translated as vafrī.

2. Cp. AE 3.292, 1.11f.: Sed Paulus illic (sc. in Romans 7) adeo lubricus est ut nunc huc respiciat, nunc illuc.
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 ἄρος/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 tempor i 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


of Erasmus, 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, amphibologice, amphibologia, along with their German equivalents (Tischreden §§ 446, 699, 811, 821, 1139, 2205a, 3010, 3284, 3302ab, 3327b, 3392ab, 4899; cp. §§ 523 (ambiguus), 4905 (bilingues ... et simulatores), 5487 (ambiguus et cavillator), of Erasmus, and, in general, cp. § 2541ab.

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. At the Vulgate reading domino servientes Luther's interlinear gloss was, non vobis, nec que vestra, querentes. 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 Καρπός 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 amphiboliarum from Tischreden § 3392b and mistranslates it as 'king of Amphibians'!
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.
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 pietae 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: he! 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!

Six years later, translating the New Testament into German from Erasmus's second edition (1519), Luther followed Erasmus's newly adopted καὶ πρέπει 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 ἐὰν ἀγοραῖς ὁμοιοτῶν καθότι 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 τῶν καίρων δουλεύοντες in Romans 12 at the other two Pauline passages, in the form: schickt euch in 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 Grimm’s Deutsches Wörterbuch vol. 8 (Leipzig 1893), col. 2651f., s.v. Schicken 2d), where after the reference to ‘Röm. 12,11’ the editors add: ‘hiermacht sprichwörtlich und formelfaßt’, G. Büchmann, Geflügelte Worte (Berlin 1926’), p. 67, and, for further bibliography about Middle High German usage, WA vol. 41 (Revisionsnachtrag, 1974), p. 218, 11. 27-30.

4. Cp. WA vol. 51, pp. 60-67, esp. p. 65, 1. 15, and, for another example, WA vol. 41, p. 448, 1. 21: loset die zeit, in a sermon preached on 18 October 1535.
comments on the meaning of schicken euch in die Zeit. 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, welches das beste sey, eyn iglicher neme, welches yhm gefellet. After interpreting Κυρίων, 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 du thun mügest, wie und was dyr fur handen kompt. He applies this against the Werckheylingen, 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 το Κυρίων σου ευσεβεῖς. 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 zeyt!); 36; 707, 1. 21. Luther appears never to have preached on the parallel in Colossians 4.5.

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.

But Martin Bucer (†1551) did recognise and comment on Romans 12.11c.

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 Kρός into the debate (p. 543C-544E).

John Calvin (†1564) published three editions of a commentary on Romans, in 1540, 1551 and 1556. As far as Romans 12.11c is concerned, the first two agree in a short note that combines Spiritu ferventes and temporis servientes that also takes account of studio

non pigri: nam si Spiritu Dei accensi simus, ille nos satis excitabit, ne pigrescamus. Neque ab ipsis alienum est tertium, ut serviamus tempore. Multum siquidem in ea re positum est momenti, ut noverimus nos tempore 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 tempore 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 priorius 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, dicet quispem, 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 impulsum nostra iniuria suffocari et extinguere. Eodem pertinet etiam tertium, Ut tempore serviamus. Nam ut breve est vitae curriculum, statim effluere 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 tempore nos accommodare: qua in re multum momenti positum est. Sed mihi videtur Paulus cessationi opponere quod servire tempore praecipit. Porro quia in multis vetustis exemplaribus legitur Κυρίως, licet videri possit primo intuito extraneum, prorsus reicere 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 unwillingess now
It is not clear what caused the change in Calvin's mind about *domino*, whether it was renewed reflection on familiar materials or what. What we can isolate however is the fact that between 1548 and 1550 two men made their way to Geneva and served as temps. When Calvin's Romans was translated into French and when, from 1546, Calvin began to revise his cousin P. R. Olivetan's French Bible of 1535, the rendering at Romans 12.11c was always *servans au temps*.


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.

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 Kυρίω, 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 Kυρίω / *domino*, yet he published nothing until after Calvin's third edition.

1. All four editions read Kαριω.
2. As we have seen on p. 23f., Stephanus quotes in support of Kυρίω (the Complutensian Polyglott), δ. ε. ι. (three Paris MSS) and Θ. (two MSS from elsewhere).
was published in 1556. Though that does not preclude oral contact and Beza was already involved in a new annotated Latin translation of the New Testament, the evidence strongly favours Stephanus as the (inadvertent) cause of Calvin’s improved appreciation of \textit{κοπίῳ}, 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 \textit{κοπίῳ} /\textit{domino} in his numerous editions, large and small, of the Greek New Testament. His long comment is worth careful consideration. 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, \textit{τῷ κοπίῳ δουλευοντες}.


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: \textit{denique hanc sententiam vix putarim tam commode posse accipi quin a Christianismo prorsus dissidet}, 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’, \textit{Journal of medieval and Renaissance studies} 14 (1984) 89, n. 1.

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; 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 καρπὸν to the easier, pious καρπίνη: ea sententia, quoniam ethnici philosophi nomine vulgo circumferrebatur, et vafriciem quandam praecipere videbatur, offensus aliquid mutavit,...
of evidence: \textsuperscript{1} MSS and patristic material in favour of \textit{καρπῶν}; writers in favour of \textit{καρπῶν}; 3. the three ways in which \textit{καρπῶν} \textit{δευτεροτέτοις} 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 \textit{δευτεροτέτοις} and that the phrase \textit{καρπῶν} \textit{δευτεροτέτοις} is unscriptural. These are the two reasons for his choice of \textit{καρπῶν}; \textit{καρπῶν} arose out of a misreading of the abbreviation for \textit{καρπῦ}. 

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 \textit{καρπῶν}. Beza becomes more and more convinced that \textit{καρπῆς} is correct: 1565's \textit{potius legendum} becomes \textit{omnino legendum}.\textsuperscript{2} Finally we have a gratuitous anti-Catholic jibe: \textit{quam epistolam} (viz. Jerome's to Marcella) \textit{vide, queso}, lector, ut qualis fuerit olim tum Ecclesia illa Romana cognoscas. Did

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{καρπῶν} \textit{tempori} at Romans 12.11c goes unnoticed. Cp. B. M. Metzger, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{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 'Applye 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 'Authorised' version (1611),
al 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

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 'Authorised' 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 'Authorised' 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 abbreviation of Greek words to account for the problem of κατηγορία / κατηγορία, 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 κατηγορία and κατηγορία'. 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 κυς (= κυρίς ), 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.

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 \( \kappa \upsilon \varphi \omicron \nu \) (= \( \kappa \upsilon \varphi \omicron \nu \omega \)) 'had been corrupted by those who thought that \( \kappa \upsilon \varphi \omicron \nu \) (sic) represented \( \kappa \varphi \omicron \nu \varphi \). 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 \( \kappa \upsilon \varphi \omicron \nu \omega \) 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 \( \kappa \varphi \omicron \nu \varphi \) and \( \kappa \upsilon \varphi \omicron \nu \omega \). \(^2\)

---

2. Wettstein was to criticise Beza for his recourse to this type of explanation of difficulties in the text of the New Testament, probably adding Romans 12.11c amongst others as an example; cp. \( \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \gamma \delta \iota \alpha \theta \eta \gamma \kappa \omicron \nu \delta \iota \omicron \nu \gamma \) : Novum Testamentum Graecum, vol. 1 (Amsterdam 1751), p. 3.
3. In this appendix \( \kappa \rho \iota \omicron \sigma \) and \( \kappa \xi \) are my shorthand for all cases and both numbers of the noun.
Deissmann's reading of the inscription rather than its first editors', 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'. 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 $\mathfrak{Kp}$.

J. O'Callaghan in 1970 and 1971 could adduce no exception to $\mathfrak{Kp}$ when $\mathfrak{Kp}$ is abbreviated in his two surveys of third to eighth century New Testament papyri. 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


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).

knowledge and were accessible to us', there are a few exceptions. These are the facts. Of Paap's texts, 421 in all, 247 contain \textit{kupios} where it occurs, abbreviated or unabbreviated, 'sacral' or 'profane' (cp. p. 5), 2587 times. Of these \textit{kupios} is abbreviated 2431 times, 2423 times as \textit{ks}, once as \textit{ KS} (fourth-fifth century), three times as \textit{k}, or \textit{k} (fourth (?) century MS of Ps.-Barnabas) and four times as \textit{Kps} (all in one third century papyrus MS of verses from LXX Exodus 40.5-27). I shall now concentrate on \textit{Kps} because this is the abbreviation of \textit{kupios}, where the \textit{p} is preserved, which is closest to \textit{kaipos}. 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. From the following century there is an abbreviation in a Christian letter that is probably relevant: \textit{Kp} = \textit{kupios}. From the ninth century MS of the Pauline epistles, codex Augiensis (F), there is an example at 1 Corinthians 9.1. This makes eight examples of \textit{Kps} = \textit{kupios} 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 (\textit{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. 101ff. Paap's presentation of his materials is clearly based on Traube's.


3. The origin of the \textit{p} form may be by analogy with the second of the two abbreviations of \textit{Xristos}, viz. \textit{Xs} and \textit{XPs}. O'Callaghan, op. cit., (1970), pp. 68ff. and Paap, op. cit., p. 94, provide the data on \textit{Xristos}. But Paap, p. 102, n. 1, says: 'the insertion of the \textit{p} may reflect the influence of the cursive script'.


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

As for καιρός, my sources are Griesbach, Preisendanz
(probably) and chiefly Scrivener. Scrivener, 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 καιρός could be abbreviated to ςπος, just as καινή in 2 John 5
was abbreviated in codex Vaticanus to κεφανάριον.

Griesbach² adduced κατὰ κρόνος (= κατὰ καλφον) from a
ninth century 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 καιρός 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 1883), p. 16, n. 1 = (London/
Cambridge 1894), 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 καιρός rather than simply of καλ.
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 short­
comings 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 X and C will be the basis of
Tischendorf's comment at Romans 12.11c: καόημ = καομ.passimian in
edd. uncial. inventitur sic scriptum κρω. Is Lietzmann simply
borrowing from Tischendorf when he says in loc.: καόηπ = κρω ist üblich ?

3. This is Tischendorf's dating.
Although \textit{καῦρος} could be contracted in another way,\textsuperscript{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 \textit{κυρίω} possible; just as we should concentrate on those forms of \textit{καὐρος} that preserve the rho. Once again, while there must be other examples of \textit{καὐρος} abbreviated as \textit{κρος}, I do not think my conclusions will be significantly altered.

When we juxtapose what best suits the Bezan hypothesis,\textsuperscript{2} \textit{κρος} and \textit{κρ} 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. \textit{κρος} is attested sixteen times in seven documents, six times in one MS; \textit{κρ} 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. \textit{καὐρος} was only very very rarely abbreviated in any guise; \textit{κυρίος} was very often abbreviated when used in what Paap called a 'sacral' sense, but overwhelmingly as \textit{κς}. To overlook O'Callaghan's third century New Testament MSS where \textit{κυρίος} is always \textit{κς} in favour of one (admittedly contemporary) LXX MS with its \textit{κρ} is wrongheaded. To base a hypothesis on the conjunction of two extremely rarely occurring forms of abbreviation is in

\begin{itemize}
  \item [1.] Cp. T. W. Allen, \textit{Notes on abbreviations in Greek manuscripts} (Oxford 1889), p. 18, n. 2 and plate V; the \textit{καυλ}-syllable in five words in three tenth and eleventh century MSS was abbreviated \textit{ς}. Neither Avi-Yonah, O'Callaghan (1970; p. 39) nor Paap (p. 14f.) can offer any example of abbreviated \textit{καὐρος} in the inscriptions and papyri they have investigated.
  \item [2.] By this I mean the view that \textit{καὐρος} is somehow, usually palaeographically, derived from \textit{κυρίος}. The evidence available does not support the particular conclusion that Beza himself drew, that \textit{κυρ} could have been read as \textit{καὐρι}, at least deliberately.
\end{itemize}
statistical terms highly dubious. Further when we note that the evidence for the two abbreviations is not evenly spread but that of the twenty-four examples of \( \kappa \rho \upsilon \sigma \) and \( \kappa \rho \omicron \upsilon \sigma \) 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. 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 \( \kappa \upsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \sigma \) is original and \( \kappa \lambda \upsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \sigma \) has been accidentally but not palaeographically, derived from it (I say accidentally because Christian morality would forbid the reverse) or \( \kappa \upsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \sigma \) is original and that \( \kappa \upsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \sigma \) has been deliberately introduced as an obvious, improving and sanitised correction.

At least three scholars after Beza have seriously addressed the palaeographical possibilities at Romans 12.11c. John Mill (†1707), who accepted \( \kappa \lambda \upsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \sigma \), 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 \( \kappa \rho \upsilon / \kappa \rho \upsilon \) but \( \kappa \omega / \kappa \rho \upsilon \), 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 \( \kappa \lambda \omicron \) in the verse. Is this an accidental misreading of \( \kappa \upsilon \omicron \) (= \( \kappa \lambda \omicron \upsilon \omicron \)) as \( \kappa \upsilon \omicron \) (= \( \kappa \upsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \omicron \OMICRON \))? In the apparatus criticus to the Göttingen Baruch 1.14 (1976, p. 452) the Peshitta implies an alteration of \( \kappa \lambda \upsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \sigma \) to \( \kappa \rho \omicron \upsilon \omicron \omicron \); 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 \( \text{κυρίως} \) to \( \text{κυρίω} \), Mill says that all the MSS he is familiar with use the compendium \( \text{κυ} \) (sic) for \( \text{κυρίω} \), and continues: vocem \( \text{καύριω} \), 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 \( \text{καύριω} \) unquam contracte scriptum puto) sed obscuritas lectionis, ut \( \text{καύριω} \) mutaretur in \( \text{κυρίω} \).

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 \( \text{καύριω} \), 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. 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 \( \text{κυρίω} \). Sin denique e scribendi compendio enata est varians lectio, nemo \( \text{κω} \) sexcenties in N. T. occurrrens confundere potuit cum \( \text{κρω} \) admodum raro; sed in explicanda sigla parum usitata \( \text{κρω} \), eo facilius lapsus est librarius, quo planior et melior ei videbatur sensus verborum \( \text{κω} \) δειλευοντες, et quo saepius legere se in sacris litteris meminerat δειλευον θεν sive \( \text{Χριστώ} \) sive (Act. 20.19) \( \text{Tω κυρίω} \). This I believe states the whole position quite admirably.

The third scholar is M.-J. Lagrange (†1938), who seems to have been unable to make up his mind about \( \text{καρπώ} \) and \( \text{κυρίω} \). The doubt is already there in the first edition of his commentary on Romans (Paris 1916). At 12.11 (p. 303) he says of \( \text{κυρίω} \) and its context: 'la liaison des idées est donc satisfaisante', and a paragraph later: 'le contexte est donc aussi satisfaisant avec cette leçon' (sc. \( \text{καρπώ} \)). 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 \( \text{καρπώ} \) (and \( \text{μνείας} \) in 12.13):

's'expliquemment 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: \( \text{κυρίω} \) still makes excellent sense but Lagrange cannot understand the reason for the change to \( \text{καρπώ} \). Now recourse to transcriptional error will not suffice: 'L'idée ne pouvait venir à personne de résoudre une abréviation \( \text{κω} \) en \( \text{καρπώ} \) '. So, one suspects, in some desperation Lagrange attempts emendation: \( \text{κυρίω} \) ou \( \text{καρπώ} \) \( \text{σουλεύοντες} \). 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 rationelle* (Paris 1935*, 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 \( \text{τῷ καλῷ} \), reported in the third edition of Meyer's commentary (Gottingen 1859, p. 434, n.) and Alexander Pallis's \( \text{τῷ καρπώ μὴ σουλεύοντες} \), published amongst other notes on the letter in Liverpool in 1920, p. 139, and translated on p. 184: 'not obsequious to this world'.
Lagrange expresses his view that 'un lapsus de copiste' will not explain 'Καταργησαι' pour 'Καταργησαι' '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.
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.* He has a long note on Romans 12.11c (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 κατὰ τοῦ, but, drawing upon Stephanus's marginalia, reports that the Complutensian Polyglott and five Paris MSS read κατὰ τοῦ. 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.
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

\textit{Domino servlentes. Olim, ante Hieronymianam correctionem, Latini libri fere legebant Tempori servientes.}

Contemporary with Lucas is Roberto Bellarmino (†1621). Lucas's dedication of the \textit{Notationes} (coll. 3129-3134) to Cardinal Sirleto, of the Society of Jesus, includes a handsome recognition of the cooperation 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 \textit{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 (\textit{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

2. Cp. ibid., col. 3441, 11. 51-67, where acknowledgement is made of MSS loaned to Lucas by the College.
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. He repeats Erasmus’s misrepresentation of Ambrosiaster (Graeci non habent κυρίως sed κωφίοις) - 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 κωφίοις sed κυρίως, tum ex Origine, Chrysostomo, Theophylacto, et aliis Graecis Patribus, qui sic legerunt, et explicaverunt in suis commentariis. He uses Jerome 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. Three of them agree with his conclusion (that κωφίοις 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 κατάφων. In 1618 Daniel Tilenus made a similar point: most ancient Greek MSS read κυρίως, a few read κωφίοις, through a misunderstanding of the abbreviation κπσ (sic). His indebtedness to Beza is further seen in his reference to the abbreviation in Basil and

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 κυρίος 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 domina; 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 enervatus² Ames comments only on the claim: Graeci non habent κυρίος sed κυρίος. 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 stylos et literaturae, tum sensus et genuinae interpretationis ratio expenditur*, vol. 1 (Jena 1623).
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 καύετο, sed καύετο). His only contribution is the reference to the dictum of Pittacus, one of the Greek seven wise men, γίνωςκε καύετο, 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, reprint 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 Καύρμος). Erasmus had already used this dictum in the Adagia without naming Pittacus.
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 *καρποί σκολευτές*:
   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 *κοπία* 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 καυρίων alongside κυρίων! This is confirmed on p. 527 where we have his interesting note which clearly shows his preference for καυρίων. It is argued solely on the basis of the parallelism between Romans 12.11c and Ignatius's letter to Polycarp 3:

σπουδαῖος γίνομεν τοὺς καυρίους κατάμαχοντας 'is exactly agreeable and parallel to

τὴν σπουδὴν μὴ ὁκνήμορον...

τὴν καυρίων δουλεύοντες 'and may well seem an imitation of it'. 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 καυρίων 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.

2. Σευτέρας Ἀποφίλεις, 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), 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 κυρίων /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 κυρίῳ 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'.
Another survey similar to Critica sacri and Poole's Synopsis is found in J. C. Wolf, Curae philologicae et criticæ... (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 καιρῳ.

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 ἡ κατὰ γνώσιν γένεσις 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 antiques seu vetus italicæ.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 bétise 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 ςφπε. 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. But text-critically his contribution was to adduce the evidence of Gregory of Nyssa (wrongly — see above p. 456.), 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.

After Griesbach it is neither possible nor particularly fruitful to keep a full record of the decisions about ςφπε and ςαρπ 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 ςαρπ 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.
New Testament, in commentaries on Romans, and in other

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, digestit, 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. \( \text{Kalp} \) 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 \( \text{Kalp} \):


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.

CHAPTER TWO

KAIP- 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 καίρω in Romans 12.11-13 (σπουδή, ὁκνηρός, πνεῦμα, ἐλπίς, θεία, Χρεία) accompanies it in these other sources as well. The conclusion is that just as καίρω 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 καίρω at v.11c. I cannot say which of the three words preceding καίρω 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 καίρω- 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 \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho - \)) are found alongside \( \kappa \alpha \rho - \). 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 \( \kappa \alpha \rho \wedge / \kappa \alpha \rho \omega \) \( \delta \omega \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu \) 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. \( \sigma \pi \nu \omega \delta - \), \( \delta \kappa \nu - \), \( \kappa \alpha \rho - \)), but in the relatively late stage of the language represented by our texts, even by Hesiod, most links are not easily perceived (cp. \( \pi \nu \epsilon \omega \mu \alpha \) and \( \kappa \alpha \rho - \)). 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.

μηδέν ἦχον σπεῦδειν· καιρός δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀφιστὸς
ἐργασίᾳ θυβρόβιων· πολλάκι δ' εἰς ἀρετὴν
σπεῦδει ἄνὴρ κέρδος διζήμενος,...

Herodotus (5 BC)

1, 206, 1

ω βασιλεῦ τῆςδων, παύται σπεῦδων τὰ σπεῦδείς· οὐ γὰρ ἂν
εἰδεῖς εἰ τοῖς καὶ ρον ἔσται ταῦτα τελεύμενα.

Hippocrates (?) (5 BC)

Internal Conditions 28

ἡν γὰρ μεθυσθῇ παρὰ καὶ ρὸν ἡ λαχυσίη ἡ ἄλλα τι ποιήσῃ μὴ
εἰπθῆσθαι, τῷ ἦπαρ παραρθήμα γίνεται σκληρὸν αὐτῆς, καὶ
οἴδει, καὶ σφιζεῖ ὑπὸ τῆς θάνατος, καὶ ἢν τὶ σπουδῇ, ποιεῖ
ἐξαπάνθης τῷ ἦπαρ καὶ τῷ σώμα ἄπαν.

Precepts 9

μετὰ τούτων δὲ πάντων μέγα ἀν τεκμήριον φανεῖ ὁ καὶ τῇ ὀφθή
τῆς τέχνης, εἰ τίς καὶ λητείων προσαμορφοῦσις τοιαῦτης μὴ
ἀποσταῇ, κελευθοῦ τούτοι νοσεοῦτη μηδὲν ὀχλεῦθαι κατὰ
dιάνοιαν ἐν τῶ σπεῦδειν ἀφικέσθαι ἐς καιρὸν σωτηρίας.

Sophocles (5 BC)

Philoctetes 637 ff.

ἡ τοι καιρόσ σπουδῆ πόνου
λύσαντος ὅπων καράπαυλαν ἡμέραν,
οὐδὲν ἐπείδην πνεύμα τοῦκ πρώτας ἀνὴ,
τότε στελοῦμεν· τῶν γὰρ ἀντισταθεῖ.
Euripides (5 BC)

Telephus (?) fr. 149

οπεύδειν γὰρ ἐν καλῷ κρεών.

Thucydides (5 BC)

6. 9. 3

ὡς δὲ οὔτε ἐν καλῷ οπεύδετε οὔτε ἐξιδίκα ἐστὶ κατασχέτον ἢ κἂν ἄρμησθε, ταῦτα διδάξω.

Aristophanes (5-4 BC)

Plutus 253 ff

Ἀσθάνομαι δ' ἐμαυτῷ ἐξω φερόμενον τῶν καλῶν καὶ δέδοικα μὴ τις δὲξει περὶ τούτου μᾶλλον σπουδάζειν ἢ περὶ ἧς τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπεθήμην.

Isocrates (5-4 BC)

Helen 11

ἐστι γὰρ τῶν μὲν τοιούτων συγγραμμάτων μὲα τίς ὅδος, ἢν οὔθε εὑρέσθω οὔτε μαθεῖν οὔτε μαθησθαι δύσκολον ἔστιν· οἱ δὲ κοινοὶ καὶ πιστοὶ καὶ τοῦτος ἁμοιὸς τῶν λόγων διὰ πολλῶν ἰδεῶν καὶ καλῶν δυσκαταμάθητων εὐφράσκονται τε καὶ λέγονται, καὶ τοσοῦτοι χαλεποτέρως ἔχουσι τὴν σύνθεσιν, ὅσοι περὶ τὸ σεμνὸντάτοι τοῦ σκοπτεῖν καὶ τὸ σπουδάζειν τοῦ παίζειν ἐπενοχέρτοι ἐστιν.

Helen 29

Panathenaicus 86

ὡμὴν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς χαριεστάτοις τῶν ἄκροτῶν εὐδοκιμήσειν, ἡν φαίνωμαι περὶ ἀρετῆς μὲν τοὺς λόγους ποιοῦμενος, ὅπως δὲ ταύτης ἄξιως ἐρώτι μᾶλλον σπουδάζειν ἢ περὶ τὴν λόγου συμμετρίαν, καὶ ταῦτα σαφῶς εἰδὼς τὴν μὲν περὶ τῶν λόγων ἀκαλόμοις ἀδόκειτεμον εἰμὲ ποιήσουσαν, τὴν δὲ περὶ τὸ πρᾶξεις εὐθυμουσαν αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἐπαινοῦμενον ὕφελλονοιν.
Demoticus 31

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

Plato (5-4 BC)

Politicus 277a

ἀλλὰ καθ’ ἅπαντα ἀνδριαντοποιῆθεν παρὰ καὶ ἱδίως ἐνίοτε σπεύδοντες πλεῖον καὶ μεῖξι τοῦ διόντος ἔκαστα τῶν ἑργῶν ἐπεμβάλλουσοι βραδύνουσι, καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς, ...

Demosthenes (4 BC)

20.166

καὶ τις ἄρ’ ἔλθη ποτὲ καὶ ὁ καιρὸς οὐκ ἀπορρήτες τῶν ἐθελησόντων ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κινδυνεύειν. ὑπὲρ οὖν τούτων ἀπάντως οἴμαι δεῖν ὑμῶς σπουδάζειν καὶ προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν ὅπως μὴ βιοσθῆται ἀμαρτεῖν.

23.182-183

ὁ δὲ ἐξελέγεται ὡς τάξις οὐδὲν ὑμῶν, οὐδ’ ἕκειν ἐχόντος εἰναι ἡμῶς καὶ ἔκαλνται καὶ διασπόρασται μὴ λαβεῖν ὅμως.

Alcidamas (4 BC)

Sop. 13

ὁστὶς οὖν ἐπιθυμεῖ δεῖσθαι γενέσθαι δεινὸς μᾶλλον ἡ ποιητῆς λόγων ἴκαρός καὶ δοῦλος μᾶλλον τοῖς καὶ ἱδίως χρήσθαι καλῶς ἢ τοῖς ὑμῖν ὅρᾳ λέγειν ἀκριβῶς καὶ τὴν εὐθυτανὶ ἀκρωμένῳ ἐπικουροῦ σπουδάζει μᾶλλον ἡ τοῦ φθόνον ἀνταγωνιστήν, ...
Aristotle (4 BC)

Politics 1, 4, 5 (1259 a14)

ἐπειδὴ δ' ὁ καίρος ἦκε, πολλῶν ζητούμενων ἀμα καὶ ἐξαιρέσης, ἐκμισθώσατα δὲν τρίπον ἤποιετο πολλὰ χρήματα συλλέξατα, ἐπιδείξατα ὅτι πάθον ἔστι πλούτειν τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ἂν βούλωνται, ἀλλ' ὅπ τούτ' ἐστι περὶ τὸν σπουδάζουσιν.

Rhetoric B8 1366b 4-5

καὶ μάλιστα τὸ σπουδάζειν εἶναι ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις καίροις ὄντας ἐλεεινόν.

LXX (2 BC ?)

Ecclesiasticus

2, 1-2

tέκνων, εἰ προσέρχη δούλευειν κυρίων,
ηταίμασεν, τὴν ψυχὴν σου εἰς πειρασμόν;
ἐνθυσαν τὴν καρδίαν σου καὶ καρτέρησαν,
καὶ μή σπεύτης ἐν καίρῳ ἐπαρχηθῇ.

20, 18f

ολίσθημα ἀπὸ ἐδάφους μᾶλλον ἡ ἀπὸ γλώσσης,
ὁτίως πτώσοι κακῶς κατὰ σπουδὴν ἤξει.
ἀνθρώπος ἀχάρις, μῦθος αἰκαρος.

36, 10

σπεύτων καίρων καὶ μυθίζοντι ὄρκισμοῦ,
καὶ οἴκῳ σπαθίσθωσαν τὰ μεγαλεῖα σου.

43, 5-6

μέγας κύριος ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὸν,
καὶ ἐν λόγωι αὐτοῦ κατέσχεσαν πορείαν,
καὶ ἡ σελήνη ἐν πάσην ἐν καίρῳ αὐτῆς,
ἀνάδειξιν χρόνων καὶ σημείων αἰώνος.

Jeremiah 8, 15

συνήχθης εἰς εἰρήνην, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἀχάρι ἐν καίροις ἵστατο,
καὶ ἰδοὺ σπουδή.
Ezekiel 7, 11-12
καὶ σωτρίψει στήριγμα ἑκόμων καὶ οὐ μετὰ θορύβου οὐδὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς. ἦκει οὗ καιρός, ἵδοι ἡ ἡμέρα.

3 Maccabees 4,14-15
...στρεβλώθηται δὲ ταῖς παρηγγελμέναις αἰκίαις τὸ τέλος ἀφαίρεσα μιᾶς ὑπὸ καιροῦ ἡμέρας. ἔγραψε μὲν οὖν ἢ τούτων ἀπογραφή μετὰ πικρᾶς σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμοῦ προσεδρείας...

Aristeas (2 BC?)

4
ἡν (σε. προσβεβέλω) δὴ καὶ ἐποιήσαμεθα ἢμεῖς σπουδῆς, λαβόντες καιρὸν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα...

SIG 700 1.10
...σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐνλείπων ἐν δὲ τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ...

748 1.5
σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐνλείποντες, ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ τοὺς καιροὺς ἡ πόλις εὐχαριστοῦσα...

OGIS 735
...σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἐν οὐθὲν καιρῷ παραλείπων οὐθέν...

Polybius (2 BC)

1,44,1
...ἐξαπέστειλαν κατὰ σπουδῆς, ἐντελείμενοι μὴ καταμελῆσαι, χρησάμενοι δὲ σῶν καιρὸ τῇ τόλμῃ...

1,60,9
διὸ περ ἔκρυνε μὴ παρεῖναι τὸν ἐνστότα καιρὸν, συνιὼδὼ δὲ τὰς τῶν πολεμίων ναὸς ἐστιοδρομοῦσας, ἀνήγετο μετὰ σπουδῆς.

2,26,1
παρῆν βοηθῶν κατὰ σπουδὴν εὐτυχῶς εἰς δέοντα καιρὸν.
2,37,9-10

dιὰ τὸ μή τις κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐνεκεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς σφέτερας
dυναστείας χάριν ἐκάστους πολεμούσα τὴν σπουδὴν, τοιαύταν καὶ
tηλικατήρα ἐν τοῖς καθ’ ἡμᾶς καιροῖς ἐτῶν προκοπῆν καὶ
συντελεῖν τούτῳ τὸ μέρος ὠστε...

3,69,3-4

...πρὸς τὸ μῆ...ἀπελπίζειν...τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν καιρῶν
catαλαμβανομένους, τῶν δὲ προδότην ἐτίμησε μεγαλείως,
ἐκκαλέσασθαι σπουδᾶς...

3,82,7

...οὐ καὶρῶν, οὐ τῶν προοριζομένων, μόνον δὲ σπεύδω
συμπεσέν τοῖς πολεμίοις,...

3,86,3

...Γάλων Κεντήμων κατὰ σπουδὴν δοὺς τετρακυκλίδους ἐπείδη
προεξεπετείληκε, βουλόμενος, εἰ δὲ εἰσὶν εἰ καιροῖν, πρὸ τῆς
αὐτοῦ παρουσίας τούτους καταπέλτην.

3,105,5

κατὰ δὲ τῶν καιρῶν τούτων ἰδίος, θεωρῶν τὸ γινόμενον καὶ
dιαγωνίσας μὴ σφαλέος τοῖς ὁλοῖς, ἐξήνε τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ
κατὰ σπουδὴν ἐβοήθει τοῖς κυριωτάτοις.

4,22,2

...ὑπερτερῆς δὲ τῶν καιροί ἀπεστείληκε βιβλιαφόρους πρὸς πάντας
tῶν συμμάχων, παρακαλῶν ζημίαν ἐκάστους πάρ’ αὐτῶν κατὰ
σπουδὴν εἰς ἑαυτοῦ των βουλευομένων ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῆ
cυμβορίων.

4,30,4-5

ὤπερ ἀκράφνες εὖ τῶν πλεῖστοις καιροῖς οὐδενὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων
ἵπτον εὑρίσκοντας διατετρηκότες, καθπέρ ἀπὸ μικροῦ ὄρμωμεν
δυνάμεις, οἷς οὐκ ὁκνητέοι κατὰ τὰς περιστάσεις κοινωνίαν
πραγμάτων, σπευστέοι δὲ μέλλων, εἰ καὶ τις ἐτέροις τῶν
Ἑλλήνων.

5,4,1

...χώρας εὐκαίρως κειμένης, ἐσπευσάς χειρώσμενος ὡς αὐτῶν
ποίησομαι τὴν νήσου.

9,8,3

...εἰς τὴν παρατέχεως χάριν σπεύδων εὐκαίρως τινάς
προκαταλαβέσθαι τοὺς...
Testament of Naphthali (2 BC?)

2,9ff.

οὕτως οὖν ἐστωταυ τέκνα μου πάντα τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν ... μηδὲ ἐξω καὶ ρου αὐτοῦ. ὅτι ἐὰν εἴπης τὰ φθαλμά, ἥκουσ, οὐ δυνήσεται οὕτως οὐδὲ ἐν σκότει οὕτε δύνασθε ποιεῖν ἔργα φωτός. μὴ οὐν σπουδάστε ἐν πλεονεξία διαφθείραι τὰς πράξεις ὑμῶν,...

Philodemus (1 BC)

peri οἰκουμείας col. 17,δηθ.

ἕτοι γὰρ ὅτι τις ἑμετερία καὶ δύναμις καὶ peri χρηματισμῶν, ὡς οὗ κοινωνῆτε σπουδάζως λιγῆρ, οὐδὲ τούς κατορθήσει, μεθεὶ διὰ κακὴ δυνάμις 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.
Diodorus Siculus (1 BC)

5,4,5

δὴς μὲν γὰρ Κόρης τὴν καταγωγὴν ἐποιήσατο περὶ τὸν καλαίν ἐν ὑπὸ τοῦ στίου καρπίν τετελεσθεὶσα τετελεσθεὶσα, καὶ ταύτην τὴν θυσίαν καὶ πανήγυριν μετὰ τοσαύτης αξιείας καὶ σπουδῆς ἐπιτελοῦσιν,...

11,65,3

diὰ δὲ ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας ἀλλοτρίως διακειμενοῖς, πάλαι μὲν ἐσπευδοῦ ἄρας τὴν πόλιν, τότε δὲ καλαίν εὐθεῖον ἔχειν ἐυθύμηζον,...

13,45,4-5

καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν οὐς μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς πρώτας ἐπέστησεν, οὐς δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐυκαίρως ἐπέστησεν. οὐ δὲ ἔστησεν κατὰ πολλῆς σπουδῆς κατακλυσμάτων...

13,50,3-4

οὶ δὲ Πελοπονήσιοι περιχαρεῖς οὗτις ἡκολούθουσι κατὰ σπουδῆς, ὡς νικήτες. οὐ δὲ Ἀλκibiάδης ἐπειδὴ τὴς πόλεως αὐτοῦ ἀπέστατε παράδωτος, τὸ σύστημα ἴρρεν, οὐ γενηθέντος, αὐτὲ μὲν Ἀλκibiάδου τριήρεις ἐξαιρήθη πρὸς ἕνα καλάν ἐπεστρέψας...

13,110,4

οὐ τε γὰρ Σικελίωται διὰ τοῦ πέραν προερχόμενοι καθυστέρουν τῶν καλών, οὐ τε μετὰ Διονυσίου μισθοφόροι μήγες διεπορεύουσα τὰς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν διάφορα, οὐ δυνάμενοι κατὰ τὴν ίδιαν προσέφευσαν ἐπιστεύσαι.

13,111,6

... ἐπειδὴ τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἀλλοτρίους ὁ καλῶς ἀφηρέτης παραπτήσεις δε καὶ τοὺς προσβυτάτους συμβάλλουσι, βλέπουσεν παρὰ φύσιν ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἄμα τοῖς ἀκμάζουσιν ἐπιστεύσειν.

14,8,2

eἰσθείσων γὰρ αἱ πόλεις αὐταὶ κατέκειν τοὺς καλὰς τριήρεις πληθῶν διὰ ἐλάττων διδοθέων. ὅσ τὸτε τοῖς Συράκουσιοι αἱ πόλεις ἀπέστειλαν, σπεῦδουσα συνεπιλαβάθει τῆς ἀλεθερίας.

14,52,6-7

... καὶ καταλαβόμενος τινα τόπον εὐκαίρων, παρεδέχετο τοὺς περὶ τῶν Διονύσιου, οὐ δὲ Μοιθαλὶ τὸ γεγενημένον αἰσθάνομεν, παρατηκά μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς παρεβόηθουσα καὶ τῶν καλῶν
υστεροῦντες οὐδὲν ἤττου ὑπέστησαν τῶν κίνδυνων.

14,56,1

'Ιμλικων δὲ ... παρεσκευάζετο τὴν στρατιὰν ἀνάγεν ἐπὶ Μεσσηνής, σπεύδων αὐτῆς κυριεύσαι διὰ τὴν εὐκαιρίαν τῶν τόπων.

14,72,4

καταταχοῦμενοι δ' ὑπὸ τῆς ὁξύτητος τοῦ καρποῦ, τὴν ἐαυτῶν σπουδὴν εἶχον ἄπρακτον.

14,100,1

... Διονύσιος σπεύδων τὴν κατὰ τὴν νῆσον δυνατείαν καὶ τοὺς κατ' 'Ιταλίαν Ἐλλήνας προσλαβεῖθαι, τὴν μὲν κατ' ἐκείνους κοινὴν στρατείαν εἰς ἐτερὸν καρπὸν ἀνεβάλετο...

15,23,3

... πολλαὶ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων ἐσπευσθεὶσες εἰς τὴν τῶν λακεδαιμονίων ἡμεῖσαν καταλεῖβάσθαι. διὸ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς τοὺς καρποὺς πλεῖστον ἵσχυσων λακεδαιμόνιοι,..

16,46,7-8

... διὰ τὸ πρῶτον εἶναι τοῦτο καὶ μᾶλλον κέιμενον εὐκαίρως. εὐφροσύνῃ δὲ τὸ χρόνον στρατιώτατοι πεντακισχίλειοι, στρατηγοῦσι τοὺς Φιλόφρους τοῦ στρατηγοῦ. οἶ δὲ θηβαῖοι σπεύδοντες ἁπίστοι φανήναι...

16,66,7-67,1

οὗτος μὲν οὖν κατὰ σπουδὴν ἐτέλει τὸν εἰς 'Ρήγαν πλοῦν. Καρθηδώνιοι δὲ βραχὺ πρὸ τούτων τῶν καρπῶν πυθόμενοι...

18,17,3

τῶν δὲ καρπῶν κατεπειγόμενως ἠμαχάξουσαν συγκαταβαίνειν εἰς τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων κίνδυνον. ἐκτάχωμεν δὲ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ σπεύδοντες διὰ τῶν ἵππων κρύναι τὸν πόλεμον,..

18,73,2

... καταταχοῦμενος δ' ὑπὸ τῶν καρπῶν ἀνέζευσεν ἐκ τῆς Φοινίκης καὶ διὰ τῆς κολῆς Συρίας προῆκε μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως, σπεύδων τῶν ἄλλων λεγομένων σατράπειῶν αὕρων...

19,53,1

... σπεύδων Ἀλέξανδρον τῶν Πολυπέρχουτος ἐκβαλεῖν ἐκ τῆς Πελοποννῆσσας οὗτος γὰρ ἦν λοιπὸς μετὰ δυνάμεως τῶν ἄριτραττότων, καὶ κατειλήφει πόλεις τε καὶ τόπους ἐπικαλέσων.
20, 82, 1

σπεύδων αὐτοῖς ἀποστάσας τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνουν ἐπιπλοκῆς, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον προσβεντὰς ἀπέστειλε καθ᾽ ὅν καὶ ῥά ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἐλατῆς ἔπεσε. Κύπρῳ διεπόλεμει πρὸς Πτολεμαίου.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1 BC)

Thucydides 45

ην δὲ γε οὖχ ἢ ... εὔρεσις αὐτῇ καθ᾽ ἐαυτὴν ἀξία σπουδῆς, εἰ μὴ καὶ τοῖς προσβενταῖς εἶ ἑππηκοούσα καὶ τοὺς προσώπους καὶ τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀκαπνίν.

Demosthenes 42

μὲν δ᾽ ἐξειργαζόμεθα. σπεύδων ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα καὶ ἀμα δέχαμ

υφορώμενον ἀκαρίας.

Strabo (1 BC - 1)

17, 3, 17

dιατείνει δὲ μέχρι δεύορ τὰ τῶν ἀμφότερων πάθη καὶ τῶν πλημμυρίδων, καθ᾽ ὅν καὶ ῥά ὑπὲρ τὴν θῆραν ἃ προσδεόμεθα καὶ σπουδῆς θέουτες.

Livy (1 BC - 1)

22, 39, 21

Armatus intentusque sis; neque occasioni tuae desis neque suam occasionem hosti des. Omnia non properati clara certaque erunt; festinatio improvida est et caeca.

Memnon (1)

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

τυγχάνει τῆς σπουδῆς, ἐν δὲ τοῖς καιροῖς καὶ ἀρείας τῆς ἀμοιβῆς ὑποσχόμενος.
Paul (1)

1 Thessalonians 2,17

ομείς δὲ ἀδελφοί, ἀπορφασισθέντες ἐφ' ὑμῖν πρὸς καλὴν ὑπομονὴν ἐκπολέσατε τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ἵδετε ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ.

Philo (1)

Leg. 201

οὐκέτι παρὰ τῶν ἐπιφοιτήσων ἀκούοντες, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτοὶ κἄρτος κέχρηται Γάλιος περί ταῦτα ἐκθέσων καὶ ὡς ἀλλοτριώτατα διάκειται πρὸς ἅπαν τῷ Θεῷ, ἐπίτηδειον εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν παραπέμπτωκεν νομίζοντες...

Moses 2,33

... τέρας ἀνδραγαθίας καὶ φιλοθέου σπουδὴς τοιῇ λαβώνα, καθ' ὑμᾶς καὶ ἄλλοι...

1,186

οὕτω δ' ὁ τρίτος ἐνστὶ καὶ ῥετέος ἐν τῷ ἐβδόμῳ μηνὶ καὶ ζημιωταῖος μεταφορικῇ, ἐν ἄρχῃ μὲν ζηρομηνίᾳ ἀξίαν προκατορθωμένην σωλήνα, περὶ ὡς ἔλεξη πρότερον, δεκατὶ δ' ἡ υποτεία περὶ ὑμᾶς ἐπουδάκασιν...

2,23

...θεομαχεῖτε τὰ μηδεμᾶς ἡχία σπουδῆς καὶ τὰ φύτει τίμη τείχετεστεν υἱωθοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ δόρου ἐν ὑμᾶς ἐνευρότερον καὶ πολλούντες σοὶ μετρίως ἐπιτιμίᾳ καὶ ὅνειδίζετε...

2,64

... Ἰσραὴλ οὕδενα καὶ ἄλλα ἀπράκτως ἐκ τούτοις χρωμένους αὐτοῦ τῶν ἑρωτών ψυχής καὶ ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ συνέστησαν ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, ἀπένεμες καὶ τῷ σώματι τὰ οἷκελα ἔργα καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ τὰ ἐπιβάλλοντα καὶ ἐφεδρέειν τὰ ἐτέρα τοῖς ἐτέροις ἐπουδάσασθαι....
3, 188
...εἰς καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων γένεσιν ὁ Πατὴρ (c.f.) τὰ πάντα
teleiofereitai, kai prods toutois mūria ἄλλα παρακαθητηκαὶ
cai̇ periathrē̄̂sa kath tē̄i̇n kai̇ katȧ thalattan kai̇ aerā tādė
panta τῷ μὲν μετὰ σπουδῆς ἐπεδεξίατο.

4, 31
εἰς γὰρ τὸ ἀνωποδείκτου ἐκάτερος σπευδεῖν έσκευ, ὁ μὲν ἵνα
λαβῇ δοῦσ, ὁ δὲ ἵνα ἀγνοήσῃ λαβὼν. ἀφόρις δὲ πράξματι πάντως
ἀφόρις μετατείθει Θεὸς, ὡς εἰκὸς ἴπ ἄμφοτε μάρτυρα καλεῖται,
tou μὲν ὡς ἀποδώσοντος ὅταν ἀπαίτηται, τοῦ δ' ἐν καὶ
κομιομένου.

QOPL 89

POPL 89

πολλῶν κατὰ καἱροὺς ἐπαναστάτων τῇ χώρᾳ δυναστῶν καὶ φύσει
καὶ προσαιρέσθηντο κρήσαμεὶν διαφεροῦσας - οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸ
αἰτήσασον ἀφροτήτη θηρίων ἐκνικήσαν σπουδαστὲς, ...

Plant 161
... καὶ εἰ σφόδρα τοῦ πράττειν ἐπεσευνθον οἱ καὶρο, ...

Abr. 20

σπουδαίοις γελοῖα ἀναμίγνυα, διὰ τὸ μὴ πεπαιδεύθης τὸ ἐν
καὶρῳ κάλλιστον, ἡσυχίαν, ...

233

συντεκνων οὖν ἐπερύμη μὴδὲν τάχους ἀνείς, ἐὼς
καὶροφυλακής ...

Sorn. II 83

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

In Flacc. 103

... ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν σπουδαστής, ἐπηρεά ὡς τοῦ προστίθη τὴν
καίριον ἐπιδειξε ἄφαιρεθήντων.

Josephus (1)

AJ 11, 171

πᾶσιν σπουδὴ χρωμένους συνέχειν τὸ ἔργον, ὡς γε καὶρός τοῦτο
ὁδίος έστιν.
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 δὲ ποτε καὶ ρὴ, μηδὲν σπουδαζὸν φαίνου ἢ σεαυτῷ, 
tout' ἔστι θέλε γίνεσθαι μόνα τα γινόμενα καὶ νικῶν μόνον 
tῶν νικῶντα·

Diss 1, 11, 27

...ἔστι ζηγκαλύπτεσθαι τοῦ ἕπιπον τρέχοντος ὡς ἐσπουδάζει, εἰτα 
νικήσαις ποτὲ παραλέγως σπόργχων δείηθαι αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ 
ἀναληφθώματι λιποψυχώντα. τί οὖν τούτο ἐστιν; τὸ μὲν 
ἀκρίβες οὐ τὸν παρόντος καὶ ρὸν τυχόν.

Dio Chrysostom (1-2)

29, 9

dοκεῖ γὰρ ἐμοίχε τῇ ψυχῇ φιλονικήσαι πρὸς τὸ σώμα καὶ 
σπουδάσαι ὅπως δὴ τάττει εὐδοκέστερος γίνεται. γνῶς οὖν 
τῶν πρὸς ἀνδρεῖαν ἐργών κάλλιστον ἁμα καὶ ἐπιποφτατον τὴν 
ἀγάθην, ἐπὶ τάττει ἥθεν. τῶν μὲν γὰρ πολεμικῶν ὃ τε καὶ ῥο 
οὐκ ἦν ἢ τε ἀκοπήσε ηλαφρότερα.

31(14), 7

τοὺς γὰρ σπουδαίους ὑτασ περὶ τοὺς ἐνεργεῖται καὶ τοῖς 
ηγαπήκοις δικαλως χρωμένους πάντες ἤργονται χάριτος ἀξίους 
cαὶ βούλοιτ' αὖ ἐκαστὸς ὤφελείν κατὰ τὴν ἐκατοῦ δύναμιν· ἀκ 
δὲ τοῦ πολλοῦ ἔχειν τοὺς εὐνοοῦτας καὶ συμπάττουτας, ὅταν 
καὶ καὶ πολλεὰ παῦσα καὶ ἴδιωτης ἀσφαλέστερον διάγει.

32(15), 75-76

tί σφόδρα ὁντι κυκάσθε; τίς ἡ σπουδή; τίς ὁ ὁγών; οὐ γὰρ 
Πέλοψ ἐστίν ὁ δίκων, οὐδ' ὁνόμαζος οὐδεὶς Μυρτέλος, οὐ μὲν 
δεύτερος ἀπὸ Δίδος γεγονός, οὐ δὲ Ἐρμῷ παῖς, οὐδὲ περὶ 
βασιλείας οὐδὲ γνωστὸς οὐδὲ θανάτου πρόκειται κρίσις, ἀλλ' 
ἐστιν ὁ ἁγῶν ἀνδροπόδων ὑπὲρ τοῦ τυχόντος ἀργυρίου, νῦν μὲν 
ηττωμένων, νῦν δὲ νικωτων, ἄεὶ τῶν αὐτῶν. εἰ λέγοι ταύτα, 
tί ἔρειτε; η δήλω ὃτι οὐδ' ἀκούσεθε παρ' ἐκείνου τοῦ 
καὶ ρον, οὐδὲ ἂν αὐτὸς ὑμῖν ὃ τοῦ Πελοποδι διαλέγηται πρόγοιους;

34, 36

tοῦ μεντοι γε πολιτενύμνον τῆς εὐνοίας τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ τῆς 
ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν ἐπιμελείας καὶ σπουδῆς μη μᾶ Δία καὶ τιμα, 
ἐξαλερετον ἔχειν...
45,3

ὅτι γὰρ ἐν τίνος εὐτύχομεν, τότε ἐξῆν ταύτα ἔχειν καὶ τῷ παρόντι καὶ τῷ πρὸς ἔτερασ κεχρῆσαι δωρεάς, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐν υἱῷ ὑπήρξε παρὰ τούτου φιλανθρωπία καὶ σπουδὴ τοσαύτη περὶ ἡμᾶς ὡσὶν...

Plutarch (1-2)

Dion 26, 1

...αὐτὸι σπουδότνες ἀρπάζαι τὸν καὶρὸν,

Romulus 8, 1

αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν σκάφην κομίζων ἔχωρει πρὸς τὸν Νομιτόρα, σπουδὴς καὶ δέους μεστὸς ὡν διὰ τὸν καὶρὸν.

Demetrios 42, 1

ὃς γὰρ οὖ παρείχε καὶρὸν ἔντυχειν, ὁ χαλεπὸς ἐν καὶ τραχὺς ἐντυχόμενος, ἂθρατός μὲν γὰρ, περὶ οὗς ἐσπουδάζει μάλιστα τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἦτη δύο προσβείαν κατέσχεν.

MSS 68CD

ὅς δὲ παρρησία σπουδὴν ἔχεται καὶ ἡθος, ἀν δὲ ὑπὲρ μειζόνων ἢ, καὶ πάθει καὶ σχήματι καὶ τῶν φυσά τοῖς ἀξιόπιστοις ἔστω καὶ κυνηγικός, δὲ δὲ καὶρὸς ἐν παντὶ μὲν παρεθεῖς μεγάλα βλάπτει, μάλιστα δὲ τῆς παρρησίας διαφαίνεται τὸ χρῆσιμον.

139F

οὐκοῦν καὶ γενὴ φαύλος καὶ ἀκαίρος ἡ παίξειν μὲν ὑφημεῦνον καὶ φιλοσοφοῦσθαι τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐσκυθρωπακινὰ σπουδάζουσοι δέ παίζουσα καὶ γελώσα.

147F

οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἀγχόειν ἦκει κομίζων ἐαυτὸν ἔμπλησαι πρὸς τὸ ὑστέρον δὲ νοῦν ἔχων, ἀλλὰ καὶ σπουδάσας τι καὶ παίζει καὶ ἄκουσα καὶ εἰπεῖν ὡς δὲ καὶρὸς παρακαλεῖ τοὺς συνόντας, εἰ μέλλουσι μετ' ἀλλήλων ἡδεῖς ἐνεσθαί.

804C

Κάτων δὲ, περὶ δὲ ὃν ὁμιλεῖ πείσειν τῷ προκατεσχεθαί χάρισι καὶ σπουδάεις τὸν δόμον ἢ τὴν βουλήν, ἐλεγε τὴν ἡμέραν ὅλην ἀνωτάς καὶ τὸν καὶρὸν οὕτως ἐξέκρουε.

Stoicorum Venerum Fragmenta 3, 160 (?)

τὸν δὲ σπουδάζου...οὕτα...ἐυκαίρον
Ignatius (2)

Ep. to Polycarp 3,2

πλέον σπουδάζος γίνου σύ εἰ. τοὺς καιροὺς καταμάθανε, τὸν ὑπὲρ καιρὸν προσόδοκα,...

Isaiah (Aquila (2))

60,22

ἐγὼ κύριος κατὰ καιρὸν ἐπιστεύω αὐτῷ.

Ps.- Barnabas (2)

4,9

...γράφειν ἐσπουδάσα, περιψίμα ἑμῶν, διὸ προσέχωμεν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἠφελήσει ἡμᾶς ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, εὰν μὴ νῦν ἐν τῷ ἄνω καιρῷ καὶ τοῖς μελλοντινοῖς σκανδάλοις, ὡς πρέπει νῦν τοῖς θεοῦ, ἀντιστάσαμεν,...

Solinus (2) 26,4

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

Galen (2)

De totius morbi temporibus 7

εἰ δὲ τὸ πρῶτον τοὺς ἐμός ἐπίσκεψα τοὺς ἁπαξακῶς ὑπάρχοντας εἰς τὴν τῶν βοηθημάτων εἰρεσίν, ἢς ἔνεκα ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ὡς δὲ σπουδάζοται.

Ps.- Lucian (? 2)

Amores 33

ἐπειδὴ δὲ αὐτὸς ἐπευσχήμεναι χρείαν πέρας ἔχειν, οὐ δὲ τῶν ἐπιγιγνωμένων ἀπὸ λογισμοῖ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἀφελέντες ἡμεῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπινουσίν τι ὀλίγον ἐπιστήμα αὐτοῖς συνηθέσατο.
Lucian (2)

Quomodo historia conscribenda sit 49

καὶ πρὸς πάντα σπεύδετω καὶ ὡς δυνατὸν ὁμοχρονεῖτω καὶ
μεταπετέσθω ἀπ’ Ἀρμενίας μὲν εἰς Μηδίαν, ἐκείθεν δὲ δοιξῆματι
ἐνὶ εἰς Ἰβηρίαν, εἰτα εἰς Ἰταλίαν, ὡς μηδενὸς καίρου
ἀπολεῖποιτο.

De Vera Historia 1,1

ὦπερ φροντίς... τῆς κατὰ καίρον γινομένης ἀρέστως...-
οὕτως δὴ καὶ τοῖς περὶ τοὺς λόγους ἐσπούδασατιν ἴσχυμα
προσηκείς μετὰ τὴν, πολλὰς τῶν σπούδαιστέρων ἀνάγωσιν
ἀνεῖναι τε τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐπείτα καμάτων
ἀκμαίστερων παρασκευάζειν.

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

ἀδελφοί, ἡ διὸ μὲ ὁ καίρος ἐν τῇ Ἑφέσῳ ἐπανελθεῖν ἐπισκεύεται.

Julius Pollux (2)

1,43

λέγε δὲ περὶ τοῦ μὴ βραδύνουτος, ἐτοιμα, πρὸκειμένα, πρόθυμα,
ἀκόλουθος, ταχὺς, ἐκτυχ., ἐντυχ., ἐνεργός, ἀπροφανής, τῷ καίρῳ
χρώμενος, ἐνεργοποιώς, σπουδαῖος, σύδεν ὑπερθεμένος, σύδεν
ὑπερβαλλόμενος.

1,112

ὑπαινιττεται δὲ τι τοιούτῳ καὶ τῷ ξενοφώτειτον, τὸ
σπουδάζοντος τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἄρα τὸ πινεῖ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀνεμον
οὕτως εὐρήκειν ὡς εἰς ἀναγωγὴν καίρου ἐναι.

Babrius (2)

Fabula 88,11-12

οὔπω καίρος ἐστὶ νῦν φεύγειν:
ὁ γὰρ φίλοις πέποιθεν οὐκ ἄγαν ἐπεύδει.
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 vinum signum et ante tempus volente participare compendii poculo, dominus repellens eius intempestivam festinationem dixit:

Herodian (3)

1,4,2-3

υῦν δὲ καὶ ὁ ὑιὸς ἐυκαίρος ἔμοι τε αἰσθένει η μὴ μάτην ἢ σφαῖρα τοσοῦτον χρόνου τιμὴν τε καὶ σπουδὴν κατατεθεὶσθαι,

2,11,1

συντόνυς δὲ σπουδὴ καὶ γενναίοις πόνοις τὴν ὁδὸν ἐπετάξαμεν, μὴς ποὺ ἐνδιατρίβως, μὴς διδοὺς καὶ ἀναπαύσας,

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

ἄλλον γὰς σπουδάζοντα οὐκ ἔχωμεν μετὰ τοῦτον, ἔτες, ἀδελφέ, σπουδάζοντα καὶ μὴν τέχνα ἢ σφαῖρα καὶ φιλοστοργεία κατανεικῆ τὴν ἐμὴν... ἀκαίρειαν.

Origen (3)

fr. 19 on Luke

προσκοίτας ἐράσμιον πράξαμεν ὁ Ἰακαρίας ἑαυτῷ μέλλειν ἔστοιχαι οὐκ ἔπεκυν ἀπὸ καὶ ὅρον δραμεῖν πρὸς τὸ δοῦναι ὁδὸν τῇ προφητείᾳ, ...

fr. 500 in Comm. in Matthew

αἱ δὲ διεμέλεις μορφαῖ, τὸν προσήκοντα καὶ ἄναλωσασαι εἰς τὴν τῶν ματαίων σπουδῆ.

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

τὸν στίχον τούτον ἔρων μόνος ὁ καταφροῦν ἢ τῶν βλεπομένων ὡς προσκοίτας, σκοποῦν δὲ τὰ μὴ βλέπομενα ὡς αἰώνια καὶ μόνα κυρίως ἀληθὴ, καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνα σκεῦδων.
c. Celsum 3.47

ta de metatithenta tiyn psichyn ... didaskounta katafroveni mev ou proskairh twv aiophyton kai blepomeinoi apeilei de espel tis aerata kai skopetin tais blepomeva,...

Philostratus (3 or 4)

VS 1.21 (LCL p.80)

ei tous mev 'himeroi kairou hittouv espoudazev,...

2.1 (LCL p.160)

aigei de meve touto paralethein logon parata tois espoudaios aigeiopynov 'hyn mev gar ev tois faneirois espoudaios tis agyor oytos, Mouwvli de tws Turi prosofiposfisis eidospos exi tois apokriston kai to episxari sun kairod opetheven,

2.10 (LCL p.222)

paradokkotos de autov tois gammais to meve twv ton potou kairod awien, alla kakei ti espoudazei,...

Aristides Quintilianus (3 or 4)

2.5 (p.58 Winnington-Ingram)

... twn therapeiaain prosatexen edei chrismous ev kairou espoudaios tous politas kapersaxomevnois.

Didymus the Blind (4)

On Genesis 4.25

ou tov paronostos de kairod twn dyosevth tauten dielagchi aieresin, tuning me o logos megwsetai si. evnouba de kai tov logon tis Eun haper marturiaw einai tov tropou twn Sph. anti gar espoudaiou tov ide kairotos ermapnevmenos 'pontos, mos'.

4.19-22

to palaioi ouk edokei parawmon einai oude tois espoudaios doux gammaikas exei. tis diadochis gar kai to plithous twn anabropon kairos hyn.
Themistius (4)

Oratio 7 (p.128 Schenkl-Downey)

... τοῦ καίροῦ μᾶλλον τυχάνειν τῶν λιῶν ἐσπουδασκότων.

Gregory of Nazianzus (4)

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

Τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα τούς βουλομένους ἐστορεῖν τε καὶ γράφειν παρῆν, τοῦ λόγου σπεύδουτος, πολλοὶς δὲ οίμαι σπουδαστῆσθαι τοῦ τότε καίρου τὴν εἶτε τραγῳδίαν χρὴ λέγειν εἶτε κωμῳδίαν, οἷς μέρος εὐστεβεῖας δόξει λόγῳ βάλλειν τὸν ἀληθινὸν ὥς καὶ τοῖς ἐπείτα παραδοθῆναι πράγμα τοσοῦτον καὶ ἦκιστα τοῦ λαθεὶν ἄξιον.

27,3 (SC 250, p. 76)

Δει γὰρ τὸ ὅριν σχολάσαι, καὶ γνωρίσαι Θεόν, καὶ Ἡμῶν λάβωμεν καίρον, κρίνειν" θεολογίας εὐθύτητα. Τίσι δὲ; Όίς τὸ πράγμα διὰ σπουδῆς, καὶ οὐχ ἂς ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ καὶ τούτῳ φλαρεῖται ἡθειά, μετὰ τῶν ἐπικοῦν, καὶ τὰ θεάτρα, καὶ τὰ ἁγία, καὶ τὴν γαστέρα, καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γαστέρα.

John Chrysostom (4)

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

Ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὰ χρέα καὶ τὴν καταβολὴν σπεύδωμεν. "Καὶ ἔγραψεν τοῦ εὐναυτοῦ, οὐ ἀπεκέλευσας ὦ βασιλεῦς. Μελλῶ λέγειν διὰ τὸ προφῆτης ἐπισημαίνει τὸν καίρον· ἐξήτησας γὰρ χθες, ὃς ἔδηπτε τῶν προφητῶν ἀπώτερων τοῦ καίρου τῆς ζωῆς τῶν βασιλέων εἰσβοΰτων λέγειν, καὶ αὐτοῦ τούτου, ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἔθος ἔλθῃ.

Eusebius (4)

HE 5,1,$

ὁι καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἀλήξα ἐγράψαντον ἐσπεύδων πρὸς Χριστόν, ὁτιος ἐπιδεικνύμενοι, ὅτι οίκε ἔξω τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καίροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθήναι εἰς ἡμᾶς.
Makarios/Symeon (4)

18, 1, 5

καὶ πολλοὺ δεῖται καὶ δέν εἰπόντας καὶ ἐργασίας καὶ σπουδὴ καὶ πίστεως...

Athanasius (4)

Life of Anthony praef.

έπειδή δὲ γὰρ καὶ ὁ καὶ ρόδι τῶν πλω监督检查 συνέκλειε καὶ ὁ γραμματοφόρος ἐξεπεδή, διὰ τούτο ἀπέρ αὐτὸς τε γενέσθω (πολλάκις γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡμάρακας). καὶ ἀ μαθεῖν ἡδυνῆσθην προ' αὐτοῦ. ἀκολουθήσας αὐτῷ χρόνος οὐκ ἔλθῃ, καὶ ἐπιχείς ύδωρ κατὰ χέρις αὐτοῦ, γράψαι τῇ εὐλαβείᾳ ὑμῶν ἐσπούδασα.

Apollinaris (4)

ap. catenam in Ps. 119, 111 (SC 189, p. 370)

έπετελευτε τὴν ἐνδείξειν τῆς περὶ νόμου σπουδῆς, ὅποτε κλήρου ἔδειν ἔφη τηθεσθαι τῶν νόμων, ὥς πρὸς καὶ ῥόδιν, ἄλλ' εἰς ἄπαν, ...

Libanius (4)

Epistula 99, 3 (T.)

ὁ γὰρ τοῖς γε ὀλύμπιος, ἄλλ', εἴπερ τις, ἀγαθὸς χάριτώς τέ ἀπομημονευόμασθαι καὶ τηρῆσαι καὶ δημοτήτων καὶ αὐτῶν ἀμοιβῶν καὶ σπεύσας λαμπρότερον ἀποδοῦναι.

402, 3 (T.)

ἐπείθ' ἐκάμενος ἐπανήγαμεν τῆς σπουδῆς, τελευτάμεθα δὲ πρὸς τοινύστην χρόμεθα τῇ σπουδῇ καὶ δημοτήτων καὶ σπεύσας κατὰ χώραν μένειν.

1321, 3 (T.)

ἡμών μὲν οὖν ἀπὸ τοιαύτης σπουδῆς γένοντ', ἀν τι καὶ τελος ὅτιν εἴς πλείος εἰς ἐχεῖς, εἰ δ' ὁ πιθανότερος δ' ὁ διάμοι εἰς - καιτοι θεαματίου εἰ μὴ περιεχθῆ τοῦ καὶ δημοτήτων καὶ μείζον εἰς κλύδων τῆς τεχνῆ, ἄλλ' ἡμᾶς ἐς σοι τὴν προαίρεσιν ἀνήγαμον εἴσομεν.
Julian of Cilicia (4?)

On Job 33,12-13

toiata edegev tragea tachina spoudasw tifn apokrisin pareu auton. suugnous oti kairo auton idein,..

Basil (4)

Moralia, Reg. 13,2

Basil (4)

Vegetius (4)

3,6

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

Asterius of Amasea (4-5)

Homily 10,6

pantes de kairo kriptonta twn apo yhipo dourw kai blastemata twn agnoistwn tois edortazouw harizonta dithymata. ws eis tis spoudaisos twn marturon filos, exete de froutida tois twn dourw paphgynrizein paidein, ouk aw hemeran parhion tov eviavtov anedrastov.

10,8

ouk amisou de tifn eis autous spoudin epideixymethea, alla tifn prostatias autwn tifn pro theon apolaimoumen. epieidh gar ouk
ἀρκεῖ ἡ ἡμετέρα εὐχὴ διωσπῆσαι θεοῦ ἐν καὶρῷ ἀνάγκης ἡ συμφοράς - ἢ γὰρ δεήσεις ἡμῶν ὁ παράκλησις ἦστιν, ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτημάτων ὑπομνήσεις - διὰ τοῦτο τοῖς ἁγιωμένοις παρὰ τοῦ δεσπότου ὁμοδούλους προσφέρομεν, ἵν' ἐκείνοι ἐν τοῖς ἱδίοις κατορθώμας τὰ ἡμετέρα θεραπεύσωσι πλημμελήματα. ποίον ὑπὲρ ἐγκλήμα, ὅτι τιμῶντες μάρτυρας καὶ αὐτοὶ σπουδᾶσθεν ἄρέσκειν θεοῖν;

μικροὶ δὲ καρτερίασας κατάλιπε βίον πρόσκαιρον καὶ στενὸν πρὸς ζωὴν τῆς ἁμάρτιος καὶ ἀπέλευσον.

Jerome (4-5)

ep. 85,4

ἐκαὶ ῥοσπονδάσται

Cyril (4-5)

Comm. in John 5,1

οὐκόν ἐπεί περ ὁ πρὸς τὸν θεόν ἂν καὶ τοῖς καροῦς παρόντι τοῖς ἁγιωμένοις ἐπινοούμεν, εὐχητορίμως ὃς μᾶλλον, καὶ μὴ ὅτε τὸ ἐξεπελεῖν ἀναφέλει, τὸ θηρῶσθαι τὸ ὄφελων ἀνανεώειν σπουδᾶσθεν.

10,2

εἰς ὅποιον ἐπείπερ πρὸς τὸν δεσπότα, τὴν τοῦ ἐξισθαί προσδοκουμένης ἀπαραίτητον ἄφιξιν ἔξηγεται χρησίμως καὶ ἐν καὶρῷ τῷ πρόποντι, εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς τὸ καροῦ τοῦ πρόποντος μὴ ἀμαρτάνει εὐκοπδάσται, ποὺ ὁ πρὸς μᾶλλον ἄφεναι ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦτος ὁ πρὸς μᾶλλον ἢ ἡμῶν ἄρχομεν ἀναφέλειν, ὅπως τὸν χρὴν ἀναβείν ὡς εἰς αὐτὴν εὐσεβείαν.

Comm. in Haggai 1,2

ἀλλ' οὖν ἐπιμελεῖν ἀνακαίνεσαν ὁ πρὸς τὸ ὑπόμοιον καὶ ὥδ' ἐν εἰκόνι ἐπισκόπαμεν ποιεῖσθαι φρονίμια, τούτων αὐτῶν οὐ μετρίως ἁγιοδόξως.

Thalassius (?) (5)

Cramer's Catena 1,209

δ' δὲ σπουδήν παρεχόμενον εἰς τὸ χρῆσθαι τῷ τῆς διδασκαλίας χαρίσματι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πληθύνου ὄφελείαν, πλέονα ἐπισκόπασται
καὶ τὴν δωρεάν. ἀκούσμενε τούτων τῶν ἔρματων τούτων· καὶ ὡς ἔστι καὶ ῥός· ἐργασώμεθα τὴν σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν· καὶ λάβωμεν ἑλάχιστον ἐκεῖνον ἀφιλίης εἰς τὰς λαμπάδας, καὶ εἰς ὅπερ ἐλάβομεν τὰλαμμοῦν, τοὐτέστιν χάρισμα, ἐπεργασώμεθα. τοὺς πληθοὺς ἀόκινος παρακαλοῦντες καὶ νουθετούντες εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν· καὶ εἰς προστασίαν σπουδαίοι γινόμενοι· ἐν γὰρ δικυρίαστε ἐνταῦθα ἐν δραγά διάτημαν, οὔτεις ἡμᾶς ἐλεησει λοιπὸν ἐκεῖ, κἂν μυρὶα θρηνώμεν.

Hephaestio (5)

Epitoma 1,185,4 (T. vol.2 p.39)

εἰ δὲ σπουδὴ ἐπη, μὴ συντρέξουν ἐς πάντα τὰ προειρημένα, χρηστέον τοῖς πλέοντες καὶ κατὰ καὶ ροῦ δυνατοῖς.

Petrus Chrysologus (5)

Serm. 112,1

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

Socrates (5)

HE 3,20

Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ καὶ ροῦ δρακάροι πάλαι ἐπιθυμοῦντες, ἐν ὧ τὸ ίερὸν αὐτὸς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀνωκοδομηθῆται, τότε σπουδαίοι μὲν πρὸς τὸ έργον ἐγίνοντο.

Agathias Scholasticus (6)

Anth. Pal. 9,769

dεῖ γὰρ μῆτε πουεῖν ἐν αὖρμασι, μῆτε τι παῖζειν ἐν σπουδῇ· καὶ ροῦ δ’ ἵσθι νέμειν τὸ πρῆπον.

Anth. Plan. 16,332

δὲ δὲ σοφίας μῦθοι καὶ πλάσμας καὶ τραία λέξεις, παῖζων ἐν σπουδῇ, πεῑθεὶ ἐχεφροῦειν.
Justinian (6, but this law dates from 473)

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

η τούς κατὰ καλρόν περιβλέπτους δεσφερινάδονσ ἀπειράτους
βασιλικῆς κινήσεως καταλείψωμεν, εἰ τοῦ λοιποῦ τοιαύτα τινὰς
προσδέξωμεν δεσφερινὸς τὴν θυσίαν τοῖς σπουδὴν συνεισένεκοιν ἢ
υπαγορεύομεν καὶ υποσημαίνομεν καὶ συνεκατίσας κεχρηκέναι ἢ
ἀλλὰ τινὰ ῥοπὴν ἢ χρείας συνεισφέροντες.

Antiochus of Mar Saba (7)

Homily 87 (PG 89.1700D)

ἡ κατὰ Θεοῦ σπουδὴ ἐν πάντι καλῷ καὶ πράξει καλῆ ἐστὶν.

Photius (9)

Epistula 1,8,105

πολλοὺς ἔβλαψεν εὐτραπελίας. ἀπὸ γὰρ γνώμης διεκπεσόντα
παίζοντος, καρία πληγῇ γέγονε τοῖς διαπαχθείσι καὶ βραχείᾳ
τέρψει τῶν ἑπιτυχώτων, μεγάλα ἐτεχνὲν ἔχρασ τῶν σπουδαίων.

Suda (10)

3,84

καλῶς: ἀριστοφάνης: καλῶς γάρ, ὡσπερ ἀνδράς μέγιστος ἓργου
παυτοῦ ἐστ’ ἐπισκέπταις. ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐφ’ ἐκάστου πράξατος τὸ
καλῶς καὶ χρησίματον ὁ καλῶς ἐστίν: ὅποι καὶ τὰ σπουδαῖα
παρὰ καλῶς γινόμενα οὐκ ἀποδέχονται.

Symeon the New Theologian (11)

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

οὐχὶ οἱ ἐμπροευάμενοι μὲν τῶν καλῶν ἐξηγοράσαντο ἐν σπουδῇ,
tὰ τὸ καλῶ ἐπετύμηται ἐργασίμενοι καὶ κέρδος ἐκείθεν ἐκατότος
περιποιηθήσαμεν, δ’ ἐν περιεργάσημοι τὰ ἀλλότρια καὶ μὴ
πραξιματεύσαμεν, εἰ καὶ συνῆ γινόμενο, ἐξημωθῆ τὸν καλῶν,
μηδὲν ἐκ τοῦ εὐρηχήσει ἐς τὴν παντήμερων ἀφήλησε; Ἐκ δὲ
καὶ ἄλλοι μὲν αὐθίνε τῇ προσδοκίᾳ τοῦ κέρδους καὶ λητῶν
ἐφόδου καὶ κόπου δοῦνορίσας καὶ μακρᾶς δοῦν καταφρονοῦντι, δ’
δὲ, φόβῳ τούτω βαλλόμενος, καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων παρακαλήται.
συνοδοιπορήσαι αὐτοῖς, καὶ ὑποσχομένους φιλάττειν αὐτὸν ἄκοψιν ἀνά τῶν προσδοκομένων αὐτῶν κακῶν, οὐ προσερείται ἀκολουθήσαι αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπελθεῖν πραγματεύσωσαι μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ πανηγύρει, ὡς ό οὐν μὲν καλὸν ἡγοράσωτο, καλὸς πραγματευόμενοι καὶ κερδήσομε, ὡς γὰρ τοῦτον ἁρφώνως ἐξημερώθη, φοβηθεὶς ἔκει φόβον ὅθεν ἢν φόβος; Ὅτι τοιχοροῦν ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπὶ πάση πράξει καὶ ἐργασία πνευματική. Ὅταν γὰρ ἄλλοι ἐν ταῖς ἐνυτόλαις πορευόμεναι τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τὰς ἁρετὰς πάσας μετὰ σπουδῆς καὶ θέρμης ἐργαζόμεναι, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν ἀμελείᾳ καὶ ἁργῇ διάφωμεν, ἀκείνῳ μὲν ἡγοράσατο τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τὰ μεγίστα ὕψιστὰ ἐκφεύγομεν, ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ ξανατέσσεται καὶ τὸν καλὸν ἀπολέσωμεν. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἢτι τὸ νόημα ἐξετάσωμεν. Τὸ οὖν φησίν.

Eustathius (12)

Comm. in Iliad 1,258

διδάσκει ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ ἐνταῦθα, ὡς ψεύσται ποτὲ κατὰ καλὸν ὁ σπουδαῖος, καθάπερ ὁ Νέστωρ ἐνταῦθα.
(b) KAIROΣ AND ΟΚΝΟΣ

---------------------

Hippocrates (?) (5 BC)

Precepts 2
μὴ ὁκυεῖν δὲ παρὰ ἰδιωτῶν ἱστορεῖν, ἢν τί δοκῇ συνοίτειν ἐς καλρὸν θεραπεῖς.

Sophocles (5 BC)

Electra 21-22
"ιν' οὐκετ' ὁκυεῖν καλρός, ἀλλ' ἐρχων ἄκμη.

Hyperides (4 BC)

6,4
ὁ... οὐτε ὁ κα[λρός] ἀρμόττων τῷ μακρολογεῖν οὔτε ἐράδιον ἐνα ὄντα τοσαύτας καὶ τηλικαύτας πράξεις διεξελθεῖν καὶ μνημονεύσαι. ἐπὶ κεφαλαίου δὲ οὐκ ὁκυήσω εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῆς.

Demosthenes (4 BC)

60, 6
τὰ δ' εἰς ἀνδρείαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν πάντα μὲν κατοκῶν λέγειν, φυλαττόμενος μὴ μήκος ἀκαίρου ἐγένηται τῷ λόγῳ.

Proem 38, 2
οὖς, ἔκαν ἀκαίρος δυσκολάζειν, ὁκυεῖν ἀνίστασθαι ποιήσετε.

Theocritus (?) (3 BC)

1d. 25, 65-67
"ψ ψ ὁκνὶ ποτὶ χεῖλος ἐλάμβανε μῦθον ἱόντα, μὴ τί δὲ δὴ κατὰ καλρὸν ἐπος προτιμηθοῦσα τοι σπερχομένουν"
Ps. - Plato (3 BC ?)

Definitions 416a 3-6

οὐκος φυτὴν πόμων δειλία ἀντιληπτικὴ ὀρμήσ. ...
καιρός εν ὦ ἐκαστον ἐπιτήδειον παθεῖν ἡ ποιήσαι.

Polybius (2 BC)

4.30, 4-5

ὁπερ ἀκαρνανὲς ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις καιροῖς οὐδενὸς τῶν Ἐλλήνων ἡττον εὑρίσκονται διατετηρηκότες, καὶ περ ἀπὸ μικρὰς ὀρμήμενοι δυνάμεως, οίς οὐκ ὁκνητεῖον ... σπευστεῖν δὲ ...

Philodemus (1 BC)

peri ὀργῆς p. 66f. (Wilke)


Ecclesiastes (1 BC?)

10, 17-18

μακαρία σὺς, γῆς, ἡ ὁ βασιλεία σου μίας ἐλευθερων, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντές σου πρὸς καιρον φαγονται, ἐν ὑπόδῃ καὶ οὐκ ἀἰσχυνθοῦσαν.

ἐν ὠκυρόλεις ταπεινωθῆται ἡ δόκως, καὶ ἐν ἄργια χειρῶν σταξεὶ η οἰκία.

Josephus (1)

BJ 1, 375

-yyyy εὗρα ἐβρασάνεσθε πέρα τοῦ δεοντος καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν παρὰ τήν ἐμὴν γνώμην ἐξομήνυσε, καὶ ὁ Ἀθηναίων ἐνέδρας νυνὶ δὲ ὁ άκμῶν υμῶν καὶ τὸ δοκοῦν ἀθυμον ἀσφάλειαν ἐμοὶ νύκης εὐθυῖαται.

AJ 18, 70

τοῖς ἀμφὶ τῶν Ἰαλρεῶν ὑπερβολαί τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ὅσον ὀκνοῦντων πολλῶν. οὐ γὰρ Ἰαλρέας ἐκὼν εἶναι τοῦ πρᾶστειν ἀναβολὴν ἐποιεῖτο, πάντα καιροὺ ἐπιτήδειον τῇ πράξει νομίζων.
Philo (1)

Virt. 16-17

καὶ ἐπεξετάσεις πόλεμος, πολιτικὴς μὲν ὀδύνης, τούτῳ μὲν ἀποκρυφούσες ἄλλῳ δὲ καὶ ὑπομνήσας τιθέμενοι ἔντυχες ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς τὸν βιβλίον δεῖ νοῆσαι, ...

83

καὶ προτρέπει μὴ διὰ τούτῳ ἀναδύνεσθαι καὶ συμβάλλειν ὁμορρότερον, ἀλλὰ ἀνεμιμέναις χεριὶ καὶ γνώμαις μᾶλλον μὲν χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς δεομένοις, λογιζομένους ὅτι καὶ ἡ χάρις τρόπον τιμᾶ δάνειδόν ἐστιν, ἀποδοθησόμενον ἐν καιρῷ ἑλτίονι <ἀνεύ> ἀνάγκης ἐκουσίω διαθέσει τοῦ λαβόντος, ...

Mos. 1, 321

ὁ δὲ νομίζεις αὐτοὺς ἢ προεδρῶς τὴν διανομὴν τὰ τε γέρα πρὸ καιροῦ λαμβάνειν ἄξιον ἢ πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας πολέμους ἀποκεφαλεῖν, ...

Plutarch (1-2)

Mor. 804 A

οὐδὲς γὰρ οἱ καιροὶ καὶ πολλὰ φέρονται ἐν ταῖς πολιτείαις αἰφνιδίας. διὸ καὶ Ἰδρωθένης ἡλπίσατο πολλῶν, ὡς φασί, παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἀναδυόμενος καὶ κατοκουλοµένος.

Dio Chrysostom (1-2)

1 (1), 31

tίς μὲν γὰρ ὁκυνότερος πονεῖν, ὅταν τούτου καιρὸς ἢ, φίλου;

2 (2), 2

ἐνίστητε μὲν οὖν ταράττωνυ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ, διὰ τὴν νεότητα καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν φειδωμένοι πρὸ τοῦ καιροῦ καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἀνιστάντες· ἐνίστητε <γε> μὴν έιλον αὐτοὶ προπηδήσαντες. τοιαύτα ἐκεῖνος ἐπέτης τὸ πρῶτον, ὦτε καὶ τῆς ἐν χαιρωνείᾳ μάχης τε καὶ μυκῆς φασίν αὐτοῦ ἀτίτων γενέσθαι, τοῦ πατρὸς ὁκυνύτος τῶν κλησθένων.

44 (27), 10

... ὅταν η ἡ καιροῦ, οὐκ ὁκυνύων παρακαλεῖν.
Aelius Aristides (2)

Leuctrikos E (Dindorf 1.698)

αλλ' ει των άλλων ούτω προνοεσθε, ωτ' ει και πολεμείν υπερ αυτών δειοι η κατοκυείν, πως ουχ υπερ ιμων γε αυτων μέχρι του μη κινδυνεύσαι παρά καήδου προνοήσεθε;

Julius Pollux (2)

1. 43

λέγε δε περι του μη βραδύνουτος έτοιμοι, ... ἀκνος, ... τω καηδω χρώμενοι, εγγησόρας, σπουδαίος, ...

1. 178-179

περι οστρατηγού άγαθου και μη τοιούτου: ἀκανός ... τους καηδους παρείς, ..

Vettius Valens (2)

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

αλλ' οιμως, ειν μετα άκριβείας τις ζητη, ου διαμεσοθησται της δωρεάς η και τοιαύτης τιμης καταξιωθησται ησυ μη των καηδοφηλω τις ειςηλου κατα την της γενετεως υπόστασιν, ταυτα δε εν τοις εμαυτους επηεραξος ειςηλωσα ουσε ου δε μερισσησαι τους χρόνους ουτε εμαυτω ουτε τη προστοτητη, αλλα καταμαθώντα το μεγεθος της εαυτου γενετεως συντρατευσθαι τοις καηδοις γενναιως και αληπους (ουδεν γαρ ανει μοχθηρως διαζων και ηπερων τυχαις εξεφυασθαι βουλομενοι εαυτουν), εχειν δε κατα νοου το τοιουτον:

'αγου δε μ' η ζευ και συ χ' η πεπρωμενη διοι ποδι ημεν ειμι διατεστημενοι, ως εψυμα χ' ἀκνος, αν δε μη δελω, κακος γενομενος αυτο τουτο πείσομαι,

Ps. Lucian (2 ?)

Amores 31-32

οιμως ταληκες ου προδόσομεν ειξαντες οκνων. μονον ημιην συ, δαίμονο κρανως, καηδως παραστηθη φιλιας ειγνωμων,...
Ps. Lucian (2 ?)

Demosthenis Encomium 37

ὡς εἰ τοῦτον τὸν ἀγαθὸν ὁπλων ἀπεφηναν καὶ μεῖν καὶ στρατοπεδῶν καὶ καρφῶν καὶ χρημάτων κύριον, ἵνα μὴ περὶ τῆς Μακεδονίας ἀν κατέστησε μοι τὸν λόγον, ...

Dionysius (3 ?)

Ixeuticon seu De Aucupio 1,6

... ἄτεροι δὲ ἀρχότατοι καὶ πρὸς τὰς πτήσεις ὁκυνδεῖς, ὅστε τρέφεσθαι παρ’ ἄτεροι ἐθελεῖν καὶ δψὲ τοῦ καιροῦ πρὸς ἀγραν ὀρμῶν καὶ βατράχιοι επιτίθεσθαι μόνοις.

Achilles Tatius - (4 ?)

1, 5, 7

οὐ δὲ ὁκυνσί, καὶ αἶδη, καὶ ὁκαίρωσ σῳφροσίς; μὴ κρείττων εἰ τοῦ θεοῦ;

Libanius (4)

Epistula 1209, 5 (T.)

... Ἀλέξανδρος οὖν μὲν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἤκω, θυμῷ δὲ εἰς δέον χρώμενος, ὁπλὶσμον καὶ μὴ λόγοις, ὁκυνὸι καὶ κρείττων, καιροῦ <δε> δεόμενοι εἰς ἐπίδειξιν ἄρετῆς.

Cramer’s Catena 1, 209 (?)

καὶ ὡς ἐστὶ καιρὸς, ἐργασώμεθα τῷ σωτηρίῳ ἤμων, καὶ λαβώμεν ἔλαιον δαφίλες εἰς τὰς λαμπάδας, καὶ εἰς ὑπέρ ἑλάβομεν τάλαντον, τούτῳ χάρισμα, ἐπεργασώμεθα, τοὺς πληθοὺν ἄκουσ παρακάλουσ, καὶ νουθετῶμεν εἰς τὸ ἀγάθον καὶ εἰς προστασίαν σπουδαιο γινόμενοι, ἀν γὰρ ὁκυνσόμενες ἐνταῦθα ἐν ἀργία διάζωμεν, ...

Cyril (4-5)

On the Trinity 6 (§§ 6-8)

ὁκυνοῦ δὲ ἀμείνους ἤμεῖς, καὶ διερρήθω μέλλωμε, καιροῦ παραθέτοντος εἰς τὸ δεῖν ἐλέσθαι καὶ νῦν τοῖς τῆς ἁλθείας ἡμῶς συναθλήσαι δόγμασιν.
Procopius (5-6)

Wars 7, 15, 5

πέμψαντες τε παρὰ Βέσσαν αὐθες ἧττῳ μὲν ὑκησάη τινα οὖν δὲν αὐτῷ ἐμπεπτυκέναι, ἰσχυριζόμενοι δὲ ὡς δλέτες ὑστερον ἐτέραν ἐπεκδρομήν ἐσ τοὺς πολεμίους ποιήσουτε παρεκάλουν καὶ αὐτόν ἐσ καὶ τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐπιθέσαι δυνάμει τῇ πάσῃ.
(c) KAIRONOS AND ΠΝΕΣΤΜΑ

Hippocrates (?) (5 BC)

Epidemics 7, 10

προϊσύχης ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρης, ἢ τε ἄσω πλεῦσι καὶ ἀλυμοῖς, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλα τονοῦ πυκνύστερον, καὶ ὑπερότερον καὶ φιλοφρονώτερον τοῦ καὶ τυχόν προσήψερε καὶ ἔδεξιούτο.

Illnesses 4, 44, 3

κῇ ἔτι θερμής τῆς κοιλίας ἔοισης θερμύστερον τοῦ καὶ τῇ πνεύμα τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ προσγίνηται, οὐ θαῦμα ἐστὶ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τοοδοῦ πυρέτημα.

Regimen in acute diseases 58

πτυόλοι ἐφ' ἀναγωγών ἐστὶν καὶ ἐπινοοῦν. καίροὺς μὲν τοιούθε χεὶ.

Sophocles (5 BC)

Philoctetes 637 ff.

ἡ τοι καίριος σπουδὴ πόνου
λήξαται οὐκοῦν κἀρπάσαλαν ἤγαγεν.
οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὰν πνεύμα τούτο πρόφασ ἄνη,
τότε στελοῦμεν· μὴν γὰρ ἀντιστατεί.

Euripides (5 BC)

Orestes 698 ff.

ei δ' ἤτοι τις αὐτῶν ἐντείνουτι μὲν
χαλῶν ὑπελκών καὶ υπελκῶν εὐλαβοῦμενος
ἔσως ἄν ἐκπνεύσει.
Demosthenes (4 BC)

18, 308

ἐὰν ἐπὶ τοῦτω τῷ καïρῷ ῥήτωρ ἐξαίφνης ἐκ τῆς ἴσουχας ὑπὲρ πιστοῦ ἐφάνη, καὶ πεφωνηκεῖς καὶ συνειλοχὼς βήματα καὶ λόγους, συνειρετε ὑπὸ τοῦτον σαφῶς καὶ ἀπευθυνί, ...

Aristotle (4 BC)

Meteorologica 1, 4 (341 b 22)

ἐκτὸς γὰρ ἡ φλοξ πνεύματος ἡμῶν ζέσης. ἤ ἂν σὺν μάλιστα εὐκαιρίας ἔχῃ ἡ τοπατή σύστασις, ὅταν ὑπὸ τῆς περιφοράς κινήθη πως, ἐκκαίται.

1, 7 (344 b 26)

σαφεστερον δὲ ἐρόμενον καὶ περὶ τοῦτον τοῦ πάθος, ὅταν καὶ περὶ πνευμάτων λέγειν ἢ καιρός.

Problemeta 26, 13 (941 b 25)

διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ ἀρίστων γίνονται αὐτοὶ μάλιστα αἱ ημέραι καὶ ἀκαλρίαι τῶν πνευμάτων.

Politics 7, 14, 7 (1335 a 41)

οἱ τε γὰρ λατρεῖ τους καιροὺς τῶν σωμάτων ἱκανῶς λέγοντες, καὶ περὶ τῶν πνευμάτων οἱ φυσικοὶ, τὰ βόρεια τῶν νοτίων ἐπαινοῦντες μᾶλλον.

Theophrastus (4-3 BC)

De Ventis 31

ὅτι δὲ συμβαίνει κατὰ τὴν ὄραν τοὺς ἐπησίας ἐπαίρεσθαι καὶ τὴν τροπαίαν πιστὸν περὶ Μακεδονίαν ὑπὲρ σήμερα θετούν. πανταχοῦ γὰρ τῆς μεταμβείας ἀπολύει τὰ πνεύματα διὰ τῶν ἥλιων ὧν δὲ τὴ δείλη πάλιν αἴρεται, συμβαίνει δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν τὴν τεχνόπαλαν πρὸς τὰς ἀποσείεις αὐραίς καὶ τοὺς ἐπησίας ἐπαίρεσθαι πάλιν.

Polybius (2 BC)

1, 61, 7

ἐνυχρᾶς καὶ παραδόξως ἐκ μεταβολῆς αὐτοὶ πρὸς τὸν δέοντα καιρὸν τοῦ πνεύματος συνεργησάντος.
LXX (2 BC?)

Ecclesiasticus

39, 28

"Εστιν πνεύματα οἱ εἰς ἐκδίκησιν ἐκτίσται,
καὶ εἰς θυμόν αὐτῶν ἑστέρεσσαι μάστιγας αὐτῶν,
καὶ εἰς καρδία συντελεῖς ἴσχυν ἐκχεοῦσιν, ..."

Jeremiah

4, 11

ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ ἐκείνῳ ἐροῦσιν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ καὶ τῇ Ἰερουσαλημ
Πνεῦμα πλανῶσει εἰς τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ...

Diodorus Siculus (1 BC)

3, 40, 7

ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἄκαρε χρόνῳ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς δούση φύσει πάλιν
ἀπέδωκα, ...

14, 68, 6

μετὰ δὲ τὴν ναυμαχίαν, μεγάλων πνευμάτων ἐπιζημομένων καὶ τῶν
Καρχηδονίων ἀναγκασθεντῶν νεωλήται τὸν στόλον, καὶ ἔχε
τοῦ νικῶν κάλλιστον.

17, 52, 2

... εὐκαιροτάτα μὲν κειμένην (sc. Ἀλεξάνδρειαν) πλησίον τοῦ
Φάρον ἔλεμον, τῇ δ᾽ εὐστοχίᾳ τῆς ἰσομορίας ποιήσας
διαπερεσθήσα τὴν πόλιν τοῖς ἐπηρόσεις ἀνεμοῖς καὶ τούτων
πυκνοτῶν μὲν διὰ τοῦ μεγίστου πελάγους, καταψυχήτων δὲ τῶν
κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἀέρα, ...

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 ἀπαντας γὰρ καὶροὺς ἀέραν ἀντέχει
Ps. - Phocylides (17)

121
καὶ ως λατρεύειν, μὴ δ' αυτοπεσεῖν ἀνέμοιςιν.

Philo (1)

Somn. 2, 81

... ὁ ἀστείος οἶδεν ὅσον εἰσήκει πυρὲν ἰμάγη, τύχη, καλρός, βία, δυναστεία, καὶ ὅσα ὑποθέσεις καὶ ἡλίκας εὑρεῖται ἅπευστὶ δραμοῦν ἄχρις σύραυν κατέστισαι καὶ κατέρραξαι.

85

ταύτ' ἐστὶ τῆς ἀκαίρου παρρησίας τὰ ἐπεχείρα, ὅπερ παρρησίας παρὰ γε εν φρονέσθαι κρίταις, ἀλλ' εὐθείας καὶ φρενοβλαβεῖας καὶ μελαχολίας αὐτότου γέμοντα. τί λέγεις; χειμώνα τις ὄρων ἀκμάζουντα καὶ βαρὺ πνεύμα ἐναντίον ...

Abr. 92

... τοῦ μὲν ποταμοῦ ταῖς πλημμύραις λυμάσαντος ὑπὸ καλρὸ τὰ πεδία, τῶν δὲ ... πνευμάτων, ...

Jos. 32-33

... καλρῶν καὶ τῶν διαφορῶν, ὡσπερ γὰρ κυβερνήτης ταῖς τῶν πνευμάτων μεταβολαῖς συμμεταβάλλει ...

In Flacc. 152

... καθ' οὗ καλρῶν ... ἐν' αἱ τότε θεασάμεναι πόλεις αὐτὸν μέγα πνέουτα ...

Post. 113

καθάπερ οὖν ἐξίτηλοι γραφοί, οὐ χρόνου μήκει μόνον [ὧν] διεγράφων, ἀλλὰ καὶ καλρῶν οἴειας μεταβολῆς ἐκπεπεύκασαν, εἰσὶ δ' οὐκ οἷα χειμάρρον φορὰ πλημμύρων ἐξαλφήσει ἐπικλύσασα ἠφάνισεν.

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

καὶ ἀπὸ ἡμέρας καλρῶν σφαγῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας καὶ θανάτου τῶν χιτῶν ταῦτων καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἑως χαράς, ὃς ἡ ἡγαρίς τῆς γῆς, ὃς μεγάλοι ὄρμας, τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἐκπεπεύκασαν ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν, ὡς ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἔσονται, ἀφανίζοντα χωρὶς κρίσεως.

- 144 -
Testament of Solomon (?)

5, 8-12

καὶ προεφήτησεν μοι τὸ πνεῦμα λέγων· ταῦτα μεν οὖ, βασιλεὺς Σολωμὼν, ποιεῖται ημῖν. μετὰ δὲ χρόνον τινα βαχθέτατι ση ἡ βασιλεία σου, καὶ πάλιν ἐν καιρῷ διαρραγήσεται ὁ ναὸς οὗτος καὶ σουλευθήσεται πάσα Ιερουσαλήμ ἀπὸ βασιλέως Περσῶν καὶ Μῆδων καὶ Χαλδαίων· καὶ τὰ σκῆτα τούτων τρὶς ναοὶ οὐ σὺ ποιεῖτις δουλεύσουσίν τε θεοῖς. μεθ᾽ ὅνω ὡς καὶ οἱ πάντα τὰ ἀγχεῖα ἐν οἷς ἡμῖν κατακλεῖσθαι κλασθήσονται ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοῦτο ἡμεῖς ἐξελευθέρωμεν ἐν πολλῇ δυνάμει ἐνθεύς καὶ ἐνθεύς καὶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον κατασπαρσόμεθα. καὶ πλαύσομεν πᾶσιν τὴν αἰκομεμενον μέχρι παλλοῦ καλροῦ ἐως τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ υἱὸς ταυρουθῆ ἐπὶ ἐλεοῦ καὶ οὐκέτι γὰρ γίνεται τοιούτωσι βασιλεὶς ὁμοίος αὐτῷ ὁ παύτας ἡμᾶς καταργῶν, οὐ ἡ μήτηρ ἄνθρωπος ὑμᾶς μισήτωσται. καὶ τις λάβῃ τοιαύτην ἐξουσίαν κατὰ πνευμάτων εἰ μὴ ἐκείνος; ὃν ὁ πρῶτος διάβολος πειράζει ζητήσει καὶ οὐκ ἠχύνετε πρὸς αὐτοῦ, οὐ δὲ ἡ ψήφος τοῦ δυνάμοσ ὑμᾶς, ὃ πρότειν Ἐμμανουὴλ. διά τοῦτο, βασιλεὺς Σολωμὼν; ὃ καλρός σου ποιησό καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ σου μικρά καὶ ποιησό καὶ τῶν δούλω σου δοθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία σου.

17, 1

Καὶ ἐκέλευσα παρεῖμαι μοι ἔτερον πνεῦμα. καὶ ἠθέτη πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου μορφῆν ἐγὼ σκοτεινὴν καὶ ὀμφαλοῦς λάμπουτας. καὶ ἐπηρώτησα αὐτῶν λέγων· σὺ τίς εἶ; δὲ δὲ ἐφη· ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ χειλοῦ πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου γένοιτο ἐν σφαγῇ τετελευθηκότος ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῶν γιγαντῶν.

Paul (1)

Galatians 6, 8-10

... ὃ δὲ σπειρών εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωῆν αἰώνιον. τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιεῖτε μὴ εγκακάζει, καὶ ῥῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσεως μὴ εκλύμενοι. ᾠρὰ σου ἐκ καιροῦ ἐχόμεν, ἐργαζόμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς παύτας,...

Paul (?) (1)

Ephesians 6, 18

... προσευχήσεσθε εἰς τὸν πνεύμα ... 1 Timothy 4, 1

τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥήτως λέγει ὅτι ἐν ὥστεροι καιροῖς ... προσευχήσεστε πνευματικῶς πλάυνοι...
Luke (1)

Gospel 4, 13-14

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

12, 55-56

καὶ ὅταν μόνον πέφυτα, λέγετε ὅτι Καύσων ἐσται, καὶ γίνεται. ὅπερ τοῦ προποντοῦ τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, τοῦ καλροῦ δὲ τούτου πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν;

Peter (?) (1-2 ?)

Letter 1, 11

ἐραυνώντες εἰς τύχα ἡ ποιῶν καλροῦ ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεύμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρομένον ...

Dio Chrysostom (1-2)

17 (67), 19

_already εἰ ἦμιν αὐτοῖς, εἰ τῶν τῆς φύσεως μερῶν ἐκαστον εἰδολο πλεονεκτέον, ἐσθ' ὅπως τῶν βραχύτατον καλροῦ διαμείξαι δυνησθεθα; λέγω δὲ οἶνον εἰ πλέουν τινι τοῦ συμμετροῦ αἷμα γίνοντο, ἢ νῆ Δία τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θερμὸν ὅτι δηποτ' ἐν ἡμῖν ἐπιτεύγνοι παρὰ τὴν συμμετροῦ καὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν, οὐχι μεγάλας ἐπίστασθε καὶ παλάτας ἐκ τούτων ἀπαντῶν ὕδασος;

33 (16), 5

ἐπειθ' ὑμεῖς ἀκούοντες τὸ μὲν εξετάζειν καθ' ἐκαστον ἡ ἀπιστεύναι ἀνδρὸν σοφῷ φαῦλον ἤγείοντες καὶ ἀκαίρου, ἀλλος δὲ τῇ ἐρα, καὶ τῇ ταχυτητὶ τῶν λόγων ἐπαίρεσθε καὶ πάνω χαρέτε απευερνοῦτος τροποῦν ὄχλον ῥημάτων, καὶ πεπόνησεν θρίον τοῖς ὀρθῶν τοὺς ἰπποὺς τοὺς ἀπὸ πνεύμονος θεοῦτας.

34 (17), 37

ὡς δὲ ὧσπερ οἱ τοὺς ἀπογείοις, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γυναῖων πνεύμασι πλέοντες, ὅθυμα φέροντες. ἀνδρῆς Γαρσίας, οὕτε τῆς τοιάσθης πολιτείας ὥστ' ἐκείνου τοῦ πλούτου ἐμβαθίης ὀδ' ἀσφαλεῖς ἐξουσίαν ὁδοῦν. διαρκέται μὲν γὰρ ἄρχη παντός [ἡ διαστημάτος] οὐχ οὐκε τῇ εἰσιν, οἱ τοιαύται προσβολαί, πολλάκις δὲ κατεδυνα ἀκαίρως (cf.) προσπεσοῦσα.
Plutarch (1-2)

Mor. 133 F

μέτρων δὲ τοῦ καλροῦ τὸ τῆς τροφῆς καθισταμένης ἀτέμα καὶ
συμπερεύοντος τὴν πέφυν ἐγκρατὴ γενέσθαι καὶ ὑπερδείξιον.

Babrius (2)

Fabula 60

Ζωμοῦ δύτη μὴς ἐμπεσὼν ἀπωμάστῳ
καὶ τῷ λίπει πυρόπθενος ἐκπεσὼν τῷ ἔδε
βρεμύκος φῶς καὶ πέπωκα καὶ πάσης
τροφῆς πέπλησαι· καρός ἡστὶ μοι θυσίκειν.

Julius Pollux (2)

1, 105-106

πλούς εὐδιος... αὖρας ἐπιπενεύοσθα... ἀνέμου... ἐπιπνέουστο
προσπνέουστο... ἐπιλαυρων, καταβαίνοντος ἐκ γῆς τοῦ πνεύματος,
... ἐκ πρύμνης ἐπιπνέουστον, κατὰ πρύμνων τοῦ πνεύματος
εὐτηκότος... ὑποπεέων τῇ θήνῃ... πεσόντος τοῦ πνεύματος
1, 110-112

ἄνεμος βδίος, σκηρὸς... πνεύματος εὐθεστήκοτος, ἀντίον
πνέουστο τοῦ πνεύματος... ἄκριτων ὄντων τῶν πνευμάτων,
ἀντιπνεύδων... λάβρου ὄντος τοῦ πνεύματος... περιπνέουστο
... καὶ ἐναχομένου... ὑπαινίττεται δὲ τί τοιούτον καὶ τὸ
Σενοφῶντει, τῷ, ὕποπάντωτον τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἄν χα τὸ πρεῖν
ἐκ γῆς ἄνεμον ὄντως εἰρήκειν, ὡς εἰς ἀναγωγὴν καρὸν εἶναι.

Maximus of Tyre (2)

13, 7a (p. 166 Hobein)

σώζει δὲ αὐτὴν ὑπὸ μόνον κυβερνήτου τέχνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ πνευμάτων
καὶ, καὶ ὑπερεσία ναυτῶν καὶ εἰκολία δραγῶν, καὶ θαλάττης
φύσις.
Philostratus (2-3)

VS 2, 33 (LCL p. 310)

πολυμαθὴς δὲ ὁ λοπάδιος καὶ πολυψηφίος καὶ τὸ μὲν καυνοπρεπὲς ἐπαινῶ, ἐς ἀπειροκαλάν δὲ οἶδαμον ἐκπέπτων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐν καρφὶ χρῆσθαι ὥστε γιγνώσκει, τουτὶ δὲ ποι καὶ ἐν μονικῇ κρατίστῳν, οἷς ζῶσαν τῶν τῶν λυρὰ τε φωνήν ἐδώκαν καὶ ἀλώ καὶ μελώδιαν ἐπαλέουσαν. ἐπιμεληθεὶς δὲ τοῦ δόκιμου τε καὶ σὺν αφελείᾳ ἐρμηνεύειν πνεύματος τε καὶ περιβολῆς ἡμέλησε, ...

Aristides Quintilianus (3 ?)

1, 21 (p 43 Winnington - Ingram)

tῶν γὰρ λοιπῶν ὑγρῶν κατὰ πρόσολν πνεύματος ἐκφωνουμένων τουτοῦ μένου ἐμφράτωτος ἡμῶν τοὺς πόρους ἐκφωνεῖν βιαζόμεθα· κατὰ δὴ τῶν αὐτῶν καρπῶν ἐναντιοποιοῦν τὸ φωνητικὸν δρήμαν αὐτὸ ἀπεικότως κολούει τὴν τῆς φωνῆς ὁμαλότητα.

Themistius (4)

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

μετάωνα, ἐφη, βραδεία καὶ οὐ σφόδρα εὐκαίριος δαίμων, οἷος δὲ τινας οὐκ ἔχει πάμπισ ὑπὸ τῶν ἔρπετόν ἀπομυθηθεῖν, ἀλλ' ἁνίστησιν ἐτὶ πνέοντας καὶ οἰκάς ἀποσώζει.

Gregory of Nazianzus (4)

Carmen de vita sua 708ɫ.

δουλεύομεν καὶ προῖς τα καὶ λαῶν πόθοις, ἀλὰ διδόντες τῷ πνέουσι τὸ σκάφος,

Hephaestio (5)

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

ἀποτελεστικὸς δὲ καὶ τῶν περὶ τῶν ἑρατικῶν λόγων καὶ τὰς τῶν θεῶν θρησκείας καὶ τὰς βασιλικὰς προσόδους καὶ τὴς τῶν ἰθιῶν ή νομίμων κατὰ καρπῶς ἐνιαυλώσεως τῇ πρὸς τοὺς ἑκάστοτε τῶν ἀστέρων συγκρατεῖ, πρὸς δὲ τὸ περιέχον μᾶλλον ξηρός ὦ καὶ εὐκίνητος διὰ δὲ τὴν πρὸς τὸν Ἡλίου ἐξήγητα καὶ τὸ τάχος τῆς ἀνακκλήσεως πνευμάτων ἀτάκτων καὶ δεξών καὶ εὐμεταβολῶν μάλιστα κινητικὸς ὑπάρξει, βροντῶν τε εἰκότως καὶ προητέρων καὶ χαμάτων καὶ σεισμῶν καὶ ἀστραπῶν ἀποτελεστικὸς, ...
1, 21, 3-4 (p. 52)

Των δὲ ἀνέμων οἱ μὲν ἀπ’ ἀρκτοῦ πνεύματ᾽ ἐκαί ἐτέρου μέρους τοῦ ὀρέζουτος ἐν τῷ καλῷ τῆς ἐπιπέδους καὶ μονῆς ἐκείναις ταῖς χώραις ταπεινώσατο σημαίνοντο καὶ ὧν ἐγγὺς οὖσαν πνεύματι. ἐν δὲ τῇ καθότερῃ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἄλλοι πνεύματες ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐξήσουσιν, ...

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

λαμπρότεροι μὲν γὰρ καὶ μείζονες ὀρῴμενοι παρὰ τὰς συνήθεις φαντασίας οἱ εἰς ὑπολογισμὸν μέρος ὄντες ἀνέμων τρόπος ἀπὸ τοῦ οἰκείου τόπου διασημαίνοντο, καὶ τῶν αἷδων δὲ νεφελοειδῶν συστροφῶν οἷον τῆς θάνατος των ὁμοίων ἐπάνω αἰθριὰς οὔτως αἱ συντάξεις ἀμαραί καὶ ὧσπερ ἀφαίεις πεπαχυμέναι θεωρῶνται, φορέας ὀδὸν εἰς ἰδιωτικά, καθαραί δὲ καὶ παλλαμένας ἱμερίσιοι πολλῶν πνευμάτων, ἐπικεφαλεῖα τῶν ἀστέρων τῶν παρ’ ἐκατέρα τῆς θάνατος τῶν καλουμένων· ὃν τὸν βάρειον ἀφοῦ γένηται, βορεῖς πινάκες σημαίνει, έναν δὲ ὀνόματι τῶν ὑψίστων. Καὶ τῶν ἐπιγυμνών δὲ κατὰ καρποὺς γιὰ τῶν μετεώρων αἱ μὲν τῶν κοπιῶν συστροφὰ πάντως αὐξομενὶ καὶ ἀνέμων προσημαίνοντο καὶ τοσοῦτοι μείζονες ὡς ἐκ πλεῖστων καὶ ἐπὶ πολὺ ἡ σύστασις γένηται, αἱ δὲ διαδρομέας καὶ οἱ ακοντίσμοι τῶν ἀστέρων εἰ μὲν απὸ μίας γένουσι γεωίς, τὸν ἀπ’ ἐκείνης ἀμεμοῦ δηλώσιν, εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐναυτῶν, ἀκαταστασίας πνευμάτων, ...

2, 24, 8 (p. 185)

ἐν δὲ τρεῖς στερεῶς διὰ κρημνικῶν καὶ πνευμάτων, ἐν δὲ τοῖς τροπικῶς καὶ ἱσπαριστῶς δι’ ἐνδειαν τῶν ἐπιτρέψθων μετὰ τοῦ μοσείου, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀναφωσιάζοντας διὰ λαμπρῶν καὶ ἐπιβουλῶν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς χερσούσι διὰ θηρίων ἡ σειράς, Ερμοῦ δὲ προσγυμνοῦν καὶ διὰ κατηγορίων, ἔτι δὲ ἐρπετῶν καὶ λοβῶν. τάς δὲ ἐπισημασίας τοῦ <τῶν> ἐπιτρέπετε καρπῶν κατασταχεῖτε ἐκ τῆς τῶν κατὰ χρόνους ἐπεμβάσεως ποιήσθησαν.

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

τὰς τοῖς ἀναβάσεις καὶ ἀποβάσεις τῶν ὑδάτων ἐν δέοντι κατὰ λόγον λυμνεῖ, ὁμοίως τε καὶ τοῦ σπάρου καὶ τὰ λοιπά. σκοτεινὸν δὲ τοῦ ἀνέμου ἀντείλαστος πὰν τόσοντιν ἔσται καὶ τὰ γενήματα ἐν σπάνει, καὶ αἰ κάνουσι εκτρώνουνται. Ἐπιτείλας δὲ ὁ ἀστήρ μεγας καὶ λαμπρὸς βορεῖον πυρόστοι καὶ τὴν ἀνάβασιν τῶν ὑδάτων κατὰ λόγον καὶ τὰ λοιπά ἐπὶ συμβάλλει μυνεῖ ὅπως σπάροντες ἐπιτρέπετε καὶ εὐροποῦν, τῷ τῆς χώρας βασιλεύει νικητὰ ταῖς τῶν ἀντιπαλῶν μικρὸ δὲ καὶ στυγνῶς ἀνατείλας, βορεῖα ρηματόστοις ἐπιστρέψεθεν τῇ χώρᾳ τοῖς ἀκαλλάξειν οὐ καί ὧν τῆς τῶν ἀνάβασιν τοῦ βελόνου ἐνενεθεῖ κατὰ λόγον, τας τε τιμὰς ἐλπισθείσαι τὰς μέγας δὲ καὶ λαμπρός ἁλῆς ἠ νότου πυρόστοις ἀμέδας καὶ θυσίας, μετρίας τε ἀναβάσεις καὶ λίμους λυμνεῖς. Ἀνατείλας δὲ μέγας καὶ λαμπρὸς βορεῖον ἡ ἀπληθεύσις πυρόστοις τοῦ βασιλέα τῆς χώρας καταλείψειν τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀφαίρῃ γενήσεσθαι
καὶ πόλεμον ἔστησαί· μικροῦ δὲ ἀνατείλαντος βορέων καὶ απηλιώτου πυρὸς ἀνάβασιν κατὰ λόγον ἔστησαί· κρατήρημα δὲ τὴν Ἀθηναίων ὡς τίμως δύνατον. μέλας δὲ ἀνατείλας λοιμὸν ποιεῖ, χλωρὸς δὲ νόσους, πυρρὸς δὲ πόλεμον καὶ σφαγάς.

Cyril (4-5)

On the Trinity 4

καὶ πρόσωπα βασιλείζειν οὐκ ἀνεχόμενοι, ποί φέρεσθε, τί δράτε, ἢ παντὶ πνεύματι ποιητὰ παράφοροι καὶ ἁλώσιμοι;

Ignatius Diaconus (9)

Tetrasticha Iambica 1, 45

ὁ χριστός ἄνευ δέοι ὁσίων πνεύμασιν ἐκείνῳ ἁγιασμένοις· ἐντὸς κἀ̄κτος καὶ ἅγιος πεζιστῇ, πως εἰσάγῃ ὡρθωμ. ἢ πνεύμασιν δουλούμεθα· πτολεις δὲ ἐκείνων ἐστὶν ἡμῶν ἡ στάσις."

[βέα καὶροῦ μὴ ἀντιτάττεσθαι]
Hippocrates (?) (5 BC)

On Fractures 35

ἐν τοῖς ὑμῖν ὄρνευτοις τρώμαι τοὺς μὲν κινδύνους οὗ χρὴ
ληθείν ὅποιον τινὲς εἰσι, καὶ προλέξειν χρὴ πρὸς τοὺς
καιροὺς. εἰ δὲ ἀναγκαίως μὲν ἐμβάλλειν, ἔλπίζοις δὲ
ἐμβαλλεῖν, ...

Aeneas Tacticus (4 BC) 23,3

... καὶ χρώσαντες καὶ ἐπεξελύθοντες ἐπέθευτο παρʼ ἐλπίδα
τοῖς πολεμίοις καὶ κατάρθουσαν.

Demosthenes (4 BC) 15,2

... ἐν οἷς μόνοις τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας ἔχειν τὰς
ἐλπίδας. ἄξιον δὲ θυσίαν τῷ παρόντι καὶ ἠρῴδες
18,298

... ἐὰν οὔτε καὶ ῥοδὸν οὔτε φιλαμηθροπία λόγων οὔτε ἐπαγγελιῶν
μέγεθος οὔτε ἔλπις οὔτε φόβος οὔτε ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἐπήρευν ...

57,2

...θαρρεῖν καὶ πολλὰς ἔχειν ἐλπίδας καὶ ἀρχαιολογεῖσαι,
τὸν καὶ ῥοδὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ παρωξύθαι τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὰς
ἀποψίθεσις φιλεῖσθαι.

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

ὡς γὰρ ἐλπίδος ὁ καὶ ῥοδὸς ἐφιλέωθη ...

Polybius (2 BC) 3,67,1

ὅτι δὲ συστατευόμενοι Κελτοὶ τοῖς Ρωμαίοις θεωροῦντες
ἐπικυνδοτέρας τὰς τῶν Καρχηδονίων ἐλπίδας, συνταξάμενοι πρὸς
ἀλλήλους καὶ δὸν ἔπετήρουν πρὸς ἐπίθεσιν, ...
3,69, 3-4

... δεξιά μαυλώμενος εκφέρειν τής σφετέρας προαιρέσεως πρὸς τὸ μὴ διδιότας ἀπελπίζειν τὴν παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ συνεργία τούτης ὑπὸ τῶν καρπῶν καταλαμβανομένων, τὸν δὲ προδότην ἐπέμειος μεταλέγω, ἐκκαλεσάθηναι σπουδάζων τοὺς ἐπὶ πραγμάτων ταττομένους πρὸς τὰς Ἐκρηκτησίων Ἑλπίδας.

4,51,3

ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος παραγενομένων τῶν προσβετῶν ἐβουλεύετο μὲν παρακατέχειν τὸν Ἀνδριμαχον, Ἑλπίζων αὐτῷ χρηστεύειν πρὸς καρπὸν ...

5,75,7

πλὴν ὁ μὲν Ἀχαῖος ἠκέ πρὸς τὸν καρπόν, οἱ δὲ Σέλεγες συμμείζοντες αὐτῷ μεγάλα ἔσχον Ἑλπίδας ὡς ὀλοκληρωμένοι τινος τευξομένους φιλανθρωπίας.

...5,104,7-8

... ἵνα γενόμενος ἐφεδρος ἐμφών πειραθῇ σὺν καρπῷ τῆς τῶν ὀλίγων αὐτηποίησας δυσαντείας. εἶναι δὲ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα καρποῦ οὐκ ἀλλότριον τῆς Ἑλπίδος ταυτῆς.

8,19,7

... κοιμοσμένων παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὸν καρπὸν τῇ γυναικὶ καὶ ποίησας διὰ τὸ παράδοξον τὴν ἱασικὴν ἐκφοράν, χρόνου μὲν τῶν λιπαρῶν ταυτῆς καὶ καταπράξους ταῖς προσδοκώμεναι Ἑλπίς προεκαρτέρει, ...

9,8,6-7

... καὶ τῶν βοηθοῦσιν παραγενομένων εἰς τὸν τῆς καταλήψεως καρπὸν, ταυτής μὲν τῆς Ἑλπίδος ἀπεσφάλη, ...

9,14,11

ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὑπεράρας τὸν ὑρισμένον καρπὸν αὐτῆς ἀποτυγχάνει τῆς Ἑλπίδος—

16,22a,5-6

... καὶ σχεδὸν ἀμελετήσω τῆς συνεργίας ὑποχώρησης τοῖς ἐνετολομένοις πρὸς τῶν ὀρμίν καὶ βίων τῆς Ἀλεξανδροῦ, μόνοι τῶν κατὰ Σωρίων ὑποστησαν καὶ πάσας ἐξηλεξαν τὰς Ἑλπίδας. τὸ δὲ παραπλήσιον ἐποίησαν καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐνεστῶτας καρποὺς. σωθὲν γὰρ ἀπέλευσον τῶν ἔνδεχομένων, σπουδάζοντες διαφυλάξει τὴν πρὸς τὸν Πτολεμαῖον πίστιν.
Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1 BC)

Antiquities 3,20,2-3

ταῦτα ἄρα διανοηθεΐς ὡς εἰκε τάχυς ἐθευγε καὶ συνέπεσεν αὐτῷ μὴ διαμαρτηθῇ τῆς ἐλπίδος. ὥ μὲν τὰρ ἐτέρως τῶν ἀλβανῶν οὐδὲμέν έχων πληγὴν καὶ τὸν ἑξίκεν αὐτὸν ἠκολούθεσα...

Diodorus Siculus (1 BC) 3,15,7

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

4,32,3

... δύσματι ἀδικίδοις συμαχαζέσθω εξεκλεισθεὶς διὰ τὴν ὑπήτητα τῶν καρπῶν, ἀδρολαγὰς δ’ ὅσους ἐδώτων, μετὰ τούτων ἤθελεν ἐπὶ τὰς ναεῖς, ἐλπίζω εἰ ταῦτα ἔμπροσθεν, τέλος ἐπιθύμησεν τῷ πολέμῳ.

Philo (1)

Plant 161

... καὶ εἰ σφόδρα τοῦ πράττειν ἐπεσπευδῇ οἱ καρποὶ, πάνω σιδηροῖς ἰσόμενον οὐκ ἂν τὸ ταχύ τοῦ βραδείου ἔσομεν κριτίστων’ οὐ προμηθέσει μὲν γὰρ τάχυς βλαβερὸν, βραδυθεὶς δὲ μετ’ εὐελπιστεῖν ὑφέλιμον.

Spec. L. 1,78-79

... ὀσύν τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐκάστων παραπέμψατε... ἐν γὰρ ταῖς νομίμοις ἀπαρχής αἰ τῶν εὐπρομνῶν ἐλπίδας εἰςίτων. Ψυχαὶ μὲν εἰσὶν τῷ ἐθνῷ δύσκα, μία δ’ ἐκ πασῶν ἀριστινών ἐπικραθέσθαι ἐρεῖται, γερας διαρκασθάσας καὶ φιλοθέου συπονθῆ καθ’ ὅλον λαβοῦσα, καθ’ ὅλον τοῖς έπαρθές ἥ πληθυς...

Moses 1,32

... τῆς δὲ παπώσας ἄρχης ὅπου ὑδέης γεγονὼς ἐλπίζει ταῖς ἀπόστοις διάσωσας καὶ τί γὰρ ἄλλ’ ἢ ὁ νέος βασιλεὺς προσαχρονευόμενος, τῷ συγγενείῳ καὶ προγονικῇ ἔξηλος παιδεῖον, τὰ μὲν τῶν εἰσποιηθημένων ἄγαθα, καὶ εἰ λαμπρότερα καὶ τοῖς, ὥθετα εἰναι ὑπολαβῶν, ...
...οὕτως οί περὶ νομίμου γυναικὸς η ὀικίας η χαράνου κτήσεως
ποιηθέντες καὶ δόσιν οὕτω τῇ ἔλπιδι νομίζοντες εἰς τὸν ἐκάστον
τὴν χάραν αἰφνίδια καύμων. ...

75

... ἂνω ... αἰ̓ πρὸς τὸν παρόντα καύμων νουθεσία καὶ
σωφρονισμῷ, παρακεντέσει αἰ̓ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα διὰ χρηστῶν
ἔλπιδον, αἰ̓ς ἐπακολουθεῖν ἀναγκαίον αἰ̓ σία τέλη.

123

οἱ δὲ μὴ γένει δούλοι χρηστῆς ἔλπιδος μὴ εἰς ἄπαν
ἀμοιρεῖτως, ἀλλὰ ἵπτον ἐπὶ τὴν παλαιὰν ἁδείαν, ὡς διὰ
καύμων ἄβουλητοι ἐστέρηντο.

In Flacc. 15-16

... καὶ τοὺς ἐκ πρότης ἡλικίας οἱ καύμων ἀπήλατο καὶ
dιεξεύειν. ἐπεὶ δὲ οὕν καὶ τοῦτον ἐγὼ προσανατικεύον οἱ
Φλάκκος, τὴν λοιπὴν ἔλπιδα κατὰ τὸ παντελὲς ἀπεγνώκει ...

Josephus (1)

BJ 1,4-5

... Ιουδαίων δὲ τὸ νευτερίζον τότε τεταραγμένοις ἐπαινέστη τοῖς
καύμοις ἀκμαίοις κατὰ τε χεῖρα καὶ χρήμασιν, ὡς δὲ ὑπερβολὴν
θρούβων τοῖς μὲν ἐν ἔλπιδι κτήσεως τοῖς δὲ ἐν ἀφαιρέσεως δέδο
γίνονται πρὸς τὴν ἀνατολήν, ... καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν βασιλείων
ὁ καύμων ἀνέπειθεν, τὰ στρατιωτικὰ δὲ ἡρὰ μεταβολὴς ἔλπιδι
λημμάτων.

3,204

'ὑν καύμων, εἴπων, ἀρχεσθαι μάχης, ὅτ' ἔλπις οὐκ ἔστι
σωτηρίας.'

5,29

καταπληξὶς δὲ δεινὴ καὶ δέος ἄν τοῖς γυναῖκοις, καὶ οὔτε βούλης
καύμως εἰς μεταβολὴν οὔτε συμβάσεως ἔλπις οὔτε φυγῆς τοῖς
ἐθέλοντιν.

7,76-81

... πολὺ μέρος Γερμανῶν ἐκλίψη πρὸς ἀπόστασιν, αἰ̓ς καὶ
Γαλάτων οἱ πλήθους συμφρονήσαντες κοινὴ μεγάλας ἔλπιδος
αυτοίς συνέθεσαν ὡς καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀπαλλαξόμενοι δεσποτελεῖαν. ἔπρεπε δὲ τοὺς Γερμανοὺς ὤψασθαι, τῆς ἀποστάσεως καὶ τοῦ πόλεμου ἐξενεκείλθη πρώτη μὲν ἡ φύσις οὕτω λογισμῶν ἔρθη καὶ μετὰ μικρὸς ἐλπίδας ἐτοίμως διψούσιοι· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ μέσῳ τοῦ πρὸς τοὺς κρατοῦντας, ἑπεὶ μόνολα ἦσαν Ῥωμαῖοι τὸ γένος αὐτῶν δουλεύειν βεβαιασμένοι. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ μάλιστα γας πάντως δ’ ἐκαίρια ἦσεν ποιηθῆναι· ὥστε γὰρ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς τὰς συνεχείς τῶν αὐτοκράτωρων ἐλλατάς ἐν εἰρήνη τεταραχμένην, πάντως τῇ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν οἰκουμένης πυθαγόμην μετέφερον εἶναι καὶ κραδαλυσθηναι, τοῦτον σφίζων αὐτοὺς ἀριστον ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκείνων κακοπραγίας καὶ σταύρως καὶ τὴν ηὐθύνουν ἡμᾶς ἐπαρδεδόθαι. ἐνῆγγον δὲ τὸ βοσκεμα καὶ ταῦτας αὐτοὺς τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐνόφιον Κλασσικός τις καὶ Κλουλίας τῶν παρ’ αὐτοὺς [ὀνόμα] ἤγεμονόν, οἱ δὴλοι μὲν ὡς ἐκ μακρὸ ταύτης ἐφέστω τῆς νεωτεροποιήσας, ὑπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ δὲ θαρσῆσαν προσχέετε τῆς αὐτῶν γνώμην ἐξεύθηνα· ἐμελλον δὲ προθύμων διακειμένους τὴν τείραν τοῖς πλῆθος προσφέρειν.

7, 193-194

πείρα δὲ πρότερον ἐβουλυντο τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαφεύγεσθαι τῆς πολιορκίας ἐλπίδας ἐλέγχη, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ προθύμως ἐποιούστο τὰς ἐξόντας ἀνὰ πάνω ἡμέραν καὶ τοῖς χοῦν συμπληκτομένοι πολλοὶ μὲν ἐφθήκαν, πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀνήρραν. δεῖ δὲ τοῦ κρατέρι ὁ καλός ἐβραβευν ἐκατέρροι 

AJ 2, 211

... δοῦναι τ’ ἀπαλλαγὴν αὐτούς ὡς παρ’ ἐκείνου ἐκακοπάθους τῶν καρδίων καὶ τῆς ἐπ’ ἀπολεία τοῦ γένους αὐτῶν ἐλπίδος.

15, 183

... σπείρων πρὸς Καίσαρα καὶ μηδὲν ἐλπίδαν περὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ πραγμάτων δυνάμεως χρηστῶν ἐκ τῆς γενομένης αὐτῶς πρὸς Ἀυτῶν φιλίας, ὑποτούν μὲν ἐχεὶ τὴν ἀλεξάνδρα, μὴ τῷ καρδίδι συνεποιήμενῷ τὸ τε πλῆθος ἀποστήθη καὶ στασίασθα τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείαν πράγματα,

15, 232

συνθεώρησαν δὲ τῶν καρδίων ἡ ἀλεξάνδρα καὶ διότι μικρὰς ἐλπίδας ἦχοι μὴ καὶ αὐτὴ τῶν δομίων ἐξ Ἡρώδου τυχεῖν, ...

16, 80-92

... διὸ καὶ καθάπερ ἐφεδρῶν τινα τῶν Ἀρτέμιτρον εἰσήχησαν, οἱ δέμοις ὄρθως προσευχὴν καὶ καταστάλειτο τῶν μειρακίων ἐξεῖλεν ἔρεμος λείψας βελτίσσατο, τὸ δ’ ὄχι ἐνόσοι τοὺς τὸ γας παῖντ’ οὐ υἱήσεσθη μὴ ἐδοκεῖ κεραυνῆσθαι τῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπερεία, καὶ δεινὸς ὡς τῶν τρόπων Ἀντιπατρος, ἔεισέρχεται παραποτὰς τινὰς ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ πρότερον ὅσιος ἐλπίδος ἀντεπολεμάτο, μὲν ἔσχεν ὑπόθεσιν, κακοῦ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ μὴ παραχωρεῖν τῶν πρωτείων, ἀλλ’ ἔχοντες τοῦ πατρὸς, ἦδη μὲν ἐλλοτριωμένου ταῖς διαβολαίς, εὐμεταχειρίστω 5’ ὅτους ἔσ
ὅπερ ἔσπουδακεί πολύ χαλεπότερον ἵνα γενέσθαι τοῖς διαμεθημένοις. ἦσαν οὖν οὗ παρ' αὐτοῦ μόνον οἱ λόγοι, φιλοτοπεῖν δι' αὐτοῦ δόθη τοῖς τοιοῦτα καταμηνύειν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἐχήρτο συνεφροῦν τοῖς ἀνυπότοις καὶ διὰ τὴν εὐνοιάν την πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα πιστευθησομένοις αὐτῷ πολεῖν. ἦν δὲ πλείους ἐγενέσθαι οἱ κακεύνοι ἐφ' ὅσ' ἠπάικει θεραπεύοντες καὶ τῷ Ἴρωδῃ ἐκ τοῦ δοκεῖν κατ' εὐνοιαίν τὰ τοιοῦτα λέγειν ὑπαγόμενοι. καὶ τούτων πολυπροσώπως καὶ πιστῶς ἄλλοις συναγωγοῖς, ἐτὶ καὶ μᾶλλον αὖ παρὰ τῶν μειράκιων ἀφορμαὶ προσέγγιστο καὶ γὰρ καὶ δάκρυα πολλάκις ἦν κατ' ἐπιρρεπών ὦν ἡταμάκωτο καὶ τῆς μητρὸς ἀνάκλησις, καὶ τοῦ πατέρα φανερὸς ἦν πρὸς τοὺς φίλους οὗ δικαιὸν ἐλέγχειν ἐπετήδειον. ἀπεὶ ἀπαντάκαν κακοθέως ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ τοῦ ἀντιπατροῦ καλοφυλακοῦμεν καὶ μελετοῦσι πρὸς τῶν Ἴρωδην ἐξαγγελλόμενα προθυμοῦν οὐ μικρῶν ἀπεργαζόμενα τῆς τῆς οἰκίας στάσις. ἀπεθανοῦσα γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς ταῖς διαβολαῖς καὶ τεπεινώθηκε βούλησιν τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Μαριάμης, μελετῶν ἂν ποσ τιμὴν ἀντιπάτρω παρεῖχεν, καὶ θέλω ἐπιτήδεις ἐπετηθῆς ἡ τῇ ἐκείνῃ μητέρα: Καίσαρὶ δὲ πολλὰς γραφὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἱδίᾳ συνιϊστῇ σπουδαίστερᾳ. ἀγριππά περὶ μύν ἀνυῶτος εἰς τὴν Ῥωμήν μετὰ τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς λασίας ἀδελφοῖς, καὶ μᾶλλον ἐκεῖ ἡ ἡμέρας καλοφυλακίων τοῖς πατρίδας, εἶ τι καὶ καθ' αὐτὸν ἀειφόρει ἐπεικείστερον εἰς τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Μαριάμης φονεῖν. ταῦτα δὲ δι' ἐνοῦ αὐτοὺς ἐξω ὕμικο αὐτοῖς τῆς ἐκείνου προομόλογος, ἀλλὰ κακεύνοι, ὅτι ἀνισοκράτη τι καὶ παρεξεβρέα ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατέρα κατὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, συνεχῶς ἐπετελέσαν, προφανεῖν μὲν ὡς ὑπεραγωγῶν αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἄλλης ἄφορ' ἦν ὡς ἡταμάκωτο κακοκηθεῖσθαι τῆς ἐλλίδας μεγάλην καὶ ἡταμόνα ὅλωσιν ἐμπαιρευόμενον, ἐως εἰς τὸ στόχον προφαίρεσιν τοῦ Ἴρωδῆν ὀργῆς καὶ δυσθυμίας, ὡς ἦν μὲν ἐνεχθα πιστεύομεν τοῖς μειράκιοις, ἐτὶ δὲ κατοκεύειν εἰς τοιούτοις ἐμβιβάσα πάθος, ὡς δὲ μὴν ἅμα ἔμελλεν ἐκ προπετείας ἀμαρτάνει, κρείσσον ἡγεῖται πλεῖστες εἰς Ῥωμήν εἴκε τῶν παιδιών κατηγορεῖν παρὰ Καίσαρι, καὶ μὴ τίνɛ τοιούτῳ ἐπιτρέπειτε, δὲ καὶ διὰ μέγεθος τῆς αστείας ὑπόπτων ἴησον, ὡς ἀνῆθηε ἐς τὴν Ῥωμήν, ἐγένετο μὲν μέχρι τῆς ἀκυλλήσεως πόλεως Καίσαρι συμπερνεόμεν, ἐπειξάγομεν, ἐξειδίκεισ, δὲ εἰς λόγους καὶ καλοῦν αἰτησανέας ἐπὶ μεγάλας ὅπερ ἐξείδοκεν δυσθυμεῖν, παρεστητότα μὲν τοὺς παῖδας, ἤτακτό δὲ τὴς ἀπονοας καὶ τῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως, ὡς ἐγέρθω ἐγούν ἀπαντά τρόπον ἐποιούμενος μεσεῖν τὸν ἀυτῶν πατέρα μεταχειρίσασθαι,
Plutarch (1–2)

Μον: 804 C

Κάτως δὲ, περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔλπιξε πείσειν τῷ ἐποκατέχεσθαι χάρισι καὶ σπουδαῖς τοῦ δήμου ἢ τὴν βουλήν, ἐλέγετ τήν ἡμέραν δὴν ἀναστὰς καὶ τὸν καλόν ὀὔτως ἔξεκρουε.

Dio Chrysostom (1–2)

34(17), 4

τῷ ποτ' οὖν ἐλπίδως καὶ τῇ βουληθείς παρελήφθη τοιοῦτος ὁ ὕμων καὶ τοιοῦτωι μανής γὰρ τούτῳ ἀληθινής. Ὁτι μηδενὸς ἀυτὸς δεδομαι παρ' ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐμετέρας ἐφελείας ἑκεῖνα ἐξοποῦδακα.

Herodian (3)

1.4.2–3

ἐκ γὰρ ὃν ἀυτὸς διάκειμαι, πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἀμοιβαῖ καὶ εἰνοικα ἐκδοτὸς ἡμῖν. ὅν δὲ καλῶς εὐκαίρως ἔμοι τε αἰσθένει μή μάρτιν ἐς ὑμᾶς τοσοῦτον χρόνου τιμήν τε καὶ σπουδὴν κατατεθείσθαι,...

1.10.6

εὕρετε δὴ τὴν Ματέρων καλὸς ἐπιτηδείον χώτειν ἐς το τὴν ἐπιβουλήν λαθεῦν. Ἡλισθ γὰρ...

Aelius Aristides (2)

Sikelikos B (Dindorf 1,587)

καὶ ὅπου οὐκ ἤκουσε Νικίας τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν, τί ποθ' ἤγγειλε πείσονται δευτέρας εἰλιδός ὑμῶν ἀμαρτώντως; οὕτως ἡ νυκτός πέμπετε, ἣ θέτερον οὐ βούλειμαι προσθεῖναι. ἐν οἷς δὲ ἔγγ' ἐκ δὲ καὶ παλαιάς ἔτη ἀναμνήσθων μετὰ τοῦ καλοῦ γίγνεσθαι,...

Lucian (2)

Cataplush 11

... ἢ ἐλπίζου ματαῖα ἐδρων, τῆς ἀρχῆς οὔτε φίλοι καὶ πρὸς τοῦ καλοῦ ἀποβλέπουσ;...
Vera Historia 2,28

tοῦτων γὰρ οἷς μεμνημένοι ἐπίδας ἔχειν τῆς εἰς τὴν μήνην ἀφίξεως. τότε μὲν σὺν τὰ περὶ τὸν πλοῦν παρεσκευασμένη, καὶ ἐπεὶ καρδός ἦν, συνειστικῆς αὐτοῖς.

Vettius Valens (2)

Anthologiae 6,2 (T.p. 233)

ἐτεροὶ ἐν χαλεπῇ καρδοῦ περιστάσαι γενόμενοι ἢ καὶ ἀποσυρρήσαντες τῷ βίῳ καὶ μηδεμίαν ἀγαθὴν ἐπίδα προσδοκήσαντες,...

(T.p. 236)

... καὶ εἰς ἀπόγυνωσιν ταῖς ἐπίδας ἀνατυποῦμενοι διὰ τὴν τῶν καρδῶν κακίαν,...

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

κακὸ τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς καρδοῖς ἐπὶ πλειστὸν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοὺς λόγους καὶ τὰς πράξεις ἐφήμορευ, ἀτε καὶ ἐν τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ τε ὕπάρχον καὶ τὸ ἐπιζήμενον ποιοῦμενος.

21,70,8

ότε γὰρ μηδὲν ἀλογίστως μηδὲ ἐξ ὀρθῆς ἢ καὶ ὕποσ ποιῶν ἢ καὶ λέγων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ βεβαίου τῶν λογισμῶν πρὸς πάντα τὰ καρδία ἐτοίμος ὑπὸ καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπων ἑκατέρων ἐκλογισμένος, καὶ μήτε τὶ ἀνέπλειτον ποιοῦμενος,...

42,1,4

καὶ διὰ ταῦτ', ἐπεὶ δὴ τάξιστα ἐνίκηθη, δεινῶς ἐξεπλάγη καὶ συνε τὶ βυθύμαι καρδίου οὕτ' ἐπίδα βεβαίων ἐς τὸ ἀνακοινωνεῖσθαι ἔσχεν.

63,5,1-2

...ἐκβιασάμενοι τὸ φόνυμα τῷ τε καρδῷ καὶ τῇ χρείᾳ ἐδούλευσε, μηδὲν φροντίσας εἰ τί ταπεινὸν φθείρατο, ἥρος τῆς ἐπίδας ὧν τεθύκτη, ἐπεὶ γὰρ οὕτως, ἔτι, δέοςτα, ... σος δὲ δουλὸς εἰμι. καὶ ἠλθόν τε πρὸς σὲ τὸν ἔμον θεῶν, προσκυνήσων σε ὡς καὶ τοῦ Μήθραν, καὶ ἔσομαι τοῦτο ὃ τι ἂν σὺ ἐπικλώσῃς· σὺ γὰρ μοι καὶ μοίρα εἰ καὶ τύχη.
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Libanius (4)

Epistula 165,2 (T.)

Ἡκε ἐν καιρῶς ἔργων καὶ βεβαιῶν τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐμοὶ τε καὶ τούτῳ.

Vegetius (4)

3,11

Hoc ergo tempus est, quo tanto magis duces debent esse solliciti, quanto maior speratur diligentibus gloria et malus 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

ἐκακε δὲ τοὺς σκότους ὑπὸ σκοτεινῆς ῥαγάτου, ἀφαλείας ἐξελθεῖ τὰς ἐπὶ τῆς ζωῆς ἐλπίδας ὡς ὑπὸ ἐπὶ πέτρας ἐστηριζόμενος καὶ πληθοῦσιν ἁγαθῶν ὡς δ ἡμέρας ἔσυνθα ἐν καιρῷ ὑπετόθ.

34, 5-6

πρὸ καιροῦ ἐκακοῦ ἀνακρύπτει καὶ παρὰ τὰ πεπραγμένα αὐτῷ τετιμημένη δι᾽ ὁχυριζόμενος καὶ ἀποτετευχθαὶ τῶν ἐλπίδων, ...

John Chrysostom (4-5)

On the Incomprehensibility of God 3

( SC 28 p. 222f.)

πολὺν ἐξελθεῖν σωτηρίας ἐλπίδα, εἰπὲ μοι, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον, ἁγαπητέ;
Asterius of Amasea (4-5)

Homily 10, 6

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

Preface to the Epitomes of the Apotelesmatica

Hephaestio (5)
(e) ΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΑΝΔ ΘΛΙΨΗΣ

---

Aesop (?) 32

ἐπὶ τοῖς θείβεροις ῥόμενε: πάντα γὰρ καὶ ρει ἵδιω ἔχει χάριν.

LXX (2 BC?)

Psalm 9, 10-11

βοήθεις ἐν εὐκαρπίαις ἐν θλίψει
cαι ἐπιστάσατεν ἐπὶ σε ὑδρωπόροις τὸ ὄνομά σου.

9, 22 (10,1)

ἐν εὐκαρπίαις ἐν θλίψει
cp. Aquila (2) εἰς καιροὺν θλίψεως

Simmachus (2-3) ἐν καιροῖς θλίψεως

31, 6-7

ὑπὲρ ταύτης προσεύχεται πᾶς ὁσίος πρὸς σε ἐν καιρῷ

ἐυθέτων,
πλὴν ἐν κατακλυσμῷ ὧδατων πολλῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔχτισαν.

σὺ μου εἰ καταφυγῇ ἀπὸ θλίψεως τῆς περιεχούσης μεν.'

Ecclesiasticus

6, 8

ἐστὶν γὰρ φίλος ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ,
cαι οὐ μὴ παραμείνῃ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεως σου.

40, 24

ἀδελφοί καὶ βοήθεια εἰς καιροὺν θλίψεως
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51, 10-11

... μη με ἐγκαταλιπεῖν ἐν ἡμέραις θλύσεως, ἐν καιρῷ ὑπερηφανιῶν ἀβοηθησόμεθα.

Isaiah 8, 22

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀπορία στενή καὶ σκότος, θλύσει καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ σκότος ὡστε μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ οὐκ ἀπορηθήσεται ὁ ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ ὡς καιρῷ.

Jeremiah 15, 11

... ἐν καιρῷ τῶν κακῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν καιρῷ θλύσεως αὐτῶν ...

Daniel 12, 1 (Thdt.)

ἐσται καιρὸς θλύσεως, ...

1 Maccabees 13, 5

ἐν παυτὶ καιρῷ θλύσεως

Judges 10, 14; Nehemiah 9, 27; Esther 4, 17; 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 θλύσεως.

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

... θλύβομενοι κατὰ τινὰς καιροὺς ὑπὸ τῶν παρορόντων (sic) Παισίων ...

Athanasius (4)

Ep. 49, 1

... συνορῶν τῶν καιρῶν καὶ τὰς ἐπικεκλημένας θλύσεις τῆς ἐκκλησίας.
(f) ΚΑΙΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΧΡΕΙΑ

Aeschines (4 BC)

3, 141

... καιρός καὶ φόβος καὶ χρεία συμμαχίας, ἀλλ’ οὖ δημοσθένης.

(cp. 3, 239 καιρός καὶ φόβος καὶ χρεία συμμαχίας)

Demosthenes (4 BC)

21, 101

... ἐὰν τὸν καιρόν ἡ χρεία παραστῇ.

47, 30

ὁ δὲ θεόφιμος χρόνου ἐγγεγεγένησεν, ὡς τὰ πάντα ἡκατον ἅγιοι τοῖς ἢπατοῖς, ἐμελείς φόβοιν ἀποδεικνύει, καὶ τούτοις τεκμηρίως καταχρῆσθαι ὡς ἀποδεικνύει τὰς καλὰς τὴν χρεία, ὡς οὖν ἡλίθιον ἢν οὔθ’ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔσοδον τὴν γενόμενος υδέπειπτε, ὦτ’ ἐπισχέσθη.

P. Tebt. 3/1 (1933)

(3 BC) p. 75f.

... καὶ κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς, μὴ μόνον ἀριθμὸν ἔχουσα (sc. ἄγοραν) ἀλλὰ καὶ δεδοκιμασμέναι καὶ ἐπιτήδειοι πρὸς τὰς χρείας, ἐπιπορεύουσα καὶ ἐκι ἡ ψυχεῖσσα ἐν ὡς τὰ θεοῦντα ὑφαίστασαι καὶ τὴν πλειστὴν οποῖαν πολλὰ ἔνα πλείονα τῶν ιστέων ἐνεργὴ ἦ, ...

Polybius (2 BC)

2, 13, 2

... περὶ τῆς ἡμείς εὐφυέστερον καιρὸν λαβόντες ὑποδείξομεν τὴν θέσιν καὶ τὴν χρείαν ...
2, 49, 7-10

...εϊ μέν οὖν Αιτωλοὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν Ἀχαίων εἰς αὐτοὺς χειρεμένην εὑρεθέντων ἐν τοῖς κατὰ δημήτριον καιροῖς ἑπταενεῖν τὴν ἐφηγούσαν ἀγείν ὑποκρίνεται, καθάπερ καὶ οὐ, πολεμήσεις αὐτοὺς ἐφασαν τοὺς Ἀχαίοις πρὸς τὸν Χλεομένην, καὶ μὲν ἡ τούτη συνεπιλαμβανόμενη, μὴ δείσσαν χρείας τῶν βοηθησόντων ἀλλ' δ' ἀντιπιτήτα τὰ τῆς τούτης, Αιτωλοὶ δὲ συνεπιτίθενται, προσέχειν αὐτῶν παρεκάλουν τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἵνα μὴ πρόσηται τοὺς καιροὺς, ἵπτι δὲ δυνάμενοι σύζευσαν Πελοποννησίοις ἐπαρκέσθαι περὶ δὲ πίστεως καὶ χάριτος ἀποδοθέως ραθυμέων αὐτῶν ὑώτω δείν τῆς γὰρ χρείας ἐπιτελουμένης αὐτῶν εὐφόρειν τὸν Αράτου εὐδοκουμένας ἄμφοτεροις ὑποσχούοντο πίστεις. ὡμένως δ' ἐφασαν καὶ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς βοηθείας αὐτῶν ὑποδείξειν.

2, 67, 1

ἐπεὶ δ' ομοῦ καιρὸς ἦκε τῆς χρείας, ...

3, 101, 11 – 102, 1

ἐχε γὰρ τὰς πλεῖστας ἐλπίδας τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως ἐν τῷ τῶν ἑπτά τόματι. Καὶ οὖν δὴ καιρὸν Μάρκος, συνθεωρήσας τὸ πολὺ μέρος τῶν ὑπεναίτων ἐπὶ τὰς πρεσβυμένας χρείας κατὰ τῆς χώρας σκεδασμένου, λαβὼν τὸν ἀκμαίοτατον καιρὸν τῆς ημέρας ἐξήγε τὴν δύναμιν, ...

5, 2, 5

πρὸς τὲ γὰρ τοὺς ἐν γῇ κυνδύνους ἐκ παρατάξεως φεύγαστε τοῖς πρὸς τὰς κατὰ θάλατταν ἐκ τοῦ καιροῦ χρείας ἐτοιμάστει.

5, 2, 8

... ὡστε' εκαίνους μὲν συμπαρόντας ἐπὶ αὐτῶν τῶν καιρῶν ἐθελοκακεῖν καὶ λυμαίνεσθαι τὰς τῶν βασιλείων χρείας, ...

5, 75, 6

ὁ δὲ ἐστὶ βραστὸν μὲν τῶν οὕτως, μεγίστας δὲ παρέχεται χρείας εἰς τοῖς ἑπισφαλέσσι καιροῖς, ...

8, 5, 8

... κατὰ δὲ τὸν τῆς χρείας καιρὸν ...

9, 13, 3

... ἀλλ' ὅταν δ' τῆς έκάστου χρείας καιρὸς ἐπισφαλέσθη.
Diodorus Siculus (1 BC)

3, 15, 7

πάντα γὰρ ἡ χρεία διδάσκει τὴν φύσιν, οἰκεῖως τοῖς ὑποκείμενοις καιροῖς ἀρμοδίως προς τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἔληδος εὐχρηστίαν.

17, 48, 6

... τὰς ἀρμοδίους χρείας τοῖς ὑποκείμενοις καιροῖς παρεῖχοντο.

Cicero (1 BC)

ad Fam. 4, 9, 2

Primum tempore 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 (1 BC - 1)

2, 1, 30

χρώμεθα δ’ οἰκεῖως ἐκατέρα τὸν καιρὸν καὶ τὴν χρείαν σκοποῦντες, ...

Memnon (1)

ap. F. Jacoby, FCH 38, p. 345 1.22

τυγχάνει τῆς σπουδῆς, ἐν ὁμοῖοις καιροῖς καὶ χρείαις τὴν ὁμοίβην ὑποσχόμενος.
Ps. - Longinus (1 ?)

32, 1
ō τῆς χρείας ἐκ καυρός, ...

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 permititur tempora legere (or, eligere).

Philo (1)

Spec. L. 2, 6
... μη τοποὺς εἰ βεβηλεὶ η ἑρωί, μη καυροὺς εἰ ἐπιτήδειοι, μη αὑτοὺς εἰ καθαροὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχήν, μη τὰ πράγματα εἰ μεγάλα, μη τὰς χρείας εἰ ἀναγκαῖαι πρὸ εξετάσαστε, ...

112
ἐπειδὴ γὰρ καυρόι πολλὰκις προσπέπτουσιν ἀβούλητοι, δι' οὓς ἀναγκάζονται τίνες πραᾶσκειν τὰ ἑδα, καὶ τῆς ἐν δὲ σοῦ χρείας τοῦτον προφήτη...

Paul (1)

1 Thessalonians 5, 1
περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καυρῶν, ἀδελφοὶ, οὐ χρείας ἔχετε ἤμετρον γράφεσθαι, ...

Josephus (1)

AJ 4, 293
φέρε καὶ περὶ τούτων βραχέα προσδιορίσαμεν, ὡς ἂν προειδοποιήσεις ἁ χρή ποιεῖν εἰν τῇ χρείᾳ τῶν σωτηρίων εὐπορήτε καὶ μὴ τότε ἂ δεῖ τοῖς ποιεῖν ἐπιζητοῦντες ἀπαρακείμενοι τοῖς καυροῖς περιπέσειτε.
... εἰ τις αὐτῶν καὶ ἔρωτις η ἁμεία καταχωρεῖ τοιούτων δεησόμενον.

15, 201

χρότηρ' αὐτῶν καὶ μᾶλλον εἰς πίστιν εὖνοιας καὶ προθυμίας ἐπισυνήθην, καὶ πλεῖστον ἤμεγακα τῇ χρείᾳ τοῦ καιροῦ τὸ μεγάλοφυχον ἀρμόδιον.

Epictetus (1-2)

Diss. 2, 23, 15

πότερον δ' εἰπεὶ άμεινον ή συνηισθε δαι οὕτως άμεινον ή ἁκείνος καὶ τούτο προφέντε ή σι προφέντε, καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκάστου καὶ τὴν χρείαν τὶς ἄλλη λεγει ή λῃ προαιρετικῇ;

Plutarch (1-2)

Mor. 90F

ἐξήρθε δὲ καὶ τὸ τιμωρίαν παραλιπεῖν ἐν καιρῷ παρασχόντος ἐπίεικές ἔστι. τὸν δὲ καὶ παρὰποιμείνα ἀμεθόρια καὶ δεθεύτει συνανασύνθετο καὶ παρείχε δὴ ἐξήρθε καὶ οἰκείοις πράγμασιν ἐν χρείᾳ γενομένοις σποράν τινα καὶ προθυμίας εὐνεοκάμενον, οὕτωι οὐκ ἀγαπᾷ τῆς εὐμενείας οῦδ' ἐπιλεῖ τὴν χρηστότητα, ἐκείνοις ε' ἐξ ἀδιαμαντός

ἡ σιδήρου κεχάλκευται μέλαιναν καρδίαν.

454 A

ὅταν οὐ τῆς χρείας ἀφίκηται καιρὸς ...

Herodian (3)

4, 14, 3

παρέλαβε δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν ὁ Μακρίνος οὕτως εὖνοιας καὶ πλοτεὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὡς ἀνάγκη καὶ χρείᾳ τοῦ παροῦτος καιροῦ.

Lucian (2)

de mercede conductis 13

... καὶ τούτον ἐν καιρῷ τῆς χρείας ἀπαραμόνως ἀποδίδουσθαι ...
Saturnalia 33

... ἕκεινοι δὲ ἐν καιρῷ τῆς χρείας ἡ δόσις ἀξίμηνητος.

Clement of Alexandria (2-3)

Paedagogos 2.1, 13, 2

ἀκραίας γὰρ τῆς μεγίστης συγχείν τοὺς καιροὺς, ὥς καὶ χρῆσις ἀντίμηνῳ.

Plotinus (3)

Enneads 1, 4, 16

... διοδὸς μὲν τούτῳ ὧσα πρὸς τὴν χρείαν καὶ δύναται, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐν ἀλλός οὐ καλὸνέμενος καὶ τούτῳ ἀφεῖναι, καὶ ἀφήσως δὲ ἐν καιρῷ φύσεως, ...

4, 4, 17

ὅθεν ἄλλο τὸ βούλευμα καὶ πρὸς καιρόν, ὡτε ἡ χρεία πάρεστι καὶ συμβέβηκεν ἐξοθεν τούτı, εἰτα τούτı.

Iamblichus (4)

de vita Pythagorica 181

ἐῖναι δὲ ποικίλην τινὰ καὶ πολυεἶδη τὴν τοῦ καιροῦ χρείαν.

Achilles Tatius (4 ?)

4, 14, 2

καὶ ἐκάσημην διῶργημα χώμα ἔχοσιν λέγοντες, ὡς ἄν μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ τῆς χρείας ὑπέρέχων ὁ Νεῖλος τὴν γῆν ἐπικλῦσῃ.

Priscillian (4)

Tractate 2 in it.

... temporis necessitate cogente ...
Libanius (4)

Epistula 586, 2 (T.)

συνέβη δὲ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν διὰ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χειρῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐλθεῖν, ἀνδρὸς αὐτοῦ μὲν ἥκιστα παίξειν εἰδότος, στὸ δὲ νομίζοντος μετὰ τοῦ καιροῦ τούτῳ ποιεῖν. ἀλλὰ νῦν γε οὐ καιρὸς ἐν ἐπιείκουσί τῇ χρείᾳ.

Themistius (4)

Oratio 5 (p. 96, Schenkl - Downey)

... ἀκατασκεύαστον χειροτονίαν, ἢ ὡς καὶ ἐπηφίζετο, πρὸς ἢν ἡ χρεία ἐχειραζότεθη.

Oratio 8 (p. 170, Schenkl - Downey)

... ἡνίκα ἐπὶ σκύθας στρατεύεις, ἡνίκα ἑρείπει πόλεμον ἀκραφήν, καὶ στοιμεῖον οὐχ ἐρισμένα, οὐ γὰρ ἐγχαρίζοντι εἰ μὴ τῇ χρείᾳ καὶ προσολογοῦν; καὶ γὰρ ἁμείναν, εἰ μὴ τὰς εἰσφοράς ἡ κατασχοῦσα ἀνάγκη διπλασιάζει. νῦν δὲ ἐν καιρῷ περιούσιοι αὐτοῦ διαπάνης εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀκρίβειαν ἡμᾶς ἐπωάνεις, ...

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

... ὡσεὶ οὐ πανταξῆθεν ἀπορριπτέον τὸν ἂκον καὶ κοινωνητέον ἵππον τε καὶ ἀγρυπνίας, κινδύνων τε αὖ καὶ δαπάνης καὶ ἀτιμίας, οὗ κληθῆσαν ἀναμένοντες εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν, ἀλλ' αὐτομάτως θέουντι καὶ προμαντενομένῳ τοῦ καιροῦ πολλάκις καὶ πενιουμένῳ πρὸς ἐκάστην χρείαν τοῦ φίλου τὸ πρόσωπον ὀίκειον μεταλαμβάνειν, ...

John Chrysostom (4)

Panegyrics on St. Paul 5, 11

καὶ τὸ δὲ πάλιν θαυμαστότερον, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἐξεῖπεν, ἀλλ' καὶ μέχρι τῆς χρείας ἔστη, οὐ γὰρ ὡς τοῦ καιροῦ παρέχοντος αὐτῷ πολλὰ τὴν ἄδειαν, ἀμέτρως πάλιν τῷ πράγματι ἐχρηστάτο, ἀλλ' ἔξω μέχρι ποῦ προελθεῖν ἔδει.

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

... eis kairap, γαρ τα χαρίσματα ταῦτα τῆς ἑαυτῶν χρείας παρασχόντα ἡμῖν, ...
On Vainglory 69 (SC 188, p. 168f.)

Orate  μὲν γὰρ τὰς πύλας ἐτί κοσμῶμεν, ἐκεῖνων τῶν ἀφελεστέρων χρείας, ὡστε ἐνεπετάνεται τοὺς πολίτας ρυθμίζομεν, καὶ τούτων τῶν ὑπηλεστέρων καιρὸς διηγήματι.

Vegetius  (4)

3, 26

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

Cyril  (4-5)

On the Trinity 3

... ὡς εἰν καιρῷ τε καὶ χρεία καθήκεν ἐαυτῶν εἰς ἐκοινωνίαν κένωσιν:

Comm. in Joh. 10, 2

... καιρὸς ἐκάλει καὶ χρεία, ...

Procopius  (5-6)

epistola 113 (p. 576 Hercher)

οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπον ὅτα πράττειν ὅσα τις βουλέται ἀλλ' ἀνάγκῃ παρέπεσθαι καὶ δουλεύειν τῇ χρείᾳ καὶ πείθεσθαι τῷ καιρῷ. ὃ δὲ διδόειν οὐχ ὅσα τις ἐθέλει ἀλλ' ὅσα πρὸς τὴν χρείαν ἀνάγκῃ μετρεῖ.

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

... ἐν καιρῷ γὰρ χρείας καὶ οὕτωι πολλὰ ὑφελήσουσιν.

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

p. 21

ἡ γὰρ κατὰ τῶν καιρῶν χρεία πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀντιμαχομένων πολεμίων δύναμιν, ὡς ἂν ἀπαίτησῃ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὀρμῶν.  
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... πρὸς τὴν χρείαν τὴν ἀπαίτουσαν τὸτε εἰς τὸν καλρόν ...
(g) (1) τὸ καὶ τῶν δουλεύοντες (vel sim.) in Greek literature

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

σχεδόν εἶκομεν τῶ τῆς ἀνάγκης καὶ τῶν ὑπων κυριεύοντες καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἀμα βοηθοῦ καὶ θεατὰς ἐχουσε τῆς ἀρετῆς, μὴ παραχωρήσωμεν ἀλλὰ ποιήσωμεν φανερῶν, ὡς διὰ καὶ καὶ οὐ δι' ἀνανδρίαν ὑπεμειναμεν δουλεύειν.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1 BC)

Antiquities 11,18,4

...μαθόμεθε δι' οὗ τοῖς πράγμασιν οἱ καιροὶ δουλεύομεν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς καιροῖς τὰ πράγματα.

Plutarch (1-2)

Aratus 43,2

Ἀλλὰ οὖν ἀποφαίτητον ἐπικειμένων ἀνάγκης καὶ τῶν καὶ ἐπούντες ἀρχεῖν, ἐξόριζε πρὸς τὸ δεινὸν.

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

ἐπείτα σιωπὴς κηρυχθέος ἐπεθαρρησε τε καὶ ἐκβιασμένης τὸ φρονήμα ταῦτα τὸ καιρὸ καὶ τῇ ἡρείᾳ δουλεύον, μηδὲν φροντίσας εἰ τι ταπεινὸν φθεγχαίτο πρὸς τὴν ἐπίδα τὸν τεθείτο.

Ps.- Apollonius of Tyana (4 ?)

Apotelesmata 7

περὶ τῶν ὁνομασίων τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν δουλευόντων εἰς τοὺς τέσσαρες καιροὺς. αὐτὸ ὁνομασία τῶν ἀγγέλων δι' ἀνακούσι τῶν πρώτων καιροῦ ἔστησαν αὐταί.

(This is the reading of F. Nau, who then translated serviunt quattuor (sic) temporibus (anni). F. Boll read δουλεύοντων τοὺς δικαίους. V. p. 13f. above for details.)
Athanasius (4)

Epistola 49,3

καὶ μάλιστα, ὅτι οὐ πρέπει τῷ καὶρῷ δουλεύειν, ἄλλα τῷ κυρίῳ.

Gregory of Nazianzus (4)

Carmen de vita sua 11. 708f.

δουλεύομεν καὶρῷς τε καὶ λαῶς πόθοις,
ἀεὶ διδόντες τῷ πνεόντι τὸ σκάφος,

cp. 11. 1719f.

δοῦλα καὶρῷ γὰρ φασὶ
τὰ πάντα.

Orat. 4,93

ἐπειδὴ μέσην βαδίζων ὁ τοῦ ἔθνους ἀρχων τοῦ καὶροῦ καὶ
τῶν υἱῶν — τῷ μὲν γὰρ δουλεύειν ὦτο δεῖν, τοὺς δὲ μετρίως
ηυχύνετο — …

cp. 65

μὴλιον δὲ τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ μέρος οὐκ ἐλάχιστον καὶ ὅσον
eπερ σαθρόν, καὶ νοσούσες, τοῦ καὶροῦ δοῦλον καὶ τότε καὶ
πρότερον, οὐ τὸ μὲν δεδουλώτω, τὸ δὲ ἤπειξεν.

Palladas (4-5)

Anth. Pal. 9,441,5-6

νυκτὶ δὲ μειδίως με θεὸς προσέπεπε παραστάς
καὶρῷ δουλεύειν καὶ θεὸς ὑπὸ ἐμαθοῦν.

Cp. Procopius (5-6)

Epistola 113 (p. 576 Hercher)

οὐκ ἔστων ἀνθρώπων οὔτα πράττειν ὧσα τις βουλέται, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη παρέπεσαι καὶ δουλεύειν τῇ χρείᾳ καὶ πελεύσαι τῷ καὶρῷ. οὐ δὲ δίδωσιν οὐχ οὔσα τις εἴλετε, ἀλλ' οὔσα πρὸς τῆν
χρείᾳ 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 illuc torquere et flectere, cum tristibus severe, cum remissis iucunde, cum senibus graviter, cum iuventute comiter, cum facinerosis audaciter, cum libidinosis luxurose 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 temporis 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 possimus.

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 ablere dolorem, cum velis, temporis 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 agressus quo furebat odiosa crudelitas. O philosophum adulatorum ac temporii servientem!

Osius (4)

PLS 1,195
Temporal 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 καλφ— in sections (a) to (g).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Testament of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesop (?)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Testament of Naphthali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theognis</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Philodemus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocrates (?)</td>
<td>S O P E</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles</td>
<td>S O P</td>
<td>Ps.-Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>Cicero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Diodorus Siculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dionysius of Halicarnassus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isocrates</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Strabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeschines</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Livy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperides</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Memnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demosthenes</td>
<td>S O P E</td>
<td>Q. Curtius Rufus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcidamas</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ps.-Phocylides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas Tacticus</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 Enoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle</td>
<td>S P</td>
<td>Philo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophrastus</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NT: Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epicurus</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ps.-Paul (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Tebt.</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.-Plato</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ps.-Peter (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theocritus (?)</td>
<td>(S)O</td>
<td>Josephus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX: Isaiah</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Onasander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>S P T</td>
<td>L. A. Seneca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Epictetus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel (Th.)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Testament of Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>E T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ps.-Longinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclus.</td>
<td>S P T</td>
<td>Dio Chrysostom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Maccabees</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Plutarch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Maccabees</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>'Stoarch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristeas</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ignatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG</td>
<td>S T</td>
<td>Aquila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGIS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Vettius Valens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polybius</td>
<td>S O P E</td>
<td>Maximus of Tyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ps.-Barnabas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Priscillian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmachus</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apollinaris</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelius Aristides</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Libanius</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solinus</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julian of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irenaeus</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement of Alexandria</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basil</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucian</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asterius of Cilicia</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.-Lucian</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amasea</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of John</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Pollux</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cyril</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babrius</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paulinus of Nola</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodian</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thalassius (?)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dio Cassius</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hephastius</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petrus Chrysologus</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Flor.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plotinus</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agathias Scholasticus</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origen</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justinian</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philostratus</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procopius of Gaza</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristides Quintilianus</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procopius of Caesarea</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didymus the Blind</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antiochus of Mar Saba</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themistius</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Photius</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Suda'</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilles Tatius</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignatius Diaconus</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iamblichus</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Strategemata'</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Naumachica'</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasius</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Symeon the New</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makarios/Symeon</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theologian</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chrysostom</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eustathius</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 καὐρῷ δουλεύοντες WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF ROMANS 11-15

I must now try to exhibit the function of ἑ στι καὐρῳ 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. 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: υπερφρονεῖν, φρονεῖν (twice), σωφρονεῖν; in v. 16 φρονοῦντες (twice), φρονίμοι. Paronomasia with φρον- is very widely

1. Contrast A. Pierson, S. A. Naber, Verisimilia: laceram conditionem Novi Testamenti exemplis illustrarat et ab origine repetiertur..., (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, paraenetico 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'.
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attested in Greek of all periods,\(^1\) and 13.1f. further illustrate Paul's ear for these jingles (\(\Upsilon\Pi\alpha\theta\alpha\varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon\varepsilon\Theta\omega\), \(\tau\tau\alpha\gamma\kappa\varepsilon\nu\), \(\Delta\nu\tau\iota\iota\delta\sigma\sigma\omicron\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\), \(\delta\iota\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\iiota\)\(^2\) 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 \(\phi\rho\omicron\nu\) focuses what Paul particularly has in mind in vv.1-2, especially in using \(\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\varsigma\), and what he exemplifies in 12.4-15 and 12.17-13.7. In particular I consider the contrast between \(\Upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\phi\rho\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\) and \(\sigma\omega\phi\rho\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\) (12.3) to be central in this part of the letter, and shall argue that behind this contrast is the ancient Greek contrast between \(\Upsilon\beta\rho\iota\varsigma\) (especially in the form of boasting) and \(\sigma\omega\phi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu\eta\).

Some of these \(\phi\rho\omicron\nu\) 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: \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\alpha\sigma\Theta\alpha\delta\iota\varsigma\) twice), not to 'have ideas above
their' religious 'station' (v. 20: μὴ ὑψηλαῖος/ὑψηλὰ φρόνει)
for fear their estimate of their religious privilege be based on their
own view of the matter (v. 25: ἐνέδωτος φρόνιμος, 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: ἀνεξεραθμένα, ἀνεξ-
νίκησθι) or contribute to them (v. 34: τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ
ἐγένετο) or turn them to one's own advantage (v. 35: τίς
προεδρικήν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήκησαι αὐτῷ;).

It is God and God alone who is the source and means and goal of
creation and salvation (v. 36).

Both φρόν- and καυχ- have been used even earlier in the
letter. In developing his ethical σάρξ/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
tοῦ δεινοῦ 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 καυχάσαται
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
\( \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\nu\chi\upsilon\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota \) 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: \( \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\rho\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\zeta \)).

One more passage remains to be mentioned, viz. 1.30. Though
neither \( \phi\rho\omicron\upsilon \) nor \( \kappa\alpha\nu\chi \) is used, some interesting parallels
are. Amongst the twenty-one adjectives or adjectival phrases used to
describe the Gentile world, there are \( \upsilon\beta\rho\sigma\tau\varsigma \), \( \upsilon\tau\rho\rho\rho\phi\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \),
\( \lambda\alpha\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \). We should note particularly that these three,
along with the whole catalogue, are symptoms of the \( \zeta\delta\omicron\kappa\imath\omicron\omicron\omicron \)
\( \nu\omicron\omicron\omicron \) (v. 28) which is the fundamental result of the divine
judgment. If these traits are to be tackled, the rebellious, punished
\( \nu\omicron\omicron\omicron \) 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;
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 ὑβρίς when he uses words like (κατακ.) καυχᾶσθαι, ὑπηλοθ—/ ὑπηλαί φρονεῖν, ὑπερφρονεῖν? The atmosphere is redolent of ὑβρίς, as I shall try to show below. Paul (or his source) has used ὑβρικτάς 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 ὑπηλαιοφρον— and ὑπερφρον— as synonymous (9.145; 147).
mind (1.28; 8.5-7) and its irresistible capacity for boasting.

But more evidence is necessary to establish this claim about υβρίς 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 ἔπερφονεῖν and cognates. In sixteen of these passages I found υβρίς or one of its cognates. I shall give four of these. The first and in many ways the most significant is in Aeschylus Pers. where we have not only ἔπερφονεῖν and υβρίς 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 ὑβρεως ἀπόνα καθέων φρονημάτων (808) Darius goes on (820-831):

1. But why does he not continue with υβρίς 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 ἔπερφον- 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 ἔπερφον- is not irretrievably pejorative, so that its ambiguity makes it a little less offensive than υβρίς. 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).
At AJ 1.194 Josephus is describing the arrogance of the men of Sodom:

πληθεὶς καὶ μεγέθεις Χρημάτων ὑπερφρονοῦντες εἰς τε ἀνθρώπους ἢ γὰρ ὑβρισταί καὶ πρὸς τὸ θεὸν ἀσεβεῖς, ... At or. 12.36 Dio Chrysostom like Aeschylus and Josephus uses ὑπερφρονεῖν of an attitude towards the deity:

ὑπερφρονοῦσι τὰ θεῖα καὶ μίαν ἑδροσέμεναν δύσμονα πονηρὰν καὶ ἄτοπον, τρυφὴν τίνα ἡ παθυμίαν πολλὰν καὶ ἀνειμένην ὑβριν ἱεσον ἐπονομάζουντες, γυναικεῖα τῷ ὀντὶ θεόν προτιμῶσι καὶ θεραπεύουσι...

(The use of another τιμ—cognate in προτιμῶσι will be noted, in view of τιμ together: οἶδαν βασιλεία μὲν ὑβριν ἐντεκὴ καὶ τὸ ἀνυπεύθυνον ὄλγαρχία δ᾽ ὑπερφροσύνην καὶ τὸ αὐθαίρετος δημοκρατία δ᾽ ἀναρχίαν, ἱσότης δ᾽ ἀμετρίαν, πάσας δὲ τὸ ἀνόητον.

(In view of μέτρου πίστεως in Romans 12.3 Plutarch's ἀμετρίαν will also be noted.)
2. Though to my knowledge the fact that ὑπερφον- and ὑπρι- are virtually synonymous has not been remarked, the fact that σωφρον- and ὑπρι- 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, in addition to the lines from Aeschylus Pers., already quoted, are these: Xenophon

**Cyr. 8.4.14:** τὰ μὲν ἀπὶ ὑπριν τῶν πολλοίσι τὰ δὲ σωφροσύνην τῶν πάσιν ἐμποιεῖται;

**Philo Spec. L. 2.18:** τὴν νοοθεσίαν ὑπριν εἶναι νομιζοῦσι καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἀβροδίατον ὦθουμενοι βιόν ὀλογούσι τῶν σωφρονιστῶν γέλωτα καὶ γλέναν

τιθέμενοι τὰς φρονήσεις καλὰς... λυσιτελεστάσας

**Philo Legat. 64:** οἱ δὲ πρὸς ὑπρεμος τὰς νοοθεσίς λαμβάνον τῷ πάντων οἰασθαι φρονιμώτατος καὶ σωφρονεστάτος ἔτι δὲ ἀνδρείωτατος εἶναι καὶ δικαιώτατος ἡ χαίρε μᾶλλον τῶν ὀμολογουμένων 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 Pex 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 θυντα κατ' τον Θεου τον φρονειν, and in two of his plays Sophocles expresses the same thought. In Aj. 777 (cp. 761) the hero ου κατ' εν Θεου φρονων φρονων and in Trach. 473 Lichas expresses approval of Deianeira: θυντα φρονουσαν θυντα κοινε δεινονα. Euripides Bacch. 396 has the chorus equate το τε μη θυντα φρονειν with shortness of life, referring back to the mention of Pentheus's ουβρις in 375. One later appearance of this sentiment occurs in 2 Macc. 9.12: δηκαιον ὑποταγμενεθαι τῷ θεῷ καὶ μη θυνταν οιντα ὑπερφραναν φρονειν. One is σωφρονειν 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.

4. Not only is ουβρις linked with ουτε φρονειν and per contra with σωφρονειν 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...

1. If this line runs on without break to 397, βραχυς αιων. See E. R. Dodds' note in loc. The sense is not seriously damaged if a stop is read after φρονειν.

is used twelve times. After ὑπερφρον in 387 we have in lines 391, 404, (406: ὑβρις), (410: ὑπερφρονας), 425, 436, 455, 464, 473, 480, 500, 538, 551, 554 the following cognates of ὂμπη̂ν, I boast: ὑπερκόμπης, ὑπερκόμπων, ὂ κόμπας δ' οὐ κατ' ἆνθρωπον φρονεῖ, κομπάζοντα, ὑπερκόμης, μυκτηροκόμπης, κόμπον, κόμπαζε, κομπάζεται, ἀκόμπαςτος, κομπάζμεθαν, ἄκομπος.

This steady beat, enveloping ὑβρις and ὑπερφρον, is surely saying something about one of the characteristics of ὑβρις, how it often expresses itself. In Sophocles Ajax and in Euripides Pentheus also boast in their ὑβρις. In Aj. 766 the hero's reply is given ἐφικόμπης καφρόνως; in 770 Ajax τοσοῦδ' ἐκόμπατι μυθον. In the Bacch. Pentheus is warned against boasting like his cousin Aktaeon (337-340; cp. 340: κομπάζαμαι); he is bidden honour the god (cp. 342: τειρ θείο τιμήν κίδου). 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: ἀμηέυ), 312, 314, 316, 318, (326: μαίνει), (329: τιμάν), 329, 332, using φρονεῖν, φρένες, φρονεῖν, σωφρονεῖν (twice), σωφρων, σωφρονεῖς, φρονεῖν, 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, τιμή and στοιχεῖο in Romans 12.10f. are three different facets of ἀγάπη (12.9). Φιλαδελφία can readily be seen in this way, but can τιμή and στοιχεῖο? I shall now argue that στοιχεῖο and τιμή (especially αἱ τιμ—) are introduced because they
are associated with ὑβρίς, the concept at the back of the
Pauline ὑπερφονεῖν.

The fundamental passage for ὑβρίς and ἀτιμ- is
Aristotle, Rh. 2.2.5-6. Having defined anger ( ὀργή, ibid.
2.2.1) as ὑβρίς μετὰ λύπης τιμωρίας φαίνο-
μένης διὰ φαινομένης ἐλεγχωρίαν τῶν εἰς
αὐτὸν ἢ τῶν αὐτοῦ, τοῦ ἐλεγχωρεῖν 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 ἐλεγχωρία, which he subdivides
into three types: κατὰ φρένωσις, ἐπηρεασμός and ὑβρίς.
ὑβρίς describes the injurious, annoying actions of those who,
feeling superior to their victims, express their superiority only to
degrade ( ἀληθῶς ) 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: ὑβρεις δὲ
ἀτιμία, δὲ ἀτιμομάζων ἐλεγχωρεῖ. τὸ γὰρ μὴ δενὸς
ἀξίων ὀδερμίαν ἐχει τιμήν, οὐτὰ ἀγαθότετε κακοῦ.
He clinches the connection between ὑβρίς 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 ὑβρίς
inflicted on one. ὑβρίς 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. ὀμοιότητα, τιμή, and ἐπερφοράν 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. ὀμοιότητα and τιμή are combined at Demosthenes 18.205; 21.23; Isocrates Ad Nic. 16; Ps.-Plato Definitions 415e12, ὀμοιότητα ἔδωκα προς 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, ὀμοιότητα καὶ τιμή.

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 ... τῇ τιμῇ τῇ τιμῇ).

6. Similarly I shall argue that the unexpected ἔξοθεν, devotion to another's interests, as in 2 Corinthians 7.12; 8.16, is introduced to counter ὀλιγυρία, belittling of, contempt for, another's interests, which functions in the background of chs. 11-15, and of which ὀμοιότητα 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 ἔξοθεν (14.3; 10) we have a ΚΟΙΝΗ equivalent for ὀλιγυρία, and so a continuation of the theme of ὀμοιότητα. In ch. 14 it is the weak brother who feels he may eat

1. ὄψιν, which is translated ὀλιγυρία in Proverbs 3.11, is frequently translated by ἔξοθεν or ἔξοθεν in LXX; cp. Judges 9.38. In Testament of Benjamin 9.3 we have ἐν εἰς κύριος ὀμοιότητα καὶ ἔξοθεν θαύμαται.
only vegetables who is in danger of being despised and who is being championed by Paul. In both verses the verb is parallel to ἑρμίνω 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 ὑπερφορεῖν. I recognise the danger of wishing to see ἑρμίσ everywhere in Romans and so shall say no more about ἑρίνειν! but I propose that ὑπερφορεῖν ἡ ὁνήμον ὑπερφορεῖν is specifically a counter to hybristic ὀλιγωρία.

I wish to draw attention to material that links section 5 (ὑπερφορεῖν— and ὑπερφορεῖν—) 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 ἑρμίς, 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 ἑρμίς they

οὐ θεῶν βρέτη

ἡδοντο συλαν οὔτε πιμπέναι νεώς

βρωμοὶ δ’ ξεῖτοι δαιμόνων θ’ ἱδρύματα.
7. Finally I propose that it is the Τιμωρία wordgroup, cognate with Τιμή, 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 Υπρής 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 ἐμoι ἐκδίκησίς Paul might have said ἐμοι τιμωρία, 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 Υπρής; 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 πονηραὶ, μὲ ἐν τῷ κρίνατα ἐν ἐκδίκησιν, θυμοῦ μου... καὶ ἐκκοστισμένη ἐπι σέ λίμον καὶ θηρίῳ πονηρά καὶ τιμωρίσοµαι σέ, ... but Josephus AJ 14.369 and especially Phil Det. 169 treat them almost as synonymous.
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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 *δραγή* (12.19) it is its agent in the present. By executing upon disobedience this Τιμωρία God's Τιμή as expressed in his laws for the world is recognized and enhanced. The capacity for dishonour in ὑπερήψ 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 ὑπερήψ-Τιμή (Τιμωρία) theme there is the ὑπερήψ-(dis)obedience theme. Greek literature frequently links ὑπερήψ with civil unrest and disorder. To that Paul opposes, as a feature of σωφροσύνη, ἐνταξία; cp. δικαίαγη in 13.2 and the whole Τάκσι group. Solon fr. 6 says that the people obey their leaders best when there is not too much wealth about to produce ὑπερήψ. Creon in Sophocles *Antigone* describes the heroine in this way (480-483):

αὐτή δ' ὑπερήψειν μὲν τότ' ἐξηπίστατο,

¹. This link between the two passages is cemented by common words: ἄνοικτον (12.17; 21; 13.3-4), ἄνακτόν (12.21; 13.3-4), ἐκδικάζεται (12.12; 13.4), δραγή (12.19; 13.5) and ἀποκτέναι (12.17; 19; 13.7).
Further we note the expression here of ἐβρις in boastfulness (ἐπαυχεῖν) and we are reminded of Romans 1.32, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράξεσιν.  

In the Ajax Menelaus (1052-1090) points out the connection between ἐβρις, the wilful disobedience of the privileged individual and national ruin. 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 ἐβρις.

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? ὑπερφονεῖν, 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 ἐβρις. The Pauline hope is for φονεῖν, even for σωφρονεῖν, 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 ὑπερφονεῖν and σωφρονεῖν, almost certainly means limit, with πίστευς 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. The believer is not a Prometheus 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. \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho \nu \ \pi \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \) is very similar to \( \lambda \nu \alpha \lambda \alpha \gamma \eta \alpha \eta \ \pi \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \) and, I believe, \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \oslash \) (v. 11).

The link between \( \sigma \omega \phi \rho \omicron \nu \) and \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho \nu \) 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 \( \sigma \beta \rho \omicron \nu \) and \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho \nu \) at Philo Spec.L 2.83; Josephus AJ 2.56; 7.172; Plutarch Mor. 827A; PRyl. 150, 1. 8-9; Philostratus Her. 27.11. \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho \nu \) is found alongside \( \hat{\omicron} \tau \eta \rho \phi \rho \omicron \nu \) in Plutarch Mor. 827A; Philostratus Her. 27.10-11; id. VA 5.29; 7.28; Plotinus Enn. 2.9.16; Clement of Alexandria QDS 1 (med.). \( \mu \varepsilon \delta \omicron \oslash \) is found with \( \hat{\omicron} \tau \eta \rho \phi \rho \omicron \nu \) in Aristeas 122.

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 \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \oslash \) prematurely and lay myself open to the charge of seeing it, like \( \sigma \beta \rho \omicron \nu \), everywhere, but I cannot help reporting my observation of the combination in various ways of \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho \nu \), \( \mu \varepsilon \delta \omicron \oslash \) and \( \kappa \alpha \nu \rho \oslash \) in many periods of Greek literature: Hesiod WD 694; Pindar Ol. 13.47-48; 1d. 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 (+ \( \sigma \omega \phi \rho \omicron \sigma \theta \omicron \nu \gamma \)) 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: Παρὰ καλῶ) is for that realism, fellow-feeling and sense of common cause (vv. 15-16a: χαιρέν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαίοντων τῷ αὐτῷ... φρονοῦντες) which do not allow pride or flights of religious emotion or fancy (vv. 3; 16: μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν, ἐφοβεῖται) to remove one from where one's brother is, whether in joy or grief. 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 φρονίμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς).

Though the word is not used here, it is ταπεινοφροσύνη, self-effacement, another φρόν- word, that Paul has in mind here (cp. v. 16: τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι; can this mean, share the life-sentence of the humble?).

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 ἔδει τὸ δεῖνα

2. Contrary to the analysis and advice of Epictetus as reported by Arrian in Disc. 3.24.1, οὐ γὰρ συναρθεὶς εἰνοθεῖς πέφυκας οὔτε συνετυχεῖν ἠλλὰ συνευτυχεῖν. cp. Ps.- Oecumenius at PG 118.564D.
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means to belong to X's party, in order to contrast those who support 
the σαρξ and those who support the πνεῦμα. But in 
Romans 12.2 for some reason φιλέω or φιλένημα is not 
used. Possibly νοῦς 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 
φιλέω / φιλένημα because only that word will allow the 
alliteration of four cognates in vv. 3; 16. But νοῦς and σωφρονόω 
were regularly used together in Greek literature,¹ and we have an 
example of the reverse move in vv. 16-17: φιλένημα → προσοψάμενοι.

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 vv. 1-2, rather than emotional 
language; e.g. παρακαλέω, οἶνος, δίκαιος, λογική, δοκιμάζειν, 
θέλημα 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 
ταπεινός, the ἀληθεία. The language of sacrifice 
itself conveys, amongst other things, the implication of the Roman 
Christians' being at the disposal of God; λογική 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 σωφρένα : 
§ γα νοᾶν ἔχων δυνατόν φιλένημα. 
2. Again though I do not wish to introduce Καλλίπος 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.226-9, 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' (\(\alpha \delta \iota \omega \nu\)) 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 \(\epsilon \upsilon \alpha \rho \varepsilon \sigma \tau \omicron \omicron\) 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 (\(\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \gamma \delta \alpha \iota\), thought out (\(\lambda \omicron \omicron \iota \kappa \eta \nu\)) surrender to God, who is merciful (\(\delta \iota \alpha \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron\), picking up 11.30-32; \(\eta \lambda \epsilon \gamma \theta \eta\tau\varepsilon\ \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \varepsilon\iota\), \(\epsilon \lambda \eta \gamma \tau \omicron \omega \sigma\iota\), \(\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \prime \gamma \eta\)), 1 and totalitarian (\(\theta \omicron \omicron \sigma \iota\alpha \nu\), \(\lambda \alpha \tau \rho \varepsilon \iota \alpha \nu\)), and meticulous (\(\epsilon \upsilon \alpha \rho \varepsilon \sigma \tau \omicron \omicron\), \(\alpha \gamma \iota \alpha \nu\)).

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 (\(\epsilon \nu \alpha \delta \tau \omicron\), \(\tau \iota \sigma \tau \omicron\)w).  

1. The move from \(\epsilon \lambda \varepsilon \omicron\) to \(\omicron \iota \kappa \tau \iota \rho \mu \omicron \omicron\) is probably to be explained by the fact that \(\epsilon \lambda \varepsilon \omicron\) 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. \(\omicron \iota \ktau \iota \rho \mu \omicron \omicron\) is used in the plural in thirty-one cases out of thirty-nine examples in LXX.
Paul is speaking quite generally, to all (πᾶντες τὰ ὄντα ἐν ὑμῖν) and not only to the obviously gifted. God has granted each individual (ἐνόχες τῷ ὅπλε) 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 ἄλλα προφανεία.

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
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 \textit{μεταδίδως} can have ulterior motives, the opposite of or different from \textit{εὐλογησ}, hidden away in his heart; the \textit{προστάμενος} can do what he has to do\textsuperscript{2} without his heart being in it, the opposite of \textit{σπουδή}; and the \textit{ἐλεέων} can stitch an artificial warmth onto his face, hardly real \textit{εὐφρότης}. Hence the appeal that \textit{ἀγάπη}, the origin of the motive for \textit{μεταδίδωναί}, \textit{προστάθηκαί} and \textit{ἐλεέων} be \textit{ἀνυπόκριτος}, no fiction, the genuine article. It would not be authentic if Christians were those who in their hearts \textit{ἀποστυγούντες} to \textit{ἀγαθόν}, \textit{κολλώμενοι} \textit{τῷ} \textit{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 \textit{ταξίνων}, \textit{καὶ ὑπερεῖς}?) and lively compassion will be possible.

In vv. 10-11a, \textit{ἀγάπη}, introduced in v. 9, is analysed into three of its elements: \textit{φιλαδελφία}, \textit{τιμή}, \textit{σπουδή}. If \textit{φιλαδελφία} after \textit{ἀγάπη}, means, when \textit{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 \textit{ἐν}, formally continue the pattern from vv. 7-8a (ἐν τῷ \textit{εἰδάκονται} etc.), but the discontinuing of the article \textit{τῷ} and of a word cognate with the participles (\textit{μεταδόσοις}, \textit{προστάθηκαί} and \textit{ἐλέος} 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.
make sure it is real family affection that is demonstrated. ( Philostratus and its root στερεύων are often found in descriptions of family ties.) Where there is that brand of loving within the community, ὑπερφρονεῖν is impossible.

Earlier I suggested that it is Paul's polemic against ὑπερφρονεῖν which has determined his selection of τίμη and σπουδή. τὴν τίμην ἀληθέως προηγουμένοι 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 τὴν σπουδὴν μὴ ἐκνηπὰί 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. τῶν πνεύματι, δεόντες 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 Tertullian's?) because of the preceding ἀληθέως, or a Latinism, with antecedere in mind. It is interesting that there may be more Latinisms in the chapter: στάδιον genitive in v. 1 is sometimes seen as such (cp. per); Pallis thought that σπουδή 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 σπουδὴ = studia in Philostratus is regarded as a possible Latinism; to anticipate a little it is possible that τῶν καλῶν δουλεύοντες is another example; certainly temporis (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 bilingualisme (Paris 1985), pp. 177ff., 227, and pp. 172ff. The evidence might suggest that τῶν καλῶν δουλεύοντες is a Latinism that Paul has not understood or has deliberately modified, so that καλός is not taken temporally (as temporis (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 (τιμή, σπουδή, φιλαδελφία) must always be aware of ἱλικός, which I do understand to mean the correct amount, the right degree, and to be themselves they must observe it strictly (σουλεύοντες).

The danger is that, careful about not being found ὑποκρίτης (v.9), the Christian goes to the other extreme, to such a whole-hearted commitment that might become fanaticism and boasting. In other words ἡ καρπὴ σουλεύοντες 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 τῇ καρπῇ σουλεύοντες. 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 ἀμετρα καρχησόμεθα

1. If σπουδή could be regarded here as specifically as φιλαδελφία and τιμή and if μὴ ὑποκρίτη 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.
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is an application to boasting of the principle expressed by Ἐὐαρπίσμενοι. As we have seen there are many passages throughout Greek literature which show that μέτρον, μέτρον, and καύρω 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 (εἰλήθεϊς ἐξ Χρυσάνθω, ἐλπίδας ἐξ Χρυσάνθως.) 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 καύρως is then understood temporally, sometimes as the eschatological καύρως). 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 (ἀφοβισμός, μέτρον, καύρως) 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 καύρως and ὑπάττις, 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, Ὑπάττις καύρως, παρὰ καύρων/μελαστεύω ὑποκλέειν. 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 βασιλείας θαλαττίν καὶ κρατεῖν ζωλον αὐτῆς οὐ συγκατα- λογίζομένη τῷ καρπῷ, πολλάκις μὲν ὀβριστικῶς αὐτῇ προσηνέχθη. The following section goes on to speak about her διακλειστείν and κακῶς λέγειν and στὰκτοι elements not too far removed from the degrading and civil strife we have observed before in some classical descriptions of ὠβριστ. But to return to the main clauses: Mariamme behaves ὠβριστικῶς towards Herod because she had not sufficiently (εὐγενεῖα ... καρπῷ) 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 καρπῳ, she would not, could not, have behaved ὠβριστικῶς towards him.

The theme of ἀγαθοποιία in its different manifestations continues in the last two of the thirteen phrases that we have in vv. 9-13: ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἀγαθῶν κοινωνοῦτες τὴν φιλοζεύσιν ἐστῖκουτες. 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 ἀγαπὴ 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 ὑπερπηρία 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 (Θλίψις) 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. Θλίψις in v. 12 has prepared the ground, but v. 13: διώκοντες has provided the language: ἐυλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντες ὑπαίτι... μὴ καταρασθε. The theme of non-retaliation is resumed in vv. 17-21. Vv. 15-16 deal with the common mind that forestalls ὑπερπηρία 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, ὑπερπηρία, or more exactly, the opposite of ὑπερπηρία, is in mind. If there can be no ὑπερπηρία in the community, then there can be no retaliation 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 ὑπερπηρία and ἐπιστολή.
2. Though in one definition of ὑπερπηρία Aristotle himself excludes retaliation.
'state' can act against ὑβρίς. This was in accord, consciously or otherwise, with the old Athenian view, that whereas ἀκίδα, grievous bodily harm, was a private affair for which the individual either sought or did not seek redress (δίκη ἀκίδας), ὑβρίς was an infringement of more than individual honour and it was the 'state' that brought the ἀφίκη ὑβριστειν.

Romans 13.8-10 remind us that we are still exploring ἀγανή though in language again subconsciously supplied by the context (13.7: ὄφειλας; 13.8: ὄφελετε). The eschatological passage 13.11-14 is not likely to have much to do with ὑβρίς and therefore the use of κακός (v.11) in a different sense from 12.11c should cause no problem. We have seen that Paul can alter the force of δίκαιον 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 ὑβρίς.

I do not wish to see ὑβρίς 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 ὑβρίς, which itself was undertaken when work on the Pauline ἐπιφονεῖν 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, ὑβρίς should be allowed to bat and face the bowling, with κακός as due measure at the other end!
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