

errors of interpretation that so often are thoughtlessly admitted or distinctly maintained (as by Doddridge) in dealing with the English version, "For of such is the Kingdom of God" (or "of heaven"). Lass. however does go wrong in the verb, which he gives as "est composé de," a meaning of which *ἐστίν* with a simple genitive and with no other noun is quite incapable. That it may mean "belongs to" is clear from *ἡμῶν ἔσται*, Mark xii. 7, *τελείων ἐστίν*, Heb. v. 14, and many other passages, including

αὐτῶν ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν

(Matt. v. 3, 10), the exact correspondence of which to

τῶν τοιούτων ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν

is too commonly overlooked. That Lass., not himself a professed scholar, should have fallen into error here is not surprising.¹

Nor again when he failed to see the force of the tense in *ἴσχυεν* in Mark v. 4, where the sense is that no one "was strong enough to" overpower the unhappy demoniac. "Était parvenu à" in his rendering: Seg. and Stapf. give "avait la force de."

Also Lass. is less accurate in his handling of the passage in Luke x. 18, *ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σάταναν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα*, "j'ai vu moi-même Satan succomber, aussi vite que la foudre qui tombe du Ciel." Seg. and Stapf. both give, "je voyais Satan tomber du ciel comme un éclair." All three however rightly translate *πεσόντα* by the infin., and not by the part. like Chat. (*trébuché*) and the Laus. editors (*tombe*). The "having fallen" of our R.V. is indeed astonishing. The aorist is the tense used to indicate the action looked at in its entirety: the mood is the participial, in accordance with the general rule after *verba sentiendi* in Greek. How would our Revisers translate Hom. Odyss. II. 528-530,

*κεῖνον δ' οὐ ποτε πάμπαν ἐγὼ Φίδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν
οὐτ' ὠχρήσαντα χροῶ κάλλιμον, οὔτε παρειῶν
δάκρυ ὁμορξάμενον—?*

¹ Chateillon gives, "a tels ét le regne de Dieu;" De Sacy, "est pour ceux qui leur ressemblent;" Ost., "à tels est, &c.;" and the Lausanne edition, "est à ceux qui sont tels."