

New Testament Greek

20. Lesson 15: Second Aorist Active/Middle Indicative

Date: 080210G

Time: 1:15:38

1:1 Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. 2 οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. 3 πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν, ὃ γέγονεν. 4 ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 5 καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

Looking at today's lesson, you might almost wonder why we didn't just include it last week.

Almost exactly the same things are said about the second aorist for this lesson as were said about the first aorist last week.

It's almost amusing the way §195/187 says exactly the same things as §174/167, only using "preterit" instead of "past" for English past tense, and using "like" and "strike," instead of "bake" and "take," as examples.

It tells us, as we were told last week, that there is no way to know if a particular verb's aorist form will be first or second aorist.

We will just have to look up in the Greek-English Vocabulary what the third principal part of that verb is.

However, there are a few new things we need to know, including a couple things I mentioned last week.

First, the endings of the second aorist active and middle are exactly the same as the imperfect active and middle/passive voice.

The only difference is that the imperfect stem is the stem of the first principal part; the second aorist stem is the third principal part, which does not typically resemble the first principal part at all.

Second, something I mentioned in passing last week, but I do need to repeat it with emphasis, is that a given verb will usually have either a first aorist or a second aorist, but not both. The aorist is the aorist. Whether it's first or second only refers to the fact that not all aorist forms follow the same pattern.

You know, if they wanted to be consistent, they could have defined a first and second future: those that simply add a σ to their first principal part, such as λύω — λύσω, they could classify as a first future, and those are more involved. the second future. And as with the aorist, a given verb would generally have one of those future forms; but, occasionally, there could appear to be both.

But we just have to learn it the way the book teaches it.

In fact, when a verb appears to have both a first and second aorist, it generally involves a related verb, such as with βλέπω. And, in this case, it also seems to have two forms for the future!

Notice in our vocabulary, ὄψομαι is given as the alternate future for βλέπω. But, if you look in your Greek-English Vocabulary, what is the future of βλέπω? Just a regular, βλέψω. So, they are saying this verb can have two future forms, but in reality, the one form is simply taken from another verb that means the same thing.

Likewise, the first aorist of βλέπω is ἔβλεψα, but the Vocabulary says the first aorist is rarely found; then today's lesson gives another form, clearly unrelated to βλέπω, but related to a different verb, namely, the same verb from which the alternate future is taken.

So, what I am saying is, if a verb appears to have both a first and a second aorist form, it will be this kind of situation, involving an aorist form taken from a totally different, but synonymous verb.

Do you all understand this?

It would be like, in English, we have the word search, for which the past tense is searched. We also have a word seek, which, in the past, is not seeked, but sought. However, think about it: we do, commonly, use sought as the past tense of search, don't we? In a sense, we are borrowing the past of seek, using it for the past tense of search. It's the same idea with verbs that seem to have both a first and second aorist form.

I think this is just a matter of how you perceive and describe it.

To me, it would be less confusing to say, the first aorist is such and such, but it rarely occurs. The second aorist, borrowed from the synonymous verb such and such, is the form commonly found.

But, a second aorist isn't necessarily borrowed from another verb.

Let's go through the vocabulary and see what we can learn.

γάρ, for, like δὲ is always postpositive, not the first word of a phrase.

ἔβαλον, 2nd aorist for βάλλω, and in this case there's a similarity.

ἐγενόμην, 2nd aorist of γίνομαι, actually quite similar in form.

εἶδον, actually 2nd aorist of ὁράω, but commonly used for βλέπω.

εἶπον, really 2nd aorist of an obsolete form, εἶπω, used for λέγω.

ἔλαβον, 2nd aorist of λαμβάνω, barely related, if at all.

ἤγαγον, 2nd aorist of ἄγω, related, but strangely so.

ἤλθον, 2nd aorist of ἔρχομαι, no evident relationship whatever.

ἤνεγκα, called 1st aorist of φέρω! no evident relationship.

λείπω, I leave, 2nd aorist ἔλιπον, relationship evident.

ὄψομαι, borrowed from ὁράω, common deponent future for βλέπω,

πίπτω, I fall, 2nd aorist ἔπεσον, no clear relationship.

προσφέρω, I bring to, 2nd aorist follows pattern of φέρω — ἤνεγκα

Well, I guess we can see, there are several possibilities. Our task, as usual, it to recognize what we are looking at when we see these primary forms, and their derived forms, in the Greek.

It's nice to see no attempt to translate the middle forms, §202/194, in this lesson, but just to be told they are mainly for deponents. Just one more important thing we need to know, and I would say it is quite a crucial thing to be relegated to a mere footnote!

This is on page 120: that, in fact, once we have learned the second aorist forms, we will find that in actual use, they often take first aorist endings! What's this? What defines first or second aorist? In fact, the lexicon form ending in *-ον* is the only sure thing. But as we have just seen, that does not mean *-ον* endings in usage!

You can always recognize a first aorist by the *-σα* commonly found as part of the endings. But there are exceptions, such as *ἤνεγκα*.

If the stem doesn't look familiar, replace the ending with *-ον*, then, look it up in the vocabulary!

For the simple reason that 2nd aorists cannot be recognized easily in relation to their verbs, most of them (all of today's) will be listed separately in lexicons.

Are there any questions?

Well, let's go after some exercises now.

GE1. καὶ εἶδομεν τὸν κύριον καὶ ἠκούσαμεν τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ.

καὶ: both; εἶδομεν: s.1paai we saw; τὸν κύριον: d-o asm the Lord;

καὶ: and; ἠκούσαμεν: s.1paai we heard; τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ: d-o apm, psv 3gsm His words

- We both saw the Lord and heard His words.

EG1. We did not see him, for we were not yet disciples of him.

We did not see: -s.1paai οὐκ εἶδομεν; him: d-o 3asm αὐτόν; <for> we were not yet: adv s.1pii οὐπω <γὰρ> ἦμεν; disciples: pn nrm μαθηταὶ; of him: psv 3gsm αὐτοῦ

- οὐκ εἶδομεν αὐτόν, οὐπω γὰρ ἦμεν μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

GE2. οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰσῆλθες εἰς τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν, οὐδὲ εἶπες αὐτοῖς παραβολήν.

οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰσῆλθες: cnj, adv, s.2saai for you(s) neither entered; εἰς:

p.a into; τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν: o-p apm, psv 3gp their houses;

οὐδὲ: nor; εἶπες: s.2saai did you(s) say; αὐτοῖς παραβολήν: d-o

asf, i-o 3dp a parable to them

- For you(s) neither entered into their houses, nor did you(s) say a parable to them.

EG2. The apostle brought the sinners to him.

the apostle: nsm ὁ ἀπόστολος; brought: προσήνεγκε; the sinners: d-o apm τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς to him: i-o 3dsm αὐτῷ

- ὁ ἀπόστολος προσήνεγκε τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς αὐτῷ.

GE3. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐγένοντο μαθηταὶ τοῦ κυρίου.

ἐν: p.d in; ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ: o-p dsf that hour; ἐγένοντο: s.3pami they became; μαθηταὶ: pn nrm disciples; τοῦ κυρίου: psv nsm of the Lord

- In that hour they became disciples of the Lord.

EG3. You(p) did not hear me, but you came to my disciples.

You(p) did not hear: -s.2paai οὐκ ἠκούσατέ με: d-o 1ds μου; but: ἀλλ'; you came (to): s.2paai ἦλθετε; to: p.a πρὸς; my disciples: i-o dpm, psv 1gs τοὺς μαθητάς μου

- οὐκ ἠκούσατέ μου, ἀλλ' ἦλθετε πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς μου.