A GRAMMAR OF SEPTUAGINT GREEK

by Frederick Cornwallis Conybeare

Conybeare and Stock's scholarly grammar of the Greek used in the Septuagint (LXX), the ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. The work provides historical context for how Alexandria became the center of Greek learning where this pivotal translation was produced, then analyzes its distinctive grammatical features.

16 Chapters

Table of Contents

A Grammar Of Septuagint Greek

Preface

IN dealing with the Septuagint in and for itself we feel that we are in a humble way acting as pioneers. For hitherto the Septuagint has been regarded only as an aid to the understanding of the Hebrew. We have reversed that procedure and have regarded the Hebrew only as an aid to the understanding of the Septuagint. This would be in a strict sense preposterous, were it not for the admitted fact that the Greek translation of the Old Testament has occasionally preserved traces of readings which are manifestly superior to those of the Massoretic text. That text, it should be remembered, was constituted centuries after the Septuagint was already in vogue in the Greek-speaking portion of the Jewish and Christian world. For permission to use Dr. Swete's text we beg to offer our respectful thanks to the Syndics of the Cambridge Pitt Press and to Dr. Swete himself. To our own university also we owe a debt of gratitude. The Concordance to the Septuagint, edited by Dr. Hatch and Dr. Redpath, is a magnificent work worthy of a university press. Without this aid it would be impossible to speak, with the precision demanded by modern scholarship, about the usage of words in the Septuagint. It is greatly to be regretted that the list of con tributors to this work should somehow have got lost owing to the lamented death of Dr. Edwin Hatch. The labour of many good men, such as the Rev. W. H. Seddon, now Vicarof Painswick, and the Rev. Osmond Archer, to name two who happen to fall under our own knowledge, has thus been left without acknowledgement. They toiled silently for the advancement of learning, like the coral insects who play their part beneath the waters in rearing a fair island for the abode of man. No one can well touch on Old Testament studies without being indebted to Professor Driver, but our obligations in that and other directions have been acknowledged in the body of the work. In composing the Grammar of Septuagint Greek we have had before us as a model Dr. Swete's short chapter on that subject in his Introduction to the Septuagint. Help has also been derived from the grammars of New Testament Greek by Winer and by Blass, and from the great historical grammar of the Greek language by Jannaris. But in the main our work in that department is the direct result of our own observation. To come now to more personal debts, our common friend, Walter Scott, sometime Professor of Greek in the University of Sydney, not merely gave us the benefit of his critical judgement in the early stages of the work, but directly contributed to the subject-matter. We have accepted his aid as freely as it was offered. No Higher Critic is likely to trouble himself about disentangling the different strands of authorship in our Introductions and Notes. Still, if anyone should be tempted to exercise his wits in that direction by way of practice for the Pentateuch, we will give him one clue: If anything should strike him as being not merely sound but brilliant, he may confidently set it down to this third source. To the Rev. Samuel Holmes, M. A., Kennicott Scholar in the University of Oxford, our thanks are due for guarding us against mistakes in relation to the Hebrew: but he is not to be held responsible for any weakness that may be detected in that direction. It remains now only to express our sincere gratitude to Professor Thomas D. Seymour for his vigilant and scholarly care of our work during its passage through the press; and to tender our thanks to Messrs. Ginn & Company for extending their patronage to a book produced in the old country. May the United Kingdom and the United States ever form a Republic of Letters one and indivisible! OXFORD, May 22, 1905.

Introduction

THE work of the Bible Society may be said to have been begun at Alexandria under the Ptolemies: for there the first translation of the Bible, so far as it then existed, was made. Under the old kings of Egypt there was no city on the site of Alexandria, but only a coast-guard station for the exclusion of foreigners, and a few scattered huts of herdsmen. These monarchs had no enlightened appreciation of the benefits of commerce, and cherished a profound distrust of strangers, especially of Greeks, whom they regarded as land-grabbers. [1] But when the Greeks knocked at the doors of Egypt in a way that admitted of no refusal, the lonely coast-guard station saw a great change come over itself. Founded by Alexander the Great in B.C.331, Alexandria became the capital of the new Greek kingdom of Egypt and took its place as a great centre both of commerce and of literature, the rival of Carthage in the one, of Athens in the other. Alexander is credited with having perceived the advantages of situation which conferred upon Alexandria its rapid rise to prosperity. With the Mediterranean on the north and Lake Mareia or Mareotis on the south, it received the products of the inland, which came down the Nile and were conveyed into the lake by canal-boats, and then exported them from its harbours. Under the Romans it became of still greater commercial importance as the emporium of the trade then developed between the East and the West, of which it had a practical monopoly. The vicinity of sea and lake had advantages also in the way of health: for in the summer the etesian winds set in from the north, and the lake, instead of stagnating, was kept full and sweet by the rise of the Nile at that season. The kings too by their successive enclosures secured those breathing-places which are so necessary for the health of a great city. It is estimated by Strabo that a quarter, or even a third, of the whole area was occupied by parks and palaces. Among the royal buildings was the famous Museum with its covered walk and arcades, and its hall for the "fellows" of the Museum, as Professor Mahaffy aptly calls them, to dine in. [2] This institution had endowments of its own, and was presided over by a priest, who was appointed by the King, and, at a later period, by the Emperor. What relation, if any, the Alexandrian Library, which was the great glory of the Ptolemies, bore to the Museum, is not clear. The Museum stood there in Roman tunes, and became known as "the old Museum," when the emperor Claudius reared a new structure by its side, and ordained that his own immortal histories of the Etruscans and Carthaginians should be publicly read aloud once every year, one in the old building and the other in the new (Suet. Claud.42). The library however is related to have been burnt during Caesar's operations in Alexandria. Not a word is said on this subject by the historian of the Alexandrian War, but Seneca [3] incidentally refers to the loss of 400,000 volumes. The inhabitants of Alexandria are described by Polybius, who visited the city under the reign of the second Euergetes, commonly known as Physcon (B.C.146-117), as falling into three classes. There were first the native Egyptians, whom he describes as intelligent and civilised; secondly the mercenary soldiers, who were many and unmannerly; and thirdly the Alexandrian citizens, who were better behaved than the military element, for though of mixed origin they were mainly of Greek blood. [4] Polybius makes no mention of Jews in Alexandria, but we know from other sources that there was a large colony of that people there. Their presence in Egypt was partly compulsory and partly voluntary. The first Ptolemy, surnamed Soter, who had a long and

prosperous reign (B.C.323-285), had invaded Palestine and captured Jerusalem on the sabbath-day, on which the Jews offered no defence. [5] He carried away with him many captives from the hill country of Judaea and from the parts about Jerusalem, and also from Samaria. These were all planted in Egypt, where they carried on their quarrel as to which was the true temple, whither yearly offerings should be sent -- that at Jerusalem or the one on Gerizim. (Cp. Jn.4:20.) Soter, recognising the fidelity of the Jew to his oath, employed many of these captives to garrison important posts, and gave them equal citizenship with the Macedonians. This liberal treatment of their countrymen induced many more Jews to immigrate voluntarily into Egypt, in spite of the prohibition in the Mosaic law -- "Ye shall henceforth return no more that way" (Dt.17:18). There were also Jews in Egypt before this time, who came there under the Persian domination, and others before them who had been sent to fight with Psammetichus (B.C.671-617) against the king of the Ethiopians (Aristeas § 13). Jeremiah, it will be remembered, was carried perforce by his countrymen into Egypt (Jer.43:5-7, 44:1), some of whom may have escaped the destruction which he prophesied against them (Jer.42:16). This was shortly after the reign of Psammetichus. Thus the return of the Jews to Egypt was no new thing, and there they again multiplied exceedingly, even as they are recorded to have done at the first. Philo, who was a contemporary of Jesus Christ, but lived into the reign of Claudius, declares that of the five districts of Alexandria, which were named according to the first five letters of the alphabet, two were especially known as Jewish quarters, and that the Jews were not confined to these (Lib. in Flac. § 8, II 525). With this large Jewish population in Alexandria, whose native language was now Greek, and to whom Hebrew had ceased to be intelligible, we see an obvious reason why the first translation of the Bible should have been made in that city. Arguing a priori we should certainly be inclined to assume that it was the necessities of the Alexandrian synagogue that brought about the translation. This however is not the account which has conic down to us, and which worked its way into the fabric of Christian belief. That account represents the desire of the second Ptolemy for the completeness of his library, and Pagan curiosity about the sacred books of the Jews, as having been the motives which led to their translation into, Greek. It is contained in a letter purporting to be written by one Aristeas to his brother Philocrates. Aristeas, we gather, was a person of high account at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C.285-247), probably one of the three captains of the royal body-guard, Sosibius of Tarentum and Andreas (§§ 12, 40) being the other two. [6] He was a warm admirer of the Jewish religion, but not himself a Jew by race. [7] Rather we are invited to think of him as a philosophic Pagan interested in the national customs of the Jews (§ 306). On one occasion he was present when King Ptolemy addressed a question to his librarian, Demetrius of Phalerum, the Athenian statesman and philosopher, as to the progress of the library. Demetrius replied that it already contained more than 200,000 volumes, and that he hoped in a short time to bring the number up to 500,000; at the same time he mentioned that there were some books of the Jewish law which it would be worth while to have transcribed and placed in the library. Then why not have it done?' said the king. You have full powers in the matter.' Demetrius mentioned a difficulty about translation, and the king came to the conclusion that he must write to the High-priest of the Jews in order to have his purpose effected. Hereupon Aristeas seized an opportunity, for which he had long been waiting. He represented to the king that he could hardly with any grace ask a favour of the High-priest while so many of his countrymen were in bondage in Egypt. This suggestion being seconded by silent prayer on the part of Aristeas and by the concurrence of Sosibius and Andreas, the result was an immense act of emancipation, by which all the Jewish slaves in Egypt,

amounting to over 100,000, regained their freedom, at a cost to the king of more than 660 talents. The way was now clear for the contemplated accession to the library. The king called upon the librarian to send in his report, which is quoted as from the royal archives. In it Demetrius recommended that the king should write to the High-priest at Jerusalem, asking him to send to Egypt six elders from each of the twelve tribes, men of approved life and well versed in their own law, in order that the exact meaning of it might be obtained from the agreement among the majority (§ 32). Not content with his munificence in the redemption of the slaves, the king further displayed his magnificence in the handsome presents he prepared for the Temple, consisting of a table inlaid with precious stones together with gold and silver vessels for the use of the sanctuary. [8] The conduct of the embassy was intrusted to Andreas and to Aristeas himself, who gives his brother an interesting account of the Temple and its services and the magnificent vestments of the High-priest, the conjoint effect of which he declares is enough to convert the heart of any man. [9] Notices are also given of the citadel and of the city and country -- its cultivation, its commerce, its harbours, and its population -- which in some respects show the temerity of the tourist, for the writer speaks of the Jordan as flowing at the country of the Ptolemaeans' (§ 117) into another river, which in its turn empties itself into the sea. The High-priest Eleazar, in compliance with the request of Pbiladelphus, selected seventy-two venerable elders, six from each tribe, whose names are given, men not only learned in the law, but also skilled in the language and literature of the Greeks, [10] who were to accompany the ambassadors to Egypt on the understanding that they were to be sent back when their work was done. Before their departure Eleazar held a conversation with his guests, in which he offered a defence of the ceremonial ordinances of the Jewish law, and expounded views on the symbolic meaning of clean and unclean animals, resembling those set forth in the Epistle which goes under the name of Barnabas. When the deputation arrived in Egypt, the king waived the requirements of court ceremonial and received the elders in audience at once. He first paid reverence to the volume of the law written in letters of gold, which they carried with them, and then extended a welcome to its bearers. After this they were entertained for a week at banquets, at which everything was arranged by a special court functionary in accordance with their own customs, so that there might be nothing to offend their susceptibilities. Elisha, the eldest of the Seventy-two, was asked to say grace, the ordinary court-chaplains being superseded for the occasion. The grace he pronounced was as follows: May God almighty fill thee, O King, with all the good things which he hath created; and grant to thee and to thy wife and to thy children and to those who think with thee to have these things without fail all the days of thy life!' (§ 185). The delivery of this benediction was followed by a round of applause and clapping of hands.The feast of reason was added to the enjoyment of the royal fare. For at a certain point in the proceedings the king addressed questions of a vaguely ethico-political character to the elders, which were answered by them to the admiration of all, especially of the philosophers who had been invited to meet them, among whom was Menedemus of Eretria. [11] Each evening for five days ten elders were interrogated, but on the sixth and seventh evenings eleven were taken, so as to complete the whole number. The questions were elaborated by the king beforehand, but the answers were given impromptu by the elders. The record of them occupies a considerable portion of the letter (§§ 187-294). The law of the answer, if we may so put it, seems to be that each should contain a reference to God and a compliment to the king. We are assured that we have them as they were taken down by the royal recorders.At the close of this week's festivities an interval of three days was allowed, after which the elders were conducted by

Demetrius to the island of Pharos, which was connected with the mainland by a dam nearly a mile long [12] and a bridge. At the north end of this island they were lodged in a building overlooking the sea, where they would enjoy absolute quiet. Demetrius then called upon them to perform their work of translation. We have particulars of their habit of life while it was going on. Early in the morning every day they presented themselves at court and, having paid their respects to the king, returned to their own quarters. Then they washed their hands in the sea, offered up a prayer to God, and betook themselves to the task of reading and translating. Their work was harmonized by collation, and the joint result was taken down by Demetrius (§ 302). After the ninth hour they were free to betake themselves to recreation. It so happened, we are told, that the work of transcription was accomplished in seventy-two days, just as though it had been done on purpose (§ 307).When the whole was finished, Demetrius summoned all the Jews in Alexandria to the island of Pharos, and read the translation aloud to them all in the presence of the interpreters, after which a solemn curse was pronounced upon any one who altered it. Then the whole work was read over to the king, who expressed much admiration at the deep insight of the law-giver and asked how it was that historians and poets had combined to ignore his legislation. Demetrius of Phalerum replied that this was because of its sacred character. He had heard from Theopompus [13] that that historian had once wished to avail himself in his history of some inaccurate renderings from the Jewish law, and had suffered from mental disturbance for more than thirty days. In a lucid interval he prayed that it might be revealed to him why he was thus afflicted. Thereupon he was informed in a dream that it was because he had presumed to divulge divine things to common' men (§ 315: cp. Acts 10:15). I have also,' added Demetrius, received information from Theodectes, the tragic poet, [14] that, when he wished to transfer some of the contents of the Bible into a play of his own, he found himself suffering from cataract on the eyes, from which he only recovered after a long time, when he had propitiated the god.' On hearing this the king paid reverence to the books, and ordered them to be kept with religious care.The elders, having now accomplished the work for which they had come, were dismissed by the king with handsome presents both to themselves and to Eleazar, to whom Philadelphus at the same time wrote a letter begging that, if any of the elders purposed to come and see him again, the High-priest would not prevent it.Such is the traditional account of the origin of the Septuagint, of which we have next to consider the value. But first there are a few points to be noted.To begin with, we see the reason of the name. The Seventy (Lat. LXX: Gk. hoi O) is a round number for the Seventy-two. There were seventy-two interpreters, who took seventy-two days over their work.Next we see that the name is a misnomer as applied to the Greek version of the Old Testament generally. There is no word in Aristeas as to a translation by the Elders of anything but the Law. [15] But the name, having once been applied to the Greek translation, was gradually extended, as the Prophets and the Books were added in a Greek dress to the Law. Thirdly we have to notice that in the Letter of Aristeas no claim to inspiration is advanced on behalf of the translators.That the Bible, as we have it in English, is inspired, has often been tacitly assumed, but seldom laid down as a doctrine. But the inspiration of the Greek version was a point of belief with those who used it, and presumably is so to the present day in the Greek church. Already in Philo we find this claim advanced. He says that the interpreters all agreed in employing exactly the same words, as though by the whispering of some unseen prompter' Vita Mosis II § 7, II 140), and that a comparison of the original with the translation by those who are acquainted with both tongues will clearly show that they were not mere translators, but inspired hierophants and prophets.Josephus (Ant. XII 2), presumably because he was not a Hellenist, and

could read his Bible in the Hebrew, does not see the necessity for this doctrine of the inspiration of the Septuagint. He follows Aristeas closely, except at the end, where he actually turns the curse pronounced on alteration into an invitation to retrench superfluities or supply defects! [16]The early Christian Fathers gave play to their imagination over the story of the Septuagint. Justin Martyr (Apol. I 31 §§ 2-5) has a brief allusion to it, but the amount of credit which is due to him in this connexion may be judged from the fact that he makes Ptolemy send to King Herod for interpreters of the sacred books!Irenaeus about a quarter of a century later (A.D.175) says that Ptolemy, being afraid lest the translators might combine to conceal the truth in some matter by their interpretation, had them isolated, and ordered each to translate the whole. When it was found that they all agreed word for word, then of a truth the Gentiles knew that the Scriptures were interpreted by inspiration of God. But this, he adds, was nothing surprising, seeing that, when the Scriptures had been lost during the captivity in Babylon, God inspired Ezra to rewrite them. [17]Clement of Alexandria (about A.D.190) follows to the same effect as to literal inspiration, and adds the prophetic writings to the work of the first interpreters (Strom. I § 148, p.409 P).Eusebius, with his exceptional regard for truth, is content to give us an epitome of Aristeas. [18]Epiphanius however (died A.D.402) is lavish of details. He tells us that the king had thirty-six houses constructed on the island of Pharos, in which he shut up the interpreters two together. In these houses, which had no windows in the wall, but only skylights, the interpreters worked from morning till evening under lock and key. In the evening they were taken over in thirty-six different boats to the palace of Ptolemy Philadelphus, to dine with him. Then they slept two together in thirty-six different bedrooms. All these precautions were taken to prevent communication between the pairs, and yet when the thirty-six copies of each book of the Bible were compared together, they were found to be identical. So manifestly were these men inspired by the Holy Ghost, and where there was an addition made to the original, it was made by all, and where there was something taken away, it was taken away by all; and what they took away is not needed, and what they added is needed.'This explicit assertion of the plenary inspiration of the Septuagint is manifestly prompted by the craving for an infallible Bible, which was felt in ancient as in modern times. St. Jerome, who, unlike the bulk of the Christian Fathers, made himself acquainted with the text of the original, nailed this false coin to the counter; [19] nevertheless his younger [20] contemporary Augustine gave it full currency again, declaring that the same Spirit which spoke through the prophets spoke also through their interpreters, and that any diversities there may be between the translation and the original are due to prophetic depth.' [21]These later embellishments of the story of the Septuagint may unhesitatingly be set aside as the outcome of pious imagination. But what of the original narrative which goes under the name of Aristeas? Is that to be regarded as fact or fiction?At first sight we seem to have strong external evidence for its truth. There was an Alexandrian Jew named Aristobulus, who is mentioned at the beginning of Second Maccabees as the teacher of king Ptolemy' (1:10). The Ptolemy in question was the sixth, surnamed Philometor (B.C.180-145). Aristobulus, though a Jew, was also a Peripatetic philosopher, and anticipated Philo as an exponent of the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture. So at least we gather from Eusebius, who in his Praeparatio Evangelica several times quotes a work on the Interpretation of the Holy Laws' [22] addressed by Aristobulus to Philometor. The interest of this work to us is that in it Aristobulus refers to the translation made in the reign of his majesty's ancestor Philadelphus under the superinten dence of Demetrius Phalereus. This seems decisive in favour of the historic character of the main facts recorded in the Letter of Aristeas. And there is another piece of external evidence to be added. For

Philo, who himself lived at Alexandria, tells us that a festival was held every year on the island of Pharos in honour of the place whence the blessing of the Greek Bible first shone forth (Vita Mosis II § 7, II 141). The external evidence being thus favourable, let us now examine the internal.Time is the great revealer of secrets, and it is also, in another sense, the great detector of forgeries. We have therefore first to inquire whether the document is consistent in point of chronology with its own claims. Who are the persons mentioned, and did they live together? With regard to what may be called the minor characters there is no difficulty. Aristeas himself, Andreas, and Sosibius are otherwise unknown, while in the case of Menedemus of Eretria, Theodectes, and Theopompus, we are not debarred by considerations of time from accepting what is said of them, though it would fit in better with the reign of the first than of the second Ptolemy. But the relations between Ptolemy Philadelphus and Demetrius of Phalerum, as represented in the Letter, are inconsistent with what we know from other sources. Demetrius was expelled from Athens in B.C.307 by his namesake Demetrius the Besieger of Cities. Having subsequently found his way to Egypt, he became the chief friend of Ptolemy Soter, by whom he was even intrusted with legislation. [23] Unfortunately for himself he advised that monarch to leave the kingdom to his children by his first wife Eurydice. Soter however left it to Philadelphus, the son'of Berenice, on whose accession Demetrius was disgraced. He died soon after owing to a snake-bite received during his sleep. [24] This account is given by Diogenes Laertius (V § 78) on the authority of Hermippus, whom Josephus [25] declares to have been a very exact historian. If his authority is good in favour of the Jews, it must be equally good against them.It would seem then that, if Demetrius of Phalerum had anything to do with the translation of the Jewish Scriptures, that translation must have been made under the first Ptolemy. This is actually asserted by Irenaeus, [26] who seems here to have followed some account independent of Aristeas. And in another respect this alternative version of the facts is intrinsically more credible. For, whereas the Letter of Aristeas represents Eleazar as an independent potentate, Irenaeus expressly says that the Jews were then subject to the Macedonians, by whom he doubtless means Ptolemy Soter, who is recorded to have subdued the country. But, if the Letter of Aristeas is wrong on so vital a point of chronology, it is plain that it cannot have been written by its assumed author, who can hardly be supposed to have been mistaken as to whose reign he was living under. In that case its historical character is gone, and we are at liberty to believe as much or as little of it as we please.There are some minor points which have been urged as proofs of historical inaccuracy in the Letter, which do not seen to us to have any weight. One is connected with the letter of Eleazar, which begins thus (§ 41) -- If thou thyself art well, and the queen Arsinoe, thy sister, and the children, it will be well, and as we would have it.' Now Philadelphus had two wives in succession, both named Arsinoe. By the first, who was the daughter of Lysimachus, he had three children, Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Berenice; by the second, who was his own sister, he had none. But then, as Eleazar was addressing Ptolemy, who was aware of these facts, it would have been superfluous for him to guard himself against misconstruction (cp. § 45). Again (§ 180) Philadelphus is made to speak of his victory 'in the sea fight against Antigonus.' It is asserted that Philadelphus was really defeated in this battle: but, if so, this fal sification of fact is not inappropriate in the monarch's own mouth. Who does not know the elasticity of the term 'victory'?More important than the preceding are two passages in which the author, despite his cleverness, seems to forget that he is Aristeas, and to speak from the standpoint of his own later age. For in § 28, in commenting on the systematic administration of the Ptolemies, he says for all things were done by these kings by means of decrees and in a very safe

manner.' Now it is conceivable that Aristeas might say this with reference to Philadelphus and his father Soter, but it seems more like the expression of one who could already look back upon a dynasty. Again in § 182, in recording how the national customs of the Jews were complied with in the banquet, he says for it was so appointed by the king, as you can still see now.' This could hardly be said by a person writing in the reign of which he is speaking.Our inquiries then seem to have landed us in this rather anomalous situation, that, while external evidence attests the genuineness of the Letter, internal evidence forbids us to accept it. But what if the chief witness be himself found to be an impostor? This is the view taken by those who are careful to speak of the pseudoAristobulus. Aristobulus, the teacher of Ptolemy, would be a tempting godfather to a Jewish author wishing to enforce his own opinions. One thing is certain, namely, that the Orphic verses quoted by Aristobulus (Eus. Pr. Ev. XIII 12) are not of Greek but of Jewish origin. This however does not prove much. For since they were employed by some Jew, why not by one as well as by another? The Jewish Sibylline verses also go back to the reign of Ptolemy Philometor. There is another thing which may be affirmed with safety, namely, that the closest parallel to the Greek of Aristeas is to be found in the Greek of Aristobulus. Indeed it might well be believed that both works were by the same hand. We incline therefore to think that whatever was the date of the Interpretation of the Holy Laws' was the date also of the Letter of Aristeas. If the former work is really by Aristobulus writing under Ptolemy Philometor, then we assign the Letter to the same period. But, if the Jewish love of pseudonymity deludes us here also, then we are unmoored from our anchorage, and can be certain of nothing except that the Letter was accepted as history by the time of Josephus, who paraphrases a great part of it, and mentions the name of the supposed author. Philo's evidence is not so clear. He agrees with the author of the Letter in making the translation take place under Philadelphus, but he diverges from him, as we have seen, in asserting its inspiration, nor does he anywhere refer to the writer as his authority in the way Josephus does. The Teubner editor of the Letter, Paul Wendland, puts its composition later than the time of the Maccabees (say after B.C.96) and before the invasion of Palestine by the Romans, B.C.63. The earlier limit is determined by arguments from names, which might be disputed, and the later is taken for granted. We ourselves think that the work was composed before the Jews had any close acquaintance with the Romans: but there is a point which might be urged against this view. Among the questions asked lay Philadelphus of the Elders there are two in immediate succession -- (1) What kind of men ought to be appointed strategoi? (2) What kind of men ought to be appointed commanders of the forces'? (§§ 280, 281). One or other of these questions seems superfluous until we inquire into the meaning of strategoi in this context. The answer to the question in the text clearly shows that the word here stands for judges.' Now, if we remember that strategos was the Greek equivalent for the Roman praetor, it might at first seem that it could only have been under the Romans that strategos acquired the meaning of judge.' But this leaves out of sight, the question how strategos came to be selected as the equivalent of the Roman praetor. -The word must already in Greek have connoted civil as well as military functions before it could have seemed to be a fit translation of praetor. And this we know to have been the case. The strategoi at Athens were judges as well as generals. At Alexandria they seem to have become judges instead of generals.Turning now from the date of the Letter of Aristeas to that of the Septuagint itself, we have already found that there were two forms of the tradition with regard to its origin, one putting it under the reign of the second, the other tinder that of the first Ptolemy The latter comes to us through Irenwus and is compatible with the part assigned to Demetrius of Phalerum in getting the

Law of Moses translated, whereas the former is not. Both versions of the story were known to Clement of Alexandria, who gives the preference to the former. They were combined by Anatolius (Eus. H.E. VII 32), who declares that Aristobulus himself was one of the Seventy, and addressed his books on the Interpretation of the Law of Moses to the first two Ptolemies. This however is out of keeping with the fragments of Aristobulus themselves.From the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus we may fairly infer that the Law, the Prophecies, and the rest of the Books,' so far as the last were then written, already existed in Greek at the time of writing, and the text itself shows acquaintance with the phraseology of the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch. That Prologue cannot have been written later than 132 B.C., and may have been written as early as the reign of the first Euergetes, who succeeded Philadelphus (B.C.247-222). [27]Philo displays an acquaintance through the Greek with all the books of the Old Testament, except Esther, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and Daniel. But he quotes the Prophets and Psalms sparsely, and seems to regard them as inferior in authority to the Law.The making of the Septuagint, as we have it, was not a single act, but a long process, extending perhaps from the reign of the first Ptolemy down to the second century after Christ: for the translation of Ecclesiastes looks as if it had been incorporated from the version of Aquila, of which we shall speak presently. Tradition is perhaps right in connecting the original translation of the Law with the desire of the early Ptolemies for the completeness of their library. Eusebius sees in this the hand of Providence preparing the world for the coming of Christ by the diffusion of the Scriptures, a boon which could not otherwise have been wrung from Jewish exclusiveness (Pr. Ev. VIII 1).We need not doubt Tertullian's word when he says that the Old Testament Scriptures in Greek were to be seen in the Serapeum in his own day along with their originals. But the question is how they got there. Were they really translated for the library? Or, having been translated by the Jews for their own use was a copy demanded for the library? On this question each must judge for himself. To us the story of the Seventy-two Interpreters carries no conviction. For why should the king send to Judaea for interpreters, when there was so large a Jewish population in his own kingdom? The seventy-two interpreters, six from each tribe, savour strongly of the same motive which dictated the subsequent embellishments of the story, namely, the desire to confer authority upon the Hellenist Scriptures. We lay no stress in this connexion on the loss of the ten tribes, which has been supposed to render the story impossible from the commencement. If it had been an utter impossibility to find six men from each tribe at Jerusalem, no Jew would have been likely to invent such a story. Moreover in New Testament times the ten tribes were not regarded as utterly lost (Acts 26:7, James 1:1). Though they never came back as a body, probably many of them returned individually to Palestine; and the Jews were so careful of their genealogies that it would be known to what tribe they belonged. The wholesale emancipation of Jewish slaves by Philadelphus at his own cost is so noble an example to kings that it is a pity to attack its historicity: but it is necessary to point out that the price recorded to have been paid for each, namely twenty drachmas, is utterly below the market-value, so that the soldiers and subjects of Philadelphus would have had a right to complain of his being generous at their expense. [28] Josephus is so conscious of this flaw in the story, that in two places he quietly inserts a hundred' before the twenty drachmas,' notwithstanding that this sixfold, but still modest, price does not square with the total. Of any attempt prior to the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew Scriptures we have no authentic information. It is true that the writer of the Letter speaks of previous incorrect translations of the Law (§ 314) as having been used by Theopompus: but his motive seems to be a desire to exalt the correctness of what may be called

the authorised version. Similarly Aristobulus (Eus. Pr. Ev. IX 6, XIII 12) speaks of parts of the Pentateuch as having been translated before Demetrius of Phalerum' and before the supremacy of Alexander and the Persians.' But again there is a definite motive to be found for this vague chronological statement in the attempt which was made at Alexandria to show that Plato and before him Pythagoras were deeply indebted to Moses. [29] For when the Alexandrian Jews paid Greek philosophy the compliment of finding that in it lay the inner meaning of their own Scriptures, they endeavoured at the same time to redress the balance by proving that Greek philosophy was originally derived from Jewish religion, so that, if in Moses one should find Plato, that was only because Plato was inspired by Moses. The motto of this school is conveyed in the question of Numenius What is Plato but Moses Atticizing?' One of its methods, we regret to add, was the fabrication of Orphic and Sibylline verses, to which we have already had occasion to allude. This industry was carried on by the Christians, and affords a reason why in the vision of Hermas (Herm. Past. Vis.114 § 1) the Sibyl could at first sight be confounded with the Church. In Lactantius the Sibylline verses form one of the chief evidences of Christianity.Of translations of the Old Testament subsequent to the Septuagint the three most famous are those of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Aquila, like his namesake, the husband of Priscilla, was a native of Pontus, and though not a Jew by birth was a prose. lyte to the Jewish religion. His version is distinguished by the total sacrifice of the Greek to the letter of the Hebrew text. So much is this the case that a Hebrew prefix which is both a sign of the accusative and has also the meaning with' is represented, where it occurs in the former sense, by sun, so that we are presented with the phenomenon of sun with the accusative. This peculiarity presents itself in the Greek version of Ecclesiastes [30] alone among the books of the Septuagint, so that the rendering of that late work may be conjectured to be due to Aquila. This translator lived during the reign of Hadrian (A.D.117-138).Theodotion of Ephesus is said to have lived towards the close of the same century, under Commodus (A.D.180-192). He also was a Jewish proselyte. His work was rather a revision of the Septuagint than an independent translation. So far as the book of Daniel is concerned, it was accepted by the Christian Church, and the older Septuagint version was discarded.Symmachus of Samaria, who, according to Eusebius (H.E. VI 17), was an Ebionite Christian, flourished in the next reign, that of Septimius Severus (A.D.193-211). His version was more literary in form than that of Aquila.The reader will observe that all three of these versions come from the side of Judaism. The Christian Church was content with the Septuagint, whereon to found its claim as to the witness of the Old Testament to Christ. Eusebius points to the providential nature of the fact that the prophecies which foretold his coming were stored in a public library under the auspices of a Pagan king centuries before his appearance, so that the coincidence between prediction and fulfilment could not be ascribed to any fraud on the part of the Christians. The Jews however were not so well satisfied with this aspect of things. The question of the Virgin birth divided the religions world then, as it does now. Aquila and Theodotion were at one in substituting neanis for parthenos in Isaiah 7:14, and the Ebionites found support in this for their declaration that Jesus was the son of Joseph. There were writings of Symmachus still extant in the time of Eusebius, which were directed against the Gospel according to St. Matthew (H.E. VI17).Besides these well-known versions there were two other anonymous ones, which were brought to light through the industry and good fortune of Origen, the most scholarly of the Christian Fathers. One of these, which was called the Fifth Edition, was found hidden in an old wine-cask at Jericho in the reign of that Antoninus who is better known as Caracalla (A.D.211-217); the other,

which was called the Sixth Edition, was discovered in the subsequent reign of Alexander Severus (A.D.222-235) concealed in a similar receptacle at Nicopolis in Epirus, where we may presume St. Paul to have spent his last winter (Tit.3:12). Who knows but that it may have been one of the books which he was so urgent upon Timothy to bring with him? We do not think the chances very strongly in favour of this hypothesis: but it would account for some things, if we knew St. Paul to have had access to another version besides the Septuagint.The renderings of the four main versions were arranged by Origen in parallel columns along with the original both in Hebrew and Greek characters, in a work which was consequently known as the Hexapla. For the Psalms Eusebius tells us Origen employed not only a fifth, but also a sixth and seventh interpretation' (H.E. VI 16). There was another work published by Origen called the Tetrapla, which contained only the Septuagint along with the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. What the I seventh interpretation' spoken of by Eusebius was, it would be hard to say. What is called by Theodoret the Seventh Edition was the recension of Lucian, which was later than the work of Origen. Lucian was martyred under Diocletian (284-305 A.D.). The work of Origen might enlighten the learned, but it did not affect the unique position held in the Christian Church by the Septuagint ever since it was taken over from the Hellenist Jews. We are familiar with the constant appeal made by the writers of the New Testament to Scripture,' an appeal couched in such words as It is written' or As the Scripture saith.' In the great majority of cases the Scripture thus appealed to is undoubtedly the Septuagint; seldom, if ever, is it the Hebrew original. We have seen how, even before the Christian era, the Septuagint had acquired for itself the position of an inspired book. Some four centuries after that era St. Augustine remarks that the Greek-speaking Christians for the most part did not even know whether there was any other word of God than the Septuagint (C.D. XVIII, 43). So when other nations became converted to Christianity and wanted the Scriptures in their own tongues, it was almost always the Septuagint which formed .the basis of the translation. This was so in the case of the early Latin version, which was in use before the Vulgate; and it was so also in the case of the translations made into Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian, Gothic, and other languages. The only exception to the rule is the first Syriac version, which was made direct from the Hebrew. When at the close of the fourth century St. Jerome had recourse to the Hebrew original in revising the accepted Latin text, the authority of the Septuagint stood in the way of the immediate acceptance of his work. , The Churches of Christ,' said St. Augustine, do not think that anyone is to be preferred to the authority of so many men chosen out by the High-priest Eleazar for the accomplishment of so great a work.'Nevertheless Jerome's revision did triumph in the end, and under the name of the Vulgate became the accepted text of the Western Church. But the Vulgate itself is deeply tinctured by the Septuagint and has in its turn influenced our English Bible. Many of the names of Scripture characters, e.g. Balaam and Samson, come to us from the Septuagint, not from the Hebrew; our Bible often follows the verse-division of the Septuagint as against that of the Hebrew; the titles of the five books of Moses are derived from the Septuagint, not from the Hebrew. Thus the Septuagint, while it still survives in the East, continued its reign even in the West through the Vulgate; nor was it until the time of the Reformation that the Hebrew Scriptures themselves began to be generally studied in Western Europe.Never surely has a translation of any book exercised so profound an influence upon the world as the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. This work has had more bearing upon ourselves than we are perhaps inclined to think. For it was the first step towards that fusion of the Hebraic with the Hellenic strain, which has issued in the mind and heart of modern Christendom.

Like the opening of the Suez Canal, it let the waters of the East mingle with those of the West, bearing with them many a freight of precious merchandise. Without the Septuagint there could have been, humanly speaking, no New Testament: for the former provided to the latter not only its vehicle of language, but to a great extent also its moulds of thought. These last were of course ultimately Semitic, but when religious ideas had to be expressed in Greek, it was difficult for them to escape change in the process.So long as the New Testament is of interest to mankind, the Septuagint must share that interest with it. The true meaning of the former can only be arrived at by correct interpretation of the language, and such correct interpretation is well-nigh impossible to those who come to the Jewish Greek of the reign of Nero and later with notions derived from the age of Pericles. Not only had the literary language itself, even as used by the most correct writers, undergone great changes during the interval, but, further than this, the New Testament is not written in literary, but rather in colloquial Greek, and in the colloquial Greek of men whose original language and ways of thinking were Semitic, and whose expression was influenced at every turn by the phraseology of the Old Testament. If we wish then to understand the Greek of the New Testament, it is plain that we must compare it with the Greek of the Old, which belongs, like it, to post-classical times, is colloquial rather than literary, and is so deeply affected by Semitic influence as often to be hardly Greek at all, but rather Hebrew in disguise. That everything should be compared in the first instance with that to which it is most like is an obvious principle of scientific method, but one which hitherto can hardly be said to have been generally applied to the study of the New Testament. Now however there are manifold signs that scholars are beginning to realise the importance of the study of the Greek Old Testament in its bearing upon the interpretation of the New.Attic Greek was like a vintage of rare flavour which would only grow on a circumscribed soil. When Greek became a world-language, as it did after the conquests of Alexander, it had to surrender much of its delicacy, but it still remained an effective instrument of thought and a fit vehicle for philosophy and history. The cosmopolitan form of literary Greek which then came into use among men of non-Attic, often of non-Hellenic origin, was known as the Common (koine, sc. dialektos) or Hellenic dialect. Aristotle may be considered the first of the Hellenists, though, as a disciple of Plato, he is far nearer to Attic purity than the Stoics, Epicureans, and Academics who followed him. Hellenistic Greek we may regard as the genus, of which Alexandrian Greek is a species. Now the language of the Septuagint is a variety of Alexandrian Greek, but a very peculiar variety. It is no fair specimen either of the colloquial or of the literary language of Alexandria.The interesting light thrown upon the vocabulary of the Septuagint by the recent publication of Egyptian Papyri has led some writers to suppose that the language of the Septuagint has nothing to distinguish it from Greek as spoken daily in the kingdom of the Ptolemies. Hence some fine scorn has been wasted on the myth' of a Biblical' Greek. Biblical Greek' was a term aptly applied by the late Dr. Hatch to the language of the Septuagint and New Testament conjointly. It is a serviceable word, which it would be unwise to discard. For, viewed as Greek, these two books have features in common which are shared with them by no other documents. These features arise from the strong Semitic infusion that is contained in both. The Septuagint is, except on occasions, a literal translation from the Hebrew. Now a literal translation is only half a translation. It changes the vocabulary, while it leaves unchanged the syntax. But the life of a language lies rather in the syntax than in the vocabulary. So, while the vocabulary of the Septuagint is that of the market-place of Alexandria, the modes of thought are purely Hebraic. This is a rough statement concerning the Septuagint as a whole: but, as the whole is not homogeneous, it does not apply to

all the parts. The Septuagint does contain writing, especially in the books of the Maccabees, which is Greek, not Hebrew, in spirit, and which may fairly be compared with the Alexandrian Greek of Philo.The New Testament, having itself been written in Greek, is not so saturated with Hebrew as the Septuagint: still the resemblance in this respect is close enough to warrant the two being classed together under the title of Biblical Greek. Hence we must dissent from the language of Deissmann, when he says The linguistic unity of the Greek Bible appears only against the background of classical, not of contemporary "profane," Greek.' Biblical Greek does appear to us to have a linguistic unity, whether as compared with the current Alexandrian of the Papyri or with the literary language of such fairly contemporary authors as Aristeas, Aristobulus, and Philo, not to add others who might more justly be called profane.'The language of the Septuagint, so far as it is Greek at all, is the colloquial Greek of Alexandria, but it is Biblical Greek, because it contains so large an element, which is not Hellenic, but Semitic.Josephus, it has been asserted, employs only one Hebraism, namely, the use of prostithesthaiwith another verb in the sense of doing something again' (see Gram. of Sept. Gk. § 113). For the accuracy of this statement it would be hazardous to vouch, but the possibility of its being made serves to show the broad difference that there is between Hellenistic Greek, even as employed by a Jew, who, we know, had to learn the language, and the Biblical Greek of the Septuagint.The uncompromising Hebraism of the Septuagint is doubtless due in part to the reverence felt by the translators for the Sacred Text. It was their business to give the very words of the Hebrew Bible to the Greek world, or to those of their own countrymen who lived in it and used its speech; as to the genius of the Greek language, that was entirely ignored. Take for instance Numbers 9:10 Anthropos anthropos ho ean genetai akathartos epi psuche anthropou, e en hodo makran humin e en tais geneais humon, kai poiesei to pascha Kurio. Does anyone suppose that stuff of that sort was ever spoken at Alexandria? It might as well be maintained that a schoolboy's translation of Euripides represents English as spoken in America.One of our difficulties in explaining the meaning of the Greek in the Septuagint is that it is often doubtful whether the Greek had a meaning to those who wrote it. One often cannot be sure that they did not write down, without attaching any significance to them, the Greek words which seemed to be the nearest equivalents to the Hebrew .before them. This is especially the case in the poetical passages, of which Deuteronomy 33:10b will serve for an instance -- epithesousin thumiama en orge sou, dia pantos epi to thusiasterion sou.. We can account for this by aid of the original: but what did it mean to the translator?Another obvious cause of difference between Biblical and Alexandrian Greek is the necessity under which the translators found themselves of inventing terms to express ideas which were wholly foreign to the Greek mind.The result of these various causes is often such as to cause disgust to the classical student. Indeed a learned Jesuit Father has confessed to us what a shock he received on first making acquaintance with the Greek of the Septuagint. But the fastidiousness of the classical scholar must not be nourished at the expense of narrowing the bounds of thought. The Greek language did not die with Plato; it is not dead yet; like the Roman Empire it is interesting in all stages of its growth and its decline. One important stage of its life-history is the ecclesiastical Greek, which followed the introduction of Christianity. This would never have been but for the New Testament. But neither, as we have said before, would the New Testament itself have been but for the Septuagint.

Abbreviations

---

1 Clem. 1 Clement

2 Clem. 2 Clement

Acc. Accusative

Ant. Antiquities.

B (Codex) Vaticanus

B. J. Wars of the Jews (Josephus)

Barn. Barnabas

Ep. Epistle

Gen. Genitive (sometimes Genesis)

Herm. Hermas

Hes. Hesiod

Hom. Homer

Il Iliad

Isocr. Isocrates

Jos. Josephus

L. & S. Liddell and Scott.

Mart. Martyrdom of Polycarp

Mss. Manuscripts

N.T. New Testament

O Origen

Od Odyssey

Past. Mdt. Shepherd, Mandate.

Past. Sim. Shepherd, Similitudes.

Past. Vis. Shepherd, Visions.

Plat. Plato

Plaut. Plautinus

Th Theodotion

S. Ign. Ignatius

Sim. Similitudes

Xen Xenophon

Ec Economics

Eur Euripides

I.T. Iphigenia in Tauris

Phaedr Phaedrus

Thuc Thucydides

Cyrop Cyropedia

NOUNS, 1-14

1. Disuse of the Dual. The Greek of the LXX has two numbrs, the singular and the plural. The dual, which was already falling into disuse in the time of Homer, and which is seldom addhered to systematically in classical writers, has disappeared altogether.Gen.40:2 epi tois dusin eunouchois autou. Ex.4:9 tois dusi semeiois toutois.Contrast with the above -- Plat. Rep.470 B epi duoin diaphorain. Isocr. Paneg.55 c peri toin poleoin toutoin.2. Heis as Article. Under the influence of Hebrew idiom we find the numeral heis turning into an indefinite pronoun in the Greek of the LXX, as in Gen.42:27 lusas de heis ton marsippon autou, and then subsiding into a mere article, as -Jdg.13:2 [Codex B] aner heis, 9:53 gune mia.2 K. [2 Sam.] 2:18 hosei mia dorkas en agro.2 Esd. [Ezra] 4:8 egrapsan epistolen mian. Ezk.4:9 angos hen ostrakinon.There are instances of the same usage in the two most Hebraistic books of the N. T.Mt.8:19 heis grammateus, 9:18 archon heis, 21:19 suken mian, 26:69 mia paidiske, Rev.8:13 henos aetou, 9:13 phonen mian, 18:21 heis angelos, 19:17 hena angelon.Our own indefinite article a' or an' (Scotch ane) is originally the same as one.' We can also see the beginning of the French article in the colloquial language of the Latin comedians.Ter. And.118 forte unam aspicio adulescentulam.Plaut. Most.990 unum vidi mortuum efferri foras.Apart from the influence of the Hebrew, heis is occasionally found in good Greek on the way to becoming an article. See L. & S. under heis 4. In German the indefinite article and the first of the numerals coincide, and so a German, in beginning to speak English, frequently puts one' for a." In the same way a Hebrew learning to speak Greek said heis aetos and so on.3. First Declension. In classical Greek there is a tendency for proper names, especially those of foreign origin, which end in the nominative in -a preceded by a consonant other than r, to retain the a in the genitive, e.g. Ledas, Andromedas, Komplegas (name of a Spanish town, App. VI De Reb. Hisp.43). In pursuance of this analogy we have such genitives as Ballas and Zelphas (Gen.37:2), Sousannas (Sus. O 30).On the other hand, nouns in -a pure, or -a preceded by r, are in a few instances found in the LXX to take the Ionic form of the genitive and dative in -es and -e.Ex.8:21[20] kunomuian . . . kunomuies, 15:9 te machaire. and Gen.27:40.1K. [1 Sam.] 25:20 autes epibebekuies epi ten onon.2 Mac.8:23, 12:22 speires.It is said that in the Papyri speires is always used, never speiras.The plural of ge is found in the LXXAcc. gas 4 K. [2 Kings] 18:35. Gen gaion 4 K. [2 Kings] 18:35; Ps.48:11; Ezk.36:24; 2 Esd. [Ezra] 9:1 and three other passages. Dat. gais 4 K. [2 Kings] 10:11. gas 4 K. [2 Kings] 19:11. gaiais Dan. O 11:42.4. Second Declension. theos has a vocative thee. Dt.3:24: Jdg.21:3, 16:28; Wisd.9:1. Usually, however ,the nominative is employed for the vocative, as in -- Ps.21:1 [21:2] ho Theos ho Theos mou prosches moi hinati enkatelipes me;But in Matthew 27:46 this passage assumes the form -- Thee mou Thee mou hinati me enkatelipes;The Attic form of this declension is of rare occurrence in the LXX. Laos and naos are the regular forms. Leos does not occur at all, and neos only in Second Maccabees. halos is common: but for that there is no non-Attic form, as it does not arise, like the others, on the principle of transpositon of quantity.5. Third Declension. The word sknips (Ex.8:16) is interesting, as adding another instance of a noun-stem in -ph to the rare word katelips and nipha, which occurs only in the accusative in Hes. Op.533. Sknips is also found in the LXX with the stem sknip-.6. Absence of Contraction. Many words are left uncontracted in the LXX which in Attic

Greek would be contracted, e.g. -- Dt.18:11 epaeidon epaoiden. Prov.3:8 osteois. Sir.6:30 chruseos. Ps.73:17 ear.7. Feminine Forms of Movable Substantives. The form basilissa for basileia was not approved by Atticists. It is comon in the LXX, whereas basileia does not occur. Cf. Acts 8:27. On the analogy of it we have Arabissa in Job 42:17, phulakissa in Song of Solomon 1:6. The following also may be noted: -- genetis Wisd 7:12 A, technitis 7:22, mustis 8:4. hubristria Jer.27:318. Heteroclite Nouns.aithale (Ex.9:8, 10) for aithalos, which does not occur.halon (Hos.9:2), haonos (Jdg.15:5) for halos, halo. Cf. Mt.3:12, Lk 3:17 ten halona. In the LXX both halon and halos are of common gender. Thus Ruth 3:2 ton halona, 3:14 ten halona; Jug.6:37 te haloni; 1 Chr.21:15 en to halo, 21:21 ek tes halo. Josephus (Ant.5.9.3) has tes haloos.gerous, gerei for geros, gera, but nominative always geras. For gerous, see Gen.37:3; Ps.70:9, 18; but in Genesis 44:20 geros. For gerei see Gen.15:15, Ps.91:15, Sir.8:6, Dan. O 6:1. When one form is used, the other generally occurs as a variant. In Clement 1 Cor.63:3 we have heos gerous.eleos, to for eleos, ho. Plural ta elee (Ps.16:7). The masculine form occurs in some dozen and a half passages (e.g. Ps.83:11; Prov.3:16, 14:22). In N.T. also and in the Apostolic Fathers the neuter is the prevailing form, e.g.2 Tim 1:16, 18; Tit.3:5; Hb.4:16; Herm. Past. Vis.2.2.3, 3.9.1, Sim.4.2; 1 Clem.9:1, 14:1; 2 Clem 3:1, 16:2; Barn. Ep.15:2. In Mt.9:13, 12:7, 23:23 the masculine form occurs, the two former being quotations from Hos.6:6, where the LXX has the neuter. enedron (Jdg.16:2) for enedra. The former is quite common, the latter occurs only in Josh.8:7, 9; Ps.9:28.luchnos, to (Dan. O 5:0).nikos, to (1 Esdras 3:9) for nike. Cp.1 Cor 15:55, 57; Herm. Past. Mdt.12.2.5.skotos, to for ho, occurs in the best Attic prose as well as in the LXX (e.g. Is.42:16) and in the N.T. (e.g.1 Thes.5:5). Cp. Barn Ep.14:6, 18:1.The N. T. and the Apostolic Fathers afford other instances of heteroclites, which do not occur in the LXX. Thus -- zelos, to (Phil.3:6; 1 Clem.4:8, 11, 13; 6:1, 2; 9:1; 63:2, but in 5:2, 5 dia zelon; Ignat. Ad Tral.4:2).plous declined like bous (Acts 27:9; Mart. S. Ign.3 eicheto tou ploos).ploutos, to (2 Cor.8:2; Eph.1:7; 2:7; 3:8, 16; Phil.4:19; Col.1:27; 2:2).tuphos, to (1 Clem.13:1).9. Verbal Nouns in -ma.a. The Abundance of verbal nouns in - ma is characteristic of Hellenistic Greek from Aristotle onwards. The following instances from the LXX are taken at random -- agnoema Gen.43:12 (6 times in all).anomema 1 Ki. [1 Sam.] 25:28 (17 times in all).dichotomema Gen.15:11 (5 times in all).kataleimma Gen.45:7 (20 times in all).hupsoma . . . gauriama . . . kauchema Judith 15:9b. A point better worth noting is the preference for the short radical vowl in their formation, e.g. -- anathema Lvt.27:28 etc. So in the N.T. Acts 23:14; Rom.9:3; 1 Cor.12:3, 16:22; Gal.1:8, 9. In Judith 16:19 we have the classical form anathema. For the short vowel in the LXX, cp. thema, ekthema, epithema, parathema, prosthema, sunthema.aphairema Ex.29:27; Lvt.7:4, 24 etc.aphema 1 Mac.9:28. So kathema, Is.3:19, Ezk.16:11.Gen.25:6 etc. So in N.T.heurema Sir.20:9; 29:4.hepsema Gen.25:29 etc.sustema Gen.1:10 etc. So anastema. In Judith 12:9 anastema.chuma (for) 2 Mac.2:24.10. Non-Attic Forms of Substantives.alopekas accusative plural (Jdg.15:4) for alopekas.arkos (1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:34) for arktos, which does not occur. Cp. Rev.13:2 arkou.dina (Job 13:11; 28:10) for dine.eustron (Dt.18:3) for enustron. So in Jos. Ant.4.4.4.epaoidos (Ex.7:11) for epodos, which does not occur.klibanos (Ex.7:28) for kribanos. So also in N.T.molibos (Ex.15:10), the Homeric form, for molubdos.tameion (Ex.7:28: Jdg.3:24, 15:1, 16:12) for tamieion, which also occurs frequently. The shorter form is common in the Papyri.hupseia (Tob.8:21) for hugieia. In later Greek generally hugeia is usual, but the fuller form prevails in the LXX.cheimarros (1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:40) for cheimarrous.11. Non-Attic Forms of Adjectives.euthes, euthes, for euthus, eutheia, euthu, which also occurs frequently.hemisus, -u is an adjective of two terminations in the LXX. hemiseia does

not occur. Cp. Nb.34:14 to hemisu phules Manasse with Jos. Ant.4.7.3 kai tes Manassitidos hemiseia.chalkeios, -a, -on, the Homeric form, occurs in Jdg.16:21, 1 Esd.1:38, 5 times in Job, and in Sir.28:20 for chalkous, chalke, chalkoun, which is very common.argurikos 1 Esd.8:24 only. Cp. Aristeas.37, who has also elaikos, sitikos, charistikos (112, 37, 227).aischunteros Sir.26:15, 35:10, 42:1 only.sigeros Prov.18:18, Sir.26:14 only.klepsimaios Tob.2:13 only.Thnesimaios often used in the neuter for a corpse,' e.g.3 K. [2 Kings} 13:25.12. Comparison of Adjectives.agathoteros (Jdg.11:25, 15:2) is perhaps an instance of that tendency to regularisation in the later stages of a language, which results from its being spoken by foreigners.aischroteros (Gen.41:19) is good Greek, though not Attic. Aischion does not seem to occur in the LXX.engion and engistos are usual in the LXX, e.g. Ruth 3:12, 3 K. [2 Kings} 20:2, Enguteros does not seem to occur at all, and engutatos only in Job 6:15, 19:14.plesiesteron adv. for plesiaiteron (4 Mac.12:3).13. Pronouns. a. Classical Greek has no equivalent for our unemphatic pronoun he.' One cannot say exactly he said' in the Attic idiom. Autos ephe is something more, and ephe something less, for it may equally mean she said.' The Greek of the LXX gets over this difficulty by the use of autos as an unemphatic pronoun of the 3d person.1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:42 kai eiden Goliad ton Daueid kai etimasen auton, hoti autos en paidarion kai autos purrakes meta kallous ophthalmon.In the above the repeated autos is simply the nominative of the auton preceding. In a classical writer autos so used would necessarily refer to Goliath himself. For other instances see Gen.3:15, 16, 39:23: Nb.17:5, 22:22: Jdg.13:5, 16, 14:4, 17: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:2, 18:16. Winer denied that this use of autos is to be found in the N.T. But here we must dissent from his authority. See Mt.5:5 and following: Lk.6:20: 1 Cor.7:12.b. As usual in later Greek the compound reflexive pronoun of the 3d person is used for those of the 1st and 2d.Gen.43:22 kai argurion heteron enenkamen meth' heauton. Dt.3:7 kai ta skula ton poleon epronomeusamen heautois.1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:8 eklexasthe heautois andra.So also in Aristeas 3, 213, 217, 228 (heauton = seauton), 248. This usage had already begun in the best Attic. Take for instance -Plat. Phoedo 91 C hopos me ego... hama heauton te kai humas exapatesas, 78 B dei hemas eresthai heautous, 101 D su de dedios an... ten heautou skian. Instances abound in N.T.Acts 23:14 anethematisamen heautous, 5:35 prosechete heautois.c. A feature more peculiar to LXX Greek is the use of the personal pronoun along with the reflexive, like the English me myself,' you yourselves,' etc.Ex.6:7 kai lempsomai emauto humas laon emoi, 20:23 ou poiesete humin heautois.So also Dt.4:16, 23: Josh.22:16.As there is nothing in the Hebrew to warrant this duplication of the pronoun, it may be set down as a piece of colloquial Greek.d. The use of idios as a mere possessive pronoun is common to the LXX with the N.T. e.g. -Job 7:10 oud' ou me epistrepse eis ton idion oikon. Mt.22:5 apelthon, ho men eis ton idion agron, ho de epi ten emporian autou.14. Numerals. a. dusi(n) is the regular form for the dative of duo. So also in N.T. e.g. Mt.6:24, 22:40: Lk.16:13: Acts 12:6. duein occurs in Job 13:20, duoin in 4 Mac.1:28, 15:2. Sometimes duo is indeclinable, e.g. Jdg.16:28 ton duo ophthalmon.b. The following forms of numerals differ from those in classical use: -deka duo Ex.28:21: Josh.21:40, 18:24: 1 Chr.6:23, 15:10, 25:10ff. So in N.T. Acts 19:7, 24:11. Cp. Aristeas 97.deka treis Gen.17:25: Josh.19:6.deka tessares Josh.15:36: Tob.8:20. So in N.T.2 Cor.12:2, Gal.2:1. Cp. Diog. Laert.7.55.deka pente Ex.27:15: Jdg.8:10: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 19:17. So in N.T. Gal.1:18.deka hex Gen.46:18: Ex.26:25: Josh.15:41.deka hepta Gen.37:2, 47:28.deka okto Gen.46:22: Josh.24:33b: Jdg.3:14, 10:8, 20:44: 1 Chr.12:31: 2 Chr.11:21.The above numerals occur also in the regular forms -dodeka Gen.5:8.treis kai deka, triskaideka Nb.29:13, 14tessares kai deka Nb.16:49.pente kai deka Lvt.27:7: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 9:10hekkaideka, hex kai deka Nb.31:40,

46, 52hepta kai deka Jer.39:9.okto kai deka 2 K. [2 Sam.] 8:13.ennea kai deka 2 K. [2 Sam.] 2:30 only.c. The forms just given may be written separately or as one word. This led to the tessares in tessareskaideka becoming indeclinable, e.g. -2 Chr.25:5 huious tessareskaideka.The same license is extended in the LXX to deka tessares.Nb.29:29 amnous eniausious deka tessares amomous.The indeclinable use of tessareskaideka is not peculiar to the LXX.Hdt.7.36 tessareskaideka (triereas). Epict. Ench.40 apo tessareskaideka eton. Strabo p.177, 4.1.1 prosetheke de tessareskaideka ethne, 189, 4.2.1 ethnon tessareskaideka.d. The alternative expressions ho ei-s kai eikostos (2 Chr.24:17) and ho eikostos protos (2 Chr.25:28) are quite classical: but the following way of expressing days of the month may be noted -Haggai 2:1 mia kai eikadi tou menos.1 Mac.1:59 pempte kai eikadi tou menos. Cp.4:59.2 Mac.10:5 te pempte kai eikadi tou autou menos.

VERBS, 15-33

---

15. The Verb Einai. emen the 1st person singular of the imperfect, which is condemned by Phrynichus, occurs frequently in the LXX. It is found also in the N.T. -- 1 Cor.13:11: Gal.1:10, 22: Acts 10:30, 11:5, 17, 22:19, 20: Mt.25:35: Jn.11:15. According to the text of Dindorf it occurs even in Eur. Hel.931. It is a familiar feature of Hellenistic Greek, being common in Philo and Josephus, also in the Pastor of Hermas, and occuring moreover in such authors as Epictetus (Diss.1.16.19), Plutarch (Pomp.74), Diogenes Laertius (6.56), Lucian (Asinus 46). es for estha, which is condemned by the same authority, occurs in Jdg.11:35: Ruth 3:2: Job 38:4: Obd.1:11. Cp. Epict. Diss.4.1.132. estosan is the only form for the 3d person plural imperative, neither eston nor onton being used. This form is found in Plato (Meno 92 D). See 16 d. eto or esto occurs in Ps.103:31: 1 Mac.10:31, 16:3. So in N.T.1 Cor.16:22: James 5:12. Cp. Herm. Past. Vis.3.3.4: 1 Clem.48:5, where it occurs four times. emetha for emen occurs in 1 K. [1 Sam.] 25:16: Baruch 1:19. This form appears in the Revisers' text in Eph.2:3. 16. The Termination -san. a. Probably the thing which will first arrest the attention of the student who is new to the Greek of the LXX is the termination in -san of the 3d person plural of the historical tenses of the active voice other than the pluperfect. There are in Greek two terminations of the 3d person plural of the historic tenses -- (1) in -n, (2) in -san. Thus in Homer we have eban and also ebesan. In Attic Greek the rule is that thematic aorists (i.e. those which have a connecting vowel between the stem and the termination) and imperfects take n, e.g. -- e-lus-a-n, e-lab-o-n, elamban-o-n, while non-thematic tenses and the pluperfect take -san, e.g. -- e-do-san, e-ti-the-san, e-le-luk-e-sanIn the Greek of the LXX, which in this point represents the Alexadrian vernacular, thematic 2d aorists and imperfects may equally take -san.Of 2d aorists we may take the following examples -- eidosan or idosan, eiposan, ekrinosan, elabosan, epiosan, heurosan, epherosan (=2d aor.), ephagosan, ephugosan, elthosan, hemartosan, erosan (Josh.3:14).Compounds of these and others abound, e.g. -apelthosan, dielthosan, eiselthosan, exelthosan, parelthosan, perielthosan, proselthosan, sunethosan, enebalosan, parenebalosan, exeliposan, kateliposan, apethanosan, eisegagosan.b. Instances of imperfects, which, for our present purpose, mean historic tenses formed from a strengthened present stem, do not come so readily to hand. But here are two -elambanosan Ezk.22:12. ephainosan 1 Mac.4:50.These seem to be more common in the case of contracted vowel verbs -- egennosan Gen.6:4 euthenousan Lam.1:5.

epexonousan Nb.1:18. enomousan Ezk.22:11.

epoiousan Job 1:4. katenoousan Ex.33:8.

etapeinousan Judith 4:9. oikodomousan 2 Esd. [Ezra] 14:18. eulogousan Ps.61:5. pareterousan Sus. Th:12.

edoliousan Ps.5:9, 13:3.Cp. Herm. Past. Sim.6.2.7 eustathousan, 9.9.5 edokousan.Such forms occur plentifully in Mss. of the N.T., but the Revisers' text has only edoliousan in Romans 3:13 (a quotation from Ps.13:3) and parelabosan in 2 Thes.3:6.c. The same termination -san sometimes takes the place of -en in the 3d person plural of the optative.ainesaisan Gen.49:8. thereusaisan

Job 18:7. eipoisan Ps.34:25. idoisan Job 21:20. ekkopsaisan Prov.24:52 kataphagoisan Prov.30:17. ekleipoisan Ps.103:35. olesaisan Job 18:11, 20:10. elthoisan Dt.33:16: Job 18:9, 11. peripatesaisan Job 20:26. enenkaisan Is.66:20. poiesaisan Dt.1:44. eulogesaisan Ps.34:25. purseusaisan Job 20:10. heuroisan Sir.33:9. pselaphesaisan Job 5:14, 12:25.d. In Hellenistic Greek generally -san is also the termination of the 3d person plural of the imperative in all voices, e.g. -- 1 K. [1 Sam.] 30:22 apagesthosan kai apostrephetosan.For instances in N.T. see 1 Cor.7:9, 36: 1 Tim.5:4: Tit.3:14, Acts 24:20, 25:5.17. Termination of the 2d Person Singular of Primary Tenses Middle and Passive. In the LXX, as in Attic, the 2d person singular of the present and futures, middle and passive, ends in -e, e.g. arxe, phage, lupethese. The only exceptions to this rule in Attic are boulei, oiei, opsei, and esei, of which the last is only used occasionally. In the LXX we have opsei in Nb.23:13.The full termination of the 2d person singular of primary tenses middle and passive (-sai), which in Attic Greek appears only in the perfect of all verbs and in the present of -mi verbs, as le-lu-sai, di-do-sai, is occasionally to be found in the LXX in other cases.apexenousai 3 K. [2 Kings} 14:6.koimasai Dt.31:16 (A).ktasai Sir.6:7.piesai Dt.28:39: Ruth 2:9, 14: 3 K. [2 Kings} 17:4: Ps.127:2: Jer.29:13 (A): Ezk.4:11, 12:18, 23:32, 34.phagesai Ruth 2:14: Ezk.12:18.So in N.T. -- kauchasai Rom.2:17, 23: 1 Cor.4:7.katakauchasai Rom.9:18.odunasai Lk.16:25.phagesai kai piesai su Lk.17:8.The Pastor of Hermas yields us epispasai, planasai, chrasai. Such forms are still used in Modern Greek.In theory -sai is the termination of every 2d person singular in the middle and passive voices, as in di-do-sai, le-lu-sai, so that pi-e-sai, is a perfectly regular formation. But in Attic Greek the s has dropped out wherever there is a connecting vowel, and then contraction has ensued. Thus piesai becomes first pieai, and finally pie. Confirmation of this theory is to be found in Homer, where there are many examples of the intermediate form, e.g. anaireai, deueseai, ercheai, eucheai, ideai, keleai, lexeai, lilaieai, maineai, nemeai, odureai, poleai. It is an interesting question whether piesai and phagesai are survivals in the popular speech of pre-Homeric forms, or rather revivals, as Jannaris and others think, on the analogy of the perfect middle and passive of all verbs and of the present middle and passive of -mi verbs.In kauchasai and the like, contraction has taken place in the vowels preceding the s (kauchaesai = kauchasai). apechenousai (3 K. [2 Kings} 14:6) looks like a barbarism for apexenosai.As against these fuller forms, we sometimes find contracted forms in the LXX, where the -sai is usual in Attic.dune for dunasai. Dan. O 5:16. So in N.T. Lk.16:2: Rev.2:2. In Eur. Hec.253 Porson substituted duna for dune, as being more Attic. dunasai itself occurs in Job 10:13, 35:6, 14, 42:2: Wisd.11:23: Dan. Th 2:26, 4:15, 5:16: Bel Th:24.episte for epistasai. Nb.20:14: Dt.22:2: Josh.14:6: Job 38:4: Jer.17:16: Ezk.37:4.18. Aorist in -a. a. Another inflexional form for the frequency of which the classical student will hardly be prepared is the aorist in -a in other than semivowel verbs. Attic Greek offers some rare instances of this formation, as eip-a, enenk-a, eche-a, and in Homer we have such stray forms as keantes (Od.4.231), aleasthai (Od.9.274), seua (Il.20.189). Nevertheless this is the type which has prevailed in the modern language. b. In Attic the aorist eipa occurs more frequently in the other moods than in the indicative (e.g. Plat. Soph.240 D eipaimen, Prot.353 A eipaton imperative, Phileb.60 D eipato, Meno 71 D eipon imperative).In the LXX this aorist is equally common in the indicative.eipa Dt.1:20: Ps.40:5.eipas Gen.44:23: Judith 16:14. Cp. Hom. Il.1 106, 108.eipamen Gen.42:31, 44:22, 26.eipate Gen.43.29, 44:28, 45:9.eipan Jdg.14:15, 18: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 10:14: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 17:20, 19:42: 4 K. [2 Kings] 1:6: Tob.7:5: Jer.49:2.eipon Gen.45:17: Dan. O' 2:7.eipato Dan. Th 2:7.eipate (imperative) Gen.50:7. Cp. Hom. Od.3.427.eipas Gen.46:2.c. While the classical aorist elthon is common in the

LXX, the form with -a also occurs, especially in the plural.elthamen Nb.13:28.elthate Gen.26:27, 42:12: Dt.1:20: Jdg.11:7.elthan Gen.47:18: Jdg.12:1: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 17:20, 24:7: 2 Chr.25:18: Dan. Q 2:2.elthato Esther 5:4, 8: Is.5:19: Jer.17:15.elthate Prov.9:5.eiselthatosan Ex.14:6.This aorist is common in Mss. of the N.T., but has not been admitted into the Revisers' text. Cp. Herm. Past. Vis.1.4.1 elthan, .3 apelthan: 1 Clem.38:3 eiselthamen.d. By the side of eidon we have an aorist in -a, especially in the 3d person plural, where its advantage is obvious. (See h below.)eidamen 1 K. [1 Sam.] 10:14.eidan Jdg.6:28, 16:24: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 6:19: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 10:14, 19.e. Similarly by the side of ei-lon we have parts formed as though from ei-la.katheilan Gen.44:11: 3 K. [2 Kings} 19:14.heilato Dt.26:18.aneilato Ex.2:5.apeilato 1 K. [1 Sam.] 30:18.dieilanto Josh.22:8.exeilamen 1 K. [1 Sam.] 10:18.exeilato Ex.18:4, 8: Josh.24:10: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 12:11, 17:37, 30:18.pareilato Nb.11:25.f. The aorist epesa occurs frequently in the 3d person plural, but is rare in other parts.epesa Dan. O 8:17. pesato Jer.44:20 (AS), 49:2 (AS).epesas 2 K. [2 Sam.] 3:34. pesate Hos.10:8.Among compounds we find apepesatosan, diepesan, enepesan, epepesan.So in N.T. -- epesa Rev.1:17.epesan Rev.5:14, 6:13, 11:16, 17:10: Hb.11:30.exepesate Gal.5:4.Cp. Polyb.3.19.5 antepesan.g. Other aorists of the same type are -apethanan Tob.3:9. elaban 2 K. [2 Sam.] 23:16.enkatelipan 2 Chr.29:6. ephagamen 2 K. [2 Sam.] 19:42.ebalan 3 K. [2 Kings} 6:3. ephugan Jdg.7:21.embalate Gen.44:1.h. The frequency of the 3d person plural in this form is no doubt due to a desire to differentiate the 3d person plural from the 1st person singular, which are confounded in the historic tenses ending in -on. It also secured uniformity of ending with the aorist in -sa. In 2 K. [2 Sam.] 10:14 we have this collocation -eidan . . . ephugan . . . eiselthan . . . anestrepsan.In Jdg.6:3 we find the anomalous form anebainan followed by sunanebainon.19. Augment. a. The augment with the pluperfect is at times omitted by Plato and the best Attic writers. Instances in the LXX are -bebrokei 1 K. [1 Sam.] 30:12. endedukei Lvt.16:23. dedokein 2 K. [2 Sam.] 18:11. epebebekei Nb.22:22. dedokei 3 K. [2 Kings} 10:13 pepokei 1 K. [1 Sam.] 30:12. endedukein Job 29:14.So in N.T. -- dedokei Mk.14:44. memenekeisan 1 Jn.2:19. dedokeisan Jn.11:57: cp. Mk.15:10. pepisteukeisan Acts 14:23. ekbeblekei Mk.16:9. pepoiekeisan Mk.15:7. kekrikei Acts 20:16.But in the LXX we occasionally find other historic tenses without the augment, e.g.2 Esd. [Ezra] 14:18 oikodomousan. This is especially the case with eidon.ides Lam.3:59. idon Gen.37:25, 40:5.

iden Gen.37:9, 40:6. proidon Gen.37:18.b. In Attic Greek, when a preposition had lost its force and was felt as part of the verb, the augment was placed before, instead of after, it, as ekatheudon, ekathizon, ekathemen.The same law holds in the Greek of the LXX, but is naturally extended to fresh cases, e.g. to pronomeuein, which in the Alexandrian dialect seems to have been the common word for to ravage.'epronomeusamen Dt.2:35, 3:7. enechurasan Job 24:3. epronomeusan Nb.31:9.c. The aorist enoixa is already found in Xenophon. In the LXX it is common, though by no means to the exclusion of the form with internal augment. Besides enoixa itself, which is conjugated throughout the singular and plural, we have also the following -- enoichthe Nb.16:32: Ps.105:17, 108:1. enoigon 1 Mac.11:2. enoichthesan Ezk.1:1. enoigeto 3 K. [2 Kings} 7:21. enoigmena Is.42:20.So also in N.T. -- enoixe Acts 12:14, 14:27: Rev.8:1. dienoigmenous Acts 7:56. dienoixe Acts 16:14. enoige Rev.11:19.Besides the Attic form with double internal augment, aneoxa, the LXX has also forms which augment the initial vowel of this, and so display a triple augment. -- eneoxe Gen.8:6: 3 Mac.6:18.eneochthesan Gen.7:11: Sir.43:14: Dan.7:10.eneogmenous 3 K. [2 Kings} 8:29: 2 Chr.6:20, 40, 7:15: Neh.1:6.eneogmena 3 K. [2 Kings} 8:52.So in N.T. -- eneogmenon Rev.10:8.d. In propheteuein the internal augment is

wrong, since the verb is formed on the noun prophetes. In the LXX proepheteusen occurs only in 1 K. [1 Sam.] 18:10 (A) and Sir.46:20. Nevertheless this is the form which has been everywhere preferred in the Revisers' text of the N.T. proepheteuon Acts 19:6.proepheteuse Mt.15:7: Mk.7:6: Lk.1:67: Jn.11:51: Jude 14.proepheteusamen Mt.7:22.proepheteusan Mt.11:18.e. Instances of double augment in the LXX are -- apekateste Ex.15:27.apekatestesen 1 Esd.1:33.enochlethen 1 K. [1 Sam.] 30:13. Cp. Dan.3:50: Dan. O' 6:18.20. Reduplication a. In verbs compounded with a preposition reduplication is sometimes applied to the preposition.kekataramenos Dt.21:23: Sir.3:16. Cp. Enoch 27:2.pepronomeumenos Is.42:2. Cp.19.b.b. In the form kekaterantai (Nb.22:6, 24:9. Cp. Enoch 27:1,2.) we have what may be called double reduplication.c. With rherimmenos (Jdg.4:22) and ekrerimmenen (Jdg.15:15) may be compared Homer's rherupomena (Od.6.59). rheriphthai [rheriphthai] is cited from Pindar by Choeroboscus.d. The reduplicated present ekdiduskein occurs in four passages -- 1 K. [1 Sam.] 31:8: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 23:10: Neh.4:23: Hos.7:1. It is used also by Josephus. Kichran, to lend,' occurs in three passages -- 1 K. [1 Sam.] 1:28: Prov.13:11: Ps.111:5. kichremi is used in this sense by Demosthenes.e. The verb krazein has a reduplicated weak aorist, ekekraxa, which is very common, especially in the Psalms; also a reduplicated strong aorist, though this is very rare.ekekragen Is.6:3. ekekragon Is.6:4.21. Attic Future. a. What is called the Attic future, i.e. the future out of which s has dropped, is more common in the LXX than in Attic Greek. Thus the future of elpizein, so far as it appears in Attic authors at all, is elpiso: but in the LXX it is always elpio. Among verbs in -izo which take this form of future are -- aichmalotizein engizein keratizein oionizein

aposkorakizein episterizein komizein sabbatizein

aphagnizein euangelizein melizein sullogizein

aphanizein katharizein merizein sunetizein

aphorizein kathizeinThere is no apparent reason for the contradiction in the future of verbs in -izein. The retention of s in the future of such verbs is quite exceptional, as in Eccl.11:4 therisei (mid.), Lvt.25:5 ektheriseis. Of the two versions of Daniel O has in 4:29 psomisousi, while Th has psomiousin. Meniein has a future in the LXX of the same sort as verbs in -izein.menio Jer.3:12. menieis Lvt.19:18.

meniei Ps.102:9.b. In Attic Greek there are a few instances of verbs in -azein dropping the s and contracting in the future. Thus bibazein, exetazein have the futures bibo, exeto in addition to the full forms. In the LXX the former of these sometimes retains the s in the future (Dt.6:7: Ps.31:8: Is.40:13: Wisd.6:3: Sir.13:11), the latter always: but the tendency which they exemplify is carried out in the case of other verbs in -azein. Hence we meet with the following futures -- harpa Lvt.19:13.harpomai Hos.5:14.ekdikatai Lvt.19:18: Dt.32:43: Judith 11:10.erga Gen.4:12, 29:27: Ex.20:9, 34:21: Lvt.25:40: Dt.5:13, 15:19: 2 K.[2 Sam.] 9:10.ergatai Lvt.25:40: Job 33:29.ergontai Is.5:10: Jer.37:8, 9, 22:13, 41:14: Ezk.48:19.katerga Dt.28:39.koima Dt.31:16.koimatai Job 8:17.c. Both in the LXX and in the N.T. semivowel verbs, i.e. those with l, r, m, n, have a contracted future, as in Attic, e.g. psalo, spereis, temeis, rhanei.d. In Attic Greek the future of cheo is still cheo and indistinguishable from the present. In the LXX the future is distinguished by being treated as a contracted tense. Thus we have -- ekcheo, echeeis, ekcheei,

ekcheeite, ekcheousi.The 1st person plural does not seem to occur.e. To the contracted futures the LXX adds the post-classical helo, from the same stem as ei-lon. This future occurs both in the active and the middle voices, e.g. aphelo (Nb.11:17), exeleisthe (Josh.2:13).So in N.T. -- anelei 2 Th.2:8.f. In Attic telein and kalein are in the future indistinguishable from the present. In the later Greek of the LXX this ambiguity is avoided by the retention of the full form of the future. Thus we have -- sunteleso, sunteleseis, suntelesei,

suntelesete, suntelesousin,andkaleso, kaleseis, kalesei,

kalesete, kalesousin.g. The future oleso, which is common in Homer but rare in Attic, does not occur in the LXX, which has only the contracted forms -- olei Prov.1:32. oiountai Prov.2:22, 13:2, 15:5, 16:33, 25:19. oleitai Job 8:13.h. On the other hand, elaseis in Ex.25:11 is the only instance of the future of elauno in the LXX.i. In Attic skedannumi has future skedo, but in the LXX it retains the s, e.g. diaskedaso Jdg.2:1.22. Retention of Short Vowel in the Future. As a rule in Greek a and e verbs lengthen the vowel in forming the future. Exceptions are spao and chalao among a verbs, and among e verbs aineo, kaleo, teleo. When the vowel is short in the future, it is also short in the 1st aorist.To the e verbs which have the vowel short in the future and 1st aorist we may add from the LXX ponein, phthonein, phorein.So in N.T. -- ephoresamen . . . . . phoresomen 1 Cor.15:49.Cp. Herm. Past. Sim.9.13.3, 15.6 ephoresan.23. Aorist of Semivowel Verbs. In Attic Greek semivowel verbs with a? in their stem lengthen the a? into e in forming the 1st aorist (as phan-, ephena), except after i or r, when they lengthen into a? (as mian-, emia?na, peran-, epera?na). See G. .672. In the LXX many such verbs lengthen into a? when the a? of the stem is preceded by a consonant. Hence we meet with such forms as eglukanas, ekkatharon, exekathara, epecharas, epiphanon, epoimanen, esemanen, semane, huphanai, huphanen, huphanes, psalate. In Amos 5:2 esphalen is ambiguous, as it might be 2d aorist.The form kathares is read in Dindorf's text of Xen. Ec.18.8, and in Hermann's text of Plato Laws 735 we have kathare in B followed by kathereien in D. The aorist esemana is found as early as Xenophon. Cp. Aristeas 16, 33. Ekerdana was always regarded as good Attic.Such forms are also to be found in the N.T., e.g. -- ebaskanen Gal.3:1. esemanen Rev.1:1.24. The Strong Tenses of the Passive. The Greek of the LXX displays a preference for the strong over the weak tenses of the passive, i.e. for the tenses which are formed directly from the verbal stem, namely, the 2d aorist and the 2d future. Thus engelen, which is not to be found in classical authors, except in a disputed reading of Eur. I.T.932, occurs frequently (in compounds) in the LXX, and the future passive, when employed, is the corresponding form in -esomai, e.g. Ps.21:81 anangelesetai, Ps.58:13 diangelesontai.So again from rhipto we find only the 2d aorist and 2d future passive, e.g. Ezk.19:12 erriphe, 2 K. [2 Sam.] 20:21 rhiphesetai.The following are other instances of the same formation: -brachesetai (Brecho) Is.34:3.graphesontai Ezk.13:9. Cp. Aristeas 32.diethrubesan Nahum 1:6.eklegenai Dan. O' 11:35.heligesetai Is.34:4.enephrage Ps.62:12.exaliphenai 1 Chr.29:4. Cp. Plat. Phaedr.258 B.epeskepesan 1 Chr.26:31.ekatastatesan Tobit 1:15.oruge Ps.93:18.perieplakesan Ps.118:61.sunephrugesan Ps.101:4.hupetagesan Ps.59:10.25. The Verbs peinan and dipsan. In Attic Greek these two verbs contract into e instead of a?. In the LXX they contract into a?, and peinao further forms its future and aorist in a? instead of e.ean peina . . . ean dipsa Prov.25:21. epeinas Dt.25:18. dipsa (ind.) Is.29:8.The parts of peinan which occur in the future and aorist are peinasei, peinasete, peinasousi, epeinasen, epeinasan, peinaso (subj.), peinasomen, peinasete.So also in N.T. -- peinan Phil.4:12.peina (ind.) 1 Cor.11:21.peina . . . . . dipsa (subj.)

Rom.12:20 (quoted from Prov.25:21).ean tis dipsa Jn.7:37.For the future and aorist of peinan in N.T. see Mt.12:1, 3, 25:35: Lk.4:2: Jn.6:35: Rev.7:16.26. The Perfect of hekein. Hekein in the LXX has a perfect heka, which occurs however only in the plural.hekamen Gen.47:4: Josh.9:12.hekate Gen.42:7, 9: Dt.12:9: 1 Chr.12:17.hekasi(n) 18 times.This form occurs once in the N.T. -- hekasi Mk.8:3.Cp.1 Clem.12:2 in a quotation from Josh.2:3.The aorist hexa, which is found in late authors, is not used in the LXX.Wherever the form heke occurs, it is either imperative, as in 2 K. [2 Sam.] 14:32, or imperfect, as in 2 Mac.4:31, 8:35, 14:4, 26.27. Presents formed from Perfects. a. From the perfect hesteka there was formed a new present steko, which occurs in two or three passages of the LXX.stekei Jdg.16:26. stekein 3 K. [2 Kings} 8:11. stekete (imper.) Ex.14:13 (A).So in N.T. -- stekei Rom.14:4.stekete (ind.) Phil.1:27.stekete (imper.) 1 Cor.16:13: Gal.5:1: Phil.4:1: 2 Thes.2:15.stekete 1 Th.3:8: Mk.11:25.b. Similar to this is the verb gregorein, formed from egregora. We may conjecture that the pluperfect egegorei came to be regarded as a contracted imperfect, and so gave rise to gregoro.egregoroun Jer.38:28.gregorein 1 Mac.12:27.gregorounton Neh.7:3.gregoreso Jer.38:28.egregorese(n) Jer.5:6: Bar.2:9: Dan. Th 9:14.egregorethe Lam.1:14.From this verb in its turn was formed a new verbal noun gregoresis Dan. Th 5:11, 14. Cp. also the proper name Gregorios.So in N.T. -- gregoromen 1 Th.5:6.gregoreite (imper.) 1 Cor.16:13: Mk.13:37.gregoresate 1 Pet.5:8.c. Of like origin is the aorist epepoithesa, which occurs in Job 31:24. From pepoithein again we have the noun pepoithesis 4 K. [2 Kings] 18:19.d. The tendency to form new presents from perfects is already exhibited in Homer. Thus we have anogei (Od.5.139 etc.) formed from anoga, and gegonein (Il.12.337) from gegona; also the imperfect ememekon (Od.9.439) from memeka.28. The Verb histanai and its Cognates. By the side of the forms in -mi there existed from Homer downwards alternative forms in -o. Some of these present themselves in the LXX. Thus we have the following parts of the transitive verb histao.histosin 1 Mac.8:1.histon 2 K. [2 Sam.] 22:34: Job 6:2: Ps.17:33: Sir.27:26: Is.44:26: 1 Mac.2:27.Among its compounds we may notice the following -kathiston Dt.17:15: Dan. O' 4:34. Cp. Aristeas 228.kathista. . . . . methista Dan. Th 2:21.methiston . . . . . kathiston Dan. O' 2:21.methistosi 1 Mac.8:13.methistan 3 Mac.6:24.So in N.T. -- histomen Rom.3:31. suniston 2 Cor.10:18.

apokathista Mk.9:12. sunistontes 2 Cor.4:2, 6:4.The form histanein, also transitive, occurs in Ezk.17:14. Cp. Aristeas 280, 281 kathistanein.So in N.T. -- methistanein 1 Cor.13:2. sunistanein 2 Cor.3:1. Cp.5:12, 10:12. Cp. Herm. Past. Vis.1.3.4 methistanei.Later Greek has a transitive perfect hestaka, which is implied by the rare, though classical, perfect passive hestamai (Plat. Tim.81 D). Thus in [Plato] Axiochus 370 D we find periestakas.hestakamen 1 Mac.11:34.aphestaka Jer.16:5.kathestaka Jer.1:10, 6:17.kathestakamen 1 Mac.10:20. Cp. Aristeas 37.So in N.T. -- exestakenai Acts 8:11.In Josh.10:19 there occurs the irregular perfect imperative hestekate with connecting vowel a instead of e. With this form may be compared pepoithate Ps.145:3: Is.50:10: Jer.9:4.29. The Verb tithenai and its Cognates. This verb does not offer much scope for remark. The imperfect is formed, so far as it occurs, from the alternative form titheo.etitheis Ps.49:18, 20. etithei Prov.8:28.This is in accordance with classical usage, which however has etithen in the 1st person. Etithe is read by A in Esther 4:4.The strong and weak aorists active seem to be about equally frequent. The only person of the latter that is missing is the 2d person plural. Ethekamen is found (2 Esd. [Ezra] 15:10: Is.28:15) and ethekan is common.The 2d person singular of the strong aorist middle is always ethou, as in Attic.In 1 Esd.4:30 we find epitithousan formed from the thematic titheo.30. The Verb didonai and its Cognates. The present tense runs thus -- didomi,

didos, didosi,

didoasin.In Ps.36:21 we find 3d person singular didoi from the cognate didoo. The imperfect runs thus -- edidoun, edidous, edidou,

edidoun or edidosan.Edidoun as 3d person plural occurs in 2 Chr.27:5: 3 Mac.3:30; edidosan in Judith 7:21: Jer.44:21: Ezk.23:42: 3 Mac.2:31.The imperative active didou is found in Tobit 4:16: Prov.9:9, 22:26. The 1st aorist is common in the singular and in the 3d person plural of the indicative, edokan.The 2d aorist subjunctive runs thus -- do, dos, do,

dote, dosi.Of the above forms only didoi, 3d person plural edidoun, and edokan are non-Attic.The optative of the 2d aorist has the stem vowel long -does Ps.84:7, 120:3.doe 29 times. In Job 6:8, 19:23: Sir.45:26 doie occurs as a variant. Cp. Aristeas 185 doe.So in N.T. -- doe 2 Th.3:16: Rom.15:5: Eph.1:17: 2 Tim.1:16, 18, 2:25.31. The Verb hienai and its Cognates. a. The simple verb hienai does not occur in the LXX. It has therefore to be studied in its compounds. The regular inflexion of the imperfect in Attic is supposed to be hien, hieis, hiei, though in Plat. Euthyd.293 A we have 1st person singular ephiein. Ephieis therefore (Sus. O' 53) may be considered classical.b. The following two passages will set before us the points that have to be noticed with regard to aphienai -- Ex.32:32 ei men apheis . . . aphes.1 Esd.4:7 eipen apheinai, aphiousin.In the former of these apheis must be from apheo, a cognate thematic form to aphiemi, but without the reduplication.In the latter we have a new formation which treats the reduplication as though it were itself the stem. Of this new verb we have the following parts -- aphio Eccl.2:18. aphiousi 1 Esd.4:50.

aphion Eccl.5:11.In the N.T. also we find apheis (Rev.2:20) and ephie(n) (Mk.1:34, 11:16)the imperfect of aphio. Cp. Herm. Past. Vis.3.7.1 aphiousin.The weak aorist occurs in the singular and in the 3d person plural aphekan, e.g. Jdg.1:34.c. A thematic verb suniein existed in classical Greek. Theognis 565 has the infinitive suniein: Plat. Soph.238 E uses xunieis. Of this verb we find the following parts in the LXX, if we may trust the accentuation -- suniein 3 K. [2 Kings} 3:9, 11. suniousin (dat. pl.) Prov.8:9. sunion 2 Chr.34:12.So also in N.T. -- ho sunion Rom.3:11. In Mt.13:23 the R.V. text has sunion.suniousi (3d pl.) Mt.13:13: 2 Cor.10:12.d. In addition to this we find a verb of new formation like aphio -sunieis Tob.3:8: Job 15:9, 36:4.suniei Prov.21:12, 29: Wisd.9:11.sunion Dan. Th 8:5, 23, 27 and passim.sunionton (gen. pl.) 2 Chr.30:22.In 2 Chr.26:5 suniontos and 2 Esd. [Ezra] 8:16 suniontas the accent seems to be misplaced.The new participle sunion has not entirely ousted the -mi form in the LXX. We have sunieis Ps.32:15: hoi sunientes Dan.12:3: sunientas Dan. Th 14: ton sunienton Dan.11:35.e. The 3d person plural of the 1st aorist hekan, which occurs in Xen. Anab.4.5.18, is used in the LXX in its compound aphekan.f. The verb suniein is to be met with also in the Apostolic Fathers -sunio Herm. Past. Mdt.4.2.1, 10.1.3.suniei 4.2.2.suniousin 10.1.6.sunie 6.2.3, 6: Sim.9.12.1.sunion Barn. Ep.12:10.g. The 2d person singular present middle proie in Job 7:19 is doubtless formed on the analogy of lue, but might be reached from proiesai by loss of s and contraction.32. The Imperatives anasta and aposta, etc. It is the by-forms in -o which account for these imperatives (anasta = anasta-e). Anasta in the LXX is used interchangeably with anastethi. Thus in Dan.7:5 O has anasta, while Th has anastethi. But the same writer even will go from on to the other. Thus in 3 K. [2 Kings} 19 we have anastethi in v.5 and anasta in v.7, and again in 3 K. [2 Kings} 20 anasta in v.15 and anastethi in v.18. So also Ps.43:24, 27 anastethi . . . anasta. Aposta occurs in Job 7:16, 14:6, 21:14. So in N.T., where we

find in addition the 3d person singular and the 2d person plural.anasta Acts.12:7: Eph.5:14. katabato Mt.27:42.

anaba Rev.4:1. anabate Rev.11:12.Cp. Herm Past. Mdt.6.2.6, 7 aposta . . . apostethi, Vis.2.8 antista.Similar forms are to be found even in the Attic drama and earlier.emba Eur. Elec.113: Ar. Ran.377.epiba Theognis 845.esba Eur. Phoen.193.kataba Ar. Ran.35, Vesp.979.proba Eur. Alc.872: Ar. Ach.262.33. Special Forms of Verbs.hairetizein denominative from hairetos.amphiazein 4 K. [2 Kings] 17:9: Job 29:14, 31:19 (in 40:5 amphiesai) = amphiennunai.apoktennein Ex.4:23: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 4:12: 4 K. [2 Kings] 17:25: Ps.77:34, 100:8: Wisd.16:14: Hab.1:17: Is.66:3: Dan. Th 2:13: 3 Mac.7:14.apotinnuein Gen.31:39: Ps.68:5: Sir.20:12.elean for eleein. Ps.36:26, 114:6: Prov.13:9, 14:21, 31, 21:26, 28:8: Sir.18:14: Tobit 13:2: 4 Mac.6:12, 9:3. So in N.T., Jude 22, 23. Cp.1 Clem.13:2: Barn. Ep.20:2.elousthes Ezk.16:4.heorakas 2 K. [2 Sam.] 18:11. Maintained by some to be the true Attic form.erregos for errogos. Job.32:19.esthein for esthien. Lvt.7:15, 11:34, 17:10, 19:8, 26: Sir.20:16. Old poetic form. Hom. Il.24.415: Od.9.479, 10.273.kathou for katheso. Gen.38:11: Jdg.17:10: Ruth 3:18: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 1:23, 22:5, 23: 4 K. [2 Kings] 2:2, 4, 6: Ps.109:1: Sir.9:7. Formed on the analogy of luou. Katheso itself occurs in 2 Chr.25:19. In Ezk.23:41 we have imperfect ekathou. So in N.T., Mt.22:44: Mk.12:36: Lk.20:42: Acts 2:34: Hb.1:13 (all quotations from Ps.109:1): James 2:3.maimassein Jer.4:19.oisthas Dt.9:2. Cp. Eur. Ion 999 (Dindorf).piazein for piezein. Song of Solomon 2:15: Sir.23:21. Piezein occurs only in Micah 6:15 in the original sense of to press.'rhassein Jer.23:39 and eight other passages.34. Adverbs. Hellenistic Greek supplied the missing adverb to agathos. Agathos occurs in Aristotle Rh.2.11.1. In the LXX it is found in 1 K. [1 Sam.] 20:7: 4 K. [2 Kings] 11:18: Tob.13:10.Among adverbs of time we may notice ek proithen and apo prooithen as peculiar to the LXX. For the former see 2 K. [2 Sam.] 2:27: 3 K. [2 Kings} 18:26: 1 Mac.10:80; for the latter Ex.18:13, 14: Ruth 2:7: Job 4:20: Sir.18:26: 1 Mac.9:13. Similar to these among adverbs of place is apo makrothen, Ps.138:2. Such expressions remind us of our own double form from whence,' which purists condemn.In the Greek of the LXX pouv is used for poi, just as we commonly say where' for whither.'Jdg.19:17 Pou proeue, kai pothen erche;Cp. Gen.37:31: Josh.2:5, 8:10: Jdg.19:17: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 10:14: Zech.2:2.Poi occurs only in a doubtful reading in Jer.2:28, and has there the sense of pou.Similarly hou is used for hoi, which is not found at all.Jer.51:35 hou ean badises ekei.Cp. Gen.40:3: Ex.21:13: 3 K. [2 Kings} 18:10: Ezk.12:16.So in N.T. -- pou = poi 1 Jn.2:11, 3:8, 8:14: Hb.11:8.hopou = hopoi James 3:4.hopoi does not occur in Biblical Greek.35. Homerisms. The Ionic infusion which is observable in the Greek of the LXX may possibly be due to the use of Homer as a schoolbook in Alexandria. This would be a vera causa in accounting for such stray Ionisms as kunomuies, machaire, epibebekuies, and the use of speires in the Papyri; possibly also for gaion, gaiais. Such forms also as epaoidos, esthein, etanusan (Sir.43:12), molibos, chalkeios, cheimarros, polemistes, have an Homeric ring about them.36. Movable Consonants. n ephelkustikon is freely employed before consonants, as in Gen.31:15, 41:55: Dt.19:1: Ruth 2:3: Jdg.16:11.To achri and mechri s is sometimes appended before a vowel and sometimes not.Jdg.11:33 achris Arnon. Josh.4:23 mechris hou.

Job 32:11 achri hou. 1 Esd.1:54 mechri hou.

2 Mac.14:15 achri aionos. Job 32:12 mechri humon.Anti?kru and anti?krus differ from one another by more than the s. The former does not occur at all in the LXX, the latter in Swete's text only

once, 3 Mac.5:16 antikrus anaklithenai autou.In the Revisers' text of the N.T. we find achri before a consonant in Gal.4:2; achris hou 1 Cor.11:26, 15:25: Gal.3:19, 4:19: Hb.3:13; mechris hou Mk.13:30; mechris haimatos Hb.12:4; antikru Chiou Acts 20:15.37. Spelling. In matters of spelling Dr. Swete's text appears to reflect variations in the Mss.a. The diphthong ei is often replaced by i, as in 1 Esd.1:11 chalkiois compared with 2 Chr.35:13 chalkeiois. This is especially the case with feminine nouns in -eia, asapolia, doulia, latria, plinthia, sungenia, hugia, pharmakia.Neuters plural in -eia also sometimes end in -ia with recession of accent, as -- angia Gen.42:25. poria Gen.45:17.In the pluperfect of histemi again we sometimes find i for ei -- histekei Jdg.16:29. ephistekei Nb.23:6,17.paristekei Gen.45:1.So also in the future and 1st aorist of leicho, as -- eklixei, eklixai, elixan, lixousin.On the other hand eideai for ideai (nom. pl. of idea) occurs in Dan. Th 1:13.b. n in composition is sometimes changed into m before a labial and sometimes not, as -- sumbibaso Ex.4:12. sunbibasato Jdg.13:8.Before a guttural or p, n is often retained, instead of being turned into g, as - enkathetai, enkrateis, enkrouses, enkruphias, enpoie, enchorio.But on the other hand -sunkrisis, sungenia.c. In the spelling of lambanein m appears in parts not formed from the present stem, as -- lempsomai, lepse, lempsesthe, elemphthe, katalempse.This may indicate that the syllable in which the m occurs was pronounced with b. In modern Greek mp stands for b, and we seem to find this usage as early as Hermas (Vis.3.1.4), who represents the Latin subsellium by sumpselion. Cp. Hambakoum for Habakkuk.d. The doubling of rh in the argument of verbs is often neglected, as -exeriphesan, eranen, erapizon, eripsen.e. The following also may be noticed -eraunan for ereunan Dt.13:14.mieros, mierophagia, mierophagein, mierophonia all in Maccabees only.tesserakonta Dt.9:9, 11: Josh.14:7.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE SENTENCE, 38-43

---

38. The Construction of the LXX not Greek. In treating of Accidence we have been concerned only with dialectical varieties within the Greek language, but in turning to syntax we come unavoidably upon what is not Greek. For the LXX is on the whole a literal translation, that is to say, it is only half a translation - the vocabulary has been changed, but seldom the construction. We have therefore to deal with a work of which the vocabulary is Greek and the syntax Hebrew.39. Absence of men and de. How little we are concerned with a piece of Greek diction is brought home to us by the fact that the balance of clauses by the particles men and de, so familiar a feature a Greek style, is rare in the LXX, except in the books of Wisdom and Maccabees. It does not occur once in all the books between Deuteronomy and Proverbs nor in Ecclesiastes, the Song, the bulk of the Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel; and in each of the following books it occurs once only -Leviticus (27:7), Numbers (22:33), Tobit (14:10), Haggai (1:4), Zechariah (1:15), Isaiah (6:2). Where the antithesis is employed, it is often not managed wiht propriety, e.g. in Job 32:6. As instances of the non-occurrence of one or both of the particles where their presence is obviously required we may take -Gen.27:22 E phone phone Iakob, hai de cheires cheires Esau.Jdg.16:29 kai ekratesen hena te dexia autou kai hena te aristera autou.2 K. [2 Sam.] 11:25 pote men houtos.3 K. [2 Kings} 18:6 mia . . . alle.40. Paratactical Construction of the LXX. Roughly speaking, it is true to say that in the Greek of the LXX there is no syntax, only parataxis. The whole is one great scheme of clauses connected by kai, and we have to trust to the sense to tell us which is to be so emphasized as to make it into the apodosis. It may therefore be laid down as a general rule that in the LXX the apodosis is introduced by kai. This is a recurrence to an earlier stage of language than that which Greek itself had reached long before the LXX was written, but we find occasional survivals of it in classical writers, e.g. Xen. Cyrop.1.4.28 kai hodon te oupo pollen dienusthai autois kai ton Medon hekein. Here it is convenient to translate kai when,' but the construction is really paratactical. So again Xen. Anab.4.2.12 Kai touton te pareleluthesan hoi Hellenes, kai heteron horosin emprosthen lophon katechomenon. Cp. Anab.1.8.8, 2.1.7, 4.6.2; also Verg. Æn.2.692 -Vix ea fatus erat senior, subitoque fragore intonuit laevom.In the above instances the two clauses are coordinate. But in the LXX, even when the former clause is introduced by a subordinative conjunction, kai still follows in the latter, e.g. -Gen.44:29 ean oun labete . . . kai kataxete ktl.Ex.13:14 ean de erotese . . . kai ereis ktl. Cp.7:9.Josh.4:1 kai epei sunetelesen pas ho laos diabainon ton Iordanen, kai eipen Kurios.Sometimes a preposition with a verbal noun takes the place of the protasis, e.g. -Ex.3:12 en to exagagein . . . kai latreusete.In Homer also kai is used in the apodosis after epei (Od.5.96), emos (Il.1.477: Od.10.188), or hote (Od.5.391, 401: 10.145, 157, 250).The difficulty which sometimes arises in the LXX in determining which is the apodosis amid a labyrinth of kai clauses, e.g. in Gen.4:14, 39:10, may be paralleled by the difficulty which sometimes presents itself in Homer with regard to a series of clauses introduced by de, e.g. Od.10.112, 113; 11.34-6.41. Introduction of the Sentence by a Verb of Being. Very often in imitation of Hebrew idiom the whole sentence is introduced by egeneto or estai.Gen.39:19 egeneto de hos ekousen . . . kai ethumothe orge. Cp. vs.5, 7, 13.3 K. [2 Kings} 18:12 kai estai ean ego apeltho apo sou, kai pneuma Kuriou arei se eis ten gen hen ouk oidas.In

such cases in accordance with western ideas of what a sentence ought to be, we say that kai introduces the apodosis, but it may be that, in its original conception at least, the whole construction was paratactical. It is easy to see this in a single instance like -Gen.41:8 egeneto de proi kai etarachthe he psuche autou,but the same explanation may be applied to more complex cases, e.g. -Nb.21:9 kai egeneto hotan edaknen ophis anthropon, kai epeblepsen epi ton ophin ton chalkoun, kai eze. And there was when a serpent bit a man, and he looked on the brazen serpent, and lived. Cp. Gen.42:35, 43:2, 21: Jdg.14:11.42. Apposition of Verbs. Sometimes the kai does not appear after egeneto, egenethe, or estai, thus presenting a construction which we may denote by the phrase Apposition of Verbs.Jdg.19:30 kai egeneto pas ho blepon elegen . . .1 K. [1 Sam.] 31:8 kai egenethe te epaurion, erchontai hoi allophuloi.Gen.44:31 kai estai en to idein auton me on to paidarion meth' hemon, teleutesei.In two versions of the same Hebrew we find one translator using the kai and the other not.4 K. [2 Kings] 19:1 kai egeneto hos ekousen basileus Hezekias, kai dierrexen ta himatia heautou.Is.37:1 kai egeneto en to akousai ton basilea Hezekian, eschisen ta himatia.43. De in the Apodosis. The use of de to mark the apodosis, which is found occasionally in classical authors from Homer downwards, is rare in the LXX. Josh.2:8 kai egeneto hos exelthosan . . . haute de anebe.

THE ARTICLE, 44, 45

44. Generic Use of the Article. This is due to following the Hebrew. 1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:34 ho leon kai he arkos = a lion or a bear,' 17:36 kai ten arkon etupten ho doulos sou kai ton leonta. Amos 5:19 hon tropon ean phuge anthropos ek prosopou tou leontos, kai empese auto he arkos. Is.7:14 idou he parthenos en gastri lempsetai. 45. Elliptical Use of the Feminine Article. The use of the feminine article with some case of chora or ge understood is not due to the influence of the Hebrew. he hup' ouranon Job 18:4. ten hup' ouranon Job 1:7, 2:2, 5:10, 9:6, 28:24, 34:13, 38:24. tes hupo ton ouranon Ex.17:4: Prov.8:28: 2 Mac.2:18. tes hup' ouranon Job 38:18. te hup' ouranon Esther 4:17: Baruch 5:3. So in N.T. -- Lk.17:24 he astrape astraptousa ek tes hupo ton ouranon eis ten hup' ouranon lampei.

GENDER, 46, 47

46. Elliptical Use of the Feminine Adjective. There is nothing about the feminine gender which should make ellipse more frequent with it than with the masculine or neuter. Only it happens that some of the words which can be most easily supplied are feminine. This elliptical use of the feminine adjective (or of adv. = adj.) is a feature of Greek generally. It is not very common in the LXX. Instances are - ep' eutheias (hodou) Josh.8:14. en te eutheia Ps.142:10. tes plateias Esther 4:1. ten sumpasan (gen) Job 2:2, 25:2. heos tes semeron (hemeras) 2 Chr.35:25. ten aurion 3 Mac.5:38. eboesen megale (te phone) 4 K. [2 Kings] 18:28. eis ten hupselen (choran) 2 Chr.1:3. In the N.T. this idiom occurs much more frequently. Take for instance Lk.12:47, 48 daresetai pollas . . . oligas (plegas). Cp. also - ten pros thanaton (hodon) Eus. H.E.2.23.ouk eis makran Philo Leg. ad C.4.ep' eutheias Philo Q.O.P.L.1.epi xenes (choras or ges) Philo Leg. ad C.3.pedias te kai oreine ibid.7.te patrio (glosse) Jos. B.J. Prooem.1.tas perioikous (poleis) ibid.8.47. Feminine for Neuter. The use of the feminine for the neuter is a pure Hebraism, which occurs principally in the Psalms.Jdg.15:7 ean poiesete houtos tauten, 21:3 eis ti . . . egenethe haute;1 K. [1 Sam.] 4:7 ou gegonen toiaute exthes kai trite. Ps.26:3 en taute ego elpizo, 26:4 mian etesamen . . . tauten ekzeteso, 31:6 huper tautes proseuxetai pas hosios, 117:23 para Kuriou egeneto haute, 118:50 haute me parekalesen, 118:56 haute egenethe moi.In the N.T. this license only occurs in Mk.12:11, Mt.21:42 in a quotation from Ps.117:23.

NUMBER, 48, 49

48. Singular for Plural. Sometimes in imitation of Hebrew idiom we find the singular used in the sense of the plural. When the article is employed along with a singular noun, we have the Generi Use of the Article (44), but the presence of the article is not necessary. Ex.8:6 anebibasthe ho batrachos (= frogs), 8:18 exagagein ton sknipha, 10:13 kai ho anemos ho notos anelaben ten akrida, 10:14 ou gegonen toiaute akris. Jdg.7:12 hosei akris eis plethos (cp. Judith 2:20 hos akris), 21:16 ephanisthe apo Beniamein gune. 4 K. [2 Kings] 2:12 harma Israel kai hippeus autou. Ezk.47:9 estai ekei ichthus polus sphodra. This throws light on an otherwise startling piece of grammar - Jdg.15:10 eipan aner Iouda. 49. Singular Verb with more than One Subject. In accordance with Hebrew idiom a singular verb often introduces a plurality of subjects, e.g.- 4 K. [2 Kings] 18:26 kai eipen Eliakeim . . . kai Somnas kai Ioas, 18:37 kai eiselthen Eliakeim ktl. This may happen also in Greek apart from Hebrew. Xen. Anab.2.4.16 Epempse meAriaios kaiArtaozos.

CASE, 50-61

50. Nominative for Vocative. a. The use of the nominative for the vocative was a colloquialism in classical Greek. It occurs in Plato, and is common in Aristophanes and Lucian. When so employed, the nominative usually has the article. As in Hebrew the vocative is regularly expressed by the nominative with the article, it is not surprising that the LXX translators should often avail themselves of this turn of speech. 3 K. [2 Kings} 17:18 ti emoi kai soi, ho anthropos tou Theou; 18:26 epakouson hemon, ho Baal. Cp.3 K. [2 Kings} 20:20: Ps.21:1, 42:2. For an instance of the nominative without the article standing for the vocative take - Baruch 4:5 tharseite, laos mou. The nominative, when thus employed, is often put in apposition with a vocative, as - 3 K. [2 Kings} 17:20 Kurie, ho martus tes cheras, 17:21 Kurie, ho Theos mou. b. In the N.T. also the nominative with the article is often put for the vocative. Mt.11:26 nai, ho pater. Lk.8:54 he pais, egeirou. Mk.9:25 to pneuma to alalon . . . exelthe. Lk.6:25 ouai humin, hoi empeplesmenoi nun. Col.3:18 hai gunaikes, hupotassesthe. Eph.6:1, Col.3:20 ta tekna, hupakouete. The use of the nominative without the article for the vocative is rare in the N.T., as it is also in the LXX. In Lk.12:20 and 1 Cor.15:36 we find aphron put for aphron, and in Acts 7:42 oikos Israel does duty as vocative. As instances of apposition of nominative with vocative we may take -- Rom.2:1 o anthrope pas ho krinon. Rev.15:3 Kure ho Theos, ho pantokrator In Rev.18:20 we have vocative and nominative conjoined -- ourane, kai hoi hagioi.51. Nominative Absolute. Occasionally we get a construction in the LXX, which can be described only by this name.Nb.22:24 kai este ho angelos tou Theou en tais aulaxin ton ampelon, phragmos enteuthen kai phragmos enteuthen.Nb.24:4 hostis horasin theou eiden, en hupno, apokekalummenoi hoi ophthalmoi autou.As this construction arises out of a literal following of the Hebrew, it would be superfluous to adduce Greek parallels. Like effects might be found, but the cause would be different.52. Nominative of Reference. What is meant by this term will be best understood from the examples -Job 28:7 tribos, ouk egno auten peteinon.Ps.102:15 anthropos, hosei chortos hai hemerai autou.To throw out the subject of discourse first, and then proceed to speak about it, is a Hebraism, but at the same time it is a common resource of language generally.So in N.T. -- Acts.7:40 ho gar Moses houtos . . . ouk oidamen ti egeneto auto.Rev.3:12 ho nikon, poieso auton stulon en to nao tou Theou mou.53. Nominativus Pendens. The nominative which is left without a verb owing to a sudden change of construction is a familiar feature in classical Greek, especially if this be at all colloquial. It is not however very common in the LXX.Dan. O 7:15 kai akediasas ego . . . etarasson me.Such cases can generally be explained on the principle of construction according to the sense.It is seldom that we meet with so violent an anacoluthon as the following in the N.T. -- Mk.9:20 kai idon auton, to pneuma euthus sunesparaxen auton.54. Accusative for Vocative. The accusative for vocative might seem an impossibility, yet here is an instance of it.Ps.51:6 egapesas panta ta rhemata katapontismou, glossan dolian.55. Accusative of Time When. In connexion with classical Greek we think of Time When as being expressed by the genitive or dative, rather than by the accusative, though the latter also is used. The employment of the accusative became more frequent after the classical period, and alone survives in the modern language.Gen.43:16 met' emou gar phagontai hoi anthropoi artous ten mesembrian.Ex.9:18 idou ego huo tauten ten horan aurion chalazan.Dan.

Th 9:21 hosei horan thusias hesperines (O has en hora).So also sometimes in N.T. -- Jn.4:52 chthes horan hebdomen apheken auton ho puretos.Rev.3:3 kai ou me gnos poian horan hexo epi se.56. Cognate Accusative. a. By a Cognate Accusative is here meant that particular form of the Figura Etymologica in which a verb is followed by an accusative of kindred derivation with itself, irrespective of the question whether it be an accusative of the external or of the internal object. We have both kinds of accusative together in the following verse, where theran = venison.Gen.27:3 exeste de Isaak ekstasin megalen sphodra kai eipen "Tis oun ho thereusas moi theran;"b. The great frequency of the cognate accusative in the LXX is due to the fact that here the genius of the Hebrew and of the Greek language coincides. Besides being a legitimate Greek usage, this construction is also one of the means employed for translating a constantly recurring Hebrew formula. Sometimes the appended accusative merely supplies an object to the verb, as in such phrases as danion daneizein, diathesthai diatheken, diegeisthai diegea, enupnion enupniazesthai, epithumein epithumian, thuein thusian, nesteuein nesteian, horismon horizesthai, plemmelein plemmelesin or plemmelin, prophasizesthai prophaseis.At other times it is accompanied by some specification, as -Nb.18:6 leitourgein tas leitourgias tes skenes tou marturiou.Dan.11:2 ploutesei plouton megan.1 Mac.2:58 en to zelosai zelon nomou.c. Sometimes the cognate accusative is conveyed in a relative clause, as -Ex.3:9 ton thlimmon hon hoi Aiguptioi thlibousin autous.Nb.1:44 he episkepsis hen epeskepsanto.1 K. [1 Sam.] 2:23 he akoe hen ego akouo.d. By other changes of construction we have still the figura etymologica, but no longer a cognate accusative. Thus, starting from the common phrase dounai doma, we have dedomenoi doma (Nb.3:9) and doma dedomenon (Nb.18:6).e. In one instance the cognate accusative is reinforced by a still further application of the etymological figure -Gen.47:22 en dosei gar edoken doma tois hiereusin.This is not due to the Hebrew.f. In a wider sense the term cognate accusative' includes an accusative of kindred meaning, though not of kindred derivation, as -Jdg.15:8 epataxen . . . plegen megalen.g. Instances of cognate accusative are common enough in the N.T., e.g. -1 Jn.5:16 hamartanonta hamartian me pros thanaton.Mt.2:10 echaresan charan megalen sphodra.Jn.7:24 ten dikaian krisin krinate.There also it occurs sometimes in a relative clause -Mk.10:38 to baptisma ho ego baptizomai.Jn.17:26 he agape hen egapekas me.Eph.4:1 tes kleseos hes eklethete.h. We have a triple use of the etymological figure in -Lk.8:5 exelthen ho speiron tou speirai ton sporon autou.i. That the playing with paronymous terms is in accordance with the spirit of the Greek language may be seen from the frequent employment of the device by Plato, e.g. - Prot.326 D hosper hoi grammatistai tois mepo deinois graphein ton paidon upograpsantes grammas te graphidi houto to grammateion didoasi.Hip. Maj.296 C Alla mentoi dunamei ge dunantai hoi dunamenoi; ou gar pou adunamia ge.57. Accusative in Apposition to Indeclinable Noun. In the LXX an indeclinable noun is sometimes followed by an accusative in apposition to it, even though by the rules of grammar it is itself in some other case, e.g.-Is.37:38 en to oiko Nasarach ton patrarchon autou.4 K. [2 Kings] 1:2 en to Baal muian theonAkkaron.Perhaps it would be more satisfactory if this and § 54 were thrown together under a head of Bad Grammar, a category which the reader might be inclined to enlarge.58. Genitive Absolute. Strictly speaking, a Genitive Absolute is a clause in the genitive which does not affect the general construction. It ought not therefore to refer either to the subject or the object of the sentence. Even in classical authors however the so-called genitive absolute is sometimes not employed with the precision which grammarians might desire, e.g. -Plat. Rep.547 B biazomenon de kai antiteinonton allelois . . . homologesan.Xen. Cyrop.1.4.2 kai gar asthenesantos autou oudepote apeleipe ton pappon.Xen. Anab.1.2.17 thasson proionton . . .

dromos egeneto tois stratiotais.The genitive absolute is often employed in the same loose way in the LXX.Tob.4:1 hote emen en te chora mou . . . neoteruo mou ontos.Dt.15:10 ou lupethese te kardia sou didontos sou auto.Ex.2:10 hadrunthentos de tou paidiou, eisegagen auto.Ex.5:20 sunentesan de . . . erchomenois . . . ekporeuomenon auton.So in N.T. -- Mt.1:18 mnesteutheises tes metoos . . . eurethe.Acts.21:17 genomenon de hemon eis Hierosoluma asmenos apedexanto hemas hoi adelphoi.2 Cor.4:18 katergazetai hemin, me skopounton hemon.59. The Genitive Infinitive of Purpose. The genitive of the verbal noun formed by prefixing the article to the infinitive, which we may call for convenience the Genitive Infinitive, is one of the regular ways of expressing purpose in Biblical Greek, corresponding to our use of to.' The construction is not entirely unknown to classical authors (e.g. Plat. Gorg.457 E tou kataphanes genesthai) and is especially favoured by Thucydides. There is nothing in the Hebrew to suggest it. The following will serve as examples -Jdg.16:5 kai desomen auton tou tapeinosai auton.Ps.9:30 enedreuei tou harpasai ptochon.Job 1:19 elthon tou apangeilai soi.So also frequently in N.T., e.g. -Mt.13:3 exelthen ho speiron tou speirein.James 5:17 proseuxato tou me brexai.60. Other Uses of the Genitive Infinitive. a. The genitive infinitive of purpose is only one use out of many to which this syntactical device is applied. Take for instance -Ex.14:5 Ti touto epoiesamen tou exaposteilai tous huious Israel tou me douleuein hemin (= hoste me douleuein);Purpose is not expressed in either of these cases. In the former we have what may be called the Explanatory Use of the Genitive Infinitive; in the latter we have something which represents from serving us' in the orginal, but which we shall nevertheless class as a Genitive Infinitive of Consequence, since it is only thus that the Greek can be explained.b. The Explanatory Use of the Genitive Infinitive is common in the LXX, e.g. -Gen.3:22 Adam gegonen hos eis ex hemon, tou gignoskein kalon kai poneron.Ex.8:29 me prosthes eti, Pharao, exapatesai tou me exaposteilai ton laon.Ps.26:4 tauten (§ 47) ekzeteso; tou katoikein me ktl.So in N.T. -- Acts 7:19 ekakose tous pateras hemon, tou poiein ektheta ta brephe auton.Gal.3:10 ho ouk emmenei en pasi tois gegrammenois . . . tou poiesai auta.c. As an instance of the Genitive Infinitive of Consequence we may take -Ex.7:14 bebaretai he kardia Pharao tou me exaposteilai ton laon.So in N.T. -- Hb.11:5 Enoch metetethe tou me idein thanaton.d. What is called in Latin Grammar the prolative infinitive' after extensible' verbs, or more simply, the latter of two verbs, is also commonly expressed in the LXX by the genitive infinitive, e.g. -Ps.39:13 ouk edunasthen tou blepein.2 Chr.3:1 erxato tou oikodomein.Gen.18:7 etachunen tou poiesai auto.So in N.T. -- Acts 3:12 hos . . . pepoiekosi tou peripatein auton, 15:20 episteilai . . . tou apechesthai, 27:1 ekrithe tou apoplein.61. Cognate Dative. a. Another form of the figura etymologica which abounds in the LXX may be called Cognate Dative. As in the case of the cognate accusative its frequency is in great measure due to the coincidence of idiom in this particular between Greek and Hebrew. Let us first show by a few examples from Plato that this construction is in accordance with the genius of the Greek language.Crat.385 B logo legein. Phdr.265 C paidia pepaisthai. Symp.195 B pheugon phuge? to geras. Crat.383 A phusei . . . pephukuian. Cp.389 C, D. Phileb.14 C phusei . . . . pephukota.b. But while we have to search for this idiom in classical Greek, it thrusts itself upon us at every turn in the Greek of the LXX, owing to its aptness for rendering a mode of expression familiar in the original. c. Corresponding to the cognate dative in Greek, we find in Latin also a cognate ablative as a rare phenomenon, e.g. -curriculo percurre Ter. Heaut.733. Cp. Plaut. Most.349qui non curro curriculo domum.occidione occisum Cic. Fam.15.4.7. Cp. Liv.2.51.9.d. The instances of cognate dative of most frequent occurrence in the LXX are akoe akouein, zoe zen, thanato apothanei, thanato thanatousthai, salpingi salpizein. But besides these there are many

others, as -agapesei agapasthai kakia kakopoieinalalagmo alalazein kakia kakounaloiphe exaleiphein katarais katarasthaiapolia apollunai klauthmo klaieinaphanismo aphanizein lethe latheinbdelugmati bdelussein lithois lithoboleindesmo dein lutrois lutroundialusei dialuein mneia mnesthenaidiamarturia diamarturein oionismo oionizesthaidiaphtheirein phthora orgizesthai orgedike ekdikein horko horkizeinekballein ekbole paradosei paradothenaiekthlibein ekthlibe peripiptein periptomatiekleipsei ekleipein plemmelia plemmeleinektribe ektribenai pronome pronomeuthenaietripsei ektribenai prosochthismati prosochthizeinexepaunan exeraunesei ptosei pipteinexoudenosei exoudenoun talaiporia taleiporeinepithumia epithumein tarache tarasseinepiskope episkeptesthai huperorasei huperideinthelesei thelein pherne phernizeinkathairesei kathairein phthora phtharenaikatharismo katharizein chairein charae. From the foregoing instances it is an easy step to others in which the substantive is of kindred meaning, though not of kindred derivation with the verb.Gen.1:16 brosei phage, 31:15 katephagen katabrosei.Ex.19:12, 21:16, 17 thanato teleutan.Ex.22:20 thanato olethreuthesetai.Nb.11:15 apokteinon me anairesei, 35:26 exodo exelthe.Ezk.33:27 thanato apokteno.f. Instances of the cognate dative are to be found also in the N.T., though not with anything like the frequency with which they occur in the LXX.Jn.3:29 chara chairei. Lk.22:15 epithumia epethumesa. Acts 4:17 apeile (margin) apeilesometha, 5:28 parangelia parengeilamen, 23:14 anathemati anathematisamen. James 5:17 proseuche proseuxato. Gal.5:1 te eleutheria hemas Christos eleutherose.g. The expression in 2 Pet.3:3 en empaigmone empaiktai, while not exactly parallel with the foregoing, belongs to the same range of idiom; so also Rev.2:23 apokteno en thanato.

ADJECTIVES, 62-65

---

62. hemisus. In Attic Greek hemisus, like some other adjectives, mostly of quantity, has a peculiar construction. It governs a noun in the genitive, but agrees with it in gender. Thus - Plat. Phædo 104 A ho hemisus tou arithmou hapas. Thuc.5.31.2 epi te hemiseia tes ges. Demosth. p.44, 4.16 tois hemisesi ton hippeon. This idiom is kept up by Hellenistic writers, such as Philo, Strabo, and the translator of Josephus' Jewish War. It is however very rare in the LXX, occuring only in the following passages - 3 K. [2 Kings} 16:9 ho archon tes hemisous (§ 11) tes hippou. Josh.4:12, 1 Chr.5:23 hoi hemiseis phules Manasse. Tob.10:10 ta hemisu (sic) ton huparchonton. Ezk.16:51 tas hemiseis ton hamartion.1 Mac.3:34, 37 tas hemiseis ton dunameon. Elsewhere instead of the Attic idiom we find to hemisu or hemisu, irrespective of the gender and number of the noun which follows, e.g. - to hemisu tou siklou Ex.39:2 hemisu archonton 2 Esd. [Ezra] 4:16. to hemisu autes Lvt.6:20. en hemisei hemeron Ps.101:25 to hemisu tou haimatos Ex.24:6. to hemisu ton huparchonton Tob.8:21. 63. pas. a. In classical Greek the rule for pas in the singular is that with the article it is collective, without the article it is distributive - pasa he polis = all the city. pasa polis = every city. pas differs from ordinary adjectives in taking the predicative position in an attributive sense. Thus while agathe he polis means the city is good,' pasa he polis means all the city.' pas may however take the attributive position, like any other adjective. When it does so, the collective force is intensified -pasa he polis = all the city.he pasa polis = the whole city.Thus Plato's expression (Apol.40 E) ho pas chronos is rendered by Cicero (T.D.1.97) perpetuitas omnis consequentis temporis. For other instances of this use in classical authors we may take -Hdt.7.46 ho pas anthropinos bios. Plat. Rep.618 B ho pas kindunos, Phileb.67 B hoi pantes boes = all the oxen in the world.Xen. Anab.5.6.5 hoi pantes anthropoi.In such cases there is an additional stress gained by the unusual position assigned to pas.b. In the LXX the same distinction seems to be maintained. It is true a writer will go from one to the other, e.g. -Jdg.16:17,18 kai anengeilan aute ten pasan kardian autou . . . kai eiden Daleida hoti apengeilen aute pasan ten kardian autou -but so in English we might first say he told her his whole heart, and then add and she saw that he had told her all his heart.Other instances of the strongly collective force of pas in the attributive position are -Gen.45:20 ta gar panta agatha Aiguptou humin estai.Josh.4:14 enantion tou pantos genous Israel.Wisd.7:9 ho pas chrusos.2 Mac.8:9 to pan tes Ioudaias . . . genos.Still there is a tendency in the LXX to assimilate pas to adjectives generally and to employ it in the attributive position without any special emphasis.c. Neither is the rule that pas without the article is distributive at all closely adhered to, e.g. -Ex.8:16 en pase ge Aiguptou, 16:6 pros pasan sunagogen huio Israel.1 K. [1 Sam.] 7:2 pas oikos Israel.d. In the plural hoi pantes is rare, but may be found -Jdg.20:46 hoi pantes houtoi.1 Mac.2:37 Apothanomen hoi pantes en te haploteti hemon.2 Mac.12:40 tois de pasi saphes egeneto. Cp. Aristeas § 36 tois pasi . . . politais.Hai pasai is still rarer, but see -3 Mac.1:1 parangeilas tais pasais dunamesin.Ta panta is comparatively common, occuring, e.g., in Gen.1:31, 9:3: Ex.29:24: Lvt.19:13: 2 Mac.10:23, 12:22: 3 Mac.2:3.e. In the N.T. the collective use of pas followed by the article is clearly marked in many passages, e.g. -Gal.5:14 ho . . . pas nomos. Mt.8;34 pasa he polis exelthen.Also the distributive use of pas without the article, as in 1 Cor.11:4,5 pas aner . . . pasa de gune. In Rom.3:19 we have the two usages brought into contrast

-hina pan stoma phrage, kai hupodikos genetai pas ho kosmos to Theo.On the other hand there are also instances of pas in the singular and without the article being used collectively, e.g. -Eph.2;21 pasa oikodome.Mt.2:3 pasa Hierosoluma.Acts 2:36 pas oikos Israel.f. In the plural hoi pantes is more common in St. Paul than in the LXX. Take for instance -Phil.2:21 hoi pantes gar ta heauton zetousi. Cp.2 Cor.5:14.1 Cor.10:17 hoi gar pantes ek tou henos artou metechomen. Cp. Eph.4:13. Rom.11:32 sunekleise gar ho Theos tous pantas eis apeitheian.2 Cor.5:10 tous gar pantas hemas ktl.1 Cor.9:22 tois pasi gegona panta.hoi pantes andres.Ta panta occurs in Rom.8:32, 11:36: 1 Cor.15:27, 12:6, 19: Eph.5:13: Acts 17:25: Mk.4:11 and perhaps in other passages.64. Comparison of Adjectives. Owing to the peculiarity of Hebrew syntax the treatment of this subject mostly falls under the head of Prepositions. We need only notice here that the positive may be put for the comparative.Gen.49:12 leukoi hoi odontes autou e gala.Dt.7:17 polu to ethnos touto e ego, 9;1 ethne megala kai ischurotera mallon e humeis.So in N.T. -- Mt.18:8,9 kalon soi estin eiselthein . . . e . . . blethenai. Cp. Mk.9:43, 45.65. Omission of mallon. The comparison of attributes may be effected by the use of verbs as well as of adjectives. In such cases the omission of mallon is common in the LXX.Nb.22:6 ischuei houtos e hemeis, 24:7 hupsothesetai e Gog basileia.Hos.7:6 eleos thelo e thusian.2 Mac.7:2 hetoimoi gar apothneskein esmen e patroous nomous parabainein.Cp. Aristeas § 322 terpein gar oiomai se tauta e ta ton muthologon biblia.

PRONOUNS, 66-71

66. Superfluous Use of Pronoun. A pronoun is sometimes employed superfluously after the object, direct or indirect, has been already expressed, e.g. -- Ex.12:44 kai pan (sich) oiketen e arguroneton peritemeis auton. Nb.26:37 kai to Salpaad huio Opher ouk egenonto auto huioi. The above may be considered as deflexions of the Nominative of Reference (§ 52) into an oblique case by Attraction. So in N.T. -- 2 Cor.12:17 me tina o -- n apestalka pros humas, di' autou epleonektesa humas; Mt.25:29 tou de me echontos, kai ho echei arthesetai ap' autou. Rev.2:7, 17 to nikonti doso auto. Cp.6:4. In Josh.24:22 - humeis exelexasthe Kurio latreuein auto - Kurio should be ton Kurion (which A has). Then latreuein auto would be an explanatory clause added after the usual manner. 67. Frequent Use of Pronouns. Apart from any Semitic influence there is also a tendency in later Greek to a much more lavish use of pronouns than was thought necessary by classical authors. We have seen already (§ 13) that the missing pronoun of the 3d person was supplied. The possessive use of the article moreover was no longer thought sufficient, and a possessive genitive was added, e.g. -Gen.38:27 kai tede en diduma en te koilia autes.So in N.T. -- Mt.19:9 hos an apoluse ten gunaika autou.1 Pet.2:24 autos anenenken en to somati autou.68. Adelphos as a Reciprocal Pronoun. The use of adelphos as a reciprocal pronoun is a sheer Hebraism, e.g. -Ex.10:23 kai ouk eiden oudeis ton adelphon autou = they saw not one another.69. Hebrew Syntax of the Relative. a. One of the most salient characteristics of LXX Greek is the repetition of the pronoun after the relative, as though in English, instead of saying the land which they possessed,' we were to say habitually the land which they possessed it,' and so in all similar cases. This anomaly is due to the literal following of the Hebrew text. Now in Hebrew the relative is indeclinable. Its meaning therefore is not complete until a pronoun has been added to determine it. But the relative in Greek being declinable, the translator was forced to assign to it gender, number, and case, which rendered the addition of the pronoun after it unnecessary. Nevertheless the pronoun was retained out of regard for the sacred text. As instances of the simplest kind we may take the following -Nb.35:25 hon echrisan auton, 13:33 tes ges hen kateskepsanto auten.Is.62:2 ho o kurios onomasei auto.Gen.1:11 hou to sperma autou en auto.Dt.4:7 ho estin auto.Ps.18:4 hon ouchi akouontai hai phonai auton.Ex.6:26 hois eipen autois.b. Where the relative is followed by ean the same construction is employed, e.g. -Nb.17:5 ho anthropos o§n ean eklexomai auton, 19:22 pantos hou ean hapsetai autou ho akathartos.c. Sometimes a demonstrative takes the place of the personal pronoun -Gen.3:11 hou eneteilamen soi toutou monou me phagein.d. In all the foregoing instances the appended pronoun is in the same case as the relative, but this is not necessary.Nb.3:3 ohu eteleiosen tas cheiras auton hierateuein.The construction here, though determined by the Hebrew, happens to agree with the Greek Accusative of the Part Affected.e. Very often there is the same preposition both before the relative and before the appended pronoun -Ex.34:12 eis e§n eisporeue eis auten.Nb.11:21 en hois eimi en autois.Gen.28:13 he ge eph' hes su katheudeis ep' autes.f. Occasionally the preposition is the same, but the case it governs is different, e.g. -Jdg.16:26 eph' hois ho oikos stekei ep' autous.Josh.24:13 gen eph' hen ouk ekopiasate ep' autes.g. Sometimes the preposition is confined to the appended pronoun. Then the problem arises, Into what case is the relative to be put? -a problem which is solved differently in

different passages. In some the case chosen coincides with that of the pronoun following, e.g. -Gen.24:42 ten hodon mou, e§n nun ego poreuomai ep' auten.Ex.25:28 tous kuathous, hois speiseis en autois.Gen.21:23 te ge he su parokesas en aute.In others it does not -Nb.14:31 ten gen e§n humeis apestete ap' autes, 19:2 he ouk epeblethe ep' auten zugos.3 K. [2 Kings} 17:1 ho paresten enopion autou.h. Sometimes the relative has a different preposition from the pronoun following -Nb.13:20 tis he ge eis hen houtoi enkathentai ep' autes . . . tines hai poleis eis ha houtoi katoikousin en autais.For other instances see Ex.6:4: Nb.15:39: Dt.1:22, 1:33, 28:49.i. Sometimes the preposition is the same, but instead of a mere pronoun we have a phrase, e.g. -Gen.24:38 en hois ego paroiko en te ge auton.j. The construction of which we have been speaking is not confined to the simple relative, e.g. -Gen.41:19 hoias ouk eidon toiautas.Ex.9:18, 11:6 hetis toiaute ou gegonen.k. The habitual repetition of the pronoun in the LXX is a mere Hebraism, though a search among Greek writers might reveal traces of a somewhat similar usage arising independently. Here are a few instances -Plat. Tim.28 A hotou men oun an ho demiourgos . . . ten idean kai dunamin autou apergazetai, Parm.130 E hon tade ta alla metalambanonta tas eponumias auton ischein. Artist. Cat.5.38 hoion epi men ton allon ouk an echoi tis to toiouto proenenkein.l. In the N.T. this Hebrew syntax of the relative occurs not infrequently.Philemon 12 o§n anepempsa soi auton.Gal.2:10 ho kai espoudasa auto touto poiesai.Acts 15:17 eph' ohu epikekletai ton onoma mou ep' autous.Mk.7:25 hes eiche to thugatrion autes pneuma akatharton.Cp. Mk.1:7: Lk.3:16: also Mk.13:19, 9:3.Instances are most frequent in the very Hebraistic book of Revelation. See Rev.3:8; 7:3, 9; 13:8; 20:8. Cp.1 Clem.21:9 hou he pnoe autou en hemin estin.70. aner = hekastos. The use of aner as a distributive pronoun is a pure Hebraism.4 K. [2 Kings] 18:31 pietai aner ten ampelon autou, kai aner ten suken autou phagetai.Jdg.16:5 hemeis dosomen soi aner chilious kai hekaton arguriou. 71. hostis for hos. Except in the neuter singular ho ti, as in Josh.24:27, and in the expression heos hotou, as in 1 K. [1 Sam.] 22:3, or mechri hotou, which is found only in the Codex Sinaiticus version of Tob.5:7, hostis occurs in Swete's text only in the nominative, singular or plural. In meaning it is often indistinguishable from hos.Ex.20:2 Ego eimi Kurios . . . hostis exegagon se. Cp. Dan. Th 6:27.Ps.89:4 he hemera he echthes hetis dielthen. Cp. Nb.14:8.1 K. [1 Sam.] 30:10 diakosioi andres hoitines ekathisan peran tou cheimarrou. Cp. Ex.32:4, 9: Nb.1:5: 1 Mac.13:48.Jdg.21:12 tetrakosias neanidas parthenous, haitines ouk egnosan andra.Hoitines = hoi occurs several times in Aristeas -§§ 102, 121, 138, 200, 308.The same use of hostis for the simple relative is found in the N.T., e.g. -Col.3:5 ten pleonezian, hetis estin eidololatreia.Acts 8:15 ton Petron kai Ioannen; hoitines katabantes ktl.1 Tim.6:9 epithumias . . . haitines buthizousi tous anthropous.Gal.4:24 hatina estin allegoroumena.

VERBS, 72-84

72. Analytic Tenses. By an Analytic Tense is meant one which is formed with an auxiliary instead of by an inflexion, as in English, is coming' for comes.' No reader of the LXX can fail to be struck by the frequency of such forms. It results from the fact that both languages combine to produce them. They are suggested by the great use made of the participle in Hebrew, while at the same time there was a strong tendency towards the employment of such forms within the Greek language itself. They are to be found in the best writers, both in prose and poetry, from Homer downwards. Plato often has recourse to them, partly for the sake of philosophical precision, and partly, it must be confessed, because in his later style he preferred two words to one. In the Laws prepon esti almost altogether displaces prepei. PRESENT 3 K. [2 Kings} 20:5 ouk ei su esthion arton; Cp. Is.10:8: Ezk.36:13. 3 K. [2 Kings} 18:12 estin phoboumenos. Nb.14:8 estin rheousa. Cp.3 K. [2 Kings} 20:15: Dan.2:28. 2 Esd. [Ezra] 23:24 ouk eisin epiginoskontes. Prov.3:5 isthi pepoithos. Jdg.11:10 esto akouon. Dan. O' 6:26 estosan proskunountes. 2 Chr.15:16 einai . . . leitourgousan. FUTURE SIMPLE Gen.4:14 esomai stenon kai tremon. Cp. Dan. O 6:27.Is.47:7 esomai archousa.Gen.4:12 stenon kai tremon ese.Cp. Ex.22:25: Dt.28:29.Dt.28:29 ese . . . adikoumenos.Nb.8:19 estai . . . proengizon. Cp. Gen.18:18.Mal.3:3 esontai . . . prosagontes.Is.22:24 esontai epikremamenoi.Ezk.34:29 esontai apollumenoi. Cp. Dt.14:33PERFECTIs.8:14 pepoithos es.Is.10:20, 17:8 pepoithotes omen.Nb.22:12 estin gar eulogemenos.FUTURE PERFECTGen.43:9, 44:32 hemartekos esomai.2 K. [2 Sam.] 22:3: Is.12:2, 8:17 pepoithos esomai (fut. simp. in force).Sir.7:25 ese tetelekos.Is.58:14 ese pepoithos.Is.17:7, 22:24 pepoithos estai.Ex.12:6 estai humin diateteremenon.Is.32:3 esontai pepoithotes.Gen.41:36 estai . . . pephulagmena.IMPERFECTDan.10:2 emen penthon.Dan. O' 7:11 theoron emen.Gen.40:13 estha oinochoon.Gen.37:2: Ex.3:1 en poimainon. Cp. Gen.39:23, 42:6: Nb.11:1: Jdg.16:21: Jonah 1:10: Sus.1: 1 Mac.6:43.1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:34 poimainon en.Jer.4:24 en tremonta (sc. ta ore).3 K. [2 Kings} 18:3 en phoboumenos. Cp. Dan. O' 6:18.Dan. O' 1:16 en . . . anairoumenos.Baruch 1:19 emetha apeithountes.Dt.9:24 apeithountes ete. Cp. Dt.9:22, 31:27.Jdg.1:7 esan sullegontes. Cp. Josh.10:26: 1 Mac.11:41.PLUPERFECTDan. O' 10:9 emen peptokos.Dan. Th 10:9 emen katanenugmenos.2 Chr.18:34 en hestekos.1 K. [1 Sam.] 4:13 en . . . exestekuia.Jdg.8:11: Sus. Th 35 en pepoithuia.Josh.7:22 en enkekrummena.2 Chr.5:8 en diapepetakota.Tob.6:18 hetoimasmene en.Is.20:6 emen pepoithotes.Ex.39:23 esan pepoiekotes auta.b. Gignesthai may be used as an auxiliary instead of einai.Ps.72:14 egenomen memastigomenos.Is.30:12 pepoithos egenou.Nb.10:34 egeneto skiazousa.Ps.125:3 egenethemen euphrainomenoi.Ex.17:12 egenonto . . . esterigmenai.Sir.13:9 hupochoron ginou, 18:33 me ginou . . . sumbolokopon.c. Sometimes the verbal adjective is used in place of the participle.Is.18:3 akouston estai.Dt.4:36 akouste egeneto.Gen.45:2: Is.48:3 akouston egeneto.Is.23:5 hotan de akouton genetai.Dt.30:5 pleonaston se poiesei.d. When a causative form is wanted corresponding to akouston genesthai recourse is had to akouston poiein, e.g. -Sir.46:17 akousten epoiesen ten phoen autou. Cp. Ps.105:2, 142:8: Jer.27:2, 38:7: Is.30:30, 45:21, 48:5, 6, 20, 52:7, 62:11.e. In the N.T. these analytic tenses are relatively even commoner than in the LXX.PRESENTCol.3:2 estin . . . kathemenos.2 Cor.9:12 esti prosanaplerousa.Col.1:6 esti

karpophoroumenon kai auxanomenon.Col.2:23 esti . . . echonta.2 Cor.2:17 esmen . . . kapeleuontes.Acts 5:25 eisin . . . hestotes kai didaskontes.Mt.5:25 isthi eunoon.FUTURE SIMPLELk.5:11 anthropous ese zogron.Acts 7:6 estai . . . paroikon.1 Cor.14:10 esesthe . . . lalountes.PERFECTActs 25:10 hestos eimi (present in meaning).Acts 21:33 esti pepoiekos.1 Cor.15:9 elpikotes esmen.Hb.7:21, 23 eisi gegonotes.James 5:16 e pepoiekos.2 Cor.1:19 pepoithotes omen.Hb.4:2 esmen euengelismenoi.Hb.10:10 hegiasmenoi esmen.Acts 2:13 memestomenoi eisi.FUTURE PERFECTHb.2:13 esomai pepoithos (from Is.12:2 perfect only in form).IMPERFECTActs 10:30, 11:5 emen proseuchomenos. Cp.22:19, 20: Gal.1:22.Lk.4:44 en kerusson. Cp. Lk.5:16, 23:8: Acts 7:60, 8:13, 28, 9:28, 10:24, 12:20: Philippians 2:26.Acts 12:5 en ginomene.Acts 21:3 en . . . apophortizomenon.Acts 16:12 emen . . . diatribontes.Gal.1:23 akouontes esan. Cp. Acts 1:10.Acts 1:13 esan katamenontes. Cp. Acts 1:14, 2:2, 5, 12, 42: Mk.2:18.f. Besides einai other auxiliaries are used in the N.T. -- 2 Cor.6:14 me ginesthe heterozugountes.Col.1:18 hina genetai . . . proteuon.Rev.3:2 ginou gregoron.Acts 8:16 bebaptismenoi huperchon.With the last example cp. Aristeas § 193 ei me pepoithos huparchoi. Thesame author has kecharismenos ese in § 40 and ischuon esti in 241.g. Instances of analytic tenses occur here and there in Josephus, e.g. -B.J.1.31.1 kai touto en malista tarassonAntipatron.Ant.2.6.7 ti parontes eiemen.h. Also in the Apostolic Fathers -2 Clem.17:7 esontai doxan dontes. Barn. Ep.19:4 ese tremon,19:6 ou me gene epithumon. Cp.19:9. Herm. Past. Vis.3.4.2huperechontes autous eisin, Sim.5.4.2 esomai heorakos . . . akekoos,9.13.2 ese . . . phoron, Mdt.5.2.8 ese heuriskomenos, Sim.9.1.8 euthenounen, 9.4.1 hupodedukuiai esan . . . hupodedukeisan.73. Deliberative Use of the Present Indicative. The deliberative use ofthe present indicative is not unknown in Latin, especially in Terence, e.g.Phorm.447 quid ago? Cp. Heaut.343: Eun.811: Ad.538. It occurs also inthe Greek of the LXX.Gen.37:30 ego de pou poreuomai eti;So in N.T. -- Jn.11:47 ti poioumen; What is our course?74. The Jussive Future. a. The Jussive Future is rare in Attic Greek, and,when it does occur, is regarded as a weak form of imperative. In the LXX,on the other hand, it is very common, and is employed in the mostsolemn language of legislation. From the nature of the case it is not usedin the first person. It may be employed in command or in prohibition. Asinstances of the former we may take -Lvt.19:18 agapeseis ton plesion sou hos seauton. Cp. Ex. 34:18,20: 3 K. [2 Kings} 17:11.Lvt.19:19 ton nomon mou phulaxesthe. Cp. Lvt.11:44.Lvt.19:22 kai exilasetai ho hiereus. Cp. Lvt.19:20,21.b. Very often the jussive future follows an imperative.Gen.40:14 mnestheti mou . . . kai poieseis. Cp. Gen.44:4: Ex.7:26, 9:1, 13: Nb.15:2, 17: 3 K. [2 Kings} 17:13.Josh.8:4 me makran ginesthe . . . kai esesthe pantes hetoimoi. Cp. Nb.13:18.c. Of the use of the jussive future in prohibition we have a conspicuous example in the Ten Commandments (Ex.20:13-17: Dt.5:17-21) - Ou moicheuseis, Ou klepseis ktl. So also -Dt.6:16 ouk ekpeiraseis Kurion ton Theon sou. Cp. Nb.22:12: Ex.22:28: Lvt.19:12-19.d. In the case of the jussive future we have ou in prohibition, because the formula was originally one of prediction.e. Occasionally there is a transition from the jussive future to ou me with subjunctive -Nb.23:25 oute katarasis katarase moi auton, oute eulogon me eulogeses auton.f. In the N.T. the jussive future is often used in passages quoted from the LXX. In Matthew it is employed independently.Mt.5:48 esesthe oun humeis teleioi, 6:45 ouk esesthe hos hoi hupokritai, 20:26-28 ouch houtos estai en humin . . . estai humon doulos, 21:3 kai ean tis humin eipe ti, ereite ktl.75. The Optative. a. The pure optative, i.e. the optative as employed to express a wish, is of frequent occurrence in the LXX, as might be expected from the character of the contents, so much of which is in the form either of aspiration or of imprecation. But the use of the

optative where in Latin we should have the historic tenses of the subjunctive is hardly to be found outside of Maccabees.2 Mac.3:37 tou de basileos eperotesantos ton Heliodoron, poios tis eie epiteseios.4 Mac.17:1 elegon de kai ton doruphoron tines hos . . . hina me psauseien ti tou somatos autes, heauten erripsen kata tes puras.The established practice is for the subjunctive to follow the historic tenses in a final clause -Ex.1:11 epestesen . . . hina kakososin, 9:16 dieterethes hina endeixomai.Wisd.16:11 diesozonto, hina me . . . genontai. Cp.16:18.Cp. Aristeas §§ 11, 18, 19, 26, 29, 42, 111, 175, 193.b. In the N.T. also the subjunctive is regularly employed in final clauses after an historic tense, e.g. -Tit.1:5 toutou charin apelipon se en Krete, hina ta leiponta epidiorthose.c. The pure optative is said to occur 35 times in the N.T., always, except in Philemon 20, in the 3d person.In Luke-Acts the optative is commonly employed in dependent questions, e.g. -Luke 18:36 epunthaneto ti eie touto,with which contrastMk.14:11 ezetei pos eukairos auton parado.Outside of Acts the optative with ei is found only in four passages -1 Cor.14:10, 15:37 (ei tuchoi): 1 Pet.3:14, 17.76. Conditional with an. Occasionally we find the apodosis in a conditional sentence devoid of an.Nb.22:33 kai ei me exeklinen, nun oun se men apekteina, ekeinen de periepoiesamen. Contrast 22:29 and compare 2 K. [2 Sam.] 2:27.77. Infinitive of Purpose. The use of the infinitive to express purpose, as in English, is common to all stages of the Greek language, but abounds more in the LXX than in classical Greek.Gen.37:25 ekathisan de phagein arton. Cp.39:14, 42:7, 27, 43:22: Ex.14:11: Nb.22:20: Job.2:1.Of the use of the infinitive with the article to express purpose we have had occasion to speak already (§ 59).78. Infinitive of Consequence. This construction is of doubtful propriety in Attic Greek. In the LXX it is much less common than the Infinitive of Purpose.Ex.11:1 kai ouk eisekousen exaposteilai tous huious Israel.79. Paucity of Participles. The small use made of participles in the LXX, as compared with classical Greek, is a natural result of the paratactical construction which reigns throughout. The same is the case, though to a less extent, in the N.T. Take for instance -Mk.14:16 kai exelthon hoi mathetai, kai elthon eis ten polin, kai heuren kathos eipen autois; kai hetoimasan to pascha.The participle has disappeared in the modern language. Doubtless the influence of Biblical Greek was among the causes of its decline.80. Misuse of the Participle. The misuse of the participle marks a stage of its decline. We find this tendency already manifesting itself in the LXX. Such an anacoluthon indeed as the following -Ex.8:15, 9:7 idon de Pharao . . . ebarunthe he kardia autoumay be passed over, as it might easily be paralleled from the most strictly classical writers. But we find sentences in the LXX in which a participle is the only verb. Sometimes this arises from following the Hebrew as in -Jdg.13:19, 20 kai Manoe kai he gune autou blepontes, 14:4 kai en to kairo ekeino hoi allophuloi kurieuontes en Israel.More often it does not, as in -Ex.12:37 aparantes de hoi huioi Israel, 15:18 kurios basileuon ton aiona.Jdg.4:16 kai Barak diokon.Moreover we find a participle coupled with a finite verb by kai. When the subject of the two is the same, it is open to us to say that it is not copulative, but merely emphasizes the verb, as in -Nb.21:11 kai exarantes (Hb. impf.) ex Oboth, kai parenebalon en Chalgaei, 22:23 kai idousa he onos . . . kai exeklinen. Hardly so however when the subject is different.Ex.12:30 kai anastas Pharao . . . kai egenethe krauge.Nb.22:23 kai idon Balak . . . kai ephobethe Moab.81. The Intensive Participle. On the other hand there is a cause in operation in the LXX tending to an unnecessary use of participles. For in place of a cognate dative we often find the participle used along with a finite form of the same verb, to convey the intensive force that is accomplished in Hebrew by the addition of the infinitive to the finite verb, e.g. -Gen.22:17 ei men eulogon eulogeso se, kai plethunon plethuno to sperma sou.Jdg.11:25 me machomenos emachesato meta Israel e polemon epolemesen auton;We might fill pages with

instances of this idiom, but a statement of its frequency must suffice. This emphatic use of the participle is a more unmitigated Hebraism than the other forms of the etymological figure. The cognate accusative is quite Greek and the cognate dative is to be found in pure Greek, but we should search in vain among classical authors for the intensive use of the participle. There is a clear instance indeed in Lucian (Dialogi Marini 4.3 idon eidon), but it is interesting to remember that Lucian himself came from the banks of the Euphrates. In Hdt.5.95 autos men pheugon ekpheugei there is a difference of meaning between the participle and the finite verb - he himself escapes by flight.In the N.T. we have one instance, other than a quotation, of this Hebraism, namely -Eph.5:5 iste ginoskontes,but both the reading and the interpretation of this passage are disputed.82. Other Varieties of the Etymological Figure. In Josh.17:13 exolethreusai de autous ouk exolethreusan the infinitive absolute of the Hebrew is represented in Greek by the infinitive, instead of by a participle or a cognate dative, so that sheer nonsense is made of the translation. In another passage, where the Greek departs from our Hebrew, an adjective takes the place of the participle -Jdg.5:30 oikteirmon oikteiresei.Sometimes we find an adverb in place of the participle -Ex.15:1 endoxos gar dedoxastai.Nb.22:17 entimos gar timeso se.Prov.23:1 noetos noei, 27;23 gnostos epignose.The following turns of expression may also be noticed -Jdg.11:25 en agatho agathoteros.Dt.18:8 merida memerismenen.1 K. [1 Sam.] 1:11 doso auton enopion sou doton.83. Middle and Passive Voices. In later Greek the boundary lines between the middle and passive voices are not clearly demarcated. Even in classical authors we find the future middle used in a passive sense, as it is also in -Ex.12:10 ouk apoleipsetai a' autou heos proi, kai ostoun suntripsetai ap' autou.The same seems to be the case with xuresomai and exuresato in Jdg.16:17, 22.So in N.T. -- 1 Cor.6:11 alla apelousasthe, alla hegiasthete, all' edikaiothete, 10:2 kai pantes eis ton Mosen ebaptisanto,though here Riddell's semi-middle sense of the verb might plausibly be brought in by way of explanation.Instances of passive form with middle meaning are common in the LXX -Nb.22:34 apostraphesomai I will get me back again.Jdg.15:9 exeriphesan spread themselves, 16:20 ektinachthesomai shake myself, 16:26 episterichthesomai support myself.3 K. [2 Kings} 17:3 krubethi hide thyself, 18:1 poreutheti kai ophtheti toAchaab go and shew thyself, 20:25 eprathe sold himself.So in N.T. in Luke 11:38 ebaptisthe is used for ebaptisato.84. Causative Use of the Verb. a. The causative use of the verb which is found in the LXX may be set down with confidence as a Hebraism. Basileuein according to the Greek language means to be king,' but it is frequently employed in the LXX in the sense of to make king,' e.g. -Jdg.9:6 ebasileusan tonAbeimelech.1 K. [1 Sam.] 8:22 basileuson autois basilea, 15:11 ebasileusa ton Saoul eis basilea.There are all together thirty-six occurrences of the word in this causative sense.b. Classical Greek again knows bdelussesthai in the sense of to loathe' or abominate,' but not bdelussein in the sense of to make abominable,' as in -Ex.5:21 ebdeluxate ten osmen hemon enantion Pharao.Lvt.11:43 kai ou me bdeluxete tas psuchas humon. Cp. Lvt.20:25: 1 Mac.1:48.c. Still more strange to classical Greek is the sense of to make to sin' often imposed upon examartanein, e.g. -4 K. [2 Kings] 17:21 kai exemarten autous hamartian megalen.This is the prevailing sense of the word in the LXX, which is found all together twenty-eight times, mostly in the phrase ho exemarten ton Israel.d. In this causative use of the verb is to be found the explanation of Ex.14:25 kai egagen autous meta bias, where the R.V. margin has made them to drive.' Other similar instances are -Ex.13:18 ekuklosen = he led round.1 K. [1 Sam.] 4:3 kata ti eptaisen hemas kurios semeron;Ps.142:11 zeseis me.85. Reduplication of Words. In Greek we are accustomed to reduplication of syllables, but not to reduplication of words. This primitive

device of language is resorted to in the LXX, in imitation of the Hebrew, for at least three different purposes -1) intensification,2) distribution,3) universalisation.1) The intensifying use. sphodra sphodra Gen.30:43: Ex.1:7, 12: Nb.14:7: Ezk.9:9: Judith 4:2.sphodra sphodros Gen.7:19: Josh.3:16.To the same head may be assigned -Ex.8:14 sunegagon autous thimonias thimonias.Dt.28:43 ho proselutos ho en soi anabesetai ano ano, su de katabese kato kato.In all the above instances perhaps the kind of intensification involved is that of a repeated process.2) The distributive use.heis heis 1 Chr.24:6duo duo Gen.6:19, 7:3: Sir.36:15.hepta hepta Gen.7:3.chilious ek phules, chilious ek phules Nb.31:6.to proi proi 1 Chr.9:27.ergasia kai ergasia 2 Chr.34:13.In pure Greek such ideas would be expressed by the use of ana or kata. Sometimes we find kata; employed in the LXX along with the reduplication, as in -- Dt.7:22 kata mikron mikron.Zech.12:12 kata phulas phulas.The idea year by year' is expressed in many different ways -eniauton kat' eniauton Dt.14:21: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 1:7: 2 Chr.24:5.kat' eniauton eniauton 1 K. [1 Sam.] 7:16.eniauton ex eniautou Dt.15:20to kat' eniauton eniauto 3 K. [2 Kings} 10:28.to kat' eniauton eniauton 2 Chr.9:24.3) The universalising use.anthropos anthropos = whatsoever man Lvt.17:3, 8, 10, 13; 18:6; 20:9; 22:18: Ezk.14:4, 7.andri andri Lvt.15:3.Of the above three uses the distributive is the only one which is to be found in the N.T.Mk.6:7 duo duo, 6:39 sumposia sumposia, 6:40 prasiai prasiai.So also in the Pastor of Hermas -Sim.8.2.8 elthon tagmata tagmata, 4.2 estesan tagmata tagmata.86. Expressions of Time. a. Year after year' is expressed in 2 K. [2 Sam.] 21:1 by a nominative absolute eniautos echomenos eniautou without any pretence of grammar.b. The use of the word day' in vague expressions of time is a Hebraism, e.g. -Gen.40:4 hemeras = for some time. Cp. Dan. O 11:9.Jdg.15:1 meth' hemeras = after some time. Cp.3 K. [2 Kings] 17:7.3 K. [2 Kings} 18:1 meth' hemeras pollas = after a long time.c. Day by day' (Hb. day, day) is expressed in Gen.39:10 by hemeran ex hemeras (cp. Lat. diem ex die). In Esther 3:4 kath' hekasten hemeran is correctly used as the Greek equivalent for the phrase day and day, which St. Paul (2 Cor.4:16) has reproduced word for word in the form hemera kai hemera.d. The use of yesterday and the day before' as a general expression for past time = heretofore is a Hebraism which presents itself in the LXX under a variety of slight modifications.echthes kai triten 1K.4:7, 10:11: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 3:17, 5:2: 1 Chr.11:2.echthes kai triten hemeran Gen.31:2, 5: Ex.5:7, 14: Josh.4:18: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 14:21, 19:7, 21:5: 1 Mac.9:44.echthes kai trites Ruth 2:11: 4 K. [2 Kings] 13:5: Sus. Q 15.ap' echthes kai trites hemeras Josh.3:4.pro tes echthes kai trites Dt.19:4.pro tes echthes kai pro tes trites. Ex.21:29.pro tes echthes kai pro tes trites hemeras Ex.21:36.pro tes echthes oude pro tes trites Dt.4:42, 19:6.pro tes echthes oude pro tes trites hemeras. Ex.4:10.In Joshua 20:5, which occurs only in the Codex Alexandrinus, we have ap;#8217; echthes kai triten, where echthes-kai-triten is treated as a single indeclinable noun.e. Just at that time' is expressed variously as follows -authori Dan. O 3:15.aute te hora 1 Esd.8:65: Dan.3:5, Th 3:15. Cp. Acts 22:13.en aute te hora Dan. Th 5:5. Cp. Lk.12:12, 13:31, 20:19.en aute te hora ekeine Dan. O 5:5.en auto to kairo Tob.3:17. Cp. Lk.13:1.87. Pleonastic Use of ekei and ekeithen. Just as a personal pronoun is supplied after the relative (§ 69), so a demonstrative adverb of place is supplied after a relative adverb or after some phrase equivalent to one.Gen.33:19 hou estesen ekei ten skenen autou. Cp.39:20, 40:3: Ex.21:13.Ex.20:24 hou ean eponomaso to onoma mou ekei.Dan. Th 9:7 hou diespeiras autous ekei.3 K. [2 Kings} 17:19 en ho autos ekatheto ekei. Cp. Gen.39:20: Ex.12:13.Gen.31:13 en to topo ho eleipsas moi ekei stelen.Nb.14:24 eis hen eiselthen ekei. Cp.15:18, 35:26: Dt.4:27.Ex.8:22 eph' hes ouk estai ekei.4 K. [2 Kings] 1:4 he kline eph' hes anebes ekei.Dt.9:28 hothen exegages hemas ekeithen.Nb.23:13 ex hon ouk opse auton ekeithen.Dan. O 9:7 eis has dieskorpisas autous

ekei.This idiom, which is thoroughly Hebrew, is to be explained on the same principle as in § 69. In the N.T. it is found only in Revelation -Rev.12:6 hopou echei ekei topon, 12:14 hopou trephetai ekei, 17:9 hopou he gune kathetai ep' auton (= ekei).88. pas with ou and me. a. The use of pas with a negative particle, where in classical Greek oudeis or medeis would be employed, is a Hebraism, even though in certain cases the resulting expression may be paralleled from pure Greek usage. The pas may either precede or follow the negative (ou, me, mede, ou me) without difference of meaning.b. We will first take instances from the LXX where the pas precedes the negative.Ex.12:43 pas allogenes ouk edetai ap' autou. Cp.12:48: Ezek.44:9.Dan. O 5:9 pas anthropos ou dunatai. Cp. Dan. O 2:10.Hbk.2:19 pan pneuma ouk estin en auto.1 Mac.2:61 pantes . . . ouk asthenesousin.Ex.22:22 pasan cheran kai orphanon ou kakosete.Jer.17:22 pan ergon ou poiesete. Cp. Ex.12:16, 20: Nb.28:18: Jdg.13:14. So in N.T. -- Rom.10:12 pas ho pisteuon ep' auto ou kataischunthesetai. Cp. Eph.4:29, 5:5.Rev.18:22 pas technites . . . ou me heurethe en soi eti.2 Pet.1:20 pasa propheteia graphes idias epiluseos ou ginetai.1 Jn.2:21 pan pseudos ek tes aletheias ouk esti. Cp.1 Jn.3:6, 10, 15; 4:3; 5:18: Rev.22:3.c. In the following passages of the LXX the pas follows the negative -Ps.142:2 ou dikaiothesetai enopion sou pas zon.Eccl.1:9 ouk estin pan prosphaton hupo ton helion.Ex.20:10: Dt.5:14 ou poiesete en aute pan ergon. Cp. Ex.20:16.2 K. [2 Sam.] 15:11 ouk egnosan pan rhema.Tob.12:11 ou me krupso aph' humon pan rhema.Ps.33:11 ouk elattothesontai pantos agathou.Jdg.13:4 me phages pan akatharton.Tob.4:7 me apostrepses to prosopon sou apo pantos ptochou.So in N.T. -- Romans 3:20 ex ergon nomou ou dikaiothesetai pasa sarx. Cp. Gal.2:16: Mt.24:22.Lk.1:37 ouk adunatesei para tou Theou pan rhema.Acts 10:14 oudepote ephagon pan koinon.1 Cor.1:29 hopos me kauchesetai pasa sarx.Rev.21:27 ou me eiselthe eis auten pan koinon.

PREPOSITIONS, 89-98

89. Prominence of Prepositions. The prominence of prepositions in the LXX is partly a characteristic of later Greek generally and partly due to the careful following of the Hebrew. But while prepositions are employed to express relations for which in classical Greek cases would have been thought sufficient, there is at the same time a tendency to blur some of the nice distinctions between the uses of the same preposition with different cases. 90. eis. a. eis in classical Greek denotes motion or direction: in Biblical Greek it denotes equally rest or position, and may be translated by at' or in' as wel as by to,' e.g. - Gen.37:17 poreuthomen eis Dothaeim . . . kai heuren autous eis Dothaeim. Josh.7:22 edramon eis ten skenen . . . kai tauta en enkekrummena eis ten skenen. Jdg.14:1 kai katebe Sampson eis Thamnatha, kai eiden gunaika eis Thamnatha. For examples of the former meaning only we may take - Gen.42:32 ho de mikroteros . . . eis gen Chanaan. Nb.25:33 ten gen eis he humeis katoikeite. Judith 16:23 apethanen eis baituloua. b. In the N.T. eis denoting rest or position is very common. Mk.2:1 eis oikon = at home. Cp. Lk.9:61: Mk.10:10. Mk.13:3 kathemenou autou eis to oros ton elaion.Jn.1:18 o on eis ton kolpon tou patros.Acts 21:13 apothanein eis Hierousalem.Cp. also Eph.3:16: 1 Pet.3:20, 5:12: Mk.1:9, 39; 13:9: Lk.4:23, 11:7: Jn.9:7, 20:7: Acts 7:4, 8:40, 25:4.The obliteration of the distinction between rest and motion is one of the marks of declining Greek. In the modern language eis has usurped the functions both of en and pros.c. The use of eis with the accusative after einai and genesthai as practically equivalent to the nominative may safely be regarded as a Hebraism.d.1 Chr.11:21 en autois eis archonta, 17:7 einai eis hegoumenon.3 K. [2 Kings} 20:2 estai moi eis kepon lachanon. Cp. Gen.48:19: 1 Chr.11:6.1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:9 esometha humin eis doulous.Jer.38:33 esomai autois eis Theon, kai autoi esontai moi eis laon. Cp. Jer.38:1: Gen.48:19: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 7:14.Gen.2:7 egeneto ho anthropos eis psuchen zosan.Ex.2:10 egenethe aute eis huion.1 K. [1 Sam.] 4:9 genesthe eis andras.pros in one passage takes the place of eis.Sir.46:4 mia hemera egenethe pros duo.e. In the New Testament this idiom occurs both in quotations from the Old and otherwise.1 Jn.5:8 kai hoi treis eis to hen eisin.Lk.3:5 estai ta skolia eis eutheias (Is.40:4).2 Cor.6:18 esesthe moi eis huious kai thugateras (2 K. [2 Sam.] 7:8: Is.43:6).Mt.19:5 esontai hoi duo eis sarka mian (Gen.2:24).Mt.21:42 egenethe eis kephalen gonias (Ps.117:22).Lk.13:19 egeneto eis dendron. Cp. Rev.8:11.Jn.16:20 he lupe humon eis charan genesetai.The same usage is to be found also in the Apostolic Fathers -Herm. Past. Sim.9.13.5 esontai eis he pneuma, eis hen soma.1 Clem.11:2 eis krima kai eis semeiosin . . . ginontai.Ign. Eph.11:1 hina me hemin eis krima genetai.f. The employment of eis to express the object or destination of a thing might easily be paralleled from classical Greek, but its frequent use in the LXX is due to its convenience as a translation of the corresponding Hebrew.Gen.34:12 kai dosete moi ten paida tauten eis gunaika.Ps.104:17 eis doulon eprathe Ioseph.3 K. [2 Kings} 19:15 chriseis tonAzael eis basilea.Gen.12:2 poieso se eis ethnos mega.When the verb is active and transitive, as in all but the second of the above instances, eis might be dispensed with as far as Greek is concerned. When a verb of being is employed, this use runs into the preceding -Gen.1:29 humin estai eis brosin, 1:14 estosan eis semeia.g. The use of eis with the accusative, where classical Greek would simply have employed a dative, is shown by the Papyri to have been a

feature of the vernacular Greek of Alexandria.Ex.9:21 ho de me proseschen te dianoia eis to rhema kuriou ktl.So in N.T. -- 1 Cor.16:1 tes logias tes eis tous hagious (the collection for the saints).91. en. a. Although en was destined ultimately to disappear before eis, yet in Biblical Greek we find it in the plenitude of its power, as expressing innumerable relations, some of which seem to the classical student to be quite beyond its proper sphere. One principal use may be summed up under the title of "The en of Accompanying Circumstances." This includes the instrumental use, but goes far beyond it. Under this aspect en invades the domain of meta and sun. In most cases it may be rendered by the English with.'Hos.1:7 soso autous en kurio Theo auton, kai ou soso autous en toxo oude en rhomphaia oude en polemo oude en hippois oude en hippeusin. Cp.1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:45, 47: 1 Mac.3:12.Ex.6:1 en gar cheiri krataia ktl. (But in Ex.3:19 we have ean me meta cheiros krataias.) Cp. Ex.3:20: Jdg.15:15, 16.Jdg.14:18 ei me erotriasate en te damalei mou. Cp.3 K. [2 Kings} 19:19.4 K. [2 Kings] 18:17 en dunamei bareia. In the parallel passage Is.36:2 meta dunameos polles.1 Mac.4:6 ophthe Ioudas . . . en trischiliois andrasin.So in N.T. -- 1 Cor.4:21 en rhabdo eltho pros humas; Cp.1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:43: Ps.2:9.Eph.6:2 entole prote en epangelia.2 Pet.3:16 en anthropou phone.Mt.9:34 en to archonti ton daimonion ekballei ta daimonia. Cp. Mt.12:24, 25:16.Mt.26:52 en machaira apolountai.b. The en of accompanying circumstances is not wholly foreign to classical Greek, though the extended use made of it in Biblical diction is.Eur. Tro.817 o chruseais en oinochoais habra bainon.c. In another of its Biblical uses en becomes indistinguishable from eis, as in -Ex.4:21 panta ta terata ha edoka en tais chersin sou.Jdg.13:1 paredoken autous Kurios en cheiri Phulistieim. Cp. Jdg.15:12, 13; 16:23, 24.Is.37:10 ou me paradothe Hierousalem en cheiri basileos, while the parallel passage in 4 K. [2 Kings] 19:10 has eis cheiras basileos.Tob.5:5 poreuthenai en Rhagois. Cp. Tob.6:6, 9:2.So in N.T. -- 2 Cor.8:16 charis de to Theo to didonti ten auten spouden huper humon en te kardia Titou.Mt.14:3 etheto en phulake.Jn.3:35 panta dedoken en te cheiri autou.Rev.11:11 pneuma zoes ek tou Theou eiselthen en autois.92. apo. a. apo in the LXX is often little more than a sign of the genitive, like our English of,' provided that the genitive be partitive.Ex.12:46 kai ostoun ou suntripsete ap' autou. Josh.9:8 ouk en rhema apo panton hon eneteilato Mouses to Iesoi ho ouk anegno Iesous.3 K. [2 Kings} 18:13 ekrupsa apo ton propheton Kuriou hekaton andras.Joel 2:28 ekcheo apo tou pneumatos mou.2 Esd. [Ezra] 11:2 heis apo adelphon mou.So in N.T. -- Lk.6:13 eklexamenos ap' auton dodeka.Jn.21:10 enenkate apo ton opsarion o -- n epiasate nun.b. apo = by reason of' is another unclassical use which occurs in the LXX.Gen.41:31 kai ouk epignosthesetai he euthenia epi tes ges apo tou limou.Ex.2:23 kai katestenaxan hoi huioi Israel apo ton ergon,3:7 kai tes krauges auton akekoa apo ton ergodiokton.Ps.11:6 apo tes talaipoorias ton ptochon . . . anastesomai.Sir.20:6 estin misetos apo polles lalias.Nahum 1:6 hai petrai diethrubesan ap' autou.In this way apo becomes = hupo, as in Dan. O' 1:18.So in N.T. -- Hb.5:7 eisakoustheis apo tes eulabeias.Lk.19:3 ouk edunato apo tou ochlou, 24:41 apistounton auton apo tes charas. Cp. Acts 12:14, 22:11.Jn.21:6 ouketi auto helkusai ischuon apo tou plethous ton ichthuon.Of apo = hupo see instances in Lk.9:22, 17:25: Acts 20:9.c. The combination apo . . . heos is a Hebraism. It may be rendered "from . . . unto," as in -Dt.8:35 apo ichnous ton podon sou heos tes koruphes sou,or "both . . . and," as in -Ex.9:25 apo anthropou . . . heos ktenous.Sometimes kai precedes the heos -Jdg.15:5 apo . . . kai heos . . . kai heos both . . . and . . . and. Cp. Sir.40:3: Jer.27:3.93. meta. meta with genitive = in dealing with' is a Hebraism.Jdg.15:3 hoti poio ego met' auton ponerian.So in N.T. -- Lk.10:37 ho poiesas to eleos met' autou: Acts 14:27. Cp. Herm. Past. Sim.5.1.1: 1 Clem.61:3.94. huper. a. The frequent use of huper in the LXX

to express comparison is due to the fact that the Hebrew language has no special form for the comparative degree. We therefore sometimes find the LXX representing the original by the positive with huper.Ruth 4:15 he estin agathe soi huper hepta huious. Cp.1 K. [1 Sam.] 1:8, 15:28: 3 K. [2 Kings} 20:2: 2 Chr.21:14.1 K. [1 Sam.] 9:2 hupselos huper pasan ten gen.1 Chr.4:9 endoxos huper tous adelphous autou.Sir.24:20 huper meli gluku.Ezk.5:1 rhomphaian oxeian huper xuron koureos.b. More often however the comparative is used, but the construction with huper still retained.Jdg.15:2 agathotera huper auten. Cp. Jdg.11:25.Jdg.18:26 dunatoteroi eisin huper auton.Ruth 3:12 engion huper eme.3 K. [2 Kings} 19:4 kreisson . . . huper tous pateras. Cp. Sir.30:17.Hbk.1:8 oxuteroi huper lukous.Dan. O' 1:20 sophoterous dekaplasios huper tous sophistas.c. huper is employed in the same way after verbs -Ex.1:9 iEschuei huper hemas.1 K. [1 Sam.] 1:5 ten Annan egapa Elkana huper tauten.Ps.39:13 eplethunthesan huper tas trichas tes kephales mou.1 Chr.19:12 ean kratese huper eme Suros.Jer.5:3 estereosan . . . huper petran, 16:12 humeis eponereusasthe huper tous pateras humon. Cp.17:23.Jer.26:23 plethunei huper akrida.Dan. O' 3:22 he kaminos exekauthe huper to proteron heptaplasios.d. So in N.T. -- after a comparative -

Lk.16:8 phronimoteroi huper tous huious tou photos.Hb.4:12 tomoteros huper pasan machairan.after a verb -Gal.1:14 proekopton . . . huper pollous.Mt.10:37 ho philon patera e metera huper eme.Cp. Herm. Past. Mdt.5.1.6 he makrothumia glukutate estin huper to meli. Mart. Polyc.18 dokimotera huper chrusion osta autou.95. epi. a. epi with the accusative is used of rest as well as of motion.Gen.41:17 hestanai epi to cheilos tou potamou.Ex.10:14 kai anegagen auten (ten akrida) epi pasan gen Aiguptou, kai katepausen epi panta ta horia Aiguptou polle sphodra.Jdg.16:27 epi to doma = upon the roof.b. epi is sometimes used to reinforce an accusative of duration of time.Jdg.14:17 kai eklausen pros auton epi tas hepta hemeras has en autois ho potos.c. In Josh.25:10 we find megan epi tou idein where in classical Greek we should have only megan idein.d. In the N.T. also epi with the accusative is used of rest or position -2 Cor.3:15 kalumma epi ten kardian auton keitai.Mk.2:14 kathemenon epi to telonion. Cp. Lk.5:27.Mk.4:38 epi to proskephalaion katheudon.Mt.14:28 peripaton epi ten thalassan (in Jn.6:19 peripatounta epi tes thalasses).Lk.2:25 pneuma hagion en ep' auton. Cp. Lk.2:40.Jn.1:32 emeinen ep' auton.96. para. a. para naturally lends itself to the expression of comparison, and is so used occasionally in the best Greek, e.g. Thuc.1.23.4: Xen. Mem.1.4.14: Hdt.7.103. It is therefore not surprising that it should have been employed by the translators in the same way as huper.Ex.18:11 megas Kurios para pantas tous theous. Cp. Ps.134:5: Dan. O' 11:12.Nb.12:3 kai ho anthropos Mouses praus sphodra para pantas tous anthropous.Dan. O' 1:10 asthene para tous suntrephomenous humin (Th has skuthropa para ta paidaria ta sunelika humon). Cp. O' 1:13.Dan. Th 7:7 diaphoron perissos para panta ta theria.1 Esd.4:35 ischurotera para panta.Dan. O' 11:13 meizona para ten proten (Th has polun huper ton proteron).Dt.7:7 humeis gar este oligostoi para panta ta ethne.Gen.43:34 emegalunthe de he meris Beniamein para tas meridas panton. Ps.8:6 elattosas auton brachu ti par' angelous.b. In the N.T. para after a comparative is abundant in Hebrews -1:4, 3:3, 9:23, 11:4, 12:24.We find it after a positive and after a comparative in Luke -Lk.13:2 hamartoloi para pantas tous Galilaious, 3:13 meden pleon para to diatetagmenon humin prassete,and after verbs in -Rom.14:5 ho men krinei hemeran par' hemeran.Hb.1:9 echrise se ho Theos . . . para tous metochous sou.c. In the Apostolic Father cp. -Herm. Past. Vis.3.12.1 hilaroteran para to proteron, Sim.9.18.2 pleiona . . . para.Barn. Ep.4:5 (in a quotation from Daniel which is neither O' nor Th) chalepoteron para panta ta theria.97. New Forms of Prepostion. a.

Besides the more liberal use made of the prepositions already current in classical Greek, we meet also in the LXX with new forms of preposition.b. apanothen occurs in Swete's text in Jdg.16:20: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 11:20, 24; 20:21: 3 K. [2 Kings} 1:53: 4 K. [2 Kings] 2:3. It not unnaturally gets confused in some places with the classical epanothen, which is very common in the LXX, having been found a convenient rendering of certain compound prepositions in the Hebrew.c. hupokatothen, which is only used as an adverb in classical Greek, assumes in the LXX the function of a preposition, e.g. -Dt.9:14 exaleipso to onoma auton hupokatothen tou ouranou.The corresponding form huperanothen occurs in the LXX only twice, once as an adverb in Ps.77:23 and once as a preposition in -Ezk.1:25 huperanothen tou stereomatos.d. enanti in many passages of the LXX has been replaced in Swete's text by enantion, but there are still numerous instances of it left, e.g. Ex.28:12, 23, 34; 29:10, 23, 24, 25, 26, 42. In N.T. is occurs in Lk.1:8, Acts.8:21.apenanti is also common, e.g. Gen.3:24, 21:26, 23:19, 25:9, 49:30. In the N.T. it occurs in the sense of contrary to' in Acts.17:7.kateenanti is specially frequent in the book of Sirach.e. enopion is another preposition unknown to classical authors, but extremely common in Biblical Greek, as being an apt equivalent for certain Hebrew forms of expression. Deissmann gives instances of its adverbial use in the Papyri, so that we need not suppose it to have been invented by the translators of the O.T. In the N.T. it occurs frequently in Luke-Acts, Paul, and Revelation, but is not used in Matthew or Mark.katenopion occurs in the LXX in Lvt.4:17: Josh.1:5, 3:7, 21:44, 23:9: Esther 5:1: Dan. Th 5:22. In N.T. in Eph.1:4: Col.1:22: Jude 24.f. opiso as a preposition is unclassical, but extremely common in the LXX.In the N.T. it occurs in 1 Tim.5:15: Acts 5:37, 20:30: Mt.4:19, 10:38, 16:24: Lk.14:27: Jn.12:19: Rev.13:3.g. katopisthe(n) is construed with a genitive in Hom. Od.12.148, but its classical use is almost wholly adverbial, whereas in the LXX, in which it occurs twenty-four times in all, it is mainly prepositional.In 2 Chr.34:38 we have apo opisthen Kuriou. Cp. Eccl.1:10 apo emprosthen hemon.h. kuklothen occurs in the LXX as a preposition in 3 K. [2 Kings} 18:32: Sir.50:12 A: Jer.17:26, 31:17: 1 Mac.14:17.In N.T. only in Rev.4:3, 5:11 kuklothen tou thronou.kuklo is sometimes used in the same way, as in 3 K. [2 Kings} 18:35: Sir.23:18: Is.6:2: Jer.39:44.Cp. Strabo 17.6, p.792 ta de kuklo tes komes.i. Other prepositions that may be briefly noticed are echomena petras Ps.140:6, esoteron tes kolumbethras Is.22:11.In Sir.29:25 we have the combination kai pros epi toutois.98. Prepositions after Verbs. The great use made of prepositions after verbs is one of the main characteristics of Biblical Greek. It is partly a feature of later Greek generally, but to a still greater extent it is due to the influence of the Hebrew. In the following list of instances perhaps the last only is irreproachable as Greek: -adunatein apo Dt.17:8.athetein en 4 K. [2 Kings] 1:1; 3:5, 7; 18:7; 24:1, 20: 2 Chr.10:19.hairetizein en 1 Chr.29:1: 2 Chr.29:11.bdelussesthai apo Ex.1:12.boan en 3 K. [2 Kings} 18:24.ekdikein ek Dt.18:19.eklegein en 1 Chr.28:5.elpizein epi with accusative Ps.4:6, 5:12, 9:11, 40:10.elpizein epi with dative Ps.7:1.enedreuein epi Jdg.16:2.entrepesthai apo 2 Chr.36:12: 1 Esd.1:45.epikaleisthai en 3 K. [2 Kings} 18:25, 26.esthiein apo Lvt.22:6: Jdg.13:16.eudokein en Ps.146:10.thelein en 1 K. [1 Sam.] 18:22: 1 Chr.28:4: Ps.146:10.theorein en Jdg.16:27.kataphronein epi Tobit 4:18.logizesthai eis 1 K. [1 Sam.] 1:13.mukterizein en 1 Esd.1:51.patassein en 2 Chr.28:5, 17.poiein eleos en Josh.2:12.poiein eleos meta Jdg.8:35.polemein en 1 K. [1 Sam.] 28:15.prosechein eis Ex.9:21.prosochthizein apo Nb.22:3.sunienai eis Ps.27:5.huperephaneuesthai apo Tobit 4:14.pheidesthai epi Dt.7:16.phobeisthai apo Dt.1:29, 7:29: Josh.11:6: 4 K. [2 Kings] 1:15: Ps.3:7.phulassesthai apo Jdg.13:14. Cp. Xen. Cyrop.2.3.9, Hell.7.2.10.

CONJUNCTIONS, 99-111

99. ei with the Subjunctive. a. In Homer ei, or its equivalent ai, is common with the subjunctive, especially when accompanied by ke(n), e.g. Il.1.80, 4.249, 7.375, 8.282, 11.791, 15.403, 16.861, 18.601: Od.4.35, 5.471, 472, 16.98, 22.7. In classical authors instances of ei with the subjunctive (without an) are rare rather than absent. Some of them may have been improved out of existence, owing to a desire for uniformity. Plato Laws 761 C ei ti pou alsos . . . aneimenon e. Xen. Anab.3.2.22 hoi potamoi, ei kai proso ton pegon aporoi osi. Soph. Ant.710 kei tis e sophos. See GMT.454. b. In Hellenistic Greek the use of ei with the subjunctive becomes common, e.g. - Arist. E.E.2.1.17 ei e anthropos, 8.9 ei tis prosthe, 18 ei gar . . . apokteine, 10.21 ei polemosin. Philo 2.19, De Abr. §25 ei emmisthos e. Jos. B.J.1.31.1 ei . . . asthenese, Ant.1.2.3 ei kai sumbe. We should therefore antecedently expect to find this construction in the LXX, and yet it is seldom found. It occurs in Jdg.11:9, where an indicative and subjunctive are both made dependent on ei - ei epistrephete me humeis parataxasthai en huiois Ammon kai parado Kurios autous enopion emou. In Dt.8:5 Swete's text has paideusai in place of paideuse. In 1 K. [1 Sam.] 14:37 ei katabo opiso ton allophulon is so punctuated as to become an instance of ei interrogative (§100). In Sirach 22:26 ei kaka moi sumbe, the sumbe has given place to sumbesetai. In the N.T. there are a few instances of ei with the subjunctive - Rom.11:14 ei pos parazeloso.Phil.3:11 ei pos katanteso eis ten ezanastasin, 3:12 ei kai katalabo.100. ei Interrogative. a. In classical Greek ei is often used in indirect questions, e.g. -Thuc.1.5.2 erotontes ei lestai eisin.Plat. Apol.21 D ereto gar de, ei tis emou eie sophoteros.Xen. Anab.1.10.5 ebouleueto . . . ei pempoien tinas e pantes ioien.b. In Biblical Greek ei has become a direct interrogative particle. This transition seems so natural as to make us doubt the statement of Jannaris (Hist. Gk. Gr. §2055) that ei is in all these cases nothing but an itacistic misspelling for the colloquial e.' InGen.43:7 legon Ei eti ho pater humon ze; ei estin humin adelphos . . . me edeimen ei erei hemin ktl.we have first the direct and then the indirect use of ei as an interrogative particle. For other instances of the former take -1 K. [1 Sam.] 15:32 kai eipen Agag Ei houtos pikros ho thanatos;2 K. [2 Sam.] 20:17 kai eipen he gune Ei su ei Ioab;3 K. [2 Kings} 20:20 kai eipenAchaab pros Eleiou Ei heurekas me, ho echthros mou; Cp. also Gen.17:17, 39:8, 43:27: Ex.2:14: Jdg.13:11: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 9:11, 10:22,24; 14:37, 45; 15:22: 3 K. [2 Kings} 13:14, 18:17: 4 K. [2 Kings] 1:3: Tob.5:5: Jonah 4:4, 9: Joel 1:2: Dan.6:20.c. The interrogative ei is sometimes followed by the deliberative conjunctive, e.g. -Jdg.20:28 Ei prosthomen eti exelthein;2 K. [2 Sam.] 2:1 Ei anabo eis mian ton poleon Iouda;1 Chr.14:10 Ei anabo epi tous allophulous;d. In the N.T. ei interrogative is of common occurrence -Mk.8:23 eperota auton, Ei ti blepeis; Cp. Mk.10:2, where the question may be either direct or indirect.Mt.12:10 eperotesan auton legontes, Ei exesti tois sabbasi therapeuein; Cp. Mt.19:3.Lk.13:23 Kurie, ei oligoi hoi sozomenoi; Cp. Lk.22:49.Acts 1:6 Kurie, ei en to chrono touto ktl. Cp. Acts 7:1, 19:2, 21:37, 22:25, 23:9.101. ei in Oaths. a. ei is often found in the LXX after an oath in a sense practically equivalent to a negative, e.g. -Ps.94:11 hos omosa en te orge mou Ei eleusontai eis ten katapousin mou.This use of ei is a sheer Hebraism. The negative force imported into ei is due to a suppression of the apodosis, which the reader may suply as his own sense of reverence suggests. Other instances will be found in Gen.14:23: Nb.32:10,11: Dt.1:34,35: 1 K. [1

Sam.] 3:14, 14:45, 17:55, 19:6, 28:10: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 19:35: 3 K. [2 Kings} 1:52, 2:8, 17:1,12, 18:10: 4 K. [2 Kings] 2:2: Ps.131:2-4: Jer.45:16.b. When an affirmative asseveration is conveyed by the oath, it is introduced by hoti, not by ei, as in -1 K. [1 Sam.] 29:6 ze Kurios, hoti euthes su kai agathos en ophthalmois mou.3 K. [2 Kings} 18:15 ze Kurios . . . hoti semeron ophthesomai soi,or else is devoid of a conjunction, as in -1 K. [1 Sam.] 1:26 ze he psuche sou, ego he gune ktl.Jdg.8:19 ze Kurios, ei ezoogonekeite autous, ouk an apekteina humas.c. In 4 K. [2 Kings] 3:14 hoti ei me is merely a strengthened form of ei me, so that the e by which it is followed in Swete's text, instead of ei, seems to destroy the sense.d. In the N.T. we have the jurative use of ei in -Mk.8:12 amen lego humin, ei dothesetai te genea taute semeion.Also in Hb.3:11, 4:3 in quotations from Ps.94:11.102. ei' me in Oaths. As ei assumes a negative force in oaths and asseverations, so on the same principle ei me becomes positive. Instances are -Nb.14:35 ego Kurios elalesa, ei me houtos poieso (= I will do so).Is.45:23 kat' emautou omnuo, ei me exeleusetai ek tou stomatos mou dikaiosune (= righteousness shall go forth from my mouth).In 3 K. [2 Kings} 21:23 ean de polemesomen autous kat' euthu, ei me krataiosomen huper autous the oath itself is suppressed as well as the apodosis.103. ei' men. ei men as a formula of asseveration has been supposed to be a blend between the Hebraistic ei me (§102) and the Greek e men. It is however not confined to Biblical Greek, but occurs also on the Papyri. We treat it under the head of Conjunctions because of the lack of accent. It would perhaps be more correct to wirte it ei men and regard it as an Interjection. The following are all the passages in which it occurs in the LXX -Gen.22:17 ei men eulogon eulogeso se, 42:15 ne ten hugian Pharao, ei men kataskopoi este.Nb.14:23,28: Jdg.15:7: Job 1:11, 2:5, 27:3: Judith 1:12: Baruch 2:29: Ezk.33:27, 34:8, 36:5, 38:19.In 2 K. [2 Sam.] 19:35 what we have is ei interrogative (§100) followed by men.In the N.T. ei men occurs only in Hb.6:14 in a quotation from Gen.22:17.104. ean, etc., with the Indicative. a. As in Hellenistic Greek ei may take the subjunctive, so on the other hand ean, hotan and the like are found with the indicative.Instances of ean with the indicative in the LXX are -Gen.44:30 ean eisporeuomai.Jdg.6:3 ean espeiran.3 K. [2 Kings} 21:23 ean de polemesomen autous kat' euthu.Job.22:3 ean su estha.So in N.T. -- 1 Jn.5:15 ean oidamen.Acts 7:7 to ethnos, ho ean douleusousi. Cp. Herm. Past. Vis.3.12.3 ean . . . eireneuete, 1.3.2 ean . . . metanoesousin.b. Instances of hotan with the indicative in the LXX are -Gen.38:9 hotan eiserscheto. Ex.17:11 hotan eperen Mouses tas cheiras.Nb.11:9 kai hotan katebe he drosos, 21:9 hotan edaknen ophis anthropon.1 K. [1 Sam.] 17:34 hotan ercheto ho leon kai he arkos.Ps.119:7 hotan elaloun autois.c. So in N.T. -- Mk.3:11 kai ta pneumata ta akatharta, hotan auton etheorei, prosepipten auto, 11:19 hotan opse egeneto.Rev.8:1 hotan enoixe.Cp. Barn. Ep.4:14 hotan blepete, 15:5 hotan . . . katargesei.Ign. Eph.8:1 hotan gar medemia eris enereistai en humin.Herm. Past. Sim.9.1.6 hotan ho helios epikekaukei, xerai egenonto, 4.5 hotan . . . etethesan. Cp.17.3.6.4 hotan epatassen.d. Under the same head come the following -Ex.33:8, 34:34 henika d' an eiseporeueto Moses, 40:30 henika d' an anebe apo tes skenes he nephele.Tobit 7:11 hopote ean eiseporeuonto. Cp. Barn. Ep.12:3 hopotan katheilen.105. ean after a Relative. a. ean for an after a relative seems to occur occasionally in Mss. of Attic authors, especially of Xenophon, but to have been expunged by editors. It is proved by the Papyri to have been in common use in Egypt during the first two centuries B.C. Biblical Greek is so full of this usage that it is superfluous to collect examples. Besides the simple relative in its various cases we have -hosa ean Gen.44:1: Ex.13:12. henika ean Gen.24:41: Ex.13:5.hou ean Ex.20:24. kathos ean Sir.14:11: Dan. O' 1:13.hothen ean Ex.5:11.As a rule the subjunctive follows, but not always.Gen.2:19 pan ho ean ekalesen.b. The

use of an in such cases is not quite excluded, e.g. Ex.12:15, 19: Nb.22:20.c. In the N.T. also it is easier to find ean in this connexion than an, e.g. -ho ean Mt.5:19, 10:14,42: Lk.17:33.ho ean Mt.11:27: Lk.10:22.ohu ean 1 Cor.16:3.ho ean 1 Cor.6:18: Gal.6:7: Col.3:23: Eph.6:8: Jn.15:7: 1 Jn.3:22: 3 Jn.5.katho ean 2 Cor.8:12.hopou ean Mt.8:19.ho ti ean 1 Jn.3:19.For instances of an take 1 Jn.3:17: Mt.10:11: Lk.10:5,8,10,35.d. In the Apostolic Fathers also we find the same use of ean after relatives-Barn. Ep.7:11 ho ean thele, 11:8 pan rhema ho768; ean exeleusetai.Herm. Past. Vis.3.2.1 ho ean pathe, Sim.7.7 hosoi [ean] en tais entolais mou tautais poreuthosin, 9.2.7 hosa ean soi deixo.106. hina with the Indicative. a. In the vast majority of places in which hina occurs in the LXX it governs the subjunctive. The optative, as we have seen, has practically vanished from dependent clauses. But there are a few passages in Swete's text, and perhaps Ms. authority for more, in which hina after a primary tense or the imperative mood takes a future indicative.Gen.16:2 eiselthe . . . hina teknopoieseis.3 K. [2 Kings} 2:3 phulaxeis . . . hina poieseis.Sus. O 28 enedreuontes hina thanatosousin auten. Dan. O 3:96 ego krino hina pan ethnos . . . diamelisthesetai.b. The 1st person singular of the 1st aorist subjunctive may possibly have served as a stepping-stone to this use. Take for instance -2 K. [2 Sam.] 19:22 apostethi . . . hina me pataxo se.This might easily lead by false analogy to -apeleusomai, hina me pataxeis me.This theory however fails to account for the following -1 Esd.4:50 hina aphiousi.Tob.14:9 su de tereson ton nomon . . . hina soi kalos en.The last can only be regarded as a monstrosity.c. In the N.T. hina with the future indicative occurs occasionally and is common in Revelation -1 Cor.9:18 hina . . . theso.Gal.2:4 hina hemas katadoulosousin.1 Pet.3:1 hina . . . kerdethesontai.Rev.3:9, 6:4, 8:3, 9:20, 14:13, 22:24 hina estai . . . kai . . . eiselthosin.The last instance shows that even in the debased Greek of this book the subjunctive still claimed its rights on occasions.d. There are two apparent instances in St. Paul's writings of hina with a present indicative -1 Cor.4:6 hina me . . . phusiousthe.Gal.1:17 hina autous zeloute.With regard to these Winer came to the conclusion that hina with the indicative present is to be regarded as an impropriety of later Greek.' Perhaps however in these cases it is the accidence, not the syntax, that is astray, phusiousthe and zeloute being meant for the subjunctive. Winer closes his discussion of the subject by saying, It is worthy of remark, however the case may be, that in both instances the verb ends in oo.' Here the true explanation seems to lie. The hypothesis of an irregular contraction is not in itself a violent one, and it is confirmed by a passage of the LXX -Ex.1:16 hotan maiousthe tas Hebraias kai osin pros to tiktein.107. Ellipse before hoti. By the suppression of an imperative of a verb of knowing hoti acquires the sense of know that.'Ex.3:12 legon Oti esomai meta sou.Jdg.15:7 eipen . . . Sampson . . . hoti ei men ekdikeso en humin.3 K. [2 Kings} 19:2 eipen . . . hoti tauten ten horan ktl.This usage originates in the Hebrew, but has a parallel in Greek in the similar ellipse before hos, which is common in Euripides, e.g. Med.609: Alc.1094: Phæn.720, 1664: Ion.935, 1404: Hel.126, 831: Hec.346, 400. Cp. Soph. Aj.39.108. all' e. a. The combination of particles all' e occurs in Swete's text 114 times at least. In most of these passages all' e is simply a strengthened form of alla. If it differs at all from it, it is in the same way as but only' in English differs from the simple but.' In the remainder of the 114 passages all' e has the same force as the English but' in the sense of except' after a negative expressed or implied. It is thus an equivalent for the classical ei me. But even this latter meaning can be borne by the simple alla, if we may trust the reading of - Gen.21:26 oude ego ekousa alla semeron.b. The idea has been entertained that all' e is not for alla e, as the accentuation assumes, but for allo e. This view would suit very well with such passages as Gen.28:17, 47:18: Dt.10:12: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 12:3: Sir.22:14, where it happens that a neuter singular

precedes, but it seems to have nothing else to recommend it.Where all' e follows allos or heteros, as in 4 K. [2 Kings] 5:17: Dan.3:95, Th 2:11: 1 Mac.10:38, the alla would be superfluous in classical Greek, so that in these cases it might be thought that the e was strengthened by the alla, and not vice versa: but if we accept the use in Gen.21:26, it follows that even here it is the alla which is strengthened.c. In contrast with the abundance of instances in the O.T. and in Hellenistic Greek generally, e.g. in Aristotle, it is strange how rare this combination is in the N.T. In the Revisers' text it occurs only twice -Lk.12:51 ouchi, lego humin, all' e diamerismon.2 Cor.1:13 ou gar alla graphomen humin, all' e ha anaginoskete.109. hoti all' e. This combination of particles occurs in the following passages of the LXX - Jdg.15:13: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 2:30, 21:4, 21:6, 30:17, 30:22: 2 K. [2 Sam.] 13:33, 21:2: 3 K. [2 Kings} 18:18: 4 K. [2 Kings] 4:2, 5:15, 10:23, 14:6, 17:35,36, 23:23: 2 Chr.2:6.An examination of these instances will show that they all fall under the same two heads as all' e. In the bulk of them hoti all' e is simply a strongly adversative particle (= but); in the remainder it is like our but' = except' after a negative expressed or implied. The reader will observe that the range of literature, within which this combination of particles is found, is very limited, being almost confined to the four books of Kingdoms. It looks therefore as if we had here a mere device of translation, not any recognised usage of later Greek. In all but the first two instances the underlying Hebrew is the same, consisting of two particles; in the first two there is only the particle corresponding to hoti, and these passages seem really to fall under § 107.There is one place in which we find this combination of particles still more complicated by the use of dioti in place of hoti.3 K. [2 Kings} 22:18 Ouk eipa pros se Ou propheteuei houtos moi kala, dioti all' e kaka;110. hoti ei me. This combination occurs in the following passages -2 K. [2 Sam.] 2:27 Ze Kurios, hoti ei me elalesas, dioti tote ek proithen anebe ho laos.3 K. [2 Kings} 17:1 Ze Kurios . . . ei estai . . . huetos; hoti ei me dia stomatos logou mou.4 K. [2 Kings] 3:14 Ze Kurios . . . hoti ei me prosopon Iosaphath . . . ego lambano, ei' (A) epeblepsa pros se.In the first of the above passages unless,' in the second except,' in the third only that' seem to give the exact shade of meaning. In all of them the hoti might be dispensed with, and owes its presence to the Hebrew.111. all' e hoti. There are four passages in which this combination occurs -Nb.13:29 all' e hoti thrasu to ethnos.1 K. [1 Sam.] 10:19 Ouchi, all' e hoti basilea steseis eph' hemon, 12:12 Ouchi, all' e hoti basileus basileusei eph' hemon.2 K. [2 Sam.] 19:28 hoti ouk en pas ho oikos tou patros mou all' e hoti andres thanatou.No one meaning suits all the above passages. In the first of them the Hebrew which corresponds to all' e hoti is rendered in the R.V. howbeit.' In the next two all' e hoti might just as well have been hoti all' e (= Lat. sed.), as in Jdg.15:3 (§ 109). In the fourth also hoti all' e might have been used in the sense of but' in nothing but,' etc., as in 1 K. [1 Sam.] 21:6, 30:17: 4 K. [2 Kings] 4:2, 5:15: 2 Chr.2:6.112. legon, etc., for the Hebrew Gerund. a. A special cause of irregularity in LXX Greek is the treatment of the Hebrew gerund of the verb to say' (= Lat. dicendo), which is constantly used to introduce speeches. As the Greek language has no gerund, this is rendered in the LXX by a participle. But the form being fixed in the Hebrew, the tendency is to keep it so in the Greek also. Hence it is quite the exception to find the participle agreeing with its subject, as in -1 K. [1 Sam.] 19:2 apengeilen . . . legon, 19:11 apengeile . . . legousa.b. If the subject is neuter or feminine, the participle may still be masculine-Gen.15:1: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 15:10 egenethe rhema Kuriou . . . legon.4 K. [2 Kings] 18:36 hoti entole tou basileos legon.Also, if the sentence is impersonal -3 K. [2 Kings} 20:9 egegrapto . . . legon.2 Chr.21:12 elthen . . . en graphe . . . legon.Jonah 3:7 errethe . . . legon.c. But the participle may even refer to another subject, as -4 K. [2 Kings] 19:9 ekousen . . . legon = he heard say.d. It is rare for the Greek to fare so well as in

-Dt.13:12 ean de akouses . . . legonton.And here the genitive is probably not governed by akouein, but used absolutely. Cp. -1 K. [1 Sam.] 24:2 apengele auto legonton.e. A very common case is to have the verb in the passive, either impersonally or personally, and the participle in the nominative plural masculine, thus -apengele . . . legontes Gen.38:24, 48:2: Josh.2:2, 10:17: 1 K. [1 Sam.] 14:33, 15:12, 19:19, 23:1. anengele . . . legontes Jdg.16:2: Gen.22:20.dieboethe he phone . . . legontes Gen.45:16.eulogethesetai Israel legontes Gen.48:20.An adjacent case is -Ezk.12:22 Tis he parabole humin . . . legontes;f. When the verb is active and finite, the construction presents itself as good Greek, as in -3 K. [2 Kings} 12:10 elalesan . . . legontes,but this is a little better than an accident, for what immediately follows is -Tade laleseis to lao touto tois lalesasi pros se legontes ktl.In Dt.18:16 we have even eteso . . . legontes.g. Where the principal verb is not one of saying, the divorce between it and the participle is complete, both in sense and grammar -Ex.5:14 emastigothesan . . . legontes, 5:19 heoron . . . legontes,where the being beaten' and the seeing' are predicated of one set of persons and the saying' of another. Cp. the complex case in 1 Mac.13:17,18.h. In the N.T. this Hebraism occurs only once -Rev.11:15 phonai . . . legontes.113. Idiomatic Use of prostithenai. a. Another very common Hebraism is the use of prostithenai with the infinitive of another verb in the sense of doing a thing more or again, e.g. -Gen.37:8 prosethento eti misein = they hated still more. Cp. Gen.4:2, 12, 8:21, 44:23. Ex.8:29 me prosthes eti . . . exapatesai. Cp. Ex.9:28, 10:28, 14:13.Nb.22:15,19,25: Dt.3:26, 5:25: Josh.7:12: Jdg.8:28, 10:6, 13:1,21: 1 Mac.9:1.b. Sometimes tou precedes the infinitive, as -Ex.9:34 prosetheto tou hamartanein.Josh.23:13 ou me prosthe Kurios tou exolethreusai.Jdg.2:21 ou prostheso tou exarai. Cp. Jdg.9:37, 10:13.c. The same construction may be used impersonally in the passive -Ex.5:7 ouketi prostethesetai didonai achuron to lao.d. Sometimes the dependent verb is dropped after the middle or passive -Nb.22:26 kai prosetheto ho angelos tou Theou kai apelthon hupeste. Cp.4 K. [2 Kings] 1:11.Ex.11:6 hetis toiaute ou gegonen kai toiaute ouketi prostethesetai.

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ
and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present

- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online

- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries

- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net