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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 contributors 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 Vicar of 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. 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 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. 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 times, 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 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.

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. 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
He was a warm admirer of the Jewish religion, but not himself a Jew by race. 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 come 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. He was a warm admirer of the Jewish religion, but not himself a Jew by race. 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. 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. 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 Ptolemy Philadelphus, 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, 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. 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 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 character. He had heard from Theopompus the work of transcription was accomplished in seventy-two days, just as though it had been done on purpose (§ 307).

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. οἱ Ο´) 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. 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. οἱ Ο´) 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. 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!
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.

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. 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; nevertheless his younger 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.’

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’ 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 superintendence 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. 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. This account is given by
Diogenes Laertius (V § 78) on the authority of Hermippus, whom Josephus 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, who seems here to have followed some account independent of Aristaeus. And in another respect this alternative version of the facts is intrinsically more credible. For, whereas the Letter of Aristaeus 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 Aristaeus 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 seem 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 falsification 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 Aristaeas, 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 Aristaeas 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 Aristaeas 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 Aristaeas. 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 by Philadelphus of the Elders there are two in immediate succession — (1) What kind of men ought to be appointed στρατηγοί? (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 στρατηγοί 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 στρατηγός was the Greek equivalent for the Roman praetor, it might at first seem that it could only have been under the Romans that στρατηγός acquired the meaning of ‘judge.’ But this leaves out of sight, the
question how ἀπεικονίζοντα 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 ἀπεικονίζοντα 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 Irenæus 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).

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 they really translated for the library? Or, having been translated by the Jews for their own use was a copy

strathgoi, at Athens were judges as

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 proselyte 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 σὺν, so that we are presented with the phenomenon of σὺν with the accusative. This peculiarity presents itself in the Greek version of Ecclesiastes 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 coincident 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 ἰερουσαλημ for παρθένος 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. VII17).

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 (κοινή, sc. διάλέκτος) 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 προστίθεσθαι with 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 ἀνθρώπος ἀνθρώπῳ ἔτει πυρήνα ἀνθρώπου, ἂν ἐν ὅδε μακρινῷ ἴσιμον ἂν ἐν ταῖς γενεαῖς ἴσιμον, καὶ ποιήσε τὸ πάσχα Κυρίῳ. 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 doubtfull 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 — ἐπιθήσωσιν θημίσμα ἐν ὄργῃ σου, διὰ παντὸς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριόν σου. 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.

---

1. Strabo XVII § 6, p. 792 πορθητά γὰρ ἢσαν καὶ ἐπιθυμηταί κατὰ σπάνιν γῆς.
2. Strabo XVII § 8, p.794 τῶν δὲ βασιλείων μέρος ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ Μουσείον, ἔχον περίπατον καὶ ἔξοδων καὶ οἰκον μέγαν, ἐν ὦ το σησσάτιον τῶν μετεχῶν τοῦ Μουσείου φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν.
3. *De Tranq. An.* 9 — Quadringenta millia librorum Alexandiae arserunt: pulcherrimum regiae opulentiae monumentum. According to Tertullian ( *Apol.* 18) the MS. of the translators of the Old Testament was still to be seen in his day in the Serapeum along with the Hebrew original.
Josephus Ant. XII. 1 confirms his statement of this fact by a quotation from Agatharchides of Cnidos, who wrote the history of the successors of Alexander — Ἑστὶν ἔθνος Ἰουδαίων λεγόμενον, οί πάλιν ὁμιρυ καὶ μεγάλην ἔχοντες Ἰερουσαλήμ, ταύτῃ ὑπερείδον ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίω γενομένην, ὡπλα λαβεῖν οὐ θελησαντες, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀκαίρων δεσιδαιμονίαν χαλεπῶν ὑπέμειναν ἦχειν δεσπότην.

That Aristeas was himself captain of the body-guard is not stated in the letter, but it is not unnaturally inferred from it by Josephus.

This again, while only implied in the letter, is explicitly stated by Josephus, who makes Aristeas say (Ant. XII 2 § 2) Ἰσχύει μέντοι γε, ὡ βασιλεῦ, ὡς οὔτε γένει προσήκων αὐτοῖς, οὔτε ὁμοφυλός αὐτῶν ὁν ταύτα περὶ αὐτῶν ἀξίω.

The description of these presents occupies a considerable portion of the letter, §§ 51-82.

§ 99 καὶ διαβεβαιώμαι πάντα ἀνθρώπων προσελθόντα τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῶν πρωτερμημών εἰς ἐκπλήξειν ἤξειν καὶ θεωραμών ἀδιήκητον, μετατρέπετα τῇ διανοιγ. διά τὴν περὶ ἕκαστην ἄγιαν κατακεφεῦν.

§ 121: cp. Philo Vita Mosis II § 6, p. 139.

Diog. Laert. 11 § 140 Ἐπρέβευσε δὲ καὶ πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον (probably Soter) καὶ Λυσίμαχον.

§ 301. τὸ τῶν ἐπτὰ σταδίων ἀνάχωμα τῆς θαλάσσης cp. Strabo XVII § 6, p. 792 τῷ ἔπτασταδίῳ καλουμένῳ χώματι.

Theopompus came to Egypt during the reign of Ptolemy Soter.

Theodectes died at the age of forty-one, about B.C. 334, i.e. at least half a century before the time of speaking: but the expression παρὰ θεοδόκητο . . . μετέλαβον ἐγώ (§ 318), as contrasted with ἐφησον ἀκτηκοίνθην θεοτόμπου (§ 314), seems to imply that the communication was not direct.

See §§ 30, 38, 309, 312: Jos. Ant. Proœm. § 3 οὐδὲ γὰρ πάσαν ἐκείνος (sc. Ἐλεάζαρος) ἠφθη λαβεῖν τὴν ἀναγραφήν, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ μόνα τὰ τοῦ νόμου παρέδοσαν οἱ πεμφθέντες ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξήγησιν εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν.

Cp. Aristeas § 211 with Jos. Ant. XII 2 § 13 ad fin.

Irenaeus quoted by Eus. H. E. V 8.

Praep. Ev. VIII 2-5 and 9. Josephus, Tertullian, Eusebius, and most subsequent writers with the exception of St. Jerome call Aristeas Ἀρισταῖος. The two forms would appear not to have differed appreciably in pronunciation. In the names of two of the interpreters there is a similar variation, Βασίλεα and Βασίλα appearing also as Βασιλεία and Βασιλεία, whence it is an easy step to the more familiar Greek termination -αῖος.
Preface to the Pentateuch — et nescio quia primus auctor septuaginta cellulas Alexandriae mendacio suo extruxerit, quibus divis eadem scripturarint, cum Aristeas eiusdem Ptolemaei ἐπερασμιστής et multo post tempore Iosephus Nihil tale retulerint, sed in una basilica congregatos contulisse scribant, non prophetasse.

Jerome died A.D. 420, Augustine A.D. 430.

Aug. de Civ. Dei XVIII 42 and 43.


Cicero proBab. Post. § 23 implies that Demetrius was intentionally got rid of in this way — Demetrium et ex republica, quam optime gesserat, et ex doctrina nobilem et clarum, qui Phalereus vocitatus est, in eodem isto AEgyptio regno aspide ad corpus admota vita esse privatum.

Against Apion I 22 ἀνήρ περὶ πάσαν ἱστορίαν ἐπιμελής.

Quoted in Eusebius V 8.

In that case the words 'In the eight and thirtieth year in the reign of Euergetes I came into Egypt' may mean simply 'When I wax thirty-eight years old,' etc., which is the sense in which Professor Mahaffy takes them. Wendland has pointed out a resemblance of expression which might seem to imply that the writer of the Letter was acquainted with the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus. Cp. Aristeas § 7 with the words in the Prologue — καὶ ως οὗ μόνον . . . χρησίμως εἶναι.


Aristobulus in Eus. Pr. Ev. XIII 12 § 1 — Φανερῶν ὅτι κατηκολούθησεν ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ, καὶ φανερῶς ἐστὶ περιεγρασμένος ὅκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ. Διερμήνευται γὰρ πρὸς Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως δι᾽ ἐτέρων πρὸς τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως κτλ. . . . Γέγονε γὰρ πολυμαθής, καθὼς καὶ Πυθαγόρας πολλὰ τῶν παρ᾽ ἦμαν μετενέγκας εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὁμογενεῖοι κατεχὴσειν.

E.g. 2:17 καὶ ἐμίσησα σύν τὴν ζωὴν.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Clem.</td>
<td>1 Clement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Clem.</td>
<td>2 Clement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant.</td>
<td>Antiquities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>(Codex) Vaticanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. J.</td>
<td>Wars of the Jews (Josephus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn.</td>
<td>Barnabas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.</td>
<td>Epistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>Genitive (sometimes Genesis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herm.</td>
<td>Hermas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hes.</td>
<td>Hesiod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>Homer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliad</td>
<td>Iliad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isocr.</td>
<td>Isocrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos.</td>
<td>Josephus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. &amp; S.</td>
<td>Liddell and Scott.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mart.</td>
<td>Martyrdom of Polycarp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mss.</td>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.T.</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O´</td>
<td>Origen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od</td>
<td>Odyssey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past. Mdt.</td>
<td>Shepherd, Mandate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past. Sim.</td>
<td>Shepherd, Similitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat.</td>
<td>Plato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaut.</td>
<td>Plautinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>Theodotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Ign.</td>
<td>Ignatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sim.</td>
<td>Similitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xen</td>
<td>Xenophon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ec</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eur</td>
<td>Euripides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.T.</td>
<td>Iphigenia in Tauris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaedr</td>
<td>Phaedrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuc</td>
<td>Thucydides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrop</td>
<td>Cyropedia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Grammar of Septuagint Greek

ACCIDENCE

NOUNS, 1-14

1. Disuse of the Dual. The Greek of the LXX has two numbers, the singular and the plural. The dual, which was already falling into disuse in the time of Homer, and which is seldom adhered to systematically in classical writers, has disappeared altogether.

Gen. 40:2 ἐπὶ τοῖς δυαῖς εὐνοοῦσιν αὐτοῦ. Ex. 4:9 τοῖς δύοις σημείοις τούτοις.

Contrast with the above—


2. Ἐἷς as Article. Under the influence of Hebrew idiom we find the numeral Ἐἷς turning into an indefinite pronoun in the Greek of the LXX, as in Gen. 42:27 λύσας δέ Ἐἷς τῶν μαρτυππούν αὐτοῦ, and then subsiding into a mere article, as —


There are instances of the same usage in the two most Hebraistic books of the N. T.


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 adolescuentalam.

Plaut. Most. 990 unum vidi mortuum efferri foras.

Apart from the influence of the Hebrew, Ἐἷς is occasionally found in good Greek on the way to becoming an article. See L. & S. under Ἐἷς. 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 Ἐἷς ἅτος 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 -α, preceded by a consonant other than ρ, to retain the α in the genitive, e.g. Λῆδας, Άνδρομεδέας, Κομπλέγας (name of a Spanish town, App. VI De Reb. Hisp. 43). In pursuance of this analogy we have such genitives as Βάλλας and Ζέλφας (Gen. 37,2), Σούσαννας (Sus. O’ 30).

On the other hand, nouns in -α pure, or -α preceded by ρ, are in a few instances found in the LXX to take the Ionic form of the genitive and dative in -ης and -η.


It is said that in the Papyri σπείρας is always used, never σπέρας.

The plural of γῆ is found in the LXX


4. Second Declension. θεός has a vocative θεί. 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] ὁ θεός ὁ θεός μου πρόσχες μοι ἰνατί ἐγκατέλιπες με;

But in Matthew 27:46 this passage assumes the form—

Θεέ μου θεό μου ἰνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες;
The Attic form of this declension is of rare occurrence in the LXX. Δαός and μακός are the regular forms. Δέως does not occur at all, and νευός only in Second Maccabees. ἀλως is common: but for that there is no non-Attic form, as it does not arise, like the others, on the principle of transposition of quantity.

5. Third Declension. The word ἁκινής (Ex. 8:16) is interesting, as adding another instance of a noun-stem in -φ to the rare word κατηλίμα and νῆφα, which occurs only in the accusative in Hes. Of. 533. ἁκινής is also found in the LXX with the stem ἁκινήτης.

6. Absence of Contraction. Many words are left uncontracted in the LXX which in Attic Greek would be contracted, e.g.—

Dt. 18:11 ἐπαιδεύοντο ἑπαιδεύοντο. Prov. 3:8 ὀστέοις. Sir. 6:30 χρίσεος. Ps. 73:17 ἄρα.

7. Feminine Forms of Movable Substantives. The form βασιλίσσα for βασίλεια was not approved by Atticists. It is common in the LXX, whereas βασίλεια does not occur. Cf. Acts 8:27. On the analogy of it we have Ἀράβισσα in Job 42:17, φυλάκισσα in Song 1:6. The following also may be noted:—

γενέτις Wisd 7:12 Α, τεχνήτις 7:22, μύστις 8:4, ὑβρίστρωκα Jer. 27:31


αἰθάλη (Ex. 9:8, 10) for αἰθάλος, which does not occur.

ἀλως (Hos. 9:2), ἀλωνος (Jdg. 15:5) for ἀλως, ἀλω. Cf. Mt. 3:12, Lk 3:17 τὴν ἀλωνα. In the LXX both ἀλων and ἄλος are of common gender. Thus Ruth 3:2 τὸν ἄλωνα, 3:14 τὴν ἀλωνα; Judg. 6:37 τὴν ἄλωνι; 1 Chr. 21:15 ἐν τῷ ἄλω, 21:21 ἐκ τῆς ἄλω. Josephus (Ant. 5.9.3) has τῆς ἄλως.

γῆρος, γῆρει for γῆρος, γῆρη, but nominative always γῆρας. For γῆρος, see Gen. 37:3; Ps. 70:9, 18; but in Gen 44:20 γῆρως. For γῆρει see Gen. 15:15, Ps. 91:15, Sir. 8:6, Dan. Ο’ 6:1. When one form is used, the other generally occurs as a variant. In Clement 1 Cor. 63:3 we have ἔως γῆρος.

ἐλεός, τὸ for ἐλεος, ὁ. Plural τὰ ἐλέη (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. 1:6, 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.

ἐνέδρος (Jdg. 16:2) for ἐνέδρα. The former is quite common, the latter occurs only in Josh. 8:7, 9; Ps. 9:28.

λύχνος, τὸ (Dan. Ο’ 5:0).


σκότος, τὸ for ὁ, 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 heteroclitic nouns, which do not occur in the LXX. Thus —

ζήλος, τὸ (Phil. 3:6; 1 Clem. 4:8, 11, 13; 6:1, 2; 9:1, 63:2; but in 5:2, 5 διὰ ζήλον; Ignat. Ad Tral. 4:2).

πλοῦς declined like βοῦς (Acts 27:9; Mart. S. Ign. 3 εἰχετο τοῦ πλοῦς).

πλούτος, τὸ (2 Cor. 8:2; Eph. 1:7; 2:7; 3:8, 16; Phil. 4:19; Col. 1:27; 2:2).

τύφος, τὸ (1 Clem. 13:1).


a. The Abundance of verbal nouns in -μα is characteristic of Hellenistic Greek from Aristotle onwards. The following instances from the LXX are taken at random —

ἀγνόημα Gen. 43:12 (6 times in all).

ἀνόμημα 1 Ki. [1 Sam.] 25:28 (17 times in all).

ὀμονόημα Gen. 15:11 (5 times in all).

κατάλειμμα Gen. 45:7 (20 times in all).

ὑψωμα . . . γαυρίαμα . . . καύχημα Judith 15:9
b. A point better worth noting is the preference for the short radical vowel in their formation, e.g. — 

άνάθεμα 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 άνάθημα. For the short vowel in the LXX, cp. θέμα, έκθεμα, έπίθεμα, παράθεμα, πρόθεμα, ούνθεμα.

άφαίρεμα Ex. 29:27; Lvt. 7:4, 24 etc.

άφεμα 1 Mac. 9:28, 30 κάθεμα, Is. 3:19, Ezek. 16:11.

Gen. 25:6 etc. So in N.T.

έφέμα Sir. 20:9; 29:4.

έψεμα Gen. 25:29 etc.

σύστημα Gen. 1:10 etc. So σύστημα. In Judith 12:9 σύστημα.

χώμα (for) 2 Mac. 2:24.


άλλοτηκας accusative plural (Jdg. 15:4) for άλλοτεκα.

άρκος (1 K. 17:34 [1 Sam. 17:34]) for άρκτος, which does not occur. Cp. Rev. 13:2 άρκου.

δίνα (Job 13:11; 28:10) for δίνη.

έυστρον (Dt. 18:3) for ήμιστρον. So in Jos. Ant. 4.4.4.

έπαυδάδ (Ex. 7:11) for έπωδάδ, which does not occur.

κλίβανος (Ex. 7:28) for κρίβανος. So also in N.T.

μολύβδος (Ex. 15:10), the Homeric form, for μολυβδός.

ταμείον (Ex. 7:28; Jdg. 3:24, 15:1, 16:12) for ταμεῖον, which also occurs frequently. The shorter form is common in the Papyri.

ύψεια (Tob. 8:21) for ύψεια. In later Greek generally ύψεια is usual, but the fuller form prevails in the LXX.

χειμάρρος (1 K. 17:40 [1 Sam. 17:40]) for χειμάρρος.


εύθης, εύθες, for εὐθύς, εὐθεία, εὐθῦ, which also occurs frequently.

ήμισις, -ου is an adjective of two terminations in the LXX. ήμίσια does not occur. Cp. Nb. 34:14 τὸ ήμισιον φυλῆς Μανασσή with Jos. Ant. 4.7.3 καὶ τῆς Μανασσήτιδος ήμίσια.

χάλκεος, -α, -ον, the Homeric form, occurs in Jdg. 16:21, 1 Esd. 1:38, 5 times in Job, and in Sir. 28:20 for χαλκοῖς, χαλκῆ, χαλκοῖς, which is very common.

άργυρικός 1 Esd. 8:24 only. Cp. Aristaeas.37, who has also ἐλαίικος, σιτικός, χαριστικός (112, 37, 227).

αἰσχυντήρος Sir. 26:15, 35:10, 42:1 only.

σιγηρός Prov. 18:18, Sir. 26:14 only.

κλεψιμαίος Tob. 2:13 only.

Θησιμαίος often used in the neuter for ‘a corpse,’ e.g. 3 K. 13:25 [1 Kings 13:25].

12. Comparison of Adjectives.

άγαθότερος (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.

αιχρότερος (Gen. 41:19) is good Greek, though not Attic. ἄισχιον does not seem to occur in the LXX.

εγγύς and ἕγγυς are usual in the LXX, e.g. Ruth 3:12, 3 K. 20:2 [1 Kings 20:2], Ἑγγύτερος does not seem to occur at all, and ἕγγυτατος only in Job 6:15, 19:14.

πλησιέστερον adv. for πλησιαίτερον (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. Αὐτός ἐστι is something more, and ἐστι something less, for it may equally mean 'she said.' The Greek of the LXX gets over this difficulty by the use of αὐτός as an unemphatic pronoun of the 3d person.

In the above the repeated αὐτός is simply the nominative of the αὐτόν preceding. In a classical writer αὐτός 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. 17:2 [1 Sam. 17:2], 18:16. Winer denied that this use of αὐτός 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.

Instances abound in N.T.

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.

d. The use of ὅς as a mere possessive pronoun is common to the LXX with the N.T. e.g.

b. The following forms of numerals differ from those in classical use:

The above numerals occur also in the regular forms -
c. The forms just given may be written separately or as one word. This led to the τέσσαρες in τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα becoming indeclinable, e.g. -

2 Chr. 25:5 ύιόν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα.

The same license is extended in the LXX to δέκα τέσσαρες.

Nb. 29:29 άμώμους εἰναύσιους δέκα τέσσαρες άμώμους.

The indeclinable use of τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα is not peculiar to the LXX.

Hdt. 7.36 τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα (τριήρεας). Epict. Ench. 40 ἀπὸ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα ἐτῶν. Strabo p. 177, 4.1. 1 προσέπηκε δὲ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα ἕθην, 189, 4.2.1 ἐθνῶν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα.

d. The alternative expressions ὁ εἰ—ζ καὶ εἰκόστος (2 Chr. 24:17) and ὁ εἰκόστος πρῶτος (2 Chr. 25:28) are quite classical: but the following way of expressing days of the month may be noted -

Haggai 2:1 μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός. 1 Mac. 1:59 πέμπτη καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός. Cp. 4:59. 2 Mac. 10:5 τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνός.
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15. The Verb ἐίναι. ἐίναι, 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 occurring moreover in such authors as Epictetus (Diss. 1.16.19), Plutarch (Pomp. 74), Diogenes Laertius (6.56), Lucian (Asinus 46).

Because it is condemned by the same authority, it occurs also in Ps. 103:31; 1 Mac. 10:31, 16:3; so in the N.T. 1 Cor. 13:11; Gal. 1:10, 16:3; 2 Cor. 10:1, 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 occurring moreover in such authors as Epictetus (Diss. 1.16.19), Plutarch (Pomp. 74), Diogenes Laertius (6.56), Lucian (Asinus 46).

16. The Termination -αν.

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 -αν of the 3rd person plural of the historical tenses of the active voice other than the pluperfect.

There are in Greek two terminations of the 3rd person plural of the historic tenses --

(1) in -ν, (2) in -αν. Thus in Homer we have ἔας and also ἐβηναι. 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 ν, e.g. --

ἐλαβον-ν, ἐλαβο-ν, ἐλάβον-ν, ἐπιλαμβαν-ν,

while non-thematic tenses and the pluperfect take -αν, e.g. --

ἐδο-αν, ἐ-τι-θε-αν, ἐ-τι-θε-αν-

In the Greek of the LXX, which in this point represents the Alexandrian vernacular, thematic 2d aorists and imperfects may equally take -αν.

Of 2d aorists we may take the following examples --

ἐγένοσαν or ἔγενοσαν, ἐπίστευοσαν, ἐκρίνοσαν, ἐλάβοσαν, ἐπίστευοσαν, ἐὑροσαν, ἐφέροσαν (= 2d aor. I), ἐφάγοσαν, ἐφύγοσαν, ἤθοσαν, ἡμάρτοσαν, ἠροσαν (Josh. 3:14).

Compounds of these and others abound, e.g. -

ἀπήλθοσαν, διήλθοσαν, εἰσήλθοσαν, ἐξήλθοσαν, παρῆλθοσαν, περήλθοσαν, προηλθοσαν, συνήλθοσαν, ἐνεβάλοσαν, παρενεβάλοσαν, ἐξελίποσαν, κατελίποσαν, ἀπεθάνοσαν, ἐνθηγάσοσαν.

b. Instances of imperfrects, 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 -

ἐλαμβάνοσαν Ezk. 22:12, ἐφαίνοσαν 1 Mac. 4:50.

These seem to be more common in the case of contracted vowel verbs --

| ἐγεννώσαν Gen. 6:4 | εὐθύνοσαν Lam. 1:5 |
| ἐπιθύμοσαν Nbl. 1:18 | ἠμομύσαν Ezk. 22:11 |
| ἐπιστούσαν Job 1:4 | κατενοούσαν Ex. 33:8 |
| ἐπαιτευνούσαν Judith 4:9 | οἰκίοδομούσαν 2 Esd. [Ezra] 14:18 |
| ἐφαλάγοσαν Ps. 61:5 | παρεστηρούσαν Sus. Θ:12 |
| ἔδοκούσαν Ps. 5:9, 13:3 | |

Cp. Herm. Past. Sim. 6.2.7 ἐισταθούσαν, 9.9.5 ἔδοκούσαν.
Such forms occur plentifully in Mss. of the N.T., but the Revisers’ text has only ἐδολιοῦσαν in Romans 3:13 (a quotation from Ps. 13:3) and παρελάβοσαν in 2 Thes. 3:6.

c. The same termination -σαν sometimes takes the place of -εν in the 3d person plural of the optative.

| εἴποσαν Ps. 34:25. | ἵδοσαν Job 21:20. |
| ἐκκαίψασαι Prov. 24:52 | καταφάγοσαν Prov. 30:17. |
| ἐκλείποσαν Ps. 103:35. | ὄλεσασαι Job 18:11, 20:10. |
| ἐνέγκασαι Is. 66:20. | ποιήσασαι Dt. 1:44. |
| εὐλογήσασαι Ps. 34:25. | πυρεύσασαι Job 20:10. |

d. In Hellenistic Greek generally -σαν is also the termination of the 3d person plural of the imperative in all voices, e.g. --


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 - η, e.g. ἁρπᾷ, φάγῃ, λυπῆθη. The only exceptions to this rule in Attic are βούλει, οἶει, δίπει, and ἐσει, of which the last is only used occasionally. In the LXX we have δίπει in Nb. 23:13.

The full termination of the 2d person singular of primary tenses middle and passive (- σαι), which in Attic Greek appears only in the perfect of all verbs and in the present of - μι verbs, as λέ-λυ-σαι, δί-δο-σαι, is occasionally to be found in the LXX in other cases.

ἀπεξενοσαί 3 K. 14:6 [1 Kings 14:6].
κομμάσαι Dt. 31:16 (A).
κτάσαι Sir. 6:7.
So in N.T. --
καυχάσαι Rom. 2:17, 23: 1 Cor. 4:7.
κατακαυχάσαι Rom. 9:18.
ὀδυνάσαι Lk. 16:25.
φάγεσαι καὶ πέσαι σύ Lk. 17:8.

The Pastor of Hermas yields us ἐπισπάσαι, πλανάσαι, χράσαι. Such forms are still used in Modern Greek.

In theory - σαι is the termination of every 2d person singular in the middle and passive voices, as in δι-δο-σαι, λέ-λυ-σαι, so that πί-ε-σαί, is a perfectly regular formation. But in Attic Greek the ơ has dropped out wherever there is a connecting vowel, and then contraction has ensued. Thus πίςαι becomes first πίεσαι, and finally πίη. Confirmation of this theory is to be found in Homer, where there are many examples of the intermediate form, e.g. ἀναίρεσαι, δευτήρει, ἐρχεσε, εὐχεσε, ἱδήςε, κέλεσαι, λέξεσαι, λλαέσαι, μαίνεσαι, νέμεσαι, ὀδύρεσαι, πόλεσαι. It is an interesting question whether πίςαι and φάγεσαι 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 -μι verbs.

In καυκάσαι and the like, contraction has taken place in the vowels preceding the ο (καυκάσαι = καυκάσασαι ; ἀπεξενοῦσαι (3 K. 14:6 [1 Kings 14:6]) looks like a barbarism for ἀπεξενοῦσαι.

As against these fuller forms, we sometimes find contracted forms in the LXX, where the -σαι is usual in Attic.


18. Aorist in -α.

a. Another inflexional form for the frequency of which the classical student will hardly be prepared is the aorist in -α in other than semivowel verbs. Attic Greek offers some rare instances of this formation, as εἰπ-α, ἤπει-ε-α, ἤξε-α, and in Homer we have such stray forms as κήπνετες (Od. 4.231), ἄλεξαθαι (Od. 9.274), σεία (Il. 20.189). Nevertheless this is the type which has prevailed in the modern language.

b. In Attic the aorist εἴπα occurs more frequently in the other moods than in the indicative (e.g. Plat. Soph. 240 D εἴπαιμεν, Prot. 353 A εἴπαται imperative, Phil. 60 D εἴπάτω, Meno 71 D εἰπον imperative). In the LXX this aorist is equally common in the indicative.

εἴπα Dt. 1:20; Ps. 40:5.


εἴπάτω Dan. Θ 2:7.


εἴπασ Gen. 46:2.

c. While the classical aorist ἠλθον is common in the LXX, the form with -α also occurs, especially in the plural.


ἠλθασεν Gen. 26:27, 42:12; Dt. 1:20; Jdg. 11:7.


ἐλθατω Esther 5:4, 8; Is. 5:19; Jer. 17:15.

ἐλθασεν Prov. 9:5.


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 ἠλθαν . . . ἀπήλθαν : 1 Clem. 38:3 εἰονηλθαμεν .

d. By the side of εἴδον we have an aorist in -α, especially in the 3d person plural, where its advantage is obvious. (See h below.)

εἴδαμεν 1 K. 10:14 [1 Sam. 10:14].


e. Similarly by the side of εἰ—λον we have parts formed as though from εἰ—λα .


23
εἶλατο Dt. 26:18.
ἀνειλατο Ex. 2:5.
ἀπείλατο 1 K. 30:18 [1 Sam. 30:18].
διείλατο Josh. 22:8.
ἐξειλάμην 1 K. 10:18 [1 Sam. 10:18].
ἐξείλατο Ex. 18:4; 8: Josh. 24:10; 1 K. 12:11 [1 Sam. 12:11], 17:37, 30:18.
παρείλατο Nb. 11:25.
f. The aorist ἐπέσα occurs frequently in the 3d person plural, but is rare in other parts.
ἐπέσα Dan. 8:17, πεσάτω Jer. 44:20 (AS), 49:2 (AS).
ἐπάσεις 2 K. 3:34 [2 Sam. 3:34], έπέσατε Hos. 10:8.
Among compounds we find ἀπεπεσάτωσαν, διέπεσαν, ἐνέπεσαν, ἐπέπεσαν.
So in N.T. --
ἐπέσα Rev. 1:17.
ἐπέσαν Rev. 5:14, 6:13, 11:16, 17:10; Hb. 11:30.
ἐπέπεσατε Gal. 5:4.
Cp. Polyb. 3.19.5 ἀντἐπέσαν.
g. Other aorists of the same type are -
ἀπέθανεν Tob. 3:9, ἐλάβαν 2 K. 23:16 [2 Sam. 23:16].
ἐγκατέλιπαν 2 Chr. 29:6, ἐφάγαμεν 2 K. 19:42 [2 Sam. 19:42].
ἐβαλαν 3 K. 6:3 [1 Kings 6:3], ἐφυγαν Jdg. 7:21.
ἐμβάλατε 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. 10:14 [2 Sam. 10:14] we have this collocation - εἶδαν . . . ἐφυγαν . . . εἰσήλθαν . . . ἀνέστρεψαν.
In Jdg. 6:3 we find the anomalous form ἀνέβαλλαν followed by συνανέβαλλον.
19. Augment.
a. The augment with the pluperfect is at times omitted by Plato and the best Attic writers. Instances in the LXX are -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΒΕΒΡΩΚΕΙ</th>
<th>1 K. 30:12 [1 Sam. 30:12].</th>
<th>ΕΙΝΔΕΔΥΚΕΙ</th>
<th>Lvt. 16:23.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΕΙΝΔΕΔΥΚΕΙΝ</td>
<td>Job 29:14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So in N.T. --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΔΕΔΥΚΕΙ</th>
<th>Mk. 14:44.</th>
<th>ΜΕΜΕΝΗΚΕΙΑΝ</th>
<th>Jn. 2:19.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΕΚΒΕΒΛΗΚΕΙ</td>
<td>Mk. 16:9.</td>
<td>ΠΕΠΟΙΤΗΚΕΙΑΝ</td>
<td>Mk. 15:7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΕΚΡΙΚΕΙ</td>
<td>Acts 20:16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But in the LXX we occasionally find other historic tenses without the augment, e.g. 2 Esd. [Ezra] 14:18 οἰκοδομοῦσαν. This is especially the case with εἶδον.
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 ἐκάθευδον, ἐκάθιζον, ἐκαθήμην.

The same law holds in the Greek of the LXX, but is naturally extended to fresh cases, e.g. to προινομεύειν, which in the Alexandrian dialect seems to have been the common word for ‘to rave’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>επροινομεύσαμεν</th>
<th>ἐπροινομέουσαν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dt. 2:35, 3:7</td>
<td>Job 24:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. The aorist ἡνοίξα 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 ἡνοίξα itself, which is conjugated throughout the singular and plural, we have also the following --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἡνοίχθη</th>
<th>ἡνοίχθησαν</th>
<th>ἡνοίχθησαν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nb. 16:32: Ps. 105:17, 108:1</td>
<td>Ezk. 1:1</td>
<td>Is. 42:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡνοίɣετο</td>
<td>3 K. 7:21</td>
<td>1 Kings 7:21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So also in N.T. --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἡνοίξε</th>
<th>ἡνοίξεν</th>
<th>ἡνοίξεν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 12:14, 14:27: Rev. 8:1</td>
<td>Is. 42:20</td>
<td>Rev. 11:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the Attic form with double internal augment, ἱνέεκτι, the LXX has also forms which augment the initial vowel of this, and so display a triple augment. --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἱνέῳξε</th>
<th>ἱνέῳξεν</th>
<th>ἱνέῳξεν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 8:6: 3 Mac. 6:18</td>
<td>Gen. 7:11: Sir. 43:14: Dan. 7:10</td>
<td>3 K. 8:29: 1 Kings 8:29: 2 Chr. 6:20, 40, Neh. 1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱνεῳχεῖς</td>
<td>3 K. 8:52</td>
<td>1 Kings 8:52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So in N.T. --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἱνεῳχεῖς</th>
<th>ἱνεῷχεῖς</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. 10:8</td>
<td>Acts 12:14, 14:27: Rev. 8:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. In προφητεύειν the internal augment is wrong, since the verb is formed on the noun προφήτης. In the LXX προφητεύειν occurs only in 1 K. 18:10 [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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>προφητεύω</th>
<th>προφητεύεσαν</th>
<th>προφητεύεσαν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 19:6</td>
<td>Mt. 15:7: Mk. 7:6: Lk. 1:67: Jn. 11:51: Jude 14</td>
<td>Mt. 7:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προφητεύσαν</td>
<td>Mt. 11:18</td>
<td>1 Esd. 1:33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Instances of double augment in the LXX are --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἀπεκατέστησαν</th>
<th>ἀπεκατέστησαν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 K. 30:13</td>
<td>1 Sam. 30:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Reduplication

a. In verbs compounded with a preposition reduplication is sometimes applied to the preposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>κεκαταραμέμενος</th>
<th>κεκαταραμέμενος</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dt. 21:23: Sir. 3:16</td>
<td>Is. 42:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. In the form *kekathra*rantai (Nb. 22:6, 24:9. Cp. Enoch 27:1.2) we have what may be called double reduplication.

c. With ἰερομμένος (Jdg. 4:22) and ἱερομμένη (Jdg. 15:15) may be compared Homer’s ἰεροπομμένα (Od. 6.59). ἰεροπήθαι ἰεροπήθαι is cited from Pindar by Choeobocus.

d. The reduplicated present *ἐκδιδοσκευῖν* occurs in four passages --

1 K. 31:8; [1 Sam. 31:8] 2 K. 23:10; [2 Sam. 23:10] Neh. 4:23: Hos. 7:1. It is used also by Josephus. ἱερὰν, ‘to lend,’ occurs in three passages --

1 K. 1:28; [1 Sam. 1:28] Prov. 13:11: Ps. 111:5. ἱερὰ is used in this sense by Demosthenes.

e. The verb ἱλασεῖν has a reduplicated weak aorist, ἐκῴκραγε, which is very common, especially in the Psalms; also a reduplicated strong aorist, though this is very rare.

ἐκῄκραγεν Is. 6:3, ἐκ缗raγαυν Is. 6:4.


a. What is called the Attic future, *i.e.* the future out of which *σ* has dropped, is more common in the LXX than in Attic Greek. Thus the future of ἐλπίζειν, so far as it appears in Attic authors at all, is ἐλπίσω: but in the LXX it is always ἐλπίσω. Among verbs in -ίσω which take this form of future are --

| aἰχμαλωτίζειν | ἐγγίζειν | κερατίζειν | οἰωνίζειν |
| 야ποσκορακίζειν | ἐπιστρέφειν | κομίζειν | σαββατίζειν |
| ἄφαντιζειν | εὐαγγελίζειν | μελίζειν | συλλογίζειν |
| ἄφαντιζειν | καθαρίζειν | μερίζειν | συστέτειν |
| ἀφορίζειν | καθίζειν |

There is no apparent reason for the contradiction in the future of verbs in -ίζειν. The retention of *σ* in the future of such verbs is quite exceptional, as in Eccl. 11:4 ἐκερίςεί (mid.), Lvt. 25:5 ἐκερίσεις. Of the two versions of Daniel O’ has in 4:29 ὁσμόσουσί, while Θ has ὁσμοῦν. Μηνέεις has a future in the LXX of the same sort as verbs in -ίζειν.

| μηνᾶ Ιερ. 3:12 | μηνεῖς Lvt. 19:18 |
| μηνεῖς Ps. 102:9 |

b. In Attic Greek there are a few instances of verbs in -άζειν dropping the *σ* and contracting in the future. Thus βιβάζειν, ἐξετάζειν have the futures βιβάω, ἐξετάω in addition to the full forms. In the LXX the former of these sometimes retains the *σ* 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 -άζειν. Hence we meet with the following futures --


ἐκδικᾶται Lvt. 19:18; Dt. 32:43; Judith 11:10.


ἐργώνται Is. 5:10: Jer. 37:8, 9, 22:13, 41:14; Ezek. 48:19.

κατεργάζ. Dt. 28:39.

κομίζ. Dt. 31:16.

κομίσσα Lvt. 8:17.
c. Both in the LXX and in the N.T. semivowel verbs, i.e. those with λ, ρ, μ, ν, have a contracted future, as in Attic, e.g. ἐγκαλῶ, σπερεῖς, τεμεῖς, ἣρεῖ.

d. In Attic Greek the future of χέω is still χέω and indistinguishable from the present. In the LXX the future is distinguished by being treated as a contracted tense. Thus we have --

```
ἐκχεω, ἐχεῖς, ἐκχεῖ, ἐκχειτε, ἐκχεοῦσαι.
```

The 1st person plural does not seem to occur.

e. To the contracted futures the LXX adds the post-classical ἠλω, from the same stem as εἰ.—λον. This future occurs both in the active and the middle voices, e.g. ἀφελῶ (Nb. 11:17), ἐξελέιοθη (Josh. 2:13).

So in N.T. -- ἄνελεῖ 2 Th. 2:8.

f. In Attic τελέιν and καλεῖν 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 --

```
συντελέσω, συντελέσεις, συντελεί, συντελέστε, συντελέσουσιν,
```

and

```
καλέω, καλέσεις, καλέσει, καλέστε, καλέσουσιν.
```

g. The future ὄλέοω, which is common in Homer but rare in Attic, does not occur in the LXX, which has only the contracted forms --

```
```

h. On the other hand, ἐλάσεις in Ex. 25:11 is the only instance of the future of ἐλαύνω in the LXX.

i. In Attic ἕκατάηνημι has future ἑκατώ, but in the LXX it retains the σ, e.g. διακεκάθᾶς Jdg. 2:1.

22. Retention of Short Vowel in the Future. As a rule in Greek α and ε verbs lengthen the vowel in forming the future. Exceptions are σπάω and χαλάω among α verbs, and among ε verbs αἰνέω, καλέω, τελέω. When the vowel is short in the future, it is also short in the 1st aorist.

To the ε verbs which have the vowel short in the future and 1st aorist we may add from the LXX πονεῖν, φοβεῖν, φορεῖν.

So in N.T. --

```
ἐφορέσαμεν . . . . . φορέσαμεν 1 Cor. 15:49.
```


23. Aorist of Semivowel Verbs. In Attic Greek semivowel verbs with ά in their stem lengthen the ά into η in forming the 1st aorist (as φαν-, ἐφήνα), except after ι or ρ, when they lengthen into ἄ (as μιαν-, ἐμίανα, περαν-, ἐπεραν̄). See G. 672.

In the LXX many such verbs lengthen into ἄ when the ά of the stem is preceded by a consonant. Hence we meet with such forms as ἐγκάθαις, ἐκκάθαιρον, ἐκκάθαιρα, ἐπέχαρας, ἐπίφανον, ἐποίμανθον, ἐσήμανεν, σημάνθη, ὕψαναι, ὕψανθεν, ὕψάνθης, ψάλλετε. In Amos 5:2 ἐσφαλεῖν is ambiguous, as it might be 2d aorist.

The form κατάρης is read in Dindorf’s text of Xen. Ec. 18.8, and in Hermann’s text of Plato Laws 735 we have κατάρη in B followed by καθήρειν in D. The aorist ἐσήμανα is found as early as Xenophon. Cp. Aristeas 16, 33. Ἐκέρανα was always regarded as good Attic.
Such forms are also to be found in the N.T., e.g. --

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 ἤγγιξαν, 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 - ἰσαμαι, e.g. Ps. 21:81 ἀναγγέλθησαι, Ps. 58:13 διαγγέλθησαι.

So again from ἐπέβα, skanen Gal. 3:1, ἐπήμαι Rev. 1:1.

The following are other instances of the same formation:

25. The Verbs πείναν, διψάν. In Attic Greek these two verbs contract into η instead of ἄ. In the LXX they contract into ἄ, and πείναω further forms its future and aorist in ἄ instead of η.

26. The Perfect of ἥρκεν, Ἡρκεν in the LXX has a perfect ἥκα, which occurs however only in the plural.

28
29

27. Presents formed from Perfects.

a. From the perfect ἐστίνηκα there was formed a new present στήκω, which occurs in two or three passages of the LXX.

- στήκει Jdg. 16:26.
- στήκειν 3 K. 8:11 [1 Kings 8:11].
- στήκετε (imper.) Ex. 14:13 (A).

So in N.T. --
- στήκετε (ind.) Phil. 1:27.
- στήκετε (imper.) 1 Cor. 16:13; Gal. 5:1; Phil. 4:1; 2 Thess. 2:15.

b. Similar to this is the verb γρηγορεῖν, formed from γρηγόρα. We may conjecture that the pluperfect ἐγγέργερε came to be regarded as a contracted imperfect, and so gave rise to γρηγορώ.

- ἐγρηγορῶν Jer. 38:28.
- γρηγορεῖν 1 Mac. 12:27.
- γρηγοροῦσιν Neh. 7:3.
- ἐγρηγοροῦσθε ν (A) Jer. 5:6; Bar. 2:9; Dan. Θ 9:14.
- ἐγρηγοροῦτο Lam. 1:14.

From this verb in its turn was formed a new verbal noun γρηγόρης Dan. Θ 5:11, 14. Cp. also the proper name Γρηγόριος.

So in N.T. --
- γρηγορῶμεν 1 Th. 5:6.
- γρηγορεῖτε (imper.) 1 Cor. 16:13; Mk. 13:37.
- γρηγορήσατε 1 Pet. 5:8.

c. Of like origin is the aorist ἐπεσεῖθα, which occurs in Job 31:24. From πεποίθηκεν again we have the noun πεποίθησις 4 K. 18:19 [2 Kings 18:19].

d. The tendency to form new presents from perfects is already exhibited in Homer. Thus we have ἄνωγει (Od. 5.139 etc.) formed from ἄνωγα, and γεγονοῦν (Il. 12.337) from γέγονα; also the imperfect ἐμέμηκον (Od. 9.439) from μέμηκα.

28. The Verb Ἰστάω and its Cognates. By the side of the forms in - μι there existed from Homer downwards alternative forms in - ω. Some of these present themselves in the LXX. Thus we have the following parts of the transitive verb Ἰστάω.

- Ἰστῶσαι 1 Mac. 8:1.
- Ἰστῶν 2 K. 22:34; [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:

καθιστάων  

καθιστα. . . .  μεθιστα Dan. Θ 2:21.
μεθιστάω 1 Mac. 8:13.
μεθισταν 3 Mac. 6:24.

So in N.T. --

| Ἰστάμεν Rom. 3:31. | συμιστῶν 2 Cor. 10:18. |
| ἀποκαθιστῷ Mk. 9:12. | συμιστῶντες 2 Cor. 4:2, 6:4. |


So in N.T. --

| μεθιστάνειν 1 Cor. 13:2. | συμιστάνειν 2 Cor. 3:1. Cp. 5:12, 10:12. |


Later Greek has a transitive perfect ἐστάκα, which is implied by the rare, though classical, perfect passive ἐσταμαι (Plat. Tim . 81 D). Thus in [Plato] Axiochus 370 D we find περιεστακας.

ἔστάκαμεν 1 Mac. 11:34.
ἀφεστάκα Jer. 16:5.
καθέστακα Jer. 1:10, 6:17.

So in N.T. --

ἐξεστακέναι Acts 8:11.

In Josh. 10:19 there occurs the irregular perfect imperative ἐστήκατε with connecting vowel α instead of ε.

With this form may be compared πεποίηκε Ps. 145:3: Is. 50:10: Jer. 9:4.

29. The Verb τιθέναι 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 τιθέω.

ἐτίθεις Ps. 49:18, 20.  ἐτίθει Prov. 8:28.

This is in accordance with classical usage, which however has ἐτίθην in the 1st person. Ἔτιθη 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.

Ἐθήκαμεν is found (2 Esd. [Ezra] 15:10: Is. 28:15) and Ἐθήκαν is common.

The 2d person singular of the strong aorist middle is always ἔθου , as in Attic.

In 1 Esd. 4:30 we find ἐπιτιθέοσαν formed from the thematic τιθέω.

30. The Verb διδόναι and its Cognates. The present tense runs thus --

| δίδομι, | δίδω, | δίδοσι , |
| δίδασκεν . |

In Ps. 36:21 we find 3d person singular διδόσαν from the cagnate διδόω . The imperfect runs thus --

ἐδίδοσαν,  ἐδίδους,  ἐδίδου.
The imperative active δείξε is found in Tobit 4:16: Prov. 9:9, 22:26. The 1st aorist is common in the singular and in the 3rd person plural of the indicative, δείξας.

The 2d aorist subjunctive runs thus --

δῶ, δόξ, δῶ.

δοτε, δοσι.

Of the above forms only διδοί, 3rd person plural δείδουν, and δείκνυσι are non-Attic.

The optative of the 2d aorist has the stem vowel long -

δῆς Ps. 84:7, 120:3.


So in N.T. --

δῆ 2 Th. 3:16; Rom. 15:5; Eph. 1:17; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18, 2:25.

31. The Verb Λέγω and its Cognates.

a. The simple verb λέγω 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 ἵλιν, ἵεις, ἴει, though in Plat. Euthyd. 293 A we have 1st person singular ἵλιν. Ηλίεις 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 ἄφειναι --

Ex. 32:32 εί μεν ἄφεις . . ἄφες.

1 Esd. 4:7 εἶπεν ἄφεναι, ἄφιοισιν.

In the former of these ἄφεις must be from ἄφεω, a cognate thematic form to ἄφίημι, 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 --

ἄφίω Eccl. 2:18.

ἄφιοισι 1 Esd. 4:50.

ἄφιοι Eccl. 5:11.

In the N.T. also we find ἄφες (Rev. 2:20) and ἄφνηε (Mk. 1:34, 11:16)


7.1 ἄφνοσσαι.

The weak aorist occurs in the singular and in the 3rd person plural ἄφηκαν, e.g. Jdg. 1:34.

c. A thematic verb ἄσπειν existed in classical Greek. Theognis 565 has the infinitive ἄσπειν: Plat. Soph. 238 E uses ἀπεινείς. Of this verb we find the following parts in the LXX, if we may trust the accentuation --


外交部 (dat. pl.) Prov. 8:9.

外交部 2 Chr. 34:12.

So also in N.T. --

ὁ ἄσπεν Rom. 3:11. In Mt. 13:23 the R.V. text has ἄσπεν.

外交部 (3d pl.) Mt. 13:13; 2 Cor. 10:12.

d. In addition to this we find a verb of new formation like ἄφιω -

外交部 Tob. 3:8; Job 15:9, 36:4.

外交部 Prov. 21:12, 29; Wisd. 9:11.
32. The Imperatives ἀνάστα and ἀπόστα, etc. It is the by-forms in -ω which account for these imperatives (ἀνάστα = ἀνάστα-ε). Ἀνάστα in the LXX is used interchangeably with ἀνάστηθι. Thus in Dan. 7:5 O’ has ἀνάστα, while Ἤ has ἀνάστηθι. But the same writer even will go from on to the other. Thus in 3 K. [2 Kings] 19 we have ἀνάστηθι in v. 5 and ἀνάστα in v. 7, and again in 3 K. [2 Kings] 20 [1 Kings 20] ἀνάστα in v. 15 and ἀνάστηθι in v. 18. So also Ps. 43:24, 27 ἀνάστηθι . . . ἀνάστα. Ἀπόστα occurs in Job 7:16, 14:6, 21:14. So in N.T., where we find in the 3d person singular and the 2d person plural.

| ἀνάστα | Acts. 12:7; Eph. 5:14. | καταβάτο | Mt. 27:42. |
| ἀναβά | Rev. 4:1. | ἀναβάτε | Rev. 11:12. |

Cp. Herm. Past. Mtd. 6.2.6, 7 ἀπόστα . . . ἀπόστηθι, Vis. 2.8 ἀντίστα.

Similar forms are to be found even in the Attic drama and earlier.

33. Special Forms of Verbs.

ἀιρετίζειν


ἐλοφυκός Ezk. 16:4.

ἐφάκας 2 K. 18:11 [2 Sam. 18:11]. Maintained by some to be the true Attic form.

ἐρρημός for ἐρρημός. Job. 32:19.


μαμάσσειν Jer. 4:19.


πιέζειν for πιέζειν. Song 2:15; Sir. 23:21. Πιέζειν occurs only in Micah 6:15 in the original sense of ‘to press.’

ῥάσσειν Jer. 23:39 and eight other passages.

34. Adverbs. Hellenistic Greek supplied the missing adverb to ἄγαθός. ἄγαθός occurs in Aristotle Rh. 2.11.1. In the LXX it is found in 1 K. 20:7: [1 Sam. 20:7]: 4 K. 11:18: [2 Kings 11:18]: Tob. 13:10.

Among adverbs of time we may notice ἐκ προσέχειν and ἀπὸ προσέχειν as peculiar to the LXX. For the former see 2 K. 2:27: [2 Sam. 2:27]: 3 K. 18:26: [1 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 ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, 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.’


Ποὺ occurs only in a doubtful reading in Jer. 22:8, and has there the sense of pou. Similarly οὔ is used for οί, which is not found at all.

Jer. 51:35 οὔ ἐὰν βαδίζῃς ἐκεῖ.


So in N.T. --

ποὺ = ποὶ 1 Jn. 2:11, 3:8, 8:14: Hb. 11:8.

ὁποῖ = ὁποὶ James 3:4.

ὁποῖ 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 κυνομινθῇ, μαχαιρῇ, ἐτύμβουκαι, and the use of σπείρῃσ in the Papyri; possibly also for γαῖας, γαῖας. Such forms also as ἐπαυωδός, ἐθέβειν, ἐτάνυσαν (Sir. 43:12), μόλιβος, χάλκεος, χέιμαρρος, πολεμιστής, have an Homeric ring about them.

36. Movable Consonants. υ ἐφελκυστικῶν is freely employed before consonants, as in Gen. 31:15, 41:55: Dt. 19:1; Ruth 2:3; Jdg. 16:11.

To άχρι and μέχρι ζ is sometimes appended before a vowel and sometimes not.


Josh. 4:23 μέχρι oū. 1 Esd. 1:54 μέχρι oū.


To άχρι and μέχρι differ from one another by more than the σ. The former does not occur at all in the LXX, the latter in Swete’s text only once, 3 Mac. 5:16 ἀντικρός ἀνακληθήσει αὐτοῦ.

In the Revisers’ text of the N.T. we find άχρι before a consonant in Gal. 4:2; άχρι oū 1 Cor. 11:26, 15:25: Gal. 3:19, 4:19: Hb. 3:13; μέχρι oū Mk. 13:30; μέχρις ζῷων Hb. 12:4: ἀντικρό Χίου Acts 20:15.
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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 χαλκίοις compared with 2 Chr. 35.13 χαλκείοις. This is especially the case with feminine nouns in -εία, as

 yaptiía, doulía, latríía, pλυθiá, súgyenía, ígyía, φαρμακiá.

Neuters plural in -εία also sometimes end in -ια with recession of accent, as --

άγγiα Gen. 42.25. πόρiα Gen. 45.17.

In the pluperfect of ἔστημι again we sometimes find ι for ei --

ιστήκει Jdg. 16.29. ἐφιστήκει Nb. 23.6.17.

παριστήκει Gen. 45.1.

So also in the future and 1st aorist of λείχω, as --

ἐκλίξει, ἐκλίξαν, ἔλιξαν, ἔλιξαν.

On the other hand εἰδέαι for ιδέα (nom. pl. of ιδέα) occurs in Dan. Θ 1:13.

b. in composition is sometimes changed into μ before a labial and sometimes not, as --

συμβιβάσω Ex. 4.12. συμβιβάσατω Jdg. 13.8.

Before a guttural or π, is often retained, instead of being turned into γ, as -

ἐνκάθηται, ἐκκρατεῖς, ἐνκρατήσας, ἐνκρατήσας, ἐνποιη, ἐνχωρίῳ.

But on the other hand -

σύγκριςας, συγγενή.

c. In the spelling of λαμβάνειν μ appears in parts not formed from the present stem, as --

λήψαμαι, λήψη, λήψεον, λήψηθη, καταλήψη.

This may indicate that the syllable in which the μ occurs was pronounced with β. In modern Greek μπ stands for β, and we seem to find this usage as early as Hermas (Vis. 3.1.4), who represents the Latin subsellium by συμψέλιον. Cp. Άμβακοιμ for Habakkuk.

d. The doubling of ρ in the argument of verbs is often neglected, as -

ἐξερήσαν, ἔραν, ἔραπιζον, ἔρυψεν.

e. The following also may be noticed -

ἔραυναν for ἐρευναν Dt. 13:14.

μιερός, μεροφαγία, μεροφαγεῖν, μεροφονία all in Maccabees only.

τεσσεράκοντα Dt. 9.9, 11; Josh. 14:7.
A Grammar of Septuagint Greek
SYNTAX

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 μέν and δέ. 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 μέν and δέ, 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 with 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 Ἡ φωνὴ φωνῆ Ἰακὼβ, αἱ δὲ χεῖρες χεῖρες Ἡσαύ.
Jdg. 16:29 καὶ ἐκράτησεν ἑνα τῇ δεξίᾳ αὐτῶ καὶ ἑνα τῇ ἀριστερὰ αὐτῶ.

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 καὶ, 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 καὶ. This is a recurrence to an earlier stage of language than 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 καὶ ὁδὸν τε οὖπω πολλὴν διηνέσθαι αὐτῶς καὶ τὸν Μήδον ἔκειν. Here it is convenient to translate καὶ 'when,' but the construction is really paratactical. So again Xen. Anab. 4.2.12 Καὶ τούτων τε παρελθήσαν οἱ Ἑλλήνες, καὶ ἔτερου ὀρῶσιν ἐμπρόσθεν λόφου κατεχόμενον. 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, καὶ still follows in the latter, e.g. -

Gen. 44:29 ἐὰν οὖν λάβητε . . . καὶ κατάξετε κτλ.
Josh. 4:1 καὶ ἐπεὶ συνετέλεσαν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς διαβαίνων τὸν Ἰορδάνην, καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος .
Sometimes a preposition with a verbal noun takes the place of the protasis, e.g. -

Ex. 3:12 ἐν τῷ ἐξαγαγείν . . . καὶ λατρεύσετε.

In Homer also καὶ is used in the apodosis after ἔπει (Od. 5.96), ἔτε (Il. 1.477: Od. 10.188), or ὅτε (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 καί 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 ὅτε, 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 ἐγένετο or ἦσται.

Gen. 39:19 ἐγένετο δὲ ὡς ἤκουσεν ... καὶ ἐθυμώθη ὄργη. Cp. vs. 5, 7, 13.


In such cases in accordance with western ideas of what a sentence ought to be, we say that καί 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 ἐγένετο δὲ πρῶτο καὶ ἐταράχθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ,

but the same explanation may be applied to more complex cases, e.g. -

Nb. 21:9 καὶ ἐγένετο ὅταν ἤδακνεν ὡς ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν ὅφιν τὸν χαλκοῦν, καὶ ἦς. 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 καί does not appear after ἐγένετο, ἐγένηθη, or ἦσται, thus presenting a construction which we may denote by the phrase Apposition of Verbs.

Jdg. 19:30 καὶ ἐγένετο πᾶς ὁ βλέπων ἐλεγεν ... 

1 K. 31:8 [1 Sam. 31:8] καὶ ἐγενήθη τῇ ἑπαύριον, ἐρχομένοι οἱ ἄλλοιαίοι.

Gen. 44:31 καὶ ἦσται ἐν τῷ ἱδεῖν αὐτοῦ μὴ δι τὸ παιδάριον μεθ' ἡμῶν, τελευτήσει.

In two versions of the same Hebrew we find one translator using the καί and the other not.


Is. 37:1 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἀκούσαι τον βασιλέα Ἑζεκίαν, ἔσχωσεν τὰ ἰμάτια.

43. Ὅτε in the Apodosis. The use of ὅτε to mark the apodosis, which is found occasionally in classical authors from Homer downwards, is rare in the LXX.

JOSH. 2:8 καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἔξηλθοσσαν ... αὐτὴ ὅτε ἀνέβη.
44. Generic Use of the Article. This is due to following the Hebrew.

1 K. 17:34 [1 Sam. 17:34] ὁ λέων καὶ ἡ ἀρκος = ‘a lion or a bear,’ 17:36 καὶ τὴν ἀρκον ἔτυπτεν ὁ δοῦλός σου καὶ τὸν λέοντα.

Amos 5:19 ὅτι τρόπον ἐὰν φύγῃ ἄνθρωπος ἕκ προσώπου τοῦ λέοντος, καὶ ἐμπέσῃ αὐτῷ ἡ ἀρκος.
Is. 7:14 ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται.

45. Elliptical Use of the Feminine Article. The use of the feminine article with some case of χώρα or γῆ understood is not due to the influence of the Hebrew.

ἡ ὑπ' οὐρανόν Job 18:4.


τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν Ex. 17:4; Prov. 8:28; 2 Mac. 2:18.

τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανόν Job 38:18.

τῇ ὑπ' οὐρανόν Esther 4:17; Baruch 5:3.

So in N.T. --
Lk. 17:24 ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν λάμπει.
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:

ép' ευθείας (όδου) Josh. 8:14.
én τῇ εὐθείᾳ Ps. 142:10.
τῆς πλατείας Esther 4:1.
ἐκεῖ τῆς σήμερου (ἡμέρας) 2 Chr. 35:25.
tín αὕριον 3 Mac. 5:38.
ἐβόησεν μεγάλη (τῇ φωνῇ) 4 K. 18:28 [2 Kings 18:28].
eis τὴν ψηλῆν (χώραν) 2 Chr. 1:3.

In the N.T. this idiom occurs much more frequently. Take for instance Lk. 12:47, 48 δορύσεται πολλάς . . . ολίγας (πληγάς).

Cp. also -
oûk eis μακράν Philo Leg. ad C. 4.
ép' ευθείας Philo Q.O.P.L. 1.
épí ξένης (χώρας or γῆς) Philo Leg. ad C. 3.
pedá̂s te kai õreinêhíbid. 7.
tás περιοίκους (πόλεις)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 ἐὰν θουστε ὁυτως ταυτην, 21:3 eis τι . . . ἐγενήθη αὐτή;

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 ἀνεβιβάσθη ὁ βάταραχος (= frogs), 8:18 ἔξαγαγεν τὸν σκνίφα, 10:13 καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος ὁ νότος ἀνέλαβεν τὴν ἀκρίδα, 10:14 οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀκρίδα.

Jdg. 7:12 ὦσεὶ ἀκρίς εἰς πλῆθος (cp. Judith 2:20 ὡς ἀκρίς), 21:16 ἡφανίσθη ἀπὸ Βενιαμεὶν γυνή.


Ezk. 47:9 ἔσται ἐκεὶ ἰχθύς πολὺς σφόδρα.

This throws light on an otherwise startling piece of grammar -

Jdg. 15:10 εἶπαν Ἄννη Ἰούδα.

49. Singular Verb with more than One Subject. In accordance with Hebrew idiom a singular verb often introduces a plurality of subjects, e.g.-


This may happen also in Greek apart from Hebrew.

Xen. Anab. 2.4.16 Ἔπεμψε μὲ Ἀριαῖος καὶ Ἀρτάοζος.
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.


For an instance of the nominative without the article standing for the vocative take -

Baruch 4:5 θερασθε, λαὸς μου.

The nominative, when thus employed, is often put in apposition with a vocative, as -


b. In the N.T. also the nominative with the article is often put for the vocative.


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 ἀφρων put for ἀφρόν, and in Acts 7:42 ὀίκος Ἰσραήλ does duty as vocative.

As instances of apposition of nominative with vocative we may take --

Rom. 2:1 ὁ ἀνθρώπος πάς ὁ κρίνων. Rev. 15:3 Κύριε ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ <βρ><βρ>

In Rev. 18:20 we have vocative and nominative conjoined --

ὀφαλεῖ, καὶ οἱ ἁγιοί.

51. Nominative Absolute. Occasionally we get a construction in the LXX, which can be described only by this name.

Nb. 22:24 καὶ ἔστη ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἀυλαῖς τῶν ἀμπέλων, φραγμὸς ἑπτεύθην καὶ φραγμὸς ἑπτεύθην.

Nb. 24:4 ἄρα ὁ ἄγγελος προσεβαίνει, ἐν ὑπνῷ, ἀποκαλυπτέτων οἱ ὁφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ.

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 τρίβος, οὐκ ἤγνω αὐτὴν πετεινὼν.

Ps. 102:15 ἀνθρώπος, ὁ σὺς χόρτος αὐτῷ ἤμεραι αὐτοῦ.

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 ὁ γὰρ Μωσῆς ὁ οὗτος . . . οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί ἐγένετο αὐτῷ.
Rev. 3:12 ὁ νικῶν, ποιήσω αὐτὸν στύλον ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ μου.

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. 7:15 καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἐγὼ . . . ἐτάρασάν με.

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 καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν, τὸ πνεῦμα εὐθὺς συνεσπάραξεν αὐτὸν.

54. Accusative for Vocative. The accusative for vocative might seem an impossibility, yet here is an instance of it.

Ps. 51:6 ἡγάπης αὐτή τῷ ἡμέρα καταποντίσμου, γιλώσαν δολίαν.

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 μετ’ ἐμοί γὰρ φέρονται οἱ ἀνθρώποι ἅρτους τὴν μεσημβρίαν .

Ex. 9:18 ἰδὼν ἐγώ ὅσ τεῦτον τὴν ὄραν αὔριον χάλαζαν .

Dan. 8:21 οὐκ ὃραν θυσίας ἐσπερινής (Ὁ ἔχει ὦ ὄρας).

So also sometimes in N.T. --

Jn. 4:52 χθές ὄραν ἔβδομην ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός .

Rev. 3:3 καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς ποιάν ὄραν ἤξω ἐπὶ σε .

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 ὄραν = venison.

Gen. 27:3 ἔξεστι δὲ Ἰσαὰκ ἐκστασιν μεγάλην ὀφόρα καὶ εἶπεν "Τίς οὖν ὁ θερεύσας μοι θήραν;"

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 δάνειον δανεῖζειν, διαθέσαι διαθήκην, διηγεσθαι διήγησθαι, ἐνυπνάζεσθαι, ἐπιθυμεῖν ἐπιθυμίαν, θείες θυσίας, ὑπηρετεῖν ὑπηρετεῖν, ὀρίζεσθαι, πλημαλεῖν πλημμέλησιν οἷον πλημμελεῖν, προφασίζεσθαι προφάσεις.

At other times it is accompanied by some specification, as -

Nb. 18:6 λειτουργεῖν τῷ λειτουργίας τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου .

Dan. 11:2 πλουτίσει πλοῦτον μέγαν .

1 Mac. 2:58 ἐν τῷ ζηλώσαι ζήλων νόμου .

c. Sometimes the cognate accusative is conveyed in a relative clause, as -

Ex. 3:9 τῶν θλιμμῶν ὃν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι θλίβουσιν αὐτοῖς .

Nb. 1:44 ᾧ ἐπίσκεψις ἦν ἐπεσκέψατο .


d. By other changes of construction we have still the figura etymologica , but no longer a cognate accusative. Thus, starting from the common phrase δοῦσαι δόμα , we have δεδομένου δόμα (Nb. 3:9) and δόμα δεδομένου (Nb. 18:6).
e. In one instance the cognate accusative is reinforced by a still further application of the etymological figure -

Gen. 47:22 ἐν δόει γὰρ ἐδωκεν δόμα τοῖς ἱρεύσιν.

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 ἐπάταξεν . . . πληγῆν μεγάλην.

Instances of cognate accusative are common enough in the N.T., e.g. -

1 Jn. 5:16 ἀμαρτάνοντα ἀμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον.

Mt. 2:10 ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα.

Jn. 7:24 τὴν δικαιὰν κρίσιν κρίνετε.

There also it occurs sometimes in a relative clause -

Mk. 10:38 τὸ βάπτισμα ὦ γνώστε βαπτίζομαι.

Jn. 17:26 ἢ ἀγάπη ἢν ἡγάπηκάς με.

Eph. 4:1 τῆς κλήσεως ἃς ἐκλήθητε.

h. We have a triple use of the etymological figure in -

Lk. 8:5 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ.

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 ὥσπερ οἱ γραμματίσται τοῖς μήπω δεινοῖς γράφειν τῶν παιδῶν ὑπογράφοντες γραμμαῖς τῇ γραφῇ οὕτω τὸ γραμματεῖον διδόσκω.

Hip. Maj. 296 C Ἀλλὰ μέντοι δυνάμει γε δυνάμει τοι ν δυνάμειν οὐ γὰρ ποι ἄδυναμία γε.

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 ἐν τῷ Οἰκώ Νασαράχ τὸν πάτραρχον αὐτοῦ.


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 Β βιαζομένων δε καὶ ἀντιτεινόντων ἀλλήλοις . . . ὑμαλόγησαν.

Xen. Cyrop. 1.4.2 καὶ γὰρ ἀθετήσατος αὐτοῦ οὐδέποτε ἀπέλειπε τὸν πάππον.

Xen. Anab. 1.2.17 θασσον προϊόντων . . . δράμος ἐγένετο τοῖς στρατιώταις.

The genitive absolute is often employed in the same loose way in the LXX.

Tob. 4:1 οτε ἦμην ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ μου . . . νεωτέριο μου ὄντος.

Dt. 15:10 οὐ λυπηθήσῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου διὸντος σου αὐτῷ.

Ex. 2:10 ἀδρυνθείτος δε τοῦ παιδίου, εἰσῆλήγεν αὐτῷ.

Ex. 5:20 συνήτησαν δε . . . ἑρχομένως . . . ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν.

So in N.T. --

Mt. 1:18 μητρευθεὶς τῆς μητοίδι . . . εἰρέθη.

Acts. 21:17 γενομένων δε ἡμῶν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀσμένως ἀπεδέχαντο ἡμᾶς οἱ ἁδελφοί.
2 Cor. 4:18 κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν.

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 τοῦ καταφαίνεις γενέσθαι) and is especially favoured by Thucydides. There is nothing in the Hebrew to suggest it. The following will serve as examples -

Jdg. 16:5 καὶ δόρομεν αὐτῶν τοῦ ταπεινώσαι αὐτῶν.
Ps. 9:30 ἐιδορεύει τοῦ ἀρπάσαι πτωχόν.
Job 1:19 ἦλθον τοῦ ἀπαγγελλαί σοι.
So also frequently in N.T., e.g. -
Mt. 13:3 ἔξηλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν.
James 5:17 προσήξατο τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι.

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 Τί τούτῳ ἐπονόμασεν τοῦ ἔξαποστελλαί τοῦ ντεύχος Ἰσραήλ τοῦ μὴ δουλεύειν ἡμῖν (= ὡστε μὴ δουλεύειν);

Purpose is not expressed in either of these cases. In the former we have what we may call the Exploratory Use of the Genitive Infinitive; in the latter we have something which represents 'from serving us' in the original, 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 Ἄδαμ γέγονεν ώς εἰς ἡμῶν, τοῦ γεγινώσκειν καλῶ καὶ ποιηρῶν.
Ex. 8:29 μὴ προσθήκη έτι, Φαραώ, ἔξαπατήσαι τοῦ μὴ ἔξαποστελλαί τον λαόν.
Ps. 26:4 ταύτην (§ 47) ἐκζητήσαο τοῦ κατοικεῖν με κτλ.
So in N.T. --
Acts 7:19 ἐκάκουσε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, τοῦ ποιεῖν ἐκθετα τα βρέφη αὐτῶν.
Gal. 3:10 ὦ εἰκών ἐμμενει ἐν πάσι τοὺς γεγραμμένοις . . . τοῦ ποιησά ταύτα.

c. As an instance of the Genitive Infinitive of Consequence we may take -
Ex. 7:14 βεβαίρηται ὡς καρδία Φαραώ τοῦ μὴ ἔξαποστελλαί τον λαόν.
So in N.T. --
Hb. 11:5 Ἑνὼς μετετέθη τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον.

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 οὐκ ἡδυνάσθην τοῦ βλέπειν.
2 Chr. 3:1 ᾿Ηράξατο τοῦ οἴκοδομείν. 
Gen. 18:7 ἐτάχυνεν τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτῶ.
So in N.T. --

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.
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. -

qui non currro curriculum domum.

c. Corresponding to the cognate dative in Greek, we find in Latin also a cognate ablative as a rare phenomenon, e.g. -
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 άκοη άκοειν, ζωή ζην, θανάτω άποθανεῖ, θανάτω θανατοῦσθαι, σάλπιγγι σαλπίζειν. But besides these there are many others, as -

άγαπησει άγαπᾶσθαι κακίς κακοποίειν
άλαλαγμῷ αλαλάζειν κακίς κακοίν
άλοιφῃ έξαλείφειν κατάρας καταράσθαι
άπωλίᾳ ἀπολλυόναι κλαυθμῷ κλαίειν
άφανισμῷ άφανίζειν λήθῃ λαθεῖν
βοδέλγματι βοδέλυσειν λίθος λιθοβολεῖν
δεσμῷ δεῖν λύτροις λυτροῦν
διελίσθει διαλύειν μικρὰ μηνιθήναι
διαμαρτυρίᾳ διαμαρτυρεῖν οἰωνισμῷ οἰωνίζεσθαι
διαφθείρειν φθορᾶ ὀργίζεσθαι ὀργῇ
δίκῃ ἐκδίκειν ὀρκίζειν
ἐκβάλλειν ἐκβολῇ παραδοῦσθαι παραδοθῆναι
everθαλίβειν ἐθελθῇ περιτπέπτειν περιπτώματι
ἐκλείψειν ἐκλείπειν πλημμελίᾳ πλημμελεῖν
ἐκτριβῇ ἐκτριβῆσθαι προνομῇ προνομευθῆναι
ἐπιτρίβειν ἐπιτριβῆσθαι προσοχθῆσαμεν προσοχθίζειν
ἐπεστράπειν ἐπεστράψατο πτώσει πέπτειν
ἐξουσιωθεῖν ἐξουσιωθῆναι ἐξουσιωθῆναι ταλαιπωρεῖν ταλαιπωρεῖν
ἐπιθύμηᾳ ἐπιθυμεῖν ταραχῇ ταράσσειν
ἐπισκόπητι ἐπισκόπηται ὑπερορᾶσθαι ὑπερορᾶειν
θελήσαι θέλειν φερνίζειν
καθαιρέσει καθαίρειν φθορᾷ φθαρνήσθαι
καθαρίσω καθαρίζειν χαίρειν χαρᾶ

e. 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 βρῶσει φαγῇ. 31:15 κατέφαγεν καταβρῶσει.
Ex. 19:12, 21:16, 17 θανάτῳ τελευτᾶν.
Ex. 22:20 θανάτῳ ὀλεθρευθῆσαι.
Nb. 11:15 ἀπόκτεινοι μὲ ἀνάρεσει. 35:26 ἐξόδῳ ἐξέλθῃ.
Ezk. 33:27 θανάτῳ ἀποκτεῖν.
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.


g. The expression in 2 Pet. 3:3 ἐν ἐμπείριμονῃ ἐμπαίκται, while not exactly parallel with the foregoing, belongs to the same range of idiom; so also Rev. 2:23 ἀποκτείνῳ ἐν θανάτῳ.

ADJECTIVES, 62-65

62. ἡμίσος. In Attic Greek ἡμίσος, 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 -


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, occurring only in the following passages -


Elsewhere instead of the Attic idiom we find τῷ ἡμίσου or ἡμίσος, irrespective of the gender and number of the noun which follows, e.g. -


63. πᾶς.

a. In classical Greek the rule for πᾶς in the singular is that with the article it is collective, without the article it is distributive -πᾶσα ἡ πόλις = all the city.

πᾶσα πόλις = every city.

πᾶς differs from ordinary adjectives in taking the predicative position in an attributive sense. Thus while ἀγαθῆ ἡ πόλις means 'the city is good,' πᾶσα ἡ πόλις means 'all the city.' πᾶς may however take the attributive position, like any other adjective. When it does so, the collective force is intensified -

πᾶσα ἡ πόλις = all the city.

ἡ πᾶσα πόλις = the whole city.

Thus Plato’s expression ( Apol. 40 E) ὁ πᾶς χρόνους 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 ὁ πᾶς ἄνθρωποινός βίος. Plat. Rep. 618 B ὁ πᾶς κύνδυνος. Philib. 67 B οἱ πάντες βόες = all the oxen in the world.

Xen. Anab. 5.6.5 οἱ πάντες ἄνθρωποι.

In such cases there is an additional stress gained by the unusual position assigned to πᾶς.

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 καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν αὐτῇ τὴν πάσαν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ εἶδεν Δαλειᾶ ὅτι ἀνήγγειλεν αὐτῇ πᾶσαν τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ -

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 πᾶς in the attributive position are -

Gen. 45:20 τά γὰρ πάντα ἁγαθὰ Αἰγύπτου ὑμῖν ἔσται .

Josh. 4:14 ἑκατοντάριον τοῦ παντὸς γένους Ἰσραήλ .

Wisd. 7:9 ὁ πᾶς χρυσός .

2 Mac. 8:9 τὸ πᾶν τῆς Ἰουδαίας . . . γένος .

Still there is a tendency in the LXX to assimilate πᾶς to adjectives generally and to employ it in the attributive position without any special emphasis.

c. Neither is the rule that πᾶς without the article is distributive at all closely adhered to, e.g. -

Ex. 8:16 ἐν πᾶσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου , 16:6 πρὸς πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν ὑμῶν Ἰσραήλ .

1 K. 7:2 [1 Sam. 7:2] πάς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ .

d. In the plural οἱ πάντες is rare, but may be found -

Jdg. 20:46 οἱ πάντες οὐτοὶ .

1 Mac. 2:37 Ἀποθάνωμεν οἱ πάντες ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι ἡμῶν .


Αἱ πᾶσαι is still rarer, but see -

3 Mac. 1:1 παραγγελίας ταῖς πάσαις δυνάμεσιν .

Τὰ πάντα 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 πᾶς followed by the article is clearly marked in many passages, e.g. -

Gal. 5:14 ὁ . . . πᾶς νόμος. Μт. 8:34 πᾶσα ἡ πόλις ἐξῆλθεν .

Also the distributive use of πᾶς without the article, as in 1 Cor. 11:4.5 πᾶς ἄνδρη . . . πᾶσα δὲ γυνὴ . In Rom. 3:19 we have the two usages brought into contrast -

Ἅνα πᾶν στάμα φραγῇ, καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ Θεῷ .

On the other hand there are also instances of πᾶς in the singular and without the article being used collectively, e.g. -

Eph. 2:21 πᾶσα οἰκοδομή .

Mt. 2:3 πᾶσα Ἡροδολύμα .

Acts 2:36 πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ .

f. In the plural οἱ πάντες is more common in St. Paul than in the LXX. Take for instance -

Phil. 2:21 οἱ πάντες γὰρ τὰ ἐαυτῶν ζητοῦσι . Cp. 2 Cor. 5:14, 1 Cor. 10:17 οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνός ἄρτου μετέχουσιν . Cp. Eph. 4:13, Rom. 11:32 συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπείθειαν . 2 Cor. 5:10 τοῖς γὰρ πάντας θημάς κτλ . 1 Cor. 9:22 τοῖς πᾶσι γέγονα πάντα .

οἱ πάντες ἀνδρῶς .

Τὰ πάντα 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 λευκοὶ οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ ἢ γάλα .
Dt. 7:17 ὅ τι ἄθινος τούτῳ ἢ ἐγώ, 9:1 ἑκάτη μεγάλα καὶ ἴσχυρότερα μᾶλλον ἢ ἰμεῖς.

So in N.T. --
Mt. 18:8,9 καλὸν σοι ἔστιν εἰσελθεῖν . . . ἢ . . . βληθῆναι. Cp. Mk. 9:43, 45.

65. Omission of μᾶλλον. The comparison of attributes may be effected by the use of verbs as well as of adjectives. In such cases the omission of μᾶλλον is common in the LXX.


Hos. 7:6 ἔλεος θέλω ἡ θυσίαν.

2 Mac. 7:2 ἔτοιμοι γὰρ ἀποθνῄσκειν ἐσμεν ἢ πατρίδος νόμους παραβαίνειν.

Cp. Aristeas § 322 τέρπεσεν γὰρ οὐκαί σε ταῦτα ἢ τα τῶν μυθολόγων βιβλία.

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 καὶ πᾶν (σιχ) οἰκέτην ἢ ἀργυρώνητου περιτεμεῖς αὐτῶν.

Nb. 26:37 καὶ τῷ Σαλπαδῷ υἱῷ "Οφερ οὐκ ἐγένοντο αὐτῷ υἱοί.

The above may be considered as deflections of the Nominative of Reference (§ 52) into an oblique case by Attraction.

So in N.T. --

2 Cor. 12:17 μὴ τίνα ω—ν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς; Mt. 25:29 τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντος, καὶ δ' ἐχει ἀρθήσεται ἃπ' αὐτοῦ.


In Josh. 24:22 - ἰμεῖς ἐξελέξασθε Κυρίῳ λατρεύειν αὐτῷ - Κυρίῳ should be τὸν Κύριον (which A has). Then λατρεύειν αὐτῷ 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 καὶ τῇ δὲ ἡν οἴδιμα ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς.

So in N.T. --

Mt. 19:9 δς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.

1 Pet. 2:24 αὐτὸς ἀνήργηκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ.

68. Ἀδελφός as a Reciprocal Pronoun. The use of ἀδελφός as a reciprocal pronoun is a sheer Hebraism, e.g. -

Ex. 10:23 καὶ οὐκ εἶδον οὐδεὶς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ = 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** ὅν ἔχρισαν αὐτὸν, **13:33** τῆς γῆς ἦν κατεσκέψαυτο αὐτὴν.

**Is. 62:2** ὁ κύριος ἀνομάζει αὐτό.

**Gen. 1:11** οὗ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.

**Dt. 4:7** ὃ ἐστιν αὐτῷ.

**Ps. 18:4** ὅν ὑψί ἀκούονται αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν.

**Ex. 6:26** οἷς ἔπεν αὐτοῖς.

b. Where the relative is followed by ἐὰν the same construction is employed, e.g. -

** Nb. 17:5** ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς οὕν ἐὰν ἐκλέξωμαι αὐτῶν, ο` ἀ;ηρωποί ὕπν ἐν ἑκλήσιοι ἑκλάματο ν ἐν ἑκλεγμα τοῦ ἐν ἑκλήσιοι.

**Ps. 18:4** ὅν ὑψί ἀκούονται αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν.

**Ex. 6:26** οἷς ἔπεν αὐτοῖς.

b. Where the relative is followed by ἐὰν the same construction is employed, e.g. -

** Nb. 17:5** ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς οὕν ἐὰν ἐκλέξωμαι αὐτῶν, ο` ἀ;ηρωποί ὕπν ἐν ἑκλήσιοι ἑκλάματο ν ἐν ἑκλεγμα τοῦ ἐν ἑκλήσιοι.

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** εἰς ηἰν ἐν εἰσπορεύη εἰς αὐτὴν.

**Nb. 11:21** ἐν οἷς ἐκμὴ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

**Gen. 28:13** ἣ γῇ ἐφι ἣς οὐ καθεύδεις ἐπ` αὐτῆς.

f. Occasionally the preposition is the same, but the case it governs is different, e.g. -

**Jdg. 16:26** ἐφ' οἷς ὁ οἰκος στήκει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.

**Josh. 24:13** γῇ ἐφ' ἢν οὐκ ἐκτίσασθε ἐπ' αὐτῆς.

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** τὴν ὅδον μου, ἦδν νῦν ἔγῳ πορεύομαι ἐπ' αὐτῆν.

**Ex. 25:28** τοὺς κυάθους, οἷς σπείρεσθε ἐν αὐτοῖς.

**Gen. 21:23** τῇ γῇ τῇ σὺ παρόκχεας ἐν αὐτῇ.

In others it does not -


h. Sometimes the relative has a different preposition from the pronoun following -

**Nb. 13:20** τίς ἢ γῇ εῖς ἢν οὕτω ἔκκαθηται ἐπ` αὐτῆς . . . τίνες αἱ πόλεις εἰς ἢ οὕτω κατοικοῦν ἐν αὐταῖς.

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** ἐν οἷς ἐγὼ παροικῶ ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν.

j. The construction of which we have been speaking is not confined to the simple relative, e.g. -
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. 28A ὅτου μὲν οὖν ἦν ὁ δημιουργὸς . . . τὴν ἰδέαν καὶ δύναμιν αὐτοῦ ἀπεργάζεται , Parm. 130E ὅτι τὰ ἄλλα μεταλαμβάνονται τὰς ἐπαναμειᾶς αὐτῶν ἴσχεν . Artist. Cat. 5:38 οἶον ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων οὐκ ἂν ἦχου τις τὸ τοιοῦτο προεικεῖν .

I. In the N.T. this Hebrew syntax of the relative occurs not infrequently.

Philemon 12 οὐχί ἀνέπεμψε σοι αὐτοῦ .

Gal. 2:10 ὅ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιησά .

Acts 15:25 ὡς ἐίχε τὸ θυγάτερον αὐτῆς πνεύμα ἀκάθαρτον .

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 οὐ ἡ πιστή αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστίν .

70. ἄνθρωπος = ἔκαστος . The use of ἄνθρωπος as a distributive pronoun is a pure Hebraism.


Jdg. 16:5 ἡμείς δώσομεν σοι ἄνθρωπος χίλιους καὶ ἑκάτων ἄργυρίος .

71. ὅστις for ὁ . Except in the neuter singular ὁ τι , as in Josh. 24:27, and in the expression ἔως ὅτου , as in 1 K. 22:3 [1 Sam. 22:3], or μέχρι ὅτου , which is found only in the Codex Sinaiticus version of Tob. 5:7, ὅστις occurs in Swete’s text only in the nominative, singular or plural. In meaning it is often indistinguishable from ὁ .


Jdg. 21:12 τετρακοσίας νεανίδας παρθένους, ὅστις οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἄνδρα .

Ὅστις = οὗ occurs several times in Aristeia? -

§§ 102, 121, 138, 200, 308.

The same use of ὅστις for the simple relative is found in the N.T., e.g. -

Col. 3:5 τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἦτις ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρεία .

Acts 8:15 τῶν Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννης. ὅστις καταβάντες κτλ .

1 Tim. 6:9 ἐπιθυμίας . . . ὅστις βιβλίζοντι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους .

Gal. 4:24 ἄτινά ἐστιν ἄλληγοροῦμενα .
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 \textit{Laws}πρέπον ἔστι almost altogether displaces \textit{πρέπει}.

\textbf{PRESENT}

Prov. 3:5 ἵσθι πεποιθῶς .
Jdg. 11:10 ἢστῳ ἀκούων .
2 Chr. 15:16 εἴναι . . . λειτουργοῦσαν .

\textbf{FUTURE SIMPLE}

Is. 47:7 ἔσομαι ἀρχουσα .
Dt. 28:29 ἔσῃ . . . ἀδικευμένος .
Mal. 3:3 ἔσομαι . . . προσάγοντες .
Is. 22:24 ἔσομαι ἐπικρεμάμενοι .
PERFECT

Is. 8:14 πεποιθώς ἢς.
Is. 10:20, 17:8 πεποιθότες ὡμεν.
Nb. 22:12 ἔστιν γὰρ εὐλογημένος.

FUTURE PERFECT

Gen. 43:9, 44:32 ἡμαρτηκώς ἔσομαι.
Sir. 7:25 ἔση τετελεκὼς.
Is. 58:14 ἔση πεποιθώς.
Ex. 12:6 ἔσται ὡμέν διατετηρημένον.
Is. 32:3 ἔσονται πεποιθότες.
Gen. 41:38 ἔσται . . . πεφυλαγμένα.

IMPERFECT

Dan. 10:2 ἦμην πενθών.
Dan. Ὁ 7:11 θεωρῶν ἦμην.
Gen. 40:13 ἦσθα οἰνοχοῦν.
1 K. 17:34 [1 Sam. 17:34] ποιμαίων ἦν.
Jer. 4:24 ἦν τρέμοντα (sc.tā ὥρη).
Dan. Ὁ 1:16 ἦν . . . ἀναίρετημενος.
Baruch 1:19 ἦμεθα ἀπεθανότες.

PLUPERFECT

Dan. Ὁ 10:9 ἦμην πεπτωκός.
Dan. Θ 10:9 ἦμην κατανευριμένος.
2 Chr. 18:34 ἦν ἑστηκός.
Jdg. 8:11: Sus. Θ 35 ἦν πεποιθώς.
Josh. 7:22 ἦν ἑνκεκρυμένα.
2 Chr. 5:8 ἦν διαπεπετακότα.
Tob. 6:18 ἡτοιμασμένη ἦν.
Is. 20:6 ἦμεν πεποιθότες.
Ex. 39:23 ἦσαν πεποιηκότες αὐτά.

b. Γίγνεσθαι may be used as an auxiliary instead of εἶναι.
c. Sometimes the verbal adjective is used in place of the participle.

Ps. 18:3 ἀκουστῶν ἦσται.

dt. 4:36 ἀκουστῇ ἡγένετο.

Gen. 45:2; Is. 48:3 ἀκουστῶν ἡγένετο.

Is. 23:5 ὅταν δὲ ἄκουστον γένηται.

Dt. 30:5 πλεοναστῶν σε ποιήσει.

d. When a causative form is wanted corresponding to ἀκουστῶν γενέσθαι recourse is had to ἀκουστῶν ποιεῖν, e.g. -


e. In the N.T. these analytic tenses are relatively even commoner than in the LXX.

PRESENT

Col. 3:2 ἔστιν . . . καθήμενος.

2 Cor. 9:12 ἔστι προσαναπληροῖσα.

Col. 1:6 ἔστι χαρπαθοροίμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον.

Col. 2:23 ἔστι . . . ἔχουτα.

2 Cor. 2:17 ἐσεῦ . . . καταλεύκουτε.


Mt. 5:25 ἵσθι εὐνοῶν.

FUTURE SIMPLE

Lk. 5:11 ἀνθρώπως ἐση ζωγρῶν.

Acts 7:6 ἔσται . . . πάρουκον.

1 Cor. 14:10 ἐσεσθε . . . λαλοῦντες.

PERFECT

Acts 25:10 ἔστως εἰμι (present in meaning).


1 Cor. 15:9 ἡλικιώτες ἐσμὲν.

Hb. 2:1, 23 εἰσὶ γεγονότες.

James 5:16 ἢ πεποιηκός.

2 Cor. 1:19 πεποιθότες ὄμεν.

Hb. 4:2 ἐσμὲν εὐθυγελισμένοι.

Hb. 10:10 ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν.

Acts 2:13 μεμεστωμένοι εἰσί.
FUTURE PERFECT

2:13 ἐσομαι πεποιθός (from Is. 12:2 perfect only in form).

IMPERFECT

Acts 12:5 ἦν γινομένη.
Acts 21:3 ἦν . . . ἀποφορτιζόμενον.
Acts 16:12 ἦμεν . . . διατρίβοις.

f. Besides ἐίναι other auxiliaries are used in the N.T. --
2 Cor. 6:14 μὴ γίνεσθε έτεροζυγούντες.
Col. 1:18 ἦν γενήται . . . πρωτεύων.
Rev. 3:2 γίνον γρηγορῶν.
Acts 8:16 βεβαπτισμένην ὑπήρξον.

With the last example cp. Aristeas § 193 εἰ μὴ πεποιθός ὑπάρχει. The same author has κεχαρισμένος ἐση in § 40 and ἵστατε in 241.

g. Instances of analytic tenses occur here and there in Josephus, e.g. -
B.J. 1.31.1 καὶ τούτῳ ἦν μάλιστα τάρασσον Αντίπατρον.
Ant. 2.6.7 τί παρόντες ἔτημεν.

h. Also in the Apostolic Fathers -
2 Clem. 17:7 έσονται δόξαν δόντες. Barn. Ep. 19:4 ἐσῃ τρέμων,
ὑπερέχοντες αὕτως εἰσών, Sim. 5.4.2 ἐσομαι ἑωρακώς . . . ἀκηκοάς,
9.13.2 ἐσῃ . . . φορών, Mdt. 5.2.8 ἐσῃ εὑρισκόμενος, Sim. 9.1.8 εὐθηνοὺν
ἡν, 9.4.1 ὑποδεικνύει ἦσαν . . . ὑποδεικνύειαν.

73. Deliberative Use of the Present Indicative. The deliberative use of the 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 in the Greek of the LXX.
Gen. 37:30 ἑγὼ δὲ ποῦ πορεύομαι ἔτι;
So in N.T. --
Jn. 11:47 τί ποιούμεν; 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 most solemn language of legislation. From the nature of the case it is not used in the first person. It may be employed in command or in prohibition. As instances of the former we may take -
34:18,20: 3 K. 17:11 [1 Kings 17:11].


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) - Οὐ μοιχεύσεσι, Οὐ κλέψεις κτλ. So also - Dt. 6:16 οὐκ ἐκπειράσεσις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου. Cp. Nb. 22:12; Ex. 22:28; Lvt. 19:12-19.

d. In the case of the jussive future we have οὐ in prohibition, because the formula was originally one of prediction.

e. Occasionally there is a transition from the jussive future to οὐ μὴ with subjunctive - Nb. 23:25 οὐτε κατάρασις καταράσῃ μον αὐτόν, οὐτε εἰλογῶν μὴ εὐλογήσῃς αὐτόν .

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 ἐσοθεὶ οὗν ἰμείς τέλειοι , 6:45 οὐκ ἐσοθεὶ ώς οἱ ὑποκριταί, 20:26-28 οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ἦμιν . . . ἔσται ἦμιν δύολος , 21:3 καὶ ἐὰν τις ἦμιν ἐτή τι, ἐρείτε κτλ.

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 τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως ἐπερωτήσαντος τὸν Ἡλίοδωρον, ποιός τις εἴη ἐπίτηρειος .

4 Mac. 17:1 ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ τῶν δορυφόρων τινες ὡς . . . ἵνα μὴ ψάψεις τι τοῦ σώματος αὐτής, ἐαυτὴν ἐρρίψεις κατὰ τής πυρᾶς.

The established practice is for the subjunctive to follow the historic tenses in a final clause - Ex. 1:11 ἐπέστησαν . . . ἵνα κακώσωσιν , 9:16 διετηρήσης ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι .


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 τοῦτον χάριν ἀπέλπισεν σε ἐν Κηρήτῃ, ἵνα τὰ λείτουτα ἑπιμυροθῶσῃ .

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 ἐπιθύμησεν τι εἴη τοῦτο , with which contrast

Mk. 14:11 ἐξῆτε πῶς εὐκαίρως αὐτῶν παραδώ .

Outside of Acts the optative with εἰ is found only in four passages - 1 Cor. 14:10, 15:37 (εἰ τύχοι); 1 Pet. 3:14, 17.


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 ἐκάθισαν δὲ φαγεῖν ἄρτον . 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 καὶ οὐκ ἔσθήκοσαν ἔξεστείλαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ.

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 καὶ ἔξηλθον οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ἤλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ εὗρεν καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἤτοιμασάν τὸ πάσχα.

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 ιδὼν δὲ Φαραώ . . . ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ

may 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 καὶ Μωυσε καὶ η γυνὴ αὐτοῦ βλέποντες τριστερά καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι κυριεύοντες ἐν Ἰσραήλ.

More often it does not, as in -

Ex. 12:37 ἀπαραντες δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ, ἀπαραντες τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς μεταβολῆς. Ἐρινθαὶ ἠγαγον τὴν πόλιν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν.

Jdg. 4:16 καὶ Βαρέκ διάκονος.

Moreover we find a participle coupled with a finite verb by καὶ. 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 -

Jdg. 13:19-20 καὶ Μωυσε καὶ η γυνὴ αὐτοῦ βλέποντες τριστερά καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι κυριεύοντες ἐν Ἰσραήλ.

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 εἰ μὴ έυλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε, καὶ πληθυνών πληθυνώ τὸ σπέρμα σου.

Jdg. 11:25 Μι μαχόμενος ἐμαχέσατο μετὰ Ἰσραήλ ἢ πολεμῶν ἐπολέμησαν αὐτῶν;

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 ιδὼν εἶδον), but it is interesting to remember that Lucian himself came from the banks of the Euphrates. In Hdt. 5.95 αὐτός μὲν φεύγων ἐκφεύγει 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 ίστε γυνάκοινες,

but both the reading and the interpretation of this passage are disputed.

82. **Other Varieties of the Etymological Figure.** In Josh. 17:13 ἐξολοθρεύσαν δὲ αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἐξολοθρεύσαν 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 οικτείρμων οικτείρησει.
Sometimes we find an adverb in place of the participle -
Ex. 15:1 ένδοξως γὰρ δεδοξασταί.
Nb. 22:17 ἐντίμως γὰρ τιμήσω σε.
Prov. 23:1 νοστίμως νόει, 27:23 γνωστώς ἐπιγνώσῃ.
The following turns of expression may also be noticed -
Jdg. 11:25 ἐν ἀγαθῷ ἀγαθότερος.
Dt. 18:8 μερίδα μεμερισμένην.

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 οὐκ ἀπολείψεται ἡ αὐτοῦ ἔως πρῶτοι, καί ὀστοῦν συνεπίφυεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.
The same seems to be the case with ξυρήσωμαι and ξυρήσατο in Jdg. 16:17, 22.
So in N.T. --
1 Cor. 6:11 ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἧγιόσητε, ἀλλ' ἐδικαιώσητε, 10:2 καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωσῆν ἔβαπτισάτο,
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 ἀποστραφήσωμαι I will get me back again.
Jdg. 15:9 ξερίφθησαι spread themselves, 16:20 ἐκτιναχθήσωμαι shake myself, 16:26 ἐπιστηριχθήσωμαι support myself.
3 K. 17:3 [1 Kings 17:3] κρύβηθι hide thyself, 18:1 πορεύθητι καὶ ὀφθητὶ τῷ Ἀχαβῷ and shew thyself,
20:25 ἐπράψθη sold himself.
So in N.T. in Luke 11:38 ἐβαπτίσθη is used for ἐβαπτίσατο.

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. 
Βασιλεύειν 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 ἐβασιλεύσαν τοῦ Ἀβεμέλεχ.
1 K. 8:22 [1 Sam. 8:22] βασιλεύσων αὐτοῦς βασιλέα, 15:11 ἐβασιλεύσα τὸν Σαουλ ἐἰς βασιλέα.
There are all together thirty-six occurrences of the word in this causative sense.
b. Classical Greek again knows βοδιλούσεσθαι in the sense of 'to loathe' or 'abominate,' but not βοδιλοῦσειν in the sense of 'to make abominable,' as in -
Ex. 5:21 ἐβοδιλοῦσθε τὴν ὁδὴν Ἰμών ἐναντίον Φαραώ.
c. Still more strange to classical Greek is the sense of 'to make to sin' often imposed upon ξαμαρτάνειν, e.g. -
This is the prevailing sense of the word in the LXX, which is found all together twenty-eight times, mostly in the phrase ὁ ἐξῆμαρτεν τὸν Ἰσραήλ.
d. In this causative use of the verb is to be found the explanation of Ex. 14:25 καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτοὺς μετὰ βίας, where the R.V. margin has 'made them to drive.' Other similar instances are -

Ex. 13:18 ἐκύκλωσεν = he led round.

1 K. 4:3 [1 Sam. 4:3] κατὰ τῇ ἐπαυσεν ἡμᾶς κύριος σήμερον;
Ps. 142:11 ζήσεις με.

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.

σφόδρα σφόδρα Gen. 30:43; Ex. 1:7, 12; Nb. 14:7; Ezek. 9:9; Judith 4:2.
σφόδρα σφοδρῶς Gen. 7:19; Josh. 3:16.

To the same head may be assigned -

Ex. 8:14 συνήγαγον αὐτοὺς θημωνιάς θημωνιάς.

Dt. 28:43 ο ἰσοπλήστος ὁ ἐν σοὶ ἀναβῆσαι ἄνω ἄνω, σὺ δὲ καταφήσῃ κάτω κάτω. In all the above instances perhaps the kind of intensification involved is that of a repeated process.

2) The distributive use.

εἰς εἰς 1 Chr. 24:6
δύο δύο Gen. 6:19; 7:3; Sir. 36:15.
ἐπτά ἑπτά Gen. 7:3.
χιλίους ἑκ φιλης, χιλίους ἑκ φιλης Nb. 31:6.
τὸ πρώτον 1 Chr. 9:27.
ἐργασία καὶ ἐργασία 2 Chr. 34:13.

In pure Greek such ideas would be expressed by the use of ἀνά or κατά. Sometimes we find κατά; employed in the LXX along with the reduplication, as in --

Dt. 7:22 κατὰ μικρὸν μικρὸν.
Zech. 12:12 κατὰ φυλακὰς φυλακὰς.

The idea 'year by year' is expressed in many different ways -

ἐνιαυτῶν κατ’ ἐνιαυτῶν Dt. 14:21; 1 K. 1:7; [1 Sam. 1:7]; 2 Chr. 24:5.
κατ’ ἐνιαυτῶν 1 K. 7:16 [1 Sam. 7:16].

ἐνιαυτῶν εἰς ἐνιαυτοῦ Dt. 15:20.
τὸ κατ’ ἐνιαυτῶν ἐνιαυτῷ 3 K. 10:28 [1 Kings 10:28].
τὸ κατ’ ἐνιαυτῶν ἐνιαυτῶν 2 Chr. 9:24.

3) The universalising use.

ἄνδρι άνδρὶ 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 δύο δύο, du,o du,o,o du,o du,o,o du,o du,o,o du,o du,o,o 6:39 συμπόσια συμπόσια, sumpo,sia sumpo,sia sumpo,sia sumpo,sia sumpo,sia sumpo,sia 6:40 πρασιαι πρασιαι.

So also in the Pastor of Hermas -
86. Expressions of Time.

a. ‘Year after year’ is expressed in 2 K. 21:1 [2 Sam. 21:1] by a nominative absolute ἐνιαυτὸς ἐχόμενος ἐνιαυτοῦ without any pretence of grammar.

b. The use of the word ‘day’ in vague expressions of time is a Hebraism, e.g. -

- Jdg. 15:1 μεθ’ ἡμέρας = after some time. Cp. 3 K. 17:7 [1 Kings 17:7].
- 3 K. 18:1 [1 Kings 18:1] μεθ’ ἡμέρας πολλὰς = after a long time.

c. ‘Day by day’ (Hb. day, day) is expressed in Gen. 39:10 by ἡμέραν ἡμέραι (cp. Lat. diem ex die). In Esther 3:4 καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν 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 ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμέρας.

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.

- ἀπ’ ἐγκεκριμένοι καὶ τρίς ἡμέρας Josh. 3:4.
- πρὸ τῆς ἐγκεκριμένοι καὶ τρίς Dt. 19:4.
- πρὸ τῆς ἐγκεκριμένοι καὶ πρὸ τῆς τρίς . Ex. 21:29.
- πρὸ τῆς ἐγκεκριμένοι καὶ πρὸ τῆς τρίς ἡμέρας Ex. 21:36.
- πρὸ τῆς ἐγκεκριμένοι οὐδὲ πρὸ τῆς τρίς . Ex. 21:36.
- πρὸ τῆς ἐγκεκριμένοι οὐδὲ πρὸ τῆς τρίς ἡμέρας . Ex. 4:10.

In Joshua 20:5, which occurs only in the Codex Alexandrinus, we have ἀπ’ ἐγκεκριμένοι καὶ τρίς, where ἐγκεκριμένοι-καὶ-τρίς is treated as a single indeclinable noun.

e. ‘Just at that time’ is expressed variously as follows -

- ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ Dan. O’ 5:5.

87. Pleonastic Use of ἐκεῖ and ἐκείνειν. 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.

- Ex. 20:24 οὗ ἐαν ἐποιομασώ τὸ διόμα μου ἐκεῖ.
- Dan. Θ 9:7 οὗ διεύρευσεν αὐτοῦς ἐκεῖ.
- Gen. 31:13 ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ὧ ἠλευθάσας μοι ἐκεῖ στήλην .
- Ex. 8:22 ἐφ’ ἦς οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ.
Dt. 9:28 οθεν ἐξῆγαγες ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖθεν.
Nb. 23:13 εξ ὧν οὐκ ὄψη αὐτῶν ἐκεῖθεν.
Dan. Ο’ 9:7 εἰς ἀς διεσκόρπισας αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ.

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 -

88. πᾶς with ὦν and μὴ.

a. The use of πᾶς with a negative particle, where in classical Greek οὐδεὶς or μηδεὶς would be employed, is a Hebraism, even though in certain cases the resulting expression may be paralleled from pure Greek usage. The πᾶς may either precede or follow the negative (οὐ, μὴ, μηδὲ, οὔ μὴ) without difference of meaning.

b. We will first take instances from the LXX where the πᾶς precedes the negative.
   Hbk. 2:19 πᾶν πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ.
   1 Mac. 2:61 πάντες . . . οὐκ ἄσθενήσουσιν.
   Ex. 22:22 πᾶσαν χῆραν καὶ ὄρφανον οὐ κακώσετε .

So in N.T. --
Rev. 18:22 πᾶς τεχνίτης . . . οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἐτὶ .
2 Pet. 1:20 πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἴδιας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται.
1 Jn. 2:21 πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστι . Cp. 1 Jn. 3:6, 10, 15; 4:3; 5:18; Rev. 22:3.

In the following passages of the LXX the πᾶς follows the negative -
Ps. 142:2 οὗ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν .
Eccl. 1:9 οὐκ ἔστιν πᾶν πρόφατον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον .
Ex. 20:10; Dt. 5:14 οὐ ποιήσετε ἐν αὐτῷ πᾶν έργον . Cp. Ex. 20:16.
Tob. 12:11 οὗ μὴ κρύψῃ ἀφ’ ὕμων πᾶν ῥήμα .
Ps. 33:11 οὐκ ἐλαττωθήσονται παινός ἀγαθοῦ .
Jdg. 13:4 μὴ φάγῃς πᾶν ἀκάθαρτον .
Tob. 4:7 μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἀπὸ παινός πτωχοῦ .

So in N.T. --
Lk. 1:37 οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πᾶν ῥήμα .
1 Cor. 1:29 ὅπως μὴ καιρότητα πᾶσα σάρξ .
Rev. 21:27 οὗ μὴ εἰσελθῇ εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κολον.
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. εἰς.

a. εἰς 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 well as by 'to,' e.g. -

Gen. 37:17 πορευόμεν εἰς Δωθάει... καὶ εὗρεν αὐτοὺς εἰς Δωθάει.
Josh. 7:22 ἔδραμον εἰς τὴν σκηνήν... καὶ ταῦτα ἦν ἐικεκριμένα εἰς τὴν σκηνήν.
Jdg. 14:1 καὶ κατέβη Σαμψών εἰς Θαμιάθα, καὶ εἶδεν γυναίκα εἰς Θαμιάθα.

For examples of the former meaning only we may take -

Gen. 42:32 ὁ δὲ μικρότερος... εἰς γῆν Χανάαν.
Nb. 25:33 τὴν γῆν εἰς ἡ ὑμεῖς κατοικεῖτε.
Judith 16:23 ἀπέθανεν εἰς βατυλούα.

b. In the N.T. εἰς denoting rest or position is very common.

Mk. 2:1 εἰς οἶκον = at home. Cp. Lk. 9:61; Mk. 10:10.
Mk. 13:3 καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν.
Jn. 1:18 ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός.


The obliteration of the distinction between rest and motion is one of the marks of declining Greek. In the modern language εἰς has usurped the functions both of ἐν and πρὸς.

c. The use of εἰς with the accusative after εἶναι and γενέσθαι as practically equivalent to the nominative may safely be regarded as a Hebraism.

d. 1 Chr. 11:21 ἦν αὐτοῖς εἰς ἁρχοντα, 17:7 εἶναι εἰς ἡγούμενον.
Gen. 2:7 ἐγένετο ὁ δανθρωπός εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.
Ex. 2:10 ἐγεννήθη αὕτη ἡ εἰς υἱόν.
1 K. 4:9 [1 Sam. 4:9] γένεσθε εἰς ἄνθρωπος.

πρὸς in one passage takes the place of eis.
Sir. 46:4 μία ἡμέρα ἐγεννήθη πρὸς δύο.

e. In the New Testament this idiom occurs both in quotations from the Old and otherwise.
1 Jn. 5:8 καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσίν.
Lk. 3:5 ἦσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείας (Is. 40:4).
2 Cor. 6:18 ἐσοθεὶ μοι εἰς υἱοῖς καὶ θυγατέρας (2 K. 7:8; [2 Sam. 7:8] Is. 43:6).
Mt. 19:5 ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν (Gen. 2:24).
Mt. 21:42 ἐγεννήθη εἰς θεφαλὴν γυναῖκα (Ps. 117:22).
Jn. 16:20 ἡ λύπη ἵματι εἰς χαρὰν γεννήσεται.

The same usage is to be found also in the Apostolic Fathers -
Herm. Past. Sim. 9.13.5 ἔσονται εἰς ἑ πικήμα, εἰς ἑν σῶμα.
1 Clem. 11:2 εἰς κρίμα καὶ εἰς σημείωσιν... γίνονται.
Ign. Eph. 11:1 ἢνα μὴ ἵματι εἰς κρίμα γένησται.

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 καὶ δώσετε μοι τὴν παιδί τινὸς εἰς γυναῖκα.
Ps. 104:17 εἰς δοῦλον ἔπραθη Ἡσοφή.
Gen. 12:2 ποιήσω σε εἰς ζώνα μέγα.

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 ἵματι ἦσται αὐτοίς βρῶσιν, 1:14 ἐστωσαν εἰς σημεία.

f. 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 ὁ δὲ μὴ προσέχειν τῇ διανοίᾳ εἰς τὸ ρῆμα κυρίου κτλ.
So in N.T. --
1 Cor. 16:1 τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους (the collection for the saints).

91. ἐν.

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 ἐν of Accompanying Circumstances.” This includes the instrumental use, but goes far beyond it. Under this aspect ἐν invades the domain of μετά and σὺν. In most cases it may be rendered by the English ‘with.’
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Hos. 1:7 σῶσον αὐτούς ἐν κυρίῳ Θεῷ αὐτῶν, καὶ ὃς σώσῃ αὐτούς ἐν τῷ θύσιν αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ δόξῳ σαλώμην ἐν τῷ θύσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ἱππείσιν. Cp. 1 K. 17:45 [1 Sam. 17:45]; 47: 1 Mac. 3:12.

Ex. 6:1 ἐν γὰρ χειρὶ κραταίᾳ κτλ. (But in Ex. 3:19 we have ἐὰν μή μετὰ χειρὸς κραταίᾷς.) Cp. Ex. 3:20; Jdg. 15:15, 16.


1 Mac. 4:6 ὁφθή Ἰουδαίας... ἐν τρισχιλίοις ἀνδράσιν.

So in N.T. --

1 Cor. 4:21 ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἕλθω πρὸς ἴμας; Cp. 1 K. 17:43: [1 Sam. 17:43] Ps. 2:9.

Eph. 6:2 ἐνυπολή πρώτῃ ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ.

2 Pet. 3:16 ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ.


Mt. 26:52 ἐν μοχιτείᾳ ἀπολύνονταί .

b. The ἐν of accompanying circumstances is not wholly foreign to classical Greek, though the extended use made of it in Biblical diction is.

Eur. Tro. 817 ὁ χρυσάεις ἐν οἰνοχῶις ἀβρά βαίνων.

c. In another of its Biblical uses ἐν becomes indistinguishable from εἰς, as in -

Ex. 4:21 πάντα τὰ τέρατα ἐ ἐδώκα ἐν ταῖς χερεῦν σου.


Is. 37:10 ὃς μὴ παραδόθη Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐν χειρὶ βασιλέως, while the parallel passage in 4 K. 19:10 [2 Kings 19:10] has εἰς χείρας βασιλέως.


So in N.T. --

2 Cor. 8:16 χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ διδόντι τὴν αὐτήν σου ὑπὲρ ἴμων ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ Τίτου.

Mt. 14:3 ἐθετο ἐν φυλακῇ.

Jn. 3:35 πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.

Rev. 11:11 πνεῦμα ζωῆς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσήλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

92. ἀπὸ.

a. ἀπὸ 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 καὶ ὁστόνι ὁς συντρίψετε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ.

Josh. 9:8 οὐκ ἦν γῆμα ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν ἐκείλατο Μωσῆς τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ὧν ὁ ΟΣ ἦν ἀνέγνω Ἰσραήλ.


Joel 2:28 ἐκεῖθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ πνευματός μου.


So in N.T. --

Lk. 6:13 ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ’ αὐτῶν δώδεκα.

Jn. 21:10 ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὁμαρίων ὡ—ν ἐπιάσατε νῦν.

b. ἀπὸ = ‘by reason of’ is another unclassical use which occurs in the LXX.

Gen. 41:31 καὶ οὐκ ἐπηγινωσχήσεται ἡ εὐθυνία ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ λιμοῦ.

Ex. 2:23 καὶ κατεστέναξαν οἱ οἱ Ἰσραήλ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑργῶν.
3:7 καὶ τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐργοδωμῶν.
Ps. 11:6 ἀπὸ τῆς ταλαιπωρίας τῶν πτωχῶν . . . ἀναστήσομαι.
Sir. 20:6 ἔστιν μισητός ἀπὸ πολλῆς λαλίας.
Nahum 1:6 αἱ πέτραι διεθρύβησαν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ.

In this way ἀπὸ becomes = ύπό, as in Dan. Ο’ 1:18.

So in N.T. --
Hb. 5:7 εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας.

Jn. 21:6 οἰκείτι αὐτῷ ἐλκύσαι ἰχθύων ἀπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους τῶν ἰχθύων.


c. The combination ἀπὸ . . . ἔως is a Hebraism. It may be rendered “from . . . unto,” as in -
Dt. 8:35 ἀπὸ ἰχθυών τῶν ποδῶν σου ἐως τῆς κορυφῆς σου,
or “both . . . and,” as in -
Ex. 9:25 ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου . . . ἔως κτήματος.

Sometimes καὶ precedes the ἔως -
Jdg. 15:5 ἀπὸ . . . καὶ ἔως . . . καὶ ἔως. b. More often however the comparative is used, but the construction with ὑπέρ still retained.
Jdg. 18:26 δυνατώτεροι εἶσιν ὑπέρ αὐτῶν.
Hbk. 1:8 δύστεροι ὑπέρ λύκους.

93. μετά with genitive = ‘in dealing with’ is a Hebraism. It may be rendered “from . . . unto,” as in -
Jdg. 15:3 ὅτι ποιώ ἐγὼ μετ’ αὐτῶν ποιηρίαν.

So in N.T. --

94. ὑπέρ .

a. The frequent use of ὑπέρ 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 ὑπέρ.
1 K. 9:2 [1 Sam. 9:2] ὑψηλὰς ὑπέρ πάσαν τὴν γῆν.
1 Chr. 4:9 ἐνδοξός ὑπέρ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ.
Sir. 24:20 ὑπέρ μέλι γλυκύ.
Ezk. 5:1 ῥομφαίαν ὁξείαν ὑπέρ χυμὸν κουφέως.

b. More often however the comparative is used, but the construction with ὑπέρ still retained.
Jdg. 18:26 δυνατώτεροι εἰσὶν ὑπέρ αὐτῶν.
Ruth 3:12 ἐγγίζων ὑπέρ ἐμε.
Hbk. 1:8 δύστεροι ὑπέρ λύκους.

c. ὑπέρ is employed in the same way after verbs -
Ex. 1:9 Ἡχοῦσε ὑπέρ ἡμᾶς.
1 K. 1:5 [1 Sam. 1:5] τὴν “Αναμνῆ ἡγάπα Ἑλκανά ὑπέρ ταῦτην.”
Ps. 39:13 ἐπιθυμήθησαν ὑπὲρ τὰς τρίχας τῆς κεφαλῆς μου.
1 Chr. 19:12 ἦλθαν κρατήσας ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ Σύρος.
Jer. 26:23 πληθύνει ὑπὲρ ἀκρίδας. 

d. So in N.T.--
after a comparative -
Lk. 16:8 φρονιμοῦσαν ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς.
Hb. 4:12 τομύτερος ὑπὲρ πάσαι μάχαιραι.
after a verb -
Gal. 1:14 πρόκειται . . . ὑπὲρ πολλοῦ.
Mt. 10:37 ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ.


95. ἑπὶ.
a. ἑπὶ with the accusative is used of rest as well as of motion.
Gen. 41:17 ἐστάναι ἐπὶ τὸ χέιλος τοῦ ποταμοῦ.
Ex. 10:14 καὶ ἄνήγενεν αὐτὴν (τὴν ἀκρίδα) ἐπὶ πᾶσαν γῆν Αἰγύπτου, καὶ κατέπαινεν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ὀρια Αἰγύπτου πολλῆ σοφόρα.
Jdg. 16:27 ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα = upon the roof.
b. ἑπὶ is sometimes used to reinforce an accusative of duration of time.
Jdg. 14:17 καὶ ἔκλασαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰς ἡμέρας ἡς ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁ πότος.
c. In Josh. 25:10 we find μέγαν κατειν ὧν where in classical Greek we should have only μέγαν ἴδειν.
d. In the N.T. also ἑπὶ with the accusative is used of rest or position -
2 Cor. 3:15 κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται.
Mk. 2:14 καθημενον ἐπὶ το τελῶνον. Cp. Lk. 5:27.
Mk. 4:38 ἐπὶ το προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων.
Mt. 14:28 περιτατῶν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν (in Jn. 6:19 περιτατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης).
Jn. 1:32 ἐμείνεν ἐπ' αὐτῶν.

96. παρά.
a. παρά 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 ὑπὲρ.
Nb. 12:3 καὶ ὁ ἀνθρωπός Μωυσῆς πρᾶς σοφόρα παρὰ πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.
Dan. Θ 7,7 διάφορον περισσότερο παρὰ πάντα τὰ θήρια.
1 Esd. 4:35 ἱσχυρότερα παρὰ πάντα.
Dan. O’ 11:13 μείζονα παρὰ τὴν πρότετη (Θ has πολὺν ὑπὲρ τὸν πρότερον).
Dt. 7:7 ἵματις γὰρ ἐστε ὀλιγοστοὶ παρὰ πάντα τὰ ᾠδηνή.

Gen. 43:34 ἐμεγαλύθη δὲ ἡ μερὶς Βενιαμεὼν παρὰ ταῖς μερίδας πάντων.

Ps. 8:6 ἡλπίττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ’ ἄγγέλους.

b. In the N.T. παρὰ after a comparative is abundant in Hebrews -


We find it after a positive and after a comparative in Luke -

Lk. 13:2 ἀμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους, 3:13 μηδὲν πλέον παρὰ τὸ διαταγμένον ἵματιν πράσοσετε,

and after verbs in -

Rom. 14:5 ὅ μὲν κρίνει ἡμέραν παρ’ ἡμέραν.

Hb. 1:9 ἔχριας σε ὁ Θεὸς . . . παρὰ τοὺς μετάχους σου.

c. In the Apostolic Father cp. -

Herm. Past. Vis. 3.12.1 ἵλαρωτέαν παρὰ τὸ πρῶτον, Sim. 9.18.2 πλεῖοντα . . . παρά.

Barn. Ep. 4:5 (in a quotation from Daniel which is neither Ο’ nor Θ) καλεπωτέρων παρὰ πάντα τὰ θηρία.

97. New Forms of Preposition.

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. ἐπάνωθεν occurs in Swete’s text in Jdg. 16:20; 2 K. 11:20 [2 Sam. 11:20], 24; 20:21; 3 K. 1:53; [1 Kings 1:53] 4 K. 2:3 [2 Kings 2:3]. It not unnaturally gets confused in some places with the classical ἐπάνωθεν, which is very common in the LXX, having been found a convenient rendering of certain compound prepositions in the Hebrew.

c. ὑποκάτωθεν, which is only used as an adverb in classical Greek, assumes in the LXX the function of a preposition, e.g. -

Dt. 9:14 ἔξαλείψω τὸ νόμομα αὐτῶν ὑποκάτωθεν τοῦ αἵματος.

The corresponding form ὑπεράνωθεν occurs in the LXX only twice, once as an adverb in Ps. 77:23 and once as a preposition in -

Ezk. 1:25 ὑπεράνωθεν τοῦ στερεώματος.

d. ἐναντίοι in many passages of the LXX has been replaced in Swete’s text by ἐναντίοιον, 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.


κατέναντι is specially frequent in the book of Sirach.

e. ἐνώπιον 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.


f. ὁπίσω 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. κατόπισθεν 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 ἀπὸ ὁπίσθεν Κυρίου. Cp. Eccl. 1:10 ἀπὸ ἐμπρόσθεν ἠμῶν.

h. κυκλώθηκεν occurs in the LXX as a preposition in 3 K. 18:32; [1 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 κυκλόθεν τοῦ θρόνου.
κύκλῳ is sometimes used in the same way, as in 3 K. 18:35; 1 Kings 18:35; Sir. 23:18; Is. 6:2; Jer. 39:44.
Cp. Strabo 17.6, p. 792 τὰ δὲ κύκλῳ τῆς κόμης.
i. Other prepositions that may be briefly noticed are ἐχώμενα πέτρας Ps. 140:6, ἐσώτερον τῆς κολύμβηθρας Is. 22:11.
In Sir. 29:25 we have the combination καὶ πρὸς ἐπὶ τούτοις.

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:

ἀδυνατεῖν ἀπὸ Dt. 17:8.
ἀδελεύειν ἐν 4 K. 1:1; 2 Kings 1:1]; 3:5, 7; 18:7; 24:1, 20; 2 Chr. 10:19.
ἀἰρεῖται ἐν 1 Chr. 29:1; 2 Chr. 29:11.
βεβλεύεσθαι ἀπὸ Ex. 1:12.
ἐκδικεῖν ἐκ Dt. 18:19.
ἐκλέγειν ἐν 1 Chr. 28:5.
ἐλπίζειν ἐπί with accusative Ps. 4:6, 5:12, 9:11, 40:10.
ἐλπίζειν ἐπί with dative Ps. 7:1.
ἐνεδρύειν ἐπί Jdg. 16:2.
ἐντέρπεσθαι ἀπὸ 2 Chr. 36:12; 1 Esd. 1:45.
ἐφόδοικεν ἐν Ps. 146:10.
θέλειν ἐν 1 K. 18:22; 1 Sam. 18:22]; 1 Chr. 28:4; Ps. 146:10.
θεωρεῖν ἐν Jdg. 16:27.
καταφρονεῖν ἐπί Tobit 4:18.
λογίζεσθαι εἰς 1 K. 1:13; 1 Sam. 1:13.
μικτηρίζειν ἐν 1 Esd. 1:51.
πατάσσειν ἐν 2 Chr. 28:5, 17.
ποιεῖν ἔλεος ἐν Jdg. 8:35.
ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετά Jdg. 8:35.
πολεμεῖν ἐν 1 K. 28:15; 1 Sam. 28:15.
προσέχειν εἰς Ex. 9:21.
προσοχθίζειν ἀπὸ Nb. 22:3.
συνιέσθαι εἰς Ps. 27:5.
ὑπερηφανεύεσθαι ἀπὸ Tobit 4:14.
φεύγοισθαι ἐπὶ Dt. 7:16.
φοβεῖσθαι ἀπὸ Dt. 1:29, 7:29; Josh. 11:6; 4 K. 1:15; 2 Kings 1:15; Ps. 3:7.
CONJUNCTIONS, 99-111

99. ei with the Subjunctive.

a. In Homer ei, or its equivalent αι, is common with the subjunctive, especially when accompanied by κε(ν), 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 ἀν) 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 τί ποιάς . . . ἀνεμένον ἦ.

Xen. Anab. 3.2.22 οἱ πόταμοι, ei καὶ πρόσω τῶν πηγῶν ἀπορού ὡσι.

Soph. Ant. 710 κε τις ἡ σοφός. 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 ἢ ἀνθρώπως; 8.9 ei τις προσθῇ, 18 ei γάρ . . . ἀποκτείνῃ, 10.21 ei πολεμῶσιν.

Philo 2.19, De Abr. §25 ei ἐμμισθοθεος ἦ.

Jos. B.J. 1.31.1 ei . . . ἀσθενής, Ant. 1.2.3 ei καὶ συμβῆ.

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 ἐπιστρέφετέ με ύμεις παρατάξασθαι ἐν ύποις Ἀμμών καὶ παραδῷ Κύριος αὐτοῖς ἐνώπιον ἔμοι. InDt. 8:8, when ei is used with the subjunctive makes it dependent on ei - ei ἐπιστρέφετε με ἐμοίς παρατάξασθαι ἐν ἑαυτῶι Κύριος καὶ παραδῷ αὐτοῖς ἐνώπιον ἔμοι.

In the N.T. there are a few instances of ei with the subjunctive -

Rom. 11:14 ei πως παραζηλώσω.

Phil. 3:11 ei πως καταντήσω εἰς τὴν ἐξαισθασίαν, 3:12 ei καὶ καταλάβω.

100. ei Interrogative.

a. In classical Greek ei is often used in indirect questions, e.g. -

Thuc. 1.5.2 ἐρωτῶντες ei λησταί εἰςιν.

Plat. Apol. 21 D ἥρετο γάρ ὁδή, ei τις ἐμοί eiς σοφώτερος.
In Biblical Greek εἰ 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 εἰ is in all these cases ‘nothing but an itacistic misspelling for the colloquial ἢ’. In Gen. 43:7 λέγων Ἕτε ἐτι ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ζή, εἰ ἐστιν ὑμῖν ἀδελφός ζ. . . μὴ ἴδεις μεν εἱ ἔρει ἤμιν κτλ. we have first the direct and then the indirect use of εἰ as an interrogative particle. For other instances of the former take -

1 K. 15:32 (1 Sam. 15:32) καὶ εἶπεν Ἀγάγ Εἱ οὔτως πικρὸς ὁ θάνατος;
2 K. 20:17 (2 Sam. 20:17) καὶ εἶπεν ἡ γυνὴ Εἰ ὅποι εἰ Ἰωάβ;

c. The interrogative εἰ is sometimes followed by the deliberative conjunctive, e.g. -

Jdg. 20:28 Εἴ τε προσθέμειν ἐτι ἔξελθειν;
2 K. 2:1 (2 Sam. 2:1) Εἰ ἀναβῇ εἰς μιᾶν τῶν πόλεων Ἰωάνα;
1 Chr. 14:10 Εἰ ἀναβ spriteBatch ὑπὸ τούς ἀλλοφύλους;

d. In the N.T. εἰ interrogative is of common occurrence -

Mt. 8:23 ἐπηρώτα αὐτῶν, Εἰ τί βλέπετε; Cp. Mk. 10:2, where the question may be either direct or indirect.
Mt. 12:10 ἐπηρώταν αὐτῶν λέγοντες, Εἰ ἔζητες τοῖς αἵμασιν ταπεινόν; Cp. Mt. 19:3.

101. εἰ in Oaths.

a. εἰ is often found in the LXX after an oath in a sense practically equivalent to a negative, e.g. -

Ps. 94:11 ὡς ὄμοσα ἐν τῇ ὑγιῇ μου Εἰ ἐλεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάφυσιν μου.

This use of εἰ is a sheer Hebraism. The negative force imported into εἰ is due to a suppression of the apodosis, which the reader may supply 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. 3:14 [1 Sam. 3:14], 14:45, 17:55, 19:6, 28:10; 2 K. 19:35; [2 Sam. 19:35]; 9 K. 1:52 [1 Kings 1:52], 2:8, 17:1, 12, 18:10; 4 K. 2:2; [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 ὅτι, not by εἰ, as in -

3 K. 18:15 [1 Kings 18:15] ὅτι Κύριος . . . ὅτι ἄμερον ὑφθάλμων σοι, or else is devoid of a conjunction, as in -
1 K. 1:26 [1 Sam. 1:26] ὅτι ἡ ψυχή σου, ἐγὼ ἡ γυνὴ κτλ.
Jdg. 8:19 ὅτι Κύριος, εἰ ἐξωγονήκετε αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἄν ἀπέκτεινα ἵμας.

c. In 4 K. 3:14 [2 Kings 3:14] ὅτι εἰ μὴ is merely a strengthened form of εἰ μὴ, so that the ἢ by which it is followed in Swete’s text, instead of εἰ, seems to destroy the sense.

d. In the N.T. we have the jurative use of εἰ in -

Mk. 8:12 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτης σημεῖον.

Also in Hb. 3:11, 4:3 in quotations from Ps. 94:11.

102. εἰ μὴ in Oaths. As εἰ assumes a negative force in oaths and asseverations, so on the same principle εἰ μὴ becomes positive. Instances are -

Nb. 14:35 ὡς Κύριος ἐλάλησεν, εἰ μὴ οὕτως ποιήσω (= I will do so).
Is. 45:23 κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὁμολογῶ, εἰ μὴ ἔξελυσεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου δικαιοσύνη (= righteousness shall go forth from my mouth).
In 3 K. 21:23 [1 Kings 21:23] ἕαν δὲ πολεμήσομεν αὐτοῖς κατ’ εὐθὺ, εἰ μὴ κραταίσσομεν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῖς the oath itself is suppressed as well as the apodosis.

103. εἰ μὴ, εἰ μὴ, εἰ μὴ, etc., as a formula of asseveration has been supposed to be a blend between the Hebraistic εἰ μὴ (§102) and the Greek ἐὰν μὴ, ἐὰν μὴ. 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 write it εἰ μὴ and regard it as an Interjection. The following are all the passages in which it occurs in the LXX:


In 2 K. 19:35 [2 Sam. 19:35] what we have is εἰ interrogative (§100) followed by μὴ.

In the N.T. εἰ μὴ occurs only in Hb. 6:14 in a quotation from Gen. 22:17.

104. ἕαν, etc., with the Indicative.

a. As in Hellenistic Greek εἰ may take the subjunctive, so on the other hand ἕαν, ὅταν and the like are found with the indicative.

Instances of ἕαν with the indicative in the LXX are:

Gen. 44:30 ἕαν εἰσπορεύομαι.
Jdg. 6:3 ἕαν ἐσπειραν.
Job. 22:3 ἕαν σὺ ἤρθα.
So in N.T. --
1 Jn. 5:15 ἕαν ὑλάσαμεν.

b. Instances of ὅταν with the indicative in the LXX are:

Gen. 38:9 ὅταν εἰσήρχετο.
Ex. 17:11 ὅταν ἔπηρεν Μωσῆς τὰς χεῖρας.
 Nb. 11:9 καὶ ὅταν κατέβη ὁ ὅρος, 21:9 ὅταν ἔδακνεν ὁφις ἀνθρωπον.
1 K. 17:34 [1 Sam. 17:34] ὅταν ἤρχετο ὁ λέων καὶ ὁ ἄρκος.
Ps. 119:7 ὅταν ἐλάλουν αὐτοῖς.

c. So in N.T. --
Mk. 3:11 καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτῶν θεώρει, προσέπιπτεν αὐτῷ, 11:19 ὅταν ὄψῃ ἐγένετο.
Rev. 8:1 ὅταν ἦνοιξε .
Ign. Eph. 8:1 ὅταν γὰρ μηδεμία ἐρίς εἰσήρθεται ἐν ὑμῖν.
Herm. Past. Sim. 9.1.6 ὅταν ὁ ἡλίος ἐπικεκαύκει, ἦμαι ἐγένοιτο, 4.5 ὅταν . . . ἐτέθησαν . Cp. 17.3. 6.4 ὅταν ἐπάτασαν .

Under the same head come the following:

Ex. 33:8, 34:34 ἡμίκα δ’ ἄν εἰσεπορεύετο Μωσῆς, 40:30 ἡμίκα δ’ ἄν ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς ἢ νεφέλη.

105. ἕαν after a Relative.
a. ἐάν for ἀν 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 -

ὅσα ἐάν Gen. 44:1; Ex. 13:12, ἡμείς ἐάν Gen. 24:41; Ex. 13:5.


ὅσον ἐάν Ex. 5:11.

As a rule the subjunctive follows, but not always.

Gen. 2:19 πᾶν ὅ ἐάν ἐκάλεσεν.

b. The use of ἀν 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 ἐάν in this connexion than ἀν, e.g. -

ὁ ἐάν Mt. 5:19, 10:14,42; Lk. 17:33.

ὁ ἐάν Mt. 11:27; Lk. 10:22.

ὁ ἐάν 1 Cor. 16:3.

ὁ ἐάν 1 Cor. 6:18; Gal. 6:7; Col. 3:23; Eph. 6:8; Jn. 15:7; 1 Jn. 3:22; 3 Jn. 5.

καθό ἐάν 2 Cor. 8:12.

ὁποῦ ἐάν Mt. 8:19.

ὁ τι ἐάν 1 Jn. 3:19.

For instances of ἀν 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 ἐάν after relatives-

Barn. Ep. 7:11 ὅ ἐάν τιθήσαι ἀν κήσησαι ὅτε ἐάν ἐξελίσσεται .

Herm. Past. Vis. 3.2.1 ὅ ἐάν πάραθη, Sim. 7.7 ὅσοι [ἐάν] ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς μου ταύταις πορεύθωσιν ,

9.2.7 ὅσα ἐάν σοι δειξίζω .

106. ἵνα with the Indicative.

a. In the vast majority of places in which ἵνα 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 ἵνα after a primary tense or the imperative mood takes a future indicative.

Gen. 16:2 ἐπανέλθη . . . ἵνα τεκνοποιήσεις .

3 K. 2:3 [1 Kings 2:3] φιλάξεις . . . ἵνα ποιήσεις.


b. The 1st person singular of the 1st aorist subjunctive may possibly have served as a stepping-stone to this use. Take for instance -


This might easily lead by false analogy to -

ἀπελεύσομαι, ἵνα μή πατάξῃς με.

This theory however fails to account for the following -

1 Esd. 4:50 ἵνα ἀφίοισι.

Tob. 14:9 οὗ δὲ τήρησον τὸν νόμον . . . ἵνα σοι καλώς ἦν.

The last can only be regarded as a monstrosity.

c. In the N.T. ἵνα with the future indicative occurs occasionally and is common in Revelation -

1 Cor. 9:18 ἵνα . . . θήσω .
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 ἵνα with a present indicative -

Gal. 1:17 ἵνα αὐτοῖς ζηλοῦτε.

With regard to these Winer came to the conclusion that ἵνα 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, φυσιοῦσθαι and ζηλοῦσθαι 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 -σται.’ Perhaps however in these cases it is the accidence, not the syntax, that is astray, φυσιοῦσθαι and ζηλοῦσθαι 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 -σται.’

107. Ellipse before ὅτι. By the suppression of an imperative of a verb of knowing ὅτι acquires the sense of ‘know that.’

Ex. 3:12 λέγων ὅτι ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ.

Jdg. 15:7 εἶπεν . . . Σαμψῶν . . . ὅτι εἰ μὴν ἐκδικήσω ἐν ὑμῖν.


This usage originates in the Hebrew, but has a parallel in Greek in the similar ellipse before ὃς, 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. ἄλλα ὅ. a. The combination of particles ἄλλα ὅ occurs in Swete’s text 114 times at least. In most of these passages ἄλλα ὅ is simply a strengthened form of ἄλλα. 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 ἄλλα ὅ 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 εἰ μὴ. But even this latter meaning can be borne by the simple ἄλλα, if we may trust the reading of -

Gen. 21:26 οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ἠκούσα ἄλλα σήμερον.

b. The idea has been entertained that ἄλλα ὅ is not for ἄλλα ὅ, as the accentuation assumes, but for ἄλλο ὅ. This view would suit very well with such passages as Gen. 28:17; 47:18; Dt. 10:12; 2 K. 12:3; [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 ἄλλα ὅ follows ἄλλος or ἔτερος, as in 4 K. 5:17: [2 Kings 5:17] Dan. 3:95, 3:11; 1 Mac. 10:38, the ἄλλα would be superfluous in classical Greek, so that in these cases it might be thought that the ὅ was strengthened by the ἄλλα, and not vice versa: but if we accept the use in Gen. 21:26, it follows that even here it is the ἄλλα 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 οὔτι, λέγων ὑμῖν, ἄλλα ὅ διαμερισμὸν.

2 Cor. 1:13 οὗ γὰρ ἄλλα γράφομεν ὑμῖν, ἄλλα ὅ ἡ άναγεννώσκετε.

An examination of these instances will show that they all fall under the same two heads as ἀλλὰ ἢ. In the bulk of them ὅτι ἀλλὰ ἢ 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 ὅτι, 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 διότι in place of ὅτι.


110. ὅτι εἰ μὴ. This combination occurs in the following passages -


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 ὅτι might be dispensed with, and owes its presence to the Hebrew.

111. ἀλλὰ ἢ ὅτι. There are four passages in which this combination occurs -

Nb. 13:29 ἀλλὰ ἢ ὅτι ἔραξα τὸ ἔθνος.

1 K. 10:19 [1 Sam. 10:19] Οὐχὶ, ἀλλὰ ἢ ὅτι βασιλέα στήσεις ἐφ' ἡμῶν . 12:12 Οὐχὶ, ἀλλὰ ἢ ὅτι βασιλεύς βασιλεύσει ἐφ' ἡμῶν.


No one meaning suits all the above passages. In the first of them the Hebrew which corresponds to ἀλλὰ ἢ ὅτι is rendered in the R.V. ‘howbeit.’ In the next two ἀλλὰ ἢ ὅτι might just as well have been ὅτι ἀλλὰ ἢ (= Lat. sed), as in Jdg. 15:3 (§ 109). In the fourth also ὅτι ἀλλὰ ἢ might have been used in the sense of ‘but’ in ‘nothing but,’ etc., as in 1 K. 21:6 [1 Sam. 21:6], 30:17: 4 K. 4:2 [2 Kings 4:2], 5:15: 2 Chr. 2:6.

112. λέγων, 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 -


b. If the subject is neuter or feminine, the participle may still be masculine-

Gen. 15:1: 1 K. 15:10 [1 Sam. 15:10] ἐγεννήθη ῥῆμα Κυρίου . . . λέγων.


Also, if the sentence is impersonal -


2 Chr. 21:12 ἡλθεν . . . ἐν γραφῇ . . . λέγων.

Jonah 3:7 ἔφρευσε . . . λέγοντα.

c. But the participle may even refer to another subject, as -


d. It is rare for the Greek to fare so well as in -

 Dt. 13:12 ἐὰν δὲ ἀκούσῃς . . . λέγοντων.
And here the genitive is probably not governed by ἀκούειν, but used absolutely. Cp. - 1 K. 24:2 [1 Sam. 24:2] ἀπηγγέλη αὐτῷ λέγοντων. 

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 - ἀπηγγέλη . . . λέγοντες Gen. 38:24, 48:2; Josh. 2:2, 10:17; 1 K. 14:33 [1 Sam. 14:33], 15:12, 19:19, 23:1. ἀπηγγέλη . . . λέγοντες Jdg. 16:2; Gen. 22:20. 


An adjacent case is - Ezek. 12:22 Τίς ἢ παραβολή ύμιν . . . λέγοντες; 

f. When the verb is active and finite, the construction presents itself as good Greek, as in - 3 K. 12:10 [1 Kings 12:10] ἐλάλησαν . . . λέγοντες, but this is a little better than an accident, for what immediately follows is - Ῥάδε λαλήσας τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ τοῖς λαλήσασι πρὸς σὲ λέγοντες κτλ. 

In Dt. 18:16 we have even Ἔτησα . . . λέγοντες. 

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 ἐμαστιγώθησαν . . . λέγοντες, 5:19 ἑώρων . . . λέγοντες, 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 φωναὶ . . . λέγοντες. 

113. Idiomatic Use of προστίθεναι. 

a. Another very common Hebraism is the use of προστίθεναι with the infinitive of another verb in the sense of doing a thing more or again, e.g. - Gen. 37:8 προσέθεντο ἐτι μισεῖν = they hated still more. Cp. Gen. 4:2,12, 8:21, 44:23, Ex. 8:29 μὴ προσθήσετε ἐτι . . . ἐξαπατήσαντο. 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 τοῦ precedes the infinitive, as - Ex. 9:34 προσέθετο τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν. 

Josh. 23:13 οὐ μὴ προσῆθη Κύριός τοῦ ἐξολοθρεύσαι. 


c. The same construction may be used impersonally in the passive - Ex. 5:7 οὐκέτι προστίθησαι διὸναι άχυρον τῷ λαῷ. 

d. Sometimes the dependent verb is dropped after the middle or passive - Nb. 22:26 καὶ προσέθετο ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἄπελθὼν ὑπέστη. Cp. 4 K. 1:11 [2 Kings 1:11]. Ex. 11:6 ἦτει τοιαῦτῃ οὐ γέγοιν καὶ τοιαῦτῃ οὐκέτι προστίθησαι.