Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies (old series)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

Migne.	*Corrections.*
549 C	Insert '(ex Hieron.)' at *Hanc parabolam.*
D	Insert '(ex August.)' at *Lampades autem.*
	Insert '(ex Tyconio)' at *Ergo non possunt.*
550 A	Substitute '(ex Ambr.)' for '(Ex August.)'.
	Insert '(ex Gregor.)' at *Per oleum.*
B	Insert '(ex August.)' at *Laetitia.*
C	Insert '(ex Hieron.)' at *Consequenter.*
D	Insert '(ex Hieron.)' at *Per angelorum.*
551 A	(The Paris MS gives Ā opposite *virgines surgunt,* the Berlin MS opposite *Oportet.*)
B	For '(Ex Hieron.)' my MSS give nothing.
D	At *Euntibus* for '(Ex Aug.)' the Berlin MS. gives Ḡ.
552 A	Opposite *O si sapere* Berlin MS gives Ḡ.

The defects of the printed editions in this matter of citation are sufficiently apparent. They can be paralleled by defects in the texts presented. The student is warned not to trust the editions for critical work of any sort. It is hoped that the present paper will save a good deal of vain searching after passages wrongly ascribed. I have left the MSS to speak for themselves, and have rarely searched in the original authors for verification of their testimony, except in the case of comments on the Pauline Epistles.

<div style="text-align: right">A. SOUTER.</div>

RENDERINGS OF THE INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE IN THE LXX.

A VERY common usage of the Hebrew language is that of the infin. abs. of a verb in conjunction with the finite parts of the same verb, to express emphasis of some kind, e.g. מוֹת תָּמוּת, 'thou shalt surely die'. The translators of our English A.V. have shewn much skill and versatility in their renderings of this form of expression. Most often they employ an adverb or an adverbial phrase. The following are a few examples:—Gen. ii 16 'Thou mayest *freely* eat', xvii 13 '*must needs* be circumcised', xxxi 30 '*sore* longedst', xl 15 '*indeed* I was stolen away', 1 Sam. ii 27 '*plainly* appear', vi 3 '*in any wise* return', Is. xxiv 19 'The earth is *utterly* broken down, the earth is *clean* dissolved, the earth is moved *exceedingly*'.

The Greek translators have, for the most part, employed one of two methods for rendering the infinitive absolute, one of which is not

foreign to the spirit of the Greek language, while the other is, to say the least, distinctly unidiomatic.[1] These two methods are (1) the use of the finite verb with cognate noun, usually in the dative (sometimes in the accusative), and (2) the use of the finite verb with the participle of the same verb or a verb of kindred meaning.

Both these equivalents for the infin. abs. occur in each section of the Greek Bible, and the total number of instances of the two constructions is about the same, but there is a marked diversity between the earlier and the later books in the preference shewn for the one mode of translation or the other.

(1) The books of the Pentateuch prefer the *construction of noun and verb*, which is found in them more than twice as often as the use of part. and verb. The former construction had some classical authority in phrases like γάμῳ γαμεῖν ('in true wedlock'), φυγῇ φεύγειν ('flee with all speed'), and in the use of the cognate accusative. The construction with the noun is always used in the Pent. where the verb is in the passive, e.g. Gen. xvii 13 περιτομῇ περιτμηθήσεται, xl 15 κλοπῇ ἐκλάπην, Ex. xviii 18 φθορᾷ καταφθαρήσῃ, xxi 20 δίκῃ ἐκδικηθήτω, xxi 22 ἐπιζήμιον ζημιωθήσεται, xxi 28 λίθοις λιθοβοληθήσεται (instrum. dat.), Lev. xix 7 βρώσει βρωθῇ, N. xv 31 ἐκτρίψει ἐκτριβήσεται (cf. Dt. iv 26), Dt. xxi 14 πράσει οὐ πραθήσεται. Where the verb is active or middle either construction may be used, and there seems to be no very definite rule for determining the choice. Thus we have Gen. ii 16 βρώσει φάγῃ beside L. vii 19 φαγὼν φάγῃ, Dt. xxiv 13 ἀποδόσει ἀποδώσεις beside Dt. xv. 10 διδοὺς δώσεις. But in general it may be said that the Pentateuch translators prefer the former construction wherever there is a convenient cognate noun available.

If the translations of the LXX are considered with regard to their degree of proximity to classical style, the five books of the Pentateuch stand at one extreme and the four books of 'Kingdoms' at or near the other.[2] In these four books all endeavour to write a good classical Greek has been abandoned: the one aim of the 'translators' is to produce a literal rendering of the Hebrew, with the natural result that they are often unintelligible. In rendering the infin. abs. these translators, apart from a single phrase[3] θανάτῳ ἀποθαν(εῖται) (θανατώσητε, etc.), (1 K. xiv 39, 44, xxii 16 : 2 K. xii 14, xiv 14 : 3 K. ii 37, 42, iii 26 f : 4 K. i 4, 6, 16, viii 10) and its opposite ζωῇ ζήσῃ (4 K. viii 10, 14), have

---

[1] See, however, J. H. Moulton *Grammar of N. T. Greek* vol. I p. 75 f.

[2] This and the following sentence apply more especially to the portions which I have elsewhere called βδ, viz. 2 K. xi 2—3 K. ii 11 and 3 K. xxii 1—4 K. end: see *J. T. S.* vol. viii pp. 262 ff.

[3] The occurrence of this phrase in the familiar story of the Fall (Gen. ii 17, iii 4) probably accounts for its retention.

practically dropped the construction of verb and cognate noun and used the other construction (part. + verb) throughout. 2 K. has, besides, three instances of the noun construction, viz. i 6 περιπτώματι περιέπεσαν, xviii 3 φυγῇ φύγωμεν, xix 42 βρώσει ἐφάγαμεν (βρῶσιν A): 1, 3 and 4 K., apart from the two phrases already named, have none. A comparison of Pentateuch and Kingdoms gives the following results (if my calculation is correct):—

	Inf. absolute rendered (1) by noun + verb.	(2) by part. + verb.
Pentateuch	108	49
1–4 Kings with θανάτῳ or ζωῇ ⎱ 15 ⎰	18	59
with other nouns 3		

In the remaining books of the LXX both constructions are used, but the participial construction preponderates except in Isaiah (8 exx. of noun to 3 of part.), Ezekiel, Micah, the A text of Joshua (2 exx. of noun to 1 of part.), and the A text of Judges (10 exx. of noun to 8 of part.).

(2) With regard to the *participial construction*, it may be noted that where this is used in the Pentateuch an attempt is often made to render it more classical by varying the verb (e.g. Gen. xviii 10 ἐπαναστρέφων ἥξω, Ex. xxi 5 ἀποκριθεὶς εἴπῃ, xxiii 4 ἀποστρέψας ἀποδώσεις, Lev. xiii 7 μεταβαλοῦσα μεταπέσῃ, xiv 48 παραγενόμενος εἰσέλθῃ, cf. Gen. xviii 18 γινόμενος ἔσται) or by using the simple and compound verb (Gen. xliii 7 ἐρωτῶν ἐπηρώτ., Lev. x 16 ζητῶν ἐξεζήτησεν, N. xii 14 πτύων ἐνέπτυσεν, xxx 15 σιωπῶν παρασιωπήσῃ). The use of the aorist participle also helps in the same direction. Instances of the bald use of the present participle and finite form of the same verb, such as πληθύνων πληθυνῶ Gen. iii 16, xvi 10, γινώσκων γνώσῃ Gen. xv 13, are not frequent until we come to Deuteronomy which has nine of them.

In the four books of Kingdoms, besides the great increase in the number of participial constructions, we note these further points. (i) This construction is used even where the main verb is passive, e.g. 1 K. ii 27 ἀποκαλυφθεὶς ἀπεκαλύφθην, 2 K. vi 20 ἀποκαλύπτεται ἀποκαλυφθείς, xx 18 ἠρωτημένος ἠρωτήθη(ν) (where there is a doublet with ἐρωτῶντες ἐπερωτήσουσιν), 3 K. ix 6 ἀποστραφέντες ἀποστραφῆτε: (ii) the second instance quoted above shews that the usual order of words is sometimes reversed (cf. 1 K. x 16, xiv 30, xx 21, 2 K. xvii 9): (iii) the use of different verbs or simple and compound verb is abandoned (the nearest approach to this is seen in 1 K. xx 21 εἴπω λέγων, 3 K. xiii 32 γινόμενον ἔσται, 4 K. xiv 10 τύπτων ἐπάταξας).

The use of the passive participle occurs also in Jeremiah (iii 1, x 5, xxviii 58, xxix 13, xxxix 28, xlv 3) and in some of the minor Prophets (Am. v 5, Mic. ii 12, Zech. xi 17 *bis*). The use of different verbs or roots may be illustrated by Ψ. cviii 10, cxvii 13, cxxv 6.

The tense of the participle may be present or aorist. The future is used in Jd. iv 9 A πορευσομένη πορεύσομαι (B πορευομένη) and in Sir. xxviii 1 διαστηριῶν διαστηρίσει (-ριεῖ) : cf. Aquila Ψ. xlix 21 ἐσόμενος ἔσομαι.

(3) Once the place of the participle is taken by an adjective : N. xiii 31 δυνατοὶ δυνησόμεθα.

(4) In the B text of Jos. xvii 13 there seems to be the solitary attempt in the LXX to render the Hebrew construction quite literally : ἐξολεθρεῦσαι (A ὀλεθρεύσει) δὲ αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἐξωλέθρευσαν.

(5) The method adopted by the English translators of the A.V. of using an adverb, adverbial phrase, particle or other form of paraphrase is sometimes, though sparingly, employed by the Greek translators. In the Pentateuch we have Gen. xxxii 12 καλῶς εὖ σε ποιήσω (not a doublet apparently), Ex. xv 1 ἐνδόξως δεδόξασται, N. xxii 17 ἐντίμως τιμήσω σε. In the other books we have 4 K. v 11 πάντως ἐξελεύσεται, (?) Is. lvi 3 Ἀφοριεῖ με ἄρα, and in Proverbs the infin. abs. is rendered by an adverb in the three cases where it occurs in the M T (xxiii 1 νοητῶς νόει, xxiii 24 καλῶς ἐκτρέφει, xxvii 23 γνωστῶς ἐπιγνώσῃ) : in xxiv 22 a of the same book the participial construction occurs in a Greek addition (δεχόμενος ἐδέξατο). Paraphrases occur in Job xiii 10 οὐθὲν ἧττον ἐλέγξει and (with εἰς τέλος) in Gen. xlvi 4, Am. ix 8. Θανάτου ἔνοχος ἔσται replaces the usual θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖται in Gen. xxvi 11.

(6) In a considerable number of passages (some fifty in all) the infinitive absolute is not rendered. The majority of these occur in the first four books of the Pentateuch and in 'Jeremiah a'.[1] The omission in the case of these books was no doubt intentional, and is not merely due to difference of text. The translators of these books shewed a greater freedom in their work. In some cases it was quite unnecessary and would have been difficult to reproduce the Hebrew construction. Cf. Gen. xliv 28 θηριόβρωτος γέγονεν with Ex. xxii 13 ἐὰν δὲ θηριάλωτον γένηται.

(7) In some passages one of the two main forms of the Greek construction is found where there is no infin. abs. in the Massoretic text. This is generally no doubt due to the translators having a different text from our Hebrew. Examples are Gen. xix 17, Ex. xi 9, Lev. xiv 48 (N.B. the double negative οὐ διαχύσει οὐ διαχεῖται), N. v 6 (καὶ πλημμελῶν πλημμ.), xxx 6 = 9, 1 K. v 5, 2 K. xvii 11, 3 K. xi 34, xxii 6, Jer. iii 1 (ἀνακάμπτουσα ἀνακάμψει), xii 11, xxii 24, xli 2.

(8) Neither construction appears to be used in the 'Greek' (i.e. untranslated) books, but, as already stated, we have one instance of the participle, δεχόμενος ἐδέξατο, in a section of Proverbs (xxiv 22 a) for which there is no Hebrew equivalent extant.

[1] i.e. the first twenty-eight chapters of the Greek text. See *J. T. S.* vol. iv pp. 245 ff.

(9) The participial construction was purely 'translatese' and does not appear to have been adopted in the colloquial or the literary language. There are no examples of it in the New Testament except in Old Testament quotations (Blass *Gramm. d. neut. Gr.* § 74, 4). On the other hand the New Testament has several examples of the verb with dat. of the cognate noun : in Lc. and Acts ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα, ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλ., παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγ., ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεμ., in Jo. χαρᾷ χαίρει, in James προσευχῇ προσηύξατο (ibid. § 38, 3).

H. St. J. Thackeray.

THE DATE OF THE DEATH OF NESTORIUS: SCHENUTE, ZACHARIAS, EVAGRIUS.

The recovery of the work of Nestorius cited by Ebed Jesu under the title 'the Book of Heraclides' shews conclusively that Nestorius survived the Council of Chalcedon.[1] There is no doubt that Schenute survived Nestorius. Schenute cannot, therefore, have died on July 7, 451 ; and Dr Leipoldt's confident assertion[2] ' Schenutes Todesjahr ist und bleibt 451 ' must be revised in the light of the new evidence. If it is certain that he died on July 7 (the day of his commemoration) the earliest year would be the year 452—a date which on other grounds some scholars have preferred. But there are references in Schenute's writings which imply that Nestorius had been long dead, and if Schenute ' must have died in 451 or in 466 ', as Dr Leipoldt says before deciding for the earlier date, we must now without hesitation choose 466 as the year of his death. Part of the evidence on which Dr Leipoldt depends, in coming to his own conclusion that Schenute died in 451, is the statement of Evagrius[3] that Nestorius had already departed this life at the time of the Council of Chalcedon. This statement Dr Leipoldt misrepresents in claiming the authority of Evagrius for the view that Nestorius had been already *a long time* dead (*dass Nestorios im Jahre* 451 *längst nicht mehr unter den Lebenden weilt*). But his argument has drawn my attention to the fact that I have myself much more seriously misrepresented the evidence of Evagrius on this point : whereas he has only overstated this evidence, I regret that I have

---

[1] See my *Nestorius and his teaching* p. 34 f.
[2] J. Leipoldt *Schenute von Atripe* Texte u. Unters. xxv, n. F. x 1 p. 46.
[3] Evagrius *H. E.* ii 2.