

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XXIV.

OCTOBER, 1920.

No. 4.

Up-to-Date Theology at Concordia Seminary.

At the opening of the St. Louis Seminary, on September 8, the President addressed the students on a most timely subject. In our time — these were the thoughts he elaborated — there is one qualification of theology that is stressed with unusual emphasis, *viz.*, that it must meet the demands of the times, and be up to date. At the same time we Missourians, so called, are charged with failing to meet this requirement of theology. The theology of the Missouri Synod has fallen under censure as being out of date. This charge lacks foundation. You, students of Concordia, will study with us a theology that is up to date, really up to date, both as regards form and contents.

As regards the form, a theology that is up to date requires principally efficiency in the various *languages* in which we have an opportunity and are called upon to proclaim the Gospel of Christ. That an adaptation to languages is necessary to an up-to-date church was foreshadowed by the events of the first Pentecost. Since there were gathered at Jerusalem on that day "men out of every nation under heaven," the Galilean orators on that festival day were impelled by the Holy Spirit not to speak Hebrew only, but to employ the various mother-tongues of their hearers — Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, etc. This method of adaptation we follow in our own work. In our country and under the conditions under which we have to do our work, two living languages in particular, the *German* and the *English*, are necessary — besides other languages — for our Gospel ministry. Accordingly, we are up to date in imparting

Notes on the Greek of the Septuagint and the New Testament.

As for the material coherence of the New Dispensation with the Old Testament, I may well take that for granted. If I were to name but four of the prophetic and determining records vouched for the Christian by the utterance of the Savior Himself, it might suffice: I mean Daniel 7, Isaiah 53, Psalms 2 and 22; and all summed up and stamped with the discourses of the risen Lord, Luke 24, 27. 44: *ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσέως καὶ προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ.*

I have taken some pains (as many others, of course, have before me) to make especial note and count of the number as

well as of the form and matter of the citations (in or by the writers of the New Testament) of the Septuagint. In Matthew, about 32; in Mark, 10; in Luke, 11; in John, some 14; in Acts, about 15; in James, 4; in 1 Peter, 7; in 2 Peter, 3, 2 (collectively, 1); in 1 John, none; in Jude, 1 (Enoch prophesied, vv. 14, 15); in Romans, about 36, in 1 Corinthians, 8; in 2 Corinthians, 9; in Galatians, 6; in Ephesians, 7; in Philippians, 2; in Colossians, 1; in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, none; in Hebrews, 33; in the pastoral letters, but 2: 2 Tim. 4, 17, and Titus 2, 14; in Revelation, 15 times.

The next point is this: In what form was the Old Testament read in the synagogues of the Jews of the *Diaspora*? Was it not the Alexandrine Version? What was the *Diaspora* before 70 A. D.? Let us consider this matter a little more closely. So in John 7, 35: "Whither is He going to go, that we shall not find Him?" the King James version proceeds: Will He go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles? *μη̄ εἰς τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων μέλλει πορεύεσθαι καὶ διδάσκειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας*; Of course, the *Diaspora* here are the Jews; their "scattering" is conceived as their removal and remoteness from Palestine and from the Holy City. Clearly the *Diaspora* of John 7, 35 spoke Greek. Special students cite Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV, 7, 2 (which, in turn, was transcribed from the now lost historical work of Strabo, *The Cappadocian*, the famous author on ancient geography and ethnography, of Amabea, viz., his continuation of Polybius; cf. Mueller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, III, p. 492). Speaking of the treasures gathered together for the Temple at Jerusalem: "Mithridates sent to Kos and took the funds which the queen Cleopatra had placed there, and the 800 talents of the Jews." (Cf. Appian, *Bellum Mithridaticum*, c. 23.) This was in the year 86 B. C. What funds were these? These were funds gathered from the Jews of the *Diaspora*, in the Roman province of *Asia*, funds for the Temple, then in a paroxysm of revolt in the interest of Mithridates of Pontus; and, to save the fund, the Jews had had it conveyed from the continent of the province to the island

of Kos. The inference as to the great number and the wealth of Jewish populations in that province, where Greek was the current speech, is quite obvious. In this same era of Sulla one complete quarter of Cyrene was held by Jews. (*Ibid.*) And Sulla even then said in a military order to his subcommander Lucullus: "This [race] had now come into every city (*παρεληλυθει*), and one cannot easily find a spot in the inhabited world which has not received this race." (*Ibid.*) Both these and the Jews of the great metropolis of Alexandria, where they occupied two out of the five quarters of the city, were rigid purists as far as the tradition of the Fathers was concerned. The very fact of the (gradual) version of the Septuagint, primarily or originally made for the needs of the Alexandrine Jews, and ultimately for all the Hellenistic Jewish Diaspora, shows this. And as for Palestine itself, almost all the aristocracy of its theocratic rulers in time had Greek names, and the Hellenistic movement was greatly accelerated by that adroitest of rulers and politicians, Herod, son of Antipater, the Idumean, who changed Samaria into a Greek glorification of Augustus, *Σεβαστή*. After all, Jerusalem lay fairly midway between the mighty capitals of the Hellenistic world, Antioch, once that of the Seleucidae, and Alexandria, once that of the Lagidae, whose rule terminated in August, 30 B. C.

If we now move forward into the very first decades of the Christian Church, to the short reign of Caligula, we may well pause to transcribe from the epistolary petition of Herod Agrippa to that emperor: "This, as I said, is my native city [Jerusalem], the mother-city not of a single Jewish territory, but also of the most of them, on account of the colonies (*διὰ τὰς ἀποικίας*) which she sent out from time to time [or 'in certain emergencies,' *ἐπὶ καιρῶν*] into the contiguous countries, Egypt, Phenicia, Syria, both the other and Coelestria, so called, and into those [colonies] variously settled farther away, Pamphylia, Cilicia, the greater part of [the Roman province of] Asia, as far as Bithynia and the nooks of Pontus, — and in the same way also into Europe: Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedon, Aetolia, Attica,

'Argos, Corinth, the most and best parts of the Peloponnesus. And not only the continents are full of Jewish settlements, but also the most notable of the islands, Euboea, Cyprus, Crete.'" (Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*, ch. 36.) A record and document this, of striking significance, which might well be prefixed to every edition of the Acts of Luke, and indeed it adds materially to our own perspective in the present study.

The mode of citation of the LXX in the New Testament is much varied; often direct, without naming any book or writer at all, *e. g.*, Matt. 10, 35; 19, 5. 18; 21, 9; 27, 46; Mark 15, 34; Luke 23, 13; 1 Pet. 1, 24; 2, 3. 4. 24; 3, 10; 5, 5. 7; and many others. It is notable that in Revelation all are so made. Or: *γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου*, Matt. 2, 6; *ἐρρήθη*, Matt. 5, 43; *οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε οὐτι*, Matt. 21, 16. 42; *πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις*, Luke 10, 26; *Δαυεὶδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτὸν*, Acts 2, 25; *ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεός*, Acts 7, 6, etc., etc. Now the Septuagint was not merely text and apostolic material for the earlier mission-work of the Christian Church, but it furnished also language and manner in great part. Or one may perhaps put it so: The writers of the New Testament were more conversant with these books, the Greek Old Testament, than with any other Greek books. We know that the Greek literary culture of Paul and of the author of Hebrews was larger or wider than that of the others. Still we are everywhere confronted with the essentially identical features of what we may call the Alexandrine dialect, or the Jewish Alexandrian dialect. The grace and Attic purity of Philo furnishes the readiest contrast or discrimination to him who is chiefly bent on comprehending the essentials here.

Before me lies a book entitled: *Selections from the Septuagint*, according to the text of Swete by F. C. Conybeare, M. A., and St. George Stock, A. M., both Oxford men (Ginn & Co.); the preface is dated Oxford, May 22, 1905. The introduction furnishes all the material and also the well-established criticism as to the "letter" of Aristias and from p. 21 deals with "Hellenistic Greek." The entire introduction covers 107 pages, and in concrete detail records or analyzes the Greek of the Sep-

tuagint very exhaustively, indeed, almost as carefully as Blass did with the grammar of the New Testament, the English version of which, London, Macmillan, 1898, is in my hands at this moment. Neither Conybeare and Stock nor Blass need any commendation in this place from me. At the same time the collections which I made directly both from the Septuagint and the New Testament are entirely my own, as well as the points and observations which I presently shall bring forward. And I do not hesitate to say that the attrition and constant contact with the language of all the Greek classics carried through many decades should fairly enable one to feel and see quite directly what is non-Attic, or better, post-Attic, and what are the chief outstanding features of this Biblical Greek. I quote from p. 22 of Conybeare and Stock: "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." Most familiar probably even to young students is the Hebraism in both LXX and New Testament, the *instrumental* $\epsilon\upsilon$, which special lexicons like Grimm-Thayer do not adequately present or classify; cf. Blass, § 38; he notes the heavy preponderance in the Apocalypse.

In the present study, then, merely brief and hortatory as to design, it seems necessary to exclude lexical matters, and to limit ourselves to forms and structure. Still I would beg to present one curious and typical illustration as to the kinship of words and phrases also. Some time ago I excerpted from my New Testament, from the several writers thereof, post-Attic or non-Attic words; likewise from Job, Psalms, Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, and Genesis. Making a test then in a concrete case, I found that of my list, lexical, of the Psalms, 34 per cent. recurred in the New Testament.

Coming now to certain features of the Alexandrine idiom, the great outstanding fact is this: In actual speech and current usage of life there came about a *fusion and so a confusion of resemblances*. So $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ was freely used as equivalent to the poten-

tial or indefinite ἄν. So ὅς ἐάν: Luke 4, 6; 9, 24; John 15, 7; 1 John 3, 21; Col. 2, 23. The dialect simply has no consciousness of the difference. So also ὅπου ἐάν. Further there is no longer any genuine discrimination between ὅς and ὅσους, the individual and generic; cf. Matt. 7, 26; 22, 2; 25, 1; Mark 15, 7; Luke 7, 39; Acts 10, 41; Rom. 6, 2; Heb. 12, 5. Ὅποτε for ὅτε, Luke 6, 3; ὅταν used as equivalent to ἐπεὶ, Rom. 2, 14. Reflexive constructions frequently take the place of the older middle: φυλάξατε ἑαυτά, 1 John 5, 21; βλέπετε ἑαυτούς, 2 John 8; ἑαυτοὺς τηρήσατε, Jude 21; the middle and passive are confused or fused: ἐσπλαγγίσθη, Matt. 14, 14; cf. ἐφοβήθη, ἀπεκρίθη, πλανηθῆ, Matt. 18, 12; ἐλυπήθησαν, 18, 31; ἐθαμβήθησαν, Mark 1, 27; cf. 9, 15; ἀνακλασθήσονται, Luke 13, 29; ὅς μὲν — ὅς δέ and ὁ μὲν — ὁ δε: in Rom. 14, 2 we actually have even ὅς μὲν — ὁ δέ. (Blass, § 46, 2.) Active-middle in ἐγείρω: we have ἐγειρε in Luke 5, 24; 6, 8; but also ἐγείρου, Luke 8, 54.

The sense of *shall* is almost equally felt or conveyed, often, in subjunctives and in future indicatives;* so often in final clauses with ἵνα or μή (Blass, 65, 2): μήποτε ἔσται θόρυβος τοῦ λαοῦ (Mark 14, 2). Pluperfect functions = aorist: μεμενῆκεισαν ἄν μεθ' ἡμῶν, 1 John 2, 19. Ἔσχεν for εἶχεν: ὁ ἔσχεν, ἐποίησεν, Mark 14, 8; cf. John 4, 52; ἰσχύσαμεν for ἔδυνάμεθα, Acts 15, 10; and conversely the imperfect for the aorist: ἀνεβαίνομεν — συνῆλθον, Acts 21, 15. 16. Perfect for aorist: ἐληλαότες οὖν . . . θεωροῦσιν, John 6, 19; προσενήνοχεν, Heb. 11, 17; πεποίηκεν 11, 28: these perfects literarily in a row with: προσέφευρον, εὐλόγησεν, ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἐνετείλατο, ἐκρύβη, ἠρνήσατο, κατέλιπεν, etc., etc. Confusion of τίς and ὅς: ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σὺ, Mark 14, 36 (Blass, § 50, 5); ὥστε (always consecutive in Attic Greek) for final use: ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἕως ὄφρους τοῦ ὄρους, . . . ὥστε κατακρημνίσαι αὐτόν (Luke 4, 29); conversely we meet ἵνα as a consecutive conjunction: τίς ἤμαρτεν, οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα (with the result that) τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ; As in

* Cf. οὐ μή in prediction or otherwise: almost exclusively construed with subjunctive both in LXX and New Testament.

the Septuagint, so in the New Testament, *passim* ὡσεὶ is used for ὡς and ὡσπερ.

Next let us look at one of the most striking phenomena of the Alexandrine dialect. I now refer to forms, *viz.*: the blending, fusion, simplification of verb-inflection as to the preterit tenses, especially in the fusion of first and second aorist. In Job: ἐποίουσαν (1, 4), εἶδουσαν (εἶδον), 9, 25; εἶπα (38, 11). In Psalms: ἐπέπεσαν 15, 6; προσέλθατε, 33, 6; ἤλθοσαν, 47, 5; συνῆκαν, 63, 10; ἔφανα, 76, 19; ἐφάγοσαν, 77, 29; ἀπέκτενον, 100, 8; εὔροσαν, 118, 143. Isaiah: εἴλοσαν, 22, 10; εἰπὼν as imperative, Hag. 1, 1; 2, 1; κατελάβοσαν, Zech. 1, 6; or the futures φάγονται, etc., Ps. 20, 10; 21, 27; 49, 13; καθ-ελ-εἶς, 27, 5; ἐξ-ελοῦμαι, 49, 15; 90, 15; or the optatives: ἔλθοισαν, Job 18, 9, 11; ὀλέσαισαν, 18, 10; 20, 10; ἔδοισαν, 21, 20; φάγοισαν, 31, 8, etc., etc. Precisely the same are used in the New Testament. Matthew: ἐλθάτω, 6, 10; ἤλθατε, 25, 36; ἴδαν, 13, 17; ἔπεσαν, 17, 6; Mark: εἶδαμεν, 2, 12; ἄν-ευραν, 2, 16; εἶπ- throughout with first aorist inflection; εἶχοσαν, John 15, 24; ἔγνωκαν, 17, 7. Acts: ἀπέσταλκαν, 16, 36; ἔβαλαν, 16, 37; 21, 27; παρεῖχαν, 28, 2. The imperative form ἦτω (ἔστω), Jas. 5, 12, as in LXX γέγοναν, Rom. 16, 7; παρελάβοσαν, 2 Thess. 3, 6; εὐράμενος, Heb. 9, 12. Almost throughout ἐγενήθην steps into the place of ἐγενόμην. See Conybeare, *Introduction to Septuagint Greek*, pp. 31 sqq.

Further: The emphatic duplication of the verb in predication, warning, etc., is one of the most familiar idioms of Hebraism: cf. Job: φυγῆ φεύξεται, 27, 22; ἄκουε ἀκοήν, 37, 1; ἐν ὕψει ὑψώσει, 39, 18; Psalms: πορευόμενοι ἐπορεύοντο, 125, 6; εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω, 131, 15; ἀγαλλιᾶσαι ἀγαλλιάσονται, 131, 16; τέλειον μῦθος ἐμίσου, 138, 22; Isaiah: ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ, 21, 2; φθορᾷ φθαρήσεται, 24, 3; κλωνμῶ ἔκλωνσεν, 30, 19; cf. 19, 22; 24, 3; 24, 19; 26, 4; 42, 17; 61, 10 with examples which could be adduced from all the Minor Prophets. I have found a few in the New Testament also: ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην, Matt. 2, 10; ἐξέστησαν . . . ἐκστάσει μεγάλη, Mark 5, 42; ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπε-

θύμησα (a splendid form of internal historical evidence for this great narrative), Luke 22, 15; = Gen. 31, 30. — *Χαρῆ χαίρει*, John 3, 29; *παραγγελία παρηγγείλαμεν*, Acts 5, 28; *αναθέματι ἀνεθεματίσαμεν*, 23, 14; *προσευχῇ προσήύξατο*, James 5, 17; *ἐθαύμασα θαῦμα μέγα*, Rev. 17, 6.

Again, one of the oddities of relative construction here and there in the Old Testament is the iteration for the relative or the, to us, superfluous special word of reference: Isaiah: *ἐφ' ᾧ πέποιθας αὐτῷ*, 37, 10; *τὴν ὁδὸν ἐν ἣ πορεύσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ*, 48, 17 (cf. Conybeare, p. 65, *Hebrew Syntax of the Relative*); *ἐφ' οὗς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς*, Amos 9, 12; cf. Joel 3, 7; Zech. 1, 4; *οὗ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ*, Gen. 1, 12; cf. 13, 4; 24, 3. This extreme peculiarity recurs in the New Testament and characteristically, too, in Revelation, especially: *ἦν οὐδείς δύναται κλεῖσαι αὐτήν*, 3, 8; *οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς*, 7, 2; *ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ*, 12, 6; *ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπ' αὐτῶν*, 17, 9; *ὧν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν*, 20, 8. With this one may compare also: *τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις*, Luke 5, 35; *εἰδότε οὖν καλὸν ποιεῖν καὶ μὴ ποιοῦντι ἁμαρτία αὐτῷ ἐστιν*, James 5, 1; *ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς*, 2 Pet. 3, 15; *τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα*, Rev. 2, 17.

Prepositions. (Blass, § 39 sqq. Conybeare, p. 80 sqq.) Here, too, we must limit ourselves to those data which illustrate fusion and confusion, omitting those usages which reproduce Hebraism, such as *εἰς* for result or the final point of production, *ὅπερ* in comparisons, *ἐν* instrumental, many uses of *ἀπό*, as of material, Matt. 3, 4, as of source and cause, *φυγεῖν ἀπό*, Matt. 3, 4; *παθεῖν ἀπό*, Matt. 16, 21; *ὕψους ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος*, Mark 5, 34; *βλέπειν ἀπό*, guard against (= classic *φυλάττεσθαι*), Mark 8, 15; 12, 38; often also used like classic *ὅπό* with passives. *Περί* often functions for classic *ὅπερ*, as John 17, 9; or *προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν*, Heb. 13, 18. The most striking single feature is the confusion, or mixture of *ἐν* and *εἰς*: *ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν*, Mark 1, 21; *εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε*, Mark 13, 9; *ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν*, Mark 13, 16; cf. Luke 4, 23; 4, 44; 11, 7; *νύφαι*

εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν, John 9, 7. We have πιστεύειν ἐν, Mark 1, 15; εἰς *passim*, ἐπ' αὐτόν, Matt. 27, 42, and ἐπ' αὐτῷ, Rom. 9, 33. — Ἐν, where classic Greek would use εἰς: ἤγειτο . . . ἐν τῷ ἐρήμῳ, Luke 4, 1; πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, John 3, 35. Ἐπὶ is fairly non-determined by classic usage: ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν εἰστήκει, Matt. 13, 2; περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν . . . ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα, Matt. 14, 25. 26; καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελῶμιον, Mark 2, 14; ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων σταθήσεσθε, Mark 13, 9; πνεῦμα ἦν ἄγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν, Luke 2, 25; χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό, Luke 2, 40. The phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό is characteristic of the Alexandrine dialect. Πρὸς is freely used like classic παρά, *apud*; "His sisters," οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσιν, Matt. 13, 56; Mark 6, 3; πρὸς ὑμᾶς (παρ' ὑμῖν) ἔσομαι, Mark 9, 19; Luke 9, 41; ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, John 1, 2; cf. 2, 1; ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτόν.

Another incisive matter: the luxuriance of articular infinitives in a great multitude of syntactical forms. Blass, § 71. The genitive, to give design or result: ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν, Matt. 13, 3; with many examples cited by Blass, p. 235; cf. Ps. 8, 3; 9, 29; 30, 32; in all I counted some 67 occurrences in that book alone. Or in Genesis: ὠραῖόν ἐστι τοῦ κατανοῆσαι, 3, 6; or ὡς εἰς ἐξ ἡμῶν, τοῦ γινώσκειν (ὥστε γινώσκειν) καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν, 3, 22. I marked some thirty examples in Genesis alone. With prepositions the articular infinitive functions in many ways, *e. g.*, as an equivalent to temporal clauses; πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, Gen. 2, 5; some twelve cases in that book, while only once we have πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν με, 27, 4; ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς with ἐγένετο: one of the stated figures in the manner of narrative in the Old Testament, ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐπαύριον, καὶ εἶπεν ἡ πρεσβυτέρα πρὸς τὴν νεωτέραν, Gen. 19, 34; cf. 20, 13; 22, 20, and some 22 further instances in Genesis alone. Now when we compare the writers of the New Testament on this particular idiom or turn of expression, we see in Grimm-Thayer, p. 115: "very common in the first three Gospels, especially that of Luke, and in the Acts is the phrase καὶ ἐγένετο (?!) followed by !)." I so found the heavy

preponderance in Luke before consulting Grimm-Thayer. I have noted some 28 examples in the Gospel of Luke and about 16 in his Acts, one of the many proofs for the identity of the author of both works.

This *ἐγένετο* is continued sometimes by an indicative, and sometimes by infinitives. Very often, and this is the frequent manner in the Old Testament, an articular infinitive with *ἐν* is incorporated in this idiom of expression, as, *e. g.*: *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν . . . ἀνερχοθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν*, Luke 3, 21; *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστῶς*, 5, 1; *ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον συνῆσαν*, 9, 18; *ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας . . . καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήριξεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι*, 9, 51. Or Acts: *ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι, ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐγγίξιν τῇ Δαμάσκῳ*, 9, 3; *ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον*, 10, 25. In Acts, Luke seems to have settled down almost uniformly to continue the introductory *ἐγένετο* with an infinitive. We may illustrate by a few examples from the Septuagint: *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι τὸν βασιλέα Ἐζεκιάν, ἔσχισε τὰ ἱμάτια*, Is. 37, 1; *καὶ ἐγένετο πρὸ τοῦ συντελέσαι αὐτόν . . . καὶ ἰδοῦ Ρεβέκκα ἐξεπορεύετο*, Gen. 24, 15; *ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τὸ γηράσαι τὸν Ἰσαάκ, καὶ ἡμβλύνθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄραν*, Gen. 27, 1; *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀφιέναι αὐτὴν τὴν ψυχὴν . . . ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, Gen. 35, 18. I will add but one more idiom. It is the introduction of a direct question by an *εἰ*. Blass, § 77, 2; Conybeare, p. 89: "In Biblical Greek *εἰ* has become a direct interrogative particle, citing Gen. 43, 7: *εἰ ἔτι ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ζῆ*; cf. also *εἰ ἔστι παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ σου τόπος ἡμῶν τοῦ καταλῦσαι*; Gen. 24, 23. We may compare the use of German *ob*, which is used in direct questions also. *Εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι*; Luke 13, 23. (Cf. Grimm-Thayer, 1896, N. Y., p. 170 sq.)

And now, in the conclusion of this little paper I am indeed fortunate. Before me lies a rare and most precious work, of the existence of which even, until a short time ago, I had not even heard or read anywhere; Blass, Lachmann, Tischendorf, West-

cott and Hort, Tregelles, Moulton — these were all more or less familiar — but who was *Edward William Grinfield*? Accidentally I came upon his two volumes, which had come into the possession of New York University in 1892, with and in the library of Lagarde of Goettingen. Every possible or adducible parallel of phrase or matter is presented in the Greek of the Septuagint under almost every verse of the New Testament, almost — but such are few and far between. Sometimes even Josephus is drawn upon, as on *νομικός*, Matt. 22, 35: Josephus, *Bell. Iud.* II, 21, 7. — I should at least cite a few parallels at random: Luke 18, 8: *ὅτι ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν αὐτῶν ἐν τάχει: — ἕως ἂν ἀπολέσῃ σε ἐν τάχει*, Deut. 28, 20; 9, 3; Ps. 2, 12. Of the publican, Luke 18, 13: *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπέσῃαι: — καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ ἐπάρῃ*, Ezek. 18, 6. Is. 51, 1. Of course, in a book like Revelation the illustrations afforded are simply overwhelming. There are full parallels cited also of the New Testament. Hesychius and Suidas figure in many delicate lexical definitions.

A curious thing about the work is the omission of accents. The two volumes together have their joint pages numbered consecutively, there being 1493 in all. There are data about Grinfield in the National Biography of Britain: his life lay between 1785 and 1864, A. B. (Lincoln College), Oxford, 1806; a clergyman of the Church of England. Some 24 titles of his pen are cited, most of them dealing with current problems; but *this* work clearly was his great task of a full decade's earnest devotion, from 1833 to 1843. The general title is given in Greek and in Latin, thus: *Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, κατὰ τοὺς Ἑβδομήκοντα διερμηνομένη. Novum Testamentum Graecum*, Editio Hellenistica. (London, Wm. Pickering, 1843.) I transcribe a few utterances from his preface, dated Brighton, Sussex, July 1, 1843: "Necesse est, ut omnes, veram et interiorem et reconditam Novi Testamenti interpretationem scrutantes, et res et voces pariter perciperent." He has referred to Philo more than 2,000 times in his study of the Septuagint text. With fervid emphasis he says further: "Nullo certe argumento veras et

antiquas religionis nostrae origines melius ostendere quam hoc ipso lectionis tempore Christi et Apostolorum usitatae, oculato quasi teste." — "Sive ergo Hellenisticam, sive Hebraeo-Graecam, sive Macedonicam, sive quovis alio nomine hanc dialectum vocaris, nequaquam credendum est Grammatistis, qui voces et phrases sacrosanctas ex auctoribus profanis interpretentur, et Iordanis flumina cum Tiberis aut Arethusae aut Alphei limo et colluvione, ut ita dicam, contaminare elaborent," — which I think is the plain truth.

University Heights, N. Y., June 25, 1920. E. G. SHILLER.