

**SEMITIC INFLUENCE ON VERBAL USAGE AND  
ON THE SUBORDINATE CLAUSES IN THE  
APOCALYPSE**

Steven Thompson

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews



1975

Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13838>

This item is protected by original copyright

University of St. Andrews  
Department of New Testament

SEMITIC INFLUENCE ON VERBAL USAGE  
AND ON THE SUBORDINATE CLAUSES IN THE APOCALYPSE

A Thesis

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Steven Thompson

August, 1975



ProQuest Number: 10166447

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166447

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th  
8745

## ABSTRACT

of a thesis titled SEMITIC INFLUENCE ON VERBAL USAGE AND ON THE SUBORDINATE CLAUSES IN THE APOCALYPSE, submitted to the Department of New Testament in the University of St. Andrews.

August, 1975.

Steven Thompson

The major peculiarities of the language of the Apocalypse related to the usage of the Verb and of the Clause are here explained as due to the influence of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages, not to the author's lack of familiarity with Greek.

The approach has been to isolate in each case the usage which is not compatible with Hellenistic Greek syntax, and then to extract from the Septuagint identical constructions. The next step was to determine the type of Hebrew/Aramaic construction responsible for the anomaly in the Septuagint, and then to apply the same explanation to the identical construction in the Apocalypse. While this method has proven to be fundamentally sound and reliable, it is a strange fact that previous treatments of the Semitic element in the language of the Apocalypse have failed to apply it consistently. Another basic presupposition of this thesis is that the research should not be restricted to a single Greek manuscript or printed text of the Apoca-



lypse. Instead, an eclectic approach is made, which respects any manuscript evidence supporting the more semitised construction.

The study included every significant facet of verbal usage from that of lexicography, Voice, Mood, Tenses of the Finite Verb, case additions to the verb, and the Infinitive and Participle. Included in the section on Clauses were Noun - and Verbal - Clauses, plus the Subordinate Clauses such as Relative, Circumstantial, Conditional, Temporal, Final, and Consecutive. Specific types of Semitic influence were seen to be present in each section listed. In at least some cases the Semitic influence was of such a direct nature that it could be explained only as due to direct translation from a Semitic source. While the evidence points predominantly to Hebrew sources underlying the Apc., the case for Aramaic influence at some points cannot be ruled out without doing an injustice to the facts. The results of this study, based as they are on directly observable Semitic influence on the Greek of the LXX, can be applied to any Jewish translation Greek text, to serve as a syntactical survey of that language.

The study also demonstrated that the eclectic approach to the text of the Apocalypse is the only sound one, because no single manuscript or family of manuscripts has preserved a majority of the semitised (and therefore more nearly original) readings.

I hereby declare that this thesis has been composed by the candidate and that the work of which it is a record has been done by him. It has not been previously submitted for a degree.

---

In 1969 I graduated B.A. from Southern Missionary College, Collegedale, Tennessee with a double major in History and Theology. From October, 1969 to June, 1972 I was enrolled as a student in the Theological Seminary of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, where I received the degree of M.Div. in June, 1972. In October, 1972 I was admitted as a research student in the University of St. Andrews, and was granted candidacy for the degree of Ph.D. in October, 1973.

I hereby affirm that the conditions of the  
Resolution and Regulations for the degree of Ph.D. in  
the University of St. Andrews have been fulfilled.

---

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE	
ABBREVIATIONS	
INTRODUCTION .. .. .	1
CHAPTER I TEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS .. ..	13
CHAPTER II GREEK VERBS WITH HEBREW MEANINGS	20
CHAPTER III SEMITIC INFLUENCE ON VERBAL SYNTAX	30
PART A. VOICE .. .. .	30
THIRD PERSON PLURAL VERBS WITH INDEFINITE OBJECT .. .. .	30
PASSIVE USE OF <u>MNHΣOHNAI</u> ..	47
Summary of Chapter III Part A .. .. .	49
PART B. MOOD .. .. .	50
DELIBERATIVE USE OF THE PRESENT INDICATIVE .. .. .	50
AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE REPLACED BY FUTURE INDICATIVE FOLLOWING <u>'INA</u>	54
MODAL USE OF THE FUTURE INDICATIVE FOR HEBREW JUSSIVE ..	56
Summary of Chapter III Part B .. .. .	57
PART C. TENSES OF THE FINITE VERB .. ..	58
Introduction .. .. .	58
FUTURISTIC USE OF THE GREEK PRESENT INDICATIVE .. .. .	59
PRESENT TENSE PASSING INTO THE FUTURE TENSE .. .. .	71

	<u>Page</u>
PRESENT TENSE VERBS WITH PAST OR IMPERFECT SENSE .. .. .	73
GREEK AORIST INDICATIVE FOR SEMITIC PERFECT VERBS .. ..	78
GREEK PERFECT FOR SEMITIC DERIVED CONJUGATION VERBS .. ..	92
MIXING PERFECT AND PRESENT TENSES	99
GREEK FUTURE INDICATIVE FOR SEMITIC IMPERFECT VERBS .. ..	101
THE PROBLEM OF SHIFTING TENSES	106
PERIPHRASTIC CONJUGATIONS ..	112
<u>MEAAEIN</u> PLUS INFINITIVE ..	118
Summary of Chapter III Part C .. .. .	119
PART D. EVIDENCE OF UNDERLYING <u>WAW-</u> CONSECUTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS .. ..	121
Summary of Chapter III Part D .. .. .	127
PART E. IMPERATIVES .. .. .	128
INFINITIVE WITH IMPERATIVE SENSE	128
GREEK PARTICIPLE FOR IMPERATIVE	131
<u>AEUTE</u> FOLLOWED BY THE IMPERATIVE	133
Summary of Chapter III Part E .. .. .	134
PART F. INFINITIVES .. .. .	134
THE ARTICULAR GENITIVE INFINITIVE	135
INFINITIVE RESOLVED INTO A FINITE VERB .. .. .	145
NOMINAL USE OF THE INFINITIVE ..	149
Summary of Chapter III Part F .. .. .	151

	<u>Page</u>
PART G. PARTICIPLES .. .. .	152
GREEK PARTICIPLES RESOLVED INTO FINITE VERBS .. .. .	152
PARTICIPLES IN THE SENSE OF FINITE VERBS .. .. .	156
INDECLINABLE     ΑΕΤΩΝ REPRESENTING     ἑταῖροι .. .. .	163
PERFECT PARTICIPLE FOR HEBREW DERIVED CONJUGATIONS .. .. .	167
PARTICIPLES USED AS RELATIVE CLAUSES .. .. .	173
TIMELESSNESS OF THE PRESENT TENSE PARTICIPLE .. .. .	179
THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE PARTICIPLE .. .. .	180
PARTICIPLE FOR SEMITIC INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE .. .. .	190
Summary of Chapter III Part G .. .. .	191
CHAPTER IV CASE ADDITIONS TO THE VERB ..	192
PART A. WITHOUT PREPOSITIONS .. .. .	192
1. Nominative .. .. .	192
2. Accusative .. .. .	194
3. Cognate Accusative (Accusative of Content) .. .. .	206
4. Genitive .. .. .	207
5. Dative .. .. .	207
PART B. WITH PREPOSITIONS .. .. .	211
Summary of Chapter IV .. .. .	220

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER V SEMITIC INFLUENCE ON THE CLAUSE IN THE APOCALYPSE .. ..	221
PART A. NOUN & VERBAL CLAUSES .. ..	221
Introduction .. ..	221
NOUN CLAUSES .. ..	222
PRESENT INDICATIVE FOR THE PARTICIPLE IN NOUN CLAUSES IN THE LXX .. ..	228
VERBAL CLAUSES .. ..	237
Summary of Chapter V Part A .. ..	240
PART B. SYNTAX OF THE SUBORDINATE CLAUSES	241
RELATIVE CLAUSES .. ..	241
CIRCUMSTANTIAL CLAUSES .. ..	248
CONDITIONAL CLAUSES .. ..	254
TEMPORAL CLAUSES .. ..	258
FINAL CLAUSES .. ..	263
CONSECUTIVE (RESULT) CLAUSES ..	269
Summary of Chapter V Part B .. ..	270
CONCLUSION .. ..	273
APPENDIX I: <u>'EXON</u> .. ..	285
APPENDIX II: THE RESUMPTIVE PRONOUN .. ..	290
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

## P R E F A C E

The writing of a Ph.D. thesis is the responsibility of its author, but he, more than anyone else, realises that the task would never reach completion without the co-operation of many others.

The foremost debt of gratitude is owed to the writer's supervisor in the University of St. Andrews, Professor Matthew Black, who suggested the topic for research out of which this thesis has developed, and who has patiently read and criticised each section. The characteristically high standard of scholarship maintained by Professor Black has been a source of encouragement, and the writer only wishes that this work could have given more adequate reflection of that standard.

The contact which I have enjoyed with others of the Teaching Staff in the Department of New Testament is also appreciated. My understanding of the language of the Old Testament has benefited in no small way from the privilege granted me of attending the postgraduate Old Testament Seminars conducted by Professor McKane and his staff during the past three years. For this also I am thankful.

The staff in the University Library have been courteous and helpful in assisting me; their services have not gone unnoticed.

My wife Ellen-Kristin has provided patient and valuable support while this thesis developed. Words cannot express my gratitude to her.

Finally, I would like to pay a tribute to my parents for their willing support in every way during my twenty-one years of formal education. I only hope that they derive some satisfaction from the product of their investment!

August, 1975.

Steven Thompson

## ABBREVIATIONS

Allo	E.-B. Allo, <u>Saint Jean L'Apocalypse</u> <sup>4</sup>
Apc., Apoc.	The Apocalypse
Aram.	Aramaic
<u>Aramaic Approach</u> <sup>3</sup>	M. Black, <u>An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels &amp; Acts</u> <sup>3</sup>
<u>Aramaic Origin</u>	C.F. Burney, <u>The Aramaic Origin of The Fourth Gospel</u>
Bauer	W. Bauer, <u>Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch ...</u> <sup>5</sup>
Bauer & Leander	H. Bauer & P. Leander, <u>Grammatik des biblische-Aramäischen</u>
BDB	F. Brown, S.R. Driver, C. Briggs, <u>A Hebrew and English Lexicon</u>
Beyer	K. Beyer, <u>Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament</u>
Bl-D	F. Blass and A. Debrunner, <u>A Greek Grammar of The New Testament</u> (trans. by R. Funk).
Bousset	W. Bousset, <u>Die Offenbarung Johannis</u> <sup>6</sup>
Charles, I (II)	R.H. Charles, <u>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John</u> , 2 vols.
Conybeare & Stock	F.C. Conybeare & G. Stock, <u>Selections from the Septuagint</u>
Driver, <u>Tenses</u>	S.R. Driver, <u>A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew</u> <sup>3</sup>
<u>GK</u>	Gesenius-Kautzsch (Cowley), <u>Hebrew Grammar</u> <sup>2</sup>
Hebr.	Hebrew
Helbing	R. Helbing, <u>Die Kasussyntax der Verba die den Septuaginta</u>
Hoskier	H.C. Hoskier, <u>Concerning the Text of the Apc.</u>
<u>Idiom Book</u>	C.F.D. Moule, <u>An Idiom Book of New Test. Greek</u>
Jannaris	A.N. Jannaris, <u>An Historical Greek Grammar</u>
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>

<u>JTS</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
Kühner	Kühner-Blass, <u>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache</u>
Lancellotti	A. Lancellotti, <u>Sintassi ebraica nel greco dell' Apocalisse</u>
Liddell & Scott	Liddell & Scott-Jones, <u>Greek-English Lexicon</u> <sup>9</sup> . With a Supplement
Lohmeyer	E. Lohmeyer, <u>Die Offenbarung Johannes</u> <sup>2</sup>
Mandilaras	B. Mandilaras, <u>The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri</u>
Mayser	E. Mayser, <u>Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit</u>
Moulton-Howard II	J.H. Moulton and W.F. Howard, <u>A Grammar of New Testament Greek</u> , vol. II.
Moulton-Turner III	J.H. Moulton and N. Turner, <u>A Grammar of New Testament Greek</u> , vol. III
Mussies	G. Mussies, <u>The Morphology of Koine Greek</u>
n.	note
NEB	New English Bible
Nöldeke	T. Nöldeke, <u>Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik</u>
<u>NTS</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
Ozanne	C.G. Ozanne, <u>The Influence of the Text and Language of the Old Testament on the Book of Rev.</u>
Radermacher	L. Radermacher, <u>Neutestamentliche Grammatik</u> <sup>2</sup>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
Schwyzler	E. Schwyzler, <u>Griechische Grammatik</u> <sup>2</sup>
Scott	R.B.Y. Scott, <u>The Original Language of The Apocalypse</u>
Stevenson	W.B. Stevenson, <u>Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic</u> <sup>2</sup>
Theod.	Theodotion
Torrey	C.C. Torrey, <u>The Apocalypse of John</u>
<u>TWNT</u>	<u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u>
<u>ZAW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
Zerwick	M. Zerwick, <u>Biblical Greek</u> <sup>4</sup>
<u>ZNW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>

## INTRODUCTION

The justification for writing this thesis is found in the fact that it puts forward a number of explanations for the peculiar language associated with the verb and with clauses in the Apocalypse which have for centuries been a source of perplexity and misunderstanding to students and especially to translators of the book.

At least since the time of Dionysius bishop of Alexandria (died 265 A.D.) questions have been expressed about the un-Greek nature of the language of the Apc. Dionysius drew attention to the fact (see Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, vii.25.7ff.) that the Greek of the Apc. contained a number of unusual constructions which cannot be explained in terms of Greek grammar and syntax. This peculiar disregard has perplexed modern scholars as well. In the words of R.H. Charles who studied the book for many years while preparing his commentary, the Apc. possesses a distinctive character of its own which makes it 'absolutely unique' linguistically<sup>1</sup>. More recently Matthew Black observed<sup>2</sup> that "there is one New Testament book, Revelation, whose crude Greek is particularly stained by 'Semitisms' ".  

---

<sup>1</sup>R.H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Revelation (Edinburgh, 1920), I, cxliii (hereafter cited as Charles I (or II), foll. by page number).

<sup>2</sup>'The Biblical Languages' in The Cambridge History of the Bible (Cambridge, 1970), I, 10f.

While one could not pretend at this stage to be able to explain all linguistic oddities in the book, yet this introductory survey demonstrates that the major part of the peculiarity attached to the un-Greek use of the verb in the Apc. can be ascribed to the influence of Semitic syntax, primarily biblical Hebrew.

With the turn of the century as the starting point for this survey, we begin with the 5th edition of Meyer's Kritisch-exegetisch Kommentar über Die Offenbarung Johannes, by Wilhelm Bousset. Under section vii of the introduction the editor begins a discussion titled 'Gebrauch des Verbums',<sup>1</sup> by stating that verbs in the Apc. are characterised by haphazard shifts between present and future tense. Especially in chapter eleven is this evident. He also notes that the use of the imperfect is not frequent in the Apc., but in those places where it has been employed, it has been done deliberately. It is preferred, for instance, in descriptive, explanatory relative clauses such as those in i.12, ii.14, and vi.9. Outside of such special categories the imperfect is not in general use in the Apc.

Noteworthy also is the nearly exclusive employment of aorist infinitives, with seemingly little sense for the distinction between aorist and present infinitive.

While he points to Hebrew parallels to the language of the Apc., Bousset does not go so far as to see behind the

---

<sup>1</sup>pp. 168-71.

use of the verb traces of direct Semitic influence, although at certain places in the book he recognizes the possibility of direct translation from Hebrew sources.

Another study touching on the use of the verb in the Apc. is that of T.C. Laughlin, The Solecisms of the Apocalypse<sup>1</sup>. The book (a published Ph.D. thesis) surveys briefly various peculiarities in the language of the Apc. traceable to Hebrew influence. Concerning the verb two points are noteworthy: first, the absolute use of the participle λέγων<sup>2</sup> as found for example in Apc. xi.1. This is LXX usage, he says, based on Hebrew  $\text{גַּזַּל} \text{לֵב}$ ; the second point concerns the tenses, the mixing of present and future tense verbs in the same clause or sentence when according to Greek usage we should expect only future verbs<sup>3</sup>. The observations of Laughlin though brief are valuable for the LXX parallels which are cited to illustrate the Hebraic nature of the usage he discusses.

H.B. Swete's The Apocalypse of St John (London, 1907) is valuable for its discussion of the vocabulary of the Apc., but regarding the syntax of the verb, no significant new information is produced.

---

<sup>1</sup>Princeton, 1902. Thanks are due to Professor Bruce Metzger who provided a photocopy of this thesis.

<sup>2</sup>p.16f.

<sup>3</sup>p.19f.

A comprehensive survey of the grammar of the Apc. was provided by R.H. Charles in his commentary on the Apc.<sup>1</sup>. His observations on the Semitic influence on the verb<sup>2</sup> will be surveyed briefly. He notes the frequent wavering of the text of the Apc. between present and future tenses, but notes that in most cases the changes are not arbitrary<sup>3</sup>. A careful study of context will show that while in some places the future is rightly employed, there are other places where the present occurs when we would expect the future or participle. This may be due to the influence of Hebrew tense usage, since a Hebrew imperfect (and perfect) may be rendered as past, present, or future, according to context. Cases of confusion of this nature can be amply illustrated from the LXX. The possibility of a confusion of future tenses for pasts on the basis of Semitic idiom is suggested by Charles at Apc. iv.9-10<sup>4</sup>. The past imperfect or historical present is frequently replaced in the Apc. by a participle. Cf. the following: i.16 ἐκπορευομένη  
iv.2 καθήμενος. He notes this use of the participle for a finite verb is frequent in late Hebrew, and the same use is also even more frequent in both Aramaic and

---

<sup>1</sup>I, clix.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. cxxiii - cxxvii.

<sup>3</sup>On p.cxxiii, note 1 he points out the relative confusion exhibited in chapter 11, ascribing it to the author's use of 'traditional material'.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p.cxxiv.

Syriac; thus its displacement of the past imperfect in our author is probably due largely to Hebraic influence<sup>1</sup>. Regarding the use of the infinitives, Charles notes that they at times are used in the sense of finite verbs in conditional clauses, as well as in principal sentences, while the infinitive plus the article serves as a finite verb.

Charles maintains that the criteria of grammar and syntax in the Apc., including syntax of the verb, can be employed in separating portions of the book which originated with the Seer from sections which were based on sources<sup>2</sup>. Concerning the nature of the language of the Apc., he expressed the opinion that while its author wrote in Greek, he remained in the thought world of the Hebrew Bible<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, while related closely to Greek as found in the LXX and other Greek OT versions, and the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, the Apc. nevertheless possesses a distinct character of its own<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles here (p.cxxiv) and elsewhere notes usage of language which is more akin to Aramaic than to classical Hebrew; however, he does not seem to consider seriously the possibility of Aramaic sources behind portions of the Apc., nor does he say much about the influence of an Aramaic mother tongue on the author of the Apc.

<sup>2</sup>I, 271-73.

<sup>3</sup>I, cxliii.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

The next significant work on the language of the Apc., drawing heavily on that of Charles, was by R.B.Y. Scott who in 1928 published his Ph.D. thesis, The Original Language of the Apocalypse<sup>1</sup>. Scott stated his premise at the outset; 'the Apocalypse as a whole is a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic'<sup>2</sup>. Though basing his conclusion ultimately on alleged mistranslations from the Semitic source, Scott also examined certain Hebrew idioms frequently encountered in the book. Regarding the verb, he follows Charles in referring to participles used as finite verbs. He also pointed to a number of cases in which the Greek of the Apc. employs the participial forms of ἐχων to represent possessive Lamedh in Hebrew. The occurrence of a peculiar Hebrew construction is also noted in which a finite verb is used with a noun that has the particle of comparison, where in Greek a participle would be used<sup>3</sup>.

Since the majority of Hebrew verbs have causative stems, while in Greek separate verbs must be added, and while in Hebrew causative expressions are comparatively more frequent than in Greek, Scott finds it natural to expect that in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Toronto University Press.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch (Cowley), Hebrew Grammar, §155g. (hereafter cited as GK).

Apc. clumsy phrases with  $\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  or  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon$  would be found to express the causative idea<sup>1</sup>. Cf. Apc. xii.13 ...  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\eta}$  ...  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$  . Also noted by Scott are a number of cases in which confusion of tense has occurred. He makes two observations on the matter: first, that the difficulty often arises from the various meanings of the Hebrew imperfect (i.e. imperfect, present, and future) and, where that does not operate, a misunderstanding of a Waw consecutive for simple Waw or vice versa may have occurred when the Seer rendered an unpointed Hebrew text into Greek. Scott also feels that present participles are found where aorist or perf. participles are expected in several places.

In his conclusion Scott reaffirms his premise that the Apc. originated in Hebrew and was translated into Greek by an early Christian. By this he does not deny the possibility that the book is composite in origin; nor does he ignore the fact that distinctions in style and diction are apparent in the book. These differences he sees, though, in the Hebrew original, not in Greek.

In his commentary on the Apc.<sup>2</sup> Father E.-B. Allo of the University of Fribourg notes that certain participles

---

<sup>1</sup>Scott, op. cit., p.10.

<sup>2</sup>Saint Jean L'Apocalypse, 4th edn. (Paris, 1933). The verb is discussed on pp.cliii - clv.

must be given the sense of finite verbs. This he ascribes, as did the others, to Hebrew influence, and especially to Aramaic. He also noted the appearance of the impersonal plural verb, and asked if it could be due to Aramaic influence.

In his final work, published post-humously, C.C. Torrey sets forth his reasons for believing the Apc. was written originally in Aramaic and later translated into Greek<sup>1</sup>. His arguments touching on the use of the verb include the use of the indefinite 3rd person plural in place of the passive voice, in line with Aramaic usage. Torrey sees evidence in the Apc. of very frequent use of the Aramaic participle, which prompted the translator to employ a Greek corresponding participle where a finite verb would have sufficed. Similarly, where the Greek present tense occurs, Torrey felt an Aramaic participle could be taken for granted. This is cause for a number of places where the Greek has (or should have) the future. Finally, he mentions the confusion of tenses which arises over the similarity between Aramaic peal participles and perfect tense verbs in unpointed texts.

Torrey has not time, however, to consider influence of the Hebrew tense system on the verbs of the Apc. - 'In short there is in Rev. no trace of Hebrew usage in the tenses employed. Whatever evidence there is of falsely or too literally rendered verbs points to Aramaic rather than to Hebrew'<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Apocalypse of John (New Haven, 1958).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p.57.

The first monograph devoted to a study of the verb in the Apc. is Angelo Lancellotti's Sintassi Ebraica nel Greco Dell'Apocalisse. I. Usò delle forme verbali<sup>1</sup>. He attempts to show how the verb in the Apc. is employed along Semitic, and more specifically, Hebraic, lines by analysing certain verbs in the Apc. in the light of Hebrew grammar. His first chapter discusses the distinction between the Hebrew and Greek concept of verbal tenses; following chapters present descriptions of verbs in the Apc. which conform to the Hebrew qatal, yiqtol, the participle in its differing Hebrew and Greek roles, especially employed nominally and verbally; the infinitive in its nominal and independent employment is discussed last, followed by a final chapter of recapitolazione and a conclusion.

Regarding tense, Lancellotti notes that the aorist for the most part is employed along normal Greek lines, but in a few cases a rather Hebraic sense is displayed when the Greek aorists in the Apc. express the sense of Hebrew perfects. The perfect tense in the Apc. has little connection with Hebrew syntax, although a possible connection with Hebrew perfect is suggested. The present tense more than the others is used abnormally. Omitting the cases in which the present is found in indirect discourse, dependent on a past tense verb, Lancellotti asserts that the so-called 'quasi atemporal' use of the present in the Apc. is due to

---

<sup>1</sup>Collectio Assisiensis I, Assisi, 1964.

Semitic influence. Finally, the futuristic present is attached by him to the Hebrew imperfect referring to future events (but wrongly, as we shall see infra). While the future in the Apc. is generally used along Greek lines, its substitution for the aorist subjunctive is unusual, and its use with the value of an imperfect<sup>1</sup> is based on Hebrew imperfect tense usage. Also, its modal use with the value of a Hebrew jussive and as cohortative is Hebraic.

Lancellotti discusses Semitic influence on attributive and circumstantial participles, bringing out several specific points at which, he says, Semitic influence is at work. The participial clause also is included in his discussion. Finally, the case for Hebrew influence at work on the infinitive is presented.

The study is wide-ranging and suggests many possibilities for further study and research. While specific criticisms of his findings are included at the appropriate places in this thesis, we could note here the general weakness of his monograph-inadequate documentation and illustration from Hebrew and the LXX of the existence of the many syntactical equations which he suggests.

The significant but difficult to read morphological study of the Apc. by G. Mussies<sup>2</sup> requires mention here since

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lancellotti, p.116.

<sup>2</sup>The Morphology of Koine Greek as Used in the Apocalypse of John. A Study in Bilingualism (Leiden, 1971).

its concluding chapter is titled 'The Use of the Verb in the Apocalypse'. Here is given in detail a discussion, plus statistics, of use of the Voice (pp. 330ff.), Moods (pp. 321ff.), participles (pp. 324ff.), and the durative, aoristic, futural and perfective categories (pp. 330ff.). Again, specific criticisms of his work are to be found in the main portion of this thesis.

At this point attention should be drawn to three recent monographs in the field of Hellenistic Greek syntax which are valuable to the student of the NT for the light they throw on the language of the NT. From Sweden comes L. Rydbeck, Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und neues Testament. *Studia Graeca Upsaliensa* 5 (Uppsala, 1967); from Greece comes B. Mandilaras, The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri (Athens, 1973), and from the Netherlands comes W.F. Bakker's Pronomen Abundans and Pronomen Coniunctum (Amsterdam & London, 1974). Discussions in relevant parts of this thesis have been significantly enriched by use made of the findings of the above-mentioned authors, and appreciation is expressed for the attention given by each to the influence of his research on the Greek of the NT as seen in its Hellenistic matrix.

This introductory survey could not be concluded without reference to two classic studies devoted to the Semitic element in the language of the New Testament. First, a work which is so widely established and recognised that it hardly requires mention is Matthew Black's An Aramaic

Approach to the Gospels and Acts. Now in its third edition, it serves as the standard presentation of the Aramaic element in the Greek of the Gospels and Acts. The usefulness of this great store of information has a wider application than that implied by the title however, and even though the author excluded from his study Semitisms due exclusively to Hebrew (cf. p.34), yet anyone acquainted with An Aramaic Approach will observe how this thesis has, with certain modifications to allow for a difference in subject matter, patterned itself after Black's study.

In a more recent monograph Klaus Beyer has made his important contribution to the understanding of New Testament Greek. His Semitische Syntax im neuen Testament, of which Part I only has appeared, brings to bear a great deal of Semitic evidence which illuminates un-Greek usage of the Clause. His study, rich in Hebrew and Aramaic examples illustrating the constructions under discussion, has been drawn upon in several places where it discussed constructions which are found in the Apocalypse.

CHAPTER I

TEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

The preparation of this thesis has been greatly facilitated by the excellent textual studies published during the last six decades for the Apocalypse, making it the most thoroughly studied New Testament book, from the viewpoint of text. The commentaries of Bousset and Allo are rich in textual references; both however were superseded by the commentary of R.H. Charles, who in vol. II included the Greek text of the Apc. with extensive critical apparatus. Latin sources, meanwhile, were carefully presented by H.J. Vogels<sup>1</sup>. These works, in their turn were superseded by the masterly apparatus prepared by H.C. Hoskier<sup>2</sup> representing thirty years of labour collating and recording in toto the variants found in every Greek ms. of the Apc. known in his day, plus a comprehensive treatment of the ancient versions. While today some doubt is expressed about the accuracy of his citations of some versions, yet his accurate work on the Greek text is definitive and irreplaceable.

The Greek material presented in Hoskier's apparatus has been studied and carefully analysed by Josef Schmid of Munich, who has aimed at determining manuscript families and the

---

<sup>1</sup>Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Apokalypse-Übersetzung (Dusseldorf, 1920).

<sup>2</sup>Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse 2 volumes (London, 1929).

allegiance of the Fathers. In his major work his task is sixfold<sup>1</sup>: (1) to accurately define the two medieval forms of the text of the Apc. (Koine, and the text used for the Commentary of Andreas); (2) to note the relationship of these two forms to one another, (3) to demonstrate the two-fold nature of the earlier tradition made possible by the discovery of Chester Beatty Papyrus p<sup>47</sup>; (4) to consider the possibility of a 'neutral' text; (5) to note the relation of the Koine and Andreas texts to this earlier tradition; (6) testing of the manuscript tradition by the criteria of the language and usage of the Apc.<sup>2</sup>. In addition to these main objectives Schmid notes<sup>3</sup> that so far no trace of a Western text of the Apc. has been found<sup>4</sup>.

Since the publication of Hoskier's apparatus the early text of the Apc. has been further illuminated by discovery of the p<sup>47</sup>, a late third-century manuscript containing

---

<sup>1</sup>Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes 2. Teil Die alten Stämme (München, 1955).

<sup>2</sup>Admirably summarised in an article by J.N. Birdsall, 'The Text of the Revelation of S. John', Evangelical Quarterly xxxiii (1961), 228-37.

<sup>3</sup>On pp.12, note 2 and 150, note 1; cf. ZNW 59 (1968), 251, where this is repeated.

<sup>4</sup>For a review of Schmid, cf. G.D. Kilpatrick, Vigiliae Christianae 13 (1959), 1-13.

chapters ix.10 - xvii.2<sup>1</sup>. Several manuscript discoveries of minor significance are described by J. Schmid<sup>2</sup>. He concludes, after describing some thirty-one previously unknown or unnoticed manuscripts of the Apc. that these are not of any help in illuminating the early character of the text (they date mostly from the 10th to the 17th centuries)<sup>3</sup>.

In light of these major textual advances in the Apc. during the past half century it need not be stressed that in the work of analysing the nature of Semitic influence on syntax, the approach which is based on a single manuscript or printed NT text is inadequate, and can lead only to unsatisfactory results. Matthew Black<sup>4</sup> long ago demonstrated the weakness of a similar approach, relying only on the Westcott-Hort text, for studying the Semitic element in the Gospels and Acts. His practice of granting a hearing to the more Semitised reading, regardless of its textual pedigree, should be applied to other portions of the NT text, Apc. included. No single manuscript or textual family preserves

---

<sup>1</sup>Published by F.G. Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, fasc. iii (London, 1934). For evaluations see M.J. Lagrange, 'Les Papyrus Ch. Beatty', Revue Biblique 43 (1934), 488-93 and R.V.G. Tasker, JTS 50 (1949), 65ff.

<sup>2</sup>ZNW 52 (1961), 82-88; ZNW 59 (1968), 250-58.

<sup>3</sup>ZNW 59 (1968), 251.

<sup>4</sup>Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, p.28f.

all the more Semitised and therefore more original readings in those portions of the NT dependent on Semitic sources.

It is all the more surprising then to notice that the two most recent studies on the verb in the Apc., i.e. those of Lancellotti and Mussies, ignore in large measure the wealth of textual information so readily available, thereby limiting their studies to a single printed text of Merk in the case of Lancellotti, and a single uncial manuscript (Alexandrinus) by Mussies!

In the chapter of his monograph titled 'Textual Criticism and Linguistics' Mussies gives reason for his choice of Alexandrinus as the basis for his study of the Apc. (p.14):

Instead of describing the use of language of a text edition which is inevitably eclectic the linguist will have to choose the best ms. available and describe in the first place the idiom of that one alone.

This approach is justified if one were aiming to describe the use of language as influenced by the textual tradition responsible for producing the selected manuscript. In the case of codex A for the Apc. we have in fact the book at a stage of textual transmission which it reached in the hands of 5th century Alexandrian textual scholars.

To penetrate behind this stage of the manuscript tradition it is necessary to draw upon a wide range of witnesses for the evidence they contain of the earlier, less polished constructions, especially Semitisms, which were almost certainly

removed by certain later copyists. By limiting his work to the basis provided by codex A, Mussies imposes undue limitations on his findings, especially those in his final chapter on the verb.

The only alternative to the single text method pursued by Lancelotti and Mussies is that of adopting a judicious eclecticism. This means, according to G.D. Kilpatrick<sup>1</sup>, that:

No readings can be condemned categorically because they are characteristic of manuscripts or groups of manuscripts. We have to pursue a consistent eclecticism. Readings must be considered severally on their intrinsic character.

Elsewhere he notes<sup>2</sup> that in principle any variant which occurs in a manuscript which is not a copy of another manuscript may prove to be original. It should not be dismissed because it does not occur in this or that textual type, nor because it has inadequate attestation<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>'The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the Textus Receptus' in The New Testament in History and Contemporary Perspectives; Essays in Memory of G.H.C. Macgregor, edited by H. Anderson and W. Barclay (Oxford, 1965), p.205f.

<sup>2</sup>Vigiliae Christianae 13 (1959), 6.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

Another factor, related to eclecticism in solving textual differences in the Apc., is of course an awareness of Semitic idiom in Greek dress. Metzger observes<sup>1</sup> that 'a knowledge of Hebrew and especially Aramaic will occasionally throw light upon a variant reading in the Gospels'. The same point is made by Kilpatrick regarding the Apc. when he notes<sup>2</sup> that here perhaps the most important consideration is language. Among the writers of the NT the Greek of the Apc. stands out, and would 'invite correction'. J. Schmid emphasizes the importance of understanding language of the Apc.<sup>3</sup>

This consideration of textual matters concludes with a mention of the criterion of Atticism and its implications for the text of the Apc. Atticism became a dominant trend in Greek literary circles during the first and second centuries A.D.; it induced scribes to insert into the NT text Attic forms in place of the Hellenistic originals. Kilpatrick in discussing this trend notes<sup>4</sup> that the most evident stylistic consideration at work on the NT text was the smoothing over or removal of Semitic idioms. He rightly suspects that sometimes the attempt to improve the language

---

<sup>1</sup>The Text of the New Testament (Oxford<sup>2</sup>, 1968) p.233.

<sup>2</sup>Vigiliae Chr. 13 (1959), 6.

<sup>3</sup>Op. cit., pp. 249-51.

<sup>4</sup>'The Greek New Testament Text of Today ...', op. cit., p.126.

of the NT was successful to the point that the more atticised Greek expression appears in our text while the original un-Greek one is relegated to the apparatus. This is evident, for example, in the use of the tenses of verbs, and where an un-Greek tense occurs, there is almost invariably textual evidence of considerable uncertainty among ancient copyists, with many attempts at smoothing. Our findings, presented in the body of this thesis, lend greater support to the idea of textual smoothing, showing its extensive nature.

Except in places where the readings of specific NT manuscripts are cited, the Greek text used in this thesis is that of the United Bible Societies, edited by Aland, Black, Martini, Metzger, and Wikgren (2nd edition, 1968). It was not chosen arbitrarily, but because examination shows that in it, more than previous printed texts of the Greek NT, an effort was made by the editors to include in the text of the Apoc. the more semitised readings, whenever textual support allowed. For citations of the Hebrew OT the edition of Biblia Hebraica, edited by P. Kahle, was employed. For the LXX the 3 vol. hand edition by H.B. Swete was relied upon, since its apparatus criticus is superior to that of Rahlfs.

CHAPTER II

GREEK VERBS WITH HEBREW MEANINGS<sup>1</sup>

In Apc. xvii.6 we read that the Seer was 'astonished' at the vision of the great harlot, ἐθαύμασα ἰδὼν αὐτήν θαύμα μέγα. Here the traditional meaning of θαυμάζειν 'marvel', 'wonder', 'be astonished'<sup>2</sup> hardly bears the force required by the passage; better, 'he was greatly appalled - a sense however unattested in secular Greek. In an almost identical expression in Dan. iv.16 we find that Aramaic דַּרְשׁ means 'appalled, dumb-founded' - 'Daniel was dumbfounded for a moment'. The reason is given in the following phrase, 'Do not let the dream and its interpretation dismay you'. It should be noted that LXX of Dan. here uses the verb employed by the Seer; μεγάλως δὲ ἐθαύμασεν ὁ Δανιηλ. Note the use of corresponding Hebrew דַּרְשׁ<sup>3</sup>, with identical meaning in Lev. xxvi.32, which in the LXX is

---

<sup>1</sup>For a recent evaluation of words in the Apc. under real or supposed Hebrew influence, cf. Matthew Black, "Some Greek Words with 'Hebrew' Meanings in the Epistles and Apocalypse" in the forthcoming Festschrift for Prof. William Barclay.

<sup>2</sup>In later development the Hellenistic θαυμάζειν took the auxiliary definition of 'honour', 'admire'; cf. Liddell & Scott, s.v. θαυμάζω.

<sup>3</sup>The term דַּרְשׁ has two definitions, with uncertain connection; 'desolated', and 'appalled'; cf. BDB Hebrew Lexicon, s.v.

translated by θαυμάσονται ἐπ' αὐτῆ οἱ ἔχθροι ὑμῶν  
'the enemies who occupy it shall be appalled' (NEB).

Elsewhere in Dan. we find the expression in viii.27 'I was  
appalled by the vision' (LXX καὶ ἐθαύμαζον τὴν ὄρασιν ).

On the basis of these occurrences it is here suggested  
that when θαυμάζω is employed, and the meaning 'marvel',  
'astonished' seems too weak, one should understand 'appalled'  
after the meaning of the Hebrew equivalent. We could add  
here Apc. xvii.7 Διὰ τί ἐθαύμασας; ; 'why are you  
appalled?'

The two remaining occurrences of θαυμάζω  
require separate consideration. In Apc. xiii.3 ἐθαυμάσθη  
ὅλη ἡ γῆ ὀπίσω τοῦ θηρίου , the traditional rendering  
of which is represented by the NEB 'The whole world went  
after the beast in wondering admiration'; cf. '... followed  
the beast with wonder' (RSV). Both renderings attempt to  
deal with the incongruous aorist passive<sup>1</sup>. The traditional  
explanation, that here we have a passive form for deponent  
is not convincing, because in his two uses of the verb noted  
above the Seer chose the active voice. A different explana-  
tion is called for, and the conjectural translation to  
follow is based on the fact already established, that

θαυμάζω in the Apc. has the meaning of Heb. דָּאָוַן

---

<sup>1</sup>On the aorist form for possible active verbs, cf.  
Bl-D §78, also section on Voice, infra. Apc. xiii.3 and  
xvii.8 contain the only two occurrences of the passive form;  
elsewhere the NT uses the active.

I conjecture that in Apc. xiii.3  $\epsilon\theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta$  =  
 'be desolated' in the sense expressed numerous times by the  
 Hebrew equivalent; eg. Eze xxxv.15  $\text{נִיִּןְךָ} \text{נִיִּןְךָ}$   
 'You shall be desolate'. It should be noted in support  
 that while in Greek an increasing sense of 'honour', 'admire'  
 become attached to the verb<sup>1</sup>, Hebrew has no such connota-  
 tion, however. Therefore in order to appreciate what effect  
 the sense of Hebrew 'desolate', 'devastate' would give, we  
 must read Apc. xiii.3-4 without any trace of the idea of  
 worship - i.e. 'The whole world was devastated in the wake  
 of (  $\epsilon\pi\lambda\omega$  perhaps for  $\text{אַחֲרָיו}$  with the sense  
 'behind') the beast. So they threw themselves down before<sup>2</sup>  
 the dragon because it gave authority to the beast; then  
 they threw themselves down before the beast, declaring "who  
 is like the beast? Who can make war against him?"  
 The final phrase supports the conjectural translation; the  
 beast is free to devastate and tyrannize the earth because  
 there is no force to oppose it. Finally, verse 7 reveals  
 that the same beast has conquered the saints in battle;  
 furthermore, he exercises  $\epsilon\gamma\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$  over every tribe,  
 people, language group, and nation. In vs.8 all on earth  
 (except those inscribed in the lamb's book) again prostrate  
 themselves before the tyrant. The fate of any who refuse

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bauer-Arndt & Gingrich, s.v.  $\theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  2,  
 where 'wonder' is equated with 'worship'.

<sup>2</sup>Here  $\pi\upsilon\sigma\sigma\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega$  without sense of 'worship'.

to capitulate is stated indirectly 'for those who have ears' in v.10 - exile and death by the sword, in words taken from Jeremiah's captivity passages, xv.2 and xliii.11. The Seer closes this dramatic section with the words 'here is the patience and faith of the saints'.

Seen from this angle, one comes to doubt whether any sense of 'worship', 'marvel', 'admiration' finds its way into the passage. To the contrary, the mood is created by a powerful irresistible tyrant beast who extracts submission from his subjects.

The other passive, θαυμασθήσονται, in Apc. xvii.8 should be translated 'those who inhabit the earth shall be devastated'. Unfortunately for this conjecture, θαυμάζω with the sense 'to devastate' does not occur in the LXX.

Δίδωμι appears frequently in the Apc., as does its equivalent ]ן] in the OT, sometimes in the sense of 'to set, place'<sup>1</sup>: Apc. iii.8 δέδωκα ἐνώπιον σου θύραν is unusual Greek, but as Helbing in his observations on the cases in the LXX notes, is Hebraic<sup>2</sup> and means 'set', 'place', as does ]ן] in 2 Ki iv.43, where the LXX renders τί δὲ τοῦτο ἐνώπιον ἑκατὸν ἀνδρῶν; 'How am I to set this before a hundred men?' ( ἐνώπιον = 'ן]בָּ ). Cf. also xiii.16 'place a mark'; xvii.17 '... put it in their heads'.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Black, *op.cit.*; cf. his *Aramaic Approach*<sup>3</sup>, p.132.

<sup>2</sup>*Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta* (Göttingen, 1928), pp.52, 193.



and in a secondary sense 'to inherit'<sup>1</sup>. It is employed elsewhere in the LXX with similar force; Lev. xx.24 'you shall take over their land (s.c. the land of the nation which Jahweh was to cast out before them, vs. 23), for I will give it to you to possess'. (Again, Hebrew  $\psi \gamma'$ ).

Such usage can only be described as a pure Semitism, since nothing like it is to be found in Greek. Many times in the LXX this verb is used in a milder though still Semitic sense of 'acquire, possess', without implied force. Isa. lxi.7 '... in your land you shall possess a double portion' - here again  $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\nu = \psi \gamma'$   
Cf. 3 Ki. xvii.24 '(The king of Assyria brought people ... and placed them in the cities ...) so they took possession of Samaria' (italics mine). In the majority of OT passages where  $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\nu$  translates  $\psi \gamma'$ , the idea of possessing land, cities, fields, etc. which were in the hands of others is expressed. Only in a comparatively few places does the term actually denote its Greek sense 'to inherit'.

Since Polybius (II B.C.) uses  $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\nu$  twice in the sense 'to acquire, obtain,  $\tau\eta\nu \dots \delta\delta\epsilon\alpha\nu$  in 15,22,31,  $\phi\eta\mu\eta\nu$  in 18,55,8,<sup>2</sup> it is not a pure Hebraism. But except for these two passages, its only

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. BDB Hebrew Lexicon s.v.  $\psi \gamma'$

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Liddell & Scott, s.v.  $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\omega$

attestation meaning 'acquire, possess' comes from 2nd century A.D. authors such as Lucian and Phrynichus. Never does it take this meaning in classical Greek<sup>1</sup>.

In line with OT usage and opposed to Hellenistic Greek, the verb meaning 'inherit' is rare in the NT; according to Bauer<sup>2</sup> only once, Gal. iv.30: οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱός 'this son (of a slave) shall by no means inherit', which cites LXX Gen. xxi.10, where κληρονομέω =  $\psi$   $\gamma$  . Other NT occurrences (about 17) conform to Hebraic usage, e.g. Matt. v.5 αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν '... they shall possess the land' (a citation of Ps. xxxvii.11); no idea of inheritance in the legal sense is implied; this refers to the taking possession of a territory in the OT sense, although allowance must be made for a metaphorical, not literal 'territory'; cf. xix.29 'whoever has left houses ... or lands for my sake ... shall gain possession of ( κληρονομήσει ) eternal life'.

In Apc. xxi.7, immediately following his vision of a new heaven and new earth (land), the Seer reports the promise of the one on the throne: ὁ νικῶν κληρονομήσει ταῦτα 'the one who is victorious shall take possession of all this'. Here is the final canonical echo of the promise of a land

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bauer, s.v. κληρονομέω 2.; this is Hellenistic Greek usage, he notes.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. 1.

and heritage first made to Abram, according to Gen. xv.7. In neither passage does the verb κληρονομέω / ψ 7" denote 'inherit', so it must be understood in its Hebraic sense. The idea of heirship is expressed in both passages, however, and it is certainly not coincidental. In Gen. xv.1-4 Abram's chief concern is his lack of a male heir; he was childless, so the possession of the promised land meant little, if it could not be passed on to a legitimate heir.

The Seer dealt with a similar concept, which included in common with the Gen. passage a 'new land', a city (cf. Heb. xi.10 Abraham looked forward to a city), and the issue of legal heir: Apc. xxi.7b ἔσομαι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπὸς ἔσονται μοι υἱός ; the matter in the Apc. was resolved by conferral of sonship.

Black in his article cited supra has dealt with the various Hebrew meanings expressed by ἀδικεῖν when it translates Ἰψλ 'to oppress', or more specifically, 'to defraud, to cheat'; e.g. Hos. xii.8 'False scales are in merchants' hands and they love to cheat' (NEB).

Of the ten occurrences of ἀδικεῖν in the Apc., nine (xxii.11 being excepted) were declared by Charles<sup>1</sup> to mean 'hurt'. Black is not so sure, and in his examination makes some interesting suggestions. The difficult 'hurt not ( μὴ ἀδικήσῃς ) the oil and the wine' of vi.6 could in fact express the sense 'and do not (fraudulently)

---

<sup>1</sup>I, 59; II, 222.

withhold the oil and the wine'<sup>1</sup>. This suggestion seems to derive support from its context, which is generally understood to refer to a fixing of the maximum price for the main food-stuffs - a whole day's wage for the average daily consumption of a workman.

In a number of passages in the Apc. which refer to God's judgments 'harming' - i.e. smiting, or destroying the earth, Black agrees that ἀδικεῖν has the sense of hiphil of  $\text{𐤇𐤃𐤍}$  'to smite': e.g. Isa. x.20. Generally, the English versions render 'to harm', but a stronger sense of 'to smite' seems justified in Apc. vii.2,3, ix.4,10, and possibly ii.11.

Charles suggests<sup>2</sup> that κοιμᾶναι should be given the secondary sense of Hebrew 'to devastate' in Apc. ii.27 and xix.5, based on the LXX mistranslation in Ps. ii.9. Black however dissents, pointing out that the fact that the LXX mistranslated does not imply that the Seer intended to express the sense of 'devastate': it means 'rule' only. But although he notes that κοιμᾶναι is paralleled with συντρίβεται in ii.27 and κατάξῃ in xix.15, Black does not explain how the concepts of 'rule' and 'smash' the nations are to be combined. Certainly behind both passages lies the idea of conquest, patterned after the conquest of Canaan by the Hebrews under Jahweh's

---

<sup>1</sup>As rendered by Black, op. cit.

<sup>2</sup>I, 76.

command, with the goal of 'possessing' the territory promised to the patriarch Abraham<sup>1</sup>. In this sense

ποιμαίνειν = 'push aside' or 'shepherd away' the heathen to make way for Jahweh's chosen people.

Finally, Black notes that the favoured expression νικῶν in the Apc. (15 occurrences) is used along Greek lines for the most part. Abnormal 'hebraic' usage which was claimed for Apc. v.5 by Scott<sup>2</sup>, who would translate 'worthy, able', on the basis of Aramaic  $\text{ܢܝܚܝܢ}$ . Black is not convinced however, and is probably right in accepting the NEB rendering '... the lion of the tribe of Judah ... has conquered, so that he can open the scroll ...'.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the discussion under κληρονομεῖν supra.

<sup>2</sup>P.20; cf. Torrey, The Apocalypse of John, p.107.

CHAPTER III

SEMITIC INFLUENCE ON VERBAL SYNTAX

PART A. VOICE

THIRD PERSON PLURAL VERBS WITH INDEFINITE SUBJECT

In his Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup> Matthew Black draws the following summary of Aramaic influence on Greek impersonal 3rd-person plural verbs in the Gospels and Acts<sup>1</sup>:

The passive is less frequently used in Aramaic than in Greek, its place being taken by an impersonal construction, uncommon in Greek apart from λέγουσι , φασί . In the appearance of this impersonal construction in the Gospels, Wellhausen detected the influence of Aramaic (Einl.<sup>2</sup>, p.18; cf. Wilcox, Semitisms of Acts, pp. 127ff.). An examination of the distribution of the construction in the Gospels confirms his view.

R.H. Charles noted the occurrence of this construction a number of times in the Apc., and also pointed to its frequent occurrence in biblical Aramaic, citing a number of passages in Daniel<sup>2</sup>. In their NT Grammar, Bl-D recognise that 'the

---

<sup>1</sup>P.126f. Occurrences in the Gospels are cited. Cf. Beyer, pp. 226ff.

<sup>2</sup>Charles I, 362; Dan. iv. 13, 22, 23, 29; v.20, 21; vii. 12, 26. Ezr vi.5. Torrey, p.42 cites this as evidence of an Aramaic origin of the Apc.

range of ideas expressed by [the impersonal 3rd-person plural] enlarged under the influence of Aramaic (which is not fond of the passive); in classical Greek the construction is used primarily with verbs of saying, etc., as is the case in Modern Greek<sup>1</sup>; Nigel Turner adds several examples illustrating the variety of subjects which can be understood<sup>2</sup>.

In a more recent study on the indefinite 3rd plural, a Swedish Greek scholar, Lars Rydbeck, has presented new evidence which, he believes, should bring about a revision of the traditional views of both classical grammarians and NT Greek and Semitic specialists on this construction<sup>3</sup>. In his first chapter, titled 'Subjektlose 3. Person Plural für den Begriff "man" bei Verben ausserhalb der Gruppe der verba dicendi', Rydbeck states as the object of his study a presentation of a hitherto little-known application of the 3rd person plural, exclusive of verbs of saying, during the various periods of the Greek language<sup>4</sup>. He first notes that grammarians are at fault for always distinguishing between the Greek 3rd person plural indirect verb and the

---

<sup>1</sup>130(2); cf. Moulton-Howard, Gramm. II, 447 for similar statement.

<sup>2</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 292f.

<sup>3</sup>See his book, Fachprosa, Vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 5 (Uppsala, 1967).

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p.27 n.1.

use of 'one' (German man) in modern usage when expressing a general, concrete meaning. While the Greek language has its peculiar sense attached to certain occurrences of the indefinite 3rd person plural, it is in many cases rendered smoothly and practically by the use of 'one'.<sup>1</sup>

To illustrate this point, several examples of the impersonal 3rd plural are drawn from the works of Dioscurides, the Greek medical author of the mid-1st century A.D.

Rydbeck shows how Diosc. applied verbs other than those of saying/naming in the 3rd person plural in a more or less general meaning: examples include  $\deltaολιζουσιν$  ,

$\chiρβινται$  ,  $μισγουσιν$  ,  $\deltaποκαπνιζουσιν$  ,

$\deltaναλαμβανουσιν$  , etc. Further, he notes that these and

other verbs were employed alternately as passives, as are the verbs of saying. Thus he concludes that these verbs in the impersonal 3rd plural always possess a very concrete sense; they lead one to think immediately of the persons who have to do directly with the matter in question. It does not then appear unnatural that a language so concrete as Greek should make use of the 3rd person plural directly, without an anchorage to a particular subject. While the use of a passive was always open to Diosc., yet on occasion he employed the indefinite plural as a necessary variation; one can further formulate that his technical prose needed a

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p.28.

linguistic expedient, of itself unmeaningful in character, when it came to portraying to a definite person facts which were of a more general and timeless nature<sup>1</sup>.

Rydbeck continues to develop his view by citing a number of occurrences of the impersonal 3rd person plural from various periods of Greek literature; from the classical period of Thucydides, Plato, Xenophon, Pseudo-Demosthenes, etc., he finds about fifteen examples, some of which were considered by modern editors to be errors, thus standing altered in the critical apparatus<sup>2</sup>. More classical examples could be found, he asserts, if one took the time to search for them. He further states that in this connection one must concede that when such impersonal passages in the 3rd person plural form (if they may be called such) are occurring in classical Greek, it is not improbable that the subject is of a general nature, which appears vaguely to the writer in his actual train of thought, prepared in this person, and situated in this verb ending<sup>3</sup>.

In short, by Hellenistic times the impersonal 3rd person plural was employed as an effective and practical linguistic expedient, whenever general discussion or reference was desired, to 'what one did'<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p.29f.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p.34.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p.35.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p.36.

At this point Rydbeck asks, why have the grammarians not hitherto noted this construction's more general existence by the time of Hellenistic Greek? The reason given is that in nearly every case their conclusions are based on linguistic material only down to Aristotle, thus giving phenomena such as the impersonal 3rd plural the designation of 'exception'. The line of continuing development shown by Greek prose is thus not recognised, and the artificial demarcation (between various periods of the language) is created, upon which rests our estimation of the manner of expression, thus aggravating our prospects of understanding such an elementary type of expression in Greek<sup>1</sup>.

While holding reservations about his concluding assertion, we nonetheless recognise that Rydbeck has made a valuable contribution in assembling examples which demonstrate the existence of the impersonal 3rd plural from earliest Hellenistic times right through to the beginning of the 3rd century A.D.; his book should be consulted for the twenty or so examples cited.

Turning his attention to NT Greek, Rydbeck makes a special examination of this phenomenon in Luke, and confesses that he is unqualified to handle the Aramaic and Hebrew antecedents which might lie behind this construction in

---

<sup>1</sup>Rydbeck, op. cit., p.37.

biblical Greek; nor does he discuss whether the phenomenon can be found in the LXX. He then cites NT grammarians, and notes the case made by Dalman for Semitic influence in the form of the 3rd person plural as an indirect reference to God; he then cites seventeen Lukan passages which contain the construction and makes the following observations: while Luke's impersonal 3rd plural verbs usually occur in the future and narrative tenses, the non-biblical examples with a few exceptions were always in the present tense. He concludes that the impersonal and general meaning of the construction is easier to understand intuitively when the verb is present tense. Also, Dalman's suggestion that reference to God stands behind several at least of the Lukan occurrences Rydbeck cannot criticise. He does note, however, that even in those cases where Semitic influence must be reckoned with, they are not of such a nature that they would not have been subject to the more powerful influence of Hellenistic Greek usage, since the inherent Greek characteristics were evolving along similar lines as those of the Semitic languages. Also of significance to Rydbeck was his final point, that some occurrences of the construction in Luke (i.e. vi.44, xii.11, xiv.35) are so similar to those shown from secular prose that they are indistinguishable<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Op. cit., pp. 39-42.

From the foregoing summary of Rydbeck's first chapter two firm conclusions can be drawn: first, the occurrence of impersonal 3rd plural verbs (excluding those of saying) in classical Greek is more widespread than was previously recognised; second, it becomes increasingly evident that this construction underwent development during the history of the Greek language, with an apparently increasing frequency of use in later periods. In short, Rydbeck has succeeded in legitimising the construction in literary secular Greek, and has shown its acceptable use in various periods of the language. What he admittedly failed to do, however, was to explain how an acceptable, albeit infrequent, point of grammar as the 3rd person plural came to be used with significantly greater frequency just in those Greek documents which have a direct or indirect link with an Aramaic source, i.e. Theodotion's Greek version of Daniel, the Gospels, and quite possibly, some portions of the Apc. Nor has he satisfactorily shown that in Greek there was the same distinction between the indefinite plural subject ('one') which is commonly found in colloquial speech in many languages, and the truly Aramaic (and, to a much lesser degree, Hebraic) indefinite subject which admits of no particular human agent and is thus equivalent to a passive<sup>1</sup>. His discoveries thus have not done away with the need for seeking an explanation

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Kautzsch, Gram. d. bibl.-Aram. §96.

of many NT occurrences of impersonal 3rd person plural verbs on lines other than those of Greek usage.

A survey of the occurrences of this construction in the biblical material reveals that it is found in the OT very frequently to express the ordinary indefinite plural subject 'they', 'one', when reference is made to people generally. This, then, would correspond to the category of the Greek construction demonstrated by Rydbeck. There are however a few occurrences of the 3rd person plural to express an indefinite subject, where the context would not admit of an human agent, or at least not of several<sup>1</sup>. In this case the 3rd person plural comes to have the meaning of a true passive, as noted supra for Aramaic. Of the ten examples of this latter category cited by GK, which have their parallel in the LXX<sup>2</sup> only one was rendered by a Greek impersonal 3rd person plural, viz. Gen. xxxiv.27  $\epsilon\mu\lambda\alpha\nu\alpha\nu$  'they polluted Dinah'.

This paucity of occurrences contrasts sharply against the concentrated cluster found in the Aramaic portions of the OT, and their corresponding rendering in Greek, especially

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §144 d-g.

<sup>2</sup>Gen. xxxiv.27; Job vii.3, iv.19, vi.2, xviii.18, xix.26, xxxiv.20; Ps. xliii.11; Prov. ii.22, ix.11.

in Theodotion's Daniel. Charles cited eight from Daniel: iv.13, 22, 23, 29; v.20, 21; vii.12, 26; also Ezra vi.5. Five of these are rendered by the Greek 3rd person plural.

In the Apc.

The construction appears in the Apc. in the following passages: ii.24 ὡς λέγουσιν 'what they call' (i.e. 'what is called'); viii.2 καὶ εἶδον τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλους ... καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς (Copt.) 'and I saw the seven angels ... who were given' (lit. 'and they gave to them').

In his book The Words of Jesus Gustaf Dalman drew attention to the tendency of Aramaic, noted by Rydbeck, of preferring the passive voice of the verb in order to avoid naming God as subject. Many times the Aramaic passive was in fact expressed by an active 3rd person plural. This Dalman illustrates with passages from Daniel<sup>1</sup>. It is significant to note that the following passages from the Apc. fall into the same category, where reference to God is made:

x.11 καὶ λέγουσιν (N A p<sup>47</sup>: corrected to λέγει by many minusc. plus the versions) μοι Δεῖ σὲ πάλιν προφητεῖσαι 'and they said to me, you must prophecy again' (lit. 'and God said to me ...'); xii.6 ἵνα ἔχει τρέφωσιν ( τρέφει: 2026) αὐτήν '... that

---

<sup>1</sup>English translation of Worte Jesu (Edinburgh, 1902), pp. 224-26.

there they (God?) might feed her';

xvi.15      καὶ βλέπωσιν      (      βλέπει

1852:      βλέπει      2071) τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτοῦ

'[blessed is he ... who keeps his garments, that he go not naked] and they (i.e. God) see his indecency'. It is evident that uncertainties arose over the construction in each case, but nowhere was a correction made to a passive form.

INTRANSITIVE ACTIVE VERBS EXPRESSING CAUSATIVE SENSE<sup>1</sup>

Conybeare and Stock note that in the LXX an intransitive active verb may express a causative sense, most certainly due to Hebrew influence. For example, βασιλεύειν in Greek means 'to be king' but it is often found in the LXX with the sense 'to make king'. In their discussion of this phenomenon, Bl-D recognise this and other verbs in the LXX

---

<sup>1</sup>Conybeare & Stock §84; cf. Bl-D §309 (1).

as causative, although they are less certain of its Hebraic nature than is, for example, W. Schmid<sup>1</sup> who in a review of R. Helbing's volume on Kasussyntax in the LXX lists (along with βασιλευειν ) ζην 'to animate' as an example of numerous verbs which in secular Greek are intransitive, but which take on a causal meaning in the LXX under influence of the Hebrew piel and hiphil stem verbs, which are then usually followed by direct objects in the accusative case. Such constructions made no significant appearance in classical Greek, or in the language of the papyri, but are abundant in the LXX; note Gen. iii.18 ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους ἀνατελεῖ σοι 'thorns and thistles it shall cause to come forth to you', which translates a Hebrew hiphil imperfect Π'צצן . Note also the objects in the accusative case. P. Katz noted that some LXX translators, such as that responsible for Lamentations, go far in the use of these intransitive active verbs in a causative sense<sup>2</sup>.

In the NT

In the NT μαθητευειν often occurs with the same

---

<sup>1</sup>Philologische Wochenschrift 49 (1929), 468.

<sup>2</sup>In J. Ziegler, Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta. Nachrichten der Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen (phil.-hist. Klasse), Jahrg. 1958, nr. 2.

sense; also other verbs<sup>1</sup>. In the Apc. two occurrences of the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι are suggested as intransitives with causative sense; cf. also Acts xvi.17D\*.

Apc. x.7 ὡς εὐηγγέλισε (-σατο minusc.) τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους τοὺς προφῆτας. Charles notes that only

here is εὐαγγελίζεσθαι plus accusative as an active found in the NT. Cf. xiv.6 ἔχοντα εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον

εὐαγγελίσαι (-γγελίζασθαι p<sup>47</sup>) ἐπὶ τοὺς καθήμενους. The causative sense of both is however

disputed by B1-D, who prefer the wider Hellenistic sense of 'to announce the good news' for these occurrences.

R.B.Y. Scott in his published thesis The Original Language of the Apocalypse<sup>2</sup> drew attention to what he described as 'periphrasis' for Hebrew verbs in the causative stem. In Greek, the causative sense must be expressed by use of a second verb, auxiliary to the main one. Such constructions are relatively much less common in Greek than in Semitic languages, which expressed causatives by a simple modification of the verbal stem. A helpful study of these two distinctive methods of rendering the Semitic causative into an Indo-European language has recently been published by Dr. Kedar-Kopfstein, of Israel, in an article titled 'Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen Kausative in der Vulgata'<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. B1-D §309 (1) for further examples.

<sup>2</sup>Toronto, 1928, p.10.

<sup>3</sup>ZAW 85 (1973), pp. 197-219.



clearly the case in the Apoc. as well, for while only two somewhat uncertain cases of the synthetic type of causative εὐαγγελίζεῖν occur, there are numerous cases of the analytic type, employing a form of ποιεῖν plus main verb (usually in the infinitive). Scott<sup>1</sup> cites as an obvious example Apoc. xiii.13 πῦρ ποιῆ ... καταβαλεῖν . With this construction the mss. evince a widespread uncertainty, with a strong tendency to omit the very un-Greek ποιῆ , while changing inf. καταβαλεῖν into a finite form. Scott cites also the following:

iii.9 ἰδοὺ ποιήσω αὐτοῖς ἵνα  
ἤξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ...<sup>2</sup>

xiii.12 καὶ ποιῆ ... ἵνα προσκυνήσουσιν

(vs. 15) καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι ...  
καὶ ποιήσῃ ἵνα ...  
προσκυνήσωσιν <sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Op.cit., p.10; but cf. LSJ, s.v. ποιέω A.Π. 1b.

<sup>2</sup>Mussies, p.321, notes that ἵνα plus subjunctive/fut. indic. could reflect the semitic causative sense as could the infin. when following ποιεῖν.

<sup>3</sup>Mussies, loc. cit., argues that the seemingly synonymous construction of δίδωμι plus inf. etc., really means 'permit, allow', rather than 'cause', thus not expressing a true causative sense (here also he should place xii.17 δύνηται ἀγοράσαι ἢ πωλῆσαι , which means 'no one able (permitted) to buy or to sell').

(vs. 16) καὶ ποιεῖ ...  
ἵνα δώσιν ...

xvi.6 αὐτοῖς δέδωκας πιεῖν  
(but the verb here is not  
intransitive).

We thus see here a demonstration of how the modes of translating Semitic hiphil causatives into Greek, plainly documented in the LXX and other Greek versions of the OT, have made their way into the language of the Apc., especially in the analytic form, by which a Semitic causative stem verb is rendered by use of the verb ποιεῖν plus main verb, which is often (not always) intransitive, and which occurs as an infinitive or aor. subj./fut. indic. It may be worthy of note when considering the possibilities of Semitic substrates underlying portions of the Apc. that the exx. cited here are grouped for the most in vs. 13-16 of ch. xiii.

Along similar lines we note that the auxiliary use of the verb as discussed by Black, Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, p.125f., which is based again on Semitic usage, occurs also in the Apc.: xvi.1 Ἔπαγετε καὶ ἐκχέετε τὰς ἑπτὰ φιάλας 'go and empty the seven bowls'; cf. verse 2 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην. J. Jeremias in his Abendmahls Worte Jesu<sup>2</sup> pp. 88ff. (cited by Black, loc. cit.) cites also Apc. viii.5 καὶ εἴληφεν ὁ ἄγγελος τὸν

λιβανωτὸν καὶ ἐγέμισεν αὐτόν 'The angel took and emptied the censer'.

PASSIVE OF ΘΑΥΜΑΖΕΙΝ

Several commentators<sup>1</sup> have called attention to the strange use of passive forms ἔθαυμάσθη (- μασεν PQ minusc.) in Apc. xiii.3 and θαυμασθήσονται (AP 1611 syr<sup>ph</sup>: θαυμασονται Koine) in xvii.8. Grimm-Thayer's New Testament Greek Lexicon would make these occurrences in the Apc. middle; the construction is 'neither Greek nor Hebrew', remarked H. Gunkel! That the Seer himself knew the proper use of the active form of the verb is evident from verses 6 and 7 of chapter xvii, where the active form occurs twice. One must therefore seek some external influence which led the Seer, deliberately or otherwise, to employ passive forms just in these two passages.

According to H. St. J. Thackeray, a tendency of the Greek language during Hellenistic times was for many deponent verbs, particularly those expressing emotion, to adopt the aorist passive suffix - θην in place of the aorist middle. A further stage of this development included the substitution

---

<sup>1</sup>Bousset, p.162; Allo, p.206; Charles, I, 350f.

of the passive for the old middle futures<sup>1</sup>. On the analogy of this trend, he would account for the deponent use of the aorist passive and future passive forms in Apc. xiii.3 and xvii.8, respectively.

Turning to the biblical literature, we find that

θαυμάζειν occurs a number of times in the LXX, where it translates a variety of Hebrew verbs. Thackeray<sup>2</sup> observed that ' ἔθαυμάσθην , θαυμασθήσομαι in LXX are used passively (in class. sense), not as deponents, as in the Apocalypse'. An examination of the other occurrences of θαυμάζειν in the LXX suggests a possible exception to that cited by Thackeray; Isa. lxi.6 ἐν τῷ

πλούτῳ αὐτῶν θαυμασθήσεσθε 'and you shall glory in their riches' (MT וַבְּכֹבֶדוֹ וּבִגְבוּרָתוֹ ). The significance of this passage lies in the fact that the passive θαυμασθήσεσθε renders an underlying hithpael verb<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>H. St. J. Thackeray, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge, 1909), I, 238f. Kühner-Blass, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache (Hannover, 1890) I, §324 contains a list of some 55 verbs which had already in class. Greek expressed deponents with passive forms; cf. Bl-D §78. Against Blass (followed by W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, s.v. θαυμάζω 2) who urges that θαυμάζειν was among that class of deponents preferring aorist forms; textual evidence indicates that the active ἔθαύμασα was preferred by later copyists.

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., p.240, n.1.

<sup>3</sup>The underlying Hebrew root, גָּלַח or גָּלַח (probably the latter, cf. BDB Hebrew & English Lexicon, s.v. גָּלַח , p.56 b) means 'act proudly'.

The explanation for the passive forms, which are to be construed as true passives, is to be found in the conjecture developed elsewhere in this thesis<sup>1</sup> that the verbs are to be understood as meaning 'be desolated', a sense expressed by the underlying Hebrew  $\square \aleph \psi$ <sup>2</sup>. Thus Apc. xiii.3 I would translate 'the whole world was devastated by ('in the wake of'?) the beast', and xvii.8 'those who inhabit the earth shall be devastated'.

PASSIVE USE OF ΜΝΗΣΘΗΝΑΙ<sup>3</sup>

Charles<sup>4</sup> draws attention to the passive use of  $\mu\eta\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$  in Apc. xvi.19  $\kappa\alpha\iota \beta\alpha\beta\upsilon\lambda\omega\acute{\nu} \eta \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta \acute{\epsilon}\mu\eta\sigma\theta\eta \acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\omega}\pi\tau\iota\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\grave{\iota}$  'and Babylon the great was remembered before God to give to her ...' (as opposed to the idiomatic RSV rendering 'and God remembered'). This verb obviously fits into the class termed 'theological passives' by M. Zerwick<sup>5</sup> which are employed in order to avoid directly naming God as agent. That this construction

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. supra, Greek Verbs with Hebrew Meanings.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. BDB, op. cit., s.v.  $\square \aleph \psi$

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Bl-D §313; Moulton-Turner Gramm. III, 58.

<sup>4</sup>II, 52.

<sup>5</sup>M. Zerwick, Biblical Greek (Rome, 1963), §236.

is used widely throughout the NT, with a variety of verbs, he demonstrates from the beatitudes: Matt. v.5ff. 'they shall be comforted', 'they shall be filled', 'they shall be called', etc. J. Jeremias<sup>1</sup> considered this construction in the gospels as an Aramaism which is found frequently in the discourses, thus perhaps serving to indicate the ipsissima verba of Jesus. The same verb which occurs in Apc. xvi.19 is also found, with identical meaning, in Acts x.31, where Peter declared to Cornelius εἰσηκούσθη σου

προσευχῆ καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἐμνήσθησαν ἐνώπιον

τοῦ θεοῦ 'your prayer was heard and your charities remembered before God'. It could be argued that this particular use of the passive voice as an indirect reference to God has no special Semitic flavour were it not for obvious OT antecedents employing an identical construction, as noted by Charles: Ezek. iii.20 οὐ μὴ μνησθῶσιν αἱ

δικαιοσύναι αὐτοῦ 'his righteous deeds will not be remembered'; cf. xviii.24. In both places the Greek passive translates a Hebrew 3rd person plural niph'al

נִפְּלָגָה. This is no doubt a case of Hebrew influence on the voice of the verb, since such usage is neither classical, nor is it found in the papyri<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Festschrift Wikenhauser, p.93 (cited by Zerwick).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Moulton-Turner III, 58.

Summary of Chapter III Part A

In drawing this chapter to a close we summarise our findings, noting first that while the pioneering work of Rydbeck shows the impersonal 3rd person plural construction in Hellenistic Greek to be more widespread than previously assumed, still it cannot account for the greatly expanded use of it in Greek documents under direct Aramaic influence. Thus the occurrence of the 3rd person plural, to avoid naming God, also is found in the Apc. We argued also that the two occurrences of intransitive εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in the Apc. express a causative sense, based on the Hebrew piel and hiphil stem verbs. The Semitic custom of employing an auxiliary verb has probably left its mark on the Apc. in those places where we read such constructions as 'go and pour out', 'take and pour out'. Regarding the long standing puzzle of passive forms of θαυμάζειν with active sense in the Apc. we have cited new evidence showing them not to be merely deponent preferring the aorist passive endings, but rather to express the Hebrew sense 'devastate'. Finally, the passive μνησθῆναι was presented as a member of that group of 'theological passives' used to avoid naming God. This is due to the influence of Hebrew niph'al.

PART B. MOOD

DELIBERATIVE USE OF THE PRESENT INDICATIVE<sup>1</sup>

The deliberative question is one expressing doubt or perplexity, in which a person asks what is to be done, rather than simply what will happen. Such questions may be real, asking for information, or simply rhetorical, taking the place of a direct assertion. Classical examples include  $\pi\omicron\varsigma \kappa\omicron\rho\epsilon\nu\theta\omega$  ; 'whither shall I go?',  $\epsilon\lambda\kappa\omega \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha$  ; 'shall I say this?',  $\tau\acute{\iota} \pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omega$  ; 'what shall I undergo?' In common Greek usage, the deliberation is expressed by the verb in the subjunctive mood, chiefly in the first person<sup>2</sup>. Occasionally also in classical Greek the deliberative is expressed by the indicative mood, but then always in the future tense<sup>3</sup>. In the NT the deliberative is most often expressed in the subjunctive, but with several occurrences of the future indicative<sup>4</sup>. In addition to the 1st person, the 2nd and 3rd person forms of the deliberative

---

<sup>1</sup>Schwyzler, II, 318; Bl-D §366; Mandilaras, §§397-99.

<sup>2</sup>Jannaris, p.466.

<sup>3</sup>Bl-D §366 cite Euripides, Ion. 758  $\epsilon\lambda\kappa\omega\mu\epsilon\nu \ \eta \sigma\iota\gamma\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$  ;  $\eta \ \tau\acute{\iota} \ \delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$  ; Cf. Moulton-Turner III, 98.

<sup>4</sup>Deliberative subjunctives in the NT include among others Matt. vi.31, xvi.26, Mk. xii.14, Lk. xiv.34, xvi.11f. Deliberative futures include Mk. vi.37, Lk. xi.5, xxii.49, Jn. vi.68, Rom. iii.5.

are found in the NT. Conybeare & Stock<sup>1</sup> note that in biblical Greek, questions of deliberation are sometimes expressed in the non-classical present indicative ('very rarely' Bl-D) instead of the accepted Greek subjunctive or future indicative. The corresponding Latin present indicative is pointed out, quid ago?; any case for Latin influence on biblical Greek at this point is weakened however by occurrences of the same type in the LXX. Examples in the NT of the present indicative are found only in John xi.47

τί ποιῶμεν ; possibly I John iii.17 πῶς ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ μένει (- εἶ. preferred by Bl-D §366 (4) ) ἐν αὐτῷ . In the Apc. there is also one case, vi.10 ἕως ἄρτι ... οὐ κρίνετε (altered to future κρίνετε in 1854 2046 598) καὶ ἐκδικεῖς ( εκδικησεῖς 2321).

This strange usage is found by Conybeare & Stock in the LXX in Gen. xxxvii.30 ἐγὼ δὲ ποῦ πορεύομαι ἔτι ;

'but I, where shall I go?' Note also the following: Gen. xliv.16 τί ἀντιροῦμεν τῷ κυρίῳ ; 'what shall we say to the Lord?'; Judg. xviii.18 τί ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε ; 'what are you going to do?'.<sup>2</sup>

A plausible explanation for this un-Greek use of the present indicative is that in the Hebrew underlying two of

---

<sup>1</sup>§73.

<sup>2</sup>This use of the deliberative present indic. was designated by Millar Burrows as 'one of the characteristic idioms of the LXX', in JBL xlix (1930), 105. Of course the true Greek form of the deliberative appears often in the LXX as



Hebrew participle, the Greek present served<sup>1</sup>. There are of course exceptions to the general pattern traced here, which prevent the formation of an absolute rule. Yet this basic pattern played a vital role in the phenomenon of biblical Greek<sup>2</sup>.

Other deliberative questions in the Apc. are expressed by δύνασθαι in the 2nd and 3rd persons, followed by an infinitive: vi.17 and xiii.4 (cf. Matt. xii.34)<sup>3</sup>. This use of the infinitive has a partial parallel in the papyri however, where in one case an indirect question of deliberation is expressed by τί ποιῆσθαι ; (PSI IV, 368, 26)<sup>4</sup>.

---

The Greek Chronicles. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum XXV (Leiden, 1974), I, 42.

<sup>1</sup>For an example of the deliberative question in the aorist tense, cf. Gen. xxvi. 10 τί τοῦτο ἐποίησας ἡμῖν ; 'What is this you have done to us?' from a Hebrew perfect.

<sup>2</sup>For a more comprehensive presentation of the Greek equivalents of Hebrew tenses, cf. section C, Tenses of the Finite Verb, infra.

<sup>3</sup>B1-D §366.

<sup>4</sup>Ed. Mayser, Gramm. II, 2, 1; 236.

AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE REPLACED BY  
FUTURE INDICATIVE FOLLOWING 'INA<sup>1</sup>

It is a well-known fact that in NT Greek there is apparent confusion between the aorist subjunctive and the future indicative, especially following ἵνα. Most of these are in the Apc., and perhaps the best known example is xxii.14 μακάριοι οἱ πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν ἵνα ἔσται ἡ ἐξουσία<sup>2</sup>. B1-D list examples from other parts of the NT (§369), plus extensive literature on the matter. The reason usually put forward for this phenomenon is the Hellenistic tendency to blur the distinction between the future indicative and aorist subjunctive suffixes. It is thus widely assumed that in the NT as well as in Hellenistic Greek at large the future indicative has been introduced in those very places where it would not have been tolerated in classical times.

Since the LXX contains some of the earliest examples of ἵνα plus future indicative<sup>3</sup> it is worthwhile to inves-

---

<sup>1</sup>Conybeare & Stock §106; B1-D §369 (2); Mandilaras §413; Mussies, 322.

<sup>2</sup>Occurrences in the Apc. cited by Mussies are ii.22, 25, iii.9, iv.9f., vi.4, 11, viii.3, ix.4, 5, 20, xiii.12, xiv.13, xv.4, xviii.14. Since manuscript evidence can be cited for additional examples, Mussies rightly suggests that the number of futures indic. in the Apc. was originally higher, the aorists subjunctive lower. Scribal alterations account for the changed ratio.

<sup>3</sup>Conybeare & Stock, loc. cit.

tigate the possibility of Semitic influence behind this strange preference for the future indic. Examination of the Hebrew text underlying ten occurrences of  $\Upsilon\upsilon\alpha$  plus future indicative revealed that in each case the Hebrew imperfect was being translated mechanically by Greek future indic.<sup>1</sup>

It seems most satisfactory, on the evidence presented from the LXX, to conjecture that where in the Apc. the future indicative follows  $\Upsilon\upsilon\alpha$  it reflects a Hebrew imperfect tense verb<sup>2</sup>. Alongside this of course we allow for the fact that in some places the Hellenistic blurring of subjunctive and indicative forms influenced certain copyists. Unfortunately there is no reliable method for distinguishing one from the other.

---

<sup>1</sup>Passages examined are: Gen. xvi.2, Ex. i.11, Deut. xiv.28, xxii.7 (cf. verse 17), III Km ii.3, 4, II Chr. xviii.15, Prov. vi.30, ix.6, Jer. x.24, xxix.11, Lam. i.19.

<sup>2</sup>Mussies, p.322 explains this phenomenon in similar terms. He noted that since the Semitic verb system lacked a special subjunctive category, the imperfect tense came to bear, during later periods of the Hebrew language (i.e. 1st cent. A.D.) the value of a Greek subjunctive. Admittedly, this category was infrequent in the Hebrew/Aramaic of 1st century Palestine. Had Mussies not insisted that the Seer was influenced only by late Hebrew, he would have seen the clear influence of earlier Hebrew at this point.

MODAL USE OF THE FUTURE INDICATIVE

FOR HEBREW JUSSIVE

Mussies notes that the Semitic verb system lacked not only a special subjunctive category, but a 3rd person imperative as well<sup>1</sup>. Therefore the Semitic imperfect tense has a jussive aspect which can be equated with the Greek 3rd person imperative. He expects that certain future indicative verbs in the Apc. betray an incidental jussive or imperatival colour<sup>2</sup>, and cites the following instances: iv.9f.<sup>3</sup>, ix.4, xix.7, xxii.18, 19. His point seems to be weakened however by the fact that all the above except xix.7 (which, he notes, is in the 1st person) are best understood as indirect, therefore taking the form of requests rather than commands. This would seem not to reflect any influence of the Semitic jussive use of the verb. While in the LXX and in the NT the hortatory is usually expressed by the subjunctive, cases can be cited for the employment of the future indicative on the model of the Hebrew cohortative imperfect: Gen. xviii.21 καταβάς οὖν ἔψομαι

---

<sup>1</sup>p.322f.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., cf. Lancellotti, 69ff.; B1-D §§362, 365.

<sup>3</sup>καὶ ὅταν δώσουσιν... περουνται...καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν  
... καὶ βαλοῦσιν . But this passage seems to fit the indicative instead of jussive sense, perhaps in a past tense, as suggested by Nigel Turner in Moulton-Turner Gramm. III, 86.

( ΠΝ?ΝΙ ); cf. Ps. lix.9 τὸ κράτος μου πρὸς  
 σὲ φυλάξω ( ΠΝ?ΝΙ ΠΝ?ΝΙ ΠΝ?ΝΙ ).

Perhaps this best explains the future indic. δώσομεν in  
 Apoc. xix.7: [χαίρωμεν (-ομεν 2019 2022 180 2053 a1) καὶ  
 ἑγαλλιάωμεν (-μεθα 2048 808 Syr<sup>ph</sup>)] καὶ δώσομεν (N<sup>a</sup> A  
 2042 2067 2055 a1) ['Let us rejoice and exalt]and give Him  
 glory' which stand in place of the Greek hortatory sub-  
 junctive<sup>1</sup>. This is likely Semitic influence, because it  
 corresponds to the Hebrew lengthened imperfect expressing  
 the sense of the cohortative<sup>2</sup>.

Summary of Chapter III Part B.

In this section we noted how the deliberative question  
 is cast in the present indicative instead of the customary  
 subjunctive mood under influence from the Hebrew participle,  
 which is used often for deliberate questions in the OT,  
 since the Greek present indicative served as a formal trans-  
 lation equivalent for Semitic participles. Where in  
 biblical Greek the deliberative question is stated by a  
 future indicative verb, this can be traced to an underlying  
 Hebrew imperfect tense.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lk. ii.15 Διέλθωμεν δὴ ... καὶ ἕδωμεν  
 which is the usual Greek hortatory construction.

<sup>2</sup>GK §48.

Concerning the substitution of future indic. for aorist subjunctive, we noted how in the Apc. and elsewhere this can be explained as due to the tendency to translate Hebrew imperfect by Greek future indic. The related use of future indicative for the Semitic jussive while well-attested elsewhere in the NT does not seem to enjoy much use in the Apc. The cohortative however does appear.

### PART C. TENSES OF THE FINITE VERB

#### Introduction

The task of determining the nature of Semitic influence upon Greek verb tenses seems at first to yield results less convincing than in other areas. C.F.D. Moule, who takes a generally cautious view towards alleged Semitisms in NT Greek, is sceptical; 'most possible Semitisms of tense seem to me to be too uncertain to be profitably discussed'<sup>1</sup>. Semitic scholars on the other hand have been more confident. They realise perhaps more fully than others how striking is the difference between Semitic and Greek languages in the matter of tenses<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Idiom Book of New Testament Greek<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge, 1963), 181.

<sup>2</sup>For discussion of this distinction, cf. Lancellotti, chapter I; Mussies, chapter 12; Charles, I, cxxiiiiff. who devotes several paragraphs to the topic under consideration.

FUTURISTIC USE OF THE GREEK PRESENT INDICATIVE

A point of biblical Greek grammar not yet adequately explained by grammarians is the strange yet obvious futuristic sense expressed by certain present indic. Greek verbs. Speaking of the classical period, Eduard Schwyzer remarks that the futuristic use of the present indic. is 'infrequent, and bound to specific conditions'<sup>1</sup>, while N. Turner in Moulton-Turner Grammar, 63f. notes that the pres. indic. sometimes occurs in the New Testament referring to an obviously future event; he quotes Moulton's Einleitung, p.196, suggesting that these presents differed from the future tense 'mainly in the tone of assurance which is imparted'. They express a note of confidence in the approaching event. Turner himself noted the (rare) futuristic present in classical Greek in a prophetic sense which corresponds to the frequent New Testament references to the Coming One with the verb ἔρχομαι . In a prophetic sense which corresponds to the references to oracles other verbs in secular Greek are thus used. Blass-Debrunner<sup>2</sup> give limited recognition to the presence of futuristic pres. indic. verbs in the NT, especially in prophecies (again, with ἔρχομαι ), and

---

<sup>1</sup>Griechische Grammatik II, 273.

<sup>2</sup>B1-D, §323; cf. E. DeW. Burton, New Testament Moods and Tenses<sup>2</sup> (Edinburgh, 1894), 9f., who cites examples in Mark ix.31 παραδίδοται ; Matt. xxvi.18 ποιῶ ; xxvii.63 ἐγείρομαι ; Luke iii.9 ἐκκόπεται .

also verbs of coming/going. This latter category is the only one widely-employed in class. Greek, and takes its sense from the fact that ἐλεύσομαι is ordinarily not used in Attic prose, its sense being expressed by εἶμι as the future of ἔρχομαι.<sup>1</sup>

In Greek literature of the Hellenistic period, L. Radermacher<sup>2</sup> cites as futuristic the verbs βαπτίζω φέρω, ὑπόκειμαι, πείθω, and ἔρχομαι. Jannaris<sup>3</sup> observes that the pres. indic. in animated speech is often used for the future, especially in post-class. and NT Greek. He cites numerous examples, mostly from NT and other Christian literature; however, in his Appendix IV which treats the fut. indic. since Attic times, several secular exx. are cited.

The state of the futuristic pres. indic. in the Greek non-literary papyri was described by Edwin Mayser in his Grammatik; with a measure of caution he cites the possible (but not always certain) occurrences from a few of the papyri<sup>4</sup>. For expanded treatment of this category we now have the newly-published work of B. Mandilaras<sup>5</sup>, who cites a total of 28 exx.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. W.W. Goodwin, A Greek Grammar (London, 1897), §200, n.3.

<sup>2</sup>Neutestamentliche Grammatik<sup>2</sup> (Tübingen, 1925), 152.

<sup>3</sup>A.N. Jannaris, An Historical Greek Grammar (London, 1897), 434.

<sup>4</sup>Gramm. d. Griech. Papyri (Berlin, 1926), II.1. 133f.

<sup>5</sup>The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri (Athens, 1973), §214ff.

from the papyri examined by him, grouped in the following categories:

- a) those giving temporal indication of future time;
- b) those with verbs of coming/going;
- c) the present as apodosis in conditional sentences;
- d) in prophecies, here found particularly in questions to oracles.

Aside from a remarkable passage illustrating this last category, from P. Oxy, 1477, dating from c. 300 A.D., and containing a mixture of pres. and fut. tense verbs, with mostly future sense, the futuristic pres. indic. in the papyri seems to occur with no greater frequency than in the class. period. Certainly there is no expanded use of the tense in the period which produced the bulk of the papyri.

These occurrences, plus those cited earlier, clearly illustrate two facts; first, that the futuristic use of the pres. was in use during the Hellenistic era, and second, that the widely-scattered examples of it in secular literature do not compare at all in frequency with the multitude of exx. to be found in biblical and other Jewish translation Greek.

For the sake of illustration, a few exx. are cited here to demonstrate the widened use of the Greek pres. with future sense; Gen. xli.25 καὶ εἶπεν Ἰωσήφ τῷ Φαραῶ

Τὸ ἐνύπνιον Φαραω ἓν ἔστιν ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ποιεῖ ἔδειξεν

'Joseph said to Pharaoh, the dream of Pharaoh is one; God has shown ... what He will do.' The case often cited by grammarians is Mark ix.31 παραδίδοται (periphrastic future in the Matt. parallel) followed by the future

ἀποκτενοῦσιν . From Theodotion's version of Daniel comes an example, influenced by the Hebrew portion of the underlying MT; x.11 σύνεε ἐν τοῖς λόγοις οἷς ἐγὼ λαλῶ σέ 'attend to the words I shall speak to you'. Exx. could be multiplied, testifying to the relative frequency of the futuristic pres. indic. in biblical and Jewish translation Greek in contrast to occasional appearances of it in secular literature of the period.

This preponderance of the construction leads one to examine the Semitic antecedents of such Greek to determine a cause for this over-worked usage. In Hebrew and Aramaic the expression of future events certain to occur ('prophetic' futures) was often made by use of the participle which represents the event as already beginning; the name of futurum instans is applied to this use of the participle when it asserts future events, especially divine acts<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>S.R. Driver, Hebrew Tenses<sup>3</sup> (Oxford, 1892), 169. For a description of the use of the partic. in Bibl. Aramaic cf. A.F. Johns, A Short Gramm. of Biblical Aramaic (Berrien Springs, Michigan, 1966), 25, and H. Bauer & P. Leander, Gramm. des bibl.-Aramäischen (Halle/Saale, 1927), 29ff., who note that while the futuristic use of the partic. is not so common in Bibl. Aram., it comes to predominate by the time of Jewish-Palestinian Aram., where it tends to replace the futuristic impf. W.B. Stevenson, Gramm. of Pal. Jewish Aramaic<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1962), 56f., can also be consulted for discussion of this use of the participle.

In this role the partic. usually stands as the predicate of a noun clause; it is frequently found thus when expressing deliberative questions, as well as future actions<sup>1</sup>.

A selection of these participles from the OT which has been compiled<sup>2</sup> and compared with the rendering of each in the LXX (including Dan. Theod.) reveals the following facts: of a total of 54 exx., 38 were rendered by Greek pres. indic. while the future indic. was employed in only 13 cases, giving the following percentages:

Greek present indic.	70% of cases
Greek future indic.	24% of cases.

Of course the translators did not limit the futuristic present to the category represented by the Semitic prophetic participle; and exceptions can be found. But in spite of these, the over-working of an acceptable Greek usage permits us to look to Semitic influence on the Greek composers and translators as the explanation for this construction.

Further LXX examples include the following: Gen. vi.17

ἐγὼ δὲ ἰδοὺ ἐπάγω 'and I, behold, I will bring';

xix.13 ὅτι ἀπόλλυμεν ἡμεῖς 'about to destroy'; I Sam.

iii.11 ποιῶ 'shall do'; I Ki. xiii.2f. γίνεται

---

<sup>1</sup>G-K §116p.

<sup>2</sup>Strictly speaking, futurum instans is employed only by grammarians in describing Bibl. Hebrew. However, since the corresponding Aram. participle can express identical future sense, we follow C.F. Burney, Aramaic Origins, 94 in extending the use of the term to include Aramaic as well.

'shall be born'; cf. II Ki. xxii.20, Isa. xiii.17, xxvi.21, Mic. i.3, Zech. iii.8.

These are but a sampling of the many occurrences which could be cited. It is noteworthy that all are more or less of the category of oracular, or prophetic present tenses; thus some would insist that they can be accounted for along the lines of Greek usage and indeed the Semitic tense of futurum instans plays no role here, but that the frequent usage of this construction in biblical Greek is due merely to an over-working of the Greek construction. If this were the case, we could expect to see a corresponding tendency toward over use in the secular Hellenistic Greek documents. Mayser<sup>1</sup> however cites but few examples from the papyri, and points out that some even of them are disputable, due to the close connection of the adverbs εὐθέως or ταχὺ ( ε ), giving an immediate rather than truly future sense to the verbs in question. The use of this special futuristic sense of the present indicative then in biblical Greek has developed quite independently of Hellenistic literature. In addition to the 'prophetic' occurrences cited supra, there are others of a patently non-prophetic nature, e.g. Deut. i.20 εἰ δέδωκον ὑμῖν 'shall give to you'; Dan. vii.19 (Theod.) καὶ εἶπεν 'Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ γνωρίζω σοι 'and he said I shall make known to you'.

---

<sup>1</sup>Op. cit., 133f.

C.F. Burney was among the first to apply the Semitic partic. of futurum instans in explaining futuristic pres. verbs in the NT. In his Aramaic Origin 94f. he explains the futuristic ἔρχομαι found often in the fourth Gospel as due to Aramaic influence of this nature, and notes that in a majority of cases where the futuristic ἔρχομαι occurs, the Peshitta represents it by a participle. Burney appended a list of exx. of the futuristic pres. in the Apoc. also, but the passages listed were limited to those containing the verb ἔρχομαι. Thus, while being the first to point to the Semitic construction behind these verbs, he did not make his case sufficiently strong, since as noted supra the verb ἔρχομαι with futuristic sense can be explained solely on Greek grounds. In order to demonstrate the case made for Semitic influence at this point on the Apoc. it is necessary to find verbs other than ἔρχομαι with futuristic sense.

Black recognised the existence of futuristic pres. indic. verbs outside of ἔρχομαι in the Gospels which show the influence of the Aramaic participle<sup>1</sup>.

In the Apoc. these pres. verbs fall into two categories, those in which the verb is preceded by ἰδοῦ, and those without it. Exx. of the former include ii.22 ἰδοῦ βάλλω (βαλλω  $\lambda^a$  046 P325 al) αὐτήν εἰς κλίβανον 'behold,

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 131f.

I shall cast her into a bed'<sup>1</sup>. Charles notes that βάλλω 'represents a participle in the Hebrew which can refer to the future, the present, or the past, according to context. Since it is parallel here with ἀποκτενῶ in verse 23a it refers, of course, to the future'<sup>2</sup>. Also noteworthy here is the fact mentioned supra that the introductory

ἰδοῦ precedes the Greek rendering of a Semitic partic. of futurum instans; on this point S.R. Driver observed, 'when applied to the future, the Hebrew participle is very frequently strengthened by an introductory ׀ ׀ ׀ '<sup>3</sup>. Hebrew exx. of this are too frequent to require illustration here, and their Greek equivalent, ἰδοῦ plus pres. verb appears a number of times in the Apoc. in addition to the clear case cited. Further occurrences follow; iii.9

ἰδοῦ δίδωμι (future in boh ethio latt); ii.16  
 ἴδε (88) εἰ δὲ μῆ, ἔρχομαι ... καὶ πολεμήσω ;  
 iii.11 Ἰδοῦ (- Ἰδου CAP 046 minusc) ἔρχομαι ταχύ ;

---

<sup>1</sup>Knowing that the text of the NT often underwent scribal revising and correction, and that this work was not carried out with consistency, even within the compass of single mss. (on this see Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 28-34), it is necessary to base a study of syntax on as wide a textual base as possible, to allow for the uneven revision of mss., and to aid in detecting more primitive readings. This comprehensive textual foundation has been provided for the Apoc. by H.C. Hoskier's Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse, 2 vols. (London, 1929), which provides a collation of all Apoc. Greek mss. known at the time, plus the testimony of the versions and partistic commentaries. To his apparatus criticus this study is indebted for practically all Greek ms. citations.

<sup>2</sup>Charles I, 71.

<sup>3</sup>Driver, op. cit., 168.

ix.12 ἰδοὺ ἔρχονται ;<sup>1</sup> xvi.15 ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι  
 xxi.5 ἰδοὺ καινὰ ποιῶ ( ποιήσω 522 copt)

In this passage we see a literal rendering of a Hebrew expression from Isa. xliii.19  $\text{׀} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃} \text{ׄ} \text{ׅ} \text{׆} \text{ׇ} \text{׈} \text{׉} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$

for which the LXX gives 'Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ποιῶ καινὰ ;

cf. Isa. lxxv.17  $\text{אָרְבָּבַיִן} \text{׀} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$  . In both places the Hebrew partic. occurs with future sense.

Thus, while recognising that the pres. ἔρχομαι alone has no special Semitic flavour, even when its sense is future, we have demonstrated that when preceded by ἰδοὺ the resulting bibl. Greek construction can represent the literal rendering of Hebrew  $\text{׀} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$  plus partic.

The second category of futuristic present verbs in Apoc. includes those not preceded by ἰδοὺ , and those not expressing coming/going, thus less explicable from Greek lines. Exx. follow:

Apoc. i.11 ὃ βλέπεις ( βλέψεις 2200)

γράψον εἰς βιβλίον 'write what you shall see in

a book'. The future sense of this verb led the copyists of a single extant minuscule to alter the tense to fut.; there is Coptic evidence, however, which shows the temptation to read a fut. here was more widespread; 'shall hear'

<sup>1</sup>Lancellotti notes this corresponds to Hebr. qotel preceded by  $\text{׀} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the expression common in Jeremiah:  $\text{׀} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$   
 ...  $\text{׀} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ} \text{׃}$ .

(for 'see') (boh); 'which you see and shall see (sah). Further exx. include ii.27; iii.5, 7, 9; v.10 (A 046); vii.15, 17 (82 91 al); ix.6<sup>1</sup>; xi.5, 9, (N CA), 10<sup>2</sup> 15; (325 al); xiii.10<sup>3</sup>; xiv.9, 10, 11; xvii.12, xvii.11; xix.3, 11<sup>4</sup>, xxii.5<sup>5</sup>.

Charles was one of the first to seriously consider the future sense of certain pres. verbs in the Apoc. as due to Semitic influence; in fact, he devoted a section of his Short Grammar of the Apocalypse to discussing the phenomenon, but he ascribed it to the Hebr. imperfect tense rather than to the partic. of futurum instans<sup>6</sup>. Strangely,

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles I, cxlix, prefers to render this pres. as a future, ascribing it however, to influence of Hebr. imperfect rather than partic.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Simcox, Revelation, 121, who notes that most of these presents are rendered as fut. in Latin.

<sup>3</sup>This pres. is 'clearly jussive' according to G. Mussies, Morphology, of Koine Greek, 337; but we would prefer to see some precedent, from the LXX or other translation Greek, of Semitic jussives rendered by Greek pres. indic. before accepting his explanation of this verb. In a brief examination of the LXX rendering of 18 Hebr. jussives, 8 were expressed by the Greek future (- εἶσθαι 3 times), 4 by subjunctives, 5 by imperatives, 1 by aorist indic. In none was the pres. indic. employed; thus, we prefer to understand Apoc. xiii.10 as a futuristic pres. indic.

<sup>4</sup>Charles II, 131, compares here Isa. xi.3, where the sense is obviously future; thus the verbs in Apoc. can well be taken as futures also.

<sup>5</sup>Charles II, 210, 'The fut. εἶδουσιν (A vg minusc) is to be preferred to εἶχουσιν. All verbs in this description of the New Jerusalem are futures'. This might however be a case of shifting tenses, a characteristic of the Apoc. based perhaps on the Hebr. tendency to alternate

Charles also recognised the future sense of certain pres. verbs under influence of the Semitic partic., but mentioned it only in a brief note (cf. Charles I, 71) and did not develop it in his Grammar.

Angelo Lancellotti in his monograph on Hebraic influence on verbs in the Apoc. follows Charles in attributing the futuristic pres. to Hebr. imperfect, taken with future sense, and adds the following examples:<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xxii.5; xiv.11; xi.5, 9; ix.6; xvii.12, 13, 16. Unlike Charles, Lancellotti gives no consideration at this point to the influence of the Hebr. partic. on the verbs in the Apoc. outside the group preceded by *לִדְבַר*. Nor does he support his position by illustrations from the LXX; in fact, the single passage of bibl. Greek outside the Apoc. which he cites is Isa. xxiv.10 LXX<sup>2</sup>, which renders Hebr. imperfect by a future, not present, tense. Thus nothing is demonstrated; yet he can still argue thus:<sup>3</sup>

---

between partic. and finite verb. The present is the more difficult reading.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., I, cxxiii.

<sup>1</sup>Sintassi, 67ff.

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., 68.

<sup>3</sup>Op. cit., 67.

Now, since the *yiqtol*, having itself the 'durative' value of the present and the past, corresponds in Greek to the present stem, the author of the Apocalypse, influenced by Hebraic syntactical categories, displays not infrequently the tendency to employ the present for the future ...

G. Mussies, in the final chapter of his recent work on the morphology of the Apoc. ventures into a discussion of 'The Use of the Verb in the Apocalypse'. Earlier in the book he proposed that the Semitic substrate of the language of the Apoc. was limited to the form of Hebr. and Aramaic current in Palestine during the first Christian century; namely, Mishnaic Hebrew and the Aramaic dialect represented by the Palestinian Pentateuch Targum<sup>1</sup>. Although Mussies admits that bibl. Hebr. also had its influence on the author of the Apoc., he makes little allowance for it. A more balanced view would certainly consider the influence of spoken Semitic vernacular, but it of necessity would not overlook the influence of Hebrew/Aramaic of the OT and pseudepigrapha, since it was primarily to this literature, more than to later material, that the Seer made reference. In its repeated allusions to OT passages and in its general idiom, the Apoc. shares in the full, flowing style found in classical Hebrew prophets, while on the other hand it displays none of the terse, highly-compressed and sometimes abbreviated style so characteristic of Mishnaic language.

---

<sup>1</sup>Morphology, 312ff.

Mussies numbers 39 occurrences of the future pres. indic., including five where he would expect future subjunctive (xi.5; xiv.4, 9 twice, 11 - all from codex A), as compared with our own total of 33. He neglects listing the references, however, so the two lists cannot be compared.

Since neither Mussies nor his predecessors gave convincing demonstration from the LXX or other translation Greek to establish that there was a pattern for translating futuristic Semitic imperfects by Greek present indic., we prefer to accept instead the explanation demonstrated here that the Semitic participle of futurum instans was the prime influence behind futuristic present verbs in the Apoc.

#### PRESENT TENSE PASSING INTO THE FUTURE TENSE

T.C. Laughlin in his thesis The Solecisms of the Apocalypse<sup>1</sup> followed a suggestion made earlier by G. Ewald<sup>2</sup> that Hebr. influence is responsible for the passages in the Apoc. where pres. and future tenses occur co-ordinately in the same clause or sentence where we should expect the fut. of all verbs. The following exx. are cited:

---

<sup>1</sup>Princeton, New Jersey, 1902.

<sup>2</sup>Commentarius in Apocalypsin, 39.

i.7 ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν καὶ ὄψεται  
αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς 'Behold,  
He shall come with the clouds, and every eye  
shall see Him ...'

ii.5 εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔρχομαι σοὶ καὶ κινήσω τὴν  
λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς '... I  
shall come ... I shall move ...'

ii.22f ἰδοὺ βάλλω ( βαλλω  $\chi^a$  BP  
minusc) αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν κλίην ... καὶ τὰ  
τέκνα αὐτῆς ἀποκτενῶ ἐν θανάτῳ . 'Behold  
I shall cast her ... shall kill ...'

iii.9 ἰδοὺ δίδω ... ἰδοὺ ποιήσω

xvii. 12-14 λαμβάνουσιν ... ἔχουσιν  
... δίδασιν ... πολεμήσουσιν  
... νικήσει (all have future sense).

This passing from pres. to fut. tense is found also in  
the LXX; Zech. ii.13 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπιφέρω τὴν χειρὰ μου  
ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔσονται σκῦλα 'Behold, I will shake  
my hand over them, and they shall become plunder ...';  
cf. vs. 14 δίδωτι ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἔρχομαι καὶ κατασηνώσω

'for behold, I will come and I will dwell ...'.

The explanation for this is closely connected with that of the previous section on futuristic Greek pres. indic., i.e. the Greek renders a Hebr. partic. of futurum instans.

In Zech. ii.13       $\text{קָרַבְתִּי} = \text{ἐπιφέρω}$  ; in ii.14

$\text{בָּרַחְתִּי} = \text{ἐρχομαι}$  <sup>1</sup>. The following Hebr. verb

in each case was a perfect tense, plus waw consecutive, rendered in the LXX by a Greek future tense. Thus further support is given for our hypothesis that most pres. indic. verbs in the Apoc. with future sense are influenced by the Semitic participle of futurum instans.

PRESENT TENSE VERBS WITH PAST OR IMPERFECT SENSE<sup>2</sup>

Under this heading come two divisions under which several passages from the Apoc. will be considered.

Historic Present

First to be considered is the widely-discussed historic present, since it occurs several times in the Apoc. In his thesis G.C. Ozanne referred to several occurrences

---

<sup>1</sup>While this is a general rule, there are exceptions. Cf. e.g. Zech. iii.9 where present  $\text{בָּרַחְתִּי}$  renders Hebr. perf.  $\text{בָּרַח}$ .

<sup>2</sup>Moulton-Howard II, 456f; Moulton-Turner III, 60f; Bl-D §321; Lancellotti 62-66. For LXX exx. cf. Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, 21f.

of the verbs ἔδουσιν , κρίζουσιν as historic (aoristic) presents which reflect 'an essentially Semitic influence'.<sup>1</sup> Most grammarians agree to the contrary however, that the historic present, especially with verbs of saying, proclaiming, etc., was acceptable Greek idiom during the classical period, the time of the papyri, LXX, literary Koine, and Modern Greek, especially in vivid narrative<sup>2</sup>. Thus, 'apart from its over-use in [Mark and John] , there is nothing specially Semitic about the tense', concludes Black<sup>3</sup>.

When verbs in this category are excluded, however, we are left with numerous pres. tense verbs not of the category of saying which have a past sense. While some would prefer to explain them merely as historic presents along Greek lines, it is well to recall the tendency, noted previously, for Semitic authors to employ, when writing Greek, the present tense along the lines of Semitic participles, which can refer to future, present, or past actions. This past sense of a pres. indic. is not unknown in the LXX, as the following exx. indicate:

Gen. xlii.23     αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν ὅτι ἄκουει  
                  'Ἰωσήφ                             .     'they did not know  
                  that Joseph understood them' (Hebr. partic. יָדַעַ).

---

<sup>1</sup>The Influence of the Text and Language of the Old Testament on the Books of Revelation (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Manchester, 1964), 34.

<sup>2</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 60.

<sup>3</sup>Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 130.

Judg. xiv.4     ὅτι ἐκδίκησιν αὐτὸς ζητεῖ

(     εκζητει     A) ἐκ τῶν ἄλλοφύλων

'for he was seeking vengeance against the Philistines [lit. 'foreigners'] (Hebr. partic.  $\psi\grave{\rho}\ \underline{\iota}\chi\grave{\iota}$  ).

2 Km. xii.19     καὶ συνῆκεν Δαυεὶδ ὅτι

καὶ δες αὐτοῦ ψιθυρίζουσιν .     'And David

saw that his servants were whispering ...'

(Hebr. partic.  $\square\ \psi\grave{\rho}\eta\grave{\iota}\eta\chi\grave{\iota}$  ).

Further exx. could be found if time were taken to search them out, but the list given is adequate to demonstrate the existence of a pres. indic. verb with past sense or, more specifically, an imperfect sense, with emphasis sometimes on the duration of the action or state. The Hebr. partic. with past durative sense<sup>1</sup> is obviously responsible for the LXX translation with a present tense verb at these points.

The identical phenomenon occurs in the Apc. The sequence of imperfect and present tenses in ix.9-11 for example, has caught the attention of recent scholars: καὶ εἶχον ...

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Driver, Hebrew Tenses, 166.

καὶ ἔχουσιν ( εἶχον 2020 2067 vq gig) ... ἔχουσιν (2067: εχοντες 2080). Lancellotti, p.59f. observes that Semitic nominal constructions expressing possession often are translated by a form of ἔχω (cf. infra, the section on Noun Clauses). So in this passage the present ἔχουσιν found in a sequence of other tenses of the same verb seems to express the atemporal sense of the Semitic nominal phrase.

Other present tense verbs with past sense include ix.17 ἐκ τῶν στομάτων αὐτῶν ἐκπορεύεται ( ἐξεπορευετο 2020 2080 a1) 'from their mouths was issuing fire'; ix.19 καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς ἀδικοῦσιν ( ἠδικουσιν 2020 2080 a1) 'and by their tails they were stinging'; xiii. 11-17 Καὶ εἶδόν ἄλλο θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἔχει κέρατα δύο ὅμοια ἀρνίῳ καὶ ἐλάλει (present gig) ὡς δράκων ... ποιεῖ ( εποιεῖ 2080 a1) ... καὶ ποιεῖ (BE a1) ... καὶ ποιεῖ ( εποιεῖ E 2016) ... καὶ ποιεῖ ( εποιεῖ 1611). 'Then I beheld another beast arising from the earth, and it had two horns like a lamb, and was speaking like a dragon ... he made ... and he made ... etc. Here we find a mixture of tenses, mostly present but with seemingly little logic employed in their use. Charles notes that the vision begins in the past tense, so he gives a past sense to the following cluster of present tense verbs. The only reasonable explanation is that they here represent a Semitic participle with past sense. Note also Apc. xiv.3 καὶ ἄδουσιν ὡς ψῆν καινήν ...

καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται (2038) μαθεῖν τὴν ψῆδὴν  
'and they sang a new song ... and no one was able to learn  
the song'. xvi.21 καὶ χάλια μεγάλη ὡς ταλαντιαία  
καταβαίνει (κατεβαίνειν 1611) ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
'and hail stones large like talents fell from heaven ...';  
xix.15 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται (εκπορεύετε  
792) ῥομφαία ὀξεῖα (preceded in previous verse by imper-  
fect ἠκολούθει ) 'and from his mouth issued a  
sharp sword'.

A variety of explanations have been put forward by the commentators for this anomalous use of the present tense for past, mostly on stylistic grounds. None have explained it as we have here, by demonstrating its dependence upon the Semitic participle used as a finite verb and expressing past or imperfect action. It cannot be denied that the Greek historic present could be used to express similar sense in Koine Greek, although it was never used on a large scale. But in such a text as the Apc. which is noted for its Semitic constructions, this use of the present tense can be described as yet another point of contact with Semitic sources.

GREEK AORIST INDICATIVE FOR SEMITIC PERFECT VERBS<sup>1</sup>

In the LXX

One finds in the LXX a number of aorist verbs which cannot be made to bear the Greek punctiliar sense; they seem to have the continuing sense of a state, though not that of the gnomic aorist<sup>2</sup> which in class. Greek expresses timeless maxims. Most of the LXX aorists so employed appear to be simple statements of fact, with emphasis on the present. Examination of these occurrences shows that there was a tendency for the LXX translators to render Hebr. perfects by the Greek aorist. From lists of the Hebr. perfect (with either present or future sense) given by Driver Hebrew Tenses and GK, a selection of 95 occurrences were examined, and the Greek rendering of each studied in context to ascertain that the sense was identical with the Hebrew passage from which it derived. The following list presents relative frequencies by which these Hebr. perfects. were rendered into the various Greek tenses:

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. K. Beyer, Semitische Syntax, 86ff.

<sup>2</sup>Concerning the presence of the gnomic aorist in the NT Bl-D §333 note that it appears infrequently, nearly always in comparisons. The same is true for classical Greek.

Greek aorist	45
present	21
future	16
imperfect	2
perfect	7
participles	3
subjunctive	1
	—
Total	95

A surprising 47 per cent were translated by the Greek aorist, while the combined total of the present and future Greek tenses, which would logically express the meaning of a Hebr. stative or prophetic perf., reaches only 39 per cent.

Among the more frequent Hebr. stative perfs. represented by Greek aorists are

ἐμεγαλύνθη	'am great' Ps. xcii.6;
ἐλπισα	'I hope' Ps. vii.2; xxxi.2, 7;
ἐμίσησα	'I hate' Ps. v.6; xxxi.7. Also note:

'I know not'	οὐκ ἔγνων	Gen. xxi.26
'we remember'	ἐμνήσθημεν	Nu. xi.5
'is like'	ὁμοιώθη	Ps. cxliv.4
'is full'	ἐπληρώθη	Ps. civ.24
'rejoices'	ἔσπερεώθη	I Sam. ii:1
'requireth'	ἐξεζήτησεν	Isa. i.12
'wait'	ὑπέμεινεν	Ps. cxxx.5
'delight'	ἐβουλήθη	Ps. xl.12
'abhor'	ἐβδελύξαντο	Job. xxx.10
'stand aloof'	ἐφείσαντο	Job. xxx.10
'abides'	παρασυνεβλήθη	Ps. xlix. 13,20
'am weary'	ἐκοπίασα	Ps. vi.6
'delighteth'	εὐδόκησεν	Isa. xlii.1

The following Hebr. perf. verbs which occur in direct discourse to express actions in process of accomplishment are rendered by Greek aorist: ἵμοσα 'I swear' Jer. xxii.5; συνεβόλευσα 'I counsel' 2 Sam. xvii.11; εἶπον 'I decide' 2 Sam. xix.29; εἶπον 'I declare' Job. ix.22.

The Hebr. prophetic perfect (and related perfectum confidentiae) which has as its primary function the expression of a future event certain to occur, is also rendered in the LXX frequently by a Greek aorist. Driver<sup>1</sup> quotes the Greek grammar of Jelf, §403 to show that the Greek aorist is similarly used, at least in the apodosis, to 'express future events which must certainly happen'; several passages from Plato are cited. Though this appears in class. Greek, yet there is little doubt that the greater frequency of this usage in the LXX is due more to the adoption of the Greek aorist as the equivalent of the Hebr. perf. tense than to any tendency in Greek usage. The biblical Greek grammarians mention no occurrences of the class. 'futuristic' aorist in Hellenistic literature, so appeal cannot be made on this point to a developing tendency in Greek. Yet numerous examples of 'prophetic' aorists are found in the LXX; especially striking is Jer. v.6

ἔπαισεν αὐτοῦ λέων ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ 'a lion from the

---

<sup>1</sup>Hebrew Tenses, 18, n.2, 63. Cf. M. Black 'The Christological Use of the OT in the NT' NTS 18 (1972), 10, n.4 for a NT occurrence.

forest shall slay them' (note also following verbs 'shall destroy', 'is watching', also rendered by Greek aorist); others include:

'shall be full'	ἐνεπλήσθη	Isa. xi.9
'will destroy'	ἔθραυσεν	2 Chr. xx.37
'shall be [exiled]'	ἐγενήθη	Isa. v.13
'shall fall'	ἔπεσεν	Amos v.2
'is laid waste'	ἀπόλετο	Isa. xxiii.1 (cf. vs.14)
'shall speak'	εἶπεν	Isa. xxiii.4
'shall be exiled'	ἠχμαλωτεύθησαν	Mic. i.16 (cf. vss.9,12)

Especially striking are the examples of this Semitic usage of the aorist in Daniel Theod., where extensive passages of discourse and prophetic description call for numerous instances of the Semitic perfect verb forms<sup>1</sup>. Note the following:

---

<sup>1</sup>The translation/revision by Theodotion proves most suitable for this study for two reasons; first, since the LXX of Daniel is periphrastic in nature, and marked by the presence of textual expansions in some cases, it proves difficult to determine the Hebr./Aram. original behind it. Dan. v.14a, for example, is missing in the LXX, though it appears in both the MT and Theodotion. Second, in the more literal version of Theod. there appears to be a text with less literary smoothing than the single 10th/11th cent. A.D. ms. (codex Chisianus) which preserves the LXX text. A brief comparison of the two versions reveals that where Theod. tacks phrases together in Semitized paratactic style, the LXX employs the smoother Greek hypotaxis. The fact that Theod. is dated 2nd cent. A.D., thus making it much too late to have influenced the author of the Apoc. does not reduce its value as biblical Greek. Evidence is strong for the existence of a 'proto-Theod.' text during the 1st cent. A.D., since characteristically Theod. readings from Dan. appear in

Dan. (Theod.) ii.45    ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας  
ἐγνώρισεν τῷ βασιλεῖ    'The great God is  
making known to the king ...' (Aram. perf.

𐤅𐤓𐤁𐤀 );

v.16    ἤκουσα περὶ σοῦ    'I hear  
concerning you' (repeated in v.14a) (Aram. perf.

𐤏𐤃𐤒𐤀𐤓𐤀 );

v.14b    καὶ σοφία περισσὴ εὑρέθη ἐν σοί  
'and great wisdom is found in you'. (Aram.

𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤓𐤀𐤓𐤀𐤓𐤀 );

x.17    νῦν οὐ στήσεται ἐν ἐμοὶ ἰσχύς καὶ  
    πνοή οὐκ ἄπελεφθη ἐν ἐμοὶ    'Now no  
strength remains in me, and no breath is left  
in me'. (Hebr.    𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤓𐤀𐤓𐤀𐤓𐤀 ); along with  
these should be listed the following, still with  
present sense:

vi.8    συνεβουλεύσαντο πάντες    '[all the  
presidents of the kingdom ...] are agreed' (Aram.

𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤓𐤀𐤓𐤀𐤓𐤀 ); cf. iv.36; ix.24; x.11.

---

works authored before his time. This makes it appear that Theod. revised a version which long pre-dated him. Cf. R.K. Harrison, Introduction to the Old Test. (1969), 1134; for the most recent discussion, with references, cf. E. Würthwein, Der Text des alten Testaments<sup>4</sup> (Stuttgart, 1974), 56f.

The following aorist verbs are employed to render the Semitic prophetic perf. or perfectum confidentiae tenses:

iv.31 ἡ βασιλεια παρῆλθεν ἀπὸ σου

'the kingdom shall be taken from you' (Aram.

ܢ ܚ ܝ ) ;

v.28 διήρηται ἡ βασιλεια σου καὶ ἐδοθη ...

'your kingdom is taken ... and shall be given'

(Aram. ܢ ܚ ܝܢ ) ;

x.20 καὶ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔρχετο

'and the ruler of the Greeks shall come'

(Hebr. ܟ ܚ ) .

It is significant at this point to note that each of the Greek aorist verbs listed, which does not express the sense of punctiliar past time, represents a Semitic perfect verb with stative or future sense.

II. In the New Testament

The existence of this futuristic sense of the aorist in the NT is noted by Bl-D<sup>1</sup>, who draw scattered parallels from Homer and Modern Greek to demonstrate that an aorist after a future condition can have a future sense. They note that since 'the Hebr. perfect serves not only as a narrative tense, but also to denote a timeless act, the Greek aor. also appears for this second kind of perfect in lyrical passages in the LXX, and hence also in the Magnificat, Luke i.46ff.'. Zerwick<sup>2</sup> also senses the Hebraic flavour of certain aorists in the Magnificat, while Moule<sup>3</sup> recognises Semitic antecedent for the aorists employed in Jn. xv.6, noting that they 'may be explained as representing the Hebr. perf., which is not used "gnomically" as is sometimes claimed, but to emphasise immediacy'.

We now realise that these writers greatly underestimated the extent to which the Greek aorist in the NT was influenced by Semitic perf. verbs. A much more accurate summary of this phenomenon in the Gospels and Acts is provided by M. Black, who notes that the Greek aorist renders not only the Hebr. prophetic perf., but also the Stative

---

<sup>1</sup>Bl-D §333 (2).

<sup>2</sup>Biblical Greek §259 (incorrectly cited as §59 by R. Funk in Bl-D).

<sup>3</sup>An Idiom Book of NT Greek, 12f.

perf.; reference to his work can be made for exx. he cites to support these points<sup>1</sup>.

Only one of the occurrences of this tense in the Gospels is cited here: Jn. xv.25 cites a LXX expression attested primarily in the Psalms, 'they hate' *ἐμίσησαν*, which speaks of present or stative sense, as is clearly illustrated by Ps. v.6 and xxxi.7 (cited supra, p.15).

### III. In the Apocalypse

Turning to the Apoc., we find a number of passages in which the aor. tense must be rendered with the sense of the Semitic perf.<sup>2</sup>. For sake of convenience, these are divided into three categories; those which express present sense, those with future sense, and those which are described by Charles as 'timeless'. All three seem to represent the Semitic perf. of state, prophetic perf., and expression of general truths (and thus somewhat similar to the Gnostic aorist)<sup>3</sup>. These categories must be understood as merely

---

<sup>1</sup>Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 129f.

<sup>2</sup>Mussies, Morphology, 337ff. denies that the use of the aorist in the Apoc. has anything peculiar about it, although he feels that it serves a number of times for the futurum exactum, as could the Hebr./Aram. qatal. He makes no mention, however, of the Greek aorist indic. with a patently present sense which we have clearly illustrated supra.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Driver, Hebrew Tenses, 13-26.

suggestive; they are not rigid and distinctively separate, since some of the following verbs can be placed in two or even all three with equal plausibility.

A) Aorist with Present Sense:

Apoc. 1.2 ἔμαρτύρησεν - translated as present by Allo<sup>1</sup> who considered it an epistolary aorist.

ii.21 καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῇ χρόνον ἵνα μετανοήσῃ  
'and I give her time that she might repent'

(note following pres. verbs οὐ θέλει ...  
ἰδοὺ βάλλω )<sup>2</sup>.

ii.24 ... οἵτινες οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰ βαθέα  
τοῦ Σατανᾶ ὡς λέγουσιν 'who know not the  
deep things of Satan, as some are speaking ...'.

iii.4 οἱ οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν  
'who stain not their garments'.

iii.8 καὶ ἐτήρησάς μου τὸν λόγον καὶ  
οὐκ ἠρνήσω τὸ ὄνομα μου 'yet you are  
keeping my word, and not denying my name'.

---

<sup>1</sup>L'Apocalypse, 2.

<sup>2</sup>Lancellotti, 49 notes these aorists are used in the sense of Hebr. perfect.

iii.9c ἐγὼ ἠγάπησα σε (cf. Isa. xliii.4  
ἐγὼ σε ἠγάπησα ) '... I love thee'.

iii.10 ὅτι ἐτήρησας τὸν λόγον 'because  
you are keeping the word'.

xi.17d ἐβασίλευσας καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ὀργίσθησαν  
'you are reigning; and the nations rage ...'  
(cf. Ps. xcvi.1 κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν  
ὀργιζέσθωσαν λαοὶ ).

xiii.14 τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι  
'the signs which it is allowed to perform'  
(cf. also vs. 13 ἐθεραπεύθη ; vs. 15  
ἐδόθη ).

xiv.4z. οὗτοι ἠγοράσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων  
... καὶ ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν οὐκ εὑρέθη  
ψεῦδος 'These are redeemed from among  
men ... and in their mouth no falsehood is found'  
(cf. Zeph. iii.13 LXX, where the same verb  
appears in the subjunctive mood).

xxii.16 Ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς ἐπεμψα τὸν ἄγγελόν μου  
'I Jesus am sending my angel ...'.

B) Aorists with Future Sense:

x.7 ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ... καὶ  
ἐτελέσθη ( τελεσθήσεται

2026 2038<sup>mg</sup>) τὸ μυστήριον 'but in those  
days ... the mystery shall be finished'<sup>1</sup>.

xi.2 ὅτι ἐδόθη τοῖς ἔθνεσιν 'for it shall  
be given to the gentiles'.

xi.10-13 οὗτοι οἱ δύο προφῆται ἐβασάνισαν  
... εἰσηλθόντες ... καὶ ἔστησαν ...

ἐπέπεσαν ... The  
extensive series of aorists in these verses  
have long puzzled Bible translators, as the  
recent English versions indicate. That some  
of the verbs are futuristic is clear, but others  
are best classified as 'timeless' or even as  
stative.

xii.8 οὐκ ἴσχυσεν - this is an idiom,  
corresponding to Hebr. לָכֵן - אָב (perfect  
tense) according to Charles, who cites on this  
point Dan. vii.21; cf. Apoc. xx.11.

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles I, 265, explains this aorist as a Hebraism  
for  $\square\lambda\psi\ \text{!}!$ .

xiv.8 ἔπεσεν ἔπεσεν βαβυλῶν ἡ μεγάλη  
'Babylon the Great is falling, is falling'<sup>1</sup>.

xviii.17,19 μιᾷ ὥρᾳ ἡρηώθη ὁ τοσοῦτος  
πλοῦτος 'in one hour so much wealth is  
laid waste'<sup>2</sup>.

xxi.23 ἡ γὰρ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐφώτισεν αὐτήν  
'for the glory of God shall illuminate (or  
'illuminates') it'.

### C) Timeless Aorists

A third category of the Greek aorist in the Apoc. is mentioned because of the important role it plays in certain visions of the Apoc. Verbs in this category have close affinity with the Hebr. perfect used to express a general truth, and are best rendered by the English present. This category of the Semitic perfect tense is evident from the OT, as shown by the following exx. from Dan.:

---

<sup>1</sup>Mussies, 338, considers this as aorist of proleptic past, based on the parallel passage in Isa. xxi.9 (LXX κέπτωκεν ). But the translation of this phrase by the present tense is acceptable, - in any case, the Hebr. stative perfect  $\text{נִבְּרַח}$   $\text{נִבְּרַח}$  has influenced the choice of the Greek aorist; cf. Charles II, 14.

<sup>2</sup>Allo, L'Apocalypse, 306, suggests xix.20 ἐβλήθησαν should be fut.

vii.14     καὶ αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ  
τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία καὶ πάντες οἱ λαοὶ  
φυλαὶ γλώσσαι αὐτῷ δουλεύουσιν     'and  
to him is given dominion and glory and kingdom,  
and all peoples, nations, and languages shall  
serve him'.

vii.27     καὶ ἡ βασιλεία     ... ἐδόθη  
ἀγίοις ὑψίστου     'and the kingdom ... is given  
to the saints of the most High'.

xi.21     καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν δόξαν βασιλείας  
'and the glory of a kingdom is not granted him'.

While some would argue that the exx. cited here are merely Greek gnomic aorists, it is noteworthy that again the verbs in the underlying Hebr./Aram. text are in the perfect tense.

In the Apoc. we cite the following exx. of the timeless aorist:

v.9     καὶ ἠγόρασας τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου  
'and art ransoming men for God by your blood'.

v.10 και ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν  
 βασιλείαν 'and are making them a kingdom  
 to our God'.

xiv.4 οὗτοι ἠγοράσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων  
 ... καὶ ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν οὐκ εὑρέθη ψεῦδος  
 'these are redeemed from among men ... and in  
 their mouth no falsehood is found'.

xvi.20 οὐκ εὑρέθη 'is not found';  
 cf. xx.11 ἔφυγεν ἡ γῆ ... καὶ τόπος οὐκ  
 εὑρέθη . Charles (II, 53) noted  
 this is a Hebrew idiom:  $\text{ןללל} - \text{ל}$   
 (niph'al perf.); cf. Ps. xxxvii.36.

xvii.17 ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἔδωκεν εἰς τὰς καρδίας  
 αὐτῶν ποιῆσαι τὴν γνώμην 'For God  
 puts it into their heads to carry out his  
 purpose ...'. Both Charles and Allo note the  
 Hebraic flavour of ἔδωκεν , in that it  
 reflects the verb  $\text{ןל}$  , both in tense  
 and in causative meaning.

xix.2 ὅτι ἔκρινεν τὴν πόρνην ... καὶ  
 ἐξεδίχησεν τὸ αἷμα <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles II, 119f., found in Hebrew texts an idiom  
 corresponding to this construction. See II Ki. ix.7  
 where perfect  $\text{ןלרן}$  is employed.

xix.6 ὅτι ἐβασίλευσεν <sup>1</sup>.

xx.12 καὶ βιβλία ἠνοίχθησαν

'and

books were open'; this is an echo of Dan. vii.10, where a pass. perf. verb is employed.

In determining the date or time of the aorist verbs cited in this section, one must always rely upon the context of the passage in question, just as is necessary in determining the time of perfect tense verbs in Semitic texts.

#### GREEK PERFECT FOR SEMITIC DERIVED

#### CONJUGATION VERBS<sup>2</sup>

In this chapter allowance has been made so far for the rendering into Greek of the Semitic primary conjugation verbs i.e. Hebrew qal, and Aramaic peal, in their perfect, imperfect and participial forms. Anyone translating from one of these Semitic languages into Greek, however, would

---

<sup>1</sup>Again, Charles II, 125 calls attention to the similar use of  $\text{קָלַל}$  in Ps. xcvi.1, where again we note that the Hebrew perfect is translated by aorist in the LXX.

<sup>2</sup>For discussion of Greek Perfect Participles for Semitic Participles of the derived Conjugations, cf. section on Participles. Black, Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup> 129f., drew attention to anomalous occurrences of the perfect in the Gospels.

be obliged to deal not only with the primary conjugation, but would also have to translate verbs of the derived conjugations such as Hebrew niph'al, piel, pual, hiphil etc., and their Aramaic counterparts.

The Greek OT provides ample evidence to indicate that in many places its translators attempted to indicate that a derived conjugation verb occurred in the Hebrew text by making an alteration in the tense or mood of the corresponding Greek verb.

A striking illustration of this is seen in the use of the Greek perfect indicative in a context where the traditional sense of the perfect seems not to fit at all, the only justification of its presence being to indicate an underlying Semitic verb of a derived conjugation. For example, Eze. iii.10 πάντα τοὺς λόγους οὓς λελάληκα μετὰ σοῦ 'all the words which I shall declare to you'.

The only justification for the perfect here is the underlying Hebrew piel  $\text{לָאָמַר}$  : In vs.13 καὶ ἐπιγνώσῃ διότι ἐγὼ Κύριος λελάληκα ἐν ζήλω is best rendered 'and they shall know that I, Yahweh, declare in my jealousy' - the context of the passage is future, the Hebrew verb is piel (same construction repeated in verse 17).

In Dan. ix.18 (Theod.) τῆς πόλεως σου ἐφ' ἧς ἐπικέκληται 'the city which is called' [by thy name] the perfect verb represents a niph'al  $\text{נִכְרַת}$  . Likewise Ex. ii.14

ἐμφανὲς γέγονεν τὸ ῥήμα τοῦτο 'the thing is known' is not the most natural construction; it represents an

attempt by the translator to signal the presence of a niph'al verb in the underlying Hebrew רָצַףּוּ וַיִּזְוּ

The hiph'il could also be represented by a Greek perfect, as in Eze. viii.12 Ἐδρακας ... ὁ οἱ

κρεσβύτεροι τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ ποιοῦσιν 'do you see ... what the elders of the House of Israel are doing?'

( וַיִּזְוּ ).

Especially striking in this respect is Ex. xxxii.1

ἰδὼν ὁ λαὸς ὅτι κεχρόνισε Μοϋσῆς 'the people noticed that Moses delayed ...'. Moulton<sup>1</sup> noted the problematic perfect tense in this verse, but his attempt to explain it as merely oratio obliqua is not convincing. One should look at the underlying Hebrew text where the rare וַיִּזְוּ occurs, a polel form of וַיִּזְוּ. Once again the translator attempted, by employing a Greek perfect, to signal the presence of a derived conjugation Hebrew verb. Elsewhere the translator of LXX Eze. employed the Greek perfect in its proper sense, demonstrating that he suffered no misunderstanding of the proper use of the tense, but in the occasions just cited he sacrificed idiomatic meaning for slavish literalness using the perfect tense in a way wholly against its natural meaning.

---

<sup>1</sup>Gramm. I, 142.

In the NT

The application of this previously unnoticed characteristic of translation Greek to relevant passages in the NT should bring about a re-evaluation of those perfects which have long been known to stand in opposition to the rules of Greek syntax.

There are, for example, perfects in the NT which have no more than simple aorist meaning, and in fact have been described thus by grammarians<sup>1</sup>. Burton<sup>2</sup>, for example, notes that while NT writers had an adequate concept of the distinction between perfect and aorist, he has to admit some perfect tenses had the force of aorists. A good example is Mt. xiii.46  $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\pi\rho\rho\rho\kappa\epsilon\nu \kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \delta\upsilon\alpha \epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\nu$   
 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \eta\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$  . Mk. xi.2  $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\theta\iota\kappa\epsilon\nu$  (N BC al).  
Note also the sudden change of tense in Jn. iii.32:

$\delta\ \acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \eta\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron \mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  . This latter passage may not represent direct Semitic influence since the perfect  $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$  is a favourite form in the 4th Gospel occurring more than twenty times. More difficult to account for on Greek grounds is Acts xxi.28  $\text{Ἕλληνας}$   
 $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\acute{\omicron} \dot{\iota}\epsilon\rho\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa\epsilon\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\nu \tau\acute{\omicron}\pi\omicron\nu$   
According to Bl-D<sup>3</sup> the perfect here denotes 'a continuing effect on the object'. This seems too subtle - I maintain that Semitic influence is at work here, the Greek perfect

---

<sup>1</sup>Bl-D §343 is thus aptly titled 'Perfect for the aorist'.

<sup>2</sup>New Testament Moods & Tenses, 44.

<sup>3</sup>§342 (4).

representing an Aramaic pael verb, perhaps  $\text{ܠܝܢܐ}$   
( $\sqrt{\text{ܠܝܢܐ}}$ ) 'to profane'. The simple peal of  
this verb is nearly an antonym, meaning 'to purify' -  
thus it was important to distinguish between peal and  
pael, even in Greek translation! It is of interest  
at this point to compare the Hebrew piel  $\text{לָלַן}$   
'to profane', in Dan. xi.31. The piel  $\text{לָלַן אֶת הַזֶּבֶחַ}$   
in Ex. xx.25 'if you use a tool on [the altar], you  
profane ...' is translated by a perfect tense ( $\mu\epsilon\mu\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ )  
in the LXX, although Greek grammar would not tolerate a  
perfect verb in the apodosis of such a conditional  
sentence.

Matthew Black cites other NT perfects which  
might belong here<sup>1</sup>, including Matt. xxii.4  $\eta\tau\omicron\lambda\mu\alpha\sigma\alpha$   
which was apparently altered to  $\eta\tau\omicron\lambda\mu\alpha\sigma\alpha$  (  $\Theta$  ,  
Koine), a case of assimilation to other aorists in  
the context. Interestingly, in biblical Hebr. the

---

<sup>1</sup>Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 129f.

equivalent of this verb is chiefly hiphil of  $\text{ךָּיָד}$ ,  
the niph'al and other conjugations mean 'be established,  
certain, ready', etc.<sup>1</sup>. As a more certain instance  
Black cites Mark x.28 where  $\text{לָּ$   $\text{ע}$ , al read  
 $\text{הִּיְלוּ־וָהָמָהּ}$  against BCD al  $\text{הִּיְלוּ־וָהָמָהּ}$   
and argues that the aorist is a mistaken assimilation  
to the preceding aorist  $\text{אָפָהָמָהּ}$  which likely  
belongs to aorist class ('we have (just) left, etc.').  
An aorist is expected here, not a perfect.

In the Apc.

Josef Schmid<sup>2</sup> in his discussion of the text of the  
Apc. is puzzled when he observes that the perfect repeatedly  
stands in place of the aorist, or in parallel with it, as  
if there were no distinction of meaning between the two  
tenses. He cites ii.3  $\text{הַיְמוֹנִיָּהּ עָלַיְךָ וְעַל הַבָּשָׂרִים...}$

---

<sup>1</sup>BDB s.v.  $\text{ךָּיָד}$  hiphil, 2.a.

<sup>2</sup>Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse  
Textes II. Die alten Stämme (München, 1955), 207.

καὶ οὐ κεκοίταες (AC: οὐκ ἐκοπίασας  $\chi$  );  
 xvi.6 ἐξέχεαν καὶ ... δέδωκας (AC 1611:  
 ἔδωκας p<sup>47</sup>  $\chi$  al). Cf. xviii.3 κεπότικεν  
 ( πεπτωκασιν  $\chi$  046 1611 al: ἐποτίσε ( ν ) 2071  
 2072 2074 al) πάντα τὰ ἔθνη .

G.D. Kilpatrick accounts for this odd use of the perfect by noting that the classical perfect tense was on the wane in Hellenistic Greek, so he assumes that where it exists as a variant for the aorist, the aorist is original while the perfect is an atticizing alternative.

The most striking occurrence of this type of perfect is Apc. vii.14 καὶ εἶρηκα αὐτῷ 'and I said to him', which was altered to εἶπον by 046. It probably represents piel  $\text{ךָ } \underline{\text{וּ}} \text{ךָ}$ , which occurs often in the MT, where it is usually (not always) translated by λαλέω. It is worthy of note that in Num. xii.2  $\text{ךָ } \underline{\text{וּ}} \text{ךָ}$  is translated by λελάηκεν : Μὴ Μωϋσῆ μόνω λελάηκεν Κύριος ; οὐχὶ καὶ ἡμῖν ἐλάησεν ; Did Yahweh speak only by Moses? Did He not also speak by us? Here the copyists of A and F altered the perfect to aorist, to harmonise with the second. ἐλάησεν . Note also Apc. xix.3 καὶ δεύτερον εἶρηκαν Ἀλληλουϊά . V.7 ἦλθεν καὶ εἴληφεν has caught the eye of grammarians<sup>1</sup> as has the similar usage in viii.5 εἴληφεν ὁ ἄγγελος ...

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bl-D §343.

καὶ ἐγέμισεν 'the angel took ... and emptied'.  
In both passages there was obviously semitic influence.

Mixing Perfect and Present Tenses

The mixing of perfect and present tenses in iii.20 is puzzling: ἰδοὺ ἕστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν καὶ κρούω 'behold, I stand by the door and knock'.<sup>1</sup> The Seer is fond of the perfect tense of ἵστημι using it either as a finite verb or participle about twelve times, often in places where another tense would be expected; e.g. viii.2

ἐπὶ ἀγγέλους ... ἕστηκασιν ; xii.4 ὁ δράκων ἕστηκεν . At the same time the Seer correctly employs the aorist and future tenses of the same verb. Could it be that in those places where the perfect occurred, it was influenced by Hebrew נצנ , which in the OT occurs in the niph'al conjugation meaning 'to stand'? The likelihood of this explanation is greatly increased when it is observed that in the LXX of Ex. xvii.9 identical usage is found, where ἕστηκα translates the niph'al of נצנ :

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἕστηκα 'behold, I will stand ...'  
Apc. ii.3 καὶ ἐβάστασας ... καὶ οὐ κέκοπιακες 'you bore up ... and did not weary' is another unusual combination of aorist and perfect tense. The latter verb probably represents the Hebrew נצנ 'to tire, weary', perhaps the niph'al conjugation (not found in the OT). Finally, the phrase in Apc. xix.13 καὶ κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bauer, s.v. ἵστημι II, 2.

ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ is similar to the LXX of Isa. xliii.7

πάντες ὅσοι ἐπικέκληνται τῷ ὀνόματι μου  
which translates niphal  $\chi \tau \rho \text{ } \text{?} \text{?} \text{?}$ . Other passages  
where a Greek perfect is used to translate niphal of  $\chi \tau \rho$   
include Jer. vii.10, 11, 14, 30, Amos ix.12. Note also  
Dan. Theod. ix.18 and Ex. ii.14, cited supra.

It hardly requires saying, that if the proposal  
maintained here that where a Greek perfect is used in a  
manner not acceptable to Greek syntax in the NT where  
translation from a Semitic source has occurred, the tense  
of the verb can be ignored, since it merely indicates a  
derived conjugation semitic verb. The temporal sense of  
the verb would thus be determined in the light of its context.  
This would in turn remove the obligation hitherto felt by  
exegetes to account for the 'perfect' or 'completed' nature  
of the action of verbs where this was not easy to account  
for.

Charles notes that in Apc. vii.14, for example, the  
perfect 'seems to be used as an aorist'<sup>1</sup>. He is nearly  
correct, needing only to modify his statement to say that  
 $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \rho \eta \kappa \alpha$  means the same as piel of  $\tau \tau \tau$ , which  
could have a past, present, or even future sense, depending  
on context.

---

<sup>1</sup>I, 212. I wonder, though, about his assertion that  
'This aoristic use of the perfect is not found in the  
Fourth Gospel'.

GREEK FUTURE INDICATIVE  
FOR SEMITIC IMPERFECT VERBS<sup>1</sup>

The debate over the past sense of certain future tense verbs in the Apoc. is an old one<sup>2</sup>, and will here receive a brief summary. A crucial passage around which the discussion has centred is Apoc. iv.9-10 *καὶ ὅταν δώσουσιν* ( *δώσουσιν* *Ν*. 046: *δωσιν* Koine) ... *πεσοῦνται* ... *καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν* ... *καὶ βαλοῦσιν* ( *βαλουσιν* 046). The presence of variants attests to scribal efforts to improve the sense of the passage by altering the problematic futures. George Ewald<sup>3</sup> as early as 1828 noted against Winer that in this passage the Seer represented the Hebr. imperfect by the Greek future tense, and he implies that as a result the meaning here could be past. Most commentators since have followed either Ewald's or Winer's position, who sees the verbs as true futures. Simcox<sup>4</sup> for example doubts that fut. time is to be understood here; 'it is always a question in this book [Apoc.]

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Charles I, cxxiv; Moulton-Turner III, 86; Zerwick §281; Lancelotti, 65f; Mussies, 34ff.

<sup>2</sup>As early as 1825 G.B. Winer argued against those who held that the fut. tense verbs in Apoc. iv.9-10 referred to past time.

<sup>3</sup>Commentarius in Apocalypsin Johannis exegeticus et criticus (Leipsig, 1828), 38f.

<sup>4</sup>Cambridge Greek Testament: The Revelation of St. John, 76.

whether the use of the tenses be not accomodated to the rules of Hebrew rather than Greek grammar; the sense may, after all, be merely frequentative'. Charles (I, cxxiv) takes δάσουσιν as frequentative, then notes that on the basis of Hebr. idiom the futures in this passage could be rendered by a past. Nigel Turner goes further in stating that the futures in this passage are due entirely to Semitic influence<sup>1</sup>. Zerwick (§281) and Lancellotti, (p.42) in their notes on Apoc. iv.9-10 likewise see a Hebraic past sense for these fut. tense verbs, but G. Mussies (341ff) makes an extensive and closely argued appeal for understanding them as true futures, following Winer, et alia.

The first step in this study is to determine whether there is any precedent in bibl. Greek for rendering the fut. indic. anomalously by the past sense, since secular Greek literature appears devoid of such usage. A startling illustration of such usage is found in Ps. ciii.6 ἐπι

των ὀρέων στήσονται ὕδατα 'waters stood upon the mountains' = MT וַיִּשְׁטַח יְהוָה מִן הַר The reference is clearly to the past - the Creation of Gen. i. - yet the Greek fut. στήσονται is employed, apparently as a servile rendering of the Hebr. imperfect tense verb.

Nigel Turner notes two occurrences in vs.7 ἀπὸ ἐπι-  
 τιμήσεώς σου φεβζονται... δειλιάσουσιν (MT = וַיִּפְּחוּ)  
 ... וַיִּפְּחוּ ) 'they fled from your rebuke ... they

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 86; cf. Turner's Grammatical Insights Into the New Testament (Edinburgh, 1965), 158ff.

took to flight'. Again, the past sense is unmistakable. Another passage to which Ewald, followed by Lancellotti, made reference in Num. xvii.25<sup>1</sup>.

From these exx. it is evident that the equation of Greek fut. indic. = Hebr. imperf., though somewhat rare, does exist in bibl. Greek, in spite of the protests from some modern commentators that such an equation is highly illogical! We now turn to examine occurrences in the Apoc. with an allegedly past sense. In addition to iv.9-10 we note the following:

v.10           καὶ ἐποίησας αὐτοῖς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν βασιλείαν  
καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν (βασιλευουσιν

A 046 1006 1611 1859 2020 2065 2081 2138) ἐπὶ

τῆς γῆς .

The sense here, though,

could be properly future, 'and they shall reign upon the earth'.

---

<sup>1</sup>In this passage the Hebr. perfect plus Waw consecutive  $\sqrt{0}]]$  with past meaning is curiously rendered several times in the LXX by fut. ἐξαροῦσιν. While at first this would seem to be contrary to equation of Greek fut. = Semitic imperf., yet we note that the Hebr. perf. plus Waw consec., since it takes on the sense of whatever verb precedes it in a given context, can have the same meaning as imperf.

xi.15 'Εγένετο ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ  
κυρίου ἡμῶν ... καὶ βασιλεύσει εἰς  
τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων . Perhaps  
we should render this 'and he continues  
reigning forever and ever', which is also a  
possibility with the Hebrew imperfect tense.

xiii.8 καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτὸν οἱ  
κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς which is  
preceded by a series of past tense verbs ἐδόθη  
... ἤνοιξεν ... ἐδόθη ... Mussies  
however explains this future as due to a shift  
of viewpoint, not a 'confusion of tenses' to  
use his term<sup>1</sup>. Charles (I, 353) also proposed  
future sense, and suggested the Seer translated  
an original Waw consecutive as if it were simple  
Waw. In any case, the future sense is not demanded  
by the context.

xvii.8 καὶ θαυμάσθησονται ( θαυμάσων  
2031) οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς .  
Lohmeyer<sup>2</sup> called attention to the contrast between  
the description of the beast in xvii and that given  
in xiii, which include the different tenses of the

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 335.

<sup>2</sup>Offenbarung, 142.

verb θαυμάζειν ; cf. xiii.3 και  
ἐθαυμάσθη ἅλη ἡ γῆ<sup>1</sup>. The sense  
of the Hebrew imperfect could be taken here,  
thus reading 'and those dwelling on the earth  
constantly marvel ...'.

While we are not obliged by context to render all the pas-  
sages cited by past tenses, yet the possibility is open,  
should the sense be better suited thereby. Another  
example is Apc. xxi.3 σκηνώσει (qig has a past tense),  
noted by Allo.

The documentation of this long disputed usage by means  
of examples from the LXX helps establish it as a true  
Semitism, for which non-biblical Greek has no parallel  
whatever. We are led to the conclusion that here we are  
dealing with translation Greek, and furthermore, Greek which  
is intelligible primarily to readers familiar with Semitic  
languages. An ordinary non-Jew could hardly be expected  
to understand that the future tense contains a past reference,  
along the lines of the LXX instances cited supra.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>On the passive use of these forms, cf. Bl-D §78.

<sup>2</sup>Charles' term 'thinking in Hebrew while writing in  
Greek' seems inadequate to account for the more peculiar  
usage noted in this section.

THE PROBLEM OF SHIFTING TENSES<sup>1</sup>

On the basis of Semitic influence adduced for irregular use of the present, aorist, and future tenses, we can now consider the related phenomenon of sudden and seemingly inexplicable shifts among aorist/present/future tenses of verbs in connected narrative, without a corresponding shift in the time during which the action being described actually takes place. While related shifts are found in a limited degree in other parts of the NT,<sup>2</sup> the phenomenon is more pronounced in the Apc.

Nearly 150 years ago Ewald<sup>3</sup> observed that sometimes one finds in the Apc. an astonishing mixture of future and past tenses, such as in xx.7-10, where aorist and future verbs are scrambled in apparently random fashion, all with future sense. W. Bousset in his commentary on the Apc. described this tendency as an irregular fluctuation (regellose Schwanken) and considered it a characteristic of the author's style, distributed in the epistles to the seven churches, and especially in chapter eleven<sup>4</sup>. G. Mussies

---

<sup>1</sup>Lancellotti, 39-43; S.M. Reynolds, 'The Zero Tense in Greek' Westminster Theological Journal XXXII (1969), 68-72.

<sup>2</sup>The shift from aorist to present and even from pres. to future is not unknown in the NT, but a direct leap from aorist to future (or vice versa) is, so far as I can determine, limited to the Apc.

<sup>3</sup>Op. cit., 39f.

<sup>4</sup>Op. cit., 168f.

ascribed the phenomenon to the fact that the Seer usually began recounting his visions in the past tense, then quickly shifted to the present because 'he is no longer telling what he saw in the past, but rather what he is seeing again before his eyes, and as such these present indicatives give the idea of lively presentation ...<sup>1</sup>.

A further complication in the Apc. is the fact that the visions are supposed to predict future events. Most other commentators who have considered the question of shifting tenses have explained them along similar lines. A different approach, however, has been taken for the Gospels in an article by Stephen Reynolds (cf. note 1, p.106). He accepts the findings of linguist Paul Kiparsky who maintains that it is characteristic in early forms of Indo-European languages to reduce the past tense to a so-called 'zero tense' in continuous narrative, thus giving a past sense to verbs which are present in form. While this rule accounts for mixing of past and present tenses, Kiparsky would also apply it to explain alternation between future and present tenses within a future context<sup>2</sup>. While this discovery is significant for Greek syntax in the NT, as Reynolds clearly demonstrates, it alone cannot account for the shift between aorist/future and future/aorist which occurs in the LXX and in the Apc.

---

<sup>1</sup>Op. cit., 334.

<sup>2</sup>Foundations of Language IV (1968), 33-35 (cited by Reynolds, op. cit.).

Charles, in his explanation of un-Greek tense usage as due to the influence of the Semitic tense system<sup>1</sup> offered the clue to explain also these remarkable shifting tenses. This point has been taken up by Lancellotti and applied to the question of shifting tenses in continuous narrative passages in the Apc.<sup>2</sup> While this explanation has hypothetical appeal, it has not proved convincing to Mussies (and probably to others) because Lancellotti failed to demonstrate from a Semitic text and its Greek translation that such shifts of tense were actually caused by corresponding shifts in the underlying Semitic original. If the Seer could produce such strange yet acceptable phenomena, then surely there must have been some precedent for it. The explanation of course is clear in the light of the Semitic influence on the Greek tenses, especially that of aorist for prophetic perfect. Several examples of shifting Greek tenses, always based on shifts in the underlying Semitic verb tenses, illustrate clearly the identical shifts in the Apc. A good illustration in Daniel Theod. iv.31f. ἡ

βασιλεία κερφήθεν ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων σε ἐκδιώκουσιν  
(B) ... καὶ χόρτον ὡς βοῦν ψωμιοῦσιν σε καὶ ἑπτὰ  
καιροὶ ἀλλαγῆσονται ἐπὶ σέ 'The kingdom shall be taken  
from you, and they shall drive you from men ... and they  
shall feed you grass as an ox, and seven seasons shall pass

---

<sup>1</sup>I, cxixiii ff.

<sup>2</sup>P.42f.



shall eat ... they shall commit whoredom ...'. Future

καὶ φάγονται = perfect plus Waw consecutive יָבֹאֲרָה

while aorist ἐπόρνευσαν = hiphil perfect יָבֹאֲרָה

cf. ix.3b κατέκησεν Εφραϊμ ... ἀκάθαρτα φάγονται

'Ephraim shall return ... he shall eat ...'. Here aorist

κατέκησεν = perfect יָבֹאֲרָה, future φάγονται =  
imperfect יָבֹאֲרָה . From these examples it is

apparent that radical shifts in tense, from future to aorist and vice versa which are inexplicable from a Greek viewpoint are acceptable in Semitic Greek since they represent a literal rendering of the underlying Semitic tenses, usually influenced by the presence of prophetic perfects.

In the Apc.

There are several passages in the Apc. which reflect the same shifts noted just supra; e.g. xx.7-10 καὶ

ὅτε ἐτελέσθη (2059 2081 syr<sup>ph</sup>) τὰ χίλια ἔτη λυθήσεται ὁ

Σατανᾶς ... καὶ ἐξελεύσεται πλανῆσαι τὰ ἔθνη ...

καὶ ἀνέβησαν ἐπὶ τὸ πλάτος τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐκύκλευσαν ...

καὶ κατὰβη πῦρ ... καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ὁ

διάβολος ὁ πλανῶν αὐτοὺς ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν λίμνην ...

καὶ βασανισθήσονται ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός 'And when the

thousand years are ended, Satan shall be loosed ... and will come forth to deceive the nations ... and they shall march up over the broad earth and surround ... but fire shall fall ... and shall devour them and the Devil who deceives

them shall be thrown into the lake [of fire] ... and they shall be tormented ...'; vi.15-17 και οι βασιλεις της

γης ... εκρυψαν εαυτους εις σπηλαια ... και λεγουσιν τοις ορεισι και ταϊς πετραις ... οτι

ηλθεν η ημερα της οργης αυτου και τις δυνησεται (2053)

σταθηναι ; 'And the kings of the earth ... hid themselves in caves ... calling to the mountains and rocks ... because the day of his wrath is come, and who is able

to stand?'; vii.16,17 ου πεινάσουσιν ετι ουδε διψη-

σουσιν ετι ουδε μη κεση ... οτι το αρνιον το ανα-

μεσον του θρονου ποιμαίνει (82 91 314) αυτους και

οδηγησει αυτους επι ζωης πηγας υδατων και

εξαλειψει ο θεος . 'They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; [the sun] shall not strike them ...

because the Lamb in the midst of the throne shall shepherd them, and shall guide them to springs of living water, and

God shall wipe away every tear ...'This passage seems to be based on phrases taken directly from Isa. xlix.10;

Ps. xxiii.1,2; and Isa. xxv.8 where a remarkable correspondence with the verb tenses of the MT is apparent:

future	πεινάσουσιν	= imperfect	וַיָּבֹאוּ
future	διψησουσιν	= imperfect	וַיִּשְׁחַרְפוּ
present	ποιμαίνει	= partic.	וְיָרֶם
future	οδηγησει	= imperfect	וַיְהִי
future	και εξαλειψει	= perf. + Waw-consec.	וַיִּמְחַק



one. Most examples of periphrases are found in the Gospels, so a complete analysis of the matter lies outside the scope of this study. Since a limited number occur in the Apc. however, the occasion will be used first, to criticise previous studies on the subject and afterwards, to re-evaluate the Semitic evidence traditionally cited in discussion of the question.

G. Björck's work, HN ΑΙΤΑΞΕΩΝ Die Periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen<sup>1</sup> has, together with its French predecessor Les Tournines Periphrastiques<sup>2</sup>, set the mood for the current evaluation of the question. Björck (*ibid.*, 59-62) seems to seriously discard any form of Semitic influence, since scattered occurrences of the construction are to be found in classical authors. Although he discusses briefly the 'Semitismusfrage'<sup>3</sup>, yet the validity of his conclusion in this field is seriously undermined by his lack of first-hand acquaintance with Semitic languages, which he openly acknowledges<sup>4</sup>. It becomes immediately apparent that he and anyone else viewing the phenomenon of periphrasis in

---

<sup>1</sup>Skrifter Utgivna av. Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps - Samfundet i Uppsala 32: part 2 (Uppsala, 1940).

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 111-185 in Paul Regard's La Phrase Nominale dans la Langue du Nouveau Testament (Paris, 1919).

<sup>3</sup>Pp. 59f., 67f., 123ff.

<sup>4</sup>Pp. 67f. .

the NT only from the Greek side is working under a serious limitation.

In summary, his thesis of the purely Greek character of periphrasis in the NT is maintained wrongly in the face of three significant facts in the historical evolution of the Greek language:

- 1) while periphrasis was employed by classical authors in its most common forms (i.e. plus perfect and present participles) yet Hellenistic Greek, even in the papyri makes only limited use of the construction<sup>1</sup>;
- 2) even within the Hellenistic period this construction did not receive its most notable development until the post-Christian era, as Björck concedes<sup>2</sup>;
- 3) at the same time, it is significant that while periphrasis is rare in Hellenistic literature it is found in the LXX with surprising frequency<sup>3</sup>.

On this final point Björck asked an important question: how is the use of periphrasis in the LXX related to the underlying Hebrew? Had he been able to provide the answer, it is likely that his conclusions would have been different.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bl-D §353 (1); Mayser II, 1, 223ff.; Moulton-Turner III, 87.

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., 96.

<sup>3</sup>Conybeare & Stock, §72.

Periphrasis in biblical Hebrew, employing either the perfect or imperfect of  $\text{פ}^{\text{א}} \text{פ}$  plus participle, is well-established and widely distributed, if not very frequent<sup>1</sup>. Characteristic of the former, expressing

emphasis of a past action, is Gen. xxxvii.2 ...  $\text{וַיִּזְרֶה}$   
 $\text{וַיִּזְרֶה} \quad \text{פ}^{\text{א}} \text{פ}$  Joseph ... was herding' which

in the LXX becomes 'Ιωσήφ ... ἦν ποιμαίνων .

This is the type of periphrasis most frequently found in the OT. For an example from bibl. Aramaic, cf. Dan. v.19

$\text{וַיִּזְרֶה} \quad \text{וַיִּזְרֶה}$  'they were trembling' (Theod.  $\text{ἦσαν}$   
 $\text{τρέμοντες}$  )<sup>2</sup>. Not every periphrastic construction

in the LXX of course is the result of the underlying Hebrew. Sometimes the translators employed the construction in its own right, to express (usually) a continuing or repeated action, condition, etc. But investigation shows that the high frequency of the construction in the LXX is due primarily to the same construction in the underlying Semitic text. This has recently been shown by W.J. Aerts, in his work Periphrastica<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. GK §116r.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Stevenson, Gram. of Palest. Jewish Aramaic, 58 who also cites Dan. ii.31, vi.5, 11, 15.

<sup>3</sup>Amsterdam, 1965 (cited by Mussies, 304).

In the NT

The periphrastic tenses in the Gospels are cited and discussed by others<sup>1</sup>.

Occurrences in the Apc. are not so numerous as, for example, in Mark, Luke and the first half of Acts. This is possibly due to the fact that while the latter owe some of their examples to the form of Aramaic current in 1st century Palestine, the Apc. reflects the variety of Hebrew/Aramaic found in the OT, which contains proportionately fewer occurrences of periphrasis.

Grammarians customarily include under the heading 'Periphrasis' both those with and without the accompanying auxiliary form of εἶναι and those with the participle alone. Here only examples with the auxiliary verb are discussed such as Apc. i.18 ζῶν εἰμι present, and xvii.4 ἦν περιβεβλημένη imperfect. The participle alone in the sense of a finite verb receives fuller treatment in Chapter III of this dissertation, Part G. 'Participles in the Sense of Finite Verbs', pp. 156ff.

Turner<sup>2</sup> lists, as present periphrasis without εἶναι Apc. iii.17, and as imperfect i.16, x.2, xxi.11,14, and as perfect (or pluperfect) vii.5, xxi.19.

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 87-89 cites many (perhaps all?) occurrences in the NT; cf. also discussions in B1-D §§352-56. Both allow for Semitic, especially Aramaic, influence. Black, Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 130 is in agreement. For the most recent discussion, cf. Mussiès, 302-08.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.



γίνου γρηγορῶν . But this is hardly periphrastic in meaning, but as noted by Black<sup>1</sup>, should be rendered 'become watchful'. Likewise Apc. xvi.10 καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἐσκοτωμένη is a doubtful case, since the verb 'to be' usually immediately precedes the participle<sup>2</sup> in the Semitic languages and in genuine NT occurrences of periphrasis. Here the καὶ ἐγένετο is perhaps better understood as introductory, while ἐσκοτωμένη represents a hofal participle of 'was caused to become darkened'<sup>3</sup>.

Μέλλειν plus Infinitive

The use of μέλλειν plus infinitive to express something about to occur is not unknown in classical Greek, so its frequent occurrence in the Apc. cannot be strictly ascribed to Semitic influence. It also appears (infrequently) in the LXX where it usually translates an imperfect Hebrew verb with the sense 'about to occur'. Neither in the Apc. nor in the LXX does μέλλειν

---

<sup>1</sup>Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 130.

<sup>2</sup>According to Moulton-Turner, III, 89.

<sup>3</sup>Apc. i.18 ἐγενόμην νέκρος is also cited by Turner, III, 89, along with iii.2, xvi.10

plus infinitive seem to be used in the common classical sense to refer to a fixed necessity, something destined to occur, except perhaps Apc. i.19 'write therefore whatever you see, and whatever is, and whatever is about to come (or, 'must come') after these things', ἃ μέλλει

γενέσθαι

. It probably means no more than 'things about to come'.

Summary of Chapter III Part C

This section has developed more clearly than any previous study the formal translation equivalents employed in biblical and Jewish translation Greek. For the sake of clarity the relation between Greek and Semitic tenses is presented in the following chart:

Greek (Indicative Mood)	Aramaic/Hebrew
Present Tense (Futuristic present) (Present with past sense)	Participles (Partic. of <u>Futurum Instans</u> (Partic. of past action)
Aorist (Futuristic aorist) (Aorist with present sense) (Timeless aorist)	Perfect (Prophetic perf. & <u>Perf. confident.</u> ) (Stative perfect) (Perf. expressing general truth)
Future (with past sense)	Imperfect (With past sense)
Perfect (omnitemporal)	Derived Conjugation Verbs

These translation equivalents were of course not always adhered to, and exceptions can be found for every category. On the other hand, the very simplicity of this pattern, when seen in light of the many illustrations cited here, argues for its general validity. In determining the time at which the action took place one must deal with biblical Greek tenses in the same manner he would render biblical Hebrew/Aramaic - rely on the context of the verb in question.

The related problem of sudden shifts of tense in the Apc., which has puzzled generations of scholars, is likewise solved by appealing to the shift in tense made in an underlying Semitic source.

Regarding the periphrastic conjugations in NT Greek, it can no longer be maintained that they are purely Greek in origin, since they occur also in Hebrew and Aramaic. On the other hand, it must not be assumed that when found in the NT they always show Semitic influence. The true periphrasis, using a participle accompanied by a form of the verb 'to be' is infrequent in the Apc.; when it occurs it seems to stress the continuing nature of the action.

PART D. EVIDENCE OF UNDERLYING

WAW-CONSECUTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

One of the unique characteristics of Biblical Hebrew syntax is its employment of the Waw-consecutive with perfect and imperfect tense verbs. This peculiarity, which is not shared by Aramaic, Syriac, or even the later form of Hebrew found in the Mishnah, is described by GK §49a in the following terms:<sup>1</sup>

... the Hebrew consecution of tenses is the phenomenon that, in representing a series of past events, only the first verb stands in the perfect, and the narration is continued in the imperfect. Conversely, the representation of a series of future events begins with the imperfect, and is continued in the perfect ...

This progress in the sequence of time, is regularly indicated by a pregnant and (called waw consecutive) ...

---

<sup>1</sup>The significant advance in understanding of the development and function of Waw-consecutive, from the earlier explanation given by S.R. Driver, through that put forward in 1948 by Father Henri Fleisch in his article 'Sur le système verbal du semitique commun et son évolution dans les langues sémitiques anciennes', in Melanges de l'Université Saint Joseph (Beirut), XXVII (1947-48), 39-60, which was adapted by Frank Blake of Johns Hopkins University, and is generally accepted today serves as the position from which this section is written. For the standard presentation, see Blake's A Resurvey of the Hebrew Tenses (Rome, 1951), 44-53.

This fundamental point of Hebrew syntax requires no illustration here; it is so widely employed in the OT that examples can be found throughout. We will at this point seek to establish as clearly as possible the influence exerted by the Waw-consecutive on the syntax of the LXX, especially on the tense of verbs involved. The results will then be used to evaluate any constructions in the Apoc. which are alleged to be the result of Hebrew Waw-consecutive influence.

In the LXX

It would be strange indeed if a structure so fundamental as the Waw-consecutive left no mark on the LXX, especially in those portions where a more literal method of translation was followed. For purposes of limiting the field of uses of this construction, the examples cited here come from a single category - that which uses a Hebrew perfect plus Waw-consecutive which serves to introduce the apodosis after sentences which contain a condition or a reason<sup>1</sup>. This choice is based on three considerations:

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §112ff.

- 1) this use occurs very frequently in the OT;
- 2) this construction, when rendered into Greek, shows an obvious deviation from Greek idiom;
- 3) alleged occurrences of Waw-influenced constructions in the Apoc. are mostly of this type. Four examples follow:

IV Ki. vii.4b και εαν θανατωσιν ημας ,  
 και αποθανουμεθα 'and if they kill us,  
 we shall but die'; MT וְיַהֲרֹגוּךְ - וְאַתָּה  
 וְיַהֲרֹגוּךְ

Nu. xxx.16 εαν δε περιελων περιελη αυτης  
 ... και ληψεται την αμαρτιαν αυτου  
 'But if he makes ... null and void ... he  
 shall bear his iniquity'; MT וְאִם יִשְׁמַד  
 וְאִם יִשְׁמַד

III Ki. iii.14 και εαν πορευθης εν τη  
 οδω μου ... και πληθυνω τας  
 ημερας σου 'and if you will walk  
 in my way ... I will lengthen your days';  
 MT וְאִם יִשְׁמַד וְאִם יִשְׁמַד

Isa. iv.4f. εκπλυεις Κεριοσ τον ρυκτον  
 ... και 'When the Lord shall  
 wash away the filth ... then there will be' [but MT  
 וְאִם יִשְׁמַד וְאִם יִשְׁמַד]

These cases could be multiplied, but they are sufficient to demonstrate that the LXX translators usually translated a Hebrew perfect plus Waw consecutive by Greek καί plus future tense verb, instead of the customary aorist equivalent for Hebr. perfect. An exception to this rule of practice is Num. xxi.9 καὶ ἐγένετο ὅταν ἔδακνεν ὄφις ἄνθρωπον , καὶ ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν χαλκοῦν καὶ ἔζη . 'if a serpent bit any man, he would look on the bronze serpent and live', where Hebr. perfect plus Waw-consecutive is rendered by an aorist verb. The Hebraic flavour of καί introducing the apodosis in Biblical Greek has been recognized previously; 'The use of καί to introduce an apodosis is also due primarily to Hebrew, although it appears as early as Homer'<sup>1</sup>; here we have analysed the construction from the point of view of the tenses employed.

#### In the Apoc.

Commentators have called attention to several passages in the Apoc. where the Waw-consecutive construction introducing the apodosis is echoed<sup>2</sup>. Most widely-noted of

---

<sup>1</sup>BL-D §442 (7); cf. Beyer, 66f.; Bousset, 160.

<sup>2</sup>Although evidence has been presented by others for the influence of Waw-consec. via καί in the NT on the apodosis expressing (a) a condition (b) a reason, (c) a statement of time (cf. Scott, 11), (d) resuming a

these is:

iii.20 εἰς τὴν ἀκοήσῃ τῆς φωνῆς μου  
καὶ ἀνοίξῃ τὴν θύραν, καὶ  
(X 046) εἰσελεύσομαι πρὸς αὐτὸν  
'If anyone hears my voice and opens the  
door, I will come in to him ...'.

x.7 ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ... ὅταν  
μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελέσθῃ  
τὸ μυστήριον 'but in those days ...  
when he is about to sound, the mystery [of  
God] will be fulfilled'. Here Allo<sup>1</sup> notes  
that καὶ represents the Waw-consecutive  
before the perfect with future sense.

iii.10 ὅτι ἐτήρησας τὸν λόγον τῆς  
ὑπομονῆς μου, καὶ γὰρ σε τηρήσω ἐκ  
τῆς ὥρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ (if the word order of  
minusc. 2026 935 2196 is accepted) 'Because  
you kept the word of my patience, I will  
keep you from the period of temptation ...

---

final clause, etc. (cf. Moulton-Turner, 334f.; B1-D  
§442 (7) ), my discussion will be limited to a considera-  
tion of the influence of the Waw on the tense of verbs  
which it immediately precedes.

<sup>1</sup>P.141. Cf. G.R. Driver, JTS n.s. XI (1960), 386;  
Beyer, 69.

In these exx. one can trace the obvious influence of the Biblical Hebrew Waw-consecutive. Cf. also xiv9.

An interesting point has recently been raised by G. Mussies who is of the opinion that 'Mishnaic Hebrew is the best basis for comparison with the use of Greek in the Apoc.; first, because it is contemporary with the book; second, because it is not classicistic but reveals the development of Hebrew after the OT period, and third, because the quantity of literature composed in it is sufficient'<sup>1</sup>. He comments in detail about the disappearance of Waw-consecutive tenses in Mishnaic Hebrew<sup>2</sup>, and refers to the tendency of the Qumran Isaiah scroll (IQIs<sup>a</sup>) to avoid the consecutive Waw-tenses as if this were simply part of a line of development, traceable from the early form of the language (i.e. the MT) through Qumran Hebrew to that preserved in the Mishnah. While we will not at this point examine the matter in detail, it is important to correct a false impression which Mussies seems to give, that in IQIs<sup>a</sup> and in other Hebrew documents from Qumran the Waw-consecutive tenses had all but disappeared. Examination shows to the

---

<sup>1</sup>Mussies, 314.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.; cf. M.H. Segal, A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew (Oxford, 1927), 72f.

contrary that Waw-consecutive tenses were still in use; and even in places where they are avoided<sup>1</sup> a Waw-conjunctive is substituted in nearly every instance. A sharp contrast is noticed in Mishnaic Hebrew, where the Waw-consecutive is conspicuously absent, except in scattered OT quotations<sup>2</sup>, and where even the Waw-conjunctive coupled with verbs appears infrequently. While agreeing fully with Mussies that tendencies can be seen in Qumran Hebrew which point in the direction of Mishnaic Hebrew, we would dispute his supposition that the disappearance of the Waw consecutive tenses in Mishnaic Hebrew can be seen as an intermediate stage in LQIs<sup>a</sup>, and suggest instead that in the use of Waw in connection with verbs, the biblical scrolls of Qumran have greater affinity to the MT than to the Mishnah.

#### Summary of Chapter III Part D

Here is shown that the Hebraic Waw consecutive construction has left its mark on the syntax of the Apc. most clearly where it is used (translated by καὶ ) to introduce the apodosis of a conditional clause, thus creating a syntactical oddity unknown in secular Greek.

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Burrows, 'Orthography, Morphology and Syntax of the St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript', JBL 68 (1949), 209f., lists only about twenty cases in which Waw-consec. tenses are avoided. See Mussies, 313, n.2 for further references to relevant literature.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Segal, loc. cit.

PART E. IMPERATIVES

Mussies notes that since the Greek imperative 3rd person mood had no Semitic counterpart<sup>1</sup>, one might expect to find in the Apc. future indic. verbs with the value of an imperative, since Semitic languages expressed the 3rd person imperative by the imperfect (or jussive)<sup>2</sup>. The question of Greek future for Hebrew jussive receives discussion elsewhere;<sup>3</sup> here attention will be drawn to alternate constructions which have a supposed imperative meaning.

INFINITIVE WITH IMPERATIVE SENSE

There are scattered cases in the NT of the infinitive expressing the sense of an imperative. This is well in line with Greek usage, being attested as early as Homer<sup>4</sup> and, while less common in Attic literature<sup>5</sup>, was widely

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 322.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. GK §§109, 110.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. section 'Future Indicative for Semitic Jussive'.

<sup>4</sup>Schwyzler II, 380.

<sup>5</sup>B1-D §389.

employed in the papyri<sup>1</sup>. With such strong attestation in secular Greek it may appear futile to suggest the possibility of Semitic influence on the infinitive at this point. Moule, for example, notes that 'whether the Hebrew "Infinitive Absolute" has influenced the use of infinitive for imperative at all is hard to judge; but Homeric instances make one cautious about detecting Semitic influence'<sup>2</sup>. While every occurrence of this construction in the NT can be accounted for along Greek lines, yet an instance of it in the Apc. deserves attention because it closely reflects Ezk. iii.1-3. In Apc. x.9 we read  $\kappa\alpha\iota \ \acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\lambda\theta\alpha \ \pi\rho\delta\varsigma \ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu \ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu \ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\theta\grave{\iota}$

$\delta\omicron\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota \ \mu\omicron\iota \ \tau\acute{\omicron} \ \beta\iota\beta\lambda\alpha\rho\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$  'so I went to the angel and said to him, "give me the little book" '. Charles prefers<sup>3</sup> to take the Hebraic sense of  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$  (=  $\gamma\eta\chi$  ) meaning 'to command', thus translating 'bidding him to give me the little book'. On one hand this phrase corresponds with the appearances in the papyri of an imperatival infinitive depending on the verb signifying 'to command', etc., which is either stated in the text or at least understood from context<sup>4</sup>; but at the same

---

<sup>1</sup>Mayser II, 1, 303-5; Moulton-Turner Gramm. III, 78, and especially Mandilaras 316, who provides abundant examples of the imperatival infinitive from the papyri.

<sup>2</sup>Idiom Book, 127.

<sup>3</sup>I, 267.

<sup>4</sup>See Mandilaras, 318 for illustrative passages.

time we cannot ignore a similar Hebrew idiom. The use of the Hebrew infinitive absolute to express the imperative idea is 'extraordinarily common'<sup>1</sup>, and it seems that as with the case of Greek, likewise with Hebrew, this infinitive could be used as a kind of fixed word of command<sup>2</sup>. So if δοῦναι in Apc. x.9 is taken as an imperative, it could perhaps be explained as due to a convergence of Greek and Hebrew influence. An attractive alternative explanation is that suggested by Charles<sup>3</sup>, who takes λέγων to mean 'command', leaving δοῦναι with the true sense of a Greek infinitive. The same can be said of Apc. xiii.14 λέγων τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι εἰκόνα τῷ θηρῶ 'ordering those dwelling on earth to make an image to the beast ...'. Cf. Acts xxi.21 λέγων μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτούς 'commanding them not to circumcise ...'.

Understood either way, this use of the infinitive preceded by λέγων in the Apc. shows the Seer's acquaintance with and awareness of biblical Hebrew idiom.

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §113, n.2.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>I, 267.

GREEK PARTICIPLE FOR IMPERATIVE

It is well known that in several places in the NT, especially in Paul and I Peter, the participle is employed in place of a finite verb with imperatival sense<sup>1</sup>. The fullest discussion of this phenomenon remains that of David Daube<sup>2</sup>, who disputes Moulton's claim that such usage represented a genuine Hellenistic development. Daube prefers to explain this usage as due to Hebrew (or less probably) Aramaic influence<sup>3</sup>. Mishnaic Hebrew expresses what ought to be done by the use of the participle. In this role the partic. comes very close to the sense of the imperative, which Daube illustrates by numerous Hebrew passages from post-biblical material. He thus seeks to explain the imperatival partic. in the NT as due to Hebrew, not Hellenistic Greek, influence, and his explanation seems to be sound<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>B1-D §468 (2).

<sup>2</sup>In 'Participle and Imperative in I Peter', appended note to E.G. Selwyn's The First Epistle of Peter (London, 1947), 467-88 (summarised by W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 329).

<sup>3</sup>Op. cit., 471.

<sup>4</sup>It is accepted by Moule, Idiom Book, 179, while Zerwick also mentions it, §373. P. Joffe in his Grammaire de l'hebreu biblique (Rome, 1947), §121e n.2 cites the usage as a characteristic of Mishnaic Hebrew.

A new evaluation of the evidence from the papyri cited by Moulton to support his position that the imperatival partic. was a Hellenistic development has been recently made by Mandilaras<sup>1</sup>, who is more reluctant than his predecessor to see a truly Greek imperatival partic.; 'Such a use of the partic. is indeed rare in the papyri ...'. He is doubtful of the strong case Moulton made on this point, and reveals that the construction is much less common in the papyri than Moulton believed. Naturally, the case for semitic influence is enhanced by such findings.

An occurrence of an imperatival partic. has heretofore not been cited from the Apoc., but in view of the arguments noted supra it may be instructive to examine a variant reading in iii.2  $\gamma\lambda\nu\omicron\nu\ \gamma\rho\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\omega\delta\nu$  , (omitted by 2060)  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\zeta\omega\nu$  (336 459 628)  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \lambda\omicron\iota\pi\acute{\alpha}$  'awaken, and strengthen what remains ...'. The partic. appears in none of the printed Greek texts, which generally prefer the aorist imperative  $\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\zeta\omega$  of the Textus Receptus. The variant  $\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\zeta\omega\nu$  is supported by only one family of rather late minuscules (11th to 16th century) which were produced by rather careful copyists, probably from an earlier uncial archetype<sup>2</sup>. While the textual pedigree of this variant is admittedly unimpressive, yet it clearly represents the more difficult reading. It also may be significant that the passage is part of the

---

<sup>1</sup> §§922-24.

<sup>2</sup> H.C. Hoskier, Concerning the Text of the Apoc. (London, 1929) I, 23, 122, 515.

epistles to the seven churches, and that it consists of admonition. There is no other occurrence of this construction in the Apc.

ΔΕΥΤΕ FOLLOWED BY THE IMPERATIVE

W.H. Simcox in his comments on the text of the Apc.<sup>1</sup> seems to imply that the verbal use of δεῦτε immediately preceding an imperative represents a Semitic construction. On this point Ozanne makes even more certain claims for its Hebraic nature<sup>2</sup>, arguing that in Apc. xix.17 δεῦτε, συνάχθητε represents a Hebraism, due to the fact that in the LXX the adverb δεῦτε commonly represents the imperative of  $\text{הָלַךְ}$ <sup>3</sup>. The expression is not peculiar to Hebrew however, but is present in many languages in essentially the same form. In Greek the sequence δεῦτε plus imperative has been employed since the time of Homer in poetic passages and appears in later prose works<sup>4</sup>. It seems that this particular use

---

<sup>1</sup>Cambridge Greek Testament. The Revelation of St. John the Divine (Cambridge, 1893), 180.

<sup>2</sup>Ozanne, Thesis, 36.

<sup>3</sup>Occurrences of δεῦτε immediately followed by imperative in the LXX: Gen. xi.1, IV Km. i.6, vi.13, xxii.13, Ps. xxxiii.11, lxxv.16, Isa. lvi.9.

<sup>4</sup>Liddell & Scott-Jones, Greek-English Lexicon, s.v. δεῦτε.

of the imperative has little significance for illustrating Semitic influence on Greek syntax, or for indicating a Hebrew source for the Apc.

Summary of Chapter III, Part E

The infinitive with imperative sense is attested in Hebrew and in Hellenistic Greek, so does not per se point to Hebrew influence. The well-established late Hebrew use of the participle for imperative is known from other parts of the NT; in the Apc. however it has only a single weakly-attested occurrence.

Concerning the use of  $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  followed by the imperative, little significance should be attached. The construction occurs in Hebrew, but is well-established in Greek from ancient times onward.

PART F. INFINITIVES

B1-D note that in comparison with classical Greek the use of the infinitive in the NT has shifted greatly, with some categories, such as the infinitive of purpose and certain forms of the substantival infinitive growing more common, while other forms were falling into disuse.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>§388.

This changing syntactical scene, including both the replacement of temporal and causal clauses by the infinitive, and the intrusion of *ἵνα* and *καί* constructions into territory formerly held by the infinitive has motivated a considerable amount of study dealing with the position of the infinitive in Hellenistic Greek.

#### THE ARTICULAR GENITIVE INFINITIVE

Perhaps the most striking point of NT usage of the infinitive is its employment preceded by the genitive article *τοῦ*<sup>1</sup>. In the NT this construction is used 'in a lavish way' (Bl-D §388) to express a variety of meanings, including purpose; a consecutive sense; and a final sense<sup>2</sup>. All these uses can be explained on Greek grounds; indeed, the construction is acceptable Greek. It is found in the language of Plato and Polybius, and was somewhat favoured by Thucydides for expressing purpose<sup>3</sup>, and is used in a wide range of meanings in the papyri<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Schwyzler, 372f.; Mandilaras §§815ff.; Moulton *Gramm.* I, 216f.; Conybeare & Stock, §§59, 60; Jannaris, 482f., 578f.

<sup>2</sup>Bl-D §400 concentrate on these and other meanings of the construction.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, cf. Conybeare & Stock, §59.

<sup>4</sup>Mandilaras, §§815ff.

In addition, B1-D note (§400 (7,8) ) the Semitic flavour of certain infinitives with prefixed τοῦ after the pattern of the LXX, which often employed this construction to render the Hebrew infinitive with prefixed  $\text{ל}$ . This NT usage falls into two categories: a) a loose, general tendency to prefix τοῦ onto any sort of infinitive; b) a manner in which the Greek consecutive sense all but disappears, where the relation between τοῦ plus infinitive and the remainder of the sentence is very loose<sup>1</sup>.

In the LXX

Under a) B1-D list the following examples from the LXX:

3 Km. i.35      καὶ ἐγὼ ἐνετείλαμην τοῦ εἶναι  
εἰς ἡγοῦμενον ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα

'and I have appointed him to be ruler over  
Israel and Judah' which translates a Hebrew  
infinitive construct       $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

Ezk. xxi.11 ἑτοίμη τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτήν εἰς  
χεῖρα ἀποκτενοῦντος 'ready to be  
placed in the hand of the slayer' (Hebrew  
הַיָּד הַזֶּה ).

To these we add Ps. xxvi.13 πιστεύω τοῦ  
ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου ἐν γῆ ζώντων  
'I believe that I shall see the good things  
of the Lord' (Hebrew הֵי אֶרְוֶה ).

The Hebrew construction in each case is the infinitive construct preceded by  $\text{?}$ , which occurs very frequently in the OT with a variety of meanings<sup>1</sup>. It becomes apparent that biblical Greek writers in certain instances employed the τοῦ plus infinitive as the equivalent of Hebrew  $\text{?}$  plus infinitive, thus giving the previously infrequent Greek construction a much wider range of meaning in biblical Greek.

While Charles and others are content to point out the Hebrew antecedent of this genitive articular infinitive, it is worth noting that in Aramaic the same construction occurs with even greater frequency. In biblical Aramaic the infinitive plus  $\text{?}$  stands almost without exception following a governing verb to express command, intention,

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §114f.; cf. Driver, Hebrew Tenses, 275f.



which recognises the widespread use of the corresponding Semitic construction in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac, and which allows the Greek construction to represent this Semitic one by a literal rendering of  $\text{?}$  by  $\text{τοϑ}$ .

After noting the especially wide employment of this construction in Aramaic, it may be instructive to repeat the observation made earlier that outside the Apc. it is found most frequently in Luke-Acts. While the occurrences in the Apc. are most likely due to Hebrew influence<sup>1</sup>, it is tempting to conjecture that those in Luke-Acts provide a link, heretofore un-examined, with Aramaic sources<sup>2</sup>.

#### In the Apc.

Previous searches for the genitive articular infinitive in the Apc. have yielded meagre results since they have been based only on the published critical editions of the Greek NT. Bl-D for example find only one certain occurrence (xii.7), and two which are weakly attested (ix.10 and xiv.15)<sup>3</sup>. A construction of this nature would

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Ozanne, Thesis, 36f., who rejects Aramaic influence.

<sup>2</sup>The view that Semitisms in Luke-Acts were Septuagintisms sheds no light on this construction, since in the LXX it is not rendered consistently. According to Charles, the LXX translators 'reproduced it in many ways'.

<sup>3</sup>Bl-D §400 (8).

doubtless by smoothed by copyists with an eye towards improving their texts, so it is safe to assume that the Apc. originally contained a greater number of occurrences than do the mss. on which printed editions are based. In Hoskier's apparatus attestation is given for several more, three of which seem to reflect the Hebraic loosely attached to an infinitive following a governing verb:

Apc. iv.11      ἄξιός ἐστι ὁ κύριος καὶ  
 θεὸς ἡμῶν τοῦ                      (469) λαβεῖν τὴν  
 δόξαν    'Thou art worthy, O Lord and our  
 God, to receive glory ...'<sup>1</sup>

25

v.3      καὶ οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο                      ... τοῦ  
 (2019) ἀνοῦξαι τὸ βιβλίον  
 'And no one was able ... to open the book ...'.

ix.6      καὶ ἐπιθυμήσουσιν τοῦ                      (792)  
 ἀποθανεῖν .    'And they shall desire  
 to die ...'.    Here we might add the weakly  
 attested              τοῦ κηρῦξαι                      in i.2.

---

<sup>1</sup>This relatively high frequency of the construction in the Apc. makes necessary the modification of an observation by A.T. Robertson that in the NT 'it is only in Luke (Gospel 23 times, Acts 21 times) and Paul (13 times) that τοῦ with the infinitive (without prepositions) is common'. (Cited by Moule in his Idiom Book, 129). According to Bl-D §400 (3) this usage is also classical.

xii.2 καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα καὶ κράζει

ὠδίνουσα καὶ βασανιζομένη τοῦ

(468 2017 2040 syr<sup>ph</sup>) τεκεῖν 'And she

was with child and she cried out in pangs of birth, and anguished for delivery' (cf.

Isa. xxvi.17 where τεκεῖν renders

Hebrew  $\eta \tau \ddot{\tau} \ddot{\tau}$  'about to be delivered',

a familiar Hebrew idiom)<sup>1</sup>.

Closely related syntactically is a category of the infinitive plus genitive article expressing necessity. While 19th century commentators noticed the Semitic nature of the passage in question (Apc. xii.7), they wrongly ascribed it to the influence of the Hebrew infinitive absolute<sup>2</sup>. R.H. Charles has given the best explanation of the construction, summarised here:

First, Charles noted the unconvincing attempts of others to remove the un-Greek construction in this verse either by changing the infinitive into a finite verb, or by removing the subjects Michael and his angels, or at

---

<sup>1</sup>So Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos, 200, n.2; Charles I, 317; Lancellotti, 110f.

<sup>2</sup>E.g. the nineteenth century commentaries by Ewald and Züllich, who explained τοῦ πολεμῆσαι as due to the Hebrew infinitive absolute (cited by Lücke, Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in der Offenbarung des Johannes, II, 453f.).

least by rendering them in the accusative instead of nominative case. 'Some acquaintance of the LXX' has enabled Charles to illustrate convincingly that the infinitive with genitive article, preceded by a subject in the nominative case represents the literal rendering of a pure Hebraism. As examples from the LXX he cited:

Hos. ix.13 Ἐφραϊμ τοῦ ἐξαγαγεῖν

(= אֶפְרַיִם לְיָצֵא ),

'Ephraim must bring forth'; also:

I Chr. ix.25 ἀδελφοί αὐτῶν ...

τοῦ εἰσπορεύεσθαι κατὰ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας

(= אֶבְרָתָם לְבָרֵךְ ... אֶתְּיָדָם

אֶתְּיָדָם ) 'Their brethren had to come in ...

every seven days';

Eccl. iii.15 ὅσα τοῦ γίνεσθαι ἤδη γέγονεν

( = אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ לְבָרֵךְ אֶתְּיָדָם )

'What is to be hath already been'.

'Thus in the Hebrew the subj. before  $\text{ל}$  and the infinitive is in the nominative and the Greek translators have literally reproduced this idiom in the LXX'<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles, I, 321f.; cf. GK §114k for an explanation of this use of the Hebrew infinitive construct.

The soundness of Charles' explanation is recognised by W.F. Howard<sup>1</sup>; cf. N. Turner<sup>2</sup>, who gives a survey of recent opinions on this construction.

In his treatment of Apoc. xii.7 Lancellotti recognises this infinitive plus subject in the nominative case as Hebraic, but argues wrongly for rejection of the genitive article, primarily because it is attested in mss. considered textually inferior; also because, according to his text, the infinitive generally occurs without the article: He suggests perhaps it entered the text as a result of dittography of the final syllable of the preceding word  
αὐτοῦ<sup>3</sup>.

Another occurrence of the phenomenon, cited by Charles, is Apoc. x'iii.10 εἴ τις ἐν μάχῃ ἀποκτανθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν μάχῃ ἀποκτανθῆναι. Here he would understand αὐτόν as a corruption for αὐτός, and he also notes that the article τοῦ is not attested in any manuscript. The idiom is still Hebraic, and should be understood as meaning 'if any man is to be slain with the sword, he is to be slain with the sword'<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton-Howard II, 448f.

<sup>2</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 141; cf. his Grammatical Insights, 160f.

<sup>3</sup>Lancellotti, 112.

<sup>4</sup>Charles, I, 355f; cf. cxlvi.

The remaining cases of τοῦ plus infinitive in the Apc. appear to express either purpose or consequence, and thus can be explained along the lines of the (infrequent) Greek genitive articular infinitive<sup>1</sup>. If indeed these are such acceptable Greek as is maintained by Bl-D, one wonders why the article was subsequently omitted in the major mss. containing the Apc.? Certainly the article represents the more difficult reading in each case, and the temptation for copyists would be to eliminate it, indicating perhaps their judgment that the construction was somewhat un-Greek in character<sup>2</sup>.

Since the widely employed Hebrew infinitive construct plus  $\text{?}$  could also express purpose and consequence<sup>3</sup>, one could safely postulate that at least in the Apc. the cases of τοῦ plus infinitive cited supra are attributed more to Hebraic than to Greek influence.

---

<sup>1</sup>Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, 578 notes a total of 3 occurrences in Plato, 5 in Xenophon, and 12 in Thucydides.

<sup>2</sup>Other occurrences in the Apc. include i.12 τοῦ βλέπειν (598 2038); ii.14 τοῦ φαγεῖν (325 336 517 620); xvi.9 τοῦ δοῦναι (628); xvi.19 τοῦ δοῦναι (X 2014 2034).

<sup>3</sup>Cf. GK §114g.





Other cases could be cited. These illustrate that the un-Greek resolution of an infinitive into a finite verb preceded by καί is due to the influence of the corresponding characteristic in biblical Hebrew.

In the Apc.

This phenomenon appears in the Apc. at xiii.15

καί ἐδόθη δοῦναι ... καί ποιῆσαι (καί) <sup>1</sup>.

'And it was given unto him to give ... and to cause ...'

Charles<sup>2</sup> tentatively reconstructs the underlying Hebrew which he sees at this point:

וַיִּתֵּן ... לְהַעֲשִׂי  
וְיַעֲשֶׂה

The translation of this verse depends of course on whether it is the beast or the image of the beast which is the subject of 'to cause'. This writer follows Charles in taking the beast to be the subject, since it seems unlikely that if the image of the beast were the subject, it would appear so soon in the same verse as the object of the verb προσκυνῆσαι.

---

<sup>1</sup>For the latter verb Hoskier wrongly cites Syriac evidence for an infinitive; in Gwynn's transcription the verb is peal impf.

<sup>2</sup>I, cxlvi.

xii.17f. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ποιῆσαι πόλεμον  
μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ... καὶ ἐστάθη  
ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης 'And he  
departed to make war with the remnant....  
and to stand on the sand of the sea'.<sup>1</sup>

By understanding the verb ἐστάθη in the sense of an infinitive we would be able to settle the textual dispute over whether the variant ἐστάθη 'I stood' should be read here as the introduction to what follows in chapter xiii.

xiii.5f. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ποιῆσαι  
μῆνας τεσσαράκοντα δύο καὶ ἠνοιξεν τὸ  
στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰς βλασφημίας πρὸς τὸν  
θεὸν βλασφημῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

. 'And he is allowed to  
exercise authority forty two months, and to  
open his mouth in blasphemies against God,  
to blaspheme his name ...'.

In both cases the sentence is relieved of a certain awkwardness when the finite verb following the infinitive is understood as a Semitic second infinitive, resolved in form to a finite verb.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Charles I ad. xii.17f.

NOMINAL USE OF THE INFINITIVE

Under the heading of the Nominal Use of the Infinitive in his monograph Lancellotti notes the occasional use of an infinitive in a servile manner to supplement the verbs μέλλω, θέλω, δύναμαι, λέγω, etc.<sup>1</sup>. While he rightly recognises that such usage is fully acceptable in Greek, he suspects Semitic influence to be at work when the infinitive in dependence on δίδωμι is used to express the sense 'concede', 'permit', in Apc. ii.7 and xiii.15, and λέγω in the sense of 'demand', 'request' in x.9 and xiii.14<sup>2</sup>. These definitions are by no means un-Greek<sup>3</sup>, nor is there any irregularity in the fact that they are followed by infinitives. Lancellotti succeeds however in drawing attention to the interesting fact that this Greek usage is exactly paralleled by a corresponding Hebrew construction, well-illustrated in the case of λέγω by I Chr. xxi.17  $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר אֲנִי הָיָה לְעָמְרָן לְמַנְתֵּן אֶת-עַמִּי לְמִנְתֵּן}$  'Was it not I who commanded to number the people?' (LXX

---

<sup>1</sup>p.109f.

<sup>2</sup>Lancellotti does not specify the nature of the influence, but refers to P. Joüon, Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique, §157c, n.2.

<sup>3</sup>Liddle and Scott, s.v. δίδωμι list no fewer than eight secular examples where the verb followed by an infinitive means 'grant', 'concede', while for λέγω with the meaning 'command', ten cases are cited.

οὐκ ἐγὼ εἶπα τοῦ ἀριθμησαί τῳ λαῷ ; ), and in  
the case of *διδάμι* by Gen..xxxii.7 - אָלַי

יְהוָה לֹא אָמַר לְיִצְחָק אֲנִי אֶמְצָא אֶת אֱלֹהִים

'God did not permit him to harm me' (LXX καὶ οὐκ

ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς κακοποιῆσαι με ); cf. Job  
ix.18 אֲנִי יָדָעְתִּי כִּי יִשְׁחָק בְּפִי וְיִשְׂחָק בְּפִי

'he will not permit me to draw my breath' (LXX οὐκ

ἔδωκεν γὰρ με ἀναπνεύσαι ).

This construction, identical in both Hebrew and Greek, seems not to represent so much a case of Semitic influence on our author's Greek, but rather to be a basic characteristic of many languages which is used to express a particular idea. This element has found its way into numerous languages in similar form to that shown here in the case of Hebrew and Greek.

Perhaps a similar explanation can be offered to explain the phenomenon pointed out by Charles<sup>1</sup> in Apc. xvi.19 where we read καὶ βαβυλῶν ἡ μεγάλη ἐμνήσθη

ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ δοῦναι αὐτῇ τὸ ποτήριον Charles notes the construction ἐμνήσθη δοῦναι should be compared with Ps. cix.16 and ciii.18 where the infinitive

'to give' follows *דָּן* . The construction *μιμνήσκω* followed by an infinitive occurs numerous times in secular

---

<sup>1</sup>II, 52.

Greek<sup>1</sup>, so of itself it shows no direct Semitic influence<sup>2</sup>.

Summary of Chapter III Part F

In summary, we note that while Charles long ago laid the foundation for explaining the Semitic nature of τοῦ plus infinitive in certain passages of the Apc. as expressing necessity, here for the first time evidence is cited demonstrating that the construction was even better known in Aramaic and Syriac than in biblical Hebrew. By availing ourselves of Hoskier's apparatus we have discovered occurrences in the Apc. not before seen.

In the case of infinitives which are resolved into finite verbs, based upon a well documented Hebrew practice, further examples have been suggested in addition to those presented by Charles.

Regarding the so-called 'nominal' use of the infinitive ascribed by Lancellotti to Hebrew influence, it was noted here that the construction is found in Greek literature as well, although there is admittedly a Hebraic construction in the OT which is identical.

---

<sup>1</sup>Liddell and Scott, s.v. μνηστω for examples.

<sup>2</sup>On the unusual construction in this passage of ἐμνήσθη ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ as a modification of the Aramaic indefinite 3rd person plural, cf. supra, section A of Part III.

PART G. PARTICIPLES

Introduction

While Greek participles have many functions in common with their semitic counterparts, yet they differ from one another on several points. The observations presented in this section deal with those points where a participial usage more or less restricted to Hebrew and/or Aramaic has influenced their employment in the Greek of the Apocalypse.

GREEK PARTICIPLES RESOLVED INTO FINITE VERBS

The participle in the Apoc. is sometimes employed in circumstances where, in the following clause, it is resolved into a finite verb which expresses the sense of a participle. Close attention has been given to this usage by R.H. Charles<sup>1</sup> who explains its Hebraic nature. He cites S.R. Driver<sup>2</sup>; 'it is a common custom with Hebrew writers, after employing a participle or infinitive, to change the construction, and if they wish to subjoin other verbs, which logically should be in the participle or infinitive as well, to pass to the use of the finite verb'. Note the following illustrative examples:

---

<sup>1</sup>I, cxliv f.

<sup>2</sup>Hebrew Tenses, 136f. Cf. GK §116x.

Gen. xxvii.33      אֲבִיךָ וְיָבִיִךְ וְהָבִיִךְ

'who hunted game and who brought'.

Here the LXX renders idiomatically, using two participles.

Ps. cxxxvi.13f      ... לְגִזְרֵי יָם סוּף  
בְּתוֹכוֹ יִשְׁאַל יְהוָה וְיַעֲבִיר 'to him

who divided the Red Sea ... and made Israel  
pass in its midst'.

Again the LXX gives an idiomatic rendering: τῶ

καταδιελθόντι τὴν ἔρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ... καὶ

διαγαγόντι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ

I. Sam. ii.8      ... מִקִּיָּם מֵעַד לְדָל  
יָרִים אֶבְיוֹן

'He raises the poor from the dust ... he lifts  
the needy'.

Here the LXX renders ἀνιστά ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς κένητα ... ἐγείρει πτωχόν.

While the construction is primarily Hebraic, Burney notes<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Aramaic Origin, 96f. Lancellotti, 105f., declares that it is not found in Aramaic!

Dan. iv.22 as an Aramaic example

ܘܢܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܝܢܘܢ

ܘܢܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܝܢܘܢ

ܘܢܝܢܘܢ ܘܢܝܢܘܢ

... 'And they shall drive you ...

(lit. 'driving you') and with grass like oxen they shall feed you'.

In the NT

Burney cites two occurrences of the construction from the 4th Gospel: i.32 *Τεθέσμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαίνον* ... *καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν* ; cf. v.44 *λαμβάνοντες* ... *καὶ οὐ ζητεῖτε* <sup>1</sup> Black, in his discussion of parataxis in the Gospels <sup>2</sup> notes that 'in D, *καὶ* occasionally introduces a finite verb after a participle'. Among the exx. he cites are some similar in function to the cases cited supra; e.g. Lk. ix.6 *ἐξέρχόμενοι* ... *καὶ ἦρχοντο* (D) *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι καὶ* *θεραπεύοντες* (lit.) And they departing and going ... evangelizing and healing'.

---

<sup>1</sup>Burney, loc. cit., where he notes it also occurs in Pal. Syriac of John i.32.

<sup>2</sup>Aramaic Approach <sup>3</sup>, 68.

In the Apoc.

C.C. Torrey<sup>1</sup> called attention to this construction in Apoc. i.16 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ῥομφαία

ἐκπορευομένη, καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος φαίνει 'and out of his mouth a sword coming, and his face as the sun shining ...'. Burney in an article devoted to this construction in the Apoc. collects from Charles' commentary the following examples of the construction<sup>2</sup>:

i.5f. τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς ... καὶ  
ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς 'Unto him who loves  
us ... and makes us' (not RV 'and He makes  
us');

ii.2 τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους,  
καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν 'Those calling  
themselves apostles, and are not (not  
RV 'and they are not');

ii.9 τῶν λεγόντων 'Ιουδαίους εἶναι  
ἑαυτοῦς, καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν 'Those  
claiming to be Jews, and are not' (Apoc.  
iii.9 identical);

---

<sup>1</sup>The Apocalypse of John, 43f.

<sup>2</sup>'A Hebraic Construction in the Apocalypse' JTS  
XXII (1921), 371-76.

ii.20 ἡ λέγουσα ἑαυτὴν προφητιν ,  
καὶ διδάσκει 'Who says ... and teaches  
(not RV 'and she teacheth');

ii.23 ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἐραυνῶν ...  
καὶ δῶσω 'I am he who searches ...  
and who gives';

vii.14 οἱ ἐξερχόμενοι ... καὶ  
ἐκλυναν Also xiv.2,3; xv.2,3.

Burney adds to Charles' list xiii.11 ἄλλο θηρίον  
ἀναβαίνον ... καὶ εἶχε . He rejects i.18  
and xx.4 which Charles included. Finally I would add  
vii.2f. ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα ... ἔχοντα  
... καὶ ἔκραξεν .

#### PARTICIPLES IN THE SENSE OF FINITE VERBS

Hjalmar Frisk in an article titled 'Partizipium und Verbum finitum im Spätgriechischen' in *Kleine Schriften. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XXI* (Gothenburg, 1966), 432-42 argues against what he terms the 'wide and growing opinion that the partic. in later Greek was used on occasion as a finite verb. He asserts (on p.432) that the partic. is always to be understood as a participle.

Where it seems to have the sense of a finite verb the explanation can be found in what he describes as 'stylistic peculiarities'.

Frisk of course was referring to later (Hellenistic) Greek. In biblical Greek there are of course occurrences of the participle in place of the finite verb to express finite action. The Hebrew practice of using a participle for a finite verb is responsible for the construction in the LXX. Especially significant are occurrences of sentences or primary clauses in which the partic. is the only verb<sup>1</sup>. This un-Greek practice owes its explanation to semitic influence. In Hebrew, the partic. on occasion is found in place of a finite verb in a main clause:

Gen. iv.10      קוֹל דַּם אֶחָיו  
                    שֶׁצָעַק אֵלַי

'The voice of your brother's blood cries  
(lit. 'crying') unto me'.

Gen. xliii.5      אֲנִי וְאַתָּה  
                    לֹא נֵשֵׁב וְלֹא נֵיכַל

'but if you  
will not send him, we will not go down  
(lit. 'if you not sending him');

---

<sup>1</sup>Conybeare & Stock, §80; cf. Mandilaras, §920 who points out that although this phenomenon is found in the papyri, yet the ten cases he cites occur mostly 'in letters or writings of less educated people', and that some cases represent nothing more than a stereo-typed mode of epistolary address. The obvious contrast between these and the literary nature of the Apoc. makes it clear that the one can hardly be used to account for the other.

Eccl. i.4                   דֹר הַלֵּךְ וְדֹר בָּרָא  
 אֶבְרָא   'One generation passes away,  
 another generation comes' (lit. 'one passing  
 ... one coming');

Eccl. i.6                   סִבֵּב הַזֵּיף  
 הִתְהַוֶּה   'The wind turns about and  
goes (lit. 'turning ... going the wind');  
 cf. vs. 7:               כָּל-הַנְּחָלִים  
 הֹלְכִים אֶל-הַיָּם   'Every stream  
runs to the sea' (lit. 'running').

The exx. cited so far are rendered in the LXX by present indic. verbs which, as noted earlier in this study, are in the tense frequently preferred for translating semitic participles. In the exx. which follow, however, the partic. was translated literally into Greek;

Jdg. xiii.19           וַיִּבְטְחוּ וַיִּשְׁתּוּ רֵאִים  
 'And Manoah and his wife looked on' (lit.  
 'looking on').   LXX   καὶ Μανωὲ καὶ  
 ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ βλέποντες

Judg. xiv.4           וַיִּבְעֹתוּ הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים  
 בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל   'And in that time the Philistines ruled in

Israel' (lit. 'ruling'). LXX καὶ ἐν  
 τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ οἱ ἄλλόφυλοι κυριεύοντες  
 ἐν Ἰσραηλ .

While this use of the partic. is found infrequently in Hebrew, the situation is the reverse in the branches of Aramaic relevant to our subject, where very frequently the partic. serves as a finite verb expressing present, past, or future sense<sup>1</sup>. In biblical Aramaic for example, Stevenson notes 'the partic. is the ordinary equivalent of a present tense ...'<sup>2</sup>. Charles and Burney<sup>3</sup> cite biblical Aramaic on this point, noting that in various places in the Aramaic of Daniel partics. occur in the sense of ordinary finite verbs. The majority of these partics. in Dan. are rendered in LXX and Theodotion by the indicative. For example, Dan. ii.8

יָדָעְתִּי כִּי אַתְּ מִתְּחַלְּשׁ יָדָעְתִּי כִּי אַתְּ מִתְּחַלְּשׁ יָדָעְתִּי כִּי אַתְּ מִתְּחַלְּשׁ

'Of a certainty I know that you are trying to gain time'.

Here the partic. יָדָעְתִּי appears in both LXX and Theod. as οἶδα . This mode of translating is predictable, again because Jewish Greek often uses pres. indic. to represent semitic participles. What is worthy of note is that in some places a literal translation of Greek

<sup>1</sup>So Stevenson, 56; Bauer and Leander, §81; Nöldeke §269.

<sup>2</sup>Stevenson, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup>I, 316; Aramaic Origins, 88.



In the NT

From the evidence presented, we can safely conclude that since this use of the partic. is standard in Aramaic, while less common in Hebrew, wherever it occurs in the NT it can be more probably ascribed to Aramaic than to Hebrew influence. Wellhausen<sup>1</sup> long ago suggested that in Mark's Gospel certain partics. could best be understood as full indicatives. This point has been discussed by Black<sup>2</sup> and even J.H. Moulton, who stressed its existence in the papyri, conceded that the occurrences in Mark, especially in codex D, arise from literal translation from Aramaic<sup>3</sup>. Moule cites a few Pauline passages where the partic. has the force of a finite verb<sup>4</sup> but offers no explanation for the phenomenon.

---

<sup>1</sup>Einleitung in d. drie erst. Ev.<sup>2</sup> (1911), 14.

<sup>2</sup>Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 68, 130.

<sup>3</sup>Grammar I, 222-24.

<sup>4</sup>Idiom Book, 179. Relevant are Rom. v.11; II Cor. v.12; vii.5; viii.4; ix.11.

In the Apoc.

C.C. Torrey<sup>1</sup> followed by Lancellotti<sup>2</sup> calls attention to this Aramaism in the Apoc. when he discussed x.8

καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἦν ἤκουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πάλιν

λαλοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ λέγουσαν 'then the voice which I heard from heaven again speaks to me and says ...'.

To this I would add iv.1b καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ἦν ἤκουσα ὡς σάλπιγγος λαλοῦσης μετ' ἐμου λέγων 'and the first voice which I heard speaks to me like a trumpet, saying ...'<sup>3</sup>. R.B.Y. Scott<sup>4</sup> adds xii.2 καὶ βασαν-

ιζομένη τεκεῖν and xix.11 καὶ ὁ καθήμενος

ἐπ' αὐτὸν πιστὸς καλούμενος καὶ ἀληθινός (His

other exx. cited do not properly belong here).

Torrey (p.43) cites as a passive example vii.4 ἑκατὸν

τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες ἐσφραγισμένοι (The

other passages cited by him do not belong here).

These passages, which are clumsy Greek, seem to be identical in nature to those noted earlier from the Greek OT which literally rendered semitic participles with the sense of finite verbs.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Apocalypse of John, 43, 119f.

<sup>2</sup>p.98.

<sup>3</sup>Charles conjectures that λαλοῦσης μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγων might be a Hebraism (  $\text{וְהַקוֹל הַשֵּׁנִי הָיָה כְּשֹׁפָרָה}$  ) here and in x.8.

<sup>4</sup>p.9.

INDECLINABLE AETON REPRESENTING לֵאמֹר

In biblical Hebrew the infinitive absolute לֵאמֹר (from אָמַר ) is employed with two meanings. First, it represents in a few places only the simple meaning 'to say' of the finite verb, e.g. II Sam. ii.22 'And Abner said ( לֵאמֹר ) again to Asahel ...'<sup>1</sup> while its other, and best-known, meaning is as an introductory formula meaning 'as he said', 'with these words', and often best rendered simply as 'thus', or even as a pause before direct discourse, the counterpart of Greek ὅτι recitativum. In this role לֵאמֹר occurs some 800 times<sup>2</sup> in the OT.

The former usage is not surprising, since elsewhere in Hebrew the infinitive absolute appears as a finite verb<sup>3</sup>, while the latter usage could possibly have arisen from the tendency to follow a verb with an infinitive absolute to intensify the idea of the main verb<sup>4</sup> although there is admittedly little sign of intensity in most of the verbs followed by לֵאמֹר in the OT.

---

<sup>1</sup>According to Lisowsky's Konkordanz zum Hebr. Alt. Test., 123, I found only eight such passages (he cites nine) where the inf. absolute is thus employed.

<sup>2</sup>My own count, based on Lisowsky's Konkordanz.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. G-K §113y.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. G-K §113r.

Ozanne<sup>1</sup> makes a misleading statement in this connection when he describes this construction as 'a pure Hebraism, there being no indigenous equivalent in Aramaic'. He argues that the Targumic  $\text{ךן ךן}^3$  corresponding to  $\text{ךן ךן}^?$  is itself a Hebraism. But he should have noted that this 'Hebraism' is found not only in targumic Aramaic, but also in *Ezr. v.11*, at least three times in the Elephantine papyri<sup>2</sup> and at least three times in non-Jewish Aramaic sources cited by Vogt in his *Aramaic Lexicon*<sup>3</sup>. All the exx. mentioned are of the same nature as the latter category of Hebrew cases just described, and are best-translated 'thus' or 'as follows'. While the basically Hebraic flavour of this usage is evident, yet it is only fair to recognise its existence, on a limited scale, in Aramaic also.

The redundant  $\text{ךן ךן}^?$  is translated hundreds of times in the LXX by λέγων / λέγοντες / λέγουσιν which are usually indeclinable. Under the first use of the word (= 'to say'),  $\text{ךן ךן}^?$  is rendered by λέγων in the LXX in only a few places, for example *II Sam. ii.22*, *Isa. xlix.9*; *Zech. vii.3*. All remaining occurrences are of the second category, the redundant λέγων<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Thesis, 19; but he seems to reverse his opinion on p.39f.

<sup>2</sup>A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the 5th Century B.C.* (Oxford 1923), 30:7, 16:8, 20:6.

<sup>3</sup>*Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti* (Rome, 1971), s.v.  $\text{ךן ךן}$ .

<sup>4</sup>Ozanne is mistaken when he says that parallels to the indeclinable form of the partic. are extremely rare or non-existent in the LXX. Cf. his thesis, p. 18f.

In the NT

Both uses of λέγων are found in NT Greek<sup>1</sup>. The former<sup>2</sup> is found in Matt. iii.2 'Ἰωάννης ... κηρύσσων [ καὶ ] λέγων 'John ... preaching and saying ...'; cf. Matt. viii.2 καὶ ἰδοὺ λεπρὸς ... προσεκύνη αὐτῷ λέγων 'a leper ... knelt before him and said ... '. The latter use, naturally, is more common so needs no illustration.

In the Apoc.

Charles and Bousset have commented on this construction which occurs frequently in the Apoc<sup>3</sup>. It is rightly traced by them to Hebrew influence, but neither they nor anyone else, so far as I can determine, has distinguished between the two meanings of λέγων in NT Greek; i.e. 'to say' versus λέγων plus another verb meaning 'thus'. The following exx. illustrate. First, those where the term means 'say':

Apoc. v.11f καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἀγγέλων

... λέγοντες φωνῇ μεγάλῃ

'I heard the sound of angels ... say in a great voice ...'

---

<sup>1</sup>B1-D §368; Moulton-Howard Gramm. II, 454.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. B1-D §420 (3) where this use as a finite verb as in Hebrew, is noted.

<sup>3</sup>Charles I, cl; Bousset, 243. Cf. Moulton-Turner III, 315.

xi.1 καὶ ἐδόθη μοι κάλαμος  
... λέγων 'he gave me a reed ...  
and said ...' cf. also i.11,17; iv.8<sup>1</sup>.

The second category, in which λέγων follows another verb of saying, crying, singing, etc. is illustrated by v.9:

καὶ ᾄδουσιν ᾠδὴν καινὴν λέγοντες  
'and they sing a new hymn ...' cf. vi.10  
καὶ ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγοντες  
'he cried in a loud voice ...' Other exx.  
include vii.2,3,10,13; xiv.18; xv.3;  
xvii.1; xviii.2,15,16,18; xix.17; xxi.9.

While there is limited evidence for similar employment of λέγων in class. Greek (cf. B1-D<sup>3</sup>420), yet in the case of NT Greek both usages owe their sense to the semitic influence of  $\text{קָוַלְתָּ} \text{כִּי}$ . This construction alone is not direct evidence of translation Greek though, because an expression of this nature would be quickly stereotyped in Jewish Greek.

---

<sup>1</sup>Some of the cases cited here could be explained as parataxis since two or more verbs (including λέγων) occur.

PERFECT PARTICIPLE FOR HEBREW

DERIVED CONJUGATIONS<sup>1</sup>

The Seer employs perfect tense participles a number of times. He also favours the present tense participles; future ptcs. are not found.<sup>2</sup> It is generally believed that there has been no Semitic influence on the perfect tense participles<sup>3</sup>. The inaccuracy of this view regarding perfect indicative verbs has already been demonstrated supra for the perfect indicative, and the following evidence will show that for nearly every perfect tense participle occurring in the Apc. justification can be found from the biblical Hebrew usage of the derived conjugations. Mussies has allowed for Semitic influence on the perfect participle at one point: the perfect middle (surely he meant middle and/or passive?) participle, which, he says, 'reflects certainly the Semitic gerundive qatul'<sup>4</sup>. Although noting that this type of participle occurs 67 times in the Apc., Mussies cites only two cases where, he alleges, it expresses the passive qal participle, i.e.

xiii.8 ἔσφαγμένου and xviii.2 μεμίσθημένου

---

<sup>1</sup>For similar treatment of perfect tense finite verbs cf. section on Tenses.

<sup>2</sup>According to Charles, I, cxxvii.

<sup>3</sup>For example, see Mussies, 347.

<sup>4</sup>P. 348.

At this point note how the following perfect passive participles in the LXX are equivalents of Hebrew participles of the derived conjugations, especially niph'al, piel, hoph'al; their use in the Apc. is always identical to that of the LXX. Especially striking are several cases where the correct meaning of the verb demanded by its context is expressed only by the derived conjugation, the meaning of the gal form being different.

xvii.4 κεχρυσωμένη (perfect participle of χρυσῶ ) chiefly in the LXX for  $\text{כִּפְּסָה}$  piel).  
 κεχρυσωμένη translates a pual participle of  $\text{כִּפְּסָה}$  'overlaid with gold'. It is identical to Ex. xxvi.32  
 κεχρυσωμένων χρυσῶ , which translates  $\text{כִּפְּסָה}$   
 $\text{כִּפְּסָה}$ . The gal of  $\text{כִּפְּסָה}$  means something quite different: 'to arrange'.

Apc. i.13 ἐνδεδυμένον = pual participle.  
 $\text{שָׁבַדְתָּ}$  ( $\text{לְבָשׁ}$ ) cf. II Chr. v.12 where it is translated τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτῶν, τῶν ἐνδεδυμένων  
 'their kinsmen, arrayed [in fine linen]'; cf. xviii.9.

Apc. i.13 περιεζωμένον = niph'al participle  
 $\text{רָזַח}$  ( $\text{רָזַח}$ ), which in Ps. lxx (LXX lxiv).7 is rendered, as in Apc. i.13 by περιεζωμένος.

Apc. i.15 πεπυρωμένος - the niph'al of  $\text{רָזַח}$   
 means 'to refine' (gal can mean the same, but it usually

has the simple meaning 'to smelt').

Apc. ii.17 κερυμμένον 'hidden' - probably  
 from niph'al of נִבֵּן (qal not found in OT),  
 'hide'. Γεγραμμένον - primary meaning of niph'al  
 of כָּתַב is 'to write (words) in a book'. The  
 partic. is כָּתוּב (14:1, 17:5, 19:12,16, 20:12,15,  
 21:12,27, 22:18).

Apc. iv.1 θέρα ηνεωγμένη Why perfect?  
 Does it equal niph'al participle נִבֵּן ? (cf.  
 Apc. x.8).

Apc. vi.9 perfect passive ξοφαγμένων ( in LXX  
 chiefly for שָׁחַט which, in the niph'al conjugation  
 (found twice in the OT) means 'be slaughtered' (cf.  
 Apc. xiii.3,8).

Apc. vii.4,5,8 perfect passive ξοφραγισμένων  
 chiefly in OT for סָדַק . The niph'al participle  
 סָדוּק 'sealed with the king's ring' actually  
 occurs in Esth. iii.12, but the phrase is not found in the  
 LXX. Cf. Apc. xviii.24.

Apc. vii.9 περιβεβλημένους (chiefly for  
ןֹוֹ piel, also for ׀ֹוֹ (?). (Cf. Apc.  
x.1, xi.4, xvii.4, xviii.16, xix.13).

Apc. ix.1 πεπρωότα (cf. Lk. xviii.10;  
Enoch lxxxiv.1, lxxxvi.1). No piel of ׀ֹוֹ is  
found in the OT; hiphil meaning seems not to fit.

ix.14 δεδεμένους (perfect passive participle  
of δέω ) cf. Acts xxii.29 perf. act ptc. δεδεκώς ;  
in LXX for ׀ֹוֹ. Isa. xxii.3, though a verse with  
problems of its own, it illuminates somewhat this usage,  
since there plural of ׀ֹוֹ is translated in the LXX  
by the analytic δεδεμένοι εισίν .

ix.15 perfect passive participle ἠτοιμασμένοι  
(in LXX chiefly for hiphil of ׀ֹוֹ ) clear distinction  
to be made from qal, meaning 'stand firm, be secure,  
lasting'. The polal of ׀ֹוֹ is found a single  
time in the OT, in Ez. xxviii.13, meaning 'prepared'.  
The hophal conjugation can also have the meaning 'be made  
ready'. In any case, the distinction between qal and  
the derived conjugations was significant enough that the  
Seer apparently chose to indicate that he was not trans-  
lating qal of ׀ֹוֹ by ἠτοιμασμένοι (cf.  
Apc. xii.6, xxi.2).

xv.2 μεμιγμένην (perfect passive participle of μέγνυμι ) chiefly in LXX for כִּרְצַח hith. Only in the hithpael does כִּרְצַח mean 'to mix,' 'mingle'.

xvii.16 perfect participle ἡρημαμένην ( ἔρημω ) in LXX for כִּרְחַח hiphil, רָחַץ piel, etc.). The construction ἡρ. ποιήσουσιν is not Greek, but obviously represents a hiphil participle of כִּרְחַח 'cause to dry up'. The addition of ποιήσουσιν gives the strong causative sense, while the perfect participle ἡρημαμένην also underscores the fact that hiphil, not simple qal 'to dry up' is intended. Here again the full force of the passage is felt when the conjugation of the underlying Semitic verb is known.

xix.9 κεκλημένοι (perfect passive) in LXX for קָרָא . Niphal participle קָרְאָה = 'be called', 'be summoned'. Of the several passages in the LXX in which niphal of קָרָא is translated by the perfect of καλέω , we notice especially Isa.

xlviii.1 οἱ κεκλημένοι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰσραήλ . Which in the MT is קָרְאָה בְּשֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל because of its similarity to Apc.

xix.13 βεβαμμένον (perfect passive participle of βάπτω ) ( כָּבַט ) niphal of כָּבַט occurs once in OT, meaning 'be dipped'.

κκ.4      πεπελεκισμένων      perfect passive participle  
 (      πελεκίζω      'behead') not occurring in LXX - extra-  
 biblical Hebrew uses either of two words for the same  
 meaning, i.e.       $\psi\chi\gamma \quad \gamma^{\iota}\delta\eta$       or       $\psi\chi\gamma \quad \tau^{\iota}\beta\eta$   
 in both cases, the hiphil is used.

It should be noted here that the occurrences of the  
 perfect and pluperfect tenses of      ἵστημι      in Apc.  
 are also influenced by Hebrew usage<sup>1</sup>. The Seer employs  
 the verb at least fifteen times, once the pluperfect  
 εἰστήκεισαν      (vii.11) the remainder perfect indic.  
 or perfect partic., ἕστηκεν      (xii.4, etc.) and  
 ἐστῆκες      (v.6, etc.).

The same verb forms of      ἵστημι      stand very  
 frequently in the LXX, nearly always for the common  $\tau\chi\gamma$   
 in Gen. xviii.8 pluperfect (      παρ-      ) ἵσθηκει  
 perfect indic.      ἕστηκας      (Ex. iii.5), perf. partic.  
 ἐστῶτα      (Ex. xxxiii.10).

From this evidence it is seen unnecessary, like Mussies,  
 to      appeal to any particular new Greek stem.  
 Nor is one obliged to force a perfect or pluperfect meaning  
 on any occurrence of the verb in biblical Greek, at least  
 in places where Semitic influence was exerted. The forms  
 under discussion are simply formal translation equivalents  
 for the much-used Hebrew verb.

<sup>1</sup>This usage is discussed by Mussies, 347f. who ascribes  
 the verbs a non-perfective meaning based not/Hebrew but on  
 the new Hellenistic present stem ἵσθῃω .      on

PARTICIPLES USED AS RELATIVE CLAUSES<sup>1</sup>

Participles with or without definite articles were widely used in both Greek and Hebrew to express the sense of relative clauses. They could be substantival partic.,, such as the well-known Johannine  $\delta$  πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ 'He who believes (lit. 'the believing one' in me ... )<sup>2</sup>.  
 Attributive (adjectival) partic. are also thus employed: Acts iv.12 οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομα ἕστιν ἕτερον τὸ δεδομένον 'for there is no other name which is given ... '. As would be expected for a construction well rooted in both Hebrew and Greek (but not Aramaic<sup>3</sup>) there is considerable discussion devoted to whether the many occurrences in the NT owe their existence to semitic or Hellenic influence. Beyer's elaborate discussion of the phenomenon<sup>4</sup> is especially rich in Semitic examples. He analyses NT occurrences of this type of partic. according to the following categories into which the Hebrew equivalents fall:

---

<sup>1</sup>B1-D §§412,13; Moulton-Turner III, 150-53; Beyer, 196-216; Lancellotti, 75, 79f., 100-103; Schwyzer, 408f.; Mandilaras §§882-89.

<sup>2</sup>Note the similar phrase in LXX Isa. xxviii.16b  
 καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐκ' αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ κατασχυνοθῆ  
 (here ὁ πιστεύων = partic.  $\int^{\text{א}} \text{א} \text{א} \text{א} \text{א} \int$  ).

<sup>3</sup>The partic. in Aramaic assumed the role of a finite verb, making it unsuitable for this use.

<sup>4</sup>See Beyer, 196.

- a) the partic. as subject of the main clause;
- b) the partic. as object of the main clause;
- c) the partic. which precedes the main clause as 'casus pendens'.

For each category he concludes as follows: under a) this category is by far the most common in Hebrew and in the NT. The likelihood of Semitic influence is increased, he feels, when the partic. is preceded by  $\kappa\alpha\varsigma$  (=  $\text{כִּי}$ ):  
Matt. v.22  $\kappa\alpha\varsigma$   $\delta$   $\delta\rho\gamma\iota\zeta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\tau\omega$   $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ .

Under b) he notes that in Hebrew the partic. is only very rarely found when it is not the subject of the main clause. Thus if there is good reason to suppose an Aramaic origin, this construction could very well be a primary indication of the Aramaic relative clause.

Under c) he refers to the Hebrew substantival partic. which often precedes the clause and is resumed at a suitable point in the clause by a suffix. The literal Greek rendering of this would employ the corresponding form of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  as a resumptive demonstrative.

The LXX translates this, for example, in Gen. ix.6  $\delta$

$\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$   $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$

$\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\chi\upsilon\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ . NT constructions in this class are definitely under Hebrew influence, although the possibility of Aramaic is not excluded, since the Greek partic. could be a rendering of an Aramaic relative clause. These occurrences are usually best translated 'when somebody ...' cf. Mt. v.40

(D)  $\delta$   $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\nu$   $\sigma\omicron\iota$   $\kappa\rho\iota\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\omicron\nu$   $\chi\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha$   $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$   $\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  ...

... 'when somebody would sue you and take your coat ... '.

In the Apoc.

From the Apoc. Beyer cites the following exx., according to the categories listed supra: a) partic. as subject of main clause:

ii.11b     ὁ νικῶν οὐ μὴ ἀδικηθῆ ἔκ τοῦ  
θανάτου τοῦ δευτέρου           'The conqueror  
shall not be hurt by the second death.  
(i.e. 'he who conquers')'.

iii.5       ὁ νικῶν οὕτως περιβαλεῖται ἐν  
ἱματίοις λευκοῖς           'The conqueror  
shall be clad thus in white garments'.

Here Charles would add xi.10     οἱ κατοικοῦντες  
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς           and xix.9     Μακάριοι  
οἱ ... κεκλημένοι .

xxii.17     καὶ ὁ ἀκούων εἰπάτω, "Ἐρχου  
καὶ διψῶν ἐρχέσθω καὶ ὁ θέλων λαβέτω  
ὔδωρ ζωῆς δωρεάν           'and the one  
hearing, let (him) say, come, and the one  
thirsting, come, and the one desiring (let  
him) take the water of life freely'.

Under b) the partic. as indirect object of the main clause he lists:

ii.7b τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ  
φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου... 'to the overcomer  
I will grant to eat of the tree of life'.

xxi.6 ἐγὼ τῷ διψῶντι δώσω ἐκ τῆς  
πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς  
'to the thirsting one I will give water  
from the fountain of life ... '.

Under c) the partic. which stands before the main clause as casus pendens, a very Hebraic characteristic<sup>1</sup>, he lists:

ii.26 ὁ νικῶν καὶ τηρῶν ἄχρι τέλους  
τὰ ἔργα μου, δώσω αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ  
τῶν ἔθνων 'He who conquers and  
keeps my word to the end, to him will I  
give ... '.

iii.12 ὁ νικῶν ποιήσω αὐτὸν στυλόν  
'He who conquers, I will make him ... '.

---

<sup>1</sup>So also Lancellotti, 83; cf. Black, Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 51f. for Aramaic examples.

iii.21    ὁ νικῶν , δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι  
μετ' ἐμοῦ    'He who conquers, I will  
grant him to sit with me ... '.

xxi.7      ὁ νικῶν , αὐτὸς    (Syr<sup>ph</sup>)  
κληρονομήσει πάντα    'He who conquers,  
he shall inherit all things ... ' <sup>1</sup>.

Lancellotti, who also discusses the use of the partic. in place of a relative clause<sup>2</sup>, makes a very strong case for its Hebraic nature. His point is strained because his desire to support his thesis of a Hebrew substratum for the Apoc.<sup>3</sup> leads him to push the Hebrew evidence on this point to the neglect of Aramaic and even Hellenistic Greek influence which was likely playing its role. Instead of attempting to explain the many partic. in the Apoc. which are used as relative clauses as due solely to Hebrew influence, it would be safer to admit that while this explanation is likely, it is not conclusive nor can it be proven in every case.

---

<sup>1</sup>This passage is listed by Beyer under headings a) as it stands in the text and under c) if the Syriac variant is accepted.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. 75, 79, 83, 100f..

<sup>3</sup>See 83, n.3.

Even the fact that Aramaic usually preferred a relative clause where Hebrew would have employed a partic. does not exclude Aramaic influence in theory, as Lancellotti would have it<sup>1</sup>, since it is possible that Aramaic relative clauses, especially where they underlie Gospel passages, were translated by Greek participles. The fact that in the LXX a partic. can be used in this sense even when the Hebrew text does not employ a partic. should be fair indication that in Hellenistic Greek this usage existed in its own right. Otherwise, remarks Beyer<sup>2</sup>, the 266 substantival participles used relatively in the NT, if understood as literal translations from Semitic language, would have to be taken as representing exclusively Hebrew originals, not Aramaic! This conclusion, obviously, is not convincing.

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 79; 83 n. 3.

<sup>2</sup>P. 205f.

TIMELESSNESS OF THE PRESENT TENSE PARTICIPLE

One notable distinction between Hebrew and Greek participles is seen in their roles of expressing relative time. While Greek partics. have their own designation for time, which is indicated by the tense in which they occur, there is no semitic equivalent. S.R. Driver describes the Hebrew partic., for example, in the following terms: 'In itself it expresses no difference of time, the nature of the "tenses" not favouring, as in Greek, the growth of a separate form corresponding to each; and the period to which an action denoted by it is to be referred, is implied, not in the participle, but in the connection in which it occurs'<sup>1</sup>. We find Hebrew participles used of past, present, and future time with no alteration of form, in sharp contrast to their Greek counterparts.

The mark which this distinction has left on biblical Greek is pointed out by Zerwick<sup>2</sup>, who calls attention to the use of the present tense partic.  $\delta$  βαπτίζων to describe John 'The Baptizer' even after his death. In the Pauline epistles also, such usage appears, e.g. Phil. iii.6 Paul describes himself as  $\delta$  δώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν and in I Thess. i.10 Jesus is called  $\delta$  ῥυόμενος ἡμᾶς

---

<sup>1</sup>Hebrew Tenses, 165.

<sup>2</sup>§§371, 72.

ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς 'the one who delivered us', although the atemporal flavour of the partic. may be intentional in this passage to stress the timelessness of deliverance.

In the Apoc. Lancellotti<sup>1</sup> finds this use (or misuse) of the partic. in iii.12 where a present partic. expresses a future sense: ὁ νικῶν ποιήσω αὐτὸν στύλον

'He who conquers (lit. 'shall conquer') I shall make a pillar ... ' Charles sees similar usage in xv.2 καὶ

τοὺς νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου 'and those who have overcome the beast ... '. Here he prefers to take the partic. as a perfect tense.<sup>2</sup>

### THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCUSATIVE PARTICIPLE<sup>3</sup>

C.C. Torrey<sup>4</sup> has drawn attention to what he designates as the 'adverbial' accusative use of the participle in the Apoc. which is based on Semitic usage. An illustration he cites is Apoc. vii.9 ὄχλος ... ἐστῶτες ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου ... περιβεβλημένους στολᾶς λευκάς

5

---

<sup>1</sup>P.82.

<sup>2</sup>Charles II, 33.

<sup>3</sup>This differs from the circumstantial clause, for which see Black, Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 81f.

<sup>4</sup>Apocalypse of John, 112f.

<sup>5</sup>The accusative partic. standing after a nominative is solecistic; cf. Moulton-Turner III, 314.

'a multitude ... standing before the throne ... clothed in white garments'. Here a condition of the subject is expressed by an appended passive partic. The grammarians<sup>1</sup> recognise the adverbial accusative use of the participle to describe the manner in which an action or a state takes place. These participles can be placed after the main verbs, as in the following cases:

Num. xvi.27 וְדָתָן וְאַבִּירָם יֹצְאוּ  
נֹצְרִים פֶּתַח אֹהֶל יְכֹם

'Then Dothan and Abiram came out,  
standing at the opening of their tents ...' .

Jer. ii.26f.... כִּן הִזְבִּיטוּ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל  
אֲמַרְיִן לְעֵץ אָבִי אַתָּה

'The house of Israel shall be ashamed ...  
saying to a tree, "you are my father" ...'

Cf. Ps. vii.3 'Lest like a lion they rend  
me, dragging ( פִּרְקוּ ) me away';

Job xxiv.5 'like a wild ass in the desert  
they go forth to their toil, seeking  
( מִשְׁחָרִי ) prey ...' .

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g. GK §118p.

These passages, employing the accusative participle in subordination to the main verb, illustrate what is known as the looser subordination of the accusative to the verb<sup>1</sup>. They differ from the ordinary accusative of the direct object<sup>2</sup> by specifying not the object of the verb in question, but some more immediate circumstance affecting the action, such as place, time, measure, cause, or manner. The part of speech subordinated in this fashion may be a noun, an adjective, or, of special interest at this point, a participle, according to GK §118 n,o,p.

The circumstantial partic. usually follows its main verb as in the Hebrew passages cited supra. It can also precede the main verb, as in the following exx.:

Gen. xlix.11 'Tying ( ךְּוֹחַ ) his foal  
to the vine ... he washes his garments in wine'.

Ps. lvi.2 '... all day long making war  
( ןַוִּיִּשׁ ) they oppress me'.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. GK §118.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. GK §117.

The construction is found in biblical Aramaic, as seen from the fall:

Dan. ii.22      אֲרִי־עֲמִיקֵי אֲגַלְגַּל  
                  אֲרִי־עֲמִיקֵי אֲגַלְגַּל אֲרִי־עֲמִיקֵי אֲגַלְגַּל

'He reveals deep and mysterious things,  
knowing what is in the darkness'.

Dan. iii.3      ... בְּאֵינֵי אֲרִי־עֲמִיקֵי  
                  אֲרִי־עֲמִיקֵי אֲרִי־עֲמִיקֵי אֲרִי־עֲמִיקֵי

'Then they were assembled ... and stood  
(lit. 'standing') before the image'. It should be noted also, that where the Targum of the Hebrew examples cited supra is available (i.e. Num. xvi.27, Jer. ii.26f), it also employs the circumstantial partic. in a literal rendering of the Hebrew original.

While it is true that in Hebrew the case-endings have disappeared, yet it is generally agreed that Hebrew, like Assyrian and classical Arabic<sup>1</sup>, has three cases, with some remains of the case endings.

Therefore the fact that the cases of the nouns, adjectives, and partics, loosely subordinated to the verb are accusative can be seen first from the fact that in some cases the nota accusativi ( אֲרִי ) is prefixed; secondly, that on certain

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §90.

occasions the old accusative termination (  $\bar{\Pi}_{\tau}$  ) is employed; thirdly, in classical Arabic these constructions are consistently set in the accusative<sup>1</sup>. On this basis Torrey argues that 'in an inflected Semitic language, as regularly in Arabic, such a partic. would be shown as accusative; and where there is no inflection, as in Hebrew, this construction, the "adverbial" acc. is recognized by grammarians.'<sup>2</sup> Other exx. from the Apc. include xi.3:

καὶ προφητεύουσιν ... περιβεβλημένους  
(K\*AP 046: -μενοι C); cf. x.8: καὶ ἡ  
φωνὴ ἣν ἤκουσα ... κάλιν λαλοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ λέγουσαν.

Here Ozanne<sup>3</sup> states that the force of ἤκουσα is carried over into the second part of the sentence, and accordingly the two participles are adverbial/circumstantial in character. The Hebraism was here unduced by attraction to ἣν .

Perhaps the simplest and strongest objection which has been raised against this alleged semitism is that it is merely a solecism, a 'hanging accusative'<sup>4</sup> in the case of vii.9, which has been attracted to εἶδον . In fact, Turner has drawn attention to a similar (mis)use of the nominative and genitive circumstantial ptc<sup>5</sup>. Nowhere in the Greek OT versions has this writer found such a literal translation of a circumstantial accus. ptc.

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §118b.

<sup>2</sup>Torrey, op. cit.

<sup>3</sup>Thesis, p.22.

<sup>4</sup>B1-D §136 (2)

<sup>5</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 314.

Even if a final decision cannot now be reached regarding the accusative use of the circumstantial participle in the Apc., we must still give attention to a fundamental distinction between Hebrew/Aramaic circumstantial participles and their Greek counterparts.

From the exx. cited supra it is clear that the relationship between participle and its main verb in semitic languages is not temporal - that is, no sequence of events is expressed in which the action of the partic. can be said to occur either before, simultaneous with, or after the main verb. The partic. merely provides additional information about the action or state of the main verb. This is clearly seen in Canticles ii.8 where the participles leaping and bounding clarify the manner in which the young man approaches. Even a passage such as Num. xvi.27 'Dothan and Ab. came out, standing ... ', which could be made to read paratactically 'came out and (then) stood' thus expressing a temporal relation, is best understood as purely circumstantial; to impose a sequence of chronological order is foreign to the nature of the semitic construction. Classical Greek however employs the circumstantial participle to express precisely the temporal relationship. W.W. Goodwin notes that 'The tenses of the participle generally express time present, past, or future relatively to the time of the verb with which they are connected'<sup>1</sup>. An Aorist partic.

---

<sup>1</sup>Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb (London, 1889), 47.

would then represent an action as past in reference to its main verb, a present partic. would represent action occurring at the same time with its main verb, etc. While these categories of time are not totally inflexible, exceptions in class. Greek are so rare that when they do occur, they require special comment.

The aorist circumstantial partic. in the NT is a striking exception in numerous places where it expresses not the anticipated past action, but action occurring at the same time as its main verb, or even following it in time<sup>1</sup>. The most disputed passage of this nature in the

NT is Acts xxv.13<sup>2</sup>: Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ Βερνίκη  
κατήντησαν εἰς Καισάρειαν ἀσπασόμενοι τὸν Φῆστον .

'Agrippa the king and Bernice arrived in Caesarea,

greeting Festus'. The variant ἀσπασόμενοι

an obvious emendation to bring the passage into line with Greek syntax, the greeting thus following the arriving.

The following main positions have been maintained for

---

<sup>1</sup>A few class. Greek examples of this usage are cited by Goodwin, Ibid., 52.

<sup>2</sup>The literature on this aorist partic. is enormous; the most important notes include the following: W.G. Ballantine, 'Predicative Participles with Verbs in the Aorist' Bibliotheca Sacra (Oberlin, Ohio, 1884) XLI, 789; Burton, NT Moods & Tenses, 65f.; C.D. Chambers, 'On A Use of the Aorist Partic. in Some Hellenistic Writers' JTS xxiv (1923), 183; W.F. Howard, 'On the Futuristic Use of the Participle in Hellenistic' JTS xxv (1924), 286; Zerwick, Biblical Greek §264; Bl-D §339 (1); Moule, Idiom Book, 100, 202; Albert Wifstrand, 'Apostelsgeschichte 25, 13.' Eranos (Uppsala) liv. (1956), 123ff. The latter

this participle:

- a) it indeed expresses an action which follows the main verb, contrary to Greek practice (so Burton and Howard);
- b) it makes an additional assertion or modification of the act of the main verb, a usage foreign to class. Greek syntax, but found often in the NT (so Ballantine);
- c) it expresses an act simultaneous with the main verb, which in class. Greek would be expressed by the present tense partic. (so Moulton and Robertson);
- d) the most candid admission, from no less an authority on Greek syntax than Professor Friedrich Blass, is that this use of the aorist partic. 'is not Greek'<sup>1</sup>.

Assuming Blass to be correct, we would here suggest that the Semitic mode of employing a circumstantial partic., as discussed in this section, offers a plausible explanation for the timelessness of some circumstantial participles in the NT. We noted already how the semitic construction was devoid of the idea of temporal relationship, ascribing rather additional circumstances to the main verb. Such an influence on ἀσπασόμενοι in the passage in Acts xxv.13 would remove the difficulty

---

article provides further bibliographical references, plus analyses, on this much-disputed participle.

<sup>1</sup>Grammar of NT Greek (London, 1898), 197. Blass rejects the aorist partic., adopting the poorly-attested future partic. in its place.

of explaining how an aorist partic. expresses an act which in fact should follow its main verb. The observation that these unusual aorist partic. abound just in the NT<sup>1</sup> would also be more understandable if their existence were traceable to an underlying semitic sense of the partic. By assuming semitic influence, the objection that the temporal order of events is incorrect is thus removed.

In the Apoc.

In addition to the unusual employment of the accusative case of the participles noted by Torrey<sup>2</sup>, Lancellotti<sup>3</sup> notes in the following verses the incongruence between the tense of the main verb and its participle:

xi.3 προφητεουσιν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας  
ἑξήκοντα περιβεβλημένους (N\*AP 046)

'they shall prophecy a  
thousand, two hundred and sixty days clothed  
in sack cloth.' Lancellotti adds :

---

<sup>1</sup>Especially in Acts; cf. iii.26; vii.26; x.29; xii.24,25; xvi.23; xxi.24; xxiii.35; xxiv.23. The Gospels also contain quite a number of these; cf. John xi.2,3; Lk. ii.16; Mt. xxvii.4; Mk. i.31; xiv.39.

<sup>2</sup>p.112f.

<sup>3</sup>p.90f. Apoc. vi.2, suggested by Lancellotti, is not a true example of this usage.

xv.6 ἐξῆλθον οἱ ἑπτὰ ἄγγελοι ...  
ἐνδεδυμένοι λίνον ... καὶ περιεζωσμένοι  
... 'the seven angels came ... robed in  
linen ... and girded ... '.

In each case the tense of the participle does not coincide with that of the main verb, as would be expected in Greek. Cf. also:

vii.1 εἶδον τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους ἐστῶτας  
... κρατοῦντας 'I saw seven angels  
stand (taking the participle as an indicative,  
under Semitic influence) ... holding (the  
four winds) ... '

xix.14 τὰ στρατεύματα ... ἠκολούθει  
αὐτῷ ... ἐνδεδυμένοι 'the armies  
... followed him ... clothed (in white linen)  
... '.

xxi.2 Ἰερουσαλὴμ καινήν εἶδον  
καταβαίνουσαν ... ἡτοιμασμένην  
'I saw new Jerusalem descend ... prepared  
(as a bride) ... '

xiv.15 και ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐξηλθεν

... κρᾶζων ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ

'and another angel came out ... crying  
in a loud voice';

xviii.15 οἱ ἔμποροι ... στήσονται

... κλαίουντες καὶ πενθοῦντες 'the  
merchants ... shall stand ... weeping and  
mourning'; verse 18 καὶ ἔκραζον βλέποντες  
'and they cried, seeing ... '.

#### PARTICIPLE FOR SEMITIC INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE<sup>1</sup>

Thoroughly Semitic is the addition of a participle of the same verb in order to strengthen the verbal idea. This construction is rare in the NT, being restricted for the most part to LXX citations.

Mussies<sup>2</sup> discusses the construction in the Semitic languages briefly, then cites five (not four, as he declares) alleged examples of the construction from the Apc. However, iii.17 and xviii.6 are certainly not true examples; and xvi.9 and xvii.6 are in fact accusatives

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 156f.; B1-D §198 (6); Conybeare & Stock, §81. For a variety of methods of translating the Infinitive absolute in the LXX, cf. H. Kaupel, 'Beobachtungen zur Übersetzung des Infinitus Absolutus in der LXX' ZAW n.f. 20 (1945-8(1949)), 191ff.

<sup>2</sup>P. 323f.

absolute<sup>1</sup>.

Summary of Chapter III, Part G

The resolution of a participle into a finite verb, on Hebraic lines, is well-attested in the Apc., and has been studied previously.

On the widely debated issue of whether participles used as relative clauses fall under some variety of Semitic influence, it is decided best to avoid the one-sided argument of exclusive influence of Hebrew which is maintained by Lancellotti, and recognise that Hellenistic Greek made wide use of the same construction.

In contrast to Greek participles which usually denote time past, present, or future in relation to their main verb, Hebrew participles of themselves express no difference of time. This has been traced in the Apc. as well. Such usage appears most clearly in the circumstantial employment of the participle. We noted here also that when the tense of the participle did not coincide in proper chronological sequence with that of the main verb, along the lines of Greek syntax, it was due to this timeless nature of the Semitic participle.

---

<sup>1</sup>Discussed infra in section 'Case Additions to the Verb'. Only vi.2 remains:  $\kappa\alpha\iota \ \xi\epsilon\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu \ \nu\iota\kappa\omega\nu \ \kappa\alpha\iota \ \Upsilon\upsilon\alpha \ \nu\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\eta$ . There is a question of translating it to give the intensive or strengthened sense of the verb - perhaps 'so he departed that he might surely conquer?'

CHAPTER IV

CASE ADDITIONS TO THE VERB

PART A. WITHOUT PREPOSITIONS

Where verbs in biblical Greek take objects in a case different from that customary in classical Greek, one of two phenomena have influenced the change, either the demands of Hellenistic usage, or the fact that in Hebrew or Aramaic the corresponding verbs take their objects in a different case.

1. Nominative<sup>1</sup>

Proper names usually take the case required by the construction to which they are attached, e.g. Matt. i.21

τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν etc. When, however, they are introduced independently in the nominative in biblical Greek, Semitic influence can be suspected, although this is found rarely in classical writers.

In the Apc. note ix.11 ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολλῶν (the omission of ὄνομα ἔχει in vg is possibly an attempt to avoid the construction, it is not original).

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton-Turner, III, 230; Bl-D §143, 144;  
R. Helbing, Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta (Göttingen, 1928) does not discuss the nom.

Identical constructions in the LXX are due to the fact that the underlying Hebrew does not distinguish between nominative and accusative in this use<sup>1</sup>: Isa. vii.14

καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουηλ 'you shall call his name Emmanuel'; cf. xliv.5 βοήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι 'Iακωβ 'he shall call himself by the name of Jacob'; Isa. lx.14 κληθήσεται πόλις κυρίου 'it shall be called city of Jahweh'; cf. vs. 18 κληθήσεται Σωτήριον τὰ τείχη σου 'your walls shall be called Salvation'; Gen. xi.9 ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Σύγχυσις 'its name was called confusion'; Gen. v.2 ἐκωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἀδὰμ 'he named him Adam'.

It would be more accurate to say that since Hebrew nouns did not express cases by the method of inflections, Greek proper nouns used to translate them tend to remain in the primary case, nominative. It would be, therefore, more accurate to describe what at first appears to be a misuse of the nominative case as in fact an accommodation to Hebrew usage. The case of the noun is to be determined by its context.

Closely related is the sometimes striking use of the divine name in the nominative, when syntax demands another case. Apc. i.4 ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, following ἀπὸ . The passage has received much

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. GK §79b.

discussion<sup>1</sup>. From the practice of LXX translators noted here, of employing Greek nominative to represent Semitic nouns of any case, one can easily see why such lack of concord of cases could be tolerated. To the first Jewish Christian readers of the Apc. there appeared in fact no lack of concord at all!

When the so-called 'parenthetical nominative'<sup>2</sup>

ὄνομα αὐτοῦ occurs it too can be explained by reference to Semitic usage, as shown elsewhere in this study. This phrase (or a similar one) is found three times in the Apc. (vi.8, viii.11, ix.11) as well as in the Gospel of John i.6, iii.1, xviii.10.

## 2. Accusative

The most evident and widespread Semitic influence on the case endings attached to verbs is the use of the accusative, especially with verbs which in classical Greek would take the Genitive. Following is a list of verbs which seem to be under such influence: ἀκοῶ<sup>3</sup>  
The consistent classical usage of ἀκοῶ with the genitive to express 'to hear a sound' etc. by ἀκοῶν

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles, I ad i.8; cf. Bl-D §143 for references to recent literature.

<sup>2</sup>Bl-D §144; Moulton-Turner III, 230.

<sup>3</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 233; Bl-D §173; Helbing, 150-53.

φωνῆς , βοῆς etc. appears to have broken down in NT usage, which wavers between genitive and accusative<sup>1</sup>. Grammarians have postulated a distinction of nuance for such mixing of cases in the NT, e.g. Acts ix.7 (genitive: the men with Paul heard the sound) and the accusative in Acts xxii.9 (they did not understand the voice<sup>2</sup>). A similar distinction has been traced by some in John with the genitive meaning 'obey', the accusative expressing mere perception. No such distinction is to be found in Acts or Apc., nor in the LXX, and even the case for it in John and Acts is weakened in view of the LXX's use of both genitive and accusative after ἀκοῶν based on mechanical translation, where the underlying Hebrew object is accusative: e.g. Gen. iii.8 καὶ ἤκουσαν τὴν φωνήν translates the accusative לִּיפְ - תֵּן ; but note Gen. xxi.12 ἔκουε τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῆς (= וַיִּשְׁמָע אֶל־כּוֹלֵי־בְּרִיָּהּ ), while in xxiv.30 ἤκουσεν τὰ ῥήματα 'Ρεβέκκας (= וַיִּשְׁמָע אֶת־כּוֹלֵי־רֵבֶקָה ). It is obvious that the difference between accusative and genitive here is not that of nuance, but merely a literal translation of Hebrew.

The same indiscriminate mixing of cases following ἀκοῶν occurs in Acts and Apc.<sup>3</sup>. The accusative is used in Acts ix.4 ἤκουσε φωνήν ; cf. xxii.9

---

<sup>1</sup>B1-D §173 (2).  
<sup>2</sup>Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §50 (cited by Moulton-Turner, III, 233).  
<sup>3</sup>Moulton-Turner, III, 234; B1-D §173 (2).

φωνήν οὐκ ἤκουσαν xxiv.14

ἤκουσα φωνήν ( φωνῆς E); genitive in ix.7

ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς ; xxii.7 ἤκουσα φωνῆς .

In the Apc. the accusative is found in i.10

ἤκουσα ... φωνήν ( φωνῆς 2057 743 2051  
a1); v.11 ἤκουσα φωνήν ( φωνῆς 2028 2029 a1;

also in vi.6,7, ix.13, x.4, xi.12, xiv.2, xviii.4, xix.1.

The genitive occurs in xvi.1 (CA 046 a1).

It is apparent that no distinction of nuance can be maintained in these passages. The selection of case could be safely ascribed to Semitic influence in both Acts and Apc. The accusation of grammarians that the cases were used 'indiscriminately' is a misrepresentation of and misunderstanding of biblical Greek on this point.

Γέμω . In classical Greek the verb took the genitive of material: κλοῖα γέμοντα

χρημάτων (Thuc. 7.25). According to N. Turner<sup>1</sup> the change to accusative in biblical Greek is due to direct Semitic influence, illustrated by Ex. xxxi.3

ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θεοῦ (note the double accusative here) =

□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□  
□□□□□□□□□□ 'I filled him with a divine spirit'.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 232f.; cf. Helbing, 144-49; BL-D §159 (1).

<sup>2</sup>The Hebrew נָשָׂא takes accusative of material, cf. BDB, Hebrew Lexicon, s.v. נָשָׂא .

In the Apc. γέμω takes the following cases: iv.6  
γέμοντα ὀφθαλμοῦς (336 2014 2019 a1:  
ὀφθαλμων Textus Receptus); cf. vs. 8 γέμουσιν  
ὀφθαλμοῦς (336 2014 a1: οφθαλμων Textus Receptus);  
v.8 γεμοῦσας θυμιαμάτων : xv.7 γεμοῦσας τὸν θυμὸν  
(2062: του θυμου Textus Receptus); xvii.3 γέμ-  
οντα ὀνόματα ; xvii.4 γέμον βδελύγματα (792:  
βδελυγματων Textus Receptus); xxi.9 γεμόντων τῶν  
ἐπὶ κληγῶν τῶν ἐσχάτων .

The fact that the accusative is often preserved only in manuscripts of minor importance indicates that the accusative was subject to scribal correction in the better mss. to the Greek genitive.

Γεβομαι plus accusative is not classical, but is good Hebrew usage, as Helbing noted<sup>1</sup>. Cf. Job xii.11 γευ . σῖτα , which literally translates the underlying Hebrew.

There is no occurrence of γεβομαι in the Apc.

Ἐπιθυμέω with genitive is classical, although sometimes the accusative was employed<sup>2</sup>. Often in the LXX it takes accusative where it translates

פִּיֵּל or פִּיֵּל followed by accusative.

Ex. xx.17 οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα , cf.  
xxxiv.24 οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσει οὐδεὶς τὴν γῆν (F:

---

<sup>1</sup>P.135.

<sup>2</sup>B1-D §171 (1); Helbing, p.137.

της γης all others) σου, for the accusative

וְאִישׁ לְאָדָמָה וְאִישׁ לְאָדָמָה וְאִישׁ לְאָדָמָה 'nor

shall anyone desire your land'. Having established this Semitic usage, we note it in the NT in Matt. v.28 τὸ

ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν (BDWE: αὐτης λ<sup>c</sup>).

The verb in Apc. ix.6 is used transitively, but is of interest on another account. It reads '(in those days men shall seek death and not find it,) and they shall desire to die ...' καὶ ἐπιθυμήσουσιν τοῦ (792)

ἀποθανεῖν . While the use of the infinitive

with ἐπιθυμέω is not unknown to classical Greek, yet its use here, especially with the Semitic genitive article, can be accounted for from biblical Hebrew usage; the identical syntactical structure is found, with ל

plus infinitive, in Deut. xii.20 לֶחֶם אֲכָלְתָּ וְשָׂרֵי אֲכָלְתָּ , LXX ἐπιθυμῆσαι (A) ...

ὥστε φαγεῖν ... 'you desire to eat'.

Καλέω in both classical idiom and the LXX

usually takes an accusative object. In the LXX it renders in most places ληρ plus ל connected to the object, as in Gen. i.5 וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי

καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ... 'and God called the light ...' LXX

ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ... Against this idiomatic usage compare the mechanical translation by Aquila<sup>1</sup> τῷ φωτι ἡμέρα, where λ + object = dative.

<sup>1</sup>From Field's Hexapla (cited by Helbing, 50).

In its usage the Apc. stands closer to the language of the LXX than to Aquila's in the use of cases. Finally, it should be observed that the Hebrew idiom  $\text{קָרָא בְּשֵׁם ה'}$  ( $\text{καλεῖν τὸ ὄνομα}$ ) appears in Apc. xix.13  $\text{κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ}$ , 'the name by which he is called is the Word of God'.

$\text{Κληρονομέω}$  in classical Greek takes the genitive, but in the LXX the genitive occurs only seldom, although outside biblical Greek the only known pre-Christian occurrence of this verb plus accusative is from Lycurgus. Leocr. 88 (iv B.C.)  $\text{ταύτην}$  (sc. the earth)  $\text{ἐκληρονόμουν}$  a dead person<sup>1</sup>.

The striking, almost total abandonment of the genitive object in the LXX is due to the underlying verb, usually  $\text{אָרַב}$  which takes the accusative object. Num. xiii.30 'Let us go up at once and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it' (sc. 'the land');  $\text{אָרַבְתִּים אֶת הָאָרֶץ}$   $\text{אָרַבְתִּים}$ . LXX has  $\text{καὶ κατακληρονομήσομεν αὐτήν}$ . In NT the accusative object is usually found.

Note the similarity of both syntax and ideas between the Num. passage just cited and Apc. xxi.7  $\text{ὁ νικῶν κληρονομήσει ταῦτα}$  which is usually rendered 'the one who conquers shall have this heritage' (RSV); in light of the OT, could it be that the idea is 'the one who is able shall possess this heritage?'

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Liddel and Scott, s.v.  $\text{κληρονομέω}$ . On the use of the verb in the LXX, cf. Helbing, 138ff.

κρατέω . In Hellenistic Greek κρατέω with the sense 'to hold fast' takes a genitive object<sup>1</sup>. While the accusative object is not unknown outside biblical Greek, its use in the LXX is certainly due to the fact that Hebrew hiphil רִיַּץ or qal יָצַח takes the accusative of the thing grasped or held fast. The LXX translators were not consistent, and there is a mixture of accusative and genitive objects following κρατέω as a result. Perhaps the majority of instances in the LXX used the genitive in good Greek style.

In the NT the cases are mixed as well, with the literary Koine represented by Heb. iv.14 κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας . The accusative is favoured as would be expected by Mark and the Seer in the Apc.<sup>2</sup>.

The verb is found eight times in the Apc., five times in the second chapter. It has two meanings, viz. 'grasp', 'take hold of' in ii.1 ὁ κρατῶν τοῦς

ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας 'grasping the seven stars'; vii.1 κρατοῦντες τοῦς τέσσαρας ἀνέμους 'holding back (clutching) the four winds'; xx.2 ἐκράτησεν τὸν δράκοντα 'laid hold of the dragon'. The remaining

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bl-D §170 (2); cf. Helbing, 119f.

<sup>2</sup>Moulton-Turner, III, 232. E.g. Mk vii.13 κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν 'holding fast the tradition'; ix.10 τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν 'they kept hold of the matter'; cf. 2 Thess. ii.15.

passages mean 'hold fast' i.e. be closely united with it :

ii.13 κρατεῖς τὸ ὄνομα μου ; cf. vs.14

κρατοῦντας τὴν διδαχὴν (also vs.15); vs.25

ὃ ἔχετε κρατήσατε 'hold fast to what you have'  
(cf. iii.11 κράτει ὃ ἔχετε ).

Μαθητῶν takes the genitive of the person  
(or takes a preposition παρά ) and the genitive of  
the matter being taught in classical Greek<sup>1</sup>. In Hebrew  
however לִמְדוֹתָא its equivalent takes the accusative,  
e.g. Prov. xxii.25 לִמְדוֹתָא דְּוִיִּן  
'lest you learn his ways' (LXX genitive object τῶν  
ὁδῶν however).

In the NT accusative is found in Matt. xxiv.32  
μάθετε τὴν παραβολὴν 'learn the lesson'; in  
Apc. xiv.3 μαθεῖν τὴν ᾠδὴν '(no one was able) to  
learn the song ... '.

Μεθύω / Μεθύσκω in classical Greek usually  
takes ὑπό plus genitive of the intoxicating agent,  
e.g. μεθ. ὑπό τοῦ οἴνου 'drunken with wine'  
etc.<sup>2</sup>. In biblical Greek the influence of Hebrew  
יָגַד (= ἀπό or ἐκ ) has exerted itself  
in the LXX of Deut. xxxii.42 μεθύσω τὰ βέλη  
μου ἀφ' αἵματος 'I will make my arrows drunk with blood'.

<sup>1</sup>Helbing, 158. But in LSJ the accus. of thing learnt.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Liddell and Scott sv. μεθύω .

Helbing<sup>1</sup> cites similar examples which stem from hiphil of  $\text{יָזַן$   $\text{בַּדָּם}$ . The Apc. preserves an identical usage (with substitution of  $\text{ἐκ}$  for  $\text{ἀπό}$ ) in xvii.6  $\text{μεθούσαν ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος}$  'drunk with the blood'; cf. vs.2  $\text{καὶ ἐμεθύσθησαν οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου}$  'and those dwelling on earth were intoxicated with the wine ...'. While classical Greek can express this sense using genitive with  $\text{ἀπό}$ , or the genitive alone, as in Plato Symp. 203b  $\text{μεθυσθεὶς τοῦ νέκταρος}$ , yet no parallel is known in secular classical Greek for use of  $\text{ἐκ}$  or  $\text{ἀπό}$ . This is a pure Hebraism.

$\text{Πειράζω}$  took the genitive case object in early Greek<sup>2</sup> (most examples are Homeric<sup>3</sup>). In the LXX only a few examples with the genitive are found. Most in the LXX and all in the NT which have an object take the accusative case, most probably due to the equivalent piel of  $\text{פָּרַז}$  and accusative.

Occurrences in the Apc. include ii.2  $\text{ἐπειρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους}$  and iii.10  $\text{πειράσαι τοὺς κατοικοῦντας}$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>p.50.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Helbing, 143f.; B1-D §171 (2).

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Liddell and Scott, s.v.  $\text{πειράζω}$ .

Περιβάλλω in the LXX usually translates hiphil  $\psi\text{ב}\text{ל}$  or piel  $\pi\text{ו}\text{כ}$ , both of which take a double accusative<sup>1</sup>, as in Zech. iii.5  $\text{וַיִּבְשְׂמוּ אֶת־הַיָּרֵךְ}$   
 $\text{וְהִלְבְּשׁוּ אֶת־הַיָּרֵךְ}$  'they clothed him with garments' (LXX περιέβαλον αὐτὸν ἱμάτια ).

Most occurrences in the Apoc. like those in the LXX, take the accusative, e.g. vii.9 περιβεβλημένους στολᾶς λευκάς 'clothed with white garments', cf. vs. 13, x.1, xi.3, xii.1, xvii.4, xviii.6, xix.8,13.

A related construction in Hebrew uses preposition  $\text{כ}$  (= ἐν ) after the verb, as in Ps. cxlvii (cxlvi) 8 περιβαλ . οὐρανὸν ἐν νεφέλαις (=  $\text{כְּ}\text{וַיִּבְשְׂמוּ אֶת־הַיָּרֵךְ}$  ) 'he covers heaven in clouds'. This construction is found in Apoc. iii.5 περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις 'covered with (white) garments'; cf. iv.4.

Πίνω . While in classical idiom the partitive sense 'to drink of' (or from) was expressed by the genitive case (e.g. Homer, Od 11.96 αἵματος ὄφρα πῖω 'so that I may drink of the blood'), the expression in Hebrew employed the preposition  $\text{מִ}$  to express the partitive sense<sup>2</sup>. Note Gen. ix.21  $\text{וַיִּשְׂתֶּי מִן־הַיַּיִן}$  'so he drank of the wine' (LXX καὶ ἔπιεν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου ). This Hebraism is found in Apoc. xiv.10 αὐτὸς πίνεται

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Helbing, 46.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Helbing, 131ff. But cf. LSJ s.v. πίνω for classical examples using ἐκ / ἀπό .



cf. vs. 20, x.10, xvii.16, xix.18.

Elsewhere  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  like  $\text{אֵלֶּי}$ , is often followed by  $\text{אֵלַי}$  as in Gen. xxvii.19 'eat from my game', which is rendered in the LXX by  $\alpha\pi\omicron$  plus genitive. This occurs in the NT in John vi.26  $\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$

$\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ , cf. 2 Ki. xii.3  $\phi\alpha\gamma\ .\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , etc. In the Apc. it occurs at ii.7  $\phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$   $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \xi\delta\lambda\omicron\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$  'to eat of the tree of life';

possibly also in vs.17  $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega\ \alpha\beta\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\ \alpha\pi\omicron$  (omit  $\phi\alpha\gamma\ .\ \alpha\pi\omicron$  CA 046 a)  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\alpha$ . 'I will make him to eat from the manna'. But the text is uncertain.

This latter construction finds no parallel in pre-Christian secular Greek authors<sup>1</sup>, thus is considered a pure Semitism.

$\phi\omicron\beta\epsilon\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  when it has an object in the Apc., takes the accusative as in classical Greek. The Hebrew  $\text{לָקַח$  also takes an accusative object. Cf. Apc. ii.10, xi.18, xiv.7, xv.4, xix.5.

The use of  $\alpha\pi\omicron$  after  $\phi\omicron\beta\epsilon\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  in the LXX (e.g. Deut. i.29  $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\ \phi\omicron\beta\eta\theta\eta\tau\epsilon\ \alpha\pi'\ \alpha\beta\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$  'do not fear them' is based on Hebrew  $\text{לָקַח}$  which occurs numerous times, usually translated by  $\alpha\pi\omicron$  in the LXX. This Hebraism occurs in Matt. x.28  $\mu\grave{\eta}\ \phi\omicron\beta\epsilon\iota\tau\eta\epsilon$   $\alpha\pi\omicron\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\omicron\tau\epsilon\nu\nu\delta\omicron\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\omicron\delta\ \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$  'do not fear those who kill the body ...'. Such usage is not found in the Apc.

---

<sup>1</sup>Says Helbing, 132.

3. Cognate Accusative (Accusative of Content)<sup>1</sup>.

Hebrew and Aramaic make use of the cognate accusative to strengthen the verbal idea<sup>2</sup>. The addition takes the form of a noun derived (not in every case) from the verb stem, or at least from a stem of similar meaning<sup>3</sup>, e.g.

Gen. xxvii.34       $\text{הָיָה} \quad \text{קוֹל} \quad \text{בְּיָדָיו} \quad \text{בְּקוֹל} \quad \text{בְּיָדָיו}$   
 $\text{גָּדוֹל} \quad \text{וְרָע} \quad \text{בְּקוֹל} \quad \text{בְּיָדָיו}$  'he cried (with) a very  
great and bitter cry'; cf. LXX Zech. i.2  $\omega\rho\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta \dots$

$\delta\rho\gamma\eta\nu \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta\nu$  (=  $\eta\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha \dots \eta\gamma\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ )  
'(Jahweh) was very angry ... ' cf. the similar expression

in Apc. xvii.6  $\epsilon\theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\alpha \text{ \textit{I}d\omega\nu} \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu \theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha$   
'seeing her, I marvelled very much'; cf. xvi.9  $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\nu-$

$\mu\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu \kappa\alpha\theta\mu\alpha \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha$  'scorched by a great  
heat'. Cf. also Matt. ii.10  $\epsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \chi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta\nu$   
'they rejoiced exceedingly with great joy'.

While classical Greek contains similar constructions there is no doubt that in biblical Greek they are rooted in Semitic usage.

---

<sup>1</sup>Helbing, 88ff.; Bl-D §153; GK §117 p-t.

<sup>2</sup>GK §117q.

<sup>3</sup>GK §117p; Bl-D §153 (1).

4. Genitive

R. Helbing notes<sup>1</sup> that 'Die hebräische Sprache kennt keinen adverbialen Genitiv'<sup>2</sup>. For this reason, and also because no vestige of the genitive case ending was in regular use in biblical Hebrew<sup>3</sup>, the use of the genitive case attached to verbs in the LXX shows no dependence on Hebrew syntax. Therefore the genitive case in biblical Greek seems to be employed in the same sense as in Hellenistic Greek.

5. Dative

'Αὐτῷ 'to praise', usually takes the accusative in biblical Greek, which conforms with the pre-Christian secular use (very rare). It also conforms with the Hebrew accusative after. ללπ.

It is worth noting however that the Hebrew of the later OT books (Ezra, Neh. Chron.) often introduced a dative object, e.g. I Chr. xvi.36

ללפ' 'praise Jahweh' which was rendered literally by the LXX; ἤνεσαν τῷ κυρίῳ cf. II Chr. v.13, xx.9; Dan. Theod. iv.31, etc.

---

<sup>1</sup>P.107.

<sup>2</sup>For the adverbial genitive cf. Bl-D §169f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. GK §89.

This later OT usage is responsible for the occurrence of αἰνεῖτε τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν in Apc. xix.5.

Διδάσκω which translates in the LXX Hebrew piel 7X7 usually takes accusative of person and object, which conforms with both Greek and Hebrew usage<sup>1</sup>.

A peculiar intrusion of the dative in Apc. ii.14 requires explanation: ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλάκ 'he taught Balak'. This has no parallel in Greek, and indeed the manuscripts show confusion over the case; the dative is the more difficult reading. Perhaps it is a reflection the Hebrew usage illustrated by Job xxi.22

7Y7 - 7X7; 7X7 7X7 'will one teach (to) God knowledge?' Here the object 7X7 has the sign of the dative 7 attached.

---

<sup>1</sup>Helbing, 39.

'ὀργίζομαι in classical Greek usually takes a dative object, as it does in the LXX often.

Only a few instances of ὀργίζω with ἐπί plus dative are known in classical Greek. Under Hebrew influence<sup>1</sup> one finds the expression in Gen. xl.2

ὀργίσθη Φαραω ἐπὶ τοῖς δυοῖν εὐνούχοις 'Pharaoh was angry with his two officers' (=  $\text{פָּרֹאֲרַיִם} \text{ אֲרִיבָה} \text{ אֶל} \text{ שְׁנֵי} \text{ מְשִׁלְמֵי} \text{ הַמִּצְרַיִם}$  );

other OT examples could be cited. This usage has entered the Apc. in xii.17 ὀργίσθη ὁ δράκων ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικί. The dragon was angry with the woman!.

ποιέω plus dative in the LXX reflects Hebrew  $\text{עָשָׂה} \text{ לְ} \text{ אִישׁ}$  which is used to express doing something for someone; e.g. Gen. xxx.31  $\text{עָשָׂה} \text{ לְ} \text{ מִיָּדְךָ}$

'you will do for me', LXX ποιήσεις μοι. In most places in the OT this construction is translated by Greek dative<sup>2</sup>; Greek would ordinarily use the accusative or a following preposition. This is found only rarely in classical authors<sup>3</sup> but often in the LXX as a Semitism. The NT uses it; e.g. Lk. vi.27 καλῶς

ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς 'do good for (or 'on behalf of': not 'to' of RSV) those who hate you'; Mk. xiv.7 αὐτοῖς (A αὐτον) εἶποιτε 'do good on their behalf'; Apc. xiii.14

<sup>1</sup>Helbing, 211.

<sup>2</sup>Helbing, 3.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Moulton-Turner III, 245; Helbing, 3.

ποιῆσαι εἰκόνα τῷ θηρίῳ 'to make an image  
for the beast'.

These NT occurrences are best-understood as Semitisms.  
Remaining occurrences of ποιέω in Apc. which take  
an object take it in the accusative case.

προσκυνέω. Nigel Turner<sup>1</sup> observes that while  
this verb in classical Greek takes the accusative in the  
LXX it has the dative c.150 times, against about ten  
times with an accusative object. Scattered occurrences  
with dative are found in Dio Cassius, Lucian, Josephus,  
and Aristeas. The Hebrew פּוֹדֵן is usually followed  
by לְ, which in the LXX would be translated by dative.  
This accounts for the dative following προσκυνέω  
in Apc. iv.10; vii.11, xiii.4,15, xiv.17, xvi.2, xix.4,  
10,20, xxii.8,9. Cf. occurrences with accusative object in  
ix.20, xiii.8,12, xiv.9,11, xx.4.

A similar mixing of dative and accusative objects  
is found in Matt. and John.

Verbs of saying, εἶπον, λέγω nearly always  
in the LXX represent פָּדַן with לְ or לְךָ<sup>2</sup>  
In the LXX לְ = dative, and לְךָ = πρός. Individual  
translators sometimes mixed one construction for the  
other according to individual preference. For instance

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton-Turner III, 245.

<sup>2</sup>Helbing, 217; Moulton-Turner, III, 237.

in LXX Gen. Helbing counted 218 occurrences of the dative and 47 of  $\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ , while in the books of Kings  $\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  predominates. The Greek dative represents  $\beta$  459 times,  $\beta\chi$  333 times, while  $\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  =  $\beta\chi$  812 times,  $\beta$  only 49 times.

The Seer in the Apc. preferred the dative, which according to Turner's tabulation<sup>1</sup> he uses 28 times, but  $\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  is not used.

PART B. WITH PREPOSITIONS<sup>2</sup>

In his 'Preparatory Note on Prepositions in NT' Nigel Turner<sup>3</sup> concedes that the study of case endings with prepositions is important for the exegete but he clearly warns against forming a 'theology of prepositions' which presses fine distinctions too far, thus disregarding the overall Hellenistic tendency of laxity in using prepositions. The observations which follow will aim to point out the influence of Semitic usage on the prepositions in the Apc. and elsewhere in biblical Greek, demonstrating that what appears to be careless or ignorant choice of a

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Moulton-Turner, III, ch.18.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 249.



established him king' (=  $\text{קָיָם לְמֶלֶךְ}$  ). This usage is found in Apc. ix.7  $\text{ἵπποις ἡτοιμασμένοις εἰς}$

$\text{πόλεμον}$  'horses prepared for war;' cf. vs.15

$\text{ἡτοιμασμένοι εἰς τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν}$  'prepared for the hour and day'.

$\text{Κλαίω ἐπὶ .}$  In Judg. xi.37  $\text{κλαύσομαι ἐπὶ}$

$\text{τὰ παρθένια μου}$  = 'I shall bewail my virginity

(  $\text{ἐπὶ} = \text{לְ}$  ). Cf. Apc. xviii.9  $\text{καὶ κλαύσουσιν}$

...  $\text{ἐκ'}$  (NC 046 a1)  $\text{αὐτήν οἱ βασιλεῖς}$  'the rulers shall bewail her;' cf. vs. 11  $\text{οἱ ἔμποροι}$

...  $\text{κλαύουσιν}$  ...  $\text{ἐκ' αὐτήν}$  'the merchants

... bewailing ... her'. The verb  $\text{κενθεῖν}$  in Apc.

xviii.11,15 is used in this Hebraic manner with  $\text{ἐπὶ}$

also.

$\text{Κρύπτω ἀπό .}$  A common expression in the LXX<sup>1</sup>

influenced by  $\text{לְ}$  used to express the person. For

example, 2 Chr. xxii.11  $\text{ἐκρύψεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ προσώπου}$

'hid him from ...' =  $\text{׀ ׀ ׀ ׀}$  . Helbing<sup>2</sup> cites

only one secular Greek occurrence of  $\text{κρύπτω ἀπό}$  , from

the late historian Theophylactus 7.17.1.; also one

instance of the passive from Homer and Euripides,

respectively. Note Apc. vi.16 ...  $\text{κρύψατε ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ προσώπου ...}$

$\text{Πολεμέω μετὰ .}$  In classical Greek 'to make

war against' is usually expressed by this verb plus

dative,  $\text{πολεμέω μετὰ}$  having the meaning 'to make

<sup>1</sup>Helbing, 42.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

war in conjunction with; e.g. Xenophon Historica Graeca 7.7.27. In biblical Greek however κολ . μετά always means 'to war against'; e.g. Judg. v.20 (A) ἐπολέμησαν

μετὰ Σισαρα 'they warred against Sisera'  
(= וַיִּלָּחֶם ).

The expression is found in the Apc. in ii.16

πολεμήσω μετ' αὐτῶν 'I will war against them'

cf. xii.7 τοὺς πολεμήσαι μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος , cf.

xiii.4 πολεμήσαι μετ' αὐτοῦ ; xvii.14. The Hebraic

meaning is required in each case, with no possibility that the classical sense could be read into the passages.

Προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιον σου in LXX

Ps. xxi (xxii).28 = Heb. יִשְׁתַּחֲוֹתוּ לְפָנַי

'they shall prostrate themselves before you'; cf. Ps.

lxxxv (lxxxvi).9; Isa. lxvi.23. In the Apc. the

identical Hebrew idiom in translation is found in

iii.9, xv.4, xxii.8.

Φωτίζω ἐκ . In Apc. xviii.1 ἡ γῆ

ἐφωτίσθη ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ 'the earth was illuminated by his glory' is very unusual Greek. The construction with ἐκ is Hebraic for אֶל e.g.

Eze. xliii.2 'the earth shone with his glory, וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֹתוּ

לְפָנַי (LXX ἡ γῆ ἐξέλαμπεν

... ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης ) is nearly identical to

the usage in the Apc., the only difference being the

exchange of ἐκ for ἀπὸ .

χαίρω ἐπί in the LXX usually translates  
 Π ρ̄ ψ̄ or לִיָּג with לַי . Classical Greek  
 takes the dative after the verb<sup>1</sup>, but due to Hebrew  
 influence biblical Greek adopts ἐπί , e.g. 4 Ki.  
 xx.13 ἐχάρη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς Ἐζεχίας 'Hezekiah took  
 pleasure in (lit. 'over') them'; cf. Apc. xi.10

χαροῦσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς 'they will rejoice over them'.

χορτάζω takes an object in Greek, as does  
 its Hebrew equivalent וַיִּשָּׂא . But elsewhere in  
 the OT after this verb partitive לִי in several  
 places is translated by ἐκ or ἀπό , e.g.

Job. xix.22 'why are you not satisfied with my flesh?'

( ἀπό δὲ σαρκῶν μου = וְלִיִּשָּׂא בָּשָׂרִי ).

It is employed figuratively of the earth having its fill  
 of rain, Ps. ciii (civ).13 ἀπὸ κέρπου τῶν ἔργων

σου χορτασθήσεται ἡ γῆ 'with the fruit of your  
 labour the earth is satisfied'. One finds identical

usage in Apc. xix.21 τὰ ὄρνεα ἐχορτάσθησαν ἐκ

τῶν σαρκῶν 'the birds were sated with flesh'. The

expression would not be tolerated in idiomatic Greek,  
 but represents acceptable Hebrew usage.

In Apc. v.9 ἠγόρασας ... ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου  
 'purchased ... by your blood', N. Turner<sup>2</sup> suspects

<sup>1</sup>Helbing, 258f. But there are classical occurrences  
 of χαίρω ἐπί .

<sup>2</sup>Moulton-Turner, III, 253; cf. Bl-D §219 (3).

Semitic influence on the instrumental use of  $\epsilon\upsilon = \beth$  which though known in classical Greek was comparatively rare before the LXX in which it is extremely common. Likewise it is very frequent in the Apc. It appears in the NT often in the phrase  $\epsilon\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  (  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  ) common to Paul and others. Note the similar use in LXX Lev. xiv.52  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\alpha\gamma\upsilon\iota\epsilon\iota \tau\eta\upsilon \omicron\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\nu \epsilon\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\rho\nu\iota\theta\lambda\omicron\upsilon$  'he shall cleanse the house by the blood of the bird' which represents Hebrew  $\beth \beth \beth$  'by the blood'. Dr. Turner<sup>1</sup> notes further that here in Apc. v.9 we have an occurrence of the curious instrumental dative of price, which he considers a rendering of the beth pretii<sup>2</sup> meaning, 'with', 'for', 'at the cost of'; elsewhere in the NT it occurs in Rom. iii.25  $\iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$  ...  $\epsilon\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\delta\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  'at the price of his blood' and v.9  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \nu\upsilon\nu \epsilon\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota \alpha\delta\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  'now having been made right at the price of his blood'.<sup>3</sup>

$\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ . Apc. xiv.15  $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega\nu \epsilon\upsilon \phi\omega\nu\acute{\eta}\iota$   $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta$  likewise expresses an instrumental sense in a peculiar manner reflecting the practice well-established in biblical Hebrew<sup>4</sup> where the object of an action may be understood as the instrument by which it is performed.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>BDB, Hebrew Lexicon s.v.  $\beth$  III, 3.

<sup>3</sup>These latter two passages are very doubtful.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. BDB op.cit. s.v.  $\beth$  III, 4.

Note Ps. lxvii (lxviii).34

לִּפְתֹּחַ יְהִי

'to utter with the voice (LXX δώσει ἐν τῇ φωνῇ )'.

The expression is found of course with other verbs;

וַיִּשְׁקַע בְּרֹאשׁוֹ 'to shake with the head', etc.

At this point we note Apc. ii.23 τὰ τέκνα

... ἀποκτενώ ἐν θανάτῳ 'the children I shall kill ... through pestilence', which is a Hebrew expression using ἐν to express 'instrument by which' cf. Jer. xiv.12

וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אֲנִי אֶתְכֶם בְּפֶשֶׁעַיִם

'... and by pestilence I shall devour them' (LXX ἐν θανάτῳ ἐγὼ συντελέσω αὐτοῦς ). Apc. vi.8

ἀποκτείνει ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ

reflects identical usage.

Καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς represents a Hebrew use

of לַיְהִי of a transition into a new state, condition, character, etc.; cf. Apc. viii.11 ἐγένετο

τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων εἰς ἄψινθον 'a third of the waters turned into wormwood'; cf. xvi.19 καὶ ἐγένετο

ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη εἰς τρεῖς μέρη 'the great city was divided into three parts'. This idiom is found in many connections in the OT<sup>1</sup>, e.g. Gen. ii.7

וַיִּהְיֶה אָדָם לְחַיָּוִת 'man became a

living person, LXX καὶ ἐγένετο ... εἰς ψυχὴν

ζῶσαν . On this point Turner<sup>2</sup> notes occasional

parallels exist outside biblical Greek, but the semitic

<sup>1</sup>BDB s.v. לַיְהִי I. 4

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., 253.

origin of the construction in the Apc. is obvious, especially when εἰς is linked with a form of εἶναι. In Matt. xix.5 (= Gen. ii.24) ἔσονται εἰς σάρκα μίαν, Lk. xiii.19 ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον etc.

Νικᾶν + ἐκ - Apc. xv.2 τοῦς

νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου is puzzling<sup>1</sup>. Turner<sup>2</sup> suggests that it is a 'compressed phrase (sc. by separating themselves from or and delivered themselves from).

Nowhere else in Greek does νικᾶν take the preposition

ἐκ; moreover, conjectures about the way this phrase should be rendered have so far been inadequate. This is because the definitions (Hebraic and otherwise) traditionally assigned to νικᾶν are unsuitable with what follows - ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου<sup>3</sup>. In making a fresh

approach to the question, we first note that several times the LXX employed ν[ε]ξκος and νίκη to translate

נֶֿֿֿ and נֶֿֿֿ respectively. While the former has the sense 'everlastingness'<sup>4</sup> (cf. Am. i.11) the former's primary meaning is eminence; e.g. I Chr. xxix.11 'To you, O Jahweh ... the pre-eminence ( נֶֿֿֿ נֶֿֿֿ ),

<sup>1</sup>This is a very difficult phrase, admits Charles, II, 33.

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., 260.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew Black has discussed the use of νικᾶν in Romans and the Apc. in his article 'Some Greek Words with "Hebrew" Meanings in the Epistles and Apocalypse' in the forthcoming Festschrift for Prof. William Barclay.

<sup>4</sup>As noted in Black's article cited supra.

LXX σοῦ (A) κἀριε ... ἡ νίκη (not 'victory' of the RSV; cf. BDB op. cit., s.v.  $\text{נָצַח}$  where the definitions 'eminence, enduring, everlastingness perpetuity' are listed). The related verb,  $\text{נָצַח}$  is represented in the LXX by corresponding νικᾶν in Hab. iii.19.

It is important to note that while in the Hebrew text the third chapter, which is a psalm, concludes with

יָנִיבִי אֲנִי לְפָנֶיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ 'to the

choirmaster: with stringed instruments' the LXX mis-translated at this point: '(Jahweh, God is my strength, he fixes my feet among the company, he makes me tread upon my high places) to be pre-eminent in his song of praise' ( τοῦ νικῆσαι ἐν τῇ ψῆδῃ αὐτοῦ ).

The slip of the translator reveals the fact that in Jewish Greek νικᾶν was used to express the idea of being pre-eminent.

Possibly this is the sense required in Apc. xv.2; instead of struggling to understand the concept of victory, could it not be conjectured that τοῖς νικῶντας = 'those have pre-eminence over ( ἐκ here =  $\text{עַל}$  in the sense of comparison<sup>1</sup>) the beast, his image, and his numerical name?

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. BDB, op. cit., s.v.  $\text{עַל}$  6; cf. Lev. 21:10 a priest that is great above his brethren.

Summary of Chapter IV

It has become apparent that at least in the Apc. (likewise in the LXX) when case endings attached to verbs with or without prepositions vary from literary Koine usage, this can be ascribed to Hebrew influence, and does not represent incompetence on the part of the respective authors. The widespread use of the accusative and dative cases in the Apc. reflects the fact that in Hebrew these are the commonly-occurring case endings. The fact that the genitive is rare in the Apc. is explained by the near absence of any Hebrew equivalent.

The choice of prepositions to follow verbs has also been influenced by Hebrew usage, and in some passages a mistranslation could result if this fact is overlooked.

CHAPTER V

SEMITIC INFLUENCE ON THE CLAUSE IN THE APOCALYPSE

PART A. NOUN & VERBAL CLAUSES

Introduction

Basic to the structure of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages and that of Semitic languages generally is the distinction between noun and verbal clauses or sentences. A noun clause, according to the standard grammarians<sup>1</sup>, has as both subject and predicate a noun or its equivalent

(especially participles), e.g. Isa. xxxiii.22      $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה}$   
 $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה}$  'Jahweh [is] our king'. A verbal clause

on the other hand always contains a finite verb as predicate, and a noun (or pronoun) for its subject, e.g.

Gen. i.3      $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים}$       $\text{וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים}$      'and God  
said ... '.

This basic distinction between noun and verbal clauses is not of merely technical interest, but has an important role to play in expressing meaning, and according to Gesenius-Kautzsch<sup>2</sup>,

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g. Gesenius-Kautzsch §141a,b.

<sup>2</sup>See §140e.

... is indispensable to the more delicate appreciation of Hebrew syntax ... since it is by no means merely external or formal, but involves fundamental differences of meaning. Noun-clauses with a substantive as predicate represent something fixed, a state or in short, a being so and so; verbal clauses on the other hand, something movable and in progress, an event or action (italics original).

After noting this important point of Semitic syntax, one is led to inquire whether a distinction of such basic significance in the OT left its mark on biblical Greek. In answering this query, the noun clause will be considered first, followed by the verbal clause.

#### NOUN CLAUSES

As noted supra, a noun clause contains no finite verb, but has as both its subject and predicate a noun or its equivalent. It stresses the state of being of the subject, its existence, its attributes, always in the sense of a fixed state<sup>1</sup>.

All Hebrew noun clauses fall into one of seven categories, depending on the type of nominal construction which serves as predicate; e.g.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax (Neukirchen, 1956), 10.

- a) with substantive for the predicate;
- b) with adjective for predicate;
- c) with participles;
- d) with numerals;
- e) with pronouns;
- f) with adverbs;
- g) with any other construction such as prepositional phrase, as predicate.

Under each of these categories representative Hebrew/ Aramaic examples will be cited, with the LXX translation following, where it shows a literal rendering into Greek of the Semitic nominal construction:

a) With substantive for predicate (this mode of expression is characterised by Gesenius-Kautzsch as 'especially semitic')

Gen. v.1     סֵפֶר דְּיָמֵי הַדּוֹרֹת רַבִּי הָאֵל

'This book [is] the generations of mankind';

LXX     Αὕτη ἡ βιβλος γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων .

Isa. xxxiii.22

κριτῆς ἡμῶν κύριος	=	רַבִּי הָאֵל
ἄρχων ἡμῶν κύριος	=	רַבִּי הָאֵל
βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν κύριος	=	רַבִּי הָאֵל

b) With adjective for predicate:

Eze. xli.22b            יָצַע וְיָדֵי קִירָאָהּ

'and its walls [were] of wood';

LXX     καὶ οἱ τοῖχοι αὐτοῦ ξύλινοι            (adjective).

Gen. ii.12            וְכִי־יֵצֵא אֶת־הָאָרֶץ לְבָרֶכְתָּהּ

'and the gold of that land [is] good';

LXX     τὸ δὲ χρυσὸν τῆς γῆς ἐκείνης καλόν

Gen. xiii.13           אֲנָשִׁים וְרָשָׁעִים וְעֹשֵׂי־רָעָה

'The men of Sodom [were] evil and sinners';

LXX     οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ἐν Σοδομοῖς  
          πονηροὶ καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί .

c) With participle for predicate:

Gen. xxiv.1           וְאַבְרָהָם הָיָה לָבוֹא

'And Abraham ... [was] advancing in days';

LXX     καὶ Ἀβραάμ            ... προβεβηκῶς ἡμέρων

Gen. ii.11            וְנָחַל אֶת־הָאָרֶץ כָּל־יְמֵי־חַיָּוֶיהָ

'it [is] the one flowing around the whole land';

LXX     οὗτος ὁ κυκλῶν πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν .

d) With a numeral for predicate:

Gen. xlii.13            יְשָׁרְיָם לְפָנֶיךָ יְיָהוָה

'the twelve (of us) [are] thy servants';

LXX     Δώδεκά ἐσμεν οἱ παῖδες σου .

e) With a pronoun for predicate:

Gen. ii.4            נִי־דָוָרִים אֵלֶּיךָ

'these [are] the generations';

LXX            Ἀὕτη ἡ βίβλιος γενέσεως .

Cf. Gen. xlii.13    וְיָבִין אֵלֶיךָ מִן־מִצְרָיִם

f) With an adverb:

Ps. cxxxvi.1f       וְיִשְׁמַח אֱלֹהֵינוּ

'His mercy [is] forever;

LXX            εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ .

g) Other constructions (usually prepositional phrases):

Gen. xlii.13b        וְיָבִין אֵלֶיךָ מִן־מִצְרָיִם

'The youngest [is] now with our father';

LXX            ὁ νεώτερος μετὰ πατρὸς ἡμῶν σήμερον

Gen. i.1            וַיְהִי עֲרָבִים עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם

'and darkness [was] upon the deep';

LXX            καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου

It must be noted at this point that in Hebrew a true noun clause can sometimes contain the verb 'to be' without surrendering its essential nominal quality. For example, in Gen. i.2 we read 'and the earth was (  $\aleph \eta \text{ } \eta \text{ } \eta$  ) waste and emptiness'; this cannot be regarded as a verbal clause, since  $\aleph \eta \text{ } \eta \text{ } \eta$  here is only used to express past time, not a sense of action or progress. The clause would have identical meaning if the verb were omitted. The two conditions under which  $\eta \text{ } \eta \text{ } \eta$  can occur in a true noun clause are

- a)  $\eta \text{ } \eta \text{ } \eta$  itself retains no verbal force of its own in the sense 'to become', 'to exist', but is weakened to become a mere copula;
- b) the natural word order of subject-predicate is retained<sup>1</sup> (the natural word order for verbal clauses, on the other hand, is verb-subject).

This point of syntax is important for biblical Greek, since it means that a translated noun clause containing the copula could still be regarded as a noun clause, in translation, provided it complied with the two general conditions just cited. This is in contrast to the Greek understanding of nominal phrases, which of course can exist only when the copula is absent. This

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §§141i, 142c,f.

fact requires illustration from the Hebrew OT and LXX, since it will be employed to explain a significant characteristic of NT Greek infra. The following Hebrew noun clauses are rendered in the LXX by use of the appropriate form of the verb εἶναι :

Deut. xiv.1    אַתְּ הֵינְךָ בְנֵי יְהוָה

'You [are] children ...'

LXX υἱοὶ ἐστε κυρίου

Gen. xlii.13    אֲנִי וְעַבְדֵי יְהוָה

'The twelve (of us) [are] your servants';

LXX Δώδεκά ἐσμεν οἱ κατ'δός σου .

Gen. xlii.21    אֲנִי וְעַבְדֵי יְהוָה

'Truly we [are] in the wrong';

LXX ἐν ἀμαρτία γὰρ ἐσμεν

Eccl. i.7b    הַיָּם לֹא מִלֵּא

'the sea [is] not filled';

LXX ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἐσται ἐμπιπλάμενη

PRESENT INDICATIVE FOR THE PARTICIPLE  
IN NOUN CLAUSES IN THE LXX

We have noted earlier in this study that a Semitic participle was often translated in biblical Greek by the present indicative. This is likewise the case even in some noun clauses - the Hebrew noun clause with a participle for predicate can be translated into Greek by the use of a present indicative form representing the participle. In each case where this occurs we would be justified in understanding the indicative verb as expressing not the action or motion of a verbal clause, although indeed a finite verb is employed, but a state or quality, along the lines of the Semitic noun clause in which it occurs. See, e.g., the following:

Gen. ii.10      נָחִיךְ    נָהֵר

'A river flowing';

LXX      ποταμός δὲ ἔκπορεύεται

Gen. iv.9      אֲנִי    אֶחָיו    שׂוֹמֵר

'Am I my brother's keeper?';

LXX      μή φύλαξ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ εἰμι ἐγώ;

Eccl. i.7a 'All streams flowing (

וְכָל־נְחָלִים )  
to the sea';

LXX πάντες οἱ χειμάρροι πορεύονται  
εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

### Nominal Constructions in Greek

The nominal clause is of course not unique to the Semitic languages. In classical Attic the verb ἔστιν as a copula was often omitted<sup>1</sup>, producing a nominal phrase which in appearance is identical to the Semitic noun clause. Like Hebrew, the Attic noun clause could have as its predicate:

- a) an adjective
- b) adjectival participle (which was most frequent)
- c) an adverb (rare - limited to fixed formulas such as θαυμαστὸν ὅσον ).

The copula was very often omitted in poetic expression<sup>2</sup>. Against these similarities however we now cite some striking differences. For Attic, the copula omitted was for the most part limited to the 3rd person singular present indicative - ἔστιν<sup>3</sup>. Other forms of εἶναι

---

<sup>1</sup>Kühner-Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache, II. I. 1., 40.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., cf. Bl-D §127, where it is termed the 'most frequent omission by far'.

when omitted in Attic, call for special mention in the grammars. Hebrew however could omit, with perfect ease and freedom, any person or tense of corresponding  $\bar{\eta} \bar{\eta} \bar{\eta}$ . Furthermore, while Attic Greek makes a relatively wide use of the ellipsis of the copula, the same is not the case for other epochs of the Greek tongue. According to E. Schwyzer<sup>1</sup>, the predominant post-classical tendency was to reserve noun clauses, which were viewed as ellipses, for use in archaic poetic turns, fixed formulae, and stylized expressions. The NT has in many places gone even further than its contemporary literary Koine in employing the copula<sup>2</sup>. Hebrew and other Semitic languages, in contrast, make a significantly wider use of the noun clause (without copula) than the indo-European family of languages<sup>3</sup>.

While both Semitic and Greek noun clauses frequently employ adjectives and participles as predicates, yet there is nothing corresponding in Greek to the distinctive Semitic use of a substantive as predicate of a noun clause, e.g. Eze. xli.22  $\Upsilon \Upsilon \quad \bar{\eta} \bar{\eta} \bar{\eta} \bar{\eta} \bar{\eta}$  'The altar [was] wood ...'. This category is especially

---

<sup>1</sup>Schwyzzer, II, 623 (cited by N. Turner in Moulton-Turner, III, 294).

<sup>2</sup>Moulton-Turner, III, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup>Brockelmann, loc. cit.

characteristic of the Semitic mode of expression, which emphasises the identity of subject with its predicate<sup>1</sup>. Finally, semitic noun clauses stand in sharpest contrast to their Greek counterparts on the question of expressing fixed states, attributes, etc. While this sense is basic to semitic, there is no indication that Greek nominal phrases per se are to be taken to express states as opposed to actions. Such is foreign to Greek nominal phrases.

#### In the Apocalypse<sup>2</sup>

An examination of the Apc. shows clearly that constructions very much like translated Hebrew noun clauses noted supra in the LXX are present, and furthermore, they can quite naturally be placed in the same categories into which OT noun clauses were divided.

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §141b.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. B1-D §§127, 28; Moulton-Turner III, 294-310 gives a comprehensive analysis of the Greek nominal phrase, including tables of statistics for NT and Koine authors. It should be noted that the total of 91 occurrences of ellipse listed there for the Apoc. is higher than that which is found in this study. This is due to the fact that here most cases of ellipse which occur in subordinate clauses are excluded, and will be treated separately under the various categories of clauses to be discussed infra.

The categories listed *supra* on p.2 are repeated here, with exx. from the Apc. in each:

a) With Substantive for predicate (especially semitic):

xix.12 οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ ...

φλῶξ (if ὡς is omitted).

xx.5 αὕτη ἡ ἀνάστασις

xxi.18a καὶ ἡ ἐνδύμησις ... Ἰασπις

xxi.18b καὶ ἡ πόλις ... χρυσοῦν

xxi.21b καὶ ἡ πλατεῖα ... χρυσοῦν

xxi.22b ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ... ναδὲ

αὐτῆς (- εστιν 104\* 459 al)

xxi.23b καὶ ὁ λύχνος αὐτῆς τὸ ἄρνιον

xxii.13 ἐγὼ τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὠ ,

ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος .

In addition, several examples could be listed which include the copula but, just as in the examples cited supra from the LXX, essentially are noun clauses:

xvii.9 αἱ ἑπτὰ κεφαλαὶ ἑπτὰ ὄρη

εἰσὶν ... καὶ βασιλεῖς ἑπτὰ εἰσὶν

Cf. verse 12 καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα ... δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσὶν

xvii.15 Τὰ ὕδατα ... λαοὶ καὶ ὄχλοι εἰσὶν καὶ ἔθνη ...

xvii.18 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ... ἔστιν ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη

With these exx. from the Apc. compare Matt. v.13

Ἕμεῖς ἔστε τὸ ἅλας

'You are the salt ...'

and Acts v.32            και ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν                            ( - εσμεν  
B )    μάρτυρες                            'You are witnesses'.

b) With adjective for predicate:

i.3    ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἔγγυς

xiv.13    Μακάριοι οἱ νεκροί

xv.3    Μεγάλα και θαυμαστά τὰ ἔργα σου  
δικαιαι και ἀληθιναί αἱ ὁδοί σου

xvi.7b    ἀληθιναί και δικαιαι αἱ κρίσεις σου

xviii.8    ὅτι ἰσχυρὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς

xix.2    identical to xvi.7b supra.

xix.9a    Μακάριοι οἱ ... κεκλημένοι

Add also xx.6; xxi.16b,c, 19; xxii.6

xix.11    ὁ καθημενος ἐκ' αὐτὸν πιστὸς ...  
και ἀληθινός

Compare also Matt.v.3    Μακάριοι οἱ

πτωχοί    'Blessed [are] the poor ... ';

v.12    ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς

'Your reward [is] large ... ';

and in Acts iv.13 the same type of

phrase is found with copula: ἄνθρωποι

ἀγράμματοι εἰσιν και ἰδιῶται

'They [are] unlearned and ignorant men ... '.

c) With participle for predicate:

i.16 ῥομφαία διστομος ὄξετα ἐκπορευομένη

ii.17 ὄνομα καινὸν γεγραμμένον

iv.1 καὶ ἰδοὺ θύρα ἠνεωγμένη

iv.5 καὶ ἐπὶ λαμπάδες κύρος καιόμεναι

xii.1 γυνὴ περιβεβλημένη τὸν ἥλιον

v.1 βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ... κατεσφαγισμένον

xiv.4 οὗτοι οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ ἀρνίῳ

xvii.4 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἦν ( ἡ Koine)

περιβεβλημένη καὶ κεχρυσωμένη ... ἔχουσα

xxi.19a οἱ θεμέλιοι ... κεκοσμημένοι

xxii.7b Μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν

xxii.8 Κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων ταῦτα

xxii.14 Μακάριοι οἱ πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν

Add to these Acts ii.16 τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον

'This [is] that spoken ... ';

Mk. i.33 ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη

'the whole city [was] gathered'.

d) A numeral for predicate:

Apc. xiii.18b καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ

ἑξακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα ἕξ

'Six hundred sixty-six [is] his number';

e) A pronoun for predicate:

i.6 ἀπὸ ἧ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος

xx.14 οὗτος ὁ θάνατος ὁ δευτέρος

ἔστιν (- εστίν 104 680 1380)

'this [is] the second death';

xi.4 οὗτοι εἰσιν αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι καὶ δύο λυχνίαι

'these [are] the two olive trees and the two lamps ... '.

Compare with these Mk. i.27 τί ἐστιν τοῦτο ;

'What is this! '

f) An Adverb for predicate:

xiv.12a Ὡδε ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν

(- εστίν 808 1893) 'here [is]

the patience of the saints'.

xvii.9 Ὡδε ὁ νοῦς

'here [is] the mind ... '.

Elsewhere in the NT note Acts iv.3

ἦν γὰρ ἑσπέρα ἤδη

'it was already evening'.

g) Other constructions for predicate

(usually prepositional phrases):

xii.1 ἡ σελήνη ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῆς

xxi.3b Ἴδοὺ ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν

ἀνθρώπων

- xxi.3    καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔσται  
xxi.8    τὸ μέρος αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ τῇ  
          καιομένην κυρὶ καὶ θείῳ  
xxii.2b  καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐντεῦθεν καὶ  
          ἐκεῖθεν ξύλον ζωῆς  
xxii.2c  καὶ τὰ φύλλα τοῦ ξύλου εἰς  
          θεραπείαν τῶν ἔθνῶν  
xxii.4b  τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν  
xxii.12  ὁ μισθὸς μου μετ' ἐμοῦ  
xxii.15  ἔξω οἱ κύνες καὶ οἱ φαρμακοὶ  
          καὶ οἱ πόρνοι

Compare Acts vii.9    καὶ ἦν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ  
          'but God was with him'.

While scattered references can be found in both Bl-D and Moulton-Turner, Gramm. III to Semitic influence on specific, narrow aspects of certain types of nominal phrases in NT Greek<sup>1</sup>, neither they nor any other grammarian, so far as I am able to determine, has come upon the explanation of noun clauses in Greek dress presented here. The correspondence between the Semitic noun clause and its Greek counterpart appears to be both close and widespread, and the fact that there is simply no

---

<sup>1</sup>Bl-D §128 (7); Moulton-Turner, III, 295f.

phenomenon elsewhere in Koine Greek of quite the same order as the noun clause in the LXX and NT seems to exclude the possibility that the point under discussion simply underwent parallel but unconnected development in the two languages involved.

The recognition of the existence of noun and verbal clauses in biblical Greek, with their basic distinction in sense and meaning, would, it seems, call for another look at many scriptural passages where such clauses occur, to determine what implications their presence might have for both translation and exegesis.

#### VERBAL CLAUSES

Verbal clauses, as noted supra<sup>1</sup> always use a finite verb and thereby place primary emphasis on the action stated by that verb. Because of this emphasis, the natural position for the verb is preceding its subject<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>p.221.

<sup>2</sup>GK §142a. This order can of course be reversed to subject - verb if special emphasis is to be put on the subject in question.

In the Old Testament

Since the verbal clause is the basic and commonest sentence structure of the Hebrew language, it seems unnecessary to cite examples of it from the OT at this point; it should be adequate to state simply that the LXX translators tended to render verbal clauses literally into Greek, retaining in most cases the original word order.

In the Apocalypse

Verbal clauses in the Apc. cannot, of course, have any unique claim to Semitic influence as was found to be the case with semitic type noun clauses, simply because such verbal constructions, using finite verbs, are basic and natural in Indo-European languages as well as those of the Semitic family. It is instructive for our purpose, however, to note the word order followed in certain cases by verbal clauses in the Apc.:

- a) the natural Hebrew word order in a verbal clause is Verb-Subject (- Object). In secular Greek as a whole, this order is certainly possible, but is common only with verbs of saying<sup>1</sup>. Cf. the follow-

---

<sup>1</sup>B1-D §472 (1).

ing: Apc. iv.10 πεσοῦνται οἱ εἴκοσι  
τεσσαρες πρεσβυτεροι  
vi.17 ἦλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα ; x.7 και  
ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον ;  
xi.18 ἦλθεν ἡ ὀργή σου ; xii.16  
και ἤνοιξεν ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς

- b) The word order of Object-Verb-Subject is also frequent in Hebrew<sup>1</sup>: Apc. vi.6  
και τὸ ἔλαιον και τὸν οἶνον μὴ αδικήσης  
ii.1 Τάδε λέγει ὁ κρατῶν  
ii.3 και ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις
- c) An order which is Hebraic, yet even more common in Aramaic<sup>2</sup> is that of Subject-Object-Verb: Apc. i.7b  
και οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν
- d) Finally, it should be noted that in the arrangement very frequently found in the Apc. of Subject-Verb (- Object), no Hebrew or Aramaic influence is present. It seems rather to be a favourite arrangement which belonged to the Seer's own style.

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §142f.

<sup>2</sup>Kautzsch, Gramm. des bibl. Aram., §84, 1b, who

Summary of Chapter V Part A

No previous discussion of NT Greek syntax has considered the influence on Greek of the basic distinction of Aramaic and Hebrew into noun and verbal clauses. It was found that noun clauses in the Apc. can be sorted into the same categories as their Hebrew equivalents, depending on their mode of construction, and their meaning is the same - that of a fixed state.

Verbal clauses, expressing action in contrast to a fixed state, are basic to both Greek and Hebrew, thus no case can be made for Semitic influence upon them, except possibly regarding their word order.

While the evidence cited here sheds important new light on biblical Greek syntax, and aids in better exegesis by underlining the distinction between a fixed state and an action, it is not of such a specific nature that it would serve to indicate direct translation from Semitic sources.

---

cites Daniel ii.7,10. For a Hebrew example, cf. Isa. iii.17.

PART B. SYNTAX OF THE SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

RELATIVE CLAUSES<sup>1</sup>

The great majority of relative constructions in the Apc. are expressed by use of the attributive participle, with or without the article<sup>2</sup>: Apc. xvii.1 εἷς ἐκ

τῶν ἐπτά ἀγγέλων τῶν ἔχόντων τὰς ἐπτά φιάλας .

'one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls ... '.

This use of the participle is in full harmony with Greek syntax, but the frequency of occurrences in the Apc. is high. Quite frequently also the Apc. employs the relative clause proper, consisting of a relative pronoun followed by some form of the verb. Occurrences of this in the Apc. also follow normal Greek usage.

When these categories of the relative construction have been allowed for, there remain certain phrases which seem to demand a relative sense yet which are puzzling indeed when viewed only in the light of Greek syntax. In contrast to customary Greek, the Semitic languages frequently formulate a relative clause by using a noun clause, as follows: 2 Sam. xx.21 'a man of the hill country of Ephraim יִשָׁיִךְ . וְשֵׁם whose name

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton-Turner, III, 106-10; B1-D §§293-97.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. B1-D §412 for general comments on the attributive participle.

was Sheba'; an analogous instance from biblical Aramaic is Ezra v.14  $\text{ܡܫܫܒܐ}$   $\text{ܟܝܘܢ ܫܫܒܐܝܘܒ}$  'to one whose

name was Sheshbazzar'. Job iii.15 'with princes  $\text{ܕܩܝܢܝܐ}$   $\text{ܕܗܘܘܢ ܕܗܘܘܢ ܕܗܘܘܢ}$  that had gold'. This abbreviated form of

relative clause omits the relative pronoun  $\text{ܕܩܝܢܝܐ}$  and is linked to its antecedent by simple co-ordination<sup>1</sup>.

It has left its mark on the NT in four well-known passages which are identical to the example cited supra, two of

which are in the Apc.<sup>2</sup>: vi.8  $\text{καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ θάνατος}$  'and the one sitting on it, whose name [was] death'; ix.11  $\text{τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἑβραϊστὶ Ἀβαδδὼν}$

'the angel of the abyss, whose name is ...'<sup>3</sup>. To these we add the following: perhaps viii.9  $\text{τὰ ἔχοντα ψυχὰς}$  'those which were living (probably on the

pattern of Hebrew  $\text{ܕܩܝܢܝܐ}$   $\text{ܗܝܘܢ ܕܗܘܘܢ}$  ); xiii.1  $\text{θηρίον ... ἔχον κέρατα δέκα}$  'a beast ... which had ten horns'; xiv.17  $\text{ἄγγελος ἔχων καὶ αὐτὸς δρέπανον}$  ; cf. verse 18  $\text{ἔχων ἕξουσιαν}$ .

The Hebrew relative clause is frequently introduced by  $\text{ܕܩܝܢܝܐ}$  which is not a relative pronoun in the Greek sense, but an original demonstrative pronoun<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>GK §155e.

<sup>2</sup>The other two are John i.6, iii.7.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Burney, Aramaic Origins, 30-32.

<sup>4</sup>GK §138a.

Since the demonstrative sense of  $\gamma\psi\chi$  is connected with its use in relative clauses, it is not surprising to discover that the Hebrew demonstrative pronoun proper ( $\text{הַזֶּה}$  etc.) and sometimes the definite article are used to introduce relative clauses, especially in poetic expression<sup>1</sup>. Under Hebrew influence the Apc. in several places uses the definite article to introduce a relative clause which consists of a preposition plus noun (or pronoun). First, a Hebrew example: Gen. i.7

$\text{מַיִם בְּתַיִתֵּי הַרְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם}$  'The waters which were under the firmament' (lit. 'those under the firmament'), which in the LXX is rendered in such a way that  $\gamma\psi\chi$  is represented by the genitive article  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ .

This unusual syntax is found in the Apc. in the following passages: v.13b  $\tau\alpha \epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$  'all [living things] which are in them ...'; Apc. ii.1,2,12,18, iii.1,7,14  $\tau\omega \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega \tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\nu \text{'Εφεσω εκκλησίας,}$  etc. The long standing debate over whether  $\tau\omega$  should be read instead of  $\tau\eta\varsigma$  is carried a step further by noting that in the LXX passage just cited the genitive article was used to translate  $\gamma\psi\chi$ <sup>2</sup>, viii.3

<sup>1</sup>GK §138g.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Charles, I, clvi, f.; J. Schmid, Studien zur Geschichte des Griechischen Apok.-Textes 2. Teil, 198. G.D. Kilpatrick reviews both in Vigiliae Christianae 13 (1959), 7f.

... τὸ χρυσοῦν τὸ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου 'the golden [altar] which is before the throne'; x.6 τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ

τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ

τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ 'the heaven and those things which are in it, and the earth and the things which are in it, and the sea and those things which are in it';

xx.13 τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ 'those which were in it';

possibly also i.4 καὶς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ 'to those who are in Asia'. To these examples without the relative

pronoun we add the following which are based on the same Hebrew construction but in which the pronoun occurs:

Apc. v.13 πᾶν κτίσμα ὃ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ 'all creation which is in heaven' (from a construction employing

טוּח־לְךָ); i.4b ἃ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ

'... which are before his throne ... '.

The common Hebrew practice, after employing a participle, to resolve the construction into a finite verb plus Way is a familiar one, discussed elsewhere in this study<sup>1</sup>. It is cited here for the light it casts on certain relative constructions in biblical Greek which are introduced by an attributive participle which in the following portion of the relative clause is resolved into καὶ plus a finite verb. Some of the Hebrew exx. cited by Driver<sup>2</sup> illustrate the Hebraic nature of

<sup>1</sup>See section III, part D.

<sup>2</sup>Hebrew Tenses<sup>3</sup>, 137f.

the phenomenon: Gen. xxvii.33

וַיִּצְדַּק וַיִּבְרָךְ

וַיִּצְדַּק 'who hunted game and brought it before me'

(lit. 'who hunted game, and he brought ... '). The LXX translates idiomatically with two participles:

ὁ θηρεύσας θήραν καὶ εἰσενέγκας .

In several passages in the Apc. the same construction appears, which slavishly resolves the second participle (and any subsequent ones) into a finite verb: vii.14

Οὗτοι εἰσὶν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης καὶ ἔπλυναν ( πλυνοντες sahidic) τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν 'these are those who

come through great tribulation, and who wash (lit. 'and they washed') their robes and whitened them' (lit. 'and they whitened them'); possibly also viii.2 ἐκτὰ

ἀγγέλους οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστήκασιν καὶ

ἐδόθησαν αὐτοῖς ἐκτὰ σάλκιγγες 'seven angels which stand before God, to whom were given (lit. 'and they were given') seven trumpets'; xiv.18 ἄγγελος ...

ἔχων ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός καὶ ἐφώνησεν 'another angel ... who had control over the fire, and who spoke' (not 'and he spoke'); perhaps also xx.12 καὶ εἶδον

τοὺς νεκροὺς ... ἐστῶτας ἐνώπιον θεοῦ

καὶ βιβλία ἠνοίχθησαν 'then I saw the dead ... which stood before God, and the books which were opened' (instead of 'and the books were opened').

Lohmeyer<sup>1</sup> followed by Ozanne<sup>2</sup> has drawn attention to the relative clause in the first verse of the Apc. which contains a Hebrew construction practically identical to those just cited supra. The first clause ἣν ἔδωκεν is continued by means of the resolved finite verb plus

καὶ ἐσφύραμεν, on the analogy of the Hebrew construct following  $\text{רָשָׁא}$ . Ozanne cites OT examples exhibiting similar characteristics, such as Isa. xlix.7<sup>3</sup>:

$\text{לְמַעַן יִיָּדָעְךָ יְיָ הַקֹּדֶשׁ הַיֵּחָדָשׁ וְיִבְרַחְךָ יְיָ$   
'because of the Lord who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel, who has chosen you' (lit. 'and he chose you').

On the basis of this verse, the similar syntax of Apc. i.1 should lead us to translate 'the revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave ... and which He made known (not 'and he made it known').

Attention has been called by R.B.Y. Scott<sup>4</sup> to a pair of verses in the Apc. which have what he terms 'comparative relative clauses' expressed with the finite verb instead of the participle. He notes that the construction is well known in Hebrew<sup>5</sup>, as relative sentences

---

<sup>1</sup>Die Offenbarung Johannes, 6; Burney, Aramaic Origins, 95f., also discusses this construction.

<sup>2</sup>In his Ph.D. thesis, Influence of Text and Lang. of OT on Rev.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Gen. xxiv.14, Judg. i.12, 1 Sam. xvii.26.

<sup>4</sup>The Original Language of the Apocalypse, 9.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. GK §155g.

which are attached to substantives which have the particle of comparison (usually  $\text{כִּי}$ ): Job vii.2  $\text{כִּי־יִשְׁׁוֹׁב}$

$\text{לְיָֿ-הַשֶּׁׁמֶשׁׁ}$  'as a servant desiring (lit. 'he desires') the shade'; Isa. lxii.1b  $\text{וְיִשְׁׁוֹׁב־כִּי־יִשְׁׁוֹׁב}$

$\text{וְיִשְׁׁוֹׁב־כִּי־יִשְׁׁוֹׁב}$  'and her salvation as a torch burning' (lit. 'as a torch burns'); LXX renders  $\tau\omicron\ \delta\epsilon$

$\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\delta\omicron\nu\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \omega\varsigma\ \lambda\alpha\mu\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\upsilon\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ .$

In these examples it is noted that the particle of comparison is attached to the noun, and the following verb is finite, not participle. This construction occurs also in the Apc., in the following places: i.16  $\omega\varsigma$

$\delta\ \eta\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \phi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota$  (later corrected to  $\phi\alpha\iota\upsilon\omega\nu$  by 1611 2067 al) 'as the sun shining' (not 'as the sun shines'); x.3  $\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\rho\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu\ \mu\upsilon\kappa\alpha\iota$  (altered to

$\mu\upsilon\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  93) 'as a lion roaring' (not 'as a lion roars'). As indicated by the presence of variants, the corresponding Greek construction preferred a participle in such constructions..

Klaus Beyer in his detailed analysis of the Semitic element in NT conditional relative clauses<sup>1</sup> touches on a phenomenon which is found twice in the Apc.<sup>2</sup>. He notes that while by nature the Semitic relative clause is singular, referring for example, to 'when somebody ...', such clauses are often translated in the LXX in plural

<sup>1</sup>Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament, 141-232.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. 192.

form since in Greek the plural indefinite relative clause is very common. This is especially noted in the LXX when the finite verb of the main clause in Hebrew is plural. Thus the plural forms of the relative pronouns in the two Apc. passages may in fact reflect a Semitic type relative clause, as follows: Apc. iii.19

ἐγὼ ὅσους ( οὓς 2019 sy<sup>ph</sup> vg) εἰς φιλῶ

'those whom I love ... ' xiii.15 ποιήσῃ ἵνα

ὅσοι εἰς<sup>μή</sup> προσκυνήσωσιν 'cause those who would not

worship ... '. In supporting his point Beyer cites two striking OT parallels to the Apc. passages where the identical sense is expressed by the singular relative pronoun: Prov. iii.12 (cf. Apc. iii.19), and Dan. iii.6,11 (cf. Apc. xiii.15).

This examination has shown how the numerous relative clauses in the Apc. which do not follow the accepted Greek form actually preserve one of several types of relative constructions native to biblical Hebrew and Aramaic.

#### CIRCUMSTANTIAL CLAUSES<sup>1</sup>

Any words which relate a fact subordinate to the main flow of narrative, or which describe a circumstance

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. BL-D §417.

connected with the action expressed by the main verb may form a circumstantial clause. Black gives the following apt definition<sup>1</sup>:

One of the commonest of Semitic subordinate clauses, characteristic of both Hebrew and Aramaic, is the so-called Circumstantial Clause, by which circumstances are described which are attendant on or necessary to the understanding of the action of the main verb, but subordinate to it ... Its translation may vary with the requirements of the context, but it is usually best rendered by 'now', 'while', 'when'.

This is illustrated by Gen. xix.1 'The two messengers came to Sodom in the evening, while Lot was sitting in the gate of Sodom'.

The inclusion of a circumstantial clause into a sentence in Hebrew or Aramaic is of course affected by the tendency of these languages towards simple coordination; in other words, the clause will appear to have been simply thrown into the sentence<sup>2</sup>, with a Waw providing the only syntactical link with what precedes<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 81.

<sup>2</sup>Driver, Tenses, 195f.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

Word order in circumstantial clauses varies, but that encountered most frequently is: conjunction (Waw) plus noun (pronoun) plus verb (or participle or predicate noun, etc.). The primary position of the noun serves to arrest the attention of the reader, by altering the word order of the natural flow of clauses.

The Semitic circumstantial clause corresponds on the whole to the Greek circumstantial participle<sup>1</sup>, which denotes manner, accompaniment, etc. especially in its modal use; a good example is Demosthenes De Cor. 217:

λυπούμενος καὶ στείνων καὶ δυσμενάων οἴκοι καθήτο  
'he sat at home grieving and groaning and fretting'.

The striking difference between Semitic and Greek circumstantial clauses is of course a matter largely of syntax. The hallmark of the Semitic type clause is its introductory Waw, followed by a noun (pronoun) which is a construction not paralleled in Greek<sup>2</sup>. Note the following: 1 Ki. xix.19 'and he went thence and found

Elisha, וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיִּפְּלֵג and he was ploughing;

LXX renders the Hebraic clause literally by καὶ

αὐτὸς ἦροτρα . Gen. xviii.8 'as he stood beside them

וַיֹּאכְלוּ they ate'. LXX

---

<sup>1</sup>Designated as 'adverbial' in some grammars, cf. Bl-D §411.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. GK §156.

αὐτὸς δὲ παρειστήκει αὐτοῖς ; 2 Chr. x.2

'while he was in Egypt      ׀ׁׂ׃׃ׂ׃      ׀ׁׂ׃׃ׂ׃

Lxx καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ .

R.B.Y. Scott<sup>1</sup> drew attention to the occurrence of this type of circumstantial clause in the Apc. in the following passages: ii.18      καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ

ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ      'now his feet are like burnished bronze'<sup>2</sup>.      x.1      καὶ ἡ Ἴρις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ

τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος καὶ οἱ πόδες

αὐτοῦ ὡς στῆλοι πυρός 'now the rainbow was on his head, and his face was like the sun, and his legs were like flaming pillars';      xii.1 'a woman clothed with the

sun, with the moon under her feet      καὶ ἡ σελήνη ὑποκάτω

τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῆς ;      xvii.11 'and the beast which was and is not, now he is an eighth and is of the seven

καὶ αὐτὸς ὄγδοός ἐστιν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐπτὰ ἐστιν .

Another type of circumstantial clause which in Hebrew is introduced by Waw followed by the predicate with a preposition<sup>3</sup> is also reflected in the Apc.      A good

---

<sup>1</sup>p.11.

<sup>2</sup>The following, cited by Scott, appear doubtful: Apc. ix.7,8,9,17, xvii.4.

<sup>3</sup>Such a construction is found in Greek as well, but only with the circumstantial participle: ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅρματος καθήμενος τὴν πορείαν ἐποιεῖτο 'he was making the journey seated in his chariot' Xenophon, Anab. i.7,20.

Hebrew example is Isa. iii.7: 'I will not be a healer while in my house is neither bread nor clothing

וְלֶחֶם לֹא יִמְצָא וְבִגְדֵי שָׂרָף לֹא יִמְצָא. Clauses of this sort

have a somewhat more independent character than those discussed supra. but are still to be regarded as circumstantial clauses<sup>1</sup>. Note the following: Isa. vi.6

'and he sent one of the seraphim to me, now in his hand was a glowing coal'

וְהִנֵּה בְּיָדוֹ אֶבֶן עֹרָה LXX

καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ εἶχεν ἄνθρακα ; Amos vii.7

The Lord was standing beside a wall ... now in his hand was a plumb line'

וְהִנֵּה יְהוָה עֹמֵד בְּיָדוֹ לְמִשְׁכָּל לְמִשְׁכָּל LXX

καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἀδάμας ; 2 Sam. xiii.18

'now she was wearing a long robe

וְהָיָה לָהּ שָׂרָף אָרוֹן

LXX καὶ ἐκ' αὐτῆς ἦν χιτὼν

Scott noted occurrences in the Apc. of clauses which fit this pattern, although he does not make any attempt to illustrate the Semitic nature of the construction or to distinguish between the two forms of the clause which are employed in Hebrew. Note the following: Apc. ii.17

'I shall give him a white stone and upon the stone a new name written

καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ψίφον ὄνομα καινὸν γεγραμμένον <sup>2</sup> ; xii.3 'a dragon ... having seven

heads and ten horns, now upon his heads were seven crowns

καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ ἑπτὰ διαδήματα ;

<sup>1</sup>GK B156b.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Lancellotti, 98f,

xii.1 'a woman clothed with the sun ... now a crown of twelve stars was on her head και ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς

αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα ; xiii.1 'then I saw a beast ... now ten crowns were on his horns και

ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων αὐτοῦ δέκα διαδήματα and a name of blasphemy on his heads και ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ

ὄνομα βλασφημίας ; xiv.1 'I saw and beheld the lamb standing upon mount Zion, now a hundred forty-four thousand were with him και μετ' αὐτοῦ ἑκατὸν

τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες ; xiv.14 'now upon the cloud was sitting και ἐπὶ τὴν νεφέλην καθήμενον

xvii.5 'now on her forehead a name was written' και

ἐπὶ μέτωπον αὐτῆς ὄνομα γεγραμμένον ; xix.12 'while many diadems were on his head και ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ...

xxi.12 'now at the twelve gates were twelve angels'

και ἐπὶ τοῖς πυλῶσιν ἀγγέλους δώδεκα .

By comparing these passages with the LXX translations of Hebrew circumstantial clauses cited supra, it becomes clear that they are of the same character, both representing the purely Semitic mode of denoting circumstances attendant to the main action of the sentence in which they are found. The primary difference being in the introductory Waw (και) used in the Semitic type clauses.

CONDITIONAL CLAUSES<sup>1</sup>

A degree of uncertainty in the text of Apc. vi.1 indicates a measure of primitive dissatisfaction with the construction which according to the Received text ends with two imperatives ἔρχου καὶ βλέπε (ιδε

Ν 046 1828 2042 sy<sup>ph</sup> al). The phrase is repeated with similar textual support in verses 3,5 and 7.

A similar current dissatisfaction and uncertainty with the Received reading led some modern editors of the Greek NT (Nestle-Aland, United Bible Societies' Greek NT) to excise the καὶ plus second imperative probably due in part to the repetitive sense which would result in three of the above-mentioned passages (verses 1,5,7) from the inclusion of the καὶ εἶδον which opens the following verse: cf. vs. 5 Ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε, καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄρκος μέγας (but there is in each case textual evidence for omitting καὶ εἶδον); cf. xvi.1 Ἰπάγετε καὶ ἐκχέετε.

A glance elsewhere in the NT shows that this curious expression employing two imperatives coupled by καὶ is not limited to the Apc. but is found also in the sayings of Jesus. In Jn. i.39 for example, when questioned about where he stays, Jesus replied, Ἔρχεσθε

---

<sup>1</sup>See also chapter III part D 'Semitic Influence of Waw consecutive'.

καὶ ὄψεσθε (cf. i.46 where ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε occurs); Mk. vi.38 ἰπάγετε ἴδετε (καὶ om)<sup>1</sup>. Blass-Debrunner describe this construction as 'asyndeton instead of subordination with finite verbs'<sup>2</sup> and refer to the similar classical expression ἔγε, ἴθι. As used in the NT however, the two imperatives coupled by καὶ are distinguished from an ordinary imperatival construction such as 'rise, take up your pallet ...' in one important sense. While the double imperative, known from class. Greek as well as in Koine expresses a command, in the standard imperatival sense, the construction with which we are dealing can be best understood as a conditional clause of a decidedly un-Greek nature. Thus ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε should be translated in the Apc. by 'if you come, you shall see' - at once different from simple command.

Such a construction is in harmony with a Hebrew construction scattered throughout the OT, described as an imperative in logical dependence on a preceding imperative<sup>3</sup>. The two are connected by Waw copulative, and while the first imperative as a rule contains a condition, the second states the consequences of that

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. B1-D §461 (1) for further examples. Black, Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup> has also discussed this idiom; cf. 90f.

<sup>2</sup>B1-D §461 (1); cf. Moulton-Turner III, 75.

<sup>3</sup>GK §110f.

condition's fulfillment. The construction is used especially to express the consequence especially desired by the speaker: Gen. xlii.18

וְעָשׂוּ וְחָיוּ

'This do, and live' (i.e. 'if you do this, you shall continue to live'); note how the LXX translator altered the second imperative to future tense, bringing the construction more in line with ordinary Greek syntax:

Τοῦτο ποιήσατε καὶ ζήσεσθε ; Isa. xxxvi.16

וְעָשׂוּ וְחָיוּ וְצָדִיק וְצָדִיק וְאָכַל וְשָׂבַע

'make with me peace, and come out, and eat ... ' ('if you make peace and come out, then you shall eat'); LXX

εἰ βούλεσθε εὐλογηθῆναι ἐκπορεύεσθε .

This construction of the conditional clause in the Apc. is preserved in its most literal form where the two imperatives are employed.

K. Beyer<sup>1</sup> has drawn attention to the use of the conditional clause plus εἴ or εἰάν with the indefinite subject to express 'if anybody', etc.

This use of εἴ τις, εἰάν τις while acceptable Greek, is used frequently in the LXX to translate a Semitic conditional clause plus conjunction or, respectively, a conditional participle: Gen. xix.12

וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לְךָ

וְלְכָל

'and all who you have' (i.e. 'if you have anyone with you'), LXX εἴ τις σοι . Note also the

<sup>1</sup>Semitische Syntax, 226ff.

plural Hebrew protasis, rendered singular in the LXX<sup>1</sup>.

On the basis of this evidence Beyer reckons that frequently εἴ τις / εἰάν τις in the NT is based on a Semitic relative clause or conditional participle.

From the Apc. he cites xiii.9 εἴ τις ἔχει οὖς (wrongly cited by him as ὥτα ); cf. ii.7a ὁ ἔχων οὖς where a substantival partic. serves as protasis<sup>2</sup>.

xiv.11 εἴ τις λαμβάνει . In each passage the translation 'if somebody/anybody' is to be preferred, on the basis of the Hebrew pattern which underlies the construction.

Semitic influence on individual conditional clauses in the Apc. is also treated by Beyer, who calls attention, for example, to occasions when, in Semitic languages, the customary sequence of protasis followed by apodosis is reversed, usually to express a strong wish, an oath, or a command<sup>3</sup>. This seems to have influenced the similar reversal in the Apc. on three occasions: xiv.11

καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνάπαυσιν ἡμέρας καὶ νύκτος ...  
καὶ εἴ τις λαμβάνει τὸ χάραγμα 'they have no rest day or night ... whoever receives the mark' (i.e. 'whoever receives the mark has no rest ... '); ii.5

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. ibid. for other examples.

<sup>2</sup>For many similar passages in the Gospels cf. ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Op. cit., 75f.

ἔρχομαι σοι καὶ κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν ...

ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσῃς 'I will come to you and remove you lamp ... if you do not repent' (i.e. 'if you do not repent, I will ... '); cf. vs. 22 ἰδοὺ βάλλω αὐτήν

εἰς κλίνην ... ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσωσιν 'Behold, I will throw her on a sickbed ... if they do not repent' (i.e. 'if they do not repent, I will ... ').

TEMPORAL CLAUSES

An oddity of biblical Hebrew is its custom of introducing a temporal clause by imperfect consecutive

וְיָבֵן ( καὶ ἐγένετο ), especially if the temporal clause is slightly independent of the narrative in which it is imbedded, or if it opens a new section of that which has been narrated previously<sup>1</sup>. In rare cases

the perfect consecutive וְיָבֵן is used in similar fashion. In translating, it is usually found best to ignore the וְיָבֵן which is redundant, and begin with the temporal conjunction, as in Judges i.1:

וַשִׁׁיבֵן תָּמוּ וְיָבֵן

which is translated by RSV rightly by 'After the death of Joshua' (not 'It came to pass, after ... '). It is especially instructive for understanding NT Greek to note

---

<sup>1</sup>GK §111f, g.



Along with the fully written introductory formulas

וַיְהִי / וַיְהִי biblical Hebrew employed

an abbreviated introduction, retaining the Waw and temporal

conjunction, but omitting the וְ / וְהִיא :

Judg. ii.18

וַיְהִי קִים וְיָמֵי 'whenever

Yahweh raised up' which the LXX translates literally:

καὶ ὅτι (sic) ἐγένετο κρείσσος ; Judg. iii.31

(preposition) אַחֲרָיו וַיְהִי שָׁמְגָר 'after him

there was Shamgar'; LXX καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ἀνέστη Σαμαγάρ .

In the first chapter of his Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament<sup>1</sup> Beyer surveys the temporal constructions

under discussion here<sup>2</sup>. The construction וַיְהִי

followed by temporal conjunction occurs about 400 times

in the OT<sup>3</sup>, especially in the older portions of the

Hebrew writings<sup>4</sup>. He concludes from his study that

while this construction was an essential syntactical

medium<sup>5</sup> for the original Hebrew narrators, it was

unnecessary for the LXX and other ancient versions of the

OT. The oddity of this construction literally trans-

<sup>1</sup> 'Satzeinleitendes καὶ ἐγένετο mit Zeitbestimmung', 29ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. especially 32-52.

<sup>3</sup> For statistics in the OT see Johannesson, op. cit. 161.

<sup>4</sup> p. 30.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Beyer, 61, 'notwendige syntaktische Mittel'.

lated into Greek becomes apparent when the temporal clause in the LXX is compared with natural Greek idiom. Nowhere in secular Greek does there appear anything related to the construction under consideration. In the first place, temporal conjunctions do not often appear as the first element in classical and Hellenistic Greek temporal clauses. When they do, however, they can stand alone ὅταν ἀπολύονται or, in most cases, they are followed by δὲ or οὖν ; ὅταν δ' ἀλλοικηται , ὅταν οὖν ἀβτδς παραγίνομαι .

In the NT

The majority of temporal clauses in the NT are written in good Greek style, employing δὲ immediately following the temporal conjunction; cf. Matt. vi.16

Ὅταν δὲ νηστεύητε 'When you fast'; Mk. xiii.14 Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα 'When you see the abomination'; Lk. xii.11 Ὅταν δὲ εἰσφέρωσιν ὑμᾶς 'When they bring you'. However there are scattered occurrences in the Gospels of temporal clauses which have a close similarity to the Semitic type noted in the LXX. Burney<sup>1</sup> cites five cases in Matt. where the

---

<sup>1</sup>Burney, op. cit., 12. On pp.11-13 are listed many instances of a closely related Hebrew idiom, that in which the introductory  $\text{׀} \text{׀} \text{׀}$  is followed by an infinitive with a preposition, usually  $\text{׀}$  or  $\text{׀}$ , rendered in the LXX by ἐν τῷ plus infinitive. Instances of

Hebraic καὶ ἐγένετο plus temporal conjunction is found, always at the conclusion of a narrative passage: vii.28 καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν Ἰησοῦς 'when Jesus finished'; cf. xi.1, xiii.53, xix.7, xxvi.1. This fully written form of the Hebraic temporal clause does not occur in the Apc.

An abbreviated form, based on examples from the OT noted supra, is found in the NT, employing καὶ as the first element of the clause, followed immediately by the temporal conjunction (omitting ἐγένετο ): Matt. vi.5 καὶ ὅταν προσεύχησθε 'when you pray'; the Lukan parallel (xi.2) has eliminated the καὶ. Cf. Mk. xi.25 καὶ ὅταν στήκετε ; cf. xii.11, xiv.7,25.

In the Apc.

A search of Hoskier's apparatus yields several passages which preserve the Semitic καὶ preceding the temporal conjunction: vi.12 καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγίδα 'I looked when he opened the seal'. Here the second καὶ supported by uncial P (Gregory 024) plus numerous minuscules is totally

---

this are to be found in the NT, especially in Luke-Acts. This type of temporal construction, however, is not found in the Apc.

unnecessary to the sense of the sentence from a Greek point of view, and is quite untranslatable. The only explanation for its existence seems to be that it represents a Hebrew Waw in  $\text{ׁו}$ . Other occurrences are: iv.9, vi.3,5,7, viii.1, x.4, xi.7, xii.4 καὶ (για)  $\text{ἵνα ὄταν τέχη}$ , also vs. 13; xvii.10, xviii.1, xix.1, xx.7, xxii.8.

#### FINAL CLAUSES

In Attic Greek, Final Clauses introduced by  $\text{ἵνα}$  or  $\text{ὅπως}$  employ either the subjunctive or (less frequently) the optative mood of the verb<sup>1</sup>, never the indicative<sup>2</sup>. In the NT the mood employed is generally subjunctive<sup>3</sup>, but especially significant is the occasional use (especially in Paul and the Apc.) of the future indicative in place of aorist subj.<sup>4</sup>, as illustrated by Apc. iii.9  $\text{ἰδοὺ ποιήσω αὐτοῦς ἵνα ἤξουσιν}$

---

<sup>1</sup>Schwyzler, 671ff.; K-G II, §553.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Moulton-Turner, III, 100, 'Its mood was always subjunctive in classical Greek (or oblique optative) ...'.

<sup>3</sup>So Bl-D §369.

<sup>4</sup>Turner, loc. cit., remarks that in Apc. and Paul the fut. indic. is used 'quite profusely' (with aorist subj. as variant, Bl-D §369 (2) ).

( ἤξωσι 046) καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν (-σῶσιν  
046) ... καὶ γυνῶσιν ( γνώσῃ Ν ) 'I will  
require of them that they come and prostrate themselves  
... and learn'.

The significant question, heretofore unsettled, may now be asked: is the intrusion of the future indic. in these NT final clauses to be attributed to a tendency in Hellenistic Greek to substitute indicative for subjunctive?<sup>1</sup> Turner, in his thorough treatment of NT final (purpose) clauses (note 2 supra) states that the fut. indic. is used in final clauses in Hellenistic Greek. Examples can be found in Radermacher's Grammar<sup>2</sup>: note the following:

ἀνάβαινε πρὸς με , ἵνα σοὶ ἀποτάξομαι <sup>3</sup> 'come towards me that I may set you apart'. Radermacher cites nine other exx. illustrating this use of fut. indic. in Hellenistic literature (but one example, Enoch vi.3 must be discounted because of its Semitic background). By his own admission, however, these are far from abundant<sup>4</sup>, so could hardly be called upon to explain the proliferation of ἵνα plus the future indic. in the NT, where Turner

---

<sup>1</sup>On the mixing of future indicative with aorist subjunctive, cf. Bl-D §§363, 369 (2), Radermacher, Neutestamentliche Grammatik (2nd ed. 1925), 174.

<sup>2</sup>Radermacher, op. cit., 173.

<sup>3</sup>Berlin Grk. Urk. III 8842, 14.

<sup>4</sup>Loc. cit., 'doch sind die Beispiele nicht häufig'.

finds no fewer than thirty-seven examples<sup>1</sup>. It is safe to say that the substantial intrusion of these futures indic. in NT final clauses cannot be adequately explained as due to Hellenistic developments. The NT as a whole exhibits neither carelessness nor indifference regarding the choice of mood.

In this study it was noted earlier (supra, chapter III, 'Aorist' subjunctive replaced by Future indicative following  $\Upsilon\upsilon\alpha$  ) that under specific conditions of Semitic influence biblical Greek employed the future indic. where it would not be acceptable in Greek. This was often done in the LXX to represent an imperfect tense verb in the original Hebrew text<sup>2</sup>. When a study is made of the final clause in biblical Hebrew one is struck by the fact that when the clause is expressed by a final conjunction plus finite verb, that verb is always an imperfect<sup>3</sup>. It is natural then for a Greek translator at least sometimes to forsake idiomatic Greek usage which would use  $\Upsilon\upsilon\alpha$  plus subjunctive, and to use instead the future indicative as the formal translation equivalent of the Hebrew imperfect tense. This is illustrated by the following examples from the LXX: Deut. xix.28  $\Upsilon\upsilon\alpha$  εὐλογῆσαι

---

<sup>1</sup>Turner, op. cit., 100, cf. Radermacher, op. cit., 216, who gives further examples outside the NT.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. also Bl-D §363.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. GK §165a,c; 107g.

(A) σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου 'so that the Lord your  
God might bless you' (MT verse 29) ]ַ]ַ]

יְיָ יְבָרֶכְךָ׃ הַיְיָ׃ יְיָ יְבָרֶכְךָ׃ III Ki. ii.3

ἵνα συνήσεις ἃ ποιήσεις 'that whatever you do  
might prosper'; MT תַּחַ לְיָשׁוּבַּ ]ַ]ַ]

תַּחַ לְיָשׁוּבַּ תַּחַ לְיָשׁוּבַּ - לַבַּ cf. ii.4 ἵνα

στήσει 'that the Lord may establish'; MT

וַיִּשְׁתַּבַּח׃ ]ַ]ַ]

The Hebrew passages are cited to illustrate how the imperfect always follows the final conjunction.

In the Apc.

In the following passages from the Apc. the final clauses are identical in syntax to those from the LXX:

(iii.9 cited supra), vi.4 ἵνα σφάξουσιν cf. verse 11

ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται (AP 046 1), viii.3 ἵνα δώσει

cf. verse 6 ἵνα σαλπύσουσιν (2084 2321), ix.4

ἵνα ἀδικήσουσιν verse 5 ἵνα βασανισθήσονται

verse 20 ἵνα μὴ προσκυνήσουσιν (N CA) (xiii.12

is identical), cf. viii.13 ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιήσει

(616 2084 2321), xiv.13 ἵνα ἀναπαήσονται ; verse 16

ἵνα δώσει , xviii.4 ἵνα μὴ συνκοινωνήσετε

(2044 2054 al), xix.18 ἵνα φάγετε (051\* 2056),

xxii.14 ἵνα ἔσται ... καὶ εἰσελεύσονται (syr<sup>ph</sup>)<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Turner, op. cit., 100 cites examples elsewhere in

It is now necessary to examine final clauses of another type. Frequently in biblical Hebrew the final clause, like most other dependent clauses, may be joined to its main clause by simple Waw copulative without the final conjunction<sup>1</sup>: see for example Lam. i.19

'... while they sought food ַן־נֶאֱמַר וַיִּשְׁׁוּ׃  
וַיִּשְׁׁוּ׃ that they might revive themselves'.

Here the LXX translator felt obliged to indicate the final force of the clause by inserting *ἵνα* : *ἵνα*

*ἐπιστρέφουσιν.* (X) *ψυχὰς ἀδελφῶν* ; cf.

I Ki. xi.21 'Send me away

׃ וְיֵצֵא־נִי לְאֶרְצִי׃

that I may go to my land'; LXX in this instance renders literally, in very un-Greek manner: *Ἐξαποστείλον*

*με καὶ ἀποστρέψω εἰς τὴν γῆν μου .*

In the Apc.

Compare now the following final clauses from the Apc. which exhibit identical construction: iv.1b

'*Ἀνάβα ὧδε , καὶ δεῖξω σοι* 'come up here so that I can show you'<sup>2</sup>; this is not Greek, but is obviously

---

the NT which employ future indicative in final clauses, indicating that this Semitism was widespread in biblical Greek.

<sup>1</sup>GK §165a.

<sup>2</sup>Not jussive as was suggested by Lancellotti, 71.

representing the Hebraic mode of final clause under discussion. The tense used in both LXX and Apc. is future indicative. A passage which has caused considerable confusion to translators is v.10 και ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς ... βασιλείαν και ἱερεῖς και βασιλεύσουσιν ( N P: not βασιλευουσιν of A 046 al) ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς 'and he made them ... kings and priests that they might reign on the earth' (not 'and they shall reign' of the RSV); ix.19 ... και ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀδικήσουσιν (181) 'that with them they might injure'<sup>1</sup>. Possibly also xi.7 'The beast shall make war with them και νικήσει αὐτοῖς και ἀποκτενεῖ αὐτοῖς that he might conquer and kill them'; xiii.7f. ... και ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἐπὶ πᾶσιν φυλῆν και λαδν ... και προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτόν ... and authority was given him over all tribes and peoples ... so that they should worship him'. xv.4 πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἤξουσιν και προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιον σου 'all the nations shall come that they might worship before thee'; xx.7f. λυθήσεται ὁ Σατανᾶς ... και ἐξελεύσεται κλανῆραι τὰ ἔθνη 'Satan shall be released ... that he might come forth to tempt the nations'; xx.10 (possibly): και ὁ διάβολος ... ἐβλήθη εἰς λίμνην τοῦ κυρδς και θελου ὕπου και τὸ θηρλον και ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης ,

---

<sup>1</sup>Lancellotti, 62f. would make ix.19b a circumstantial clause; I would prefer, on the basis of the syntax described here, to understand it as final.

καὶ βασανισθήσονται 'and the devil ... is thrown into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are, so that they might suffer'.

CONSECUTIVE (RESULT) CLAUSES

This section on syntax will conclude with observations on the Semitic nature of certain consecutive clauses in the Apc. The accepted manner of expressing result is by use of ὥστε followed by an infinitive<sup>1</sup> or indicative (rare in the NT): Rom vii.6 '... we are set free ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς so that we might serve ...'.

In Hebrew however, the consecutive clause is most frequently added by means of simple Waw copulative followed by the jussive<sup>2</sup>. This is especially found after interrogative sentences, e.g. Hos. xiv.10

מִי יָדוּעַ אֵלֶּיךָ אֲנִי מִי יִבְרָא אֵלֶּיךָ 'who is wise, so that he understands these things?'

The LXX translates

literally: τίς σοφός καὶ συνήσει ταῦτα ;

A clear occurrence of the same type of translation consecutive clause is found in Apc. xxi.3a 'Behold, God's presence is with men καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν

<sup>1</sup>Moule, Idiom Book<sup>2</sup>, 141.

<sup>2</sup>GK §166a.

so that He dwells with them'.

Summary of Chapter V Part B

The use of the attributive participle to express a relative clause is in line with Greek syntax, but the high frequency of occurrences in biblical Greek is difficult to account for, except as due to Semitic influence. The use of the possessive pronoun in a relative clause is peculiar to the Semitic languages, however, and is to be found influencing the phrase ὄνομα αὐτοῦ in the Apc. as well as in the 4th Gospel. Introduction of the relative clause by the use of an article, especially in the genitive case, can be traced directly to Hebrew syntax, which sometimes uses a definite article as a relative pronoun. This has influenced the Apc. in several places.

The translation of the Apc. is affected by the recognition that the attributive participle used to introduce a relative clause can, in Hebraic fashion, be resolved into a finite verb yet still express the sense of the participle, as in Apc. vii.14 'these are those who come ... and who wash ... ', and who whiten ... '. Such highly characteristic Semitic usage could hardly be explained as due to the author's style - it is best explained as translation Greek. Scott's 'comparative relative clause', found twice in the Apc., also can best be accounted for as due to translation from Hebrew.

The occurrence in the Apc. of two distinctly Semitic circumstantial clauses also is difficult to explain apart from the hypothesis of dependence on Semitic sources.

The conditional clause expressed by two imperatives linked by *καὶ* which Black cites where it occurs in the Gospels is also found in the Apc., based here on OT Hebrew usage. Most significant in determining Semitic influence is the phenomenon noted by Beyer where the customary sequence of the conditional clause is reversed, the apodosis followed by the protasis. This seems not to have any parallel in secular Greek, and can only be explained on the basis of such a reversal well-known in the Semitic languages. The three occurrences of this in the Apc. would seem to suggest again a Semitic source.

The Semitic mode of introducing a temporal clause with Waw immediately followed by the temporal conjunction is found several times in the Apc. Its un-Greek nature is emphasised by the fact that in some places copyists excised the *καὶ* from their texts.

Final clauses in Hebrew are expressed by the imperfect tense of the verb, and this usage has influenced passages in the Apc. to employ the Greek future indicative instead of the customary subjunctive. Where this has occurred, direct Semitic influence can be suspected. Likewise, the joining of a final clause to its main clause by simple Waw has influenced the Greek of the Apc. in several passages. Such usage is foreign to the Greek

language, and can be justified only by appealing to translation of a Semitic source for each occurrence.

Finally, the Hebrew consecutive clause, expressed by Waw plus jussive verb, is seen as the explanation for the unusual syntax of Apc. xxi.3.

CONCLUSION

The most significant observation which can be made regarding the Greek text of the Apc. is that there appears to be no manuscript or family of manuscripts which preserve a relatively high number of more Semitised readings affecting verbs and clauses. Research has failed here as it has with previous studies to turn up anything equivalent to the Western text of the Gospels and Acts with its greater number of Semitisms. Another fact, noted by previous researchers, has been observed again here as well, that the relative antiquity of the individual witnesses to the text of the Apc. has little to do with the number of Semitisms preserved by them. Of the Semitic constructions discussed in this thesis which are preserved in fewer than five extant witnesses, the 3rd century p<sup>47</sup> gives the more Semitised form in five places, but in four places the Semitism has been smoothed over. This hardly differs from a fifteenth century minuscule 2067, which has alone, or with just a few others, preserved in three places the more Semitised reading. From this it is evident that the reconstruction of the more primitive, Semitised text of the Apc. must proceed from a broad textual basis, not overlooking the testimony of any witness. It is interesting to note that codex Aleph, while considered to be inferior to the other uncials in the text of the Apc., has preserved more of the

Semitised readings cited in this thesis (a total of six), than has Alexandrinus, which is judged to be the best complete witness to the Apc. (it preserved only four Semitic readings in places where fewer than five witnesses support the variant, as compared to six for Aleph). Thus while no single manuscript of the Apc. can be considered as superior in respect to its more semitised nature, neither can any witness be a priori rejected merely on grounds of its age.

Regarding Hebrew meanings expressed by Greek verbs, a conjecture was made that passive occurrences of

θαραύξεται in the Apc. should be translated to express the sense 'be devastated', 'desolated'. Also the use of δίδωμι for 'set', and causative require is due to Hebrew usage.

The primary contribution of this study has been an increased understanding of the specific nature of Semitic influence in the important areas of verbal syntax and clauses in the Apc. The results, of course, may be applied to other Jewish Greek. The findings may be summarised as follows: 3rd person Impersonal Plural - while recent scholarship has shown this construction to be more widespread in Hellenistic Greek than previously assumed, still it cannot account for the greatly expanded use of it in Greek documents under direct Aramaic influence. The use of this construction to avoid naming God, also found in the Apc., can be shown to be based

on Aramaic usage. Concerning another problematic usage of the Voice in the Apc., we argued that the two occurrences of intransitive εὐαγγελίζεσθαι express a causative sense, based on the Hebrew piel and hiphil stem verbs. The Semitic custom of employing an auxiliary verb has probably left its mark on the Apc. in those places where such constructions as 'go and pour out', 'take and pour out', etc. occur. Regarding the long-standing puzzle of passives of θαυμάζειν in the Apc. we have cited new evidence showing them not to be merely deponent preferring the aorist passive ending, but rather to reflect a Hebrew meaning. Finally, the passive μνησθήναι was presented as a member of that group of 'theological passives' used to avoid naming God. This is due to the influence of Hebrew niphāl.

The use of the Mood in the Apc. has undergone the following forms of Semitic influence: the deliberative question is cast in the present indicative instead of the customary subjunctive mood under the influence of the Hebrew participle, which is used often for deliberative questions in the OT. Concerning the substitution of future indicative for aorist subjunctive, we noted how in the Apc. and elsewhere this can be explained as due to the tendency to translate Hebrew imperfect by Greek future indicative. Likewise the Greek future indicative with hortatory sense is due to a Hebrew cohortative.

Perhaps the single most important section of this study was that on the tenses of the finite verb, which developed more clearly than any previous study the formal translation equivalents employed in biblical and Jewish translation Greek. For the sake of clarity the relation between Greek and Semitic tenses is presented in graphic form, on p. 119 supra. At its most elementary level, the Greek present indicative represented a Semitic participle, while Greek aorist was used to render Semitic perfect tense verbs. The Greek future, then, was reserved for the Semitic imperfect, while the perfect represents Hebrew derived conjugations. Such translation equivalents were of course not always adhered to, and exceptions can be found for any category cited here. On the other hand, the very simplicity of this pattern, when seen in light of the many illustrations cited in the relevant section of this thesis, argues for its general validity. In determining the time at which the action took place one must deal with biblical Greek tenses in the same manner he would render Hebrew or Aramaic verbs - rely on the context of the verb in question. The related problem of sudden shifts of tense in the Apc., which has puzzled generations of scholars, is likewise solved by appealing to the shift in tense made in an underlying Semitic source.

A related Hebraic construction, the Waw consecutive, has left its mark on the syntax of the Apc. most clearly where it is used (represented in translation by *καὶ* ) to introduce the apodosis of a conditional clause, thus creating a syntactical oddity unknown in secular Greek.

Regarding Semitic influence on the infinitive, we noted that long ago Charles laid the foundation for explaining the Semitic nature of *τοῦ* plus infinitive in certain passages in the Apc. as expressing necessity. Here for the first time evidence is cited demonstrating that the construction was even better known in Aramaic and Syriac than in biblical Hebrew. By availing ourselves of Hoskier's apparatus we have discovered occurrences of this construction in the Apc. which have escaped the notice of previous scholars. In the case of infinitives which are resolved into finite verbs, based upon a well-documented Hebrew practice, further examples have been suggested in addition to those presented by Charles. Regarding the so-called 'nominal' use of the infinitive ascribed by Lancellotti to Hebrew influence, it was noted in this section that the construction is found in Greek as well, although there is admittedly a Hebraic construction in the OT which is identical.

In the section on Participles, it was shown that the resolution of a participle into a finite verb, on Hebraic lines, is well-attested in the Apc. New occur-

rences were added to those cited by previous scholars. The Seer's use of the perfect participle was seen to reflect Hebrew derived conjugations. On the widely-debated issue of whether participles used as relative clauses fall under some variety of Semitic influence, it is decided best to avoid the one-sided argument of exclusive influence of Hebrew, maintained by Lancellotti, and recognise that Hellenistic Greek made wide use of the same construction. In contrast to Greek participles which usually denote time past, present, or future in relation to their main verb, Hebrew participles of themselves express no difference of time. This has been found to influence the use of the participle in the Apc. Such usage appears most clearly in the circumstantial employment of the participle. We noted also that when the tense of the participle did not coincide in proper chronological sequence with that of the main verb, along the lines of Greek syntax, it was due to this timeless nature of the Semitic participle.

In a chapter on case additions added to the verb it was seen that when verbs in the Apc. take a case different from literary Greek usage, Hebrew syntax has influenced such a change. When the preposition is attached to the verb, its translation can be significantly varied if such Hebraic influence is overlooked.

Another aspect of Semitic influence on Greek not previously discussed is that of Semitic noun and verbal clauses. In this thesis it was seen that noun clauses which can be traced in the Apc. can be sorted into the same categories as their Semitic counterparts, depending on their mode of construction, and their meaning is the same - that of a fixed state. Verbal clauses, expressing action in contrast to a fixed state, are basic to both Greek and Semitic languages, thus no case can be made for Semitic influence upon them, except possibly regarding their word order, when it varies from that expected in usual Greek. While the evidence cited in this study sheds important new light on biblical Greek syntax, and aids in better exegesis by underlining the distinction between a fixed state and an action, it is not of such a specific nature that it would serve to indicate direct translation from Semitic sources.

The final chapter, dealing with Semitic-type subordinate clauses, showed that the use of the attributive participle to express a relative clause is in line with Greek syntax, but the high frequency of occurrences in biblical Greek is difficult to account for, except as due to Semitic influence. The use of the possessive pronoun in a relative clause is peculiar to the Semitic languages, however, and is to be found influencing the phrase  $\delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\ \alpha\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  in the Apc. Introduction of the relative clause by the use of an article,

especially in the genitive case, can be traced directly to Hebrew usage. This has influenced the Apc. in several places. The translation of the Apc. is affected by the recognition that the attributive participle used to introduce a relative clause can, in Hebraic fashion, be resolved into a finite verb yet still express the sense of the participle. R.B.Y. Scott's 'comparative relative clause', found twice in the Apc., is due to Hebrew influence also. Both these constructions can best be accounted for as due to direct translation from Hebrew. The occurrence in the Apc. of two distinctly Semitic circumstantial clauses also is difficult to explain apart from the hypothesis of dependence on Semitic sources. The conditional clause expressed by two imperatives linked by  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  which Black cites where it occurs in the Gospels is also found in the Apc., based here on OT Hebrew usage. Most significant in determining Semitic influence is the phenomenon noted by Beyer where the customary sequence of the conditional clause is reversed, the apodosis followed by the protasis. This seems not to have any parallel in secular Greek, and can only be explained on the basis of such a reversal well-known in the Semitic languages. The three occurrences of it in the Apc. would seem to suggest a Semitic source. The Semitic mode of introducing a temporal clause with Waw immediately followed by the temporal conjunction is found several times in the Apc. Its un-Greek nature is emphasised by the fact that

in some places copyists excised the *na!* from their texts. Final clauses in Hebrew are expressed by the imperfect tense of the verb, and this usage has influenced passages in the Apc. to employ the Greek future indicative instead of the customary subjunctive. Where this has occurred, direct Semitic influence can be suspected. Likewise, the joining of a final clause to its main clause by simple Waw has influenced Greek of the Apc. in several passages. Such usage is foreign to the Greek language, and can be justified only by appealing to translation of a Semitic source for each occurrence. Finally, the Hebrew consecutive clause, expressed by Waw plus jussive verb, is seen as the explanation for the unusual syntax of Apc. xxi.3.

It would be futile to suppose that on the basis of the new evidence presented in this study the vexing question of the original language of the Apc. could be finally and convincingly answered, but it would be disappointing as well if this research did not provide limited direction toward the eventual solution of the problem. Briefly, there have been three basic replies to the question of original language:

- a) the Apc. was originally written in Hebrew (Aramaic) and subsequently translated into Greek;

- b) the Apc. is in part a translation from Semitic documents, with linking sections written in Greek;
- c) the Apc. is composed de novo in Greek, uninfluenced by direct translation from sources; its peculiar grammar and syntax is to be explained solely on grounds of the author's unusual style.

The evidence here presented has, I believe, testified against alternative c), since the syntactical oddities examined were so often seen to be the same as those found in the LXX, and there due to translation of Hebrew. The choice between a) and b) is not so simple as some would wish, due to two facts; first, the Semitisms affecting the Verb and the Clause are seen to be widely scattered throughout the Apc., thus preventing the formation of a hypothesis that Semitic sources lie behind only certain portions of our present text. On the other hand, the second fact is that there are portions of the Apc. which are nearly free from Semitisms - i.e. the epistles to the Seven Churches, and at the same time portions which contain a concentration of these constructions, such as chapters eleven and twelve, etc. This has been noted previously, especially by Bousset and Charles, and it effectively prevents a cursory decision that a Semitic source underlies the entire Greek text of the Apc. It is perhaps best to suspend judgment on the matter until the complete evidence of the Semitic influence on grammar and syntax of the Apc. has been presented.

The related question of which Semitic language, Hebrew or Aramaic, underlies the relevant portions of the Apc. must also be reconsidered in the light of this thesis. R.B.Y. Scott, who maintained that the Apc. was wholly a translation from Hebrew, based his arguments partly on the obvious fact that the Apc. is very closely bound up with the Hebrew OT so far as citations and allusions are concerned. He and others who have adopted the same view have been unable to account for a few syntactical constructions which are far more at home in Aramaic than in OT Hebrew, however. Most noteworthy is the use of the participle in the sense of a finite verb, which is usual practice in Aramaic, but which occurs only occasionally in the Hebrew of the OT. Similarly, the use of the 3rd person impersonal plural verb is strongly Aramaic in character, while it occurs but rarely in biblical Hebrew. Also, the use in biblical Greek of the genitive articular infinitive influenced by the use of l<sup>e</sup> plus the infinitive is much more widely spread in Aramaic than in Hebrew. On the other hand, it is wise to avoid the opposite extreme of C.C. Torrey, who insisted that all evidence pointed to an Aramaic source for the whole of the Apc. Most of the syntactical peculiarities cited in this study could in fact be ascribed to both Hebrew and Aramaic. Until we have evidence to the contrary, it is probably safest to assume that due to its strong links with the language of the OT prophets, the

primary source of Semitic influence on the Apc. is biblical Hebrew, with allowance being made for certain Aramaisms whose existence is well established.

One recalls the statement by Nigel Turner in his discussion of the Greek of the 'Testament of Abraham'<sup>1</sup>:

... biblical Greek ... is usually so drenched in Semitic idioms and forms of syntax that it is extremely difficult to decide whether a book has been translated from Hebrew into Greek or whether it was originally composed in that language.

For the 'Testament of Abraham' Turner concludes that Hebraic influence is so strong that the book was either a direct translation, or it was composed in a form of Greek already influenced by Hebraic idiom and syntax.

'We may' he closes, 'call this "Jewish Greek" '. The Apc. can accurately be described in identical terms, and with no hesitancy be categorized as 'Jewish Greek', in the fullest extent of that term, in spite of recent protest<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>NTS 1 (1955), p.222f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Dr. Rydbeck's 'What Happened to New Testament Grammar after Albert De Brunner?' NTS 21 (1975), 425: 'peculiar language of a peculiar people is too much of a polemical slogan ... '.

APPENDIX I: "ΕΧΩΝ

Charles, followed by Ozanne, attributes ἔχων which is seemingly employed as a finite verb in Apoc. i.16 to semitic influence<sup>1</sup>, since it follows the pattern of participle equivalent to finite verb. But Beyer<sup>2</sup> points out that ἔχουσιν has no verbal equivalent in Hebrew or Aramaic. In illustrating this he cites statistics which show that the partic. active of ἔχουσιν (except in expressions such as ἐν γόσφρῳ ἔχουσιν, καθὼς ἔχουσιν, etc.) appears 115 times in the LXX, sixty of which are in I-IV Maccabees<sup>3</sup>. He concludes from this fact that NT occurrences of the related substantival partic. ὁ ἔχων reflect a Greek, not semitic, mode of expression. While it is so that ἔχων is used in Greek with the sense 'to have', yet the manner in which it is found (with or without article) in some NT passages seems to me to reflect a semitic construction which I will attempt to demonstrate.

---

<sup>1</sup>I, 29, 316; Ozanne, Thesis, 18f., who cites Apoc. v.6; x.2; xiv.14; xvii.3; xxi.24.

<sup>2</sup>Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament, 208f.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. Cf. H. Hanse, TWNT II, 817.

In the description of the four beasts given in Dan. ch. vii, the Aramaic  $\text{ܕܢܝܚܐ}$  is used to express the dative of possession, as follows:

vii.40  $\text{ܕܢܝܚܐ ܕܢܝܚܐ ܕܢܝܚܐ ܕܢܝܚܐ}$   
'and it had the wings ... of an eagle';

cf. verse 6  $\text{ܕܢܝܚܐ ܕܢܝܚܐ ܕܢܝܚܐ ܕܢܝܚܐ}$   
'and it had four wings ... ';

note also its use in vss.7,20. With these verses we now compare the description of the four living beings about the heavenly throne in Apoc. iv.7f, where the identical descriptive style of language is found:

καὶ τὸ τρίτον ζῶον ἔχων τὸ  
πρόσωπον [ ὡς ] ἀνθρώπου

'and the third being had the face of a man ... '

(vs.8) καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα ...  
ἔχων ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἕξ

'and the four beings ... had each six wings ... '

καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν οὐκ ἔχοντες  
(2053: εχοντα 2023\*\* 2321) ἡμέρας

καὶ νύκτος

'and they have no rest day nor night ... '

The Seer uses the partic. in this sense in the description of the New Jerusalem, ch. xxi. 11,12,14:

( και ἔδειξεν μοι ... Ἱερουσαλὴμ  
καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ... )  
ἔχουσαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ <sup>1</sup> ...  
ἔχουσα τεῖχος μέγα ... ἔχουσα  
κυλῶνας δώδεκα ...

(and he showed me ... Jerusalem descending from heaven ...) with the glory of God ... having a great wall ... with twelve gates ... and the wall of the city had twelve foundations ...'.

Obviously ἔχων is no literal equivalent of Aramaic  $\pi \zeta$  expressing possession, nor of Syriac 'iyt leh, which renders ἔχων every time it occurs in the Apoc. The significance is to be found, however, in the fact that all the ἔχων clauses cited are the equivalents of semitic noun clauses which in Aramaic/Syriac would be expressed by  $\pi \zeta$  / 'iyt leh (in

---

<sup>1</sup> Ἐχων here seems to express 'with', 'accompanied by' rather than simple possession, thus paralleling what Bl-D §419 term 'pleonastic' meaning 'with', which occurs in Lk. ii.42D: 'and when he was twelve years of age, his parents went up to Jerusalem with him ( ἀνέβησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες αὐτόν ). Cf. Mussies, 325f.

Hebrew,  $\text{is}$  ) of possession<sup>1</sup>. The importance of the distinction between noun and verbal clauses in semitic languages is universally recognised. The former always refers to a fixed state, the latter to an act. This basic difference of syntax plays an important role in OT exegesis<sup>2</sup>, and realisation that a similar mould was forced by Jewish and Jewish Christian authors on Greek syntax should open the field for possible new insights into translation and exegesis of portions of the NT as well. The syntactical distinction in this case derives from the fact that in Hebrew and Aramaic the noun clause is often used in descriptions such as those just cited<sup>3</sup>.

It remains now to explain why the Seer would favour the participial form  $\text{ἔχων}$  to express possession in a (Greek translation) noun clause<sup>4</sup>. This is likely due

---

<sup>1</sup>Lancellotti, 88 reaches similar conclusions along Hebrew lines.

<sup>2</sup>G-K §140e: the distinction 'is indispensable to the more delicate appreciation of Hebrew syntax ... involves fundamental differences of meaning'.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Bauer and Leander, 326 'drücken einen Zustand aus dienen der Beschreibung und Schilderung'. The distinction between noun - and verbal - clauses in Syriac is less distinct (cf. Nöldeke, 215).

<sup>4</sup>Of course not every occurrence of  $\text{ἔχων}$  in the Apc. should not be assigned a semitic sense;  $\text{ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα}$  is good Greek, likewise  $\text{ἔχων ἐν τῇ χειρὶ}$  has close parallels in other Greek literature.

to the fact that semitic noun clauses contain only nouns or their equivalents, i.e. pronouns, adjectives, or participles<sup>1</sup>. A verbal clause, on the other hand, has as its predicate a finite verb. The Seer, in employing this descriptive quality of the semitic noun clause would choose the partic. form ἔχων ; the finite ἔχω in such a context would signal a verbal clause instead of descriptive noun clause, thus spoiling the sense. The growing tendency in Aramaic to employ partics. as finite verbs<sup>2</sup> would of course blur somewhat the distinction between the two types of clauses in places where partic. were used<sup>3</sup> but this does not affect the construction under consideration because Aramaic possessive ܐܘܢܐ and Syriac 'iyt leh are of course not participial; and are firmly rooted in noun clause usage.

The distinction between noun and verbal clauses was bound to affect biblical Greek, yet NT grammarians seem not to have considered its influence, as far as I can determine. Even Charles in his Short Grammar of the Apoc. failed to note how the basic forms of the two types of clause have been transferred quite literally into Greek<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>G-K §140a, §141b.

<sup>2</sup>Bauer and Leander, .326.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>This subject will be treated supra in the section of this dissertation dealing with clauses.

APPENDIX II: THE RESUMPTIVE PRONOUN

We now make an excursus to study another Semitic characteristic of relative clauses, the resumptive pronoun, and especially to survey the recent work of W.F. Bakker<sup>1</sup>.

Professor Bakker, of the University of Amsterdam, has made a significant contribution to our understanding of the resumptive pronoun in Greek relative clauses. The study includes a rich selection of examples of its occurrence, arranged chronologically to cover Homer, the classical period, and Hellenistic Greek, in the widest sense of the term. Although tacitly confessing a lack of knowledge of Semitic languages<sup>2</sup>, the author does not hesitate to deal with the Greek of the LXX (including the apocrypha) and the NT, and to contend with the closely-debated issue of Semitic influence on the frequently-occurring resumptive pronouns there<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Pronomen Abundans and Pronomen Coniunctum.  
Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie  
van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks,  
Deel 82 (Amsterdam and London), 1974.

<sup>2</sup>On p.34, n.103 credit is given to P.W. van der Horst  
'for his assistance in interpreting the Hebrew texts'  
[of the OT] .

<sup>3</sup>See especially 34-42.

The author's primary contribution to the understanding of resumptive pronouns, stated in briefest form, is the distinction made for the first time between non-essential versus essential relative clauses. By non-essential (non-restrictive) is meant one which 'is not essential to the meaning of the sentence, but merely adds an idea. Such a clause does not determine the antecedent, but is almost independent'<sup>1</sup>. Into this category fall the resumptive pronouns in both ancient and Koine Greek, but excluding most (not all) from biblical Greek. Thus the author can conclude<sup>2</sup> that in ancient Greek the term pronomēn abundans is a misnomer because where the pronoun is employed it is not redundant, but serves a definite purpose. The situation in Koine Greek differs, since in at least some cases the pronomēn abundans serves to reinforce the relative pronoun which had been reduced to a mere connective.

The function of the widely employed resumptive pronoun in Semitic languages, according to Bakker, is altogether different. While truly Greek relative clauses which include a resumptive pronoun are non-essential, in

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 13,36; cf. 29 'not only in Ancient Greek, but also in the Koine, the pronomēn abundans is used for clearness' sake and in order to emphasise a certain word'.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. 32.

Hebrew/Aramaic the relative pronouns  $\aleph$  /  $\aleph^1$  have an inherent obscurity which is cleared up by addition of a personal or demonstrative pronoun. They become necessary to the full understanding of the sentence so are termed essential, in contrast to the non-essential Greek counterpart.

By applying this distinction to the resumptive pronouns in the LXX, the apocrypha, the NT, and NT apocrypha, Prof. Bakker seeks to determine whether occurrences of the resumptive pronoun in biblical Greek are due to Semitic influence.

Examination of Hoskier's apparatus shows the textual evidence to be surprisingly stable and consistent in transmitting the resumptive pronoun. The only possible instances not appearing in Nestle's text of the Apoc. for which ms. evidence exists are ii.18  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \delta$

$\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\upsilon\omicron\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\delta\varsigma\ \delta\omicron\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\delta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \phi\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\alpha$

$\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  'Thus says the Son of God, who has eyes like flames of fire' (lit. 'who has his eyes ... ')<sup>2</sup>; possibly also i.11, where a single minuscule preserves a resumptive pronoun:  $\text{Ὁ βλέψει γράψον εἰς βιβλίον καὶ πέμψον}$

$\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$  (792)  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma$  'Whatever you shall see, write in a book and send them to the churches'; finally, under this heading a conjecture will be put

---

<sup>1</sup>Described by the author as merely nota relationis, therefore by nature weaker and more ambivalent than a true relative pronoun.

<sup>2</sup>Cited by Lancellotti, 101f.

forward which, if accepted, would contribute to resolving an ambiguous, if not particularly troublesome, verse. Apc. i.1 is traditionally rendered 'The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him, to show to his servants what must take place' (RSV). The versions, ancient and modern, do not stray from this, and indeed it is the only way to understand the present text. The relative clause 'which God gave him' is the heart of the puzzle, though. How could the Seer write of God giving a disclosure of Jesus to Jesus? Textual evidence hints at a bit of primitive uncertainty at this point as well - for

ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ      046 reads      αὐτῇ      181 reads

αὐτοῦ . It could at least be suggested that αὐτῇ represents a corrupt form of an original resumptive pronoun αὐτήν ; i.e. ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτήν ὁ θεός 'which God gave it'. The verse would then be translated 'The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to show his servants what must take place ... '. The traditional αὐτῷ would be a primitive corruption which entered the text prior to the time the ancient versions were translated.

The method so clearly developed and fully set out in Prof. Bakker's monograph is accepted by this writer, with but two criticisms. First, the crucial decision of whether the relative clause in question is essential or not allows for a measure of subjective opinion, and so, it seems, cannot in itself be relied upon as an absolute

guide as to whether any given resumptive pronoun is essential or not. It would be safer to ask, after applying this rule, whether there is evidence for Semitic influence on the particular passage in question, before declaring that the resumptive pronoun is or is not Semitic. The author himself recognises this problem when he discusses the occurrences in the NT<sup>1</sup>. The second criticism concerns the accurateness of the statement made that the Semitic

$\gamma\psi\chi$  /  $\tau$  used to introduce relative clauses are merely nota relationis<sup>2</sup>. There is ground for arguing to the contrary, that  $\gamma\psi\chi$  is not simply a loose connecting particle but is essentially a demonstrative pronoun, often belonging to the main clause<sup>3</sup>. This has support from the fact that in Hebrew the demonstrative pronouns  $\overline{\pi}\overline{\iota}$  and  $\overline{\iota}\overline{\iota}$  are sometimes used as relative pronouns.

Bakker finds 18 examples of the resumptive pronoun in the NT<sup>4</sup> (based on Nestle's text), eight of which follow the Greek pattern (i.e. are non-essential). This number in a text the size of the NT corresponds favourably

---

<sup>1</sup>See 39f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. 33, 36.

<sup>3</sup>GK §138a, e.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. 42.

to the frequency of the construction in Koine Greek. Along with these are two examples termed 'uncertain'; then are listed eight cases where Greek would never have used a pronomen abundans, one in Mark (vii.25), seven in the Apc. (iii.8, vii.2,9, xii.6, xiii.8,12, xvii.9)<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Bakker also cites four Semitic type resumptive pronouns occurring in codex D (Luke viii.12, xii.43; Matt. x.11, xviii.20), but failed to include them in the statistics. Cf. Black Aramaic Approach<sup>3</sup>, 101 'The construction [resumptive pn.] again predominates in the text of D'.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, F.-M. Grammaire du Grec Biblique<sup>2</sup>, Paris, 1927.
- Allen, Leslie. The Greek Chronicles, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum xxi. 2 Vols, Leiden, 1974.
- Allo, E.-B. Saint Jean L'Apocalypse<sup>4</sup>, Paris, 1933.
- Bakker, W.F. Pronomen Abundans and Pronomen Coniunctum. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 82, Amsterdam & London, 1974.
- Ballantine, W.G. 'Predicative Participles with Verbs in the Aorist'. Bibliotheca Sacra (Oberlin, Ohio) XLI (1884), 787-99.
- Bauer, H. & P. Leander. Grammatik des biblischen Aramäischen. Halle-Saale, 1927.
- Bauer, W. Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literature. 5. Aufl. Berlin, 1958.
- Beyer, Klaus. Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament. Band I: Satzlehre. Göttingen, 1962.
- Birdsall, J.N. 'The Text of the Revelation of Saint John'. Evangelical Quarterly xxxiii (1961), 228-237.
- Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts<sup>3</sup>. Oxford, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Biblical Languages'. The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. I. Ed. by P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans. Cambridge, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Some Greek Words with "Hebrew" Meanings in the Epistles and Apocalypse', in the Festschrift for Prof. William Barclay, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament'. NTS 18 (1972), 1-10.
- Blake, F.R. A Survey of the Hebrew Tenses. Rome, 1951.
- Blass, F. Grammar of New Testament Greek. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. London, 1898.
- \_\_\_\_\_ & A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Trans. and Rev. by Robert Fund. Chicago, 1961.

- Bousset, W. Die Offenbarung Johannis<sup>6</sup>, Meyer's  
Kommentar. Göttingen, 1906.
- Brockelmann, C. Hebräische Syntax. Neukirchen, 1956.
- Brown, F., S. Driver, C. Briggs. A Hebrew and English  
Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford, 1907  
(1974 reprint).
- Burney, C.F. 'A Hebraic Construction in the Apocalypse'.  
JTS xxii (1921), 371-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_ The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel.  
Oxford, 1922.
- Burrows, Millar. 'Orthography, Morphology and Syntax  
of the St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript'. JBL 68  
(1949), 209-17.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Original Language of the Gospel  
of John'. JBL 49 (1930), 95-139.
- Burton, E. De.W. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New  
Testament Greek<sup>3</sup>. Edinburgh, 1898 (reprinted  
1955).
- Caird, G.B. A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John  
the Divine. Black's New Testament Commentaries.  
London, 1966.
- Chambers, C.D. 'On a Use of the Aorist Participle in  
Some Hellenistic Writers'. JTS XXIV (1923),  
183-87.
- Charles, R.H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on  
the Revelation of St. John. The International  
Critical Commentary. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1920.
- Conybeare, F.C. & George Stock. Selections from the  
Septuagint. Boston, 1905.
- Cowley, A. Aramaic Papyri of the 5th Century B.C.  
Oxford, 1923.
- Dalman, G. Words of Jesus. Edinburgh, 1902.
- Daube, David. 'Participle and Imperative in I Peter'  
in E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of Peter.  
London, 1947.
- Davies, W.D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism<sup>2</sup>, London, 1962.
- Delitzsch, Franz. Hebrew New Testament<sup>5</sup>. London, 1883.

- Driver, G.R. Review of C.C. Torrey, The Apocalypse of John in JTS n.s. xi (1960), 383-89.
- Driver, S.R. A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew<sup>3</sup>. Oxford, 1892.
- Ewald, George, H. Commentarius in Apocalypsin Johannis Exegeticus et criticus. Leipsig, 1828.
- Frisk, Hjalmar. 'Partizipium und Verbum finitum im Späthgriechischen'. Kleine Schriften. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XXI (1966), 432-42.
- Gesenius-Kautzsch (Cowley). Hebrew Grammar<sup>2</sup>. Oxford, 1910.
- Goodwin, William W. A Greek Grammar, London, 1891.
- Gwynn, John, ed. The Apocalypse of St. John in a Syriac Version Hitherto Unknown. Dublin, 1897.
- Hanse, H. Article ἔχω in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. II, 817-32.
- Harrison, R.K. Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1969.
- Helbing, R. Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta. Göttingen, 1928.
- Hort, F.J.A. The Apocalypse of John I-III. London, 1908.
- Hoskier, H.C. Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse. 2 vols. London, 1929.
- Howard, W.F. 'On the Futuristic Use of the Participle in Hellenistic'. JTS xxiv (1923), 403-6.
- Jannaris, A.N. An Historical Greek Grammar. London, 1897.
- Johannessohn, M. 'Das biblische καὶ ἐγένετο und seine Geschichte' Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 53 (1925), 161-213.
- Johns, A.F. A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic. Berrien Springs, 1966.
- Jodon, P. Grammaire de l'hebreu biblique. Rome, 1947.
- Katz, P. in J. Ziegler, Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta. Nachrichten der Akademie der wissenschaften in Göttingen (phil.-hist. Klasse), Jahrgang 1958, nr.2.

- Kaupel, H. 'Beobachtungen zur Übersetzung des Infinitivus Absolutus in der LXX', ZAW n.f. 20 (1945-48 (1949) ), 191-92.
- Kautzsch, E. Grammatik des biblische-Aramäischen. Mit einer kritischen Erörterung der aramäischen Worte im Neuen Testament. Leipzig, 1884.
- Keder-Kopfstein. 'Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen Kausative in der Vulgata'. ZAW 85 (1973), 197-219.
- Kenyon, F.G. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Fasc. iii. London, 1934.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. 'Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament' in Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid. Regensburg, 1963. Pp. 125-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . 'Professor J. Schmid on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse'. Vigiliae Christianae 13 (1959), 1-13.
- Kühner-Blass. Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. 2 vols. Hannover, 1890.
- Lancellotti, A. Sintassi ebraica nel greco dell 'Apocalisse: I. Uso delle forme verbali. Collectio Assisiensis I. Assisi, 1964.
- Laughlin, T.C. The Solecisms of the Apocalypse. Princeton, 1902.
- Liddell & Scott-Jones. Greek-English Lexicon<sup>9</sup> with a Supplement. Oxford, 1968.
- Lisowsky, A. Konkordanz zum hebräischen Alten Testament. Stuttgart, 1958.
- Lohmeyer, E. Die Offenbarung des Johannes<sup>2</sup>, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen, 1953.
- Lohse, E. Die Offenbarung des Johannes. Neue Testament Deutsch 11. Göttingen, 1960.
- Lücke, F. Versuch einer Vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesammte apokalyptische Litteratur. Bonn, 1852.
- Mandilaras, Basil G. The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri. Athens, 1973.

- Mayser, E. Grammatik der Griechisch. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. II. Satzlehre. Berlin & Leipzig, 1926.
- Moule, C.F.D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek<sup>2</sup> Cambridge, 1970.
- Moulton, J.H. & W.F. Howard. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. vol. II. Edinburgh, 1929.
- Moulton, J.H. & Nigel Turner. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. vol. III. Edinburgh, 1963.
- Mussies, G. The Morphology of Koine Greek as used in the Apocalypse of St. John. Supplement to Novum Testamentum xxvii. Leiden, 1971.
- Nöldeke, T. Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik. Leipzig, 1880.
- Ozanne, C.G. The Influence of the Text and Language of the Old Testament on the Book of Revelation. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Manchester University. Manchester, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Language of the Apocalypse'.  
The Tyndale House Bulletin 16 (April, 1965), 3-9.
- Rabin, C. Zadokite Documents. Edited with a Translation and notes. Oxford, 1954.
- Radermacher, Ludwig. Neutestamentliche Grammatik<sup>2</sup>. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen, 1925.
- Reynolds, Stephen. 'The Zero Tense in Greek. A Critical Note'. Westminster Theological Journal, xxxii (1969), 68-72.
- Rydbeck, Lars. Fachrosa, Vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 5. Uppsala, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'What Happened to New Testament Greek Grammar after Albert De Brunner?' NTS 21, (1975), 424-27.
- Schmid, Josef. 'Neue Griechische Apokalypsehandschriften' ZNW 59 (1968), 250-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes. 2. Teil, Die alten Stämme. Munich, 1955.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Unbeachtete und unbekannte griechische Apokalypsehandschriften' ZNW 52 (1961), 82-88.
- Schmid, Wilhelm. Review of R. Helbing, Kasussyntax. Philologische Wochenschrift 49 (1929), 468.
- Schwyzler, E. Griechische Grammatik<sup>2</sup>. vol. II Syntax (completed and edited by A. Debrunner). Munich, 1959).
- Scott, R.B.Y. The Original Language of the Apocalypse. Toronto, 1928.
- Segal, M.H. A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew. Oxford, 1927.
- Simcox, W.H. The Revelation of St. John the Divine. Cambridge Greek Testament. Cambridge, 1893.
- Stevenson, W.B. Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic<sup>2</sup>, Oxford, 1962.
- Swete, H.B. The Apocalypse of St. John<sup>2</sup>. London, 1907.
- Tasker, R.V.G. 'The Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Apocalypse of John'. JTS 50 (1949), 60-68.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek. Part I. Cambridge, 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_ The LXX and Jewish Worship<sup>2</sup>. London, 1923.
- Torrey, C.C. The Apocalypse of John. New Haven, 1958.
- Turner, Nigel. Grammatical Insights into the New Testament. Edinburgh, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Testament of Abraham: Problems in Biblical Greek'. NTS 1 (1955), 222-23.
- Vogels, H.J. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Apokalypseübersetzung. Dusseldorf, 1920.
- Vogt, E., ed. Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti. Rome, 1971.
- Wellhausen, J. Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien<sup>2</sup>. Berlin, 1911.
- Wifstrand, Albert. 'Apostelsgeschichte 25, 13' Eranos (Uppsala) LIV (1956), 123-37.

Wilcox, Max. Semitisms of Acts. Oxford, 1964.

Wüthwein, E. Der Text des Alten Testaments<sup>4</sup>.  
Stuttgart, 1974.

Zerwick, M. Biblical Greek<sup>4</sup>. Rome, 1963.

Kilpatrick, G.D. 'The Greek New Testament Text of Today  
and the Textus Receptus'. The New Testament  
in History and Contemporary Perspectives;  
Essays in Memory of G.H.C. Macgregor. Edited  
by H. Anderson and W. Barclay. Oxford, 1965.

Metzger, B.M. The Text of the New Testament<sup>2</sup>. Oxford, 1968.